U.S. Congress.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 77th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 87—PART 11

MARCH 17, 1941, TO MAY 20, 1941

(PAGES A1185 TO A2384)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1941

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
APR 4 '42

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 77th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Appendix

White House Correspondents' Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 17, 1941

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very outstanding address delivered by the President of the United States at the White House correspondents' annual dinner at the Willard Hotel on Saturday evening, March 15, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The PRESIDENT. This dinner of the White House Correspondents' Association is unique. It is the first one at which I have made a speech in all these 8 years. It differs from the press conferences that you and I hold twice a week. You cannot ask me any questions; and everything I have to say is word-for-word on the record.

For 8 years you and I have been helping each other. I have been trying to keep you informed of the news of Washington, and of the Nation, and of the world, from the point of view of the Presidency. You, more than you realize it, have been giving me a great deal of information about what the people of this country are thinking.

In our press conferences, as at this dinner tonight, we include reporters representing papers and news agencies of many other lands. To most of them it is a matter of constant amazement that press conferences such as ours can exist in any nation in the world.

That is especially true in those lands where freedoms do not exist—where the purposes of our democracy and the characteristics of our country and of our people have been seriously distorted.

Such misunderstandings are not new. I remember that in the early days of the first World War the German Government received solemn assurances from their representatives in the United States that the people of America were disunited; that they cared more for peace at any price than for the preservation of ideals and freedom; that there would even be riots and revolutions in the United States if this Nation ever asserted its own interests.

Let not dictators of Europe and Asia doubt our unanimity now.

Before the present war broke out on September 1, 1939, I was more worried about the future than many people—most people. The record shows I was not worried enough.

That, however, is water over the dam. Do not let us waste time reviewing the past, or fixing or dodging the blame for it. History cannot be rewritten by wishful thinking. We, the American people, are writing new history today.

The big news story of this week is this: The world has been told that we, as a united Nation, realize the danger which confronts us—and that to meet that danger our democracy has gone into action.

We know that although Prussian autocracy was bad enough, nazi-ism is far worse.

Nazi forces are not seeking mere modifications in colonial maps or in minor European boundaries. They openly seek the destruction of all elective systems of government on every continent—including our own; they seek to establish systems of government based on the regimentation of all human beings by a handful of individual rulers who have seized power by force.

These men and their hypnotized followers call this a new order. It is not new. It is not order. For order among nations presupposes something enduring—some system of justice under which individuals, over a long period of time, are willing to live. Humanity will never permanently accept a system imposed by conquest and based on slavery.

These modern tyrants find it necessary to their plans to eliminate all democracies—eliminate them one by one. The nations of Europe, and indeed we ourselves, did not appreciate that purpose. We do now. The process of the elimination of the European nations proceeded according to plan through 1939 and 1940, until the schedule was shot to pieces by the unbeatable defenders of Britain.

The enemies of democracy were wrong in their calculations for a very simple reason. They were wrong because they believed that democracy could not adjust itself to the terrible reality of a world at war.

They believed that democracy, because of its profound respect for the rights of men, would never arm itself to fight.

They believed that democracy, because of its will to live at peace with its neighbors, could not mobilize its energies even in its own defense.

They know now that democracy can still remain democracy and speak and reach conclusions and arm itself adequately for defense.

From the bureaus of propaganda of the Axis Powers came the confident prophecy that the conquest of our country would be "an inside job"—a job accomplished not by overpowering invasion from without, but by disrupting confusion and disunion and moral disintegration from within.

Those who believed that knew little of our history. America is not a country which can be confounded by the appeasers, the defeatists, the backstairs manufacturers of panic. It is a country which talks out its problems in the open, where any man can hear them.

We have just now engaged in a great debate. It was not limited to the Halls of Congress. It was argued in every newspaper, on every wave length, over every cracker barrel in the land. It was finally settled and decided by the American people themselves.

The decisions of our democracy may be slowly arrived at. But when that decision is made it is proclaimed not with the voice of any one man but with the voice of 130,000,000. It is binding on all of us. And the world is no longer left in doubt.

This decision is the end of any attempts at appeasement in our land, the end of urging us to get along with the dictators, the end of compromise with tyranny and the forces of oppression.

The urgency is now.

We believe firmly that when our production output is in full swing the democracies of the world will be able to prove that dictatorships cannot win.

But now the time element is of supreme importance. Every plane, every other instrument of war, old and new, which we can spare now we will send overseas. That is common-sense strategy.

The great task of this day, the deep duty which rests upon us is to move products from the assembly lines of our factories to the battle lines of democracy now.

We can have speed and effectiveness if we maintain our existing unity. We do not have and never will have the false unity of a people browbeaten by threats and misled by propaganda. Ours is a unity which is possible only among free men and women who recognize the truth and face reality with intelligence and courage.

Today, at last, ours is not a partial effort. It is a total effort; and that is the only way to guarantee ultimate safety.

Beginning a year ago, we started the erection of hundreds of plants and we started the training of millions of men.

Then, at the moment the aid-to-democracies bill was passed, we were ready to recommend the $7,000,000,000 appropriation on the basis of capacity production as now planned.

The articles themselves cover the whole range of munitions of war and of the facilities for transporting them.

The aid-to-democracies bill was agreed to by both Houses of the Congress last Tuesday afternoon. I signed it one-half hour later. Five minutes later I approved a list of articles for immediate shipment. Many of them are on their way. On Wednesday I recommended an appropriation for new material to the extent of $7,000,000,000; and the Congress is making patriotic speed in making the appropriation available.

Here in Washington we are thinking in terms of speed, and speed now. And I hope that that watchword will find its way into every home in the Nation.

We shall have to make sacrifices—every one of us. The final extent of those sacrifices will depend upon the speed with which we act now.

I must tell you tonight in plain language what this undertaking means to you—to your daily life.

Whether you are in the armed services; whether you are a steel worker or a stevedore, a machinist, or a housewife, a farmer or a banker, a storekeeper or a manufacturer—to all of you it will mean sacrifice in behalf of country and your liberties. You will feel the impact of this gigantic effort in your daily lives. You will feel it in a way which will cause many inconveniences.

You will have to be content with lower profits from business because obviously your taxes will be higher.

You will have to work longer at your bench, or your plow or your machine.

Let me make it clear that the Nation is calling for the sacrifice of some privileges, but not for the sacrifice of fundamental rights. Most of us will do that willingly. That kind of sacrifice is for the common national protection and welfare; for our defense against the most ruthless brutality in history; for the ultimate victory of a way of life now so violently menaced.

A half-hearted effort on our part will lead to failure. This is no part-time job. The concepts of "business as usual" and "normalcy" must be forgotten until the task is finished. This is an all-out effort—nothing short of all-out effort will win.

We are now dedicated from here on to a constantly increasing tempo of production—a production greater than we now know or have ever known before—a production that does not stop and should not pause.

And so tonight I am appealing to the heart and to the mind of every man and every woman within our borders who love liberty. I ask you to consider the needs of our Nation at this hour and to put aside all personal differences until our victory is won.

The light of democracy must be kept burning. To the perpetuation of this light each must do his own share. The single effort of one individual may seem very small. But there are 130,000,000 individuals over here. There are many more millions in Britain and elsewhere bravely shielding the great flame of democracy from the black-out of barbarism. It is not enough for us merely to trim the wick or polish the glass. The time has come when we must provide the fuel in ever-increasing amounts to keep the flame alight.

There will be no divisions of party or section or race or nationality or religion. There is not one among us who does not have a stake in the outcome of the effort in which we are now engaged.

A few weeks ago I spoke of four freedoms—freedom of speech and expression, freedom of every person to worship God in his own way, freedom from want, freedom from fear. They are the ultimate stake. They may not be immediately attainable throughout the world but humanity does move toward those ideals through democratic processes. If we fail—if democracy is superseded by slavery—then those four freedoms, or even the mention of them, will become forbidden things. Centuries will pass before they can be revived.

By winning now, we strengthen their meaning, we increase the stature of mankind and the dignity of human life.

There is a vast difference between the word "loyalty" and the word "obedience." Obedience can be obtained and enforced in a dictatorship by the use of threat and extortion or it can be obtained by a failure on the part of government to tell the truth to its citizens.

Loyalty is different. It springs from the mind that is given the facts, that retains ancient ideals and proceeds without coercion to give support to its own government.

That is true in England and in Greece and in China and in the United States today. And in many other countries millions of men and women are praying for the return of a day when they can give that kind of loyalty.

Loyalty cannot be bought. Dollars alone will not win this war. Let us not delude ourselves as to that.

Today, nearly a million and a half American citizens are hard at work in our armed forces. The spirit and the determination of these men of our Army and Navy are worthy of the highest traditions of our country. No better men ever served under Washington, or John Paul Jones, or Grant, or Lee, or Pershing. That is a boast, I admit, but it is not an idle one.

Upon the national will to sacrifice and to work depends the output of our industry and our agriculture.

Upon that will depends the survival of the vital bridge across the ocean; the bridge of ships which carry the arms and food for those who are fighting the good fight.

Upon that will depends our ability to aid other nations which may determine to offer resistance.

Upon that will may depend practical assistance to people now living in nations which have been overrun should they find the opportunity to strike back in an effort to regain their liberties.

This will of the American people will not be frustrated either by threats from powerful enemies abroad or by small, selfish groups or individuals at home.

The determination of America must not be obstructed by war profiteering.

It must not be obstructed by unnecessary strikes of workers, by short-sighted management, or by deliberate sabotage.

For, unless we win, there will be no freedom for either management or labor.

Wise labor leaders and wise business managers will realize how necessary it is to their own existence to make common sacrifice for this great common cause.

There is no longer the slightest question or doubt that the American people recognize the extreme seriousness of the present situation. That is why they have demanded, and got, a policy of unqualified, immediate, all-out aid for Britain, Greece, China, and for all the governments in exile whose homelands are temporarily occupied by the aggressors.

From now on that aid will be increased—and yet again increased—until total victory has been won.

The British are stronger than ever in the magnificent morale which has enabled them to endure all the dark days and the shattered nights of the past 10 months. They have the full support and help of Canada, and the other Dominions, of the rest of their Empire, and non-British people throughout the world who still think in terms of the great freedoms.

The British people are braced for invasion whenever the attempt may come—tomorrow—next week—next month.

In this historic crisis, Britain is blessed with a brilliant and a great leader in Winston Churchill. But, no one knows better than Mr. Churchill himself, that it is not alone his stirring words and valiant deeds which give the British their superb morale. The essence of that morale is in the masses of plain people who are completely clear in their minds about the one essential fact—that they would rather die as free men than live as slaves.

These plain people—civilians as well as soldiers and sailors and airmen—women and girls as well as men and boys—are fighting in the front line of civilization, and they are holding that line with a fortitude which will forever be the pride and the inspiration of all free men on every continent and on every island of the sea.

The British people and their Grecian allies need ships. From America, they will get ships.

They need planes. From America they will get planes.

They need food. From America they will get food.

They need tanks and guns and ammunition and supplies of all kinds. From America they will get tanks and guns and ammunition and supplies of all kinds.

China likewise expresses the magnificent will of millions of plain people to resist the dismemberment of their nation. China, through the generalissimo, Chiang Kai-Shek, asks our help. America has said that China shall have our help.

Our country is going to be what our people have proclaimed it must be—the arsenal of democracy.

Our country is going to play its full part.

And when dictatorships disintegrate—and pray God that will be sooner than any of us now dares to hope—then our country must continue to play its great part in the period of world reconstruction.

We believe that the rallying cry of the dictators, their boasting about a master race, will prove to be pure stuff and nonsense. There never has been, there isn't now, and there never will be any race of people fit to serve as masters over their fellow men.

The world has no use for any nation which, because of size or because of military might, asserts the right to goose step to world power over other nations or other races. We believe that any nationality, no matter how small, has the inherent right to its own nationhood.

We believe that the men and women of such nations, no matter what size, can, through the processes of peace, serve themselves and serve the world by protecting the common man's security; improve the standards of healthful living; provide markets for manufacture and for agriculture. Through that kind of peaceful service every nation can increase its happiness, banish the terrors of war, and abandon man's inhumanity to man.

Never in all our history have Americans faced a job so well worth while. May it be said of us in the days to come that our children and our children's children rise up and call us blessed.

The Ohio Society of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAN GURNEY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 17, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT A. TAFT, OF OHIO

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] before the Ohio Society of New York on Monday, March 10, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My good friends from Ohio, for 2 months the attention of the country has been directed almost exclusively to the subject of aid to Britain and the lease-lend bill. The building up of our own Army and Navy has gone steadily on, but the newspapers and the radio have paid little serious attention to our own defense. Now that the lease-lend bill is out of the way, there is no subject upon which we can achieve national unity so easily and so quickly as on that of national preparedness. Hardly a speech made for or against the lease-lend bill failed to assert with emphasis the speaker's belief that our primary concern was the defense of the United States. Aid to Britain itself was urged only as the best method of assisting our own preparedness program. The appropriation of billions for Great Britain was justified as a method of avoiding the appropriation of still more billions for ourselves.

The question of military preparedness is one of money and organization. Congress has appropriated the money without limitation as soon as it was asked for by the Executive. Sometimes I think the grants have been almost too liberal. But the organization of industry has been much more slowly brought about. Practically nothing was done before the German attack in May, 1940. Then for months we functioned under a Council of National Defense, without a chairman and without power. Finally, after the November election, a more effective organization was set up—the Office of Production Management—with two coordinate chiefs, but with considerably more power than the Council of National Defense. The theory of two bosses of equal authority is recognized as unsound by nearly everyone who analyzes the problem, but I am sincerely hopeful that it is working in spite of this handicap. Certainly production is rapidly increasing, and we should be soon in a position where we can be of some real assistance to Britain. Industrial production has always been a more important means of aiding England than the lease-lend bill.

SOUND FISCAL POLICY ESSENTIAL TO DEFENSE

But there is one field in which no progress whatever has been made, even in the determination of basic policy. That is the field of finance. After all, financial preparedness is just as necessary as military preparedness. We cannot organize successfully for production except on a sound financial foundation. We cannot obtain military and naval equipment and supplies unless we are prepared to pay for them. We cannot get men to work in industry without providing them with the means for a reasonable living for themselves and their families. Today, more than ever before, war is a matter of organization, and the whole structure of mechanized warfare and unlimited production must be built on a sound fiscal foundation. Disorganization in finance will disorganize production, perhaps at the very moment when that production is most essential to success in war.

It is peculiarly necessary that we place our finances on an absolutely sound basis, because we are up against an opponent whose organization in this field is nothing if not efficient. Hitler has not followed orthodox methods. He has not the slightest interest in maintaining free enterprise or a system of private investment. He has organized his country on a socialistic basis, and, according to some of his own supporters, he deals in work hours instead of in money. That is merely a method of saying that he compels his workmen to take what he can give them in the way of food and clothing and housing instead of paying them wages in real money. All of us are convinced that our own American system is the best in the long run, and absolutely essential to maintaining the liberty of our people, but if it is going to compete with Hitler's system, it must be administered with ability and courage and sympathy. If it is administered by incompetent hands, or by those who are more interested in changing the system than in making it work, Hitler's ruthless competence will have a big advantage. If we should be caught in the transition from a capitalistic economy to a socialistic economy, we would have all the disadvantages of both systems.

CONDITION OF THE BUDGET

Up to this time we have disregarded all the danger signs pointing toward a breakdown of our present system. We have seen it abused without effective protest. We have seen 10 years of completely unbalanced Budgets. We have steadily increased the debt from $20,000,000,000 to $45,000,000,000. The Budget just presented by the President indicates a deficit of $6,000,000,000 for the year ending July 1, and a deficit of $9,000,000,000 for the year ending July 1, 1942. But that is only the beginning. We have already received estimates for $4,220,000,000 of appropriations and a billion and a half dollars of contract authorizations, deficiency or supplemental, which were not included in the Budget. It is estimated that there will be at least another one and one-half billion dollars of similar estimates. The probable expense under the lease-lend bill is perhaps limited by the physical shipments which it is possible to make out of this country, but, as passed, we have authorized the Government to finance shipments to England from all over the world, and to advance unlimited sums to any nation in the world. An estimate of $4,000,000,000 for the next 12 months is probably reasonable. Altogether that indicates a deficit for the 2 years of at least $27,000,000,000 and a public debt on July 1, 1942, of more than $70,000,000,000. This is in spite of a considerable increase in taxes and estimated tax receipts for the next fiscal year of $8,900,000,000. The whole tax program has been a patch quilt, and no comprehensive study has been made to determine what our tax system should be, or how much of the defense program should be paid from taxes and how much from borrowing.

CONDITION OF THE BANKING SYSTEM

The condition of our banking and currency system is also extremely unsatisfactory. Of the outstanding Government bonds, approximately twenty billion are held by the banks, and represent money loaned by the banks to the Government rather than a permanent placing of such bonds with investors. The Treasury is apparently planning to sell at least a billion of bonds a month for the next 15 months. If it succeeds in placing three billion of these bonds with investors, I think it will have done a good job. That means that the Government is intending to call on the banks to lend them an additional $12,000,000,000, with almost a corresponding increase in deposits, and an artificial increase of purchasing power in this country. Of course such an increase will tend to raise prices and start an inflationary spiral, increasing in turn the expense of the defense program, and promising a fatal reaction after the war. Incidentally, it is likely to force the Government to adopt a complete price-control system and the planned economy which must accompany such a system. The volume of demand deposits and currency is already 50 percent greater than in any other period in our history. Excess reserves are huge and are constantly increasing. The last report shows that they amount to $7,000,000,000. Since the early part of 1934, $15,000,000,000 of gold have flowed into this country, and there is no immediate prospect that the direction of this flow can be reversed. The presence of these excess reserves removes to a large extent the control which the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury can exercise over private lending if prosperity should develop.

The situation with regard to reserves is so serious that for the first time since the creation of the Federal Reserve System, the Board of Governors, the presidents of the 12 Federal Reserve banks, and the members of the Federal Advisory Council representing the 12 Federal Reserve banks, presented a joint report to Congress on January 1, 1941. They called attention to the dangerous financial condition, and made certain definite recommendations regarding the increase of statutory reserve requirements and the repeal of various powers given to the President looking toward further inflation of the currency. Since that report was presented, the administration has not made a single step toward its enactment into law. I, myself, introduced bills increasing the reserve requirements in accordance with the Federal Reserve recommendations putting an end to the President's power further to devalue the dollar, ending his power to issue $3,000,000,000 in greenbacks and one and a half billion dollars more silver certificates against the silver seigniorage, and stopping the purchase of foreign silver. The only comment from the administration has been a slighting remark about the Federal Reserve report from the Secretary of the Treasury at a press conference.

I do not think it is possible to exaggerate the danger in the present situation. Of course, no one can tell when the lid will blow off. But if anything is certain, it is that no nation, any more than an individual, can go on living indefinitely on borrowed money, and no nation can permit artificial purchasing power to increase indefinitely through the expansion of private credit without fatal consequences at some time. Sooner or later the end must be the bankruptcy court in one form or another. Inflation has so many meanings, and we have been threatened by it so often that most men have apparently lost their concern about its coming to pass. But if we pursue our present course, it must come to pass. Presumably it will be at the moment when our system is subjected to the greatest strain, and obviously that time is going to be in the midst of war if we get into war. War today is costing Britain $30,000,000,000 a year. It would undoubtedly cost this country $50,000,000,000 a year. Piled on top of the tremendous debt which already exists, it is certainly no mere pessimism which sees the possibility of a financial breakdown at the very time when we require the greatest war effort.

INFLATION AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

What is inflation and what are its consequences? Inflation really means a spending by the Nation as a whole of more money than is justified by what the Nation is producing, or by the normal production which can be maintained for any considerable length of time. It is made possible by the borrowing of money either by the Government, which is deficit spending, or too much borrowing by the people, sometimes politely called an expansion of credit. It may be in all degrees. We saw an inflation in the World War due to vast foreign purchases and the war expenditures of our own Government, which could not be maintained after the war. We saw an inflation in the twenties, brought on by loans to finance exports and loans to buy securities, loans which could not go on continually increasing, and some of which turned out to be bad from the beginning. The result is always a reaction to a level below normal. In 1932 the reaction was peculiarly violent, bringing on the depression, bankrupting many individuals and communities, and throwing millions out of work.

Many instances of still more violent results exist in the history of the world. As a rule, the worst are in connection with an inflation of the currency, but such an inflation has nearly always resulted from a continually unbalanced budget, that is, the continued borrowing of money by the Government itself. If the Government stops borrowing, it is likely to bring about depression. If it continues borrowing, the debt in time becomes so heavy that the people will not stand for the burden. The Government might frankly repudiate its obligations or impose a capital levy, but usually it has printed paper money with which to pay its debts, and finally that paper money has depreciated and sent prices sky-high.

Of course, no one suffers so much from inflation as the poor man. He is the one who is thrown out of work by the depression. In the first stages of currency inflation, prices increase much faster than wages, and, of course, that affects the poor families most. As men lose confidence in the Government's credit or in its sincere determination to maintain that credit, prices rise much faster. In Germany they got to a point where a pair of shoes cost $10,000, and then ultimately $100,000. Wages go up, but not quite so fast. Those who are most seriously affected are the groups on a fixed salary like employees of government and teachers of all kinds. Colleges and charitable institutions find their income destroyed. They have the dollars from their investments, but the dollars won't buy anything. A man who has saved all his life in the savings banks or by the purchase of life insurance finds that his widow may get the same amount in dollars, but the dollars she gets won't even pay the water bill. Inflation is just a form of Government repudiation, which benefits no one except the speculator and injures the poor man more than the wealthy. It is redistribution of wealth with a vengeance but without the vestige of any justice or equality.

The policy which we are pursuing is one which must lead ultimately to the destruction of the free-enterprise system. If we do bring about a depression greater than the one in 1932, or if we do bring about a currency inflation, my own judgment is that the Government will have to step in and reorganize the entire system. We will have to start again from scratch. If a system is put together by the Government, it is going to be some form of socialism. The free-enterprise system is like humpty-dumpty—if it is once broken, all the king's horses and all the king's men can't put it together again, except perhaps in the form of an omelet. And it doesn't make any difference that the system will have been wrecked by abuse and maltreatment without any fault of its own. It won't make any difference that its failure was brought about by those who wanted it to fail.

Already in England the debt has become so tremendous that we hear talk of a capital levy and complete socialism after the war. We have not yet the proportionate debt that England has, but a few years of war would take us there. We would at best face a redistribution of wealth and a system in which a supposed equality is maintained by the Government. That can't be done except under a totalitarian state. American totalitarianism might not take the form of fascism or communism, but it would be likely to leave just as little freedom to the individual.

Whether we get in the war or not, we face an exceedingly serious problem. No matter how we treat that problem, we are going into a period of some inflation which must inevitably bring about some kind of bad reaction. There is a proper demand that we commence to study now the measures that we should take after the war. But the best way to deal with the situation after the war is to pursue now the soundest and most intelligent policy. Our only hope can be to make the reaction as mild as possible.

The plans of the New Deal economists to deal with the after-war crisis are even more alarming than the crisis itself. In brief, they consist of more and greater Government spending for New Deal purposes as the spending for defense decreases. Priming the pump having failed, they have now evolved a theory that the people are saving too much money. First, they say thrift must be discouraged. Second, the Government must tax it away from the thrifty. Third, if the Government can't take it by taxation, at least it must borrow it and spend it on other less thrifty people. Of course, this theory leads to an indefinite expansion of the Government debt, to the discouragement of private investment, and the ultimate control of all investment by the Government. If you think I am exaggerating, just read the testimony of Mr. Mordecai Ezekiel before the T. N. E. C. on February 24. The way to cure the evils of excessive Government spending is more Government spending. If they are right, we must throw into the wastebasket all the lessons of arithmetic and experience combined.

Then there are plenty of people in Washington who actually desire to secure the kind of government which will administer planned economy. There are plenty of people in Washington who see in the wreck of our present financial system the possibility of bringing about the policy they have been promoting for many years. It is essential that the fiscal policy be worked out and administered by those who are real friends of the present American way of life, sincerely desiring to make the present system work. It is very discouraging that no policy has even been suggested. Up to date we have only had the makeshift bill to increase the national-debt limit so that borrowing may be made easier and easier.

A DEFINITE POLICY NEEDED

What should our policy be? How can inflation be checked? How can we avoid bankruptcy and post-war disaster? Obviously the best way is to cut down the Government deficit. That can be done by cutting expenses or by increasing taxes. The President and the Secretary of the Treasury have themselves stated that all non-defense expenditures must be cut to the bone. But when they present their own budgets we find that those expenses have not been cut in any degree, and I do not think they are going to be. Congress is always a poor body to accomplish economy, and when the Executive has once requested the money and has a majority to support him in both Houses of Congress a reduction of his estimates becomes almost impossible. It is very difficult to concentrate responsibility in Congress, and even an economy bloc often loses the votes of those Members whose constituents are directly benefited by the expense in question.

Furthermore, it is almost impossible to cut expenses without a radical change in many of the New Deal policies which the administration is carrying out. If we are going to have a Federal W. P. A. instead of assisting the States, then the billion dollars which is requested for next year is none too much. This is the time when the whole policy ought to be changed, and relief turned back to the States and local authorities with Federal grants to assist. This is the time when the agricultural policy ought to be changed and plans to benefit the farmer worked out which do not involve vast subsidies from the public purse. There are plenty of plans which will remove the need of a direct agricultural subsidy of a billion dollars a year. It is perfectly futile for the administration to talk about cutting domestic expenses at the same time that they advocate the very policies which require that those expenses continue.

NECESSITY FOR MORE TAXES

The alternative is the increase of taxation. After all, we may as well face the facts. If the people demand the continuance of the kind of government which is spending 25 percent of the national income on Federal, State, and local expenses—and apparently they do—then we must devise a tax system that will take 25 percent of their income away from the people and give it to the Government to pay for those expenses. Probably at the present time it is impossible completely to balance the Budget. We may perhaps legitimately say that a considerable part of the defense expenditures is extraordinary. The cost of the new ships necessary to make a two-ocean navy and the cost of training camps may well be shared with future generations, but the normal maintenance of these increased military establishments should be paid from taxation. As far as I can see, we are going to have a two-ocean navy no matter who wins the war. We are going to have an increased army and air force no matter who wins the war. I have estimated very roughly that the normal maintenance of Army and Navy is going to amount to $4,000,000,000 a year for many years to come, in place of the billion and a half which we spent the last year before the war. That is a permanent increase, and it ought to be met by permanent taxation. It means a normal Federal tax bill of $11,000,000,000, an increase of $2,000,000,000 a year over the taxes to be produced under existing law.

I have not studied the problem completely enough to advocate as yet any particular form of taxation. The Secretary of the Treasury has refused to do so, although he recommends that 60 percent of the expenses be paid from taxation, which would certainly mean a $2,000,000,000 increase in taxes. We might as well face the fact also that these taxes are going to fall on every man, woman, and child in the United States. If Government requires 25 percent of the national income to pay its expenses, then it is simply impossible to obtain anything like that amount from the wealthy directly or through corporation taxes. If we confiscated all income in excess of $10,000 apiece, we could only get about three and a half billion dollars, of which we already get 40 percent from existing law, and we would only get that for about a year. If we can get from the wealthy from 5 to 10 percent

of the national income, which would require very high rates indeed, we will have done a good job. So if we require 25 percent of that income for Government expense, all the rest of the people are going to have to contribute from 15 to 20 percent of their individual income toward the expense of government. This means more income taxes, sales taxes, and pay-roll taxes, for rich and poor alike. It is highly desirable that all of us know we are paying the taxes which we all inevitably pay even today, so that we can restore again some sense of responsibility about Government activities. We have been going on the theory that we can have something for nothing; that we can have all kinds of Government hand-outs without anybody paying the bill. If the present system is going to work at all, if we are going to avoid a worse depression than 1932, if we are going to secure financial preparedness, we must face the facts and pay the taxes that are necessary.

CHECKS ON CURRENCY INFLATION

The reduction of the President's powers to inflate the currency is also highly desirable, so that no one can take the first steps on the road to currency inflation. If those powers are removed, the pressure toward a sound policy of taxation becomes greater. The power to devalue the dollar would increase the price of gold, which is already far above its real value. The issue of greenbacks is inconceivable.

Some increased power over reserves is necessary to check inflation in case we should develop a real business boom in the United States. We have had a long psychology of pessimism about business activity, but public psychology sometimes changes overnight, and the time may easily come when demands for private loans meet the desire of the banks for increased profits. Whether the exact reserve plans of the Federal Reserve banks are the best, I do not pretend to know, but I do think that Senator WAGNER, as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, should immediately proceed to obtain all the expert opinion possible and take some such action as the Federal Reserve authorities recommend. There must be some power somewhere to control the unlimited increase of private credit.

UNITY CAN BE SECURED

Above all, we must face the problem. It has been made even more acute by the passage of the lease-lend bill. It is the principal problem before Congress and the principal task of Congress between now and the 1st of July. In no field of activity has the administration been as reckless and uninterested as in the field of finance. For years it has been inspired by the belief that deficits are a blessing in disguise; that they promote prosperity; that debt can go on increasing forever. But now we are up against a situation where the Nation must insist on a sound policy. Now we are up against a situation where the financial soundness of the Nation is just as essential a part of national preparedness as battleships and soldiers and guns. If the administration will not recommend a policy, then Congress itself must develop that policy. I don't believe that there would be any serious difficulty in reaching an agreement on policy between the majority and minority leaders in Congress if the New Dealers don't interfere. Certainly the Republicans are willing to share the responsibility for whatever unpleasant realities are necessary to insure the sound financial preparedness of the United States. I trust they may be consulted in the preparation of a program.

Discussion of Farm Legislation by Clinton County (Ind.) Farmers' Guild

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 17, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE FRANKFORT (IND.) MORNING TIMES OF MARCH 4, 1941

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Frankfort (Ind.) Morning Times of March 4, 1941, entitled "Farmer Guild in Discussion of Legislation."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Frankfort (Ind.) Morning Times of March 4, 1941]

FARMER GUILD IN DISCUSSION OF LEGISLATION—SAMUEL BOLLINGER PRINCIPAL SPEAKER AT REGULAR MEETING SATURDAY NIGHT

Farm legislation was the topic for discussion of the Clinton County Farmers Guild when they met Saturday evening in Dinwiddie Hall. Sam Bollinger led the discussion and gave an interesting talk concerning the efforts of the American farmer to secure the American markets at an American price. He traced the history of farm legislation and spoke of various farm bills now before Congress. He spoke substantially as follows:

The first society for the promotion of American agriculture was organized in 1785, having for its purpose the improvement of lands and crops. Many others followed. The United States Department of Agriculture was established in 1862 as a bureau for educational purposes under the direction of a commissioner. It was made an executive department in 1889 under President Cleveland, and became the only business to have direct representation in the President's Cabinet. The Land Grant Act was enacted in 1862 whereby 30,000 acres of land were set aside for each Congressman to permanently endow at least one college in each State for the teaching of agriculture and mechanical arts. The Hatch Act of 1887 provided an annual appropriation for each of these schools of $15,000, followed by the Adams Act of 1906 with an annual appropriation of $15,000 additional. Then came the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, the Clarke-McNary Act of 1924, the Purnell Act of 1925, and the Capper-Ketchum Act of 1928, all carrying appropriations for these colleges and their extension work. Some of these acts require appropriations by recipient States to match the Federal grants. The total grant to Indiana for 1935 was $225,000 and the State of Indiana raised $317,000 to match these funds, for cooperative extension work. The educational program was further extended by the Farmers Institute, the agricultural fairs, and the county-agent system. This program raised yields, improved livestock, and raised the standard of rural health, and took but little interest in marketing conditions. The world markets readily absorbed our surpluses, and newly married couples could embark in farming and in due season become landowners. Latin America was not much of a competitor, and no thought was given to an agricultural protective tariff.

The World War of 1914–18 suddenly changed the entire picture. Argentina, attracted by high farm prices, suddenly practiced intensive farming and became a competitor. European farm inventories were at low ebb after the war, and with the release of Army manpower the farmers of Europe set to rebuilding their own markets. The American farmer was thus deprived of his markets, and to add to his woes the Federal Reserve Board began the process of devaluation, starting the agricultural depression which is with us to this day.

The agricultural colleges, to which the farmer had turned for a solution of his problems for 60 years, at last failed him. Schooled only in production, they were helpless before the problem of economics. The solution was thrown back on the farmers themselves, and in 1925 the leaders of 46 distinct farm organizations met and formed the Corn Belt Committee. At this meeting were representatives of the National Grange, Farmers Union, Farm Bureau, the present officers of the National Farmers Guild, and many commodity cooperatives. Agriculture at least presented a united front, and through this Corn Belt Committee solidly endorsed the McNary-Haugen bill, which presupposed that the farmer was entitled to his costs of production. A subcommittee was appointed to ascertain production costs, which consisted of Milo Reno, Edward Kennedy, John Tromble, Thomas Cashman, and Henry A. Wallace, now Vice President of the United States. This committee established cost-of-production figures as follows: Milk, $2.76 per hundredweight; corn, 94 cents per bushel; hogs, $11.32 per hundredweight; wheat, $1.33 per bushel; cotton, 25 cents per pound; oats, 50 cents per bushel. However, at Mr. Wallace's insistence, his schedule was adopted, with milk, $4.04 per hundredweight; corn, $1.36 per bushel; hogs, $13.60 per hundredweight; wheat, $2.90 per bushel; cotton, 32 cents per pound; and oats, 75 cents per bushel.

The McNary-Haugen bill was passed by Congress only to be vetoed under influence of the industrial East, who could not see that $1 of farm income produced $5 turnover in national income. Following these vetoes there came the Thomas-Swank bill and the McNary-Woodruff cost-of-production bills, but the farmers were rebuffed as they awaited the new administration of 1933.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act was passed in 1933 calling for parity loans, which were to act as a ceiling over farm prices. The Norris-Simpson amendment to give cost of production was discarded. On July 12, 1933, Mr. WALLACE, then Secretary of Agriculture, issued a release to the press stating that cost-of-production prices in Iowa and Illinois was 34 cents for corn, 30 cents for oats, and 66 cents for wheat. Immediately following this release, corn dropped 17 cents per bushel, wheat dropped 35 cents per bushel, and oats dropped 14 cents per bushel in 3 days' time, and the grain market called for a close to prevent utter collapse.

Under the old A. A. A., the Secretary of Agriculture asked distillers to use only cereal grains bought at the market plus the processing tax, and, if this did not equal parity prices, to pay the difference into the Treasury to be used as a special fund to make parity payments to farmers. The distillers agreed, but this fund of over a million dollars still lies in the United States Treasury.

In 1934 was introduced the Thomas cost-of-production bill, but the tendency was to give the A. A. A. a trial. The Massingale-Eicher cost-of-production bill was introduced in 1936, but the Presidential campaign called for defense of the A. A. A. and it was forgotten. In 1937 the Massingale-Eicher-McAdoo cost-of-production bill was introduced and was defeated in the Senate. In 1939 there was introduced in Congress a bill entitled the "Agricultural Equality Act," sponsored by 18 Senators and 13 Representatives, which would have accomplished parity for agriculture without drawing parity loans from the Government. It would have placed a "floor" under farm incomes, but the A. A. A. seemed intent on placing a "ceiling" over farm incomes through the storage of huge surpluses, and the legislation died in committee.

The present Congress is already glutted with bills covering the farm problem, all sincere, no doubt, but many misdirected. The A. A. A., in asking a continuance for its policies, is asking full "parity-price loans" of 100 percent on cotton, wheat, tobacco, and rice and 85 percent on corn, although some agitation is being seen to include corn on a full parity basis. Just why the A. A. A. sponsors 100-percent loans instead of market parity I do not know. Full parity loans require costs of interest, handling, administration, etc., to be carried by the taxpayers as an unnecessary expense during the stress of national defense, when market parity is being offered, waiting only for the stroke of a pen. The Agricultural Equality Act of 1941 will establish full market parity and remove the "ceiling" from farm incomes without taking 1 cent from the Federal Treasury. It retains some of the worthy features of the A. A. A. Other proposals are the "income certificate," which is a refined processing-tax plan, and an outright processing tax as outlined in the pending Agricultural Commodities Parity Act.

Other pending farm legislation of interest to farmers is the Gilchrist hog processing-tax refund, to release to farmers invalidated processing taxes, the farmers refinance measure to finance farm indebtedness at rates accorded the Federal Treasury, proposals as yet to be introduced, for extension of Frazier-Lemke moratorium, refinancing of moratorium cases by the F. C. A. at 100 percent of appraised value, repeal of Reciprocal Trade Act, establishment of a Bank of the United States, and unlimited extension of the Dies committee.

General Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 17, 1941

ARTICLE BY IGNATIUS K. WERWINSKI

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD a tribute to Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, Polish-American hero of the Revolutionary War, written by Ignatius K. Werwinski, United States Commissioner of Deeds for Indiana, who is one of many who have exerted their efforts to have October 11 established as General Pulaski's Memorial Day.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNDER OUR FLAG

(By Ignatius K. Werwinski, lieutenant, Officers' Reserve Corps; also former chairman of the United States Pulaski Sesquicentennial Commission)

Under our flag, purest, most potent emblem of law, order, Christian civilization, that ever saluted the dawn, during the Revolutionary War, gave a life to a hero of two hemispheres, Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

Under our flag, ne'er dropped in dust of defeat, fostered by revered father of the Revolution, the name of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, is imperishably written in letters of gold on the pages of American history, defying the ages.

Under our flag, floating in zephyrs of high heaven o'er the eternal capital of a republic, founded on the rock of righteousness, symbol of humanity's fondest, dearest hope, forever proclaiming justice, human brotherhood throughout the land, through the inspiration left us by Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

Under our flag, unstained, untarnished, bejeweled, gleaming in darkest night, her triumphal march across the centuries a path of light. Who dare touch with profaning hand, this sleepless majestic guardian of an ardent, strong, brave, free people, and under which flag Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski gave his life in Savannah, Ga., on October 11, 1779.

Under our flag, inspiration of a mighty race, mingling in sentiment of cherished children, native of her soil undefiled, and lovers of liberty from every clime, seeking naught but the common good, yearning to serve mankind 'neath sheltering aegis of the red, white, and blue, under which Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski fought.

Under our flag, immortalized by Washington, and under which flag fought Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, her beauteous folds spread from Gulf to coast by Jefferson, borne aloft by Lincoln in strife of heroes that united as one a sisterhood of States and blended the blue and gray, in fires of patriotism, preserving every star in the shining standard of national sovereignty. May Old Glory, under which Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski fought and gave his life, in all the flood of time, wave with undimmed radiance and increasing splendor over the fairest expanse of God's earth.

Under our flag, precious, sublime inheritance, blessing of America's faith, power, unity, sanctified by patriot blood of our hero, Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, we consecrate anew in o'erflowing measures our hearts, our eager, willing service of hand and brain to the defense and greater glory to our country for which Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski fought and gave his life.

Under our flag may the American people pay the due tribute to the memory of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski on the one hundred and sixty-first anniversary of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, Revolutionary War hero, by observing and commemorating the anniversary of his death.

Dedicated to the Sons of the Revolution.

October 11, 1940.

National Labor Relations Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 17, 1941

ARTICLES BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in view of the fact that insertions have been made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of statements with respect to certain articles written by David Lawrence, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the articles to which references have previously been made.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[March 3, 1941]

The National Labor Relations Board has just issued what may prove to be an invitation to labor unions in national-defense industries to use a new weapon of sabotage—the "slow down" strike.

Although the Supreme Court of the United States has denounced the "sit down" strike, the Labor Board now rules that because there is no seizure of property or damage to property in the "slow down" it is a legitimate vehicle of union activity.

The latest decision was rendered by Members Leiserson and Smith. The third member of the Board, Dr. Millis, did not participate because he was not in office when the hearings were held. But the decision stands because it is Mr. Leiserson's vote that is decisive.

The Board has once before, under the old regime, arrogated to itself the right to say that it may rule on whether union activities are defensible, but it was not believed that in view of the spirit, if not the letter of the Supreme Court's opinion in the so-called Fansteel case, the Labor Board would ever sanction plain weapons of sabotage.

The text of the new ruling, which came down in the Cudahy packers' case last week, says in part:

"During each of the three work stoppages staged by the P. W. O. C. (a C. I. O. union) that day the employees walked about the room, conversed in scattered groups, sharpened their knives, or stood or sat down at their stations of work. There was no violence or injury to persons or property nor any attempt to exclude officials of the company from the floor. The employees appear to have completed the slaughtering of the scheduled number of animals that day, and, inasmuch as the respondent deducted one-half hour from the time clocked by the employees in each department that day, it evidently sustained no financial loss from the stoppages. * * *

"DEFENSES REVIEWED

"It is clear, as the respondent (the company) virtually conceded, that the employees in the beef and sheep departments concertedly stopped work on February 25, 1939,

pursuant to a program planned and executed by the P. W. O. C. in support of its position in a dispute with the respondent (the company) respecting conditions of work. The stoppages were, in other words, instances of collective union activity. To discharge employees for leading participation in such activity necessarily discourages membership in a labor organization.

"In advancing the second asserted defense of the discharges the company assumes correctly that the stoppages of February 25 were a type of strike. However, the claim that an employer is privileged to discharge employees for striking is refuted by the express language of the act, which specifically safeguards the right to strike. Section 13 of the act provides: 'Nothing in this act shall be construed so as to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike * * *.'

"Nor can we agree with its (the company's) contention that these stoppages were sit-down strikes or an 'outlaw enterprise.' The stoppages did not involve seizure or destruction of or damage to the respondent's property."

Now the Supreme Court may or may not uphold that decision, which is obviously an attempt to legalize "slow-down" strikes by introducing a narrow interpretation of the alleged difference between two types of sabotage. But Congress certainly did not intend to give the National Labor Relations Board plenary powers to legalize interferences with production on the ground that they are covered by the right to strike. The fact that the employees did not leave the plant, but occupied the work benches, and that conveyor belts were stopped so as to prevent work from going on is in itself a form of "sit-down" strike, different only from the Michigan strikes in that work is intermittently stopped and not over long periods of time. The interference with production is as plain in one case as in the other.

PRECEDENT ESTABLISHED

Although the employer is held to have deducted wages for the interruptions, and in this instance the same amount of work was done in a day as if work hadn't stopped, the Labor Board nevertheless establishes a precedent allowing employees to introduce work stoppages irrespective of what may happen to deliveries of the goods. Stoppages on airplane production could be compensated for in deductions of wages, but that would not bring planes to Britain on scheduled delivery dates.

The significance of the decision lies in the possibility of bringing labor relations in America closer and closer to the communistic concept of workers' committees which control production. The idea was conveyed by C. I. O. leaders in connection with "slow-down" strikes in the automobile industry a year or so ago and it was revived in another form in the so-called Reuther plan, supposedly for making 500 planes a day—an important feature of which was workers' participation in the management function.

If employers must now submit to work stoppages which are legally construed to be a proper union activity so that the employer is legally prevented from hiring new employees who will work continuously at the job, the transition from management control of production to workers' committees or unions may be said to be complete.

The surprise is that W. M. Leiserson, who has been hailed as an impartial labor expert, should join with the radical member, E. S. Smith, in writing such a destructive precedent. If Congress does not soon overhaul the Wagner Act so as to limit its operations insofar as defense industries are concerned, the number of work stoppages in America which are so pleasing to Herr Hitler are bound to multiply in the critical months of 1941.

[March 7, 1941]

To what extent is the National Labor Relations Board and its policies responsible for the encouragement of agitation which leads to strikes because of a refusal by the board to compel collective bargaining elections the moment there is a public claim of a majority or a dispute concerning the desires of a majority of the workers in a given plant?

This question is pertinent in view of the confession just made by the Labor Board itself of the various dilatory steps which its procedure permits before elections for collective bargaining are actually ordered.

The Board, of course, contends that it is the Wagner Act itself which permits such delays, but in truth the regulations of the Board and its discretionary power could cover the contingencies mentioned without legislation.

Thus, for example, the Board claims that it permits employers to petition for an election and this impression has been broadcast, but the truth is the board allows the employer to petition for an election only when there is a dispute between two rival unions. He is not allowed to petition if he has reason to doubt that a union has a majority of his employees signed up and if he thinks his employees want no union at all to represent them.

EXAMPLE IS CITED

In the last 24 hours an interesting example of the break-down of the Wagner Act's provision for collective bargaining as an alleged means of preventing strikes has been given to the public. John R. Steelman, director of the United States Conciliation Service, who is trying to bring the C. I. O. and the International Harvester Co. together so as to terminate a serious strike on a defense contract, said that the company urged that the strikers go back to work and petition for a National Labor Relations Board election to determine whether a majority were members of a C. I. O. union that called the strike. The head of the C. I. O. flatly refused the proposal and insisted that the grievances be settled at once.

It might be asked of what avail is a collective-bargaining machinery when it does not promptly establish in the public interest whether a union does or does not possess the majority power? The fact is that the Labor Board in many instances does not interject itself into the the situation and compel elections, but avails itself of all sorts of devices which prevent the election from being held, so that in many cases the unions themselves see no advantage in immediately using the machinery set up for them by the law.

The exact words of the Board's policy are given in a circular letter sent out by the Board's director of information a few days ago to the press in which this confession is made:

"If there is reasonable doubt as to the union's claim of a majority, or if the majority is contested by another organization, then the Board holds an election. There are still other cases in which a union may be sure of its own majority, but the employer may say that he has no knowledge of the majority. In such cases the union may insist on recognition by the employer and refuse to petition for an election. The law gives the union this right, and it takes the chance of proving its majority and a violation of the act at a hearing, when the employer is charged with refusing to bargain collectively. But in every case where a union asserts a claim of a majority to the Board the Board conducts an investigation; and if the claim is supported by a sufficient showing of membership or designation of the union by employees, or other designation by the employees of the union to represent them, and charges of unfair labor practice are disposed of, the Board orders an election."

EXPLANATION OF STRIKES

In the foregoing explanation by the Board itself can be seen why defense strikes are on the increase. The Board takes the view that a union can refuse to petition for an election but can file unfair labor-practice charges on the ground that an employer refuses to bargain. The employer may be in doubt as to whether a majority of his employees have designated the union as a bargaining agent, but he cannot find out the truth through any help from the Board; for the Board doesn't let him petition unless there are rival unions.

The union which claims the majority isn't compelled to show as against an unorganized group, whether it has a majority, nor can it be compelled to desist from raising the issue every few weeks. For, unless the Board steps in and orders an election—which is what this correspondent has been advocating as a means of making collective-bargaining machinery effective—there can be no immediate counting of noses in a shop and hence conditions can be kept upset indefinitely.

The Board's policy in insisting that unfair labor practice charges be disposed of before elections are ordered merely prolongs the agitation. For it takes a long while to handle these charges in hearings and through the courts, when the whole issue could have been resolved at the outset by a mandatory election which the Board really has power to effectuate now under the present act. If it be charged that this works against a union which hasn't attained at the time enough members for a majority rule, then the Board could specify that elections can be held every 6 months on a given date from the time the issue is resolved. The Board's present policy merely has the effect of collusion with labor organizers until a propitious moment for the holding of an election and then the Board freezes the situation for at least a year, and sometimes longer.

The fact remains that nothing of a truly effective nature is being done in the defense situation particularly, to compel collective bargaining so as to carry out the boasted preamble of the Wagner law, which is that establishment of collective bargaining will tend to promote labor peace.

[March 8, 1941]

The National Labor Relations Board maintains an office of information for the purpose of informing the press of its activities and policies, but lately the board has countenanced the sending of misleading statements to the newspapers in a manner prejudicial to the American Federation of Labor.

The chronology of the incident is as follows:

On February 2, William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, issued a public statement which was widely printed in the newspapers of the country, declaring that the American Federation of Labor

claimed it had a majority of the workers in the three big Ford plants in Michigan.

On February 3 this correspondent referred in these dispatches to Mr. Green's statement as an evidence of a conflict of interest between the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, which also claimed a majority and hence the right to sole bargaining power for all Ford workers.

On February 27 news came of the formal filing with the Michigan Mediation Board of an intention by the Congress of Industrial Organizations to call a strike in the Ford plants. This correspondent wrote on that date: "The Congress of Industrial Organizations claims a majority of workers in the big Ford plants and so does the American Federation of Labor," and added that it was up to the National Labor Relations Board to bring about an expeditious election.

ERROR CHARGED

On March 3 the Director of Information of the Labor Board wrote a circular letter to the newspapers in which he said: "Mr. Lawrence's statement that the American Federation of Labor 'claims a majority of the workers in the big Ford plants' is another error. We know of no such claim."

But it develops that on March 1 Harold A. Cranefield, regional director of the National Labor Relations Board, with offices in Detroit, Mich., addressed a letter to all American Federation of Labor unions having workers in the Ford plants and also to Mr. Green, formally notifying the latter that the C. I. O. had claimed a majority and asking if the A. F. of L. wished to dispute the claim in formal proceedings.

On March 6 Mr. Green wrote to the Labor Board declaring that the A. F. of L. did claim an interest in the election. He said: "We will gladly submit evidence in support of our claim of interest in the representation of the employees of the Ford Motor Co. at its Lincoln plant in collective bargaining." He added that he was inclosing a copy of a statement to the press, in which the A. F. of L. chieftain made this further comment:

"We will welcome this opportunity to intervene, and we sincerely hope that an election among the employees of the Ford Motor Co.'s Lincoln plant will be held at a very early date. The American Federation of Labor will steadfastly maintain the right of the American Federation of Labor Federal Union established at the Lincoln plant of the Ford Motor Co. to represent said employees as their collective bargaining agency. * * * ."

READY "AT ANY TIME"

"We are ready for an election at the Lincoln plant of the Ford Motor Co. at any time. We seek a determination of the issue raised by the representatives of the C. I. O. as quickly as possible."

It will be noted that the A. F. of L. does not ask that there be an adjudication of any alleged unfair labor practice charges pending against the Ford Co. before the election is held, but that the A. F. of L. is ready for the election now. Will the Labor Board delay the election, or will it follow the procedure it has often insisted upon; namely, that unfair labor practice charges must be disposed of first before there is an election? This procedure sometimes takes as much as 2 years.

Just why the National Labor Relations Board refused in its letter to the press on March 3 to take cognizance of the A. F. of L. claims is somewhat of a mystery. It might be that the Board doesn't consider a claim exists unless it formally is filed with the Board, but this writer on February 27 was discussing what was a widely known fact—namely, that the A. F. of L. and C. I. O. were each claiming the right to represent Ford workers as the sole bargaining agent.

SHOULD ACT SPEEDILY

The point was made that the Labor Board ought not wait for a lot of red tape to be unraveled, but should act the moment public claims of a majority were made by conflicting unions. Evidently the regional director of the Labord Board in Detroit knew on March 1 what the A. F. of L. claimed or he would not have written to all the A. F. of L. unions and Mr. Green on that date asking them to offer evidence to substantiate their claims. It may be, of course, that the office of information of the N. L. R. B. here did not know what was happening in its Detroit office or that it didn't read the front pages of the newspapers of February 2, when Mr. Green's first claim was published. It would appear that the letter sent out on March 3 by the Labor Board was a serious misstatement on a question of fact which could not but be regarded as publicity unfavorable to the A. F. of L.

In view of President Roosevelt's statement that the Nation would not countenance jurisdictional strikes called as a result of conflict between two unions working on defense contracts, it would be regrettable if the C. I. O. now went through with its announced intention of calling a strike at the three Ford plants involving some 95,000 workers without giving the Labor Board a chance to order an election. But it is, on the other hand, true that the Board does not feel compelled to order an election until unfair labor practice charges on other matters are disposed of, in which case the Nation will witness the collapse of the basic principle of the Wagner Act, namely, that if collective bargaining machinery is provided by law, labor peace will be promoted.

Mr. Mellon's Gift to the Nation

REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1941

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, tonight at 10 p. m. the President will receive from Mr. Paul Mellon, of Pittsburgh, Pa., son of the late Hon. Andrew W. Mellon, LL. D., the National Gallery of Art on Constitution Avenue, together with the Mellon collection of art.

Mr. Mellon will present the gallery and collection to the President in behalf of his father and the trustees of the A. W. Mellon educational and charitable trust. Hon. Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and ex officio chairman of the board of trustees of the gallery for the Federal Government, will preside.

The National Gallery of Art is a $50,000,000 gift to the Nation from the late Mr. Mellon. This magnificent gift will be dedicated to and accepted by the President in behalf of the Nation. At the same time the gift of the Samuel H. Kress collection of Italian paintings and sculpture, announced in 1939, will be made, and in this connection Mr. Joseph A. Widener has announced recently that he would give to the Gallery his collection of art works, which has been valued unofficially at $50,000,000.

At the time of announcing his gift Mr. Mellon had expressed the hope "that it may attract gifts from other citizens who may in the future desire to contribute works of art of the highest quality to form a great national collection," and to that end his gift provided for the $15,000,000 required for the construction of the building and a $5,000,000 endowment for acquisitions and other purposes.

The splendid gifts of Messrs. Kress and Widener bear witness to the fact that his appeal has been heard and most generously responded to on the part of these two gentlemen.

The structure which will house these collections is believed to be the largest marble building in the world, being 782 feet long and 303 feet wide, exclusive of steps and approaches, or slightly more than the length of the Capitol, including both House and Senate wings. Constructed principally of hard-surfaced pink Tennessee marble, the structure was designed in accordance with suggestions of Mr. Mellon by the late Russell John Pope. Ground was broken in June 1937, and on August 26 that year Mr. Mellon died, and Mr. Pope died the next day. The architect's associates, Otto B. Eggers and Daniel Paul Higgins, of the New York firm of Eggers & Higgins, carried the work to completion. Tennessee marble was chosen because it ages to a beautiful mellowness. The interior is finished in Italian marble, and has as its central unit a circular rotunda, 103 feet high and 101 feet in diameter. Around its rim are 24 massive columns of Verte Imperial marble, with caps and bases of Istrian Nuage. The Verte Imperial is a deep-green marble and the Istrian Nuage is a contrasting buff.

The gallery will be maintained by the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution and the Board of Trustees, which consists of Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice of the United States, chairman; Cordell Hull, Secretary of State; Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury; Charles G. Abbot, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution; David K. E. Bruce; Ferdinand Lammot Belin; Duncan Phillips; Samuel H. Kress; Joseph E. Widener.

The officers of the gallery will be: President, David K. E. Bruce; vice president, Ferdinand Lammot Belin; secretary-treasurer and general counsel, Donald D. Shepard; director, David E. Finley; administrator, Harry A. McBride; chief curator, John Walker; and assistant director, Macgill James.

In offering the gallery to the Nation in 1936, Mr. Mellon, with characteristic modesty, expressly stipulated that it should not bear his name, and the gift was accepted by Congress on March 24, 1937.

Andrew William Mellon was born in Pittsburgh, Pa., on March 24, 1855. His father, Thomas Mellon, had emigrated to this country from County Tyrone. His mother was Sarah Jane Negley. In 1869 he became a student at the Western University of Pennsylvania, now the Uni-

versity of Pittsburgh. He left the university in 1873 without graduation; in his own words he welcomed this because he escaped making his graduation speech. After successfully conducting a lumber business at Carnegie, Pa., he and his younger brother, Richard, were invited by their father to enter his bank. Mr. Mellon at that time was 18 years old.

The plan of the Mellons was this: First, find an honest man capable of managing his own business. Next loan him all the capital he needs, taking shares in the business and allowing him to run his business in his own way. When the loan is repaid, repeat the plan. This gives opportunity to men of special ability, and they in turn give employment to many others. In 1913 Mr. Mellon and his brother, Richard, founded the Mellon Institute of Industrial Research as a memorial to their father. Its purpose is to conduct skilled research and investigation into physical science and technology as an aid to industry. It is not a commercial enterprise. It is interesting to learn that the oldest fellowship at the institute is that of bread.

Mr. Mellon served under Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover as Secretary of the Treasury. His last public service was that of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Great Britain.

On June 15, 1921, the University of Pittsburgh conferred upon him the honorary degree of doctor of laws. Dartmouth College likewise on June 20, 1922; on June 12, 1923, Rutgers University; on June 19, Princeton University, and on June 20, 1923, the fifth honorary degree of doctor of laws was conferred on him by Pennsylvania Military College. On June 4, 1924, Columbia University conferred the same degree upon him and on June 16, 1925, Kenyon College at Gambier, Ohio, did likewise; on June 21, 1926, Amherst College was the eighth American college to confer this degree; then followed Harvard University on June 24, 1926; next was that by Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., on June 27, 1929, then came one from Yale University; and in 1931 Cambridge University also conferred upon him the degree of doctor of laws. Twelve in all.

Whether Mr. Mellon was the greatest Secretary of the Treasury since Alexander Hamilton is now immaterial. He has gone the way of all the earth and has been gathered to his fathers. As his memory recedes into the vista of time, the sharp political charges will be forgotten, his services to his country will be remembered and the beautiful building on Constitution Avenue will stand for many years as the silent yet lasting memorial of his munificence, his gratitude toward, and his love of his fellow citizens of the Nation.

May the National Gallery of Art long continue to inspire all those who love the beautiful in painting and sculpture.

I include as a part of my remarks the following address delivered by Mr. Mellon in Pittsburgh in 1929:

[Speech delivered by Hon. Andrew W. Mellon, LL. D., at the annual Founders' Day exercises of the Carnegie Institute of Technology, in Pittsburgh, Pa., October 1929]

DEVELOPING THE NATION'S CAPITAL

I am glad to be here for this occasion. For many years, in my capacity as a trustee of the Carnegie Institute, I have attended the Founder's Day exercises; and, since I have been in Washington, I have looked forward each year to returning home and joining with you in celebrating the founding of this institution, which is doing so much for the cause of education and in training the youth of the country in a knowledge of the arts and sciences.

It is because of your interest in such things that I want to speak to you on a subject somewhat different from those usually associated with the work of Government in Washington. It has to do with the carrying out of the original plan whereby the city of Washington shall become not only one of the most impressive capitals in the world, but one which shall be representaive of the best that is in America. The importance of the work was stressed by President Coolidge in his last annual message to Congress, in which he said:

"If our country wishes to compete with others, let it not be in the support of armaments, but in the making of a beautiful Capital City. Let is express the soil of America. Whenever an American is at the seat of his Government, however traveled and cultured he may be, he ought to find a city of stately proportions, symmetrically laid out and adorned with the best that there is in architecture, which would arouse his imagination and stir his patriotic pride."

Congress has made the necessary appropriation to initiate this work and to carry out the most important features of that long-neglected plan of Washington and L'Enfant for the development of the city. The responsibility for carrying out this plan, by the purchase of sites and the erection of buildings, was placed by Congress on the Secretary of the Treasury and has become, therefore, an integral part of Treasury activities.

Before entering upon a discussion of what is to be undertaken, it is necessary to have a clear understanding of the historic background against which this work must be done. Washington, as you know, was founded for the express purpose of being the Nation's Capital. There have been only two other world capitals so founded—the former Russian capital of Petrograd, and the newly created city of Canberra in Australia. To me there has always seemed something heroic about the early beginning of Washington. When we remember that at that time the entire country had a population of less than 6,000,000; that communication was difficult and the Government almost without financial resources, we marvel at the courage and vision of men who proceeded to build a city in a wilderness and to project it along lines so magnificent that even today we do not find it easy to carry their plans to completion.

The new capital was established in accordance with a provision inserted in the Constitution; and it thus became one of the first duties of the newly formed Government to carry this provision into effect. You remember how both the Northern and the Southern States desired that the Federal Capital should be located in their territory. The final decision was made in a way that settled another question then agitating the public mind. Alexander Hamilton, as Secretary of the Treasury, had succeeded in having the Federal Government assume the payment of all debts incurred by that Government in the prosecution of the Revolutionary War. But the assumption of the debts incurred by the States was another matter. The States with small debts felt that it was unfair to ask them to help discharge the larger debts incurred by other States, and proposed assumption by the Federal Government. As it happened, the States with small debts were mostly in the South, where it was ardently desired that the capital should be located. Hamilton felt that assumption of the debts was a vital part not only of his financial policy for establishing the public credit but of that larger purpose involved in tying the States together in a firm and indestructible Union. He determined, as someone has remarked, to resort to the expedient of "giving a civility in exchange for a loaf of bread." He asked Jefferson, who represented the southern party, to give a dinner. At this dinner-party it was arranged that the Capital City should be located in the South and in return the South agreed to support assumption of the State debts by the Federal Government.

Subsequently Congress authorized the Capital to be established on the Potomac River and that President Washington be allowed to select the exact spot. He did so, with the aid of Jefferson and Madison; and these two, with the three Commissioners appointed to prepare the new seat of Government, gave to the city the name of Washington and to the District the name of Columbia. * * *

The President's next step was to secure the services of a man who should design the city. He chose Maj. Pierre Charles L'Enfant, a young French engineer officer, who had served in the Army during the Revolutionary War. * * *

L'Enfant threw himself into the work with enthusiasm. With Washington and Jefferson he worked out a plan for a splendid city, with a system of streets running from north to south and from east to west. Superimposed upon this rectilinear arrangement were those diagonal avenues radiating from the Capitol and the White House, as do the spokes from the hub of a wheel. * * *

During its first hundred years, the city of Washington suffered many vicissitudes. It struggled into existence as best it could with little regard for the plan of L'Enfant or any other plan. On the removal of the Federal Government from Philadelphia in 1800, the new city was almost as much of a wilderness as it had been a little earlier when the Indians of the Powhatan Tribe held their councils at the foot of Capitol Hill. Fortunately the Capitol building and the White House had been started before the death of Washington, and so the main axes of the new city had been fixed. Both buildings were badly burned during the British raid on Washington in 1814, but were soon restored in accordance with the original designs; and, in the case of the Capitol, the wings and dome were added a few years later. During this same period of good taste, the Patent Office was built and also the present Treasury building, two of the architectural glories of Washington.

I would like to say a word about the Treasury. The building in which it was originally housed was destroyed by the British in 1814. The new building, erected in its place, was destroyed by fire in 1833; and finally, in 1836, the present building was begun on the site designated by President Jackson. It was commonly reported that, becoming wearied of the delay in selecting the location, General Jackson planted his cane one morning at the northeast corner of the present site and said, "Here, right here, I want the cornerstone laid." And it was laid there, notwithstanding the fact that, when finally completed in 1869, the south wing was interposed between the Capitol and the White

House and thus shut off the vista at that end of Pennsylvania Avenue. * * *

Later President Grant induced Congress to give the city a territorial form of government; and under Alexander R. Shepherd, a man of extraordinary energy, courage, and vision, who became Commissioner of Public Works, the city was transformed. * * * During this period, one great work, the half-built Washington Monument, was carried to completion in 1884. But the Mall, on which it was placed, had never been properly developed; and throughout the entire city the effect for which Washington and L'Enfant strove was entirely lacking.

Such was the condition of the Nation's Capital in 1900, when the one-hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of government in the District of Columbia was celebrated. At the invitation of President McKinley a meeting was held in the White House, attended by many high officials of the Government and by the members of the American Institute of Architects, then meeting in Washington. Interest in the L'Enfant plan was revived, and shortly afterward Senator McMillan secured authority from Congress for appointment of a special commission of experts, who should recommend a plan for the beautification and development of Washington.

That commission included Daniel H. Burnham and Charles F. McKim, architects; Augustus Saint-Gaudens, sculptor; and Frederick Law Olmsted, landscape architect. It was a notable group, such as has seldom been brought together in one undertaking.

After a careful study of Washington and its possibilities, these men presented a report, known as the Plan of 1901. In it they recommended a return to the original plan of Washington and L'Enfant, with such extension of it as might be required to meet modern conditions and the city's growth. * * *

Now, I just ask you to return for a moment to a consideration of another vast project which will eventually realize L'Enfant's dream for a great avenue bordering the Mall and leading from the Capitol to the White House. You are familiar with the distressing spectacle which Pennsylvania Avenue presents today. It is perhaps our most important street and certainly there is no avenue of corresponding importance in any capital which can compare with it in sheer ugliness or lack of architectural dignity. It is the street over which our great processions pass in triumph to the Capitol. Yet never, in the days of either the ancient or the modern world, has anyone seen before a great triumphal way bordered, throughout much of its length, by gasoline stations, lodging houses, and Chinese laundries.

This state of affairs, I am glad to say, will soon be remedied. Congress has determined that the Capitol shall be approached by an avenue commensurate in dignity with its importance. * * * The amounts already appropriated will be used to initiate the most important features of the plans for Washington's development, with special regard for the Mall and for improving Pennsylvania Avenue.

The Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to use this money in the purchase or condemnation of land and the erection of public buildings. It is intended to carry through, as rapidly as possible, the most pressing needs as regards housing of Government departments and activities. These will include a new and larger building for the increased activities of the Department of Commerce, a Supreme Court building, a building for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, an Archives Building, a building for the Department of Agriculture, still another for the Department of Labor, and several others besides. * * *

Departmental buildings are to be placed along the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue from the Treasury to the Capitol. In addition to facing on Pennsylvania Avenue, these buildings will face also on a grand boulevard which is to be cut through the city bordering the Mall and stretching from the Capitol to the new Memorial Bridge on the Potomac near the base of the Lincoln Memorial. * * * It is intended that these buildings, while having each a separate and distinctive architectural treatment, shall be of harmonious design and grouped around two large interior courts or plazas somewhat after the arrangement of the Louvre in Paris. * * *

All of this will take time, of course. But Rome was not built in a day, nor for that matter was Paris. Paris has passed through many stages, each distinct from the other. The Gothic Paris is as different from the Paris of the Renaissance as the Paris of Louis XIV differs from that of Napoleon III. * * *

And yet Washington has many advantages insofar as its future development is concerned. Its life centers around the Government, as those who planned the city intended it should do. There is no manufacturing, and the engineering and industrial problems, which have to be met at such expense and effort in great industrial centers like Pittsburgh and Chicago, are entirely absent. Washington is still a city of moderate size, notwithstanding the fact that its population has grown from 75,000 at the time of the Civil War to about a half million today. But, so long as it remains chiefly a seat of Government, it will retain its unique character among the cities of the country. More and more it will be visited by people who will go to Washington because of its beauty and their feeling of pride and personal ownership in the Nation's Capital. * * *

But there are weightier reasons than that why we should give our support to the effort to rebuild our National Capital. Until recently America has been in the frontier stage as nations go. We were too busy about the hard realities of existence to have much time for the amenities. But now we have the opportunity and we have also the resources to raise the standard of taste in this country; and the extent to which this is being done has no parallel at present in any country in the world. * * *

It has been said that in evolving the skyscraper we have made the only original contribution to architecture since the Gothic. * * * Judged by that standard, the Woolworth Building is a work of art, both because it is beautiful in itself and because it expresses the needs and aspirations of a great people. If we can give to our office buildings something of the beauty of Gothic cathedrals, or model our banks and railroad stations after Greek temples, we shall, in time, provide a magnificent setting for the requirements of modern civilization.

But we must remember that, just as these things are architectural expressions of the Nation on its commercial side, so should the city of Washington, as President Coolidge has said, express the soul of America. We do well, therefore, to give to it that beauty and dignity to which it is entitled. In doing so we are not only carrying out those plans which Washington made so long ago for the city which he founded, but at the same time we are justifying that faith which he had from the beginning in the future greatness of America.

Private Flying Safety Record

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1941

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the public has become concerned over the recent accidents on our domestic air lines. Some people have criticized directly or indirectly the Civil Aeronautics Administration because of these recent accidents.

I feel that the Civil Aeronautics Administration should receive public commendation on the decreased fatality rate in private flying operations since it has been charged with the administration of air safety under Reorganization Plan IV.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include here at this point a table which I received from Col. Donald H. Connolly, Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, last Friday:

Private flying operations and accidents

[1940 figures are preliminary]

	January-June 1940	July-December 1940	1940	1939	1938	1937	1936	1935
Airplanes in operation	13,859	16,500	16,500	12,274	10,718	10,446	8,849	8,613
Miles flown	84,400,000	144,600,000	229,000,000	177,868,157	129,359,095	103,196,355	93,320,375	84,755,630
Number of fatal accidents	87	144	231	194	172	185	159	164
Miles flown per fatal accident	970,115	1,004,167	991,342	916,846	752,088	557,818	586,920	516,803
Total fatalities	135	221	[1] 356	314	275	283	272	252

[1] Includes 196 pilots, 13 dual pilots and students, 138 passengers, 9 ground-crew and third-party fatalities.

You will note that in the period from July to December 1940, private flying operations showed a splendid safety record of over 1,000,000 miles flown per fatal accident, which represents a commendable improvement in the safety of private flying over any preceding period in the history of aviation; and this was accomplished under the present Civil Aeronautics Administration.

It is noteworthy in passing that there was a tremendous increase in safety in private flying operations which followed the Civil Aeronautics Authority Act, which went into effect in 1938; because in 1937 you will note that there were approximately 560,000 miles flown per fatal accident; this jumped to 752,000 in 1938 and to 970,000 in the first half of 1940—prior to Reorganization Plan IV. But I want to emphasize the fact that this improvement continued during the last half of 1940 under the Civil Aeronautics Administration. It is true there was an increase in the total number of fatalities, but there was a tremendous increase, you will note, in private flying operations, much of which was brought about by the

civilian-pilot-training program, in which there were 30,000 students participating from July to December.

In connection with this program, I think Colonel Connolly and his associates, including Mr. Grove Webster, chief of this section, are to be complimented.

I quote from Colonel Connolly's letter, as follows:

It is indeed gratifying that with this large increase in instructional flying, there has been a decrease in the general accident rate. In recognition of the safety of the civilian-pilot-training program, the insurance underwriters, effective January 1, 1941, doubled the amount of hospitalization and medical reimbursement for C. P. T. students from $500 to $1,000 with no increase in premium. In September 1940 they reduced the premium to $9, from an original rate of $20 for the first C. A. A.-controlled course in 1939. This premium covers both the $1,000 for injury and $3,000 in case of death.

Mr. Speaker, this last paragraph does indeed speak volumes of praise for those connected with the C. P. T. P., and I congratulate Colonel Connolly and his associates.

Air Tragedies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 17, 1941

ARTICLE BY MERLO J. PUSEY

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on air tragedies by Merlo J. Pusey. The article appeared in Saturday's edition of the Washington Post. I think it is a common-sense approach to the Civil Aeronautics Authority situation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of March 15, 1941]

THE AIR TRAGEDIES—TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS AS A CLEW

(By Merlo J. Pusey)

Robert H. Hinckley, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, appears to have given one clew to the mysterious increase in air-transport crashes since the Civil Aeronautics Authority was reorganized last July. Following the tragic smash-up near Atlanta last month, Mr. Hinckley invited the operating heads of the air lines to Washington for a heart-to-heart talk. He reports that they do not favor another reorganization of the C. A. A. On the contrary, he said, they believe that there have been "too many moves around here already."

Here is an unmistakable hint that the shake-up in the C. A. A. last summer may have had some bearing upon the series of air-line accidents which have since claimed the lives of 54 persons. The remarkable safety record achieved by the air lines during the 17 months ended last August came at a time when the C. A. A. was well organized and its inspection machinery was functioning smoothly. In that period not a single fatality occurred on any air-transport line. The disastrous smash-ups at Lovettsville, Centerville, Utah, Chicago, St. Louis, and Atlanta took place during the period of the C. A. A.'s reorganization.

It should be noted, of course, that most of the regulatory machinery set up by the original Civil Aeronautics Authority was preserved by its successor, the Civil Aeronautics Administration. In some respects the new set-up seems to offer advantages from the viewpoint of safety in aviation. It brought about a closer relationship between the C. C. A., the Weather Bureau, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Bureau of Standards, all of which are now under the general supervision of Mr. Hinckley as Assistant Secretary of Commerce. Moreover, the technique of making inspections and investigating accidents remains the same. On the surface it appears that the reorganization of the C. A. A. should have had no appreciable effect upon the safety of travel by air.

But there are many intangible factors in a shake-up of administrative personnel. Even if the same men stay on the job during a reorganization, they may work with less efficiency. If the period of transition is prolonged, morale may be severely impaired. No inspector, for example, can be expected to demand rigorous compliance with the rules if he is concerned about his own status and if he can't be certain of full support from his chief. And supervising officials are not likely to follow a vigorous policy when their own positions seem to be lacking in security.

The really astonishing fact about the new C. A. A. is that neither its executive officer nor any one of its six division chiefs has yet been granted a permanent appointment. Several of them are career men, but they are all listed as acting directors. These include A. S. Koch, acting director of the vital inspection service. Mr. Koch supervises a large staff of inspectors who check the performance of airplanes the qualifications of pilots, and the adherence of air-line companies to the safety regulations prescribed by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

These inspections are the heart of the Government's air-safety program. One of the duties of the C. A. A. inspectors is to sit with pilots on their regular flights to determine whether or not all the rules of safety are observed. They have the dual function of detecting violations of the safety code and of suggesting improvements in that code to the Civil Aeronautics Board. It is easy to see how even a slight let down in the morale of this group or any confusion as to the backing they will have in making violation reports might lead to a less rigorous observance of safety requirements.

Safety in aviation, said the C. A. A. in its last annual report, can be attained only by "the promulgation and enforcement of the best possible set of minimum safety standards, rules, and regulations, and the maintenance of an efficient system of examinations, inspections, and certifications * * *." The truth of that statement is not open to question. Indeed, the present C. A. A. this week recognized the primary importance of an effective inspection service by ordering 10 of its best men to make a special 90-day survey of all air lines, their equipment, and pilots in an effort to forestall repetition of the Atlanta tragedy.

This action also suggests some fear in the minds of C. A. A. officials that the routine inspection service is not entirely satisfactory. Their effort to make a more thorough check is commendable, but, of course, a special survey will not eliminate any disadvantages that may result from confusion and uncertainty at the top. Some inspectors have left the service, apparently in dissatisfaction over the prolonged period of reorganization. Information as to the extent of the turn-over cannot be readily attained. There are indications, however, that the turn-over is less important than the lack of permanent organization in the Inspection Service.

After 6 months of operation the new C. A. A. has not even issued an organization chart. That fact alone suggests a lack of clearly defined responsibilities. When it is combined with the equally significant fact that the division chiefs have not yet attained a permanent status, confidence in the ability of this organization to enforce safety regulations with full efficiency may be easily shaken.

It is important to remember that fatal accidents in the air are very largely a matter of personnel failure. Not all crashes involve negligence on the part of the pilot or disregard of safety regulations. But even those crack-ups resulting from mechanical failures or bad weather can be reduced to a bare minimum by proper inspections and scientific use of weather data. It is the business of the Government to make certain that these safety measures are fully applied.

The congressional committees set up to investigate the recent air-line tragedies may thus be expected to give the activities of the C. A. A. a thorough airing. If these inquiries are constructive, they may have a salutary effect upon future safety in the air. At the moment only one point seems to stand out clearly. Efficient regulation certainly cannot be obtained by subjecting the regulatory agencies to frequent reorganizations. Stability is often more important in difficult undertakings of this kind than a theoretically perfect organization.

Congress may easily blunder, therefore, if it tries merely to decide whether the old independent C. A. A. or the new C. A. A. in the Department of Commerce affords the best pattern for an aviation-control system. The real question seems to be whether the poor showing of the new C. A. A. to date is merely incident to its reorganization or whether it indicates fumbling that cannot be overcome by an administrative agency for aviation within the Department of Commerce.

David Wilmot

REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT G. RUTHERFORD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1941

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, March 16, 1941, marked the seventy-third anniversary of the death of David Wilmot, antislavery leader and judge, who represented some of the counties which now comprise my district in Congress before the Civil War. That he was a great statesman no one will deny. His memory is revered by the people of my district. He was born in my home county and for that reason I take this opportunity to bring the matter to the attention of this body at this time. The following article sent out by the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce and published in many papers in my district gives a short account of his many accomplishments. The article is as follows:

Born in Bethany, Wayne County, in 1814, David Wilmot became a lawyer and statesman who fought for the free-State principle. When territory was to be obtained from Mexico he framed a proviso to the effect

that "neither slavery nor involuntary servitude" should ever exist in any part of that territory. This caused much consternation in the House because Members had not previously realized that the antislavery feeling was growing so fast, especially in the North.

Much to the surprise of both sides of the house, the proviso was adopted by a vote of 83 to 64. Later, when Wilmot was a candidate for reelection to Congress, the proviso was used by opposition forces against him, and he withdrew in favor of Galusha A. Grow, a lawyer from Susquehanna County, who shared Wilmot's views on the slavery question.

When David Wilmot ran for the governorship on the Free Soil ticket in 1857 he was defeated by William F. Packer. He then returned to the bench of the judicial district composed of Bradford, Susquehanna, and Sullivan Counties on which he served when he retired from Congress. He held that position until 1861.

That same year he was defeated as a candidate for United States Senator, but when Simon Cameron resigned his Senate seat Wilmot was chosen to succeed him and remained for 2 years. He was temporary chairman of the convention which nominated Abraham Lincoln for President and later was appointed judge of the Court of Claims by Lincoln.

David Wilmot's grave is in Riverside Cemetery, Towanda, where one side of the simple headstone bears the text of the Wilmot proviso.

The Federal Mine Inspection Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE E. IMHOFF

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1941

Mr. IMHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly glad that the Federal Government has finally become concerned with the loss of human life in our mining industry and is now, therefore, going to undertake the supervision of our mines throughout the entire United States in order that something may be done to remedy the inadequacies of State mining laws in insuring greater safety in our mines; and, thus, prevent the reoccurrence of these disastrous catastrophes, the thought of which haunts every miner as he goes down into the bowels of the earth to dig out one of Nature's most prized treasures.

Yes, it is indeed a pleasure for me to be representing the Eighteenth Congressional District of Ohio, which district is located in the eastern part of Ohio and represents one of the largest coal-producing areas in the State as well as in the Nation. I am happy to have an opportunity to manifest my interest and feelings in behalf of the thousands of miners whom I represent, and who are close to my own life.

I believe that this legislation will be welcomed by all the groups interested in the mining industry. Yes; the miner as well as the operator, the owner, and the consumer, because all of these groups are, first, primarily interested in safeguarding the lives of those men whose hazardous occupation down in the bowels of the earth makes possible the production of coal. The use of coal has helped to build America into a great industrial country, and the least we can do is to show our appreciation to that particular class of workers by helping to make their respective occupation less hazardous.

In my opinion, it is not the purpose of this bill to usurp the powers of our States' mine divisions, nor is it an attempt to create a hardship upon our operators and owners. It is, however, an effort to assist the States, the operators, and the owners by offering to them all the scientific knowledge now in the possession of our Federal Bureau of Mines in order that proper safety measures may be practiced and safety devices installed so as to decrease the possibility of wholesale loss of life in the mining industry. Records of the Federal Bureau of Mines conclusively show that many of our mine disasters could have been averted or reduced in severity had the mine operators or owners followed the practices recommended by the Federal Bureau of Mines. It is within my own personal knowledge that even today some of our smaller mines are operating under such conditions which have been termed "extremely hazardous and dangerous to life" by the Federal Bureau of Mines.

Let us examine the record of accidents in the mining industry in Ohio. During the last 12 years there have been more than 71,000 accidents, resulting in over 1,600 deaths. Of this number of fatalities, over 230 have resulted directly from an explosion in the mine. During 1940 the major mine disasters in the United States alone accounted for the loss of some 276 lives. This record is absolutely inexcusable.

I am vitally concerned in the significance of this record because one of the worst disasters happened at the Willow Grove Mine, Neffs, Belmont County, Ohio. This mine is not many miles removed from my home, and I assure you all that the news of the explosion last March 16 was certainly shocking to the senses. I know that it must have been shocking to the senses of all of us who are interested in the preservation of human life.

Perhaps some of you have not had the occasion to be in a community following a mine disaster and seen the miners' sorrowful mothers, wives, children, and friends gather around the particular mouth of the mine, anxiously awaiting and praying that Mother Earth deliver from its bowels those loved ones who may have been trapped thousands of feet below the surface. Yes; hour by hour they await patiently for the victims to be brought out of the mine, many permanently injured; but at the Willow Grove Mine the bodies of 72 dead persons were brought to the top.

This mine catastrophe should have served notice to the mine owners in neighboring vicinities. However, it did not, for with the Willow Grove disaster still fresh in our memories another explosion happened on November 29 at the Nelms Mine, Cadiz, Harrison County, Ohio, which took the lives of 31 men.

If for no other reason, certainly this record of the loss of life in mine disasters warrants the enactment of the Federal mine-inspection bill. Our consideration of this legislation, coming on the eve of the first anniversary of the Willow Grove disaster, will be most gratefully welcomed by all, and I strenuously recommend its enactment, for I am sure that it will be encouragement to the thousands of men who day in and day out leave their homes and loved ones to go down into the bowels of the earth and pursue their occupation, never knowing whether or not they will again return to see the light of another day.

The Defense of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following speech which I delivered in Cleveland, Ohio, on the afternoon of March 16 before the United Temperance Forces, Hon. Harvey O. Yoder, honorary president, and Hon. Parker C. Williams, president, presiding:

The battle for the defense of America has already begun!

We see that battle in the planes rolling off the assembly lines; we see it in the ships being built for a two-ocean navy; we see it in the increased production of tanks, guns, and other weapons of modern, mechanized warfare; we see it in the billions appropriated by Congress for defense; we see it in the gallant young men who, almost overnight, have doubled and redoubled the size of our armed forces.

Yes; what we see on every side, in every activity, through every day is evidence of the mightiest defense effort in all American history. America is preparing for any eventuality. And that, I contend, is just as it should be, for the situation which confronts us today is without precedent or parallel in the annals of our national development.

OUR HIGH RESOLVE

We, the American people, are advancing in the spirit of national unity because never were we more united in a common purpose than we are today in our determination to make this Nation strong enough to withstand the onrushing tide of armed aggression. To us it is something which concerns a way of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness that has prevailed on this continent for over a century and a half. In our high resolve to preserve that way of life, we are forming what may well become democracy's last great line of resistance to the encroachments of totalitarian despotism. Men who represent the cause of freedom the world over to us are saying:

"Stand, thou great bulwark of man's liberty

* * * * * *

Hold your proud peril! Freemen undefiled."

The defense effort goes on at top speed. But while the planes are rolling off the assembly lines; while ships are being built for a two-ocean Navy; while the production of defense armaments moves ahead, while billions are being spent for defense, and while young men are undergoing military training, the liquor traffic is permitted to continue its attack on America's strength through the medium of alcohol. We are bending every effort to gain increased strength, striving to prepare this Nation for any eventuality, and yet we tolerate an evil which undermines the foundations of our defense system by destroying the power and endurance of our manhood.

This is a serious matter. Our production of the weapons of defense is going forward at top speed, but the conservation and strengthening of our manpower, that is to defend this Nation if need be, has all too long been neglected. Yet the internal forces which induce weakness and promote debility should be considered no less seriously than the technical problems which create "bottlenecks" in our defense industries. The one, like the other, is a hazard to national security; the one, like the other, must be overcome.

GREATEST FOE OF ARMY

During the last World War it was our own Gen. John J. Pershing who described alcohol as America's deadly enemy when he declared: "Banish the entire liquor industry from the United States; close every saloon and brewery; suppress drinking by severe punishment to the drinker * * * and the Nation will suddenly find itself amazed at its efficiency and startled at the increase in its labor supply. I shall not go slow on prohibition, for I know what is the greatest foe to my men, greater even than the bullets of the enemy." British Prime Minister David Lloyd George likewise said: "We are fighting Germany, Austria, and Drink, and, so far as I can see, the greatest of these deadly foes is Drink."

The recent fate of France should stand before us as a grim reminder of disaster. France entered the present European War with at least one outstanding asset and with one known liability. Military experts all agreed that France possessed the best trained Army in the world—that was a real asset. Medical authorities declared that France's per capita consumption of alcoholic beverages exceeded that of every other European nation—that was a decided liability. A number of factors may have accounted for the incredible fall of France last spring but the factor of alcohol appears to have weighed heavily. The part that alcohol played in the fall of France was stated in a news dispatch from Vichy on August 29 last, reading as follows: "A Government spokesman said today that alcohol was one of the chief causes of the moral collapse of France under attack."

Yesterday France came to grips with a Germany so intent on success and victory that she established higher standards of self-discipline and sobriety than ever attempted by the French people. Today, Germany being more intent than ever on success and victory has pushed to even higher levels her standards of self-discipline and sobriety. The question is, Will tomorrow find America softened by alcohol for the same sort of moral collapse which spelled disaster for France or will we be found hardened for any possible test of strength?

LIQUOR TRAFFIC IMPOSES BURDEN

No thoughtful American would underestimate the importance of that question. No patriotic American would scoff the warning implied by that important question. The pity of it all, however, is that our national attitude toward alcohol and the liquor traffic has been conditioned to such a high degree of indifference that millions of Americans are no longer sensitive to the injurious qualities of alcoholic beverages, nor are they fully aware of the burden which it imposes on our national strength. To witness the fact that the American people are willing to endure the liquor traffic at a time when every obstacle to complete national defense should be removed is to fully realize that the American people have been tricked into a false line of reasoning which carries to a false sense of security on the subject of alcohol.

But if there obtains throughout our land a sad state of public indifference to the evils of alcohol, such is not the expressed will of the American people but rather the direct result of a hideous brand of propaganda which seeks to make what is a lie the truth, and what is the truth a lie. We find the climate of public thinking still beclouded by the misty arguments and flimsy pretenses of those alcoholic missionaries who were once bold to preach the gospel that to legalize the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages would be no mistake and could do no harm.

We observe that interests of the liquor traffic have spared no effort in their attempt to drape the white linen of virtue over the naked evil of drinking. For instance, the word saloon, the American people made it too harsh for social respectability, so exponents of the liquor traffic now describe drinking places as cocktail lounges. A cocktail lounge, however, is no different from a saloon except for the absence of a brass rail and the presence of women. The brass rail with all its manifold evils hardly seems worse than the spectacle of dragging the motherhood of the Nation down to places of drinking. National advertising on an unparalleled scale has been employed to weaken all lines of resistance to alcohol. What do we see in our newspapers and magazines—attractive, carefully worded, skillfully designed advertisements which begin with the brazen assumption that drinking is no evil and end with deceptive claims as to the values of alcoholic beverages. Thousands of dollars are spent daily to perpetrate the lie that beer is real food while hardly a penny is given to publicize the truth that milk is nutritious.

ALCOHOL UNDERMINES NATIONAL DEFENSE

But the time has come, and it is later than you think, to lift this veil of propaganda and look down on the real facts. The American people cannot longer fail to realize that alcohol is no friend of national defense. These truths I hold to be self-evident:

First. Alcohol wastes national wealth needed for national defense.

Second. Alcohol saps the strength of manpower essential to national defense.

Third. Alcohol undermines the spiritual and moral forces which must sustain the efforts of men and women when the hour of greatest national crisis comes.

Alcohol wastes national wealth. Since repeal in 1933 we have spent $20,000,000,000 in the United States for liquors, not including illicit liquor. Today we are spending more than three and one-half billions annually for liquor, and for many months following the outbreak of the European war our importation of Scotch whisky from England was so heavy that it enabled Great Britain to maintain a favorable balance of trade with the United States despite her enormous purchases of planes, tanks, and other war materials from American manufacturers.

The total amount of our national income which is absorbed by alcohol annually is not fully represented in these figures since they only account for the outright sale of alcoholic beverages. The indirect costs of the liquor business run into still more billions of American dollars, as witness the size of our crime bill, which has reached a high of $15,000,000,000 a year. It is conservatively estimated that arrests for intoxication cost the country at least $6,000,000,000, while another $15,000,000,000 goes for the treatment and care of persons in mental hospitals due to alcoholism. In this year, 1941, at a time when billions are needed for defense expenditures, how can we afford to dissipate so sizable a portion of our national income on alcohol?

Alcohol not only wastes national wealth, needed for national defense, it saps the strength of our manpower essential to national defense. Medical authorities regard alcohol as being primarily a narcotic drug. Dr. Haven Emerson, professor of public-health practice, Columbia University, recently declared: "Alcohol is a depressant, habit-forming narcotic drug. Alcohol is a protoplasmic poison. Alcohol reduces endurance, accuracy, and rapidity of muscular action of all kinds. Alcohol deteriorates emotional and nervous control, as expressed in unreliable judgment and self-control."

MUST PRESERVE FIGHTING STRENGTH

Modern warfare is mechanized warfare; modern defense is mechanized defense in which men with clear brains and steady hands must exercise split-second judgment for precision in the operation of planes, tanks, and other motorized units of a modern defense system. This thing which confronts us is not a theory, it is a practical problem: We simply must preserve the physical, fighting strength of this Nation for common defense against any eventuality. The late Thomas A. Edison, that greatest of inventive geniuses, had a message for us when he said: "To put alcohol in the human system is like putting sand in the bearing of an engine." What good will it do us to fashion the weapons of defense if we dispossess ourselves of the strength with which to wield them against the foe?

The fact that alcohol destroys essential teamwork between head and hand is reflected in the ever-increasing number of automobile accidents since repeal. In 60 percent of the fatal motor accidents for the year 1939 investigation proved that drivers had been drinking 1 hour before the accident. That world-famous surgeon, Dr. Charles Mayo, sums the matter up in these words: "You can get along with a wooden leg, but you can't get along with a wooden head. The physical value of a man is not so much. Man as analyzed in our laboratories is worth about 98 cents. Seven bars of soap, lime enough to whitewash a chicken coop, phosphorus enough to cover the heads of a thousand matches, is not so much, you see. It is the brain that counts, but in order that your brain may be kept clear you must keep your body fit and well. That cannot be done if you take liquor."

If there are those who are inclined to view this particular problem without any expression of concern, I ask them can comfort be found in the fact that approximately 50 percent of the young men examined for regular service in the United States Army are being rejected because of failure to meet minimum standards of physical well-being. This is, indeed, an alarming revelation, but still more alarming are the War Department's reports concerning the pressure of the liquor traffic on young men now undergoing training in Army camps throughout the country. Army Chief of Staff, Gen. George C. Marshall, recently deplored the fact that "establishments for the purpose of selling liquor are becoming increasingly active in the communities adjacent to camps." Said General Marshall: "Here we have on the one side a sordid business for the accumulation of money and on the other the interest of every parent in the United States who has a son in the Army."

Letters from parents aroused by these reports are now reaching Members of Congress. Is there any reason why parents whose sons are now serving with our armed forces should not be manifestly concerned about this acute problem which, in the words of General Marshall, threatens to undermine the integrity of our young Army? We ask thousands of young men to serve with our armed forces. They gladly respond to our call, leaving behind homes with stabilizing influences and interests. Is this what they deserve for

their sacrifice, exposure to evils and inducements capable of undermining their integrity?

OUR MEN DESERVE PROTECTION

There can be but one answer to that question: We owe it to these young men and we owe it to their mothers and fathers as well to expressly forbid the sale of alcoholic liquors inside or near any United States Army camp or other military establishment. Senator SHEPPARD, of Texas, chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, has introduced a bill which admirably provides for such restrictions. This measure is entitled, "A bill to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments." Now pending before the House Military Affairs Committee are similar legislative proposals. I am actively supporting these measures, and it is my determination to work for their enactment at the present session of Congress.

In our drive for increased national defense, we must not forget that alcohol undermines the spiritual and moral forces which strengthen individual character and national unity. On the occasion of his recent inaugural address President Roosevelt pointed out that a nation, like a person, has a body, mind, and spirit and, like a person, to be strong must possess a full measure of physical, mental, and spiritual vitality.

The physical, mental, and spiritual havoc wrought by alcohol and the liquor traffic has been well described by Col. Robert G. Ingersoll who remarked: "Intemperance cuts down youth in its vigor, manhood in its strength, and age in its weakness. It breaks the father's heart, bereaves the doting mother, extinguishes natural affections, blots out filial attachments, blights parental hope, and brings down mourning age in sorrow to the grave. It produces weakness, not strength; sickness, not health; death, not life. * * * It is the son of villainies, the father of all crimes, the mother of abominations, the devil's best friend, and God's worst enemy."

DEFENSE CONTROLLING OBJECTIVE

Today, we are called upon to subordinate all lesser interests to the interest of national defense. The controlling objective before us is increased national defense. So to those who are not disturbed by the fact that our per capita consumption of alcoholic beverages reached the high of 14 gallons in 1940; to those who would ignore the fact that the estimated drink bill of the United States in 1940 was $5,000,000,000; to those who would trifle with an evil which contributed to the moral collapse of France; to those who would overlook the fact that arrests for drunkenness were three times as great in 1939 as they were in 1932, the year before repeal; to those who would defy the findings of science and scoff at standards of morality; to those who would obey the false commands of propaganda, believe its lie, till it lulls them into a false sense of security, I ask them of what aid is alcohol and the liquor traffic to national defense?

If we be conscientious, it is for us to realize that the fate of a nation will ultimately depend upon the strength and health of her population. If we be sincere, it is for us to realize that a nation, like a person, may drift with the tides of indulgence that end in oblivion or sail on the winds of self-discipline, which lead to greatness. If we be true to the traditions of our forefathers, we must, in this fateful year of 1941, set our sails to the purpose of gaining such increased strength as may be essential for the fulfillment of America's destiny among the nations of the world.

America, our faith is still in thee. For—

"We do not know beneath what sky
Nor on what sea shall be thy fate;
We only know it shall be high,
We only know it shall be great."

The Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NAT PATTON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1941

MESSAGE OF GOV. W. LEE O'DANIEL TO THE FORTY-SEVENTH LEGISLATURE OF TEXAS

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the attached message by the Governor of Texas, the Honorable W. Lee O'Daniel, to the forty-seventh legislature.

In these times the attention of every American is focused on the great defense program, and I do not believe that the American people plan to tolerate any activity or influence that will hinder the progress of preparedness. In my judgment, the statements of Governor O'Daniel reflect the feelings of the people.

The message follows:

MARCH 13, 1941.

To the Members of the Forty-seventh Legislature:

Today I am addressing you on one of the most momentous problems which I believe has ever confronted our State.

There may be some important State problems on which our opinions are divided, but on this problem which I now mention I cannot believe that there can be any division of opinion. This problem is that of strikes and lock-outs within our State during this grave national emergency.

I have been over this State a great deal lately and have seen and heard much, and duty demands that I speak frankly to you.

Yesterday I attended the dedicatory ceremonies of the great new naval base at Corpus Christi, which, by the way, is the largest naval base in the United States. I looked into the faces of those young officers and men and saw written thereon the grim determination to protect and preserve our American way of life, at any cost. Yes, even at the cost of their own lives.

As commander in chief of the Texas National Guard I have learned to know personally many of these splendid officers and men. They are the finest and cleanest of our true Texas boys. They have now stepped into the national service, and not one murmur of dissatisfaction or complaint have you heard from one of them. They have made the most colossal personal financial sacrifices and have said to their superior officers, "Here I am, my all, my life, if necessary, to protect and preserve our American way of life."

As each new day dawns, the cold, stark realization comes to more and more of us that the most horrible and devastating war of all ages is raging on the most of this earth's surface, and the main goal of the power-crazed aggressors is the overthrow of democracy, including our American way of life. Particularly does this realization strike home when your boy or my boy answers to the call of his number, abandons his life's plans, packs his suitcase, and bids good-bye to his mother, wife, sister, sweetheart, and others near and dear to him, and walks out into the darkness of a muddled world.

Into the sincere, patriotic faces of these fine young men have I looked. From their lips I have heard these words: "Governor O'Daniel, our training is being held up and retarded on account of strikes stopping production in national-defense industries."

Now, ladies and gentlemen of this Forty-seventh Texas Legislature, are you going to sit idly by with a cry like that ringing in your ears?

Texas cannot answer this pathetic cry of our brave boys for the other States in this Union, but this Forty-seventh Texas Legislature can answer that cry for Texas and you can answer it today. This is one subject which needs no debate and on which there surely can be no opposition.

While our Texas boys and boys from other States are sacrificing their jobs—yes; sacrificing their whole future opportunities and possibly their very lives—for the pittance of from $21 to $30 per month, are you going to permit those whose lives are safe and who are making wages from 5 to 10 times that amount call strikes overnight and shut down essential industries in this State, and, by so doing, deprive these soldier boys of things they so desperately need? Where is the inherited blood of Sam Houston, Travis, Bonham, Crockett, and other noble Texas patriots?

So far as I am concerned, I believe every employee in this State has a right to join any organization he chooses to join, and I think the same right should be accorded to every employer in the State, but I am unalterably opposed to resorting to force and violence in labor disputes.

While we are dealing with this question I think no one would contend that we should not go beyond our national-defense program, and in addition to protecting our national-defense program, at least protect our own citizens from force and violence in exercising their right to work in all industries regardless of what organization they may be affiliated with or whether or not they are affiliated with any organization.

War supplies cannot be produced in factories which are closed down by strikes or lock-outs. Dead war industries mean dead soldiers. I have no sympathy with strikes being called in essential industries where workmen in these industries are frequently making more money in 1 week than these soldier boys make in a whole month, and the lives of these industrial workers are safe, while our soldier boys' lives are in jeopardy. Especially are these strikes intolerable when the facts indicate that in some cases they have been promoted by the racketeering element who have sought to impose their leadership upon the conservative workmen in these essential industries.

Texas is indeed a great State, and resplendent in heroic deeds of the past. Our people are peaceful and fair and patriotic. While we are wearing only our swaddling clothes as an industrial State, yet the dawn is now breaking on a new industrial day for us. Within the past 2 years more than $100,000,000 has been invested in new industries in Texas, not including those established on account of our national-defense program. Around $300,000,000 worth of new national-defense industries have recently been allotted to Texas. Naturally, on account of this great industrial expansion within our State, some labor agitators and racketeers have been attracted here from other places for the purpose of fomenting labor trouble. Now is the psychological time to head this off. So let us serve notice to the world that Texas is going to tolerate none of this imported racketeering, "fifth column," radical violence-producing element while this national-defense program is under way.

I am wholly opposed to those academic "alibiers" who seek to show by scientific percentages that only a small percentage of our national-defense factories are idle on account of strikes. I am reminded of the old saying, that:

"For the want of a nail the shoe was lost,
For the want of a shoe the horse was lost,
For the want of a horse the rider was lost,
For the want of a rider the battle was lost."

I consider that we owe a duty to these noble mothers of Texas and other States whose sons are steadily advancing toward the front. I do not intend that they shall be short a gun or a drop of oil for that gun, or anything they need, be it large or small, and be it only one one-thousandth or less of our whole national-defense production. If this is an all-out-aid defense program, let us quit quibbling about percentages, let us make it 100 percent, with no industries shut down which are directly or indirectly contributing to our national-defense program.

There is so much racketeering and "fifth column" activities and un-American activities now going on in Texas, that no doubt many of you will want to go much further in enacting legislation than I am hereby recommending. But let me caution you to be conservative. Let us be fair with both labor and capital. The bill I am attaching to this message seeks to stop force and violence in labor disputes in Texas. It provides for a cooling-off period of 60 days before strikes or lock-outs can start. It provides for peaceful picketing so that labor organizations can let the public know that a strike exists, but peaceful picketing can be accomplished by two pickets at the entrance to the industry. More than two are superfluous, and more than two can easily lead to force and violence instead of peaceful picketing. It provides for free men to work when they can get a job, and without being forced to pay a fee to some racketeeer, or without being forced to ask the consent of any other person, or without joining any organization. That is in accord with our American way of life.

May I urge you to please pass this conservative bill without adding any harsh, radical, or unreasonable amendments, or controversial amendments. If any of you have additional legislation in mind, please bring it up in another bill after this bill has been passed.

Some folks may say that this job is for the Federal Government. Surely we must admit that the Federal Government has a most gigantic task on its hands and why should we fold our arms and wait for the Federal Government to do it all?

I want to announce to the whole wide world today that, as Governor of this great State of Texas, there are not going to be any strikes or lock-outs in the national-defense industries or other essential industries in Texas during the time of this national emergency, without it proving to be very unprofitable for those who engage in such strikes or lock-outs.

I am submitting this as emergency legislation, and I ask for the concurrence of the Forty-seventh Texas Legislature by the quick enactment of the attached bill today, if possible.

Respectfully submitted.

W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Governor of Texas.

A bill to be entitled, "An act requiring employers and employees in industries essential to national defense, and certain businesses charged with a public duty, to file notice of any intended strike or lock-out with certain county officials; fixing the time such notice shall be given and the nature thereof; declaring certain strikes and lock-outs to be illegal; making unlawful the giving of aid and assistance to persons engaged in illegal strikes or lock-outs, and fixing penalties therefor; making unlawful the using of more than two pickets at any entrance to place where labor difficulty exists, and fixing penalties for violation thereof; making unlawful the use of force and violence, or threats thereof to prevent any person from engaging in any lawful vocation, and providing penalties for violation thereof; making it unlawful for persons to assemble and attempt by force or violence to prevent any person from engaging in any lawful vocation, and making unlawful the promoting, encouraging, and aiding of such unlawful assemblages, and prescribing penalties for the violation thereof; making the provisions of this act cumulative of existing laws, and providing a severance or saving clause; and declaring an emergency"

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Texas:

SECTION 1. Hereafter, when a dispute shall arise between an employer and employees in an industry which is essential to national defense, or where the employer is operating a hospital, public utility, or a transportation system, before any strike shall be engaged in or put into effect by such employees, or before such employees shall be locked out by the employer, a written notice shall be filed by such employees or employer, as the case may be, with the county clerk of the county where the industry is situated, as well as with the respective county clerks of all other counties in which such industry operates its business, if any, and the same is affected by such dispute. Such notice by the employees shall state that it is the purpose of such employees to enter upon a strike and state the reasons and demands, and such notice by the employer shall state that it is the purpose of such employer to close his business and lock out the employees and give the reasons therefor. No such strike shall be entered into, and no such lock-out shall be made effective, until after the lapse of not less than 60 days from and after the filing of said notice or notices with the county clerk or county clerks as herein provided. Such notice when filed with the county clerk shall be posted by him in a public place in the courthouse and shall be released to the press.

Any strike which may be called in violation of this section shall be deemed to be an illegal strike, and any lock-out which shall be made in violation of this section shall be deemed to be an illegal lock-out, and any person acting by himself, or as a member of any group or organization, or acting in concert with one or more other persons, who shall knowingly grant any aid or assistance to any person engaged in any such illegal strike, or any such illegal lock-out, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than $1,000, nor more than $5,000, and each day such aid or assistance is continued shall constitute a separate offense. The provisions of this section shall not apply to employees of railroads or the management of railroads who are under the jurisdiction of the Federal Railway Labor Act.

SEC. 2. In all cases where disputes exist between employers and employees, it shall be unlawful to have more than two persons on picket duty at any entrance to a place or building where a labor difficulty exists. Any person guilty of violating this section, or any person or organization guilty of abetting or aiding others to violate this section, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than $100, nor more than $1,000, and each day such violation of this section shall continue shall constitute a separate offense.

SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful for any person by the use of force or violence, or threat of the use of force or violence, to attempt to prevent any person from engaging in any lawful vocation within this State. Any person guilty of violating this section shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by confinement in the State penitentiary for not less than 1 year nor more than 2 years.

SEC. 4. It shall be unlawful for any person acting in concert with one or more other persons, to assemble at or near any place where a labor difficulty exists, and attempt by force or violence to prevent any person from engaging in any lawful vocation, or for any person acting either by himself, or as a member of any group or organization or acting in concert with one or more other persons, to promote, encourage, or aid any such unlawful assemblage. Any person guilty of violating this section shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by confinement in the State penitentiary for not less than 1 year, nor more than 2 years.

SEC. 5. The provisions of this act shall be cumulative of all other existing articles of the penal code upon the same subject, and in the event of a conflict between existing articles and the provisions of this act, then and in that event the provisions, offenses, and punishments set forth herein shall prevail over such existing articles.

SEC. 6. If any section, paragraph, clause, or provision of this act is declared unconstitutional, inoperative, or invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, the same shall not affect or invalidate the remainder of this act.

SEC. 7. The fact that it is essential that industries of this State engaged in national defense be protected from strikes and that all citizens of this State be protected from the use of violence in labor disputes, creates an emergency and an imperative public necessity that the constitutional rule requiring bills to be read on 3 several days be suspended and it is hereby suspended and this bill shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage, and it is so enacted.

An Unfortunate Circumstance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. JONES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE PIQUA (OHIO) DAILY CALL

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Piqua (Ohio) Daily Call:

[From the Piqua (Ohio) Daily Call]

AN UNFORTUNATE CIRCUMSTANCE

One of the major problems facing selectees, or more specifically draftees, today is whether they are going to be accepted in the United States Army even after they have been ordered to report for induction. The notice of selection specifically states, "Persons reporting to the induction station in some instances may be rejected for physical or other reasons. It is well to keep this in mind in arranging your affairs, to prevent any undue hardship if you are rejected."

This is indeed an unfortunate circumstance and places young men in a most difficult position. It leaves his future hanging in midair. He must prepare to leave his home and job for 1 year or more, for if accepted he does not come back. At the same time in disposing of his automobile and such property he faces the financial loss should he be rejected.

What to do? That is certainly the problem facing the hundreds of young men being taken into the Army. But the most unfortunate part of the question is that it could easily be remedied and should be at once.

It should be just as easy to examine a man finally in his home town and give him sufficient notice as to whether he is going to the Army or not before he actually makes preparation to leave.

It is true that there is a local examination, but apparently the United States Army does not have sufficient confidence in local physicians to give them final decision in the matter. It is no hidden fact that the percentage of rejections has been and still is much higher than the Army anticipated—that is, rejections at the induction station.

Four Piqua men have made preparations to leave for a year or more. In each of these cases the man was back home 24 hours later. In at least one instance the selectee had gone to much trouble to turn over his business and other affairs only to have the trouble, worry, and perhaps financial loss go for naught.

The remedy for the problem seems to be confined to two alternatives: Either the Army place sufficient confidence in local physicians for final decision on the question of physical fitness or send Army physicians to each community for wholesale examinations of men eligible for call. In the latter case registrants should have sufficient notice that they were going to enter Army service and could act with full knowledge that they were to be accepted when the time arrived.

It is indeed an unfortunate and perplexing circumstance faced by young men who must literally gamble with their business and personal property when induction time comes.

Fort Lincoln, N. Dak.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE NORTH DAKOTA STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, at this time, when the Congress is being called upon for large appropriations all important in their character, I am sure, and thoroughly needed in our defense program, I cannot fail to present to the House Concurrent Resolution U from the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, asking that the Congress give due consideration to some phase of economics in this rather extensive appropriation campaign in which we are engaged.

There is located today in the State of North Dakota an important Army post that has been in existence for a long span of years, the name of which is Fort Lincoln. Originally this post was located just across the river, the Missouri River, and was the post at which General Custer and his forces were located when he received his order to go forth and engage the Indians in battle. The history of this important episode is now known to all. It is not, however, to the tradition back of this old post that I direct the attention of the Congress today, but rather to the fact that the post today is one of the finest in the country, excellent officers' quarters and first-class barracks, smaller by far than many other posts, but yet well equipped, modern, and up to date, and in excellent condition.

Within the last 2 years the Government has expended large sums of money on repairs; conspicuous among them was the building of a fine outdoor swimming pool at the cost of many thousands of dollars. This important post has been abandoned at a time when these vast appropriations are being made for Army housing. It does not seem to me to be consistent with good business. True, the argument is made that it is a cold country, and the cost of the Army is too expensive. This is not altogether a reasonable argument when we take into consideration that the Government still maintains Fort Meade in South Dakota and Fort Missoula in Montana, both of which suffer the same degree of cold weather as does Fort Lincoln. Surely if these other posts are practical to maintain, the Government should give due consideration to the already large investment at Fort Lincoln, and the post should be regarrisoned at the earliest possible date.

I submit herewith the resolution from the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota:

House Concurrent Resolution U

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to maintain a military post at Fort Lincoln

Whereas Fort Lincoln is situated in approximately the center of an individual area comprising 150,000 square miles, with a population of 1,250,000, and is supported by an excellent rail and highway network, and is adjacent to a proposed international air line joining the United States, Canada, and Alaska; and

Whereas Fort Lincoln is situated in the geographical center of the State, and is the only military post in North Dakota, and the only one between Fort Snelling, in Minnesota, and Missoula, Mont., and is the only military post between the Canadian border on the north and Fort Meade, in the Black Hills section of South Dakota, on the south; and

Whereas the buildings and grounds comprising the military post of Fort Lincoln are in excellent condition and are capable of caring for many hundreds of citizens called to the service of their country during the present national emergency: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-seventh Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to take such steps as are necessary to maintain Fort Lincoln as a military post.

EARL D. SYMINGTON,
Speaker of the House.
C. E. TERRY,
Chief Clerk of the House.
OSCAR W. HAGEN,
President of the Senate,
W. J. TROUT,
Secretary of the Senate.

Under Our Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1941

ARTICLE BY IGNATIUS K. WERWINSKI

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I was encouraged by the unanimous support given by the House this afternoon to the pending resolution providing for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski on October 11, 1941. In the Third Congressional District of Indiana, which I have the honor to represent, we have an outstanding citizen, Mr. Ignatius K. Werwinski, who has devoted many years of his life to preserve the memory of this gallant soldier, a soldier who played such an important role in our war for independence. Mr. Werwinski formerly served as Chairman of the United States Pulaski Sesquicentennial Commission and is a lieutenant in the Officers' Reserve Corps.

On Pulaski Day, October 11, 1940, Mr. Werwinski wrote a beautiful tribute to the memory of General Pulaski. With the unanimous consent of the Members of the House I am pleased to submit it herewith:

UNDER OUR FLAG

(By Ignatius K. Werwinski, lieutenant, Officers' Reserve Corps; also former Chairman of the U. S. Pulaski Sesquicentennial Commission)

Under our flag, purest, most potent emblem of law, order, Christian civilization that ever saluted the dawn, during the Revolutionary War, gave a life to a hero of two hemispheres, Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

Under our flag, ne'er dropped in dust of defeat, fostered by revered father of the Revolution, the name of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is imperishably written in letters of gold on the pages of American history, defying the ages.

Under our flag, floating in zephyrs of high heaven o'er the eternal capital of a republic, founded on the rock of righteousness, symbol of humanity's fondest, dearest hope, forever proclaiming justice, human brotherhood throughout the land, through the inspiration left us by Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

Under our flag, unstained, untarnished, bejeweled, gleaming in darkest night, her triumphal march across the centuries a path of light. Who dare touch with profaning hand, this sleepless majestic guardian of an ardent, strong, brave, free people, and under which flag Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski gave his life in Savannah, Ga., on October 11, 1779.

Under our flag, inspiration of a mighty race, mingling in sentiment of cherished children, native of her soil undefiled, and lovers of liberty from every clime, seeking naught but the common good, yearning to serve mankind 'neath sheltering aegis of the red, white, and blue, under which Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski fought.

Under our flag, immortalized by Washington, and under which flag fought Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, her beauteous folds spread from gulf to coast by Jefferson, borne aloft by Lincoln in strife of heroes that united as one a sisterhood of States and blended the blue and gray in fires of patriotism, preserving every star in the shining standard of national sovereignty. May Old Glory, under which Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski fought and gave his life, in all the flood of time wave with undimmed radiance and increasing splendor over the fairest expanse of God's earth.

Under our flag, precious, sublime inheritance, blessing of America's faith, power, unity, sanctified by patriot blood of our hero, Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski. We consecrate anew in o'erflowing measures our hearts, our eager, willing service of hand and brain to the defense and greater glory to our country for which Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski fought and gave his life.

Under our flag may the American people pay the due tribute to the memory of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski on the one hundred and sixty-first anniversary of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, Revolutionary War hero, by observing and commemorating the anniversary of his death.

Dedicated to the Sons of Revolution.

OCTOBER 11, 1940.

A Separate Air Force Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address, entitled "A Separate Air Force Now," I made over the Columbia network Friday, March 14:

A SEPARATE AIR FORCE

This week the Government of the United States took a historic step to clarify its position in regard to World War No. 2. What you or I thought of this position last week, or last month, is no longer important. The vital fact is that a majority of the Congress—the duly elected representatives of the people—joined with President Roosevelt to enact a national policy whose significance is unrivaled in the history of this Nation; yes, perhaps unrivaled in the history of the world. Now that the policy has been adopted, the important thought for everybody—you and me—is to see that this policy is carried out with the greatest possible degree of efficiency; nothing short of complete success will do. The best is none too good, and we won't stop until the best is achieved. This is the American way.

AN ARSENAL OF DEMOCRACY

The best and clearest way for me to outline this new national policy for you is to quote from President Roosevelt's brief letter to Speaker of the House RAYBURN last Wednesday. The President declared:

"This Nation has felt that it was imperative to the security of America that we encourage the democracies' heroic resistance to aggressions by not only maintaining but also increasing the flow of material assistance from this country. Therefore, the Congress has enacted and I have signed H. R. 1776.

"Through this legislation our country has determined to do its full part in creating an adequate arsenal of democracy. This great arsenal will be here in this country. It will be a bulwark of our own defense. It will be the source of the tools of defense for all democracies who are fighting to preserve themselves against aggression.

"While the defense equipment produced under H. R. 1776 remains under the control of the United States until it is ready for disposition, it is the fixed policy of this Government to make for democracies every gun, plane, and munition of war that we possibly can."

To me this means a national policy based on two equally important points: First, the United States will provide every possible gun, plane, and munition of war to help the democracies who are fighting aggression and who are thereby forming our first line of defense; second, the United States will continue its present policy of building our own defense strength so that, come what may in Europe and Asia, the Western Hemisphere will always remain the citadel of democracy and international law and order. Since we are committed to a policy of sending every possible ship, plane, gun, and shell to Europe, the efficiency with which we use what is left on this side of the Atlantic and Pacific becomes the paramount factor in our own defense program. Efficiency and unity—these are the key words. Gone are the days when we could indulge in the amusing spectacle and luxury of interdepartmental debate and discussion. Gone are the days when we could afford forensic discussions on whether wars are won by infantry or battleships—whether fleet power is more important than air power, or whether the United States should stock up on long-range bombers or pursuit planes.

The answer to these questions and hundreds of similar ones is as simple as it is important. The answer is—we need as much of everything as we can get; we need as many battleships, cruisers, and destroyers as we can build; we need as large an army training force as we can handle; and we need as many planes of every category as we can make. But even more important than the mere collection of men, matériel, and equipment, we need a unified plan which provides for utilization of men, matériel, and equipment with the greatest degree of efficiency ever known to mankind.

MUST LOOK TO FUTURE

I don't want to be critical of what has been done thus far. I think our Army and Navy have done the best job possible under the circumstances. I am not interested in the past. Post mortems don't win wars. I am interested in the future. I want to see the best possible use made of all the equipment that is not sent across the Atlantic and the Pacific. And to provide this unity and efficiency I have introduced legislation which would provide a unified department of national defense in the Cabinet. This bill, also before Congress last year, would substitute the unified and streamlined department of national defense for the now separated War and Navy Departments. Under my measure the War and Navy Departments would become important segments of a single defense command.

And what is just as important, my proposal would provide that the Nation's air power would become an independent segment of the unified command. It would be raised to a position of equal importance to the Army and Navy. In short, our three equally important fighting forces—the Army, Navy, and Air Corps—would be welded into one unified and efficient defense machine under the leadership of one coordinating head who could sit at the Cabinet table and speak for all the fighting forces in one breath. I believe this to be in line with the provision of the Constitution making the President the Commander in Chief of all the Nation's fighting forces. If the Constitution provides for one Commander in Chief, I believe it is up to Congress to provide for one—and only one—unified fighting force. There might have been a time when we could afford to have a separate War and Navy Department, but I honestly believe that such a time has become history along with the events of the last 18 months.

Now that I have described the primary purpose of my bill H. R. 3795—the unification of the Nation's fighting forces—let me point out another important end that would be accomplished. I refer to the fact that it would liberate our air-fighting power from under the bushel that is now hiding its true light. I am not interested in past debates over whether the Army and Navy have placed sufficient emphasis on air power. I am only interested in making certain that future development of United States air power will be placed in the hands of those who have only one responsibility—maximum development of United States air power. I want the United States air force to be the most efficient and powerful in the world, and to achieve this end I believe every military flying machine in the Nation should be under one command. That is real unity—the essence of our national defense.

WAR IS FOUGHT IN AIR

So far as I am concerned, this is not a new project or a novel idea. I am not a military expert. I am a layman. So are most of you, my listeners tonight. But I do not believe it takes a military or naval expert to see the logic of a unified defense command—of an air force equal in rank to the Army and Navy. I do not believe it takes a military expert to judge the importance of air power in modern warfare. Just read the newspaper headlines or listen to the radio news broadcasts that will follow this program, and you can see the reason I stress the need for an efficient and unified Air Corps. I do not claim to be a prophet, but I should like to recall an excerpt from a speech I made in February 1937 during a debate on the House floor:

"The next war will be fought in the air. * * * We must realize that the center of our national defense has shifted from the land and sea into the air. * * * With this fact in mind, prompt preparedness at that point should be our chief concern."

Let us see what has happened to my prediction. Let me quote from an excellent article published in the March issue of Readers Digest. This article, Why We Must Have a Separate Air Force," was written by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky, a United States Air Corps Reserve specialist, who commanded a Russian air squadron in the World War, and who has been designing and manufacturing airplanes and inventing bomb sights for the United States Army Air Corps since he became a United States citizen in 1927. He unexpectedly is in the studio tonight. I am happy he is here. Major de Seversky opens his article:

"In Europe today a flaming scroll bearing a military message of tremendous import is

being unrolled before America's eyes. That message is ominously clear: Vast armies lie immobilized in England and Europe; once-proud navies venture forth in peril of destruction from the skies; and plainly for all to see, the air has become the decisive arena of combat."

AMERICAN AIR FORCE WEAK

With this introduction, the Major continued:

"I have studied, as far as I am aware, all recent attacks on the idea of an independent air force. * * * The common denominator of all the objections is the claim that the United States has built a fairly creditable air force under the aegis of the two older services.

"The rebuttal is simple: It is that at present the United States has no air power at all. We have a miscellany of warplanes but no air power. We have an effective naval air arm, plus an amorphous mass of Army aircraft. Neither of them, nor the two together, constitute air power"

In giving his expert analysis of the strategic lesson to be learned from the events in Europe to date, the Major declared: "The present war discloses one basic principle of air power: No land or sea operations are possible where control of the air is in the hands of the adversary. Dunkerque is a superb demonstration. The withdrawal operations there were accomplished primarily because the British had established local superiority in the air. British Spitfires and Hurricanes, masters of any German pursuit plane by reason of a mere 25-mile-per-hour margin, were able to control the air over the Channel; without such control the evacuation would have been a shambles. This supremacy, however, applied only within a radius of 150 miles—the effective range of land-based British pursuit planes.

"The same local superiority accounts for Hitler's inability hitherto to invade England. The Battle of Britain is an almost perfect laboratory case of pure-air warfare. Out of it one blood-red fact emerges: Hitler cannot invade Britain, so long as a swift British fighter command maintains its margin of superiority in the skies over the British Isles."

GENERAL ARNOLD SEES NEED

No less an authority than Maj. Gen. Henry H. Arnold, Deputy Chief of Staff of the United States Army, and head of the Army Air Corps, has given tacit approval to the idea of a unified air command. I have already asked the House Committee on Executive Expenditures for an immediate hearing on my bill, and I have a list of air force experts who will be called as witnesses when this hearing is granted. I can tell you now that Major Arnold will be one of the experts whose testimony I will be most anxious to hear. In his new book, Winged Warfare, Major Arnold, in collaboration with Col. Ira C. Eaker, his former executive officer in the Air Corps, declared:

"Many feel that eventually the defense air component of the Nation will be given a status coordinate and commensurate with that of the Army and Navy. When that time will come, if it does come, is not yet clear. It came in some of the other nations of the world when the pressure of war was upon them. We shall be fortunate in our time if that reorganization comes in the relative calm of peace, or at worst, in the preparatory stage and not in the fighting stage."

The book continues:

"It may be that eventually air forces for all countries will be separated from land and sea forces for the same reasons that sea and land forces were separated more than a century ago."

When Major Arnold says that every nation might eventually have to separate air power this question, Why shouldn't the United States do this very thing right now while we are in the midst of the greatest national preparedness effort in our history?

I believe we should.

from land and sea forces, I am forced to ask

Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1941

RESOLUTION BY THE WISCONSIN STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin:

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 1

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to enact a just and adequately financed old-age-pension law

Whereas 53,310 persons received old-age-assistance grants in Wisconsin in the month of December 1940, with the average payments of $22.80 per recipient; and

Whereas such payments are wholly inadequate to maintain the American standard of living because of the mounting food prices and increase in rent costs; and

Whereas it is now an accepted duty of our Government to provide security for the aged, even inadequate and complex as it is, by reason of an advanced age qualification of 65 years and a faulty system of taxation to raise sufficient revenues to carry on the program in decency; and

Whereas most northern Wisconsin counties cannot raise sufficient moneys to pay the 20 percent charged back to them for old-age assistance because of delinquent tax rolls caused by cut-over lands, thereby causing the State to lose much revenue because of inability to match the Federal allotment to which it would be otherwise entitled, and which, if received and matched by the State, would enable payments to old-age-pension recipients of $40 per month as provided by law; and

Whereas many authorities, including President Roosevelt, are in full accord with a Federal old-age-pension system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Wisconsin Legislature respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to consider the passage of a just and adequately financed national old-age-pension law; and be it further

Resolved, That this legislature urges the consideration of legislation as proposed in bill H. R. 1036, introduced in the Seventy-seventh Congress and known as the Townsend General Welfare Act, which provides for liberal pension payments for all over 60 years of age and carries with it a just tax measure, based upon the ability to pay; and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to both Houses of the Congress of the United States and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

WALTER S. GOODLAND,
President of the Senate.
VERNON W. THOMSON,
Speaker of the Assembly.
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
ARTHUR L. MAY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

The Townsend Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE TOWNSEND NATIONAL WEEKLY

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial comment from Townsend National Weekly:

[From the Townsend National Weekly]

AN OPEN LETTER TO DR. LEWIS HANEY, PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

DEAR DR. HANEY: You have recently carried two articles in the nationally syndicated Hearst newspapers purporting to answer questions regarding the Townsend plan.

On March 4 you printed the following item:

"Chicago asks:

"'Why did you fail to answer the second part of the question about the Townsend plan—what are the objections to it?'

"Answer: I did answer, but the answer seems to have been cut. The plan is unsound and bad in every way, and no reputable economist has ever favored it. It would give money to people, regardless of what they may or may not have done to earn it. The burden of additional taxes would be enormous, and would take away as much purchasing power as given. It would force inflation and a rising cost of living.

"Fortunately this wild scheme does not have the ghost of a chance now when we need all our funds for defense."

First, Dr. Haney, you say the "plan is unsound and bad in every way."

Are we to assume that you mean bad as to its objectives too? And just what is meant by "unsound"? Or are you merely expressing a prejudiced opinion? What portion of the plan is unsound? Is it the gross income tax you object to—a levy that has been proven successful in actual operation—or is it the retirement of the aged on a decent living basis?

Incidentally, you might tell us if you consider mass unemployment of youth and the virtual starvation of the aged economically sound.

You say that "no reputable economist has ever favored it" (the Townsend plan).

Please tell use how many reputable economists have ever favored any plan that was of benefit to the mass of the people. We know

the difficulties in their way, because they would immediately lose their reputation and highly remunerative assignments.

Your next line is a gem:

"It (the plan) would give money to people regardless of what they may or may not have done to earn it."

Please tell us what authority is set up to protect the position of those who have worked hard and earned retirement. What of the aged investors in 10,000 smashed American banks? What of those who lost their all in the failure of hundreds of life-insurance companies, building and loan associations, and high-class stocks? What of those who worked, slaved, and earned only to have their savings taken from them in some high-sounding legitimate promotion?

And what of the two-thirds of the population who do not have a mathematical chance, regardless of the opportunities at the top, to earn enough to have any real savings?

You know that of the 64,000,000 persons covered by life insurance in the United States, nearly 80 percent will have their insurance policies terminated in a manner which does not fulfill the principal purposes for which insurance was intended. Only a fraction of America's insurance policies are terminated by death.

As a reputable economist, you certainly are familiar with the vast inroads made on employment by the march of technological advance. Even national defense has proven but partially effective in eliminating unemployment.

Whether we like it or not, there are no jobs for millions—and particularly for the aged—yet abundance can be produced for all (national survey of potential product capacity).

You say the burden of additional taxes under the Townsend plan would be enormous.

Will you figure the additional cost of a ton of coal, or a loaf of bread, from the ground to the consumer, and show us just exactly what that burden will be? Prove, if you can, that it could possibly be more than a mere 5 percent—actually a replacement tax and not a fresh burden.

And what of the stupendous load of taxation that the Townsend plan will lift from the shoulders of the economically oppressed? What of the canceled 6-percent social-security tax on pay rolls, or the savings on the cost of maintaining old people's homes, hospitals, present pension payments (small as they are), the saving on our $15,000,000,000 annual crime bill through the employment of youth, as well as the moral, spiritual, and physical satisfaction accruing to the whole of society?

To our unbounded surprise, Dr. Haney, you also state that this "burden of additional taxes * * * would take away as much purchasing power as given. It would force inflation and a rising cost of living."

Come, come Doctor. Surely it is not possible for one simple tax to do both these things. If it takes away as much purchasing power as it gives, it could scarcely add to the gross amount of purchasing power—and therefore could not force inflation or a rise in the cost of living. We are sure that you will at least admit you are wrong on one of these two contradictory statements.

Your last paragraph, which seeks to discourage the only hope held by millions who are not wanted or needed by industry, and in which you rejoice that this "wild scheme does not have the ghost of a chance because we need all our funds for defense," is again a mere expression of personal opinion. Your use of the word "scheme" reflects your bias against the Townsend plan.

We believe that we can demonstrate to even the reputable economists, if they will open their minds, that the operation of the Townsend plan would be of the greatest possible advantage to the defense program. We know that it will add to the national-defense revenue by bringing idle excess savings into circulation and through its forced spending program, beginning with those who now have little or nothing, give the Government new billions to tax.

The legislatures of 19 States, representing 40,000,000 people, have given their approval to the plan and have memorialized Congress to enact it. At least 200 Congressmen are known to be favorable, as well as many Senators, including Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY, recently Republican candidate for the Vice Presidency. Your colleague, Cecil B. Dickson, of International News Service, has informed us that the President has endorsed three cardinal features of the Townsend plan.

In conclusion, be assured that we are not cross with you but are very happy that you have found it necessary to give us so much attention in your interesting column. It gives added assurance to the timid that an organization of 10,000 clubs, stretching from coast to coast, is very much alive.

Sincerely,

SHERMAN J. BAINBRIDGE,
Editor, Townsend National Weekly.

Is the St. Lawrence Seaway a "Gateway to World Trade?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS JOURNAL

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, among the many extravagant benefits credited to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project has been added the glib promise that the farmers of the great agricultural areas of North America will reap an increase in the money obtained for the fruits of their production.

It is another artful attempt by those advocating this unsound and impractical seaway project to try and mislead the American people into regarding the St. Lawrence seaway as a harbinger of increased commerce and an aid to our national defense.

The fallacy of being blindly led into a veritable "fool's paradise" in accepting the proposed St. Lawrence seaway is ably portrayed by the following editorial written by Paul M. Smith, editor of the Locomotive Engineers Journal, issue of March 1941.

Editor Smith's message is as follows:

[From the Locomotive Engineers Journal of March 1941]

A MESSAGE

To the Membership:

Baited with glittering misconceptions, the farmers of the great agricultural areas of North America are being led to believe that the St. Lawrence waterway and power scheme will help them get more money for their products. They are told that such a project would make the area a mighty "gateway to world trade."

Skillful instigators of the scheme have neglected to mention that this so-called gate to world trade, which is so generously offered this great area—at the expense of the already overburdened taxpayers—is a swinging gate. One that will swing back and smack the face (and security) of the very same farmer and businessman, small and large, who would have to struggle to pay this enormous tax bill. The great farm areas should become alert to the fact that America's agricultural markets are jeopardized by this scheme which is being proven unsound economically and politically.

A quick survey of world trade conditions reveals the backswing that could be expected from the St. Lawrence scheme. Most of America's trade, except for war and defense transactions with Great Britain, is with South America and probably will remain so balanced for years to come. Our good neighbor policy will see to that.

In return for our goods Latin America offers principally agricultural products, cattle and hides. Through lower living standards and peon labor their cost of production is much cheaper than in the United States and Canada. Thus the St. Lawrence scheme would enable them to dump these products into the very center of America's own agricultural area and would do much to demoralize the markets.

Not so long ago, you may recall, a number of small ocean-going boats from South America came through the circuitous St. Lawrence route and unloaded their cargoes of grain in the Midwest. This raised havoc with grain markets in the area.

With the good-neighbor policy enforced, politicians would find it most discomforting and embarrassing to endeavor to raise protective tariffs to guard our agricultural markets in the Midwest. Thus, through the St. Lawrence scheme, America's great army of farmers would toil in their fields to raise the taxes for a project that would severely cripple their own markets.

Increased opposition to the St. Lawrence project is becoming more evident throughout Canada and the United States, as people become more familiar with its economic and political effect. As a defense measure it cannot be completed in time to be of any use in the present conflict, and when completed it could be used only about 7 months of each year because it would be icebound and unnavigable 5 months of the year. As a power project steam plants have been conceded to be far more desirable because they can be erected where the power is needed, more quickly and at less cost.

A channel 27 feet deep is specified in the project, which eliminates the possibility of building warships of capital size—battleships or cruisers—in the Great Lakes shipyards as many of the project's proponents would have us believe. Lake shipbuilding facilities are already congested with their share of the construction of boats which can go through the existing water route.

As we consider the St. Lawrence scheme in the solid light of day we must not neglect the fact that it will do much to harm the farmers of Canada and the United States. Neither can we forget that the scheme will serve to drain millions of dollars from overburdened taxpayers in every part of the country now (and for many years to come) when every effort and dollar is urgently needed for advancement of a vital rearmament program.

Yours fraternally,

PAUL M. SMITH, *Editor.*

The Cotton Situation—Parity for Domestic Consumption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1941

LETTER OF GEORGE SEALY, OF GALVESTON, TEX., TO THE NATIONAL COTTON COUNCIL, MEMPHIS, TENN.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I embrace in my remarks on the cotton situation the letter of Mr. George Sealy, of Galveston, Tex., to the National Cotton Council, Memphis, Tenn. Mr. Sealy is a man of wide experience in the cotton business and his letter will be found of interest.

The letter follows:

GALVESTON WHARVES,
Galveston, Tex., March 14, 1941.

NATIONAL COTTON COUNCIL,
Memphis, Tenn.

GENTLEMEN: Replying to your recent letter asking for remedial suggestions pertaining to our cotton problems, I give you the following, which I have advocated consistently for the past 8 years, and which is gradually, although not admittedly, being put into practice.

I refer more specifically to a two-price system on cotton, one domestic and the other foreign, or an "inverted tariff policy" upon that portion of cotton domestically consumed.

Since the cost of a farmer's living is based largely upon factors wholly within our country, and is based upon a needed income for the cotton farmer to live decently, I feel that since his revenue has largely been curtailed through causes not of his own making, but in behalf of the general good of all, as so ably explained in exhibit B of the National Cotton Council of America, he should be reimbursed for this loss of revenue.

This reimbursement should apply to that quantity of his product eligible for sale in his domestic market, inasmuch as his necessities are based upon domestic market prices.

The quota allotted to him in the American market should be based upon bales and not acres, and the Government should not, on one hand, abandon cotton acreage and, on the other hand, through the expenditure of millions of dollars, encourage a similar production on the remaining acreage allotted for cotton.

If industry has two prices for its product, agriculture should have the same opportunity in meeting foreign competition with a lower price, if need be.

Cotton cannot ask for favors, nor charity, from its Government, and it must be consistent in its demands for a near parity price for its product sold in its home market, and, like indusry, take its chances in selling any surplus production abroad.

Sugar producers in America enjoy a bonus upon that portion of their product domestically consumed, and American labor and farmers contribute largely to such an added cost for sugar. In some instances the average protection per pound of sugar has been 2 cents since the beginning of the Sugar Act in 1934. This is equivalent to 172 percent ad valorem of the average world price of 1.2 cents a pound in the same period.

It might not be inappropriate to mention that Secretary Wallace, then Secretary of Agriculture in 1938, estimated the total net cost to the Nation of sugar protection, under the quota-subsidy system, was about $300,000,000 per year.

A small bonus given to the cotton farmer upon his share of domestic consumption would not bear heavily upon the ultimate consumer of his finished product. Even if 10 cents per pound were added to the present price of, say, 10-cent cotton, giving the farmer 20 cents a pound upon that portion of his cotton sold in America, would add only 5 cents to the cost of a laborer's shirt, ½ cent to the cost of his socks, 2½ cents for his towel, and 10 cents to the cost of his pants, all of which any retailer of laboring men's apparel would advise offers no great sales resistance.

In other words, give the farmer 80 percent of parity price on the domestically sold cotton, to which he is justly entitled, and as a bonus, for his loss of his foreign cotton on account of no fault of his own, add a $10 bill per bale, or just 2 cents per pound.

His small surplus remaining must find a foreign market, like any other product, or a loan at world's prices could be given him.

Eighty percent of parity, or say 12 cents for the farmer's entire 12,000,000-bale crop would be $720,000,000.

The farmer would receive this sum in the following manner:

80 percent of parity, or say 12 cents for 9,000,000 bales domestically consumed would be	$540,000,000
A proposed bonus of, say, 2 cents on his 9,000,000 domestic sales would be	$90,000,000
(This bonus is on account of loss of foreign markets, Neutrality Act, etc.)	
3,000,000 bales remaining for foreign sales at 6 cents, or a Government loan at world competitive prices would be	90,000,000
	720,000,000

Ample Government machinery is already established for fair allotment purposes, and since the general consensus of opinion seems to be that all past efforts have not solved our cotton difficulties, it seems to me that the above suggestion might at least be attempted.

With thousands of southern acres suited only to cotton cultivation, there can be no further abandonment of any more cotton land without disrupting the entire economic structure of the South.

Since those days when we first started a curtailment program, foreign nations have consistently increased their cotton planting, and during the past several years for every single acre increase in foreign cotton acreage we have reduced ours 3 acres.

With 24,400,000 acres planted to cotton in 1940 and only 1,200,000 acres in sugar beets and sugarcane, it does seem the cotton farmer rightfully deserves an inverted tariff like the direct tariff applicable to the sugar producer.

It is doubtful if any other product of human endeavor, either in industry or agriculture, calls upon so many human hands for its passage into ultimate consumption from the time it was conceived.

Hand chopped and hand picked, ginned and compressed bale by bale, loaded and unloaded into cars by human effort alone, sampled, classed, and marked, tagged and weighed, trucked and toted bale by bale, until it is stowed into the hold of a ship, and stacked by sweating muscles, until it reaches the textile mill at home or abroad.

Hundreds of thousands have depended upon and coordinated the ramifications of cotton growing and handling, and the world still clamors for more and more cotton, while we stack ours higher and higher, like Brazil did with its coffee, Canada with its wheat, and England with its rubber.

It all seems so simple if the cotton farmer could just get an even break at home, and, like the producer of steel, kodaks, and sewing machines, meet foreign prices with his surplus, if need be.

Perhaps this plan is too easy, but it might be well worth trying.

Yours truly,
GEORGE SEALY, *Chairman.*

P. S.—Total cotton exports from all the South today are 759,006 bales as against 5,067,870 bales last year—while Brazil sells her cotton to Canada.

Government Can Save $2,000,000,000 a Year on Interest Charges and Prevent Dangerous Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. WRIGHT PATMAN, OF TEXAS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me on Saturday, March 15, 1941, over the Mutual Broadcasting Co.'s national hook-up from Washington, D. C.:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, the country faces today vast new economic as well as social problems. We now speak in terms of billions of dollars, whereas, up until the recent past such huge amounts were seldom referred to. Changes in the structure of our country are occurring with bewildering speed.

Every citizen is deeply and earnestly concerned about the national debt. It is said if we keep on expanding the national debt at this rate that we will go broke; that we will not be able to pay our debts.

History teaches us that governments do not default on their debts to their own people. They always pay them; however, it is not unusual for such debts to be paid in money of a changed value.

NATIONAL DEBT EQUIVALENT OF $130,000,000,000

By the end of this year our Federal Government will owe $65,000,000,000. It will be owed to individuals and corporations holding United States Government bonds. The interest burden on this enormous debt will exceed $2,000,000,000 annually. A debt of $65,000,000,000 is equal to a per capita debt of $500, or for a family of five, it is equal to $2,500. The interest on this $65,000,000,000 debt will amount to as much as the principal by the time the debt is paid. So our debt is really $130,000,000,000 instead of half that amount, if our unconstitutional method of Government financing is not changed. This debt, including principal and interest, is $1,000 per capita, or $5,000 for a family of five.

It is now generally talked on Capitol Hill, here in Washington, that more taxes will have to be raised, that all sorts of nuisance taxes will have to be levied, and individuals with incomes as low as $20 a week will likely have to pay a part of it in taxes.

HOW DEBT CAN BE EASILY RETIRED

Our $65,000,000,000 national debt can easily be retired in 25 years and no interest will have to be paid if Congress will carry out a constitutional mandate. That is what I desire to talk to you about.

The deadline for filing income-tax returns and making the first payment on 1940 income taxes was reached today. The tax burden has assumed proportions never before dreamed of in this country. More individual citizens filed Federal income-tax returns this week than ever before in the history of this Government.

It is one of the duties of a Member of Congress to see that the money collected from the taxpayers for the Government is not squandered. Wasteful and extravagant spending must not be permitted. At the same time, we must spend the amount of money necessary for the purpose of adequately and properly preparing our country against any attack, and we must not be niggardly in defense expenditures.

In financing defense the Government should not promise to pay interest on its obligations when it is unnecessary, useless, and wasteful.

CONGRESS HAS FARMED OUT SOVEREIGNTY OF NATION

The Constitution says that Congress only can coin or print money. The Constitution also says that no State shall coin or print money. The Federal Government is, therefore, supreme over others and is the highest in power on the question of issuing money. I say to you, without any fear of contradiction, that Congress many years ago farmed out to special interests the sovereignty of our Nation to issue money. The people are paying for it now, and paying dearly.

GOVERNMENT INTEREST HAS BECOME A BURDEN

For the first 125 years of our country's existence, the matter of the Federal Government paying interest on bonds was no problem at all as the amounts paid were not sufficient to cause concern. During recent years we have been paying up to $1,000,000,000 a year in interest on United States Government obligations. Now, with our interest burden approaching more than $2,000,000,000 a year, it is time that we give this question serious consideration and, at the very earliest date possible, take away from private interests the power to create money on the Government's credit and vest such power where it belongs—in an agency of Congress. This will not only save the people $2,000,000,000 a year in interest; it will be helpful in many other ways.

SOVEREIGN GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT PAY INTEREST

If a State borrows money, it is proper that the State promise and pay interest on the bonds issued, which are sold for the money issued by the Federal Government. This should not be true of the sovereign Federal Government, since the Federal Government creates all money. It does not make sense to say that the Federal Government should sell interest-bearing bonds to private interests for money that the Government itself creates and furnishes the private interests, in order for them to buy the bonds.

A private corporation must sell interest-bearing bonds to obtain money that is created by the Government. That is no reason why the Government, which creates both bonds and money, should sell interest-bearing bonds in return for money of its own creation. I insist it is illogical and unfair.

MONEY-ISSUING PRIVILEGE FARMED OUT

Through the Federal Reserve Bank System, the money-issuing power of the Government has been farmed out to the private commercial banks. These 12 Federal Reserve banks are owned—lock, stock, and barrel—by the private banks of the country. It is said in reply that the Federal Reserve Board which administers the law is appointed by the President of the United States, which is true, but the members of this Board are paid their salaries by the private banks and the system is otherwise controlled by the private banks. They are Federal in name only. No individual can do business with them. These 12 banks are for banks exclusively.

These 12 Federal Reserve banks perform a governmental function by issuing money upon the credit of the United States Government. The money issued by these 12 banks is really Government non-interest-bearing bonds, and upon the face of this money, it is stated that it is an obligation of the United States Government. This is in violation of the Constitution of the United States, which says that Congress shall issue money. This privately owned Federal Reserve System is certainly not an agency of Congress.

The private commercial banks, in order to claim this great System, have purchased by permission of Congress $138,000,000 of its stock, which represents all of the stock outstanding. Although this is a large amount of money, it is insignificant compared to the privileges enjoyed and exercised by these 12 banks. These 12 banks are privileged to issue money—blanket mortgages on the Government's credit—by paying the cost of printing, which is about 30 cents per thousand dollars. The Treasury sells Government interest-bearing bonds. These 12 privately owned banks pay 30 cents a thousand dollars for another form of Government obligation—money—to buy them with. Perfectly ridiculous, but it enables these 12 banks to pay salaries up to $50,000 a year and receive other undue benefits. These 12 banks pay no taxes to the Federal Government, and no part of their earnings goes to the United States Treasury, as required in the original law. These 12 Federal Reserve banks also claim title to more than $20,000,000,000 in gold that Congress by penal laws has forced the people to give up. In addition, these 12 banks have issued more than $6,000,000,000 in money. All of this, mind you, upon the small investment of $138,000,000 upon which they, too, receive an annual dividend of 6 percent.

This money issued by the 12 Federal Reserve banks is a mortgage upon all of the property of all of the people and is used for the benefit of a few. The salaries and earnings of every individual are pledged to pay any debt contracted by these 12 banks on the credit of the Nation.

TIME HAS COME FOR A CHANGE

The famous Disraeli, former Prime Minister of England, once said:

"Nothing is so powerful as an idea whose time has come."

I say to you, in all earnestness, that the time has now come for the people to change the unconstitutional system of permitting the private banks of the country to use the Goverment's credit free of charge. Congress can, by the enactment of a law of less than 100 words, change this system entirely and save the people more than $2,000,000,000 a year in interest that they will be compelled to pay if the system is not changed and, in addition, can entirely pay off and liquidate the $65,000,000,000 national debt in 25 years by paying on the principal of Government bonds each year what will have to be paid as interest if the system is not changed. The law suggested should provide, among other things, that the $138,000,000 invested by the private banks in the Federal Reserve System should be returned to them immediately. Then the Government will own these money-issuing banks and, without any cloud whatsoever, will own the enormous gold supply of more than $20,000,000,000, and that gold can be used in the interest of the people instead of permitting its use by the private banks.

NON-INTEREST-BEARING BONDS SHOULD BE USED

When the Government owns the 12 Federal Reserve banks, it will not be necessary for the Government to issue and sell interest-bearing bonds. Then as money is needed, non-interesting-bearing bonds can be delivered to these 12 banks, credit given for them on the books of the banks, and checks drawn by the Treasury to pay any debt that is owed by the Government. All outstanding Government bond issues can be paid the same way as they become due or callable. This will be exactly the same system that is used today, except interest will not be paid. The money or credit will be paid into circulation. No more money will be printed than is printed under the present system. There will be no substantial change whatsoever, except the people—the taxpayers—will save $2,000,000,000 a year. It will not be necessary for bonds to be sold to anyone.

I respectfully submit that the Government needs neither the money created by private banks nor the savings of the people to finance our defense program.

THIS PART OF MONEY SYSTEM NO MYSTERY

It is realized by me and others, who are advocating the change of this system, that if anyone speaks out on the subject of money, he is immediately told that this subject is too deep for the common intellect; that it is understandable only by a seventh son of a seventh son, born with the vail in the dark of the moon and that the rest of us must not presume even to think on the subject. The fact is that anyone who knows the difference between right and wrong knows that it is absolutely wrong for the Government to issue interest-bearing bonds when it is absolutely unnecessary, extravagant, and wasteful.

The slogan, "Money is a mystery," has been worth billions of dollars to special interests in this Nation.

Representatives of the people are driven to cover with slogans that mean nothing in connection with this problem.

NO EFFORT TO STIR UP HATE AGAINST THE BANKERS

I have no desire to engage in the old technique of stirring up hate against bankers. They are as fine a group of citizens as we find in the country, and this is not a fight against banking institutions or bankers.

Bankers have much to do in connection with national defense without creating money on the Government's credit and lending it to the Government with interest. The financing of their customers in defense operations will be quite a great undertaking and in addition to their normal business operations.

If commercial banks properly develop their service opportunities to the utmost, it will not be necessary for them to rely, in whole or in part, upon the ownership of Government bonds for support.

OUR PROPOSAL NOT NEW

Mr. Thomas A. Edison said:

"It is absurd to say that our country can issue $30,000,000 in bonds and not $30,000,000 in currency. Both are promises to pay, but one promise fattens the usurer and the other helps the people."

Mr. Edison said further:

"If our Nation can issue a dollar bond, it can issue a dollar bill. The element that makes the bond good makes the bill good

also. The difference between the bond and the bill is that the bond lets money barkers collect twice the amount of the bond and an additional 20 percent interest, whereas the currency pays nobody but those who contribute directly in some useful way."

Those of us who believe that the Government policy of issuing interest-bearing bonds is absolutely idiotic are fortified with the views of some of the greatest men who have ever lived in this country. Among those who entertained the same views were Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Andrew Jackson, Thomas A. Edison, and many others.

No sane argument has ever been presented in favor of the sovereign Government of the United States issuing interest-bearing bonds in preference to its own credit, non-interest-bearing bonds.

INFLATION COMING

It is evident that we are going to have what is generally referred to as inflation. The issuance of bonds and selling them to the banks is the creation of additional money or credit and is more inflationary than if the Government issued the money or credit in the first instance. Because we are going to have inflation does not mean that it should necessarily be ruinous inflation. It can be controlled, and it must be controlled.

ENCOURAGE PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

We should encourage private enterprise, the Government should not engage in any business that can be properly conducted in the interest of the people without Government help. At the same time, the private commercial banks should not be in the Government's business. The issuance of money is a governmental function, and should not be farmed out to private banking interests as it is today.

If the Government issues non-interest-bearing bonds, that does not mean that they will never have to be paid. They will have to be paid, but it does mean that the Government will not have to pay a dollar in interest for every dollar of principal.

No effort is being made to prevent the charging of private interest, or to cause the Government to take over the private banking institutions. The only effort we are making is to have the Government reassume its constitutional duty of coining money and regulating its value. The first step is for the Government to own the Federal Reserve Banking System, which should be just as much a part of this Government as the Treasury itself. When private selfish interests succeeded in getting control of the money-issuing privilege of the Government, they obtained a franchise which is possibly worth more money than a franchise to levy and collect taxes from the people.

THE BILL TO CARRY OUT THE PROPOSAL

For many years I have had pending in Congress a bill providing for the Government ownership of the 12 Federal Reserve banks. In the present Congress that bill is H. R. 116. Time for its consideration has not been ripe in the past, but now the time has come when its consideration cannot be evaded.

If you are interested in preventing dangerous inflation, saving the taxpayers $2,000,000,000 a year, paying our $65,000,000,000 debt in 25 years, and in repealing the law which has farmed out the use and abuse of our Government's credit to the private commercial banks, please let your Congressman and your Senators in Washington, D. C., know your views.

Inauguration of President of Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 17, 1941

ADDRESSES BY DELEGATES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on the occasion of the inauguration of Manuel Avila Camacho as President of Mexico the Mexican Congress most kindly invited several of the visiting delegates to address them in the congressional Chamber. Because of the fact that hemispheric solidarity is so important for mutual defense of the Western Hemisphere, I ask permission that the speeches made on that memorable occasion be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

4 DE DICIEMBRE DE 1940—SESION DE CONGRESO GENERAL

En esta sección se incluyen los discursos proununciados durante la sesión que celebró el Congreso de la Unión en honor de las misiones especiales que vinieron a la transmisión del Poder. Se da a estos discursos el orden en que sus autores ocuparon la tribuna de la Cámara.

El señor diputado doctor don José Gómez Esparza, a nombre de la Cámara de Diputados, dijo: Excelentísimos Señores Embajadores, Honorables Senadores y Diputados, Señoras, Señores: Estamos viviendo en este País hondos capítulos de la vida institucional de la República.

Son los solemnes momentos en que un gran patricio mexicano, el general Lázaro Cárdenas, ha terminado su mandato presidencial, dejando tras de siuna estela luminosa, especialmente marcada en la historia de la Revolución.

Son los instantes en que, cubierto con el blanco manto de la democracia, un ciudadano ilustre, pleno de patriotismo y de virtud, el general Manuel Avila Camacho, ha sido electo Presidente de la República. (Aplausos.)

Y es en el clímax de estos acontecimientos, cuando hoy el Congreso de la Unión de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos se honra con vuestra presencia, excelentísimos señores embajadores, en este nuestro recinto parlamentario.

Desde esta tribuna, que significa el eco más alto de la representación nacional, que tanto enaltecieron con la inspiración de su verbo y la alteza de su pensamiento las más autorizadas voces de mi País, recibid, Excelentísimos Señores, la más cordial bienvenida que os envía sincera el pueblo entero de México. Aceptadla como el homenaje augusto que os tributa una nación, que tiene recorrido un largo y cruento camino, en busca de la libertad y en pro de la democracia.

Deseamos vivamente que vuestra estancia en este suelo sirva para afianzar la amistad, que felizmente hemos tenido con todos los pueblos latinoamericanos y las naciones de los demás continentes, así como también para unir una vez más el noble pabellón de las estrellas y las barras, con el tricolor emblema de la República Mexicana.

Ojalá que vuestra permanencia en México sirva también para daros aunque sea noción somera de la enorme mutación social que está experimentando un pueblo, cuyos aborígenes vivieron largos siglos como siervos durante la dominación colonial; no conocieron su liberación después de la independencia; siguieron atados a la esclavitud durante la dictadura porfiriana y sólo comenzaron a vislumbrar el horizonte de su bienestar al amanecer glorioso del año de 1910.

Al iniciarse ahí el movimiento vindicativo mexicano, la Revolución tuvo, en sus múltiples fases, tragedias sólo comparables a la fantasía titánica de Esquilo y dramas tan sólo concebidos por el genio divinamente fatídico del Dante; pero dramas y tragedias que encerraban en el fondo de su pavura el anhelo infinito de un pueblo, al pretender arrancar de las manos de un dictador la pertenencia a sus derechos y a sus principios más cruelmente conculcados.

Esta es, excelentísimos señores embajadores, la inmanente justicia que asistió desde sus comienzos al postulado de la Revolución Mexicana.

Su primera etapa fué de orden eminentemente político; luchar por el derrocamiento de un régimen presidencial, convertido en aquel entonces en un trono de oropel y en cortes de brillo y plata.

El voto popular, constantemente violado, constituía una de las formas más sangrientas de nuestra ciudadanía y por ello los venerables iniciadores de aquella fuerte cruzada, inscribieron en sus pendones el noble signo de combate: "Sufragio Efectivo y No Reelección."

Fué la época romántica de nuestra causa, el idealismo electoral coronaba el pináculo excelso en la ambición más cara de los hombres de aquellos tiempos.

Después, y en el transcurso de dos décadas y media, la Revolución comprendió que no debía dedicar sus energías exclusivamente a defender el respeto del sufragio; pues no se puede concebir una democracia, en cerebros sin ilustración aunque sea rudimentaria; en hombres no organizados, que con paupérrimos salarios, tenían que doblegar sus convicciones ante la crueldad del amo que les pagaba, y en campesinos que no eran dueños siquiera del techo que piadosamente los cubría de las inclemencias del cielo.

Y en este ambiente, la Revolución se lanza en forma definitiva al campo de la acción social, abordando el problema de los latifundios, los derechos del obrero, la educación de las masas analfabetas del país y el ingreso a la civilización de la sufrida raza de nuestros indios.

Los Gobiernos que sucedieron a don Francisco I. Madero, trabajaron con más o menos entusiasmo, pretendiendo solucionar asuntos tan importantes; pero, a decir verdad, y juzgando ya el pasado como un hecho que a la historia pertenece, no fué sino hasta este último sexenio cuando un conductor de multitudes, con recio perfil de apóstol, el general Lázaro Cárdenas, ha dado el más vigoroso impulso al temario de la Revolución Mexicana. (Aplausos.)

Y así llegamos a los días en que se verifica la elección más democrática y por excelencia ejemplar: la elección que designó al general Manuel Avila Camacho como Primer Magistrado de este nuestro país, debiendo agregar que al Presidente Constitucional de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos, general de división Manuel Avila Camacho, no lo llevó al poder ninguna falacia electoral sino el clamor vibrante y magnífico que brotara espontáneo y sincero del alma popular de la República. (Aplausos.)

Es por esto que el general Manuel Avila Camacho será un Presidente para todos, sin distinción de credos políticos ni religiosos; su Gobierno tendrá la significación de un Gobierno eminentemente nacional, donde impere la justicia y se imponga la moral. Para él no existirán vencedores ni vencidos, sino únicamente mexicanos que conviertan a su nación en un laboratorio fecundo de trabajo para el engrandecimiento creciente de esta tierra mexicana.

Bajo la égida del Gobierno del señor general Avila Camacho, quedarán abatidos todos aquellos pendones que signifiquen ideas contrarias a nuestro medio, para izar en su lugar y en el más alto de los mástiles de la nave de su Gobierno, la única bandera que podemos enarbolar, la que está por encima de todas las ideas, la que está por encima de la propia filosofía y del pensamiento, de todo concepto contrario a nuestra nacionalidad, el pabellón que preside estas sesiones: la bandera santa de la Patria. (Aplausos.)

México y su Presidente fervientemente desean la Paz del mundo y condenan la guerra que está minando a la humanidad.

Dice un original pensador mexicano, don Félix F. Palavicini, que las tiranías son entidades secularmente belicosas, porque su emblema es la fuerza; pero cuando pierden a los soldados que las sostienen, se precipitan sin remedio hasta el fondo mismo del desastre.

Son, pues, los ejércitos los pedestales más firmes para entronizar a los dictadores.

Pero si en los países demócratas se permite la constante propaganda contra la defensa nacional y, consiguientemente, contra su instituto armado, esto es sencillamente entregarse a los tiranos; no es salvar a la democracia.

De suerte que cuando los agitadores de profesión y más que ellos los demagogos, combaten a los ejércitos de los países demócratas, están haciendo la preparacion del campo para el advenimiento de una nueva tiranía.

Las democracias necesitan forzosamente de un ejército que defienda sus instituciones.

Es por ello que México no ha visto jamás en los ejércitos de América masas agresivas de combate, sino fuertes atalayas de defensa que sabrán resistir en todo tiempo los embates del destino, haciendo respetar su profundo espíritu demócrata, que forma la escencia misma de nuestra soberanía continental.

Y en esta hora de angustia y desesperanza, en que la continenda de Europa está llenando de luto a multitud de hogares de combatientes, y en esta austera sesión en que para la fortuna histórica de mi País están reunidos aquí embajadores de treinta y una naciones amigas nuestras, me permito, con toda emoción y en nombre del Parlamento Mexicano, elevar nuestra voz junto con la vuestra, excelentísimos señores embajadores, en favor de la Paz universal, evocando la memoria de esos paladines anónimos de las democracias del mundo, que enarbolando el estandarte de la libertad entre el fragor del combate, han caído arrogantes y soberbios, con el cuerpo acribillado por las balas y el espíritu alucinado por la victoria, teniendo el aire del campo de batalla como único aliento de su vida, y la soledad impenetrable y muda como único testigo de su muerte. (Aplausos.)

México les envía su pleitesía más excelsa y el homenaje sublime de su eterna admiración.

Sénores Embajadores: Que lleguéis con felicidad a vuestras naciones, es el mejor deseo de esta tierra méxicana. (Aplausos.)

JOSÉ GÓMEZ ESPARZA.

El señor senador General don Enrique Estrada, en representación del Senado de la República, dijo: Señores Embajadores y Representantes Extranjeros: El deseo satisfecho de veros hoy en el recinto de este Congreso, tiene un significado especial: esta es la representación del pueblo de México. Queremos que captéis fielmente el sentir real, la sinceridad de este momento, y que os dignéis transmitir su viva expresión, como un mensaje fraternal de este pueblo a los pueblos hermanos que representáis aquí, porque sabemos que sois valores auténticos, representativos reales de vuestros pueblos. Uno de vosotros, el señor Wallace, conserva viva la emoción de las manifestaciones de su pueblo al conferirle una alta investidura en su patria.

Seáis bienvenidos.

Apreciamos vuestra actitud de comprensión ante el drama mexicano de treinta años, para crear nuestra democracia y una efectiva justicia social. Vuestra presencia nos conforta y aviva nuestra fe. Asistís a la culminación de un proceso democrático que significa la afirmación de neustras tendencias. Ciertamente nos falta la cooperación directa de Cárdenas; pero tenemos ya la dirección de Avila Camacho. El primero es despedido con gratitud y respeto por su pueblo, y al segundo, le da su cooperación y confianza para cumplir con su misión en el interior y responder a la solidaridad continental.

Ante vuestra presencia nuestro pueblo se pregunta: ¿por qué la representación de estos hombres tiene ahora un sentido real, distinto del convencional de la diplomacia? Es que por primera vez surge una conciencia continental respecto al espíritu de nuestros pueblos y la estructura de nuestras nacionalidades, sobre los mismos principios de libertad y de justicia, tanto individuales como nacionales, cuyo valor, por contraste con los novísimos de otros continentes, se destacan salvadores.

El mundo extraamericano debe entender que las naciones de América creen:

En los Gobiernos emanados de la voluntad popular.

En el mantenimiento de libertades colectivas e individuales.

En el respeto a la soberanía de las naciones, sin distingos por su fuerza material.

En que el concepto de superioridad de raza es injusto y ofensivo.

En que la comprensión y la cooperación son factores positivos que deben sustituir en definitiva el negativo de la agresión brutal, para resolver los problemas internacionales. (Aplausos.)

Más allá de nuestras fronteras oceánicas, el Continente Americano debe aparecer como una gran patria, dispuesta a defender sus principios de libertad, igualdad y fraternidad, aplicados tanto a individuos como a naciones.

No pretende México, como lo dijo nuestro actual Presidente, estar organizado militarmente ni lo estará nunca con fines de agresión; odiamos la guerra, pero nos prepararemos a ella y la afrontaremos con apasionamiento en defensa del Continente Americano, sin menoscabo de nuestra soberanía.

En la tragedia de Europa hemos escogido el campo de nuestra simpatía, pero no el de nuestro odio. Por igual sentimos el drama de los pueblos inglés, alemán, francés o español. Todos ellos han contribuido a la cultura americana, que sentimos nuestra. Reconocemos tener esa deuda y la pagaremos creando una América unida y fuerte, que sea un inexpugnable baluarte de la civilización occidental y de la libertad humana.

Debemos ser dignos de la herencia de Wáshington, Bolívar e Hidalgo, y nos proponemos que no haya poder humano que la destruya.

Confiamos en que de hoy en adelante desaparezca de nuestras fronteras la rigidez de los prejuicios, y que surjan los derechos precursores de una ciudadanía continental. (Aplausos.)

ENRIQUE ESTRADA.

El Excmo. Señor don Manuel Hidalgo Plaza, a nombre de las misiones diplomáticas, dijo: Una circunstancia especialísima, la de estar indispuesto nuestro Decano, me impone la obligación de contestar los dos magníficos discursos que habéis escuchado. Lo haré, acogiéndome a la exquisita benevolencia vuestra, que espero, porque sé que me encuentro en un Parlamento de un pueblo que, como lo han manifestado sus representantes, afirma que la expresión más soberana de él es la que viene de sus propias entrañas y el representante de Chile, en esta ocasión, interpreta a su pueblo, viene de las masas humildes de la clase trabajadora hasta llegar al honroso cargo que ostenta. (Aplausos.)

En nombre del Cuerpo Diplomático nos asociamos con intensa emoción, los que aspiramos a que en América haya una democracia, abandonando un poco los conceptos un tanto rígidos de la igualdad ante la ley, para declarar que la democracia en sus esencias más íntimas y profundas, descansa en la igualdad de posibilidades ante la vida; México en estos momentos representa la avanzada de una cultura política superior, la afirmación internacional de que en América el acto de transmitir el poder es la forma habitual, trasunto de nuestra educación cívica, que ahora venimos a presenciar en este instante de regocijo de la democracia del Nuevo Mundo, y asociarnos en el momento en que deja el Gobierno un hombre de la figura de Cárdenas. (Aplausos.) A los que han soñado, a los que han afirmado enfáticamente que en las democracias latinoamericanas no surgen mentalidades excelsas, podemos deciries nosotros y vosotros los mexicanos, que tenéis una figura que ha escrito la más espléndida página de vuestra historia, con otra que viene a sucederle y que espera y que esperamos los representantes de los pueblos amigos, que afirme esta gran jornada de progreso, de civilización y de cultura, que significa incorporar a un pueblo a todas sus conquistas, no sólo políticas, sino económicas, porque la democracia que se expresa afirmando que el pueblo es soberano y lo clava en la cruz del hambre, es una democracia fingida y mentirosa. (Aplausos nutridos y prolongados.)

Las democracias nuestras, los pueblos de América, empiezan a orientarse en esta concepción de que no es una élite, que no es un grupo reducido de la sociedad quien dirige a la nación; que es el concurso de todos los hombres, que es la herencia magnífica del pueblo griego que, para afirmar su concepto de democracia, se reunía a juzgar a sus hombres para llevarlos a la primera magistratura, que salía a designar en las justas de sus contiendas olímpicas a sus grandes poetas. Afirmamos que en América queremos trasplantar este ideal democrático en medio de una civilización que agoniza en la más espantosa de las tragedias que haya visto el mundo.

¿Por qué esta asociación? ¿Por qué la concurrencia de 31 delegados de pueblos que vienen a unirse a vuestra fiesta? Se trata de decir qué pasa en esta ocasión: ¿Una fiesta deslumbrante de oro o de vanas exteriorizaciones? No. Asistimos a la fiesta en que un pueblo delega en un ciudadano el derecho de gobernar confiado en que este hombre responderá ampliamente a las aspiraciones de bien y de justicia social del pueblo mexicano. (Aplausos.)

A cuantos nos han acusado en el pasado por nuestra inexperiencia política, porque no hemos sabido gobernarnos con la tranquilidad que los pueblos viejos lo hacían, podemos en esta ocasión deciries ante el mundo que nos negaba el derecho a gobernarnos consciente y realmente, que los pueblos como México, como la Argentina, como Bolivia, como Cuba, como Chile, como todos los países que forman la América Latina, y como todos los representantes que aquí han concurrido, que la fiesta de la democracia es la fiesta de la

afirmación de la nacionalidad, porque cuando un pueblo tiene conciencia para elegir a sus representantes, ese pueblo irá a cualquier sacrificio por mantener la fórmula de dirigirse a sí mismo antes que alguien pretenda, por cualquier causa, por cualquiera predestinación enseñorearse de él. Los pueblos que saben darse gobierno se perpetuarán en la historia y serán ejemplo para los países que en un momento dado olvidan los principios eternos de la justicia y del derecho por afanes transitorios. Para mí la fórmula que vosotros habéis impuesto, la que celebra en estos momentos América, es la solución del porvenir. Por eso, cuando un orador distinguido decía aquí que las democracias deben tener Ejército, lo que creo que es inevitable, la verdad es, pensé, que las democracias cuentan con esa inmensa falange, esa inmenso ejército de los obreros, creadores de riqueza en la paz y que en un momento culminante sabrán abandonar la herramienta para empuñar el fusil en defensa de su ideología y de su patria. (Aplausos.)

Esta solemne fiesta de un pueblo libre, que nos invita a congregarnos para participar con él en este torneo de la libertad, deseo que trascienda las fronteras de América, que llegue hasta la agitada y trágica Europa y le diga con el ejemplo nuestro, que los pueblos pueden vivir perfectamente en unidad y en comunión de fronteras; pero, para alcanzarlo, es necesario comprender que hay fórmulas económicas que lo impiden y que en América tenemos nosotros que resolverlas.

Demos nosotros el ejemplo de que los países poderosos, fuertes económicamente, pueden vivir en perfecta sociedad con los países débiles. Y si esto no es posible, si la convivencia económica en América no es una realidad, nuestra fraternidad es simplemente una dicción gramatical, falta de todo sentido. [Aplausos.] Necesitamos, en el concurso de los países americanos, que los que hayan alcanzado una holgada situación económica, contribuyan a afianzar las conquistas políticas y sociales de sus hermanos menores, sin lo cual no hay posibilidad de fraternidad internacional. Es menester que nos convenzamos de que hemos luchado un siglo por realizar el pensamiento de Bolívar y que no son únicamente problemas políticos los que nos dividen, puesto que nuestros países tienen muy semejantes formas de gobierno, que son las fronteras económicas las que no nos han permitido realizar el ideal del genio hispanoamericano, y es necesario que nosotros, después de una larga experiencia, busquemos la solución, tratemos de encontrar el camino definitivo que nos una, porque el día que nosotros hayamos barrido con las fronteras económicas de las diversas nacionalidades, la solución del problema político de la unidad continental efectiva será una perfecta realidad. (Aplausos.)

Señores diputados y senadores de México: Yo quiero, en nombre del Cuerpo Diplomático, elevar en este momento nuestra más profunda admiración por la manera de resolver vuestros problemas políticos, por el acierto de manejar la democracia y ojalá que los pueblos del Continente, siguiendo vuestro ejemplo, encuentren la solución interna de sus problemas sociales y algún día esta América pueda vivir unida bajo la orquestación plena de todas las libertades. (Aplausos prolongados.)

MANUEL HIDALGO PLAZA.

El señor Maury Maverick, Alcalde de la ciudad de San Antonio, Texas, E. U. de A., dijo: Señor Presidente, mis colegas de la democracia constitucional, amigos Diputados y Senadores, México entero: Estimados amigos míos, no hablo el español bien, mi gramática es terrible. Hoy soy el Alcalde de una gran ciudad—la ciudad de San Antonio, Texas—, y cien mil de mis conciudadanos, son méxico-americanos. Son buenos ciudadanos; son mis amigos; así, pues, aunque mi español es malo, cuando hablo de los mexicanos hablo con el corazón. (Aplausos.)

Nuestra amistad, el acercamiento de nuestras gentes, están completamente establecidas ya. Ha habido tiempos en que se ha dudado de nuestras relaciones internacionales; pero ahora nuestra amistad está firmemente cimentada y no existe entre nosotros ninguna sospecha. ¡No, absolutamente ninguna! (Aplausos.)

Pero ha sonado ya la hora de obrar. Podemos hablar de amistad y de acercamiento eternamente; mas en estos momentos, no es eso sólo lo necesario; debemos efectuar una verdadera cooperación; no simplemente hablar de cooperación, sino que ésta sea efectiva en los órdenes económico, social y político.

El objetivo de todos nosotros, de todos los que creemos en la democracia constitucional debería ser elevar el nivel de vida de nuestras gentes; no sólo preservar su libertad, sino ensancharla.

Amigos míos, está surgiendo algo que yo desearía llamar "La Constitución de las Américas"; florece hoy en los corazones de las gentes del Hemisferio Occidental.

Y es que jamás construiremos fortalezas unos contra otros; el Río Grande será conocido como el Río de la Paz. (Aplausos.)

En segundo lugar, jamás entraremos en guerra unos contra otros.

En tercer lugar, nos defenderemos mutuamente.

Y, por último, habrá igualdad entre todas las naciones—ninguna nación dominante—todos seremos iguales. (Aplausos.)

Considero una grande honor hablar en esta Cámara de Diputados del Congreso de México.

Amigos míos, nosotros tenemos al gran libertador y Presidente George Washington, pero (aquí señala el orador hacia el muro en donde figura inscrito el nombre del Padre Hidalgo) ustedes tienen a su libertador, Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla. (Aplausos.)

Nosotros tenemos a Lincoln—¡al gran Lincoln!—, pero ustedés (aquí apunta hacie el nombre de Juárez), tienen a ese gran patriota, al Benemérito de las Américas.

Y, amigos míos, nosotros también tenemos al gran amigo del pueblo, a un hombre de grandes miras y de grande espíritu, a Franklin D. Roosevelt, y ustedes, a su vez tienen a Lázaro Cárdenas, el Presidente que se retira.

Nosotros los de los Estados Unidos estamos muy orgullosos del señor Henry A. Wallace; de mi Vicepresidente, nuestro amigo, el amigo del pueblo; y ustedes tienen a su nuevo Presidente, el señor general Manuel Avila Camacho. A él, es decir, a estos dos, vayan hoy nuestras mayores felicitaciones y nuestros mejores deseos.

¡Viva mi patria!

¡Viva México!

¡Vivan todas las gentes de Norte, de Centro y Sudamérica! ¡Viva la libertad y viva la Independencia! (Aplausos.)

MAURY MAVERICK.

El señor diputado Sol Bloom, Presidente de la Comisión de Asuntos Exteriores de la Cámara de Diputados de Estados Unidos de América, dijo: Señores: Es para mí un gran placer y más que placer un gran privilegio el formar parte de la Delegación de los Estados Unidos de Norteamérica y de encontrarme junto con los señores delegados de mi país en el Congreso de la Unión de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos. Hace unos breves momentos, cuando llegué a este recinto parlamentario, algunas personas me pidieron que dirigiera unas cuantas palabras a los señores representantes y enviados extraordinarios aquí congregados, y debo deciles que entonces me sentí completamente feliz, porque desde hace cinco días que me encuentro en esta vuestra bella ciudad y hasta la fecha nadie me había pedido que hablara. ¡Y ustedes saben lo que es un diputado que no esté constantemente hablando! (Aplausos.)

Al escuchar los discursos que se han pronunciado esta tarde, mi espíritu me llevó a otros lugares del planeta y pensé, entonces, que lo que aquí se hace en estos solemnes momentos, no solamente interesa a nosotros, sino que interesa profundamente a todos los pueblos de la tierra que tienen su mirada fija en lo que estamos realizando en este recinto: demostramos ante el mundo entero que podemos reunirnos hombres de diversos países en perfecta armonía, con el propósito de entendernos mejor. Yo estoy seguro, pues, que esta reunión que no se parece a las reuniones que se verifican en otros lugares de la tierra, habrá de ser un bello ejemplo de lo que los pueblos de este Hemisferio pueden hacer. (Aplausos nutridos.)

Siento profundamente no hablar el español.

Yo visité vuestro país hace cincuenta y dos años y no es sino hasta ahora que regreso para concurrir a la ceremonia de toma de posesión del Presidente de México. Debo confesar que durante dicha ceremonia no me dí cuenta, no pude entender el formidable discurso, el magnífico discurso que pronunciara el señor Presidente Avila Camacho. Lo aplaudí porque presentí lo grandioso de sus conceptos; pero después, al leerlo en su traducción al inglés—¡y lo he leído lo menos seis veces!—, me dí cuenta de que se trata de un documento de singular importancia, de enorme trascendencia. Por esto soy de opinión de que este Mensaje debe traducirse a todos los idiomas y debe hacerse llegar a todos los países del mundo para que los hombres de todos los pueblos conozcan el pensamiento de un gran estadista. (Aplausos nutridos.)

Tengo en mi poder la traducción al inglés del Mensaje pronunciado por el señor Presidente Avila Camacho. Lo conservaré como un documento histórico de gran valor.

No quiero dejar de manifestaros que al concluir la ceremonia de toma de posesión, visité la ciudad por todos los rumbos; escuché opiniones de toda clase de personas y tengo la impresión de que la opinión optimista que yo me he formado, es una opinión compartida por todas las gentes que viven en este país. Al escuchar esas opiniones, me preguntaba a mí mismo: ¿será posible que en otros países del mundo puedan observarse las caras de satisfacción que tienen las gentes en México al escuchar las palabras pronunciadas por su nuevo Mandatario? El párrafo sobre el cual yo quiero hacer hincapié, es el siguiente: "Tenemos que unir nuestros esfuerzos para cooperar desde el fondo de nuestros corazones para armonizar los sentimientos con los que estamos forjando nuestro destino bajo una misma bandera. Yo pido con todas las fuerzas de mi espíritu a todo el pueblo mexicano, a todos los patriotas mexicanos, que se unan y que lancen fuera de sí toda intolerancia, todos los odios estériles, en esta cruzada de fraternidad constructiva y de grandeza nacional". (Aplausos nutridos.) Tengo la seguridad de que fué este uno de los párrafos al que se refirió de un modo preferente el orador que primero hizo uso de la palabra desde esta tribuna. Pensamos nosotros como piensa el general Avila Camacho; él ha expresado el punto de vista que servirá para hacer historia en el pueblo de México y en el pueblo de los Estados Unidos y en los pueblos todos del mundo. Tengo la seguridad de que en este discurso—en el que trató, además de este tema importantísimo, veinte o más temas de igual trascendencia—el general Avila Camacho ha señalado una serie de puntos fundamentales que de ser cumplidos, de ser realizados, habrán de traer la felicidad para todos los hombres del mundo. (Aplausos nutridos.)

Terminaré a la mayor brevedad posible. Quiero solamente decir, para concluir, que iniciada la tarea que ha anunciado el señor general Avila Camacho, mucho habrá de lograrse. Habrán de pasar a la historia monumentos, habrán de destruirse obras materiales; pero la obra que él ha preconizado en su discurso

perdurará, será inmortal. Yo tengo la seguridad de que las palabras del señor Presidente Avila Camacho constituirán un faro que alumbrará el camino a los otros pueblos, para señalarles la ruta del amor, de la verdad y de la felicidad. (Aplausos nutridos y prolongados.)

SOL BLOOM.

El señor Dennis Chavez, senador de los Estados Unidos de América por el Estado de Nuevo México, dijo: Honorable Congreso de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos: Respetables diplomáticos, embajadores de diversos países, que estáis aquí ahora pagando homenaje a la voz del pueblo mexicano, representado por el nuevo Presidente, el general Manuel Avila Camacho, y también—usando las palabras del más grande humanitario, de aquella persona que representa la libertad humana, el Presidente de mi patria, Roosevelt—, "my friends". (Aplausos.)

Como dijo el señor Secretario de la Cámara que me presentó a ustedes, yo soy de origen español y mexicano; pero me presento ante ustedes como americano de Estados Unidos, por la gracia de Dios y nada más.

Los míos han hecho en tiempos pasados todo lo que un ser humano puede hacer como sujeto del virreinato español, como ciudadano del pueblo mexicano, y ahora estamos haciendo lo mejor que nos es posible, como buenos americanos en Estados Unidos.

Me presento ante ustedes de esta manera y, reconociendo vuestra inteligencia, comprendo que aceptarán mis humildes frases, aunque sean en mal español, en el intento con que yo sé que serán aceptadas; vienen del alma; yo soy amigo de México y del pueblo mexicano.

Siendo mis antepasados españoles y mexicanos, conociendo la libertad fundada en Estados Unidos por Wáshington y los demás; sabiendo bien la libertad que Hidalgo quería, puedo apreciar las tristezas y las alegrías, los esfuerzos y los deseos del pueblo mexicano que ama la libertad. Yo sé que hay esperanza, yo sé que hay por qué tener regocijo y tener esperanza de que en poco tiempo la libertad del pueblo mexicano, el avance económico, el progreso social y el progreso político, serán una cosa real en México. Eso es lo que espero.

Hace dos o tres días que tenían en México otro Presidente. Espero que interpreten debidamente lo que deseo expresar. No pretendo tomar parte en política extranjera, en la política de cualquier país fuera de Estados Unidos; pero sí, como ser humano, creo que tengo derecho a creer en ciertas cosas; tengo derecho de opinor si tal o cual persona está haciendo bien a su país. Hace tres o cuatro días rendía yo respeto, como oficial americano, como ciudadano particular, a una persona que yo creo que fué gran Presidente de la República Mexicana, el general Cárdenas, y ahora quiero expresar el mismo respeto, la misma admiración que le tenía yo al Presidente, al ciudadano Lázaro Cárdenas. (Aplausos.) Pero en los asuntos políticos del país, el pueblo mexicano ha hablado, y esto nada más se debe tener en la mente. El pueblo mexicano ha dicho: el general Manuel Avila Camacho es el President. (Aplausos.) Con todo el respeto que puede tener una persona que conoce las debidas normas de relación entre pueblos cristianos, entre pueblos que entienden los derechos ajenos, con todo el respeto que le tengo yo al Presidente, admiro más el hecho del pueblo mexicano que eligió a Avila Camacho Presidente de la República. (Aplausos.) Este asunto de personalidad en aquellas personas que creen en derechos de los pueblos, de gentes, no es más, en mi poquito español, que incidental. Roosevelt representa una idea; Avila Camacho representa una idea: uno, al pueblo americano, otro, al pueblo mexicano. (Aplausos.)

Yo sé que expreso los sentimientos de mis compañeros americanos que se hallan presentes: le deseamos a México, le deseamos al pueblo mexicano, le deseamos al señor Presidente de la República, le deseamos al Congreso Nacional el éxito mejor, el mejor que quiera Dios. Gracias. (Aplausos nutridos.)

DENNIS CHAVEZ.

El señor Henry A. Wallace, Vice presidente electo de los Estados Unidos de América, y Representante del Presidente Roosevelt, dijo: Señor Presidente, señores miembros de la Honorable Cámara de Diputados, señores Senadores, Vuestras Excelencias: Es para mí un gran placer dirigirme al distinguido Cuerpo Legislativo de la gran República de México. Estoy convencido de que el supremo pensamiento de ustedes, como acontece en todas las democracias, es de mantener vivientes los principios fundamentales que mejor sirvan a los intereses de esta gran República.

Durante los últimos siete años, he tenido la oportunidad de estar en contacto con la Cámara de Diputados de vuestra república hermana del norte. De esta asociación, he llegado a la conclusión de que un representante popular tiene que enfrentarse a muchos problemas a fin de determinar el camino conveniente para la realización de su programa legislativo. Por lo tanto, vuestra responsabilidad es, ciertamente, ilimitada, y lleva en sí una gran oportunidad de servir a vuestro pueblo.

Como estudiante de las actividades del gobierno, siempre me ha interesado profundamente vuestro país, ya que ocupa tan importante posición en los asuntos de este Hemisferio. Vuestro país ha hecho grandes progresos y su historia tiene el privilegio de grabarse en la mente. Habéis producido numerosos hombres de gran capacidad. Vuestro suelo, vuestros minerales y vuestro clima, únicamente pueden ser apreciados en toda su amplitud por aquel que ha tenido el privilegio de visitar este encantador país—un país de un pasado grandioso y de un futuro aún más prometedor. Vuestros recursos naturales son extensísimos, pero el don más valioso de México, es el corazón noble y amistoso de su pueblo.

La fortuna de visitaros personalmente, me ha dado una comprensión más profunda de la fuerza fundamental del verdadero México. La cortesía de los mexicanos, su gran simpatía, y, sobre todo, sus aspiraciones de mejoría hacia sus hijos, se graban indefectiblemente en el ánimo del visitante. He quedado profundamente impresionado con aquellos que cultivan el suelo y constituyen uno de los sectores por los que trabajáis, y no dudo que esta Honorable Cámara de Diputados hará máximos esfuerzos por serviles. Todo cuanto pueda fortalecerles por medio de la educación, por medio de preparación agrícola, y por medio de préstamos a bajo rédito, será reembolsado por ellos mismos con un aumento de producción y de felicidad, bases sobre las cuales se levanta una nación poderosa.

Deseo expresaros mi más alto agradecimiento por los fervientes tributos que el señor Presidente de la República, general don Manuel Avila Camacho, y vosotros, habéis hecho al espíritu del panamericanismo.

El ideal más elevado para los habitantes de este Hemisferio, es el panamericanismo. Sin esta solidaridad hemisférica, jamás podremos trabajar ordenadamente por esa prosperidad en la agricultura, en el trabajo y en el comercio, que ciertamente es nuestro mayor anhelo.

En esta solemne ocasión ha sido para mí un gran placer el haberme asociado a los distinguidos representantes de numerosas naciones, quienes han venido desde los más apartados rincones de la tierra a desearle bienestar. Los considero amigos a quienes espero volver a ver en Wáshington. Nunca habrá demasiadas reuniones de hombres de buena voluntad.

Gobierno y pueblo mexicano, permitidme agradeceros nuevamente vuestras múltiples cortesías, y, estad seguros, de que esta visita quedará para siempre grabada en mi corazón.

HENRY A. WALLACE.

Stanford—The First 50 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE SAN FRANCISCO NEWS

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein an article which appeared in the San Francisco News under date of March 8, 1941, entitled "Stanford—The First Fifty Years."

[From the San Francisco News of March 8, 1941]

STANFORD—THE FIRST 50 YEARS—1891–1941

(By Robert de Roos)

In 1884 a 16-year-old boy—"the luckiest and richest kid in America"—died in Florence, Italy.

That event almost crushed the tough spirits of the boy's parents, Senator Leland Stanford and Jane Lathrop Stanford. But the loss of their only son, heir to the Stanford railroad millions, led them to establish Leland Stanford Junior University so that "the children of California will be our children."

Tomorrow Stanford University observes the first event of its program commemorating the first 50 years at Stanford—founders' day.

Between the death of that American boy in Italy and tomorrow's celebration of a half century of progress are many events, many men and women, many hardships, many a triumph.

THE IDEA GOT A LAUGH

When Senator and Mrs. Stanford announced the founding grant for a university of high degree November 11, 1885, there were a lot of people who thought the bearded senator had gone off his rocker. Wits called the projected university "Stanford's circus." Editors declared the university "as unnecessary as a home for retired admirals in Switzerland." The boys down at the barber shop would give two-to-one that the institution never would open.

And for a while it looked as though the scoffers might be right. But on May 14, 1887, the university's cornerstone was laid right out in the green fields of Senator Stanford's Palo Alto stock farm, 30 miles south of San Francisco. Four years later, Senator Stanford, standing with David Starr Jordan, a young educator chosen as Stanford's first president, greeted the university's first 559 students. Not many for a start, but at that, 39 more than the University of California attracted that year.

The doors of Stanford University opened only to let trouble in. Financial problems, the cross of many a young undertaking, beset the university despite a popular idea that 20 of the Stanford millions had been laid aside for the university's spending money. Actually, on that opening day, October 1, 1891, the Stanford endowment consisted of 8,800 acres of rolling farm land—beautiful but startlingly unproductive. For administrative and running expenses, the university had to depend on Senator Stanford's business enterprises.

MRS. STANFORD'S DETERMINATION WINS

Senator Stanford died in 1893. The Nation was in the depth of a panic. The entire

Stanford estate was tied up in court—$8,000,000 in debts and bequests had to be paid before university funds would be available. Mrs. Stanford, having lost her beloved son and her stalwart husband, determined that the university should not close.

A court allowed her $10,000 monthly from the estate for personal maintenance and for servants. Stanford professors were blanketed in along with Mrs. Stanford's domestics, and the university battled along on this cash and a few other dollars which came in from sale of the stock-farm equipment. Then the Federal Government stepped in with a suit against the estate for $15,000,000.

Mrs. Stanford warned the first graduating class, which included young Herbert Hoover and CHARLES L. MCNARY, that loss of this suit would mean the closing of the university. But the suit was won, and Stanford University continued after "6 pretty long years."

Meanwhile the university was growing physically. The first quadrangle was supplemented by an outer quadrangle which surrounded it. New library, science, and gymnasium buildings were erected. When Mrs. Stanford died in 1905, her grants increased the original endowment of the university to $20,000,000.

A UNIVERSITY IS REBUILT

On the morning of April 18, 1906, Stanford University was jolted out of its sleep by the crash of falling sandstone, the clatter of glass as a rumbling earth tossed the buildings around. Two persons were killed; buildings were shattered.

"It is not buildings but men that make a university," said Dr. Jordan, pitching into the task of rebuilding. Stanford reopened for the fall term.

Dr. Jordan retired as president in 1913 and was succeeded by Dr. John Casper Branner. Dr. Branner served until he reached retirement age and Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur was appointed in 1916.

Under Dr. Wilbur's administration the university has made great progress. Perhaps his most notable achievement is the high estate of the present medical school—his baby from the first.

The first 50 years have seen Stanford taking part in the shaking events of the world. It sent Herbert Hoover to the White House after he had served in a Presidential Cabinet; it sent Dr. Wilbur to serve as Secretary of the Interior; it sent graduates to become presidents of 14 universities; 360 of its graduates are listed in Who's Who—1 out of every 100.

Its men of science have contributed to human well-being. Dr. Ernest C. Dickson gave the first complete account of valley fever; Dr. Edwin W. Schultz directed research which discovered a preventative for infantile paralysis in monkeys; Dr. Paul J. Hanzlik and Dr. H. G. Mehrtens discovered iodobismitol for treatment of neurosyphilis; Prof. E. C. Dickson's studies of botulism enabled food manufacturers to protect canned foods; important work has been done on high voltages in the Ryan laboratory, on insulin research, on food research, in aeronautics, in education, in history, in medicine.

Stanford has developed educational techniques. It was first to inaugurate a "major course" system. It led in the development of a lower division, in independent study, in the start of a university division designed for superior students.

FIFTY YEARS—JUST A GOOD START

Stanford's men have served in two wars and are ready for what comes. Stanford teams—in football, track, swimming, basketball, baseball—have won their share of championships. Its engineers have helped reshape the world; its graduates have helped recast business procedures; its doctors have saved countless lives.

From that small inner quad the university has grown into a sprawling giant. Newest building is the Hoover Library of War, Revolution, and Peace, a 274-foot tower containing one of the world's biggest stores of documents on the World War.

Fifty years isn't such a long time. But down at Stanford they figure they've got a pretty good start.

Michigan Large Milk State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1941

ARTICLE RELEASED BY THE MILK INDUSTRY FOUNDATION

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following release from the Milk Industry Foundation:

MICHIGAN LARGE MILK STATE, FOUNDATION FIGURES REVEAL

NEW YORK.—Michigan's outstanding position in the dairy industry is vividly depicted in a new handbook issued by the Milk Industry Foundation. According to the book, Milk Facts, 932,000 cows valued at $60,580,000 produced $62,090,000 in cash farm milk income for Michigan farmers in 1939. Production of farm milk in the State for the year totaled 2,205,000,000 quarts; creamery butter, 90,088,000 pounds; cheddar cheese, 13,328,000 pounds; ice cream, 13,851,000 gallons.

The United States is one of the ranking milk-using nations in the world with per capita consumption of fluid milk totaling 153 quarts a year, pictographs show. Milk and its products comprise over 25 per cent of the 1,500 pounds of the principal foods consumed each year by the average American, the book says, with 45,000,000 quarts of milk delivered daily to homes and stores.

Pictorial charts and figures show the importance of the milk industry to the country's economic picture and illustrate how milk costs less in the United States in minutes of labor. Diagrammatic charts illustrate how the annual milk supply of some 51,000,000,000 quarts is utilized.

Fluid or fresh milk for cities and villages providing the farmer's highest cash return, accounts for 29.9 percent of the country's yearly production. Creamery butter takes 31.6 percent; farm butter, 9.2 percent; while 11.7 percent of the milk is used as fluid milk on farms where produced. In making cheese 6.3 percent of the total milk is used; ice cream, 3.1 percent, and canned milks, 4.5 percent, according to charts.

A chart of the distributor's milk dollar shows 52.31 percent going to dairy farmers for milk, 19.24 percent to delivery labor, 8.21 percent to delivery expense, 6.33 plant expense, 4.94 plant labor, 2.78 administrative labor, 2.18 administrative expense, 1.68 office labor, and profit, 2.33 percent, representing only a fraction of a cent per quart of milk.

"The production and utilization of milk have so increased in this country," says the booklet, "that today we are the greatest of dairy nations. Milk, butter, and other dairy products annually create an output valued at three and one-half billion dollars.

"Facts about the cows and the farmers that furnish the milk, the distributors whose efficiency has made wide usage possible, and the consumption of this 'most nearly perfect food' should lead to a clearer understanding of milk economics.

"One out of ever fifteen families in the United States is dependent on milk for a livelihood. Milk is the largest single source of farm cash income—larger than cattle, twice cotton, 3 times wheat, 5 times tobacco. There are 25,000,000 cows on three-quarters of the Nation's 7,000,000 farms.

"Americans enjoy the best milk in the world, and economical distribution, meticulous sanitation, pasteurization, and other safeguards have made our milk supply a world standard."

Communism, Fascism, and Nazi-ism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 17, 1941

LETTER FROM THE SENTINELS OF AMERICA

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an open letter written by R. Swinburne Clymer, supreme commander of the Sentinels of America, which has been brought to my attention by Earl B. Musser and a large number of other citizens of Kansas City, Kans., setting forth the stand taken by that organization in opposition to communism, fascism, and nazi-ism. I also approve the sentiments expressed in this statement with respect to the large number of aliens who are permitted to remain in America while they are seeking to overthrow it as a free Nation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO SENATORS, CONGRESSMEN, REPRESENTATIVES, AND ALL AMERICAN CITIZENS, AND A DEMAND FOR ACTION BY ALL THE MEMBERS OF THE VARIOUS LEGISLATIVE BODIES

(By the Sentinels of America)

Three short years ago the Sentinels of America, in their first open letter to Senators, Congressmen, Representatives, and all American citizens, made the statement that there were no less than 3,500,000 aliens in America.

These claims were ridiculed at that time, and we were accused of being alarmists. Denials were issued from every quarter, and our contentions were set aside as unworthy of consideration.

Now, however, as a result of the Alien Registration Act, more than 5,000,000 aliens have registered, and it has been vividly proven to the American people and their representatives that, instead of being extremists and alarmists, our estimate was short almost 2,000,000.

It is therefore definitely established that America is harboring some 5,000,000 aliens, many of them of the most vicious, and a vast number of them engaged in subversive activities of the worst kind.

Since we have been vindicated and proven correct in the first claim brought to an issue, some of our other statements are now being resurrected and receiving renewed consideration.

We now add to our former statements the fact that many of the aliens in America, adhering as they do to communism, fascism, and nazi-ism, are the scum of the underworld of nations now engaged in destroying democratic nations as nations; murdering women, children, and old people; aye, even invalids and mothers-to-be in hospitals; and that these aliens in our midst would not hesitate to do these things to us at their first opportunity and as a step toward destroying America itself as a free nation.

Two years ago, and again a year ago, we issued numerous statements regarding the great number of these aliens, thorough converts to the doctrines of communism, nazi-ism, fascism, and nihilism, willing to give their lives if need be, engaged in overt acts and in converting many disgruntled American-born to their vicious system and obtaining their willing help in carrying forward their plans of destruction.

We and our many members demanded the enactment of legislation—our 16 points of a clear-cut remedy (published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 86, p. 2311)—for the registration of aliens, as well as other necessary laws. Such a law was passed, and these aliens, both desirable and undesirable, are now registered. However, that is but the first step. Though registered, the vicious element of these aliens has not been curbed. They are as active and more vicious than before. Neither the Communist, Nazi, nor Fascist Party has been outlawed in America. This is because of many factors, among them interference by interested parties, and, except for the fact that we have a record of most of the aliens in America, we are not in a much better position to deal with the active "fifth column" in America than we were before.

Possibly the greatest shame of the American Nation is the fact that there are possibly 3,000,000 aliens in America who are members of one of the three major "isms"—Communist, Nazi, or Fascist—or very sympathetic to them, and that there are no less than 2,000,000 American-born either downright converts to these "isms" and their activities or favorable to their doctrines and ready to help in their acts of sabotage. The money spent by these 5,000,000 potential enemies of America, her people, and her institutions, would well nigh arm us for defense. This statement may at the moment be contradicted, but when all the facts are known, the estimate will be shown to be modest.

We boldly charge that the United States is today, as were the Allies of the past, slumbering under a foolishly mistaken idea that it cannot happen here. As a matter of fact, it is now happening, and all our institutions, our unions, our business concerns, and even families are honeycombed by "fifth columnists," be they Communists, Fascists, or Nazis, and when the people finally do awaken there will be much "wailing and gnashing of teeth."

England had a bitter awakening and has lost untold billions in property, not to mention the great loss of life. Our neighbor, Canada, showed greater wisdom, has outlawed the "isms," and has swiftly punished even her own people who were found active in any one of the "isms." We, America alone, are sound asleep at the helm of our immense ship of state. Unless America soon awakens from her slumber, God alone can foresee what the result will be.

The fundamentals of our liberties are based on certain privileges; among these:

When civil liberty sedately permits disloyal expressions and acts, it becomes license and is destructive to liberty itself.

The voice of the people is the voice of the Nation, and as such should be free, but when that voice is raised for the purpose of destroying cherished institutions or forms of government by force, it is anarchy.

It is the right of all men to seek and maintain freedom. This includes all citizens. The employer should be as free to hire men of his choice, without restriction or interference, as the individual to seek employment wherever he pleases and without restriction, except his own capability and capacity. Argentina, one of the great South American republics, early recognized this fact and wrote into her Magna Carta: "There is equality before the law, and the right to take any kind of job without any other condition than the capacity to fill it." That is the creed of freemen.

They who see wrong committed against State or Nation, either in word or deed, and refuse to eloquently voice their disapproval or attempt to stop it, are disloyal to State and Nation and, by inaction and inertia, help bring about their own ruin and thereby sell themselves into slavery.

Aliens do not by right possess the essentials of freedom. They have not the right of free speech or even free action because they, lacking citizenship, do not belong to the society of either State or Nation. Only those who assume the full responsibility of any given order or society possess the rights and privileges of that society. Were it otherwise there would be no incentive to assume the burdens and responsibilities of such State, order, or society.

The State belongs to man and not man to the State. The citizen has the right to change constitutions and forms of government, but only by right of franchise. Aliens do not possess such franchise and therefore have no right to attempt or work for the bringing about of any changes in our form of government. Only the citizen can express his will by the right of his vote.

Our Constitution confers certain rights upon its citizens, but only on citizens. Americans should be proud of their rights as citizens and so jealously guard these rights that no one will be permitted to interfere with or destroy them. Only thus can the rights, privileges, and liberties of the Nation—the members of this free society—be guaranteed a continuation of such liberties.

We, as American citizens, believe that if American freedom is to continue, it is necessary to firmly demand the passage of certain legislation, and that it is the duty of the duly elected Representatives to pass, in due and righteous form, such acts of legislation, among these being:

Recommendation No. 1: Since both the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Dies committee have uncovered the existence of schools and centers teaching methods of sabotage, and that it is an undeniable fact that the acts of such saboteurs may readily and frequently cause death of air pilots, soldiers, and others engaged in vital preparations for the defense of the Nation, it is essential and no more than just to all those engaged in defense work of whatever nature that laws be enacted for their protection and for the punishment by life imprisonment, or the death penalty, of all those convicted of such acts, and long-term imprisonment for those convicted of being engaged in teaching such methods.

Recommendation No. 2: The outlawing of all organizations of a communistic, Nazi, Fascist, or other un-American nature and a ban, under heavy penalty, against all such meetings. (Canada should serve as an example.)

Recommendation No. 3: Communist, Nazi, Fascist, as well as members of all other un-American alien and subversive organizations, should be banned from all work, all projects, and all activities of whatever nature which have to do with the building of airplanes, ships of every nature, and defense material of every kind.

Recommendation No. 4: The prevention of all strikes and labor disputes in every department of the manufacture of material for defense purposes, as well as in the building and construction trades connected with the housing of soldiers, the building of ships and airplanes, and in every department where the welfare of the individual soldier, marine, and of the Nation is concerned, making it compulsory for labor and the manufacturer to settle all disputes by arbitration, empowering for this purpose a board so composed as to guarantee its impartiality.

Recommendation No. 5: The placing of all seamen, both of merchant and passenger ships, into the active Reserve during the period of the present emergency. The dissatisfaction of the American people traveling on American ships will force the issue in some other manner if not settled by legislation.

Recommendation No. 6: The prohibition via the mail of all totalitarian propaganda literature; the immediate repeal of the Universal Postal Union laws which permit the free (or paid) distribution of subersive propaganda literature in the United States, whether this be direct from Germany, Russia, Italy, or Japan or through their agents in America.

What manner of fools are we staunch Americans who pay, via taxes or otherwise, for the distribution of millions of pieces of literature which has as its aim the destruction of our institutions, while we, as Americans, find it impossible to reach our friends in France, Holland, Belgium, and other conquered territory by even first-class, paid postage?

Let it be noted that the writer and his associates, after his return from Europe 2 years ago, contributed to the libraries and individuals in France, Belgium, and Holland thousands of dollars' worth of books on religion, philosophy and science, absolutely gratis, because these people were too poor to buy such books. Today these books, both in libraries and private homes, have been confiscated and destroyed. Despite such acts, we permit the distribution, and pay for it by our taxes, of millions of pieces of literature issued by these same subversive agencies now engaged in despoiling the people and in destroying our literature. Senators and Congressmen, again we ask you: What manner of people are we, the American people, to continually permit such outrages upon us, a free people, and, in addition, be made to pay the expense?

Recommendation No. 7: The revocation of citizenship of anyone convicted of espionage or any act against the interests of American institutions or the American people as a whole.

Recommendation No. 8: Compelling all aliens to take an oath of loyalty to America and her institutions before they may be employed in any essential industry, however menial the position may be.

Recommendation No. 9: The control of all alien fishing, freight, or other boats operating in domestic waters. Such an enactment should include the registration of all boats, of whatever nature, while operating in American waters, together with the strict control of the purpose of the boats and the crews.

Recommendation No. 10: The immediate withdrawal of all State and Government funds from all schools, colleges, and every public educational institution wherein is taught any subversive propaganda, any inculcation inimical to American thought, or which employs any teacher or professor, or permits any student in attendance, subscribing to such "isms."

Recommendation No. 11: Making it compulsory for the Department of Labor or some other department of state to deport within 3 months after conviction any alien found guilty of subscribing to or of being a member of a local or foreign center of the Communist, Nazi, Fascist, or other subversive party, adhering to or spreading such inculcations.

Recommendation No. 12: Making compulsory the revocation of the citizenship of any foreign-born union official found guilty of a major act of grafting on either the union, business institutions, the Government, or its own members.

Recommendation No. 13: The prohibiting of the citizens of America, aliens of any country, banks, or institutions, from sending funds in any form from the United States to any government, or to any individual through whom it might reach any government now engaged in making war upon democracies.

(It should be noted that Canada restricts its own good citizens from spending any money except for legitimate business purposes, even in friendly neighboring countries, and no one has declared this to be unjust.)

These laws, we, the citizens of America, request that you, our Senators, Congressmen and Representatives, enact for the purpose of safeguarding our rights and liberties, our country and our institutions. We declare them just and proper and of such nature as we ourselves would be governed.

Respectfully submitted,

R. SWINBURNE CLYMER,
The Sentinels of America,
Supreme Commander.

The Securities and Exchange Commission and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. SUMNER T. PIKE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Sumner T. Pike, Commissioner, Securities and Exchange Commission, before the New York Securities Dealers Association, New York City, March 7, 1941:

There is today in this Nation a singleness of purpose. We are united toward one overriding objective—making ourselves so strong that no power on earth will dare to challenge our way of life. The towering necessity for attaining this objective with all possible speed overshadows all other needs, both in our national and in our personal lives. Differences which were important not long ago have melted to nothing as the inferno abroad has drawn closer to our shores.

Tonight I am not going to talk about problems arising from the relationship of the brokers and dealers to the Securities and Exchange Commission. I shall talk about our common problems in connection with national defense. I shall tell you some of the things we are trying to do in Washington. And I want to discuss with you how you can take a greater part in this defense job.

Discussion of finance during defense refers sooner or later to control of capital issues. This is natural, because, at the time of the first World War, capital was not plentiful in this country. It had to be conserved and directed into the most useful channels of our war economy. It was essential that capital should not be frittered away on projects not absolutely necessary for the creation and support of our Army and Navy.

Today our problem is somewhat different. Of all the resources necessary for our present national-defense drive money is probably the most abundant. Reserves of private capital today appear to be comparatively plentiful. To be sure, our capital is not as productive as it should be. Nonetheless, we seem to have ample reserves. Because of these reserves, control of capital issues to conserve capital funds seems unnecessary for the present.

Of course, the cost of defense absorbs a great portion of the Nation's income. Or, to state it another way, military expenditures must utilize a great portion of the Nation's capital, labor force, natural resources, and plant equipment. In the economic sense, a considerable part of our productive resources is used to produce military goods instead of civilian or commercial goods. Since our full productive capacity has not yet been reached, however, the economic problem may not be so much one of shifting productive efforts as increasing them on all fronts. A main function of finance is to make it possible to attain shifts and increases in productive effort. The scope of defense finance, therefore, goes much more deeply than the problem of available capital. We must always keep in mind that basically the problem is one of shifting and increasing the employment of our resources—labor, materials, and equipment. A primary economic balance must therefore be sought between production for defense and production for nondefense purposes.

There are many essential materials which must be conserved. I refer, of course, to raw materials, to products of industrial plants, to many classes of labor. The wasteful or unwise employment of these resources now must be guarded against, and it is, of course, to this end that the Adisory Commission to the National Defense Council, the Office of Production Management, the Priorities Board, and other special agencies and offices have been created, to which leaders of business, finance, and government are now giving their time and energy. Control of capital borrowing, as such, has not yet been necessary. However, we must be careful that our abundance of capital does not promote competition with the national-defense effort for these resources.

This problem of competition with the national-defense program for our Nation's resources has been brought forcibly to our attention in connection with our job of protecting the investor under the Securities Act. Only a few months ago, after we were well into the defense program, a registrant came to our Commission with a project to raise funds for the building of a grandstand at a race track. The issue was effectively registered and, so far as I know, the money was raised. Later we got to thinking about this, and other issues of the same kind. We began to wonder about the materials and labor which would be necessary to complete the project. Steel forms would undoubtedly have to be used, and labor which could handle that type of construction. These problems were brought more sharply to our attention when, a little later, several commercial air lines registered issues the proceeds of which were to be used for the purchase of additional commercial airplanes. Not very long after these issues were registered and the money raised, these air lines were told that they could not have their planes because of the needs of the Army and Navy. Then there was the big biscuit company which raised money, after registration, for the erection of a $1,500,000 new cracker plant in a midwestern area where there is great need for new construction for defense purposes. Here again the question was, Could it get the materials and labor to do the job? I do not for a minute suggest that any of these enterprises was contrary to the national objective of total defense. I don't know the answer. But two main problems arise. The first is, Do the Priorities Board and the labor-control administrators within the national-defense organization know about these projects; and second, are we permitting, by inadequate disclosure, the investment of the public's money in projects which national defense cannot permit to materialize? In other words, are we adequately protecting the investor?

We have recently discussed this matter with Chairman Stettinius of the Priorities Board and Mr. Hillman's office, and we have developed the following working arrangement. I am now authorized to state that henceforth, where new projects are concerned, we shall regard as material for registration purposes any information relating to priorities for raw materials and equipment or the availability of labor necessary for the completion of the project. Wherever it appears that any of the proceeds of a securities issue registered with us are to be used for new or additional facilities, such as buildings or machinery, we shall contact these two branches of the national-defense organization. If they tell us either that materials or labor are unavailable or likely to be unavailable for the purpose specified in the registration statement, we shall require that this information be prominently displayed in the registration statement and prospectus. Similar disclosure will be required whenever the Priorities Board or labor director of O. P. M. indicates that there may be substantial delay in obtaining the necessary materials, equipment, or labor. It may well be that this disclosure will discourage financing of such projects. Of course, our interest is that the prospective investor will be sufficiently on guard so that he can make an enlightened judgment. As a result of this program, the national-defense organization will have all efforts for the public raising of money for new projects brought to its attention whether or not priorities have already been sought, and we shall be properly warning investors that they may be putting their money into impossible or unlikely undertakings. The Securities Act already gives us ample authority to do this job. For priorities information at a time like this is obviously necessary to full and truthful disclosure to the investor.

Of course, the Securities Act is also designed to prevent fraud. This enables us to prevent the diversion of the public's money and the Nation's resources into fraudulent channels, and conserves them for legitimate business and bona fide defense industries. All kinds of companies, for instance, have mushroomed in the last year in the name of national defense. Our investigators all over the country have been watching these promotions and it is clear that some of them are plain, unadulterated frauds. These frauds are ruthless efforts to prey upon the patriotic emotions of small and unsophisticated investors. Fortunately, the securities laws are on the books. By criminal prosecution and by injunction we prevent expenditure of the public's money on fraudulent schemes. Money that might have gone into phantom factories is thus saved for legitimate business, including defense industries.

Under the Public Utility Holding Company Act the problem of priorities of materials has also arisen in connection with utility financings. We know that greatly increased generating facilities are rapidly becoming necessary for national defense, and at first blush it seems inconceivable that such utility projects should not obtain a clear track. From the standpoint of priorities, however, there are actually situations where this is not true. Battleships and cruisers require enormous generating capacity, and we are building a great number of these today. The question has been raised whether our present capacity is adequate to meet our increased naval and industrial requirements. Not long ago, I heard of an instance where a battleship had to be tied at dock for several months to supply the power needs of an expanded naval post ashore. The net result is that additional generating capacity must meanwhile be carefully apportioned between our mili-

tary and our civilian needs, and then, carefully reapportioned between civilian projects in areas most vital to national defense. All this until our capacity to build generators can be increased to meet our needs. To this end, this Commission must scrutinize all applications by utilities to raise funds for generating facilities. Under the Holding Company Act, of course, our powers over utility financings are more pervasive than under the Securities Act. We shall be alert that utility financings for additional facilities are reviewed from the standpoint of national defense priorities of materials and equipment and the availability of labor.

In these connections, private finance can play a role. You can spot these things as they arise, even before they come to us. When a prospective issuer talks to you about preparing an issue, you can raise the priorities and the labor question, and discourage issues which appear to be out of line with the defense program—or at least have him make sure that the project is not out of line. Our primary function of protecting the Nation's investors is inseparably linked to the fundamental endeavor to make the Nation secure. In short, we can jointly aid the defense program by preventing the diversion into illusory ventures of funds and resources which might otherwise stimulate bona fide defense projects. I realize that in these days it is difficult for the financial community to discourage issues. But because I know you, I have no doubt that you will do it when necessary to our common defense program.

The S. E. C. has also participated in another aspect of the defense program. Under the Second Revenue Act of 1940, special accelerated amortization deductions are permitted for additional emergency plant facilities. These special amortization deductions, however, are granted only if a so-called certificate of necessity is obtained from the Secretary of War or Navy and the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense certifying the need of the additional plant facilities in the interest of national defense during the emergency period. Errors may result in corporations gaining undue tax advantages and unconscionable profits, contrary to the intent of Congress, and might possibly lead to dislocation of our economy after the emergency is over.

Facts are important. And that is where the S. E. C. comes in. We have made our facilities available for aiding in the investigation of applicants for such certificates, thereby helping to get the facts for the War and Navy Departments and the Advisory Commission, where they want to supplement existing information. After we have delivered the relevant facts, the defense authorities can make an informed judgment. The decision as to whether the certificate of necessity should be granted or denied appropriately rests with the defense authorities, not with us. We are merely advisory fact finders for the defense authorities when they need us. But fact finding, I am sure you will agree, is a necessary and important preliminary job.

The Commission's duty to integrate and simplify holding-company systems under section 11 of the Public Utility Holding Company Act is another front on which the arsenal for democracy is being forged. Before I go into that, I want to remind you that section 11 isn't only a problem of the utility industry. It's another field in which you and we can work together for the common good. The successful accomplishment of the task of integration and simplification so that their benefits may be quickly felt in the national-defense program is a very large and important job for the financial community. But if it is large, it is still one which will not be without its rewards for those who play a part. The section 11 program is on its way. It will be done and it will be completed as speedily as practicable. The distribution of securities is your business. It is the business from which you make your livelihood. The realists among you will acquaint themselves with the utility situation and help work out the section 11 problems. They who allow emotional opposition to the objectives of the Holding Company Act to obscure their vision will be left by the wayside while the more practical members of the financial community get the business and reap the benefits.

The electric- and gas-operating utilities are vital to the national-defense program. Section 11, however, is aimed at the holding company. Section 11 will not uproot or destroy physical operating facilities. To the contrary, the act is designed to improve the operating efficiencies and financial health of the operating companies. It's the holding company superstructure above the vital foundation of operating companies that we are directed by the act to integrate and simplify.

Efficiency in operation of utilities is necessary to defense and the public good. Efficient operation requires intimate knowledge of the operating property, local industrial needs, and community problems. Remote control by holding company executives in large financial centers is scarcely compatible with efficient operation. Local operating executives who are animated by puppet strings pulled in distant financial centers cannot give us the benefits of localized management and efficient operation. Only management which is on the operating scene, not absorbed in the far-flung problems of running a utility empire of four or five layers spread over half the world can do the job with the high degree of efficiency that is now vital. Integration and simplification will increase utility managerial and operating efficiencies which are essential to the effective mobilization of industry for defense purposes.

The present absence of integration obstructs an effective national-defense program. Lack of integration of utility properties makes power more costly and tends to block proper coordination of power resources. The growth and extension of holding companies has had little relation to economy of management and operation or the integration and coordination of related operating properties. Desirable grouping of adjacent properties has been prevented in many instances by rival holding-company systems which gobbled up everything in sight without regard for their digestive abilities. For example, look at the utility situation in the State of Ohio, one of the most important steel, rubber, machine-tool, munitions, and powder-plant manufacturing centers in the country. The entire State of Ohio is split up into isolated islands of separate utility properties owned by rival holding-company systems. I counted more than 50 different islands of holding-company system operating properties on the map of Ohio the other day, and that doesn't begin to take in some of the municipals. Holding-company systems such as North American Commonwealth & Southern, American Gas & Electric, United Light & Power, Columbia Gas & Electric, Cities Service Power & Light, American Water Works, Associated Gas & Electric, Utilities Service Co., Crescent Public Service Co., United Public Utilities Co., Midland United, and others all have their own preserves in this State. In many cases their own properties are separated from each other by intervening properties of other companies. Proper coordination of power facilities in Ohio is a tough assignment because of this holding-company-system hodgepodge.

The country-wide scatteration of electric utility service areas and the consequent paralleling and leapfrogging of transmission lines are the natural results of a development which has come about without proper regard for regional considerations. Under the present set-up, transmission lines have been badly located, and frequently parallel and jump over those of rival systems. Generating and transmission facilities sometimes have been built because of holding-company benefits and without regard to the power needs of the area served. The existence of rival holding-company systems in an area which should be a single integrated system causes the building of unnecessary generating plants and, in some cases, an uneconomical location of generating plants, resulting in waste of our power resources as well as investors' and consumers' money. Not only this, but the pressure of the holding company to take up earnings from its operating subsidiaries has had a marked effect on the condition of generating stations. Inadequate depreciation allowances and reserves increased reported earnings of operating companies which were siphoned off by parent holding companies. Adequate depreciation policies and plowed-back earnings would have enabled many operating companies to build new, modern generating plants. Instead, because of holding-company appetites for subsidiaries' earnings, we have old, obsolescent power plants still being used for national defense.

I want to illustrate the unfortunate situation frequently caused by scattered holdings of rival holding-company systems. An Army aeronautical research laboratory located at Langley Field, near Newport News, Va., required additional power. Virginia Public Service Co., a subsidiary of the Associated system and formerly an Insullite, happens to have an isolated eastern division, far removed from the rest of its facilities, which serves Langley Field. Virginia Public Service, however, had neither the capacity nor the money to meet the need of this Army station. Now it so happens that Virginia Electric & Power, a subsidiary of the rival Engineers Public Service System, is logically located to serve the Langley Field area, and had the capacity and necessary financial resources to furnish the needed power. Yet, because Virginia Public Service had previously stretched out into this territory, it was necessary to deal with it and for it, in turn, to go through months of negotiations with Virginia Electric & Power to work out a plan for extending power facilities into the area. Negotiations were not successful. Finally, the Government found it necessary to begin construction of a 10,000-kilowatt power plant to take care of the peak loads at Langley Field. To this day the Army station at Langley Field needs more power. Lack of integration of operating facilities caused unnecessary delay on defense work. The program, under section 11, will eliminate these unfortunate delays and break-downs in defense by providing for integrated utility systems which are devised by engineers' planning, rather than financiers' scheming.

The section 11 program is aimed at integrating properties like this so that the crazy-quilt situation will disappear. As the Federal Power Commission's reports on electric power requirements and supply indicate, we need a great deal of utility expansion in the next few years to meet the demands of national defense. It is urgently necessary—not only for national defense but to protect us from paying excessive rates for the next few decades—that these new facilities be planned and operated as coordinated parts of integrated systems. We can no longer afford the wastes and inefficiencies of the past. I believe that the widely scattered properties of today show that the holding companies haven't done much sound planning. And I am convinced that the S. E. C. integration and simplification policies will make possible intelligently planned power programs which will effectively coordinate the needs of national defense.

Integration and simplification will also improve the financial status of many operating utilities. The holding company, by and large, has not done the job of sending downstream equity money to its operating subsidiaries.

The record will bear me out that holding companies proceeded most reluctantly in putting their money into operating subsidiaries. Before the Utility Act, the favorite device of pyramiding was often based on running a shoestring investment into control of a vast number of operating companies. So small was the holding-company stake in its subsidiaries at times that Congress, in passing the Holding Company Act, specifically mentioned the evils caused by "disproportionately small investment." And before the act the studies of Dr. Moulton, of Brookings Institution, showed that very little of the money put into holding company securities went into productive capital for operating companies. The holding companies, by and large, financed their subsidiaries by selling senior securities of those subsidiaries to the public.

I want to give you some figures that were startling to me. From November 1, 1935, to the end of 1940 there have been registered with the S. E. C. under the Holding Company Act, security issues by holding companies in the total amount of $466,000,000. Of these, our records show that securities amounting to a grand total of about $8,000,000 were sold by the holding companies for expanding the productive power facilities of their operating subsidiaries. And of this total, $1,250,000 was raised by an R. F. C. loan. Now, these figures do not take into consideration other funds sent down to the operating companies from sale of portfolio securities or from dividends or interest received. But it does give you an idea of the holding company as a means for raising money for expansion of power facilities of its subsidiaries. These figures would seem to kill any contention that the holding company has been a valuable vehicle for financing the operating companies. If the holding company does send money downstream, it appears to serve largely as a mere conduit, taking up money from the operating companies and then releasing it to them. Even in this regard it is known that frequently the parent has taken up excessive dividends and then returned them to the operating subsidiary in the form of interest-bearing debts which rank ahead of publicly held preferred stocks.

The operating utility, cut loose from holding-company shackles under section 11, can borrow privately or publicly just as well as it does today. In fact, in some instances its credit might be improved if the holding company is taken off its back. For the most part the operating companies are in a stronger financial position than the holding companies; yet many of them are unable to undertake new financing necessary for defense construction only because they are tied to the holding company. For instance, this may occur where an operating company needs additional facilities but cannot sell additional senior securities because the holding company had already overloaded it with excessive bonds and preferred. New money might possibly be raised on common stock, but the controlling holding company won't let the public in on the ground-floor common-stock investments in its operating subsidiaries. And the holding-company parent has neither the money nor the credit necessary to subscribe to additional common itself.

The corporate simplification program contemplated by section 11 (b) (2) of the act is designed to reorganize the holding company and the corporate structure of the holding-company system so that healthy, vigorous utilities may emerge to serve the public interest. Some of the holding companies have been so sick that they couldn't possibly do their job of financing operating subsidiaries even if they wanted to. In many instances the corporate simplification program will enable a holding company to clean up arrearages and take a new lease on life with a sound capital structure. For the first time in a decade some of the holding companies will be able to raise money on their own for expanding the operating facilities of their subsidiaries.

For the past several years our experts have cooperated in planning an over-all power program for the Nation's defense needs. Our knowledge of the Nation's power requirements and supply convinces us that we can aid the national-defense program by an intelligent, speedy enforcement of section 11. Cooperation from the utility industry and the Street's representatives would be in keeping with a true mutual national-defense effort. And the cooperation that we have recently received from executives of some of the major systems in working out parts of the program I commend to the rest of the utility industry.

As for the investment banking and dealers of the country, there is little question in my mind that they can do a fine job in meeting the financial problems raised by integration and simplification. The ice is breaking in this field. Before long you will have the job of distributing the shares of many operating companies to the public. I repeat that it is a very important undertaking from the standpoint of national defense, and I know you can do it well. The electric and gas operating utilities are sinews of our national strength. We must free them from the handicaps which are preventing their proper development.

A powerful defense must be predicated upon a vital working democracy. For if our democratic system fails to work, the defense machinery will be powerless. We must strive together to vitalize the working democracy in finance upon which a vigorous defense must be built.

Indiana a Large Dairy State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1941

REPORT OF THE MILK INDUSTRY FOUNDATION OF NEW YORK

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my colleagues from Wisconsin, who never miss an opportunity to proclaim that they are from "America's Dairyland," I wish to call attention to a recent report of the Milk Industry Foundation of New York, which points out that Indiana holds an important position as a dairy State.

The report follows:

INDIANA LARGE DAIRY STATE, FOUNDATION FIGURES REVEAL

NEW YORK.—Indiana's important position in the dairy industry is vividly depicted in a new handbook issued by the Milk Industry Foundation. According to the book, Milk Facts, 774,000 cows valued at $44,892,000 produced $42,121,000 in cash farm milk income for Indiana farmers in 1939. Production of farm milk in the State for the year totaled 1,496,000,000 quarts; creamery butter, 68,972,000 pounds; cheddar cheese, 24,186,000 pounds; ice cream, 7,765,000 gallons.

The United States is one of the ranking milk-using nations in the world with per capita consumption of fluid milk totaling 153 quarts a year, pictographs show. Milk and its products comprise over 25 percent of the 1,500 pounds of the principal foods consumed each year by the average American, the book says, with 45,000,000 quarts of milk delivered daily to homes and stores.

Pictorial charts and figures show the importance of the milk industry to the country's economic picture and illustrate how milk costs less in the United States in minutes of labor. Diagrammatic charts illustrate how the annual milk supply of some 51,000,000,000 quarts is utilized.

Fluid or fresh milk for cities and villages providing the farmer's highest cash return, accounts for 29.9 percent of the country's yearly production. Creamery butter takes 31.6 percent; farm butter, 9.2 percent; while 11.7 percent of the milk is used as fluid milk on farms where produced. In making cheese 6.3 percent of the total milk is used; ice cream, 3.1 percent; and canned milks, 4.5 percent, according to charts.

A chart of the distributor's milk dollar shows 52.31 percent going to dairy farmers for milk; 19.24 percent to delivery labor; 8.21 percent to delivery expense; 6.33 plant expense; 4.94 plant labor; 2.78 administrative labor; 2.18 administrative expense; 1.68 office labor; and profit 2.33 percent, representing only a fraction of a cent per quart of milk.

"The production and utilization of milk have so increased in this country," says the booklet, "that today we are the greatest of dairy nations. Milk, butter, and other dairy products annually create an output valued at $3,500,000,000.

"Facts about the cows and the farmers that furnish the milk, the distributors whose efficiency has made wide usage possible and the consumption of this 'most nearly perfect food' should lead to a clearer understanding of milk economics.

"One out of every fifteen families in the United States is dependent on milk for a livelihood. Milk is the largest single source of farm cash income, larger than cattle, twice cotton, three times wheat, five times tobacco. There are 25,000,000 cows on three-quarters of the Nation's 7,000,000 farms.

"Americans enjoy the best milk in the world and economical distribution, meticulous sanitation, pasteurization, and other safeguards have made our milk supply a world standard."

Detroit, the Bulwark of National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1941

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, Detroit has long been known as the automobile city; today it more properly might be called the city that is the bulwark of national defense. In this great metropolis, American science and technology are being brought to a focus, as the country's engineers and technicians devote all of their energies to our one common cause of making America and its democratic heritage free from the threat of conquest by any nation or group of nations in the world. No other city is contributing more to our united effort to make this Nation impregnable.

The world and its way of living has changed considerably since Antoine de la Mothe Cadillac founded the "city of the straits" in July 1701, and Detroit not only has managed to keep up with this change, but the city itself has been one of the major contributing factors which brought about the new pattern of life. Long ranking first of all American cities in its exports, which in normal times have a value of nearly a million dollars a day, Detroit is a city that is geared 100 percent to the industrial processes that are the backbone, not only of the material needs of modern life, but also, lamentably, of modern warfare.

Detroit has 11 miles of river frontage. To meet the economic needs of this restless, dynamic metropolis, over 25,000 vessels sail the Detroit River annually and during the season a steamship passes the city once every 3 minutes. Detroit River tonnage is about 100,000,000 tons a year. Further, the city has over 2,200 manufacturing plants which employ the world's most highly skilled workers at the world's highest wages. Lying midway between the iron ore deposits of Michigan and Minnesota and the coal mines of the Eastern States, Detroit is geographically as well as technologically the hub of American industry. Its central location on the continent, easily reached by either rail, water, or highway, adds to its great strategic importance as the center for national-defense industries.

Detroit, the oldest city in the United States west of the Thirteen Original Colonies, has been predominantly a manufacturing center ever since the opening of the Erie Canal made the export of its products possible. Always alert to changing social conditions, the businessmen of the city have been ever ready to adopt new and growing industries, so that at one time or another during the last century Detroit has been a center for tanning, hat making, flour milling, copper smelting, shipbuilding, cigar making, freight-car building, and so forth. Four pioneers of the automobile industry—Ford, Olds, and the two Dodge brothers—did their early work in Michigan, and it was Detroit's bankers who were ready to back the new enterprise despite the skepticism of the financiers of the East. Further, because the city had long been a manufacturing town, Detroit residents knew how to run the new machinery that was needed by the automobile industry. Today, in this age of mechanized battle, Detroit manufacturers once more have been alert to the new needs, and the city's gigantic mass-production plants speedily are being converted to the manufacture of all kinds of military products for national-defense purposes. Once more Detroit's skilled technicians are transferring their energies to a new industry.

In order that we may better understand the immensity of the present national effort to secure complete safety from any possible attack by aggressors, I should like to analyze today only a part of the present defense activity in Detroit with the aim of showing how it is taxing to the utmost the manufacturing capacity of even this most technological city in the world.

Let us take for our first example the present activity of the Packard Motor Co., one of the oldest automobile and engine manufacturing concerns and one which won distinction during the World War for its famous Liberty engine. This company, despite its outstanding manufacturing record of the past, now is undertaking the biggest job in its history—a job so large that this already mammoth manufacturing plant is being forced to spend $62,000,000 for 3 new buildings and 3,000 different pieces of machinery and, in addition, is finding it necessary to more than double its personnel. In all its previous years of industry the Packard Co. had built up a total factory personnel of 10,000 workmen, and we may better judge the immensity of its present effort when we note that for its present airplane-engine program alone the company will require an additional 17,000 highly skilled men.

At present, only 600 men are at work on the airplane-engine program, under which Packard will build 6,000 Rolls-Royce Merlin aircraft engines for England and 3,000 more for the United States. Company officials point out that this means that there is a shortage of 16,400 men which will have to be overcome within a few months if they are to attain the scheduled production rate of 809 engines a month by fall of this year. The officials add that the 10,000 regular Packard employees cannot be used to build airplane engines because they are not trained for the more exacting duties of this type of construction.

W. P. A. employment officials in Michigan several months ago had a "labor pool" of 112,000 men listed as being available for work on defense projects, but today this list has dwindled to 30,000 and this number is further reduced by the new restrictions imposed upon national-defense workmen which bar all but American citizens and require minimum qualifications and physical fitness. Technological experts estimate that 80,000 additional trained men are needed for defense work in Detroit alone, despite the fact that this city has more skilled workmen than any other in the world.

The implications of this situation with respect to the economic life of the city are tremendous. First of all, there is the immediate problem of housing the 80,000 new employees needed in the area, for housing authorities estimate that there is not now available housing for more than 12,000 additional persons, despite the fact that housing conditions in Detroit are far superior to those of most cities in the East. Closely related to the housing problem is the immense program of construction which the industrial concerns themselves are being forced to undertake in order to provide working facilities for their additional employees, and the $62,000,000 Packard program and the new $21,000,000 airplane factory being erected by the Ford Motor Co. are only examples selected from innumerable instances of necessary industrial expansion. To supply these new plants, machinery and tools are necessary, and that means a heavy strain upon the tool and die plants of the city. The Packard Co. has placed orders totaling $18,000,000 for 3,000 different machines ranging in size from 1,000 to 60,000 pounds and costing from $600 to $125,000 apiece. The company is spending $400,000 for soundproofing of cells for testing the engines after they are completed.

In my own congressional district on Detroit's east side, the Chrysler Corporation has thrown its titanic production facilities into the national-defense program. Already it has manufactured and shipped a large proportion of United States Government orders for a total of 58,000 vehicles of various descriptions, some of them highly specialized, for defense purposes. Work on a new tank arsenal, for which a contract was awarded last August, is proceeding on schedule and 700,000 square feet of the new building are now under roof. The building is enclosed and heated, and the installation of mass-production machinery has been started.

For the Chrysler Corporation's part in the manufacture of airplane parts and subassemblies, some 600,000 feet of floor space has now been made available preparatory to work designed to expand the production of Martin bombers. A complement of able and experienced manufacturing executives, drawn from the corporation's regular staff, for many months has been making a special and intensive study of the problems involved in this work. In the airplane-building program, the Chrysler Corporation is serving as a subcontractor to the Glenn L. Martin Co. Meanwhile, Chrysler engineers have been busy studying the special characteristics of airplane engines, and the Air Corps at the present time is showing interest in a new in-line liquid-cooled airplane motor which they have designed.

The Chrysler Corporation also has taken an order to convert the design of a foreign machine gun to American standards and to produce two sample guns. At the Government's request, the firm is preparing a proposal to manufacture these guns in substantial quantities. Additional educational orders for shells, shell cases, and bomb fuses will shortly be completed, and an order for field kitchens already has been filled.

At the Ford Motor Co., where work is getting under way on the $122,000,000 Government contract for 4,236 Pratt and Whitney twin Wasp air-cooled engines, a total of 1,540 new machines is required and the new plant will have to be supplied with entirely new tools from the ground up. To make production on the assigned schedule possible, the already over-burdened machine-tool industry must deliver before the end of March a total of 7,484 machine fixtures such as punches, dies, jigs, gages, and chucks. Because of the highly specialized problems involved, the Ford Co. has let out most of the orders to plants already building them for the airplane industry. Also, because there was a threatened shortage of magnesium, the Ford Co. has erected an $800,000 magnesium foundry, located not far from the $21,000,000 aircraft-engine plant being built at the Rouge.

In the face of similar activity all over the country, technical experts say that Germany, or any other country, can never hope to match the industrial production of the United States, and after consideration of the foregoing, the reason becomes obvious. American advances in metallurgy, the substitution of castings for forgings in aircraft engines, and the adaptation of automobile production methods to airplane manufacture—all these emanating for the most part from Detroit—will, I am confident, make America secure. In this time of national emergency, Detroit the dynamic, once the automobile city, has become indeed the bulwark of national defense.

The Dairy Industry in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1941

REPORT OF THE MILK INDUSTRY FOUNDATION

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a report recently made by the Milk Industry Foundation in New York, with reference to the dairy industry in Oregon. The release follows:

OREGON LARGE DAIRY STATE, FOUNDATION FIGURES REVEAL

Oregon's important position in the dairy industry is vividly depicted in a new handbook issued by the Milk Industry Foundation. According to the book, Milk Facts, 258,000 cows, valued at $13,158,000, produced $18,566,000 in cash farm-milk income for Oregon farmers in 1939. Production of farm milk in the State for the year totaled 634,000,000 quarts; creamery butter, 31,127,000 pounds; cheddar cheese, 19,907,000 pounds; ice cream, 2,067,000 gallons.

The United States is one of the ranking milk-using nations in the world, with per capita consumption of fluid milk totaling 153 quarts a year, pictographs show. Milk and its products comprise over 25 percent of the 1,500 pounds of the principal foods consumed each year by the average American, the book says, with 45,000,000 quarts of milk delivered daily to homes and stores.

Pictorial charts and figures show the importance of the milk industry to the country's economic picture and illustrate how milk costs less in the United States in minutes of labor. Diagrammatic charts illustrate how the annual milk supply of some 51,000,000,000 quarts is utilized.

Fluid or fresh milk for cities and villages providing the farmer's highest cash return accounts for 29.9 percent of the country's yearly production. Creamery butter takes 31.6 percent; farm butter, 9.2 percent, while 11.7 percent of the milk is used as fluid milk on farms where produced. In making cheese 6.3 percent of the total milk is used; ice cream, 3.1 percent; and canned milks, 4.5 percent, according to charts.

A chart of the distributor's milk dollar shows 52.31 percent going to dairy farmers for milk, 19.24 percent to delivery labor, 8.21 percent to delivery expense, 6.33 plant expense, 4.94 plant labor, 2.78 administrative labor, 2.18 administrative expense, 1.68 office labor, and profit 2.33 percent, representing only a fraction of a cent per quart of milk.

"The production and utilization of milk have so increased in this country," says the booklet, "that today we are the greatest of dairy nations. Milk, butter, and other dairy products annually create an output valued at $3,500,000,000.

"Facts about the cows and the farmers that furnish the milk, the distributors whose efficiency has made wide usage possible, and the consumption of this 'most nearly perfect food' should lead to a clearer understanding of milk economics.

"One out of every fifteen families in the United States is dependent on milk for a livelihood. Milk is the largest single source of farm cash income—larger than cattle, twice cotton, 3 times wheat, 5 times tobacco. There are 25,000,000 cows on three-quarters of the Nation's 7,000,000 farms.

"Americans enjoy the best milk in the world and economical distribution, meticulous sanitation, pasteurization, and other safeguards have made our milk supply a world standard."

Agriculture and Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1941

EDITORIAL BY MARVIN CLEMENT, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER OF THE CANBY NEWS, CANBY, MINN.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following worth-while editorial on the relation of agriculture to national defense. Mr. Clement, editor and publisher of the Canby News, Canby, Minn., brings out in the following editorial, that, without parity, the debt-ridden, discouraged farmer is an unfirm cornerstone in our national economy, and a weak spot in our defense:

AGRICULTURE AND DEFENSE

It is becoming apparent that in the hustle and bustle of making this Nation impregnable, the farmer is going to be elbowed and shouldered out of the way in Washington. His hoarse appeal for parity is being drowned out by the roar of guns and crash of bombs in Europe and by the clatter of defense machinery in America.

The industrial East has a blind spot which makes it impossible for it to see that it is just as vital to our national economy and to the defense of our Nation to have farm machinery oiled and in good repair as it is to have the machinery for producing guns and planes running smoothly. The guns of the Allies in the last war made a terrific din and spewed death and destruction like water out of a garden hose, but it was the pangs of hunger in blockaded Germany which really won the war.

As the defense program accelerates, prices will go up. But prices for farm products, burdened by huge surpluses which will be increased by buying in South America to win friendships in the interest of hemisphere defense, will have little chance to rise far. The disparity between what the farmer receives and what he must pay, narrowed in recent years, will widen again.

This is no time for selfishness, no time to go begging to Washington for hand-outs. This is a crisis, a time when we should ask ourselves what we can do, not what we can get. In asking for parity the farmer isn't asking for a hand-out, he's asking for justice, for the right to sell what he produces at a fair price, so he may pay his share of the defense bill. Without parity, the debt-ridden, discouraged farmer is an unfirm cornerstone in our national economy and a weak spot in our defense.

New York Leading Dairy State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1941

REPORT OF THE MILK INDUSTRY FOUNDATION

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following release from Milk Industry Foundation:

NEW YORK LEADING DAIRY STATE, NEW FOUNDATION FIGURES REVEAL

NEW YORK.—New York's leading position in the dairy industry is vividly depicted in a new handbook issued by the Milk Industry Foundation. According to the book, Milk Facts, 1,437,000 cows, valued at $112,086,000, produced $134,018,000 in cash farm milk income for New York farmers in 1939. Production of farm milk in the State for the year totaled 3,472,000,000 quarts; creamery butter, 17,052,000 pounds; cheddar cheese, 21,970,000 pounds; ice cream, 33,882,000 gallons.

The United States is one of the ranking milk-using nations in the world, with per capita consumption of fluid milk totaling 153 quarts a year, pictographs show. Milk and its products comprise over 25 percent of the 1,500 pounds of the principal foods consumed each year by the average American, the book says, with 45,000,000 quarts of milk delivered daily to homes and stores.

Pictorial charts and figures show the importance of the milk industry to the country's economic picture and illustrate how milk costs less in the United States in minutes of labor. Diagrammatic charts illustrate how the annual milk supply of some 51,000,000,000 quarts is utilized.

Fluid or fresh milk for cities and villages providing the farmer's highest cash return accounts for 29.9 percent of the country's yearly production. Creamery butter takes 31.6 percent; farm butter, 9.2 percent; while 11.7 percent of the milk is used as fluid milk on farms where produced. In making cheese 6.3 percent of the total milk is used: ice cream, 3.1 percent; and canned milk, 4.5 percent, according to charts.

A chart of the distributor's milk dollar shows 52.31 percent going to dairy farmers for milk; 19.24 percent to delivery labor; 8.21 percent to delivery expense; 6.33, plant expense; 4.94, plant labor; 2.78, administrative labor; 2.18, administrative expense; 1.68, office

labor; and profit, 2.33 percent, representing only a fraction of a cent per quart of milk.

"The production and utilization of milk have so increased in this country," says the booklet, "that today we are the greatest of dairy nations. Milk, butter, and other dairy products annually create an output valued at three and one-half billion dollars.

"Facts about the cows and the farmers that furnish the milk, the distributors whose efficiency has made wide usage possible, and the consumption of this 'most nearly perfect food' should lead to a clearer understanding of milk economics.

"One out of every fifteen families in the United States is dependent on milk for a livelihood. Milk is the largest single source of farm cash income—larger than cattle, twice cotton, three times wheat, five times tobacco. There are 25,000,000 cows on three-quarters of the Nation's 7,000,000 farms.

"Americans enjoy the best milk in the world, and economical distribution, meticulous sanitation, pasteurization, and other safeguards have made our milk supply a world standard."

Pollution Prevention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1941

LETTER FROM THE GOVERNOR OF IOWA AND RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF IOWA

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter received by me today from Gov. George A. Wilson together with a copy of House Concurrent Resolution No. 22, passed by the Forty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Iowa.

The people of Iowa are keenly interested in all phases of conservation. The fish and game clubs are pursuing constructive programs; farm practices reveal the enterprise of a forward-looking and progressive rural population; and good health is receiving more and more of the attention which this most valuable asset merits.

The people of Iowa should be commended for their zeal in promoting and practicing conservation on a broad scale.

The letter and resolution follow:

STATE OF IOWA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Des Moines, March 15, 1941.

Hon. HENRY O. TALLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have the honor to transmit herewith certified copy of House Concurrent Resolution No. 22 of the Forty-ninth General Assembly of Iowa, which has just recently been adopted.

I ask that you give the contents your very serious consideration and that the matter receive the attention of the Congress.

With expressions of high regard.

Sincerely yours,

GEO. A. WILSON.

House Concurrent Resolution No. 22

Concurrent resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to pass a bill for an act to abate existing pollution, to prevent the future pollution of the waters, streams, and lakes under present Federal control, and to impress upon the Iowa Members of the National Congress the desires of the Iowa people for the abatement and prevention of such pollution by national law

Be it resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized and requested to pass a law along general, broad, and effective lines to abate existing pollution, and to prevent the future pollution of the Federal waters, streams, and lakes of the United States.

That the Governor of the State of Iowa is hereby requested to officially convey such memorial and petition to the Congress of the United States, and to the Iowa Members thereof.

New Hampshire Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 17, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN G. WINANT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by His Excellency John G. Winant, United States Ambassador to Great Britain. This address was made before a joint session of the New Hampshire Legislature prior to Mr. Winant's departure for Great Britain. It gives an insight into the thoughts in Mr. Winant's mind as he undertakes this major post.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Governor Blood, Mr. Speaker, members of the general court, no compliment you could have paid me could mean more to me than to meet with you in these legislative halls before leaving for England.

A quarter of a century has gone by since I first served, as you are now serving, as a member of the general court.

Nothing is more real to me than the memory of those with whom I worked here.

More than once I have told you, that what we do alone is of little importance, because what we accomplish is always measured by what others can do in relation to it.

There is nothing today in my opinion that means so much to this great country as unity in support of right action. Everybody counts. What we do together can never fail.

It was here that I learned, in the years of the depression, that the social and economic problems that we faced reached beyond State lines and across national frontiers. It was because I understood that and because I realized that security, a stabilized economy, and peace were essential to the happiness of all people everywhere that, whether in Washington or in Europe, I felt that I was still working for you here at home.

We know that the frontiers of democracy have been receding and the fundamental principles upon which this country rests have been challenged by those who would replace with force "government by consent." I can illustrate what I mean quite simply. Some days before the invasion of Czechoslovakia I visited there. Immediately following the invasion the students protested, not differently than students might demonstrate here in America. Six students were shot by the invaders, the other undergraduates were placed on forced labor. The university was closed.

For nearly 5 years now I have worked for an organization in which there is a representation of employers, labor, and of government. Many of the men with whom I have associated in the past have been killed or imprisoned, and the right to organize has been denied all those workers in those countries which have been invaded.

Just before the battle of Paris I was taken to Geneva by automobile. I saw not hundreds but thousands upon thousands of refugees—of farmer folk who worked all their lives for what little they had and who had been driven out by the invaders. That is what happened to youth and that is what happens to workers and employers as well and to their organizations, and that is what happens to farming people who come under the heel of the invader.

And then there is another thing that I think we all realize today, and I think it can't be said too often. The pillars of our Republic, the sinews of democracy have to do with the right of free speech, the right to peaceably assemble, the right of the free press, habeas corpus, the right of a man to his own body and trial by jury, the right to worship according to our conscience.

In the aggressor countries and in every country dominated by the aggressor countries, all these rights have been wiped out. There is no right of free speech, no right to assemble peaceably, no right of free press. All men subject to arrest at will, no trial by 12 men good and true, no trial by peace.

All those things that men have fought for here in this country; all those things that have made America what it is, those things have been wiped out in Europe. We are today the "arsenal of democracy," the service of supply against the aggressor nations.

England has asked that we give them the tools that they "might finish the job." We can stand with them as free men in the comradeship of hard work, not asking but giving, with unity of purpose in defense of liberty under law, of government answerable to the people.

With God's will and a just cause, we can do no less.

There is only one thing I would ask of you, and that is to believe me when I say that wherever I may be in the world, this is forever home to me.

Democracy in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1941

ADDRESS BY R. M. EVANS, ADMINISTRATOR OF THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given

by R. M. Evans, Administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, before a meeting of farmers and A. A. A. committeemen in St. Paul, Minn., Friday, March 14, 1941:

If we were living under the kind of system that dominates most of Europe, we would not be gathered together in a democratic meeting like this today. Free discussions and free decisions by freemen could not exist.

Instead of thinking out farm problems together and taking cooperative action through a truly democratic program, you would probably be getting your commands from a one-party, one-track bureaucracy. About this time of the year perhaps you would receive in the mail a technical document ordering you how to use every square foot of your farm, telling you exactly how much you will be allowed to keep for your own use and how much you must deliver to a government-controlled market at a government-fixed price. Later on an inspector would come to your farm and measure everything to see that you obeyed your orders to the last drop of milk or the last kernel of wheat. After that there would probably be more inspectors to check up on the first one, and then maybe some members of the secret police to check up on the inspectors and on you, too. If you made one little slip, or if you dared argue against the system, there would be a concentration camp waiting for you—or, in time of war, even a firing squad.

But this is America. You have something to say about how you will tackle your farm problems, and each man decides for himself whether he will participate in the farm program. That is democracy. And the Triple-A is democracy in action. If you choose to cooperate, you are making use of a program that you helped plan, that you are carrying out in your locality through farmer committees which you yourselves have elected. To conserve your soil, adjust your acreage in line with market demand, store your crops in the ever-normal granary, support your prices, and improve your income, you are offered certain positive incentives—not only payments and loans, but a stable agriculture for the entire country. Then, if world events beyond our control threaten to pile up surpluses, you can resort to marketing quotas by a two-thirds vote in a popular referendum.

Triple A is really a great cooperative. Six million farmers are its members and stockholders. Farmer committees, elected annually by farmers in all the agricultural communities of the country, are its real managers. They apply national policies to each individual farm. They are finally responsible for the success or failure of the whole enterprice. From their own practical experience, they constantly supply suggestions for improved administration year after year. Without hesitation or qualification, I can tell you that the farm program depends on these elected farmer committeemen to maintain real democracy and real efficiency in our cooperative enterprise.

I can promise you further that the overwhelming majority of farmers in America are determined to defend their cooperative farm program against any possible attack either from abroad or from within our own borders. Democracy has worked, and democracy will fight in self-defense.

Today I am here to report to you on the farm situation, which is partly good and partly bad. I'll begin with the favorable aspects.

First of all, agriculture is 100 percent prepared for total defense. In fact, farmers were ready long before the emergency call was issued.

We did not have to organize local committees all over the country to speed up the production of food and fiber. Farmers had already created their own organization of elected committeemen and had proved that they could work together to meet any kind of crisis.

We did not have to plow up every hillside in a desperate attempt to feed the Nation. Farmers were producing more than the people were consuming, more than we were able to export, and more than we needed to carry as reserves against any possible emergency. Moreover, 6,000,000 farmers were creating a second storehouse underground by putting into the soil the fertility that can be converted into food at any time. By resting crop-worn acres and by carrying out land-building practices through the agricultural conservation program, farmers have stored up great potential harvests for tomorrow.

If it had been necessary to mobilize 6,000,000 farmers to produce an abundance of food and fiber all of a sudden, in a frantic last-minute drive, the entire population would have stood up and cheered the dramatic effort. I believe the Nation owes an ever greater tribute to farmers for having done the same job before the emergency arose. It is certainly more foresighted and more heroic to prevent bottlenecks than to struggle to break them after they occur.

The second item that I have to report on the favorable side of the farm picture is that domestic demand for some types of commodities is definitely improving and is bound to improve still more. Producers of dairy, livestock, and poultry products, as well as most fruits and vegetables, can look forward to better prices as more people get jobs and as the wages of the workingman rise with greater industrial activity. Then, too, the food consumption of low-income families is being increased substantially by such programs as the stamp plan, free school lunches, and the purchase of surplus commodities for distribution to people on relief.

Two-thirds of all the families in this country are living on inadequate diets. To promote the general welfare and to provide for the common defense, we should lose no time arranging things so that all families can earn enough purchasing power to buy the food and clothing they need. We are moving in this direction, but we still have a long way to go for full employment and adequate income to provide the kind of living standards which only the United States of America can afford for all its citizens.

From the standpoint of the farmer, I am happy to say that butter and milk prices are now about 90 percent of parity. Pork prices are less than 80 percent of parity, but are considerably higher than last year. Beef prices are about 25 percent above parity.

But let's not fool ourselves with a false sense of security. Some day the war will end, and our defense program will no longer need to expand. That's all to the good, of course, but it will mean a violent shock for the farmer. After the war and the defense emergency are over, America faces the threat of a thundering depression. If the Nation's buying power skids downward, farm prices will slide in the same direction. The consequences would be especially disastrous for dairy and livestock producers who are now building up their herds to meet the rising demand brought about by the defense program.

This year the producers of our basic export crops are confronted with a grave crisis as a result of the war. If we do not solve their pressing problems, we cannot expect to have a stable agriculture in the years ahead. Essentially all farmers are in one boat, and in that same boat are the workers and businessmen who depend for a large part of their income upon rural buying power. All of us will have to pull on our oars, for there is a storm brewing, a dark and threatening storm big enough to tip over the boat if we do not work hard together.

I for one, am gravely concerned about the folks who cannot hope to make a decent living in agriculture. Bigger and better machines have made it possible to produce abundantly with less manpower. There are from six to eight million people on farms who are not needed to supply the Nation with food and fiber. One out of every four or five farm families could be taken off the land, and modern agriculture could still supply all our needs for home consumption and for export.

Of course, the defense program will provide work and wages to some of these people—temporarily at least—but the war has also wiped out several hundred million dollars' worth of agricultural exports on which many farm families depend for a good share of their income.

Where are these millions of farm folks who are not needed in agriculture and who cannot make a living by farming? They are not counted among the millions of folks who are roaming the country as homeless migrants. They are not counted among the millions of unemployed in our cities and towns. They have simply stayed on the farm because there are no opportunities for them elsewhere.

By supporting from six to eight million farm people who are not required for commercial production, agriculture is carrying out a large-scale relief program at its own expense. It is taking care of more people than all of the direct relief programs in all of the 48 States combined.

This situation is bad for agriculture and bad for the Nation. For several million people, farming is only a matter of keeping from starving. These folks commonly live on small parcels of land which they cultivate to the point of exhaustion. The result is a steady disappearance of soil resources accompanied by lower living standards for more and more farmers.

My grandparents came all the way from Norway to take up a homestead here in the Middle West. They were looking for something more than a bare existence with an overdue mortgage hanging over their heads. They wanted a chance to work for the real opportunities that America had to offer.

Subsistence farming on submarginal land is not an American answer to the stranded families who are unable to make an adequate living in agriculture. It is up to the Nation to give these folks a chance in other fields of enterprise. The problem of finding useful work for the surplus population on farms is a national problem, and it will take a great national effort to solve it.

I said before that the present war had brought on a grave crisis for the producers of our export crops. Farmers in this part of the country have felt the wartime loss of markets for about 90,000,000 bushels of wheat, 75,000,000 pounds of pork, and 140,000,000 pounds of lard.

As a matter of fact, the foreign market for our farm products has been shrinking for many years. In the early 1920's more than 60,000,000 acres were devoted to the production of farm exports, but during the current marketing year perhaps less than 15,000,000 acres will be required to produce all the agricultural commodities we are able to export.

Up to the present time at least, the war has hit farmers in the United States much harder than producers in other Western Hemisphere countries. Great Britain, the greatest buyer of foodstuffs in the world, has been forced to conserve its dollar exchange for the purchase of airplanes and other war materials in this country. Britain has thus imported a large share of its farm products from countries like Canada and Argentina that accept the pound sterling in exchange. These countries have actually increased their exports of some agricultural commodities during the war, while farm exports from the United States have gone down.

The main wheat exporting countries of this hemisphere are Canada, Argentina, and the United States. During the year ending on June 30, 1940, Canadian wheat exports were

81 percent larger than during the year before, and Argentine wheat exports were 53 percent larger. Wheat shipments from the United States, however, were 53 percent less.

Canada and the United States are the largest pork-exporting countries of this hemisphere. In the calendar year 1940 Canadian pork exports were 81 percent more than in 1939 and 358 percent more than the average of the 5-year period 1925–29. Pork exports from the United States in 1940 were 28 percent less than in 1939 and 74 percent less than the 1925–29 average.

In spite of more favorable export conditions for some commodities, huge agricultural surpluses have piled up in the farming countries of the Western Hemisphere. Lacking production control, they are in very serious trouble.

Canada has enough wheat to supply its markets for 2 years even if not another bushel were raised. The Canadian Government has been compelled to impose a penalty of fine and imprisonment upon farmers who market more than a fixed quota of wheat, and the quota is on the average only about half of the yield of the great wheat farms on the Canadian prairie.

Argentina has so much cheap corn that it is being burned as fuel in creameries, electric plants, and other establishments. The Argentine Government gave farmers some 20 cents a bushel for last year's corn and then offered it back to the farmers for about 5 cents a bushel. But the farmers would not even buy back their corn for a nickel, and much of it is just stacked up outdoors where it is rotting away.

I am citing these examples as a warning that our own farmers who raise export commodities would be in an equally serious plight if they did not have acreage allotments, commodity loans and marketing quotas.

Nobody knows just what the foreign market for our farm products will be after the war. We certainly cannot take it for granted that all our export trade in agricultural commodities is gone forever, any more than we can assume that we are sure to get back to the highest levels of the past. The future is a question mark. However, our agriculture has been geared to produce large quantities of some commodities for export, and I believe we should put up a fight, within the limits of good national policy, to regain our fair share of the foreign markets that farmers need so badly. It seems to me that Western Hemisphere countries in their own interest should work out marketing agreements for their great export commodities.

At any rate, right now farmers in the United States are facing a grave crisis as a result of vanishing exports. We will have to exercise stricter controls than ever before to keep the supplies of wheat and corn, for example, within the limits of available markets.

Let me add up what I have been saying about the farm crisis today and tell you what I think we can do about it.

1. There are too many people in agriculture wearing themselves out and wearing out their land by raising crops which are not needed to supply our markets.

2. Our exports of farm products have fallen away for many years; they have almost disappeared as a result of the war, and it is doubtful if they will come back in full after the war is over.

3. Farmers in this country have suffered worse losses in foreign trade than producers in other countries of this hemisphere.

4. In the absence of production control, farmers in Canada, Argentina, and other countries are having acute surplus troubles that we are able to avoid through the national farm program.

These factors add up to the proposition that for the first time farmers this year will have to decide in a referendum whether they will adopt marketing quotas for both wheat and corn.

The main reason is vanishing exports. Supplies are piling up as a result of the war, and we are also feeling the effects of long-time shrinkage in the foreign market for our farm products.

During the 20 years before the present war we exported on the average about 150,000,000 bushels of wheat and about 980,000,000 pounds of pork and lard annually. In this fiscal year, ending June 30, we do not expect to ship abroad more than about 20,000,000 bushels of wheat and about 230,000,000 pounds of pork and lard. Thus at present we have lost the foreign markets for almost nine-tenths of the wheat and more than three-fourths of the pork and lard that we formerly exported.

Primarily, because of shrinking foreign markets, our supplies of wheat and corn are now close to record levels. The 1940–41 wheat crop and carry-over from the year before amount to over a billion bushels of wheat. The corn crop and carry-over last fall amount to more than 3,000,000,000 bushels of corn.

It looks as if the supplies of both wheat and corn will exceed the levels that Congress has determined to be necessary to call for a referendum on marketing quotas. After a referendum is announced wheat growers will vote early this summer, and corn-hog producers in the commercial corn area will vote in the fall.

For years farmers have had their prices protected and their incomes increased by loans and payments and a Nation-wide adjustment program. If our only objectives were to control production and take care of the land in accordance with the best conservation practices, we could reduce the acreage of soil-depleting crops like wheat and corn to lower levels than ever before. But we cannot cut acreage so drastically as to squeeze out farmers who are having a hard enough time trying to live on small plots of ground. Farmers cooperating in the adjustment programs have gone about as far as they can under present conditions to keep corn and wheat supplies in line with existing demand.

It is now up to all farmers to do their part in keeping abundant supplies from running into wasteful surpluses. The most effective means available is to set limits on the marketings of those farmers who at present are not cooperating in the agricultural-adjustment program. Marketing quotas are the farmers' answer to the problems brought about by world forces which none of us created.

It is my duty to be very frank with you about the choice before us, and I am going to talk straight from the shoulder.

If marketing quotas fail to be approved by a two-thirds vote, wheat and corn loans are automatically eliminated by law. That might mean 30- or 35-cent wheat and 20- or 25-cent corn. Wheat and corn-hog farmers would face a crisis just about as bad as in 1932.

But that's not all. When corn is too cheap and too plentiful, farmers will feed more of it to an increasing number of hogs and also beef cattle and dairy cows. Eventually that means danger ahead for livestock and dairy producers.

We are going to work for the kind of America in which every family is able to buy the meat and milk and eggs that they need and should have. Farmers are going to keep on producing these good things in full measure for their fellow citizens. However, we now have on hand enormous supplies of foodstuffs. It would be folly to accumulate unmanageable surpluses. Past experience has shown this to be wasteful.

What I fear is that after the war ends, for the long pull after the defense program stops expanding, the number of dairy cows, beef cattle, and hogs will be in an upward spiral, and producers of dairy and livestock products will be overstocked at a time of falling prices and shrunken national income.

That is not the only danger ahead. If farmers cannot raise wheat profitably because of surpluses and low prices, many of them are bound to shift over to more commercial dairying and livestock production.

You may remember that wheat supplies began to pile up in the years following 1925, and wheat prices started to fall at the same time. Farm income from wheat fell off every year following 1927 right down to the bottom of the depression. Shortly after wheat prices and income had begun to slide downward in 1928, beef-cattle and dairy-cow numbers began an upward march for 6 years.

Many farmers have told me that the dairy and livestock business at that time looked better to them than wheat, and so they began to build up their herds.

Once an increase in livestock numbers is under way, however, it is hard to govern even when the bottom falls out of prices. When the depression came along after 1929, the prices of beef and veal and dairy products sank to the lowest levels on record, but the number of dairy and beef cattle kept right on increasing until the drought in 1934.

A slump in buying power in this country after the present war might catch farmers in just about the same position. If too much cheap corn is fed to an increasing number of hogs, and if cheap wheat causes too many farmers to stock up on dairy and beef cattle, there is a real danger that the dairy and livestock business may be overcrowded later on just when the market is at its worst.

That's why dairy farmers and livestock producers have a personal interest in the success of marketing quotas on corn and wheat this year. The stability of grain prices is their best assurance against excessive competition and overproduction in their own field at some future time when prices take a toboggan slide. Over a period of years the regulation of feed-grain supplies and prices will go a long way toward straightening out the wide swings in livestock numbers and prices that have ruined producers and hurt consumers in the past.

I have told you about the probable consequences if marketing quotas are voted down. Now let's see what will happen if marketing quotas are adopted.

Those of you who are cooperating in the triple-A program won't have to change your plans at all. You can market the entire output of your acreage allotment.

It is the noncooperator who will be brought into line. If he markets more than his quota, he will have to pay a penalty. If he wants a loan to store the excess over his quota, he can get only 60 percent of the rate that is available to cooperating farmers.

But I don't believe very many farmers will stay out of the program if marketing quotas are adopted. Since noncooperators will be subject to the quota, anyway, it will be to their advantage to plant within triple-A allotments, to take part in the agricultural-conservation program, and to establish eligibility for the full amount of commodity loans.

Marketing quotas will bring about almost complete participation and thus assure the greatest possible success of the entire program. Those who are not participating now will benefit from the many advantages offered by the farm program. Those who are a part of the program already will have the assurance that markets won't be flooded by noncooperators.

I saw a newspaper story recently to the effect that Australia is having trouble with large landowners who are trying to increase their wheat acreage in order to obtain larger payments from the Government. These large growers in Australia must be somewhat like the noncooperator in this country who raises all he can in an attempt to take unfair

advantage of the higher prices which are brought about by acreage adjustments and commodity loans.

Marketing quotas and high penalties for nonparticipation will make it impossible for a selfish minority to chisel on the overwhelming majority who are ccoperating in the national farm program. Marketing quotas treat everyone alike, big or little. In particular, they protect the small farmers who plant within their allotments year after year.

I hope I have made it clear what you will be deciding if you take part in a wheat or corn referendum this year. Failure to approve marketing quotas would mean surpluses and ruinous prices for wheat and corn, as well as grave perils for dairy and livestock producers. The adoption of quotas would mean cooperation by practically all commercial wheat and corn producers to keep supplies under control, to support prices, and to increase the farmer's cash return from wheat and corn.

Our goal is parity for the farmer. We have just about doubled farm income in the past 8 years, but agriculture as a whole is still about $2,000,000,000 below parity. We are not going to rest until that deficiency in farm income is made up in full.

Of course, we will hear the argument over and over again that parity prices for the farmer would mean undue hardship for the consumer. When you hear that complaint, I hope you will remember a few simple figures.

The wheat farmer gets only about 1 cent from a loaf of bread that sells at the store for 5 or 9 cents. The farmer's share of a 7-cent package of corn flakes is just a little over 1 cent. The cotton producer gets only about 7 cents from a dollar cotton shirt. Several years ago, when tobacco prices were above parity, the producer got only a cent and a half from the sale of the average package of cigarettes.

If the farmer were to get parity prices for his wheat and corn, the retail cost of a loaf of bread and a package of corn flakes would not need to increase by more than three-fourths of a cent each. Parity cotton would add only about a nickel to the cost of a cotton shirt.

Parity prices on farm products like wheat, corn, and cotton should mean very little increase in retail costs because the farmer gets such a small share of the consumer's dollar. But parity would mean a great deal to the farmer, and would also mean decided gains for labor, business, and industry. If the farmer is earning only enough to get along on the barest necessities, he obviously does not have enough left over to buy a radio or a car or an electric refrigerator. But just as soon as farm income rises above a subsistence level, the farmer's money goes to town in a big way. Then every additional dollar of farm buying power turns over in the channels of trade and brings more than a dollar's worth of benefit to the workingman, the storekeeper, and the manufacturer. For every $100 that farm income has increased since 1932 rural retail sales have gone up about $120. Thus, parity for the farmer would be a real gain for the folks who live in our cities and towns.

The farmer is genuinely interested in the welfare of consumers. They are his customers. Their welfare has been carefully safeguarded in A. A. A. legislation, through the ever-normal granary and otherwise. I am sure the overwhelming majority of city folks are equally fair in their attitude toward farmers. Consumers are apt to think fair prices are low prices. But all of us should keep in mind that food prices in America since the opening of the West have been the cheapest in all world history. As measured by the fair yardstick of parity, farmers have actually subsidized consumers about $2,000,000,000 a year for a long time in the form of cheap farm prices. This inequality can be ended with only slight advances in food costs that will be returned to consumers many times over through greatly increased farm buying power for city products.

I know we are all agreed that adequate farm income is vital to the welfare and the defense of America. Complete preparedness means more than guns. It means building up the physical and moral strength of every man, woman, and child. The farmer, like anyone else, must have a real stake in the democratic way of life that we are determined to defend. A strong agriculture is every bit as much a part of national preparedness as our planes and tanks and battleships. The first, the last, and the best defense of America is the American citizen himself.

Labor's Non-Partisan League

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 14, 1941

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take issue with the gentleman from California, but I do know that Labor's Non-Partisan League in Massachusetts is not communistic and has in it no communistic influence or control. I can speak for my own State. I know many of them personally. Those that I know are constructive labor leaders. Of course, they are men of varying shades of thought and of opinions on matters of public interest, but they are all fine Americans. Speaking for Massachusetts, I feel it my duty to defend the men I know who belong to Labor's Non-Partisan League. I cannot speak as to the situation outside of Massachusetts; I am not taking issue with or entering into any controversy with the gentleman except insofar as Massachusetts is concerned. I have no knowledge of conditions elsewhere, upon which I can base and express an opinion. However, I do know that the members of Labor's Non-Partisan League in Massachusetts are very fine Americans. [Applause.]

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I confined my remarks only to California.

Old-Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1941

MEMORIAL BY THE WASHINGTON STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, public opinion throughout the Nation is rapidly crystallizing in favor of a national old-age pension, financed by a national tax and uniform throughout the 48 States of the Union. This is the formula which some of us have been advocating for the past 7 years, ever since the Townsend plan was first proposed in 1934.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington relating to this subject:

Senate Joint Memorial No. 4

Relating to old-age pensions

To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition Your Excellency and honorable body as follows:

Whereas the present National and State social-security laws relating to old-age pensions are steps in the right direction, but have proved unsatisfactory, inadequate, inefficient, and subject to many conflicting State and National interpretations, all of which have created uncertainty and doubt as to the time, amount, and payment of old-age pensions; and

Whereas President Roosevelt has advocated a liberal, uniform, national old-age pension system; and

Whereas the Gallup old-age pension poll indicated that the citizens of the United States favor a uniform, national old-age pension system with individual monthly payments of $40 and such additional amounts as the Congress may from time to time decree; and

Whereas the electors of the State of Washington in the recent general election clearly indicated by the passage of an initiative measure that individual pension payments be increased to $40 per month: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, do hereby respectfully memorialize and petition the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to cause to be enacted into law a uniform, national, old-age pension system along the lines of the desire of the people as expressed in the Gallup national poll; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Washington.

Agriculture and Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN BOLLES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1941

LETTER AND RESOLUTION FROM WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter and resolution I have received from the Wisconsin

Council of Agriculture of Madison, Wis., relating to the position of agriculture in national and Western Hemisphere defense, as follows:

WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE,
Madison, Wis., March 11, 1941.

Hon. STEPHEN BOLLES,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOLLES: The Directors of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture in session at Madison Thursday, March 6, after due consideration, adopted a resolution concerning the position of agriculture in national and Western Hemisphere defense. A copy of this resolution is herewith enclosed. I am sure you will be very much interested in studying this united considered opinion of Wisconsin farm leaders assembled in the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture.

Consumer minded groups and individuals, both in and outside governmental agencies, today exert considerable influence in the way of restricting price advances of consumer goods. This is evident with respect to consumer propaganda found in the National Defense magazine. Within the A. A. A., the consumers' division exerts a similar influence on the price trends of agricultural products.

Throughout this program of national preparedness, few seem to realize that the costs of the things farmers buy are rising way out of proportion to the farmer's ability to pay. Many of these same people who are very conscious of any increases in the cost of consumer goods, condone increasing labor rates, and pay little attention to the rising cost of capital goods, industrial products, and defense materials.

In view of this situation so adverse to the interests of agriculture, the free importation of products from Latin America is certain to have a further depressing effect which will be much more manifest in the case of agriculture than in its influence upon industry.

Your defense of American agriculture in helping to curtail these influences and proposed policies that threaten agricultural well-being will be very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
MILO K. SWANTON,
Executive Secretary.

RESOLUTION REGARDING THE POSITION OF AGRICULTURE IN NATIONAL AND WESTERN HEMISPHERE DEFENSE AS ADOPTED BY THE WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE AT MADISON MARCH 6, 1941

Hemisphere defense involves economic as well as military considerations and we urge that especial care be exercised during this period of emotional stress in order that agriculture in this country not be asked to carry an undue share of the economic burdens of such Western Hemisphere defense. Latin America is suffering from decreased agricultural exports, as is this country. They are accumulating agricultural surpluses as are we. Some of their surpluses are identical in kind with our own.

The Wisconsin Council of Agriculture urgently requests that our Government proceed slowly and cautiously in assuming responsibility for these foreign surpluses, at least until we have formulated methods for the efficient handling of our own agricultural surplus problems.

In relation to other major economic groups and classes in America, the farmers stand ready and are willing to assume their full share of the burdens and responsibilities of national defense. This is just as true now as during the last World War. Our production of food and fiber goes into the channels of trade largely in the form of consumer goods. Hence, the prices of our farm products are most directly affected and influenced by the efforts and propaganda of the consumer groups for stabilization of prices as voiced by the Consumer Division of the A. A. A. and as expressed in the National Defense magazine.

We protest that this program, designed to restrict price advances affecting agricultural commodities, apparently does not attempt at the same time to curtail the rising cost of capital goods, industrial products, and defense materials. The effect of this is to increase cost of production on the farm while curtailing the prices farmers receive. This results in lower net farm income.

We urge that efforts be made by our State and National Governments to assist more aggressively in moving our surplus agricultural commodities into world markets when and where at all possible.

The Harry Bridges Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1941

STATEMENT BY THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, more interest has been manifested in Harry Bridges than in any other alien in our history. A long battle has been waged to deport him. My bill last year to deport him passed the House by a vote of 330 to 42, and was bottled up in another body. I have reintroduced the bill again this year (H. R. 1644) and it is now pending in the House. The American Legion has compiled a chronological statement of the Bridges case and because of the very great interest in the subject I am inserting it here in the RECORD.

[From National Publicity Division, the American Legion, Indianapolis, Ind., April 17, 1939. Revised and new material added February 14, 1941]

CHRONOLOGICAL REVIEW OF HARRY BRIDGES CASE

1900

July 28: Harry Bridges born at Melbourne, Australia.

1918

October 18: United States Congress passes Immigration Act providing for the deportation of dangerous aliens.

1920

April 12: Harry Bridges enters the United States at San Francisco, Calif.

1921

Bridges files application for citizenship papers at New Orleans, La., but permits them to lapse.

1928

Bridges files second application for first citizenship papers at San Francisco, Calif., but again permits them to lapse.

1930

November 17: In an important decision on Immigration Act, United States Circuit Court of Appeals for Ninth District, definitely holds that an alien is deportable because of membership in Communist Party. Decision made in case of an alien named Kenmotsu.

1931

March 23: United States Supreme Court denies certiorari in Kenmotsu case.

1933

September 23: Hearing starts at Little Rock, Ark., before Immigration Director Walter L. Wolfe, in case of Joseph George Strecker, an alien of Polish origin, charged with being a Communist active in 1932 Presidential election, for whom deportation warrant is asked. Strecker admits former membership in Communist Party but denies present membership.

October 25: Strecker hearing continued at Little Rock before Immigration Inspector Carroll D. Paul.

November 25: Deportation warrant under provisions of Immigration Act of 1918 issued for Strecker's arrest.

1934

January 23: Strecker is arrested at Little Rock, Ark., on deportation warrant.

May 8: Immigration authorities hold public hearing in Strecker case as provided by law.

May 9: Bridges leads San Francisco longshoremen into bloody strike. He is now president of the Pacific coast district of the International Longshoremen's Association, president of the San Francisco district council of the Maritime Federation, and vice president of the California State Federation of Labor.

July 5: Two strikers are killed and scores are injured as Bridges' longshoremen clash with San Francisco police.

July 16: Bridges foments a general strike in San Francisco which ties up all business, as a protest against the killing of two of his men. Governor proclaims martial law, calls out 7,000 California National Guard men.

August 14: Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins signs order for the deportation of Strecker.

1936

Bridges files third application for first citizenship papers at San Francisco but again lets them lapse.

June 25: Strecker, who has been held pending establishment of his foreign citizenship, files petition for a writ of habeas corpus in Federal court at Little Rock, Ark., which action stays deportation proceedings.

October 22: Republic of Poland recognizes Strecker as a citizen of Poland and Polish consul in Chicago issues him a passport.

December 26: Bridges jailed at Long Beach, Calif., after his car in which he was hurrying to address a meeting of strikers at Wilmington Bowl runs down and kills 8-year-old Joe Miranda.

December 27: Bridges released from Long Beach jail on writ of habeas corpus. He had been booked for investigation of negligent homicide. His defense was boy was riding bicycle without lights on wrong side of street and he did not see him.

1937

January 28: United States District Court for Eastern District of Arkansas denies writ of habeas corpus to Strecker in deportation case.

May 17: United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Eighth District, dismisses Strecker appeal.

June 16: Strecker starts new habeas corpus action in Federal court at New Orleans, La.

July 30: Federal Judge Wayne G. Borah, at New Orleans, denies Strecker a writ of habeas corpus.

September 21: Strecker appeals to the United States circuit court of appeals again, this time in fifth district.

September 22: Photostatic copy produced by Portland, Oreg., officials of 1937 Communist Party membership book No. 54,793, issued to Harry Dorgan, an alias of Harry Bridges.

September 22: Application made at Seattle, Wash., by Divisional Director R. J. Norene and

District Director R. P. Bonham, of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service, to Edward J. Shaughnessy, Assistant Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, Washington, D. C., for a deportation warrant for Harry Bridges. The application included nine grounds, the last being "that he, Bridges, believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States of America."

October 18: Gerard D. Reilly, solicitor for the Department of Labor, examines Harry Bridges under oath in New York City to get a deposition in connection with the deportation action. To Reilly's question whether he had associated with the top fraction of the Communist Party, Bridges replied: "I decline to answer on advice of counsel." The counsel was Sidney E. Cohen, New York attorney.

Following the New York hearing, a number of protests reached the Department of Labor against the move to deport Bridges. Typical of these protests is the following from Mauritz Hallgren and Elizabeth Gilman, chairman and secretary, respectively, of Maryland Civil Liberties Committee:

"Maryland's Civil Liberties Committee strongly protests against reported intention of Department of Labor to issue warrant for deportation of Harry Bridges on unsupported charges that he is a radical agitator. We consider this contemplated move wholly an unwarranted attack upon constitutional rights of American labor."

1938

January 28: Solicitor Reilly replies to Maryland protest as follows: "Your committee need have no fear that the Department proposes to deport Mr. Harry Bridges or anyone else on unsupported charges. You may be sure that such procedure would be as repugnant to the Secretary of Labor as it would be to the Civil Liberties Committee of Maryland."

February 2: International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union of Bellingham, Wash., sends resolution to Secretary Perkins attacking the record of District Director Bonham and demanding his removal. He is the official who filed deportation charges against Bridges.

February 3: Bridges writes to Secretary Perkins asking for a bill of particulars of the charges against him.

February 5: Department of Labor finds that the original copies of the application for the warrant for Bridges' arrest, made by the Seattle officials, have disappeared from the files of the Department. A request is rushed to District Director Bonham at Seattle to forward his office copies.

February 8: Wisconsin Workers' Alliance telegraphs Secretary Perkins as follows: "Wisconsin Workers' Alliance demands that President Bridges, of the Timber Workers' Union, be admitted to citizenship of this United States at once. We believe that no one should be denied citizenship because of his activities in labor circles."

February 8: Secretary Perkins writes to Harry Bridges admitting her office is investigating him. Madam Secretary in reply to Bridges' allegation that the charges against him were "trumped up," says: "Should the Department proceed with hearings it does not mean that it has adopted the view that the evidence which the complaining witnesses are submitting is necessarily trustworthy."

February 8: Solicitor Reilly is quoted in New York Herald Tribune as stating that "the Department of Labor was in possession of sufficient information about Harry Bridges, Pacific coast maritime leader for the C. I. O., to make out a prima facie case for his deportation as an alien."

Later Reilly declared he had said only that "a prima facie case could be made out against Bridges."

February 11: Bridges wires Secretary Perkins asking immediate hearing on the deportation charges, alleging that attempts were being made to prejudice the case against him.

February 12: James L. Houghteling, Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, advises Bridges: "Have your request for prompt hearing and agree with you that it is desirable that you be given opportunity to be heard as soon as possible on charges relating to deportation. Unable to advise you today the details of time and place but will notify you when arrangements complete."

March 5: Bridges arrested at Baltimore, Md., on deportation warrant at office of Acting District Director Leon R. Fouch of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Released on his own recognizance. Hearing scheduled for April 25, 1938, at San Francisco, Calif.

Original warrant for the arrest of Bridges found to be endorsed on its face as follows:

"Pending further proceedings, the alien may be released from custody upon his own recognizance."

On back of warrant is following endorsement:

"Served on alien at the office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service at Baltimore, Md., at 10:10 a. m. March 5, 1938. Hearing to be commenced at San Francisco, Calif., April 25, 1938. Charles R. Frank, Immigrant Inspector."

March 23: Secretary Perkins advises the Attorney General of the United States that formal deportation charges against Harry Bridges would be aired at a public hearing at San Francisco, Calif., beginning April 25, 1938.

March 25: District Director Bonham, of Seattle, reports to T. B. Shoemaker, Deputy Immigration and Naturalization Commissioner in Washington, D. C., that Communists were plotting to intimidate witnesses scheduled to appear against Bridges at San Francisco deportation hearing, that radicals also plotted to picket the hearing, and that numerous protests were being received against the holding of public hearings in the case.

April 6: United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit at New Orleans, La., reverses the decision of District Judge Borah which denied a writ of habeas corpus to Strecker. The higher court held, in effect, that membership in the Communist Party, standing alone, is not sufficient ground for deportation, thus setting up a conflict with the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth District which had held exactly the reverse in the Kenmotsu case.

The decision of the higher court in the Strecker case, however, was based upon the conclusion of the court that insufficient evidence had been offered by the Government to show that the Communist Party was an organization that taught the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence.

It followed, therefore, that at a retrial before the district court an opportunity would have been given to the Government to introduce additional evidence showing the character of the Communist Party. Certain stock exhibits which had been offered usually by the Government in such deportation cases to show the character of the Communist Party, and which for some unknown reason were not offered in evidence before the district court in the Strecker case, were available and had previously been accepted by many Federal courts as proof that the Communist Party was an organization that taught the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence.

Nevertheless, Secretary Perkins, Commissioner Houghteling, and Solicitor Reilly refused this opportunity to submit the usual stock exhibits in a retrial of the Strecker case, but proceeded to have the case appealed to the United States Supreme Court on an admittedly defective record.

April 8: Arthur J. Phelan, inspector in charge of legal division in San Francisco, notifies the Department of Labor that an informant had reported that Harry Bridges had ordered his "beef squad" to get in a lot of practice because there would be a lot of work to do on the witnesses who were to appear against him. Bridges also was quoted as boasting he would beat the deportation charges, and that if he did lose, he would be able to stave off his deportation for years.

April 12: Bridges through his counsel again demands a bill of particulars of the deportation charges against him.

April 14: District Director Bonham writes Commissioner Houghteling that "in my opinion and that of others with whom I have talked, the safest place to hold Bridges deportation hearing would be at Angel Island; they have a special launch that we could utilize, if necessary, for the safety of our witnesses."

April 14: Commenting on Bridges' request, Deputy Commissioner Shoemaker, in a memorandum to Solicitor Reilly, says: "The basic thought is that the Department would be less likely to be criticized from any sources if it adhered strictly to the long-established practice in warrant proceedings and did not depart therefrom for this or any other particular case."

In long hand on the margin of this letter is found the following notation: "I do not entirely agree but matter can be postponed until case is set down for hearing again. G. D. R." (G. D. R. are the initials of Solicitor Reilly.)

April 14: Commissioner Houghteling sends memorandum to Secretary Perkins suggesting as one reason for postponing of Bridges' deportation hearing, the following:

"If we go ahead with the hearing scheduled for April 25 and the Supreme Court should later affirm the action of the circuit court of appeals in the Strecker case, the Department might be charged with 'smearing' Harry Bridges unnecessarily."

April 20: District Director Bonham wires Commissioner Houghteling as follows: "Radio news announces your continuance of Bridges deportation hearing until Supreme Court decides New Orleans Strecker case. Hope this is incorrect as difficult to protect our witnesses indefinitely. I have examined entire record of testimony and the court decisions in Strecker case. Service failed introduce adequate proof Communist Party teaches violence. We have ample such evidence, both in current official party documents and on part of witnesses. New Orleans Strecker case weak and devoid of proper proof; therefore, not hurtful or controlling our case. Hope same will not be regarded as precedent or of sufficient consequency postponing pending case. Please wire instructions."

April 21: Edward W. Cahill, District Immigration Commissioner at San Francisco, writes letter to Commissioner Houghteling, containing following significant sentence:

"Before we bury this Bridges case, may I just present this sequence of facts?"

April 21: Commissioner Houghteling writes to Cahill, saying:

"Because of the reproof which I was obliged to administer therein to Mr. Bonham's excessive zeal and bad judgment in putting into the record his telegram prejudging the action of the central office, I request that you destroy this copy after reading it; you may, however, show it to Mr. Haff, whom I wish to keep in touch with the developments in this situation. Because Raphael Bonham is so keenly devoted to his duty as he sees it, I should not want a knowledge of this gentle reprimand to go beyond yourself and Mr. Haff."

April 26: Petition for rehearing of the Strecker case by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals filed at New Orleans by United States District Attorney R. A. Viosca.

May 5: Commissioner Houghteling in an address before the National Executive Committee of the American Legion in Indianapolis, announces that the Department of Labor had postponed the deportation hearings in the Bridges case, scheduled to start April 25, because of the appellate court decision in the Strecker case, and that the Bridges case would be held in abeyance until the United States Supreme Court settled the issue whether membership in the Communist Party of America was grounds for deportation.

May 6: National executive committee of the American Legion adopts resolution demanding deportation of Harry Bridges. The resolution follows:

"Whereas Harry Bridges has been charged with fomenting strikes, labor racketeering, conspiracy to cripple our merchant marine, membership in the Communist Party, intention to attempt overthrow of the American Government by force, and other acts making him ineligible to American citizenship and subject to deportation; and

"Whereas appropriate charges are pending against the said Bridges before the Department of Labor; and

"Whereas trial of said charges has been repeatedly continued and now appears to have been indefinitely postponed; and

"Whereas activities such as those with which Bridges is charged will, if continued, inflict damage upon our citizenry and endanger our form of government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the national executive committee of the American Legion, That demand be made upon the Department of Labor to proceed with the immediate prosecution of the charges against Harry Bridges."

May 26: Largely as the result of the efforts of the American Legion, Congress adopted House Resolution 282 providing for a special committee headed by Congressman MARTIN DIES, of Texas, to investigate un-American activities within the United States. The sum of $25,000 is appropriated for the work of this committee.

August 14: Dies committee opens its probe into un-American activities. Edward F. Sullivan, one of its investigators, files charges that Harry Bridges, west coast C. I. O. leader, was being advised, instructed, and protected by "an outstanding" official of the Department of Labor.

August 16: Dies committee votes to inquire immediately into charges that Labor Department officials had given "aid and advice" to Harry Bridges when efforts were being made to have him deported as an alien Communist.

September 7: Petitions for certiorari filed in Strecker case in United States Supreme Court.

September 22: The twentieth annual national convention of the American Legion at Los Angeles, Calif., elects Stephen F. Chadwick, of Seattle, Wash., as national commander and adopts following resolution on Bridges case:

"Be it resolved by the national convention of the American Legion, That we demand the immediate trial and deportation of Harry Bridges and like undesirable aliens."

September 22: American Legion national convention at Los Angeles also adopts following resolution:

"Whereas certain officials of the Department of Labor have failed miserably in enforcement of the laws relative to immigration and deportation; and

"Whereas said officials of the Department of Labor have consistently blocked the passage of new and much-needed laws to regulate immigration and deportation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the American Legion in national convention at Los Angeles, That it demands that the Congress of the United States investigate the failure of these officials to comply with the existing immigration laws and take such steps as may be necessary to correct this unwarranted failure of duty."

October 17: Writ of certiorari granted by United States Supreme Court in Strecker case.

October 24: Ray E. Nimmo, American Legion attorney from Los Angeles, Calif., appearing before Dies committee in Washington, accuses Secretary Perkins of resorting to a "subterfuge to protect" Harry Bridges.

November 15: National Commander Chadwick addresses a letter to Secretary Perkins demanding that the Department of Labor proceed with the trial of Bridges.

November 18: Secretary Perkins replies to Commander Chadwick, saying the Bridges case was being held up pending a decision by the United States Supreme Court in the Strecker case.

November 24: National Commander Chadwick again addresses letter to Secretary Perkins urging her to bring Bridges to trial not on grounds he is a member of the Communist Party but on the grounds that he advocates the overthrow of the Government by force or violence.

December 7: National Commander Chadwick appears before the Dies committee and reviews Bridges case.

December 27: National Commander Chadwick sends a letter to every Member of the new Seventy-sixth Congress, outlining charges against Bridges and reviewing failure of Labor Department officials to enforce the deportation law against Bridges.

1939

January 3: Dies committee files exhaustive 124-page report of communistic penetration of Government, and asks for $150,000 for continuance of its probe.

January 24: Representative J. PARNELL THOMAS of New Jersey files House Resolution 67 asking for the impeachment of Secretary of Labor Perkins, Commissioner of Immigration Houghteling, and Solicitor Reilly. Resolution is referred to the Committee of the Judiciary.

February 3: The House, by a vote of 344 to 35, votes to continue Dies committee; also votes appropriation of $100,000 for committee's expenses.

February 8: Secretary of Labor Perkins makes a personal appearance before the House to defend herself in lengthy address on Bridges case.

February 10: Strecker case argued before United States Supreme Court.

March 23: House Judiciary Committee returns unfavorable majority report on Parnell resolution seeking impeachment of Secretary Perkins and her two aides, and House adopts the majority report, thus ending impeachment attempt. However, a minority report charged that the three Labor Department officials had been "lenient and indulgent to Harry Bridges in the conduct of his deportation case to an unprecedented extent."

The minority report on the Parnell resolution follows:

"We are in general agreement with the findings and recommendations contained in the report of the committee, but disagree to the extent and in the particulars contained in these additional views.

"We feel that from the testimony adduced before the committee and from the records and files examined by the committee it is apparent that the Secretary of Labor, the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Solicitor of the Labor Department have been lenient and indulgent to Harry Bridges in the conduct of his deportation case to an unprecedented extent.

"The record before us lacks proof of any kind as to the motive actuating such leniency and indulgence. It cannot escape our severe condemnation and censure. Bridges' record as a sympathizer with radical and communistic movements, if not his active participation therein, is an open book. He should have been dealt with firmly, and his case should have been disposed of with all possible speed. The confidence of the people in the proper administration of the laws governing the deportation of aliens, particularly those associated with the extreme radical and communistic elements, by the present Secretary of Labor and her subordinates has been profoundly shaken by the failure promptly, vigorously, and impartially to proceed to a final determination in his case.

"This course of conduct which we condemn does not justify impeachment, but it does call for the official and public disapproval of this committee.

"U. S. Guyer, C. E. Hancock, Earl C. Michener, John M. Robsion, Chauncey W. Reed, John W. Gwynne, Louis E. Graham, Wallace E. Pierce, B. J. Monkiewicz, Raymond S. Springer."

March 28: Harry Bridges files fourth application at San Francisco for first citizenship papers.

April 17: United States Supreme Court, in a long-awaited decision in the Strecker appeal, rules, in an opinion written by Justice Owen J. Roberts, that the Immigration Act does not authorize the deportation of a nonnaturalized alien solely because he once held membership in the Communist Party.

The high Court held the 1918 statute providing for the deportation of nonnaturalized aliens belonging to organizations advocating violent overthrow of this Government was intended to apply only to two classes:

1. Those belonging to such organizations when they entered the country.

2. Those belonging to such organizations when the deportation proceedings were instituted.

The immediate effect of this ruling was to order Strecker released from custody, but by wiping out a construction of the deportation statutes, followed by the Department of Labor for many years, the ruling affected many other cases.

July 10: Bridges' deportation hearing opens at San Francisco, with James M. Landis, dean of the Harvard Law School, as special examiner.

September 14: Bridges' deportation hearing closes at San Francisco.

December 30: In an 80,000-word report, Special Examiner Landis reports to Secretary Perkins that in the 1,500,000-word testimony of 32 witnesses at the San Francisco hearing he could find no substantiation that Bridges is or ever was a member of the Communist Party.

1940

January 8: Secretary Perkins cancels deportation warrant issued against Bridges.

January 27: Bridges seeks a short cut in San Francisco to American citizenship by seeking to invoke the provisions of the Cable Act of 1922. This provides that an alien may apply immediately for his second, or final, papers by proving he or she had been married for 3 years to an American and was living in this country. Bridges explained his wife, born in Scotland, acquired American citizenship by a prior marriage to an American.

February 8: Dies committee renews fight on Bridges, according to announcement of Representative NOAH M. MASON, of Illinois, a member of the committee.

May 14: American Legion-sponsored bill to deport Bridges introduced in House of Representatives by Representative A. LEONARD ALLEN, of Louisiana. Measure is known as H. R 9766.

June 13: House of Representatives passes Bridges deportation bill by a vote of 330 to 42.

September 25: The twenty-second national convention of the American Legion adopts following resolution:

"Resolved, That we urge the speedy enactment of H. R. 9766 and the immediate deportation of said Harry Bridges."

1941

February 12: Attorney General Robert H. Jackson announces that on the basis of "new and additional" evidence contained in a 2,500-word report on Bridges prepared by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, he had ordered a new deportation hearing for Bridges, to start in San Francisco, Calif., March 31.

Cladakis, Administrator of the New York State Milk Pact, is an Able and Fearless Official—Except for the Racketeers and a Few Die-Hards, Administrator Cladakis Has the Producers of New York State Backing Him to a Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS D. CULKIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1941

ARTICLE BY JOHN H. BRIOR, WATERTOWN (N. Y.) TIMES

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, a Daniel has come to judgment in the clear-visioned Cladakis, Federal and State administrator of the New York State milk shed. In that murky atmosphere where distributor interests until recently controlled, Mr. Cladakis has hewed to the line and steadily refused to be purchased or intimidated. The Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Claude Wickard, has been most valiant in his support of Mr. Cladakis and is thoroughly steeled against the arts and wiles of the milk politicians, who have consistently and for many years sold the New York State producers down the river.

Under the firm, impartial, and intelligent supervision of Mr. Cladakis, and partially as a result of the almost unanimous vote on the amendments to the Federal-State milk orders on February 17, this milkshed is in a comparatively peaceful condition. As a result of this vote, $5,000,000 will be added to the dairymen's annual income. In addition to this, the amendments give the administrator the power to audit the books of the dealers and cooperatives.

As a result of the new powers granted under the amendments, Mr. Cladakis has promptly uncovered fraudulent practices in buying milk for the New York State market. These frauds stem from the dealer-contrived device of surplus, and are said to be wholesale in character. Mr. Cladakis intends to bring these malefactors to justice. I trust that he will call in the long arm of criminal law for the purpose of putting these thieves, big and little, behind the bars. I was district attorney of my county for 10 years, and it was my observation that as long as lawbreakers are able to keep out of jail they continued to offend. Reimbursement or a payment of a penalty is simply a license to go and steal some more. My suggestion to Mr. Cladakis is that these cases, when they arise, should be called to the attention of the district attorney of the county where the offense was committed and put them on trial before up-State juries. When these "gentry" learn that that is to be the procedure, they will mend their ways.

Naturally, this action of Mr. Cladakis in bringing these thieves to book has created some excitement. They have enjoyed immunity so long with State instrumentalities inactive or failing to follow up with criminal prosecution that they are naturally greatly disturbed. They now seek the removal of Cladakis and the substitution of a weaker type of administrator. These larcenists are seeking to appoint their own prosecutor. The answer is to push these prosecutions vigorously and without mercy.

I am including a statement which appeared in the Watertown (N. Y.) Times of March 15, 1941, and written by its able dairy editor, Mr. John H. Brior. Mr. Brior is correct in his statement that any move on the part of the exploiters of the dairymen to force the transfer of Administrator Cladakis will meet with rebuke from the producers of New York State.

Pursuant to the permission of the House, I append hereto Mr. Brior's article:

[From the Watertown (N. Y.) Times of March 15, 1941]

DRIVE AGAINST CLADAKIS SEEN—PETITION FOR REMOVAL REPORTED CIRCULATED—CONTENTS NOT ANNOUNCED—OBJECTION TO MILKSHED ADMINISTRATOR BELIEVED BASED ON FEDERAL ORDER REVISION AND RECENT ORDERS HITTING INCOME OF SOME HANDLERS

(By John H. Brior)

A small group of milk dealers in New York City and up-State were today reliably reported to be quietly circulating a petition asking for the removal of N. J. Cladakis as Federal administrator of the New York milkshed.

The petition, whose contents have not been divulged, today was said to bear the signatures of "only a few" milk dealers, and it is said there is some question if it will ever be submitted to Secretary Claude R. Wickard in Washington, as was the original plan.

Circulation of the petition started, it is reported, after a conference of a small group in a New York City hotel. An attempt was made more recently to have it supported by a dealers' association in New York but the attempt failed and reference to it was kept from the minutes of the meeting.

Federal officials, admitting knowing of the petition unofficially, decline to discuss it excepting to say that "there is nothing we can do about it. If any individual or group seeks to petition the Federal Secretary, it is their right and should not be discouraged."

It is known that several dealers have refused to join in signing the petition.

The move is the second against Mr. Cladakis since he was transferred from Chicago to New York nearly 9 months ago.

It is said that revision of order 27, the marketing pact for the New York milkshed, and Mr. Cladakis' subsequent orders will affect income margins of dealers generally in the industry.

Officials feel that any move to force the transfer of Administrator Cladakis would meet with rebuke by the industry. Revision of the marketing agreement and orders to prevent discrimination against New York producers should benefit all phases of the State's $2,000,000,000-a-year dairy business.

The new program, effective since March 1, is expected to be a tremendous stabilizing influence in the market and raise prices to farmers, at the same time lowering consumer costs and making sales volume turnover steadier.

Proportion of Defense Expenditures To Be Raised by Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1941

LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, at this time when taxes are very much in the public mind I think that a letter I have received from the Secretary of the Treasury will be of general interest. In it he expresses his views as to the proportion of national-defense expenditures that should be raised by taxation and the proportion that should be raised by borrowings.

His letter follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, March 14, 1941.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Appropriations for Treasury and Post Office Departments,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: It has come to my attention that the printed record of the hearings December 17, 1940, on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for the 1942 fiscal year incorrectly indicates that I believed the cost of Government, as increased by national-defense needs, should be financed on a ration of one-third from revenues and two-thirds from borrowing. This unfortunate impression has since been referred to as fact by a number of reporters and editorial writers.

On February 12, 1941, in testimony on the Public Debt Act of 1941 before a subcommittee of the Senate Finance Committee, I responded as follows to a question by Senator BYRD:

"If the Congress would adopt a program under which we could raise through revenues an amount sufficient to finance two-thirds of all expenditures, and one-third from borrowing, I think it would be a very wholesome method to follow."

I shall appreciate any help you can give me in clearing up my position in the minds of Members of the Congress, writers, and others interested.

With sincere personal regards, I am

Faithfully yours,

HENRY MORGENTHAU, JR.,
Secretary of the Treasury.

For the Best Interests of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM IL PROGRESSO ITALO-AMERICANO AND THE CORRIERE D'AMERICA

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in Il Progresso Italo-Americano and in the Corriere D'America on March 2, 1941:

[From Il Progresso Italo-Americano and Corriere D'America of March 2, 1941]

FOR THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE NATION

There is too much discussion, particularly for and against the foreign and economic policies of the Government. These policies are being discussed in Congress, in the press, on the radio, and in meetings of every party. Special organizations have been formed with the most diversified aims, to oppose any trend in favor of intervention or to reinforce it against the opposition of the isolationists; to invoke a policy that is clearly defensive or one more vigorously anglophile. And these organizations send out a flood of telegrams, resolutions, and pamphlets, to Senators, Congressmen, newspapermen, and heads of societies of every kind.

No one should even think of placing a gag on public discussion. But neither should it be forgotten, particularly when it concerns people who hold places of some responsibility, that we are in a period of exceptional emergency and that it is necessary spontaneously and conscientiously to impose limits on the free exercise of any propaganda which might create obstacles in the way of Government policy and consequently in the way of the best interests of the Nation.

A few short months ago we reelected for a third consecutive term a President who spoke to the American people in the clearest terms even as regards foreign policy. And one of the reasons which favored his reelection was that the pilot of the ship should not be changed while the storm rages, particularly when you have an expert commander. And after all what would the country have gained from the election of his opponent Wendell Willkie, notoriously ignorant of the great international problems who, in the end, fully endorsed the Rooseveltian foreign policy and who, even after his much-publicized visit to England, came back with several proposals which Congress could not consider because they were contrary to the interests of national defense.

President Roosevelt has at his command the most complete and most precise elements of judgment. And he is steadfast for his program which—no one can deny—has had the approval of the great majority of the American people. He therefore has the right to count on the confidence and cooperation of all in this moment charged with grave responsibilities, while the work of national rearmament continues with ever-increasing rhythm so that, regardless of how events may develop beyond both oceans, the country will be prepared to face any situation.

It is high time to support with discipline, serenity and confidence, the work of the Chief Executive, sacrificing, whenever necessary, ideologies, sympathies, and personal or partisan interest for the best welfare of the Nation.

Even the President's warning to the press to avoid publishing military secrets will not remain unheeded.

When the skies are clear again, that is, when the war is ended, we shall again take up our discussions with greater freedom. And let us hope that we shall not have to wait long, for in no field as in that of the press do we more painfully feel the duty of sacrificing, in times of national danger, the right of free expression in favor of the duty of not endangering the safety of the internal united front and the work of defense entrusted to the care and responsibility of the Federal Government.

GENEROSO POPE.

Newspaper Public Service in Times of Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN BOLLES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1941

LETTER FROM INLAND DAILY PRESS ASSOCIATION, INC.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter I have received from the Inland Daily Press Association, Inc., of Chicago, Ill., containing a statement of their policy as to newspaper public service in times of emergency, as follows:

THE INLAND DAILY PRESS ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., February 27, 1941.

Hon. STEPHEN BOLLES,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

This is to certify that the following statement of policy as to newspaper public service in times of emergency was presented to the delegates of our member newspapers on February 18, 1941, in regular convention assembled and unanimously adopted:

"The Inland Daily Press Association, the oldest and largest regional daily newspaper association in America, representing more than 300 dailies in 19 North Central States, is proud of its long record of public service.

"This association and its individual members always have loyally supported the Nation in time of emergency.

"Today, as the Nation is again engaged in a great defense effort, the Inland Daily Press Association, assembled for its fifty-seventh annual meeting, urges the press of America to use its facilities to best further real national unity.

"We urge our members and the newspapers of America to cooperate to the fullest with the Government in the safeguarding of vital military secrets. Likewise, we urge the Government to keep the American people as completely informed on the progress of national defense and of developments in international affairs as is compatible with the national safety.

"At the same time, we urge that the press remain ever vigilant to the preservation of civil liberty, freedom of speech, and of the press. These are paramount if our Republic is to survive the world tide of totalitarian ideologies."

Respectfully submitted.

INLAND DAILY PRESS ASSOCIATION, INC.

Wisconsin's Milk Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN BOLLES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1941

NEWS RELEASE BY THE MILK INDUSTRY FOUNDATION

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a news release by the Milk Industry Foundation of New York City, relating to milk production in Wisconsin, entitled "Wisconsin Largest Dairy State," as follows:

WISCONSIN LARGEST DAIRY STATE, NEW FOUNDATION FIGURES REVEAL

NEW YORK.—Wisconsin's leading position in the dairy industry is vividly depicted in a new handbook issued by the Milk Industry Foundation. According to the book, Milk Facts, 2,223,000 cows valued at $157,833,000 produced $134,991,000 in cash farm milk income for Wisconsin farmers in 1939. Production of farm milk in the State for the year totaled 5,569,000,000 quarts; creamery butter, 173,227,000 pounds; cheddar cheese, 284,035,000 pounds; ice cream, 7,588,000 gallons.

The United States is one of the ranking milk-using nations in the world with per capita consumption of fluid milk totaling 153 quarts a year, pictographs show. Milk and its products comprise over 25 percent of the 1,500 pounds of the principal foods consumed each year by the average American, the book says, with 45,000,000 quarts of milk delivered daily to homes and stores.

Pictorial charts and figures show the importance of the milk industry to the country's economic picture, and illustrate how milk costs less in the United States in minutes of labor. Diagrammatic charts illustrate how the annual milk supply of some 51,000,000,000 quarts is utilized.

Fluid or fresh milk for cities and villages providing the farmer's highest cash return, accounts for 29.9 percent of the country's yearly production. Creamery butter takes 31.6 percent, farm butter 9.2 percent, while 11.7 percent of the milk is used as fluid milk on farms where produced. In making cheese, 6.3 percent of the total milk is used; ice cream, 3.1 percent, and canned milks, 4.5 percent, according to charts.

A chart of the distributor's milk dollar shows 52.31 percent going to dairy farmers for milk, 19.24 percent to delivery labor, 8.21 percent to delivery expense, 6.33 plant expense, 4.94 plant labor, 2.78 administrative labor, 2.18 administrative expense, 1.68 office labor, and profit 2.33 percent, representing only a fraction of a cent per quart of milk.

"The production and utilization of milk have so increased in this country," says the booklet, "that today we are the greatest of dairy nations. Milk, butter, and other dairy products annually create an output valued at 3½ billion dollars.

"Facts about the cows and the farmers that furnish the milk, the distributors whose efficiency has made wide usage possible and the consumption of this most nearly perfect food should lead to a clearer understanding of milk economics.

"One out of every 15 families in the United States is dependent on milk for a livelihood. Milk is the largest single source of farm cash income, larger than cattle, twice cotton, three times wheat, five times tobacco. There are 25,000,000 cows on three-quarters of the Nation's 7,000,000 farms.

"Americans enjoy the best milk in the world and economical distribution, meticulous sanitation, pasteurization and other safeguards have made our milk supply a world standard."

Extracts From Letters Concerning the Proposed St. Lawrence Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED F. BEITER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1941

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following quotations from a few letters which I have received lately concerning the St. Lawrence seaway. These show in a few words widespread opposition to that project.

Ralph L. Carr, Governor, State of Colorado, February 3, 1941:

I learned more about it than I had known heretofore when I visited Washington recently and became convinced at that time that it was not for the best interests of the people of this section of the country at least.

Ben F. Stapleton, mayor, Denver, Colo., February 25, 1941:

I cannot see any reason why anybody west of Buffalo should be in favor of such a project.

L. C. Heare, mayor, Port Arthur, Tex., March 6, 1941:

Our chamber of commerce has gone on record as being opposed to this project.

George W. Morgan, mayor, city of Beaumont, Tex., February 24, 1941:

A resolution passed by the city commission on December 31, 1940, opposing the St. Lawrence Seaway says:

"There is no need for the St. Lawrence Waterway by the citizens of the United States in reaching the open sea, incident to the exportation, importation or other handling of foreign and domestic commerce by water, existing port facilities being adequate to care for the needs thereof."

F. G. Robinson, traffic manager, Galveston Chamber of Commerce, May 21, 1940:

I might state that both the Texas and Southwestern Industrial Traffic League, of which we are members, have all along vigorously opposed the St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty, and I know that that position will be adhered to in the event the matter again comes before Congress.

R. A. Hefner, mayor, city of Oklahoma City, Okla., February 26, 1941:

I can see no reason why we should spend that large amount of money for this purpose. It cannot be regarded as a war measure or defense project; besides, I don't believe in loading the people with taxes. We are bending now until our backs are breaking with the burden of taxation.

Joseph M. Boos, city clerk, Battle Creek, Mich., February 20, 1941:

Resolution adopted by city commission on February 10, 1941:

"Whereas the effect of this project, if consummated, will, in our opinion, be detrimental to the welfare of the Nation, to its industries, and the transportation agencies which now serve such industries; and

"Whereas the seaway route if constructed will be tolls free, thus benefiting no one except the navigation companies who do not reflect the savings thus made in the price of commodities transported, to the consumer: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we seriously object to the taxpayers of this community being saddled with this additional tax burden at a time when they are being called upon to carry such a load of taxes for our preparedness program."

Daniel J. Hackett, mayor, city of Jackson, Mich., February 25, 1941:

Both the city commission of Jackson, and the Greater Jackson Association have passed resolutions against the project.

It is my understanding that a deeper St. Lawrence would harm that territory immeasurably.

J. G. Payne, mayor, Oil City, Pa., February 19, 1941:

I am very much opposed to this project as being unwarranted and economically unsound. It offers no benefits to anyone commensurate with the money to be expended—most of which will be advanced by the American people. With the Nation confronted with the present emergency, this is particularly no time to go into the construction of this project which, at the best, will take 6 or 7 years to complete and will utilize resources that might better be used in the defense program.

J. Paul Pedigo, secretary to the Governor, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, February 18, 1941:

Great harm would result in construction of the St. Lawrence waterway which proposes to connect the Great Lakes with the Atlantic Ocean at a Canadian seaport. We approve the action of our representatives in the Congress in opposing this project.

Rhode Island State Industrial Union Council, March 7, 1941:

It has been pointed out that, should the enabling legislation pass, the result would be a dumping of cheap foreign coal into the Canadian and American markets, mined by ill-paid foreign workers and carried by foreign vessels.

United Mine Workers of America:

Local No. 2246, Marstellar, Pa.: "Our local, composed of about 600 members, have gone on record as opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project."

Local No. 6240, Morrisdale, Pa.: "Five hundred members of the United Mine Workers of America, local union No. 6240, Morrisdale, Pa., are against any potential legislation drafted for the purpose of subsidizing the St. Lawrence waterway project."

Local No. 160, Shamokin, Pa. (membership 800 to 1,000): "Resolved, whereas we, the entire membership of Commeron Local No. 160, U. M. W. A., do hereby protest against any and all legislation that would enable the passing of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project or any other bill leading to same."

District 7, U. M. W. A., Hazelton, Pa.: "May I inform you that the tridistricts executive members, comprising districts Nos. 1, 7, and 9, representing 100,000 miners, at their last meeting of February 21, 1941, have adopted resolutions in regards to this project.

"No doubt this project, if passed by Congress, will be detrimental to the entire anthracite industry."

Local No. 6165, Alpoca, W. Va.: "With a membership of 240 members, this local voted 100 percent against the passage of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project."

Local No. 1840, Bellaire, Ohio: "Our local of 600 men go on record as opposing the St. Lawrence seaway and power project."

Local No. 35, Harco, Ill.: "The members of local union No. 35, U. M. W. A., representing 500 miners of Harrisburg, Ill., goes on record condemning the St. Lawrence seaway project."

The Truth About Canada and the St. Lawrence Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1941

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

A great deal has been said by proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway, claiming all kinds of advantages to this country and Canada should the seaway become an actuality.

Time and again the glittering but empty promises made in an effort to enlist support for the undertaking from within the United States have been shown to be the fruits of wishful thinking or stock propaganda.

This has happened so often and over such a protracted period of time that most of us have had countless opportunities to realize this project is extravagant, useless, and even deleterious to the welfare of our Nation. We recognize the national defense claims made for this project, which could not be completed within 6 or 7 years, to be utter nonsense.

However, we have had little authentic data relative to the Canadian position. Many rumors are in circulation which indicate this country is taking undue advantage of the grim plight of the British Empire to barter aid to England for the St. Lawrence seaway. The State Department has termed these rumors fantastic and they certainly are when applied to the Nation.

The good common sense of the American people, I am thoroughly convinced, causes them to oppose the St. Lawrence scheme but even if they were completely sold on the undertaking, the traditional good sportsmanship of the American people would restrain them from taking advantage of such a friendly nation when in trouble.

Yet the very fact the State Department deemed it necessary to answer such rumors shows the huge proportions they have assumed. It seems incredible that our Government would do anything to infer that

aid to England and Canada would be affected in any way or in any degree by the outcome of Canadian-American St. Lawrence seaway negotiations.

Nevertheless there is justification for Canadian officials to assume that such is the case in view of the past unreasonable attempts to bludgeon approval of the seaway project.

In order to disclose these previous attempts, it is necessary to give some of the Canadian background. As far back as 1923, the possibility of diverting water from the James Bay watershed into the Great Lakes was studied by the Province of Ontario through the Ontario Hydro Electric Commission. Surveys were made and plans prepared for the diversion of 4,000 cubic feet of water per second from the headwaters of the Ogoki River to Lake Superior. The entire project was estimated to cost an amount not to exceed $3,000,000.

In 1924, surveys were also initiated by the Hydroelectric Power Commission which ultimately led to a project designed to divert 1,200 cubic feet of water per second from the Kenogami River into Lake Superior. This required a dam to be built on the Kenogami River some miles below Long Lac, and a channel excavated from the southerly end of the lake across the divide to the headwaters of the Aquasabon River which flows to Lake Superior.

The Ontario Hydroelectric Commission proceeded with the Kenogami development but restricted the diversion to minimum amounts required for the transportation of pulpwood—and only during the driving season—because our Government would not consent to a revision of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909. Without the treaty revision, Ontario could not use waters at Niagara diverted into Lake Superior at her own expense from rivers normally flowing to Hudson Bay.

The Province of Ontario had a "Back to Niagara Policy" for power development. The first step in this program was the full Long Lac diversion into the Great Lakes and its use at Niagara Falls. Later it was hoped to proceed with the Ogoki diversion with similar use—either at Niagara or the Welland Canal, De Cew Falls development.

The United States would have benefited tremendously and at no expense by the construction of these projects. The increased flow into the Great Lakes would have materially benefited navigation and assisted in elimination of river pollution which today is taking a terrific toll in fish life.

But no; our Government wouldn't permit the full Canadian use of these projects to be constructed wholly at Canadian expense unless that country agreed against her will to sanction the St. Lawrence seaway project. That's a serious statement but the following quotation taken from official correspondence will prove the charge beyond any peradventure of a doubt.

OGOKI DIVERSION

Letter from O. D. Skelton, under secretary of state of external affairs, to T. S. Lyon, chairman, Hydroelectric Power Commission of Ontario, February 15, 1936:

"A separate treaty for this purpose (the Ogoki diversion) would be difficult to negotiate with the United States for the double reason that the administration would not wish to sidetrack the St. Lawrence Treaty, and that it would not in the present short pre-election session undertake any new negotiations."

Letter from the Prime Minister of Canada, Right Honorable W. L. MacKenzie King, to the Premier of Ontario, Hon. Mitchel F. Hepburn, January 8, 1937:

"It is further quite clear that they are much more interested in the St. Lawrence than in the Niagara treaty. * * * It is quite clear that it will not be possible to make any agreement with the United States with regard to Niagara without asking an agreement on the St. Lawrence as well."

KENOGAMI DIVERSION

Letter from the Prime Minister of Canada, Right Honorable W. L. MacKenzie King, to the Provincial Secretary of Ontario, H. C. Nixon, September 7, 1937:

"The United States Administration would be unwilling to sidetrack the St. Lawrence Treaty for such an object (diversion at Niagara equivalent to Kenogamy)."

PREMIER OF ONTARIO OPPOSED TO SEAWAY—NO POWER NEEDED

The Honorable M. F. Hepburn wrote to the Right Honorable W. L. MacKenzie King, in reply to inquiries as to his views pertaining to the St. Lawrence seaway, November 25, 1937:

"Yesterday I consulted with my cabinet colleagues on the question of Ontario's position in respect to the proposed St. Lawrence waterways scheme, as a result of which I can only reaffirm the position taken by me during the time of the discussion we had on the occasion of your visit to this office.

"Having finally arrived at a tentative arrangement with respect to a settlement of our power problems with Quebec companies, I am advised by the hydro commissioners and technicians that Ontario's power requirements have been taken care of for many, many years to come.

"We are, therefore, not in need of power; nor, in my opinion, having in mind our acute railway problem, any additional avenue of transportation.

"In my judgment, the purchasing power of European and Asiatic countries will collapse with the continued dissipation of gold reserves for armament purposes and this continent will, as a consequence, witness an era of depression comparable to the one through which we have just passed.

"I should be very happy to have members of the hydro commission and technical officers confer with your officials at any time you so desire."

PREMIER OF ONTARIO WANTS THE NIAGARA PROBLEM SEPARATED FROM THE ST. LAWRENCE

The following is a quotation from a letter by the Honorable M. F. Hepburn to the Prime Minister of Canada, the Right Honorable W. L. MacKenzie King, February 14, 1938:

"By reason of the settlement effected with the Quebec power companies, our engineers advise that our power requirements have been taken care of for many years.

"I am hoping that you will reconsider the position of your Government and endeavor, on behalf of the Province of Ontario, to separate the general scheme of the St. Lawrence waterways from the problem of diverting the waters above Niagara."

THE PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA HAS TRIED TO SEPARATE THE NIAGARA PROBLEM FROM THE ST. LAWRENCE, BUT THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT WILL NOT CONSENT

The following is a quotation from the Prime Minister of Canada to the Premier of Ontario, February 22, 1938:

"In conclusion, you express the hope that the Canadian Government will reconsider the position and, on behalf of Ontario, will endeavor in the international negotiations 'to separate the general scheme of the St. Lawrence waterways from the problem of diverting the waters above Niagara.' In this connection I have observed public statements intimating that our Government has been trying to impose a general scheme upon Ontario against her will.

"None of the correspondence or consultations with Ontario representatives affords any foundation for such suggestions. At no time has the Canadian Government declined to ask the United States Government if they could deal particularly with this problem of retaining for Canada the benefits of waters that might be diverted into the Great Lakes; nor has there been any effort to impose anything upon Ontario. What has been done has been to bring to the attention of the Ontario authorities the position of the United States Government from time to time as it has become known to us; and, in view of the practical importance of all these matters to Ontario, we have invited discussions with your representatives. This we were naturally bound to do in order to find out what it might be practicable to say in reply. In so doing the Canadian Government was merely making known the position taken by the United States, whose cooperation was necessary to the settlement of any international water development. At no time has the Government of Canada itself taken the position that the St. Lawrence waterway, Niagara, and other boundary waters questions must be settled as a whole, or that it was not prepared to deal with the projects for diversions into the Great Lakes separately from the St. Lawrence project."

It is quite evident from the above correspondence that our Government is using the Ogoki and Kenogami projects, which the Province of Ontario finds so necessary for the development of vast areas of their north country, and will eventually desire for power purposes at Niagara Falls, as a bludgeon to force that country to accept the St. Lawrence seaway.

Is it any wonder, then, that rumors to the effect Canadian acquiescence will have a direct bearing upon our aid to England?

The Congress of the United States should decisively reject any proposal to consider any agreement or treaty pertaining to the St. Lawrence. Even the most ardent advocate of the project should resent being asked to take such an advantage of our friend and neighbor during her terrible hour of need.

The Canadian tax and loan load for next year only will put a burden of $225 on every man, woman, and child in that country. This terrific tax load is more than half the Canadian national income. When the Minister of Finance, Mr. Ilsley, made that statement to the House of Commons the latter part of February this year, he stated that even that amount may not be enough.

Should our Government force Canada to add more hundreds of millions of dollars to their staggering debt loads to satisfy a whim for a project which even advocates admit is highly controversial? Of course, not. It is time Mr. Berle and Mr. Olds, of our Government, stop heckling the Canadian Government about the seaway. But if they do not—if the project comes before the Seventy-seventh Congress, it should be shouted down with a vehement "No."

Hitler's Phony Money Versus Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I place in the RECORD an editorial

from the Chicago Tribune on putting our gold to work. It follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune of March 9, 1941]

AN UNCONQUERABLE ARMY

In the serious magazines—those sometimes described as the ones which are read on trains by girls who want to be alone—a number of articles have appeared from time to time in recent years discussing German monetary practice under Hitler. The early articles asserted that Hitler would not long be able to carry on his financial operations without a collapse, and told why. The later pieces assert that Hitler has been able to create a new money system, which will work in peace and war, and tell why.

The writers who have recently been telling why the German financial explosion has not come off, as forecast, appear to us to have given every reason for it, except one—the right one. Hitler's money hasn't caused him any grief, despite a shortage of gold, the world's standard of value, because the United States has acquired nearly all of the world's gold and buried it in Kentucky, where it isn't of use to anyone. Hitler money gets by because all other countries, and especially this country, have adopted his methods.

Hitler's money is phony. It is money only on his say-so. It is printing-press stuff. It isn't exchangeable for gold or for anything. It is just paper. Hitler's money isn't essentially different, except in quantity, from that of the wild inflationary period in Germany in the early twenties.

But American money is also fiat money now. It was really money in 1923. On the face of a $10 bill it is stated explicitly that the United States will pay $10 to the bearer upon demand. The bill isn't money. It is just a promise to pay money, and as good as the promise. But when you present a bill to the Government or to its agent, the Federal Reserve bank, you are told that you may have only other promises to pay money. You can't get any hard standard money for it.

It is true you may have silver dollars. But the silver dollar is real money only up to 26 cents, the other 74 cents representing what is attributed to the coin because of the Government's imprint. Real money, in gold, the kind we always had before 1933, has intrinsic worth here and anywhere. It doesn't vary with time or place. The value of our old gold dollar was in the gold itself, not in the printing. It didn't depend upon the will of any man, any political party, or the outcome of any war. The imprint of the Government merely was a certification as to weight and purity.

Hitler has averted his financial doom, not only because of his own efforts but because of those of our national administration. By imitating the Hitler fiat-money plan we give the phony German mark a standing in Germany and in neighboring countries. He has the same kind of money rich America uses.

Re-create the full gold standard with currency freely convertible into gold and see where Hitler will be. We have $24,000,000,000 worth of gold—three times as much as would be necessary to redeem every paper dollar that could be presented. Let the world know that American money cannot be inflated because there is full value in gold back of every dollar of it, which anyone may obtain freely.

Gold and steel make an irresistible combination. We have 24,000,000,000 gold men to array in battle against any contender, and we have the requisite amount of steel to defend this mighty army. If the Roosevelt administration really wants to do Hitler some dirt, let them call into the Nation's service the army of 24,000,000,000 confined to barracks at Fort Knox.

Strikes

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts from newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Government has completed a powder plant in Virginia, but production there is delayed because the Government cannot get the machinery necessary to start full production out of the Allis-Chalmers plant in Milwaukee. That strike began on the 22d day of January last, and ever since material needed by the Navy and the machinery needed in the Government's power production plant has been held up. The point at issue is the demand of the C. I. O. that no one, other than members of its organization, be permitted to work. Thus it will be seen that the C. I. O., at the Allis-Chalmers plant, has been holding up our national-defense program.

It is reported that a majority of the workers desire to return to work, but have been prevented from doing so by manipulation of elections which have been held at the plant to determine the question of whether the employees should accept the company's proposals, whether the strikes should be called off. A few days ago, I put into the RECORD a form of the ballot which it was said had been used in one of these elections.

A copy of the ballot which was used on January 21, 1941, reads as follows:

Shall the bargaining committee's recommendation to reject the company's current proposals and to authorize the bargaining committee to call a strike be accepted?

Proceedings have been instituted by the company and the Wisconsin authorities to determine whether the employees are guilty of unfair labor practices. Angelo Christopher, one of five C. I. O. men who had charge of the balloting, was asked by the company's attorney, Leo Mann, whether he understood the ballot quoted above. He replied that he did. He then was asked:

Question. If you had wanted to vote in favor of accepting the company's current proposals, would you have voted "yes" or "no"?

Answer (after a long pause). I don't know. That question runs together. You can't separate it.

Question. What were the company's current proposals?

Answer. I don't know that.

If a member of the election board having charge of the election, and evidently a C. I. O. official, would not know how to vote on this question, how can it be expected that the employees could vote intelligently?

Another point showing the need of a fair election among the employees as to whether the men should return to work is found in the discrepancy between the number of ballots cast and the number of employees voting. A record was kept of the number of employees voting at the election, and it was found that but 4,547 persons voted. Nevertheless, a count of the ballots showed that 6,759 votes were cast. Is it not amazing that the ballot boxes, when opened, showed that there were 2,212 more votes cast than there were persons voting? Someone must have had two or more ballots and voted more than once. Such ambiguity in a ballot; such fraud in the election will explain in part why it is that this particular strike continues. All too often strikes are declared and carried on contrary to the wishes of many of the employees for the gratification or for the enrichment of those who do not have the true interests of the workers at heart.

To remedy this evil, yesterday I introduced a bill.

This bill provided that when there was a strike which interfered with or delayed the use, production, fabrication, or transportation of any material as defined in the Lend-Lease Act, the Department of Justice should call an election of the employees at the struck plant. It further provided that unless 50 percent of the employees of the plant voted in favor of continuing the strike, the board should certify the result to the nearest Army officer in charge of the territory in which the plant was located. That, thereupon, such Army officer should use whatever means were necessary to prevent interference with any employee returning to work or continuing at the task assigned to him. No doubt this bill will be characterized as "antilabor"; nevertheless, its only effect is to enable employees who want to work to proceed at their tasks having to do with national defense without interference from anyone. No loyal worker, it would seem to me, can honestly object to such a procedure. If he claims for himself the right to work for his Government, he should be willing that a like privilege should be enjoyed by other employees. This bill is submitted for your earnest consideration.

The opposition of union officials to this bill is illogical. They contend for majority rule, for a closed shop. They certainly should have no objection to permitting their members, when a majority expresses that wish, to return to their jobs.

Yet, when the International Harvester Co. proposed an election among its employees at its strike-bound plant at Richmond, Ind., its plea was rejected by the C. I. O. leaders. A petition was presented to the company, signed by nearly 700 of the 1,174 union members and union eligibles, asking for such an election. Yet the leadership of the C. I. O. turned it down.

Unless we are willing to permit minorities to obstruct preparations for national defense, some action must be taken. It is no answer to say that the delays are not serious.

This morning's issue of the United States News contains a summary showing how strikes hamper defense industries. It is as follows:

[From the United States News of March 21, 1941]

HOW STRIKES HAMPER DEFENSE INDUSTRIES—PRODUCTION OF PLANES, TANKS, MUNITIONS, SHIPS SLOWED BY STOPPAGES—ADMINISTRATION BEGINS ACTION TO AVERT NEW WALKOUTS AS THREAT OF TROUBLE SPREADS

Strikes are hampering defense production in 20 States. Plants manufacturing arms, ammunition, and equipment for the fighting forces are being closed, sometimes for a few hours, sometimes for weeks. Production for Britain has been affected.

Manpower lost to the defense program in 5 weeks would have been sufficient to produce 397 light pursuit planes, or 95 light bombers, or 10 flying fortresses or 4 destroyers.

Labor Secretary Frances Perkins has reported that more strikes occurred in January than in December. More time was lost in February than in January. The March strike record is going to be even higher on the basis of early returns.

The pinch is being felt by both Army and Navy. Few producers are ever one jump ahead of the Government's demands. Every delay is fatal to the timing of military plans. This is true not only of aircraft, but of the production of such essential items as gunpowder, tanks, cantonments, even shirts. Equally important are delays in the basic industries, in coal mining, in steel, in oil, in lumber, in rubber.

Here are some delays that have held up production of vitally important equipment:

Gunpowder: Approximately 7,800 men, C. I. O. members, have been on strike at the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee, since January 22. Time lost: 2,174,000 man-hours. Work on three turbo-generators has been held up. Without these generators the Hercules Powder Co. cannot bring the new Radford (Va.) powder plant into full production. The Radford arsenal was expected to double the Army's supply of gunpowder. The Combustion Engineering Co. manufactures all nitric-acid equipment for all ordnance works now under construction except the Radford Arsenal. A C. I. O. union shut this company's plant for 2 weeks. Time lost, 28,000 man-hours.

Aircraft: The C. I. O. strike against the Vultee Aircraft Co., San Diego, was a direct delay to aircraft production. This strike lasted from November 15 until November 26, 1940. Time lost: 410,400 man-hours. An A. F. of L. strike against the Motor Wheel Corporation, Lansing, Mich., lasted 13 days. This company makes landing-wheel drums for the Curtiss P–40. Other strikes have hampered the production of many airplane parts. These include acetone, batteries, airplane cloth, carburetors, rheostats, screws, and bolts. An A. F. of L. strike at Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio, is delaying construction of the Air Corps' testing center, an important part of the air expansion program.

Tanks: American Car & Foundry Co. at Berwick, Pa., is the only current source of light tanks for the Army. Some 2,800 C. I. O. members kept this plant shut from February 12 to February 18. Construction of a new tank arsenal at Detroit has been delayed because of a dispute among A. F. of L. unions.

Trucks and tractors: The new army on wheels has had difficulty in obtaining its most important means of locomotion — trucks. C. I. O. strikers have kept shut 4 plants of the International Harvester Co. producing trucks and trailers for the Army. The Motor Wheel strike delayed work on wheel drums for the Yellow Cab Co., which has an $83,000,000 order for Army trucks. The Motor Wheel Corporation also is producing similar equipment for British antiaircraft batteries. A C. I. O. strike at the Fisher Body plant at Oakland, Calif., delayed work on cars being assembled for the Army. At Detroit, 1,700 C. I. O. members struck against the Midland Steel Products Co., delaying the work on Army truck frames for three companies.

Ships: The Allis-Chalmers strike is estimated to have delayed the Navy's destroyer program 3 months. Allis-Chalmers manufactures pumps and turbines, the latter also essential to the submarine program. Conversion of merchant ships into naval vessels was halted by another C. I. O. strike at Mobile, Ala., site of the Alabama Drydock & Shipbuilding Corporation. A. F. of L. patternmakers are now on strike against several west coast shipyards.

Artillery: Two strikes, involving both C. I. O. and A. F. of L. unions, closed the Pullman Standard Car Co. plant at Michigan City, Ind. This plant makes gun carriages and trench mortars for Britain as well as the United States Army. Time lost: 144,000 man-hours. Other strikes affected manufacture of shells, gun mounts, and howitzers.

Scores of other items of equipment essential to the Army and Navy have been delayed in production because of strikes, most of which involved C. I. O. unions. These include ammunition, bombs, fuzes, small arms (four strikes), boxes and chests, blankets, hammers, khaki cloth, mattresses, socks, shirts, ranges, towels, trousers, underwear, copper wire, batteries, wire and cable, generators, insulator equipment, radio equipment, and lumber.

Basic to all munitions manufacturing is the steel industry, which has been in turmoil for the past 2 months. Organizational drives by the C. I. O. Steel Workers' Organizing Committee are in progress. Bethlehem's Lackawanna, N. Y., plant, furnishing basic steel to both Army and Navy, was shut for 19 hours. Dues-collection picket lines, stoppages of single departments in mills, and other nuisance strikes have occurred in big and little steel mills in Pennsylvania, Indiana, Ohio, and New York. Today new strikes face Bethlehem. A Crucible Steel Co. plant at Pittsburgh is down.

The picture in other basic industries is threatening. The C. I. O. coal miners' union is now demanding a $1-a-day wage increase. The important Edgewater, N. J., plant of the Aluminum Co. of America has been closed by the C. I. O., as has the smaller Fairmount Aluminum Co. plant in West Virginia.

In the oil industry, a C. I. O. union has threatened to strike against the Shell Oil Corporation's refinery at Houston, Tex. This refinery produces about half the Army's supply of aviation gasoline.

The Vanadium Corporation of America furnishes alloys essential to the production of special steels. About 15 percent of the armament program is dependent on these alloys. The C. I. O. closed the company's Niagara Falls, N. Y., plant for 8 days, and its Bridgeville, Pa., plant is still closed in a month-old dispute. The Bridgeville strike has been branded a violation of the union's contract by C. I. O. officials, but still local leaders refuse to send the strikers back to work.

Strikes resulted in loss of 1,461,000 man-days in defense industries last year, an average of 121,750 man-days a month. Under Secretary of War Patterson reported that 120,000 man-days were lost during 1 week in February. The Labor Department has not yet completed its tabulation of time lost through strikes for February. Other sources place the total time lost in defense industries alone at 468,000 man-days or 3,744,000 man-hours. This loss is 75 percent higher than the total time lost through strikes in all industries last February. Time lost during the first week of March amounted to 128,900 man-days, an increase of almost 9,000 man-days over the previous week.

This was the situation in which Labor Secretary Frances Perkins; William S. Knudsen, Director General of the Office of Production Management; and Sidney Hillman, Office of Production Management's Associate Director General, took to the White House their proposals for a new national-defense mediation board. This was the situation on Friday when the President called to the White House 16 labor-union officials who comprise Mr. Hillman's Labor Policy Advisory Committee.

The men who administer labor policy in Washington have all had a hand in shaping the new program. Edward F. McGrady, special assistant to Secretary of War Stimson and vice president in charge of labor relations for the Radio Corporation of America, is a long-time exponent of Government mediation. Isador Lubin, Commissioner of Labor Statistics; John R. Steelman, Director of the United States Conciliation Service; William M. Leiserson, of the National Labor Relations Board, and Dr. Harry A. Millis, new N. L. R. B. chairman, have been consulted.

These men do not agree on the specifications for the new Mediation Board. Generally, they are in agreement with Mr. Hillman and Miss Perkins that the time has arrived when some agency should be set up to serve as a court of final appeal in disputes between management and unions. Leaders of the A. F. L. have expressed their agreement with the proposal. On the other hand C. I. O. leaders are strenuously opposed.

The men who make labor policy already are working in their own agencies to stem the strike tide. The Conciliation Service is asking Congress to increase its staff of 107 conciliators to permit speedier handling of defense cases. Dr. Millis has announced the Labor Board's new policy of giving priority to all cases involving defense industries in order to make it easier for unions to resort to the Board in certain types of disputes.

The thinking of all these men is summed up by Miss Perkins. "Labor," she asserts, "has status today as never before, and that status carries with it responsibility which calls for cooperation by labor with employers and with all responsible groups to avoid delays and interruptions in defense production."

The Mahoning Valley is the Ruhr of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1941

STATEMENTS OF MAYOR ROBERT H. ROBERTS, OF WARREN, OHIO, AND OTHERS

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include the following statements of the mayors of several cities in my district:

MARCH 18, 1941.

To the Members of the Seventy-seventh Congress:

The Mahoning Valley, extending from Newton Falls, Ohio, east to the Pennsylvania State line, a distance of approximately 30 miles, is frequently referred to as "the Ruhr" of America. It has a population of approximately 400,000 people. Its industry is in the main the production of iron and steel. In this industry there is invested more than a billion dollars. Its annual capacity exceeds 8,000,000 tons of pig iron, 10,000,000 tons of steel ingots and castings, and 13,000,000 tons of rolled products. In 1929 the value of its products exceeded $440,000,000, and in 1941 will, it is estimated, exceed $500,000,000. Until recently the Mahoning Valley was second only to Pittsburgh in the production of iron and steel. It has since been displaced by the Chicago district. Such plants as those of the Republic Steel Corporation, located in Newton Falls, Warren, Niles, and Youngstown; the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., located in Hubbard and Youngstown; the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation, located in McDonald and Youngstown; the Sharon Steel Co., located in Niles, Youngstown, and Lowellville; the Thomas Steel Co. and the Brainard Steel Co., of Warren; the Mahoning Valley Steel Co. at Niles, are all now engaged to a large extent either directly or indirectly in assisting to meet the present defense needs of the country. The Copperweld Steel Co., of Warren, Ohio, a manufacturer of steel alloys, is now engaged 100 percent in defense activities. The Packard Electric Division of General Motors Corporation, which manufactures about 50 percent of all of the electric cable sets for automotive equipment and airplanes that are manufactured in the country, is largely engaged in defense work. Attached hereto and marked "Exhibit A" is a statement of the industries in and about Warren, prepared by the Honorable Robert H. Roberts, mayor of the city of Warren, which shows in some detail the industry centered in this one portion of the Mahoning Valley.

Large amounts of river water are required by these industries. Ground water in sufficient quantities is not available. The only source of water supply is the Mahoning River, which in periods of dry weather and low flow has upon occasions yielded as little as 20,000,000 gallons a day. While the latter is exceptional, the average low-flow yield is but 50,000,000 gallons per day. Yet the demands for industry alone are approximately 800,000,000 gallons a day. Thus the Mahoning River at its average low flow and within the short distance from Warren, Ohio, to the Pennsylvania State line is at the time of low flow used 16 times. The Ohio Public Service Co. requires 120,000,000 gallons of water a day in the generation of electric energy in its power plant at Warren. At times of low flow it recirculates all the water in the river, using it more than twice. The Republic Steel Corporation in its Warren plant alone requires sixty to seventy million gallons of water a day. As a result of this continuous reuse of the water, the summer temperatures of the river at Youngstown, prior to use by all the industries there located, frequently reaches a temperature of 120° F. The dire need of this "Ruhr" of America for additional water is thus apparent.

The cities of Niles and Youngstown organized, in 1928, the Mahoning Valley Sanitary District, which now supplies their needs for domestic water from a reservoir on Meander Creek. The city of Girard and the village of Newton Falls procure their domestic supply from deep wells. How long these wells will last in face of the receding water table in Ohio is problematical. The city of Warren, with a domestic requirement of from four to five million gallons of water a day, obtains the same from the Mahoning River. The cost of cleaning, cooling, softening, and purifying the water is such that in view of the constant increasing demand for water it is imperative that it seek a supplemental or entirely new source of supply. Experimentation with underground water has so far been unsuccessful. Low flow periods coupled with intense industrial activity and the dumping of untreated or partially treated industrial wastes into the river impart an acid characteristic to the stream, damaging water intakes, pumps, and other equipment. During such periods total hardness in excess of 300 parts per million is encountered. On two occasions, once in 1929 and again in 1930, the hardness approached 400 parts per million at Youngstown.

None of the cities in Ohio bordering upon the Mahoning River has sewage-disposal plants of any kind. In the short distance of 20 miles from Warren to Youngstown there is discharged into the Mahoning River about 40,000,000 gallons of untreated domestic sewage a day. If it were not for the simultaneous discharge of industrial acid wastes the river would be a highly offensive stream due to the natural decomposition of sewage matter. In fact, in August of 1930, when there was but little industrial activity, the river at Youngstown was black in color, boiling and bubbling with putrefaction, and giving off offensive sewage odors. Sewage-disposal plants must soon be built, and it has been estimated that such plants will initially cost the Mahoning Valley approximately $6,000,000, not including the cost of intercepting sewers and collecting appurtenances.

Recently the Federal Government saw fit to locate what is known as the Ravenna Arsenal on the west branch of the Mahoning River. This arsenal is now under construction, with some 7,000 people engaged in the building thereof. It is anticipated that by August of 1941 some ten or twelve thousand people will be employed there and the probabilities are that most of them will take up their residence in Newton Falls and Warren. A defense-housing project is now under way in the city of Warren to house some of these employees, and the city of Warren has agreed to furnish water and sewer facilities for the occupants thereof. All waste matters and sewage from the arsenal and its employees will be dumped into the Mahoning River about 9 miles above Warren, and despite the fact that disposal plants are being installed at the arsenal the Mahoning River will be further polluted.

What is needed is additional reservoirs on the headwaters and tributaries of the Mahoning River. At the present time only one such reservoir exists, to wit, Lake Milton, having a storage capacity of 9,000,000,000 gallons of water. This was built in 1913 by the city of Youngstown to regulate the flow of the Mahoning River, from which it was then obtaining its domestic as well as industrial water. Prior to the construction of Milton Dam the river flow in dry periods was as low as 5,000,000 gallons a day. Since the construction of Meander Dam and its completion in 1931 or 1932, Milton Dam has been used to regulate the flow of the Mahoning River for industrial purposes. Even with Milton Dam, the flow in the summer months and dry periods is as low as 50,000,000 gallons a day on the average. Another dam site is available above Lake Milton, at what is commonly referred to as Berlin, where a reservoir can be created capable of impounding from 6,000,000,000 to 18,000,000,000 gallons of water, depending upon the height of the dam. Another site is available on the west branch of the Mahoning River, at Charleston, where a reservoir capable of impounding 8,000,000,000 gallons of water can be built. A third site is available on Mosquito Creek, a tributary of the Mahoning River, the reservoir capacity of which is 36,000,000,000 gallons of water. A fourth site is on Eagle Creek, the capacity of which is 6,000,000,000 gallons of water.

If these reservoirs were built and used for the purpose of regulating the flow of the Mahoning River, the average low flow could be increased from 50,000,000 gallons a day to 300,000,000 gallons a day, just one-third of the average daily amount required to supply the needs of the many industries located in the 30-mile stretch from Newton Falls to the Pennsylvania State line. A low flow of 300,000,000 gallons a day would so dilute the sewage now discharged into the river as to make it unnecessary to build complete sewage-disposal plants. Partial-treatment plants would suffice and they can be built and subsequently operated at one-half the cost of complete-treatment plants. Such reservoirs would also so retard floodwaters and could be so operated as to guarantee to the Mahoning Valley freedom from flood.

Mahoning Valley has its fingers crossed. Its fear is not enough or too much water. If the one and only reservoir—Milton Dam—should be sabotaged, or if the summer of 1941 should be unusually dry, or if an unusual rainy season, with its attendant floods, should intervene, it could not make the contribution it is now making, or the contribution it is expected to make, to national defense. The Mahoning Valley is one of the chief sources of supply for all items of national defense. Without steel, there can be no airplanes, motors, guns, battleships, tanks, or shells. Steel cannot be made without water or in a flooded area. The crippling of the Mahoning Valley means the severing of one of the main life lines of national defense. It is no answer to say that reservoirs cannot be built overnight; neither can battleships, airplanes, or any other item of national defense; and who is the prophet who can foretell the duration of the present emergency? Moreover, the present emergency is not the last one that will ever confront us. How soon another will follow the one now existing, we do not know. Reservoirs on the headwaters of the Mahoning River are lasting and permanent improvements which will guarantee to our Government the full productive capacity of the Mahoning Valley at all times to come. To build them is to guarantee that the foundation upon which present and future national-defense programs rest will support the superstructure. It is safe to say that the success of any defense program is dependent at least to the extent of 40 percent upon the productive capacity of the Mahoning Valley. The expense is not great. According to engineers who have hereto studied the problem, no one of the 4 reservoirs suggested will cost more than $4,000,000. All 4 can be built for $12,000,000—a small price to pay to meet existing emergencies and to insure a firm foundation upon which to rest in meeting future problems.

Mahoning Valley, on behalf of the Nation, respectfully implores your earnest consideration and assistance.

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT H. ROBERTS,
Mayor of Warren.
WILLIAM P. KEARNEY,
Mayor of Niles.
ELMO W. BAILEY,
Mayor of Newton Falls.
HARRY L. DITTMER,
Engineer of Trumbull County.
DON DAWSON,
Secretary of the Warren Chamber of Commerce.
KARL B. DODGE,
Secretary, Trumbull County Manufacturers Association.
H. H. HOPPE,
Chairman, Water Defense Committee.

EXHIBIT A

MARCH 11, 1941.

Hon. FRITZ G. LANHAM,
Chairman of the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: The Warren district, located entirely within Trumbull County, contains approximately 60 industrial plants; of these, 45 are located in Warren, Ohio.

The 60 industrial plants are now employing in excess of 28,000 employees, the 45 industries in Warren are employing in excess of 20,000.

The major industries, together with their products, are as follows:

Aetna Standard Engineering Co.: This company manufactures tin-mill machinery and at the present time are manufacturing gun carriages for the United States Army.

Air Reduction Sales Co.: Manufacturers of acetylene and other gases vital to welding. Oxyacetylene and electric cutting and welding equipment.

American Welding & Manufacturing Co.: Steel products fabricated by electric butt, spot, arc, or gas welding. This company is now in a period of a $100,000 expansion due to national-defense orders for Army tank parts.

Associated Box Co.: Manufacturers of wood boxes, crates, and platforms. The major portion of this company's products are used by steel manufacturers, and so are instrumental in the defense program.

Beaver Pipe Tools, Inc.: Pipe cutters and threaders, bolt threaders, reamers, vises, etc. This company is making products for the United States Department of the Interior, the United States Army at Fort Banks, Fort Bragg, Fort Leavenworth, Fort Mason, and the United States Navy, as well as a long list of industrial users.

Brainard Rivet Co.: Manufacturers of steel rivets.

Brainard Steel Corporation: Cold rolled, and both cold and hot rolled electro-galvanized strip steel.

Copperweld Steel Co.: Electric furnace and open-hearth alloy-steel billets, bars and rods. Aircraft, stainless and special tool steels. This company, in production for less than 1 year, now employs in excess of 1,500 employees and its entire output is going to the United States Navy and manufacturers of aircraft for the Army and Navy. Within the next year this company, now in third place as a producer of electric furnace alloy steel, will, upon completion of additional furnaces, greatly advance its production capacity.

Denman Tire & Rubber Co.: A full line of pneumatic tires including truck tires, and pressed rubber goods. Manufacturers of bumper rubber for pressed steel companies and rubber covering for industrial steel rolls.

Federal Machine & Welder Co.: Resistance welding machines including spot welders, projection welders, roll-seam welders, butt and flash welders and special welding machines.

At the present time this company is manufacturing shell turning lathes for the turning and boring of projectiles. This firm is almost exclusively working on national defense, having recently received Government orders for airplane factories, navy yards, and munitions plants in excess of $150,000.

Flexible Road Joint Machine Co.: Surfacing and joint installing machinery for concrete highway construction.

General Fire Extinguisher Co.: Automatic sprinkler fire-protection systems; power and industrial piping, and piping supplies, a good share of which is being used in airplane hangars.

Heltzel Steel Form and Iron Co.: Road building and construction equipment. Steel mill and fabricated structural, annealing furnaces, heavy welded steel machinery parts and fabricated steel from ⅛ inch to 18 inches in thickness.

Hilton Steel Co.: Plate-fabricated steel equipment, machine bases, rubber-covered and lined-steel equipment used by steel and chemical industries.

Hull Manufacturing Co.: Magnetic compasses of many types now being used on trucks combat cars, tanks, boats, and aircraft.

Lenney Machine & Manufacturing Co.: Manufacturers of variable speed transmissions.

Mullins Manufacturing Co.: This company is now working on a $6,000,000 order of the United States Government of deep-drawn antiaircraft shells. This company's regular products are vitreous enameled sinks, bath tubs, lavatories, synthetic enameled kitchen equipment, and general stamping contract work, a good share of which is being used in Army cantonments and defense housing.

Oakes Bronze & Aluminum Co.: Manufacturers of castings in electrolytic and casting copper, aluminum and its alloys, brasses and bronzes of any analysis and to specifications; Mallory alloys of hardened copper, cast iron, semisteel, nickel-iron, and nickel-chrome iron; also pattern service in both wood and metal.

Ohio Corrugating Co.: Manufacturers of steel drums, capacity 2 to 60 gallons, both tight and open head; also steel pails, capacity 2 to 10 gallons, both tight and open head; also sanitary containers for foods up to 60 gallons.

Ohio Lamp Works of General Electric Co.: Manufacturers of incandescent lamps, 200 to 1,500 watts, inclusive; also many special types.

Packard Electric Division, General Motors: This company, a division of General Motors Corporation, manufactures 50 percent of all automotive electric cable used by the automotive and aircraft industry. At the present time this company has just completed a large addition to their Warren plant for the express purpose of manufacturing aircraft shielded and unshielded electrical ignition, starting and lighting cable, per Army and Navy specifications, also radio shielded look and antenna cable assemblies. This firm has doubled its employment, due to national defense.

Peerless Electric Co.: Manufacturers of fractional to 10-horsepower motors; also, exhaust fans and blowers. This company has large defense contracts.

Reed Iron & Steel Co.: Manufacturers of steel building supplies.

Republic Steel Corporation: The Warren district of the Republic Steel Corporation manufactures 95,000 tons per month of finished steel and employs in excess of 6,000 employees. Their products are classified as hot- and cold-rolled carbon, silicon, and stainless strip steel; carbon and silicon steel sheets; tin, terne, black, lacquered, and coated terne plate steel. It is hard to estimate the percentage of this company's products that is going into direct defense items, but it is safe to assume that by far the greatest percentage is being so used. At present it is estimated that Republic Steel, of Warren, uses 60,000,000 gallons of water per day.

Schaefer Equipment Co.: Manufacturers of drop-forged railroad equipment.

Seminole Pigment Co.: Manufacturers of pigment for ceramic, industrial paint, and mortar color trade. This product is used for iron, steel, and wood.

Standard Transformer Co.: Manufacturers of distribution and power transformers (oil or pyranol filled), instrument transformers, general-purpose dry-type transformers, auto transformers, street-lighting transformers, testing transformers, and special transformers. This company is now working on Navy contracts.

Sunlight Electric Division, General Motors: Manufacturers of alternating-current fractional-horsepower motors.

Halsey W. Taylor Co.: Manufacturers of water coolers, both ice and electric, drinking fountains, valves, and fittings.

Taylor Winfield Co.: Spot-, butt-, flash-, seam-, and resistance-type electric welding machines. This company's engineering department and laboratory has designed and is now making hydromatic, hydrospeed, and hi-wave machinery for welding aluminum which is being used in the manufacture of airplanes for both Army and Navy.

Thomas Steel Co.: Cold-roll, zinc-coated, copper-coated, nickel-coated, brass-coated, tin-coated, and painted strip steel.

Trumbull Bronze Co.: Brass, bronze, copper, and aluminum castings.

Trumbull Lamp Works of General Electric: Sealed beam head lamps and special incandescent lamps.

Trumbull Manufacturing Co.: Manufacturers of tank-car fittings, machine equipment, fabricating products, and complete steel-mill equipment.

United States Gypsum Co.: Manufacturers of metal lath, steel building supplies, and expanded metal and accessories for partition and reinforcing.

Van Huffel Tube Corporation: This company's products consist of all types of tubing such as open-seam, tight-butted, lock-seam construction, and welding tubing, made from cold-rolled, hot-rolled stainless and alloy steel.

Warren City Tank & Boiler Co.: Welded or riveted steel plate fabricated storage or pressure tanks, bins, and hoppers.

Warren Tool Corporation: Manufacturers of forged tools; commercial heat treating, drop forging, and upsetting.

Wean Engineering Co.: Processing equipment for the manufacture of sheet-, strip-, and tin-mill products.

This imposing and important list of manufacturers, all located in Warren, is dependent for power on the Ohio Public Service Co. This company is now capable of producing 80,000 kilowatts of capacity which is entirely insufficient and which capacity cannot be increased due to the lack of water available from the Mahoning River.

Nine miles west of Warren, Ohio, and serviced from this district, is being constructed an ordnance plant where 12,000 employees will be working on shell loading by August of 1941. This plant will need ample water as will its employees. This plant will require 5,000 kilowatts that are to be supplied from the Warren plant of the Ohio Public Service Co.

A survey of Warren industry, made in November 1940, indicated that at that time 14 percent of the total industrial employees were engaged on national-defense orders. Recent estimates indicate that 20 percent are now so engaged, but under the broadest heading of "national defense," both direct and indirect, it is safe to say that 60 percent of Warren's industrial employees are so engaged.

Warren's industries need power to produce that which is being asked of them for national defense. It takes water to give industry the necessary power. It is not at all farfetched to say that Warren's manufacture of defense items is dependent upon its ability to secure an adequate water supply.

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT H. ROBERTS,
Mayor, City of Warren, Ohio.

On Being an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM US WEEK

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I found on my desk volume 1, No. 1, of a little magazine entitled "US Week." This statement appears on the editorial page:

Established to foster and forward the Jeffersonian democratic ideals of William E. Dodd and supported by the William E. Dodd Foundation, Inc.

I note that they carry no advertising. I find, also, on the editorial page the following editorial whose philosophy I like very much. I reproduce it for all to read and ponder. The article follows:

[From US Week of March 12, 1941]

ON BEING AN AMERICAN

There is something about being an American today that was never so before. Something that closes the throat. A sense of luck you're likely to have while you're riding on the bus or washing the baby's face, or even while you're poring over the want ads. It's no longer a sensation reserved for the Fourth of July. It's gone beyond flag waving and 4-minute speeches. Textbooks have nothing to do with it.

It's still a joyful thing, thank God. You can sing it or swing it and be glad. But it's too important to need advertising, too solemn to be exhorted. It's something like the feeling you would have looking at your child just after the neighbor's child had been killed. It's a private matter. Nothing you care to argue about. Beyond other people's doubts or questioning.

Each of us has his special reasons. One loves America because he can be a Catholic here in peace; another because his kids can go to public school; another because he belongs to a successful trade-union; another because he has got riches by his own efforts.

Perhaps it is because I have three little daughters that I am so unendingly glad we are Americans. They are sturdy children, with sweet, fair faces. For them this is a good world—safe and joyful and promising. War and Europe are very remote. They know nothing of labor camps. The future seems dazzling. One wants to be a foreign correspondent; one isn't quite sure whether to be an architect or clerk in a candy store, or just have a large family; the third wants to drive a big green bus. The oldest is rapt about swing; the middle one likes Mr. Roosevelt's fireside confidences, particularly when they last past bedtime; the little one likes everything.

I do not clip the wings of their plans. As they grow, I know they will explore ideas, test their abilities, discover what is good and what is less good. As adults, they will hold what opinions seem right and there will be no dreadful consequences. I need not teach them to lie or be furtive. For this is America, and for this I am grateful every hour of every day.

Our loyalty to America is the loyalty of citizens in a democracy. We give it freely, gladly, in exchange for the birthright of our children. Those groups which would bully Americans into conforming to their personal or corporate purposes by shouting "un-American" at what they do not like mistake the quality of the feeling. They crack the word like a lash over opinions and groups not subservient to their interests. But this is America.

In Germany they crack the whip to command loyalty. The product is not, I think, what we want here. The sudden pounding of storm troopers in the dawn, the secret spying of neighbor on neighbor, the show of public frenzy—these methods are offensive to the decent tastes of citizens in a democracy. Here, as in Germany, the authors of the methods are the enemies of democracy.

And democracy is the American idea. It is the very stuff of patriotism. The record of our history shows that it is from the warp and woof of proposal and protest, of majorities and minorities, that the fabric of progress is woven.

As we love this country, so we plan for it, work for it, advocate for it, and criticize it. The right to protest is more precious to an American than the privilege of goose-stepping could possibly be to a German. As Americans, we will speak when there is need of speech. When we encounter a child, undernourished and whimpering with cold, we will say, "This must not be."

We speak as Americans.

Give 'Em Plenty of Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1941

ARTICLE BY CLARENCE W. HALL, MAGAZINE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Advocate is the official organ of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Its magazine editor, Clarence W. Hall, made a special study of our Army camps. He has written a series of articles for his magazine describing the conditions as he found them. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am reproducing the fourth in this series.

I am sure the membership of this body will be appalled as was I and desire to do something about it. Surely these young men coming mostly from sheltered homes, and often not of their own free will and accord, have the right for better than that described in Mr. Hall's article. It is a challenge to all—the military authorities, the local civil authorities, and last but not least, the Congress of the United States.

I also suggest to my colleagues after reading this article to think again as to whether the draft ages should be lowered to 18 as advocated by some. Should mere children be subjected to such conditions?

The article follows:

[From the Christian Advocate of March 13, 1941]

"GIVE 'EM PLENTY OF RELIGION," SAID THE SERGEANT

(By Clarence W. Hall)

A leathery old top sergeant was sitting next to me on the bus running between Starke, Fla., and Fort Blanding. The conveyance was jammed with soldiers, most of them newly arrived "selectees." Virtually all were in various stages of drunkenness, induced by frequent references to a bottle of "corn" acquired in Starke, legally "dry."

It was Saturday night, and they were returning to quarters after a night's diversion in the vastly bloated little town, whose population of 1,400 drowsed contentedly beneath its moss-hung live oaks, before the defense program dropped 10,000 construction men and 40,000 soldiers on its doorstep.

The old sergeant, a self-described "relic of the World War," watched the antics of the soldiers with disgust. Two were unconscious on the floor of the bus. A trio in the back was rendering bawdy songs. Then a fight started in front, and the harassed driver stopped the bus while the sergeant went up to quell it. He came back dusting his hands.

"Look at 'em!" he said. "All clean-looking kids—most of 'em from good homes. Some punk with hell-raising in his heart leads 'em on—and zingo, they go to the devil."

"Well, what's the answer, Sarge?" I asked.

"I've been in the Army a long time. An outfit's only as clean as the towns they can get to. If things are wide open, we have trouble. If the people in these towns make the shady politicians clean things up, chase out the women and the liquor, we do all right. Soldiers are pretty much like everybody else—they don't go to the devil if you give 'em plenty of religion."

I brooded on that. "Plenty of religion" to this hard-boiled soldier meant influences for good—a clean-up of bad spots and a development of decent environments. That, averred my unclerical preacher, was the answer. It was good preaching.

I found a vast need for that kind of sermon in all the areas around camps I visited.

Take Jacksonville, Fla., for instance. Forty-seven miles from Blanding, it has an average of 4,000 soldiers a day on its streets—not a big number in a big city, it's true, but in the eyes of liquor and vice racketeers these 4,000 are a veritable Klondike gleaming with gold.

In this city the National Defense Commission made a mayor's committee responsible for cleaning things up and providing decent recreation for the soldiers to keep them out of the hands of the vultures. The committee got as far as recommending a segregated district for prostitution, which plan was promptly scuttled by Col. Bascom Johnson, of the Public Health Department, then foundered.

However, the Jacksonville Ministerial Alliance was awake. Snubbed by the mayor's group, the preachers, headed by Methodist District Superintendent J. H. Daniel, formed their own committee. They have opened a splendid recreation building in the downtown section and, in cooperation with camp chaplains, are doing a beautiful piece of work.

But Jacksonville itself is odoriferous. Soldiers reeling drunk down the streets (until the M. P.'s get them) are common. I found the Houston Street vice district, only a few blocks from the Blanding bus station, resembling "old home" week for streetwalkers.

In the vicinity of the camp itself whole villages of trailer camps mushroomed into activity and vice flourished until pounced upon by the military police. But this action only put hundreds of prostitutes touring the highways near the camps in cars, "mobile units" of assignation.

The seeds of reform in Jacksonville are being lightly sown, but it will take some energetic cultivation by public opinion before anything very virile sprouts up to crowd out entrenched vice.

Everywhere, however, you find the liquor industry trying to curry public favor by inspiring its associates. While the Jacksonville ministers' project was being launched a prominent liquor dealer strolled in with social-climbing intentions.

"See where you need money to get this place going," he observed amiably. "Well, just say the word, and I'll be glad to get some contributions for you. The boys of our association are making a lot of money now, what with all these soldiers, and they feel they'd like to kick in—sort of a gesture of appreciation, you know!"

This thank offering got short shrift from the Methodist lady who was hanging curtains. Her pastor will probably forgive her for the uncharitable language she used in the sulfurous lacing she handed out!

The evils surrounding Fort Dix, near Trenton, N. J., are scattered throughout the numerous small and large towns in this populous area, therefore do not appear so boldly on the surface as in communities adjacent to the large southern camps. But the smaller places—like Pointville and Wrightstown—are "frontier" towns in spirit and activity, constructive and destructive. And you can find plenty of evidence that hordes of harlots have set up profitable "housekeeping" in Camden and Trenton.

Dr. W. R. Raver, Methodist district superintendent, gave me an encouraging picture of the work being conducted by the Fort Dix Community Service, a federated group comprising 23 religious and social-service organizations. Headquarters for this unit have been set up in the parish house of the Pointville Methodist Church.

I found Battle Creek, Mich., to be a town where liquor flows without restraint, but prostitution is not rife. The police department began early to eliminate the swarms of lewd women who drifted in, and an unofficial red-light district of long standing was dispersed. It is too much to claim, however, that prostitution doesn't exist here, for while no solders in uniform are admitted in certain houses that informed citizens will point out to you, they get around this by coming in civilian clothes—at the suggestion of the women themselves.

I visited Fort Custer on pay day. One soldier prophesied in my hearing, "Boy, what a beating Battle Creek is going to take tonight!" He was right. I stayed long enough to witness it.

Kalamazoo, also within easy distance from Custer, is likewise "taking a beating." A newspaperman there, commenting on the recent formation of a Women's Home Guard, who promised to drill with real rifles "in defense of home and community," sardonically remarked to me: "They're trying now to get the rifles. They'd do better to get hatchets, a la Carrie Nation, and go to work on some of our taverns. That's where our trouble is coming from." I think he has something there.

Not much of an antidotal program seemed to be under way at my visit. They were talking of a clubhouse soon to be obtained for the soldiers. But pending this, Rev. Spencer B. Owens and his live-wire fellowship league are featuring special open-house programs for soldiers in the First Methodist Church of Battle Creek. A more nearly community-wide program is slowly getting under way.

Last stop on my camp itinerary was Fort Sheridan, near Chicago. Here, too, the acuteness of the liquor-vice problem is lost to view in the big city. I talked at some length with Lt. Albert R. Haney. I also visited several of the 23 taverns in Highwood, a town of 3,600 population bordering the fort. I counted 15 saloons in 1 short block, and the keepers frankly told me their main support came from soldiers.

A local military regulation forbids the sale of bottled liquors to soldiers within 5 miles of Sheridan, but no limits are placed on counter and table consumption.

In Sheridan an efficiently operating morale division and chaplains' corps are striving, with considerable success, to keep the soldiers' minds off outside attractions. And in Col. John L. Homer, fort commander, the churches have a warm backer.

In totaling the sum of my impressions of the camps—together with what I learned in Washington of the War Department's attitude toward the problem—I get this:

"The coalition of liquor, gambling, and prostitution is strong in almost every community adjoining the camps. All three are readily available for the soldier who looks for them. In many cases the arrangements between such forces of corruption and local politics appear to be based on an amiable reciprocity."

"Their patronage comes not only from men already addicted to such practices, but also from adventurous youths who, separated from home ties and tempted by the propinquity of such evils, dabble experimentally for the sake of an unaccustomed thrill. The resulting rapid decadence of morals among hitherto clean young men is a threat that only a mind persistently blind will fail to see.

"The communities themselves are saddled with a tremendous problem, one that is bound to become more complex as the camps grow in population. A few are wrestling bravely, against such odds as limited facilities and corrupt local government, to master the problem before it masters them. But others are dazed, bewildered. The local papers carry little or no reference to the problem—a good many, doubtless, being in the same boat as one editor who phrased it thus: 'I am in the embarrassing position of having yelled for repeal. Now I can't face about without losing face!'

"The Army commanders, charged with the task of turning out men who are physically and morally fit, are frankly apprehensive—'off the record.' In many cases their own military police have had to step in and, as one expressed it, 'wash the town's dirty linen because the local people are too lazy or too holy to tackle it themselves.'

"The Army's own morale division and corps of chaplains are doing a splendid job in the camps. But, as General Marshall told me, 'When the soldiers leave camps they're on their own.'

"Official Washington is making some motions to help. A whole batch of committees is now out surveying conditions for the National Defense Commission. But little will be accomplished because of bureaucratic red tape.

"Legislative action by the Federal Government seems to be the only answer to any widespread reform. A bill, proposed by Representative MAY, aims to outlaw prostitution near the camps; the War Department high command favors its passage; it stands a good chance of being enacted. But official Washington definitely shies away from any similar attempt to control liquor—probably made chary by the administration's own attitude toward anything resembling a return to prohibition. My attempts to point out the inconsistency of favoring prostitution control while evading liquor regulation met only silence—no argument—on the part of Washington's 'brass hats.'"

In view of all the foregoing, it would appear to this reporter that the only hope of bettering conditions on anything like a broad scale lies in following the suggestion given me privately by a high-ranking War Department official whose name, for obvious reasons, I cannot divulge. Said he:

"My suggestion is that the church people of America band together, first force their local governments to clean up liquor and vice conditions, and then unite with others all over the country to put up such a holy howl to Washington that Federal legislation will have to be enacted—or else!"

Unity and Cooperation on the Part of the City of York, Pa.

REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY L. HAINES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for these few minutes today to speak upon a subject that is uppermost in the minds of our people at this time—peace or war. There is a wide diversity of opinion not only in this House, but also in the rank and file of our citizens concerning the effect that the passage of H. R. 1776 will have upon the future of our beloved country. There is no doubt but that this country now faces a crisis probably more serious than at any other period of our national existence. I believe that a large majority of our people prefer the road to peace, and because I believed that the passage of H. R. 1776 would contribute to peace I supported that legislation. I hope that I am not mistaken in this conclusion, but should I be I want to assure my countrymen that I voted my honest convictions. I have always believed that the surest guarantee for peace rested in the strength of our Army and Navy.

We have charted our course, Mr. Speaker, and there can be no turning back. We are appropriating billions of dollars that future generations must pay, but if it will mean peace, I am sure it is money well spent, and that our posterity will not look back upon us with any degree of disfavor, but rather with a spirit of thankfulness for having done what we believed to be right at a most critical period. On the other hand, should we be compelled to defend ourselves against those who would destroy our democracy, we have the satisfaction of having had the courage to do what we believed was in the best interest of our own country.

I said these were critical days, Mr. Speaker. Believing this, I am firm in my convictions that these days call for a spirit of unity and a fine spirit of cooperation on the part of every citizen. This is particularly true with labor and industry. May I call your attention to a city in my congressional district where such a spirit of unity and cooperation does exist. I refer to that old, historic city of York, Pa., a city noted for its industrial activity. Although York ranks fourteenth in population among the cities of Pennsylvania, it leads all of the

cities of that Commonwealth in its variety of the finished product in proportion to its population. It has the proud distinction of having a greater percentage of its population gainfully employed than any other city of that State. I would be glad to have the membership of this House acquaint itself with the variety of the finished product manufactured in York, and would also like to advise that this city has nine industrial plants that lead all others in volume of production. It is a city of fine people, who are intensely patriotic and anxious to do their full share in these days of emergency.

York's historic background is unsurpassed. Indeed, I have the honor to represent cities like Gettysburg and Chambersburg, where men of the North and the South struggled in other critical days for a cause that both believed to be just. In Hanover, in my district, the first blood was shed in the great Civil War north of the Mason and Dixon's line, and I am very proud of the fact that I represent this section of our great Nation. York's place in Revolutionary history has not received the publicity to which it is entitled. It was at York that the Congress convened in the darkest days of the American Revolution, and for 9 months it was the seat of this Nation. When the British occupied Philadelphia, Congress traveled westward, stayed 1 day at Lancaster, then crossed the Susquehanna River, and from September 30, 1777, to June 27, 1778, was in session at York. These sessions were held in the little courthouse that was located on what is now known as Continental Square, and it was here that Congress learned of the surrender of Burgoyne.

It was here that Congress passed the Articles of Confederation, issued the first national Thanksgiving proclamation, received the news from Benjamin Franklin in Paris that France would send a fleet, money, and an army; received Baron Von Steuben and Lafayette and commissioned them as major generals.

It was in York that the plot to supplant Washington with Gates was frustrated by Lafayette, when at an opportune time at a banquet he proposed a toast to the Commander in Chief. This plot is known in history as the Conway cabal. It was the home of James Smith, a Member of Congress from York and a signer of the Declaration of Independence. He lies buried in the First Presbyterian Churchyard, and this churchyard also contains the body of David Grier, a colonel in the Revolution and a delegate to the convention that nominated Washington for the first term. In another cemetery lies the body of Philip Livingston, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, who died in York while a Member of the Congress. On the site of the Continental Treasury there is now erected a splendid bank building, the First National Bank of York. The building used by General Wayne as headquarters while recruiting his brigade for the march upon Yorktowne still stands. In another burial ground of a church erected in 1743 lies the body of Thomas Hartley, colonel of the Revolution and a Member of Congress from York for 12 years, and John Clark, a major in the Revolution and chief of staff for General Greene after 1778, is also buried here.

These and other interesting historical facts make York a sacred spot in our American concept of freedom and liberty, and I feel that I am justified in anything that I might say here today when we are considering the appropriation of money for the defense of a country that these men were willing to die for.

This year—in November—York will celebrate its two-hundredth anniversary by staging ceremonies that are fitting and due the memory of those who struggled and gave their best in the early days of our great, free land.

Mr. Speaker, I have requested the Post Office Department to issue a commemorative stamp for this celebration, and I am certain you will agree with me that with the place York has in our early history this recognition is due.

I stated that York is a great industrial center. Indeed, as early as 1831 a gentleman by the name of Phineas Davis built a locomotive and called it the York, and this old locomotive won first prize offered by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad at their great exposition held a few years ago. Phineas Davis was a watchmaker by trade. He resided in York, and the city has honored him by naming one of its high schools in his memory.

The York Imperial apple originated in York County.

The present citizenship of York has had a fine heritage, and this is evidenced by the fine spirit of cooperation that now characterizes its people today. They believe in the old philosophy of helping each other "to do what we can with what we have." That is the philosophy back of the so-called York plan that has attracted Nation-wide interest. York industrial and labor leaders got together and decided upon a course of action that might well be copied by all the Nation. Very early in our present defense program these industrial and labor leaders got together and with a fine spirit of cooperation they agreed upon 15 objectives that have since attracted so much attention that our own Government heads have approved and complimented these men and women for their fine spirit of helpfulness in a day when this Nation wants unity in action.

The York plan is an ideal one and any section of the country can copy it. This is not a patented idea—simply good horse sense, as Mr. William Shipley, president of the York Ice Machinery Corporation and chairman of the Defense Board in York, stated in an address to the Manufacturers' Association of York recently.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission I am going to name these 15 objectives with a view of having the attention of the entire Nation called to them. They are:

First. To use our present facilities in regard to tools.

Second. To get idle tools and idle men working.

Third. To make a survey of the tools outside the metal trades.

Fourth. To study what type of work we can do with the facilities at our command.

Fifth. To make a decided effort to explain and sell in detail the defense plan to our community.

Sixth. To assist in educational work as it pertains to educating new employees.

Seventh. To study housing.

Eighth. To study workers' health.

Ninth. To establish the costs of the subcontractor to the prime contractor.

Tenth. To study deliveries of subcontractor to prime contractor so that the material would be supplied to the prime contractor as needed.

Eleventh. To study supplying needed labor if and when working three shifts.

Twelfth. To impress on the minds of the subcontractor the necessity for accuracy of work so as to assure the Federal acceptance of the parts being furnished to the prime contractor.

Thirteenth. To study labor potentials in York.

Fourteenth. To take steps to supply this additional labor when and where needed.

Fifteenth. To enter into all local activities that deal either directly or indirectly with the present emergency.

With these objectives, and the fine spirit of these people, there is little wonder that the men who advanced this program are being sought throughout the entire country to go and tell their story.

Mr. Shipley is ably assisted in this great program by Mr. Turner, Mr. W. J. Fisher, and Mr. Warren C. Bulette, all fine industrialists who have won the confidence of labor and their organizations. With such leadership in every part of the Nation we cannot fail.

Terminus of the Alaska Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

MEMORANDUM OF B. C. JOHNSON, OF SEWARD, ALASKA

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum of B. C. Johnson, of Seward, Alaska, relative to proposed change of terminus of the Alaska Railroad:

Congress is asked, in a Budget-supported estimate, to make an appropriation with which to relocate the southern end of the Alaska Railroad and to change the seaboard terminus of that railroad from the city of Seward, Alaska, to a point at the head of Passage Canal. In the judgment of the writer, the suggestion is unsound, and a thorough investigation of the subject should be made before action is taken on the requested appropriation.

The Alaska Railroad is owned and operated by the United States Government. The seaboard terminus of the railroad is at the city

of Seward, Alaska, situated on the shores of Resurrection Bay, which opens into the Gulf of Alaska. From Seward the railroad extends northerly a distance of 471 miles to Fairbanks, Alaska. The railroad has been continuously operated for its entire length since 1920. A considerable portion of the railroad is located in mountainous country. North of Seward for approximately 60 miles the road follows a series of low valleys through the mountains and crosses two low passes in those mountains.

It is now proposed to change the seaboard terminus of the railroad from Seward to a place at the head of Passage Canal, sometimes called Portage Bay, which is an inlet of Prince William Sound. Congress is requested to appropriate $5,300,000 for that purpose. Such a change would necessitate the building of 14 miles of new railroad, departing from the present line at or near mile 64, north of Seward. Upon the building of the new line to the head of Passage Canal it is proposed to abandon and dismantle all of the railroad between Seward and mile 64.

The reasons assigned for the proposed change of terminus of the railroad are two in number: First, that the timber structures on the present line between Seward and mile 64, particularly a long and high wooden trestle at or near mile 50 and wooden bridges in what is called the loop at or near mile 51, are readily susceptible to destruction by sabotage, and such destruction would cause considerable interruption of traffic; and, second, it is asserted by the geenral manager of the railroad that the building of the new line to Passage Canal would result in considerable economies in operation and of maintenance.

The railroad is of military importance because of the recent establishment and construction of an army air station at the northern terminus of the railroad at Fairbanks, Alaska, and of an army base and military post at Anchorage, Alaska, which is located on the railroad 114 miles north of Seward. For this reason, the military authorities are naturally concerned that there should be no interruptions of traffic on the railroad and, therefore, the War Department is supporting the proposed change in the interests of national defense.

From intimate knowledge of conditions in that region gained by personal inspection and examination, I am cofident that the national defense will be better promoted, and at much less expense, by not changing the terminus of the railroad to Passage Canal, but rather by rehabilitating the present line of the railroad between Seward and mile 64.

The danger which now exists to interruption of traffic through the possible failure or destruction of the timber structures on the line above mentioned can be readily and cheaply obviated by making fills of earth and rock at these points and thus totally eliminating the timber trestle and bridges. The cost of making all the necessary fills to replace the present structures of wood would not exceed $400,000. The railroad between Seward and mile 64 is located on hard, solid ground, or on rock and, therefore, there is no danger that this particular portion of the railroad is any more liable to destruction through sabotage or otherwise than would be the proposed new line if built to Passage Canal.

It is further asserted that since the railroad between Seward and mile 64 crosses two low passes in the hills, it is unduly expensive to operate because additional power is sometimes needed to haul trains through these passes. It should be noted, however, that the steepest grade on the present line between Seward and mile 64 is 2.4 percent, compensated. On the grades complained of, that at mile 12 could be practically eliminated by the construction of a tunnel if the cost thereof were deemed justified. The traffic over both summits can easily be taken care of at slight expense by having an extra locomotive stationed in that area and supplied by only one crew. As compared with the interest on the money necessary to be borrowed to build the proposed new line to Passage Canal, the cost of maintaining one locomotive and one train crew on this part of the line is entirely negligible.

It is true that the original cost of construction on that part of the road between Seward and mile 64 was considerable, because a large portion of that work was in solid rock. But that construction is now in and will last indefinitely, and the only thing needed to make all of the line safe is to provide earth and rock fills for the present wooden structures in that area.

While someone has estimated that the cost of construction from mile 64 to Passage Canal is $5,300,000, I wish to put myself on record new that the proposed new line between mile 64 and Passage Canal when completed with the necessary terminal facilities, and giving credit for whatever material may be recovered from dismantling the present line between mile 64 and Seward, minus the expense of recovery, will cost between $10,000,000 and $12,000,000, and, therefore, the estimate of $5,300,000 is a gross underestimate for the job. The total cost of rehabilitating the present line of the railroad between Seward and mile 64, including a span at Snow River and the making of fills in the loop district so as to eliminate all trestles and wooden bridges, would not exceed $1,400,000. Such rehabilitation would make the present line between Seward and mile 64 at least as safe as the proposed new line between mile 64 and Passage Canal.

Moreover, on the proposed mile 64-Passage Canal line two long tunnels will be necessary, one about 2½ miles and the other a little less than 1 mile in length. These tunnels must be driven in proximity to enormous glaciers which fill the intervening valleys. In fact, if it were not for the glaciers, no tunnels would be necessary on this proposed route. The nearness of the tunnels to the glaciers to me spells wet tunnels. This means that they must be heated in the winter months to keep them from freezing, and how this can be done in such long tunnels, with the maintenance of proper ventilation, is a difficult problem to solve. For any man to say that the cost of maintenance of the proposed new line to Passage Canal will be less than the cost of rehabilitation and maintenance of the existing line between mile 64 and Seward is simply to indulge in guesswork.

It is said that the line between Seward and mile 64 is in poor condition, and that is correct as to the wooden structures to which I have referred, but it must be remembered that the remainder of the railroad north of mile 64 is also in poor condition. I have walked over the entire railroad from one end to the other, in both directions. In many places, the rail joints are bent and the rail ends battered. For dozens and dozens of miles, the railroad crosses soft ground and at those places there should be at least 1 foot of ballast instead of 6 inches put under the ties which would allow drainage in the fall of the year when the rainy season sets in and would do away with a lot of frost heaving and costly maintenance and would avoid the danger of the necessary shimming of the track to compensate for frost heaves.

To go on north from mile 64: We find at mile 70 that there were six snowslides this year, in the same location, 400 to 500 feet long and 25 feet deep; along Turnagain Arm a number of snow-and-rock slides occur and at a place near Potter mud sloughs off from under the tracks; fills in the Turnagain Arm area are continually settling; mud is encountered between Anchorage and a point north of Eklutna; a lake in the glacier at the head of Knik River breaks every year and floods the country on occasion for days at a time; mud slides occur between Wasilla and Matanuska and north of Montana; between Talkeetna and Curry, the Susitna River causes trouble on many occasions and there are several mud slides in that region; between Canyon and 15 miles north, the Indian River in flood washes out the railroad in several places, and on this account all traffic was suspended over the railroad at one time for weeks. Between Cantwell and McKinley Park, the track glaciers over during the winter at several points; between McKinley Park and Healy is the most dangerous track on the entire road, extremely costly to maintain and hazardous to operate trains over; from Healy to Nenana, trouble is encountered with glaciers during the winter season.

Taking the railroad as a whole, it is, in my judgment, indisputable that if the railroad between Seward and mile 64 is rehabilitated, it will be the safest and best part of the entire road and certainly no more costly to maintain and operate than the rest of the line.

In fact, rather than spend even $5,300,000 to build the proposed new line into Passage Canal, it would be much better to relocate that part of the railroad between mile 28 and mile 81 by following a low open valley called Moose Pass and crossing the head of Turnagain Arm with a bridge. This entire job could be done for not more than $4,000,000 and would eliminate all of the so-called loop district where the dangerous timber structures are located. However, it is totally unnecessary to even consider this alternative because the present line, if rehabilitated at comparatively small expense, will serve every possible purpose for many years to come.

The people who reside in the city of Seward and for 50 miles north thereof are deserving of some consideration. Probably 1,500 citizens reside in this area. If the proposed new line is built to Passage Canal and the line to Seward abandoned, more than half of those residents will lose their homes and practically everything they have. To thus ruin them without any necessity for such action would be a cruel thing. The present line of the railroad and its present terminus should by all means be maintained.

I have discussed this subject at some length with the Delegate from Alaska, who is personally familiar with the entire area mentioned, and I believe Mr. DIMOND concurs with the views herein expressed.

Respectfully submitted.

B. C. JOHNSON.

Position of Agriculture in National and Western Hemisphere Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

LETTER AND RESOLUTION OF THE WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the agricultural people of this country, who represent 25 percent of the population and must be content with less than 10 percent of the national farm income, are continually striving to obtain economic justice for the rural people. Thousands

of agricultural college graduates, thousands of teachers of agriculture in high schools and thousands of agriculturally trained people living on the farms of our country are, in a constructive manner, seeking to obtain fair consideration for the rural population.

The following letter and resolution from the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture is an example of this interest:

WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE,
Madison, Wis., March 11, 1941.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN MURRAY: The directors of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture in session at Madison, Thursday, March 6, after due consideration, adopted a resolution concerning the position of agriculture in national and Western Hemisphere defense. A copy of this resolution is herewith enclosed. I am sure you will be very much interested in studying this united considered opinion of Wisconsin farm leaders assembled in the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture.

Consumer-minded groups and individuals, both in and outside governmental agencies, today exert considerable influence in the way of restricting price advances of consumer goods. This is evident with respect to consumer propaganda found in the National Defense magazine. Within the A. A. A., the Consumers' Division exerts a similar influence on the price trends of agricultural products.

Throughout this program of national preparedness few seem to realize that the costs of the things farmers buy are rising way out of proportion to the farmer's ability to pay. Many of these same people, who are very conscious of any increases in the cost of consumer goods, condone increasing labor rates, and pay little attention to the rising cost of capital goods, industrial products, and defense materials.

In view of this situation so adverse to the interests of agriculture, the free importation of products from Latin America is certain to have a further depressing effect which will be much more manifest in the case of agriculture than in its influence upon industry.

Your defense of American agriculture in helping to curtail these influences and proposed policies that threaten agricultural well-being will be very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

MILO K. SWANTON,
Executive Secretary.

RESOLUTION REGARDING THE POSITION OF AGRICULTURE IN NATIONAL AND WESTERN HEMISPHERE DEFENSE AS ADOPTED BY THE WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE AT MADISON, MARCH 6, 1941

Hemisphere defense involves economic as well as military considerations, and we urge that especial care be exercised during this period of emotional stress in order that agriculture in this country not be asked to carry an undue share of the economic burdens of such Western Hemisphere defense. Latin America is suffering from decreased agricultural exports, as is this country. They are accumulating agricultural surpluses, as are we. Some of their surpluses are identical in kind with our own.

The Wisconsin Council of Agriculture urgently requests that our Government proceed slowly and cautiously in assuming responsibility for these foreign surpluses, at least until we have formulated methods for the efficient handling of our own agricultural surplus problems.

In relation to other major economic groups and classes in America, the farmers stand ready and are willing to assume their full share of the burdens and responsibilities of national defense. This is just as true now as during the last World War. Our production of food and fiber goes into the channels of trade largely in the form of consumer goods. Hence the prices of our farm products are most directly affected and influenced by the efforts and propaganda of the consumer groups for stabilization of prices as voiced by the Consumer Division of the A. A. A. and as expressed in the National Defense magazine.

We protest that this program, designed to restrict price advances affecting agricultural commodities, apparently does not attempt at the same time to curtail the rising cost of capital goods, industrial products, and defense materials. The effect of this is to increase cost of production on the farm while curtailing the prices farmers receive. This results in lower net farm income.

We urge that efforts be made by our State and National Governments to assist more aggressively in moving our surplus agricultural commodities into world markets when and where at all possible.

Mr. Speaker, the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture is a parent organization and represents the various agricultural organizations throughout the State of Wisconsin.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JARED Y. SANDERS, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

RESOLUTION BY THE BOARD OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICE OF LOUISIANA

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of the department of public service of the State of Louisiana in opposition to the so-called St. Lawrence River-Great Lakes navigation and power project.

This resolution well expresses the considered opinion of informed and responsible people in my State and the reasons that actuate our people in opposing this proposed project. The resolution was unanimously adopted by the board and director of the department of public service of Louisiana on March 10, last. The resolution in question is as follows:

Whereas it is currently reported in the public press and through other media that there will be introduced at the 1941 session of the Congress of the United States, either in the form of a treaty between the Governments of the United States and the Dominion of Canada, or in the form of other legislation, a measure to revive the so-called St. Lawrence River-Great Lakes navigation and power project, similar in substance to the proposed treaty between the two Governments which failed of ratification in the Senate at the 1934 session of Congress; and

Whereas in the judgment of the board and the director of the department of public service in the State of Louisiana, the proposed project is economically unsound and inimical to the best interests of the United States as a whole, and in particular is prejudicial to the State of Louisiana, its ports, industries, and commerce, in that—

(1) The vast amount of preliminary work necessary before actual construction can be commenced will divert to an objective which cannot be attained for a number of years to come, engineering and other technical personnel vitally needed in designing and carrying into effect the national-defense program; to the extent that the project has for its objective providing an additional water transportation route between the ports of the Great Lakes and the sea, it is unsound because in the opinion of recognized authorities, due to the channel-depth limitations only 30 percent of the registered tonnage of the world could use the waterway; and but 5 percent of the tonnage registered under the American flag could use it, for like reasons; and this use would be restricted to a maximum of from 5 to 6 months in a year, due to the freezing over of the St. Lawrence River. Thus the project, as an instrument of commerce and navigation, would impose a cost upon the United States wholly disproportionate to its value as such a facility.

The project is further objectionable in that practically the only vessels which could navigate the waterway would be small foreign-flag carriers of the tramp-ship type engaged in the handling of low-grade bulk commodities, such as coal, grains, etc. This type of carrier would thus be enabled to reach the Great Lakes ports laden with such commodities as ballast produced in other nations under substandard wage, working, and living conditions and moving in substandard carriers. These cargoes would be dumped on the domestic market in competition with the agricultural, mining, and other industries of the United States to their great harm and detriment. This dumping process would adversely affect the line ships of the American merchant marine which now serve the recognized and established ports of the United States—a merchant marine upon which the United States has in recent years spent, and upon which it is now spending, hundreds of millions of dollars in construction and operating subsidies. This ill effect would reflect itself not only upon the American merchant marine as an industry but upon the shipowners and operators, the employed personnel, and would generally adversely affect the operating and financial stability of the organizations and facilities of established ports of the United States.

Specifically the project would gravely prejudice the ports and port facilities of Louisiana (upon whose bonds the State of Louisiana is an unconditional guarantor in an amount in excess of $35,000,000), as well as other ports in the Gulf. The port of New Orleans normally handles a great volume of import and export tonnage destined to and originating in that area of the United States adjacent to the American segment of the projected waterway. This traffic is presently handled by common carrier, contract carrier, and private barge lines operating on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, as well as by railroad and truck lines.

The Mississippi River, in conjunction with the Illinois and Desplaines Rivers and the Chicago Sanitary Drainage Canal, is the main stem of this water lane, forming a through route from the Great Lakes to New Orleans, and it is vital to the port of New Orleans as well as other Gulf ports that a channel be maintained of sufficient depth to permit unimpeded navigation thereover. At certain seasons of the year this minimum channel depth is only made possible by a diversion of water from Lake Michigan; and, indeed, in years of abnormal drought conditions in the upper Mississippi Valley even this water diversion is not sufficient to fully accomplish this purpose.

"During 1938, river conditions were quite satisfactory. In 1939, although no unusual navigational difficulties were experienced during the first 8 months, during the remainder of the year low river stages on the Missouri, lower Mississippi, and to some extent on the upper Mississippi, slowed up tow movements and increased the difficulty of maintaining regular schedules.

"Delays on account of low channel and consequent groundings on the Mississippi system consumed 7,310 hours during the last 4 months of the year. These delays made it necessary to add more power in order to complete deliveries, and, of course, added to the cost of operation." (Annual Report of the Inland Waterways Corporation for the calendar year 1939, p. 2.)

Lake Michigan alone of the Great Lakes lies wholly within and is subject to the exclusive sovereignty of the United States. As much as 10,000 cubic feet per second has been withdrawn from Lake Michigan and diverted to the existing waterway. However, under a decree of the Supreme Court of the United States entered in 1931, and arising out of litigation between several States, the present maximum diversion is fixed at 1,500 cubic feet per second, plus an insignificant allowable pumpage. There is presently no legal impediment to the Supreme Court increasing the allowable diversion in the event conditions required and justified such a modification of its decree. Under the proposed treaty of 1938—and a treaty has the binding force of law—the amount of diversion would be limited to the present 1,500 cubic feet per second, save in case of emergency, and the existence of such an emergency, under the proposal, must be submitted to an international tribunal for adjudication should the Dominion of Canada object to the additional withdrawal.

Thus, and to this extent, the future of a vital avenue of transportation lying wholly within the United States is, in part at least, surrendered to a foreign sovereign jurisdiction.

(2) To the extent that it is either a primary or incidental purpose of the proposal to provide facilities for the generation of hydroelectric power, then it is objectionable and prejudicial to the interests of Louisiana and to the South as a whole in that electric energy, in the present state of development, cannot be economically nor feasibly transmitted except for relatively short distances—recognized authorities fix the maximum, under the most favorable conditions, at 300 miles. Practically the whole of this generating capacity would be on that segment of the waterway known as the International Rapids section; and the availability of the cheap power there generated would be restricted by transmission limitations to the Province of Ontario and the State of New York. Obviously the great volume of power so generated would have to find its principal market in industrial consumption; that market, as to the proportion allocated to the United States, being in an area that is presently one of the most highly industrialized in the United States. Much of this power would be so-called dump power—that is, surplus power, sold for whatever it will bring in a competitive market.

The State of New York, and many of its larger industrial cities, including the city of New York, are parties to those proceedings before the Interstate Commerce Commission, commonly known and referred to as the Southern Governors' cases, wherein the Southern States, including Louisiana, are attacking the centralization of industry in so-called official classification territory—which includes the State of New York—insofar as that centralization is the result of the creation and maintenance of artificial rate and transportation barriers against manufactured articles from the South, made from and with the raw materials and natural resources of the South, seeking markets in that most-densely populated section of the United States—official territory. Availability of dependable supplies of electric power, and the price thereof, are, in the absence of most unusual conditions, among the prime determinative factors considered in the location of industrial plants. In the Southern Governors' cases the State of New York and its interests are opposing, to the extent of their ability, the contentions of the southern interests.

Under such conditions the South generally, and Louisiana in particular, would not only receive no advantage from the projected waterway and power project, but would be actively prejudiced thereby, and would be called upon to pay their proportion of the construction and operating costs of the project, and possibly the deficits arising therefrom, while their own natural resources, fuels, minerals, and others, will continue to be transported to the pools of cheap power, and there consumed or processed, as the case may be.

In consideration of the foregoing, as well as other pertinent facts, which cannot be here set forth because of the limitations of space: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board and the director of the Department of Public Service of the State of Louisiana, in session at its offices in Baton Rouge on this March 10, 1941, That we do hereby express our unalterable opposition to participation by the United States in the proposed construction of the St. Lawrence River-Great Lakes navigation and power project; and we respectfully urge upon the Members of the Congress from the State of Louisiana that they oppose any and all legislation, of whatsoever character, having for its purpose the construction of said project; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be transmitted to all Members of the Congress of the United States from Louisiana.

I, Alex Grouchy, acting secretary of the Board of the Department of Public Service of the State of Louisiana, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution this day unanimously adopted by the Board and the Director of the Department of Public Service of the State of Louisiana.

In faith whereof, I have hereunto officially signed my name and affixed the seal of the Department of Public Service of the State of Louisiana at Baton Rouge, La., this March 10, 1941.

[SEAL] ALEX GROUCHY,
Acting Secretary of the Board of the Department of Public Service of the State of Louisiana.

Reapportionment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

RESOLUTION BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF IOWA

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a resolution adopted by the Forty-ninth General Assembly of Iowa, petitioning Congress to call a convention to consider amending the Constitution so that "Representatives in Congress shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of citizens in each State."

The resolution follows:

House Concurrent Resolution No. 19

Whereas section 2 of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides that Representatives in Congress shall be determined by counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed; and

Whereas the apportionment of Representatives on this basis works a hardship on certain sections of the United States; and

Whereas certain other sections of the country have large numbers of persons who are not citizens of the United States; and

Whereas Congress shall, upon application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, call a convention to consider amendments to the Constitution of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of Iowa, duly assembled in Des Moines, Iowa, respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States and that said convention, when so called, shall consider amending the first sentence of section 2 of the fourteenth amendment so that the same shall read as follows: "Representatives in Congress shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of citizens in each State"; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each United States Senator and Representative from the State of Iowa, to the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Governors of the 47 States, and to the President of the United States.

I hereby certify that House Concurrent Resolution No. 19 was adopted by the Forty-ninth General Assembly of Iowa. Done at Des Moines, Iowa, this 15th day of March 1941.

A. C. GUSTAFSON,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives, Forty-ninth General Assembly, State of Iowa.

A. A. A. Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, quite recently I have received a number of letters from people who are engaged in farming, in my congressional district, in which they have advised me that in some of the counties the A. A. A. Board which is now endeavoring to secure signers for the 1941 contracts is resorting to threats and unreliable propaganda in an effort to secure the farmers' signatures to such contracts. It has been my very definite understanding that the matter of signing such contracts for allotments was to be a matter which was left to the discretion of each farmer, and that in the event he desired to sign the same he would do it

of his own volition, and that the Board would have no power or authority to attempt to force our farmers to sign such contracts against their own free will and accord.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is a very sad commentary which we face when the local A. A. A. Boards in their anxiety to secure a large number of signers to such contracts will resort to threats and trickery upon our farmers in an effort to secure such signatures. This is one matter which is left entirely to the discretion of each farmer, and he has the perfect right to either sign or reject such proffered contract. Those A. A. A. Boards which resort to threats and trickery upon our farmers in an effort to secure their signatures to such contracts are violating both the letter and the spirit of the law, and those who would engage in such ulterior practices in order to attempt to force our farmers to sign such contracts for 1941 should be replaced very promptly. The people of our country have but little freedom remaining, and our farmers still have the right to determine for themselves whether they desire to sign the Government contracts, or whether they desire to farm their own farms in the manner they may determine. These Boards which attempt to "high pressure" our farmers into signing such contracts, by resorting to threats, unreliable propaganda and trickery should be promptly removed; there is no place for such practices among the good people of our country today.

Mr Speaker, in extending my own remarks on this subject, I ask unanimous consent to include therein a letter which I have just received from one of the good farmers in my congressional district, which is pertinent upon this subject. I hope every Member of the House will read this timely letter, which follows:

ST. PAUL, IND., *March 16, 1941.*

Hon. RAYMOND SPRINGER.

I just wanted to call your attention to the threats and un-American propaganda the Decatur County A. A. A. Board is putting out to get farmers to sign the 1941 contract.

They are getting signers through threats of penalties on overproduction of wheat and corn.

This board is one-sided politically and unreasonable.

Some of the farmers can sign and get along all right, but others don't have the base and just can't afford to.

We want this kept voluntary.

Back President, Says Farnum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

ARTICLE BY GEORGE R. FARNUM, FORMER ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George R. Farnum, of Boston, former Assistant Attorney General of the United States, which was published in the Boston Traveler of March 8, 1941:

[From the Boston Traveler of March 8, 1941]

BACK PRESIDENT, SAYS FARNUM—LEASE-LEND CONTROVERSY SEEN PARALYZING NATIONAL ACTION

(By George R. Farnum, Boston lawyer and former Assistant Attorney General of the United States)

Regardless of their personal opinions and political affiliations, most people want to see our Government steered through the present hurricane by a captain who is strengthened by the knowledge that he has the confidence and can depend upon the cooperation of his crew. They know in their hearts that this is not the hour to dangerously rock the boat by personal animosities, political bigotry, or violent partisanship. They cherish, of course, their right to censure by their votes and criticize by their speech their public officials. They know that the full and free exercise of this privilege is one of the best guaranties that democracy possesses. They see that where it is lost freedom is undermined and autocracy ultimately prevails. The President of the United States enjoys no immunity from the judgment of his fellow citizens. "The king can do no wrong" is not a part of the American tradition.

There is a type of criticism, however, which defeats its own purpose by its intemperance. It is a thoroughly bad state of affairs when, in the discussion of public questions, people cease to think for themselves, throw all restraint to the winds, and permit reason to abdicate to passion. Things have come to a deplorable pass when dissatisfaction with Presidential policies and methods is accompanied by contempt and hatred for the man who for the time being is the voters' choice as Chief Executive of the Nation. It is difficult for most people to respect an office if they despise the incumbent. If the Presidency of the United States falls into disrespect, it is but a short step to distrust in democracy itself.

The agitation over the lend-lease bill in Congress, in the press, over the air, and in private discussion has been characterized by a controversial violence and personal bitterness that is not conducive to clear and honest thinking, and is certainly not promoting our national unity and consolidating American opinion at the very crisis of one of the really momentous periods in modern history. If there ever was a time since the Civil War when the administration, in its aim to render America the impregnable citadel of democracy at home and the hope of democracy abroad, deserves the support of all loyal Americans, whether private citizens or public servants that time is right now.

In the Old World civilization is disintegrating at a frightful rate. The work of centuries is being ruthlessly destroyed. The ideals for which men have toiled and sacrificed for countless generations have been betrayed and repudiated. Might, exultant and brutal, has replaced right as the law of existence. America and her way of life are anathema to those madmen who have brought down the terrible calamity on the world. Their advance guards, their propagandists and spies, have long since penetrated our defenses. It is fatuous and suicidal at this fateful time to encourage these implacable enemies of democracy in the belief that our councils are divided, our purposes unsettled, and our public opinion vacillating on the vital issues of the hour. It is supreme folly to give them any impression that our President lacks the respect and trust of the American people and that, having paid him the unprecedented honor of a third term, they are not wholeheartedly behind him in his foreign policies. To deliberately stir up public resentment against him, to try to shake public confidence in his motives and judgment, or to paralyze vigorous national action at this crucial hour by filibuster or otherwise, as some of our Senators and other politicians are doing, is in effect, to betray democracy and play directly into the hands of Hitler and his allies.

Our problem today is to maintain unimpaired all our rights of free speech and corrective action, but at the same time to exercise them so as not to poison the spirit and undermine the morale of the people at large, weaken the hand of the administration when it should be steady in purpose and strong in action, and not lend "aid and comfort" to those who detest us as a people, despise our ideals, and plot our ruin. We will not surrender our constitutional privileges as free people. It is quite another thing, however, to voluntarily impose upon ourselves some rational restraint in their exercise in times of grave public danger.

Wendell Willkie, whose patriotism, statesmanship, and good sense no one can seriously impugn, has set a worthy example to his fellow Republicans as well as to the country at large. The growth of his popularity since the election, as shown by the recent Gallup poll, proves that the people realize this fact, however he may be regarded by some of our politicians.

Fiftieth Anniversary of the Norwich Sun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NORWICH (N. Y.) SUN

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Norwich (N. Y.) Sun of March 17, 1941:

[From the Norwich (N. Y.) Sun of March 17, 1941]

OUR FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY

Just 50 years ago, or to be exact, on Monday, March 16, 1891, the first copy of the Morning Sun rolled off the press, to the great delight, evidently, of its then editor, Reed Campbell, the entire staff, and to residents of the community which it served. So today we are celebrating our golden anniversary in a very conservative manner and reminding our 15,000 readers that we are still going strong and that there is every reason to believe that the Norwich Sun will continue to thrive and to serve Norwich, Chenango County, and this entire area as faithfully during the next half century as it has during the past.

The first issue of the Morning Sun was of 6 pages, 7 columns in width. A news item of the issue of the second day stated that there were 17 columns of display advertising in the first issue, and that, of course, was interesting, even thrilling, to Editor Campbell and the new owners of this youngest daily newspaper. At the head of the editorial columns there was no indication as to who owned the newspaper, neither was there any indication as to its staff. Today the Federal statutes provide for the publication of newspaper ownership, and for the naming of its officials. This statute was

enacted so that financial and other responsibility might be established.

However, the following announcement appeared in the editorial column on page 2: "The Morning Sun will be issued every day except Sundays. It will be thoroughly independent, and especially so as regards politics and religion. It will publish the news from day to day in a truthful and concise manner and in every way try to advocate such needed reforms as will be of lasting benefit to every man, woman, and child in the beautiful village of Norwich. The office has been thoroughly equipped with new and modern presses, type, and everything necessary to make a first-class newspaper. The paper will be under efficient business management and the editorial writers will devote their entire time in making the Morning Sun a bright, interesting, and readable newspaper."

After a period of 50 years has elapsed, we would say that the policies as laid down by the management in the year 1891 were most commendable, and if today, a half century later, we can "follow up" we shall be happy and entirely satisfied. In the second issue of the Morning Sun there were compliments from probably 50 of the prominent citizens of Norwich, each of whom in a short terse sentence expressed themselves on the advent of a daily newspaper in the village of Norwich. The first of the testimonials was from the late Judge George W. Ray, who said: "The paper is very good, indeed." The only resident of Norwich now living, who at that time said a good word by way of commendation was J. Bennett Turner, who with Mrs. Turner, is vacationing in Florida this winter, and he expressed himself as follows: "The paper is all right and a credit to the town."

The Morning Sun continued under the management of Reed Campbell until his death in 1903, when it was transferred to the Norwich Publishing Co. under the management of William H. Clark. At that time the Chenango Telegraph, owned by Mrs. C. E. Merritt, was transferred to the same organization. That management has continued to the present time under its original president or by his heirs and associates down to this very day. Under the new management the name was changed to the Norwich Sun, and it became an evening newspaper. The Chenango Telegraph was changed from a weekly newspaper, established in 1829, to a semiweekly newspaper, and this publication has been issued on Tuesdays and Fridays since the two newspapers began their publication from the same office in 1903. The Morning Sun was first published in a one-story building still standing and in use on Mechanic Street, just off North Broad.

Today the Norwich Sun has a circulation of approximately 3,500, while the Chenango Telegraph has more than 1,000 on its lists. The plant has been greatly enlarged, and it is equipped with the most modern typesetting machines and other equipment obtainable. The management endeavors to give the best possible service to readers and to advertisers. While it is not the largest newspaper and job-printing plant in central New York, it is one of the most completely equipped. We appreciate the confidence which our readers place in us for the integrity of the news which goes out every day in the columns of the Norwich Sun. Patrons and subscribers who get our newspaper every day have learned to like it, and it has become a household word in practically every home in Norwich as well as in hundreds of other homes within a radius of 40 miles. We trust this reader-confidence will continue, and all may rest assured that we shall continue our efforts to make the Norwich Sun not only one of the brightest and best newspapers in the State of New York but the very best in any city the size of Norwich or in any county with a population comparable to Chenango.

The Wealth Escaping Taxation Is More Than That Upon Which Taxes Are Paid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago, I called attention to the fact that the Committee on Ways and Means, of the House, when it conducts hearings on the new tax bill, should give consideration to taxing intangible wealth.

A large number of people in our country own a tremendous part of the wealth of the Nation and pay no taxes whatsoever.

The individual States have endeavored to tax intangible property, but have encountered obstacles that could not be overcome. These obstacles will not confront the Federal Government in its efforts to tax such wealth.

I asked Mr. Colin F. Stam, chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation of Congress, to give me information as to the value of the intangible and tangible property in the United States.

Under date of March 11, 1941, he replied to me as follows:

It is very difficult to obtain a figure as to the amount of intangible property in the United States. However, from such a preliminary investigation as I have been able to make, it appears that a conservative figure would be around $250,000,000,000.

In regard to the tangible property upon which taxes are customarily paid to the States or local governments, a figure around $50,000,000,000 would appear to be approximately correct.

It will be noticed that the intangible property in the Nation upon which there is practically no taxes at all paid is five times as much as the tangible property upon which taxes are customarily paid to the States and local governments.

It is true that one pays income taxes, if subject thereto, on the income from intangible property. It should be remembered that tangible property pays both a capital levy and income.

Mr. Stam was requested to furnish me a break-down of the intangible property in the United States, and his reply is as follows and is self-explanatory:

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: In accordance with your request, I am submitting herewith a break-down of the intangible property in the United States. As you will note from the attached table, the figure we gave you the other day did not include bank deposits or cash or take into account any increase in Federal bonds since June 30 of last year. If these items are taken into account, it appears that the total figure can be safely estimated to be around $300,000,000,000.

Sincerely yours,

COLIN F. STAM,
Chief of Staff.

Intangible property in the United States

[In billions of dollars]

Stocks	96.8
Bonds and long-term obligations, and short-term obligations held by private interests; farm and urban mortgates owed by individuals	98.4
Privately held public securities (as of June 30, 1940)	54.8
Total intangible property	250.0

This estimate is very conservative. It does not take into account bank deposits or cash. Moreover, the Federal bonds have increased considerably since June 30 of last year.

Since deposits in commercial banks (eliminating interbank deposits, governmental deposits, and deposits of business concerns) are approximately $32,000,000,000, it can safely be estimated that the total figure after taking into account these items will be around $300,000,000,000.

The date submitted has been collected from various sources, including the Treasury Department, Commerce Department, National Resources Committee, Securities and Exchange Commission, Report from Twentieth Century Fund, and the Federal Reserve Board.

From this information we learn that six times as much property as we ordinarily and customarily pay taxes on in this country goes untaxed by the individual States because of their inability to properly reach this intangible wealth.

This information is submitted in the hope that the Committee on Ways and Means will give it consideration.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

RESOLUTION BY THE DETROIT-GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY COMMITTEE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

RESOLUTION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES FROM DETROIT GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY THE HONORABLE EDWARD J. JEFFRIES, JR., MAYOR OF THE CITY OF DETROIT

Whereas a bottleneck of approximately 48 miles in the St. Lawrence River deprives the people of the United States of vital production and transportation facilities in the Great Lakes area; and

Whereas the deepening of the St. Lawrence Channel as advocated by President Roosevelt will enable us to make our full contribution to the present needs of our Nation and to participate in the post-war program of world rehabilitation and stabilization; and

Whereas our national defense requires full utilization of the potentialities of our 21 active shipyards on the Great Lakes; and

Whereas the deepening of the St. Lawrence Channel could be completed in time to aid

the present defense program, and reliable investigations reveal that the proposed deepened channel could permit passage of all ships except battleships and aircraft carriers; and

Whereas engineering surveys made by our Government have approved the feasibility of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project and forecast a benefit to the entire Nation; and

Whereas the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River provide an unparalleled natural highway of over 2,350 miles from the heart of our Nation to the Atlantic Ocean; and

Whereas a deep waterway from our great inland industrial, mineral, and agricultural region is vital to our Nation and a bulwark of strength to our defense; and

Whereas the people of Michigan and the States adjacent to the Great Lakes possess a natural right to transport their industrial products, agricultural and mining commodities to the markets of America and the world in the most economical manner; and

Whereas the midwestern section of our Nation, which is a part of the Great Lakes region, produces more agricultural commodities and has more industrial production than any other section of the country; and

Whereas the Detroit industrial area and the State of Michigan are a part of the great midwestern section of our country in which 40,000,000 people live; and

Whereas the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project is not only a defense measure but also a means of bringing a new era to the country's most important agricultural and industrial region: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Detroit Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway Committee, appointed by Edward J. Jeffries, Jr., mayor of Detroit, pursuant to request of the common council, That we do formally and respectfully request the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation enabling the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project by removing existing barriers; and be it further

Resolved, That a formally attested copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States of America, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Senators and Representatives in our National Congress, and to the mayors of our important sister cities throughout the United States.

Respectfully submitted.

DETROIT GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY COMMITTEE,
W. C. COWLING, *Chairman.*

Approved for city of Detroit:
EDWARD J. JEFFRIES, Jr., *Mayor.*

Adopted March 10, 1941.

Congratulating General Hines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NATIONAL TRIBUNE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Frank T. Hines has a very outstanding record as an administrator of one of the largest and most important departments in our national Government; a department that has more difficulties connected with its enforcement than any other department. General Hines, by reason of his native ability, education, training, and unusual poise and discretion, has been able to accomplish what probably no other person has accomplished in our national life. It is not known to the public generally, but nevertheless true, General Hines' life has been jeopardized upon many occasions because of his sincere and honest desire to do complete justice to everyone, safeguarding the rights of the Government and making sure that every veteran and others entitled to benefits under his administration receive them. General Hines has been guarded, but notwithstanding these efficient guards, mentally deranged veterans who unjustly harbored the thought that General Hines had treated them unfairly, have succeeded in reaching him for the purpose of doing him bodily injury, and upon one occasion in his office here in Washington, D. C., he was severely assaulted by a veteran armed with a deadly weapon; the wounds received in this assault will be with him as long as he lives. Very few people know or realize what General Hines has suffered in order to make the excellent record that he can now point to with pride.

The National Tribune, in the Thursday, March 13, 1941, issue carries a very commendable editorial, congratulating General Hines on his eighteenth anniversary of entrance into the service of the Government.

The editorial is as follows:

[From the National Tribune of March 13, 1941]

CONGRATULATIONS, GENERAL HINES

March 2 marked the eighteenth anniversary of Gen. Frank T. Hines' entrance into the civil branch of the Government as Director of the Veterans' Bureau. He was called to this post of duty by President Harding, who then needed a strong man as head of this important agency. The fine work of the general since succeeding to the directorship of veterans' care testifies to the excellent judgment exercised by President Harding.

The Veterans' Bureau then dealt solely with World War beneficiaries, but in 1930 the Pension Bureau and the homes for Volunteer soldiers and sailors were placed under General Hines' control and the Veterans' Administration was established. The general became Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and, under this set-up, he administers the laws affecting the beneficiaries of all wars.

At the time of the consolidation it was necessary that General Hines receive a new appointment as Veterans' Administrator. This is the only time in his 18 years of service that action was required to affirm his original appointment.

General Hines has served under four Presidents—Warren G. Harding, Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. Since 1923 he has been on the job, and a difficult job it has been. In those 18 years he has earned the respect of his superiors in the Government, of Senators and Representatives in Congress, and, best of all, of the veterans and their dependents who are beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration.

General Hines brought to his task a sympathetic understanding of veterans because he is one himself. He started his military career in the Philippines with the famous Utah Battery. He elected to remain in the Army and rose to be a brigadier general. In the World War he served as embarkation officer at Hoboken, N. J., and was responsible for transporting thousands of troops to Europe. Following the war he resigned from the Army to become head of a shipping company and remained in that position until called upon to assume his duties with the Veterans' Bureau.

During his long tenure of office, General Hines has seen many new hospitals for veterans constructed, as well as numerous additions to existing facilities. He now heads 91 hospitals and homes in all parts of the country, at the same time administering the disbursement of many millions of dollars to disabled veterans and their dependents. Since he took over, he has spent some five billions of dollars, yet there has never been a breath of scandal connected with his office.

In addition to those jobs, General Hines must make important decisions concerning the application of highly technical laws, particularly those affecting World War veterans. In this capacity he has shown the happy faculty of dealing as liberally as he believed possible in keeping with the intent of Congress. Some of his decisions, naturally, have caused adverse criticism, but, by and large, the justice of his opinions has proved highly satisfactory.

When called upon by committees of Congress to advise with them regarding proposed legislation, General Hines has not taken it upon himself to offer gratuitous criticism. Rather he has given them the benefit of his administrative experience and expressed the views of the executive branch of the Government.

It has been said that General Hines' job is a thankless one, and in a way it is. There are many veterans who are firmly convinced that they are entitled to aid from the Government which is denied them. Perhaps they are, but General Hines does not make the laws; his task is to administer them to the best of his ability. He has been blamed for many things in the 18 years he has been in office, but he always comes up smiling. It is because he realizes, we assume, that he has dealt honestly and justly with all who sought his aid.

Few men have held as important a position in the Government for the length of time General Hines has. It is only natural that a person in such a position would be wide open to criticism from many sources. There have been some questions raised from time to time about the administration of some of the veteran's laws, but, because of his frankness, his desire to be just, and his honesty of purpose, General Hines has always been prepared to make such corrections as were within his power, and he has done so.

Too frequently we are wont to criticize. Praiseworthy administration at times has not been fairly appraised. As he starts on his nineteenth year in high public office, the National Tribune wishes to join with others of his many friends in congratulating General Hines on his fine record. We want to assume the privilege of expressing to him our appreciation of the manner in which he has accomplished a huge task. He has a splendid record, for which he deserves the highest commendation. In wishing him well as he continues his administration, we bespeak not only our own views but also the views of an overwhelming majority of veterans and their dependents.

Importance of Industry in Times of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and to include therein certain letters, I now sub-

mit for the RECORD the correspondence to which I referred:

AUGUST 12, 1936.

Mr. R. E. FLANDERS,
President, Jones & Lamsen Machine Co., Springfield, Vt.

DEAR MR. FLANDERS: Do you think that business has received the "breathing spell" that President Roosevelt has promised for some time?

How do businessmen look upon the New Deal administration and its policies? Do you think that Mr. Roosevelt should be reelected?

Sincerely,

JOSEPH LEIB.

JONES & LAMSON MACHINE CO.,
Springfield, Vt., August 25, 1936.

Mr. JOSEPH LEIB,
President, the First Roosevelt for President Club, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to yours of August 12, will say that while I have endeavored to support all the policies of the New Deal that seemed to me to be constructive, it has been increasingly difficult to do so.

In particular, medium- and small-size business has received a thrust in its vitals instead of the "breathing spell" promised by the President. The new tax bill, with its special tax on undistributed profits, prevents the growth of small companies and does worse than that. In our case, and in that of many companies similarly situated who exhausted their reserves and borrowed at the bank for maintaining employment during the depression, it taxes the funds used in paying back the borrowing, it taxes the funds used in expanded working capital for expanding operations and increasing employment, and makes it practically impossible either to pay dividends or lay aside reserves to meet future conditions of unemployment.

I can only conclude that there is no such thing as a "breathing spell" so long as Mr. Roosevelt is President.

Yours very truly,

R. E. FLANDERS.

FEBRUARY 19, 1941.

Mr. RALPH E. FLANDERS,
President, Jones & Lamson Machine Co., Springfield, Vt.

DEAR MR. FLANDERS: I was just going through my files and noticed your interesting letter of August 25, 1936, which ends as follows:

"I can only conclude that there is no such thing as a 'breathing spell,' so long as Mr. Roosevelt is President."

In view of this, I was wondering how a businessman looks upon the present situation in the political and business world.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH LEIB.

JONES & LAMSON MACHINE CO.,
Springfield, Vt., February 24, 1941.

Mr. JOSEPH LEIB,
National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LEIB: I have your letter of the 19th, to which I am glad to reply.

It strikes me that the importance of industry and the importance of increasing the production of industry has been more clearly seen as a war measure than it has as a peace measure. And, since we are now at war, much of the misunderstanding of the peacetime situation no longer holds.

I am not saying more than this publicly or privately because I am at the present time a part of the administration as Administrator in the Machines and Tools Group of the Priorities Division of the O. P. M.

Yours very truly,

RALPH E. FLANDERS.

Mr. Speaker, from the War Department records I learn that this concern has been given something near $467,000 of war orders. I bring this matter to the attention of our people in the hope that our business leaders will not get the thought fixed in their minds that industry is more important in times of war than in times of peace. It appears to me that this gentleman is in error in making his observation contained in his letter of February 24, 1941. I think it can be generally stated that the absence of industry in times of peace ultimately leads to social upheavals and that often these bad conditions based on the absence of industrial activity, employment, production and distribution of consumers' goods, greatly contributes to war.

Let us hope that none of our people will become too greatly influenced by war activities, and to the extent that they will acquire such a vested interest in war that they will be unwilling to return to the activities of peace, peacetime production, and all the blessings which peace can bring to our people and the other nationals of the world.

Vested interests often lead to much trouble and many times to great suffering of the general public. War tends to feed on war but after all, Mr. Speaker, if we correctly read the pages of history we find that war never pays dividends in the long run for anyone.

Tribute to Hon. Pius L. Schwert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, as a colleague of the late PIUS L. SCHWERT, of New York's Forty-second Congressional District, I was profoundly shocked by his untimely death on March 11.

During the time he served in the House I came to regard "Pi" as my personal friend. He was affable, generous, and considerate. In hundreds of little ways he found opportunities to pay daily kindnesses to those of us who worked with him. He had the cheery greeting and the ready smile that go so far to lighten the burdens we share, particularly in these strenuous days.

PIUS SCHWERT was another victim of overwork in this House. He worked with great seriousness and with unflagging devotion to his district and to his country. Elected to the House in 1938 to hold the seat vacated by the Honorable JAMES M. MEAD, who became at the same time the junior Senator from New York, he inherited many active tasks. He proved an eminently worthy successor to JIM MEAD. He overtaxed himself, however, and over a year ago felt the first warnings of physical fatigue. An outstanding athlete all his life and still a young man in his forties, he heeded the warning that his heart needed a rest. He took scrupulous care of himself for many months and returned to his desk in what he felt was perfect health. But the ordeal of last autumn's election campaign plus the heavy legislative duties since January sapped that precious reserve of vitality which he had so carefully built up with months of conscientious self-discipline.

The exemplary public career of PIUS SCHWERT was cut short with a swiftness that was tragic to us all. Many of us talked with him on his last day of service in this body. His last official act was to cast his vote for the lend-lease bill. He appeared in jovial spirits and gave no hint that he was in anything but the best of health. A few hours later, after delivering a brief and witty talk to a party of friends, he collapsed. A few moments later he died in the arms of his best political and personal friend, Senator MEAD.

Although my district in Oklahoma is far from the Forty-second District of New York, I have been told many times of the countless friends who were loyal to PIUS SCHWERT. An indication of this may be learned from the fact that upon his second bid for membership in this body his constituents returned him to Congress by a vote that was approximately three times that of his first election. He won friends easily, and he kept them permanently by reason of his tolerance and fairness and industry.

PIUS SCHWERT lived a full life of accomplishment. An officer in the Navy, a big-league baseball player, a storekeeper, a banker, a Member of Congress, and, above all, a devoted husband and friend, he achieved much in his 48 youthful years of life.

I pay tribute to the memory of my popular and beloved colleague. I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Schwert and to the legion of friends who mourn their loss in his passing. The House has lost an able Member. The Nation has lost a public servant of the finest quality.

Program of Machinists' Union To Eliminate Strikes on Defense Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following statement of action by the executive council of the International Association of Machinists speaks for itself, and I am pleased to include it with my remarks herewith:

The executive council of the International Association of Machinists assembled at Washington, D. C., for its biannual session on March 12 adopted a three-point program to eliminate strikes of its members on national-defense projects or in plants doing national-defense work.

The plan provides that whenever a controversy arises in a plant, on a project, or a job which affects the national-defense program that cannot be settled in conference between the representatives of the employer

and the employees, the following procedure shall be followed:

1. Mediation shall be invoked by calling upon the United States Bureau of Conciliation to attempt a settlement.

2. If the Conciliation Bureau, after being given a fair opportunity, does not succeed in adjusting the differences, the Director General of the Office of Production Management will be asked to intervene for the purpose of effecting a settlement.

3. Should the efforts of the Director General of the Office of Production Management also fail to bring about a settlement that is mutually acceptable, the union will agree to submit the issues in the controversy to arbitration. The only limitations placed on the offer to arbitrate are in controversies where the issues involve encroachments on the work jurisdiction of the International Association of Machinists or compromise the rights of workers set forth in the National Labor Relations Act; and in cases where the employer takes advantage of the time delay to practice intimidation and coercion on his employees in an effort to weaken or destroy the union in his plant.

The full text of the resolution adopted by the machinists, in which the three-point program for the elimination of strikes on defense work is set forth, follows:

Whereas for many years it has been the policy of the International Association of Machinists not to resort to strikes until all peaceful means for settling differences with management have been exhausted and an opportunity given to the Bureau of Conciliation, United States Department of Labor, to settle the dispute: Therefore be it

Resolved, That during the present national-defense program it is the position of the International Association of Machinists whenever members of the association are employed in plants or on jobs in which national-defense contracts are involved, any differences arising with management which cannot be settled by direct conference shall be treated as follows:

The Bureau of Conciliation, United States Department of Labor, shall be called upon to mediate such differences. If mediation does not effect an early settlement, the Director General, Office of Production Management, shall be requested to intervene at the earliest possible date to the end that there may be a settlement mutually acceptable. If no settlement by such means can be effected, and if the grievance involves issues other than work jurisdiction or workers' rights as set forth in the National Labor Relations Act, the grievance shall be arbitrated, provided the employer is sincerely cooperating to effect a settlement and is not resorting to coercion or intimidation in an effort to weaken or destroy unionism in his plant.

Strikes and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

EDITORIAL APPEARING IN IL PROGRESSO ITALO-AMERICANO AND IN THE CORRIERE D'AMERICA

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Il Progresso Italo-Americano and in the Corriere D'America on March 16, 1941.

STRIKES AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Since the institution of compulsory military service, the young men of America are gradually filling the military training camps. These young men form the nucleus of that powerful United States Army which will constitute the strongest guaranty of our homes, our families, and our goods. These young men, the flower of every race in the great American melting pot, have answered and continue to answer the country's call in the highest patriotic spirit. But the country has a twofold duty toward its armed forces. The first is that it must not disturb the sentiments of unity and harmony which stir these young conscripts, with manifestations of partisan differences or racial discriminations which are absolutely unjustified because there are no Americans more American than others and no one has the right to assume he is more patriotic than another.

Every subtle inquiry concerning national origins, every equivocal reference to what is happening on the other side of the Atlantic or Pacific, every ancient or recent prejudice against one class or another of native or naturalized citizens is detrimental to national solidarity. It is a speculation of the real enemies of America's united front; it is treason which must be denounced and severely punished without pity.

The other sacred obligation that we have toward the young men upon whom devolves the supreme duty of the Nation's defense is to equip them in the best possible manner and in the shortest possible time. They not only await the best armaments and abundant supplies, but also the most complete personal equipment in time of peace as well as in time of war.

The Government and Congress have not placed any limit on expenditures. Everywhere, in plants specializing in military production, constructive work is being speeded up. But, unfortunately, here and there strikes slow up production.

We are among those who have always favored labor's gains, who hold these gains sacred, and who recognize the right of labor to better its conditions still further, within possible limits. But in times of emergency and in the field of labor destined for the fastest production of the means of national defense we must be prepared for some sort of compromise which shall avoid a repetition of these strikes which are no longer popular.

Everyone must have learned with satisfaction that President Roosevelt is contemplating the creation of a Federal board of mediation supporting the work of the Office of Production Management, thus assuring it the continuity of work in every arsenal even should differences between the workers and the industrialists arise.

There was a special Labor Board during the World War. A new one must be created which shall still more effectively respond to the needs of the new situation.

We are confident that the President will organize this new Board so as to satisfy both the unions and the employers, without the need of coercive laws which would nullify existing labor legislation.

An enormous responsibility falls not only upon the Government and Congress but on the employers and the workers in the gigantic arsenal of American war production, which must be in perfect working order and must cooperate in reaching this goal. The people of the United States, the soldiers, sailors, and aviators of Uncle Sam await the undelayable realization of this duty of supreme national discipline.

GENEROSO POPE.

What Are Our War Aims?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday night the President called on Americans for an all-out effort until a total victory has been won against the Axis Powers. This national program will involve sacrifices on the part of every person, he stated, to preserve "liberties and fundamental rights," to which he pledged every national resource.

There is little doubt that the Chief Executive, under the provisions of the lend-lease bill, will receive wholehearted support, although there is little to indicate what objectives this country may have in mind following a military victory. And what is Great Britain fighting for? Both the President and Prime Minister Churchill have declared that the object is to crush Hitlerism. But that still doesn't answer the question in the minds of Americans.

The Washington Times-Herald recently called attention to this situation in the following editorial pointing out that there are a number of possible war aims:

WHAT ARE OUR WAR AIMS?

When H. R. 1776 was passed by the American people's duly elected Congress and signed by the people's duly thrice-elected President, the people committed themselves to a policy of giving Great Britain all necessary help within our power for the winning of Britain's war against Germany.

We don't see any logical course for Americans in general to take except to stand by the President as he uses the practically dictatorial war powers our elected Congress has thus given him. In fact, with the enactment of H. R. 1776 we have no choice about it.

But the question remains: What is Great Britain fighting to accomplish? What are we helping Great Britain fight to accomplish?

Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt have said, in slightly different language, that the object is to beat Hitler and Hitlerism. But that still doesn't answer the question. How much of a beating are we to try to give Hitler and Hitlerism?

POSSIBLE WAR AIMS

There are a number of possible war aims for Great Britain, the United States, and such other nations as may join with them:

(1) The fight might be only to save the United Kingdom itself from invasion; it might be agreed that peace offers would be made and accepted as soon as Hitler showed himself to be convinced he never could successfully invade England. Perhaps only our Navy and air force would be needed for this.

(2) The object might be only to preserve the British Empire intact against the threats of Germany, Japan, and Italy to take choice pieces out of it. Perhaps only our Navy and air force would be needed.

(3) Or the aim might be to consolidate Britain's recent and prospective seizures from

Mussolini of all the Italian colonies in Africa as new parts of the British Empire. Perhaps only our Navy and air force would be needed.

(4) The objective might be to bring matters to a point, by British fighting and a flood of American supplies, where Hitler would be willing to call hostilities off and talk peace on terms of mutual advantage—a peace without victory. Perhaps only our Navy and air force would be needed.

(5) Or Britain may be expecting to fight until it can restore full sovereignty and independence to Holland, Belgium, Denmark, Norway, and occupied France, and/or Poland. Our Army as well as our Navy and air force would be needed for this.

(6) There is a growing school of thought, both in this country and Britain, which believes Germany should be taken apart and split into small countries, to remove it as a menace to mankind. We don't believe you can lick Germany without fighting; and this would take a lot of fighting—our Navy, our air force, and an A. E. F., much bigger than last time, to invade Europe.

(7) Britain, talking much about the rights of small countries to survive, may even be planning to accomplish aims 5 and 6, and also to take eastern Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia away from Stalin and set them up in business again. Our Army, expanded to over 10,000,000 men, our Navy, and our air force would be needed.

LET US IN ON THE SECRET

Nobody in authority in England or America has yet stated which of these aims England is fighting for. We don't know.

All we know is that England is putting up a fierce fight in several parts of the globe and is making ready for an Armageddon at home if Hitler's men ever establish a bridgehead on an English shore. As to the terms of peace we want, we aren't informed.

Yet we have been asked to underwrite England's war efforts, whatever they are, and Congress and the President have most graciously consented to do so.

The more extensive the British war aims are, of course, the more it will cost us in money and men.

So far as we are informed, we are giving Britain a blank check to spend on any of the above war aims it may select. What, if any, are our own independent war aims?

The American Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY JOHN B. HUGHES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following portion of broadcast delivered by John B. Hughes, Thursday, January 30, 1941, over the Mutual Broadcasting System, originating station, KFRC, San Francisco:

Things were booming in this American scene back in the days of World War No. 1—the factories and machine shops—the steel works and the logging camps were running wide open—wages were up, and a man could find work to do. Things were good on the land, too. Maybe we didn't say so, but we were the arsenal of the Allies then—and the food basket of the world. In the Dakotas they talked about the wheat crop in 1915—in the South the cotton crops meant cash—in the Southwest the cattlemen smiled, watching the cattle fatten on the grasslands—in the Cornbelt the farmers watched their bank accounts grow, four figures, even five, sometimes six figures. "Whatever grows best and brings in the most cash is the crop for me"—that was the attitude then—"when the land gives out move on to new land." By the time we found there was no new land—by the time we realized we had sucked the land dry—by the time the markets fell out from under us and we'd learned the ache that can follow prodigality, a decade and more had passed—and the weather we couldn't control combined with the things we might have controlled to send half a million farm families rolling down our highways seeking work that couldn't be found—left countless others on the old land that bled the bank accounts, and then the mortgage money, and finally all the credit—leaving only the relief rolls to turn toward for help. Well, not the relief rolls alone, for the Farm Security Administration stepped in and tackled the job of rehabilitation, which not only included the need for stabilizing our agricultural system, but the need for making some basic changes in traditional American thinking.

Although the Farm Security Administration is concerned with meeting the emergency presented by migratory farm labor, its less spectacular but equally important concern has been to rehabilitate these families who have a piece of land—which they either own or lease, but which does not support them, and which has failed them to a point where the family is forced to seek relief.

In fact, not until the farm family is forced to seek relief does the Farm Security Administration start to function in its behalf. Then it functions in several ways on a basic plan which has been called live-at-home farming, or the farm-and-home plan. Before it agrees to help the farm family, the Farm Security Administration insists that the family forget its old philosophy of squeezing money out of the land with a single cash crop, and adopt a plan that contains three basic points. First, the plan calls for home production of most of the family's food supply and livestock feed. Second, it calls for the development of two or more farm enterprises that will produce goods for the market. And finally, for the adoption of methods that will build up soil fertility.

These three points are designed to guard against the chief causes of farm failure. They assure the farmer food for his family and his livestock, whether he has a cash income or not from other crops. By developing several cash crops he cuts down the risk of a poor market; by crop rotation and correct planting methods he protects the land that supports him. Its curious that some American farmers forgot what the world's farmers have long known, that the rotation of crops and the use of fertilizers are necessary to keep the land fertile and replenished.

Most American farmers need advice before they can work out the farm and home plan. The Farm Security Administration provides experts who help the farmer work out details—who give the farmers advice on how to make a small farm self-sufficient. The farm and home plan calls for no particular crops, but a variety of crops; it calls for no particular size farm, except that the farm should be large enough to produce a living for the family, and does not require much farm labor, in addition to that supplied by the family. The plan covers household operations, as well as those of the farm. Home economists teach the farm wife how to prepare balanced diets; how to garden, to sew, to make mattresses and clothing; how to put up fruits and jellies—all the household operations that will help make the farm and family as self-sufficient as possible—how to produce a maximum amount of the family's daily needs so that the family can work on a small margin and still have a standard of sufficiency.

Knowing how to be self-sufficient is enough to return hope and confidence to any family, but the farm and home plan goes even further. It requires the family to keep records of what it earns and spends; teaches them to analyze the cost of farm and household operations, to make a balance sheet on the efforts of each year, and through analysis to plan for the future, to stand on their own abilities and knowledge and determination, to regain their rightful place in our national economy.

There isn't time here to tell of all the ramifications of the farm-and-home plan—of its variations on a basic theme—of the way it spreads from family to family as they get together for mutual consideration of problems and the exchange of experience and information. There isn't time here to quote the figures that prove the plan a palpable force in raising the standard of living in family after family to the number of a million families helped in the last 5 years—and at such a little cost. In the cities relief is estimated to cost an average of $800 per family a year—in the rural areas relief costs $350 and upward per year per family. But rehabilitation—counting all losses on loans, the cost of supervision, and every other item of expense—costs only about $72 a year per family—and it is not relief—is self-liquidating to an estimated 90-percent return on all loans made to the small farmers working under the direction of the Farm Security Administration.

Surely here is our democracy in action—the justification of the faith we hold in the American way of life. In this way, and to this extent, we prove our responsibility has not been shirked—that we can and will deserve our heritage, preserve our right and pride, in our American scene.

Maj. A. N. Phillips

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LE ROY D. DOWNS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE STAMFORD (CONN.) ADVOCATE

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, under permission granted me, I wish to insert the following article from the Stamford Advocate of March 15, 1941, relating to former Congressman A. N. Phillips, of the Fourth District of Connecticut:

[From the Stamford (Conn.) Advocate of March 15, 1941]

PHILLIPS OFFERS SERVICE IN ARMY IN ANY CAPACITY—WIRES MAJOR GENERAL PAYNE OF FORTY-THIRD DIVISION OF HIS WILLINGNESS TO AID

Former Congressman A. N. Phillips, Jr., offered himself to the armed forces today in a telegram to Maj. Gen. Morris B. Payne of the Forty-third Division now at Fort Blanding, Fla.

Willing to do anything in the Army from kitchen police up or down, the former National Guard major said, he asked General Payne to advise him when and where to report.

Major Phillips enlisted twice before in the National Guard, the first time while a student at Yale in 1916, when the Yale Battery and the Stamford Battery of the National Guard trained in Pennsylvania for service on the Mexican border, then in 1917 for service in the World War.

OFFICER IN WORLD WAR

The Yale Battery did not get to the border, despite its protests in a signed declaration, but was sent back to New Haven. After enlisting for the World War, Private Phillips was sent to Plattsburg, N. Y., officers' training school and won a commission as a second lieutenant. He served with the A. E. F. in France

Later, he reorganized the National Guard in the southwestern section of Connecticut and won appointments that elevated him to the rank of senior major of the National Guard in the State. He served about 8 years and resigned because of the press of business.

While in the National Guard, he was a crack rifle shot, having been a member of the Third Battalion State championship rifle team.

His private affairs have been arranged, he said, today, and his physical condition is good, so that he is ready for service again.

Defense Aid Appropriation Bill, 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today this Nation is faced with a situation that can very quickly become even more serious from the standpoint of continued national peace and security than it is now. The precarious position in which we now find ourselves is in large measure due to the foreign policy that has been pursued by this Nation. As a result of this policy, we are placed irrevocably on the side of Britain. If Britain succeeds in holding off the Axis Powers, we can feel a degree of safety. If, however, Britain falls, then no one can foretell how long or to what extent we are safe. Faced with this situation, it seems both logical and sensible to support Britain as a means of protecting and making more certain and sure our own safety. On this basis the expenditure of $7,000,000,000 provided for in the appropriation bill, now before the House, is an expenditure for our own defense though part, or all of the defense material, is used on the British front or anywhere else where its use makes possible a victory for the democracies.

Whether we like it or not, the fact now is that the defense of Britain is our own defense. We may regret that such is the case. We may disagree with the foreign policy which has been pursued by the President and which has brought us to our present status, but the fact remains we are now in a position that demands that aid be extended to Britain and other democracies, if our own peace and security are to be strengthened. I wish that our foreign policy had been of a character that would have kept this Nation free and clear of any and all possible involvement, but it has not. Therefore, as I stated when presenting my views to the House when the lend-lease bill was before us for consideration, we are faced with a condition and not a theory. The question before us is not what should have been our foreign policy. Nothing worth while can be gained by a discussion of that subject at this time. The time has passed. The only question that is now appropriate is to consider what should or can be done now to help this Nation to strengthen our defense, prevent actual participation, keep the war away from our shores and our boys at home.

There is nothing that concerns our people more at this time than the fear that war may come to our shores, and that it will be necessary for our boys to become engaged in the war. The people of this Nation are unanimous in their support of any and all legislation that will prevent either of these conditions from happening. The question of cost does not enter the mind of the people. They are willing to expend billions in money to avoid it. That, in my opinion, was the reason there was such a display of national unity in support of the lease-lend bill, and of this present appropriation bill that is larger than any single appropriation bill to come before Congress. The people of this Nation want to avoid war; they want to keep it away from our shores and our boys at home. It seems they are willing to pay any price in dollars that will provide for us national security and peace.

The appropriation bill now under consideration by the House is offered as a means to help make effectual our defense and our peace. The purpose and intent in this respect was clearly and forcibly stated by the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, when he appeared before the Appropriations Committee of the House in support of the bill. He said:

Our safety and the success of the course upon which we have set ourselves demand the courage and the wisdom to go full out in furnishing adequate material aid to the nations whose defense is necessary to our defense. When we do this, we take the most effective step possible in the circumstances to keep war away from our hemisphere, from our own Nation. Doing this, we act in defense of our homes, our institutions, our liberties, our way of life.

Furthermore, it should be emphasized that the purpose of all this preparation for defense is not to create a situation that will necessitate the use of our boys in foreign war but to eliminate even the possibility of such a course. Time and again the President has given us his assurance that American boys will not be sent abroad to fight. In his address delivered at Philadelphia on October 23, 1940, the President said:

We are arming ourselves not for any purposes of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes. I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party: We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack.

Again, on December 29, 1940, in a fireside chat, the President gave similar assurance. He said:

There is no demand for sending an American expeditionary force outside our own borders. There is no intention by any member of your Government to send such a force. You can therefore nail any talk about sending armies to Europe as deliberate untruth.

What could be plainer or more explicit? How could a more definite promise to keep our boys at home be expressed? I have accepted this statement of intention by the President at its face value. I believe in such a policy 100 percent. If there is to be any change, it will not be upon my part.

The President, members of his Cabinet, and other high officers in the administration have made it clear that the lend-lease bill, and the pending appropriation bill in support of it, are defense measures, the purpose of which is to keep the war away from us and our boys at home. On this basis I give my wholehearted support. The objective is laudable and undoubtedly represents the desire of our people.

Veterans Demand Fair Treatment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

RESOLUTION OF ALLIED VETERANS' COUNCIL OF DEARBORN, MICH.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution from the Allied Veterans' Council of Dearborn, Mich.:

Whereas we the Allied Veterans' Council of the city of Dearborn, composed of the veterans and legionnaires of the Detroit metropolitan area, are in quorum assembled; and

Whereas it has come to the notice and attention of this body that a series of malicious and libelous, false and slanderous, fictitious and untrue statements have been published in a news magazine known as Friday and circulated in the Detroit area, about and concerning, and related to the Ford Motor Co., Mr. Henry Ford, Mr. Edsel Ford, Mr. Harry Bennett, Mr. William Cameron, and divers other persons associated with the said Ford Motor Co.; and

Whereas upon occasions too numerous to contain in this resolution, the said Ford Motor Co. and hereinbefore-named persons have kindly and gratuitously assisted our group both as an organization and as individuals, upon occasions when assistance from other sources was refused; and

Whereas the said Ford Motor Co. does, humanely and without consideration, now employ members of our group who are barred from employment in other places of industry

by reason of either old age or physical disability incurred, in many instances, while serving in the United States Army in France and in other wars of our country; and

Whereas the said magazine Friday, on page 6 of an issue dated January 31, 1941, does specifically and maliciously and libelously, state:

"Besides a network of spies, undercover men for all sorts of assignments and the common brand of factory stool pigeon, Bennett has carefully organized for Ford a private army of men who saw action in France during the World War—men capable and experienced in the use of machine guns, men needing no training.

"The technique of organizing this division was the same as the method of getting factory stool pigeons. I have testimony of veterans employed at Ford's right now. They are willing to take the witness stand before any governmental investigation body to tell of this private army estimated to number 5,000 men."

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the said Allied Veterans Council, of the metropolitan area of the city of Detroit, in quorum assembled, do hereby demand that the editors, publishers, and person or persons controlling the policy of the said magazine Friday, immediately, publicly, and in print as prominent as that which created these libels, fictions, misstatements, and falsehoods, retract and correct the said libels, fictions, and misstatements within a reasonable time after receiving notice of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to each of the United States Senators from the State of Michigan; the various Representatives of the State of Michigan in Congress; the Attorney General of the United States; the national commander of the American Legion; the national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; Mr. Henry Ford, Mr. Edsel Ford, Mr. Harry Bennett, Mr. W. J. Cameron, of the Ford Motor Co.; and the magazine Friday in which these statements appeared.

Made this 17th day of February, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and forty-one.

WM. BUSHAW,
Commander.
EARL O. SMITH,
Junior Past Commander.
ROBT. H. HYNETT,
Adjutant.
EARL O. SMITH,
Junior Vice Commander, Post No. 134, Veterans of Foreign Wars.
JESSE L. HILL,
Commander, Post 173, American Legion.
WALTER DUNN,
Commander, Post 364, American Legion.
LEO C. MARKEY,
Commander, Post 1494, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

A Tribute to the Brave Spartans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, on a hillock above the narrow pass of Thermopylae, stands in heroic size a marble lion—fit emblem of intrepid courage—and at its base is found the inscription:

Go tell the Spartan, thou that passeth by,
That here obedient to their laws we lie.

To this shrine of Spartan valor, the Spartan mother brings her son, and reading the message which the dead sends to the living, recounts the story of Leonidas, the young king, and his Spartan band who gave up their lives in order that their country's liberty might live.

This same sentiment, ancient to Greece but ever new, still survives and continues to live. Twenty-three centuries have not extinguished their right of liberty and freedom of speech, and the privilege to participate in the kind of government that shall control their people.

Let us this day pause and rejoice with the subjugated nations and peoples of Europe, that the ancient cradle of democracy is again showing to the people of the world how to achieve, how to hold, and how to acquire their liberties as upheld in arms by the founders of civilization itself.

So today, we in America are glad to pay our tribute of respect to the Grecian people for their bravery and courage in again holding high their torch of liberty and carrying it safely to victory, against the greatest enemies of free government that the world has ever known.

What America Expects of Today's Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN J. MAAS
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY ADMIRAL HAROLD R. STARK, CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Admiral Harold R. Stark, United States Navy Chief of Naval Operations, in honor of the ninety-fifth anniversary of charter day of Bucknell University, delivered over Mutual Broadcasting System network, on the subject What America Expects of Today's Youth:

President Marts and gentlemen of Bucknell College and your guests, I regret I could not have joined with you in your anniversary celebration in New York tonight, but I do consider it a great honor to be asked by you to speak on the theme you have chosen, namely, What America Expects of Today's Youth.

I have spent most of my life at sea working with young men drawn from the length and breadth of our land. For these young men the Navy demands the best in material that science, research, and mechanical ingenuity can devise, but the Navy realizes that even more important than material is the character of the youth who make up its fighting strength, where discipline, cheerful obedience, intelligence, sound bodies, and wholesome minds are essential to the individual and to the team play required.

Recent history gives merciless proof that any country which makes ready only for material defense is preparing itself for defeat. Hope of security also demands the upbuilding of national character into more heroic stature.

We talk much of our material production, of bottlenecks, strikes, etc. We have need also to check up on our spiritual progress—our national character.

The character of our youth is the bedrock upon which the country must build for the future. It will always constitute our first great line of defense.

If we are to depend on our youth to carry on and maintain those things which are dear to us we must give them an ideal.

Youth is a time for ideals and if these ideals are to endure they must be sound, must inspire faith and allegiance, must command loyalty. If they do this, then the running start which youth gets in its teens and early 1920's will serve as a firm foundation which will guide them aright in the confused issues of the present day, and the tougher days ahead.

I cannot help contrasting, for a moment, youth's situation today with what I faced in my school days.

In those days there was a reasonable measure of security in the world. The father of a family could lay down general directives for his children based on his own years of experience and observations in a world fairly well stabilized. He could plan for their careers and make provisions for their guidance. A young fellow plotted his future, with some certainty that, granted good behaviour and average good fortune, he could steer the course he had set for himself.

It is not that way now. The world is not secure any more, in anything. Social revolution, and industrial revolution, and new ideologies have precipitated vast social and military convulsions and are now tearing the old world to pieces, and even threatening the democratic institutions of the Western Hemisphere.

In our own country we face great uncertainties, and more disturbing dangers than ever confronted our fathers. The events in Europe and Asia and Africa and the measures for security which we in our Republic are now taking, will affect, in one way or another, the life of every person alive today in this country.

No one can tell just what the future holds. But it must be plain to all of us that in these times, and in more critical times to come, every American must be prepared to sacrifice for the common good.

Some undoubtedly will have the privilege and the honor of serving our country in arms. All, in whatever work engaged, will find a large proportion of their energies diverted, directly or indirectly, to national, rather than to individual needs. All must hold themselves ready to meet this changed life with courage, and to give the best that is in them for our country and all that we hold dear.

In times like these, people want something to hold to, something that stands firm in a changing world. And, therefore, I am going to ask you to think about character; to think about the age-old fundamental human virtues of courage, loyalty, perseverence, generosity, sacrifice, initiative, enthusiasm, the Golden Rule, common sense, hard work, and honesty. These are the elemental things that make character. They were good when man did his fighting with bows and arrows. They are good now, in the vast complexity of modern life.

We live in the machine age, but if all the power plants go out, and all the gadgets cease to function, we will still be men and women, and it is character upon which we will stand or fall.

If we are to expect much of youth we must give them much in their early training. The all-encompassing great essential is character and if our youth have that, and love of country, they will give what America expects, that is, continuance and security of those things which have made us great as a Nation, and which, if guarded, will make us greater—and preserve our way of life.

Our way of life is not something static. It is something adaptable to changing conditions as time goes on. But, its foundation of freedom, individual initiative, equal opportunity, freedom of speech, the Bill of Rights, the obligation of the individual, self-discipline, fair play, and a square deal, are as important now as when our forefathers fought and won them for us.

Our way of life will continue only if our youth and the oncoming generations believe in it. Therefore, that way of life must be the beacon light whose path shines out as so much brighter, so much better and richer than any other way, that our youth will be willing to give their all to see that it endures.

Abraham Lincoln referred to America as "the last great hope on earth."

To help nurture and sustain that hope, I should like to see hanging in every school and in every college and in every home of the United States the American's Creed, so forcefully and beautifully written by William Tylor Page:

"I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign nation of many sovereign States; a perfect union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

"I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies."

What a nation this would be if every boy and every girl were reared with an intense loyalty to that creed—loyalty that would carry on through life.

I previously mentioned loyalty and courage and some of the elemental points of character. I should like to touch on just a few of them very briefly. They are simple to comprehend but difficult to stick to unless and until solidly welded into character.

I shall speak of courage first. It is a military virtue, but it has a wider application. It is the thing that stiffens your backbone when you are afraid—afraid of being hurt, afraid of tomorrow, afraid of failure, afraid of being afraid. Courage is more than the absence of fear.

To set one's course and to follow it, regardless of personal consequence—that is courage.

As for loyalty, the loyal man serves; he does not merely follow his own impulses. This is well exemplified in one of the greater social passions such as patriotism. It fixes our attention upon a course, bids us look outside ourselves to serve that cause, makes it one of the keystones of our life, our will, our devotion. It comes first, regardless of strain or labor; it sacrifices in the service of the ideal.

Loyalty means giving one's self to the cause, and the art of giving is learned by giving.

Perseverance is the ability to take it when it hurts—to hang on when 'twould be so easy to quit. It is refusal to be licked. It was exemplified when John Paul Jones, with his ship apparently hopelessly beaten, was called upon to surrender and replied, "I've not yet begun to fight."

Sacrifice. I like to think of this all-essential virtue in the words of the late Theodore Roosevelt, who said, "There never was a service worth rendering that did not entail sacrifice, and no man renders the highest service if he thinks overmuch of the sacrifice."

Common sense is the capacity to see and take things in their right light. It is the exercise of sound judgment. It is the saving salt of realism. It looks facts squarely in the face and deals with them according to the means at hand. It cuts the cloth to suit the garment.

There is no substitute for common sense, nor is there any for hard work. As for honesty, I like the old saying that "An honest man is the noblest work of God."

Some of the other homely virtues that go to make up character are: generosity, tolerance, charity, patience, kindness, courtesy, giving of one's self to help another, looking for the good rather than the bad—realizing that there is a "window in every life if we can only open it," remembering that it takes only a moment to administer a rebuke but a long time to forget it.

Youth is born with certain tendencies but their character is something which they make themselves as they go along—and it is by their character that their associates will judge them. It is by their character that they will succeed or fail.

If, in their bringing up, youth are indulged in the soft ways of life they will ultimately fail, and the Nation with them.

There can be no compromise between self-indulgence and self-preservation.

Last year a young man asked me if a conscientious hard-working person could reach the top without influence, or, as he put it, "pull." I told him, "Yes." "Pull," which is to say favorable influence exerted at critical times, has its place in human affairs—but the best that "pull" ever does is to get a man an opportunity. It can't do his job for him. If his character doesn't lift him through, the influence is wasted and the opportunity will go to the next man.

The uncertainty, the insecurity in the world of today, will not appear so disturbing to the present generation as to the older one, because youth of the present day are being brought up in its atmosphere, and it may be that they are fortunate.

The calls that will be made upon them will stimulate their energies and draw from them qualities they may not even know they possess.

Their forefathers won the things that have made the American way of life, by self-denial, by hard work in peace, and by hard fighting in war.

If our youth have the traits of character I have touched upon, and I have an abiding faith that they have, they will maintain our way of life at all costs.

The youth of this generation will bear a heavy share, for they not only have to deal with the uncertain present, but also with a more uncertain future.

They may be proud that their generation has the opportunity to serve in such a critical period in the world's history.

If their actions are directed by courage, armored with hope, sustained by determination, enthusiasm, and the will to sacrifice and the will to win, our country will have nothing to fear from any enemy, within or without, and they will justify their lives, and their heritage, and will carry forward.

In the successful accomplishment of difficult tasks youth will also gain the greatest of all treasures—that inner reward that comes only from difficult tasks—well done.

Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, this is a grave hour. We in this House owe a duty to one country only—our own United States. I assert at the very outset that I have voted for every appropriation for national defense. Covering a period of the last 5 years successive incidents have occurred in this Nation which have led up to this very hour when we are considering the appropriation of the most gigantic sum ever asked of the Congress of the United States when the Nation was at peace with the world.

As far back as 1937, when the President of the United States urged that aggressor nations be quarantined, the road on which we are traveling today was charted. Since that time a special session of the Congress considered and passed, and at the same time emasculated, an admirable piece of legislation designed to keep the United States at peace—namely, the Neutrality Act. In that special session an amendment to that law was passed by the Congress lifting the embargo on arms. That step brought us a little nearer to the vote we are about to take this afternoon on the question of adding another heavy burden to the taxpayers of this Nation, the appropriation of $7,000,000,000 for the defense of Great Britain.

The 1940 election turned primarily on the policy of the present administration and the President to keep America out of war.

Shortly before the election the people of this country were amazed when they were confronted with a proposal to draft the young manhood of America and adopt a policy from which our ancestors fled in the proposal and passage of the compulsory military training bill, less harshly known as the Selective Service Act. The passage of that bill brought us one step closer to this crucial hour.

The election of the President for a third term turned mainly and was influenced mostly by the repeated assurance that America was to be kept free from war. Then, before this year was a month old, came the most unneutral proposal ever presented to Congress, when the lease-lend bill came before this body. The word "neutrality" left the American tongue. Everyone knew that no longer was the United States to remain a neutral nation, for our very navy yards and harbors were offered for the repair and outfitting of the ships of war of belligerent nations. It was a step toward war. And

when that bill was before this House more than 6 weeks ago I said then, and repeat now, that in my judgment it was a step that would lead to war. Today is the last and final step.

We are asked to take from the people of our country the colossal sum of $7,000,000,000 and with it produce the sinews of war for a foreign country. When this bill is passed, and undoubtedly it will be passed by a large majority, we will have committed an act not only to drive the United States closer to the precipice of war and with accelerated speed hasten it along the road to national bankruptcy and ruin.

This is but the beginning of a demand for other huge sums of money to feed the relentless god of war. This week we will be asked to vote for four and a half billion dollars more to provide tanks and airplanes for our own defense. I shall support that bill and vote for it.

I cannot vote for this measure (H. R. 4050) on the ground that it is in the defense of the United States. Thus far nearly $40,000,000,000 have been provided from the resources of this Nation for wild expenditures, wasteful and extravagant projects, all in the name of national defense. No one in this House can foretell where the end will be, but this much I am sure, that if America follows the course it now pursues that ultimate financial and economic collapse will be the lot of the American people. Life in the United States and the standard of living we once knew will be things of the past, and will be known no more. The resources and credit of this Nation are not unlimited. The time will come, and it is not far distant, when the resources and the credit of this Nation will be exhausted, and then, when we are weak and helpless, subversive interests, which have grown so rapidly in the last 6 or 7 years, encouraged by the acquiescence or indifference of government, will take advantage and assert themselves by overturning the Republic of the United States. This is not a pleasant prophesy, my colleagues, but it falls very fairly within the realm of possibility.

We are asked by the President for unity. We can have unity in this country when loyalty and demand for unity in building a national defense is exerted and enforced by the President and officials high in the administration of the Federal Government. The President demands speed and speed now. In the face of incredible conditions in the world, Republicans and Democrats alike join him in that necessity, but there has been no speed and there will be no speed in the production of national-defense material while the President permits and refuses to act with promptness and decision in putting an end to destructive and inexcusable strikes in defense industries. Every daily newspaper has carried the news to the American people of strikes in defense industries from one end of this land to the other. They increase instead of decrease and for 2½ months or more this Government has remained impotent and seemingly unwilling to take a determined stand to prevent radicals, among honest American labor, from retarding the production of the very things for which we are asked to vote today, the astronomical sum of $7,000,000,000. American labor is just as loyal and patriotic as any other group in this land. It desires to do its part. The condition existing in our production program, which even officials high in the Government now admit, has retarded and held back that program. Destructive and unnecessary strikes are the work of subversive and radical interests who do not have the welfare of this Republic at heart.

It is difficult, indeed, to ask the Representatives of a sovereign people to surrender their conviction and their judgment to provide this vast sum of money for a foreign government in the face of this fatal policy and failure to insist that the industry of this Nation engaged in the manufacture of defense articles shall go forward without labor disputes of one kind or another.

It has been shown on this floor that England has five and a half billion dollars in securities in the Western Hemisphere. In my judgment, those resources should be first used in the purchase of the materials that would be provided under this bill and the taxpayers of England bear the burden as long as they have the money with which to buy. The legislation before us takes no notice of that, but asks the American people, already overburdened with debt and governmental expenses, to assume the additional load provided in this legislation.

In discharging my responsibility and duty to the people of my district, for whom I speak, I cannot surrender my conscience and my conviction and vote for this bill. Come what may, I take my stand in the firm belief that a vote for this measure would be a contribution to the destruction of our Republic. I realize full well that the die has been cast; that the Government, by a majority vote in this Congress, has committed itself to a policy of "all-out aid," not alone for the Government of England but for all other democracies in the world.

I am in sympathy with aid to Britain, but I do not take the view that England is fighting America's war. If such is the case, I would be ashamed of America, for if it is our war then we should be at England's side, not only with materials but with manpower, for the manhood of America has never been wanting when the defense of our country was at stake.

I am fully aware that my vote against this bill, and those who will join me in a negative answer to this proposal, may become the target for abuse and criticism, similar to that leveled at a small and courageous band who served this Nation in this body in 1917 and who had the courage of their convictions and voted against war. Hysteria ruled the land then. We see more clearly now in retrospect. The whole picture presents itself. The entire effort was futile and empty. We neither fought a war to end war nor did we make the world safe for democracy. I fear it is too late now to draw back. The fatal decision has been made. This bill will not keep America out of war and neither will it keep war out of America. In my judgment it will plunge our beloved land into the conflict.

May a benevolent Providence, who has given us this favored land, guide us in our steps as we walk humbly toward our destiny.

Within Our Gates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

ADDRESS BY GEORGE ELLIS TO KIWANIS CLUB OF ARDMORE, OKLA.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very timely and impressive address by George Ellis, a student of Ardmore High School, Ardmore, Okla., made at a recent meeting of the Kiwanis Club of Ardmore. My information is that his talk was based on his own research on espionage and sabotage in this country. It shows that the youth of America are thinking today, and are seriously concerned about un-American elements within our gates.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In a fertile valley, between the sun-kissed hills of yesterday reflecting a marvelous past, and the mist-enshrouded peaks of tomorrow with some ominous shadows, lies this country of ours. We are the last frontier of democracy and have become a world citadel of liberty, equality, and justice. Each citizen dares express his own thoughts and exercise every privilege guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. But wait. Danger ahead, if we too freely extend to evil forces our long-cherished rights of free speech and public assembly.

In all the pages of history, there is no parallel to the war now raging in Europe. Germany warned of a secret weapon, then after the fall of Austria, the rape of Czecho-Slovakia and Poland, the collapse of Norway, Belgium, and The Netherlands, climaxed by the fatal weakness of France, it dawned upon the world that the secret weapon was but a state of mind, brought about by long-conceived espionage and propaganda. Hear the words of Hitler: "We need armies but we shall not use them as in 1914. The enemy peoples must be demoralized; mental confusion, contradiction of feeling, and panic—these are our weapons."

We wondered how Germany could penetrate America and make these weapons effective. The course lay open. Friendly nations grant to ambassadors, consuls, their families, and servants, freedom from arrest and from search and seizure of papers and property. This is diplomatic immunity. Unfortunate for us today, an old treaty with Germany extends a more favored protection than to any other nation. To Hitler and his saboteurs, this immunity has offered a splendid cloak to conceal an undercover warfare against us, through the 25 German consulates in the United States.

Everywhere they have been beehives of Nazi activity, presided over by the most astute, cunning, and ruthless emissaries Germany could muster. Now, mind you, the only duty of a consul is to assist his countrymen in business and travel, yet today there is no business, nor any travel, between us and the Germans. When the late war began, the English travel bureaus closed, but not so with the Nazis, who have swarmed about the consulates. The fraud is apparent.

Heading this organization in Germany is Ernest Bohle, not even German-born, but a citizen of Bradford, England, just as Hitler comes from Austria, Hesse from Egypt, Darre from Argentina, and Rosenberg from Russia—all powerful political figures in the Reich and worthy members of that band of conspirators that plotted war on democracy in Germany 15 years ago. This, my friends, is the Nazi International, the handmaiden of the war machine. So successful has it been that we behold eight nations prostrate.

Suave Herman Scholz is consul at Boston and an intimate friend of Himmler, head of the German Gestapo. There is Tannenberg, handsome adviser of the Embassy at Washington; Albert Mueller, at New York, and Friedheim Draeger, formerly with the German Legation at the capital of Mexico. He is the man who in 1939 signed himself leader of the Nazi Party in America, the fuehrer of the American bund, whose membership could not be reached by a Government subpena, being protected by diplomatic immunity. Finally, Ignatz Griebl was convicted of espionage, the court declaring him to be head of the greatest spy ring ever found in the United States. He had delivered to Germany plans of our newest destroyers, a coding machine for the Navy, and blueprints of 12 airplane types.

At New Orleans is Baron von Spiegel, a former submarine commander in the German fleet, now supported by a staff of 110, where formerly there were but 39. Why? Arrived this year, by way of Japan and Russia, comes Von Wegerer, with 20 packing cases, supposed to contain Nazi propaganda, but protected by diplomatic immunity.

Manfred Zapp, in New York, son of a German steel baron, is head of Trans-Ocean News Service, which operates over the whole Western Hemisphere, and particularly in South America. Fritz Zeiglein announces himself "German consul general" and founded the German Professional Alliance, which served as a shelter for those who fled from the bund after conviction of Griebl, because orders came from Germany for a more subtle approach.

Once the German consular work at Philadelphia was done by an American lawyer, in his spare time, where now reigns Eric Wedels, a former Nazi diplomat in Canada, with two other Germans of consular rank and the usual band of satellites. In recent years the number of German agents in New York has increased from 38 to 118, and the entire groups in the United States have more than trebled. Again, we ask why?

The most wily of them all is Fritz Wiedemann at San Francisco, head of all German agents in Central and South America. He chose his own field, and selected our west coast as being most ripe for German penetration. He was the superior officer of Hitler in the first World War.

Every German-born citizen in this country has been tabulated. Every one is known who may be depended upon in time of peril to set a bomb, blow up an arsenal, or destroy a factory.

The F. B. I. is now studying 6,000 cases. Time was when complaints of espionage and sabotage numbered about 35 in a year. Now they mount as high as 3,500 in a single day. Evidence in Germany is reported of complete knowledge of American industry and all its plants, classifying every workman politically, racially, and by religion—a more complete record than could be given off-hand by the owners themselves. One of our highest military authorities, seeking details of our coast defenses, was unable to find satisfactory evidence in this country. Does it not amaze you that he found what he had been seeking in a magazine published in Germany?

Last summer in New Jersey the Federal Bureau of Investigation followed from a bund meeting five members to Picatinny Arsenal, largest in the United States, where 2 months later a great blast occurred; 12 were followed to the National Guard Service and 3 to the Hercules powder plant, where later the greatest explosion in America's industrial history killed 52 men.

The last World War began quickly. Espionage and sabotage were not planned years in advance, as we find them now. Only two inexperienced Germans, with meager funds and no organization, Von Papen and Von Rielen, operated in America, yet 76 factories, railroad terminals, and freight ships were bombed.

The Dies committee is uncovering activities that are startling—things of which a sleeping America never dreamed. Be it said to the everlasting credit of one Oklahoma county attorney that our prison shall hold for 10 years one who has preached the downfall of our Government. Would that this court scene might be enacted in every one of the 3,000 counties in the land. The juries are ready to convict. The curtain is ready to rise upon a stage set to astound the American audience. Let us lift it high in a vast, concerted action of patriotism.

With the shadow of the swastika over Mexico, the infiltration in Brazil and the Argentine, the activities in Bolivia, the attack on us is going in full blast. From such a far-flung scheme could it be possible to exclude the richest prize of all—the one great democracy that has such striking force, once aroused? To see that it be not aroused comes this army of spies and saboteurs from the Reich, armed with that choice diplomatic treaty.

Picture the devastation that would follow a concerted attack upon our arsenals, railroads, factories, docks, powder plants and our every industry, by 10,000 agents, placed by this band of trained saboteurs that has operated these years, sowing seeds of treason, sedition, and death. "For the Fatherland and the Fuehrer" would they shout, and gladly would they go down in the maelstrom of horror, could they but carry with them to destruction by fires, bombings, and murders, more treasure and more human lives than ever were lost in any catastrophe of war.

Thus the ground has been prepared and sown. The subversive efforts are bearing fruit. In far away German archives rest the plans in safety, against that day when they shall open as a book before the German Board of Strategy, revealing the full picture of American power and weakness in machines, men, and fortifications.

It is for us to stand guard at the gates that have already swung too wide; for us to say, "Out with the consuls and their every entourage." Close the doors of these false travel bureaus. Amend that favored diplomatic treaty to conform to the needs of the hour. Drive from our midst this former superior officer of Hitler at San Francisco; this submarine commander at New Orleans; the ally of the German Gestapo at New York; and all their like and all their kind. Free the very air from the contamination of their presence, for it breeds only death. Obliterate the snaky trail they have traced to the very heart of our defenses and our power, lest we lose at one fell stroke all that we have, all that we are building, all that we hope to achieve in the years to come. Let us stand guard over the ramparts we watch that the rays of every dawn shall disclose, gallantly streaming, the "Broad stripes and bright stars."

Reasons Why Federal Reclamation and Water-Conservation Program Should Be Carried Forward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit for the consideration of my colleagues in Congress certain pertinent facts in connection with the Federal reclamation and Great Plains water-conservation programs.

This matter of land reclamation and water conservation and utilization affects the entire Nation, and directly affects the western half of the United States. We will shortly be considering the Interior appropriations bill, which carries the funds for Federal reclamation. These appropriations have been opposed heretofore by some Members of Congress who did not have a full appreciation of the importance and significance to the national welfare that the reclamation program means when it is fully understood.

There is almost a unanimity of opinion in the conclusion that we must spend the tremendous sums we are now appropriating for national defense. To make a military defense establishment an effective agency, we must certainly maintain a domestic production economy in the best and most effective condition. No greater calamity could befall the western half of the United States than a curtailing and crippling of the present policy and program being carried forward by Federal reclamation. In fact, the critical times actually call for a substantial expansion of this program, and it is with the hope that Members of Congress will familiarize themselves more fully with this important governmental activity, that I submit the following facts, to justify a continuation of the Federal reclamation and Great Plains water-conservation programs, with expansion to include gravely needed projects:

First. Drought and agricultural maladjustments have driven more than three-quarters of a million persons from the Great Plains in 10 years.

Second. At least 150,000 Great Plains families have migrated westward to the Mountain and Pacific States and tightened the population pressure on areas without surplus irrigated land.

Third. Census reports show 501 of 650 counties in the Great Plains had a net population loss of 753,554 from 1930 to 1940.

Fourth. In contrast, 277 out of 309 counties to the westward had a net population gain of 1,941,601. The increase was twice the national average.

Fifth. Uprooting of Great Plains families and their migration westward with other destitute groups swelled Federal relief costs to more than 2½ billion dollars in 7 years in 17 States affected.

Sixth. These relief payments per family of $5,000 to $6,000 would be sufficient to provide an irrigated farm on which a family would be permanently self-supporting and able to repay the cost.

Seventh. The impact of the migrations is particularly heavy on rural areas needing additional irrigation and which are far from defense industries. Similarly, the Great Plains areas are distant from arms-producing centers.

Eighth. Although climatic and crop conditions in the Great Plains show some improvement, there is still most distressing migration westward, in some sections as heavy as in 1939. In addition, many established farm areas in the West face water shortages.

Ninth. Shortages of power vital to the national defense are imminent in several areas where reclamation projects are under construction or can be quickly launched.

As from 3 to 8 years are required to build a multiple-purpose irrigation and power project, the program here proposed looks to securing long-range objectives as well as meet immediate needs, as follows:

(a) Employment on construction of 35,000 to 40,000 workers, mostly unskilled, who otherwise would be on relief, without detriment in any way whatever to national-defense accomplishment.

(b) Supplemental water and settlement opportunities to give security to 150,000 farm families now in the West and rehabilitation of 30,000 families who otherwise would be forced to migrate from the Great Plains and similar areas.

(c) Support in nearby cities and towns for two to three times the farm population and supplementary food supplies for the Nation.

(d) Adequate power facilities for any emergency and future needs of the West.

(e) Irrigated farms for support of industrial workers in western centers when present emergency ends. An implemented settlement program for industrial workers and returning soldiers would prevent a recurrence of the serious economic upheaval experienced at the close of the last war.

To accomplish these results at an expenditure in reimbursable funds of less than a third of the 7-year Federal relief outlay in the 17 arid and semiarid States a 10-year program of appropriations is urged, as follows:

Seventy-five million dollars annually for construction of reclamation projects.

Ten million dollars annually, supplemented by W. P. A. and C. C. C. labor allocations, for small projects in the Great Plains and similar areas.

About one-half of this outlay would be repaid by power and the remainder by water users.

Commissioner of Reclamation John C. Page, before the Tolan migrant committee at Lincoln, Nebr., in September, summarized what could be accomplished by continuance of reclamation appropriations of reimbursable funds for 10 years at approximately the present rate of around $75,000,000 annually, supplemented by diversion of relief funds for the Great Plains type of projects.

Results he confidently predicted were:

First. Irrigated farms where 40,000 to 50,000 families would be self-sustaining.

Second. Supplemental water for farms for 85,000 families now facing water shortages.

Third. Rehabilitation in the Great Plains and similar areas of 20,000 to 25,000 farm families.

In addition to the above, these developments would support in nearby cities and towns two to three times the farm population.

Highways for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered last night over the radio:

HIGHWAYS FOR DEFENSE

An outstanding lesson in Germany's amazingly successful blitzkrieg is the importance of an adequate and integrated system of highways. From the day he attained power until he struck his first devastating blow Hitler had some of the best engineering brains of Germany constructing a network of superhighways on a scale the nation had never seen, coordinating it with the development of rail-, water-, and air-transportation systems. It was this system that made possible the gigantic expansion of German armaments in the few short years that followed Hitler's march into the Rhineland. And when Poland's hour struck it was the broad, perfectly constructed roads right to the border which enabled his swiftly moving mechanized hordes to accomplish what military men considered an utter impossibility.

NARROW ROADS HAMPER ALLIES

In Hitler's headlong rush to the French coast it was again the superhighway system that transported his unending stream of tanks and motorized troops in contrast with the relatively inadequate system of narrow roads used by the French and British. The Allies were slow in their initial advance through Belgium to meet the Germans, and then were "bottlenecked" without supplies or reinforcements when the narrow roads were choked with fleeing humanity and blasted by Stuka bombers. It was the story of one- and two-lane roads, vulnerable to attack, against a vast system of six- and eight-lane superhighways.

In relation to our industrialization, size, and strength, our highway system today is little better than were those of the conquered countries. Nearly one-third of our 75,000 miles of strategically important highways do not at the present time meet even the minimum requirements of the War Department. Some of it is too crooked, some too steep, some too light in construction to stand military transport. During maneuvers last fall of the District of Columbia National Guard, centering in the West Virginia mountains at my home town of Elkins, heavy trucks carrying antiaircraft guns had to be rerouted from the main highway between Washington and Elkins because in that 230-mile strip of excellent road there were two bridges over which the trucks could not pass. This condition is duplicated in all parts of the country; maneuvers in Texas this year showed that only 25 percent of the roads used were adequate to handle even the comparatively light 10-ton tanks and 155-millimeter howitzers, which were the heaviest equipment used. What would we do if the coming heavy tanks were rushed into this possible invasion site under conditions of actual warfare?

NEW HIGHWAY BILL NEEDED

This Congress must meet the responsibility of preparing and passing supplemental legislation to provide for an immediate program of constructing highways adequate for our national-defense requirements. This should be in addition to the regular biennial Federal-aid highway measures. I believe that the Federal Government should bear the brunt of this cost, perhaps as much as 80 percent, instead of the 50 percent borne under our regular Federal aid to States. I believe the Federal Government should bear this high ratio of the expense because such a program is as essential to our rapidly expanding defense effort as are new manufacturing facilities.

We need transport and more transport, particularly since the Federal Government has at long last recognized the need for decentralizing defense industries. Five years ago I advocated such a plan; today, factories by the score for production of aircraft, munitions engines, nitrates, and other sinews of war preparedness are being located in Illinois, Kansas, Iowa, Missouri, Ohio, Kentucky, West Virginia, and other interior States.

Industrial mobilization, plus an increasing peacetime traffic, already threatens to overtax our present transportation system. Highway problems are more serious in America than ever before, due in part to the staggering total of 32,000,000 motor vehicles now in use. Railroads, with equipment depleted by depression years, may soon feel the pressure of transporting defense materials. Waterways have been steadily improved in recent years, but still fall far short of carrying their share of the load. Commercial aviation, with emphasis on passengers and speed, grows in importance daily, but cannot the automotive industry, which grew to its present giant stature with the growth of highways, lend its facilities to speeding defense transport, provided we build the roads to carry the trucks? Our transportation network must be strengthened at every point.

STUDIES BEGAN 20 YEARS AGO

Some 20 years ago the War Department began studies of our highway needs, which are being modified today to meet the new tempo of modern war. We realize that we must revamp our conception of minimum requirements. Testimony before the House Roads Committee, of which I am a member, revealed that there are some 6,390 miles of highway in the New England States alone that should be rebuilt, widened, or relocated. There are also 506 bridges that should be widened or rebuilt. And these recommendations, which will cost an estimated $388,223,000, are based only on our immediate peacetime needs to better traffic conditions and promote highway safety. The cost of building New England's highways to serve the

dual purpose of civil and military use would probably reach the staggering total of $600,000,000. At this time it is impossible to estimate accurately how many billions will be needed for necessary highway expansion and improvement through the entire Nation.

President Roosevelt now has under consideration a comprehensive report from the Federal Works Agency which is the result of a comprehensive study made by the Public Roads Administration of our highway defense needs. It is believed that this broad program will take the form of a recommendation to Congress and that legislation will be formulated for important defense road improvements. It is proposed that $150,000,000 be used for so-called access roads, with the total cost being borne by the Federal Government, due to the fact that these roads would be used almost entirely for military and navy reservations and defense industry sites. It is proposed also that $100,000,000 is required on strategic roads where there would be replacement of substandard bridges and correction of critical deficiencies. On these projects the cost would be borne by Federal and State governments. It is believed that so-called tactical roads should be constructed at a cost of approximately $25,000,000, and these would be used regularly in maneuvers of the Army.

Yesterday Congress received from the President a $6,000,000,000, 6-year public-works program prepared by the National Resources Planning Board. It is noteworthy that one hundred and twenty-four million of this amount would be set aside for transportation.

How can we pay this gigantic bill?

In the first place, we can abolish the present pernicious practice of diverting funds from Federal gasoline and other automotive taxes to uses other than highway construction and maintenance, and under the same terms levy such additional taxes as are found necessary for this building program.

There is a place for high-speed toll roads, such as the Pennsylvania Turnpike, where revenues are far in excess of advance estimates. Roads of this character have tremendous military value. If properly located, they are sound financial risks and can be financed through loans and the issuance of bonds.

SUPERHIGHWAY BILL DISCUSSED

I have reintroduced this year a bill to provide for transcontinental motor transportation, the facilities for national defense and promotion of public safety. This measure (H. R. 3973) looks toward the construction of a superhighway system. One of these would extend in approximately a straight line from near Boston, Mass., to near San Francisco, Calif.; two would extend from the Great Lakes region and New York to Florida; one from the Canadian border in Minnesota to Laredo, Tex., connecting with the Pan American Highway to Central and South America; one from Jacksonville, Fla., in a direct line to San Diego, Calif.; and one between San Diego, Calif., and Vancouver Island. There are, of course, many other sections of the country where highways of this general nature should be built.

It is highly desirable at this particular time that plans be consummated to construct a superhighway between Washington, D. C., and Baltimore, Md. The National Resources Planning Board has estimated that a $7,000,000 highway between these two cities is badly needed. It is my considered judgment that the Nation's capital and the first city of Maryland need such a road, and a program should be worked out at once to make its construction possible. Washington will increasingly become the planning center of our governmental defense program, and the Baltimore area is rapidly assuming major importance as a territory engaged in the production of preparedness materials. The building of such a road is long overdue. Surely the construction of this link would open the way for an extension into New York and the New England States.

Recently, on the House floor, there was held an interesting and informative discussion on the feasibility of superhighways in this country. I was gratified at the reaction. It will be remembered that the House Roads Committee in May 1937 held the first hearing on this subject. I hope that in the near future a definite Government plan can be evolved for the building of these roads. Charles Upham, noted highway builder, told me only today that superhighways in many parts of the Nation are urgently needed.

We will need close cooperation from the various States. Many of these political subdivisions, knowing that the Federal Government condones it, have continued to use their gas revenues for almost every purpose but that originally intended. Were these funds returned to their proper uses, these States would have little difficulty in sustaining their present schedules of construction and maintenance and joining hands with the Federal Government in this greatly needed military program. These and other important problems will be considered in formulating legislation.

AMERICA MUST ACT NOW

There are those who contend that these improvements should be treated from a long-range standpoint, that we should approach them with the ease of a peacetime stride. I cannot agree with their sentiments in this respect.

I do believe we should eliminate the elements of rush and reckless emotional haste, but I emphasize the need for immediate and thorough action. It is quite obvious that our military experts believe that America is closer now to warfare on her own soil than at any other time in her recent history. May God spare us this reality. In the meantime, our wisdom dictates that we take stock of our highway deficiencies and begin a program that will modernize our national road system and make it the finest for peacetime service and at the same time a highly developed and definitely efficient adjunct for our national defense.

Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the congressional leaders in the House will not think that I am trying to retard the progress of the present appropriation bill which we are considering; however, I do want especially the leaders of the House to know that we people of the South are looking for and expecting their aid in securing a sufficient amount of the national-defense industry and national air fields to properly protect our coasts. We all know that the Atlantic and Gulf coasts of the United States are the most vulnerable points on the face of our Nation to all foreign enemies at the present time.

I agree with the President that we should not interfere with the military leaders in designating the most-strategic points throughout the United States where air bases, firearms, and other factories will be built under the present national-defense program. However, we do feel that up until this date there has been some discrimination made by the national-defense officials. Practically all of the great airplane factories, powder plants, and other national-defense projects have been built in the already highly congested industrial centers of the New England States.

I expect to vote for the President's request for an appropriation of $7,000,000,000 before Congress adjourns this afternoon. However, before voting for this appropriation bill I want to register my protest against the manner in which contracts have been awarded for national-defense projects up until the present time.

I represent approximately 360,000 red-blooded Americans, and they are practically 100 percent behind the President in his national-defense program and his foreign policies. We, however, expect in return to receive proper consideration from the President and the Congress of the United States for having our shores properly protected against any eventualities. In my opinion, the people of the South are the most peace-loving people in the world. However, when it has been proven to them that our liberty and country is in danger they are willing to give their last penny and, if necessary, their lives to protect the same. We all hope that it will never become necessary for any of our citizens to fire a gun during this war or any other wars. However, we are going to prepare ourselves for any eventuality. The citizens in my district expect me to let Congress know just how they feel regarding the lend-lease bill and other matters pertaining to the welfare of the Nation, and that is the only reason I have begged a few minutes of the precious time we have allotted to consider this $7,000,000,000 appropriation bill this afternoon.

I know the chairman of the Appropriations Committee is anxious for the House to pass the $7,000,000,000 appropriation bill for Great Britain in sufficient time to send the same to the Senate this afternoon, therefore I will refrain from making any further remarks regarding this program at the present time.

War for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of today:

[From the New York Times of Wednesday, March 19, 1941]

AID-ALLIES POLICY HELD BID FOR WAR—AMERICA FIRST GROUP ISSUES STATEMENT DENOUNCING "TRIAL BALLOON" OF COMMITTEE—CONVOY PLAN IS OPPOSED—RECRUITING BY BRITISH HERE AND FIRM STAND BY UNITED STATES IN FAR EAST ALSO ASSAILED

The America First Committee charged yesterday that the statement of policy issued Monday by the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies contained recommendations that would get the United States into war.

The Aid Allies Committee had recommended that American naval vessels convoy ships to England if necessary; that legislation be enacted granting right to the British to recruit men here, and that the Government announce a firm stand in the Far East.

POLICIES ARE DENOUNCED

These declarations were denounced by the America First Committee in the following statement:

"Americans are now wondering what the next step will be toward war. They need not be in any doubt. Whenever the Government is preparing some new forward movement to war, the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies is used to send up the trial balloon. Yesterday this committee, which speaks for the war groups in America, issued a new program. These men are not satisfied with the lend-lease bill and the $7,000,000,000 gift to Britain. They now demand more. Most important, they demand that American naval vessels shall convoy ships to Britain; that the British Army shall be permitted to recruit here American soldiers for the English Army; that the Government shall announce that it will aid England to defend Singapore and the Dutch East Indies.

"On December 28, 1940, William Allen White, organizer of that committee, said: 'It is not true even remotely that we favor repealing that portion of the neutrality law which forbids American ships to carry contraband of war into the war zone. That would lead us into war and our organization and I personally are deeply opposed to it.' Senator GEORGE, in the debate on the lend-lease bill, declared emphatically that convoying would mean outright war. Is this not a perfect example of how the American people are being deceived into one step after another? The committee which only 3 months ago declared it was opposed to convoying because that meant war is now demanding it.

"CHURCHILL'S WORDS RECALLED

"As to changing the law to permit Americans to enlist in the British Army and to allow the British Army to start recruiting here—what becomes of the solemn assurance that England does not need men? Winston Churchill in 1914 wrote Earl Grey, British Foreign Minister, urging him to arrange to get plenty of Americans in the British Army. He said 'nothing will bring America in on our side quicker than some American blood spilled in Europe.' Churchill himself tells this in his own book, The World Crisis.

"Here is a plan to get our ships with their sailors into the warring water and American soldiers into Northern Africa and Greece. It is a plan to have American ships sunk and American blood spilled as the final prelude to an American expeditionary force. When will the American people be aroused to the dangers that are being arranged for them? The lease-lend bill was called 'all-out aid to Britain,' but apparently it is not enough. Churchill said, 'Give us the tools and we'll finish the job.' The Government is giving them $7,000,000,000 worth of tools. Now they are preparing to ask for men. The America First Committee is opposed to all of these dangerous proposals."

Proposed Dam on the Savannah River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, we are now considering before the Rivers and Harbors Committee what is known as the proposed Clarks Hill Dam on the Savannah River between the States of Georgia and South Carolina, and I want to point out briefly what this development would mean to the people of those States.

In addition to other benefits to be derived from this development, including flood control, navigation, and national defense, this project would produce 444,000,000 kilowatt-hours of firm power a year. What we mean by firm power is power that can be produced the year round. In other words, power that can be produced constantly without reference to fluctuation in the flow of the stream.

It would also produce 100,000,000 kilowatt-hours of secondary power a year; that is, power that can be produced by the floodwaters during what we call the rainy season, which, in that country, covers about 6 months in the year—from November to April, and extending at times to the 1st of June.

It comes just at the time when extra power is needed and when the use of electricity is increased in every home and in every business establishment. It is not waste power, and should never be referred to as "dump" power. It is merely increased production, and can be easily absorbed by the area served.

The experts testified before the committee that this firm power could be produced at 2.77 mills a kilowatt-hour and the secondary power at 0.5 mill a kilowatt-hour. This would amortize that part of the development charged to power within a period of 40 years. Remember that seven-eighths of this entire development is to be charged to power and that if this entire output were sold at these rates—2.7 mills a kilowatt-hour for the firm power and one-half mill a kilowatt-hour for the secondary power—it would amortize that part of the investment charged to power within 40 years and would amortize the entire development in 46 years.

Expert engineers appearing before the committee on yesterday testified that this power could be transmitted 100 miles at a cost of 0.75 mill a kilowatt-hour, which, added to the cost of production, would make this firm power cost 3.52 mills a kilowatt-hour laid down wholesale 100 miles from the dam, and the secondary power cost 1.25 mills a kilowatt-hour laid down wholesale 100 miles from the dam.

In this connection I might state that this is less than any municipality pays for power purchased wholesale from the T. V. A. anywhere from Knoxville, Tenn., to Macon, Miss.

Knoxville, which is within a few miles of the Norris Dam, paid 4 mills a kilowatt-hour wholesale for its electricity purchased from the T. V. A. during the month of December 1940; and Macon, Miss., the most remote municipality that purchases wholesale power from the T. V. A., paid 6.92 mills for its electricity purchased wholesale from the T. V. A. during the month of December 1940. Both of these municipalities distributed this power at the T. V. A. yardstick rates, as did all the other municipalities and cooperative associations purchasing T. V. A. power throughout that area.

If the people throughout the States of Georgia and South Carolina had received their electricity at the T. V. A. yardstick rates, last year, the people of Georgia would have saved $12,460,000, and the people of South Carolina would have saved $5,910,000.

These experts testified that this power could be transmitted 150 miles at a maximum cost of 1 mill a kilowatt-hour. That means that it could be laid down in Savannah or Atlanta, Ga., at Charleston or Columbia, S. C., or at other points within that range at 3.77 mills a kilowatt-hour for the firm power, and at 1.5 mills a kilowatt-hour for the secondary power.

They also testified that this power could be transmitted 250 miles at a cost ranging from 1.25 to 1.5 mills a kilowatt-hour. A 250-mile radius from this dam would cover the entire States of both Georgia and South Carolina. That means that this power could be laid down at any point in either one of those two States at a maximum of 4.27 mills a kilowatt-hour for the firm power and 2 mills a kilowatt-hour for the secondary power.

That means that we could supply power not only to every town but to every farmer in those two States at the T. V. A. yardstick rates or less and at the same time take care of all expenses, including money paid in lieu of taxes equal to the amount of taxes paid by private power companies, and amortize the entire investment within 46 years, and could amortize that part charged to power in 40 years.

In other words, this development in the long run would not cost the United States Government a single dollar. But on the other hand, it would add hundreds of millions of dollars to the national wealth.

It would force private power companies to bring their charges down to the proper levels and reduce light and power rates to the people of the States of Georgia and South Carolina, even on the present load, by more than $18,000,000 a year—or the value of 360,000 bales of cotton a year at $50 a bale.

But it would do more than that; it would double the consumption of electricity throughout that area, add to the comforts and conveniences of every home,

including every farm home, stimulate industry, and lift untold burdens from the shoulders of the merchants and other commercial consumers of electricity throughout those two States.

Tribute to William Jennings Bryan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. CLYDE L. HERRING, OF IOWA

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, yesterday was the anniversary of the birthday of the late William Jennings Bryan. The Senate was not in session, but tribute to him would be timely and deserved on any day. In many ways he was the John the Baptist who proclaimed the New Deal, and, with the exception of Franklin D. Roosevelt, no man in our time has held a greater place in the hearts of the common people of America than did William Jennings Bryan.

In 1936 the distinguished Senator from Iowa, Mr. HERRING, delivered an able and beautiful address in Lincoln, Nebr., on William Jennings Bryan, The Man of the Future. In appreciation of the address and as a tribute to Mr. Bryan, I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

William Jennings Bryan is dead. His grave is strewn with flowers and his memory adorned with ecomiums. Little more than a dozen years have elapsed since his brave attempt to vindicate the doctrine of the church—the view of the fundamentalists—that man is ascended from angels, not descended from monkeys.

He died on a pleasant summer day, July 26, 1925, after what appeared to be a losing battle. Nothing could have been more consonant with his unusual life than his unusual demise, since throughout his existence, with few rare exceptions, William Jennings Bryan appeared to be battling on the losing side.

His family, whom he loved and who loved him, prepared to bury him, while his enemies complacently prepared to bury his ideas. William Jennings Bryan was expected to become a part of America's past—a milestone on the tortuous path of American democracy.

He believed what he believed, whether another man agreed with him or not. Principle was to him the important thing. The course once determined, he then sought converts.

So his faith in the soul of man. He could not accept the scientific explanation of creation because it did not square with his religious concepts, with his belief in the immortality of the soul.

What appeared to be a losing battle is turned into victory. The spirit, the ideas, the soul of William Jennings Bryan continue to direct the actions of men as when he stood before an audience and exhorted them to act in their own behalf. The immortality of his soul is demonstrated by the fact that William Jennings Bryan is still the inspirer of men, and the principles for which he stood continue to be the ideals for which men strive. He is not to be left in the past of the United States. Bryan belongs to the future of America.

From a poor boy in Nebraska to cosmopolite and world traveler he moved with the lightning-like rapidity of our times. He accumulated during his busy, fruitful life upwards of a million dollars which he left as a limited inheritance to members of his family, charity, and friends. To the people of the Nation he left a greater inheritance in ideas and ideals, the fulfillment of which is a major task belonging to our generation and to others which shall come after us.

Although elected to Congress but twice, Bryan was a busy legislator throughout his 40 years of active public service. To chronicle all of the legislation, State and national, for which he was responsible would consume infinite time and serve no useful purpose. Suffice it to say that he was able to amend the United States Constitution successfully on four separate occasions. The first was the direct election of United States Senators after a comparatively brief "lobby" of only 23 years—from 1890 to 1913. He helped to write the Income Tax Law of 1894, which a year later was declared unconstitutional. He only required 19 years to secure the necessary constitutional amendment—also in 1913.

In a nation where repeal is still being celebrated, I should not wish to put undue emphasis upon the passage of the eighteenth amendment, but all of us are aware of the great part which Bryan played in bringing about its adoption.

The nineteenth amendment, giving the franchise to women, received his hearty and consistent support.

He was largely responsible for the creation of the office of Secretary of Labor, which he hoped would serve to abolish government by injunction, prohibit child labor, and secure an 8-hour day.

Since the days of the Spanish-American War (for which he organized a regiment) he advocated independence for the Philippines. Congress in the first months of Wilson's administration adopted a resolution embodying the declaration which he had written into every Democratic national platform from 1900 down to 1912. We have witnessed in recent years the first fruits of that effort.

It was Bryan's insistence that the "sovereign right to issue money" be made a part of the Currency Act—a right which had been surrendered to national banks, that secured the passage of that act.

During his brief service of 2 years as Secretary of State in the Wilson cabinet he originated 30 treaties with other nations, revised the Federal Reserve Act, composed the Japan-California controversy, and offered effective opposition to the proposal of American bankers to loan money to China.

Disagreeing with his colleagues on the interpretation of the *Lusitania* disaster, he resigned as Secretary of State only to reenter the political scene as author of the famous slogan, "He kept us out of war," which elected Woodrow Wilson to a second term.

Despite his pacifism and avowed support of the ideals of peace, he nevertheless volunteered his services to his country, which, however, because of age were not accepted.

It was this strange admixture of pacific idealism and fearless militancy which accounted for the uncommon number of successes in his career, sometimes as conciliator—more often as combatant. He believed with Henry Ward Beecher: "I need no armor save the justice of my quarrel."

Bryan arrived at maturity at a time as epic-making as our own. Civil War he had been spared, save as memory would carry him back to the tales told him in infancy. He lived through the great industrial revolution which followed the war, when the machine lured men from the land into mill and factory, and the railroads and the saloon were developing that dual strength which was to affect all succeeding elections for a long period of years to come.

The death of William Jennings Bryan's father, Judge Silas Bryan, probably affected the agrarian revolt more than any other single factor. Had he lived, Bryan would have gone to Oxford, England, to complete his post-graduate studies. His death, and the discovery that two notes of $15,000 each endorsed by Judge Bryan for friends in whom he had faith, and who failed that trust, completely changed the currents of life for young Bryan. He gave up the idea of Oxford and turned a "young man's fancy" to the practical problem of becoming self-supporting. His next years were full of struggle and hard work but they were spent fruitfully, and under the inspiration of a great and romantic love, which dominated his life to the very end.

Friendship brought William Jennings Bryan to Lincoln. The irrepressible spirit of the "pioneer" caused him to resolve to return and make Lincoln his home. The assurances given him that the West offered great opportunities for young men were more sanguinely enthusiastic than real. Always a thoughtful student of American politics—Bryan realized that Nebraska — although agrarian — was hopelessly Republican. Democrat that he was he took into account his political extinction—there would be no place in Nebraska for a Jeffersonian Democrat, but there might be a place for a good lawyer.

"He who waits for a situation entirely favorable never does anything." Bryan moved to Lincoln. He could not afford to bring his wife and baby, and so he came alone, using his office for home as well as place of business.

He proved the wisdom of the adage "Our doubts are traitors, and make us lose the good we oft might win, by fearing to attempt."

Success doubtless appeared to be "just around the proverbial corner," but the fact is, it came quickly and with comparative ease. In a Republican State young Bryan was able to rouse a militant minority, which went into party convention with banners streaming, and a battle cry of confidence which roused even the delegates themselves. In 1890, to his complete astonishment, he had been elected to Congress from a Republican State on the Democratic ticket.

It has been said that Bryan was 20 years ahead of his time. An examination of the platform upon which he was elected will reveal that he is more likely to have been a century ahead of his time. His attack upon the McKinley tariff bill was vehement. His opposition to the development of "trusts and monopolies" was so far-sighted the American people are only now beginning to comprehend the significance and purport of his words. His championship of labor, and the right of the farmer to receive a just price for his produce made him a "first pleader" in the cause of human justice, and afforded the arguments upon which to base the rationalization of public opinion.

With equal force and eloquence he attacked the willingness of legislators to become "subsidized tools" of economic groups of especial and unequal privilege, which sought "unjust economic advantage over their fellows through the securing of sub-

sidies and other preferential treatment." He advocated the abolition of special privilege. He demanded that corporate greed be curbed, declaring: "a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable."

Realizing the importance of honest elections by voters, free from the influence of bribery or intimidation, Bryan advocated the adoption of the Australian ballot system, which made voting secret, and thereby encouraged the expression of conviction and freedom of conscience. Every American who votes enjoys the privilege of secret balloting, forgetful of the crusader, who forced it upon unwilling political bosses.

The Federal Reserve System, the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and lastly the Security Exchange Commission were all outgrowths of ideals and principles advocated by William Jennings Bryan. He supported the rural-credits law, the Farm Loan and Joint Stock Land Bank Act and urged the guaranty of bank deposits. Long before the fitful days of depression, when the 20,000 ragged soldiers and their friends marched on to Washington in the latter days of the Hoover administration—demanding payment of their bonus—Bryan urged liberal pensions for disabled veterans, an obligation which the country has been slow to recognize, even after nearly 46 years of propaganda by him.

Consistent in his demand for the remonetization of silver, he fought the gold standard and its advocates in Wall Street, and died leaving the obligation to carry on with Senators WHEELER and THOMAS and a handful of silver colleagues in Congress. Great progress has been made since his death. The fight for free silver goes on.

The several Western States whose internal economy is in large measure dependent upon the mining industry have renewed hope that they may once more attain a degree of prosperity and economic self-sufficiency.

His opposition to "inordinate gifts of public lands" to absentee landlords is inextricably interwoven with the "free homestead" movement and the development of our great railroad systems.

The abolition of political caucus and secret conclave and the introduction of the primary system, initiative, referendum, and recall, the compulsory publication of campaign contributions before elections—these and other changes in the functioning of democracy under our elective system can be traced to the early pronouncements of William Jennings Bryan.

He died still advocating that "sound system of public highways" and "public ownership of the means of transportation and communication," which had been the cherished dream of John Quicy Adams during his administration, the fulfillment of which is promised sometime in the not-too-near future.

Striving to raise the American standard of living and wages, Bryan forcefully advocated immigration laws restricting the "importation of pauper labor," "arbitration in labor disputes," "abolition of government by injunction," and "recognition of the right of labor to collectively bargain." He gave his unqualified support to every piece of legislation having for its object the safeguarding of life and property in industry, as well as laws affecting "employer's liability" and "workmen's compensation," including maritime legislation regulating wireless and other safety devices.

Critical of the growth of monopoly, he nevertheless believed in the development and extension of the electrification system, which would bring within reach of home and pocketbook, the benefits derived from hydroelectric power.

He was in harmony with all that is good in our age—he was the avowed enemy of all that is bad. Nor was his vision obscured. He could examine any phase of social, political, or economic organization, and point out the sound and useful features in contrast to the dangerous and unsound practices.

Satisfied with the traditional policies of democracy, Bryan stood ever willing and eager to grasp the new and untried—if the new and untried could square with his logic and reasoning. He demonstrated what to many seems an irreconcilable point of view—if you are for tradition you cannot be for change, and vice versa. He used experience as his yardstick of measurement for what was sound, and necessity as his measure for what is necessarily experimental.

With all of the notable achievements of his ideas the bulk of his program remains unfulfilled. He is still the man of the future.

Nor was he without potency in the life of the Republican Party. He provided the "shock engagement" which tested that party's strength, and brought to the fore the leadership, which controlled it for upward of three decades. I refer, of course, to the late Theodore Roosevelt, who but for William Jennings Bryan, would have had a somewhat different career.

At a time when "big business" was "small" as compared to today, but when the leaders of industry were possessed of egos, somewhat distended, Bryan issued a challenge to all who were contending for inordinate profits on the one hand, and the exploitation of the farmer and labor on the other. In a country of 21-cent wheat and a subsistence living standard, Bryan laid down the gantlet to "organized greed," and it was picked up and flung in the faces of the people, whose champion he had become, by Mark Hanna, greatest political influence of his day, and regarded by all beholders as invincible.

National elections up to the campaign of 1896 had been what might be termed, in the light of subsequent events, child's play. With the advent of the "young upstart" from Lincoln, Nebr., as the Presidential nominee of the Democratic Party, Mark Hanna, railroad magnate, and overlord, took his road-crossing sign seriously. He stopped, looked, and listened. As "President maker" he nominated William McKinley on the Republican ticket and gave out the word: Bryan must be defeated at any cost—the cost was $4,000,000 in the Republican campaign coffers—an unheard-of sum. Although Coxey's army had marched on the Nation's Capital 6 years before—they were a handful of men, compared with the millions, whom the silver-tongued orator might have stampeded into a war on the "sovereignty of gold" and "the divine right of monopoly."

The campaign of 1896, while it brought defeat to the Democratic Party and its young candidate, caused such furor that it forced a compromise from Mark Hanna in the following campaign—the compromise—the acceptance of young Theodore Roosevelt as McKinley's running mate for a second term.

But for Bryan, Roosevelt would have received no such consideration. Once elected, fate conspired to elevate him from the Vice Presidency to the Nation's Chief Executive.

Going beyond party boundary, Roosevelt proceeded to adopt as his war cry many of the "radical and revolutionary planks" of the Democratic Party, and for 30 years thereafter he hammered away, sometimes effectively, sometimes not, but always at some part of the Bryan program, seized upon by a great opportunist, quick to see the value of the ideas and the benefits of the strategy.

Had Bryan's father not died when he did there would have been no organized agrarian revolt. If McKinley had not been shot, it is doubtful if "Teddy, the Trust Buster," would ever have been President.

Upon such events does the destiny of empire depend.

The platform of William Jennings Bryan in 1896 had provided ample campaign material for successive years. Numerous planks have been incorporated into the Constitution, and the statutes of our land, but the great plan of William Jennings Bryan remains unfulfilled—the emancipation of the American farmer and the American laborer, and the world launched upon an intelligent program of enduring international peace.

William Jennings Bryan may be dead—but his ideas and his ideals march on—and until they are translated, in their most comprehensive meaning, into the economic, social, and political life of America—William Jennings Bryan will continue to be—the man of the future!

Why Continually Cater to Cotton?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the never-ending number of bills introduced in Congress in regard to cotton and the huge sums of money annually appropriated from the United States Treasury for cotton should prompt every Member of this House to seek information about this crop.

First, let us note where cotton is grown and which States lead in the production of cotton:

[U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, Washington, D. C.]

COTTON REPORT AS OF DECEMBER 1, 1940

The Crop Reporting Board of the Agricultural Marketing Service makes the following report from data furnished by crop correspondents, field statisticians, and cooperating State agencies. The final total ginnings for the season will depend upon whether the various influences affecting the harvesting of the portion of the crop still in the field will be more or less favorable than usual.

State	Acreage for 1940 crop	Yield per acre		Production (ginnings) 500-pound gross-weight bales	
	Left for harvest	Average, 1929–38	1940 (Dec. 1, estimated)	Average, 1929–38	1940 crop (Dec. 1, estimated)
	Thous. acres	*Lbs.*	*Lbs.*	*Thous. bales*	*Thous. bales*
Missouri	405	337	448	270	380
Virginia	31	269	385	37	25
North Carolina	833	278	425	658	740
South Carolina	1,242	251	374	820	970
Georgia	1,946	218	251	1,175	1,020
Florida	66	151	145	34	20
Tennessee	735	250	335	472	515
Alabama	1,980	215	191	1,200	790
Mississippi	2,545	239	241	1,619	1,280
Arkansas	2,104	224	350	1,283	1,540
Louisiana	1,126	225	194	709	455
Oklahoma	1,846	135	209	812	805

State	Acreage for 1940 crop	Yield per acre		Production (ginnings) 500-pound gross-weight bales	
	Left for harvest	Average, 1929–38	1940 (Dec. 1, estimated)	Average, 1929–38	1940 crop (Dec. 1, estimated)
	Thous. acres	*Lbs.*	*Lbs.*	*Thous. bales*	*Thous. bales*
Texas	8,523	149	185	3,876	3,285
New Mexico	105	420	561	99	123
Arizona	221	382	422	154	195
California	348	513	723	315	525
All other	22	297	391	15	18
United States	24,078	198.1	252.4	13,547	12,686
Sea Island [1]	27.7	-------	72	-------	4.1
American Egyptian [1]	68.6	226	261	17	37
Lower California (Old Mexico) [2]	122	210	211	42	54

[1] Included in State and United States totals. Sea Island grown principally in Georgia and Florida. American Egyptian grown principally in Arizona.
[2] Not included in California figures, nor in United States total.

W. F. CALLANDER, *Chairman,*
L. H. WILAND, *Secretary,*
JOSEPH A. BECKER,
D. A. MCCANDLISS,
F. H. WHITAKER,
V. C. CHILDS,
H. H. SCHUTZ,
Crop Reporting Board.

Approved:

CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary of Agriculture.

It is evident from the above table that one State, California, has had an average annual production over a 10-year period of 513 pounds per acre and a 1940 production of 723 pounds per acre, while another State, Texas, has had an average annual production during the same 10-year period of only 149 pounds per acre and a 1940 production of only 185 pounds per acre.

It should be pointed out at this time that the cotton acreage has been partially frozen by recent legislation, and a new producer would be compelled to pay a domestic penalty or domestic tariff of 3 cents per pound if cotton were offered for sale having been grown on other than acreage allocated under the A. A. A. This fact, no doubt, will have a tendency to keep cotton acreage from moving westward into regions evidently more suited to efficient cotton production, like Arizona, New Mexico, and California.

The acreage, production, and price of cotton from 1900 to 1940 are shown in the following official table:

Cotton: United States—Acreage, production, price per pound, and value, 1900–1940, by years and 5-year averages

[U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, Crop Reporting Board]

Year	Acreage		Production lint 500 pound gross weight bales	Lint price per pound	Lint value of production
	Planted	Harvested			
	Thousand acres	*Thousand acres*	*Thousand bales*	*Cents*	*Thousand dollars*
1900	-------	24,886	10,124	9.15	463,295
1901	-------	27,050	9,508	7.03	334,075
1902	-------	27,561	10,630	7.60	403,717
1903	-------	27,762	9,851	10.49	516,764
1904	-------	30,077	13,438	8.98	603,433
5-year average	-------	27,467	10,710	[1] 8.65 [2] 8.67	464,257
1905	-------	27,753	10,576	10.78	569,788
1906	-------	31,404	13,274	9.58	635,537
1907	-------	30,729	11,106	10.36	575,207
1908	-------	31,091	13,241	9.01	596,611
1909	31,744	30,555	10,005	13.52	676,558
5-year average	-------	30,306	11,640	[1] 10.65 [2] 10.49	610,740
1910	32,480	31,508	11,609	13.96	810,507
1911	35,634	34,916	15,694	9.65	756,989
1912	33,199	32,557	13,703	11.50	787,645
1913	35,721	35,206	14,153	12.47	882,502
1914	36,197	35,615	16,112	7.35	592,192
5-year average	34,646	33,960	14,254	[1] 10.99 [2] 10.75	765,967
1915	30,544	29,951	11,172	11.22	626,897
1916	33,977	33,071	11,448	17.36	993,514
1917	33,064	32,245	11,284	27.09	1,528,535
1918	36,123	35,038	12,018	28.88	1,735,227
1919	34,573	32,906	11,411	35.34	2,016,075
5-year average	33,656	32,642	11,467	[1] 23.98 [2] 24.07	1,380,050
1920	35,872	34,406	13,429	15.89	1,066,759
1921	29,716	28,678	7,945	17.00	675,500
1922	32,176	31,361	9,755	22.88	1,116,133
1923	37,000	35,550	10,140	28.69	1,454,714
1924	40,690	39,501	13,630	22.91	1,561,021
5-year average	35,091	33,900	10,960	[3] 21.47 [3] 21.40	1,174,825
1925	45,968	44,386	16,105	19.61	1,578,674
1926	45,839	44,608	17,978	12.47	1,121,185
1927	39,471	38,342	12,956	20.19	1,308,088
1928	43,737	42,434	14,477	17.99	1,302,049
1929	44,448	43,232	14,825	16.79	1,244,852
5-year average	43,593	42,600	15,268	[3] 17.41 [3] 17.17	1,310,970
1930	43,329	42,444	13,932	9.46	659,044
1931	39,110	38,704	17,097	5.66	483,639
1932	36,494	35,891	13,003	6.52	424,013
1933	40,248	29,383	13,047	10.17	663,516
1934	27,850	26,866	9,636	12.36	595,615
5-year average	37,408	34,658	13,343	[1] 8.83 [2] 8.47	565,165
1935	28,063	27,509	10,638	11.09	590,137
1936	30,627	29,755	12,399	12.33	764,433
1937	34,090	33,623	18,946	8.41	796,179
1938	25,018	24,248	11,943	8.60	513,638
1939	24,683	23,505	11,817	[3] 9.09	[3] 536,744
5-year average	28,496	27,788	13,149	[1] 9.90 [2] 9.74	640,226
1940 [3]	25,073	24,078	12,686	9.40	595,720

[1] St. average. [2] Weight average. [3] Preliminary.

The preceding table shows the following:

First. Although there has been a gradual reduction in cotton acreage there has not been the proportional reduction in the amount of cotton produced.

Second. That as late as 1925 cotton lint had a value of $1,578,674,000, and 15 years later, or 1940, this crop has only an estimated value of $595,720,000. It is interesting to note that during the past 8 years of the New Deal the average price per pound has been 10.18 cents with a total value of $5,055,982,000; during the last 8 Republican years cotton averaged 13.58 cents per pound with a total value of $8,121,544,000; during the last 4 Republican years the average price was 9.6 cents and the last 4 years of the New Deal it averaged only 8.8 cents per pound.

Third. A gradual decline in the price per pound and in the total value has governed since 1930 when the Democrats got control of the House of Representatives. Since that time there is little evidence of constructive cotton legislation.

Fourth. The 9.4-cent price average under the New Deal must have some relationship with the subsidies from the United States Treasury, which include (a) the export bounty, (b) the storage-charges subsidy, and (c) the cotton given away and charged up to the taxpayers of the country, (d) the soil payments, and (e) the parity payments.

Fifth. The reduction in acreage is not reflected in a reduction of production as the per acre yield is rising due to fertilizer subsidized out of the Federal Treasury or due to better cultural practices.

WHEN COTTON FINDS A MARKET

Following is a table giving the export figures on cotton for the past 40 years:

Raw cotton (excluding linters): [1] *United States exports in crop years, 1901–40*

[U. S. Tariff Commission, Washington, February 1941]

Yearly average or year [2]	1,000 bales [3]	1,000 pounds	1,000 dollars
1901–05	7,097	3,548,500	334,256
1906–10	7,850	3,925,000	437,582
1911–15	9,318	4,659,000	537,044
1916–20	5,920	2,960,000	765,515
1921	5,745	2,986,592	591,312
1922	6,184	3,173,853	600,130
1923	4,823	2,503,343	639,199
1924	5,656	2,907,304	906,566
1925	8,005	4,120,059	1,049,065
Average, 1921–25	6,083	3,138,230	757,254
1926	8,051	4,133,590	922,737
1927	10,927	5,649,742	855,788
1928	7,542	3,928,688	820,105
1929	8,044	4,209,338	847,409
1930	6,690	3,517,652	657,727
Average, 1926–30	8,251	4,287,802	820,753
1931	6,760	3,566,464	420,972
1932	8,708	4,596,391	339,940
1933	8,419	4,447,675	342,699
1934	7,534	3,982,246	421,406
1935	4,799	2,518,674	325,683
Average, 1931–35	7,244	3,822,290	370,140
1936	5,973	3,133,646	383,537
1937	5,440	2,844,295	372,923
1938	5,598	2,988,187	306,586
1939	3,327	1,756,184	170,682
1940	6,192	3,265,812	343,944
Average, 1936–40	5,306	2,797,625	315,534

[1] Linters included prior to 1921.
[2] Years ended June 30 prior to 1921; July 31 thereafter.
[3] Equivalent 500-pound bales prior to 1921; running bales thereafter.

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, Statistical Abstract of the United States; Cotton Production and Distribution; Monthly Summary of Foreign Commerce of the United States.

A study of this table reveals the following facts: First. That the exports of cotton have not been as greatly reduced by the World War II as is generally believed. Second. The 1940 exportation of cotton was comparative in bales to that of all of the years since 1921 with the exception of the years 1925, 1926, 1927, 1929, 1932, and 1933, when it was somewhat higher. It is not the amount that was exported which is so discouraging as it is the value of the same as shown

in the last column of the table. Here we find a gradual reduction in the value of cotton exported, ranging from the 1921–25 5-year average of $757,254,000 to the 1925–30 of $820,753,000, then to the 1931–35 average of only $370,140,000 and finally to the 1936–40 5-year average of only $315,534,000. Third. In 1940 an export bounty of millions was paid in order to obtain even the $343,944,000 worth of exports and in fairness this export bounty of $52,584,456 should be deducted from the $343,944,000. Fourth. We must also take into consideration that some 650,000 bales of cotton were bartered for rubber from Britain and that probably 400,000 bales of this barter are reflected in the 1940 exports of 3,255,812 bales. The subsidized cotton exports would reduce the total normal exports very materially, which fact is self-evident.

The extent of export bounties paid out of the Federal Treasury for 1940 is shown in the following table taken from the 1940 Report of the Surplus Marketing Administration:

Export encouragement programs conducted during the fiscal year 1940

Export program	Quantity	Unit	Expenditure [1]
Cotton and cotton products.	[2] 6,335,358	Bales	$40,940,402
One variety cotton.	12,592	Bales	54,455
Wheat	18,572,354	Bushels	5,659,339
Wheat flour	16,447,496	Bushels	4,426,451
Corn	25,282,000	Bushels	758,460
Butter to the Canal Zone.	239,207	Pounds	8,753
Winter pears	123,737	Boxes	[3] 49,675
Walnuts	38,001	100-pound bags.	[3] 152,004
Red Cross export:			
Raisins	750,000	Pounds	1,500
Prunes	800,000	Pounds	8,480
Pork products.	2,517,273	Pounds	141,620
Wheat products.	13,283,840	Pounds	233,060
Corn products.	1,250,000	Pounds	12,625
Rice	559,990	Pounds	25,200
Evaporated milk.	1,911,215	Pounds	110,851
Dry skim milk.	25,0008	Pounds	1,575
Total			52,584,456

[1] Figures reported subject to revision when all obligations incurred have been liquidated.
[2] Represents total declared for export.
[3] Estimated.

It is noticeable that the ever-present appearance of our friend, cotton, has had the benefit of a $40,994,857 subsidy of a total of $52,584,456 expended in this program, or 78 percent of the money. With all these subsidies it must be borne in mind that cotton represents only a small percentage, less than 10 percent, of our national agricultural income.

DIVERSION PROGRAM

During 1940, $4,361,972 Federal funds were spent for diversion programs of some agricultural products, as is shown by the following table from page 14 of the Annual Report of the United States Department of Agriculture for 1940:

WIDER OUTLETS FOR SURPLUSES

Search for wider outlets and new uses for agricultural commodities in which surpluses exist was continued during the 1940 fiscal year through diversion programs. These programs dealt with surpluses of such commodities as cotton, peanuts, sweetpotatoes, dates, figs, fall and winter pears, dried prunes, walnuts, Puerto Rican coffee, and fluid milk.

Diversion of agricultural commodities to by-products and new uses, quantities, and expenditures, fiscal year 1940 [1]

Program	Quantity	Unit	Expenditure
Cotton:			
Diversion to cotton bagging.	13,361	Bales	$302,825
Diversion to paper	1,066	Bales	33,505
Diversion to insulation.	1,046	Bales	180,000
Wheat: Diversion of Pacific Northwest wheat to livestock feed.	11,647	Bushels	8,054
Coffee: Puerto Rican, to United States.	4,200,000	Pounds	200,000
Peanuts: Diversion to peanut oil.	34,671	Tons	1,280,843
Sweetpotatoes: Diversion to starch.	272,881	Bushels	54,577
Fluid-milk utilization:			
Boston, Mass.	19,064,921	Quarts	305,337
Chicago, Ill.	18,035,487	Quarts	701,306
New Orleans, La.	271,498	Quarts	18,894
Dates: Diversion to byproducts.	1,626,438	Pounds	49,608
Figs: Diversion to stockfeed.	3,059	Tons	51,457
Winter pears: Diversion to new markets.	203,071	Boxes	[2] 81,040
Prunes: Diversion to stockfeed.	5,176	Tons	104,443
Walnuts: Diversion to shelling.	272,761	100-pound bags.	990,044
Total			4,361,972

[1] Figures reported subject to revision when all obligations incurred have been liquidated.
[2] Estimated.

Of the foregoing total, $516,330 was spent for cotton directly and $1,280,843 was spent for the diversion of peanuts, which crop was increased, due to the reduction in acreage of cotton by the Administration.

The peanut-diversion program on the 1940 crop will likely reach $12,000,000. At election time mattress making and distribution was very generously promoted, especially shortly before election.

The following table reveals where the A. A. A. payments were distributed in 1940 and shows that six cotton States received 27 percent of the funds and one State over $50,000,000 of the $451,000,000 disbursed:

Estimated payments under the 1940 agricultural conservation program (preliminary)

[In thousands of dollars]

	Total gross payments
Maine	1,751
New Hampshire	399
Vermont	831
Massachusetts	624
Rhode Island	63
Connecticut	557
New York	4,642
New Jersey	985
Pennsylvania	4,721
Total, northeast region	14,573
Illinois	24,888
Indiana	13,984
Iowa	36,697
Michigan	6,373
Minnesota	21,063
Missouri	15,153
Nebraska	19,137
Ohio	11,700
South Dakota	13,377
Wisconsin	10,725
Total, north central region	173,097
Delaware	492
Maryland	1,519
Virginia	4,288
West Virginia	1,653
North Carolina	14,114
Kentucky	10,025
Tennessee	9,428
Total, east central region	41,519
Alabama [1]	13,346
Arkansas [1]	14,665
Florida	2,782
Georgia [1]	13,873
Louisiana	8,608
Mississippi [1]	18,398
Oklahoma [1]	13,854
South Carolina	9,728
Texas [1]	50,657
Total, southern region	145,911
Arizona	2,156
California	8,737
Colorado	4,737
Idaho	3,193
Kansas	19,243
Montana	6,703
Nevada	154
New Mexico	2,945
North Dakota	16,031
Oregon	3,263
Utah	876
Washington	3,633
Wyoming	2,069
Total, western region	73,741
Naval stores [2]	1,365
Insular region	1,303
Total	451,509

[1] Leading cotton States.
[2] Not distributed by States.

Source: Office of the Administrator, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Mar. 11, 1941.

The following table shows where parity payments have been expended and to what crops it has been allocated. You will note that cotton has had $96,389,000, or 45 percent of the total disbursement.

Estimated payments under the 1935, 1937, and 1939 price-adjustment programs

[In thousands of dollars]

State and region	1935 cotton	1937 cotton	1939				
			Cotton	Corn	Wheat	Rice	Total
New York					206		206
New Jersey					25		25
Pennsylvania					771		771
Total Northeast region					1,002		1,002
Illinois	2	15	23	11,449	2,057		13,529
Indiana				4,880	1,810		6,690

Estimated payments under the 1935, 1937, and 1939 price-adjustment programs—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

State and region	1935 cotton	1937 cotton	1939				
			Cotton	Corn	Wheat	Rice	Total
Iowa				18,228	608		18,836
Michigan				475	918		1,393
Minnesota				5,098	1,690		6,788
Missouri	585	2,235	2,193	3,727	1,540	1	7,461
Nebraska				7,877	3,047		10,924
Ohio				3,606	1,967		5,573
South Dakota				1,718	2,668		4,386
Wisconsin				1,304	108		1,412
Total North Central region	587	2,250	2,216	58,362	16,413	1	76,992
Delaware					119		119
Maryland					487		487
Virginia	68	345	235		312		547
West Virginia					44		44
North Carolina[1]	1,725	6,443	4,437		76		4,513
Kentucky	24	110	103	325	279		703
Tennessee	1,106	4,292	3,525		179		3,703
Total, East Central region	2,923	11,190	8,300	325	1,496		10,121
Alabama[1]	4,690	10,758	9,040				9,040
Arkansas[1]	3,206	11,785	8,970		8	330	9,308
Florida	131	275	230				230
Georgia[1]	4,383	10,542	8,220		9		8,229
Louisiana	2,745	6,052	5,200			781	5,981
Mississippi[1]	5,830	13,445	12,580				12,580
Oklahoma[1]	1,265	8,488	5,090		2,890		7,980
South Carolina[1]	3,015	7,581	5,890		5		5,895
Texas[1]	9,892	34,174	24,850		3,440	325	28,615
Total, southern region	35,157	103,100	80,070		6,352	1,436	87,858
Arizona	336	1,570	1,505		63		1,568
California	576	3,255	3,508		854	355	4,717
Colorado					935		935
Idaho					1,781		1,781
Kansas		3	2	1,503	9,879		11,384
Montana					2,926		2,926
Nevada					25		25
New Mexico	190	834	788		215		1,003
North Dakota					7,341		7,341
Oregon					1,480		1,480
Utah					300		300
Washington					2,315		2,315
Wyoming					246		246
Total Western region	1,102	5,662	5,803	1,503	28,360	355	36,021
Hawaii						3	3
Less undistributed	13	64					
Total	39,756	122,138	96,389	60,190	53,623	1,795	211,997

[1] Leading cotton States.

Payments under the 1935 program were made mostly in 1936; those under the 1937 program mostly in 1938; and those under the 1939 program mostly in 1939.

Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Feb. 24, 1940.

The following figures from the Administrator of the A. A. A. shows the parity payments as to crops for 1940:

The latest estimates of parity payments under the 1940 program are as follows:

Cotton	$96,183,000
Corn	48,824,000
Wheat	56,666,000
Rice	1,359,000

I wish to point out that cotton, representing less than 10 percent of the national farm income, obtained 47 percent of the parity fund, which percentage is about the average for the past several years. Note that the rice farmers received $1,359,000 for their crop, which has a national production annual value of only $35,000,000.

Mr. John T. Flynn, in the Washington Daily News on February 26, 1941, and March 7, 1941, is rather critical of the manner in which the domestic and foreign cotton business has been conducted by the New Deal. His articles are as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of February 26, 1941]

PLAIN ECONOMICS

(By John T. Flynn)

NEW YORK, February 26.—HENRY WALLACE, now Vice President, has spoken his piece to the farmers to bring them along in the war drive. The bogey he holds out before them is the loss of their foreign markets when the war is over and totalitarianism takes possession of the world.

He put particular emphasis on the cotton farmer, whose foreign markets he said would be destroyed.

First of all, it is a fairly safe bet that no matter what Hitler does he will never do as much to destroy the foreign markets of the American farmer as HENRY WALLACE has done.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Wallace told the farmers, when he started in to save them as Secretary of Agriculture, that they had to make up their minds to curtail their crops on the theory that their foreign markets were gone. He did more than any other man to induce the farmers themselves to throw away their foreign markets.

He proceeded to apply a group of policies designed to raise farm prices above the world levels in the world market. The foreign market for cotton had certainly suffered severely. But Mr. WALLACE managed, by his price policies, to ruin most of what was left of it. If there is any foreign market left for the American grain and cotton farmer, certainly it is not Mr. WALLACE's fault.

He draws a picture of how Hitler will go to the Argentine and offer farmers there a price for their wheat, and if the Argentine isn't satisfied he will threaten to buy from the United States. Mr. WALLACE seems to be afraid that we might be able to sell some wheat that way.

His theory is that there will be only one buyer for the products of South America, and that will be Hitler. Or, at least, he insists that the dictator countries will be the only buyers for South America's products.

Of course, there are some of her products that North America buys. As for those we do not want, the dictator countries have been for a good while the only buyers. There will not be much change there. There has been no place for South America to sell certain of her products save to Germany, Italy, and Japan.

Mr. WALLACE, having succeeded in ruining the foreign market for our own farm products, is now collaborating with British propagandists to ruin the foreign markets of South America. Does he imagine he is rendering a service to American hemisphere unity by this policy?

[From the Washington Daily News of March 7, 1941]

PLAIN ECONOMICS

(By John T. Flynn)

NEW YORK, March 7.—Somehow or other the American farm problem is about to intrude itself on Congress. And the intrusion seems geared in a manner to cause some scrapping—if Congress ever permits itself to be diverted from more important subjects, like settling the affairs of Malay and Indochina, to deal with so trivial a matter as the American farm problem.

As matters stand, the Government has an immense amount of cotton and wheat on its hands. It has been making loans to farmers on the cotton and wheat they cannot sell. So there is hanging over the market a tremendous surplus which cannot be used here, while people in other lands perish of starvation or go unclothed.

The farmer has sort of ambled along, not through any settlement of his problem, but practically entirely by getting money from the Government. The Government has handed out billions. But the problem remains the same.

At the moment the Government owns about 6,183,000 bales of cotton outright and has, besides, cotton as collateral for $283,000,000.

Now, to make matters worse, new crops are abundant and the surplus promises to be greater than ever. So the farm Congressmen and the Agricultural Department have cooked up some more bills.

The basis of all these bills is control—control of crops, prices, surpluses, etc. And, like all control measures, it is always found that the first controls are inadequate and must be buttressed by more controls.

The new bill will provide for quotas, taking wheat, for instance, on farmers raising over 200 bushels or planting to 10 or more acres. The quotas having been fixed, farmers who exceed their quotas will be subject to penalties—loss of benefits, etc., but also to money penalties—and now, such is the course of control, to criminal action. So that the farmer who exceeds his quota may be sent to jail for a year or fined $5,000.

Thus the whole tendency is toward tighter, more drastic, more comprehensive regulation and control, beginning with loss of benefits for the recalcitrant and ending with jail sentences for them.

Another proposal, of course, and as inevitable as the penalty provision, is to pay the farmers more money—to establish parity prices and pay them 100 percent of that. There is plenty of dynamite, financial and social, in all these devices. But there apparently is no solution of the farm problem in them.

MR. WICKARD'S OPINION

Mr. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, states that "the South will grow more of those products even if it gets quite a bit of its cotton market back." By "those products" he refers to crops generally produced in the Corn Belt. An article taken from the Washington Sunday Star of February 23, 1941, in reference to his speech at the National Farm Institute at Des Moines, Iowa, on this subject is as follows:

WICKARD SAYS SOUTH WILL SOON COMPETE WITH CORN BELT—SECRETARY HOLDS TREND WILL GO ON EVEN IF COTTON MARKETS ARE RESTORED

DES MOINES, Iowa, February 22.—Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard predicted here today that the southern farmer whose cotton and tobacco markets have been choked by the European war will expand production of crops generally produced in the Corn Belt.

Secretary Wickard spoke at the National Farm Institute, which is considering economic preparedness and agriculture.

"Here in the Middle West," Mr. Wickard stated, "We might as well recognize that all indications are that the South in the future will grow more hogs, raise more corn and wheat, and produce more livestock and dairy products generally.

"The South will grow more of those products even if it gets quite a bit of its cotton market back."

Mr. Wickard said he knew that a lot of middle-western farmers look none too favorably on this trend; yet, he continued, "a sizable increase in southern production of food and feed crops is desirable from every standpoint."

The Secretary said he thought there was little likelihood "that we will produce too much meat, butter, cheese, milk, and other dairy products in the market to come.

"I have an idea," he continued, "that all we produce in the South and elsewhere will be needed."

The administration is evidently at as much of a loss as ever to solve this cotton problem. It seems to be about right where it was 10 years ago. The following article from the Christian Science Monitor of February 5, 1941, would justify such a conclusion:

WICKARD SEEKS COTTON PLAN SUGGESTIONS

WASHINGTON.—Secretary Claude Wickard sought suggestions for a long-range cotton adjustment program from representatives of organized farmers, processors, distributors, labor, and the public.

The Agriculture Department Chief and assistants prepared to lay the problem of "too much" cotton and shrinking export markets before the Agricultural Advisory Council, an organization formed in 1939 to advise the Secretary of farm problems arising from the war.

Aides said Secretary Wickard would ask council members to express themselves on various proposals intended to place southern agriculture on a firmer foundation. Because of the loss of European markets for cotton and tobacco, southern farmers have been hardest hit by the war, officials said.

PROPOSALS SCHEDULED

Proposals up for discussion, said aides of Mr. Wickard, included:

Further reduction in A. A. A. cotton-acreage program to bring production more nearly in line with market requirements. The 1941 cotton-planting goal has been set at about 26,000,000 acres. The acreage formerly averaged 40,000,000.

Expansion of programs for distributors of cotton goods among needy persons.

Inauguration of an export-subsidy program which would make American cotton fully competitive in world markets. South American cotton has been underselling American cotton in several important markets, including Canada.

Greater governmental inducements to shift from production of cotton to food, feed, and livestock in the South. The Department is offering southern farmers $28,000,000 this year for shifting more cotton land into production of foods for farm-home consumption. This offer is in addition to regular soil-conservation and parity payments.

PEG PRICES

Employ the Government commodity-loan program to peg cotton prices at higher prices. The American Farm Bureau Federation, which was expected to be represented by its president, Edward A. O'Neal, has gone on record for loans at 85 percent of parity.

Members of the council include Oscar Johnston, president, National Cotton Council; Daniel Tobin, American Federation of Labor leader; Van A. Bittner, Congress of Industrial Organizations leader; Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia, of New York City; Louis J. Taber, master of the National Grange; Claudius T. Murchison, president of the Cotton Textile Institute; M. W. Thatcher, Farmers' Union official; John D. Miller, president of the National Cooperative Council; W. L. Clayton, Houston, Tex., cotton exporter; former Gov. Bibb Graves, of Alabama; and Barry Bingham, Louisville, Ky., publisher.

Further evidence of the complexities of this cotton situation is shown in the following article by Mr. Charles E. Harner, Associated Press market writer, in the Washington Evening Star on February 13, 1941:

BRITISH TRADE PLANS COMPLICATE AMERICAN COTTON PROBLEM — UNITED STATES HOLDS SURPLUS EQUAL TO ENTIRE YEAR'S OUTPUT

(By Charles E. Harner)

NEW YORK, February 12.—Great Britain's mighty effort to maintain world trade and supply herself with fighting materials is recognized in trade circles as complicating the United States' No. 1 farm problem—cotton.

Recognized experts among the cotton traders point out that the United States Government holds 11,663,000 bales of cotton, a full year's production, and that Great Britain requires heavy shipments of the fiber; but:

1. The British are buying cotton from Brazil and Peru, as well as from Egypt and India.

2. The United States buys cotton from Brazil.

3. The British are shipping Welsh coal to Brazil and even to the United States.

Great Britain, it was reported, has contracted to buy half Peru's exportable surplus of 50,000 bales of long-fiber cotton, and last year took almost one-third of Brazil's 984,000-bale export.

At the same time, United States manufacturers purchased 12,000 bales of Brazilian long-fiber at prices said to be considerably lower than North American quotations for similar high-grade cotton. The general level of Brazilian cotton is about 1½ cents a pound under United States prices.

Thus far in the 1940–41 cotton year England has bought 44,000 bales from Brazil and the United States has bought 8,000.

FIND BARTER NECESSARY

Cotton and shipping men canvassed today concerning this situation explained it by saying the British were endeavoring to pay for raw materials as they fight; that they were engaging in barter operations with such countries as need manufactured goods and, at the same time, keeping their steamships operating on regular routes.

American shippers said that, for example, United States vessels nowadays were running to South American ports with extremely light cargoes—sometimes actually in ballast—but were sailing north with their holds jammed to capacity and even with deckloads. Their cargoes are raw materials destined, in many cases, for transshipment at New York and Boston to Canada.

British vessels, operating in the Southern Hemisphere in competition with the Americans, make it a point to carry from their home ports Government-designated cargoes at almost any price. Their chief allotment, it was said, is coal and coke for the use of Brazilian industry and North American steel mills in the Baltimore area.

In both cases the British freighters return across the Atlantic with full supplies of cotton, coffee, and manganese from Brazil and steel products from the United States.

"It's a pay-as-you-go process," said one shipping man. "And it's also a smart preparation for the resumption of world trade when the war ends."

Textile industrialists were interested in the Manchester report that Sir Percy Ashley, cotton controller, has asked English spinners to curtail their production to permit numbers of workers to leave the looms for munitions making.

MILLS NEAR CAPACITY

It was suggested in some circles that such curtailment might increase the demands upon American textile manufacturers, but it also was asserted that the American mills already were operating near capacity—in some cases on a three-shift basis—and would have a limited opportunity to fulfill export commitments.

The American cotton-growing industry—from which some 10,000,000 Americans depend for all or part of their living—has been hard hit by the war-forced curtailment of exports, now cut to 16 percent of last year's poor market and the worse since the War Between the States. Only a few years ago the United States exported as much as 60 percent of its raw cotton production.

Some alleviation of this condition was furnished by the Government's barter of surplus cotton for British-grown rubber, but 400,000 bales of that agreement already have been shipped, leaving about 250,000 more to go.

Because of the great oversupply in the United States and the disappearance of foreign markets—Germany and Italy formerly were among the United States' best cotton customers—agitation has arisen to include cotton provisions in the lease-lend bill.

Proponents of this plan assert that England is the natural outlet for this cotton, in view of her present needs and the short transportation required.

Some cotton men discount discouragement at the present domestic surplus, asserting that the whole world will demand every available bale of cotton when the war ends, pointing to the skyrocketing market which followed the termination of the World War.

CONCLUSIONS

In making deductions in connection with cotton and cotton farmers, I try to do so in as unbiased and nonpolitical manner as possible. To me the cotton problem is a national problem and not a sectional or a political one. My deductions are based, not only upon reading and studying, but upon some first-hand experience and countless conversations with Representatives and others interested in the cotton problem.

First. There is a grave danger that the United States will never regain its export market, as the South American countries undersell even our present low price, which is not much over 50 percent of parity. We are producing 12,000,000

bales of cotton annually with a normal domestic consumption of only 7,000,000 bales. It does not solve the problem to remind our majority party that their cotton program was responsible for our losing the export market. We can grant to the argumentative that the present administration did, by its program, do great harm to the export-cotton business, but the fact that we have to face is that we are producing 5,000,000 bales more cotton annually than we use domestically.

Second. The cotton interest cannot expect the United States Treasury to continue forever to (a) subsidize the growing of cotton; (b) furnish 100-percent subsidy to people to grow cotton; (c) spend millions of dollars on export bounties for cotton; (d) pay millions of dollars annually for storage of cotton in excess of all evident economic requirements; (e) spend millions of dollars for a diversion program annually for cotton; (f) appropriate funds to discover new uses for cotton; and (g) pass legislation which compels industry to use the crop for the reason that cotton interests feel that someone should be compelled to use it to rid them of their surpluses, surpluses actually created by a Federal subsidy.

Third. Cotton farmers and cotton interests must face the fact that farmers in other sections of the country have had to meet this same type of a problem. Wisconsin passed from grain growing to livestock and dairying through necessity. Potato producers throughout a large part of Wisconsin today face a serious situation. Potato-disease control and other factors are being studied, but the production in many areas is still most discouraging.

Fourth. There have not been as many foreclosures on farms by the F. C. A. in the Cotton States as in some other sections of the country. The delinquent loans in parts of Wisconsin on January 1, 1940, were over 50 percent, which is a higher percentage than in the cotton country. Of course, Wisconsin had small soil checks and very little in parity payments throughout the greater part of the State. The 42-percent reduction in the tariff on cheese by the present Administration did not help the situation either.

Fifth. The press quotes Secretary Wickard as saying that we can expect to see more livestock, hogs, and dairy products produced in the South. Whether these livestock products are grown on the millions of acres not needed for cotton or whether they are to be continually imported brings up another question. Up to the time the tariff was removed by the Tariff Act of 1913 under President Wilson we were on a beef-exporting basis, and ever since that time we have been on a beef-importing basis, as is shown in the following table:

Tariff rates on beef cattle and beef products since the Tariff Act of 1897

[U. S. Tariff Commission, Washington, Mar. 10, 1941]

	Cattle	Beef		Tallow	Hides, raw or uncured
		Fresh or frozen	Canned		
Tariff Act of 1897	$2 per head,[1] or $3.75 per head,[2] or 27½ percent ad valorem.[3]	2 cents per pound	25 percent ad valorem.	¾ cent per pound	15 percent ad valorem.
Tariff Act of 1909	do	1½ cents per pound	do	½ cent per pound	Free.
Tariff Act of 1913	Free	Free	Free	Free	Do.
Tariff Act of 1921 (emergency tariff).	30 percent ad valorem	2 cents per pound	25 percent ad valorem.	do	Do.
Tariff Act of 1922	1½ cents per pound,[4] or 2 cents per pound [5]	3 cents per pound	20 percent ad valorem.	½ cent per pound	Do.
Tariff Act of 1930	2½ cents per pound,[6 7] or 3 cents per pound [8 10]	6 cents per pound	6 cents per pound, but not less than 20 percent ad valorem.	do.[9]	10 percent ad valorem.

[1] If less than 1 year old.
[2] If 1 year old or over and valued at not more than $14 per head.
[3] If 1 year old or over and valued at more than $14 per head.
[4] Weighing less than 1,050 pounds each.
[5] Weighing 1,050 pounds each or more.
[6] Weighing less than 700 pounds each.
[7] Under trade agreement with Canada, effective Jan. 1, 1936, cattle weighing less than 175 pounds each were dutiable at 1½ cents per pound on entries not in excess of 51,933 head in any calendar year. Under the new Canadian agreement, effective since Jan. 1, 1939, the reduced rate applies to cattle under 200 pounds each and the tariff quota is increased to 100,000 head per calendar year. Entries in excess of tariff quotas are subject to original tariff act rate of 2½ cents per pound.
[8] Plus 3 cents per pound import excise tax (sec. 2491 (a), Internal Revenue Code).
[9] Weighing 700 pounds each or more.
[10] Beef cattle weighing over 700 pounds each were dutiable under the first Canadian trade agreement at 2 cents per pound on entries not in excess of 155,799 head in any calendar year. Under the new Canadian agreement, the tariff quota was increased to 225,000 head and the rate reduced to 1½ cents per pound. Entries in excess of tariff quotas are subject to original tariff act rate of 3 cents per pound.

Sixth. The United States, as a whole, might be better situated if the cotton interests produced the 700,000 head of cattle imported under the New Deal rather than to be getting subsidies for producing 5,000,000 bales of cotton for which there is no evident profitable market.

Cattle and beef: United States imports and exports, annual averages by 5-year periods, 1900–1938, and for calendar years 1939 and 1940

[U. S. Tariff Commission March 1941]

Period[1]	Imports			Exports		
	Live cattle	Beef and veal		Live cattle	Beef and veal	
		Fresh, chilled or frozen	Canned and pickled or cured		Fresh, chilled or frozen	Canned and pickled or cured
5-year average:	*Head*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Head*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*
1900 to 1904	100,000	398,000	(2)	448,000	307,405,000	115,276,000
1905 to 1909	64,000	212,000	(2)	426,000	222,060,000	95,807,000
1910 to 1914	399,000	36,918,000	(2)	88,000	29,453,000	42,265,000
1915 to 1918	414,000	74,083,000	(2)	14,000	242,216,000	118,359,000
1919 to 1923	319,000	35,208,000	8,131,000	61,000	2,628,000	23,422,000
1924 to 1928	301,000	28,692,000	29,842,000	39,000	2,451,000	29,068,000
1929 to 1933	185,000	11,696,000	47,250,000	5,000	2,477,000	13,824,000
1934 to 1938	359,000	3,911,000	77,130,000	5,000	4,735,000	10,373,000
1939	774,000	2,529,000	88,035,000	3,000	6,214,000	8,949,000
1940	631,000	11,216,000	62,743,000	[3] 3,000	[3] 7,265,000	[3] 8,207,000

[1] Fiscal years 1900 to 1918, inclusive; 1915–18 is a 4-year average; calendar years 1939–40.
[2] Not separately reported.
[3] 11 months.
Source: Official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

If these cotton interests are not going to be able to continue forever to obtain huge annual sums in farming the United States Treasury, they might be interested in supplying part of the pork now being imported. Statistics are as follows:

United States imports of hogs and hog products, 5-year averages, 1900–1938, and annual, 1939 and 1940

Period[1]	Quantity					Value				
	Hogs, live	Fresh pork	Hams, shoulders, and bacon	Other pork	Lard	Hogs, live	Fresh pork	Hams, shoulders, and bacon	Other pork	Lard
5-year averages:	*Thousands*	*1,000 pounds*	*1,000 pounds*	*1,000 pounds*	*1,000 pounds*	*1,000 dollars*	*1,000 dollars*	*1,000 dollars*	*1,000 dollars*	*1,000 dollars*
1900–1904	7	59	376	----------	4	98	8	68	----------	(2)
1905–9	1	163	449	----------	4	17	24	95	----------	(2)
1910–14	21	1,100	905	----------	29	313	139	199	----------	3
1915–18	53	5,480	2,165	----------	483	688	725	349	----------	89
1919–23	6	1,410	787	(2)	775	182	381	241	(2)	210
1924–28	82	8,846	2,039	1,547	4	1,797	1,748	695	577	1
1929–33	1	1,504	2,145	1,376	3	14	273	638	578	(2)
1934–38	37	8,354	24,758	2,958	81	660	1,225	6,651	787	3
Annual:										
1939	86	2,264	36,316	2,358	1	5	422	9,568	681	(2)
1940	55	1,421	1,756	675	----------	3	267	478	225	----------

[1] Fiscal years 1900 to 1918, inclusive; 1915–18 is a 4-year average; calendar years, 1919–40.
[2] Less than $500.
[3] Not reported separately until 1923 when 108,000 pounds valued at $48,000 were imported.

Source: Official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.
Note this 36,316,000 pound import of hams, shoulders, and bacon that might be produced by cotton farmers now getting Federal subsidies for crops not needed for our own economy.

Seventh. The following table shows the agricultural exports and the competitive and noncompetitive agricultural imports:

Total value of United States foreign trade in agricultural products

Year	Exports	Imports[1]	
		Not produced at all in the United States	Supplementary agricultural imports
1920	$3,443,000,000	$1,092,000,000	$2,157,000,000
1921	2,114,000,000	584,000,000	735,000,000
1922	1,884,000,000	773,000,000	834,000,000
1923	1,820,000,000	934,000,000	1,094,000,000
1924	2,110,000,000	927,000,000	984,000,000
1925	2,136,000,000	1,339,000,000	1,001,000,000
1926	1,817,000,000	1,443,000,000	973,000,000
1927	1,885,000,000	1,225,000,000	996,000,000
1928	1,863,000,000	1,145,000,000	955,000,000
1929	1,693,000,000	1,201,000,000	1,017,000,000
1930	1,201,000,000	768,000,000	701,000,000
1931	821,000,000	561,000,000	447,000,000
1932	662,000,000	372,000,000	296,000,000
1933	694,000,000	367,000,000	365,000,000
1934	733,000,000	408,000,000	413,000,000
1935	747,000,000	483,000,000	589,000,000
1936	709,000,000	547,000,000	695,000,000
1937	797,000,000	711,000,000	868,000,000
1938	528,000,000	479,000,000	477,000,000
1939	655,000,000	592,000,000	526,000,000
1940	517,000,000	742,000,000	543,000,000

[1] Preliminary.

It is only fair to point out that $52,000,000 in export counties were paid from the United States Treasury so our net agricultural exports were in reality only $465,000,000.

Possibly the United States as a whole would welcome the time when the cotton States would produce a greater share of the agricultural products consumed in this country. The foregoing table shows the amounts being imported. If the cotton States produced these products now being imported, they would not be continually figuring out new schemes to extract money out of the United States Treasury. By producing and processing these products in this country they would be contributing a larger share toward the expenditures of the Federal Government than they are now doing. You will note in the above table that 25 percent of the time, or 2 years out of 8 New Deal years, our imports of competitive agricultural products exceed our total agricultural exports. Why subsidize cotton when we have no use for cotton and import agricultural products which we need in our own economy?

Eighth. We are importing large amounts of flax and other grains which can be grown in the United States. We import 50 percent of the wool utilized in the United States, so why not produce more wool and less cotton rather than depend to such a large extent on the crop continually harvested from the Federal Treasury?

Ninth. Cotton interests cannot expect to continually knock at the door of the United States Treasury and obtain moneys out of proportion to the value of the crop and out of line with the amounts obtained by producers of other crops. If other crops are to be provided parity, then, of course, cotton is entitled to its 16 cents per pound, but this must, in fairness, be based on the 7,000,000 bales domestically consumed. The less fertile land can be put into forests and the rest devoted to crops which will produce a profit for the owner. The sooner the cotton interests wake up to this fact the better for them and for the general public. Out of the 320,000,000 acres of crop land in the United States, there is plenty of room for the cotton farmers who really want to farm.

I repeat, cotton interests cannot expect constant subsidies for the bales of cotton not needed in this country and for which no evident profitable home can be found.

North Dakota Raises the Food With Which All Wars Are Won but Cannot Obtain a Government Contract to Furnish That Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

LETTER FROM THE MANAGER OF THE NORTH DAKOTA STATE MILL AND ELEVATOR

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, North Dakota's share of defense contracts is exactly nothing. Only two States have been left out in the entire Union, North Dakota and Montana.

Is there anything about North Dakota and her industries that can contribute to the national defense? Yes; the greatest industry of all. That industry without which no war can be won by any power on earth—food. North Dakota is one of the greatest food-producing States in the Union. For the years 1939 and 1940 North Dakota produced 22.43 percent of all hard-spring and durum wheat, and during the same years North Dakota produced 11 percent of all wheat produced in the United States.

The Government is now contracting for flour, and while North Dakota raises the wheat and has a State-owned mill which is capable of manufacturing the flour, yet North Dakota has not secured a single contract for the purchase of flour by the Government. In my judgment North

Dakota will not receive a single contract unless the regulations of the Government as to the content of the flour required is changed. Hard-spring wheat is the best flour wheat known, and it makes the best flour in the world. The Government specifications are such that cheap wheat can be used in the manufacture of flour and which wheat can be purchased on the market for 16 cents per bushel less than the market value of North Dakota wheat. For this reason North Dakota cannot compete on Government contracts.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to set forth herewith a full report on this matter supplied by the manager of the North Dakota State Mill and Elevator.

STATE MILL AND ELEVATOR,
Grand Forks, N. Dak., March 18, 1941.

In re flour purchases by Government agencies.

Hon. USHER L. BURDICK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BURDICK: The following information is enclosed so that you will understand our problem in bidding on flour for use by Federal agencies:

1. Page 28, February 7, 1941, issue of The National Week showing "How our States look in proportion to their share of defense contracts."

NOTE.—Nothing reported for Montana, New Mexico, and North Dakota.

2. Number of bushels of wheat grown in the United States for the years 1939 and 1940.

3. Number of bushels of hard spring and durum wheat grown in North Dakota for the years 1939 and 1940.

4. Hard wheat flour specifications issued by the Federal Government.

5. Blended flour specifications issued by the Federal Government.

6. Soft wheat flour specifications issued by the Federal Government.

Hard spring and durum wheat grown during the years 1939 and 1940 averaged 22.43 percent of all wheat raised in the United States.

During the years 1939 and 1940 North Dakota raised an average of 11 percent of all wheat grown in the United States.

Many mills grinding southwestern wheats have been able to buy hard winter wheat for the past several years at an average of 16 cents per bushel less than dark northern spring wheat at Minneapolis. This means their wheat cost is 72 cents per barrel of flour less than ours.

Wheat prices at Duluth and Minneapolis terminals are based on weight and protein. Government loans are all based on weight and protein and are higher on hard spring wheat than hard winter wheat.

Federal purchases of flour should be apportioned according to the percentage of wheat grown in the several States.

A specification should be issued by the Federal Government covering flour made from hard spring wheat. This flour should be milled in the State where it is grown so that no southern soft or hard wheat can be mixed with the hard spring wheat. The protein in the specification of hard spring wheat should not be less than 12.6 percent and not over 0.5 percent ash. Please note the low protein in the Government specifications covering hard wheat flour (No. 4, attached), blended flour (No. 5, attached), and soft wheat flour (No. 6, attached). We are unable to purchase hard spring wheat to make flour with a protein as low as specifications covering hard wheat flour No. 4.

Government specifications are very low. That is, they are possible of fulfillment by using the cheapest and lowest-grade wheat obtainable. We repeat, many mills can buy this low protein wheat at an average of 16 cents per bushel, or 72 cents per barrel less than our wheat cost. You can readily see that we are not going to be able to secure a single contract unless a new specification is issued covering flour made from northern spring wheat.

All employees of the State mill, terminal elevator, powerhouse, and feed mill are members of the American Federation of Labor.

Bread made from Hard Spring wheat contains a greater amount of protein essential for muscle building. Not only is the protein in a greater amount but it has a quality of gluten superior to southern wheat which enables the baker to produce a better texture loaf of bread, conducive to good digestion. Not only is our Hard Spring wheat flour more nutritious but it has a superior flavor. It contains more essential vitamins than low-protein wheat flour.

In issuing a new specification, apportioning Federal purchases according to the percentage (11 percent) of wheat grown in our State and having the mills in the State grind this wheat into flour it will enable North Dakota mills to secure their share of this business. On all contracts secured by the State mill a direct benefit will accrue to every citizen of the State of North Dakota.

This letter and information is being sent to all North Dakota Members of Congress. Please meet and discuss this problem and present the information to the President or to the people who are authorized to act for him.

The President is interested in having these contracts placed so that labor in all States will receive its share of Government expenditures. The President is interested in having industry make a reasonable profit over the cost of production. The President is also interested in having an industry owned by the State secure its just share of this business. The State mill can be classed with T. V. A. and other governmental agencies as a yardstick with which to measure milling costs.

Please feel free to call upon us if additional information is needed to properly present this matter to the officials at Washington.

The people of North Dakota will appreciate your efforts in their behalf, as any business secured by the mill will be a direct benefit to every citizen in this State.

With kind personal regards, I remain

Very truly yours,

R. M. STANGLER,
General Manager.

Number of bushels of each kind of wheat grown in the United States for 1939–40

Kind of wheat	Year	Number of bushels	Percent
Hard Winter	1939	309,300,000	41.16
Soft Winter	1939	206,413,000	27.48
Hard Spring	1939	120,674,000	16.06
Durum	1939	35,083,000	4.66
White Winter and Spring	1939	79,965,000	10.64
Total		751,435,000	100.00
Hard Winter	1940	315,077,000	38.58
Soft Winter	1940	219,557,000	26.88
Hard Spring	1940	161,357,000	19.76
Durum	1940	35,799,000	4.38
White Winter and Spring	1940	84,908,000	10.40
Total		816,698,000	100.00
Average for years 1939 and 1940		784,066,500	

Number of bushels of hard spring and durum wheat grown in North Dakota for years 1939 and 1940

Kind of wheat	Year	Number of bushels
Durum	1940	27,082,000
Hard Spring	1940	69,972,000
Total		97,054,000
Durum	1939	27,918,000
Hard Spring	1939	51,150,000
Total		79,068,000
Average for years 1939 and 1940		88,061,000

HARD-WHEAT FLOUR SPECIFICATION ISSUED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Type A, hard-wheat flour, shall be made from sound hard wheat, free from smut and weed seeds; shall be strong, high ground, well dressed, and of a good creamy-white color; shall be capable of yielding a loaf of good volume, texture, odor, and taste. Shall be not lower than a straight grade; shall contain not more than 13.5 percent moisture, determined by the vacuum-oven method or other method of test which the Association of Official Agricultural Chemists may consider as equivalent. Shall not exceed 0.52 percent of ash, not less than 11 percent of protein (N×5.7). The flour shall be capable of absorbing not less than 58 percent (by weight) of water. The ash, protein, and absorption will be computed on a basis of 13.5 percent of moisture.

BLENDED-FLOUR SPECIFICATION ISSUED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Shall be made from blends of sound hard wheats or blends of sound hard wheats and soft wheats, all of which are free from smut and weed seeds. Shall be high ground, well dressed, of good creamy-white color, and capable of yielding a loaf of good volume, texture, odor, and taste. Shall be a long-patent grade; to contain not more than 13.5 percent moisture, determined by the vacuum-oven method or other method of test which the Association of Official Agricultural Chemists may consider as equivalent; shall not exceed 0.48 percent of ash and not less than 10 percent of protein (N×5.7). The ash and protein will be computed on a basis of 13.5 percent moisture.

SOFT-WHEAT FLOUR SPECIFICATION ISSUED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Shall be made from sound, soft wheat, free from smut and weed seeds. Shall be high ground, well dressed, and of a good white color. Shall be a long-patent grade and shall contain not more than 13.5 percent moisture, determined by the vacuum-oven method or other method of test which the Association of Official Agricultural Chemists may consider as equivalent; shall not exceed 0.45 percent ash and not more than 9.5 percent of protein (N×5.7). The ash and protein shall be computed on a basis of 13.5 percent moisture.

Removals from W. P. A. Rolls

REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, this morning I am introducing

a bill to repeal the provisions of law relating to the compulsory removal of certain individuals from the rolls of the W. P. A.

It seems almost incredible in this day and age with the gigantic defense program under way in this country that any man should find it impossible to secure a job, but such is the case. Many men are not able to secure jobs because of physical imperfections and incapacity, for in many States insurance companies insist on high physical standards for employment. These men, therefore, experience discrimination in industry, but they have got to be taken care of somehow.

I fully realize it may be late at the present time to hope to repeal that provision in current law, but I sincerely hope it will be given utmost consideration when the W. P. A. relief bill for the next fiscal year is presented to the House.

The Menace of Communism in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, announcement of the appointment of a Mediation Board yesterday comes at an important time in the development of our national-defense program. Coincident with that announcement was a speech made on the floor of the House by the Honorable MARTIN DIES, chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activites. If Mr. DIES' charges are true, then the new Mediation Board has a tremendous responsibility and that must be met today and not at some distant date in the future. There is no doubt about the correctness of the charges made in Mr. DIES' speech yesterday. The Communists representing the government of Stalin are active in this country. Their purpose is to cripple and ruin our national-defense program. Mr. DIES has made a notable contribution to the cause of natonal defense in pointing out that a well-known Communist, Kenneth Eggert, organizer in Toledo, Ohio, was transferred to Inglewood, Calif., and is responsible for a strike being carried on in an industrial plant engaged in the manufacture of war materials.

Undoubtedly, the Communists are active all over the United States. As Mr. Dies indicates, they do not operate in the open, but they have organizations of respectability, either do their work for them or they operate under such a cloak.

This speech yesterday gives a picture which everyone in America should carefully consider. There is no escape from the conclusion that deadly enemies are within our gates and that there is as much danger to America from enemies in this country, as there would be from any foreign foe. In my opinion, the time arrived quite a while ago when people should take a stand for or against American institutions. We must rid this land of communism and of those traitors who are working on a deliberate plan of sabotage and destruction of the national-defense program.

The House of Representatives may well feel proud of the fine work which the Committee on Un-American Activities has performed. The announcement yesterday indicates that we should increase the appropriations for this committee and authorize and direct it to proceed full-speed ahead in uncovering the treacherous and disloyal enemies of the Republic. We should then take such measures as are necessary to require the proper Government officials to bring such offenders before the courts for punishment. The Dies committee should have the full cooperation of every Member of this House in taking steps as rapidly as possible to meet the situation disclosed by Mr. DIES in his speech on the floor yesterday.

Agreement With Canada on St. Lawrence Waterway Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers yesterday carried a story which is of tremendous importance to the American people. They tell us that an agreement was signed on that day by officials representing Canada and the United States for development of the St. Lawrence waterway project which will make it possible for oceangoing vessels to come from the Atlantic seaboard into the Great Lakes. This is a hopeful sign. No one can stop the march of civilization and progress.

Volumes have been written upon the advantages that will come to the people of Canada and to the people of the United States when this great engineering project is accomplished.

Objections to the signing of this agreement yesterday will come from powerful lobbies which are operating to defeat the plan. Enemies of the seaway have been active and are boastful in their claims that they can prevent this development. We shall see.

Almost from time immemorial every argument against the St. Lawrence seaway development has been answered time after time and the fallacies exposed to the public.

Those groups which may not show their hands in this fight against the seaway project have been the beneficiaries from the bounties of the Congress of the United States and their activities in view of the great favors that they have had in the past ought not be tolerated by the present administration.

Selfish and sectional interests should not prevail over a project that will be of lasting benefit not only to our present generation but to generations yet unborn.

The President of the United States is quoted yesterday as writing Prime Minister King in part as follows:

> I am sure that you will agree with me that while our countries must put forth the maximum immediate defense effort, we must also prepare for the possibility of a protracted emergency which will call upon the industries on both sides of the border to meet constantly expanding demands. The combination of advantages offered by the St. Lawrence project makes it imperative that we undertake it immediately.

The newspaper items also indicate that President Roosevelt informed Prime Minister King that the time factor should not be considered an objection to undertaking this project at this time.

In other words our national-defense program will run over a period of years and vessels are now being constructed, but they will not be completed before the St. Lawrence waterway project is ready for use.

The Great Lakes States have a special interest in the announcement because the opening of the waterway would make possible an expansion of our shipbuilding program in the Great Lakes area.

This will mean also that additional factories will be constructed in the Great Lakes area and employment made possible for thousands of people in that section.

Racial Discrimination

REMARKS

OF

HON. U. S. GUYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to the gross discrimination against Negroes to be exercised by North American Aviation, Inc., which will operate the bomber assembly plant in Kansas City, Kans., in violation of the spirit of fairness toward one of the most loyal and patriotic groups of citizens in the United States. The Negroes are and always have been loyal in both peace and war. You do not find them striking in munitions plants or other defense work. While our other people strike and retard all sorts of defense work these loyal citizens keep on the job and thus promote defense operations. Now they are protesting against this, another act of discrimination against them. What purpose has the State in creating great schools for the technical training of these people if they are to be prevented from using their skill in the national defense? This is in conflict not only with simple justice but the principle followed

in the authorization for training of defense workers, which provides that:

No trainee under the foregoing appropriations shall be discriminated against because of sex, race, or color (Public, No. 812, 76th Cong., H. R. 10539).

Like provision is contained in Public, No. 783, which provides against discrimination on account of "race or color." The civil-service law makes like provision against such discrimination.

J. H. Kindelberger, president, North American Aviation, Inc., which will operate the bomber plant now being erected at Kansas City, Kans., is reported in the Kansas City Star of March 17, 1941, as saying that Negro workers "will be considered only as janitors and in other similar capacities." He is reported as saying:

While we are in complete sympathy with the Negro, it is against the company policy to employ them as mechanics or aircraft workers. We use none except white workers in the plant here in Inglewood and the plant in Dallas, and we intend to maintain the same policy in Kansas City. There will be some jobs as janitors for Negroes. Regardless of their training as aircraft workers, we will not employ them in the North American plant.

Dr. W. M. Blount, Kansas City, Kans., writes:

To our way of thinking, such a statement was ill-timed, un-American, and undemocratic at a time when our country is offering all of its resources to preserve democracy in the world and at a time when unity should be the slogan of every liberty-loving American.

Such a statement is not only an insult to the Negroes of Kansas but to the 12,000,000 Negroes of America, and should be an insult to every liberty-loving American citizen.

We doubt whether Hitler himself could have made a more vicious statement. The colored people have always been loyal to the American flag; we have never produced a traitor nor a slacker. We have always been willing and ready to fight and defend this country. We are willing to fight at this time, but we also want to work to make an honest living as any other true American citizen.

We feel that the name of Kansas shall still be the symbol of equality and justice. We learned that there is a Federal statute recently enacted which forbids discrimination in defense work because of race, creed, or color. This company has large defense contracts. This is or will be a flagrant violation of that statute.

We are asking you to use the influence of your high office to see that the colored American of Kansas gets a square deal.

W. M. BLOUNT.

Negro students of the Sumner High School and the Kansas City, Kans., Junior College, wired:

Negroes of Kansas City, Kans., protest reported announcement of J. H. Kindelberger, president of the North American Aviation Co. that Negroes will be employed in North American bombing plant in Kansas City, Kans., as janitors only. We regard Kindelberger's action as unpatriotic and un-American—a violation of the policies of the National Defense Commission. The national defense program can only be effective through cooperative work of all citizens, both black and white. We, the students of Sumner High School and Sumner division of the Junior College of Kansas City, Kans., wish to voice the protests of our school as well as of our race against this very undemocratic practice. Action should be taken against this discrimination immediately.

As a remedy for this situation I want to urge the passage of H. R. 3994, now referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. It provides among other things:

It shall be unlawful for any person administering any department of the Government or subdivision thereof, and for any person administering any agency supported in whole or in part with funds appropriated by the Congress to discriminate against any individual, in the use of facilities at the disposal of such agency or in the dispensation of benefits administered through such agency, or in the execution of any of his administrative duties, because of such individual's race, color, or creed.

This should become the law of the land and it would end this unfair discrimination against Negroes.

Wool in National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. WORTH CLARK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. D. WORTH CLARK OF IDAHO

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by me entitled "Wool in National Defense."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is an ironic comment on the chaotic condition of the present-day world that some 50,000,000 sheep grazing peacefully on our hills and in our valleys provide this nation with an indispensable wartime commodity—wool.

Today, probably more than at any time in our history, the nations of the world, locked in the most titanic and tragic war of all times, are safeguarding their supplies of wool as they safeguard their high explosives and other engines of death—but for an exactly opposite reason. Wool spells health, and in many cases continued life, to civilian and military forces alike, as bitter experience has taught in past wars.

It is a matter of military record that where wars have been fought in northern and temperate zones, lack of an immediately available supply of wool and wool products has been an important contributory cause of defeat. The last World War furnished an example of this. The inability of Germany and her allies to obtain a sufficient supply of wool uniforms for the fighting forces and wool clothing for the civilian population was an important factor in impairing the stamina and destroying the morale of the defeated countries. History may well repeat itself in the present war.

Today the need for wool in the Axis and conquered countries is daily becoming more acute. They are cut off by the British blockade from their foreign sources of wool on which they must depend. The clothing ration of civilians in the Axis and conquered countries are rigidly limited, and even the rags from worn-out clothing, blankets, and other articles have become most precious assets. They are carefully hoarded to be ground up into fiber again for refuse.

GERMANY HOARDED WOOL AS WAR WEAPON

Despite her grievous lack of foreign exchange, Germany before the war accumulated huge reserves of Australasian and South American wools. She remembered her cold, dispirited, illy clothed army and her half-starved and half-frozen civilian population in the last months of the World War. Insofar as was possible, Germany determined to guard against a like fate in any future war. The supplies she accumulated have until now enabled her to clothe her army. Even at the outbreak of hostilities, however, the uniforms of the private soldier contained only 70 percent new wool and 30 percent adulterant cellulose fibers, with a resultant loss in both their service and their protective qualities. The officers' uniforms contained 90 percent wool and 10 percent adulterant synthetic fibers.

The situation in Italy is equally bad, if not worse. Stringent laws, in effect long before Italy entered the war, require that all materials containing wool contain also cellulose or casein fibers. The civilian population of Italy has long been on rigid clothing rations. The uniforms of her armed forces contain large percentages of adulterants; and when the history of the Greek campaign is known, there is little doubt it will be found that insufficient and improper clothing played an important part in the failure of the Italian Army, despite its modern armament, to fight successfully in the bleak and mountainous Greek terrain.

UNITED STATES HAS BEST-DRESSED ARMY AND NAVY

In view of the primary importance of wool to both the armed and civilian populations, it is a pleasure to be able to report to the parents, relatives, and sweethearts of our military and naval forces that the present Army and Navy is the most warmly clothed and best-clothed military force in our history. Not only does every article of their equipment represent well-made, durable clothing of the best grades of wool, they represent also especially fine grades of wool carefully made into materials which in most cases are higher in quality than those prevailing in civilian life. This includes uniforms, overcoats, underwear, socks, and, last but not least, the important army blanket in which the permanent-warmth qualities found only in wool are so vitally important to health.

During the 12 months ending December 31, 1940, uniform equipment for our great peacetime Army required 248,000,000 pounds of wool, or more than 50 percent of the total 1940 American wool clip. Additional uniform equipment now on order, on which delivery is to be completed by August of this year, will consume an estimated additional 175,000,000 pounds of wool.

EIGHTEEN SHEEP REQUIRED TO CLOTHE A SOLDIER, SEVEN FOR NAVAL FORCES

It requires approximately 146 pounds of grease wool for the peacetime uniform equipment of every man in the United States Army. This represents the wool of approximately 18 sheep. It requires on an average of 60 pounds of wool for the uniform equipment of every enlisted man in the United States Navy, or the wool of 7 sheep. Present indications are that our land and sea forces by the end of 1941 will number approximately 2,000,000 men. To properly clothe this huge force will require the wool of between 25,000,000 and 30,000,000 sheep.

The vast purchases made by the Army up to and including December 1940 provided only for the initial issuances, and for maintenance and reserves, for an Army of some 1,500,000 men for a period of 12 months. If the present tragic and chaotic conditions in this world should unfortunately draw us into war, the wool requirements for every member

of the United States Army would be practically doubled. Basing its conclusions on conditions such as those which prevailed in France in 1918, Army officials estimate that it will require approximately 279 pounds of wool for every man in the fighting forces. This represents the wool clip of approximately 35,000,000 sheep.

ARMY ORDERS IN TEN TO TWENTY MILLION UNITS

As an example of what a titanic task it is to clothe a great army, and the indispensable part which wool plays in military preparedness, might I recite briefly a few of the wool items purchased by the War Department during 1940 alone? These figures do not include supplies being ordered for 1941, which will increase the amounts quoted about 50 percent. Here are some of the 1940 purchases: 5,000,000 blankets, 3,000,000 pairs of gloves, 13,000,000 pairs of socks, and 3,500,000 undershirts, 3,500,000 drawers, 30,000,000 yards of uniform materials, 14,000,000 yards of flannel shirting and 10,000,000 yards of overcoating. The uniform materials and shirtings all had to be manufactured into garments in carefully graded sizes to fit men of widely varying builds from every part of the country.

The specifications for the Army selectee and the naval recruit's wardrobe are the result of careful and long experiments to determine the best materials and best constructions. Every article is subjected to careful inspection before it is accepted. The very strictness of the Government's examination makes manufacturers especially careful in fulfilling Army contracts and guaranteeing what the trade calls "perfect deliveries."

As a result, when the American soldier or sailor steps out on parade today, his uniform and other clothing equipment are superior in many particulars to the uniforms furnished officers during the World War.

There is no desire to make a dandy or a drawing-room pet out of the men in our Army or Navy. Quite the contrary is the case. Army and Navy officials are not only convinced that good and durable uniforms of excellent quality which wear well and fit well are an essential in maintaining the high morale of any armed force. They believe that when these young men at the beginning of their earning and spending careers, return to civil life, the appreciation for clothing of good and substantial character which they have gained during their military service, will provide a most desirable permanent asset for retail merchants who sell them clothing, and for the wool growers who provide the raw material for that clothing.

NAVY SAYS MORALE REQUIRES GOOD WOOL UNIFORMS

The reasons for the insistence of both the Army and Navy upon wool as the basic fiber for uniforms were succinctly stated to me by Rear Admiral Ray Spear, Paymaster General of the Navy and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, and Maj. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, Jr., formerly Commandant at West Point and present director of the Bureau of Public Relations of the United States Army.

Admiral Spear said:

"Among the large consumers of wool, the one least known to the sheep-raising industry is our Navy. In order to build and maintain the good health and high morale necessary in an efficient naval service, it is basically important that the personnel be well clothed and well fed and, as a result, our Navy, although far removed from rural communities, is one of the farmers' best customers. The standards of our naval service are necessarily high and it is, therefore, not surprising to find that our blue jackets are equipped with uniforms and blankets made from virgin wool, which is admittedly the best in appearance, weight, and warmth and, in the final analysis, the most economical. I am sure that it will be gratifying to every American wool grower to know that it requires about 60 pounds of grease wool to outfit each naval recruit, and that the responsible naval officials very wisely prohibit the use of shoddy, waste, and other adulterants in the manufacture of woolen fabrics and blankets intended for the men in our first line of defense."

ARMY DEMANDS WELL-DRESSED SOLDIERS

Maj. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, Jr., director of the Bureau of Public Relations of the Army, was equally explicit in emphasizing the importance of wool in national defense as an essential in maintaining the morale and fighting strength of our armed forces. I quote him:

"When the Army brings into its ranks the selectees, the military authorities regard themselves as trustees of the boys' physical, mental, and moral education. They look upon the selectee as a ward of the Army whose whole life it is hoped to influence for the better by his service with the colors. Parents of our young soldiers should have no apprehension regarding the care of their young men, for the military authorities are leaving no stone unturned to provide these boys with clothing of excellent quality—warm in winter and cool in summer—with the best of food—and to surround them with an atmosphere of clean, healthy living."

In view of the importance of wool to the people of this Nation for both civilian and military purposes, it is natural to ask where is the vast supply coming from to meet our present demands and to meet any abnormal requirements that might result from a further extension of our great national-defense program.

The United States is the second largest wool-growing country in the world. The American wool-textile industry is probably the largest in the world in point of production capacity and modern equipment. Between 400,000,000 and 500,000,000 pounds of grease wool are produced annually in this country, the greater portion of which comes from the mountain States of the West, and from Texas. Our domestic production of wool, even in peacetime, is not sufficient to meet all our needs. We are, and always have been, importers of wool.

A BILLION POUNDS OF WOOL AVAILABLE

Fortunately, we have immediately available from Argentina and Uruguay an annual wool clip of over 450,000,000 pounds of apparel wool. Due to wartime conditions, we are at this time practically their sole remaining market. In Australasia there are vast supplies available so long as the ocean lanes remain open. American wool manufacturers are buying large quantities of these wools, some of which are going into American Army uniforms.

A large part of the 233,000,000 pounds of wool we imported in 1940 came from our South American neighbors. We are continuing to make large purchases from them. The wool which we buy provides our friends to the south of us with a market for one of their most important commodities. In return, it provides us with an indispensable essential in our national-defense program. Finally, to prevent any shortage of wool due to unforeseen circumstances, there is now being stored in warehouses throughout the United States, 250,000,000 pounds of Australian wool as a strategic reserve to be used in the event any bottleneck or shortage develops in the normal markets.

It will be seen from the foregoing that there is immediately available in our own clip, in South American supplies, and in the Australian reserve a total of more than 1,000,000,000 pounds of wool, sufficient to meet fully all our civilian and military requirements during the present year.

Despite abnormal demands for national defense, prices of wool today are on an average about equal to the best prices paid in 1939. They are far below the prices which prevailed during the World War when wool supplies were controlled by the Government, and during peacetime periods of national prosperity.

Wool growers have pledged their utmost assistance to the Government in keeping wool prices at reasonable levels. Thanks, therefore, to our great storehouse of available wool, and to reasonable price levels, our armed forces and our civilian population face no danger of being forced to forego the healthful protection of wool—which is so essential to our peacetime civilization and so indispensable as a factor for victory in time of war.

Proposed Arkansas Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM ARKANSAS, OVER BLUE NETWORK, NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, one of the most logical and fair addresses I have heard for some time over the radio was delivered on March 17 by Hon. CLYDE T. ELLIS, a Representative in Congress from the Third District of the State of Arkansas, on the subject of the Arkansas Valley Authority bill now pending both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROPOSED ARKANSAS VALLEY AUTHORITY

To build now our defense against enemies and potential enemies from without the United States and to build now our defense against enemies and potential post-war enemies from within, whether they be individuals or conditions—that is the twofold task supreme in the mind of every true American.

We are sacrificing our resources today to aid other peoples in saving their democracies—and ours. Surely we can afford to prepare now also for a sufficient utilization of those resources to cushion the shock of the inevitable chaos that shall accompany peace.

This second World War is only the immediate pain of the present. Behind it all is a world revolution, a revolution of hopeless, poverty-stricken masses inspired by demagoging maniacs, against the capitalistic system and democracy.

Democracy is not a static thing. It must live and grow. It must give hope and inspiration. It must work.

As a contribution toward these ends—defense now and later and as a tool for aiding the masses to enjoy the rich, dormant resources of four great river basins—the Arkansas Valley Authority is proposed.

I quote the first paragraph of identical bills pending in both Houses of Congress:

"SECTION 1. The drainage basins of the Arkansas, St. Francis, Red, and White Rivers contain natural resources capable of providing products useful for the general welfare during times of peace and for the national defense during times of war or emergency. It is the purpose and policy of this act to provide for the fuller development and utilization of these resources through plans, projects, and activities for or incidental to the promotion of navigation, the control and prevention of floods, the safeguarding of navigable waters, and the reclamation of public lands, in order to aid and protect commerce among the several States, strengthen the national defense, conserve the water, soil, and forest resources of the Nation, and promote the general welfare of the United States.

It is called the Arkansas Valley Authority only because the Arkansas happens to be the largest of the four rivers.

Averaging 400 miles in width and extending from the Mississippi more than 1,000 miles westward to the crest of the Rocky Mountains, covering 300,000 square miles with a population of 9,000,000 people, the Authority would embrace all or part of eight States: Arkansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Oklahoma, Kansas, Texas, New Mexico, and Colorado—seven times larger than the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Nowhere is there a domain richer in all the basic elements essential to a prosperous economic life. Its fertile soils have produced much of the Nation's wheat, corn, cotton, rice, sugar, fruits, and other agricultural products. Its lands have produced much of our cattle, hogs, sheep, and poultry. A large portion of the country's oil, gas, coal, all the world's supply of helium, and 95 percent of our bauxite ore, raw material for aluminum, are there. Many other minerals are there and in commercial quantities, including lead, zinc, mercury, manganese, antimony, phosphate and even silver, gold and diamonds. From this area comes annually a large percent of the Nation's forest products.

But we may as well face the facts. With all these, our people are poor—very poor. The latest census figures, for example, show the per capita income of Arkansas at only $244 or less than half the $536 per capita average for the Nation as a whole. All the other seven States are comparatively low.

Low income takes its toll in living standards, in education, in health, in migration victims and in countless other ways. As long as such low incomes persist, this region will never provide its proper market for the automobiles of Michigan; the farm machinery of Illinois; the shoes, hats, electrical appliances and other products of the North and East.

And why, these conditions? There are many and varied reasons dating back into our historical development along the lines of an agricultural and raw materials economy. But that is history. The conditions facing us now—the problems with which the Authority is designed to deal—are those of waste—waste of natural resources and particularly those of soil, water, and manpower.

The waters of these basins are bleeding white the lands of the great Southwest. We've seen only the beginning of the plague of the Grapes of Wrath. The loss of a seat in the House of Representatives for each Oklahoma and Kansas, and possibly Arkansas, is only one of the many warnings of trends that spell disaster. To ignore these trends is to admit defeat; to conquer them—and they can be conquered—is to open new frontiers and a new era of hope and prosperity for approximately one-tenth of the United States.

Rivers are tools to either build or destroy the democracy.

LET US TURN FOR A MOMENT TO THE EROSION AND DUST-CONTROL PROBLEMS

Each year hundreds of thousands of our people living on millions of acres of these lands are forced into the grim realization that their soils have been literally blown or washed from beneath their feet.

Already more than 28,000,000 acres in these basins have been essentially ruined by erosion for any further cultivation or grazing. That would supply 230,000 families each with a 100-acre farm. But that is gone. Approximately 95,000,000 additional acres are from 25 to 100 percent ruined. These lands were in productive use, for cultivation or grazing, less than one century on the average. What can this continued devastation of soils mean to a nation with millions of unemployed and with new frontiers in demand? What will the next century bring? Authorities agree that in these four basins practically all erosion can and must be stopped, else we shall build ourselves a huge American desert.

The Soil Conservation Service and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration are each doing splendid work in soil conservation, but there is duplication of effort and lack of unified planning.

FLOOD CONTROL

Eroded lands encourage floods. The ever increasing direct flood damage in these valleys is estimated by the War Department to have reached the staggering sum of $9,000,000 annually.

Flood waters accumulate in the alluvial plains of the lower valleys and destroy all in their wake, but whose floods are they? They don't originate with those who are their victims and who pay for them with their crops, their livestock, their businesses, their homes, and even sometimes their lives. The floods of New Mexico, Colorado, Kansas, Texas, Oklahoma, and Missouri can all rage down upon Louisiana and Arkansas at once. And yet there are those who preach the doctrine of laissez faire; that the democracy must keep hands off.

The United States Army Engineers have spent millions over the past two decades in exhaustive studies and surveys of these basins. A total of 35 reservoirs to cost an ultimate $400,000,000 are already constructed, under construction, authorized by Congress, or recommended by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War.

The 12 dams constructed, or already under construction, will provide a total of 6,000,000 acre-feet of flood storage—6,000,000 acres saved from 1 foot of water.

Control of floods involves, also, soil building and soil control. Here again the Soil Conservation Service, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Army Engineers are doing a most excellent job, but there is much duplication of effort and lack of coordinated planning.

We have learned from experience in the Tennessee Valley and elsewhere that an overall authority is necessary to operate these dams even for flood control alone.

IRRIGATION

Aid to irrigation is one purpose of the A. V. A.

Rumblings of disapproval have been heard from certain individuals of Western States, lest it interfere with vested water rights. Since the passage of the Reclamation Act in 1902 the Federal Government has spent billions in the West to reclaim arid lands, to irrigate them, and to turn them into rich and fertile fields. The South and East and North have always supported the program, believing in progress and in the development of the Nation as a whole. Such projects as Roosevelt Dam, Coolidge Dam, Bonneville, and Grand Coulee, and even the later projects of Conchas and Caddoa on the Arkansas in New Mexico and Colorado, all stand out as everlasting monuments to the determined effort of the Federal Government to open the West.

The water rights of many Western States are older than the States themselves. Water rights are property rights, and the due-process clause of the Constitution specifically guarantees that no person shall be deprived of his property without due process of law.

Alarmists have alleged that the waters of the upper Arkansas are desired by the people of the lower Arkansas for power and navigation. If water were needed in the lower Arkansas for these purposes it would be needed most in the dry season and in the dry season the Arkansas River is practically dry a few hundred miles east of Colorado.

There are no suitable power sites on the main stem of the flat, meandering Arkansas, and the tributaries of the lower Arkansas, properly controlled, would furnish sufficient water, if that were the only problem, for navigation to Tulsa, Okla., or above.

President Roosevelt, in several conferences on this measure, has made it plain to western congressional leaders that every water-right will be fully protected and they have been requested to write their own ticket on irrigation. Not a drop of water that is needed for irrigation in the upper valleys should ever be permitted to waste itself down the rivers to the sea. Water is life to the upper valleys but it is death to the lower valleys.

The Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Engineers are each performing excellent service in this field but there is duplication of effort.

DRAINAGE

The people of Arkansas, Louisiana, and Missouri have spent endless millions through their levee and drainage districts, without much help from the Federal Government, to drain their fertile lowlands and to keep them drained, only to have their accomplishments periodically torn asunder by "somebody else's water from somebody else's State."

NAVIGATION

These rivers are all navigable for short distances and they were once navigable for greater distances but "somebody else's sand" has filled the stream beds until navigation is perishing. For as long as man has sailed the seas, navigation has been the cheapest transportation and wherever it has been encouraged it has brought with it increased rail and motor transportation.

T. V. A. has made the Tennessee one of the world's busiest lanes of water traffic. The channel was far from complete a year ago, but the developments there had increased traffic from 20,000,000 ton-miles in 1935 to 91,000,000 ton-miles in 1939. New industries are moving in and other types of transportation are rapidly increasing.

When the four rivers of the A. V. A. are brought under control, channel developments, no longer subject to flood hazards, will become permanent and flood waters released from the dams during the dry season will make each river navigable for several hundred additional miles.

POWER

The authority will be authorized to generate and distribute electric power.

The 9,000,000 people of the A. V. A. basins are laboring under power rates so high that electricity is barely more than a luxury; so abominably high that millions cannot afford it, and so high that commerce and industry, in our highly competitive economy, can never experience normal growth. Conservative estimates of the Army Engineers are that more than 4,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours can be produced annually, economi-

cally, and feasibly at these multi-purpose dams. This power, supplemented by additional power from steam plants run with the area's cheap gas, oil, and coal would be sufficient to supply every home, urban and rural, every commercial establishment, and every industry at a rate even cheaper than that of T. V A.

To the extent that the Authority can make available large amounts of cheap electricity, it holds the key to the regeneration of life there. It is the genesis of new hope.

The Federal Power Commission reports an imminent and impending shortage of electricity in the area.

The pressing demand of the defense program for electric power throws into bold relief the hydroelectric projects which A. V. A. will construct. Many electrochemical and electrometallurgical industries vital to the defense require huge amounts of cheap electricity. Aluminum is only one.

These industries always locate near the source of cheap power, and that is why more industries have lately grown up in the Tennessee Valley than T. V. A. can supply. Practically none of the new defense industries have come to the A. V. A. basins and thus our economy is thrown further out of balance. Barrier No. 1 against these States obtaining defense industries, and against their proper industrial, commercial, and agricultural growth is the total lack of reasonable power rates.

The latest compilation of figures shows that for that year the people of Arkansas used a half-billion kilowatt-hours, for which they paid nearly $12,000,000. Under the T. V. A. rates, just across the river, they would have paid $6,000,000 for the same amount and they would have saved nearly $6,000,000. This $6,000,000 is the overcharge paid by the people of Arkansas as tribute to the absentee-owned, Wall-Street-controlled, Power-Trust monopoly.

In Louisiana during the same year the people were overcharged $9,500,000 by comparison with T. V. A. rates.

The people of Missouri were overcharged $21,000,000.

The people of Texas, $31,000,000.

The people of Oklahoma, $11,500,000.

And during the same year, the people of Kansas were overcharged by comparison with T. V. A. rates ten and one-half million dollars. The people of New Mexico, one and one-half million dollars, and the people of Colorado, eight and one-half million dollars. The total overcharges paid that one year by the people of those 8 States by comparison with the T. V. A. rates was seventy-nine and one-half million dollars. Think of it, seventy-nine and one-half million dollars annually. That would pay for all 35 dams now planned in 5 years.

The power rates in each of these States are from two to three times higher than in the T. V. A., and, mind you, the T. V. A. is reimbursing the States, the counties, municipalities, and school districts for all tax losses.

The average T. V. A. residential consumer is using, due to the low rates, 1,425 kilowatt-hours of power annually as compared to 950 for the Nation and 720 for the A. V. A. region. The consumer in Tupelo, Miss., can use 100 kilowatt-hours per year for $2.25, but in Harrison, Ark., a typical A. V. A. town supplied by one of the big companies, the same amount of power costs him $4.30 as compared with the $2.25. A commercial user in Little Rock must pay $67 for 1,500 kilowatt-hours monthly but in Knoxville the same power costs not $67 but $22.

From power sales alone last year T. V. A. netted $4,300,000 after paying tax equivalents and providing depreciation.

Yes, Tennessee lost a Member of Congress under the reapportionment of 1931 but she is gaining one under the reapportionment of 1941. T. V. A. came in the meantime.

Two A. V. A. dams now under construction will produce 300,000 kilowatts of firm power. If these and others can be tied into an integrated transmission system and peak power built into firm power, facilitated by steam, this can be doubled and the rates still further reduced. If the 35 dams already on the way are to be of maximum benefit for the control of floods, aid to drainage, navigation, and irrigation, and for power production, they must be interconnected for systematic and scientific operation. That is a major objective of A. V. A. and that is the alternative of waste.

RECREATION

It is now the Government's policy to construct permanent recreation pools in flood-control reservoirs. Multipurpose reservoirs with higher permanent levels for power are even more ideal for recreation. The most popular tourist attraction is water. The lakes of the A. V. A., like those of the T. V. A., would become valuable recreation centers.

PUBLIC WORKS

This vast A. V. A. domain has enjoyed very little of the permanent New Deal construction. If this proposal becomes law, not much new work would be begun during the defense program, but it would be ready to go when the war is over. I think I am at liberty here to quote President Roosevelt. His words were substantially these: "This war will be over one of these days, and then what are we going to do with millions of unemployed? We've got to get this Authority and other projects set up now."

Each dam will provide an average employment for one to two thousand men for 2 to 4 years.

We could help the democracies win this war and yet lose all. Make no mistake about it, the forces of destruction are at work among us, and they thrive on insecurity and inequality of opportunity.

This program will, in the end, cost the Nation not a penny and, in addition, will have brought all those tremendous benefits. Returns from power alone will pay the total cost.

WHAT IS THE NATURE OF THE PROPOSED AUTHORITY?

Drafted at the direction of President Roosevelt, it naturally follows closely the plan of the T. V. A., but with material changes—changes based upon T. V. A.'s experience and that fit it into a slightly different topography. It is, in plain language, an agency to assist a courageous and hard-working people in their efforts to build for themselves a higher standard of living.

Rivers know no boundaries. They cannot be trapped and confined within rigid, imaginary lines. Their waters and their watersheds, irrespective of State lines, are geographic entities.

It is obvious that the planning and direction of such an integrated development can be advanced only through an exercise of the powers and extension of the assistance of the Federal Government. It is essential that it be carried on not by remote control from Washington but by an agency—an agency operated by a board or a director, close to the people and their problems and in daily contact with them. Only if an agency operates in the field—at the grass roots—can it hope to deal adequately with local problems as they arise, with full knowledge of all the facts, and without irksome, if not fatal, delays. The Arkansas Valley Authority is designed as such an agency, "a Government corporation," to borrow a phrase from the President's speech proposing the T. V. A., "clothed with the powers of government but with the flexibility of a private corporation." What better paragon could we seek than T. V. A.? After 7 years of struggle and litigation against bitter opposition it has emerged as the world's outstanding monument to democracy successfully at work.

STATES' RIGHTS

It is claimed by some that the authority would infringe upon States' rights.

Certain special interests throughout the Nation are condemning the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court in the New River case because it recognizes the necessity of the Federal Government manifesting some control over the entire basin of a navigable interstate stream. Any State that would deny the Federal Government the right to bring such a stream under control must assume the responsibility of controlling the stream itself, free from Federal assistance. This no State has done, and obviously no State can do. To assist a region of people in doing what no State or States can do is not an infringement of States' rights. That is the purpose of the Federal Government.

CONCLUSION

Therefore, as an agency to turn our rivers and basin waters from instruments of destruction into tools of democracy; to end wasteful erosion; to control devastating floods; to reclaim and irrigate new lands and to drain others; to aid navigation; to develop for the people from their God-given natural resources an abundance of cheap power; to open new havens of recreation; as an agency to utilize for a little while some of our own idle money to employ our own idle manpower to conserve and develop our own idle resources for a deserving people at a time when they shall need every encouragement; and to help preserve the democratic way by also stressing the economic side of democracy, the Arkansas Valley Authority is submitted for your approval.

Vermont and the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on Vermont and the Union, delivered by Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill before the Vermont Society of the District of Columbia on March 14, 1941, and before the Governor and General Assembly of the State of Vermont at Montpelier, Vt., on March 20, 1941, on the occasion of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the admission of Vermont into the Union.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VERMONT

Oh, Vermont, where spring, the laggard, lingers hand in hand with June,
Opens buds with chary fingers, lest the summer come too soon:
And the April rains still scatter, truant lads among the hills,
Till the woodlands echo laughter of a thousand baby rills.

All thy days are spanned with sunshine, from Monadnock's distant dome,
Like an eastern pleasure palace, till the sun goes westward home.
Where Old Granite lifts a shoulder and a rugged pine-topped crest,
In a silhouette of splendor 'gainst the flaming of the West.

Oh, Vermont, thy pasture uplands rise so green to June's blue sky,
All thy valleys cup so gently where the winding rivers lie!
And my heart is yearning after one green hill and cottage tower,
For I know the little hollow where rose laurel is in flower,—

Where the wood thrush sings her matins, and her Angelus at eve,
And the cowbells' mellow music with the little night sounds weave
That sweet symphony of twilight which is mine to treasure still
Tho' an exile from my little laurel-slippered, star-crowned hill.

—*M. S. A.*

Your speaker should have been Calvin Coolidge, the man who went from Plymouth Notch to become Governor of the great Bay State, with whose people and history we are so intimately connected; who went from Massachusetts to discharge the duties of the greatest office in the world; who understood both State and Nation; who carried into public office principles to which America must return; who now sleeps on the quiet hill he loved so well—it is he who could have stated best the significance of the event we celebrate.

Or, not to mention distinguished Vermonters now living, but going to an earlier generation, how proud we would be if on this rostrum stood today Edward J. Phelps, orator, of Bennington; George F. Edmunds; Justin S. Morrill, Stephen A. Douglas, Lincoln's great adversary; or many another who made Vermont an envied and beloved name.

I am, however, deeply honored that you have asked me here. I was born on the far Pacific, but from the time I was 6 years old I was nurtured on your soil, and in my veins runs the blood of four generations of Vermont men and women who did not flinch from life because they found it hard, who lived without serious fault, and who died in the peace of God. I am proud of that inheritance.

It has been my fortune to have been in every State of the American Union. I have spoken publicly in at least 28. I do not say (out loud) that Vermont is better than its sister States. I do say that it is different. And wherever I have been, and whenever it has been known that I am Vermont bred, strangers have told me, with a light in their eyes and warmth in their handclasp, that they, too, trace back to some forebear from Vermont. I wonder if you fully realize the immense good will you enjoy everywhere in this land. It is a jewel that has no price.

On February 18, 1791, the following act of Congress became part of the supreme law of the land:

"An act for the admission of the State of Vermont into this Union.

"The State of Vermont having petitioned the Congress to be admitted a member of the United States—

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, and it is hereby enacted and declared, That on the 4th day of March 1791 the said State, by the name and style of 'the State of Vermont,' shall be received and admitted into this Union as a new and entire member of the United States of America.

"FREDERICK AUGUSTUS MUHLENBERG,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"JOHN ADAMS,
"Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate.
"Approved February 18, 1791.
"GEORGE WASHINGTON,
"President of the United States."

One hundred and fifty years ago, therefore, the 4th of this month, and 2 years and 1 day from the date of the convening in New York City of the First Congress under the Constitution of the United States, Vermont ceased to be an independent nation and became the first of a great galaxy to be added to the 13 original stars of the American flag. The year 1791 is further memorable by the adoption of the first 10 amendments, or Bill of Rights, to the Constitution of the United States, among which was one particularly congenial to the Green Mountain Boys: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

Vermont was not carved out of Federal territory nor was it fragmented from another State, like West Virginia. Previous to its admission to the Union it had been a soverign Nation. Only the State of Texas ever enjoyed a similar status. To the fact of its previous independence and the way it was won may be traced much of Vermont's character and philosophy of government. It had stood on its own feet before 1791 and it has stood on its own feet since. It regarded the Nation as a bond of common strength, "a watchdog to be fed and not a cow to be milked," to quote Marshal Petain, of what was France. Although the State, in party division, has been labeled Republican, it has been, in fact, as strongly Jeffersonian in its fundamental attitude toward centralized power as any State in the Union.

On January 16, 1777, a convention of township delegates meeting at Westminster Courthouse unanimously voted "That the district of land commonly called and known by the name of New Hampshire Grants, be a new and separate State, and for the future conduct themselves as such."

On the same day Nathan Clark and Capt. John Burnham, of Bennington, Ebenezer Hoisington, of Windsor, Jacob Burton, of Norwich, and Col. Thomas Chittenden, of Williston, were appointed to draft and report a more formal declaration of independence.

This they did on the following day and to the following effect:

"That the district of territory, comprehending and usually known by the name and description of the New Hampshire Grants, of right ought to be, and is hereby declared forever hereafter to be considered, as a free and independent jurisdiction, or State; by the name, and forever hereafter to be called, known, and distinguished by the name of New Connecticut, alias Vermont. And that the inhabitants that at present are, or that may hereafter become resident, either by procreation, or emigration, within said territory, shall be entitled to the same privileges, immunities, and enfranchisements, as are allowed; and on such condition, and in the same manner, as the present inhabitants, in future, shall or may enjoy; which are, and forever shall be considered to be such privileges and immunities to the free citizens and denizens, as are, or, at any time hereafter, may be allowed, to any such inhabitants of any of the free and independent States of America. And that such privileges and immunities shall be regulated in a bill of rights, and by a form of government, to be established at the next adjourned session of this convention."

This declaration was adopted without dissent. It was also voted to inform the Continental Congress "of the reasons why the New Hampshire Grants had been declared a free State, and to pray Congress to grant said State a representation in Congress," etc. It was also voted that a "Committee of war be appointed on the east side of the mountains, to be in conjunction with the committee of war on the west side of the mountains, to act on all proper occasions." The convention then adjourned to meet at Windsor on the first Wednesday in June.

The notification "To the honorable the Continental Congress" of the action taken at Westminster is a noteworthy state paper, not only because it summarizes the case for independence on high and commanding ground, but because it portrays the plucky determination of a wilderness community of not over 30,000 souls to form a "free and independent State." I quote as follows:

"Your petitioners, by virtue of several grants made them by the authority aforesaid, have, many years since, with their families, become actual settlers and inhabitants of the said described premises; by which it is now become a respectable frontier to three neighboring States, and is of great importance to our common barrier Ticonderoga; as it has furnished the army there with much provisions, and can muster more than 5,000 hardy soldiers, capable of bearing arms in defence of American liberty.

"That shortly after your petitioners began their settlements, a party of land-jobbers in the city and State of New York began to claim the lands, and took measures to have them declared to be within that jurisdiction;

"That on the 4th day of July 1764, the King of Great Britain did pass an order in council, extending the jurisdiction of New York government to the Connecticut River, in consequence of a representation made by the late Lieutenant Governor Colden; that for the convenience of trade and administration of justice, the inhabitants were desirous of being annexed to that State;

"That on this alteration of jurisdiction, the said Lieutenant Governor Colden did grant several tracts of land in the above-described limits to certain persons living in the State of New York, which were at that time in the actual possession of your petitioners; and under color of the lawful authority of said State, did proceed against your petitioners as lawless intruders upon the Crown lands in their province. This produced an application to the King of Great Britain from your petitioners, setting forth their claims under the government of New Hampshire and the disturbance and interruption they had suffered from said post claimants under New York. And on the 24th day of July 1767 an order was passed at St. James' prohibiting the Governors of New York, for the time being, from granting any part of the described premises on pain of incurring His Majesty's highest displeasure. Nevertheless, the same Lieutenant Governor Colden, Governors Dunmore and Tryon, have, each and every of them, in their respective terms of administration, presumed to violate the said royal order by making several grants of the prohibited premises and countenancing an actual invasion of your petitioners by force of arms to drive them off from their possessions.

"The violent proceedings (with the solemn declaration of the supreme court of New York that the charters, conveyances, etc., of your petitioners' lands were utterly null and void) on which they were founded reduced your petitioners to the disagreeable necessity of taking up arms as the only means left for the security of their possessions. The consequence of this step was the passing of 12 acts of outlawry by the Legislature of New York on the 9th day of March 1774.

* * *

"Your petitioners having had no representative in that assembly, when these acts were passed, they first came to the knowledge of them by public papers, in which they were inserted. By these, they were informed, that if three or more of them assembled together to oppose what said assembly called legal authority, that such as should be found assembled to the number of three or more, should be adjudged felons: And that, in case they or any of them should not surrender himself or themselves to certain officers appointed for the purpose of securing them, after a warning of 70 days, that then it should be lawful for the respective judges of the supreme court of the province of

New York, to award execution of death, the same as though he or they had been attainted before a proper court of judicatory. These laws were evidently calculated to intimidate your petitioners into a tame surrender of their rights, and such a state of vassalage, as would entail misery on their latest posterity. * * *

"The convention of New York have now nearly completed a code of laws for the future government of that State; which, should they be attempted to be put in execution, will subject your petitioners to the fatal necessity of opposing them by every means in their power.

"When the declaration of the honorable, the Continental Congress, of the fourth of July last past, reached your petitioners, they communicated it throughout the whole of their district. * * *

"And for the mutual support of each other in the maintenance of the freedom and independence of said district or separate State, the said delegates did jointly and severally pledge themselves to each other, by all the ties that are held sacred among men, and resolve and declare that they were at all times ready, in conjunction with their brethren of the United States, to contribute their full proportion toward maintaining the present just war against the fleets and armies of Great Britain.

"To convey this declaration and resolution to your honorable body, the grand representative of the United States, were we (your more immediate petitioners) delegated by the united and unanimous voices of the representatives of the whole body of the settlers on the described premises, in whose name and behalf, we humbly pray, that the said declaration may be received, and the district described therein be ranked by your honors, among the free and independent American States, and delegates therefrom admitted to seats in the grand Continental Congress; and your petitioners as in duty bound shall ever pray.

"New Hampshire Grants, Westminster, January 15, 1777.

"Signed by order, and in behalf of said inhabitants.

"JONAS FAY,
"THOMAS CHITTENDEN,
"HEMAN ALLEN,
"REUBEN JONES."

Due to objections strongly made by New York, Congress on June 30, 1777, dismissed the foregoing petition and stated:

"That the independent government attempted to be established by the people, styling themselves inhabitants of the New Hampshire grants, can derive no countenance or justification from the act of Congress declaring the United Colonies to be independent of the Crown of Great Britain nor from any other act or resolution of Congress."

The Green Mountain Boys were thus confronted with the following situation: They were at war; at the Canadian frontier were armies of the most powerful empire in the world; at their west was the great State of New York hostile to their claim; and at Philadelphia was a Government of Thirteen States which refused to recognize their right to be free.

In the midst of such vast difficulties most men would have flinched and fled. But—

"Two things have failed not since first the dawn began,
"The beauty of the wild green earth and the bravery of man."

Vermont was beautiful, and her men were brave. Having set their plow to its furrow they turned neither to the right nor to the left, nor to the rear. Forward was the only word they knew.

Meeting at Windsor in pursuance to their previous resolve, they proceeded to form a constitution. While they were in their seats came the terrifying news that Ticonderoga had evacuated before the army of Burgoyne. This exposed their very homes to the ravages of Indians and redcoats. Nevertheless they stuck to their post until the Constitution had been adopted July 2, 1777. A month later, August 16, Vermont, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire troops, under the command of General Stark, engaged Burgoyne and his redcoats (most of whom, by the way, were Germans) at the Battle of Bennington and halted His Majesty's ambitious plan to drive south to the mouth of the Hudson and cut America in two.

Small wonder Burgoyne wrote, "The Hampshire grants in particular, a country unpeopled and almost unknown in the last war (French and Indian) now abounds in the most active and most rebellious race on the continent, and hangs like a gathering storm on my left."

Thus, amidst the clash of arms and the birth pangs of a nation ranging from Boston to Savannah, the little nation of Vermont established its sovereignty. From 1777 to 1791, a period of 14 years, Vermont owed allegiance to no power on earth but the Lord of Hosts and the God of Battles.

The constitution which they adopted was notable in at least five particulars:

1. It was the first American constitution to abolish slavery, thus firmly meeting the issue that had been avoided in drafting the Declaration of Independence at Philadelphia the previous summer.

2. It was the first to provide for universal manhood suffrage, without any property qualification.

3. It required every man of the age of 21, as a condition to being a "freeman" and to vote as such, to take an oath that when voting, "touching any matter that concerns the State of Vermont, I will do it so, as in my conscience, I shall judge will most conduce to the good of the same, as established by the Constitution, without fear or favor of any man." This oath to support constitutional government preceded the Dies committee by 160 years. Our forebears were not so soft-headed as to tolerate disloyalty to their fundamental law.

4. The constitution immediately called for the establishment in each town of schools "for the convenient instruction of youth * * * making proper use of school lands thereby to instruct youth at low prices." Here was a beginning, in a wilderness settlement, and in the midst of alarms, of the great public school system of this country. Again the men who gathered at Windsor had Horace Mann's great concept in their brains 17 years before he was born.

And, fifth, the Constitution contained this memorable paragraph, which ought to be required reading by every American every day of their lives:

"That frequent recurrence to fundamental principles, and a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, industry and frugality, are absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty, and keep government free. The people ought, therefore, to pay particular attention to these points, in the choice of officers and representatives, and have a right to exact a due and constant regard to them, from their legislators and magistrates, in the making and executing such laws as are necessary for the good government of the State."

I shall touch on this later.

Until the first election could be had the supreme executive, legislative and judicial power of the State was exercised by the council of safety, which was in turn an outgrowth of committees of safety organized in the various townships. Although this small body of men had absolute power their record is one of the few instances in human history when absolute power has been exercised firmly but with moderation. In all the years of conflicting claims between settlers and land-jobbers, and despite the passionate and unyielding determination to hold the homes they had carved from the wilderness with infinite toil, it is to the eternal credit of these sturdy men that no murder was committed and no human life lost in a controversy lasting 26 years. They maintained their homes against New York State sheriffs and writs of ejectment more by the psychology of fear than by force. A few men were whipped, some fences were torn down, a few log houses burned, gun shots were heard at night, threats were made, and big words used, but there was less actual bloodshed than in a single brawl in a frontier saloon. The record is a remarkable instance of men being reverent of law and human life even when they defied the will of their King or the Governor of New York, or the Continental Congress.

The first Government under the Constitution began business March 18, 1778, when the first General Assembly met at Windsor. It was largely a Government on foot or horseback, for the legislature met successively at Windsor, Bennington, Windsor, Bennington, Windsor, Manchester, Westminster, Bennington, Windsor, Bennington, Charleston, New Hampshire, Bennington, Windsor, Manchester, Rutland, and Norwich, during a period of 6 years. Judge Wendell Phillips Stafford is authority for the statement that the ark of government had 15 temporary resting places before it finally found its seat at Montpelier.

I must shorten the story. The war dragged on. Royalton was burned by Indians. The dauntless leader, Ethan Allen, was captured in Canada and taken in irons to England. Vermont repeatedly solicited admission into the Union and the adjustment of the boundary line disputes. Congress, to keep the good will of New York, procrastinated and refused. Then new misfortunes crowded upon the young State. Sixteen townships, east of the Connecticut, asked to join. The Assembly voted to admit them. This was a mistake. New Hampshire, heretofore a friend of Vermont, resented the act. New Hampshire and New York joined hands. They negotiated to divide Vermont between them at the watershed of the Green Mountains. They solicited the support of Congress. Congress undertook to decide the fate of Vermont.

The year was 1781. It was the supreme hour in Vermont's fight to live. New Hampshire to the east, New York to the west, and Congress to the south, all hostile. Canada and Indian massacres to the north. Great Britain across the sea. It was "the world against Vermont, and Vermont against the world."

Then came the cry of undying defiance to one and all. Vermont denied the power of Congress to judge her right to exist. Then came words that prove when men are fit to be free. It is Ethan Allen speaking to Congress: "We are as resolutely determined to defend the independence of Vermont as Congress that of the United States; and rather than fail we will retire into the desolate caverns of the mountains and wage war with human nature at large." This was indeed a time "when men grew tall."

Not only words, deeds. New Hampshire's settlements on the Connecticut and New York's east of the Hudson wanted to join this dauntless State. Vermont annexed them and asked no one's leave. It doubled her territory at a stroke of the pen.

This act of reckless bravery, of impudence even, brought Congress to its senses. It said, "Give up this new territory and you may enter." General Washington counseled Governor Chittenden to the same effect. Vermont voted to withdraw from her new territory. New York, however, remained obstinate, and by ceding public lands to Congress maintained pressure on Philadelphia.

So for 7 years longer Vermont went her sturdy way. New York would not recognize her; Congress would not admit her. But the war with George III was over. Vermont was

free from invasion from the north. She did not now particularly care whether she joined or not. Congress and the 13 States were loaded with debt. Vermont was debt free. She had paid as she had fought. Consequently settlers thronged to her, a point to be remembered today. As stated in Williams' History, written a century and a quarter ago: "Encouraged by the mildness of the government, the smallness of the taxes, the fertility and cheapness of the land, large additions were annually made to their numbers and property by the accession of inhabitants from other States." While chaos threatened the other States Vermont prospered. She coined money, opened post offices, fixed standards of weight and measures, maintained a mild and frugal government, and sawed wood. She pursued happiness while worry pursued others. So may it be now and forevermore.

Finally, however, Kentucky "wanted in" as we say in Indiana, and New York and the North suddenly found it desirable to balance her votes in Congress with votes from Vermont. They now practically asked Vermont to join, and as Judge Stafford puts it, Vermont said, "That if it would be any accommodation to the Union she didn't know but that she would."

And so she did, March 4, 1791, 150 years ago. And they lived happily ever after.

Nevertheless, Vermont has continued obstinate when she thought she was right. Years later Congress passed the fugitive-slave law. But nary a slave on the "underground railroad" to Canada through Vermont was turned back to southern masters.

And so Vermont proved her mettle and became the fourteenth star in Old Glory. She gave the first blood of the Revolution; received the first surrender of a British flag; was first to seize and sell the property of Tories; first to prohibit slavery by bill of rights; first to answer Lincoln's call for volunteers; in proportion to population had a greater percentage of soldiers killed in action than any other State, and never surrendered a battle flag. In the Spanish-American War when her quota was only a battalion she gave a regiment—and Dewey.

Vermont has never had much of the trappings of wealth or power. But "if you know how precious freedom is you would defend it with axes," as the Spartans said when the king's satrap ridiculed their arms.

Vermont had men. In the great struggle between North and South she sent one-tenth of her population, more than one-half of her able-bodied men. At Gettysburg came Sedgwick's order, "Put the Vermonters in front and close up the column."

I have sketched the story of 1791. But has it no meaning for the days in which we live—days in which democracies have grown fat? Has not Vermont a message for soft living? Are we to grow mendicants or men? Are the bread and circuses of modern Caesars to be the food of coming generations? Or is American manhood still to be honored? And where and how is manhood nurtured? On government handouts and deficits? Or by frugal spending, plain living, and hard work?

The latter, I submit. And here is proof. Who's Who in America is recognized as a fair measure of men's achievement. Some years ago an analysis was made of the place of birth of those who had won recognition in that index of accomplishment. Per 100,000 of population Vermont led every State, New Hampshire second, Maine third, Massachusetts fourth, Connecticut sixth, and Rhode Island eighth, the 6 New England States in the first 8 of 48. In a similar publication, Men of Science, Vermont again ranked first, New Hampshire second, Massachusetts third, Connecticut fourth, and Maine tenth, 5 New England States in the first 10.

Perhaps the uplifters and the bleeding hearts on the Potomac can do a better job of breeding Americans than Vermont and New England. But it remains to be proved.

Notable as is her past, I believe Vermont has a great future if she will "put her feet in the tracks of her forefathers where she may neither wander nor fall," as Edmund Burke once said. I will tell you why. This Nation is marching nonchalantly toward bankruptcy. For 11 years the Nation has lived beyond its means, and the end is not yet. So with States and cities. A pleasure-mad people who give votes to politicians in exchange for tickets to the public's treasure refuse to tighten their belts and do with less. It is a shocking fact that New York City's debt today is greater than that of the entire Nation plus the 48 State governments in 1914. Property in great cities is being torn down or abandoned to avoid taxes. There is a turn in the tide. Of the 10 largest cities in America, 5 declined in population this past decade. The tinsel is leaving the fleshpots. The prodigal son is thinking of home.

If, therefore, Vermont remembers that "the mildness of her government and the smallness of her taxes" once drew settlers from debt-ridden States, it may well recur again. I believe, too, that if those responsible for the administration of your schools and colleges let it be known that you will not tolerate the teachings of "pinks who would be red if they were not yellow," but insist that loyalty to constitutional government, as set forth in your freeman's oath, must be taught, whatever else is not taught, that fine youngsters and their parents will cross your frontiers.

In a day of mass emotion, radio, and moving-picture and Government propaganda, of headline thinking and thoughtless living, let Vermont repeat to the Nation the words in the introduction to her State Papers of 1823:

"The general diffusion of intelligence constitutes the life of a free government. Upon every department of such a government the people exert an unremitted influence, and stamp on all its measures the impress of their own character. Called upon to act, they should become accustomed to think; and though they cannot ordinarily possess extended and comprehensive views of other systems of government, they should at least understand their own. The whole science of government consists in a knowledge of the practical operation of principles. With the science thus understood, the citizens of every free government owe it to themselves and their posterity to become familiarly acquainted. The preservation of their political institutions depends, under Divine Providence, on themselves."

At a time when communities and States are abdicating their responsibilities; at a time when we hear the tread of returning Caesars and their boast that the individual has no rights which the State is bound to respect, let these words of 1823 be held in remembrance.

The "preservation of our political institutions depends, under Divine Providence, on ourselves." And on no one else. And when we are seeking within our midst the open enemies of the Republic, let us assert the truth—that the most dangerous enemy to free institutions, the worst of "fifth columnists," is the indifferent and apathetic citizen, the hitch hiker in government.

If government is to be kept within bounds, if the tyrannies against which our fathers fought are not to return to curse our sons, government must be kept close to the people. As Mr. Coolidge said:

"No method of procedure has ever been devised by which liberty could be divorced from local self-government. No plan of centralization has ever been adopted which did not result in bureaucracy, tyranny, inflexibility, reaction, and decline. * * * The States should not be induced by coercion or favor to surrender the management of their own affairs."

Jefferson, the elder Coolidge said: "What has destroyed liberty and the rights of man in every government which has existed under the sun? The generalising and concentrating all cares and powers into one body, no matter whether the autocrats of Russia or France or the aristocrats of the Venetian Senate."

Local self-government. This is the glory of the New England Town Meeting, the most perfect instrument to keep government free and frugal and honest. Although not adapted to large areas, one of the cleanest winds blowing in these murky days is the old town-meeting idea applied to broader problems—where both sides are certain to be heard. There are always two sides to a question. But let us not think that the side is not important. There are two sides to flypaper, but it makes some difference to the fly which side he lights on. And so with principles of government.

And if government is not to be tyrant and master it must be kept poor. Jefferson wrote, "We must make our selection between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude." And Coolidge, the modern Jefferson, said:

"I favor the policy of economy, not because I wish to save money, but because I wish to save people. * * *

"One of the first signs of the breaking down of free government is a disregard by the taxing power of the right of the people to their own property. It makes little difference whether such a condition is brought about through the will of a dictator, through the power of a military force, or through the pressure of an organized minority. The result is the same. Unless the people can enjoy that reasonable security in the possession of their property which is guaranteed by the Constitution, against unreasonable taxation, freedom is at an end. * * *

"I am for economy. After that I am for more economy."

It has seemed in recent years when public debt is held of no importance because "it is owed to all of us;" when deficits are glorified as "net contributions to national purchasing power;" when there has seemed no end to our ability to mortgage the patrimony our fathers saved for us, that Jefferson and Coolidge were the fiscal relics of a foolish age. But be not deceived. God is not mocked. Whatsoever one soweth, that shall he also reap.

Today, lean, hard men are on the march. Millions of Japanese, willing to live on naught but rice and fish, filled with a fierce religion which makes it life's greatest glory to die for the Emperor; millions of Italians struggling, as they say, to escape the prison of their own sea; millions of Germans who, despite the worthless word of their Fuehrer and despite their ruthless crushing of little states which asked only to live as friendly neighbors, are, as a people, capable of any sacrifice for their fatherland, willing to work 60 hours a week for meager living—these are they who challenge the modern democracies grown soft and fat and corrupt and contented. Rotten city governments. Mendicant State governments. Spendthrift National Government. Their war cry is "Charge it on the cuff." Their slogan is "Less work, more pay; produce less and have more." Their shibboleth is "Bigger pensions for everybody." Upon their banner is that strange device, "Special privileges for all." In this sign they conquer—for a time.

It is needless to say that all this is the exact opposite of the hardy self-reliance that has made Vermont an honored name since the time when, like yellow jackets tearing from their nests, the Green Mountain boys hurled defiance at one and all—and paid their way as they went.

None of this new dogma fooled Calvin Coolidge. He never worshipped this modern Baal. He remained steadfast to the gods of the hills, contemptuous of the gods of the valleys to which sloth and ease threw incense.

Eighteen years ago, and it seems a strange prophecy today, this greatest son of old Vermont had this to say to his countrymen:

"We have come to our present high estate through toil and suffering and sacrifice. That which was required to produce the present standards of society will ever be required for their maintenance. Unless there is an eternal readiness to respond with the same faith, the same courage, and the same devotion in the defense of our institutions which were exhibited in their establishment, we shall be dispossessed, and others of a sterner fiber will seize on our inheritance."

Ladies and gentlemen, in 1791 Vermont joined the Union. In 1941 the Union should join Vermont.

The Southern Economy in the Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

ADDRESS BY CHESTER C. DAVIS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have before me a copy of the address of Hon. Chester C. Davis, member of the National Advisory Commission, delivered before the Southern Governors' Conference in New Orleans on March 15 last, on the subject The Southern Economy in the Defense Program. I wish to call particular attention to these words from Mr. Davis' address. He said:

It is significant that our greatest success in expanding industry in the South, both before and since the beginning of the defense program, has been in two directions. One was the shift of the textile industry nearer to the source of raw material and labor supply. The other has been in the immediate Tennessee Valley area. Within recent months the Tennessee Valley Authority and Tennessee Valley Authority power have brought an aluminum industry, an ammonia industry, and the manufacture of explosives to Tennessee and Alabama; there would have been precious little defense industry in these States without Tennessee Valley Authority facilities. The development of the Tennessee Valley was largely the product of southern initiative and imagination. It should be an object lesson to the South in what a genuine industrial development requires.

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You have asked me today to talk about the role of the Southern States in the defense program; and on the relation of war and our defense effort to the peculiarly difficult problems which you have faced in this part of the country in recent years. I believe it is necessary for me to begin with this second phase of my topic—with some consideration of the economy and economic problems of the cotton South. I do this because to me it is self-evident that a strong and effective participation in the work of national defense proceeds from a sound and properly organized economic life. Energies which must be devoted and absorbed completely in the struggle for existence cannot be diverted to defense activity.

The South has come through difficult years, and there are difficult days ahead. But if it is to be an effective participant in the work of defense, it must have an economic organization which makes effective use of southern manpower and material resources. An economic organization that holds the great mass of the people struggling to grow one crop which, under existing and prospective conditions cannot produce a decent American standard of living for many of them, does not make full and effective use of resources.

The South is an agrarian economy—its living, or the vast part of it, has been derived directly from the soil. Traditionally the farmer has organized his operations and planned his output independently of his neighbor. He has taken the market-determined price for whatever supply resulted from the combination of individual decision and crop yields. Nowhere else in our economic system in recent times has there been the same dependence on the free, uncontrolled, and competitive market.

During the aggressive expansion of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries this economic isolation of the farmer was not a serious disadvantage. His market both at home and abroad expanded as rapidly—sometimes more rapidly—than his ability to supply it. But since the World War the American farmer has been living in a contracting market. European countries during the post-war period no longer financed our railroads and our industries, and we no longer serviced our debt with wheat and cotton. With controlled immigration and latterly a slower rate of population increase, our domestic market has been growing less rapidly than before. The free market of the farm producer reflected the full burden of this new situation—and reflected it directly on the producer. The farmer could not, as could industry, control or check the downward movement in his prices and gradually adjust his supply to the new situation. He had to take the rap.

As I see it in broad outline, during the last 8 years we have made some progress in meeting the fundamental situation—the farmer has managed, and nowhere with such unanimity of action as in the Cotton Belt—to develop a measure of control over his production and the price at which it sells.

Agriculture has gained a measure of protection from the vicissitudes of uncontrolled production in the free market. This protection together with the expansion of domestic demand which has taken place in recent years has put some farmers in a reasonably favorable position. Some 2,000,000 persons have found employment during the past 12 months; it is fair to assume that nearly all of these have increased their purchases of food. The market for beef, lamb, pork, milk, butter, eggs, and cheese—all luxury items for many Americans—again is expanding.

But the position of the 2,000,000 farms which produce cotton, and of the 10,000,000 people who live on these farms, is very different. These and the tobacco and wheat producers do not face an expanding market; rather, they now face adjustment to a still further contraction in their existing market. Before the war—the present war—we were holding our own against our old cotton competitors, Egypt and India. And in spite of the increasing use of cotton substitutes the world consumption of cotton was increasing. In 1914 the world consumed about 20,000,000 bales, and after the interruption of the World War it again reached this figure in 1923. By 1936 world consumption had climbed up to some 30,000,000 bales. The world still likes cotton, and I think this is important. However, as you well know, strong new competitors have arisen in South America, Africa, and China. These new competitors probably have a staying power in world markets at least as great as ours. Finally, the war for the time being has slashed off the greater part of our overseas market in its entirety.

Obviously if southern manpower, land, and resources are to be used most effectively in the period ahead, vigorous and imaginative action is necessary. Steps must be taken which will provide a supportable livelihood for those whose markets were in the path of the aggressors; we must find a useful outlet for the manpower which in the past produced for these markets; and, if possible, we must work toward a solution which will leave the South prosperous and secure when the present period of crisis is over.

To begin we must take for granted, I think, that the South is going to continue to grow cotton and that the world in the future will purchase a part of it. Even were we told tomorrow that not another bale of American cotton would ever leave the country, we could not at once place ourselves on a purely domestic basis. But I see no reason why we should make any such assumption. We are still part of the world. Our policy of aid to Britain, so firmly supported in this part of the country, shows the extent of our participation in the world community. This policy means that we intend in the future to participate in the world community. On the economic level it means we will continue to supply the world with a part of its cotton.

In both the immediate and the indefinite future the South will be living with its great staple crop. It follows that cotton prices must provide a supportable return to those who produce it. We must continue with measures which will make cotton growing remunerative particularly in those areas and for those people with no ready alternative. We must do this even though, temporarily, we may accumulate surpluses even larger than those we now have. I should like to add here that I hope we do not spend too much time worrying about the size of this surplus. Many of you will disagree with me, I know, but I must insist that the problem of our cotton stocks is in part a state of mind. Were they half as large as they are, we would still worry; were they half as large again, we would not worry much more. We can develop and in some measure we have developed machinery so that a 12,000,000-bale carry-over bears little more heavily on the producer than a 10,000,000-bale carry-over. Let us count on this machinery of loans and storage, or the equivalent of this machinery, to protect the producer from the price-depressing effects of our surplus. And as for the surplus let us not during this crisis worry too much about something that every other industrial country would consider a great asset.

But to make cotton reasonably profitable to live with is only a first step. It still leaves us with idle hands and idle lands. It still leaves us with the curse of a one-crop economy.

We must have a better-balanced agriculture. You all know the difficulty in the past which has faced those who have talked of the diversification of southern agriculture. It has been the question of alternatives. We have wanted to diversify our cotton acreages but with what? Other things besides cotton were plentiful, too. Now this situation is changing. There are alternatives.

We are entering a period of expanding domestic demand for dairy products, meats, and vegetables. We face a period when the South can increase its production of foods without raiding the markets of other areas. As the Nation's food requirements expand in months ahead, I feel that we must look upon the South as a new and important part of the Nation's larder. By so doing, we will save ourselves from uneconomical and perhaps, in the long run, unnecessary expansion in the present meat and dairy areas. But particularly we will leave the South with a better balanced agriculture for an increased and better-balanced home consumption. In all our agricultural programs, both State and national, we should give close attention to expanding the food resources of the South. The time has come, I think, when we can approach this matter as a truly national objective on which all can agree. To the extent we are successful we will accomplish the second great step, the diversification of the agricultural economy of the South.

There are several further steps in a complete program, but there is one which I should like to stress in particular. Diversification of agriculture is but one step in a larger process—the process of diversifying an economy. A diversified economy is one which combines both agriculture and industry. Full adjustment and full balance in the southern economy will not come until a part of the agricultural population has found an effective and useful employment through southern industrial expansion. This is the great step which is necessary if the South is to become a strong and effective part of our national economy. It is the step which must be taken if the full power of the South is to be made available and used in the defense effort. It is one of the purposes to which this association of Governors of the Southern States is dedicated.

There is no easy road to industrial development. In modern economic society the tendency is to a centralization rather than to a decentralization of industrial production. The British Empire has developed with a small industrial core on the British Isles and a vast world hinterland from which it draws food and materials, and to which it ships finished products. Somewhat similarly the United States has developed its own industrial core in the North and Northeast with its own agrarian empire in the South and West.

In the case of both Britain and the United States this pattern of industrial concentration has been deeply influenced and confirmed by war. The era of industrial expansion in Europe, which historians term the industrial revolution, coincided with the Napoleonic Wars. England entered these wars with a substantial head start in its industry and while the Continent suffered under a succession of military campaigns, English industrial production continued intact. England became the banker and in measure the arsenal for her continental allies. By the time peace came she had far outstripped her industrial rivals across the Channel. She was able, as we know, to maintain this leadership for more than a century.

Very similarly in the United States the War between the States found the North with a nucleus of industry which was greatly expanded to supply its armies. The antebellum South, using its agricultural advantages, had specialized on cotton, tobacco, and sugar. Its industry was undeveloped and it was destroyed or rendered ineffective particularly after Sherman's campaigns. Northern industry was confirmed in its head start, and it too has maintained that lead.

The Great War brought a new period of expansion—one far in excess of that of the war of the 1860's. During the Great War we expanded existing industries and we located our new war industries close to the present centers of industrial activity. The result reinforced the industrial concentration of the Northern and Northeastern States. I might add also that this policy created some very serious subsidiary problems. So great was the congestion of industrial activity in the northeastern triangle that in 1918 the War Industries Board was forced to suspend for a period all further war orders in a selected group of Northeastern States. The task of supplying fuel and food to these areas had gone beyond the capacity of the railways and the ability of the main rail gateways to handle freight. Acute labor shortages developed in spite of mass migration into the northeastern area. At the same time manufacturers outside of the area had a labor surplus and idle plant capacity. In many cases they were unable to use this labor and plant because of their inability to get materials which were tied up under priorities in the eastern areas.

I stress these matters for I believe the current flows strongly in the United States toward a concentration of industrial enterprise and it is vital that we watch this current in time of war. People in the South and West have looked at times upon their labor force and their raw material resources and have assumed that the logic of events would cause them to be used—that if they waited, industry would employ these resources. I can't help thinking that they were too optimistic. I have had some recent experience with this problem.

When the National Defense Advisory Commission was organized last summer, I expressed the view that new industries required under the defense program should not be located in areas where existing industries essential to defense are now concentrated, when there was any possibility of placing them elsewhere without sacrifice of speed and efficiency. It was clear that this was the only way in which new reservoirs of unemployed labor and resources would be tapped without uprooting families and shifting them thousands of miles into communities, where ebbing of the armament effort would leave them stranded.

The plans, such as they were, which had been made prior to the emergency for maximum war production were not based on such a principle. In carrying out the program we have made some progress toward decentralization, but I have been far from satisfied. I am afraid that in the defense effort up to date we have followed the same pattern of regional concentration that was followed in 1917 and 1918. Then, as I have said, we handicapped our effort by shortages of labor and transport and left an aftermath of overbuilt and overconcentrated industry. I am afraid that we will again reap some of the same harvest of economic and social consequences.

In the period between June 1 of last year and January 31 of this year some seven and one-half billions of defense contracts have been let. These exclude contracts for ship construction and supplies where obviously seaboard States must dominate the picture. Of this total, only slightly over a half billion, or approximately 7 percent, have been placed in the 11 States of Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Oklahoma, Florida, Arkansas, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas. This 7 percent of the total compares with a value of manufactures in 1937 in these States of slightly over 11 percent of the national total. These figures are for defense contracts. Up to March 1 plans have been completed for the construction of some 302 new facilities for defense production. Of these, only 24, valued at $166,271,860, have been located in the 11 States I have just listed, as compared with 302 at a cost of $1,574,523,000 in the rest of the country. These, as I say, were the new facilities and included many plants where I had hoped we would have a special freedom of choice in finding favorable locations in accordance with the broad pattern of decentralization. I am far from satisfied with the showing, and, as I have said on other occasions, I feel equally dissatisfied with the results in the rural areas of the West.

In part, our hands were tied by the compelling need for speed. But there were other reasons. The line of least resistance was to place business and locate industry in existing industrial areas. Those of us who were interested in a larger decentralization of this effort found ourselves placed largely in an advisory role. An adviser whose advice runs counter to established lines of procedure is pretty sure to have some difficulties. Industrial management has thought largely in terms of doing the new business of war production on the old stand. On occasions they stoutly opposed any shift from their existing areas of operation. We were faced with inertia and conservatism. We found people unable to visualize the vast productive power the United States could release were we able to mobilize the reservoirs of manpower now partially or ineffectively used throughout the South and West.

I think there is another reason perhaps more important than the ones I have cited. I was interested and I was somewhat shocked a few days ago to see a tabulation of the distribution of defense orders to date not as between areas but between industrial concerns. Included in the tabulation were eleven and one-half billions of prime contracts awarded between June 13 of last year and February 15 of this year. This tabulation includes all types of contracts. Of this vast total, between one-fifth and one-quarter had gone to 2 groups of companies of closely interconnected ownership. Between 40 and 45 percent had gone to 6 closely interconnected groups. And a total of 80 percent has gone to 62 companies or interrelated groups of companies. There is rich food for thought in these figures. I believe they are closely related to the mediocre success we have had in apportioning a part of this new defense industry to the States represented here today. Our defense contracts are being absorbed by a small handful of concerns. The very smallness of the number threatens to be a serious bottleneck on the full use of our industrial and human resources. It is a bottleneck which must be broken.

Fortunately, serious work has been undertaken and is now under way to try to spread this work. A Nation-wide organization is being set up under the Office of Production Management which seeks as its primary purpose to get as large a portion of the work covered by these prime contracts scattered throughout the country into the plants and factories of subcontractors as is possible. This is going to require a lot of attention and a lot of hard work. I attended a conference this morning at the New Orleans branch of the Federal Reserve banking system on this very subject. I have just told Governor Dixon, your chairman, that Commander Simpson of the United States Navy is in the city today and is available to tell your conference of the steps that have been taken and will be taken to distribute production under these defense contracts. I hope he will have an opportunity to meet with you.

For the South the lesson is clear. Your area has been waiting for industry to come and use its manpower. I am afraid it is going to be a long wait, and one which will only provide a few crumbs from the concentrations of existing enterprise. Nothing short of the most vigorous and most positive efforts to achieve recognition of your labor reserves and labor resources will suffice.

But more than this is required. The time has come, I think, for the Southern people to join together and start on the hard route to industrialization—that of industrializing themselves. It is significant that our greatest success in expanding industry in the

South, both before and since the beginning of the defense program, has been in two directions. One was the shift of the textile industry nearer to the source of raw material and labor supply. The other has been in the immediate Tennessee Valley area. Within recent months, the T. V. A. and T. V. A. power have brought an aluminum industry, an ammonia industry, and the manufacture of explosives to Tennessee and Alabama; there would have been precious little defense industry in these States without T. V. A. facilities. The development of the Tennessee Valley was largely the product of Southern initiative and imagination. It should be an object lesson to the South in what a genuine industrial development requires.

In the first stages of the defense program, I must frankly say, important opportunities have been missed. I had hoped that we might use this surplus manpower, or ineffectively employed manpower, of the South and make it a part of our full labor-power potential. I had hoped we might use this labor near home and thus avoid moving folks across the country to supplement a labor supply which, in some of the large urban centers, is already running short. I had thought that this might open the way for a better balance between industry and agriculture for the future. The farmer who depends only on one crop is never in a very secure position. As I have suggested, the same is true on a larger scale of those parts of our country—those States and regions—which depend only on agriculture. They, too, are one-crop areas, and they lack the stability and security of better-diversified areas. The job in the future will have to be done better than it has been done in the past.

Now, in conclusion, as I look back over what I have said this afternoon, I realize that little of it was new to you. You have been thinking and saying these things yourselves, some of them for years, some during recent months. We must continue to say them, patiently and persistently, until they are translated into accomplishment. We must not permit temporary set-backs to discourage us as we stand shoulder to shoulder on these principles.

The Lend-Lease Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. SMATHERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY MRS. DWIGHT W. MORROW

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address on the subject of the lend-lease bill, recently delivered by one of New Jersey's most distinguished citizens, Mrs. Dwight W. Morrow.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am speaking in favor of the lend-lease bill to urge its immediate passage without weakening amendments or strangling clauses. The bill has been before Congress for 56 days. Technicians, experts, politicians, officers of government, the active heads of our fighting force, and men of affairs have given testimony about it. I am none of these. Why then should I add to this babel of tongues? I have no expert advice, no new strategy to offer, but I am concerned over the honor of my country. I believe the bill should be passed, first, to give Britain, who is fighting for our democratic faith, the assurance of victory. Second, to give the United States the assurance of security. Third, to fulfill a moral obligation assumed by our country. The American people have declared in favor of aid to England. We cannot decently go back upon our word.

Further, I believe the bill should pass by a majority large enough to show the President the great popular support which exists here for the policy of aid to Britain. We have a chance to show national unity in a time of great crisis. The opponents of the bill argue that it will involve us in war, that it gives the President dictatorial powers, and that it sets aside our real task which is to perfect democracy at home.

As to the first argument it assumes that something we may do will irritate Hitler. I use that trifling word purposely. To the point of his making war upon us. All his actions show that he makes war when it suits him. The strictest observance of neutrality has not saved those countries which he desired to attack. I cannot see that to do stingily, badly, and late, what we have already promised to do will make us more vulnerable than to give aid generously, efficiently, and promptly. It is a difference of degree, not of kind.

As to the second argument that the bill confers dictatorial powers upon the President, I would call your attention to a few things that the bill does not do. It does not give the President power to declare war. The President already has sufficient constitutional power to precipitate war if he wished to do so. It does not give the President power to write a check for anything he wants to spend or power to give the Navy away.

The bill does add to the powers of the President, but note these powers are to be used within the United States in the one field of regulating American production and distribution of war materials for our own forces and for those nations whose defense is deemed vital to our defense.

The third argument is that we should stay at home and strengthen democracy here before we try to help it overseas. This has a noble sound. Let us examine it. I am aware of the grave inequalities in our democratic system. We deny certain rights to whole classes of our people; great masses of them, too, suffer constantly from a sense of insecurity in getting work in youth, in getting aid in old age. These abuses should be corrected. Will they be if the lend-lease is defeated? Both opponents and advocates of this bill agree that we ought to defend ourselves, that we ought to prepare for that defense on so large a scale that when it is ready we should have nothing to fear from anybody. This huge defense plan means a military economy for the United States for an indefinite future. An ever larger regulation and control of industry and manpower. A lowering of the standard of living. And inevitably a checking of generous treatment of the underprivileged.

No; this plea lacks reality. If we do not help England we must spend even more time and money on our own military equipment. The underprivileged will not benefit.

As I have listened to the arguments against this bill I have said to myself Is Hitler hypnotizing this country? He appears to have the power to mesmerize his opponents into apathy. Britain only awoke after the shock of Dunkerque, while France never wholly threw off his hypnotic power.

Unlike the famous slogan of a French doctor, "Every day in every way I am growing better and better," the Fuehrer says again and again no democracy can help, no democracy can work, America can't help, America is too late, her people are divided, she is rich, fat, and weak. Can we be paralyzed by such words? Will we accept this opinion of ourselves given by a man who scorns all democratic prophesies? And yet division and delay are here with us.

The majority of Americans want a British victory, first because of what Great Britain stands for, all the liberties we love, the way of life we honor. Second, because of what she stands against—aggression and ruthless force. Third, because if America allows Britain to be defeated and her victory is dependent upon American supplies, she will have deliberately helped to remove the last barrier between herself and Nazi world domination. Then America will be forced either to appease or fight. I believe the bill should pass because it gives Britain the tools with which to win. We have not been asked for manpower, but we should give munitions and supplies of all kinds—food, money, guns, airplanes, ships—everything that will not impair our own safety.

The bill, I believe, should pass because it will heighten England's morale. I shall not enlarge upon the gallant resistance of the English people. But, of course, they are trusting to us. The morning after Mr. Roosevelt made his speech at the beginning of January a new slogan ran through Great Britain, and the next day they chalked on the walls of their bombed buildings, "We are not alone." They thought we were really with them. How terrible if we give them too little and too late.

And yet the Senate minority is denying the American people the chance they want to help Britain, for a measure which is demanded by all responsible officers of Government and by responsible men of both parties, which has been considered for 56 days, cannot be brought to a vote. This is against the cardinal principle of democracy, where the will of the majority is supposed to rule. While men and women whom we have promised to help, endure and die, we haggle and compromise, hesitate, hold out hope with one hand and draw it back with another. The danger is immense. Every hour counts. Yet at this very moment Senators are droning on.

What a spectacle we present of a democracy. Are we the descendants of the men and women who crossed the Plains in covered wagons, and, despite all hardships, conquered the wilderness, or are we weaklings illustrating a dictator's views on how a free people work? If this picture of fear and hesitation is a true one of the United States, I can only say, in the words of the Old Testament, "Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon, lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice."

Efficiency and Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

STATEMENT BY W. C. PICKETT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have been much interested in a most informing

and valuable statement made by Hon. W. C. Pickett, Special Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, with respect to increasing the efficiency of our governmental organization. I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The future of the people of the United States is at stake in a race between time and the development of efficiency in government. Industrial efficiency we have, commercial efficiency we have, but efficiency in government we have not—regardless of political administrations—and the lack of it menaces America with economic and social crises. The efficiency of our people in industry and commerce is accompanied by a constant increase in their interdependence, adding to the demands upon government. This constantly increasing burden necessitates increased governmental efficiency if we are to assure the avoidance of undemocratic changes in the form of our Government.

The basic reason for efficiency in other fields and inefficiency in government is the driving force of self-interest which promotes efficiency in the one instance and inefficiency in the other. The problem of how to promote better and more efficient government is the problem of harnessing the driving force of self-interest so that it will impel us toward the objective and not away from it. At the present time it is possible for individual and group interests to be opposed to the national interests and to be promoted at the expense of the common welfare because of the lack of complete and accurate information concerning governmental operations on the part of the electorate and the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

The Government of the United States has become an organization so large and engaged in activities so numerous and varied that no individual can ever acquire an intimate knowledge of what it is doing and how well it is being done. The President of the United States necessarily acts upon many matters concerning which his own personal knowledge is incomplete. He must rely upon the knowledge and judgment of subordinates, and assume that their recommendations are based upon considerations of national welfare, uninfluenced by hidden conscious or unconscious motives of personal or group advantage. The national scandals in our history have been the result of this necessity of reliance by the President upon subordinates who, in these fortunately rare instances, proved venal. Lesser officials of the Government are likewise forced to act frequently upon matters of national importance without complete personal information and lesser scandals, more frequently occurring, reflect the same unfortunate necessity of reliance by Cabinet officers and other officials upon the knowledge, judgment, and integrity of their subordinates.

Less sensational, but far more important to the Nation than the occasional resultant scandal, is the toll exacted as the result of the formulation of national policies on the basis of information which may be the best available at the present time, but which is nevertheless inadequate. An increase in the reliability and an enlargement of the scope of the information upon which national policies are formed by the President and his official family would serve well the interests of the Nation.

The legislative branch of the Government is likewise the victim of inadequate knowledge of many matters concerning which it is necessary for it to act. This well-known fact is no reflection upon the industry or intelligence of the legislators, because even within the field of a single important phase of government it is physically impossible for any legislator to gather personally the information requisite to the understanding of the subject which he should have in formulating legislation respecting it. He must accept the representations and opinions of individuals in whose knowledge, judgment, and integrity he has confidence, and in many instances must rely upon the representations of subordinate, nonelective Government officials, whether or not he has confidence in them. Yet every Member of Congress is required to form and register some opinion by voting or refraining from voting upon legislation affecting every phase of governmental operations. An increase in the reliability and an enlargement of the scope of the information upon which legislation is based would serve well the interests of the Nation.

Every election requires the voter to register his convictions with respect to governmental policies, directly or indirectly, and ordinarily he is even less conversant than Government administrative or legislative officials with the facts upon which opinions with respect to such policies should be based, and he is invariably subjected to the further confusion of propaganda and counter-propaganda of rival candidates, of rival organizations, and individuals and groups interested in promoting individual, group, or class interests. An increase in the reliability and an enlargement of the scope of the information upon which the electorate might form its opinions with respect to national policies would serve well the interests of the Nation.

The present lack of complete and accurate information concerning governmental operations is thus a basic national deficiency. It is responsible for many administrative and legislative evils and constitutes a potential threat to democratic government. The deficiency may be corrected by the compilation, organization, analysis, and publication of such information periodically, under such circumstances as will provide every possible assurance of intelligent completeness, accuracy, and freedom from even the suspicion of bias. Such service would require access to Government records and, therefore, could not be accomplished by any private organization. Its general acceptance would require an obvious possession of the qualities of personal integrity, high intelligence, and freedom from bias of the individuals participating in it. It may be provided by the creation, under the authority of the Constitution of the United States, of a National Advisory Council, completely independent of control by the executive and legislative branches of the Government, and subject to judicial control only to the extent that the executive and legislative branches are now so subject.

The proper functioning of such an advisory council, established with proper authority, properly limited, would result in greatly increased governmental efficiency. The intelligent compilation, organization, analysis, and publication of the facts relating to governmental operations would provide the basis for the formulation of sound national policies and avoid expensive experiments induced by lack of information on the one hand and self-interest on the other. Petty corruption and padded pay rolls could not withstand the disclosure of such investigations, nor could incompetence in office remain undisclosed. The overlapping activities of various Government agencies would be brought into bold relief. Even the threat of a searching, nonpolitical analysis of its activities would have a most salutary effect upon every Government office in avoiding those practices which presently promote individual and group interests at the public expense and in the aggregate exact a terrific toll. The individual interests of Government officials and employees would tend increasingly to coincide with the national interests.

A plan based upon an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the establishment and permanent maintenance of a coordinate branch of the Government to be known as the National Advisory Council should contain such provisions as these:

1. It shall be the duty of the council to ascertain and publish information affecting the operation of the National Government to the extent that such ascertainment and publication will, in the opinion of the council, be in the public interest.

For that purpose the council shall have the power—

(a) To examine all records of any branch of the Federal Government and to investigate all acts of any employee of the Federal Government affecting the performance of official duties; to procure from any other source evidence of matters affecting the operation of the Government of the United States; provided that (1) upon order of the President information held by the President to be confidential on the grounds of military, naval, or diplomatic secrecy shall be withheld from the council while such grounds exist, and (2) the power of the council to compel production of evidence from private sources shall be the same as the power of Federal courts to compel production of evidence.

(b) To publish any of its findings, together with conclusions drawn therefrom and opinions based thereon, when such publication is deemed by a majority of the council to be in the public interest; provided that (1) publications of the council shall plainly distinguish, so far as practicable, between facts and conclusions or opinions; (2) upon request of the President, or upon resolution of either House of Congress, the council shall investigate any matter affecting the operation of the National Government and, if so requested, publish its findings regardless of whether the council deems such publication to be in the public interest. (3) All material ordered by the council to be published shall be submitted to the President prior to its publication, and during a period of 15 days the President shall have the power to veto the council's order for publication in whole or in part. Publication contrary to the President's veto shall be made only upon a repassing of the order to publish by a two-thirds vote of the council members, and after consideration of any reasons assigned by the President for his veto. (4) The publication of any report by a majority of the council shall also include in the same document any other report by a minority of the council.

2. The provisions of the Constitution governing the qualifications, appointment, tenure, and compensation of the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States shall govern the qualifications, appointment, tenure, and compensation of the chairman and associate members of the Council, except as otherwise specifically provided in this amendment.

3. The Council shall consist originally of a chairman and four associate members, and be increased in size to not fewer than 10, nor more than 20, associate members, as Congress may from time to time prescribe. Not more than five members of the Council shall be appointed by any one President.

4. No member of the Council, during his tenure of office, or for a period of 1 year thereafter, shall be eligible for any other public office, and no member shall receive for his services any emolument from any source whatever other than the compensation to be paid to him as a member of the Council.

5. All information procured by the Council in the course of official investigation shall be confidential, except when published as herein provided, and no member of the Council, either during or after his tenure as such member, shall divulge any information procured by reason of his official position.

The very existence of such an Advisory Council would lessen the tremendous strain of office upon the President, for while his responsibilities would not be decreased, he would be aided in the intelligent discharge of his duties by the factual reports and opinions of the Council, and by the practical elimination of anxiety concerning malfeasance in office on the part of his subordinates. It cannot be doubted that our Chief Executives have been personally free of participation in any degree in the scandals which have sometimes been linked in history with their administrations. Moreover, it is reasonably clear that timely knowledge on the part of the President of the malfeasance in office of trusted subordinates has been lacking in such instances, although the belief is widely held that suspicion of betrayal may have been responsible for the sudden death of one of our Presidents.

One of the very important benefits of the Advisory Council would be the impartial development of the facts which would make possible a coordination of governmental operations to reduce the cost of government without interfering with its essential services. The numerous attempts—public and private—which have been made in an effort to do this, testify to the general appreciation of the need of such action, the accomplishment of which has heretofore been balked by the fact of conflicting personal and group interests, making difficult the ascertainment of the proper means of accomplishing an admittedly desirable result. The force of the opposition to proposals to reorganize the administrative branch of the Government would be effectively reduced if the proponents of such reorganization were armed with information developed by an agency obviously free from reasonable attack upon the grounds of bias or inadequate appreciation of the problem.

It would be speculative to say that the cost of government in any administration would ultimately be reduced by not less than 20 percent as the result of the elimination of the overlapping functions of various Government bureaus, discontinuance of appropriations for obsolete agencies, and reduction of appropriations for obsolescent agencies, the avoidance of costly legislative and administrative experiments as the result of a scientific marshalling of information, the virtual elimination of graft and of the padding of pay rolls by personal politics, but no informed student of the subject of governmental operations can doubt that the savings would be tremendous.

An independent body, served by high intelligence and character, gaining experience in its own work with the passage of the years, protected by every constitutional guarantee and by the alertness of an informed electorate, the Advisory Council would contribute tremendously toward a purity and efficiency hitherto unknown to government by eliminating vast, but now effectively hidden, waste originating in the self-interest of countless subordinates, in the self-interest of forces to which both subordinates and higher officials are subject, and in the simple lack of the requisite information for the formulation of sound national policies. The National Advisory Council, as a coordinate branch of government, free of the dangerous drug of power, but armed with the means of ascertaining what needs to be known, and charged with the duty of informing the executive, the legislative, and the electorate, would be truly a sentinel of our liberties.

The New York Stock Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. DANAHER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

ADDRESS BY THEODORE S. WATSON

Mr DANAHER. Mr. President, on March 11 there was delivered over the facilities of radio station WMCA in New York an address by Mr. Theodore S. Watson, which I feel is of such public importance that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I personally have formulated no definite conclusions as to whether or not the problems raised by Mr. Watson and the solutions he suggests are fundamental and compelling. I do say that his broad personal experience in the New York Stock Exchange entitles the statement of his position to great respect, and it is my hope that we can elicit the judgment and thereafter the comment of competent observers. If there can thus be laid the foundation for better collaboration between the stock exchange and the Securities and Exchange Commission, I have no slightest doubt that a stronger and healthier market situation will result, surely a desideratum in these trying times, when popular confidence must be maintained at peak. It is my thought that Mr. Watson's viewpoint should be submitted to stock-exchange firms, bankers, insurance companies, and Government agencies concerned with our fiscal situation, and accordingly I present his address entitled, "The Role of the New York Stock Exchange as the Capital Market Place in Our National Economy and Its Relation to Our Democratic Traditions."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Democracy Goes to Town and Wall Street Takes It" sums up an unusual event that took place last Wednesday. The president of the New York Stock Exchange in his valedictory talk told the members of the Exchange in no uncertain terms what they should have realized years ago. The response has been astonishing. There are encouraging signs that the members are thinking for themselves instead of letting some one else do it for them.

As a partner for 20 years of one firm which for 16 years had held memberships on the Exchange and successfully financed new corporations now grown large, I may speak with an inference in my favor. That experience caused me long ago and prior to 1934 to publicly urge changes in the administration of the Stock Exchange. The failure of any business to effectively regulate its own affairs leads to legislation. Wall Street's inability to correct the abuses of the few, including some of the privileged, led to the enactment of the Securities Exchange Act in 1934 which created the Securities and Exchange Commission as the people's regulatory agency.

It has taken Wall Street 6 years to learn that the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 expressed and still expresses the national will. It is one statute which will remain on the statute books. I agree with the observations of the Stock Exchange's president that no changes in the act itself are necessary and that revision will not now increase the volume of trading.

It is surprising to me to read one die-hard writer assert that changes in the act are necessary, "Unless, indeed, the S. E. C. is to attain the objective of certain of its present and former members, namely, to abolish organized exchanges or to reduce them to mere functions of transfer."

That statement goes beyond fair comment. The record disproves it.

The Securities and Exchange Commission officially recognized in a release dated January 27, 1938:

"The vital and public role of the stock exchange in the Nation's economic affairs."

Would it appear from reading that statement that the people's regulatory agency is anxious to abolish the New York Stock Exchange? That statement by the S. E. C. was issued in connection with a report on the the reorganization and administration of the exchange which had been prepared by the stock exchange's own committee.

This report declared that the exchange in its evolution had assumed a public character. It made certain recommendations for the democratization of the exchange.

That 1938 report was approved. The committee's recommendations were carried out. This was the first step toward making the exchange a truly public institution.

Now, let us take a 1941 inventory. Before doing so, keep in mind the three elements—the Nation is one, the second is the people's regulatory agency (S. E. C.), and third, the exchange itself.

It is essential that we recognize that the exchange is a national institution. Eighty-five percent of its business for the public comes from outside of the city of New York. Including the business of the New York Curb Exchange, it does 90 percent of the business done on all the 20 registered securities exchanges in the country.

Such a national institution should serve the whole Nation. It should afford the people an auction market for the ready conversion of capital investments into cash.

But the New York Stock Exchange is not functioning as the national market place. The volume of trading is dwindling, tremendous blocks of securities listed on the exchange are being sold off the floor of the exchange even at prices higher than quoted on the exchange. In its present state it serves chiefly as a guide to prices, not as the market place.

Such a situation has elements detrimental to the Nation's welfare. It is imperative that the people's regulatory agency (S. E. C.), and the exchange work harmoniously together to serve the Nation.

The vital national market place can be the New York Stock Exchange if it is managed as a national and public institution. Many of the retiring exchange president's suggestions should be immediately carried out—the number of the board of governors decreased, the number of committees reduced, and more responsibility placed on the paid staff. And there should be associate memberships, the proceeds from the sale of which would be used to decrease the number of full memberships.

As I first urged in the early 1920's brokers should have separate organizations to act as underwriters and dealers in order that customers' securities and free-credit balances

will not be subject to the risks incurred in an underwriting business. And as its chief executive officer there should be a hard-hitting independent man with experience who can effectively merchandise the services rendered by this national and public institution. Thus the democratization of the exchange as started in 1938 must be furthered so that the exchange will be responsive to the public needs and reflective of changing conditions.

I am confident that once the exchange is known to be an independently managed national and public institution the friction points between the exchange and the S. E. C. will be eliminated. You will then not hear about S. E. C. seeking power to regulate internal rules affecting only the members.

In that connection I would like to digress. Past actions of the S. E. C. have encouraged the development of the 17 local exchanges situated outside the city of New York. Local exchanges have been granted freely the right to trade on an unlisted basis in securities listed on the New York Stock Exchange. This has been attributed to a desire to eliminate an undue concentration of control over wealth said to exist in New York. There would not be such a desire if the Exchange were an independently managed institution of the character I have mentioned. And I am sure that students recognize that those actions which emphasize sectionalism fall right into line with a basic Nazi formula for destroying a country. It is dissension—playing one faith against another, one class against another, one section against another. At such a time as this when the emergency calls for a unified nation, nothing should be done to encourage the development of sectionalism.

But to continue. After the friction points between the Exchange and the people's regulatory agency—S. E. C.—have been removed, public confidence in the national market place will be restored, the volume of business will increase, and prices will more truly be reflective of the Nation's judgment.

You may then expect the S. E. C. to help establish the Exchange as the national market place. It can do so by clarification of its rules and simplification of its procedures. It is to its advantage that there be such a market because regulation is easier and they can spot more readily and more quickly stop the operation of any stock-market manipulator than if he is operating in the over-the-counter market.

There is another advantage to the S. E. C. Since 1935 it has been administering the Public Utility Holding Company Act. A duty was imposed upon it to bring about the corporate simplification of public utility holding companies. In pursuance of such duty, S. E. C. has directed certain companies to pursue financing through the sale of common stock rather than by issuing obligations with fixed charges.

In a report prepared under S. E. C.'s auspices for the Temporary National Economic Committee, the desirability was emphasized of checking the prevalent trend of industrial financing through the issuance of debt.

Thus we have the S. E. C. urging common-stock financing. However, it is not now easy to raise capital through the sale of common stock. Last year American corporations raised only $135,000,000 of new money by stock financing, yet in the depression year of 1931 the figure was $311,000,000. Investors cannot be induced to buy new common-stock offerings when the markets for seasoned stocks wither away. Thus it is to S. E. C.'s advantage that there be a strong, healthy market. If individuals are to be encouraged to invest their savings in common stocks there must be public confidence in the market. So I say that when the exchange is independently managed as a national public institution, then S. E. C. must cooperate. It will contribute to the positive job of diverting savings into channels needing capital.

This is to the advantage of the Government itself, inasmuch as a Nation-wide campaign to sell defense bonds will be commenced May 1 and a vigorous national market is essential if the Government expects its citizens to purchase a substantial amount of the bonds.

It is, therefore, in the public interest that the exchange be made into a national market place.

The standard of conduct for the people's regulatory agency—the S. E. C.—is clearly set forth in the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. Congress stated that "transactions in securities * * * upon securities exchanges * * * are affected with a national public interest," and Congress said that S. E. C. must measure its actions by whether they are "necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors."

Once the exchange is run by men who recognize the national and public character of the exchange, and who will themselves insist upon the maintenance of fair and honest markets, will prevent manipulation and sudden and unreasonable fluctuations of security prices and excessive speculation, then the S. E. C., in observance of that standard imposed by Congress, will, in my opinion, permit self-regulation and devote its energies to effectively administering the other five acts.

I am confident that the Government does not seek to be the operator of the New York Stock Exchange, nor does the S. E. C. seek to be more than a policeman—but it will be unless the exchange is made truly a national public market place independently managed and maintained in the public interest.

Fortification of Guam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

ARTICLE BY MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM C. RIVERS, UNITED STATES ARMY, RETIRED

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers, United States Army, retired.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Evening Herald and Express of March 3, 1941]

OPPOSES FORTIFICATION AT GUAM—GENERAL RIVERS BRANDS MOVE STRATEGIC ERROR

(By Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers, United States Army, Retired)

(Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers, United States Army, retired, takes issue in the following article with the proposed expansion of defense facilities at Guam, holding such a move to be a strategic error—creation of an exposed and advanced western salient that could not be held.)

NEW YORK, March 3.—Fortifying Guam has two aspects.

One is the strategic phase: That a base at Guam would aid our own defense. Congress cannot build a base at Guam, because Guam is too far—almost 4,000 miles—from our great base at Hawaii. The radius of action of a fleet is but about 2,500 miles. Therefore, all that Congress can build at Guam would be an exposed, untenable advance salient. Military history is full of the troubles and misfortunes of distant and exposed salients. Only a globe will show how far Guam lies off the normal straight steamer route from our west coast to Japan and the Orient.

Also, Guam is 1,500 miles farther from the west coast than Japan is. Hence, the location of Guam prevents its being of value to defense of our west coast.

Guam is in the midst of many Japanese islands, many of which have good submarine and airplane harbors. The erection of a great fortified salient at Guam would project our own line of defense far into the western Pacific. Admiral William D. Leahy said to the House Naval Committee:

"The defense line runs from the Aleutian Islands to the Hawaiian Islands, to Samoa, and to the Panama Canal," and "the Navy which America now has, and the Navy which it will have when it is increased by this bill will be seriously inadequate to the task of sending a naval force to the Philippines."

The projection of our defense area so far in the Western Pacific would seem a threat to Japan, which lies so near Guam. The Filipino people earnestly desire the independence we have so frequently promised them.

The political aspect of making a great fortified salient at Guam would be the demand to hold the Philippines as some sort of a dominion. Japan will, in any event, always get much of the trade in the Philippines. But Japan will not annex the Philippines after 1946.

SALISBURY STATEMENT

Making great forts at places such as far-off Guam reminds one of a statement of Salisbury when Prime Minister. Kitchener, then head of the Egyptian Army, had asked for funds to construct strong points on his line of march toward Khartoum. Salisbury cabled to Cromer, then British agent in Egypt, that if not watched, soldiers were liable to ask for funds with which to garrison the moon as a defense from an attack from Mars.

My long residence in the Far East convinces me that it is unwise to provide for fortifying Guam and Wake Island. This unnecessary action would entail a colossal financial burden on the American people. It would also prevent our giving aid to any nation on the east of South America if they should need our aid in defending South America.

Possible Participation in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

EDITORIALS FROM THE CARBON COUNTY NEWS, RED LODGE, MONT.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several editorials from the March 14 issue of the Carbon County News, of Red Lodge, Mont., which bear on the possible participation of our country in the present war in Europe.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Carbon County News, Red Lodge, Mont., of March 14, 1941]

IF THIS IS OUR WAR—LET'S DECLARE IT

It's time to quit quibbling.

It's time to be honest with ourselves.

Is this our war, or isn't it?

If it really is our war, then we should do the only honorable thing. We should declare war.

If it isn't our war, we should stay out of it.

The issue is narrowed down as simple as that.

If this is our war—and the Carbon County News has consistently declared that it isn't our battle—then we should stop hiding behind Britannia's skirts.

Of course, if we decide that it's our war, then we might just as well resign ourselves to recurring European battles forever and ever.

We might just as well conclude that all our forefathers made a mistake when they came to America to escape those perennial European disputes. They might as well have stayed home.

As long as there is a strong America there will be European countries seeking that reserve strength for their own ends. When we capitulate to Europe's demands we cease to be strong.

It was true in the last war; it looks like the same story in this one.

Is this our war, or are we to establish here in the Western Hemisphere an example of democracy? The decision must be ours. There are no two ways about it.

Which?

LET'S HOPE THEY'RE RIGHT

As expected, the United States Senate, by a vote of 60 to 31, Saturday put final approval on the administration's lease-lend bill.

They did this with a rubber-stamp Senate despite valiant opposition on the part of such men as WHEELER, WALSH, TAFT, LA FOLLETTE, JOHNSON, and a few new additions to the senior legislative body.

This new act which places this Nation's future at the mercy of Presidential whims poises America so precariously near to war that every conscientious citizen should use what Democratic influence left him to see that backers of the bill fulfill their promise that the act was purely a defensive measure and would in reality keep us further from war.

All logic would indicate they are wrong, but the entire welfare of this Nation rests on the premise that the majority Senators are right. Now that the bill has passed and is a law, we trust, as good Americans, that the expressed goal of the bill will be realized. If so, we will readily admit that we are wrong.

Responsibility for this extreme measure rests on the shoulders of the 60 Senators, but responsibility for the country's fate now rests squarely on the shoulders of President Roosevelt. With the powers granted him he can toy with this Nation as he likes. We can only hope he arises to the emergency and that he has the character to keep this Nation intact and strong, and that he will heed the people's mandate last November 5 to keep us out of war.

THE SUPREME EFFORT

Barring superhuman and, we must admit, unexpected sagacity on the part of President Roosevelt, only an aroused American public can now keep us from the brink of actual war.

The powers granted in the lease-lend bill, coupled with recent warlike tones of Roosevelt's speeches, lead us to fear the worst. The Carbon County News has repeatedly warned that the course of this Nation's ship of state was hurrying pell-mell into a repetition of the 1917 turn of events and that war, either declared or undeclared, would be the inevitable result.

If the last November 5 election was a mandate to help England, as proponents of the lease-lend bill so argued, then it was even more a mandate that no American boys would be sent to fight in a European war. Both Roosevelt and Willkie won thunderous applause on that latter campaign promise.

But what has happened? What do the signs unmistakably indicate?

A bill has been passed giving aid to England beyond the dreams of Great Britain; in fact provisions of the bill make this country more generous in her aid than component parts of the Empire involved in war. And now already we are hearing talk of England needing and asking for men.

Shadows of the impending storm are seen in recent utterances in the British House of Commons in which it was clearly stated that England needs men.

So goes the cycle. At first, England needed destroyers. She got them by Presidential decree. More, more, and more she wanted: airplanes, war goods of all description. She got in the lease-lend bill more than she had reason to hope for.

Isn't it logical that men, that actual participation in the war, is the next demand to be placed before the American administration? No one can blame England. Encouraged by the lease-lend bill, committing this Nation to acts of undeclared war, she can now go the whole way.

Not even President Roosevelt will take this Nation into war, however, if the people are overwhelmingly against such action. America is not Europe and the people, once aroused, are a force to be reckoned with. The fiber of the American people is not of the stuff to take kindly to dictatorship unless the administration reflects the wishes of the people.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER has indicated he will carry the fight to the people themselves, that he will elaborate on the effects of the lease-lend bill with one view in mind, to keep us out of what he believes would be a disastrous involvement in war.

It seems to us the administration has placed too much emphasis in recent months on sending our resources to England, and not enough emphasis on strengthening the resources of America. Things aren't going as planned in the defenses of the Nation, and we would like to see a little Presidential activity in stepping up our defense program.

Help or no help for England, this Nation's best insurance for the future is a strong military defense. Such a program seems to us the No. 1 goal toward which all people should put forth a supreme effort.

Already we have become so involved in this war that the Axis Powers will seek retaliation, making defense necessary. We think we have gone too far, but the fact remains that our neck is stuck out and will need some protection when the Axis ax falls.

That is why we have advocated caution in sending so much of our defense material to England. We are just naive enough and nationalistic enough to believe that we should think of our own country first when it comes to self-preservation.

ARE WE LOSING OUR IDENTITY?

Because we are opposed to provisions of the so-called lease-lend or war bill which would permit President Roosevelt to send American Navy vessels to Britain, thus precipitating this country into a war, we have been termed anti-British by individuals too old to fight and lacking in imagination of what a war would do to this country.

We are not anti-British. If there must be a victor in this war, we hope the British win. If they do win, however, we hope Winston Churchill won't impose a peace that will bring another war, as Britain and France did last time. We refer to the Treaty of Versailles which we did not ratify.

We are not anti-British; we are simply pro-American.

England we hold our friend, though she hasn't always been so, but we consider America our mother.

We would not countenance injuring our mother, to say nothing of killing her, to help our cousin and occasional friend, Britain, which has gotten herself into two major wars in the last 27 years and expected us to pull her out of it each time.

We do not consider it our duty, now or ever, to back up Great Britain every time she gets herself into a dogfight over the decaying carcass of Europe. If Britain gets the impression—for the second time in the last 25 years—that we'll run to her aid every time she gets into a mess, then, to put it bluntly, we're in for a hell of time ahead.

As the Washington Times-Herald puts it: "We'll wind up by losing all identity with our past—which, incidentally, contains some periods when all was not amity between this country and Britain."

To those who want war, we simply rest our case. If this be treason, make the most of it.

The Weapon of Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM BOSTON EVENING TRANSCRIPT

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Boston Evening Transcript of March 13, 1941, entitled "The Weapon of Food."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Evening Transcript of March 13, 1941]

THE WEAPON OF FOOD

Force may or may not conquer Hitler. But force by itself certainly is not going to bring victory for the cause of freedom. It never has, and it never will. It may bring a temporary hollow victory; it may bring a truce till the opposing powers of force recuperate. But force alone will never bring permanent peace, spiritual progress, or economic prosperity.

Statesmen are often prone to consider force their only weapon. There are other weapons even more powerful. Let us consider the weapon of food. Although the problem has its moral aspect, let us here consider it only from the point of view of strategic statesmanship.

Britain says no food shall go through the blockade to the conquered peoples of Europe. We are all familiar with the argument. It will be stolen by the Nazis. Or its equivalent will be saved by the Nazis. And in this age of chemistry, food materials are also converted into war materials.

The argument is easy to accept when one is fighting for life. The misfortunes of others fade into the background. But America has less excuse for short-sightedness than has Britain. Britain is too close to the bombs to have perspective.

The argument is not sound when examined in the light of self-interest and strategic expediency of winning the war. The policy enunciated by Britain may well spell her defeat unless it is changed.

Victory and an ultimate peace which is worth fighting for, which is worth any fractional part of the sacrifices we and the entire next generation must make, are absolutely dependent upon a reasonable degree of world unity when peace comes.

Does anyone think for a minute that the Belgians, the French, or the Norwegians, or the Dutch will come rushing under the banners of the Anglo-American order, if America and Britain have refused them food and they have seen their wives, their children, their mothers, their fathers die of starvation or its attendant diseases? When such food as they did have was Nazi food and Britain and America refused even to try to send any?

Not for one minute!

Can anyone possibly assume, after Britain survives the threatened invasion, that these same peoples are going to rise up and welcome a British rescue party when there are vacant chairs at every family hearth because America and Britain refused to allow food to go through the blockade? Of course, they are not. These peoples are going to hate Britain, and they are going to hate America. And in their hate, they are going to accept the Nazi hand that fed them, even though scantily.

It is no use to argue that the food would not get through and would aid the enemy. Very likely it would be diverted to Germany. But in refusing to make the attempt, Britain and America are adopting a policy which may well spell ultimate defeat in this war, to say nothing of destroying any possibility of creating a world order thereafter which is worth any part of the effort.

By refusing to send food, we put Germany in a position to say quite truthfully to the conquered peoples that Britain and America allowed them to starve as a military necessity, and to say that she herself has done all the feeding. The Nazi propagandists would hardly express it so politely. And Britain and America could make no acceptable reply whatsoever.

Suppose, on the other hand, we do send food. It will either get there for the purpose intended or it won't. If it does, the beneficiaries are our friends for life. During the progress of the war, as well as thereafter, this is worth more in a military way than all the "billions for defense." If it is not used as intended, then shipment should be stopped.

At this point the shoe goes on the other foot. The Nazis, instead of Britain and America, become the goat. We sent the food. We tried to feed. All the hate will then be directed at the Nazis who stole it. Enough news will get through, by underground channels, so that the Nazis or anybody else cannot hide it. From the strategic viewpoint, the attempt is more important even than the actual amount of food which gets through.

In America's hands lies the decision. Today, we have the ultimate power. Britain has asked our unlimited aid. We have agreed to place our entire national economy behind her, realizing that it is also in our interest. At 4 o'clock Tuesday afternoon, America became entitled to express her will in the conduct of the war. Whether we do so or not, we will now be held jointly responsible for policies pursued.

We should tell Britain immediately that food is going to be shipped and that we hope it will be shipped with her aid. But shipped it's going to be.

Mr. Hoover is ready to do the job. The Society of Friends is known to have the confidence of all the European peoples. Whether we agree or disagree with Mr. Hoover politically, we are unanimous that he, more than anyone else in this world, is best equipped to undertake the task.

Mr. Hoover and a few food ships will do more to win the war for a new world order than the combined British and American Navies will ever do by force alone.

Let every person with a tongue and a pen speak up. Now is the time. Next year, next month, next week will be too late. As long as we are free, every citizen shares the responsibility for what America does.

Let's realize that, in the end, it's love, not hate, that it's food, not bombs, that it's freedom, not force which conquers.

Communists in the United States

REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN DIES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I stated to the House that from time to time pertinent information would be given the House with reference to Communists who are in charge of some labor unions and who have instigated strikes. I do not have the time this morning to read this statement, but it deals with another union. It deals with one of the important strikes of the country and gives the record of certain of the leaders of that organization, records that cannot be denied or disputed.

In addition, I present a further record of Kenneth Eggert, who was sent to the west coast to instigate a strike in a bottleneck industry, and who is seeking to sabotage the national-defense program in that area.

I propose that we continue to read the records of some of these men until the time comes when we can get action.

I also hold in my hand a photostatic copy of a list of members of the German-American Bund and the occupations they hold in the United States. They are working in key industries of this country. Eight months ago we submitted to the Federal Bureau of Investigation a list of more than 2,000 German Bundists who are working in the national-defense industries of this country. In Chicago the German Bund was composed entirely of citizens of the German Government, and they hold key positions in some of the national industries in Chicago. These people must be driven from our national-defense industries.

Yesterday on the floor of this House I called attention to the critical situation which has arisen in the aircraft industry on the Pacific coast, due to a piece of deliberate sabotage engineered by a leading Communist Party member sent to the Pacific coast from Toledo.

Today there is an important sequel to the facts which I presented yesterday. This sequel is as important as the original set of facts.

When we began our investigation of the strike situation at the Harvill plant in Inglewood, Calif., we established the fact that the strike leader there was one Kenneth Eggert who has recently been the section organizer for the Communist Party in Toledo, Ohio. We further established the fact that Eggert was sent to the Pacific coast by the Communist Party for the express purpose of sabotage of our national-defense program.

In typical Communist fashion, Eggert then attempted to conceal his identity by a change of his name. When approached by our investigator in California a few days ago, Eggert loudly proclaimed that he was not Eggert but Eckert. Of course, there is no way of telling, many times, what a Communist's real name is. The Communist Party, being a conspiratorial organization, practices concealment by the use of aliases. What we do know, however, is that the man on the Pacific coast who declared to our investigator that his name was "Eckert" is the same man who operated in Toledo, Ohio, under the name of "Eggert." His real name may be either of these or something entirely different.

After having made a feeble attempt to deny his identity, Eggert or Eckert last night admitted his Communist Party affiliation. I hold in my hand a telegram from our California investigator stating that Eggert or Eckert has made this admission.

It is also highly important that the California president of the C. I. O. Diecasters Union attempted to conceal the true facts in this case by stating to the press yesterday that "he did not know a Kenneth Eggert, named in Washington today by Representative MARTIN DIES as a Communist." This statement made by John Marcotti, California president of the C. I. O. Diecasters Union, was in effect a falsehood. Marcotti knows Eggert or Eckert very well and has been actively working with him in the Harvill strike.

This case illustrates one of the difficulties which we face in our investigation, but what is even more important it illustrates something of the menace to our national security which arises from the tactics of the Communist Party. Those tactics are everywhere characterized by concealment, subterfuge, intrigue, lying, fraud, and the use of aliases.

There are those who have been hoping for a long time that the C. I. O. would take effective measures to purge its ranks of the Communists who have penetrated it so all-pervasively. That hope seems to have been a fond illusion. Instead of stating to the public that Kenneth Eggert or Eckert would be removed promptly from his leadership in the Harvill strike, the president of the C. I. O. union undertook to shield him and to destroy the facts in the case.

From all over the country, we have reports based upon thorough investigation by our committee's agents, which reports reveal that the Communist Party was never more active and never more successfully active than it is today in its program of sabotage. The party is engaged in a highly organized effort to undermine

the very foundations of our national security.

This morning, I call to your attention another situation which vitally affects our national-defense program. For weeks there has been a strike at the International Harvester plants in the vicinity of Chicago. The union involved in this serious stoppage of our defense program is the C. I. O. Farm Equipment Workers Organizing Committee. Negotiations in that case are now deadlocked. The strike has been going on for weeks. Both the union leaders and the strike leaders at International Harvester are known Communists. Here are just a few of the facts in this case:

Dewitt Gilpin, a leader of the strike at International Harvester, has been a regular correspondent for the Communist Party's Daily Worker for many years. He was also connected with the American League Against War and Fascism. Gilpin is the educational director of the Farm Equipment Workers Organizing Committee. As long as these C. I. O. unions retain known Communists in such important posts as those of educational director and strike leaders, just so long must the verdict stand that these unions constitute a menace that we dare not ignore. In coddling these unions and their Communist leaders on the shabby pretext of friendship for organized labor, we do organized labor a great disservice, but what is more important we take a viper to the bosom of our national security.

I could, if time permitted, give you in detail the Communist records of all the leaders of the strike at International Harvester. Those records are not guesses or hearsay. They are indisputably factual.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *March 19, 1941.*
Representative MARTIN DIES,
Chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Negotiations for the settlement of differences between my company and the United Automobile Workers of America, Local No. 683, completely broke down when Kenneth Eckert from Toledo, Ohio, entered the negotiations. Your statement regarding a man named Eggert indicates beyond doubt he and Eckert are one and the same. Eckert refused to abide by negotiations completed prior to strike and entered first negotiations meeting unprepared to present claims for union, further delaying this vital national-defense industry strike. Our inability to furnish die-cast parts to the aircraft industry threatens to stop producton of military aircraft on Pacific coast. We refuse to negotiate with such radical elements and lawbreakers who ignore local antipicketing laws, nonloitering laws, and injunctions of the Superior Court of State of California.

H. L. HARVILL,
President,
Harvill Aircraft Die Casting Corporation.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *March 20, 1941.*
ROBERT E. STRIPLING,
531 Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Eggert tonight admitted party affiliation. No picture available due to "goons." He drives tan Buick coupe, 1941 Ohio license No. 9900C.

STEEDMAN.

The Securities and Exchange Commission Demands Disintegration of the Commonwealth & Southern

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, at last the Securities and Exchange Commission is beginning to function as Congress intended, and to enforce the Holding Company Act, as the law provides. From the morning paper we notice that the Commission is going to compel the dissolution of the Commonwealth & Southern, that "Grecian horse" that Wendell Willkie helped to create.

Of course, Mr. Willkie bailed out in time with his Wall Street parachute, using the Republican Party as a fire escape; and he is now using national defense as a storm cellar to escape the righteous wrath of an outraged public opinion, while the American people are left holding the bag. [Laughter and applause.]

The Securities and Exchange Commission is demanding that this law be complied with, and that this vast, useless holding company known as the Commonwealth & Southern be dissolved.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield for a question.

Mr. RICH. This national-defense question has taken the gentleman down the road, and he is one of them that is riding along, if he will look at his vote of yesterday. He has gone down the chute.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Now there is a Daniel come to judgment. He is one of the victims of this utility racket and does not seem to realize it.

Mr. RICH. I am trying to save this Nation. I am not trying to save Mr. Willkie.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. That is not necessary; if he does not take care of himself, Wall Street will look after him.

In the creation of the Commonwealth & Southern these manipulators combined four companies, the Allied Power & Light Corporation, the Penn-Ohio Edison Co., the Commonwealth Power Corporation, and the Southeastern Power & Light Co., which had total ledger-value securities on their books of $340,896,260.27. They put these companies all together and organized the Commonwealth & Southern and put these same securities on the books of the new corporation that same day at $872,101,832.19—a write-up of $531,205,571.92.

With one stroke of the pen they inflated those values, or watered them, if you please, by more than $531,000,000, and then proceeded to sell securities against those inflated valuations. That is what is known as thievery within the law. Anybody without the protection of Wall Street who had perpetrated such a fraud and used the mails in connection with it would have been prosecuted without stint or limit.

We passed the Holding Company Act for the purpose of breaking up these far-flung holding companies, and I am glad to note that the Securities and Exchange Commission proposes to carry out the provisions of the law and compel the Commonwealth & Southern to divest itself of control of operating power companies in different sections of the country.

I hope they speed up this proceeding and then follow the same course with the Electric Bond & Share and every other one of these large holding companies that are now operating in violation of the Holding Company Act.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a release issued by the Securities and Exchange Commission giving a synopsis of this case, including the Commission's order.

The matter referred to follows:

[United States of America, before the Securities and Exchange Commission. At a regular session of the Securities and Exchange Commission, held at its office in the city of Washington, D. C., on this 19th day of March, A. D. 1941. In the matter of the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation and its subsidiary companies, respondents. File No. 59-8]

STATEMENT OF TENTATIVE CONCLUSIONS OF THE COMMISSION AND NOTICE OF AND ORDER RECONVENING HEARING PURSUANT TO SECTION 11 (B) (1)

Pursuant to respondents' request and the Commission's undertaking in its opinion dated June 1, 1940, there are set forthwith hereinafter the tentative conclusions of the Commission as to the action which the respondents should take under the provisions of section 11 (b) (1) of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935. In view of the fact that these conclusions are expressed prior to the taking of testimony, as a result of the request of the respondents made at the outset of the hearing, the views here expressed must of necessity be entirely tentative in character.

To aid the Commission in arriving at its conclusions, the Commission directed its staff to prepare a report setting forth informative data with respect to the holding-company system of the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation and suggesting the application of the pertinent provisions of the act. Such a report has been prepared and has been filed as a part of the public proceedings in this case; copies of the report will be furnished to the respondents simultaneously with the issuance of this statement.

I. APPLICABLE STATUTORY PROVISIONS

For convenience, we repeat here the full text of the principal statutory provisions applicable to the present proceedings.

Section 11 (b) (1) of the act provides:

"(b) It shall be the duty of the Commission, as soon as practicable after January 1, 1938:

"(1) To require by order, after notice and opportunity for hearing, that each registered holding company, and each subsidiary company thereof, shall take such action as the Commission shall find necessary to limit the operations of the holding-company system of which such company is a part to a single integrated public-utility system, and to such other businesses as are reasonably incidental, or economically necessary or appropriate to the operations of such integrated public-utility system: *Provided, however,*

That the Commission shall permit a registered holding company to continue to control one or more additional integrated public-utility systems, if, after notice and opportunity for hearing, it finds that—

"(A) Each of such additional systems cannot be operated as an independent system without the loss of substantial economies which can be secured by the retention of control by such holding company of such system;

"(B) All of such additional systems are located in one State, or in adjoining States, or in a contiguous foreign country; and

"(C) The continued combination of such systems under the control of such holding company is not so large (considering the state of the art and the area or region affected) as to impair the advantages of localized management, efficient operation, or the effectiveness of regulation."

The Commission may permit as reasonably incidental or economically necessary or appropriate to the operations of one or more integrated public-utility systems the retention of an interest in any business (other than the business of a public-utility company as such) which the Commission shall find necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors or consumers and not detrimental to the proper functioning of such system or systems.

Section 2 (a) (29) is as follows:

"(29) 'Integrated public-utility system' means—

"(A) As applied to electric utility companies, a system consisting of one or more units of generating plants and/or transmission lines and/or distributing facilities, whose utility assets, whether owned by one or more electric utility companies, are physically interconnected or capable of physical interconnection and which under normal conditions may be economically operated as a single interconnected and coordinated system confined in its operations to a single area or region, in one or more States, not so large as to impair (considering the state of the art and the area or region affected) the advantages of localized management, efficient operation, and the effectiveness of regulation; and

"(B) As applied to gas utility companies, a system consisting of one or more gas utility companies which are so located and related that substantial economies may be effectuated by being operated as a single coordinated system confined in its operations to a single area or region, in one or more States, not so large as to impair (considering the state of the art and the area or region affected) the advantages of localized management, efficient operation, and the effectiveness of regulation: *Provided*, That gas utility companies deriving natural gas from a common source of supply may be deemed to be included in a single area or region."

Interpretation of clause (B)

In our statement of tentative conclusions issued January 18, 1941, in the proceedings similar to this involving the United Gas Improvement Co.[1] we tentatively concluded that the standard established by clause (B) of section 11 (b) (1) meant that a holding company might continue to control an integrated public-utility system or systems additional to the "single" integrated public-utility system referred to in section 11 (b) (1) only if all such additional system or systems are located in the same State or States in which the "single" system is located, or in States adjoining thereto.[2] We follow this tentative conclusion as to the interpretation of clause (B) and have used it in reaching the tentative conclusions hereafter set forth with respect to the holding-company system of the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation.

II. THE PROCEEDINGS TO DATE

The Commonwealth & Southern Corporation registered as a holding company under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 on March 25, 1938. On March 6, 1940, we issued a notice of and order for hearing pursuant to section 11 (b) (1) of the act with respect to the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation and its subsidiary companies. We then stated that it appeared that the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation holding-company system was not confined in its operations to those of a single integrated public-utility system and to such other businesses as were reasonably incidental or economically necessary or appropriate to the operations of such a system within the meaning of the act.

Subsequent thereto the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation and various of its subsidiary companies requested that they be furnished with a statement of the Commission setting forth the Commission's tentative conclusions with respect to what action the Commission tentatively believed would be required by section 11 (b) (1) of the act. The respondents' request was similar to that made by the respondents in the similar proceeding involving the United Gas Improvement Co. and the Commission, by memorandum opinion filed June 1, 1940 (Holding Company Act release No. 2083), stated that it would grant the request in the same manner as it had undertaken in the United Gas Improvement Co. matter.[3] The proceedings have been held in abeyance pending the preparation and issuance of the Commission's statement of tentative conclusions.

III. APPLICATION OF STATUTORY STANDARDS

The notice of and order for hearing in itself shows that the present holding-company system of the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation is engaged in extensive electric and gas operations in a number of States scattered in different parts of the United States. The extent to which these operations are scattered is particularly shown by the maps included in that notice, and the nature and character of the operations are described in more detail in the staff report. Various nonutility businesses are also conducted by certain of the subsidiaries of the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation.

In the light of the facts as they now appear to us, we proceed to set forth our tentative conclusions as to the application of the statutory standards to the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation and its subsidiary companies.

Effect of clause (B) of section 11 (b) (1)

The interpretation which we have tentatively adopted of clause (B) of section 11 (b) (1)[4] necessitates the following conclusions:

(a) If one or more of the properties of Consumers Power Co. (located in Michigan) is considered as the "single" system, there cannot be retained under common control therewith any of the southern properties of the holding-company system (i. e., any of those located in Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, or South Carolina) nor any of the properties located in Illinois or Pennsylvania.

(b) If one or more of the properties of Alabama Power Co. is considered as the "single" system, there cannot be retained any of the northern properties of the holding-company system (i. e., any of those located in Michigan, Illinois, Ohio, or Pennsylvania) nor any of the properties located in South Carolina.

(c) If one or more of the properties of Georgia Power Co. is considered as the "single" system, there cannot be retained under common control therewith any of the northern properties of the system nor any property located in Mississippi.

(d) Properties of Ohio Edison Co., located in the neighborhood of Akron and Youngstown, Ohio, are interconnected with and form a single integrated public-utility system with the electric properties of Pennsylvania Power Co. Consequently, since the Pennsylvania properties may not be retained under common control with any property located in Michigan, the eastern properties of Ohio Edison Co. may not be retained under such control within the requirement of clause (B), unless they are separated from the Pennsylvania properties, a result which would not appear to be economically sound.

Application of size standard of sections 2 (a) (29) and clause (C) of section 11 (b) (1)

Under the size limitation contained in section 2 (a) (29) and in clause (C) of section 11 (b) (1), no single integrated public-utility system, nor any combination of such systems permitted to be retained under common control, may be "so large (considering the state of the art and the area or region affected) as to impair the advantages of localized management, efficient operation, and the effectiveness of regulation." We do not deem it necessary at this time to suggest tentative conclusions as to whether the properties now owned and operated either by Consumers Power Co., Alabama Power Co., or Georgia Power Co. are as to any one of these respective States too large for localized management, efficient operation, or effective regulation. We believe it suffices for the present purpose to reach the tentative conclusion that each of these State-wide areas either exceeds, or in any event approaches, the maximum size which can be so retained consistently with the statutory requirements. In this connection it may be observed that each of these three companies serves an area over the major part of the States served. Even within such areas it may be difficult to find that management can be localized or to conclude that regulation can be effective over companies which dominate whole States. In any event, we conclude that no substantial amount of utility property may be retained under common control with properties now constituting either those of Consumers Power Co., Alabama Power Co., or Georgia Power Co.

If our tentative conclusion on this point stands, the effect will be to make impossible the retention under common control with Consumers Power Co. any of the other properties of the holding-company system, or the retention under common control with any of the properties of Alabama Power

[1] *In the Matter of The United Gas Improvement Company* (File No. 59-6, Holding Company Act Release No. 2500).

[2] Some of the considerations upon the basis of which the Commission reached the tentative conclusions then adopted were set forth in a memorandum dated January 8, 1941, to the Commission from the Public Utilities Division, which memorandum was made public at the time of the issuance of our statement of tentative conclusions in the United Gas Improvement Company matter (Holding Company Act Release No. 2500); copies of this memorandum are available on request.

[3] For the Commission's views as to the considerations leading to the issuance of this statement, see *In the Matter of United Gas Improvement Company* (Holding Company Act Release No. 2065).

[4] Requiring that all additional systems be located in States adjoining the State where the "single" system is located; see *In the Matter of The United Gas Improvement Company* (footnote 1, supra).

Co., either any of the northern properties or any property now owned by Georgia Power Co.[8] or South Carolina Power Co. Similarly, there could not be retained under common control with the properties of Georgia Power Co. either any of the northern properties or any properties of Alabama Power Co., Mississippi Power Co., or Gulf Power Co. We leave open for further consideration the question of whether any of the properties now owned by Mississippi Power Co. or by Gulf Power Co. might be retained under common control with any of the property now owned by Alabama Power Co.; similarly we leave open for further consideration the question of whether any property now owned by South Carolina Power Co. may be retained under common control with any property owned by Georgia Power Co.

The various properties of Central Illinois Light Co., Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Co., and the two separated properties of Ohio Edison Co. (the Akron-Youngstown area and the Springfield area) are widely separated to distance and are not coordinated with each other. We tentatively conclude because of the distances separating these properties and the lack of present interconnection or coordination between them, no combination of any of these properties may be retained under common control consistently with the statutory requirements of localized management, efficient operation, and effective regulation.

Application of clause (A) of section 11 (b) (1)

Under the provisions of clause (A) of section 11 (b) (1) no additional system can be retained under common control with the "single" system unless such additional system "cannot be operated as an inedependent system without the loss of substantial economies which can be secured by the retention of control by such holding company of such system."

Consumers Power Co., Central Illinois Light Co., Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Co., Ohio Edison Co., and Pennsylvania Power Co., each have their own officers. With the exception of the Pennsylvania-Ohio interconnected system, they are operated separately and are not coordinated in their physical operations. The only common element of operations is the fact that each of these companies obtains service from the same service company and is controlled by the same holding company. Similarly, the Springfield Division of the Ohio Edison Co. operate separately and is neither interconnected nor operated with the remaining property of that company.

Under these circumstances we tentatively conclude that neither the properties of Central Illinois Light Co., Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Co., the Springfield Division of Ohio Edison Co., the interconnected Pennsylvania-Ohio property, nor the Akron-Youngstown Division of Ohio Edison Co., nor Pennsylvania Power Co. considered separately, could qualify for retention as an "additional system" to those of Consumers Power Co., or as additional systems to each other (except as to the interconnected Pennsylvania-Ohio group), under the limitations imposed by clause (A) of section 11 (b) (1).

For the purposes of this statement we do not deem it necessary to consider the application of clause (A) to any of the Southern properties of the holding company system.

[8] A minor exception to this conclusion involves the Credille property owned by Georgia Power Co. and located in Georgia which is interconnected with and operates with the properties of Alabama Power Co.; another possible exception involves the gas property located in Phenix City, Ala., which is interconnected with and operates on a coordinated basis with the Columbus City gas property of the Georgia Power Co.

Other businesses

With the consent of the respondents we have already directed Tennessee Utilities Corporation to sell the various transportation and other properties which it owns, such sale to be completed on or before July 1, 1942.

The General Corporation and Transportation Securities Corporation conduct, either directly or through subsidiaries, ice, transportation, and other businesses located in various States. Certain of the utility subsidiaries of the holding company system also themselves operate, either directly or through subsidiaries, certain transportation, water, ice, heating, and other businesses other than electric or gas utilities. We conclude that none of such businesses are reasonably incidental or economically necessary or appropriate to the operations of any of the electric or gas utility properties controlled by the holding company system or by any of its subsidiaries, and are therefore not possible of retention within the holding company system of a registered holding company.

The Commonwealth & Southern Corporation (New York) is a mutual service company rendering services to all of the various subsidiary companies of the holding company system. In view of the conclusions hereafter reached, we conclude that the business of this service company, as presently constituted, is not reasonably incidental or economically necessary or appropriate to the operations of any of the utility properties.

Tentative conclusion as to holding company

Summarizing the foregoing, we conclude tentatively that, if the property of Consumers Power Co. is considered as the "single" integrated public utility system, the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation can retain no other properties; that if the "single" system is located in Alabama, no other properties can be retained with the possible exception of those located in Mississippi and Florida; and that if the "single" system is located in Georgia, no other properties can be retained with the possible exception of those in South Carolina. From this it would seem to follow that the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation cannot continue to control more than one of its major units of property.

V. ORDER RECONVENING HEARING

It is hereby ordered that—

1. The hearing heretofore commenced in this proceeding shall be reconvened on April 3, 1941, at 10 o'clock in the forenoon of that day at the offices of the Securities and Exchange Commission, 1778 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., in such room as may be designated on such date by the hearing-room clerk in room 1102, before the officer of the Commission heretofore designated to preside at the hearing previously commenced, or before such other officer as the Commission may hereafter designate. The officer so designated to preside at such reconvened hearing is hereby authorized to exercise all the powers granted to the Commission under section 18 (c) of said act and to a trial examiner under the Commission's rules of practice.

2. At the outset of said hearing, to be reconvened as aforesaid, the respondents and other parties in interest shall be given an opportunity to be heard with respect to the statements of fact contained in the aforesaid report of the Public Utilities Division, heretofore filed as part of the public proceeding in this case, and all such persons shall have an opportunity and are invited to state at that time any differences which they may have with respect to any of the facts contained in said report of the Public Utilities Division, and all such persons shall have an opportunity to be heard with respect to the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 to 47, inclusive, of the aforesaid order of March 6, 1940.

3. At such time the respondents shall state what properties they believe constitute the "single integrated public-utility system" to the operations of which they believe their holding-company system should be limited, as provided in section 11 (b) (1) of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, and said respondents shall also state what other systems, if any, they claim to be entitled to retain as additional systems pursuant to the proviso embodied in clauses (A), (B), and (C) of said section 11 (b) (1), and shall state what other businesses they claim are reasonably incidental or economically necessary or appropriate to the operations of such integrated public-utility systems as said respondents wish to retain.

4. At such time said respondents and all other parties in interest shall be given an opportunity to be heard for the purpose of showing cause why an order should not be entered pursuant to section 11 (b) of said act, requiring—

(a) The divestment of control by the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation of either:

(1) Its northern properties, comprising all of its utility assets located in the States of Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania; or

(2) Its southern properties, comprising all of its utility assets located in the States of Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina;

(b) The divestment of control by the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation of all of the utility assets owned by Central Illinois Light Co. and of the utility assets comprising the interconnected electric facilities owned by Ohio Edison Co. and Pennsylvania Power Co.;

(c) The divestment of control by the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation, if, pursuant to clause (1) of paragraph (a) above, it divests itself of its northern properties, also of either:

(1) The utility assets owned by Alabama Power Co., Mississippi Power Co., and Gulf Power Co.; or

(2) The utility assets owned by Georgia Power Co., and South Carolina Power Co.

5. At such time consideration will also be given, and respondents and all other parties in interest shall have an opportunity to be heard, with respect to the time and manner for disposition of any other issues presented in these proceedings.

It is further ordered that the Secretary of the Commission shall serve notice of the said reconvened hearing by mailing a copy of this order, together with a copy of said report of the Public Utilities Division, dated March 10, 1941, by registered mail to The Commonwealth & Southern Corporation, to each of the attorneys of record herein, and to each of the interveners herein, and that notice of the reconvening of said hearing is hereby given to the said respondents and interveners and to all other persons, including the security holders and consumers of the said respondents, to all States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States within which are located any of the utility assets of any of the companies of the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation holding-company system, or under the laws of which any of the respondents are incorporated, to all State commissions, State securities commissions, and all agencies, authorities, or instrumentalities of one or more States, municipalities, or other political subdivisions having jurisdiction over any of the businesses, affairs, or operations of any of them, such notice to be given by publication of this order in the Federal Register and by publication of this order as a general release, distributed to the press and mailed to the mailing list

for releases issued under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935.

It is further ordered that jurisdiction be and is hereby reserved to separate, either for hearing, in whole or in part, or for disposition, in whole or in part, any of the issues or questions which may arise in these proceedings, and to take such other action as may appear conducive to an orderly and economic disposition of the issues involved.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] FRANCIS P. BRASSOR,
Secretary.

New Industries for the New South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

ADDRESS BY DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by David E. Lilienthal, Director, Tennessee Valley Authority, at the Southern Scientist Symposium held at Mobile, Ala., March 20, 1941:

Seven years ago the Tennessee Valley Authority began its program of industrial research. Our purpose was to uncover new opportunities for the development by businessmen and farmers of the resources of the South. This pioneering activity of the T. V. A. has developed, year by year, until today it is the most extensive regional public research development in the country. These efforts have produced practical results, new industries, newly invented products and equipment, in profitable use in private business.

You and I are gathered here because of our common interest in southern economic development through science and technical skills. Since one example is usually worth an hour's generalization, for my part in the discussion I can do no better than to set out, as specifically and concretely as possible, some of these practical and tangible results of T. V. A. industrial research. Since this is a program in action, such a description of what has been done and why it has been done will, I trust, be stimulating to you as you plan for the future expansion of technical research in the South.

There are certain principles upon which we in T. V. A. have proceeded in this work. Because of the limitation of time today, I shall simply state these propositions without spelling out the supporting reasons. A decade or so ago the way some of these principles might work out would have aroused no end of controversy; that is no longer true today. Even the past few years have brought a great change in this respect. Five years ago I spoke at commencement at the University of Alabama on some of these underlying propositions. Even in the brief span of those 5 years there has come a marked degree of agreement upon these principles.

THE FIVE PILLARS SUPPORTING THE T. V. A. INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH PROGRAM

The T. V. A.'s industrial research program rests mainly upon these five propositions:

(1) It is in the interest of the entire country that the income of the South be greatly increased above its present low level.

(2) An increase in the income of the South requires a drastic change in our way of making a living, a greater reliance upon the manufacturing or processing of the raw materials of the South, and less reliance upon shipping those raw materials out of the region in their raw state or only partly processed.

(3) An industrial development program for the South should so far as possible originate in southern needs and opportunities and be directed toward meeting southern problems. To be truly successful, our industrial development cannot merely ape that of other regions of the country.

(4) Industrial development that drains and exhausts our basic resources, that puts the whole region in the red, is bad business, even if it shows a paper profit to a limited number for the time being.

(5) New industries for the new South must come from a partnership of the scientist, the engineer, and the businessman.

COTTONSEED-MACHINERY INVENTION AS ILLUSTRATION

To illustrate the T. V. A.'s research program, I have chosen one project: The development of a new method of obtaining oil from the cottonseed. This one illustration will throw light upon the content and methods of the entire effort. There are many others—a new quick-freezing machine which a few days ago we licensed for commercial use to a firm in Alabama; a method of producing alumina from the clays of the South; the list is long and covers many fields. I have chosen the cottonseed process because in this one illustration there are embodied probably more phases of the T. V. A.'s procedure than in any other single illustration.

The first development of this project was a new device for the cooking of cottonseed under pressure. The result is a drastic improvement in the yield and quality of oil from cottonseed. This machinery has gone successively through the laboratory and the pilot plant stages; the machinery has now been manufactured under license by a number of private firms and has been purchased and is in use in 13 cotton-oil mills in six States of the South. Businessmen and the association of the cottonseed industry have pronounced the development a practical and financial success.

Let me carry you through the various steps in this development. First of all was the problem that led to the research. It seems to me important that souhern research originate in problems peculiar to the South. That was notably true in the case of this project. For the cottonseed-oil industry is substantial in size. There are in the South some 420 cotton-oil mills. Their purchases of cottonseed and the methods of marketing the resulting product exert a strong influence on cotton agriculture and the fortunes of all who depend upon cotton for a livelihood. And the fate of southern soil fertility is tied up with the cottonseed-oil industry. It is in the cottonseed meal rather than in the cotton fiber that the three major mineral elements conained in commercial ferilizer are to be found: Phosphorus, potash, and nitrogen. The more cottonseed meal sold and used outside the Cotton Belt, the more of these essential plant nutrients we ship out and lose each year. Therefore, the southern farmer must continually buy in commercial fertilizer, the very same plant nutrients that are contained in the cottonseed meal. But ordinarily what he nets from his cotton crop is not enough to buy back anything like the quantities of plant food elements which he ships out. And so our soil declines in fertility, and the economic opportunity of those who depend on the land—and that means all of us—shrinks.

Over the South as a whole, the general practice is for a large proportion of the cottonseed meal to be marketed outside the South. This export of cottonseed meal over the last 75 years has been one of the major causes of the exhaustion of the soil of the Cotton Belt, and in turn, of low income. If this meal can be fed to livestock in the South, as much as 80 percent of the fertilizing value of the meal may be returned to the soil rather than being continuously drained from the soil by export.

And so to improve the chance of profit by these cotton-oil mills—they are, typically, small local industries—is a matter of great concern. If the cottonseed extraction business could be put on a paying basis in the South, benefits would result not only to them but to the entire region.

The cotton-oil industry has been in considerable difficulties. Hundreds of the small mills have been operating for years at a very low rate of return. The equipment used in the extraction of cottonseed oil has not been improved for over 50 years. If it is to survive, if it is to be able to provide local opportunity to return plant nutrients to the soil, the small southern cotton mill must have earnings sufficient to improve its equipment and keep up with the technical advance of the industry.

Here, then, is a typical southern problem for industrial research. The results that have been reached—the practical, tangible results that you can see and weigh and appraise—were achieved through the teamwork of scientists, engineers, and businessmen. This is how the project proceeded from an idea to a manufactured product bought and sold in the marketplace.

For a number of years, begining in 1929, laboratory research on this problem of improving cottonseed oil extraction methods went forward at one of our southern universities. The work in the laboratory was on a very modest scale; but it showed pretty conclusively that the laboratory process, if fully developed and applied, had great practical potentialities. But you cannot determine costs nor solve practical operating difficulties in test tubes. And you cannot convince businessmen that a new process will be profitable and justify private investment on the basis of laboratory results alone. What is required is that the preliminary experiments be advanced to the semicommercial scale. In other words, a so-called pilot plant must be constructed and operated. The Tennessee Valley Authority, having made some contribution to the laboratory work, at this point joined with the University of Tennessee College of Engineering in the work of designing and building a pilot plant pressure cottonseed cooker, in which the new process discovered in the laboratory could be tried out at full-plant scale. At this stage, leading operating executives in the coton-oil industry, who had been following this research with interest, agreed to supply additional equipment at their expense, such as crushing rolls, a huge press, a high-pressure hydraulic pump and accumulator, and other equipment.

The example we have been discussing indicates one way—not the only way by any means—of overcoming the handicap that businessmen of this region suffer in the initiation of new enterprises that depend upon research. The concentration of existing industry in the Northeast carries with it a similar concentration of research facilities in that region. In this and other cases T. V. A. has helped in bringing research to the place where businessmen could see possibilities of profit, and could therefore see their way clear to carry the financial burden involved in the research.

The net result is that the South now has a completely equipped pilot plant for mechanical processing of cottonseed and other oil-bearing products. This establishment includes not only excellent laboratory apparatus and competent laboratory personnel but also a fully equipped cotton-oil plant capable of turning out 18,000 pounds of meal and 6,200 pounds of oil per day. With this equipment, the practical difficulties and

problems of actual operation in this industry could be resolved, and data to estimate costs and profitability could be obtained. This work required a year of pilot-plant operation and experimentation.

The problem that we next faced was how to get these results into use; how to bridge the gap between a successful piece of industrial research and its use at a profit by private industry, especially when this involves a new process and new machinery. This problem was solved through the services of a nonprofit research corporation, the directors of which are prominent businessmen. This corporation agreed to act as the agent of the T. V. A. and the University of Tennessee in commercializing the new invention. The research corporation licensed three machinery manufacturers to build these new pressure cookers for cottonseed mills—the Davidson-Kennedy Co. of Atlanta, the V. D. Anderson Co. of Cleveland, Ohio, and the French Oil Mill Machinery Co., of Piqua, Ohio. Each of these companies received assurances that no other manufacturer would be given more favorable terms and each pays a modest license fee into a revolving fund. This fund may be used for further research.

The use of the financial income derived from public industrial research to carry on further research is an interesting aspect of this program. The principle has been used successfully on a large scale by an institution known as the Research Corporation of New York. While the revenues in the early stages of the T. V. A.'s work are small, in the long run they will undoubtedly be substantial and will permit other industrial research uncovering additional opportunities for industrial processing of southern products.

Now we come to the final stage of this story: The sale of this new machinery by these private manufacturing concerns to cotton-seed mills. Among the southern mills in which this equipment has recently been installed are Taylor Oil Mills, at Moultrie, Ga.; Delta Products Co., Wilson, Ark.; Terminal Oil Mill, Oklahoma City, Okla.; the P. M. B. Self Mill at Marks, Miss., and nine other cotton-oil mills in the South.

As I have said, there are many other results of the T. V. A. cooperative industrial research program which could be cited. Some of them were carried on wholly in T. V. A.'s laboratories, the total expense being borne by the Federal Government. One example is the production of alumina from clays; another is the production of an almost 100-percent plant food, known as potassium metaphosphate. Both of these are carried on through various stages at the national laboratory T. V. A. operates at Muscle Shoals. In most cases, however, the research involves cooperation between T. V. A.'s technicians and the various research institutions of the South, public and private. For we in the T. V. A. are persuaded that the best results are obtained by such joint activities between this Federal regional agency and the established State and communnity institutions of the South.

I am attaching to this paper as an appendix a fairly comprehensive list of these research projects, some of which are in early stages and some of which, such as the cottonseed-processing machinery, are actually in use in private enterprise.

Every instance of technical research that leads to practical results for the people of the South must go through somewhat the same steps as those I have outlined. And that is true whether the research is conducted by a private concern or by public institutions. Let us go over those steps again.

First, there must be a valuable idea. Whether the invention is carried on in a solitary way by an Edison or the Wright Brothers, or whether it emerges from a huge modern laboratory like du Pont's or A. T. & T. or T. V. A., we begin with an idea. In the case of southern research projects, the idea, it seems to me, should be directed toward the solution of some specific southern problem to fill some characteristically southern need. The utilization of the fast-growing southern pine for newspaper print, the discovery of a commercial product which can be made from the southern sweetpotato—this is the kind of problem toward which all of our research activities in this field may well be turned.

Then the new idea must be explored in a laboratory—explored from every possible viewpoint. A research worker in that laboratory must try it out in various ways. He must sometimes reject ways which have no apparent use at the moment. He must determine upon some industrial utilization which seems practical. Then he must conduct many, many tests in order to be assured of its practicability. These operations are ordinarily carried on in scientific or engineering laboratories.

There can't be too much support and stimulation given to the ideas of these men in the research field. What goes on in one laboratory stimulates the workers in others, and the problems are so extensive and so great that large numbers of inspired research men everywhere throughout the South are needed.

But after the men in the laboratory have discovered a new product or process, the job is only one-third done. The next one-third of the job ordinarily consists of solving the engineering problems. If it is a new product, such as making a plastic from cottonseed hulls (like this sample I have in my hand, made on a T. V. A. cooperative research project), a man working in a laboratory must produce some of it in order to see what kind of machinery is going to be needed to make the product in quantities. If we are talking about a completely new process, there is frequently the job of actually designing the necessary machinery. In the case of the new process for extracting cottonseed oil, to which I have previously referred, mechanical engineers had to design, build, and test a pressure cooker.

The next third of the job, and I am inclined to think it is much more than a third in most cases, is for the businessman. It is the job of finding where and how to break into the business world with the new product or process and make a commercial success of it. This means he must be able to make a profit in so doing, and that is a long story, as many of you well know. It takes the special skill and judgment that only good businessmen have; and it takes faith, and often courage, and always patience and persistence.

Consider, for instance, the cottonseed cooker to which I have referred. After the Davidson-Kennedy Co., of Atlanta, had been completely convinced of the feasibility of the pressure-cooking process, and had actually seen a successful cooker, made by T. V. A. engineers, in operation, there was plenty more to do. They had to put their engineers to the job of changing the design of the cooker so that it would synchronize with the other customary process machinery for cotton-oil mills which they also manufacture. While the pilot plant cooker was large enough for the smallest mill, Davidson-Kennedy had also to build larger equipment; and this required that the engineers do more design work. The Davidson-Kennedy Co. then had to test their own design to make sure that no mistakes had crept in, and this involved selling several cookers, on approval, to oil mills, guaranteeing to take them back without cost in case they should fail to perform according to expectation. The company then had to get out photographs and catalogs of the new equipment. It had to call all its salesmen in and convince them of the soundness of the idea, for unless they were convinced they would be poor hands at convincing potential buyers. The Davidson-Kennedy Co. had to arrange with its directors to finance the cookers which were to be sold on approval and which would bring them no money for some time.

In this process of commercialization of a new development, particularly where inventions are involved, there is often the need for some practical channel of contact between public research and private business. One such channel of contact is well illustrated in Georgia, which has an Industrial Development Council. This organization is a corporation, nonprofit in character, under the leadership of prominent businessmen. It can receive inventions from public research agencies, and has provision to accumulate a fund from royalties on such inventions. Out of this fund it can finance further research. In addition, it can do the job of liaison between public research and private business.

The task of building southern income, the task of expanding southern manufacturing based upon materials and resources found in our own area, calls for teamwork between these three groups of workers: The scientists, the engineers, and the businessmen.

Here in the South we have men and institutions that can grow and develop to meet the very great, almost overwhelming, opportunities and problems of sound industrial development. No one of these three teammates can win this game alone. The scientist without the businessman will be carrying on research which will have no practical consequences for the people of the South. The engineer without his partners would be futile and useless, and the businessman without the aid of his technical brethren would make slow progress indeed. But when all three work together, we can look forward with confidence to the future.

We need not and should not rely upon any one method of stimulating new industries in this region. We need more public research by our State institutions and by the T. V. A.; we need more private research by industries having a long-time interest not only in their own business but in the foundations of all business in the South.

So far as the T. V. A. is concerned, we stand ready, willing, and eager to extend to every person and every southern institution, public and private, State and local, the fullest measure of cooperation in all such efforts that lies within our power.

There is one thought that is in the mind of every one of us at this grave time of actual danger to our country. That thought is the defense of our shores and the preservation of our freedom, without which nothing has meaning to us. It goes without saying that such a program as I have been describing is an integral part of a program of industrial preparedness and a means of increasing our national vigor. For whatever we do to strengthen the South will strengthen the entire Nation.

APPENDIX[1]

T. V. A. INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH—RESEARCH DEVELOPMENTS NOW IN COMMERCIAL USE (AS OF MARCH 1941)

A. Developments of new and improved methods for local processing of the region's raw materials

1. Immersion process and equipment for quick-freezing fruits, vegetables, fish, and meats.

2. Improved pressure cooker for cottonseed and other vegetable-oil seeds.

---

[1] Most of the following research developments have been conducted in cooperation with the region's engineering and agricultural experiment stations or State geology departments and have been tested in the field in cooperation with the State agricultural extension services and private operators.

8. Electric cabinet for aging hams and other meats.

4. Improved method of refining kaolin, in cooperation with private producer, and surveys of kaolin deposits in North Carolina.

5. Surveys of vermiculite deposits in North Carolina, with subsequent new mining developments by private producers.

B. Developments to encourage soil conservation and increased farm income

1. Furrow seeder for planting fall grains in hillside lespedeza sod.

2. Barn hay dryer to increase feeding value of hay and reduce weather losses.

3. Small thresher for recovery of grain and legume seed on small acreages.

4. Improvements to Lespedeza harvester with a self-raking type of feed pan for recovery of seed on small or rough acreages.

5. Community walk-in type refrigerator for use by rural groups.

6. Milk coolers for small dairy farms.

7. Irrigation systems, adapted to Tennessee Valley farm conditions.

8. Sweetpotato curing by electric heat, adapted to Tennessee Valley farm conditions.

9. Electric hotbeds, adapted to Tennessee Valley farm conditions.

10. Lespedeza seed scarifier of improved type.

DEVELOPMENTS STILL IN RESEARCH STAGE (AS OF MARCH 1941)

1. Portable quick-freezing machine of 100 to 200 pounds' hourly capacity.

2. Growing and development of suitable varieties of fruits and vegetables for quick-freezing and testing of such products on the experimental freezing machine.

3. Partial extraction of protein from cottonseed, prior to processing for oil and meal, for use in industry.

4. Microscopic studies of vegetable-oil seeds. New uses for peanuts.

5. Growing fiber flax suitable for processing and commercial uses.

6. Processing of southern flax to produce fiber suitable for spinning and weaving on cottol-mill machinery. Suitable equipment has been developed in laboratory, and pilot plant has been constructed to test processes on semicommercial scale.

7. Development of processes and equipment for new and wider uses of wood and other forest products: Automatic wood-burning dehydrator, portable wood fuel preparing apparatus, slow combustion wood-burning stove, and improved gas producer for converting wood and charcoal into fuel for internal-combustion engines.

8. Development of economical method for converting sawdust and waste wood into gas producer fuel.

9. Methods for small-scale low-cost production of paints from local materials for southern rural uses.

10. Development of automatic feeding device and control, for small feed grinders.

11. Extraction of magnesium metal and compounds from North Carolina and Georgia olivine, for use in airplane construction.

12. Tests on vermiculite concrete mixtures to determine physical properties and best mixtures for maximum strength and thermal insulation values, for wider use in building construction.

13. Development of new plastic material using mica from mica schist (large reserves in Georgia and North Carolina) and synthetic resin, for use in electric appliances.

14. Beneficiation of Georgia manganese ores.

The Public Life of R. Walton Moore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR., OF VIRGINIA

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday evening, March 11, 1941, the Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce held a memorial service in honor of one of its distinguished charter members, the late Hon. R. Walton Moore, of Fairfax, Va., late Solicitor of the Department of State, and from 1919–31 a Member of this House. The meeting was presided over by Mr. Herbert Williams, president of the chamber of commerce, and former State Senator John W. Rust introduced the speakers. Resolutions drafted by Senator Rust, John W. Brookfield, and John T. Blincoe were adopted. The meeting was addressed by Senator TOM CONNALLY, of Texas; Hon. S. OTIS BLAND, of the First Congressional District of Virginia; Hon. John S. Barbour, of Fairfax, one of the most distinguished members of the Virginia bar and for years a member of Judge Moore's law firm, and myself. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the address I delivered on the occasion:

R. Walton Moore, take him all in all, was probably the greatest Virginian of his day. Versatile of mind, he mastered the law, delved deep into the philosophies of government, understood the social, economic, and political aspects of history, and became a master upon the public stage where, for over half a century, he played a leading part in the development and advancement of the social, economic, and political life of his community, the State, and the Nation.

During his long and eventful life, other Virginians, from time to time, vied with him for honors. There were those who burst forth like meteors and as suddenly disappeared; some with brilliant one-track minds who went far in their particular field, but contributed little to the public good outside of their narrow sphere; others, unable to adjust themselves in a changing world to new thoughts and new conditions, developed a static complex that hampered and limited their public service; while still others, after years of honest, courageous service, fell prey to the ravages of age and passed into Shakespeare's seventh age of man of "Second childishness and mere oblivion, sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste, sans everything"; but Judge Moore, his body unshaken by age, his eye undimmed by time, his character as stainless as a Damascus blade, his mind holding its mental vigor and splendor, completed his public service, his activities still as broad as human needs, his trust and confidence in the future of democracy still unshaken, with a heart and mind still attuned to the public good, with a spirit of humor still sparkling and scintillating, with a freshness still akin to youth, and amid surroundings in which only the select could survive. Yes, when at last he dropped behind the western horizon, like the sun, his courageous heart still faced the east, and faced it with all the hope and confidence and buoyancy that was his when the morning of his life was yet young.

Like all strong men, Judge Moore was a man of deep convictions. He was not a negative character. He stood for something. That something was advancement of democracy along lines that would bring the greatest good to the greatest number. He believed in progress. There was nothing static in his make-up. And so he was not afraid of progressive democracy but shuddered to think what would happen if our democracy ever grew static. He believed that men, if rightly led, had the capacity not only to preserve democracy but to develop democracy to the point where the blessings of free government, like the snows of heaven, would fall upon all classes alike. He not only believed in democracy but, unlike many in high positons during his day, lived his democracy. And his innate love for the foundation stones of democracy, for liberty and freedom and equality, his abiding confidence that men are capable of self-government and would not only preserve but extend the liberty, freedom, and equality that is ours by reason of our democratic heritage, naturally generated in him a freshness of life that age could not destroy, a perennial youthfulness that time could not age, and caused him to ever live in the present and look hopefully to the future.

These convictions, these views that Judge Moore entertained were not of mushroom growth; they were not picked up from current trend and adopted to satisfy fickle public favor, but were part and parcel of the very man himself. They were born in him as courage is born in the lion. They were a part of his bold, courageous, democratic heritage. Back in the formative period of our country his ancestors entertained the same views with respect to the great cornerstones of democracy—with respect to freedom and liberty and equality. They, too, believed that governments derive their just power from the consent of the governed and must grow and develop in keeping with the ideals, the desires, the needs, and the demands of the governed.

On his maternal side his ancestor, Lewis Morris, of New York, signed that immortal document which declares:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are Endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.—That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.—That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness."

On his paternal side his ancestor, Jeremiah Moore, a Dissenter during the days when religious intolerance hung like a blight over a land that had been dedicated to freedom, rather than surrender that freedom, served a term in jail for the then high crime—as Judge Moore on one occasion expressed it to me—"of preaching the glorious gospel of Jesus Christ without a license."

Oh, I like to think that one of the acorns from these mighty oaks of the early American political and religious forests, fell into

the fertile democratic soil that was prepared by their sacrifices, their hardships, their sufferings, yea, their blood, and grew into the giant oak of the Virginia forest of my day, R. Walton Moore.

Heritage is a great thing. I like to contemplate our family heritage, our religious heritage, our democratic heritage, our American heritage. Oh, my friends, the heritage of the humblest American means more, because it has real values back of it, than the heritage of the most exalted of any other nation of the world. And as long as the American people respect and revere the heritage that is theirs, so long will this Republic exist.

That a man with such a background, so richly endowed with a strong versatile mind, with vision, with faith in the democratic way of life, with buoyancy and youthfulness of spirit, with "such humor as distils from blessed gods," and who by study and industry had improved these God-given talents, should be called to public service is but natural.

Let me chronicle the calls that came from the people: State Senate of Virginia, 1887–90; Cleveland Presidential elector, 1892; Virginia Constitutional Convention, 1901–2; and Congressman from the Eighth Congressional District of Virginia, 1919–31.

There were other calls, too, that came from the people, even to the chief magistracy of his State, to which circumstances would not permit him to respond.

May I pause at this point to call attention to the fact that he was never defeated in a contest before the people, and that he voluntarily retired both from the Virginia Senate and the United States House of Representatives.

He was not only called by the people to service, but he was frequently called by those in authority to assist them in rendering better and more efficient service in their administration of public affairs. I do not know of a man who gave so freely of his time to such service, most of which was gratuitous.

Let me chronicle these calls to which he responded:

Assistant General Counsel, United States Railroad Administration, 1918–19.

Assistant Secretary of State, 1933–37.

Counselor of Department of State, 1937–41.

Acting Secretary of State, November 7, 1936, to January 13, 1937.

Member, board of visitors of University of Virginia.

Member, board of visitors of William and Mary College.

Member Virginia State Board of Education.

Member, board of directors of Episcopal High School.

Director, Madeira School for Girls.

Member Executive Committee Virginia Cooperative Association and chairman of the Department of County Councils.

President, Virginia State Bar Association, 1911.

Vice president of Virginia Historical Society.

Member of the Board of Regents, Smithsonian Institution, 1922–41.

Member George Washington Bicentennial Commission, 1930–33.

Chairman, Fredericksburg Battlefield Park Commission.

Chairman, Board of Trustees, Export-Import Bank of Washington, 1934–41.

Chairman, Board of Trustees, Second Export-Import Bank of Washington, D. C., 1934–36.

Member of the Department of State Committee on International Civil Aviation, 1935–38.

Chairman, Interdepartmental Committee on Civil International Aviation, 1935–38.

Chairman, United States-Canada Aviation Conference, Washington, D. C., 1938.

Member of the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, 1939–41.

Member, Central Committee of the American Red Cross, 1936–41.

Second vice president, Washington National Monument Society, 1937–41.

Member, Board of Foreign Service Personnel, 1934–37.

Member, Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service, 1934–37.

Member, Foreign Service School Board, 1934–37.

The above recitation of the public elective and appointive offices held by Judge Moore demonstrates the versatility of his mind, the reach of his abilities. As was said by Secretary Hull in a press release under date of February 8, "His interests knew no narrow bounds; his abilities carried him to ever wider fields of service." His was not the one-track mind. It was too broad and versatile to be confined to any particular phase of the public service to the exclusion of all others. While it may be said he had a particular flair for education, history, and public improvements and betterments, his talents were in nowise exclusively directed to these particular fields. He browsed all over the public domain, and wherever he browsed he contributed something to the public good. Nor was there anything spectacular in his public service. Upon the public stage he never blazed forth like a comet to excite the people by some colorful statement or spectacular act. Tinkling cymbals and sounding brass were foreign to his nature. Rather, his public life was patterned after the North Star, giving men the true direction.

Here in this historical town where he spent his entire life he was, from early manhood, one of the leaders in your religious, civic, and public affairs. And when his influence commenced to spread until it covered the State, the Nation, and affected world affairs, and great demands were made upon his time, he still never became too busy to participate in the affairs of the community. He never outgrew his home people. He never grew too big for Fairfax. Truly a mark of greatness, because you will ever find that the man who is too big and important to mix and mingle with the home people and participate in local affairs is usually too small to render higher service. And so we find Judge Moore actively participating in local affairs here in his home town to the end. Senior vestryman in Truro Episcopal Church, deeply interested in the local schools, charter member of the Fairfax Chamber of Commerce, one of the organizers of your volunteer fire department, instrumental in establishing the health department for Fairfax County, contributing from his own funds $1,000 as the county's share to supplement State funds for the first 2 years, and never too busy to point out to the stranger your many historical treasures, among them the wills of George and Martha Washington.

And he left his impress upon his native State that he loved so well. No Virginian during his day ever served her with greater ability, with more fidelity and pride. In young manhood as State senator from the Fairfax district, although he only served one term, his poise, his soundness of judgment, his sincerity, his devotion to the public good, won State-wide recognition, and he became from that time on a State figure in the truest sense. At the noonday of his life he was again called upon by the people of his section to represent them in the State constitutional convention and as chairman of its legislative committee he rendered a service excelled by no member of that historic convention which was composed of the best minds of the Old Dominion. While this was the last elective State office that he held, his interest in the welfare of his State never abated and is testified to by the long line of distinguished services he rendered in other than elective positions: Member of the board of visitors of the University of Virginia; member of the board of visitors of William and Mary College; member of the board of directors of the Episcopal High School; member of board of directors of Madeira School for Girls; member of the Virginia State Board of Education; president of the Virginia State Bar Association; vice president of the Virginia Historical Association; and member of the executive committee of the Virginia Cooperative Association and chairman of its department of county councils.

In recognition of his distinguished services to the State, the Virginia General Assembly at its last session, by resolution unanimously adopted, extended to Judge Moore an invitation to address the assembly. The resolution was agreed to January 31, 1940, and reads as follows:

"The Honorable R. Walton Moore, of Fairfax County, Counselor of the State Department and one of Virginia's most distinguished and beloved statesmen, has served this State in the Senate from 1887 to 1890 and in the Constitutional Convention of 1901–2, besides making many other notable contributions to the Commonwealth.

"He has also served the Nation with equal distinction both in the House of Representatives and in the Department of State, being the only Virginian who has acted as Secretary of State since John Tyler. Since few men now living have a more comprehensive and exact knowledge of Virginia traditions and since there is no one from whom those who are trying to carry on these traditions could learn more: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of delegates, the senate concurring, That the General Assembly does hereby invite the Honorable R. Walton Moore to address a joint assembly of the members of the General Assembly, to be held immediately after the joint Democratic caucus on Tuesday, February 6, 1940, at 3 p. m., in the hall of the House of Delegates."

No higher tribute could have been paid a Virginian.

In 1919, Judge Moore, now in his sixtieth year, entered the national field as a Representative from the Eighth Virginia Congressional District in the United States Congress. No man ever entered the House better prepared. He brought with him maturity of age, experience, a deep and broad knowledge of history, and an intimate acquaintance with governments, past and present, acquired through actual experience and long and careful study. From the beginning of his congressional career, without going through the apprenticeship the congressional freshman is scrupulously required to serve, he took his rightful place among the leaders of Congress and became identified, more or less, with all of the various and varied deliberations of the House. Becoming a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, he played an important part in the World Court fight, and, I think, envisioned what we are going through today as a result of partisanship and politics defeating President Wilson's great effort to insure world peace. He also bitterly opposed the administration policies in Mexico and Nicaragua under President Coolidge and gave considerable thought and time to an extensive study of our foreign-debt situation. He took an active part in the preservation of our history and historical sites, and rendered signal service as chairman of the Fredericksburg Battlefield Park Commission, as a member of the George Washington Bicentennial

Commission, as vice president of the Washington National Monument Association, and as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. After leaving the House, by special act of Congress, he served on as one of the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution until his death. And that his services in Congress contributed largely to the improvement and embellishment of our Capital City and its environs is well known. The Arlington Memorial, Key Bridge, Chain Bridge, the George Washington Memorial Highway, and the New House Office Building are largely children of his vision and untiring efforts. Joseph Sinnott, likewise a Virginian in whom all Virginians take pride, the veteran Doorkeeper of the House, a fine judge of men with an excellent opportunity to judge, and who, during his connection of over 50 years with the House, has seen hundreds of Members come and go, stated to me the other day that, in his opinion, R. Walton Moore was the greatest Member to sit in the House during his entire service. Few, if any, will question dear old Joe's judgment.

Entertaining the views he did with respect to democratic government, it would have been strange indeed if Judge Moore had not enthusiastically championed the cause of progressive democracy as preached by the greatest leader of democracy since the days of Thomas Jefferson, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, because both the record of the President and the record of Judge Moore show that they were firm believers in the fundamental principle that governments should rest upon the consent of the governed and should ever be administered, in the light of the conditions and problems of the present, so as to promote the happiness, the security, and the general welfare of the governed.

In his excellent address on Zachary Taylor, delivered before the Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Virginia on July 4, 1934, Judge Moore clearly and forceably enunciated Jefferson's theory of government and, inferentially to say the least, justified his own position in supporting the Roosevelt administration. Said Judge Moore:

"This incident reminds us of the frequency with which there is appeal to the authority of Jefferson, and often by those on both sides of a controversy. This is ascribable to the fact that Jefferson was an unflinching liberal who always thought freely and acted freely. He was fixed in adherence to the fundamental principle that government should rest upon the consent of the governed, but he was equally fixed in adherence to the principle that the administration of government at any given time should be controlled by conditions then existing, so as to promote the interests and opportunities of the people. He was like a planet that moves on a definite course, but an unresting planet that never ceases in its forward progress. If the political philosophy of Jefferson is thus rightly indicated, I do not believe in this year 1934, when the conditions are so entirely different from what they were when Jefferson was laid to rest at Monticello, that any man has any warrant whatever for any measurably positive opinion that Jefferson, if he were now here, would find fault with the present governmental program put into effect by the action of Congress and the Executive, and, therefore, I do not believe anyone is entitled to assert that the program operates to sacrifice what we are accustomed to speak of as Jeffersonian democracy. * * * I am satisfied that should some highly qualified student from a foreign land, coming to this country without much knowledge of our political system, make a very thorough fresh examination of the books and documents mentioned in order to determine what was Jefferson's philosophy, and whether or not, if now on the scene, he would condemn the administration's program as contrary to that philosophy, he would be obliged to give a negative answer to that question. It is not to be implied from what I am saying that any citizen for a single moment is to be denied the right of adverse criticism should he believe such criticism wise at this fateful juncture, but I do deny his right to assume that Jefferson, were he now living, would endorse the criticism. In my judgment, it is easier to assume that the program would have his approval."

That Judge Moore was by heritage and intellectual conviction a Jeffersonian Democrat there can be no question. That he and President Roosevelt were in accord on fundamental principles of government there can be no earthly doubt. And that he considered the President a great exponent of Jeffersonian democracy is equally as clear, not only from the excerpt I have read from the address on Zachary Taylor, but from many other statements contained in his written word—one other I shall make reference to—and from his spoken word to many of his friends and acquaintances. On July 5, 1937, Judge Moore again addressed the Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Virginia. On this occasion he was speaking on avoidance of international war and preservation of international peace, and in the course of his address again emphasized the similarity in the beliefs of Jefferson and Roosevelt. Said Judge Moore:

"It is unmistakably clear that peace is likewise the master passion of President Roosevelt, whose fundamental beliefs are so much in accord with those of Jefferson."

And so we find that early in the Roosevelt administration, although in his seventy-fourth year, he was invited to become Assistant Secretary of State, succeeding Raymond Moley, which position he held except for the short period he served as Acting Secretary of State until January 13, 1937. On January 13, 1937, Sumner Welles, also an Assistant Secretary of State, was named Under Secretary to fill the post vacated by William Phillips, who resigned to become Ambassador to Italy. Upon the elevation of Mr. Welles to the Under Secretaryship Congress revived the title of Counselor of the Department of State, unused since the World War, and Judge Moore was appointed to this post, with rank and pay coequal with the Under Secretary, which position he held until his death on February 8, 1941.

He was peculiarly fitted for service in the State Department. A deep student of history and public affairs, he brought to the Department a wealth of information, tempered with the practicality of the experienced politician.

As was said editorially by the Washington Star on February 9, 1941:

"A scholar, an accomplished lawyer, an ardent patriot, a keen student of the theory of government and social progress, he was an ideal counselor on foreign affairs in the stress of a period of gravest concern to American civilization."

It is probably during this period—1933–41—that Judge Moore rendered his greatest public service, a service, I am afraid, that too few know about. During this period I was more or less intimately associated with Judge Moore, as frequently we discussed not only the problems that confronted my district and our native State, but the many serious and complicated problems that confronted our Nation. It is this service that I desire to emphasize.

Prior to the advent of the Roosevelt administration, Judge Moore and the President had been close personal friends for many years. Judge Moore had also served in Congress with Secretary Hull. Here a close friendship, based not only upon mutual confidence and trust but upon mutual respect each had for the other's learning, sound judgment, and general knowledge of domestic and international affairs, had grown up.

That the President and Secretary Hull relied, and relied heavily, upon the judgment of this quiet, unassuming, elderly Virginian, there can be no doubt. The great service that he rendered around the council table when important and momentous questions were up for decision and when from the richness of his experience, the fullness of his knowledge, and the soundness of his judgment, the answer came, others, I am constrained to believe, on more than one occasion reaped glory and fame that were rightly his. Of these things, of course, the general public knew nothing, and Judge Moore would have been the last man in the world to have even hinted that he played a leading part in the solution of any of these great problems, because he was never a glory seeker. He was only seeking to serve the land that he loved, and which his forefathers had helped establish, in her greatest hour of need. I once heard a homely expression, that frequently comes to mind when I think of Judge Moore: "The bigger they are, the less they strut." Yes, my friends; humility and humbleness have ever been the true badges of greatness.

Judge Moore's work as Assistant Secretary of State was described as follows in 1936:

"One Assistant Secretary of State is charged by the Secretary of State with certain important assignments relating to such matters as supervision of the Legal Division of the Department, the international traffic in arms, ammunition, and implements of war; the neutrality policy of the United States; the settlement of the general and special claims, United States and Mexico; and international civil aviation. He is chairman of the Export-Import Bank and of the Interdepartmental Committee on Civil International Aviation, and a member of the Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service, the Board of Foreign Service Personnel, and the Foreign Service Officers' Training School Board."

Judge Moore's work as Counselor of the Department of State was described as follows in 1940:

"The Counselor of the Department of State is one of the two principal assistants to the Secretary of State in the discharge of his various functions, aiding in the formulation and execution of the foreign policies of the Government and the reception of representatives of foreign governments and in work of a highly responsible character. He gives especial attention to such phases of our foreign relations as may be assigned to him by the Secretary of State. In the absence of the Secretary of State and the Under Secretary of State he becomes Acting Secretary of State."

Judge Moore played an important part in the recognition by the American Government of the Soviet Government of Russia, and his presentation of the matter over the National Broadcasting Co. on the night of November 22, 1933, is clear and forceful and convincing. This broadcast was arranged by the Washington Star, one of the leading newspapers of the Capital City, and was so well received that it was gotten out by the Star in pamphlet form and widely distributed. He also played important parts in neutrality and arms embargo legislation. The important part he played in these questions was given particular recognition by Secretary Hull in his press release, heretofore referred to, of February 8, 1941. Said Secretary Hull: "As an authority on constitutional law and international law his counsel was invaluable in such matters as recognition and neutrality, particularly the multifarious questions connected with the latter subject."

On November 6, 1936, President Roosevelt issued the following Executive order:

"EXECUTIVE ORDER

"DESIGNATION OF R. WALTON MOORE, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE, TO ACT AS SECRETARY OF STATE

"By virtue of and pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 179 of the Revised

Statutes of the United States (5 U. S. C., sec. 6), I hereby authorize and direct R. Walton Moore, Assistant Secretary of State, to perform the duties of the Secretary of State during the absence of the Secretary of State.

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

"THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 6, 1936.*"

Upon the issuing of this order, a Virginian, for the first time in 92 years, held the office of Secretary of State. The last Virginian to hold the No. 1 post in the Cabinet was Abel P. Upshur, who served—1843–44—as Secretary of State under President Tyler. Moreover, upon the elevation of Judge Moore to the Secretaryship two Virginians now occupied posts in the Cabinet, the other Virginian being the congenial, lovable, capable, efficient Claude A. Swanson, Secretary of the Navy, who, prior to his Cabinet post had been a member of the House of Representatives from the Fifth Virginia District for 14 years, Governor of Virginia for 4 years, and United States Senator from Virginia for 23 years. From the days of Tyler to Roosevelt no two Virginians ever occupied Cabinet posts at the same time. And it is quite a coincidence that under Tyler two Virginians, Abel P. Upshur, Secretary of State, and Thomas Walker Gilmer, Secretary of the Navy, occupied at the same time the same Cabinet posts occupied by R. Walton Moore and Claude A. Swanson under Roosevelt. It may be of interest to note that on February 28, 1844, President Tyler, along with several members of his Cabinet, went down the Potomac on the gunboat *Princeton* to see Commodore Stockton's "peacemaker" throw a 200-pound ball. One of the guns on the *Princeton* exploded, and though the President miraculously escaped, both Secretary Upshur and Secretary Gilmer were killed.

The occasion for the appointment of Judge Moore as Acting Secretary of State was brought about by Secretary Hull's trip to South America to attend the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, which was held at Buenos Aires, and he served as Acting Secretary from November 6, 1936, until January 13, 1937. While nothing of a startling nature took place during this period, Judge Moore discharged the duties of Secretary conscientiously and with efficiency and maintained at all times the best traditions of the high office. All of the nine press releases made by him during his short incumbency, except one, deal with the civil war in Spain and are models in diplomatic pronouncements.

To show the youthfulness that remained with him to the last, his progressive spirit, even at the risk of trespassing upon your patience, permit me to briefly review his aviation activities. Judge Moore may well be called the father of international aviation.

As the principal State Department officer in charge of the Department's activities in the field of international aviation, Judge Moore exerted great influence in the development of United States international air services during the 7 years that he served the Department.

Recognizing the growing importance of international aviation, Judge Moore suggested to the President the formation of an interdepartmental committee to coordinate the handling of these matters. Such a committee was formed in July 1935 at the President's direction, and Judge Moore became chairman, a post which he held throughout the life of the committee. As chairman of this committee, which was known as the Interdepartmental Committee on Civil International Aviation, he presided over meetings held with official air missions from Great Britain, Canada, the Irish Free State, France, Germany, and the Scandinavian countries. These missions all came to Washington to discuss the establishment of trans-Atlantic air services, and the present trans-Atlantic service is an outgrowth of those conferences, which began late in 1935. In addition to the special aviation mission, Judge Moore conferred frequently with high foreign officials who came to Washington on matters dealing with international aviation.

Under the leadership of Judge Moore, the Interdepartmental Committee on Civil International Aviation also took a prominent part in the development of domestic aviation legislation. As early as 1935 a study was undertaken of existing aviation legislation to determine in what way it might be improved. Two years later Judge Moore was appointed to the Interdepartmental Committee on Civil Aviation Legislation which, after extensive hearings, sponsored the enactment of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. Upon the creation of the Civil Aeronautics Authority under the provision of that act, Judge Moore felt that there was no further need for the Interdepartmental Committee on Civil International Aviation, and at his suggestion the committee was disbanded.

Judge Moore's great interest in the practical as well as the theoretical side of aviation is indicated in his flying activities. He was a passenger on a demonstration flight of the German dirigible *Hindenburg;* he made one of the first flights to Bermuda when the air service from New York was inaugurated, in his eightieth year, namely on June 24, 1939, he was one of the passengers on the *Yankee Clipper* of the Pan American Airways, the first airship to cross the Atlantic in regular commercial service, and he held the distinction of being the oldest man ever to fly the Atlantic.

His ambition to fly the Pacific was never realized because the pressure of official duties would not permit him to be absent from Washington long enough to justify such an extensive trip.

The prominent part taken by Judge Moore in the development of international aviation was recognized at the testimonial luncheon given in honor of his 80th birthday anniversary by his friends of the Department of State and Civil Aeronautics Authority at the Carlton Hotel, at which time he was presented with a tooled-leather folder, bearing the inscription:

"Yours was the wisdom, like that other distinguished Virginian, George Washington, that guided our fledgling wings to 'happy landings' on both sides of the Atlantic. On the occasion of your birthday we salute you, sir."

That he did render an unselfish and outstanding service, both the President and Secretary Hull testified to in letters, both carrying the date of his death, to his sister, Miss Helen Moore:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 8, 1941.

MY DEAR MISS MOORE: In the sorrow which has been laid so heavily on you and your sister, please accept this assurance of deepest sympathy, in which Mrs. Roosevelt joins. Your brother was an old and devoted friend whose passing is a personal grief.

A faithful and efficient public servant, always wise in counsel, he was also a cultured and courtly gentleman, who was greatly beloved and who will be widely mourned.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

MISS HELEN MOORE,
Fairfax, Va.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D. C., February 8, 1941.

DEAR MISS HELEN: Mrs. Hull and I wish you and Miss Margaret and Mrs. Keith to know of the profound feeling of personal loss which we have experienced on learning of the death of Judge Moore, to whom we were deeply attached and who holds a lasting place in our affection. He was a true and loyal friend for a period of more than 20 years. The wide range of his talents and interests gained for him an enviable position and a preeminent record in many fields of endeavor—in law, in historical science, education, and various branches of public service. He was a man of sterling character and worth whose generous spirit and gentle nature endeared him to all. The world has suffered grievously in the passing of one of its most distinguished citizens.

We in the State Department have lost one of our ablest associates, a patriot and a statesman who was universally loved, admired, and respected.

Mrs. Hull and I extend to you and to all the members of the family our deepest sympathy in this sad hour of your bereavement and grief.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

MISS HELEN MOORE,
Fairfax, Va.

Secretary of State Hull on the day Judge Moore died also issued a press statement to which I have already made several references. Coming from a man in whom the whole country has such unbounding confidence and who knew Judge Moore so intimately for years, and who is so conservative in his statements and never given to fulsome praise, I cannot refrain from quoting the statement in full:

"I make the announcement of the death of Mr. R. Walton Moore with a sentiment of deep personal sorrow. By his passing from this life I have lost a dear friend and the country has lost one of its ablest citizens, whose long years have been spent in faithful service to its welfare. His interests knew no narrow bounds; his abilities carried him to ever-wider fields of service. From State legislator he entered upon a distinguished legal career of national scope, followed by more than a decade of service in the House of Representatives. The third and final phase of his career began in 1933 when he came to the Department of State as Assistant Secretary. As counselor of the Department since 1937 he gave of his wisdom, his ripe experience of fourscore years, and spent his strength in the stress of a period of gravest concern to his country. At all times he gave himself to the duties and obligations of his position in the Department of State. As an authority on constitutional and international law, his counsel was invaluable in such matters as recognition and neutrality, particularly the multifarious questions connected with the latter subject. Often called upon by his position as counselor to meet with the representatives of foreign governments, he maintained the best traditions of the diplomatic relationship. I have spoken so far only on his political accomplishments, using that term in its most inclusive significance. He was likewise a scholar, as all who have heard him speak on historical and legal subjects recognized. His vital interest in educational fields was only another expression of his broad and varied interests.

"We mourn the death of Mr. Moore as bereaving those who have been associated with him through the past years of an inspiring friendship. We can give him now only that tribute of devotion which is the just meed of the distinguished and unfaltering patriot whose last strength and final breath were given in service to the public good."

May I add just one more testimonial, because I know that Judge Moore would have appreciated it. It comes from that grand old patriarch whom all Virginians not only admire but love, who first entered the Virginia House of Delegates 62 years ago and who has been elected to the Virginia Senate 10 times for 4-year terms since 1888 and who, although 92 years of age, is still a member of the Virginia Senate, Senator Henry Taylor Wickham, of Hanover:

"I am profoundly grieved by the death of Walton Moore. He was somewhat younger than I. The first time I saw him he was graduating at the Episcopal High School near Alexandria. He was the valedictory orator. I had been selected to deliver the address to the graduating class, and from that moment

he and I were close friends the balance of his life. He was a great man, a great Virginian, a patriotic Virginian. He served his beloved State throughout his life with absolute devotion to it, regardless of any other motives. His death is a great loss to our mutually beloved Commonwealth."

These testimonials, my friends, while in the superlative, are not overdrawn. They but correctly characterize the life of a superlative character. The encomium passed by Jefferson on Monroe applies with all its force, its implications, and its suggestiveness to Judge Moore: "If his soul could be turned inside out, not a speck would be found upon it."

Those of us who were so fortunate as to have been associated with him and permitted to listen to his words of wisdom can, like Paul, boast that we, too, sat at the feet of Gamaliel, and, having sat there, we are better, cleaner, wiser men, have a clearer, more hopeful outlook on life, and are not liable to grow stale with the years, because there was freshness in his age and age in his freshness.

Yes, my friends, truly a great man has passed on. And in his passing, this community, this State, this Nation, and humanity in general, have suffered a great loss. I close with two quotations from Secretary Hull, one found in his letter to Miss Helen, the other in his press release of February 8:

"The world has suffered grievously in the passing of one of its most distinguished citizens."

"We can give him now only that tribute of devotion which is the just meed of the distinguished and unfaltering patriot whose last strength and final breath were given in service to the public good."

St. Lawrence River Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of today entitled "St. Lawrence: New Style."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 20, 1941]

ST. LAWRENCE: NEW STYLE

Seven years ago President Roosevelt submitted the St. Lawrence River seaway and power project to the Senate in the form of a treaty that required a two-thirds vote of approval to make it effective. The Senate failed to approve it. Now, 7 years later, the President returns to the same subject, this time with an "agreement"—signed yesterday at Ottawa—which will not require a two-thirds vote of approval, but merely a majority vote to provide the necessary money.

For this method of whipping the devil around the stump some justification might perhaps be found if the St. Lawrence project could be described as an imperatively needed defense measure. But how can this be said of a project which, by Mr. Roosevelt's own definition, cannot be completed until 1945? The President offers the explanation that we are today appropriating money for the construction of warships, which also will not be completed until 1945. But this comparison is less an argument for supporting the St. Lawrence project than it is a reason for doubting the wisdom of clogging our shipways by laying down battleships that cannot be completed for 5 years when our shipbuilding facilities are so urgently needed for merchant ships and destroyers that can be turned out quickly to meet the threat of Hitler's all-out attack at sea.

The plain facts are (1) that the St. Lawrence project cannot possibly be of the slightest use either to Canada or the United States in any crisis this year or next year or the year after that or the year after that; (2) that if Canada and the United States need more power for defense work they can get it much more quickly either at Niagara Falls or by building steam-electric plants; (3) that instead of promoting defense, the St. Lawrence project promises to get squarely in the way of it by diverting an army of men, colossal amounts of material and whole trains of railway cars to the St. Lawrence at a time when there is crying need for planes, tanks, guns, and ships.

The President has chosen an unfortunate method of reviving a favorite project. On grounds of defense efficiency his request for appropriations to support it ought to be rejected.

National Youth Administration Activities in Fresno County, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE FRESNO (CALIF.) CLARION

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Fresno (Calif.) Clarion for February 1940, entitled "National Youth Administration Sums 1940 Activities in Fresno City and County."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fresno (Calif.) Clarion of February 1941]

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION SUMS 1940 ACTIVITIES IN FRESNO CITY AND COUNTY

Nothing strikes closer home to the citizens of any community than the present and future of its young people. A visit to the Fresno County headquarters of the National Youth Administration reveals many worthwhile, practical achievements, directly affecting Fresno and Fresno County.

N. Y. A. offers youth, between the ages of 17 and 25, actual work experience on projects set up in conjunction with governmental agencies of all kinds, whether city, county, State, or National. The aim is to better fit the young people to obtain private employment in their chosen fields, thus becoming self-sustaining, productive citizens.

CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS, 1940

Reviewing the year 1940, N. Y. A. in Fresno points with pride to the ball playground recreation center building, constructed with N. Y. A. labor, under skilled supervision. Valued at approximately $52,000, the structure houses the largest basketball court in Fresno County, a large kitchen, and an auditorium seating 2,000 people. In addition to the physical value of the building, which was started in the month of August 1939 and completed in May 1940, the N. Y. A. youth employed in its construction received invaluable training in the trades, learning by doing. The practical value is demonstrated by the high record of placement of the youth workers in private industry.

ROSENBERG FOUNDATION ASSISTS

The Ball playground project was partially made possible by the financial assistance of the Rosenberg Foundation, to which much credit is due. This foundation likewise aided the establishment of another recreation construction job done by N. Y. A. during 1940, the Selma Recreational Building. Smaller in size, it is none the less complete in every detail, and serves highly important need in the city of Selma.

FAIRGROUND STRUCTURE

Begun in the month of May 1940 and completed in January 1941 the machinery display building at the Fresno fairgrounds is another community development built by N. Y. A. labor. Its value is $56,000 and like all other project accomplishments, could not have been undertaken without N. Y. A. cooperation. The abode structure is now being painted and receiving the final touches which will make it a very necessary adjunct to the fairs for years to come. So successfully did the fairgrounds improvement work out for all parties concerned, that activities on a greater scale are anticipated for the year 1941.

ROEDING PARK BENEFITS

Users of Fresno's beautiful Roeding Park are now able to approach to the borders of park lakes that were fast growing inaccessible. Water was undermining the banks to a distance of 5 and 6 feet in places. Several valuable trees had been lost, and lake bottoms were filled with the soil residue soaked away from the shoreline. N. Y. A. drained the lakes and put in a series of heavy granite retainers or walls on concrete foundations. Many of the scenic and graveled paths thus made possible are also of N. Y. A. construction.

AIRCRAFT LIGHTING

Nineteen hundred and forty also witnessed the installation of 5,600 feet of runway lighting at the Fresno municipal airport, under the supervision of Airport Manager George Johnson and City Electrician Bowman. The labor was provided by experience-seeking N. Y. A. youth.

RECREATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Specialized fields are also explored for work experience. During the year, N. Y. A. cooperation was extended Raymond Quigley, director of recreation for Fresno City. Some of the young people trained in this work are now well established in the field of playground supervision and allied professions.

MECHANICS IMPORTANT

With the increasing stress the national-defense program has placed on training and experience in the mechanical vocations, N. Y. A. has found many youths anxious to continue the training they received in school. Mr. James Welden, vocational coordinator of the Fresno Technical High School has conducted classes in various types of shop work, including machine shop, welding, auto shop, and sheet-metal work, as a part of the national-defense training program. N. Y. A. youth are being assigned in increasing numbers to this activity. Example of the prac-

tical nature of the work are the tool clerks, who become familiar with tools in use by machinists, and the functions of each, so that valuable precision instruments will not suffer loss or damage. Some of these young men show unusual mechanical aptitudes, and the skills developed are often high.

CITY SHOPS BENEFIT

Even before the call for defense training, J. W. McFarling, superintendent of the Fresno city garage, had seen the possibility of giving experience to N. Y. A. youth, and through his cooperation, work experience and training have been extended. This has also been the case in the Fresno Fire Department, through the supervision of N. Y. A. labor provided by Chief Burtner and Technician Catich.

AGRICULTURE PLAYS PART

No account of vocational help to valley youth would be complete without attention to the experiencing of agriculturally minded young people. The Fresno State College has helped in this, through the college experimental farm at Millbrook and Shields and the botanical gardens at the college, at which places projects were instituted at the suggestion of Professors Masten and Braum. Winston Strong, former George Dean instructor at Central Union High School, is the supervisor in charge. Work consists of the actual performance of all types of farm duties, using methods approved by modern research. Animal and poultry husbandry are also included. The botanical gardens provided experience in the propagation, transplanting, and care of ornamental shrubs, plants, and flowers.

GIRLS' ACTIVITIES

Young women, too, are given an opportunity to secure N. Y. A. work experience that will bring them nearer to private employment and self-sustaining careers. Since the predominant training among schoolgirls is for clerical and stenographic positions, the largest number of N. Y. A. projects are set up to give that experience, extending into governmental agencies throughout the county, whether of State, Federal, or city sponsorship. In many cases this actual performance of office duties under supervision has rendered employable girls that would otherwise have had difficulty in convincing prospective employers that an unprofitable training period would not be necessary during the early stages of their work.

HOUSEHOLD TRAINING

If a business career is not the aim of N. Y. A. girls, there is another activity included in the projects available to them. It is known as household training, and is a W. P. A. project which constitutes a thorough learning-by-doing course in home making and home economics. The bulk of the enrollment in this enterprise is from N. Y. A. applicants, and many find jobs as a result, according to Evelyn Fleming, superintendent of professional and technical projects for W. P. A. The minimum starting salary maintained for graduates placed in private jobs has been $25 per month, and room and board.

PLACEMENT THE AIM

According to N. Y. A. Area Director Johnson and Head of Personnel Carey, N. Y. A. takes the young people while they are in the formative stage and helps equip them for holding jobs in private employment, thus minimizing their future contacts with social agencies of any kind. The amount of tax money saved, and the hope and initiative engendered in the youth themselves is beyond estimate.

SCHOOLS BENEFIT

There is little if any duplication of effort between N. Y. A. work and the public-school system. According to E. W. Gillis, principal of the Snyder Continuation High School, graduates and those who have left school earlier often return to the classrooms via N. Y. A. Most important reason—project activities shorten the gap between school and the job. The best way to prove the value of an education is to use it, Gillis says. The natural urge to learn returns, replacing discouragement born of idleness. The result is renewed postgraduate work, or part-time studies, night or day. These cases of renewed school work, with a background of work experience and the incentive of possible employment, show a higher rate of interest, more intense application, and better accomplishment.

The Western Pennsylvania School for the Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES J. DAVIS, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the introductory remarks of Hon. Eugene L. Connelly, chairman of the executive committee of the Western Pennsylvania School for the Blind, together with an address made by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] at the annual meeting, June 10, 1940.

There being no objection, the introductory remarks and the address of Senator DAVIS were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I know of no function that comes to a presiding officer so pleasant as that of presenting to an audience a distinguished citizen who has been his lifelong friend. Except for one little fact, a constitutional inhibition, this lifelong friend of mine might have been President of the United States. He was born across the seas. Almost every other coveted honor within the gift of the people has come to him. I knew him before these honors began to fall upon him. He is as modest now as he was then. He had just left the heat of the puddling furnace when, as a young political writer, I was attracted by his eloquence and sturdy Americanism. I saw him become Secretary of Labor in the administration of President Harding, saw his reappointment successively by Presidents Coolidge and Hoover. Under his regime, out of his regime in the Department of Labor, labor and capital were at peace for a longer period than at any time since the establishment of the Department. While serving in President Hoover's Cabinet in 1930, he was called to represent the great State of Pennsylvania in the United States Senate, and was reelected in 1932 and 1938. I have sat with him in the Supreme Council of the Masonic Fraternity, of which he is an honorary member of the thirty-third and last degree. He is a real humanitarian, and has always felt a tender and kindly sympathy for the blind. His own father, for years before he passed on, was sightless. Is it any wonder, then, that he has come all the way from Washington in the midst of a scene of political madness and national danger to speak to us tonight.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to present to you the senior United States Senator from Pennsylvania, the Honorable James John Davis.

Senator DAVIS. I always like to tell stories when I receive an introduction about being President of the United States. When I was selected as Secretary of Labor—most of you know that I came to this country when I was about 7½ years of age and began to work when I was 10. And when I was selected as Secretary of Labor, of course, they gave me a reception in a little town that I came to. My mother and father lived there, and my father, being blind, was unable to go to the meeting, and my mother, of course, went, and your mother always stands by you, right or wrong; she believes any good thing that they might say about her boy. When I got home, it was a community of Welsh people where we lived, and they asked me afterward and my father wanted to know what they said and what kind of a speech I made. And an old neighbor by the name of Jones said to him, "Dave, the people down there said that if Jim was born in this country he would be President of the United States," and they talked about it for some time, and my mother, through a great deal of excitement, said to my father in Welsh—it's funnier in Welsh than it is in English—she said, "David, if you would have come to the United States when I wanted you to, Jim would have been born here and we would have a President."

So we have a lot of experiences in life, and you can't tell what a boy is going to be or do. There was a very good friend of mine that we used to go to work with when we were boys, worked in the nail factory, and started out in the morning—well, Sunday we would work from daylight to dark, and he was bashful, and I noticed here he was standing over against the building. He thought because I might have had this job that I was a little bit sold on myself. So I beckoned him to come over, and I didn't know what I had done to him, so finally I said to him, "Dennis, you never thought when we were boys together, going to work in the mill, that I would ever be Secretary of Labor in the President's Cabinet, did you?" He said, "No," and he said, "By golly, you didn't, either."

So there isn't anybody that knows what anybody is going to do in America. The way is open, opportunity for work, and I hope we will always keep this old glorious country in a way that will always give every boy and girl, so far as that is concerned, an opportunity to go on to reach the heights.

So I am delighted to be here tonight, because when I speak about the sightless I speak of my own experiences with the blind. Through neglect my uncle as a boy lost his eyesight. He was a fine, handsome, upstanding man. He went to a school for the blind, and there he learned how to play almost every musical instrument. He also learned to make carpets and brooms and to tune pianos, and because of this training he was able to sustain himself throughout life. I said to him one day when I saw him—went around with him as a boy to take him to these places where he might tune a piano—and I said to him, "Uncle Sam, what a marvelous man you would be if you just had your eyesight"; and he had developed something of his own philosophy, to be happy with what he had, and he said to me, "Yes; if I had my eyesight I would be down there working with your father in the mill." So he made the best of life.

So another uncle had both eyes burned out while working in the mill, but he didn't complain or grieve. Instead, he secured a corner grocery store and, applying his splendid intellect to the problems of life, developed a splendid reputation as a sage in his community.

My own father's eyes were badly affected from the heat of the furnace in the mill, and yet he was so skilled in his work that he was able to carry on for many years, until he finally went blind. I remember reading the Bible to my father many, many times after he had lost the use of his eyes, and it was a source of great inspiration to me.

One of the great-hearted women of this city, Mrs. Rea, was responsible, was partly responsible, for the organization of the Gray Ladies in Washington, who have rendered such helpful ministry to the afflicted and sightless at the Walter Reed Hospital in Washington. Mrs. Rea was responsible for interesting Mrs. Davis in this work. Mrs. Davis frequently went to the Walter Reed Hospital to read to the sightless. These difficult experiences require rare insight in order that the necessary personal adjustments may be made. Tenderest care must be shown to those who suffer such affliction.

I am one of those who believe that the child is the hand of God, and he is in the universal pages of time the history of the human race, and that no man ever stood so tall or so straight that when he bent over to lift up a little child, and the child that has lost its eyesight should receive not only a vocational education, but an academic education as well. The minds of all of us are very active, and anyone of us can readily and easily know what a loss of eyesight would mean. And when the eyes fail, these active minds must be directed in a kindly and a useful way.

I am glad to say that the Western Pennsylvania School for the Blind has earned for itself a fine name in educational circles. The educational program there extends from kindergarten through high school. Many of these students then enter some school of higher education in Pittsburgh and elsewhere.

The Pennsylvania Association for the Blind at Harrisburg, the State organization, represents one of the finest organizations in the Nation, and it has been noted for years, because its activities have been so well coordinated and its leadership of a superior type. State organizations throughout the country, such as the Pennsylvania association, have more than justified their existence. Definite recognition of need for special care of the sightless in the development of social legislation makes State organizations imperative.

One of the national problems for the sightless concerns our Federal legislation. Until recently our wage-and-hour laws have carried a special provision which declares that handicapped workers may be employed at lower or substandard wages, and may work longer hours. Now, it has been put on the individual basis, and a person must have a certificate to be allowed to work under these substandard conditions. He must not be paid less than 75 percent of the minimum wage specified in the Wages and Hours Act. We now have legislation which protects products made by the blind. Their high quality of work is thus protected.

I knew two United States Senators, blind Senators, who were very able men—Tom Schall, from Minnesota, and Senator Gore, from Oklahoma. These two men—I have sat and listened to them by the hour, talk by the hour, thoroughly familiar with the economic life of all of our people, and it really was a treat to those of us when they would open up in debate. One was a Republican and the other was a Democrat. Both of them had great views, splendid views, fine views, on the social outlook of life. So we might say that our own Congressman, Matt Dunn, had taken a part in the lower House of Congress.

So one of the obligations which the State owes to the sightless is to help them to find a place for themselves as citizens. Some work has been done in this field, but not enough. It is true that many of the sightless have been helped into more sheltered types of work—magazine stands in buildings, work shops where hand work and books are made—and in other ways. These occupations help those who have a limited education, but it does not meet the problems of those who are qualified for other tasks because they have higher education. Some college men have found employment in law, insurance, salesmanship, and a few teach in schools for the sightless, but on the whole their problem is quite unsolved. Especially difficult is the problem of the educated blind woman.

One of the great institutions in Washington is the Library of Congress, which was one of the few institutions to pioneer in library work with the sightless. In 1897 a room was set apart and furnished with a selection of over 500 books in raised letters for the use of the blind. With the passing years this program has grown in scope, and leads the way for progressive methods for providing reading materials in the Braille and Moon systems. The Braille point system, which is expressed by the use of 63 symbols, is reinforced by the Moon system, developed by Doctor Moon of Brighton, England. The Moon system is primarily for the use of those who lose their sight late in life.

In 1935 the Talking Book came into being. It resulted from investigations made by the American Foundation for the Blind, under a grant from the Carnegie Corporation, and aided by the Bell Laboratories, and others. By congressional appropriations the work has been very successfully enlarged. The average book requires about 13 records. These are packed in heavy cases, making a package somewhat like a portable typewriter, and are sent through the mail to the blind readers.

Since 1904, Congress has amended the postal laws and regulations from time to time, so as to permit reading matter for the blind to be transmitted in the United States mail free of postage, and under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe. Braille books and the Talking Books are sent under these conditions direct to the blind reader.

So it is that the duty of the home teachers for the blind has become a very interesting and valuable service. The duties of the home teachers are not confined to the mere mechanics of teaching, but extend over the whole field of service to the blind. The teachers themselves being blind, can readily understand and sympathize with all of the problems of the blind. Being skilled in practical social service, as well as the technique for teaching the blind, they can show their pupils how to meet problems, or direct them to the proper agency where they can be met.

So I want to point out to you that Seeing Eye, of Morristown, N. J., has rendered a great service to the sightless. This agency trains the dog with which the blind person makes his way not only about the home but through crowded thoroughfares. For 4 weeks the agency trains the dog with the blind person in order that the dog can be an efficient guide. The student pays $150 for the training and the dog. Probably many of you have been fortunate enough to see the Seeing Eye work in a constructive way. Chiefly German police dogs are used for this purpose.

So, my friends, I always feel a sense of beautiful companionship when with those who are sightless, for I know that under the laws of compensation they have been permitted to enter into fields of understanding that ordinarily remain closed to those of us who depend to such a large extent upon our eyes. The association I have had with many sightless persons over the years has convinced me that we do them and ourselves a grave wrong when we permit them to be regarded as objects of pity or charity. Most of the sightless men and women I have known did not wish to become dependent. They wanted to face life bravely and on their own. All that they asked was an opportunity to learn how to make this new adjustment so that they could carry on efficiently and well. This opportunity is now being made possible in an even larger way. Much still remains to be accomplished.

I congratulate all of you who are having some part in this good work, for truly it is a beautiful experience to learn how to see the true worth of the inner life and soul from those who are sightless. God bless you in this great work.

British Blockade of Foodstuffs for France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

ARTICLE BY HUGH S. JOHNSON

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by the pen of Gen. Hugh S. Johnson in reference to the British blockade upon foodstuffs for France.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

It just "ain't good enough." The British reply to Herbert Hoover's tentative plan to supply some food to starving civilians in the conquered countries—and to supply it under complete British control smells—or, as my distinguished namesake, Samuel Johnson, once said in defense of rugged Anglo-Saxon English: "You smell; I stink."

The British argument boils down to this: "Germans are responsible for their conquests. Let them do the feeding." That's swell—from the British viewpoint—but the cold humanitarian fact remains that there isn't enough food in Europe. There is another consideration here and it isn't very pleasant. It is that one of the chief weapons of modern war is morale of the civilian population. The Germans reap our rightous indignation for impairing it by bombings of nonmilitary objects. But what do we think—what are we to say of the deliberate application of starvation to wholly innocent peoples—especially to the weak and to women and children—as a possible weapon of war? It is a ghastly thought.

Remember, this is no suggestion of aid to enemy populations but to people that Britain incited to war in her own interests when she was—as has been proved—unable to aid them.

Mr. Hoover's proposal was not final. It was, by its own terms, an experiment. If it turned out to result in military aid to Hitler, it was to be abandoned. It was to cost our people nothing. Couldn't it even be given a trial?

It is a gross mistake even to mention race or creed in any of this argument. We have grown so hysterical that I have been well advised not to include even a dialect story in these dispatches. But please may I say that Mr. Hoover is a Quaker, even as were all my

mother's family. They don't believe in ferocity or blood-shedding. In Spain and almost everywhere else that humanity has suffered they have moved in with food and bandages. At the World War armistice Britain was unwilling to feed the conquered enemies. The war was over. Mr. Hoover's was the only great voice raised to favor some alleviation of "man's inhumanity to man." At his urging we appropriated and spent $100,000,000 to supply dietary deficiencies to the aged, the weak, and the helpless in the conquered countries.

This column is not to urge any softness or any slackness in our conduct of this war. As a student, if not an adept, in the whole history of wars, it recognizes that the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse are as much a part of it as gunpowder and bullets—conquest, starvation, death, and pestilence. But it is impossible here to see how our people can support a blockade of conquered peoples, friends of ours, the effect of which will probably be to starve them into submission to our potential enemies and could possibly be to warm and strengthen them into resistance in behalf of our apparent friends.

This British position goes just a little bit too far. It is all right for them to pay cash to Canada and their other associated nations for munitions they are to get free from us, to conscript Canadians for 4 months' training with no obligation to serve overseas, while we take our men by conscription for a year with no limitation as to service, and many other similar unequal burdens assumed so gratuitously by Uncle "Sap."

But when the ukase comes that we shall not even try to alleviate the sufferings of peoples who are as much part of our flesh and blood as the British—Belgians, French, Dutch, and Danes—to see whether it can be done without impairing the British military positions, my Quaker blood rebels, and while I have never before stood on common ground with Herbert Hoover, I do today. His opposition seems to me cruel and inhuman, if not positively obscene.

Bernard Baruch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

ARTICLE FROM CHARLOTTE DAILY OBSERVER

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very interesting article by the pen of Mrs. J. A. Yarbrough, of Charlotte, N. C., who writes interestingly weekly for the Charlotte Daily Observer, of Charlotte, N. C. This article is entitled "Core of My Heart Remains in South Carolina—Baruch," and relates to the career of Hon. Bernard Baruch, of South Carolina, now residing in New York, one of our outstanding American citizens, and one who is thoroughly familiar with international and hemispheral defenses and trade matters.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer]

CORE OF MY HEART REMAINS IN SOUTH CAROLINA: BARUCH—SOUTHERN-BORN FINANCIAL WIZARD AND PHILANTHROPIST WHO HEADED WAR INDUSTRIES BOARD UNDER WOODROW WILSON IS A SELF-MADE MAN, PROUD OF HIS RACE AND ANCESTRY—KNOWS AND LIKES CAROLINIANS—EULOGIZES J. B. DUKE

(By Mrs. J. A. Yarbrough)

"South Carolina is bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh, and, although I have lived in New York more than 50 years, the core of my heart remains in South Carolina," said Bernard M. Baruch, internationally known financier, philanthropist, friend of Presidents, but first of all, a South Carolinian.

In a luxurious private reception room Mr. Baruch sat and talked of many things—the genius of J. B. Duke and the humane way in which his wealth is being expended; of North Carolinians in Congress today; the first World War; his memories of South Carolina's suffering during reconstruction; of visiting his uncle, Hermann Baruch, in Charlotte during his boyhood; of his frequent trips to his plantation near Georgetown, where the people give him a warm welcome but leave him to come and go quietly in unobtrusive fashion.

His large New York office, occupying an entire floor, is maintained only for the purpose of conserving his fortune and attending to his many benevolences.

Over 6 feet, erect, slender, with classic features, ease, and poise, Mr. Baruch is a distinguished figure in any company. His blue eyes are sharp without being keen, his hair is silver without making him venerable, his gestures dramatic, his vigor and energy striking. Every few minutes he is out of his chair, pacing the floor, looking down on Madison Avenue's congestion, or going to an outer room to speak courteously to one who has perhaps called without an appointment.

Notwithstanding the fact of his investiture during the World War of the broadest authority over American industry and commerce any functionary of the United States Government had ever held, one gets from Mr. Baruch an impression of simplicity, freedom from pretentiousness, lack of affectation, and a high sense of compassion. His good deeds are frequent without being public, for he does not divulge his benefactions.

BACKGROUND OF BARUCH

He is a Jew and proud of it. His father, Dr. Simon Baruch, a Jew of Spanish lineage, emigrated to this country from Polish Prussia at an early age, settled in South Carolina and during the War between the States, was a noted surgeon of the Confederate Army. His mother was Isabel Wolfe, member of a well-known southern family whose forebearers had come to America prior to the Revolution.

Before there can be real understanding of Bernard Mannes Baruch one must first understand the background of this man who has held various national positions of trust and by authority of the President of the United States became one of the most powerful men in America during the World War.

Entering Spain as conquerors in 1500, the Moors gave favor and sympathy to the Jews, who, in time, turned barren wastes into fertile fields, hung the hillsides with purple grapes, gathered figs and olives where formerly thistles had flourished. Their clever fingers wrought marvels in precious metals, stones, fine linens, and silks. Jewish statesmen held high places in public affairs and so superior was their position in literature, art, and the sciences many came from distant countries to learn of these Hebrew masters.

From early childhood the finest traits of remote generations exhibited themselves in Bernard Baruch. Among his forebears were many rabbis, doctors, and students of philosophy and he seems to have inherited some of their idealism and impatience with error. While he is not an orthodox Jew, he observes the Jewish holidays in tribute to his parents and to his distinguished heritage.

In Sherman's march to the sea the beautiful home of Dr. and Mrs. Baruch was burned and 6 years later, their son Bernard was born at Camden, S. C., in a white frame house which is still standing. He recalls driving through the country to Charlotte, his childish impression of the splendor of his uncle's store located where Mellon's now stands, and he has vivid memories of an attack of malarial fever in Charlotte when he was given quinine in sweet milk.

When he was about 15 years of age, his father, impoverished as a result of the War Between the States, moved to New York City to practice medicine. The boy entered the College of the City of New York and was graduated from the institution, of which he is now a trustee. Although he has an academic education, he is also a self-made man with the broad sympathy such men acquire in the making.

His long residence in New York has never weaned him from the South and he takes deep pride in its traditions and accomplishments. He never allows a year to pass without spending several weeks at intervals at Hobcaw, his home near the South Carolina coast where he and his friends hunt and fish together. On the plantation he has built comfortable homes for several aged family servants and here, too, he buried his old black mammy, Aunt Minerva.

Largely through his influence a colony of northern capitalists has been established along South Carolina's coast which includes men of prominence such as Eugene du Pont, Robert Goelet, Ralph and Herbert Pulitzer, Richard Reeves and Howard S. Hadden.

"The greatest man of our time was J. B. Duke," said Mr. Baruch. "While he was hesitant and inarticulate in speech he was unerring in judgment. Throughout the world, anywhere you go, you see the discarded butt of a North Carolina cigarette or cigar. Mr. Duke, like John D. Rockefeller, wisely provided for the expenditure of his money. It was his ardent wish that it should be used for the well-being of mankind. He often talked to me about it. Today there is hardly a county in the Carolinas that does not feel the practical effect of his well-developed plans.

PROUD OF MISS ELLIOTT

"North Carolina people should be very proud of Miss Harriet Elliott. They have every reason to be. Her appointment by President Roosevelt is of transcendent importance.

"I never fail to miss Senator Overman and Senator Simmons when I am in Washington. They were my warm personal friends. J. W. Bailey, Robert Reynolds, and Josephus Daniels are among my good friends from North Carolina."

Dr. Baruch, who was one of New York's most eminent physicians, wanted his son to study medicine, but he had set his mind on a business career and after his graduation entered a broker's office in Wall Street at a weekly salary of $3. At a night school he studied law and bookkeeping.

Seven years later he had advanced no farther than a clerkship and was receiving only $100 per month. Dissatisfied, he asked his employer to double his salary in order that he might marry the girl he was engaged to. The request was promptly refused,

although his employer finally agreed to give him one-eighth interest in his business. Mr. Baruch accepted and at the end of the year he received $6,000. His marriage to Miss Annie Griffen, of New York soon followed.

Within a few years he became known as one of Wall Street's most clever brokers, and in 1902 his profits reached almost $1,000,000. He gave large amounts to his father, who used it for charitable purposes.

Before his fortieth birthday Mr. Baruch was established as Wall Street's largest and most highly esteemed speculator.

It is natural for one so successful to incur enmity, and he has been a target for the envious. His transactions have been frank and open, and never has a blemish been found.

In the heat of war's furnace many reputations wither. Success is the only test of merit, and from the general who loses a battle and the administrator who fails to make good, excuses are not accepted. Whether at fault or not they are retired, for it is achievement and not explanation that is wanted. In every war those who were supposedly able are found wanting and pass into oblivion, while others appointed to high places win public confidence for what they accomplish. Mr. Bernard M. Baruch is in the latter class.

APPOINTED BY WILSON

When President Wilson in 1916 made him a member of the Advisory Commission of the Council of National Defense it was generally regarded as a complimentary appointment, for the position carried no salary and involved more or less expense for Mr. Baruch. He had never been active in politics and had never met Mr. Wilson when he enlisted in his support to which he was drawn entirely by the idealism of the man as expressed in his public utterances.

The council was composed of the Secretaries of War, Navy, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor. The advisory commission was composed of Daniel Willard, Howard E. Coffin, Julius Rosenwald, Dr. Hollis Godfrey, Samuel Gompers, Dr. Franklin Martin, and Mr. Baruch.

Arranging all of his investments so that he could not earn a dollar of profit out of the war, Mr. Baruch also sold his seat on the stock exchange and severed his connection with the financial district in order to give his entire attention to the war work of the Nation.

He was made a member of the committee formed to purchase supplies in America for the Allies. Then the President appointed him on the War Council, which included the Secretaries of the Treasury, Navy, War, also Edward N. Hurley, Harry A. Garfield, Herbert Hoover, Vance McCormick.

On March 4, President Wilson appointed Mr. Baruch chairman of the War Industries Board. The President's letter, defining the powers and duties of the chairman stated, "The ultimate decision of all questions should rest always with the chairman," and the letter ended with the sentence that he was to be "the general eye of the supply departments in industry." And so Mr. Baruch, along with the glory of his title, was to shoulder the full responsibility.

SPEEDY AND COURAGEOUS

He had two qualities highly desirable in an administration—quickness and courage. He had them in the street and he had them in war. He was not afraid of action. A third quality which fitted him most fortunately for his duties was his ability to get people to agree on a proposition and put it through. His methods were tactful persuasion rather than coercion and he was fired with an honest ambition to serve his country. The courage with which he met many situations where he had to decide between the rights of the Nation and the rights of capital showed that he was no respecter of financial personages even though they may have been his personal friends and associates.

His dominating purpose was to "bring the people to realize their only business then was the business of war and to make the country so self-contained in an economic sense that it could, if necessary, continue to fight independently and indefinitely until victory was secured."

"Some of the war lords of the world have said I was and am a warmonger," said Mr. Baruch. "If insistence that this country be armed to protect the life and the system that we have here is warmongering, then I am a warmonger.

"Every thoughtful person knows that no one gains from war—conqueror, vanquished, and neutrals all lose. Those who think war will bring profit to any nation are in error. It is only peace that can bring gain, spiritual or material. The kind of peace we should have is that which will permit in the whole world the development of the individual, that he may be free to think, to work, and to live as we have been privileged in this country."

One-Third of Nation's Children on One-Seventeenth of Nation's Income

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1941

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a radio address delivered over the National Farm and Home Hour, March 8, 1941:

President O'Neal and State presidents of Farm Bureau, it is a privilege to have the opportunity of participating with you in the program this morning, at the conclusion of the week in which we have had your cooperation in the passage of a bill which means more to the farmers of America than any bill which has been considered during this session of Congress.

The agricultural appropriation bill is the only bill so far considered in the House which affects farm prices or the farm income, and it is a matter of gratification that after consuming most of the week in its discussion we have passed the bill in the form in which it was reported by the committee—a committee composed of both Democrats and Republicans—enacting a nonpartisan measure in which politics had no part and in which all members of the committee joined in an effort to write a bill which would render the greatest possible service to American agriculture.

As a result of the enactment of this bill, every farm family in the country will live just a little better and every business dependent on farm patronage will be just a little more prosperous. With the increased farm income provided by this bill, farms in many communities will be saved which otherwise would fall under the sheriff's hammer and farm children will be just a little better prepared for the battle of life. And—a consideration not to be overlooked at this time—the country as a whole will be not only more prosperous and a better place in which to live, but as a result of the enactment of this bill the Nation will be stronger, safer, and more secure, for the stability and power of any people rests, in the last analysis, on its farm and farm homes and its agricultural assets.

In that respect, the bill may be said to be a defense measure in the truest acceptance of the term. The farmer produces the most essential and indispensable munition of war or peace. An army may fight without tanks or planes—and armies have fought and won without either—but no army has ever been able to maintain its position or protect its frontiers without food, without an adequate ration.

And in that respect, the American farmer is discharging his duties today with exceptional fidelity. There are no bottlenecks; there are no strikes; there is no sabotage; there is no "fifth column"; and there is no red flag on the American farm.

But, notwithstanding the supreme service rendered by the farmer, he is receiving the lowest pay, the smallest comparative income in the history of the Nation. In the last few days, and in an obvious attempt to influence the consideration of this bill, releases have been sent out showing that the farmers' income now amounts to approximately $9,000,000—a little more than last year—and that the price of some farm products has advanced slightly in the last few months. But all such reports carefully overlook the fact, a fact which cannot be emphasized too strongly, that while income is larger and prices in some instances are somewhat higher than last year the national income has increased so rapidly and the price of all industrial commodities has advanced so sharply that the farmer is getting a price and an income of less purchasing power by far than he got last year, and the relative wage he receives for his labor and the return he receives from his farm are shrinking every day.

As shown during the debate on this bill in the House this week, industrial prices and dividends are today, on a conservative estimate, 50 percent above parity. Union wage scales are fully 80 percent above parity. While the farmer is receiving less than two-thirds of parity.

On this depleted income the farmer is raising one-third of the children of the Nation—and incidentally farm-born and farm-reared children are holding the key positions in America today—the farmer is raising one-third of the children of the Nation and receiving only one-seventeenth of the national income—a problem of national import.

One of the reliable statistical authorities of the Nation estimates that if farm products had advanced at the same ratio with wages in the building trades, beef would today be selling for $3 a pound, eggs for $2 a dozen, and bread for 25 cents a loaf, and other products in proportion. Now these are unreasonable prices, of course, but they are no more unreasonable than the prices the farmer must pay for goods and services in these favored trades and industries.

While the bill we have just passed does not solve this problem, it does help. But for this bill, cotton would be selling for 5 cents a pound; wheat would be selling for 30 cents a bushel. Corn would be selling for 15 cents and hogs again would be selling for $2. Through appropriations carried in this bill, through loans, parity payments, soil conservation, and other funds which it provides, we are holding farm markets and farm prices at present levels.

But we cannot indefinitely finance agriculture out of the Public Treasury when every other class in America is receiving parity in the open market. Agriculture, too, must be allowed a fair income, an honest price and a decent wage in the market place. And that is the next problem for this Congress.

It is a problem which must be solved quickly, for a day is coming which will be remembered as long as history is written. It is a day that will mark an epoch in the annals of the human race. It is the date on which

medieval history will end and modern history will begin. It is the date of the end of the war.

The end of the war will test American resources as never before. We must prepare for it and prepare now, in this session of Congress.

For on the hour the armistice is signed every war industry will close. The fires in a thousand furnaces will die, men and machines now working in three shifts, turning out a vast deluge of war material, all of which is pure enomonic waste, will stop.

The farm market will drop as it dropped in 1920 unless Congress acts now to put a floor under farm income—as it already has put a floor under labor's income. A period of destitution will come, compared with which the depression following the last war will be as a summer's zephyr to a hurricane. Hell has no fury equal to that which awaits the farmer if Congress fails him in this hour of need.

In 1919 when everybody was receiving the highest pay and the highest prices ever received—and everybody was satisfied—the farmers of America were receiving 20 percent of the national income. Today the farmers receive only 6½ percent. And the alarming thing is—not merely that the farmer's share has dropped from one-fifth to one-seventeenth but that it steadily continues to drop. In 1919 it was 20 percent. In 1925 it was 10 percent. In 1937 it was 8 percent. In 1938 it was 7½ percent. In 1940 it was 7 percent—and now in the first months of 1941 it is 6½ percent. So, receiving today less than a third of what we received for the same service in 1919, what can we expect in the future—what can we expect next year? And remember—the farmer is handling the job more efficiently than ever before. The farmer is producing more abundantly today than in any previous period. The reports of the Department of Agriculture just issued show the greatest surplus of cotton, the largest surplus of wheat, the largest number of meat animals on feed, the largest supply of tobacco ever accumulated. Surpluses of all agricultural products are record breaking. The farmer is supporting the rest of the Nation in greater luxury while he is himself receiving comparatively less. We have today the highest standard of living in the city and comparably the lowest standard of living on the farm—the widest difference in pay received by the farmer and the rest of the country—than has ever been known since Columbus discovered America.

The farmer's share in the national income has fallen in a few years from 20 to 6½ percent—and is still falling. Why this unfilial treatment of the most faithful and most patriotic class of the Nation? The farmer works 100 hours a week, including Sunday—he and his wife and his children—for half of what he got in 1919—while the rest of the Nation works 40 hours a week, with Saturday and Sunday off, for twice what they got in 1919.

Why this discrimination and inequality of compensation? The answer is written here in Washington, so bold and so clear that he who runs may read. It is because labor and industry are organized, and their representatives have influenced and are influencing Congress to pass laws which protect their interests, put a floor under their wages, stabilize their prices, and guarantee their incomes.

Now, you cannot repeal these laws. You do not want to repeal them. The farmer, above all others, believes that the laborer is worthy of his hire, and has always supported labor legislation and legislation for the benefit of American industry. But the farmer cannot leave his own interests unprotected here. He cannot let the other fellows pass all the laws while they pass none for him—he cannot let them legislate money into the pockets of others and legislate it out of the farmer's pockets to do it. In this bill alone the representatives of organized agriculture have been instrumental in raising and maintaining the price, directly and indirectly, of every farm product. But the job is not yet done. They need you and a million more like you to back them up and to back up farm Congressmen. We need the support, the counsel, and cooperation of a strong, aggressive, militant organization.

Join now. Join and bring your neighbor with you. That is the only way to get effective and permanent results. That is the way labor has lifted its status from poor pay, intolerable working conditions, and arbitrary coercion. to honest wages and a voice in its own government. Join your farm organization. Join with us in providing a stabilized, sustained, continuous prosperity for the man who feeds the Nation. And in prospering agriculture we will prosper America.

Mr. Speaker, in response to this broadcast, I received letters from practically every State in the Union. In order that we may have some idea of what the farmers of the Nation are thinking, I am giving below a brief cross section of the replies received:

NEW HAMPSHIRE

I listened with amazement this noon to a speech from you over station WBZ, Boston. My husband and I just stopped eating and looked at each other. May God bless you in your effort. Our boy, just 19, could see no future here on the farm with us, and we could not encourage him to stay and face the hard work and worry and fruitless effort. He has joined the Navy and gone. Left his colt he raised and purebred bull calf and all his animals he loved. Said maybe he could earn enough money to help us carry on. We have a hired man we haven't paid for 3 years. All my sheets are made of bleached grain bags. The children are unable to have dental attention. This week for meat we have had one piece of beef, 2 pounds of sausage. The rest of the time we have eaten eggs, and those only one a day apiece to feed a family of 5. Of course, we have our potatoes and vegetables I canned. We raised a steer, but had to sell it to pay bills. We have been to one movie in the last year. It has been a crime the way the Government has loaned money to the farmer and then gives no opportunity to make enough to pay back. One of our neighbors has just lost everything he had. A man who fought in the World War. A good farmer and fine caretaker. He loses everything, and with 3 children and a wife has to go to work by the day. I am but a poor farmer's wife, but I want to at least acknowledge my appreciation.

ARIZONA

Happened to turn on the radio and heard your speech. The farmer has less buying power than I remember. For the past few years farm expense has been going up and farm prices coming down until less than the cost of production is being realized. We must do something to keep people on the farm and give them enough to raise their children.

MARYLAND

If the farmer had money enough from his crops to buy machinery and repair his buildings and pay for what his family has to have, the merchants would have business.

CALIFORNIA

We just can't make ends meet on the farm any more. Can't Congress do something for farm prices so we can have enough to buy what we used to have.

COLORADO

Our farmers are just existing. The county agent is helpful and the Government is introducing soil-conservation methods that are helpful but that is not enough. Everything is so high we do not get enough for what we sell to buy what we have to have to live.

ILLINOIS

As you know, farming has not been profitable for the last few years. I would leave the farm and go to work but I am a World War veteran and too old to get a job and too young to get an old-age pension.

INDIANA

Your speech reminds me of a farmer who was approached by a farm editor and asked if he would not be interested in becoming a better farmer. The farmer replied: "Brother, I am not farming now half as good as I know how." Improving production when we are getting such low prices is putting the cart before the horse.

NEW YORK

My farm is one of the best in Columbia County. I just figured my income tax and find I have lost over a thousand dollars this year. Last year I lost $875.54. These losses were with my son working on the farm without pay during the last two summers. Today he is on his way to Camp Benning for his selective service.

I have been in the general merchandise and machinery business since 1913, and I am quoting herewith some of the prices that farmers had to pay and what they received for what they produced during that time.

In 1913 we sold gang plows such as we use in our country, one 14-inch gang with 5-horse steel hitch complete with 2 set shares, for $73 laid down on the farm; a grain drill, 10-foot, such as we use here, for $145; a binder for $150; a mower for $50; a wagon for $75; etc. And we received 80 cents to $1 for a bushel of wheat, and taxes were about 10 percent of what they are now. And now a plow costs $150; a drill $275; and a binder $300; and 2-percent sales tax on top of it. Now, any sane man will have to admit that the present prices are about one-half of what it should be for what a farmer raises.

Everybody is head over heels in debt, machinery worn out, taxes eating him up, and the farm going to pieces. Many farmers are dying from the effect. It has made more bums out of good hard-working farmers than we have had since the beginning of the world.

PENNSYLVANIA

A year and a half ago my husband and I moved out to the farm and had in mind we would work toward some security for our old age—he being 51 and I under 50. We were both brought up on the farm and did not find it difficult to adjust ourselves again.

The place we bought was an old, run-down, neglected poultry farm. We both like chickens so we began to grow them. I did as much of the work as I could possibly do in the daytime, and during the summer we both worked every evening until 10 o'clock. My husband works in town to earn the living and pay the bills, else we would starve. At the close of last year, with slave labor, denying ourselves of all outside pleasure and recreation, we had less than 300 head of laying stock clear. All our labor was free service, poultry inspected almost weekly by a regular inspector, all improvements were paid for with my husband's earnings.

During the month of January we thought ourselves in position to make a profit, as all growing stock had grown to laying stock. But instead, the wholesale egg prices had taken a dip. We came out $1 to the good, not counting cost of delivery, lights, or labor. We culled the flock. February eggs took another drop. Instead of coming out even we ran behind $7. Now I ask the consuming public, who are constantly striking for higher wages, how much longer is the farmer to produce his food under such conditions. Were it not for the fact that we were able to make repairs on our 3-year-back clothes, we would

be going to a rummage sale to make our purchases. All other farmers around here are making the same sacrifices as far as I can see.

St. Patrick's Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ALFRED E. SMITH

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein an address delivered on the 17th of March by one of the most distinguished citizens of New York State, a sterling patriot and a great statesman, the Honorable Alfred E. Smith, at the one hundred and fifty-seventh anniversary dinner of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in New York:

For years I have heard distinguished and eloquent men tell the history of Ireland; its battles for freedom, of the great emigration to America, of the wonderful achievements of the people of Irish birth, and of their great love and devotion to the country of their adoption, and the part played by their children in the upbuilding and development of our great democracy; how they and millions of others have looked upon America as God's gift to the poor, the downtrodden, and the oppressed of every land.

Their record is an answer to the queer notions of the dictators who believe that there can be no unity in a country like ours, because there are so many people of diverse origins, so many people with ties binding them to the old country, so many differences of opinion which, if left to ourselves, can be ironed out, but which can be played up and magnified by skillful troublemakers.

What do the dictators know about this country? They have never mingled with our people. They never saw Abie's Irish Rose or Friendly Enemies. They know nothing of the strong ties that bind our people together, irrespective of their origin.

Let them take a look at the list of men who went from a public school in Oliver Street to the first World War where they will find a representative of every nation in the civilized world. They do not know that there are 10 Chinamen in the Sixty-ninth Regiment. Kwok Chung Lee is the latest addition and upon examination it was found that he was a cook, so don't be surprised any day if you read in the paper that a large number of Irish soldiers in Alabama are eating chop suey with the same relish that they would eat corned beef and cabbage.

The dictators are foolish enough to believe that they can stir up differences, magnify grievances, and create confusion to such an extent that we would be helpless to defend our democracy if and when the time comes for a final show-down. The propaganda coming out of dictator countries rests on a complete and total lack of understanding of the motives and impulses that supply the driving force and the energy that runs this country. Anything that rests on false premises can never get anywhere because its conclusions will always be wrong.

If you don't know the psychology of a people how do you expect to get any place with them? Of all the groups that make up America the Irish people will be the last to fall for the "bunk." First, because we are patriotic and our devotion to the United States, to the Declaration of Independence, and to the Constitution has been spoken of at our annual dinners down through the years since our institution. Second, thanks be to God, the Irish people have a well-developed sense of humor and they get a big laugh from the awkward stooges who represent Adolf, Benito, and Joey. Third, Irish people have instilled in them a religious faith that is angered and affronted by the godless dictators who would tear down all religions. Now, let us take account of stock and be sure that we will not be foolish enough to believe that liberty can be kept alive surrounded on all sides by tyranny; foolish enough to think that we can get along nicely in a world dominated by European and Asiatic dictators. I don't know where the conflict will end. The forces behind the dictators are not only formidable, they are ruthless and fanatical and they have a great advantage over the slow-moving, constitutional, scrupulous, and high-minded forces of democracy.

The big question is, Can we get wartime production without declaring war? Another important question is whether or not our people are serious enough in the situation in which they find themselves. Do they realize that ordinary, easy-going living, and peacetime pursuits must give way to a rapid preparation for the defense of our country?

Whatever may be in store for us I know that the followers of St. Patrick will be found in the front rank of Americans who have no other purpose than to defend the United States against her enemies, no matter who they are or where they are.

Allocation of War Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House at this time for the purpose of presenting some observations touching the national-defense program, and calling attention to a policy which may prove to be subject to criticism if continued. I know it is an easy matter to criticize or find fault, and I take the position that no man has the right to criticize the action or policies of another unless he is able to suggest or recommend a course or policy which would prove to be more satisfactory or successful and in this I sincerely trust that what I shall say will not subject me to the possibility of the charge that I am not practicing what I preach.

Enormous sums of money have already been appropriated by Congress upon the theory that the safety and future of our Government and its institutions are seriously threatened by foes both from within as well as without. These appropriations are made primarily for the purpose of preparing this country to properly and successfully defend itself in case of an attempted invasion from the outside. Staggering appropriations in the future are being planned and will be made upon the same theory. It is not my purpose to go into great detail outlining the grounds or reasons for our apprehensions as to what we may be forced to meet. We all may be mistaken as to what may happen, and I can express the hope that we are, but I am proceeding upon the assumption that what we have already done and what we are now doing may be justified in the light of present information.

In an effort to localize our fears of attack from without it seems to be the consensus of opinion that if attack is made it will come first by way of the countries south of us. Practically all of our military experts have said and are still saying that if Britain falls the next step in the line of march for world control by the totalitarian states or the Nazi forces will be to cross the Atlantic and take charge of South America, where preparations are already being made by propaganda and otherwise to make invasion with little or no resistance from the Latin republics. Should the Nazi forces be successful in such a program and this country undertakes to defend the Monroe Doctrine, to which it has subscribed for more than a century, we will certainly be called upon to defend our Government and its institutions.

Our defense program so far has been outlined with this thought in mind. Of course, we cannot be certain that the premises laid down or the conclusions reached are absolutely correct, but I am certain that the preponderance of the evidence before us is such as to preclude any other conclusion. At least the Congress so far has been acting upon this hypothesis, and it is assumed that those in charge of the national-defense program are acting upon the same premises. Therefore, in outlining a program our defense lines should be where they will be the most effective from the standpoint of offense, because if we are correct in our assumption, and the information furnished is correct, we will be forced to take the offensive. Certainly then both our defense and offense lines should be placed south of our seat of Government, but in reality we find that a very small percentage of the preparations are being made in this section of the country. It is true most of the military training camps have been located in the South Atlantic and the Gulf States which will be the assembling ground for our Army, Navy, and Air Corps in case of an attempted invasion. One reason for the locating of camps here is in order that the trainees may be near the scene of action in case an emergency should arise. This is perfectly logical in planning a defense program, but it has occurred to me that it is a weak link in the chain of defense to train young men to become experts in military tactics and have the implements of war manufactured and stored 1,000 or 1,500 miles from what will be the assembling ground.

My thought is that if the Government is going to construct or erect added or additional plants for the manufacture of war implements such plants should be located somewhere near these young men

where they are being trained so that in case of emergency the warrior will have his weapons within arm's reach and will not be required to take the hazard of having them transported a thousand or fifteen hundred miles before he can arm himself, although he may be face to face with the enemy. To be definite and clear in the point I am trying to make, I want to suggest to those in charge of the defense program that in the creation or establishment of new plants for use in making or storing implements of war such plants should be located as near as possible to where the men are being trained. This seems to be fundamental because I am certain that if I were in training and making preparations to defend my country against a threatened or pending attack I would want to have my weapons for defense where I could put my hands on them at a moment's warning and not be forced to wait a week or 10 days or longer to get them. We must remember that the destiny of nations has been determined upon what was considered a minor loss of time—Napoleon lost the battle of Waterloo and was exiled for life because one of his subordinates was delayed in securing necessary munitions and supplies. In our war for independence Washington defeated the Hessians at Trenton because they were not able to connect up with their defense weapons in time to meet his attack.

The Case of Claire Bruno

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I received from one of my constituents:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 4, 1941.*

Congressman MARTIN J. KENNEDY,
New York, N. Y.

HONORABLE SIR: As an active worker in your district, I am bringing a problem to you that has recently been brought to my notice by friends, who say that my name appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 19, 1940, and was placed there by Congressman DICKSTEIN (Democrat, New York), along with some 599 so-called anti-Semitic leaders.

I have absolutely no affiliation with any anti-Semitic organization, and I resent this accusation of Mr. DICKSTEIN'S. It is untrue, unwarranted, and hurtful.

My problem is, How may I have my name expunged from the RECORD.

Will you be so kind, Congressman KENNEDY, and tell me how this can be done?

Very truly yours,

CLAIRE BRUNO.

Mr. Speaker, upon investigation I find that the writer was entirely justified in protesting against her name being listed by Representative DICKSTEIN in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 19, 1940. It appears that Mr. DICKSTEIN included the name of Claire Bruno in a list of alleged anti-Semitic leaders.

Claire Bruno has been an active worker in the ranks of the Democratic Party and at no time has ever been known to take part in any un-American activity. To have her name published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD without an opportunity of a hearing is, in my opinion, both unfair and unjust.

In justice to this lady I am bringing this matter to the attention of the House and request that her name be expunged from the permanent RECORD.

End Unemployment and Balance the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

LECTURE BY DR. JOHN BARR, OF URBANA, ILL.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following short lecture by Dr. John Barr, of Urbana, Ill.:

For several years before the war began in September 1939, Germany had been employing all of its people, many of them on a 10-hour day, and in addition had been importing labor from other countries. So far as we can tell, this great activity was about equally divided between the production of goods for normal civilian use, and armaments. That is, about half of the energy of the German people was devoted to preparations for war. Industry and individuals were very heavily taxed, the government having total control of production and investment, directing them into whatever channels it wished. The result was that while income was to some extent more evenly distributed, the standard of living in general was considerably lowered. The people were willing to sacrifice butter for guns.

This country likewise will not be making a full defense effort until every person able to work has a job at 48 hours per week and we are curtailing our demand for usual consumption goods so that such an amount of time and energy will be available for defense purposes as our Government may consider to be necessary. We will not be doing this out of any special love for England but for the very selfish purpose of our own protection. But if the English people are willing to stand for the bombing and loss of life and property, we should at least be ready to cheerfully forego a part of our normal peacetime wants in order to provide tools that will be used in our own behalf.

When we have reached this condition of full employment which should be brought about at the earliest possible time, our national income will be approaching the $90,000,000,000 mark and our total expenditures, including those of State and local governments will be about $30,000,000,000. This will leave about $15,000,000,000 for military purposes. This is stating the case for defense mildly. It will not be an effort comparable to what both England and Germany are now making and insofar as we fail to do this we will be belittling the power of Germany. Overconfidence has lost many a ball game.

A budget of $30,000,000,000 will be roughly a third of our national income. In 1938 this country collected $14,300,000,000 in taxes—the most that had ever been collected in any one year. The national income that year was $66,300,000,000, so that the percentage of taxes was 22 and the amount left after taxes was $52,000,000,000. This means that $52,000,000,000 worth of nongovernmental goods and services were produced to be used by all the people. If we collected $30,000,000,000 in taxes from a national income of $90,000,000,000 it would mean that $60,000,000,000 worth of nongovernmental goods and services would be available for normal civilian use—not much sacrifice so far as compared with 1938. When in a condition of full employment, we collect the exact cost of governmental activities (that is, balance the Budget) we leave the exact cost of civilian goods for the purchase of such goods.

Now, suppose that at this point of full employment, instead of balancing the Budget we continue to borrow, say, $10,000,000,000 a year from the banks. Then, instead of having $60,000,000,000 with which to buy the available amount of civilian goods, we will have $70,000,000,000 with which to buy the same amount of goods, and the price of these goods must go up, and that means inflation. That is, the price of goods must go up unless the Government fixes prices. If the Government does fix prices at the old level, then we will have $10,000,000,000 to save. This money will then go into the banks and remain idle, because there will be nothing to spend it for, and the Government will be paying interest on it. In a state of full employment, as we increase the amount of armaments produced we decrease the amount of civilian goods. We therefore sacrifice the satisfactions that the consumption of these goods would have afforded and to the same extent reduce our standard of living.

If this analysis is correct, it means that the burden of producing armaments must be borne by the people at the very time that the armaments are being produced; it cannot possibly be shifted to the next generation, even by borrowing. The burden will consist of working harder and consuming less. If we borrow and the next generation pays the bill, it will pay it to the next generation. This, of course, assumes internal borrowing, or borrowing within our own country, and there is no one else in the world that this country can borrow from at the present time.

Our annual national income is the value of the goods and services that we produce within the year. The only way that we can place a burden upon the next generation is in some way to reduce its ability to produce. We will not reduce such ability by leaving to the next generation or the people of tomorrow a vast amount of machine tools and factories produced by our own activities at the present time.

From this discussion it would appear that the sensible thing to do is to balance the Budget by taxation. We have seen that borrowing means inflation. If we borrow and the debt is paid, it must be paid by taxation. If the debt is not paid, it may mean repudiation. We therefore see that we are faced with either taxation, inflation, or repudiation. Taxation can be orderly and fair. Either inflation or repudiation can be very disorderly and very unfair. But what kind of taxation shall we have?

People of low incomes spend their money mostly for nondurable goods—food and clothing—the raw materials for which do not enter into the production of armaments. We should therefore tax the people of higher incomes, and this means higher income and inheritance taxes.

The national income in 1940 was $74,000,000,000, and total tax collections about $15,000,000,000. If we increase the national income to $90,000,000,000 and tax collections to $30,000,000,000, we can still live a little better than we did in 1940, which was not what could be called a bad year, and at the same time pay for all of our greatly increased Government expenditures. The yield from income and inheritance taxes in 1940 was probably about $2,000,000,000.

If we wish to raise the entire increase in taxes from these sources it means that they will have to yield at least seven times as much. This, of course, does not mean that rates will be multiplied by 7. A drastic increase would be necessary, but we are up against a drastic situation and drastic measures must be taken to meet it. The exact rates would have to be determined by tax experts, but there are some points which should be taken into consideration.

Rates on estates and gifts are still comparatively low except in the highest brackets. Exemptions could be lowered and the return from this source greatly increased.

I believe that ordinary corporation income taxes should be abolished, as high rates on this kind of income are very unfair to stockholders of small means. A flat corporation income tax is not progressive and violates the principle of ability to pay. But if these rates are abolished, there must be a tax on undistributed profits. The undistributed profits tax, which with a few changes would have been an excellent tax, met an untimely fate. This tax should be reenacted and there should also be an excess-profits tax with rates approaching 100 percent.

The personal income-tax rates would have to be greatly modified. In Canada the normal rate is 6 percent and the exemptions are $300 for a single person and $1,200 for a married couple without dependents. In England the exemptions are $400 for a single person and $580 for a married couple. In England about 50 percent of all taxes are income and profits taxes, as they would be here under the arrangement mentioned.

A recent study made by the Department of Commerce shows that people with incomes of less than $500 per year pay 22 percent of their income in all kinds of taxes, most of which are hidden. This percentage decreases steadily to the $5,000 to $10,000 bracket, where the percentage is only 15 percent. From that point the percentages increase, but the 22-percent figure is not again reached until we come to the $15,000 to $20,000 bracket. People with incomes of over $20,000 pay, on the average, 31.3 percent in all taxes. This shows that the greatest increases in income-tax rates should be made in the brackets from $1,500 to say $100,000. Increases should also be made in the very high brackets but not in the same proportion.

As we lower the exemptions and take in people whose income is made up mostly of wages and salaries, the collection should be made at the source. We already have the machinery for doing this in our social-security department. Employers could withhold the income taxes along with other payments.

We do not know when the present emergency will be over. If Germany wins, we will be forced to maintain a two-ocean navy and a huge standing army indefinitely. If we continue to borrow to meet this expenditure, our national debt will soon be larger than even the most carefree among us would deem comfortable. The only way to make so large a debt endurable would be to place the burden of carrying the debt upon the wealthier classes. This again would mean increased income taxes. Eventually, why not now?

If the emergency passes we will then be confronted with the danger of a great business slump. In this situation the high income taxes should be continued and other taxes reduced. The Federal Government should go in for a big program of public works and services. If more money was taken in, than could efficiently be spent in this way, part of it should be rebated to the States. These rebates should be made in proportion to the population of the States and in inverse proportion to the per capita income in the several States. The State governments would in turn rebate to their smaller subdivisions. In this way sales and property taxes would be reduced and larger purchasing power left in the hands of the mass of the people. This increased purchasing power would be an effective demand for goods and would sustain business in general.

If Germany, from 1933 to 1939, had devoted her entire energy to the production of civilian goods rather than to armaments, I can see no reason why she could not have been prosperous and peaceful. If Germany could have done it, we also could have done it. Within a short time it should be demonstrated that huge Government expenditures paid for by progressive taxation can keep all of our people busy. When the opportunity presents, all we will have to do is to keep the progressive taxes and reduce those taxes which bear more heavily on the masses.

Grand Coulee Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KNUTE HILL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

STATEMENT BY THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement issued by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior:

An idea of the size of mammoth Grand Coulee Dam in Washington whose power plant hums into action March 22 can be obtained only from comparisons, Commissioner John C. Page, Bureau of Reclamation, reported today.

To state that the dam is the most massive structure ever erected by man, or that it contains 10,500,000 cubic yards or 22,250,000 tons of concrete, fails to convey a mental picture of the vast dam.

The base of the dam covers 35 acres. The Great Pyramid of Cheops, first wonder of the world, covers 13 acres. The concrete in Grand Coulee equals about 4 Great Pyramids. About 5,000 men with modern construction machinery placed the concrete in 5 years. Herodotus related that it required 100,000 men 20 years to build the Pyramid.

The dam is 500 feet thick and 3,000 feet long at the base. It is 550 feet high, 30 feet thick and 4,300 feet long at the crest.

Translated, the figures mean that the dam is nearly 2 ordinary city blocks thick at the base and 15 city blocks long at the crest. It is as high as a 46-story building. It is only 5 feet less in height than the Washington Monument which is 555 feet from base to apex.

The cubic mass of Grand Coulee Dam could easily contain the equivalent of 250 Washington Monuments. A line of 78 of them would march across the ¾-mile length of the dam. In the center section of the dam the rows could be 9 deep. Only the pointed tops of the monuments would protrude.

The volume of Grand Coulee Dam equals the combined volume of the 20 largest concrete dams in the United States excluding Boulder. It would build a monument 100 feet square nearly 6 miles high, or if placed on an ordinary city block it would be nearly three times the height of the Empire State Building. It would pave a standard 2-lane highway from New York to Seattle and back again.

The concrete in the dam required about 12,500,000 barrels of cement. If this amount of cement were shipped in one trainload it would be 500 miles long and consist of 50,000 cars.

Concrete placement at Grand Coulee Dam went on all night long for nearly 2,000 nights under blazing electric lights. On May 25, 1939, a world record was established by pouring 20,684 cubic yards in a single 24-hour day. This was at the rate of 30 tons every minute. The 24-hour mixture and placement of concrete would have paved nearly 10 miles of standard concrete highway.

Words to the Wise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JARED Y. SANDERS, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BATON ROUGE STATE-TIMES

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Baton Rouge State-Times of March 14, 1941, under the caption "Words to the Wise." This editorial contains a clear statement of the problem confronting industry in this country in the switch from production for peace to production for defense.

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) State-Times of March 14, 1941]

WORDS TO THE WISE

If there is one nation anywhere on the face of the earth that can comment with real knowledge on the various phases of our current defense program, it is surely England. For under the stress of a need to "get things done" that was even more immediate than is ours today, the little island across the seas made most of the mistakes and achieved most of the discoveries from which we should now be able to profit.

From this point of view, some words written recently in the distinguished London Economist should be of particular interest to Americans who want to know the facts about defense. The Economist in this particular passage is explaining that it takes time to build military equipment; and what it has to say should help to show why our national-defense program is now beginning to offer real returns, after a period when some benighted critics of industry were clamoring for clouds of tanks and airplanes immediately, and claiming that the manufacturing effort was at a standstill.

Says the Economist:

"Because tanks and locomotives are both heavy vehicles made of steel, it is far too easy to assume that a shop experienced in making the one can turn over to the other. Even for a diversified and resourceful engineering industry the transformation takes a long time. Munitions are infinitely more complex than peacetime machines; very few of them lend themselves to the method of the conveyor belt. In Great Britain it took something like 4 years of planning before the curve of aircraft production really began to rise, and a still longer period for army ordnance. Even a standardized merchant ship takes a year or 18 months to build when the yards have first to be laid down anew or brought back into service."

That is the experience of Britain. Among other thoughts, it leads to the reflection that the United States is forunate in having an industrial system so adaptable and so imaginative that it has already profited from the experience of other lands, and is drastically cutting down on the delays experienced in changing over suddenly from a peacetime economy to one that must turn out vast quantities of articles for defense.

Is It Table Stakes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, since the passage of the lend-lease bill, which was forced through the legislative channels with great speed and due precision, it appears that our Chief Executive is now heading us into this European war—not merely as an arsenal for the world, but as an actual participant in the war. No one can foretell what the future holds for the people of this great Nation. But we do know if and when the President leads us into this war, and with the unbridled power granted to him under the provisions of the lend-lease bill he can do just that, no one can predict how long such a war will last, or anticipate the great waste of our manpower and money in such participation. We do know that want any misery always follow in the wake of war. We do know that with resources practically depleted, and with manpower in part destroyed or rendered unfit to take its place in the arts and trades of civil life, our Nation will suffer an economic loss which the ages will not replace. War brings to all of the people of a participating nation great suffering.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad future which we behold. If the President, in his apparent rush into this war, continues his course it will not be many days until we will feel the sting of war. He has carried us far into the field of battle, and with unslackened speed he proceeds toward the front. I shudder when I think of the boys in my congressional district—the thousands of them—who will have to respond; I think of them because they will have to bare their breasts to the enemy bullets—if the President continues his journey into this war. The people of our country want peace—they do not want war; they do not want to see hunger, suffering, and misery in this country; they do not want to have before them disabled veterans of this war, because we have them in vast numbers from the last World War; the people want the President to chart the course of peace, and they want him to follow that course. He has the power. Let him exercise it.

Mr. Speaker, in the extension of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to include therein a very carefully written editorial which appeared in the Times-Herald of Washington, D. C., of this date, which editorial follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of March 20, 1941]

IS IT TABLE STAKES?

Some people hope that President Roosevelt, leading this country into the biggest rearmament program in its history, plans to play a game of international poker for table stakes.

WE FEAR IT ISN'T

The idea would be to put together the deadly Army and the huge Navy and air force we hear so much about and are beginning to see, and then say something like this to Hitler:

"Now, Mr. Hitler, you see what we've got for fighting purposes—and you know what we've been doing and intend to go on doing to keep the British war machine fired up and functioning. Maybe you can beat the British eventually; but if you do, your troubles will be only well started, because then you'll have to try and beat us.

"So how about turning off the blood and tears, and conferring with us and the British on reasonable terms of peace? We know you will be more likely to accede to reasonable terms now that you see us sitting with the British across the table from you."

We wish that were the plan in Mr. Roosevelt's mind. It makes sense to us. But we're afraid the Roosevelt-Churchill plan is otherwise.

It looks to us as if the plan is to carry this war to a finish, to a complete knockout of Hitler's Germany. Of course, it may end in a complete knockout of British and American world power, or worse. But whichever way it ends, the chances for a magnamimous peace will be small. No finish fight in history, which ended in victory for one side, to our knowledge, ever produced a broad-minded, generous peace. Too many war-bred hates had to be satisfied at the peace conference—which in turn assured the next war.

It looks like a long war, which, even if our side wins, will be tragic, bloody, and desperate, and will leave the British and the Germans flat broke and the United States at least badly bent. Probably the only victor will be Stalin.

All of which brings up the question: Is this a war of offense or defense—that we have now taken about 95 out of a possible 100 steps to join?

WHAT'S THE DIFFERENCE?

Our arms program is commonly called the defense program. But that is chiefly because slogans count so heavily in a war. It salves many a conscience to speak of a defense program or a defensive war, instead of arms for offense or a war of offense. Actually, the distinction is vague and shadowy, and subject to change without notice.

Hitler, for example, began an offensive war against Poland, September 1, 1939. Britain and France then declared an offensive war against Hitler, but left the Poles to handle their own defensive war. Hitler was fighting a defensive war against Britain and France until May 10, 1940, when he suddenly took the offensive.

This put France, Britain, Belgium, and Holland on the defensive. The Low Countries and France passed from defensive to down and out in rapid succession, and Britain was left on the defensive, where it still is. As to Hitler, that is.

As to Mussolini, Britain is decidedly on the offensive. To make this whole world play still more fascinating, Mr. Hitler never knocks over a country by diplomacy or arms without first stating that such country is menaced by some black-hearted foe, and that Germany is forced against its will to undertake offensive steps for its defense.

Mussolini, Stalin, and the Japanese use this same technique—which isn't so dumb, either, but which surely does play hob with the once clear and distinct meanings of those words "offensive" and "defensive."

THE GOOD OLD DAYS

So we think the smart thing for this country to do is to use up as little time and mental energy as possible worrying over the difference between "defensive" and "offensive," and concentrate on building up all its armed forces as fast as it possibly can.

They may be used for offense or defense, or both; but the one safe bet appears to be that they are going to be used somehow before the war is over.

As for the hope of arming ourselves economically or cheaply, we fear that is out the window. So the talk about shaving to five billions the President's request for seven billions initial British aid under the war-power law sounds futile to us.

If this war goes to a finish, and takes as long as now seems likely, the time will come when we'll all be looking back wistfully on the good old days when it took only seven billions at one crack to carry on.

Report of the Benjamin Harrison Memorial Commission

REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1941

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, under an act approved by the President on August 9, 1939, the Benjamin Harrison Memorial Commission was created to take steps looking toward the establishment of a suitable permanent memorial to the twenty-third President of the United States, Benjamin Harrison.

President Harrison is one of the few great characters in American history for whom no national recognition has ever been shown in the form of a monument or memorial. He was a citizen and Christian of the highest civic and religious ideals. He was a statesman of sterling character, highly respected and honored

by all who knew him, an ornament to the State of Indiana and to the Nation which he served so faithfully and well. It was my privilege as a young newspaper reporter in Indianapolis to come into contact with this great man on many occasions, and though I was brought up in the Jeffersonian school and he was of the opposite political faith, I have never known a man for whom I had higher esteem or who seemed to me to possess more sheer strength of character than Benjamin Harrison.

When this bill was before the House on July 31, 1939, there was a beautiful demonstration of our ability to lay aside politics in recognition of real worth and true Americanism. I was proud to be the author of the bill, and at my side arguing for it was the revered paladin of democracy, our honored colleague the gentleman from Illinois, Representative A. J. SABATH. The bill passed this House unanimously—just as later it passed the upper Chamber unanimously.

A very able commission was appointed to consider the whole subject of a proper memorial to President Harrison. At the head of that commission is Stephen C. Noland, editor of the Indianapolis News. The other members are J. Russell Townsend, Jr., of Indianapolis; Mrs. William H. Schlosser, of Columbus, Ind.; Ross F. Lockridge, of New Harmony, Ind.; and Thomas McCullough, of Anderson, Ind. The commission has considered the matter with great thoroughness and Mr. Noland, its chairman, together with Rudolph H. Grabow, forest supervisor, and J. A. Hall, director of the Central States Forest Experiment Station, Columbus, Ohio, arrived here today bringing the commission's unanimous report. I believe the thanks of the country are due to the commission for its untiring patience and for the devotion it has exercised in the discharge of its duties. Benjamin Harrison was in a large sense the father of American forestry, and in the memorial plan that is presented to us for our consideration he is definitely identified in our fixed and permanent history with forestry—a subject in which he had the greatest heart interest. It is reasonable to believe that out of the many and varied suggestions that were offered and considered no memorial plan could have been adopted that would have been nearer to his heart than the one submitted by Mr. Noland and his associates.

The report of the commission is being placed before the House today for appropriate reference, and in view of the widespread national interest in the subject I ask unanimous consent that the text of the report and covering letter may be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I may add that in one respect this commission has established a unique record. Of a total appropriation of $2,500, a balance of $800, or nearly one-third, is being returned unexpended to the Federal Treasury. [Applause.]

The covering letter and report follow:

FEBRUARY 1, 1941.

To the Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: In compliance with the provisions of section 3 of Public Law No. 352, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved August 9, 1939, creating the Benjamin Harrison Memorial Commission, the Commission, which was appointed by the President of the United States, January 15, 1940, respectfully reports as follows:

The duty of the Commission, as prescribed in the law, is to "consider and formulate plans for establishment of a permanent memorial in the city of Indianapolis to the said Benjamin Harrison, twenty-third President of the United States."

The Commission has been advised that it is free to interpret the provision "in the city of Indianapolis" as meaning any memorial within the State of Indiana which would be consistent with the general spirit of the act.

The Commission has carefully studied the life and achievements of Benjamin Harrison. It has also studied the record of the Harrison family, from the time of the arrival of Benjamin Harrison, known as Benjamin the Emigrant, at the Jamestown settlement in Virginia about 1630. This study was broadened out of consideration for the fact that the Harrison family was intimately associated with the westward movement of population and the conquest and settlement of the territory in which Indiana now lies.

This report falls into two sections, as follows: First, a recommendation to change the name of the Hoosier National Forest to the Benjamin Harrison National Forest, speeding up the purchase schedule to the limits of ready assimilation as a demonstration of reforestation benefits, suitably marking entrances to the forest to commemorate Benjamin Harrison's great service to forestry, and providing therein a series of memorial plantations dedicated to the service which members of the Harrison family rendered to the Nation in the conquest and settlement of Indiana. This will include the designation of a road consisting of connecting stretches of two or more State roads running entirely through this memorial area and touching all the plantations, said road to be suitably marked all along the way and to be known as the Harrison Memorial Way.

The second part of this project includes a recommendation for the establishment in Marion County, Ind., of which Indianapolis is the seat, of the Benjamin Harrison Memorial Forest Institute, to be held and administered by the United States Forest Service for experimentation, advance study, and such other uses as the Forest Service may desire and Congress may authorize.

The other recommendation of the Commission is for the purchase and preservation in perpetuity by the Federal Government of the Harrison home in Indianapolis, together with contents and sufficient surrounding land to assure a proper environment for the purpose of the memorial.

Our recommendations include the suggestion that as a part of the upkeep and maintenance of the memorial, provision be made for the encouragement and direction of group pilgrimages of various kinds to high points in the memorial area as a part of the regular administration of the memorial.

Herewith the Commission submits its recommendations in detail, with reasons therefor and citations to its numerous exhibits, and also an accounting of receipts, expenditures, and remaining moneys.

The members of the Commission wish to express their satisfaction in the confidence which the President showed in them by assigning them to this duty. They realize that some sections of this report call for more study than could be encompassed in either the report or the evidence submitted with it. They stand ready to make any other investigations which congressional committees may desire or to supplement this report with such personal testimony as the committees may wish to hear.

We commend earnestly to the President and Congress the immediate timeliness of this memorial and respectfully urge that action be taken upon it during the present session of Congress.

Yours very respectfully,

BENJAMIN HARRISON
MEMORIAL COMMISSION,
STEPHEN C. NOLAND, *Chairman.*
J. RUSSELL TOWNSEND, JR.
Mrs. W. H. SCHLOSSER.
ROSS F. LOCKRIDGE.
THOMAS MCCULLOUGH.

REPORT OF THE BENJAMIN HARRISON MEMORIAL COMMISSION

SECTION 1. (a) Benjamin Harrison National Forest: While the Commission's study of the principal events of Benjamin Harrison's administration revealed several measures of noteworthy importance to the country's development, including the Sherman antitrust law, tariff acts, and the Pan American Conference, out of which grew the Pan American Union, it was decided that the most far-reaching of all his achievements was the creation of forest reserves and the impetus that he gave to the movement for conservation of the country's natural resources. His communication to Congress on the subject, dated January 20, 1890, sustaining the recommendation of a committee of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, is regarded by the Commission as the real beginning of American forest conservation. It resulted in the law of March 3, 1891, authorizing the President to set aside forest reserves by proclamation. For a discussion of these and subsequent events relating to his fathering of forest conservation, see exhibit 2, pages 202 to 204; and also exhibit 12, an extract from Gen. Lew Wallace's book, Life and Public Services of President Benjamin Harrison.

The United States Forest Service and the national forests grew out of Harrison's interest in public forestry. The work has been carried on in the spirit of his initiative and foresight. In looking over the situation in Indiana for suitable ways of memorializing President Harrison's interest in forestry, the Commission's attention was immediately attracted to the United States forest-purchase project in southern Indiana.

For a good many years the farming possibilities of an area of approximately 700,000 acres, extending from Brown County south to the Ohio River, have been steadily declining. The situation became so acute about 20 years ago that the farm communities in this area were unable to bear the tax load necessary to maintaining their essential functions of government, including schools. In this area are a number of woodworking centers populated by people who have a fine tradition of skill in converting hardwood timber into useful articles. These woodworking industries sprang up because of proximity to what seemed to be an unlimited supply of raw material, but as the land was cut over, then farmed out, or burned out, and then allowed to reforest itself at random, and cut over again, it was seen that this source of raw material had become almost depleted. At present these industries are importing into the State about 90 percent of their raw material. The burden of transportation put on their raw material is such that they are left in a severely handicapped competitive position. As a result of the decline of this soil, thousands of people in this area are dependent upon the Federal or State Government for relief or some aid in gaining a livelihood.

The Federal Government went into this area with the land-purchase and land-use program with a view to aiding these people to become self-reliant and conserving the skill and tradition of both their farming and woodworking inheritance. About 50,000 acres of this unit have been purchased. But latterly the purchase rate has declined sharply

because of lack of Federal appropriation. The result is that hundreds of families in this area are being sustained above a level of actual want but are receiving no aid that would enable them to regain their independence.

It is the belief of the Commission that if this purchase program were speeded up, so that the land could be acquired as fast as assimilation is possible, perhaps in 10 years, instead of the 40 years now contemplated, the cost would be less than the present cost to the Federal Government of maintaining these families.

The Commission made a complete survey of the 700,000-acre area, conducted public hearings for the purpose of ascertaining the economic resources of the communities and the attitude of the people in the small industrial centers toward their calling, and also studied the flood prevention, drought control, and recreational value of the whole forest project.

The Commission also consulted with members of the United States Forest Service, the Indiana State Conservation Department, Division of Forestry, and various commercial, agricultural, and civic interests in the communities within the forest-purchase unit. It made two inspection trips through the area, viewing the land, the condition of farmers, the woodworking industries, and their dependence on a supply of hardwood, and the general social and economic conditions. Testimony taken on the inspection and hearing trips is set out in the accompanying exhibits 4 and 8. Further testimony is shown in exhibit 7, pertaining especially to plantations memorializing the members of the Harrison family, and reference is also made to exhibit 6.

In order to obtain a clear account of the Harrison family's part in the settlement of America and the development of the Midwest territory and what is now Indiana the Commission felt justified in having the study. The Harrisons which accompanies this report as exhibit 2, made by Ross F. Lockridge, Jr., an authority on the subject.

The Commission especially invites attention to the testimony of citizens of Bedford and Tell City as being typical of the feeling in communities throughout the area that the memorial will have a general and immediate social and economic benefit to thousands of people who now look toward the future with doubt and misgivings. It would improve their opportunties for self-support and help to reestablish them on a basis of self-reliant citizenship.

Accompanying the report as exhibit 16 is a map of this purchase unit. It should be considered with exhibit 10, which shows desirable Harrison memorial-plantation sites, a discussion of this probable cost, and a typical development, with shelter-house and other recreational facilities. Exhibit 16 designates a road running entirely through the memorial area past all the plantation sites consisting of connecting stretches of State roads Nos. 135, 50, and 37. It is recommended that this road be officially designated as the Harrison Forest Way and that suitable markers be erected throughout its entire course, including the placing at certain selected points of elaborate kiosks bearing informative historic legends.

It was brought out in the testimony that the United States Forest Service and the forestry division of the Indiana conservation department are working in complete harmony in this area and that the Indiana forestry division would look upon the memorial as fitting appropriately into the State-reforestation plan. This plan is embodied in a report of the State planning commission.

Attention is also invited to exhibit 11, a letter from the Associate Regional Forester, United States Forest Service, Milwaukee, giving the Forest Service's approval of the project and some notes on the probable cost of memorial plantations and the annual appropriation for maintenance and fire protection.

The Commission is convinced by its study that this memorial would not only be thoroughly in keeping with what must have been in the mind of President Harrison when he inaugurated the forest-conservation program, but would also provide a substantial return on the investment of public money which it would involve.

The present purchase program calls, roughly, for the acquisition of the land in a period of about 40 years. If, as a memorial to President Harrison, Congress should appropriate sufficient money to reduce this to something like 10 years, the memorial would begin to pay dividends almost immediately and would, within a few years, pay for itself. The United States Navy has taken over 32,000 acres in Martin County within this forest-purchase area, and is acquiring 18,000 more acres, for the purpose of establishing there the munitions depot for the Atlantic Fleet. The Commission has gone into the question of the value to the safety of this depot, if it had a considerable surrounding forest area. Testimony of experts convinces the Commission that this would be helpful to the safety of the depot. The Commission is convinced that the national-defense program would be improved by speeding up the purchase of other forest land in this vicinity.

SECTION 1. (b) In conducting hearings to ascertain what could appropriately be done to memorialize President Harrison's interest in forestry and conservation, the Commission drew from members of the United States Forest Service a statement that for many years the Forest Service has hoped that the Federal Government might establish a forest institute embodying facilities for advanced research in forestry, a national repository for the archives pertaining to the development of American forestry, and an educational museum portraying the history of forestry and the utilization of wood in America. An arboretum of about 300 acres is proposed as an adjunct to the institute. Out of this study came the Commission's decision to recommend the establishment in Marion County of the Benjamin Harrison Memorial Forest Institute to fill this obvious need. It is the opinion of the Commission that this institute would augment and supplement the southern Indiana reforestation plan.

The Commission also believes that the Central States Forest Experiment Station, now on the campus of Ohio State University at Columbus, Ohio, should be combined with the forest institute. For a discussion of the feasibility of this plan see exhibit 5; likewise, see exhibit 8 for a discussion of the transfer of the experiment station to Indianapolis, and exhibit 9 for requirements of the site and the Forest Service's approval, by H. Earl Clapp, Acting Chief, of the general plan of the forest institute.

The Commission reached no definite decision as to the best location in Marion County. It employed Mr. William H. Bosson, Jr., a land expert of Indianapolis, to survey the county for sites which would conform to the general requirements of the institute as suggested by the Forest Service. The Commission viewed the sites which he suggested and voted to employ him to consult the owners of the Road 34 site as to their views about giving options in case of a Federal purchase. His reports are herewith presented as exhibit 13.

The Commission believes that if this institute is established it should be developed and maintained as a memorial to President Harrison without in any way reducing the normal appropriation of the United States Forest Service—that is, that this should be financed entirely, both for acquisition and maintenance, from money dedicated to memorializing President Harrison's service to conservation.

It is suggested that a Harrison memorial room be maintained within the institute, containing exhibits expressive of the essential purposes of the memorial. Among these exhibits, charts and maps should be displayed demonstrating the views and services of President Benjamin Harrison in connection with forest conservation, together with the achievements of his administration in the direction of national expansion and international amity.

SEC. 2. The Harrison home: The house which Benjamin Harrison built in 1871, and in which he maintained his home until his death in 1901, is at 1230 North Delaware Street, Indianapolis, Ind. It stands substantially as it did when he conducted his "front-porch campaign" from it in 1884, the difference being that it now has a front porch, whereas in 1884 it did not have a front porch. For a history of the home, see page 245, exhibit 2, of this report.

Upon the death of President Harrison, a life interest in this home descended to his heirs. The family became scattered, and the home was rented for various purposes. It fell into a state of disrepair, and efforts to persuade well-to-do people of the community to buy and maintain it were not successful.

The home came under the observation of executives of the Arthur Jordan Foundation, and they decided that its acquisition, restoration, and maintenance were within the philanthropic scope of the foundation's interests. This foundation now owns the home in fee simple. For a record of the foundation's reasons for acquiring, restoring, and refurnishing the home, see exhibit 1 of this report. This exhibit also outlines the policy of the foundation regarding the home.

Exhibit 3 is an appraisal of the land on which the home stands, made by the Indianapolis Real Estate Board, at the request of this Commission. This appraisal is on the basis of $200 a front-foot. Attached to the appraisal report is a letter giving a legal description of the land. The Jordan Foundation has not been apprised of the real-estate board appraisal.

By resolution of the Commission the purchase of the entire tract at this situation held by the Jordan Foundation was suggested as a means of obtaining enough land to protect the Harrison home from inharmonious building encroachments. The owners of the land lying between the Harrison home and the next street north—which is Thirteenth Street—are unwilling to sell at this time, but they assured the chairman of the Commission that if they should decide to sell, they would give preference to the Federal Government, and that they would be glad to consider a proposal for Federal acquisition of the land at their death. (See exhibit 7, p. 211 and following.) The resolution of the Commission to recommend the purchase of the entire Jordan Foundation holdings at this place is in exhibit 7, page 208.

Consultation with Mr. Hilton U. Brown, chairman of the board of the Arthur Jordan Foundation, failed to develop a definite statement that the foundation would sell. It is now using the two old mansions to the south to house its school of music. Part of the Harrison home is used as a dormitory for this school. Mr. Brown gave assurance, however, that his board was always governed by the essential philanthropic mission of the foundation fund for the good of all the people. He said that in line with this policy the foundation would not resist an attempt to buy for the purpose of establishing the Harrison home as a permanent memorial suitably protected.

It should be explained that the real-estate board appraisal does not include the three buildings—the Harrison home, the old Ayres home, and the old Wasson home. It was agreed by the appraisers and the members of the Harrison Memorial Commission that it

was impossible to make a trustworthy appraisal of these buildings. So much would depend upon the purpose for which they were intended, or upon zoning variances that might be obtained to permit new buildings on the site, that a dependable appraisal could not be reached.

The Arthur Jordan Foundation has rendered a notable service in rehabilitating the Harrison home substantially as it was at the time of Harrison's occupancy and in refurnishing it largely with Harrison furniture and redecorating it in the spirit of Harrison's era.

The contents of the Harrison home could not be appraised by normal means, for many items are unique and so intimately associated with the Harrison family that they could hardly be regarded as having a value except from their Harrison association. However, the Jordan Foundation and its executive director, Mr. Bernard Batty, have been at considerable expense in the restoration, and this cost could be easily ascertained by an audit of the foundation's books. Mr. Batty's statement on this subject, which accompanies this report, covers the whole situation.

Owing to the indefiniteness of the appraisals and the lack of an inventory of the contents of the Harrison home, the Commission does not feel justified in making an exact estimate of the cost of the Harrison home and the entire 538-foot frontage owned by the foundation. This property is 205 feet deep. However, it is the consensus of members of the Commission that the land, buildings, and contents of the Harrison home could be bought for about $225,000.

The heirs of Benjamin Harrison are desirous of seeing this home preserved and believe that its preservation would suitably memorialize his interest in his home, his love for Indianapolis, and the historical importance of the structure as a central point of interest in a national political campaign. In this connection, the chairman of the Commission interviewed Mr. E. F. Tibbott, who served President Harrison as Secretary during his term in the White House and until his death in 1901. Mr. Tibbott not only believed that the Arthur Jordan Foundation had done well in preserving and refurnishing the home, but was also impressed by the interest taken in it by the Daughters of the American Revolution of Indiana. Mrs. Benjamin Harrison was the first president general of the Daughters of the American Revolution. In commemorating her service the Indiana Daughters of the Revolution have caused to be copied and displayed in the Harrison home the portrait of Mrs. Harrison which now hangs in the White House. Mr. Tibbott also approved other sections of this report as being in line with President Harrison's major interests.

The Commission also recommends the establishment in part of the Harrison home—not the first-floor living rooms or Harrison's bedrooms—of a Harrison museum, within which could be suitably displayed the family possessions, mementoes of Harrison's public career, his correspondence, and other materials of value to visitors and students.

The Commission recommends that as a part of the upkeep and maintenance of the memorial, adequate provision be made for the encouragement and direction of group pilgrimages of various kinds—especially for school classes and organized clubs—to high points in the memorial area, such as the Benjamin Harrison home, the Forest Institute, and the plantation units dedicated to different individuals of the successive Harrison generations. This would make the memorial serve a definite educational and patriotic purpose for all time to come in harmony with the spirit of such a memorial.

The Commission contemplates expert direction of an educational nature for such programs and institutes for the purpose of helping to educate the public both as to the great conservation purposes involved and as to the patriotic principles to be inculcated by preserving the intimate history of the Harrison family, with particular emphasis upon the public careers of the two Presidents of the United States from that family. It would make the memorial keep alive before all the people all the time the human and historic significance of the life and career of Benjamin Harrison and of the wonderful continuity exhibited in the lives and careers of outstanding members of successive generations of this great American family.

In conclusion, the Commission respectfully commends to the immediate attention of the present Congress the timeliness of this memorial. The very urgency of our program of national defense makes most opportune the conservation of our vital natural resources, such as reforestation, both for the present and the future. At the same time, the promulgation of the patriotic and educational principles exhibited in the memorialization of Benjamin Harrison and the Harrison family will be an invaluable stimulus to American pride. Through the cultivation of historic and patriotic consciousness it will help to enhance our public morale at a time when such stimulation is of the most pressing importance.

BENJAMIN HARRISON
MEMORIAL COMMISSION,
STEPHEN C. NOLAND, *Chairman.*
J. RUSSELL TOWNSEND, Jr., *Secretary.*
Mrs. W. H. SCHLOSSER.
ROSS F. LOCKRIDGE.
THOMAS MCCULLOUGH.

Labor and Industry No. 1 Problem

REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1941

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, despite all the optimistic talk to the contrary, it was obvious in Washington this week that serious concern was being expressed over the continuance of strikes in critical defense industries. The naming of the 11-man Mediation Board, headed by Selective Service Director Clarence Dykstra, with 3 men representing the public and 8 others speaking for labor and management, was a foregone conclusion. The effectiveness of the new Board is due for quick demonstration.

At the Allis-Chalmers plant in Milwaukee, 55 days of bitterness had passed with no settlement in sight. The United Auto Workers Union was obviously in no hurry to end the strike. Neither was the managing ownership. United States conciliators had been on the scene and departed. Throughout the country other strikes no less important were slowing down production. A shut-down in one area had repercussions far away.

During February almost half a million man-days were lost on Government Army contracts. In the first 2 weeks of March, Army officials estimated that almost 300,000 days had been wasted away on idle men and idle plants.

The national mood is clear. We are determined that no time should be lost on unnecessary strikes, or through the obstinacy of management. This is the time to produce. It is up to the Federal Government to see that nothing interferes with this production.

DEFENSE CZAR HARRY HOPKINS

American defense preparations are in the hands of President Roosevelt and a four-man inner council, composed of Secretary of War Stimson, Secretary of the Navy Knox, and Production Managers Knudsen and Hillman. This last week Harry Hopkins was named as executive secretary to this Defense Council.

Mr. Hopkins gained indispensable knowledge of the specific problems of the war in Europe on his month-long tour of inspection through England. He probably knows more about what has happened in Britain than any man in America. Together with his direct experience with American working men and women as head of the W. P. A. and as former Secretary of Commerce, this information should qualify Harry Hopkins for almost any emergency task.

There are two difficulties in the way of this happy result. First and foremost is the physical factor. Mr. Hopkins has not enjoyed good health for several years. At most he can work no more than 6 or 7 hours a day. Then, too, Mr. Hopkins does not enjoy the complete confidence of either industry or labor.

To place him in a position of marked personal responsibility must be regarded as neither wise nor benevolent.

TAXES AHEAD

March 15 has come and gone, and tremendous income-tax payments have made the front pages of newspapers in every corner of the Nation. Taxes this year were higher than any before in the history of our country. They will undoubtedly become higher still.

Prospects for the future were already being considered. For the next year an estimated expenditure of some $20,000,000,000 is being considered. Including the $7,000,000,000 in aid to Britain already voted by Congress, this makes a grand total of at least $27,000,000,000 for 1941–42.

To raise this staggering sum seems impossible. But steps in that direction will be necessary. The 4 percent normal income-tax rate will be raised to at least 6 percent. Surtax levels will be lowered. Corporate taxes will probably be jumped, and taxes on theaters, liquor, tobacco, lumped together as "nuisance taxes" will be raised. Personal exemptions, lowered from $1,000 to $800 and from $2,500 to $2,000, will in all likelihood drop down to $600 and $1,800 before the next March 15 deadline.

The old saw that nothing is certain but death and taxes may be soon revised to read, "Nothing is certain but death and higher taxes."

WAR ON THREE FRONTS

Alarm over the European war has diverted American attention from the wars in Africa and the Far East. They are nevertheless real. In China, our fact-

finding emissary has just concluded a survey of conditions designed to influence our foreign policy in the Orient. In the Australian harbor of Sydney, an American goodwill visit by part of the Pacific Fleet, based on Pearl Harbor, was rousing the hearts of men "down under." In Ethiopia, Eritrea, and the Somalilands, British guns were barking out the destruction of Mussolini's African empire, with results destined to be felt even in the United States.

The "all-out" aid program means "all-out" aid to Britain, China, Greece, Turkey. It means more than a battle for the little isle of England. We have taken irrevocable steps. Every American must be alert and ready for the growing emergencies. The die is cast. Let us hope and trust that we shall never have cause to regret the action our Government has seen fit to take.

"One by One the Roses Fall"—Two More Useless Holding Companies Dissolved

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, "One by one the roses fall."

On yesterday I told you of Wendell Willkie's using the Republican Party as a fire escape just before the vast holding company known as the Commonwealth & Southern collapsed. On yesterday——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I am sorry, I cannot yield. This is not an argument on communism. I am talking about electric power now.

On yesterday, after I made my statement, the Securities and Exchange Commission demanded further compliance with the Holding Company Act and ordered dissolution or disintegration of the United Light & Power Co., which is an alleged $600,000,000 concern, and also of the United American Co. Since this is one of those cases where holding companies are stacked five deep, all sucking money out of the pockets of the light and power consumers, this action of the Commission is referred to as enforcing compliance with the "great-grandfather clause."

You people who are paying the bills, not only to support these top holding companies but all the rest of them, ought to applaud this action of the Commission.

You are not only paying the operating company but you are paying all the expenses, incomes, and overcharges of all these other four holding companies piled on top of it.

I am inserting the order of the Securities and Exchange Commission dissolving two of these useless, expensive holding companies:

[United States of America before the Securities and Exchange Commission. At a regular session of the Securities and Exchange Commission, held at its office in the city of Washington, D. C., on the 20th day of March, A. D. 1941. In the matter of the United Light & Power Co., the United Light & Railways Co., American Light & Traction Co., Continental Gas & Electric Corporation, United American Co., and Iowa-Nebraska Light & Power Co., respondents (file No. 59–17). The United Light & Power Co., applicant (file No. 54–25).]

ORDER DIRECTING CERTAIN ACTION UNDER SECTION 11 (B) (2) OF THE PUBLIC UTILITY HOLDING COMPANY ACT

The Commission having previously instituted these proceedings pursuant to section 11 (b) (2) of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935; notice having been duly given to all interested persons, and all such persons having been given an opportunity to be heard, with respect to what action should be required to be taken by said respondents to comply with certain of the requirements of said section 11 (b) (2), particularly the second sentence thereof; and

The Commission having filed its findings and opinion herein, in which the Commission finds, among other things, that the action hereinafter directed to be taken is necessary and appropriate for the purpose of bringing about compliance with the second sentence of section 11 (b) (2).

It is hereby ordered, pursuant to section 11 (b) (2) of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, particularly the second sentence thereof, that:

1. The United Light & Power Co. shall be liquidated and dissolved.

2. United American Co. shall be liquidated and dissolved.

It is further ordered that the respondents shall proceed with due diligence to comply with the foregoing order, and shall make application to the Commission for the entry of any further orders necessary or appropriate for this purpose; and the respondent, the United Light & Power Co., may submit to the Commission herein for its approval a plan proposing a method of complying with paragraph 1 of the foregoing order on a basis which is fair and equitable to its security holders, and providing for a determination of the relative rights and interests of its security holders in connection therewith; and jurisdiction is hereby expressly reserved to enter such further orders in this proceeding as may be necessary or appropriate for the purpose of carrying out the steps hereinbefore required in this order.

It is further ordered that jurisdiction be, and is hereby, reserved to enter such further orders as may be necessary or appropriate with respect to any of the remaining issues in these proceedings, and particularly for the purpose of considering what action should be ordered to be taken by the respondents to bring about compliance with the further requirements of section 11 (b) (2).

It is further ordered that the hearing heretofore held herein be, and is hereby, adjourned, subject to call hereafter upon such notice as the Commission shall deem appropriate.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] FRANCIS P. BRASSOR,
Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, if this revival of righteousness continues we may yet abolish all these useless holding companies, squeeze the water out of the stocks of the operating companies, and reduce light and power rates to the T. V. A. levels all over the country. That would save the consumers of the Nation more than $1,000,000,000 a year on their electric bills alone.

We are certainly moving in the right direction.

A Defense of the Late United States Senator the Honorable Ernest Lundeen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1941

LETTER TO THE EDITORS OF THE CLEVELAND PRESS, THE CLEVELAND PLAIN DEALER, AND THE CLEVELAND NEWS

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter recently forwarded by me to the editors of the Cleveland Press, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, and the Cleveland News:

In a recent issue you carried a letter purported to have been written by one Jean Turkovich, expressing her fears that I may hold some local meetings against our involvement in the war, and proclaiming me a satellite of Senator WHEELER and the late Senator Ernest Lundeen, of Minnesota. Of the latter she said, "now definitely determined to have been senatorial mouthpiece of a registered Hitler propagandist."

I do not dignify the comments directed against me, because I am certain the community as a whole believe with me that one does not have to be pro-British to be a good American. I do, however, resent her foul accusation against the late United States Senator Ernest Lundeen, whose lips are sealed in death. I know of no Christian worthy of the name who has joined in the smear campaign against the dead Senator. This scurrilous attack stems from the warmongers who once more want American blood shed for the imperialism of Europe.

It is the same sort of rabble who convicted and crucified Jesus Christ. History proved the Saviour innocent of the charges preferred against Him at the court of Pontius Pilate. History will prove Senator Lundeen innocent of these vicious charges.

Senator Lundeen as a young man was a member of the war Congress. On Good Friday, April 7, 1917, he voted against our entrance into the war, denouncing it as a bankers' war. He also voted against conscription. A few months later, when he returned to his home in Minnesota, in zero weather, he was seized by a group of so-called patriots and locked in a refrigerator car which was attached to a fast-moving freight train. He escaped death, after traveling in this ice box for over a hundred miles, when the train put in on a siding and a trackwalker hearing his cries released him.

After the war the people of Minnesota, including those who characterized him as a traitor, apologized and sent him to represent them in Congress. In 1936 they elected him United States Senator. A few weeks before his death I visited him in his office. Around the room were more than 20 color standards,

the flags of the American Legion posts, World War and Disabled Veterans' posts, and the Spanish-American War Veterans. All of them had been presented to the late Senator by soldiers, many who had fought overseas in that war to end all wars.

I am sure Jean Turkovich knows nothing of this. I am sure she never even wrote that letter smearing a good Christian, who, by the way, was married to an English woman. That letter was written by a political ghost writer, one of my cowardly political enemies who hides behind a woman's skirts and gets her to sign a letter besmirching the good name of a dead United States Senator, and one who had served his country in the Spanish-American War.

Jean Turkovich (Miss or Mrs.?), perhaps I should say to you, shame on you, but in the spirit of the holy Lenten season, I simply say, may God forgive you.

Sincerely yours,

MARTIN L. SWEENEY.

This letter is in reply to the publication of a letter from a reader attacking the character and reputation of our dead United States Senator Ernest Lundeen. Those of us who knew and served with the late Senator Lundeen will always remember him as a sincere, tolerant, and patriotic American. I believe it to be the unanimous opinion of those who knew him that he put the interest and welfare of his country above that of any nation on earth.

He was never the man to challenge the patriotism of any individual, even though at times he was in sharp disagreement on matters of viewpoint and policy. Recently in death he has become the victim of a vicious smear campaign by certain newspaper columnists and one radio announcer, who attempt to besmirch the patriotism of one who served in the Congress and in the military force of the United States. These cowards would not make their veiled charges against him in his lifetime, but, running true to form and giving an exhibition of their cowardice, they attack one whose lips are sealed in death. Parrotlike the author of the letter I replied to in these newspapers has joined the parade in the mud-slinging campaign against a true American. My reply in his defense is humble, indeed, in the light of the splendid contribution made by the late Senator from Minnesota.

Defense Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LE ROY D. DOWNS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE BRIDGEPORT, CONN., COMMON COUNCIL

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me I am herewith inserting in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Common Council, city of Bridgeport, Conn., on March 17, 1941, and approved by Mayor Jasper McLevy on March 18.

This resolution is a protest against the construction of row-type defense homes in that city, and requests that defense housing construction be in single units which, in the opinion of the members of the council, can be erected within the limitation of $3,000 set by the Lanham Act.

This resolution also carries objection to the placing of the $2,750 limitation on the construction cost of each unit. It is felt that the construction of a large number of row-type houses within the city of Bridgeport will not be in accordance with the city planning program and will be detrimental to the best interest of the city of Bridgeport.

The resolution follows:

Whereas there has this day been presented to this common council for its approval an agreement to be entered into between the city of Bridgeport and the Federal Works Administrator relative to the construction under the so-called Lanham Act of a housing project of 600 dwelling units for the accommodation of persons engaged in national-defense activities within the city; and

Whereas the project described in said agreement contemplates the construction of row-type houses as to which this common council did by resolution adopt at its meeting of March 3, 1941, express its opposition; and

Whereas it is still believed that the construction of row-type houses should continue to be vigorously opposed as detrimental to the welfare of the city of Bridgeport and its defense workers; and

Whereas under the Lanham Act it is provided that the average sum of $3,000 per dwelling unit may be expended in the construction of the dwelling accommodations contemplated in said act, and the expenditure of this sum of money in the city of Bridgeport would enable the Federal Works Administrator to construct the detached type of dwelling house which this common council feels should be constructed; and

Whereas the construction of row-type houses becomes necessary in the city of Bridgeport only because the Federal Works Administrator has arbitrarily and unreasonably determined that no greater sum of money than $2,750 per dwelling unit shall be expended in the city of Bridgeport, although he has provided a per unit dwelling construction cost of $3,000 on projects in other sections of the country where building costs are not as great as in the city of Bridgeport; and

Whereas, while arbitrarily insisting that no greater sum than $2,750 shall be expended in the construction cost of dwelling units in the city of Bridgeport and thus necessitating the construction of row-type houses over the opposition of all those who are familiar with Bridgeport's problems and needs, the same authority is appropriating an additional sum for each such contemplated dwelling unit in order that there may be provided in each of said units at the Government's expense a refrigerator and a gas stove for the use of each of the occupants thereof: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Bridgeport:

1. That it does hereby affirm the opposition to the construction of row-type houses in the city of Bridgeport which it expressed in the resolution relative thereto adopted at its meeting of March 3, 1941, which said resolution is hereby incorporated in and made a part of this resolution.

2. That it refuse to authorize the execution, for and on behalf of the city, of the agreement with the Federal Works Administrator which has been submitted to this body and which contemplates the construction of row-type houses.

3. That it does hereby protest against the arbitrary action of the Federal Works Administrator in setting the construction cost of the individual dwelling units of the contemplated defense-housing project in the city of Bridgeport at the figure of $2,750 and in thus denying to the city the full housing cost limits provided in the Lanham Act, notwithstanding the fact that the full individual dwelling construction cost of $3,000 has been provided for other similar defense-housing projects which have been constructed in other cities.

4. That it does hereby denounce as unfair, unjust, and discriminatory this action of the Federal Works Administrator which arbitrarily and unreasonably denies to the city of Bridgeport, and to those who may be engaged within the city in its defense industries, the full benefits of the Lanham Act which have been extended to other sections of the country.

5. That this common council does hereby affirm its belief that the full limit of $3,000 for the construction cost of each dwelling unit should be provided for the contemplated defense-housing project to the end that there may be provided decent living quarters to those who are now, or who may hereafter be, engaged in the defense industries of the city of Bridgeport, and to the end that the city of Bridgeport shall not, at the conclusion of the present emergency, be presented with the problem of a substantial number of undesirable dwelling accommodations.

6. That it does hereby urge that there be eliminated from the plan for the construction of said project the unnecessary item of Government expense involved in providing refrigerators and gas stoves for the dwelling units thereof, that the contemplated appropriation for this purpose be added to the construction cost of said dwelling units, and that the Federal Works Administrator appropriate the comparatively small additional sum which will be necessary to secure the construction of a housing project of single-type dwellings.

7. That the mayor be, and he hereby is, directed and instructed to continue unalterably his opposition to the construction of row-type houses in the city of Bridgeport, to renew his efforts to secure the allotment for use in the city of Bridgeport of such Federal funds under the Lanham Act as will enable the construction of decent defense dwelling units within the city, and to adopt and use every means and legal expedients within his power to prevent the arbitrary and unjust discrimination in the administration of the Lanham Act which will deny to the city the benefits which have been freely extended to other communities of the country.

8. That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the city clerk to the Federal Works Administrator, to the Senators and Representatives of this State in the Congress of the United States, and to the chamber of commerce and the manufacturers' association of this city.

Profits and Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1941

ARTICLE FROM LABOR

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following article from Labor newspaper is too eloquent to require comment by me. These figures ought to be

borne clearly in mind by every person who seeks to establish a fair division of the burdens and a fair sharing of such temporary advantages as there may be in connection with the defense program:

CORPORATE PROFITS PILING UP, WHILE WAGES LAG FAR BEHIND—TOP-HEAVY SITUATION THREATENS ENTIRE ECONOMIC SYSTEM, A. F. OF L. CLAIMS; DEMANDS LARGER SHARE OF DEFENSE INCOME

Vast profits are rolling into the coffers of American corporations, as a result of the defense boom, but wages are lagging far behind, the American Federation of Labor declared this week.

Figures compiled by the Federation showed profits leaped upward in 1940 by 10 to 190 percent above 1939, but that hourly wages in the same period rose only from 1 to 4.8 percent.

Seven major industries, analyzed by the A. F. of L., showed how profits outstripped earnings in 1940:

	Profit increases	Wage increases
	Percent	*Percent*
Automobiles	9.9	4.5
Petroleum products	10.6	.9
Textiles	32.9	2.9
Electrical equipment	36.1	4.8
Machinery	68.5	3.8
Iron and steel	98.5	2.8
Aircraft and parts	190.7	4.8

On the basis of net worth of these industries, profits ranged from 5.8 percent for petroleum products to 25.7 percent for aircraft.

Of course, profits for 1941 will be far above 1940, and, therefore, the contrast between profits and wages will be still more impressive.

This top-heavy situation threatens the entire economic system, the A. F. of L. warned. Industry is well able to pay higher wages, and labor will fight for such increases, the Federation made it clear.

The Federation maintained that a profit of 6 percent is enough for any industry, and that anything above that should be distributed to greater earnings to the employees.

"An adequate wage should be the first charge against any company," the A. F. of L. research service declared. "After that is met, if profits keep climbing, they should be devoted to wage increases. Such a course would keep up buying power and stabilize the economic system."

Veterans Resent Attacks on Ford Motor Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

RESOLUTION PASSED BY ALLIED VETERANS' COUNCIL OF DEARBORN, MICH.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a resolution passed by the Allied Veterans' Council of Dearborn, Mich., demanding a retraction of libelous statements concerning the Ford Motor Co., printed in recent issues of the magazine Friday.

The resolution follows:

Whereas we, the Allied Veterans Council of the city of Dearborn, composed of the veterans and Legionnaires of the Detroit metropolitan area, are in quorum assembled; and

Whereas it has come to the notice and attention of this body that a series of malicious and libelous, false and slanderous, fictitious and untrue statements have been published in a news magazine known as Friday, and circulated in the Detroit area, about and concerning and related to the Ford Motor Co., Mr. Henry Ford, Mr. Edsel Ford, Mr. Harry Bennett, Mr. William Cameron, and divers other persons associated with the said Ford Motor Co.; and

Whereas upon occasions too numerous to contain in this resolution the said Ford Motor Co. and hereinbefore-named persons have kindly and gratuitously assisted our group, both as an organization and as individuals, upon occasions when assistance from other sources was refused; and

Whereas the said Ford Motor Co. does, humanely and without consideration, now employ members of our group who are barred from employment in other places of industry by reason of either old age or physical disability incurred in many instances while serving in the United States Army in France and in other wars of our country; and

Whereas the said magazine Friday, on page 6 of an issue dated January 31, 1941, does specifically and maliciously and libelously state:

"Besides a network of spies, undercover men for all sorts of assignments and the common brand of factory stool pigeon, Bennett has carefully organized for Ford a private army of men who saw action in France during the World War—men capable and experienced in the use of machine guns, men needing no training.

"The technique of organizing this division was the same as the method of getting factory stool pigeons. I have testimony of veterans employed at Ford's right now. They are willing to take the witness stand before any governmental investigation body to tell of this private army estimated to number 5,000 men:" Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the said Allied Veterans Council, of the metropolitan area of the city of Detroit, in quorum assembled, do hereby demand that the editors, publishers, and person or persons controlling the policy of the said magazine Friday, immediately, publicly, and in print as prominent as that which created these libels, fictions, misstatements, and falsehoods, retract and correct the said libels, fictions, and misstatements within a reasonable time after receiving notice of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to each of the United States Senators from the State of Michigan; the various Representatives of the State of Michigan in Congress; the Attorney General of the United States; the national commander of the American Legion; the national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; Mr. Henry Ford, Mr. Edsel Ford, Mr. Harry Bennett, Mr. W. J. Cameron, of the Ford Motor Co.; and the magazine Friday in which these statements appeared.

Made this 17th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1941.

WM. BUSHAW,
Commander.
EARL O. SMITH,
Junior Past Commander.
ROBT. H. HYNETT,
Adjutant.
EARL O. SMITH,
Junior Vice Commander, Post 134. V. F. W.
JESSE L. HILL,
Commander, Post 173 American Legion.
WALTER DUNN,
Commander, Post 364 American Legion.
LEO C. MARKEY,
Commander, Post 1494 V. F. W.

The Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians—A Story of Communist Infiltration Into the Foundations of the National-Defense Program

REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN DIES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1941

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to bring to the attention of the House another case of Communist leadership in a C. I. O. union which operates in some of our vital defense industries, including all of our navy yards. I present to you a purely factual statement concerning the Communist Party membership of Marcel Scherer, who is the national organizational director of the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians. Scherer is by no means the only Communist who occupies a leading position in this important union of technical men. In fact, the union as a whole is under the complete domination of the Communist Party. The importance of this latter fact can hardly be overemphasized when we remember that the absolute loyalty of technical men who are employed in our defense industries is essential to our national security.

Architects, engineers, chemists, and technicians occupy strategic bottle-neck positions in American industry. Hence they are particularly important for the successful execution of the national-defense program. The attitude, affiliations, loyalties, and general trustworthiness of those engaged in these occupations is a matter of paramount significance. The following inquiry is concerned only with those who are organized in the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians, affiliated with the Committee for Industrial Organization, and claiming a membership of 8,000. The F. A. E. C. T., according to information supplied by its official organ, Technical America, and various mimeographed publications, has established contact or contractual relations with the chief navy yards and with numerous industrial plants engaged in producing supplies for military purposes.

In a letter sent to Mr. Charles Edison, Secretary of the Navy, and in a telegram sent to President Roosevelt on April 10, 1940, the F. A. E. C. T. defended its claim to the right of collective bargaining in American navy yards. It is therefore pertinent to determine just who and what the F. A. E. C. T. represents and what are its real purposes in organizing these establishments.

MARCEL SCHERER, A BIOGRAPHY

The man who has been the actual and most active organizing head of the F. A. E. C. T. is Marcel Scherer, its national organizational director. Mr. Scherer was one of its charter members and general organizer of the New York chapter, the largest and most influential chapter in

the federation, for 2 years. (See third F. A. E. C. T. annual convention program, Detroit, Mich., October 7, 8, 9, and 10, 1937, p. 9.) Here in a brief biographical sketch, he is described as having been "dismissed from high school for pacifism during the war." Mr. Scherer was an active member of the Young People's Socialist League at Erasmus Hall High School in New York City, and in 1919 engaged in student agitations at the City College of New York. He joined the Communist Labor Party at that time and later the Communist Party. In 1931 he was Communist candidate for alderman from the thirty-seventh aldermanic district in Brooklyn.

To establish Mr. Scherer's past and present connection with the Communist Party of the United States, the testimony of Benjamin Gitlow, former candidate for Vice President on the Communist ticket; Joseph Zack, former member of the central executive committee of the Communist Party; Maurice Malkin, member of the Communist Party; and John P. Frey, president of the Metal-Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor, before the Committee on un-American Activities (vol. 1, p. 101; vol. 7, p. 4709; vol. 9, p. 5456; vol. 9, p. 5770) is further cited. In a letter to this committee, published on page 11 of September 1938 issue of Technical America, official organ of the F. A. E. C. T., Mr. Scherer makes no denial of the charge that he is a Communist.

According to the F. A. E. C. T. biography of Mr. Scherer, he "left private practice to organize relief committees for striking miners." The name of this committee was the Pennsylvania-Ohio Miners Relief Committee, room 314, 611 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa. It received wide publicity and support in the official organ of the Communist Party, the Daily Worker. The Pennsylvania-Ohio Miners Relief Committee cooperated actively at the time with the Communist-inspired and controlled Save the Union Committee in its campaign within the United Mine Workers of America against John L. Lewis.

CAMP WOCOLONA

In 1928, Mr. Scherer, as president; Nathan Sparer, as secretary; and Paul Scherer, as treasurer, organized Camp Wocolona, in Monroe, N. Y. This camp was widely advertised in the Daily Worker. While ostensibly a purely recreational cooperative enterprise, the real purpose of the camp was to provide a gathering place for professionals, civil-service employees, technicians, and so forth, in preparation for the launching of a Communist-controlled union. To the regular weekly rates at this camp was added a tax of "50 cents for labor press," including the Daily Worker and Freiheit, both Communist organs. Wocolona is a contraction for Workers Colony.

STRIKE POLICY

In 1929, Marcel Scherer reappeared on the scene as the organizer of the union of technical men, among draftsmen and junior engineers of the New York Board of Transportation, a municipal government department. Nathan Sparer was vice president, Carl Weisberg was recording secretary and assistant organizer, all these officials being at that time members of the Communist Party. Since the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians, which grew out of the union of technical men, in 1933, now has contacts and contractual relationships with the chief Government navy yards and with industrial plants manufacturing supplies essential to our defense program, it is highly important to note the attitude of Mr. Scherer, those associated with him, and his organization, toward strikes in Government departments. The relations between the union of technical men, headed by Mr. Scherer, and the board of transportation, furnishes a significant test. Negotiations with John H. Delany, chairman of this board, were broken off under the threat of a strike by Mr. Scherer.

Later in the same year Mr. Scherer organized a strike of 600 construction workers on the Grand Concourse line of the New York Municipal Subway, causing 600 men to lose their jobs permanently.

In April 1937, the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians, again under the leadership of Mr. Marcel Scherer, called a strike of W. P. A. technical men working for the Federal Government, in New York City. The walkout included the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, park department, Bronx water supply, public school No. 44, Bond Street Hospital, Bronx sewer and highway construction. Mass picketing, sit-downs, and seizure of Government property accompanied this strike.

Again in July 1936, the offices of the Federal Power Commission in Washington were picketed in accordance with the F. A. E. C. T. policy of using mass pressure instead of the duly constituted legal procedures established for disputes involving civil-service personnel.

Despite the repeated assurances given by Mr. Scherer and his present union, that the organization is opposed to strikes where the Government is involved, the foregoing examples prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that Mr. Scherer has consistently advocated and executed a strike policy whenever he considered such a policy necessary for the purposes which he desired to attain.

SPECIAL ACTIVITY

The activities of Mr. Scherer should by no means be imputed to any individual proclivities or designs, for Mr. Scherer, as already indicated, is a member of a highly disciplined organization, the Communist Party of the United States. The following testimony of Joseph Zack, former member of the central executive committee of the Communist Party, at a hearing of the Committee on Un-American Activities, held on September 30, 1939 (hearings, vol. 9, p. 5453), is significant in this connection:

> The Soviet Government will utilize its American organization for whatever purpose they find convenient or necessary at all times. * * * While I was in charge of the Trade Union Unity League I was once asked to supply an engineer, a chemist, who would personally have qualifications capable, and let us say, talk to other engineers higher in the profession than himself, in this instance, specifically, certain engineers of Du Pont. I was asked to do that by Max Bedacht, who was then in charge of this phase of their secret activity. Well, I recommended a certain individual, and I was asked to meet the Ogpu agent in charge of this branch of their activities, and I introduced him to him.

Our committee has been informed by an authoritative source that Marcel Scherer was one of those selected for this type of work.

Jimmy Collins, listed as a member of the Aircraftsmen's Federation, affiliated with the F. A. E. C. T., and listed also as a member of the national council committee of the Young Communist League—hearings, volume 1, page 590—met his death on March 22, 1935, while trying out a United States Navy biplane near Farmingdale, Long Island. The plane was known as a mystery plane, whose mechanism was considered of such a confidential nature that no photographers were permitted to take pictures of the wreckage of this plane. How confidential this information remained can be imagined in the light of the fact that Mr. Collins was a top-flight member of a highly disciplined organization, the Young Communist League, which was an affiliate of the Communist International.

Realizing that skill of a highly technical nature is required for access to specialized departments of service in the Government and private industry in which the F. A. E. C. T. is interested for its own purposes, it is conducting free shipbuilding courses in naval architecture and marine engineering, covering hull construction, elementary ship calculation, elementary marine machinery, and advanced marine machinery.

Among the sponsors and teachers of this school are well-known fellow travelers active in various Communist-controlled "front" organizations.

FRIENDS OF THE SOVIET UNION

In 1931 and 1932, Mr. Scherer was appointed national secretary of the Communist-controlled Friends of the Soviet Union, which published an official organ known as Soviet Russia Today. In its issue of April 1932, page 5, we find a call to the workers of the United States to "stop the transport of arms and munitions, rally to the defense of the Soviet Union." Mr. Scherer made an extended trip to the Soviet Union for this organization and subsequently made an American lecture tour for the Friends of the Soviet Union. The Communist, official theoretical organ of the Communist Party of the United States, in its issue of October 1931, page 832, in referring to the Friends of the Soviet Union, declared:

> An important means to develop the struggle for the defense of the Soviet Union is the building of the Friends of the Soviet Union into a mass organization. The Communist Party organizations must assist in the building the Friends of the Soviet Union.

This is completely in line with the sentiment expressed in a pamphlet entitled "Through Workers' Eyes," under Mr. Scherer's secretaryship.

COMMUNIST-CONTROLLED "FRONT" ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. Scherer's continued activity in behalf of the Communist Party is indicated by his consistent and continued sponsor-

ship of Communist-controlled "front" organizations and campaigns, such as—

American relief ship for Spain, Daily Worker, September 14, 1938.

American Congress for Peace and Democracy dinner, Daily Worker, December 12, 1938.

Trade-union sponsoring committee for a Labor Party conference, Labor Party News, May 1936, page 4.

See also his letter to the Daily Worker, January 13, 1938.

LEADERS OF THE F. A. E. C. T.

Other leaders and active members of the F. A. E. C. T. have been identified with the Communist Party or with Communist-controlled "front" organizations:

Walter N. Polakov, contributing editor, Technical America, 1938, official organ of F. A. E. C. T.; signer, open letter for closer cooperation with the Soviet Union (see Soviet Russia Today, September 1939, p. 25); signer, open letter to American liberals (see Soviet Russia Today, March 1937, pp. 14–15).

Ray Aversa, Detroit organizer, F. A. E. C. T., American League for Peace and Democracy, New York City division (see letterhead, March 21, 1939); delegate, Conference on Civil Rights, I. L. D., Hotel Picadilly, December 17, 1938 (see minutes).

Russell McNutt, F. A. E. C. T. representative to the American Youth Congress. (See Technical America, September 1938, p. 6.)

Ives D. Jacquier, New York City, F. A. E. C. T. organizer on W. P. A. projects; veteran of medical service in Spain; Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy. (See leaflet.)

Leonard Sparks, writer of the pamphlet, How to Win Jobs, published by section 1, Communist Party, New York City, on the basis of data furnished by the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians.

Jules Korchien, secretary of F. A. E. C. T.; member, provisional committee for Washington Committee for Democratic Rights (see letterhead, February 2, 1940); consulting architect for the Soviet Government in Moscow and more recently housing expert for PM and Federal Housing Authority; member, board of directors Inter-Professional Association.

Lewis Alan Berne, president, F. A. E. C. T.; endorser, American Congress for Peace and Democracy (see letterhead, January 6–8, 1939); sponsor, American relief ship for Spain (see letterhead, August 3, 1939); member, national labor committee, American League for Peace and Democracy (see letterhead, February 28, 1939; national executive board of the American Peace Mobilization).

Simon Breines, organizer, F. A. E. C. T., New York, housing division; Friends of the Soviet Union, contributor (Soviet Russia Today, December 1938, p. 12); League of Workers Theatres; Film and Photo League; Workers Dance League; contributor, New Theatre magazine (September 1934, p. 40); signer, Open Letter for Closer Cooperation with the Soviet Union. (See Soviet Russia Today, September 1939, p. 25.)

Bernard J. Stern, contributing editor, Technical America, F. A. E. C. T. organ; contributor, Soviet Russia Today, May 1935, page 24; member, American Committee for Struggle Against War (see The Struggle Against War, June 1933, p. 2); League of American Writers (see We Hold These Truths, p. 85); delegate, Pan American Democracy Conference (letterhead, November 16, 1938); signer, open letter to American liberals (see Soviet Russia Today, March 1937, pp. 14–15); chairman, third annual conference, American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born (see Daily Worker, January 10, 1938, p. 4); signer, statement by American progressives on the Moscow trials (Daily Worker, April 28, 1938, p. 4); signer, call for congress of American revolutionary writers (Daily Worker, January 18, 1935, p. 5); member, National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners (letterhead, October 31, 1935); signer, open letter for closer cooperation with the Soviet Union (see Soviet Russia Today, September 1939, p. 28); member, National Committee for People's Rights (see News You Don't Get, November 15, 1938); writer under the name of Bennett Stevens for International Publishers, a Communist publishing house (hearings, vol. 7, p. 4929).

Borice Z. Borise, organizer, F. A. E. C. T., Los Angeles, Calif.; influential member of the Communist Party of California. (See testimony of Joseph Hannon, former member of the F. A. E. C. T., hearings, vol. 3, p. 2046.)

Paul Pinsky, F. A. E. C. T., California; influential member of the Communist Party of California. (See testimony of Joseph Hannon, ibid.)

William Feinberg, F. A. E. C. T. organizer, Detroit; sponsor, trade-union sponsoring committee for a Labor Party conference (Labor Party News, May 1936, p. 4); member, nonpartisan committee for the reelection of Congressman VITO MARCANTONIO (letterhead, October 3, 1936).

Nathan Sparer, structural draftsman in the Brooklyn Navy Yard, cited as a Communist (New York Times, June 26, 1929); secretary, Camp Wocolona.

Samuel Nesin, organizer, chemists section, F. A. E. C. T.; Communist candidate for New York State Assembly, sixth assembly district, Bronx, New York City (Daily Worker, November 3, 1936, p. 4); charter member of the Communist Party; a founder of the Trade Union Unity League; member of the National Committee for the International Labor Defense, 1930, 1931; member of the Executive Committee of the Unemployed Councils, New York City (see hearings, vol. 1, p. 99); member of the District Committee, Communist Party, New York, district 2 (see hearings, vol. 1, p. 130); secretary, Joint Unity Committee of Independent Trade Unions (letterhead June 28, 1935, see hearings, vol. 9, p. 5746); organizer, Trade Union Unity Council (see hearings, vol. 9, p. 5759); member of Communist Party Committee to Support the Spanish People (Daily Worker, July 29, 1936, p. 1); arrested for rioting, New York City.

Aaron Gelman, youth division, F. A. E. C. T.; appeal for Spanish refugees (Daily Worker, July 5, 1940, p. 5).

Lena Davis, State secretary, Communist Party of New Jersey (Daily Worker, March 31, 1939, p. 2); 20 years in the Communist Party (Daily Worker, April 19, 1939, p. 2); member, Communist Party National Campaign Committee, 1936 (Daily Worker, July 20, 1936, p. 2); wife of Marcel Schere.

Sioux Indian Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1941

RESOLUTION BY THE STATE LEGISLATURE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in the Seventy-sixth Congress I introduced a bill known as House Joint Resolution 352, to provide for a Claims Commission to investigate and propose a settlement of pending Sioux Indian claims based on a finding of facts.

The resolution was studied and discussed by the Sioux people at many councils. At their request I have reintroduced the resolution in this, the Seventy-seventh, Congress, and it now carries the number, House Joint Resolution 137.

This House Joint Resolution 137 is identical with House Joint Resolution 352 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, except in two particulars.

The first change is on page 1, where it is provided that at least one member of the commission shall be a Sioux Indian. There was nothing in the old resolution to have prevented the President from appointing one or more Indians as members of the settlement commission; but to insure that at least one would be, I have written that into the new joint resolution.

The second change comes at the very end of the joint resolution. The previous form required that the commission report at the opening of the session of Congress following passage of the resolution. Ordinarily there are a few months between sessions of Congress. In view of what happened last year, however, where one session of Congress ran into the next, I have thought there should be some provision to insure time for the commission to work. So the second change in the resolution provides that the commission may have 6 months in which to make its findings before being required to make its report.

Other than these two changes, House Joint Resolution 137 of the Seventy-seventh Congress is the same as House Joint Resolution 352 of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

Under permission granted by the House, I now place in the RECORD a resolution, duly adopted by the State Legislature of South Dakota, asking for the passage of my resolution which would create a special claims commission to secure a prompt settlement of Sioux claims:

House Concurrent Resolution No. 6

Concurrent resolution, proposing by this resolution, intended as a petition to the Congress of the United States, that the Congress provide by law for the creation of a Special Claims Commission to meet with the Sioux Indians of South Dakota, to effectuate prompt settlement of individual or tribal Indian claims presented and filed under the laws and treaties of the United States with said Indian tribes

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-seventh Legislative Session of State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring):

Whereas the Congress of the United States did enact into law, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1877, certain provisions intended to fulfill, and make compliance with various stipulations and agreements as were entered into in treaties with the several Indian tribes; and

Whereas many claims have been presented by the Indians, and Indian tribal organizations, said claims having been presented over a period of many years, all of which said claims have arisen from alleged violations of treaty rights, and which were intended to be fulfilled and made in compliance with, under the aforementioned act of Congress; and

Whereas such claims have not been acted upon or finally determined and are now pending in the courts of the United States and have been pending in some cases for many years; and

Whereas other and additional claims coming under said act and under treaties with Indians and Indian tribes will be filed from time to time for redress or for benefits due to such Indians or Indian tribes; and

Whereas under present law such Indian claims must be litigated in the courts, and with no prospect of final adjudication for many years after the instituting of said actions upon the same; and

Whereas the Sioux Tribe of Indians and other tribes of Indians are and have been entitled to a prompt settlement of their said claims, and the delay to final settlement and determination has been to the great loss and inconvenience of said Indians; and

Whereas the Sioux Tribe of Indians of South Dakota are now in dire need, and it is imperative for their health, proper living conditions, and their best interests that their claims be speedily adjusted, and that adequate provisions be made immediately for the furnishing to said Sioux Tribe of Indians necessary food, clothing, and other necessities of life pending the settlement of said claims; and

Whereas there was introduced at the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress in the House of Representatives, under date of July 10, 1939, House Joint Resolution No. 352, providing for the settlement of claims of the Sioux Tribe of Indians against the United States brought under the act of June 3, 1920 (41 Stat. 738), in the Court of Claims, No. C-531 (1) to (24), inclusive, and any other claims which said Sioux Tribe of Indians or any one or more of the eight divisions of said tribe hereinabove named may have against the United States, and which said resolution further provided for a commission, to be known as the Sioux Settlement Commission, to be authorized to negotiate a settlement thereof, and further provided the manner and means of settlement thereof; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has failed to act thereon: Therefore be it

Resolved, That for the best interests of the Sioux Tribe of Indians of South Dakota, and in order to provide for the betterment of the health and living conditions of said Indians of the Sioux Tribe of Indians of South Dakota, and at a time when they are in dire and serious need, and in order that a long-drawn-out controversy over said claims be avoided, and in the interests of justice, that Congress proceed to provide by law to carry out the provisions of said Joint Resolution No. 352; and be it further

Resolved, That this joint resolution is intended as a petition to the Congress.

Dated at Pierre, S. Dak., this 8th day of February 1941.

G. T. MICHELSON,
Speaker of the House.
W. J. MATSON,
Chief Clerk of the House.
A. C. MILLER,
President of the Senate.
DOUGLAS W. BARTZ,
Secretary of the Senate.

Don't Hate Roosevelt Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. McKEOUGH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY TIMES

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Daily Times:

[From the Chicago Daily Times]

DON'T HATE ROOSEVELT WEEK

(By Herb Graffis)

Although there must be at least a thousand "weeks" to promote products or causes, there is room for week 1,001, so here goes.

The country is due for a Don't Hate Roosevelt Week.

During the past month I've been trying to find out just what there was against the lease-lend defense bill. Military, industrial, and financial authorities have told me much of the opposition to the bill was based primarily on a hatred of the President.

It is the conviction of many honest, patriotic businessmen who voted against F. D. R. last year that the most serious retardant to adequate and speedy national defense is nothing else but sabotage done by those who hate Roosevelt so frantically they have become the most effective bundsmen Hitler ever had in this country.

It is plain from the votes in the 1940 Presidential election and from the words and actions of the majority of the American people since that time, that it is only a very small minority of our fellow citizens who do hate "that man."

However, it was only a very small minority of the German people that brought on the Hitler dictatorship. The tip is that the minority of Roosevelt haters are far more dangerous to our liberties than they or we may realize.

The unfortunate part of it is that they make themselves look so bad. They'd be beneficiaries of the Don't Hate Roosevelt Week.

They would establish themselves, for a week at least, as having a high regard for truth. They would not go overboard for that wild yarn of Mrs. Roosevelt's Frauenfront, which was cooked up out of bile, gall, and venom, poured into an honest, sound plan for women's work in national defense. The plan was originated by a New York Republican women's organization.

During Don't Hate Roosevelt Week there would be laid aside those charges of vindictiveness which have been hurled at F. D. R. After all, charges of vindictiveness only amuse the thinking public when such charges come, for instance, from a newspaper which for years wouldn't print the name of the late and great La Follette because he wouldn't obey its attempted dictatorship.

Don't Hate Roosevelt Week would be much kinder to those who've been ruining their digestions and mental balance than it would be to Roosevelt. He's doing O. K. for all of us despite the handicaps to America's security and strength volunteered for Hitler by the Roosevelt haters.

Mr. Roosevelt's Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Monday, March 17, 1941:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 17, 1941]

MR. ROOSEVELT'S SPEECH

We feel sure that the President's speech of Saturday evening made a profound impression on all who heard it. Never has he spoken with more force and more fervor. Moreover, the speech is to be read in the light of the Lease Lend Act, by which Congress has embarked on a policy of all-out aid to Britain, and under which Congress has granted the President the most sweeping powers; in the light of the requested appropriation of $7,000,000,000 to finance the act; and in the light of a long series of events by which the country has gradually moved from neutrality to nonbelligerency and now to nonshooting belligerency.

If the speech is thus read, no one will fail to see that the President's call for sacrifice upon the part of every citizen in the land—steel worker or stevedore, machinist or housewife, farmer or banker, storekeeper or manu-

facturer—means exactly what it says. As the President puts it, the sacrifice will express itself in lower profits because of higher taxes and longer hours at bench, plow, and machine. But it will be felt also in many other ways because the country cannot make "a total effort," to use the President's words, without altering almost every phase of our lives.

Perhaps the sacrifices that will be demanded can be more easily imagined by saying that the country is being placed on a war footing. It is not a mere question of sending war supplies to Britain, China, and Greece. To be sure, the whole country is being mobilized to do that. But it is more than that. We are now engaged and the President makes it quite plain in a partnership with those nations that will last "until total victory has been won." It is not necessary at the present time to send men along with our ships, guns, tanks, and planes, but if it does become necessary under this program, men, too, undoubtedly will be sent.

The President has made it clear that we are embarked on an all-out campaign to end dictatorships all over the world, and we urge that his words be read again and again that the full import of them may sink in. The President's goal is to end dictatorship and to substitute for it all over the world the four freedoms—freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom from fear, and freedom from want. It is a noble program, but it is one beset with infinite complexity and one which presents the most colossal practical problems.

In fact, we believe the President's speech would have been more effective if it had been less sweeping in scope and more clearly defined in aim. The defeat of Hitler, which means not only the defense of Britain but the reconquest of the European Continent, is alone a terrific objective; but the President also includes the successful defense of China and the end of dictatorship in Japan in his program. This makes us party not only to a European war but a world-wide war. The war in China has been going on since 1937, but only now is it coupled, in importance to us, with the war in Europe. Would it not be wiser to attempt to destroy one dictatorship at a time, instead of taking them all on at once? Is it not prudent and in accord with first principles of military strategy not to fight a war on more than one front at a time?

As to the President's lack of clarity in aim, he speaks of the issue today as between democracy and dictatorship, freedom and slavery. Is it being too literal to say that Greece is not a democracy but a dictatorship, and that it was ruled with an iron hand by the late Metaxas? Turkey, which is in alliance with Britain, is a dictatorship of long standing. Kemal Ataturk was a dictator, and so is his successor. China, although it established a republic after the downfall of the Manchus, has never been a democracy in our sense and is now, of course, a military dictatorship under Chiang Kai-shek. There is absolutely nothing in common between the American way of life and those of Greece, Turkey, and China. Certainly, in victory, we would not attempt to impose our way of life on our allies if they preferred their own.

If the four freedoms are to be established all over the world, the job is not done with the conquest of Germany and Japan. Another huge dictatorship remains—that of Soviet Russia, a nation covering one-sixth of the world's surface. If this is a struggle between democracy and dictatorship, Soviet Russia, too, must be attacked.

So we think the President would contribute greatly to clearer thinking if he would narrow and sharpen his objectives, since the United States, powerful as it is, should not bite off more than it can chew.

The Farmer's Stake in Transportation—Association of American Railroads Driving for Monopoly of Transportation in the United States—Wheeler-Lea Bill Is the Instrumentality by Which They Hope To Accomplish Their Purpose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS D. CULKIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. FRANCIS D. CULKIN, OF NEW YORK

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a radio address made by me over the stations of the National Broadcasting Co. on the Grange Hour, from Washington, D. C., March 15, 1941:

I greatly appreciate the opportunity to discuss on today's program the subject of the farmer's interest in transportation. It is noteworthy that the first national crusade in which the Grange participated after its birth was an effort to relieve the farmers of the West from excessive and ruinous freight charges. All through the years the Grange has continually fought the battle of the farmers in this field and kept before the minds of our citizens the public's vital interest in this matter.

It reasserted this identical principle in a resolution passed at the seventy-fourth annual session of the National Grange, held at Syracuse, N. Y., in November of last year. In that resolution it calls attention to the fact that the Congress and the Interstate Commerce Commission have failed to protect the public interest in transit costs. In this clear-visioned resolution the Grange urges that water and truck operations should not be hindered or restricted by unnecessary regulations or destructive interference on the part of the Government. In the concluding paragraph of the Syracuse resolution the Grange again rises superior to the propaganda of the railroad and other lobbies by coming out squarely for the highly meritorious St. Lawrence seaway project. Every thinking citizen must find himself in general accord with this sane, constructive program.

FREIGHT CHARGES HEAVY

I recently read an article by Mr. Brenckman, the Grange's able Washington representative, in which he stated that freight costs are the heaviest service charge that the farmer has to pay, and that during the past 2 years the farmer received only 39 cents out of every dollar spent by the consumer for food. The other 61 cents out of every dollar went for transportation and distribution. This condition is one of the most glaring and indefensible faults in our present economic system.

Let me illustrate how vitally transportation affects the farmer. In the Snake River country of Idaho, where wheat is the staple product, it cost the farmer during the depression years all he got for a bushel of wheat to carry it 100 miles, and he was still 900 miles away from his market.

Another illustration: A farmer from the State of Washington wrote me that he had $20,000 worth of apples on his trees; the transportation cost to market was $15,000; barrelling and handling charges cost $8,000; making a total disbursement of $23,000. This left him with a net loss of $3,000 on the transaction, and as a result his apples remained on the trees.

This same farmer wrote me that when he came into the Northwest under the urge of railroad propaganda he was advised that as soon as the country grew up the transportation charges would be substantially reduced. The rates are now some three times greater than when he first began to ship. In passing, may I say that if this particular farmer could get a decent rail rate to the Pacific seaboard and then ship to the East through a toll-free Panama Canal, his carriage charges in the present instance would not exceed $4,000. The farmer under these auspices would then get a living price and the people would get the apples at a reasonable cost.

WHEELER-LEA BILL

In an evil hour Congress passed the Wheeler-Lea bill, which placed coastal and internal waterways and trucks under the jurisdiction of the railroad-minded Interstate Commerce Commission. This bill provided, and its proponents succeeded in convincing Congress, that the regulation of water transportation and truck service would be administered so as "to recognize and conserve the inherent advantages of each type of transportation." It should be remembered in this connection that the carriage charges of bulk commodities by water are normally but 10 percent of the rail charges. It should likewise be remembered that prior to the Commission obtaining jurisdiction over trucks that the truck rates were about one-half of the rail rates. They are now 90 percent of the rail rates.

GRANGE FOUGHT LEGISLATION

In collaboration with the Grange and Congressmen from various parts of the country, I fought this bill when up and voted against it. It was and is my firm belief that the Association of American Railroads are driving toward a monopoly of transportation in America and that this bill is the instrumentality by which they propose to destroy waterways in its coastwise and internal phases and take the independent trucks and busses off the highways. It is my fixed belief that this same outfit plans to destroy the intercoastal water transport and to control all the outlets from the Great Lakes to the sea.

The ink was scarcely dry on the President's signature on the bill when I found my fears amply justified. Through the instrumentality of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which outfit the railroads hold in the hollow of their hands, the railroad group started a new drive for a monopoly of transportation in America.

COTTON FARMER HARD HIT

Judge MANSFIELD, of Texas, an outstanding authority in the transportation field, recently called the attention of Congress to the fact that hard-pressed Texas cotton farmers under the operation of this bill are now paying an increased transportation cost from Gulf ports to New England mills of $2.32 per bale of cotton. It should be eternally remembered that this added cost always comes out of the hide of the farmer himself. This procedure was accomplished by originally lowering the rail rates far below actual transportation costs for the purpose of killing coastwise water transportation and preventing any further investment in that field. The Interstate Commerce Commission has boldly ignored the express mandate of the law which required that the inherent advantages of water transportation shall be recognized and conserved.

Another phase of this far-flung battle line which vitally concerns the mode of living of the American people is the war that the railroad group is now making on the independent trucks and busses, which up to now have played a most important part in the transportation problems of America and, incidentally, pay annually $417,000,000 in taxes. These trucks serve 50,000 communities in the United States which are at present without rail transportation and employ some 3,545,000 men—over three times the number employed by the railroads. By authority of recent preliminary rulings of the Commission's agencies, the railroads are now going into the truck and bus business on a large scale, thus taking over these two types of transportation and in the long run making certain that the American people will pay through the nose for truck and bus service. It is likewise significant that there has been an effort in Congress to place farm trucks under regulation.

RAILROADS PLAYED AN IMPORTANT PART

May I say that I make no war on the railroads. They have played an important part in the development of America and are essential to our national life and progress. I will vote for any legislation that will enable the railroads to put their house in order, even to the extent of substantial loans from the R. F. C. However, I am unalterably opposed to the creation of a transportation monopoly which will destroy both producer and consumer alike.

MONOPOLY AT HAND

I desire to reemphasize that the railroads are driving toward a monopoly of transportation. That time is coming and, in my judgment, it is not far distant, if present auspices continue to control. The illustration I gave a moment ago as to the transportation cost of cotton from Gulf ports is an illustration of what they are doing to water transportation. This destructive procedure will soon follow on our internal waterways, which have been an effectual yardstick against high transportation costs for many years.

ARMY ENGINEERS

I wish I had time to discuss with you in detail the economics of water transportation. The United States Army engineers who have charge of our national waterways are, to my mind, the greatest body of servants in the Republic. No project goes through Congress except after their approval of the economics of the particular improvement. The engineers are under heavy fire from this railroad influence, but they are sticking to their guns and giving transportation relief to all localities where the economics of the situation justify it. They should be acclaimed and sustained by every patriotic American.

MONOPOLY MUST BE STOPPED

Monopoly in the transportation field must be stopped in its tracks if America is to remain a prosperous, growing country. It is difficult at this time, with the national thought and activity concentrated on national defense, to arouse the public on an issue of this sort. But the public should remember that it is at a time like this when the people's thoughts are centered on other things that the special interests get in their heaviest and most damaging blows. It is necessary therefore for public opinion to become active. I suggest that each of my hearers take time out to write letters to the President, to the Interstate Commerce Commission, to their Members of Congress, and the Senate protesting against the present administration of the law which is creating a monopoly of transportation in America. If a sufficient number of you do write, it will help cure this evil situation which is so fraught with economic danger to the American people, both in the consuming and producing field.

I thank you for listening.

Dedication to Humanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. BEAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1941

EDITORIAL BY LUDWIK LESNICKI

Mr. BEAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include an editorial of Ludwik Lesnicki, from a recent issue of the Union Weekly, Chicago, on what America wants. The editorial very briefly expresses the views to which many political writers and commentators subscribe.

The editorial follows:

[From the Chicago Union Weekly]

WHAT AMERICA WANTS

(Ludwik Lesnicki)

Among the many true and inspiring things said by President Roosevelt in his message to the Seventy-sixth Congress, none is truer and more inspiring than this: "Destiny first made us heirs of European culture. Fate seems now to compel us to assume the task of helping to maintain in the western world a citadel wherein that civilization may be kept alive."

This fact sets America apart from the other great nations of the earth. We have no dreams of empire. We have no dynasties nor dictators to act as storehouses for centuries-old ambitions of power and conquest. We cast eager eyes on the possessions of no nation under the sun. We are content to live and let live—to have and let have. Time and time again we have put aside opportunities which few nations would have had the courage to resist. We might have taken Cuba; we did not.

We might have taken indemnities from China; we returned them. We might have seized favorable occasions to extend our territory in this hemisphere. We preferred to stand forth before the world as a protector and not as a despoiler.

Today, when the ambitions of so many nations are expressed in terms of more territory, more power, more influence—this country stands forth as one that wants nothing for itself and asks only for the respect for the elemental rights of liberty and freedom for other nations. We stand forth as great protagonists of humanity, and the language of our national demands falls fitly into the fine and all-embracing phrases which our beloved President Roosevelt knows how to employ so well.

We ask the warring nations for nothing. We ask them to respect those elemental rights which nations must make respected or cease to be worthy of the name.

They have nothing we desire.

But we have much that we desire to keep, and those things, the essentials of nationality and the common possession of humanity, they have taken away from European nations—and cannot and will not take away from us.

We ask nothing for the United States of America except what we have a right to ask for humanity itself.

For their own purposes some foreign nations have created and maintained among themselves the legend of America's preoccupation with dollars only.

President Roosevelt's above-quoted statement answers the familiar, foolish libel by reaffirming this Nation's ancient dedication to humanity.

What Would Sam Rayburn Do?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1941

EDITORIALS FROM THE MADILL RECORD AND OKLAHOMA CITY TIMES

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include an editorial from the Madill Record, of Madill, Okla., in my congressional district, and also a letter I wrote to Mr. Herbert J. Pate, editor of the Madill Record, commenting on the editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial and lettter referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Madill (Okla.) Record of March 13, 1941]

WHAT WOULD SAM RAYBURN DO?

The following editorial was published recently in the Oklahoma City Times:

"A MILITARY ROAD NEEDS FIXING

"The people of southern Oklahoma, we believe, are justified in keeping alive their complaint about the condition of highway U. S. No. 70, which parallels the Red River from Broken Bow to Waurika and beyond.

"Some stretches of the road are so rough that heavy traffic from the lumber-milling centers in McCurtain County to Lawton or Altus turns south into Texas and travels the Texas parallel road, not because it is nearer but because it is a better and safer road.

"Many truckloads of lumber, sometimes as many as 30 truckloads a day, are moving from the mills at Broken Bow and Wright City across the southern rim of the State to Fort Sill. This heavy hauling will continue through most of this year, and a little later the hauling will increase with the setting up of the big Altus-Lugert project. Highway U. S. No. 70 is the natural route for this traffic to follow. But most of these trucks turn south at Hugo, cross the river to highway U. S. No. 82 on the Texas side, and stay in Texas until they turn north into Oklahoma again. They detour into Texas because the Oklahoma road is too rough. The stretch of No. 70 from Madill to Durant is almost impassable at times, and the thin surfacing on much of the road from Durant east to Valliant has been pounded into chug holes.

"The good old Democratic counties of McCurtain, Choctaw, Bryan, Marshall, and Jefferson don't deserve this kind of treatment. They have always voted 'right.' Or have they? But this road is a military highway. At least, it has been a military highway for the last year and will gain importance as such as long as the national-defense emergency exists. The State and Federal road authorities should not wait until 1942 to begin fixing this road. It needs fixing now."

Thanks. It really is disheartening to sit here in Madill and watch traffic leave Okla-

homa as quickly as possible in order to get to a good east-and-west highway. We cannot find it in our heart to blame even our own citizens who do this very thing—day after day.

Highway No. 70 should carry a lot of traffic, but it doesn't. If SAM RAYBURN were chairman of the Roads Committee in Congress and represented this district in Washington, southern Oklahoma would have a passable highway.

COMMITTEE ON ROADS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 18, 1941.

Mr. HERBERT J. PATE,
Editor, the Madill Record, Madill, Okla.

DEAR MR. PATE: I have read the editorial in the March 13 issue of the Madill Record under the heading "What Would SAM RAYBURN Do?" in which you quote an editorial from the Oklahoma City Times headed "A Military Road Needs Fixing."

Both editorials referred to the need for further improvement of Highway No. 70 in southern Oklahoma, in which I fully share your interest. I am glad that you and the Times have publicly called attention to the years of neglect of this important highway and pointed out some of the benefits its proper improvement will bring to our State.

I feel honored that you inferentially compared—or contrasted—me to my good friend and neighbor, the able and distinguished Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, of Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN, of course, occupies a much more important place than the chairmanship of any committee of the House, and in many respects his power and influence is second only to that of the President of the United States. He has been a Member of Congress continuously since March 4, 1913, or for more than 28 years. Only 3 Members out of the 435 in the House have had longer continuous service. He was beginning his fifteenth year of service here when I entered upon my first term in 1927.

The Fourth District of Texas is fortunate indeed to be represented in the Congress of the United States by a man with his experience and seniority and his great ability.

And if SAM wants to move to southeastern Oklahoma and represent our district in Congress, I'll resign or retire in his favor. I agree with you that he is an abler and more experienced Representative than I am, or than anyone else our district could elect.

But SAM, honest and forthright as he is, would be the first to tell you and others in our district that no Congressman—not even the Speaker of the House of Representatives—can control the expenditure of State and Federal-aid highway-improvement funds in his State or district.

Every mile of Highway No. 70 in Oklahoma is under the complete jurisdiction of the Oklahoma State Highway Commission, which, as you know, is appointed by the Governor of Oklahoma and confirmed by the Oklahoma State Senate—not the United States Congress. And the Federal Government has no right or authority to invest or expend 1 penny on that highway without the voluntary cooperation and participation of the State.

Since passage of the first Federal Aid Act in 1917, the Congress has appropriated from $5,000,000 to $500,000,000 a year to aid the States in building a connected system of highways and roads. A fair and just proportion of this money has been apportioned to Oklahoma, in accordance with a formula specified in the law, based on population, area, and road mileage. But initiative in the expenditure of these funds rests, by law, with the States, and no use of them for any purpose is possible without initiation by the respective State highway departments. The States match the Federal-aid funds with State funds, and also have the responsibility of obtaining rights-of-way and preparing plans and specifications for construction projects.

If you have any practical suggestion as to how any Congressman, under our form of government, can bring about improvement of a particular highway route in his district, when the highway is under the control and jurisdiction of the State government, I am sure that Mr. Speaker RAYBURN and other Members of Congress will be as interested as I will be to find out just how this may be done.

I was interested also in reading the feature story by Harold F. Johnson in the Daily Oklahoman of Sunday, March 9, 1941, on the Durant-Denison Dam, which contained the following reference to Highway No. 70:

"United States Highway No. 70 is an arterial thoroughfare across southern Oklahoma and is Durant's main outlet west to Madill and Ardmore. About 10 miles of this road must be relocated before the waters rise, and a new bridge must be built across the Washita. United States Army engineers have plans for this—and other roads, railroads, and bridges—all ready, the entire cost of which will be borne by the Federal Government. But as long as the Governor's opposition continues, of course, the State highway department isn't being helpful in the relocations.

"Plans of the United States engineer office at Denison call for early advertising, probably within the next 3 weeks, of a contract for relocation of the Frisco Railroad. This falls generally within the Madill-Durant area. It will involve about $3,000,000, much of which will go for labor. A 5,200-foot bridge will be built across the Washita near Durant."

That is presumably a nonpartisan report of some improvements to highway 70, and near Madill, which the Federal Government is ready to make now.

Due to the unusual circumstances this was a case where the Federal Government could and did provide specifically for some highway improvements in our district, "the entire cost to be borne by the Federal Government."

If there is any delay in making them, do you think it will be the fault of the chairman of the (House) Roads Committee in Congress?

If you can suggest how Speaker RAYBURN could get this work under way without delay, or secure any other improvements to Highway No. 70, he is our good friend and neighbor and I feel sure that he will be glad to try to help us.

I might remind you that, according to the latest report of the Public Roads Administration, Oklahoma had a balance of Federal-aid highway funds available for programmed projects, as of January 31, 1941, of $5,694,541, and a balance of Federal-aid funds available for secondary- or feeder-road projects of $1,209,791. Incidentally, every dollar of that was authorized and made available to the Oklahoma State Highway Commission by legislation which I introduced and sponsored here.

Matched with State funds, this would make possible some $14,000,000 worth of new road construction in Oklahoma, for which projects may be submitted at any time by the State.

I would like to see this money programmed and expended as quickly as possible, and, of course, I would like for a substantial part of it to be used for improvements on Highway No. 70, which runs all the way across our congressional district.

I believe you know that as chairman of the House Roads Committee I have had a leading part in making these funds available to our State. In simple fairness, don't you feel that my authority and responsibility, as a Federal official, largely ends at that point?

Also, some additional millions of Federal-aid road funds for Oklahoma have already been authorized by the Hayden-Cartwright Act of September 5, 1940, which will become available on January 1 next year.

And special appropriations for highways of national-defense importance will probably be made soon, of which I anticipate Oklahoma will receive some two or three million dollars. As tentatively planned, these funds also will be expended in cooperation with the State highway departments. Would you advise a different policy?

Very seriously, I should like to have your opinion and suggestions as to what you, if a Representative in Congress, would do to try to get Highway No. 70 properly improved. What do you think I can do, that I haven't done, as chairman of the House Roads Committee, in the interest of this, or any other particular highway in our district? Just what do you think Speaker RAYBURN could or would do now, if he represented our district in Congress, to secure specific highway improvements in southern Oklahoma?

In the interest of accuracy, before closing I should like to call special attention to the heading on the Times editorial which you quoted—"A Military Road Needs Fixing." And the statement in the last paragraph of that editorial: "But this is a military highway. At least it has been a military highway for the last year and will gain importance as such as long as the national-defense emergency exists."

I wonder just what the Times means by the term "military highway"? My understanding is that there are no military highways, as such, in the United States.

I enclose for your consideration a map showing a system of highway routes which have been designated by the War and Navy Departments as the routes of principal importance from the standpoint of national defense. This system, totaling approximately 74,600 miles, is generally referred to as the "strategic network."

The routes included in this strategic network were selected by the War Plans Division of the War Department General Staff, and I assume that there was no more politics or congressional influence in their selection than in the designing of a battleship.

Anyway, you will notice on the map, which has been revised to October 25, 1940, that neither Highway No. 70 in southern Oklahoma, nor Highway No. 82 in north Texas, are included in the strategic network as now designated. Army officials say that this network joins all important centers of defense industry and all military and naval concentration points. Its main lines include the interregional highway system recommended by the Public Roads Administration in the report Toll Roads and Free Roads (copy of which I am sending you under separate cover), and with few exceptions the routes shown are included in the Federal-aid highway system.

I know of no other official designations of highways in our State, or elsewhere, which would justify their being referred to as military highways? Do you? Or does the Times?

However, if Highway No. 70 in our State had been a part of the strategic network since approval of the Pershing map in 1922, apparently this would not have assured the programming of funds for its improvement. You will probably recall that last year the State of Oklahoma submitted to the Public Roads Administration a proposed $5,000,000 Federal-aid highway program which did not include any improvement on the 625 miles of highways in our State which are designated by the War Department as of primary military importance.

At the direction of the President, the Public Roads Administration, in collaboration with the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense and the War and Navy Departments, recently made an intensive survey of and a special report on our highway facilities from the viewpoint of national defense. I think printed copies of that report will soon be available and I shall be glad to send you a copy if you are interested.

Cordially yours,

WILBURN CARTWRIGHT.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1941

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that there has been any bill before Congress since I have been in Congress that I have studied so carefully and thought about so thoroughly as I have H. R. 4050, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the national defense, to provide aid to the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, and for other purposes.

This bill involved an appropriation of $7,000,000,000 and was predicated upon the lend-lease bill, known as H. R. 1776, and now known as Public Law No. 11. I was bitterly opposed to the lend-lease bill, talked against it on the floor of the House and voted against it, because I did not believe in the dictatorial power contained in that bill.

Nevertheless, the great majority of both branches of Congress voted in favor of the bill. The President signed it, and it became the law of the land. After it became the law, it was my duty as Congressman to stand for its enforcement so long as it remained the law of the land. The bill H. R. 4050 was a bill to appropriate $7,000,000,000 to implement the lend-lease bill. It was a tremendous amount of money and will involve considerable hardships for the taxpayers of the United States. However, the bill was advocated by the administration, by the Secretary of the Navy, by the Secretary of War, by Mr. Knudsen, of the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense, as the best means of keeping the United States out of war.

Under the terms of this bill the administration could aid any government whose defense was deemed vital to the defense of the United States. The proponents of the bill repeatedly stated that by providing the munitions of war and other material to the nations abroad, it would be the most effective means of keeping us out of the actual European warfare.

The people of the United States love peace. We want to spare America the ravages of war. We want to spare American boys the necessity of baring their breasts to the bullets of the dictators. We want to spare American homes the sadness, the sorrow and distress, and suffering and death that always follow the wake of war, and it is because we hate war and because we love peace, that this bill was deemed not only a help to the democracies abroad, but an insurance to our own country that we would remain out of war.

Not only that, it was repeatedly stated by the proponents of the bill that 95 percent of the defense articles purchased under the terms of this bill are to be such material and implements as may be used by the United States, if the times should come when we should need to use those articles. I want to emphasize that point. The vast stores of implements of defense which we are making ready will be such that may easily and readily be turned to the use of America, if the day should come when we would need to use them for our own defense.

While I was bitterly opposed to the lend-lease bill, I am so thoroughly interested in my own country that my judgment would not allow me to oppose H. R. 4050. I have repeatedly stated that I will vote for every appropriation deemed necessary for national defense for the Army, Navy, and Air Corps, until America reaches such a state that no nation dare attack us here. I voted for this bill, as did 335 other Members of Congress, because I felt that the security of the United States was best protected by its adoption.

The President has repeatedly stated that no American boy should be sent to fight on European soil. It was stated by the proponents of the bill that those munitions of war manufactured in this country could be obtained by the European democracies here and transferred at their own risk to their home country. If the President is sincere, and I believe he is, then this bill by providing the necessities and implements of war to European democracies, should strengthen them and by strengthening those democracies, establish a greater protection to our own country.

I am bitterly opposed to sending American boys to engage in this European conflict, and I was willing to vote this vast sum of money in the hope that it might better insure peace at home. We should appropriate this vast sum of money, difficult as it will be for the taxpayers to pay, if by so doing, we are safeguarding our American boys at home and preventing the necessity of sending them again to become embroiled in a European conflict.

Abraham Lincoln—Man of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1941

ADDRESS BY JUDGE ANDREW R. SCHOTTKY

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very impressive address, entitled "Abraham Lincoln—Man of the People," delivered by the Honorable Andrew R. Schottky, a superior judge of Mariposa County, Calif., before the Merced Rotary Club, on February 12, 1941:

Today is the birthday of Abraham Lincoln. Today all over the civilized world, wherever democracy endures and liberty is exalted, the name of Abraham Lincoln is spoken with reverence. David Lloyd George, former Prime Minister of England, said not long ago: "I doubt whether any statesman who ever lived sank so deeply into the hearts of the people of so many lands, as did Abraham Lincoln." No man could overcome the obstacles that Lincoln had to overcome and attain the pinnacle attained by Lincoln without a reason. In this brief address I shall endeavor to point out some of the things that made the greatness of Abraham Lincoln and why his fame has endured and increased through the years.

Abraham Lincoln was born in Hardin County, Ky., on February 12, 1809. He was reared under conditions of great poverty. In 1816 his family moved from Kentucky to what is now Spencer County, Ind. From 1816 to 1830 he lived in Indiana, and during that time he attended school not more than 1 year in all. However, he was a studious lad, and improved every opportunity that he had to obtain and read good books. At the age of 19 he was 6 feet 4 inches tall and had remarkable physical strength. In 1830 his father moved to Macon County, Ill., and there between 1831 and 1833 Lincoln was a clerk in the New Salem store, and later conducted a country store, which was unsuccessful, and then became postmaster of New Salem. He borrowed law books from a neighboring practitioner and spent his evenings in the study of law. He was admitted to practice in 1836.

In 1834 he was elected a member of the Illinois Legislature, and remained in the legislature for 8 years. In 1837 he commenced the practice of law at Springfield, the capital of Illinois. In 1846 he was elected to Congress, serving one term. When his term in Congress ended, he returned to the practice of law and was not active in politics for several years.

In 1854 when the entire country was aroused over the Kansas-Nebraska bill regarding the admission of slave States to the Union, Lincoln again came to the front and took an active part in public affairs. He protested that "slavery is founded on both injustice and bad policy," and that under no circumstances should it be extended to the territories. A few years later, in 1858, when the controversy over the extension of slavery had become even more intense, Abraham Lincoln accepted the Republican nomination for United States Senator from Illinois, and in accepting the nomination, he delivered an address which at once stamped him as the leader of the forces opposed to the extension of slavery. In that speech he said:

"A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved; I do not expect the house to fall; but I do expect that it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other. * * *

"We shall not fail—if we stand firm, we shall not fail. Wise counsels may accelerate, or mistakes delay it; but sooner or later, the victory is sure to come."

His opponent in that election was Stephen A. Douglas, the little giant of western politics, then United States Senator from the State of Illinois, who, like most of the politicians of that day, considered the slavery question from the standpoint of political expediency. Douglas was afraid to face the real issue of slavery and attempted to hide behind the doctrine of squatter sovereignty, while Abraham Lincoln took the position that human slavery was wrong, and that under no circumstances should it be extended to the Territories. Then followed the memorable Lincoln-Douglas debates, which were carried on throughout the State of Illinois. In the election that followed Douglas was elected United States Senator, but Abraham Lincoln had impressed himself upon the Nation as a man who had the courage to face the fundamental question that was involved and to urge the

solution of that question not on the basis of temporary political success but on the basis of the highest welfare of the Nation.

In 1860 Lincoln was nominated for the Presidency by the Republican Party and was elected President in November of that year. Upon the news of his election the long-expected division of the Nation upon the slave question occurred. South Carolina soon seceded, and others followed until there were 11 States in the Confederacy. On the 11th day of February 1861 Lincoln spoke a few words of farewell to his own people in Springfield, and with a sad heart turned toward the Capital "to assume a task more difficult than that which devolved upon Washington." The outlook was indeed gloomy. He was inaugurated on March 4, 1861, and in his first inaugural address he endeavored to set forth his position clearly with reference to the seceding States and also to plead for conciliation. I quote a portion of that first inaugural address:

"I therefore consider that, in view of the Constitution and the laws, the Union is unbroken, and to the extent of my ability I shall take care, as the Constitution itself expressly enjoins upon me, that the laws of the Union be faithfully executed in all the States. Doing this I deem to be only a simple duty on my part, and I shall perform it, so far as practicable, unless my rightful masters, the American people, shall withhold the requisite means, or, in some authoritative manner, direct the contrary. I trust this will not be regarded as a menace but only as the declared purpose of the Union that it will constitutionally defend and maintain itself. I am loathe to close. We are not enemies but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature."

On April 12, 1861, the war actually commenced with the attack on Fort Sumter, and from that time on Lincoln's administration was largely devoted to the suppression of the rebellion. On January 1, 1863, President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation freeing all of the slaves in the Confederate States of America. During the dark days of the Civil War the patience, perseverance, sagacity, and statesmanship of Abraham Lincoln sustained the forces of the Union, and slowly but surely the forces of the South were overcome. In 1864 he was reelected President, and when he was inaugurated for the second term on March 4, 1865, the end of the war was already in sight, as it was evident that the South could not hold out much longer. In his second inaugural address Abraham Lincoln uttered sentiments which he hoped would draw the North and South together after the bitter Civil War, closing his address with these words:

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphans, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and a lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

On April 9, 1865, Lee surrendered to Grant at Appomattox, and the Civil War was virtually over. Abraham Lincoln's purpose was accomplished—the Union was saved. The entire Nation rejoiced, but in the midst of rejoicing there came a great shock. While attending the theater in Washington on the night of April 14, 1865, Lincoln was shot by John Wilkes Booth, a fanatical secessionist. The President died the following morning. The North was paralyzed; the South was stunned; the whole world was shocked. This good man, of humble origin who, step by step, had ascended the ladder of fame, who had tasted of the fruits of victory, and who had drunk of the dregs of defeat; who through sheer perseverance and strength of moral character had attained the highest pinnacle in his career, was to be no more. Who can deny that, had he lived, the history of the reconstruction period would have been materially changed? The conservative, conciliatory, steady hand was forever stilled; the radicals and extremists obtained unrelenting control. Had Lincoln lived, much of the bitterness that arose in the South during the reconstruction days would have been avoided.

Abraham Lincoln had an abiding faith in the judgment of the people. He was first and foremost a man of the people. On one occasion he said:

"Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people? Is there any better or equal hope in the world?"

I shall never forget my visit to the historic battlefield of Gettysburg a few years ago. It was there that the battle was fought which turned the tide of the Civil War definitely against the Confederate States. The thing that impressed me most was not any of the strategic points of the battlefield but was the national cemetery in which are buried the Union soldiers who fell in that battle. And in that cemetery is a monument marking the spot where Abraham Lincoln stood when he delivered the greatest of all memorial addresses, his Gettysburg Address, on the occasion of the dedication of that cemetery. As I stood on that hallowed, historic spot, gazing at the row upon row of soldiers' graves, in fancy I could hear the Great Emancipator deliver that inspired, matchless address, and in fancy I could hear him close with these words, which should challenge every American:

"It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Lincoln dared to think. While this was the principal constituent of his public character, it alone would not have made him great. He greatly dared to act upon convictions that to him were as profound as a religion, and as the result he bore his cross in enduring silence to that Gethsemane which inevitably awaits the man who, by the leaven of his spirit, endeavors to inspire the clay-bemired feet of mankind even an inch further toward that fair horizon toward which humanity has been striving since first we became conscious that we possessed souls. And so he suffered the martyrdom that at last has enshrined him in a special holy of holies in the heart of every American.

How easy it would have been for Lincoln to have followed the easier way. No especial obligation rested upon him to undertake the task that others had shirked. From the beginning the statesmen of America had been evading the inevitable, the inexorable issue of slavery, and had been compromising on that issue. A lesser man would have been content to leave it to others to attempt a problem whose solution was already overdue. Not so Lincoln. When he found himself face to face with an issue upon the resolving of which the future of his country depended, his statesmanship became sublime. The country plow boy, the Illinois storekeeper, the struggling lawyer, the developing statesman, almost overnight became an American demigod, whose fame has increased with the passing of the years and which will endure throughout the ages.

Today, as we think of Abraham Lincoln and revere his memory, a dark cloud hangs over our civilization. A new and sinister figure has risen to a place of tremendous power. This is the figure of Adolf Hitler, the Reichsfuehrer of Germany and the master of Europe, who with his lesser ally, Mussolini, has turned their peoples away from the truth and is trying to impose upon the world what he calls the new order. By their works we know them, and we know that this new order is a very old order; indeed, it is the foul order of slavery.

Listen to some extracts from Hitler's Mein Kampf, which is rightly called the Nazi bible, and see how the views of Hitler differ from the views of Abraham Lincoln who believed in government of the people, by the people, and for the people. I quote:

"The folkish State, therefore, has to free the entire leadership from the parliamentary principle of the decision by the majority" (669).

"The state in its organization, beginning with the smallest cell of the community up to the highest leadership of the entire Reich, must be built on the principle of personality. There must be no decisions by majority, but only by responsible persons, and the word 'council' is once more reduced to its original meaning—at every man's side stand councilors indeed, but one man decides" (660).

"As to the possibility of carrying through these ideas, I want you not to forget that the parliamentary principle of democratic majority rule has not always dominated mankind, but, on the contrary, it can be found only in very small periods of history, which, however, have always been periods of decline of nations and states" (671).

We are told by Hitler and Mussolini that our form of government is outworn, inefficient, a thing of the past; that government of the people, by the people, and for the people is sure to perish from the earth. We are asked to fall on our knees in a system where one man decides for all what they shall think, read, hear, eat, drink, wear, and do—a system, the essence of which is fear, the secret police, the firing squad, the concentration camp and torture. We are told that this is the new order and that we must conform to it.

It was the aim and purpose of the wise and patriotic men who met in Independence Hall in Philadelphia in 1787 to give to our new Nation a constitution that would endure through the ages. Their task was to establish liberty and justice as well as a government. They understood the civilizations of the past and had studied the failures of government in every age. They were familiar with the cruelties of unbridled power. They determined to erect a government dedicated to all the noble purposes of government and at the same time so restrained as not to be able to deprive the humblest man of rights which they had declared in the Declaration of Independence to be unalienable—the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And so they drafted the greatest Constitution of all history, that Constitution which Abraham Lincoln revered and sought to preserve. That Constitution sought to establish a new order for our Nation and the world, a new order of freedom, democracy, peace. And neither the railings of dictators from without, nor the burrowing of enemies from within will ever prevail against that Constitution.

We know not what the future may hold for us, but we must be amply prepared for any eventuality. We can never subscribe to the doctrine that might makes right, we can never approve the ruthless trampling under foot of human rights and human liberties, or

the violation of the sovereignity of free, peaceful peoples. No bridge of understanding can be built between our Nation and the totalitarian nations because the dictators have proved to us that their pledges cannot be believed. They have discarded for themselves and for their peoples the whole code of international morality. Force, unrestrained by morality, is their creed. Our way of life is in danger. Our Christian civilization is in danger.

And as we today pay loving tribute to Abraham Lincoln, the supreme American of our history, let us highly resolve that our country will play her proper part in the present world crisis. Let us remember those words of Lincoln, uttered in his first inaugural address, when the Civil War was already in progress:

"Intelligence, patriotism, Christianity, and a firm reliance on Him, who never yet has forsaken this favored land, are still competent to adjust in the best way our present difficulty."

I close with these lines from Kipling's Recessional:

"The tumult and the shouting dies;
The captains and the kings depart:
Still stands thine ancient sacrifice,
An humble and a contrite heart.
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget, lest we forget."

Food as a Political Instrument in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1941

ARTICLE BY KARL BRANDT

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the following article, entitled "Food as a Political Instrument in Europe," has been written by Mr. Karl Brandt, and appears in Foreign Affairs, an American quarterly review, in the issue of April 1941. Mr. Karl Brandt was formerly professor of agricultural economics at the University of Berlin. He is now an economist with the Food Research Institute at Stanford University in California.

This article deals principally, as its title indicates, with food as a political instrument, and discusses its use as a political instrument by the Nazi government of Germany. It has been generally understood in this country that the use and distribution of foodstuffs by the Nazi government has been scientifically controlled, but I believe that very few Americans understand the full import of that control.

In addition to the discussion in this article, which is based largely upon quantitative factors, it is hoped that the author will write another article dealing with the qualitative factors as well as the quantitative factors.

It is well known in scientific and dietetic circles that in the course of rationing food it may be so distributed that one group or another may receive in their food rationing more or less of the various vitamins. By rationing food in such a way as to distribute less of certain vitamins, effects may be had upon the consumers of the food that may either increase or deprive them, for example, of the feeling of physical well-being through increasing or decreasing the amount of vitamin B complex in the ration. It is also possible to accomplish many other purposes through control of vitamin factors.

The article by Mr. Karl Brandt follows:

[From Foreign Affairs for April 1941]

FOOD AS A POLITICAL INSTRUMENT IN EUROPE

(By Karl Brandt)

To Americans the word "food" has fairly simple connotations. Food satisfies man's most basic and urgent need, and so seems eminently an affair of civilian economy. It is "our daily bread" of the Lord's Prayer—the stuff that keeps people from going hungry. Whether a person gets his share or not generally depends upon his income and food prices. For two decades, moreover, our Government has been worried by the presence of too much rather than too little food. It has tried to master the unwieldy food surplus in order to help the farmer, and has made a virtue of necessity by distributing surplus supplies free of charge among the needy and unemployed.

In the course of the public debate in this country regarding the European food problem, Americans have shown that they are thinking too largely in conventional physical terms. They speak about shortages created by the hostilities on land and sea, about food losses and destruction, about the consequent threat of famine to civilians, and about how to transfer enough from our land of plenty to relieve the stricken areas. Such thinking is natural enough in a democratic country where there is an abundance of the consumer goods typical of a competitive price economy. But the resulting picture is incomplete. The American public is not yet aware of the full implications of what is really going on in connection with Europe's production, distribution, and consumption of food.

II

In the totalitarian state food has ceased to be simply food as we all know it—a commodity of civilian origin and destination. It has acquired new and different aspects. It has become a complete chest of tools in the workshop of the modern tyrant. Even statistically food has been driven underground. Information on how much is harvested, imported, exported, lost, or fed to the people is now a military secret, guarded almost as carefully as the blueprints of a new bomber. Hence, a survey of Europe's food situation cannot at the present time be nearly so accurate as one compiled before the war. The economist must patch together incomplete statistics and bits of circumstantial evidence drawn from a multitude of unconventional sources.

In this total war, every nation considers food and feed essential factors in their struggle for eventual victory, along with coal, oil, electric energy, fibers, minerals, and metals. They know that thrift and foresight must be used in connection with them all. The German totalitarian state in particular, in preparing for war, made its food control a model system for all the phases of its rigid, thoroughgoing, centralized, planned economy.[1]

From the moment the Nazis seized the reins in Germany they copied the Soviets in transforming food from an economic end into a political means. Food became an instrument for executing domestic policies, for forcing the integration of the race, for persuading farmers to cooperate, for breaking the backbone of processing industries, for weaning a "degenerate" and miseducated people away from luxuries and unheroic attitudes. The granting of food became a premium for accomplishment and the withholding of it became a punishment for failure or dissent. Food could establish equality or set up distinctions, it could liquidate inferior individuals and groups, it could play Santa Claus or the big bad wolf. Since food is an inescapable necessity for the human animal, the Nazis saw what a beautiful instrument it could be for maneuvering and disciplining the masses. Their control of food put their thumb at the throat of every man and woman, of children as well as of the aged.

During the Third Reich's 6 years of peace and 18 months of war, numberless legislative and administrative decrees have given effect to this new concept of food as an all-round political instrument. The concept is entirely harmonious, of course, with the philosophy underlying the totalitarian state. If man's destiny lies in the survival of the fittest group in perennial warfare, and if his virtues flower under the enforced discipline of military command rather than in a harmonious relaxation of self-respecting citizens, then obviously it becomes a postulate of statesmanship that food is a political and military instrument. Once this idea has been conceived, it is only a matter of time before the Lord's gift of bread turns into Mephisto's rod, coaxing or cajoling, crushing or breaking, in the hands of der Fuehrer, Il Duce, El Caudillo, and the master of the Kremlin.

In the struggle of the democratic nations to survive they must understand all the techniques of their opponents, including their food policy. They must, so long as the war continues, resist aggression in every field by taking countermeasures in that same field. To fight the war strictly as gentlemen may mean the death of all gentlemen.

III

The result of efficiently engineering a nation's food policy is to give the entire food economy unprecedented elasticity. It is freer than in a "free economy," because it is relatively well protected against disturbance and can ignore both increasing costs of production and popular resentment arising from higher prices and consumer controls. Today, it is safe to say, the Germans are fairly well fed, despite a lack of some commodities; and they will probably continue to be well fed so long as they do not lose control of the conquered Continent.

The Nazi regime started its Erzeugungsschlacht, or battle of production, in 1934, in imitation of Mussolini's earlier battaglia del grano. Food imports were curtailed, farm prices for food were raised, dealers' margins were narrowed, and consumer prices were raised moderately. Agriculture, the food processing industries, and trade were studied and reassembled in accordance with the blueprint of the food cartel. Every living soul, whether farmer or laborer, grain dealer or milk retailer, thereby became a soldier in the Reich food estate, subject to the equivalent of martial law and bound to obey it on penalty of losing his freedom or his neck.

This revolutionary reconstruction of the food estate was undertaken to prepare it to withstand the test of war. The next step was to condition the consumer psychologically, to change his eating habits and the customs of kitchen management. The master minds who planned total war anticipated shortages and hardships. Hence, they put their best nutrition specialists, dietitians, economists, and psychologists to work to devise a streamlined rationing system that would feed the people sufficiently well, that would permit the regulation of the carryover through a tightening or loosening of the national belt, and that would be proof against

[1] Karl Brandt, The German Fat Plan and Its Economic Setting, Stanford University, California: Food Research Institute, 1938.

bootlegging. On the morning of the day the war against Poland began, September 1, 1939, ration cards were distributed to the German population. Rationing had been tried out long before with textiles and all sorts of other materials, and animal husbandmen had been subjected to feed rationing. In Germany, rationing is not an indication of existing real shortages of foodstuffs. It is an engineering and political science.

Addressing the German workers at the Rheinmetall-Borsig works in Berlin on December 10, 1940, Hitler[2] elaborated on the food-rationing system. "We want to avoid one person having more of the most vital commodities than another," he said. "Not everybody is in a position to buy a Titian, even if he had the money." And he added: "But in the case of food, everybody must be served." This is the socialistic refrain. But although such an égalitarian policy aims at preventing the rich from gorging or hoarding food, it establishes a class distinction between the various groups of recipients of rationing cards. First comes the "warrior caste," embracing the armed forces, the Gestapo, and to some extent the party militia. Next come the most skilled and essential laborers. Further down the scale come the unemployables, the aged, the incurably sick. At the bottom come those to whom it is an act of grace to give any rations at all: Prisoners, inmates of insane asylums and concentration camps, and Jews. Food cards express the quotation of the utility of citizens to Leviathan.

Allotments of higher rations are one means of promotion. They signify approval for laborers who pass from the unskilled to the skilled category, or from easier to harder work. One of the basic considerations is, of course, the actual caloric requirement for maintenance of any useful person's physical fitness. But a multitude of entirely different and partly contradictory calculations—including consideration of larger economic problems and astute political estimates—also come into play.

Rations may be lowered simply to accumulate greater reserves. Temporary limitations may be used to impress the people with the seriousness of the general situation, even when actual supplies on hand would allow more generous rations. Or extra rations may be granted to bolster morale in a difficult moment, even though stores thereby are drastically reduced. Cutting off luxuries prepares the people for being thankful later when a trickle of them reappears—some coffee, a little whipped cream, candies or chocolate. After the French collapse, when the German masses remained apathetic, special rations of modest luxuries were distributed to create an atmosphere of cheer and enthusiasm.

When the ministry of propaganda or the gestapo deems it advisable to play a more radical tune it turns the wrath of the masses against the capitalists by starting single-meal campaigns. Or a plan for compulsory public kitchens turns up, with the hint that a Spartan cuisine would have a good educational influence on epicureans. Hoarding or bootlegging food, or violation of the rationing laws, carries the death penalty, or in minor cases a term in a concentration camp.

IV

Food has also served the Nazis as an instrument for outmaneuvering their political opponents in neutral countries and for exacting complaisance. In fact, control of foodstuffs, including annual staple crops such as grain and sugar, or perishables such as milk, eggs, meat, fruits, and vegetables, is the main way in which the Nazis overcome patriotic resistance. It works particularly well in agricultural countries. Agriculture is relatively less elastic than industry. If the demand slumps, prices crash, and farmers default on taxes and interest. Countries with a large agricultural export are therefore most vulnerable in the game of squeeze, and the Nazi strategists have exploited the fact.

The technique used to force an agricultural country to yield, first to economic domination and later to military and political domination, is incredibly adaptable. One method is to concentrate in one hand all the foreign food purchases for the whole German nation, 80,000,000 strong. This single authority offers to buy a gigantic volume of goods in the country in question at fairy-tale prices; it sets the conditions, political or otherwse; it sees that its tempting offers become known through agents and by radio and the newspapers; and then it sits back to wait for the farmers to "turn the heat" on their governments, knowing that in all agrarian export countries the farm bloc is the most powerful of all political-pressure groups. Payment is arranged through a clearing arrangement with the national bank, which has to provide the interim payments to the farmers in national currency. Once the nation in question is in the grip of a big and powerful debtor it has to do as it is told or lose everything.

Knowing the inner structure of their victims, all their weak spots, the German experts in foreign trade, food, and feedstuffs have had an easy time preparing for "peaceful conquest." By outbidding competing countries with arbitrarily chosen higher prices; by granting subsidized credits and clearing agreements; by buying on a national scale in certain selected transactions; and by the simultaneous use of diplomatic and military pressure, Germany succeeded, between 1933 and 1939, in forcing the proportion of exports taken by her from Bulgaria, Greece, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Hungary, and Turkey from a former low of 15 percent to a high of 40 percent. Simultaneously she forced these countries to raise the percentage of their purchases in Germany, so that instead of representing 19 percent of their imports[3] these represented 46 percent.

Since actual warfare began, these forms of pressure have been supplemented by various schemes resulting in the inflation of the currencies of the neutral or conquered countries. The ratio between the mark and the currencies in question is arbitrarily fixed, and so are the prices offered by the German Government for foodstuffs. Indeed, nominally neutral countries like Hungary and Bulgaria, which have a food surplus have established rationing in order to force larger exports of food to Germany. Thus you may live in a neutral country that has food aplenty, but this does not guarantee that you will be allowed to eat it. If the food squeeze exercised from Germany becomes strong enough, not only the urban population but even the farmers themselves may have to suffer from malnutrition due to an unbalanced diet (though perhaps sufficient in calories), until for some reason of strategy the pressure is relaxed.

All the Balkan countries which, as I write, are still neutral—Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Hungary, and the European part of Turkey—are in the same boat so far as food is concerned. If they resist Germany, their food surpluses will cause them grave trouble; if they play ball with her their bread basket still will be hung high. Sweden and Switzerland are in a better strategic position, even though from a military standpoint they are at Germany's mercy, because both are food deficit countries. Switzerland will be able to adjust her agricultural production. And Sweden is so important both as a source of industrial raw materials and as a purchaser of German industrial goods that certain needed food imports are permitted by the Germans to pass from occupied Denmark into Sweden. Moreover, as neutrals, both Switzerland and Sweden benefit from receiving British navicerts and from German willingness to let them import through the blockade.

Incidentally, if this German technique were ever tried against the Latin American countries, it would work magnificently in most cases. It also would work well against Canada, Australia, New Zealand. If Hitler should occupy the British Isles, thereby gaining control over Europe's normal purchases, amounting to an average of $2,500,000,000 a year in the Western Hemisphere alone, he could throw every one of those countries into political convulsions and stir up violent hatred against the United States. To do this he would not need to make a single military move.

V

It is in the conquered and occupied countries, of course, that the totalitarian food strategy is applied in its fullest extent. Central Poland, before the war part and parcel of an agricultural surplus producing country, is exposed to the worst suffering. The hatred and contempt which the Germans feel for the Poles has led them deliberately to aim at wiping Poland out as a national entity. This central area has been severed from the annexed parts of west Poland, and into it are being dumped increasing numbers of people considered undesirable. The food situation there, as a result, grows worse and worse. Only the large potato crop and American relief activities prevent complete disaster.

Czechoslovakia, with its strong industrial backbone, receives different treatment, because it belongs in the orbit of the "Greater Reich." In fact, the food situation in the Czech and Slovak areas does not differ much from that in the Reich and Austria.

Norway has had a hard time because its supplies of grain, leguminous vegetables, sugar, fats, and fruits are short under the blockade, even though in normal times she is able to export annually 200,000 tons of fats, 85 percent of her catch of fish, and 65 percent of her potato crop. Her fisheries still yield enough for her to send train loads daily to the Reich.

Denmark fares best among all the occupied nations. Although the Danes still stubbornly maintain their tariff border, the area is, for all practical purposes, incorporated into the Reich. Food and feed are rationed. In 1940 chickens and pigs were cut down to half. Cattle were also cut heavily, though the herd of dairy cows was kept almost normal. All the butter, bacon, eggs, and cattle that can possibly be spared are sold to Germany. Instead of exerting direct pressure in Denmark, which might diminish the supply at the source, Germany has resorted to the methods of an otherwise greatly despised liberal economy—she has raised prices to such a height that foodstuffs are produced and flow freely southward over the border. Indeed, for the last quarter of 1940 the German fat monopoly raised its prices per ton for Danish butter from 2,400 kroner in 1938 and 2,750 kroner in August 1939 to 4,500 kroner.[4] For the first quarter of 1941, the price has been boosted to 5,000 kroner for the first 8,000 tons, 4,250 kroner for the next 4,000 tons. Thus Denmark has a real export boom. By December 31, 1940, her former debit on clearing account had turned into a 1.5 billion kroner balance in her favor.[5]

The Dutch likewise find themselves in a favorable situation, even though, like the Danes, they have lost their British market. Their state, a model of intensive and up-to-date farming, has been closely integrated with Germany. Huge shipments of Dutch vegetables, butter, cheese, and meat roll eastward day and night. The incentives are

[2] Facts in Review, January 20, 1941, p. 22.

[3] Wochenberichte, Institut für Konjunkturforschung, XIII, September 3, 1940, p. 105.

[4] This price applied to the first 12,000 tons. Beyond that the price was 4,750 kroner. Cf. Neue Zürcher Zeitung, November 15, 1940.

[5] New York Times, February 2, 1941.

skyrocketing prices, paid in depreciating guilders, and the withdrawal of German duties. Dutch farmers desperately need an outlet. German purchases prevent wholesale bankruptcy. The only risk from the point of view of the Germans is that stubborn Dutch political resistance might force them to impose penalties, but they will avoid this if possible, because, as in the case of Denmark, Holland is too valuable an asset in the Reich's wartime food economy to be ruined.

Belgium, as the European country with the greatest density of population and next to Switzerland the highest degree of industrialization, is probably in the worst straits of any of the occupied territories. However, there is a great difference between Germany's treatment of the Belgians and the Poles. Immediately after the occupation of Belgium the German authorities began to cooperate with the Belgian administration in planning adjustments in the production, distribution, and consumption of food. Belgium is short of fats, fluid milk, grain, and potatoes; but she has an excellent sugar-beet crop and some milk and vegetables. While Norway, Denmark, and Holland have bread rations of roughly 80, 90, and 89 ounces per capita per week, the Belgian ration is only 56 ounces.[6] To promote efficiency, industrial workers are allowed up to 112 ounces. Some food is said to be passing into Belgium with navicerts through the British blockade. But the minimum supply of staple food needed can be arranged only by Germany, by transport either from Soviet Russia or the Balkans or out of her own reserves.

In occupied France food is strictly under German control, but the situation is much better than in Belgium, the wheat-bread ration being 87 ounces a week. The occupied region contains France's main wheat, sugar-beet, and dairy areas. But these are also the principal scene of the present Battle of England. R. A. F. bombings, Germany military movements, and civilian evacuations disrupt transport, trade, and administration so that local shortages are common.

Industrial unemployment is widespread in Belgium, Holland, and occupied France, while in Germany, with German war industries booming and German armies spread out all over the Continent, there is a desperate shortage of skilled labor. Consequently Germany is eager to import as many mechanical workers as she can, especially from the Low Lands, France, and the Scandinavian countries, where skilled labor is particularly well-trained and hard-working. Food is the lure used to secure them. German employment agencies offer jobs in Germany to unemployed Belgian, Dutch, and French workers. If these refuse, they lose their rationing cards. Sometimes rationing cards are withheld from workmen—who then are informed that plenty of food can be had in such-and-such a German industrial center.

Unoccupied France has been maneuvered into an exceedingly difficult situation. Vast numbers of refugees are crowded into a small area which is ill prepared to secure or distribute the supplies necessary. Communications and transport are strained, the civilian administration is overburdened, hoarding and bootlegging produce inequalities and, in many spots, shortages. Rationing, so far, has been badly organized and remains largely ineffective. In view of this the reduced (though still not alarmingly low) ration of 74 ounces of wheat bread does not mean very much one way or another.

The territory under the Vichy government produces winter vegetables, fruit, and wine, but is short of grain and fats. Wheat came normally from northeast France, now occupied, and the former imports of tropical vegetable fats—normally from 500,000 to 600,000 metric tons net annually—are no longer available. While the chess game between Pétain and Hitler continues, the Germans have no intention of relieving the food situation in unoccupied France. Indeed, food is one of the men in the game. Thus the French people read that Germany has promised to ship 100,000 tons of potatoes from Germany to Paris.[7]

All the occupied areas have to support vast German armed forces. On the other hand, Germany feeds, on German supplies, probably an equal number of prisoners of war and drafted foreign laborers. There still remains a large net profit for Germany in this account, however, since prisoners receive the smallest and German soldiers the highest per capita ration. Moreover, German soldiers buy and send home all the bootlegged and nonrationed food they can find.

VI

In general, we see, the European food situation no longer can be measured in ratios of physically available supply and more or less urgent demand. Although crops and stocks still act as delimiting factors, the civilian food ration is determined largely with an eye on other matters. The most orderly and satisfactory situation, of course, prevails within the boundaries of Greater Germany. In Italy, too, bread is free of cards. In the neutral, the nonbelligerent, and the conquered countries every sort of condition prevails, from one roughly approximating that in Germany down to real stringency.

It would be going too far, however, to say that conditions everywhere are strictly what the German conqueror wants them to be. He took 6 years to build his totalitarian power economy at home. It works there with the precision of a carefully built and solicitously tended machine. But in the conquered territories he had hurriedly to superimpose similar methods upon radically different economic systems. Neither the psychological coordination and control, nor the technical execution, approaches the perfection achieved in Germany proper. This is why there is general disorder in the European transportation system, universal disruption of wholesale and retail trade, speculation, and a lack of information regarding stocks. All these factors hamper the proper distribution of the food which is available and assigned for use.

The longer Nazi legions and administrators rule the Continent the more order they will restore. Since the threat of undernourishment, or even actual starvation, is the canker that destroys public morale, all governments, conqueror and conquered alike, concentrate their energies on banishing this fear. And they have made remarkable progress. The point to remember is that the commanders of the German Army of occupation, with the keys to the big granaries in their pockets, will tighten or relax their grip not in accordance with the size of available supplies of food but according to the dictates of broad political strategy.

VII

Late this spring, probably, will come the critical period in Europe's food problem in this war. Thereafter the food situation will tend to become less tense, even in such hard-pressed areas as Poland, Belgium, unoccupied France, and Spain. With the coming harvest, if the weather favors, the energetic German drive to work out necessary adjustments may well begin to show astonishing results.

The yield of the Danubian Basin and the Balkan countries in food and feed crops is not likely, in general, to increase substantially (except for a larger oilseed output, especially in Hungary). Yet the more advanced agricultural methods introduced by the Germans will give new proof of their efficiency and will exploit all the latent skill of the farmers. Practically all of the northern and the middle parts of central and western Europe will show increased agricultural production. The acreage devoted to potatoes, sugar beets, and mangels will be drastically increased, and more calories will be produced on the same acreage of cultivated land.[8]

All these root and hoe crops require an increase in draft power, in manual labor, and in fertilizer. These things can be provided. The armies of the occupied nations will be demobilized, horses will be turned back to the farmers, oxen will be used where horses are too few, nitrogen and potash fertilizers are plentiful, and industrial unemployment prevails. Nothing is more sensible, then, than to turn to more hoe crops.

Indications are that greater Germany and all the occupied areas except Norway are preparing to do so. Even Belgium expects to be self-supporting in grain in the new crop year by boosting the wheat area from 160,000 to 260,000 hectares, and the potato acreage from 147,000 to 177,000 hectares. At the same time, the extremely productive small family gardens in the suburbs of all the European cities will turn out more small fruit and vegetables in due season. True, in Holland, Belgium, Norway, and Denmark the poultry flocks have been cut by emergency slaughtering to less than one-half, and the hog population has been reduced considerably. More calves and young cattle have been slaughtered than under ordinary conditions. But these inroads have not, contrary to press reports, reached alarming proportions; and as feed supplies improve, the number of chickens and pigs may well increase again fairly quickly. In the Danubian countries the stock has definitely been increased.

If in 1941 the war does not turn into a sweeping movement of invading armies on the Continent itself, and if a general crop failure does not occur, we are probably safe in assuming that the threat of famine will gradually vanish, though a dearth of fats will still persist, and eggs, fluid milk, and cream will continue to be scarce. The need for activity by the Red Cross and by local relief associations in the various nations will persist, especially on behalf of children, the poor, and prisoners. Finland, Spain, and unoccupied France have already received some overseas supplies under British navicert; recently French convoys from North Africa reached Marseilles without being molested by the British. Finland has obtained 20,000 tons of edible oils, bacon, and pork from the United States. Moreover, the United States and Great Britain have agreed to a more flexible treatment of medical supplies and concentrated foods shipped under navicerts.

This appraisal of the European food situation may seem overoptimistic. But pessimists often forget that the Continent's total import deficit in foodstuffs before the war did not amount to more than 5 percent of its bread-grain requirements or 6 percent (10,500,000 tons) of bread- and feed-grain requirements combined. The real shortage is in fats—1,300,000 to 1,400,000 tons. Germany today has an untouched war reserve of 6,500,000 tons of grain, and this alone would permit her to adjust the situation in countries of greatest need without seriously depleting her stocks. The fat deficit will persist, but it will decrease as potatoes, sugar beets, and mangels become available for feeding hogs, cows, and sheep, and as more oilseeds, such as rape, are grown. A herd of 100,000,000 pigs now consumes tremendous amounts of feed which could be used as human food. Before starvation gripped

[6] Wheat Studies of the Food Research Institute, January 1941, p. 238. This issue gives detailed bread rations for 12 countries.

[7] By the end of November she had actually shipped 8,000 tons. Potatoes, be it noted, are free from rationing in unoccupied territory.

[8] Potatoes yield two or three times as many starch calories per acre as does wheat or rye; sugar beets from four to six times as many.

the population this herd, along with cattle and sheep, would be slaughtered and eaten. Furthermore, exceptionally high prices of food and feed in all areas outside of Germany will certainly stimulate increased production and will enforce the utmost thrift in consumption. At present the greatest pressure seems destined to fall on England because of her shipping losses.

The Nazis consider themselves complete masters of the European food situation. On September 30, 1940, Walter Darré, German Secretary of Agriculture, stated that there would be "no special difficulties to overcome" in occupied countries, and that the available food supply was greatly underestimated abroad.[9] He did not think it necessary to lay any blame for food shortages on the British, though he naturally would have been tempted to do so. On January 7, 1941, the German Ambassador in Madrid, Dr. Eberhard von Strohrer, insisted that Spain did not need a hundred-million-dollar credit from the United States, because Germany was in a position to carry out an offer to provide her with all the gasoline and other supplies she needed from Rumania and Russia.[10] On February 11, 1941, the radio brought the news that a joint German-Belgian commission had negotiated food shipment from Soviet Russia to Belgium. In February Russia offered Norway to barter a million tons of Russian grain for Norwegian aluminum. Immediately Germany interfered. The Nazis do not object to relief supplies coming into Europe if they have no political implications. But they consider the regulation of Europe, including feeding it, their affair—their self-assumed right as well as obligation. It is a key factor in their new order.

In conclusion, it may be worth while to reflect upon the role played by food in the World War. Food alone did not win that war. In October 1918, General Ludendorff forced the German Chancelor, Prince Max of Baden, to sue for peace within 24 hours. He did this because the German Army had lost the battle of Amiens and would have been thrown back to the Rhine by Christmas. Certainly the food stringency was one of the factors which had exhausted the fighting stamina of the nation as a whole. Yet even in November 1918 the front-line troops still were well fed. The Nazis have laid their plans well. They are determined that no shortage of food will arise to create even as much difficulty for their juggernaut as it did for the Kaiser's. Our sympathies must not be allowed to distort our judgment about the role of food in the tremendous struggle ahead. Appraisals of the food and raw-material situation made before the commencement of the Battle of Norway and the Battle of France still hold.[11]

The Nazis will think twice before spreading pestilence and starvation in western Europe so long as they can avoid it easily. But if their plans go awry, if starvation does impend, they would and could manage so that famine would proceed in concentric rings from the extremest rim toward the German center of the fortress. In this process they would dispose of the lives of the 150,000,000 hostages they now hold without batting an eye. This is their true advantage from the conquest of the continent.

The blockade impedes the wheels of Hitler's war machine, but that machine is not going to be halted for lack of food or raw materials. The present Nazi domain contains too large resources for that, so long as they are exploited by the skillful politico-economists who drew up the blueprints of the Nazi economic tyranny. The Nazi machine will be defeated only by superior diplomacy, superior steadfastness and superior military strength.

[9] New York Times, October 1, 1940, p. 9.
[10] New York Times, January 8, 1941, p. 5.
[11] Karl Brandt, Germany Behind the Blockade, Foreign Affairs, April 1940.

Oppose Federal Taxation on State and Municipal Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1941

RESOLUTION BY THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE ASSOCIATION OF BOROUGHS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, with the present heavy expenditure of Government funds, which come primarily from the pockets of the taxpayers of America, we are confronted with an attempt to further hamper the property owners of America by the proposed Federal tax on State and municipal bonds. America has always pointed with pride to the many home owners in this country, and encouragement has always been given to home ownership.

The proposed Federal tax will increase the cost of the operation of local and State government, and taxpayers will be called upon to bear the burden of such an increase. The result of such a Federal tax imposed on State and municipal bonds has caused concern to the political subdivisions of the State affected by such legislation.

The following resolution opposing the imposition of a Federal tax on State and municipal bonds was adopted by the Pennsylvania State Association of Boroughs at their thirty-first annual convention in Harrisburg, Pa., February 27 and 28 and March 1. This resolution contains many compelling reasons why such a proposal should be defeated.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the Treasury Department of the Government of the United States has heretofore expressed to and urged upon the Congress of the United States its recommendation that the evidences of State and municipal indebtedness be subjected to Federal taxation; and

Whereas during the year 1940 the aforesaid recommendation was inquired into and it admittedly became apparent that the burden of any such taxation must necessarily resolve upon the municipalities and State issuing such evidences of indebtedness and thus add to the burden of real-estate taxation; and

Whereas admittedly real estate is presently overburdened and the taxation upon real estate should be relieved and not added to; and

Whereas such proposal would be contrary to all of our established concepts of constitutional division of powers and independence of functions between the several units of government; and

Whereas the inevitable consequence of any such proposal would be to subject municipalities to the financial domination and ultimate control of the Federal Government, thus tending to destroy the fundamental safeguard of democratic government, the independence of home rule; and

Whereas during the year 1940 committees of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and of the Senate of the Congress of the United States conducted inquiries into the feasibility of such proposal, as a result whereof, in September 1940 the said recited proposal of the Treasury Department of the United States was decisevely rejected by the Senate of the United States; and

Whereas, notwithstanding such rejection, the Treasury Department of the United States has again urged upon the Congress of the United States its desires for the imposition of said recited tax, this time upon the theory that such tax would be in aid of the defense program of the Government of the United States; and

Whereas the said recited proposal of the Treasury Department bears no proper relation to the defense program of the United States and any increased revenue to the Government of the United States would be "diminimous" and any such proposal would inevitably tend to destroy the independence of the governmental units designated as local government and would thereby tend to destroy the cornerstone of the democratic principles which it is the avowed purpose of the Government of the United States to defend: Therefore be it

Resolved, and it is hereby firmly and highly resolved by the Pennsylvania State Association of Boroughs in convention assembled, That it is the unalterable consensus of opinion of this convention that the position of the Pennsylvania State Association of Boroughs as heretofore expressed in opposition to said recited proposal of the Treasury Department of the Government of the United States be reaffirmed; and be it further

Resolved, That the officers of the State Association of Boroughs be and they are hereby directed to use their best efforts in opposition to said recited proposal; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to each and every one of the Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States representing therein the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

(This resolution, on motion of Mr. Julian Barnard, chairman of the resolution committee, was carried unanimously by the 970 delegates of the convention.)

St. Patrick's Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1941

ADDRESS OF HENRY F. BOYEN, POTENTATE, ISLAM TEMPLE, ANCIENT ARABIC ORDER NOBLES OF THE MYSTIC SHRINE

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Mr. Henry F. Boyen, potentate, Islam Temple, Ancient Arabic Order Nobles of the Mystic Shrine, at Shrine's St. Patrick's Day luncheon in San Francisco on Saturday, March 15, 1941:

Ladies and gentlemen, the greatest monuments of the world are not wrought in iron and steel. They are not cut in stone or chiseled in marble. They are wrought of words and deeds, for by words and deeds alone can you build the spirit of a people.

We who are gathered here are a part of the great spirit of liberty that is America. More than 10,000 men and women, Catholic, Protestant, and Hebrew, under one roof, in free America, to break bread together and pay our tribute in our way to St. Patrick, who built his monument in the spirit of his people and so across the centuries has lived in the hearts of men.

We do not gather to glorify any particular religion, nor is the word "tolerance" sufficiently expressive of the ideal we cherish here. There is something richer and deeper that underlies it all—that comes with the force of heaven, for the right to worship God is not man created but heaven sent, and its exercise the finest expression of liberty the world knows.

Liberty is the common ground upon which good men of all creeds may unite, stand together, each affirming and assuring to the other his right to worship God according to his lights and the dictates of his conscience.

We gather to honor St. Patrick. We dedicate this luncheon to the unity and the liberty of this America of ours. We Americans love liberty—the liberty that was bought for us in all the battles by land and sea, that made America free and independent. If we ever lose this liberty, we would buy it back with our lives, our blood, and our fortunes. It has been preserved for us by all the generations that have gone before; it could be lost by just one. So we in our turn must find within ourselves the divine spark, fan it to a flame of glorious determination that liberty shall live.

Our Nation has been the hope and aspiration of subject races throughout the world for a century and a half. Yet there are those who want us to lose faith in ourselves, to lose confidence in our institutions.

They whisper doubts and suspicions with a thousand voices, appealing to man's baser nature, preaching hate, religious intolerance, destruction of the great moral principles that have carried man from the Stone Age unto this. They want liberty to fail here. We must fight back such philosophy. We must rise as a single unit to make the common fight for the common right as parts of and not parts from America. We must call back the spirit of the pioneers—the men and women who stood as the sentinels of humanity upon the outskirts of civilization. Those who laid the foundations of our Nation, suffering all of the hardships without enjoying any of the power that was to flow from it. It is our duty in our turn to lay our stone in the temple of liberty that its base may ever broaden to support the America of advancing years, for it is our hope that we are her builders not only for this day but for an unending succession of even more glorious tomorrows.

We have been thrilled by the lives of Washington and Lincoln. We have drawn our inspirations from the graves of our unnamed dead and undoubtedly each one of us at some time in his life cherished a secret hope that he, too, might serve our Nation so that he might earn his lodgings in the "Inns of Immortality where sleep our illustrious great." If you ever hoped for such an opportunity, it is here and now, for never in the history of the world has a generation been accorded the chance to serve itself, to serve God, that is accorded to our own, for the fabric of civilization is being destroyed before our very eyes and what we in America do is going to determine the course of human history for centuries to come.

The history of the world is but the story of man's struggle against tyranny, autocracy, darkness, and oppression. All about us dictators are attempting to turn back the hands of time and are denying to their own citizens the fundamental rights of free men, of free speech, of free thought; of the right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience. Liberty is disappearing with a speed and completeness that stuns the imagination of the world. The world needs the inspiration that only free and liberty-loving America can give, for here alone does the light of liberty continue to burn and the philosophy that every man is king.

The call goes straight to the heart of every true American: Climb the ramparts, man the watch towers, become the sentinels for God, for humanity, for liberty.

We have chosen the leadership for this hour; let us each say: "I am an American. I intend to stay an American. I will do my best to wipe from the heart hate, rancor, and prejudice. I will sustain my Government, and, through good days or bad, will serve my country to the best of my ability."

As I face the flag of our Nation I am reminded of the flag presented to Abraham Lincoln, which bore an inscription of two verses of Joshua:

"Have I not commanded thee? Be thou not afraid. Be thou of good courage, for the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest. As I was with Moses, so shall I be with thee. I will not fail thee. I will not forsake thee."

Glorious promises for the President of our Nation. Men and women of America, let us face the flag of our Nation, emblem of the happiest free people in all the world today, and out of our hearts say to that flag in the promises of Joshua: "We will not fail you. We will not forsake you. We build for the unity of our land and may God ever hold you safe and at peace in the hollow of His almighty hand."

Are We to Reap the Whirlwind?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a 6-year program of public works which would constitute a "shelf" or "reservoir" of construction projects for use in time of need has been outlined by the National Resources Planning Board. The program was outlined in a report transmitted to the Congress on March 17 by President Roosevelt, who commended it as a means of maintaining "a strong and healthy national economy" and of preparing for "after-emergency adjustments."

Thus Mr. Roosevelt recognizes publicly that the situation in which we today find ourselves as a people and a Nation holds grave—very grave—possibilities of economic disaster after the war is over, and our defense mechanism has been built.

We will reach that "after emergency" problem with a Federal debt which no man today dare even try to estimate. We know, however, that it will be vastly greater than any debt any nation ever dreamed of in the history of mankind.

For the past 6 years many Members of the Congress have been warning that the spendthrift policies, and the superexpensive experiments and the costly panaceas might lead us to economic ruin and chaos if we got into a war.

It is now recognized by the soundest thinkers of this country that this grave danger does now menace us. Therefore it behooves us to exercise the greatest possible efficiency, to practice the most rigid economy possible in the governmental expenditures, even for defense, without impairing the quality of our national defense or the speed of its construction.

There is still too much loose thinking on economic questions among New Deal economists.

Mordecai Ezekiel, economic adviser to the Secretary of Agriculture, recently testified before the Senate Monopoly Committee that it would be necessary to prevent what he called oversaving if a post-defense depression is to be headed off.

These same views have been coming out of the Treasury Department from time to time. Ezekiel said:

> You can close the gap between savings and investments by the Government borrowing the hoarded savings and spending them.
>
> You can close the gap and at the same time keep the Budget balanced by having the Government tax away the hoarded savings and spending them. Or you can close the gap without action by the Government if business will so equalize the income as paid out by business that high-income groups are no longer able to save amounts in excess of the amounts needed for investment.

It would appear from a common-sense viewpoint that the surest way to produce a post-war depression in the United States would be by the Government taxing away and spending all of the savings of the people resulting from the increased expenditures of funds for national defense and war purposes, leaving no backlog of accumulated savings to provide consumer purchasing power when millions of soldiers are demobilized from military service, and at the same time millions of workers in defense and war industries are demobilized and turned out of their jobs. If at the time these demobilizations take place there is not a big reserve of consumer purchasing power with which the individual citizen can satisfy his desires and thereby provide work for industries no longer needed in defense work, we will go into economic chaos in spite of all that we can do.

It is equally true that the frantic spending of inconceivably great sums of credit money for defense work and war purposes will create a gigantic flood of new consumer purchasing power. It is also true that if some control of prices is not established prices will rapidly rise under the impact of this new flood of consumer purchasing power and we will be caught in a quick and highly dangerous inflationary boom.

It seems obvious therefore that there must some way be created by the Congress to preserve a wholesome and economically safe balance between earnings, spending, prices, and savings. If some way is not found to effectively encourage savings of wages and other incomes against the time of demobilization and cessation of war-defense work, these earnings will be recklessly spent as they are earned; prices will rise to unsound and ruinous levels, and we will face the

necessity for expenditures of more billions for vast public works to maintain the people in a new and vastly greater depression than we have experienced in the last 10 years. Such a depression would ruin this Nation and, in all probability, overthrow our present form of constitutional government.

If at the end of the defense effort, and the cessation of the war, farmers and wage earners have a healthy backlog of savings, those farmers and wage earners will be politically independent farmers and wage earners.

If, on the other hand, however, the Ezekiel-Treasury Department theories of the Government taxing and spending these accumulated savings is carried out, then farmers and wage earners will be left without a backlog of accumulated savings at the end of the defense effort and the war. In such case they will be dependent upon the Federal Government for work and income. This would keep them in the power of the political bureaucracy. Those who are leaning on the Government for support naturally tend to vote to keep in power those whom they believe are ladling out the public money to them.

Authoritarian Trend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE GRAND RAPIDS PRESS

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Grand Rapids Press of March 18, 1941:

[From the Grand Rapids Press of March 18, 1941]

AUTHORITARIAN TREND

Those who wish to keep an eye on the trends toward authoritarian government in Washington should note the latest expression of the Treasury Department suggesting lower individual income-tax exemptions combined with a system of "forced savings" among those in the lower income brackets.

The proposed scheme is that a percentage of workers' wages be deducted by employers to be saved for application on income taxes when due. The Washington bureaucrats apparently believe that small wage earners would not voluntarily lay aside sufficient funds to meet their taxes under lower exemptions.

To the average liberty-loving citizen a measure such as this would appear an unwarranted encroachment upon the private life of the individual. It may be branded moreover as class legislation of the rankest sort, placing a stigma of incompetence on the lower wage earners.

The Government has no moral right to segregate the wages of its citizens nor to determine their disposition before taxes are due. At least it would have no right to such action under democratic principles. It is authoritarian government which reaches down to control the private affairs of its citizens.

The Treasury's suggestion is just one of many signs that the scramble for war money endangers private rights. A vigilant public will be necessary to prevent a steady encroachment.

German Strategy: 1914 and 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1941

ARTICLE FROM FOREIGN AFFAIRS FOR APRIL 1941

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, Mr. "X," the anonymous author of the following article entitled "German Strategy: 1914 and 1940," is evidently a soldier of parts and a keen student and analyst of strategy in war.

This article appears in Foreign Affairs, an American quarterly review, in the April 1941 issue. The article follows:

[From Foreign Affairs for April 1941]

GERMAN STRATEGY: 1914 and 1940

(By X)

A commander in chief is not in a position to begin a war as a chess player may begin a game with a new gambit. He has to take over a play which has been opened by others—that is, the statesmen—and then carry it through according to the rules of the game. His strategical opportunities are thereby limited. In the long history of war more campaigns have been lost on account of a wrong political start than by subsequent strategical mistakes. More wars have been won by the élan, the passion, and the will to sacrifice of whole nations than by the genius of commanders.

It is in the political preparations and the use of political opportunities that we find the outstanding distinctions to be made between the strategical situation which faced Germany in 1914 and that which faced her in 1940. The German Army and German leaders of 1940 profited by mistakes of the past even more fully in the political field than they did in the field of purely military operations.

In 1914 the war began with the political odds against Germany. Close collaboration between the Chancellor and the chief of the general staff was needed urgently after the Bülow period, but it did not exist. The Chancellor, Dr. Bethmann-Hollweg, clung to the hope of reaching an understanding with England. The chief of the general staff, Gen. Helmuth von Moltke, had no such hope. He had no political imagination and he lacked the ability to foresee the psychological and political effects of his strategical maneuvers. He wavered between the fear that the Austro-Hungarian Empire might break up if the war were postponed and the fear that the German Army would not be ready for its superhuman task before 1916. He was perturbed by the shift of the French general staff in 1911 from a defensive to an offensive strategy. His only idea of parrying this threat was to speed up mobilization and to plan to attack Liege on the fifth day after mobilization. His whole plan was rigid and bound to a strict timetable. His army commanders likewise became academicians. No last-minute change to meet unforeseen alterations of the political scene was possible.

In the summer of 1914 the rulers of Germany were not able to show any flexibility of mind in meeting the changed conditions created by the murder of Archduke Franz Ferdinand and by the early Russian mobilization. Neither the chief of the general staff nor the Chancellor was able to take advantage of Britain's hesitation to define her obligation under the Belgian neutrality pact of 1839. If the British Cabinet had decided that the German passage through the valleys of the Meuse and Sambre did not violate that treaty, then General von Moltke would have been justified, at least politically, in carrying out the plan to attack Liege on the fifth day after the beginning of mobilization. Since a majority of the British Cabinet decided for the opposite interpretation, as any good judge of the prevailing temperament could have foreseen, the premature attack on Liege became a major political mistake even though only a minor military one. It took the Chancellor by surprise. Germany was brought into a disastrous impasse, diplomatically and politically, without gaining any decisive military advantage.[1]

The combination of constructive military and political imagination in one and the same man is extremely rare in history. Frederick the Great had it. Napoleon had it. In 1866 and 1871 no one man in Prussia had it. However, William I managed to prevent the frequent differences of Bismarck and Moltke from attaining serious proportions. Again, in 1914, as we have just seen, no one German had it. In France, too, in 1940 there was no such combination in one person, and no personality capable of enforcing close collaboration between the political and Army leaders.

There is a striking parallel between the way in which the strategical position of Germany slowly deteriorated before 1914 and that in which France's did before 1940. In each case the process was due to neglect of political opportunities. It seems to be an inevitable psychological sequence that the fiber of a victorious nation softens in time, while that of a defeated nation stiffens. No statesman or general can isolate himself from the mentality which surrounds him. In the words of Moltke, an army is never so weak as on the evening of the day when it has been victorious. The same holds true for a nation which assumes that a lasting political superiority can be guaranteed by a total peace. Such a nation underestimates the jealousy of former allies and neutrals. It will try to postpone new military risks at all costs. It will accept a series of diplomatic defeats. But eventually there will be a violent reaction within the nation itself which may force the political and military leaders to give battle at a moment when it would be wiser to accept one more diplomatic defeat.

Of course, there is no comparison in magnitude between the diplomatic defeats of France in the decade preceding this war and those of Germany in the two decades before 1914. The descent of French power and prestige in the years before 1939 was without parallel in its swiftness. In the summer of 1931 Germany still was totally disarmed, Great Britain had voluntarily disarmed, and all Europe, with the exception of France, was near economic collapse. At that moment France's military alliances with the Little Entente and Poland made her appear so overwhelmingly strong that the French thought it possible to dictate their own financial and political terms to the rest of Europe. Here

[1] Cf. Gen. Wilhelm Groener, Das Testament des Grafen Schlieffen, p. 216.

was the beginning of the estrangement of Anglo-Saxon public opinion from France. At the same time the countries of southeastern Europe began to realize that their economic future lay not in France but in Germany. The European financial debacle, for which French politics were partly responsible, was bound to have repercussions in France as well. Nations which face the consequences of such crises immediately and courageously, in spite of violent internal reactions, will be stronger in the end than those which try to escape by purely monetary expedients.

The fall of the Doumergue Cabinet in 1934 and the failure to pass urgent reforms were symptomatic of the illness from which France was suffering. Everywhere on his diplomatic tour of Europe Barthou encountered skepticism regarding France's ability to solve her internal problems and to meet her military obligations to her allies. This skepticism was increased by France's failure to oppose the military reoccupation of the Rhineland in March 1936. The sacrifice of Locarno was a turning point in European history. The French General Staff hesitated to act unless the Government authorized a full mobilization. The mere order for total mobilization would have been sufficient at that moment to bring about the collapse of the Hitler regime. From then on the deterioration of the European order was rapid. The sanctions against Italy left Mussolini dependent on Germany for economic support. The financial consequences of the Spanish war, and the German occupation of Austria, increased this dependence. Germany's rearmament proceeded at full speed. Britain and France still procrastinated.

The German occupation of Austria directly threatened the strategical position of Czechoslovakia, and hence the existence of the Little Entente. Instead of facing the facts the French indulged in utopian legislative controversies and changes of government. The consequence was social unrest among all classes of the population—a condition unfavorable for any military action in a modern war. On the basis of our present knowledge we cannot say definitely that France, Britain, and Czechslovakia were in a military position to make war successfully at the time of Munich. From the purely military point of view it would certainly not have been wise to start the war only to save a few Sudeten German counties for Czechoslovakia. But the Siegfried line had not yet been completed. For the Allies to sacrifice half Czechoslovakia's military strength to the Nazis, and then to await the completion of the Siegfried line, was tantamount to suicide.

The final occupation of Prague completely altered the military balance of power in Europe. Five Czechoslovak panzer divisions and 40 other Czechoslovak divisions disappeared from the list of potential Allied forces in the event of war with Germany. With the Czech arms thus acquired, Germany was able to arm 40 divisions which until then not only had not been well trained but had not even been fully equipped. The actual shift in favor of Germany in the military balance was therefore equivalent to 80 divisions; nor was that all. Poland's strategical position became precarious. France, which 4 years earlier could have mobilized half of continental Europe against Germany, was thus isolated. In case war came before 1941 she now could rely only on the Poles putting up a desperate struggle for a short while and on weak assistance from Great Britain. From this moment European politics were a race for time. The chief of the French general staff must, indeed, have been depressed as he counted over how many of his military trumps had been discarded in the vacillations of French and British politics.

The break-down of the Locarno guaranties had already created for the French chief of staff conditions similar to those which faced the German chief of staff in the decade before the war of 1914. It narrowed the scope and possibilities of strategical action by France and Great Britain. Thus General Gamelin must have seen that in the event of war he was like a chess player who has lost his queen. After the occupation of Prague and the competition of the Siegfried line he must have been fully aware that an offensive against Germany was no longer feasible. He knew, too, that he was unable to bring any decisive support to the last remaining pillar of the French system of continental alliances, Poland. It would be interesting to know positively whether General Gamelin favored giving guaranties to Rumania and Poland in the spring of 1939 or whether he was opposed. If, aware that he could not bring any effective help to save Poland from destruction, he did not foresee the disastrous consequences of the guaranty which Britain and France gave her, he is primarily responsible for his own subsequent defeat.

To guarantee the frontiers of Poland and Rumania, and then to start negotiations in Moscow, was a slap in the face for any Russian Government. No Russian Government could have omitted to utilize the opportunity of a war between Germany and Poland in order to recover Bessarabia, the Baltic countries, and the Curzon line in Polar 1. In case of war, whether or not Great Britain and France had given the guaranties in question, Russia would certainly have been forced, with or without Hitler's consent, to occupy Poland up to the Curzon line and at least some of the Baltic areas. Of course, lacking a previous agreement with Germany, she might have hesitated to march into Finland or Rumania. The point is that for Britain and France to guarantee Poland and Rumania, without simultaneously mobilizing British and French forces, could not save Poland and could not ward off the danger of a Russian agreement with Germany.

Why did the Polish general staff decide not to retreat at once from the corridor salient to the Rawka-Bzura-Pilica line? Was the chief of the French general staff told that Polish strategy had been shifted to the offensive? Was he aware that the Poles did not have enough military strength to carry offensive operations through without a simultaneous French offensive? He could at least have ordered the bombing of the armament plants in western Germany, for which the airdromes in eastern France offered excellent bases. He could also have harassed the Siegfried line more seriously than was actually done. He should have threatened to resign if the British and French Governments were not willing to bring all possible pressure to bear on the Belgian Government to permit the occupation of the Belgian fortifications by combined French and British troops. Polish neutrality having been violated, the violation of Belgian neutrality would no longer have meant very much in the moral judgment of the world. Instead, the French left the German Army more or less unmolested, and Germany gained time to build up her armaments and increase enormously the number of her divisions. In the Allied camp nobody had imagination enough to foresee the consequences of a simple technical differential. Germany's war production had been in high gear for 2 years. That of France and England had not. The Allies were not able to bring their production to full capacity even in the 8 months following the outbreak of war. Between the end of the Polish campaign and May 1940 each month added three times as much to the German armament output as to that of the Allies.

II

The topographical conditions of northwestern Europe do not admit many variations in war between Germany on the one side and Great Britain and France on the other. But the complete change in the meaning and importance of space and time in military strategy as a result of the development of mechanized warfare greatly reduced the chances of an Allied victory unless Allied troops had already occupied Belgium before Germany could shift her whole military strength to the west. When the German general staff struck in the spring of 1940, their numerical and geographical advantages had reached their highest point.

No German commander since the Napoleonic wars had enjoyed such favorable conditions for undertaking an offensive against France. No danger threatened from the east, as had been the case in 1914. Strategically, Germany can survive a European war only because she has the "inner line." In 1914 she began to make full use of it only after the first battles had been waged in France. In 1940, as a result of preceding diplomatic moves, the German general staff was able to reap all the advantages of the inner line even before the battle of France started. The maximum number of divisions was available, ready for attack on any given day. The road to Russia and the Balkans remained open, so that the Allied blockade could not be truly effective. Once the Allied Supreme War Council had decided against occupying Belgium while the Polish campaign was still in progress, even the best French military plans might have ended in failure. Because the French and British Governments had followed such an unimaginative policy in recent years, General Gamelin was compelled to make a back-to-the-wall fight, just as, for similar reasons, the German Army had been forced to do in 1914. If Britain and France, together with Poland and Czechoslovakia, had been prepared for modern warfare and had struck in 1938, Germany's position would have been utterly hopeless, as her armament industry was exposed to air attack from all directions. She would have been the besieged fortress from the very beginning of the war. The policy of the Allies, however, permitted the reverse to occur.

Only with this fact in mind can we make a fair comparison between 1914 and 1940 in their purely military aspect. The limited strategical possibilities in northwestern Europe have been studied many times. There is no leading general staff officer in France or Germany who does not know by rote all the major and minor variations of a campaign in that eternal battlefield. Thus the actual lines of the German Army's advance in Holland and Belgium and France could not have surprised anybody. The accounts of brilliant German strategy in Belgium might be justified if they were restricted to the efficiency of the German organization, the daring of the troops, and the fact that the German General Staff had profited by the mistakes of 1914. But beyond that they are a myth.

There can be no doubt that the French General Staff, in the general disposition of their forces, foresaw the possible lines of advance as clearly as the German General Staff did. Both were aware of the fact that fortifications of the type which existed along the Dutch and Belgian frontiers facing Germany could not resist for more than a few days. Only a Maginot Line from Utrecht to Montmédy, strongly manned, could have resisted for a longer period. It is always possible to filter even large forces through fortifications of the Liège type. Thus the main questions posed for the chief of the Allied forces were these: "How long can these fortifications resist? What will be the probable daily rate of advance of the German divisions after they have filtered or broken through? After that has happened, when and where will it be most opportune for us to meet them?" The questions were the same, with a few notable exceptions, in 1914 and 1940. In 1914 the German commander in chief had to take into consideration a French offensive southeast of Metz. In 1940 a French offensive in that area was impossible. Furthermore, the transfer-

ence of reconnoitering from the cavalry to the air forces and the mechanized speed of the spearhead forces had made the time factor much more decisive in 1940 than it had been in 1914.

After operations had begun in 1914 between Metz and the Scheldt, even a break-through by one army would not necessarily have meant a major defeat for the other. In 1940, however, the audacious use of mechanized divisions could prevent a retreating army from undertaking a successful reorganization within a distance of 100 miles. Joffre won the Battle of the Marne because he had an opportunity to retreat far enough, the pursuer being unable to follow at the same pace. Ludendorff, in August 1918, facing for the first time a modern combined air and tank attack, failed to see that a retreat undertaken for the purpose of regrouping his armies had to be a long one if it was to be successful. In Joffre's case a retreat of 100 miles was sufficient to gain decisive strategical advantages. To achieve the same results in 1940, a commander would have had to retreat until the inherent weakness of panzer and motorized divisions—namely, their length on the road (four times that of a normal division) and the enormous difficulties of fuel supply—slowed down the pursuit or halted it.

Mechanized warfare is not a German invention. The British developed it at the end of 1917, and the classic exposition of it was made by Field Marshal Lord Milne in 1927 in an address to the officers of the British Tank Corps. Italian and French generals as well have written understanding essays about it. No more astute analysis of the problems involved in this new type of warfare exists than was presented in a series of articles by a French General Staff officer which appeared in Le Temps between November 1939 and February 1940. These articles, dealing with the Polish campaign, sharply criticized the Polish General Staff for their failure to understand the full significance of the new type of attack. It is all the greater mystery that the mistakes made in Poland were repeated a few months later in France.

With the caution due in the absence of really detailed and authentic documentation, we can yet say one thing about the strategy of General Gamelin and, afterward, of General Weygand. They did not fully appreciate the importance of the change in the time factor introduced by mechanization. The German Army had an immense advantage in that none of its generals had ranked higher than staff captains or battalion commanders in 1917 and 1918. They had fought in the front line and seen with their own eyes the effect of the combined air, tank, and artillery attack of the British at that time. They knew from personal experience that one cause for the German disaster was the fact that even divisional commanders were too far behind the lines and that the transmission of information and orders by radio was still undeveloped. This time the divisional commanders rode in the first groups of attacking tanks, where they were able to utilize sudden opportunities as they were presented and at the same time could keep the commanders of the armies constantly informed. In contrast, General Gamelin, though he himself was in the right position, received information of the serious extent of the break-through at the Meuse only after a delay of 24 hours. Regardless of all this, the fact remains that, due to the nature of the available terrain, neither side produced any strategy which ought to have come as a surprise to anyone who had followed the evolution of military thought in the years since the last war.

With the exception of Bohemia, France has the best natural strategical frontiers in continental Europe. The only weak part is between the Meuse and the Channel. Invasion is extremely difficult in either direction in the Rhine Valley if that sector is defended. A French advance would pile up at the Black Forest; a German one at the Vosges. The creation of the Maginot line made even a German occupation of the plains of Alsace-Lorraine out of the question. The possibility of a German break-through between the Vosges and the Ardennes as far as Montmédy could be dismissed for the same reasons. But deep fortifications of the Maginot type are impossible between the Sambre and the Lys, a tributary of the Scheldt, because of the nature of the soil. Criticism of the failure to extend the French Maginot line to the coast, therefore, is not well founded. It is correct, however, if it is restricted to the line of the Meuse between Sedan and Givet. This line, with the exception of certain densely wooded areas, should have been thoroughly fortified. The experience of 1914 ought to have made this absolutely clear. But even such fortifications would not have been adequate without an extension into Belgian territory between Givet and Namur. If the Meuse had been fortified in this sector, the Germans would have been forced to concentrate their attack on the 50-mile gap between Namur and Antwerp. A line of fortifications along those 50 miles, though it would have been difficult to build at certain points because of the nature of the soil, would, of course, have provided an ideal basis for a purely defensive war, even if Holland were overrun. It would have been shorter by 50 miles than any line along the French-Belgian frontier. But political obstacles—among them Belgian timidity and naive optimism—prevented the construction of such a line in peacetime. The same political obstacles operated to prevent its construction and occupation by French and British troops after the war had started.

Specific figures of the strength of the Allied and German armies on May 10, when the attack in the Low Countries began, are not yet available. The maximum strength of the western German armies was hardly greater than it had been in 1914; that of the French troops probably about the same as it had been then. But since 1914 the French line had been extended by the acquisition of Alsace-Lorraine. In a way the Maginot line made up for the longer frontier. On the other hand, the immobilization of an important part of the French Army so far to the east left the Germans a good chance of being able to wheel the bulk of their army through Belgium and northern France into the rear of the Maginot line—a better chance than had attended their similar attempt in 1914.

III

The political prestige of having military control of Alsace-Lorraine has always been the bait which has lured the French out of their best strategical lines of defense. It was so in 1870 and again in 1914. This point must be clearly understood. General von Schlieffen[3] was willing in case of war to allow the French to occupy the whole of Alsace-Lorraine. General Groener, a member of the general staff in 1914, who had been in close contact with Schlieffen, and later minister of communications and minister of national defense in the German Republic, went even further and advised allowing the French the Saar and the whole Palatinate so that the bulk of the French troops should be immobilized there. In this way the chances for the successful execution of the ideal plan for a war in France—that is to say, the bottling up of the whole French Army from the rear in the fortified area of Lorraine—would have been greatly increased.[4]

To ward off such a danger, the French high command had to do everything possible to strengthen their center and left wing. Two alternatives were open. The French troops along the French-Belgian frontier could remain on the defensive or they could advance to meet the German attack on the Antwerp-Namur-Sedan line. The first course was preferable, but it would leave the Belgian Army to its fate. We may fairly assume that General Gamelin would have preferred this alternative, but that the supreme war council could hardly allow him to adopt it. A German occupation of the Dutch and Belgian Channel ports would have been of vital concern to Great Britain. Nevertheless, the second alternative, if it had been taken at the very beginning of the war, might have saved the Channel ports as well as the Belgian Army. But to carry it out after the German armies had begun the invasion of Holland and Belgium was tremendously risky. General Gamelin must have known it. The advance into Belgium could have succeeded only if the first line of French-Belgian and Dutch fortifications had held up the invader for at least 4 days, or if the French had had available another strong army to advance from the south through the Ardennes toward the Meuse.

The Dutch provinces of Limburg and North Brabant and the Belgian Ardennes are topographically the two areas which condition the speed of any German advance through Belgium. The Liége area is of only secondary importance. The speedy capture of Liége in 1914 was a great and daring feat, but strategically it was not decisive. Unless the German right-wing army infringed the neutrality of Holland, it was confined to the few roads in the 10-mile strip between the northern outskirts of Liége and the southern frontier of Dutch Limburg. This retarded the advance of the Army, which had to cover greater distances than any of the other German armies wheeling around the hinge of Metz. The roads through the Liége area itself had to be reserved for the second German Army on the southern flank of the first Army.

The careful wording of General Groener's studies[4] does not permit us to say definitely whether his own strategical ideas in 1914 were influenced also by political considerations. But his strong condemnation of the attack on Liége, for political as well as military reasons, suggests certain definite conclusions. He preferred to mass even stronger forces than Schlieffen planned all along the frontier of Dutch Limburg, in the belief that such a threat would force the French to invade Belgium before the Germans. Once Belgian neutrality had been violated by the Allies there need no longer have been any hesitation on the part of the Germans to march through Dutch Limburg. This would have given General von Kluck, the commander of the north-wing army, strongest of all the German armies, the possibility of advancing on a broad front. Instead, Kluck was unable to deploy until after his army had passed in deep formation through the narrow strip between Liége and Maastricht. Had he been able to use the Limburg route he would have gained 3 precious days and thus have been well in advance of the Allied schedule. In consequence he might have enveloped the northern wing of the Allied armies at Mons and prevented them from escaping to the south.

---

[3] Chief of Staff of the German Army, 1891–1907. His military writings between the time of his retirement and his death in 1913 were published in that year under the title "Gesammelte Schriften."

[4] In 1940 French territory extended much farther to the east than it had in 1914. This fact operated to produce exactly the same effect as the French offensive had in 1914—namely, to reduce the number of French troops available for the defense of the line Antwerp-Montmédy. Joffre's decision to carry out an offensive in Lorraine forced him to give up the idea of occupying the line Antwerp-Namur. Cf. Groener, Das Testament des Grafen Schlieffen.

[4] Op. cit., also Der Feldherr wider Willen, 1931.

The true students of Schlieffen, most notably General Groener, without losing sight of their object of luring the French Army back into the fortified area of Lorraine, advised cutting off segments of the Allied armies in the course of the grand maneuver. That aim was not achieved in 1914. But the lessons of the failure influenced the dispositions of the German general staff in 1940.

Dutch Limburg is like an appendix hanging down from the southeastern corner of Holland. Opposite Maeseyck, the vital point in crossing the Meuse, it is barely 3½ miles wide; yet its length is such that a whole army can pass across it on a broad front. A break-through into Belgium via Dutch Limburg reduces the importance of the fortified Liège area, including one of the strongest fortifications in Europe, Fort Eben Emael, as well as of the whole Albert Canal. A break-through, therefore, might endanger also the best line of defense for a Belgian-British-French Army, the so-called K-W line between Antwerp and Namur—unless, that is, it has been occupied soon enough by Allied troops. On account of the geographical configuration of Limburg, the Dutch have no chance whatsoever of holding a German Army there for more than a few hours. In September 1938 they fortified a marshy strip a mile wide along the northern bank of the Meuse with a bunker line. The bunkers, on account of the nature of the soil, had to be raised well above ground. They could be destroyed by direct fire from the sandy hills on the German side at the very moment when motorized German troops crossed the frontier. So, indeed, it happened. The Meuse bridge at Maeseyck was captured by motorcyclists 15 minutes after the beginning of the German advance. A few hours later, even before Eben Emael was captured, the bulk of the German troops were streaming into Belgium toward the Albert Canal, and the following day they crossed the canal at several points. On the first day, too, German motorized troops crossed the line of the Meuse farther north. This movement proved to be decisive in the conquest of Holland; it also endangered the fortified area of Antwerp. The complete occupation of Holland by the Nazis was a threat against Britain. Actually, it had little or no significance for the decisive campaign in France.

Thus the march through Dutch Limburg and Brabant reversed the situation of 1914, given the fact that the British and French decided to occupy the Antwerp-Namur line after the beginning of the German invasion. In 1914 the right wing of the German Army had to go as far as Mons in order to overtake the main forces of the Allied left wing. In 1940 the Germans contacted them as early as the third day. Thus the German lines of communication on this occasion were much shorter than they had been in 1914, a decided advantage. But if the German General Staff expected to envelop the Allied forces in eastern Belgium, making escape through Dunkerque impossible, they failed, as neither side moved fast enough. General Gamelin might even have profited from the only military advantage to be gained by moving into Belgium, namely, the use of the Belgian divisions intact on the shortest possible front if he had been able to attack the left flank of the German troops advancing through the Belgian Ardennes.

Whether or not the Allies moved into Belgium, their decisive maneuver to check the Germans would have been to attack from the south into the German flank in the Ardennes. Apparently the French General Staff did not even consider such a move. Why? In 1914 the advance of the French Fourth Army in that direction contributed more to slowing up the German advance than Joffre realized at the time. Post-war German studies demonstrate this very clearly. But General Gamelin could call upon only 9 British divisions (in addition, in case he advanced to occupy the Antwerp-Namur line, he could expect the support of a dozen Belgian divisions). Thus he might well have hesitated to start a flank attack in the Ardennes, which would have called for at least 10 first-class divisions. Perhaps he did not expect a thrust of panzer divisions through the Ardennes. The Ardennes present a densely wooded mountainous terrain, most unfavorable to the passage of panzer divisions, and there are few east and west roads. The country is such that if the Allies had had superiority in the air the advance of the panzer divisions there would have ended in a German catastrophe. The French, however, failed to reconnoiter properly, either in the air or by means of ground troops. The small detachments of light motorized cavalry which they sent forward were easily dispersed by the Germans. On account of this failure the advance of the strong panzer divisions remained unknown to the French General Staff until too late.

This neglect by the French command is the more remarkable in the light of General Groener's post-war writings. He considered the sharp southward turn of the German Army in the Ardennes in 1914 one of the fatal mistakes of the last war. In his view it should have held its westward course and thus insured a general southwestern direction of the main body of the German armies marching through Belgium. In fact, his chart of such an advance is a preview of the whole scheme of invasion in 1940. General Groener made this plan, even though he could not have foreseen that the French would leave the Meuse passages insufficiently covered at some of the very same points which had been unprotected in 1914.

In articles published in January and February 1940 the military correspondent of Le Temps, basing his prognostications on General Groener's principal ideas, though without fully understanding them clearly, predicted the main lines of the German advance. He assumed that three German Army groups would invade Belgium—a very strong one with panzer divisions would force the defenses of the Albert Canal; a second would advance slowly between Luxembourg and Liège; a third, again with very strong armored forces, would move through Luxembourg and the Ardennes to the Meuse. He perceived that both wings would be exposed to the counter-attacks of French-British forces. The provisions made by the French High Command to repulse the attack of the northern German Army group undoubtedly met this situation fairly. The advance by French elite troops and one or two large motorized units from between Lille and the Channel was well timed and well organized. But it remains a mystery how the long-anticipated thrust through southern Belgium could have been met by counterattacks (as the contributor to Le Temps predicted that it would) on the basis of the dispositions actually made by the French General Staff. The only possible explanation is that the French High Command did not take into account the possibility of the daring advance of German panzer divisions along the southern road from Luxembourg to Sedan, paralleling the Maginot Line at a distance often of no more than 10 miles.

This failure will remain one of the most amazing facts in modern military history. Articles published in the official organ of the German Army as late as the spring and summer of 1939 expressed apprehension about the risks which German motorized forces might run in advancing on that line. Even hastily constructed field fortifications 20 miles north of the Maginot line, strengthened by sufficient field batteries, could have stopped the German advance in that region, or at least have slowed it down. This would have permitted General Corap's army to arrive in time to close the gap between Namur and Montmédy. There has been much discussion of the disastrous psychological effect of the Maginot line on French strategy. It seems to be justified only when it refers to events in this area. Some French Army group and divisional commanders plainly forgot the necessity of keeping permanent contact with the enemy at all points, and of trying to harass him. Even if such activity had resulted only in securing a clear picture of the strength and direction of his advance, the benefits would still have been very great.

IV

Did the German high command foresee the ease with which their troops would cross the Meuse south of Namur and at Sedan? Did the actual crossing change their plans? We still do not know. We do know, however, that the organization of the entire German Army from Montmédy to Antwerp into two army groups prevented a repetition of the mistakes which occurred in 1914 as a result of a lack of cohesion between the Fifth, Fourth, and Third Armies and General von Bülow's army group on the extreme right wing. The German commanders were overworried, on that occasion, about a possible French counterattack from the south into the Belgian Ardennes. They tried to meet this danger by a tactical frontal attack. In wheeling to the south they neglected the central operative idea.

General Groener had contemplated the possibility of achieving a main break-through at the Meuse in a western direction; but since he could not count on large armored units he discounted its practicability.[5] Nevertheless, his plan to hold all the German armies west of Metz to a strictly southwesterly direction, despite the danger of a French counter-attack from the south into the Belgian Ardennes, left the way open for the execution of such a maneuver should the opportunity arise. This was the significant advance of the German General Staff over the original Schlieffen plan.

In 1914 the German cavalry failed utterly to fulfill its task. In 1940 the panzer and motorized divisions seem to have been under a unified command within each of the two army groups. This arrangement, and not simply the perfect composition and the new tactics of these modern cavalry units, was responsible for their decisive successes. The French do not seem to have understood all the possibilities of the new arm. Their tanks were not concentrated under a single command, but were placed in relatively small units at the disposal of divisional and army group commanders.

The initial successes of the German panzer and motorized divisions enabled them to advance in the two directions where they could make use of their striking power to the fullest extent. Topographically speaking, there are two lines of advance into France which present hardly any obstacles to motorized divisions once they have crossed the Meuse. The area between the Argonne and the Seine is open country, and so is the area between the Meuse and Abbeville. Both regions offer ideal conditions for operations (such as the military correspondent of Le Temps described in February 1940) by autonomous mechanized divisions fighting in isolation from the main armies.

Exactly what happened in the first 2 days following the rapid destruction of General Corap's army is not yet known. The Allies' only possible chance of recovery was to retreat at almost any price from Belgium to the lower Somme and simultaneously to attack from the Verdun area toward Rethel, into the flank of the German Army group advancing directly toward Laon. The first maneuver risked losing the entire British Expeditionary Force. The second was impossible because there was no reserve army available for the purpose. Even two modern tank divisions in reserve south of Montmédy could

[5] Cf. Groener, Der Feldherr wider Willen, p. 239.

have dealt a shattering blow to the German advance. They were lacking. The inability of the French High Command to execute either of these maneuvers should have convinced it, at the latest by May 24, 14 days after the beginning of the German attack, that desperate decisions were necessary.

The plan of General von Schlieffen was that the German armies should arrive in full force at the Abbeville-Verdun line on the seventeenth day after the beginning of the attack. In 1940, although the bulk of the German Army was unable to reach the Abbeville-Verdun line on the seventeenth day in accordance with the Schlieffen plan, motorized divisions had already advanced beyond that line and had cut off large detachments of Allied troops.

The French replaced General Gamelin by General Weygand on May 19. They were unfortunate even in their choice of the moment to change the high command. The shift entailed a 4-day lull in planning operations at a decisive time, and the time lost was never made up. When General Weygand finally found himself able to issue new orders it was already too late to withdraw the French left wing to the lower Seine. The Somme-Aisne-Montmedy line was actually the shortest line of defense. But when General Weygand had failed to halt the Germans by May 25 only one maneuver remained feasible—to retreat all the way back to the line Loire-Dijon-Belfort. That would have meant sacrificing Paris and the Maginot line, with an enormous amount of immovable artillery. Such a long retreat might have had a disastrous effect upon French morale. But the choice was between certain disaster and possible survival, and the risk would have been worth taking. General Weygand's decision to make his new stand on the Seine turned the Maginot line from an advantage to France into a disadvantage.

After the surrender of Belgium and the escape of the British and French forces from Dunkerque, though without their arms, the further advance of the German armies proceeded exactly in accordance with the ideal Schlieffen plan as developed by General Groener. He had taken into account the possibility of a resumption of French resistance along the line Seine-Oise-Verdun.[6] He presupposed that the French would protect the crossings of the lower Seine with relatively weak forces. In his view, the weakest link in the French line would be the Oise flank, despite its support by the fortress of Paris. He thought the Germans ought to attack across the Oise and across the Seine at the same time. If in meeting these attacks the French were to weaken their front farther to the east, along the Aisne, then the Germans could break through on that front between Soissons and Rheims. If the French neglected to strengthen the Oise-Aisne front, the break through could be made between Soissons and Creil.

Here we reach a very important point in General Groener's calculations. In order to carry out their maneuver successfully, the Germans had to be on the heels of the French at the Aisne, but they must be careful not to attack prematurely.[7] In the Groener plan the German cavalry would reach Rouen and Les Andelys (on the Seine) on the twenty-fourth day of the attack. They would be followed by the infantry, spreading west to Beauvais and beyond. On the twenty-seventh day they would cross the Seine at those points. At the same time an attack on the fortified Lorraine area from the east would be begun. In the actual event—in the Battle of France, 1940—Beauvais was reached on the twenty-fourth day of the attack. On the twenty-seventh day the lower Seine was crossed at Rouen and Les Andelys, the points indicated by General Groener.

The French decision to make a final stand on the line Seine-Oise-Verdun came, as already mentioned, too late. Looking ahead, General Groener believed that under conditions like those which prevailed in 1940 even the Marne line would not be tenable. He envisaged a wheeling movement of the German right wing, south and southeast through Dreux and Chartres, and then turning eastward to cut off Paris from Orleans. The plan was carried out to the letter in 1940.

General Groener foresaw that the French commander in chief would then face a desperate decision. Would he defend the upper Seine, a decision which offered certain advantages if coupled with an attack on the German right wing from the Loire? Or would he sacrifice the whole fortified area in Lorraine and retreat to the Loire and a line running across to the Jura Mountains on the Swiss-French frontier? The decision would depend upon his temperament. A French counterattack centering on Chartres could slow up the German advance, but Groener was doubtful whether one could be made because of the probable inability of the French to concentrate sufficient forces for the purpose. He thought the best strategy for France would be to take up the Loire-Jura line, as the German armies would be approaching exhaustion and would have to allow the French a breathing spell in which they might reorganize their forces. In any case, France would be in a stronger position to negotiate an Armistice.

V

In this article we have mentioned the difficulties of supplying the enormous quantities of fuel required by motorized divisions. But no attempt has been made to evaluate the effect of German air attack on the French morale or the French lines of communication. Nor is any opinion offered regarding the activities of the "fifth column." A comparative study of strategy, based on exact data, leads one to conclude that these factors have been overestimated in their actual bearing on the outcome of the war in France.

French strategy was under an evil star before the war began. If it is true that General Gamelin sent an ultimatum to the Belgians via the Quai d'Orsay the middle of January 1940, to the effect that the Allies should either be permitted to occupy Belgium at once or should plan not to enter Belgium at all, then he foresaw all. If he expected to await the German attack on the French-Belgian frontier, without preparing an attack from the south into the flank of the German columns proceeding across the Belgian Ardennes, then he faced carrying on a sterile defensive. But in that event, even though the Germans might have broken through at the Meuse or elsewhere, thus creating disorder in the Allied lines, the envelopment of the British and French forces in Belgium might have been prevented. Probably it would have been necessary to sacrifice the Channel ports; but though that would have been a serious blow to Britain it need not have greatly affected the campaign in France.

Afterward, an early retreat to the Seine-Oise-Aisne-Montmédy line, and the concentration meanwhile of strong reserve armies in Paris and between the Marne and Verdun, might have set the stage for holding up the German advance. To retreat to the Loire and to abandon Paris and the Maginot Line would have injured a French commander and French prestige. Yet that became precisely what had to be done. This was the innate danger in the French strategical position. The French Army clung to the Maginot Line and became too extended, with too few men per kilometer.

The Germans won not simply because they possessed superior numbers and had mastered a more modern tactical use of mechanized forces in the air and on land. The political mistakes of the Allies had lost them the war in France even before it began. Moreover, the German high command and the Army commanders, most of whom had received their previous promotions from General Groener while he was Minister of National Defense from 1928 to 1932, avoided all the major mistakes of 1914.[8] There was a clear strategical plan. There was a logical subdivision of the Army into groups suitable to the new type of warfare. In the mechanized divisions, further, there was daring as well as a capacity to check it when this became necessary in the orderly development of the general plan of operations. In all these particulars the situation of the German Army was the reverse of what it had been in 1914.

German strategy in France, as conceived by General von Schlieffen and developed by General Groener, was completely successful. If the Germans had captured the entire body of French and British troops at the Channel ports, instead of their arms only, the outcome of the war would very likely have been decided last summer. We should refrain from vilifying the leaders of the French Army, or from questioning the gallantry of the common French soldiers, whose exploits in isolated detachments are among the most heroic in history. France was not lost mainly through her Army. France was lost mainly through her politics in the period between the two wars. The events still to come will prove whether the Channel is to be a second Marne, and whether France is still to be saved through the resistance of Britain.

[6] Das Testament des Grafen Schlieffen, p. 228, et seq.

[7] Evidently when the maneuver was actually carried out the French General Staff did not understand what was going on. On May 25 the official report regarding the situation on the Aisne read, "Since yesterday we have dominated the enemy."

[8] General von Brauchitsch, commander in chief of the German Army in 1940, was a staff captain in 1914 and was selected for vital liaison work between Generals von Kluck and von Bülow. Cf. Reichsarchiv, Der Weltkrieg, p. 353.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, when the world makes bigger sacks to hold, we will hold them.

Belligerence cannot hide behind an arsenal for democracy.

We predict a second aid bill to free England before Independence Day.

Wallace's duck-dinner ducking of a tie vote was a blessing to our farmers.

The Chief goes fishing again. Last Saturday he called on all to make sacrifices.

Members swallowed elephants this last week who previously had strained at ants.

We must have another U-boat next week, Mr. Halifax, to insure a big vote in the Senate.

This has been the 7-come-11 week in the House—seven billion for King George

Wednesday and four billions more Friday for the other one.

There are four times as many men striking on defense projects as in January. This is our second greatest threat—Hitler our third.

Our present position is not the inevitable one. It would have been different under TAFT, VANDENBERG, WHEELER, or HIRAM JOHNSON.

When we recondition British ships in our docks we may bring the war to our shores under the bill which guaranteed to keep it away.

They may have taken Wendell in, but while in captivity he has taught Franklin and all the Cabinet to repeat frequently his "American way of life."

It was said in the recent famous debate that Congress would still have its hands on the purse strings. You will notice how dictatorial still they are.

Mr. Roosevelt made a Hitler speech to his defense workers, the pencil pushers. A lot was said about the common people to the 700 stuffed shirts just before the floor show.

Retail Prices of Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1941

ARTICLE BY CHARLES J. WELCH

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting article which deals with the problem of retail prices of sugar. The article was written by Mr. Charles J. Welch, a member of the firm of Welch, Fairchild & Co., Inc., of New York City, and was released by him for publication under date of March 19, 1941.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Those in the sugar business know all about the price of raws and the wholesale price of refined. The minute a sale of raws is made a broker rings you up and advises you. Changes in the price of refined are immediately telegraphed all over the United States. But what do we know about the most important price of sugar, as far as the general public is concerned, namely, the retail price? The answer is—practically nothing. We doubt very much whether the best informed men in the sugar trade know what the sugar used in their own household costs.

The official retail price of sugar is ascertained by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, and this information is issued periodically. The annual average retail price of sugar, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, was as follows:

	Cents
1890	6.9
1895	5.3
1900	6.1
1905	6.0
1910	6.0
1915	6.6

After 1915 we get some interesting figures:

	Cents
1916	8.0
1917	9.3
1918	9.7
1919	11.3
1920	19.4
1921	8.0
1922	7.3
1923	10.1
1924	9.2

After the depression the retail price of sugar decreased considerably:

	Cents
1930	6.1
1931	5.6
1932	5.0
1933	5.3
1934	5.5
1935	5.7
1936	5.6
1937	5.6
1938	5.3
1939	5.4

Last year the average retail price of sugar was 5.1, not the lowest on record, but very little above the all-time low of 1932, which was 5 cents.

What do these Government figures mean, and how are they made up? Quoting from the pamphlet of the Bureau of Labor, "Retail Prices 1890 to 1927":

"HOW PRICES ARE OBTAINED

"Retail prices of food are collected from retail dealers through monthly reports of actual selling prices on the 15th of each month. The stores are selected by agents of the Bureau from those patronized largely by wage earners. Prices are secured from every type of store—the neighborhood store, the downtown store, the department store, and the chain store—provided a large part of the patronage comes from wage earners. Some of the stores are credit and delivery, some are cash and carry, and some are cash and delivery. No 'fancy' stores are included.

"The number of firms is apportioned according to the industrial importance of each city. For the larger cities reports are obtained from 25 to 30 stores and for the smaller cities from 10 to 15 stores. The total number of firms furnishing prices on one or more articles of food each month is now approximately 1,800. Quite naturally, firms are not constant, but when one firm drops out permanently another firm, similar in kind, is selected to replace it. Moreover, as the wage-earning population of a city shifts, stores are selected in the new localities to preserve the representative character of the prices."

The 51 cities cover the United States pretty thoroughly. New England, Middle Atlantic, North East Central, which includes Chicago, West North Central, which takes in Kansas City, Minneapolis, Omaha, and St. Louis; South Atlantic—Atlanta, Baltimore, Jacksonville, Richmond, Savannah; and so on. Cities in all parts of the United States are taken.

But as far as the price of sugar is concerned, just what does an average retail price taken in this way mean? The basic price for refined sugar in the United States is the price where the refineries are situated, namely, at the seaboard—Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Savannah, New New Orleans, San Francisco, and Galveston. Refined sugar in interior points is the seaboard price plus the freight. The freight to Chicago at present is 37.6 cents a hundred pounds. The freight to Kansas City is 49 cents. Now if the average retail price in all these cities is taken, is there any allowance made for freight? A price of 6 cents in New York might be high, but would a price of 6 cents be high in an inland city when the freight alone costs 50 cents?

But, anyway, we wanted to find out what the retail price of sugar in New York City was. We sent out someone with instructions to buy two pounds of sugar in ten different stores on the East Side of New York between Ninety-third Street and Sixty-fifth Street, and from Madison Avenue to First Avenue. In these 10 stores 1 sold a 2-pound carton at 11 cents; 7 charged 12 cents; 1, 13 cents; and 1 charged 15 cents. Our instructions were to ask each of the grocers whether or not they thought the price of sugar was going up. All 10 said they thought so. The other question was whether they were selling any more sugar now than was usual at this time of the year. Six said they were, four said they were not. Of the 10 2-pound cartons bought, 3 were National-Jack Frost brand, 7 were the American Sugar Refining Co.'s Domino brand.

A friend of ours on Staten Island the same day bought four 5-pound bags—not cartons—with the following results: 1, 25 cents; 1, 26 cents; 2, 27 cents.

In response to the question, "Do you think the price of sugar is going up?"—three said "Yes." The fourth said he could not make up his mind. In response to the second question, "Do you think your customers are buying more sugar now than is usual at this time of the year?"—one said "Yes." That was the A. & P. The other three places said, "Not yet, but as the price advances, feel people will be buying a lot more." In other words, the consumer does not buy an article because it is cheap. He, or rather she, buys because she thinks the price is going to advance

Now let us analyze these figures and get them down to a per-pound basis. In 5-pound bags the prices per pound were as follows: 1, 5 cents; 1, 5.2; 2, 5.4.

In 2-pound cartons: 1, 5½ cents; 7, 6 cents; 1, 6½ cents; 1, 7½ cents.

One strange thing was this: The grocer who sold at 11 cents and the one who sold at 15 cents both said that their customers were not buying more sugar than they usually did at this time of the year. We could well understand why the man who was charging 15 cents for a 2-pound carton was selling less, but the man who was selling at 11 cents was not selling more than usual. In the case of the 2-pound cartons, the variation in price was 2 cents a pound. That is almost incredible. Two cents a pound in one small district of New York City. And yet Washington gets very much excited if the price of sugar advances one-fourth cent a pound, and throws a fit it goes up one-half cent. Sugar is evidently not economics. It is politics.

This little experiment of ours has proved (at least to our satisfaction) that the consumer does not care a whoop how much he pays for sugar. If there can be a variation of 2 cents a pound between one store and another, there is something queer about retail selling. But why should the housewife raise a disturbance if her grocer charges her 2 cents a pound more than she can buy the same sugar for at another grocery store maybe one-half block or a block away? Why doesn't she just go to the cheaper man and get her supplies, and quit squawking?

Then there is the question of the amount of money that is paid for a piece of cardboard called a carton. Sugar that is sold in 5-pound bags is put up in packages of very strong paper. Housewives tell us that they like it better than the cloth, because there is no sifting. Why should anybody pay a big premium for a carton? That is quite beyond us. But the fact of the matter is that a great deal of sugar is sold in cartons, and the housewife pays this extra cost—for what reason only she and God know. If the housewife wants to economize because the price of sugar is going up, all she has to do is buy her sugar in bags instead of cartons—and she saves the entire advance unless it is a very sharp one. In September 1939 the housewife's kick was not nearly so much at the high price of sugar (it wasn't so awfully high) but because she could not get sugar. That made her mad.

The above facts were a revelation to us, and possibly they may be a revelation to about 99.5 percent of those actively engaged in sugar. We don't suppose it would be to the retail trade, because they must know all about it. We are speaking more about producers and merchants who think they know everything about sugar—but sometimes they don't. And it might also be a revelation to some of our statesmen in Washington who have delusions about knowing all about sugar very similar to the delusions that exist in the sugar trade.

We omitted to mention that these sugars were bought on March 14. On that day the raw sugar price had advanced to 3.30, and the refiners' list price was 4.85.

England Expects Every American To Do His Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. WORTH CLARK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1941

EXCERPTS FROM BOOK BY QUINCY HOWE

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from England Expects Every American To Do His Duty, by Mr. Quincy Howe.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM "ENGLAND EXPECTS EVERY AMERICAN TO DO HIS DUTY"

(By Quincy Howe, published by Simon and Schuster, New York, 1937)

The amazing, historical, and prophetic book published 4 years ago and today partially suppressed. Copies cannot be purchased at leading Washington book stores despite repeated requests.

Reveals the high and mighty manipulations of the British network in the United States—how the world's greatest empire, through its highly placed powerful American intriguers, hypnotizes and master minds the world's richest Nation to pour out its blood and treasure not only to defend the world status quo, but actually to enrich that vast world empire.

Author Quincy Howe, born in Boston, Mass., August 17, 1900; prominent editor and writer, graduate of Harvard, 1921, and student at Christ College, Cambridge, England, 1921–22.

EXCERPTS FROM FOREWORD

Never since the days of ancient Rome has so much power remained concentrated in so few hands for so long a period as in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and its overseas empire. It is to those who govern this empire and its island headquarters that the words England and Britain refer throughout this book.

Not one but many books would be needed to describe how the British Empire functions. Suffice it to say here that its rulers have organized themselves on six different levels. First of all they have a state church which claims ecclesiastical parity with the Church of Rome. Second, they have a royal family and a whole supporting substructure of hereditary nobles. Third, the British Empire has an Army, Navy, and Air Force officered by members of the ruling caste and supplied with information by the most efficient secret service in the world. Fourth, the British Empire has the most efficient permanent civil service of any nation. This organization attends to all nonmilitary aspects of imperial administration, notably foreign policy. Fifth, in the Bank of England the rulers of Britain control a private banking house whose name still remains a synonym for financial stability. Sixth, in the House of Commons the rulers of Britain maintain the world's most exclusive and powerful club.

There is a saying in Hollywood that you don't have to be crazy to get into the movies, but that it helps. In like manner you do not have to have attended one of Britain's exclusive public schools to become a bishop, a member of the House of Lords, an admiral, a permanent undersecretary for foreign affairs, a governor of the Bank of England, or a Prime Minister. It simply helps. Now and then a Rufus Isaacs becomes Lord Reading, Viceroy of India, or a Ramsay MacDonald rises to the premiership. But by the time such self-made men have come to the top they are more royalist than the King.

Although 2,000 families are said to rule England, membership in the British ruling caste does not go entirely by birth—or by wealth either. And the 2,000 families are a purely arbitrary estimate. They simply indicate how intensely power is concentrated. The actual figure may be 20,000 or 200, depending upon one's definition of power.

This book, however, has no concern with the concentration of power as such. Neither does it try to draw distinctions between the British Government and the British people. To claim moral credit for having no quarrel with any people is like boasting that one has no quarrel with the tide or with the weather. To indict a people is like indicting the Atlantic Ocean or a thunderstorm.

HOW ENGLAND INFLUENCES AMERICA

What concerns me here is not the character of Britain's 45,000,000 inhabitants or of America's 130,000,000. Neither am I concerned with the moral qualities of Britain's rulers or America's. Such topics require far more space and far more knowledge than I have at my disposal. I am concerned solely with the influence of the rulers of Britain—hereafter referred to for the sake of brevity as England or Britain—upon certain influential Americans, and, through these individuals, upon the American public. Finally, I have written this book in the belief that this influence will play a larger part than any other single factor on the destinies of both the English and the American peoples in the course of the next 10 years.

EXCERPTS FROM CHAPTER SOS EMPIRE CALLING

In 1917 the United States entered the World War, which not only rescued but extended the British Empire. Today the problem of the British Foreign Office is to repeat the trick and save the Empire from an even graver crisis. Since 1920 the wheels that will involve the United States in another war to save the British Empire have moved ceaselessly and at accelerating speed. How urgent is Britain's need? America's peace depends on the answer.

The dozen or more different nations that competed against each other for colonies, trade, and investment opportunities throughout the nineteenth century finally divided into the two camps that opposed each other in the World War. And the defeat of the Central Powers left England more powerful than ever before and established the present world order of monopoly imperialism, which corresponds on the international scene to monopoly capitalism on the national scene.

BRITISH CREATE MONOPOLY IMPERIALISM

The aftermath of the war revealed monopoly-imperialism in all its glory. Three empires—the Russian, German, and Austro-Hungarian—had perished. Two of the victorious allied powers—Italy and Japan—received only a handful of the territorial spoils. A third—the United States—received nothing. This left Britain and France dividing Germany's former colonies, with Britain getting the lion's share. In central Europe millions of Slavic peoples, who had occupied a colonial status in the German, Austrian, and Russian Empires, won national independence, but depended on the Bank of France and the Bank of England for financial support. The Portuguese and Dutch colonial empires depended, as ever, on the protection of the British Fleet; even the French required British support to keep open their trade route to Indochina, while Britain's control of the Mediterranean placed French North Africa at Britain's mercy. The British had created a new thing under the sun—monopoly imperialism. * * *

Something more than mass discontent caused these concessions. From time immemorial the great bulk of the Indian people had lived in poverty and ignorance. Before British traders and administrators wrecked India's balanced, primitive economy, the Indians received better schooling and lived a more secure existence than they do today. The peasants wove their own cloth and supplied most of their own needs with their own labor. During the nineteenth century and up to the time of the World War, Britain destroyed India's home industries by selling cheap manufactured goods to the Indian market. In 1914 India was importing 75 percent of its cotton textiles from Great Britain.

* * * * *

A comparison between England's pre-war and post-war policies illustrates this point. Britain entered the Entente Cordiale with Russia and France not merely to protect the Empire against German aggression. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Britain emerged from the World War in possession of Germany's colonies. In other words, it was a war of aggression on both sides. Furthermore, having decided to support the Entente Cordiale, the British followed that course consistently. German diplomats may have expected Britain to remain neutral—the more fools they; the diplomats, the military and naval staffs, the chief banking interests in France and Russia labored under no such delusion. They knew that the British would come to their aid. Only the British people and the German Government expected anything different.

* * * * *

On June 18, 1935, the pro-German faction in Great Britain scored a major political victory. After secret negotiations in London, England signed a naval treaty giving Germany the right to build a navy 35 percent as large as its own. This agreement not only violated the Versailles Treaty, it violated a much more recent Anglo-French agreement of mutual consultation on all European problems.

To what extent the Anglo-German naval treaty represented a victory for the pro-German faction and to what extent it represented official recognition of the inevitable must remain a matter for conjecture. There can be no doubt, however, that it reflected the growing power of Germany and the declining power of Britain. Winston Churchill summed up the position in the House of Commons on July 22, 1935: "Lord Beatty said the other day that we ought to be grateful to Germany for not having asked for 50 percent, and the first lord indicated that she might have asked for 100 percent. But would our answer have been the same? I hope not. But the reasons by which it would have been defended would have been the same. You would say, 'What could we do? We could not control them. Nobody is going to war to prevent them.'"

BRITISH CONCESSION TO HITLER

The one justification for the Anglo-German naval treaty lies in the field of politics, not strategy. If Britain has more to fear from

Soviet Russia than from Nazi Germany, then a strong German Navy is to be welcomed—and the stronger the better. But until Britain is committed to cooperate with Germany in Europe, a strong German Navy simply represents a concession to Hitler in exchange for nothing at all. Furthermore, Britain is drifting toward the opposite camp in the Far East where Japan, Germany's new ally, stands out as the chief threat to British imperialism. The ideal solution would, of course, be to have the United States and the Soviet Union fight Japan in the Far East while France and the Soviet Union fight Germany in Europe Still hoping for that happy issue, Britain therefore tries to avoid any commitment in Asia or Europe.

EXCERPTS FROM CHAPTER THE BRITISH NETWORK

It's fun, of course, to be fooled by the British for a century and more, but it's more fun to know how the trick works. The previous chapter simply reviewed the record; this one will try to show how the record took the form it did. And an extraordinary spectacle unfolds. We shall see almost the entire ruling caste in the United States obeying British orders with an eager servility that arises from the unique character of modern American society. We shall see that the relationship between America and England has no parallel in the modern world.

Italians and Frenchmen sometimes refer to each other as Latin brothers; before the war, the Russians tried to take the smaller states of southeastern Europe under their wing; since the war, Germany has exerted a growing attraction on the people of Austria. But a common culture is not the only tie that binds the Latin, Slavic, and Teutonic peoples. They are also held together by geographic proximity and trade. Indeed, the fact is that common economic interests frequently take precedence over a common culture. Thus, during the World War, the Bulgarian Slavs fought against their Slavic neighbors from Serbia while Turks and Germans fought side by side against the Moslems of Arabia and Britain's Christian soldiers.

AMERICA APES BRITISH FOREIGN OFFICE

In short, a nation's foreign policy is usually determined by its natural resources, its social order, its population density, its technical equipment, and its geographic position. But the United States, alone among the great powers, bases its foreign policy on an entirely different and quite intangible factor. Ancestral ties of language, tradition, and blood exercise such an attraction upon the American ruling class that it adapts its own selfish interests—not to mention the interests of the country as a whole—to the needs and desires of the British Foreign Office.

ENGLAND'S HOUR OF NEED

The history of Anglo-American relations might seem, on the surface, to suggest that British statesmen had bludgeoned or bamboozled American statesmen into taking orders from Downing Street. But the power that Britain wields in the United States does not arise from intellectual or economic superiority. If England, in its hour of need, expects every American to do his duty, that expectation does not arise from the usual economic consideration. On the contrary. If material factors alone determined American national policy, the United States would either have taken over the British Empire after the war or retired into its shell. Instead, it has puttered about the four corners of the earth only to emerge at every critical juncture defending British interests more heartily than the British themselves.

SPEAK SAME LANGUAGE

To account for this curious state of affairs it is necessary to recall certain facts that many Americans accept as instinctively as they do the color of the sky. First, and most important, Englishmen and Americans speak the same language. They read the same books, magazine articles, and news dispatches; they hear the same lectures and radio broadcasts; they attend the same plays and talking pictures. Furthermore, this common language originated in England, whence the first settlers of the Thirteen Colonies also came. In consequence many Americans look instinctively to England as the court of last appeal in all questions involving tradition, scholarship, morals, law, and manners.

This tendency to hold England in reverence appears most flagrantly in the American governing classes. They prefer to commune with their Maker in the exclusive atmosphere of the Episcopal Church, which grew from England's official national church. The private boarding schools which the sons of the American aristocracy attend are modeled on Eton, Harrow, and Winchester. The cult of the gentleman and the gospel of fair play originated in England and have been taken up more enthusiastically in the United States than in any other country. The great American unwashed may attend professional baseball games—just as the great unwashed of England attend professional football matches; the Anglo-American aristocracy prefers polo, yacht races, and fox hunts.

VISITING AMERICANS GET "WORKS"

The weakness of well-dressed Americans for the British way of life has given rise to an elaborate ritual, vulgarly known as the works, to which visiting Americans are subjected in London. Seedy yearning journalists from the Corn Belt find themselves seated in the distinguished visitors' section of the House of Commons. Business and professional men will be asked to teas and garden parties by the new rich of old England. Utility magnates, Senators, railroad, bank, and college presidents rate dinner and week-end invitations from members of the nobility.

Shortly after the World War, William Randolph Hearst had the distinction of receiving the complete works. After all, he had built enormous circulation for his many newspaper properties by his unremitting attacks on perfidious Albion and only at the eleventh hour had he endorsed the crusade for democracy. Something had to be done to bring him into line. The treatment included dinners, week ends, and lunches with various distinguished Englishmen, climaxed by a meeting with the King. It worked like a charm. When Mr. Hearst returned to the United States he announced that the salvation of the world depended on the cooperation of the two great English-speaking democracies.

CECIL RHODES SHOWED WAY

The circumstances that few of the Englishmen who honored Mr. Hearst had ever in the past expressed anything but contempt for his opinions and journalistic methods did not prevent them from giving him the complete works with as much gusto as if he were the twin brother of Walter Hines Page. As a rule, however, the complete works, including presentation of wife and daughter at the Court of St. James's, are reserved for those Americans who have already proved their loyalty to the British throne.

The British Empire could never have attained its present stature if its rulers had not turned this state of affairs to their advantage. More than a generation ago, Cecil Rhodes showed the way when he endowed the scholarships that bear his name and that enable hundreds of promising young Americans and colonials to expose themselves for 3 years to the influence of Oxford. For Britain's imperialists proceed on the theory that their cultural heritage is their strongest card, both in the United States and their own dominions, and insofar as they fear the United States, they fear the growth of a native and distinctive American culture. A South African delegate to the British Imperial Conference at Toronto in 1933 put it this way:

"What lies before us now is a cultural struggle. Are the dominions going to build up local self-sufficient, self-inspired cultures which owe comparatively little to cultures elsewhere? Or are they going to acclimatize and adapt to meet local conditions the culture of Europe and particularly that of England, so that this remains unchanged in all its essentials, however much the particular form of its expression may alter? Or (a much more formidable possibility) whilst retaining the outward form and political machinery of a British Commonwealth, are they going to establish in their own areas a culture which owes all its inspiration to the United States of America? Personal contacts and the fostering of common beliefs, traditions, and practices are the only forces that in the long run can counteract the effect of the thousands of miles of salt water which Burke pointed to as the causa causans of the regrettable incident of 1783."

ENGLAND EXPORTS CULTURE

To judge from the cultural interests of most well-to-do Americans, they share this Old World regret for the incident of 1783. They flock in droves to hear Lord Lytton, Sir Arthur Salter, and Sir Arthur Willert interpret world affairs from the point of view of the British Foreign Office. They lap up the novels of Sir Hugh Walpole, Charles Morgan, and Warwick Deeping from whom they gain an insight into the finer shades of civilized life as only English ladies and gentlemen can live it. And even if they never plan a pilgrimage to such Anglo-Saxon shrines as Westminster Abbey, Shakespeare's birthplace, or the Albert Memorial, they become unofficial members of the great British family of nations by joining the English Speaking Union.

SPEARHEAD OF HER DRIVE

For all its innocent appearance, this organization is nothing more nor less than the spearhead of England's cultural drive on the United States. The purpose of the English Speaking Union, according to its own prospectus, is: "First. To draw together in the bond of comradeship the English-speaking people of the world. Second. To strengthen the friendly relationship between the people of the United States and of the British Empire by (a) disseminating knowledge of each to the other and (b) inspiring reverence for their common institutions." The activities of the English Speaking Union include hospitality to overseas travelers, forums for discussion, interchange of secondary school teachers, scholarships, special luncheons and dinners, cooperation with other organizations in entertaining visitors, intelligent travel service, friendly personal contacts, and interchange of gifts and messages between cities and towns in Great Britain and their namesakes in the New World.

The facilities of the English Speaking Union include its headquarters in London and smaller branches in many other cities in the British Isles, the Dominions, and the United States. British subjects and citizens of the British Dominions may join the English Speaking Union of the British Empire for a guinea a year. Citizens of the United States may join the English Speaking Union of the United States, a parallel and self-governing organization, for $5 a year. All member receive the same monthly bulletin, The Landmark, published, as luck will have it, in London, and all have access to any of the Union's quarters.

DIRECTORS FROM UPPER CRUST

The English Speaking Union was born in the historic year of 1917, and since then has not only helped thousands of travelers but has encouraged social contacts between all English-speaking peoples. Yet its directors are better known as financiers, statesmen,

churchmen, journalists, educators, lawyers, and industrialists than as lecture managers, tourist agents, or professional entertainers.

Thus anyone who accepts their aims at face value will be surprised to learn that the first chairman of the English Speaking Union of the British Empire was none other than the late Lord Balfour, who originated the doctrine that the United States should pay the entire cost of the World War from April 1917 through November 1918. And when we survey the guiding spirits of the English-Speaking Union of the United States, we see the same pattern. Its president, John W. Davis, succeeded the late Walter Hines Page as America's wartime Ambassador to London, and after seeking the Presidency of the United States on the Democratic ticket in 1924 devoted himself entirely to his legal practice. By 1933 he had become J. P. Morgan's most trusted adviser and coached him during the famous senatorial investigation of that year. In 1935 Mr. Davis again attracted public attention as one of the founders of the American Liberty League.

MORGAN PARTNER TREASURER

A Morgan partner also holds the post of treasurer of the English Speaking Union of the United States—Harry P. Davison, son of the man who went to London in 1914 to make the Morgan bank sole American purchasing agent for the British Government during the World War. Henry J. Fisher, chairman of the union, has more connections in the publishing than in the financial world. He is chairman of the board of the McCall Publishing Co. and of the Popular Science Publishing Co. He is a member of the executive committee of Harper & Bros., of which he is also a director, and a member of the board of governors of the Yale Publishing Association. Thus the three chief figures in the English-Speaking Union include J. P. Morgan's personal attorney, a full-fledged Morgan partner, and the director of several publishing concerns, some of which cater to the masses, others to the smaller but more influential quality audience.

The board of directors of the English Speaking Union of the United States runs to 18 names. The most important on the list is Gen. James G. Harbord, chairman of the board of the Radio Corporation of America and of the National Broadcasting Corporation. Of equal significance is the name of John H. Finley, editor in chief of the New York Times. Through these two men the English Speaking Union makes its voice heard on the most powerful newspaper and the most powerful radio chain in the United States. Other names worth noting are those of Mrs. Robert Bacon, widow of a Morgan partner; Harry A. Garfield, former president of Williams College and chairman of the Williamstown Institute of Politics; Mrs. Henry Goddard Leach, wealthy wife of the editor of the Forum; Langdon P. Marvin, Wall Street lawyer; and George E. Vincent, honorary president of the Chautauqua Association and former president of the Rockefeller Foundation.

ELITE VICE PRESIDENTS

In addition to its 18 directors, the English Speaking Union has 10 vice presidents. Two of these are bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, no other denomination being officially represented. Two others are men of considerable distinction: Frank B. Kellogg, former Secretary of State, and Paul D. Cravath, a director of R. C. A. and N. B. C. David P. Barrows, another vice president, is a trustee of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; Victor Elting is former president of the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations; Mrs. F. Louis Slade is a member of the executive committee of the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations; Alexander W. Weddell has been in the consular and diplomatic service since 1908 and became American Ambassador to Argentina in 1933.

Far from regarding membership in the English Speaking Union as a form of hyphenated Americanism, these influential citizens believe that to give aid and comfort to the British Empire is to serve the highest aims of the United States and even of humanity as a whole. Most of them, in fact, would be profoundly shocked to find themselves listed as anything short of 100-percent Americans, and they will frequently take issue with certain aspects of British policy and British civilization. They simply lend themselves to the cause of their favorite charity, their favorite political party, or their chosen religion.

IDEAL FOR BRITISH FOREIGN OFFICE

Furthermore, if the British foreign office were to prepare its own ideal roster of those Americans who could do most to promote British interests in the United States, it could scarcely improve on the actual list of men and women who control the English Speaking Union. This does not mean that the English Speaking Union is the creature and creation of the British foreign office or that its directors consciously and deliberately serve British interests at the expense of American interests. On the contrary, they regard themselves as the noblest Americans of them all. But whether it actually serves the best interests of the American people to give aid and comfort to the British Empire is another story.

That story unfolds as we pursue the interests and activities of English Speaking Union leaders in various directions. To begin with, they all tend to favor internationalism in general and the League of Nations in particular. They oppose isolation, economic self-sufficiency, and high tariffs. They support Secretary Hull's reciprocal trade treaties though most of them voted for Landon. Thus we find the board of directors of the English Speaking Union interlocking with the boards of other organizations devoted to League of Nations affairs and to a more cooperative American foreign policy. Not every director of these other organizations is necessarily as pro-British as the directors of the English Speaking Union, but insofar as any American supports the League of Nations, for example, he is lending aid and comfort to Britain. That he may not be aware of what he is doing does more credit to his heart than to his head; officially or unofficially, consciously or unconsciously, he is a faithful soldier in His Majesty's service. Though he may not recall that the League of Nations originated in the British Council of Imperial Defense, he can hardly have failed to hear Stanley Baldwin's repeated pleas to the United States to join.

MORGAN ATTORNEY, VICE PRESIDENT

And whom do we find on the board of directors of the League of Nations Association—"an organization of men and women convinced that the United States should become a member of the League of Nations"? Mr. Morgan's John W. Davis appears as 1 of its 3 honorary vice presidents; its 27 directors include Newton D. Baker, who set forth the Morgan thesis on America's entry into the World War in the October 1936 issue of Foreign Affairs. These two men make no secret of their sympathy for the British point of view; others, by reason of their support of the League of Nations, automatically (if unconsciously) support the British position. And many of them are men of substance: Raymond B. Fosdick, president of the Rockefeller Foundation; Manley O. Hudson, recently appointed member of the World Court; Prof. James T. Shotwell, director of the division of economics and history of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; and S. Van B. Nichols, chairman of the association's board, who lists himself in Who's Who as "public speaker on League of Nations, World Court, and international subjects." It is not difficult to imagine the gratification that the activities of these men must arouse in the British foreign office.

INTERLOCKING AID ENGLAND DIRECTORATES

If the League of Nations Association interlocks with the English Speaking Union in respect to personnel, objectives, and general character, the Foreign Policy Association bears a similar relationship to the League of Nations Association. Just as the League of Nations Association does not announce Anglo-American cooperation as its primary aim, so the Foreign Policy Association does not assert that its objective is to get the United States into the League of Nations. Yet that is the open ambition of many of its leading spirits.

James G. McDonald established the Foreign Policy Association after the war in order to educate American public opinion in world affairs. In 1934 he quit his position as chairman to head a League of Nations Commission for the care of German exiles. This humanitarian work naturally added to his enthusiasm for the League, and he returned to the United States urging his countrymen to cooperate with the Geneva organization to prevent armed conflict. Mr. McDonald is also a member of the editorial staff of the New York Times under our English-speaking unionist, Dr. John H. Finley. The English Speaking Union has further representation on the Foreign Policy Association in Mrs. Henry Goddard Leach, a director of the Union and vice chairman of the Foreign Policy Association.

MORGAN PARTNER'S WIFE AIDS

On the national board of directors of the Foreign Policy Association we find the name of Mrs. Thomas W. Lamont, wife of the Morgan partner, who himself appears on the national council along with Robert W. Bingham, American Ambassador to Great Britain. At a dinner held in London on July 4, 1936, Mr. Bingham declared: "The British and ourselves have sought to lead the world in the path of peace and disarmament. Unfortunately so far we have failed. But in a world armed and arming I shall expect this Nation and my own to match gun with gun, ship with ship, plane with plane, man with man in the protection of our countries and our homes." The National Council of the Foreign Policy Association also includes Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt (a vice president of the League of Nations Association), Manley O. Hudson, and Stephen Duggan (both directors of the League of Nations Association), and such outstanding figures as Roscoe Pound, former dean of the Harvard Law School, Silas H. Strawn, of the Liberty League, Felix Warburg, William Allen White, and Owen D. Young.

BELONG TO BRITISH NETWORK

Not all these people have publicly advocated Anglo-American collaboration. Some of them have not even declared themselves in favor of the League of Nations. They do, however, stand for two things. They all belong to or speak for the conservative propertied classes and they all favor a more positive cooperative foreign policy. Which is exactly the same thing as saying that they belong to the British network. For, in respect to foreign policy, the propertied classes in the United States have no alternative to offer.

Still another organization devoted to American foreign policy illustrates still more clearly the pro-British bias of most well-to-do Americans. The Council on Foreign Relations, organized shortly after the war, calls itself "a nonpartisan and noncommercial organization studying the international aspects of America's political, economic, and financial problems. It is not a trade organization and has no connection with any political party. Its membership is composed of men of many professions, with a variety of interests and views." Membership in the council is elective and the 500 rank-and-file

members include a real cross section of political and economic opinion. Even the quarterly organ of the council, Foreign Affairs, prints as varied an assortment of articles as any magazine in the field.

But on the board of 18 directors we encounter many of our friends of the English Speaking Union. The ubiquitous John W. Davis appears both as a director and as a member of the nine-man editorial advisory board of Foreign Affairs. Here, too, we again meet Harry A. Garfield, of the English Speaking Union; Stephen Duggan, of the League of Nations Association and the Foreign Policy Association; and Newton D. Baker, of the League of Nations Association. Walter Lippmann, friend and defender of the Morgan partners, also serves both as a director and as a member of the editorial advisory board. Paul D. Cravath, one of the 10 vice presidents of the English-Speaking Union, is a director of the Council on Foreign Relations, together with Russell C. Leffingwell, a Morgan partner.

PRO-BRITISH ORIENTATION

The late George W. Wickersham, president of the League of Nations Association, saw no inconsistency in serving also as president of the Council on Foreign Relations, but since his death he has been replaced by Norman H. Davis, whose labors at several naval conferences gave so much satisfaction to the British Foreign Office. Owen D. Young is also a board member of the council. Mr. Young, it will be recalled, endeared himself to England when he suggested that his European collaborators on the plan that bears his name prepare a special memorandum urging the United States to take Lord Balfour's advice and cancel the war debts in exchange for exactly nothing at all. In short, by reason of their very importance and influence and by reason of their honest endeavor to include many points of view, the directors of the Council on Foreign Relations stand as living proof of the predominantly pro-British orientation of the American ruling class.

So far, our survey of the British network has been confined to international sport, to the synthetic hospitality of an English-Speaking Union dinner, and to the grinding boredom produced by the meeting of the minds of Walter Lippmann, Newton D. Baker, and Norman Davis in the innermost sanctum of the Council on Foreign Relations. Let us now watch these gentlemen at their daily duties. For to discover the members of the British network doing their masters' business we must see them doing their own.

ROLE OF MORGAN BANK

At the risk of hammering one point beyond recognition, mention must again be made of the importance of the Morgan Bank as Britain's financial base of operations in the United States. Its role in the World War as sole purchasing agent for the British Government leaves no doubt as to its importance during that period, and the statements of Messrs. Morgan and Lamont at the time of the Nye investigation do credit to their forthright support of the British position.

To Mr. Morgan there was never any question of following the lead of his President and remaining neutral in mind and thought. The moment the Germans threatened the security of England by invading Belgium, "We found it impossible to be neutral." And if we are to believe Thomas W. Lamont, Mr. Morgan's partner and spokesman, most of the best people who lived along the eastern seaboard felt the same way. "Does anyone," asked Mr. Lamont in a letter to the New York Times, dated October 18, 1935, "even of the post-war generation, believe that business interest determined the pro-Ally sentiments of Morrow or Morgan or Davison, or any of us? Surely not. Like most of our contemporaries and friends and neighbors, we wanted the Allies to win from the start. We were pro-Ally by inheritance, by instinct, by opinion, and so were almost all the people we knew on the eastern seaboard of the United States from the moment Germany violated Belgium's neutrality."

NEW YORK TIMES PRO-BRITISH

Mr. LaMont's priceless definition of the American aristocracy—"almost all the people we knew on the eastern seaboard"—holds just as good today as it did in 1917. It also covers like a tent the chief figures in the British network, notably the owners and editors of the New York Times, which is Britain's chief propaganda organ in the United States, just as Morgan's is Britain's chief financial base.

We have already seen the late Adolph S. Ochs, who built up the Times to its present commanding position, acting as intermediary between the British Admiralty and the American Department of State and preparing the way for the British-inspired naval conference at Washington in 1921. Furthermore, it was during his conversations with Lord Lee, of the British Admiralty, that Mr. Ochs defined the policy of his paper in terms that might have surprised those readers who took at face value the Times' slogan: "All the news that's fit to print."

ADOLPH OCHS PREACHED UNITY

"I told him," he wrote afterward, "that I had always felt the peace and welfare of the world rested with the English-speaking nations, and particularly with the United States and the British Empire, and that I regarded it as my patriotic duty to promote that as far as lay within my power; that the New York Times was dedicated to that policy; that I never thought it necessary to have treaties or written agreements to that effect; that I thought to express it in writing would simply be qualifying the broader principles of our friendly relations; that I thought we were in full accord in our ideas of justice and righteousness; and that while our interpretations of these principles might not at all times be in accord with the understanding of other nations, we should unitedly be strong enough to maintain our ideals, protect them, and win respect for them, if by no other means than by our power and strength."

EXCERPTS FROM CHAPTER, THE ANCIENT GRUDGE

To watch first the British Foreign Office and then the British network in action is to detect a contrast between British and American foreign policy. Whereas the British Empire needs the aid of the United States to maintain its rule over one-quarter of the earth's surface, the United States derives no corresponding benefit from the partnership. Its stake in the Empire would appear to be more sentimental than material.

Which gives rise to a horrid thought. Granted that all Mr. Lamont's friends along the eastern seaboard pledge the last full measure of their devotion to King and country, can this enlightened group prevail forever against those dark hordes whose motto reads, "What is there in it for me?" For it must be confessed—more in sorrow than anger—that we cannot all sustain ourselves in the rarefied spiritual atmosphere that Mr. J. P. Morgan breathes when he declares that Americans fought in the World War to save their immortal souls. Human nature being what it is, we cannot all subordinate crass self-interest to the higher purposes of the British Foreign Office—at any rate, not all the time.

ANOTHER WAR WITH BRITAIN?

By increasing its export trade, by investing more money abroad, and by importing more raw materials, the United States found itself conflicting with Britain in three separate spheres. The wartime era of Anglo-American good feelings gave way to a period of mounting suspicion. By 1930 the tension had reached such a point that Ludwell Denny, one of the most knowledgable correspondents on the Scripps-Howard staff, wrote a book entitled "America Conquers Britain: A Record of Economic War." "War between America and England," he declared, "is more probable than war between America and any other power." Nor was he alone in this view. David Lloyd George and the late Frank H. Simonds agreed with him. So did Lieutenant Commander Kenworthy, a Labor Member of Parliament, now Lord Strabolgi, who prophesied in 1928, "The danger of Anglo-American conflict is as real as was the danger of war between Britain and Germany in 1905. We are heading straight for the same tragedy as 1914."

* * * * *

AFTER ALLIANCE—WHAT?

Let us assume, however, that the Anglo-American honeymoon runs its chartered course and culminates in something like the Anglo-American alliance toward which the British Foreign Office has been working. What then? May not a struggle ensue in which a new breed of American imperialists, less Anglophile than the Morgans, may refuse to accept dominion status? Aye, there's the rub. War between England and America may be as unthinkable as the prophets of the English Speaking Union say, but isn't peace between them equally unthinkable in the long run? In fact, isn't it possible that even the early, immediate stages of Anglo-American collaboration do not mean peace but the sword?

* * * * *

It would be difficult to name any two countries that have fewer common interests or more points of difference than Great Britain and the United States.

* * * * *

It is especially interesting to note that the Morgan-Grenfell bank is the parent house of all the Morgan institutions. It was founded in 1838 by an American citizen, George Peabody, and in 1854 Junius S. Morgan, grandfather of the present J. P. Morgan, entered the firm. Though an American citizen, Junius Morgan lived in London, and his son, the original J. P., emigrated to the United States. E. C. Grenfell, one of the managing directors of Morgan's London house, is on the court of the Bank of England.

BRITISH INTERNATIONAL BANKING

Here is evidence not only of still another link between British and Morgan interests, but of the international character of British banking generally. Hambros Bank, for instance, was founded by a Dane and specializes in Scandinavian and Greek issues because it was a Danish Prince who ascended the throne of Greece as George I in 1881. Lazard Brothers specializes in Anglo-French issues. Schroder's has a large stake in Germany.

* * * * *

If all this belongs in the field of conjecture, let me recall that the bulk of this chapter rests on the supposition that England and America can—if they wish to do so—defend the existing world order. The record of the first Roosevelt administration not only shows the United States declining to compete with England for foreign trade and foreign investments; it shows American Treasury officials and American naval officers working closely with their British counterparts.

* * * * *

ALLIANCE NO WORLD PANACEA

Thus the prospects of an Anglo-American alliance cannot be judged in terms of American interests alone, or even primarily in those terms. Just because Britain has always dominated American foreign policy, just because a British network of highly placed Americans rallies to the support of the Empire, just because the latent conflicts between England and America have relaxed temporarily—all this does not mean that an Anglo-American alliance can instantly and permanently stabilize the world the moment it is concluded. To accept that view is to

adopt the perspective of Dr. John H. Finley as he quotes Kipling at an English Speaking Union dinner.

In short, the full implications of English-speaking unity do not emerge until the positions of both England and the United States have been analyzed. We have seen what the policy of supporting Great Britain has meant to the United States. We have seen how the British network operates and why the United States defends Britain's stake in the world. And we have reached an uncomfortable dilemma. Has Britain become so weak that only the aid of the United States can preserve the Empire? Or has Britain's position become so strong that only the United States stands in the way of its universal rule?

EXCERPTS FROM CHAPTER, ENGLAND, WHAT OF THE NIGHT?

Britain's domestic dilemma is largely the product of the imperial and foreign dilemmas and the two names—Britain and England—reduce it to two words. For Britain sounds imperial, England insular. Britannia rules the waves, but it is of England that the poets from Shakespeare to Rupert Brocke have sung. Perhaps, indeed, the part is greater than the whole, for the island of Great Britain includes three nations, England, Scotland, and Wales, and it is the English Nation that has dominated the other two since Queen Elizabeth's time.

ENGLAND'S INTERNAL DECAY

Yet this nation which has impressed its language, its institutions, and its rule not only on the island of Great Britain but upon a quarter of the earth's surface shows signs of internal decay. The same dangers of revolution and war that threatened the British Empire also threaten the mother country. Furthermore it is primarily because of its foreign conquests, because of its dependence on foreign lands that these dangers threaten the British people so acutely.

* * * * *

What does have bearing on the fate of England is the physical well-being of its people. Sir John Boyd Orr, director of the Rowett Institute for Research in Animal Nutrition in Aberdeen, threw some disturbing light on this subject in March 1936, when his book entitled "Food, Health, and Income" appeared with the astounding statement that half the British population is undernourished. Some four and a half million people have only 4s. ($1) a week to spend on food, and 9,000,000 more spend only 6s. A minimum of 10s. a week is required for an adequate diet; 6s. do not buy enough milk, fruit, or vegetables; 4s. do not buy enough food of any kind.

CHILD ARISTOCRATS HEALTHY

Of the different income groups Sir John writes, "As income increases, disease and death rate decrease, children grow more quickly, adult stature is greater, general health and physique improve." In consequence boys who attend the fashionable schools of the aristocracy average 5 inches taller than the corresponding sons of working men. This condition continues in adult life; less than half the applicants for army enlistments can pass the physical examination.

The trend of the birth rate, both in Great Britain and the Dominions, also causes alarm. If the present annual rate of less than 15 births per thousand remains constant—and it has fallen steadily from 35.4 per thousand in 1880—England's population will decline 10,000,000 during the next 20 years. Australia and New Zealand are not reproducing themselves and since 1931 more people have been migrating from the Dominions to Britain than have been leaving Britain to populate British possessions overseas.

DRY ROT CORRUPTS

While men decay, wealth accumulates. The same process of dry rot that has been corrupting the leadership of the labor party also afflicts the aristocracy. The incident of the Zinoviev letter shows the conservative party stooping to hire a gang of forgers in order to win a general election. Nor was this an isolated incident of corruption.

* * * * *

It requires no microscope to detect England's symptoms of decay: The discrepancies of wealth and poverty, the corruption in high places, the generally slack morale leap to the eye.

EDWARD'S ABDICATION UNFORTUNATE

Nowhere did the whole episode (Edward's abdication) make a more unfortunate impression than on the United States where British spokesmen had bragged for years about the unassailable moral and material position of their empire. Furthermore, the venomous comments of the archbishops and other worthies made it quite plain that the same British aristocrats who had shouted themselves hoarse between 1914 and 1917 for America to rescue their imperial holdings actually in their heart of hearts despised the United States as the "alien" source of Edward's corruption. Indeed, as long as the memory of the abdication lingers, it will be just a little harder for these same Englishmen and their faithful henchmen at 23 Wall Street, Times Square, and points west to draw America into the second world war on the British side.

EXCERPTS FROM CHAPTER ALLIANCE: ENGLAND'S SALVATION

At the same time, however, a recent survey conducted by Dr. George Gallup's American Institute of Public Opinion shows that 70 percent of the American people now believe that the United States should not have gone into the World War. Even the New York Times sorrowfully confesses that the sentiment of the country is overwhelmingly isolationist

* * * * *

ROOSEVELT ALLIANCE MINUS ADVANTAGES

This is no academic matter. Already, in the name of the "good-neighbor" policy and international appeasement, the Roosevelt administration has begun assuming the responsibilities of an alliance with England without receiving any advantages in exchange. Speaking in Atlantic City on May 13, 1937, Raymond Leslie Buell, director of the Foreign Policy Association, pointed out, "America is drifting into a tacit alliance with Britain and France and so far has received little in return. Today we are in effect morally supporting the status quo in Europe without participating in the decisions made by Britain and France which may determine the peace of the world." He then cited the tripartite monetary agreement, the American naval program, and the cash-and-carry neutrality measure as advantageous to British interests.

Mr. Buell is perhaps a bit of a dreamer to expect a consistent and clear-cut foreign policy from a President who, in domestic affairs, turns over his New Deal to reactionary southern Senators, stock-market gamblers, municipal machine politicians, former commanders of the American Legion, and Texas bank presidents. But if the domestic situation can wait while Roosevelt makes up his mind whether he is saving capitalism or peacefully installing a new social order, the foreign situation calls for a definite line of policy, thoroughly worked out in advance and ready for immediate application.

A STATUS QUO ALLIANCE

If the United States decides to support England, it may appear to be acting in behalf of peace and democracy, of collective security and resistance to aggression. In effect, however, the decision will mean that the greatest Empire on earth and the world's strongest Nation will be putting their combined support behind the status quo everywhere.

* * * * *

Communism, fascism, national socialism—Japan, Russia, Germany, Italy—the names of the possible opponents of democracy change from sentence to sentence and from paragraph to paragraph. And if President Nicholas Murray Butler, who has received more honorary degrees than almost any man alive, cannot name the line-up in the next world war or define its objective, the problem defies the power of the human intellect. But it does not require superhuman gifts to detect the political purpose of an Anglo-American alliance.

CRUSADE'S OBJECTIVE THE SAME

Perhaps the British Foreign Office will invite the American people to crusade against fascism; perhaps it will be an anti-Communist crusade—God only knows and this time he has not vouchsafed His secret to the president of Columbia University. All that mere mortals can know is that the next crusade Britain undertakes will have the same objective as the last one, the protection of British interests. And it is a prime British interest to defeat any political movement—Fascist or Communist—that threatens the Empire.

The possibility of course exists that the next world struggle will finally simmer down to a conflict between fascism and communism in the course of which some of the democracies will turn one way, some another. It does not, however, require the services of a crystal gazer to guess which way the British Empire would move or which camp the British network would urge the United States to support.

NORMAN + MORGAN = DEMOCRACY?

What, then, becomes of the democratic professions of Sir Arthur Salter and Lord Lothian? That an Anglo-American alliance is well calculated to support the existing order throughout the world, even at the expense of democracy against fascism, should not cause John W. Davis to resign from the English-Speaking Union. It should, however, give pause to anyone who calculates that Montagu Norman plus J. P. Morgan equal democracy.

The least, then, that the Anglo-American alliance offers is a crusade against revolution; at most it may include an additional preliminary crusade against fascism before the "red" hunt begins. All of which has exactly nothing at all to do with the present outcry against dictatorship and the present enthusiasm for democracy. In short the political appeal of the Anglo-American alliance is just as spurious as the cultural appeal. In the one instance the British have made their interests synonymous with democracy; in the other with civilization.

EXCERPTS FROM CHAPTER, ISOLATION: AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY

To continue in the present direction is to drift into an unwritten alliance with England and to receive nothing in exchange. A policy that is at once progressive and isolationist offers the only solution.

Such a policy must meet the three chief problems that confront the United States today. First, it must keep the United States out of war abroad and defend the American people against foreign attack. Second, it must make the United States economically independent during a period of foreign war. Third, it must take measures to prevent what happened in Germany from happening here.

BRITISH NETWORK BACKS STATUS QUO

There is no use pretending that the United States can stay out of war and maintain the existing system at home and abroad. The members of the British network hope, of course, to keep the peace, but in 1937, as in 1917, they would go to war rather than let Britain down. And with even better reason. For in 1937 the British Empire stands out as the mightiest vested interest in a changing world. Any threat to its existence also threatens America's vested interests at home and abroad. In short, it is no accident that the

British network tends to become more and more difficult to distinguish from the wealth and fashion of the land.

* * * * *

As long as the United States has overseas possessions, overseas investments, or overseas trade to protect, its Army and Navy must plan to deploy thousands of miles from home. And to achieve its purpose such an expedition calls for a greater national effort than that of 1917–18. In fact, the next crusade will begin where the last one left off, and embody at the start the lessons of the World War.

WASHINGTON WAR DICTATORSHIP

While the public at large looked the other way the generals, the admirals, and the businessmen have laid their plans. In consequence, a body of legislation now exists which, according to Mr. Hallgren, will establish a dictatorship in Washington the moment war is declared: "These powers are absolute. They cover everything. They can be used to suppress any newspaper, printing press, publishing firm, or any other business, or any individual in a position to influence or appeal to public opinion. They can be used to compel any corporation, other organization, or individual to do whatever the dictatorship orders done. Nor will the Government hesitate to use any of its powers, explicit, implicit, or assumed, to smash anyone and everyone who might dare to stand in the way of its war effort or of the dictatorship. Whatever its own interests and desires may be, the whole Nation will be forced to submit to the wisdom or madness, as the case may be, of those who will be sitting in power in Washington when the war comes."

To judge from the experience of the last war and from the record of the N. R. A., those "sitting in power in Washington" will include the same dollar-a-year men whose firms made profits of 200 percent and 300 percent in 1917–18. The failure of Congress to pass any legislation limiting profits in time of war, and Walter S. Gifford's opposition to any plan that would not "leave enough profits to keep the wheels of industry moving" suggest that the dictatorship will not bear too heavily upon the possessing class.

BRITISH NETWORK BACKS FOREIGN WAR

Nor do the advocates of aggressive war misrepresent their aims. General after general and admiral after admiral have testified in Washington that the United States must prepare to fight abroad. And the civilian members of the British network back them up 100 percent.

* * * * *

Secretary WALLACE says, in effect, that the United States can stay out of war if it becomes self-sufficient. General Butler says, in effect, that the United States can stay out of war if it keeps all its armed forces at home at all times. But in order to become self-sufficient in time of war the United States must acquire stores of raw materials from abroad. And in order to keep its armed forces at home, it must withdraw from its various colonial possessions.

DANGEROUS MILITARY DICTATORSHIP

Secretary WALLACE sees that his plan would mean an unprecedented exercise of power by the Federal Government. General Butler merely asks for a constitutional amendment. Both men foresee the danger of a military dictatorship in the United States; both doubt that any foreign war could benefit the American people or, indeed, anybody else. That Mr. Davis desires peace and abominates war as much as Mr. WALLACE or General Butler no reasonable man can doubt. But it is difficult to see how his policy of rearmament and collaboration with Britain can lead to anything but war abroad and dictatorship at home.

What, on the other hand, will a policy of self-sufficiency and noninterference in foreign war involve? First, more centralized power in Washington; second, liquidation of all foreign investments and colonial possessions; third, recognition by the Federal Government that the United States is already facing the same revolutionary issues that have risen more sharply elsewhere. I have suggested how the United States might become self-sufficient if it abandoned its foreign holdings and its foreign military outposts. The time has come, however, to suggest a practical alternative to the military dictatorship which the British network proposes as the final solution of America's domestic problem.

* * * * *

At this point extremes meet. The British network anticipates that only an Anglo-American alliance can preserve the status quo throughout the world. But it also believes that the end in view justifies war and a military dictatorship in the United States. The Communist International anticipates that only a united front of all the democratic powers can overthrow fascism and promote social revolution throughout the world. And it, too, believes that the end in view justifies war. In fact, the Communist International will go further any say that capitalism cannot avoid war anyway.

Although the British network and the Communist International see the same policy leading to diametrically opposite conclusions, they agree that the same means justify the opposite ends for which they are working. They also agree that the "middle way" leads nowhere at all.

* * * * *

The British Foreign Office understands clearly enough that an alliance with the United States is not practical politics today. In fact, the British Foreign Office decidedly prefers the present state of affairs whereby the United States unofficially underwrites the British Empire and gets nothing in exchange. It is only the American members of the British network who advocate some more formal arrangement involving a quid pro quo. Even J. P. Morgan does not like to give something for nothing.

To adopt a continental foreign policy, the United States does not need to take every last measure recommended here. It does, however, need to reverse the present trend toward an unofficial alliance with England. Where this trend leads we already know. What, then, would a reversal toward isolation involve?

ISOLATION SERVES CIVILIZATION

An isolationist foreign policy serves not only the interests of the American people but the interests of civilization, democracy, and progress throughout the world. It will deliver the very goods that the British network only promises.

A self-sufficient America promotes western civilization by preserving it in the one country where it has not gone into a decline. Furthermore, an isolated America will not uphold England's dead hand over one-quarter of the earth's surface. Other nations will have a chance to find their places in the sun. Nor will the British people stand to gain the least from a collapse of the British Empire.

WAR MEANS UNITED STATES DICTATORSHIP

A self-sufficient America promotes democracy by preserving it in its country of origin. The moment the United States fights the war of aggression into which the British network is now forcing it—in the name of peace and democracy—it will establish a dictatorship on its own soil.

A self-sufficient America promotes progress and aids world organization. It promotes progress by showing what one continental area can do under its own steam. It aids world organization by transferring its present support from a lost but mighty cause, the British Empire, to the mightier winning cause of a cooperative world community. And a cooperative American community offers the best immediate contribution toward that cause today.

"IT CAN HAPPEN AGAIN"

Not one of these prophecies may ever come true. It all depends upon the course of events and upon what policies the United States follows. But the British Empire anticipates trouble during the next 5 or 10 years and seeks American support. The best-informed foreign service in the world looks for wars and revolutions in the near future. The most skillful diplomats and propagandists have set the wheels in motion to mobilize America when the lightning strikes.

It can happen again.

Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1941

ARTICLE BY T. D. KEMP, JR.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most interesting article by Mr. T. D. Kemp, columnist, who writes daily for the Charlotte Observer of Charlotte.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Now

(By T. D. Kemp, Jr.)

The lend-lease bill becomes law and so the British rain bombs on German cities in their most ambitious raids of the war. The Germans likewise intensify their raids on British cities. We still sleep peacefully, but our political leaders have succeeded in pouring oil on the fire so that it may spread now into a world-consuming conflagration.

Mr. Herbert Agar, editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal, tells a Boston audience the lend-lease bill is not a bill to keep us out of war but a bill to "fight an undeclared war against Germany, and those who say it is anything else are lying."

Intelligent people know Mr. Agar is right, although few admit it. Others in this Nation, for selfish or revengeful reasons, are delighted to see this "oil poured on the fire," feeling that it will enrich them while they sit at home and watch "democracy" triumph.

You recall in that last World War we determined to make "democracy triumph" in the same way. The net result was millions dead and wounded. Communism in Russia, fascism in Italy, nazi-ism in Germany, class rule in England, social degeneracy in France, widespread misery and poverty in Austria and the Balkans, and $22,000,000,000 worth of unpaid debts owed us by England and her Allies which finally led to the depression. Our thanks for participation was the title of "Uncle Shylock," which one heard everywhere in Europe in the 1920's. We have learned nothing.

Now by a slow and calculated process we are back in the mess again. The pity is that

we don't admit it, get down to brass tacks, try to win the war before communism spreads, and then have a guiding hand at the peace conference instead of getting kicked out as we were before.

Our political leaders will, of course, wait for some incident to admit to the American people that we are at war. That incident will probably come by summer. In the meantime our Army camps are here to stay, our taxes will increase to the breaking point, freedom of speech will be more and more curtailed, and our present way of life may become as obsolete as a stable in Detroit. But we may yet save the British Empire, even though it may not be worth saving, provided we face the facts and stop "kidding."

Mr. Roosevelt wants $7,000,000,000 at once for the purchase of materials to aid England. He will get it, and the American people will pay, despite the fact that English capitalists have billions of dollars invested in this country and in South America, most of which could be put up as collateral or converted. Unless you have actually lived in England, you have no idea how wealthy the wealthy Britisher really is.

Congressional fiscal experts have already suggested a 5-percent tax on the weekly pay check of most of this Nation's workers to pay for the aid to England. Thus a worker getting $40 a week would actually get only $38 and a tax receipt for $2. When this war is over, those tax receipts will not buy food and clothes for that worker's family.

Russia's state planning commission is assigned the task of drawing up a new 15-year plan, by Mr. Stalin, "to make the Soviet Union the greatest industrial nation in the world."

Those communist leaders have long had the ambition to become the world's industrial leader. Now they are swapping grain, cotton, timber, and oil for lathes, turbines, tools, electrical equipment, hydraulic presses, precision instruments, etc.

The intelligent nations are busy manufacturing guns, ammunition, and other instruments of destruction.

No wonder that sinister Stalin chuckles to himself as he watches this war spread, making every agreement necessary to keep it going in full fury as long as it doesn't involve Russia.

Carol Hohenzollern, ex-king of Rumania, and his mistress, Magda Lupescu, are reportedly making plans to go to Cuba. The couple, after their recent escape from Spain, where they were under technical arrest, are now in Lisbon at the home of Carol's Portuguese business agent.

Worth millions, and with much of his fortune banked in New York City, Carol and his fat Pompadour, who is said to be the clever one of the two, will probably turn up in this country eventually. New York cafe society, already filled with scum, will welcome this couple with open arms.

Harsh Realism for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1941

ARTICLE BY STUART CHASE

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the current issue of the Progressive, by Stuart Chase, entitled "Harsh Realism For America."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Progressive]

HARSH REALISM FOR AMERICA

(By Stuart Chase)

William C. Bullitt made a speech recently. He said: "The moral code which was accepted by all the rulers of the earth has been denied, derided, and defiled by the dictators of Germany, Italy, the Soviet Union, and Japan. For them the Ten Commandments have lost all meaning. They have discarded all the teachings of the words and life of Christ, 'Love thy neighbor as thyself.' Quote that to Hitler, Stalin, Mussolini, or the Japanese militarists and hear them laugh. We can expect neither honor nor mercy in their dealings with us or with any nation."

Mr. Bullitt then goes on to say that isolationists are like sufferers from dementia praecox "who cannot bear to face the harsh reality of the real world."

This kind of talk leaves me groggy. Mr. Bullitt leaps blithely from the Golden Rule to the harsh realities of power politics. He has hopelessly mixed his frames of reference. When, in the bloody course of history, have dealers in power politics ever been concerned with the words and life of Christ? Does Mr. Bullitt want us to go to war against sin, or does he want us to be realistic about defending our country? These are two very different things.

Tangling up hymns and howitzers leaves us in a mental fog, paralyzing intelligent action. Interventionists are continually doing it. Let us see if we can untangle Mr. Bullitt, and keep out frames of reference clear. The moral case against the Axis Powers runs something like this:

The world was struggling toward the light. Christian decency and good cricket was the order of the day. Suddenly, apparently out of nowhere, arose four powers of darkness—Germany, Italy, Japan, and Russia. Without warning and in defiance of their most sacred obligations, they assaulted the children of light—Ethiopia, China, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the rest.

Britain alone hold out. If she falls, the powers of darkness will blacken the maps of Africa, Asia, the Indies, and perhaps those of Latin America and Canada. The United States will be the last stronghold of Christian decency, democracy, liberty, and enlightened capitalism. How long before it too will be blacked out?

To avoid this fate, worse than death, we must now join all available children of light anywhere, and smite the powers of darkness hip and thigh. Otherwise it will be too late. The night will come down for a thousand years. All that we hold dear, all that we have stood for and fought for, the freedom and the future of our children's children, are at stake. Britain, China, Greece, Australia, Sumatra, we are coming. The black night shall not fall.

AND NOW REALITIES

I think this does the moral case adequate justice. In fact, I should not be surprised to hear it coming back at me over the radio some day. But it takes a high-powered microscope to find any traces of harsh realism in these cadences.

The case for political and military realities is in another frame of reference altogether. I am not necessarily advocating it. I am just stating it. It runs something like this: The object of a realistic foreign policy for the United States in 1941 is to maintain the undisputed sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Nation with a minimum loss of manpower, resources, and democratic institutions. No policy is worth considering which runs beyond our military power to enforce.

As has happened consistently in the past, various sovereign states have now burst the varnish of world order and the status quo, and marched forth to acquire additional real estate at the expense of whomever it may concern. The essential anarchy of international relations is again exposed. They have "ganged up" to remake the boundary lines of Europe, and to conquer and divide large sections of the British, French, and Dutch colonial possessions. They are well armed, well led, and extraordinarily determined.

Germany, Italy, and Japan have agreed to fight jointly any nation which makes war on any one of them. This compact seems to be aimed specifically at the United States. If we go to war with Germany, we shall automatically have Japan to fight in the Pacific. There are no moral principles in the Axis protocol at all—only the toughest kind of power politics. Russia is probably a silent partner of the Axis because she fears both Germany and Japan more than she fears us.

FOUR AMERICAN STEPS

Now in these tumultuous circumstances what should the United States do to carry on the object of national survival stated above? Four steps are indicated on the basis of harsh realism.

1. Arm to the point of repelling all possibility of invasion. Do not, however, arm against invasion in general, only against tangible, computable military forces. There is no point in building battleships and vast standing armies just for the exercise. Hard-boiled military men should set the limits.

2. Tie up the Western Hemisphere economically to insure all essential raw materials in case needed imports from abroad are cut off. Ring the hemisphere with bases in cooperation with Canada and Latin America. This gives us a cyclone cellar.

3. Tie up with potential allies who are in a position to give us military and economic help, and where geography is not too vulnerable to defend. How much of the British Empire is a good military risk is for experts to decide. Off-hand it looks as if the defense of Canada were the best kind of military risk, the defense of the British Isles one of the poorest.

4. Endeavor by diplomatic and economic pressure to sow dissention in the ranks of possible enemies—divide them, split them, turn them against each other. Avoid like the plague any commitment to take on Germany, Italy, Russia, and Japan at once.

DEFEND WHAT WE CAN

Do we live in a world of Christian decency? Alas, we do not; and never have. Most of the world's peoples are not Christians to begin with. Can we shoot the words and life of Jesus into benighted aggressors? Alas, we cannot—and it would be a wicked hypocrisy to attempt it. Can we make the world safe for the gold standard, free trade, Sir Montagu Norman, political democracy, and international rotary? Not unless we lick the tar out of 400,000,000 exceedingly well-armed patriots, who are very difficult to get at in the military sense.

Eighty-five percent of us do not want to lick the tar out of anyone unless he should attack the New World. Here is a grave problem of morale which needs more realistic consideration than the interventionists have ever given it. Can we defend the Western Hemisphere and save our own democratic way of life? We have a good fighting chance to do so if we concentrate on it. We have no chance at all if we scatter our forces on wild-goose chases all over Europe, Africa, and Asia.

It thus appears that Mr. Bullitt's war against sin is just about an all-time low in harsh realities. I never met a military man who would undertake to purify the planet with TNT. It would be easy to purify the solar system if elevating rhetoric could do it;

but if Berlin is to be taken by armed assault, another and more rigorous strategy must be employed.

No interventionist has indicated the vaguest outline of what such strategy shall be. Pending a practical plan cast in terms of men, materials, and fire power, harsh realities dictate defending what we can defend and letting crusades for utopia go over until the next meeting.

If the American people want a moral crusade, it is their right to have one; but it is criminal folly to tell them that such an adventure has any connection with the practical realities of their survival as a free people in a very dangerous world.

Why the Bill Regulating the Warehousing of Cotton Should Become a Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1941

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday, March 26, 1941, the House, in all probability, will resume consideration of S. 262, an act regulating the warehousing, storing, and reconcentration of cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Thursday, last, this bill was debated in the House, and all time for general debate expired except 31 minutes' unused time, 14 for the proponents and 17 for the opponents. After the 31 minutes are consumed by the proponents and the opponents of the bill, the bill will then, doubtless, be read under the 5-minute rule.

WHY BILL SHOULD PASS

This bill should become a law for the following reasons:

1. It will help the farmer, the small local warehouseman, the local community, and the Government.

2. It will not prevent reconcentration of cotton if the local warehouse fails to agree to a fair storage charge.

3. It is unreasonable to ask the Government to spend $2.18 per bale to reconcentrate cotton in order to secure a saving of only 48 cents. This is especially true since the Government must borrow the $2.18 and pay interest on it.

4. If the cotton is sent to the ports where the warehouses are owned by a very few people, the Government will be at the mercy of these port warehouses. Then in order to get a fair rate, the Government will have to ship the cotton back to the interior. Then if the Commodity Credit Corporation officials are right in believing that all of this cotton will be exported, the cotton will then have to be shipped from the interior to the ports again. It will be three trips over the railroads this cotton will have to take, if the Commodity Credit Corporation's contention is carried to its logical end.

5. The Commodity Credit Corporation will not save $5,000 a day as alleged, because the cost of removal, including freight, is not considered.

6. If the Government can save $5,000 a day, it will be against the interest of the farmer and the country for the cotton to be removed, because it will cause the farmers to pay $17,500 a day additional in higher storage rates, which cannot be prevented.

7. If the time should come when the price of cotton would justify the farmers in redeeming this cotton that has been taken over by the Government, it would be in the public interest to let the farmers redeem it. In that event, if the cotton has been reconcentrated at the ports, the farmer would receive much less for his cotton than he would in his local community.

8. The transportation system is going to be taxed to the limit during this emergency and it should not be further burdened with the needless and useless removal of the cotton from the interior warehouses to the ports.

9. The only sure gainers, if this bill is not passed and the cotton is reconcentrated, will be the railroad owners and the owners of the large port warehouses. The large warehouses at the ports could afford to offer to store the cotton free the first year.

10. No individual with business judgment would consider for a moment reconcentrating his own cotton under the circumstances and conditions that the Commodity Credit Corporation is proposing to reconcentrate the cotton involved in the bill.

11. Congress has compelled the local interior warehouses to pay higher wages and has caused them to gather the cotton in from the farmers one and two bales at a time without any charge whatsoever, and it would certainly be unfair to give a few owners of port warehouses the benefit of the free service rendered by the interior warehousemen.

TOO MANY UNCERTAINTIES

It is said of Christopher Columbus that when he left home that—

he didn't know where he was going; when he got there, he didn't know where he was; when he returned home, he did not know where he had been.

It happened that Columbus' voyage was a successful one, but since the law of averages has not been repealed, one can hardly conceive of the Commodity Credit Corporation successfully and in the public interest handling the cotton in the way and manner it is proposed. It is proposed that the cotton be shipped to the ports. It is known how much the freight will be. Incidentally, more than four times as much as the known savings on storage. It is not known how much the storage will be after the first year. Neither is it known whether the cotton can possibly remain in the warehouses where reconcentrated after the first year, and it is not known how much the freight will be back to the interior, in the event it must be shipped back.

THIS BILL IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

If the Members of Congress understand this bill, I venture to say that a comparatively few votes will be cast against it.

I cannot understand why any Government official or Member of Congress would attempt to cause the Government to do something that he, as an individual, would not do himself.

In this case, I venture to say that no one connected with the Government would consider it good business judgment to reconcentrate the cotton in the manner proposed by the Commodity Credit Corporation if such person owned the cotton himself instead of the Government owning it.

The hearings on this bill disclose that no witness would say that he would ship this cotton to the ports from the interior warehouses, if it belonged to him and not to the Government.

I asked Dr. Robbins, the president of the Commodity Credit Corporation this question:

Dr. Robbins, let us suppose that you own a thousand bales of cotton in an interior warehouse; that you are now paying 12½ cents per bale per month storage, including insurance, and all other charges; that the owner of a port warehouse is insisting that you move your 1,000 bales of cotton from the interior warehouse to a port warehouse; that the charges per bale per month would be reduced 4 cents, or 48 cents per bale per year; that the freight rate on the cotton and other handling charges, which you would have to incur to move the cotton from the interior warehouse to the port warehouse would average $2.18 per bale; that the port warehousemen would not agree to keep your cotton for 4 cents per bale per month less, except for 1 year; and that the contract would not be good longer than 1 year. Would you, as a business man looking after your own private, selfish interest, move your 1,000 bales to the port warehouses under those circumstances?

Dr. Robbins has never until this good day stated that he would ship his cotton to the port under these circumstances, neither has any other witness to whom the same interrogatory was propounded. The main witness for the ports admitted he would not ship his cotton to the ports under such circumstances.

It would not be good sense and good business judgment for him to move his cotton—whether one bale or a thousand bales—to the port warehouse for the following reasons:

1. He would have to immediately spend $2.18 removal charges on each bale, when he would only have definite assurance of a 48-cent saving. It would require 4½ years for him to save as much as the removal charges, if the savings continued.

2. After he had received the benefit of a saving of 48 cents per bale for the first year, the warehouseman could raise his rate to 25 or 50 cents per bale per month, or even more.

3. If he were unable to receive a satisfactory rate from the port warehouse at the end of the year, the only alternative he would have would be to move the cotton again; and if he had to move it back to the interior, the rate would be at least $2.18 and possibly much more, since the railroad companies do not have a published rate at this time from the ports to the interior.

4. He would not know where his cotton was going to be used, since the export market is practically gone and it is pos-

sible that his principal market in the near future will be in the interior.

5. Storage space is becoming more scarce at the ports and an increase in charges is probable. Steamship rates from the ports have increased from 85 cents per ton to $9 per ton during the past few months. There are four bales of cotton to the ton, so this increase in bales of cotton would have amounted to from 21 cents to $2.25 per bale. In other words, if the ports increase their storage charges in proportion, instead of the Government being required to pay only 8½ cents per bale per month, it will be compelled to pay more than 80 cents per bale per month, or $9.60 per year. If this increase in storage goes into effect, the owner of the cotton would find himself in the following position at the end of 2 years:

Removal charges, including freight from interior to port	$2.18
Storage, first year	.96
Storage, second year	9.60
Total	12.74
Interior storage, first and second year would have been	3.00
Loss to owner of cotton in 2 years	9.74

This will be the loss at the end of 2 years, if storage charges at the ports increase like shipping charges at the ports and the charges will be prohibitive after 2 years. In 3 or 4 years the port storage companies would receive from the Government more money for storage charges than the cotton is worth. I know it will be said that this is an extreme illustration. A few months ago the same thing would have been said about storage space in ships, but it happened just the same.

BAD FOR GOVERNMENT

The removal of the cotton would be especially bad for the Government. The savings promised are practically nil compared to the risk the Government will be compelled to run in making the change.

In one lot of cotton reconcentrated by the Commodity Credit Corporation, amounting to 300,000 bales, it will take the Government 9 years to save enough on storage charges to pay the cost of reconcentrating the cotton.

Further, there are big programs, which demand the use of cotton in the interior. I refer to the mattress program and the programs to use cotton to construct bomb-proof shelters and to make paper by mixing cotton with wood pulp and to make finished products, which are to be sent to Great Britain. These programs if carried out will absorb the entire cotton surplus in the interior.

The testimony before the committee disclosed that cotton was shipped from an interior point to a port and then this same class cotton was needed in the mattress program and the Commodity Credit Corporation was compelled to ship cotton back from a port to this interior point for that purpose, causing a loss of several dollars a bale.

BAD FOR THE FARMERS

The farmer is dependent upon a bonded warehouse, in order to obtain a loan on his cotton. When our exports were normal, the interior warehouses would only keep the cotton 2 or 3 months each until it was shipped to the port and then shipped overseas. Along with the loss of our export market and the piling up of a huge surplus of cotton, the interior warehouses were compelled to greatly enlarge their facilities.

In addition to their local and State taxes and income taxes to the Federal Government, the interior warehouses have recently had an increased burden added in the form of higher wages to their employees, caused by the passage in Congress of the wage and hour law.

Notwithstanding the enlargement of their facilities and the increased cost, the interior warehouses have been able to reduce storage charges from 50 cents per month to 12½ cents per month per bale. This was brought about because the local warehousemen had this Government cotton, which enabled him to collect storage 12 months in a year instead of only 2 or 3 months as heretofore. If the Government cotton is removed, the interior warehouses will have to put their charges back where they were or go out of business. If they go out of business, the farmers will not have a place nearby, where the cotton is grown, to obtain a loan. Therefore, an injury to the local warehouseman is an injury to the farmer in two ways:

1. In increased storage charges, and

2. Reduced facilities and possibly the elimination of the warehouse that he is looking to in his local community to store his cotton and obtain a loan. It must be remembered that no loan can be granted by the Commodity Credit Corporation unless the cotton is stored in a bonded warehouse, approved by the Commodity Credit Corporation. If the warehouse cannot operate, the former will not be able to obtain a loan in accordance with the farm act intended to help the farmer.

When the farmer seeks a loan on his bale of cotton, some one must fill out a very complicated form in duplicate. The forms are so large that a carbon cannot be used, so each of the two copies must be an original. The warehouseman is glad to fill out these forms for the farmer free of charge, because the cotton will be stored with him and he will collect money each month for the storage. It costs on an average from 15 to 25 cents to pay the expert help to fill out one of these forms. If the local warehouseman fills out the form and renders the other free service of taking a sample of the cotton and shipping it to the nearest Government classing office to get the grade and staple certified, which requires an expenditure for postage, bookkeeping, and other expenses, it will take him 2 or 3 months to get his money back before he collects a penny in gross profit from the farmer on storage.

The local warehouseman collects this cotton on one- and two-bale lots, and when it is accumulated in a local warehouse, the large Mammoth Cave port warehouse can afford to bid a much lower price, because it will be getting the cotton in large quantities without the expense of having served the farmer in the manner indicated and outlined. I venture to say if the ports were required to establish offices and gather this cotton in the same way that the local warehousemen gather it that the ports would not be able to offer a rate as low as the local warehousemen offer.

It is claimed that this bill will cause the Government to lose $5,000 a day. The charge is a ridiculous one and cannot be substantiated at all. However, if true, it is certainly not a good policy for the Government to save $5,000 a day if it will cost the farmer—as it will—$17,500 a day in extra storage charges that they will have to pay. The Commodity Credit Corporation is a part of the whole farm program.

GAINERS IF BILL NOT PASSED

If this bill does not become a law, the railroads will be sure of an enormous profit in transporting the cotton from the interior to the ports and possibly also earn a large profit in shipping much of it back from the ports to the interior. The large port warehouses will profit because the Government will be at their mercy when the cotton is once stored with them, and they will certainly have a good excuse to raise storage rates.

MONOPOLY

There are about 1,600 interior warehouses, most of them independently owned. There are 45 warehouses at the ports, owned by 33 companies. One company owns 14 of these port warehouses. It will be much easier for 33 concerns, which are already closely interlocked, to get together and frame up on the Government than it would be for 1,600 independent warehouses scattered over the entire country.

ADMITTED BY PORT REPRESENTATIVE THAT SMALL INTERIOR WAREHOUSEMEN WOULD BE RUINED

Mr. Greenville Mellen, of Gulfport, Miss., was the official spokesman for the big port warehouse interests before the committee. He presented the charts and maps that were prepared by Anderson-Clayton & Co. representatives and in the offices of Anderson-Clayton & Co. This is admitted in the testimony. The maps and charts attempted to present information that would lead members of the committee to believe that it was in the public interest for the cotton to be reconcentrated.

As official representative of the big port warehouse interests and when he was testifying, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, a member of the committee, asked him the following question:

> And with this other cotton it would contribute about four or five million bales. And suppose the Government had 11,000,000 bales of cotton. And suppose you go ahead and undertake to get the lowest bid and exercise any other discretion under the law and submit bids and get the lowest bidder. Now, don't you know the little warehouse would be cleaned out and won't have any cotton at all, and the big warehouses would get all of it?

Mr. Mellen's reply was:

> Yes, sir.

Then Mr. BROWN asked him this question:

> That is the reason this bill was introduced, as I understand?

And Mr. Mellen's reply was:

Yes, sir.

In this testimony we have the positive proof from the monopolistic port warehouse interests that they are attempting to force a situation that will cause the Government to give them a great advantage over the interior warehouses.

MR. CRAWFORD ADMITS STORAGE SPACE BECOMING SCARCE AT THE PORTS

In the printed hearings before the House committee, page 236, Mr. CRAWFORD of Michigan, a member of the committee, made the following statement and asked the following question:

Well, you have got your Government scouting the whole country today for warehouse space in connection with the defense program. How does he know but what within a few days he will be offered more earnings than he now has in the warehouse?

Mr. CRAWFORD, the leading opponent of this bill is apparently apprehensive of what the port warehouses will do. He has suggested that space is becoming scarce—and it certainly becomes scarce at the ports first—and will, doubtless, expect the port warehouses to increase their charges at the end of the first year. The warehousemen at the port, if this bill does not pass, can kindly inform our representative of the Commodity Credit Corporation that he will be compelled to pay a much higher price for storage at the end of the year, but if he doesn't like the rate, there is nothing to keep him from paying the freight on the cotton back to the point that it was originally shipped from.

I repeat that no individual would reconcentrate this cotton as proposed by the Commodity Credit Corporation if he owned it individually. We should certainly not do anything for the Government that would be against our own selfish interest if we were occupying the Government's place in the transaction.

In order that the Members of the House may know the kind of form that the local warehouseman must fill out, making two original copies, I am inserting it herewith:

[Front]

Fill all blanks with ink, indelible pencil, or typewriter. Only white copy marked *original* is to be signed; the colored copy marked *duplicate* is to be retained by the producer. No papers containing additions, erasures, or alterations will be accepted by Commodity Credit Corporation

C. C. C. Cotton Form A (1940-41)

This note must be tendered prior to July 1, 1941

(Original)

DO NOT WRITE ON THIS FORM UNTIL YOU HAVE CAREFULLY READ 1940-41 INSTRUCTIONS

COTTON PRODUCER'S NOTE

$_____ Date _____

On demand but not later than July 31, 1941, for value received, the undersigned promises to pay to the order of _____, payee, at the office of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Washington, D. C., _____/100 dollars, with interest from the date hereof at the rate of 3 per centum per annum payable at maturity. The makers and endorsers severally waive presentment for payment, demand, protest, notice of protest, and notice of nonpayment of this note.

This note is secured by a pledge of warehouse receipts representing _____ bales of cotton aggregating _____ pounds gross weight.

Witness:

_____ (Name) _____ (Address) _____ (Signature of producer)

Warehouseman should complete schedule of warehouse receipts. If space insufficient, attach schedule firmly. Have producer and warehouseman identify same by signature Note in space below that schedule is attached and fill in line marked "Total" only.

SCHEDULE OF WAREHOUSE RECEIPTS

[Enter warehouse receipt numbers representing cotton of only one grade and staple length]

	Warehouse Receipt or Tag No.	Gross Weight	*	Tare	Net Weight	Grade	Staple	Loan Value per Pound	Amount
_____ (Name of Warehouse)									
_____ (Address)									
All cotton securing this note must be in the same warehouse and secured by single-bale receipts									
	TOTAL		X	X					$

*Indicate type of bagging or round bales by symbol as follows: J, 2# jute; JJ, 2½# jute; S, sugar cloth; C, cotton bagging; R, round bales.

LIST OF LIENHOLDERS AND THEIR WAIVER AND CONSENT PLEDGE

The party making the loan agreement on the reverse side hereof certifies and warrants that the cotton covered by such agreement is free and clear of any and all liens and encumbrances except in favor of the lienholders listed herein below. If no liens insert "None."

Names of lienholders—including Federal agencies and landlords

_____

_____

_____

_____

We certify that we are the herein-named holders of liens on the cotton covered by the loan agreement on the reverse side hereof and hereby authorize (1) the pledge of the same in accordance with such agreement and the above-described note and any extension or renewal thereof, and (2) redelivery of warehouse receipts on payment of the loan, and (3) payment of any proceeds of such loan and of the proceeds of the sale of such cotton or insurance proceeds to the party making such loan agreement.

Signatures of lienholders or agents as provided in section 10 of 1940-41 C. C. C. Cotton Form 1

_____

_____

_____

_____

WAREHOUSEMAN'S CERTIFICATE AND STORAGE AGREEMENT

All charges on the cotton listed in the above or attached schedule are paid to August 1, 1940, or dates of warehouse receipt(s), whichever is later. This cotton is in existence, is undamaged, and is and will be kept under cover within a structure enclosed in such a manner that the cotton is adequately protected from weather damage. The cotton represented by the warehouse receipt(s) listed above or in the attached schedule is insured against loss or damage by fire for the full market value at the time and place of loss under policy or policies providing coverage similar to that afforded under the standard fire policy of the State in which the cotton is stored, and will be kept so insured so long as the receipt is outstanding. All charges, except as stated below, including storage and insurance, receiving, tagging, weighing on arrival, sampling on arrival, storage of samples, picking out by tag numbers and loading into cars or trucks, will be at the rate of 15 cents per bale per month or fraction thereof, or the warehouseman's established tariff, whichever is less, for the period from August 1, 1940, or the dates of the warehouse receipt, whichever is later, through July 31, 1941, and at the rate of 12½ cents per bale per month or fraction thereof, or the warehouseman's established tariff, whichever is less, after July 31, 1941. Charges for reweighing and resampling will be at the rate of 10 cents per bale for each service (including ranging or out-and-in charges) or the warehouseman's established tariff, whichever is less. Compression charges, and flat delivery charges on cotton moved from a warehouse operating compress facilities without payment of compression charges, will be at the rate provided in the warehouseman's established tariff in effect July 1, 1940. The warehouseman agrees that the charges specified herein shall apply for the benefit of Commodity Credit Corporation, the producer signatory to the note and any subsequent holder of the warehouse receipt, provided that after 15 days from the date the cotton is released from the loan this agreement of the warehouseman shall not be applicable. Commodity Credit Corporation may, by agents or otherwise, inspect the cotton, the warehouse, and the records of the warehouse at any time. The warehouseman agrees that if the cotton is ordered shipped by Commodity Credit Corporation, for the purpose of reconcentration or otherwise, shipments will be made promptly and storage charges will stop on receipt of shipping instructions and surrender of the warehouse receipt(s) unless the cotton is shipped within a reasonable time, as determined by the Corporation. Representative samples from both sides of the bale(s) of cotton listed in the above or attached schedule were drawn by the undersigned warehouseman and

delivered or forwarded for classing to a Board of Cotton Examiners of the United States Department of Agriculture, except for cotton classed under either a Form 1, Form A-2, or Form MD-4 Classification Memorandum of the United States Department of Agriculture, and the grade and staple shown in the above or attached schedule is the grade and staple reported by said Board of Cotton Examiners. The undersigned has read sec. 7 of the Loan Agreement on reverse side hereof.

Date....., 19...

..... (Signature of warehouseman) ..... (Agent or officer—Title)

(Warehouseman's Certificate must not be dated more than 5 days preceding date of above-mentioned note.)

CERTIFICATE OF COUNTY AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION COMMITTEE

(Use whichever is applicable)

(A) The undersigned, acting for the County Agricultural Conservation Committee of the county in which the producer signatory to this note and loan agreement produced cotton in 1940, certifies that said producer is a "cooperator" in the county and is entitled to a loan at the rates applicable to "cooperators." The serial number of the farm on which the cotton, covered by the warehouse receipts listed above, was produced is .....

For the ....., ... Agricultural Conservation Committee.
(State) (County)

....., 19..
(Date)

By .....
(For county committee)

(B) The undersigned, acting for the County Agricultural Conservation Committee of the county in which the producer signatory to this note and loan agreement produced cotton in 1940, certifies that said producer is a "noncooperator" in the county and that the amount of cotton used in computing the amount of this loan and all other loans certified by this committee for said producer is not in excess of the amount of cotton on which such producer is eligible for a loan at the rates applicable to "noncooperators." The serial number of the farm on which the cotton, covered by the warehouse receipts listed above, was produced is .....

For the ....., ... Agricultural Conservation Committee.
(State) (County)

....., 19..
Date)

By .....
(For county committee)

PAYEE'S CERTIFICATE

The undersigned payee certifies that the producer signatory to this note holds a white cotton marketing card on Form Cotton 411 issued by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, bearing Farm Serial No. ....., and such card is not marked "Penalty Secured," or "One Thousand Pounds."

.....
(Payee sign exactly as written in note above)

(Advice of loan to be detached)

C. C. C. Cotton Form A
(1940-41)

ADVICE OF LOAN—LENDING AGENCY MUST DETACH THIS SLIP AND MAIL IT TO COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION, WASHINGTON, D. C.

To: COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION,
Washington, D. C.

We have this day made Cotton Producer's Loan as follows:

..... (Date)

A. A. A. Farm Serial No.	Producer's Name	Location of Farm		Number of Bales	Grade	Staple	Amount
		County in which farm is located	*State in which farm is located*				
							$.....

..... (Name of warehouse where cotton stored) ..... (Address of warehouse—City and State)

..... (Lending agency) ..... (Address of lending agency—City and State)

[Back]

LOAN AGREEMENT

Print or Type { Producer ..... County ..... } Print or Type
{ Address ..... (Post office) R. F. D. ..... State ..... }

To secure note of ..... (Date) of ..... (Insert face amount) payable to ..... (Name of payee)

1. The undersigned hereby sells, assigns, pledges, and/or hypothecates to said payee and any subsequent holder the warehouse receipts for cotton listed on the reverse side hereof as collateral security for the payment of the indebtedness as evidenced by the note referred to above in this loan agreement.

2. In consideration of the loan evidenced by the aforementioned note, the undersigned represents and warrants to and agrees with all holders of the note as follows:

(a) That the cotton represented by the warehouse receipts listed herein or in the attached schedule is in existence and in good condition and that such cotton was produced in 1940 by or for the undersigned on only one farm and that such farm is located in ..... County, State of ..... as ..... (state whether landowner, landlord, tenant, or sharecropper. If as tenant or sharecropper, landlord must execute lien waiver on reverse side hereof unless the note and loan agreement are signed jointly by landlord and tenant or landlord and sharecropper as the case may be).

(b) That said cotton is "eligible cotton," as defined in section 1 (c) of the Instructions (1940-41 C. C. C. Cotton Form 1) or any amendment thereto.

(c) That if the acreage planted to cotton in 1940, on any farm in which the undersigned had an interest in 1940, exceeded the cotton acreage allotment established for such farm, he has obtained the approval in section *A*, or *B* on the reverse side hereof of the County Agricultural Conservation Committee of the county in which such farm is located.

(d) That if any tenant or sharecropper has an interest in the proceeds of the cotton pledged in security for this loan that such tenant or sharecropper will be paid his pro rata share of the proceeds of this loan and his pro rata share of any additional proceeds received from such cotton.

(e) That he is the owner of such cotton, has the legal right to pledge same, and that the beneficial title thereto is and always has been in the undersigned producer and that the benefits of the loan will accrue solely to the undersigned and any tenant or sharecropper having an interest in the proceeds of such cotton and have not been assigned or transferred to any other party by way of assignment, sale, or option. (A misstatement or misrepresentation in regard to any of the foregoing renders the producer personally liable under this loan agreement and subject to criminal prosecution under the provisions of the Criminal Code of the United States.)*

3. Upon maturity any holder is authorized to place all or any part of said cotton in any pool or pools with any other cotton held by the holder under generally similar loan agreements, and, either by pool or separate contract, to sell, assign, transfer, and deliver the cotton or cotton documents, evidencing title thereto, at such time, in such manner, for cash or upon such terms and conditions, as such holder may determine, at any cotton exchange, or elsewhere, or through any agency, at public or private sale, for immediate or future delivery, and without demand, advertisement, or notice of the time and place of sale or adjournment thereof or otherwise; and upon such sale, the holder may become the purchaser of the whole or any part of such collateral security.

4. After deducting all fees, costs, and expenses incident to insuring, carrying, handling, and marketing the collateral and accounting to the undersigned producer, including reasonable attorney fees, the holder shall apply the residue of any sales proceeds or insurance proceeds toward the payment of the above-mentioned note, returning the overplus, if any, only to the undersigned, or his personal representatives, without right of assignment or substitution of any other party. The undersigned producer shall be and remain liable to the holder for any deficiency only in the event that the loan was obtained through fraudulent representations by the producer.

5. The undersigned agrees that if any Federal agency or instrumentality shall become the holder of the above-mentioned note, it may, before or after maturity, move the collateral cotton from one storage point to another, subject to the provisions of the act of June 16, 1938 (Public, No. 660, 75th Cong.), and pay freight; may compress the commodity; may store separately, in block, or otherwise; may insure or reinsure against any risks, or otherwise handle or deal with the commodity, as may be deemed appropriate and proper subject to the terms of this loan agreement, releasing, substituting, and obtaining any and all instruments and documents, and paying or discharging any accrued or accruing charges or expenses as may in any way be appropriate or necessary therefor. Any costs and expenses connected with such handling without regard to insurance savings by reclassification or duration shall be a charge against the commodity, payable out of any proceeds thereof.

6. The undersigned further warrants for the benefit of any holder of the above-mentioned note, other than the payee, that he has no defenses to said note or set-offs or counter claims against the payee; that none will be claimed which may hereafter arise against any prior party and that in case of any judicial proceedings on said note by any such holder he hereby waives the right to any and all defenses, counterclaims, or set-offs against any or all prior parties.

7. The undersigned, and all warehousemen by executing certificate and storage agreement on the reverse side hereof agree that they and each of them have full knowledge of the provisions of section 35 of the Criminal Code of the United States,* and have made the representations and statements contained herein, for the purpose of influencing the Commodity Credit Corporation to acquire the above-mentioned note by purchase, discount, or rediscount, or otherwise, or to extend or renew credit in reliance thereon.

8. Unless the above-mentioned note is made payable to the Commodity Credit Corporation the undersigned represents he received on the day the above-mentioned note is dated the full amount thereof, without deductions for interest, commissions, storage, insurance, or other charges. The undersigned hereby acknowledges that he has received a copy of this agreement and the above-mentioned note.

Read, considered, and signed.

WITNESS:

(Signature of producer)

(Address)

By ---

(For corporate or agent's signature)

*Section 35 of the Criminal Code of the United States (18 U. S. C. A. 80) reads in part as follows:

"Whoever * * * for the purpose and with the intent of cheating and swindling or defrauding the Government of the United States, or any department thereof, or any corporation in which the United States of America is a stockholder, shall knowingly and willingly falsify or conceal or cover up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact, or make or cause to be made any false or fraudulent statements or representations * * * shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both."

The loan evidenced by the note on the reverse side hereof was made in good faith and the undersigned payee had no notice of any liens on the pledged cotton other than those listed in the above loan agreement. The undersigned payee warrants the genuineness of the signatures to the note referred to herein.

Pay to the order of ---
without recourse on the undersigned.

(Payee must endorse here)

Pay to the order of ---
without recourse on the undersigned.

(Endorser sign exactly as written in above endorsement)

Pay to the order of ---
without recourse on the undersigned.

(Endorser sign exactly as written in above endorsement)

(Last endorser sign here)

Pay to the order of The Commodity Credit Corporation without recourse on the undersigned.

(Last endorser sign exactly as written in above endorsement)

I am inserting herewith The Story of S. 262, which was prepared by the central committee representing the cotton compress and cotton warehouse industry throughout the interior of the cotton-producing States:

THE STORY OF S. 262—REGULATING COTTON WAREHOUSING

THE NECESSITY FOR THE BILL

The bill is made necessary because the Government-owned cotton is not technically covered by existing acts of Congress specifically expressing the policy of the Congress with reference to the movement of cotton from interior locations to port locations.

The warehouse industry is an essential part of the Government's loan program. Without a warehouse near the source of production the producers would be unable to obtain Government loans, because the warehouseman's certificate and waiver is an essential part of the loan agreement (see record, pp. 496 to 500.)

Early in the beginning of the loan program the Commodity Credit Corporation undertook a comprehensive movement of the cotton from interior locations to port locations. The Congress, in response to protests from interested producers, added an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 prohibiting such movement without the written consent of the producer (sec. 383 (b) of A. A. A. of 1938.)

With this law in effect the Commodity Credit Corporation made it a condition precedent to the obtaining of a loan by the producer that he waive such rights and give written consent to the movement of his cotton from interior locations for reconcentration purposes.

Based upon this written consent thus obtained, the Commodity Credit Corporation entered upon another program of moving the cotton from its interior locations to the ports. Again Congress received protests from the interested producers, and in response to that protest passed what is known as the Bankhead Act (Public, No. 660, 75th Cong., effective June 1938). This act related only to Government-loan cotton. At that time there was no Government-owned cotton.

Subsequent to its passage and some time during July 1939, the Government negotiated a barter deal with England providing for the exchange of cotton for rubber, involving about 600,000 bales of cotton.

Before this treaty was completed and the details worked out, the Commodity Credit Corporation announced for the third time that it was going to move from interior locations to the ports substantial volumes of cotton so as to have it available for exchange with England under the barter agreement. It was variously estimated that it would require the movement of some 3,000,000 bales from the interior to the ports for that purpose. This record shows through the testimony of the Government that it would have required the movement of more than 6,000,000 bales from interior locations to port locations in order to find the grades and staples involved in the 600,000 bales delivered to Great Britain (R. 344).

Because of the announcement of the Commodity Credit Corporation of its intention to move this large volume of cotton from interior locations to port locations, for the purpose of meeting the terms of the barter deal, Congress, in passing the Barter Act, inserted an amendment that required the Corporation to sample, grade, and class the cotton at its then location rather than to incur the cost of handling, rehandling, and transportation to the ports. Experience has now shown the wisdom of the congressional amendment. If the Commodity Credit Corporation had obtained its way, 6,000,000 bales would have incurred transportation cost averaging approximately $2 per bale for the movement to the ports in order to deliver 600,000 bales to the British Government.

The prior regulations prohibiting the movement from interior locations to port locations related to Government-loan cotton and to the barter cotton. After the completion of the barter deal the regulations contained in that act were no longer effective, having automatically expired upon delivery of the cotton to Great Britain, and there were no regulations covering the cotton to which the Commodity Credit Corporation had taken title.

Therefore, as soon as the barter deal was completed and the 6,200,000 bales of Government-owned cotton relieved of the regulations of Congress, the Commodity Credit Corporation again inaugurated a program to move the cotton from interior locations to port locations. This time it was inaugurated under a so-called scheme of competitive bidding. The important fact, however, to bear in mind is that just as often as the Congress expressed its will to prevent the movement from interior locations to port locations the Commodity Credit Corporation has undertaken such movement regardless of the declared policy of the Congress. Technically, the Government-owned cotton does not come under the terms of the existing acts of Congress, but the cotton was originally under such acts, and since they had been passed at least on three occasions by the Congress it should be expected that the policy of the Congress would be well known to the agencies of this Government and respected.

THE REASONS WHY THE COTTON SHOULD REMAIN AT ITS PRESENT LOCATIONS

(a) No export demand

Port stocks now exceed any possible present or future export demand.

	Bales of cotton
Exports (period Aug. 1, 1940, to Jan. 19, 1940)	636,602
Exports (period Aug. 1, 1939, to Jan. 19, 1940)	3,451,045
Stocks of cotton in port warestocks	3,404,791

These port stocks have actually increased since 1938 from 2,981,873 bales with a declining export demand.

The distribution of the Government-owned and Government-loan cotton as of November 30, 1940, but not including any of the 1940–41 loan cotton (because of the lack of a record showing its distribution) as between ports and the interior communities, is as follows:

[In bales of cotton]

	Government owned	Government loan	Total
Ports	1,552,994	404,924	1,957,918
Interior	4,646,921	1,626,498	6,273,419
Total	6,199,915	2,031,422	8,231,337

The Government-owned and Government-loan cotton located in interior warehouses is situated in 907 interior communities, having an average stock of 6,917 bales per community. The port stocks are located in 17 port cities, and they have an average stock of 115,172 bales per port community.

Since there is no possible immediate demand for the cotton in export commerce, it is contrary to sound economics to incur handling and transportation costs on the cotton for such movement. The Government stated that the cost of freight would be $1.43 per bale (R. 370) and 10 cents per bale for receiving, 5 cents per bale for supervision (R. 371), and 60 cents per bale for compression (R. 372), totaling $2.18 per bale and equaling, on the 2,000,000 bales to be moved to port locations, $4,360,000.

The greatest amount that the Government has alleged would be saved as a result of competitive bids is stated by the Government to be $1,800,000. It would take nearly 3 years for this savings to equal the transportation and incidental costs.

(b) Interior stocks have an important bearing on warehouse handling and storage charges

The location of the Government-owned cotton in interior warehouses is now serving as a basis to bring down the producer's handling and storage charges on Government-loan, Government-owned, and the producer's cotton sold independently of the Government loan.

The record shows by undisputed testimony that as interior stocks have gone up the cost of handling the producer's cotton has gone down, and as to interior points this included both Government-loan cotton and the producer's cotton sold independently of the loan (R. 69). Briefly, the showing is that prior to the Government loans the handling and storage charges were 50 cents per bale for the first month and 25 cents per bale for the next 3 succeeding months. The average holding time was shown to be 3 months. It was also shown that as the Government-loan stocks went up at interior points these charges went down, and on the date of the hearing the charge was 15 cents per bale per month for the first month and each succeeding month including insurance, whereas the prior rates did not include insurance. This cost amounts to 3.257 cents per bale per month.

It was shown that the charges, at the ports for handling the Government-loan cotton for the account of the producer, were the same as at interior points, but for the han-

dling of the producer's cotton marketed independently of the loan, the charges were on substantially the same basis as they had been for many years and that the lowest charge was shown to be 35 cents for receiving and the first month's storage, and 21 cents per bale for each succeeding month thereafter. For the average period of 90 days this represents a cost to the producer at the ports of 77 cents per bale as compared with the cost at interior points of 45 cents per bale (R. 72–74).

The importance to the producers and the Government of holding the charges down on the producer's cotton, both that marketed through the loan and that marketed independently of the loan, is reflected by Exhibit 5 (R. 68). It is there shown that for the eight seasons for which we have a complete record there were seven loan programs in which the producers inducted 19,614,553 bales into the Government loans. Of that figure the producers had repossessed on July 31, 1940, 7,753,607 bales and sold it into trade channels. During the eight seasons in which there were seven loans the cotton farmers of America produced 100,357,233 bales; nearly 90,000,000 of those bales were marketed through the interior facilities and the handling charges of such facilities are, therefore, an important factor in the producers' income. Based on the yearly average production of 12,397,000 bales for the 8-year period the savings to the producers amounted to $5,579,000 per annum in connection with the cotton marketed into trade channels.

In other words, by holding this cotton back in the interior and thus creating a backlog of dead stock, so to speak, supporting the interior warehouse industry, the charges to the producers, as a whole, have come down to where the producer is saving almost $6,000,000 per annum, and adding that to his income from the production of cotton.

Conversely, it is shown that the advocates of the competitive-bidding system have not brought their charges down, but rather advocate a two-price system, namely, a level of rates based on the dead stock at the very lowest level with the highest rates applicable on the producers' moving stocks. The adoption of the competitive-bidding system can only mean the spreading of this two-price system throughout the entire industry.

Measuring the possible future charges to the producers, if the Government's program is made effective, by the charges made at port locations and by the advocates of competitive bidding the producers would have added to their handling and storage bill nearly $6,000,000 per annum so that the Government could save an alleged amount of $1,800,000 per annum and lose in transportation charges approximately $5,000,000.

The president of the Commodity Credit Corporation admitted that the presence of the Government stocks at interior locations had enabled the warehouses serving the farmers to reduce their charges on current cotton, thus confirming the major contention of the warehousemen supporting S. 262 (R. 415).

The record shows by reference to income-tax returns of the largest and most profitable operators; of average operators; of medium-size companies and the smallest operators, that none is making more than a reasonable profit and that the smaller companies are, indeed, on the ragged edges of bankruptcy under the present rates (see pp. 82, 83, 84, 85, and 488, 489, 490, 491, 492).

The record also shows that charges of the interior warehouses to the Government have come down from 25 to 18, to 15, to 12½ cents per bale per month (R. 69–70). Under such circumstances it is reasonably certain that if we place the Government-owned dead stock on the competitive-bidding basis and bring the rates on that stock down to the lowest level, then obviously the rates on the other stocks must rise correspondingly. The program of competitive bidding presents the narrow view of obtaining the lowest cost to the Government and ignoring the effect of such system upon the charges paid by the producer.

THE CALL FOR BIDS FAVORED PORT WAREHOUSES AND DID NOT PERMIT INTERIOR WAREHOUSES TO COMPETE ON A FAIR AND EQUITABLE BASIS

The call for bids, dated November 8, 1940, was presented to the warehouse industry on three forms (R. 100–105). The important thing in connection with all three forms is that the Corporation included the Government-owned and the producer loan cotton of 1938–39 and 1939–40. Form 2 covered the cotton on hand and permitted a bid to be made to obtain additional cotton moving from its present location to the warehouse of the bidder. It, too, covered both Government-owned and producer loan cotton.

However, the producer loan cotton was subject to the Bankhead Act and could not be moved. The Government-owned cotton was not technically covered by that act. Therefore the bidder for reconcentrated cotton knew that he could bid for Government-owned dead stocks and receive only that. This is an important fact dealing with the unfairness of the method of calling for the bids.

Bearing the above facts in mind, attention is directed to the fact that Form 55–A–2 contained eight arbitrary, fixed amounts for the performance of such services as compression, receiving, and delivery to shipside, whereas Form 1 did not contain any such arbitrary, fixed amounts.

Therefore, in order for the interior warehouses to compete for the reconcentration of cotton, they would have to bid to compress cotton for 30 cents per bale. Their taxes and labor costs exceed 35 cents per bale. They would have to bid and assume an obligation of effecting delivery to shipside (meaning delivery of the cotton within 200 feet of the ship's tackle) for 15 cents per bale. This was obviously an impossibility and presented an impossible commitment to be made by an interior warehouse.

In answer to this proposition, the president of the Commodity Credit Corporation stated that the term "shipside delivery" was a service that is rendered only by port warehousemen (R. 341), thus admitting that the forms were deliberately designed for bids from port warehouse only, and permitting those facilities to bid on Government-owned dead stocks, while requiring the interior facilities to bid on all characters of cotton in such a manner as to require the averaging of the bids. Obviously the interior facilities were placed at a decided disadvantage and were unable to bid in order to hold or reconcentrate the Government-owned cotton.

The most conclusive fact establishing the noncompetitive character of the call for bids is shown by the limited nature of the response received by the Corporation. As to interior points, dealing with the reconcentration bid (Form 2), the Corporation received bids for only 270,450 bales out of an existing stock in excess of 8,000,000 bales from bidders other than Anderson, Clayton Co. From that company the Corporation received bids for 365,000 bales to be moved from one interior warehouse to another and 1,125,000 bales to be reconcentrated at port locations. Thus, disclosing that only the powerful financial companies were able to bid to reconcentrate the cotton at interior points under the form containing the arbitrary fixation of amounts for compressing and delivery to shipside.

The president of the Commodity Credit Corporation admitted that it probably would not move in excess of 2,000,000 bales and more than likely only 1,500,000 bales. (R. 337.) Of this figure Anderson, Clayton Co. is the bidder for 1,490,500 bales, and under the conditions set out in the form it is almost a foregone conclusion that it will be the successful bidder.

The total bids received on all cotton for movement from one warehouse to another (reconcentration) covered 3,396,450 bales, nearly half of the bids on this amount were bids from facilities owned and controlled by Anderson Clayton Co. Only 270,450 bales were included in the bids of interior warehouses other than those owned by Anderson Clayton Co. Obviously, this meager amount of cotton discloses the inability of the interior to bid on the forms as presented. As a matter of fact, the Corporation received bids from only 25 bidders at port locations and 62 bidders at interior points for the reconcentration of any of the cotton (R. 411, 420–421).

S. 262 PRESERVES THE PRESENT SYSTEM OF HANDLING GOVERNMENT-OWNED, GOVERNMENT-LOAN, AND PRODUCERS' COTTON

Heretofore, and prior to November 8, 1940, the Government has called the industry in and negotiated rates for the handling of the cotton. That system has produced the results heretofore described. The purpose of S. 262 is to preserve that system. It provides that such contracts shall be negotiated if, as a result thereof, the Corporation is able to obtain reasonable and satisfactory rates, otherwise it permits the Corporation to freely advertise for competitive bids in order to protect the Government and the producers.

The Lend-Lease Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1941

RADIO ADDRESSES BY HON. GERALD P. NYE, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several addresses I have delivered over the radio.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEST WE FORGET AND REGRET

(Delivered over radio forum, Mutual Broadcasting System, Willard Hotel, Sunday evening, January 19, 1941)

The advocates of H. R. 1776 have maintained that dictatorship was a thing that had to be destroyed, by steps short of war, of course. It is anything but humorous now to find these advocates concluding that the only way to destroy European dictatorship is to create an American dictatorship. That is precisely what H. R. 1776 does.

This measure is another step, but not to be called a step short of war. It is a step all but straight into war.

Under its terms and "notwithstanding the provisions of any other law" the President is empowered to give, lend, lease, or sell any American defense article to any nation he chooses (however secret and advantageous to our own defense our military mentors might consider it); to communicate any defense secret he might wish to any nation; to permit warring nations he names to repair their ships in American ports and thus bring the war to our very shores; to give our

Navy to another nation if he chooses; to open the doors of the Treasury to such nations as he might choose and at such time as pleases him. It is the most brazen request ever made, a request upon Congress to surrender every bit of control it possesses to check or halt a march to war, a request for Presidential power greater than was ever accorded even a wartime President.

The fundamental objections to this bill are in no way related to the issue of helping Britain to win her war, the war which she herself declared.

Honesty in our thinking now may save a lot of dishonest explaining in the years to come. What help that is short of war might we now give Britain that isn't already being given, or that cannot be given by a Congress that has overwhelmingly granted help it could consider short of war?

And what is it that Britain wants and needs? Churchill, who once told us that the war could have been ended in 1917 if only we had stayed out of it, tells us now that Britain must have credit, a thing we were told by our own leaders she had so much of back in the arms-embargo-repeal days. In the same breath Mr. Churchill says Britain does not need American sons, not in 1941, just credit and lots of it. (Churchill didn't say what would be the need for American boys in 1942.) It's credit they ask now, whereupon the President asks for the power to give England our Navy if he thinks such is in defense of America. Incidentally, the call for American credit comes long before those who have profited from the British style of democracy have even begun to scratch their own resources to save their own country. Morgenthau, Knox, and Stimson to the contrary notwithstanding, Britain has great sources of credit here in the Americas upon which to draw, as revealed by the Federal Reserve Bank and other good sources.

What of Britain's need for ships if she is to save herself; her ability to carry on her necessary commerce? The London Economist of November 21 boasts of Britain's unprecedented naval and shipping tonnage. Statistics by the British Government in September reveal that during the war months Britain has managed to increase her own imports to the tune of 33 percent and has lost only 2 percent of her export trade in spite of the war.

If Britain must be helped with her commerce, what's the matter with our offering to take her shipping and commerce in neutral waters off her hands, turn her ships free for her immediate war needs, and get our idle merchantmen at work? Why not? A London publication of last month tells why, by boasting of British ability to hold her foreign auto market against all comers.

Let's quit mincing words. This present howl is not occasioned by fear of the outcome of the war for England nearly so much as by fear that England may have to pay for her own war, and by some Americans who probably encouraged England to take the war route. This is a good time for Americans to do a visit to the nearest veterans' hospital, and to weigh again the other costs still upon us as a result of our last "democracy" rally. Such visiting and such weighing may save us from the plunge that 1776 invites. We should do these things lest we forget, lest we regret once again.

OUR REAL DANGER IS IN INVOLVEMENT IN WAR

(Delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System on Saturday, February 1, 1941)

Once we were of pretty much one mind in determination that our American life depended largely upon our continuing divorcement from the politics, the hates and the wars of Europe, the divorcement for which the fathers of '76 paid so dearly. In 1917 we took a little feeler on the theory that maybe Europe had changed since '76. That feeler and the consequent experience gave meaning and new life to the warnings of Washington, Jefferson, Monroe, and their kind.

But during late months we have given ear to propaganda. We've permitted sympathies to become powerful emotions which have carried us to dangerous extremes, and now, finally, to the challenge of participation in war abroad.

That challenge is the lend-lease bill, ironically numbered 1776. It is a brazen, open proposal to let the President set aside, at his choosing, provisions of existing law which safeguard our continued noninvolvement in Europe's war. It would authorize the President to exercise complete control over the American purse and to take certain steps which are actual steps to war. None who read the lend-lease bill is going to call these provisions of the law "hidden." They are as open as the face of the clock, as direct as provisions of law can be direct.

Only yesterday Secretary Knox testified that the President already has the power to order the American Navy to convoy munitions shipments into dangerous war zones. What this action would invite is obvious. Denial of this power ought to be clearly written into law by this Congress. The lend-lease bill would put us straight into the war by permitting the war vessels of belligerent nations to enter our own ports for repairs, bringing submarine warfare to our very shores. The bill would empower the President to give to any nation he chooses any part or all of our Naval Establishment.

This is a sad hour. Many are believing that the lend-lease bill is nothing more than a give-help-short-of-war-to-England bill. Overwhelmingly, the American people seem to favor help to England. Once the ice was broken, as it was by repeal of the arms embargo, it has not mattered how much or how little help we gave, or give, so long as it was short of war. These people must be given time to realize that this pending lend-lease bill is not confined to steps short of war. Indeed, this present legislative effort combined with what is being done by our Government through the purchase, for instance, of the tags which are to identify our dead and our wounded, should stir in every American heart the knowledge that we are moving fast, oh so fast, into another European war with the only purpose to be that of reforming and bringing order to Europe. What a sight it makes! Thomas Jefferson described it when he said: "For us to attempt to reform all Europe and bring them back to principles of morality, and a respect for the equal rights of nations, would show us to be only maniacs of another character."

What can we do for Britain short of war that is not now being done? The answer to the question is only revealing of the fact that the lend-lease bill contemplates steps now that are not short of war. It is amazing how lightly this challenge seems to rest upon some heads.

Without the fear of danger of our being successfully attacked by European powers if they were successful in Europe, this kind of legislation could not get to first base.

This fear is not warranted. Give Hitler whatever power might come to him by reason of the outcome of the war in Europe and give us the same time that he has to add to that power, then if he should choose, foolishly, to make war upon this hemisphere we can give him, if I may use the expression, "the works" as no power was ever given "the works" before.

Just now we are being filled up with the awful fear that England is unprepared to carry on further without our financial aid, when in truth England has possessions and holdings here in this hemisphere convertible into a purchasing power that is great enough to continue her purchases, on such a scale as she has been purchasing, for many, many years. Surely, if the cause of saving England is a good cause, Englishmen themselves should be willing to spend their own wealth in that savings before we are asked to pour our resources into such a cause. Sometimes I think that the real purpose involved in all of this agitation for our benefit is that mainly of winning access to our resources and wealth, to be poured into that wasteful European game as we poured it once before, never to see it again. The Indians have a word for it. It is an old saying among the Indians that "White man fool Indian once, shame on white man; white man fool Indian twice, shame on Indian."

Our American defense has never been dependent upon the British Navy, and it is not thus dependent now. And it never will be thus dependent. Instead of dribbling away our resources and gambling on any order in Europe, we ought to be making ourselves strong in an economic way, building up our resources, making strong and healthy our own land, and devoting our full energy to the building of whatever defense might be called for against the worst that could possibly grow out of this pending world strife. We ought to take hold of ourselves before it is too late. It is going to be too late if we permit enactment of this so-called lend-lease bill. That can be prevented only if the American people will make strong, very strong, their protest against this drift to war; so strong that the protest can be heard above the din and the rabble occasioned by this pressing propaganda and the voices of fear and of hate, voices that have quite completely forgotten that America's real danger lies in involvement in another war, which will add to burdens already so great that ours is a struggle to win our way out. Let that voice be heard. Democracy, our kind of democracy, can be expected to respond to it. Let us make it heard as it will be heard if only there will be acknowledgment of the fact that the "isms" of today are as nothing compared with what will be our lot if we invite the shambles that will be ours in a political, economic, and social way if we but let ourselves be dragged into this war that promises a duration of years.

POLITICAL BETRAYAL?

(Excerpts from address before Legion of Honor, Lincoln Day banquet at Philadelphia, Pa., Wednesday evening, February 12, 1941)

Lincoln, with all his other accomplishments to which we pay constant tribute, contributed more than did any other to the creation of a great political party, the Republican Party. He gave that party great character by his leadership. His was a leadership recognizing the need for a strong second-party system; a leadership of integrity; a leadership which offered phrases and speeches which were meant by that leader and stood by that leader. Lincoln's was a leadership that inspired confidence in what he did and what he had to say.

Not as much can be said of some more modern leaders who talk in a campaign for oratorical effect and who say things in a campaign which they do not mean.

Last fall a paramount issue confronting the people of the United States in the Presidential campaign was the question of staying out or getting more deeply into Europe's war. Millions of the American electorate listened again and again and again to Wendell Willkie, counting him more apt than his opponent to keep us out of that war. During his campaign he told Americans it was his purpose to "keep out of war at all hazards"; that "the battle of America is a battle for liberty." "It belongs right here at home." The American people listened again and again to assurances by Willkie of will and determination to keep this country out of war. He charged

again and again and again that the Roosevelt administration was edging us toward war by careless speech and careless action. He declared that President Roosevelt was deliberately inciting us to war, encouraging other countries to hope for more from us than we were able to give. That the President was being pushed and moving to dictatorship; that Roosevelt contributed to the downfall of European democracy and alleged that Roosevelt shared direct responsibility for the European war. Willkie alleged a determination to do everything possible to prevent a moving in of dictatorship upon our own Government. Just before election Mr. Willkie said at Baltimore: "On the basis of Roosevelt's past performance with pledges to the people you may expect we will be at war by April 1941 if he is elected."

And now comes a legislative proposal called the lend-lease bill proposing the conferring upon the President of powers hereto unheard of even in wartime in this country of ours. There follows a hurrying and scurrying on the part of Mr. Willkie to move again into the limelight; he flies to England, spends 6 or 7 days with officials and photographers, and returns as an expert on the issues involved in the pending fight on the lend-lease bill.

Yesterday, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Willkie was confronted one after another with these election declarations of his. Men upon the committee wanted to know what had come over the man that would cause him to so completely alter the position he had enunciated in the last Presidential campaign. His explanations were arrogant and an insult to the American electorate and particularly those millions who listened to him in all seriousness last fall. What was his explanation? Merely this: "It was a bit of campaign oratory."

I am not one to enjoy and laugh at light explanations of that kind. Instead I find myself enraged, enraged because of the degree of betrayal which was afforded by party leadership last fall. If Mr. Willkie has not destroyed a two-party system in this country, he has at least contributed largely to its destruction. He has told the American electorate not to believe Presidential candidates in the future. He has very definitely jeopardized the two-party system and contributed to the creation of a one-party system and a drift to dictatorship.

My mail for many weeks has brought to me communications from individuals who were wondering if there might have been a conspiracy starting with the nominating convention here in your city of Philadelphia last summer; a conspiracy by forces whose purpose it was to deny to the American people an honest division of opinion on this international meddling issue; a conspiracy to deny to the people of America a chance to make their individual weight and wishes felt on this question of our democracy moving into another foreign war.

Whatever degree of conspiracy did or did not exist, there can be no discounting the degree of betrayal which many people who supported him feel that Wendell Willkie has afforded. His leadership has been indeed far, far removed from the caliber of leadership which was our good fortune in the days of Abraham Lincoln.

AID BRITAIN INSIDE THE LAW

(Radio address February 17, 1941)

If the people of America only knew what was in this so-called lease-lend bill—if they only knew how far it was from being a national-defense bill, or a bill for aid to England—they would raise their voices in louder protest than the American voice has ever been raised before.

Many Americans who know what is in the bill are restraining their voices because of an element of fear that has been injected, fear of retaliation against those who dare to protest this proposed grant of unheard-of power to the President. There is not need to fear honest expression of honest American thought at this time. We are not at war. Instead we are at peace with all the world, and presumably our democracy is functioning as always. Let the courageous American voice be heard. Let there be honest speaking of wishes and interests at this time when, as many of us believe, the future of democracy rests in the decision to be made within the next 2 or 3 weeks by the 96 Members of the United States Senate.

The lease-lend bill is a bundle of concealed dynamite—dynamite that would destroy quite completely the power of the people or their representatives, the Congress, to exercise any voice of influence in the further course that our country may pursue which would lead inevitably to our participation in Europe's war. The bill is a vast grant of powers belonging with the people but given under this bill to the President. It would give him the power to make commitments with no limit to any power upon this earth, commitments which a Congress would quite surely have to back up with appropriations since it would be Congress that granted the power to the President to make the commitments.

It is a bill which, becoming the law, would find the President empowered to open our ports to the war vessels of certain nations at war, for repairs. This would most certainly bring to our very shores submarine warfare and all its challenge to what we certainly would consider our own best interests and defense. The bill would permit the President to give to any power upon earth that he chose, any part or all of our national-defense establishment, including our Navy. This power would include that of giving such part of our national defense as is now on order to another power when it is completed. The bill is one that would empower the President to ignore any law that has been written with a view to keeping us out of war, and to promulgate his own rules and regulations as respects our further contact with the European war. To put it mildly, the lend-lease bill is a go-to-war bill, and its execution would certainly bring those incidents which would leave Congress with no alternative than that of declaring war.

All of these powers are granted in the name of insuring our defense and of helping England. We are told that England is out of money and can no longer continue making purchases of the supplies she needs from us unless we afford her the money and credit necessary; and whose word do we take as to the truth of this declaration? Only that of spokesmen for Great Britain. No American study has been made or permitted of just what might be the holdings of Great Britain in this hemisphere that are convertible to a purchasing power. The truth is that on the basis of Federal Reserve bank figures afforded last fall Britain has much here to draw on still to continue her cash-and-carry purchases of necessities. We are being brought into this war to finance it—to finance the saving of England—even before England had begun to use her own resources to the saving of herself. It has been the same old story of making a sucker of Uncle Sam without a thought of the awfulness that is to follow when we strive again to balance our economy and to operate on a normal basis. When it is found that the repeal of our arms embargo and the enactment of the lend-lease bill, with all its powers to the President, is not enough, from England's standpoint, we shall expect the invitations sure to follow—to send some American boys to the European battlefields to the end that there might be American bloodshed there. In this manner can our interest in the war be expedited to a point where we shall throw our everything into a cause that is so completely foreign to our own.

This all happened once before. We even went so far in 1917 as to believe that we could declare war without having to send men into the service and into Europe. Months after this declaration of war Englishmen were wishing for the shedding of some American blood in Europe so that President Wilson would drive for greater force by America in the European war. Viscount Esher, who was then the right-hand man to the King of England, wrote in his journals on August 3, 1917, this: "No American is likely to be killed before November. This is unfortunate, as Wilson may require to be steadied before then, and only the death of young Americans can insure him stability." Here was a cold, cold prayer for blood. A few days later, after making this entry, Viscount Esher writes in his journals that Henry Morgenthau, at that time prominent in administration circles, as his son is prominent at the present time as Secretary of the Treasury, had asked to see him, and of this visit with Mr. Morgenthau the British nobleman wrote in his journal this—of Mr. Morgenthau's report to him:

"Hitherto American organization has proceeded slowly. There are reasons concerned with the domestic adjustment of American policy that made more rapid progress impossible. But the Government now possesses fuller powers and progress should be accelerated. * * * That there is another aspect of this question Mr. Morgenthau is aware, and he realizes the importance upon the morale of the French Army and the French people of cementing the alliance by shedding American blood at the earliest possible moment. If many lives have to be sacrificed, the influence upon the American people can only be beneficent."

Ah, how cold-blooded was the process then! How easily then we came to feel that American blood was a sacrifice quite necessary! We shall bring ourselves to that point of view again if we permit a continuation of this mad course upon which we have been set and which has now culminated by the offering of the lend-lease bill. All the assurances to the contrary notwithstanding, there will be declared need for American boys in the European war, and those who today plead no such need will be the first to suggest or demand it.

Secretaries in the President's Cabinet decline to tell the Senate Foreign Relations Committee just what is the purpose of all the provisions of the lend-lease bill. Each one suggested to the committee that another member of the Cabinet was better prepared to discuss this than he. Inability to get from the administration a direct expression of purpose in the bill makes it altogether fair that we go to the address by the President himself; his address to Congress shows the base for the lend-lease bill. In that address the President stated eloquently a purpose that this program would serve. Here was his declaration:

"In the future days we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms.

"The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world.

"The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world.

"The third is freedom from want * * * everywhere in the world.

"The fourth is freedom from fear * * * anywhere in the world."

A beautiful vision indeed, but how shall it be accomplished? By making ourselves an arsenal for all the world? By giving power to the President to underwrite every cause which he might believe to be right, everywhere in the world? And when shall this dream be realized? Well, the President himself tells us when. Quoting again from his January 6 address to the Congress, he said: "That is no vision of a distant millenium. It is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our time and generation." There

you have it. In our time and generation. We are going to bring to all the world four essential human freedoms which we in America do not yet enjoy—freedoms which in some particulars are growing smaller and ever smaller even for Americans.

What shall we say of this pattern of purpose for the lend-lease bill which the President laid down in his address to Congress? Shall we call it madness—downright madness—or shall we call it what Wendell Willkie calls "campaign oratory" when he himself is found saying things which he does not believe, things to catch the fancy and the votes of Americans. For months we have witnessed in America in the name of "steps short of war," steps which aggregate finally a march to war. Grant now the powers which the President demands in the lend-lease bill, and the only question that will remain will be one as to just when we might move definitely and actively to war.

American voters, American fathers, American mothers, American boys and American girls, demand to know what is in this lend-lease bill. Demand of your newspapers that they publish the bill in its entirety. It is not so long that it won't bear publication. Then after knowing what is in the bill, write to your own two Senators here in Washington, write intelligently and let them know what you think of it. Here in Washington the impression is strong that the American people are overwhelmingly for this bill. My own guess is that the people of America are overwhelmingly against this bill, when they know what is in it.

There can be no denying that there is a preponderant wish in America to aid England, within the law and within such bounds as will keep us out of the war. This lend-lease bill is not such a bill. Instead, it is a bill establishing new law, new ways to help England at our own expense, new ways to get into the war.

Americans, make yourselves heard. In doing that you not only exercise a right, but you pursue a duty, a duty to be served if the one great remaining democracy upon the face of this earth is to endure.

LEND-LEASE BILL A GRAB FOR POWER

(Address before America First mass meeting, New York, Thursday, February 20, 1941)

Increasingly apparent is that preponderant need for such constitutional provision as well give to the people of the United States chance to vote, and the sole right to determine, whether the United States should engage in another foreign war. In the immediate absence of such a provision within our Constitution it is essential, so essential, that the people of this country voice themselves emphatically in opposition to this pending lend-lease bill if our country is to be saved from the ravages that will follow our plunging again into the hates, the fears, and the wars of Europe.

I never dreamed that in this enlightened age the American people could be so completely blinded and would so absolutely lend themselves to the blinding process to which they have had to submit, as is evident on every hand these days.

Hate and fear, planted by the Lippmanns and the Lawrences and the Winchells and the Dorothy Thompsons and the Roosevelts and the Knoxes and the Stimpsons and the Morgenthaus, have brought our Nation to the brink of the most terrible challenge it has ever known. If we, you and I, permit this so-called lend-lease bill to become the law of the land we shall find ourselves, almost overnight, in war, the very kind of war with which 85 percent of the people of this country have vowed again and again they would have nothing to do. What that kind of war is going to mean, and what our indulgence in it thus far is going to ultimately cost, staggers the imagination. Yet we had better awaken these imaginations of ours and see what we are wishing upon ourselves and upon the generations to follow.

We can't be unmindful of the cost of dollars today when we are pouring out at the rate of ten to twenty billion dollars a year, and would, under the lend-lease bill, make the sky the limit as respects the power of the President to draw dollar aid to Great Britain. We had ought to be mindful of what a billion dollars is. Are you aware of the fact that if every income in the United States of 10,000 dollars or more per annum were to be confiscated by the Government, that it would bring a total income of only $4,000,000,000?

Add to this kind of consideration the death and the heartbreak that will come to every cross road in America, if not to every hearthstone in America, and then be mindful of the fact that, even though we win another war, we shall have won an economic consideration that will find the United States entertaining more "isms" than the world ever dreamed possible upon its combined surface. The shambles that will be ours in an economic way, in a social way. The damnedest, finest ruins the world has ever seen. Not patriotic now, but wait.

The most dangerous column a nation of free people has ever known has been that column of American columnists feeding us daily with the fear of what is going to be our lot if Britain loses this war. I am not ready for a moment to concede that Britain is going to lose the war, however sure I am that Britain isn't going to win the war in the sense that wars have been won in the past. But isn't it passing strange that these very same people who are so fearful about our fortune in the event of British failure to win are the same identical people who were not sufficiently fearful about the future to care a hang about what 50 destroyers might mean to us if the worst that might happen in Europe were to be turned upon the United States?

I am sick and tired of the degree to which we have been caused to feel that our life as a nation is dependent upon somebody else's navy. The only navy in the world that has ever been a threat to any liberty or any policy pursued in the Western Hemisphere is the navy which we are now caused to believe is our first line of defense. We never, never have been dependent upon the British Navy. We are not dependent now upon that Navy, and God forbid the day when we shall let ourselves be dependent upon that Navy.

Much is said now concerning the question of Great Britain and her nationals liquidating their securities in this Western Hemisphere, converting them to dollars that they might continue to buy the help that we are ready to give in the way of supplies needed to help England defend herself. There are billions of that kind of security upon which Britain might draw, yet, with the aid of the columnists we are being educated now to see how unfair it would be to ask Britain to liquidate any further than she has; unfair to ask Britain and her nationals to spend their own resources to save themselves before we start pouring out our resources in their salvation.

Leslie Gould, financial editor of the New York American, tells in his column of how international bankers sought to prevail upon him to open up the way for this kind of propaganda, to write a story to the effect that we should not ask Britain to liquidate further, a story that would say to the American people: "Britain is fighting our war, we ought to be willing to spend some billions in their behalf." Gould tells us that these bankers told him that if he didn't choose to enjoy the scoop of writing and publishing such a story, they could get Walter Lippmann or David Lawrence to do it. What a rotten reflection upon American journalism—my own profession if I have one.

This is the same Lippmann who only this morning reflects upon the noninterventionists in Congress and insinuates that there has been no consistency in our policy of providing a national defense for our own country. That is the same old story that has long prevailed whereas, in truth, our purpose has been that of providing adequately for the defense of the United States. That larger defense has grown increasingly necessary as the Roosevelt administration, cheered by the Lippmanns, has pursued a foreign-policy conduct that requires more and ever more of national defense. A two-ocean navy, a three-ocean navy, a four-ocean navy is quite inadequate if it seeks to run with a policy that finds the President of the United States challenging every power upon this earth. For what?

Under the lease-lend bill the United States is being asked to do for England many, many times more than England's dominions are being asked to do for England. No lend-lease program has been passed by Canada. In Canada's relations with England, she is demanding for all that England buys cash on the barrel, and getting it. If we pass the lend-lease bill, mark my word, it will be the United States cash that England will use in continuing her cash purchases from her own dominions.

We indulge ourselves in a conscription program that makes uncertain for years the fortunes of millions of America's young men. In Canada they conscript as of a limited age for a mere 4 months of military training, which is accompanied by a guaranty that the conscriptees will engage in foreign service only if they volunteer to engage in it.

What monkeys—what sillies we Americans are being made! The Indians have a word for it. Say they: "White man fool Indian once, shame on white man; white man fool Indian twice, shame on Indian."

Advocates of the lend-lease bill paint a picture of it that would have us believe that it was the most innocent piece of legislation that Congress has even been asked to enact. They toss a blanket of denial upon every charge concerning the powers that it will bring to the President. In the name of unity they ask for support of it as merely "aid for England," as "only national defense," as "for democracy." Ah, what a bill we shall pay in the name of these things if the lend-lease bill is made the law!

Americans, don't fool yourselves. With eyes you can read, with ears you can hear that this bill grants very definite powers to the President of the United States, powers in excess of those ever granted to a President even in time of war. In this bill are the powers to the President alone to:

First. Make military alliances with any nations anywhere in the world.

Second. Give away the United States Navy.

Third. Dispose of every scrap of defense material of the Army.

Fourth. Part with every airplane in our Air Service.

Fifth. Hand over to other nations our airplane and other military secrets.

Sixth. Give to foreign governments all our military plans.

Seventh. Open our harbors to a belligerent fleet and so to bring the war to our shores.

Eighth. Seize the ships of other nations and turn them over to a belligerent.

Ninth. To junk all the laws for the protection of labor.

Tenth. To send naval convoys into war zones.

Eleventh. To fix the terms by which our defense materials are to be turned over to another nation.

Twelfth. To determine what payment, if at all, this country would receive in return for these vast grants to another country.

Thirteenth. To saddle upon the United States the costs of a foreign government's war.

Fourteenth. To place upon the taxpayers of the United States the entire cost of the second world war, if we enter it.

Fifteenth. To buy the British Navy.

Sixteenth. To ignore or repeal any existing law which the President considers interferes with his conduct of national defense.

Seventeenth. To govern through administrative proclamation.

With our country at peace, are such powers necessary? Aren't they instead sticks of dynamite that could destroy representative government and substitute a military economy for our own economy?

Help England before England is ready to help herself? Help England even to the extent of completely demoralizing our economy? Help England to the extent of giving to one man the power to tie us directly into that European war? My friends, its insanity, madness, suicide.

Of course, we like to have the world enjoy the privileges which have been in better days the fortunes of us Americans. But we ought to know that it doesn't lie within our power to inflict our ideals upon all peoples. We tried it once. We failed miserably. We swore we would never do it again. But pass this lend-lease bill and we will do it again without any more prospect of winning the cause for which we fight than we enjoyed the last time. Jefferson told us that "For us to attempt to reform all Europe and bring them back to principles of morality and a respect for the equal rights of nations would show us to be only maniacs of another character."

But our President sees nothing insane about his undertaking to such ends. Hear his appeal to Congress a month ago, just preceding the introduction of the lend-lease bill:

"In the future days we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms.

"The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world.

"The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world.

"The third is freedom from want—anywhere in the world.

"The fourth is freedom from fear—anywhere in the world."

And when is this eloquent dream to be realized? Five hundred years from now, perchance, if we will but devote ourselves intelligently to it? Oh, no; the President in his same message declared: "That is no vision of a distant millennium. It is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our time and generation."

Is this madness, sheer madness, or is it what Wendell Willkie would call campaign oratory, just intended to sell a bill of goods to the people in which the seller didn't believe?

There are two large prospects of development under this bill. First, we shall undertake to make delivery of the materials counted essential to Britain's success. Shipload after shipload of American supplies will be sent to Great Britain, carried, of course, for the moment at least, by British ships. One by one these ships are going to be the victims of submarine warfare and warfare from the air. Our program of aiding Britain will be found to be jeopardized by these attacks. Spokesmen for this legislation insist that the President has the power to utilize our Navy in convoying merchantmen if he chooses to so use the Navy. Can anyone doubt that when the success of our program of aiding Britain is jeopardized by submarine and aerial warfare that we are not going to be rather ready to accept convoying by our Navy as an essential if our purpose is to be fulfilled? And when we do that, is there a question in anybody's mind as to what is going to happen sooner or later to one of these naval vessels? And when that happens, who is foolish enough to believe that the Congress and the country isn't going to be ready to go the rest of the way in an all-out war?

Again, here is the provision in the law permitting the President to open our ports to the vessels of any nation he might permit for repairs and for supplies. Does anyone doubt but that this will bring submarine warfare to our very shores, and this being accepted as a challenge to our peace and our security?

My fellow Americans, I plead with you to observe that this lend-lease bill is a direct challenge to every American who is determined that his country shall not get into that European war.

I am bewildered by the prominence of the defeatist attitude that has been planted throughout our population of 131,000,000 people. The papers each day reek with the word that the lend-lease bill is certain to pass, that the fight which we are making against it in the Senate is for a cause already lost.

Believe me when I tell you that the cause is not lost. It is lost only if the American people, after being given full opportunity to know what is in the bill, decline to make their voices of protest heard by their Senators in Washington.

The grab for power which lodges in the lend-lease bill can be defeated only when, and if, the American people catch up with its contents. Every day is bringing increased opportunity for the people to know the truth. Every day enlarges upon the chance to defeat the bill. But I say to you that defeat is accomplished only by the degree to which the American people will make the thinking that is in their heart and in their minds known to their own Senators in Washington, with the result that those Senators may banish the thought that has been planted with them in Washington that there is overwhelming public support for the lend-lease bill.

PEACE TERMS

(Address over National Broadcasting System Saturday afternoon, March 8, 1941)

At this hour administration forces are pressing with all their might to finish without further delay their drive to accomplish enactment of the most terrific grant of power for the Executive ever asked for in America's history.

It is inconceivable that the people, and a Congress presumably representative of them, could be moved as they have been moved, in the very shadow of our experience of so few years ago, and with memory what it is concerning uninterrupted teaching and warning by those who gave this Nation its life and strength. The more I see of the ease with which we can be moved as a people into turning loose our emotions to a point that seems to leave us dull of mind and reckless in a supreme degree, the more I am inclined to believe that except for the existence of the laws of neutrality upon our statute books we would have been plunged into Europe's war and the war in Asia much sooner than now. Of course, we are all aware that the passage of this pending legislation, 1776, grants to the President the power to abandon all these laws of neutrality.

It isn't easy in such an hour as this to devote one's mind to the answering of such a question as is "What peace terms do we want," but that is the subject to which I have been asked to address myself for these few minutes.

What peace terms do we want? To this question I must respond with another: What do you mean by "we"?

Presumably the President speaks for "we." The President is "we." What he says and what he does is an undertaking in the name of 130,000,000 people. Remembering this, it is fair to say that we have no peace terms, that we want no peace at this time; that our lone call is "win the war—crush Hitler." Each and every suggestion of any undertaking to accomplish a peace, negotiated or otherwise, has met only with an emphatic "no" in the official circles of the United States.

With the largest part of the world in the throes of this disease called war, with daggers drawn in a program that can only mean suicide for one and all who participate in the war, it would seem that here in the United States there could be afforded that leadership that would at least strive for whatever chance there might be of accomplishing an end to hostilities now while there is still something to be saved. But instead we find American leadership bent upon going through on lines that other nations have laid down and determined that we shall pour all our energy, including American lives, into the winning of causes that others have declared.

During the last three days of debate on this go-to-war bill effort after effort has been extended to accomplish within the measure a declaration against the use of American troops and our naval establishment on foreign ground. The administration forces have successfully met every such effort and have denied the chance for any such declaration. Not even the appeal of Senator GEORGE NORRIS to offer such an amendment and reassure the mothers of America that we were not going to send their sons abroad to fight in other people's wars could win the favor of the Senate which seems to be set upon giving the President everything that he wants and just as he wants it.

What can it all mean if it doesn't mean that we are about to play the same role that our country played in 1917? We know now that back in 1917 the war would very probably have ended except for our entry into it, that we urged a continuation of the war with the promise of larger participation in it. We have been scored by various English leaders since that time, for having prolonged it and for having prevented the kind of peace that might have been attained in 1917, a peace that could not have been dictated by a victor, but a peace that might have been inclusive of such provisions as would have afforded a more enduring peace. Churchill himself declared after the last war that Europe would have been better off had we stayed out of the war and minded our own business. Are we about to repeat the same awful blunder which was ours then? I wish I could answer this with an emphatic "no" but the evidence is overpowering that we are going over the same futile road that we traveled then, with gain for no one, least of all ourselves and our own country.

Peace? What peace terms do we want? Why, it is so apparent that we want nothing so little at this time as peace. The President has made it plain that what we want is a crushing of the alleged aggressors and that we will talk peace only after that crushing is accomplished. And Americans with minds that have been purposely confused are so often ready to give approval to this policy without a thought to what it must mean. If England is to crush the aggressors on the European Continent she must have tremendous help from the United States, including millions of men as well as oceans of war material; the crushing of Hitler and Mussolini is not going to be accomplished by merely helping Britain to resist the attacks upon England. If the aggressors there are to be crushed they must be crushed by hordes of troops marching into and through the Continent. To crush the aggressors to the west at the same time means activity of a military order which we, and we quite alone, must furnish. If we follow through to the ultimate conclusion on this theory of talking peace only after the alleged aggressors are crushed, we talk about a chore that will in all probability require years and years of endurance and the pouring of blood and of wealth as we have never poured before. It can all mean in the end only the crushing of ourselves and the bringing of economic, political, social, and moral shambles to our own great land.

What peace terms do we want? Well, we ought to want such peace terms at this time as would prevent the suicide to which the world, and now we, appear to be headed. And if we were to find that peace in Europe was not attainable for Europe, we ought to be fighting at least for the continuation of peace for our part of the world. But I fear that only a miracle today, this afternoon or this evening, can accomplish even that. Such a miracle could come to pass only as the masses of American people might succeed in making their objection to this situation known to their representatives in the Senate.

NO FURTHER STEPS TO WAR

(Address over Mutual Broadcasting System network, New York, Friday, March 21, 1941)

What shall be our choice: A united front meekly consenting to adoption of European hatred, fear, and war as American policy and responsibility, or a united front by men and women determined to avoid the economic, social, and political suicide certain to follow our participation in another European war?

That is the choice left to Americans today. Neither choice can be served by us. Each way has its advocates, its leaders, though the leadership is not always as honest about its direction as to permit a people to know where they are going.

It is my choice to contribute to the building of an American front that can be strong in enforcing what I am certain is an overwhelming American determination to more largely mind our own business, to mind our own business at least to an extent that will forever let us be free from those European institutions and influences which destroy progress and freedom—those institutions from which America took leave under the leadership of Washington, Jefferson, Adams, and the patriots of 1776.

War to Europe is as habitual almost as breathing. War has torn and weakened generation after generation of Europeans. Power politics there has everlastingly whipped Europe into roads that had no place or room for such freedom and for such opportunity as we have known in America. So long as we have held ourselves apart and away from involvement in Europe we have grown and prospered gloriously. When we took a single fling at sharing in European causes and at reforming the world back in 1917 we sorely weakened ourselves and slowed up the opportunity for men and women to enjoy the full advantages and opportunities presumed to be the lot of Americans. The burden of that experience starting in 1917 has so weakened us that we have since been staggering. To repeat that experience is only to add hopelessly to the burden already ours, and to complete that sordid job of showing the American way off the world stage.

Obvious, indeed, are the consequences of our underwriting European causes as our own. But however obvious, we are nevertheless definitely marching fast to that underwriting and to the consequences which it invites. Some there are who assert that we are already in Europe's war; that it remains only for the shooting to begin. I insist that we can yet save ourselves from involvement in actual war, and that this salvation rests wholly with the American people and their willingness to continue to express their determination to keep American blood out of this war. But I cannot deny that rapid indeed has been the progress of those who would take us to war but who have operated in the name of keeping us out of war.

Our greatest weakness today is to be found in that broad field of American willingness to concede that our involvement in Europe's war is inevitable. That attitude is the consequence of many months of propaganda intended to make our involvement seem inevitable. We need now to most desperately take hold of ourselves and bring ourselves to realization of this truth—our involvement in Europe's war is only as inevitable as we, the people, permit it to be inevitable. We need to resist this spirit of inevitability with all our might. We need to let experience in the past more largely guide us and to check immediate emotions as are general. A determined people can keep out of this European war if only they will keep alive and vibrant a powerful voice of protest against involvement in the war. It is true that our Government has pursued courses that have been quite contrary to a sound purpose of keeping out of war, but that voice of protest has nevertheless played a powerful part in checking the course that would have been ours except for these protests.

There can be unbelievable transformations and steps in the name of a people when those people permit themselves to be blinded to the obvious and moved only by emotions grounded on hatred and fear. We have seen in our time, indeed we have seen in very recent years, so complete a transformation as must leave us wondering how we could be moved as far as we have been moved in a direction so contrary to that which would best serve the mighty determination of the overwhelming majority of the American people to stay out of war.

We must not, and cannot be unmindful of the steps which have been taken following the last war. We awakened one day to discover that not a single cause which we had declared ourselves wanting to serve when we entered that war as being a cause that could be counted as won. With this awakening came the awful economic consequences of the war, the struggle to readjust our lives and our economy to a peacetime basis. Surely we cannot forget how tremendously great and strong became American determination to never again permit our country to be drawn into another European war. The wish to avoid involvement again in Europe, plus the revelations years later of how we had been moved to war even while leaders talked peace, found the American people demanding the writing of whatever law might help to fortify us against involvement abroad again. In 1936, an enthusiastic and determined Congress set to the task of writing the laws which would prevent our being again involved in Europe for such causes as stood revealed as responsible for our involvement the last time. These laws became known as the laws of neutrality. They forbid Americans to travel in war zones. They forbid loans and credits to nations at war. They forbid the use of our ports and harbors to belligerent vessels. The laws forbid the sale of munitions of war to nations at war. They required nations at war desiring supplies other than munitions to come, buy them, pay for them, and carry them away in their own ships. The laws were enacted in an hour that was free from hate, free from fear. Hours that could be devoted to the strengthening of America, and to the service of America.

Then came the threat of war and war itself to Europe. With the threat came the breeding again of hatred and fear. Propaganda from abroad, propaganda engineered in Washington, propaganda fanned by such Americans as those who affiliate with the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, put our own fortification against involvement in war under constant attack. Little by little we were brought nearer to involvement in the war. First came repeal of that feature of the neutrality law which forbid the sale of American war supplies to nations at war. Then came our dispossession of destroyers thought to be essential in our own defense. Finally, under the lash of exceeding propaganda, there came the grant of power to the President to ignore the remainder of the neutrality laws or any other law that might stand in his way of giving all-out aid to Britain, and now the appropriation of unheard of billions to the cause of saving the British Empire and destroying Hitler.

All of this, beginning with the determination to build against involvement in Europe again, and ending with this mad, all-out program called the lend-lease bill, has transpired under the leadership of one and the same man, who first encouraged and cheered and then scoffed and damned the course America had set to mind her own business and remain free from entanglement in the meshes of European power politics.

I don't know what historians will do to the course which has prevailed in these last 4 or 5 years. No one can know. But it is going to be surprising if we escape utter condemnation for our inconsistency and our weakness to resist forces so obviously selfish and bent upon making our country again the underwriter of a European war.

That we are underwriting such a war is evidenced today, as it has been for many months. At the moment we are about to pour out seven billions of dollars, and there are among us those who would delay not a day for weighing our ability to do this or for weighing what the consequences can be. About 30 percent of our entire population is resident upon the farms of America. The gross income of that 30 percent of our people last year was less than $7,000,000,000. But we observe the seven billion being advanced for final appropriation these hours by a bewildered Congress that seems to be resigned to the thought that this is not the time to be thinking, but instead to be acting in accordance with the wishes and the dictates of one lone individual.

What will be the next move in the name of a great people who have been caused to entertain hate and fear can only be guessed. Already our leadership is openly acknowledging its concern about accomplishing delivery of the production which $7,000,000,000 will buy, and though they deny that there are plans to convoy these British supplies across the ocean under the protection of American naval vessels and planes, it ought to be freely acknowledged that if in aiding Britain to the extent of $7,000,000,000 of supplies we fail to get those supplies to Britain, there will be growing want to go however much further might be required to accomplish that purpose. Be is called a system of convoying or patrolling, it means immediate involvement in war as soon as it is practiced. And involvement in that war means expenditure of untold of billions in addition to the billions that will be required in addition to the seven to underwrite the alleged needs to those we elect as our Allies.

We may even undertake this dangerous step while avowing a determination to keep out of the war. We moved thus foolishly once before. Back in 1917, when we declared war, it wasn't with the thought of doing anything more than financing our Allies. We were not going to have to furnish men or ships—just dollars. But those who had brought us into it knew better and impatiently awaited the day when a little American blood could be shed in Europe to the end that America might go the full route to war, pitching her might of wealth and of men into the European cause.

It seems to me that this is a thing that Americans ought to be constantly mindful of: that the shedding of American blood in this war is the thing that will take us down the full suicidal route, however strongly determined we declare ourselves to be today against becoming involved. Winston Churchill knew back in 1917 what American blood spilled in Europe would mean, and he wrote of it. He knows today what it will mean, even while he declares that there is no need for American sons in Europe. Every leading Englishman in 1917 knew how urgent

it was that American blood be spilled in Europe. Viscount Esher, a very leading statesman of his day, wrote in his journals as of a period, several months following our declaration of war, that it was unfortunate that American blood could not be shed in Europe sooner than seemed to be in prospect so that America might have her full might into the war on the side of Britain. And in those journals he wrote, following an audience he had had with Henry Morgenthau, as prominent in the administration then as his son is prominent in the administration of our Government now, that Mr. Morgenthau shared the view that American blood must be spilled on European soil soon in order to accomplish full participation by America in the war.

Let's not deceive ourselves. Many of those who talk about the needlessness of American lives being sent to Europe to there bleed and die are in their hearts wanting American blood on the other side of the world more than they want anything else today, and we find ourselves furthering that wish with our Navy clear on the other side of the earth, with convoys and patrols in the offing, with the threat an hourly one that will have American blood shed in a cause which, however inviting of sympathy it might be, isn't worthy of one American life.

What shall and what can a people determined to keep out of war do in hours like this? They ought to be constantly voicing protest against the possibility of convoys and patrols. They ought to be protesting against the movement which is taking our Navy far away from those lands and institutions it was intended to defend. We should protest everlastingly any alleged right resting with the President to send our fighting forces into possessions that are inviting of trouble. We should be protesting with all of our power against the departures of men from promises publicly made. We should be insisting upon a careful weighing of every dollar afforded under the lend-lease program. We should be insisting that, though we are ready and willing to help Britain, we expect Britain to utilize her own wealth in helping herself. We should be jealously battling for preservation of freedom and of the right of Americans to exercise their choice in this business of keeping out of war, and we ought to be encouraging and supporting legislation which would require Congress to refer to the people of America for decision in at least an advisory election of when, if ever, we shall send land, naval, or air forces for service outside the Western Hemisphere or the Territorial possessions of the United States.

These things—all of these things—we must do if we would save ourselves from the awful shambles certain to be the lot of every nation that permits itself to become involved in that return engagement of war to its favorite stage—Europe.

The Horizons of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES M. MEAD, OF NEW YORK

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on the evening of March 22 the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] delivered an address over the facilities of the Buffalo Broadcasting Co., Buffalo, N. Y., on the subject The Horizons of Small Business. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This program on which I speak tonight was scheduled to carry the remarks of the late Representative Pius L. Schwert. To substitute for him, under these circumstances, is one of the saddest duties I have ever undertaken. He was my personal friend and neighbor; he was an outstanding public servant; he was a great American. He always carried on in the face of adversity and he would have us carry on—even though our hearts be full of sorrow over the loss we have suffered with his passing.

Therefore, I have agreed to make these remarks this evening. In doing so, I hope to call to your attention some of the pertinent facts about the horizons of small business.

We have heard it often said in recent years that the new frontiers of this country, now that our geographical frontiers have been conquered, are technological and sociological frontiers.

We have finally conquered our broad land, with its mountains, rivers, plains, and valleys and we have made vast strides toward taming them to our will—and that will, of course, is the national will for a life of greater abundance and happiness for all of our people.

In many fields of internal improvement, we, as a nation, have been bold and courageous. For example, we have built vast dams to control our rivers to the end that they shall contribute life-giving water to millions of acres of farm lands and labor-saving electrical power to our great sprawling cities and to our rural communities; we have converted man-killing dust into corn and wheat in the seemingly unconquerable dust bowl of the Nation; we have taken thousands of families out of tubercular slums and we have brought them into the fresh air and cleanliness of modern habitations; we have not hesitated to pile the resources of our national Treasury behind the vital life savings which our people have invested and deposited in commercial banks; we have taken our boys off the streets and out of unwholesome environments into the great health and character-building camps of the C. C. C.; we have relieved men and women of the great fear of poverty and dependency in their old age; we have saved homes and farms from widespread and reckless mortgage foreclosure; we have found worthwhile and productive employment on public-works programs for the temporarily jobless.

Yes; we have been proudly bold and nationally courageous in many fields. We have recognized that the greatest investment a Nation can make is in the health, happiness, and security of its people. We have found that such an investment always reaps rich dividends in tangible and intangible national wealth.

But there are some fields in which we have been less active. It is to one of those major fields of endeavor that I point tonight—to the field of small business.

I have been giving the problems of smaller enterprise considerable time and attention during the past 5 years because I consider it to be vital to our economy and to our democracy to solve these problems.

A number of congressional hearings have been conducted on my proposals to aid small business during the past few years but the glaring realities of the little businessman's dilemma has only recently come into the spotlight of national attention.

The defense program has rendered more acute the already chronic difficulties of smaller concerns to obtain adequate credit and capital which it must have to survive.

There is abundant evidence that, since the lush years of the latter twenties, the flow of credit and capital to small businesses has been systematically choked. I do not mean to imply that the strangulation of small enterprise through the lack of credit has been an intentional program on the part of banks and of Federal lending agencies. Rather, it has been the result of a tendency which has been allowed to flourish uncurbed.

While the Government has been rightfully solicitous of the welfare of great groups of our people, strangely enough, the plight of little business has received a modicum of attention.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been in existence nearly 10 years and has provided substantial financial aid to many industrial concerns. It is to be commended for the contribution which it has made and is today making. However, its assistance has been but a drop in the bucket if the national needs of small business are surveyed. Furthermore, it has not provided a decentralized, convenient, nor speedy method for extending credit. That type of a method is largely the responsibility of local banks where the businessman has a right to expect he can obtain capital if he has a legitimate need for it and can show reasonable security and promise of repayment.

Unfortunately, the R. F. C. and the Federal Reserve banks (also equipped, in a restricted sense, to extend loans) have been overwhelmed with industrial loan applicants who have been unsuccessful, for one reason or another, in their efforts to obtain loans locally. While the rejections of Federal applications have been high, nevertheless, in the cases where loans have been granted, the record of losses has been amazingly low. In fact, last year the chairman of the R. F. C. explained that his agency made a profit on the vast majority of such loans.

Now, the business of these Federal lending agencies has been too brisk and the record of loan repayments has been too good to substantiate the claim of some bankers that every businessman who deserves a loan can get it at his local bank. As a matter of fact, the situation has reached the point where thousands of small businessmen no longer go through the formality of filing loan applications at their banks. They feel they have at least two strikes on them before they start. As a result, the initiative of smaller enterprise has been sapped; its expansion has been thwarted; its operations have been curtailed.

I am not placing the blame at the doorstep of the local banker. Quite the reverse, I think we should eliminate the obstacles which he claims interfere with the ready extension of sound loans. I am, however, citing the deplorable circumstances which throttle the progress of small business.

This damming up of the flow of credit and capital to the little fellow has, naturally enough, encouraged the growing concentration of economic and financial power in the hands of a relatively few great corporate empires which, in turn, threatens with ultimate extinction the smaller, independent business enterprises.

Conditions exist today in relation to small business which 25 years ago would have been declared impossible. There are communities in this country now in which virtually every phase of business and social life is completely dominated by some great individual corporate organization. The food which the community eats, the clothes which it wears—its schools, hospitals, newspapers—are all owned by a single company. In such an economic environment, private initiative largely disappears and the independent small businessman is entirely banished. It is the road to industrial regimentation and collectivism. It is a warning that one important organism of our democracy is not in sound health. Now is the time to heed that warning. It will not do to wait until the economic damage is complete.

Today war rages in Europe. It is essentially a war of machines and of superb industrial organization. Today our Nation bends every effort to defense production. In this program, little business plays a vital role—an indispensable role.

Behind every assembly line supplying the parts and materials for bombers, pursuit planes, tanks, guns, and the vast array of armaments, there is to be found an army of subcontractors—and those subcontractors are largely composed of the smaller units of industry and manufacture.

I am happy to say that there is an increasing awareness on the part of the Army, the Navy, and the defense authorities that the subcontractor lies at the very heart of the problem of defense production; that only through the widespread utilization of subcontracting can defense production move with the desperate speed which is required. Commendable steps have been and are being taken to gear into speedy operation our smaller plants.

Again and again, however, there crops up the ever-present demand for more liberal capital and credit agencies. Little concerns are found to have antiquated machinery and buildings—they are found to lack capital for expansion—for meeting pay rolls—for purchasing raw materials.

Emergency means are being found to finance small companies which are required to produce essential and strategic defense materials. That is laudable and it should be done. It fails, however, to fulfill the needs of countless other small enterprises which, with adequate credit, could make valuable indirect contributions to defense and to the general welfare of the Nation.

It is my recommendation, and I have it in concrete form in bills now pending in the Senate, that an Industrial Loan Corporation be established within the framework of the Federal Reserve System which can make direct loans to business or commitments to local banks on loans to business. Such a set-up, and I have not the time now to detail its provisions, would operate chiefly through our local commercial banks and would provide a simplified, decentralized, convenient, economical, and speedy system for the extension of credit and capital to smaller businesses.

Additionally, I believe careful attention should be given to the establishment of an Agency of Information at Washington which could supply small industries with current information and assistance of all types. As it is, most small businesses now flounder in the darkness of bewilderment and misinformation.

The horizons of small business are narrowing instead of broadening; its security and stability is threatened; its future is darkened by the specter of credit starvation. We are doing our democracy a disservice by blinding ourselves to its imperative needs. I am appealing for prompt and effective aid to small business.

Unity for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. WORTH CLARK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. BURTON K. WHEELER, OF MONTANA

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a radio address delivered by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] on March 20, 1941, on the subject Unity for Peace.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H. R. 1776—a bill granting the President the right to give billions of American tax dollars to finance foreign wars for any country on any continent in the world "and for other purposes" is now the law of the land. The bill was debated fully. A majority of both houses voted for it. The President signed it. It must and should be respected by all our people regardless of their previous opposition to it.

The opponents branded the bill a measure authorizing the President to wage an undeclared war. Its friends in Congress declared it a peace bill—a bill to keep this Nation out of war.

Whether the opponents or the proponents were correct will depend almost entirely upon the future actions of one man—President Roosevelt himself. It is for him to determine by his future course whether or not his spokesman in Congress misled the people. Vast powers are vested in him and all right-thinking Americans will pray that those powers will be used wisely and in the interest of 130 million people here in the United States of America.

To many of us, the President's recent speech carried dark foreboding for the future of the Republic.

To you, Americans who waged a valiant fight against the lend-lease bill, I say—continue the fight—not against the bill—now a law—but against war and against every step which gives dictatorial powers to the President. I am opposed to Nazism, Fascism, Communism or one-man Government in any country under whatever name it may be designated.

I think it is fair to say that nearly all—if not all—proponents of the bill in Congress are agreed:

1. That the President is not authorized to use convoys under the present law.

2. That the law does not authorize the sending of sailors, airplane pilots, or soldiers into combat areas.

3. That the President of the United States has no right—though he may have the power—to authorize or direct our armed forces to wage offensive war.

4. That nothing forbids citizens from continuing to petition their Senators and their President to fulfill campaign pledges to keep the United States out of a foreign war.

5. That Congress may still—if it will—refuse to give billions of your tax dollars to Great Britain without first obtaining Mr. Churchill's war aims—without knowing if the objectives are the extermination of Hitler or the annihilation of 80,000,000 million German people.

6. That Americans should still insist that Congress carefully scrutinize all appropriations to the end that no tax dollars are squandered.

Before going further I want to give full credit to the British propagandists and the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies upon the deadly effectiveness of their propaganda. They have nearly attained their objective—active American participation in a foreign war. They have accomplished it adroitly. Their work has avoided detection by the Nation as a whole—and this notwithstanding the fact that they followed the identical methods of 25 years ago.

Someone has said, "Fool me once, shame on you—fool me twice, shame on me."

In 1812 the British invaded the United States. With men and arms they ravaged our Capitol. We fought force with force. It was army against army. Today in March 1941—just as before the last World War—the British have again invaded Washington—not with redcoats—but with some 2,000 agents and employees. In New York City they have an official propaganda agency for the United States. It is called the British Library of Information. It is a vast network for dissemination of war propaganda.

We can see and recognize armed forces. We can and would conquer a foreign army—but insidious and vicious foreign propaganda can be recognized only by those armed with a knowledge of the facts. Clever propaganda can be combated only with reason and sanity—and even these are ineffective weapons during periods of hysteria.

To illustrate some methods of war propagandizing, I want to read a letter received a few months ago from a responsible former publisher of a daily paper—Mr. A. P. Whiteside, of Foristell, Mo.—I quote:

"He (the American professor acting as a British agent) told me that he had recommended my paper for free newsprint and that his recommendation has been approved. All I had to do was to file my application with J. P. Morgan & Co. of New York and print paper in carload lots would be shipped to me."

Is history now repeating itself?

It is not difficult to secure a congressional investigation of German propagandists, of Russian propagandists, of Italian propagandists, or of the activities of peace organizations or labor unions in the United States. But a proposal to investigate all foreign propaganda—which would include the British—dies slowly but surely in congressional committees.

A real investigation of British and American war propaganda would have revealed much. It would have exposed the propaganda efforts in the United States of all foreign governments. How much money they spent and to whom it was paid. It would have shown the parts played by Mr. Bullitt and other American ambassadors prior to the outbreak of war. It would have shown the promises that were made to foreign governments by American ambassadors—roving or stationary. It would have taken the American people behind the scenes in this great game of war.

A congressional investigation would have shown the people of America that pronouncements by the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies foretell the next administration move toward war. This week that war committee advocated the convoy of ships to Britain, American defense of Singapore and the Dutch Indies, and permission for the British to recruit soldiers in the United States for the British Army. William Allen White, then chairman of the Committee to Aid the Allies, unequivocally stated on December 28, 1940, that American convoys meant war.

And what does recruiting American soldiers for the British Army mean? Winston Churchill could best answer that. In his book, the World Crisis, Churchill states: "Nothing will bring America in on our side quicker than some blood spilled in Europe." American youth killed at Singapore, American youth slaughtered on land and sea—war—that is what the Committee to Aid the Allies advocates today.

And this committee, aided and abetted by war makers, have led the American people to believe their only choice today is war or slavery under Hitler. They have been and are creating a war psychology by making it appear that war is inevitable because peace means slavery. Nothing could be more fantastic. But many honest and sincere people believe that to oppose war, to oppose the delegation of dictatorial powers to the President, is no longer patriotic, is no longer pro-American. Propaganda has made honest though deluded Americans actually believe opposition to war and dictatorship in the United States is pro-Nazi.

All of us who can envision the loss of life and the return of American boys from faraway battlefields with bodies maimed and

minds twisted, and who can see the financial ruin and the utter destruction of democracy that a foreign war would bring to this Republic, gain courage from righteousness of the cause—the cause for peace. We cannot be deterred or dismayed by name calling. We can take it and we can give it. But more important, we expect to continue the fight to keep this country at peace.

Less than a month ago I spoke to the American people, not over a combined network of all great radio chains but over a part of a single system. At that time I asked, and now I repeat the question: "Is the forgotten man of 1932 doomed to be the unknown soldier of 1942?"

Tonight I venture another statement—all-out aid for England, Greece, and China means all-in war for the United States.

Let me read from the President's last speech. I quote: "This is an all-out effort—nothing short of an all-out effort will win." During the 1940 Presidential campaign it was all aid short of war—now it is all-out effort—and the opiate phrase "short of war" is conspicuously lacking.

The Chief Executive told us "all-out effort" included ships, planes, tanks, guns, and supplies of all kinds. Just what else does it include? I hope the answer cannot be found in that single line used by the President: "Dollars alone will not win this war." Does this mean, that if supplies are not enough, troops will be dispatched? What is meant by the President's "bridge of ships" across the ocean? Does this mean convoys? Convoys manned by American sailors who will shoot at and be shot by German sea raiders?

The American people have a right to know how many of our warships, airplanes, tanks, and antiaircraft guns are necessary to aid England? Obviously, the most competent authority on British needs would be Mr. Winston Churchill. Will it be he who determines to what extent our defenses are stripped? Will it be the British Prime Minister who decides how much of the taxpayers money is to be given away? China's needs are known best to Chiang Kai-Shek, the military dictator of China. Will the generalissimo be given a blank check on our war and naval supplies? Will he determine whether or not we send troops to keep open the Burma road? If you approve all-out aid to these countries—who knows best what these countries need—the President, Mr. Willkie, or Mr. Churchill?

Is this what the American people want? Do you want your foreign policy, directly or indirectly, dictated by a European imperialist or an oriental military dictator?

Seven billion dollars for Britain, for China, and for Greece. When we are giving $7,000,000,000 to foreign governments let us consider for a moment what seven billion would mean in American terms. Seven billion is 14 times the value of our 1938 wheat crop—14 years of wheat crops!; 14 times the value of our 1938 cotton crop—14 years of cotton crops!; and it is 6 times the value of the 1938 corn crop. Seven billion dollars for Britain means an additional tax of $234 on each American family and it means $210,000,000 a year in interest for bondholders.

Not many months past—just a year or two ago—some economy-minded Congressman and Senators fought appropriations of millions with which to aid our jobless workers, to build schools, hospitals, and homes. Congressmen who fought millions with which to aid America and Americans today sponsor appropriations of $7,000,000,000. Billions for the British—but what for Americans?

A billion for America is rank idiocy; seven billion for the British is sheer genius.

When this administration thought of our American people, thought of our workers, thought of our farmers, then forty, fifty, or sixty dollars a month for a jobless worker on a W. P. A. project was socialism or communism. Then aid to drought-stricken farmers and parity for agriculture meant disaster and ruin to the Republic. Then $2,000,000,000 for the veterans of the last World War meant bankruptcy for a Nation with a debt of thirty billion. Dr. Townsend was a dangerous radical for suggesting his pension plan, but seven billion would pay a million of our senior citizens $200 a month for nearly 3 years. That was in the days when President Roosevelt—to use his own language—was driving the money changers from the temples of Government and Wall Street lawyers practiced law in New York City.

Today all is changed. Where are the "money changers" and the "economic royalists" now? They have been reinstated in the temples of Government. They have been lured from Wall Street to Washington with White House invitations. They are no longer called economic royalists; they are the dollar-a-year men who dispense billions upon billions of dollars in defense contracts. It is they who sit in the seats of the mighty. It is they who direct the policies of this Government.

It is these fugitives from Wall Street, accompanied and guided by royal refugees and British propagandists, who insist the present war is a crusade against fascism. They told us that Britain entered the present war to crusade against and to crush fascism. Forgotten except to history is official British recognition of Italian conquests of Albania and Ethiopia. Forgotten except to history are British approval of Italian aggression and their own conquests of people and nations. Who believes that Mussolini's Italy with which England sought to avoid war last June was less Fascist than the Italy Britain fights today?

Before the present war the leader of this so-called crusade against dictatorship entertained some startling views on Italian fascism. Mr. Winston Churchill said, "If I were an Italian, I would be a Fascist." These words from the lips of the British Prime Minister are reported in the Sheet Metal Workers Journal of March 1927. Think of it—Mr. Churchill saying, "If I were an Italian, I would be a Fascist." The same Mr. Churchill who would take your sons to fight Mussolini and Hitler; the same Mr. Churchill to whom you are giving seven billions of your tax dollars.

Britain is today fighting Adolf Hitler—the aggressor—not Adolf Hitler, the Nazi. Britain is realistic, not idealistic. So long as the British lion's tail was not twisted, Britain had no quarrel with Nazi Germany. Is it difficult to recall that many Britons—including the late Ambassador Lothian—were great respecters of Nazi Germany prior to 1939? The present British Ambassador, Lord Halifax, went to Nazi Germany to visit and go shooting with Goering, and was known to be persona grata to the Nazis—and they apparently were so to him.

Fascism was not born with Hitler and will not die with Hitler. Fascism is something which springs from a certain type of economic and social soil. Nowhere does there exist such fine soil for fascism as a land economically exhausted and unbalanced by a costly war—and disillusioned by the inevitable tragic post-war awakening. That is the soil in which fascism flourishes. That is the soil which produced Soviet Russia, Fascist Italy, and Nazi Germany. That is the soil which will produce a Hitlerized America—even though Hitler will be dead and buried.

And a nation at war is almost by definition a regimented nation. It operates on the dictatorship principle. The individual is subordinated to one objective—the waging of war. In consequence, civil liberties are curtailed, censorship imposed, industry taken over, labor's right to strike abridged or abolished, and all opposition ruthlessly crushed. Already in the United States we are witnessing the abridgments of precious liberties and constitutional guaranties. What will war and a post-war period do to them? The answer is obvious.

Those of us anxious to preserve civil liberties and peace have been subjected to a smear campaign. Never once has fact been answered with fact, or reason with reason. Instead, cries of "pro-Nazi, Hitler agent, anti-Semite" are shouted at the opposition.

This is bigotry in its vilest form. This is a return to the monarchial concept that the king can do no wrong.

I have said—and I repeat—that there are men in the world who are far more concerned with the restoration or the preservation of their economic and social status than with the welfare of the masses of the people.

I am not interested in the race or creed of these men. I am concerned—and always have been—with the welfare of the great mass of humanity, with the underprivileged with the economic and social status of those who are ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed.

I abhor and oppose those in this country, or in any country in the world, who make a fetish of the persecution of any minority group. I denounce those who seek to play upon the passions and emotions of our people with this kind of medieval mendaciousness.

Today we witness legislative and administrative actions which inevitably must lead to the denial of the rights of minorities.

A lend-lease bill—an alien concentration camp bill—an anti-strike bill—a wiretapping bill—these are the vehicles of one-man government. They will lead to chains and tears for the minorities in our land.

Wave after wave of every kind of intolerance will roll over our Nation. No minority group, economic, political, racial, or religious, can be certain that it will escape the tide. These are the results of war and of war psychology.

The Constitution of the United States is the basis of our form of government. We were to have a government of checks and balances—three independent branches, each to act as a check upon the others. Inherently and by it we were to be a government of laws and not men. It was to escape the tyrannies and corruption which always have following in the wake of one-man government that this Nation was founded.

Our forefathers placed their faith in laws. Europe has placed her faith in men.

Therein lies the key to Europe's failures. Therein lies the key to our successes—and therein lies our only real hope for higher standards of living—continued progress of the human race—future greatness and peace. Today by our acts we are abandoning the philosophy of government of our forefathers by returning to government of men—one man. Every time some of us oppose granting more power and more power to the President, we are asked, Can't you trust the President? Americans, that is the doctrine that brought chaos and wars to Europe.

The proponents of peace deeply appreciate the magnificent support that untold millions in all walks of life gave us during the debates on the lend-lease bill. We plead for their continued support in a crusade against war—in a crusade of facts to defeat a hysteria born of fear, emotionalism, and sentimentalism but which would lead our country into war and into dictatorship.

On October 23, 1940, at Philadelphia, President Roosevelt declared: "I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party: 'We will not participate in foreign wars and we will not send our Army, naval, or air force to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack.'"

Today, we, the American people must unite to help the President keep this solemn promise of peace.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS M. BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1941

LETTER FROM M. S. ECCLES TO HON. WRIGHT PATMAN, OF TEXAS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, on March 21 the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System addressed to Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, a Member of the House of Representatives, a letter in which the Chairman of the Board very thoroughly argues the question of inflation, which is disturbing so many persons. I think his reply to the Representative from Texas is a splendid one. I understand it is to be released for publication today; and I ask unanimous consent that it may appear in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, March 21, 1941.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: From time to time my attention has been called to your frequent public utterances on the floor of the House and over the radio, culminating in your recent radio address as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 17, 1941. You have long charged that the Federal Reserve System is under the domination of the private bankers of the country and more recently you have proposed that the Government finance its entire expenditures through the issue of new money and without the payment of interest. Since these questions are of increasing importance in these times, I feel that your statements should not remain unanswered lest the public be misled into supposing that the issue by the Government of interest-bearing bonds is unnecessary, extravagant, and wasteful, as you contend. Your propositions concern matters in which I have an especial interest and for the purposes of the record I am making this personal reply. While I have no reason to believe that the Board would differ with the substance of this letter, it has not been submitted to the other members and therefore does not necessarily represent their views.

Your plan as described in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is for the Government to finance its expenditures by issuing new money and avoiding the payment of interest. In this fashion you would have the Government meet not only its normal expenditures in excess of receipts but also the enormous defense expenditures now under way and in contemplation and ultimately the entire outstanding Federal debt.

The sovereign power of the Congress to authorize such a program is beyond question. What has to be determined, however, is whether it would be for the good of the country to embark on such a course. To my mind it would be disastrous. Plausible as your proposals may be made to appear, there is no escape from the truth that someone must pay for everything. If the Government could save the billion or more a year without causing any corresponding or greater losses to the country, no one could reasonably be opposed to your proposal. I am convinced, however, that the creation of the huge amount of new money contemplated by your plan could only lead to incalculable losses for the country as a whole.

At the outset I think it necessary to dispose of some of your misconceptions on the subject of the banking system. First of all, the interest received by the commercial banks of the country on their Government bond holdings is not an unconscionable tribute, as one might imply from your discussion. The banking system of the country is an indispensable part of our capitalistic economy. Practically all the people make use of some banking service, either directly or indirectly. How would these people be affected by your proposal? If the revenue from Government bond holdings should be taken from the banks, they would seek some other source of revenue to replace it or reduce their disbursements. Obviously they could not raise their lending rates, since the huge amount of new money involved in your plan would drive interest rates even below their present low levels. The banks would be obliged to reduce still further the rate of interest paid on their savings accounts although the savers of the country are now receiving an excessively low rate of return. Beyond that, the banks would have to increase materially their service charges of various kinds, principally for checking accounts. These efforts to replace the revenue now derived from interest on Government securities would impose a new burden upon the people of the country substantially in the same amount as the interest now received by the banks on their Government bond holdings. There is this important difference, however, that the new burden upon savers and other individuals using banking services would fall most heavily upon the more numerous owners of small accounts, whereas the burden of taxes collected by the Federal Government to pay interest on its bonds falls for the most part upon those with ability to pay.

Nor can it be truthfully said that banks make inordinate profits, and that they could operate on a sound basis with less income. During the 10-year period 1930–39 the average rate of net earnings on invested capital by member banks was 2 percent, which is less than a reasonable rate of return. It should be noted that these earnings relate only to banks which survived the great depression. A complete picture would show that during the period 1929–33, inclusive, 9,755 banks failed and their stockholders in nearly every instance lost their entire investment and in many cases paid assessments up to the par value of their stock. During the 5-year period 1935–39 the average rate of return was 6.1 percent, but this better showing was due in large part to the fact that during this period banks were realizing recoveries on losses charged off during the depression and profits on the sale of securities in a steadily rising bond market. Obviously, these are nonrecurring items, without which the earnings for this recent 5-year period would have been substantially lower.

That the banking business is not considered lucrative by the investing public is attested by the fact that during 1940 the average price of common stocks of 19 New York banks was about 55 percent of the corresponding prices in 1926, whereas public utilities stock prices averaged around 80 percent and industrials around 100 percent of the corresponding prices in 1926.

The effect of your proposals upon mutual savings banks, life-insurance companies, educational endowments and other institutional investors who hold Government bonds would be even worse because these institutions would have great difficulty in making up the loss of revenue. They would be compelled to reduce drastically their disbursements. Savings banks would have to reduce still further the rate of interest paid on their accounts, life insurance companies would have to curtail dividends on outstanding policies and charge higher premiums for future policies, and educational endowments would be forced to decrease their support of schools and colleges.

One of your favorite complaints is that the Federal Reserve banks are owned by private bankers and that the Board of Governors in Washington as well as the Federal Reserve banks are operated in the interest of private bankers. These charges will not stand up under examination. The Board of Governors, the members of which are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, is a public body. As to the Federal Reserve banks, you rest your case upon the slender point that the stock of the Federal Reserve banks is owned by the member banks. Congress specifically provided for this, as well as for the rate of dividend, and Congress can change the nature of the stock and the rate of return at will. This so-called stock ownership, however, is more in the nature of an enforced subscription to the capital of the Federal Reserve banks than an ownership in the usual sense. The stock cannot be sold, transferred, or hypothecated, nor can it be voted in accordance with the par value of the shares held. Thus the smallest member bank has an equal vote with the largest. Member banks have no right to participate in earnings above the statutory dividend, and upon liquidation any funds remaining after retirement of the stock revert to the Government. You greatly exaggerate the significance of this so-called stock ownership. At the current dividend rate of 6 percent, it involves the payment annually of approximately $8,000,000 to more than 6,000 member banks, and could be done away with altogether without important effects except to put an end to an illusion created by you and others in the minds of some people. At the same time, it is my view that the Federal Reserve System should be unequivocally a public instrumentality, but the ownership of the stock of the Federal Reserve banks is not the determining factor.

Coming to the principal issues involved in your proposal to issue a constant stream of new money to finance the Government, the reasons why this would be contrary to the public interest may be summarized as follows: (1) Borrowing by the Government at interest, particularly the borrowing of money actually saved by consumers, rather than issuance of currency, is a necessary safeguard against inflation, particularly at this time, and (2) borrowing by the Government at interest is an essential part of the capitalist economy in which we live.

There are times when the money supply should be increased and times when it should not be. It is one of the tasks of the Federal Reserve System to see that the money supply is adjusted to current requirements of the economic situation. The System has powers to supply almost unlimited increases, but its powers to prevent harmful increases or to bring about needed decreases are now wholly inadequate.

The prevailing situation, which is likely to continue during the next few years, does not call for increases in the available supply of money. The amount of adjusted demand deposits and currency, which together constitute the supply of money owned by the public, already exceeds $42,000,000,000 or more than double the amount that existed in 1933 and some $15,000,000,000 more than was on hand at the peak of the boom period of the twenties. A large part of these deposits represents idle funds being held on demand for future investment. In addition, commercial banks of the country have over $6,000,000,000 of reserve funds in excess of their requirements and available as a basis

for a multiple expansion of loans and investments and therefore of deposits. In fact, existing deposits, if utilized at the rate of turnover that prevailed in the twenties, could support a tremendous boom without creation of an additional dollar of new money.

With prospects for improved business under the stimulus of the defense program, it is probable that individuals and institutional investors will find greater demands for their now idle lendable funds, and that these funds will be put to more active use. In the first place, idle funds will be lent to the Government for its defense expenditures, and this will unavoidably put them into active circulation. Then, as business improves, idle funds will be put to use by large and small business units raising new capital. Even beyond this, as prosperity grows, individuals themselves will put into circulation part of their accumulated cash savings by buying goods and services of one kind and another, the purchase of which they postponed in the past when they accumulated those cash savings. It is possible that this expansion of the use of existing funds may go so far that, added on to the present rate of turnover of money and goods and services, it may exceed the productive capacity of our economic system. Such a condition is one of monetary inflation, characterized by attempts to buy things that cannot be bought, that is, by the bidding up of prices of goods, of equities, and of other property—in other words by the usual phenomena of general inflation.

One way of helping to avoid this development is for the Government to finance its expenditures by taxation and by borrowing existing funds. It is better that borrowing be done from the current savings of the public and from past savings now held as deposits of individuals, business corporations, insurance companies, and other fiduciary institutions, rather than from the idle reserve funds of the banking system. Borrowing from the latter results in a further increase in the supply of bank deposits. It amounts to financing with new money which would be dangerous if the supply of deposits were already actively in use and with production already nearing capacity levels. Yet your proposal would court this danger by bringing about an even greater increase in bank deposits. In order to carry out the growing defense program it may at some stage become desirable that borrowing be entirely from current savings—which will, however, need to be larger than now—so that for every dollar the Government spends the consuming public will have spent a dollar less. It may also be necessary to absorb a part of the banks' additional lending power by increasing their reserve requirements, as was indicated by the special report which the Federal Reserve System submitted to Congress on December 31, 1940. Your proposal, on the contrary, would increase manyfold the excess reserves of member banks, through the issuance of new money by the Federal Reserve banks for Government expenditures, and would add enormously to the banks' lending power.

Your plan is inconsistent with the nature of our capitalistic democracy. As our economic system works, a large part of the public saves a part of its income which is invested in homes or in plant, equipment, and the like, which supply current goods and services to others. Or they lend to the Government to meet its expenses in excess of tax receipts. Interest is the most common form of compensation that these individuals obtain for the use of their money. These savings are often not invested directly but are entrusted to insurance companies, banks, and other institutions which do the lending. These institutions receive interest and in turn either pay interest or provide services to savers, as well as meet their operating costs.

Interest on debt—a large part of which is public debt—constitutes income of private individuals, of educational and charitable trusts, of insurance companies, and of banks. A certain part of it pays for the costs of the process of investment. Discontinuance of interest on the public debt, therefore, must be thought of not merely as so much saved the Government or the taxpayer but also as so much income cut off from savers, trusts, institutions, and individuals that require the safest type of investment.

If there were some virtue in your ideas for Government financing, other countries might be expected to follow them. But the fact is that not even the dictator nations and none of the other powers have abandoned the payment of interest on government issues. For all of the boasted efficacy of German financial management, the Nazi government has adhered to strict orthodoxy in paying interest rates, considerably higher than those prevailing in the United States, on its obligations and has sought with much success so far to avoid creating new money. Instead, by heavy and widely distributed taxation, the Nazi government has sought to finance its vast expenditures so far as possible out of existing funds and to avoid monetary inflation, possibly because the memory of the demoralization of the mark after the first World War is still so fresh in German memory.

Financing government by issuing currency would have a double-barreled effect upon the interest income of the public. It would reduce the amount of interest received by savers, and it would increase the amount of money available for investment. As use for these funds was sought, interest rates on all types of debt would decline, until the bare costs of investment could not be met. In such circumstances funds intended for investment would either remain uninvested or would out of necessity be used for the speculative purchase of existing consumption goods, physical property, or equities of various kinds. This would intensify the inflation already generated by capacity production for the defense program if financed by new money. Such conditions would completely demoralize our economic system as now constituted. It would mean the end of capitalism and require the substitution of some other system in its place.

Very truly yours,

M. S. ECCLES,
Chairman.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

The O'Mahoney Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK VAN NUYS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS STAR-TIMES

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very laudatory editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times of March 12, 1941, entitled "The O'Mahoney Report."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Star-Times of March 12, 1941]

THE O'MAHONEY REPORT

The future course of American life may be indicated, though not decided, by the response to the preliminary O'Mahoney report recommending a new effort to liberate and stabilize our business system.

This is not because Mr. O'MAHONEY's report is drastic in its specific recommendations. Quite the opposite. After 2½ years of voluminous hearings by the monopoly committee the chairman advances only a few concrete proposals for legislation. None of these is new, and only one can be called basic. It may be, indeed, that other members of the committee will want a far more sweeping final report.

Strict enforcement of the antitrust laws has been a pious pledge in party platforms since the Sherman Act was adopted in 1890. (Only recently, under Thurman Arnold, has any administration since Theodore Roosevelt's, attempted to redeem such a pledge, and the results are inconclusive.)

Encouragement to small business and new enterprises through tax relief has been demanded both from conservative and liberal sources. The establishment of a system of privately insured loans to such businesses would avoid the alternative of Government-insured loans.

Federal charters, instead of State charters, for huge corporations which are interstate in scope, is the one "radical" reform Senator O'MAHONEY urges. This, however, to establish "a national rule for national business," he considers fundamental.

The process of business merger and consolidation was not reversed during the depression. The process of technological improvement did not falter; on the contrary, the United States now can produce more manufactured goods, with fewer industrial workers, than ever before. More and more farms have passed out of the hands of small owners into corporation ownership, and the previous owners are either working them as tenants or subsisting on city relief.

There is hope in the picture providing the country recognizes the truth of O'MAHONEY'S declaration that cooperation—genuine cooperation among groups hitherto suspicious and antagonistic—is necessary to abolish economic uncertainties "which seem to threaten even our political system."

There is hope providing we realize that the concentration of economic power, as President Roosevelt said nearly 3 years ago, is leading "toward a concealed cartel system after the European model" instead of maintaining a truly free economy.

There is hope providing leaders of all groups and interests heed Senator O'MAHONEY'S warning (surely not a radical doctrine):

"The danger to democracy does not proceed from those who believe in the authoritarian state, but from our own failure to comprehend the causes of economic instability and to proceed immediately to democratic remedies."

There can be little hope, however, if even the most reasonable suggestion that the Government take the lead in bringing about cooperation in the common interest inspires merely blind denunciation or apathetic resentment.

Those who believe in the free economic system and want to see it work should be first to endorse O'MAHONEY'S proposal for a national conference, in which spokesmen for business, labor, farmers, and consumers may attempt to work out a technique for solving our basic problems within the framework of democracy.

The Vision of Woodrow Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1941

ARTICLE BY JOSEPH CONRAD FEHR

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a stimulating article written by Joseph Conrad Fehr, entitled "The Vision of Woodrow Wilson." This article appeared first in the South Atlantic Quarterly, published by Duke University, in January 1941.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in th RECORD, as follows:

[From the South Atlantic Quarterly, published by Duke University, Durham, N. C., January 1941]

THE VISION OF WOODROW WILSON

(By Joseph Conrad Fehr)

Although there are still many who insist that the greatness of Woodrow Wilson was but the glamour of the moment which died with him, anyone who can interpret the signs of the times can see that the late President's hopes and aspirations for a new world in place of the old are again engaging men's serious thought and attention. Indeed, there is an ever-growing conviction among people generally that by disavowing Wilson's inspired program for a lasting peace—that the nations arrayed against Germany and her allies temper their attitude by high-minded justice, and in place of the historic conception of the Pax Romana (peace by universal empire) adopt a new-world policy for the purpose of establishing peace cooperatively among independent nations—the so-called peacemakers who met at Versailles sowed the very seeds of the portentous unrest now engulfing the entire world.

There is little doubt that the outspoken idealism of President Wilson was largely responsible for breaking the resistance of Germany in 1918. According to his magnanimous view there had been no war against the German people, as such. Although the Treaty of Versailles was not to his liking, and, in fact, betrayed the high purposes that had brought him to Paris, he accepted it only because he sincerely believed that his League of Nations, with its promise of a new reign of reason and restraint, would inevitably remove, one by one, its many injustices. In spite of the compromises he had to make, President Wilson believed that there was a latent nobleness in nations as well as individuals. "Be noble," he seemed to say, "and the nobleness which lies in other men, sleeping but never dead, will rise in majesty to meet thine own." And in order to touch off this divine spark, he boldly set the example of asking nothing for his country, only peace.

Wilson's enemies still argue that he allowed himself to become imbued with a childish naïveté, "impractical dreamer that he was," thereby becoming a dupe at the hands of the ruthless realists he had to cope with. His devoted followers, on the other hand, insist that Wilson's dream of the dawning of a new international era could and would have been realized, in spite of a vengeful peace treaty, if the United States had not rejected the League of his own creation. It is the age-old conflict between two schools of thought—idealism versus realism. This much only seems definitely certain, that without the United States as a member the League was doomed to failure from the start and that the world became once more blinded to those almost divinely conceived principles of national and international right and policy which Wilson championed up to the very time of his death.

President Wilson's two eventful administrations were characterized by a unity of purpose and solicitation for the people's welfare as had not motivated American politics since the days of the founding fathers. He dignified public life as never before. In his masterful hands, government again became an instrument of service for poor and rich alike. He not only made himself the mouthpiece of the people, speaking always "as one having authority," but also as the enlightened prophet of an enlightened people.

By sheer force of mind and character, colored by a mixture of radicalism in the realm of ideals and stubborn conservatism in the application of principles, he seemed to be in touch with the centuries and because he was so intimately familiar with the history of the world he had not only imagination to envision and plan for the future, but the courage to do so as well.

It is, of course, foolhardy to maintain that Woodrow Wilson had no defects. His brilliant and lofty mind, as is so often the case with great men, made him impatient of the simulations and dissimulations of the men he was constantly called upon to deal with. He was often irritated by what appeared to him their lack of vision. No matter what his mistakes, however, it cannot be gainsaid that he was at all times governed by the highest motives. Make-believe was altogether foreign to his make-up, and he could never hide his contempt for mere expediencies. As he remarked of Edmund Burke, he was himself "First and last a master of principles." And when the people of the United States exalted him to the highest position of trust and honor within their gift, the country's affairs were once again in the hands of an expert in statecraft.

Woodrow Wilson sought to lead and guide not only the American peoples, but the peoples of all civilized nations to a higher plane of political life. His power over men and affairs was essentially spiritual. No one can deny that he lifted the eyes, first of his countrymen and then of the world at large, above purely selfish standards and gave them a new measuring rod by which to gage public service. He typified the sort of great man Emerson spoke of, one "who knows that the spiritual is greater than any material force." As such he was a missionary specially called into an incredulous world to convince his fellow men that America had a heart and soul as well as gold and silver. He gave pride of country a new spiritual tone, and when the smoke of battle had vanished away and people everywhere cried out for peace and something stable upon which to rebuild civilization, it was Woodrow Wilson, the President of the United States, who climbed to the summit of the ages to teach mankind that only through love and sacrifice could the world be made a new and really worth while place to live in.

It was this deeply religious force of his constant and sincere nature that captured the world's imagination. No wonder that he was called by some a theorist and a dreamer. His idealism, contagious as it was, was too lofty for most men. But history, as it has repeatedly done with the great characters of the past, must acknowledge the stimulating influence of Mr. Wilson's unwavering idealism. He has said, "Do you covet honor? You will never get it by serving yourself. Do you covet distinction? You will get it only as a servant of mankind." And to prove it he went to work and became the most honored and most distinguished citizen and statesman of his generation. There have been other men of great deeds in times of epochal events, but they have usually been men of little, if any, spiritual growth and comprehension. Few of them were capable of seeing farther than the mere outline of material forces. Like all men of vision and dominating leadership, Woodrow Wilson was destined to pay the usual price for genius—that of being "misunderstood."

America has been blessed with few Chief Magistrates who have been really great men. However, Woodrow Wilson will be known for all time as one of his country's chosen and anointed leaders. His greatness rests not alone upon that cultured mind which he himself so perfectly defined—"a mind quit of its awkwardness, eased of all impediment and illusion, made quick and athletic in the acceptable exercise of power * * * at once informed and just * * * habituated to choose its course with knowledge, and filled with assurance, like one who knows the world and can live in it without either unreasonable hope or unwarranted fear"—but primarily upon his amazing strength of character. His record of accomplishments and deeds as the Nation's Chief Executive during a perilous international crisis is everlasting proof that a scholar and literary man is by training and study capable of being entrusted by any people with leadership in public affairs. Wilson was never so busy that he could not write his own state papers and addresses. It is because they punctuate the very essence of a great man's thinking and emotions that they are such powerful and permanent documents. Long years of academic training as a student and teacher, and then as president of one of the foremost institutions of learning in the land, coupled with a rigorous rearing while a child in a Christian home, combined to develop in him those marvelous gifts of intellect and traits of character which won for him the admiration of the world for all time.

During those quiet but fateful years as student and teacher, Woodrow Wilson was molding his knowledge into wisdom and power. His reputation for learning spread throughout the land, and men of affairs took note of his scholarship and exceptional qualities as a leader of both thought and action. In the fullness of his prime he was called by the people of his State to forsake his vocation as a teacher in order to become their Governor. So successful was he in demonstrating the practical value of his vast academic training and experience that he was after 4 eventful years elevated to the Presidency of the United States by a grateful people, whose enhusiasm had been fired by his voice and achievements.

Thus he came as a crusader, rich in the knowledge of universities and ripe in the wisdom that can only be garnered through a lifelong experience in which a man must first be tried and found true in many a difficult place, preaching and laboring for an interdependent world that would always be at peace. No sooner had he uttered his first inaugural address than America knew that her choice was justified. Here was "a man to the manor born." He seemed to know intuitively all the basic and fundamental principles upon which society rests, and therefore all the virtues and defects of democratic forms of government.

In point of character and intellectual attainments, Woodrow Wilson was too unusual a man to be a typical American. Like those other unusual Americans — Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, Hamilton, Jackson, and Lincoln—he was, however, a typical American in the magnificent use he made of his genius. He had that uncommon faculty of

seeing with his own eyes, and was never satisfied unless he understood the cause and effect of things. In the following paragraph from his essay on Walter Bagehot, a Literary Politician, Woodrow Wilson perhaps best pictures the man and statesman he himself was:

"It is not the constitutional lawyer, nor the student of the mere machinery and legal structure of institutions, nor the politician, a mere handler of that machinery, who is competent to understand and expound government; but the man who finds the materials for his thought far and wide, in everything that reveals character and circumstance and motive. It is necessary to stand with the poets as well as with law givers; with the fathers of the race as well as with your neighbor of today; with those who toil and are sick at heart as well as with those who prosper and laugh and take their pleasure; with the merchant and the manufacturer as well as with the closeted student; with the schoolmaster and with those whose only school is life; with the orator and with the men who have wrought always in silence; in the midst of thought and also in the midst of affairs, if you would really comprehend those great wholes of history and of character which are the vital substance of politics."

Never before had the American people elected as their President a man who was able to measure up to every one of these exacting requirements of the scholar-statesman. But Woodrow Wilson did. Orator, lawyer teacher, he could commune with the muses as well as confer with merchants, manufacturers, and laborers. On the strength of his extensive and varied interests, talents, and abilities he was always able to find "the materials for his thought far and wide, in everything that reveals character and circumstance and motive." No wonder that his eager mental curiosity and fearlessness of character eventually brought him into conflict with men whose interests were on a more mundane level. Although his refusal to be self-cautious had endeared him in the confidence and esteem of the masses, born aristocrat that he was, his detractors finally succeeded in destroying him. As was ever the case, however, the destruction of the man merely gave the vision he gave his life to greater impetus and served to insure its growth and propagation in a world which is still hovering between peace and war.

At heart always "a man of the people," the same as that other American aristocrat, Wendell Phillips, not because he was essentially a common man but because he was a professed servant of the people, Woodrow Wilson never failed to follow the Biblical injunction, "Let Him who would be chief among you be your servant." It was probably this determination to detach himself from class distinctions and narrow points of view and to look at a problem from all angles instead of being governed by mere expedients of the moment which gave rise to that distaste for the practice of law which Wilson carried through life. It was apparently difficult for him to master court procedure, and it seemed to disgust him to see about him men whose talents he justly looked down upon excelling in an "art" that was distasteful to him. 'The life of a lawyer," he wrote of Edmund Burke, whom he so much admired, "would inevitably confine his roving mind within intolerably narrow limits." That exhibits precisely Wilson's own attitude toward the profession of law and no doubt explains many of the other cross-currents of his eventful life. As a lawyer Woodrow Wilson was at his best as a champion and expounder of legal principles.

While Woodrow Wilson was President of the United States his ideals had a special appeal to the youth of the land. His high conceptions of public service and his brilliant manner of discharging the manifold duties of the Presidency served as a concrete demonstration that education was never intended to be merely a means of making a livelihood but for the nobler purpose of acquiring knowledge with a view to developing character and wisdom. He permitted nothing to draw him away from the lofty ideals that he fostered as a young man, and he never suffered them to be smothered in the crucible of everyday struggles, discouragements, and apparent failures. During the tension, excitement, and passion of the World War he steadfastly maintained his sense of proportion—never forgetting that his main object was peace and not war.

And when the war was over he became once more the teacher in a Herculean effort to convince an outraged world that only through the political and economic cooperation of a society of nations could lasting peace be achieved.

Day after day, in the course of a Nation-wide speaking tour in the summer and fall of 1919, Wilson risked not only the prestige of his high office but also his life in order to convince his indifferent countrymen that his plan of a permanent peace, based on the willingness of nations to cooperate instead of seeking to dominate and subjugate one another, was sound. Whether we want to be or not, he argued, the United States is part and parcel of an "interdependent world," which fact alone commits our country to assume the responsibility of promoting "international understanding" as a peaceful member in the family of nations. To do otherwise, he pointed out, this great country would only serve the forces working to bring about international discord and the disintegration of democracy. "You cannot," he said, "trade with a world disordered." And just before he was stricken ill he made the following notable declaration in his speech at Des Moines, Iowa: "The isolation of the United States is at an end, not because we choose to go into the politics of the world but because by the sheer genius of our people and the growth of our power we have become a determining factor in the history of mankind. After you have become a determining factor you cannot remain isolated, whether you want to or not. Isolation ended by the processes of history, not by our independent choice."

Because President Wilson taught his countrymen to think less in terms of material things, important as they are, and to strive more for the durable spiritual heritages left them by their forefathers, men not capable of such "dreams" called him an impractical visionary. As a matter of fact, Wilson could more than likely have readily forsaken the field of scholarship and entered upon a successful and prosperous career as a lawyer had he been so minded. But to his everlasting credit and the ultimate good of humanity, he blinded himself to any selfish desires he may have had for riches, and chose to make his career in the quiet haunts of a university cloister where by indefatigable industry he trained and equipped himself to assume charge of the epochal world events to which a kind providence later called him as a leader of leaders.

Wilson failed in the supreme effort of his life to establish ways and means that would insure universal peace, which Dante, more than 600 years ago, declared to be "the first blessing of mankind." Even now, nearly a generation later, there are critics of Wilsonian policies no kinder than were the critics of 1919. But all that is presently transpiring, either to involve this country in the present world conflict or to keep it our of war, bears witness to the fact that the United States, by and large, is ready to accept Wilson's basic concept of the interdependence of nations. It is becoming more and more evident that the American people, now under the leadership of a Chief Executive and a Secretary of State having the same perspective as the great War President under whom they served, are at last ready to do justice to the memory of Woodrow Wilson. There can be little question that when the history of the twentieth century is written, Wilson will be proclaimed as one of its most heroic as well as tragic figures. And if, as Marcus Aurelius remarked, "The value of a man is the value of the objects on which his heart is set," then Woodrow Wilson's name and fame are unquestionably engraved for all time in the hearts of his countrymen and lovers of peace and justice everywhere, for thinking people throughout the world now see in his work not merely the outlines of a system of world peace in our times but the very warp and woof of a pattern of world readjustment for more than a century to come.

Report of Temporary National Economic Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE NATION

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very excellent article in The Nation of March 22, 1941, referring to the investigation by the Temporary National Economic Committee, and especially to the final statement of the chairman, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nation of March 22, 1941]

O'MAHONEY SUMS UP

(By I. F. Stone)

WASHINGTON, *March 16.*

The investigation made by the Temporary National Economic Committee under Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY in the past 2 years and 9 months will rank with the great inquiries of the past, with Frank Walsh's Industrial Commission and Samuel Untermyer's Pujo committee. Like its predecessors, the Temporary National Economic Committee has shown the extent to which this country and its institutions, to echo Lincoln, no longer belong to the people who inhabit it. [The facts are vividly summarized in Senator O'MAHONEY's final statement, a document which deserves to be read by every American.] To a greater extent than ever before, our economy is dominated by the corporation rather than by the individual entrepreneur. These corporations are collective enterprises without collective responsibility. "In popular discussion," Senator O'MAHONEY says, "they are regarded as 'private enterprise.' But how private is such enterprise after all?"

The Senator closed the work of the committee, as he began it, with "a declaration of faith in the traditional institutions of our country." But he makes it clear that when he says "traditional" that is what he means. He does not intend to endow monster corporations, which have often irresponsibly revolutionized our ways of doing business, with the basic immunities with which we protect

personal property and personal liberty. "When one considers the number of policyholders who are the owners of mutual life-insurance companies like Metropolitan and Prudential, wholly national in their operation and effect, the number of stockholders and employees of a utility like American T. & T., or of an industrial like General Motors, and the stockholders, employees, and natural resources of industrials like the Standard Oil of New Jersey and United States Steel, it becomes immediately clear that there is no justification whatsoever for thinking of those units or of dealing with them as though they were natural persons clothed with the rights which are guaranteed to flesh-and-blood persons by the Constitution of the United States." We have passed, in the opinion of the Senator, as of most intelligent people, "from an individual economy to a corporate economy" and must act accordingly. The alternative before us, he says, is "free private enterprise or Government planning."

The chances are that the choice, as in most epigrammatic antitheses, will not prove a real one. Given time, a measure of good will, and a minimum of stability, and the solution will no doubt combine a good deal of both. The Senator himself is all for reviving free enterprise, i. e., enterprise free from interference by corporate monopoly as well as Government official. But the possibility of turning back the clock is certainly a slim one, and his own remedy seems a puny one for so gigantic and revolutionary a change as has taken place since the seventies in our economy. He wants Federal incorporation of all corporations operating in interstate commerce, a measure he and the late Senator Borah long championed. "The first and foremost step," the Senator says, "is to recognize that we must have a national rule for national business." With that none will disagree. Nor with his statement that "it is idle to think that the huge collective institutions which carry on modern business can continue to operate without more definite responsibility toward all the people of the Nation than they now have." But one wonders whether he has gone to the heart of the matter when he says that "the Insulls and the Hopsons, the Coster-Musicas have been able to prey upon the economic system of all the people solely because they were able to secure the separate State charters which enabled them to engage in national commerce, although their creators had neither the desire nor the governmental power to regulate the commerce in which we are engaged." The railroads have long been regulated by the Federal Government, through the I. C. C., but that did not prevent the operations of the Van Sweringens.

One may support O'MAHONEY's proposal for Federal incorporation without having any great confidence that it would prove effective. The Senator wants a national charter law drafted so "as to reduce materially not only the possibilities of evasion of the antitrust law but the difficulties of its enforcement." He wants this law written to "make corporate directors trustees in fact as well as in law." He would regulate subsidiaries through this law and "standardize intercorporate financing."

A steady stream of monographs has been issuing from the crowded archives of the committee. They are well worth watching, as are the concrete proposals put forward by its chairman. Given the complexities of business enterprise and the difficulties involved in even so seemingly simple a matter as the maintenance of competition, it is increasingly likely that some kind of administrative regulation will be necessary. Perhaps an easier way to keep the great collective enterprises of the corporation socially responsible would be to provide by law that large, widely held corporations admit the Federal Government into a share of their management.

Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1941

ARTICLE BY JOHN SAARI

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the chairman of the Finnish-American relief committee, John Saari, which article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Saturday, March 15, 1941. The article explains Finland's present situation and is therefore of great public interest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 15, 1941]

FINLAND SEEKS A LOAN—SMALL DEMOCRACY REQUIRES MONEY FOR FOOD SUPPLIES

To the New York Herald Tribune:

I wish to thank you for your commendatory editorial Finland—a Year Ago, appearing in your today's issue. It accurately describes the progress Finland has made in a year—since the peace with Russia—in the rehabilitation of the country and the resettlement of the refugees from the territory ceded to Russia. There is one thing, however, Finland has not yet been able to solve, and that is the food shortage which was caused by the loss of a very productive area to Russia and the additional demand on the remaining arable land to feed the whole population of the country, including the 450,000 refugees from the ceded area; nor the shortage of the imported foods, created by the impediments of the war.

As a result, Finland today is facing a serious shortage of vital necessities of life. The people already are on very short rations, and if it had not been for the loan by our Government last winter and the private contributions of the American people, enabling the purchase and shipment of food from here, the people of Finland would have starved. The shortage of necessities is increasing daily, and the domestic harvest is 7 months off. In fact, some of the essential foods are already exhausted, and the people are depending wholly on foreign supplies for these foods or go without.

Therefore, to save the people of Finland from starvation and the children from becoming deformed and stunted, Finland must have outside aid, and quickly, and the only country from where this aid can come is America.

To illustrate the seriousness of the food shortage today in Finland, let me give you the actual rations of some of the food items: Meats, 13 ounces a week, to be reduced in April to about 6½ ounces (normal American average is about 2½ pounds a week); fats, 6 ounces a week of butter and margarine together; coffee, one-half pound every 2 months; tea, 1.7 ounces a month; sugar, 1 pound 10 ounces a month; fruits, lacking, and cereals (the basic ration of bread and cereals) is about half a pound a day. This ration can be maintained only if imports from abroad can be arranged in the near future; the present resources suffice only to late spring. Clothing, dress goods, and shoes are strictly rationed for lack of raw materials. Finland, too, is a cold country; the people require a great deal more heat-producing foods than the people of warm climates.

The money that our Government lent to Finland is used up, and the private contributions now are very small, due to so many other countries in need. Finland's export trade, too, as you know, is shut off; hence, she cannot get foreign exchange to pay for what she needs. The only way Finland can get dollar exchange today to purchase enough food to save the people from actual starvation, is by another loan by our Government.

The administration, I understand, through the Federal Export-Import Bank, is in position to make further loans to Finland. I hope the administration will find a way to help Finland with another loan. What the minimum amount is that Finland needs until her own crops mature, I do not know; the Minister of Finland can advise on that. But whatever the amount she needs, it all will be spent here for food and clothing. No; the money will not go out of the country; on the contrary, it will help our farmers to dispose of some of their surplus stocks.

We are so absorbed in the British war situation and the means of rendering her adequate aid that we have virtually overlooked everything else that affects the democratic world; for instance, the serious food situation in the little democracy of Finland. True, Finland is outwardly at peace; but the people are fighting just as valiantly now as they did last winter, only against a more insidious, baneful, and demoralizing force—hunger. Finnish morale, of course, is good and strong, but the people are up against a force which can be overcome only by proper food. I am sure that the American people will not let the people of Finland starve.

Furthermore, helping of Finland will not in any way help the enemies of the British. On the contrary, aid to Finland will be to a friendly, independent nation, and also will help to keep democracy alive in that last post of the western civilization. British recognize these facts in allowing shipments of food to Finland.

The food situation in Finland cannot wait for aid until "signs of peace appear in Europe." The question of aid to Finland is immediate, facing us now. Although there are enough Finnish ships to carry the goods needed from here to Petsamo, shipment at the best nowadays is a very slow process, and months of delay may cause irreparable harm to the people.

JOHN SAARI,
Chairman, Finnish-American Relief Committee, Inc.
NEW YORK, *March 13, 1941.*

The St. Lawrence Seaway Survey, Part VI, entitled "The Economic Effect of the St. Lawrence Power Project," Is Now Available.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS D. CULKIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1941

LETTER OF SUBMITTAL TO SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, a study of part VI of the St. Lawrence Seaway Sur-

vey, now available, is particularly recommended to the Members of Congress from New York State and New England. It is likewise urged that those groups in New York State who are opposing the seaway set aside their ancient but unjustified fears long enough to give this very admirable report their careful consideration and study. It appears from this report, which is amply buttressed by facts and figures, that development of power and navigation in the St. Lawrence will open up new frontiers in the Northeast along industrial lines, frontiers which thus far have not been fully and adequately considered in connection with the seaway project.

The fact is that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project offers the people of New York and New England an opportunity to make full use of the great natural resources with which Nature has endowed those regions. A great volume of the cheapest power in the history of hydroelectric development will become the basis for great industrial development in New York and New England.

The attention of the doubting Thomases in New York and New England is also respectfully called to the fact that these areas possess, according to the Bureau of Mines, in excess of 4,000,000,000 tons of iron ore, 1,000,000,000 tons of which is the purest ore in the world, outrivaling the famous Swedish and Norwegian ores.

New England and New York possess billions of tons of pyrites available for sulfuric acid, and this hitherto has been untouched. These areas likewise include extensive deposits of salt, assuring an unlimited supply of sodium and chlorine. They likewise possess excellent deposits of graphite and zinc.

This document carries a message of hope not only to New York and New England but to the entire country.

Pursuant to the permission of the House, I append hereto the letter of submittal to Secretary Jones, of the Department of Commerce:

LETTER OF SUBMITTAL

DECEMBER 19, 1940.

The Honorable SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have the honor to submit to you part VI of the reports of the St. Lawrence survey. This part deals with the economic effects of the St. Lawrence power project. It considers principally the availability of a market for the large amount of hydroelectric power latent in the St. Lawrence River and the effect of this low-cost power upon industry and transportation systems of New York State. The report was prepared by the survey with the generous assistance of Prof. Edgar M. Hoover, Jr., of the University of Michigan, and Mrs. Grace Knott, now with the National Defense Advisory Commission. The maps and charts were executed by Mr. Earl G. Millison, Chief of Graphic Services, and Mr. George Newman, Head Statistical Draftsman, Work Projects Administration. The survey has been fortunate also in having the advantage of criticisms and suggestions on earlier drafts of this report from the following individuals: Prof. James C. Bonbright, chairman, and Mr. Gerald V. Cruise, executive secretary of the Power Authority of the State of New York; Hon. Leland Olds, chairman, and Mr. J. V. Alfriend, Jr., engineer, Federal Power Commission; and Mr. J. A. Krug, Chief Power Engineer, Tennessee Valley Authority.

Even though the survey has been concerned principally with the St. Lawrence seaway, the hydroelectric power aspects were studied because the project has always been considered as a combination seaway and power project; consequently, the net effects of the undertaking could not be evaluated without reference to the influence that hydro power would have upon New York State industry and employment. A final judgment on the benefits of the combined project could not fail to include a thorough consideration of the benefits of cheap hydroelectric power.

In the exploration of future demand for power in New York State, this report considers not only the disposability of St. Lawrence power at the international rapids section, but also that which can be obtained through the redevelopment of Niagara River. This latter has been included because it has been an integral part of the plans of the Power Authority of the State of New York, the duly constituted State agency for the exploitation of the waterpower resources of the St. Lawrence River, and also because the draft treaties heretofore considered by the Governments of the United States and Canada included provisions for the redevelopment of Niagara River. The effect of the inclusion of additional power at Niagara upon the estimates of the report is to make them highly conservative, for if combined Niagara and St. Lawrence power could be marketed, then surely there would be ample market for St. Lawrence power alone. On the other hand, if the St. Lawrence power is developed first, then the estimated effects upon industrial expansion and employment should be reduced possibly by two-fifths, the proportion of new hydro power at Niagara to the combined St. Lawrence-Niagara system.

The estimates of energy requirements in New York State are carried in this report to the year 1950. This does not imply that it would take 10 years to complete the power project. The year 1950 was selected for several cogent reasons. First, it would allow a period of several years of active operation of the new power system so that the full influence of this economical supply of power upon industry would be felt. In the second place, the year 1950 is a convenient signpost from the point of view of statistical technique, for other studies and estimates dealing with population and demand for power have used that year as a basis of computations.

The selection of the year 1950 does not imply that the development of the project need be delayed until a later date. The estimates of future power requirements in this report were based upon the extension of normal trends in various classes of energy demand. Since the initiation of this study, the national-defense program has been unraveled swiftly and in large dimensions. The obvious effect of this program upon demand for electrical energy will be to accelerate and emphasize the amplitudes of growth here indicated. Hence, the anticipated effect should be to telescope time and bring the need for this hydroelectric development nearer than 1950. This will mean, of necessity, expediting the development so as not to be caught with a shortage of power resources in the industrial Northeast. The accelerating effect of the national defense program upon power requirements in New York State will be more fully treated in part VII of the survey reports.

The present report is detailed and technical. The conclusions, and the facts upon which they are predicated, however, are clear and irrefutable. Even when individual procedures and points of detail may be subject to alternative solutions, the final over-all conclusions and their implications are beyond serious dispute.

Briefly, the survey reveals the following facts:

1. The proposed St. Lawrence-Niagara development is designed to make available to the United States additional hydroelectric generating capacity of 1,100,000 horsepower at the International Rapids and 787,500 horsepower at Niagara Falls. The area served by the transmission system planned in connection with this generating capacity coincides approximately with New York State, and contains about one-tenth of the population of the United States.

2. New York State as a whole has suffered a definite decline in manufacturing employment over the past 20 years. In 1919 New York State had 1,228,000 wage earners employed in manufacturing, or 13.5 percent of the national total. By 1937 the number had fallen to 996,000 or 11.6 percent of the national total.

3. The Buffalo area, where Niagara power was being exploited on a large scale between 1895 and 1924, has recently been affected by this apparent cessation of industrial growth. The Buffalo industrial area's percentage share of the national total of manufacturing wage earners rose from 0.97 percent in 1899 to 1.31 percent in 1923, and by 1935 had fallen to 1.13 percent. In 1937 it was 1.23 percent. The chief industries in which this area specializes are chemicals, metal products, paper, and grain products. In all of these industries, the importance of electric energy costs is relatively high.

4. Since 1924 there has been no further expansion of Niagara hydrogenerating facilities, and considerable steam-generating equipment has been added to take care of the increasing demand. Between 1928 and 1939 steam central-station generating capacity in the Buffalo industrial area increased from 252,955 horsepower to 655,324 horsepower, or 159 percent; while in the same interval, hydro capacity has increased only from 624,710 horsepower to 639,758 horsepower, or 2.4 percent. Out of the total increase of 417,417 horsepower in that period, 402,369 horsepower, or nearly 97 percent, was in steam capacity.

5. New York State has expanded its hydroelectric generating capacity much more slowly in the past decade than most other States. While the United States as a whole increased its hydro capacity by 54.7 percent in the decade 1927–37, New York's hydro capacity increased only 12.4 percent. Only 15 States showed a smaller percentage increase in hydro capacity than New York in that period, although New York State is among the most richly endowed in waterpower resources.

6. Due to lack of mineral fuels New York State is at a very substantial disadvantage in steam-power generation as compared with coal- or oil-producing States. Representative large power stations in New York in 1937 paid from 11 to 17 cents per million B. t. u. for their coal, while comparable stations near mines in Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia paid only 6 or 7 cents.

7. At the present time the cost of electricity to most representative classes of users is higher in New York State than the United States average.

8. Since about the time Niagara power was fully utilized, industries using relatively large amounts of electric power have expanded in other States and regions more rapidly than in New York State. This is particularly true of certain electrochemical and electrometallurgical industries.

It is fairly clear from this summary of facts that New York State will suffer under an increasing competitive disadvantage so long as available sources of cheap hydropower continue to be neglected. In the Buffalo area, where industry has been based on cheap power to a relatively large extent, the threat of stagnation is perhaps even more serious than in the rest of the State. The proposed St. Lawrence Niagara hydrodevelopment offers a new lease on life to New York State industry—a source of cheap electricity which

should make possible the resumption of manufacturing growth.

Based on experience, past trends, and a consideration of the probable future developments, energy consumption in 1950 has been conservatively estimated at almost double that of 1937. The additional generating capacity which must be built during the next decade to supply these estimated requirements is about one-third greater than the entire capacity of the St. Lawrence-Niagara project, which indicates that there is no question of the disposability of the project's output of energy.

As compared with the best possible alternative all-steam plant, the St. Lawrence-Niagara hydroproject promises savings on the State's entire power generation averaging approximately 1 mill per kilowatt-hour, plus the provision of 1,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually at very low rates to high load-factor industries. The Power Authority of the State of New York estimates that the annual savings in the cost of electricity to New York State consumers as a result of St. Lawrence-Niagara development would be $26,000,000.

A study of the chief electroprocess industries in New York State leads to the conclusion that this group can absorb at least the additional billion kilowatt-hours tentatively allocated to it on the proposed plans. This degree of expansion would give employment to 7,000 additional men; while in the absence of such new cheap power, the growth prospects of these industries are substantially nil.

The probable effects of a 1-mill power-cost differential on several selected manufacturing industries outside the electroprocess group were likewise investigated. It was estimated that direct savings from such a differential would amount to approximately 0.7 percent annually on invested capital in the chemicals industry, 0.5 percent in the cement industry, and smaller percentages in 15 other industries. Also, on the basis of certain estimates, the total minimum increase in employment in industries outside the electroprocess group, as a result of the 1-mill differential in power costs, would be at least 18,000 wage earners.

As a general rule there is one wage earner in service occupations for every worker engaged in manufacturing in New York State. The effect of the 25,000 new wage earners in manufacturing employment will probably provide 25,000 additional jobs in such auxiliary occupations. Thus the St. Lawrence-Niagara project will probably create, directly as a result of cheaper power, remunerative employment for 50,000 workers more than the alternative all-steam plan. This estimate does not include derivative employment from the sale of household electrical appliances which experience shows would result from low-rate schedules to domestic and farm consumers.

Combining the additional employment prospects for the high-load factor and other industries, and making allowance for complementary trade and service activities and for population not gainfully employed, the saving in power costs afforded by the St. Lawrence-Niagara hydrosteam plant as compared to the alternative all-steam plan was finally translated into terms of economic support for the equivalent of a community of 125,000 persons.

In terms of demand for transportation, the added freight revenue ascribable to the project is estimated at $5,500,000 annually, in addition to at least $3,300,000 spread over the years of active construction.

All these estimates are based on very conservative assumptions, and the result should be considered a minimum. If the past history of Niagara Falls and the more recent experience of T. V. A. is any criterion of what may be expected in New York State as a result of the St. Lawrence-Niagara development, surely the conclusion is justified that this project will be a great boon to the lagging industrial development of New York State, particularly in northern New York. This area, unlike the southern end of the State, is sparsely populated and free from industrial congestion. With access to the St. Lawrence seaway as a cheap form of transportation, and with unusually low power costs, upState New York will receive from the proposed project the necessary stimulus for progress which has been lacking since the exhaustion of new hydro power at Niagara.

Very truly yours,

N. R. DANIELIAN,
Director, St. Lawrence Survey.

Financial and Monetary Principles of George Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1941

ADDRESS BY WALTER E. TRENT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address recently delivered by Walter E. Trent before Washington College, Chestertown, Md., in connection with the subject of gold and our American monetary system. In this address Mr. Trent develops the early beginnings of our monetary system, and the teachings of George Washington in relation to that subject.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I very much appreciate the privilege of appearing here today. I have heard of Washington College for many years, and I am familiar with your historic and interesting traditions. I am indebted primarily to your alumnus, Mr. William Frazier Russell, for the opportunity to meet you today, as he most considerately suggested to your President, Dr. Mead, that I be asked to speak to you on the subject of the financial and monetary principles and achievements of George Washington.

A few months ago I was associated with our late Senator Pittman in the State of Nevada during his campaign for reelection. I have been a legal, but itinerant resident of the Sagebrush State since the gold-boom mining days of 1906. About 10 days before election the Senator was stricken with a heart attack, which made it impossible for him to complete further speaking engagements. Your Mr. Russell, who happened to be in Nevada at the time, volunteered his services in the emergency and Senator Pittman assigned him to speak in his place at a number of his most important meetings, which assignments Mr. Russell fulfilled with pronounced success, a rather unusual achievement for a stranger in any community. Mr. Russell endeared himself to the Senator and his innumerable friends in the State of Nevada. In a few years' time many of you will be scattered to the four corners of the United States and it may be well for you to remember that similar opportunities for service will present themselves to you as they did to Mr. Russell, and I am sure all of you will respond to every such occasion, both for the common good and for your own.

The people of the United States have been taught that it is impossible to understand the subject of money. George Washington reduced the science of money to its most simple and fundamental state. He considered gold and silver to be the only true moneys. Financial history for the last 150 years has proved that he was right. Paper moneys are not real money. Only those paper moneys which can be converted to gold and silver are worthy to be designated as money. Fiscal and financial practices have become complicated because, periodically, the bankers and Government officials have departed from the teachings of George Washington in respect of the utilization of gold and silver as the basic moneys. George Washington learned the facts of money by his prolonged and diversified business experience and by his profound studies of the monetary history of the European countries and the 13 independent colonies of America.

Since the coinage of money started in this country with the introduction of the pine-tree shilling in the colony of Massachusetts, the citizens of the country have endured 14 separate and distinct experiences in the suspension of payments of gold and silver by the banks and governments. The shortest period was for only a few weeks and the longest for 17 years, from 1862 until 1879. Every panic has been precipitated by a scarcity of specie. Specie is the terminology for both gold and silver. Issues of worthless or depreciated paper moneys drove the metals into hoarding and caused their export to other countries. Successively, every panic was converted into prosperous times when circulation of specie was resumed by the banks and governments.

The colonists of New England brought little money with them and so they were forced to barter amongst themselves. They used various commodities as units of value, such as skins and corn; cows also became legal tender.

The colonists, being desperately short of both capital and production capacity, started shipbuilding and the fishing industry. Their trade was principally with the West Indies. Their coin supply was greatly augmented in this trade and also by the expenditures of visiting buccaneers. But their need of European goods was so great that the maritime merchants carried off the metallic money as fast as it came into the country.

The first mint was built in Boston in 1652. It converted foreign coins into the pine-tree shillings. An effort was made to retain these silver coins in circulation by reducing their silver content below that of the English shillings and by prohibiting their export under drastic penalties. The pine-tree shilling became the standard for the future, but the supply was so inadequate that bartering continued. The differences in quality of the barter currencies led to insolvable problems.

The governors of the New England provinces organized military expeditions into Canada for purposes of increasing their wealth by loot, but the only result achieved was an overproduction of colonial paper money, which immediately suffered depreciation and virtual extinction of value. One expedition against the French colony of Louisburg on Cape Breton succeeded at the cost of enormous paper-money inflation on the part of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and New Hampshire, but strangely and fortunately, the British Parliament decided to ransom Louisburg from the colonists. The sum paid to Massachusetts, amounting to 140,000 pounds sterling, was sufficient to cancel their depreciated paper. This money was received in foreign silver dollars and copper pennies, which were gradually placed in circulation during 1750. Massachusetts enjoyed a business boom. The West India trade, which had been largely centered at Newport, migrated to Salem and

Boston. A semblance of monetary stability continued until Rhode Island went on a paper basis in 1751. In 1751 Parliament passed an act forbidding any more legal-tender-paper issues, but new war with the French in 1756 involved them once more, as war expenditures had caused the issue of interest-bearing exchequer bills to be redeemed by taxes, which were not forthcoming.

As silver came into circulation in Massachusetts a monetary phenomenon occurred which has plagued the United States and all countries ever since. Gold from the West Indies began entering the Colony, and in 1762 was made legal tender at 2½ pence per grain. This rating made it a cheaper money than silver by about 5 percent. As a consequence, the silver money was replaced by gold. The silver was shipped to countries which maintained higher values for the white metal, but the gold from the West Indies was not sufficient to balance the exchange with England and leave a surplus for local circulation.

Soon thereafter the Colonies were engaged in the War of Independence, all of them under conditions of debt and depreciated currencies.

The Continental Congress issued paper money in 1775 and every year thereafter until 1779. In 1780 all issues of the money had depreciated to almost zero value.

During the Revolutionary War virtually the Colonies' only source of incoming gold and silver was obtained indirectly by the expenditures of the British forces and the personnel of the ships of the French allies.

THE CONTINENTAL CONGRESS

At this stage General Washington's influence appears prominently in rescuing the credit of the Continental Congress by arranging future convertibility of outstanding continental notes. On July 28, 1780, the Congress enacted:

"*Resolved*, That the principal of all loans that have been made to the United States shall finally be discharged by paying the full current value of the bills when loaned, which payment shall be made in Spanish milled dollars, or the current exchange thereof in other money at the time of payment thereof, etc."

The circulation of the defunct Continental bills was stopped by congressional act in 1781.

The next effort by General Washington toward establishing a financial system was his sponsorship of Robert Morris in starting the Bank of North America, through which the future financing to prosecute the war was hoped to be achieved. This bank was chartered by Congress and opened for business at Philadelphia January 7, 1782. The capital was supplied by public subscription to the sum of $70,000, and by Congress, $254,000. Cornwallis surrendered 10 months after the bank started.

It was the first bank incorporated in the United States. It enjoyed high confidence and its notes circulated at par because of specie reserves. The Government sold its interest in 1783, but the bank is still in existence in Philadelphia as a national bank.

Alexander Hamilton, in his report to Congress, refers to the bank as follows:

"The aid afforded to the United States by this institution, during the remaining period of the war, was of essential consequence; and its conduct toward them since the peace has not weakened its title to their patronage and favor."

On January 20, 1783, the preliminaries of peace were signed between England, on the one hand, and France and Spain on the other. The news arrived in America on the 23d of March, in a letter to the President of Congress from Lafayette, who had returned to France soon after the victory of Yorktown. Washington, on the 8th day of June, in view of the approaching disbandment of the Army, addressed a circular letter to the governors and presidents of the several States which he wished to have regarded as his legacy to the American people. In this letter he insisted upon four things as essential to the very existence of the United States as an independent power:

"First, there must be an indissoluble union of all the States under a single Federal Government, which must possess the power of enforcing its decrees, for without such authority it would be a government only in name.

"Secondly, the debts incurred by Congress for the purpose of carrying on the war and securing independence must be paid to the uttermost farthing.

"Thirdly, the militia system must be organized throughout the 13 States on uniform principles.

"Fourthly, the people must be willing to sacrifice, if need be, some of their local interests to the common weal; they must discard their local prejudices; regard one another as fellow citizens of a common country, with interests in the deepest and truest sense identical."

George Washington returned to Mount Vernon and occupied himself with furthering the plans which had entered his mind at the first meeting of the Continental Congress in 1774. His conception was to bring the western wilderness into commercial communication with the seaboard colonies. He fully realized that all of the territory west of the Alleghenies, with drainage to the Mississippi, had available a natural water system of transportation to New Orleans, and hence to the rest of the world, and that if fully made use of before east and west transportation facilities were established, the whole western country commercially and politically would be lost to the original States.

Washington visualized the imperative need of canals and post roads. He studied the four feasible east and west roads: (1) Connecting the Hudson River with Lake Erie through the Mohawk Valley; (2) the Susquehanna River route; (3) the valley of the Potomac River; (4) the James River and an auxiliary canal between the Chesapeake Bay and the Delaware River.

In order to carry out the enterprise of extending the navigation of the Potomac, it became necessary for the two States, Maryland and Virginia, to act in concert. A joint commission met at Mount Vernon in 1785 at which a compact insuring harmonious cooperation between the two States was prepared. Washington suggested to the commissioners that Maryland and Virginia should agree upon a uniform system of duties and upon a uniform currency.

As Washington intended to connect the Potomac River with the Ohio, it was further necessary to invite Pennsylvania to become a party to the compact. It was later suggested in the report from Maryland that Delaware as well as Pennsylvania ought to be considered since the scheme should rightly include a canal between the Delaware River and the Chesapeake Bay and why not also consult these States about a uniform currency? If 2 States can agree upon these matters, why not 4? And still further, said the Maryland message might it not be well, if we are going to have such a conference, to invite commissioners from all of the 13 States to attend it? An informal discussion can hurt nobody; the conference of itself can settle nothing; and if 4 States can take part in it why not 13? Great things were destined to come from these modest beginnings. In fact, the organization of the United States Government eventuated as a direct result therefrom. Washington's original suggestion that the independent monetary controls of the 13 colonies be vested exclusively in the United States Government gradually evolved into their centralization as defined in the Constitution.

Commissioners from all of the States were invited to meet on the first Monday of September 1786 at Annapolis.

"It may not amount to much," wrote Madison to Monroe, "but the expectant is better than nothing, and as the recommendation of additional powers to Congress is within the purview of the commission, it may possibly lead to better consequences than at first occur." The seed dropped by Washington had fallen on fruitful soil. The report of the Commissioners was brought before Congress in October, but action was prevented temporarily by the delegates of Massachusetts.

In an ordinary session this would perhaps have ended the matter, but the winter of 1786–87 was not an ordinary session. All the troubles of the various States seemed to culminate just at that moment. The paper money craze in so many of the States, the distressing paper money excesses of Rhode Island, the riots in Vermont and New Hampshire, the Shays rebellion in Massachusetts, the dispute with Spain, and the consequent imminent danger of separation between North and South had all come together.

In 1783 when the cessions of western lands were creating a national domain, a promising plan had been devised for relieving the country of its load of debt and furnishing Congress with money for its current expenses. There now seemed nothing left for Congress to do but adopt the recommendation of the Annapolis commissioners and give its sanction to the proposed convention. Madison, however, had not waited for this, but had prevailed upon the Virginia Legislature to go on and appoint its delegates to the convention. Under Madison's lead, Virginia played her trump card and chose George Washington as one of her delegates. As soon as this was known there was an outburst of joy throughout the land. It was felt that the time had come when the question of national revenue must be seriously considered. Every week saw fresh converts to the party which called for stronger government. New Jersey followed Virginia in appointing delegates, then Pennsylvania, North Carolina, and Delaware.

Rufus King now brought the matter up in Congress; he moved that Congress should of itself propose a convention at Philadelphia identical with the one which the Annapolis commissioners had already recommended. The motion was carried and in this way Congress formally approved and adopted what was going on. Massachusetts immediately chose delegates and was followed by New York. In April Georgia and South Carolina followed suit; Connecticut and Maryland came in May and New Hampshire somewhat tardily in June. Of the 13 States, Rhode Island alone refused to take part in the proceedings.

In the long negotiation and debates which led up to the signing of the Constitution, the following clause provided against an occurrence of the worst evils that had been felt under the "league of friendship":

"No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation; grant letters of marque and reprisal; coin money; emit bills of credit; make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts."

So far as the State legislatures were concerned, paper money was to be ruled out forever. But how was it with the Federal Government? By the Articles of Confederation, the Government was allowed to issue bills of credit, and make them a tender in payment of debts. In the Federal Convention the committee of detail suggested that this permission might remain under the new Constitution but the suggestion was almost unanimously condemned. All the ablest men in the convention spoke emphatically against it.

Governeur Morris urged that the Federal Government, no less than the State governments, should be expressly prohibited from issuing bills of credit, or in anywise making

its promissory notes a legal tender. He went over the history of the past 10 years; he called attention to the obstinacy with which the wretched device had been resorted to again and again, after its evils had been thrust before everybody's eyes; and he proved himself a true prophet when he said that if the United States should ever again have a great war to conduct, people would have forgotten all about these things, and would call for fresh issues of inconvertible paper, with similar disastrous results. "Now was the time to stop it once for all." "Yes," echoed Roger Sherman, "this is the favorable crisis for crushing paper money." "This is the time," said his colleague, Ellsworth, "to shut and bar the door against paper money, which can in no case be necessary." "Give the Government credit, and other resources will suffer." "The power may do harm, never good." "There was no way," he added, "in which powerful friends could so soon be gained for the new Constitution as by withholding this power from the Government." James Wilson took the same view. "It will have the most salutary influence on the credit of the United States," said he, "to remove the possibility of paper money." "Rather than grant the power to Congress," said John Langdon, "I would reject the whole plan." "The words which grant this power," said George Rand, of Delaware, "if not struck out, will be as alarming as the mark of the beast in the Apocalypse." On none of the subjects that came up for discussion during that summer was the convention more nearly unanimous than in its condemnation of paper money. The only delegate who ventured to speak in its favor was Mercer, of Maryland. What Hamilton would have said, if he had been present that day, we may judge from his vigorous words published some time before:

"The power to emit an inconvertible paper as a sign of value ought never hereafter to be used; for in its very nature, it is pregnant with abuses, and liable to be made the engine of imposition and fraud, holding out temptations equally pernicious to the integrity of government and to the morals of the people." Paterson called it "sanctifying iniquity by law."

The same views were entertained by Washington and Madison. There were a few delegates, however, who thought it unsafe to fetter Congress absolutely. To use Luther Martin's expression, they "did not set themselves up to be wise beyond every event." George Mason said he "had a mortal hatred to paper money," yet, as he could not foresee all emergencies, he was "unwilling to tie the hands of the legislature." "The later war," he thought, "could not have been carried on had such a prohibition existed." Randolph spoke to the same effect. It was finally decided, by the vote of nine States against New Jersey and Maryland, that the power to issue inconvertible paper should not be granted to the Federal Government.

An express prohibition, such as had been adopted for the separate States, was thought unnecessary. It was supposed that it was enough to withhold the power, since the Federal Government would not venture to exercise it unless expressly permitted in the Constitution. "Thus," says Madison, in his narrative of the proceedings, "the pretext for a paper currency, and particularly for making the bills a tender, either for public or private debts, was cut off."

The first session of Congress under the Constitution began on the 4th of March 1789. General Washington was inaugurated President on the 30th of April following the opening of Congress. In his first annual address, January 8, 1790, President Washington portrays his profound and continuing interest in establishing a hard-money basis by the following statements.

"Uniformity in currency, weights, and measures of the United States is an object of great importance and will, I am persuaded, be duly attended to."

In his second annual address of December 8, 1790, he stated:

"The establishment of the militia, of a mint, of standards of weights and measures, of the post office and post roads are subjects which I presume you will resume, of course, and are abundantly urged by their own importance. We shall also never lose sight of the policy of diminishing the public debt as fast as the increase of the public resources will permit, and are particularly sensible of the money considerations which present a resort to the auxiliary resources furnished by the public lands."

In his third annual address of October 25, 1791, President Washington stated:

"The rapid subscriptions to the Bank of the United States, which completed the sum allowed to be subscribed in a single day, is the striking and pleasing evidence which presents itself not only of the confidence in the Government but in results of the community. The disorders in the existing currency or small change, a scarcity so peculiarly distressing to the poorer classes, strongly recommend the carrying into immediate effect the resolution already entered into concerning the establishment of a mint. Measures have been taken pursuant to that resolution for procuring some of the necessary artists, together with the necessary apparatus."

The Congress responded to General Washington's importunities by the act of April 7, 1792, establishing the first mint by the United States. The act provided for the coinage of gold, silver, and copper, based on the decimal system. The eagle, or $10 gold piece, was to contain 247½ grains; the half eagle, or $5 gold piece, to contain one-half of the above gold; and the gold dollar, one-tenth of the amount. The gold dollar and the double eagle, $20 gold piece, were not authorized for coinage until March 3, 1849). The silver dollars, or units—each to be of the value of the Spanish milled dollar as then current, and to contain 371.25 grains of pure silver; the decimal silver coins at the same rate, the dime being the smallest coin authorized. By this act both gold and silver were made monetary standards at the value ratio of 15 grains of silver to 1 grain of gold.

Until this time the Spanish silver dollar had really been the standard of value, but there was less than $2,000,000 of coin in the United States at the time with a population of 4,000,000 people—less than 50 cents per person. In order to increase the stocks of gold and silver coins the Congress enacted the act of February 9, 1793, making the gold and silver coins of Great Britain, France, Spain, and Portugal legal tender in the United States. Ten additional acts of the same character were enacted between 1798 and 1843, giving legal-tender status in the United States to the gold and silver coins of additional countries of Europe, Mexico, and the principal countries of South America. These acts were not repealed until 1857, at which time California had made the United States the leading gold-producing country of the world. The new mint at San Francisco had been in operation since 1854.

Finally, President Washington in his sixth annual address, November 19, 1794, reports:

"The mint of the United States has entered upon the coinage of the precious metals and considerable sums of defective coins and bullion have been lodged with the Director by individuals. There is a pleasant prospect that the institution will, at no remote date, realize the expectation that was originally formed of its utility."

F esident Washington appointed Alexander Hamilton Secretary of the Treasury, September 11, 1789. On January 9, 1790, he submitted his first report on the public credit, in which he concurred in the language of the resolution of the United States House of Representatives, which had requested the report, as follows:

"That an adequate provision for the support of public credit is a matter of high importance to the honor and prosperity of the United States."

As a basis for debt settlement Hamilton stated:

"It is agreed on all hands that the part of the debt which has been contracted abroad and is denominated the foreign debt ought to be provided for according to the precise terms of the contracts relating to it."

Of the most profound interest concerning Washington's determination to abolish public debt is the opening paragraph of the report of Alexander Hamilton to the Senate on public credit, January 1795, as follows:

"The President of the United States, with that provident concern for the public welfare which characterizes all his conduct, was pleased, in his speech to the two Houses of Congress at the opening of the present session, to invite their attention to the adoption of a definitive plan for the redemption of the public debt, and to the consummation of whatsoever may remain unfinished of our system of public credit, in order to place that credit, as far as may be practicable, on grounds which cannot be disturbed, and to prevent that progressive accumulation of debt, which must ultimately endanger all government."

The main part of the debt was domestic, consisting of about two-thirds principal and one-third interest. The Hamilton plan included assumption of the debts of the several 13 States which existed when they entered the Union under the Constitution of 1789. The Southern States strenuously opposed the assumption because their debts relative to population were much less than those of the North. The North was much interested in refunding of all debt, and was profiting immensely by the acquirement of depreciated currencies by anticipating their return to parities. Hamilton carried through his plan of assumption by having the Northern States agree with those of the South to locate the Capital in what is now the District of Columbia. The consolidated unredeemed debt of the United States and the debts of the separate colonies amounted to $76,100,000. The plan took effect January of 1795.

This total debt, together with the war debt of $103,000,000 created during the war of 1812–15 was discharged by 1836. Washington's plan of refunding bonds payable in specie was passed and skillfully executed by Hamilton. He depended largely on revenue from the sale of public lands in which he was not disappointed. The payment of the debt of 1814 again was successful on the issuance of specie bonds after the country had been on a paper basis since the British had captured Washington, August 14, 1814.

Since 1933 the United States has purchased all gold and silver offered from all countries at prices fixed by the Treasury. All gold, including that produced in the United States, has been withdrawn from circulation and its citizens deprived, under the Gold Act of 1934, of the right to own or use gold money. The gold actually has been paid for by the Federal Reserve banks by the granting of deposit credits, but notwithstanding this fact, both

the banks and the depositors are deprived of its use.

The withholding of gold from circulation has caused a profound change in the fiscal and financial conditions of the United States. The Government has had to expand the public debt by billions of dollars and will be compelled to continue the debt increase during whatever period of duration the gold remains hoarded by the Government. For the period 1934–40 the public debt has increased an average rate of about $3,000,000,000 per year, but due to the abnormal costs of defense preparation and war conditions the war debt will from now on increase from $7,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000 per year.

If the gold and silver from now on continues to be withheld from active use an adequate rise in national income will thereby be prevented. It is difficult to visualize a billion dollars. Mr. Al Smith, of New York, some years ago wished to discredit the administration because of the billions of expenditures occurring. He tried to simplify the visualization of a billion dollars by saying that if $5 bills were placed end to end they would reach to the moon and back and in addition thereto encircle the world innumerable times. This illustration made the visualization more difficult. It is quite simple to contemplate a billion dollars in thinking of it in terms of the population of the United States. It represents $7 each for 130,000,000 people. A maximum debt perhaps of $700 per person will be attained before the debt reduction commences.

The recurring plague of war debt once more frowns upon young America. Six separate and distinct times the country has been oppressed with the debts accrued by six wars. Each time gold and silver has been the base upon which debt extinction was achieved. Following the War of 1812–15 came the Mexican War of 1846–48 with its special debt of $63,605,000, the payment of which was made possible by the record gold production from California, which started in 1848. Then came the Civil War with the resulting debt of $2,783,000,000, which was liquidated by means of continuing gold production of California and new production of gold and silver from Nevada and other Western States. The Spanish-American War was financed by President McKinley by the issuance of gold bonds and the coinage of all silver bullion in the vaults of the Treasury and all currently produced silver. The debts of the great war were well on the way to extinction by the redemption of the gold bonds issued to finance the war. The 208,000,000 ounces of silver loaned to Britain to save the credit of British India from its redundant issue of paper rupees was a prime factor in the success of Britain's participation in that war. This fact is eloquently testified to by Ambassador Lord Reading in a speech at a dinner of farewell tendered him by the English Speaking Union, February 12, 1921, in New York.

"My views on this subject are too well known to need repetition, and were I so minded I could relate tales during my experience in America on the four visits to it during the war which would take a long time in telling, but each incident of which would impress upon you most deeply the value and generosity of American friendship. There is just one incident to which I will briefly refer which has not been told you. During the war, as you know, every attempt was made to sow dissension in the Empire by insidious propaganda. Every attempt was made to create distrust of the British and of the British Empire. There arose in India a situation which is not known to the general public, but gives material for a story which illustrates American good will and friendship as well as anything I know during the war—except, perhaps, the greatest event of all, when President Wilson agreed that American troops should be brigaded with the British and the French if they were needed.

"It was a moment when, owing to the war and to this propaganda, there was a great scarcity of silver in India as well as elsewhere, and in India it was of more consequence than in most places. There was a moment at which we were very hard pressed to find the metallic reserve, particularly the silver which was necessary in India, it being incumbent that the paper-note issue should be convertible immediately into the silver rupee. Owing to this great scarcity our difficulty was to find the silver. There was no means but one; that seemed impossible. In the vaults of the American Treasury there were vast stores of silver preserved there as the financial backing against the notes which were issued—silver which could not be disturbed, no matter how much it was wanted. It could not be taken out of the vaults of the United States except by act of Congress; to whatever party they belonged, all legislators joined in an endeavor to meet the situation by passing an act of Congress without discussion, because discussion would have been serious.

"Practically without any debate this measure was passed in almost record shortness of time. It became a law within a very few days of its seeing light (Pittman Act, April 1918). The vast millions of ounces of silver from the vaults were released and were sent across by arrangement between America and ourselves to India, with which America had no concern but simply because it was necessary at that moment to help the British Empire. Nothing was said of this. Even the newspapers—remember the newspapers were conscious of it—knew as well as possible what was happening; but they did not mention it because they knew that if they did they would detract largely from the generous services that America was rendering and they passed it over in silence. Nothing has been heard of it or said of it since. I do not know myself that now, long after war, America has ever claimed in any way our recognition of that service.

"I only instance this for the purpose of bringing home to the mind of the British people not only what America can do if she once sets her mind to do a thing but I want strongly to impress upon you the generosity with which America responded to the demands which were made upon her."

The seventh war-debt crisis the greatest of all time, confronts the rising generation. You who are here today and others of your generation will inherit the problems of solving the financial difficulties of your country. It would be well for all of you to feel a responsibility in acquiring a practical understanding of money. After many years of study I have become a devoted disciple of George Washington in his conviction that gold and silver alone are the real moneys and that paper moneys, while necessary for the convenience of transacting business, have no inherent values unless they can be exchanged for either gold or silver; that when paper becomes anything other than proxy moneys for gold and silver, it is dangerous money, and inevitably leads to hard times and panics.

Young ladies and gentlemen of Washington College, will you challenge the problem, following the precepts of George Washington and those who have followed him, or will you resort to experiments which have had no successful precedents? Your President and the Congress have provided for you the world's greatest accumulation of gold and silver, which now virtually unused, is available for use in your country's needs.

Planting of Trees for Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE DIVIDE COUNTY FARMERS PRESS, CROSBY, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Divide County Farmers Press, of Crosby, N. Dak., of March 21, 1941, on the subject Saskatchewan Plants Trees.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Divide County Farmers Press, Crosby, N. Dak., of March 21, 1941]

SASKATCHEWAN PLANTS TREES

The Federal Government's program for farm shelterbelts lends itself particularly well to the needs of northwest North Dakota, and it is hoped that Congress, while appropriating large sums for other purposes, will not neglect to provide funds necessary for continuance of this work.

Evidence accumulates that trees are an essential part of any program for soil and moisture conservation in this territory, and that Federal assistance is needed if the program is to be extended along the lines which will meet our requirements satisfactorily.

Long ago Jim Hill and his railroad, in planting thousands of trees along the right-of-way to stop snow from drifting over its tracks, proved to the satisfaction of most of us that trees are practical here.

Work of hundreds of farmers—like George Frye, of Stanley—who on their own initiative have planted and maintained groves of trees on their farms for years, offers all the additional proof that is necessary.

Thousands of shelterbelts in the northern plains area have done rather well—well enough to show their value—although many of them now need replacement.

Experimental plantings of farm shelterbelts in the Minot area, established under the Prairie States program, also are looking well at this time.

We especially need field plantings of trees in large numbers to mitigate the force of winter winds, to stop blowing of soil, and to trap snow on the fields, where its falls. The Federal Government's program carries out this aim better than any plan so far advanced.

Experience in establishing trees and shrubs in fields of the Bottineau soil conservation district and in farm shelterbelts farther east and south, where the Federal program has been underway for several years, should serve as a guide for practical extension of the program in our region, where it is so vitally important.

Narrow strips of trees along quarter lines in every cultivated section, with other narrow strips of shrubs at intervals, running north and south in large fields, and other plantings placed in strategic spots wherever practical, would do much to preserve the soil and to aid in water conservation in this territory.

Saskatchewan's problem is similar to ours, and it is noteworthy that in the past 5 years 11,000,000 trees have been distributed and planted in that province under the program of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation administration. This work, according to George Spence, director, is part of the Dominion's program of moisture and soil conservation in the prairie provinces. Generally speaking our Canadian neighbors are hard-headed when it comes to spending money and undertaking large-scale programs. If trees are the recognized need of Saskatchewan, they are not less important to the prairies of northwest North Dakota.—Minot Daily News.

Special Committee on Un-American Activities

REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN DIES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1941

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, the steel industry is one of the most vitally important of all our industries from the standpoint of national defense. Billions of dollars in defense contracts have been let to the concerns in this industry. Today a strike is threatened in one of the largest of the steel concerns. During recent weeks there have been strikes in some of the smaller steel plants.

The issue which confronts us in this situation has nothing to do with the rights of organized labor, nor is there any disposition on the part of anyone to condone any faults of management in the steel industry. The issue is strictly one of Communist operations in the steel industry for the sole purpose of obstructing the progress of the national-defense program.

I have here before me today a mass of evidence which our committee has gathered, evidence which will show something of the degree to which the Communist Party has concentrated its efforts in the steel industry. I shall put into the RECORD some of the Communist names which our committee has assembled, and shall designate the Communist affiliations of each of these persons. The picture as a whole is an alarming one. From its very inception the Steel Workers Organizing Committee of the C. I. O. showed a strong disposition to place on its pay rolls scores of organizers who had records of Communist Party membership.

This has been in line with the basic strategy of the Communist Party, which is one of organizing in the most important of our industries regardless of the numbers of workers employed there. I call upon the Members of this House to ponder the facts which I shall put into the RECORD.

The following record of Communist infiltration into the steel industry through the Steel Workers Organizing Committee will serve to show something of the Communist menace in this vitally important national-defense industry:

William K. Gebert, member of the Communist Party and one-time member of the party's central committee; has been located in Pittsburgh as the chairman of the Communist Party's steel organizing campaign; has had the use of office space used by Philip Murray in the headquarters of the S. W. O. C. Gebert has a long record of activity on behalf of the Communist Party, including the following: Contributor to The Communist; contributor to the Workers Monthly; contributor to The Party Organizer; contributor to The Daily Worker; contributor to the official organ of the National Miners Union; contributor to International Press Correspondence; representative of the Trade Union Unity League; district organizer of the Communist Party in Chicago; organizer for the National Miners Union, official of the International Workers Order; signer of the call to the second congress of the American League Against War and Fascism; and honored by the Michigan State executive committee of the Communist Party for 25 years of service in the revolutionary movement.

Jack Johnstone, member of the Communist Party; Member of the national committee of the Communist Party of the United States, according to the testimony of Earl Browder; has directed all activity of the S. W. O. C. in the Chicago and Gary area where Communist organizers were involved. Johnstone's record of Communist Party activity includes the following: National organizer of the Trade Union Unity League; candidate for United States Senate on the Communist Party ticket in Illinois in 1940; instructor in the Chicago Workers School; member of the credentials committee of the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International; contributor to the Daily Worker; contributor to the Party Organizer; sponsor of the Mother Bloor banquet; contributor to the Communist; member of the National Mooney Council of Action; and speaker at the sessions of the Communist International.

Ben Careathers, member of the Communist Party; has been on the pay roll of the S. W. O. C. Careathers' record in the Communist Party includes the following: Convicted and sentenced a few days ago in Pittsburgh for fraud in connection with the circulation of the Communist Party's election petitions in Pennsylvania; candidate for Lieutenant Governor on the Communist Party ticket in Pennsylvania in 1938; candidate for State treasurer on the Communist Party ticket in Pennsylvania in 1940; delegate to the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International; chairman of discussion group at the National Negro Congress; and instructor in the Pittsburgh Workers School.

William Hill, member of the Communist Party, and one of its section organizers; has been organizer for the S. W. O. C. Hill's Communist Party record further includes the following: Discussion leader at the National Negro Congress, and contributor to Soviet Russia Today.

George Powers, member of the Communist Party; has been one of the district directors for the S. W. O. C. Powers' real name is Morris Pobersky. He was born in Russia, and was first active for the Communist Party in Minneapolis. Powers testified before our committee that he had forgotten his real name. He was cited for contempt by the House of Representatives for refusal to answer questions before our committee. He has just been sentenced to 2 years' imprisonment in Pennsylvania for fraud in connection with the circulation of the Communist Party's election petitions. Powers' record of activity for the Communist Party also includes the following: Organizer for the Trade Union Unity League; candidate for the State legislature in Pennsylvania on the Communist Party ticket in 1940; district secretary of the Communist Party in Pittsburgh; speaker at the National Party Builders Congress in 1938; member of the American League Against War and Fascism; and organizer for the Communist Party in Georgia under the name of M. H. Powers.

Tom Meyerscough, member of the Communist Party; has been on the pay roll of the S. W. O. C. Meyerscough was formerly president of the National Miners Union, an affiliate of the Trade Union Unity League, which was in turn affiliated with the Red International of Labor Unions.

Joseph Howard, member of the Communist Party and organizer for the Communist Party in Birmingham, Ala., on the pay roll of the S. W. O. C. Howard was Alabama delegate to the Communist Party Convention in 1934.

Lloyd Brown, member of the Communist Party and Communist Party organizer; has been organizer for the S. W. O. C. Brown has also been district organizer for the Young Communist League, and a contributor to the Young Communist Review. He has been connected with the National Negro Congress as well.

Jack Russak (or Rusak), a member of the Communist Party according to testimony before committee; has been on the pay roll of the S. W. O. C. Russak has also been district secretary of the International Workers Order in Chicago.

Joe Weber, member of the Communist Party, has been on the pay roll of the S. W. O. C.; and has also been the chief organizer of the Farm Equipment Workers' Organizing Committee which has been on strike at International Harvester for several weeks. Weber was a member of the National Mooney Council of Action, a sponsor of the Chicago Race Relations Conference, and a signer of the call for the Provisional Committee Trade Union Conference for United Action—all fronts for the Communist Party.

Ethel Stevens, member of the Communist Party, also a secretary of the Communist Party in Gary Ind.; has been a paid organizer of the S. W. O. C. Ethel Stevens has also been an instructor in

the Chicago Workers School and a contributor to the Party Organizer.

Jess Gonzales, member of the Communist Party, has been Communist Party organizer in Denver, Colo.; has been on the pay roll of the S. W. O. C.

Eleanor Rye, member of the Communist Party; has been on the pay roll of the S. W. O. C.; was Chicago organizer for the National Negro Congress. Eleanor Rye was a member of the national campaign committee of the Communist Party in 1936.

Clarence Irwin, member of the Communist Party, according to testimony before committee; has been adviser to Martin Young, alias Leon Platt, one-time district organizer of the Communist Party in Pittsburgh; has been on the pay roll of the S. W. O. C. Irwin was a member of the national executive committee of the American League Against War and Fascism in 1935.

Israel Berenstein, alias Blaine Owen, alias Boris Israel, member of the Communist Party; was sent to Pittsburgh by the central committee of the Communist Party to work with William K. Gebert. Berenstein's father has been the representative of Amtorg on the Pacific coast. Under the name of Blaine Owen, Berenstein has been a member of the International Workers Order and a reporter for the Sunday Worker. Also, under the name of Blaine Owen, he went to Spain to fight for the Loyalists. Under the name of Boris Israel, Berenstein has been a contributor to the New Masses and to New Pioneer, both Communist Party publications.

Doyle Glormer, member of the Communist Party; has been an organizer for the S. W. O. C. Glormer has also been a reporter for the People's Press.

John Steuben, member of the Communist Party; has been a section organizer for the Communist Party; has been on the pay roll of the S. W. O. C. This man's real name is Itzok Ryshak, in addition to the name of John Stevens, Martin Rijak, and Izak Rijack. This man was fined $300 and given 30 days in jail in Mahoning County in 1937 for "malicious destruction of property." The court records show the charge as entered against John Steuben alias Stevenson. At the same time Robert Burke was found guilty of inciting to riot. The Eye Opener, official publication of the S. W. O. C. in Butler, Pa., had the following to say concerning John Steuben, alias Stevenson:

> We could go on and defend Mr. Stevenson, but we wish to keep personalities out of this matter. A discussion of Mr. Stevenson's past or communism's future has nothing to do with the basic principles of the C. I. O. We wish to point out—and note that we are not admitting any of the charges against him—that even if it were true that Mr. Stevenson has been a Communist has nothing to do with the work he has been doing at Butler.

Despite the refusal of the Butler, Pa., S. W. O. C. to admit the facts concerning John Steuben, alias Stevenson, there is not the slightest doubt possible that he has been one of the most active Communist Party organizers in the United States. There is also no doubt possible concerning his conviction for the malicious destruction of railroad property. He entered a plea of guilty to the charge. All of this took place before he was employed by the S. W. O. C. Steuben, or whatever his right name may be, has been a contributor to The Party Organizer, a contributor to The Communist, organizer for the Communist Party in Youngstown, Ohio, instructor in the Pittsburgh Workers School. The Communist Party Yearbook for Ohio in 1937 lists him as a leader of the Communist Party in Ohio. In 1938 Steuben was one of the chief witnesses before the La Follette committee of the United States Senate.

Joe Mankin, member of the Communist Party, according to testimony before the committee, has been on the pay roll of the S. W. O. C. Mankin has been an official of the International Workers Order.

Richard H. Lawry, member of the Communist Party, according to testimony before the committee, has been on the pay roll of the S. W. O. C. Lawry was a witness before our committee last year. In his own testimony he declared that he had been active on behalf of the Workers Alliance and the Unemployed Councils, and that he was district president of the International Workers Order. Lawry has also been president of the League for the Protection of Minority Rights, a Communist front organization. In December 1939 Lawry was appointed supervisor of the United States Census for the third and fourth districts of Pennsylvania.

Helen Anderson, member of the Communist Party, and also secretary of several Communist Party units, has been on the pay roll of the S. W. O. C.

Norman Ross, member of the Communist Party, delegate to New York State convention of the Communist Party in 1938, speaker for the American League for Peace and Democracy, organizer for the Young Communist League, sent to Canada to organize for the S. W. O. C.

Joe Cook, member of the Communist Party, has been a paid organizer for the S. W. O. C. Cook has been connected with the Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.

Ralph Shaw, member of the Communist Party, has been State secretary for the Communist Party in Missouri, also candidate for the United States Senate on the Communist Party ticket in Missouri in 1940, contributor to the Communist, has been a paid organizer for the S. W. O. C.

Mrs. Mineola Ingersoll, member of the Communist Party, member of the advisory board of the International Labor Defense in Illinois, office secretary of the American League for Peace and Democracy in Chicago, has been on the pay roll of the S. W. O. C.

R. McKinney, member of the Communist Party, has been on the pay roll of the S. W. O. C. McKinney was a member of the Provisional Committee Trade Union Conference for United Action, a Communist Party united front.

Robert L. Crudden, member of the Communist Party, contributor to New Masses, correspondent for the Daily Worker and for International Publishers, contributor to The Communist, has been on the pay roll of the S. W. O. C.

Gertrude Haessler, member of the Communist Party. When the S. W. O. C. began its drive in Buffalo, Gertrude Haessler appeared on the scene. One of the directors of the S. W. O. C. in Buffalo has testified before our committee that Gertrude Haessler appeared "out of nowhere" and was promptly made educational director for the campaign. This woman is the author of the Communist Party's booklet entitled "Shop Paper Manual." In this booklet, Gertrude Haessler revealed an extremely important item in the Communist Party's strategy of organization in labor unions. She said:

> This means that more factors should enter into consideration than mere numbers of workers in the factory. It is a small shop in a decisive war industry or a large shop manufacturing, let us say, buttons. If it comes to a choice, then the former by all means should be chosen.

In other words, the Communist Party is not so much interested in helping the largest possible number of workers as it is in organizing where it can do the most damage to our national security. Gertrude Haessler has a long Communist Party record which includes the following: Translator for the New Masses, instructor in the Workers School, editorial board of New Pioneer, contributor to the Party Organizer, contributor to the Daily Worker, and head of the Communist Party's shop paper committee. After serving for the S. W. O. C. in Buffalo, Gertrude Haessler was placed in charge of adult education in the W. P. A.

I have by no means exhausted the list of active Communists who have penetrated the steel industry through the S. W. O. C., but the foregoing list is sufficient to indicate the menace of Communists in this most important national-defense industry. We ignore this menace at our great peril. Our committee is in possession of indisputable evidence that the Communist Party, through its members and organizers in the S. W. O. C., are working toward a complete tie-up in the steel industry, an industry which has billions of dollars in defense contracts.

In addition to the names which I have cited, our committee has heard sworn testimony which identifies scores of other S. W. O. C. organizers as members of the Communist Party. Furthermore, our committee is in possession of evidence which shows that hundreds of employees in steel mills have recently signed the Communist Party's election petitions.

Naturally, I have no way of knowing precisely how many Communist Party members are on the pay rolls of the S. W. O. C. as of today. I do not have access to the account books of the organization, and they alone would tell what the situation is at the moment. It is, however, an indictment of this labor organization that it ever allowed so many Communists of public record to infiltrate into its organizing work.

Bureaucracy A Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE DETROIT TIMES

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial Bureaucracy A Menace, which appeared recently in the Detroit Times:

[From the Detroit Times]

BUREAUCRACY A MENACE

The situation of the bituminous coal industry in the United States, under the dictatorial Guffey Act, was analyzed in a comprehensive manner the other day by B. C. Forbes in his column, Business and Finance, which appears in this newspaper.

This situation, according to Mr. Forbes, is the nearest approach to pure socialism that we have had in the United States.

It involves the arbitrary fixing of minimum prices.

It has increased the cost of soft coal to American consumers by not less than $40,000,000 annually.

It has virtually eliminated competition from one of the most important industries in the Nation.

The American people may not wish to change this situation, and indeed might not be able to change it if they wished.

But they should at least be informed about it and understand it.

As Mr. Forbes says, "What Washington has done to the soft-coal industry it aspires to do in many other directions, namely, usurp dictatorial powers."

And if the situation prevailing in the soft-coal industry should ever be broadened to include all, or even many, of the vital industries of the country, the United States would automatically become a Socialist country and not a democracy.

"The term 'defense' is on everybody's lips," says Mr. Forbes.

"But there is another form of defense which should be occupying the mind of every responsible citizen, namely, the defense of the system of government which contributed incalculably to our rise to world leadership."

It would simplify this problem immeasurably if the American people could be made to understand what it means to have socialized industry.

It means complete control of industry by bureaucratic agencies of the Government—in other words, political control.

And, of course, it will ultimately mean political control of labor, too.

It certainly means, as experience in the soft-coal industry proves, not only fixed prices but higher prices.

Nothing is every economically done under political bureaucracy.

Favoritism and patronage are the inevitable implements of the political bureaucrat.

Extraagance and inefficiency are the tools of his trade.

His aim is not to provide goo .s and services that are essential to the people at a minimum cost, but to build up a position of power for himself and to perpetuate himself in that place.

Bureaucracy must rule high-handedly and iron-handedly, because its methods eventually become oppressive and obnoxious, and it must anticipate this reaction by being in a position to compel submission.

A free people cannot afford to rely upon its ability to unseat bureaucracy when it becomes oppressive and obnoxious, for by that time it- powers have become so deeply rooted as to be nearly absolute.

For an illustration of this, let us now witness with what difficulty the bituminous coal industry of the United States endeavors to deliver itself from its present bureaucratic stranglehold.

The Guffey Coal Act expires next month, and before extending it the Congress is supposed to determine if it has been beneficial or otherwise.

Let the American people observe carefully how tenaciously the agencies of political bureaucracy will seek to retain their grip on this industry, and how zealously they seek to hold their great power.

Let the American people note how difficult it is to unseat bureaucracy in this instance, and restore the traditional American system of conducting the vital affairs of our national life.

Then let the American people ponder deeply upon the prospect of having other vital American industries and activities, and perhaps ultimately all of them, fall into the same plight.

Surely these observations and reflections will suggest to the American people, if they still care and have the will and courage to keep the historic American system of free enterprise and democratic government, that the means and methods of halting socialism must be included in our provisions for national defense.

Middle Westerners Are Americans, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE OMAHA WORLD-HERALD

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, there is an increasing and an unjustified tendency on the part of some eastern editors, columnists, and radio commentators to take unto themselves the authority to speak for all America. This type of professional provincialism indicates a genuine lack of perspective on the part of these writers and speakers, and ignores the significant fact that the center of population of this Republic is today located some place in Indiana and that many, many more people like west of the Allegheny Mountains than live on the eastern seaboard. An old-fashioned lesson in geography might have a salutary effect upon some of the public commentators of the times.

The attached editorial from the Omaha World-Herald was recently reprinted in the Sioux Falls Daily Argus Leader. Thus, since it is authored by the editor of one of the great newspapers of the Middle West and approved by another outstanding newspaper in the heart of America, it merits thoughtful reading by Members of Congress and by writers and speakers who have not recently visited the agricultural sections of the United States and whose comments therefore reflect far too narrow a cross section of American public opinion.

[From the Omaha World-Herald]

MUST WE RULE BY FORCE?

"The isolationist belt" is dealt with unsparingly, even savagely, by Raymond Clapper in his today's article.

Like a good many others, this able correspondent has become frankly warlike.

He sees a great white light and reads the writing on the wall. It tells him that "force and the threat of force will rule the world for some time to come." And he has decided that it is the force of the United States of America that must do the ruling.

Therefore we must get in there—into Europe, into Asia, into Africa—and join in the fighting.

Bluntly he charges that "the isolationist belt"—our own Midwest—has been "frightened into self-defeating paralysis by appeals to fear hysteria."

Among its unworthy fears he lists fear of war, fear of offending Hitler, fear that England will out-trade us, fear of losing our democracy, fear that our Budget can't be balanced.

And so—shame on us!

Clapper's attack is significant not in itself but because it voices the anger of the war-minded in and out of the administration. The people of the great interior States are finding themselves held up to scorn as cowardly, without vision or intelligence, their patriotic spirit subnormal.

It is not strange if midwesterners are perplexed. For their attitude now is the same as it was only 3 months ago.

It was then the attitude not alone of Raymond Clapper but of President Roosevelt as a third-term aspirant, and of Wendell Willkie, his opponent.

Both candidates promised solemnly and publicly not to lead this country into war. They promised not to send our armed forces to fight in Europe or Asia. They promised to make our America strong in self-defense. Mr. Willkie, for one, warned repeatedly of the danger of losing our democracy. Mr. Roosevelt promised as repeatedly to preserve it. Mr. Willkie warned repeatedly of the deadly menace of an unbalanced Budget. Mr. Roosevelt had recognized the danger and had promised repeatedly to avert it. As for "offending Hitler," neither candidate had hesitated to do that publicly, and the Midwest had joined heartily in the chorus. And as for England outtrading us, we doubt if then or now it has affected the Midwest consciousness. That, if it influences the present frame of mind, is a seaboard fear.

Why is it shameful for the Midwest to have held firm to its convictions for as long as 3 months?

Why is it gloriously brave and patriotic for candidates and their spokesmen to have changed—once election day was past?

The Midwest is unable to understand. Is that because its intelligence is of a low order?

But the Midwest does understand, as it did 3 months ago, why it is averse to war, why it cherishes democratic liberties, why it dreads crushing debts threatening catastrophe, why it values a free economy, and why it hates Hitler, who stands against everything the Midwest holds dear.

The Midwest does not believe that now, or ever, will it be necessary or wise for our own country to set out to "rule the world by force and the threat of force."

No one so much as suggested that astounding policy in the late campaign. No candidate would have dared.

The Midwest believes we have enought to do to rule ourselves as a free people; to preserve our own rights and liberties here at home; to banish the "fear of fear and the fear of want" from our own confines before setting out, crussding with armies and navies to establish freedom and security for "all peoples, everywhere." We think this latter an order impossible of fulfillment.

If adherence to these beliefs and convictions are hysterical then the Midwest is subject to that charge. But the truth is, there is no hysteria—not here in the cornlands and wheatfields. Our people are soberminded and thoughtful. The hysterical screams Mr. Clapper hears come from beneath his open window.

Rubber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SAN JOSE MERCURY-HERALD

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in these days of feverish haste on national-defense projects it appears to me that Congress can well afford to give some careful consideration to those strategic materials in which the United States is deficient. Particularly at this time do we need an ample supply of rubber and yet we continue to overlook the fact that this product can be grown successfully in our own country. The Congress is subsidizing many important activities including agriculture, shipping, defense industries, and others. Funds are being expended in attempting to develop a supply of rubber in Central and South America with no regard to further developing a domestic industry that has tremendous potential possibilities. When are we going to wake up?

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following timely editorial from the San Jose Mercury-Herald:

THE RUB IN RUBBER

More power to the Salinas Chamber of Commerce in its effort to rouse a little Federal interest in the guayule rubber enterprise in our neighbor valley.

World's largest rubber users, we have suddenly discovered that in days we were preoccupied developing our own country we let Brazil lose its rubber business to East Indian possessions of England and Holland. Now the Federal Government is subsidizing its return to Brazil for self-protection and as a "good neighbor" gesture. It is also spending $100,000,000 to encourage American synthetic rubber production.

Meanwhile the Federal Government refuses to send a representative to investigate natural rubber potentialities at Salinas, even though the chamber of commerce has offered to stand all expenses, and even though Salinas guayule growers and refiners have pioneered this enterprise since 1912, bucking foreign monopoly and economics to develop a new American industry unaided.

Salinas guayule men, in the best spirit of American enterprise, have cross-bred the primitive Mexican desert shrub until it produces more rubber, have invented better production methods until guayule rubber can be made for 20 cents a pound. That's a fourth the cost of synthetic rubber and only a half-cent above the foreign monopoly price, but the guayule rubber is of such superior quality that the Salinas plant's limited output to date is all taken by a national tire firm.

Perhaps Uncle Sam would bother more about the Salinas guayule men if they had located in South America and flirted loudly with Hitler—for an American loan. Perhaps we must continue to pour our good-neighbor grease on hemispherical wheels, squeaking ever louder. But why in the name of rubber self-sufficiency must we do it by frowning on the one domestic-rubber enterprise that has proven practical—and one that offers breathtaking agricultural and industrial potentialities for this region.

Conservation and Utilization of Oil and Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1941

ADDRESS BY J. HENDRIX ALPHIN

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of J. Hendrix Alphin before a State-wide oil and gas proration hearing at Magnolia, Ark., March 21, 1941:

It is my pleasure to appear before you gentlemen that are charged with the duty of protecting, conserving, and seeing to the proper utilization of our State's most valuable resource—oil and gas.

It is also my honor to be appointed by our Governor, the Honorable Homer M. Adkins, as Arkansas' representative on the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, which our State has been empowered to join through action of our recent legislature and the efforts of our Governor.

Knowing that your docket is filled and there are many important matters you must hear and pass judgment upon this afternoon, my remarks will be very brief, but I will attempt to make them pointed.

First, a word about the compact. The Oil Compact Commission is composed of representatives from the States of Arkansas, California, Colorado, Illinois, Louisiana, Michigan, Nebraska, New Mexico, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming. These States contain over 97 percent of the known oil reserves of the Nation and are now producing over 95 percent of the Nation's daily supply of oil. For your information, I will hand you a tabulation showing the position of each of these States in the oil industry at the conclusion of my remarks.

The compact has been authorized by the National Congress for the express purpose of allowing the compacting States to meet together periodically and discuss informally their experiences in the prevention of waste of oil and gas in their respective States. Progress has been made as a result of these meetings, voluntary progress, for there is no compulsion in the compact. There is no need for compulsion since the strength of the compact is contained in the force of enlightened public opinion.

The compact has nothing to do with the fixing of allowables—a question I have been asked several times. The member States believe that each of them is capable of knowing the proper production quota for his respective State. They believe they can decide these, and other waste-prevention measures, at home and without Federal intervention. They oppose Federal control of our oil resources.

I believe in the compact, having attended their meetings in an unofficial capacity since it was formed in February of 1935. They are getting the job done, and we of Arkansas will do our part toward assisting our sister States prevent waste of oil and gas.

Now, that brings me to my second thought, and that concerns our immediate affairs here at home.

Our oil and gas commission, you gentlemen, enjoy an enviable reputation for honesty and plain dealing. Everywhere I go there is praise for the conservation progress of our State. That is splendid, and I am sure that all present here today join with me in complimenting you. The engineers tell me that our oil pools are in fine physical condition, and I am glad to know that.

However, gentlemen, another problem has arisen, as you know, and the way you meet and solve this problem will decide the judgment the people of our State pass upon you and upon the oil and gas companies exploiting our resource. We will help you, all of us, but I caution you, respect our trust.

I have attended your hearings without exception; I attended your informal conference this morning; I attended the O. V. A. hearing in Little Rock early this month; I have read accounts of the meeting of the southern Governors in New Orleans; and, gentlemen, I realize you have a problem in our newly discovered gas fields, but I also realize in your hands rests an opportunity, a sorely needed opportunity, for all of us here in Arkansas.

Be not unmindful of the things that have happened in other gas areas of the Southwest. The Panhandle Field of Texas, the world's largest, that contains not a single major industry in its vicinity, but finds itself in the deplorable condition of having its production piped to the industrial East. Then there is the Monroe field of Louisiana, only a short distance away, that has had its very heart sucked out to satisfy the industrial East, with only minor benefit to the good people of that State.

The gas from the Monroe Field, a part of it, is piped to St. Louis, where it is used to calcine our bauxite. The Monroe Field is being depleted and I have been informed that the gas from Lafayette County's giant pool, McKamie, may replace it. I say, gentlemen, if our gas and our bauxite are both hauled out of the State for processing, then that is what I call rubbing your nose in it.

Be not unmindful, gentlemen, and you operators here, that over 90 percent of the gas used in our kitchen stoves and to turn the wheels of our industries is imported into the State. I say that before we accept 3 cents a thousand cubic feet for our gas to be exported into some other State, let's see if we cannot replace a little of the expensive gas here for the home folks. You gentlemen of the department of public utilities think that over.

I have taken up more of your time than I intended, but let me leave this parting thought.

See that our gas is produced properly so we can recover all of it from the earth, see that these companies do not waste it, help us use as much of it here at home as is economical.

We are willing to space our wells along the best pattern, we are willing to abide by

efficient production practice, we are willing and anxious to see these companies save and make money in Arkansas.

But, gentlemen, we expect to be given a fair shake in this game. Some of the money the companies save we want spent here in Arkansas for the good of our people—and if this does not come about, I promise you, someone is going to find himself between the hammer and the anvil.

United States reserves and production

Reserves, Jan. 1, 1941, 18,745,250,000.

Production, daily: Current, 3,615,000 barrels.

OIL COMPACTING STATES

State	Reserves, thousands of barrels		Daily production, barrels	
	Jan. 1, 1941	Percent, total	Current	Percent, total
California	3,375,000	18.2	617,250	17.1
Wyoming	310,000	1.6	74,500	2.1
Colorado	24,000	.1	3,600	.1
Kansas	760,000	4.1	177,500	4.9
Nebraska	4,000	.0	2,790	.1
Oklahoma	1,040,000	5.5	418,600	11.6
Arkansas	310,000	1.6	71,000	2.0
Louisiana	1,225,000	6.5	294,190	8.1
Texas	9,950,000	53.1	1,341,900	37.1
New Mexico	680,000	3.6	102,650	2.8
Illinois	575,000	3.1	322,750	8.9
Michigan	48,750	.3	39,510	1.1
Total	18,301,750	97.7	3,466,240	95.9

NONCOMPACTING STATES

Montana	93,000	0.5	18,900	0.5
Mississippi	7,500	.0	19,970	.6
Indiana	16,000	.1	19,800	.5
Kentucky	42,500	.2	13,000	.4
Ohio	30,500	.1	8,000	.2
New York	32,000	.2	13,000	.4
Pennsylvania	175,000	1.0	40,000	1.1
West Virginia	45,000	.1	9,000	.2
Miscellaneous	2,000	.1	7,090	.2
Total	443,500	2.3	148,760	4.1

A Voluntary Defense Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JARED Y. SANDERS, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1941

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, within the last few days, this House has passed a bill appropriating $7,000,000,000 to implement the lend-lease bill (H. R. 1776), and a bit later the House also passed H. R. 4124 containing an appropriation of $4,000,000,000 for national defense. Thus, in just 1 week, something like $11,000,000,000 have been appropriated. Other appropriations have been made for the same purpose.

These measures were required by the emergency that confronts us and have been passed in accordance with the wishes of an overwhelming majority of the people of this country.

The only way to finance aid to Britain and the national-defense program is by taxation. The Ways and Means Committee of the House is now studying our tax problem and can be expected to report a revenue-raising bill before long. Such a bill will not read pleasantly for anyone. Anyone who tries to tell you that we can get by without all of us footing tLe bill is simply misleading the people.

However, I believe that our people for the most part feel like Mr. John Dakmak, who is a citizen of my home city of Baton Rouge, La., and who, according to the public press, recently contributed a thousand dollars to the United States Government in the form of a voluntary defense tax. Many people in Louisiana are stated to have made voluntary defense-tax contributions, ranging from $1.50 to $1,000. Of course, not many of us are in the position to give $1,000, but I feel that most of our people are willing to meet whatever contribution is called for by the Government.

I desire to include in my remarks a news report from the Baton Rouge (La.) State-Times of March 19, 1941, which reads as follows:

GIVES $1,000 FOR DEFENSE

A $1,000 contribution in the form of a voluntary defense tax was paid by John Dakmak, proprietor of the Paramount billiard hall on Third Street, when he filed his income tax here last week.

Explaining that he did not want any publicity about the contribution, he said he was glad he was "able to give the money to the fund."

"In times like these," he said, "all should do anything which we are able to do for the protection of our country."

Mr. Dakmak was born here. He is unmarried.

Reports from New Orleans stated that about 200 persons in this State had made voluntary defense-tax contributions ranging from $1.50 to $1,000. All returns have not been checked yet.

A Song of Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1941

POEM BY MRS. J. W. CURTIS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit for insertion a poem written by Mrs. J. W. Curtis, of Lewiston, Idaho. This poem has received wide publication in the West and is to be included in an anthology of American verse being prepared in New York. The poem follows:

A SONG OF IDAHO

I sing a song of this great State,
The greatest one of forty-eight,
  Oh, Idaho, my Idaho;
O'er hill and dale the gentle breeze
That whispers through the lofty trees,
Joins in my simple melodies
  For Idaho, my Idaho.

We see the wondrous timbered hills,
Mighty rivers and rushing rills
  In Idaho, my Idaho;
The silent mountains grandeur lend,
As toward the sky their peaks ascend,
And beauty's in each river's bend
  In Idaho, my Idaho.

Oh this great climate gives us health,
Valley and mountain give us wealth
  In Idaho, my Idaho;
Just see the fields of golden grain
And luscious fruits of vale and plain,
Then join with me in this refrain,
  Oh, Idaho, my Idaho.

Years ago the brave pioneer,
Lured by thy greatness, settled here
  In Idaho, my Idaho;
And peopled valley, hill, and plain
With a valiant, progressive strain
Who gladly join in this refrain,
  Oh, Idaho, my Idaho.

—*Mrs. J. W. Curtis, Lewiston, Idaho.*

Only the Pure May Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BINGHAMTON (N. Y.) SUN

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Binghamton (N. Y.) Sun:

[From the Binghamton (N. Y.) Sun of March 14, 1941]

ONLY THE PURE MAY DIE

The Army's draft ban on former convicts is stirring a storm of protest throughout the country. The Army's contention is that it wants only men with clean records and society wants to know whether the Army is too good for men who, having paid their debt to society, must make a place for themselves in life, or whether they are too bad for the Army.

Armies are formed for the purpose of subduing a common or particular enemy. War legalizes maiming and killing. Whether defensively or offensively, combatants must be wounded or must die. Those who kill and survive, return as conquering heroes, soon to be forgotten.

Criminals come from the "big houses" where men die, whether by the noose, electric chair or gas, because they, without benefit of government, took matters in their own hands and killed.

Young men are being torn from their schools, jobs, and homes these days to enter the service and have nothing to say about it. Selective service was supposed to be a big gamble in which no favoritism was to be shown and the millionaire's scion was to be on a level with the janitor's son. There was not to be any immunity in cases where young, able-bodied men had no dependents.

As it turns out, for every former convict turned down, a clean young man must substitute for him, or it amounts to as much in any case. Why should they be penalized? It would seem that these former convicts, under the rigid discipline of Army life, would

be in better position to make the most of the opportunity to rehabilitate themselves. They have known discipline and the penalty for violating it. Would they be better off, left to drift back to the old ways of life?

A comparatively small percentage of felons is vicious, incorrigible. Case-hardened criminals have made admirable soldiers in other armies. But how about the fellows whose feet slipped just enough to merit indictment and conviction; those who forged a small check, hit and ran, stole a car or happened to be short in accounts? The uniform might easily help them bury the past and point a smoother path to the future.

Under the present set-up only the good are fit to fight and die. Hitler's hoodlums make pretty fair fighters. Anyway, what are we training the boys for, battle or a cotillion?

Conservation and Utilization of Oil and Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. HOMER M. ADKINS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following address by Hon. Homer M. Adkins, Governor of Arkansas, before a State-wide oil and gas proration hearing at Magnolia, Ark., March 21, 1941:

It affords me much pleasure to be here today and observe the proceedings of the Commission, talk with producers and royalty owners, obtain the views of the outstanding men of science, and the great leaders of the industry, who have come here today to lend us assistance in the search for the solution of the problems with which we are confronted.

On behalf of the State of Arkansas and its people, let me extend a hearty welcome to those citizens of our sister States who are our guests today. We thank you for your presence here, for your kindly interest, and for your valuable assistance.

For more than 20 years Arkansas has been well known as an oil-producing State—Smackover will always be a significant name in the early history of oil in the Southwest.

But we do not need to live in the past. Within the past year 5, and within the past 4 years 13, new pools have been discovered in Arkansas. There are in Arkansas at present 31 untested known structures, covering an aggregate area of more than 100,000 acres, believed likely to produce oil and gas.

From 1919 to the present there have been drilled 9,753 wells in search of oil and gas, resulting in 6,780 oil wells, 706 gas wells, and 2,267 dry holes.

Arkansas has produced a total of more than 525,000,000 barrels of oil and the estimated reserve in her present producing fields exceed 300,000,000 barrels.

In 1940 we produced 25,000,000 barrels of crude oil and 22,000,000 gallons of natural gasoline. Approximately one-half of our crude oil production is being processed through the six refineries located in Arkansas.

It is apparent, therefore, that the oil business is a major factor in the economic life of this State. Petroleum is now third in value on the list of commodities annually produced in Arkansas, and may soon be first.

Two years ago a statute providing for controlled production was adopted. During the consideration of that measure, a suggestion that national market demand should be considered as a factor in fixing allowables was definitely rejected. Thus in the very outset Arkansas served notice that production control was to be administered solely to prevent physical waste, and from the standpoint of what was to the best interest of Arkansas producers, Arkansas royalty owners, and Arkansas citizens generally, and that her right to seek the most favorable position possible in the national and world markets was to be in no way abridged. This policy has been and will continue to be uppermost in the minds of the members of the Commission in fixing allowables.

The known gas reserves of Arkansas hold even greater promise.

During 1939 the total consumption of electrical power in Arkansas was slightly more than 567,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

Based upon estimates that 15 cubic feet of gas represent 1 kilowatt-hour of power, the State's known present gas reserves of 763,000,000,000 cubic feet would each year for a period of 90 years supply the fuel to produce an amount of power equal to the total consumed in the entire State during 1939.

The State is rich in raw materials that lend themselves to profitable processing through the use of natural gas as the agent. Among these raw materials available is bauxite, over 3,000,000 long tons of metal ore; timber, over a million acres of productive forest within easy hauling distance of where I stand; and limestone in practically unlimited quantities. These are only a few of the many.

Scientific processes now convert raw material into a multitude of uses. Natural gas into synthetic rubber, alcohol, dry ice, and toluol—the basis of TNT. Early this month one of the leading technologists of the Southwest told me that our timber could be converted into smokeless powder.

Our wood, we know, can be processed into cellulose—the foundation of plastics, one of the country's fastest growing industries. It seems further that this cellulose can be nitrated to nitrocellulose and then granulated into smokeless powder.

Thus there appears upon the horizon the picture of a great industrial empire rising here in Arkansas as a direct result of discoveries of these great gas reservoirs. But a cloud partially obscures the picture. Some contend that on account of its large sulphur content this gas cannot be made commercial. Others, apparently equally well informed, contend that the extraction of this sulphur presents no serious engineering or financial problem. Most of these gas reserves produce distillate, which can be produced only in conjunction with large quantities of gas. The people of this State will not long endure a wasteful method of production, which saves only the distillate and utterly wastes the greater product, the gas. Nor will they be content to see this gas consumed in wasteful enterprises, or the greater part thereof piped away to feed industrial furnaces in other States. A proper use for this gas must be quickly found, or arrangements must be made to return it to the reservoir for the benefit of those who come after us and who doubtless will have the wisdom to apply it to its proper use.

The primary responsibility of finding a present suitable use for this gas must of necessity rest upon those who own the oil and gas leases covering these structures. A few weeks ago the oil and gas commission, at the urgent request of the lease owners interested, and after a full hearing, declared one of these fields, McKamie, to be a gas field. It is unnecessary for me to remind the lease owners that paragraph 11, subsection I of section 9 of act 105, defines as waste which is prohibited by the act "permitting gas produced from a gas well to escape in the air." It is clear, therefore, that a use for this gas must be found or it must be returned to the reservoir.

The State of Arkansas and its representatives stand ready to cooperate fully with those operators who in good faith are now seeking, or will seek, methods of making this gas available for the industrial expansion of Arkansas.

On the other hand, the despoilers (and as yet I have no reason to believe there are any) who should seek to waste these reserves without consideration for the interest of Arkansas and her people will find all of the power of a sovereign State and the hands of her citizens turned against them.

St. Lawrence-Great Lakes Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. A. A. BERLE, JR.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. A. A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, over station WMAL, National Broadcasting Co., March 22, 1941:

Last Wednesday, in Ottawa, the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada signed a pact which is known as the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence agreement.

Now, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence development is the last great development possible in North America which could compare in importance with, let us say, the Panama Canal.

The St. Lawrence agreement contemplates two huge undertakings.

The first is the building of a dam across the St. Lawrence River near Massena, N. Y., capable of developing 2,200,000 horsepower of electricity. There are also provided additional works at Niagara Falls which will preserve the beauty of the falls—and incidentally develop a large amount of additional power there. The United States will spend about $110,000,000 for its share. It is planned to go ahead and develop this electric power immediately.

The second big job is the authorization of a deep-water canal around and locks to bypass the dam. This will make it possible for an oceangoing ship to come from anywhere in the seven seas and dock at Buffalo, N. Y., or Cleveland, Ohio, or Detroit, Mich., or Chicago, Ill., or Duluth, Minn., or any other Great Lakes port. It will connect the whole of the Middle West with the whole of the open sea.

The engineers tell us that under normal conditions it will take about 3½ years to build the dam and about 4 years to build the canal. This can be speeded up somewhat if we put the job on an emergency basis.

We want to start work on the dam as soon as the Congress approves the agreement and passes the necessary legislation. The sooner the better. We have to move fast on this phase of it. We need the electricity, and we need it now.

The seaway is arranged a little differently. The agreement calls for its completion in 1948. But Canada and the United States have agreed to watch the situation, so that they can push the seaway at once if circumstances require it for the national defense. Or they can postpone it if in the opinion of experts war efforts call for handling it differently.

There is a story behind both of these projects.

The chapter about the dam and the need of electric power is the most interesting, because it is the most urgent. It is this:

The Lord Almighty so built the Continent of North America that most of the water in the northeast quarter of the Continent forms streams and rivers which flow into that huge collection of reservoirs we call the Great Lakes. This is an enormous amount of water. All of it funnels out to the sea through a single great millrace, which is the St. Lawrence River. If that water is ever harnessed, it will make the largest and cheapest supply of electricity available anywhere in the wide world.

HOOVER FOR SEAWAY

Seven years ago President Roosevelt foresaw the need of using this power, and urged that a treaty with Canada be ratified so that the two countries could harness and use it. This was not a partisan matter; the treaty had actually been negotiated when Herbert Hoover was President. That treaty was not ratified, principally owing to the activities of the railroad and utility lobby in Washington—a lobby which, incidentally, is still on the job. Opponents of the project said—and many people were simple enough to believe them—that nobody would ever need that much power. The real point, of course, was that they did not want anyone to interrupt a power monopoly which then had things pretty much its own way.

Well, it is now 1941, and here is the situation. We are using all the electric power we can buy, or scrape, or beg, in the St. Lawrence Valley, and in the Niagara Valley, above it. We are borrowing on temporary agreement, all the electricity that Canada can spare for us. We are building our industries on the chance that Canada will graciously go on giving us the power that we need. But we know that Canada bitterly needs that power today for her own national defense.

POWER BADLY NEEDED

Still worse, we have American companies begging us to get vast additional quantities of electricity—to borrow it, or buy it, or take it from Canada—although Canada has none to give. I have on my desk now letters from the O. P. M. asking me to get them more power at Niagara; and requests from the Federal Power Commission asking whether we cannot get even more power from Canada for the St. Lawrence Valley. When I asked why they wanted this, I was told that the United States needs aluminum for airplanes, and chemicals for explosives, and electric furnaces for the new metals we put into planes and tanks and shells and rifles. I was told that we could not keep up the schedule in our rearmament unless electric power could be found to make the aluminum, to run the plants, to weld the steel, to keep the assembly lines moving.

Even if there had been no European war, and if we had not had to rearm, our figures show that we should have needed all the St. Lawrence power by the year 1948. So we have to start the job in the next 2 or 3 years anyhow. Because we have to rearm, and because Canada is fighting, we need the power as rapidly as we can get it—we ought, in fact, to have got started long ago.

So we do not have any time to lose. We must get the power and get started right away, and push it through as fast as we can. Meantime, we must use every temporary makeshift we can work out. We will use steam when we can—but you cannot get steam generators in quick time. It would take longer to get steam generators for 2,200,000 horsepower than to build the dam. But we only dare to use makeshifts if we know that at the end of 3 years or sooner if possible we shall have new supplies of electricity coming along to keep the mills going.

You ought to know this story for a very simple reason. You are going to hear it said that there is no sense in building the St. Lawrence Dam: It will not be done "in time" to be of use in our national defense. The people who tell you that are the same people who thought in 1934 that you never would need all this power. Today they all agree that it was a mistake not to build the St. Lawrence Dam 7 years ago—and jump to the strange conclusion that we ought not to do it at all. These people are like the man with the leaky roof. When the weather was fair the leak didn't need to be mended. When rainy weather came, he said it couldn't be mended. Finally, the roof fell to pieces.

This time we must not make the mistake that was made 7 years ago. Everybody hopes that the war may be over before 3 years have passed. But since nobody can guarantee that, we must not take any chances. We thoroughly believe that Great Britain will win this war, but we propose to be fully prepared for defense, no matter what happens. We think that there will be total victory for peace-loving nations in Europe. But if there is not, we are going to be set for the total defense of our own country and our own hemisphere. That means having electricity and plants and planes and ships and guns enough to do the job. I do not think we can afford to be stopped in our preparedness by any group of interests whose desire is to keep electricity scarce and prices high.

SEAWAY DEFENSE FACTOR

The other end of the story has to do with the seaway. We may well be in a position in which we will need that seaway as much, if not more, than we need the St. Lawrence Dam and its electric power.

The world needs ships, millions and millions of tons of them in ordinary peacetimes. In time of war she needs even more. Now, this war is less than a year and a half old. Five million tons of shipping have already been sunk. The German Government tells us that the war on shipping has only barely begun; they are going to uncork their really heavy drive to sink ships this spring. If they make this threat good, the ships which are the life line of our commerce, and the bridge for the defense of Britain, and which make the life of half the world possible, will be at the bottom of the Atlantic Ocean. We are the only Nation in the world which can build ships in large quantity today. We are doing so now. Every shipyard on the Atlantic and on the Pacific coasts is already working to capacity. They are building the merchant ships as fast as they can; but they are also building the two-ocean navy which we know now is needed for our national safety. All these shipyards, taken together, are nowhere near enough to do the job that has to be done.

The logical place to do a great part of that job is of course in the Great Lakes region. It is far inland and cannot be attacked. It is near the great steel plants which make the girders and hulls from which the ships are built. It is in the area where the engines which drive the ships are manufactured, and where the skilled labor is available.

It will surprise many of you to know that during the World War—the first World War, in 1917—we built ships in the Great Lakes. And, God forgive us, because we had never had the brains to dig the St. Lawrence Canal, we cut these ships in two and floated them in parts down to Montreal and then put them together again.

We could lay down a heavy cruiser at Chicago today and have the seaway open before she could be put into commission and sent out to sea. The moment work begins on the seaway, I expect you will find naval construction beginning in the Lakes—clearing the seacoast yards for more immediate needs.

UNLOCKS GREAT LAKES AREA

That is why the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence agreement authorizes the building of this seaway so that we can unlock the huge resources of the Great Lakes with its ore and its industry. They are unlocked, for use in peace, if peace shall come; they are unlocked for national defense if things go badly overseas. You will see why we have to think of this when you remember that the entire American merchant fleet is only 7,000,000 tons, and that our shipyards can only build a million tons a year—at a time when the Germans have been able to sink half a million tons a month.

Again you will hear people say about the seaway: "Why do it now? It won't be ready in time." But I should like to ask: Well, suppose we don't do it now, and suppose the time comes when we need it and are not ready? If we fail to fill our industrial lamp now that we can, when we need it most, the light will go out. Statesmanship has to be built on better sense than that.

REAL ANSWER TO DICTATORS

We have had the most careful and elaborate studies of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence project. They show pretty conclusively, that the completion of the seaway, like the completion of the St. Lawrence power, will be excellent business for everybody, all around. If you are interested, you can get those St. Lawrence survey reports from the Government Printing Office.

I believe that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence project is the best answer to dictators, who say that democracy cannot act. It is a magnificent undertaking in a great time. Two free nations, Canada and ourselves here pool their resources in friendship, for their common welfare and their common defense. I hope you will support the approval of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence project as a measure for protection in need, and for production and prosperity when God grants us peace again.

Fort Peck, Mont.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1941

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

FORT PECK, MONT.

1. Has accommodations right now for from 5,000 to 10,000 men in training.

2. Can be expanded in short time and at minimum expense to accommodate from 20,000 to 30,000.

3. Is ideally situated for training men for service in northern climates.

4. Has ample and excellent housing facilities for commissioned and noncommissioned officers and families.

5. Has thousands of acres of varied terrain, Government owned, ideally adapted for tank

maneuvers, rifle, artillery, and bombing ranges.

6. Has large laundry, cold storage, and warehouse installations for 5,000 to 10,000 men.

7. Has hospital schools, stores, restaurants, laboratory, administration, and other buildings.

8. Has water supply and sewage system ample for a camp of 15,000 men, and which can be easily and speedily increased.

9. Has large recreation hall, largest theater in the Northwest, and athletic fields.

10. Has unlimited supply of natural gas, with elaborate distribution system for heating, cooking, baking, shop, and industrial uses.

11. Town of Fort Peck and adjacent territory are already under Army control and supervision.

12. Has extensive railroad yards, and Government-owned short-line rail connection with transcontinental Great Northern Railway.

13. Has large, well-equipped machine shops, garages, and material-storage yards.

14. Site is contiguous to Fort Peck Lake, largest body of water in Northwest, suggested by military experts as ideally adapted for seaplane base.

Wheat Grades Should Be Based on Milling Value

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1941

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 12 OF KANSAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am submitting a copy of House Concurrent Resolution No. 12 recently adopted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas.

I believe that the suggestions contained in this concurrent resolution should receive the careful consideration of the Department of Agriculture and that the study requested should be made. In view of the fact that new types and varieties of wheat are constantly being developed, it is important that research and study be continuously conducted by the Department of Agriculture in order that grades and standards reflect the real value of wheat for milling and industrial purposes.

The resolution is as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution No. 12

Concurrent resolution urging the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States to make an immediate study and revision of Federal standards for wheat to the end that farmers will be paid for their wheat more nearly on a basis of true value and quality

Whereas the Federal grain standards put undue stress on test weight of wheat as a grading factor, thus penalizing types having light test weight, but excellent baking quality, and putting a premium on types which have heavy test weight, but inferior baking strength; and

Whereas the Federal standards require hard red winter wheat to have test weight of 60 pounds per bushel to grade No. 1, while the standards for hard spring wheat require test weight of only 58 pounds per bushel for No. 1 grade, thus penalizing our Kansas turkey types: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the Senate concurring therein), That the Kansas Legislature urge the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States to make a thorough and immediate study of the wheat grades, making such revisions as are needed, to (1) remove the present disparity in test weight requirements between No. 1 and the lower grades in hard red winter wheat versuse hard red srping wheat, and (2) to more definitely describe the milling and baking qualities of hard red winter wheats of Kansas, to the end that farmers will be paid for their wheat more nearly on the basis of its true industrial value than is practical under the present Federal grain standards; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and to each member of the Kansas congressional delegation and to each of the United States Senators from Kansas.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT G. RUTHERFORD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SUSQUEHANNA (PA.) TRANSCRIPT

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, the St. Lawrence seaway proposition is attracting much attention throughout the East. The people most affected by this scheme are against it. Why the President is so set upon putting this measure through is beyond their comprehension. The following editorial from the Susquehanna Transcript, Susquehanna, Pa., shows that the editors of our small dailies are not being hoodwinked and understand the folly of the whole proposition:

[From the Susquehanna (Pa.) Transcript]

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY FOLLY

The Congress now has the say as to whether or not a tremendous sum of money needed for other purposes shall be wasted in deepening the St. Lawrence River, making it into a commercial stream. How silly it is to contemplate such foolishness.

The St. Lawrence River is 1,900 miles long, more than twice as long as the Susquehanna River from Otsego Lake, at Cooperstown, to the mouth in Chesapeake Bay. The St. Lawrence is an important stream; always has been, and serves a fine purpose "as is."

To deepen and widen the stream, making a 24-foot channel for freight and passenger carriers, is about as necessary as deepening and widening the Susquehanna River from end to end—or in sections—for the same purpose.

Imagine even dredging the Susquehanna River from Susquehanna to Binghamton, and the installation of a lock or two, to carry freight and passengers with the Erie and Lackawanna railroads on either side. That, in brief, is the picture now complete concerning what it is planned to do with the St. Lawrence, except that the St. Lawrence project covers many more miles.

Railroads and bus lines now serve all the territory of the St. Lawrence on both sides of the border. Water power developments are not needed, as steam plants can be operated at less cost, the figures show.

As a defense measure, the St. Lawrence with a 24-foot stage of water will not admit any boats of size; and as far as creating ship-building yards on the interior to be reached by the widened and deepened river, that is uncalled for. Thousands of miles of the American seacoast, Atlantic and Pacific, are untouched and yet can be used at small cost compared to the St. Lawrence development.

The taxpayers' money to be dumped into the "deeper and wider" St. Lawrence River can be put to better use in defense work, all of which will become more apparent as the spring and summer come.

A Narrow Road—Let Us Try To Stay on It and Get Through

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1941

LETTER FROM HON. FRANCIS CASE, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I place in the RECORD the following letter which I have written to people in my district:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, March 24 1941.

To the people in the Second Congressional District:

As you know, since I have been in Washington I have believed that you were entitled to know what goes on here that directly concerns you. I think you are entitled to know that, despite all disclaimers you may hear, official Washington is in the war—with money, materials, guns, ships, planes, everything except men on the firing line.

Because it will affect you individually, I think you are entitled to know so that you can plan accordingly.

Please do not interpret this as a political statement. When the lease-lend bill was introduced I said that it was a bill to wage war with everything except men. I tried to make that clear by sending marked passages from the bill and letting you see what the bill itself said. A few, perhaps, thought I was trying to make a political statement. I was not. I was simply trying to say in plain language what the bill meant.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT

So now I think you should have a frank picture of the situation because it concerns you. Up to 2 weeks ago, most statements by responsible leaders in the administration to the effect that we were in the war, were behind closed doors. In his speech to the

White House correspondents, however, the President publicly promised:

"Unqualified, immediate all-out aid for Britain, Greece, China, and for all governments in exile. * * * From now on," he said, "that aid will be increased, and yet again increased until total victory has been won."

The President further said that 5 minutes after he signed the lease-lend bill he started shipments on the $1,300,000,000 authorized from materials on hand. From the viewpoint of those who believe the United States should "guarantee the four freedoms" to all the world, the President made a magnificent speech, without question one of the greatest of his career. But it means war—if present efforts fail.

Now this will change what you and I otherwise would or could do. On this basis the Government officially supplying one belligerent with aid to insure "total victory" we can no longer claim or hope for the privileges of a neutral while performing the functions of a belligerent. Neither as a Nation nor as loyal citizens of that Nation.

We have been told all along that the lease-lend bill was a peace bill. I believed and said that I believed it was a war bill. I fought it. I voted against it. I voted for every amendment which, in my judgment, would make it less of a dictator-war bill, including the 12 weak but restraining amendments added by the Senate. But it is now the law and the President, as director of the Nation's foreign policy, and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, has begun operations under its terms.

YES, BUT HERE WE ARE

I feel with many of you that it was not necessary for us or for other nations to be in the present situation. But here we are—involved in the war, committed to "total victory." It may still be possible to get along without sending our men into the fighting. I shall oppose that to the bitter end.

Our only chance to do that, however, rests upon two things:

1. Making ourselves "too strong for any other nation to attack" (as many of you heard me say last fall).

2. Avoiding those "incidents" which start shooting.

In taking his oath of office a Member of Congress swears to protect his country against all enemies, foreign and domestic. We are now taking sides in the war—officially. As a nation we are providing guns for one side in the fight—not merely permitting private firms to sell them. To take sides and not to look to our own defenses would be suicide. That was what I did not like in those early inflammatory remarks of the President. You may remember that I recalled the words of another Roosevelt—T. R.—who said, "Speak softly and carry a big stick."

All of us are going to do some things we do not like. Last week I voted for a $7,000,000,000 bill, after trying in vain to get out of it the provision which I thought most dangerous—funds to repair foreign vessels in our harbors. But, during previous days I had heard testimony from General Marshall, Chief of Staff, General Brett, Chief of the Air Corps, and William Knudsen, director of the O. P. M., which made me think that after we had started actually to supply arms to a belligerent, we better buy protection where we could get it, at least until our big bombers get into production. The bill provides that the articles can be turned over to our own defense agencies if desired.

WE ARE IN THE CAR

My situation might be likened to that of a rider in a car. I may tell the driver, "Don't go down that road. Here is a stopping place. Here is a place we can turn off. Please don't go down that road. It is narrow. It is rough. It endangers every one of us."

But if he goes on, and I am riding in that car, and all the people I love and hold dear are riding in that car, do I tell him I will not help him buy enough gas to get across the canyons and the swamps and the mountains?

No, when he passes the fork of the roads, when the road is too narrow to turn around, when he has burned the bridges behind us, I do my best to help him keep on the narrow road, treacherous though it may be. I do my best to help him to get through.

I have no doubt of the loyalty and patriotism of the people of South Dakota. They sacrifice and they give and they pay. It is precisely because you do, that I have thought you were entitled to my frank and honest estimate of the present situation.

Loyally and sincerely yours,

FRANCIS CASE.

Sale of Alcoholic Liquors at Military Bases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1941

RESOLUTION BY MASS MEETING OF THE UNITED DRY FORCES

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of the United Dry Forces, held at the National City Christian Church, Sunday, March 23:

Whereas the greatest misfortune has come upon humanity in the history of the world, in what threatens to become a world-wide military conflagration that may end in the wreck of civilization, a conflict between two irreconcilable theories of government—democracy and dictatorship, Christianity and totalitarianism; and

Whereas our President has called this Nation into that conflict as the world's last hope, and mobilized its youth in the selective-service camps to prepare to meet this call all-out conflict which is to determine the fate of the world for generations to come, and that only men physically, mentally, and morally fit to lead, fly, and fight can endure the strain of modern mechanized methods of warfare; and

Whereas the collapse of the French Army and its defeat by the more abstemious Germans was declared by the French Government to have been due in the first instance to alcoholism among the soldiers and its concomitant social and sex evils; which is reminiscent of the statement of David Lloyd George in the House of Parliament, after witnessing the human wrecks from overindulgence in alcoholic liquors, returning from the front in the first World War: "We are fighting Germany, Austria, and drink, and the worst of these is drink"; and

Whereas Chief of Staff Gen. George C. Marshall has lately warned of immoral conditions existing within the areas outside the camps, and has called for their removal in protection of our soldier sons from the traffic in liquors and licentiousness when they are on leave from military duty: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we call upon our President to defend our defenders by immediately abolishing the sale and consumption of all alcoholic liquors in the forts, training camps, cantonments, flying fields, and all military bases on land and sea, wherever the American flag flies; and

Resolved, That we call upon Congress to enact immediately such legislation, with severe penalties for its violation, as will protect the youth of the Nation from this recognized "fifth column" in the Army and in all forts and camps, as an act of patriotic service in defense of the flag, and the protection of the Nation's youth from the formation of habits that will unfit them for their best service while in the Army and impair their physical health and moral character for their civic duties, should they survive the conflict: Be it further

Resolved, That we call for the immediate passage of bill S. 860, introduced by Senator SHEPPARD in the Senate, and Congressman HOUSTON in the House, and such other measures as will be found essential to carry out these recommendations in this all-out war against the enemies of democracy and the American way of life, to which our President has summoned the Nation.

The Late Harry B. Swan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following eulogy presented by the Lieutenant Governor of Iowa at the funeral of Harry B. Swan, of Atlantic, Iowa, State chairman of the Republican State committee, who was recently killed in an accident:

To stand today in the silence beside one with whom yesterday we walked; to show in hushed reverence the respect and love that yesterday's association brought; to gain comfort and courage from the memories that fill our hearts; to know deeply the sorrow of great loss; all are the sacred rights of humanity and brotherhood.

Today we come, all of us, and countless others who are with us in spirit, to claim those rights and in some small way pay tribute to our friend Harry Swan; and to bring such comfort to a devoted wife and loved ones as sympathy and sincerity may give. In so doing we may, in turn, soften our own sorrow with the memories of yesterday.

Man was not meant to stand alone; the upsurge of all humanity has been marked by the interdependence, in varying degrees, of each upon the other, and some are specially endowed with those qualities that attract and hold the confidence and loyalty of their fellow men. Harry Swan possessed those qualities in a high degree; he early assumed the moral responsibilities that so distinguished his later years and enabled him to discharge every trust with honor and ability. His early life in this community, where he was born, speaks eloquently of his basic character. He was schooled in industry and integrity and their tenets took deep root in his life. He chose the law for his vocation; those who knew him best know

that this choice was moved by his sense of justice and right and from a natural aptitude for fair and equitable adjustment of differences between his fellow men rather than from any mercenary urge. He was a leading figure in his college affairs, in spite of the fact that he worked to earn a substantial portion of the cost of his education, and his leadership, as always, inspired trust and confidence in his associates.

After his admission to the bar he came back to his home town to enter the practice of law, but very shortly the call of his country in war caused him to follow the path of duty and he entered the Army. Again his leadership brought him recognition and to the rank of first lieutenant; he was honorably discharged as such at the war's end. He returned to Atlantic and the practice of law and has lived here ever since.

The natural understanding that Harry had of his fellow men, his instant sympathy with those in distress, and the integrity of his private and public conduct soon established him as a leader among those who knew him and brought countless people to his door; his judgment was sound and the continued growth and extension of his clientele throughout western Iowa bespoke these qualities as well as the brilliance of his professional ability. No colleague ever had occasion to question his word; no client ever had cause to complain of any neglect of duty. He represented his obligations with the highest fidelity and he discharged his trusts with utmost honor. It was not in his nature to take mean advantage of an adversary nor to use his abilities to oppress or destroy; on the contrary, he guided his affairs by the rules of conscience and equity and he could stand before all mankind without fear.

Quite naturally, he became interested in politics; as a lawyer he knew that government and its forms can protect or destroy human rights and he gave of his time, energy, and ability to local affairs; the mark of his contribution has been stamped permanently in the structure of this community. More extensive political interest led him to the head of the county organization of his party and his local success made him the natural choice as chairman of the Seventh Congressional District and then to the post of chairman of the Republican State central committee. Here he had opportunity to bring to bear all of his tremendous ability and his success was outstanding. With quiet courage and sound judgment he brought together divergent opinions; he was never autocratic but was a leader, accepting and using the best and discarding and refusing to use anything petty or small. Every act and policy he tested by the rules of honesty and he inspired unbounded trust. He sincerely respected the rights of those opposed to his party and, in turn, few men could command such sincere respect as he from those same opponents. His leadership and success in Iowa made him a rising national figure; his counsel and advice on public questions were sought and many matters of national importance bear the mark of his stable judgment. His stewardship to the end was one of high intelligence, faith, and honor.

The tragedy of his passing appalls us; at once we form the question "Why?", but it is never asked for it is not ours to question; sufficient be it that we have been helped by knowing him; he will continue to sit in our councils and walk by our side; his physical absence will but add strength to memory, and we may say, with the poet—

"Well blest is he who has a dear one dead,
A friend he has whose face will never change—
A dear communion that will not grow strange
The anchor of a love is death."

The thread of life is slight indeed; its strength is governed by the mysteries yet unsolved; and the curtain that conceals the great unknown is often made of flimsy stuff. When sorrow darkens all our thoughts we sometimes feel that all is gone, yet one thing death can never conquer—one all-comforting possession that dispels the gloom—that is the light of memory. It transcends the tomb and illuminates the dark avenues of loneliness; it grows brighter with time and brings comfort to those who grieve; it is the one sure means of contact across the void.

This heritage of memory is man's great comfort; it recalls the path that others have traveled. In memory we learn the lessons of great accomplishments and are stimulated to go forward by their example. If we lean upon memory it will help avoid the pitfalls of the future, and it puts its sheltering arms about us in present sorrow. The physical existence is transitory and mortal; but when that existence ceases then recollection and memory bring immortality for our aid and comfort.

Harry Swan's work is not done; so long as we recall his complete devotion to his wife and home, his loyalty to his friends, the wisdom of his advice and the moral honesty of his mind and character, his influence will be felt and we are and will be better for the privilege of knowing him. Indeed, he has lifted the veil and is walking unafraid in the unknown; perhaps we wonder where that path may lead but faith can answer all our queries; it has not been given us to know; one has said,

"Strange, is it not? that of the myriads who
Before us passed the door of darkness through,
Not one returns to tell us of the road
Which, to discover, we must travel too."

But again I say that faith is comfort—and because the all-wise Voice has spoken we are content—the sorrow of the moment will be replaced by the comfort of memory.

Today, we bring assurance to wife and loved ones that we, too, knew and loved him; that we, too, are better because of our association.

Harry Swan was a man of courage—of loyalty—of honor. His intelligence and leadership were freely given; his influence has been felt by his fellow men in near and far places; all who knew him trusted him. What more can be said of any man?

The temptation may be great to dwell in the speculative realm of "what might have been", but that can bring regret alone. "What might have been" must always be submerged to the inevitable command of the divine judgment and we accept, as best, those things over which we have no control and sometimes little understanding, being thankful only for the good that we have been permitted to share.

And so we say farewell, but as the echo of that parting dies, we open wide our hearts in the glorious realm of memory.

The Easier Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1941

POEM BY EDGAR A. GUEST

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Edgar A. Guest, which has a special bearing on the problem of labor and the national defense. It was sent to me by a constituent, L. F. Alexander, of Fort Wayne, Ind., with the suggestion that it be prominently displayed in every defense plant in the country.

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of March 18, 1941]

THE EASIER WAY

(By Edgar A. Guest)

Before the time for blood and tears
Before the days of heavy hearts
Before the dark and dreadful years—
Let's win the war before it starts!

A little faster hand and wrench!
A little longer hand and drill!
'Tis happier service at the bench
Than being sent to die or kill.

From every cupola and dome
Now let the streams of metal run,
Let's win the war in peace at home!
Better the hammer than the gun!

Before the days of bomb and mine
Of sorrow, anguish, and regret,
Speed up! Speed up, production line.
Let's win the war with toil and sweat.

Distribution of Power at Canby, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. PIERCE
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1941

STATEMENT BY THE BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following release of the Bonneville power administration:

[Bonneville Power Administration Information Service]

The Canby, Oreg., city council advised the Bonneville Power Administration today that as a result of progressm made possible by the distribution of Columbia River power during the past 12 months retail power rates to Canby customers will be reduced by an average of 16 percent effective probably in April.

"The new rate reduction is the second to be announced by the city since its purchase of Columbia River power," Canby's Mayor J. R. Vinyard said. "The first was announced 1 year ago at the time the city executed its power contract with Bonneville. Naturally we are pleased with the showing we have been able to make and with the benefits and conveniences gained by Canby power users.

Combination of the two reductions represents an overall cut of 43 percent in domestic power rates and 50 percent for commercial customers.

"Canby rate cut brings its charges for power below the standard retail rates recommended by Bonneville as a suitable basis for the operations of most of its power distributors," Administrator Paul J. Raver commented. "I am gratified that the remarkable results of Columbia River power sales during the past year have enabled Canby to make such a drastic reduction in power charges."

"Canby's situation proves that Bonneville's low standard retail rates are conservative and practical and within reach of almost any publicly owned power distribution system which is in a position to buy Columbia River power at wholesale.

"Canby, by virtue of the fact that it has a long-established system, is free of debt, and has the benefit of astute and competent management, has been able this week to announce rates that, in some brackets, are the lowest in the United States. There is no reason why these rates cannot ultimately be met by other northwest public systems using Columbia River power."

The new Canby residential rate follows:

	Cents
First 50 kilowatt-hours per month	2½
Next 50 kilowatt-hours per month	1½
Next 100 kilowatt-hours per month	1
Next 600 kilowatt-hours per month	½
Over 800 kilowatt-hours per month	¾

Minimum bill, 75 cents per month.

Commercial lighting and power rate:

	Cents
First 150 kilowatt-hours per month	2½
Next 350 kilowatt-hours per month	1½
Next 1,000 kilowatt-hours per month	1
Next 13,500 kilowatt-hours per month	.7
Next 50,000 kilowatt-hours per month	.5
Above 65,000 kilowatt-hours per month	.3

For customers with demands greater than 10 kilowatts the excess of demand above 10 kilowatts will be charged at 95 cents per kilowatt.

For use in excess of 360 times the demand the energy charge shall be 50 percent of the otherwise applicable rate, except that no energy shall be billed at less than 2½ mills per kilowatt-hour.

Canby officials point out that customers who use more than 250 kilowatt-hours of power each month will have the benefit of the lowest retail rates in the country. For power in less than this quantity, Tacoma and Eugene rates are still slightly lower. For customers using 500 kilowatt-hours per month on the residential rate the bill at the new Canby rate would be $4.50. At the Eugene rate the bill would be $5.80 and at the Tacoma rate it would be $5.30.

In the new rate schedule Canby has pioneered in the direction of providing lower rates for irrigation users and for commercial customers using electricity for heating. The new commercial power schedule which would apply to irrigation installations of 10 horsepower or larger provides that the rates named in the schedule shall be reduced 50 percent for customers who use their equipment more than half of the time. This means that a rate of 3½ mills per kilowatt-hour is available for the smaller customers making long hour use of their irrigation equipment, such as is possible for irrigation users. Canby officials point out that the area served by the Canby municipal plant has excellent possibilities for the development of irrigation, and it is expected that the new rate provisions will give great impetus to this development.

Canby also adopted a new rate of 7 mills per kilowatt-hour for commercial electric space heating installations. This is one of the lowest commercial electric-heating rates in effect anywhere.

Canby's earnings during the first 12 months in which Bonneville power was distributed at the standard resale rates were sufficient to pay all costs of operation including depreciation, and to provide for payment to the city of a tax equivalent equal to the taxes that a similar private utility would pay, plus an additional payment equal to 6 percent on the city's investment in the electric plant. Surplus earnings after all these deductions amounted to $4,000 for the 12 months, or 26 percent of revenues. The new rates are also expected to result in surplus earnings after providing for tax equivalents and return on the city's investment.

St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of March 22, 1941:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of March 22, 1941]

GET THE WATERWAY STARTED

If the United States Senate had ratified the St. Lawrence waterway treaty in 1934, America would today have, completed or nearing completion, a mighty arm for defense. There would be power enough from this development to answer any fear of a power shortage. The current would be there to run all the aluminum plants necessary.

The shipbuilding problem would be solved, or nearing solution, in the same way. The great inland lakes would be open for the shipbuilding industry. Great Lakes shipyards, close to materials and an adequate body of labor, could be developed in comparative safety from attack.

President Roosevelt now makes an attempt to recover from that mistake of the Senate by negotiating a new agreement with Canada. It is not a formal treaty but it requires congressional approval. The President, it is clear, is trying to meet conditions as they are today. Power is adjudged to be the immediate need, so the emphasis is on power. But the canalization of a waterway is not forgotten; it is provided for over a course of years.

Canada, actually at war, is not in a position to spend money on internal improvements as she was 7 years ago. So the Canadian part of the work, which is mainly waterway improvement, is to be spread over a span of years.

America, on the other hand, will go ahead with the improvement of the International Rapids section. There is our main job, as it was also our main job by the provisions of the treaty that was not ratified. We shall count the money as a part of defense expenditure.

The cry will be raised—is being raised—that since this agreement requires only majority congressional approval, here is a dodge around the constitutional provisions requiring a two-thirds approval by the Senate of a formal treaty.

In a sense, this is true. But it must be remembered that the President, and the Lake States for that matter, had experience with the kind of opposition that balked the formal treaty. There could be enough of it to win over a third of the Senators, even though the arguments were contradictory and unsound. Maybe it will be impossible to deceive a majority of Congress.

We know the same opposition would be met again in consideration of a formal treaty because the contradictory assertions of such organizations as the Transportation Association of America are already being revived.

The association says, for instance, that the waterway is not feasible because it would not be used enough by oceangoing vessels. Then it says that so much traffice would be diverted as to upset the American transportation system. Which is correct? Both conclusions cannot be.

The association says farmers would not be benefited because there would not be the supposed lowering of rates. Then it says the Middle West's industry would be ruined by foreign goods coming through the waterway—this importation being made possible, of course, by cheaper rates. One assertion or the other is hay wire.

The President has chosen a method of gradual planning and progress in developing the project. This requires a permanent planning body, which is provided for in the agreement. To leave the project thus fluid and capable of change may, in the end, prove to be the wiser course. The old treaty fixed the development completely.

The 7 years lost cannot be made up. Nobody can say today whether the development will prove a defense measure, so far as the present European war is concerned. But Mr. Roosevelt has taken the safe course. He proposes to get the project under way. The Great Lakes area will be with him on that.

Bituminous Coal Act Should Be Extended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1941

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 was administered by a Bituminous Coal Commission created by the terms of the act. The act itself provided for conservation of coal resources, the stabilization of the coal industry, and for the creation of a coal code. The life of the act was limited to 4 years.

As a member of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee on independent offices, which dealt with appropriations for the Bituminous Coal Commission when it was an independent body, there was ample opportunity to get a first-hand knowledge of the administration of the act. It is unfortunate indeed that the original Commission staged a very inefficient and tragic performance. The Commission itself became a catch-all for patronage and political appointments and became one of the most inept agencies of government.

The most disconcerting thing about this performance was the enormous waste of years in promulgating a coal code. The record will show that even a three-man court in the District of Columbia which was inclined toward liberality disavowed the first price structure set up by the Commission because the statute was not followed. This decision was unanimous and was something of a reflection upon the inefficiency of the Commission.

The administration of the Bituminous Coal Act was finally transferred to the Department of the Interior under the provisions of plan No. II, submitted to Congress by the terms of the Reorganization Act of 1939. Evidently the Presi-

dent himself recognized the incapacity and the inefficiency of the Bituminous Coal Commission in administering the act.

The present Bituminous Coal Division was set up in the Department of the Interior by an order of the Secretary of the Interior dated June 16, 1939. This Division has therefore functioned less than 2 years in the Department of the Interior.

It is my considered opinion that this act is entitled to a full and fair opportunity so that it can be determined whether the basic purposes of the act can be accomplished in bringing stability to the bituminous-coal industry. In view of the earlier maladministration of the act, it can scarcely be said that there has been such full opportunity, and hence I am in favor of a further extension of the life of this act.

Program for Forest Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE RAPID CITY CHAPTER OF THE IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted unanimously by the Rapid City Chapter of the Izaak Walton League of America at their regular meeting on March 14, 1941:

RAPID CITY CHAPTER,
IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
Rapid City, S. Dak., March 14, 1941.

The following resolution was unanimously approved at a regular meeting of the Rapid City chapter of the Izaak Walton League of America, held in Rapid City, S. Dak., March 14, 1941.

REDFORD H. DIBBLE, *Secretary.*

PROGRAM FOR FOREST LANDS

All forest resources—land, soil, forest, range, watershed, wildlife, recreation, etc.—regardless of ownership, should be protected from depletion, developed, and utilized in the best interests of all the people. These resources should be made to contribute to the fullest extent to the permanent solution of social and economic problems, to national defense, and to permanent human welfare and security. The Federal Government should make its own lands outstanding examples of good management. Since the forest problems are inextricably bound up with the use of land for other agricultural purposes and with other agricultural problems, forest-land problems should be fully correlated therewith. As a partial contribution to the above, the following steps are necessary and at the same time will increase national wealth and provide much-needed employment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates assembled in this annual convention of the Izaak Walton League of America express their grave concern over the lack of a comprehensive national program of forestry and urge that such program be adopted; be it further

Resolved, That the Izaak Walton League of America go on record as follows:

1. The enactment of additional legislation and the appropriation of such funds as may be needed to make the national forests of South Dakota and of the Nation as a whole serve as models of practical and scientific management of forest land; to add to the present national-forest system additional areas needed to create a permanent forest economy; to regulate run-off and control erosion; and to insure proper management of large areas of submarginal lands.

2. Public regulation of private forest lands to insure that they are kept productive and that there may be adequate supplies of forest products for the normal needs of the Nation as well as in times of emergency.

3. Perpetuation and management of the fish and game resources as one of the natural assets of the State of South Dakota and of the United States as a whole.

4. Further development of the recreational possibilities of the State of South Dakota and the national forests of America; be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

An American's Right To Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on the floor on several occasions I have called the attention of the House to section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act, which reads:

Employees shall have the right to self-organization; to form, join, or assist labor organizations; to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing; and to engage in concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.

Several times an effort was made by me to amend that section by adding the four words "or not to join," so that the first part of the paragraph would read:

Employees shall have the right to self-organization; to form, join, or not to join, or assist labor organizations—

And so forth. My efforts in behalf of all those American citizens—and there are some 30,000,000 of them—who want to exercise the right given them by the Constitution to work for a livelihood, without being required to join any organization or to pay whatever fee might be assessed by the officials of a union, have been opposed by those who advocate the closed shop. The closed shop means that no one shall work in a given industry unless he belongs to a union. One of those who on the floor has fought frequently and vigorously my every effort to give American workingmen the right to work is the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

I do not question the gentleman's sincerity, nor do I question his good judgment, but I cannot agree with him. He frequently talks about the right to bargain collectively, and he has had not a little to say about the right of unions to enforce their rules and regulations upon all workers.

So today, to show you how some of these unions get their members and how they act, I am printing herewith a news story carried by the press on March 20 showing something of the things that are happening now and which shows you, too, how employees are actually prevented from bargaining collectively, from exercising their rights as employees. All those who believe that they are doing labor a service by insisting upon the closed shop in defense industries should read this account as well as the story from Gary, Ind. This Chicago story is as follows:

HARVESTER MAPS PLANS TO REOPEN MCCORMICK PLANT—A. F. OF L. WORKERS READY TO GO THROUGH C. I. O. PICKET LINE

Officials of the International Harvester Co., in an all-day conference yesterday, formulated plans to reopen the company McCormick works in Chicago.

This plant, at Blue Island and Western Avenues, has been shut down nearly 3 weeks by a strike of the Farm Equipment Workers' Organizing Committee (C. I. O.) The company's nearby tractor works at 2600 West Thirty-first Street has been closed for 7 weeks by an F. E. W. O. C. strike.

POLICE PROTECTION PLEDGED

Although no official statement was made by the company after yesterday's meeting, it became known that the McCormick works would resume operations perhaps by the end of this week or early next week. Capt. John Prendergast, chief of the uniformed police of Chicago, said that whenever the plant was ready to open adequate protection would be given to any employees who desired to return to work and that striking workers would not be permitted to interfere with their actions.

More than 1,000 members of the recently formed McCormick works A. F. of L. union attended a gathering at Twenty-fifth Street and Claremont Avenue and cheered speeches by organizers who announced the union would go through the C. I. O. picket lines to work as soon as the doors of the plant are opened.

Ernest Pugh, C. I. O. regional director, said he has sent telegrams to 200 presidents of locals in the Chicago area, asking them to attend a meeting in the Midland Hotel tonight to discuss ways to help the Harvester strikers.

OTHER LOCALS MAY PICKET

"We will draw up some sort of plan," he said. "It may take the form of financial aid or it may mean that other C. I. O. locals will help in the picketing."

At the Richmond, Ind., Harvester plant it was announced that arrangements for reopening would be made as soon as adequate protection could be furnished those employees willing to work. The Richmond plant also is shut down by C. I. O. action, but it has been announced that more than 700 of the 1,164 workers have signed petitions asking that operations be resumed.

The F. E. W. O. C. called its strike at the tractor works in Chicago on January 29, 7

weeks ago yesterday, and 6,500 workers there have been idle since. At this plant the C. I. O. union is the legally designated bargaining agent.

PEACE ATTEMPTS FAIL

Numerous attempts at negotiation have failed. Union demands are for a basic minimum wage of 75 cents an hour for men, and 65 cents for women instead of the present 62½ cents; elimination of piece work and adjustment of wage inequalities, and payments to men called into military service.

There has been no move to reopen the tractor plant. The situation there is somewhat different from that at McCormick. At the latter plant there has been no designated bargaining agent since the National Labor Relations Board in early February dispossessed an independent union on the ground it was company dominated. (This is denied by the company.)

The McCormick employees continued to work until February 28, when a detail of about 50 C. I. O. men invaded the plant, called out their members, and forcibly ejected others. There were a few fights, and the non-C. I. O. forces refused to leave until the company, fearful of the disorders, shut off the plant power and requested that all the workers leave.

A. F. OF L. MAJORITY CLAIMED

Harry O'Reilly and Irving Brown, A. F. of L. organizers, now claim a substantial majority of the McCormick workers, and their insistence on reopening has been a large factor in the company officials' decision. They have said repeatedly that their union has no complaint about wages and hours and that it wants to get its members back to earning. The 6,000 McCormick workers are losing about $200,000 in pay weekly, and the tractor workers are losing about the same amount.

The A. F. of L. has requested a plant election under N. L. R. B. supervision, but the C. I. O. has refused to agree on this.

The F. E. W. O. C. has a soup kitchen near the tractor works, but gives no benefits to offset the loss of wages. It was learned that hundreds of letters, some from C. I. O. members, have been received by the company and the A. F. of L. union pleading for a chance to work.

Many of these men who make more than a dollar an hour on piecework in many cases are said to be opposed to the C. I. O. demand that such work be abolished. The company has produced figures to show that pay in its plants here is higher than in similar units anywhere in the country.

"WE WANT WORK," PAYLESS STRIKE VICTIMS ASSERT—HARVESTER MEN HIT C. I. O. UNION TACTICS

Investigation yesterday tended to show that the rank and file of workers at the tractor works and McCormick works of the International Harvester Co., which have been shut down for weeks by C. I. O. strikes, are growing impatient at their lack of income and lay the blame principally on the union.

In an effort to get at the real sentiments of the men in the ranks, the Tribune sent out reporters with instructions to interview workers at random, including C. I. O. members, members of the American Federation of Labor, and independent workers, and to quote the men verbatim.

HERE ARE THE FINDINGS

From the answers these general facts were discovered:

1. Many of the idle men are nearly destitute, and others have about exhausted their savings.

2. Many are willing and anxious to return to work at their old scale of pay and consider it adequate.

Some of the answers, with the identities of those interviewed concealed, follow:

Mr. A. (C. I. O. member at the tractor works): "We have been on strike 7 weeks. I am in debt. I had some money saved, but my wife has been sick, so that is all gone. I averaged $45 a week when I worked. What is going to happen to all of us? Why don't the union and the company get together and open the plant? If the tractor works were opened, I would be in the front line going back to work. I am sick of unions that do nothing but hurt us. I had a good job, and I want it back, right now."

QUITS C. I. O. FOR A. F. OF L.

Mr. B. (former C. I. O. member at the tractor works): "I joined the C. I. O. union when it was started and voted in by tractor-plant men. I just quit the C. I. O. and have joined the A. F. of L. in the hope they can get us back to work again. I worked here for 18 years and always got good money. The little bit that I have left from my savings is going fast. If the company opens the tractor works, I will be in there working, and nobody is going to stop me. This thing is no joke with us, and I don't think many of the workers here wanted to go out."

Mr. C. (independent worker at McCormick works): "We got thrown out of the plant by the C. I O. It was a rotten deal. I had a good job in department 75 as a pot packer and made more than $8 a day on piecework. Why should I have to work on an hourly rate when I can make more for myself on piecework? The C. I. O. says they want to do away with piecework. They don't mean this because why should a man who is afraid to work make as much as a good worker? A man ought to be paid for what he can do, and the C. I. O. knows most of the good workers want piecework and those that don't like work want a high hourly rate. But how can the company make any money if they have to pay by the hour, whether you do your work or not? I don't want to join any union; I just want to go back to work. Why should I pay to be allowed to work"?

WON'T JOIN EITHER UNION

Mr. D. (independent worker at McCormick works): "I will not join either union. I have worked here 25 years and have always made good money. When the plant closed I was making $9 a day. During the depression, when the plant was practically shut down, the company let me and many others work 3 days a week, even though there was little to do. The company also gave me some ground at Irving Park Boulevard and Cumberland Avenue to raise a garden on. They let me borrow money and sent a nurse out when my wife was sick. They also sent food and paid my rent. I want to go to work. It is not right that a few C. I. O. men should stop me. All my friends want to work. Why doesn't the company open the gates? We'll go in."

Mr. E. (A. F. of L. worker at McCormick works): "I have a wife and two children and I worked in the gray iron department at McCormick and was an independent. Now I have joined the A. F. of L. In this department 900 men were working when about 50 C. I. O. men rushed in and attempted to get the workers to strike. There were only about 20 C. I. O. men among the 900, and none of them went because they did not want the strike either. We stayed at our work until the power was shut down and the superintendent told us to go home. I averaged $9 a day. We had no trouble and why should the C. I. O. be allowed to threaten workers?"

FATHER OF SIX TELLS STAND

Mr. F. (independent worker at McCormick works: "I will not join any union until they show they can help me. I have six kids. I have worked here 30 years. No union ever did anything for the McCormick workers. If I have a raise coming I get it; the company makes us feel like one big big family. No union got me $8 a day like I get here when I work, and no union will stop me working when the doors open."

Mr. G. (A. F. of L. member at McCormick works): "For 15 years I worked as a molder in the McCormick foundry and averaged $8 a day. I have joined the A. F. of L. because I don't know anybody, even their own members, who wanted to go on the C. I. O. strike. Why doesn't the company open the gates? What are we outside for? I have been helped by the company and they will help me again. I know the A. F. of L. will never do what the C. I. O. did at McCormick. I go back when the doors open."

Susan B. Anthony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1941

MEMORIAL SERVICES AND ARTICLE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a description of the memorial services to Susan B. Anthony, recently held, commemorating the anniversary of her birth, which celebration took place in the Capitol February 15, 1941. I also include an article on the trial of Susan B. Anthony.

The matters referred to follow:

[From Equal Rights for March 1941]

MEMORIAL SERVICES TO SUSAN B. ANTHONY

There was a sense of drama in the one hundred and twenty-first celebration of the anniversary of the birth of Susan B. Anthony, equal-rights pioneer and suffrage leader, which took place February 15, 1941, in the same Capitol to which Miss Anthony made pilgrimages year after year, for half a century, speaking innumerable times before Congress, asking for the enfranchisement of women.

Representatives of 75 organizations, totaling millions of American women, paid tribute to the crusader for the cause of democracy.

In the brightly lighted Crypt, the Women's Monument was the center of the reverent throng. This monument, the work of Adelaide Johnson, noted sculptor, including the busts of Miss Anthony, Lucretia Mott, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, was presented to the United States Government by 45 women's organizations in 1921.

The United States Marine Band Orchestra, under the leadership of William F. Santelmann, played Handel's Largo, with William F. Peiffer conducting. Later in the program they played the Melody of Peace, by Martin. The Honorable C. WAYLAND BROOKS, junior Senator from Illinois, spoke on the topic "How the Republican Party furthered the work of Susan B. Anthony"; the Honorable JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, junior Senator from Pennsylvania, talked on how to make the fourteenth amendment a success; and the Honorable JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr., of Virginia, talked on a Congressman's impression of Susan B. Anthony. Mrs. Maud Howell Smith, dramatic reader, read Miss Anthony's address to the court in 1873, when she was tried and fined for voting illegally, she having persuaded the election commissioners that women were enfranchised by the fourteenth amendment. Miss Helen Elizabeth Brown, lawyer from Baltimore, spoke on the topic

How the fourteenth amendment failed; and Mrs. George Mesta, congressional chairman of the N. W. P., paid a glowing tribute to the pioneer leader as she laid the large memorial wreath on the statue. Mrs. Pinckney Estes Glantzberg, legislative chairman, New York League of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, presided with poise and power throughout the meeting.

Quoting first from Senator BROOKS' eloquent address:

"The part played by the heroic women in building this, the greatest civilization on earth, is the most romantic story of the civilized world. Their efforts in building homes, their courage in helping cross frontiers, their loyalty during war, had raised them to a height of appreciation not enjoyed anywhere else in the world. But to bring about their full right to participate in the affairs of their Government took a courage a little different from the courage displayed in any other place in the lives of other American women.

"Consequently, history records the events of the lives of a number of famous women of the United States, and among these, stands high on the list, the name of Susan B. Anthony.

"In these days, when women may be doctors, lawyers, artists, architects, or may engage in any other profession or occupation they may choose, these facts alone are a monument to the memory and life of Susan B. Anthony, whose undaunted courage made these opportunities a reality.

"I do not boast of the part of the Republican Party played in bringing about the adoption of the woman-suffrage amendment, but, with pride I review the fact that the Republican National Convention, in 1916, for the first time in history, included a woman-suffrage plank in its platform, and the then Republican candidate for the Presidency, now the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, the Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, expressed himself in these words: 'My view is that the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting votes to women should be submitted and ratified, and the subject removed from political discussion.'

"It was significant that in the State that I have the honor to represent, the State of Illinois, in appreciation of the attitude of the Republican Party and its standard bearer, the women voted two to one for Mr. Hughes for President of the United States.

"It was only a further fulfillment in Illinois of the effort of Illinois' great contribution to the march of freedom in America, for Abraham Lincoln, elected to the Presidency from that State, not only freed the slaves but was in favor of woman suffrage as well.

"It is significant that when the suffrage amendment passed the House on January 10, 1918, by a vote of 274 to 136, exactly 40 years from the time the suffrage amendment was first introduced in Congress, 82 percent of the Republican Congressmen voting on the measure voted in favor of it.

"On February 10, 1919, the vote on the suffrage amendment occurred in the Senate, and stood 63 to 33, and of the 63 favorable votes 32 were Republicans. In other words, 44 Republicans in the Senate—32 of them voted for the amendment; and on May 21, 1919, the Republican House of Representatives passed the measure by a vote of 304 to 89. This was 42 votes above the required two-thirds majority.

"On June 4 the measure passed the Senate by a vote of 66 to 30. Of the 49 Republicans in the Senate at the time 40 voted for the amendment; and thus we may conclude that in the march of liberty the Republican Party has played a magnificent role: First, in electing Lincoln President to save the Nation and set men free; and, second, in advancing and finally succeeding in securing the adoption of the woman-suffrage amendment. But that was yesterday.

"To maintain the gains thus far attained, and to press constantly on for a greater social justice, the Republican Party stands dedicated to the continued march of liberty and the preservation of this, the finest form of government on earth."

In introducing the next speaker, Senator JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, of Pennsylvania, Mrs. Glantzberg said, "We are always grateful to him, a liberal champion of the rights of women; he comes from Pennsylvania, the Quaker State. Lucretia Mott, Susan B. Anthony, and our beloved Alice Paul, the leaders in this movement, are Quakers whose lives and religion signalize the equality of the sexes. He is the brother of our intelligent, beloved, and courageous friend, Emma Guffey Miller."

Senator GUFFEY said, in part:

"As we gather tonight in the crypt of our Nation's Capitol, may I, figuratively speaking, direct your gaze upward 300 feet to the very top of the dome which is surmounted by a heroic bronze figure of a woman, officially known as the Statue of Freedom.

"The history of this figure is analogous to the struggle of the women of the United States for legal equality.

"History does not make clear who conceived the idea of having a woman represent freedom at a time when both tradition and law classed her 'with idiots and children.'

"However, Thomas Crawford, an American sculptor living in Rome, was commissioned to execute the statue, and he made the plaster model in 1857, but soon after died. In April 1858 the model was put on the brig *Emily Taylor* and started for Washington. This ship sprung a leak and had to lay by at Gibraltar for repairs. Repairs made, she again set forth only to encounter terrific weather which necessitated throwing part of the cargo overboard and again putting into a harbor for safety—this time Bermuda—where the vessel was condemned and sold and what cargo remained, including the model for freedom, placed in storage.

"Several months later a New York firm notified Captain Meigs, who had charge of the work at the Capitol, that a steamer had arrived with some statuary consigned for the United States Government.

"This was welcome news until it was discovered that only part of the lady had arrived. A year later all sections of the figure reached our shores and the contract was let for the bronze replica to be made by a firm in Maryland. By that time the Civil War was in progress and all work on the statue stopped. Several months later work was resumed and by November 1862 the Statue of Freedom was completed and placed on the Capitol Grounds for the public to see. More than a year later the work of elevating the statue to its lofty position was begun; one by one, four sections were riveted together and finally, on December 2, 1863, the fifth and last section was fastened in place.

"The populace cheered, the Stars and Stripes were unfurled, a salute of 35 guns was fired, and thus the architectural design of this great building was complete.

"I wonder if it ever occurred to the lawmakers of that day how inconsistent they were in exalting the figure of a woman to represent freedom and at the same time remain deaf to the pleas which Susan B. Anthony was making to be granted the simple right of suffrage.

"It is almost 80 years since this statute was given to the Nation as an emblem of Freedom, and though women have been given the right to vote they are still without that legal equality which is theirs by natural right because the Supreme Court has not interpreted the Constitution as including women among persons.

* * * * *

"In case of murder, theft, arson, or payment of taxes, our laws make no distinction between men and women; both pay equal penalties. But in numerous other legal particulars the discriminations are most unfair and unjust.

"To deny a woman the right to earn a living because she is married is as logical as it would be to force me, a bachelor, to get married before I could vote on laws affecting married women.

"To make laws that deny women the right to bargain for their own wages and hours of labor is not only primitive reasoning but the acme of selfinishness and indifference.

"Some people still think that the vote conferred legal equality on women, but from many decisions of the Supreme Court we know it to be otherwise. When the Constitution was written its primary objective was to insure the rights of the individual against the Government, to establish fixed limits within which government could operate, and to reserve to the people all other powers. This was to make certain that the inalienable rights of the individual might never be imperilled by an autocratic majority. The makers of the Constitution wanted law to apply with justice to all; they wanted every individual to have equal protection under the law; and the Constitution was not fully accepted by the people until the Bill of Rights, guaranteeing such protection, was made a part of the Constitution. In the fifth amendment we find the phrase, 'due process of law,' which has been interpreted to mean that 'all laws must be in conformity with the fundamental principles of th Constitution.'

"It remained, however, for the fourteenth amendment, to define more clearly the rights and liberties of individuals. It reads:

"'All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States and of the State in which they reside. No State shall make or enforce any laws which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law.'

"What an explicit definition of equality before the law and yet in the light of court decisions what an empty hope it has been for American women.

"Men and groups of men operating as corporations have received every right guaranteed under this amendment, but the highest courts do not look upon women as coming under the protection of the fourteenth amendment. Since the passage of this amendment a number of tests of the status of women have been made, but all decisions have left women exactly where they were before the Constitution was written.

"On the other hand the humblest male is afforded every protection of the law. For example, in the famous case of a Chinese laundryman, Yo-Wick (118 U. S. 356), who was forbidden by a local California ordinance, to carry on his trade in a certain section while white men could, was granted by the Supreme Court every right and privilege under our constitution. All liberty-loving men approved this decision, forgetting that at the same time no American-born woman was granted the same protection as the alien Chinaman.

"There were several decisions of this type which gave great hope to women until within recent years the Supreme Court reversed itself and closed the door of equality to women.

"Despite rights and privileges which have been granted by some Federal and State statutes, the only guaranteed constitutional right which women possess is the right to vote.

"Other rights and privileges granted by the States and the Congress to women may be repealed at will, hence the need for a constitutional amendment which will guarantee them 'Equal Justice Under the Law.'

"Those words are carved over the portals of the marble palace where the Supreme Court resides, but what a travesty that sentiment becomes when we examine the many laws regarding women which are entirely contrary to the spirit of the fourteenth amendment.

"Chief Justice Hughes wrote a number of years ago, 'The Constitution is what the courts make it.'

"Even though the membership of the Supreme Court may at times render decisions under the fourteenth amendment favorable to women, another membership may annul them. Therefore, the only secure method to establish equal justice for women is by writing into the Constitution an amendment which will state 'Men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction.'

* * * * *

"The struggle for woman's freedom under the law has been subject to as many vicissitudes as the Statue of Freedom before it reached its proud pinnacle, but bear in mind that even the roughest voyage has an end.

"So let us hope that will be the history of the equal-rights amendment. May the period of its uncertainties soon cease; may your cry for justice soon become one of thankfulness that at last you have entered into full legal privileges and protection under the Constitution. Then the Statue of Freedom will come to life."

Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr., Representative from Virginia, paid a brilliant tribute to Susan B. Anthony, in part:

"I pause to pay simple tribute to those inspired pioneers of thought whose signal fires illuminate the past, embellish the present, and cast their reflected glory down the pathway that leads to the future. Those select men and women of vision who, like Paul, in the face of calumny, derision, and persecution, remained steadfast and true and were 'not disobedient unto the heavenly vision. * * *' Possessing a soul free from bondage to precedent or servitude to custom, the vision of Susan Brownell Anthony unforged the shackles that enslaved the voice of her sex in the affairs of state, placed in their hands the rightful heritage of all freemen, the ballot, and thus brought to democracy fresh troops to battle for future social and economic advancement."

Helen Elizabeth Brown, of Baltimore, gave an extemporanecus address on "Why the Fourteenth Amendment Did Not Work." In part, she said:

"The fourteenth amendment declared as plainly as possible that all persons born or naturalized in the United States are citizens and should have the equal protection of the law. What happened? Many Members of Congress held this view. The Attorney General of Nebraska, also, so ruled. In 1872 and 1873 women tried to vote. They were denied the right. They turned to the courts for redress."

She related the case of Virginia Minor in 1872. Mrs. Minor, when refused the right, appealed to the Supreme Court Justice Waite took 14 pages to explain his views. He said the fourteenth amendment declared women were persons. It did not take the fourteenth amendment to make women citizens. Women were gathered together in communities. They owed allegiance to these communities and the communities owed them protection. But when women demanded the right to vote they were not included. Women were then ruled out of the Constitution and have been out ever since. Miss Brown also cited the case of Mrs. Myra Bradwell, who tried to be a lawyer in the State of Illinois in 1872 and was denied. She appealed to the Supreme Court. Justice Bradley said the fourteenth amendment could not be used as a barrier to protect females in their right to earn a living. No woman should have a career apart from her husband. The domestic sphere is the domain of women. Their paramount task is that of wife and mother. Hence women lost their rights not because of any defect in the fourteenth amendment but because of court rulings alone. Susan B. Anthony spent a lifetime freeing women, which also included men. Women are now out of the Constitution and it will take the equal rights amendment to get them back. Miss Brown closed by quoting Miss Anthony on her deathbed as saying, "Failure is impossible."

We were delighted to have with us also, unexpectedly, the president of the National Women's Christian Temperance Union, Mrs. Ida B. Wise Smith, who gladly shared the platform with the other speakers to pay tribute to Miss Anthony, as the friend of Frances Willard, founder of the W. C. T. U. Mrs. Smith appealed to the many young women present exhorting them to embrace the privilege of working for a continuation of effort to secure women's rights. She said that Miss Anthony thought when women got the ballot they would win all their rights. This did not happen. Those rights are not yet won. Mrs. Smith referred to the long friendship between Miss Anthony and Frances Willard, whose "heavenly birthday" was commemorated on February 16, in Statuary Hall. She called Miss Anthony and Miss Willard the "maiden mothers of reform." Mrs. Smith said the members of the national W. C. T. U. have always stepped right along with the women who have been working for political rights. She concluded with a wish to speed us on our way, in continuing the work of Miss Anthony and was glad to pay tribute to that noble pioneer herself. In the course of her remarks she quoted the noble Frances Willard as saying "Death is but a bend in the river of life, which sets our current heavenward;" and further, "In death we shall pass to the life where activities are not succeeded by weariness."

The presiding officer, Mrs. Pinckney Estes Glantzberg, summed up the effect of Miss Anthony's efforts in the following interesting analogy:

"Not long ago, Dr. Edward P. Cheyney, one of our great historians, made an address on the agitator in history, using agitator in the honorable sense. He defined the agitator as 'One who, striving to bring about some social or political advance, enlightens ignorance, stirs indifference, arouses courage, or in other ways lifts men from the dead level of willing acceptance of bad existing conditions.' His examples are striking, omitting, as he does, the Great Obvious One. He names John the Baptist, Jean d'Arc, John Ball, Clarkson, Wilberforce, and Romilly, giving the reforms finally effected through the years of what to the agitators themselves seemed futile effort, the gains being made inch by contested inch. 'Whenever a man or woman has a warm dissatisfaction with things as they are, is keenly alive to the desirability and possibility of change, boldly speaks out what he thinks, and takes some active part in efforts for reform, he is essentially an agitator. They are the precursors of progress. They are the men and women who will not let us sit down and accept things as they are.'

"He or she represents what is apparently an indispensable factor in all social progress. Of this great company, Susan B. Anthony is one—an agitator for freedom for one-half of all humanity.

"The constant temptation of humanity is to sink into conservative inaction; the agitator, whether in the past or in the present, is the man or woman who keeps us stirred to our work.

"Wanted, then, an agitator, a real living troublesome agitator who will not let us be comfortable until the work for freedom is accomplished—another Susan B. Anthony."

THE TRIAL OF SUSAN B. ANTHONY

(By Amelia Himes Walker)

PROLOGUE

Ladies and gentlemen, let us not forget that this is the winter of 1941. Let us imagine that it is June of the year 1873. Almost a century has passed since the Declaration of Independence was written by Thomas Jefferson, and proclaimed as the faith of our Nation. Almost a century since Abigail Adams wrote to her husband, John Adams, asking that women be granted more rights in the Constitution of the Nation.

It is almost a quarter of a century since a group of women, mindful of their great responsibilities to this expanding Nation, met in Seneca Falls, N. Y., and drew up a new declaration of independence for women, asking for equal rights under the law of this maturing Republic.

It is 10 years since the Battle of Gettysburg decided the fate of the Civil War, and ended forever in America the enslavement of the colored race. Following the useless carnage and destruction of the finest young men of the North and South, the Negro man found himself honored by full citizenship and equal rights with the white man. Congress had passed the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments which had guaranteed these rights for all time.

But the women of the United States, in spite of their education, of their possession of property, of their equal burden of taxation with men, were denied all rights of citizenship, and were classed under the law with children and idiots.

At a Presidential election the previous November 1872, Susan B. Anthony, having read in a newspaper in Rochester, N. Y., the notice of registration of citizens, exhorting them to register without fail, had gone to the polls with her sister and had registered. Fifty women in Rochester had done the same; 14 were from the same ward as Miss Anthony. Of course, the men in charge of the registration could not legally prevent women from registering their names as members of their chosen parties. And bright and early on the 5th day of November, Susan and a number of her friends went to the polls and voted. And on Thanksgiving Day, which at that time was on the last Thursday of November, those 14 offending citizens were informed that they were to be prosecuted by the United States Government.

During the intermediate period between November 28, 1872, and January 21, 1873, Miss Anthony, in the eye of the law a prisoner, but the marshal, though somewhat uneasy, left her free to attend her lyceum engagements and attend woman suffrage conventions. A singularly anomalous position for a criminal traveling around the country as a teacher of morals to the people, wasn't it?

Her trial was held on the 18th of June 1873.

To all of us, citizens of 1941, the arguments used against the prisoner were ridiculous and ludicrous.

The fact that the judge ordered a verdict of guilty from the jury and then did not allow the jury to render a verdict, is a shocking travesty of justice.

So that we may comprehend more clearly the brilliant mind of this woman who struck this bold blow for the women of future generations, the closing scene of the trial will now be presented. (It is verbatim.)

THE TRIAL OF SUSAN B. ANTHONY

The COURT. The prisoner will please stand up. Has the prisoner anything to say why sentence should not be pronounced?

Miss ANTHONY. Yes, Your Honor, I have many things to say; for in your ordered verdict of guilty, you have trampled underfoot every vital principle of our Government. My natural rights, my civil rights, my political rights, are all alike ignored. Robbed of the

fundamental privilege of citizenship, I am degraded from the status of a citizen to that of a subject. And not only myself individually but all of my sex are, by your honor's verdict, doomed to political subjection under this so-called republican Government.

JUDGE. The Court cannot listen to a rehearsal of arguments the prisoner's counsel has already consumed 8 hours in presenting.

Miss ANTHONY. May it please Your Honor, I am not arguing the question, but simply stating the reasons why sentence cannot, in justice, be pronounced against me. Your denial of my citizen's right to vote is the denial of my right of consent as one of the governed, the denial of my right of representation as one of the taxed, the denial of my right to a trial by a jury of my peers as an offender against the law, therefore, the denial of my sacred rights to life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness——

JUDGE. The Court cannot allow the prisoner to go on.

Miss ANTHONY. But Your Honor will not deny me this one and only poor privilege of protest against this high-handed outrage against my citizen's rights. May it please the Court to remember that since the day of my arrest last November this is the first time that either myself or any member of my disfranchised class has been allowed a word of defense before judge or jury——

JUDGE. The prisoner must sit down. The Court cannot allow it.

Miss ANTHONY. All my prosecutors from the eighth ward corner grocery, politicians who entered the complaint, to the United States marshal, commissioner, district attorney, district judge, Your Honor on the bench, not one is my peer, but each and all are my political sovereigns. And had Your Honor submitted my case to the jury, as was clearly your duty, even then I should have had just cause of protest, for not one of those men was my peer; but native or foreign, white or black, rich or poor, educated or ignorant, awake or asleep, sober or drunk, each and every man of them was my political superior, hence, in no sense, my peer.

Even under such circumstances, a commoner of England, tried by a jury of lords would have far less cause to complain than should I, a woman, tried before a jury of men. Even my counsel, the Honorable Henry R. Selden, who has argued my case so ably, so earnestly, so unanswerably before your honor, is my political sovereign. Precisely as no disfranchised person is entitled to sit upon a jury, and no woman is entitled to the franchise in the courts, and no woman can gain admission to the bar, hence judge, jury, counsel, must all be of the superior class.

JUDGE. The court must insist—the prisoner has been tried according to the established forms of law.

Miss ANTHONY. Yes, your honor, but by forms of law all made by men, interpreted by men, administered by men, in favor of men and against women; and, hence, your honor's verdict against a United States citizen for the exercise of that citizen's right to vote simply because that citizen was a woman and not a man.

JUDGE. The court orders the prisoner to sit down. It will not allow another word.

Miss ANTHONY. When I was brought before your honor for trial, I hoped for a broad and liberal interpretation of the constitution and its recent amendments, that should declare all United States citizens under its protecting aegis—that should declare equality of rights the national guaranty to all persons born or naturalized in the United States. But failing to get this justice—failing to get a trial by a jury not of my peers—I ask no leniency at your hands, but rather the full rigors of the law.

JUDGE. The court must insist (here the prisoner sat down). The prisoner will stand up. (Here Miss Anthony arose again.) The sentence of the court is that you pay a fine of $100 and the costs of the prosecution.

(And Miss Anthony was never required to pay her fine. Yet it was 57 years after this shocking travesty of justice before women won the right to vote in 1920. May our right of jury service in the State of Maryland and our amendment to the Constitution of the United States giving us equal rights under the law be granted us this year so that our Government may be a true democracy indeed.)

Miss ANTHONY. May it please your honor, I shall never pay a dollar of your unjust penalty. All the stock in trade I possess is a $10,000 debt, incurred by publishing my paper, The Revolution—4 years ago, the sole object of which was to educate all women to do precisely as I have done, rebel against your man-made, unjust, unconstitutional forms of law, that tax, fine, imprison, and hang women, while they deny them the right of representation in the Government; and I shall work on with might and main to pay every dollar of that just debt, but not one penny shall go to this unjust claim. And I shall earnestly and persistently continue to urge all women to the practical recognition of the old revolutionary maxim, "Resistance to tyranny is obedience to God."

S. 935

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1941

LETTER OF HON. J. H. BANKHEAD, OF ALABAMA, RELATIVE TO S. 935, AND ANSWER THERETO BY HON. REID F. MURRAY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from Senator BANKHEAD in regard to the agricultural bill S. 935, an accompanying digest of the bill by him, and my answer thereto:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
March 18, 1941.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am enclosing you statement on the cotton phase of S. 935 introduced by me. This bill provides for parity price loans. I hope you will carefully examine the figures which I am submitting. Unless legislation is enacted at an early date, it will be too late to be effective for this year's crop.

Sincerely yours,

J. H. BANKHEAD.

S. 935—EXPLANATION BY SENATOR BANKHEAD

COTTON

Objectives:

1. Increase the income of the farmers.
2. No additional appropriations.
3. No increase in loan stocks.

Production, 12,000,000 bales (under present allotment.)

Approximate average present loan rate, 9 cents.

12,000,000 bales at 9 cents or $45 per bale	$540,000,000
Soil-conservation payments	100,000,000
Parity payments	90,000,000
Total income	730,000,000

MY PLAN

1. Income (assuming reduction of 2,500,000 bales by paying farmers $40 per bale for reduction):

9,500,000 bales at 14½ cents or $72.50 per bale	$688,750,000
Pay for taking 2,500,000 bales out of production at 8 cents or $40 per bale	$100,000,000
Soil-conservation payments	100,000,000
Total income	888,750,000

Increase in income, $158,750,000.

2. No additional appropriations:

Appropriation now available for parity payments	90,000,000
20 percent of appropriation for Surplus Marketing Administration	40,000,000
Available from existing appropriations	130,000,000
Cost to decrease production 2,500,000 bales, at 8 cents, or $40 per bale	100,000,000
Cost to secure title to loan cotton	10,000,000
	110,000,000

Thus the plan would be financed without additional appropriations.

3. No increase in loan stocks:

	Bales
Normal production under present allotments	12,000,000
Reduction	2,500,000
Actual production	9,500,000
Consumption (domestic)	9,000,000
Surplus needed for selection of grades and staples and for small exports	1,000,000
Total consumption	10,000,000

Thus there would be no increase in loan stocks.

If additional cotton is needed by the trade, the Secretary can release it from Government-owned cotton.

On August 1, 1941, the surplus will be 12,500,000 bales, of which the Government will own about 11,000,000. If a normal crop is produced this year and there is no reduction in planted acreage, the surplus August 1, 1942, will be increased to 15,000,000 bales.

LOAN COTTON

1938 crop, 2,000,000 bales.

The loan, plus carrying charges, makes the amount required for withdrawing the cotton more than the market price.

Title cannot be acquired until August 1. The bill provides that owners of this cotton who do not promptly assign title to the Government cannot participate in the parity-price loan.

1940 crop, 2,800,000 bales.

DEMAND NOTES

Present cost for withdrawal, 9.64 cents.

Market price March 1, 10.26 cents.

Amount required to pay borrowers for their equity, $10,000,000.

With the supply of free cotton adjusted to the domestic consumption, the trade would buy all the crop at the loan price and none of the new crop would go under loan.

AMOUNT OF NEW LOAN

Parity price, 15.87 cents.

If conservation payments are deducted, the loan price would be 14½ cents.

Result:

1. Increase of $158,750,000 in income of farmers.

2. No additional appropriations.
3. No increase in loan stocks.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 24, 1941.

Hon. J. H. BANKHEAD,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BANKHEAD: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 18, enclosing digest of bill S. 935 introduced by you in the Senate.

There are so many angles to all agricultural legislation that one hesitates to make comments without clarifying and supporting any statements made. One is accused of sponsoring a sectional viewpoint in spite of any effort made to maintain a national viewpoint.

With this thought in mind, I want to frankly state that I am in sympathy with the objectives of your bill. However, this bill must, of necessity, be considered, not only in the light of cotton benefits, but also in the light of all other crops as well.

Up to the present time the cotton interests have had the following subsidies: (1) A. A. A. payments made to the six leading cotton States, alone, of about $124,793,000. (2) Up to January 1, 1940, received 45 percent of the parity money disbursed in the United States and in 1940 had $96,000,000, or 47 percent, of the $203,000,000 disbursed. (3) Cotton received $40,994,857 of the $52,584,456 spent for export bounty last year. (4) It is further subsidized out of the Federal Treasury in order to pay the storage charges of $1.50 per bale on over 11,000,000 bales, or a sum of $15,000,000 to $20,000,000 annually. (5) Cotton has an annual subsidy of nearly one-half million dollars to discover new uses for cotton. (6) Millions of dollars are being spent in giving away cotton mattresses and other cotton goods subsidized by the Government. (7) Another cotton subsidy is the cotton stamp plan and the diversion program which cost $516,330 last year, directly for cotton, and due to the reduction of the acreage of cotton and the increase of production of peanuts it took over $12,000,000 out of the Federal Treasury to divert peanuts. (8) Cotton farmers, as well as others, are being financed for fertilizer with the subsidies of soil-conservation money to grow more surpluses, to have larger storage charges, to receive more diversion, to provide more export bounty, and more money is appropriated to find new uses for surpluses.

In addition to the foregoing, we have done two other things: (1) We have furnished 100-percent subsidy from the Federal Treasury to start up new cotton farmers. We have purchased these farms with the Government furnishing all the money and set them up in business with 40-year loans at 3-percent interest. We have set them up to compete with men who are already farming and who are, and would now be, paying 4- and 5-percent interest if the present administration had not been outvoted on the question. We are making tenants out of landlords faster than we are making landlords of tenants. We have purchased some 12,234 farms at an average cost of $5,721 and have also built our city cousins, through the United States Housing Administration, up to August 1, 1940, 90,436 housing units which averaged $4,350 apiece, and we pay from the United States Treasury an average of $193 per unit per year toward the rent for the next 60 years. While we have been performing this humanitarian act, we have been doing something else hard to name. We have, up to January 1, 1940, driven 96,135 farmers from their homes because they could not pay an average interest charge of $112 on an average $2,800 loan. This is evidently false humanitarianism and a fake social gain. During the past few months Dr. Black has tried to correct some of the evils of this situation.

(2) We have been appropriating other millions of borrowed Federal money under the guise of rural relief and aid to cooperatives. We have been appropriating around $150,000,000 per year for rural relief. Mr. Edward O'Neal states that we are spending $40,000,000 of this in overhead and over $20,000,000 of it here in Washington. I have written to the Secretary of Agriculture for verification of these figures but have not heard from him as yet. My colleague, Hon. H. P. FULMER, in speaking of these funds, said, as shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 6, 1941, "this would enable the farmers in association on a cooperative basis to build refrigeration plants, small canning plants, fruit-drying plants, and woodworking plants out in those parts of the country where we have unemployment running rampant and where you are spending money today to investigate migration from the farms." Are we to continue private enterprise, or are we to abandon it?

I feel justified in opposing this legislation, as the canning factories of this Nation and of my State are having enough trouble to keep going without having the Federal Government furnish 100 percent of the funds to start new businesses in opposition to people now in business and in opposition to farmers in other areas now raising canning crops. Most anyone can see through the smoke screen of calling them cooperatives because the United States Treasury is the great cooperator on these projects. Our background of cooperatives in Wisconsin leads us to believe in cooperatives which mean what they say, and the bank of cooperatives can take care of the financial needs of any crop in the land. I have a list of the 20 federally subsidized canning factories in the United States and would be glad to make a copy for you if you should care to have it for your files. Four out of the twenty are already acquired by the Government or are being foreclosed on at the present time.

Senator BANKHEAD, I would like very much to cooperate with you on a farm program which was not filled with cross purposes. I would like to lend my every effort to (1) a farm program which was for the benefit of all formers and not only the few; (2) one that included all crops and did not result in the farmers of some States receiving 20 to 25 percent of their annual income from the United States Treasury, and farmers of other States receiving 1 to 2 percent from the same source; (3) one that gives parity to all crops for the part of the crop consumed in this country; (4) one that, if subsidies are to be paid out of the Treasury, they should go to the real farm people of this country and to the people who live on and operate their own farms; (5) one whereby the parity price is based on the amount of crops produced by this family-sized farm. Communal farms are not needed in this country, and their promotion by the present administration will not be to the benefit of our agricultural people; (6) one whereby money appropriated for agricultural purposes would be used for agriculture and would find its way into the pockets of the farm people of this country.

My colleague, Hon. FRED L. CRAWFORD, of Michigan, states that we have had 26 bills in Congress in connection with cotton which have called for over $1,900,000,000 from the Federal Treasury. It is surely time that we all cooperate with you in bringing some constructive farm legislation before Congress.

The congressional district in Wisconsin which I have the honor to represent has had a much higher percentage of Federal farm foreclosures than the cotton States. The percentage on January 1, 1940, was 50.2 percent.

I have always tried to improve the present A. A. A. I have tried to show its cross purposes. Your letter and digest is one more example of a crying need for a (1) sane land policy in our country and (2) a farm program with benefits for the many and not the few and one based on common sense and common justice.

Please accept this letter in the spirit in which it is sent, and be assured of my wholehearted cooperation for constructive legislation.

Sincerely yours,
REID F. MURRAY, M. C.,
Member Committee on Agriculture.

How the C. I. O. Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1941

NEWSPAPER ARTICLE FROM GARY, IND.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said on the floor about the right of union men to organize. It is about time, that right being conceded, that something be said about the right of men and women, who do not want to submit to the rule of a union, to refuse to sign up.

Here is a news story from Gary, Ind., which appeared in the press on March 21. I quote:

WOMEN OF GARY STEEL MILL GIVE VIEWS ON C. I. O.—DESCRIBE TERRORISM IN MEMBER DRIVE

Since February 25 the Steel Workers' Organizing Committee (C. I. O.) has periodically picketed the huge tin and sheet-metal mills of the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Co. in Gary, where 9,000 men and women are employed.

There is no strike in progress. The union's avowed purpose is to force all employees who do not belong to the organization to join. Nonmembers who refuse to pay the $3 initiation fee and the first month's dues of $1 are barred from their work by the pickets. Gary policemen stand idly by.

The union's agreement with the management has expired but its terms continue in force, although the union has given 30 days' notice of intention to terminate them. The company is preparing to enter negotiations on the union's demand for an increase from 62½ to 72½ cents an hour in the minimum wage.

The Tribune sent a reporter to interview workers to determine their sentiments regarding the C. I. O. round-up. Below are the comments of some women workers, who number 1,500. Each of them spoke frankly about her reasons for refusing to join and her desire for an opportunity to work. And each of them was willing for her name to be used. This was in contrast with most of the men interviewed, who talked but asked that their names be withheld for fear of beatings and sluggings by union hoodlums in reprisal.

WHAT WORKERS THINK

Helen Bar Scharf, 552 Adams street, Gary, assorting room worker 14 years in the company's employ:

"I rode to the mill on a bus. Two C. I. O. men got on and ordered all passengers off. I said I had paid my fare to the mill and that was where I was going. The C. I. O. men went back to two men who had refused to leave. They refused again. Then Frank Grider [S. W. O. C. subdistrict manager in Gary] got on and the three union men pulled one of the workers off.

"A supervisor for the Gary Railways [operator of the bus] was aboard. I said to him,

'You know that when we pay our fares on this bus we are insured for $10,000.' 'Yes, I know,' he told me. 'Are you going to let this go on?' I asked. 'There is nothing I can do,' he said. 'What's wrong with the Gary police?'

"The union men went back to Mr. Titus, the other man who refused to leave, and told him to get off or sign up. He answered that he was a war veteran and belonged to the American Legion, and he didn't see why he should have to join any organization to be allowed to work in America. Grider told his men to get him. They pulled Mr. Titus off the bus.

"Then they came back to me. They pulled my right arm and got me out of my seat. I fell into the opposite seat, so they pulled my left arm. I struggled, but they finally got me to the door of the bus. Frank Grider got outside and pulled my left leg. I managed to land on my feet, but I have been black and blue ever since, and a finger on my left hand was pulled out of joint.

"A bus then drove up with 60 girls. None was a member, so it was sent back after I had been put on it. We went to the Gary police station where we were advised to go to the county seat at Crown Point. We went to Crown Point and tried to see Prosecuting Attorney Felix Kaul and Sheriff John Knott, but couldn't. So we went home.

"I will not join the C. I. O. What did it ever do for the workers?"

VETERAN JERKED OFF BUS

Mary Tomak, 1550 Grant Street, Gary, assorter:

"I saw Frank Grider and two pickets jerk a middle-aged man from a bus. The man said, 'I fought for my country in the last war and you fellows don't have to tell me what to do. I'm not too old to fight yet.' Frank Grider instructed the men to get the —— and they tried, but a plain clothes policeman interfered."

Sophie Wolcszyn, 1700 Cleveland Street, Gary, assorter:

"Our bus was stopped at the entrance and we were ordered off. Pickets jumped and seized girls who wouldn't get off, and forced them off. As private automobiles came up they were stopped. Pickets boarded them if the men had no union cards.

"Many of these pickets were drunk and used profane language. The cars were driven into a lot littered with whisky bottles. There union officials were ready to sign up anyone with $4. A few cars tried to go through the picket line. One of them was stopped. The driver was yanked out and beaten.

"A burly picket whose breath reeked from liquor asked us, 'If you won't pay your fee why don't you go home and give your job to someone who will?' Someone accused him of being drunk. He blew his vile breath in our faces and said, 'Here, you punks, you wanta get drunk, too?' "

Julia Halas, 805 Monroe Street, Gary, assorter:

"I usually drive to work but I took a bus when picketing was going on. At a mass picket line, we were all ordered off. I got off, but several girls were yanked off. One was bounced from one seat to another and finally dragged off by the legs.

"I have tried to find out what the C. I. O. has done for us workers and what we will get if we join. I asked a girl member. She answered. 'You know the soft-drink machines around the plant would not be here if it weren't for the C. I. O. And what about the short socks we are allowed to wear to work? Don't you remember that we always had to wear long stockings. Don't you appreciate anything?' "

MOLEST MOTHER, DAUGHTER

Margaret Elkins, 4009 Park Avenue, Gary, black plate department worker:

"My mother and I work in the mill. We drive to work. When I drove to the picket line I had my doors locked. I was told to open the doors or windows but I refused. The pickets said they would turn my car over. They all grabbed one side and lifted it into the air. My mother screamed. Then they let the car down and lifted it again. Then they shouted that I would have to turn the car around.

"So I did and drove home. My mother and I will never join a union like that."

Elizabeth Nuzzo, 1191 West Forty-first Street, Gary:

"I work in the assorting department. There are about 500 in this department, 247 of them girls. Eighty-one girls have not joined, and the others joined only because they were bluffed into paying their money. Some of them didn't get a receipt; so they couldn't get to work until the next day anyway. What a racket.

"After the pickets had gone we went to work. The C. I. O. girls were told by Sam Taylor of the C. I. O. grievance committee to quit working with us, but we kept on working. Foreman Frank Riley made a speech telling us the company had a contract with the C. I. O. (the C. I. O. has bargaining rights for its own members only) but that there was lots of work and we could have it whether we belonged to the union or not.

"Taylor climbed up on a table and said, 'We don't give a damn what the company's policy has been. Either join or go home.' He came by later when a C. I. O. organizer was trying to tell us what the C. I. O. could do for us and told the organizer:

" 'Don't talk to those——. We'll get them into the union if we have to club them.'

"The department was shut down because C. I. O. girls were ordered not to work. I wouldn't join this union even if the company wanted me to."

THE UN-AMERICAN WAY

Edna Thomasson, 4960 Cleveland Avenue, Gary, tin-mill worker:

"I had heard rumors of the mass picketing for a couple of months. Girls would say that if we didn't join the union we would lose our jobs. As an American I resented being told that I had to pay my way into the mill.

"Not being a union member, I was left standing outside in the bitter cold one morning of the picketing. A girl refused to get off a bus. Several men tossed her out into the crowd. A gentleman standing there ran up and said, 'You can't treat ladies that way.' They hit him.

"I didn't realize things like this could happen in America."

Mr. Speaker, just when will Congress try to protect American citizens?

The Indomitable Spirit of the Britons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1941

LETTER OF SIR HARRY LAUDER, OF STRATHAVEN, SCOTLAND, TO AN AMERICAN FRIEND

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, we are deeply interested at this time in securing all first-hand information concerning the morale of the people in the British Isles as they undergo the severest test ever endured by any people in withstanding the barbaric attacks made upon them by the Axis Powers.

Recently it was my privilege to read a letter written in Strathaven, Scotland, by one well known in America, Sir Harry Lauder, to his friend in New York City, Mr. Jesse Eldot. Sir Harry Lauder has entertained thousands of Americans with his humor, his homely philosophy, and his Scotch songs. He is, perhaps, almost as well known here as in his native home of Scotland. It will be recalled that during the last World War he lost his only son. He is well advanced in years, and is now living in Scotland, and it has been quite a long while since he visited America.

His letter to Mr. Eldot typifies not only his courageous and indomitable spirit, but it also reflects the temper and the fiber of the British people in this grave crisis; and, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I submit herewith this letter:

LAUDER HA',
Strathaven, February 2, 1941.

MY DEAR OLD FRIEND JESSE: What a mess this worl' is in, but as the old Scotch body said, wait, "They'll catch it." I am very busy raising funds for every fund imaginable and we need all we can get. We are now in the front line, hard hit, but we are all willing to sacrifice and struggle to help our country out of the hell we are in. We sure are fighting a religion—the worst idea that has ever struck civilization—and we must destroy it and we will. We fight for God and country till we win, win, win, and win we must and shall.

We are waiting on the Hun coming over and he'll get a warm reception. We pray and trust in God for our liberation. What the enemy has done is beyond all human idea. What they have done to other states is beyond expression. When the history of this war is written the half of humanity will not believe it. We do not know what any moment may bring to us. Death and destruction faces us always, and what a peaceful view from my home here presents. One would think, thank God for a haven like this; but we sing a "starry night" and think of all our good friends in America and all over the world. I have a thought we shall all meet again in jubilation.

All our love.

As ever,

HARRY LAUDER.

National Maritime Union

REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN DIES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I have just received reliable information that the leaders of the National Maritime Union have definitely agreed to call a general strike in the event that Harry Bridges is ordered deported. Because of the seriousness of this threat, I desire to place in the RECORD the record of the National Maritime Union, a completely dominated Communist organization.

The National Maritime Union has its roots in the Marine Workers Industrial

Union. The Marine Workers Industrial Union was one of the affiliated organizations in the Trade Union Unity League, which was an out-and-out Communist affiliate. The T. U. U. L. was headed by William Z. Foster and was affiliated internationally with "red" international labor unions, with headquarters in Moscow.

In this statement I give you the leaders of the National Maritime Union and their records, which they cannot deny; and again I call upon the administration and upon responsible labor leaders and upon industrialists to take immediate action to expel from their ranks and their employment those who are no more nor less than the agents of foreign powers determined to sabotage our national defense. [Applause.]

MARINE WORKERS INDUSTRIAL UNION

Mr. Speaker, the National Maritime Union had its roots in the Marine Workers Industrial Union. The M. W. I. U. was one of the affiliated unions in the Trade Union Unity League which was an out-and-out Communist Party federation of labor organizations. The T. U. U. L. was headed by William Z. Foster and was affiliated internationally with the Red International of Labor Unions with headquarters in Moscow.

The Marine Workers Industrial Union never sought to conceal its connections with the Communist Party and other Communist-controlled groups. (See exhibit No. 1.)

CURRAN'S CHARGES

In the early days of the National Maritime Union, Joe Curran was among those who frankly charged the N. M. U. with domination by the Communist Party. In letters addressed to Peter Innes, Jr., Curran made his position clear on this matter. In his own handwriting, on August 23, 1936, Curran wrote to Innes, as follows:

> I frankly do not believe there is anything here as I believe the C. P. have broken all our chances up.

Again, with reference to the Communist Party in the National Maritime Union, Curran wrote to Innes, as follows:

> They think they are big shots now the C. P. have about got control of the outfit now with Tommy Ray director of operations here in New York.

(See exhibits Nos. 2A, B, 3.)

Tommy Ray, according to the testimony of several witnesses before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, is the Communist Party's dictator in the National Maritime Union.

CURRAN SWITCHES TO COMMUNISTS

It is the testimony of Peter Innes, Jr., and others that Curran switched from his critical position on the Communist Party to a position of complete following of the party line. This occurred late in 1936 when, according to Innes and others, Curran joined the Communist Party.

The evidence of Curran's subsequent closeness to the Communist Party is overwhelming. Instances of his connections with the party's organizations are listed below, as follows:

First. Curran's autograph on the delegate's card of Kenneth Goff at the eighth national convention of the Young Communist League. (See exhibit No. 4.)

Second. Curran speaking for the American Youth Congress along with Harry F. Ward and Max Yergan. (See exhibit No. 5.)

Third. Curran's article in the Champion Labor Monthly for September 1938, a publication of the Young Communist League. (See exhibit No. 6.)

Fourth. Curran's article in the Fraternal Outlook for June 1939, official publication of the International Workers Order, which is completely controlled by the Communist Party. (See exhibit No. 7.)

Fifth. Curran's speaking at a mass meeting of the International Workers Order. (See exhibit No. 8.)

Sixth. Curran's signing, along with many avowed members of the Communist Party, of the golden book of American friendship with the Soviet Union. (See exhibit No. 9.)

Seventh. Curran's membership on the Progressive Committee to Rebuild the American Labor Party which is the alleged Communist Party faction in the American Labor Party. (See exhibit No. 10.)

Eighth. Curran's speaking at the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, a gathering where such outstanding members of the Communist Party as Elizabeth Gurley Flynn also spoke. (See exhibit No. 11.)

Ninth. Curran's sponsorship of the American Relief Ship for Spain, one of the several Communist Party front organizations which raised funds for Loyalist Spain. (See exhibit No. 12.) The acknowledged Communist Party member, Marcel Scherer, was also a trade-union sponsor of this organization.

Tenth. Curran's signing of the Call to the Mexican and Spanish American peoples Congress, an out-and-out Communist Party affair. (See exhibit No. 13.)

Eleventh. Curran's article in Fight magazine, the official publication of the American League for Peace and Democracy. (See exhibit No. 14.)

Twelfth. Curran's signing of the letter to Attorney General Robert H. Jackson in the name of the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights. (See exhibit No. 15.)

Thirteenth. Curran's membership on the Murray Defense Committee, along with the representatives of numerous other Communist-controlled groups. (See exhibit No. 16.)

Fourteenth. Curran's speaking at a mass meeting in Madison Square Garden on an occasion when the Communist Party paid for the use of the building. (See exhibit No. 17.)

COMMUNIST PARTY PAYS THE BILL

According to a communication from the president of Madison Square Garden Corporation, the Communist Party of New York, through its treasurer, paid the corporation the sum of $3,500 for the use of the Garden when Harry Bridges was the featured speaker. (See exhibit No. 18.) The money was paid by certified check, drawn by D. Leeds, who was at that time the treasurer of the Communist Party of New York. (See exhibit No. 19.)

CHARLES L. KEITH

The educational director of the National Maritime Union of America is one Charles L. Keith. (See exhibit No. 20.)

Keith is an avowed member of the Communist Party. At the recent New York State convention of the Communist Party, Keith placed the name of Al Lannon in nomination for Congress. Lannon has long been active in the affairs of the National Maritime Union and its predecessor, the Marine Workers Industrial Union, and is a member of the national committee of the Communist Party of the United States. (See exhibit No. 21.)

CORBY PAXTON

The editor of the Pilot, official publication of the National Maritime Union, is Corby Paxton. (See exhibit No. 22.) A letter from Paxton to Mike Quin shows that Paxton was a member of the Communist Party in San Francisco, unit F, No. 9. (See exhibit No. 23.)

BEN RISKIN

A letter from the People's Press, signed by Ben Riskin, deals with the support of the seamen's strike of 1936 by this Communist-controlled publication. (See exhibit No. 24.) Riskin was formerly on the editorial board of the New Order, official publication of the International Workers Order. (See exhibit No. 25.)

MARINE TRAINING SCHOOL

For several years, the Communist Party conducted a marine training school in which party workers were trained for organizing among seamen. (See exhibits Nos. 26A–28B.)

MAY DAY PARADES

On May 1, 1940, the National Maritime Union was in the front of the march in the Communist-controlled May Day parade. The N. M. U. has participated in these parades for several years. (See exhibits Nos. 29, 30A, B, C.)

COMMUNISTS ABOARD THE SHIPS

The Daily Worker recounted how Communists threw the ship's library overboard in order to compel the crew to read only Communist literature. (See exhibit No. 31.)

Witnesses before the Special Committee on un-American Activities have pointed out the dangers of sabotage which even a few Communists among the crew are able to commit.

CHANGE IN LINE

The seamen's unions under the control of the Communist Party have, like all party-controlled organizations, changed their "line" in conformity with the shifting policies of the party itself. The evidence touching this single question is set forth in large volume in the publications of the Communist Party and of the affected unions.

Construction of Naval Vessels in Great Lakes Seaports

REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, in today's Washington newspapers there is news of importance to the country and news that is exceedingly welcome to the workers and industrialists of Ashtabula, Lorain, Cleveland, and all other Great Lakes ports, in that the Rush-Bagot treaty between this country and Great Britain of 1818 has been modified to facilitate the defense of both Canada and the United States from external attack, in permitting the construction of war vessels in Great Lakes seaports.

On January 15 I wrote to the Secretary of the Navy urging that the Rush-Bagot treaty with Great Britain be modified, and that its provisions be waived by an agreement, so that not only war vessels could be constructed at Great Lakes ports, but that they could be commissioned there, manned there, armed there, and that these squadrons be trained on the Great Lakes, and before they go through the Welland Canal down the St. Lawrence to the ocean, that they be equipped and prepared for immediate action. I am happy that the State Department, at this time, has procured modification of this treaty that has been in existence for 123 years.

One by one old ties have been severed. Flintlock muskets, tallow dips, stage coaches, and moustache cups have gone, and now this out-moded agreement between our country and Great Britain, adopted directly after the War of 1812, has been set aside in the interest of national defense. The people of this country should rejoice. In particular, the people of the Great Lakes communities have reason to be very happy over this. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, the following is my letter of January 15, 1941, to the Honorable Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 15, 1941.

Hon. FRANK KNOX,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: One criticism I hear of our defense program is that small industry in the Middle West is not being permitted to participate.

In this hour of great peril to Western Hemisphere security time is of the essence in the construction of a two-ocean navy—our first line of defense.

During the year or so following the Treaty of Ghent ending the War of 1812, the British Government proceeded to increase their naval forces upon the Great Lakes. The American Government conceived it would be unwise to enter into a naval rivalry. Our Government proposed that there should be a limit to the size and number of armed vessels kept by each nation upon the Lakes, or that both nations should abstain from maintaining armed forces beyond that used for the revenue service. British officials at first refused. Later, when our Congress authorized the construction of a large number of naval vessels on the Great Lakes, British officials reopened negotiations. I find that on August 2, 1816, Mr. Monroe proposed "in the spirit of the peace which so happily exists between the two nations" that the naval vessels of each on the Lakes should be dismantled. Finally, upon April 16, 1818, an agreement was ratified by our Senate, and since that date, at you know, there have been no American or British warships on the Great Lakes other than one training vessel of each country.

My view is that this agreement with Great Britain should be modified and its provisions waived so that our Government could commence immediately the construction of mosquito torpedo boats, destroyers, submarines, and gunboats in Great Lakes ports. I urge complete construction of such warships, commissioning of these ships, and training of the crews on the Lakes. These warships, after holding maneuvers in the Great Lakes and after the personnel has been thoroughly trained, should then be sent through the canal and down the St. Lawrence fully equipped for action.

This, Mr. Secretary, seems to me would bring our national-defense program closer to our people in Ohio, Illinois, and other States bordering on the Great Lakes and would give more of our people a direct opportunity to feel that they were doing a great deal to preserve our way of life. Employment would be given to thousands in the shipyards of Great Lakes cities such as Chicago, Cleveland, Lorain, Duluth, more naval vessels would be constructed during the next few years, and war vessels so constructed could properly be given names historically significant to people of Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, and other States, and enlistments would be stimulated, particularly in the Middle West.

That something like this has never before been done surely is no argument against this proposal; and I do hope, Mr. Secretary, that you will consider this important matter and take it up at a Cabinet meeting.

Most respectfully,
STEPHEN M. YOUNG.

Mr. Speaker, not only the Secretary of the Navy, but officials of our State Department, deserve proper credit for acting with promptitude and in a forthright manner in bringing about the modernization of this century-and-a-quarter-old treaty.

A Practical Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. ALBERT S. GOSS, OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me, I am pleased to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address of Hon. Albert S. Goss before the National Farm Institute at Des Moines, Iowa, on February 22, 1941. Mr. Goss is one of the outstanding authorities in this country on farm credit.

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, every night we are admonished over the radio to beware of substitutes. I regret the circumstances that have caused me to substitute for Mr. Taber, master of the National Grange. I regret that you are denied the privilege of hearing from him. I regret the last-minute shift that has brought me here under a misunderstanding as to the exact subject I was to speak on, for you will find that I am not going to talk on the subject assigned to me as it appears on the program. You will also find that Ed. O'Neal and I didn't do any collaborating. You may conclude that we have some sharp differences of opinion. Differences of opinion, you know, are what make horse races and bring out all sides of the question. The Bureau and the Grange may have some differences, but on the whole they involve minor details. On the essential objectives of agriculture, we are in hearty accord. On the question under discussion, the differences are not as great as they may sound. They are largely a matter of timing. The Bureau is approaching the problem more from the immediate or emergency standpoint, while you will see that we are approaching it from the long-range or permanent-remedy view.

The subject, Needed Improvements in the Farm Program, is rather difficult to speak on, for it seems to imply adjustments perfecting the existing procedure. While there have been many fine accomplishments, such as soil conservation, rural electrification, crop insurance, marketing agreements, and others, I feel that the basic existing program is nothing more than an emergency program, and much of what has been done must be undone before a sound and permanent farm program can be developed.

On the other hand, we are still in an emergency, and some of the emergency practices must be continued for the time being. No lasting or sound economy has yet been developed. The war boom alone has brought temporary relief, if such it can be called, and unless we can develop an economically sound program, while war conditions exist, we will find, when the war is over, that we face worse conditions than we have yet seen. When the war is over we will face a different world. It is hard to conceive of a war-ravaged world being able to buy much of anything for cash. In general, we should strive to develop our economy along two major lines.

First, we should try to bring into balance the purchasing power of all groups within our own country, for right here at home are the choicest markets of all the world, if our economic system is such that there is an equitable or parity income for all who serve the common good, and thus obtain the broadest possible purchasing power.

Second, agriculture should develop a type of production which will not only supply our own needs, but one in which its export crops could be readily exchanged with nations which produce the things we must import. If we consistently build our program around these two basic principles, we will pass through the difficult years of peace adjustment with the least dislocation and jar.

For many years we have been treating symptoms instead of basic causes. The problem is so broad that no single remedy is possible. Agriculture's difficulties are due to many different causes, varying with each commodity and almost with each community. The National Grange has approached this

problem from a broad standpoint, as will be indicated by the following statement of policy embodying 17 points. It will be noted that some of them deal with emergencies, and some of them with a permanent long-range program. The statement follows:

SUMMARY OF GRANGE PROGRAM

"The first and foremost duty of the Nation is to defend America, and to preserve American ideals. We must build a system of defense that will be strong enough to meet any emergency, and we must do it with utmost speed.

"As a part of our scheme of national defense, it is vital that agriculture, our fundamental industry, be given proper consideration and placed on a sound basis. Agriculture asks for fair treatment rather than for special privilege. It seeks economic justice rather than subsidy. The National Grange advocates the following principles:

"1. Give agriculture its fair share of the national income. So long as farmers are compelled to buy at prices that have been raised artificially, while selling at a lower level, it is imperative that some form of benefit payments be continued until a better method of correcting this disparity is developed.

"2. Establish a plan by which groups of producers may elect to make use of a quota system to maintain prices for their products on the domestic market comparable to the prices they have to pay. [This is one of the essential points and has purposely been left broad for reasons which I will enlarge upon.]

"3. Assure the American market to the American farmer to the limit of his ability to supply it.

"4. Terminate at the earliest possible date all trade treaties that are proving harmful to agriculture.

"5. Remove all unnecessary trade barriers between States.

"6. Encourage research to find new uses for farm products, thereby diminishing the harmful effects of agricultural surpluses.

"7. Provide incentive payments to encourage production of new crops which may prove useful, especially in contributing to an efficient national defense. [We might have added, to develop a type of production designed to stimulate world trade.]

"8. Continue distribution of surplus food products to the needy, especially under the food-stamp plan.

"9. The Federal Government should take proper steps to assist in the development of a better farm marketing system.

"10. Restore the Farm Credit Administration as an independent agency of the Government, and maintain the lowest interest rates consistent with a sound loaning policy. [This is the subject I would really have liked to talk on. I consider it of major importance.]

"11. Continue soil-conservation and land-use programs, but never as a means to promote crop control.

"12. Practice greater economy in the affairs of government—National, State, and local.

"13. Maintain an adequate system of transportation, giving free play to the forces of legitimate competition.

"14. Encourage the further development of farmer-owned and controlled cooperative associations to reduce the present excessive spread between producer and consumer.

"15. Maintain the family-sized farm as the standard of American agriculture and discourage large-scale or corporation farming, thus upholding America's greatest bulwark of democracy.

"16. Promote a more satisfactory rural life through development of educational facilities, good roads, and rural electrification.

"17. Encourage cooperation, good will, and mutual understanding between agriculture, industry, and labor to promote the common welfare."

Almost every point in the program would justify use of the time allotted on the whole subject. So I will confine my remarks to the first and second points.

BASIC TROUBLE WITH AGRICULTURE

The basic trouble with agriculture—once our chief industry—is that it has been treated as a stepchild in the rearing of the economic family. When we first embarked on a policy of encouraging manufacturing by erecting tariff barriers, Alexander Hamilton pointed out that we would increase the living or operating costs of every man, woman, and child in America, and that we must extend equal protection to all, including the exporting industry of agriculture, if we were to preserve a well-balanced economy. This we failed to do. On the contrary, in order to keep other groups and industries abreast of the protected industries, we have gradually adopted various types of protective devices for our transportation—truck, rail, water, and air—for our insurance companies, for our financial institutions, for labor, and for scores of other industries, but agriculture has not been brought under the protective system.

It is true that many plans have been tried, but have either proved inconsequential or not effective, because of two basic problems that have been ignored. We have not recognized that agriculture is different from most industries because many of its branches have been dependent upon exports, and we have not recognized the difficulties in the way of organizing six and a half million farmers to protect themselves from cutthroat competition. This trend has been going on for years and agriculture has been gradually slipping into a position of greater disadvantage year by year, until recently it has been receiving the lowest percent of the national income in our history. When 25 percent of our people, with over forty billions invested in plant and equipment, even at present depleted values, receive a bare 11 percent of our national income, and when a good portion of the receipts are expended in taxes, labor, and other unavoidable production costs, something is decidedly wrong. Forty-five percent of our people are either engaged in farming or directly dependent upon the income of farmers for a livelihood, and when our system subjects 45 percent of our people to scant rations, it is no wonder that the whole Nation has unsuccessfully struggled with the recovery problem, for this problem will never be solved until there can be a more equitable distribution of the national income. If the proper balance could be restored, the increased purchasing power of this 45 percent of our people would soon solve our recovery problem.

America produces the greatest per capita wealth among nations and for a dozen years has had the largest percent of unemployment. We have been saved from having the greatest poverty and distress as a result of maldistribution of the wealth produced, largely by subsidies and charity. This is not only the farm problem, it is the problem underlying national recovery.

Farm income comes from the sale of farm products. We all know how surplus production drives down price. Frequently a large production brings the farmer less gross income than short crops. The farm-income problem therefore narrows down to the imperative necessity of having prices for farm products in economic balance with other industries. We know this is impossible on export crops. But is it impossible for the American farmer to get an equitable price on the crops consumed domestically? If we have to accept a foreign price on both the domestic portion and the export portion, agriculture's position is hopeless unless we can reduce our production to meet our domestic needs.

In the first place, this probably cannot be done, as the experience of the last few years has proved. In the second place, if it could be done, it is not an economically sound solution of the problem. It is not more sound to expect agriculture to keep out of the export business than it is to expect the automobile industry, or any other manufacturing industry, to stop exporting. Did you ever stop to consider that every step of progress civilization has made, down through the ages, has been marked by a greater consumption of goods and services? Deliberately to try to create prosperity by creating a shortage is defying economic law, and when we do that we bring on a whole train of direful consequences. The only answer, therefore, is an American price for the portion of our crops consumed domestically. In other words, a two-price system. I might say here that I did not collaborate with CLIFFORD HOPE, although we agree with him just 100 percent.

There are a number of ways in which this can be done—some simple, some complicated, some involving strong Government control, some strong farmer control. Whatever we do, we must be realistic and recognize that farmers have not been able to do the job themselves and must have help. I am not advocating gifts or subsidies. They are demoralizing. They can never be more than barely enough to avoid utter collapse. They keep the recipients in a beggar frame of mind psychologically and a beggar condition physically. What I advocate is such practical aid as will bring the farm income up to a comparable position with that of other industry. Then, and not until then, will there be stability in our national economic life.

THE PLACE TO BEGIN

How is this to be done? There are two distinct schools of thought with reference to it. One argues that if industry is put on its feet prosperity for agriculture will follow. The other says that agriculture must be put on its feet before there can be full prosperity for labor and industry. In answer to the first school, we need but recall that labor and industry enjoyed the greatest prosperity in our history during the 1920's, while agriculture lost its shirt. We lived off our working capital until our accumulated wealth was reduced 40 percent and the bankrupt condition of agriculture and the back country was one of the most potent factors in bringing on the unprecedented collapse of the early 1930's.

Turning to the second school of thought, whenever agriculture has enjoyed a substantial income, labor and industry have always prospered. A comparison of the number of people gainfully employed, with farm income, will show that with every increase of farm income, men were put to work, and with every decrease, they lost their jobs.

This is no mere coincidence. There is a sound reason for it. The farmer is the largest consumer of any class. Let us compare him with the doctor, the lawyer, or the workingman. Each consumes about the same amount of food, and shelter, and clothing, and transportation, and entertainment. But in addition to this the farmer, in order to get any income at all, must operate a small manufacturing plant, in which he consumes farm machinery, fertilizer, fencing, stock and implement housing, labor and everything that goes into the manufacture of farm products. In other words, the farmers run more than 6,000,000 small factories and pay all the cost of upkeep of such operation. So a dollar of farm income immediately goes into a type of circulation which puts men in industry to work. It has been figured that for a score of years, approximately every $275 of increase in farm income has put 1 more man to work.

As an indication of what this means, we all know what is meant by parity. Although the farm income during the 5-year period 1924 to 1929 was 5 percent below parity, it represented a goal we have been struggling

to attain ever since, so let's call it normal, just to illustrate my point. The average farm income during the last 5 years, when our present farm program has been in full operation, has been two and one-half billion dollars less than normal, or three billions less, if Government payments are deducted. The difference between normal and the farm income of the past 5 years would put 10,000,000 men to work.

HUGE SURPLUSES DEPRESS PRICES

This does not sound as much of a problem today as it would have seemed a year ago, before the war situation completely changed the economic picture; but we must not forget that these war conditions are temporary; that they will disappear, soon we hope, and that we must have a sound foundation under our economy if we are not to be plunged into a depression worse than the last. So we can ill afford to continue the basic maladjustments which now exist. Now is the time to take preventive steps.

Congress realized this in 1933 and attempted to meet the situation by a number of steps, including the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which relied upon the processing tax as a means of making a two-price system effective. This tax applied to but a few commodities, and before it could be put into effective operation it was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. At that time a great mistake was made. Instead of developing other means to meet the situation, we reasoned that if our farm problems were due to surplus production, the most effective remedy would be to abolish the surplus. I have previously pointed out two reasons why this is unsound. Let us see what happened. I will take cotton. Without attempting complete accuracy, I will use well-rounded figures to illustrate what I am driving at. We determined there must be a sharp reduction in cotton production and paid farmers to reduce acreage some 30 percent. They cut out their poorest land, took the benefit payments to buy more fertilizer, and raised more cotton than ever.

Neither Dame Nature nor human nature submit to regimentation gracefully, and when it became apparent that it was impossible to adjust production to that nicety which would result in just enough to force up prices but not enough to create want, another approach was taken. The theory of controlling price through shortage was retained, but this time it would be a controllable shortage of the ever-normal granary, made possible by crop loans. We loaned cotton farmers 10 to 12 cents a pound to hold their crops off the market on the theory that buyers would be compelled to go into the market and pay the price the farmers demanded, at least the loan price. But what happened? Instead of Europe meeting our price theories, they increased production in other parts of the world, so that some millions of acres were put into cotton in India, Egypt, and Brazil, and they ran off with our cotton markets. On the other hand, no farmer would sell for 7 cents a pound in the world market if he could borrow 10 cents a pound under terms which would not require him to repay the loan, and we piled up millions of bales of cotton, until last year we had a 13,000,000-bale carry-over.

Now, there is just one reason why cotton dealers buy cotton. They expect to sell it for more than they paid. And with 13,000,000 bales of surplus cotton overhanging the market, there was just one direction the price could go. In other words, cotton loans gave the farmer a better price than the market afforded at the time but piled up trouble for the future. What happened to cotton happened in only a less degree to wheat, corn, and other products, until the net result of our efforts to force up prices through artificial shortages has been to create the greatest surplus problem in our history. Mark this well: If it were not for the war, we would see prices at the lowest ebb since 1932 because of these surpluses. If it were not for these surpluses, we would see the highest prices since the twenties because of the war. It would be comic if it were not so serious. That is the reason I say we must undo much of what has been done, forget academic theories, and start on a sound program based on realities.

Do not misunderstand me. I am not opposed to the advantages of an ever-normal granary, but I want to point out emphatically that the creation of such a surplus will bear down the farmer's price and assure a low income unless steps are taken to control the domestic price. Neither am I opposed to the proper use of crop loans. I see two such uses. One, a limited one to avoid dumping and permit crops to flow to market in an orderly manner; the other, a strictly emergency measure for controlling prices. As such, they are effective and may be justified as temporary expedients until a basic remedy can be put into effective operation. Used too much, or too long, they are breeders of future trouble. I might point out that the loan plan as presented by Mr. O'Neal this morning is made contingent upon controlling the supply and preventing a surplus. If this can be done, the plan will work.

The basic trouble with crop loans is that they do not permit the crops to flow to market. This is the basic trouble which time and again has defeated any system of price fixing. In my judgment, no system of price fixing will work unless it provides an effective means of permitting the surplus to flow to market at whatever the export market will bring. If this is done, an economically sound method of establishing a compensatory domestic price is possible. This the Grange advocates. It has not limited its advocacy to any one plan. In my judgment, no single plan can be developed which will cover every commodity. It is no more possible to give cotton and milk the same treatment than it is to include eggs and wheat under one program. Nevertheless, I am confident that there is a practical program for most farm crops and that the problem can be solved.

DUAL PRICE SYSTEM WORKABLE

For the benefit of those who say that a dual price system is an economic impossibility, I would like to illustrate by suggesting that it would be entirely possible to establish a Government corporation, through which every pound of wheat would be sold. That corporation could establish a domestic price to the farmer of $1 per bushel and could sell for domestic use at $1.50 per bushel. The margin would enable the corporation to give away our 25-percent surplus to feed war-torn Europe and have money left over. I don't advocate such a plan, because there is a better way, but it can be done.

Or, to use another illustration, where effective cooperative marketing groups exist and where 75 percent of the producers of a crop would so petition, every producer could be compelled either to market through a cooperative or with a private agency which would maintain the same price schedules as the cooperative, all under Government supervision, to see that such schedules were just to producer and consumer alike. This is somewhat in line with the marketing agreements which have proved the most effective measure the present administration has devised, and I believe some such adaptation can be worked out for perishable crops.

You may have noted some details in the second proposal of the Grange as I read it. These details recognize certain sound principles. First, under any system designed to give agriculture a fair price someone must estimate the domestic and export quotas—not production quotas, but marketing quotas. Having determined these, the allocation of quotas to individuals should be done with the cooperation of the farmers themselves. Let me digress and say that we believe in farmer ownership and farmer control of the whole farm set-up. We oppose centralized control and resent the practice of making up a program in Washington, taking it out and selling it to the farmers with high pressure salesmanship and one-sided presentation, and then calling it the farmer's program.

Let me digress again right here to point out that at this point provision could be made for establishing a sliding scale on domestic quotas which would encourage the family-sized farm and discourage corporation and large-scale commercial farming. Then production control would begin to operate under the self-enforcing laws of economics rather than under regimentation of man-made laws and regulations. Personally, I believe this is justified because I think the very safety of America depends on maintaining the farm home and a prosperous family-sized farm agriculture.

Were there time, we might discuss in detail two or three other means which might be applied to certain crops. It seems to me, however, that what is needed most to improve the agricultural situation is an enabling act which would set up a board with broad powers to apply any one of a half-dozen measures, or more, in the manner which would best meet the problems of any crop or any locality. I believe it is entirely possible to find means to assure prices which will prove compensatory to the good farmer on most of our basic farm products. Nothing will cure slovenly farm practices, or unintelligent production. Here an altogether different type of remedy is necessary, and that is education. In large sections of our country, that is a crying need. But education will do little throughout some of the large producing farming areas which are contending with impossible economic conditions.

In closing, let me remind you that for 20 years we have struggled with this problem and made no progress. Is there any sound reason why we should not try something direct and effective?

We still have the right to repeal laws if necessary, but certainly the trial would not result in worse conditions than have prevailed during the past 20 years. Certainly we could not do more violence to economic law than we have done during the last dozen years.

Irish Have Played a Vital Part in Development of United States

REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON, OF IOWA

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include a copy of the speech delivered by our colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HARRINGTON] at the ninety-second annual dinner of the St. Patrick Society of Brooklyn, N. Y., held at the

Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City on Monday, March 17, 1941.

The speech delivered by Mr. HARRINGTON on that occasion follows:

To the United States; yes, to each and every one of them and the glorious history of them all. Within the borders of each there is no Irishman who would not be given a warm welcome. By the same token there are none of our people who would not feel at home and proud of our ancestry because of the significant and vital part which our race played in the birth and development of all of the 48.

In fact, the history of the United States is so emblazoned and glorified with the names of brave and brilliant men and women of Irish blood who have helped in the struggles for the freedom of our democracy and the personal liberties guaranteed to us under our constitutional Bill of Rights, that I shall pay tribute in passing by mentioning the names of but few. They do not need it. They belong to the ages just as surely as do Washington and Lincoln. One of the most eloquent voices raised in the Continental Congress on behalf of freedom was that of John Rutledge. Need I recall to this audience the deservedly illustrious names and achievements of Charles Carroll of Maryland, Maj. Gen. John Sullivan, who opened the Revolutionary War on land by the storming of Fort William and Mary; of Commodore Barry, or the O'Briens? I want to recall briefly the epic of Maurice O'Brien and his five sons. It deserves telling, and always delights good Irish hearts.

The British warship *Margaretta* came to anchor in Machias Bay, Maine, in May 1775. She had been sent to subdue the rebellious colonists. Maurice O'Brien, with his five sons, got together a band of patriots, and they put out in their fishing boats and promptly captured this proud British ship of war. Angered and humiliated, the British admiral sent two more war ships, the *Diligence* and the *Tapnaguish*, to punish the colonists, and to recapture the *Margaretta*. Instead, Maurice O'Brien and his five sons, heading a band of patriots, again put out in their fishing boats and promptly captured these two additional British warships. Jeremiah O Brien, the oldest son, sailed with the three prizes to Watertown where the Provincial Congress was in session, and delivered them over to the Congress to become a part of the first American Navy.

Truly it has been said that Commodore Barry was the father of the American Navy, but that the O'Briens might be classed as its grandfathers.

But the fame of Irishmen and their great exploits is not confined to New England or New York or Philadelphia, or for that matter, to any one section of the country or era of its history. The Great Plains of the Middle West from the Alleghenies to the Rockies, and from Canada to New Orleans, felt the vigorous, intelligent hand of the Irish.

On the slopes of the Pacific, and in the great Southwest the names of Irishmen are enshrined forever. At the Alamo in Texas, at Custer's last stand on the Little Bighorn River in Montana, the Irish served with valor and distinction. In fact, the history of the winning of the West is so interwoven with the lives of the sons and daughters of Ireland that a notable western historian says of them that "They and their descendents are more nearly the truly great Americans, because they are the building Americans, than any other nationality which came to the shores of this continent from the time of its discovery."

Builders—yes; builders all—not alone with hands, but with minds and hearts and souls as well. In every profession, the arts and sciences, in every walk of life, you have found the Irish among the leaders since the beginning of the westward expansion and before and continuing on up to the present day.

No race has given the world greater names, or abler statesmen, more successful generals, more eloquent orators, more enchanting poets, more entrancing musicians, more powerful religious leaders, more energetic entrepreneurs, than have the Irish people.

Among those whose names are famous as pioneers in the development of western industry we find James C. Flood, James G. Fair, and William O'Brien, who developed the gold and silver mines of the West. Cyrus McCormick invented the reaper and other agricultural implements which revolutionized farming in America, and the great Mississippi Valley was transformed into the bread basket of the whole Nation.

But gold and silver and improved farm machinery were not enough—until another Canadian-born Irishman, James J. Hill, laid the third foundation stone of the wealth of the Northwest by building its first great railroad system, thereby giving effect to its magnificent economic potentialities. The story of Jim Hill's masterful planning, his untiring efforts, his ability to overcome obstacle after obstacle, until at last he completed a great transportation system from Chicago to the Pacific coast, is in itself one of the great business romances of modern times.

If it is true, as it has been said, that the "Irish built the railroads of America," then it is doubly true in the case of western railroad development, because it was to the railroad camps of the sixties, seventies, eighties, and nineties that many of the Irish immigrants flocked for employment; and throughout the West today the sons and grandsons of these people are to be found as leaders in hundreds of communities.

It was men such as these who helped to hew this great western nation out of the primeval forests and granite-walled mountains—always in the forefront were the indomitable Celts.

But that is not the only contribution of the Irish of the plains and mountains. What of religion, medicine, education, poetry? Archbishop Ireland stands out as a Gibraltar of Christianity in the West. To him, perhaps more than to any other, must go great credit for the vision, the courage, the hope of the western pioneer. So great has been his influence for good that even today the work that he wrought in colonization has given the States of Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, the Dakotas, and Montana, particularly, populations which are more truly, humble, God-fearing Americans, than any.

And who does not recall the lovely lyrical, earthy ballads of James Whitcomb Riley, or the philosophical mysticism of the poems of Father Charles O'Donnell, both of Indiana?

Who in the educational world does not remember the story of Thomas Halfpenny, sometimes called the schoolmaster general of Illinois; and who is there who does not recall with a prayer in his heart the skill of that great surgeon, Charles Murphy, of Chicago?

To be a bit more recent and in still another field of endeavor, does anyone here have to be reminded that the great Boston College football teams of the past few years have been coached by a South Dakota Irishman, Frank Leahy; or that those wonder teams which Fordham has been turning out are coached by that Irish wit from Wisconsin, Jim Crowley?

And so, my friends, whatever the calling—wherever in this grand country of ours we may chance to be—of one thing we can be certain—there'll always be Irishmen of distinction.

In closing I want to repeat a story which applies to this last statement.

In the young Irish disorders in Ireland in 1848 there were nine men tried and convicted of treason against Her Majesty the Queen. All were sentenced to death, but before passing sentence the judge asked if there was anything that any of them wished to say. Thomas Meagher, speaking for all, said:

"My lord, this is our first offense, but not our last. If you will be easy with us this once, we promise, on our word as gentlemen, to try and do better next time. And next time—sure we won't again make the mistake of being caught."

Thereupon, the indignant judge sentenced them all to die—to be hanged by the neck until dead and drawn and quartered in the approved fashion.

But passionate protests from all the world forced Queen Victoria to commute the sentences, and the nine men were banished for life and transported to far away, wild Australia.

In 1874 word reached the astounded Queen that the Sir Charles Duffy, who had just been elected Prime Minister of Australia, was one of the nine men whose sentences she had commuted and who had been banished 26 years before. On the Queen's demand the records of the rest of the transported men were revealed, and this is what the amazed British ruler found had happened to the other eight who had been banished with Duffy:

Thomas D'Arcy McGee, Member of Parliament, Montreal; Minister of Agriculture and President of Council of the Dominion of Canada.

Richard O'Gorman, Governor General of Newfoundland.

Morris Lyene, Attorney General of Australia; and

Michael Ireland, succeeded him in that office.

Terence McManus was a brigadier general United States Army, as was Patrick Donohue.

John Mitchell was a prominent New York politician and the father of New York's later mayor, John Purroy Mitchell.

Thomas Meagher, who had done the talking for all nine men at the time of their sentencing, had been Governor of Montana.

So it seems that Irishmen will be successful any time, anywhere, under any circumstances. We are a strange mixture of success, happiness, and sometimes melancholy. The tear and the smile oftentimes sparkle on the cheek together. The warm, deep, impetuous temperament of the Irish must have been the inspiration for these few lines from Santayana:

"O world, thou knowest not the better part,
It is not wisdom only to be wise,
And on the inward vision close the eyes,
But it is wisdom to believe the heart."

And so again I say to the Irish of the United States—north, south, east, and west—they have built, and planned, and fought, and studied well; but in so doing they have not forgotten the dictates of their souls, nor of their hearts.

Agriculture During and After the National-Defense Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY DR. JOHN LEE COULTER

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to me, I take great pleasure in presenting the views of Dr. John Lee Coulter on the important matter of agriculture during

and after the national-defense crisis, to the Members of Congress and the country. Dr. Coulter is one of the leading agricultural economists of our country.

The address follows:

At this time, when so much special consideration is being given to foreign wars and to national defense (by the Government and by writers and speakers in the press and over the radio), it may be wise to pause for a few moments to ask about the Nation's welfare from the point of view of food products, fiber and textile materials, leather products, sugar, and the many other special products of agriculture. I shall, therefore, devote the short period at my command to a brief discussion of such problems as—

(1) Will there be enough of all of these important farm products for all of our people?

(2) To what extent must we depend upon imports to supply our national requirements?

(3) Are there any important surpluses available for export or to accumulate as reserves?

(4) Would it be desirable to curtail production of some farm products while encouraging the expansion of others?

(5) What about the price structure and inflation?

(6) What chance is there for farmers to reach price parity or to gain a fair share of the national income?

These are only a few of the vital problems confronting the people of this country, from the standpoint of agriculture. Since time does not permit a full outline and discussion of all of different aspects of agriculture's situation, we shall limit ourselves to only a brief reference to these.

HOW NEARLY SELF-PROVIDING IS THE UNITED STATES?

1. Clearly, our first problem is whether there will be enough of all important agricultural products to supply the people of this country during this crisis. The answer is "yes." The United States is in an entirely different position from Great Britain or the Continent of Europe or the great Chinese-Japanese Empires or other great areas on the face of the earth. Fortunately, the United States, extending from the Canadian border to the Gulf of Mexico and from the Atlantic to the Pacific seaboard, has such a wide range of temperature, of rainfall, of soils, of altitudes, etc.—indeed, such a wide range of all of the important natural features—that it may be said without fear of contradiction that no other similar area and no other country in the world is so abundantly provided with so nearly every important agricultural product—grains and seeds, fruits and vegetables, livestock products of every sort, and important special products such as sugars, starches, oils and fats, and the like.

Even such exotic or foreign products as bananas, coffee, and cocoa are readily available in Latin-American countries immediately south of us. Only a few special agricultural items such as tea and rubber are not available in the Western Hemisphere in quantities sufficient for our normal use. And now science is advancing so rapidly that we may presently find ourselves producing in factories synthetic rubber and such fibers and other products as are not available to us in their natural form. On this point it may unquestionably be stated that the United States is more nearly independent of outside sources than any other nation, large or small, on the face of the globe.

Many students, political leaders, businessmen, and others—hearing of the world struggle for food and other farm products—are often led into the false position of trying to drag us into the same struggle.

WHAT ABOUT OUR NEEDS FOR IMPORTS?

2. From what I have already said, it appears that the second question has largely answered itself. The United States does not need to depend in any large measure upon foreign areas for products of agricultural origin except such exotic items as already referred to—like tea, coffee, cocoa, rubber, etc. It is true that in normal times we do import considerable quantities of various products of farm origin, especially of fibers such as silk, jute, wool, linen and coarse fibers such as hemp and sisal. But in the case of many of these, the people of this country could very well get along for long periods without great worry, and many of them or their equivalents could readily be produced by our own farmers or in synthetic factories.

WHAT ABOUT EXPORTS OF SURPLUS PRODUCTS?

3. Our next question had to do with the problem of exporting burdensome surpluses of a few staple farm products. During normal times the United States has been one of the world's greatest surplus producers of certain nonperishable products such as cotton, tobacco, and wheat, and has had considerable quantities of some other important farm products available for export. Our principal markets for these products have been Great Britain and various western European countries together with Japan. All of these are now involved in military activities. In other words, our export markets for perhaps two-thirds of our surplus products are now largely closed to us. As a result, one of the leading problems confronting agriculture in the present crisis is what to do with these surplus products.

SHOULD WE ATTEMPT TO REDUCE SURPLUS ITEMS AND EXPAND OTHER PRODUCTS?

4. During the great World War tremendous armies moved back and forth over Europe and destroyed literally millions of acres of wheat, oats, barley, and rye, as well as sugar beets and other crops. Large portions of the gardens, orchards, and vineyards were destroyed, and untold numbers of livestock were consumed during the emergency. A tremendous market was opened for most of our surplus farm products and prices doubled in a relatively short time. But an entirely different situation presents itself during the present struggle. Destruction in the warring areas is being held to a minimum, and increased production is being stressed. Now our problem really is, Shall we continue to produce these surpluses and accumulate great warehouses full of cotton, tobacco, wheat, and other items, or devote more attention to other farm products?

WHAT ABOUT THE PRICE STRUCTURE?

5. Turning to the domestic market, attention is frequently called to the fact that many millions formerly unemployed will presently be fully engaged as a result of the vast defense program now being organized. It is suggested that with the reemployment of five or ten million workers, there will be a tremendous increase in the domestic demand for food, textiles, leather, and all other farm products. It is even suggested that domestic prices of these farm products may again advance to relatively high levels.

Lest this point of view be overemphasized, it may be well to remember that during the long depression period, through which this country has been passing, practically all of the unemployed have been fed and clothed. If they were unable to purchase supplies from normal earnings, they have been largely provided through government or other channels. While it is true that the least prosperous would undoubtedly buy more meats, dairy, and poultry products, fruits and vegetables if they were financially able, it probably would not be wise to conclude that the demand at home will be increased to such an extent as to justify any hope for—or fear of—run-away prices due to change in domestic demand. If there should be a large shift from cotton, tobacco, wheat and other surplus crops to the livestock items, fruits, vegetables, etc., it is more likely that the prices of all would suffer.

If there is a great upsurge in prices, it is more likely to be due to an unsound economic structure, unwise increases in wage rates, or other undesirable situations.

And in this connection it will be well for those engaged in agriculture to bear in mind that prices of commodities and services which farmers must buy may advance at as great a rate or even more rapidly than prices of products which farmers have for sale. Since there is nothing to indicate a great expansion in the market for such commodities as cotton, tobacco, wheat, and some other stable products, it is more likely that agriculture will be less well off as a result of the national-defense crisis now receiving almost universal consideration.

WHAT CHANCE IS THERE FOR FARMERS TO ATTAIN PRICE PARITY OR INCOME PARITY?

6. The last question stated is particularly pertinent at the present time because of the fact that during the last 3 years (1938, 1939, and 1940) the National Department of Agriculture has continued to report that, in spite of all efforts on the part of the Government, farmers have received an average of less than 80 percent of what is defined as price parity, which was set as the goal in order to attain for agriculture a fair share of the national income.

Another way to state this question is to inquire whether it is likely that new conditions in the world, including our own national-defense program, will be of such a character as to bring farm prices and farm income into harmony with prices in general and national income in general—in face of the fact that the Government, after years of experimentation and effort, has failed to accomplish these desirable goals.

Now, I have reviewed only a few of the special problems which clearly are going to face those interested in the welfare of agriculture. There is nothing in the picture thus far to indicate great gains for farmers as a result of the new wars now raging in most other parts of the world or as a feature of the national-defense boom. In other words, there is nothing to indicate that farmers may hope to secure a more equitable share in the national income. The situation thus far, in the new wars which are raging, is entirely different from that during the great World War of 25 years ago.

ARE WE PREPARED TO FACE THE PROBLEMS WHICH MUST BE MET WHEN PEACE TAKES THE PLACE OF WAR?

Even so short a discussion as that which is possible in 10 or 15 minutes would be incomplete without a concluding reference to prospective conditions when peace is restored and great wasteful and extravagant programs have come to an end. Undoubtedly much of the world is already weary of the conflict and wishes that somehow destruction and waste might be brought to the earliest possible close.

Whether peace comes soon or is long delayed, what the outcome may be, and how the terms of peace are finally negotiated are not a part of my statement. I am only presenting some of the leading problems of agriculture which should not be left to solve themselves.

From the standpoint of agriculture and of national welfare, it is important we begin even now to consider the difficult problems which must present themselves with the close of wars and national-defense programs. If, as a result of pyramiding wages, prices, and values, the United States, along with the rest of the world, moves into a new period of uncontrollable inflation because of unsound and unwise economic programs, must we again pass through a great period of deflation and depression? Must we again face a period of vast unemployment and distress? Must we again face a period of bankruptcy and economic chaos?

My only conclusion at the moment is that it would seem that, as part of the great national-defense program, the time had already arrived when thoughtful and deliberate consideration should be given to the probable situation after the fury of wars have spent their force. If we merely stand by and hope that demand for farm products will increase, that farm prices will be improved, and that farmers' share in the national income will be more just, and, at the same time, assume that new burdens will not come to farmers in the form of taxes and higher prices for all goods and services purchased, is it not likely that we are indeed living in a fool's paradise, engaged in wishful thinking, and counting upon short-time gains to conceal the distress of long-time losses?

If I had one wish more than any other to express, it would be that agricultural leaders, and all others interested in both agricultural and national welfare, begin to turn their attention now not only to the immediate problems involved but to the long-time difficulties which may confront us as a result of present chaos.

San Francisco Bay and Hunters Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, for many years the strategic importance of San Francisco Bay and Hunters Point, with its immense drydocks, which are among the largest drydocks in the world, has been stressed by the Navy and War Departments.

The recent purchase of Hunters Point by the Government was based on the findings and report of special naval boards on many occasions. Nearly 25 years ago a special commission appointed by Congress, having Admiral J. W. Helm as senior member, reported, in part, as follows:

San Francisco Bay is the only body of water on the Pacific coast south of Cape Flattery offering a safe anchorage from wind and weather to a large number of ships which can be entered under all ordinary conditions of wind and sea.

San Francisco Bay has ample anchorage, with a good holding ground for a fleet of any size.

Later Admiral Charles F. Hughes, then Chief of Naval Operations, made the following statement:

San Francisco Bay is, as you know, the principal harbor of the Pacific coast. To my mind, it belongs to the Nation; it is not the property of California nor of the cities that are on its shores. From its natural advantages and its location, San Francisco Bay is certain to be the major continental fleet base for any extensive campaign in the Pacific. It will be the point where the fleet will concentrate at the beginning of a war.

When the bill authorizing the purchase of Hunters Point was before the Committee on Naval Affairs, former Chief of Naval Operations Admiral William D. Leahy made the following statement during the hearings:

The program does not provide for a naval drydock in the San Francisco Bay area capable of taking a major capital ship. The privately owned drydocks at Hunters Point, lacking in the equipment necessary for repairs to our large war vessels, are not a satisfactory solution to the Navy's problem in time of war.

In my opinion, the Navy should acquire the Hunters Point drydocks and should provide weight-handling facilities, power connections, galley, latrines, storehouses, and an assembly plant to permit the overhaul of our largest vessels in conjunction with the Mare Island Navy Yard.

On March 8, 1939, in hearings before the Committee on Naval Affairs, the Chief of Naval Operations made the following statement with regard to the need of naval docking facilities:

The situation confronting the Navy with respect to adequate drydocking facilities is of serious concern to the national defense. Docking facilities on the west coast and in Hawaii are now inadequate to meet the needs of the existing fleet in time of peace. Even with the completion of the drydocks now under construction at the Navy Yards, Mare Island and Puget Sound, the peacetime situation will become steadily worse unless further relief is afforded as vessels now under construction or authorized are added to the fleet.

The question of docking facilities has been the subject of exhaustive study and analysis in the Navy Department over a great many years. Shortages exist in all sizes of docks to meet peacetime and wartime requirements. As a result of these studies the Department has outlined a program of additional docking facilities considered essential for the proper support of the fleet in the Pacific.

The results of the studies mentioned in the second paragraph of the above quotation indicate the absolute need for 13 additional drydocks on the west coast and in Hawaii if the overhaul requirements of the Navy now in being, under construction, or authorized are to be met. As regards sizes of these additional docks, these are as follows:

Battleship and carrier	2
Cruiser	2
Destroyer and destroyer leader	9

During these same hearings Rear Admiral Ben Moreell, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, made an equally strong presentation before the committee urging the purchase of Hunters Point.

During the consideration of the bill, now Public Law No. 106, the Naval Affairs Committee, by resolution, requested the appointment of a special naval board to make further study and negotiate for a purchase price for Hunters Point and Hunters Point drydocks. This special board subsequently reported unanimously in favor of the Government acquiring the property and agreed on a purchase price of $3,933,572. In addition to the purchase price, an additional $2,000,000 was appropriated for the necessary equipment referred to by Admiral Leahy.

It has developed that the $2,000,000, in addition to the purchase price of the property, is entirely inadequate to meet the present emergency. Both Admiral Harold R. Stark, Chief of Naval Operations, and Rear Admiral Ben Moreell, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, recommend an additional appropriation of $2,500,000 at this time to adequately equip Hunters Point for the repair of larger naval vessels.

The special board on Hunters Point drydocks, in its report to the Secretary of the Navy, made particular reference to inadequate drydock facilities on the Pacific coast, as follows:

Studies of shipbuilding and drydock facilities, both naval and commercial, show that on the Pacific coast there are at the present time only one existing naval drydock and another under construction which will accommodate battleships and aircraft carriers. (Dock No. 3, at Hunters Point, which is a commercial dock, is not taken into consideration for reasons which will be made apparent in the next paragraph.) Both of these docks are located at the Puget Sound Navy Yard, Bremerton, Wash. In other words, in a coast line some 1,260 miles long, naval facilities for docking our capital ships exist at only one point, namely, the northern terminus of our coast line. Except during the summer months, operations of the fleet are carried on at least 1,000 or more miles to the southward of this point. This means, in effect, that for the greater part of the year any of our major ships requiring regular or emergency docking in naval docks must steam on the order of 2,000 or more miles. With excellent facilities available in the San Francisco Bay area, such a procedure is economically unsound. Furthermore it is illogical to presuppose that, in the event of a national emergency, concentration of all of our major ships would take place at only one point, and that point the most northern one, of our Pacific frontier. Thus, both from economic and strategic viewpoints, the establishment of a naval drydock capable of taking care of our capital ships in the San Francisco Bay area is fully warranted. * * *

The power-length ratios of naval vessels are many times greater than those of commercial vessels and, as a consequence, the normal commercial yard does not have the shop capacity nor the weight-handling equipment which are essential for proper overhaul of naval vessels. As was pointed out, the Hunters Point dock is lacking in even the minimum essential facilities for minor overhaul and the present owners have failed to provide these facilities on the ground that the income from their plant does not warrant the necessary expenditure.

There are two graving docks at Hunters Point—the larger of the two will dock any ship that can pass through the Panama Canal. The smaller dock can accommodate ships of the cruiser type.

Hunters Point drydocks in San Francisco Bay and the Bremerton Navy Yard drydocks are the only docking facilities along our entire Pacific coast—extending more than 2,000 miles from Canada to Mexico—which are capable of handling large ships, such as men-of-war, airplane carriers, or large merchant ships, for repairs. The Hunters Point drydocks are advantageously located about midway between the Canadian and Mexican borders, while the Bremerton facilities are 815 miles north of San Francisco Bay. As a matter of fact, if you will follow the great triangle extending from the Aleutian Islands to Hawaii and thence to the Panama Canal, often referred to by the Navy Department, there are only four drydocks within the triangle—two on the Pacific coast, one at Pearl Harbor, and one at the Panama Canal.

The Mare Island Navy Yard, located on the northerly end of San Francisco Bay, under normal conditions employs approximately 3,000 men. Today there are over 17,000 men employed in that yard. This force is being increased daily. By reason of inadequate housing facilities, thousands of men journey miles to their employment in this particular navy yard. There are men living in the vicin-

ity of Hunters Point who travel daily to the Mare Island Navy Yard, making a 60-mile round trip back and forth to work, necessitating the payment of four bridge tolls. It is estimated that 75 percent of the work at the Mare Island Navy Yard is reconditioning and repairs. This is the very purpose for which the Government purchased Hunters Point—to recondition and repair the larger ships f the Navy.

It should be known and without any intended reflection on the Mare Island Navy Yard, which was built on the upper end of San Francisco Bay during a period before vessels of the present draft were contemplated, that 30 percent of the present tonnage of our Navy could, under no circumstances, be taken to the Mare Island Navy Yard for repairs.

The Navy which is the first line of our national defense consists of three links—the Navy, the merchant marine, and facilities to build, dock, and repair ships, all of which are interdependent upon each other.

Regardless of the warning of the highest naval authorities for years, including the recent statement by that eminent authority on naval affairs, former Chief of Naval Operations, William D. Leahy, the Bureau of the Budget disregarded these appeals and warnings and eliminated the reasonable request for an appropriation of $2,500,000 to complete the necessary equipment of Hunters Point.

Based upon my own lifetime study of these Pacific coast marine matters, I most urgently recommend Congress appropriate these funds that the Hunters Point drydock facilities may in fact become the great defense asset intended.

Payment to the San Carlos Apache Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

MEMORIAL FROM THE ARIZONA STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, throughout the Seventy-fifth and Seventy-sixth Congresses I have endeavored to get through a measure which would correct a mistake made by our Government in regard to some lands lying south of the Gila River in Arizona and known as the San Carlos strip. This legislation is needed to deal justly by the Indians and also certain white settlers who are now occupying the land. We did pass the bill early in the Seventy-sixth Congress but in such a form as to merit a Presidential veto. On February 14, 1940, the House gave further consideration to this legislation, which had passed the Senate and been several times reported out unanimously by the House Indian Affairs Committee. This legislation has again been introduced, and the following memorial from the Arizona State Legislature requests favorable action on it at this time.

The memorial is as follows:

House Concurrent Memorial 2

Concurrent memorial relating to authorization by Congress of payment to the San Carlos Apache Indians for lands ceded by them and the reopening of the lands to location and entry

To the Congress of the United States of America:

Your memorialist respectfully represents:

A bill (S. 254) is now pending in the Congress to authorize payment to the San Carlos Apache Indians for the lands ceded by them in the agreement of February 25, 1896, and reopening the lands to mineral entry and making them a part of the public domain.

The bill in question is designed to rectify errors made by governmental agencies in permitting citizens to homestead lands in the so-called San Carlos strip and in issuing patents to the State of Arizona and leases to other persons for lands therein, whereas under the agreement above referred to the land shoul' have been opened to mineral entry only.

The proposed bill appears to provide the only equitable method of preserving the rights of all parties concerned, and all parties concerned favor passage of the measure. It is unjust that citizens who have expended much time and money in developing lands in the San Carlos strip should be ousted therefrom when the fault lies not with the citizens but the governmental agencies. It is likewise unjust that the lands be used without compensating the San Carlos Apache Indians therefor; and it appears that, if other settlement be not soon made, the Indians and the Indian Service will demand complete restoration of the lands involved.

Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona (the Senate concurring), prays, That the Congress of the United States speedily enact S. 254, authorizing payment to the San Carlos Apache Indians for lands ceded by them, and reopening those lands to mineral entry, in order to settle for all time the confusing and conflicting claims to the lands, and to do justice to all parties.

Kenneth Farrand Simpson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, one of the saddest sights to me in Washington is that of this Capitol when the flags are flying at half mast.

There is nothing morbid about my feeling, and it certainly is not fear. Rather I find myself musing about the shattered dreams, the broken plans, and the unfulfilled intentions of some late and lamented colleague who may or may not have been a close friend or associate. For, only a few mortals in the eleventh hour of their life have been privileged to cry out in all truth:

My work is done. I have carried out all my plans and ambitions.

That more of us are not enabled to do that is perhaps the greatest tragedy of life. Perhaps it is fate, perhaps it is our own fault, because we have somehow failed to use fully each shining minute and hour that life placed at our disposal. I do not know. I do not expect to ever know in life.

What I do know is that when my friend Kenneth Farrand Simpson died recently, a useful life was shattered in midflight. Still gloriously young, he had apparently ventured only a few steps toward his goal of great usefulness to this Nation. His service as a soldier and his great serevice to his Nation and party had only whetted his ambition to one day work harder among us and help make the Nation's laws and play his part in guiding us toward more peaceful intercourse with other nations.

I had ample chance to study him closely and to learn his ideals. I found him high-minded, eager, intensely devoted to his party and strikingly loyal to his friends. Party meant much to him. We owe him much for having infused such tremendous energy and revitalizing influence in again making his party a powerful factor in governmental affairs—city, State, and Nation.

At 45, Kenneth Farrand Simpson had gone far along the road of life. At 45 he had gone farther in fact than many of us here assembled may have the privilege of going. How close he came to his ultimate goal none of us can know, but if he could speak it would be to urge us on to our best and to be loyal to our dreams and faithful to our ideals.

He was that way on earth and the fact death has removed him from us does not seem to dim the courage his presence seemed to ever infuse.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

AN ANALYSIS OF AGREEMENT PERTAINING TO THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, a cursory glance through the context of the new agreement between Canada and the United States for the construction of what has become known as a St. Lawrence seaway, would indicate that there is very little difference between that and the proposed treaty of 1938 for the same project.

I have studied the new agreement carefully, comparing it with the proposed treaty of 1938, and find some significant changes in phraseology, meaning, and intent. There are many of my colleagues who would be interested in this analysis, I believe, and therefore, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following which sets out article by article, the provisions cited in the proposed treaty of 1938, and those in the present agreement:

St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

Agreement of 1941	Proposed treaty of 1938
Article I	
The Commission: Article I of the agreement calls for the establishment of a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin Commission consisting of not more than 10 members of whom an equal number shall be appointed by each Government. By an exchange of notes the Governments may change the number of members on the Commission, provided, however, that an equal representation of each Government be maintained (subpar. 1, 4). The Governments, by an exchange of notes, shall prescribe rules and regulations for conduct of the Commission, and may extend or abridge its powers and duties, and upon completion of its duties, may terminate its existence (subpar. 4).	The Commission: Same as in agreement 1941.
Divisions of work: The Commission is to allocate construction to the two Governments in such a way that each Government shall construct the works within its own territory or an equivalent proportion in the International Rapids section (subpar. 1-b).	Division of work: Same as in agreement 1941.
Other duties of Commission: To prepare plans and specifications for construction work in the International Rapids section, in accordance with controlled single-stage project (238-242) for works in the International Rapids section; to approve all contracts in behalf of the Governments for works in the International Rapids section; supervise construction, and submit annual reports to the Governments, on the progress of the works; to certify to the Governments upon completion of the works, and perform other duties assigned to it, by the agreement.	Other duties of Commission: The Commission could prepare plans and specifications in the International Rapids section in accordance with any one of the projects described in the report of the joint board of engineers with appendixes, dated July 13, 1927. It provided, however, that any modifications, which might be agreed upon, of any joint board of engineers' plan, could not increase the proposed total cost of the project as estimated in the aforementioned joint board of engineers' report. This discretionary power differs from the single project (238-242) called for in the current agreement. This article also stipulated the Commission was to serve as an advisory body to the two Governments for the purpose of coordinating all plans for the comprehensive development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin. This is not included in the present agreement. The remaining duties were the same as present agreement.
The countries further agree: The Commission shall have authority to employ such persons and make such expenditures as may be necessary; may avail itself of governmental agencies, officers, etc., as may be available; that remuneration and general expenses, etc., of its members shall be paid by the respective Governments and that other expenses of the Commission except as provided for in Article III shall be borne by the Governments in equal moieties (subpar. 2).	The countries further agree: The provisions are the same, with the exception that no mention was made as to the manner of remuneration for general expenses of the general Commission, etc.
Both Governments agree to permit entry into their countries within the work areas involved in the agreement—International Section, Niagara River Section—of personnel necessary to carry on the work and to exempt such personnel from the operation of their immigration laws and regulations within those areas. The same thing applies in the case of materials, should the Commission allocate certain construction works for one Government to perform in the territory of the other Government (subpar. 3).	The same provisions were made to cover exemption of immigration laws from customs, excise, and other imposts, whether Federal, State, or Provincial.
Article II	*Article II*
Financial obligations of Canada: According to this article, Canada agrees to construct works in the international rapids section allocated to Canada by the Commission, and to operate and maintain or arrange therefor, works situated within Canada (subpar. a). Canada further agrees to complete at a date not later than December 31, 1948, the Canadian links in the seaway, including the Welland Canal deepening, providing, however, that war conditions or defense requirements justify a modification of this period of time when Canadian work shall be completed, the Governments may, by exchange of notes, defer or expedite their completion (subpar. b).	Financial obligations of Canada: The provisions were just the same. The date of completion was set at not later than December 31, 1949. The proviso for deferment of Canadian work was not included.
Article III	*Article III*
Financial obligations of the United States: According to this article, the United States agrees to construct works in the international rapids section allocated to the United States by the Commission and to operate and maintain or arrange therefor, works situated within the United States (subpar. a). The United States further agrees to supply funds for the construction, design, and supervision, of all works in the international rapids section, with the exception of machinery and equipment for the development of power and for rehabilitation works on the Canadian side (subpar. b). The United States also agrees to complete work in the international rapids section and in the Great Lakes system above Lake Erie at a date not later than the date of completion of the Canadian links of the seaway (subpar. c).	Financial obligations of the United States: The provisions were just the same.
Article IV	
Development of power in the international section: The Governments agree they may install or arrange for installation of such machinery as may be required for the development of power at such time as may be most suitable in respect to their power requirements (subpar. a). The Governments agree, in view of the need for coordination of plans for the development of power in the International Rapids section, that the Commission may arrange for engineering services in either country with any agency authorized to develop power in that section of the St. Lawrence (subpar. b). Permitted diversions: Except as modified by article VIII, the Governments agree each country shall be entitled to the use of one-half of the water available for power in the International Rapids section (subpar. c). Control of flow in International Rapids section: The Governments agree that the flow of water through the International Rapids section and out of Lake Ontario shall be so controlled and regulated as to maintain present depths of water for navigation and shipping purposes in the harbor of Montreal and the navigable channel of the St. Lawrence River below that city, and so that power developments in the Canadian section of the St. Lawrence River shall not be adversely affected (subpar. d). Test period required: Upon completion of the works they shall be operated with the maximum water level held at 238.0, sea level datum, for a test period of 10 years, or shorter period as may be approved by a board or authority established under provisions of paragraph (f) of article IV. Should the board decide the maximum water could practicably exceed 238.0, the Governments may, by exchange of notes, subject to the terms in the notes, authorize an operating elevation exceeding 238.0 (subpar. e). Board to control diversions, regulate flows, etc.: The Governments may, by exchanging notes, provide for a board or authority to control or supervise the diversion of water in the International Rapids section, to regulate the flow out of Lake Ontario and through the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River, and to report on the feasibility of increasing the head under which the power plants at the International Rapids section may operate (subpar. f). Provisions for 14-foot canal: During construction of works in the International Rapids section adequate facilities for maintaining existing 14-foot navigation in that section shall be provided (subpar. g).	
Article V	
Ownership of works constructed: Nothing in the agreement confers upon either Government proprietary, legislative, or administrative, or other jurisdiction in the territory of the other, and they agree that all works constructed under the agreement's provisions shall constitute a part of the territory in which they are situated.	

PROPOSED TREATY OF 1938	AGREEMENT OF 1941	PROPOSED TREATY OF 1938
In this proposed treaty, the United States did not have to pay for the powerhouse superstructures nor the side canals and locks located on the Canadian side as in accordance with the present agreement.	*Article VI* Other canals permitted: Either Government may construct alternate canals and channels for navigation in the International Section, or in waters connecting the Great Lakes, within its own territory, at any time. Water may be utilized for such purposes.	*Article VI* Other canals permitted: The same provision was included excepting that approval of the Commission was required.
Provisions just the same.	*Article VII* Rights of navigation in St. Lawrence River and Great Lakes system: Both Governments agree that the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River system, notwithstanding the provisions for termination contained in any treaties, shall be open for navigation to the citizens or subjects, ships, vessels, and boats of each Government.	*Article VII* Rights of navigation in St. Lawrence River and Great Lakes system: In this article the following quotation appeared: "Nothing in this article or in any other article of this treaty shall be construed as infringing or impairing in any way the sovereignty of the United States of America over Lake Michigan." The remaining provisions as to navigation were included.
Article IV Development of power in the international section: The provisions were just the same with the exception that the article stated the Governments might construct powerhouses as well as install machinery at such time as their requirements for power might dictate.	*Article VIII* Diversions: Each Government within its own territory must measure the quantity of water diverted from or added to the Great Lakes system. It shall file such records with the other Government semiannually (subpar. a).	*Article VIII* Diversions: Same provision.
The Governments agree that the Commission shall arrange for engineering services with any agency in either country authorized to develop power in the International Rapids section.	Other diversions allowed: Each country has the exclusive right to use boundary waters in quantities equivalent to any waters diverted into the Great Lakes system from watersheds lying wholly within their particular country at all points below the point of entry of such waters added to the Great Lakes system from other watersheds (subpar. b).	Other diversions allowed: Provisions were substantially the same.
Permitted diversions: This article provided that the equal diversion of water for power purposes in the International Rapids section was to be controlled daily.	If either Government authorizes diversions—except as permitted in the preceding paragraphs—they agree to give immediate consideration to any objecting representations made by the other Government. It is agreed that should it be impossible to otherwise reach a satisfactory settlement, that the matter will be submitted to an arbitral tribunal which shall be empowered to direct such compensatory and remedial measures as it may deem just and equitable. The arbitral tribunal shall consist of three members—one appointed by each Government and a third, the chairman, selected by both Governments. This applies to any diversion made in excess of that permitted in either country on January 1, 1940 (subpar. c).	Instead of this section applying to diversions in excess of those permitted on January 1, 1940, it stipulated that water should not be diverted through the Chicago Drainage Canal in excess of the amount established by the Supreme Court by decree rendered April 21, 1930, and that diversion through that canal would have to be reduced to that amount by December 31, 1938. Any diversion made in excess would be considered "emergencies," and in the event the Canadian Government took exception, the matter was to be submitted for final decision to an arbitral tribunal, similar to the provisions proposed in the new agreement. The proposed treaty also stipulated that no diversion of water other than that referred to in connection with the Chicago Drainage Canal would be permitted to another watershed unless approved by the International Joint Commission.
Control of flow in International Rapids section: The provisions were just the same with the exception that no mention was made concerning the control of flows through the St. Lawrence River International Rapids section so as to not adversely affect power developments in the Canadian section of the St. Lawrence River.		Compensatory and regulatory works: Provision just the same.
Test period required: No such provision appeared.	Compensatory and regulatory works: The Commission is required to report upon the desirability of regulatory and compensatory works in the Great Lakes system and should the Governments approve these, prepare plans and specifications for the works and recommend allocation of their costs. The Governments are to make arrangements for their construction through exchange of notes (subpar. d).	
Board to control diversions, regulate flows, etc.: No provision for this board or authority.	*Article IX* The Niagara Falls project: The Commission shall prepare plans and specifications for works in the Niagara River, taking into account the recommendations of the Special International Niagara Board. These works are to distribute and control waters of the Niagara River so as to prevent erosion and enhance the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls.	*Article IX* The Niagara Falls project: Provisions were substantially the same.
Provisions for 14-foot canal: Not directly mentioned in proposed treaty but included in the plans of the International Joint Board of Engineers, one of which by terms of the treaty had to be substantially followed.	The Governments may make arrangements by exchange of notes for the construction of such Niagara River works, including temporary diversions to facilitate construction. The cost shall be borne in equal moieties.	The provisions were the same with the exception that the Governments were required to make arrangements for the construction works. The remaining provisions were substantially the same.
Article V Ownership of works constructed: Provision is just the same.	Notwithstanding amounts specified in article V of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, the United States may authorize an additional diversion within the State of New York, above the Falls, at a rate not exceeding 5,000 cubic feet of water per second, and Canada may, within the Province of Ontario, divert a like amount, upon completion of the Niagara River works.	Provisions the same.

AGREEMENT OF 1941	PROPOSED TREATY OF 1938
The Commission is required to test Niagara River construction works under a wide range of conditions and to certify to the Governments the effect of such works and make recommendations respecting water diversions. In doing so, the Commission shall take special cognizance of scenic beauty of the Falls and rapids, the requirements of navigation on the Great Lakes system, and efficient utilization and proportionment of waters for power purposes. The Governments may, by exchanging notes and concurrent legislation, determine the methods by which these purposes may be attained.	The provisions were the same excepting that the Commission was required to report on the equal and equitable diversion for power purposes, rather than just the efficient and equitable as in the present agreement.
Article X	*Article X*
Claims: Each Government agrees that provisions for the disposition of claims and satisfaction of valid ones occurring in the territory of the other in connection with construction by such Government of works authorized by the agreement, shall be made (subpar. a). Each Government is released from responsibility for damage or injury to persons or property in the territory of the other caused by any action authorized by the agreement other than damage or injury covered in the preceding paragraph (subpar. b). The governments agree that each will assume responsibility and expense in acquisition of lands required to carry out the agreement.	Claims: No provisions made for these claims. Provisions were substantially the same.
Article XI	*Article XI*
Ratification: The agreement is subject to the approval of the Congress of the United States and the Parliament of Canada. Following such approval it shall be proclaimed by the President and ratified by the King of Great Britain. It shall become effective on the day of exchange of the instrument of ratification and a copy of the proclamation which shall take place at once.	Ratification: The treaty shall be ratified in accordance with the constitutions of the two governments. Same provisions.

Wisconsin Legislature Wants More Dairy Products Served to Our Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE LEGISLATURE OF WISCONSIN

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, in the permission given me to extend my remarks I wish to include a joint resolution passed by the Wisconsin Legislature memorializing the President of the United States, the Congress, the Secretaries of War and the Navy to provide our armed forces with adequate dairy foods.

I have previously taken this up with the Secretary of War and was advised that the daily cheese allowance is one-fourth ounce per enlisted man. We in Wisconsin, where more than 50 percent of the Nation's cheese is produced and where we know the value of good cheese in the daily diet, feel that this one-fourth of an ounce of cheese per day is not playing fair with the dairy industry, which is by far the largest single agricultural industry in America. I am certain that all the boys from Wisconsin serving in the armed forces would eat several times that amount if it were available.

While I have been advised by the Quartermaster General that the boys are given a liberal allowance of milk, I still feel that a great many men would rather drink milk than either coffee or tea if it were permissible for them to choose. Certainly no food or combination of foods comes nearer to being a balanced ration than does good clean milk from healthy cows. I am certain that our Wisconsin Legislature would not have passed this resolution if they did not have facts upon which it is based, namely, that many Wisconsin men have let it be known that they would like more dairy products in their daily ration.

Why not give them what they like best? I am sure that nobody will object. They deserve the best we can give them, even if the cost should be a trifle higher than it is at present.

The resolution follows:

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 4

Joint resolution memorializing Congress, the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy to use their offices, powers, and influence to cause our armed forces to be furnished with adequate dairy foods.

Whereas it appears that oleomargarine is used almost to the exclusion of butter, cheese, and other dairy products in feeding the armed forces of the United States; and

Whereas it is common knowledge that dairy products are far superior in food value to any substitutions; and

Whereas it is desirable that the industrial benefits from the defense program be distributed uniformly throughout the Nation; and

Whereas the dairy farmer has not received his equitable share of the increased business resulting from the defense program or any previous Federal program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That this legislature respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States, the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy to use their offices, powers, and influence to cause our armed forces to be furnished with adequate dairy foods; and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, to both Houses of the Congress of the United States, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

VERNON W. THOMSON,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ARTHUR L. MAY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
WALTER S. GOODLAND,
President of the Senate.
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

The Power Situation in the Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO THE EDITOR OF THE PORTLAND (OREG.) DAILY JOURNAL

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication sent recently by the Secretary of the Interior to the editor of the Portland (Oreg.) Daily Journal:

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Daily Journal of March 21, 1941]

A LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR OF THE UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, *March 14, 1941.*

To the EDITOR OF THE JOURNAL:

I have read the editorial appearing in the Oregon Daily Journal on March 6, in which you discuss my recent statement relative to Governor Sprague and the power situation in the Northwest.

I will not seek to match the malapert invectives employed by you, as apparently you excel in that field. However, I feel called upon to analyze a few of your statements and to present, if you will accord my letter space in your newspaper, a few of the facts involved.

The Honorable WALTER M. PIERCE, former Governor of Oregon, said in the House of Representatives on March 6 (the date of your editorial) that "Under pressure of defense this great monopoly (the Aluminum Co. of America) has attempted a repetition of its wicked and scandalous monopolization of Niagara power. It would now monopolize, for a single private industry, the present

available power of the greatest power stream on earth. There is a perfect setting for this proposed monopolization—a Governor ready to fight for Alcoa, a complacent State utilities commissioner, and a legislature controlled against public power. A subservient press streamlines the effort."

I would emphasize that this analysis of the situation was made by an honored citizen of Oregon who has received repeated votes of confidence from the citizens of that State.

Had I not renounced any effort to match you in the employment of invective and innuendo, I would be tempted to call attention to the Congressman's concluding sentence: "A subservient press streamlines the effort." I cannot, for the same reason, now dwell upon the application of that statement to your editorial. Nor can I now speculate on the reason for the omission from your editorial of any reference to the more than $1,000,000 spent since 1935 by the privately owned utilities in attempts to influence elections in the Northwest. I will, therefore, reserve for another occasion the observation that it appears to have been spent in an effective manner.

You state that "what irked and alarmed Governor Sprague, Mayor Riley, of Portland, and many others in Oregon was not so much what Mr. Ickes did in refusing Alcoa additional power but the high-handed and arbitrary manner in which he did it." The law governing the administration of Bonneville was passed by the elected representatives of the people, including many of those from Washington and Oregon. That law provides that we shall "prevent the monopolization thereof (the power generated by Bonneville) by limited groups."

Simple arithmetic demonstrated that Alcoa, if its request for more power had been allowed, would have a monopoly of the power available for industrial consumers. In fact, Alcoa, if we had granted its request, would have under contract, for an indefinite period, 55 percent of the ultimate installed firm capacity of Bonneville.

What, then, was high-handed or arbitrary in refusing the request for more power? We could not do otherwise under the law. To determine that two and two make four may be arbitrary and high-handed, but it is the right answer.

Is it, in your opinion, high-handed and arbitrary to enforce the law? Or is it high-handed and arbitrary only when its enforcement is felt by monopolies?

Although the Aluminum Co. of America was denied additional power, as required by law, another company, the Reynolds Metals Co., was enabled to commence operations in the same area. The power available for industrial purposes will, therefore, be fully utilized.

Do you not believe that the diversity of interests resulting therefrom will contribute to the economic stability of the Northwest? That is one of the benefits contemplated by that section of the law which precludes monopoly.

Perhaps light can be thrown on your position respecting monopoly by an observation derived from one of your statements.

You say that "Westerners were pioneering in the power field before Mr. Ickes knew the difference between A. C. and D. C." Perhaps that is so. But I am versed in economic philosophies and yours smacks of that in vogue in B. C.

In another choice bit of vitriol you suggest that "The West neither needs nor wants a tin-crowned Washington bureaucrat to give it lessons in power utilization or to crack the whip and yell 'Giddyap! Whoa!'" Your individual preference, apparently, is for a gold-plated Wall Street market manipulator who will crack the whip for eastern-controlled holding companies.

I doubt if sober analysis of your editorial by you will result in any pride of authorship, for you say, in effect, that the West does not want the Federal Government to construct such projects as Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and Boulder Dam. Or is your position that, now that they are constructed, or nearing completion, you want the Federal Government to turn them over to the holding companies for exploitation?

I stand, as I have always stood, for the development of these resources by and in the interests of the people, as determined by the Congress; not by and in the interests of monopolies. I will administer the law as passed by the Congress; not as interpreted by those who serve a private interest.

So,

"Lay on, Macduff;
And damn'd be him that first cries, 'Hold, enough!'"

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

Flanner House of Indianapolis—An Institution of Unique Characteristics That Might Well Serve as a Pattern for Other Industrial Centers

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1941

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, in the city of Indianapolis, in the district which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, there is an institution which has demonstrated a great capacity for service in improving conditions among our colored people and which may well be considered and evaluated as an example of what might be accomplished by similar institutions located in other centers of population.

This institution is known as the Flanner House, and its function is to prepare Negroes for practical service along the lines of their various aptitudes. It derives its name from Frank W. Flanner, a philanthropist of far-seeing vision, who donated three lots and a building to establish the institution which was founded in 1898 by a group of white and colored citizens to meet a specific social need among colored persons.

Since 1925 more than 2,500,000 southern Negroes have moved into the industrial North. Thousands of them came to Indianapolis in response to the great demand for unskilled labor which followed immediately after the first World War. A recent study of our local problem indicates that 88.5 percent of all Negro family heads were not natives of Indianapolis. Most of them, because of their background, were not fitted for life in a large industrial community. With the coming of the depression they found themselves out of work and untrained to meet the keener competition for jobs. They became a problem to themselves and consequently to our community.

PROBLEM CREATED IN ALL INDUSTRIAL CENTERS

This trend has indeed created a real problem, not only in Indianapolis but, broadly speaking, in all of the industrial centers of the North. In Indianapolis the answer has been found in the Flanner House, which, during 43 years of service, has been working unceasingly and intelligently toward the solution of this problem arising from Negro migration northward, which has become especially acute during the last 15 years. Through it the interests of many of our Indianapolis people of both races have been directed toward making a larger proportion of Negro citizens self-supporting and self-reliant. By promoting Negro welfare, Flanner House has been markedly successful in promoting the welfare of our community as a whole. Through the interest of the Board of Trustees, composed of prominent local citizens, white and Negro, a most efficient staff has been built up, capable by training and experience to direct its work effectively, with Cleo W. Blackburn at its head as superintendent. Frank B. Flanner, an outstanding businessman of Indianapolis, is president of the board of directors. The vice president of the board is F. B. Ransom, a nationally known leader of the colored race. There are 22 members of the board of directors and 69 members of the advisory committee, comprising solid, substantial men and women of both races. Governor Henry F. Schricker, of Indiana, and Mayor Reginald H. Sullivan, of Indianapolis are among the members of the advisory committee.

A THREE-FOLD PROGRAM

The essentially rural background of our Negro population has made it necessary that Flanner House offer a three-fold program, as follows:

First. Education for living in a large industrial city.

Second. Vocational training to enable this group to earn its living.

Third. Leadership training to the end that their efforts as citizens may be directed in the best channels.

The main purpose of Flanner House is to train Negroes along practical lines, thus enabling them to take their part in the activities of the workaday world and assuring them of the happiness and self-respect that come from self-support and a realization of the Negro's best opportunities for service.

The institution maintains vocational training departments of various kinds, an employment department, which is one of its most valuable instrumentalities of service; a health department; social service department, and so forth.

In my home city and State Flanner House is at this time very much in the public eye because of a drive just recently begun to raise a fund to construct a new institutional building. This drive is in most competent hands. Harry V. Wade is the general chairman of the campaign; Russell W. McDermott is chairman and Mrs. Kin Hubbard, widow of the distinguished humorist, vice chairman of the special gifts division.

PLANS FOR NEW BUILDING

The new Flanner House will be equipped to attack the great problems of poverty, sickness, dependency, and crime.

It is planned as a modest fireproof building which will serve as headquarters for important city-wide activities of the agency.

The new building will provide for a vocational-training program, including woodwork, metal crafts, sewing, laundering, maid craft, cooking, and training of gardners, chauffeurs, housemen, and caretakers; teaching upwards of 600 young men and women a year as against 250 in the present quarters. This at no additional cost.

The new building is designed to provide for an adequate up-to-date nursery and nursery school to care for more than 100 youngsters of working mothers. Currently, facilities for this important work are almost completely worn out and the present cramped quarters provide no isolation room, no adequate bathing facilities and no equipment for an education program.

The new Flanner House through its expanded recreational facilities will be a powerful agent in the prevention of delinquency and crime by keeping Negro youth wholesomely occupied during leisure hours. In the new building will be a gymnasium-auditorium which will make available recreational facilities to hundreds of boys, girls, and adults not now being served.

Last year the 4 health clinics at Flanner House served approximately 1,000 different patients. The new building will make available medical and dental clinic services for more than 2,000 persons annually. This expanded program will have a direct bearing upon general community health.

In 1940 the Flanner House free employment department received 21,000 applications for jobs. Although operating in woefully overcrowded quarters, the department was able to place 6,500 applicants. The new building is designed to expand this department, rendering more efficient service to employer and employee alike, and removing hundreds of additional families from relief rolls. Here, indeed, the well-known Flanner House tradition—helping others to help themselves—will find its full expression.

The decision to build a new Flanner House was reached only after more than 2 years of careful research and analysis on the part of representative Indianapolis citizens.

The financial objective of the building program, $150,000, will make possible grounds, building, equipment, and necessary maintenance.

BOOTH TARKINGTON'S TRIBUTE

Booth Tarkington is a warm friend of Flanner House, and I quote a statement made by him a few days ago, entitled "Flanner House," as follows:

"United we stand, divided we fall" is a familiar statement of a truth recognized by all Americans. We know it is true, and especially in this year of 1941 we know that its truth is being tested and that if we don't strongly unite in friendly cooperation with one another, it's not impossible that we may weakly slip into cruel divisions fatal to all of us. Flanner House in Indianapolis is a bright and encouraging symbol of the sort of voluntary union that helps to keep us strong; and the fact that in this serious year Flanner House plans to expand is a good omen, indeed. Every citizen of Indianapolis who has at heart the welfare of Indianapolis Negroes knows something of the sturdy influence of Flanner House, where colored people are helped sensibly—taught how to make themselves useful and self-supporting and self-respecting, and therefore happier. Even more important, however, than its provenly successful work of turning helpless Negro citizens into capable Negro citizens is the fact that Flanner House is by no means merely a charity supported by richer white people for the alleviation of the lot of poorer colored people. No; Flanner House is the result of the united efforts of those enlightened colored people and white people who have what has been called educated hearts, and who, working together in good will, contributing together their time, intelligence, and money, have made Flanner House valuable to the life of their city.

Indianapolis can benefit now from a greater, a larger Flanner House; and if we generously manage to give that to ourselves, we shall also be contributing in no small measure to the all-American defense that first and last depends upon our being one people indivisible.

MY TELEGRAM TO MR. M'DERMOTT

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion permit me to say that I, too, have a great heart interest in Flanner House because I know the well-springs that motivate it. I have witnessed it in operation over a long period of years and I have seen much good come from its beneficent activities. On the opening day of the drive I sent to Mr. McDermott the following telegram, which expresses my true and sincere interest in the project, based on personal observation:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 14, 1941.*
Mr. RUSSELL W. MCDERMOTT,
Indianapolis, Ind.:

Flanner House is a credit to our community, to our State, and to our Nation. Every dollar invested in it is an investment in human progress and human happiness. It is an investment to help to make the world better. I am sure that our people recognize the value of Flanner House and its beneficent activities, and regard it as a splendid community asset, and I hope that all who can render assistance in the drive that is now beginning will exercise the utmost liberality in supporting it. I would have been greatly pleased if I could have returned to Indianapolis to be with you today and to testify by my presence to my great interest in Flanner House, and the movement in its behalf, of which you are a chosen leader. Although my exacting committee duties make it impossible for me to leave Washington at this time my heart is with you, and I am wishing you the utmost success in your drive.

LOUIS LUDLOW.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

ARTICLE BY JAY FRANKLIN

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is one of the soundest economical and practical proposed developments which will come before this Congress. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Jay Franklin, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on Monday, March 24, 1941, and which gives a new angle on the subject:

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 24, 1941]

Behind the Government's decision to push through the St. Lawrence seaway and power project as a part of national defense lies the realization that a shortage of industrial power has been driving industry out of New York State.

The proposed development on the International Rapids will harness 1,100,000 horsepower of hydroelectric energy, while nearly 800,000 additional horsepower will be tuned in at Niagara Falls for American use, with comparable amounts available to Canada. This will constitute the largest single source of hydroelectric power in the world.

The release of this energy, which will largely be for use in New York State, will make possible a 25 percent reduction of rates, with annual savings to industries and private consumers of about $26,000,000 annually. This represents a "social investment" of nearly $900,000,000, capitalized at 3 percent, as against a total cost to the United States Government for the combined power and seaway project of $166,000,000. While the engineering estimates are not conclusive, the costs have been allocated as follows: Of the $266,000,000 required to complete the works at the International Rapids, $150,000,000 is to be contributed by New York State ($90,000,000) and Canada ($60,000,000) in return for power allocations. While Canada undertakes to deepen the Welland Canal, the United States Government will spend $50,000,000 to dredge the 86-mile stretch of the Detroit and Lake St. Clair Rivers and the 63-mile stretch (including a new lock) on St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie.

JOBS FOR 50,000 WORKERS

The need for this additional power in New York State—to convert the St. Lawrence into an industrial pistol aimed at Hitler's new Europe—is shown by studies of the St. Lawrence survey. Since 1919 manufacturing employment in New York State has dropped from 1,228,000 to 996,000 in 1937. This decline is partly due to failure to develop industrial power. In the 10-year period, 1927–37, while the United States as a whole increased its hydro capacity by 54.7 percent, New York State increased by only 12.4 percent.

So far as labor is concerned the St. Lawrence-Niagara project is expected to create industrial jobs for 50,000 more workers than could be served by the alternative plan for steam-power generation, with savings equivalent to the economic support of a community of 25,000 people. So far as the farmers are concerned the electricity to be distributed by the New York State Power Authority will be available at savings equal to two-thirds of the present rates—with corresponding advantages to the dairy industry and to residential consumers.

Following hard on the St. Lawrence agreement will come the pending proposals for an Arkansas Valley Authority, to create industrial power west of the Mississippi River. This also has a defense angle, since the greatest and best deposits of bauxite are located in Arkansas and the production of aircraft can be economically decentralized once the industrial power is made available by developing the hydroelectric resources of the Arkansas River.

SELF-DEFEATING "LOGIC"

As with the original Federal power development at Muscle Shoals, the national-defence emergency provides an occasion to undertake developments which a more far-

sighted national policy would have undertaken in time of peace. The argument that it is too late to develop these great assets now must be balanced against the argument heard in 1934 (when the Senate rejected the first St. Lawrence Treaty), that there was no need for additional power at that time. To accept this self-defeating "logic" would be to condemn the country as a whole to continuous frustration and to the ultimate failure of dynamic democracy.

National defense is a pretty big tent, and this is a pretty big enterprise, but the Roosevelt administration is committed to the belief that this is a pretty big country and we can do big things in a big way, unhampered by the petty motives and the narrow interests which hamper the thinking and the doing of less spacious lands and less enterprising peoples than our own. So Washington expects the St. Lawrence agreement to win swift approval from a Congress which is now learning to think and act in billions.

Charge of Monopoly Should Not Cause Rights of Little Man To Be Overlooked—Cotton Warehouse Bill Should Pass to Protect Farmer, Little Warehousemen, Local Community, and the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the argument will be made by the opponents of S. 262, as it was made before the Committee on Banking and Currency, that the passage of S. 262 will freeze the Government-owned cotton in the interior warehouses and cause them to have a monopoly on the storage. Such a charge will not hold water.

It is true that the Federal Compress & Warehouse Co. has stored at this time about 20 percent of the Government-owned cotton in the interior, and the Anderson-Clayton Co., on the ports and in the interior, has about 10 percent of this cotton. In all, the two have about 30 percent of the Government-owned cotton in storage. While charges are being hurled back and forth from one side to another about monopoly, we should not overlook the real independent small warehousemen, who have 70 percent of this Government-owned cotton.

It should also not be overlooked that although the Federal Compress & Warehouse Co. has a large part of this cotton, it is owned by 9,700 stockholders, or an average of more than 100 stockholders to every warehouse, and these stockholders reside in the communities where the warehouses are located, and many of them are farmers.

If this bill (S. 262) is not passed, the Commodity Credit Corporation will accept such bids as they desire to accept on the future storage of the Government cotton. The idea of competitive bids impresses one of its fairness. However, on second thought, one will quickly realize that competitive bidding should not apply to a product like cotton, where it must be shipped hundreds of miles to be stored by the lowest bidder and the freight rates must be paid in cash.

The Commodity Credit Corporation would be opposed to being forced to accept the lowest bid. It is known that there are other factors that should be taken into consideration and it would be against the interest of everyone concerned for the lowest bid to be accepted in some cases. The Corporation still desires to retain the right to reject any and all bids, although very low, and to enter into negotiated bids instead of competitive bids, so the controversy is not about competitive bidding entirely.

It should be remembered that the interior warehouses, if permitted to do so, will bid just as low or lower for this cotton as the port warehouses. The bids submitted were not fairly presented, and therefore the interior warehouses could not bid. It will take the passage of S. 262 to right this wrong.

Regarding the question of freezing the cotton in the interior warehouses, if this bill passes, I suggest that the contention is absolutely without merit. There are 1,600 warehouses bidding against one another on this cotton, and in the localities where the cotton is stored there are other warehouses in competition, and where removal charges will be practically nothing. Whereas if the cotton is sent to the ports, a few people own the warehouses, as there are only 45 in all, it will certainly be frozen or the Government compelled to pay any rate fixed by the owners of these port warehouses. It is a beautiful theory to say that the ports can bring the cotton in from the interior without extra expense because the freight rate is always added on export cotton anyway, but let us consider what will happen when you get it stored in the port warehouses. There will be no competition, as these warehouses are so few and are so closely held. Then if an interior warehouse bids a lower price, the Government will have to spend several dollars a bale to ship the cotton to the interior warehouse where the lower rate is available. Then when it is needed for export, several dollars must be paid to ship it back to the port for export.

If S. 262 becomes a law, the Commodity Credit Corporation can still move any cotton it desires to move to the ports, if the warehouses now storing this cotton refuse to give the rate which the Commodity Credit Corporation demands. In other words, if S. 262 becomes a law, no interior warehouse will have a monopoly, and the rate that will be collected by the interior warehouse for storage must be acceptable to the Commodity Credit Corporation or the cotton can be moved.

Further, regarding the charge of monopoly, I believe that the Members of the House will admit that a Member of Congress is anxious to carry out the will of the people whom he has the honor to represent. If a Member from a cotton-growing section should vote for a bill that is against the farmers' interest and in favor of a monopolistic warehouse concern, his chances for reelection would not be so good next time. In other words, a Representative from a farming section is certainly not going to vote against the interest of a great majority of his voters and constituents, in order to favor some big concern, as alleged at the hearings. He would be very foolish to do so, and Members of Congress do not usually deliberately do something against the interest of the people in their districts.

It should be noted as one of the strongest points in opposition to this charge of monopoly that every Member of Congress from a cotton-growing district is in favor of this bill, S. 262. It is, therefore, inconceivable that anyone would say that any Representative in this Congress who represents cotton growers is favoring a monopolistic storage trust in preference to the farmers of his own district. I repeat that the passage of this bill is in the public interest and should be passed.

If this bill is not passed, the Commodity Credit Corporation will ship 2,000,000 or more bales of cotton to the ports. It will require an expenditure of between four and five million dollars to make the shipment. It will require the services of 15,000 boxcars that are needed in our preparedness program. If Uncle Sam had the money—cash in hand—a surplus, it would not be good business for him to ship this cotton to the ports when he has no assurance that there will be no more than a 48-cent saving per bale, since the contract for storage at the ports is good for only 1 year, and it will require on an average of $2.18 a bale to get it there. In this case the Government would have to borrow the money to pay the freight.

I respectfully submit that even if the Government could save $5,000 a day, which I deny, it would not be in the public interest to accept such a saving when it would cost the suffering cotton farmer more than $17,500 a day.

Monopoly Threats in a Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

STATEMENT OF WILLIS J. BALLINGER, ECONOMIC ADVISER TO THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION AND DIRECTOR OF STUDIES

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Willis J. Ballinger, the economic adviser to the Federal Trade Commission, is a young man of great ability, splendid courage, and possessed of a penetrating comprehension of the grave problems confronting the United States in a period of crisis. He was a classmate of mine at Yale University. Recently he made a remarkable statement to the Temporary National Economic Committee which I believe worthy of republication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In it

he discusses the general subject of military preparedness and antitrust enforcement. He calls attention to the dangers of allowing our antitrust laws to be thwarted and circumvented on the excuse of national defense. He very properly points out that it is a great danger to allow monopolies to be further entrenched and strengthened during the crisis.

I append hereto his statement, which is self-explanatory.

Mr. Chairman, since the Temporary National Economic Committee began its work, a situation has arisen which threatens to render difficult a strengthening of the antitrust laws for an indefinite period.

The Nation is now embarked upon a vast program of military preparedness. Over the past year there have been indications that a strong effort will be made to curb antitrust enforcement for the period of the emergency. It is contended by some that an enforcement of the antitrust laws during the period of the present emergency will hamper the effort to expedite national defense.

The antitrust laws have been suspended in effect during previous periods of military preparedness. Since the passage of the Sherman Act in 1890, the United States has never engaged in war or preparation for war but that the antitrust laws were practically disregarded. This was particularly true in the World War of 1918.

The Commission believes that antitrust enforcement will materially help and not hinder the objective of our present program of national defense. It believes that failure to enforce the antitrust laws during the present emergency may have very serious consequences for the future security of our democracy. Nearly a quarter of a century has passed since the first World War. Any abandonment of the antitrust laws at the present time will be a more serious matter than it was 25 years ago.

The Honorable Thurman Arnold, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, has already stressed to this Committee the useful role of antitrust enforcement in protecting Government purchasing from exploitation during the present period of emergency. We wish to emphasize other reasons why an enforcement of the antitrust laws during the present emergency is a matter of great importance.

The objective of our present defense program is to make American democracy secure form external destruction. The history of democratic government, however, has demonstrated that democracies may be destroyed from the inside as well as from the outside. Democracies have perished in the past at the hands of conquerors. They have also been wrecked from the inside. Roman democracy, for instance, was permanently put out of business by Romans. The modern democracy of Germany was destroyed by local leaders. The wreckers of the German democracy got part of their opportunity from a misfunctioning economic system.

There are enough facts at hand to know that in the case of Germany, monopolistic business which restricted production and aggravated unemployment was a factor contributing to the economic chaos which culminated in political dictatorship.

The relationship between free enterprise business systems which fail to "sustain standards of living acceptable to the people" and political dictatorship was recognized by Hon. Joseph C. O'Mahoney, chairman of this committee, when he said, on January 15, 1941:

"If, however, we are frank with ourselves, we must realize that if the democratic world had succeeded in the past in distributing the products of commerce and industry among the masses; if it had been successful in preventing the growth of the proletariat, there never would have been such a thing as the rise of the totalitarian system.

* * * * *

"The truth of the matter is that we are today faced by the appalling alternative of so adjusting our economic mechanisms as to preserve free, private enterprise in order to enable it to provide stable employment of the masses, and of seeing big government in one form or another take over the controls. The crisis in Europe has arisen because the democratic governments of Great Britain and France permitted the exponents of statism to fasten their theories upon three great nations by their own refusal to face the economic facts. They temporized with disaster. They permitted a large segment of the population, both in the cities and in the country, to become a propertyless class, and they closed their eyes to the fact that by neglecting to make the system work equitably for all, they were inviting the destruction of democratic capitalism, the very basis of which is the ownership of property by individuals."

Why are the products of industry not effectively distributed among the masses in a system of democratic capitalism? Why do free enterprise business systems break down into plutocracies and proletariats? Because government permits the growth and operation of predatory business practices in industry and finance.

Our democracy had a serious problem of internal security before the problem of protecting that democracy from any external menace became apparent. President Roosevelt recognized this fact when he said in his message to the Congress which led to the creation of the Temporary National Economic Committee:

"Unhappy events abroad have retaught us two simple truths about the liberty of a democratic people. Both lessons hit home.

"The first truth is that the liberty of a democracy is not safe if the people tolerate the growth of private power to a point where it becomes stronger than their democratic state itself. That, in its essence, is fascism—ownership of government by an individual, by a group, or by any other controlling private power.

"The second truth is that the liberty of a democracy is not safe if its business system does not provide employment and produce and distribute goods in such a way as to sustain an acceptable standard of living.

"Among us today a concentration of private power without equal in history is growing.

"This concentration is seriously impairing the economic effectiveness of private enterprise as a way of providing employment for labor and capital and as a way of assuring a more equitable distribution of income and earnings among the people of the Nation as a whole."

The present crisis of rearmament is different from the one that confronted the Nation in 1916. We entered the present crisis with an economic system still suffering from depression. In spite of tremendous efforts on the part of government, our economic system was still unable to afford employment to millions. Millions of workers were unemployed when the Defense Commission was created.

Military preparedness is not going to solve this unfinished problem. Government spending and war industries will undoubtedly create a large amount of employment. But when the present emergency is over, the problem of unemployment in peacetime industries will return. We will be right back where we left off when the Defense Commission was created. Indeed, the situation may be worse. The Nation will be burdened with heavy taxes to pay the cost of rearmament. Many workers engaged in peacetime industries before the present emergency arose will undoubtedly be drafted for wartime industries, and they, too, will be faced with the problem of peacetime reemployment.

At this juncture in our affairs we must make up our minds about antitrust enforcement in terms of the following consideration: "What were the factors that prevented our system of private enterprise from affording full employment before the present crisis of rearmament arose? If monopolistic practices were an important factor, it would seem to be common sense to proceed with their elimination during the present emergency, so that at the end of the road of rearmament our free enterprise system will be more capable of affording employment. If our free enterprise system becomes less capable of affording work at the end of the emergency than it was when the emergency started, because we permitted a further growth of factors reducing its capacity to provide employment, a serious situation may be encountered. Another period of widespread and prolonged unemployment for millions of Americans could furnish an efficient economic cause menacing from the inside the security of our democracy.

It is clear that a suspension of the antitrust laws during this emergency would further the growth of monopolistic practices in industry. It remains, therefore, to consider whether monopolistic practices in business were an important factor in preventing full employment before the present emergency began.

President Roosevelt, in his message to Congress which resulted in the creation of the Temporary National Economic Committee, stated that private enterprise had too long been unable to "furnish jobs or income or opportunity for one-third of our population."

The President also said: "In output per man or machine we are the most efficient industrial nation on earth.

"In the matter of complete mutual employment of capital and labor we are among the least efficient.

* * * * *

"One of the primary causes of our present difficulties lies in the disappearance of price competition in many industrial fields.

* * * * *

"Managed industrial prices mean fewer jobs. * * *

"When prices are privately managed at levels above those which would be determined by free competition, everybody pays.

"The contractor pays more for materials; the home builder pays more for his house; the tenant pays more rent; and the worker pays in lost work."

The President referred to noncompetitive industries as industries "which choose to hold their prices rather than to move their goods and employ their workers."

He commented that monopoly "destroys the buying power of the Nation as a whole."

The President also pointed out that monopoly and free enterprise were incompatible:

"Private enterprise in the United States is ceasing to be free enterprise, and is becoming a cluster of private collectivisms; masking itself as a system of free enterprise after the American model, it is in fact becoming a concealed cartel system after the European manner."

Referring to a program for eliminating specific trade and financial practices, including those which restrain trade, vitally affecting the successful functioning of free enterprise in American business, the President said:

"It is a program whose basic thesis is not that the system of free private enterprise for profit has failed in this generation but that it has not yet been tried."

This message of the President was sent to Congress on April 29, 1938.

Between the enactment of the Sherman law in 1890 and the World War of 1918, antitrust enforcement was highly sporadic and in general ineective in preventing the growth of monopolistic practices in business. During the World War of 1918, monopolistic practices received a great impetus. During

the twenties, when business had a "free hand, practically undisturbed by Government intervention,"[1] restraints in trade continued to multiply.

The N. R. A., which operated to afford industry the opportunity to engage legally in price fixing and restriction of production activities, further increased the load of trade restraints which our free-enterprise system had to carry. The lack of funds for effective antitrust enforcement during the greater part of the depression, has further aggravated the situation.

Since the date of the President's letter leading to the creation of the Temporary National Economic Committee, progress has, of course, been made in antitrust enforcement. It is significant that coincidental with substantially larger appropriations for the Department of Justice more antitrust suits were commenced in the courts in 1940 by the Department than occurred in the preceding 10 years. Mr. Arnold told this committee that he still had a long way to go. The Federal Trade Commission, too, knows that effective antitrust enforcement is still a large task.

Important businessmen have testified that holding prices up has a very serious effect upon industry's capacity to employ.

The views of Mr. Ford are well known. They can be paralleled by those of other automobile executives. Mr. Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., said:

"Stabilization means a higher price level. * * * (It) discounts individual aggressiveness and ability and penalizes the new and better to protect the vested rights of the past. * * * One thing is perfectly evident today. Those who have followed the practice of lowering the cost of goods and services are the ones who show the smallest amount of unemployment and have, therefore, made the most progress toward recovery. On the other hand, those who have followed * * * the principle of stabilization have progressed the least."[2]

Among economists the weight of opinion is that monopolistic practices do restrict employment and standards of living for the people.

We wish to put into the record at this time the conclusions reached by an important economic research organization. On a grant of money from the Falk Foundation the Brookings Institution of Washington, D. C., undertook a comprehensive survey and appraisal of the factors retarding economic progress in the United States. The findings and conclusions of the institute are found in five volumes: America's Capacity to Produce, America's Capacity to Consume, The Formation of Capital, Income, and Economic Progress, and Industrial Price Policies in Economic Progress.

There is little doubt that there was unutilized capacity in American industry during the twenties. Our industrial plants, our laboring force, our technology could have produced more goods and services than were in fact produced. All during the twenties there were enormous sales efforts. Installment credits were abused to the point where they resulted in inducing consumers to buy more goods than they could afford. There was a continual emphasis by various industries and Government on the necessity of expanding foreign trade by means of credits and otherwise. There was also evidence from manufacturers themselves that industry was capable of producing a great deal more. It is reasonably clear that the great problem of American business during the twenties was not how to produce more but how to sell what had been produced.

The Brookings Institution estimated that during the peak year of business activity—1929—only approximately 80 percent of our productive capacity was being utilized, and that there was "20 percent of practical, reclaimable slack."

Was there need among the masses of the people for more production during the twenties? Data published by the Census, the Income Tax Section of the Treasury Department, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and various private and other governmental studies afforded an opportunity to form a reliable opinion on this question. A number of studies made during this period all pointed to very low incomes for the great majority of those gainfully employed during the twenties. These studies showed that the requirements of the masses of the people for even the elementary necessities of food, clothing, and shelter, were far from satisfied.

The Brookings Institution estimated:

In 1929 there were approximately 27,474,000 families in the United States consisting of more than one person, and 2,351,000 persons classified as families because of their occupancy of individual living quarters.

In addition, there were some 6,637,000 income-receiving individuals living outside of family groups—in hotels, etc. The total number of income-disposing units was thus about 36,462,000.

Approximately 16,000,000 families, or 60 percent of the total number of families, had incomes less than $2,000.

Approximately 20,000,000 families, or 71 percent of the total number of families, had incomes less than $2,500.

The Brookings Institution commented:

"A family income of $2,500 at 1929 prices was a very moderate one, permitting few of the luxuries of life."

The following was interpolated at the time this statement was read to the Temporary National Economic Committee:

"Dr. ANDERSON. Would the display of data of this sort be complete without indicating what the upper brackets had by way of income at a comparable time?

"Mr. BALLINGER. Yes; I could give you that information.

"Dr. ANDERSON. Obviously the upper brackets were overloaded, proportionately speaking, with income at their disposal, much of which they could not use in the consumption of goods. Wouldn't it be necessary to indicate that in order to complete the data?

"Mr. BALLINGER. I will put that in. Before I come to that I would like to finish the figures of distribution in the lower-income brackets, and I will add this. This was, unfortunately, left out by the printer.

"About 32 percent of unattached individuals and 1-person families, some 9,000,000 income-disposing units, had incomes under $2,000. Distribution between farm families and nonfarm families was very striking. In 1929 there were approximately 5,800,000 farm families and 21,674,000 nonfarm families. The total income for farm families amounted to seven and two-tenths billions of dollars. This income for farm families included an allowance for rent and farm produce consumed and included also the earnings from nonfarm activities of all members of the family. Consequently, the average income of the farm family in 1929 was $1,240 as compared with $3,226 for town and urban families.

"Now, concerning the concentration of income in the upper brackets, here are a few facts: Only 2,000,000 families in 1929, or 8 percent of the total number of families, had incomes in excess of $5,000. About 600,000 families, or 2.3 percent, had incomes in excess of $10,000; 11,653,000 families with incomes of less than $1,500 received a total of about $10,000,000,000. At the other extreme 36,000 families having incomes in excess of $75,000 received an aggregate income of 9.8 billions of dollars. It would thus appear that one-tenth of 1 percent of the families at the top received practically as much as 42 percent of the families at the bottom of the scale."

Why did our economic system, with the capacity to produce more and a great need for more production, fail to turn out more goods and services during the 1920's?

Was there any deficiency or bottleneck in the production mechanism? The Brookings Institution was unable to find any. The supply of raw materials, both agricultural and mineral, was abundant. There was no dearth of manufacturing capacity. The transportation system could have carried more goods. Marketing and merchandising establishments and facilities were abundantly adequate for the stocking, handling, and selling of goods as they passed from the hands of producers to general consumers. Our economic system was not short of fuel or other forms of power. There was enough labor to produce more goods. Money and credit were adequate for the needs of business.

Why was our economic system unable to produce more during the 1920's?

There are a number of competent economists who believe that the fundamental trouble was a lack of buying power among the great majority of the American families. These families simply did not have sufficient income to buy more goods. Our economic system will not produce more goods unless such goods can be bought. Consequently, unused productive capacity in our economic system will not be put to use unless there is sufficient buying power to call it into operation.

At this point it is important to emphasize that the utilization of all existing unused capacity to produce in our economic system will only be a step toward a larger goal. Even if our economic system had produced all it could during the 1920's, much more production would have been necessary if living conditions for the masses of the people are to be substantially improved. The Brookings Institute estimated that production would have had to have been stepped up 75 percent in our economic system in 1929 to do this, whereas the use of all unutilized capacity in our economic system during the twenties would have increased production by only 20 percent. But the use of idle capacity and the further enlargement of productive capacity in the economic system will both depend on our ability to find some way of increasing the purchasing power of the masses. Mass production "marks the highest level under man's productive programs."[3] However, "we cannot have the economics of mass production save in an economy of mass consumption. Each is the condition of the other."[3]

What is the best way to increase the buying power of the great majority of consumers in America? What have we been doing about this problem?

Some radical thinkers have proposed that we divide up wealth or income. This is a proposal which has periodically appeared in America and at times appealed strongly to many people. We do not see any way that wealth could be arbitrarily equalized without having the Government own all business. Redistributing income equally would be an administrative job of impracticable proportions. Furthermore, a reasonable inequality in income acts as a valuable stimulant to industry and enterprise, and is highly desirable. The Brookings Institute also discourages radical proposals to divide up wealth or income.

The most obvious method by which the income of the masses might be expanded is through an increase of money wages. This is the method which has been most widely discussed in recent years. It is the method which has been most steadfastly advocated by labor organizations in this and other countries.

While admitting that wage increases resulting from union activities have been helpful, the Brookings Institution was of the opinion that this method had limitations.

[1] President's message to Congress, April 29, 1938.

[2] P. 29, Industrial Price Policies, Public Affairs Committee, Inc.

[3] Brookings Institution, Income and Economic Progress.

One important limitation is that increasing wages increases purchasing power for only a part of our consuming population.

According to the 1930 census the total population of the United States was 122,775,046, of which 44,636,770 were classified as farm population, while another 9,183,453 lived in towns having less than 2,500 inhabitants. This rural population was approximately 44 percent of the total population.

Furthermore, the money wage method of increasing purchasing power does not extend to those employed in connection with Government activities or to those employed by educational, philanthropic, or charitable organizations or to those engaged in personal or domestic service.

The number of individuals employed in personal or domestic service was, in 1930, 4,952,453. The professional group numbered 2,253,884 in 1930.

Moreover, there are many small shopkeepers and tradesmen who fall outside the wage system. Finally, only a part of the wage-earning population itself is effectively organized to obtain higher incomes through trade-union activities. Many wage earners are either unorganized or ineffectively organized.

The wage-increase method for increasing purchasing power has another drawback. The Brookings Institution points out that sometimes wage increases cause higher prices and thus decrease the purchasing power of the many millions who live outside the wage system.

Wage increases have undoubtedly been useful in increasing the purchasing power of wage earners, but something must be done to add to the incomes of the many millions whose purchasing power is not increased by this method.

The most effective way to increase purchasing power among all consumers is to reduce prices. This way involves no radical philosophy. It is a way which is fundamental to the theory of capitalism. The classical economists who blueprinted what we call "modern capitalism" particularly stressed the relationship of the distribution of income to economic progress. They clearly perceived that a way must be found to make it possible for the masses to buy the additional goods and services made possible by technological progress which would enable the capitalistic system to produce more goods for the same or less effort. Otherwise, technological advances in efficiency would accrue to only a small class, who would obtain excessive and unwarranted profits through holding prices up while lowering the cost of production.

The classical economists envisoned capitalism as an economic system whose fundamental principle was to secure a wide dissemination of well-being among the masses as a result of technological improvements. Capitalism was intended to function in the interest of all the people, and not for the enrichment of a few. The economic philosophers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries clearly recognized that the ability of capitalism to produce more goods because of lower costs would be entirely conditioned by the ability of the system to produce sufficient income to purchase the increased production. The competitive mechanism was relied upon to do this. Increased efficiency would make possible lower prices. Competition would insure the actual reduction of prices. Thus existing income would be increased by a reduction in prices. The expanding demand required to take increased quantities of goods off the markets would be automatically created by the reduction of prices.

The price reduction method of increasing purchasing power among the masses eliminates group and sectional friction in our economic system. It gives at once "to every consumer a larger return for his money."[4]

Furthermore, the price reduction method sets in motion a process whereby not only is the existing capacity of our economic system to produce fully used, but the system is permitted to increase its capacity to produce. Through this process the capitalistic system works constantly toward higher levels of prosperity for the people as a whole.

Such a process does not deprive capital of its just reward or fail to compensate enterprisers for the risks they incur in promoting and conducting business. Under this process a free enterprise system is expanded to the fullest degree. The fullest employment of capital and labor is afforded, and the material well-being of the people is progressively advanced.

The Brookings studies declare:

"The broad highway along which continued economic progress must be sought in the avenue of price reductions. When this road is followed, the benefits of technical improvements are conferred automatically upon all the population. Maximum opportunity for expansion of production and the free interchange of goods, both between different divisions of our domestic economy and between nations, is thus provided. Such a method, instead of centering upon a redistribution of an existing amount of income, promotes the progressive erection of additional income, and its prompt and thorough dissemination among the entire population."

Moreover, when all American industry travels the road of price reductions, our industry becomes more effective in foreign markets. Getting prices down in American industry will not only benefit domestic business, but will make it possible for that part of our business which must seek foreign markets to improve its competitive position in those markets.

If reducing prices is the most effective way to promote the fullest use and expansion of our economic system, what has prevented the use of this method? The Federal Trade Commission knows that price reductions over large areas of business have been prevented for many years because of the wide-spread operation of techniques to restrict production, maintain or enhance prices. This, of course, is our opinion, and we have had very practical contact with the problem. The Brookings Institute, too, express an opinion on the reason why price reductions in business have not operated to permit the fullest use and expansion of our economic system:

"It is, however, evident from the facts disclosed in our general study of the distribution of income, that the competitive process upon which we rely to disseminate the benefits of progress has failed to function with expected effectiveness. Accordingly, we must now seek to discover what factors or forces have impeded the operation of the price-reduction method of distributing income.

"The method of continuously expanding markets through a persistent reduction of prices as efficiency increases has, in a considerable measure, ceased to operate in American business. Price stabilization policies have in many lines come to stand in the way of a dissemination of the benefits of business progress, and have therefore tended to nullify the results of technological advance. This unexpected outcome of the evolution of the capitalistic system obviously requires explanation.

"The basic economic policy which we are enunciating does, however, definitely attack what we regard as a serious abuse of the profit system and the institutions of private capital which have grown up in modern times. This is the tendency to centralize economic advantage, to protect existing business enterprises by protecting the price structure. For more than 50 years this tendency has been developing through the devices of corporate consolidations, pools, trusts, cartels, trade associations, and code authorities. Particularly since the World War, and often with the active assistance of Government, efforts have been going forward to stabilize existing business situations, and to underwrite the prosperity of individuals, corporations, or large business groups by attempting to stabilize prices. We believe the evidence is clear that such attempts, however well intentioned, are dangerously shortsighted."

Now, Mr. Chairman, the failure of competition to function effectively in industry during the twenties was a factor in causing the collapse of business in 1929. During the twenties there were large sums available for investment. One of the principal places where savings could have been soundly invested should have been provided by industry willing to build new plants and expand productive capacity. Only a part of a very large amount of savings, however, found its way into new industrial plants. The reason for this may be found in the following statement by the institute:

"Instead of producing all the goods possible and pressing them into consumptive channels, business enterprisers held production in leash with a view to maintenance of prices and of stable conditions.

"Second, and of more fundamental significance, the actual rate of growth of new plant and equipment during these years was held in hand. Instead of being expanded to the fullest degree possible, the growth of new capital was adjusted to the growth of consumptive demand. Funds were available, labor was available, and materials were available with which to expand productive capacity much more rapidly than it was in fact expanded."[5]

The widespread existence of interferences with competition in business during the twenties is also testified to by a report of the Federal Trade Commission to the President of the United States in 1921. The Commission was asked by the President to report on conditions which it thought basically responsible for the decline of business in 1921.

The Commission reported that "the following are among the principal causes * * *:

"(1) The excessive price of many basic commodities, prominent among which is coal, which vitally affects the cost of other commodities.

"(2) The existence of the typical corporate monopolies and agreements in violation of the antitrust laws.

"(3) Open price associations in many cases not yet challenged by the law, yet tending to bring about and maintain unduly high prices.

"(4) Interference with the channels of trade by distributors, trade associations, particularly by activities tending to maintain an unnecessary number of inefficient regular dealers while shutting out new dealers seeking to sell at lower prices."

Much of the savings during the twenties were therefore forced, in many cases, to seek unsound channels of investment. The mirage of prosperity was largely created by financing promoters of unsound securities, by building apartment houses, and developing land booms for which there could be no reasonable expectation of utilization. This kind of profligacy had to have its day of termination. A few major collapses of unsound and fantastic investment structures pricked the bubble of business confidence and helped to plunge our capitalistic system into a severe depression.

[4] Income and Economic Progress, Brookings Institution.

[5] P. 139, Formation of Capital, Brookings Institution.

The Commission's letter states, and Brookings' studies clearly infer, that if competition had functioned effectively during the twenties idle capacity in industry would have been utilized. Productive capacity would have been expanded "much more rapidly than it was, in fact expanded." The thrift of the American people would have been devoted more to the sound end of materially raising the level of prosperity for all the people; and with savings and investment in better balance, the depression of 1929, if it had to come at all, would not have been so severe.

Mr. Chairman, during the present depression the failure of competition to function effectively in business has been an important factor in preventing the full recovery of our free-enterprise system. In 1932, 127 distinguished American economists declared in a joint statement:

"The most competent economic opinion, as well in Europe as in this country, can be cited in support of the view that a strong contributing cause of the unparalleled severity of the present depression was the greatly increased extent of monopolistic control of commodity prices which stimulated financial speculation in the security markets. There is growing doubt whether the capitalistic system, whose basic assumption is free markets and a free price system, can continue to work with an ever-widening range of prices fixed and manipulated by monopolies." (Federal Trade Commission's Report to the President, November 1934, p. 39.)

Making competition function effectively in business offered one of the soundest ways of getting American business entirely out of the depression. The Government borrowed large sums to give purchasing power to the unemployed and to stimulate buying power through public enterprise, but these efforts were frequently frustrated by the ability of industries to raise prices. The increased purchasing power provided was pocketed in many cases without bringing full employment. During the depression public relief and public construction were frequently financed at controlled price levels. Thus governmental activities to stimulate buying power failed generally to get business under way on its own power. There was a way to do this; only we neglected it. The thorough breaking up of trade restraints in business would have stimulated competition to reduce prices. This would have generated a substantial and sound demand for the production of more goods. The response to this demand would have automatically caused the employment of more workers. Our economic system would have been started on the road to recovery under its own power.

Under conditions of modern industry a difference of a single cent in the price of a product to consumers often involves a large increase in purchasing power for the masses.

In 1937 a difference of a cent on the price of a gallon of gasoline would have involved an increase of purchasing power for consumers of over $200,000,000.

In 1937 a difference of a cent in the price of a quart of milk would have increased the purchasing power of consumers by approximately $375,000,000; a saving of 2 cents per quart would have increased this to $700,000,000.

A difference of a cent on the price of a loaf of bread in 1938 would have increased purchasing power among the consumers of the Nation by approximately $120,000,000.

I could multiply these illustrations. There were many dollars of increased income at stake for the great mass of the American people during the twenties and during the present depression if fair and open competition in industry had not been throttled by combinations in restraint of trade, price-fixing, production control, and other monopolistic practices.

Today we have on our hands two critical problems. There is the problem of swiftly rearming the Nation. There is also the problem of looking beyond the emergency, of accomplishing as much as possible during the emergency toward preparing our free enterprise system to afford the fullest employment and the greatest prosperity to the people as a whole when war industries have done their job. Another period of widespread and prolonged unemployment when rearmament is over may imperil our free institutions.

It is encouraging that some of the Nation's most important businessmen agree with us that during the period of emergency we must not neglect this task.

Only a month ago Mr. Charles E. Wilson, president of the General Electric Co., said before the convention of the American Institute of Electrical Engineers at Philadelphia, Pa.:

"There must be a complete, realistic comprehension of the fact that the world—our Nation included—is passing through what history may later record as the second stage of a revolutionary movement of the masses—a movement born during World War No. 1 and likely to last, with intermittent armistices of one kind or another, for two or three decades more.

* * * * *

"Today the practical controlling fact is that hundreds of millions of people throughout the world have been persuaded, to the point of evangelistic conviction, that the capitalistic system is the cause of the economic insecurity of the common man and that, as the root of his economic ills, this system must be drastically modified, or failing that, destroyed.

* * * * *

"At this time, when our future economic security is at stake, we must call upon all of our vision and imagination, upon all of our resources, upon all of our ingenuity, and, above all, upon the same deep sense of service that now motivates us, as we move forward in providing the materials for our physical security, to the end that all employables will be kept employed, and that the preponderant majority will find employment on the pay rolls of the private-enterprise system."

To this end Mr. Wilson specifies that the country needs:

"A wholly free and enterprising system of free enterprise.

"The free flow of all goods, purchasing power, and enterprise capital for production.

"The encouragement and development of new inventions, accompanied by aggressive pioneer product promotion."

Hand in hand with the great ultimate benefit of making our democracy more secure after rearmament, collateral benefits of great importance will also be realized from antitrust enforcement. During the present national emergency we must produce as much as possible of consumers' goods. The antitrust laws must prevent consumers' goods industries from conspiring to restrict production or raise prices.

The more real wealth we are able to produce during the present period of emergency, and the more afterward, the greater will be our ability to pay for the cost of rearmament. This will be a large cost, and is likely to impose a heavy tax burden upon industry in the future.

For 50 years a philosophy of restricting production in industry has been steadily advancing. This philosophy has robbed the past of untold material well-being. It has divided the farmer and the laborer, the laborer and the capitalist, the rich man and the poor man, and generated a dangerous lack of confidence in private enterprise. It has sown seeds of destruction for our free institutions by promoting a faith in collectivistic government. Before national defense we had made progress toward subduing this enemy within our gates. We cannot stop now.

Our plea is that antitrust enforcement and national defense should work cooperatively to defend our democracy from within as well as from without.

The Responsibilities of the Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, the Republican National Committee at its meeting which was held here in Washington yesterday, reelected as its chairman the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., minority leader of the House.

At that meeting Mr. MARTIN delivered an address which challenged the devotion and loyalty of those Americans who believe in the two-party system of government and who continue in their conviction that the Republican Party has a most important role to play in this critical period of our Nation's history. The address, Mr. Speaker, is a clarion call to every American who cherishes the heritages which are ours as free men and who look to the Republican Party for the safeguarding and perpetuation of these heritages.

Mr. MARTIN'S address follows:

Everyone in this country wants national unity wherever and whenever national unity aids in the preservation of America and the security of our people. No one wants national unity in anything which is not for the best interests of the Nation. No real American wants unity in any policy or any movement which would destroy the two-party system of government in America.

Time and experience have demonstrated the two-party system of government to be the only system which will preserve the American way of life. It guarantees the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It has built a strong America. It will preserve a free America. We must maintain in this country a strong opposition party if we are to remain a constitutional republic.

There is a vital need today for a vigorous, virile Republican Party. That need is the greatest in our history. The safety and security of our people depend upon an intelligent, constructive, and courageous opposition.

We are at this hour in the midst of a great national crisis. Vast and unprecedented powers have been given to the executive department of the Government. Bewildering sums are being spent for defense, and in the name of defense. Enormous taxes are soon to be imposed upon our people. We stagger along in the direction of war. We are face to face with the possibility of national bankruptcy.

This picture is not a pleasant one, but it is the realistic one. This is no hour for "echo men." It is a time demanding courage and honest thinking. Our first thought must be the welfare of our country.

A vigorous, courageous Republican Party is essential to police and audit the New Deal administration as it revels in the spending of thirty or forty billions of dollars and in the possession of vast and unparalleled powers granted it only because of the urgent needs of national defense. We must police and audit the New Deal administration to

protect our country from financial, political, and social bankruptcy.

We must police the great powers granted to the President to assure as far as possible their wise administration. We must be ready to fight to restore those powers to the people's representatives when the emergency has ended. We must police the bureaus and the men to whom the fate of the Nation has been entrusted. Their work must be done efficiently, honestly, economically, and on a nonpartisan basis. We must audit those who have been entrusted with the handling of sums so vast they are beyond comprehension. Our national debt is already enormous. We cannot tolerate extravagance or dishonesty. Racketeering must have no place in our national defense. We Republicans in Congress must perform the thankless but patriotic and essential task of policing and auditing those in charge of our national defense. The scandals of 1918 must not be repeated.

We Republicans have a vastly important function in this national emergency. The safety and security of our Nation are at stake. We must not fail. We will not fail.

There is, of course, a genuine need for national unity in our defense plans. Republicans, Democrats, and independents must stand together in support of measures to make our country invincible against any assault, whether it comes from the outside or the inside of the country. Events abroad must not distract us from the vigilance required at home. Our greatest danger is still from insidious inside forces. We must exert our influence against all menacing influences.

A grave responsibility rests upon us all, whether we be Republican or Democrat, employer or employee, public official or private citizen. We must all unselfishly contribute all we can to our national security. Those who may seek to take advantage of this perilous hour to exploit the Nation's needs to their own profit or to advance their own selfish interests will sooner or later find themselves condemned as traitors and outcasts by the power of public opinion. We simply cannot tolerate profiteering.

This is no time for strikes or lock-outs which will prevent us from achieving at the earliest possible moment an adequate national defense. Waste of time, waste of money, waste of men—these are the fatal mistakes which could end the glorious reality of free America.

The Nation is demanding production, and more production. It demands efficiency and it demands patriotism above selfishness. The call is imperative; as Americans who love their country; as Americans who prize its priceless liberties, privileges, and advantages; as Americans determined to remain free, let us press forward with our defense program. As we go forward with these defense plans, let our fervent prayer be that we can preserve America from having to send millions of our boys to the trenches. Let us never, for a moment, lose sight of the suffering and the perils which would come with our participation in another World War.

Now as to strictly party matters, there is no reason for Republicans to feel discouraged over the campaign of last fall. Under the vigorous, dynamic leadership of Wendell Willkie we polled more than 22,000,000 votes. No impartial observer would deny this was a good majority of the free votes in the country.

Outside of the 10 Southern States, the Willkie vote was 47.3 percent of the total, which is especially significant as he was opposed by the strongest candidate it was possible for the Democrats to nominate.

Today in 20 of the 48 States in the Union we have Republican governors.

The Republican congressional candidates, outside the same 10 Southern States, based on major party totals, received 50.3 percent of the vote.

Excepting again the 10 Southern States, we find the Republicans carried 1,120, and the Democrats 936 counties in the other 38 States. If the strength of a party is in the county seats, then, indeed, are we a virile party. These figures are more impressive when we remember that in 1932 we carried only 363, and in 1936 only 438 counties. In these county seats are the shock troops who will bring to us merited victories in 1942 and 1944.

Our principal weakness is in the large cities. The New Deal carried most of the big Northern States because of the majorities it rolled up in one or two large cities.

Yes, the 1940 election showed the strength of the supporters of the American way of life. With this as a basis, we must press forward. The outlook is not at all discouraging. We are better organized today than at any time in the last 12 years. We have once more developed some strong State leadership, and there is an enthusiasm which has great potential possibilities.

The great objective of the last campaign must continue to be the objective of the Republican Party. Truth and justice will eventually triumph. As patriots banded together in a great cause, let us go forward to the battle to retain the American way of life, and to build a finer and better America. Millions of Americans are looking expectantly to us. We must not fail them.

St. Patrick's Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE, OF NEW YORK

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an address delivered by our colleague, Hon. WILLIAM T. BYRNE, at the celebration of the Hibernian Society of Savannah, Ga., on St. Patrick's Day, March 17, 1941.

It was my good fortune to be present at this testimonial to the patron saint of Ireland and listen to the stirring patriotic remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BYRNE].

The address follows:

Mr. President, my fellow guests, and gentlemen of the Hibernian Society of Savannah, "I am delighted to be in Savannah tonight. I always accept every invitation that I can possibly meet for the celebration of St. Patrick's Day. There I know I shall find that essence of good fellowship, that makes the evening's splendid influence memorable and lifts the soul into an atmosphere that one likes to live in. When that is mixed with the flavor of southern hospitality you have a mixture and an amalgam that you cannot excel anywhere."

My dear friends, the salutation that I have just delivered is the introductory remark of President William Howard Taft, delivered at your one hundredth anniversary dinner on May 1, 1912.

You have honored me with the subject title of "The United States," and it seemed highly appropriate that I should quote the words of that great President who honored you with his presence on the occasion of your most outstanding celebration, the one hundredth anniversary of the organization of your magnificent society.

Today we commemorate the life of an illustrious saint, and the glories of an honorable and ancient race. Today we applaud and sing the praises of our fathers and mothers in the skies. Today all of the memories of our youth are rekindled and revivified by the recollection of the joy that this day brought to the hearts and souls of our fathers and mothers when they celebrated, as we are today, the life and accomplishments of St. Patrick and the land he purified from evil and consecrated to justice and liberty. It is manhood which St. Patrick sanctified, which O'Connell humanized, and Emmet crowns. It is a manhood which succeeded over hardships such as the world has never seen, a manhood that, true to the teachings of its patron saint, is divine in its humanity and human in its divinity.

For the purpose of securing a satisfactory background of historic facts regarding the influence of Irish men and Irish women in the South, particularly in Georgia and Savannah, I read a little book entitled "The Irish Race in America," by Edward Condon, published in 1887, and when I came to chapter 6, which carried the title "The Irish in the South," I was more deeply thrilled than the limitations of time tonight will permit me to express. I found much in this chapter that reminded me of your very beautiful Story of a Century, published in 1912, and I found the early history of many of the families who have contributed so gloriously to the growth and development of your magnificent State and city, they having come to this part of our great country from Ireland as early as 1607, and at page 67 of this little book I was thrilled to find a reference to Savannah, which I quote: "At the first public meeting of the Sons of Liberty here in Savannah, July 14, 1774, John Glenn was chairman, and amongst those present were S. Farley, J. Bryan, W. Gibbons, J. Winn, E. Butler, and several others bearing Irish names."

I am assuming that in this gathering tonight there are those among you who have in your veins the blood of some of those who attended that meeting of the Sons of Liberty held on the 14th of July 1774.

I must restrain myself in the use of extravagant language in giving a word picture of the value of Irish men and Irish women to the growth and development of the United States of America. Again because of time limitation I can only cite the participation of our Irish brethren in the Revolutionary Army as a concrete illustration of what Irishmen have contributed throughout the history of our country to make it the Nation it is today.

Before an English parliamentary inquiry in 1779 Joseph Galloway stated that the American Revolutionary Army and Navy was composed of about one-half Irish; there were over 1,500 commissioned officers of Irish blood in the Revolutionary Army and Navy, and two of Washingtons' secretaries, Reed and Casey, were the sons of Irish immigrants, and Moylan, McHenry, and Fitzgerald were all natives of Ireland; and it is interesting at this time to find that among the privates in Washington's army, selecting but 15 Irish names, that there were 695 Kellys, 494 Murphys, 327 Connors and O'Connors, 531 McCarthys, 332 Ryans, 266 Rileys, 266 Sullivans, 248 Daughertys, 243 Connollys, 321 Burkes, 230 O'Briens, 178 O'Neills, 184 Fitzgeralds, 155 Donnellys.

At least seven of the signers of our Constitution were Irishmen, five born in Ireland and two in America; those born in Ireland were Thomas Fitzsimmons, Pierce Butler, George Read, James McHenry, and John Rut-

ledge, and Daniel Carroll and William Few were of Irish descent. The Irishmen who were signers of the Declaration of Independence were Charles Carroll, Matthew Thornton, George Taylor, and those of Irish descent were George Read, Thomas McKean, Thomas Nelson, Edward Rutledge, and Thomas Lynch.

An Irishman was the first under the Stars and Stripes to capture a British ship of war, and an Irishman took $2,000,000 worth of sea prizes from the British Navy to assist this country in gaining its freedom.

An Irishman won the last battle of the Revolution on the seas just as 7 years before he had won the first under the Stars and Stripes, and when the Confederation was dead and the Union had been formed, George Washington made this Irishman senior officer of the United States Navy, and where Washington had placed him Adams and Jefferson kept him, and the Irishman who did all this was Fighting Old Jack Barry.

My enthusiasm for the patriotism, valor, and courage demonstrated by the Irish, not only in the United States but everywhere in the world, is very deeply imbedded in the stories that came to me from my dear departed father who was born in the County Kildare, August 1, 1839, and who at the age of 4 in his father's arms, in September 1843, heard Daniel O'Connell deliver one of his greatest orations for the annulment of the union with England. My father committed to memory this entire address and upon the slightest provocation would recite it, in season and out of season, to those who would be willing to listen. The following quotations would bring tears to his eyes and, I feel confident, to the eyes of every Irishman who loves the aspirations and heroism of the Irish people:

"Yes, among the nations of the earth, Ireland stands No. 1 in the physical strength of her sons and in the beauty and purity of her daughters. Ireland, land of my forefathers, how my mind expands, and my spirit walks abroad in something of majesty when I contemplate the high qualities, inestimable virtues, and true purity and piety and religious fidelity of the inhabitants of your green fields and productive mountains. Oh, what a scene surrounds us! It is not only the countless thousands of brave and active and peaceable and religious men that are here assembled, but Nature herself has written her character with the finest beauty in the verdant plains that surround us. Let any man run round the horizon with his eye and tell me if creative Nature ever produced anything so green and so lovely, so undulating, so teeming with production. The richest harvests that any land can produce are those reaped in Ireland; and then here are the sweetest meadows, the greenest fields, the loftiest mountains, the purest streams, the noblest rivers, the most capacious harbors, and her water power is equal to turn the machinery of the world. Oh, my friends, it is a country worth fighting for, it is a country worth dying for."

It was in this country that the Irishman found the temple of liberty and the open door to success.

Wherever liberty has called for aid, wherever there have been great contests in behalf of justice and for the uplifting of humanity, Irishmen have played a noble part in writing the history of the world.

"These are the reasons that we today celebrate the Irishmen's membership in the citizenship of our glorious country; these are the reasons why we today commemorate the life of an ancient race and an illustrious man; these are the reasons why today we sing the praises of our mothers and fathers in the skies.

"If I were a sculptor, I would chisel from the marble my ideal of a hero. I would make it the figure of an Irishman sacrificing his hopes and his life on the altar of his country, and I would carve on its pedestal the name of Robert Emmet.

"If I were a painter, I would make the canvas eloquent with the deeds of the bravest people who ever lived, whose proud spirit no power can ever conquer, and whose loyalty and devotion to the hopes of free government no tyrant can ever crush; and I would write under the picture Ireland.

"If I were a poet, I would melt the world to tears with the pathos of my song. I would touch the heart of humanity with the mournful dirge of Ireland's wrongs and Erin's woes. I would weave the shamrock and the rose into garlands of glory for the Emerald Isle, the land of martyrs and memories, the cradle of heroes, the nursery of liberty.

"Tortured in dungeons and murdered on scaffolds, robbed of the fruits of their sweat and toil, scourged by famine and plundered by the avarice of heartless power, driven like the leaves of autumn before the keen winter winds, this sturdy race of Erin's sons and daughters have been scattered over the face of the earth, homeless only in the land of their nativity, but princes and lords in every other land where merit is the measure of a man."

"O Ireland, isn't it grand, you look
Like a bride in her rich adorning;
And with all the pent-up love of my heart
I bid you the top of the morning."

The Interior Warehouse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the bill which we have been discussing for some time, S. 262, being commonly known as the cotton warehousing bill, is due to come up for final consideration Wednesday. This bill means so much to Louisiana as a whole, and especially to north Louisiana, that I am no longer content to remain silent on this vital matter.

Some of my colleagues have already dwelt upon a phase of this matter which I think is of especial importance to the Nation as a whole, but I feel that further discussion of it will be appropriate.

The hearings on this bill show that all Government-owned and Government-loan cotton is located in 43 port warehouses and in some 1,700 interior warehouses, in the proposition of 8,800,000 bales in the interior and 1,900,000 bales in the ports. This bill will allow 33⅓ percent of this cotton to remain or be placed in port warehouses and the remainder to remain on storage in the interior until the time for sale. The port warehouses are owned by some 26 separate interests. Under this bill the amount of cotton presently stored in the ports will be materially and equitably increased. This bill then will be fair to the ports of the Nation and at the same time fair to the interior.

Roughly, I have pictured the situation at the present time. The bill is designed to, more or less, maintain this ratio as a fair and equitable one for the storage of Government-owned and Government-loan cotton. Without this bill, the Federal Commodity Corporation having already asked for bids will now proceed to move this cotton from the interior where it is grown and originally stored and place it in port warehouses almost to the limit of Government cotton. Thus, without action, the present status of this matter will be materially changed to the hurt of the great area of our country which produces the cotton.

To a large extent, the question is whether we shall continue to try to favor the small independent business or whether we shall further proceed to consolidate the business of the Nation in large groups to the injury of the small individual. They say, of course, in opposition, that one of the interior warehouses is a large one and this test cannot be applied. This may be so; but even if so, this leaves some 1,600 individual businesses which are yet interested and will be seriously hurt by the plan proposed, if Congress permits it to be carried out.

I do not personally know conditions in reference to warehousing throughout the entire South. I do know personally conditions and warehousing in certain parts of the South.

I know these conditions in Louisiana. I have personally visited some of these warehouses, with the knowledge at the time of the visit that this matter could again come to the attention of the House of Representatives. I have been there at the time the rush season is on, seen the farmers coming in with their bales of cotton representing their entire year's crop. They bring it in trucks drawn by motors and in wagons drawn by horses and mules. There is especially the little farmer who has only two or three bales of cotton. He brings it personally and talks to the warehouseman. He wants to know generally about the amount and grade of the current crop. He wants certain information about the Government program for the next year, if it has been announced, or about the Commodity Credit Corporation loans. He watches the unloading and the storing of the cotton and, it may be, assists in this work. He is not content until he personally sees just where the cotton is being stored and where he expects it to remain until it is finally sold.

These little warehouses, during the cotton season, stay open until late at night to serve the local farmer coming in. It stays open late Saturday afternoon and even Saturday night. The people know that the farmer with his cotton wants to have it ginned and placed in the warehouses at one and the same time.

It may be that he will not come to town again for weeks. He is probably trying to do his shopping and the laying in of his supplies at the same time. He does all of these things in this little town and makes no plans to go farther from his home.

There is a genuine need for the little warehouseman in each local community of the cotton-growing South. He renders a personal and unpaid-for service. He has the confidence of the farmer and is certainly conveniently available for him.

In these warehouses throughout the South the overhead runs almost the same from day to day save during the season, when it is necessary to remain open long hours and increase the personnel. During the normal months the overhead remains practically the same, month by month. The Commodity Credit cotton is stored in this little warehouse; and they tell me that to a large extent it takes care of this continuing overhead, permitting the warehouseman to pass on to the farmer with his newly grown and newly ginned cotton some of the advantages of this storage. And the farmer does enjoy a lower rate for housing his cotton than ever at any other time in the history of the South.

They have said that his low rate is brought to the farmer and to the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of the efforts of the Corporation in continually beating it down. It may be that this is the case; but regardless of the reasons, the farmer does enjoy the lowest storage rates in the history of the cotton business. It certainly is interesting to know that he enjoys lower rates, far lower rates, than he enjoyed before the Commodity Credit Corporation came into the picture and when competition remained free and uninterrupted.

The best interest of the country as a whole is served by working with the little interior warehouses. There are almost 1,700 of them; and they form an integral part of the cotton industry of the Nation. They may be crippled, if this bill is passed. They may be driven in self defense to consolidate. In some instances they may be forced out of business. In other instances they may be compelled to raise rates upon the transient cotton which will immediately reach the farmer. The wise, the wholesome policy of this Nation is to encourage them and assist them, especially when it appears that no saving can be effectuated by the concentration of the cotton in the few large warehouses of the ports. From the standpoint of the ports, those will grow which aid and cooperate with the interior, helping to build it up and develop the section of the Nation which they directly serve.

Our Relations With Latin America—The Betrayers of the Good Neighbors—Our Officials Analyzed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, too little attention has been given to the obvious weaknesses of our good-neighbor program. With Hitler's shadow ominous over Latin America, it is high time to scrutinize the men and agencies in charge of our Government's cultural, commercial, and defense relations. We need more speed, honesty, and intelligent planning. We must get more action and results. The American people are not being informed of the real issues and dangers in Western Hemisphere defense by the men now handling or mishandling it. Pan Americanism is in danger of being a big flop.

Some desirable half steps are being taken in New World cooperation for defense with the limited funds appropriated by the Congress. Noted Latin Americans of all professions and students are being brought to the United States to lecture and travel. They will return to report to their countrymen. A few American writers, students, and professors are being sent by the State Department to Hispanic America.

WE SHOULD DRAMATIZE OUR EFFORTS

A better job could be done, however, to dramatize and publicize these steps. For example, our Government is helping Peru establish a bureau of fisheries. For the initial surveys a splendid 80-foot refrigerated purse seiner, the *Pacific Queen*, was chartered with the most complete United States fishing and scientific equipment. This vessel was built in 1939 at Tacoma, Wash., on Puget Sound, which closely resembles the scenic evergreen-forested islands, mountains, and bays of southern Chile.

WE SHOULD EXPAND OUR RADIO EFFORTS

The State Department and Office of Coordination of Commercial and Cultural Relations with Latin America should have on their staffs persons with the imagination and training to capitalize on the news and educational values of such examples of inter-American cooperation. Materials could be prepared for use by the radio, press, libraries, and schools in North and South America. The new Radio and Hispanic Divisions of the Library of Congress could doubtless do much in this direction if they could get the required funds from the Coordination Office. Interest would not be confined to the cities of Peru and Puget Sound. A New World audience of millions could be reached with such stories.

LET US SUPPORT AND PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FINANCING TO EXISTING AGENCIES

The Coordination office was given $3,400,000 from the President's defense fund to spend on cultural and trade relations. Nelson A. Rockefeller has stated that his agency is putting money into various Government and private organizations and searching for worthy groups to finance. One such, I am informed by Charles A. Gauld, a citizen of my State of Washington, who is a specialist on Latin America at the Library of Congress, is the newly established Latin American Economic Institute of Boston. Its scholarly members are scattered from New England to California. The institute has two sound and admirable projects for which it needs funds, preferably from private sources, for obvious reasons. The first is a solid joint economic study of the basis for a democratic cooperative order in this hemisphere to oppose Hitlerism. The second is described by Dr. J. F. Normano, the noted economist and writer on Brazil, as follows:

THE IMPORTANCE OF BRAZIL EMPHASIZED

The economic and military defense of the hemisphere would be impossible without the cooperation and good will of the largest and most populous country of Latin America—Brazil. While for many reasons Brazil is traditionally cooperative with the United States, there are signs of certain fluctuations of ideology in the present Brazilian Government. We will not be able to understand and measure the situation without a better knowledge of the actual economic processes which took place since 1930 without a study of the Vargas regime changes.

In addition, Mr. Gauld has told me of the excellent work of the Inter-American Bibliographical and Library Association, founded by Prof. A. C. Wilgus, of George Washington University, a most active lecturer and writer. Both these organizations need funds for their programs and plans for publishing.

WHY BE NIGGARDLY IN SUPPLYING FUNDS?

It is regrettable that the timid and conservative Department of State has asked for only small sums, and that the Congress has granted them even less than requested for cultural relations. With billions now available for defense in all its aspects, there should be no further quibbling over the dangerously inadequate appropriations for Hispanic-American projects. Both the State Department and Congress must wake up.

Is there a slow-down in our defense relations with Latin America? And where does the fault lie? Are there too many dollar-a-year men sitting around talking and endlessly studying memoranda on what should be done about Brazil and Spanish America instead of going ahead and doing it? One hears the possibly unfair accusation that the men of State and Coordination consider themselves answerable only to the President and to God and not to the American people and their elected representatives. A drastic reform in men and methods seems to be needed.

It is not just a matter of too little and too late south of the Rio Grande. Our agencies, public and private, are doing far too little about certain dangers to American security through Nazi penetration and native fascism.

NAZIS CONTRASTED WITH US

Hitler is not losing precious time. The Nazis for years have been busy on the economic and propaganda fronts. In nearly every Latin American capital Germany has diplomatic staffs three or four times as large as ours. Zealous and hard-working Nazi agents should be matched, at least man for man, in South America by our State, War, and Navy Departments. Praise, however, is due many of our men there. The Nazis are militant believers in totalitarianism and work day and night to discredit the Anglo-Saxon democracies.

All too many American representatives are said to be rich reactionaries, indifferent to the Bill of Rights and bitter critics of President Roosevelt's reforms. Hitler claims his men are carefully trained in special institutes in Germany

where they are taught Spanish or Portuguese, and the history, geography, and culture of Brazil and the Spanish-American countries, each of which is proud of its own rich heritage. American consuls and diplomats are chosen chiefly for wealth and family position. It is no wonder that some of our frequently incompetent and tory snobs work only half as hard for American democracy as Hitler's hundreds of spies and embassy attachés who swarm freely over Latin America with diplomatic immunity.

STATE DEPARTMENT SHOULD BE LIBERALIZED

The papers have just carried the story of Assistant Secretary of State Berle's attempt to fire the son of a rich reactionary diplomat who admires Franco and fascism. The State Department could stand a lot of such house cleaning, as the late Ambassador Dodd's diary and the series in the newspaper PM make clear. Dorothy Thompson wrote in the Ladies' Home Journal, of August 1937, that the American people should demand and get a better Diplomatic Service, of men who know the languages, history, and culture of foreign lands. It would not cost much to double or treble the State Department budget and permit our best men to become our diplomats, to put democracy into our diplomacy. Let us democratize its policies and selection of personnel.

COMBATTING TOTALITARIANISM REQUIRES INTENSIFIED PERFORMANCE

The State Department has been functioning with too much secrecy and censorship. Roscoe Drummond, of the distinguished international newspaper, the Christian Science Monitor, recently raised the question of the press' right to information for the national good. Democracy needs the assurance and strength that fact alone gives. The German Embassy continues to be better informed than the American people.

Germany has been spending unlimited sums to win the small, rich, sophisticated class that owns and rules Latin America, along with the London and New York banks. Are we to continue to indulge in unsound, false economy by denying the Government even the paltry amount it requests for use in cultivating this key group? The spies, propagandists, and potential fomenters of disintegration and civil war are hard at work for Hitler in South America. It is clear that United States foundations, State, and Coordination are doing too little to train or employ young Americans to labor in the thorny Latin vineyard.

There does not seem to be any published data on whether the Army's Division of Military Intelligence and the Office of Naval Intelligence are as alert as they should be regarding South America. Until recently our Government was barely keeping abreast of what the Japanese, Germans, Italians, and their Spanish Phalanx allies were doing in Latin America to undermine democracy and smear this country. Now some steps are being taken, but they may be too few and too slow.

TOO MANY TORIES

The United States is pitting a Foreign Service consisting largely of Tories indifferent to American ideals against the fanatical agents of fascism. The Fascist missionaries are apparently making more converts among the generals, landowners, and dictators of Latin America than are our diplomats. Let anyone who doubts this read Pearson and Allen, Hubert Herring, the late Ambassador Dodd, and the 10 articles dissecting the Department of State in the newspaper PM in February 1941.

Let the doubters of these perils read what Archibald MacLeish wrote over a year ago in the Nation for February 10, 1940, of the disastrous loss of prestige we face if we fail to convince the ruling class in Brazil and Spanish America of the superiority of democracy. The able and eloquent Librarian of Congress is an authority on the art of being a good neighbor. He feels strongly that the American people and Government have committed themselves so definitely to better relations with Latin America that we must make good. He states that to fail would be fatal. We must send our ablest scholars and believers in free institutions, not mediocrities. Latin Americans judge nations by their cultural achievements and must be shown convincing proofs of the creativeness and vitality of our culture. If the dominant class is not converted to democracy, it may shortly go completely totalitarian. It is partially so now, particularly certain Nazi-decorated generals. We are fighting a cultural campaign against Hitler in Hispanic America without spending enough money and effort. The battle is in the balance, and it is not sure that we will win.

THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS EULOGIZED

Archibald MacLeish is the ideal type of United States official to lead the cultural forces of our democracy. He had a brilliant career at Yale and Harvard, was an officer in the last war, and then spent years in France and in North and South America as a forceful poet, speaker, and writer. MacLeish, in preparing his epic poem on the conquest of Mexico, followed the route of Cortez from the coast to Tenochtitlan—Mexico City. As an editor of Fortune magazine, he recorded his penetrating observations of Chile and Argentina in 1938. Librarian of Congress since October 1939, he has worked tirelessly to cement pan-American cultural relations.

At the Library of Congress Mr. MacLeish has been ably supported by the Chief Assistant Librarian, Dr. Luther H. Evans. For years Dr. Evans headed the Historical Records Survey, which did such a splendid job recording and preserving the records of our history. This work is a model of what we might encourage and help Latin-American nations do with their priceless historical materials going back to the early sixteenth century.

Archibald MacLeish is the best-qualified general for our cultural war in Latin America with the forces of Fascist barbarism and imperialism. MacLeish won his spurs by fearlessly defending Loyalist Spain in its fight against United States and European Fascists. He knows the issues in South America, whose educated men have long looked to France as the mother of culture. MacLeish believes in organized labor and in making the Americas a bulwark of democracy. He feels deeply about the problems of racial injustice, exploitation of labor sweated by selfish corporations, and poverty, such as the poverty of Puerto Rico, whose nearly 2,000,000 American citizens have no vote in Congress. MacLeish plans to go to Puerto Rico next month to the conference of inter-American writers he helped organize. If only State and Coordination had a group of men like MacLeish!

WE MUST CONVERT LATINS AWAY FROM THEIR SUSPICIONS OF "YANKEE IMPERIALISM"

Most of Spanish America, although dreading a Hitler victory, is still suspicious of United States imperialism. They wonder if part of our huge and growing power is not designed to occupy and "protect" Latin America for United States corporations and banks.

Brazil alone likes and trusts us and has done so for decades. Yet to date we have done almost nothing to strengthen this providential friendship with Brazil. We have made little effort to understand the problems and progress of this nation of over 42,000,000 people, the most strategic and vulnerable part of Latin America, as I pointed out in my speech contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 14, 1941. Our schools ignore the amazing complexities of race and culture of Brazil, recently described by Charles A. Gauld in the Negro History Bulletin for February 1941.

BRAZIL IS OUR BEST FRIEND IN LATIN AMERICA

Brazil is our best friend in Latin America, but our country has failed to match the years of German cultural efforts and the publishing of Brazilian classics in German mentioned by Mr. Gauld. Fascist propagandists, press, and radio in Latin America have sneered at our half-hearted program as typical of a decadent and ineffectual democracy. South Americans see almost no United States students, professors, artists, or lecturers who might answer the Fascist attacks on us. How much longer are we going to talk and not act?

ENCOURAGE APPRECIATION OF LATIN LABOR PROBLEMS

We should send scores and scores of our brilliant and liberal union officials, college men, and teachers to Latin-American capitals as labor and cultural attachés. The A. F. of L. and C. I. O. should jointly strengthen Latin-American labor by insisting on labor attachés in our embassies. Why not? Labor relations and labor solidarity are the very basis and bulwark of democratic defense. The New Republic of February 17, 1941, under "Labor and defense" says:

> Labor morale is not unshakable. It can be maintained only through a belief in the democratic nature of the defense effort. If that belief is allowed to die, we shall have lost the entire struggle. We must remember now how plainly Europe has shown us that labor, not industry, is the strength of a democracy.

PROVIDE AN INTERCHANGE OF SOCIAL WORKERS AND LABOR LEADERS

Prof. S. G. Inman in this month's Survey Graphic declares the New World's best defense lies in solid unity for social and economic justice. In the long run,

it will be more important for the United States to help Latin America solve her social problems than to arm her. There should be an interchange of social workers as well as of labor leaders.

Dr. Inman last year attended a great labor rally in Buenos Aires and heard Argentinean workers demand cooperation with United States labor and democracy against Fascist forces, domestic and imported. A popular liberal poet drew tremendous applause, as Latins honor their poets before they die. Inman praises Argentina's large Jewish community for its model charities and Loyalist Spanish exiles as among the best opponents of totalitarian agents. Hitler's victims now help expose and combat his methods in Latin America. Yet our State Department has not helped bring them from European concentration camps to Latin-American nations which have opened their doors. The newspaper PM has for months been condemning our diplomats for their un-American callousness.

CLAUDE BOWERS IS AN IDEAL DIPLOMAT

Professor Inman lauds Ambassador to Chile Claude Bowers as one reason why South America trusts us more. Bowers is one of our rare envoys who displays real devotion to social democracy. Only as we send more diplomats like him to Latin America will we win full confidence.

If United States labor, liberties, and social progress are sacrificed in the name of defense and profits, Hispanic America will fear a new era of Yankee imperialism and may choose fascism as the lesser evil.

Charles W. Taussig, president of the American Molasses Co., writes with liberalism and sympathy of basic economic and social reforms needed in the Caribbean area. His Survey Graphic article this month shows how fair a progressive United States businessman can be about labor, social services, and the rights of the predominantly Negro masses of the poverty-stricken Caribbean islands. Mr. Taussig, unlike the majority of our corporation executives, criticizes reactionary foreign firms which treat Latin-American laborers and non-Caucasians badly and deny them fair wages, unions, and sufficient schools and hospitals.

Our Government's entire Latin-American program seems to be based on policies of ignoring labor and the interests of the majority of our people. Hemisphere defense is in the hands of tories and businessmen. These gentry were recently caught allowing petroleum products and aviation gasoline to reach Hitler through reexports from Latin America and Spain. What will they not do next for profits and to smash labor?

LET US HAVE MORE DIPLOMATS OF JOHN WINANT'S CALIBER

Fortunately the President occasionally gets time to appoint a man of genuine liberalism, like Ambassador Winant, who has a fine article on social security for Latin-American labor in the valuable special Hispanic-American issue of Survey Graphic. In a recent speech, Mr. Winant, a staunch friend of labor, said something that certainly applies to South America:

> We cannot now expect that a citizen with no share in the benefits of democracy will give his faith and his life for the preservation of the empty promises of democracy. * * * To win the war or build our defense, we must first justify our beliefs by strengthening the fundamental economic, social, and civil rights of all.

Pan-Americanism has heretofore been the property of reactionary big business and it has used politicians and diplomats adept at bartering the heritage of the common people. It is high time to apply to pan-Americanism the high ideals of the founding patriots of both North and South America. The American people must demand a better Latin-American policy or State and Coordination may go on ignoring their rights.

It is the workingmen and common people who will have to do the fighting and dying to defend the New World's imperiled freedom. Labor and liberals cannot count on any help from the Tory press, as George Seldes tells us every week in In Fact. The publishers are for the fine phrases but not for higher wages for Latin-American workers. Representative United States leaders, except labor leaders, are to be sent to Latin America by the State Department.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR IS PERFORMING GREAT SERVICES IN ITS TREATMENT OF LATIN AMERICA

In addition to the newspaper PM, the Christian Science Monitor deserves great praise for its Latin-American and labor coverage. Its eminent editor, Erwin D. Canham, has often written of labor's contributions to the upbuilding and protection of better citizenship and democracy. The Christian Science Monitor does much to raise the prestige of United States journalism in Latin America. Coordination might well finance an index to the Monitor to make it doubly useful in the Nation's schools and colleges.

DR. ERNESTO GALARZA

My attention has been directed to the unusually laudable set of articles in Survey Graphic of this month. Dr. Ernesto Galarza's "Labor—Leaven of Democracy," is the most important from the viewpoint of the strengthening of the democratic popular base of hemisphere defense, to which I referred in my speech on Brazil in the RECORD of March 14, 1941. Dr. Galarza has been doing exceptional work at the Pan American Union as chief of the neglected, almost sabotaged, but potentially vital, Division of Labor and Social Information. Dr. Galarza shows the need of an inter-American institute for social and labor research with adequate staff and funds for the significant study of social and economic aspects of labor's place in defense. He stresses labor's faith in democratic institutions and enthusiasm for their protection.

WE SHOULD BE AWARE OF DANGERS IN THE OFFING

Prof. W. R. Sharp, of New York, thinks the Pan American Union is understaffed and overworked. Salaries are as low as at the Library of Congress because of insufficient appropriations. Dr. Sharp recommends certain reforms at the P. A. U. to increase its effectiveness and multiply its contacts below the Caribbean. The P. A. U. seems to suffer from the same bureaucratic ills and stodginess as State. Sharp concludes his Survey Graphic article thus:

> Should the Axis win, pan-Americanism will require consummate wisdom, courage, and self-restraint to survive the ideological, economic, and perhaps military offensives that will beat upon it from without. If the democracies triumph, pan-America may well exhibit what can be accomplished through international good will and intelligent action—an example to the other hemisphere.

Professor Sharp contributed a most valuable study of the Vargas dictatorship, based on his visit in Brazil, to the Inter-American Quarterly of October 1940.

I trust there is nothing to prevent the Coordination Office from helping finance Dr. Galarza's Labor Division research and the publication acquisition programs of the Pan American Union and the Library of Congress.

WE MUST EVIDENCE A WILLINGNESS TO COOPERATE, EVEN THOUGH IT MAY CUT PROFITS

In the same Survey Graphic issue Hubert Herring, the much-traveled director of the Committee on Cultural Relations with Latin America, writes:

> The final test of the reality of our neighborliness will be our willingness to limit our immediate profits for the sake of a larger American prosperity. We must move toward an authentic all-American cooperative economy, else all talk about cultural interchange may well be put down as so much twaddle.

It may be difficult for certain State and Coordination officials to sacrifice the profits of their big business relatives and friends. However, Nelson Rockefeller exposed part of the sordid story of United States firms doing business with Nazis in Latin America. I hope this is just a curtain-raiser and that he will go after the shipments of oil and gasoline to Japan and Hitler Europe that some United States officials continue to permit. This two-faced policy does not favorably impress Latin Americans with our sincerity.

Has the Coordination Office tackled the placing in the Government service of young experts on Hispanic America whose talents are not now being used? The Civil Service Commission has been overworked and understaffed, and has not created a register of Latin-American specialists from the hundreds on the translator and other registers. Civil Service has been accused of lacking imagination and initiative, but the chief fault lies in the State, War, and Navy Departments for not requesting more such personnel to increase their staffs and replace deadwood.

EXPERTS ARE AVAILABLE—LET US RETAIN THEM

The Library of Congress wants to hire such experts but lacks the funds. In recent years it has had to employ young specialists on Latin America with 5 to 7 years of university training at as low as $1,020 and $1,260 a year. Most persons in this field seeking Government posts are bitterly disillusioned. They see the Government full of incompetents and reactionaries while highly trained college graduates are denied even $1,260 clerkships. The big foundations appear to be doing little to help them get to South America for research. Dr. Lewis Hanke, the dynamic Director of the Library of Congress' Hispanic Division, recently blasted the fossilized foundations for their do-nothingism, in Harpers magazine for November 1940.

The Army and Navy are, of course, doing the usual necessary things to promote United States-Latin American defense cooperation. Missions of our experts are in all parts of the South American continent. United States and Latin-American scientists jointly seek oil, strategic minerals, and expanded rubber production—one of the projects begun by HENRY WALLACE while still Secretary of Agriculture. Pan American Airways' several subsidiaries are splendid examples of cooperative enterprises of defense value.

OUR ARMY AND NAVY CAN DO MUCH

It is in the unusual necessary things requiring flexibility and imagination that our Navy and War Departments are said to be deficient. Fortunately, they apparently are only slightly less alert and ingenious than the Nazis. Lewis Mumford has dissected the military and bureaucratic mind, caustically depicting its conservatism and lack of creativeness. Like State and Coordination, the Army and Navy have moved slowly while the Germans acted swiftly, ignoring the cost. War and Navy may not have done enough to build civilian staffs of experts. Civil Service has sent them lists of eligibles passing the language examinations, and some young university graduates trained in Latin-American problems. However, few seem to have been hired in the Munitions Buildings or sent to South America. Presumably the departments depend almost solely on the reports of diplomats and attachés. These gentlemen are sometimes, but not always, as shrewd and hard-working as Hitler's numerous agents. Many of our officers are distinguished graduates of the special advanced schools of the Army and Navy. We may have too few men on the job of keeping track of Nazi and other subversive activities and reporting on conditions and important developments.

NAZIS DILATE ON RACIAL DISCRIMINATIONS

The Germans are capitalizing on our "too little and too late" policy in Hispanic America. The tireless Berlin propaganda in South America smears us systematically. The Nazis spread a revolutionary gospel in Spanish or Portuguese for the non-Caucasian and exploited masses, condemning United States discriminations in industry and the armed forces against Negroes and others, and pointing with alarm to Yankee imperialism, past and present. Because Hitlerism is both revolutionary and cynical, it plays class against class and race against race in Hispanic America to stir up as much disintegration as possible. Civil war is a trump Hitler is holding up his sleeve. He won some cheap and notable conquests in Europe by such disruptive and astute tactics. He sells a very different bill of goods to the upper classes in Latin America, but the United States is libeled in any case. How Hitler could attack the United States without invasion, with economic and political pressures and "diversions," was mentioned in the United States News for February 14, 1941.

WE ARE DERELICT ON THE PROPAGANDA FRONT

Propaganda Analysis for December 15, 1940, claims:

The United States has done little on the propaganda front to meet the Axis challenge. Until quite recently only the radio chains made any real effort to interpret the United States to Latin America. The Government itself has done almost nothing, although plans are now under way to remedy this situation.

That is the trouble—fine plans and insufficient action. Propaganda Analysis is right in urging the close study of totalitarian propaganda techniques and results among the Latins. Without such basic information, no intelligent program to counteract untruths is possible. If the Coordination Office has not yet sent well-qualified observers fluent in Portuguese or Spanish to South America, it might consider financing Propaganda Analysis, which should be able to do an excellent job.

Certain officials in the War, State, and Navy Departments are superficially qualified to deal with complex and perilous situations. Actually, these men's intellectual horizons are frequently seriously limited in several directions—by ultraconservatism, inflexibility, and stodginess. Germany is said to have rigorously trained officials and military men daringly and brilliantly to plan and execute unusual maneuvers on the economic, cultural, and war fronts. Sad things have been happening to European governments whose officers and bureaucrats failed to keep abreast of those of Germany. It is to be hoped that Hitler is not preparing any unpleasant surprises for us in South America for which we are not forewarned and well prepared.

WE MUST OFFSET NAZI FOMENTATIONS

Our diplomatic and defense officials will have to shoulder their share of the blame if the worst comes and Hitler is able to foment civil wars in Brazil and Spanish America. The Axis may in 1941 or 1942 decide to start trouble in our backyard to deflect the flow of aid to Britain. Hitler might try this regardless of whether he is winning or losing. God knows it might be a decisive factor.

What forces are there in Latin America which would welcome United States help in crushing Nazi-led civil strife or invasion? There are the untrustworthy domestic Fascists, dictators, generals, and tories whose selfish regimes our State Department apparently favors and supports in return for concessions to United States trade and speculators. There are the common people, left in poverty and illiteracy save in a few fortunate areas. Antilabor and imperialistic forces are powerful in this country and influence every administration's foreign policy. Their kept officials in our diplomatic service have knifed Latin-American labor and democracy. These forces and these men still strongly affect United States policies. Our cooperation with democratic groups in South America may yet be prevented by inside sabotage. Let us hope this betrayal will not come to roost on the Axis perch like the sell-out of Loyalist Spain by our own Fascists.

WE MUST ACT NOW

It is never too late to let the American people in on the truth and give them their choice of policies. We can give Latin Americans as well as our own citizens a better social and economic system and a democracy worth defending. That is sound defense strategy which our officials would do well to study carefully.

Export-Import Bank loans such as those to several nations for their steel industries should include labor safeguards and wage stipulations. Good pay and conditions are sound economics and build better markets and living standards. Mordecai Ezekiel pictures this clearly and eloquently in a major study published in "International Conciliation" last month. The question arises whether State and Coordination officials, as at present constituted, can be trusted not to continue to run defense policies in Latin America so that big business enjoys excessive profits with Government support of its imperialism. Let the American people beware of the prostitution of defense. As the world's leading Republic, we might try the novel experiment of an honest, open democratic and truly American program of diplomacy and defense.

At present our tactics seemingly tend to support tyrannies and to undermine truly liberal regimes like those in Mexico under Cárdenas, in Colombia and in Chile, which attempt to put human rights above foreign corporations' property rights. As many hard-hitting newspaper stories point out, this betrayal of liberty supplies ammunition to Hitler's propagandists and the native totalitarians south of us. Hispanic America's harassed democrats cannot be expected to continue their faith in our system of government if the officials of the great democracy of the north betray them while its people sleep.

To paraphrase George Seldes in In Fact of March 10, 1941, this Republic is in a position to extend its aid and open its markets in exchange not only for promises of democracy from Latin America's dictators, but for actions establishing democracy there now. Those who block this are the betrayers of the good neighbors.

The Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE NEW CASTLE COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY AND ENDORSED BY THE MEDICAL SOCIETY OF DELAWARE

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution from the New Castle County Medical Society and the Medical Society of Delaware, referring to the Selective Service Act:

Whereas it has come to the attention of the society that certain provisions of the

National Selective Service Act have proved unjust and unreasonable in their effect on members of the medical and dental professions—namely, that physicians and dentists have been inducted into military service as privates rather than as members of their respective professional groups, and that no provision has been made for medical students, hospital internes, and residents to complete their professional training; be it

Resolved, That the following recommendations express the opinion of this society:

(1) That the physicians and dentists called into service under the Selective Service Act be permitted to apply for commissions in the Medical or Dental Corps.

(2) That in the event such commissions are not available because the personnel of either corps is adequate, such selectees be permitted to enlist in the Reserve Corps, medical or dental, respectively.

(3) That medical and dental students' military service, if selected, be deferred until the completion of their professional training or until professional degree is granted.

(4) That internes be permitted to complete their terms of internship as provided in their contracts, being deferred if selected prior to the completion of interneship.

(5) That residents engaged in advanced training in an approved hospital for qualification in a specialty be permitted to complete their training, being deferred if selected prior to the completion of their residency. Such advanced training and approved hospitals are to be understood as those meeting the requirements of the examining boards of the particular specialty.

(6) That none of the foregoing recommendations are to be understood as suggesting that medical and dental students, physicians, and dentists be exempt from military service, or that internes and residents be deferred beyond the usual term of their hospital contracts, or that internes and residents be permitted to complete new hospital contracts for additional training made after they have been selected for military service, or that internes and residents be refused permission to make such new contracts before they have been selected for military service; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread on the minutes of this meeting, and that the endorsement of the Medical Society of Delaware and the Delaware State Dental Society be requested, and that copies of the resolution be sent to the Senators and Representative of Delaware in the Congress of the United States, and the American Medical Association.

Greeks Fighting for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

ARTICLE BY GEORGE J. S. CHRYSSIKOS AND COMMENTS OF OUTSTANDING AMERICANS ON THE VALOR OF THE GREEK PEOPLE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, 120 years ago today Greece started its war for independence with the help of Great Britain.

Today the whole world realizes history is repeating itself and the heroic valor of that little country has aroused the admiration of every liberty-loving American. That country—and it is a small country—has stood up and fought fascism to a standstill. It has put new heart into the little countries. I would like to quote from an article written by George J. S. Chryssikos, of the State of New York, as well as a quotation from Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt and other outstanding Americans:

GREEKS FIGHTING FOR ALL—APPEAL TO EVERY LOVER OF LIBERTY AND FREEDOM

One of the smallest nations of Europe, with ancient traditions of liberty—a nation, in fact, whose history from the fifth century, before Christ, to the present time is a long succession of heroic struggles in defense of western civilization and freedom—stands today in need of quick and generous help from the liberty-loving people of America. Greece, the cradle of civilization and the mother of democracy, is fighting valiantly against heavy odds. With a population of 7,000,000 inhabiting a mountainous country of superb beauty, but with few natural resources, she was unjustifiably attacked by Italy, with a population of 45,000,000. Everyone expected Greece to yield to the Italian aggression without resistance and to surrender her extremely important bases to the Fascist forces for use against the British Navy in the Mediterranean and against the British land forces defending Egypt, the Suez Canal, and Palestine.

But Greece chose to fight. Not only is she fighting now; she is fighting victoriously, showing to the world that a sense of honor and love of freedom, bravery, and a spirit of sacrifice are superior to numerical strength, even in modern warfare, with motorized armies and bomber planes. Greece has shown to us and to every other nation threatened by aggression that the Axis Powers are not unbeatable, that totalitarian invincibility is a myth.

Greece needs help, however, in order to stand the strain of this unequal struggle. She needs help urgently; she needs food and clothing for the families left behind by those hardy mountaineers who have rushed to the front and, at the point of the bayonet, driven the Fascist legions from Greek territory far into Italian-occupied Albania. Greece needs milk for the babies whose fathers are fighting to prevent the Axis Powers from completing their domination of continental Europe. She needs medical supplies and ambulances and hospital equipment to care for and save the lives of her heroic wounded soldiers. She needs warm undergarments and socks for her gallant warriors who are fighting at altitudes ranging from 6,000 to 8,000 feet above sea level. One or both legs of many of these soldiers have had to be amputated to prevent their frozen feet from being gangrenous as they chased away the invaders from snowy mountain peaks and high narrow passes.

To secure American help for Greece a Nation-wide organization has been established by prominent American citizens, with headquarters in New York City. This committee is known as the Greek War Relief Association, Inc., and has the honor of including the first lady of the land, Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in the long list of its distinguished members. Its offices are located at 730 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

In asking you to send your generous contributation to the Greek War Relief Association, Inc., I wish to remind you that the heroic fight of Greece against Fascist imperialism has a significance which transcends her geographical boundaries and even those of Europe. To every American who believes with our Government that the British Fleet is our first line of defense and that continued British resistance is essential to our safety, it must be obvious that Greece's fight on the side of England and her splendid victories against Fascist forces, overwhelmingly superior in numbers as well as in modern equipment, serve to reduce the possibility of this country's having eventually to defend itself and the rest of the Western Hemisphere against foreign attack.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that Greece's struggle has a world significance and is not merely a Greco-Italian or even a strictly European affair. For this reason, it is in the interest of every one of us as a peace-loving people, as free citizens, as fathers and mothers of young men of military age serving in the fighting forces of the United States or waiting to be called for defense duty, to give Greece all possible help in order to encourage her in the unequal struggle and to enable her to emerge victoriously from the war into which she was plunged by Fascist aggression. This heroic little nation has poured out its blood and its treasures without stint.

In order to appreciate the importance of the refusal of Greece to surrender to the Axis and to become a tool against Great Britain and, indirectly, against the United States, one has but to compare the war situation as it existed on October 27, the eve of the Italian invasion of Greece, with the war situation as it stands today.

On October 27 everything had been arranged and prepared for a sudden descent of the German armies upon the eastern Mediterranean, with the Italians striking from Albania and advancing through Greece to join forces with their German allies at the Dardanelles. On October 28 the Italian invasion of Greece took place, but was quickly stopped, and the Greek Army took the offensive, driving the Italians out of Greek territory far into Albania. As a result of this the German armies are still in Bulgaria.

Nevertheless the struggle is not yet over by any means. Again let me urge that Greece must have assistance from abroad in the form of food, clothing, medical supplies, and the like, if she is to carry her gallant fight to a victorious end. Greek cities and villages are being systematically ruined by Italian bombing planes aiming at the destruction of the magnificent morale of the Greek people. The need for help is not only great and urgent but also immediate.

Let us consecrate ourselves to every necessary sacrifice for the Greek people and guarantee the future security of Greece, of democracy, of civilization, and of humanity. Spyros P. Skouras is the national president of the Greek War Relief Association.

Adolph Zukor, chairman of the board of Paramount Pictures, has organized the motion-picture industry and starting today in 8,000 motion-picture theaters throughout the United States collections are being taken to help the women and children of these dauntless defenders of democracy.

Here are a few tributes that have been made to that gallant country by famous Americans:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 15, 1941.

MY DEAR MR. ZUKOR: I am very happy to send you a few words to pay tribute to the valor of the Greek people in their defense of their country.

They are true to their traditions and all the world must pay them homage.

Very sincerely yours,

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT.

Not "the glory that was Greece," but, now, "the glory that is Greece."

To our everlasting debt of gratitude to the Aegean land for having enriched the intellectual and aesthetic life of mankind, we are once more adding new applause.

The glory that was Greece springs to life again, in deeds of valor, patriotism, and all the aspects of human chivalry that men admire, respect, and love to honor.

Down the glittering corridors of your intellectual and national history, O Greece, your long and glorious line of poets, sculptors, painters, statesmen, heroes, and patriots must be singing a heavenly chorus of hallelujah.

More power to the glory that is Greece!

FANNIE HURST.

Can our great Nation ingloriously desert and betray the Greeks in their hour of returning glory? Once more the Greeks are giving their blood for the freedom of the world. Shall we not even give them of our money?

RUPERT HUGHES.

Let us do our utmost now when real help will encourage this brave people to stand up as their forefathers did so many times before. We are undoubtedly all very sorry for them. Let us demonstrate how sorry we really are. No matter what other tasks we have this is one we should perform with great willingness and most generously.

HENRY MORGENTHAU.

I have just returned from the front impressed by the terrific problem there presented in connection with the relief of human suffering Certainly the work already being done by the authorities and your committee is magnificent but I believe that no efforts can be too great to meet the indescribable suffering and privation. I tell you this because I have myself witnessed the patience and heroism of people overwhelmed by war conditions in the depths of winter, people who though homeless and half frozen cheer when they hear the name of America, and I say God bless your efforts.

Col. WILLIAM DONOVAN.

Responsibility for Strikes in Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SANTA MONICA EVENING OUTLOOK

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Outlook of Santa Monica, Calif.:

[From the Santa Monica Evening Outlook of March 20, 1941]

ARE THE COMMUNISTS RESPONSIBLE?

As the number of strikes in defense industry multiplies, it becomes increasingly hard to believe that any honest American labor leader could be so heedless of the country's paramount need as to persist in such strikes in defiance of the pleas and warnings of the President of the United States.

The suspicion that many of these strikes are the work of Communists or other "fifth columnists" deliberately attempting to hamstring the defense program, is strengthened when one considers how skillfully these hamstringing tactics are being applied.

One of the latest and most striking examples of an industrial bottleneck being tied up by a strike is that of the Harvill die-casting plant, in Inglewood. Although this small company employs only 425 men, it furnishes castings to practically all the important airplane companies on the Pacific coast. It has been closed by a strike since last Friday, and the head of the Aircraft Division of the O. P. M. in Washington, Merrill C. Meigs, testified before a House committee that airplane production on the Pacific coast is likely to be completely stopped by this one small strike.

Is it simply a coincidence that such a small plant, which never had any serious labor trouble before, is closed by a strike at the very moment when its production becomes essential to aircraft production. The average American, recalling that the C. I. O. has never purged itself of its large communistic element, can only wonder whether the Communists in this country are not carrying out a deliberate plan for sabotaging American defense and aid to Britain.

If anything is certain, it is that the Communists will do everything they can to defeat this defense program. The Communist "party line" has decreed this and for the present all "reds" and party sympathizers in this country are virtual allies of the Axis Powers. It would not be surprising if they had a well-considered plan for sabotaging the defense industry. A great many of them occupy important positions in unions belonging to the C. I. O.

It is rather staggering to realize that the huge and powerful labor organization which the administration has favored these last 6 years contains among its leadership a considerable number of men who are enemies of our defense program and system of government. But the fact had better be realized soon, and these men deprived of their present power to sabotage the defense of democracy.

House Resolution 98

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, my resolution, House Resolution 98, which was presented to the last Congress as well as this Congress, had for its object the feeding of the starving millions in the conquered and occupied countries of Europe.

The following article endorses what I proposed to the Congress:

[From the New York Times of March 25, 1941]

ARCHBISHOPS BACK HOOVER FOOD PLAN—CARDINAL O'CONNELL, FLOERSCH, MCNICHOLAS, AND 17 BISHOPS ARE SIGNERS OF STATEMENT—CITE INJUSTICE OF FAMINE—VICTORY "BUILT ON THE BODIES OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN" IS NO SOLUTION, THEY ASSERT

Three archbishops of the Roman Catholic Church and 17 bishops of Catholic dioceses throughout the United States have signed a statement supporting the plan of Herbert Hoover for relief of famine conditions among the small European democracies, according to an announcement made yesterday by the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies, 420 Lexington Avenue.

William Cardinal O'Connell, archbishop of Boston, headed the list of 20 Catholic prelates endorsing the Hoover plan. The other archbishops among the signers were the Most Reverend John T. McNicholas of Cincinnati and the Most Reverend John A. Floersch, of Louisville, Ky.

TEXT OF STATEMENT

The statement follows:

"As individual American citizens—in cooperation with religious leaders of every denomination, who have publicly expressed their support and approval of Herbert Hoover's plan to relieve starvation within the occupied countries of Europe—we join in giving expression to our strong belief that the exigencies of even a just war do not require that millions of innocent children, women, and noncombatants be made to endure famine.

"A victory built on the dead bodies of starving women and children, innocent victims of the war over which they have no control, will destroy human sentiments that must necessarily enter into any form of enduring peace.

"The proposals of the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies, of which former President Herbert Hoover is honorary chairman, are humanitarian and should be carried out in the name of Christian charity. Conditions set up by this committee specifically provide that none of the food, directly or indirectly, shall reach or benefit Germany. As long as this condition is maintained we cannot see why such a humanitarian and Christian proposal should be rejected.

"We hope and pray that those who guide the destinies of nations will be conscious of their obligation to protect the innocent, and not lay obstacles in the path of a movement whose sole object is to alleviate dire distress without affording aid to those who have invaded the lands of these many millions of starving and helpless fellow humans.

"With the Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, we believe that 'we can desire nothing more in such a convulsion of things than to help the bodies and raise the spirits' of the innocent victims of war."

OTHERS WHO SIGNED

Other signers of the statement, in addition to Cardinal O'Connell and Archbishops McNicholas and Floersch, were:

The Most Reverend Karl J. Alter, bishop of Toledo (Ohio).

The Most Reverend Stanislaus V. Bona, bishop of Grand Island (Nebraska).

The Most Reverend Matthew F. Brady, bishop of Burlington (Vermont).

The Most Reverend Joseph F. Busch, bishop of St. Cloud (Minnesota).

The Most Reverend John A. Duffy, bishop of Buffalo.

The Most Reverend Edmund F. Gibbons, bishop of Albany.

The Most Reverend Thomas K. Gorman, bishop of Reno (Nevada).

The Most Reverend William A. Griffin, bishop of Trenton.

The Most Reverend Francis C. Kelley, bishop of Oklahoma City and Tulsa.

The Most Reverend John T. McNicholas, bishop of Norwood (Ohio).

The Most Reverend Aloisius J. Muench, bishop of Fargo (North Dakota).

The Most Reverend Gerald P. O'Hara, bishop of Savannah-Atlanta (Georgia).

The Most Reverend John H. Peschges, bishop of Crookston (Minnesota).

The Most Reverend Joseph E. Ritter, bishop of Indianapolis.

The Most Reverend Paul P. Rhode, bishop of Green Bay (Wisconsin).

The Most Reverend Frank A. Thill, bishop of Concordia (Kansas).

The Most Reverend Charles D. White, bishop of Spokane.

The Most Reverend Christian Winkelmann, bishop of Wichita (Kansas).

Nation-wide Water Power Development, H. R. 4128

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill (H. R. 4128) to create regional authorities similar to the T. V. A. for the development of the water power in every section of the United States; not only for the development of hydroelectric power, but for the development of every navigable stream and its tributaries, for purposes of national defense, navigation, flood control, irrigation, reclamation, and soil conservation, as well as for the generation of electric energy.

The passage of this measure would do more to absorb unemployment throughout the country in case this defense program should terminate, than anything else that could be done at this time. Not only that, but it would give the American people in every State in this Union the benefit of their own natural resources. It would reduce light and power rates by a billion dollars a year. These reductions would go to every community in America.

I recognize the fact that national defense comes first. If we had all the navigable streams in this country and their tributaries thoroughly developed, as they have in Europe, there is no telling what it would be worth to us in the present emergency; and there is no telling what it will be worth to the people of this Nation in the years to come if this program is carried out and these resources are developed as rapidly as possible.

The measure is subject to amendments, of course, and it is likely that two of these authorities may be combined.

I recognize the fact that next to domestic use and national defense, irrigation and reclamation have priority right to the use of the water in these streams. This measure recognizes those rights and provides for their exercise.

In other sections of the country floods are more disastrous than droughts, and the people in those areas are entitled to all the protection that can be given against disastrous overflows in their respective areas. This measure provides for that protection.

It is absolutely necessary that we improve the navigation of our inland waterways, not only for purposes of national defense but also for the purpose of transportation in times of peace.

We were told by a member of the Federal Power Commission, Mr. John W. Scott, a few days ago that the undeveloped water power in this country would produce 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity annually.

All the electric energy used in the United States in 1940 amounted to only $118,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, as you will see from the table which I am inserting at the end of these remarks.

In other words, our undeveloped water power that now is going to waste amounts to almost twice the amount of electricity produced in this country last year with coal, gas, oil, wood, and water power.

This program would pay for itself within a generation, or within 50 years at the outside; and then the Nation would have an unencumbered asset that would be worth untold billions to the country as a whole.

In addition to that, it would force reductions of light and power rates to their proper levels in every section of the country, increase the use of electricity in every home and every business establishment, and enable us to electrify every farmhouse in America at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution.

That would save the present users of electricity a billion dollars a year, on the present load, in addition to amortizing the investment within the time stated.

These savings would increase with the increasing load, and by the time this entire development is amortized the ultimate consumers of electricity in the United States would save enough on their light and power bills alone to pay off the national debt.

I am inserting at the close of these remarks tables showing the number of customers in every class of service in every State, during the year 1940, the amount of electricity used, the revenues derived therefrom, and the overcharges according to the T. V. A. rates, the Tacoma, Wash., rates and the Ontario, Canada, rates; and then a final table giving the composite figures for all classes of service in every State in the Union. If there is anyone who doubts the accuracy of these figures, let him get the electric-rate book, or the one called Typical Electric Bills, for his own State—both of which are published by the Federal Power Commission—and make his own comparisons. He will see that these figures are extremely conservative.

What we are doing for the people in the T. V. A. area, we now propose to do for the people of the entire Nation.

The tables referred to follow:

TABLE 1.—*Residential electric service, 1940*

State	Estimated sales data for 1940			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—					
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tupelo, Miss. (Tennessee Valley Authority)		Tacoma, Wash.		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	221,000	227,814,000	$6,390,066	$4,249,394	$2,140,672	$3,840,430	$2,549,636	$3,290,884	$3,099,182
Arizona	82,000	45,800,000	2,050,733	844,902	1,205,831	762,873	1,287,860	654,184	1,396,549
Arkansas	139,200	78,497,000	3,836,221	1,776,170	2,060,051	1,603,540	2,232,681	1,373,367	2,462,854
California	1,805,000	1,425,978,000	45,428,363	29,346,722	16,081,641	26,484,736	18,943,627	22,714,182	22,714,181
Colorado	203,500	144,308,000	6,750,508	3,341,650	3,409,158	3,017,611	3,733,197	2,585,559	4,165,249
Connecticut	446,300	455,275,000	18,167,204	9,446,946	8,720,258	8,538,586	9,628,618	7,321,383	10,845,821
Delaware	51,100	44,162,000	1,979,093	940,069	1,039,024	849,031	1,130,062	728,306	1,250,787
District of Columbia	61,362	171,355,000	4,405,613	3,594,980	810,633	2,436,237	1,969,376	2,784,347	1,621,266
Florida	310,000	297,369,000	13,285,191	5,752,488	7,532,703	5,194,510	8,090,681	4,450,539	8,834,652
Georgia	300,000	347,378,000	9,805,216	5,912,606	3,892,610	5,343,843	4,461,373	4,579,036	5,226,180
Idaho	101,000	114,032,000	2,964,697	1,636,513	1,328,184	1,476,419	1,488,278	1,265,926	1,698,771
Illinois	1,790,000	1,557,509,000	61,954,827	35,066,432	26,888,395	31,658,917	30,295,910	27,136,214	34,818,613
Indiana	708,000	530,287,000	21,380,365	11,716,440	9,663,925	10,583,281	10,797,084	9,065,275	12,315,090
Iowa	454,000	315,410,000	13,486,531	6,905,104	6,581,427	6,230,777	7,255,754	5,340,666	8,145,865
Kansas	316,000	244,694,000	10,053,312	5,127,189	4,926,123	4,634,577	5,418,735	3,971,058	6,082,254
Kentucky	304,000	203,213,000	7,596,987	4,223,925	3,373,062	3,813,687	3,783,300	3,266,704	4,330,283
Louisiana	263,000	151,983,000	7,757,478	3,723,589	4,033,889	3,358,988	4,398,490	2,885,782	4,871,696
Maine	185,700	117,692,000	5,328,096	2,445,596	2,882,500	2,205,832	3,122,264	1,891,474	3,436,622
Maryland	425,638	294,616,000	11,357,797	6,564,807	4,792,990	5,928,770	5,429,027	5,088,293	6,269,504
Massachusetts	1,132,500	822,891,000	38,774,188	18,340,191	20,433,997	16,556,578	22,217,610	14,191,353	24,582,835
Michigan	1,257,000	1,310,810,000	40,625,040	25,390,650	15,234,390	22,953,148	17,671,892	19,662,519	20,962,521
Minnesota	484,200	476,983,000	15,926,569	9,078,714	6,847,855	8,201,183	7,725,386	6,784,718	9,141,851
Mississippi	123,000	77,516,000	3,228,500	1,775,675	1,452,825	1,601,336	1,627,164	1,375,341	1,853,159
Missouri	650,000	619,761,000	21,499,199	12,254,543	9,244,656	11,072,087	10,427,112	9,481,147	12,018,052
Montana	103,000	98,778,000	3,495,897	1,719,981	1,775,916	1,552,178	1,943,719	1,331,937	2,163,960
Nebraska	234,000	173,030,000	6,974,288	3,640,578	3,333,710	3,284,890	3,689,398	2,817,612	4,156,674
Nevada	22,000	19,670,000	730,739	300,334	430,405	271,101	459,638	232,375	498,366

TABLE 1.—*Residential electric service, 1940*—Continued

State	Estimated sales data for 1940			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—					
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tupelo, Miss. (Tennessee Valley Authority)		Tacoma, Wash.		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
New Hampshire	127,000	83,710,000	$4,069,058	$1,761,902	$2,307,156	$1,591,002	$2,478,056	$1,363,134	$2,705,924
New Jersey	1,087,000	849,627,000	41,347,506	19,474,675	21,872,831	17,614,038	23,733,468	15,091,840	26,255,666
New Mexico	39,300	28,302,000	1,488,556	593,934	894,622	537,369	951,187	459,964	1,028,592
New York	3,410,000	2,658,571,000	119,669,009	60,073,843	59,595,166	54,210,061	65,458,948	46,431,575	73,237,434
North Carolina	350,000	250,345,000	8,447,784	4,832,132	3,615,652	4,367,504	4,080,280	3,742,368	4,705,416
North Dakota	66,400	59,982,000	2,410,209	1,135,208	1,275,001	1,026,877	1,383,332	879,726	1,530,483
Ohio	1,580,000	1,475,545,000	50,502,010	30,806,226	19,695,784	27,826,608	22,675,402	23,836,949	26,665,061
Oklahoma	270,000	189,386,000	9,043,375	3,997,172	5,046,203	3,608,307	5,435,068	3,092,834	5,950,541
Oregon	258,000	298,919,000	7,359,749	4,894,233	2,465,516	4,423,209	2,936,540	3,790,271	3,569,478
Pennsylvania	2,100,000	1,901,028,000	53,497,736	27,658,330	25,839,406	24,983,443	28,514,293	21,399,094	32,098,642
Rhode Island	182,000	121,330,000	6,591,958	2,972,973	3,618,985	2,682,927	3,909,031	2,287,409	4,304,549
South Carolina	145,500	120,265,000	3,852,115	2,315,121	1,536,994	2,091,698	1,760,417	1,791,233	2,060,882
South Dakota	77,000	63,002,000	2,663,067	1,182,402	1,480,665	1,067,890	1,595,177	916,095	1,746,972
Tennessee	317,000	308,392,000	8,768,974	7,041,486	1,727,488	6,357,506	2,411,468	5,454,302	3,314,672
Texas	800,000	616,165,000	26,512,557	13,203,253	13,309,304	11,930,651	14,581,906	10,233,847	16,278,710
Utah	117,000	114,386,000	3,884,039	2,182,830	1,701,209	1,969,208	1,914,831	1,689,557	2,194,482
Vermont	75,200	56,951,000	2,590,316	1,152,691	1,437,625	1,041,307	1,549,009	893,659	1,696,657
Virginia	354,000	323,241,000	11,873,737	6,281,207	5,592,530	5,675,646	6,198,091	4,868,232	7,005,505
Washington	441,000	638,542,000	14,343,148	9,710,311	4,632,837	8,763,663	5,579,485	7,515,810	6,827,338
West Virginia	234,000	191,811,000	7,544,510	4,058,946	3,485,564	3,666,632	3,877,878	3,146,061	4,398,449
Wisconsin	608,000	589,867,000	18,976,497	10,512,979	8,463,518	9,488,249	9,488,248	8,140,917	10,835,580
Wyoming	39,600	24,948,000	1,323,573	562,519	761,054	508,252	815,321	435,456	888,117
Total	24,850,500	21,334,126,000	791,992,501	431,520,561	360,471,940	388,887,196	403,105,305	333,730,514	458,261,987

COMMERCIAL RATES

The following table shows the overcharges paid by the commercial consumers in every State and the District of Columbia. Any merchant, hotel, restaurant, filling station, barber-shop or beauty-parlor operator, any professional man, or anyone who pays commercial rates can take the rate schedule for his home town and figure these overcharges for himself.

When these commercial consumers realize that they are paying an annual overcharge for their electric energy ranging from $386,438,000, according to the T. V. A. rates, to $449,527,000, according to the Ontario rates, it is enough to stir them to revolt.

TABLE 2.—*Commercial electric service, 1940*

State	Estimated sales data for 1940			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—					
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tupelo, Miss. (Tennessee Valley Authority)		Tacoma, Wash.		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	36,848	214,014,000	$5,816,019	$3,268,603	$2,547,416	$2,669,553	$3,146,466	$3,222,075	$2,593,944
Arizona	15,397	71,198,000	2,227,377	946,635	1,280,742	772,900	1,454,477	933,271	1,294,106
Arkansas	32,317	100,352,000	4,078,471	1,692,565	2,385,906	1,382,602	2,695,869	1,664,016	2,414,455
California	364,908	2,368,783,000	52,976,582	33,057,387	19,919,195	26,912,104	26,064,478	32,747,645	20,228,927
Colorado	43,240	160,571,000	6,407,527	3,024,353	3,383,174	2,460,490	3,947,037	2,966,685	3,330,842
Connecticut	65,142	312,432,000	12,120,062	5,017,706	7,102,356	4,096,581	8,023,481	4,944,985	7,175,077
Delaware	3,182	49,341,000	1,332,750	606,401	726,349	494,450	838,300	597,072	735,678
District of Columbia	21,398	207,663,000	4,700,414	3,468,906	1,231,508	2,834,350	1,866,064	3,421,901	1,278,513
Florida	64,719	266,177,000	11,539,872	4,200,513	7,339,359	3,415,802	8,124,070	4,131,274	7,408,598
Georgia	55,620	363,499,000	10,406,169	5,005,367	5,400,802	4,079,218	6,326,951	4,922,118	5,484,051
Idaho	16,600	125,616,000	2,308,909	1,115,203	1,193,706	905,092	1,403,817	1,094,423	1,214,484
Illinois	251,262	1,605,268,000	53,180,700	25,101,290	8,079,410	20,527,750	32,652,950	24,782,206	28,398,496
Indiana	106,784	694,902,000	19,249,450	9,720,972	9,528,478	7,930,773	11,318,677	9,586,226	9,663,224
Iowa	89,215	335,136,000	11,884,166	5,953,967	5,930,199	4,848,740	7,035,426	5,858,894	6,025,272
Kansas	59,126	253,548,000	8,523,536	4,057,203	4,466,333	3,307,132	5,216,404	3,989,015	4,534,521
Kentucky	50,845	221,454,000	7,076,843	3,545,498	3,531,345	2,894,429	4,182,414	3,495,960	3,580,883
Louisiana	46,192	177,335,000	6,170,879	2,443,668	3,727,211	1,987,023	4,183,856	2,394,301	3,776,578
Maine	32,900	139,087,000	4,432,268	2,034,411	2,397,857	1,653,236	2,779,032	1,994,521	2,437,747
Maryland	52,389	328,085,000	9,974,017	5,465,761	4,508,256	4,458,386	5,515,631	5,385,969	4,588,048
Massachusetts	179,446	1,128,008,000	36,210,228	13,86 ,517	22,341,711	11,297,591	24,912,637	13,651,256	2,558,972
Michigan	168,222	1,190,971,000	34,270,673	16,861,171	17,409,502	13,776,811	20,493,862	16,621,276	17,649,397
Minnesota	93,633	406,661,000	14,155,692	6,539,930	7,615,762	5,322,540	8,833,152	6,426,684	7,729,004
Mississippi	28,035	91,112,000	3,505,499	1,479,321	2,026,178	1,205,892	2,299,607	1,454,782	2,050,718
Missouri	118,346	645,446,000	19,635,818	10,073,175	9,562,643	8,227,408	11,408,410	9,935,724	9,700,097
Montana	16,563	92,384,000	3,431,938	1,650,762	1,781,176	1,341,888	2,090,050	1,616,443	1,815,495
Nebraska	42,347	171,974,000	6,330,599	3,304,573	3,026,026	2,703,166	3,627,433	3,260,258	3,070,341
Nevada	4,418	32,150,000	932,092	427,830	504,262	349,535	582,557	421,306	510,786
New Hampshire	18,725	32,311,000	3,090,602	1,353,684	1,736,918	1,103,345	1,987,257	1,332,049	1,758,553
New Jersey	188,799	369,045,000	36,604,418	13,690,052	22,914,366	11,164,347	25,440,071	13,470,426	23,133,992
New Mexico	9,400	43,545,000	1,892,100	720,990	1,171,210	588,443	1,303,657	709,538	1,182,562
New York	602,634	4,420,435,000	148,630,896	58,709,204	89,921,692	48,007,779	100,623,117	57,817,419	90,813,477
North Carolina	64,404	310,371,000	8,422,363	4,472,275	3,950,088	3,638,461	4,783,902	4,396,473	4,025,890
North Dakota	21,766	61,924,000	2,613,833	1,076,899	1,536,934	878,248	1,735,585	1,061,216	1,552,617
Ohio	214,038	1,193,872,000	35,696,346	19,133,241	16,563,105	15,635,000	20,061,346	18,883,367	16,812,979
Oklahoma	59,699	345,134,000	10,268,446	4,374,358	5,894,088	3,573,419	6,695,027	4,302,479	5,965,967
Oregon	43,428	312,764,000	7,394,129	3,844,947	3,549,182	3,127,717	4,266,412	3,771,006	3,623,123
Pennsylvania	310,670	1,356,277,000	29,011,435	13,954,500	15,056,935	11,401,494	17,609,941	13,780,432	15,231,003
Rhode Island	26,649	88,886,000	3,961,762	1,505,470	2,456,292	1,224,184	2,737,578	1,473,775	2,487,987
South Carolina	28,975	125,577,000	3,830,587	2,011,058	1,819,529	1,639,491	2,191,096	1,976,583	1,854,004
South Dakota	21,902	69,552,000	2,908,884	1,207,187	1,701,697	980,294	1,928,590	1,183,916	1,724,968
Tennessee	48,974	258,826,000	8,138,254	6,014,170	2,124,084	4,907,367	3,230,887	5,916,511	2,221,743
Texas	157,309	924,944,000	26,865,543	12,626,805	14,238,738	10,316,369	16,549,174	12,438,746	14,426,797
Utah	12,530	82,651,000	2,729,307	1,241,835	1,487,472	1,012,573	1,716,734	1,220,000	1,509,307
Vermont	13,931	35,871,000	1,409,134	591,836	817,298	480,515	928,619	579,154	829,980
Virginia	57,669	295,749,000	8,949,477	4,134,658	4,814,819	3,373,953	5,575,524	4,072,012	4,877,465
Washington	67,398	582,623,000	11,230,774	6,839,541	4,391,233	5,581,695	5,649,079	6,738,464	4,492,310
West Virginia	34,404	216,990,000	6,541,870	3,277,477	3,264,393	2,675,625	3,866,245	3,225,142	3,316,728
Wisconsin	105,468	450,458,000	15,057,460	7,829,879	7,227,581	6,399,421	8,658,039	7,709,420	7,348,040
Wyoming	7,332	31,484,000	1,454,969	600,902	854,067	488,870	966,099	590,717	864,252
Total	4,175,198	23,912,456,000	729,581,139	343,142,556	386,438,583	280,054,052	449,527,087	338,169,131	391,412,008

INDUSTRIAL RATES

While the large industries of the country, as a rule, are able to secure electricity at reasonable rates, or produce it themselves, the smaller industries pay exorbitant overcharges, as the following table shows:

TABLE 3.—*Industrial and other electric service, 1940*

State	Estimated sales data for 1940			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—					
	Number o customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tupelo, Miss. (Tennessee Valley Authority)		Tacoma, Wash.		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	34, 454	1, 262, 016, 000	$11, 368, 562	$8, 310, 419	$3, 058, 143	$5, 195, 433	$6, 173, 129	$7, 639, 674	$3, 728, 888
Arizona	2, 896	409, 530, 000	4, 469, 976	2, 212, 638	2, 257, 338	1, 385, 093	3, 084, 283	2, 033, 839	2, 436, 137
Arkansas	10, 641	414, 228, 000	5, 139, 118	3, 078, 332	2, 060, 786	1, 922, 030	3, 217, 088	2, 826, 515	2, 312, 603
California	106, 012	6, 440, 382, 000	69, 009, 610	64, 316, 957	4, 692, 653	40, 232, 603	28, 777, 007	59, 141, 236	9, 868, 374
Colorado	11, 864	420, 990, 000	6, 455, 668	3, 912, 135	2, 543, 533	2, 446, 698	4, 008, 970	3, 595, 807	2, 859, 861
Connecticut	4, 769	824, 448, 000	12, 666, 979	8, 005, 531	4, 661, 448	5, 003, 457	7, 663, 522	7, 359, 515	5, 307, 464
Delaware	843	143, 219, 000	1, 588, 990	1, 053, 500	535, 490	657, 842	931, 148	967, 695	621, 295
District of Columbia	1, 086	507, 470, 000	5, 163, 016	3, 541, 829	1, 621, 187	2, 214, 954	2, 948, 062	3, 252, 700	1, 910, 316
Florida	9, 377	453, 890, 000	6, 519, 119	3, 644, 188	2, 874, 931	2, 275, 173	4, 243, 946	3, 350, 827	3, 168, 292
Georgia	4, 274	1, 187, 228, 000	10, 845, 077	7, 678, 315	3, 166, 762	4, 804, 369	6, 040, 708	7, 060, 145	3, 784, 932
Idaho	6, 506	494, 465, 000	4, 028, 471	2, 981, 069	1, 047, 402	1, 865, 182	2, 163, 289	2, 739, 360	1, 289, 111
Illinois	60, 508	5, 517, 468, 000	62, 269, 560	35, 742, 727	26, 526, 833	23, 354, 772	39, 914, 788	32, 878, 328	29, 391, 232
Indiana	69, 366	1, 866, 810, 000	23, 877, 921	15, 066, 968	8, 810, 953	9, 407, 001	14, 470, 020	13, 849, 194	10, 028, 727
Iowa	40, 635	861, 080, 000	10, 661, 633	6, 844, 768	3, 816, 865	4, 275, 315	6, 386, 318	6, 290, 263	4, 371, 370
Kansas	22, 745	686, 228, 000	8, 630, 216	5, 626, 901	3, 003, 315	3, 512, 498	5, 117, 718	5, 169, 490	3, 460, 717
Kentucky	19, 165	744, 430, 000	10, 122, 422	6, 609, 942	3, 512, 480	4, 129, 948	5, 992, 474	6, 073, 453	4, 048, 969
Louisiana	4, 539	852, 423, 000	8, 842, 906	5, 827, 475	3, 015, 431	3, 643, 277	5, 199, 629	5, 349, 958	3, 492, 948
Maine	5, 406	774, 597, 000	5, 668, 988	3, 690, 511	1, 978, 477	2, 307, 278	3, 361, 710	3, 390, 055	2, 278, 933
Maryland	26, 074	1, 335, 045, 000	13, 858, 228	8, 411, 944	5, 446, 284	5, 252, 268	8, 605, 960	7, 732, 891	6, 125, 337
Massachusetts	14, 460	1, 443, 618, 000	22, 214, 471	13, 217, 610	8, 996, 861	8, 263, 783	13, 950, 688	12, 151, 316	10, 063, 155
Michigan	24, 277	2, 880, 573, 000	33, 560, 501	18, 491, 836	15, 068, 665	11, 578, 373	21, 982, 128	17, 015, 174	16, 545, 327
Minnesota	20, 979	949, 322, 000	13, 198, 382	8, 248, 989	4, 949, 393	5, 160, 567	8, 037, 815	7, 575, 871	5, 622, 511
Mississippi	11, 930	289, 498, 000	4, 241, 628	2, 566, 191	1, 675, 447	1, 603, 330	2, 638, 299	2, 358, 351	1, 883, 287
Missouri	33, 486	1, 792, 092, 000	18, 691, 625	13, 102, 829	5, 588, 796	8, 186, 032	10, 504, 593	12, 056, 098	6, 635, 527
Montana	2, 457	1, 438, 488, 000	6, 646, 792	5, 576, 658	1, 070, 134	3, 482, 919	3, 163, 873	5, 124, 677	1, 522, 115
Nebraska	13, 850	406, 747, 000	5, 369, 183	3, 672, 521	1, 696, 662	2, 298, 010	3, 071, 173	3, 377, 216	1, 991, 967
Nevada	327	73, 397, 000	955, 274	782, 300	172, 905	489, 100	466, 174	718, 366	236, 908
New Hampshire	3, 177	187, 516, 000	3, 226, 775	2, 187, 753	1, 039, 022	1, 368, 153	1, 858, 622	2, 010, 281	1, 216, 494
New Jersey	14, 405	1, 879, 464, 000	25, 552, 896	15, 025, 103	10, 527, 793	9, 403, 466	16, 149, 430	13, 824, 117	11, 728, 779
New Mexico	799	34, 214, 000	729, 541	361, 852	367, 689	226, 158	503, 383	332, 671	396, 870
New York	53, 268	8, 534, 487, 000	80, 572, 364	46, 893, 116	33, 679, 248	29, 328, 340	51, 244, 024	43, 106, 215	37, 466, 149
North Carolina	26, 087	1, 873, 814, 000	19, 085, 211	14, 103, 971	4, 981, 240	8, 817, 367	10, 267, 844	12, 958, 858	6, 126, 353
North Dakota	2, 403	40, 938, 000	890, 560	487, 136	403, 424	304, 572	585, 988	447, 061	443, 499
Ohio	96, 072	4, 875, 052, 000	57, 782, 691	36, 865, 357	20, 917, 334	23, 055, 294	34, 727, 397	33, 860, 657	23, 922, 034
Oklahoma	19, 043	623, 574, 000	7, 151, 141	4, 748, 358	2, 402, 783	2, 967, 724	4, 183, 417	4, 362, 196	2, 788, 945
Oregon	12, 908	668, 941, 000	7, 377, 026	6, 218, 833	1, 158, 193	3, 887, 693	3, 489, 333	5, 717, 195	1, 659, 831
Pennsylvania	60, 421	8, 929, 770, 000	133, 601, 406	13, 253, 781	40, 347, 625	58, 250, 213	75, 351, 193	85, 772, 103	47, 829, 303
Rhode Island	2, 226	452, 750, 000	6, 548, 681	4, 125, 669	2, 423, 012	2, 580, 180	3, 968, 501	3, 791, 096	2, 756, 995
South Carolina	8, 503	1, 065, 800, 000	9, 899, 033	7, 345, 082	2, 553, 951	4, 593, 151	5, 305, 882	6, 751, 141	3, 147, 892
South Dakota	3, 678	60, 953, 000	1, 420, 815	733, 141	687, 674	458, 923	961, 892	673, 466	747, 349
Tennessee	10, 797	1, 053, 436, 000	11, 387, 174	10, 180, 134	1, 207, 040	6, 365, 430	5, 021, 744	5, 397, 520	5, 989, 654
Texas	40, 414	2, 062, 810, 000	22, 996, 134	14, 970, 483	8, 025, 651	9, 359, 427	13, 636, 707	13, 751, 688	9, 244, 446
Utah	2, 308	660, 698, 000	6, 154, 560	4, 336, 965	1, 817, 595	2, 708, 006	3, 446, 554	3, 988, 155	2, 166, 405
Vermont	3, 338	147, 439, 000	3, 046, 611	2, 205, 746	840, 865	1, 377, 068	1, 669, 543	2, 025, 996	1, 020, 615
Virginia	14, 919	871, 832, 000	9, 781, 430	6, 964, 378	2, 817, 052	4, 352, 736	5, 428, 694	6, 406, 837	3, 374, 593
Washington	26, 726	1, 700, 764, 000	11, 951, 292	9, 561, 034	2, 390, 258	5, 975, 646	5, 975, 646	8, 784, 200	3, 167, 092
West Virginia	24, 482	1, 406, 680, 000	14, 219, 679	9, 456, 087	4, 763, 592	5, 915, 386	8, 304, 293	8, 688, 224	5, 531, 455
Wisconsin	75, 916	1, 616, 757, 000	20, 380, 000	12, 472, 560	7, 907, 440	7, 785, 160	12, 594, 840	11, 453, 560	8, 926, 440
Wyoming	944	77, 039, 000	1, 256, 407	772, 690	483, 717	483, 717	772, 690	709, 870	546, 537
Total	1, 065, 790	73, 314, 410, 000	841, 075, 753	565, 484, 381	275, 591, 372	353, 513, 504	487, 562, 249	515, 891, 820	325, 183, 933

TOTAL OVERCHARGES BY STATES

The following table gives the composite overcharges, showing that they amounted, in 1940, to more than $1,000,000,000.

I hope every Member will investigate these tables carefully and check them carefully by comparing them with the rates charged in his home State, his home city, his home town, or his home community.

TABLE 4.—*Total electric sales, 1940*

State	Estimated sales data for 194			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—					
	Number o customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tupelo, Miss. (Tennessee Valley Authority)		Tacoma, Wash.		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	292, 332	1, 703, 844, 000	$23, 574, 647	$15, 828, 416	$7, 746, 231	$11, 705, 416	$8, 754, 245	$14, 152, 633	$9, 422, 014
Arizona	100, 293	526, 528, 000	8, 748, 086	4, 004, 175	4, 743, 911	2, 921, 466	4, 999, 675	3, 621, 294	5, 126, 792
Arkansas	182, 158	593, 077, 000	13, 053, 810	6, 547, 067	6, 506, 743	4, 908, 172	6, 989, 336	5, 863, 898	7, 189, 912
California	2, 275, 920	10, 235, 143, 000	167, 414, 555	126, 721, 066	40, 693, 489	93, 629, 443	49, 700, 758	114, 603, 063	52, 811, 492
Colorado	258, 604	725, 869, 000	19, 614, 003	10, 278, 138	9, 335, 865	7, 924, 799	10, 223, 767	9, 148, 051	10, 465, 952
Connecticut	516, 211	1, 595, 155, 000	42, 954, 245	22, 470, 183	20, 484, 062	17, 638, 624	22, 313, 547	19, 625, 883	23, 328, 362
Delaware	55, 125	236, 722, 000	4, 900, 833	2, 599, 970	2, 300, 863	2, 001, 323	2, 503, 852	2, 293, 073	2, 607, 760
District of Columbia	83, 846	886, 488, 000	14, 269, 043	10, 005, 715	3, 663, 328	7, 485, 521	5, 456, 627	9, 458, 948	4, 810, 095
Florida	384, 096	1, 017, 436, 000	31, 344, 182	13, 597, 189	17, 746, 993	10, 885, 485	19, 089, 682	11, 932, 640	19, 411, 542
Georgia	359, 894	1, 898, 105, 000	31, 056, 462	18, 596, 288	12, 460, 174	14, 227, 430	13, 955, 086	16, 561, 299	14, 495, 163
Idaho	124, 106	734, 113, 000	9, 302, 077	5, 732, 785	3, 569, 292	4, 246, 693	3, 939, 497	5, 099, 709	4, 202, 368
Illinois	2, 101, 770	4, 680, 245, 000	177, 405, 087	95, 910, 449	81, 494, 638	74, 541, 439	89, 475, 693	84, 796, 748	92, 608, 339
Indiana	884, 150	3, 093, 999, 000	64, 507, 736	36, 504, 380	28, 003, 356	27, 921, 955	30, 926, 714	32, 500, 695	32, 007, 041
Iowa	583, 850	1, 511, 626, 000	36, 032, 330	19, 703, 839	16, 328, 491	15, 354, 832	18, 108, 045	17, 489, 923	18, 542, 407
Kansas	397, 871	1, 187, 470, 000	27, 207, 064	14, 811, 293	12, 395, 771	11, 454, 207	13, 638, 454	13, 129, 572	14, 077, 492
Kentucky	374, 010	1, 169, 097, 000	24, 796, 252	14, 379, 365	10, 416, 887	10, 838, 064	11, 478, 194	12, 836, 117	11, 960, 135
Louisiana	313, 731	1, 181, 741, 000	22, 771, 263	11, 994, 732	10, 776, 531	8, 989, 288	11, 597, 777	10, 630, 041	12, 141, 222
Maine	224, 006	1, 031, 376, 000	15, 429, 352	8, 170, 518	7, 258, 834	6, 166, 346	7, 879, 773	7, 276, 050	8, 153, 302
Maryland	504, 101	1, 957, 746, 000	35, 190, 042	20, 442, 512	14, 747, 530	15, 639, 424	16, 390, 942	18, 207, 153	16, 982, 889
Massachusetts	1, 326, 406	3, 394, 517, 000	97, 198, 887	45, 426, 318	51, 772, 569	36, 117, 952	56, 127, 108	39, 993, 925	57, 204, 962
Michigan	1, 449, 499	5, 391, 354, 000	108, 456, 214	60, 743, 657	47, 712, 557	48, 308, 332	53, 234, 419	53, 298, 969	55, 157, 245
Minnesota	598, 812	1, 832, 966, 000	43, 280, 643	23, 867, 633	19, 413, 010	18, 684, 290	21, 507, 931	20, 787, 273	22, 493, 770
Mississippi	162, 965	458, 126, 000	10, 975, 637	5, 821, 187	5, 154, 450	4, 410, 567	5, 602, 218	5, 188, 474	5, 787, 163

TABLE 4.—*Total electric sales, 1940*—Continued

State	Estimated sales data for 1940			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—					
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tupelo, Miss. (Tennessee Valley Authority)		Tacoma, Wash.		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Missouri	801, 832	3, 057, 299, 000	$59, 826, 642	$35, 430, 547	$24, 396, 095	$27, 486, 427	$27, 424, 318	$31, 472, 969	$28, 353, 673
Montana	122, 020	1, 629, 650, 000	13, 574, 627	8, 947, 401	4, 627, 226	6, 376, 985	5, 103, 903	8, 073, 057	5, 501, 570
Nebraska	290, 197	751, 751, 000	18, 674, 070	10, 617, 672	8, 056, 398	8, 286, 066	9, 013, 493	9, 455, 066	9, 218, 984
Nevada	26, 745	125, 217, 000	2, 618, 105	1, 510, 533	1, 107, 572	1, 109, 739	1, 215, 097	1, 372, 047	1, 246, 058
New Hampshire	148, 902	353, 537, 000	10, 386, 435	5, 303, 339	5, 083, 096	4, 062, 500	5, 504, 335	4, 705, 464	5, 680, 971
New Jersey	1, 290, 204	3, 598, 136, 000	103, 504, 820	48, 189, 830	55, 314, 990	38, 181, 851	59, 701, 332	42, 386, 383	61, 118, 437
New Mexico	49, 499	106, 061, 000	4, 110, 197	1, 676, 676	2, 433, 521	1, 351, 970	2, 622, 533	1, 502, 173	2, 608, 024
New York	4, 065, 902	15, 613, 493, 000	348, 872, 269	165, 676, 163	183, 196, 106	131, 546, 180	199, 761, 313	147, 355, 209	201, 517, 060
North Carolina	440, 491	2, 434, 530, 000	35, 955, 358	23, 408, 378	12, 546, 980	16, 823, 352	13, 845, 472	21, 097, 699	14, 857, 659
North Dakota	90, 569	162, 844, 000	5, 914, 602	2, 699, 243	3, 215, 359	2, 209, 697	3, 522, 341	2, 388, 003	3, 526, 599
Ohio	1, 890, 110	7, 544, 469, 000	143, 981, 047	86, 804, 824	57, 176, 223	66, 516, 902	63, 654, 082	76, 580, 973	67, 400, 074
Oklahoma	348, 742	1, 164, 094, 000	26, 462, 962	13, 119, 888	13, 343, 074	10, 149, 450	14, 532, 878	11, 757, 509	14, 705, 453
Oregon	314, 336	1, 280, 624, 000	22, 130, 904	14, 958, 013	7, 172, 891	11, 438, 619	8, 361, 145	13, 278, 472	8, 852, 432
Pennsylvania	2, 471, 091	12, 187, 075, 000	216, 110, 577	134, 866, 611	81, 243, 966	94, 635, 150	86, 471, 859	120, 951, 629	95, 158, 948
Rhode Island	210, 875	662, 966, 000	17, 102, 401	8, 604, 112	8, 498, 289	6, 487, 291	9, 069, 621	7, 552, 870	9, 549, 531
South Carolina	182, 978	1, 311, 642, 000	17, 581, 735	11, 671, 261	5, 910, 474	8, 324, 340	6, 505, 464	10, 518, 957	7, 062, 778
South Dakota	102, 580	193, 507, 000	6, 992, 766	3, 122, 730	3, 870, 036	2, 507, 107	4, 211, 441	2, 773, 477	4, 219, 289
Tennessee	376, 771	1, 620, 654, 000	28, 294, 402	23, 235, 790	5, 058, 612	17, 630, 303	6, 849, 395	16, 768, 333	11, 526, 069
Texas	997, 723	3, 603, 919, 000	76, 374, 234	40, 800, 541	35, 573, 693	31, 606, 447	39, 156, 731	36, 424, 281	39, 949, 953
Utah	131, 838	857, 735, 000	12, 767, 906	7, 761, 630	5, 006, 276	5, 689, 787	5, 449, 160	6, 897, 712	5, 870, 194
Vermont	92, 469	240, 261, 000	7, 046, 061	3, 950, 273	3, 095, 788	2, 898, 890	3, 318, 493	3, 498, 809	3, 547, 252
Virginia	426, 588	1, 490, 822, 000	30, 604, 644	17, 380, 243	13, 224, 401	13, 402, 335	14, 590, 667	15, 347, 081	15, 257, 563
Washington	535, 124	2, 921, 929, 000	37, 525, 214	26, 110, 886	11, 414, 328	20, 321, 004	13, 618, 822	23, 038, 474	14, 486, 740
West Virginia	292, 886	1, 815, 481, 000	28, 306, 059	16, 792, 510	11, 513, 549	12, 257, 643	12, 507, 715	15, 059, 427	13, 246, 632
Wisconsin	789, 384	2, 657, 082, 000	54, 413, 957	30, 815, 418	23, 598, 539	23, 672, 830	26, 053, 727	27, 303, 897	27, 110, 060
Wyoming	47, 876	133, 471, 000	4, 034, 949	1, 936, 111	2, 098, 838	1, 480, 839	2, 265, 137	1, 736, 043	2, 298, 906
Total	30, 091, 488	118, 560, 992, 000	2, 362, 649, 393	1, 340, 147, 498	1, 022, 501, 895	1, 022, 454, 752	1, 128, 223, 764	1, 187, 791, 465	1, 174, 857, 928

Feed the Hungry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I introduced a bill to establish a European food distribution commission which would attempt to alleviate the hunger in the conquered countries of Europe.

To date, only two objections have been raised against this proposal: First, we should feed our own people first; second, some of the food might go to Germany.

Let me discuss these objections briefly. I agree that our own people should be fed first. "Charity begins at home." In fact when I introduced my bill I stated publicity that "it is true that our own people must be fed, but I propose to use only the surplus food over and above our own needs." We have ample supplies of food to care for our own and at the same time assist other hungry people. The Commodity Credit Corporation in the United States owns or holds under loans 283,000,000 bushels of wheat; Argentina has 175,000,000 bushels in storage; and Canada has a surplus of 672,000,000 bushels. Argentina and the United States between them have 1,160,000,000 bushels of corn. We also have a surplus of pork, lard, fresh fruits, milk products, eggs, and meats. This should prove that we can afford to send some food to Europe without causing hardship to our own people. And in addition, our farmers are well prepared to raise far more food than we could possibly use ourselves.

It is true that there is a slight possibility that Germany might confiscate a part of this food. But it is highly improbable, for that would automatically end the plan. The food is to be distributed directly to needy individuals and families by agents of our own Government. Certainly, there is little danger here of the food being diverted to the German Army.

As other objections are raised, I shall discuss them with you. But in the meantime I believe that action should be taken on this matter. We have demonstrated our desire to help Britain, why should we not try to alleviate the suffering of those who were Britain's allies until they were overthrown by a power greater than they could withstand? They are now caught between the cruel and unjust occupation of Hitler on the one hand, and the needless and unsympathetic blockade of Britain on the other. We have a right to ask permission to feed these poor people. We have a duty to perform this act of charity. We want to save democracy, we want to stop aggression, but these people are starving. Since when has America marched to her objective over the emaciated bodies of helpless women and children? The end may be glorious, but it does not justify such means.

The Cotton Warehouse Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I hesitate to take further of your time on this cotton-warehouse bill, S. 262, especially after such southern Members as Judge HATTON SUMNERS, HENRY STEAGALL, JERE COOPER, PAUL BROWN, BUTLER HARE, ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN, WRIGHT PATMAN, GEORGE MAHON, and others, representing as they do, every portion of the Cotton Belt, have told you of its operation and explained to you that its passage will not in fact cost the Government any more money but that it will be greatly to the benefit of the cotton grower for this cotton to remain on storage in the interior warehouses.

But there are some points I feel should be emphasized and more clearly explained to Members who are not familiar with the method of storing and marketing cotton, and I hope you will indulge me a few moments.

If stored in a good building and kept clean and dry, cotton will keep almost indefinitely and does not deteriorate. Consequently, there are cotton warehouses all over the interior of the Cotton Belt, at almost every point where it is ginned. After a farmer gins a bale of cotton he invariably carries it to a warehouse directly from the gin, has it weighed on certified scales, and receives a ticket or warehouse receipt for it. His cotton then is contained in the same building with his other cotton and that of his neighbors, and can easily be seen and graded by the buyers. The local warehouse therefore makes it possible for the farmer to have a market close to his home, and he has always been able to sell his cotton at the market price. Buyers take the cotton either for domestic mills or export. If the domestic mills buy it, they ship it to their own warehouses at their mills, and if it is bought for export, it is shipped on to the concentration warehouses at the ports for compress and shipment.

There was ample local warehouse space in the Belt to handle the crop until export shipments began to fall off a few years ago. All interior warehouses filled up and there was no place to store the

cotton. It was piled up on the streets around the warehouses in the weather where it would deteriorate. In most cases the farmers themselves erected new buildings to house this cotton, and they have had to make sacrifices to build them. In doing this, however, the farmers have been able to help themselves, for they have lowered the storage rate on cotton. Formerly cotton did not remain long in the interior warehouse before it was sold, so that the storage rate was 40 to 50 cents per bale per month. Now, because this surplus cotton is remaining the whole year, and because of the quantity of it, this monthly rate has been greatly reduced, the Government only paying 12½ cents per bale per month. If this Government cotton is reconcentrated at ports, it will cost the Government as much or more than any saving in storage rate to haul the cotton to the port by freight train, and if the cotton is removed from the local interior warehouse it will be absolutely necessary for the local storage rates to farmers to be increased.

There is another point I would like to stress; our export trade in cotton has dwindled to almost nothing comparatively. Why store it at the ports when it will in all probability have to be shipped back to local cotton mills for consumption? Our domestic consumption of cotton is increasing. American mills used more cotton in January of this year than ever before in any one month. If they keep up that rate they will use in this year, 1941, as much cotton as is produced this year.

I represent the fourth district of Georgia in Congress. The cotton mills in that district use far more cotton than the farmers of the district produce, and yet our district is one of the best cotton-producing districts. Do not you think it would be folly to move the Government cotton from the warehouses of our district to the ports?

Let me close with this thought. Cotton is one of the most vital materials in the defense program. Blankets, clothing, tents, hospital supplies, and gunpowder itself are made from it. One factory in the defense program alone uses more than 100 bales for explosives daily.

Is it wise to concentrate the Nation's cotton in a few vast port warehouses where one act of sabotage might destroy a considerable portion of it?

I do sincerely hope you will join with us in passing this bill.

The Weapon of Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON EVENING TRANSCRIPT

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Evening Transcript of March 13, 1941:

[From the Boston Evening Transcript of March 13, 1941]

THE WEAPON OF FOOD

Force may or may not conquer Hitler. But force by itself certainly is not going to bring victory for the cause of freedom. It never has and it never will. It may bring a temporary victory; it may bring a truce till the opposing powers of force recuperate. But force alone will never bring permanent peace, spiritual progress, or economic prosperity.

Statesmen are often prone to consider force their only weapon. There are other weapons even more powerful. Let us consider the weapon of food. Although the problem has its moral aspect, let us here consider it only from the point of view of strategic statesmanship.

Britain says no food shall go through the blockade to the conquered peoples of Europe. We are all familiar with the argument. It will be stolen by the Nazis. Or its equivalent will be saved by the Nazis. And in this age of chemistry, food materials are also converted into war materials.

The argument is easy to accept when one is fighting for life. The misfortunes of others fade into the background. But America has less excuse for shortsightedness than has Britain. Britain is too close to the bombs to have perspective.

The argument is not sound when examined in the light of self-interest and strategic expediency of winning the war. The policy enunciated by Britain may well spell her defeat unless it is changed.

Victory and an ultimate peace which is worth fighting for, which is worth any fractional part of the sacrifices we and the entire next generation must make, are absolutely dependent upon a reasonable degree of world unity when peace comes.

Does anyone think for a minute that the Belgians, the French, or the Norwegians or the Dutch will come rushing under the banners of an Anglo-American order, if America and Britain have refused them food and they have seen their wives, their children, their mothers, their fathers die of starvation or its attendant diseases? When such food as they did have was Nazi food and Britain and America refused even to try to send any?

Not for 1 minute!

Can anyone possibly assume, after Britain survives the threatened invasion, that these same peoples are going to rise up and welcome a British rescue party when there are vacant chairs at every family hearth because America and Britain refused to allow food to go through the blockade? Of course they are not. These peoples are going to hate Britain, and they are going to hate America. And in their hate they are going to accept the Nazi hand that fed them, even though scantily.

It is no use to argue that the food would not get through and would aid the enemy. Very likely it would be diverted to Germany. But in refusing to make the attempt, Britain and America are adopting a policy which may well spell ultimate defeat in this war, to say nothing of destroying any possibility of creating a world order thereafter which is worth any part of the effort.

By refusing to send food, we put Germany in a position to say quite truthfully to the conquered peoples that Britain and America allowed them to starve as a military necessity, and to say that she herself has done all the feeding. The Nazi propagandists would hardly express it so politely. And Britain and America could make no acceptable reply whatsoever.

Suppose, on the other hand, we do send food. It will either get there for the purpose intended, or it won't. If it does, the beneficiaries are our friends for life. During the progress of the war, as well as thereafter, this is worth more in a military way than all the "billions for defense." If it is not used as intended, then shipment should be stopped.

At this point the shoe goes on the other foot. The Nazis, instead of Britain and America, become the goat. We sent the food. We tried to feed. All the hate will then be directed at the Nazis who stole it. Enough news will get through, by underground channels, so that the Nazis or anybody else cannot hide it. From the strategic viewpoint, the attempt is more important even than the actual amount of food which gets through.

In America's hands lies the decision. Today we have the ultimate power. Britain has asked our unlimited aid. We have agreed to place our entire national economy behind her, realizing that it is also in our interest. At 4 o'clock Tuesday afternoon America became entitled to express her will in the conduct of the war. Whether we do so or not, we will now be held jointly responsible for policies pursued.

We should tell Britain immediately that food is going to be shipped and that we hope it will be shipped with her aid. But shipped it's going to be.

Mr. Hoover is ready to do the job. The Society of Friends is known to have the confidence of all the European peoples. Whether we agree or disagree with Mr. Hoover politically, we are unanimous that he, more than anyone else in this world, is best equipped to undertake the task.

Mr. Hoover and a few food ships will do more to win the war for a new world order than the combined British and American Navies will ever do by force alone.

Let every person with a tongue and a pen speak up. Now is the time. Next year, next month, next week will be too late. As long as we are free every citizen shares the responsibility for what America does.

Let's realize that in the end it's love not hate, that it's food not bombs, that it's freedom not force which conquers.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW ORLEANS ITEM

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New Orleans Item, I offer the following article in connection with the St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty:

[From the New Orleans Item]

THE SEAWAY STRATEGEM

President Roosevelt, with the aid of the State Department, has put over a fast one. Instead of trying again to obtain two-thirds Senate approval of a St. Lawrence seaway with Canada, he arranges for our Minister to Canada and Prime Minister MacKenzie King to sign for the two countries an agreement to proceed at once with the long and hotly disputed project. The President must now ask Congress for money to do the job, but a simple majority vote can give him that.

All may be fair in love and war, and the President, in presenting the seaway and power proposal to the country this time has decked it out as a defense effort. But even so the

proverb will fall far short, in the eyes of many, of justifying the President's resort to roundabout devices to wish his pet project on the country. His course does not in the least invalidate any of the objections to it.

We hoped the southern Governors, when in conference here recently, would pass a resolution opposing the President's scheme. To advance this as a preparedness measure is to our mind absurd.

After years of delay and a great effort, the city of New Orleans, strategically situated for war or peace at the mouth of the Mississippi, gets one relatively small shipyard. Yet ships can be built here the year round. But it is in the same period seriously proposed to devote 4 or 5 years to construction of a St. Lawrence seaway so that ships may be built on the Great Lakes of a size to pass through a larger canal. And this is to be undertaken in the midst of a war which, God willing, may be ended in a couple of years. Meantime, thousands of men are to be diverted from immediate preparedness labor to build the canal.

As a byproduct of the last war, the Mississippi Valley has greatly advanced navigation on its inland waterway from the Gulf to the Great Lakes. Diversion of water from Lake Michigan is needed to insure a navigable depth in the Mississippi at low-water periods for this great and growing barge-borne river commerce. One of the proper protests against the St. Lawrence scheme is based on the possibility of its threatening the valley's cargo-bearing, diverted water from Lake Michigan.

To bear its part in the country's World War shipbuilding effort, New Orleans spent $20,000,000 on its Industrial Canal. Six months' work and $15,000,000 would extend that canal, for a 40-foot depth, to deep water in the Gulf. And along that canal sites would be available for 50 or more shipyards—yards in which the climate would permit full-time operation 12 months of the year.

The St. Lawrence seaway project would vitally and adversely affect most of our Southern and Valley States. Yet, strange to say, many of the Senators and Representatives from these States have voted for it.

Americans, Be on Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE DELAWARE REPUBLICAN

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from a recent issue of the Delaware Republican:

[From the Delaware Republican]

AMERICANS, BE ON GUARD

Sportsmen throughout the State have been greatly alarmed by the introduction of a measure in the New York Legislature providing for the registration of all guns, including sporting arms, by their owners. This iniquitous measure would make it nothing less than a felony to own a shotgun, rifle, or airgun, or have such in one's possession without registering such arms with the police.

A felony is a major crime. The new measure is designed to cover all arms not covered by the Sullivan law, which requires a permit to possess a pistol or revolver, and would cover usable antiques and muzzle-loaders.

The Constitution of the United States says that the "right of the people to bear arms shall not be abridged." The first step necessary to a would-be dictator is to take arms away from the people. Then, when they have no means of defending themselves, to subject them to slavery. France, Holland, Belgium, and other countries had forbidden possession of arms—even sporting arms—by the common people. And we have seen what has happened to those countries. Even England, a democratic country, had forbidden possession of arms by the common man, and when invasion threatens the country has had to call on America to send over a lot of old arms with which the civilian population may hope some day to save itself from parachutists, "fifth columnists," and invaders.

Of course, there are always a lot of well-meaning but ignorant people who believe that guns and rifles are bad, that shooting game is wicked, and that anything that is fun is a sin. These mistaken people are a very small minority. Others think to disarm the people would lessen crime. The error in that logic is that having been disarmed, the law-abiding citizen has no protection against thugs, who can always secure guns, law or no law.

Americans want no law abridging the constitutional right to bear arms. Tell your senator and assemblyman that in no uncertain words.

A Reasonable Variable Grant Formula for Pension Increases to Those Senior Citizens of the Poorer States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a pension bill which, although it is not the ideal solution to the problem, is offered only for the purpose of equalizing as far as possible the benefits to those senior citizens who happen to live in the poorer States. And when I say "as far as possible" I mean as far as we could probably go at this time. To this end the bill does, in my opinion, represent the best thought of those who have given the problem long and careful study. It is obviously a variable grant formula.

Offered as an amendment to the existing law, the bill briefly provides that for those States whose per capita incomes are below the national average the Federal Government will pay up to three-fourths of all expenditures for old-age assistance and assistance to dependent children and the blind in the same ratio as the per capita income of the United States bears to the per capita income of those States. In other words, in Arkansas our 3-year average for 1937, 1938, and 1939 in per capita income was $240, as compared to $535 for the Nation. That of the Nation, therefore, was 2.23 times greater than that of Arkansas. Therefore, the Government would pay to the old people of Arkansas under this plan $2.23 for every $1 paid by the State. The average amount paid out in January by Arkansas for old-age assistance was $7.82. Half of this, or $3.91, was Federal funds. Instead of multiplying the $3.91 by one and adding it to $3.91, which is the present system, under this bill we would multiply the $3.91 by 2.23. That would be $8.71, or the Federal grant. Add this to the State grant of $3.91, and this would have given the old people of Arkansas, under this bill, for January an average of $12.62 instead of $7.82, or an increase in the Federal grant of $4.80.

Even this is wholly inadequate, but it is far better than the present system.

I quote here the bill in full:

Be it enacted, etc., That effective January 1, 1942, there is added the following new section to the Social Security Act, as amended:

"SEC. 1108. (a) In any case in which the per capita income in any State is less than the per capita income of the United States, the amount to be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury, for each quarter to such State which has an approved plan for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, or aid to the blind, shall bear the same ratio to the amount so expended which is derived from State sources as such per capita income of the United States bears to such per capita income of such State, but in no event shall the amount paid under this provision to any State for any quarter be more than three-fourths of the total of the sums so expended in such State for such quarter.

"(b) The total amount to be paid under subsection (a) to a State for a quarter for all approved plans shall in no case exceed the difference between the total of expenditures under all such plans for such quarter, and one-fourth of the total of expenditures derived from State sources for all such plans for 1940.

"(c) The per capita income of each State except Alaska and Hawaii and of the United States excluding Alaska and Hawaii shall be determined by the Social Security Board between July 1 and December 31 of each even-numbered year for the most recent period of 3 consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such determination shall, for purposes of this section, be conclusive as to per capita income for each of the eight quarters in the period beginning on the July 1 next succeeding such determination; provided that for each of the 10 quarters in the period beginning on January 1, 1942, the average per capita income of the years 1937, 1938, and 1939 shall apply."

Platform of Dairy Cooperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN BOLLES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

PLATFORM ADOPTED AT ANNUAL MEETING OF LAND O'LAKES CREAMERIES, INC.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include a platform adopted at the annual meeting of the Land O'Lakes Creameries, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn., as follows:

We believe that agriculture will be best served, and along with it the best interests of America as a whole, if Congress gives study and consideration to the need of managed currency. This is a duty and obligation bestowed upon Congress by the Constitution of the United States and, under existing circumstances and situations that we are bound to face in the future, we are definitely of the opinion that Congress must exercise to a greater extent its control over monetary matters.

We recommend that appropriate steps be taken to the end that all agencies of the United States Government, when purchasing agricultural products, shall accept the grading and inspection services of the Agricultural Department, or of any State department of agriculture, or the organized grading and inspection service of the industry involved where any such grading and inspection services have been established and are available.

We urge the Food and Drug Administration of the Federal Security Agency in its orders prescribing labeling to make such regulations to the end that they do not interfere with the free distribution of natural foods.

We commend the Federal Government for encouraging the rural electrification program. We believe the R. E. A. project should be developed and maintained as bona fide cooperative enterprises, the Government being repaid by cooperating users well within the established physical life of the facilities.

We oppose any amendment to the existing Federal oleomargarine law which will have the effect of lessening present regulatory powers of the Federal Government.

We also urge the enactment of legislation designed to prohibit the shipment in interstate and foreign commerce of any oleomargarine product containing any ingredient of milk and its products.

Despite vigilant and continuous efforts by Federal authorities to enforce the Federal law prohibiting interstate commerce in filled milk, this traffic is growing and is steadily becoming a menace to public health and to the dairy industry.

We therefore urge the Congress to amend the law so as to enable the Federal authorities to enforce this act.

Whereas for years skimmed milk and dried skimmed milk has been dealt in commercially as a food product of recognized value, but due to the fact that the word "skimmed" cast a stigma on the product in the minds of the public, it is felt that the new terminology, namely, "Dry milk solids not over 1½ percent fat" proposed by the dry milk industry of this country is a proper descriptive name for this product; and

Whereas the States of Minnesota, Michigan, Illinois, Utah, and Rhode Island have officially promulgated definitions and standards for this product in the new terminology—namely, "Dry milk solids not over 1½ percent fat"; and

Whereas the Food and Drug Administration, Federal Security Agency, has promulgated a definition and standard of identity for this product as "Dried skimmed milk," and has refused a request of the milk industry for a rehearing on this matter: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Land O'Lakes Creameries, in annual meeting assembled, go on record as being opposed to the terminology "Dried skimmed milk" for this product, or any terminology, including the word "skim," or any derivation of such word, and favor the new terminology adopted by the several States named above.

In the course of national preparedness commissions of various kinds are being set up whose duty it is to assist in the complete mobilization of manpower and resources in the defense of this Nation. So far agriculture has not been properly represented on these commissions.

Therefore we urge that the President of the United States recognize the importance of agriculture and its ability to serve the Nation in equal capacity on these commissions as that of industry and labor.

The Federal Government is hereby urged to regulate its purchases of agricultural products so as to give preference to those produced in the United States and to extend credits now available to other nations for such purchases, with the understanding that available agricultural products of the United States will be given primary consideration because: (1) The tax burden supporting such purchases falls heavily on farmers, (2) there exist surpluses of many staple and specialty agricultural crops, (3) the normal export markets for substantial portions of the agricultural crops of this country have disappeared.

We urge that all States, in preparing legislation of special interest to the residents of their own States, avoid so far as possible the enactment of legislation that will set up unnecessary trade barriers between States.

These are times when the 48 States need to cooperate to the full extent of their ability in making American markets fully and unrestrictedly the property of the American people. This can only be accomplished if and when States recognize their interstate obligations and consider the fact that in the times ahead of us our home markets are going to be even more essential to the well-being of America than they have been in the past.

The Problem of Parity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

RESOLUTION BY CONSOLIDATED BADGER COOPERATIVE AND REPLY THERETO BY HON. REID F. MURRAY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, there have been very extensive discussions about parity in Congress and throughout the entire Nation. Both political parties gave great import to parity in their platforms. The hearings before the Subcommittee on Appropriations on the agricultural bill recently passed indicate the interest shown by Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of this subcommittee.

The machinery to give the farmers parity for their products is nearly enough perfected and the legislative situation is such that the farmers can be given parity any time the President wishes them to have it. The so-called basic commodities—cotton, wheat, tobacco, corn, and rice—at this time are so affected by legislation as to enable the farmers who raise these crops to obtain loans of 52 to 75 percent of parity plus the subsidies that accompany the present so-called parity payments and other subsidies enjoyed by this group. The nonbasic commodities, which represent the great bulk of our national agricultural production, can be assured parity by loans already available under present legislation. Of course, there are no legislative restrictions on these nonbasic crops at this time.

I wish to bring to your attention a resolution forwarded to me by one of Wisconsin's largest dairy cooperatives and my reply thereto. They are as follows:

CONSOLIDATED BADGER COOPERATIVE,
Shawano, Wis.

HON. REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In accordance with the desire of the membership of the Consolidated Badger Cooperative we are sending you a copy of the resolution that was adopted at our annual meeting held March 4, 1941:

"Whereas the dairy industry is the largest and most necessary national-defense industry in America; and

"Whereas the dairy industry is the only industry in America selling their products far below cost of production; and

"Whereas the fight between capital and labor will skyrocket taxes and the cost of products and service the farmer must buy: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the members of the Consolidated Badger Cooperative, recommend that the Federal Marketing Act be amended and that 100 percent parity be set as a goal for dairy products, and that the Secretary of Agriculture instruct the Dairy Products Marketing Association to increase gradually the price of butter and cheese until 100 percent parity is reached."

We further recommend that in order to maintain a parity price level that a production control be set up by the A. A. A. and supervised through the town, county, and State Soil Conservation committeemen.

It is further agreed that a copy of this resolution be mailed to the Secretary of Agriculture, Senators LAFOLLETTE and WILEY and all other Congressmen in Washington.

Yours very truly,
CONSOLIDATED BADGER COOPERATIVE,
By GEO. W. RUPPLE, *Manager*.

MARCH 18, 1941.

MR. GEO. W. RUPPLE,
Manager, Consolidated Badger Cooperative, Shawano, Wis.

DEAR MR. RUPPLE: This will acknowledge receipt of the resolution passed at the annual meeting of your cooperative in regard to the Federal Marketing Act of 1940.

I have been spending considerable time in learning the present status of legislation in connection with parity. It seems that the basic commodities—corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and tobacco—are entitled to loans running from 52 to 75 percent of parity. There is at the present time legislation under consideration to raise these loans to 85 percent of parity and there has been a bill introduced to make loans of 100 percent of parity for the five so-called basic commodities.

In studying this matter I have learned, through the legislative counsel of the House of Representatives, that there is a provision made in section 302 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act which reads as follows:

"SEC. 302. (a) The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized, upon recommendation of the Secretary and with the approval of the President, to make available loans on agricultural commodities (including dairy products). Except as otherwise provided in this section, the amount, terms, and conditions of such loans shall be fixed by the Secretary, subject to the approval of the Corporation and the President."

This paragraph, I am advised by the legislative counsel, makes it possible to loan up

to parity on all agricultural products except the basic commodities. The present legislation is such that loans can be made on basic commodities at 52 to 75 percent of parity and on nonbasic commodities loans can be made up to 100 percent of parity if the Secretary of Agriculture so desires and if he has the approval of the Surplus Commodities Corporation and the President.

The above-mentioned parity approach to nonbasic commodities would be arrived at by loaning parity amounts rather than by direct price fixing or direct appropriation from the Federal Treasury. One thing must be kept in mind and that is that there is no present legislative control over production of the nonbasic commodities.

So, in direct reply to your letter and resolution, I wish to say that the present administration has sufficient existing legislation now to provide parity prices for dairy products and other nonbasic farm commodities up to 100 percent of parity, if and when the Secretary of Agriculture, the Surplus Commodity Corporation, and the President desire you to have it.

The apparent unfairness of the parity payments to date is shown by the fact that these payments have been going to only a little over a third of our agriculture. The following table shows where the money appropriated for parity payments has gone during the year 1940:

Cotton	$96,183,000
Corn	48,824,000
Wheat	56,666,000
Rice	1,359,000
Total	203,032,000

You will note that cotton has had 47 percent of the funds appropriated for this purpose although cotton represents less than 10 percent of our national farm income. At the present time there is more of an interest in an all-inclusive farm program than there has been at any time since I have been here.

You have assurance of my keen interest and continued effort in regard to this question and I shall be glad to have further comments on this or other legislation of interest to you at any time.

Sincerely yours,

REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress.

A Letter to Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD P. NYE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 24, 1941

ARTICLE BY COL. CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, during my years of membership in the Senate I have listened to many witnesses who have appeared before congressional committees. I have yet to hear a witness, and I think I never shall hear a witness, more direct, more sincere, more courageous, than was Col. Charles A. Lindbergh in his appearance before the Committee on Foreign Relations in January.

The current number of Collier's magazine contains an article entitled "A Letter to Americans," by Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, which, like his testimony, is direct and excellent, and at this time I am almost led to think should be required reading. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Collier's for March 29, 1941]

A LETTER TO AMERICANS

(By Charles A. Lindbergh)

I address this letter to every man and woman in America who is opposed to our country's entry into the European war. I write because we are being led toward that war with ever-increasing rapidity and by every conceivable subterfuge. While our leaders have shouted for peace, they have constantly directed us toward war, until even now we are seriously involved.

I write to ask your immediate aid in maintaining the independent American destiny our forefathers established. I write to warn you that the men who entice us on to war have no more idea of how that war can be won than the Governments of France and England had when they declared war on Germany. The interventionists call on us to fight, and then their responsibility ends. They offer no feasible plan for victory.

The situation in America today is alarmingly similar to that of France and England in the years prior to this war. There, as here, people let their emotions get the better of their judgment; and they had the same unwillingness to face realities. Both countries had refused to take part in a European readjustment while there was still time to make it peacefully. Both had refused to make the sacrifice that was essential for adequate rearmament. They, too, had cultivated the philosophy that it was necessary to defend someone else in order to defend themselves. How they could defend anyone else if they were unable to defend themselves they apparently did not consider any more than we are considering today.

Their failure is now obvious and stands out clearly before us. The imposition of "sanctions" did not save Abyssinia, but it threw Italy into the arms of Germany and sowed the seeds for the Axis. The threat of war by England and France did not save Poland, but it forced Germany and Russia into an alliance and precipitated a disastrous war. Adjustments that should have been made in peace and moderation were finally brought by war and resulted in immoderation. The failure to face realities in peace brought the curse of war on Europe. The failure to face the realities of war brought defeat to France and devastation to England.

When the last war ended, the victorious Allies had two courses open to them. They could either have assisted Germany back onto her feet as a self-respecting nation, or they could have kept her in a weakened condition by the use of military force. But they followed neither of these policies. England and France wavered back and forth between the two, while the United States withdrew her armies and her politics to the Western Hemisphere, avowedly forever.

During the years immediately succeeding the last war, Germany was held down with an iron heel. The terms of Versailles were the terms of a military victory, and when Germany defaulted on her payment of reparations, French troops occupied the Ruhr. But during the following 2 decades England decided to disarm, while France allowed the equipment of her army to become obsolete for modern warfare. Then Germany broke the terms of Versailles, rearmed, and marched her troops back into the Rhineland. When this happened, a few men in France and England, with greater vision than the rest, cried out that Germany must be stopped then or that it would be forever too late. Their statements were met with popular indifference.

During the most active years of German rearmament, France and England exerted relatively little effort to compete. It seemed impossible for them to realize what was taking place in central Europe. But later, after Germany had trained her armies, built her air force, and constructed the Siegfried line, the demand grew in France and England for military action—a demand which culminated in the declaration of war of 1939, and which has already caused the defeat of France and the devastation of England. While there was still time to fight, populace and politician refused to let the armies move. When the time to fight had passed, the armies were forced into a hopeless battle.

I sat in England one afternoon in 1938, listening to the man who had charge of coordinating defense for the British Government. I had pleaded with him to take additional steps to safeguard the British position in aviation. I had told him that if this were not done, Germany would soon become as supreme in the air as England was at sea. He listened courteously, and then replied that if the wars in Spain and China had demonstrated one thing, it was that the danger of air bombardment, and the damage which could be inflicted by bombing planes, had been grossly exaggerated. He said that the British aviation program was being "adequately expanded."

A few months later, at the time of the Munich crisis, I went to see one of the foremost leaders of England. I went at the request of other English leaders, to tell him my belief that the strength of German aviation was underestimated in England, and that the strength of Russian aviation was almost as much overestimated. He did not agree with me, although he admitted that the situation was serious. While I was there, however, he showed me an official report concerning British antiaircraft units. The report stated that not enough antiaircraft guns existed in all England to form an adequate defense for the city of London alone. Yet that man at that moment was advocating war.

At the time of Munich, the Royal Air Force had only a few squadrons of modern fighters and bombers. The majority of their planes were obsolete. And all of them put together totaled a fraction of the German air force. The condition of French aviation was even more deplorable. There was not a single squadron in France equipped with modern pursuit planes, and the French Government was looking forward to the time when its aircraft production would reach a total of 200 fighting planes per month.

When I returned to Paris after a flight to Russia, in the fall of 1938, I met, at his request, one of the members of the French Cabinet. I gave him my estimate of the Russian and German air forces, telling him of the tremendous expansion of military aviation that had taken place in Germany, and that Russian aviation had been unable to keep pace. He replied that my estimates confirmed the worst fears of the French, and corresponded to the reports of an air mission they had recently sent to Germany. I found that aviation circles in France, at that time, freely admitted that Germany would take supremacy of the air almost as soon as a war started.

From the standpoint of logic, the aviation situation in Europe was in itself sufficient reason to prevent a declaration of war by France and England in 1939. But when one looked further, he found that the same conditions existed in relation to the ground armies of Europe. Even the civilian population of Germany had been trained and prepared for war, while the people in France and England were not.

One of the striking differences between France and England, during the months immediately preceding this war, lay in the fact that France was alert to her danger but disorganized; while England was organized but only half awake. In France, internal conditions were so bad that I often wondered whether war or revolution would break upon the country first. In England there was no danger of revolution, but the people of that nation had never adjusted themselves to the tempo of this modern era. Their minds were still attuned to the speed of sail rather than to that of aircraft. The way of life in England was ideal for times of peace, but fatal for a modern war. In Germany, on the other hand, one found a nation that had risen from the prostration of a previous defeat—a nation less tolerant, less satisfied than its neighbors; a nation fully trained for war, and nurtured on the philosophy that right is inseparable from might.

The true facts of the European situation had been hidden from the people of England and France. They were not adequately informed either of Germany's strength or of their own weakness. Politicians and idealists harangued them about stopping aggression, about defending freedom and democracy, about maintaining their way of life, but the realities of modern warfare—the elements that spell failure or success—were seldom discussed. The orators shouted: "We must stop Hitler." The newspapers echoed: "Down with the Nazi regime." The people of France and England resigned themselves to the inevitability of war. But not a single man told how to break the Siegfried line.

I can best illustrate the attitude in the democracies of Europe by telling you of a conversation I had one evening with a French businessman on the outskirts of Paris. He had been talking for nearly an hour about the inevitability of war, and why German aggression must be stopped. He advocated a declaration of war by France.

"What would your first move be?" I asked him.

"We must fight the Germans," he replied.

"But how?" I asked him. "Do you think the French Army can break the Siegfried line?"

He looked startled, then sank back into his chair. "Oh, I don't know about that," he answered. "That's up to the military men."

A week or two later I was having lunch with one of those military men—a general in the French Army. I asked him if he felt that the Siegfried line could be broken.

"No," he replied; "I don't think so." And then added, "But if it could, the cost would be too high."

"What's the answer, then?" I asked, for the war drums were beating loudly.

He shrugged his shoulders. "If only they had let us attack when we wanted to," he said. "When we could have won, the people would not fight. And now, when we cannot win, they want war."

France waited until it was too late. England waited until it was too late. We in America have waited until it is too late; and yet we step closer and closer to the war, as though hypnotized by its bombing and its fury. Like France and England in 1939, we are unprepared today. We have not as many thoroughly modern fighting planes in our Army and Navy combined as Germany produces in a single week, and our Army is deplorably lacking in such essential items as tanks and antitank cannon. We have not made the sacrifice necessary for adequate rearmament. We, too, have cultivated the philosophy that it is essential to defend someone else in order to defend ourselves. Our politicians and idealists harangue us about defending freedom and democracy and our way of life. They are now shouting, "We must stop Hitler." Our newspapers echo, "Down with the Nazi regime." But not one feasible plan has been offered us for an invasion of the Continent of Europe. With the disaster of France and England fresh before us, we are following the selfsame path.

We in America are being led to war by a group of interventionists and foreign interests against the will of a majority of our people. Every poll of public opinion has shown that from 80 percent to 95 percent of Americans are opposed to entering this war. Both the Republican and Democratic Parties were forced to incorporate antiwar planks in their platforms. Both Presidential candidates were compelled to take a stand against our intervention. Yet today, although no one has made an attempt to attack us, we already have one foot in the war. We have even now entangled "our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, and caprice."

What has happened to us? How was this condition brought about? The procedure has not been dissimilar to that which took us into the last war. When hostilities in Europe began it was fully realized by the foreign interests and interventionists in this country that the great majority of Americans stood firmly opposed to entering the conflict. These interventionists knew that it was useless for them to advocate openly a declaration of war by America. They therefore adopted a more subtle plan. They believed that while the people of the United States would not agree to a declaration of war we could be beguiled into supporting steps that would inevitably lead to war. Consequently, instead of advocating war, they advocated steps which they called short of war—steps which have already entangled us, and which will leave us no alternative to war if we continue to take them. The policy of the interventionists has been from the beginning to support every movement that would lead us in the direction of war, and to oppose every movement that would not—always under their mask of "aid short of war." I have listened more than once to interventionists in America discuss the question of what steps "short of war" would take us into war most quickly.

To be specific, soon after war was declared in Europe, the interventionists advocated, and obtained, the revision of our Neutrality Act. They persuaded us that we could sell arms on a "cash and carry" basis without becoming involved in the war ourselves. They were emphatic in saying that no one asked us to lend money, or to send troops abroad. Their next step "short of war" was the demand that aircraft, cannon, destroyers, and other munitions be taken from the American Army, Navy, and Air Corps, and transferred to the French and British forces in Europe. In this, too, we acquiesced. Then we began to hear it whispered that we were already too far in the war to back out—whispered by the very people who had advocated the steps "short of war" which involved us. Now we are told that we have not done enough; that there must be no limit to our assistance; that we must be the "arsenal of democracy" for the entire world, lending, leasing, or giving all the resources of our Nation, if necessary, to the cause of the British Empire. (And here it is interesting to note that the cause of the British Empire does not prevent us, as the "arsenal of democracy," from supplying arms to Russia, though she be both an aggressor nation and a totalitarian state.) The advocates of intervention are beginning to forget the qualifying phrase "short of war." The more daring among them are openly discussing and American expeditionary force for Europe.

Along with steps "short of war" has gone a supporting campaign of propaganda. Our country has been full of it for many months—a propaganda as subtle, insidious, and effective to date as that which led us into the last war. Before we entered war in 1917 we were told, as we are being told today, that American troops would not be needed. Then, after we declared war, we were asked for a "token" division to fight in Europe. But we ended up with more than 2,000,000 soldiers overseas, and a war debt that has not yet been paid.

British propaganda in the United States attempts to persuade us that Great Britain will win the war, provided she receives somewhat more help than we have, up to this moment, given her. Coupled with this has been a campaign to convince us that a British victory is essential to American security. It is taken for granted that we would not be willing to take part in a war which we felt would be unsuccessful. Consequently, news releases from London minimize all German successes and exaggerate all British successes. They avoid any discussion of war aims, peace terms, or how England can win now that Germany has defeated France and controls the continent of Europe. This is simply the A B C of wartime propaganda. It is carried on by both sides in a war. I am discussing British propaganda because it is that to which we have been subjected and therein lies the danger of our involvement. There is certainly no danger of our fighting on Germany's side, and her propaganda in America has been relatively ineffective.

To be specific again, you will remember that even before hostilities commenced, factual statements concerning the growing military strength of Germany were bitterly attacked by the pro-British press. Those of us who saw the growth of the German air force were severely assailed because of the reports we made describing it, although these reports now turn out to have been almost unforgivably conservative. Then, you recall that when the Germans invaded Austria, it was claimed by the propagandists that their mechanized divisions broke down; that the workmanship on their tanks, trucks, engines, etc., was too inferior to operate successfully in a major war. German aircraft were said to be weakly constructed; there was a shortage of pilots, raw materials, and fuel. We were told that Germany did not have sufficient food to wage a war. And in addition to all this, internal conditions were said to be so bad that the German people would start a revolution rather than fight again.

If you question the accuracy of my statement that we have been misinformed through propaganda, I ask you to glance through our daily newspapers since the war began. If you are pressed for time, take any one of the major campaigns—Poland, Finland, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France. You will find that we in America were misinformed about these campaigns until the actual military position made it impossible to hide the facts any longer. Do you remember when we were informed over the radio that the French Army had penetrated the Siegfried line in five different places? Do you recall the headlines of battles raging on the western front during the winter of 1939–40—battles we now know were never fought? Were we told how desperate the Finnish position was before the final break-through of the Russian Army? Do you remember how, after reading day after day of allied successes in Norway, and how Germany had put her neck in a noose, we were startled by the announcement that the Allies were evacuating all of their forces? Who was it said the Maginot line was impregnable; that bombing planes were no match for the British Navy; that England had the submarine menace well in hand and had already "won the battle of the air"?

The propagandists who made these claims do not bother to explain them. They know that people forget quickly, and they are too busy leading us along with new fallacies. They must confuse America's desire to aid England with our desire to stay out of the war. They must convince our people that England is winning the war in Europe, even though she has lost every major engagement in which she participated—that all she needs is more help than we have up to that mo-

ment given her; and that if we should get into the war, it would not be necessary to send troops. They must build up the element of fear in America. They must persuade us that if England loses, we are not strong enough to defend ourselves; that we may be invaded by aircraft from the Greenland ice cap, or even by trans-Atlantic parachute troops descending on our city streets. They have already led us far along the road to war—the same road that we traveled in 1917; then, too, at their behest.

But there is one all-important difference between the European war when we entered it in 1917 and the European war today. It is this difference which must be brought to the attention of every American, for the entire future of our Nation hangs upon it. It is that when we entered the last war we could see how victory could be won, but today we cannot. In 1917 the Central Powers were fighting France and Great Britain in the west, Russia in the east, and Italy in the south. The German armies had already suffered severe reverses. Even Japan had entered the war on the allied side.

In 1941, however, we face an entirely different situation. Germany has conquered France. She has an alliance with Italy, Russia, and Japan—300,000,000 people. Her armies control the coast of Europe from Spain to the Arctic Ocean. British shipping losses are already of the utmost seriousness, and the major ports and industrial centers of England have been heavily bombed.

The fact is that America is not in a position to wage a successful war in Europe under present conditions. We ourselves are not prepared, and even if we were, where would we send our soldiers to fight? How are we to force a landing on the European Continent against the prepared positions of the strongest military power in the world? If the British, French, and Belgian Armies combined could not hold the fortifications they had spent years in building along the German border, how can we be expected to cross the Atlantic Ocean and invade the Continent of Europe against the opposition of the same army, navy, and air force that thrust the British Fleet from the coast of Norway and broke the Maginot line?

The people who shouted for England and France to declare war in 1939 called for suicide and defeat. Because of their hysteria and blindness, the bravest men of France and England marched to disaster and to death. While the intellectuals of Europe preached of Christianity, democracy, and idealism, they threw a wave of human flesh against a fortified concrete line—without adequate guns, or tanks, or aircraft even for defense, to say nothing of attack.

Has this attitude of life succeeded? Has it gained freedom for France or security for England? Has it stamped out aggression or heightened civilization? Has democracy gained or has it lost through such leadership? These are questions that we in America must answer. With failure in Europe before our eyes, shall we follow this same course? Shall we throw ourselves into war in a fervor of idealism, shouting about how we think the world should be run? Or shall be discuss calmly how our objectives can be accomplished, and adequately prepare ourselves to reach them?

Personally, I believe that by our withdrawal from Europe after the last war, and our failure to prepare for this one many years ago, we are already committed to a policy of military isolation. I believe that if we abandon this policy at the present time, we are courting national disaster, just as France and England courted disaster when they, unprepared, declared war over the German invasion of Poland. A nation cannot change overnight from an attitude of peace to an attitude of war. It takes many years of planning and preparation before great military strength can be attained. I believe it is not any longer a question of what we wish to do in this war, but rather one of what we can do. I believe that for us to enter the conflict in Europe at this time would result in defeat and humiliation. If we are to enter such a conflict successfully, then we must prepare for it not for 1 year or for 2, but for 10 years or for 20 as Germany has done.

On the other hand, I believe that we can build a military and commercial position on this continent that is impregnable to attack, and which will force other nations to trade with us, if through expediency alone. Even if America intended eventually to dominate the entire world, as some people now seem to want us to do, I would say that our first step should be to consolidate our defenses at home, so that we could prepare ourselves in safety for our adventures beyond the seas.

Every difficulty we would have in invading Europe would be an advantage for us in defending America. Our armies would be fighting on home soil, our Navy would be close to its bases, our air force could strike with its utmost effect. It would be the enemy's problem, not ours, to cross the ocean with millions of troops and their supplies, to pass by our submarines, our battleships, and our bombing planes, and to force a landing on American shores against the guns of our coast artillery and our Army.

When England could not hold the coast of Norway against the German air force; when the British Navy dared not remain in the Skagerrak, or even permanently in the North Sea; when the German military machine, after crashing through the Maginot line and routing the French Army and the British Expeditionary Force, has been held up for 9 months by 25 miles of English Channel—how is any navy to approach the shores of America and land an invading army against the combined resistance of our military forces?

There has been much discussion of an air invasion of America. This is partially due to propaganda, partially to hysteria, and partially, I believe, to a misconception of the so-called air invasions of Norway and Holland by the German air force. Personally, although I think the effectiveness of military aviation is still underestimated, I do not believe there is the slightest danger of a purely air invasion of America now or at any time we can now foresee. To begin with, the distance across the oceans is far too great to permit the air transport of armies large enough to invade us successfully, even if one assumes that they had a place to land unopposed by our own military forces. But, aside from the question of distance, we should be reassured by the fact that there has never been a successful invasion by air alone. The outstanding examples of the use of aviation for invasion of enemy territory occurred during the German occupations of Norway and Holland. But in each of these instances the landing of troops by air was carried on simultaneously with the movement of ground and naval forces on a major scale. The maximum number of troops that could have been transported and supplied by air would have been ineffective without the immediate support of a ground army. If air invasion alone could be successful, it would have been used by the Germans against England many months ago.

But what about the northern routes, cry the alarmists; won't we be invaded by way of Greenland and Alaska, where the distances between land are short? Possibly the best answer to this question is in the form of another: Why, if these northern routes are so advantageous, do you suppose the commercial air lines to Europe and Asia prefer the great over-water distances farther south? The answer is that ice and fog and bitter cold still force men southward in their quests of commerce and of war. Except in adventure and exploration, men follow the routes which offer the greatest safety and require the least effort—and these are not in the north.

Of all the trans-Atlantic air routes, the simplest to fly is the one that lies between Africa and South America. This fact is being used today in much of the war propaganda we hear. German airplanes, we are told, will fly to Africa by the thousands, hop across the ocean to South America, refuel, and fly up and invade the United States.

Leaving aside the problems that would have to be solved in Europe and Africa before thousands of German airplanes could take off on such a venture, let us consider what preparations would have to be made for their arrival in South America—in Brazil, to be specific. There would have to be dozens of previously prepared airdromes, equipped with tanks and fuel and crews of skilled mechanics. All of the men and supplies required would have to be transported by sea. In fact, many ocean transports and tens of thousands of workmen would have to be busy for months before the necessary landing facilities could be arranged. So that when anyone speaks of an air invasion via Africa and South America, he presupposes that Germany has won the war in Europe; that the countries she has conquered are either so well satisfied or so completely subdued that she is able to devote her attention to an interhemispherical struggle (with Asia always at her back door); that she has Africa also well in hand; and, finally, that she has, in opposition to the armed forces of Brazil backed by our own Army, Navy, and Air Corps, been able to construct and supply the necessary airdromes in eastern South America.

After that, of course, it is still farther from eastern Brazil to the continent of North America than it was from Germany originally, so other groups of air bases would have to be established farther north before enemy planes based in South America would have any advantage over enemy planes based on their home airports in Europe. And since there are no railroads through that portion of South America, these bases, too, would have to be established by sea.

No; the more one studies the problem, the more obvious it becomes that an air invasion of America is entirely out of the question. Invading forces would have to come by sea, and if they made such an attempt, it would be our American aviation that flew out to meet them and did the raiding.

Of all the nations in the world, we hold the most impregnable position of defense. We have highly developed industries, great national resources, and a population of 130,000,000 people upon which to draw. There is not a nation in this hemisphere strong enough even to consider attacking us. We are flanked by the Atlantic Ocean on the east and the Pacific on the west. In the north, we are protected by the wastelands of the Arctic. Where in all history has a nation been similarly blessed? Then why in our maturity any more than in our youth, "Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?"

It is often asked today why our rearmament program moves so slowly, why our people are so divided and confused. Why, indeed. The answer is clear. It is because we have neglected the wisdom and experience of our forefathers—we have not followed Washington's advice. We have let the destiny of America become confused and entangled with that of foreign lands. Our leaders have attempted to transfer loyalty for our own country to loyalty for a part of Europe. One portion of our people has attempted to force its ideas about Europe upon another portion of our people—to inject into our midst today the very quarrels of the Old World that our forefathers left behind.

We, in America, should not be discussing whether we will enter the war that England

declared in Europe. We should not be wasting our time arguing about whether it is cheaper to defend someone else than to defend ourselves. We should not be conscripting our youth for a foreign war they do not wish to fight. We should all be marching together toward one clear and commonly accepted goal—the independent destiny of America. If we desire unity and strength among our people, we must turn our eyes back from these everlasting wars of Europe—back to our own country, to the clear horizons of a great American future. Let us learn from the errors made by the democracies abroad, and not repeat them. Let us give thanks to the generations of Americans before us who won and maintained the independence of our Nation against far greater dangers than we face today. Let us dedicate ourselves to guarding that independence that we may pass it on to the future in even greater security than we received it from the past. It is by building our own strength and character at home—not by crusading abroad—that we can contribute most to civilization throughout the world.

If you believe that we should not enter this war, your help is needed vitally by those of us who stand against our intervention. The policy of our Nation is still influenced by the desires of its people. You can help us by organizing mass meetings against our entry into the war. You can help by attending such mass meetings. You can help by writing to your Congressmen, to your Senator, and to your local newspaper, telling them of your views. Such letters have more influence than most people realize. But if you stand with us against war, you must act now or it will be forever too late. It is not enough to write once. Write every time an issue arises—several letters each week until this crisis has passed. Demand of your representatives that they oppose our entry into the war, and be on guard against these steps that will inevitably lead us to it. It is worth all the effort we can give. Our future, our children's future, our country's future, all that we hold worth while is in the balance.

I have one last request, and then this letter is ended. Before you make your final decision, reason through for yourself what war would mean to this country. Demand a practical plan from those who preach of defending democracy throughout the world. Ask them to explain how we are to invade successfully the Continent of Europe—how we are to impose our ideology on the peoples of Germany, Russia, Italy, and Japan combined against us. Insist on an answer that is clear, couched in terms of soldiers killed and years of war. Stop them from telling you what should be done, and make them demonstrate to you what we have the ability to do. Ask them to define our war aims; our plan of defense and of attack. And if someone says that such questions must be left to experts, ask them: To what experts? To the same experts who for the last 20 years led France to defeat and England to ruin? To the same experts who have created the greatest national debt in American history, and still left us a nation unprepared in the midst of a world at war? To the same experts who failed either to maintain peace or to prepare for war? No; such leadership will never make us a strong and victorious nation. It will not carry us successfully through these periods of war and crises. If our American ideals are to survive, it will not be through the narcotic of a foreign war, but through a reawakening of the spirit that brought this Nation into existence. It will be only if you and I and people like us take the reins in hand once more, as our forefathers have done in times of crisis.

The future of America, of our way of life, and of western civilization itself lies not so much in the outcome of these wars abroad as in the action that we take now, here, in our own country. In this action your help is urgently and immediately needed.

W. P. A. and Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN BOLLES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT WISCONSIN CONSTRUCTORS' CONVENTION

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include resolutions passed at the annual convention of the Wisconsin constructors' convention assembled at Fond du Lac, Wis., February 7, 1941, as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 1—W. P. A.

Whereas 80 percent of the employables under W. P. A. were placed in the construction industry and thereby caused a serious dislocation of employment of construction workers; and

Whereas at the present time there is before Congress a relief and work appropriation bill calling for additional funds for W. P. A.; and

Whereas it has been demonstrated through investigation that the time necessary to complete construction work under W. P. A. methods is 400 to 500 percent longer and at least several times the cost of equivalent production under the contract method; and

Whereas W. P. A. continues to undertake construction projects for which they have no qualification whatsoever; and

Whereas millions are returning to private employment under the defense program and an equal number are being inducted into the military service, yet further W. P. A. appropriations in excess of a billion dollars are being considered; and

Whereas the defense program requires economical completion of projects in the shortest possible period of time and which we know to be impossible under W. P. A. methods: Be it hereby

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Constructors' Convention, assembled at Fond du Lac, Wis., February 7, 1941, hereby suggest that the above appropriations be curtailed to cover only indigent workmen and other unemployables as their needs may arise; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to the House Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives and to the Wisconsin Senators and Representatives.

RESOLUTION NO. 2

Whereas we believe that the Temporary National Economic Committee has in the past given valuable information regarding housing costs: Be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Constructors recommend and urge that a study be made by the Temporary National Economic Committee and sufficient funds be provided to finance such a study investigating the field of low-cost small-home construction.

RESOLUTION NO. 3

Whereas the Wisconsin Constructors, representatives of the construction industry of Wisconsin, are assembled at their fifth annual convention at Fond du Lac; and

Whereas the United States Government, according to newspaper reports, has awarded $1,800,000,000 of defense-construction contracts for all types of defense work to date, over 400 projects, and not a single one in Wisconsin; and

Whereas the State of Wisconsin, in population, industry, and taxation, is about twelfth ranking in the United States; and

Whereas the State of Wisconsin, in its metropolitan area, has over 84,000 men and women on W. P. A., relief, direct and indirect, and a similar condition throughout the State; and

Whereas the State of Wisconsin has one of the greatest heavy-machinery centers in the country, with thousands of skilled mechanics; and

Whereas the construction industry, due to the stoppage of P. W. A. and all other forms of Government construction activity outside of defense, has a large surplus of employed construction workers; and

Whereas the State of Wisconsin leads as a pioneer in vocational-school training and has thousands of unemployed youth: Be it

Resolved, That we, the Wisconsin Constructors, representing an industry which employs 25 percent of the State's employable workers, hereby petition the President of the United States, our United States Senators and Congressmen to provide our State its fair and equitable proportion of the national-defense construction activities, and that copy of this resolution be sent to all our National Representatives.

The Forgotten Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

ARTICLE BY EDWARD A. O'NEAL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I include an article by Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the Federation of the Farm Bureau, in the April number of the Nation's Agriculture:

[From the Nation's Agriculture for April 1941]

THE FORGOTTEN MAN

(By Edward A. O'Neal)

Washington, nerve center of a great nation undertaking frantically to rebuild our military defenses, is boiling with activity. A determined President, Commander in Chief of the United States military forces, and clothed with vast authority, sits in the White House at the controls of the colossal mechanism that is the national economy.

By cable and by wireless, the President is in constant touch with United States emissaries in the far corners of the world, through whose reports he feels the world pulse. Direct wires to key men in Government agencies carry an almost continuous stream of messages, which, digested and relayed to the Chief, supply him with the information upon which he bases daily decisions which in the aggregate shape our national policies.

Fingering the levers, accelerators, petcocks, buzzers, and countless other gadgets of power, and watching the speed meters, power gages, pressure indicators, barometers of public opinion—and above all the clock and the calendar—the President spurs the United States monster production machine to greater and ever greater output. And the American people are solidly back of him.

Well the President knows that the giant which is United States industry, and the giant which is United States labor, both must be encouraged as well as goaded, enticed as well as exhorted, if they are to render maximum service. A great industrialist and an outstanding labor leader were placed in positions as first lieutenants, so to speak, taking orders direct from the President, and dealing for him with the industrial and labor groups.

Industrialists were assured that their interests would be safeguarded in new defense undertakings. Contracts were made on a cost-plus basis; cash by the wagonload was made available to them; easy amortization arrangements on capital expenditures were provided; assurances were given that all excess profits on Government contracts would not be taken away by taxation; in many other ways industry was coaxed, cajoled, patted on the back.

Labor was assured that its gains of recent years would be fully protected during the emergency. Limited hours, short workweeks, excess pay for overtime work were guaranteed, and no pledge to refrain from strikes was demanded. Opportunity was given to labor unions to add millions to their membership. In addition to being patted on the back, labor was kissed on both cheeks.

Agriculture was taken for granted because its granaries were filled to overflowing as never before. Farmers, alone of all groups, were ready for any emergency. "We can always depend on the farmer; that's one thing we won't need to worry about," expressed the general attitude. Agriculture was given a sort of window-dressing place in the inner councils, but window dressing is about all that it has amounted to. The farmer has become the forgotten man in Washington.

Farmers stand to gain nothing and lose much out of the war emergency. The war has turned off the farm-export faucet. Increased domestic demand for some food products will ensue, but it won't offset the loss in foreign outlets. More than half of United States farmers produce crops that depend heavily on foreign markets. Relatively no cotton can be exported, and we have on hand a 2-year supply. Almost no wheat can be exported, and we have on hand more than a year's supply. Trainloads of surplus corn are in storage. Tobacco, lard, fruits, canned goods, and many other products have piled up in domestic warehouses.

And so, while industry's prices rise and labor's earnings soar, the farmer's prices are held down by the burden of surpluses. Commodity loans underpin the price of some commodities, but the loan level is on a peacetime, not a war basis. Parity payments were included in the Federal Budget, but that amount will take us only part way to parity. It comes as a shock to the farmer to learn that the principal Government proposal to help farmers is to buy more farm products to feed the Nation's jobless. And this at a time when men are going back to work at a rate never before approached in this country.

Appeals for farm parity make little impression today. Congress hands out billions for battleships, billions for bombers, billions for guns, billions without end for armaments, billions for Britain (and I approve of all this)—while the farmer plows and plants, digging and hoeing as usual, while his goal of parity recedes further and further in the distance—eventually, perhaps to be blotted out entirely by the clouds of war. We have fought for 20 years to overcome the disparity brought about largely by the last war.

If anything is to be done for the farmer, he must see to it himself. He can do it in only one way—through his organizations. He can't go to Washington himself, but he can send representatives. Farmers are people. Farmers have to eat and wear clothes and educate their children. Farmers supply their full share of soldiers for the Army. Farmers produce, as Representative CLARENCE CANNON says, the munition without which no war can be fought. Adequate supplies make a nation impregnable. And farmers have votes. They can get parity if they will fight for it. They must let their Congressmen know how they stand on this vital issue.

The Farm Bureau has written a bill that will, if adopted, assure parity, or close to it, for the America farmer. It simply gears up the present farm program to make it more effective. We will fight to push this bill through Congress. We will never haul down the flag of parity. We do not ask for cost-plus prices, for time-and-a-half returns for our efforts, for shorter hours and shorter workweeks, for the right to strike—all we ask is prices and income that will enable us to exchange our products on a fair basis for the goods and services produced by other groups.

Food is cheaper, relatively, than any other thing the people buy; and yet metropolitan dailies thunder about food prices. Laboring men are better able to buy food and fiber than they have been for many years; and yet there are outcries against the price of steaks and beef roasts. We get only 40 cents of the consumer's dollar; only a few years ago we got 53. We ask for less than any other group, and yet that little has been denied us. Consumers regard low farm prices as normal prices. They have been fed and clothed at the expense of agriculture for many years. Parity farm prices will not penalize a single consumer.

This Nation must make a decision now. Either agriculture must be given its fair share of the national income or inevitably it will decline, and gutted soils, withered farm buying power, and eroded humanity will result. Peasantry and bare subsistence have no place in the American plan. American agriculture is a $46,000,000,000 industry and represents 32,000,000 people. It is the world's greatest mass market for goods and services. No nation can long endure, much less prosper, if it allows its agriculture to deteriorate.

And so for the farmer's welfare, and for the Nation's welfare, the Farm Bureau raises again the flag of parity and marches into battle. This is a critical hour for agriculture. Well we know that if we do not get parity now for this crop in 1941, we will have small chance of getting it in the economic cataclysm that will surely follow the war. We are not defeatists. We will not falter in the fight. We will not haul down our colors so long as we have even a handful of farmers to support us. This fight is your fight; this flag is your flag. Let us rally behind it and drive on, against any and all opposition, to final victory in a cause that is just.

Un-American Activities in the Western Hemisphere

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the matter of hemisphere defense has become very obvious at a time that this Government obtained military and naval bases among British possessions in the Western Hemisphere. The vital need for our defense was recognized by the Government of Great Britain and that Government very graciously ceded to us territories which would enable us to establish bases for our defense throughout the Caribbean Sea. Now that the need for our defense has been recognized both by Congress and the public of the United States, it becomes very important for us not to permit infiltration of subversive activities from other countries into this hemisphere.

I take great pride in the fact that it was I who recognized this danger back in 1934, and was instrumental in creating a committee by this House to investigate and expose subversive activities. It was my action which made it clear to every right-thinking American how important it was to guard ourselves against our enemies from within. Foreign governments have for many years been fomenting unrest and treason within the borders of this Republic. Those governments have been spending large sums of money for the distribution of tons of propaganda by mail, as well as agitation by many professional spies and saboteurs. These activities have been exposed by me, and I am happy to feel that the ideas which germinated through my efforts in 1934 have borne fruit.

Congress is now definitely committed to a policy of investigating, exposing, and eradicating anti-American subversive movements. Congress is now committed to a policy of fighting treason within our borders with every weapon at our command. Congress is likewise committed to the view that it is of great concern to us how the Western Hemisphere as a whole can be fitted into the defense program of the United States.

Our President has made it clear that this hemisphere must be defended as a unit and that we will not allow any foreign country to interfere with the liberties of the peoples of this hemisphere; not only the American people but every nation which has established its independence on this hemisphere has the right to our protection should its independence be threatened in any way, either from within or from without.

The Nazi technique of infiltration is different from every other form of conquest which this world has seen before. The Nazis do not send large armies to conquer small nations. What they do is to send trade envoys, tourists, students, and other inconspicuous individuals to divide and conquer. These agitators seek to spread their poison in subtle and devious ways. In one place some innocent-looking individual will establish a trading post for the Nazi regime; in another place some other gentleman will establish a tourist center; another man will simply advertise German goods for sale and will seek to undersell everyone else by every possible trick of the trade. Another method of attack is to establish schools for German children, or even churches for German residents, so that with the aid of these agencies there may be spread every possible infiltration of nazi-ism into the commercial, economic, or business life of these nations.

This method is not new. It has worked very successfully in the countries adjoining Germany in Europe. Side by side with German conquest by arms there was

and is German infiltration by salesmen, tourists, and other agencies.

In this era of commercial expansion, it is particularly dangerous to overlook the fact that the German regime is able by underselling every other country to sell its products in Latin America despite the strong effort of the British blockade. Boatloads of German merchandise are being dumped on the South American market, particularly Argentina and Brazil. Millions of dollars' worth of uncut diamonds are being brought into South America and then find their way into the United States. The accumulation of moneys from the sale of these products aids in the purchase of raw materials for Germany at present, such as oil, cotton, and other products for war purposes. Thousands of agents in the last 12 months have found their way into South America. One of the most outstanding agencies of strong Nazi pressure was the activity of German Consul Reid, whose activities in South America far overstepped the propriety of consular services. He himself organized bund posts and Nazi schools for purposes inimical to the forms of government existing in South America.

In my own exposure of conditions prevailing in the German consulates throughout the United States I had occasion to establish the fact, which can be proved by reference to our own CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that the many German consulates throughout the United States are used to a very large extent as agencies of propaganda and for the purpose of glutting this country with its insidious propaganda. All these activities which now exist to such a large extent in South America were tried in this country. It was only due to our own vigilance and the fact that Congress has ever been alert to suppress such activities that our German consulates in this country have been brought to some measure of control, although I am sure that we have not gone far enough in suppressing all anti-American activities which emanate from German consulates in this country. Nevertheless, a beginning was made, and largely through the vigilance of our State Department it was possible to expose some of the more glaring violations of international comity by the German consuls in this country.

I am sure that this House will ever watchfully continue to pay its attention to the work of these German consulates, and that it will be impossible for these consulates to become what they seek to become—centers of espionage.

At this point, my friends, I wish to call your attention to a very serious leak in the matter of freezing foreign funds. This Government saw fit to freeze the funds of all nations which are occupied or under the domination of Germany, but we have not seen fit to freeze German funds, so that it is still possible for Germans to transfer their assets to Mexico, and every day large amounts of money are being diverted to Mexico for the purpose of doing the sabotage and espionage work which otherwise was infesting the United States and Canada. Thus, it becomes doubly necessary to examine into the situation prevailing south of the border, and I am sure that if the Mexican Government will see fit to cooperate with us, it will gain the benefit of our experience in tracking down subversive agitators and keep them under their own surveillance. In this connection it is very interesting to observe that because of the cooperation this country received from the Republic of Panama, it was possible to clean house in the Canal Zone and get rid of the most daring and glaring members of this espionage group in that locality.

We must not forget that in the city of New York there is an institution known as the German Library of Information which seemingly still operates without restraint and which is perhaps one of the most effective centers of Nazi propaganda anywhere in the Western Hemisphere. Nor must we forget the German American Board of Trade in the city of New York which is likewise an arm of the German Government operating as the headquarters of the entire German economic system in the North American area.

Totalitarian methods are much more devious than those with which we are familiar and to which we are accustomed. We feel that there is a logical way of coping with a situation such as the one I described heretofore. The totalitarian powers do not work that way at all. What they do is enlist the services of every man and woman and child and, by pushing and pressing from all directions at once, they are able to achieve results where our democratic set-up is wholly incapable of coping with the situation.

It was therefore a great source of gratification to me that I was able to learn that the Federal grand jury in the district of New York saw fit to indict the manager of a German news agency known as Trans-Ocean, as well as an employee of that agency, for noncompliance with the law relating to registry of foreign agents, a law which was enacted by Congress after the committee of which I was a member and vice chairman saw fit to recommend such a statute to this House. I feel that my work of 8 years' standing is beginning to bear fruit, and I hope that in the not-too-distant future all foreign agitators, spies, and saboteurs will be put where they belong.

Many years ago it became quite obvious that in Brazil particularly there was a large-scale German colony and that since Hitler came into power that colony became the springboard from which all antidemocratic activities were launched. Hitler sent his district leaders, county leaders, and state leaders down to Brazil to organize the German people into a compact group.

The same policy was adopted with reference to Argentina, Bolivia, Peru, Chile, Ecuador, and other countries. Everywhere the technique was the same. You send down an organizer, who takes charge of the particular population, making various members of the German colony act as a unit in all matters, and in due course you have an army on your hands which will fight at will and by direction of this foreign agent. This has been the modus operandi throughout the length and breadth of South America. In this way every German tourist and every German resident, teacher, and even German servant girls were part of a ruthless machine which aims to dominate the world. Each has assigned to him or her a special function and each will be the particular means by which our democracy will be overthrown. Such at least is the scheme and plan of the master who sent all these agitators to the South American countries, and it requires great vigilance on our own part to prevent these agitators from becoming a menace to our own security and defense.

Our national defense requires, in the words of our President, that we give an all-out aid to all democracies wherever they find themselves beset by totalitarian aggressors. The democracies of South America are now in this very position. By subtle propaganda and deft working from within the Nazi regime has obtained a strong foothold on these many South American lands, which in turn would impair and destroy the efficiency of our own national defense.

It might perhaps be a good idea for the President to call together a convention of all the heads of the Latin-American governments to meet in Washington and to decide in which way this defense of our hemisphere could be made more effective. I am sure that one of the ways by which this defense could be made very strong will be by close supervision of all activities by foreign agitators throughout our hemisphere. Only by continuous vigilance can we find the means of our own national defense.

I cannot let this opportunity pass by without expressing my particular appreciation of the work of two outstanding statesmen in Latin America who have done everything in their power to clean house within their respective borders. One of them is the President of Cuba, Col. Fulgencio Batista, and the other is the former head of the Dominican Republic, General Trujillo. These men have performed a real yeoman service and deserve the thanks of the American people for having in their own way done away with and cleared up a great deal of subversive activities which otherwise would menace not only their own country but the United States as well.

The Strike Situation in Re National Defense

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has become thor-

oughly aroused by the epidemic of strikes which has been dangerously delaying national-defense work. Letters and telegrams are beginning to reach Members of Congress from citizens all over the United States who are becoming alarmed and indignant that the Nation's needs in its hour of peril are being utilized, apparently, by some labor leaders for their own personal and official profit and power without regard to the welfare of the country as a whole.

Those Members of the Congress who, like myself, have, down the years, been the friends and champions of organized labor hope that only a few of the labor leaders are guilty of demanding extortionate fees from free American citizens for permits to work on national-defense projects. The real friends of organized labor in the Congress hope that only a very small percentage of labor leaders are guilty of bringing about strikes in defense industries in order to increase the dues income of their unions, their powers over the unions, and to augment the political powers which some labor leaders are seeking to extend at the expense of the national defense.

The real friends of organized labor in the Congress are seriously embarrassed by these unwholesome and un-American attitudes exhibited in various ways by some labor leaders. We like to believe, we want to believe, we do believe, that the rank and file of American workingmen are just as patriotic as any class of citizens in the country, but we friends of labor in the Congress are afraid that labor may be misled by self-seeking leaders into sacrificing the good will of the American people. That would be a tragic thing to happen to the organized American wage earners.

The good will of the general public in America is vitally essential to the maintenance of all that labor has gained in the last 20 years.

Labor itself must put an end to these strikes. It is obvious the administration is still temporizing with the problem. The President recently named an 11-man Mediation Board. That Board was supposed to operate to prevent strikes in the same way the Railway Labor Mediation Board does. The President left a fatal flaw in his set-up. The Mediation Board cannot touch a single strike or dispute in defense industries until the Secretary of Labor, Madam Perkins, certifies the strike or labor dispute to the Board for action. Before doing that, Madam Perkins is empowered to decide two questions: First, whether, in her opinion, any strike or labor dispute does in fact delay or threaten to delay the defense program; second, having decided that point, whether or not a bureau in her own Department—the United States Conciliation Service—can handle such strike or dispute without referring it to the Mediation Board.

Under this set-up, if the Army officials, the Navy officials, the O. P. M., and any or every other agency of Government might be convinced a strike or labor dispute was, in fact, delaying progress of the defense program, it would still remain for Madam Perkins to take all the time she might deem necessary to determine the two important questions prerequisite to certification to the Mediation Board for action, namely, whether Madam Perkins believed the strike or dispute was damaging the national-defense program, and whether she believed her Department's own Conciliation Service might handle the situation without the help of the Mediation Board.

Obviously, the effective way to have the Mediation Board operate would be to have it work directly with the Office of Production Management and the appropriate Army and Navy officials, leaving the Labor Department to handle its routine peacetime duties.

As it is, the Mediation Board cannot be anything more than a secondary fact-finding commission and information bureau to try to bring about, by influencing public opinion, results which the Railway Mediation Board has long since proved can be achieved in another, and vastly more efficient, way.

It is regrettable—and dangerous—that the administration does not see fit to meet this menace of strikes and labor disputes which are threatening national defense, and which, if allowed to go sufficiently long, could do to this country what the same kind of strikes and labor disputes did to France.

St. Patrick's Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RAYMOND S. McKEOUGH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES P. McGRANERY, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Hon. JAMES P. McGRANERY on March 17, 1941, at the annual dinner of the Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, in response to the toast to the United States:

Mr. President, reverend clergy, distinguished guests, and fellow members of the Friendly Sons of Saint Patrick, it is a happy and hallowed occasion when once again on the feast day of Ireland's great saint we gather together as friendly sons of Saint Patrick and raise our glasses, "Beaded bubbles winking at the brim," to toast the United States—the country of our first loyalty, the land where our Irish ancestors gained the freedom of their heart's desire.

It is a particular joy and privilege for me—as a member of this truly American organization—to respond to the toast to the United States, and I answer with renewed oath of fealty to this our beloved America. I answer with my heart, as any American in whose veins flows the blood of Ireland must answer, when speaking of the United States, the final bulwark of man's liberty today.

It was James Stephens, that most characteristic of Irish writers, who quoted the philosopher as saying: "That the head does not hear anything until the heart has listened, and that what the heart knows today the head will understand tomorrow."

No wonder, then, that our hearts are full this evening with a knowledge that has come down through the one hundred three score and ten years passed since this group first organized to aid future Americans who might emigrate from Ireland. A few minutes ago, as I saw your upraised goblets, I visioned joining with you in that toast one who was himself a friendly son of St. Patrick, and who was also the father of these United States.

And the echo of some of his words resounded in my memory—those well-chosen words in his first inaugural address:

"The preservation of the sacred fire of liberty and the destiny of the republican model of government are justly considered * * * deeply, * * * finally, staked on the experiment intrusted to the hands of the American people."

If that were true in 1789—and no one dare deny it—how much more significant is that statement today.

In the time of Washington the spirit of democracy was inspiring a new nation born in spite of the alien influences of contemporary nations. In the time of Lincoln the spirit of democracy was revivifying itself in the face of alien influences within the Nation. Today the spirit of democracy must rearm against hostile forces not only abroad but also at home.

We hear much of the need for defense material, for reorganization of the Army and the Navy. And your Congress has devoted itself to the task of materially rearming the United States, at the same time providing material aid for victims of aggression.

For from the beginning it has been demonstrated, as that great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, has so well expressed it, that:

"For us to withhold aid to victims of attack would not result in a restoration of peace. It would merely tend to perpetuate the enslavement of nations already invaded and subjugated and provide an opportunity for the would-be conquerors to gather strength for an attack against us."

Therefore during the week just concluded the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States voted and the President signed the aid-to-democracies bill, which will speed to Greece, to China, to Britain the ships, the planes, the food, the guns, the ammunition, and the supplies of all kinds required for them to continue to wage war against their totalitarian foes. The pagan forces that would enslave the world learned during this last week that the United States is eager, ready, and fit to be the arsenal of democracy, as President Roosevelt long since foretold.

During these many months the Congress has provided for a two-ocean Navy, for adequate defenses on land, on sea, and in the air. Appropriate legislation has for a fixed period enrolled in the Army our young men that they might be adequately trained to defend their country. Public-spirited representatives of labor and of management have given of their time and of their energy in organizing the assembly lines to produce the material needed by the forces of democracy on the battlefields abroad and in the training camps at home. Already under congressional appropriation $28,500,000,000 have been set aside to purchase implements and material required to carry out our program of national defense.

And during this week just beginning, under a special rule there will be brought to the floor of the House of Representatives a bill

which will authorize the expenditure of another $7,000,000,000 to pay the costs contemplated by the aid-to-democracies bill. Of this sum, in my judgment, about $2,054,000,000 will purchase airplanes; $362,000,000 will purchase tanks, trucks, and armored cars; $629,000,000 will purchase ships; $1,343,000,000 will purchase ordnance supplies, gun parts, and ammunition; and $1,350,000,000 will purchase agricultural and similar commodities.

It is my conviction as I stand before you this evening that the House of Representatives will pass this bill and will send it to the Senate with all the patriotic speed asked by our great President.

The Republic of the United States has visibly demonstrated to the world of dictatorship that democracy can function with efficiency and unity in the face of menace from abroad.

It will continue to do so because the representatives of the people are themselves the sons of men, plain men, who came here from far countries, seeking liberty.

And so, though they may differ about many things, and please God, they always will share points of disagreement, nevertheless they are united against foreign threats to our democracy.

All the activity for defense of our rights, and of the rights of others, to democracy has been carried on within the framework of the Constitution and without violation of the Bill of Rights. We have maintained freedom of religious worship, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of elections, while in other parts of the world freedom is rapidly being replaced by slavery.

The sacred fire of liberty has indeed been kept burning on these shores—although there is a black-out abroad—whether we look east or west.

We have organized and rearmed; we are rearming materially to shield the flame of democracy. But we must also rearm spiritually if our program of defense is to be effective.

The spiritual stamina of our people must be renewed; our spiritual vigor must be increased, for a time of trial is at hand, and only with the spiritual armor of brave souls and stout hearts will we survive the test that is coming.

The stout-hearted men of Erin who were our forebears shared that spiritual armor with the men who walked barefoot at Valley Forge, with the men who smiled—even if a bit grimly—during the tedious and troubled times of the reconstruction.

Because these men knew the spirit of sacrifice, the light of freedom has continued to glow through the darkness of the years. And the same spirit of sacrifice will be called for from our generation of Americans as we begin to pay the price of defending democracy.

The cost of liberty, though high, I am convinced will be met by our fellow Americans with courage and realism. The true story of the gallant defenders of democracy in our age will be the tale of the average American who, while going about his daily work—supporting wife and children—will be contributing his share, through taxes, of the tremendous cost of the defense of freedom in the world. He will be another unsung hero of the humdrum. No medals will adorn his breast. No military titles will precede his name. But it will be his willing sacrifice of luxuries, perhaps even of necessities, that will make it possible for our Nation to continue free for his children, and for his children's children.

The spirit that will animate him will be the American spirit, rearmed and refortified. It is the same spirit that inspired our forefathers to immigrate to the shores of these United States, the land of liberty, their heart's desire. It is the same spirit that has filled the hearts of Friendly Sons of St. Patrick since 1771. It is the same spirit that inspires us as we are gathered here to rededicate ourselves to the purposes of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick to the democratic ideals of these United States, and to the eternal truths of our divine creator.

May God bless these United States.

Seven Billion for Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MADISON (IND.) COURIER

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial of March 13, entitled "Seven Billion for Britain," by Mr. M. E. Garber, editor of the Madison Courier, Madison, Ind.:

[From the Madison (Ind.) Courier of March 13, 1941]

SEVEN BILLION FOR BRITAIN

Perhaps it was intentional, or possibly just a coincidence, but the Roosevelt request for $7,000,000,000 to finance the aid-to-Britain bill set the exact sum that Woodrow Wilson sought to take this Nation into the World War 24 years ago.

Wilson sought to impress the enemy with the financial strength of the United States and its intention to carry on in such a big way that there could be no escape from its power, and Roosevelt is credited by his friends with having the same ambition.

In carrying out this policy of overwhelming the enemy with the size of the American effort the Wilson administration ran the public debt from $1,000,000,000 in April 1917 to $27,000,000,000 in November 1918 and spent more in 18 months than Great Britain and France spent in 4 years and more.

It was this policy of breaking hearts by the size of the American expenditures that brought Muscle Shoals into being, that planted embryo steel plants here and there over the Nation and caused the billion-dollar airplane effort and Hog Island, all of which had no direct effect upon the war but added about half of the debt.

Starting with almost fifty billions of public debt rather than a mere one billion as was the case in 1917, it may be better policy to impress the enemy with a determination to spend freely but also wisely and at such a pace as may be kept up over a term of years and not as a spendthrift handles money carelessly and then finds himself unable to complete the effort.

Every group of reformers has found some way to hitch their cause to national defense, and unless some restraining influence is placed upon the aid to Britain there is a real danger that the move will become so burdened with extraneous matter and so wasteful that the Nation will be unduly weakened before the desired end is gained.

Strikes Are Dangerous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

EDITORIAL BY COL. E. E. HOWARD

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very worthwhile, common-sense editorial in the Wheaton (Minn.) Gazette of March 21 on the strike situation. Col. E. E. Howard brings out in this editorial the danger to our Nation at this time of the strikes hampering our national defense, and I wholeheartedly commend this editorial to the attention of the House.

The editorial follows:

[From the Wheaton (Minn.) Gazette of March 21, 1941]

While President Roosevelt has been inclined to minimize the effect that strikes have had in hampering defense efforts, there were 31 strikes going on the first of this week.

There have been twice as many strikes in 1941 as in the same period a year ago. Many of these strikes are over nothing more nor less than the question of which union shall control the workers on a job. They are known as jurisdictional disputes.

If we are to have "all-out defense" measures, it is certain that we cannot be successful without the cooperation of employers and labor.

Labor must realize that it has a stake in our democracy which must be defended. What became of the unions in Germany and Italy? What would become of the social gains made in the United States if Hitler took over?

National defense will require sacrifices on the part of every American. When thousands of young men are being called to serve a year or more at $21 up per month, is it too much to ask the laborer to refrain from holding up work vital to the supplying of these men with the arms and ammunition needed for a successful defense?

The young men inducted into the Army do not have the right to quit and go home. They are serving Uncle Sam. Workers on defense industries, even though paid by a private employer or a corporation, yet are working for Uncle Sam when they are making guns, cars, or powder needed by the Army. While they get paid 2 to 10 times as much as the draftee, yet they want the privilege of striking to get higher pay.

Much talk is heard of the right to strike. Time was when Americans believed that anyone who quit a job had every right in the world to do it but he had no right to keep anyone else, by force or intimidation, from taking the job he vacated. Today it seems any outfit of "hooligans" that calls itself a branch of a union can commit almost any act of violence and get by with it.

The political strength of union labor seems to have grown so great that no man in high office dares question any act of a union or its members. When it comes to a question of seriously interfering with defense measures though, public opinion will demand

that the welfare of the Nation be placed above all else.

Strikes have no place in the picture while the emergency exists.

Letter to Hon. Marriner S. Eccles in Answer to Charge of Inflation Against Proposal That Government Can Save $2,000,000,000 a Year in Interest Charges

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a good slogan, or "catch" phrase, is oftentimes sufficient to crush and absolutely stop the timid, afraid, and uncourageous person. If anyone suggests a sound, feasible plan that cannot be answered that is against the interest of the few money changers, who have been controlling our monetary system for so many years, he has hurled at him immediately such phrases as "inflation," "printing-press money," "baloney dollars," and other similar phrases and slogans. Some people are willing to accept a slogan as a truth, since they hear it repeated so much and so often.

GOVERNMENT INTEREST BURDEN GREATLY INCREASED

In the case of our money system the payment by the Government of interest on bonds for the first 25 or 50 years of our Government's existence, when the amount of interest paid each year by the Government seldom exceeded $3,000,000 per year, was not burdensome; and possibly it was not so bad up until 25 years ago, when our Government seldom paid more than $25,000,000 a year in interest charges. But now, when the interest burden on the Federal Government alone has increased to more than $1,000,000,000 a year—and next year it will be at the rate of $2,000,000,000 a year—it is time for sane, sensible people to sit down and reason this thing out; and if there is a way that this interest can be saved without jeopardizing the country's welfare, it should be done.

Whenever you talk about depriving the greedy of a few billion dollars you will certainly have plenty of opposition. You may well expect those who are selfishly interested to disseminate their slogans and phrases all over this Nation through the use of every means of communication possible. The people of this country cannot understand why they have to pay $2 for every $1 that is borrowed by the Federal Government. They cannot understand why the Government that creates both bonds and money must sell its bonds for the money of its own creation and pay interest on the bonds each year.

MR. ECCLES' LETTER

A few days ago I received a letter from the Honorable Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D. C. It was dated March 21, 1941. I replied to his letter March 24, 1941, and after I had mailed my reply to him he not only made public his letter to me but he also delivered a copy to a Member of another body and caused it to be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I wonder why someone in the House did not submit the letter for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

MR. ECCLES HAS BECOME MY INSTRUCTOR

This does not meet with my disapproval. I welcome the opportunity of bringing this issue into the open. If those of us who entertain the views entertained by me are wrong, our arguments will not stand the light of day and we will lose. On the other hand, if we are right, Mr. Eccles and his group will lose. Therefore, it is very pleasing to me to thrash this issue out before the Congress and the people of the country. There is no better way to start than to get an understanding between ourselves as to what each is contending and proposing. For that reason my letter to Mr. Eccles is not a reply to the statements he made but is for the purpose of eliciting from him additional information which I should have in order to adequately reply to his letter. I shall await with interest his reply to my questions. He can submit them with the understanding that I expect to place his reply in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and give it just as much publicity as I am giving to my own letter. Mr. Eccles has taken it upon himself to become my instructor. This, too, is all right with me. All I ask him is not to give me a lecture and stop there. He should also submit to questions. If I am misleading the people, as alleged, he should assist me in obtaining the correct information. I do not promise to be an apt pupil but I will be a willing pupil, anxious to learn, and while he is teaching me he can also teach the people, many of whom entertain the same views I do. I am convinced that Mr. Eccles will not try to keep his light under a bushel. His letter to me was given to the press before I had time to reply. He is not trying to hide anything that is favorable to himself.

The letter is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 24, 1941.

HON. MARRINER S. ECCLES,
Chairman, Board of Governors,
Federal Reserve System,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ECCLES: I have received your letter of March 21, 1941, and I expect to reply to it as soon as I have the time to do so. It is my belief that your views should be given to the public, and when I reply to your letter, I expect to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with my reply.

Before replying to it, and in order to get our definitions straight, I would like for you to answer the following questions:

1. Has the Federal Reserve Banking System refused to comply with certain laws, which affect governmental institutions, including civil service, because the Board took the position that it is not a governmental institution?

2. Is it not a fact that the Open Markets Committee has the greatest power and influence that can be exercised by any group in connection with the Federal Reserve Banking System? (If you disagree about this, please outline the tremendous powers that can be exercised by this Committee and state wherein these powers are not as great as the powers possessed by any other committee or group in the System.)

3. Please give the names and addresses of the Open Markets Committee and the institutions in which the members of this Committee, who are not on the Board of Governors, are connected.

4. Please give the names and addresses of the Advisory Committee and the names of the companies and institutions the members of this Committee are connected with.

5. I have asserted that the Federal Government can issue either interest-bearing bonds or money, or both bonds and money. Is this a correct statement or not?

6. I have also asserted that a Federal Reserve bank obtains money from the Federal Reserve agent for the cost of printing, which is approximately 30 cents per $1,000. If this statement is not true, please indicate wherein it is untrue.

7. I have also asserted that Federal Reserve notes that are paid into circulation by a Federal Reserve bank are not obligations of the Federal Reserve bank, but these notes state on their face: "United States Government promises to pay upon demand ——— dollars." Am I correct in the statement that the money issued by the Federal Reserve banks is obligations of the Federal Government and not the Federal Reserve banks and is the same as a Government noninterest-bearing obligation?

8. I have stated that under our present system, the Treasury can sell a thousand-dollar bond providing for an annual interest payment to a Texarkana, Tex., bank and that the Dallas Federal Reserve Bank could take the $1,000 worth of Federal Reserve notes and buy these bonds from the Texarkana bank. That the Federal Reserve bank at Dallas could continue to hold the Government bonds until due and collect interest each year when payable from the Government; that this was, in effect, permitting a privately owned institution—the Dallas Federal Reserve Bank—to use the Government's credit free of charge to buy an interest-bearing obligation, which the Government must continue to pay interest on. Do you agree that this illustration is possible under our present system? If not, why not?

9. Do you agree with my statement that the private commercial banks have created by bookkeeping transactions almost $20,000,000,000 the past few years for the purpose of acquiring United States Government interest-bearing obligations?

If you agree that the banks create this money, do you also agree that the Government could create it directly without having any more money in circulation than if the banks created it?

10. Do you also agree that the Federal Reserve Banking System creates money on the Government's credit without paying the Government anything therefor?

11. Do you agree further that the same security that is behind a United States Government bond is behind a Federal Reserve note, which is a Government non-interest-bearing obligation?

12. Do you believe that the Federal Reserve Banking System should be wholly owned and controlled by the United States Government through its duly appointed representatives?

13. Is it a fact that if a board in charge of the Federal Reserve System is given the powers, which were recently requested in a

special report, that dangerous inflation can be prevented, even though the Government uses its own credit by paying money into circulation instead of using the present system?

14. If in answer to the preceding interrogatory you state that the powers would be insufficient under the circumstances, what additional powers could be granted by Congress that would absolutely control and prevent dangerous inflation?

15. I have often asserted that by the time the Federal Government pays a long-term bond, it will pay as much in interest as on the principal. Do you agree that this statement is correct? If not, give me your opinion.

16. Do you consider the title to the gold in the United States Government or in the Federal Reserve banks?

17. How much money could be created by the Federal Reserve Banking System under existing laws and regulations if used to the limit upon the gold certificates claimed by the Federal Reserve banks and United States Government bonds held by both the Federal Reserve banks and the member banks?

18. Is it true that the Board of Governors have agreed upon a policy to pursue that will cause an increase in interest rates generally?

19. Is it true or not true that you personally believe interest rates should be much higher?

20. Is it true or not true that you favor the Federal Government taxing the income of State and municipal securities for the purpose of causing an increase in interest rates generally?

21. Please state your answer to the following:

(a) All of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks is owned by private commercial banks and not one penny of it is owned by the Government or the people.

(b) The Federal Reserve banks pay no taxes whatsoever to the Federal Government and only pay taxes on real estate to the States and political subdivisions in which they are located.

(c) Salaries are paid to individuals connected with the Federal Reserve Banking System up to $50,000 a year.

(d) Practically all of the income of the Federal Reserve banks is from Government bonds which were purchased through the free use of the Government's credit.

(e) Although the original law required excess profits of the Federal Reserve banks to go into the Federal Treasury, at this time, under existing law, the Federal Reserve banks do not pay anything into the Federal Treasury.

22. I would like to precede this question with an explanation. My proposal is for the Government to pay the private commercial banks the $138,000,000 that they have invested in stock in the Federal Reserve Banking System and for the Government to take over the System and operate it in the public interest. If Congress should enact such a law, do you agree that the Federal Reserve banks could accept from the Treasury non-interest-bearing obligations and give the Government credit upon the books of the Federal Reserve banks therefor, permit checks to be drawn upon the account by the Treasury, and no more credit or money would be placed in circulation than if Government interest-bearing bonds had been issued and sold to the commercial banks?

23. Do you agree that if the Federal Reserve Banking System is owned by the Government and Government expenditures are financed as proposed by me that there will be no more actual money printed than is printed under the present system?

24. Although the members of the Board of Governors are appointed by the President, is it a fact that their salaries are paid by the privately owned banks?

For your information, I am not advocating the issuance of any kind of new money and am not advocating abolishing the charging of private interest, except on United States Government obligations. Further, I am not proposing for the Government to issue money or credit with no expectation of it being paid. I agree that some one must pay for everything, and if the Government issues non-interest-bearing bonds under my proposal, they could be paid back 4 percent a year and the debt entirely liquidated in 25 years, whereas under your system, if 4-percent interest is paid each year for 25 years, the Government will still owe the principal of the debt.

When you have replied to these questions, and I hope you will see your way clear to do so at an early date, I shall be very glad to answer every question raised in your letter of March 21, 1941.

Yours sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

Mr. Speaker, it is hoped that a reply will be forthcoming within the near future. I hope his replies are reasonably short and to the point, in order that the issues between us may be clarified easier and more quickly.

MY PROPOSAL

More than half of the Members of the House of Representatives have expressed themselves in favor of Government ownership of the 12 Federal Reserve banks. I have advocated the Government ownership of these 12 banks for many years, and my proposal embraces more than government of the 12 banks. It is substantially as follows:

First. The Government to acquire the entire ownership and control of the Federal Reserve Banking System by paying the member private commercial banks the $138,000,000 they have invested.

Second. Have a board of 12 governors appointed by the President, each representing a different area to have control of the system.

Third. Any member of the board, or all of the members of the board, subject to removal by the passage in either the House or the Senate of a resolution asking for dismissal.

Fourth. Have this board stabilize the value of money and prevent booms and depressions, which we have suffered every few years. Our opponents say this cannot be done. We believe it can be done. We know the present system has failed, and a change could not be a serious mistake.

Fifth. Directors of each of the 12 Federal Reserve banks to be appointed by the Board of Governors.

Sixth. Placing all Federal Reserve employees under civil service.

Seventh. Abolishing the Federal Advisory Council, which is composed of private bankers, and who have demonstrated the enormous powers they exercise over the Board of Governors.

Eighth. The private commercial bankers not to be on the Federal Open Markets Committee. This committee to be composed of the 12 members of the Board, who are responsible to the people and subject to the will of Congress.

Ninth. No officer or employee of any Federal Reserve bank to receive an annual salary in excess of $25,000.

Tenth. Permit no connection between the private commercial banks and the Board of Governors. At present the salaries of the Board of Governors are paid by the privately owned institutions.

Eleventh. Then when the Government needs money, the Treasury can deliver to the Federal Reserve Banking System interest-bearing bonds and receive credit upon the books of the Federal Reserve System for the amount of the bonds. Checks can be drawn by the Treasury to pay any debt owed by the Government. The Government owning the System, the profits from the interest on the bonds will flow right back into the Treasury, unlike the present system where the interest is held by the Federal Reserve Banking System and used to pay fabulous salaries and extravagant expenses. Or, have the United States Treasury deliver to the Federal Reserve Banking System non-interest-bearing obligations and have the System give the Treasury credit for the amount of the bonds. Checks can be drawn upon the account and any debt owed by the Government can be paid as at present.

Twelfth. The Board of Governors to be given enormous powers over excess reserves and sufficient powers to absolutely stop at any time any serious threat of dangerous inflation. The plan advocated by the special report of the Board of Governors in a communication to Congress recently would not be bad if the powers are exercised by a Board that is more subject to the will of Congress, in no way connected with the private banking system, solely under obligations to the people and under no circumstances their salaries paid by the privately owned institutions.

If this plan is placed into execution, it is my contention that it will prevent dangerous inflation. It will save the taxpayers $2,000,000,000 a year in interest. Our entire national debt can be liquidated in 25 years by paying 4 percent each year on the principal of the bonds, instead of paying 4 percent each year on the interest and nothing on the principal. Last, but not least, it will repeal the laws which have farmed out the use and abuse of the Government's credit to the private commercial banks.

Importation of Dressed Meats and Meat Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE MINNESOTA STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota:

Joint resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States not to repeal or modify the Embargo Act of 1927 relating to importation of meats from foreign lands

Whereas as a result of repeated outbreaks in this country prior to 1927 of the dreaded cattle disease known as rinderpest, or foot-and-mouth disease, there was enacted in that

year a congressional embargo upon the importation into this country of dressed meats and meat products from any country where said disease exists; and

Whereas prior to the imposition of the embargo the spread of that disease in this country demoralized the domestic livestock industry, seriously jeopardized the public health, and resulted in the expenditure of millions of dollars by Federal and State governments and by the livestock industry for the eradication of that evil; and

Whereas the wisdom of that congressional embargo, embodied in the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, has been indubitably justified, as attested by the fact that since January 1, 1927, there has been only one minor outbreak of that disease—in the State of California in 1929—which outbreak has since been traced directly to a violation of Federal regulations relating to the unloading of certain materials; and

Whereas there is increasing evidence from authoritative sources that a serious attempt is now under way to influence the President of the United States and Congress to circumvent or remove the embargo upon the importation of dressed meats and meat products for the benefit of certain foreign nations in which the said livestock disease is prevalent; and

Whereas any modification of that embargo would be inimical to the best interests of this Nation and would cause a recurrence of the evils existing prior to 1927 as enumerated above; and

Whereas the agricultural and livestock industry of this Nation is playing and must continue to play a vital and indispensable part in the program of national defense, and nothing would more seriously affect that burden and the program of national defense than a relaxation of the existing barriers to the importation of infected livestock: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, in regular session assembled, That we hereby respectfully and earnestly importune the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States, for reasons herein stated, to resist any attempts and to refrain from any action designed to repeal, circumvent, or modify the Embargo Act of 1927 relating to the importation of dressed meats and meat products from foreign lands in which there is prevalent the livestock foot-and-mouth disease; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota is hereby instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Minnesota in the Congress of the United States.

The United States "Neither Realistic Nor Rational"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of March 22, 1941:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of March 22, 1941]

THE NEW APOCALYPSE

It is time to realize that this country has assumed an unlimited responsibility for the outcome of the war. This means simply that anything short of the total overthrow of the Nazi principle in Europe would be an American defeat.

We have arrived at that responsibility with no material condition, no bargain, no stipulation beforehand—at least none that the American people are aware of—and, so far as we are informed, with no realistic political forethought. The premises were all emotional. Beyond the fear motive, our obligation to humanity, to civilization, to anything in the world calling itself democracy has been passionately acknowledged. Almost nothing has been said about our rights.

What are the American rights in this war? Who has yet defined them? What steps have been taken to protect them?

We know for sure only that the war will sometime end, and that when it does there will be some kind of peace. How the war will end, or what the world will be like at that time, we do not know, and yet the possibilities are few and may be stated.

The British Empire could fall. In that case we should be at war with Hitler, facing him alone, and how that would turn out we think we know; but this, we believe, is, of all the possibilities, the one most remote.

The German thing could itself collapse. That seems unlikely to happen, but if it did, there would be consequences over which, so far as we can see, we should have no control whatever. What would the next state of Europe be, and what should we have to say about it? The probability is that we should lose everything it had cost us to assist in bringing that sequel to pass, and be expected besides to aid in the reconstruction, as a duty, on the ground that we had let others do the fighting.

It could come to a kind of stalemate between Great Britain and Germany. That is to say, Hitler might see that he could never conquer the British with the American arsenal behind them, and so abandon that idea and go on the defensive in Europe; and the British at the same time might see, as perhaps they see already, that even with the American arsenal behind them, they will be unable to reconquer Europe with their own manpower. At that point they might be strongly tempted to consider a negotiated peace. They might think of embracing the Lothian formula, which was that Great Britain should detach itself from the European system, simply let it alone, and find its own future in the world system. We do not say this is probable. We say only that it is one of the possibilities, and one that is bound to be taken account of by intelligent statesmanship. And if it began to materialize, what could the American Government do about it? What hostage has been taken against it? Definitely, that outcome would be an American defeat. There would exist then a European system under Hitler, a world system dominated by Great Britain, and the American system. How could the rivalries among them be resolved? What would be the position of the American system?

But the American Government has said there shall not be a negotiated peace. The outcome we have underwritten, the one for which we have assumed an unlimited responsibility, is a complete victory over the Nazi principle, no matter how long it may take, nor how much it may cost. Anything less, as we have said, would be an American defeat.

Suppose then a victory in that shape, since it is the only kind we can accept. What shall we do with it? What shall be done with the Germans? How shall the principle of aggression be chained down? How shall the age-old racial and national conflicts in Europe be composed? Shall all the former national sovereignties be restored, and if so, with what sureties for a durable peace among them? And shall the new order be trusted to keep itself? If not, who shall keep and mind it? And when all of this has been arranged, what of the new Anglo-American world? How shall that be divided up?

The only answer to such questions as these is a vague romantic assumption that when, by the exercise of its irresistible economic power, America has destroyed the terrible viper of Europe, its moral authority will be irresistible, too, and the Old World will be happy to embrace it.

Mr. Willkie now expounds that idea. "Our concern," he says, "is broader than the welfare of any single nation. It is that the area of freedom be as large as possible. If Britain prevails, the enslaved democracies of Europe will revive." When he was asked by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to be specific, to say what democracies and what of Finland, he answered: "If America gives effective aid to Britain, America will dominate what happens afterward. * * * If we give her that effective aid, then gentlemen such as you, Senator, will determine whether or not these enslaved democracies will survive. * * * If America gives that effective aid, then America will have the power to determine whether the captured democracies of Europe survive. And, in my judgment, American public sentiment will require that they survive."

We think there have been few more touching illustrations of the innocence and political immaturity of the American mind. Mr. Willkie may know what he means by the democracies. We certainly do not. We would challenge him to define them. Was Greece a democracy? Anyhow, upon all nations from Athens to Cathay that will make the genuflection to democracy we are going to confer the gift of life. The American Senate can do that. If the American Senate cannot do it, the public sentiment of America will.

And then, according to the vision of the President, the four horsemen of American freedom will go riding to all corners of the earth—freedom of speech, freedom of conscience, freedom from fear, and freedom from want—"which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world." This vision, not of a "distant millennium," says the President, but of "a kind of world attainable in our own time and generation," represents the American war aim. A New Deal for the whole world, planned that way, and financed in the beginning with American billions.

The British, who live in the world in a practical way, have not subscribed. They have steadily refused to define their war aims or to say what kind of world they are thinking of to come afterward. What they think of the American millennium they wisely do not say.

Is it permitted to ask what America will get back? Do you suppose the liberated democracies of Europe in their gratitude will buy the American agricultural surplus instead of South American grain and meat and cotton at lower prices? Or can you imagine that Europe would say that the rich American people, by providing the only weapons—if that were all—had tried to buy the right to dominate the peace? What if Europe should resent our moral imperialism? And if Europe did that, what could we do about it? Demand our weapons back? Or ask to be paid for them in cash?

We are being neither realistic nor rational. No other people in the world would behave in this manner, or could survive if they did. The world we now undertake to save is one we have imagined. It does not really exist. But for all we have said, and beyond any reason, the spirit of crusade is a noble possession.

The Enfield Navigation-Power Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address, which I delivered over the radio on March 23:

The project to improve the Connecticut River between Hartford and Holyoke is before Congress again. This project has two aspects. One is navigation, the other is power.

This project was authorized by Congress 11 years ago. Authority then was given to a private power company to construct a dam at Enfield. That power company had a license from the Federal Power Commission, but it didn't raise enough capital and never exercised that license. The company has since gone out of existence.

In 1935, 6 years ago, the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives authorized the Army engineers to review the whole proposal and to advise Congress whether the project should still be undertaken and whether changes should be made in the original plans. As a result of their further study, the Army engineers 2 years ago again recommended that the project be undertaken, but this time they recommended that the power dam at Enfield be constructed by the Federal Government instead of by private interests. This dam is a necessary part of the navigation-improvement plan, but a substantial amount of electric energy can be produced there. Therein lies a focal point of opposition.

The House committee approved the Army engineers' recommendation, but the proposal was defeated in the House.

It is now before us again for consideration.

First, I want to call attention to the changed attitude of Connecticut toward this project. Two years ago the entire congressional delegation opposed it. The man who was then Governor opposed it. Speaking for him, witnesses from Connecticut holding official positions appeared before the committee in opposition.

This year I am glad to report that I expect several of my Connecticut colleagues to support it. Our efforts are considerably bolstered by the open mind of our Governor and his sincere desire that the benefits of cheaper power be made available to Connecticut residents in the cities as well as in the villages.

Now, bear in mind that the Army and Federal Power Commission engineers are career men. Their duty is to state the merits and the demerits of proposals of this nature solely from the point of view of ultimate benefit to a section and the Nation as a whole.

The opposition to this project suggests that the dam at Enfield will increase the flood hazard. This question was raised 2 years ago. It was raised again at the hearing last week.

Col. John S. Bragdon, head of the Army engineers at Providence, and the engineers of the Federal Power Commission are thoroughly familiar with the flood conditions in the Connecticut River Valley. They told me the dam could never heighten the flood level by more than 2 inches. I was guided by their recommendations when I urged Congress and the President to approve the project and funds for the diking system at Hartford and East Hartford, as well as the comprehensive flood-control system of dams and reservoirs along the upper Connecticut River, when I was your representative before. Government engineers are emphatic in stating that there will be no increase in flood hazards if the Enfield Dam is built. It is my own opinion that flood threats are only a scheme to frighten the people against the project.

Naturally for construction of the dam some land must be taken. There are wild rumors about the amount of land which will be needed. I am specifically informed by the engineers that not more than 900 acres will be required, not 9,000 as reported in the Courant. And that land will be paid for.

This is the first project of its kind for Connecticut. We have the successful example of similar projects at Bonneville and Grand Coulee on the Columbia River, at Boulder Canyon on the Colorado; the 10 projects on the Tennessee River and Fort Peck on the Missouri River. Other projects have been built and are being built on other rivers of the Nation. The natural resources in those sections have tremendously enhanced in value. The people of those sections are enjoying lower electric rates from the Government and from private utilities too. And the private utilities are still making handsome profits.

In this great crisis in our Nation's history these projects are important to our national defense.

I am pleading that we of Connecticut may have the same advantages which wise men have secured for other regions. All these projects are going to pay for themselves.

The opposition now proclaims that we should concern ourselves only with flood-control projects.

You remember, during the flood-control fight of 1936 and 1937, that we asked for flood-control projects. The question of power did not enter into our plans. It was this same utility opposition to this power dam at Enfield which injected the question of power into the flood-control projects at that time. They knew there was power to be developed, and they attempted to secure for themselves the rights over that power for 999 years. At that time I agreed to accept their compact if they would strike out all reference to power. This they refused to do. Now that they know that we know there is power in this proposed Federal navigation dam at Enfield, they piously plead for flood control and flood control only. Aren't they cute?

One more word on the question of flood control. Today at Hartford and East Hartford the dike program is two-thirds completed. Definite flood control is assured.

The power interests, as usual, are smart. They have set up headquarters in Washington, and their representatives are attempting, on the quiet, to swing Members of Congress against it. The Washington correspondent of the Hartford Times reported this last week. Commenting on this lobby, the Holyoke Transcript editorially said, "Power is powerful."

Members of Congress know that the objections come from two sources. The railroads don't like it because the people will get lower freight rates. The power interests don't like it because they don't want a yardstick that will show up their high rates.

It is well known that the Connecticut charges for electricity, home, business, and manufacturing consumption, are among the highest in the country. Just over the Massachusetts line, Holyoke has a municipal plant. It charges $1 for 25 kilowatt-hours. Chicopee, next door, has a municipal distributing plant but has to purchase its power from the Holyoke Water Power Co. It charges $1.30. Windsor Locks, this side of the line and away from a public yardstick, pays the Connecticut Light & Power Co. $1.82.

From three different citizens' groups at Thompsonville I received telegrams urging the adoption of this project. Thompsonville is forced to pay the same high rates as Windsor Locks. Incidentally, in Hartford we pay the Hartford Electric Light Co. $1.75, while Farmington, a suburb of Hartford, pays the Connecticut Power Co. $2.35. Everyone knows the Connecticut Power Co. and the Hartford Electric Light Co. are Mr. Ferguson's twins. Maybe Mr. Ferguson would like to explain this.

The concern expressed by certain newspaper advocates of private utility companies about the $13,000,000 which the entire project calls for overlooks entirely that Connecticut might very easily through the Enfield Dam save that entire cost to the people in 1 year by reducing the cost of electricity.

Even if it took 2 years of reduced rates to make up this $13,000,000, which is about one-third the amount paid by consumers each year to electric companies in Connecticut, don't you believe with me it would be sound economics and worth while?

At Windsor Locks the Army is establishing an air base, which will bring here about 2,500 Army men, with their families. The testimony at the hearing last week revealed that the Hartford Electric Light Co. submitted a wholesale estimate for electric service for this national-defense air base which, as one Member of Congress remarked, is higher than the retail rate charged in his State. Even the Army can't get away from excessive Connecticut rates.

Electricity can be obtained from the Enfield Dam for the Windsor Locks air base at about one-third the charge now asked, and I take into account the cost of building the dam as well as manufacturing the electricity.

The increased industrialization of this region points to a shortage of power after 1942 despite efforts being made by local utility companies to increase their production capacity. There has been an effort to belittle the amount of electricity that could be generated at the Enfield Dam.

Opponents of this bill intimated that this power would be available only a few weeks of the year.

I was concerned about this, and I asked the Army engineers. They assured me the power from this dam will be available 24 hours a day every day of the year.

While substantial navigation benefits will accrue through use of river transportation, those benefits alone might not warrant the cost of improving the river. Combined, however, with the benefits from power production, the project is economically sound. In addition, the residents, businesses, and manufacturing concerns will have the use of power so generated at greatly reduced rates.

Undoubtedly many of you will have questions to ask or will want more information than time has permitted me to give. I want you to understand this subject, so please ask me for any further facts you want. I shall be happy to answer.

Real Security for America's Old Folks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, it is our duty to plan now to carry our country safely over the difficult and dangerous period of adjustment which will inevitably come upon us when the period of our huge defense program comes to an end.

If America is to survive and prosper, it will be necessary to decentralize industry and bring the factory to the farm, place a legal floor under domestic farm prices, build a four-lane highway system, plan a housing program, perfect a better youth program of education, and establish the right kind of a social-security program for our elders, disabled, and dependents.

First we should establish a social-security program which will not only protect our elders against want and insecurity, but which will also operate as a means of maintaining a balance between the producer and the consumer.

We should have an old-age-assistance program for all American citizens over the age of 60, except those persons whose incomes are large enough to pay a Federal income tax.

A program of this kind will keep our elders from the W. P. A. and relief rolls. They will not have to mortgage their little homes to participate. In such a system investigators and red tape will be eliminated. All Federal payments will be direct and on an equal basis to all people throughout the United States.

Adequate provision must be made for dependent children, widowed mothers, the blind, and the disabled. This should be financed, as at present, out of general revenues on the part of the Federal Government, together with the participation by the States in proportion to their ability to pay.

The program of old-age assistance could be supported by a national gross income tax. In 1933 the State of Indiana enacted a gross-income tax as a major part of a replacement-tax program to alleviate the disproportionate tax burden of property owners and to provide an adequate source of revenue to meet the general welfare and public school operating costs. In Indiana the greater part of the revenue from the gross-income tax is returned to the local school corporations on a basis of teaching units. In the past years, each teacher received $700. In addition to the money paid the teachers, the State pays from the gross income tax revenue 30 percent of the cost of old-age assistance, 40 percent of the cost of caring for dependent children, and 50 percent of the cost of caring for the needy blind.

Since the enactment of this law in Indiana the number of licensed stores have increased from 58,763 in 1933 to 73,060 in 1939, a gain of 14,297 in a 6-year period. We have had far fewer business failures in proportion than States that have been using the sales tax. Property taxes in Indiana have been reduced almost 30 percent.

The revenue from a national gross income tax could adequately finance a decent old-age assistance program. America, with an $80,000,000,000 national income and an average 2-percent gross income tax, would yield our elders about $73 per month. An average gross income tax of 1½ percent would yield our elders $50 per month.

This old-age system would be on a pay-as-you-go basis—everyone pays his share of the tax and all needy American citizens over 60 years of age participate.

The national gross income tax is a tax imposed upon all persons, firms, groups, and corporations, except labor unions, hospitals, and religious organizations and educational institutions which are not organized or operated for private benefit. It is purely a gross-receipts tax and applies to every kind or character of income.

In the application of the national gross income tax, gross income and gross receipts are synonymous. Gross receipts is the measure of the tax imposed and means all cash, credits, notes, or other property received in lieu thereof from any and all sources, and includes the following:

Compensation for personal services, including wages, bonuses, pensions, fees, salaries, commissions, gratuities, rentals; gross receipts received from trade, business, or commerce; gross receipts received from the sale, transfer, or exchange of property, tangible or intangible, real or personal, including the sale of capital assets, or from the assignment or sale of rights; all the receipts received from the performance of contracts; all receipts received as prizes and premiums; all receipts from insurance; all receipts received as alimony, damages, or judgments; investments of capital receipts, such as interest, discount, rentals, royalties, dividends, fees, and commissions; receipts received from the surrender, sale, transfer, exchange, redemption of, or distribution upon, stock of corporations or associations; and all other receipts of any kind.

Gross income of banks, trust companies, building and loan associations, brokers, finance companies, dealers in commercial paper, and persons engaged in the business of lending money or credit, shall be deemed to mean "gross earnings." This is also applicable in the case of individuals dealing in margins, without any deduction for losses and without any deductions for taxes, brokerage commissions, or other expenses incident to the transaction.

RETAIL SALES

The term "selling at retail" means and includes only a transaction by which the ownership of tangible personal property is transferred, conditionally or otherwise, for a consideration, when such transfer is made in the ordinary course of business and at a fixed and established place of business. Retail sales also includes all sales to a division, subdivision, agency, instrumentality, unit, or department of government, or any other sale not defined as wholesale.

WHOLESALE SALE, ONE-FOURTH OF 1 PERCENT

First. Sales of any tangible personal property, except capital assets of the seller, to a purchaser who buys the same for the purpose of reselling it in the form in which it is sold to him—sale of goods to a grocer.

Second. Sales of any tangible personal property as a material which is to be directly consumed in direct production by the buyer in the business of producing tangible personal property by manufacturing, processing, refining, repairing, mining, agriculture, or horticulture.

Third. Sales of any tangible personal property which is to be incorporated by the buyer as a material or an integral part into tangible property produced by such buyer in the business of manufacturing, assembling, constructing, refining, or processing—sale of wood to furniture factory.

Fourth. Sale of drugs, medical and dental preparations, to be directly consumed in professional use by doctors, hospitals, embalmers, and tonsorial parlors.

Fifth. Sales of tangible personal property to be directly consumed by the buyer in the business of industrial cleaning—sale of soap to laundries.

Sixth. Sales of any tangible personal property to be directly consumed in the business of rendering public-utility service—sale of coal to a public utility.

To distribute the tax burden with exact justice is impossible. The tax burden under a national gross income tax rests on different taxpaying groups with more equity, more equality, and more balance.

SUGGESTED GROSS INCOME-TAX SCHEDULE OF RATES

First. Tax on income from salaries, wages, and commissions:
$1 to $800, 1 percent tax.
$801 to $5,000, 2 percent tax.
Over $5,000, 3 percent tax.
Second. Tax on selling at retail:
Under $1,000, one-half of 1 percent tax.
$1,001 to $30,000, 1 percent tax.
$30,000 to $1,000,000, 2 percent tax.
Over $1,000,000, 3 percent tax.
Third. Tax on gross receipts from trade or business, except receipts from retail:
Under $1,000, one-half of 1 percent tax.
$1,001 to $30,000, 1 percent tax.
$30,000 to $1,000,000, 2 percent tax.
Over $1,000,000, 3 percent tax.
Fourth. Tax on selling at wholesale,
Tax on display advertising and subcontracts, any amount, one-fourth of 1 percent tax.

We should be willing to try this plan for 1 year. Everyone should be willing to pay his share of gross income toward insuring the security of this country, the stability of his job, and the welfare of his people. Every American who seeks the protection of his elders should demand immediate action.

Protest Concentration of Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTHERN GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE AT MOBILE, ALA.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas at the September meeting of the Southern Governors' Conference at Mobile, Ala., by appropriate resolution, the attention of the President of the United States and the members of the National Defense Council was

directed to the importance and advisability of utilizing for national preparedness the vast reservoirs of natural resources and available labor offered in the South; and

Whereas in said resolution we have called pointed attention to the necessity of immediate action to effect further decentralization of industry in the interest of the national security and post-war economy for all sections of our country; and

Whereas it is now apparent from statistics reported in an address by the Honorable Chester C. Davis before the Southern Governors' Conference now in session at New Orleans, La., that these recommendations have not received deserved attention; and

Whereas these statistics disclose that the policy now being pursued by those in authority is resulting in a greater concentration of industry than ever before, thereby endangering our national security and post-war economy for all sections of our country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Southern Governors' Conference, assembled, hereby goes on record as condemning the continuation of this unsound and dangerous policy now being pursued by those in authority, and hereby directs the chairman of the conference to appoint a committee from the membership of this conference to wait upon the President and the Office of Production Management, to present in person this protest, and at the same time urge immediate correction of this situation.

This the 15th day of March 1941.

FRANK M. DIXON, *Chairman.*

Attest:

WALTER R. MCDONALD,
Executive Secretary.

Office of Government Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, since the days of the immortal George Washington, almost every one of our Presidents, regardless of political persuasions, has found it necessary from time to time to remind Congress that it is essential the American people be kept informed on the processes of government; that they have the widest possible knowledge and public education on the ideals of democracy and the broader conceptions of national life.

Never has this been a partisan issue, nor advice and admonition flavored with politics. There is a unanimity of opinion among our great statesmen of the past, although they phrased the objective in a variety of words. Thomas Jefferson expressed it this way, and I quote:

> Education is the true corrective of abuses of constitutional power. Ours, as you know, is a government which will not tolerate the being kept entirely in the dark.

From the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, page 470, you will find these enduring words from James Madison; and again I quote:

> Whilst it is universally admitted that a well-instructed people alone can be permanently a free people, and whilst it is evident that the means of diffusing and improving useful knowledge form so small a proportion of expenditures for national purposes, I cannot presume it to be unseasonable to invite your attention to the advantages of superadding to the means of education provided by the several States, a seminary of learning instituted by the National Legislature.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, and fellow Members, I could continue to turn the pages of history and summon as witnesses the wisdom and bound thought of Ulysses S. Grant, Rutherford B. Hayes, Theodore Roosevelt, the beloved Woodrow Wilson, and that great statesman and great American, William Howard Taft. Their state papers all testify to the value of wide dissemination of useful information and the security which rests in a forum of enlightened people.

Because the minority has both respect and veneration for the reasoned opinions of William Howard Taft, I should like to point out a very brief passage from his Messages and Papers, which testifies to his broad vision, and might well be used as an argument for H. R. 3368. On December 6, 1910, he said in a message to the Congress, and I quote:

> The president of a private corporation doing so vast a business as the Government transacts would, through competent specialists, maintain the closest scrutiny on the comparative efficiency and the comparative costs in each division or department of the business. He would know precisely what the duties and activities of each bureau or division are in order to prevent overlapping. No adequate machinery at present exists for supplying the President of the United States with such information respecting the business for which he is responsible.

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what the Office of Government Reports, and this authorization provides. It provides exactly what President Taft felt he needed to implement his office with essential information, and it places at the continuing disposal of President Franklin D. Roosevelt a facility that has helped make him the most enlightened man in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to take up the time of this House with any glorification of the present administration. The record of achievement has been sufficiently endorsed by the American people. Nor can any feeble words of mine add to the accomplishments and career of Mr. Lowell Mellett, an outstanding liberal in thought and deed; a newspaperman who left his indelible impression for integrity and sound logic on the profession he adorned before he was called into the service of the Government.

I would address myself in these brief remarks to the paradoxes and contradictions which have surrounded discussion of this bill, and which becloud its merits. I discern not only one red herring drawn across the line of vision, but a subtle attempt to drag in an aquarium.

For myself, I am quite content to accept the word of the President of the United States, as voiced in his letter to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'LEARY]:

> In brief, the Office of Government Reports, operating at modest expense, is an essential part of the executive office of the President.

In these times of stress and world struggle I am certain that no patriotic member of this body consciously would restrict the Chief Executive, or deny him any facilities that would help in the solution of grave problems, or the fulfillment of his heavy tasks.

They say—and I refer to the minority report—that it is a step toward the creation of a propaganda machine. They bring no facts or records to sustain the charge because, frankly, gentlemen, any examination of the activities of the Office of Government Reports reveals nothing to give credence to such a vague indictment.

What is propaganda? In world affairs we have come to think of it as lies artfully camouflaged to resemble truth. Or as it is scientifically disseminated by the organized voices of aggression, the sugar-coated disguise applied to cover bitter reality. In Germany of today it is everything but the truth. How that nation has retrograded since Frederick the Great, succeeding to the throne in 1740 said, and I quote:

> A man that seeks truth and loves it must be reckoned precious to any human society.

I am reluctant to believe that any American today feels this Government would sanction, or lend even tacit approval, to an official agency pledged to mislead, or circulate anything not founded upon solid fact. No, gentlemen, we use the word carelessly, and in politics we are prone to label something the other fellow says that we do not particularly like as propaganda. Only those nations can endure whose cornerstones and foundations are raised upon the abiding strength that reposes in truth.

What is a propaganda machine? In its invidious sense, I presume we can call it an official agency of the governing power to control and direct public expression, whether the approach be through the printed word, the radio, or other avenues of enlightenment. In operation the people hear what the Government wants them to hear; it colors and distorts the truth to suit official purpose, it molds and guides public opinion by dictatorial ukase, and it absolutely strangles any minority thought, or ideas, that run counter to the ruling power. It runs contrary to the American concept of liberty, a free press, the rights of the minority, and other democratic ideals. I say now, it has not, and never can be created here.

Let us look at the facts. The Office of Government Reports, since its inception in November 1933, has issued but one press release. That release was a summary of the report to the President on the activities of the National Emergency Council. I submit to you gentlemen that Herr Goebbels would discard as a travesty on propaganda efficiency any agency which in 7½ years issued only one official communiqué designed for newspaper consumption.

The Washington Office of Government Reports retains no high-priced staff of writers or word manipulators issuing regular releases conceived, as some seem to fear, to extol the present administration. It has never tried, nor never will, to influence editorial opinion one way or the other. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, it

is exactly what is was created to be, a central clearinghouse for information concerning Federal activities, to report on the opinions, needs, and desires of citizens. And that, may I add, includes Members of Congress, who use—and are invited to use to the full extent—its great wealth of background and factual information, and its source material on happenings in a fast-moving world.

Now, I should like at this time to comment briefly on how this agency touches upon the essential work of every hard-working and conscientious Member or Congress. How it saves time and voluminous correspondence for those Members who must keep in touch and meet the daily demands of a constituency. Perhaps the secretaries of Members, who handle office detail, would be better witnesses for O. G. R. efficiency. Last year this agency handled 8,000 inquiries referred to its office by Members of Congress. During 1940 it furnished, upon request, some 166,000 clippings to the Members of both branches. There is no definite record of how much factual information, statistics, and pertinent data it provided Senators and Representatives for the preparation of public speeches and reports. Its service is, of course, nonpartisan and nonpolitical, as it is accurate and comprehensive. I know, as do many other Members, how handy and useful it can be as a central source for information on perplexing questions that are conjured by constituents in the daily routine.

Take the matter of finding defense jobs. I mention that subject because every Member of this House has been flooded with requests for definite information from men and women eager to ally with the defense program. We like to give them this information as quickly as possible. I am sure that the little booklet Defense Employment and Training for Employment has satisfied more requests for this knowledge than any other Government publication. Over 10,000 copies have been provided by O. G. R. for congressional offices, and 80,000 have been distributed. Not being a statistician, I cannot compute the hours saved and the travel to Washington avoided by having such information readily available through the Office of Government Reports. Does this sound like the work of a bureau of propaganda?

Here I should like to comment on the work of this highly important office with relation to the general public and what we popularly call big business. In 1940, during the normal months, and before defense preparation involved such wide Federal expansion, it received and answered some 100,000 requests for information on governmental activities. These inquiries came from every section of the country, and since the period of the emergency general public correspondence with the Office has trebled.

Businessmen generally have keen interest in Government contracts and expenditures incidental to defense preparation. The Office of Government Reports prepares and distributes a regular tabulation, National Defense Contracts and Expenditures, which is the only authoritative and over-all compilation of its kind. It is an invaluable aid to the world of business, and of tremendous assistance to Members of Congress in keeping them aware of activity in their particular districts. This tabulation is sent every fortnight to 55 Senators, 199 Representatives, 117 Federal agencies, 75 railroads, 99 newspapers and magazines, 90 banks, and 630 individual business concerns. The United States Chamber of Commerce distributes more than 3,000 copies of a summary of this tabulation, and the National Defense Advisory Commission distributes it to all local and State defense councils.

We might truthfully say that most mail, carelessly directed to the Government, Washington, D. C., finds its way to the O. G. R., and it is efficiently administered. The President has remarked this agency could be addressed as "Uncle Sam, post-office box No. 1," since a huge volume of direct-contact mail from the general public is handled by O. G. R. That includes, of course, thousands of letters from the parents and relatives of men now in the service, or about to be drafted, which are routed to the proper departments for final disposition.

No, gentlemen, I submit this has been, and will continue to be, an administration of unparalleled openness. In this House we occasionally hear criticism that the Government conceals, or keeps secret, its intentions and purposes, or exercises in fact a limited censorship. The facts belie the charge. What President in the history of this Republic twice weekly undergoes gracefully a searching quiz from 80 to 100 trained newspaper correspondents, privileged to ask the answers on matters of public policy? What President has regularly reported to the Nation, and the world, on matters of public importance? Where are all Cabinet offices open to representatives of the press? All officials concerned with the defense programs can be readily contacted. There has been no policy of suppression, repression, or censorship. Indeed, the policy is one of free expression. Government information has been more readily obtainable in Washington than in any other world capital. And it will continue to be. We have the pledged word of Mr. Lowell Mellett, Director of O. G. R., that no censorship is contemplated—and I quote from the published hearings of this committee:

The CHAIRMAN. The press seems to have criticized section (c) of the bill, fearing that it might bring about a censorship. What are your comments on that section?

Mr. MELLETT. If any censorship is contemplated by this administration, I believe our organization would not be a particularly useful one for that purpose. I do not believe we are organized in any way that would make us a good spot for any censor to operate from. However, I do know that no censorship is contemplated.

Mr. BENDER. Is a censorship contemplated during wartime?

Mr. MELLETT. None that I know of. It is my belief—and I believe my information is as good as anybody else could have on the subject—that none is contemplated in wartime. If I might be permitted to explain, that does not mean in case there should be war that there will not be military censorship, as there has always been, and I presume always will be. In other words, the Army and Navy will have control over the information coming from the Army and Navy. But censorship in the sense I believe is feared—that is, the kind we see abroad—the actual censorship of newspapers or other publications, simply is not contemplated in any manner.

I have up to now merely touched upon the controversial phases of this bill. In its broader aspects the Office of Government Reports performs such important functional services that I assume there is no dispute about the necessity of sustaining it as an official arm of the Chief Executive. Let me briefly summarize how it fits perfectly into an efficient governmental pattern. It has three operating divisions: Field Operation, Press Intelligence, and Information Service.

The Division of Field Operations serves as a contact between the Federal and State Governments, local governments, and citizens. It serves also as a liaison and coordinating office between Federal agencies in the field. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, it serves as an information service to the President on the functioning of Federal programs in the States.

At present there are 34 State offices, and if and when this bill meets with the approval of Congress, these will be enlarged to give every State representation. With 44 State legislatures meeting this year, the service has been expanded. Over 150 bills, including defense-housing bills for 40 States already have been cleared to State directors, and reports on current status of bills covering roughly 53 general subjects are being prepared biweekly. Through the State offices weekly broadcasts were made during the year in cooperation with various other Federal agencies, intended to explain the functioning in the field of these Government units. The Office also aided in the presentation of a series of 15 electrical transcriptions on the national-defense program, at the request of the National Defense Commission, over some 250 stations throughout the country.

The Division of Press Intelligence makes available to Government officials—executive, legislative, and judicial—a day-by-day and permanent record of newspaper information and newspaper opinion on matters of public importance. It provides a daily bulletin, an index of news and editorial comment from 350 daily newspapers. This bulletin is distributed each morning to executive officials and Members of Congress. The service unit provides for the prompt delivery of requested clippings, it conducts special research for Federal agencies and Members of Congress, and in 1940 filled 1,996 such requests.

The Information Service provides for the public a single, central clearing house in Washington for inquiries concerning all branches of the Government. By mail, telegraph, telephone, and in person inquiries pour into this office, the total in 1939 reaching 88,500 requests, and last year well over 100,000 applications were satisfied. The Service limits its dissemination of information to strictly factual. The staff does not undertake to interpret regulations, orders, reports, or other data, but refers inquirers to the sources from which interpretations may be obtained. Students, research workers, and

writers in quest of factual data on the Government use the reference facilities of the Service in addition to making specific inquiries.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to give in a short time a brief but accurate perspective of a service that the President of the United States deems essential to the effective conduct of his high office. I feel that we should accept his words on the requirements of the Executive, just as he religiously accepts our findings on the contingent appropriations and the conduct of the legislative department. Some Members say we are fortunate to have a man of such high-minded purpose and solid character as Lowell Mellett as Director of O. G. R., but what is to become of it after he leaves? That, I say, is tomorrow's problem.

May I, in closing, turn again to the words of another of our Presidents, Rutherford B. Hayes. Like many of his predecessors and those who have come later to the White House, he saw the value of public education and the necessity of promoting it. Let me quote his exact words, which seem so appropriate at this very moment:

> The capital of the Nation should be something more than a mere political center. We should avail ourselves of all the opportunities which Providence has here placed at our command to promote the general intelligence of the people and increase the conditions most favorable to the success and perpetuity of our institutions.
>
> Whatever government can fairly do to promote free popular education ought to be done. Wherever general education is found, peace, virtue, and social order prevail and civil and religious liberty are secure.

As it was in 1876 so it is today. The need for information was never more urgent, for if humanity is ever going to return to the highway of universal peace, that happy day will arrive when enlightened peoples impress upon their rulers the follies of war and organized destruction.

Eternal Vigilance Is Still Price of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1941

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, passage of the so-called lease-lend bill and our subsequent seven-thousand-million-dollar gift to Great Britain have placed this Nation in the war to such an extent that we are compelled to see it through to the finish.

Whether we supported or opposed the lease-lend bill, every American must now support this administration's war policy. Unless Hitler and the other dictators are defeated, they can hold the United States liable for tremendous damages under the lease-lend legislation. Members of this House recall that this Nation collected staggering sums from Great Britain following the Civil War for damages done to our shipping through similar aid given by England to the Confederacy. Because of this, if for no other reason, it is now to our interest to see that the Axis Powers are defeated.

I do not apologize to anyone for my opposition to the lease-lend bill. As has been stated by others during this debate, I owe allegiance to but one nation, and that Nation is the United States of America. I have consistently opposed all measures which I believed would lead this Nation into actual participation in the European war. At the same time I have given active support to every effort to improve our national defense.

I pray that the steps we are taking will lead us in the opposite direction from war, but after reviewing the program of this administration since its inception, I am frank to say that I have little hope that this Nation will escape actual involvement.

Let us go back to 1932 when Mr. Roosevelt was a candidate for the Presidency for the first time. At that time he said to the American people:

> But, remember well, that attitude and method—the way we do things, is nearly always the measure of our sincerity.

That statement was a true statement. It is as true today as it was on September 19, 1932. Time and again since then, up to November 1938, Mr. Roosevelt declared against war. He declared over and over and over again against America's having any part in anybody's war anywhere in the world. He summed it all up best in his statement at Chautauqua, N. Y., on August 14, 1936, when he said—and I quote:

> The Congress of the United States has given me certain authority to provide safeguards of American neutrality in case of war.
>
> The President of the United States, who, under our Constitution, is vested with primary authority to conduct our international relations, thus has been given new weapons with which to maintain our neutrality.
>
> Nevertheless—and I speak from a long experience—the effective maintenance of American neutrality depends today, as in the past, on the wisdom and determination of whoever at the moment occupy the offices of President and Secretary of State.
>
> It is clear that our present policy and the measures passed by the Congress would, in the event of a war on some other continent, reduce war profits which would otherwise accrue to American citizens. Industrial and agricultural production for a war market may give immense fortunes to a few men; for the Nation as a whole it produces disaster. It was the prospect of war profits that made our farmers in the West plow up prairie land that should never have been plowed, but should have been left for grazing cattle. Today we are reaping the harvest of those war profits in the duststorms which have devastated those war-plowed areas.
>
> It was the prospect of war profits that caused the extension of monopoly and unjustified expansion of industry and a price level so high that the normal relationship between debtor and creditor was destroyed.
>
> Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.
>
> They would tell you—and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity—that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations, the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations, that credit would be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts. They would tell you that America once more would capture the trade of the world.
>
> It would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond—to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning, that come from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace.
>
> If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer—must answer—"We choose peace." It is the duty of all of us to encourage such a body of public opinion in this country that the answer will be clear and for all practical purposes unanimous.
>
> * * * But all the wisdom of America is not to be found in the White House or in the Department of State. We need the meditation, the prayer, and the positive support of the people of America who go along with us in seeking peace.
>
> No matter how well we are supported by neutrality legislation, we must remember that no laws can be provided to cover every contingency, for it is impossible to imagine how every future event may shape itself. In spite of every possible forethought, international relations involve of necessity a vast uncharted area. In that area safe sailing will depend on the knowledge and the experience and the wisdom of those who direct our foreign policy. Peace will depend on their day-to-day decisions.
>
> At this late date, with the wisdom which is so easy after the event and so difficult before the event, we find it possible to trace the tragic series of small decisions which led Europe into the Great War in 1914 and eventually engulfed us and many other nations.
>
> We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide have a sufficiently detailed understanding of international affairs to make certain that the small decisions of each day do not lead toward war and if, at the same time, they possess the courage to say "no" to those who selfishly and unwisely would let us go to war.

Here was a profound and fundamental basic statement by Mr. Roosevelt against everything that the administration is doing now.

Here in this statement Mr. Roosevelt envisioned every bit of the propaganda that the New Deal has since sponsored to get us into war. In this speech Mr. Roosevelt foresaw all the stresses and strains and pressures that would be brought to bear to induce us to send American boys back into the horror of the trenches.

Why have all of those declarations against our participation in war been forgotten? Why is it that before the November elections there was not a responsible New Deal spokesman who did not preface everything he said about aid to the other democracies, including Stalin's "wonderful Russian democracy," with the statement that we would give aid "short of war"; we would adopt measures "short of war"; we would take steps "short of war"?

I want to ask if there is any Member of this House who can rise and point out one single time since election when any responsible person in the administration, from the President down, has used that term one single time? It has completely disappeared from the lexicon of the New Deal administration as though the words did not belong in the English language.

Now, let me again go back to the sentence with which I opened this address:

But remember well that attitude and method—the way we do things is nearly always the measure of our sincerity.

Now, the President and his spokesmen have talked one way. Have they done things the way they said they would? Has their attitude and method been in accord with the words they have spoken, with the promises they have made, with the speeches they delivered when they wanted votes for a third term?

I am fully aware of the serious implications of the things I am saying to you. I am fully aware that we are in this war now up to our ears. I am fully aware that as long as we have been taken into this war that we must have unity in building our national defense; that we must have unity in trying to create for ourselves a protection against the resentments of other nations against whom we are at war that will enable us to maintain our security.

Both candidates, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie, made speech after speech during the campaign in which their sole platform, the platform on which they ran for, in one case, reelection and, in the other case, election, was "America must be kept out of war." I am going to leave it to you to judge whether or not the attitude and method since then have been in accord with, and consistent with, those solemn promises.

The fact of the matter is that the American people never voted on the question of how far we should go into the war. The American people never voted on the question of unlimited aid to the other countries in the war who might be fighting the dictatorships. The American people never had a chance to pass judgment or register their will on any question of whether or not we should hand over billions piled upon billions of dollars of their money under any so-called lease-lend plan.

I think it is time for just plain, common honesty with the American people. I want to say that there is nobody in Washington in an official position that I know who even remotely expects ever to get back a dime or a dollar of anything that we lease or lend to the other countries. On the contrary, when the war is over, if it ever does end, we will go into a new era of propaganda designed to have us finance and feed the rest of the world, including the dictator powers, just as we did after the last war.

There is a line written somewhere that—

The luring voice having spoken, falls silent and only echo answers.

It has been written somewhere else—I believe by our old friend Omar Khayyam in the Rubaiyat—

The moving finger writes, and having writ moves on.

Those voices which were raised in the luring promises that America can be kept out of war have fallen silent, and only echo answers, but the moving finger having writ—having writ that our neutrality law must be amended to the point of attrition—moves on to write that the lease-lend bill must be passed. That $7,000,000,000 must be voted to be given away to other countries. That same moving finger will soon write that the St. Lawrence waterway, which has been debated over and over in Congress and time and again turned down, must now be built, and that the people of the United States must pay practically the whole cost of its building, as a measure of national defense. Now I hope that moving finger may not move on to write another message which may be "our boys must go across again."

I said a moment ago that the people of America never had a chance to vote on any of these measures. The only issue on which the people had a chance to register their will at the polls last November was on the issue of keeping America out of war. That is the issue the people voted on and it is my honest opinion that practically everybody who voted, voted with that issue in mind—keep America out of war.

I also said a moment ago that we must now all pull together to get through these perilous times as best we may, but that we must be vigilant because national defense means something vastly more than defense against some dictator across the sea. It means vastly more than getting into bed with Stalin, the bloody-handed dictator of Russia, and that we are going to deliver the bloody hand of the dictator Hitler, or the trembling palsied hand of Mussolini. National defense means to defend ourselves by our vigilance and our alertness against alienisms here at home. It means to defend ourselves against sabotage inside our own borders. It means to defend ourselves against those who would lay the pattern for first, war; second, economic chaos; and, third, the overturn of constitutional government.

I do not intend to take your time by narrating step by step the attitude and method by which we have been taken into this war in the very hour when, word by word and speech by speech, we were being assured we would be kept out of this war. We are in position now where we realize that the captain of the ship has let the ship go into the breakers. Now that we are in the breakers, we must stand by the captain of the ship as far as we may and help him get the ship out of these breakers if we can, but that does not mean that we must all unite in permitting the ship of state to be steered out of the breakers up on the beach of communism, or fascism, here in America.

We are fighting today to retain constitutional government. We are fighting today to maintain the Declaration of Independence. No thinking man and woman who reads the newspapers can escape the implication inherent in statements by Harold Laski, British labor economist; by Mr. Bevin, the labor representative in the British Government; by Mr. Wedgwood, labor Member of Parliament, all of whom have declared within the last 7 days that industry must be socialized in England after this war is over and that a necessary measure is that industry must be socialized in all the other countries, including the United States of America and all the dominions and colonial possessions of Great Britain.

We find in this country today a definite, well-defined, highly financed propaganda for "union now," which means to say, union with Great Britain. We find today in America active propaganda which may soon crystallize to take us into the British family of dominions.

I want to say now, so there can be no misunderstanding of my position, that I, for one, want the United States of America to remain the free and independent United States of America.

There has been a good deal of the appearance of spontaneity given to these various steps leading us into war, but let me remind you of something. The morning newspapers of March 22, last Saturday, carried the story that Gen. Sir Arthur Salter, K. C. B., had arrived in Washington to coordinate the shipping interests of the United States and Britain. Now, let me call your attention to a mimeographed brochure issued by Sir Arthur Salter on November 11, 1937, concerning an Anglo-American trade agreement, in which General Salter pointed out several important and significant phases of the British trade agreement then being discussed.

He said in one point in this brochure:

The technical negotiators naturally proceed with this as their main preoccupation; political advantages are not their professional concern. At the same time, the Foreign Office, which would naturally welcome an agreement for its political advantages, has some difficulty in making its point of view effective, because the negotiations are, in their nature, highly technical and complex and outside their professional competence to assess exactly.

The issue will, therefore, probably depend upon whether the political advantages are adequately realized, and are given their full weight by means of constant pressure on the Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary, assisted by clear indications of the interest of the general public.

Now let me quote another paragraph which is carried under the title "The Political Implications."

I quote:

The political importance of these trade agreements can hardly be overstated. All those in America who are concerned to see an improvement of relations with this country attach the utmost importance to a successful conclusion of the negotiations. They regard it as a crucial test of the possibility of a real development of cooperation between the two countries; and believe that while success will give a strong impetus to this development, failure will no less certainly involve a very serious setback. Those who are most closely in touch with American opinion are aware that the importance attached to the negotiations in the United States of America is immensely greater than is generally realized here and are bound to accept the evidence that America's attitude toward this country and, indeed, her policy generally in regard to external relations will be substantially affected by this particular issue.

I continue to quote:

That being so, the importance of the question is obviously very great at this juncture. President Roosevelt is trying, as his great Chicago speech of October 5 showed, to arrest and reverse the strong movement toward complete isolationism reflected in the neutrality legislation. It is also obvious that he is encountering great resistance. It is evident that an American movement toward cooperation can only proceed through economic, as distinct from political, action. Economic cooperation, however, inevitably has a political effect; it may, or may not, lead later to political action—e. g., a modification of the neutrality law or direct advice

in a particular political dispute, or even in a particular case, economic action directed to a political purpose.

Let me now quote a few more lines from General Salter's brochure.

I quote:

The international position has so deteriorated that the peace-loving nations with systems of government that are favorable to policies assisting the prospects of peace cannot count upon a position in diplomacy which is stronger than that of the aggressive dictatorships. The balance is doubtful and precarious. But the dictators are not yet confident of their superior strength. There are too many uncertain factors. They are pursuing a power diplomacy, in which every sign of weakness in the free countries, every indication that they are unable to cooperate or to act, encourages them to a more aggressive policy; while, conversely, any indications of the opposite kind have a restraining effect.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask you if you believe, in view of what I have read, which was written and issued and distributed to certain people in Washington on November 11, 1937, this brochure, which was written by Sir Arthur Salter, indicates that there was any intention or even idea on the part of the administration then—in 1937—to take us into this war, economically or otherwise?

We find, as I said, that this same Sir Arthur Salter is now in Washington to coordinate shipping relations between the two nations. From what we know of the British, I ask if any man here ever heard of a Britisher who did not coordinate shipping to the advantage of Great Britain whenever he got a chance?

Now, this has not been a pleasant task for me to speak as I have, and the reason I have spoken to you in this vein is because eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty in the United States of America. If we are to maintain and retain the Bill of Rights, and if we are to uphold the Constitution, then we must be mindful of the dangers which may threaten us from within as well as those which, we are told, threaten us from without.

In the last campaign I told the people of my district that I was against this country being taken into war. Previous to that, during my first term in Congress, I made a speech in which I discussed frankly the horrors of war. My position today is unchanged. I am still against America being taken into foreign war. I am in favor of a national defense that will be absolutely impregnable to the assaults of any nation or any group of nations, or collection of nations, which might at any time in the future seek to implement by action their natural resentments of our efforts to aid in their defeat. I believe that we should maintain the kind of a defense that can meet an enemy so far off our shores and defeat him so far out at sea that our coastal cities will not have to suffer.

I believe, however, that if we undertake to establish the now famous "four freedoms" in every country in the world that we will have serious trouble with Great Britain, because I do not know how Mr. Roosevelt can proceed to establish his famous "four freedoms" in India without some misunderstanding with Great Britain. I do not know how we are going to assure the hordes of Asia, the hungry millions of Russia, and other hungry millions of China freedom from fear, freedom from want, at the expense of American citizens, without bankrupting the people, without bankrupting this Nation.

Do not misunderstand me. If I had it in my power to so change the mental attitude of peoples that every man would be every other man's brother, and that peace and good will would cover this earth from pole to pole, God knows, I would do it. But let me say to you that freedom is not an external condition. It is an inner light. Freedom cannot be legislated. It must be lived. Good will cannot be legislated, it must be lived. Honesty in government cannot be legislated; it must be inherent in the heart, the mind, and the desires of the administrators. You may compel a man to act as though he is honest, but he will be honest only when he loves honesty more than he loves his own personal interest. You may compel a man to act as though he were just, but he will be just in truth only when he loves justice more than he loves his own immediate personal interests. You may compel a man to talk as though he loves his country, but he will love his country only as he loves the rights, the freedoms, the liberties, and the privileges which his country made possible for him. And he can enjoy those rights, those liberties, those freedoms, and those privileges only so long as he accords the same rights to his fellow man and is willing to correct his own action so as not to infringe upon those rights.

We cannot take the gospel of democracy to India, because India does not want democracy. We cannot take the gospel of plenty to China until Chinese millions are ready to have plenty and know how to use plenty.

Mr. Speaker, there is so much here that we try to dispose of by words, by slogans, by shibboleth that must be lived in the hearts and minds of the people before it can be realized. Therefore, in conclusion, let me say to you that while we must all unite in trying to carry our Nation through these perilous hours of its utter danger we must be just as alert to the dangers to our freedoms and to our constitutional Republic from within as to any dangers that may threaten us from without. And may God help us to avert them both.

Sale of Alcoholic Liquors at Military Posts and Naval Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

RESOLUTION BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF IOWA

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa to pass the bill S. 860:

House Concurrent Resolution 28

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to the early consideration and passage of Senate file 860

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States proposed legislation, designated as Senate file 860, providing for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; and

Whereas the Federal Government has located in the State of Iowa, and may hereafter locate in this State, an ordnance plant or other plant or plants which it may deem desirable in the development of the national defense; and

Whereas it is desirable in the interest of the common defense to provide for the suppression of all forms of vice in the vicinity of such plants or projects, and the people of the State of Iowa are greatly interested in the passage of such legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the General Assembly of Iowa respectfully petition the Members of Congress to give early consideration to Senate file 860, now before the Senate, and to the enlargement of the provisions thereof in order to include the suppression of vice in the vicinity of ordnance plants or projects now or hereafter erected and maintained by the Federal Government in the development of national defense, and to enact such legislation at an early date: Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress and to each of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from Iowa in the Congress of the United States, and that they be urged to use their best offices to procure the enactment of such legislation in Congress.

I hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was duly adopted by the forty-ninth general assembly.

A. C. GUSTAFSON,
Chief Clerk of the House.

The Vision of Benjamin Harrison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent of the House, I submit for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Indianapolis News, dealing with Benjamin Harrison's far-reaching vision as a conservationist.

The editorial follows:

[From the Indianapolis News]

HARRISON'S VISION

In carrying out its duty to recommend to Congress a form of memorial for Benjamin

Harrison, the Benjamin Harrison memorial commission has suggested that the 700,000-acre national forest purchase unit in the south part of the State be named in his honor and soon acquired, that a national forest institute be established in Marion County in his honor, and that the Harrison home in North Delaware Street be preserved by the Federal Government.

The forest memorial recommendation was adopted after a study of the Harrison administration and the effect of its achievements on the country. Few of Harrison's contemporaries would have ranked his forestry policy as important during his administration, but he saved the California redwoods by executive order, set aside 13,000,000 acres of the public domain for the first national forests and created the United States Forest Service.

In the perspective afforded by 50 years, the tariff issue, the question of Latin-American relations, the foreign policy, the admission of six States in the westward movement have receded to a secondary place in the achievements of Harrison's administration. Today it is seen that Harrison was a man of great foresight. He is being ranked by some authorities as the most farsighted conservationist of the nineteenth century.

If Congress approves the recommendations, Indiana will feel not only that its only President has been suitably recognized, but that the country has gained much in its battle to conserve its lands and forests. Harrison's stature grows with the years, and the people's sense of their indebtedness to him grows with it.

Oregon Requests Legislation on Matters of Interest to State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

RESOLUTIONS BY OREGON LEGISLATURE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask consent to extend my remarks by including three memorials recently passed by the Oregon State Legislature. Senate Joint Memorial No. 7 petitions the Congress to enact Federal legislation against lynching; House Joint Memorial No. 8 requests removal of all restrictions on hunting of blue herons and mergansers in the State of Oregon; and Senate Joint Resolution No. 16 petitions the Congress to provide for the establishment of a supplementary military or naval academy somewhere within the borders of the State of Oregon.

The memorials and resolution referred to follow:

Senate Joint Memorial No. 7

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Forty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in regular session assembled, respectfully request and petition as follows: to wit:

Whereas the heinous crime of lynching still continues occasionally in various States of the United States; and

Whereas local law-enforcement officials have in numerous instances been unwilling or unable to protect citizens against this outrageous practice; and

Whereas the people of the State of Oregon, in common with nearly all citizens of the United States, are eager to see the crime of lynching forever eliminated from our democracy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon, the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein, That we, your memorialists, the Forty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, do hereby most respectfully request and petition the Congress of the United States and the Members of Congress from the State of Oregon to consider favorably and enact Federal legislation against the crime of lynching; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this joint memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Oregon to the President of the United States, to both Houses of Congress of the United States, and to each member of the Oregon delegation in Congress.

House Joint Memorial No. 8

Whereas the blue heron and merganser are included in the migratory bird treaty and, therefore, are protected from hunting by regulations of the Federal Government; and

Whereas the blue heron and merganser exist almost entirely on young fish life; and

Whereas the blue heron and merganser are widely known water birds in Oregon and are found in practically every creek and lake throughout the State, and cause a heavy toll of young fish each year: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States hereby be memorialized to take such action as will remove all restrictions on hunting of blue herons and mergansers in the State of Oregon; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the members of the Oregon delegation in Congress and to the director of the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service.

Senate Joint Resolution No. 16

Whereas the defense of America requires strong bulwarks of protection on both seaboards; and

Whereas there are now pending in Washington, D. C., proposals to establish supplementary naval and military academies at various points along the Pacific coast; and

Whereas the State of Oregon is strategically located with respect to harbors, rivers, and mountain ranges; and

Whereas training and instruction near to home often result in stronger cultural and social ties so far as the recruit is concerned: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring), That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to provide for the establishment of a supplementary military or naval academy somewhere within the borders of the State of Oregon; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, and to all the Members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Our National Defense—Reporting Action of the Legion's National Executive Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. LARRABEE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. MILO J. WARNER, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. LARRABEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues, who may not have had an opportunity to hear the message, nor to have read a detailed report of same, the statement made on Sunday evening, March 16, over a national radio chain, by Hon. Milo J. Warner, national commander of the American Legion.

Mr. Warner's address on that occasion called to the attention of the Nation the action of the national executive committee of the American Legion, in its special meeting at Indianapolis, March 14 and 15, in which meeting the committee considered the question of national defense in the light of recent developments and upon the basis of the report made to the committee by the American Legion mission, which only recently returned from a study of affairs and conditions in Great Britain.

Whether or not we agree with the action of the American Legion's national executive committee, the report of the Legion's mission to Britain, or the statements made by Mr. Warner in reporting to the Nation, I am sure we shall all agree that the Legion and its leadership is primarily interested in the welfare of our country and our people, and the views of the Legion's executive committee and the Legion's commanding officer are certainly worth our careful consideration.

I submit herewith Mr. Warner's statement:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, today, we of the American Legion, more than 1,000,000 members strong, in nearly 12,000 posts, in every community of our land comprising those who fought in the armed forces in the last war, are celebrating our twenty-second birthday as an organization, at a time when world events which threaten the life of democracies are sweeping us on toward a new destiny.

Yesterday the American Legion's national executive committee, composed of one representative from every State in the Union, concluded a special 2-day meeting at its national headquarters in Indianapolis. This meeting was called to consider our national defense in the light of present-day events and to receive and act upon the report of an American Legion mission which it had authorized to visit Great Britain for the

twofold purpose of studying civilian defense and to consider how best to make effective a resolution adopted at our 1940 Boston convention last September, to the effect that a sound national defense for our country calls for the giving of all practicable aid to Great Britain at this time.

This mission, made up of Franklin D'Olier, the Legion's first full-time national commander; Maj. Gen. Frank Parker, United States Army, retired, who commanded the First Division overseas in the last war; Joseph S. Deutschle of the national headquarters staff, and the speaker, left New York by clipper ship February 5, returning March 6, after an 18-day visit in England.

We went as fact gatherers and observers for the American Legion. Our purpose at all times was to serve the Legion's interests and the interests of the United States first, last, and always. We endeavored at all times to keep ourselves in an objective frame of mind. We represented no other group or organization, political or otherwise, and we did not go as individuals. We went solely in the service of the American Legion.

We visited Coventry and Birmingham in the Midlands, Bristol on the west coast, Portsmouth, Southampton, Bournemouth, Folkestone, and Dover on the Channel coast. We were with the Army, the Navy, and the Royal Air Force, and inspected Home Guard battalions and units. We studied air-raid precautions. We visited factories engaged in vital defense production. We inspected observation posts, air-raid shelters, communal feeding, canteen services, the fire brigades, some of the shipping docks, and met with numerous officials of the British Government in all lines of military and civilian defense. We observed the activities and leadership of labor and industry and the morale of the people and the armed forces.

We met with the British Legion, an organization somewhat similar to the American Legion, and observed its activities in wartime. We were privileged to meet with Prime Minister Winston Churchill, and were deeply impressed by his great leadership and ability. He is a truly great leader.

Although our time was too short in England to make any highly accurate technical study of particular phases of the various situations, we were conducting an intensive reconnaissance, and did get and feel the force and impact of certain impressions which came to us, not through the sieve of censorship or colored glasses, but from actual conditions and events which we saw and which could not be denied.

These are some of the impressions which we of the mission received and reported to the national executive committee of the American Legion at its meeting:

The British on the island have made a remarkable recovery from the very severe punishment of last fall and the early winter.

They fully realize the terrific seriousness of their present situation and unquestionably appreciate it is a life-and-death struggle in which they are determined to win out, no matter what the cost.

The morale of both the civilian population and the armed forces is excellent. The armed forces particularly are hungry to close with the enemy and get their hands on him. I would not like to try to land or place an invading force among them. The civilian population is unselfishly sacrificing and courageously carrying on.

They sorely need war materials, munitions, and certain food supplies, and it is definitely in the balance whether they can win without them; that is, the actual delivery to them in Great Britain of these much-needed munitions and food supplies, with which their ultimate victory is practically certain.

Germany is conducting a carefully planned, relentless, and besieging warfare by submarine and bomber upon English shipping, its life lines and terminals, and while the British Air Force is confident that Germany will never secure supremacy of the air over England and the Army is confident that an invasion cannot ultimately be successful, nevertheless the British realize the great threat against their shipping and the difficulty actually to get munitions and supplies into England.

This, in part, was our report to the national executive committee.

So that you will gain some definite impression of the importance attached to this emergency by the Legion, I want to say that the meeting of that committee held in Indianapolis Friday and Saturday of the past week was only the fourth such special meeting of this committee ever held in 22 years.

The national executive committee represents every section of our Nation, and each member speaks for his own State in matters of Legion policy. Agriculture and industry and labor, the civilian, the spokesman for military interests, and those who have occupied high places in the Government were represented in the expressions arising out of the meeting.

There was entire freedom of expression in the discussion that followed our presentation of our impressions.

Following this discussion a subcommittee composed of five past national commanders of the Legion drafted a resolution to express the thought of the organization in the present situation. It was unanimously adopted by our national executive committee.

There has been some confusion in the public mind arising from the manner in which that resolution was reported in the newspapers. There is no confusion in my mind as to the definite statement that was made by the national executive committee of the American Legion.

Basing its resolution on the action of the 1940 Boston national convention of the Legion, the national executive committee quoted the Boston convention where that body went on record by saying, "that we should at this time give all practicable aid to Great Britain and those alined with her in their fight for freedom.

But in this special meeting, the national executive committee, taking into consideration the state of national affairs created by the passage of the lend-lease bill, and associating such a national action with the reports of our mission, definitely gave recognition to the belief that aid to Great Britain should be delivered to her now.

Our national executive committee recognized the urgency of prompt delivery to Great Britain of the materials that will be helpful to her in the terrific struggle in which she is engaged. That means delivery now. It means delivery when and where delivery will be of some benefit. It does not mean the delaying of aid to Great Britain. It means the actual delivery of every resource we possess which can be of help to Great Britain without crippling our own national defenses.

Over and beyond the Legion's statement of its policy with respect to giving aid to Great Britain, our national executive committee went further and declared that the administration should remove any tolerance of bottlenecks, obstructions, or hindrances of whatever nature which now hamper and delay the production and delivery to Great Britain and those alined with her of all necessary arms, tools, and materials of national defense.

It is as direct a statement as could possibly emanate from such a group. We have said that aid should be delivered to Great Britain. We have said that no delays in producing the material aid should be tolerated. To the Government we have left the direction and the management of all the component elements which will make production and delivery with speed and in quality and quantity sufficient to the needs of the hour.

In committing itself to the above policy the American Legion says that all this should be done, not because of any sentiment for Great Britain but on the purely patriotic basis of the best possible defense of our own country.

At all times all of us of the American Legion who have been privileged to fight for our flag and country are thinking and acting solely in its interests, first, last, and always.

England is dependent upon us for munitions and supplies to win the war in which she is engaged against dictator nations and totalitarianism.

Should England fail, our combat, or potential combat, task will be all the harder.

Should England fail, our need for continued maintenance of larger armies and navies will not only be necessary but absolutely essential for our self-preservation as the great Nation we are.

Should England fail, the need and danger of sending many of our armed forces into the face of blazing war and actual combat will be much greater. So it is for our interests as a nation that we say we should actually deliver all the aid we can to Great Britain at this time and see to it that it actually reaches Great Britain.

Every American citizen should be filled and inspired with the will to live and fulfill our destiny as a nation—the will and determination to go on and on when the going is hard for all of us, each doing his part when the doing of it is hard; each of us strengthened by the will to reach the goal, which is the very breath and spirit of life—of real life—without which there is mere existence, not life as free, courageous, alive American people.

Let every American man and woman accept the self-discipline necessary to say truthfully:

"I am really doing my bit and all of it; I am a true American; I am not failing my Maker, who placed me here for life on earth. I am dealing fairly with my God and with my country. I am showing my gratitude to God, who made me, and to my country, which has given me so much, by not holding out on either of them, but going on fearlessly toward that destiny which lies ahead."

Serious Situation Confronting the Nation's Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. T. BUCKLER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

LETTER FROM JAMES M. WITHEROW, OF MOORHEAD, MINN.

Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter which I received yesterday from James M. Witherow, of Moorhead, Minn. He brings out some facts and presents some viewpoints and observations which should be of interest to the people of the United States and particularly to Members of Congress. His letter is as follows:

MOORHEAD, MINN., *March 22, 1941.*

Hon. R. T. BUCKLER,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BUCKLER: The situation of the farmers throughout the United States still continues to be serious, by reason of the

eastern newspapers and eastern politicians representing manufacturing organizations. It is almost impossible for a real farmer or any person representing the interests of the farmers to be heard fully and frankly on the merits of the industry in which their money is invested, without eastern politicians and eastern newspapers attempting to make it an object of ridicule.

Two years ago one of the large eastern magazines sent out one of its reporters to cover the Dust Bowl region and report upon its conditions. The burden of his report was that he found the dust piled up around the fences and the barns in many places to such an extent that the farmers and the livestock were without any food and provisions. Then he told of driving to a nearby village where the only provisions he could get were warm beer and poor-boy sandwiches. The general substance of his argument was that the efforts of the Government to build up the community was "boondoggling," and the real sufferer was the poor reporter who was obliged to subsist on warm beer and poorman sandwiches. The fact that the homesteaders had invested their all and striven to build up a home and a family was something that was not entitled to consideration.

Another magazine reporter, who likes to pose as an economist, took a trip around, consulting with the local bankers, railroad agents, and Republican newspaper proprietors, and then wrote an article which he entitled, "The Pain in the Northwest," in which he attempted to ridicule farmers for cultivating their soils and making an effort to obtain the same economic privileges for livelihood which was enjoyed by other citizens in the Republic.

And so it goes. One newspaper after another using their circulation to suppress both the expression and the opportunities of the farmers to develop their industries along sound industrial experience instead of under eastern domination. Quotas are attempted to be established to meet the requirements of the eastern manufacturers rather than the farmers. For example, 25,000,000 bushels of flax are imported every year from Argentina, because the handicap of railroad freights to the eastern crushing points are practically equal to the tariffs, and outside markets have control over our flax market; and still the farmers, who are paying steadily increasing taxes upon flax land, are criticized for their lack of economic progress.

The same thing is true in regard to the sugar industry. Both the cane and the beet producers are kept under the financial control of the manufacturers; and through lack of an adequate tariff they are scarcely permitted to make a decent living.

Even the Weather Bureau is charged up against the Agricultural Department, and its agents and observers are kept constantly employed working for the transportation companies, while observation in regard to moisture conservation of the soil, percolation, and cultivation are not only steadily neglected, but are treated with ridicule when they are asked to devote their attention to the service for which the Government pays them a salary.

Experience shows that food production in Europe and other portions of the world are being diminished and reduced to a very limited supply. Yet Mr. Jesse Jones lends billions of dollars to other enterprises, but will not reply to a letter relative to the opportunity to finance agriculture and the exports of the products abroad. Throughout the country manufacturers, banks, railroads, and every other financial organization have their needs carefully considered, and liberal advances made; but agriculture is a "Cinderella industry" and it is not socially proper to have the interests of the farmers considered; while the lobbyists of the industries throng the Washington hotels.

I realize the obstacles which confront you as being one of the very few real operating farmers who are in Congress, but I will be glad if you will put these matters in progress and see if it isn't possible that the farmers should have at least a decent hearing in regard to their problems instead of being constantly made an object of ridicule and braintrusting for the benefit of the other industries of the country.

Very truly yours,

JAMES M. WITHEROW.

Communists in Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN DIES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

TELEGRAMS FROM OFFICIALS OF STEEL WORKERS' ORGANIZING COMMITTEE AND REPLY THERETO

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegrams and a copy of my reply to Mr. Philip Murray:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 25, 1941.*

Congressman MARTIN DIES,

House of Representatives:

You are quoted in today's newspapers as having made speech in Congress about alleged Communist operations speech in steel industry and of their supposedly being on pay rolls of Steel Workers Organizing Committee. You are quoted as naming 27 individuals in this respect. I have no knowledge of these individuals being Communists or ever having been Communists. But I have definite knowledge of the fact that of the 27 individuals named by you, only one, namely Clarence Irwin, is on S. W. O. C. pay rolls. He is wiring you direct. Eleven individuals named by you were never on S. W. O. C. pay rolls; the other 15 have been disassociated from S. W. O. C. for a considerable period of time, ranging from 3 years to 5 years ago. This information would have been available to you had you been interested in making a fair investigation. If this is the nature of evidence you are quoted as saying presents an alarming picture, I believe the facts herein show your speech to be a false alarm. I can give you my personal assurance that your concern on this score is entirely groundless. I shall appreciate your reading this telegram on the floor of Congress.

PHILIP MURRAY,
Chairman, Steel Workers Organizing Committee.

BALTIMORE, MD., *March 25, 1941.*

Congressman MARTIN DIES,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.:

I see by the press that you have used my name in your speech before the House of Representatives in some sort of connection with the Communist Party. I absolutely deny any connection of any kind, either past or present, with the Communist Party. I have for many years been an active member of the organized labor movement and your vicious attempt to smear my name with such false, slanderous statements can only be interpreted as an attack on the legitimate labor movement as well as an attack on me personally. I request that this wire will be read by you before the House of Representatives.

CLARENCE IRWIN,
National Representative,
Steel Workers Organizing Committee.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 26, 1941.*

PHILIP MURRAY,

Chairman, Steel Workers Organizing Committee, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D. C.:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your telegram which you have requested me to read to Congress.

In my speech before the House I stated that the persons named by me had been connected with the S. W. O. C.; that I did not know whether they were still on the pay rolls of the S. W. O. C. as of today as I do not have access to the account books of the organization. Our committee gave this information to the country nearly 3 years ago. Spokesmen for your organization denounced the committee as red baiting. Now I am advised that 15 of these people have at some time been connected with your organization, but have been disassociated from it. You do not state why these people were disassociated from the organization, but evidently it had nothing to do with their Communist connections since you state that you have no knowledge of these individuals being Communists or ever having been Communists. This statement on your part amazes me because many of these people are notorious and active members of the party.

As chairman of the C. I. O. please advise me by telegram at once so that I may read your reply to the Congress whether or not the C. I. O. is ready and willing to expel from its ranks and from positions of leadership members of the Communist Party.

What does your organization propose to do with the following officials of the C. I. O. concerning whose Communist affiliations there can be no doubt in view of the evidence before our committee?

Joseph Curran, head of the National Maritime Union and vice president of the C. I. O. as well as a member of your executive board; Ben Gold, president of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union and a member of your executive board; Donald Henderson, president of the United Cannery Agricultural Packing and Allied Workers of America and also a member of the executive board of the C. I. O.; Harry Bridges, president of the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Association and a member of your executive board; Michael Joseph Quill, president of the Transport Workers Union and a member of your executive board, and also John Santo, Austin Hogan, officials of the same union; Lewis Merrill, president of the United Office and Professional Workers of America and a member of your executive board; Abram Flaxer, president of the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America and a member of your executive board; Ralph Dawson, alias Austin and Olney, president of the Los Angeles C. I. O. industrial council; Kenneth Eggert, international representative of the National Die Casters Association; Marcel Sherer, national organizer for the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians Association, and Lewis Alan Berne, president of the same union; Grant Woakes, chairman of the Farm Equipment Workers Organizing Committee; Joseph Selly, president of the American Communications Association; James Matles and Neil Brandt, organizers for the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, and others whose Communist records are equally clear.

Earl Browder testified before our committee that 50,000 members of the Communist Party are also members of trade unions; that two-thirds of them are affiliated with your organization and that hundreds of his members are officials of your unions.

I will appreciate a direct and unequivocal answer so that the Congress and the country may definitely know once and for all what the attitude of your organization is with respect to the retention in your ranks and in positions of leadership of well-known Communists.

MARTIN DIES,
Member of Congress.

Investigation of Subversive Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LE ROY D. DOWNS
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

RESOLUTION BY THE YANKEE DIVISION VETERANS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I wish to insert the following resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as adopted by the Yankee Division Veterans' Association:

Whereas the investigative personnel of the United States Treasury Department, operating under the direction of Elmer L. Irey, Chief Coordinator of the Treasury enforcement agencies, Secret Service, Intelligence, Alcohol Tax, Narcotic, and Customs Units, be delegated the authority to investigate subversive activities: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the American Legion and Yankee Division Veterans' Association strongly urge upon the President and the Congress of the United States the immediate adoption providing this authority to the Treasury enforcement agencies in the field in eliminating all subversive activities in the United States and assist in the successful prosecution in the courts in accordance with the due process of law, to the end that these groups and these individuals will be entirely eliminated from our Nation.

Minority Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of March 26, 1941:

[From the Washington Post of March 26, 1941]

MINORITY ROLE

Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN'S dual role as minority leader in the House of Representatives and chairman of the Republican National Committee gives him a heavy burden to carry. Nevertheless, the G. O. P. National Committee has shown good judgment in refusing to permit Mr. MARTIN to resign, for he has proved himself to be a capable party leader and a statesman of considerable stature. Probably more effectively than any other G. O. P. leader in Congress, Mr. MARTIN has outlined a reasonable course of action for Republicans in the present emergency. "We may differ among ourselves," Mr. MARTIN told the House in supporting the Senate amendments to the lease-lend bill recently, "but there is no division in our loyalty to our country or our determination to protect the security of our people. We are one people, an undaunted people, determined that real Americanism shall not perish * * *." That note was reiterated in his address to the Republican National Committee on Monday.

Mr. MARTIN sees no occasion for inactivity on the part of the minority party. He seeks national unity for defense and in pursuance of other policies which Congress approves through the democratic process. But he also points to the need for "an intelligent, constructive, and courageous opposition." National unity, vital as it is, must not degenerate into the expression of a single standpoint. When the Nation is face to face with gigantic problems, the opposition party has a special obligation to counsel the administration in a spirit of nonpartisanship and to criticize policies it believes to run counter to the national interest. In the present emergency the minority party has an obligation only less important than that of the majority to meet each new problem with courage and honest thinking. Mr. MARTIN provides a happy link between Republican legislators and the party organization in fulfilling this responsibility.

Iowa Press Association Says Wages and Hours Act Is Unfair To Small Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

RESOLUTIONS OF THE IOWA PRESS ASSOCIATION

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include resolutions adopted by the Iowa Press Association in their convention March 15, 1941:

Be it resolved by the Iowa Press Association in convention assembled this 15th day of March 1941, That this association expresses heartily to its officers and directors its appreciation of the service rendered during the past year and the efficient manner in which its business has been conducted, especially commending President Ward Barnes, Managing Director Don Reid, and his office assistant Miss Cleona Neidt.

We further express our appreciation for the entertainment and courtesy extended by the Greater Des Moines committee. Its activities have done much to unify the spirit of all Iowans. We also thank those who have taken part in the program, which has been both profitable and enjoyable: Be it further

Resolved, That the Iowa Press Association welcomes as a valuable cooperator the Iowa Press Women's Club, an organization calculated to stimulate the spirit and efficiency of the press of Iowa.

Resolved, That this association approves the efficient and speedy manner in which the General Assembly of Iowa is handling the routine of its work. It is a record of which the State may be proud. While on the subject of legislation we urge action to coordinate the Federal and State laws on unemployment compensation and to assure that those establishments which maintain a high stability of employment may receive merit rating and appropriate relief from taxation to carry the load of employers who do not maintain such stability. We further endorse the passage of Senate file 360, the bill to require the publication of the proceedings of school boards in the larger districts. If we did not have faith in the power of publicity we would not be in that business. The major portion of local taxes are spent by school boards. Publication of such expenditures will be a protection to both the public and the school-board members. And in this connection we urge our own members to publish all official proceedings of public bodies in such manner as to be easily readable by the public: And be it further

Resolved, That the press of Iowa pledges its support to the Government and people of the United States in the effort to maintain the opportunities for free governmen in the world. Whatever we may have come through or wherever we may be going, the immediate task ahead is the defeat of totalitarianism in the world. We would call the American people to a more profound realization of the serious responsibilities ahead of them. Hitler prepared for this war by more work and less booze. The United States has been preparing by less work and more booze. As a nation we will have to reverse this condition and rise at least to the standard of Hitler in these matters. But we must go further and renew our faith and allegiance to the Divine Creator, whom Hitler has rejected. If we do this, then "this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Whereas the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act, commonly known as the wage-hour law, has brought about a condition which, in our opinion, instead of promoting fairness, is, in fact, unfair to local small newspapers and the communities where they are located, the Iowa Press Association in convention assembled this 14th day of March 1941 subscribes to the following statement of facts:

The wage-hour law exempts from its provisions retail mercantile establishments, farms, and most local industries. It also exempts weekly and semiweekly newspapers having circulations of under 3,000. All other newspapers, according to the interpretations of the Wage and Hour Administration, are covered by the act. It is apparent from the exemption made that it was the intention of Congress to exempt, along with other local enterprises, newspapers doing mainly a local business.

But there are many weeklies and semiweeklies having circulations in excess of 3,000 and small dailies doing a strictly local business in small cities and rural communities. Their business is almost entirely within a limited local trade area and they are supported by communities in which nearly all business is exempt from the provisions of the wage-hour law. Their interstate business is confined to a comparatively few subscribers, former residents of the communities where published, who want the old-home news. Such circulation does not contribute to the cultivation of interstate trade.

By imposing the regulations of the wage-hour law on such small dailies, weeklies, and semiweeklies Congress has set them up as

islands of short hours and high wages in communities where the prevailing hours are longer. From the apparent intention of Congress to exempt small local papers, it would seem that failure to include in the exemption small dailies and local weeklies and semiweeklies with circulations above 3,000, but doing a local business only, was due to a misunderstanding by Congress of the true situation with regard to such papers.

This discrimination is unfair to the publishers of such papers, to their workers, and to the communities which support them. A peculiarly intimate relationship exists between the country newspaper and its supporting community. The demand for newspaper and printing service in such communities is not, and cannot be, uniform throughout the year. If the newspaper is to serve its supporting community, it must serve it when it needs service. Such a paper usually employs all the printers in the community. If work is not reasonably steady, printers will not remain in the rural communities, but drift to the larger centers. In fact, such newspaper shops usually recruit and train their help from among local boys as more printers are needed. When the peak load comes, these regular forces must carry them. There are seldom any reserves of idle printers on which to draw.

If the overtime provisions of the wage-hour law are enforced the publishers must either lower in some way the regular 40-hour wage scales, gouge the patrons to make up the higher costs, lay off men whenever possible, do business at a loss, or refuse to care for the needs of the community. While such local, home-trained printers are usually among the best-paid workers in the ordinary rural community, taking in their total annual incomes and working conditions, their scales are not up to city wage scales, which would be out of line with local prevailing wages and conditions. Therefore, the publisher cannot go to the cities for extra help without seriously upsetting his regular schedule of prices and costs.

Because of a lower wage scale the printers in the rural communities need to work more hours in order to have an adequate income, and can do so without injury to health, as they usually live close to their work and have more life in the open air than workers in the larger cities, and in doing so they are only accommodating themselves to the conditions of workers in other local enterprises exempted by Congress from the provisions of the Wages and Hours Act.

The conditions of which we complain are aggravated by the defense program and the Selective Service Act. There never had been any surplus of skilled printers in the smaller communities. Under the defense program there is already a serious shortage. This will bear especially hard on the smaller papers of limited circulation as the larger papers will draw on their labor to fill vacancies.

The Iowa Press Association makes no complaint against the general spirit and purpose of the Wages and Hours Act, but it does complain that it is an unfair discrimination to enforce its provisions against newspapers in communities where the overwhelming majority of the people from whom local papers derive their support are not so covered.

The most of strictly local newspapers would be included in an exemption of all papers, daily as well as weekly and semiweekly, having circulations of under 5,000, or exemption of newspapers when 75 percent of their circulation is in the local trade area where published: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Iowa Press Association respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to so amend the Wages and Hours Act as to exempt all local community newspapers, including dailies, having circulations of under 5,000, and/or all such papers 75 percent of whose circulation is within 40 miles of the place of publication. It is the intent of this resolution to ask that the wage scales and working conditions of newspaper workers be made to conform with the prevailing scales and conditions of the communities in which they are published; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this statement and resolutions be forwarded by the secretary of the Iowa Press Association to the Senators and Congressmen from Iowa and to the chairmen of the Labor Committees of the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States.

Was It Pure Demagogery?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT], in a speech March 24, page 2595 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, criticized some remarks I made March 21 and used the following language—I quote:

> It is pure demagoguery, and was doubtless made for the purpose of injuring me politically.

On March 21 I was speaking in reply to an attack made upon me by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON]. I referred to the attitude of Republicans generally in connection with the Work Projects Administration. I also called attention to an amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] to the urgent deficiency bill.

Now, what are the facts? I have made a little investigation to find out just what Mr. BENNETT would have accomplished by his amendment, and I find the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1940, passed in June 1940, contained a limitation for administrative salaries of $34,105,000, on expenditures for the entire fiscal year if the original appropriation of $975,000,000 was made to last throughout the entire fiscal year. However, in view of the fact that the original appropriation was expended in 8 months, it was necessary, in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, to increase the total amount to be obligated for administrative salaries for the entire fiscal year to $37,100,000. The Work Projects Administration has already obligated, through February 28, 1941, a total of $25,479,811 for administrative salaries. Mr. BENNETT's amendment therefore would have reduced the authorization below the amount which had already been spent during the first 8 months. The $25,000,000 contained in Mr. BENNETT's amendment would have limited the expenses for administrative salaries to 1.8 percent of the total appropriation of $1,379,650,000 for the fiscal year. The $37,100,000 now authorized is 2.7 percent of the total appropriation. I said in my statement it was about 3 percent.

W. P. A. administrative employment has been reduced from an average of 36,003 in the fiscal year 1939 to 21,237 on February 28, 1941. The $37,100,000 now authorized in itself requires a further reduction to approximately 18,750 persons by June 30, 1941.

As far as possible, W. P. A. administrative employees are picked from the needy unemployed. However, for the proper operation and supervision of the whole program it is necessary that administrative employees be chosen primarily for their qualifications to perform specific functions and not solely on the basis of need. It is necessary to pay salaries such as will permit the employing of qualified persons. However, the average salary of W. P. A. administrative employees is approximately $300 per year less than the average salary of Government employees in other Federal agencies.

After reading this analysis of Mr. BENNETT's amendment I do not feel anyone would be justified in stating my language could be classed as pure demagoguery.

Initiation Fees of Labor Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by President Green, of the American Federation of Labor, to Senator NORRIS, of Nebraska:

MARCH 24, 1941.

Hon. GEORGE W. NORRIS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In the letter you sent me dated March 21 you advise me you have received complaints from individuals against the amount of membership initiation fees charged by local unions which were chartered by international organizations affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

Be assured that I fully appreciate the importance of the complaints referred to and the effect which such complaints have upon public opinion. As you have convincingly pointed out in your letter, some complaints are well founded, while others are not. Only an investigation of each complaint could actually determine whether they were well founded and true, or whether they were false and exaggerated.

I can assure you that the members of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, including myself, are gravely concerned over the situation which you bring to my attention. We have been and are now dealing with it in accordance with the provisions of the laws of the American Federation of Labor, and within the limitations of its constitution. Unfortunately, there are many people—some friendly and sympathetic to the American Federation of Labor and others who have ever been hostile and unfriendly—

who conclude that initiation fees charged new members by local unions during these days when our Nation is engaged in the execution of a national-defense policy, is new, of a special nature, and imposed only upon those employed upon defense projects. In other words, it is alleged by some friends, as well as our foes, that union labor is taking advantage of the national emergency to impose excessive, indefensible initiation fee charges in order to enrich the treasuries of national and international unions.

These assumptions and conclusions are wrong. Instead, the facts are that labor unions always required nonunion workers to pay an initiation fee when they become members of the union, and the initiation fees charged nonunion members who secure employment on defense projects are no higher now, but in some instances lower than the initiation fees charged during normal periods, before the national-defense program was launched.

When the officers of the American Federation of Labor take up complaints which allege the imposition upon nonunion members of excessive initiation fees with the officers and members of local unions located at points where these complaints originate, said local officers and members immediately explain that they sacrificed much while fighting for the establishment of decent wages and working conditions during a period of many years in the localities in which they reside. They show that they were compelled to pay the same amount of initiation fees now collected from new members into the local when they joined, and that during all the time while they were members of their local they paid their dues and assessments regularly each month. They protest strongly that nonunion men who now secure employment made no contribution toward the establishment of the decent wage scales which prevail, but in securing employment become the beneficiaries of the wage level established by the union, are entitled to enjoy all its benefits, and that the union requires and compels the contractor to pay the newly admitted member the same wage scale and accord to him the same favorable working conditions as every union member employed at the plant enjoys. These union members argue vehemently that the initiation fees charged new members do not represent an amount of money equal to that which they paid into the union over a long period of time all during which they fought for the establishment of decent wages and humane conditions of employment.

These local union officers and members also point out that the initiation fees charged and collected from new members go into the local union treasury, and that the new member, through the payment of his initiation fee, acquires an equity in the funds belonging to the local union. Not one single penny of the initiation fees collected goes to the national union treasury. All of it, every penny of it, is held by the local; belongs to the local; is deposited in the local union's treasury, protected and safeguarded by local union officers who are required to furnish adequate bond. Thus, new members who join the local and pay their initiation fees, become beneficiaries in that the funds thus accumulated in the local treasury are used for the purpose of paying sick, death, and accident benefits, and unemployment benefits in many instances. In other words, the funds are used for the benefit of the local members and are identified with the local organization, and the newly admitted members share equally with every other member of the union in the benefits guaranteed to individual members.

You can see by this brief explanation that the older members of a union establish the fact that they paid into the local more in money than do new members and, in addition, immeasurable sacrifice and suffering which resulted from strikes, discharge for union activities, and discrimination on the part of hostile employers. The newly admitted member made no financial contribution to the establishment and maintenance of the union or the establishment of decent wages and working conditions.

It is pretty difficult to argue with the members of a local union that now they should admit nonunion members when economic conditions have changed without collecting any initiation fee or only a nominal fee. They insist on demanding that nonunion members pay the same initiation fee they paid when they joined the union.

The working men who make up these local unions in different American communities are hard-working American citizens. They are neither dishonest nor are they racketeers. They shape and formulate the policies of the American Federation of Labor. No doubt you know personally many of these capable, highly skilled mechanics who reside in the State of Nebraska and in the community in which you live. These men and women point out that, figuratively speaking, they have built a house which cost them much and in which the family of organized labor resides. They maintain that simple justice and fairness call for the payment of an entrance fee to anyone who now enters this house of labor and occupies a room therein, enjoying all its benefits and protection. Can anyone challenge the validity of such a position?

I am not presenting this situation to you as a justification for the imposition of high initiation fees, particularly at this time. Instead I feel that the exigencies of the situation call for special consideration and special action by the membership of our affiliated unions. In every attempt we make, however, to achieve this purpose, we are brought face to face with constitutions of national and international unions which were adopted at conventions in a democratic way by a majority vote of delegates in attendance, which are now in effect, and which confer upon local organizations the power and authority to fix the initiation fees which nonunion members are required to pay, and which will remain in effect until changed by future conventions.

We have, however, taken definite action within the limitations of our authority. National and international unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, acting in accordance with authority conferred upon them, have instructed local unions that only a uniform, standard initiation-fee charge can be made. That is, one local organization in some locality where the local is strong cannot charge a higher initiation fee than other locals in other localities. This means that a limit has been placed upon these local unions thus affected as to the maximum amount which they may charge as initiation fees. Frankly, I called upon our affiliated unions to eliminate the abuses in connection with the collection of initiation fees and dues by local organizations affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. I am strenuously endeavoring to prevail upon local organizations to collect only a nominal fee from nonunion members who secure employment and work in defense-production industries. Such action on the part of our locals would be in keeping with the requirements of the situation which call for the adoption of moderate policies, sacrifices, if necessary, in the interest of the common good, and for patriotic reasons at this time when we are preparing to fight for the preservation of freedom, liberty, and democracy throughout the world, and for the protection of America.

If you will supply me with a report of the individual cases which have been called to your attention wherein it is charged that excessive initiation fees have been imposed, I will assign a capable representative to make an investigation of each case, with instructions to ascertain the facts, and, if an injustice has been done, to act vigorously in bringing about a correction upon some fair and just basis.

In conclusion, may I assure you that it is my intention and purpose to present complaints which have reached me, similar to yours, against the imposition of excessive initiation fees by our local unions, to a meeting of the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor which will be held within the near future, with the request that the council deal with said complaints insofar as its authority and power may permit.

Be assured that I appreciate the fine spirit which prompted you to write me as you did. I regard your letter as coming from one who during all his years of public service has manifested a most friendly and sympathetic attitude toward the cause, aims, purposes, and objectives of the American Federation of Labor.

Very sincerely yours,

WM. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

What Is Going To Happen To California's Old-Age Pension Law?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY MARTHA CHICKERING

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following speech by Martha Chickering, director of the Department of Social Welfare of California, speaks for itself. I want to say, however, that I agree with her spirited defense of our California law and I earnestly hope some way can be found to prevent the ruling of the Social Security Board from compelling a backward step by our State.

I am indeed appreciative of the opportunity afforded to me by Governor Olson to explain to you this evening the important issue facing California. Our California State programs for aid to our needy aged and needy blind are seriously threatened.

Word has been received by the State that the Federal Government may withdraw its share of California's payments to persons who receive what is popularly known as the old-age pension. As a matter of fact, of course, this isn't really a pension. It is public aid to old persons who are in need—in other words, it is aid to the needy aged. Any person over 65, who is in need of assistance in California may receive up to $40 a month, of which the Federal Government at present contributes one-half. Now there is a serious possibility that the Federal Government will cease to give its half of this aid. This would be a catastrophe to the State, and our citizens wonder how it can be. They remember that it was due to the Federal Government that most of the States of the Union first

started to give aid to their needy aged. They remember that it was only when the Congress of the United States, under President Roosevelt's leadership, passed the Federal Social Security Act late in 1935 that most States began to give regular assistance to needy aged citizens. It seems almost unbelievable, therefore, that the Federal Government should now be requiring that California reduce the amount it gives its older citizens or have Federal help taken away.

What, then, has happened? You will remember that the State of California has always been more generous to its older citizens than any other State in the Union. When California's old-age security system came into being in 1930, we were the first State in the Union to have State-wide payments to aged citizens. You probably know that from the beginning in 1930 until this very day California has consistently made higher payments to aged aid recipients than any other State in the Union. Today it is giving this public assistance to more persons than any other State. Finally (and here is where we get to our present problem), California has, in addition, a provision in its law which makes it possible for an old person to receive his $40 of public assistance and also to earn up to $15 a month over and above his aid grant. California, of course, believes that this is in line with our own best traditions. California has always believed that it is important for a man or woman to have work to do and to want to do it. We believe that it is better to make an effort and earn something each month, even if you are past the age of 65, than it is to sit idly at home and wait for the postman to bring you your monthly check from the State. The old people themselves would rather work while they have the strength, and for this reason the California Legislature passed this law which made it possible for these older citizens with strength and health enough to do it to be allowed to earn and retain this small sum of $15 each month without having it deducted from their $40 grant.

Now this is where the difficulty begins. In 1939 the Congress of the United States passed an amendment to the Federal Social Security Act which provides that (and I quote the exact words of the Federal law)—"Effective July 1, 1941, the State shall, in determining need, take into consideration any other income and resources of an individual claiming old-age assistance." The California law, however, provides that (and I quote the exact words of our State law—"Net income from any of the following sources of a combined total value not exceeding $15 per month shall not be considered for any purpose." And then the California law goes on, as I have indicated, and lists these exempt sources of income: Earnings from the applicant's labor or services; value of foodstuffs or other merchantable products which he himself produces; the value of firewood or water produced on his premises; or the value of gifts of money other than those from responsible relatives. These things, most of them good pioneer ways of trying to earn a living, a man or woman may have in California and still not have the amount of his old-age assistance reduced.

What I have just told you about California's aged-aid law and the possible effect on it by amendments to the Federal law is also true with respect to California's blind-aid law. Let me list briefly the points of similarity. As with aged aid, California was a poineer State in providing for its needy blind residents, the present system beginning in 1929. As with aged aid, California is paying blind aid to more persons than any other State in the Union participating in the Social Security program. As with aged aid, California is more liberal in its payments to needy blind persons than any other State.

In order to provide blind persons with added incentives and means to rehabilitate themselves, California's law permits them to earn or have other income up to $33.33 a month without requiring any deduction from their normal blind-aid payments. Now, the amendments to the Federal Social Security Act regarding blind aid are exactly the same as those governing aged aid. If our California code provisions are out of line with the Federal amendments regarding income of aged aid recipients, they are also out of line with regard to the Federal amendments regarding income of blind aid recipients.

So let us go on to a consideration of California's immediate emergency, bearing in mind that it affects both recipients of old-age security and State aid to the needy blind. As we have seen, the Federal law as amended says that income must be taken into consideration and the California law requires that certain income be not taken into consideration. This clearly required an amendment to our law, and bills have been introduced into the legislature to meet the requirments of the amended Federal law with provisions that regular income received from labor or gifts should be deducted from the amount of the monthly aid grant.

But here is a strange thing: When Congress passed the Federal amendment it intended to liberalize aid to the aged citizens of these United States, and that will be the actual effect in most States. The Social Security Board then issued regulations telling States that they should not figure up and deduct from the grant of each recipient of aid income that was irregular, casual, or inconsequential. So the bills introduced into the first session of the legislature were carefully worded to protect for the blind and aged every advantage of such a liberal interpretation of the Federal amendments. Then the blow fell. Word came that the Federal Social Security Board does not regard California's proposed amendments as satisfactory. They told us our law can contain no provisions to guarantee to the recipients of aid any security above the actual monthly grant—no exemption of firewood, no exemption of foodstuffs raised in the backyard, no exemption of occupancy of a man's own home.

The Federal officials said if a similar State regulation should be passed that might be accepted. But we must not write any protection into our law, even though we in California have long had a preference for having the protection of our citizens clearly stated in the law, rather than left to administrative rulings. They told us that we must not provide in the law that an old man or woman can raise a few vegetables in his yard without having their value deducted from his grant. They said that we must not provide that a blind man can do a little work every few months, or than an old man could try to raise a small crop and have some income from it 1 or 2 months out of the year without taking an equivalent amount out of his grant. Finally, the Federal officials ruled that if a person receiving public assistance is living in the home which he bought and paid for years ago out of his own labor and on which he has paid taxes most of his life, our law must require that the income value of living in his own home must be deducted from his monthly aid. The Federal Social Security Board says all this is in order to make the treatment of all recipients of aid equal, but the Governor of this State and the State Social Welfare Board do not agree that this will be its effect.

When these Federal rulings came to the State, Governor Olson, always interested in the welfare of the people of his State, immediately sent a letter of protest to Mr. McNutt, the head of the Federal Social Security Agency, asking that this State be allowed to secure a court ruling as to whether the Federal act really means that we must deduct these things from our grants to recipients of aged and blind aid. In addition, he sent an urgent letter to the President of the United States, asking him to do what he could to prevent California from being forced to retreat from its advanced system of aid. Most of California's Representatives in Congress are reported also to have protested against this ruling. I am going to quote briefly from Governor Olson's letter to Mr. McNutt:

"I am compelled in the name of the people of California to protest against these interpretations of the Federal act and to express to you and to the Federal Social Security Board the request that the Board reconsider these provisions of the act with a view to finding a more liberal interpretation, that will enable California to maintain its present standard of assistance to its needy aged and blind and receive the Federal grants upon which it depends in its present provisions for aid to its needy aged and blind.

"California and other progressive States, in taking the lead toward securing provisions for adequate old-age pensions and blind assistance by State and Federal Government, should not be compelled to retreat from the advanced positions they have achieved by any Federal act, and certainly not by any interpretation of any Federal act which is not absolutely compelled by the plain wording of that act."

To this a reply has just come from Mr. McNutt and other officers of the Social Security Board. They indicate that a way may be found to amend California's law without forcing us as a State to retreat from the social advances we have made. They do not indicate exactly what that way shall be, but the door is not finally closed.

This, then, is the issue which is today before the State of California. It is a very serious issue. The State department of social welfare has estimated that if we take the interpretations made by the Federal social-security officials and amend our law in accordance with their rulings, grants to some 45,000 needy persons will be reduced in California. Whereas, if California refuses to make further concessions, Federal aid to the State will be withdrawn by the Social Security Board as a penalty. This State would then lose $3,000,000 every month in Federal funds and thousands of blind persons and old men and women may be thrown into acute want and suffering.

The Federal letters indicate that the Federal Government may want us to put our needy aged and blind back on a budget as a basis for each grant. A budget, as you know, is an estimate of what a person on relief must have to meet his actual needs—how much food, how much clothing, how much for his tobacco, how much wood to keep him warm, and how much money to pay for rent. This is set up as a measure called a budget, and is used as a basis in each county to decide the grant to each individual, wherever he is. California tried it once, and the legislature wiped it out of the law several years ago because of popular demand. The old people and the blind just didn't like it. Will California be forced to take up this method again?

The effective date of the Federal amendment is July 1, 1941. How far should California go in being forced into conformity with Federal rulings? Can we stand the loss of Federal financial help on the aged and blind aid programs? Is a budget basis the answer, as the Federal people seem to think?

The people and their representatives in legislative and executive authority must decide California's course of action.

There Is No "Pork" in Legislation for Improvement of Rivers and Harbors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

ARTICLE BY DURWARD H. PRIMROSE, EDITOR, MARINE JOURNAL

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, there is no class of projects undertaken by the Federal Government which possesses greater merit or which is subjected to more thorough study and investigation than projects for the improvement of rivers and harbors. Some of the reasons why this is the fact are succinctly set forth in an article by Mr. Durward H. Primrose, editor, Marine Journal, New York City, which was published in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., March 21, 1941, reading as follows:

SAYS THERE IS NO "PORK" IN LEGISLATION FOR IMPROVEMENT OF RIVERS AND HARBORS

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

Year after year the opponents of river and harbor legislation try to kill it by derision. "Pork barrel," they say, meaning that the bill carries appropriations for projects without merit except political advantage. The astounding thing is that so many believe it, despite the fact that river and harbor legislation is entirely free from "pork" by reason of the method of its adoption and enactment, and has been so for a generation.

In the first place, Congress does not appropriate for particular projects. It appropriates lump sums to be spent by the Secretary of War at his selection (and that means at the selection of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army) from a list of approved projects. And what are these approved projects?

They are projects that have been certified economically sound after long study by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, made first by the district officer, reviewed by his superior, the division engineer, then by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and finally by the Chief of Engineers. No part of the study is perfunctory. Many projects are rejected.

Having passed that test, they go to the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House, and, if approved, are incorporated in the river and harbor authorization bill, which carries no money.

When the bill becomes law they become approved projects, to which the Secretary of War may allot funds when made available by Congress.

There is no form of Government expenditure subjected to closer scrutiny as to its worth. Not to use too strong a word, labeling such legislation "pork barrel" is unscrupulous. To do so is to impugn the integrity of the Corps of Engineers and its Chief, the integrity of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and the Members of the House and Senate.

The use of such a weapon suggests a bad cause.

DURWARD H. PRIMROSE,
Editor, Marine Journal.

NEW YORK CITY.

Net-Worth Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BOEHNE, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

Mr. BOEHNE. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a communication from the Honorable Benjamin E. Buente, judge of the superior court, Vanderburgh County, Evansville, Ind., as well as president of the Indiana Judges Association, which is of more than passing interest. I have asked that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the question he presents may be studied by all those interested. He proposes a constitutional amendment, reading as follows:

NET WORTH TAX

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on the net worth of persons, in whatever form or from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

In commenting on this subject, he writes:

The Government must be kept solvent and the bonded debt burden should not be carried too far into future generations. Therefore, the Government must have greater income, which income should be derived according to ability to pay. Present income alone does not correctly reflect ability to pay; net worth should also be considered.

The vast Government expenditures are for the purpose of defense, and those who have more in value to defend have a greater obligation to pay the defense tax. This is based on the sound principle upon which insurance premiums are formulated—the more you have to insure, the more premium you have to pay.

Pursuant to such constitutional authority the Congress could enact a law requiring all persons having a net worth above a specified amount (say $10,000) to file a schedule showing their assets and liabilities. From the net worth thus ascertained, appropriate exemptions could be allowed for dependents.

Some Sound Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

ADDRESS OF CHESTER C. DAVIS, DIRECTOR OF THE AGRICULTURAL DIVISION OF THE ADVISORY COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, when the conscription bill was up before the House last year, as I recall, only two men from the Southern States, both Republicans, voted against it. This year, when the lend-lease bill was up before the House, only four men from the South, three of them Republicans, voted against it. Later, when the $7,000,000,000 appropriations bill to aid England came before the House, not a single southern man voted against it.

It is clear, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the South has shown in every way possible its patriotic zeal. In the face of these facts it is a hard blow to our section of the country to know that the South has been almost completely ignored in the establishment of defense industries and has been largely ignored in the placing of defense orders. Notwithstanding the fact that the South is the gateway to most of the island possessions of foreign governments from which trouble may first come if the European nations who are unfriendly to the United States should get a foothold, and notwithstanding the fact that it was generally understood only a few months ago that defense industries would be scattered around, we find now a greater concentration than ever in regions near the coast. The South has abundant labor, has much of the raw materials, has abundant cheap fuel in the form of natural gas and crude oil, and has a climate making possible year-around production of defense materials. This Nation ought to profit by the experience of other nations and should distribute these industries so that if an attempted invasion should ever come, we will have ample factories in the interior to make it possible for this Nation to adequately defend itself.

Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Chester C. Davis, Director of the Agricultural Division of the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense, in an address on March 15, in New Orleans, before the southern Governors' conference, discussed the position of the South in this respect with such clarity and force that I believe that all of the South and much of the balance of the Nation would be interested in it and will read it with profit. I therefore ask that this speech be inserted here in the RECORD.

The address follows:

Governor Dixon, and gentlemen, I can imagine the palpitating interest with which this audience awaits my words, which were published in the city generally, in the early editions of the afternoon paper. Something was said to me, I think, by wire, about radio broadcasting, and that will be my excuse, gentlemen, for having prepared the talk I am going to deliver today, as you have already noticed by the papers, and I hope you will pardon me for following my notes with some care. Somewhere along the latter part of the talk are some statements made I would like to see quoted literally.

You have asked me today to talk about the role of the Southern States in the defense program; and on the relation of war and our whole defense effort to the peculiarly difficult problems which you have faced in the South in recent years. I believe it is necessary for me to begin with this second phase of my topic—with some consideration of the economy and economic problems of the South. I do this because to me it is self-evident that a strong and effective participation in the work of national defense proceeds from a

sound and properly organized economic life. Energies which have to be devoted and absorbed completely in the struggle for a bare living cannot be diverted to defense activity.

The South has come through difficult years, and we know there are difficult days ahead. But if it is to be an effective participant in the work of defense, it must have an economic organization which makes effective use of the southern manpower and material resources. An economic organization that holds the great mass of the people struggling to grow one crop which, under existing and prospective conditions cannot produce a decent American standard of living for many of them, is not making full and effective use of this section's resources.

The South is an agrarian economy—its living, or the vast part of it, has been derived directly from the soil. Traditionally the farmer has organized his operations and planned his output independently of his fellows. He has taken the market-determined price for whatever supply resulted from the combination of individual decision and the accident of crop yields. Nowhere else in our economic system in recent times has there been the same dependence on the free, uncontrolled, and competitive market as in the case of agriculture.

During the aggressive expansion of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, this economic isolation of the farmer was not a serious disadvantage. His market, both at home and abroad, was expanding rapidly—sometimes more rapidly than his ability to supply it. But since the World War the American farmer has been living in a contracting market. European countries during the post-war period no longer financed our railroads and our industries, and we no longer were able, therefore, to service our debt with wheat and cotton. With controlled immigration and latterly a slower rate of population increase, our domestic market has been growing less rapidly than before. The free market of the farm producer therefore reflected the full burden of the producer—and reflected it directly on the producer. The farmer could not, as could industry, control or check the downward movement in his prices and gradually adjust his supply to the new situation. He had to take the rap.

Now, as I see it in broad outline, during the last 8 years we have made some progress in meeting this fundamental situation in agriculture; the farmer has managed—and nowhere with such unanimity of action as in the Cotton Belt—to develop a measure of control over his production and the price at which it sells. In other words, agriculture has gained a measure of protection from the vicissitudes of uncontrolled production in the free market. This protection, together with the expansion of domestic demand which has taken place in recent years, has put some farmers in a reasonably favorable situation. Some 2,000,000 persons have found employment during the past 12 months; it is fair to assume that nearly all of these have increased their purchases of food products. The market for beef, lamb, pork, milk, butter, eggs, and cheese—these are luxury items for many farmers still—again is expanding.

But the position of the 2,000,000 farms which produce cotton and of the 10,000,000 people who live on these farms is very different. These, and the tobacco and wheat producers, do not face an expanding market; rather, they now face an adjustment to a still further contraction in their existing market. Before the war—the present war—we were holding our own against our old cotton competitors, Egypt and India. And, in spite of the increasing use of cotton substitutes, the world consumption of cotton was increasing. In 1914 the world consumed about 20,000,000 bales of cotton, and after the interruption of the World War it again reached this figure in 1923. By 1936 world consumption had climbed up to some 30,000,000 bales. The world still likes cotton, and I think it is important to keep that in mind. However, as you well know, strong new competitors have arisen in South America, Africa, and China. These new competitors probably have a staying power in world markets at least as great as our own staying power. Finally, the war, for the time being, has slashed off the greater part of our overseas market in its entirety.

Obviously, if southern manpower is to be as effective, land and resources are to be used most effectively in the period ahead, vigorous and imaginative action is necessary. Steps must be taken which will provide a supportable livelihood for those farmers who were in the path of the aggressors; we must find a useful outlet for the manpower which in the past produced for these markets; and, if possible, we must work toward a solution which will leave the South prosperous and secure when the present period of crisis is over.

To begin with, we must take for granted, I think, that the South is going to continue to grow cotton and that the world in the future will purchase a part of our cotton products. Even were we told tomorrow that not another bale of American cotton would ever leave the country, we could not, at once, place ourselves on a purely domestic cotton basis. But I see no reason why we should make any such assumption or take a defeatist attitude. We are still part of the world. Our policy of aid to Britain, so firmly supported in this part of the country, shows the extent of our participation in the world community. This policy means that we intend in the future to participate in the world community. On the economic level, it means that we will continue to supply the world with a part of its cotton.

In both the immediate and the indefinite future the South will be living with its great staple crop. It follows that cotton prices must provide a supportable return to those who produce it. We must continue with measures which will make cotton growing remunerative, particularly in those areas and for those people who have no ready alternative. We must do this even though, temporarily, we may accumulate surpluses even larger than those we now have. I should like to add right here that I hope we do not spend too much time worrying about the size of this cotton surplus. Many of you will disagree with me, I know, but I must insist that the problem of our cotton stocks is in part a state of mind. Were they half as large as they are, we would still worry; were they half as large again, we would not worry much more. We can develop, and in some measure we have developed, machinery so that a 12,000,000-bale carry-over bears only a little more heavily on the farmer than a 10,000,000-bale carry-over. Let us count on this machinery of loans and storage, or the equivalent of this machinery in some other form, to protect the producer from the price-depressing effects of our surplus. And as for the surplus, let us not during this crisis worry too much about something which any other industrial country would be delighted to have.

But to make cotton reasonably profitable to live with is only a first step. It still leaves us with idle hands and idle lands. It still leaves us largely with the curse of a one-crop economy.

We must have a better balanced agriculture. You all know the difficulty in the past which has faced those who have talked about the diversification of southern agriculture. We have wanted to diversify our cotton acreages, but with what? Other things besides cotton were too plentiful to sell at a remunerative price. Now this situation is changing. There are alternatives. We are entering a period of expanding domestic demand for dairy products, meats, and vegetables. So we face a period when the South can increase its production of foods without raiding the markets that heretofore have been enjoyed by other nations. As the Nation's food requirements expand in months ahead, I feel that we must look upon the South as a new and important part of the Nation's larder. By so doing we will save ourselves from uneconomical and perhaps, in the long run, unnecessary expansion in the present meat and dairy areas of the United States. But particularly we will leave the South with a better balanced agriculture for an increased and better balanced home consumption. In all our agricultural programs, both State and national, we should give close attention to expanding the food resources of the South. The time has come, I think, when we can approach this problem as a truly national objective on which all can agree. To the extent we are successful then we will accomplish something toward the second great step, the diversification of the agricultural economy of the South.

There are several further steps in a complete program, one which I should like to stress in particular. Diversification of agriculture is but one step in a larger process—the process of diversifying an economy. A diversified economy is one which combines both agriculture and industry. Full adjustment and full balance in the southern economy will not come until a part of the agricultural population has found an effective and useful employment through southern industrial expansion. This is the great step which is necessary if the South is to become a strong and effective part of our national economy. It is the step which must be taken if the full power of the South is to be made available and used in this defense effort. It is one of the purposes to which this association of Governors of the Southern States is dedicated.

There is no easy road to industrial development. In modern economic society the tendency is to a centralization rather than to decentralization of industrial production. The British Empire has developed with a small industrial core on the British Isles and a vast world hinterland from which it draws its raw materials and to which it ships finished products. Somewhat similarly, the United States has developed its own industrial core in the North and Northeast with its own agrarian empire in the South and West.

In the case of both Britain and the United States this pattern of industrial concentration has been deeply influenced and confirmed by war. The era of industrial expansion in Europe, which historians term the "industrial revolution," coincided with the Napoleonic Wars under way at this time. England entered these wars with a substantial head start in its industry, and while the Continent suffered under a succession of military campaigns, English industrial production continued intact. In other words, England became the banker and in measure the arsenal for her continental allies, and by the time peace came she had far outstripped her industrial rivals across the channel. She was able, as we know, to maintain this leadership for more than a century.

Very similarly in the United States, the War between the States found the North with a nucleus of industry which was greatly expanded to supply its armies. The antebellum South, using its natural agricultural advantages, had specialized on cotton, tobacco, and sugar. Its industry was relatively undeveloped and what there was was destroyed or rendered ineffective, particularly after Sherman's campaigns. Northern industry was confirmed in its head start and it, too, has maintained that lead throughout these years.

The Great War—1915–18—brought a new period of expansion—one far in excess of that of the war of the 1860's. During the Great War we expanded existing industries and we located our new war industries close to the present centers of industrial activity.

The result reinforced the industrial concentration of the Northern and the Northeastern States. I might add, also, that this policy created some very serious subsidiary problems. So great was the congestion of industrial activity in that northeastern triangle that in 1918 the War Industries Board was forced to suspend for a period all further war orders going into the factories of Northeastern States. The reason for that was the task of supplying fuel and food to these areas had gone beyond the capacity of the railroads and the ability of the main rail gateways to handle freight. Acute labor shortages developed in spite of mass migration into the northeastern area. While that was going on in 1918, manufacturers outside of the area had a labor surplus and idle-plant capacity. In many cases they were unable to use this labor and plant because of their inability to get materials which were tied up under priorities in the eastern areas.

I stress these matters for I believe the current flows strongly in the United States toward a concentration of industrial enterprises, and it is vital that we watch this current, particularly in time of war. People in the South and West have looked at times upon their labor force and their raw-material resources and labor supply and have assumed that the logic of events would cause them to be used—that if they waited industry would employ these resources in the community where they existed. I can't help thinking that they were too optimistic. I have had some recent experience with this problem that leaves me in a frame of doubt.

When the National Defense Advisory Commission was organized last summer I expressed the view that new industries required under the defense program should not be located in areas where existing industries essential to defense are now concentrated when there was any possibility of placing them elsewhere without sacrifice of speed and efficiency. It was clear that this was the only way in which new reservoirs of manpower, unemployed, and resources would be tapped without uprooting families and shifting them thousands of miles into communities where ebbing of the armament effort would leave them stranded.

The plans, such as they were, which had been made prior to the emergency for maximum war production were not based on such a principle. In carrying out the program we have made some progress toward decentralization, but I have been far from satisfied with it. I am afraid that, in the defense effort up to date, we have followed the same pattern of regional concentration that was followed in 1917 and 1918. Then, as I have said, we handicapped our effort by shortages of labor and transportation and left an aftermath of overbuilt and overconcentrated industry. I am afraid that we are again going to reap some of the same harvest of economic and social consequences.

In the period between June 1 of last year and January 31 of this year some seven and one-half billions of defense contracts had been let; this figure excludes contracts for ship construction and supplies where obviously seaboard States must dominate the picture. Of this total only slightly over a half billion, or approximately 7 percent, have been placed in the 11 States of Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Oklahoma, Florida, Arkansas, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas. This 7 percent of the total compares with a value of manufactures in 1937 manufacturers census in these States of slightly over 11 percent of the national total. These figures are for defense contracts. Up to March 1 plans have been completed and allocations made for the construction of some 302 new facilities for defense production. Of these 302 only 24, valued at $166,271,860, have been located inside the 11 States I have just mentioned, as compared with 302 at a cost of $1,600,000,000 in the rest of the country. These, as I say, were the new facilities and included many plants where I had hoped we would have a special freedom of choice in finding favorable locations in accordance with the broad principle of decentralization. As I said, I am far from satisfied with the showing and, as I have said on other occasions, I feel equally dissatisfied with the results in the rural areas of the West.

In part, the hands of men working on the defense programs were tied by the compelling need for speed. But there were other reasons. The line of least resistance was to place business and locate industry in existing industrial areas. Those of us who were interested in a larger decentralization of this effort found ourselves placed largely in an advisory role. An adviser whose advice runs counter to established lines of procedure is pretty sure to have some difficulties. Industrial management has thought quite largely in terms of doing new business at the old stand. On occasions they stoutly opposed any shift from their existing areas of operation. We were faced with inertia and habits of thought in that line. We found people unable to visualize the vast productive power of the United States could release were we able to mobilize the reservoirs of manpower now partially or ineffectively used throughout the South and West.

I think there is another reason, equally important to the ones I have cited. I was interested and I was somewhat shocked a few days ago to see a tabulation of the distribution of defense orders to date not as between areas but between industrial concerns. Now, included in the tabulation were eleven and one-half billions of prime contracts awarded between June 13 of last year and February 15 of this year. This tabulation includes all types of prime contracts. Of this vast total, between one-fifth and one-quarter had gone to two groups of companies of very closely interconnected ownership. Between 40 and 45 percent had gone to 6 very closely interconnected groups. And a total of 80 percent has gone to 62 companies or financially interrelated groups of companies. There is rich food for thought in these figures. I believe they are closely related to the mediocre success we have had in apportioning a part of this new defense industry to the States represented here today. Our defense contracts are being absorbed by a small handful of concerns and the very smallness of the number threatens to be a serious bottleneck on the full use of our industrial and human resources, and it is a bottleneck which must be broken.

As I mentioned to one of your Governors, Commander Simpson is in the city today, and will be here part of the time tomorrow. He attended a meeting this morning at the New Orleans Division of the Federal Reserve System, discussing the steps which are being taken to make these 36 Federal Reserve offices possibly of service, and trying to get the subcontracts tied in with the prime contractors, and, as I say, this work that represents eleven and one-half billion dollars of orders in a relatively few hands must be spread out, and the only way is through the subcontracts, and I hope your conference will have some time to meet Commander Simpson while here.

For the South the lesson is clear. Your area has been waiting for industry to come and use its manpower. I am afraid it is going to be a long wait and one which will only provide a few crumbs from the concentrations of existing enterprise unless the most vigorous and most positive efforts to achieve recognition of your labor reserves and labor resources can be made.

But more than this is required. The time has come I think for the southern people to join together and start on the hard route to industrialization—that of encouraging industrialization. It is significant that our greatest success in expanding industry in the South, both before and since the beginning of the defense program, has been in two directions. One was the shift of the textile industry nearer to the sources of raw material and labor supply. The other has been in the immediate Tennessee Valley area. Within recent months the T. V. A. and T. V. A. power have brought an aluminum industry, an ammonia industry, and the manufacture of explosives to Tennessee and Alabama; there would have been precious little defense industry in these States without T. V. A. facilities. The development of the Tennessee Valley was largely the product of southern initiative and imagination. It should be an object lesson to the South in what a genuine industrial development requires.

In the first stages of the defense program I must frankly say important opportunities have been missed. I had hoped that we might use this surplus manpower or ineffectively employed manpower of the South and make it a part of our full labor-power potential. I had hoped we might use this labor near home and thus avoid moving folks across the country to supplement a labor supply which in some of the large urban centers is already running short. I had thought that this might open the way for a better balance between industry and agriculture for the future. The farmer who depends only on one crop is never in a very secure position; the same is true on a larger scale of those parts of our country—those States and regions—which depend only on agriculture. They, too, are one-crop areas and they lack the stability and security of better-diversified areas. The job in the future will have to be done better than the job has been done in the past.

Now in conclusion: As I look back over what I have said this afternoon I realize that little of it has been new to you. You have been thinking and saying these things yourselves, many of them for years, some during recent months. We must continue to say them, patiently and persistently, until they are translated into accomplishment. We must not permit temporary set-backs to discourage us as we stand shoulder to shoulder on these principles. Thank you. [Applause.]

Dominion of Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1941

ADDRESSES BY HON. CLAUDE PEPPER, OF FLORIDA

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD some addresses recently delivered by the junior Senator from Florida in the Dominion of Canada.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Address before the Empire Parliamentary Association composed of the members of the Senate and House of Commons of the Canadian Parliament at Ottawa, Canada, March 18, 1941]

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Senate, Members of the House, it is difficult to say

whether a sense of honor or a sense of satisfaction is uppermost in my mind as I have for the first time this great privilege of addressing in this historic chamber you who represent the people of Canada with whom we in the United States have so long enjoyed what one has called the brotherly relation of peace with friction.

When I reflect upon our long and happy associations I am reminded of the country boy in my State of Florida who, when his girl accepted his stammered proposal, was so beside himself that he rushed out of the house into the beautiful moonlight, stretched his hands upward to the kindly moon, and said, "Oh Lord, I ain't got nothin' agin nobody."

While I should have liked my visit to Canada to have been earlier, yet I believe that if I could have chosen a time in my life to visit you, I would prefer this time when I can come fresh from the Congress of the United States and tell you and through you the heroic people of Britain and the stalwart peoples of the British Commonwealth that we will not abandon you in this hour of trial. We free men and women challenge the enslaved to a test of endurance. Let us see who is made of the sterner stuff.

We challenge the dictators in Europe and in the Orient to shake off Winston Churchill, McKenzie King, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the others who speak for free men.

I owe it to you to say that it is the gallant and limitless way in which all of you who are fighting this good fight of faith have thrown yourselves into it which has made our people as determined as they are to help you until it hurts. Before I came here I knew what share of your income you were spending in the cause. I was aware of some of the external evidences of your mighty effort, but I did not know until I came to see it and to feel it just how fixed and determined was the purpose of your people to carry on until the inevitable day of victory against this devilish attack upon freedom everywhere.

It is like your great past, like the great races to which you belong, to entertain these sentiments. It is like you not to give them up at any cost.

Our people in the United States are not strangers to these same sentiments. You know how common our origins are, how parallel have been our careers, how much alike we are, how these same mountains and plains and lakes and rivers, these great forests, the tides of these oceans, have their counterpart with us. You know how freely and naturally travel and trade and understanding, the niagaras of friendship, have flowed across this almost imaginary line that barely perceptibly divides us from each other.

You know the history of the long years in which we have each worked out by the oceans, by the streams, in the forests, in the fields, the kind of a world which seemed right to us, and how the taproots of our lives reach down deep into the same earthlike traditions which we cherish. Whatever our shortcomings, whatever we may not have done or have done poorly, the effort has been ours. Under God it has been our world here. Under God it shall be our world to the end.

We are not ashamed to say that both you and we prayed that this cup might pass from us. Our lives, our destinies are in the Americas. In nothing that we have done, in nothing that we intend to do, do we propose to lose sight of that first principle of Americanism. Assuredly the most repugnant policy imaginable to the minds of our peoples is to seek involvement in any foreign war. The whole race knows not only how we cherish peace, but what we have done to assure it and to preserve it. Nothing could enough entice us, so allure us by way of gain for selfish purpose, that we would for it spend the life of a single boy in any province or state.

But we are sensible people. We know the delicate equilibrium there is in the world in which we live. We know how the economy, the security, the integrity of the whole world, has become a single pattern. To tear it or break it anywhere weakens the whole and dislocates and disturbs all lives and all nations. We know that we do not and cannot live alone and live as we now live. We must sell to others and buy from others. To buy and sell we must be able to carry our goods and our people along the sea lanes of the world. We know there must be a medium of exchange that will promote rather than clog our commerce. We know we must be able to depend upon men's words and men's bonds to do business—to carry on. We know we must have a satisfying sense of security, to know that we will not be attacked in the night by some powerful enemy. We know that nothing is safe, neither life nor property, if international brigands bent upon loot, stopping at nothing, are allowed to run loose. We know that if force be the criterion of all things among nations, if might be the single arbiter of right, all that we have tediously and painfully built up, all that the sweat and tears and blood of the past have won and kept, is lost. We know that if tyranny gains supremacy over the earth freedom is dead, and our race of men still prefers death to slavery.

In these circumstances, then, what can we do save to say that these cruel men who would destroy all these things upon which we live cannot and shall not prevail? We are bent upon a single purpose. We shall choke them into impotence. They shall not destroy our world. To that task each of us in his own way and according to his own tradition shall give himself without stint.

How could we if we would restrain the impulse of exultation and joy that rises up within us from the spectacle of what our kind of men and women, boys, and girls are doing in other parts of the world? Let those who scorn what they call the decadence of free men behold what fighting men they are, entrenched behind their homes and altars, their temples, the ramparts of their faith. Let them see how terrible is their wrath when provoked beyond endurance.

No knight was ever braver, more gallant, than those boys who left their classrooms a few months ago and have now saved a world in the clouds. No heroine was ever more noble than those women who have sent their offspring away while they stayed to carry on, to dress the wounds of the injured, to solace the hurt, or those who have saved their bodies that they might throw them as a shield between a devil's bomb and an innocent babe. Such courage no pitiless power can break.

It is a paradox that while one part of this generation has reached the depths of depravity yet another part has soared into the sun.

When we think of the future we turn to the past. I wonder if you remember the letter that a great American, Simon Bolivar, wrote in 1815 to an English gentleman in the English colony of Jamaica, who had given him friendly refuge from the unfavorable fortunes of the revolution which he was leading. In this letter Bolivar said:

"How beautiful it would be for the Isthmus of Panama to be for our nations what the Corinthian Isthmus was for the Greeks. Would to God that some day we might enjoy the happiness of having there an august congress of representatives of the republics, kingdoms, and empires of America to deal with the high interests of peace and of war with the nations of the other three parts of the world."

When he had gained the liberation of his people this great patriot and prophet set out to make real his dream, a Congress of American nations. He issued an invitation to all the free nations of this hemisphere, including the United States. You will recall that an English observer was invited also. This is an excerpt from the note sent to Great Britain:

"The Congress of Panama will bring together representatives from all the governments of America and a diplomatic agent of His Brittanic Majesty. This congress seems destined to form the vastest league, the most extraordinary and the strongest which has ever appeared on earth. * * * The human race would give a thousand thanks for this league of salvation, and America and England would receive manifold benefits from it."

This is the significant statement with which the invitation concluded:

"Such ideas are to be found in the minds of some Americans of the highest quality; they wait with impatience for the congress of Panama to initiate this project, which may be the occasion for the consolidation of the union of the new states with the British Empire."

This congress, of course, was ahead of its time, and it failed. What might have been saved, how many might have been spared had the world embraced the dream of Simon Bolivar only the historian and the Omniscient One can say.

But this concept of Bolivar, thinking of unity in the Americas which Great Britain and the United States had solidly resolved would forever be for Americans, had also sprung out of the fertile mind of Thomas Jefferson. It found fervid echo in the eloquence of Henry Clay. It came forever into reality when James G. Blaine, as Secretary of State of the United States, in 1889 called in Washington the first Pan-American Conference. This first conference laid the foundation and breathed the spirit of the noble edifice which was to grow upon it. Former President Richardo J. Alfaro, of the Republic of Panama, described this first conference in these words:

"No treaties or conventions were signed at this meeting, yet its achievements were great, for it served three transcendent purposes. In the first place it crystallized into action the latent sentiment of pan-Americanism and laid down the foundations of a united America, as dreamed by Bolivar and Clay. In the second place it gave birth to the central organ of continental action, the Commercial Bureau of the American Republics, which was the forerunner of the present Pan American Union. And last but not least, the conference of 1889 went down in history as the first occasion upon which representatives of the great majority of the continent united in condemning the right of conquest and in proclaiming the principle of compulsory arbitration.

"* * * Pan-Americanism is a structure devoted to peace and prosperity. That structure rests upon the four pillars of independence, equality, justice, and cooperation, and those four pillars were erected in 1889."

Nine further historic conferences since that one in 1889 have built the permanent and effective institution of pan-Americanism. Not only a new spirit but a new relationship has come about among the 21 republics on your southern border. New standards in international affairs not only are spoken of but are observed.

One of those who has taken the mote out of its own eye before complaining about the beam in the eye of its neighbor has been the United States. That country has frankly confessed the error of many of its own ways. It has expressed the principle which perhaps more than any other epitomizes this new spirit—the principle of the good "neighbor who resolutely respects himself, and because he does so, respects the rights of others," uttered by an Elisha worthy of Simon Bolivar's

mantle, a friend to man, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In the spirit of the new pan-Americanism each nation has reexamined its policy to be sure there was nothing by omission or commission in that policy that would be inconsistent with these new concepts of neighborliness.

At Montevideo in 1933 this policy of the good neighbor found expression in solemn covenants wherein every one of these 21 republics with unshakable determination resolved that no nation in all this continent had a right to interfere with the internal affairs of any other nation, and that the territorial and national integrity of each nation was to be respected by all others as a sacred thing.

At Buenos Aires in 1936 met the first Pan American Conference, dedicated to the maintenance of peace in the Western Hemisphere. There for the first time effective collective action was taken and machinery for collective cooperation set in motion that gave a real as well as a philosophical solidarity to all this vast territory and all these many peoples. It was readily recognized no less enthusiastically by the United States than by any other power that the Monroe Doctrine was not a doctrine of the United States of America but a doctrine of the Western Hemisphere, which, asserted the right of this hemisphere to be free of European aggression and to develop its own destiny in its own way. The interdependence of all our many nations was recognized in the conclusion of this conference, that a threat to the security of one of our neighbors was a danger to the safety of all our western neighborhood.

In 1938 came the Conference of Lima and its splendid declaration of American principles. Here consultative machinery was more specifically provided for and set in motion. This principle of solidarity among the American republics was becoming one of the vital forces of the world.

Then at Panama in 1939 met the foreign ministers of the pan-American group to meet the challenge of this new menace to our security.

In 1940 at Habana again came together all our 21 republics and further coordinated our common effort, strengthened our common ties and quickened the pace of our cooperation.

These conferences have been but the external appearances of deeper forces which were moving through the minds and hearts of our governments and our quarter of a billion people.

In Washington the great Pan American Building is the seat, not only of the pan-American sentiment, but of an effectively functioning pan-American service. Committees of earnest and able representatives of all these nations are constantly working through the day and the night to improve and to better assure the security, to improve the health, to raise the standard of living, to promote a better exchange of the cultures of all our nations and all our peoples. We stop not at the noncontroversial boundaries, but the common effort enters also into the field of reciprocal helpfulness one to another in the strengthening of one another's economic life.

I may mention what my own country is doing through the Export-Import Bank in furnishing capital and credit to our friends and neighbors which has the double aspect of helping both them and us. This fact alone indicates most significantly a new attitude in the realm of international relations and international finance. Capital is regarded as the instrument of national policy, the vehicle for international progress, and not the exploiting tyrant which in some times past has bent national policy supinely to its will.

The armed forces of no one of the pan-American republics is thought of in relation to the collection of either private or public debts. The good neighbor policy is, of course, bilateral and multilateral. It is mutual and reciprocal in its character. Nevertheless, it is ancient history in the pan-American world that even severe differences in business transactions or policies can be a cause for intervention, much less war.

In the modern pan-American order we no more think of the use of a gun in international business affairs than in private business affairs.

The United States, as you all know, has even removed the former vestiges of the old order, in, for example, our voiding of the Platte Amendment which gave our Nation certain rights in respect to our neighbor Cuba, the revision of our treaty with Panama, which in its original form was thought somewhat to impair the national integrity of our good friends in the Republic of Panama.

In these days when we hear so much of the greed of nations for territory and resources, it is perhaps permissible to add that any suggestions relative to any change in the existing law providing for the independence of the Philippines has come from the Filipinos themselves and not from us.

All these things that I have said simply relate to doings in our neighborhood in which I knew you were keenly interested. No discussion, of course, of international affairs could leave out of consideration, indeed of emphasis, a system and a sentiment which has given peace over a larger area to more people for a longer time than any other system in history.

What a happy prospect it is to turn our eyes to your great Nation here, to think of the long years of our unbroken friendship, the many ties of interest, understanding, mutual helpfulness, and affection which bind us together with hoops of steel.

You and I know that we could no more get along without each other sentimentally than we could get along without each other economically. What an example to the world we have given in mutual confidence and trust, in working out our differences by honest discussion or fair arbitration, in maintaining the machinery for the adjustment of frictions which inevitably develop among strong peoples, in the removal or the limitation of artificial barriers which impede the natural flow of goods and services across our thin boundary. And last, and most glorious of all, the welding together in insoluble bonds our two Nations for our common defense.

What our President said to you here at Queens College in 1938—that we would not sit idly by and see your fair land made the victim of aggression by any foreign power—was but a natural assurance of what you knew already; and but the same sentiment which your great Prime Minister, whom we so highly esteem, would have expressed in my country had circumstances made it appropriate there. In other words, it is a good idea for nations to do what husbands and wives ought to do—tell each other they love each other, even if each knows it already.

At Ogdensburg, of course, our cooperation began in earnest. Personally, as a legislator, I have the right to hope that our cooperation shall extend far beyond what was said at Ogdensburg; that our effort to build here in this continent an overflowing arsenal of democracy shall be so synchronized that it shall be as much one as are our common wills that democracy shall survive.

Is it too much to hope that the spirit of Simon Bolivar, Henry Clay, and those who have dreamed their dreams, can see this glorious spectacle in which your people and mine join together the two mightiest systems upon the face of the earth, half of all the world's people, more than half of all the world's surface, in a common friendship, common understanding, and a common purpose?

It is no Pax Romana; it is no gigantic slave state; we are not brought together under the yoke of tyranny. Ours is a new kind of empire. It is a new kingdom, a dominion of the spirit which echoes back the hosannas of the angels, "On earth peace, good will toward men."

When we have passed as we shall the crisis in this malady from which the world so bitterly suffers, our next problem shall be to think of a healthy future. Each of us, all of us, must make it his first concern that we shall not make the mistakes we have made in the past. The scales have fallen from many eyes and they no longer see as through a glass darkly. They see clearly the tragedy which has befallen a selfish and a short-sighted policy. We in our country are beginning now to be a little ashamed of ourselves, not of what we did in the World War, but of what we didn't do after that war. We are praying that we shall be big enough and wise enough this time not to try to run away from a world from which there is no escape for any of us. There was a time in your country and mine when it was easy to flee beyond the mountains, beyond the rivers, beyond the plains, from the exacting pressures behind. With both of us that time has largely passed. However we "grunt and sweat," there is no place now to flee to. We must stay and meet our problems like men.

It is not easy, of course, for your people or mine to come to the consciousness that they are just a family in a busy world community.

We have had so long security here upon our continent that many have come to confuse security with what some called isolation. Even in an earlier day we were not so much isolated that both you and we did not feel the dynamic reverberations of the earth-shaking wars of Europe. The oceans were not so broad that the soldiery of Europe could not reach again and again our own lands and the lands of our neighbors. That was before modern ships, the long-range bomber. Who can say what will be the weapons of tomorrow, when men are talking about the release of the energy of the infinitesimal particles of matter.

But we are come to see in our country that it was not the oceans which gave us our security, but the statesmanship and the courage of our leaders and our people. For over a century because of the happy accord between Great Britain and the United States in laying down and in maintaining the Monroe Doctrine, the fleets of those nations have lain like an impenetrable screen across the exits of the Old World and the entrances to the new. We recognize the farsightedness of our Jefferson who saw that the restless Napoleon was not a good neighbor.

Now not only our President but our people have come with rare unanimity and by the democratic process to the solemn resolve that we shall pour our substance out to those heroic men and women who upon any one of the world's fronts is stemming the tide of slavery.

I like to imagine that I see in spite of all its fluctuations some continuity in the sentiment of our people, a persistent adherence to the principles of freedom, independence, and justice. What we gained for ourselves we have many times helped others to gain. We will now help others to keep.

None of us can see over the hill and know just what our path will be beyond the crest, but we know the direction in which we are going. We know the faith which shall move us and guide us, both here and on the other side. We shall not be afraid of sacrifice in peace as we have not feared it in strife. Man's destiny grows fuller. He has hardly begun, even to see it, let alone to reach it. Nothing can stop his onward march.

There are some words with which I should like to close. They are the last words uttered by Woodrow Wilson in the last speech he made in the West before he fell like a brave

soldier facing the enemy. As he uttered those words I visualize him in the shining raiment of prophecy. He said:

"Now that the mists have cleared away, I believe that man will see the truth, eye to eye and face to face. There is one thing that the American people always rise to and extend their hand to, and that is the truth of justice and of liberty and of peace. We have accepted that truth and we are going to be led by it, and it is going to lead us, and through us the world, out into pastures of quietness and peace such as the world never dreamed of before."

[Address before the Canadian Club of Montreal, Canada, March 21, 1941]

DEMOCRACY IN THE MODERN WORLD

Mr. President, neighbors, and friends of Canada, President Wilson, appearing before the convention which nominated him for the governorship of New Jersey, opened his remarks with these words: "Have you ever experienced the elation of a great emotion?" One could not come, as I am privileged to do today, to address for the first time an audience of neighbors and new friends, friends which he expects to know and to cherish for a very long time, without experiencing the elation of the great emotion of happiness.

You know, we in North America are friendly people. We like to visit, and it is easy for us to know one another because we have so many things in common. We both have our oceans, our mountain ranges, our plains, our barren lands, our lakes; in the East we have industry and, westerly, agriculture.

We even have the same troubles. We make more, in factory and on farm, than we consume. We live and have our being in a great world from which we buy and to which we sell many things. The streams of world thought and the ebb of world tides wash across both our countries.

We both have politics, good, and in our case, at least on occasion, even bad politics and politicians.

We have the same traditions. We didn't, like Topsy, just grow. We both grew slowly, tediously, even painfully. We together, and many times with mutual helpfulness, turned forests into thriving cities, beautiful villages, and inviting countryside, wildernesses into farms and humming factories. We have laden the backs of our streams with burdens of commerce and harnessed the waters to the dynamos of the modern world.

We have wrought the spirit of our creative peoples into great institutions of inspiration, stability, and permanence. We have developed sentiments which we think of as colored by our own evolution of them—such sentiments as liberty, freedom, responsibility, national and personal dignity, physical, mental, and spiritual integrity.

Now, I guess we are both about grown up. I remember when I was a little past 11, somehow I got the impression that one did not become morally accountable until he reached the age of 12. I shall never forget what great satisfaction I derived from the escapades I committed in those last months before reaching 12, devilishly immune from accountability for those wrongs of which I was gleefully aware.

After a fashion I had the same experience when I got into politics. Surely, I thought, no one could be held really accountable for what he did when he was still under 40. Last fall I reached that perihelion, and, alas, I am afraid that now I shall have to answer to my constituents in Florida for what I do that they don't like. So you and I and Canada and the United States are now grown up, and we shall have to face this modern world like mature men and nations, and we shall not be able to make excuses either for our failure to understand it or to meet it. Our people and our history will observe only that we either did or did not meet that world as we should.

This modern world presents to the institution of democracy its most supreme challenge. No institution has ever struggled with a world like this because there has never been a world like this. There were never before so many people, and since people make problems, there were never before so many problems. People never lived so intimately before. They were never so interdependent. Their welfare was never so inextricably interwoven. They never were so keenly competitive as they now are. They never had so many things in common. They never had so many reasons to oppose one another for what there is. They never had so many causes to work together to enjoy what there is and to make more.

Obviously, when almost all the world can hear a man speak at the same time, when most of the world knows most of the world's news at almost the same time, when modern transportation has contracted the globe almost to a neighborhood, no part of the world or the race of man does or can live alone. Modern technology has emphasized our interdependence, for from the ends of the earth come together the elements of our daily lives. Interrupt the streams of raw materials as they move almost like falling waters toward the machines of the world and modern life would stop. Disturb the delicate equilibrium and adjustment of the labor which turns and guides those machines and life slips back at once through the centuries. Affect the delicate mechanism of the exchanges and immediately comes chaos and confusion. Burden the free movement of vital forces with unnatural restrictions and the whole economic machine groans.

Is it possible that fair balance can be kept in this giant constellation by the processes of democracy as you and I know them?

From many parts of the world the answer is an authoritative "No." This is all too vast, too complicated, too delicately balanced, too throbbingly alive to be guided by more than a single mind—steered by more than one hand. In no other way, say they, can there be the timing or the comprehensiveness which will keep it in order. It is a job, they contend, only for especial skill. It requires a particular technique which grows out of nice distinctions and subtle differentiations. It must have, they contend, scientific accuracy and no allowance can be made for human error or frailty. All must be subordinated to the central purpose. The individual must give way to the group. The individual is nothing—the state all, and above the state must be one to say, "I am the state."

Those who believe that and we who believe our way are in mortal struggle which can end only when the stronger and the right shall prevail.

It is the fiercest struggle of history. The whole world is engaged. Some contribute materials, some heroically give both men and materials. Some give their mite, and others, whom inglorious circumstances have made mute, give only their prayers; but all give something which is their stone in the edifice of our effort, bearing their own craftsmen's mark.

If our kind of democracy is to persist we must first make it work in our own nations. Second, make it work in our continent; and third, do our part to make it work in the world. Undoubtedly, to make democracy work in the modern state in this technological age, is the severest test of genius, understanding, and patience. If there is overproduction in the totalitarian state, the adjustment is made by an order. If populations are needed in one place more than another, they are simply moved, body and soul. If there is no money with which to pay them, their labor is forced by a simple decree. If funds are not to be found, currency can be issued, obligations put into circulation by simple steps of inflation, while by mere mandate prices and wages remain stable. Of course, the innocent can be robbed to fill the looters' treasury and the concentration camp or the nameless grave can stifle the remonstrances or the cry of the protestant against any ravage.

With us men and women are still sane. They can speak, assemble, write, and vote. They can stir up a terrible tempest in the political teapot. They have to be explained to as to why you do and why you don't. They have to be told why they don't get something, and if they get something why they didn't get more. They have to vote contributions to the tax gatherer. They have to be compensated for their property or their time. They have something to say as to what kind of work they do, what kind of crops they grow, and where they labor or produce.

And they insist on doing it all in their own way and in their own good time, regardless of whether that is the scientific way or not. Moreover, they must have it not only in circumstances as they want it, but by the particular method they prefer, and in getting what they want they insist that they will not give up things which may be to some just ideas, but to them are very valuable possessions.

It is clearly apparent that something must enter into the spirit of men, a new kind of willingness to assume a new kind of discipline, before such democracy can really save the modern world as we know it in our homelands.

There are some who think that any discipline is tyrannical. You and I know that the character of the disciplined depends upon its source, its authority. If our farmers, because they have an unmarketable excess, see their Congress establish a method to curtail production and to enrich their soil, if two-thirds of them in a fair election in which only farmers participate approve that method and reapprove it each year it is in force, the resulting mandate which carries out that method is not dictatorship, it is democracy.

If we agree that we will pay a minimum wage; that we will not exceed maximum hours of labor; that we will break up monopolies; that we will forbid unfair trade practices; that we will regulate commerce in its flow; that we shall require the observance of private morals in business financing; these are but the evidence of our common will imposed for the common weal. If we plan, think ahead, give and take, we surrender no liberties. We gain independence.

Of course, it is not always easy for one to fit into his or her particular place, however strong the wish to do so. Ability to serve contemplates not only willingness but training and helpful instruction. And there must be an understanding that democracy is a pearl of great price and cannot come cheaply. It must be bought with sacrifice and sometimes with "sweat and tears and blood."

We cannot ask the world to adopt and live by the principles of democracy unless we can show them that we have first made democracy work in our continent. Cooperative democracy in this hemisphere has given peace to more people over a larger area and for a longer time than the world has ever seen before. In this dreary hour, when men have so much to bring despair to their hearts, where is there a picture so inspiring, so reassuring as that which is presented over all these thousands of miles, among all of these 22 nations, among all these different people, speaking their different languages, having their variable origins, their own distinctive characteristics and aspirations?

See them, wedded together in sickness and in health, in peace and in defense, until God doth them part.

Was there ever such neighborhood in the world? It is the very antithesis of the pax romana, the totalitarian state, where unity is achieved by force. With us unity springs

from the deeper source, a deep-rooted consciousness of right, justice, interdependence, and awareness that we are not our brother's killer but our brother's keeper.

Here we meet not by summons of the gun; we sign our conventions not under the drawn sword. We come together because we want to work together, and we make our accords because true friendship is in our hearts. Our many differences, our natural frictions, we settle not by command and coercion, but by reasoning together, by give and take, by arbitration.

In all this massive land dividing the oceans we have found no problem—territorial, racial, religious, political, economic, social, or cultural—which would not melt under the radiance of these warm sentiments of mutual respect and affection.

I delight to do honor to a great American, not of our continent, but of our land, Simon Bolivar. You know the story of how this far-seeing patriot wrote a letter in 1815 to an English gentleman in the English colony of Jamaica where he had found a friendly haven from the vicissitudes of the revolution he was leading. In this letter he said:

"How beautiful it would be for the Isthmus of Panama to be for our nations what the Corinthian Isthmus was for the Greeks. Would to God that some day we might enjoy the happiness of having there an august congress of representatives of the republics, kingdoms, and empires of America to deal with the high interests of peace and of war with the nations of the other three parts of the world."

Having achieved his glorious victory at Ayachuco in 1824 the independence of the Americas was assured. The distinguished prophet of the future set about to realize his dream of a congress of American nations. Invitations were issued to the free nations of the hemisphere, including the United States. An English observer was invited as well. Here are excerpts from the memorandum sent to Great Britain:

"The Congress of Panama will bring together representatives from all the governments of America and a diplomatic agent of His Britannic Majesty. This congress seems destined to form the vastest league, the most extraordinary, and the strongest which has ever appeared on earth. * * * The human race would give a thousand thanks for this league of salvation, and America and England would receive manifold benefits from it."

The invitation concluded with this significant statement:

"Such ideas are to be found in the minds of some Americans of the highest quality; they wait with impatience for the Congress of Panama to initiate this project which may be the occasion for the consolidation of the union of the new states with the British Empire."

This congress was, of course, doomed to failure. It was too far ahead of its time. We will leave it to the historian to reflect upon what the world might have been spared had it then embraced the dream of Simon Bolivar.

But these sentiments, having found happy lodgment in the United States, finally in 1889 resulted in James G. Blaine, as Secretary of State of the United States, calling in Washington the first Pan-American Conference.

The nature of this conference, the foundations it laid for the whole structure of pan-American unity, which has so gloriously grown up since, is well stated by former President Ricardo J. Alfaro, of the Republic of Panama, who said:

"No treaties or conventions were signed at this meeting, yet its achievements were great, for it served three transcendent purposes. In the first place, it crystallized into action the latent sentiment of pan Americanism and laid down the foundations of a united America, as dreamed by Bolivar and Clay. In the second place, it gave birth to the central organ of continental action, the Commercial Bureau of the American Republics, which was the forerunner of the present Pan American Union. And last, but not least, the conference of 1889 went down in history as the first occasion upon which representatives of the great majority of the continent united in condemning the right of conquest and in proclaiming the principle of compulsory arbitration.

"* * * Pan Americanism is a structure devoted to peace and prosperity. That structure rests upon the four pillars of independence, equality, justice, and cooperation, and those four pillars were erected in 1889."

Since that historic conference there have been nine Pan American conferences, which have molded pan-American relations into an edifice of firmness, effectiveness, and permanence. An entirely new relationship among the 21 republics on your southern border has, under the impulse of this American spirit, come about. The United States has frankly reversed some of its own policies. It has laid down what it may not be too much to say has become the principle that best expresses this American spirit—the principle of the good "neighbor, who resolutely respects himself, and because he does so respects the rights of others," uttered by a worthy champion of Simon Bolivar's dream, a friend of man, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The United States now is proud of its friendship with the other nations of our world, proud of the fellowship which it enjoys with them, proud of the happy community which we have created with these great Americas, proud of the respect which each accords the others and enjoys for all, proud of the friendship of the smallest as of the largest, and no more designing upon the one than the other. It is a source of immeasurable satisfaction to us that what was once taken as policies of paternalism or maybe aggression are now taken by none except as ties that bind us together for our common defense against a common danger.

But most salutary of all is that out of this new fraternity in the Americas there has come not only sentiments of understanding and friendship but effective, efficient, constantly functioning instrumentalities and agencies for meeting and solving the myriad problems of the workaday world which affect us all. In Washington stands an imposing building which is the seat of pan-American functioning as well as sentiment. Supporting this superstructure of pan-American accord are numerous committees working through the days and the nights to improve the health, the standards of living, the cultural opportunities, the security, may I add the happiness, of a quarter of a billion men, women, and children whom God has blessed with the Americas.

And here, as you and we clasp hands across this almost imaginary border which hardly perceptibly divides us, Simon Bolivar's dream has come to a substantial reality, for which the contact between you and us, the British Commonwealth of Nations, a great and salutary world institution is brought into the comradeship of your neighbors in the Americas. Can the spectacle fail to inspire you?

A major part of the world's surface, the dominant part of the world's people, constituting two gigantic world systems meeting at an unfortified boundary between your country and mine.

How pitiful, how spiritually barren, is the so-called new state by comparison. Here no chains of slavery forged by a tyrant, no throwing of people together into the dungeons of slavery, but more than half the people of the earth saying to one another, "We want to be your friend. We want to work together in peace so that the humblest man, the frailest little child, shall have a fair chance to find a way to his own just destiny."

Is it surprising, then, that we are not afraid, that we are confident, that we defy the monsters who would crush all these fine things in their cruel and lustful grasp, who would scorch our fair lands with their flaming hate?

It gives me no little satisfaction to come fresh from the American Congress, which has laid down in the democratic way the positive policy of our people, which is understood by all—that we shall build an arsenal for democracy the like of which the world has never seen.

It is not enough to have democracy these days in a part of the world. Democracy must and can live only in a healthy environment. The world can no more be half slave and half free than can a nation be. The very nature of each philosophy makes totalitarianism and democracy mutually exclusive. They can no more live in the same earth than light and darkness can at the same time occupy the same space. The organization, the aims, the very spirit of each is repugnant to the other. Now the struggle is on, the issue joined as to which shall live and which shall die. The first task then is to throw back the beast which leaps at us all, to strangle him into impotence, to destroy his power, to disturb the orderly progress of man upward.

That we shall do, each in his own way, consistently with his own traditions and institutions, but so cooperatively that there shall be no doubt about the unity and the effectiveness of the common effort. And we shall stay at it until the job is done, because it is the history of our people that having taken hold we don't turn loose.

When that job is done in due course, then we shall have to think about what we ought to do to encourage a cooperative peace and progress in the world. Not one of us, I am sure, but what is willing to do his or her part; not one of us has a thought of shirking our fair share of responsibility; not one of us is unwilling to measure fairly and squarely the risk of doing something with the risk of doing nothing.

Whatever form it may take, we know that the pillars of the structure will be the principles of the good neighbor which prevail with us here—"the neighbor who resolutely respects himself and, because he does so, respects the rights of others."

In the foundations can be no other supports than willingness to admit the other man's rights while you insist upon your own, earnest recognition of the interdependence of us all, sincere desire to cooperate helpfully with one another, acceptance of the principles of honest discussion or fair arbitration as a method of settling differences, recognition that whatever impairs or obstructs the fullest possible exchange of goods, services, ideas, and inspirations harms all, and, above all, understanding that the most glorious monument that man can build is not a dazzling state but a healthy, busy, happily striving people.

While the sky is dark, while the hearts of men are heavy, and the cries of the anguished echo around the world, those of us who have never lost our faith in man and man's God know that the darkest hour comes just before the dawn and from the fallow ground of suffering have sprung forth the most beautiful specimens of the spirit.

The portals of the future are ajar. They challenge us to open them and through them to enter into the abundance, the security, and the beauty of a better world.

[Address before the Canadian Club of Toronto, Canada, at noon, March 17, 1941; the Canadian Club of Ottawa, Canada, March 19, 1941; and the Canadian Club and the Canadian Women's Club, at Quebec, Canada, March 22, 1941]

SHALL DEMOCRACY MEET THE CHALLENGE OF TODAY?

Mr. Chairman, friends, and neighbors, you can imagine what a thrill and what a joy it is for one who has admired you so much to be able to come to know you—to greet you for the first time. To me this is a significant occasion, because I venture to believe that I am making friends whom I shall long cherish, and I have the stimulating consciousness that I am in the flood of friendship which flows in ever-increasing volume between your country and mine. I know of no happier picture than that of the comradeship and the cordiality of the United States and Canada; not just of the Governments of our two countries, as intimate as they are, but the people themselves, in whatever part of our respective countries they live.

Surely Canada has no better friends than in my State of Florida, which lies far to our south. Many of your people come to visit with us, and we accept them as one always does when a good neighbor comes to see him. Many of our people, in turn have the privilege of visiting your inviting land and come back again and again for refreshment, recreation, trade, and sometimes residence.

It is easy for us to be friends, of course, for we have learned here in the Americas that the test of virtue is what you are and not where you come from, what race you belong to, what language you speak, or what is your faith. Here in our great countries people readily lose all allegiance save to our own fallow ground. There is something about our mountains, our plains, our rolling rivers, our pulsating lakes, our great forests and wide fields, even the waters from the broad Pacific and the Atlantic which lave our shores, that bind us together with hoops of steel. We are proud to say that we are Americans, first, last, and all the time.

We have out of a common experience developed common traditions and concepts. When men and brave women pull down the forests, clear the fields, open up the wilderness in a new land they become comrades whether they do it north or south of a given line of latitude.

Our forebears came here with a new spirit. They were resolved that there should not only be here something different, but something new. And by newness they meant not only new fields and new homes and new shops; they meant new institutions and particularly a new spirit. They meant to do things in a new way because they had seen how the old way had borne down upon them, its burdens of sadness and sorrow. How it had frustrated the dreams of the multitudes for peace, security, abundance, happiness. They had followed son after father and son after father in the long lines, the unending lines, of those whom jealous conflict had led to an obedient soldier's grave. There was always generation after generation, a tearful mother, a sad wife, who were no less the victims of the old way than those who died.

Hence, here we sought understanding of each other's problems, adjustment in an honorable way of recurring frictions which are the incidents of innumerable contacts between busily striving people. So well have we succeeded that over 5,000 miles of boundary, barely perceptible to us, demark you from us, without a sentinel or a fort, without a thought of fear each of the other. We have through the long years lived the policy which our President promulgated in his first inaugural, the policy of the good neighbor; "the neighbor who resolutely respects himself, and because he does so, respects the rights of others."

But we have gone far beyond a neighborly relation which just forbids each to attack the other. We have made the concept of neighborhood an attitude of mutual helpfulness. We not only visit together, we work together in the same spirit in which the pioneers of both our lands built together their homes and churches and schools in the wild wilderness.

Knowing that trade is the lifeblood of our prosperity, we have sought in every way possible to remove or to diminish impediments to its natural flow between us; and our aim, of course, goes far beyond what we have so far been able to achieve. We have set up and propose to maintain a continuous body which shall concern itself not only with the adjustment of questions of boundary and the like but with any other problem the adjustment of which is mutually desirable to promote cordial and profitable contacts and cooperation between us.

And now we are wedded together in the greatest effort of our history, each in his own way, in accordance with its own tradition and circumstance, to throw back this monster who strikes at us from beyond the seas, who wills to destroy all these fine things we have won and saved from the "sweat, tears, and blood" of the past.

What was said by your great Prime Minister, who holds such high place in our regard, and our President at Ogdenburg, was what our respective peoples, of course, expected them to say. And what has been done to promote the common defense since that time, and what is yet further to be done, is simply a reflection of our determination to stand shoulder to shoulder in this hour of greatest peril. I know that you and I hope and expect that the military aspects of our cooperation will be the least part of it all. We hope as laymen and as citizens that our economies, the productive facilities of our two nations, shall be so molded that they make a common front and an overflowing arsenal against which this sinister enemy cannot stand.

In this coordination which will be another great step in world pioneering, where the money comes from, where the machines are, on which side of a line of latitude they stand, by whom they are operated, is really immaterial. The important thing is that they are soldiers of democracy, who shall together bring victory to our honorable cause.

It is not men with guns, I venture to say, but men and women who man these whirling machines, who shall eventually strangle into impotence these brigands who aim at nothing less than the loot of the world.

It gives me not a little satisfaction to come to you now fresh from the Congress of the United States, which has in the democratic way laid down the forthright policy of the people of the United States. You know that we have resolved to spare no expense, to shirk at no sacrifice to make our country a Niagara of support to those heroic peoples who stand today with indescribable valor in the front lines. You and they can count upon it that we are with you to the end. We have adopted in our hearts those words which were the spirit of Verdun, "They shall not pass."

We hope only that it may be said that our effort is as splendid as yours, for we know that it is no less our cause than your own. This thing is no European war, no boundary dispute, no struggle for trade. It is a world shaking revolution led by the most sinister genius who has appeared to degrade the name of man. It aims to shake from their foundations every institution which we have built in our world, to strangle every dream which has burst from our hearts, to tear asunder the pattern of these lives which we have woven from the sacrifice of our honorable ancestors.

Not law, not justice, not right, is their creed, but—

"The simple plan,
He may take who has the power,
He may keep who can."

They propose not only to take from us what we have gained from our labors but the very liberty which to us is life itself. This devilish Samson, in the agony of his blind hate, is willing to run the risk of his own destruction in order to pull down the temples of our world. All that he preaches, all that he teaches, is the antithesis of what we believe. Where he raises race to hate race, nation to hate nation, creed to hate creed, paganism to hate religion, we have all these years been trying to bring men together in the realm of understanding and in the spirit of tolerance. Instead of setting religion against religion, we have lifted our eyes to the horizon of the world and seen there many honest men and many honest faiths.

One, Harry Romaine, has expressed what he saw in these words:

"At the Muezzin's call for prayer,
The kneeling faithful thronged the square,
And on Pushkara's lofty height
The dark priest chanted Brahma's might.
Amid a monastery's weeds
An old Franciscan told his beads;
While to the synagogue there came
A Jew to praise Jehovah"s name.
The one great God looked down and smiled
And counted each His loving child;
For Turk and Brahman, monk and Jew
Had reached Him through the gods they knew."

We have shown the world that men do not have to speak the same language, belong to the same race, look or dress alike, to respect one another and to live together in peace and brotherhood.

What a discouraging spectacle it is when there was so much to indicate the race's progress toward peace and understanding, one part with another, to have these jungle forces to rear their ugly heads across our path.

Here in Canada two great races have found friendship and accord. In my country many races from many lands have become one people. Here in this continent even nations have come to be members of a happy neighborhood.

I like to let memory run back to Simon Bolivar, a great American, who held up first in a letter to an English gentleman in Jamaica who had given his weary body and mind refuge in 1815, the dream of a happy family of American nations living in cordial and free intimacy with another neighborhood, the British nations. What romance there is in seeing this dream echoed and reechoed in the eloquence of patriots and prophets of our lands and finally coming into reality in 1889 in the first Pan American Congress called by one of your closest neighbors, James G. Blaine, of Maine, then Secretary of State of the United States.

You know that since that eventful congress there have been nine additional congresses of the 21 American republics lying beyond your southern border. Now, the world knows that pan Americanism is one of the most vital forces in the affairs of men. Through it there has come about a new relationship, a new spirit throughout these many nations, these many people, stretching over these many thousands of miles, permeating many races, bringing together men of many origins.

This system, be it known, has given peace and tranquillity to more people, over a longer period of time, throughout a larger area, than has ever been seen in the world before. It has not only established the principles of the

good neighbor, of equality, justice, honorable dealing, one nation with another, but it has been the means of these 21 republics actually setting up the functioning machinery of cooperation.

This cooperation covers the whole field of our relationships. It is working for our common defense. It is strengthening our several economies. It is promoting better understanding of one another's language, culture, and aspirations. What it means is that what the world has known as Americanism is now not confined to any segment of these great continents of ours, but to the whole area from Arctic to Antarctic.

I include the people of Canada, of course, when I speak of these American sentiments, because what has now grown up, the principles which are now cherished among us and our neighbors to the south, some geographically remote from us, have been from a time whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary the sentiments between my country and yours.

Have you realized what it means for the people of Canada and the United States to be joined together in friendship; have you realized that through us across this thin boundary line come together the two greatest political systems in all the world, in peace, understanding, good will, and now in common unshakable resolve?

What could be so comforting to him who has flashes of fear from all these horrible things that are now going on in the world, as to realize that the mightiest assault of history has not only left these two systems, the British Commonwealth and pan-America, unshaken, but stronger in their unity than they have ever been, both introsystem and intersystem. It does not seem to us that there are insurmountable barriers to the spread of the sentiments which have made up these systems to other nations and other peoples of like mind and heart.

Our first task, of course, is to chain the international culprits to the stocks, to shut them in the prison walls of impotence, to take the dangerous weapons from their hands; then men of good will may lay down their arms and sense the inexpressible satisfactions of peace.

Then will be the time for men to plan their peace. Not only to cherish it but to nurture it, so that it shall grow from a frail plant to a giant, unshakable tree.

You and I know how we have flung away opportunities to save the peace in the past. You will understand me, I know, when I say that I know how culpable my own country has been; that our regret is not what we did in the last war but what we did not do when the storm of that struggle had passed. We have not committed the only error, either of omission or commission, which has been committed. We are not alone at fault. Some of our leaders have not been the only ones who did not see.

But when the mischief has been undone again the test of the sincerity of our repentance will be what use we make of future opportunities.

What is there to prevent the application of the principles of pan-Americanism to the wide world—to other hemispheres as well as our own? It may or may not be too soon, even when peace is with us again, to set up the superstate or a proven form of world organism, but it will certainly not be too soon for the representatives of all the nations of the earth, great and small, black and white, yellow and brown, to establish the habit of meeting together, of talking about common problems, of setting up the machinery of cooperation, in meeting those things that threaten us all—disease, crime, poor food, poor shelter, poor working conditions—to work out the many noncontroversial ways in which we may help one another, all may help each.

I will not believe that any one of the British Commonwealth or of the pan-American republics would object to such an effort and would withhold its honest cooperation from such an aim.

There has never been such an opportunity as there will be when this outbreak of outlawry shall again be suppressed; there has never been the intimacy among the peoples of the world there now is, physically, intellectually, spiritually. A man now speaks and the world hears him, writes and the world reads him, thinks and the world thinks with him. If there was ever any doubt that any of us was not an integral part of this great world organism, that doubt has passed away. We move in the rapidly flowing stream of life all along together, whether we want it or not, whether we know it or not. If we would guide our own course, we must guide the course of it all, for where they go, we go, and where we go, all go.

Destiny has chosen your people and mine to have an honorable part in our time. At each stage in our history we have seen the expanding frontier. First it crossed the mountains, then the rivers and the plains. It stopped not at the mountains again. Finally it reached the moving waters of the Pacific. Since we have seen it stretch to the north and to the south. It moves in its irresistible march across yet other rivers, other plains, more mountain ranges, until it passes the torrid lands of the Equator and finally reaches the cold seas of the Antarctic. Now it has changed direction, but it moves on, for we have come to see that frontiers are not geographic but mental and spiritual.

But those who shall break the new ground as the new pioneers must have the intrepid spirit of the old. They must be unafraid, strong, and have in their minds no thought except forward, ever forward.

The fascinating adventure of this future reaches out its hand to us. Under the leadership of Winston Churchill, McKenzie King, and Franklin D. Roosevelt we shall take that hand, and in the words of Woodrow Wilson, who fell leading the hope of an earlier day, "it shall lead us, and through us, the world, out into pastures of quietness and peace such as the world never dreamed of before."

Presentation of State Flag of Wisconsin at Independence Hall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on March 24, 1941, it was my privilege to present the State flag of Wisconsin for inclusion in the permanent display of State flags in Independence Hall.

The flag was the gift of the Wisconsin Society of the Sons of the American Revolution as an expression of honor and reverence for the Revolutionary War soldiers buried in Wisconsin.

It was a great honor to present the flag of my State to the Mayor of Philadelphia for the collection in Independence Hall, because I believe that in these troubled times particularly the presentation of this flag may, in a sense, symbolize our national unity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this very brief presentation speech inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: My pleasure in being permitted to be here with you today is tempered only by a distinct regret that the late Mrs. George Horace Lorimer, who gave so unsparingly of her time and thought to the creation of this "trooping of the State colors" in Independence Hall, is not with us. She was one of the truly great patriotic women of our time.

At the outset of this ceremony I should like to acknowledge a debt of gratitude to this outstanding patriot for her fervent interest and for her work in arranging for the display of the State flags. In a real sense this proceeding today is a memorial to her.

I should like also to acknowledge my appreciation to Mrs. Robert Carson and her associates in the Hannah Penn House for the painstaking care which they have devoted to this presentation. In so doing I know that they are building a memorial not only to a worth-while cause but also to a beloved associate.

At this time may I also express my appreciation to Mr. Alonzo H. Wilkinson, of Milwaukee, Wis., who arranged for the gift of the Wisconsin State flag by the Wisconsin Society of the Sons of the American Revolution as an expression of honor and reverence for the Revolutionary War soldiers buried in Wisconsin.

It is an honor for me to be present with you people today, in this hallowed hall. Independence Hall is a patriotic shrine for all America. It is a cathedral of American hopes and American ideals.

As we step across its threshold, we embrace the memories of those great men who lived in the formative period of our Nation. Here in this very hall Washington and Jefferson, Franklin and Adams, Hamilton and Lee, Hancock, Sherman, Morris, Rush, Wilson, and Livingston, and other great nation-builders met and discussed the affairs of state.

Every schoolboy knows the story of Independence Hall. It is the first place we want to see when we come to Philadelphia. My visit here today brings back pleasant memories of former years when, as a young man, I walked through these sacred halls.

As I entered the building today, I felt the same thrill, the same fervor, that I did in my first visit.

The history of this building dates from that chilly morning in 1732 when the 30 members of the Provincial Assembly reached the still-uncompleted Statehouse.

This building on that sultry 4th of July in 1776 saw the Declaration of Independence receive the signatures which made it official. It was here on July 16, 1775, that Washington was given command of the Continental Army. It was here on July 9, 1778, that the Thirteen Colonies were welded into a union by the ratification of the Articles of Confederation.

It was here on September 17, 1787, that the Constitution was drawn. It was here in 1848 that the draped body of John Quincy Adams lay in state in the same room where his father had fought for independence. It was here some 4 years later that a funeral procession bearing torches arrived at midnight with the body of Henry Clay.

This building saw Independence Square thronged with people singing deliriously as

Richmond fell. It was here just 2 weeks later that a double file of soldiers marched in lockstep to the south door of Independence Hall bearing on their shoulders the casket of the martyred Lincoln.

Independence Square is alive with the memories of the famous 100 working days with George Washington presiding in his high-backed chair, and turning now and then to speak to the aging Benjamin Franklin.

Independence Square saw the creation of the Federal Government and the Constitution, the Army, the Navy, and the Mint. It was here that the Jay Treaty was debated and ratified. It was here that Washington was inaugurated for a second term. It was here on September 17, 1796, that he delivered his Farewell Address.

Independence Square for three-quarters of a century was the stage on which the great drama of a new nation was unfolded. We could say of Independence Square, as Byron said of Greece, "Where'er we tread, 'tis haunted holy ground."

The corporeal heritage of those stirring days lives here in Philadelphia, but the spirit of independence and freedom which was born in these halls lives today in the hearts and minds of men and women and children all over America. It is a proud part of the birthright of every American. It is a part of the heritage of each of our States.

I come from a section of the country about which the founding fathers knew little or nothing, but down through the years we, too, have lived and breathed in the spirit of this glorious heritage whose shrine is here in Philadelphia. I bring to Independence Hall today the flag of a State about which the founding fathers scarcely dreamed.

Of course, Wisconsin's vast area of some 56,000 square miles had already been traversed by the French explorers. That French period began with Jean Nicolet's voyage to the heart of Wisconsin in 1634 and it ended with the Treaty of Paris in 1763. It was a period when Wisconsin was a far-flung fringe on the French-Canadian life which had its heart along the St. Lawrence River. It was through the historic gateway of the St. Lawrence River that Wisconsin was discovered and explored more than three centuries ago by the men of New France.

It is not my purpose to discuss here today the history of this land crossed by the great glaciers more than a million years ago. It is not my purpose to tell you a story of timber and trapping, of the stark daring of frontier life in the northland, of the century when we were the favored recruiting ground of the French, of the courageous explorations by the missionaries, of the alliance which the Wisconsin Indians made in 1778 with George Rogers Clark.

It is not my purpose to discuss the two centuries of romance which preceded the days when Wisconsin emerged from the winding Indian trails unto the broad highways of a great agricultural, dairying, and industrial State.

I am interested, however, in recalling to your minds the fact that when John Jay and John Adams went to Paris to join Benjamin Franklin, the fate of the West and the fate of Wisconsin was at stake. There was a treaty signed on September 3, 1783, and under the terms of that treaty Wisconsin was included in the United States.

Again at the time of the War of 1812, the fate of Wisconsin was dependent upon a European treaty. The Treaty of Ghent ended European control in the Northwest, and Wisconsin territory was still a part of the United States.

It is well today that in this birthplace of independence we recall that this Wisconsin flag represented a territory once dominated by European control.

For the most part, during the revolutionary days, my State was a land of virgin forests, inhabited only by the painted tribesmen of Wisconsin. Its towering pines reached upward to the sky, and its great lakes, Superior and Michigan, and the great "Father of Waters," the Mississippi River, were known only to few, and they only thought of them as names associated with distant lands.

But now, thank God, this State which I have the honor to represent in the United States Senate is one of the Original Thirteen. We are one country—one people.

It is a great happiness I am experiencing today. I bring to you the flag of my Commonwealth, to be placed in this sacred depository along with the other State flags as a symbol of national unity. Each of our flags becomes a part of the greater flag—the red, the white, and the blue of America. Each flag symbolizes a star in the firmament of the United States.

This Commonwealth, which I have the honor of representing and which was little known in the days when this Nation was born, now has a population comparable to that of the Thirteen Original Colonies. In the State of Wisconsin we have great and beautiful cities, fertile farm lands, sparkling brooks, thousands of inland lakes, and great rivers—a land singularly blessed by the Creator and extending from the rolling hill country of southern Wisconsin to the pine-crowned Apostle Islands of the Chequamegon Bay of Lake Superior and from the rugged western sentinel cliffs of the Mississippi to the broad expanse of sandy beaches fronting Lake Michigan.

Wisconsin, thoroughly American, is a melting pot of the strong races of the world—races who have met here and formed a great, sturdy, and industrious people.

Though, according to the rich historical lore of Wisconsin, our State made provisions for a flag as early as 1863, it was not until 1913 that our State flag was officially adopted. Since our State flag consists of the State coat-of-arms, it is interesting for us to briefly consider the history of the great seal and the coat-of-arms of Wisconsin.

Our State was admitted to the Union on May 29, 1848, and on June 21 of that year the first great seal of the State was engraved. Gov. Nelson Dewey didn't like the first great seal of the State, however, and in 1851 he took steps to have a more satisfactory one provided. We are told that when he went to New York he carried with him a design which had been prepared at his request by Chancellor John H. Lathrop of the University of Wisconsin.

It was said that Governor Dewey took the design with him with the intention of having it engraved. According to the story, as he was walking down Wall Street, he met Edward G. Ryan, afterward chief justice of the supreme court of Wisconsin. Governor Dewey showed Mr. Ryan the design and Mr. Ryan pointed out several features which he disapproved. That discouraged Governor Dewey and he abandoned the design.

Then the two men sat down together on the steps of one of the banks on Wall Street and worked out the design which is today the present coat-of-arms and the great seal of the State. The new seal was practically a reproduction of the seal of 1851, though some changes were made.

The coat of arms of the State of Wisconsin is in reality a part of the State seal and consists of a quartered shield—the quarters bearing, respectively, a plow for agriculture, an arm and hammer to represent manufacturing, a shovel and pick to represent mining, and an anchor to represent navigation.

In the center of the shield there is a smaller shield with 13 upright bars, as shown in the coat of arms of the United States. Around the smaller shield is a double circle or garter on which appears the motto of the United States, "E pluribus unum." The motto and seal of the United States were both included as symbols of Wisconsin's loyalty to the Union.

Beneath the larger shield is a pyramid of pig lead and a cornucopia or horn of plenty. The lead indicates Wisconsin's mineral wealth and the cornucopia indicates the general resources for prosperity in Wisconsin.

There are two supporters of the larger shield. The dexter or right supporter is a sailor holding a coil of rope which represents labor by water. On the left or sinister side there is a yeoman with his left hand resting on a pick. He represents labor by hand.

Just above the shield is the form of the badger from which our State derives its familiar designation as the Badger State. Above the crest on a banner is the word "Forward," the motto of the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, I present this flag not only to be a part of a State display of flags, but to emphasize that unity of purpose, that oneness of ideals by which we as a Nation may go forward.

Here in Independence Hall today, it is well for us to reconsecrate ourselves to the beliefs which first found their expression in this hallowed place; to rededicate our lives to the cause which was born in Independence Square to recovenant our faith in our way of life; to rekindle in our hearts the fervor and the flame of loyalty and devotion of a united people to the United States. There are challenges today as great as those which confronted the men who from this hall began a crusade which has given us the greatest land and the greatest people which the world has known since the beginning of time.

It is my hope that we will meet the challenge of this ruthless era with the same sincerity and abiding faith which characterized the men of Independence Hall. In that high hope, Mr. Chairman, I present this flag as a symbol of Wisconsin's devotion to the unity of this great land.

Address Before American Legion, Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM LANGER, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] before the Second Division Post of the American Legion at Washington, D. C., on March 18, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Post Commander and members of the Legion, I feel greatly honored by your invitation this evening.

I am a newcomer to Washington. I come from the great prairie State, North Dakota.

In North Dakota we still are proud of the boys who went to war in 1917 and 1918. We have done many things for World War veterans. In 1919, the legislature of our State enacted and the State paid the largest State bonus ever paid to World War veterans. We paid $25 per month for each month while in the military service. Some of our boys got as high as $800 State bonus. I understand that in the District of Columbia no bonus was paid and that in many of the Eastern States only a small State bonus was paid. Our bonus was paid in cash by direct taxation and our people gladly paid it because they knew of the sacrifices which our boys made. We have for a number of years maintained a State service commissioner on the State pay roll, whose sole duty is to look after claims of veterans and their dependents. All of this may be done when a free people have a voice in their government. I have always felt, and now feel that it is the first duty of a State or a country to take care of its citizens first, to protect the economic status of the ordinary citizens and to see that the average man and woman gets a square deal. That is why when I was Governor of my State I invoked a moratorium on mortgage foreclosures so that the average citizen who owned a home or a farm might recover his economic status. A nation is no stronger than its citizens. To have a strong nation we must have happy and contented people who own their homes and are free from burdensome debts and worries. While my primary interests are directed to saving of the agricultural interests from economic ruin I have in my heart a deep desire that this Nation shall fairly and justly treat the Nation's defenders in the last war.

In the early part of the World War Congress enacted the War Risk Insurance Act, which provided among other things for the payment of compensation to men in the military or naval forces of the United States and also provided for the issuance of insurance. The two things are separate. As you men know, if you wanted to have insurance, you must have made application therefor and paid the necessary premiums. About four and one-half million applied for this insurance. Millions of your dollars were paid into the Treasury of the United States as premiums on this insurance. Compensation was payable whether you applied for insurance, but insurance was payable only if you paid the premiums, except during the short period of time in which so-called automatic insurance was in force. The Government required you to keep your part of the contract, and I feel, like a great many others, that the Government should keep its part of the contract. The insurance contract provided insurance against death or permanent and total disability. No one explained to you at the time just what constituted permanent and total disability. Total disability was defined by regulation as any impairment of mind or body which prevents the disabled person from following continuously any substantial gainful occupation, and total disability was deemed to be permanent when it was founded upon conditions which made it reasonably certain the total disability would continue throughout an insured's lifetime.

Many thought that in order to obtain their insurance one would have to refrain from all work. The insurance issued in 1917-18 was not authoritatively defined until many years later when the Supreme Court in January 1934 spoke in the Lumbra decision. The Supreme Court held that one did not have to be bedridden in order to recover, and that the mere fact that one had done some work would not prevent a recovery for permanent and total benefits on the insurance contract. It was not until this decision came down that a great many persons entitled to insurance knew what their rights were under the insurance contracts. In the meantime, the right to file suit on such claims for insurance had expired some 8 years before this authoritative decision was rendered. In order to have the right to file suit the claim for insurance, unless within a 6-year period, must have been filed prior to July 2, 1931. In other words, the Supreme Court of the United States did not make any definite decision as what constituted permanent and total disability under the contract of insurance until 3 years after the present statute of limitations had run. I am, of course, speaking of the claims for insurance from 1918 and 1919. The Veterans' Bureau, and later the Veterans' Administration, has rated a large number of cases at, say, 65- to 90-percent disability for compensation purposes. Many of these veterans have never worked since they came back from the war, or they may have worked for short periods of time. They were under the mistaken impression until the Supreme Court spoke that they could not recover because the Veterans' Bureau had never rated them 100 percent disabled. This is not true, but when they found out that fact they no longer had a right to bring suit on their claims.

The act of March 20, 1933, also known as the Economy Act, repealed all rights under the insurance contracts, and from this date until the Supreme Court 2 years later, in the Lynch and Wilner decisions, held this repealing clause was unconstitutional, veterans did not file claims. This little-known decision of the Supreme Court, scarcely mentioned in the press of this country, is one of the most important decisions ever rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States. It holds that the United States Government cannot repudiate its contracts. That the insurance which you men had constituted contracts, and that if you had any rights under them, that the Government could not take away such rights without violating the Constitution of the United States. But because Congress did pass such a statute attempting to take away these rights, many persons thought it was a valid act and saw no use of filing claims if such benefits were repealed.

A suit also cannot be brought against the Government without a disagreement. That means that the claim for insurance must be denied by the Veterans' Administration before a suit may be filed. Much confusion arose when a disagreement existed, and Congress defined this by an act of January 28, 1935, and made the provisions retroactive as of July 3, 1930. Prior to that time a claimant had to prosecute his claim through the appellate boards of the Veterans' Administration. When this retroactive statute was enacted the statute of limitations began to run as of July 3, 1930, or when a denial was made by a subordinate board. This resulted in many decisions which appear to me to be unjust. The Frank Parker case arising in West Virginia is a fair example. Parker filed a suit prior to January 28, 1935, after a denial of his insurance claim by an inferior board. This suit was filed in the northern district of West Virginia. Under the ruling of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, the suit had to be dismissed because he had not prosecuted his claim to a final decision in the Veterans' Administration. He therefore dismissed his suit and then proceeded to further prosecute his claim in the Veterans' Administration.

He got a final denial and filed suit, and in the meantime the act of January 28, 1935, had been enacted. The district court held that the action was then barred by limitations. A third suit was filed within 1 year as it is provided may be done under the statute where the prior suit was dismissed for a reason not affecting the merits, and this suit was dismissed because it was held that Parker had his day in court and the issue was res judicata. The case was appealed, but the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit held that Parker had a "trial on the merits" and that he had his day in court. Certiorari to the Supreme Court was not asked, because shortly after the circuit court held this World War hero had his day in court he died from his wounds. He had lost a leg overseas and had spent the major portion of his time since discharge in hospitals of the United States. I mention this case in passing simply to show you the importance of the giving to every veteran a right of a real day in court where his case may be heard upon its merits and not upon technical defenses.

I am informed that the principal defenses of the Department of Justice to this class of litigation is technical defenses, such as the statute of limitations.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars have had a bill introduced abolishing all statutes of limitations in insurance cases. There is much merit in this contention. Why should any government who entered into a contract and sends its men to foreign lands to fight an enemy have any qualms about hearing cases on their merits and not on technical defenses? At common law there is no statute of limitations. It was not until the legislative body enacted a statute that one was prevented from going into court and having his claim heard upon its merits. The statute of limitations has been the refuge of the cheater and the dead beat—the man who did not want to pay his legitimate debts. It was enacted primarily against stale claims, but insurance claims are not in this category. The Government, through the Veterans' Administration and the War Department, have complete records of all veterans. These are official records entitled to be admitted as evidence. There is very little opportunity that a fraud may be perpetrated upon the Government. The cases can be and will be heard upon their merits if my bill is enacted.

Senate bill 954 simply extends the time for filing suit on these claims, and makes a few more exceptions to the general statute, which has not been amended since July 3, 1930.

It preserves the right of trial by jury, and provides that suit may be brought either in the District of Columbia or the district in which the claimant resides. It goes somewhat further in that it permits the recovery of costs and interest against the Government. In this respect it makes the law uniform. Interest and costs may be taxed against the Government in all civil suits except in war-risk insurance cases. If you file a suit in the Court of Claims, you recover your costs, and if you obtain judgment you are entitled to interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum until the judgment is paid. These provisions I have written into the bill for the reason that I feel that the veteran is entitled to the same rights as any other citizen who may sue the Government.

The bill also provides that the remedy under act to proceed by suit shall not prevent a court from compelling the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs from performing his duty by paying claims. When the Supreme Court of the United States in 1940 overruled the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in cases arising under section 305 of the World War Veterans' Act, by holding that insurance might be revived after July 2, 1927, there were, I am informed, several hundreds of cases pending in the Veterans' Administration which were payable under this decision. Some of these cases have been paid, but in some of them, new ratings have been made and the provisions of section 305 of the act have been defeated. The courts hold that a new rating for compensation cannot be made which would defeat the provisions of section 305 of the act. But the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs pays no attention to the law as laid down by the courts, he still continues to make such ratings. Many

claims have been denied. The courts cannot compel the Administrator to pay the claims, although they are clearly payable under the law and the facts, and suit cannot be brought because the statute of limitations bars suits. The courts have held that where a remedy is available, that mandamus will not lie. It is difficult to reconcile this rule with the principles of right and justice but it is the rule as laid down by the courts and suits here in the District of Columbia, otherwise clearly payable have been dismissed. I, therefore, provide in the bill that the right of suit on the insurance contract is not exclusive; that the courts of proper jurisdiction may also compel the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay claims for insurance which are clearly payable under the law and the facts.

I have also provided in the bill that mere delay in prosecuting a claim shall not create any presumption. The courts have arbitrarily created this rule, and I feel that it should be abolished. So long as there is a right of suit, no presumption should be created against the claimant. In trials of this character, involving permanent and total disability, medical testimony is of the utmost importance. Such medical experts are better qualified to state whether an insured is able to work. I feel that they should have this right. I have therefore provided in the bill that they may state their opinion on the ultimate fact for the benefit of the jury or the court.

The Government has taken many appeals in war-risk insurance cases. Many of the judgments obtained by claimant have been affirmed on appeal. The cost of printing briefs, attending court, and other incidental expense has been thrown upon counsel for the plaintiffs. Under the present law, a claimant cannot recover costs. The attorneys are entitled to no greater fee than if there had been no appeal. I therefore feel that the Government should pay an extra attorney's fee as costs if they without merit appeal from a judgment. This will stop the Government attorneys from taking appeals where the judgments are meritorious. The fee is small, at any rate, being limited to 10 percent of the amount recovered. The bill simply adds that amount of fee to be paid by the Government if it loses on appeal. This will stop appeals being taken simply to harrass a claimant. It follows closely the statutes in many States imposing a fee as a penalty for an appeal taken without merit.

I have further provided in the bill that the verdict of a jury should not be lightly set aside; that if two juries find that an insured is permanent and total that no court shall set aside such a verdict. There has been a growing tendency upon the part of circuit courts to substitute their judgment on the facts and set aside the jury's verdict. The recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Leroy A. Berry on March 3, 1941, may stop this practice. Berry recovered a judgment on his war-risk insurance contract in the District of Vermont. The Government, not satisfied, appealed, and the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, which sits 300 miles from the place of trial, set aside that verdict and ordered the action dismissed. Berry, however, asked the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari, which was granted. On March 3, 1941, the Supreme Court, in an opinion by Mr. Justice Black, reversed the circuit court and affirmed the judgment of the district court. The Supreme Court said that issues of fact were for the juries and not for a reviewing court to substitute its judgment. I hope that this decision will put a stop to the prevailing practice of the circuit courts.

In plain words, I am only asking that a disabled veteran, so disabled that he could not perform any gainful occupation, be given the right to come into court and have his case heard on its merits.

St. Lawrence Waterway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS M. BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1941

LETTER BY HON. PRENTISS M. BROWN, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, several Senators have suggested that I place in the RECORD a letter which I sent to the chairman of the Commerce Committee a few days ago. I do not in this communication intend to touch on the larger aspects of the proposal but to call attention to certain related matters and obtain expert opinion on them, particularly as they affect Michigan.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
March 25, 1941.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: I write you in regard to the general subject of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway. I realize that there has been no definite assignment of the matter to the Committee on Commerce. Some suggestions were made on the floor of the Senate yesterday. I interposed to say that consideration might be given to the matter of joint reference to Commerce and Foreign Relations. This has been done in some instances. However, regardless of the reference of the subject matter, the inquiries I here am about to make affect water-borne commerce on the Great Lakes.

Great Lakes commerce is a very important factor in our economic life. It is probable that more tonnage floats on the Detroit River than on any other comparable stream in the world. Duluth Harbor is second only to New York Harbor in total cargo tonnage. Tonnage passing through the locks at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., is greater over the years than the tonnage passing through the next three largest canals in the world—the Panama, the Suez, and the Kiel. Approximately 90 percent of our iron ore, which is probably the most vital single commodity in our defense program, is transported for the major part of its journey from mine to mill on the waters of the Great Lakes. The journey is close to 1,000 miles in length. It is often said that the Great Lakes provide the cheapest carriage of commodities to be found anywhere.

The Government of the United States, through the War Department, in the construction of the Soo Canal and locks, the deepening of the connecting waters between Superior and Huron, Huron and Erie, and the improvement of various harbors, has been a great factor in the development of this commerce and unquestionably has made the cost of iron and steel and the multitudinous commodities that come from this basic industry much cheaper than would be the case otherwise.

I am not without experience in relation to these matters, and the inquiries I make are the result of considerable thought on my part over the years. I would appreciate it if you would forward a copy of this letter to Maj. Gen. Julian L. Schley, Chief of Engineers, War Department, for comment on my questions and observations.

The questions I have to ask of the War Department are there:

Would it be possible to raise the level of Lakes Huron and Michigan by the construction of works at Port Huron at the foot of Lake Huron, at the source of the St. Clair River?

Would the construction of such works to retard the flow of water there require similar works at the foot of Lake Erie at the source of the Niagara River?

Would the raising of the levels of these lakes, the levels of which are much below their original or natural height, be the economic thing to do considering these two opposing factors:

(1) Possible damage to shore lines necessitating the raising of docks, etc.?

(2) Eliminating the necessity of deepening many harbors?

The damage to docks and other riparian rights, it seems to me, would not be very great if we raise the level to the 1929 figure, which as I recall it was slightly over 582 feet. In 1936 the Michigan-Huron level was slightly over 577 feet or a 5-foot drop.

In this connection in my own time I have seen the levels of Lakes Michigan and Huron vary, according to the best of recollection, around 5 or 6 feet. It occurs to me that if we could put 3 feet or thereabouts on top of the present level in Huron and Michigan, we might save considerable money that would be otherwise expended in the deepening of the various harbors and connecting ways by reason of the necessities arising under the St. Lawrence plan. I refer to the greater depths that would be required by ocean-going ships entering the Great Lakes.

It has seemed to me that by diminishing the flow at Port Huron and possibly by diminishing it at other points along the St. Clair and Detroit Rivers, we could substantially raise the levels of Huron and Michigan and possibly solve the troublesome Chicago Drainage Canal problem without serious impediment to navigation. We might even provide some compensation to dock owners and other riparian owners without spending as much money as would be required to deepen the many harbors and these two lakes.

The Meander line established by the Mullett and Burt survey of the 1840's in my State is very far from the present water line on Michigan and Huron. In my judgment, in addition to the cycle movement so often referred to by marine men on the lakes, there have been three principal factors in the fluctuation and decline of water levels. One is probably the denuding of the forests in Great Lakes watershed; second, the deepening of the St. Clair and Detroit Rivers, both by erosion and the dredging operations of the War Department; and third, the turning around of the Chicago River, and the drainage canal. The cycles which some marine men say occur each 7 years do, it seems to me, show a periodic upsurge from low levels, but they seldom seem to reach as high a point as was reached in the preceding cycle. In other words, there has been a gradual decline in levels. I think there is no doubt about this statement.

The more constant conditions on Lake Superior bear out the theory that by the construction of retarding works at Port Huron, we would materially raise the levels of Huron and Michigan. The level could be fixed by proper control at Port Huron. I believe it could be done without a lock, or a dam reaching above the maximum depth required for commerce. I have in mind the construction of weirs, and possibly the construction of an underwater dam at the point where the St. Clair River leaves Lake Huron between Fort Gratiot and Port Edwards, that would diminish the depth to say 30 feet. Possibly a lock

would be necessary, but I doubt it. I grant that the situation is somewhat different at the St. Marys Falls, because at that point there is a definite falls or rapids where the drop is some 18 or 20 feet within a short distance, while the lesser fall of about 6 feet from Huron to Erie is over a considerable distance. It is well-known that the level of Lake Superior has been maintained at approximately 601 feet above sea level, and that it has been reasonably constant. It can, within limits, be controlled. Observation of the shores and the distance of the timber growth from them on Michigan and Huron as contrasted with Superior indicates by the closeness of the timber line to the water on Superior that the level has been approximately the same for a great many years, while the great distance of the timber line from the shores of Michigan and Huron shows that there has been a considerable recession of water (with possibly some accretion of land) in the last 50 or 75 years. I think the Government record as to levels will bear out this statement.

If Lake Superior can be maintained at a constant level by the dams at the head of the St. Marys Rapids, it seems to me that Michigan and Huron, as well as Erie, could be similarly maintained at a constant level by works at Port Huron and at Fort Erie.

The above has to do with considerations affecting commerce and navigation. I now want to ask about power. Have we developed fully the water power at Sault Ste. Marie? I think not. While this is merely a matter of recollection on my part, a considerable addition to the water power at the Soo was contemplated some 30 or 40 years ago, and a canal was at least partly constructed. At the present time there is a small power canal which services the city of some 15,000 population and surrounding territory. There is a power canal of considerable size which services some local industries, principally the Union Carbide Works. These are on the American side. On the Canadian side there is also a power canal. My own impression is that considerably greater development could take place. It seems to me that in the St. Lawrence agreement as proposed great emphasis is placed on power development in the northern New York area in and about Massena, with little said about power development elsewhere. We in Michigan and the Midwest are delighted to supply the water for New York, but we want careful consideration given to our own power possibilities.

May I call attention to the fact that the area around Sault Ste. Marie is most favorably situated for the development of industry. With closer relations developing between the United States and Canada, the immense raw-materials supply of the Lake Superior area on both sides of the international boundary—its timber, its minerals, and other resources—might well give rise to a manufacturing industry where cheap power could be found, as I think it can be found by further development of power at St. Marys Falls. This industrial area, based on raw materials and power, would, in my judgment, develop on both sides of the boundary between our State of Michigan and Canada's Province of Ontario. I am confident that in the contemplation of the entire St. Lawrence-Great Lakes project that not only Michigan's Senators and Representatives, but many others, will be interested and affected by these considerations.

While I am of the offhand opinion that there is little likelihood of power development between the foot of Lake Huron and the head of Lake Erie, a fall of less than 10 feet and a distance of approximately 90 miles, I do want to ask whether or not any consideration has been given to this subject.

I would appreciate it very much if General Schley could give me the benefit of the Department's views on these questions and observations to aid me and others in our general consideration of the commercial and navigation questions that arise by reason of the submission of the St. Lawrence waterway proposal to the Congress.

Yours truly,

PRENTISS M. BROWN.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1941

EDITORIALS FROM THE MANCHESTER UNION AND CONCORD MONITOR

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials on the St. Lawrence waterway and power project. Both of these editorials oppose this project and are worthy of the attention of the country. They are editorials from the Manchester Union and the Concord Monitor.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manchester Union of March 22, 1941]

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

The Roosevelt administration has apparently adopted some clever maneuvering to win its way on the question of the St. Lawrence waterway. This project was decisively defeated by the Senate 7 years ago. At that time it was introduced in the form of a treaty between the United States and Canada, which required a two-thirds vote of the Senate for adoption.

Now it is brought up in the guise of a defense measure. But that is not all. It is presented not in the form of a treaty but of an agreement between the United States and the Canadiar Governments, which must come before both Houses, but will require not a two-thirds vote but only a majority. The administration doubts its ability to get the two-thirds endorsement required for a treaty, but it believes that it can obtain a majority.

That raises the question of the difference between a treaty and an agreement as an international pact. Moreover, the argument supporting this issue as a defense measure is particularly weak. According to the agreement, Canada proposes to complete essential links in the waterway by December 31, 1948. What value can a project have as a defense measure to meet the emergency facing the United States today that cannot be completed for almost 8 years?

Meanwhile the project will add, according to the lowest estimates, at least half a billion dollars for expenditures, at a time when the Nation is bearing an excessively heavy burden to meet defense needs that are imperative.

[From the Concord Monitor of March 21, 1941]

CONTRARY TO PRIMARY NEEDS

President Roosevelt seems determined to use national defense as an excuse for building the St. Lawrence waterway at an estimated cost of nearly $700,000,000, which actually will probably become a billion and a half dollars before the project is completed.

The single fact that the project probably could not be completed in less than about 6 years is sufficient to impress the average American that its construction for national defense, at least in the current international situation, is mere pretext and probably folly. Yet the average American feels that somehow, and without congressional consent, the President will have his way, which only illustrates to what an extent the American people have lost confidence in the Congress and in the United States Supreme Court as checks and balances designed to prevent unconstitutional acts by the Chief Executive.

The United States has one great task immediately ahead of it, arming against every eventuality which may grow out of the second World War. To divert any least part of the national effort to such a project as the St. Lawrence waterway would be to reduce the effectiveness of the defense program by just that much.

Proponents of the St. Lawrence waterway say that it would provide benefits within a group of northern Central States roughly bounded by a line drawn through New York, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, Kansas, Colorado, Wyoming, and Montana. Were the project to be built, 85 percent of the taxes necessary to pay for its construction would be raised in the States outside this area. Not only would these States pay for the bulk of the project, but it would in turn damage their economy. All the New England States are outside of the area which its proponents claim would be benefited by the waterway.

The commercial value of the waterway is also questionable. For 5 of the 12 months it would not be available to shipping because it would be frozen. It would be usable in the warmer months, when rail traffic which now provides the service for which it would be a substitute can best handle that traffic.

The President, using the defense excuse for the waterway, points to waterpower which would be an incidental development. If more power is needed for the current emergency then the way to get it quickly is to build steam plants, for which the country has ample coal, oil, and gas. They can be built in months, rather than years.

Ocean-going ships for defense could be built in the Great Lakes were the waterway constructed, say its advocates. Not in time for this war. Nor would such a fleet be of much use were the militarily vulnerable waterway to be bombed or sabotaged and egress to the sea interrupted.

As a matter of fact the Congress has the final say in this matter. It is not safe for the American people to assume that Congress will not be susceptible to public opinion in the matter, even though the President has repeatedly been able to persuade the Democratic majority to go along with his proposals. He has not done so in every instance and the St. Lawrence waterway should be another. It can be if the people of the Nation present their views to Congress.

The Government might as well resume the Quoddy development and the abandoned Florida ship canal as start the St. Lawrence waterway at this time. Both were projects which found favor with the President but which Congress finally stopped by withholding appropriations. Both were grandiose, but not nearly so much so as the St. Lawrence waterway, the cost of which would far exceed that of the Panama and Suez Canals combined and still provide for only 30 percent of ocean-going tonnage, and for that only 7 months out of 12.

There has been talk as the defense program has been accelerated of bottlenecks. There has been no talk that we have heard of a power bottleneck. So far as we can

discern the Government already has developed far more power than there is a ready market for in the Tennessee Valley, in the Northwest, and in Nebraska.

The President could provide national reassurance by issuing a statement to the effect that the desirability of the St. Lawrence waterway at this time is contrary to the primary needs of a nation arming itself with all possible speed. That he will do so we doubt. He has said something about planning a reservoir of public projects with which to cushion the national economy when the war and defense needs subside. We doubt if the St. Lawrence waterway can even be justified as such a made work project, but as such it would come closest to justification.

Undue Delay in National-Defense Program

REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, every person who reads the newspapers or listens to the radio is aware that a number of delays in making national-defense materials is daily taking place. Despite the appointment of the Mediation Board, there seems to be little prospect at this moment that the delays will cease. In my opinion, there is far too much unnecessary hampering of the national-defense program. I sincerely believe the American people possess the same belief.

Although we occasionally receive figures which tend to show that there is less delay these days than there was in 1917 and 1918, still the fears of the American people are not allayed by such comparisons and their worries are not minimized because the American people are keenly aware that the dangers facing America now are many times more pronounced than they were in the World War period. Too, the American people are beginning to realize as never before what a little time lost in one plant can mean to the general program of preparation.

One of the most simple, yet salient illustrations along this line I have yet heard was mentioned to me by some friends of mine from Texas not long ago. A new North American Aviation plant is being built near Dallas, Texas, and the question of transferring materials, freight, and so forth from points of arrival of those materials in Dallas to the North American Aviation Plant which is located some 6½ miles from the city limits of Dallas was discussed. Incidentally, the plant when completed will manufacture airplanes under a national-defense contract it has received. It was stated by one in authority that a 2- or 3-hour delay in the delivery of certain materials or parts for the plant or production line could easily cause a 2- or 3-day delay when this 2- or 3-hour delay is felt by and exerts its influence on the sum total of the steps in the processing circuit, and in the last few days we are reading in various newspapers that defense materials cannot be delivered because some vital part, the manufacture of which was to have been consummated at some plant where a strike is in progress, is not available.

Every week I receive numerous letters from my district admonishing me to do that which I can to see that our defense program is not delayed. Apparently, many of the writers of letters to me feel that Congress is being derelict in its duty by not passing additional legislation to preclude the slowing-up of our defense program.

There seems to be considerable confusion as to whose responsibility it is to stop these various delays. Obviously until now—or until the new Mediation Board was named—the responsibility could not have rested outside the realm of the legislative branch of our Government, the authority of the Executive of the United States, or the authority of the Secretary of Labor, the Attorney General of the United States, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the National Defense Commission. Certainly in the days, weeks, and months gone by it should have been the concern of one of these eight to prevent the delays, if possible, and it is somewhat interesting to endeavor to ascertain what position authoritative spokesmen for each of these divisions of our Government have taken. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee on November 26, 1940, propounded an inquiry to the proper authorities as to whether or not any legislation is needed to deal with delays. Thus far, according to the latest information I have received—and perchance it is not the very latest—he has received no recommendations from any division of the executive branch of our Government suggesting or requesting additional legislation other than that suggestion made by Mr. Knudsen as to the need of a cooling-off period. Since the latter part of November I have corresponded with various ones in the executive branch of our Government with reference to the delays. The letter I addressed to the Chief Executive was referred to the Secretary of Labor. The Secretary of Labor, in turn, insofar as I have been able to learn, offered no suggestions as to needed legislation, but did state in answering my letter the question is being studied.

The Attorney General stated, in effect, that the matter of preventing delays was largely one, with the exception of prosecuting where violations of a criminal nature are found, with which the War, Navy, and Labor Departments should deal.

The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in answering my letter stated that the question of the adequacy of legislation to deal with delays should be referred to the Attorney General.

The Secretary of War gave no suggestions but stated the question is being studied.

The Secretary of the Navy commented on the question by saying, since the Congress has written into law as part of the Selective Service Act, a provision whereby a plant necessary to the national defense might be taken over by the Government when those in charge of that plant failed or refused to work reasonably harmoniously with the Government in supplying defense materials, that, in his opinion, the Government might be able to take over a plant manufacturing defense supplies. The Secretary of the Navy further commented:

> In view of the fact that this was a matter affecting not only the Navy Department but also many other branches of the Government, a coordinated recommendation could be expected in the near future from the National Defense Advisory Commission.

The National Defense Commission, through Mr. Sidney Hillman, expressed very keen interest in the problem of speeding up our defense program but did not suggest the need of any additional legislation, nor was I able to learn whether or not, in the opinion of the authorities of the Defense Commission, the Defense Commission is able to assure the American people that the policy of the Government "to keep plants engaged in filling defense orders open" will be observed and upheld.

It can be seen that it has been very difficult to ascertain, in the first place, whether or not there is authority to now deal with the delays; and if there be authority, who has the right and duty to exercise the authority.

I want to say that I base the foregoing statements on written communications I have received from the various heads of the departments mentioned above and the record as I have been able to comprehend it. I want to be fair in saying that letters and communications constituting the record which has been available to me have been written and recorded during recent months; the first letter to which I have referred was written about November 26, 1940.

In presenting these statements it certainly is not my purpose to embarrass or harass any person or group of people; nor is it my purpose to inferentially show that some person or some group of people has been oblivious to duty; but I am anxious to clearly portray the situation which has obtained in the last few months, and which still for the most part prevails.

Someone must assume the responsibility to see that the program which the Congress has inaugurated and instituted—a program which, in my opinion, is overwhelmingly approved by the American people—to make secure the defense of America is not scuttled and defeated. That the objective of all patriotic citizens is to move forward with great rapidity in our defense efforts admits of no question; and it seems to me, when we have instituted such a great and comprehensive program in behalf of democracy, and pursuant thereto appropriated billions of dollars, the payment of which will long burden the taxpayers of this Nation, that no time should be lost—not even a few hours when avoidable—in hastening with lightning speed the carrying out of the program.

Particularly does it seem there should be no laxity in our defense effort when American young men have so unselfishly

obeyed the summons to service and assumed the responsibility of providing American manpower, which must always constitute the spearhead and backbone and nucleus of any American defense effort. These young men are paid $21 and $30 a month and many of them sacrifice much more than these sums per month. The least a man or an industry can do—any man or any industry—is to cooperate fully, even though in so doing sacrifice ensues.

Food for France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK DAILY NEWS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial by Capt. Joe Patterson, editor and publisher of the New York Daily News, entitled "Just Let France Starve?" This editorial appeared in the New York Daily News of March 11, 1941, and also in the Washington Times-Herald of the same date.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Daily News]

JUST LET FRANCE STARVE?

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT (Republican, Ohio), speaking Sunday on the passage by the Senate of H. R. 1776, commented on the vast powers the bill gives the President. "It practically," said Senator TAFT, "enables Mr. Roosevelt to run the British war effort from this side of the Atlantic"—though Mr. TAFT added that he hoped the President wouldn't go that far, because "he can't run the war as well as the British are running it."

Certainly the bill, which the President is expected to sign tomorrow, enables him to have as large a finger as he wishes in the shaping of British war policies. Having all that money and material to lend, lease, give away, or withhold, Mr. Roosevelt can swing enormous weight at No. 10 Downing Street.

With this prospect in mind, we'd like to discuss the question of food for France.

The British Embassy made public Sunday evening a long statement, in which it reiterated Britain's resolves not to let food shipments from the United States or anywhere else pass through the blockade into German-occupied countries, including the German-occupied part of France. This is the latest British reply to Herbert Hoover's proposals to feed noncombatant men, women, and children in those countries, with guaranties to call the whole thing off the moment the Germans are found to be grabbing any of the food.

The British Government bases its refusal on the same old plea—that such food shipments would help Germany indirectly if not directly. With regard to unoccupied France, the British reply to Hoover was silent, as far as we could make out. Apparently an occasional Red Cross ship carrying canned milk, vitamin concentrates, oatmeal, etc., is all the British propose to let through the blockade for unoccupied France.

Yet unoccupied France is in fully as unhappy a condition as is occupied France.

WHY STARVE THIS AREA?

The Germans are systematically looting occupied France, with its approximately 24,000,000 people. But unoccupied France, with about 16,000,000 people, has few factories, inferior railroads, a lot of mountains, and nothing to brag about in the way of integrated farming. The Germans took the best part of France while the taking was good.

Consequently the food situation in unoccupied France is very bad; and it is hard to see how it can be brought to rights this spring, summer, and fall unless Hitler turns loose a lot of his 2,000,000 French war prisoners so that they can come home and get to work on the farms. Hitler shows no intention of doing that any time soon.

HOW ABOUT SOME COMMON SENSE?

Unoccupied France is not at war. Yet the British insist, as far as their reply to Hoover shows, on trying to starve it along with the German-occupied territories. Why? How can that help the British cause or hurt the Germans?

Aside from the humanitarian angle (meaning the angle presented by children stunted or dying through lack of food), we think this British policy is unwise.

It can't build up sympathy in France for the British. It can be used by smart German propagandists to turn French public opinion against the British. Already vaguely worded warnings are coming from Admiral Jean Darlan, Petain's side-kick, that France may take to convoying food shipments with what is left of its Navy. That would inevitably lead to shooting somewhere on the high seas, which, in turn, might move the French to reenter the war on Hitler's side.

Up to now our Government has refused to lift a finger to influence British policy in this matter. We've sat by and acquiesced in anything Britain wanted to do through its blockade. Isn't it time for our Government to use some of its influence toward (1) persuading the British to give the Hoover plan a fair trial; or, if that is beyond its will, toward (2) persuading the British at least to permit food shipments to unoccupied France?

Strikes in Defense Industries

REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT G. RUTHERFORD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in and out of Congress with reference to the strike situation in the various plants engaged in the manufacture of articles for our national defense. Every friend of labor realizes that the action of a few labor leaders is bringing all labor into disrepute and is causing the public to lose faith in labor as a whole. The President could settle this whole matter at once if he were inclined to do so, because he has the power to do it. Why does he hold back and let our national defense lag? Congress has given him all power and billions of dollars for defense and aid to Britain and the country expects that he will see to it that the money is properly spent and that nothing should be let to interfere with the steady flow of war materials. The newspapers of the country, both Democratic and Republican, are calling for quick action. As the Towanda Daily Review, Towanda, Pa., says, "It should not be permitted."

IT SHOULD NOT BE PERMITTED

Again the headlines bear the information that "millions for defense" are tied up by strikes. Apparently the C. I. O. is back of the move, and that, to any good American, fits into the charge recently made in Congress that un-American ideas are prompting a lot of this labor upset.

We don't pretend to know for sure just how far and how deep this element is trying to run industrial affairs. But we do know that whenever a disturbance occurs the C. I. O. is always mentioned. Just how long this condition will be permitted to go on it is hard to say, but already we have had too much of it.

By general consensus this country is in the midst of an emergency. Admittedly, this country is not prepared for any kind of a defense, except in a lot of plans that seem to get overthrown when a real start to prepare is made. If we have waited too long, it takes speed in production to catch up. The longer we wait the greater the need for speed. And then when all apparently is set for more speed ahead the leaders of labor, regardless, call a strike, and the whole works is tied up and thousands of laborers, willing and wanting to work, just sit idly by while their leaders bicker.

It would seem strange, wouldn't it, if any person drafted for military service had the right and enjoyed the privilege of calling his or her case before a tribunal of some sort, to argue that military service in that particular case was subject to discussion. But that can't happen. When, in that instance, the Government calls, it means business. The issue cannot be ducked. But an industrial worker, working for the Government, on a hurry-up defense program, can decide to sit down and quit, regardless of results. And every agency of the Government says, "Let's talk it over."

We agree that there should always be a time to talk, if the talk can be sensible. But under the present idea of free thinking or talking, or something, labor and industry seem to have a perfect right to talk over, where that same right is denied in almost every other controversy.

It's high time a halt to all this was made. We believe the rank and file of America believe this. Then why is this strike situation permitted to exist?

If the unions generally don't cure this evil themselves, it will not be long before the American rank and file will make a demand for correction that cannot go unheeded.

Communist Leadership in Labor Unions

REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN DIES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, the shocking revelation that the strike at the Allis-Chalmers plant was called as a result of

a fraudulent ballot should occasion no surprise. We have been calling the attention of this House to the Communist leadership in that strike. We have informed the House that Harold Christoffel, president of the Allis-Chalmers striking local of the Automobile Workers Union, has a record of Communist affiliation. There was nothing extraordinary in the fact that a trade-union local under such leadership cast 2,200 fraudulent ballots when the strike vote was taken. That sort of thing will continue to occur as long as Communist leadership is tolerated in labor unions. Fraud is one of the methods frequently employed by the Communist Party to attain its ends.

We have also called attention to the fact that the Communist Party is bent upon a course of obstruction to defeat the national-defense program for which this House is appropriating billions of dollars. We may expect a mounting wave of strikes in our key industries. We may expect a mounting wave of violence in connection with these strikes. We may expect repeated instances of fraud. These things are the natural fruit of Communist leadership in labor unions. For almost 3 years the C. I. O. has refused to take any action looking toward the removal of Communists from its leadership. On the contrary, the C. I. O. has defended its Communist leadership in a dozen of its constituent unions.

In this connection, it is pertinent to call attention once more to an organization which calls itself the American Peace Mobilization. A recent investigation by our staff convinces me that the peace mobilization is simply a front for the Communist Party. It is more completely Communist in its complexion and control than was the American League for Peace and Democracy. The American League flourished in the period of the People's Front, and was able, therefore, to conceal its Communist control more successfully than is the case with the American Peace Mobilization. This latter organization belongs to the period of collaboration between Stalin and Hitler, and this fact stamps it more clearly as an instrument of the foreign policy of the "red" dictator. The American Peace Mobilization has a single aim, and that aim is to defeat the program of national defense. That is likewise the aim of the Communist Party.

The thousands of innocents who were hoodwinked into aiding the American League for Peace and Democracy are not to be found in the American Peace Mobilization. The Peace Mobilization's objectives are too plain on the surface to allow innocents to be misled.

The outstanding facts about the American Peace Mobilization is the support which it receives from the Communist-dominated unions in the C. I. O. It is this C. I. O. support which makes the American Peace Mobilization a sinister force in the country today.

A few weeks ago the Daily Worker listed the names of the C. I. O. leaders who are backing the American Peace Mobilization. Those names belong in the RECORD. They go a long way toward explaining the wave of strikes and violence that now jeopardizes our national-defense program. Here are the C. I. O. leaders who are, according to the Daily Worker, behind the program of the American Peace Mobilization:

Reid Robinson, president of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers of America, a man with a very long record of affiliation with the front organizations of the Communist Party. Robinson is a vice president of the C. I. O.

Michael J. Quill, president of the Transport Workers Union, about whose membership in the Communist Party there can be little doubt.

George C. Peacock, president of the National Association of Die Casters, whose union carried on the strike at the Harvill plant in Inglewood, Calif., under the leadership of Kenneth Eggert and Ralph Dawson, two Communist Party members of public record.

Lewis Alan Berne, president of the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians, a union whose national organizer, Marcel Scherer, ran for office on the Communist Party ticket.

E. F. Burke, secretary of the National Marine Cooks' and Stewards' Association, a union under the complete control of Harry Bridges.

Abraham Flaxer, president of the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America, a man with a long record of affiliation with Communist Party front organizations.

Ben Gold, president of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union, an avowed member of the Communist Party.

Donald Henderson, president of the United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers of America, an avowed member of the Communist Party.

J. F. Jurich, president of the International Union of Fishermen and Allied Workers of America, another Bridges' union.

Mat Meehan, secretary of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, Bridges' own union.

Lewis Merrill, president of the United Office and Professional Workers of America, a union which our committee found to be under Communist control.

Frederick N. Myers, general organizer of the National Maritime Union, about whose Communist Party membership there can be no doubt, and a man with a serious criminal record under another name.

Grant W. Oakes, chairman of the Farm Equipment Workers Organizing Committee and leader of the strike at the plants of International Harvester, the man who so recently threatened wholesale violence in this strike.

O. M. Orton, president of the Woodworkers of America.

Joseph Selly, president of the American Communications Association. Selly has under his supervision at least half a dozen short-wave radio stations operated by members of his union. Selly has recently been appointed a member of the Labor Advisory Board for Defense Communications.

All of the foregoing prominent leaders of the C. I. O. are announced as supporters of the American Peace Mobilization. I reiterate the question: What are you, Mr. Philip Murray, going to do about this Communist leadership in the C. I. O.?

Answering Critics of T. V. A. and R. E. A.

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted, with apologies, to paraphrase the language of our old friend, Bret Harte, I would say that—

Which I wish to remark,
And my language is plain,
That for ways that are dark
And for tricks that are vain,
Utility propagandists are peculiar.

Today, for the second time within a week, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has gone just about as far from the Tennessee Valley as he could within the continental limits of the United States, to get information furnished by one of these utility propagandists, who are now filling the press of this country with misleading attacks on the Tennessee Valley Authority—the greatest agency for the protection of the American people who pay electric light and power bills that has yet been created.

Today he has inserted some silly fulminations of one Mr. C. M. Jansky, a superannuated professor in Wisconsin, who attacks the T. V. A. yardstick rates, or the rates paid by the ultimate consumers in the T. V. A. area, without touching side, edge, or bottom of the economic justification of those rates.

While Professor Jansky admits in other correspondence that he is a stockholder in several private power companies, which indicates that he evidently investigated them before he made any purchases, he merely attacks the retail rates now charged in the T. V. A. area, where the distribution agencies pay an average of about 4½ mills a kilowatt-hour for T. V. A. power wholesale and sell it for a maximum of 3 cents a kilowatt-hour to the ultimate consumer, whereas the private power companies, which he now defends, purchased this same power at Muscle Shoals during the Hoover administration at about 2 mills a kilowatt-hour and sold it to the ultimate consumers at a maximum of 10 cents a kilowatt-hour.

The professor also overlooks the fact that private power companies are now selling electricity to each other wholesale in that same area at a lower rate than the T. V. A. is selling it to the municipalities and cooperative associations. But when the private power companies retail it to the ultimate consumers their overcharges, compared with the rate the municipalities and cooperative associations sell T. V. A. power, amounts to about 100 percent. The professor does not seem to be in the least disturbed over the fact that in 1940 the people in Wisconsin were overcharged $23,598,000, according to the T. V. A. yardstick rates. He would probably attempt to justify this on the grounds of taxes, when, as a matter of fact, the overcharges in Wisconsin for that year

amounted to $26,053,000, according to the Tacoma, Wash., rates, and the Tacoma municipal system pays more taxes and cash contributions to the city, according to the electricity produced and consumed, than is paid by any private power company anywhere in the United States.

This power could be produced in Wisconsin with coal, gas, oil, or water power, and distributed at the T. V. A. yardstick rates or the Tacoma, Wash., rates, or the Ontario rates, without loss on legitimate investments. Reducing those rates to their proper levels would double the consumption of electricity in that area, and would enable us to electrify every farm home in Wisconsin at the T. V. A. yardstick rates. But Professor Jansky does not seem to be interested in the ultimate consumers of electricity in Wisconsin, or elsewhere.

In the Appendix of the RECORD page 689, there appeared a statement prepared by one Mr. H. T. Bennion, of New York City, and inserted in the RECORD by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] attacking the overcharge tables I have presented to the House.

It is interesting to note that in the absence of finding any errors in the method of calculations or conclusions of my tables, the writer of this statement resorts to side opinions and misleading statements, in an attempt to set up a fallacious reply. His whole statement is grossly inaccurate and misleading. It is the same old utility propaganda.

On several occasions I have pointed out the McCauley statement that if it were of pecuniary advantage to some men they would attempt to disprove the universal law of gravitation. The inserted statement I am answering falls in this category. Therefore, before identifying the fallacies in this presentation, it is necessary to cover the background of the author, in order to establish the motive.

The author of this statement is a graduate of West Point Military Academy and was assistant chief engineer of the Federal Power Commission from 1920 to 1924. He resigned from the Army in 1926 to become engineer director of the odious Insull controlled National Electric Light Association, and during 1932 and 1933 was assistant manager of that malodorous association. When this organization was forced to change its name in 1933, because of public opinion, Mr. Bennion became assistant managing director of the new Edison Electric Institute, the mouthpiece of the power trust. From 1933 to date Mr. Bennion has been connected with this organization as vice president and managing director. Naturally he speaks as a representative of the private power interests rather than an independent or neutral observer. His statement simply represents the inaccurate allegations of the private power companies which were originated by the National Electric Light Association and were contained in the Wyer report on Ontario Hydro. This manufactured propaganda was exposed some years ago as a result of the Walsh investigation, and public reaction was so strong that this organization was forced to change its name and solemnly promise the American people that it would desist from such evil practices.

It has not kept its promise. Only recently, utility hearings brought out the fact that this association and its members paid two eastern college professors over $150,000 for manufactured material going out under the names of supposedly neutral observers. I wonder if Professor Jansky got any of it.

Mr. Bennion could spend his time more profitably by endeavoring to stamp out the illegal and immoral practices recently brought to light by the Federal grand juries in Missouri, Illinois, and New York, and by stamping out such practices in his own organizations, as revealed by the Dorau testimony before the Securities and Exchange Commission.

THE ALLEGED ERRORS

Mr. Bennion alleges errors in the overcharge tables, based on eight matters of opinion, without pointing out any actual errors in the tables. The basic opinions of his allegations are: First, the rates of the private companies are just and reasonable; second, the prices of the cited public yardstick plants are arbitrarily set; third, these public plants are tax-eating subsidized enterprises; fourth, selection was made from better-than-average plants; fifth, cost of rendering electric service varies considerably; sixth, proved advantages of private ownership; seventh, public plants are inefficient; eighth, the economic significance of cost of electricity in home and in industry is grossly exaggerated. These allegations, and other presentations made, do not come from a neutral witness; therefore, it is in order to present the facts on all the points cited by him.

PRIVATE RATES

The rate actions of the private companies refute the first Bennion thesis. Since the publication of the T. V. A. yardstick rates showing what electricity is worth, the private power companies have been consistently reducing rates. When T. V. A. power at T. V. A. rates was extended to Tarrant City and Bessemer, adjacent to Birmingham, Ala., it broke the rates in Birmingham more than $1,000,000 a year.

When under pressure of competition private rates are always cut drastically—another notable example being the recent reduction in Spokane, Wash. By these rate actions the private companies have pleaded guilty. Anyone interested can verify the facts from the publications of the Federal Power Commission on net billings, rate reductions, and consumer savings. With the decrease in rates, consumption and earnings have increased, showing that it is good business to reduce rates.

In 1928 the industry had 22,319,000 consumers, sold 66,987,000,000 kilowatt-hours, and collected $1,784,309,100. In 1932, the year before the T. V. A. was created, these figures were 24,055,754 consumers, 63,710,000,000 kilowatt-hours sales, and $1,813,717,100 collections. In 1939 these figures had risen to 28,200,000 consumers, 106,087,000,000 kilowatt-hours sales, and $2,293,643,900 revenue. With a 24.3-percent reduction in average unit price, the kilowatt-hours sales increased 66 percent, and the gross revenue jumped from $1,813,717,100 to $2,293,643,900 revenue. Last year—1940—production was 118,560,000,000 kilowatt-hours and the total revenue therefrom amounted to $2,362,649,000.

I have pointed out on several occasions, by yearly tabulations, how the common-stock earnings of the local Washington, D. C., company increased from a fairly low figure up to a range of 64 to 75 percent, with sizable distributed rate reductions. This axiomatic principle, which, for short, I have called the law of increasing returns, is generally accepted. It is the application of this law which has made billions for the automotive industry, and has given the private companies increased returns, in spite of inefficient over-all operation and scandalous financial manipulations under inadequate rate cuts.

MORE ALLEGATIONS

His statement that the sale prices of the yardstick plants I have tabulated are arbitrarily set is ridiculous. He knows, as well as many other informed people, that the Ontario Hydro and Tacoma have operated for many years under low, scientific rates, have produced substantial earnings, set us sizable reserves, and have amortized their debt. The private power industry is deplorably weak by comparison on these points. His statement is only the opinion of those who have self-serving interests, and the annual reports of these two plants show the facts, which are completely at variance with his expressed opinion. Any fair statement should back up allegations with proof, which he fails to do. The T. V. A. resale rates were based on a scientific analysis of the Tacoma and Ontario operations, and the results in the T. V. A. cities, towns, and cooperative associations have demonstrated the soundness of their resale-rate policy.

His next point is the old, threadbare, and misleading statement that the yardstick plants are tax-eating, subsidized operations. Again this is a manufactured self-serving opinion, without foundation, and made without offering any proof. Ontario Hydro has been supported by its rates and not by taxes. The Ontario Hydro-Electric Commission was created in 1906 by the Provincial Government to generate, transmit, and wholesale current to municipalities and other governmental subdivisions at actual cost. Incidentally, the Provincial government at that time was conservative but able. Therefore, any analysis should point out the operating results of both the wholesaling agency and the retailing municipalities. Mr. Bennion fails to offer any proof to back up his misleading and deceptive allegation. Historically, the facts are that since 1906 no city or municipality in Ontario or the Provincial government has levied any taxes to support Hydro. They have paid their way out of earnings, with low rates and large net profits. Hydro started serving 14 municipalities in 1910.

If there is any validity in the Bennion statements, we would find the worst conditions in these municipalities which have been in business over 30 years. An ex-

amination of the reports show that 10 of these cities—Kitchner, London, St. Thomas, Guelph, Waterloo, Woodstock, Ingersoll, New Hamburg, Preston, and Herpeles—have paid off their entire debts. The remaining 4 original distributing cities are nearly out of debt and would be free if it were not for large growth and necessary resulting expansion of facilities. Each of these municipalities has built up large surpluses out of operating revenues. The financial history of the 14 founding municipalities and the other 270 communities served has been covered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 15, 1938. The facts have been presented and are of record. These facts destroy the validity of the Bennion statements applying to Ontario Hydro. Ontario Hydro and its distributing municipalities are financially sound, with large surpluses, and the largest part of their debts amortized. The tax situation has also been covered in the record referred to.

TACOMA'S RECORD

Under the lowest electric rate in the United States, Tacoma, Wash., has paid for 87 percent of its electric property out of earnings, without any tax contributions. In addition, the electric property is paying annually $268,000 in taxes, has acquired for the city a clear investment of $21,842,847, and is saving its citizens over $1,000,000 a year in electric bills compared with the average "lower cost" private companies. Tacoma's outstanding indebtedness on its $25,078,847 plant is now only $3,230,000, which could be paid off completely in a short time if the bondholders would surrender their gilt-edge security before maturity. The electric system is netting $912,300 annually above all operating expenses, taxes, interest, amortization, and $475,000 for depreciation. The net earnings after all kinds of charges and expenses is nearly a million dollars per year, which could wipe out the entire debt in 3 years, leaving the city with a clear $25,000,000 revenue-producing plant. With the debt cleared, the lowest rates in America could be cut in half or the city could become a taxless community.

T. V. A. is operating on the same basis as Tacoma and will amortize its investment. The Bennion article fails to point out the true T. V. A. set-up and to differentiate between the wholesale agency and the distributing municipalities, the financial results, and comparative rates. If this had been given, his fallacious argument would have been destroyed.

YARDSTICK PLANTS

My tables represented comparisons with actual yardstick plants, which were selling current at actual cost. This has always been my thesis, as my purpose has been to show savings based on actual over-all costs rather than on any hypothetical cost basis. There are two types of public plants. The first type keeps rates high in order to turn in large profits to city treasuries for general uses. The second type sells current at low rates or at cost, and thus passes the benefits to the rate payer. In the first instance, the plant becomes a secondary tax collector, or subsidizer of other nonrelated functions, whereas, in the second case, the plant is operated for the benefit of the investor and the rate payer. Naturally Mr. Bennion and his associates would advocate a comparison based on pyramided cost plus more profits for the manipulating overlords. This is the nub of his allegations on selection, and cost variations. Actual cost variations are of minor importance in this problem, as has been shown on numerous occasions.

ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES

Bennion gives a general statement as to proven advantages of private plants and the inefficiency of public plants. He presents no proof and fails to give the true legal background governing the utility business. The few figures I have given on Tacoma refute his opinion on these two points. If Mr. Bennion wants to render a real service to the American people, he should interpret the significance of the few Tacoma facts I have presented, and to show how greatly inefficient are the private companies he represents, when compared to Tacoma or the Ontario system.

MOCK ADVANTAGES

The advantages of private ownership to which he refers has not been proved. In fact, he fails to offer any proof. The slush-fund uses, as brought out by the St. Louis and Springfield grand juries, might be considered an advantage by public officials who accepted money out of this till, whose books of accounts were kept under the carpet in a power company's vice president's office. The recent investigation of the Power Commission tells the story of the wicked influence of private power companies on the exercise of free democratic processes. In the light of these recent developments, the Bennion statement of "proven advantages" is a mockery. Whenever there has been a free election the people have answered by their votes his argument as to the economic significance of the cost of electricity. Translated into simple terms, this statement means that the price of electricity is so insignificant that the housewife, store owner, or small industrialist is content to pay an overcharge of 100 percent. An excess national electric bill of more than a billion dollars a year, or a quarter of all our export values, is not an insignificant economic item, as he would have us believe. These overcharges would liquidate our national debt within a reasonable time.

THE CRUX OF THE PROBLEM

Mr. Bennion fails to even mention the crux of the problem, which is amortization or debt repayment. The private companies he represents have collectively outstanding over $5 in securities for every dollar of public power securities in the hands of the public. Why did he not mention this significant fact in his discourse. The reason is obvious, as such a fact would knock the props from under his tax-subsidy argument. By reducing debts the public plant is making a real investment for the people. This equity, which is being built up for the people, through debt repayment, is never mentioned by the advocates of private power interests.

In addition to the eight major points I have covered, Mr. Bennion makes numerous other misstatements as to T. V. A., R. E. A., and bonded municipal debts.

T. V. A. FACTS

His statements as to the T. V. A. are just as inaccurate, absurd, and misleading as the rest of his statements. This point can be illustrated by citing his allegation that T. V. A. project cost $400,000,000, all of which should be regarded as power investment. Out of this sum he states, "T. V. A. acknowledges having received $306,000,000." To this amount he then adds $71,000,000 in back interest; $12,000,000 for the Sheffield steam plant; and another $10,000,000 which he says, "represents the difference between the cost of the Muscle Shoals plant and what T. V. A. put on its books therefor," in order to arrive at a fictitious value.

His $306,000,000 figure apparently was obtained by subtracting from the fixed asset item of $341,933,435 given in the T. V. A. balance sheet on page 54 of the 1940 annual report, the sum of $35,111,833 representing construction in progress. Included in this $306,000,000 figure are: $4,608,200 for the fertilizer plant, $10,170,000 for other general plants and properties not in any way connected with power, and $263,000 used for advance investigations and surveys.

The back interest item of $71,000,000 is fantastic. No supporting data are offered and manifestly it is impossible to identify the investment to which his calculation applies. Doubtless the nitrate plants and other properties outside of the power field are included. The fallacy of this Bennion back interest statement can be brought out by this simple analogy:

Assume that Mr. Bennion were to approach his banker for a loan of $1,000 and was told that the bank would gladly loan him the $1,000, but that this $1,000 had been idle in the bank for the last 10 years and there was an accumulation of $790 of compound interest against this amount and that Mr. Bennion, in order to have the $1,000, would have to pay interest on $1,790 and repay his note for that amount.

Mr. Bennion doubtlessly knows that the Sheffield steam plant is reserved for national defense and is not included in the investment of the T. V. A. The Authority has operated this plant at different times, during emergencies, largely to supplement private-utility generation. Since the creation of the T. V. A. this steam plant has been in operation a total of less than 6 months. Nevertheless, T. V. A. expense accounts have been charged rental and upkeep on this steam plant.

The $10,000,000 included by Bennion is roughly the excess cost of the Wilson Dam, resulting from hasty war construction. Congress directed T. V. A. to establish a present value for this plant. The present value of the Wilson plant appears on the T. V. A. books at around $31,000,000, which amount is less than the historic cost, but is way in excess of the value placed upon it by the private-power companies and other private interests in their offers to purchase or lease made during the early days of the Muscle Shoals legislation.

After having built up this fictitious figure, Bennion then makes the statement, "The T. V. A. allocated only $163,000,000 of this investment to power, disregarding 60 percent." This is also an erroneous statement, and anyone interested in the facts can find them given in Schedule B, page 62, of the 1940 Annual Report of the T. V. A.

Mr. Bennion's further reference to Pennsylvania conditions and the point that rate reductions would wipe out one-third of the investors and result in consequent wage reductions indicates that he is either intentionally misrepresenting the facts or is engaged in loose thinking. The utility earning figures given out by his own organization, which I have cited, refutes this allegation. His wage and investment allegations show that purposely he does not acknowledge or does not comprehend the effect of the principle of increased returns or the workings or the results of a low-rate policy. In making such a statement he ignores completely the combined experience of private companies which compose his organization. I am inserting a table showing how the law of increasing returns has worked with the private companies in the T. V. A. territory. This table shows that Mr. Bennion's conclusion as to Pennsylvania conditions and effect on wages and investments is totally in error. I might cite, for Mr. Bennion's information, that the total revenues from residential service in the T. V. A. area are now 20 percent higher than they were before the advent of the T. V. A., in spite of the fact that rates have been reduced by the T. V. A. yardstick, because the consumption of electricity under these low rates has grown by leaps and bounds.

TABLE 1.—*Comparative residential data*

1933

	Average consumption	Average rate (cents per kilowatt-hour)	Average bill	Total[1] residential customers
Alabama Power Co.	793	4.62	$36.64	76,676
Georgia Power Co.	805	5.16	41.54	114,332
Tennessee Electric Power Co.	612	5.77	35.31	87,278
Mississippi Power Co.	555	6.16	34.19	27,060
United States as a whole	595	5.49	32.67	16,296,709

1939

Alabama Power Co.	1,413	2.76	$39.00	123,597
Georgia Power Co.	1,446	2.84	41.07	179,331
Tennessee Electric Power Co.[2]	1,461	2.75	40.18	123,660
Mississippi Power Co.	954	3.78	36.06	28,740
United States as a whole	890	4.03	35.87	20,160,733

[1] As of Dec. 31. Includes farm and rural customers.
[2] Figures for the calendar year 1938, as this company operated only 7 months in 1939

Source: Electrical World Supplement.

I might cite also for Mr. Bennion's information, that the average residential use in Pennsylvania, as shown by statistics of his own organization, lags behind the national figure, despite the higher Pennsylvania wages and income. In 1939 the average annual consumption per residential electric consumer in Pennsylvania was 876 kilowatt-hours. The private companies surrounding the T. V. A., under reduced rates, have a comparative figure of 1,165, and in the T. V. A. system this figure is 1,231. For the same period the national average was 890 kilowatt-hours. By the end of 1940 the average residential use on the T. V. A. system had risen to 1,425. There are a number of projects in the T. V. A. system where cities and cooperatives report average residential use per customer above 2,000 kilowatt-hours a year.

T. V. A. EARNINGS

The Bennion statement that the T. V. A. power sales have made no contribution to the Federal Treasury is completely erroneous. If he is interested in the facts, he can find them on page 56 of the Annual Report of the T. V. A. which shows a net income for the fiscal year 1940, about $4,300,000. After paying the operating expenses of the navigation and flood control features of the program, there still remains a net income of nearly $3,000,000. The Federal Treasury was surely benefited by these earnings. The point at issue is not the actual present interest payments, but whether or not the revenues of the Authority are and will be sufficient to pay all overhead charges. The analysis on page 19 of the 1940 Annual Report shows that these revenues, on a liquidation basis, are sufficient to provide a return of 3.6 percent on T. V. A.'s power investment. This percentage certainly exceeds the cost of money to the Federal Government. If Mr. Bennion would analyze the true overall T. V. A. figures closely and be fair in his analysis, he could only state that the T. V. A. is a completely self-liquidating project which will not cost the taxpayers of the Nation 1 cent.

In addition, T. V. A. during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, paid more than a million and a half dollars in tax equivalents to counties and States. This sum, together with the tax and tax equivalent payments of the distributing agencies buying T. V. A. wholesale power, increases the total tax payments to more than $3,200,000. This sum is practically the same as the taxes formerly paid by the private owners to municipalities, counties, and States, when these electrical properties were under private ownership.

The $693,000 tax loss referred to in his statement as coming from Governor Cooper represents loss of franchise taxes formerly levied against the private companies. New business brought into the T. V. A. territory as a result of the new low-rate policy compensates for this so-called loss. What Mr. Bennion really states is that the total tax loss amounts to $693,000. This tax situation, which he mentions, was of so little consequence that the Tennessee Legislature has recently adjourned without passing any remedial legislation covering this item. I doubt that there has been any tax loss sustained, and if it has, it is a very small amount, and in no way compares with the annual savings made in the electric bills of some $7,600,000 in the State of Tennessee alone. The savings in the district I represent in Mississippi amount to more than $2,000,000 a year compared to the rates the private power company was charging us a few years ago.

The Bennion criticism as to capital costs and taxes is directed at the wholesale agency in an attempt to show subsidy. He ignores the distributing agencies which retail electricity at yardstick rates. Such an analysis is distinctly unfair, as he fails to mention the agencies whose rates he attacks. The distributing agencies, whose rates he dislikes, in the fiscal year 1940 earned a net income of $6,000,000, on an $80,000,000 average investment. After taxes and full depreciation allowance, this represents a 7½ percent return for a starting business.

These distributing agencies purchased wholesale power from the T. V. A. at prices conceded to be on a level with private power generating costs.

It is the distributing agencies which serve their consumers at the yardstick rates, but he ignores them completely, although making an attack on my tables, which clearly set out savings based on the sale prices of the distributing agencies. These distributing agencies purchase wholesale current from the T. V. A. at prices at least equal to or above the prices that the private companies are selling similar current. I have on several occasions placed these comparative figures in the RECORD and they are available for Mr. Bennion's inspection. On this point there is substantial agreement, and in fact the power companies introduced witnesses in the T. V. A. hearings who sustained this fact. Any fair-sized municipality can generate power at a cost within 1 or 2 mills of the price which T. V. A. sells wholesale power. Therefore, T. V. A. wholesale rates are removed from any factual discussion, as the private power companies operate on practically even terms with the wholesale prices of the T. V. A.

THE JOKER

Tennessee Valley Authority's wholesale operations form a self-liquidating project, and are therefore not subsidized. However, to demonstrate the fallacy of Mr. Bennion's analysis, let us remove this allegation from the argument, and start from the city gate. The cost up to this point will be approximately the same whether wholesale service is rendered by a private company or the T. V. A. Therefore the adequacy of the yardstick rates is determined by costs and profits between the city gate and the consumers meter. Just remember that T. V. A. is selling this power wholesale, at an average of 4.51 mills a kilowatt-hour, and that the Republican administration, under which Mr. Bennion served sold it to the private power interests at an average of less than 2.4 mills a kilowatt-hour. That is what he would call sound business.

During the fiscal year 1940, 106 municipalities and cooperatives distributed T. V. A. power to their consumers at a rate saving of over $9,000,000 per year in comparison with recent former rates. These retailing projects during this same year earned a combined net income exceeding $4,000,000, under an average

wholesale rate of about 4.5 mills per kilowatt-hour. If this average wholesale rate had been increased practically 50 percent, then some agencies could have still maintained the yardstick rates and would have made about a quarter of a million dollars net. In this same year Tupelo, Miss., had net earnings equal to 26 percent of its gross income. If the wholesale rate to Tupelo had been increased 40 percent, Tupelo's net earnings would have been 12 percent of the gross revenues. These facts and figures show the relative unimportance of the wholesale rate in the distribution picture, as these large percentage differences in the wholesale price amounts to less than one-quarter of a cent per kilowatt-hour. The joke in the Bennion submission lies in ignoring distribution and concentrating his entire attack on a cost component which could not exceed 10 percent of the consumer price, and would normally approach zero if the private companies sold electricty wholesale to municipalities at the same prices they sell to each other.

R. E. A. CRITICISM

Mr. Bennion made the statement that "Testimony of R. E. A. officials indicate that the average rate was about 5.7 cents per kilowatt-hour against an average rate for the entire utility industry for 1939 of 1.9 cents per kilowatt-hour." He knows, or ought to know, that the maximum rate to the farmers in the T. V. A. area is 4 cents a kilowatt-hour for the first 50 kilowatt-hours a month and that it scales down to 4 mills a kilowatt-hour, and that these rates include payments to amortize investments in the lines. As soon as they are paid out the rates will be reduced. Private power companies never amortize.

Besides, inquiry develops that no such testimony was given as that to which he refers. Mr. Bennion arrived at these figures from computations of doubtful accuracy, based on a very limited number of R. E. A. projects published in the Directory of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1940. Such averages are not fair representation, and should not be used, for the following reasons: (1) The service period of R. E. A. projects are too short to represent full utilization development; (2) the average quoted rate of the private companies include suburban consumers in the rural classification; (3) R. E. A. rates include items not included in the rates of the other cited utilities. The facts on these three items will now be given.

R. E. A. FACTS

First. The average time which rural consumers have been served on R. E. A.-financed lines is only 1.2 years compared with an average of more than 9.6 years for such consumers on the lines of other electric utilities. Assuming both classes of utilities render service in comparable territory under comparable conditions—which is not the case—the difference in average length of service alone would result in a larger proportion of minimum bill consumers and a lower average use per consumer on R. E. A.-financed lines. These facts operate to materially increase the average rate per kilowatt-hour for R. E. A.-financed systems even though they operate under identically the same rate schedules as the other utilities. Larger average use with the resultant lower average rates will accrue to R. E. A.-financed lines with the passing of time, as consumers purchase appliances and realize economies in the use of electricity. The older R. E. A.-financed systems have higher average consumptions and lower average rates per kilowatt-hour than the younger systems, the differences in the average running as high as 60 kilowatt-hours per month in average use and 3 cents per kilowatt-hour in average rates. Temporarily high average rates per kilowatt-hour for the youthful R. E. A.-financed systems therefore do not indicate relatively high typical electric bills.

The latest available statistics on densities on rural lines of electric utilities other than R. E. A.-financed systems indicate that 2.6 percent of "rural consumers" were served by utilities which reported over 20 "rural consumers" per mile; 39 percent were served by utilities which reported over 10 "rural consumers" per mile; and only 3 percent were served by utilities which reported 2.5 or less rural consumers per mile. Such densities definitely indicate service in suburban areas rather than rural areas as commonly understood in the United States. They are what are known as city farmers, who live "in the edge of town."

The majority of consumers on R. E. A. financed systems are dirt farmers living in areas where the density per mile is low. The other electric utilities serve suburban gentleman farmers, and call them rural consumers. In some instances these utilities, following census definitions, report all consumers living in communities of less than 2,500 population as rural consumers. These differences are reflected in the density per mile, average use per consumer, ability to pay, the average revenue per consumer, and other factors and thus do not permit a ready comparison of rates and service between R. E. A.-financed systems and rural consumers of other electric utilities.

With proper allowances for all of these factors a difference in the overall average rate per kilowatt-hour of as much as 50 percent in favor of rural consumers of electric utilities other than R. E. A.-financed systems would not be unfavorable to R. E. A. lines, and even Mr. Bennion did not claim these differentials.

The average rate per kilowatt-hour for R. E. A.-financed lines covers, in addition to all the usual costs, several important items not included in the average rate per kilowatt-hour for other electric utilities. On R. E. A.-financed systems the consumers are purchasing the plant on a 25-year amortization plan and these consumers, unlike rural consumers on the lines of most private utilities, were not required to make a large initial contribution of capital for building the line or to guarantee a minimum monthly or annual payment for extended periods of time. These items account for from 16 to 35 percent difference in average rates with at least 16 percent of the difference attributable to the amortization requirement alone.

R. E. A. PAYMENTS

Mr. Bennion added another inaccurate statement when he wrote:

It may be pointed out that according to the latest Budget of the United States Government, in spite of the rates these cooperatives are charging, they are having great difficulty to pay their way, because, though they borrowed up to June 30, 1940, $270,000,000, the Budget estimates that for the present fiscal year they will pay into the Treasury $18,000 in interest, and $72,000 as repayment of principal.

To correct such an erroneous implication it is necessary to insert at this point the facts which I have developed by inquiries.

Less than 2 percent of total repayments made by R. E. A. borrowers has been sent to the Treasury. Ignorance is the only excuse for such a gross misuse of data. No reasonable presentation of facts would imply that a new business should make interest and principal payments before the lines were constructed and energized or that the measure of interest and principal payments of R. E. A. financed systems is R. E. A. payments to the Treasury. The facts as of June 30, 1940, as reported by R. E. A. are as follows:

Allotments	$269,748,614
Miles, loan contract estimate	253,189
Consumers, loan contract estimate	856,182
Funds advanced	$220,513,614
Miles weighted construction	241,493
Miles energized	233,166
Consumers connected	567,998
Amounts due from borrowers	$4,489,748.68
Interest	2,346,393.33
Principal	2,143,355.35
Amounts paid by borrowers from revenues	$4,905,937.01
Interest	2,520,343.12
Principal	2,358,921.66
Paid within 30 days	26,672.23
Borrowers not paid within 30 days	25
Amounts not paid within 30 days	$79,837.01
Borrowers with advance payments	62
Amount of advance payments	$496,025.34

Thus with only 66 percent of the consumers anticipated under the $269,748,614 allotment actually connected—some of them for less than 1 month—the R. E. A. financed systems have paid nearly $5,000,000 from revenues. Payments were made to the R. F. C. from which R. E. A. has secured a large portion of its funds, and not to the Treasury.

Another misuse of data is the following Bennion statement:

Sixty percent of the farmers in Pennsylvania have electric service against 10 percent for Tennessee and 20 percent in Mississippi. The T. V. A. with all of its subsidies, has not equaled the record of the private utilities in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Bennion, if he so desired, could have found the facts from the data published by his own Edison Electric Institute Report on Farm Electrification, published February 27, 1941, which I present in table 2.

Table 2

Item	Pennsylvania	Tennessee	Mississippi
Number of farms, Apr. 1, 1940	169,027	247,617	291,092
Farms electrified:	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Dec. 31, 1934	23.6	3.9	1.0
Dec. 31, 1940	71.4	17.1	10.7
Farms electrified by Rural Electrification Administration, Dec. 31, 1940	8.7	15.4	8.4
Farms not electrified Dec. 31, 1934, electrified by Rural Electrification Administration	11.9	16.0	8.5

The other 2.5 percent in Mississippi were electrified through T. V. A. before the R. E. A. entered the field.

This table shows, without allowance for R. E. A. stitmulating effect, that the Authority has been as effective in electrifying farms in Pennsylvania as it has in Tennessee and Mississippi.

Thus if Mr. Bennion's figures demonstrate anything, it is the failure of utilities other than the R. E. A. financed systems to develop rural areas comparable to those found in Tennessee and Mississippi; not the failure of R. E. A. to accomplish results comparable to those of private utilities.

TRUE REASONS

Again, Mr. Bennion, in one of his footnotes, states in effect that the weighted average rate is favorable to the public plants because of the dominatory influence of three large west-coast municipal systems with rates lower than the average. This inference does not tell the full story. The fact is that the weighted average rate is unfavorable to the private companies because of the excessively high rates in numerous New England and North Atlantic States served by the private companies, in addition to the low rates of the Pacific coast public plants. The dominating influence of 48 eastern cities of 50,000 population or over in the Federal Power Commission New England and North Atlantic geographic divisions, with rates exceeding the average, shows up in such an average. Naturally, Mr. Bennion leaves out all reference to high private utility rates.

TAXES AND BONDED DEBT

Mr. Bennion makes this statement, "Low taxes resulting from * * * leaving to private enterprise the business it can perform outweighs the influence of electric rates." He follows with a table comparing Tupelo, Miss., and Lock Haven, Pa., bond and tax figures. His motive is to attempt to prove that public plants symbolize high taxes and private plants low taxes. His statement and submitted proof are meaningless and deceptive if not fraudulent. In the first place, his table contains a substantial error. Secondly, the private electrical utility is not a private business either in law or in fact. In the third place, no discussion is offered as to tax and bonded debt comparisons.

His table contains a gross error as to the bonded debt per capita for Lock Haven, Pa. His tabular figure is $17.63. From Moody's Governments and Municipals, 1941, and the State and Municipal Compendium, published by the William B. Dana Co., I find that the gross bonded debt of Lock Haven is $372,500. This town's preliminary 1940 population figure is 10,799. From these two figures it can be seen that Lock Haven's bonded debt per capita is $34.53 instead of $17.63, as given by Mr. Bennion.

There are many considerations outside of power plants and distribution which govern municipal bonded debt. A great deal could be said on this subject and detail after detail given. It is sufficient to say and to summarize the municipal bonded debt is controlled by the topographic lay-out of the city, and the quantity, quality, and type of service rendered by the municipality for other functions besides power and the type and quality of municipal government. The following cities served by private companies have per capita bonded debt as follows, compared to Tupelo:

City	Gross bonded debt	Per capita debt compared to Tupelo
		Percent higher
New York City	$2,650,402,608	535.0
Pittsburgh, Pa	85,582,126	127.5
Chicago, Ill	321,379,245	67.3
St. Louis, Mo	76,044,000	66.2
New Orleans, La	56,131,000	66.2
Philadelphia, Pa	613,480,300	461.0

Above data from National Municipal Review, June 30, 1940, p. 396.

These private-utility cities have very much higher per capita debt than Tupelo. If I had used the method of Mr. Bennion, I could have presented the data above without description or qualification. The facts are that these high debts are largely due to the reasons I have given previously. Such facts collapse the Bennion inference that public plants bring high debts. He ignores all reference to revenue bonds.

Different cities have different assessment ratios, based on true values. These ratios vary from 37 percent to 100 percent. The only true tax comparison can be made by adjusting the used tax rate to the basis of 100-percent true value. The comparative tax rates of 301 American cities in 1940 have been made by the Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research and published in the Municipal Review for December 1940, page 792, reduced to a 100-percent adjusted rate. From this publication it can be seen that cities having municipal power plants rank favorably in this listing. Again this is not a complete measure, as the tax and debt situation is governed by the over-all factors I have given.

I have answered all of the various points presented by Mr. Bennion in his attempt to challenge my overcharge tables. His approaches were by indirection, and I have met these approaches squarely. As no direct approach was made against the accuracy of these tables, they stand untouched, as representing the overcharges paid by the American electric consumers, compared to actual "at cost" yardstick rates. Therefore, in the light of my answer, Mr. Bennion's article is nothing more than a check on my conclusion by the spokesman of the private power companies.

The fact remains that the American consumers of electricity were overcharged more than $1,000,000,000 for their lights and power in 1940, as shown by the tables attached to my remarks on February 12, of which these utility propagandists so loudly complain.

What I am trying to do is to develop the water power of this Nation and get it distributed at rates based upon the costs of generation, transmission, and distribution, so as to force reduction of light and power rates to their proper levels in every locality throughout this broad land, in order to make every community in America a better place in which to live.

Strikes Are Sabotaging the Country's Defense Preparations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as strikes against the defense of our country continue to increase, and as the stoppages in production of arms becomes more frequent and more ominous, I again call attention to the series of speeches I have made to the House on the subject of strikes in defense industries and the amendments which I have repeatedly offered—and which have been repeatedly defeated—that would have prohibited the prevailing racket that compels free American citizens to pay tribute to a labor union in order to work for their country.

How much longer will the American people complacently permit the manufacture of vital munitions, planes, and ships to be delayed and hampered by strikes called by labor leaders for the purpose of forcing Americans to pay tribute to labor unions for the right to work as freemen?

How long will the boys you have drafted at $30 a month be compelled to wait for guns and powder and trucks and planes, in order that racketeers may ply their nefarious practices of extorting fees from American citizens in return for the right to work for a country that calls itself a democracy?

How long before the American people will realize the deadly parallel between what happened in France and what is happening in America today? Let us see that the awakening is not too late.

On November 25, I made the following statement on the floor of this House:

STRIKES ARE PREVENTING PROPER OPERATION OF OUR DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to echo and enlarge upon the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox]. We all know about these strikes that

are preventing the proper operation of our defense program, and I want to talk about two of these situations for a very few minutes. Now, take the Vultee strike. That concern has the sole contract for the production of training planes to train the boys that this Congress has conscripted into the service of their country. Now, that in itself is pretty serious. Let us see what caused that strike. We now have the official statement from the Attorney General that behind that strike is the "red" hand of communism. I echo the words of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], What is this Congress, that is charged with responsibility, going to do about it? How do a few "red" Communists manage to stop the entire production of training airplanes for this country in its emergency?

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOSSETT. The Congress is now coming in for some lambasting, it seems, and I want to ask the gentleman whether he does not feel that the executive and administrative agencies of this Government have not the power and the responsibility to deal immediately with this situation.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. In all fairness, I am not sure that they have. I am not sure there is sufficient legislation on the books to do the business.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. COX. But does not the gentleman recognize the responsibility upon the heads of Government at least to express disapproval of what is going on?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I would wish they would do so, but coming back to the responsibility of this Congress, which was what I was getting around to, how do a handful of "red" Communists manage to disrupt and interfere with the entire program of this Nation for planes to train the boys you have conscripted into service? How do they do it? They do it because they are members of a labor organization, and under the cloak and under the protection of that radical labor organization they are able to interfere with and stop the program of defense of this country.

Then you will ask, How does any minority labor union exert such a power? How can the C. I. O. or any other labor union say to 140,000,000 people, "You shall not build airplanes to train the boys you have conscripted into service"? Because there is a law known as the National Labor Relations Act, which stands behind and protects the activities of labor unions, which time and time again, by its ukase, has said to the employers of this country, "You shall not discharge a Communist from your organization." Time and again that has happened, and I can cite you the cases where they have said that. I can cite you a case decided in the last 90 days where the Labor Board has said to an executive of the New York Times, "You cannot fire your confidential secretary because she is a Communist."

So they operate under the protection of labor unions, and the labor unions, in turn, operate under the protection of the National Labor Relations Act.

Under whose protection does the National Labor Relations Board come? It comes through this Congress. It comes through us who have put it into effect and have not seen to its proper administration and amendment.

So, Mr. Speaker, that brings us right straight back to the proposition of where this trouble lies. We cannot lay it on the administration. We cannot lay it on the labor unions. We cannot lay it on the Communists. It comes straight back to our door, and I repeat the question, What are we going to do about it?

Now, let us consider the aluminum strike for a moment. One of those strikes, I am informed, has been going on for a month, delaying the production of aluminum. Another strike, as the gentleman from California has just told you, occurred in the last few days because one man would not pay tribute to a labor union.

Now, he has paid that tribute but still the strike goes on because he has not been discharged. You will recall that in the last 60 days this Congress was called upon for an authorization of $25,000,000 to increase the facilities of the T. V. A. at the request of the Defense Commission. Why? Because we were informed that in our defense program if a bottleneck ever came in that work it was going to come in the production of aluminum, because we were informed that it requires 5,000 pounds of finished aluminum for every airplane, much to my astonishment. We were informed that we must have additional power at the T. V. A. in order to produce that aluminum.

Now, does it strike you as significant that this little handful of radical "reds" in these various key matters have been able to absolutely stop the production of necessary and essential materials in two of the most important things that this country has to deal with?

Mr. Speaker, I have concluded. I just urge the Congress again to wake up and get out of the class of Rip Van Winkle and let us do something about it. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following statement from the Vultee Co., as to the situation in regard to their plant:

"Failure to reach a settlement of the strike at the Vultee aircraft plant, Downey, Calif., is due solely to the refusal of C. I. O. negotiators to protect national-defense production by agreeing to an arbitration clause in the proposed contract.

"No question of wages, hours, or working conditions remains between the company and the union. Full agreement has been reached on those points.

"The company, however, insists that for the term of the proposed contract—2 years—any differences arising between the company and the union should be adjusted by arbitration in case agreement by negotiation fails.

"Union officials, however, have refused to accept the arbitration clause. They insist on full freedom to strike in case of failure to reach a settlement by negotiation within 5 days.

"The 2-year period of the proposed contract covers the term of operations that will be necessary for Vultee to turn out basic training planes contracted for by the Army Air Corps and the fighter planes under contract by the British Purchasing Commission.

"The company submits that during this period of intensive production for national defense, public interest—even more than any interest of the company—demands that its aircraft production be protected against arbitrary strikes. Such protection would be afforded by the proposed arbitration agreement.

"The right to strike for better wages and working conditions is, of course, a prerogative of labor. But for union leadership to insist on reserving a right to strike during the period of a contract can mean only one thing in the opinion of the company. It means that the union desires to reserve an opportunity further to impede the progress of our national-defense program.

"The question of granting that right is one which no company engaged in defense production should be permitted to decide. That decision should rest with the Government and the people."

On January 24, 1941, I made the following speech on the floor of this House:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I favor the objectives of this bill, and I expect to support it. I think we must all realize that when this war is over, whether we get into it or not, the world tonnage is going to be so reduced that additional tonnage constructed by this country will be very welcome.

I think we need speed in this program as we need speed in every program of national defense. With this end in view, I have in mind to offer an amendment to this bill when it is read for amendment which I think will be helpful not only in speeding production here but, if adopted in other appropriation bills, will be helpful in speeding production there, and at the same time will eliminate one of the most un-American and reprehensible practices I know of. I speak of the practice that prevails today in the construction of every cantonment in the United States, where before a man can go to work under a defense project for his country he must pay a tribute arbitrarily fixed by a labor union. I have talked to a great many Members of the House on this subject, and they have said something ought to be done about it. Every time I suggest doing something about it, however, about as far as I can get is that somebody suggests that that is not the right thing—that we had better do something else. I think the way to do this thing is to do it effectively, and the most effective way I can think of doing it is to put a limitation upon every defense appropriation providing that no part of this appropriation may be used where any condition of employment requires a person to belong or not to belong to a labor union.

I expect specific instances have come to your attention as to abuses of this nature. I am going to cite a few right in my own district. I notice the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK] has just arrived on the floor. Two of his constituents were in my office yesterday. They were men who belonged to a union in good standing and had their cards with them. They wanted to go to work at Fort Belvoir where painters are needed, yet they were not permitted to do so. I can cite you many instances. The other day there came to my attention the case of three or four common laborers in my district. We have all been sympathetic with their conditions. In the last few years we have given them W. P. A. help and have tried to create jobs for them. This cantonment building creates jobs, but these constituents of mine who were just common laborers wanted to get a job digging a ditch, but they were not permitted to handle a pick or a shovel until they paid to the common laborers' union a fee of $23.

I have a painters' union in my town. In the suburbs of that town is Fort Belvoir. This painters' union is a regularly chartered A. F. of L. union. Their initiation fee is $50. The initiation fee in Washington, I am told, is $150. What happens? Why, the big boys in Washington just go down there and by main strength and awkwardness take control of jurisdiction in a cantonment in Virginia which is in the jurisdiction of the Alexandria Painters' Union.

Mr. Chairman, those things the Members all agree are not right. No man ought to be compelled either to join or not to join any organization in order to work for his country. [Applause.] What happens?

We are drafting men at $31 a month and sending them to these cantonments in wintertime. The draft bill contained a provision which says that men may not be put into those camps until the camps are completed. We are drawing the boys in day after day and these camps are not ready for them. There are instances at these camps where the mud is knee deep and where the men are housed

in tents and where everything is in confusion. And why? What is the natural result of this practice? I speak of a man's having to pay a fee to work for his country. The natural result is that men go there who are inexperienced and incompetent. They pay their fees, work for a week or so, and then get fired. As a consequence there is a continual turn-over of labor that disrupts the whole organization. I can cite other cases that have come within my own personal knowledge of men who have been engaged in their particular trades for years, who are experts, who have come here and been compelled to join these unions, have paid their initiation fees, and after a couple of weeks' work, forsooth, when they have earned the money to pay the tribute, for some unknown reason they lose their jobs, and the next day a new crop comes in.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I expect to offer this amendment to this bill. I expect to offer it to every appropriation bill that carries money for national defense. I agree with everything that has been said that we should have general legislation on this subject, but some of you may know the difficulty I have encountered in getting some legislation that two-thirds of the House thought was very essential on labor matters. If we cannot do it in one way, I think this Congress ought to do it in the other way and in the way they absolutely control—that is, by control of the purse. I shall offer this amendment. I hope the Committee will not object to it. I think it ought to be adopted, and hope it will be adopted.

Again, on the same day, January 24, 1941, I offered the following amendment to the pending defense appropriation bill, which was defeated, and, at the same time, spoke as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 3, after line 4, insert '*And provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be paid to any person, firm, or corporation that requires as a condition of employment of any employee that he either join or not join a labor union, nor shall any part of this appropriation be used to pay directly or indirectly the salary or wages of any person who advocates or belongs to any organization which advocates the duty, necessity, desirability, or propriety of overthrowing the United States Government by force or violence.'"

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment which I discussed in general debate and which you have heard discussed pro and con in general debate by others. I listened with interest to the remarks of my good friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] for whom I have the highest respect and affection, but I think he totally misconstrued the amendment which I have offered.

He made the statement, if I recall correctly, that this amendment would prevent and destroy labor unions in defense industries. The amendment does nothing but say that no man who wants to work for his country in this time shall be required to pay tribute to any organization. That seems a proposition that no one ought to dispute. I cannot understand why the members of the Labor Committee, who have told us so often of their affection for the laboring man, should come to this floor and advocate a situation which many people say amounts to nothing short of a "racket" sanctioned and upheld by the Government of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, my complaints do not come from employers. They come from the man in the street, the laborer who for 10 long years has been struggling for a living, through conditions of Nation-wide unemployment.

Now that this manufactured prosperity has come to pass, with a demand for his services, he goes to a cantonment, where he expects to get good wages, and asks for a job. He is told by the employer, "I will hire you if the labor union will let me." He goes to the labor union and is told, "You may go to work if you pay a certain fixed, arbitrary sum."

I am informed reliably that in my district, for a common laborer to dig a ditch, before he can put his hand on a pick he must pay the union $23. If he wants to be a painter, I am told that he must pay the union, before he can put his hand on a paint brush, $150.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. A common laborer here in the District, I understand, has to pay $87.50 before he can work.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If he is a carpenter, before he can manipulate his saw he must pay the labor union $58.

My colleagues, when you say you do not favor this amendment, and when you go through the tellers, as you will a little later on on this amendment, are you going to say by that that you sanction and approve such a practice, that prevails—and you know it prevails—in every district in the United States where defense work is going on?

I have been told that I ought to do this by means of general legislation. My genial friend the gentleman from Georgia has assured the House that if I introduce such a bill—what is he going to do? He is going to give me a hearing. I do not want a hearing. What I want is action. I have been fooling with hearings on these labor matters for 2 years, and where do you get?

If you gentlemen think it is right that a man should pay tribute before he can work, then vote my amendment down. If you think this practice is wrong, I am telling you here today that this is the only chance you have to correct it and the only chance you probably ever will have to correct it. [Applause.]

Again on January 24, 1941, in debate on the same bill, I said:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a very illuminating, useful, and helpful discussion on the amendment which I offered to this bill. I am glad to note that every one who spoke on the subject of the amendment which I offered expressed their approval of the objective of that amendment, but wanted it done in some other way.

It so happens that last December I offered a bill to do it in some other way, which bill was referred to the Judiciary Committee, and there died. In the hope that the situation would straighten itself out or that we would get some help, I have not reoffered that bill, but I am now going to accept the challenge of those gentlemen who opposed the amendment which I offered, and will this afternoon drop into the basket the bill which I have in my pocket. This bill will undertake by legislation to do the thing I have been unable to accomplish by an amendment to this appropriation bill. The bill, I believe, will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I will follow that with a letter this afternoon to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, inviting his attention to the RECORD of today and telling him how very anxious every Member who spoke on the subject this afternoon is to correct this evil practice which we all know exists. I hope you will all intercede with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and urge that we get not only a hearing on this bill but action.

On February 27, 1941, I offered the following amendment to the then pending defense appropriation bill, and spoke as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Page 3, line 8, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"'No part of this appropriation shall be paid to any person, firm, or corporation who requires or consents to a condition of employment of any employees that he either be a member or not be a member of, or join or not join, a labor union.'"

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have just offered is similar to the amendment which I offered to the appropriation bill for money to build ships, and that subject was debated quite fully in the House within the past 2 weeks.

The amendment is simply this: It withholds any of this appropriation from any person, firm, or corporation who requires any of its employees to join or not join a labor union. It brings to us again the troublesome and old subject that we have been dealing with since the defense program began, namely, the prevalent and universal custom throughout all of these defense industries that says to an American citizen, "You shall not work for your country unless you pay tribute to a labor union."

The amendment presents squarely this question. It is for this House to say whether it approves or disapproves of this practice. It is a practice that is prevailing in every district of every Member of this House, and I am wondering what we are going to say to our constituents who complain to us that "here I am competent to perform work for my country, and I have applied for a job; I am out of employment; I have been on relief, drawing the money that Congress has appropriated for relief; and here is a good job for me, and I am not permitted to take the job because I am not able to pay some labor union $50 or $100, or what have you."

This is the sole question presented here today, and I am going to ask the Members of this House to stand up and be counted on this proposition. It was suggested to me in the debate which we had on this subject 10 days ago that this is a matter that could be taken care of by general legislation. Mr. Chairman, you know as well as I do that that argument just begs the question. You know that before you can get legislation that is going to do away with this racket you have got to get a bill through a legislative committee—and I may say that the Judiciary Committee is now considering it, and considering it very seriously—but you have got to get a bill out of that committee, you have got to get a rule on the bill, you have to pass the bill through this House, you have to pass it through the Senate, and then you have got to get it signed by the President. All of you know the history of legislation that has anything to do with touching the sacred labor laws, and you know that it is well-nigh impossible, even though this House might vote for it 2 to 1, as it did on the amendments to the National Labor Relations Act. It is well-nigh impossible to jump all the hurdles that are going to confront you in attempting to secure legislative action unless you do put the limitation on an appropriation bill, as this amendment

proposes. This is a very simple way to do it. You have the power to do it right here this morning.

You may, by the adoption of this amendment, stop this racket right in its tracks. When you put a limitation on an appropriation bill that says no dollar of this money shall be spent in any form that puts up with such a condition as one that requires these employees to pay tribute to any private individual or organization, you kill that proposition there and then, and you do not have to get any more legislation enacted to take care of it.

This is the simple way to do it, and it is the practical way to do it. The question is whether or not there are votes in this House willing to stand up and do it; and that is the proposition I put up to you this morning.

I want now to call to your attention a newspaper clipping which I obtained this morning, consisting of only four lines. It is dated Gary, Ind., and says that the C. I. O. steel-union pickets refused to permit nonunion workers to enter the Carnegie steel and tin mill, which normally employs 9,000 men working to produce instruments for the defense of your country. A private organization has the assurance to say to American citizens that they shall not cross a line until they pay a price to this organization. Are you Members of the House going to stand for that indefinitely? That is the question I present to you today. Take the hearings of the Committee on the Judiciary, within the last 10 days, in which it was stated and proven that the glazier's union charge men $1,500 initiation fee for the right to work for their country, and the panes of glass that will protect your boys from the weather will lie there waiting until somebody can raise $1,500 to do that work. That is all the proposition is. It is, simply, you vote for it or you vote against it, and then make your explanation to your own conscience and to your own constituents.

Again, on March the 19th, I offered the following amendment to the pending defense appropriation bill and spoke as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Page 5, line 9, strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: '*And provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be paid to any person, firm, or corporation that requires, as a condition of employment of any employee, that he either join or not join a labor union; except where prior to the effective date of this act, an employer is under a contract with his regular employees which contains such a condition.'"

Mr. SMITH of Virgina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the sole and simple purpose of this amendment is to put a stop now to the unconscionable practice that has aroused the righteous anger and indignation of the American people and which has tended to slow down and sabotage our defense industries. It is the practice, which prevails in every congressional district in the United States, of requiring American citizens to pay tribute to a labor union for the privilege of working for their country. That is the simple proposition which I now present to you.

When I offered this amendment some time ago to a bill, my distinguished colleague from Virginia spoke against the amendment and based his opposition on the proposition that there were many industries now working on defense which had existing closed-shop contracts with their employees. In order to meet that objection, I have changed the amendment so that it will not apply to any firm that now has an existing closed-shop contract, but the amendment will tend to stop these organization drives which are paying more attention to union dues than they are to the defense of our country.

I will give you two brief examples. You have today a strike, about which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] spoke this morning, in the Harvill plant, which is making vital parts for airplanes. This is an organizational strike, a strike for a closed shop. When that particular supply of parts for airplanes, already manufactured, has become exhausted, as the Committee on the Judiciary was told the day before yesterday by an official of the United States Government, airplane production will have to stop until production of those parts is resumed.

You all know about the Allis-Chalmers strike, which has been going on for nearly 2 months in Wisconsin. In that plant they are making vital parts for battle cruisers. Until those parts are made, the cruisers cannot come off the ways.

It is going to be said that this amendment should not be adopted for some psychological reason that I have never been able to understand, in that we ought not to put any amendment on this bill. I want to say to you gentlemen that it is equally important that we get this work done as it is to commit the idle gesture of sitting here and appropriating $7,000,000,000, because appropriating $7,000,000,000 is not going to do a nickel's worth of good unless you get it into production.

I want to tell you in conclusion some of the things that are being done under this practice which I am seeking to prevent.

Competent men seeking employment even on direct Government work are required to pay unconscionable fees to union representatives under the guise of initiation fees. Instances of these fees in individual cases run from $23 to $1,500. I have evidence of many instances where inability to pay the required amount has foreclosed the worker from obtaining employment.

The payment of such fees, in many instances, does not admit the employee to membership in the union or to the rights and privileges of union members, but merely gives him a temporary license or permit to work on a single job.

In some instances, in lieu of the so-called initiation fee, he is charged a flat sum per day or per week for a permit to work, for which he likewise receives no union privileges or right of participation in union affairs.

In some instances of so-called jurisdictional controversies, one union, through arbitrary action, will prevent members of other equally legitimate unions from working on Government jobs.

Farm boys, from your district and mine, seeking temporary work as common laborers, are refused employment on Government projects in their own vicinities unless they pay the demanded tribute to a union representative.

Competent unemployed men, who are able to pay the required initiation fee, are refused work until all union men have first been employed.

Contractors, through voluntary agreements with unions, encourage these practices.

Closed-shop demands are at this moment preventing delivery to the Government of finished materials urgently needed, because labor unions have refused to permit the Government to enter and take them out of the factories.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman where the information comes regarding the fee of $1,500.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It came, if I recall correctly, from Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold, in his testimony before the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives pertaining to a glaziers' union where the Government was seeking at that moment to put glass in the barracks during the month of February for the boys that you put into the Army at $30 a month.

On March 21, 1941, I made the following speech on the floor of the House of Representatives:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have tried on previous appropriation bills to obtain an amendment which would have stopped in its tracks the racket prevailing universally in this country of requiring a man to pay tribute to a labor union in order to work for his country. That amendment has been repeatedly voted down. I had intended to offer it to this bill, but on coming here this morning I find that it is a deficiency bill, running to the period of June 30, 1941, and I think it would be a futile thing to offer it after the money in fact has been spent.

There are a few things I want to say on this subject, now that I have a little time to do it. We did not have time the other day.

We all know the conditions that prevail. We know that they are interfering seriously with our defense program in the production of materials, the production of vital materials, that are delaying many things that you must have, and have at once.

When I offered this amendment 2 or 3 days ago, my godd friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], in the heat of debate, was unkind enough to say that the purpose of my amendment was to destroy labor unions in this country. My good friend, the majority leader, was, I think, thoughtless enough, in the heat of that debate, to say that I was attempting to throw monkey wrenches into the defense program.

So far as the defense of my country is concerned, either in voting for appropriations or anything else, I stand on my record in this House, and I put it against the record of any man here. But let us see who is throwing monkey wrenches into the defense program and let us see who is threatening to break up labor unions in this country and set them back 25 years in the gains they have made under this Administration. Do you gentlemen who get on this floor and proclaim yourselves the friends of labor realize that 1 percent of those interested in the labor movement are rapidly destroying the gains of organized labor by their unwillingness to cooperate with their country in the hour of its greatest emergency? Do you suppose for a minute that the average workingman in this country is any less loyal to his country than you or I? If you do, you are wrong. Do you suppose that the average workingman in this country, who in many instances has been out of employment for years, wants to strike on these high wages and stop his work and stop the flow of the pay roll which is supporting his family? Of course not. He has to strike because somebody at the top of the union, for some reason that he does not know anything about, says to strike. When those leaders say "strike," whether there are underlying reasons of communism or fascism, or whatever they

may be, he must strike. A picket line is thrown around his place of work and he is not permitted to enter. If you gentlemen who claim to be the friends of labor would just realize what is going on in this country and stand up here and do something to stop this thing and see that the production for our national defense proceeds, you would be doing labor the greatest favor that has ever been done to it on this floor [applause], because I warn you gentlemen who claim to be the friends of organized labor that if something is not done in the next 30 days, and these strikes keep on, all of us who are real friends of labor and real friends of honest organized labor are going to have to stand on this floor and fight drastic legislation that would take away the proper gains of organized labor that it has taken them 25 years to bring about.

Now, let us see who is throwing monkey wrenches into the defense program. I am accused of throwing monkey wrenches into the defense program because I want to see that no man shall be required to pay tribute to a labor union in order that he may work for his country. If that is throwing a monkey wrench into the defense program, what is the Allis-Chalmers strike, brought about by a Communist, and preventing the production of vital defense articles that this country needs? What kind of a monkey wrench is that, and where is it being thrown? If the Members of this House would put their foot down on that sort of thing, they would take some of the monkey wrenches out of the machinery that have already been thrown there by others, and which I have been trying to stop. [Applause.]

I think this thing is too serious and too imminent and the time is too precious for us to hesitate to give voice to the words in our hearts, and the knowledge that we have in our minds, as to these things, irrespective of whom it may offend.

May I say a word about the Mediation Board? We looked forward with great hope that this Mediation Board just created was going to do something about this situation. Have you read the Executive order? I read it with great disappointment. Under the Executive order creating this labor Mediation Board, do you know that it has no functions? It cannot perform one single act to prevent a strike. It cannot operate at all until the Secretary of Labor, having exhausted every means within her power, having used all the facilities of the Conciliation Department, having gotten to the end of the rope, and the strike probably having been going on for some time, finally makes up her mind that she cannot do anything more about it; then she is permitted, if she so pleases, to invite the Mediation Board to come in and see what they can do about it.

Now, what does that mean? That means that this Mediation Board has but one function. That is, after the damage has all been done, and after the strike has been called and defense production has been stopped and your program destroyed in that particular part of the work that is going on, then the Mediation Board may come in and solemnly "view the remains." And that is about all it can do. I challenge anybody to say it can do anything else.

Now, gentlemen, in all seriousness, this program does not need an undertaker; it does not need somebody to come in and view the remains after it is all over; we can all foresee that; what we need is a physician—somebody to prescribe the remedy, somebody to prevent these stoppages in defense employment—and this Congress—this Congress, the representatives of the 130,000,000 people of the United States—is that physician. It is your duty to prescribe; it is your duty to enact legislation. You cannot abdicate your functions to an executive department. Your people and mine will expect us to perform our constitutional functions. How long are the American people to be subjected to the delay in their vital defense matters because this Congress refuses or fails to function? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Just one or two little items of what is happening: In my State the Radford powder plant was built and completed in less time than the contract required. Only one-quarter of this plant can go into operation. Why? Because the machinery for the other three-quarters is tied up by the strike in the Allis-Chalmers plant, and this strike, as the gentleman from Alabama has just demonstrated very clearly to you, was called and fostered and brought about by communistic influences. Do we not realize that when we put these boys in the Army at $30 a month we have got to give them some powder to shoot with? Do we not realize that when we are training these boys at the risk of their lives every day to fly planes, that we must give them some planes to fly?

Then there is the Harvell strike, which was shown by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] yesterday conclusively to be engendered by the Communists. This strike is tying up the vital production of parts for airplanes, and you are advised authoritatively that unless this strike is immediately settled, the whole airplane-production program is going to be slowed up because they cannot get that particular part. I have several instances of similar character, and if I had a few minutes more, I could tell you about them. I wish I had the time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

On yesterday, strikes that have been delaying our defense preparations flared into violence amounting to civil insurrection. The recently appointed Mediation Board confessed its lack of authority or power to act in the premises. The Congress has so far failed to exercise its constitutional function to legislate in behalf of a nation facing the most critical period in its history.

Again I urge the Congress to enact legislation before it is too late that would put a stop to the racketeering, the strikes, and the threatened strikes that may cause us to face the crisis ill armed, ill trained, ill equipped, and ill prepared.

Defects in Education System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK DAILY ENQUIRER

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very able editorial entitled "Education in America Is Recreant." This editorial is by the pen of Hon. William Griffin, editor and publisher of the New York Daily Enquirer, published in the issue of March 3, 1941. This editorial is particularly timely in view of the widespread publicity given the fact that communist ideologies are creeping and seeping rapidly into some of the public-school systems of the country, as alleged by organizations which have for several years past made a very close study of the subject.

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Daily Enquirer]

EDUCATION IN AMERICA IS RECREANT

Education in America, public and nonpublic, represents a tremendous financial investment and burden for the taxpayers and all others upon whom it relies for its monetary requirements. In no land upon earth is so much cash spent upon education as is expended in the United States. But, despite the financial and other advantages enjoyed by education under the folds of Old Glory, American education is far, very far, from what it should be.

One of the primary functions of education is the development of good citizenship in those educated. By good citizenship we mean moral, patriotic, and intelligent citizenship.

Our American schools should be nurseries of sound patriotism. For the greater part, they are hotbeds of antipatriotism and pseudo patriotism. And, with the exception of certain denominational schools, the cultivation of real moral consciousness, which must be based upon a belief in God, is looked upon as out of date and not in harmony with the American concept of education.

The governing preoccupation of our American schools, in the ultramodern and degenerate period in which we live, is propaganda—propaganda for democracy, propaganda for internationalism, propaganda for this, for that, and a hundred things besides.

Patriotism, honest, active, uncompromising love of America, such as that love which burned in the souls and hearts of Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, Carroll of Carrollton, Hancock, Jackson, and Lincoln is absolutely essential to the survival of the United States of America.

Because of the manner in which genuine patriotism is scorned and outlawed in American classrooms, the thought of what the Republic will suffer in years to come, unless public opinion and popular action correct the situation in time, is anything but agreeable.

Nationalism is the bedrock of this Republic.

It was the impelling force which came from our God-given independence as a Nation among the nations, that exalted our forbears, expanded the Republic to ocean-to-ocean dimensions, and won for the names "America" and "American" a glory never matched in all history.

Our American schools—we should call them our so-called American schools—are engaged in classroom propagandizing which is destroying the sacred gift of American nationalism that is the birthright of every American boy and girl. This is a condition of things whose existence it is humiliating to have to acknowledge and whose existence is a direct challenge to the men and women of America who are still loyal to the American faith of their fathers.

Poison the minds of the children of today and you poison the minds of the grown-ups of tomorrow.

Answers to Questions About Steel in Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1941

PAMPHLET PREPARED BY THE AMERICAN IRON AND STEEL INSTITUTE

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, steel is the backbone of our national-defense production. Iron and steel mills are working day and night, 7 days a week, to meet the needs of the Nation. The American Iron and Steel Institute has prepared a very informative pamphlet entitled "Answers to Questions About Steel in Defense," which outlines some very important questions and answers about steel in national defense and which will prove interesting to all who read it. I ask unanimous consent that this pamphlet be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEEL IN NATIONAL DEFENSE

1. How important is steel to national defense?

Steel is a necessity for almost every type of defense equipment—battleships, planes, guns, ammunition, tanks, and mobile equipment of all kinds, as well as the machines and tools with which to make them.

2. Are steel consumers who make products for the defense program getting preferences in deliveries?

From the outset of the defense program the steel industry has voluntarily given first call and right-of-way to orders devoted to that cause.

3. How has the steel industry organized itself to cooperate with the Army, Navy, and other branches of the Government on defense matters?

Acting upon the request of the Office of Production Management, the chief executives of close to 30 steel companies are organizing themselves as an iron and steel industry defense committee. That committee will work for close cooperation between industry and government, and help speed output. Another committee of expert metallurgists works with Government agencies in preparing and revising specifications for steel products, and also advises with steel consumers on specification problems.

4. How much steel can the Nation's steel industry produce?

The rated capacity of the industry was more than 84,000,000 tons of steel ingots and castings per year at the close of 1940.

5. How does our country's steel capacity compare with that for other countries?

World steel capacity outside the United States is estimated at 105,000,000 tons per year. The Iron Age estimates foreign steel production in 1940 as follows: About 42,500,000 tons were produced in continental Europe excluding Russia. Russia produced 21,800,000 tons, and the United Kingdom produced 15,000,000 tons. About 7,100,000 tons were produced in Japan, and 2,000,000 tons in Canada. Steel production in all other countries was estimated at 4,100,000 tons, bringing the total production for the world outside the United States to 92,500,000 tons. Output last year in this country was close to 67,000,000 tons.

CAPACITY TO PRODUCE STEEL

6. What percent of the world's steel-making capacity is in the United States?

About 44 percent.

7. How does our present steel capacity compare with that of 1918? Of 1929?

It has increased almost 40 percent since 1918, and fully 15 percent since 1929.

8. Has the increase in steel-making capacity kept pace with population gain?

Yes, it has far outstripped population gain. The Nation's present population is only 8 percent more than in 1929, and 27 percent more than in 1918.

9. Was any of this new capacity added last year?

During 1940 about 2,500,000 tons of annual capacity were added, and plans are now under way to increase capacity by another 3,400,000 tons during 1941.

10. Operations of the steel industry have been reported at over 95 percent of its capacity for some months. How long can they continue there?

So far there is no apparent strain on producing facilities. Actually some companies have recently been producing in excess of 100 percent of rated capacity. In 1917 the entire industry operated at 100 percent or over for 7 months.

11. How can any company operate at more than 100 percent of its rated capacity?

The reason is that the rated capacity of the industry is the sum total of maximum output attained in any recent year by each furnace in the industry, less about 11 percent which is taken off for shut-downs and repairs. Thus, the rated capacity is not the production ceiling. As a practical matter the industry could, by reducing the length of the shut-downs, lift output as much as 2.5 percent above its rated capacity in a year and for shorter periods it could probably operate at an even higher rate. It follows that the industry has a practical maximum capacity considerably higher than its rated capacity.

12. What could the industry produce if called upon to operate at its highest practical capacity in 1941?

If necessary, it probably could produce as much as 86,000,000 tons, not counting production from the new furnaces that are now being installed, and in 1942 it could produce approximately 90,000,000 tons. The maximum for 1941 would be about 20,000,000 tons more than the industry actually produced in 1940.

ABILITY TO CONSUME STEEL

13. Would 86,000,000 tons be enough for defense needs, for exports and for other needs?

It is estimated that when the defense program gets in full swing a total of 8,000,000 tons may be used for defense in a year, and another 12,000,000 tons for export to Great Britain, Canada, South America, and other countries—about 20,000,000 tons in all. That would leave at least 66,000,000 tons of steel which could be turned out for domestic civilian use.

14. How does that tonnage compare with what has been needed for ordinary commercial uses in the past?

In 1929, the best peacetime year on record, the domestic use of steel was equal to 57,500,000 tons of ingots, or 950 pounds per capita.

15. What does 66,000,000 tons represent on a per capita basis today?

It figures out to 1,010 pounds per capita, or 6 percent more per capita than was needed in the boom year of 1929.

16. What was peak production of the steel industry in the United States before, during, and after World War No. 1?

Before the first World War, the peak year of steel output was 35,057,000 tons in 1913. Biggest output during World War I was 50,468,000 tons in 1917. A later peak was 63,205,000 tons in 1929. All these earlier records were broken in 1940, when 66,993,000 tons were produced.

17. What was the rate of steel output in 1940 relative to capacity?

Steel output in 1940 represented 82 percent of the industry's rated capacity as of the end of 1939. It would represent less than 78 percent of present practical capacity.

18. Did steel output rise in response to the defense program in 1940?

Yes. Early in the spring of 1940 the industry was running at only 60 percent of capacity, while in the last quarter of the year the rate of operations averaged nearly 96 percent.

WHERE STEEL PRODUCTION GOES

19. Was this production for use in the United States alone?

In large part, although heavy shipments were made to England and her allies.

20. How much steel did we export during 1940?

Almost 11,000,000 tons of ingots were used to make steel for export last year. More than half of the exports went to the United Kingdom and Canada.

21. How do those exports compare with earlier years?

The 1940 total was over three times exports in 1939, about three times the 1929 total, and exceeded the previous 1917 peak by fully 25 percent.

22. What was done with the steel made and used in this country last year?

Preliminary estimates indicate that about 13 percent of the finished steel shipped to consumers was used in the construction of highways, cantonments, dams, bridges, and factories, including a good deal of defense-plant construction. About 18 percent went to the automotive industry to build passenger cars, trucks, and mechanized military equipment. The railroads took 10 percent, and another 10 percent was used to make tin cans, steel drums, and other containers.

23. That accounts for about half of the total. Where did the rest go?

To machinery and tool makers, to industries that press or stamp steel into various products, to ordnance makers, shipbuilders, and to a host of other industries from manufacturers of watches to airplane-engine producers.

DEFENSE USES FOR STEEL

24. How much steel is needed to make a battleship?

A big 45,000-ton battleship will require about 20,000 tons of ordinary steel, an aircraft carrier about 17,000 tons, a cruiser about 5,500 tons, and a destroyer about 700 tons. Those tonnages do not include the steel in the ship's guns and defensive armor.

25. Building a "two-ocean" navy will take how much steel, on that basis?

It has been estimated that, exclusive of guns and armor, the total number of naval vessels now under construction or appropriated for will require less than 1,200,000 tons of steel, spread over the next 4 years.

26. How does that amount of steel compare with what the automobile industry uses, for instance?

In 1940 the automobile industry consumed approximately 6,900,000 tons of steel.

27. How much steel is used in building airplanes?

To build one of the bigger planes like a transport or a heavy bomber requires at least 5 tons of high-grade alloy steels. Steel accounts for almost half the weight of both the fuselage and the engines. To build 50,000

airplanes of various types would require at the most 250,000 tons of high-quality steel.

28. Has there been any change in the types of steel used for military and naval equipment since 1918?

Yes. Better steels have been largely responsible for the faster ships, planes, and tanks of today, for the higher powered and more durable guns, and for the more effective armor plate.

29. What types of steel products are used for those purposes?

Almost every kind. To build a battleship, for instance, takes steel plates, structural shapes, wire, sheet steel, tubular products, bars—in fact, practically the whole range of products. Even tin plate has military importance in preserving food for military and naval use, while barbed wire likewise has a part to play in defense.

30. Can the American steel industry produce the high-quality steels needed for defense?

It has been producing them for years. With only a very few exceptions, such as armor plate, the steels which are used for defense equipment are also important in peacetime. Thus in the years before the present emergency the steel industry acquired the ability and equipment to produce in vast quantities the steels now needed for defense.

31. Do steel companies themselves make defense equipment, or are they primarily a supplier of steel to companies that make such equipment?

The steel industry is primarily a supplier of steel to other companies which fabricate it into defense equipment. Two of the larger companies in the industry are equipped to build naval vessels and merchant ships. Some steel companies also make armor plate and certain other heavy ordnance equipment.

DELAYS AND SHORTAGES IN OUTPUT

32. Have there been any shortages in particular kinds of steel?

The answer is "No" for the main body of steel products, but "Yes" for a few special kinds of steel, such as stainless steel and high-speed tool steel.

33. What caused these shortages?

One of the important alloys in stainless steel is nickel, and early in 1941 the supply of nickel became tight. In the case of high-speed tool steel, tungsten supplies also appeared somewhat inadequate.

34. Are most other steel products in ample supply?

Because of the great rush of orders, mills are booked ahead for some months on various products such as plates and structural shapes. Users are anticipating their needs well in advance and scheduling their orders accordingly. Instead of the "hand-to-mouth" buying which prevailed throughout the depression, the former practice of forward buying has returned. The present situation for the bulk of steel products is one of somewhat deferred deliveries, but that is not a shortage.

35. There has been talk of a shortage of aluminum. Does this bother the steel industry?

It does to some extent because the steel industry uses pure aluminum to remove gases from molten steel. Annual requirements of aluminum in steelmaking are not great as compared with consumption by other industries, but no completely satisfactory substitute exists today.

36. Have no bottlenecks appeared in any departments of the steel industry?

The nearest thing to a bottleneck was in electric furnace capacity. These furnaces make special quality alloy steels, and because of the sharply increased demand for these steels in the manufacture of airplane and tank engines and parts, and for other uses, the steel industry's former electric furnace capacity was inadequate. It is being expanded by 50 percent to a total capacity of close to 2,900,000 tons per year. From time to time expansions have been made in other departments to keep the various kinds of producing facilities in proper balance with each other.

EXPANSION OF STEEL CAPACITY

37. What about other types of equipment?

There was also a need early in 1941 for new coke ovens and blast furnaces, and these are being built, as well as new open hearth steel-making furnaces. Also a number of Bessemer converters recently retired from active service are being put back into use.

38. An expansion program like that must cost a lot of money. How much?

The steel industry is spending $282,000,000 for new equipment and construction during 1941. In 1940, it spent $171,000,000.

39. How much was spent in the preceding 10 years?

From 1930 through 1939, about $1,500,000,000 was spent by steel companies on new equipment and modernization.

40. Were those years poor ones for the steel industry?

They were. Over that whole decade the industry earned an average of less than 2 percent on its investment. Net earnings of the entire industry averaged $50,000,000 a year, or about one-third of its average yearly expenditures for new equipment and modernization. Earnings of previous years and borrowed money were used to meet the cost of new construction.

41. Was it wise for the industry to spend all that money to enlarge and improve its plants in bad times?

It was not only wise but it is most fortunate for the country that the steel industry was "geared up" for unprecedented production when the armament program appeared.

42. Is any considerable proportion of steel facilities outmoded or obsolete?

No. As a result of large expenditures in recent years, it is estimated that more than 90 percent of the industry's facilities are modern and up-to-date and capable of efficient production. Substantially all of the remainder is in operating condition, but is less efficient and economical.

43. You have mentioned electric furnaces. Are they more up to the minute than open-hearth furnaces?

They are not comparable that way because each has its own job to do. Electric furnaces are used chiefly to produce special kinds of alloy steel, while open hearths are used primarily to make the carbon steels which comprise the great bulk of total steel output.

44. What is the Dunn report on the steel industry?

It is a report to the President prepared by Mr. Gano Dunn, an eminent engineer on the staff of the Office of Production Management. The report concluded that the Nation's steel capacity is and will be adequate for all demands expected this year or next.

45. Is the industry spread out geographically or concentrated?

Its plants are spread from coast to coast, in more than 250 different communities in 28 States. The largest centers are around Pittsburgh and Chicago.

THE RAW MATERIALS FOR STEEL

46. Is the steel industry dependent on foreign sources for raw materials?

Certain essential raw materials must be imported, but these represent less than one-half of 1 percent of the total tonnage of raw materials consumed annually by the steel industry.

47. Which raw materials must be imported?

Among the more important materials that come from abroad are manganese, tin, chromium, cobalt, tungsten, and vanadium. Nickel is also imported, but principally from Canada.

48. Where do these imports come from?

Manganese from Russia, Brazil, Cuba, and Africa; tin from Malaya, the Dutch East Indies, and Bolivia; chromium from Africa, Cuba, Greece; cobalt from Canada, Africa, and Australia; tungsten from China and Malaya; vanadium from Peru and Rhodesia.

49. How are these other metals used in steel making?

In three principal ways: (1) To purify steel; (2) to impart special properties to alloy steels; (3) to serve as a corrosion-resisting coating on steel.

50. What steps are being taken to insure an adequate supply of the materials which have been imported?

The Government is purchasing reserves of some, like manganese and tin, and is also fostering domestic production. The steel companies themselves have also laid in larger than normal stocks of certain materials.

51. Do we have enough iron ore in the country to meet our present needs?

The Nation's resources of iron ore are more than adequate, as are its resources of limestone and coal, which are also very important in steel making.

52. You have said that the steel industry is made up of a number of companies. How many?

There are more than 200 companies in the industry, employing at the present time about 600,000 men and paying out almost $100,000,000 a month in pay rolls.

53. Has there been any shortage of labor in steel mills?

Thus far there has been virtually no shortage of steel workers, largely because of the job-training and apprentice-training programs which have been regularly conducted by companies in the industry. Another reason is that hourly wages paid by the steel industry are the highest in the history of the industry and average almost 30 percent higher than the average for all manufacturing industries.

54. Where may one obtain further information about the steel industry?

The American Iron and Steel Institute, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., endeavors to supply any needed information about the iron and steel industry.

Discrimination Against Negro Race at Kansas City Bomber Assembly Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. U. S. GUYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

RESOLUTION OF STATE LEGISLATURE OF KANSAS

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, again I want to call attention of the Congress and the country to the undemocratic method of discrimination against the Negro race at Kansas City, Kans., with respect to the bomber assembly plant now being built in the Fairfax industrial district, where the builders declare they are not going to hire any Negroes except as janitors and in similar positions.

This is a defense project and such conduct violates not only the letter but particularly the spirit of the law which forbids such discrimination "because of age, sex, race, or color."

The House of Representatives of the State of Kansas has denounced this discrimination by a unanimous vote in passing the following resolution.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include this resolution:

House Resolution 43

Resolution condemning discrimination practiced by certain employers in Kansas, who are now or hereafter engaged in industries essential to the national-defense program

Whereas it is a fundamental principle of the American democracy that all American citizens are endowed with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; and

Whereas it is essential, in order to pursue happiness properly, that every American citizen be given an equal right to work so that he may support himself and family; and

Whereas it is the declared policy of the Defense Commission of the United States of America that "workers shall not be discriminated against because of age, sex, race, or color"; and

Whereas contrary to such announced policy on the part of our National Government, the president and general manager of the North American Aviation, Inc., which company is to have control and management of the Government-owned bomber-plane assembly plant, to be located in the Fairfax district of Kansas City, Kans., did publish in the daily papers of Kansas City, Kans., on March 17, 1941, the following statement, to wit:

"Regardless of Negroes' training, we will not employ them in the North American plant. It is against the policy of the company to use Negroes as mechanics or aircraft workers. We intend to maintain the same policy in Kansas City, Kans."; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, That we go on record as condemning the unfair and un-American practice intended to be invoked against our Negro citizens of Kansas by the North American Aviation, Inc., at Kansas City, Kans., or any other city in Kansas; and further condemning any and all other discriminatory acts by any employer of this State, now or hereafter engaged in any phase of the national-defense program; be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully urge and request the President of the United States to investigate and to correct any and all such abuses; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to have copies of this resolution engrossed and to send a copy of the same to the President of the United States and a copy to each member of the Kansas delegation in the House of Representatives and in the Senate of the United States of America.

Adopted March 21, 1941.

CLAY C. CARPER,
Speaker of the House.
W. T. BISHOP,
Chief Clerk of the House.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, convoys mean "good-bye, boys"—the last step.

I love my country, and I hate to see it led astray.

Bringing England's cruisers into our ports for reconditioning is breeding scabs.

Painting our battleships to look like Britain's isn't insurance; it's an invitation.

One step at a time but still denying is our cumulative American way of life.

Suppose we will have to enter the war because it is April, and, too, because the 90 days is up.

This column does not waiver nor acknowledge that the die is cast till our soldiers are ordered in.

The supermediation board will be the fifteenth to settle labor disputes; they all encourage strikes.

Morale of the people generally is hurt for victory when signal failure of a domestic nature is undisputed.

The morale in our Army is hurt by the toleration given strikers in high brackets by the Government, when the soldier is sacrificing.

The President, while at sea, should be let down in a steel ball to the bottom, just to show him how deep it is.

It is a foolish and unsupported war if we are determined to whip Hitler over there in the final analysis, with men.

The miracle man of America will now please demonstrate how he is going to keep his promise to aid Greece.

Sic 'em, Russia; we are with you. We democracies have got to stand together. Sic 'em, Dictator Greece; we are praying for you in the arsenal.

The City of San Francisco With Its Bay and Adjacent Territory Is the Geographical Center of the Pacific Coast and Is of the Highest Strategic Importance to Any Adequate Defense of This Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the strategic importance of the city of San Francisco, its bay, and the adjacent territory to any adequate defense of the entire Pacific coast is beyond verbal description. San Francisco is the outlet for that vast empire embracing the San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys, each of which is traversed its length by different large navigable rivers emptying into San Francisco Bay, and the Livermore, Napa, Sonoma, and Santa Clara Valleys, all rich and profitable land. The immeasurable importance of this empire to national defense is only limited by the adequacy of transportation facilities available.

San Francisco Bay is not only the geographical center of the Pacific coast, but it is the most important and finest harbor for naval and military purposes on the entire western seaboard. This important fact has been referred to on many occasions by the highest-ranking officials of both the Army and the Navy. Admiral Charles F. Hughes, while Chief of Naval Operations, testified before a committee of Congress that:

> San Francisco Bay is, as you know, the principal harbor of the Pacific coast. To my mind it belongs to the Nation; it is not the property of California nor of the cities that are on its shores. From its natural advantages and its location, San Francisco Bay is certain to be the major continental fleet base for any extensive campaign in the Pacific. It will be the point where the fleet will concentrate at the beginning of a war.

Within this vast area—the spearhead of Pacific coast national defense—are many of the principal military establishments on the Pacific coast. Within the city of San Francisco are the Presidio Military Reservation, Fort Winfield Scott, Fort Mason, the Army transport docks, United States Risdon naval plant, and the United States Naval Drydocks at Hunters Point. Outside of San Francisco proper, but within the bay area, are the Mare Island Navy Yard, the Oakland Naval Air Base, one of the largest in the world, the Oakland Naval Supply Base, the United States Army Moffett Air Field, Fort Barry, Fort Baker, and the United States Bombardment Base. Every single one of these military and naval establishments is essential to national defense, but from the lessons of modern warfare we now know their weakest link is inadequate highways. When the completed story of the battle of France is finally written it will show the battle was lost and won mostly on the highways.

The Federal Government, of necessity, is spending billions for proper national defense. In this program careful consideration must be given to strategic national-defense highways and to bridges which are an integral part of those highways. Particularly is this true in the case of San Francisco, with all of its military and naval activities.

San Francisco, one of our great seaport cities, has a population of approximately three-fourths of a million people. Thousands of men are now engaged in building naval and merchant ships in private shipyards for the United States Government. The city itself is built on the tip of a peninsula, with an area of approximately 40 square miles, one of the smallest areas of any large city in the country. This geographic location enhances its strategic importance, but there is but one approach from the easterly or continental side of San Francisco Bay—by way of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, which is 9 miles long and 200 feet high. San Francisco Bay is 70 miles long, with an average width of some 8 miles. The only other approaches are by two roads entering the city from the south on the San Francisco peninsula and the Golden Gate Bridge at the extreme north. Thus the transportation of all materials and supplies over highways is restricted, and for purely military purposes in this defense program the Government must provide another approach. This matter has been favorably considered by military authorities already.

Several years ago the War Department approved a low-level bridge at Hunters Point connecting San Francisco with Alameda County on the east side of San Francisco Bay. Hunters Point extends well out into the bay; is 5½ miles south of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge and 11½ miles north of the next bridge to the south, the San Mateo Bridge. It is directly opposite Bay Farm Island, Alameda County, which is slightly south of the Oakland naval air base and the Oakland municipal airport. This provides an ideal location for another approach to San Francisco for the distance is only 5¾ miles from Hunters Point to the opposite shore and two-thirds of this distance is shallow water where a road could be built up by the same process as was used for the Oakland naval air base and for Treasure Island where the recent Golden Gate Exposition was held. They were reclaimed by the use of centrifugal pumps at a nominal cost. Following the type of construction used in the approaches to the San Francisco-Oakland Bridge and the San Mateo Bridge, the remainder of the road could readily be constructed on concrete piling.

A further defense requisite for adequate highways would be to provide such a bridge for the evacuation of San Francisco should that ever be necessary. In such an emergency the Golden Gate Bridge might by reason of its exposed location be of limited value and a single shell could put the 200-foot high-level San Francisco-Oakland Bridge out of commission for an indefinite period. Thus, without an additional approach, there are but two roads available—the ferry systems having been long since abandoned—and these are heavily congested even under ordinary conditions.

I was harbor master of the Port of San Francisco at the time of the great catastrophe in 1906 when 5 square miles in the heart of the city was reduced to ashes. The scene of its evacuation even at that early date beggars description. Picture another evacuation caused by shell fire from the air into a city principally of wooden construction, and the conditions will be beyond description.

The need for such a low-level bridge as an integral part of the defense program for the Pacific coast, has long since been established. It would make possible the extension of all transcontinental freight lines directly into San Francisco and the important military establishments to which I have referred. Lessons from the European war emphasize that need more certainly. National defense is predicated on the preservation of the Government and the lives and property of its citizens. The War Department approved the project years ago, and such a bridge should be immediately constructed extending from Hunters Point to the continental side of the bay, not only for the military and naval value it will be, but the great value it would be should such an emergency as necessary evacuation ever arise.

The Conquered Peoples of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY UPTON SINCLAIR

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by Upton Sinclair to the conquered peoples of Europe in February 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have been asked to speak over the radio to the conquered peoples of Europe, and to their kinsmen in other lands and on the sea. In the 46 years of my work as professional writer and speaker, I have never approached any duty with more humility of mind and spirit. I live in the sunshine of California, in a land of peace and freedom. I have my home and my garden into which no one intrudes. I read what books I please, I think what thoughts I please, I write what seems to me to be true and publish it freely. I have done this throughout my life, and although I have made many enemies none has ever been able to check me. Last November I went to the polls and cast a secret ballot for the persons I wished to have govern me, knowing that those favored by a majority of our voters would take office unopposed. In short, I am a citizen of a free, democratic society; I live under what Abraham Lincoln called a government of the people, by the people, and for the people; I enjoy what our Declaration of Independence calls the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Now I am speaking to people who have been deprived of all these rights; whose land has been invaded by conquerors, whose legal government has been driven into exile, whose liberties have been destroyed by one of the most wanton crimes in the world's long history. What can I say to such people that will be adequate to the situation? Words are so cheap in the California sunshine, but so dreadfully costly in the dark winter of oppression which has closed down upon the people of the conquered European lands.

As it happens, I am a novelist, and it has been my task to put myself by the power of imagination into the place of other people and to share their feelings. Also I have read history and know what men have endured in past ages. I know what liberty has cost mankind, what price has been paid for knowledge and enlightenment. Every step along the road of human progress has been cemented with the broken bones and the blood of human beings. Uncounted billions have been helpless victims; others have been heroes and martyrs, persons who might have saved their lives if they had been willing to keep quiet, to bow their necks to the yoke of the conquerors, to do what they were told—in short, to cease to be free men and women and become slaves. But they refused to do that; they steeled their hearts to resistance; they kept the sacred fires of revolt burning in their souls; they matched their brains against the brains of despots, and found ways, open or secret, to oppose them and in the end to overcome them.

I do not say that they have always succeeded. History would be pleasanter reading if that were true. The tragic fact is that many great civilizations have been destroyed, many truths have been rooted out and suppressed, genius and decency and kindness have been stamped into the mud by the hoofs of brutality and stupidity. But some of the good things have managed to survive, and it is obvious that none could have survived unless men had fought and struggled, first in their own souls, then in the world outside them. Such knowledge as we possess is ours because our forefathers were willing to suffer and to die in order to gain it and to spread it. Such democratic rights as are left in the world have survived because brave and good men won them and handed them on as institutions to us. Each of us who lives carries in his heart and brain a sacred treasure which it is his duty to preserve and pass on, unimpaired and if possible improved, to his children and his children's children.

For those who do not know my books let me say that from the beginning of my career I have defended the rights of the human personality against all forms of repression. Eighteen years ago, when fascism made its appearance, I raised my voice against this menace to freedom and enlightenment. I did the same against the vile Nazi creed from the first hour. As a lifelong Socialist I denounced its theft of the word "socialism"; for socialism has always been a free, democratic movement, and this Nazi thing is no kind of socialism, but the worst of state capitalism, a slavery which is not content to exploit the labor of men and women, but deprives them of that political liberty which gives them hope of economic progress.

The Nazi system robs human beings of their right to seek the truth and to speak what they have learned. Figuratively speaking, it cuts out the eyes of its followers, it breaks their eardrums it reduces them to mechanical slaves, eating ersatz foods, thinking ersatz thoughts, and making ersatz history. Such a creed is a product of depraved moral natures; and in these later tragic days the Fascists and Nazis have given overwhelming proof of the fact.

Can such cruel aggressors wreck the temple of civilization and set up their Moloch in its place? The moral life in us, the thing which we call our conscience and our God, refuses to believe it. I see a quickening of the democratic spirit in my own country, and I do not believe that the forces of so-called appeasement and of big money greed can overcome it. Certainly there has been an awakening among the free peoples of the British Commonwealth, and I am not indulging in wishful thinking when I tell the enslaved peoples of Europe that help is surely coming to them.

Your knowledge of your own souls and of the history of mankind tells you that freedom comes from within, that so long as it lives within the human soul it cannot be destroyed from without. The conquered peoples of Europe have an old culture and an old moral discipline. Steel your souls once more to endure, as heroes and martyrs have endured in your country and in mine, and in all others where there is anything worth living for. Guard the treasure of knowledge and understanding in your own minds. Make them into the food of both your body and soul. Make liberty into a prayer to be repeated day and night, a song to be sung in your hearts. Teach these prayers and songs to your children—for that is the most important thing of all, that the invading barbarians shall not be able to steal your youth and corrupt the soul of the future Europe.

Teach your children the truth about the invaders of your land, and save them from the mental degradation of nazi-ism. Teach them to be willing to suffer for truth and freedom—since it is their fate to be born in a time when they have to choose between defiance and enslavement worse than death.

We have an old motto in our country: "Rebellion to tyrants is obedience to God." Those who put this motto into action learn an important lesson of the moral life, that out of resistance comes strength to resist. You are, perhaps, still permitted to read the Bible in your captivity, so I close with a verse from the Book of Revelations: "Fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer; behold, the devil shall cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried; be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life."

Investigation of Un-American Activities

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, while we are investigating un-American activities, let the committee go the whole way. Let us not overlook any group or groups or organizations within the bounds of the United States who are practicing and preaching un-Americanism and who are seeking in some other form to undermine the Government. The newspaper PM on March 26, 1941, exposed the K. K. K. and the Legion of Death. The Legion of Death is the outgrowth of the Black Legion of Detroit. It is a strong organization within the bounds of our country, un-American, preaching destruction and race hatred. If the committee is going to make an investigation, let it go all the way. No American who has the right to call himself an American should be permitted to undermine the Government in any form.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, and to include excerpts from the newspaper PM.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[From the New York PM of March 26, 1941]

LATEST THING IN KLANNISHNESS: THE LEGION OF DEATH IN JERSEY

(By Leo Jay Margolin and John T. McManus)

Have you met the black sheep of the Ku Klux Klan yet?

Well, here it is—The Legion of Death—swishing around north Jersey, the land of Mayor Hague and the Jackson Whites, in coffin-black robes, and sworn by all manner of devil's-workshop oaths to the whole catalog of know-nothing knavery.

There's no cause for immediate worry. The Legion of Death has only about 100 members, and they're having the devil's own time getting anywhere, because the Klan itself is dead set against them—too nonsensical and too terroristic, according to Samuel G. Stouch, 3d, of Germantown, Pa., the Klan's regional director for these parts.

ARE YOU A PROTESTANT?

But just in case someone in a subway rush presses into your hand a leaflet, one of these days, all about how you will meet death, this story will explain all.

"Are you an American?" Death's leaflet asks. "Are you a patriot?" * * * "Are you a Protestant?" * * * "Are you a man of courage?"

If you are, then Death introduces himself, if you don't already recognize him: "The mysterious unknown, the secret force behind a mighty army of silent men, organized throughout (sic) our Nation to combat and destroy all things and conditions inimical (sic) * * *."

It turns out, if you read it all, that the main things "inimical" to the Legion of Death are labor, Catholics, Jews, Negroes, Communists, atheists, and rape (under some circumstances). Murder and arson are not particularly "inimical," if you get what we mean.

The way you get invited into the Legion of Death is something like being tapped for Skull & Bones. After you've been properly sized up, a Legionnaire in mufti sidles up to you and says, "Death calls you. Are you ready to face him?"

ENTER THE MORTICIAN

If you are, then come the magic words: "Keep a still tongue. * * * Wait for the mortician."

The mortician, who is the headman of the legion, is one Arthur H. Bell, a glib-talking, north Jersey man who used to be the Klan's grand dragon for New Jersey until he committed the faux pas of arranging that now-famous Klan-bund conclave and fish-fry at the bund's Camp Nordland, Andover, N. J., last August 18. Some 5,000 bundsmen and Klansmen and their women chummed together there that day for their common purposes. PM's Leo Lieb took memorable pictures, and the happy event got national publicity.

But the publicity boomeranged nastily, so Imperial Wizard J. A. Colescott, who had previously approved the meeting, disowned it and disrobed Bell, along with several other organizers of the affair.

TWO MASTERS

The Legion of Death is actually the illegitimate offspring of that Klan-Bund lovefest last August. It popped out just a month later, with Bell at the head. When Regional Director Stouch, a graying, Main-Line crockery salesman in business hours, heard about the new Legion, he summoned its organizers to his office, in his home at 6323 McCallum Street, in Germantown, Pa.

"What is this nonsense about a Legion of Death?" Stouch asked.

"It's not nonsense," Bell replied, zealously, "and what are you going to do about it?"

"You've got to choose," Stouch stated, with a ring of authority. "You can't be Klan and Legion of Death, too. Which will it be?"

There was a deathly silence. Then Bell spoke up.

"I'll take the Legion," he declared, "and you can go to hell."

AND A RAID

A short time after the meeting, on October 17, Stouch's home was entered, three doors battered down, two of them steel, and the Klan office raided of all correspondence relating to the Klan-Bund meeting. Six books containing names, addresses, and phone numbers of each of the 13 leaders in each of the 424 Klan units in Pennsylvania, 86 units in New Jersey, and 40 in Delaware were also taken. The intruders did not take a considerable bit of cash in the office, nor did they disturb a stamp collection of Mr. Stouch's valued at $8,000. They raised hob with the furniture, though, and the loss of the records has practically wrecked the Klan machinery in Stouch's area.

PM and the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League discovered the Legion of Death's existence simultaneously, and have thus far tracked it down together. One trail led to aging Alton M. Young, a former grand kliliff of the Klan's Realm of New Jersey, and one of those present when Regional Director Stouch and Mortician Bell had their argument in Germantown. Wan and chair-ridden with arthritis, old ex-Kliliff Young went even wanner when the investigators pressed him for details.

WANTS TO LIVE

"I can't open up," he said. "I want to live a little while."

When Mr. Young finally talked, it was pretty much in circles. First he said the Legion was a paper organization. Then he said it had held meetings in "the best-known hotel in New York." When he finally got warmed up, he said that the legion had a post-office box in Allentown, Pa., and that "the Legion of Death are dangerous men, and wouldn't stop at anything." Mr. Young stopped right there.

Another trail proved more productive. Mr. Young lives in a house at 294 Magnolia Street, Jersey City, in the basement of which some legion meetings are supposed to have been held. The house is owned by a Mrs. Elizabeth Cope, of 133 Garrison Avenue, Jersey City, where other legion sabbats have been held.

THE LEGION'S BETSY ROSS

The investigators knew Mrs. Cope, an ardent Klanswoman whose picture we got last August, on the platform at the Klan-bund convocation. She is a railway engineer's grass widow, and sews a fine seam, and the investigators had no trouble at all placing her in the legion scheme.

Mrs. Cope is the legion's Betsy Ross. She makes the black robes of the Legion of Death. Before she followed Mortician Bell into the legion, she used to make the ordinary white robes for the Klansmen.

The legion robes cost $4.50, a dollar more than the white ones. The extra dollar pays for the dyeing, and also for the special Legion of Death insignium, the letters L and D under a white skull and cross bones, worn in two places—on the visor of the mask worn with the hood, and over the right breast.

The Klan emblem, a white cross on a red background with a drop of blood in a diamond-shaped centerpiece, is worn over the left breast.

So far, Mrs. Cope has sold about 100 of the robes, and she had 8 or 9 waiting for customers when the investigator visited her.

This, then, is about the limit of the legion's spread thus far. That doesn't mean, however, that it can be laughed off as simply a racket to sell robes, or a protest group within the Klan. It has already been active proselytizing members among the workers in the American Can Co. factories in New Jersey.

REMEMBER THE BLACK LEGION?

Although it has thus far committed no known lawless act, or handed out anything but its comic-page mortician invitations, it has all the earmarks of the infamous Black Legion of Michigan, which started out just

as fantastically, and later committed at least a dozen murders before its 1935–36 reign of terror was ended.

The information gathered by PM and the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League was placed in the hands of the New Jersey State police 2 weeks ago. We'll let you know when the Jersey cops do something about it.

The Philippines and the Export-Control Law

REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I note in the press that the Philippine Resident Commissioner [Mr. ELIZALDE] has said that the Philippine government is earnestly desirous "to cooperate with the United States in any form of export control that may be deemed effective in safeguarding the interests of national defense."

The occasion for the statement, as he himself states, is:

That there have appeared in several newspapers here reports of recent Philippine shipments to Russia, by way of Shanghai and Japan, of copra cargoes which may ultimately be used for war purposes.

Then he said the following significant words:

It must be understood, however, that foreign relations of the Philippines are under the direct supervision and control of the United States, so that any regulations or export licensing requisites on products from the Philippines must, of necessity, emanate from the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, this subject matter is not new to me. In fact, I have been exploring it for many months. As far back as March 19, when we were debating the $7,000,000,000 British-aid bill, I took the floor and warned this Congress that the objectives of our embargo on strategic raw materials to the Axis was being defeated because they were getting some of these materials from the Philippine Islands. I hope this notice came to the attention of the Philippine Resident Commissioner at that time. The Philippines is exporting not only copra and coconut oil to Russia through the port of Vladivostok but, more importantly, iron ore to Japan which last year imported iron ore from the Philippines valued at over $2,000,000. Manganese, a strategic mineral, is also moving in the same direction. The bulk of Philippine chrome, another strategic mineral, goes to the United States. Japan takes sizable quantities of manila hemp, a strategic material essential in the making of the best ropes for the Navy.

I am thankful to the Philippine Government for their expression of eagerness to cooperate with our Government in carrying out the objectives of the export-control law. And I am also grateful to the Filipino leaders in public and private life who have stated in no uncertain terms that the Filipinos are with the United States in any international emergency that may arise.

But, Mr. Speaker, the "act to expedite the strengthening of the national defense," whose section 6 relates to the export control, was approved on July 2, 1940, nearly 9 months ago. Pursuant thereto President Roosevelt placed a long list of articles under export control by a series of proclamations, and the list includes iron ore, manganese, copra, and coconut oil.

From the statement of Mr. ELIZALDE, we understand that if it is desired to have certain Philippine exports placed under export control it is up to our Government to make the move, as, according to him, under the Tydings-McDuffie Act, Philippine foreign affairs are under the supervision and control of the United States.

With this interpretation of the situation by the Philippine Resident Commissioner, with which I disagree, there will be no export control in the Philippines and the Philippine cooperation will be but nominal on that score, for I am sure our Government out of respect for the local self-government of the Philippine Commonwealth, which is the genius and the intent of the Tydings-McDuffie Act, will not disregard that independence and pass laws and regulations, or direct them to be passed, for the Philippine Government. I, for one, stand for the integrity in word and spirit of the Tydings-McDuffie Act, the Philippine organic law. Even an invitation from Filipinos would not lead me to budge an inch from that position.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is within the power of the Philippine Government to enact a law placing itself in line with our Government, as they have stated they are desirous of doing. I wanted to make myself doubly sure in this, and so I sought the opinion of Mr. Vincente Villamin, a distinguished Filipino lawyer and economist, who has studied Philippine-American problems—economic, political, international—in a profound, realistic, and objective manner. Mr. Villamin's opinion follows:

You can quote me as saying that the Philippine government, not the Federal Government, under the Tydings-McDuffie Act, takes the initiative in enacting legislation such as the export-control law. But before such law could go into effect it would have to be approved first by the President of the United States under section 2 (a) (9) of that act, for the matter relates to exports from the Philippines to foreign countries.

Once the law is passed by the Philippine government and approved by the President of the United States the matter enters then, not before, into the realm of foreign affairs, particularly in the instant case with its known motive and objective, and as such its incidence and operation will be under the direct supervision and control of the United States, under section 2 (a) (10).

To elucidate the point, if the Philippine government, for instance, were to engage in foreign affairs, such activities will be under the supervision and control of the United States Government, but the initiative for the enactment of the enabling act resides in the Philippine government.

When Congress, on July 2, 1940, passed the "act to expedite the strengthening of the national defense," whose section 6 provides for the export-control plan, it was not made operative in the Philippines out of respect for the local self-government and independence of the Filipino people.

I repeat, the Philippine government on its own initiative and volition is empowered to pass an export-control law, and then send it to the President of the United States for approval or disapproval.

Mr. Speaker, the soundness and clarity of Mr. Villamin's opinion is obvious. I must say that the opinion was given to me at my request weeks before Commissioner Elizalde's statement appeared in the press. I wish again to commend the Philippine government for its expression of cooperation with our Government in national defense and it is meet and proper now to expect that they will take the requisite legislative action to implement their proffer of cooperation with the United States.

Soybeans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

LETTER FROM G. G. McILROY, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN SOYBEAN ASSOCIATION

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest crops produced by the American farmer is that of soybeans. Soybeans, and the products derived therefrom, have found markets throughout the world and are serving the needs of mankind in many ways.

Producers of soybeans in this country are represented by the American Soybean Association, an organization of those interested in the production and utilization of the soybean. As president of this association, the American producers of soybeans have elected and reelected a resident of my district—G. G. McIlroy, of Irwin, Ohio—a gentleman whom I am proud to call my friend.

Under date of March 25, Mr. McIlroy sent me a letter, which I believe will be not only of interest to the soybean producers of the United States but to the Congress and to all of the people of this country and of England as well. With the hope that those in charge of our foreign policy and the lease-lend program can and will follow the suggestions made by Mr. McIlroy, to the mutual benefit of American farmers and the English people, I am herewith inserting, as a part of the official RECORD, the letter I have received from G. G. McIlroy, president of the American Soybean Association:

AMERICAN SOYBEAN ASSOCIATION,
IRWIN, OHIO, *March 25, 1941.*

Congressman CLARENCE J. BROWN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROWN: Recently the American Soybean Association has had two urgent re-

quests from English sources asking that we, the soybean growers' organization, do everything in our power to secure an allotment of soybeans or soybean products for export to England under the provisions of the lease-lend bill. One radiogram from England stated "our stocks exceedingly low."

It appears to me that this situation, if taken advantage of, offers something to American agriculture. Here is a class of products which apparently is needed by the English and which cannot be procured any other place in the world except China and it is impractical, at this time, to consider going there for any food product which can be secured from this country.

With all the talk about the loss of foreign markets for the American farm crops, here we are suddenly confronted with a situation indicating that there is one crop for which England now has an urgent need. Millions of pounds of soybean oil and thousands of tons of soybean-oil meal, or shiploads of soybeans could well be supplied to our British friends in their hour of need. And at the same time we might conclude that the establishing of such an outlet now might develop into a continued demand for these products.

Also whenever the product from one acre of a grain crop is sold abroad it immediately tends to reduce by one acre the production of other crops of which we already have a surplus with prospects for a greater surplus. In other words, the movement of soybean products into export will almost directly relieve surpluses of wheat and corn just as the sale of corn and wheat products might accomplish.

Let us furnish in abundance, to England, a food product which Germany has used to such good advantage through the years, and now can secure only in very limited quantities.

I believe you will agree that these are logical statements. If so, I am sure we farmers can depend on your substantial assistance.

Very truly yours,

AMERICAN SOYBEAN ASSOCIATION,
G. G. MCILROY, *President*.

John J. Dillon, Editor and Publisher of the Rural New-Yorker, Has Fought a Lifelong Battle to Secure Economic Justice for the Dairy Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS D. CULKIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WATERTOWN (N. Y.) TIMES

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John J. Dillon, editor and publisher of the Rural New-Yorker, has just published a book entitled "Seven Decades of Milk." Coming from his pen, this publication is a painstaking and penetrating review of the economic trials and tribulations of the Northeast dairyman, and particularly those resident in the State of New York.

In the foreword to the book, Mr. Dillon states:

I have seen selfishness and greed dominating our dairy industry from its beginning; producers and consumers of milk have been continually and ruthlessly exploited. These abuses can be corrected without hardship to anyone or any class and with justice and profit to all.

This extract furnishes an index to the theme of this most revealing publication.

Mr. Dillon's spear "knows no brother" where economic injustice to the dairyman is concerned. For many years he has stood foursquare against the exploitation of the dairymen by the "milk monopoly."

The book tells in graphic detail the story of the dairy farmer from the time when he was an independent producer, down to the days when milk marketing monopoly destroyed his economic independence and robbed him of his proper share of the consumer's dollar. It offers a cure for the dairyman's condition which is the acme of simplicity. Mr. Dillon's formula is to restore to the dairyman through producer-owned and controlled cooperatives the right to fix the price of his product, free from dictation by the "milk trust."

Speaking for the congressional district I represent I extend to Mr. Dillon my hearty appreciation of his long, useful life. A life which has been a continuous protest against economic injustice to the dairymen. A life that has been lived bravely and unselfishly.

Pursuant to the permission of the House, I append hereto an editorial on Mr. Dillon's book that appeared in the Watertown (N. Y.) Times on Monday, March 24, 1941:

[From the Watertown (N. Y.) Times of March 24, 1941]

SEVEN DECADES OF MILK

Mr. John J. Dillon, editor and publisher of The Rural New-Yorker, has written another book. It will be published within a few days. The title is Seven Decades of Milk. It is an invaluable history of New York State's dairy industry. The Times will review it extensively later on. No other person in the State is so well qualified to write the story of milk as is Mr. Dillon.

He was born 5 years before the Civil War began. He is now 85 years of age, still strong, and vigorous of mind and body. He has been connected with the milk industry since his boyhood. He began life as a rural school teacher when he was 18 years of age. As a youth he became associated with the old Orange County Farmer, a celebrated dairy paper of its time. In 1890 he went to The Rural New-Yorker. He has been its editor and publisher since 1892, and no man has been closer to the milk industry of this State for 70 years than he. It is well that he has written the story. Much would have been lost had it not been for his painstaking care in recording the history of the industry as he has observed it. Two years ago he wrote his Milk Memoirs, but the present volume goes into the story more extensively.

Mr. Dillon has always been a militant force for justice to the farmer, and his paper, The Rural New-Yorker, is one of the three or four outspoken, brave, and logical agricultural publications of the country.

A Sound and Able Discussion of the Duties of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS D. CULKIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY FRED BRENCKMAN, WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, during my 12 years' service in Congress I have been frequently in touch with Mr. Fred Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange. I have ever found him to be an able, clear-headed, and fearless proponent of agriculture. Mr. Brenckman believes in agriculture as a way of life as well as a way of making a living. He has been a deep student of the Constitution and has a keen appreciation of the respective duties of the citizen to government and government to the citizen.

The following radio address entitled "Duties of Citizenship" was so outstanding in character that I deemed it worthy of publication in the RECORD. I hope every member of the House will take time out to read and consider it.

It was delivered by Mr. Brenckman over the stations of the National Broadcasting Co. on the Grange Hour from Washington, D. C., March 15, 1941.

The address follows:

THE DUTIES OF CITIZENSHIP

In the days of old Rome it was esteemed a great honor to be a Roman citizen. It was with some degree of just pride that St. Paul declared, "I, too, am a Roman citizen."

But it is a still greater honor to be a citizen of the United States of America, the greatest nation upon which the sun ever shone, and which has long been a beacon of hope to all the world.

It is merely stating a sober fact to say that no people in all history ever possessed a heritage comparable to that which is ours. The land in which it is our good fortune to live was generously endowed by nature, which gave us a healthful climate, a fertile soil, abundant mineral resources, and the greatest forests in the world. But the fact remains that the preeminence of the United States in the family of nations must be largely attributed to the freedom and security we have enjoyed for more than a century and a half under the form of government established by the founding fathers of this country.

SAFEGUARDING OUR NATIONAL HERITAGE

Every American worthy of the name should be eager and willing to do his part to safeguard our national heritage and pass it on unimpaired to our posterity.

While no form of government is perfect, it cannot be denied that democratic institutions are far superior to any others, providing the people have the virtue, the intelligence and the capacity to make them

function. With armed brutality and totalitarian might striving for the mastery, popular institutions of government throughout the world are today facing the supreme test. Under these circumstances, it behooves us to look to our foundations and to conduct ourselves as free men and women should when confronted with such conditions.

First of all, it should be remembered that hand in hand with the rights and privileges of citizenship go certain duties and responsibilities. One of the first duties of every able-bodied citizen is to do his part toward supporting the Government; any attempt to reverse this process, asking the Government to support the citizen, cannot fail, in a short time, to end in disaster.

During the course of his second inaugural address, Grover Cleveland gave utterance to some fundamental truths regarding the duties and obligations of citizenship that are just as applicable today as they were then. He said:

"The man who takes the oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States only assumes the solemn obligation which every patriotic citizen—on the farm, in the workshop, in the busy marts of trade, and everywhere—should share with him. The Constitution which prescribes his oath, my countrymen, is yours; the Government you have chosen him to administer for a time is yours; the laws and the entire scheme of our civil rule, from the town meeting to the State capitals and the National Capital, is yours. Every voter, as surely as your Chief Magistrate, under the same high sanction, though in a different sphere, exercises a public trust. Nor is this all. Every citizen owes to the country a vigilant watch and a close scrutiny of its public servants and a fair and reasonable estimate of their fidelity and usefulness. Thus is the people's will impressed upon the whole framework of our civil polity, municipal, State, and Federal; and this is the price of our liberty and the inspiration of our faith in the Republic."

WORKING WITH ORGANIZED GROUPS

In the discharge of the duties of citizenship our efforts can often be made doubly effective by working in harmony with organized groups dedicated to the same principles and striving toward a common goal. As society is organized today, that is the best way to get things done. In the words of Edmund Burke, one of the greatest orators who has spoken the English tongue, "When evil men combine, the good must associate, lest they fall, one by one, an unpitied sacrifice in a contemptible struggle."

Those who are members of the Grange will testify that it has aided them in many ways to become better and more effective citizens. We seek to promote the greatest good for the greatest number. To make a list of the measures which the Grange has supported in the development of its program for the improvement of the conditions surrounding rural life would be to enumerate practically every forward step that has been taken in this connection during the past two-thirds of a century. Without organization these good results could not have been accomplished.

Years ago I heard the late Joseph W. Folke, who was then Governor of Missouri, make an address on citizenship that made a lasting impression upon my mind. He said it was a fine thing to have the kind of patriotism that in the hour of the Nation's need would lead men to walk up to the cannon's mouth and lay down their lives. However, he rightly declared that the kind of patriotism which leads men to discharge the ordinary everyday duties of citizenship with clean hands and honest hearts is just as necessary.

It will be recalled that Mr. Foulke first came into public prominence as a prosecuting attorney. During the address to which I refer he related that on a certain patriotic occasion he stood beside a prominent public man of St. Louis, and as the band played the Star-Spangled Banner, this man was so overcome by emotion that he ejaculated, "Oh, that I might die for my country." A short time afterward Mr. Foulke had occasion to prosecute this man, and found him guilty of having bribed a whole legislature. He was anxious to die for his country, but he was not willing to live for it.

EVILS OF OVERCENTRALIZATION

Devoted as it is to the fundamental principles of Americanism, the Grange has long looked with disfavor on the growing tendency toward overcentralization of government. I believe that every time the National Government takes over some function that properly devolves upon the people of the local community, or that belongs to the States, we commit a crime against American institutions.

We are all familiar with the argument that science and invention have annihilated time and distance, that the United States today is a seamless economic web, that State boundary lines are obsolete, and that in the interest of efficiency and economy, the whole job of running America should be turned over to the Federal Government at Washington. This is both a delusive and destructive doctrine and it should be resisted to the utmost by all the friends of good government.

While it is true that science and invention have eliminated time and space, all this has not changed human nature, which is the same today that it was a thousand years ago, and the same as it will be a thousand years hence.

When we put too many people under one unit of government, it destroys the local and individual sense of responsibility, upon which good government rests.

As a rule, where popular government has broken down and become a reproach, a byword and a mockery, it has been in the great centers of population. On the other hand, where popular institutions have functioned with a reasonable degree of success it has usually been in the small towns and the rural districts.

I am not setting up the claim that the people in the small towns and the rural districts possess a superior brand of civic virtue when compared to the people in our large centers of population. The trouble is that with millions of people sharing any particular responsibility, what is everybody's business becomes nobody's business. All too often the tendency is to say, "Let George do it." In other words, the personal and local sense of responsibility has become atrophied; it no longer functions, and the cause of good government suffers as a result.

I am firmly persuaded that the United States, with its vast expanse of territory, its many diversified interests and its huge population cannot be wisely and democratically governed, down to the most minute details affecting the daily life of the people, like one unbroken empire, from the Nation's Capital at Washington.

The way to get the best results is for each unit of government, national, State, and local, to stay within its proper sphere, with each faithfully and efficiently performing the functions devolving upon it, and with none encroaching upon the rights and prerogatives of the rest.

MORTGAGING THE NATIONAL CREDIT

If as citizens we have erred in permitting an unhealthy and un-American centralization of authority at Washington, we have likewise been guilty of acquiescing in policies that have plunged the Nation head over heels in debt.

During recent years many people, imbibing the teachings of a false liberalism, have deluded themselves into thinking that the reckless and profligate expenditure of public funds should be regarded as a virtue.

In pursuing these misguided policies the credit of the Nation has been mortgaged to an extent that places us at a great disadvantage in financing our national-defense program, which, with the aid we shall extend to England and other nations opposing the totalitarian powers, will necessarily call for the greatest expenditures in our history.

Counting the $7,000,000,000 for which the President asked Congress a few days ago, together with the thirty-two billions already authorized, recommended, or appropriated for national defense, we arrive at a total of thirty-nine billions. According to Senator O'MAHONEY, chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee, the total assessed valuation of the 22 States west of the Mississippi River is only $34,720,000,000.

This is the final day for filing income-tax reports. The Bureau of the Budget estimates that income taxes paid by individuals, as distinguished from corporations, this year will total $1,222,000,000. Interest on the national debt is placed at $1,100,000,000. At that rate we may well ask how long it will take to pay off the debt itself rather than the interest on the debt.

In view of the tremendous burdens of taxation with which we are faced, the people should register an emphatic demand for proper economy in nondefense expenditures. Let us not forget that one of the most hopeless forms of slavery is the slavery that goes with debt.

Speaking of our American heritage, which should be guarded and prized by every citizen, let me quote to you the rules that Patrick Henry declared would have to be followed in the preservation of free institutions. He said:

"No free government, or the blessings of liberty, can be preserved to any people but by a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, frugality, and virtue, and by a frequent recurrence to fundamental principles."

Investigation of Life Insurance Companies by Temporary National Economic Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

ARTICLE FROM BRIDGEPORT (CONN.) HERALD

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave given me to extend my remarks, I ask permission to insert in the RECORD the following article from the Bridgeport Herald reporting on various phases of the investigation of life-insurance companies by the Temporary National Economic Committee:

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Herald of March 2, 1941]

INSURANCE RACKET IS PLAYED BY PROBER—REPORT SHOWS GRIP ON UNITED STATES BUSINESS—"SQUEEZE PLAY" BY OCTOPUS MAY BRING FEDERAL CRACK-DOWN ON ALL COMPANIES

WASHINGTON, March 1.—At last a responsible Federal official has ventured to make definite recommendations to a congressional committee for a modified form of national

supervision of life-insurance companies engaged in interstate business.

That means just about the entire industry.

In what many regard as the most comprehensive, intelligent, and constructive analysis of the life-insurance industry ever expressed in 40 pages of mimeographed copy, Sumner T. Pike, former Wall Streeter but now a member of the Federal Securities and Exchange Commission, submitted proposals to the so-called Monopoly Committee Friday for the purpose of effecting reforms and eliminating abuses in the vast insurance industry for the benefit of the policyholders and the public.

This report touched upon and condemned many of the insurance practices disclosed by the T. N. E. C. probe.

Several things render the Pike recommendation of special significance.

They are made by a man whose background is that of conservative business, thoroughly familiar with Wall Street and its methods, and a newcomer to the S. E. C.

Not by the widest stretch of imagination can spokesmen for the insurance business term him a hostile, uninformed, or irresponsible critic of America's biggest industry.

Moreover, the suggestions and analysis of what is wrong with the industry are handled in such a restrained and impersonal manner that exponents of radical changes, on the other hand, will find little in it to feed demands for a wholesale invasion of the business by the Government.

Pike speaks in the tone and language of a sincere student of the business who wishes to help it to save itself from the future bad effects of its own excesses and errors.

After reviewing the entire industry and before summarizing his conclusions, Pike has this to say about fire, casualty, and marine insurance:

"Finally, it is recommended that the appropriate committee of Congress or some designated agency of the Federal Government be directed to conduct a thorough investigation of all forms of fire, casualty, and marine insurance."

He sums up his conclusions on the subject of life insurance as follows:

"First. That the respective States make strenuous and prompt efforts to strengthen their existing machinery for regulating and supervising life-insurance companies.

"We have offered several specific suggestions to guide State commissioners and State legislatures. In most cases, if not all, the commissioners will, we believe, be ready to accept the proposals, provided they receive adequate financial support and backing from their respective legislatures.

"Second. That the Federal Government assist the States in their efforts to strengthen their existing regulatory machinery by giving advice, disseminating information, and exercising some slight supervision over certain primarily interstate aspects of the business.

"The Federal Government should render such assistance without supplanting the basic jurisdiction of the States.

"Third. That the gradual disappearance and eventual elimination of industrial insurance be encouraged by developing a plan for paying lump-sum death benefits under social-security programs or by making arrangements for the sale of insurance providing such benefits through the facilities of the Postal System.

"We do not recommend or suggest any form of strict, all-inclusive Federal regulation. On the contrary, the entire purpose of our proposals is to demonstrate that such regulation can be avoided by strengthening the existing State regulatory machinery.

"If realistic steps are taken by State officials, State legislatures, and company managements acting in cooperation with the Federal Government, we may expect not only the continuance of State regulation but may look forward to increased efficiency and public usefulness in the life-insurance business."

The S. E. C. Commissioner believes the Federal Government can assist the States in making supervision of insurance companies more effective in many ways.

Among his suggestions are the following:

That the Government be empowered to act as adviser and distributor of information on insurance operation.

That it have power to eliminate "phantom" companies and insurance "bootlegging," by preventing the sale of insurance in States by companies not having a legal right to do business in such States.

That interstate companies be required to furnish the Government, through the agency set up for the purpose, with information on mergers, etc.

That the National Bankruptcy Act be amended to permit State commissioners or a designated Federal agency to go into Federal court and seek to bring about liquidation or reorganization of a company, if, after hearing, it finds the company's reserves impaired.

That the Government be empowered to prevent payment of surrender values for a period of 90 days during a time of national economic emergency.

That officers and directors of interstate companies be prevented by statute from using their positions for improper personal gains, either directly or indirectly.

That the Government be given visitorial powers over interstate companies to permit it to examine companies and determine if an impairment of reserves exists in the case of any particular company.

That an insurance advisory council be set up to cooperate with any Federal agency designated or created to supervise insurance.

On the score of the advisory body, Pike says:

"This insurance advisory council might consist of three representatives of the designated Federal agency, three State insurance commissioners elected by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, three company officials, and three policyholders.

"The annual reports from the Insurance Advisory Council to the Congress should be of great value in many different respects.

"First, such reports would serve to point out to insurance company managements conditions requiring their attention, thus providing an opportunity for correcting abuses from within the business itself.

"Second, the reports would serve to call attention to areas where State supervisory activities could be strengthened in order to promote the efficiency of the insurance regulatory process generally.

"Third, the reports might be used on occasion to call attention of the Congress and policyholders generally to conditions in the life-insurance business considered harmful, and possibly requiring legislative correction.

"It is clear that the activities of the Insurance Advisory Council would not only do much to obviate the necessity of additional legislation, but also they would be of great value in the determination of many matters of national policy where the interest of insurance companies are vitally, though sometimes indirectly, affected.

"The Insurance Advisory Council would also serve to strengthen State regulation."

Pike makes 10 recommendations for strengthening State regulation, as follows:

"1. Insurance commissioners be appointed by a responsible executive, subject to confirmation by the proper State body, on the basis of experience and qualifications only.

"2. The tenure of office of the insurance commissioner should be increased substantially, and, insofar as possible, competent commissioners should be continued in office, regardless of their political affiliation.

"4. Insurance commissioners should not be obliged to undertake any duties other than the regulation and supervision of insurance companies.

"The employment of special outside examiners should be discontinued. The development of a civil service in State insurance departments is highly desirable.

"7. State insurance supervisory officials should strengthen examination procedures particularly in respect of companies domiciled within their State.

"The desired improvement would include more frequent examinations in some States, more competent examiners, greater publicity to and full release of all examination reports, and the undertaking of examination which would give greater attention to the insurance operations as contrasted with the purely financial aspects of the business.

"8. Closer regulation and supervision of agency practices is required. Present laws for licensing agents all too frequently administered purely as revenue measures.

"Agents should be required to show more adequate training, better prospects for financial success, and greater knowledge of the life-insurance business.

"Furthermore, State supervisory officials should give more attention to such matters as company training courses, sales contests, compensation arrangements, etc.

"9. The number of policy forms should be reduced and greater attention given to establishing standardized policy forms or policy provisions acceptable in all States. The present confusion in this field is most undesirable.

"10. State supervisory officials should more closely scrutinize activities of officers and directors and generally make more thorough checks on the competence and activities of company managements."

Three problems specifically treated by the S. E. C. member, include the necessity of liberalizing the laws governing life-insurance companies' investments, the desirability of placing State supervisory authorities in a position to police intercompany agreements restricting competition or resulting in price fixing, and the development of techniques for giving policyholders greater representation on the boards of stock and mutual companies.

On the controversial subject of company investments, Commissioner Pike says:

"The aggregate size of life-insurance companies is such that their investment activities vitally affect the credit and financial structure of the country.

"The funds which companies invest are trust funds, and it is not surprising that State laws regulating life-insurance companies have traditionally followed a broad pattern of permitting investments in bonds and forbidding investments in common stocks.

"As was demonstrated in the hearings, as well as through the Securities and Exchange Commission's special studies, the life-insurance companies are experiencing great difficulty in investing their funds.

"Their problem in this regard is threefold. The amount of money they must invest has steadily increased.

"The available supply of industrial bonds, on the other hand, is gradually decreasing."

"The interest rates to be earned on all types of debt are inadequate in many cases when measured against the earnings which the reserve requirements of the companies make necessary.

"On the other hand, certain other circumstances must be recognized. The life-insurance companies, by far our most dynamic savings institutions, are by their operation directing an increasing amount of capital away from semi-speculative or what might be called in the broadest sense of the word venture enterprises.

"Recognizing that life-insurance funds should not be recklessly invested in highly speculative securities, there does appear to be

room for the long-term investment of a portion of their funds in common stocks of substantial corporations with an established record of earnings.

"The continued flow of funds to life-insurance companies which are prevented from purchasing common stocks is certain to have serious effects on the economy.

"Common stock of substantial corporations with an established record of earnings are clearly as 'safe' as many bonds. A liberalization of investment laws to permit life-insurance companies to invest a relatively small percentage of their funds in common stocks would stimulate healthier financial structures and have a wholesome effect on the economy.

"Accordingly, it is suggested that the respective States give serious consideration to liberalizing in this direction their laws governing life-insurance investments.

"The life-insurance business is such that much good can be done through occasional intercompany conferences at which technical problems confronting the business may be worked out on a standardized basis. Mortality tables, for example, represent such an endeavor."

* * * * *

"Of course, no agreements should be permitted where the effect of those agreements is to prevent any one company from developing new services and new sales techniques which are actuarially sound.

"Similarly, life-insurance companies should not be permitted, as they have been in the past, to fix rates through direct or indirect arrangements of any kind. The life-insurance business should be conducted on a competitive basis, with emphasis on management efficiency rather than sales technique.

"It will be recalled that various intercompany agreements were reached at meetings where no State officials were present, and in most cases the basis of understandings arrived at were neither publicized nor first submitted to State authorities for their approval.

"Under the circumstances the continuance of this type of clandestine conferences should be prevented.

"Policyholders must be given assistance so they may participate more directly in the management of their companies," he says.

"It is not necessary to recall here the voluminous testimony on this subject. The self-perpetuating character of the life-insurance boards of directors is apparent, and the practical difficulties which confront policyholders who seek to elect directors of their own selection are well recognized.

"Indeed, the problem is one which permeates the entire American corporate scene.

"As we have pointed out in our report, the policyholders of stock companies contribute the great bulk of the assets, and it is to their interest that they be represented directly on the boards of the companies.

"Possible steps to be taken by the States to give policyholders greater representation on the boards of mutual life-insurance companies would include: The development of a more adequate system of notifying policyholders of their right to make nominations and of the actual results of elections held.

"Permitting policyholders to have access to policyholder lists and to examine the books and records of their companies under restrictions similar to those placed upon stockholders.

"The possible development of arrangements to assure that some directors, particularly those serving on boards of larger companies, be selected with due regard for their knowledge of and residence in different areas of the country.

"The elimination of staggered directors' terms.

"Permitting policyholders to have cumulative voting privileges.

"Requiring companies to hold annual policyholders' meetings if possible in a regional basis.

"Adopting schemes patterned on the policyholder advisory committee arrangement used by the Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co. under provisions permitting State officials to have some general supervision over methods used for selecting the committee.

"Requiring all directors to be policyholders of the particular company on which they served.

"Giving greater publicity to State examination reports.

"Requiring the submission of more complete and revealing company reports to policyholders.

"And finally developing schemes for the appointment of one or more public directors to life-insurance company boards of directors by the Governors of the States in which such companies are domiciled.

"Nothing should, of course, be done in this field which would enable irresponsible groups acting from improper motives to seize control of life-insurance companies."

The subject of the size and scope of the business leads Pike to make the following observations in his report to the T. N. E. C.:

"The national scope of the insurance business is one of its outstanding characteristics.

"Many of the largest companies operate in every State of the Union.

"There are on the average 82 companies operating in each State.

"Seventeen companies operate in over 40 States.

"Although there are 365 companies engaged in the business, two companies control 32 percent of its $28,000,000,000 of assets.

"Five companies control 54 percent of the assets, and 26 companies control 87 percent of the assets.

"While these larger companies control the bulk of the assets, we must not fall into the all too frequent error of considering all the other life insurance companies as small.

"There are 32 such companies, each with assets of more than $100,000,000 and at least 40 of which are as large as companies included in the group of 200 largest nonfinancial corporations which were the subject of special study by this Committee.

"Companies with offices in New York City and Newark, N. J., control 56 percent of the assets of all insurance companies.

"Companies in the New England and Middle Atlantic States control 77 percent of the assets. Of the 26 largest companies, only 3 have their main offices west of the Mississippi.

"It is, indeed, difficult to comprehend the tremendous size and the scope of the influence which insurance companies exercise.

"In 1938, the leading companies purchased 47.7 percent of all corporate bonds and notes issued in that year.

"In the 10-year period from 1929 to 1938, inclusive, over $42,000,000,000 were taken in by the companies, of which thirty billion represented premiums from policyholders.

"The principal companies' assets are so large they include securities representing 11.6 percent of the total Federal debt, 6.7 percent of the total State and local debt, 17.4 percent of the railroad debt, 11.7 percent of the industrial debt, 18.2 percent of the public-utility debt, as well as substantial amounts of the farm and urban mortgages outstanding.

"The companies are growing very rapidly, and with the growth their economic power increases.

"Principal companies show an increase of over 50 percent in their assets in the last 10 years. Thus, whereas in 1930 these principal companies controlled only 2.5 percent of the industrial debt, in 1937 they controlled, as has been indicated, 11.7 percent of that debt.

"In the farm-mortgage field the companies controlled 19.2 percent of the farm-mortgage debt in the West North Central States in 1939, and in that year actually owned 8.1 percent of all the land in the State of Iowa.

"Some idea of the extent of the companies' influence in farming communities may be indicated by the activities of the largest life-insurance company which is the biggest farmer in the United States today.

"This company operates over 7,000 farms, ranging in size from 200 acres to as high as 2,000 acres, and extending into 25 different States.

"During the year 1937 the company harvested 50,000 bales of cotton, 10,000,000 bushels of corn, 5,000,000 bushels of wheat, 6,000,000 pounds of peanuts, and 1,000,000 pounds of tobacco.

"The amount of money invested by life insurance companies reaches tremendous proportions, one company alone investing over $2,000,000 each business day.

"Principal companies are members of 65 different bondholder protective committees, and own and operate many apartment houses, hotels, and private dwellings.

"The extent of the companies' influence may be found not only in their investment activities but elsewhere. The number of their policyholders is significant in itself.

"One company alone insures every fifth man, woman, and child in the United States, and actually sells a policy on the life of about one out of every fifth child born before the child reaches 1 year of age.

"Concentration is increased through interlocking directorship, the 5 largest companies interlocking with 780 corporations, including 145 banks, and 100 other insurance companies, mostly fire and casualty.

"By intercompany agreements the larger companies have increased their influence in many fields, entering into rate agreements and other combinations restricting competition.

"Their influence in the field of State legislation is also worthy of note.

"The activities of their powerful Association of Life Insurance Presidents, which represents companies controlling 85 percent of the business will be recalled in this connection.

"This association is active in every State.

"Here, indeed, is a picture of the concentration of economic power which is not equalled elsewhere in the American economy.

"The committee will recall that the Armstrong report with its customary foresight recommended placing restrictions on the future growth of life insurance companies.

"These restrictions were in effect for a short time and eventually almost entirely abandoned.

"Since 1906, when the Armstrong report was released, the total assets of insurance companies have increased 800 percent.

"There is no need to discuss here the desirability or undesirability of the Armstrong report proposal. Had the restrictions on size prevailed, however, this much is clear. Not only would a different type of State regulation have developed, but it is safe to say that the pattern of our entire economy would be different from what it is today.

"We do not mean that the size of the principal life insurance companies alone has brought about all of the economic ills.

"Certainly the size of these companies has, however, been a contributory factor as far as certain of our economic problems are concerned.

"The entire question of size in the life-insurance business should be further studied by an appropriate agency of the Federal Government, which would be directed to make a report to the Congress on specific aspects of the problem.

* * * * *

"Among the steps which might be taken to limit the size of life-insurance companies or dilute their concentrated economic power are—

"Placing restrictions on insurance companies in respect to the sale of annuities and

other policy contracts when the saving element is predominant.

"Encouragin gthe development of savings-bank life insurance.

"Enacting tax legislation which would make growth beyond a certain point undesirable from a business point of view.

"Restricting the amount of assets which a company may control.

"Limiting the amount of new business which a company may write, encouraging the growth of smaller companies.

"Prohibiting various types of interlocking directorships, restricting continual development of private placements which are rapidly concentrating many security issues entirely in the hands of the largest companies, preventing insurance companies from organizing subsidiary companies.

"Preventing investment in interlocking companies or limiting the amount of money any insurance company may invest in the securities of another corporation.

"All such steps are drastic. The extent to which they would reduce concentration of economic power in the insurance business is problematical.

"As to whether all or any of them should be adopted is a matter of broad national policy which only this committee with the results of all its studies before it can undertake to decide."

Pike says, in discussing industrial insurance:

"The committee will recall that industrial insurance is a type of life insurance sold in small amounts primarily to persons of little means. Premiums are paid weekly or monthly to collectors who call at the homes of the insured.

"For many reasons, including its high agency expenses and mortality experience, this type of life insurance is the most expensive form of life insurance sold. It is sold almost entirely to low-income families.

"When sold by stock companies it has resulted in enormous profits many times over the shareholders' original investment.

"Many agents selling this type of insurance are untrained, or, for other reasons, unqualified to deal with the public. Because of their high cost and the selling practices employed, industrial policies are rarely kept in force long enough to accomplish their essential purpose. In the 10-year period ending 1937 only slightly more than 5 percent of the policies terminating terminated by death or maturity.

"The selling procedure is characterized by a 'squirrel cage' operation where the public is sold policies which lapse only to be sold again.

"State laws for this form of insurance are inadequate.

"Industrial endowment policies, for example, though outlawed in New York, are still frequently sold by companies not subject to the jurisdiction of that State.

"Finally, the number of policy forms available and variations in policy provisions are highly undesirable and conducive to misrepresentation and misunderstanding on the part of the policyholder.

"The three largest companies selling this type of insurance and several smaller companies have, partly under the pressure of public opinion and partly at their own volition, instituted many industrial insurance reforms.

"The quality of their service in this field is far better than the other one-hundred-odd companies, and indeed many of the abuses indicated above are less apparent in their operations.

"About 50 percent of the new business is being written by companies not in this category, however, and as to all companies the evils apparently of necessity inherent in industrial insurance remain.

"The Armstrong report stated over 30 years ago that from its study of industrial insurance there remained but two alternatives, to permit the continuance of that type of business with the weaknesses inherent in the system or to prohibit its sale altogether by private companies.

"The alternatives which were then so frankly recognized remain in our opinion the only alternatives today.

"The question is again presented as to whether the sale of industrial insurance should be prevented, since the number of reforms in this field which might be made by the States would, though desirable, be insufficient in our opinion to eliminate the basic difficulties.

"In this connection it should be acknowledged that if industrial insurance is to be eliminated, satisfactory substitutes must be found.

"In spite of its high cost, excessive lapsation, maldistribution, and other evils, industrial insurance now provides a type of protection earnestly desired by great segments of the population. Private companies cannot provide a substitute.

"It appears to us the only adequate substitute can be obtained either through extension of Federal and State social-security programs to provide a lump-sum death benefit for all the populace in an amount sufficient to cover burial and to compensate for expenses attendant upon the illness, or through the development of a system for selling burial benefits through the facilities of the postal system.

In the light of these considerations, we recommend the extension of social-security benefits or the development of some other program such as the sale of insurance through the Postal System to the end that industrial insurance would gradually disappear.

Nothing should be done to cancel existing policies, to cause a serious dislocation in the insurance programs of policyholders now holding this type of insurance. Furthermore, the plan should not be so drawn that it would place the Federal Government in competition with those companies selling ordinary life insurance.

Extension of the Bituminous Coal Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the House has had under consideration H. R. 4146, providing for the extension of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years.

The coal operators of this country usually view with alarm any legislation touching the management or control of their business. They are jealous of their prerogatives, and rightly so, for at its best the coal business has long been uncertain and precarious. When, however, legislation proves meritorious these men do not hesitate to approve it. Coal men looked with doubts and misgivings upon the National Recovery Act, but before the course of that act had been ended the National Coal Association was on record approving it and urging its continuance.

Four years ago, when the Bituminous Coal Act was passed, it had the opposition of practically all coal producers. Today the pending resolution for the extension of the act for an additional period of 2 years is not only endorsed by the National Coal Association but it has the approval of over 90 percent of the coal operators of the United States. These careful businessmen believe in the wisdom of the advice, "Prove all things and hold fast that which is good."

Joining with the coal operators in asking for this extension of the Coal Act, we have that greater body of men who have an interest in the measure equally as vital. I refer to the half million or more laboring men, the coal miners of the country, who depend upon the industry for a living for themselves and their families. Not only is the extension of the Coal Act asked and endorsed by the great organization of the miners, the United Mine Workers of America, but individual miners are pleading for this action.

The same can be said of that large body of citizens made up of home owners and household consumers, especially those who have been made aware of the fact that for many years the small consumers have been penalized to enable the large consumers to purchase their coal at prices below the cost of production. The users of coal for domestic purposes, who buy in small quantities, recognize the fact that under the Coal Act they will be able to purchase their fuel at the same fair price as that charged buyers of greater quantities.

The only serious criticism of the Coal Act we have yet heard offered has been directed at the long delay of the Commission in establishing minimum prices. This was indeed a grave problem and a task of magnitude. But the task has at last been completed, and minimum prices equal to the cost of production were established and made effective October 1, 1940. Since that time the act has been and is now being effectively administered. The old practices of cutthroat competition, under which bituminous coal of all grades was sold to purchasers at fluctuating prices, frequently far below the cost of production, have been entirely eliminated.

This act has breathed new life and health into a sick industry.

It is giving security and protection to a tremendous investment of capital in an industry necessary to the comfort and welfare of the Nation.

It is protecting the livelihood of and assuring a living wage to hundreds of thousands of hard-working, substantial American citizens.

It is a standing insurance against strikes and wage disputes and shutdowns in a basic American industry producing one of the commodities most essential to national defense.

It is operating to insure to all coal consumers a steady supply of an essential commodity at a fair and equitable price.

It is being administered without any cost or expense whatever to the Government, nor does it involve or contemplate the payment of any awards or subsidies.

Endorsed by mine owners, approved by the miners, favored by the public, there is certainly no valid or substantial reason why this, the pending bill, should not be enacted and the Bituminous Coal Act extended for a further period of 2 years.

Roosevelt To Reside in England, the King and Queen of England To Live at Mount Vernon, and the United States Congress To Meet in Bermuda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Saturday Evening Post of March 22, 1941:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of March 22, 1941]

A VISION OF UNION

Federal Union World is the organ of Anglo-American unionists in this country. It is published under the chairmanship of Clarence K. Streit, the author of Union Now. In the February number, as A Vision of Union, there is a dream by G. Ward Price, of the London Daily Mail.

He was going through the newspaper files for something on President Roosevelt's election to a third term when he fell asleep, or into reverie, and imagined that he was looking at newspaper clippings of the year 1944. He was struck by one from the London Times, headed Good Out of Evil, and he read:

"Since the second great war ended with the collapse of Italy in 1941, closely followed by that of her sinister German accomplice 6 months later, no news has given more satisfaction to the British public than last night's intimation that President Roosevelt intends to take up his residence in England for the concluding 2 months of his third term of office before handing over to his Republican successor next January. President Roosevelt, whose name will be forever associated with the overthrow and extinction of the authoritarian challenge to the principle of political freedom, has accepted Their Majesties' invitation to himself and Mrs. Roosevelt to spend Christmas at Windsor Castle. The chief figure of the great democratic state, with which the future fortunes of Britain are now linked in permanent federation, will spend the last 2 months of his term of office at Chequers, that historic Tudor mansion which was formerly the country seat of the British Prime Minister and which Mr. Churchill, in a well-timed gesture, presented to the President of the United States, our Federal partner, as his official residence in England."

He went on with the clippings of 1944. Their Majesties the King and Queen of England had been invited to live in the George Washington home at Mount Vernon, and the next meeting of the British-American Parliament was going to be held in the new Federal Council Building at Bermuda.

Britain Always Realistic in International Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK ENQUIRER OF MARCH 10, 1941

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Enquirer of March 10, 1941:

BRITAIN ALWAYS REALISTIC IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Citing Great Britain's cold, realistic attitude regarding the North's struggle to save the Union during the American Civil War and her blatant hostility and contempt for the military efforts of the North's foremost generals, John Knox, prominent Chicago attorney with the firm of Loesch, Scofield, Loesch & Burke, of 10 South La Salle Street, Chicago, declares in a frank appraisal of Britain's past actions on foreign events that she guides herself solely on selfish self-interest motives.

Declares Mr. Knox, in a letter to the New York Enquirer:

"If the British Isles are actually invaded this spring, the resultant hysteria in this country may overwhelm all who oppose our entrance into the war. Though we all hope that England will win and beat back any invasion that may come, let us not forget what England's attitude was when our own Government was last threatened with invasion.

"During our Civil War period the London Times, then called simply the Times, commented editorially that England was enjoying considerable prosperity at a time when the United States was tottering on the brink of destruction. By June 1863, General Lee was moving northward with one of the largest armies ever assembled on this continent.

"Following is a typical editorial comment of that day, taken from the Times for Saturday, July 4, 1863:

" 'What is America today? How is she keeping the annual festival which she consecrates to her own glorification and the vilification of all the rest of mankind? * * * The signal failure of five successive invasions must, we should hope, have done something to shake northern confidence in the skill of their generals and the invincibility of their army. The deity of size and magnitude, so often and so devoutly worshipped, has fatally deceived her ardent votaries. Big guns, big ships, big threats, and bulletins replete with statements more enormous than any of them, have all been tried in vain, and the North finds itself the object of that very invasion with which it has so continually and so vainly menaced its antagonists. * * * These are the military prospects for the Fourth of July 1863 * * *.'

"As the war progressed a group of English citizens formed the Society for Obtaining the Cessation of Hostilities in America. A year later (July 15, 1864) they called on Lord Palmerston, then Prime Minister. Palmerston was not interested. On July 18, 1864, the Times applauded Palmerston's attitude, and its editorial for that day concluded by saying:

" 'The best service the Government of this country can render the cause of peace is to let events run their course and not interfere in American politics by word or deed.'

"It is not difficult to imagine what the attitude of 10 Downing Street would have been had President Lincoln requested Lord Palmerston to supply us with munitions and loans to beat off the Confederate invasion.

"As late as 1939 Britain exhibited the same attitude when the duly elected Government at Madrid was faced with the invading army of General Franco. Upon the fall of Madrid the London Times said editorially on March 29, 1939:

" 'The British Government, beset for so long by the clamor of those who would urge them to support of one or the other of the Spanish contestants, now reaps, after much contempt and obloquy, the reward of their resolution to commit themselves to favor neither side in a quarrel irrelevant to British principles and interests. * * * Hard things are always spoken of neutrals while war rages, but an honorable and consistent neutrality comes to be appreciated when peace is won.'

"In short, Britain's attitude has been to ignore invasions of foreign capitals if such invasions did not directly concern British interests. But what a cry of 'Uncle Shylock' would arise if we maintained a similar attitude and said:

" 'Dear Mr. Churchill, we feel that the best service America can render the cause of peace is to let events run their course and not interfere in European politics by word or deed. The American people, beset for so long by the clamor of those who would urge them to support Great Britain, will certainly reap the reward of their resolution to commit themselves to favor neither side in a European quarrel. Eleven billion dollars of defaulted debts from the last quarrel reinforce this resolution.' "

Grand Coulee Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION PRESS RELEASE OF MARCH 17, 1941

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include the following release of the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior for March 17 relating to the Grand Coulee Dam:

Grand Coulee Dam, which, on March 22, begins providing power for national defense, didn't just grow to be the "biggest thing on earth." It was built by man and will remain a monument to the engineering genius of this day for generations to come.

"It is so big you cannot see it. Can an ant see an elephant?" was the reaction of one well-known writer to this plug in the Columbia River 90 miles west of Spokane.

It is 550 feet high and 4,300 feet long, and its purpose is to store 10,000,000 acre-feet of water in a 151-mile reservoir for the irrigation of 1,200,000 acres of dry land, for the generation annually of 12,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy in the largest power plant in the world, for flood control, river regula-

tion, navigation improvements, and downstream power benefits.

Who built this colossal structure? An army of men reaching a maximum of 7,455 in the front rank working on the site day and night for more than 7 years makes it possible for 2 generators to begin operation 2 years ahead of schedule.

Behind the lines was an even larger army of supporting troops, which could not be seen from the vista houses on the rim of the Columbia River Canyon. These worked in forests providing lumber; in mines producing raw materials; in steel mills providing pipe, piling, reinforcement bars; in foundries and factories making machinery and equipment; on farms producing the food for those men; and on railroads which poured the products of all their labors through the funnel and into Grand Coulee Dam.

At the site of the dam 52,919,945 man-hours of employment have been given. Off the site, in more than 40 States, approximately 89,305,000 man-hours—70 percent more than at the site of the structure—of work have been required.

Under President Roosevelt's program for meeting unemployment, construction of the dam was begun in 1933 by the Bureau of Reclamation, an agency of the Department of the Interior. The President approved an allocation of Public Works funds by Administrator Harold L. Ickes to begin construction.

To the engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation goes the credit for planning, designing, and supervising this harnessing of the country's second largest river.

To the contractors, who marshaled thousands of workers on the job, there is due commendation for the efficiency of their organizations. The results justify the confidence reposed in them.

Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes said today in commenting on the start of power generation 2 years ahead of schedule: "The Bureau of Reclamation has again justified its international reputation for outstanding engineering. Its work in planning and supervising the construction of Boulder Dam was an engineering landmark. Now a still greater achievement is added to its list, compilation of which began nearly 40 years ago. To the technical and administrative staffs of the Bureau, from the Commissioner and Chief Engineer down and to the many other loyal employees who have served with them on the Grand Coulee job, I say: 'Well done.'

"I cannot let this opportunity pass without saying a word for the thousands of men who actually made the great dam. They accepted their difficult tasks with the fine pride and good humor that are the trade-marks of American labor, and they set and broke records for preparing and placing concrete with such monotonous regularity that eventually little attention was paid to new ones. The American laboring man, from the steel mills of the east to the sawmills of the west and on the dam itself, has built himself a monument."

Dr. Elwood Mead was Commissioner when Grand Coulee Dam was begun. He died in January 1936, and was succeeded by John C. Page, who was promoted out of the ranks after more than a score of years of service with the Bureau as surveyman, engineer, project manager, and office engineer during the construction of Boulder Dam.

The construction activities of the Bureau are directed from the office at Denver, Colo., and there the designs were perfected which have been translated into the climax dam of the Bureau's long record. In Denver were:

Raymond F. Walter, Chief Engineer from 1925 until his death in 1940. He was succeeded by Sinclair O. Harper, who had been Assistant Chief Engineer under Mr. Walter. Both had long records with the Bureau in construction of irrigation projects and supervising the building of 165 dams.

Designing Grand Coulee was John L. Savage, Chief Designing Engineer of the Bureau, recognized as an authority on high dams. Mr. Savage has designed more than 55 major dams, numerous smaller structures, and canals.

L. N. McClellan, chief electrical engineer, designed the electrical installations and the powerhouses.

In command at the scene of construction activities has been Frank A. Banks, supervising engineer, in the service of the Bureau for 35 years. During that period he has supervised the construction of American Falls Dam on the Snake River in Idaho and the Owyhee Dam in Oregon, the highest dam in the world when it was completed in 1932. In addition to his duties at Grand Coulee, Mr. Banks served as acting administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration from May until September 1939.

Major contractors on the construction of Grand Coulee have been:

David H. Ryan, San Diego, Calif., removal of 4,200,000 tons of overburden earth and rock.

Mason-Walsh-Atkinson-Kier Co., comprised of the Silas Mason Co., Inc., New York; Walsh Construction Co., Davenport, Iowa; and Atkinson-Kier Co., San Francisco, for construction of the first half of the dam.

Consolidated Builders, Inc., for the construction of the high dam and power plant. It was made up of 10 firms, including the 3 companies in the MWAK Co., and the following: Morrison-Knudsen Co., Boise, Idaho; J. F. Shea Co., Los Angeles, Calif.; McDonald & Kahn, Los Angeles; Henry J. Kaiser Co., Oakland, Calif.; Utah Construction Co., Ogden, Utah; General Construction Co., Seattle, Wash.

Thumbnail sketches of the men who have planned and executed the work that has brought Grand Coulee Dam into being follow:

Elwood Mead, born in Switzerland County, Ind., January 16, 1858; graduate civil engineer of Purdue University; State Engineer of Wyoming 1888–99; Chief of Division of Irrigation and Drainage Investigations, Department of Agriculture, 1899–1907; chairman of State Rivers and Water Supply Commission, Victoria, Australia, 1907–14; professor of Rural Institutions, University of California, and chairman of State Land Settlement Board, 1914–23; Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, 1924–36. He died in office in January 1936.

John C. Page, born Syracuse, Nebr., October 12, 1887; graduate civil engineer, University of Nebraska, 1908; specialized at Cornell University in hydraulics and civil engineering; Bureau of Reclamation, topographer to project superintendent, 1909–30; office engineer, Boulder Dam, 1930–35; head of Engineering Division, Washington office of the Bureau of Reclamation, 1935–36; commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, 1936 to date.

Raymond F. Walter, born Chicago, Ill., October 31, 1873; graduate Colorado Agricultural College; civil engineering practice until 1903; engineer, supervising engineer, assistant chief of construction, assistant chief engineer, Reclamation Service, 1903–25; chief engineer, Bureau of Reclamation, 1925–40. He died in office in June 1940.

Sinclair O. Harper, graduate of University of California, 1907; civil-engineering practice, 1907–8; engineer, Bureau of Reclamation, 1908–17; superintendent, Grand Valley project, Colorado, 1917–25; general superintendent of construction, 1925–30; assistant chief engineer, 1930–40; chief engineer, 1940 to date.

John L. Savage, born Cooksville, Wis., 1879; graduate civil engineer, University of Wisconsin; civil-engineering practice, 1899–1903; engineer, Bureau of Reclamation, 1903–8; consultant, 1908–16; chief designing engineer, Bureau of Reclamation, 1916 to date.

Frank A. Banks, born Saco, Maine, 1883; graduate civil engineer, University of Maine; rodman to construction engineer, Bureau of Reclamation, 1905–33; supervising engineer, Grand Coulee Dam, 1933 to date.

L. N. McClellan, born Middletown, Ohio, 1888; graduate electrical engineer, University of Southern California; electrical assistant to chief electrical engineer, 1911–24; and chief electrical engineer since 1924.

Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 Should Be Extended for an Additional 2-Year Period

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE E. IMHOFF

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

Mr. IMHOFF. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege to again be serving in Congress as the Representative of the Eighteenth Congressional District of Ohio and to have an opportunity to voice my absolute approval for the extension of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a 2-year period. When the Bituminous Coal Act was up for consideration before the Seventy-fifth Congress, I strenuously recommended its enactment, and now, after having had an opportunity to witness the Coal Act in operation, I am more than satisfied that the Coal Act of 1937 has accomplished the purposes for which it was intended, and that if the financial stability and economic security of the bituminous coal industry is to be maintained at a par with American industry in general, then H. R. 4146, which is now being considered by the Members of this House, must be approved.

The chaotic conditions existing in the bituminous-coal industry prior to the enactment of the Coal Act of 1937 are not new to the Members of this House. For many years Congress has held hearings and made investigations of the bituminous-coal industry, and each and every time these hearings and investigations revealed without exception that year in and year out our coal industry was operating at a loss amounting to millions of dollars and ranging anywhere from a $7,000,000 deficit to the unbelievable sum of a $51,000,000 deficit in 1932. This continual financial drain on the coal industry has had far-reaching effect and undoubtedly constitutes the basic cause for the social and economic disorder existing in the industry.

I deem it not necessary to go back and review the hardships which prevailed in the operation of the bituminous-coal industry prior to the enactment of the Coal Act of 1937 because those conditions should be fresh in the minds of all of us, and especially in the minds of those of us who come from the

various areas in the United States which produce the Nation's basic fuel.

Mr. Justice Douglas, in presenting the majority opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of Sunshine Anthracite Coal Co. against Adkins, Collector of Internal Revenue, which case established the constitutionality of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, properly and accurately described the precarious situation existing in the coal industry in the following language:

> And if we undertook to narrow the scope of Federal intervention in this field, as suggested by appellant, we would be blind to at least 30 years of history. For a generation there have been various manifestations of incessant demand for Federal intervention in the coal industry. The investigations preceding the 1935 and 1937 acts are replete with an exposition of the conditions which have beset that industry. Official and private records give eloquent testimony to the statement of Mr. Justice Cardozo in the Carter case that free competition had been degraded into anarchy in the bituminous-coal industry. Overproduction and savage competitive warfare wasted the industry. Labor and capital alike were the victims. Financial distress among operators and acute poverty among miners prevailed even during periods of general prosperity. This history of the bituminous-coal industry is written in blood as well as in ink.
>
> It was the judgment of the Congress that the price fixing and the elimination of unfair competitive practices were appropriate methods for prevention of the financial ruin, low wages, poor working conditions, strikes, and disruption of the channels of trade which followed in the wake of the demoralized price structures in this industry. If the strategic character of this industry in our economy and the chaotic conditions which have prevailed in it do not justify legislation, it is difficult to imagine what would.

Let us consider for a moment exactly what was intended to be accomplished by the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, and whether or not its functioning now justifies extension of the Coal Act for an additional 2-year period. The Coal Act was approved on April 26, 1937, and for many months following, the National Bituminous Coal Commission conducted the work of establishing minimum prices. However, on July 1, 1939, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1939, the National Bituminous Coal Commission was abolished, and in its place was created the Bituminous Coal Division, which division, together with the Consumers' Counsel Division, worked untiringly carrying on investigations, compiling data, doing extensive research work and conducting public hearings in order that these agencies might be properly apprised of existing conditions in order that they might be able to establish minimum prices and marketing rules and regulations that would make possible the stabilization of the marketing of bituminous coal produced throughout the entire United States.

During the past several years both labor and the operators in the coal industry have worked together in an effort to bring forth the benefits assured by this legislation, and these two groups should be complimented upon their willingness to cooperate with the Bituminous Coal Division. The primary interest of labor and operators has been to insure the elimination of cutthroat competition and price warring in order to assure the operators a fair return on the sale of their product, and at the same time guarantee or make possible for labor the payment of a fair wage for its services.

Since its very inception the Coal Act has been a cooperative measure, and at no time has it appeared to be an attempt on the part of the Government to operate the industry, as some of the opponents to this legislation would have you believe. But what it really amounts to is an administrative effort on the part of the Government to help regulate the industry in order that the interests of the operators as well as those of the workers and the consumers may be best served and at the same time lend financial stability and economic security to the coal industry. There can be no objection on the ground that this legislation entails the expenditure of large sums of money on the part of the Federal Government, because the record conclusively shows that the income derived by a special tax levy under provisions of the act upon the coal produced exceeded the appropriations for administration of the Coal Act by more than $2,000,000. Nor can it be said that producers are being taxed too heavily under the operations of the Coal Act for 1937, because this past year, with the Coal Act having the benefits of the minimum prices under the act for only a 5-month period, still, for the first time in over 20 years, the coal industry has been able to realize a profit on the sale of its product.

Today more than 12,000 producers, who mine substantially all of the bituminous coal produced in the United States, have become code members. The combined production of the few producers who have not become code members will have little or no effect upon the coal market, because their total production is negligible. Of course, it must be borne in mind that the nonmember producers may sell their coal at whatever price they choose, but they will be subject to the 19½-percent tax on each and every sale as levied under the provisions of the Coal Act.

During the past 5 months the code members have shown a willingness to sell their coal at not less than the established minimum prices and in accordance with the marketing rules and regulations. However, such a short period of only 5 months has not been sufficient to give the coal industry time to rehabilitate itself and to take its place with our other industries which are now operating on a sound financial basis. It has taken many, many months of hard labor to bring about the encouraging results which are now being produced under the Coal Act. We are just beginning to reap the benefits of this legislation, and it would be a foolish move on the part of Congress to terminate the Coal Act at such an early stage, especially when its operation appears to be so encouraging. The industry must be considered, and we cannot be unmindful of the fact that their contribution in taxes levied by the act to defray administration expenses represents an investment of over $15,000,000, to say nothing of the thousands of dollars of expenses incurred and expended in retaining counsel to represent them at hearings, and so forth. In all fairness to the coal industry, this act should be continued in order to give industry an opportunity to realize the full benefits of its investment. The actual operating period of only 5 months under minimum prices and marketing rules and regulations has not been sufficient time to make possible and to insure permanent stability in the bituminous-coal industry.

The consideration of the extension of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 coming at such a momentous time in our Nation's history, we cannot be unmindful of the ill effects the termination of this Coal Act would have upon our national-defense program. Bituminous coal is still the Nation's basic fuel and furnishes approximately one-half of the Nation's total of all energy derived from mineral and water power. Bituminous coal also supplies over 85 percent of all the fuels and energy consumed by the railroads, and it furnishes some 49 percent of the fuel used by electric public-utility power plants; and, yes, over 75 percent of the total fuel used by all our general manufacturing plants. There can be no doubt but that bituminous coal has been and still is the basic material used in the manufacture of steam; and today, when many of our shipping lanes from across the Atlantic are closed to our import trade, we find that many commodities necessary and needed for national-defense production, and which commodities were previously imported, now must be synthetically manufactured from bituminous coal. Without the proper flow of bituminous coal it would be impossible for our manufacturing industry to operate at full capacity.

Bituminous coal spells for defense as much as guns, airplanes, and battleships, and at a time such as this, when all of us are vitally concerned in the future welfare of our Nation, we cannot afford to gamble on the future of the coal industry. We cannot abandon what has proven to be a godsend to the coal industry. We now know that the coal industry has become somewhat stabilized, and this has come about chiefly through the administration of the Coal Act. We should, and we must, continue to maintain the stability and security now existing in this now more than ever important bituminous coal industry.

I am more than satisfied that the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 has been the deciding factor in stabilizing the coal industry in my district, as well as in the entire United States. I am satisfied that the economic security which is now being enjoyed by the thousands of miners could not have been made possible were it not for the enactment of the Coal Act of 1937.

I am very much alarmed over the possible ill effects which may come to our national-defense program in the event that this Coal Act is not continued.

Therefore, because of these facts, I intend to support House Joint Resolution 101, and call upon the Members of this House to give this bill their utmost consideration and support in order to insure immediate enactment of this legislation which will make possible the extension of the Bituminous Coal Act for an additional 2-year period.

Oil May Assure Defense—Long Beach Helps Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARD JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

EDITORIALS FROM THE PRESS-TELEGRAM, LONG BEACH, CALIF.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein two short editorials from a recent issue of the Press-Telegram of Long Beach, Calif. One points out that the oil industry, privately owned and operated, is sincerely cooperating to the fullest extent with the national-defense program and is in a position to meet all emergencies that may arise demanding oil and its byproducts.

The other editorial points out the fact that the city of Long Beach is cooperating with the Navy Department in selling it surface rights to more than 100 acres of valuable ocean frontage for the sum of $1, the same to be used for a naval base. Long Beach is the home port of the Pacific Fleet and the city is cooperating in every way in supplying the children of the Navy personnel with free public-school educations, including books and supplies, and also vocational training to young men for work in building airplanes and steamships.

The editorials follow:

[From the Long Beach (Calif.) Press-Telegram]

OIL MAY ASSURE DEFENSE

So far as oil supply is concerned, the United States is safe in the air, on the water, on the highway. Experts vouch for these statistics:

There is enough petroleum in reserve in western America to fill a 65,000-gallon tank in every backyard in 11 Western States.

In England, and in Europe generally, every family is limited to a few gallons of petrol a week, if, in fact, any at all is obtainable for private use.

On the Pacific coast alone there is an estimated 3,500,000,000 barrels of petroleum on tap. Daily production could be doubled, if not multiplied many times, whenever curtailment orders are removed. As well explained in recent public discussion, California oil men regulate production by voluntary agreement, while most of the other petroleum States entered into a compact for official control. The industry in California quite generally prefers the plan in vogue here.

Oil is doing more than supply fuel for defense. A process has been perfected for the conversion of oil into rubber; and the statement is made without reservation that, if the present reserve supplies of crude rubber should be exhausted, the United States can be made 100-percent self-sufficient with rubber from a petroleum base.

Another interesting point: The petroleum industry has entered into a contract with the War Department to produce 60,000,000 gallons a year of toluene, the basic ingredient of TNT. Glycerine is being made in even greater quantities. Both of these products can be supplied in unlimited quantity, and with no delay.

Many other products also have been developed, but the two here mentioned are of special concern to national defense.

America's high-quality aviation gasoline will carry planes faster, permit them to climb quicker, and move more bombs than any other petrol in the world; another interesting factor of defense as this Nation is equipped with regard to oil.

The country's oil reserves, moreover, are held in natural reservoirs so far below ground that no bomb can reach them.

In brief, thanks to oil, its producers, refiners, and shippers, America is in A-1 condition with reference to a vital asset that may turn the fortunes of war, should there be one involving the United States.

LONG BEACH HELPS AGAIN

For all of $1 Long Beach sold to the United States Navy surface rights on more than 100 acres of Terminal Island land for a naval base. Long Beach, years before that, built a model shore landing for small Navy boats for the convenience of the officers and men of the fleet. In many other ways this city has endeavored to express its appreciation for the friendship of the Navy and its personnel.

Long Beach has scored in the support of national defense along another important line. The public-school system of this city leads other California communities in its contribution to vocational training for defense purposes. Classes in aircraft trades and in shipbuilding have been in operation here since last July. This local leadership obtains both in scope of the training and in number of workers actually placed in defense employment.

Let it be understood, of course, that this is not all Long Beach's doing. It is Long Beach's cooperation with the Federal Government, the State department of employment, and with the various manufacturers who have plants here.

Since the work was initiated 9 months ago Long Beach vocational classes have supplied 1,716 trainees to industrial plants engaged in building airplanes and steamships. The next best record is San Diego, with 1,631 placements. Los Angeles has placed 670 trainees from its vocational classes in nearby plants.

Long Beach is rapidly expanding its vocational-training activities, with special buildings being transformed into classrooms and shops and with aircraft executives furnishing both latest equipment and faculty members. The newly opened Olive Vocational Center, at Olive Avenue and Third Street, will provide training for 3,000 men on a 24-hour basis, with 3 shifts of 8 hours each.

One of the significant results of this enterprise in cooperating for national defense is that young men are being drawn to Long Beach from both nearby and distant localities, and in some instances trained men have come here to enroll at the local headquarters of the State department of employment. In 1 case 233 graduates of the Frye Training Schools of Omaha and Kansas City have reported to that office in this city and every one of them has found work in nearby plants.

It is encouraging, if not inspiring, to contemplate what this trend means to the growth and future development of Long Beach.

St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

LETTER FROM HON. SAM H. JONES, GOVERNOR OF LOUISIANA

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a copy of a letter received from the Honorable Sam H. Jones, Governor of Louisiana, in connection with the proposed St. Lawrence waterway treaty:

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Baton Rouge, March 24, 1941.

Hon. F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HÉBERT: Recent press reports indicate that the President has sent to the Congress the text, or a summary of the text, of the proposed agreement with the Government of the Dominion of Canada relating to the construction of the joint international facility known as the St. Lawrence River-Great Lakes Navigation and Power Project. These reports also are to the effect that legislation approving the project on the part of the United States will be introduced in the Congress in the near future.

With all deference to His Excellency, the President, my study of the matter leads me to the firm conviction that not only is the project, considered either as a facility of navigation or as a power facility, or both, without economic justification from the standpoint of the United States as a whole, but its construction will most adversely affect the ports of the South, the South's industrial development and its agricultural and rural population. I think I am safe in asserting that in no State of the South will this adverse economic impact be more keenly felt in all of its phases than in Louisiana. It is unnecessary, I think, for me to go into detail in this communication as to the broad reasons why every interest in Louisiana should oppose this legislation. You have been furnished, I am informed, with a copy of a recent resolution adopted by the board and the director of the department of public service which summarizes the high lights of the Louisiana objections.

I indulge the hope that you will find it consistent to oppose any legislation which may be offered having for its objective the ratification and approval of the proposed agreement, and to use your best influence toward that end with your colleagues irrespective of sectional considerations.

With personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

SAM H. JONES,
Governor of Louisiana.

The New Labor Mediation Board and the Roosevelt-Perkins Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, two strikes have been marked up against the new Labor Mediation Board before it has even gone to bat. The Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor must act and fail in the settlement of a labor controversy before the Labor Mediation Board can act. Then Madam Perkins must certify that the strike threatens to obstruct the production of materials essential in national defense before the Board can assume jurisdiction. Those of us who know Madam Perkins know how reluctant she will be to turn over any labor case to the new Board by certifying that a strike is holding up national defense. Why appoint a Labor Mediation Board and then handcuff it? The following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of Wednesday, March 26, on the new Labor Mediation Board and the Roosevelt-Perkins strikes is so timely and pertinent in this connection that I submit it for publication in the RECORD. The editorial follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune]

THE ROOSEVELT STRIKES

The strike at the Bethlehem Steel works has caused much concern throughout the country. Bethlehem has a billion and a half of war orders. There is little doubt that some men in the administration, of whom Mr. Knudsen may be taken as typical, are genuinely disturbed. It would be remarkable if the responsible officers of the Army and Navy were not of the same mind, knowing, as they do, how provocative our diplomacy has been at a time when we have almost no modern weapons and the bulk of our production is being sent overseas.

For the rest the administration seems content. So far as the Allis-Chalmers strike is concerned, evidence is now available to show that the walk-out was authorized in a referendum in which many hundreds of fraudulent ballots were cast. The fraud is admitted by the union spokesmen themselves. Nevertheless, the strike continues to halt work on $45,000,000 of defense materials, and neither the National Labor Relations Board, nor any of the half dozen mediation services, has dared to denounce the perpetrators of the fraud. Men who have followed closely the events in Milwaukee are convinced that official intervention has served rather to prolong the disturbance than to end it.

That is what might have been expected. The C. I. O. unions which are responsible for most of the more serious tie-ups exist today by virtue of the administration's support; the New Deal was midwife at their birth. Mr. Roosevelt and Madam Perkins give every encouragement to Communists to gain control of tens and hundreds of thousands of factory workers. The organizers were allowed to commit acts of violence, seize property, interfere with the movement of the mails. As a reward for tolerating such conduct, former Governor Murphy, of Michigan, was made Attorney General and later elevated to the Supreme Court.

The strikes which are now halting production in many sections of the country can properly be called the Roosevelt-Perkins strikes. The unions which are causing the trouble have long enjoyed the protection of the administration and, so far as can be seen, still enjoy it. Mr. Roosevelt himself was so little disturbed over the situation that he has gone fishing. He is supposed to have immense influence over organized labor, but he has chosen deliberately not to exert it.

Is the United States Doomed To Follow France?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE SOUTHERN LUMBER JOURNAL

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an article entitled "The Workers Fiddle While World Burns" from the Southern Lumber Journal of March 1941:

[From the Southern Lumber Journal, March 1941]

THE WORKERS FIDDLE WHILE WORLD BURNS

Democratic France lost its war against totalitarian Germany in exactly 39 days. It lost the war because the people of France were more interested in maintaining a 40-hour week than in saving their freedom by winning a war. For the next 100 years, historians and novelists will present many reasons why France lost the war but those who record the truth must always admit that France lost the war because her people would not work the long hours necessary to produce the fighting equipment and maintain the morale necessary to win.

France lost the war to Germany in 39 days because the German people worked long hours without complaint so that they might defeat France. But not even to save their country and their personal liberty would democratic Frenchmen work 12 or 10 or even 8 hours a day for 6 days per week. Forty hours per week was their limit. They were more concerned about maintaining politicians in power who would protect their 40-hour week than in putting their trust in statesmen who insisted that all France must work night and day to stem the invader.

A slow-moving Hitler gave France a year or more to put its people to work. Instead, the French put their trust in an obsolete Maginot Line that had a wide, undefended gap through which modern, mechanized regiments of Germany poured like the rushing of waters through a lifted sluice gate.

No wonder France was unarmed and untrained. Its people were wholly undisciplined. They were unarmed and untrained because undisciplined. No country can produce armies of trained men and huge quantities of surplus war materials, from fighting machines to foodstuffs, whose people use less than 25 percent of their time for productive work.

The loss in morale is as great as the failure to secure capacity production. For those who are mentally and physically idle 75 percent of the time have little inclination either to think or to struggle to do the things that must be done to save a nation and those who inhabit it. That was the situation in France before war was declared in Germany. That was the situation that existed in France until the day of its doom. Its army was untrained. It had but a few planes and few trained fliers. Its army was pitifully lacking in mechanized equipment. Its soldiers were soft and badly led. All this but reflected the softness of the French people who had gone soft because of their willingness to follow the philosophy preached by labor racketeers and the politicians who protected them in their destructive efforts.

In the United States we are now losing 104 days a year per worker by not working Saturdays and Sundays. And we are losing the equivalent of another 104 days per year by short hours and voluntary slow-downs. Our workers and our politicians are following the French method. Nothing must disturb the 40-hour week established by labor, nothing unless the pay check carries time and a half for any time worked over 40 hours. And men who work in national-defense jobs must join a union, regardless of the cost, and pay millions of dollars monthly into the treasuries of the labor racketeers.

No one who thinks believes that the United States has sufficient reserves of labor and materials to do the job ahead of us. We know we must help England win this war or yield to a world economy dominated by Prussians. Yet short hours continue, and strikes are Nation-wide and constant.

Men who manage industries producing goods for the national defense are working long hours, many of them long days and far into the nights. Men in responsible Government positions are also burning the candle at both ends trying to get greater production, trying to get organized for the war they believe to be inevitable.

But the 40-hour-per-week factory workers, and all the rest of us, are just playing along as though the whole world were at peace. We have 148 hours left each week for sleep and play, and we are sleeping and resting far less than if we worked another 20, or even 10, hours per week at the job of producing what it will take to help Britain win the war, and thus save our own hides.

Democracy in labor—the rights of individual contract, the right to employ the efficient, and to fire the drone—has given way to the autocracy of the worst gang of labor racketeers that any country has endured since the world began.

Labor strikes are rife in this country at a time when there should be peace in labor and capacity production of factories. Drunk with power because they have forced the reduction of the workweek to 40 hours without loss of income, labor leaders are now determined to force the closed shop upon all major industries before the national emergency ends.

The open-shop principle of employment is the American way of life. The closed-shop principle is the way to regimentation and the European way of life. The right of labor to organize is not even debatable. But the right of labor to so organize as to rule by force those who must work and those who have the responsibility of ownership and management cannot be supported by any form of reasoning.

I have thought that the President would try to do two things: Stop labor racketeering on a wholesale scale and increase the workweek to 48 hours, without overtime pay, during the national emergency. But the only man in the United States who could do anything about the present unsavory situation has done just nothing.

The Nation continues to drift and to suffer from labor troubles which threaten to become worse. Will it take another war to restore the American people to their senses? I fear nothing less will do it.

Put Jobless to Work Developing Irrigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

EDITORIAL BY HARRY E. POLK

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial by Harry E. Polk, publisher of the Williston Daily Herald, which clearly sets forth the problems of the unemployed throughout the Middle West, and recommends that these jobless people be mobilized to develop irrigation projects and other public works.

The editorial follows:

[From the Williston (N. Dak.) Daily Herald]

NO JOBS FOR THESE

Hundreds of job inquiries, but no jobs to offer.

That's the experience of the Williston office and all other branches of the State employment service these days, as the country engages in a tremendous shift of labor population as result of the defense program.

The job seekers in North Dakota are the common-labor type of worker, the men on W. P. A. who would like to get back into higher-paying private employment, the odd-jobs men who would like steady work, the men now working who hope to find better jobs under the huge program of national defense.

But there is nothing for these men in the newly expanding industries. Wherever in the industrial East there is construction—and there is plenty of that under the broad program of factory expansion—there is plenty of common labor available. There is therefore no need of transporting labor of that kind from North Dakota into the work centers of the East and middle East, and consequently the job seekers of this State are merely told there is no work for them.

In hearing the report of the employment service that hundreds of North Dakota workers have applied for defense jobs, we find therein cause for praise of our working population. Of these hundreds, a large part undoubtedly is W. P. A. labor, men now employed on public projects but hoping for something better, men who have accepted the help of W. P. A. to tide them over, but who now feel a surge of hope that better jobs are available, and that they can get them. We feel a justifiable pride that these men are eager to better their condition and are applying for these defense jobs, and therefore feel all the more keenly the tragedy of the situation which finds no jobs for them even though the Nation is now taking an inventory of labor because of a shortage of the kind of workers that are most needed.

Because of the defense program, which is expected to put thousands and millions of men to work, the Government has already begun to cut down on W. P. A. appropriations and cut W. P. A. workers off the pay rolls. That program of curtailment, however, should not be extended to such States as North Dakota, whose workers, even though they apply for these new jobs, can find no place in the defense effort. There is rather plenty of argument here for the continuation of a Public Works program to keep these men employed on public projects because there is nothing else for them.

As far as we are concerned, the public projects most desirable and useful to this section are those which have to do with irrigation and other water uses—from the huge Missouri diversion project on down to irrigation wells or stock-watering dams on individual farms. Our working population needs them, our farmers want them, and the whole countryside will benefit greatly if they are carried out.

Colonel Lindbergh, Expert on International Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. HAROLD CLUETT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

Mr. CLUETT. Mr. Speaker, 14 years ago the world was amazed at the extraordinary exploit of Col. Charles A. Lindbergh in flying alone nonstop from the United States to Paris—a feat never before accomplished. He was honored, and the recipient of more gifts than probably any man in history, and in the years following conducted himself as a modest, unassuming, intelligent citizen. In late years his criticism of this country's conduct of its international affairs has been rather severe, and thousands of fellow citizens who have hitherto been his ardent admirers have objected to his outspoken writings and addresses, and criticisms on vital topics of our national affairs, concerning which he was hardly considered a competent authority. No one can belittle his expert knowledge of aeronautics: but when he reaches beyond these problems, he is treading on dangerous ground. The fact of his outstanding popularity has induced those who may profit by it to drag him into the political arena for the purpose of pulling the isolationist chestnuts out of the fire. Instead, he has pulled himself into a controversy which is certain to reflect on his uniformly good judgment. Certainly, he has the right, as any other citizen has, of expressing himself on any subject. That is a constitutional right; but at this most critical time in our history, when free speech and a free press can under certain conditions be very harmful to our national and international conduct of the affairs of this country, I say that every one of us, hero or plain citizen, politician and public servant, should be careful by word and deed not to interfere with the processes of national defense in every form.

In discussing bill H. R. 1776, no one could have been denied the right of self-expression. It was a problem that tried the hearts and judgments of every one of us upon whom the responsibility of decision rested. The Congress deliberated and acted in a constitutional manner, and, as the representatives of all the people, voted for the enactment of this legislation by an overwhelming majority. I believe this vote was in accordance with the wishes of a large majority of the American people. The opponents of the measure made a desperate fight and lost. Some Senators and perhaps Representatives threaten now to again take the decision before the country and by radio, mass meetings, and other propaganda attempt to tell the American people that the judgment of Congress was wrong; that the enactment will endanger us; and that all this costly preparation for aiding friendly nations and our own national defense, was a ghastly error; that this country is not now nor ever will be in danger; that our help abroad is too late and cannot be effective. This is the philosophy of Colonel Lindbergh. I cannot help but believe that propaganda of this sort will not only give encouragement to the Axis Powers, but will have a tendency to slow down all our preparation for national defense.

The article by Colonel Lindbergh in the March 29 issue of Collier's should be widely read, especially by Members of Congress, and it is because of my resentment to his conclusions that I address myself to this House. While many of us took serious objection to his testimony before the Senate and House committees, that was his right, but now he and his isolationist friends are flaunting the law of the land and rendering a flagrant disservice to the country. I do not mean that any law is not subject to criticism, and perhaps some to repeal, but a law passed by us in the greatest crisis of all our history, and backed by the largest peacetime appropriations we have ever known, must not now be held up to the ridicule and resentment of the American people with the underlying principle that a great mistake has been made and that it is not too late to retrace our steps. I was one of the few Members of the minority in this House who voted for H. R. 1776. Not long after, when the people recognized its full meaning and the Senate voted its approval by a 2 to 1 majority, we joined with them in a vote of 317 to 71. Now, the Senate has approved the $7,000,000,000 appropriation to carry out the provisions of the lend-lease law, by an overwhelming majority of 67 to 9.

I doubt that the people will be willing as long as the war lasts to reject or materially change any provision of this act, notwithstanding the hue and cry from the defeated isolationists. I now predict that any attack from any source will meet with contempt and disfavor.

May I call your attention to an editorial appearing in the New York Herald Tribune under date of March 23? I quote:

The letter (in Collier's) also shows rather strikingly how far the colonel is allowing

himself to be driven into the methods of unwarranted innuendo, of sweeping distortions and misrepresentations of fact, and of attacks upon the sincerity and patriotism of those who disagree with him.

Allow me to quote a few passages from his letter to the American people:

We in America are being led to war by a group of interventionists and foreign interests, against the will of a majority of our people.

Here is another interesting comment. I quote:

How can we be expected to cross the Atlantic Ocean and invade the Continent of Europe?

The case which Colonel Lindbergh has presented to the people is as unfair as it is ridiculous. He has set himself up as a superauthority over these grave questions in opposition to the best minds in our Army and Navy and the Department of State. As a holder of the Iron Cross of Germany, I do not accuse him of nazi-ism, but let him beware that some of his utterances do not give aid and comfort to the enemy. I fear and will protest any such propaganda as has been intimated in the press, that a contest will be waged before the country on the merits and demerits of our recent action. Both parties to the dispute have called for unity. Without unity and the immediate carrying out of our fixed purposes, our program of aid and defense will be seriously impaired. Our whole Nation is girding itself to carry out a great purpose, and we in this House of Representatives intend that that purpose shall prevail.

In analyzing Colonel Lindbergh's message we are forced to certain conclusions. He wishes all aid to Great Britain and friendly nations discontinued. He does not believe this Nation can be successfully attacked. We not only do not propose to stop our aid as outlined, but we propose to construct ships and tanks and other war material as fast as human skill and ingenuity will permit, and when these are completed, ship them from these shores and see to it, with the help of Britain's Navy, that they reach their intended destinations, and no power of Hitler can prevent it. If Britain is defeated and their Navy lost, and God forbid any such eventuality, an invasion of South America is certainly in the realm of possibility. Germany would not overlook such a prize. Eminent Army and Navy officials are fully aware of these dangers, but apparently our friend the Colonel knows better. So repeal our appropriations, shut down our munitions works, disband our Army, close our shipping ports. Lo and behold, there is no further use for any of them and we can go about the construction of dam sites and super highways, ship canals, and Passamaquoddys, with business as usual, and with joy in our hearts that at last we are alone, without a friend in the world, and above all, safe from danger without and within. That is the program of the Lone Eagle.

This whole controversy may be aptly summed up by using the words of the late President Theodore Roosevelt:

To start something and then go soft is the one certain way to destruction.

London Paper Asks United States to Convoy War Supplies to Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, step by step, foreign and domestic propaganda is doing its deadly work in bringing this Nation into active participation in the bloody war abroad. Under leave to extend my remarks I insert the following dispatch from London:

LONDON PAPER ASKS UNITED STATES TO CONVOY WAR SUPPLIES TO BRITAIN

LONDON, March 24.—For the first time a London newspaper today urged the United States to convoy war supplies to Britain in view of the menace of the German spring sea offensive, backed up by her powerful battleship raiders, the *Scharnhorst* and *Gneisenau*.

The newspaper was the Daily Sketch. Other papers have proposed that the United States take measures to assure that American supplies reach Britain but none heretofore had asked for convoys.

"We need every enemy neutral ship that now lies idle in an American harbor," said the Sketch. "We need every American ship that America does not need herself. We need every American captain, every American ship, every engineer, every American seaman who can be spared from America's own war effort.

"We cannot afford to wait nor can America afford to wait for public opinion in the United States to mature while Germany acts with such concentrated force on our maritime resources.

"What we need most urgently is American convoys for American supplies."

Observers agreed that Britain's sea lanes are now menaced as never before by German submarines, operating in "wolf packs," the commerce-raiding battleships, and long-range bombers.

In Reply to the Toast: "The President of the United States"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LE ROY D. DOWNS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. FRANK KNOX, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, under permission granted me, I take pleasure in inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, before the Hibernian Society of Baltimore, Md., on March 17, 1941:

We have just drunk a toast to the President of the United States.

There is nothing unusual in that. It is a tradition among good Americans, but in such a gesture of respect and affection in which we have just participated, there is, right now, an exceptional and unique quality. We were, all of us, drinking a toast not only to the President of the United States, but to the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. Of course, under our system, the President is always the Commander in Chief, but in times of tranquillity and peace, we rarely think of him in that capacity. We think of him thus tonight because our country is in deadly peril, and every good American holds himself ready for any call for his services which the Commander in Chief may make. This readiness to respond by the free men who comprise the real defense of the country is without limitation. It may call for minor sacrifice of income. It may mean longer hours of labor. It might involve drastic changes in occupation. For some, it may means the rupture of home ties, the enlistment in the armed forces, the incurring of grave danger, and for some, it may mean cruel wounds or sudden death.

These are a part of the obligations of citizenship in a free country when that country is in danger.

The man who can summon us to fulfill these obligations, up to and including the supreme sacrifice of life itself, is the President; every American's Commander in Chief.

What sort of man the President is becomes of vast importance when national peril impends and ultimate sacrifice may be required. I speak to you, not as a member of the party which nominated and elected him President. As you all know, I have been a lifelong member of the opposition party. What I have to say of the President as our Commander in Chief, therefore, is not the fruit of a long-time political association with him. The basis upon which my estimate of him is made is found in 9 months of close association with him in a common effort to promote the national defense, to buttress the national security, and to keep alight the "fires of liberty" in a war-torn world.

First of all, I have found President Roosevelt a sincere, earnest, and patriotic American, who understands what Americanism is and is ready to make any sacrifice to preserve it. He has completely forsworn partisanship and is animated by as high and fine a purpose to serve his country in an hour of danger as any man who has ever filled the Presidential office and discharged the arduous duties of Commander in Chief.

I have found him one of the best informed and most understanding students of American history and of American institutions with whom I have ever come in contact. He is devoted to the cause of the common man, and can appraise the reaction of the average citizen under conditions of stress and strain better than any man of his generation.

While not a professional military man, the President thoroughly understands the essentials of high strategy, and in the disposition and employment of naval military power he is probably the equal, if not the superior, of any naval authority now living.

The prime quality required of our Commander in Chief in a time of grave danger I have left to the last. That quality is courage. Franklin D. Roosevelt is a courageous Commander in Chief. I speak whereof I know, for I have seen him repeatedly in crises which call for courage—courage to pursue the right course, regardless of consequences. If a man had every other attribute of great leadership and lacked courage, his leadership would be vain in times like these. A bold, resourceful, clear-visioned leadership has characterized the Presidency of the United States throughout the present world

crisis—the gravest in world history. It has wrought an unexampled unity in America. It is rallying our potential might for our defense. It has given assurance that our free way of life will be preserved. But it has done and is doing more than this. The courageous leadership which President Roosevelt has supplied has provided a rallying point for men who love liberty the world around. His daring and his prompt cooperation in the dark days which followed Dunkerque saved the last rallying point for democracy in all Europe. The successive measures which the President has taken to bolster the cause of democracy in the world has provided at last a reasonable hope that the march of totalitarianism can be halted and its foul champions driven back to the caves of the Dark Ages from whence they came.

This, then is my estimate of the man whose health we have drunk and who now beckons to America to fulfill its destiny as the unshakable bulwark of human freedom and individual liberty.

May we turn from a contemplation of the qualities of a Commander in Chief to the characteristics of the people—people like you and me, who fill the ranks of the battalions who loyally follow the President's leadership?

First of all, it seems to me, must come for all of us the effacement of personal and political animosities. In a moment of grave national peril a spirit of national unity must be summoned. When we are dealing with domestic questions in a democracy the airing of differences, the debating of issues, and the clash of party are necessary and admirable. The honest and sincere championship and pursuit of political purposes held to be wise and useful constitute a moral obligation under the democratic way of life. But when the danger comes from without, when some enemy threatens to destroy the very institutions under which we enjoy the privileges of democracy, then the voice of party must be hushed, the shrill tones of political conflict must be stilled; the ranks, broken by internal differences, must be closed up. To a foreign foe we must present an undivided front.

My fellow citizens, never in your lifetime or mine could a plea for an undivided solid front be made more justifiably than right now. To pursue partisan purposes and to selfishly calculate upon the effects of political action is to be guilty of adding to the perils which confront the Nation.

Modern war is not fought with guns, ships, and planes alone. It has entered into the world of the spirit. The swift advance of the means of instantaneous communication over vast distances has made of propaganda a weapon as much to be feared as the products of Krupp and Skoda combined. What we do here to meet the present situation is made known in every unfriendly totalitarian capital instantly. Evidence of disunity and excessive displays of partisanship, acrimonious debate which descends to the level of personalities, supply encouragement to those who would destroy us and impair the confidence of those struggling democratic peoples who rely upon us for help.

In a time like this, in the presence of a world movement which has for its announced purpose world domination, we cannot live unto ourselves alone. We cannot be indifferent to the effect of our actions upon others outside our borders. We must remember that our words are weighed across the oceans. We must not forget that some wavering nation under the cruel pressure of a dictator may be gobbled up for totalitarianism because of loss of hope of help from us. We must not fail to recognize that British morale more than British weapons has saved Britain for democracy, and that an obvious and unmistakable unity here strengthens that morale and renders the fall of Britain less likely. Most important of all, we must not ignore or underestimate the destructive voice of a flagrant partisanship upon our own people when the minds of the people must be concentrated upon the dangers of the hour and the imperative need of swift all-out defense.

This is no time to worry or feel concerned about the preservation of the party spirit. In legislative halls from now on division should should not be along party lines. It should only grow out of honest differences of opinion among men who desire to promote the same object—that is, the successful defense of the Nation and the preservation of our way of life. I will take a chance, readily, on the preservation of party government if we can first make sure that we preserve the institutions under which party government can flourish.

From this time forth, until this evil thing which has reared itself up to challenge all of the things that free men hold dear has been destroyed, we ought, all of us, to count ourselves just Americans.

There are some other qualities that must be found in a united America. We must recognize that our comfortable modes of life and our accustomed habits of work are subject to drastic change for the sake of common safety. If we would protect ourselves against the horrible changes which the peoples of Europe have had to endure, then we must willingly suffer minor changes not to our liking in order to be safe against that. We may have to work harder. We may have to work more hours per day and more days per week. We may have to give up wholesome pleasures and desirable recreation. We must be ready to devote more and more of our income to support the frightful cost of modern defense. There is no such thing as business as usual if our country is to be safe. The workingman and businessman alike must submit to things which are distasteful. Some forms of business not essential to national defense must be restricted, and all excess profits that flow from defense measures must go back into the common Treasury. The use of force by labor union or employer in industry vital to the national defense must be rigorously restrained, and resort must be had to the processes of conciliation and arbitration. No group, class, trade, or profession must seek unusual and selfish advantages because of national necessity.

I am convinced that popular response to these needs is well-nigh universal. Those few malcontents who would challenge this movement for national solidarity and unity will speedily be swept aside by an aroused public. I conceive these things to be essential to the forming of an invincible army of freedom with which we may challenge successfully the brutal sweep of organized barbarism toward world dominion. This is a changing world, a world in which the battle line will not be the same tomorrow as it is today.

It is not the same today as it was a year ago. Then our people were seeking congressional approval for an expanded Navy in the interests of national defense. Today, because of this law of change, they are seeking ways to help others defend themselves—people whose principles of life follow the pattern of our own, and who are engaged in open warfare to continue their life as they wish to live it, and not according to the dictates of aggressors.

Standing adamant against a war lord more ruthlessly proficient than any this earth has ever seen are millions of men and women who still would rather die than come under his rule. It is these that we would help, partly because they are fighting our battle, but more because they are fighting the battle that mankind has fought since history began to be written—the battle for the preservation and continued flowering of enlightenment, the battle for freedom of thought and speech and deed, the battle for the Sermon on the Mount.

Some foolish people have asked: "What is it they are fighting for?" When man is forced to burrow underground at night, to carry a gas mask and a gun by day, to turn his own hearthstone and plot of ground into an armed fortress, surrounded by a trench, he has not much time for statements. He has only time to think and find ways and means of driving the murderer out. He may awake to find the bodies of his wife and children submerged under heaps of rubble; he may hear their cries and be unable to answer them; he may be killed himself while they live on, pitiful victims, left destitute by the blast that destroyed their provider. There is only one answer to those who, living in peace and plenty, dare ask what such people are fighting for. That answer is to help to destroy the inhuman forces that have caused their awful plight.

These embattled peoples did not want war. Their very unpreparedness was proof of that. They did everything they could to prevent it. Did the Hollanders and the Belgians sign treaties of self-defense or even plot against the Axis Powers? They did not. Did Norway, the most advanced democracy known to man, want war? Did Denmark? They did not. Did Czechoslovakia, proud of her new-found freedom and prosperous because of it, want to come under the iron heel? It did not. Did the people of France, of Britain, of Poland, of Abyssinia, and Greece want war? Did Bulgaria wish to capitulate? Did Rumania? They did not. But nothing succeeds like success. And the successes of Hitler, like those of Alexander, Genghis Khan, and Napoleon, must spread to the seven seas and the four corners of the world, if they are not stopped by those who would die rather than see them continued.

The British Empire is at war. Its effects reach India, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and Singapore. In Indochina a defeated France must give up its right to free trade. In China itself a bewildered people fight on with the richest of their possessions stripped from them. In the Netherland Indies the Dutch carry on under ever-advancing storm clouds that may rain death down upon them at any moment.

What could be more natural than that these forces of evil which brought all this about beyond both our wide oceans should join hands together? Are not their lack of principles the same? Was not the fate of Manchuria but the beginning of an attempt by fire and sword to seize the whole world for purposes of exploitation and mass enslavement?

In the middle of this hurricane of destruction, with its winds of death ever increasing in violence, lies ours, the only hemisphere that is still unravaged by its monstrous breath. The man you have toasted tonight saw it coming in 1933. In that year he began a naval building program, the units of which, thank God, are operating with our fleet today. We are still building, and will go on building until this storm of violence has at last run its course.

Every President in time of crisis has been opposed. Washington was accused of wanting to be king; Lincoln was a warmonger to his opponents; Franklin Roosevelt has been given too much power in the minds of his. But these same voices that would disparage our leadership are the ones which would lull America to sleep with assurances that nothing can disturb our tranquillity. Oh, no; we have nothing to fear. All we have to do is build up our own defenses. We don't need to even be in any great hurry to do that. If we are strong enough, no hurricane can touch us. We are too far removed from its vortex. By our position alone we are exempt from all that has happened to others. A few planes will do the trick.

Well, this is how exempt we are. No matter who wins this war, our way of life is going to be changed. What then will it be if

the Axis Powers are completely victorious? Hitler, in control of Europe, will dominate all its trade. Our greatest market for surplus, Great Britain, will be gone. South America, with its natural European market, will be invaded by Axis colonists, developed methodically with true German efficiency. This colonization will be followed by Nazi political conquests, the latter by military domination, and the invasion of the last outpost against world domination under dictatorship will have begun.

Once entrenched, totalitarianism will spread like a plague. And we will be powerless to stop it. For with Axis domination of the whole of Europe will come the control of vast shipyards with seven times the building capacity of our own. To what might be left of the British Navy will be added the French, the Italian, the German, the Japanese, with their combined powers of enlargement far greater than are our own. With the loss of trade in the Atlantic will come similar losses in the Pacific. The markets of Japan, China, and Australia will be closed. The Netherlands Indies and the strategic materials for war without which we may become paralyzed will fall under this same rule. And in the United States could come the greatest depression in all our history. One hundred and thirty million people, raised to the highest standard of living the world has ever known, slowly strangled, to be catapulted to destruction as the tentacles of an organized world hegemony, bent on choking this Nation's breath, finally is successful in erasing the last vestiges of freedom and liberty from the face of the earth. The burning of Magna Carta and the Constitution of the United States would make the biggest bonfire the world has even seen. Then would come the dark of human slavery.

This is not a pleasant picture. The propaganda movies of the German Government that have been on view are not pleasant pictures. Like it or not, this Nazi military colossus is the most powerful land machine of death that man has ever conceived.

Fortunately, when it meets up with salt water it is forced to pause in its mad rush. It can stand and look at the British Isles a few miles away, but to date it has failed to penetrate them.

And so, with Ireland lying to their west, what would be the fate of Ireland were Britain to go down? Could it stand alone in this Nazi hierarchy? It could not. The heroes of its fight for freedom would be buried in the ashes of liberty, just as have other heroes in other lands. I am afraid the German manacles would be much more difficult to remove than were the bindings of a Cromwell or the lashings of an English aristocracy, and driving the Germans out of Ireland would be a task more difficult than any the good St. Patrick ever tackled. With an Axis victory, the garments of Irish freedom would be something to hang on the basement wall, with the penalty death if any Irishman wearing them ever emerged to tempt the light of day.

I have just returned from anotner of many inspections I have made since becoming Secretary of the Navy. It has been my good fortune to be able to fly to our many strategic points of naval defense since accepting this post and learning for myself just what we can expect in case of attack. In the Pacific I am sure we have the most powerful, straight- and hard-hitting fleet afloat. It is ready for any eventuality. It is measuring up to the finest traditions of the United States Navy and there is no cause for alarm in what it will be able to do in case of war.

A short time ago it was found advisable to reestablish the Atlantic Fleet as a major force under its own commander in chief. Our expanding Navy will find more and more units added to this already formidable force. The two-ocean fleet is no longer a thing on paper. Though not due to be completed until 1945 or 1946 under the present program of construction, vessels are being commissioned far ahead of schedule and as fast as is humanly possible. Next month another battleship, the *North Carolina*, will be placed in commission, to be followed shortly by its sister ship, the *Washington*. We are building destroyers in less than 1 year instead of more than 2 years, and will improve on that record as time goes on. We are acquiring auxiliaries for this fleet as fast as we can convert them to our uses. Minelayers and sweepers, net tenders and motor torpedo boats are being constructed and converted at a tempo unheard of in World War I.

The immediate future though not happy in its outlook has much in it that we can be thankful for. We can be thankful that we have throughout our history crushed intolerance and bigotry, and given to every immigrant who has come to our shores the right to improve his lot. We can be thankful that because of the Bill of Rights, our people today, though living in Baltimore or El Paso, Maine or Virginia, understand each other and believe in the same rights and privileges for all. We can be thankful that we have the right to say what we think, to read what we wish to read, and to believe in God in whatever manner is our choosing. We can be glad that we still live without blackouts, without breadlines, with hope in our hearts and not destitution written into our souls. We can be thankful that we are strong, that we are a credit to those who have gone before us and given to us these benefits that have made of us a great country. We can be thankful for our leadership, and be assured that it is true and forthright. And we can be glad that if the time ever comes when we must once more defend this bright land of ours, we will not be found wanting, but will prove to the peoples of the earth who look to us as the last hope of deliverance from a war-enslaved world, that we are their friends, and that we will achieve for those that came after us, a finer, better, more peaceful way of life.

Importation of Meat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

RESOLUTION BY THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota, not to repeal or modify the Embargo Act of 1927 relating to importation of meats from foreign lands:

Joint resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States not to repeal or modify the Embargo Act of 1927 relating to importation of meats from foreign lands

Whereas as a result of repeated outbreaks in this country prior to 1927 of the dreaded cattle disease known as rinderpast, or foot-and-mouth disease, there was enacted in that year a congressional embargo upon the importation into this country of dressed meats and meat products from any country where said disease exists; and

Whereas prior to the imposition of the embargo the spread of that disease in this country demoralized the domestic livestock industry, seriously jeopardized the public health, and resulted in the expenditure of millions of dollars by Federal and State Governments, and by the livestock industry for the eradication of that evil; and

Whereas the wisdom of that congressional embargo, embodied in the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, has been indubitably justified as attested by the fact that since January 1, 1927, there has been only one minor outbreak of that disease—in the State of California in 1929—which outbreak has since been traced directly to a violation of Federal regulations relating to the unloading of certain materials; and

Whereas there is increasing evidence from authoritative sources that a serious attempt is now under way to influence the President of the United States and Congress to circumvent or remove the embargo upon the importation of dressed meats and meat products for the benefit of certain foreign nations in which the said livestock disease is prevalent; and

Whereas any modification of that embargo would be inimical to the best interests of this Nation, and would cause a recurrence of the evils existing prior to 1927 as enumerated above; and

Whereas the agricultural and livestock industry of this Nation is playing, and must continue to play, a vital and indispensable part in the program of national defense, and nothing would more seriously affect that burden and the program of national defense than a relaxation of the existing barriers to the importation of infected livestock: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota in regular session assembled, That we hereby respectfully and earnestly importune the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States for reasons herein stated, to resist any attempts, and to refrain from any action, designed to repeal, circumvent, or modify the embargo act of 1927 relating to the importation of dressed meats and meat products from foreign lands in which there is prevalent the livestock foot-and-mouth disease; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota is hereby instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Minnesota in the Congress of the United States.

LAWRENCE M. HALL,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
C. ELMER ANDERSON,
President of the Senate.

Passed the House of Representatives, the 5th day of March, 1941.

HARRY L. ALLEN,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Passed the Senate, the 21st day of March 1941.

H. Y. TORREY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Approved March 24, 1941.

HAROLD E. STASSEN,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

Filed March 24, 1941.

MIKE HOLM,
Secretary of the State of Minnesota.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ROLAND KINZER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

Whereas it appears that the present Congress of the United States will be called upon to pass upon the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is opposed to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway because of its economic impracticability, its entire lack of advantage as a defense measure, and its detriment to business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States not to approve or authorize the construction of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative elected from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Senate of Pennsylvania, the 25th day of March 1941.

[SEAL] W. J. RIDGE,

Chief Clerk, Senate of Pennsylvania.

Citizenship Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1940, the President of the United States approved a joint resolution of both Houses of Congress, setting aside the third Sunday of May of each year as Citizenship Day.

The purpose of this act was to give recognition to all those who, by coming of age or naturalization, have attained the status of citizenship. In accordance with this proclamation, cities and States throughout the United States are preparing to observe this day with the proper ceremonies.

I wonder, however, how many people in this country really know the true story of the origin of this day. I wonder how many people know that a simple act of charity and kindness of a foreign-born citizen was the motivating spark which has set in motion this movement to teach all citizens to appreciate the great honor and privilege which has been bestowed upon them when they assumed their sovereign rights of citizenship.

In 1923 Mrs. A. B. Vajda came to this country in search of religious and poltical freedom. Grateful to her adopted country for the opportunities granted to her, she felt it her solemn duty to know all there was to be known about her country. She immediately started to study English and become a naturalized citizen within the shortest possible time.

Her newly acquired knowledge of her adopted country was soon to prove of great value. In 1931 a man came to her for assistance. He had applied for county relief for himself and his family but had had trouble in making himself understood because he knew no English. Instead of taking the easy way out and helping him obtain the relief he desired, she helped him find a job. He, of course, passed the word on to his friends and soon Mrs. Vajda was besieged with similar pleas for assistance.

One man complained that he was not able to obtain employment because he was not a citizen. She quickly decided that the simplest answer to this problem was to encourage and to assist aliens to become citizens. Thus, through that simple act of kindness and charity, Mrs. Vajda started a movement which has received the support of Congress and the United States.

Within a short time there were so many aliens who wished to become citizens that working 8 to 10 hours a day she could not satisfy the many requests. She thereupon called on those whom she had trained to be citizens to help her in this important work. Soon she had 32 coworkers, representing 19 nationalities. They called their organization the Americanization League of America.

On May 18, 1931, the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee recognized the splendid work of the Americanization League of America and appropriated a sufficient sum of money to defray the rental of the Milwaukee Auditorium for the first citizenship day to be held in the United States.

The first Citizenship Day was held on October 5, 1931, and was attended by approximately 500 people. Each year thereafter the Americanization League of America and the city of Milwaukee has celebrated Citizenship Day on that same date. Last year 10,000 people attended the ceremonies, and thousands were turned away. It is estimated that the Americanization League of America has helped more than 12,000 aliens become good American citizens.

The purely voluntary work of one woman has resulted in the growth of an organization with thousands of members in the city of Milwaukee, each one sworn to be a better citizen than the man who was born here. Each one has taken the pledge that he is not a member or affiliated with any organization, association, society, or group that advocates, teaches, advises, or believes in overthrowing by force or violence the Government of the United States or any form of law thereof.

And now on May 18, 1941, the various cities of the United States will observe their second Citizenship Day, just 10 years after the city of Milwaukee first recognized the splendid work of Mrs. Vajda and the Americanization League of America and established its own Citizenship Day. I am proud to be a Representative in Congress of the city of Milwaukee. I am also proud to be a member of Mrs. Vajda's Americanization League of America. As long as this democracy can develop such citizens, we need have no fear of our democracy becoming decadent.

Military Highway Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

RESOLUTION BY THE NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution by Assemblyman Leslie G. Ryan, of Rouses Point, N. Y., and adopted by the New York State Legislature:

Whereas the President of the United States in a recent broadcast to the Nation has warned that conditions abroad and lack of military preparedness at home constitute a menace to the safety and security of the people of the United States; and

Whereas the Government of the United States is now intensively engaged in preparation for hemispheric, North American, and national defense, and Congress has appropriated large sums of money for this purpose; and

Whereas an adequate system of military highways over which troops, artillery, mechanized equipment, and other materials of war and supplies may be moved without interruption and with the utmost dispatch is one of the essentials of modern warfare and a necessity in the defense of this country; and

Whereas the State of New York, one of the most important of industrial, commercial, and financial areas of the United States and a section in which arms and munitions are being manufactured and concentrated in enormous quantities, and in which army posts and military training camps are established, is located, in part, upon the eastern seaboard, while its northern frontiers bordering the Dominion of Canada, a country now at war, are entirely unfortified; and

Whereas in the event that a hostile power or hostile powers should overcome Great Britain, its naval vessels and transports might steam through the Gulf of St. Lawrence, capture Quebec and Montreal, and, in the latter city, be in a position to strike at the rich industrial and commercial centers of the northeastern United States, and hurl its armies upon Albany and New York; and

Whereas, should such events threaten, it would be of vital importance to the United States to be in a position to move troops and military equipment and supplies to our northern frontier in great numbers and in enormous quantities for use in repelling the invader; and

Whereas, if such a situation should develop, the safety and security of our entire country might depend upon the ability of our Government to move defense forces and equipment to our northern frontier, to the Atlantic seaboard, and between strategic points in the State with the utmost speed; and

Whereas our present highways are unsuited to the purpose because many of them are narrow and run through congested metropolitan districts and some are not sufficiently substantial to carry the fleets of heavy transport vehicles, motorized artillery, and other vehicles which would make use of them in the event of war; and

Whereas the Joint Legislative Highway Survey Committee has recently made a report to this body in which its members assert that, with the present contemplated allocation of Federal funds, at least 4 years will be required to improve the 3,200 miles of New York State highways considered vital for defense purposes; and

Whereas it is the considered opinion of this body that New York State, because of its geographical location and because its entire northern frontier is unfortified, would be among the first to be invaded if Great Britain and Canada should be defeated and there should be an attempt by an aggressor nation or nations to conquer the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby petitions the Federal Government of the United States to make available from funds appropriated, or to be appropriated, for defense purposes, a sum adequate to carry out a program of military highway construction to the extent considered imperative for the safety and security of the State and Nation; and be it further

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That a copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Congress elected from the State of New York.

By order of the Assembly.

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

In Senate, March 18, 1941.
Concurred in, without amendment.
By order of the Senate:

WILLIAM S. KING,
Clerk.

Jackson Day Dinner Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 31, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, OF KENTUCKY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the able address delivered by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], to the Democrats of Massachusetts at the Jackson Day banquet, held in Boston on Saturday evening, March 29, last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies and gentlemen, I appreciate the honor of being assigned the great pleasure of addressing the Democrats of Boston and Massachusetts on the occasion of this Jackson Day banquet.

We meet in honor of one of the great heroes of American history. Not only was he a great military figure, but he was a great statesman. He was a Democrat in the broad and fundamental sense of the word and not merely as a member of a political organization, although he was a member of the Democratic organization of his day and fought grimly to preserve and to advance the principles for which it stood.

Andrew Jackson was a man of superb courage. Without this courage he could never have become the great hero of his own day and of ours. The whole history of American democracy is filled with the deeds of men of courage. It has not always been merely physical courage. Physical courage is necessary in the advancement of any great cause, and Andrew Jackson possessed it in a superlative degree, not only in his dealings with the public but in his private enterprises as well. But in addition to physical courage, moral and intellectual courage were necessary a century ago, and they are even more necessary today.

We have lived in the atmosphere of democracy for so long a time that it has been difficult for us to realize that there are parts of the world in which it has never existed, or that in those parts where it has existed it could be easily overthrown. We are confronted today with the stark realization that the democracy of Jefferson and Jackson and Tilden and Cleveland and Woodrow Wilson is under attack on a wider front throughout the world than has been true in more than a century, and that it is under attack in our own country as well as in others.

I do not wish tonight to speak simply as a partisan. Although we meet to commemorate the heroic achievements of Andrew Jackson and to keep alive the spirit of that democracy which he fought to preserve and advance, we feel no compulsion to speak merely as partisans. The things for which we are fighting today are not partisan in any sense of the word. We are fighting today to preserve for ourselves, and if possible, for the world, the right of human beings to freedom and the enjoyment of equal rights under a government of laws devoted to justice and fair play.

But I am sure I will not be misinterpreted when I say that during the entire history of the party which Jefferson organized and Jackson strengthened, it has been devoted to the advancement of the welfare of the great masses of our people. It has advocated and labored for such political and economic justice as will enable them to share in the great benefits which Almighty God has bestowed upon America.

Particularly has this been true during the past 8 years. The defense of democracy is not accomplished by military power alone. Armies and navies are necessary. But without the approving spirit of the people behind the armies and navies, the principles of democracy would be short-lived.

Eight years ago it would have been fantastic for any responsible American to have prophesied that in the year 1941 we would be required to train our manpower and expend billions upon billions of dollars for the purpose of defending the freedoms which we have enjoyed for a century and a half and which we are guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. It seems almost providential, therefore, that during these 8 years the activities of our Government have been largely concentrated on defending and strengthening the social, moral, educational, and economic foundations of our own American democracy. We have been seeking to inaugurate a greater degree of social justice. We have recognized the obligations of any true civilization toward its workers and to its aged. To bring this about, we have sought a degree of social security.

We have recognized the indispensability of a satisfied agricultural background. In order to obtain it, we have strengthened the ability of the farmers to supply the rest of the nations with the necessities of life.

We have recognized that financial investment is futile without the confidence of the people in the financial stability, not only of our Government but of our private enterprises. To improve and to strengthen this stability, we have given the American people the means not only to regulate financial transactions but to learn the truth concerning the wisdom of financial investments in which they may be interested.

We have recognized the soundness of the Biblical adage that "the laborer is worthy of his hire" and we have provided for labor the right to bargain collectively with its employer in the adjustment of the conditions under which men may labor.

We have recognized that a sound and stable banking system must be maintained because when the people lose confidence in their banking institutions the foundation of banking inevitably collapses.

We have strengthened to a greater degree than ever before the confidence of the people in the banking institutions of the country and today we have the soundest and the most stable banking system in the history of the United States or of the world. Depositors no longer fear for the safety of their deposits because they are guaranteed by a Government in which the people have confidence.

We have recognized the fact that interstate corporations are the creatures of the States and the Nation and that they must be held accountable to the people for the manner in which they perform the trust which has been bestowed upon them by government. Because of this theory and necessity we have enacted legislation protecting the people from unnecessary pyramided holding companies enjoying monopolies within their respective fields in the distribution of power and light and comforts and conveniences to the people.

We have recognized that no great commercial nation can prosper long without the ability to sell its surplus products to the nations of the world. Following the first World War, insurmountable barriers were erected by nearly every nation in the world against the reciprocal flow of trade across national boundaries. In order to mitigate to some extent these harsh measures, this administration, under the guidance of Secretary Hull, has entered into trade agreements with most of the important nations of the world in order to facilitate the sale of our surplus products with advantage to ourselves. This program has been handicapped by the outbreak of the World War now in progress.

Recognizing that in times of stress, business enterprises have found it difficult to obtain that credit necessary to their continuance, the Federal Government has put at the disposal of business throughout the country, the credit of the National Government, not meaning to substitute itself for banking institutions, but that it might render them a service which private institutions were incapable of rendering.

These are but a few of the things which have been done by the American Government under the leadership of President Roosevelt that insure a greater degree of

social, political, intellectual, and economic justice to all classes of American people. This program, which I can only refer to in a small degree because time forbids that it be discussed in any great detail, has given evidence of how a great democracy can work for those who live under it. I do not claim that this program, if permitted to have proceeded without interruption, would have been the final word in the solution of all our problems, but I do claim that this program constituted a bold and necessary step in the exercise of the Government's functions in order that democracy itself might not collapse in the midst of economic disaster. I care not to what class or group men may adhere, whether in business, in agriculture, in labor, in the schoolroom, in the pulpit, in the counting house or wherever men are engaged in normal and lawful enterprises in working out our methods of life, the activities of our Government during recent years have brought benefits without which the Government itself would have found it difficult to weather the storm.

The wealth of our people has been increased in the past 8 years by more than $100,000,000,000. The income of our people has increased from thirty-eight billions in 1932 to seventy-four billions in 1940, and probably more than eighty billions in 1941. This increase in the earning power and the purchasing power of the American people must go far in enabling them to undergo the burdens now so necessary in preparing to defend the very democracy under which we live.

So I repeat what I said a moment ago—that it would have been fantastic for any responsible American 8 years ago to have predicted the conditions which we face today. It is undoubtedly true that the progress which we have made during these years to make the American people and the American families feel that their Government had an abiding interest in their daily welfare has strengthened our people to withstand the assaults now being made upon their conceptions of liberty and their methods of pursuing life, liberty, and happiness.

So as we meet tonight we find all the things for which our country has stood the object of sinister attack by the most ruthless and brutal form of dictatorship ever devised by the diabolical perversion of the human intellect.

And the question which faces America today is the question of self-preservation. We are not an aggressor nation. No other nations possess any territory or any rights which we desire to take from them. We wish to live in peace and accord with every nation and every race on this earth. And we regret that there are any nations whose conceptions of grandeur are such as to delude them into the belief that they can dominate the entire world through the exercise of brutal military force. But while we are a peace-loving nation and while we desire to live in peaceful relationship with every other nation, we do not desire it sufficiently to permit ourselves to see the liberty which we have inherited and which we enjoy destroyed or undermined by either military power or by economic or intellectual infiltration or by the subversive activities of enemies within our own gates.

It is because of these conditions that we are today training more than a million of our young men to defend their country. It is because of these things that we are spending and will spend 30 or 40 billions of dollars in the manufacture of equipment necessary to our defense. It is because of these things that we have just appropriated $7,000,000,000 for the procurement of military and other defense articles for the purpose of assisting other nations who are engaged at closer grips with this enemy of democracy, and whose defense is vital to the defense of our own country.

One hundred and seventeen years ago James Monroe announced a great doctrine. That doctrine was that the United States would regard as an unfriendly act the efforts of any European nation to gain a foothold in the Western Hemisphere. If James Monroe could have foreseen the conditions which now prevail he would have enlarged his restrictions so as to include not only Europe but Asia or any other part of the world that might seek to undermine the American theory of democracy, by which I mean the theories which have been proclaimed and are in effect in all the Western Hemisphere.

If the Monroe Doctrine was essential to our protection and to the preservation of our theory of democracy in 1823, it is infinitely more essential today. We have not and do not purpose to interfere with the internal affairs of any nation. It has a right to be or to become a pure democracy, a republic, or monarchy. The people of every country have the right to determine the form of their government. What we insist upon is that every nation has the right to reach its own determination without the interference of any dictator or any international marplot, from whatever quarter he may come.

In the preservation of the things that are dear to the American people, we might as well prepare to make sacrifices. Comparatively speaking, we have made none so far. We have undergone no hardships comparable to the hardships that are being endured by the conquered nations of Europe or Asia or by the people yet defending themselves and their institutions. It is our hope and purpose to keep war away from the American Continent and it is our belief that the best way to preserve the American Continent from the physical ravages of military warfare is to aid those nations yet able to fight to stop the aggressor in his tracks. In the accomplishment of this purpose and in the preservation of our sacred heritage of freedom the American men and women of today are no less courageous and no less determined than were our forefathers who won our independence in the beginning and who have preserved it from that day until this. As President Roosevelt said a few days ago in his remarkable address to the dinner of the White House correspondents in Washington, "all of our people must make sacrifices." We must give up something that we enjoy. We must give up something of our time. We must endure the scars which may result from the battles which democracy must fight. Let us pray that these scars will not be physical, that they may be only financial or economic. Let us hope that this struggle for democracy may be won without the sacrifice of an American life or the devastation of a single American home. It is my opinion that we can best accomplish this purpose by assisting in every material way the nations that are now undergoing the terrific onslaughts of brute force in every part of the world. We cannot pay for these enormous expenditures necessary to our defense on borrowed money alone. We must be prepared to endure heavy taxes that the burden of our defense may not be entirely passed to future generations. If we can preserve the citadel of democracy, wherever it exists and wherever it fights for its existence, it will be worth all that it costs us in sacrifices or hardships. And even though we may be compelled to pass some of these burdens on to future generations, they will rejoice at our courage and foresight in handing on to them a nation still free and still strong.

We meet here tonight in the enjoyment of the freedom of speech, the freedom of assembly, the freedom of worship, the freedom of the press. These freedoms have been obliterated in vast areas of the world peopled by men and women who love these attributes no less than we love them. If we can pass this Nation and other nations to whom we are obligated, and, in fact, the entire world, through our example and assistance, to future generations with the assurance that these blessings have been preserved and guaranteed to them, then these future generations will accept whatever obligations and commitments we may find it necessary to pass on to them.

Let us revive the spirit of Andrew Jackson as we assemble in his name. Let us reassure ourselves of the nobility of his character and of his great work, and let us take into our own hearts that superb courage to fight our battles today which enabled him to fight his battles and the battles of others in the day in which he lived.

Investigation of Defense Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 31, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN, OF MISSOURI

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio address by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the chairman of the Senate committee appointed to investigate national-defense expenditures.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, this great country of ours is facing a great emergency, perhaps the most serious in its history. This condition was brought about by factors over which we had no control and which we tried strenuously to avoid. The dictator countries have brought about a war in the Eastern Hemisphere which has an effect on every person and country on the globe, no matter how remote they may be from the center of the conflict.

To show how anxious we are to stay at peace, we enacted the Neutrality Act, voluntarily giving up some of our rights for which we had fought bloody battles. It became necessary for us to amend that Neutrality Act in order to help the democracies maintain their independence, and finally to declare ourselves the arsenal of democracy.

We suddenly decided in the spring of 1940 that we were totally unprepared to face a world at war and began a frenzied attempt to remedy that appalling situation. We decided to build a two-ocean Navy, and to train and arm a million men a year for a period of 5 years. We have begun to spend money by the billions to accomplish those two purposes. We propose to give all-out aid to Great Britain, Greece, and China, and are getting ready to spend more billions to do it.

Our national-defense machinery, never adequate nor very strong, has had to be suddenly expanded to enormous proportions. Contracts for construction, for supplies, and for munitions have been negotiated in desperate haste. Washington has been filled with people seeking contracts—some sincerely desiring to be of help to the Government, others seeking to serve only their own selfish interests.

It has become necessary to let enormous contracts for expansion of airplane plants

and for the construction of new ones. Munition plants are being constructed throughout the Nation. Clothing, supplies, munitions, battleships, airplanes, land, and everything necessary for the defense program are being purchased at a rate never before dreamed of except in 1917 and 1918. Some sixteen and one-half billion dollars in appropriations have been authorized and appropriated for defense. This does not include the appropriation of seven billions for aid to Britain or the four billions for the Army now pending in the Senate. When these appropriations are completed and authorized defense expenditures will exceed $25,000,000.

Rumors are rife questioning the manner in which contracts and the immense purchases have been handled under these appropriations. It has been charged that the contracts have been let to friends and associates of the men in charge of the national-defense program; that plants have been located on the basis of personal interests, friendship, and favoritism; that land purchases have been made at outrageous prices and that camps have been located in swamps; that in the name of speed many of the safeguards usually observed in Government transactions have been thrown aside and overlooked, although these safeguards would in no way have slowed up the program.

It has been charged that certain lobbyists have the inside track on purchases, contracts, and plant locations. Rumors of enormous fees paid to these gentlemen persist around the hotel lobbies of Washington. Purchases have been concentrated among a few manufacturers of supplies, and in some instances more money has been paid per unit on large contracts than on small ones.

It has been charged by Members of Congress that the manner proposed for Government financing of certain plants would result in the Government making a gift to the contractor or manufacturer.

Some years ago the War Department, working on a plan for an expected emergency, inaugurated what they termed an educational order. This was an order given to a manufacturer to make a few gas masks, for instance, or some other product not ordinarily manufactured in peacetime; the idea being that for this practically outright gift the manufacturer would install extra machinery to be used later on in an emergency. There have been charges that this educational order dodge has been used to make some very large gifts to the richest and most powerful manufacturers in the country since the emergency started. The time has arrived, in my opinion, for educational orders to be placed only after careful scrutiny. What we need now is actual production, and if manufacturers can't do the job, the Government itself should set up the works to do it. I would much rather see these gentlemen patriotic, however, and do the job. I do not want to see the Government operate these businesses or factories when these strenuous times pass.

There are in this great United States large numbers of small machine shops and small factories. All over the country these little independent shops and factories have made farm-machinery parts, cream separators, manure spreaders and products for the great mail-order houses. In nearly every little town there is a factory or a machine shop that keeps from a half-dozen to a hundred men employed. We want to find out whether these small shops and factories can be used in this great program. Of course, the big fellows want to buy and requisition their machines and move them out. That makes a concentration and a housing problem when they are moved, and it makes a vacant housing problem where they leave. Bulletins come out of the National Defense Advisory Commission saying they will be used, and then bulletins come out of the Office of Production Management saying that the patriotic duty of the owners is to sell them. We want to find out why they can't be used and left at home.

Subcontracts have been talked about as a method of distribution of work and profits in the program. But the big contractor wants all he can get, and he usually comes into the local set-up from some distant point, and if he lets subcontracts he brings the subcontractors with him. That is what is to be expected. Contracts should be let locally, as far as it is at all practicable.

This cannot always be true of engineering and architectural facilities. In using professional services, the best is none too good for public use, and naturally every effort should be made to get the best. It is a question, however, whether engineering firms should be made constructing contractors also. This has been done in many cases. It is also charged that one or two engineering and architectural firms have been used to the exclusion of many others just as competent and efficient.

The Senate has decided to go to the bottom of all these charges. It has created a special committee, "to make a full and complete study and investigation of the operation of the program for the procurement and construction of supplies, matériel, munitions, vehicles, aircraft, vessels, plants, camps, and other articles and facilities in connection with national defense, including (1) the types and terms of contracts awarded on behalf of the United States; (2) the methods by which such contracts are awarded and contractors selected; (3) the utilization of the facilities of small business concerns, through subcontracts or otherwise; (4) the geographic distribution of contracts and location of plants and facilities; (5) the effect of such program with respect to labor and the migration of labor; (6) the performance of contracts and the accountings required of contractors; (7) benefits accruing to contractors with respect to amortization for the purposes of taxation or otherwise; (8) practices of management or labor, and prices, fees, and charges which interfere with such program or unduly increase its cost; and (9) other such matters as the committee deems appropriate." The committee is directed to report to the Senate, as soon as practicable, the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations. I call particular attention to the breadth and scope of the Senate resolution authorizing the investigation. We shall be able to cover the subject thoroughly and completely.

This committee is a bipartisan one and has adopted a policy of making a thorough inquiry of the subjects it undertakes to investigate, without prejudice or bias. There will be no attempt to muckrake the defense program; neither will the unsavory things be avoided. The welfare of the whole country is at stake in the successful conclusion of our national-defense policy. Where there has been so much haste in the expenditure of such enormous sums there are bound to be leaks and mistakes of judgment. Many people believe in both patriotism and profits, but sometimes, unfortunately, profits come first with them. My experience with the public contractors is that they must be carefully checked on Government construction.

There has been much conversation about the distribution of plants and contracts on a more equitable basis as regards military safety and the stabilization of population, but very little has been done about it. Less than 120 contractors have received well over 80 percent of some eleven billions in contracts. A great concentration of plants and contracts is very noticeable in many areas. Tremendous housing problems have been created, both from the standpoint of empty homes caused by migration of labor from an area and by a lack of houses at the concentration point. The Senate committee will try to find what the facts are and what the reasons therefor are. The committee wants information on housing.

We want to know if we have really made speed by all this haste. Have we really accomplished our purpose? We know that the cost has been tremendous. We want to know if there has been waste in an attempt to speed up. How much excess cost has been due to speed and how much to willful or avoidable waste?

We want to know if the job is being done with minimum dislocation of the normal economic structure of the country. Is the little manufacturer, the little machine shop, the little merchant, being squeezed out in the name of national defense? Is economic power being further concentrated in a few hands? Are the big fellows being made bigger and more powerful at the expense of a democratic economy? We don't want to lose the very principles for which we stand, by a short-sighted or selfish policy in handling contracts and Government buying.

We recognize the importance of conducting this investigation so as not to add delay and confusion to an accelerated defense program; yet a properly conducted investigation now can be valuable both for its deterrent effect on those who might otherwise go wrong, and for constructive suggestions which it can offer to the Congress for legislative action and to the Executive for administrative improvement. So that instead of being a witch hunt after the mistakes are made and the crimes committed, this committee can be of immense constructive help in bringing the defense program to successful accomplishment. It is fairer to judge the conduct of the program in the light of conditions existing today, rather than in the light of conditions that may exist after the emergency has ended.

One of the most effective brakes on the insistence of private individuals and pressure groups in dealing with the Government unfairly, is the fear of immediate exposure and public criticism. If particular transactions and certain contracts are publicly labeled as undesirable by the Senate committee, it would unify administrative action and strengthen the bargaining position of the Government.

If our young men are being drafted for training and are forced to go to prepare against a real emergency, then these gentlemen who are acting for the Government must be made to be extremely careful in their handling of the preparations, the camps, and whatever else these young men may need. There should be no profiteers. Manufacturers, contractors, bankers, labor, and everyone else must be patriotic enough to do their part for the country with the same morale and the same willing spirit that these young men show in the camps. If there is profiteering, it will be exposed.

When people create delays for profit, when they sell poor products for defense use, when they cheat on price and quality, they aren't any different from a draft dodger, and the public at large feels just that way about it.

The Senate committee will start its public hearings on April 7 by first trying to obtain a clear picture of the national-defense program, how it is handled, and who is responsible for its operation. When we have that picture clearly before us we shall go into whatever details that seem to us to need adjusting. Any citizen who has information of irregularities based on facts where the Government's interests have been violated should inform the Senate Special Committee on National Defense. The committee's address is the Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

We shall make a thorough, complete, and exhaustive study of the program, and all of its ramifications. The members of the committee are Senators CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona; TOM CONNALLY, of Texas; JAMES M.

MEAD, of New York; MON C. WALLGREN, of Washington; RALPH O. BREWSTER, of Maine; JOSEPH H. BALL, of Minnesota; and HARRY S. TRUMAN, of Missouri, chairman.

Our hearings will be public, and we shall make prompt reports to the Senate on pertinent information as the investigation progresses.

Jackson Day Dinner Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 31, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. LISTER HILL, OF ALABAMA

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address which I delivered on the occasion of the Jackson Day dinner at Indianapolis, Ind., on March 29.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I bring you the greetings of my colleagues and your senior United States Senator, that able Democrat and the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, FRED VAN NUYS.

I rejoice to be with the militant democracy of Indiana. I am happy to be in the State of that charging cavalryman of democracy who for 6 years stood on the floor of the United States Senate, an accepted leader, fighting valiantly and brilliantly the battles of democracy—your friend and my friend, Sherman Minton.

I am happy to be in the State that has given to Democracy one of the finest soldiers that has ever served in our ranks and one of the great Demcorats of our day—Paul V. McNutt.

With the unswerving support of loyal Democrats such as are gathered here tonight, the national Democratic administration saved the Nation from economic chaos and financial ruin, blazed the trail of new pathways for social justice and human welfare, elevated the worth and the dignity of the individual citizen, won immortal victories for the economic rights of man, gave to the people a New Deal and a new hope, and opened the doors that common men throughout the land might enter into their inheritance.

It gave to the Nation a leader who will stand in history side by side with Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln—a leader whose services to our country's cause have been so great that the Nation cast aside a tradition so deep seated as to be almost a part of the organic law of the land and drafted this gallant leader to continue at the helm of state—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

On this Jackson Day we Democrats can well rejoice as we contemplate the brilliant achievements, the incomparable record of the past, for the past is indeed secure. As we celebrate Jackson Day we know that "Thomas Jefferson was the founder and philosopher of democracy—Andrew Jackson was the crusader and the sword." Jefferson thought primarily of freedom—freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, and the greatest possible freedom of action consistent with the preservation of stability and order.

"Andrew Jackson led the people to a victory that literally preserved freedom and popular government for posterity and gave reality to the democratic philosophy of Thomas Jefferson." Andrew Jackson with his resolute courage and his indomitable will was a mighty warrior and a mighty leader and he fought great battles and wrought wonders and won immortal victories for the people, but he lived in no such ominous hour as we live in today and his democracy was confronted with no such challenge as confronts America today.

Adolf Hitler has proclaimed a world revolution to make the Germans the master race, with all other races to be in subserviency, if not in slavery, to the Germans. Adolf Hitler would live by the sword. He has but one creed and that is the doctrine of force, of conquest, of death, and of destruction. He has declared, "Can a dynamic revolution stop at a sharing of the world? Must not the struggle continue until the final world dominion of a single nation? At the back of Germany's continental empire stands the will of absolute dominion of the world, the technical means of which are no longer lacking as hitherto."

Adolf Hitler has said: "The first condition of success is the unceasing and unending use of force." He is the sworn enemy of all that we proclaim as humanitarian and Christian. He scorns every right that we hold dear and despises the very idea of freedom for men and women. He would deny every principle proclaimed by Jefferson and fought for by Jackson. He speaks of the United States as the decadent democracy of the west and predicts our early destruction. He publicly warns the countries of South America that he will hold them to a strict accounting, remembering those who are for him and those who are against him.

All the trade routes of the world, all the sea lanes, all the separate centers of production, agricultural and industrial, Hitler would weave into one web with Berlin the center and the control. If Britain goes down Adolf Hitler and the Japanese imperialists would dominate all of Europe, Africa, Asia, and Australia. The trade of the United States would be so reduced that it would force a disastrous reduction in the standard of living of our people. Regimentation of our economic and national life and more regimentation would be necessary to the end that the liberties of our people would be more and more shorn from them.

With Hitler commanding a navy greatly superior to our own, with him possessing a capacity for shipbuilding seven times our own, the burden of armament that our people would have to bear would be staggering indeed. All America would be an armed camp. The United States would find itself within the jaws of a gigantic pincers movement—one jaw in Japan and the other jaw in world-conquering Germany with South America the handle through which the pressure would be applied to us.

With South America almost entirely dependent upon Europe for the sale of its export products, its vast agricultural surpluses, Hitler would move into South America economically, politically, and militarily. The United States would stand alone isolated without trade, without commerce, and without friends. She would be an island surrounded by a cordon of economic and military pressure and Hitler has declared that there are no longer any islands.

With such a situation confronting the United States and with the United States desiring to do all within its power to remain out of war we could follow one of two courses. Either we could do what the democracies of Europe, 12 of them, did when they indulged in the false hope and deluded themselves with the thought that Hitler would not attack them and did little or nothing to protect themselves from the Hitler menace, or we could be wise enough not to indulge in false hopes or delude ourselves but to see, to understand, and to face the situation intelligently and resolutely.

We chose the latter course. We embarked upon the latter course when we passed the Selective Service Act and the lend-lease bill, but the mere enactment of legislation and the appropriation of great sums of money, no matter how huge these appropriations may be, only start us on our course. They of themselves do not and cannot take us to our goal. To reach our goal requires a united nation—a nation in which every man, woman, and child places America and her cause first and does one thing and that one thing the thing which will contribute most to America reaching her goal.

History shows that in the past it has been practically impossible for democracies when they were still at peace and not under the compulsion of war to marshal their forces and to command their strength and meet the situation as the needs of the hour required.

This time we must change the course of history. To build our defenses in the air, on the land, and on the sea as strong as we need them, to pour out the munitions and supplies of war and to become in truth the mighty arsenal for the democracies, to reach our vast productive capacity in the shortest possible time, to do all that would become a great people and the mightiest nation on this globe is the great challenge that confronts every citizen in this Republic today. This challenge knows no party lines. It knows no factions, no classes, no groups. It summons every American under the flag to his full duty.

During the World War we organized an Army of 5,000,000 men and to the surprise of all the world placed over 2,000,000 of them on the battle lines 3,000 miles across the Atlantic. But although we were the greatest industrial nation on earth we failed in our industrial production to such an extent that the airplanes, the artillery, many of our guns and most of the ammunition that we used in those guns had to be supplied us by our Allies. If we fail industrially today as we failed in 1917–18 Britain cannot survive and our armed forces cannot be properly or adequately equipped and supplied.

We are told that the profiteering of the World War gave us a crop of 22,000 millionaires. This is no time for profiteering. This is no time for gouging the Government, be it the individual, the manufacturer, or the munitions maker. This is no time under the guise or the demands of the emergency to filch the public or rob the soldier who wears his country's uniform. There must be equal burdens and equal sacrifices for all and special privileges and special profits for none.

If the Democratic Party now in control of the Government does not exercise the taxing power and every other power at its command to prevent profiteering it will stand in default before the Nation. As we strive to eliminate profiteering we must also make every effort to eliminate strikes. I believe that labor is loyal; that labor is patriotic and I summon the rank and file of labor to charge their leaders to give their fullest and best cooperation to the National Mediation Board which has been set up by the President.

The vast wheels of American industry must turn at the fastest possible speed without the profiteering that invites and so often causes strikes and without the delay incident to strikes. The fate of our Nation may well depend upon the cooperation and the sacrifice of both capital and labor. If this cooperation and this sacrifice be not forthcoming an aroused public will demand the enactment of legislation which may take from labor some of the most precious rights for which many of us have fought through the years and which may mean the commandeering of industry.

There is no place in America today for communism, fascism, or nazi-ism, or any other isn but Americanism. Imagine, if you can, a "fifth columnist" insinuating himself into Jackson's army to sow the seeds of dissension, to sabotage or to undermine and ever living to report progress to the enemy who sent him.

As there is a difference between liberty and license so there is a difference between those who would bring about changes in our Government through orderly constitutional procedure and those who would bring about changes through sabotage and violence. The right of the former class to speak fully and freely is a right that should be preserved at all costs but there are no rights possessed by the latter class to engage in treason.

This is no time to give ear to the propaganda of those who would destroy us. There is no place in our land for the timorous or the time server or for those who would divide our people or weaken our efforts by engendering racial prejudice or class hatred. We must forget the things that may have divided us in the past and stand together as Americans, all loving and serving America.

We must build our two-ocean Navy. We must build the greatest air power in all the world. We must build an Army adequate to meet any emergency and every need. We must send every possible ship, every possible airplane, every possible gun, and all possible supplies of every kind to Britain. We must give the best that we can to the long-suffering and unconquerable Chinese, to the heroic Grseks, and to the indomitable Yugoslavians.

I pause in tribute to the valiant sons of Greece who like unto their fathers stand today at a new Thermopylae and hold the pass of civilization against the hordes of brutality and of barbarism.

I pause in tribute to the brave and sturdy Yugoslavians who thwarted a great betrayal and stand ready to fight and, if need be, to die for their liberty and for the faith that is within them.

As we pay tribute to the courage and the fighting qualities of other peoples, let us hope that the Japanese imperialists will not forget the valor and the spirit of the American people as exhibited all the way from Yorktown to the Argonne and be led into the miserable fate of the jackal of Italy, one Benito Mussolini.

I have seen the ships of our Navy in their might and their glory proudly riding the crested waves. I have visited the campfires of our selective service trainees, of our men of the National Guard, and of the Regular Army; they are the heirs in blood of the soldiers who followed Grant and Lee; they are the men and the sons of the men who two decades ago broke the arrogant and ruthless power of another conqueror dreaming of world domination, smashed his proud legions and scattered them in dismay and in defeat.

Let the Japanese imperialists, with their feudalistic sense of prowess and of vain glory, look back and remember that Japan has never met in conflict a first-rate power, and let them also look back and remember that ours is a navy and ours is an army that have known the sternest test in conflict but that have never yet known defeat.

It was written long ago, where there is no vision the people perish.

A great English statesman said on one occasion that the fortune of America lay in the fact that in the hour of her need God Almighty always raised up a man to lead and guide her. Fortunate indeed is our country that at this hour the President of these United States is a leader of unerring vision and of incomparable leadership.

From the day he took his high office he has labored to build our Navy and our defenses in the face of vigorous and at times paralyzing opposition in Congress. If his advice had been followed in 1937, when he suggested a quarantine of aggressor nations, Germany could never have received the matériel and supplies necessary to the building of her gigantic military machine. If his appeal had been heeded in the early summer of 1939 and the arms embargo repealed at that time, Germany might never have dared go to war. He of all men has divined the world situation and foreseen the dangers in it to our country.

We are witnessing today the greatest naval war in all history, and the President comprehends and understands every stratagem and every phase of such warfare. When other men could not see, he has seen with clear and definite vision; when others have doubted and dallied, he has stood forthright and foursquare; he has dared to anticipate the situation and to act and to do.

Franklin D. Roosevelt has met superbly the great trust reposed in his hands. Whatever the disagreements or differences of the past, he is the President of all the people, and for our country's cause we must rally to him as the Commander in Chief and sustain and support him.

If Britain goes down there will be another Munich but it will not be a Munich this time for Europe alone. It will be a Munich for the world with all its humiliation, its tragedy, its trials, its burdens, and its dangers for the United States.

Before our very eyes this hour there stand in ghastly and tragic relief the examples of Czechoslovakia, of Poland, of Norway, of Denmark, of Holland, of Belgium, of Bulgaria, of Rumania, of France, and of England. These nations refused to see; they failed to appreciate the task before them; they failed to recognize the danger that confronted them.

Germany was making ready, openly, arrogantly; yea, contemptuously for 7 years while the prospective victims of that preparation gave it insufficient heed. The democracies never grasped the terrible meaning of that tireless preparation. They were all too tardy in their counter preparations—all too short of vision to combine their strength while they were free people that they might continue free.

The path of destiny was clear for them to see and they glimpsed it dimly or not at all. They heard but did not heed the rumblings of the storm. Those rumblings now come to us. Shall we heed them while yet there is time or shall we disregard them and invite by default the destruction of all that we cherish?

As has been well said, Adolf Hitler has built his world picture and his world ambitions on the conviction that something which was once great in France and England and America has come to an end. The miracle of Dunkerque where a whole people rose to save its fighting men from a hopeless situation, the calm courage of the common people of London, arising daily from their air-raid shelters to find their homes destroyed and grimly planting little placards in the smoldering ruins reading "There will always be an England"; the stand to the end of the *Jervis Bay*, outarmed and outgunned, defending and saving most of its convoyed ships; and finally the Royal Air Force, whose boys willingly and smilingly engage in combat any number of enemy planes and without regard to the odds, has proved that for England at least that conviction is wrong.

As Americans we must prove that conviction wrong as to America. As Americans who would make America strong and keep America free, who would think first of America, her peace and her security, let us close ranks and, tireless and sleepless, let us march united all one way, militant and unafraid. Whatever the cost, whatever the sacrifices, as Americans let us march as Andrew Jackson would have us march. "The hour has struck. The duty is imperative and sacred. No time for discords now on nonessentials—and no possible palliation."

"Now has come the time for action,
Clear away all thought of faction
Out from vacillating shame
Every man no lie contain.
Let him answer to his name—
Call the roll."

Washington in History-Making Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 31, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a speech which I delivered on March 24, 1941, before the Republican women of Pennsylvania, at the Barclay Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Madam Chairman, distinguished guests, and my friends of the Republican women's organizations of Pennsylvania, it is a great privilege for me to speak before your group this noon, because in speaking to you I am privileged to address outstanding women leaders. You have a direct and personal stake in the future of this country, and in your capacity as leaders you can make a distinct contribution to sane and intelligent thinking throughout the entire Nation.

After all, in the ultimate sense of government, government and the policies of government are determined to an appreciable degree by leadership throughout the Nation rather than by an arbitrary determination in Washington.

CITY OF WASHINGTON NOT ULTIMATE SOURCE OF GOVERNMENT

Washington, or the District of Columbia, is an area of about 70 square miles lying between the long stretch of the Potomac and the Anacostia Rivers. The population in this small area is about three-quarters of a million, and for the past 6 months the War Department has been adding an additional 10,000 employees a month and is today adding at the rate of 1,500 a month to its civilian staff in Washington.

These 70 square miles are probably the most important 70 square miles in the world today, and yet the city of Washington is important only because it represents the sovereignty of 131,000,000 people throughout the entire United States.

The 130 Federal commissions and agencies do not constitute the Government. The 133,000 employees of the executive branch of the Federal Government employed in the District of Columbia do not represent the Government. In its ultimate sense, government has always resided in the people themselves. What Washington thinks is important, but it is important only to the degree that it represents the authority of the people back home.

I regard the concentration of all of the affairs of Federal Government in Washington, D. C., as unhealthy, cumbersome, unwieldy, inefficient, and economically unsound. I am a strong believer in decentralization. I can see no reason for the Department of Agriculture being housed in the largest office building in the world, in Washington, D. C. It would be infinitely more logical and a great deal more efficient and economical to shift that Department of Agriculture to the agricultural section of the country. There is no reason why that portion of the Agricultural Department which deals with cotton could not be located in the Cotton Belt; that portion of the Department which deals with wheat in the Wheat Belt, etc.

When we allocate all of the construction of a certain type of navy vessel to the Great Lakes, there is no reason on earth why that portion of defense activities cannot be shifted entirely to the Great Lakes region.

WASHINGTON—A BOOM TOWN WHICH SHOULD BE DECENTRALIZED

What would happen if we would decentralize Washington in this manner? First of all, we would break down the unhealthy concentration of men and power in Washington. Washington today is essentially a boom town—the largest in the United States and the largest in history. There aren't enough living quarters in Washington for all the people who work there. Many Washington employees have to locate at some distance from the Capital. Like every boom town, this concentration of people has resulted in a shortage of office and residential space, and frequently in excessive rents. The Government recently erected $200,000,000 worth of office space and still there aren't enough office buildings for the Government's needs. All of this means that the cost of government has increased.

The Federal Government pays excessive rates for more space. Rents go up, and consequently salaries must go up. Bureaus continue to multiply and with them the amount of "red tape." Available land is being occupied so rapidly that the Navy had to go as far south as Arlington, Va., when they made plans to construct a new, $3,000,000 office building. Other Government offices have been forced to shift to Baltimore.

Regardless of where any problem relating to government originates, the citizen whom it affects is forced to deal with Washington headquarters. I have always contended that many of these problems could be handled better by officers located in the fields. Such a break-down of centralization would undoubtedly result in greater economy, because Washington is one of the most expensive spots in the country to carry on Federal business.

If Federal employees are shifted out of Washington into different portions of the country, they would become part of taxpaying communities which support Federal activities, and their expenditures would be shot back into the economic blood stream of the Nation in the areas where it would be most needed, rather than into boom-town spendings.

For these reasons, particularly now, when there is such an unhealthy and tremendous expansion in Washington, I shall continue to urge decentralization of big government.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT NOT RUN AS A BUSINESS SHOULD BE

My second criticism of the Government in Washington relates to its conduct as a business. No private business in America could be run on the haphazard, hit-or-miss, crazy-quilt pattern of Federal spendings. No business in America can continue to spend indefinitely more than it takes in. In Washington there is no correlation whatever between the revenue-raising department of Government and that portion of Government which spends the funds. There is no relation whatever between income and outgo. I contend that no business could continue to exist on such a basis. This is not only true now during the defense period but this condition has obtained all along.

WASHINGTON ACTIVITIES INFLUENCE FUTURE COURSE OF THE WORLD

Not only the eyes of all America, but the eyes of all the world, are centered upon Washington. These are indeed history-making days—history making in the sense that we are now influencing the future course of the whole world.

In a sense, Washington is no different from other cities. It is made up of people—people who think, and people who don't think; rich and poor; educated and uneducated; young and old. There is this difference, however. In this city there are centered the three coordinating branches of your Government—the executive, the legislative, and the judiciary—and the men who constitute the personnel of these branches make up the machinery of government in a real sense.

The attention of the executive and the legislative branches of Government right now is concentrated largely on matters of foreign policy and national defense. The judiciary, of course, is determining the questions which come before it, but the judiciary also, as its latest decisions indicate, is cognizant of the changing world we are living in. Many of the old-established ideas have been discarded. The court is plowing its way into new fields, for better or worse.

The lend-lease bill, which caused so much disturbance in the country—that issue has been settled. While Washington was the vortex of the fight, immediately after the bill had passed the Senate, the storm subsided there. I hope that such is the case throughout the country.

I was one of those Senators who was in favor of assistance to England, but not in favor of the lend-lease bill. The President, in his recent speech, has informed the people as to what "all-out aid to Britain" means.

NEED FOR UNITY

The next day after its passage, I rose in the Senate and stated: "As one member of the minority who opposed this legislation, I want to say, today, that I believe that if this bill is sanely administered and if the totalitarian powers do not force us into this conflict, we may remain at peace. * * * This bill must be accepted by all the people as the law of the land. * * * Our job now is to forget our differences and to mold public opinion into constructive channels, which will direct and guide the administration of this legislation on a sane course. * * * We do not see things differently on the subject of love of America, the need of perpetuating our great freedoms and institutions. We do not see things differently in relation to 'fifth columnists,' unpatriotic Americans, and foreigners within our midst who would dissipate our courage and our love of country and our unity."

Of course, all thinking people realize that by this legislation we have entered upon a new field in our foreign policy. In Washington we are wondering how far it will take us, and where we will wind up.

We know our yesterdays are gone with their smugness and snugness and complacency. Yes, the old days are dead. We are entering upon a new era in world affairs. We know that the Nazi philosophy and the Nazi war methods are disintegrating forces. We want to keep America safe within and without, from those dangers.

However, history demonstrates that there have always been marauders abroad, but there have been, and will also, thank God, be constructive forces.

We know that Hitler has come to the top like froth. We cannot evaluate now all the various causes of his appearance. Much of the philosophy of Germany in the last 100 years has been a factor, and economic conditions have been another.

FACTORS WHICH DETERMINED OUR INTEREST IN WORLD ORDER

Every thinking person knows that great changes are taking place in the world's economics, politics, religious, and moral thinking. There is no question but what our present entrance into the international poker game was precipitated by the following factors:

First. Hitler's pronounced statement that he was out to conquer the world.

Second. His breach of treaties.

Third. His invasion and occupation of the small democratic nations.

Fourth. His cruel and barbarous treatment of those nations.

Fifth. His philosophy which is thoroughly anti-Christian.

Sixth. A knowledge of the detrimental effect upon our life if Hitler should subjugate Britain and dominate the Atlantic.

Seventh. His express plan for taking over South America.

Eighth. The triparty treaty between Mussolini, Hitler, and Japan involving the domination of the East by Japan.

Ninth. A partial understanding of what the subjugated nations are undergoing by having Hitler's way of slave existence imposed upon the people of those nations.

Tenth. His utter ruthlessless; his Machiavellian tactics; his utter disregard of international law and treaties and the moral code, resulting in the reestablishment of the law of the jungle, that brute force is the only law.

Eleventh. A realization that if Britain were to go down and Hitler were to dominate the world, our way of life would be jeopardized and our standard of living reduced.

Twelfth. A belief that if Britain were to go down, the Monroe Doctrine would be challenged and that would mean war.

Thirteenth. Putting it generally, Washington feels, what I believe the large percentage of the people feel, that in extending aid to Britain, making it possible for her to survive, the world will be safer and a more pleasant place in which to live, and I say this as one who favors aid to Britain but opposed the specific administration bill.

PRESENT ATTITUDE SHAPES FUTURE

There are some of us folks in Washington who are concerned about this future problem. We are trying to anticipate that period when the dove of peace will fly over the horizon, when all the industry of the world will have to change its course to a peacetime basis, when men who have been seared and crippled mentally and physically by the ways of war seek to establish themselves again in an ordered society, when the debt of this country will have reached the $150,000,000,000 mark, when all the other nations of the earth will be bankrupt, when the emotional and hate spree will have run its course—we are trying to plan for our tomorrow.

The old era will be dead. The underprivileged and the aged, the crippled and the maimed, and the tremendous number of unemployed will make their demands heard and obeyed.

Right now some of us are wondering how long this internal appeasement will go on—appeasement of the "fifth columnists"—and I define a "fifth columnist" as follows:

First. There is the actual "fifth columnist," the paid agent of a foreign government, or the loyal follower of a foreign philosophy. This man is a threat to American security, but at least he knows that he is such a threat, and we know it.

Second. The second kind of "fifth columnist" is the unwitting "fifth columnist." He is not an alien. He is an American who believes that he is a good American citizen, but he does things which shatter morale just as effectively as any of Hitler's "fifth columnists." In one sense he is the more dangerous of the two types of "fifth columnists" because he does not realize that he is a menace to American morale, nor do we realize it in every case.

Who are these unwitting "fifth columnists"?

First. They are the defeatists. They are the people who say that now that the lease-lend bill is passed, war is absolutely inevitable. They may be right, but that is no reason for us to preach that philosophy. If there is a possibility for the patient to live, the doctor does not send the man to his grave by refusing to give him hope. Instead, he encourages him to live; and sometimes he is successful.

In other words, the defeatists who refuse even to consider the possibility that we can stay at peace are doing their bit to create hysteria and to shatter morale. I refer again to the communications I have received since the bill was passed by this body. These same defeatists tell us that our American economy is no match for totalitarian efficiency. They tell us that in order to match that totalitarian efficiency we have to adopt totalitarian methods and disrupt our traditional system to an even greater degree. I call them vipers in our midst who do not know they are vipers. The person who spreads that kind of doctrine is also a "fifth columnist" and does his part in shattering American morale.

In this group of defeatists there is another type of "fifth columnist": He is the extremist who says that our security and our safety is dependent, not merely to a large degree on England's survival but that it is entirely dependent upon England.

That man is also a "fifth columnist" because he makes our morale entirely dependent upon England, so that if England should collapse our morale would collapse with it.

Mind you, I say these people are perfectly well-intentioned; certainly, but hell is paved with people who had good intentions; and I say that in their intemperate presentation of their viewpoint they are effectively serving Hitler's purposes in corroding American morale.

Second. The second group of unwitting "fifth columnists" are the pressure groups.

A pressure group is any group which places self-interest over national unity. You know to whom I refer—pressure groups that in this crisis of America place self-interest above the interest of the Nation.

Third. The third unwitting "fifth columnist" group is the intolerant group.

This group may be perfectly sincere and may have the most commendable motives. Like the other unwitting "fifth columnists," its membership may be composed of people whose patriotism, loyalty, and devotion to our country are unquestioned, and whose motives are of the highest. That, however, merely serves to make them more dangerous, because we accept the sincerity of their objectives, and are accordingly inclined to overlook the damage which they may inflict on American morale.

These intolerant groups are extremists. They are the people who set neighbor against neighbor, class against class, race against race. They are the men who say that anyone who favored the lease-lend bill is an out-and-out Anglophile and a traitor. They are the men who say that those who opposed the lend-lease bill are Nazis and traitors.

These people say these things in the fervent conviction that they are right. They say them, not from any bad motives, but because they believe it is their duty to do so.

I repeat, that has been my experience since the bill was passed by the Senate from talking with people who thought they were in contact with omniscience, that they alone knew what was right. I say they are "fifth columnists" because they create divisions, classes, and "isms" in our midst.

If this situation in Europe brings us into the maelstrom, we will all be asked, even as English men, women, and children were asked, to give up our old concepts of ease, our old ideas about certain privileges, and think in terms of duty and obligation.

Some of us in Washington know that this time may not be far distant. What this country needs now is production—accelerated production.

There is only one way to get it, and that is by work and sacrifice, not by falling asleep on the job, not by coddling the coddlers and appeasing the appeasers.

I wasn't in favor of becoming an arsenal for all the democracies of the world. I wasn't in favor of attempting to be the guardian angel of other peoples. But if the passage of the lend-lease bill is to be interpreted to effectuate that purpose—the President's message says just that—then I want Uncle Sam to do a job—a real job. What do I mean? Just this.

DEMOCRACY MUST GIRD FOR SACRIFICE

I was reading a book the other day wherein this idea was brought out—that the future historians will credit Hitler with being the savior of democracy, in that he challenged democracy. Democracy was becoming flabby, disorganized, soft, unworkable, run by charlatans and loose-thinking mountebanks. Its citizens were thinking largely in terms of pleasure and leisure, unaware of the fact that its great treasures—free thought, free worship, free speech, the right to own and control property and hold office, trial by jury—were purchased by the stress and battle and strivings of humans for a thousand years.

Democracy's educational process had put a false complexion on truth. The hunger for knowledge—real knowledge—was disappearing. There was simply the thought of satisfying the senses. The weakening process was on its way. Dissolution of a nation often follows such a weakening process.

But Hitler appeared, and with his appearance there suddenly dawned upon the people of England and of this country that the modern way of life had to go and that the new way must come in its place. They realized that whether it was to be good or evil depended upon them.

And so, now we are in the process of developing a new formula in which we hope that the rights of man will be included in the new way, together with a constitutional form of government. I say we hope, because we have not yet succeeded in downing the false philosophy rampant in Europe and the totalitarian powers are still in the saddle there.

Historians, I hope, will say that the citizens of America awoke—they thought for themselves—they realized that they were the last great democracy on which countless millions of homeless, distracted people of the world depended.

As long as freedom of thought, of speech, and worship remain in this country, and they can only be sustained by sacrifice and work, so long will this land be a torch for the benighted peoples of the earth.

It is up to all of us to do a real job for America.

UNITED STATES MUST CONTINUE TO STAND FOR MORAL WORTH OF MEN AND NATION

We in Washington know that this Nation is now in the international poker game. The hope of all America is that we can play it effectively, without getting into war—losing our chips.

Will Rogers once said, "We never lost a war, but we never won a conference."

We are not accustomed to the Machiavellian nature of Europe's diplomacy. We have stood for law and order—for the inviolability of contracts and treaties. We have stood for the moral worth of men and a nation.

In my opinion, we should continue, even though we are in this game, to stand for those virtues. We should see to it that we hold the cards. There is no need of this country engaging in a bluffing game. Let all the world know that now—now that we are in the game—that we are not bluffers. We mean what we say.

Some of us in Washington know that this means not simply voting $7,000,000,000—it means throwing American production into high gear. This means putting our industries into shifts, working each industry that is engaged in national defense 24, 22, or 20 hours a day.

It means tightening our belts and getting rid of our superficial living. It means getting rid of racketeers in industry, in labor, in every branch of our economy. It means imposing a tax bill that will bring America up short, to a realization that appropriating money is one thing—paying the bill is the real thing.

It means getting rid of the fettered, closed minds that have been running a lot of the show. Such minds did not anticipate the need of air defenses, the need of exploring intc new fields of defense and offense.

It means bringing into leadership, men with vision—men like Billy Mitchell, who was cashiered because he tried to teach the gold-braid artists something about war.

I have already mentioned that there are those of us in Washington who are thinking about the challenge which will confront us when the aftermath of war is here.

DEFENSE DEPENDENT UPON MORALE

The other day, in speaking to a Government official about the Government putting out of business certain manufacturing concerns, which were the economic backbone of communities—the Government was putting these concerns out of business because they were utilizing material that was needed for the war industries—I said to him, "Defense is something more than simply creating airplanes and guns and matériel. Every real defense," I said, "was built upon the strengthening of the fiber and the morale of our people. You are putting these industries out of business, thereby you are draining the lifeblood of those communities, because their pay rolls provide the economic life of those communities.

"Therefore, Government has the responsibility of cooperating with those industries to see that these concerns continue production. If they cannot get on the preferred list for war materials, then it is the business of the Government to cooperate with industry and show what that industry can be converted into, in order that jobs may continue, in order that fear or want and distress do not creep in, in order that men and women and children may not become the targets of those forces and those people who are always ready (now that Germany has prescribed the technique by her 'fifth columns') to sabotage the morale and strength of a people."

I reiterate that some of us in Washington see the menace of centralization, not only of power, but that form of centralization which drains the hinterland of men—of men who should, in that section, be producers of wealth and who should spend their earnings there. All over this country there are communities which have been drained of individuals who have been called into these other centers. The result is that in these communities the economic current has become stagnant, economic problems have multiplied. Business values, home values, farm values have literally been decapitated—all because of lack of vision.

Not in centralization, but in decentralization, can we get the production that is imperatively necessary for this program.

Not in centralization, but in decentralization can we maintain values, material, economic, and spiritual.

This is not theory, England in her magnificent program, whereby she rejuvenated not only the spirit of a nation but multiplied her efficiency and her production 500 fold, has seen the imperative necessity of decentralization. She has seen that it is necessary because of the nature of this war, and she has found the road to economic health in so doing.

Some of us in Washington are thinking that right now is a period for an appreciation of what love of country means. It is a period for sacrifice in material things. Talk is cheap, but the man and the nation who is going to come out of this holocaust whole and cleansed—as I believe England will—is the man and the nation that will forget self (that is, forget the profiteer's concept, one's strictly legalistic rights), and think of the duty and obligation which he owes to this Nation.

Our way of life cannot go on as usual. The old idea that the show must go on is outmoded and antiquated. This new era calls for something different from the fleshpots.

We are asked to appropriate $7,000,000,000. Two days before this request was made we passed other appropriations totaling about three and a half billion. That means debt. Do we realize the significance of it? As has been said, it is just the beginning. How much longer do we have to go on without being awakened to its real meaning?

The passage of the bill and the President's request for $7,000,000,000—this news was flashed around the world. It heartened the endeavors of all liberty-loving people to resist the aggressors. In Britain and throughout her domains, in the Netherlands and Scandinavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, France, Greece, Turkey it helped bolster their morale.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS MUST BE IMPLEMENTED BY PRODUCTION

That was fine; that was the first trump card that we played, but let us make it good. Hitler knows that talk is cheap; that it is easy to appropriate money in America. What he wants to know is: Will this Nation respond to the imperative need of this hour, tighten its belts, and get down to work and sacrifice?

He knows that the President's order, issued after the lease-lend bill was signed—his order whereby it was said he started material for Britain and Greece—Hitler and his agents know that Britain has been getting 95 percent of our planes and what material we could spare. What Hitler is interested in is to know whether we can back up our stage show with production.

If we can do that, we will put the fear of God in him, but I repeat—in order to do that there must be sacrifice. We cannot do it on a 40-hour week. We cannot do it by talk. We have got to do it by getting results.

It is time for the leaders of this Nation to stop internal appeasement; it is time for the leaders of this Nation to demonstrate to the taxpayer that in every dollar that is spent in this endeavor the Nation is going to get 100 percent in value.

There is no need of our posing as a good Samaritan for our friends across the sea and then being profligate in relation to spending the people's money back home.

I should like to see a campaign of education put on in this land whereby our people would be taught the joy and the need of sacrifice for country. There are too many who look upon this war-spending spree as an opportunity to take the public for a ride.

All over the British Empire men of great wealth have made great personal donations to the Crown. All over the empire men and women are engaged in a great spiritual crusade, are working night and day, to the end that their freedom might be kept intact.

Let me summarize; we should—

First. Write a tax bill which will bring America up short, catching its breath, so it will recognize what war costs—even as England is doing. Let no individual become a great profiteer out of war. In England it is said that the Government takes every individual's income over $20,000.

Second. Let nothing—I say nothing—interfere with our getting production.

Third. Stop internal appeasement and get rid of racketeers and saboteurs and "fifth columnists."

Fourth. Talk America up and not down. Have a thorough inventory made of her education resources and liabilities and get rid of the liabilities.

Fifth. As far as possible immunize America against foreign "isms." Check up on all who have come to these shores in the past 10 years, and if any of them are here as termites, saboteurs or "fifth columnists," put them in concentration camps.

Sixth. Hereafter watch immigration to our shores. We know what happened to every invaded country in Europe. We know Hitler's philosophy and his technique. Now, let us keep our eyes open and keep the doors of America closed to any possibility of a future infiltration of any of his agents. If we keep his agents out, we will keep his ideas out.

WE MUST UNITE OUR COMMON STRENGTH

It is not in a spirit of narrow partisanship that I address you today. These are sober days—days for straight thinking. The world is aflame with the holocaust of war, and to protect our beloved America we must unite our common strength, our common abilities, our common resources. This does not mean that we cannot have healthy differences.

It does mean we must use all the light and reason that we can muster to clarify our differences.

I am speaking today to leaders—leaders in thought and leaders in action.

I said you were leaders. Many times we do not appreciate that fact, and yet in your church groups, in your lodges, in your homes, in your business, in your social contacts others are looking to you for the word that will give guidance and direction to their actions.

The American Government must be great because of the greatness of its people. The people do not become great solely because of the Government.

Our problem today is to build a national defense so impregnable that no nation nor combination of nations will ever think of challenging us. A Republican, Teddy Roosevelt, once said, "Speak softly, but carry a big stick." We have consistently of late done the other thing. His wisdom was ignored, and now we find ourselves face to face with two additional serious problems: (1) How can we make America impregnable? (2) How can we now do those things which will minimize the problems of the post-war period?

Teddy was speaking about two phases of a national defense. He was practical and sensible to international conditions. He knew that there were two kinds of weapons—the material weapon of war and the great moral weapon of a people. In the latter class he recognized the vitality of Napoleon's statement, "Moral force is to the physical as 3 to 1." He felt that inherently this people, or any people that was to survive, had to feel the vitality of purpose in its own veins. He sensed that the first line of defense was the integrity, the courage, the vision of the American people, and he knew with this intact the material means would be sufficient and available.

When I think of integrity I would have you bear in mind that this applies to all four phases of our American life—the economic front, the moral front, the social front, and the military front.

While I have no intention of minimizing the importance of the role which Britain plays in preserving our way of life, I do believe that we must reassert the fact that we ourselves have to preserve that way of life. We cannot afford to create in ourselves a sense of dependence on any other nation.

I believe that a large proportion of our difficulties in recent years have arisen from the fact that we "let George do it."

Ladies and gentlemen, these are historic days. It is vital that our citizens maintain their mental poise and that they think clearly. So long as they do so, the Congress of the United States will not be stampeded by hysteria, whether it be on matters of foreign policy or domestic economy.

The men in Washington are the servants of the citizens of the United States. Those citizens must remain the masters rather than the servants of government.

There is a great crying need for maintaining a healthy minority party in Congress and a great articulate minority throughout the Nation.

The founding fathers in this very city saw the need for a system of checks and balances so that no man could become too strong and no party could become too powerful. They foresaw the need for a healthy minority group curbing the growth of one set of ideas which represented only one party—the majority party. They foresaw that any one philosophy of government administered largely under the direction of one party needed to be tempered by the constructive criticisms and the vigilance of a minority party. They foresaw that legislation dictated by the beliefs of the majority must be forged in the fires of minority discussions so that possible flaws might be exposed.

We must not forget that in other lands the ideas of democracies and the hopes of republics died when minority parties were crushed and government was taken over by one-party rule and one-man leadership. That this shall never happen in America, we must keep forever burning the flame of a minority party perpetually crusading for those things it believes to be right and perpetually fighting those things it believes to be wrong.

There must be a rebirth of a spirit of unity in the United States. We have seen other lands go down to defeat before the fierce onslaught of totalitarianism. We know that they failed to withstand the onslaught because they had been torn apart by class hatreds and philosophies which fail to find a common ground in their common need.

A great leader once said: "He only is fit to command who has learned to serve." It must be our obligation—our sacred obligation—each of us—to serve as vigilant Americans in this difficult hour of the world's history.

Parity Prices for Farm Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, from Baylor County, Tex., I have just received

a copy of the following letter addressed to the Vice President and to the Speaker of the House, jointly:

SEYMOUR, TEX., *March 25, 1941.*

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Care of Hon. Henry A. Wallace,
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Care of Hon. Sam Rayburn,
Washington, D. C.:

The farmers of our country have contributed to national defense a 2 years' surplus of food and fiber for which they have received far less than parity prices. They are now carrying a huge surplus at their own expense and will continue, with no thought of sabotage of production, to maintain an amount sufficient for all needs. They will join you in your efforts to encourage a wider and less costly distribution of these products to the end that the consuming public might have them at a fair price.

They do not ask the press or radio to sing their praises or parade their virtues, as is being done for those whose contributions to national defense carry a mandatory guaranty of cost plus a big profit, but they do, in the name of fair play and simple justice, ask that you provide sufficient appropriations to meet the promises of parity set up in the farm program.

FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
By L. BRIGGS, *President.*

Two hundred and fifty-three present, second annual farmers'-businessmen's banquet.

Mr. Speaker, I have always favored and voted for parity prices for farm products. I have done this because I thought it necessary to stabilize and preserve the family-sized farmer in this country. His preservation is a social as well as an economic necessity.

Agriculture is the oldest and most fundamental of all human enterprises. The tillers of the soil have since the beginning of time been the backbone of every stable society. It was the embattled farmers at Concord Bridge who fired the shots heard around the world—shots that resulted in American independence and in the formation of the democratic government under which we have enjoyed more than a century of unparalleled prosperity and progress.

Agriculture has always been the most important activity of the American people, and our farmers have been since the beginning the bulwark of American democracy. It has always been thus with every great people. Emerson once said:

The first farmer was the first man; and all historic nobility rests on possession and use of land.

Cato testifies:

The agricultural population produces the bravest men, the most valiant soldiers, and a class of citizens the least given of all to evil designs.

We could even cite Thomas Jefferson as an authority in this instance. He once said:

Wherever there is in any country uncultivated lands and unemployed poor, it is clear that the laws of prosperity have been so far extended as to violate natural rights. The earth is given as a common stock for men to labor on * * *. The small landowners are the most precious part of the State.

The home owner, especially the landowner, the man who lives upon and gets his living from the soil, is never a radical or a revolutionist. He is a man of sturdy character, of high ideals, of unquestioned patriotism. He is a lover of liberty and of justice; he is a defender of all the worth-while institutions. It is said that the late Pancho Villa, of Mexico, whose escapades you will remember, and against whom there was sent an American expeditionary force under the command of General Pershing, when given a ranch by the Mexican Government, completely changed his way of living and his philosophy of life and became a stanch defender of the rights of private property.

If the farmer receives parity prices for his products he still would not receive parity income because of reduced acreage. The farmer does not want anything to which he is not entitled. He does not like the idea of subsidies out of the Federal Treasury. He hopes the day will soon come when such will not be necessary. But he claims the right to equality with all other groups and individuals in this country. The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution were both born of this spirit—equality of opportunity, equality of privilege, equality of protection.

Each time I pass the new Supreme Court Building I take off my hat and raise my eyes to that matchless maxim of democracy so appropriately carved in white marble above the entrance to that beautiful edifice:

Equal justice under law.

The universal application of that principle to all its citizens is all the American farmer asks or expects from his Government.

Exportation of Strategic and Critical Materials

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, this country is presently embarked on an all-out program of national defense and a policy of all-out aid to Great Britain and her Allies. Unwittingly, perhaps—and certainly unwisely—we find ourselves placed in the anomalous position of aiding England on the one hand while, at the same time, giving aid and comfort to her enemies on the other. With this in mind I am today introducing a resolution calling for the creation of a special committee to investigate to what extent supplies of strategic and critical materials are being exported to the Axis Powers through Russia, Japan, or any other potential future enemies. It seems to me that it is high time that our right hand found out just what our left hand is doing.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following tables listing some of the strategic and critical materials that are being imported into and exported from the United States. Particular attention is invited to those items in which a shortage already exists in this country.

Imports for consumption of selected commodities which may be used as war materials, 1939 and 1940

Commodity	1939		1940	
	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
Raw cotton, pounds	103,577,664	$8,292,048	131,779,941	$10,630,634
Petroleum and products		43,540,828		70,109,506
Iron and steel scrap, tons	29,492	301,513	2,026	48,291
Steel ingots, blooms, etc., pounds	1,654,737	94,916	2,395,846	151,492
Tinplate pounds	157,028,803	70,590,764	279,575,365	128,294,410
Tinplate scrap	None		None	
Copper, refined, pounds	5,138,880	551,981	65,164,762	7,100,241
Copper, scrap pounds	264,068	23,334	269,322	25,635
Motortrucks	None		None	
Aircraft and parts		38,834		43,424
Firearms and ammunition		414,008		145,189
Machine tools		663,496		436,919
Total		124,511,722		216,985,741

Source: Monthly Summary of Foreign Commerce, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Exports of certain commodities to Japan, 1939 and 1940

Commodity	1939		1940	
	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
Raw cotton, bales	829,000	$42,498,000	521,000	$29,566,000
Petroleum and products		45,285,000		54,600,000
Aviation gasoline:				
In bulk, barrels	64,217	498,013	199,540	327,911
In containers, barrels	491,239	4,515,601	576,959	2,892,642
Iron and steel scrap, tons	2,035,000	32,732,000	963,000	17,082,000
Steel ingots, blooms, etc., tons	144,000	5,639,000	285,000	8,763,000
Tin plate, pounds	642,000	29,000	21,216,000	1,112,000
Tin plate scrap, tons	10,699	200,497	4,269	79,689
Copper, refined, pounds	249,277,000	27,567,000	233,897,000	24,621,000
Copper scrap, pounds	9,882,000	983,000	6,815,000	715,000
Motortrucks, busses, number	2,427	969,000	58	198,000
Aircraft and parts		3,306,000		933,000
Firearms and ammunition		6,280		4,143
Machine tools		19,811,526		17,051,359
Total		179,026,423		154,725,191

Source: Division of Regional Information, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Exports of certain commodities to Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 1939 and 1940

Commodity	1939		1940	
	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
Raw cotton, bales	None		139,000	$7,864,000
Petroleum and products, barrels	884,000	$1,949,000	1,065,000	1,850,000
Aviation gasoline	None		None	
Iron and steel scrap	None		None	
Steel ingots, blooms, etc., pounds	47,350,000	1,466,000	714,000	293,000
Tin plate, pounds	None		7,499,000	509,000
Tin plate scrap	None		None	
Copper, refined, pounds	45,496,000	5,791,000	108,956,000	14,026,000
Copper scrap	None		None	
Motortrucks, busses, etc	None		None	
Aircraft and parts		2,505,000		271,000
Firearms and ammunition	None		None	
Machine tools		15,414,268		14,316,920
Total		27,525,268		39,129,920

Source: Division of Regional Information, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

A National Disgrace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

"THERE IS NO RIGHT TO STRIKE AGAINST THE PUBLIC SAFETY BY ANYBODY, ANYWHERE, ANYTIME"—CALVIN COOLIDGE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, Messrs. Knox and Knudsen apparently fumbled the ball. All set to make the basket that would have won the game, somebody slipped.

Do any of you recall that statement that "there is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, anytime"? We need more men with Calvin Coolidge's intestinal fortitude.

These strikes against national defense, which is the guaranty for public and private safety, must be outlawed. They must stop. Congress, apparently, will have to legislate to stop them.

I am no labor baiter, nor do I fail to appreciate all that is involved. The best thing that could happen to organized labor and to employers engaged in national-defense contracts would be for the Government to take over the plants and operate them pending the determination of the rights of all parties involved.

Take the Allis-Chalmers situation: Here is a plant engaged in making absolutely vital and necessary equipment, without which—and those directing the strike from Russia well know it—we are stopped in our tracks. The Radford plant, which needs the Allis-Chalmers product, makes powder. It cannot produce a sufficient quantity for our actual present needs so long as the strike continues. There you have it.

If, as alleged by the President and by the heads of the several executive departments, there is plenty of law now, why do they not take advantage of it and use the law and stop talking? What we want is action. We have a right to take it. We insist upon it. We will take the next necessary step. I mean Congress.

As the editor of the Washington Evening Star said yesterday, this strike is a disgrace to unionism:

DISGRACE TO UNIONISM

By refusing to return to work despite an urgent request from Secretary of the Navy Knox and William Knudsen, Director of the Office of Production Management, the Allis-Chalmers local of the C. I. O. United Automobile Workers has placed itself beyond the pale of legitimate unionism.

This union, through its members, was engaged in work of vital importance to the Nation's powder-making and destroyer-building programs before going on strike more than 2 months ago. The strike was engineered by left-wing leadership and, it has since developed, was fraudulently and illegally called by "stuffing" the ballot boxes with 2,200 forged strike votes.

It was after the true character of the strike had been disclosed that Secretary Knox and Mr. Knudsen demanded that work be resumed immediately at the plant. The company agreed to resume operations, but the union, through its president, Harold Christoffel, not only refused to work but tried to browbeat other employees into staying away from their jobs by threatening to have them fired when "we, the union members, win this strike."

And now this same union, with a conduct record which is a disgrace and an affront to organized workmen, renews its refusal to work unless and until it receives "the union security" which the "United States Government has promised us." The term "union security" presumably relates to a controversy, if it may be assumed that there is any bona fide labor dispute involved in this strike, over a clause in a tentative settlement concerning the adjudication of disciplinary issues at the plant. The union claims to have received assurances from a subordinate of Sidney Hillman, associate O. P. M. director, that this clause could be interpreted as providing for maintenance of union membership. Mr. Hillman, however, issued a memorandum stating that the clause should not be construed as providing for a union shop, nor as "a device by which a man's job would be dependent on membership in the union."

This position taken by Mr. Hillman, labor's representative on the O. P. M., cannot be lightly dismissed. On the whole record of this strike, it is clear that the union, instead of being entitled to press any claim for a closed shop or Government protection, has been utterly irresponsible and faithless in its obligations, and that it has no claim whatsoever to protection or respect from the Government or any other source.

We have heard it on the floor and we have been besieged by those who insist that the laborer "must have his cut." We have been told about the huge profits that big business proposes to make out of war contracts. Well, let us look at it for a minute. If the employers think they are going to make a huge profit for themselves out of the war contracts or if the employees think this is so, they are wrong.

Owen Scott analyzed it forcefully and correctly when he said:

Labor demands at this time are based on the premise that corporations will get rich out of armament production and workers should be given a big cut of these riches.

Actually that premise is wrong.

And he goes on to say:

It is wrong because corporations are facing a tax bill that will check sharply any get-rich-quick prospect. Corporation income after taxes is likely to be no greater in 1941 than in 1940. There was an important 1940 increase owing largely to the fact that armament industries—such as steel and mining—started to make profits after they had been running deficits for many years. These corporations are not likely to make profits that correspond with those made in the last war.

High-income individuals, too, are confronted with taxes that limit their opportunity to gain riches.

This time labor is in line to reap riches. But labor, in reaping riches, can cause the country a great deal of trouble by setting under way a spiral of price increases that will become increasingly difficult to control.

Industry is being asked to avoid a raising of prices. There has been restraint in price increasing until now. But wage increases are becoming rather general, and these add to costs. As costs go up there is pressure to increase prices. Then, as prices are raised, workers demand more wage increases to maintain the purchasing power of their pay envelopes.

The result can be an inflationary price spiral. Pressures that lead to spiraling prices are beginning to be evident and are to be accentuated in the period ahead. They may become irresistible when the demands of armament industries for material make it impossible to produce goods enough both to supply the war machine and the wants of individual consumers with a record amount of money to spend.

Workers who are being encouraged by Government to demand higher wages will want new cars and refrigerators and houses. Yet the supply of those and of other commodities may be limited. There then will be competition for the available supply. Out of that competition would come a price rise difficult to control.

Consequently, Government even now is laying plans to take away from workers through taxes and forced saving part of the wage increase it is encouraging these workers to demand. Inflation control plans are having to go hand in hand with evidence that wage demands are leading to so great an increase in purchasing power that industry cannot for long produce goods in volume large enough to fill the wants of holders of that purchasing power.

Out of this situation is to grow a vast extension of Government controls, and some of those controls may extend to the labor organizations whose demands are helping to make more Government regulations necessary.

Looking at it from another angle, he says:

Labor remembers that in the last war many industries and individuals became rich. This time, workers are starting on the premise that if anybody is going to get rich

they should be the ones. War preparation is being viewed as a vast pump-priming enterprise that will produce the riches for workers the New Deal didn't succeed in doing.

The result is that three situations are giving trouble.

First, there is a wage-demand situation. Hourly wages of labor, on the average, are higher than ever before in history. An hour of work today will yield an American worker on an average about 7.5 percent more in the way of goods than 2 years ago. There are many more hours of work, assuring much bigger pay envelopes. Yet Sidney Hillman, a close adviser of President Roosevelt and codirector of the O. P. M., is setting the pattern for new wage demands by having the union he still heads demand a sharp increase.

Second, there is the situation growing out of the desire of unions to get rich quick. The Government is encouraging labor organizations to take hold in defense industries. Officials, who should know, say labor unions are collecting in initiation fees and in dues a total of $80,000,000 on construction projects alone. Congressmen are being inundated with letters from individual workmen who complain of union practices in forcing them to pay large fees for the right to work.

Third, there is the situation developing as a result of the battle between unions for the right to cut in on the defense business. This fight for jurisdiction is the most difficult of all to compose. It comes about when two A. F. of L. unions fight each other for the right to do a job or where an A. F. of L. and a C. I. O. union battle for the right to organize an industry.

The fact is the New Deal gave to labor a grant of Government power that should make most strikes unnecessary.

The Wagner Labor Relations Act gives Government protection to workers while they are organizing into unions. It requires that employers bargain with these unions after they are organized. Here is machinery that should end all thought of strikes called to organize the workers in an industry. Yet strikes for the purpose of organization still are being called in defense industries.

Strikes continue, often encouraged by high union leadership and condoned by Government officials, even when the strikes occur before the machinery afforded by Government has been utilized. It all adds up to a growing prospect that the Government which gave new powers to labor will require labor organizations to meet definite standards and submit to some regulation.

GOVERNMENT PROTECTION FOR UNIONS

Unions organized with Government protection are required to conform to no standards. Leadership is self-perpetuating. There is no requirement for an accounting of union funds. Officers of a union, unlike officers of a corporation, are held to no standard of conduct. The result is that when there is evidence of an abuse of power during a national emergency—as at present—the public is increasingly aware of the great power wielded by union leadership and of the slight responsibility that leadership is required to carry. Out of this situation can grow Government regulation of the unions it has helped to create.

Now the fault does not lie with labor or with employers alone, but with both. What they both need is to face the fact that democracy aroused is as terrible as an army with banners.

They need to have the fear of an understanding people put in their hearts. This is our land that we are undertaking to defend. If we are ever to demonstrate our ability to defend it against the subversive sabotage planned and directed and evidenced by these interferences with the orderly progress of our program to save our own governmental and individual lives, the time has come. The hour has struck. Obviously it is the burden of the responsibility of the representatives of the people to act, and that right speedily.

Did you read what Channing Pollock had to say yesterday in the magazine This Week?

He titled it "Our Lives, Our Fortunes, and Our Sacred Honor," and I commend it to your consideration:

Our newspapers these days are reporting two wars. In one, democracy fights for its life on the seas, in the air, and along a battle-front that stretches from Europe to the deserts of Africa. In the other, and what may be the decisive struggle, democracy fights its own weaknesses—crooked thinking, apathy, treachery, and venality more dangerous than tanks and planes. As the armies in Europe and Africa clash, so do front-page headlines on my desk: "War must be won in our factories," says Roosevelt—"Strikes stop defense work at three plants"—"Volunteers swelling huge draft army"—"Labor racket slows building at Fort Devens."

Luckily, so far, America is not actually engaged in the first of the two conflicts. We are definitely in the second, through our race to achieve national security and total defense in a war-torn world. If we are to be victorious, united and wholehearted effort is needed as never before. But while all over the world one kind of men and women are dying or stand willing to die for their countries, another kind are ready to betray their countries, and their fellow men, for 30 pieces of silver.

There have always been people like this; Judas was not the first, nor Benedict Arnold the last, of their tribe. Through long and bitter experience, governments have learned to ferret out and fight the spies, and saboteurs, and salesmen of military secrets. But the World War produced, and this war has multiplied and made more effective, a new and even more dangerous type of traitors. They are ordinary, everyday citizens—employers and workers—who exploit national emergency for their own selfish ends. Most of them are unaware alike of their effectiveness and their danger, but, as an eminent statesman and labor leader said recently, "every bit of grit they can put in the wheels of industry helps Hitler." That help takes many forms. It includes graft like that at Fort Devens, where the press reports pay-roll padding and other large-scale chiseling; it includes jerry-building of defense camps, scheming combinations to profiteer on defense contracts, and hasty strikes in vital industries—strikes that mght have been prevented by arbitration. The majority of these sappers of our safety would be the first to resent and the last to admit selling their birthright for a mess of pottage.

A GREATER MENACE

The truth is that they are a greater menace than any foreign foe. In some measure, the conquest of every democracy that has fallen before dictatorship may be attributed to a conscious or unconscious break-down of character among common everyday citizens of the democracies themselves. Neither unconsciousness nor any other reason excuses them. Benedict Arnold had served with valor and distinction under George Washington, and his plot to deliver West Point to the British was induced chiefly, perhaps, by resentment of his treatment by state officials. The resentment may have been justified, but the treason was not. No desire for gain, no struggle for personal or group advantage or rights, no justified or unjustified resentment or quarrel can be allowed to interfere with national security. To that, once more, an overwhelming majority of us have pledged "our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor." Lives and fortunes can be of small avail without ships, guns, tanks, and planes. These we must have, and quickly, and we cannot afford to let anyone, of whatever group or minority, check the flow.

Every responsible authority believes that the survival of democracy in the world, including our own, depends upon the productiveness of our factories. German hopes now rest on superior equipment. Our billions for defense, our willingness to be taxed to the utmost, and, if necessary, to bear arms against an enemy, will be useless if we haven't the arms. Last January, when Hitler boasted of having more than 30,000 combat planes, Secretary Stimson was telling Congress that our Army has 650. Plainly, the situation calls for everything we can muster, not only physically but mentally, morally, and spiritually; in unity, and loyalty, and selflessness, and common striving in the common cause. The delivery of West Point to the British would have been a trifling setback compared with the possible—even probable—consequence of a paralysis now of any part of our defense effort, and whoever diminishes that effort may be a more effective enemy to democracy than any soldier in an invading army.

More than ever before, perhaps, we have reached the point where no one must do that which, if it were done by everyone, would be destructive of the common good. Every American has become a vital and essential part of the structure that is America. Greed, dishonesty, loafing, and quitting that wouldn't matter much in normal times can be our undoing now. And, make no mistake, America's foes are not only quick to detect such weaknesses, but eager and ready to aggravate and profit by them. Methods and examples are to be found in scores of published confessions. Page after page of Jan Valtin's startling new book Out of the Night tells of strikes and civil disorders engineered by Nazi and Soviet agents. Almost always the plots were carried out by unsuspecting citizens who could not understand that they were preparing the ruin of their own countries. As Valtin says, they have no inkling of the dark forces egging them on.

But whether the interruption of our national defense be alien-contrived, or only the result of human desire for gain and personal rights, this is no moment for monkey wrenches in our machinery. The unthinking may ask, "Why such a fuss if two or three armament plants do close down for a few days?" The answer is that even 1 day's delay might send hundreds of men into action ill-trained and ill-equipped; secondarily, and not so very secondarily at that, it is that each grafter and racketeer and chiseler and shirker and deserter is spreading corruption, subtracting from the average of morale and efficiency, contributing his bit to what Hitler had in mind when he said he expected America to destroy itself. Each of them is giving truth and force and effect to Hitler's indictment of all democracy.

The punishment will not be the firing squad. No one shot Benedict Arnold. It may not be the loss of ill-gotten gains. Arnold died a comparatively rich man. The penalty he paid was not death but the fact that he had to live with himself. His crime was his executioner. A broken man, Gen. Benedict Arnold died a victim of his own conscience and of public scorn and neglect.

Whether or not they are sent to prison, I should not want to be among the malefactors at Fort Devens. I should not want to be one of those who put the brakes on defense. I should not want to listen to what something within me would be saying whenever I read of a child killed by a bombing plane against which there had been insufficient preparation. I should not care to take

the chance, however remote, of seeing what I knew to be needlessly long casualty lists of my fellow citiens, or of standing alone with myself while the flags of my country's conquerors passed by. I should dread hearing spoken in America the requiem Marshal Petain pronounced over France: "Our spirit of enjoyment was stronger than our spirit of sacrifice. We wanted to have more than we wanted to give. We tried to spare effort and met disaster."

SUSPEND A CONFLICT

I ask you, during this emergency which of the two conflicts are we going to suspend: The right, which they never had, of unions to strike against the national safety, or the right of 130,000,000 Americans to national defense?

And now comes another answer by Ernest K. Lindley, who tells the whole story. The question before Congress is: "Do we Members constitute a coordinate branch of this Government, or must we wait to be burned alive with Rome while the executive branch is fishing and fiddling?"

Mr. Lindley says:

Now Knudsen and Army and Navy officials want labor to forego or postpone its unquestionable right to strike. In this, they undoubtedly have the backing of public sentiment. And this should be the first rule of the new Mediation Board.

But if the time is critical enough to ask labor to forego or defer its most powerful weapon—in fact, the source of all its strength—the time is critical enough also to cut short the tedious processes by which such employers as Ford and Bethlehem are made to comply with the indisputable law of the land.

Labor cannot be expected to defer the right to strike if the result is to fortify antiunion employers. The opportunity to organize must be assured. If, after a fair opportunity, a union fails to win a majority in a craft, or a plant, or an industry—whichever the N. L. R. B. holds to be the proper bargaining unit—it must abide by the decision.

If the employer fails to provide the fair opportunity, or refuses to bargain with the union which wins the majority, the obligation of the Government is forthwith to take over and operate the plant or industry.

If the Government is willing to do this, it should not have too much trouble with strikes due to jurisdictional disputes or to demands for higher wages.

If Congress is a barometer, the public is in no mood to tolerate strikes due to jurisdictional controversies between unions—whether between C. I. O. and A. F. of L. unions or within the A. F. of L.

Obviously, the public is in no mood to tolerate the extortion of high initiation fees for union membership. Senator NORRIS has proclaimed his dissatisfaction with William Green's reply to his letter on this point. When the patience of so long and faithful a friend as Senator NORRIS is worn thin, organized labor is on dangerous ground.

To put it bluntly, all organized labor is on dangerous ground unless strikes in defense industries stop. More than $30,000,000,000 already have been appropriated for defense. Men are being drafted into service where the pay is small and the ultimate risk is life itself. The country is overwhelmingly of the opinion that its security rests, in the first instance, on the successful resistance of Great Britain and her fighting allies. It will not stand for stoppage in production.

Labor can insist that if it defers strikes powerful employers must observe the law. If such employers are brought to time—if need be by Federal troops—labor cannot, except at its own extreme peril, close its ears to an appeal to produce—and keep on producing—while its disputes with management on other questions are heard and adjudicated.

AMERICAN REPUBLICANS

Mr. Speaker, there should be no partisan politics in this matter, but every Republican should be on his toes to cooperate to see that strikes are outlawed. He should do more. He should vociferously insist that it be done—and today. As an oppositionist, every Republican should be a constructionist. We built this country. Obviously, we will have to save it, if it is not too late.

The Strike Situation and Congressional Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ALMA (MICH.) RECORD

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the public is becoming increasingly concerned about the strike situation in our defense industries. Editors all over the Nation reflect this alarm on the part of the American people. There is an increasing demand for congressional action or action on the part of the administration to insure a continuous flow of defense materials unimpeded by labor disputes. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a very timely editorial from the Alma (Mich.) Record of recent date:

[From the Alma Record]

CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Elton Eaton, editor of the Plymouth Mail, member of the legislature, and private secretary of ex-Governor Alex Grosbeck, has always been a clear thinker and careful analyst of public questions, and he assumes that Congress should assume some real responsibility instead of delegating all power to someone else.

In a recent editorial he says:

"We have always believe that our Congress possesses almost unlimited powers. In fact, a study of our Constitution and of our Government provides plenty of reason for that belief.

"Congress has the right and Congress has the power to terminate conditions it does not believe to be good for the country, there is no question about that. It can and does regulate every phase of our business existence.

"The other day during the debate on the President's lend-lease bill, Senator HOLMAN, of Oregon, who said he once voted for President Roosevelt, made some startling assertions that for some reason or other did not make the first pages or even the inside pages of any of the newspapers about here.

"He declared:

"'English financiers, together with some in our own country, financed the rearmament of Germany for the present war. The ironmasters and merchants of France supplied Germany with essential mineral elements and needed materials for the rearmament of Germany for the present war. Ironmongers and merchants in our own country have supplied Japan, and are now supplying Russia, with essential war materials and supplies. The result of this inconsistent national policy is that American taxpayers must now be made bankrupt, and possibly American youth slaughtered, because commercial greed provided a madman with the destructive weapons which already have annihilated many of the governments of peaceful peoples in Europe and threaten the destruction of modern civilization there, if not in the world.'

"It is evident from this paragraph that the distinguished Senator from Oregon would place upon 'financiers,' 'ironmasters,' and 'merchants' of this country and England the responsibility for Hitler's amazingly successful rearmament program.

"Dictator Hitler came to power in Germany the same year that President Roosevelt came to power in our own country. Hitler immediately tore the veil of secrecy that had previously surrounded Germany's rearmament efforts.

"He told the world that he intended to make the German army and navy the most powerful force in the world. He declared further that it was his intention to make Germany the ruling power of the world.

"Openly and with brass-band propaganda, he immediately proceeded to build up a great army, a great air force, and as much of a navy as he could with Germany's limited naval yard facilities.

"Not only did he carry on the most extensive rearmament program civilization has ever known, but he constantly flaunted the fact before the other nations of the world and he told our own Government and every other government just what he was doing and he sent pictures to America to show our people proof of the progress he was making.

"And still our Washington administration permitted Hitler to come to America and purchase such supplies as he needed and did nothing to stop him or to even build up our own forces to meet his threat.

"Power to check the sale of war materials to any nation lies absolutely within the control of the Congress of these United States. Congress could and can at any time pass legislation which would prevent any 'financier,' 'ironmonger,' or 'merchant' from selling anything to any other country in the world.

"And what did Senator HOLMAN try to do about it? What did Congress try to do about it? What did the President try to do about it?

"The record is too well known to the public to be retold.

"We sold Hitler everything that he needed. We fiddled along, made light of his repeated declarations of world conquest, and now comes along a western Senator who would place responsibility for it all upon a group of citizens who haven't a single right or power in the world other than that bestowed upon them by congressional decree.

"But this is no time for argument. We are confronted with a live-or-die task. Let us do the job that is before us and then after it is over, relegate to obscurity in the American way, those who are responsible for the plight we are facing."

Mr. EATON has not gone far enough in his discussion of the responsibility of Congress, so I will go on from where he left off and call attention to where Congress has been entirely indifferent and almost criminally negligent of its responsibilities.

Every day we hear or read about a strike somewhere in a plant that is working on material for defense. Plants are being closed down, thousands of men are out of work, others are picketing the plants and absolutely defying the police and the courts, and thus

interfering with production of defense material simply because Congress has delegated its powers to some board or bureau.

How any Member of Congress having a teaspoonful of common sense can give his approval to a law which puts into the hands of labor-union agitators the power to absolutely dictate how industry shall be controlled is a mystery which the common people and the taxpayers cannot solve.

There is not, at the present time, a single industry producing material for defense of this country and aid to democracy that is not being hampered and interfered with by strikes, and forms of sabotage, and Congress stands by and approves this outrage which burdens the people with tax and more tax, while the Congressmen who draw $10,000 a year, duck their sworn responsibility and betray the people who foot the bills.

It would seem as though if a man had any gray matter at all, he could see the rank injustice of sending the young men of the country to war to put up their heads for machine-gun fodder and draw a dollar a day for this work, and then letting the men who are supposed to furnish them with guns, tanks, planes, ammunition, and boats sit down or walk out and refuse to work even when drawing $10 a day.

If a young man resents going to fight for his country, and most of them are willing and glad to help, he is branded as a deserter and traitor and severely punished, but a member of a labor union can sit down and refuse to work or let anyone else work to produce defense material and Congress provides no punishment for that sort of a deserter or traitor. No matter how important the work or how necessary the continued production is to defense, Congressmen delegate their authority to boards and bureaus who approve a do-nothing policy.

Work on airplanes, on tanks, on guns, in steel mills, and manufacturing plants of all kinds is being delayed and interfered with and the welfare of the country is being endangered and the lives of the young men placed in jeopardy simply because Congress lacks the vision and the courage to say to laboring men making these things to protect the country, "You work and keep right on working or be branded as a deserter and take the consequences."

The two things that seem to be most needed in Congress are common sense and courage. If the young men of the country have the courage to go to war and fight to save the Nation, the laborers should have the courage to go into the plant and work night and day to help the soldiers protect the Nation and save democracy.

Grand Coulee Dam Mightiest Man-Made Thing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 22, the formal ceremonies were held at Grand Coulee Dam, which is located in the State of Washington, one end of it being in my congressional district and the other in the Fourth Congressional District, so ably represented by my colleague the Honorable KNUTE HILL.

This structure is almost completed now, and the celebration was held in connection with the generation of the first hydroelectrical energy in two of the smaller generating units. This giant project has many times been referred to as "the eighth wonder of the world." Its completion makes a reality of what was only a vision in the minds of a few far-sighted men 25 years ago, when "Billie" Clapp, a young lawyer at Ephrata, Wash., first proposed it. His proposal was enthusiastically supported by Jim O'Sullivan, a lawyer and engineer, who lived in Ephrata, and Gale Matthews, a businessman there. This vision was communicated to Rufus Woods, the editor and publisher of the Wenatchee (Wash.) Daily World, and he likewise being a man of vision, gave the suggestion publicity. All of these dreamers of that time were laughed at and called visionaries. Indeed, it must be a real joy and satisfaction to them, as they are still alive and active in that region, to see their dreams come true.

Under date of March 16, 1941, there appeared in the New York Times magazine section a pen picture of this marvelous structure that is so accurate and so well within the facts, as I know them, that I feel justified in making it a part of my remarks and extending it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article by the Honorable Richard L. Neuberger appears under the caption "Mightiest Man-Made Thing" and is as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 16, 1941]

Athwart the Columbia River, where it twists across the gaunt uplands of the State of Washington, a mighty structure stands. This structure is the most massive edifice ever reared by man. Soon it will be the world's greatest single source of hydroelectric energy. Most important of all, it heralds the promise of a new day in a vast American region—the Pacific Northwest.

This stern battlement of steel and concrete is Grand Coulee Dam. Construction began nearly 8 years ago in a desolate wilderness of granite cliffs and sagebrush flats. Today the dam is virtually completed; only the leveling of the parapet remains. Next Saturday a pair of 20,000-kilowatt power units will be switched on. This will be the first production of electricity at the great plant. Symbolically, in these tempestuous times, the energy will be poured at once onto a 220,000-volt line for delivery to factories turning out national-defense orders. In July the first big generator will be hooked up to its full 108,000-kilowatt output. Eventually 18 such machines will be in operation at the dam—generators 1 of which a 50-car freight train hauls across the continent disassembled. They will throw onto a network of transmission lines power to light farms, turn factory wheels, and pump water. The staggering ultimate capacity of Grand Coulee will be 10,708,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

For two decades men and women of the Northwest have awaited this moment. To the region, Grand Coulee symbolizes the passing from a frontier stage of development to a well-balanced industrial economy.

It is a multiple-purpose project. It means the irrigation and reclaiming of 1,200,000 acres of arid but fertile land. It means tapping the mightiest source of water power ever surveyed. It means improved navigation on the country's second largest river—the Columbia—and it means new farms, new homes, new industrial plants, new factories, and new cities in the Northwest.

In the autumn of 1933 Bureau of Reclamation engineers jounced across the uplands in an old touring car and began surveying the site of Grand Coulee. At that time the Great Pyramid of Egypt was still the most massive structure in the world. Now the pyramid has been surpassed. Not once, not twice, but three times. Grand Coulee, spearhead of America's last nudge at the frontier, represents a new era in engineering achievement.

The dam contains 11,250,000 cubic yards of concrete. This is enough to pave a standard automobile highway from Jersey City to Seattle and back by way of Los Angeles. Over the spillway of Grand Coulee this spring will crash a sheet of water half again as long as the American Falls at Niagara and twice as high. On the crest of the dam four liners the length of the Queen Mary might be placed end to end.

Sufficient water will flow through Grand Coulee each year to provide New York City's water supply for a century. The foundation of the dam covers 35 acres. Each of the twin power houses will produce as much electricity as Muscle Shoals and the Dnieperstroy Dam in Russia combined. Behind the dam will be a man-made lake with 2,000 gallons of water for every person on earth. There will be a dozen irrigation pumps, each of them adequate to take care of the water requirements of two communities the size of Chicago.

These comparisons might be endless. So much energy will be produced at Grand Coulee that the power houses will have to be operated by remote control. Other dams assume the proportion of toys when contrasted with Grand Coulee, which will spin out more kilowatts than all seven dams in the T. V. A. combined. Grand Coulee has more than three times the bulk of Boulder Dam.

Here is an ambitious attempt to duplicate the wonders of nature. Ages ago a finger of the Cordilleran ice cap blocked the Columbia River and forced the stream to carve a different canyon. For countless years this new chasm was gouged out at right angles to the river's original course. Then the glacial sheet retreated into the Arctic. The second canyon was left dry and silent.

This dry abyss is known as the Grand Coulee. Where the fabulous barrier of ice once stood Grand Coulee Dam now blocks the Columbia. The immense pumping plant will heave water back into the Grand Coulee, and through the gorge this water will flow to bring life and fertility to a high plateau as large as the State of Delaware. Only two other dams, Boulder and Dnieperstroy, are powerful enough to move the pumps, yet this prodigious mass of machinery will require only a fourth of Grand Coulee's output.

The dam which will accomplish these amazing feats is 4,300 feet in length, 500 feet thick at the bedrock base, and 560 feet in height. Because the Columbia River gnaws its way to the Pacific with savage fury, construction of Grand Coulee involved countless problems. Huge temporary cofferdams had to be constructed. Great ice plants were necessary to freeze slides of mud and shale. The river clawed at these devices with cold and hungry talons.

Many engineers did not believe that a dam two blocks thick at the foundation could be built across the Columbia. Grand Coulee proved it could be done. Anchoring the foundation to the living granite was accomplished within the protecting barricade of immense cofferdams. The concrete was poured incessantly 24 hours a day. A dragon-like belt brought gravel from a hill 2 miles away.

Records were broken in almost every phase of construction. Auxiliary jobs were huge tasks in themselves. Towns far upstream had to be moved out of the reach of the rising waters. Bridges 100 miles north had to be

raised and highways and railroads relocated. Innumerable trucks rolled across the Inland Empire, bringing potatoes, flour, hams, and beans for thousands of men. On one Sunday the mess hall fried 3,000 hot cakes and roasted 2,400 pounds of turkey. Everything from oatmeal to marshmallowed sweetpotatoes has been cooked in similar quantities.

Grand Coulee Dam is the key with which the Government hopes to open the last great frontier of continental United States. When construction of the dam was started, only an old pioneer named Sam Seaton lived in the area. He ran a rickety little ferry across the Columbia, which took sheep herds to their mountain pastures and Indians to the Nespelem Agency.

Sam Seaton has many neighbors now. Where his ferry threaded the river, the tailrace of the dam foams and hisses. Model bungalows for thousands of workmen and engineers are spread out in the canyon. Grass and shrubbery have unrolled on the lava rock like a great green carpet. Shack towns full of hangers-on sprawl over the uplands.

Four hundred thousand tourists a year drive from Seattle and Portland and Spokane to see the dam. And not all who come intend to depart after a sightseeing tour. Settlers and migrants are moving in. Men looking for farms to buy have got off westbound trains at Spokane and Wenatchee and gone by bus to Grand Coulee. And at the order of the President survey parties are mapping the land to be irrigated, marking where orchards should be, where alfalfa should be planted, where railroad spurs should be run in, where settlements should be. Soil and engineering experts are performing this task under the direction of Dr. Harlan H. Barrows, head of the geography department at the University of Chicago.

New industries are moving westward; a vast aluminum plant has been built on the Columbia not far from the town of Vancouver; another aluminum factory is soon to be commenced. It will be somewhere on the Grand Coulee network of electric lines. Soon airplanes patrolling democracy's lifelines over the Caribbean Sea and the English Channel will be byproducts of hydroelectricity spun out in America's greatest dam.

Since Grand Coulee Dam was begun there has been more industrial activity in the Pacific Northwest than ever before. Army engineers consider improvement in navigation one of the significant results of Grand Coulee, especially in view of the crisis in foreign affairs. They say that an emergency would impose impossible burdens on the region's twisting single-track railroads. Mountain sidetracks would clog with troops and material. But the Columbia River is a thoroughfare of unlimited capacity, and Grand Coulee will control the flow of the river all the way to the sea.

Bonneville Dam, 340 miles downstream from Grand Coulee, contains the world's largest set of lift locks. Government dredges are deepening the channel and removing gravel bars. Wheat barges and other vessels will be able to navigate the Columbia's main tributary, the Snake, all the way to Lewiston, Idaho, where they will be at the bottom end of Hell's Canyon, deepest abyss on the North American Continent.

Not far from Grand Coulee are the tumbledown farms which pioneers abandoned long ago because of lack of water. Lacy transmission towers go past some of those farms now. Irrigation canals soon will follow. The first delivery of water will be made in 1942. Thereafter 50,000 acres of land will be reclaimed each year, until the entire 1,200,000 acres of sagebrush have been transformed into a checkerboard of orchards and gardens and fields.

Power lines stretching by those spectral, deserted farmhouses tell in one silent tableau the story of Grand Coulee and the story of a new day in the Northwest.

Washington a Large Dairy State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

REPORT OF THE MILK INDUSTRY FOUNDATION OJ NEW YORK

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to a recent report of the Milk Industry Foundation of New York, which sets forth the facts showing that Washington holds an important position as a dairy State.

The report reads as follows:

WASHINGTON LARGE DAIRY STATE, NEW FOUNDATION FIGURES REVEAL

NEW YORK.—Washington's ranking position in the dairy industry is vividly depicted in a new handbook issued by the Milk Industry Foundation. According to the book, Milk Facts, 345,000 cows, valued at $20,010,000, produced $26,039,000 in cash farm-milk income for Washington farmers in 1939. Production of farm milk in the State for the year totaled 931,000,000 quarts; creamery butter, 35,838,000 pounds; Cheddar cheese, 9,557,000 pounds; ice cream, 3,768,000 gallons.

The United States is one of the ranking milk-using nations in the world with per capita consumption of fluid milk totaling 153 quarts a year, pictographs show. Milk and its products comprise over 25 percent of the 1,500 pounds of the principal foods consumed each year by the average American, the book says, with 45,000,000 quarts of milk delivered daily to homes and stores.

Pictorial charts and figures show the importance of the milk industry to the country's economic picture and illustrate how milk costs less in the United States in minutes of labor. Diagrammatic charts illustrate how the annual milk supply of some 51,000,000,000 quarts is utilized.

Fluid or fresh milk for cities and villages, providing the farmer's highest cash return, acounts for 29.9 percent of the country's yearly production. Creamery butter takes 31.6 percent; farm butter, 9.2 percent; while 11.7 percent of the milk is used as fluid milk on farms where produced. In making cheese 6.3 percent of the total milk is used; ice cream, 3.1 percent; and canned milks, 4.5 percent, according to charts.

A chart of the distributor's milk dollar shows 52.31 percent going to dairy farmers for milk; 19.24 percent to delivery labor; 8.21 percent to delivery expense; 6.33, plant expense; 4.94, plant labor; 2.78, administrative labor; 2.18, administrative expense; 1.68, office labor; and profit, 2.33 percent, representing only a fraction of a cent per quart of milk.

"The production and utilization of milk have so increased in this country," says the booklet, "that today we are the greatest of dairy nations. Milk, butter, and other dairy products annually create an output valued at three and one-half billion dollars.

"Facts about the cows and the farmers that furnish the milk, the distributors whose efficiency has made wide usage possible, and the consumption of this 'most nearly perfect food' should lead to a clearer understanding of milk economics.

"One out of every fifteen families in the United States is dependent on milk for a livelihood. Milk is the largest single source of farm cash income, larger than cattle, twice cotton, three times wheat, five times tobacco. There are 25,000,000 cows on three-quarters of the Nation's 7,000,000 farms.

"Americans enjoy the best milk in the world and economical distribution, meticulous sanitation, pasteurization, and other safeguards have made our milk supply a world standard."

Drive Against Poll Tax Gains Headway in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

ARTICLES BY JENNINGS PERRY

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a series of three articles by Mr. Jennings Perry on the poll tax. The articles appeared in PM on March 20, 21, and 23, 1941.

[From the New York PM of March 20, 1941]

DRIVE AGAINST THE POLL TAX GAINS HEADWAY IN THE SOUTH

(By Jennings Perry)

NASHVILLE, March 20.—The gentlemen have been lying down here and getting away with it. It's been going on a long time. A long time too long. But the lie plays out

The gentlemen I mean are those perfervid political orators who from festooned stumps have been singing us to sleep all our lives with the glories of "our democracy." They have freely taken the name of Jefferson and of Jackson in vain. They take the name Democrat in vain.

THERE ISN'T ANY DEMOCRACY DOWN HERE

We send some of these gentlemen up to Washington and there they keep up the appearance. Their adoration is the most strident. Their tears for the "pore little democracies" of Europe, for the plight of the "democratic way of life"—chased from peak to peak along the Alps—are the greatest and most glistening tears of all. And, from here, pure glycerine.

They haven't got democracy where they come from, or anything that decently passes for it.

Democracy in the eight States hereinafter named succumbed a generation ago. Its beautiful corpse and classic raiment still lie about the place. But democracy, the political form, is dead. Only its imperishable spirit squirms.

The form lies here with a knife in its heart and the name of the knife is poll tax.

Democracy may be having a hard time keeping alive its blessed spark in poor Czechoslovakia, poor France, poor Denmark. But

there the flame was beaten down by a brutal conqueror.

In Tennessee, Virginia, South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, Alabama, Arkansas, and Texas it was struck down by the hand of the people themselves—a political suicide of the first magnitude.

A PROGRESSIVE FAILING

I take it democracy means popular rule. I take popular rule to mean participation by at least a majority of the people in the public decisions. In Tennessee 7 of 10 of the people live, and love (I hope), and die without ever marking a ballot or seeing the inside of a voting booth

In Texas it is the same thing. In Virginia it's worse. In Georgia it's 4 of 5. In South Carolina less than 10 persons out of 100 voted in 1940—though the vast majority panted after Franklin D. Roosevelt as the hart after water.

There's no mystery about the decline and demise of democracy in these States. It was a progressive failing whose sad course, from cause to result, may be charted plainly. Take a case history—take Tennessee.

In 1888, for the last time expressing their choice freely, 90 percent of the adult male population of Tennessee cast a ballot for President. In 1890, by act of legislature, payment of the poll tax was made a prerequisite to voting. In the next Presidential year, in 1892, the voting percentage dropped 20 percent.

By 1904 it had fallen to 58 percent.

By 1920 to 46 percent.

By 1928 to 34 percent.

And in the fateful year of democracy's greatest test on the face of the earth—1940—less than 28 percent of the adult population of Tennessee had a voice in choosing the President of the United States—or the Governor of their State—or the sheriff of their county—or the mayor of their town.

What these figures paint is simply disappearance of government of, by, and for the people—a galloping retreat from those precious political principles sometimes named, I believe, the American dream.

The minority is ensconced, and that dwindling.

A DREADFUL MISTAKE

Now the people of these poll-tax States are neither morally corrupt nor politically depraved. They made a mistake.

It was a dreadful mistake. They compromised a principle and lost a right. Their power lay in a free ballot. They put a little price, $2, on this freedom. Their freedom sickened and their people's power drained away.

Now, awakening, our people face a tremendous task, crippled. Having abandoned democracy, how shall they restore democracy by popular mandate? How shall they recapture power for the people by the exercise of a power the people no longer hold?

A few years ago the people of Arkansas sought to break free from the poll tax by constitutional amendment. In the "popular" referendum held under the poll-tax requirement, 13 percent of the population voted.

ELOQUENT HYPOCRISY

Nevertheless the tremendous task is undertaken. A generation, shaken to the bottom by the political revival of the New Deal, brought up short by a world-wide attack on the democratic ideal, is fed up with the gentlemen's eloquent hypocrisy. It begins to demand the substance for the shadow of democracy at home.

Free America well may watch the struggle in these apostate but penitent States. It is the contemporary battle of the American Revolution.

In Virginia three of the four announced Democratic candidates for Governor have declared for a free ballot. This has not happened before.

In Georgia this year the legislature has been forced to face a proposal to repeal the poll tax. This has not happened before.

Louisiana threw off the poll tax in 1936, Florida in 1938.

In Tennessee the recent assembly, under the desperate knout of Boss Ed Crump, of Memphis, beat down poll-tax repealers and split the State wide open. Such a war for enfranchisement is on as these hills and valleys have not looked upon—not even when women drove for political equality—in this century. The fair name of democracy has won back its sense.

It is a war to the finish. Its echoes rumble through the Southland from the Potomac to the Gulf.

[From the New York PM of March 21, 1941]

POLL TAX HAS HELPED MEMPHIS BOSS, BUT IT WON'T MUCH LONGER—MEMPHIS BOSS GIVES LIP SERVICE TO DEMOCRACY WHILE TENNESSEE MOVES TO GET IT

(By Jennings Perry)

NASHVILLE, March 21.—The poll tax which disfranchises the great majority of the people of eight Southern States hangs on by more than inertia. It has the help and protection of the bastard political system it has created. It has its boss ———'s—the Boss ———, and all the lesser noise of his tribe throughout these States, who have known how to make capital of the restricted vote.

Boss ——— of Memphis is one of the few remaining big-name bosses of the land. He is called "picturesque." He has "made the trains run on time" in his city. I don't know whether Boss ——— thinks he believes in democracy or not. I realize that a great many people who don't believe in democracy ardently believe they do. He makes the profession of faith, like so many other of our gentlemen down here, with a straight face. He has spoken piously of the "poor men and women" the poll tax bars from the vote. He quite well may again.

But now in fact and in act he has been smoked out of his pretense. He has loved to pose as a philanthropic leader. He stands now exposed as a frog who is big merely because his pond has been kept pitifully small.

CONTROL OF PARTY

For Boss ——— throttlehold on the political life of Tennessee rests solely on the constricted vote (averaging less than 400,000 of an adult population of 1,800,000), which gives his tight Shelby County machine, with 100,000 of the 250,000 Democratic votes, control of the party.

The showdown was forced in the recent session of the Tennessee Assembly on the clear democratic issue of the right to vote. For the first time in this State, it was a legislative question of outright repeal of the poll-tax prerequisite, which in 50 years has dragged down the vote in Tennessee from 90 percent of the eligible electorate to less than 25 percent.

Repeal would have reopened the way for the return of majority participation in government in Tennessee—for the return of democracy. And for, as none better than ——— is aware, the end of ———.

For Boss ——— has no personal popularity in the State at large. In 1,000,000 votes—if even 1 Tennesseean of 2 might cast the ballot— ——— could not swim.

A truly touching circumstance of the showdown was that ——— himself had advocated poll-tax repeal. It was a promise that had been given artfully, to be sure, a bait—a little buttering of the people the people could be depended on to forget, and hence to be forgotten. Only the people were in earnest, it turned out. The repealer measures were planked down before the legislature the day the session opened.

Beautiful to behold then was ——— scurrying desperately to rescue ———'s scepter from ———'s promises.

It was done, as these things are done—with the connivance of a subservient governor, the barefaced rigging of committees, a lavish distribution of patronage. Boss ———'s personal strawbosses, Sheriff Joyner of Shelby County, and City Attorney Gerber of Memphis, posted to the capitol to ride herd on the restive representatives. The legislative session was drastically cut down from the constitutional 75 days to 41. The poll-tax repealers were stopped in the Senate, without hearing and without debate. Democracy was postponed in Tennessee.

Not for long, however, by the signs that fly. ——— and all the shoddy flummery that has passed for popular rule in Tennessee since the World War have snatched a reprieve. But at the dear cost of opening the eyes of the people to the full measure and consequence of their disfranchisement.

It had to be shown in open daylight to the people of this State that their legislature is without independence, that their political parties (which had pledged repeal) are impotent. Boss ——— bludgeoned repeal, but a generation that has grown up under the poll tax, hardly noting its corrosive effect on the elective system, now beholds the tragedy of its political circumstance, now understands the mechanics of vote restriction by which government has been taken from the many by the few.

PRESS ACTIVE

Ordinarily defeat of reform legislation is followed by a lull. Not so with this fight. The press of the State, which 2 years ago fervently denounced Gov. Gordon Browning's attempt to hamstring ——— by importing the vicious Georgia county-unit system into Tennessee, as vigorously and as unanimously has turned upon ——— methods and motives in staving off poll-tax repeal. The campaign is candid and unremitting.

Anti-poll tax organizations blossom throughout the State, uniting civic clubs, women's clubs, farmer federations, ministers, schoolmen, humanitarian societies, and all of labor. The battle will go headlong into the primary and general elections of next year.

Tennessee will be the next Southern State to return to democracy. "Pay a poll tax to kill the poll tax," is a rising and powerful slogan among a people who belatedly perceive how by this pernicious handicap they are deprived of a right lovers of freedom down through the ages have given their lives to win and to defend.

[From the New York PM of March 23, 1941]

SOUTH FIGHTS TO KILL POLL TAX—WHAT IS CONGRESS WAITING FOR?—THE DRIVE TO GAIN FREE SUFFRAGE AND REAL DEMOCRACY PROGRESSES ON MANY FRONTS

(By Jennings Perry)

NASHVILLE, TENN., March 22.—Democracy, the faith, is the conviction that the liberty of the individual and the welfare of the community are most secure in the hands of all the people. It is a jealous and uncompromising faith.

Democracy, the way of social life, rests on the chastity of certain basic rights—the right of suffrage being foremost. To democracy the vote is a breath to existence.

In the eight poll-tax States there are more young men registered for the draft—to be trained to defend democracy with the sword—than there are people who enter upon democracy with the ballot. In all, some 10,500,000 Americans down here are deprived of the vote.

This has come about, insidiously, in 50 years. If it had been done by law suddenly, there would have been, we may be sure, violent revolt. If it had happened some-

where else in the world, we by now should have been sending an expeditionary force to liberate the oppressed.

PREPARE BALLOT BATTLE

And what is being done about it as it is? I will tell you that:

The democrats of the South are preparing to win back what they have lost. I do not mean the Democrats. I mean the "democrats." It is a political renascence. It portends the next battle of the American Revolution.

In the van are young newspaper editors like Chess Abernathy, of the Cobb County Times in Georgia, a virile voice crying in that Hoke Smithian wilderness; like George Carmack, of the Knoxville News-Sentinel, and Virginius Dabney, of the Richmond Times-Dispatch, and Edward Meeman, of the Memphis Press-Scimitar. And older men of strong political morality, like Editor Julian LaRose Harris, of the Chattanooga Times. And democratic publishers like Barry Bingham, of the Louisville Courier-Journal, and Silliman Evans, of the Nashville Tennessean, who has come to all-out grips with Boss Crump on the issue and whose paper each morning demands that the poll tax be killed so that democracy can rise again.

There are courageous men in political life like Maury Maverick, of Texas, who has preached the Jeffersonian precept of the just and equal vote from San Antonio to Birmingham, and CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, who soon will introduce in the United States Senate a companion piece to Representative LEE GEYER's Federal anti-poll-tax bill now under committee veto in Representative HATTON SUMNER's House Judiciary Committee.

There is the Tennessee Committee for Majority Rule, an outgrowth of the Tennessee League of Women Voters' energetic fight for free suffrage, whose sole purpose is poll-tax repeal; and the new Tennessee Commonwealth Federation, launched by the A. F. of L., the C. I. O., and the railroad brotherhoods to fight against the poll tax and for civil rights. And the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, sponsor of the Geyer bill, whose Pirtle case—a test of the poll tax by the constitutional guaranties—is now on its way to the Supreme Court of the United States, following the recent adverse decision of Cincinnati given by Judge Xen Hicks, of Knoxville, whose associate on the sixth circuit appellate bench is Judge John Martin, of Memphis.

And there is the Southern Electoral Reform League, organized last month at Richmond to head up a south-wide drive on the poll tax and other electoral abuses, and which met again in Washington, Saturday, further to develop its program. It was at the Richmond meeting that Mrs. Roosevelt, well aware, as is the President, of the political apostacy of these Southern States declared removal of the poll tax "essential to the restoration of popular rule—doubly essential in times when this Nation should be setting an example of faithfulness to democracy before the world."

These are some aspects and fronts of the free suffrage movement in the politically blighted areas of the South. The poll tax is a large issue in the Virginia elections this year. A new referendum on the poll tax is being initiated in Arkansas. Meanwhile the issue also is before Congress which might well, in its efforts for democracy, begin at home.

ENFORCEMENT GUARANTIES

By article IV, section 4, the Federal Constitution guarantees "to every State in this union a republican form of government." Congress is not without means to enforce the guaranties of the Constitution by appropriate legislation.

Furthermore, and more specifically, the Constitution declares (art. XIV, sec. 2) that when the right to vote in Federal or State elections is in any State denied to any adult citizen of the United States, or in any way abridged," save for conviction of crime, the basis of congressional representation in that State shall be reduced in proportion to the disfranchisement.

In these eight States the right to vote is most drastically abridged. In these States the vote is so conditioned as to be denied to millions of citizens of the United States of America year after year, generation after generation.

Thus, while the people of the South, all but hog-tied by the poll tax, struggle to rejoin the democracy of the Nation, what is Congress waiting for?

Foodstuffs in Our Export Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, as aid to starving nations is now assuming much attention at home and abroad it is timely that we examine the status of foodstuffs in our export trade. Since the European war broke out in September 1939 our exports of foodstuffs have steadily declined while our food surpluses have increased.

Normally, Europe is our largest market for foodstuffs, but today that market is closed, due principally to the British blockade, and should be opened to absorb some of our ever-increasing food surpluses.

January 1941 is the latest month for which export figures are available. While one month may not be a fair line of measure, yet it does show the trend when compared with prior similar months. On this basis, I have made an analysis of our export trade of January 1941, as shown in the following table from reports issued by the United States Department of Commerce.

This analysis shows a steady decline in our exports of raw materials and foodstuffs, while increases are steady for manufactured products, principally munitions and war materials.

In the case of foodstuffs—crude and manufactured—total exports decreased from $40,310,000 in January 1938 to $13,746,000 in January 1941. This decrease was coupled with a shift in markets but not enough to benefit our farmers and producers of foodstuffs. For instance, in January 1941 Latin America, principally Cuba, became our leading market for foodstuffs.

This analysis covers more particularly Europe, our best market for foodstuffs. In January 1938 our exports of foodstuffs to Europe amounted to $30,069,000; by January 1941 they declined to $3,242,000. It is interesting to note in the table herewith the position of the European belligerents in January 1938 and January 1941. The United Kingdom, Ireland, Finland, and Sweden got most of the foodstuffs in January 1941; while Germany, Italy, and their occupied countries were cut off.

Position of foodstuffs in United States export trade, January 1941

(NOTE.—The war in Europe broke out September 1939

[Value in thousands of dollars—000 omitted]

Export items	January 1938	January 1939	January 1940	January 1941
Total exports of:				
Crude materials[1]	67,925	36,391	82,356	16,092
Foodstuffs [2]	40,310	31,051	27,705	13,746
Manufactures [3]	177,529	142,817	250,522	288,115
Total exports	285,764	210,259	360,583	317,953
Foodstuffs,[2] exports to—				
Latin America[4]	5,458	4,880	4,694	5,430
Canada [5]	2,507	2,366	3,471	2,514
Europe	30,069	21,609	16,580	3,242
Asia	1,782	1,785	2,250	2,286
Africa and Oceania	494	411	710	274
Total foodstuffs	40,310	31,051	27,705	13,746
Foodstuffs [2] exports to Europe (total)	30,069	21,609	16,580	3,242
United Kingdom	14,208	14,583	10,371	2,171
Ireland	2,380	882	747	159
Finland	68	51	10	755
Sweden	228	399	480	81
Switzerland	51	51	271	5
Portugal	3		1	13
Spain		24		12
Greece	879	35	33	
Turkey	6	1		
Russia (U. S. S. R.)			161	
Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland	1,823	323		
Norway	352	238	1,311	
Denmark	1,011	122	408	(6)
Belgium	3,668	1,082	285	
Netherlands	4,417	3,004	2,188	
France	881	770	210	
Italy	40	15	69	
Other Europe	54	29	35	46

[1] Crude materials include cotton, tobacco, crude petroleum, coal, etc.
[2] Foodstuffs include all crude and manufactured foods and beverages.
[3] Includes semi- and finished-manufactured products (except foodstuffs).
[4] South America, Mexico, Central America, Cuba and other West Indies.
[5] Includes Newfoundland, Laborador, Greenland, and Miquelon.
[6] No figures issued for Denmark.

Source: Official figures as issued by the U. S. Department of Commerce.

National Conference of Christians and Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 31, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a notable address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley before the Massachusetts committee

of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, at the Boston Chamber of Commerce, on Thursday, March 27, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Never in our history has a conference like this had greater significance. The National Conference of Christians and Jews, proclaiming as its purpose adherence to the principle of religious liberty and the promotion of that liberty, has a special meaning at this time, when democracy is being attacked all over the world. America, to a greater extent than ever before in history, is called upon to defend democracy in terms of clear thinking and vital action. It is seeking once more to prove democracy to be that form of government which has done most for the individual and most for humanity.

I shall not attempt to define the concept of democracy in exact terms. I merely wish to call attention to one or two of its aspects which are fundamental to the purposes for which we are gathered here.

If democracy means anything, it means the equality of men. That does not mean equality in all those capacities of mind and body which in the nature of things can never be equal. They cannot be equal for the simple reason that human beings are not identical. It does not apply to moral equality, for there will be some who are more kind, more charitable, and who live their lives more completely in obedience to the moral law. When the Declaration of Independence speaks of the "self-evident truth" that "all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights" it speaks of equality in a vastly more fundamental sense. It means that no human being shall be so poor or so unfortunate or so incompetent, even so unworthy, that he is not deserving of recognition as an individual. Beyond that it means that, as an individual, he has certain rights that no one is justified in destroying or denying him. It means that so far as possible he deserves equality of opportunity—an equal chance—as an individual. It is the glory of this country that it has fought to maintain the principle that every man and woman deserves a share in the benefits of our society.

When we consider this principle of equality as the basis of our democratic faith, we must recognize two other major points. The first is that, when we proclaim that equality, we are granting the truth of a fundamental religious teaching. The belief in the political equality of men springs from the belief in the essential equality of men before the common Father. This idea of equality is part and parcel of the belief in the existence of a human soul in every individual person. More, it is part and parcel of the religious assertion that the soul is an immortal soul.

Unless it is, why should human personality be sacred? Unless it is, what inalienable rights could the individual possess? Unless it is, why do individuals give of their goods, their efforts, and their lives for the sake of principle? If the individual soul is a thing that vanishes like a spark falling in the water, then it is hard to see how men can be so indifferent to their personal comfort and interest as to make any sacrifice at all for principle. Democracy, therefore, fundamentally recognizes the necessity of religion and of the teachings of religion as a guaranty of its own vitality and its own perseverance in a world of danger. The equality to which we pay reverence when we dedicate ourselves to the principle of democracy, is the equality of the human soul. To paraphrase a great American thinker, it is because the human being has moral powers, because he carries a law in his own breast and was made to govern himself, that we cannot endure to see him become another person's slave or tool. It is because we see in him the Divine image, that we demand for him means of self-development, spheres for free action, and that we call society not to fetter but to aid his growth.

The second aspect of democracy is the principle of tolerance. It is the principle of respect by the individual and for the individual. It is the principle of the many living together in a common life, maintaining peace with each other, upholding justice in their relations and, above all, actively working together to protect those who need protection in the exercise of their legitimate rights.

It is interesting that tolerance became established only slowly, only in spite of the many forces that denied the possibility of tolerance. Take the word toleration—which, I need not remind you, has a slightly different definition than tolerance. Toleration, as a national principle, came after centuries of conflict. It came after nations stood exhausted, broken up into factions and clashing armies. It was not until blood had drenched the soil of Europe that people began to recognize the essential fact that two or more religions could exist in the same nation at the same time. This principle of toleration is another name for the principle of religious liberty. It is not only the mark of a great aspiration but the mark of a very definite legal concept.

Briefly, religious liberty manifests itself in three ways.

First, it gives to the individual the right to choose his own creed, his own church, his own form of religion, so far as the exercise of that right does not impair the fundamental rights of others.

Second, it grants autonomy to a religion as an institution. It gives a religious institution the right to the pursuit of its own purposes, so far as these purposes conform with those expressed laws of the land which are designed to protect one religion as against the other. Basically, as this principle operates in America, it means that religious institutions are free to gather new members and to grow, to own property, to carry on their legitimate religious services and ceremonies, and to speak freely in the forum of public opinion.

The third characteristic of religious liberty is a recognition by the Nation of the essential equality of the different religions. That means that a small religious institution with 50 members stands within the great principle of freedom with the same rights and privileges as the largest religious institution.

It is interesting that as the nations of the world slowly came to the principle of religious freedom over past generations, the nations have differed in their ways of maintaining what they have called religious freedom. In many nations, some of them on the continent of Europe, the state actively sought to regulate religions in order, it claimed, to maintain equal status among religions. The state exercised a definite supervision over religious institutions, and, in some cases made grave mistakes and committed serious injustices in exercising this supervision.

America, however, has worked on a different principle. It seeks to maintain religious freedom by the entire separation of the church and state. We are proud, here in America, that without the active interference of the state, religions have grown, have cooperated, have recognized one another's rights, and have achieved a vital and commanding place in the great community of America.

But these formal, legal, technical aspects of toleration exist because basically the principle of tolerance is a principle that is cherished in every community that dares to call itself a civilized community. Tolerance is an expression of one of the most profoundly important qualities of a civilized human being—the capacity for self-restraint. I want to stress the word "civilized" in this connection. I want to say as strongly as I can here that the absence of tolerance is characteristic of the barbarian. I know you will understand to what I refer, for I know that all Americans feel this deeply. Tolerance is that admirable thing in a human being that makes him restrain his own power in order that others may enjoy the exercise of theirs. It is the principle that permits him to grant to his fellow man the right to be heard, that recognizes the virtue in the man on the other side of the street or in the other street or in the other town. It is the principle that prevails so magnificently in every manly sport—the thing we call sportsmanship—which, despite keen competition, restrains those who participate from a ruthless and unfair exercise of temporary advantage. It is the principle to which, in these serious days, we must rededicate ourselves.

Now that the great struggle for the existence of democracy in so many parts of the world is reaching a critical stage, the ideals of this conference assume a new—a unique—importance. They are essential to the defense of our Nation. They are also essential to the playing of our proper part in world affairs. The reason they are important to our national defense is that they are an outward sign of the principle of true unity. Only a nation that is thus united can effectively survive. Of course, there is another kind of unity in the world. That is the hard, enforced, cruel unity of dictatorship. It is a false—an artificial—unity. That is why it can be only a temporary and passing manifestation. No unity enforced in a nation by arms and power has ever survived. Such a unity is the unity of the jailer and the hangman. It is the unity of the prison and the grave. Human beings will not long submit to so vicious a denial of the simple dictates of humanity.

The unity that endures is the kind of unity we have in America. It is the unity of free people recognizing that only as others are free can they be free, recognizing that only as others are permitted to speak can they be permitted to speak, recognizing that only as others have rights can they maintain their own rights. That is the unity that quickens the heart and lifts the head of an American when he sees the flag. It is the unity of free men and free religions in a free nation.

I need not remind you that those nations that maintain unity by persecution would seek and are seeking to destroy our kind of unity by dividing us among ourselves. You and I know too well how they proceed. Intolerance is the poison they use. By pamphlets, by speeches, by whispering campaigns they try to set group against group, religious believer against religious believer, neighbor against neighbor. Lying stories of the most revolting kind—from simple slander against one or two persons to elaborate fabrications involving whole groups—are spread among the gullible. These are efforts to divide us, to destroy our unity, to sap our strength, to throw us off our course, to render us ineffective; and these efforts are rewarded whenever an American says or does an intolerant thing. Whenever we make a distinction between men because of their religion or race, whenever we impute to a whole religious or social or economic group the sins or failings or the political beliefs of some of its members, whenever we spread slanderous whispers about a religion or those who believe in it—whenever we do these things, we are helping those who wish to shatter our American unity. Intolerance is the deadliest enemy of true unity. It is the destroyer of democracy.

As I have lived and grown older in this world, I have learned not only the ethical value of tolerance but its practical necessity. Whenever, in dealing with another man, we have to stop to think of that man as a Catholic or a Jew or a Protestant and shape

our methods of dealing with him in accordance with a conception of something in him peculiar to his own religion, we fail in the practical purposes for which we all deal with each other. We cannot think straight and we cannot think effectively and we cannot get results when we have to stop and gear ourselves to supposed religious differences. Effective dealing with neighbors and friends and political and business associates means dealing with them as human beings and Americans, subject to the same fundamental desires and purposes. I have found that tolerance is not only a good moral principle; it is the only sound, practical means of successful living.

But much as we love our liberty and much as we extol the virtues we have learned over the generations in America, we must always be aware that there is such a thing as tolerance in our dealing with the world. Let us be proud, but not conceited. Let us avoid the self-deception practiced by the Pharisee who stood in the temple and thanked God that he was not as other men. Let us rather approach our national problems and responsibilities with the quiet assurance that our light will shine in the darkness around us because of what we are rather than because of what we say we are.

In the task before us, we must prevail in the spirit of our institutions. In combating intolerance in others we must not become intolerant ourselves. If we do, those against whom we struggle will have achieved the ultimate victory over us. They will have made us become as they are. They will have transformed us into the evil thing we set out to oppose. Let us, in fighting for tolerance, observe among our own people, among our own religions, the finest, greatest, most enduring unity—the unity of free men and free religions.

Oil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 31, 1941

ADDRESS BY GEORGE A. HILL, JR.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by George A. Hill of Texas, relative to oil and petroleum production.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are gathered here under the auspices of a great commercial and industrial association—the South Texas Chamber of Commerce—to celebrate an annual occasion that is happily described as the Oil Men's Jubilee; and it is, perhaps, appropriate that we, in these troubled times, should ask ourselves, by way of critical self-examination, the realistic question just what is the present and basic justification, if any, for our spirit of jubilation?

In olden times a jubilee was usually the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of some epochal event; and inasmuch as State regulation in relation to the conservation of oil and gas had its important beginnings in the Gay Nineties, it is fitting that we, in these turbulent and vexatious forties, reappraise the progress that we have accomplished.

In an address before the Natural Resources Round Table of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in Washington during the past year upon the subject of State regulation, I observed that "the accelerated pace of the petroleum industry's advance along technologic, economic, and social lines is such that constant periodic reexaminations are necessary, even for those engaged in the industry, to comprehend the significance of its broad general advance."

The number and variety and the effectiveness of such conservation processes under State regulation have been so improved, and so vast, in the immediate and very recent past, that the industry itself has largely overlooked the important public duty of, first, making known the elaborate pattern of our conservation laws and regulations; and second, recording in a more informative way, for better public understanding, the conservation results achieved.

It shall be my purpose to here review advances made in oil and gas conservation in the State of Texas—as being typical of the oil-producing States—and the beneficial results accomplished thereby, in simple terms understandable by the layman. The objective is to secure greater public appreciation of the infinite precaution in method, and of the vast minutia in detail, that has been developed in our State regulatory procedure, with the general approval of the public and the industry.

Likewise the endeavor shall be to make more apparent the resulting prevention of physical and economic waste that would not have otherwise resulted, and to make clear to all concerned that the oil and gas industry, now preeminent among all industries in its readiness and ability to serve the ends of national defense, achieved this special fitness, not fortuitously and by accident, but by painstaking method and wise design.

Early conservation legislation dealt with casing wells, prohibiting flambeau lights of natural gas, closing of wild wells, and the plugging of abandoned wells; but present conservation laws and regulations are designed to prevent waste in the production, transportation, refining, and marketing of oil and gas, and, by the application of scientific methods, to eliminate or greatly restrict underground waste, and to promote the greatest ultimate recovery.

What are the initial steps required to be taken before the commencement of the drilling of a well?

DRILLING REGULATIONS

To begin with, the operator must file with the State regulatory commission (a) an application for a permit to drill, (b) accompanied by a map drawn to prescribed scale, (c) showing ownership lines, and (d) the distance of the proposed location from boundaries.

Drilling cannot be actually commenced until a permit to drill has been issued by the regulatory commission, after checking conformance of the location with the Statewide order now in force prescribing a spacing pattern of 1 well to a 20-acre unit.

These requirements assure orderliness in the commencement of a wildcat operation.

If the application to drill is upon acreage located in a field already partially developed, such application must conform to the spacing pattern provided in the field rules governing the oil or gas field in question; and if the location sought is in violation of the general State-wide order or the local field rules, a hearing must be held upon such application after prior notice to parties interested or affected by the proposed application.

These spacing rules, as the result of progressively wider spacing, have resulted in the promotion of conservation in (a) the conservation of reservoir energy; (b) the increase in ultimate recovery; (c) the restriction of underground waste; (d) the limitation of fire hazards; (e) the diminution of danger of blow-outs; (f) with the consequent lessening of development costs; (g) a more orderly pattern upon which to allocate production; and (h) a better opportunity for the recovery by the operator of the oil originally in place.

After a discovery well is drilled, a hearing is held by the regulatory commission after notice to all parties at interest, following which there is prescribed by the commission the field rules pertaining to subsequent operations in such field. Evidence is heard with respect to the type of field, the formations encountered, and all other available data upon which to predicate sound conservation rules and regulations, including the spacing pattern. Either the laws or the rules and regulations having general application and/or the field rules and regulations prescribe—

(a) The weight and types of casing to be used (which are necessary precautions against high gas pressures and the elimination of the danger of blowouts).

(b) The methods and depths to which such casings are to be set in the casing program for such field (which are necessary precautions against damage to water sands, danger of blowouts, etc.).

(c) The manner of cementing and the approximate amount of cement to be used (in order to more carefully conserve the water resources of the State).

(d) Provisions for testing of casing and the casing settings before drilling ahead, below the casing, or completing the well (in order to protect against the dangers above referred to).

(e) The weight and viscosity of drilling muds that may be used in a given field or area (in order to lessen the hazard of blowouts in high gas pressure areas, etc.).

(f) Provisions for proper and separate slush pits for the making of mud fluid for rotary drilling.

(g) Precautions for the prevention of fire hazards.

(h) Precautions for the prevention of waste either at the surface or in the strata containing gas and/or crude oil.

(i) The requirement of the use of proper well head connections of a type and pressure test capable of controlling the producing well.

(j) Requirement of the use of specified blowout preventer and braden-heads.

(k) Procedure in relation to withdrawing drill pipe in order to prevent swabbing effect and danger of blowout.

(l) Provision for access to drilling wells by authorized agents of the regulatory commission who may supervise testing of well, casing, and settings, and with the right to inspect the records pertaining to such well.

In certain cases where, because of blowouts or other conditions, waste is being created by an operator, the regulatory commission may intervene and take charge of drilling or completion operations or for the plugging of a well, and may even require an operator to kill a blowout well by the drilling of a directionally controlled well for such purpose.

PRODUCTION REGULATIONS

Present rules provide for proper engineering practices in the production of oil and/or gas. They include—

(1) The prohibiting of the use of sweet gas for the manufacture of carbon black without first having extracted the natural gasoline content therefrom;

(2) The wasteful burning of any natural gas well;

(3) The drowning of any productive strata with water;

(4) The operation of an oil well with inefficient gas ratio;

(5) The wasting of gas into the air from a well producing oil and gas in excess of efficient operation;

(6) The production of natural gas in excess of transportation or marketing facilities or in excess of 25 percent of the open flow capacity of the well;

(7) Prohibiting the waste of reservoir energy;

(8) Prohibition of surface waste such as open-pit storage;

(9) Prohibiting the production of crude oil in excess of market facilities or reasonable market demand;

(10) The prevention of waste of oil or gas from tanks, wells, containers, or pipe lines;

(11) Prohibiting of the transfer of natural gas from one reservoir to another, i. e., when gas is extracted from one stratum and the gasoline content taken therefrom, such dry gas much be returned to its original reservoir unless used for lighting or fuel or under other orders of the Commission;

(12) Prohibits the use of sweet gas in flambeau lamps;

(13) Prohibits the operation of wells in such a manner as to afford an injury to adjoining property or property owners;

(14) Requires that Commission shall be notified of any fires, breaks, leaks, or blowouts;

(15) Requires that a separating device be used when oil and gas are produced from the same stratum;

(16) Prohibits connecting of well to pipe line until owner has secured certificate of compliance with conservation laws;

(17) Prohibits swabbing of wells except under certain conditions;

(18) Prohibits the use of vacuum pumps unless specifically permitted by the Commission;

(19) Defines marginal wells and the amount they may produce;

(20) Requires that potentials of wells be taken and reported to the Commission;

(21) Requires that the amount of oil and/or gas produced be reported to the Commission;

(22) Provides that shooting or treating of wells shall be done under direction of the Commission;

(23) Requires that wells, tanks, etc., shall be identified as to ownership by proper signs; and

(24) Provides that when any well is plugged it shall be done in a manner to effectively prevent the intercommunication between sands of oil, gas, or water.

The effects of these requirements and prohibitions are to assure that the maximum possible amount of natural gas and/or crude oil will be recovered with the minimum of waste from all of the reservoirs within the State.

TRANSPORTATION REGULATIONS

Transportation of gas is by pipe line and of oil may be by pipe line, tank cars, barges, trucks, or other motor vehicles.

Waste is prevented in the transportation of gas and of oil and its products by—

(1) Providing for permits, tenders, and other evidences of permission for the transportation of oil and/or natural gas;

(2) Prohibiting waste and surface seepage from tanks and pipe lines;

(3) Prohibits waste by elimination of open-pit storage;

(4) Prohibits the laying of pipe lines along or across public roads where such pipe lines will cause an interference to traffic or where breakage of a line might result in hazardous conditions to the welfare of the public;

(5) Provides for inspection of tanks, pipe lines, meters, and other equipment;

(6) Providing for bonds to be filed with the State by all public utilities or common carriers;

(7) Providing for authority to the Commission to fix rates and charges and make rules to govern common carriers by pipe lines to be assuring transportation facilities to the small independent operator;

(8) Providing for authority to the Commission to require extensions or enlargements of facilities of common carriers where market demand exceeds such facilities;

(9) Prevents discrimination in the purchase from others of oil and/or gas by common carriers;

(10) Provides for penalties to common carriers where the products transported are produced in violation of orders of the Commission;

(11) Provides for the keeping, by the common carrier, of such reports as will reflect the amount of crude or refined oil in the custody of the carrier, the amount of the crude or refined oil received during any month by the carrier, the available empty storage controlled by the carrier, and the amount of crude or refined oil held by the common carrier for the account of itself or parent company;

(12) Flow lines leading from more than one well into a common line to a common battery of tanks shall be equipped with proper check valves.

The above provisions relative to transportation assure outlets to market facilities and individual wells, leases, and fields, and that oil will be transported and delivered efficiently to refining facilities and assure that waste will be minimized in such transportation.

REPORT REQUIREMENTS

Assurance that waste will be eliminated and conservation practices adhered to and conservation thereby accomplished, is given and secured through the authority vested in the oil and gas commission to require reports of all kinds and character and for all purposes relative to and incidental to drilling, production, transportation, marketing, and any other phases of the oil industry. Some of the many and varied reports which are required and made available to the commission (in some cases becoming public knowledge) are as follows:

(1) Records of wells drilled;

(2) Records of the completion of wells and records of plugging when abandoned;

(3) Well status reports showing depth of well, location of well, producing horizon, amount of production, gas-oil ratio, water percentage, method of production, and whether or not the well makes its allowed production;

(4) Reports by the producer showing the allowable assigned to the well and the actual production;

(5) Reports relative to the cleaning of tanks;

(6) Reports of production of condensate and/or oil from gas wells;

(7) Gas-oil ratio reports;

(8) Reports of gas lift operation of wells;

(9) Reports showing to whom oil was sold and how delivered;

(10) Reports of purchase of oil, where secured, and disposition afterward made of it;

(11) Reports of purchase, transportation, and disposition of oil products;

(12) Reports of stocks on hand in tanks, pipe lines, and lease storage;

(13) Reports as required by the Commission as to open-flow capacity and rock pressure of gas wells;

(14) Reports of oil refined, processed, reclaimed, or blended;

(15) Reports of residue gas distribution for light and fuel at natural gasoline commingling plants.

In addition to the above-enumerated reports, many of which are made by the producer, the transporter, and the refiner, the Commission may require such other reports as it deems necessary and the Commission is to be furnished with copies of reports made to the State comptroller in connection with taxes on production and sales of gas and oil and its products.

These reports are so arranged and coordinated that it is possible to trace the movement of gas and oil from the well to the ultimate consumer within the State or to the State line in interstate shipment, thereby making certain that the production from any well is not unlawful nor produced in violation to Commission rules and regulations nor injurious to the normal production practices of any field or stratum. The production and movement of "hot oil" is eliminated and waste incidental to "hot oil" production accordingly eliminated.

MISCELLANEOUS CONSERVATION REGULATIONS

Included under this heading are certain practices, such as recycling and the manufacture of carbon black, which are calculated to prevent waste and increase recovery of natural resources and also included are certain procedures calculated to accomplish such results.

Recycling: Recycling comprises the production of natural gas in its original state from a productive horizon or stratum, from any reservoir, the extraction of natural gasoline or other heavier hydrocarbons from such natural gas and the returning of the dry or residue gas to the original reservoir from which it was withdrawn. In practice, it is essential that a knowledge of the structure be known in order that the points of inlet and outlet of such gas can be best determined on the basis of sound engineering principles. Recycling has been the outgrowth of the production practices evolved in the development of conservation since certain productive sands, although known for many years, have been nonproductive because conservation laws, rules, and regulations would not permit the withdrawal of that gas and the wasting of the residue into the air or into carbon black plants. Most of the principal recycling plants in the State of Texas have been developed within the past 5 years and there are now in operation approximately 40 plants.

Carbon black: The production of carbon black is secured by the imperfect combustion of natural gas in which the hydrocarbons are left as a residue in the natural carbonaceous state. Its production, in order to utilize waste gas in north Texas, has subsequently been increased and is now actively carried on, particularly in the areas of sour gas production. The sour gas (sulfur gas) is unfit for fuel, and modern conservation practices restrict and prohibit the use of sweet gas, except in specific instances and under exceptional restrictions.

Secondary oil recovery: In order to secure additional production from fields which would be otherwise abandoned, certain practices have been adopted and are known as secondary recovery methods. They include:

(a) Water flooding of the oil-producing horizon to effect a flushing of the oil from the interstitial spaces of the sand, and

(b) Repressuring of the original reservoir by the introduction thereinto of natural gas from some other horizon.

In the latter case, conservation has established certain rules and regulations which prohibit the introduction of natural gas into a reservoir as a repressuring agent until the natural gasoline content has been extracted from such gas.

Bottom-hole pressure surveys: Experience has shown that maintaining, as near as possible, the original pressure existing in a reservoir results in maximum efficient recovery of oil and operation of the field, and the practice of making bottom-hole pressure surveys has therefore been undertaken by the Commission and by many of the operating companies. Such surveys make it possible to produce the field at the most efficient rate to secure the maximum ultimate

production and the minimum amount of waste due to water encroachment and subsequent flooding or drowning of productive areas. Failure to be properly informed of bottom-hole pressure data may result in the partial or complete sealing of a portion of the subsurface strata and production which might be expected from that zone or area will be forever lost. Bottom-hole pressures are now accorded their proper position in the scheme of conservation and some of the more important fields in Texas are now prorated and produced on the data from these surveys. The most notable example of the above is the east Texas field. These surveys also assist the operators to maintain the proper pressure in the reservoir so that a gas cap will not be formed above the oil from gas previously in solution in the oil, thereby rendering the oil more viscous and less free to migrate to the well bore.

Proration: Proration is the apportioning of the market demand for oil among the fields of the State in an equitable manner and in accordance with sound engineering principles so that waste due to excessive production from any individual reservoir will be eliminated. The many factors which go into the formula for the ascertainment of the proper proration schedule are:

(a) Acreage or size of drilling units.

(b) Potential productive capacity of the well.

(c) Depth of the producing horizon.

(d) Gas-oil ratio of the well.

(e) Bottom-hole production or bottom-hole decline curve of the producing stratum.

(f) Thickness of the producing oil and/or gas sand.

(g) Market demand for the type of oil produced.

(h) Location of field with respect to transportation, pipe-line facilities, etc.

(i) Foreign markets.

(j) Type and quality of oil, including, among other things, the octane rating of the oil so produced.

(k) Method of production of well.

(l) Type of structure on which such productive wells are drilled, i. e., whether fault type, normal anticlinal, or dome type, or salt dome type.

(m) Percentage of water being produced with the oil.

The proration schedule, as now developed by the Railroad Commission of Texas comprises, in their engineering features, one or more of the factors above outlined.

The allowable schedules issued by the commission are issued after hearings held before the commission, at which data are presented as to physical characteristics and conditions of the fields and market demand for the oil so produced from the various fields. Each and every operator, whether small or large, has the same rights prescribed by law for a hearing to determine any inequity in the proration schedule. In arriving at market demand (which is essentially the demand at which undue storage will not accumulate), the commission considers nominations as filed by the purchasers, local conditions surrounding inland refineries, reports of stocks of oil on hand and estimates of the United States Bureau of Mines.

Cooperative development: Cooperative development has advanced rapidly within the past 10 years, under the guidance and restrictions imposed by conservation measures. As its name implies, it is a cooperation by the owners in a field or a localized area to so space and produce the wells as to secure the maximum recovery with a minimum of waste. An excellent example of this type of operation in Texas is the Van Field.

Development of cracking process: The greatest conservation accomplishment in the history of the oil industry has resulted from the development of the cracking process, by which the average gasoline yield of a barrel of crude oil has been enormously enhanced, resulting not only in much greater quantity yield, but also an increase in power and mileage in excess of 40 percent. In addition many byproducts, formerly subject, in whole or in part, to waste can be utilized (as Dr. Egloff has recently explained) for the manufacture of defense products such as "butadiene and styrene for synthetic rubber, toluene for TNT, ethylene, ethyl alcohol, glycerine, and cyclopropane for medicinals, phenol and formaldehyde for plastics, and many other hydrocarbons of wartime value. The American petroleum industry is able not only to supply abundant quantities for the United States of America and Britain of gasoline of all grades, fuel oil, and lubricants, but also a whole line of products never before commercially made in quantity from petroleum, such as those listed."

SUMMARY

Four years ago I had occasion, in a public address, to summarize the accomplishments and achievements of the oil industry. Such achievements were the direct result of the combined effect of private initiative, capital, and direction, supported by the State regulation of conservation practices. Bear in mind that these observations long preceded the advent of war and our present national-defense program. I still adhere to those conclusions then expressed and which I now repeat:

First. Private capital, individual initiative, and free competitive enterprise have achieved the highest degree of development in exploration, exploitation, and in the advancement of such of the associated sciences involved in petroleum technological progress, which have resulted in cheaper prices to the consuming public in the United States.

Second. Helpful functions of government (the State and Federal Governments acting within their respective constitutional spheres), in regulation and in aid of petroleum industrial progress are recognized in the promotion of conservation, in the prevention of physical and economic waste, and in the scientific ascertainment of consumptive demand.

Third. In the foreign field, associated private enterprise has extended the field of American industrial power and prestige, with substantial benefits to the American Government, and without the involvement of the United States Government, as such.

Fourth. Government control, whether effectuated through Government monopoly, governmental expropriation, or through the nationalization of petroleum and other natural resources, has hampered, obstructed, and restricted petroleum industrial development as compared with or measured by the achievement of private capital, private initiative, and private management.

Fifth. Foreign exploration, production, and refining of petroleum have been dependent, to the greatest extent, upon the advances made by the petroleum industry in America in production and refining technology, and in the improvements made in the art of oil finding and in American manufactured equipment and supplies. No major development has resulted from purely governmental activity in any part of the world, and no Government-controlled branch of the industry in any foreign country has been able to keep abreast of the progress made in the industry by private capital and enterprise.

Sixth. National defense and national welfare are best promoted and served by the extensive and efficient development of petroleum (an essential and indispensable weapon of national defense) through the media of private capital, initiative, and management in a free competitive system, susceptible of quick mobilization for emergent national service.

Our Part in Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 31, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. HERBERT HOOVER AT NEW HAVEN, CONN., MARCH 28, 1941

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent address by former President Hoover as to our part in the peace which will follow the present war. The address was published in the New York Times of Saturday, March 29, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have been asked to speak to you, and through you to a large group of young people, on some of the moral and spiritual problems which now confront our country. Any discussion of them in these days involves questions of war and of the peace to come. And now they are the transcendent problems before youth.

I shall therefore discuss for a few moments some of the moral, spiritual and social questions that dominate modern war and the making of peace.

Today we are pledged to give Britain the tools of war and our full economic aid. That is settled and done. Our national duty is to unite in making a good job of it, and to do it with good will.

The action of Congress has, however, enormously changed the shape of things. The aid to Britain combined with our own preparedness program forces us a long way into a war economy.

Apart from these steps, our indignation at gigantic wrong to the democracies, the repugnance of freemen for the whole totalitarian ideology, the steady impact of foreign propaganda, the constant agitation of a minority of our own citizens for all-out war—all press upon us the mental and spiritual attitudes of war.

In a fog of emotions and appeals we are fast driving into the psychosis of war.

"THREE POSITIVE APPOINTMENTS"

Whether we take the final fateful step or not, we have already made three positive appointments with destiny.

One is that we will sit at the world's peace table. Another is that we face the problems of war emotions and war psychosis. The other is that we shall meet the financial, economic, and social aftermath of a war.

America yearns for peace in the world. The freedom of men comes only in peace. It diminishes in war. The abolition of poverty and want comes only in peace. Poverty and want increase in war.

Yet the world does not know, and we do not know, how world peace can be made and maintained. The world does not know, and we do not know, how in the face of steady world impoverishment we are to abolish want.

We do not see our way. Today, over these questions, we are frustrated, confused, unhappy, and fearful.

Our unity of ideas extend only to a resolve to defend ourselves and a fervid wish that the struggling democracies shall win.

My purpose here is not to offer you a panacea for these confusions and problems. I wish to stimulate your thinking. For now is the time to think hard and think fast. We cannot wait until the appointments with destiny are upon us.

EXPERIENCE OF WORLD WAR

We joined in an exactly parallel war 25 years ago for the same purposes and under the same impulses. Even with victory, we failed to get either military, economic, or spiritual peace.

The failures of the last war to achieve peace root not only at Versailles but also in the forces generated in the war itself. They rooted deeper than that. They rooted in age-old hates and in the fires of imperialism.

But we can get some light and some guidance from the experience and failures of that war and that peacemaking.

It is over 22 years since that World War ended. The youth of America today does not know of that war from its own experiences.

I am perhaps one of the few living Americans who had full opportunity from high places to see intimately the moving tragedy of the last World War.

I saw it from its beginnings in 1914 all the way down through the long years which have not yet ended. I saw it not only in its visible ghastliness but I lived with the invisible forces which moved in its causes and its consequences.

My country and foreign countries have honored me greatly over these years. There is nothing more in office or honor that the world could give to me. I can therefore add objectively to those experiences. I favored our entry into the last war so that I speak as neither a pacifist nor a militarist but rather as an analyst.

If we would see what the moral and spiritual forces are that we have to meet, we must consider the nature of total war.

The World War was the first total war of modern history. It was the first great war after the mechanical age. Prior to that time wars were more nearly contests between armies and navies.

Civilian life proceeded with little interruption except near the actual scene of battle. The armed men represented a small part of the whole population. Their equipment was comparatively simple. Its preparation involved the energies of only a small part of industry.

The last world war was the first time that the complete energy of the whole civil population on both sides was mobilized to fight and provide materials. It was total war.

Perhaps the most striking difference of total war from the old wars was that formerly armed men fought only against armed men. There were certain chivalries and sportsmanships. There was a real desire to keep women, children, and noncombatant men apart from its shocks.

In total war the basis has shifted in large measure from war between armed men to war by armed men upon civilians.

In the last war for the first time systematic and organied terrorization and killing of civilians became a part of this strategy. Cities, villages, and homes were ruthlessly burned. Unarmed seamen and innocent passengers were drowned without a chance. Fire and explosives were rained on women and children from the skies.

Three times a day among 300,000,000 people wherever a family gathered to eat they had less because of the enemy. Nowhere in Europe were people free of fear for their lives on land or sea.

EMOTIONS OF THE CIVILIANS

In the course of that total war there developed in the civil population on both sides three fierce and total emotions. These were hate, intolerance, and a spirit of exalting crusade.

From the sufferings of civilians blazed first indignation and finally a fanatic hate. It enveloped the minds of every man, woman, and child.

And this hate was not directed solely to leaders of nations; it was poured upon every individual of the enemy nation. Soldiers fighting on the front held far less hate than civilians at home.

The second of these emotions from that total war was total intolerance. National unity was essential in the face of total national danger. But impatience at discussion rose rapidly to rabid intolerance.

In the democracies part of that intolerance ran quickly to the suppression of free speech and free press. The democratic governments had no need to impose restraints on free expression.

The crowd howled down the most objective statement, the most constructive criticism. They denounced it as the paid voice of the enemy. And intolerance went further. It persecuted inoffensive citizens.

The third great emotion of that war was a crusade of ideologies, of philosophies, of government, and of life.

The ideology of Germany was much the same pattern as the one now in use. It was not so well perfected in phrases and method as this one. But they used most of the slogans we now hear.

On our side we went to war to defeat "might makes right" and "the enslavement of the individual to the state." We said we would make the "world safe for democracy." It was to be "a war to end war."

We said the end of war was that enemy nations must change their way of life to freedom and democracy and peace. The most sublime passions of our people were summoned in action and sacrifice for this purpose.

OPERATION OF PROPAGANDA

All these emotions were stirred on both sides of the conflict by the total power of government. That total war gave birth to governmentally organized propaganda. The hates of the people, their courage, and their aspirations could not be allowed to lag in the face of reverses and suffering.

The atrocities and total wickedness of the enemy had to be constantly illustrated. All governments, including our own, engaged in it.

The heads of those bureaus in most governments have written their confessions with pride in the lies they invented. Every government justified to itself that total emotion is essential to win total war.

To show how deeply these total emotions dominate total war, I may recall that after this had gone on for over 2 years in the last war President Wilson endeavored to bring about a negotiated peace.

His representatives sought my views on its practicality. I felt that hope of negotiated peace was futile. The civilians on both sides cried out in hate and suffering for vengeance and crushing victory.

I advised that no statesman or leader dared propose the necessary compromises which must be the basis of negotiated peace. And this proved to be the case.

And, incidentally, I may observe another effect of these impelling emotions in total war between nations of large resources. Such war can apparently end only by exhaustion or revolution on one side or the other. And the victor in this race of exhaustion is only one lap behind the vanquished.

Once total war is joined it apparently can have no intermediate stops.

IMPOSING OF CONTROLS

There are economic necessities in total war that create vast social aftermaths. The World War of 25 years ago was the first time the freedoms of business, labor, and agriculture were suspended. Industry had to be expanded to meet war production. It had to be constricted in its service to civilian living.

To direct these activities dictatorial authority had to be lodged in the government. In the democracies we used soft phrases to cover these coercions. We talked of cooperation, voluntary action, but underneath we had to show "or else." The Government increased production both by going into business itself and by government dictation to private owners as to what they must do.

Whatever the fine phrases were in which we wrapped these actions, the cold fact was that government in business was socialism, and government dictation to private owners was fascism.

The word fascism had not then been invented. The freedom of labor and the freedom of the farmer were driven a long way down that blind alley. Where people attempted to stand on their so-called rights, propaganda, intolerances, and penalties of law were directed to drive them to cover. Taxes which expropriated savings, pressure loans and inflation were necessary. All that is the method of fascism.

Is it to be the tragic jeopardy of democracy that if it would go to war it must adopt the very systems which we abhor?

DEFEAT OF PEACE HOPES

One of the emotional and intellectual currents of the last total war was the hope for peace that would make total war impossible again. The people of the democracies wanted armies and navies reduced if not abolished. They were resolute that some method must be found for justice between nations.

A thousand ideas came forth. But there was no adequate discussion of how these ideals could be attained. The common expression was victory first. We had a daily reiteration of our high aims. Indeed, within them was the hope of a better world.

With all these ideas and these emotions we went to the peace table. The American people at large were totally unprepared for the problems of peace-making. And hate sat at that table. Statesmen were not free agents. The victorious peoples demanded revenge and reparations for their wrongs and sufferings.

The men who represented England and France at that conference had just been elected on the slogans of "Hang the Kaiser," "Pay every farthing," "Revenge," "Reduce them to impotence forever."

The Allied leaders were consciously or unconsciously dominated by the bitterness of their people. They had to get their treaties approved at home.

Reason could not be restored in the face of total emotion and total suffering. And although our American sufferings were far less than the others, yet we were slow to demobilize our war hates.

HATE OUTLASTING VICTORY

I recollect having had the temerity a few days after the surrender of the Germans at the armistice to say we must at once take down the food blockade on their women and children.

You would perhaps be surprised if you read the universal condemnation I received, not only in the Allied countries, but in America. They demanded more starvation after the war was over. Starvation is the mother of generations of hate.

Also remember Sherman's march to the sea. It has bred hate in our own Southern States for 80 years.

From all this the lesson is that hate, once aroused by the suffering of civil populations, outlasts even victory.

After the last total war the consequence was a treaty which in part sowed the dragon's teeth of the present war. President Wilson and his men sought valiantly to moderate it. The world hoped for a while that through the high-minded formula of

the League of Nations the failures of the peace could be remedied when hates died. But the hates and fears lived on.

COLLAPSE OF THE VANQUISHED

Then came the aftermaths of that total war.

Experience proved that liberty, freedom, and democracy could not be imposed on nations by battle. All over Europe nations did come to the mourners' bench and appeared to be converted, but soon were backsliders.

Indeed, it was proved that intellectual ideas rooted in a thousand years of racial history cannot be uprooted with a machine gun.

Every nation was impoverished. There were millions of maimed and orphaned. Millions of homes and tons of ships were destroyed.

War production had to cease, industry was dislocated, millions of men had to be demobilized. Unemployment and its thousands of miseries were inevitable.

The victorious governments which had some financial strength left carried through these burdens.

The vanquished governments could not do so. Their unemployment, starvation, and a thousand miseries bred revolution. They staved off the day of economic retribution for a few years by financial legerdemain.

But finally the former enemy countries collapsed and dragged even the victors into bitter depression. In the defeated nations the people in renewed misery demanded the existing system be turned out, whatever it was.

In those countries the man on the soap box had the solution of all ills. His phrases contained only one idea in many formulas—to take away from those who still had something. And in the chaos of agony came the man on horseback. The treadmill of the world started all over again.

"GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS"

And at home it was a difficult task for the democracies to demobilize their wartime regimes. We had given no thought, had no plans for the moral and economic demobilization or the unemployment and financial aftermaths. We had no plan, no solution. It is easier to regiment a people than to unregiment them. Great vested interests and vested habits were created which pressed for perpetuity.

Millions held Government jobs. The thousands of people in authority were reluctant to give up power. Factories had thrived on Government orders. Farmers liked the Government prices. It was only the resolution of President Wilson and the men immediately around him who forced what we now call fascism to retreat.

Nevertheless our Government remained in many kinds of business. And of more vital importance, the ideas of war fascism remained.

When in later years confronted with difficulties, the people demanded that the Government resume these war methods. We saw many of them reappear in soft phrases to make them look like democracy.

All this is but a bare skeleton of the last total war. It takes no account of the millions who died.

In the present war pressure of starvation and air attack are far more diabolic than last time. Compassion is far weaker than even last time.

FACING THE NEXT PEACE TABLE

Today, whether America joins in all-out war or not, we are faced with the same gigantic problems.

The great sacrifices which America will make are motivated by the hope of real and permanent peace.

And I urge upon youth that you study again these experiences for the light which they give upon our course for the future.

We will sit again at that peace table whenever it comes about. Hate will again also sit at the peace table.

The ghastly failures in peacemaking and in economic life after the last total war may be excused on the ground that those who led the world were groping in the dark without the lamp of experience. We have had that experience. And these failures rise now with great questions that must be answered.

And in the study of these questions, let me suggest you examine the causes of failure of the Treaty of Versailles. You will find that a large part of them were failure to allay hate, failure of economic peace, failure to give opportunity of proper elbow room, and of growth to the aspirations of peoples. It failed to secure disarmament and to prevent world inflation and bankruptcy.

Peace must come from the prosperity and the hearts of men. It cannot be held for long by machine guns.

TESTS OF A WORLD ROLE

The immediate questions which arise are these:

Are we giving aid simply to assure the independence of Britain and the others who are fighting against aggression? Or are we extending our view to remaking the world?

How are we going to hold down destructive hate that makes constructive peace so difficult?

How are we to keep aligh. compassion for the injured and starving?

How are we going to settle the relations of the 20 races in Europe?

How are we going to secure that liberty and freedom and democracy be accepted by those races whose whole racial instincts rebel against it? Are we going to police the world?

How are we going to save a world ravaged by famine and pestilence?

How are we going to restore economic prosperity to an impoverished world?

How are we going to assure the proper elbow room for growing people?

How are we going to find refuge for the oppressed?

FUTURE OF THE UNITED STATES

And here in America—

How are we going to hold down intolerance during this period which makes free speech and free press impotent to correct wrong and to develop constructive debate?

With far more difficulties than last time, how are we going to demobilize our war socialism and fascism in America and restore freedom again to men?

With far more exhausted resources than last time, how are we going to provide for our own employment and economic recovery after this war?

In fact, how are we going to make a peace that will be a permanent peace?

These questions must be answered. Some of them need answers today. The others cannot be dismissed on the ground they must await the outcome of the war. There will be no time then.

The answers are vital to the moral, spiritual, and economic welfare of our youth. They will determine your whole lives. And to that end American youth should begin to think now, for it is you who are involved.

WHAT AMERICA MIGHT DO

We cannot expect the British people in their desperation to devote much thought to these ends.

America, however, today stands a certain distance apart from that scene. We do not have the distraction, suffering, and the engrossment closer to the battlefields.

I am one who prays with all my being that America's sons should not be sent to this war. If God grants that we become no more deeply involved than we are today we may be able to bring a more constructive and warning voice to the peace table.

If our moral reservoirs are not drained by the full passions of war we may bring sanity and compassion. If our economic resources are still partly intact, we may be able to contribute something to restore another and better world.

If our faith in democracy is held high amid the storms of war economy we may yet keep the lamp of liberty alight.

Whether the fates determine that we step fully into this war or not, these same questions must be answered. I bid you to think and think fast. For our common purpose must be that our country moves in the moral, the spiritual, and the social paths that will keep it unimpaired in its freedoms, its Christion ideals, powerful and impregnable.

Likelihood of United States Entering European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 31, 1941

ARTICLE BY GEN. HUGH S. JOHNSON

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely article by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson, appearing in his column entitled "One Man's Opinion," published daily in the columns of the Daily News of Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News]

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

Despite all that has happened to push this country closer to war, the most recent polls of public opinion, for whatever they are worth, show little if any increase in the willingness of our people to go to war. The percentage is still 83 to 85 percent opposed, which is about what it has been for a year.

Yet a similar poll among Washington correspondents, policy-making Federal officials, and certainly among Army and Navy officials would, in the opinion of most observers, show a majority opinion in at least that percentage that we will be in the shooting front of this war before the summer is out and perhaps much sooner.

This is a very remarkable situation, probably without precedent. It has been almost an axiom in the past that you can't take a democracy into a war against the will of large segments of its people or that, if it could be done, it ought not to be done because of the weakness of disunity. This principle seems to have little bearing today. The saying is: "Oh, they'll come along. They did in 1917 when the country had just voted for Wilson because he kept us out of war and when, at the beginning certainly half of the people didn't want war."

That is also a good guess, although it is nothing more than a guess. But Mr. Roosevelt has shown more ability to direct popular opinion than any leader we ever had, and the past and probable future sequence of events has all led or points in the direction of war.

There is good ground for believing that the present Presidential vacation is to take decisions and place action in quiet surroundings for the crisis in world affairs that certainly lies not more than 60 days ahead—the tightening blockade of Britain and the possible assault across the Channel, Hitler's decision about the Balkans, Japan's decision in the Pacific, and Russia as to Turkey and the Dardanelles.

In the question of ocean convoys by our Navy of American-financed aid to Britain lies the surest, swiftest path toward war for us. The logic of the convoy proposal is hard to beat. This vast armament in our hands is valuable for our own defense. In British hands it aids in our defense. At the bottom of the Atlantic it aids nobody but the Nazis. Are we spending billions for Hitler to sink?

It is true that it remains to be seen how much he can sink without our intervention. But if he is even reasonably successful, what do we do? Some advocates of convoys say: "Oh, we don't need to go to war over the sinking of a few escort vessels any more than we went to war when the Japs destroyed the U. S. S. *Panay*." There isn't much in that. The Japs claimed that was an accident and indemnified the loss. If the Germans fire on our flag, sink any part of our Navy and kill our sailors, it won't be an accident and can't be disavowed. That overwhelming majority against war will begin to fade out.

Even if it doesn't, there is another unavoidable angle. If we attempt to crash the blockade by sinking German naval ships or aircraft, Germany can't ignore that any more than we could. She would almost certainly have to declare war on us—and then the 85 percent would vanish. We would be fighting a defensive war and opposition would be treason.

No, we were in every aspect of the war except the shooting part when the lend-lease bill was enacted in the form in which it passed. The next and last step into bloody war is inevitable. It is only a question of timing and arranging the developing drama to get the maximum of popular support.

Letters About Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday I received the following letter from one of the good citizens of my district:

DEAR MR. GOSSETT: My son, age 26, was drafted from a $200 per month job into the Army at $21 per month. Not one word did he say, nor did his father and mother do one thing other than encourage him on into the selective draft.

We at home get mighty sick of these strikes and hope you back the proper authorities 100 percent in either seeing that these fellows get back to work or put them on the selective draft just as you did the boys for the Army.

Gratefully yours,

J. FRED RAYZOR.

This letter is typical of many others I am receiving from some of the best citizens in the United States. In some instances they may improperly condemn labor, but they know somebody is at fault. On last Saturday also I got another letter that meant much to me. It was from a kid brother of mine. Being the son of a small southern farmer, Private Ralph Gossett had to work his way through college. Finishing this, he had just worked himself up to a fairly good job when his country called. He is now serving his Uncle Sam at $21 per month. These boys will soon number a million. Mentally, physically, and spiritually they are the cream of American youth. They have a right to demand a square deal from labor, industry, Government, and all of the individuals and groups of individuals in this country. This matter of peace, security, and democracy is a serious business with them, and they expect it to be so with all others.

Power of the President To Employ the Navy To Convoy Vessels in Time of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 31, 1941

MEMORANDUM PREPARED FOR HON. ROBERT A. TAFT, OF OHIO

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorandum which I have had prepared concerning the power of the President of the United States, when the United States is at peace, to employ the Navy to convoy vessels bound to a belligerent.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The able Senator from Ohio has just presented for printing in the RECORD what he described as a memorandum, or a legal opinion, covering the President's peacetime right to employ the Navy to convoy vessels bound to a belligerent. I should like to inquire from the Senator from Ohio what the general conclusion of his legal memorandum is on that subject.

Mr. TAFT. The general conclusion is that in time of peace the President has no power to convoy merchant ships if the practically necessary result of such convoying is war. Such action then becomes an infringement on the power of Congress to declare or not declare war; and when pressed to that extent there is no legal right. Substantially the same argument was made on the floor of the Senate with regard to sending troops to Europe. The President may be able to order the Army or Navy anywhere in the world; but he certainly has no authority to order them to land in Germany and attack Germans, because that would be war, and in violation of the rights of Congress. The conclusion reached as to convoying, when it amounts to an act of war, is the same in this memorandum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Who is the author of the memorandum which the Senator is submitting?

Mr. TAFT. Legal assistants of mine. I had the opinion prepared. I did not prepare it myself. I had assistance.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM CONCERNING THE POWER OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, WHEN THE UNITED STATES IS AT PEACE, TO EMPLOY THE NAVY TO CONVOY VESSELS BOUND TO A BELLIGERENT

It is contemplated that under the Lease Lend Act the President may use the naval forces of the United States to convoy vessels carrying so-called defense articles to Great Britain.

There is a type of neutral convoy recognized in international law. The purpose of such convoy is to avoid the exercise of the belligerent right to visit and search neutral vessels to ascertain whether their cargo consists of contraband destined for the opposing belligerent's port. In such a convoy the belligerent vessel accepts the word of the commander of the convoy that the vessels do not carry contraband bound for the enemy's ports. (See 2 Hyde, International Law [1922], sec. 734; United States Naval Instructions Governing Maritime Warfare of June 30, 1917, Nos. 51–53; see also Treaty of Commerce and Navigation Between the United States and Italy of 1871, art. XIX; 1 Malloy's Treaties 975.)

It might well be within the power of the President to use the Navy of the United States in such a convoy service. It would promote legitimate trade, and assuming that the belligerent powers recognized the right of neutral convoy, there would be little risk of becoming involved in a situation where there would be danger of active hostilities.

However, this type of convoy would not be usable for the delivery to a belligerent of war materials. The purpose of the contemplated convoy would be to prevent the interception or destruction of the war materials by the armed forces of the Axis Powers. Such conduct would, of course, be unneutral and "illegal" from the viewpoint of international law (2 Hyde, Int. Law, sec. 848). Any objection to such convoy, however, cannot be based upon the ground that it is unneutral or illegal in such a sense. If the lease-lend bill be passed, it is the established policy of the United States declared through Congress to be unneutral. The sale of munitions to a belligerent by a neutral government is equally objectionable from the standpoint of international law (Hyde, supra). The vice is that embarking upon the suggested course would inevitably involve actual hostilities. It would be the purpose of the convoying vessels to prevent the capture or destruction of the vessels carrying munitions to Great Britain. To achieve such purpose the convoying vessels would necessarily have to stand ready to oppose the Axis Powers by use of their armaments. (It is possible that the Navy of the United States would be instructed to ac-

company vessels bearing munitions to Great Britain, merely to stand by as long as the Axis Powers acted in accordance with international law in their exercise of belligerent rights. Since the views of international law taken by the United States would, without any doubt, vary considerably from those of the Axis Powers, armed conflict would again be the necessary result.) The action itself constitutes a state of war, perhaps limited in scope but nevertheless real. In all probability it would lead to more extensive combat.

In *Bas* v. *Tingy* (4 Dall. 37) the Supreme Court of the United States considered at length the relations between France and the United States in the period between 1798 and 1801. The trouble was caused by interference by French armed vessels with our commerce on the high seas. By numerous acts passed in 1798, 1799, and 1800 Congress had stopped all commercial intercourse with France, had abrogated the treaties with France, had authorized merchant vessels to resist French search, had raised a navy and commissioned privateers, and had instructed such ships to attack the armed ships of France on the high seas, to capture them, if possible, and to recapture vessels found in their possession. Of this state of affairs Mr. Justice Washington said (p. 40–41):

"It may, I believe, be safely laid down, that every contention by force between two nations, in external matters, under the authority of their respective governments, is not only war, but public war. If it be declared in form, it is called solemn, and is of the perfect kind; because one whole nation is at war with another whole nation; and all the members of the nation declaring war are authorized to commit hostilities against all the members of the other, in every place, and under every circumstance. In such a war all the members act under a general authority, and all the rights and consequences of war attach to their condition.

"But hostilities may subsist between two nations, more confined in its nature and extent; being limited as to places, persons, and things; and this is more properly termed imperfect war; because not solemn, and because those who are authorized to commit hostilities act under special authority, and can go no further than to the extent of their commission. Still, however, it is a public war, because it is an external contention by force between some of the members of the two nations authorized by the legitimate powers. It is a war between the two nations, though all the members are not authorized to commit hostilities such as in a solemn war, where the government restrains the general power."

Mr. Justice Chase, concurring, said (p. 43–44):

"What, then, is the nature of the contest subsisting between America and France? In my judgment, it is a limited, partial war. Congress has not declared war in general terms, but Congress has authorized hostilities on the high seas by certain persons in certain cases. There is no authority given to commit hostilities on land; to capture unarmed French vessels, nor even to capture French armed vessels, lying in a French port; and the authority is not given indiscriminately to every citizen of America against every citizen of France, but only to citizens appointed by commissions or exposed to immediate outrage and violence. So far it is unquestionably a partial war; but nevertheless it is a public war on account of the public authority from which it emanates.

"There are four acts authorized by our Government that are demonstrative of a state of war. A belligerent power has a right, by the law of nations, to search a neutral vessel; and upon suspicion of a violation of her neutral obligations, to seize and carry her into port for further examination. But by the acts of Congress an American vessel is authorized: First, to resist the search of a French public vessel; second, to capture any vessel that should attempt by force to compel submission to a search; third, to recapture any American vessel seized by a French vessel; and, fourth, to capture any French armed vessel wherever found on the high seas."

The action involved in convoying vessels to Great Britain in the present situation may not be distinguished from that considered in the foregoing case.

Since the action in itself is war, it would seem that embarkation upon that course should be taken only by that authority in the Government of the United States which has the power to initiate or to declare war. That power is deposited in Congress, not in the President.

The constitutional provisions with regard to the armed forces of the United States and the declaration and making of war are the following:

It is provided in article I, section 8, that—

"The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to * * * provide for the common defense * * * of the United States' (clause 1).

"To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water" (clause 11).

"To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years" (clause 12).

"To provide and maintain a navy" (clause 13).

"To make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces" (clause 14).

"To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions" (clause 15).

"To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress" (clause 16).

Article II of the Constitution provides that:

"The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America" (sec. 1, clause 1).

"The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States" (sec. 2, clause 1).

The question will be largely determined by the meaning of the phrase "to declare war." A dryly literal interpretation might be afforded that phrase, which would allow to Congress only the power to make a formal declaration and leave to the Executive the power to determine whether or not in fact the United States should engage in war. It is sufficient to say that this interpretation has never received recognition. The power to "declare" war was given Congress with the intention to confer one of the most solemn attributes of sovereignty.

The verb "declare" was not chosen carelessly. The report of the Committee of Detail of the Constitutional Convention of 1787, dated August 6, 1787, gave the power to "make war" to the legislature. When this report came before the Convention on August 17, 1787, Mr. Pinckney thought that the power should be vested in the Senate only. Mr. Butler, however, "was for vesting the power in the President, who will have the requisite qualities, and will not make war but when the Nation will support it." Mr. Madison and Mr. Gerry "moved to insert 'declare' striking out 'make' war; leaving to the Executive the power to repel sudden attacks." Mr. Sherman thought that the Executive should be able to repel and not to commence war but that "make" was a better word than "declare" since the latter narrowed the power too much. The motion to insert "declare" in the place of "make" carried by a vote of seven ayes, two noes, with one abstention. (Taken from H. Doc. 398, 69th Cong., 1st sess., p. 980, as reported in Tansill, War Powers of the president, 45 Pol. Sci. Quar. 1, at 35–36).

Hamilton in the Federalist (No. LXIX), in comparing the President to the King of Great Britain, said that the President's power "would amount to nothing more than the supreme command and direction of the military and naval forces, as first general and admiral of the Confederacy; while that of the British King extends to the declaring of war * * * which, by the Constitution under consideration, would appertain to the legislature."

Mr. William Whiting in his book War Powers (43d ed., at pp. 38–40), states:

"A state of war may exist, arising in any of the modes above mentioned, without a declaration of war by either of the hostile parties. Congress has the sole power, under the Constitution, to make that declaration, and to sanction or authorize the commencement of offensive war. The United States would ordinarily begin hostilities against a foreign nation by a public proclamation, which would be equivalent to a declaration of war.

* * * * *

"The Constitution, made as it was by men of sense, never leaves the Nation powerless for self-defense. That instrument, which gives the legislature authority to declare war, whenever war is initiated by the United States, also makes it the duty of the President, as Commander in Chief, to engage promptly and effectually in war; or, in other words, to make the United States a belligerent nation, without declaration of war, or any other act of Congress, whenever he is legally called upon to suppress rebellion, repel invasion, or to execute the laws against armed and forcible resistance thereto."

JUDICIAL DISCUSSION OF THE POWERS OF CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT

In *Talbot* v. *Seeman*, 1 Cranch 1 (1801), the Supreme Court was called upon to decide whether the United States and France were at war in connection with a controversy concerning salvage for recapture of a vessel by the United States ship of war, the *Constitution*, from a French warship. Mr. Chief Justice Marshall said (p. 28):

"The whole powers of war being, by the Constitution of the United States, vested in Congress, the acts of that body can alone be resorted to as our guides in this inquiry. It is not denied, nor in the course of the argument has it been denied, that Congress may authorize general hostilities, in which case the general laws of war apply to our situation; or partial hostilities, in which case the laws of war, so far as they actually apply to our situation, must be noticed."

In *Fleming* v. *Page* (9 How. 603) a question arose whether goods imported from a port which had been captured by the forces of the United States during the War with Mexico were subject to duties imposed upon goods imported from a foreign country. The Court held that the port was still foreign. In the course of his opinion, Chief Justice Taney said (p. 614–615):

"A war, therefore, declared by Congress, can never be presumed to be waged for the purpose of conquest or the acquisition of territory; nor does the law declaring the war imply

an authority to the President to enlarge the limits of the United States by subjugating the enemy's country. The United States, it is true, may extend its boundaries by conquest or treaty, and may demand the cession of territory as the condition of peace, in order to indemnify its citizens for the injuries they have suffered or to reimburse the Government for the expenses of the war. But this can be done only by the treaty-making power or the legislative authority, and is not a part of the power conferred upon the President by the declaration of war. His duty and his power are purely military. As Commander in Chief, he is authorized to direct the movements of the naval and military forces placed by law at his command, and to employ them in the manner he may deem most effectual to harass and conquer and subdue the enemy. He may invade the hostile country and subject it to the sovereignty and authority of the United States. But his conquests do not enlarge the boundaries of this Union nor extend the operation of our institutions and laws beyond the limits before assigned to them by the legislative power."

The most extensive discussion of the scope of the congressional and Presidential powers is contained in the *Prize Cases*, 2 Black 635. After the breaking out of hostilities President Lincoln, by proclamations issued in April 1861, instituted a blockade of the ports of the Southern States. An extraordinary session of the legislature was subsequently called and in July of 1861 passed an act ratifying the acts, proclamations, and orders of the President. The Court held that a state of war existed because the parties in rebellion occupied and held a portion of the territory of the United States in a hostile manner, declared their independence, organized arms and commenced hostilities; that the President was bound to meet the situation as it presented itself; that his duty as Commander in Chief included resistance of the rebels; and, that as the Commander in Chief in time of war the President had the right to institute a blockade. Some support was found in the subsequent act of Congress ratifying the proclamations of the President, but the chief basis of the decision was the power granted to the President as Commander in Chief of the armed forces. In the course of the opinion, Mr. Justice Grier said (p. 668):

"By the Constitution, Congress alone has the power to declare a national or foreign war. It cannot declare war against a State, or any number of States, by virtue of any clause in the Constitution. The Constitution confers on the President the whole Executive power. He is bound to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. He is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States. He has no power to initiate or declare a war either against a foreign nation or a domestic State. But by the acts of Congress of February 28, 1795, and 3d of March 1807 he is authorized to call out the militia and use the military and naval forces of the United States in case of invasion by foreign nations, and to suppress insurrection against the government of a State or of the United States.

"If a war be made by invasion of a foreign nation, the President is not only authorized but bound to resist force by force. He does not initiate the war, but is bound to accept the challenge without waiting for any special legislative authority. And whether the hostile party be a foreign invader, or States organized in rebellion, it is nonetheless a war, although the declaration of it be 'unilateral.' Lord Stowell (1 Dodson, 247) observes 'It is not the less a war on that account, for war may exist without a declaration on either side It is so laid down by the best writers on the law of nations. A declaration of war by one country only, is not a mere challenge to be accepted or refused at pleasure by the other.'

"The battles of Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma had been fought before the passage of the act of Congress of May 13, 1846, which recognized 'a state of war as existing by the act of the Republic of Mexico.' This act not only provided for the future prosecution of the war, but was itself a vindication and ratification of the act of the President in accepting the challenge without a previous formal declaration of war by Congress."

Little v. *Barrreme* (2 Cranch 170) was another case arising out of the hostilities with the French. Congress had prohibited the sailing of American vessels to French ports and authorized the President to instruct his commanders to examine vessels suspected of engaging in the prohibited commerce, and to bring in for condemnation all vessels so engaged. The instructions of the President were to capture not only vessels bound to France but also vessels sailing from French ports. The captain of a naval vessel brought in a Danish vessel which was, of course, released. The question was whether he was liable in damages and the decision turned upon whether he was protected by the instructions of the President to apprehend vessels sailing from France. Judgment against the captain was sustained, Mr. Chief Justice Marshall saying (p. 178–179):

"These orders given by the Executive under the construction of the act of Congress made by the department to which its execution was assigned, enjoin the seizure of American vessels sailing from a French port. Is the officer who obeys them liable for damages sustained by this misconstruction of the act, or will his orders excuse him? If his instructions afford him no protection, then the law must take its course, and he must pay such damages as are legally awarded against him.

* * * * *

"The instructions cannot change the nature of the transaction, or legalize an act which, without those instructions, would have been a plain trespass."

The decision is significant to illustrate that the initiation of war is solely a congressional function, and that the power of the President as Commander in Chief must be exercised within the area prescribed by Congress.

LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING THE USE BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE NAVAL FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Numerous statutes authorize the President to use the land and naval forces of the United States. Thus, in cases of insurrection or violence, the President is authorized to use the land and naval forces of the United States and the militia, for suppression thereof (50 U. S. C. A., secs. 201, 202, 203); and to assist in the collection of customs (50 U. S. C. A., sec. 220). The President may use the land and naval forces to aid judicial process in the enforcement of civil rights laws (8 U. S. C. A., sec. 55). Likewise, the land and naval forces may be used to carry out the purposes of various criminal laws concerning offenses against the neutrality of the United States (18 U. S. C. A., sec. 38), or to prevent the unlawful export of munitions (22 U. S. C. A., sec. 245). The President is authorized to retaliate for discrimination against the citizens of the United States by belligerents in a war in which the United States is not engaged, and to enforce this law may use the land and naval forces (15 U. S. C. A., sec. 77). Formerly the President could detail naval officers to assist South American governments, and officers and men of the Navy or Marine Corps to assist the governments of Haiti or the Dominican Republic (34 U. S. C. A., secs. 441, 443, 446), and may now detail officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps to assist all Latin-American governments, as well as the Philippine Islands (34 U. S. C. A., sec. 441a; 10 U. S. C. A., sec. 540). The President is also authorized to employ the land and naval forces to protect merchant vessels from piracy (33 U. S. C. A., sec. 381). The statute was originally enacted March 3, 1819 (3 Stat. 510).

None of these statutes authorize the employment of the naval forces in the protection of commerce in a manner which would involve the United States in a war.

The constitutional power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of naval forces has been exercised by the following statute:

"The orders, regulations, and instructions issued by the Secretary of the Navy prior to July 14, 1862, with such alterations as he may since have adopted, with the approval of the President, shall be recognized as the regulations of the Navy, subject to alterations adopted in the same manner" (34 U. S. C. A., sec. 591).

Pursuant to this authority the United States Navy regulations have been promulgated from time to time. These regulations have the force of law (*Smith* v. *Whitney*, 116 U. S. 167, 181; *Denby* v. *Berry*, 263 U. S. 29, 37), at least as to all persons except the Secretary of the Navy (*Denby* v. *Berry*, *supra*, at p. 38). However, it is necessarily implied in the statutes that the regulations must be consistent with the statutes that have been enacted by Congress in reference to the Navy. (*United States* v. *Symonds*, 120 U. S. 46, 49).

Chapter 18 of the Regulations, in section 2 pertaining to duties in time of war, provides:

"714. The Commander in Chief shall afford protection and convoy, so far as it is within his power, to merchant vessels of the United States and to those of allies."

"715. During a war between civilized nations with which the United States is at peace, the Commander in Chief and all under his command shall observe the laws of neutrality and respect a lawful blockade, but at the same time make every possible effort that is consistent with the rules of international law to preserve and protect the lives and property of citizens of the United States wherever situated."

In section 3, concerning intercourse with foreigners, the following is found:

"721. (1) The commander in chief shall exercise great care that all under his command scrupulously respect the territorial authority of foreign civilized nations in amity with the United States.

"722. On occasions where injury to the United States or to citizens thereof is committed or threatened, in violation of the principles of international law or treaty rights, the commander in chief shall consult with the diplomatic representative or consul of the United States and take such steps as the gravity of the case demands, reporting immediately to the Secretary of the Navy all the facts. The responsibility for any action taken by a naval force, however, rests wholly upon the commanding officer thereof.

"723. The use of force against a foreign and friendly state, or against anyone within the territories thereof, is illegal.

"The right of self-preservation, however, is a right which belongs to States as well as to individuals, and in the case of States it includes the protection of the State, its honor, and its possessions, and the lives and property of its citizens against arbitrary violence, actual or impending, whereby the State or its citizens may suffer irreparable injury. The

conditions calling for the application of the right of self-preservation cannot be defined beforehand, but must be left to the sound judgment of responsible officers, who are to perform their duties in this respect with all possible care and forbearance. In no case shall force be exercised in time of peace otherwise than as an application of the right of self-preservation as above defined. It must be used only as a last resort, and then only to the extent which is absolutely necessary to accomplish the end required. It can never be exercised with a view to inflicting punishment for acts already committed."

"724. (1) Whenever, in the application of the above-mentioned principles, it shall become necessary to land an armed force in foreign territory on occasions of political disturbance where the local authorities are unable to give adequate protection to life and property, the assent of such authorities, or of some one of them, shall first be obtained, if it can be done without prejudice to the interests involved."

"726. So far as lies within their power, commanders in chief, division commanders, and commanding officers of ships shall protect all merchant vessels of the United States in lawful occupations, and advance the commercial interests of this country, always acting in accordance with international law and treaty obligations."

The foregoing regulations might be relied upon as legislative authorization to employ the naval forces of the United States in the convoying of vessels laden with munitions to Great Britain. Reasoning to achieve this conclusion might be: That Congress has knowledge of the regulations as they exist from time to time, and particularly as they exist at the date of the passage of the lease-lend bill; by force of the statute these regulations have the force of statutory law, unless Congress has passed an act inconsistent with the regulation in question; the provision in the lease-lend bill that "nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize or to permit the authorization of convoying vessels by naval vessels of the United States" is not inconsistent with the regulations; such language merely indicated that Congress was content to allow the matter to rest in its present condition under the regulations of the Secretary of the Navy and the power of the President as Commander in Chief.

The fallacy in the argument as above outlined is that it ignores the facts, which are: that if the United States attempts to convoy vessels to Great Britain by so doing the United States joins in the current war upon her own initiative. Under the Constitution the power to so initiate a war rests in Congress alone. Quite obviously, the statute providing for the promulgation of regulations for the Navy by the Secretary of the Navy did not intend to delegate to the Secretary of the Navy, acting, of course, with the approval of the President, the power to declare war.

The present neutrality legislation provides:

"Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 245j (a), and he shall thereafter find that the protection of citizens of the United States so requires, he shall, by proclamation, define combat areas, and thereafter it shall be unlawful, except under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed, for any citizen of the United States or any American vessel to proceed into or through any such combat area. The combat areas so defined may be made to apply to surface vessels or aircraft, or both." (22 U. S. C. A., sec. 245j–2 (a).)

The regulations of the Secretary of State thereunder provide that vessels, officers, and men of the United States Navy or Coast Guard may proceed into or through combat areas when under orders so to do, or in the course of their duty (Regulations 156.3 (f) 1; 156.4 (b), set out in annotation to the above-quoted statute). Since the Executive may prescribe exceptions, this statute would not prohibit the convoying of vessels to Great Britain by the naval forces. It is even possible that by specious argument similar to that outlined above, the conclusion that the power to make it lawful to enter combat areas under rules and regulations as may be prescribed, would authorize the prescription of the use of a convoy as a condition of the exception. The same fallacy, of course, would be present.

INSTANCES OF THE EMPLOYMENT OF ARMED FORCE BY THE UNITED STATES

Not including the more pretentious struggles in which the United States has from time to time been involved, there have been numerous instances where the armed forces were employed against other nations for various purposes. A study of such instances is found in Offutt, The Protection of Citizens Abroad by the Armed Forces of the United States (1928). The author states that the armed forces of the United States landed on foreign soil more than 100 times during the past 115 years. The volume referred to contains a study of these instances grouped in 76 sections, each pertaining to a separate incident or series of incidents. My rough grouping of these incidents indicates that precisely 50 percent, or 38, of these incidents were for the purpose of protecting American lives or property during actual or threatened rebellion or other disturbances. Upon 11 other occasions the ostensible reason was the same, but the result was that the United States intervened in the political affairs of the foreign country. Whether this intervention in the internal political affairs of the foreign country was by design or accident is not always clear.

There were 11 instances where the armed forces bombarded or burned towns of semicivilized people as retribution for piratical acts of one kind or another. There were 9 instances where landings were made to pursue pirates, in some of which pirate towns were burned. On 2 occasions we find the United States negotiating a treaty of amity and commerce or amicable settlement of claims with decks cleared for action and a substantial escort of armed men. Three times action has been taken to protect American citizens and their property from irresponsible local governmental authorities. Twice the occasion was to avenge insult or to force apology. In one instance it was the act of a naval officer only, which did not receive approval from his superiors and resulted in his suspension from the Navy. In the other of these instances, the congressional approval was obtained. Certain things stand out. As common to all of these acts, the real or ostensible motive for the action was to protect American citizens or their property either by preventing damage or by instilling a healthy respect. With but one exception this use of force has taken place against incomparably weaker nations. The exception referred to is the stamping out of piracy in the Caribbean by chasing the pirates ashore on Spanish islands, and burning their ships and towns. This situation was considered at length by Congress which, because of the international situation never authorized the President to take such action. While Congress was deliberating, the action was taken by naval officers acting on their own responsibility. (See Offutt, supra, pp. 151–158.)

Specific congressional approval was requested and obtained only in the Vera Cruz incident of April 1914. In that case, pursuant to a message from the President, delivered on April 20, Congress adopted a joint resolution stating that the President was justified in the use of armed forces in Mexico, but disclaiming any hostility to the people of Mexico or the purpose of making war on Mexico. This resolution was approved April 22, 1914. It appears that the armed forces landed the day before.

In only two of the instances was the use of convoy involved. One of these occasions was a Brazilian naval rebellion in 1894. The admiral commanding the United States forces refused to allow the insurgents belligerent rights and declared he would convoy American ships whose commanders wished to dock in Rio de Janeiro. Nothing came of the incident. During the struggle for Greek independence in the 1820's, the economic condition of the Greeks was such as to drive many of them to piracy, and a system of convoy was instituted. It appeared that some of the pirate craft flew the Greek flag and held irregularly obtained commissions from the Greek Government. During the course of time several of the pirate craft were captured or burned. The commanders of the convoying vessels were ordered to scrupulously maintain the neutrality of the United States, and apparently they succeeded, for no objections are noted. (See Offutt, supra, pp. 17–20.)

The authorities seem to agree that in international law it is appropriate to use armed force to protect the lives and property of citizens abroad (Borchard, Diplomatic Protection of Citizens Abroad (1919), p. 448, et seq.; Offutt, pages 1–4). At least this seems to be approved in those instances where no attempt is made to interfere in the internal political situation.

Both Professors Borchard, supra, at page 452, and Offutt, supra, at page 4, indicate that the President as Commander in Chief of the armed forces has sufficient authority to employ those forces in the protection of citizens and property abroad. The basis for the conclusion as set forth by Professor Borchard is that—

"The landing of forces in foreign countries for the purpose of protecting American citizens is not normally an act of war, or a declaration of war, although it might possibly lead to war."

This is probably true in those instances where the state employing the armed force is much more powerful than the state subjected to the indignity. The statement would simply not be true if a powerful state were the intended victim.

It is submitted that each situation must stand alone. If the action to be taken will not result in war, the President's authority as Commander in Chief may be sufficient. In view of the established practice denial of the existence of some power would be unprofitable. On the other hand, if war would be the probable result of the employment of armed forces, Congress must take action. Otherwise, the power conferred upon Congress to declare war is a lifeless and futile thing.

This seems to have been the practical test which has been applied. In the many instances where danger of war was minimal, the Executive has acted alone. But when Mexico, a stronger nation, was involved, congressional authorization was obtained. This authorization need not be a formal declaration—it may be authorization only to act in a manner that will probably involve the Nation in a war. This type of authorization was obtained in the Mexican War of 1846. Mexico had warned that annexation of Texas meant war. Texas was annexed and while the negotiations were pending the President had sent an army to protect the Texan boundary. The Mexicans attacked this force and thereafter Congress declared the war. The Spanish-American War was initiated in

the same manner. On April 20, 1898, Congress adopted a resolution that Spain should withdraw from Cuba, and authorized use by the President of the armed forces. On April 25, 1898, a formal declaration of war was enacted stating that war had existed since April 21. A somewhat different authority was found for the hostilities with the Barbary Pirates. In that case the President, by act of March 27, 1794, was authorized to acquire a navy because it was needed to protect commerce from the Algerine Corsairs. The President dispatched a fleet to protect commerce and the first battle was fought with no further authorization. Thereafter, there were congressional declarations that certain of the pirate nations had commenced predatory warfare and the President was authorized to use the armed forces.

The foregoing justifies the conclusion that it was not the intent of the makers of the Constitution to confer upon the President any power to commence a war, and that it was the intention to confer this power solely upon Congress; that the courts, in such instances as have been considered, have uniformly so declared; that Congress has by no existing law delegated to the President its function of deciding when the United States of its own volition should embark upon a war; that the constitutional practice has been to respect these distinctions; and, finally, that the convoying by the Navy of the United States of merchant vessels carrying munitions to Great Britain, being either war itself or inevitably leading to war, is an act which is beyond the power of the President.

Dated March 15, 1941.

War Veterans in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that there are 153 Members of the House of Representatives and 25 Members of the Senate who are war veterans. Out of this total of 178 Members of Congress, 5 served in the Spanish-American War and 173 in the World War. Two members of the House of Representatives served in both the Spanish-American and World War.

A further analysis reveals that a total of 141 Members served in the Army, 62 being commissioned and 79 enlisted men. A total of 31 saw service with the Navy, 9 being commissioned and 22 enlisted men. The Marine Corps is credited with 3 enlisted men.

As a result of soliciting information from each Member, the following list has been compiled and is inserted as a matter of information. It is to be noted that the term "W" denotes World War and "S" Spanish-American War service:

War veterans in Congress

SENATE

Adams, Alva B	W
Barbour, W. Warren	W
Brewster, Ralph O	W

War veterans in Congress—Continued

Brooks, C. Wayland	W
Burton, Harold H	W
Chandler, Albert B	W
Clark, Bennett Champ	W
Connally, Tom	S
Danaher, John A	W
Ellender, Allen J	W
Gillette, Guy M	W
Gurney, Chan	W
Hayden, Carl	W
Hill, Lister	W
Kilgore, Harley M	W
Lee, Josh	W
Lucas, Scott W	W
McFarland, Ernest W	W
Maloney, Francis	W
Mead, James M	W
Pepper, Claude	W
Russell, Richard B	W
Truman, Harry S	W
Tydings, Millard E	W
Wallgren, Mon C	W

HOUSE

Allen, Leo E. (Ill.)	W
Andersen, H. Carl (Minn.)	W
Andrews, Walter G	W
Arends, L. C	W
Baldwin, Joseph C	W
Barden, Graham A	W
Barnes, James M	W
Beam, Harry P	W
Boehne, John W., Jr	W
Bonner, Herbert C	W
Bradley, Fred (Mich.)	W
Bradley, Michael J. (Pa.)	W
Brooks, Overton	W
Bryson, Joseph R	W
Bulwinkle, Alfred L	W
Camp, A. Sidney	W
Canfield, Gordon	W
Carlson, Frank	W
Cartwright, Wilburn	W
Case, Francis H. (S. Dak.)	W
Casey, Joseph E. (Mass.)	W
Chiperfield, R. B	W
Clason, Charles R	W
Coffee, Harry B. (Nebr.)	W
Cole, William P., Jr. (Md.)	W
Colmer, William M	W
Connery, Lawrence J	W
Cooley, Harold D	W
Cooper, Jere	W
Courtney, Wirt	W
Cravens, Fadjo	W
Culkin, Francis D	W, S
Cunningham, Paul	W
Dewey, Charles S	W
Dirksen, Everett M	W
Downs, Le Roy D	W
Durham, Carl T	W
Dworshak, Henry C	W
Eaton, Charles A	W
Eberharter, Herman P	W
Edmiston, Andrew	W
Elston, Charles H	W
Engel, Albert J	W
Faddis, Charles I	W
Fenton, Ivor D	W
Fish, Hamilton	W
Flaherty, Thomas A	W
Flannery, J. Harold	W
Forand, Aime J	W
Gavagan, Joseph A	W
Gearhart, Bertrand W	W
Geyer, Lee E	W
Granger, Walter K	W
Grant, George M. (Ala.)	W
Gwynne, John W	W
Halleck, Charles A	W
Hancock, Clarence E	W
Harness, Forest A	W
Hartley, Fred A., Jr	W
Healey, Arthur D	W
Hess, William E	W
Hinshaw, Carl	W
Hook, Frank E	W
Hope, Clifford R	W

War veterans in Congress—Continued

Houston, John M	W
Hunter, John F	W
Imhoff, Lawrence E	W
Izac, Ed. V	W
Jarman, Pete	W
Jensen, Ben F	W
Johnson, Jed (Okla.)	W
Kean, Robert W	W
Kelly, Edward A	W
Kilburn, Clarence E	W
King, Samuel W	W
Kirwan, Michael J	W
Kunkel, John C	W
Lambertson, W. P	W
Landis, Gerald W	W
LeCompte, Karl M	W
Lewis, Lawrence	W
McCormack, John W	W
McGranery, James P	W
McGregor, J. Harry	W
McLaughlin, Charles F	W
McMillan, John L	W
Maas, Melvin J	W
Martin, Thomas E	P, W
Merritt, Matthew J	W
Meyer, John A	W
Michener, Earl C	S
Mott, James W	W
Nichols, Jack	W
Norrell, W. F	W
O'Brien, George D	W
O'Brien, Joseph J	W
O'Hara, Joseph P	W
Oliver, James C	W
O'Neal, Emmet	W
Paddock, George A	W
Patman, Wright	W
Patrick, Luther	W
Peterson, Hugh	W
Peterson, J. Hardin	W
Pheiffer, William T	W
Plauché, Vance	W
Ploeser, Walter C	W
Poage, William R	W
Powers, D. Lane	W
Rankin, John E	W
Reece, B. Carroll	W
Reed, Chauncey W	W
Rees, Edward H	W
Richards, James P	W
Robertson, A. Willis	W
Rodgers, Robert L	S
Russell, Sam M	W
Sanders, Jared Y., Jr	W
Sasscer, Lansdale G	W
Satterfield, Dave E., Jr	W
Scanlon, Thomas E	W
Scott, Hugh D., Jr	W
Scrugham, James G	W
Shafer, Paul W	W
Shanley, James A	W
Short, Dewey	W
Simpson, Richard M	W
Smith, Martin F	W
Somers, Andrew L	W
Sparkman, John J	W
Springer, Raymond S	W
Starnes, Joe	P, W
Stearns, Foster	W
Sullivan, John B	W
Sutphin, William H	W
Talle, Henry O	W
Tenerowicz, Rudolph G	W
Terry, David D	W
Thomas, Albert (Tex.)	W
Thomas, J. Parnell (N. J.)	W
Van Zandt, James E	W
Vincent, Beverly M	W
Vorys, John M	W
Wadsworth, James W	S
Walter, Francis E	W
Wigglesworth, Richard B	W
Winter, Thomas D	W
Wolcott, Jesse P	W
Woodruff, Roy O	S, W
Young, Stephen M	W
Youngdahl, Oscar	W
Zimmerman, Orville	W

Private Flying Operations and Accidents; Air Carrier Operations and Safety Record, 1936–40

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 31, 1941

LETTER AND DATA FROM THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very important statement of private flying operations and accidents, and air carrier operations and safety record for the period 1936–40. In view of general misapprehensions, I invite Senators to give particular attention to the statement. The data come from Mr. Robert H. Hinckley, Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, March 25, 1941.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: I am inclosing to you herewith three copies each of:

Private Flying Operations and Accidents.

Air Carrier Operations and Safety Record, 1936–40.

I hope you will look these over when you have an opportunity.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. HINCKLEY.

Private flying operations and accidents

[1940 figures are preliminary]

	January–June 1940	July–December 1940	1940	1939	1938	1937	1936	1935
Airplanes in operation	13, 859	16, 500	16, 500	12, 274	10, 718	10, 446	8, 849	8, 613
Miles flown	84, 400, 000	144, 600, 000	229, 000, 000	177, 868, 157	129, 359, 095	103, 196, 355	93, 320, 375	84, 755, 630
Number of fatal accidents	87	144	231	194	172	185	159	164
Miles flown per fatal accident	970, 115	1, 004, 167	991, 342	916, 846	752, 088	557, 818	586, 920	516, 803
Pilot fatalities	74	122	196	161	141	152	130	134
Dual or student fatalities	5	8	13	7	15	16	15	19
Passenger fatalities	52	86	138	139	115	112	119	100
Aircraft crew fatalities (other than pilot, dual pilot, or student)				4	1	2	6	4
Ground crew and third-party fatalities	4	5	9	3	3	1	2	5
Total fatalities	135	221	356	314	275	283	272	262
Miles flown per pilot fatality	1, 140, 540	1, 185, 246	1, 168, 367	1, 104, 771	917, 440	678, 923	717, 849	632, 505
Miles flown per passenger fatality	1, 623, 077	1, 681, 395	1, 659, 420	1, 279, 627	1, 124, 862	921, 396	784, 205	847, 556

Air carrier[1] operations and safety record, 1936–1940

[Index, 1936=100]

	Miles flown	Fatal accidents	Miles flown per fatal accident
1936	71, 211, 726	10	7, 121, 173
1937	74, 700, 237	6	12, 450, 040
1938	78, 197, 239	8	9, 774, 655
1939	90, 976, 063	3	30, 325, 354
1940	119, 482, 711	3	39, 827, 570

[1] Domestic, foreign, and territorial.

Union With Britain?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 31, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK DAILY NEWS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by the pen of Capt. Joe Patterson, editor and publisher of the New York Daily News, of New York City, entitled "Union With Britain?" This editorial was also carried in the Times-Herald, of Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Daily News]

UNION WITH BRITAIN?

We have long had great admiration for Lord Beaverbrook. He began as an energetic and increasingly successful operator of various business enterprises in Canada, then went to England to become proprietor of the London Daily Express. The Express has the largest newspaper circulation in the United Kingdom.

Nowadays, Lord Beaverbrook is England's driving, cursing, bottle-neck-smashing and optimistic Minister of Aircraft Production. We admire the results he is evidently getting in this work as much as we admire anything else he ever has done. His radio speech of Sunday added up to a report that Great Britain has turned its most dangerous corner as regards aircraft production, and now has enough planes in reserve to cope with any invasion attempt the German Luftwaffe may launch this spring.

Beaverbrook's outstanding characteristic always has been his patriotism. He always has placed the British Empire's interests ahead of anything else in his scale of values, and always has battled for those interests. Some years before the war, for example, he was for Empire preference—meaning as much trade within the Empire as possible, and as much freezing out of other nations, including the United States, as possible.

We admire such men, no matter what flag they sail under, and we think no nation can have too many of them for its own good. The United States might profitably do with a few more of such men.

PROPOSED REUNION

Well, Lord Beaverbrook wound up his Sunday speech with an expression of fervent hope that "perhaps we will be joined together again" after the war—meaning Great Britain and the United States. Like many another Englishman and numerous Americans, Lord Beaverbrook wants to see this onetime colony of Great Britain return to the mother country after this war.

Lord Beaverbrook being the lifelong British patriot that he is, we think he expects Great Britain to gain fully as much by such a merger as it would give up—if not more. And looking over comparative conditions in this country and the Empire at this time, we think he is right. The Empire would gain a lot from a reunion with the United States. But what would the United States gain?

The United States would take on several liabilities which we would hate to see it take on.

WOULD IT HELP US?

We have already, at the President's urging and by consent of Congress, decided to go all out to save Britain from defeat in this war. The old phrase, "short of war," incidentally, is doing a fade-out. The interventionist feeling now is that if we have to go to war to save Britain, that will be O. K.

Our feeling is that we will have to go to war if the ultimate aim is to defeat Germany decisively on the European Continent. Beaverbrook's swarms of planes can't do that.

Only a huge expeditionary force can, as things now are.

If we join the British Empire after the war, we shall take on an obligation to help Britain every time it gets into a European war. It got into this one by what we have impolitely, but we think correctly, called stumblebum diplomacy. Must we bail it out every time from now on?

By rejoining Britain, we would be going back to a mother country which still has monarchs and nobles—two things our ancestors hoped to get permanently rid of when they revolted in 1776–83. And we would be underwriting the idea that in order to do plenty of business with another nation it is desirable to own that nation—as Britain owns other nations, as Germany hopes to do, as Japan hopes to do. Such ownership is unnecessary, as shown by the fact that Japan is one of our best customers, though we don't own Japan and have little use for it politically or ethically.

We would also be taking on a lot of racial problems in South Africa, India, the Malay States, etc.—and we have never been notable for successful handling of even our own racial problems.

Anyway, all talk of British-American union should be postponed till after the war. As things look now, there is likely to be little love left at that time between England and America.

Strikes in Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on March 21, 1941, I wrote Mr. Sidney Hillman of the Office of Production Management the following letter:

MARCH 21, 1941.

Mr. SIDNEY HILLMAN,
Office of Production Management,
Social Security Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HILLMAN: Will you kindly send to me by Wednesday, March 26, the following information for the use of the Committee on Naval Affairs, House of Representatives:

1. A list of all companies which have experienced any strikes during the period September 8, 1939, to date, which affected construction or procurement for the Army or Navy or which otherwise affected the national-defense program.

2. The number of days each such strike lasted; the number of men affected in the strike; and the number of man-hours lost as a result of the strike.

3. Any information which you have or which you can secure from other agencies of the Government bearing on the cause of each such strike.

Thanking you for your kindness, I am

Yours very truly,

CARL VINSON, *Chairman.*

In answer to that letter, Mr. Eric Nicol, executive assistant to Mr. Hillman, sent me a statement entitled "Strikes in Defense Industries." The statement included a list of the companies, the number of employees involved in each strike, and where the data was available, the number of man-days lost as a result of each strike. The statement also included the date of the beginning and end of each such strike, the defense materials affected, and the labor organization or organizations involved. The following is a summary of information contained in this statement:

Number of strikes	73
Number of strikes solely involving unions affiliated with the C. I. O.	46
Number of strikes solely involving unions affiliated with A. F. of L.	21
Number of strikes involving both unions affiliated with C. I. O. and unions affiliated with A. F. of L.	6
Number of employees involved	146,291
Number of man-days of labor lost	1,209,577

The above figure on man-days of labor lost does not include all of the strikes listed, but only those where data on man-days lost was available. Strikes not included are—

Aluminum Co. of America, Edgewater, N. J.: March 12–22, 1941, 3,000 employees.

American Zinc Co., East St. Louis, Ill.: January 12 to March 6, 1941, 65 employees.

Bethlehem Steel Fabricating plant, Los Angeles, Calif.: March 10–20, 1941, 100 employees.

Condenser Corporation of America, South Plainfield, N. J.: March 10, 1941, to (pending), 2,400 employees.

Cowles Tool Co., Cleveland Ohio: February 27, 1941, to (pending), 110 employees.

Curtiss-Wright Corporation, Neville Island, Pa.: March 4–5, 1941, 900 employees.

Eaton Manufacturing Co., Saginaw, Mich.: November 14–16, 1940, 315 employees.

Fairmount Aluminum Co., Fairmount, W. Va.: March 10–18, 1941, 200 employees.

Harvill Die Casting Corporation, Los Angeles, Calif.: March 13–22, 1941, 350 employees.

Indiana Steel Products Co., Valparaiso, Ind.: March 17–24, 1941, 205 employees.

Ingalls Shipbuilding Corporation, Pascagoula, Miss.; March 10–14, 1941, 135 employees.

International Harvester Co., Rock Falls, Ill.: January 21, 1941, to (pending), 250 employees.

International Harvester Co., Chicago, Ill. (tractor plant): January 30, 1941, to (pending), 6,000 employees.

International Harvester Co., Chicago, Ill. (McCormick works): February 28, 1941, to (pending), 5,500 employees.

International Harvester Co., Richmond, Ind.: February 17, 1941, to (pending), 1,500 employees.

Phelps-Dodge Corporation, Bayway, N. J.: January 29 to February 1, 1941, 1,600 employees.

Ray Day Piston Corporation, Detroit, Mich.: March 10, 1941, to (pending), 110 employees.

Rifle range and training ground, Holly Ridge, N. C.: March 3–5, 1941, 5,000 employees.

Standard Tool Co., Cleveland, Ohio: January 27, 1941, to (pending), 600 employees.

Todd Drydocks, Galveston, Tex.: March 19–24, 1941, 2,000 employees.

Universal Cyclops Steel Corporation, Bridgeville, Pa.: February 1–5, 1941, 1,100 employees; February 4 to (pending), 1,100 employees.

Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio: January 28–31, 1941, 500 employees; March 4–21, 1941, 500 employees.

Bethlehem Steel Co., Bethlehem, Pa.: March 24, 1941, to (pending), 14,000 employees.

American Steel & Wire Co., Donora, Pa.: February 19–20, 1941, 950 employees.

Combustion Engineering, Chattanooga, Tenn.: February 21–March 6, 1941, 550 employees.

Consolidated Steel Co., Orange, Tex.: March 3–7, 1941, 350 employees.

Federal Motor Truck Co., Detroit, Mich.: March 7, 1941, to (pending), 550 employees.

Middleton Steel Co., Detroit, Mich.: March 10, 1941, to (pending), 1,700 employees.

Snoqualmie Falls Timber Co., Snoqualmie, Wash.: December 16, 1940, to (pending), 894 employees.

Watertown Arsenal, Watertown, Mass.: March 3–20, 1941, 100 employees.

Mr. Speaker, the following is the statement transmitted to me by Mr. Eric Nicol, executive assistant to Mr. Hillman, entitled "Strikes in Defense Industries":

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Alabama Drydock & Shipbuilding Corporation, Mobile, Ala.: International Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, C. I. O.; building destroyers for the Navy; 3,400 employees; 27,200 man-days idle. Began January 23; ended February 2. Issue: Wages.

Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee, Wis.: United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; company produces turbines for powder plants, wide variety of machine-tool items, and special items for the Navy; 7,500 employees; 337,500 man-days idle. Began January 22; end pending. Issue: Union relations.

Aluminum Co. of America, Edgewater, N. J.: Aluminum Workers of America, C. I. O.; company produces aluminum for aircraft; 3,000 employees.[1] Began March 12; ended March 22.[1] Issues: Sunday work, wages, and union relations.

Aluminum Co. of America, New Kensington, Pa.: Aluminum Workers of America, C. I. O.; company produces aluminum for aircraft; 7,000 employees; 28,160 man-days idle. Began November 22; ended November 28. Issue: Union relations.

American Car & Foundry Co., Berwick, Pa.: Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; tanks; 1,250 employees; 1,250 man-days idle (8 hours only). Began December 30; ended December 31. Issue: Grievances.

American Zinc Co., East St. Louis, Ill.: Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, C. I. O.; bricklayers and other building trades, A. F. of L.; construction of new smelter; 65 employees.[1] Began January 12; ended March 6.[1] Issue: Jurisdictional.

Babcock & Wilcox, Bayonne, N. J.: United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, C. I. O.; boilers for the Navy; 477 employees; 8,109 man-days idle. Began January 3; ended January 27. Issues: Wages and other terms of new agreement.

Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co., Sparrows Point, Md.: Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; boats for United States Maritime Commission; 3,000 employees; 20,100 man-days idle. Began September 20, ended October 7. Issue: Wages.

Bethlehem Steel Co., Lackawanna, N. Y.: Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; steel for defense contracts; 12,000 employees; 18,000 man-days idle. Began February 27, ended February 28. Issues: Union recognition and grievances.

Bethlehem Steel Co., Johnstown, Pa.: Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; steel for defense contracts; 800 employees. Began January 3, ended January 8; 3,200 man-days idle. Issue: Grievances. 1,064 employees. Began January 25, ended January 30; 8,512 man-days idle. Issue: Grievances.

Bethlehem Steel Fabricating Plant, Los Angeles, Calif.: Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; fabricating steel for aviation plants on west coast; 100 employees.[1] Began March 10, ended March 20.[1] Issues: Wages and union recognition.

Condenser Corporation of America (Cornell-Dubilier Corporation), South Plainfield, N. J.: International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, A. F. L.; condensers for Signal Corps contractors; 2,400 employees.[1] Began March 10, end pending.[1] Issue: Union recognition.

Cowles Tool Co., Cleveland, Ohio: United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.: tools for defense contractors; 110 employees.[1] Began February 27, end pending.[1] Issue: Wages and other terms of new agreement.

Crucible Steel Corporation: Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; steel for defense contracts; Syracuse, N. Y., 2,021 employees. Began November 19, ended November 22; 6,063 man-days idle. Issue: Grievances. Midland, Pa., 3,000 employees. Began November 13, ended November 17; 11,200 man-days idle. Issue: Grievances. Harrison, N. J., 925 employees. Began October 3, ended October 8; 4,625 man-days idle. Issue: Grievances. Pittsburgh, Pa., 1,000 employees. Began March 12, ended March 17. Issue: Grievances.

Curtiss-Wright Corporation, Neville Island, Pa. (Pittsburgh): Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; propellors for aircraft;

[1] Figures and dates are from records of Office of Production Management. These could not be checked by Bureau of Labor Statistics because of lack of adequate data.

800 employees.[1] Began March 4, ended March 5.[1] Issue: Union relations.

Fort Dix, Fort Dix, N. J.: Laborers Union and Carpenters, A. F. L.; cantonment construction; 600 employees; 1,200 man-days idle. Began November 8, ended November 11. Issue: Jurisdictional.

Eastern Malleable Iron Co., Wilmington, Del.: United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; subcontracts for trench mortars; 580 employees; 24,940 man-days idle. Began January 24, ended March 20. Issues: Union relations and wages.

Eaton Manufacturing Co., Saginaw, Mich.: United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; parts for aircraft manufacture; 315 employees.[1] Short stoppages on November 14 and 16. Issue: Jurisdictional.

Eaton Manufacturing Co., Saginaw, Mich.; Battle Creek, Mich.; Marshall, Mich.; Cleveland, Ohio: United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; 3,113 employees; 9,339 man-days idle. Began January 13, ended January 15. Issue: Union relations.

Foster-Wheeler Corporation, Carteret, N. J.: United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, C. I. O.; Navy boilers for ships; 800 employees; 5,600 man-days idle. Began February 12, ended February 20. Issues: Wages and holidays.

Fairmount Aluminum Co., Fairmount, W. Va.: Aluminum Workers of America, C. I. O.; aluminum; 200 employees.[1] Began March 10, ended March 18.[1] Issues: Vacations and grievances.

Harvill Diecasting Corporation, Los Angeles, Calif.: National Association of Diecasting Workers, C. I. O.; castings for west coast aircraft plants; 350 employees.[1] Began March 13, ended March 22.[1] Issue: Wages.

Indiana Steel Products Co., Valparaiso, Ind.: Blacksmiths, A. F. L., Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; machinists, A. F. L.; magnets used in Army contracts, for telephones, switchboards, and head sets; 205 employees.[1] Began March 17, ended March 24.[1] Issue: Jurisdictional.

Ingalls Shipbuilding Co., Pascagoula, Miss.: Boilermakers and machinists, A. F. L.; ships for the Navy; 84 employees; 672 man-days idle. Began January 15, ended January 24. Issue: Wages.

Ingalls Shipbuilding Corporation, Pascagoula, Miss.: Metal trades, A. F. L. (boilermakers versus iron workers); ships for the Navy; 135 employees.[1] Began March 10, ended March 14.[1] Issue: Jurisdictional.

International Harvester Co.: Farm Equipment Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; Rock Falls, Ill., 250 employees. Began January 21, end pending. Issue: Union recognition. Chicago, Ill.; tractor plant; 6,000 employees.[1] Began January 30, end pending. Issue: Union recognition. Chicago, Ill.; McCormick Works; 5,500 employees.[1] Began February 28, end pending. Issue: Union recognition. Richmond, Ind.; ammunition components and tractors; 1,500 employees.[1] Began February 17, end pending. Issue: Union recognition.

Jones & Laughlin, Aliquippa, Pa.: Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; steel for defense contractors; 565 employees; 4,741 man-days idle. Began October 15, ended October 30. Issue: Union recognition.

Kellogg Switchboard & Supply Co., Chicago, Ill.: International Association of Machinists, A. F. L.; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, A. F. L.; switchboards and other electrical equipment for Army and Navy; 400 employees; 18,800 man-days idle. Began June 26, ended August 31. Issue: Union recognition and unfair labor practices.

King Powder Co., Kings Mills, Ohio, and Kico, Ky.: United Mine Workers, C. I. O.; powder plants; 124 employees; 2,232 man-days idle. Began September 18, ended October 10. Issues: Wages and union recognition.

Motor Wheel Corporation, Lansing, Mich.: United Automobile Workers, A. F. L.; manufacture of shells; wheels for airplanes; 2,500 employees; 22,500 man-days idle. Began February 13, ended February 25. Issues: Union relations and wages.

Phelps-Dodge Corporation, Bayway, N. J.: United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, C. I. O.; small, direct defense contracts; copper for defense contracts; 1,600 employees.[1] Began January 28, ended February 1.[1] Issue: Union recognition.

Ray Day Piston Corporation, Detroit, Mich.: United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; aluminum castings and pistons for aircraft; 110 employees.[1] Began March 10, end pending.[1] Issue: Union recognition.

Rifle range and training ground, Holly Ridge, N. C.: Building Trades, A. F. L.; Army training grounds; 5,000 employees.[1] Began March 3, ended March 5.[1] Issue: Union relations.

Shipowners Association of the Pacific, San Francisco, Calif.: C. I. O. and A. F. L. maritime unions; shipment of defense materials; 1,330 employees; 61,510 man-days idle. Began October 5, ended December 4. Issue: Wages and working conditions.

Standard Tool Co., Cleveland, Ohio: United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; machine tools for firms holding defense contracts; 600 employees.[1] Began January 27, end pending.[1] Issues: Wages and other terms of new agreement.

Todd Drydocks, Galveston, Tex.: Carpenters, A. F. L.; shipbuilding and repairing facilities; 2,000 employees.[1] Began March 19, ended March 24.[1] Issue: Grievances

Universal Cyclops Steel Corporation, Bridgeville, Pa.: Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; special steel for fuses and airplane propellers; 1,100[1] employees. Began February 1, ended February 5. Issues: Grievances and wages. 1,100[1] employees. Began February 24, end pending. Issues: Grievances and wages.

Vanadium Corporation of America, Niagara Falls, N. Y.: United Mine Workers, C. I. O.; alloy for special steel used in defense products; 386 employees; 3,860 man-days idle. Began February 10, ended February 21. Issues: Wages and union relations.

Vanadium Corporation of America, Bridgeville, Pa.: Local industrial union, C. I. O.; alloy for special steel used in defense products; 274 employees; 4,650 man-days idle. Began February 10, end pending. Issue: Grievances (union agreement).

Vultee Aircraft, Inc., Downey, Calif.: United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; aircraft for Army Air Corps; 5,000 employees; 35,000 man-days idle. Began November 15, ended November 25. Issue: Wages.

Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio: Building Trades, A. F. L., electricians, C. I. O.; construction of a wind tunnel; 500 employees.[1] Began January 28, ended January 31.[1] Issue: Jurisdictional; 500 employees.[1] Began March 4, ended March 21.[1] Issue: Jurisdictional.

Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., Youngstown, Ohio: Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; basic steel for defense materials; 900 employees; 3,600 man-days idle. Began February 11, ended February 15. Issue: Grievances.

Bethlehem Steel Co., Bethlehem, Pa.: Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; basic steel for defense contractors; 14,000 employees.[1] Began March 24, end pending.[1] Issue: Union relations under N. L. R. B. order.

LESS IMPORTANT STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Aluminum Ore Co., East St. Louis, Ill.: Federal Labor Union, A. F. L.; bauxite for aluminum; 1,468 employees; 38,168 man-days idle. Began October 24, ended November 30. Issue: Wages.

American Steel & Wire Co., Donora, Pa.: Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; manufacturers of gun shells; 950 employees.[1] Began February 19, ended February 20.[1] Issue: Wage adjustments.

B. & H. Aircraft, Long Island City, N. Y.: United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; parts for aircraft manufacturers; 120 employees; 840 man-days idle. Began February 19, ended February 27. Issue: Union recognition.

Boomen & Rafter, Olympia, Wash.: International Woodworkers of America, C. I. O.; lumber for defense contractors; 2,500 employees; 29,760 man-days idle. Began September 30, ended October 24. Issue: Wages.

Century Electric Co., St. Louis, Mo.: United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, C. I. O.; manufacturers of generators; 1,269 employees; 97,188 man-days idle. Began June 19, ended October 25. Issues: Wages and other terms of new agreement.

Clark Equipment Co., Jackson, Mich.: United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; axle housings for Army trucks; 848 employees; 4,240 man-days idle. Began January 18, ended January 24. Issues: Wages and other terms of new agreement.

Combustion Engineering, Chattanooga, Tenn.: Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; essential chemicals for explosives; 550 employees.[1] Began February 21, ended March 6.[1] Issues: Union recognition, wages and other terms of new agreement.

Consolidated Steel Co., Orange, Tex.: Laborers union, A. F. L., steel for Navy boats; 350 employees. Began March 3, ended March 7.[1] Issues: Wages, union status.

Continental Steel Co., Kokomo, Ind.: Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; basic steel for Army and Navy; 500 employees; 5,000 man-days idle. Began January 24, ended February 6. Issue: Wages.

Dahlstrom Metallic Door Co., Jamestown, N. Y.: United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, C. I. O.; parts for airplane contractors; 369 employees; 8,856 man-days idle Began July 15, ended August 15. Issues: Wages and other terms of new agreement.

Farnsworth Television & Radio Corporation, Marion, Ind.: International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, A. F. L.; Signal Corps contracts; 610 employees; 3,050 man-days idle. Began February 17, ended February 22. Issues: Union status, wages.

Federal Motor Truck Co., Detroit, Mich.: United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; tractor trucks for Army; 550 employees.[1] Began March 7, pending.[1] Issue: Union status.

Hertner Electric Co., Cleveland, Ohio: United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, C. I. O.; generators for the Navy; 81 employees; 1,944 man-days idle. Began February 10, ended March 13. Issue: Wages and other terms of union agreement.

International Harvester Co., Fort Wayne, Ind.: United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; some trucks and experimental work; 2,800 employees; 25,600 man-days idle. Began December 31, ended January. Issues: Wages and other terms of union agreement.

Kawneer Manufacturing Co., Niles, Mich.; United Automobile Workers, A. F. L.; parts for aircraft companies; 530 employees; 29,720 man-days idle. Began July 15, ended September 28. Issues: Wages, union recognition, and other terms of new agreement.

[1] Figures and dates are from records of Office of Production Management. These could not be checked by Bureau of Labor Statistics because of lack of adequate data.

[1] Figures and dates are from records of Office of Production Management. These could not be checked by Bureau of Labor Statistics because of lack of adequate data.

[1] Figures and dates are from records of Office of Production Management. These could not be checked by Bureau of Labor Statistics because of lack of adequate data.

Lacy Manufacturing Corporation, Los Angeles, Calif.; Boilermakers, A. F. L.; Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; structural work on runways for shipbuilding company; 77 employees; 2,002 man-days idle. Began November 18, ended December 24. Issues: Union recognition, jurisdictional.

Lumber companies, Oregon and Washington, various places; Lumber and Sawmill Workers, A. F. L.; some lumber for cantonments; 12,000 employees; 161,659 man-days idle. Began October 1, ended December 16 (various dates). Issue: Wages.

Mesta Machine Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.; Building Trades, A. F. L.; plant addition to house gun-forging machinery; 20 employees; 260 man-days idle. Began January 23, ended February 10. Issue: Union recognition.

Midland Steel Co., Detroit, Mich.; United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; parts for Army trucks; 1,700 employees.[1] Began March 10, pending.[1] Issue: Wages.

Mountain State Steel Foundry, Parkersburg, W. Va.; Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; contracts with Rock Island Arsenal; 210 employees; 1,050 man-days idle. Began January 28, ended February 3. Issue: Union recognition.

National Supply Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; International Association of Machinists, A. F. L.; engines for small Navy boats; 222 employees; 2,220 man-days idle. Began February 18, ended March 3. Issues: Union recognition, wages.

Powell Valve Co., Cincinnati, Ohio; Steel Workers Organizing Committee, C. I. O.; Navy defense materials; 964 employees; 5,784 man-days idle. Began February 11, ended February 20. Issues: Wages, union status, and other terms of new agreement.

Snoqualmie Falls Timber Co., Snoqualmie, Wash.; Lumber and Sawmill Workers, A. F. L.; lumber for defense contracts; 894 employees.[1] Began December 16, pending. Issues: Union status, wages.

Truck drivers, New York City; Teamsters, A. F. L.; contracts for handling defense materials; 7,000 employees; 22,000 man-days idle. Began October 8, ended October 14. Issue: Vacations.

Truck drivers, Newark, N. J.; Teamsters, A. F. L.; contracts for handling defense materials; 1,500 employees; 22,900 man-days idle. Began October 1, ended October 20. Issue: Wages.

Tugboat operators, Grays Harbor, Wash.; Masters, Mates, and Pilots, A. F. L.; Inland Boatmen's Union, C. I. O.; shipments of lumber, 40 employees; 680 man-days idle. Began October 17, ended November 8. Issues: Wages and other terms of new agreement.

Walker Turner Co., Plainfield, N. J.; United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, C. I. O.; tools for aircraft, British orders; 175 employees; 4,200 man-days idle. Began October 23, ended November 26. Issue: Wages.

Watertown Arsenal, Watertown, Mass.; A. F. L. Building Trades; construction work; 100 employees.[1] Began March 3, ended March 10.[1] Issue: Jurisdictional.

S. S. White Dental Co., Staten Island, N. Y.; Federal Labor Union, A. F. L.; equipment for the Army; 565 employees; 6,420 man-days idle. Began March 3, ended March 18. Issue: Wages.

Wire and cable companies, New York, N. Y.; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, A. F. L.; Signal Corps contracts; 860 employees; 61,765 man-days idle. Began August 8, ended September 21 (3 companies); August 8, ended February 3 (1 company); August 8, pending (1 company). Issues: Wages, union status.

[1] Figures and dates are from records of Office of Production Management. These could not be checked by Bureau of Labor Statistics because of lack of adequate data.

Minnesota Legislature Endorses St. Lawrence Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the people of the State of Minnesota are wholeheartedly in favor of action by the present Congress on the St. Lawrence seaway project. They realize the great benefit which will come to the Midwest when ocean-going vessels will be permitted to travel in the Great Lakes area. For that reason they are supporting the legislation which will be before Congress and which will provide for ratification of the agreement between Canada and the United States authorizing the commencement of this project. The Legislature of the State of Minnesota passed a concurrent resolution which was approved by the Governor on March 28, 1941, and is as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take prompt action to ratify the agreement between the Government of the United States and the Dominion of Canada for the development of the St. Lawrence waterway

Whereas the duly accredited representatives of the Governments of the United States and the Dominion of Canada have now consummated and signed an agreement for the development of the St. Lawrence River, and the improvement of the water route of the Great Lakes, so as to permit the free passage of oceangoing ships from the Atlantic Ocean to the head of the Great Lakes and the heart of the Northwest and of the American Continent; and

Whereas the Presidents of the United States for more than 20 years have committed themselves to the promotion of this great development, and President Franklin D. Roosevelt has characterized the St. Lawrence project as of economic value comparable to the Panama Canal and as a vital necessity as a defense measure, and will now ask the Congress of the United States to ratify the agreement as made and provide funds for the completion of the work; and

Whereas the State of Minnesota, through its legislature, for more than 20 years has affirmed its continued support of this project, and through the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Commission of Minnesota has consistently endeavored to bring about the realization of the hopes of the people of this State for this development; and

Whereas we believe that the St. Lawrence project is a vital necessity for the development and stimulation of the resources of this State and of the entire Northwest, and has already been too long delayed, and that great economic advantages will result not only to Minnesota, but to the Nation from the improvement of this natural avenue of commerce: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the house of representatives (the senate concurring) commend and support the President of the United States in his steadfast, consistent, and energetic support of this project, and urge the Congress of the United States, without delay, to approve and ratify the agreement already concluded with the Dominion of Canada; to provide the necessary funds for the work, and thus promote the speedy completion of this great project as a vital, economic, and defense necessity.

That the secretary of state be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress of the State of Minnesota.

A Chance To Reciprocate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE DAILY MISSOULIAN, OF MISSOULA, MONT.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Missoulian, Missoula, Mont., for February 19, 1941:

[From the Daily Missoulian, Missoula, Mont., of February 19, 1941]

A CHANCE TO RECIPROCATE

For a good many years the collector of internal revenue for the district of Montana and his staff have given excellent service to the people of the State. For thousands they have made easier the preparation of income-tax returns and have assisted competently in solving problems puzzling not only individuals but business organizations. Their cooperation has been warmly appreciated.

And now, with a new tax set-up to struggle with, an opportunity to reciprocate arises. This year the taxpayers are able to assist the internal-revenue men. This they can do by starting earlier than ever on the preparation of their income-tax returns, so that these may be filed well before the March 15 deadline. This would prevent the possible last-minute swamping of the members of the collector's staff, with the probability that many taxpayers might not be able to get this important business attended to before the time limit had expired.

As you probably have read in the news columns, the collector will have deputies in the local zone office in the Federal building from February 27 to March 15. The duty of these men will be to assist taxpayers in preparing and filing their returns. We can make their work easier, can make it possible for all local taxpayers to finish this job well on time by taking our reports and our problems to them as early as we possibly can.

As you have noted, the Missoulian has printed considerable information of value to income-tax payers. Probably you have read these articles and will read those yet to be published. Yet we think it would be well to reproduce here a statement to the Missoulian from Collector Lewis Penwell, who, in a few

words, summarizes the entire situation, including reference to the taxpayers' opportunity to help the men of his staff:

"This is the income-tax-filing period. The Congress has changed the law so that the liability for filing a return is now based on gross income, and not on net income, as in former years. The base, also, has been changed, so that single persons whose gross income is $800 a year and married persons whose combined gross income is $2,000 a year must file a return. Last year this base was $1,000 for single persons and $2,500 for married persons.

"The exemptions have also been lowered to $800 for a single person and $2,000 for married persons. The credit of $400 for each dependent has not been changed.

"Last year in Montana there were filed some 42,000 income-tax returns. This year, partly because of these changes, we expect about a 50-percent increase. Most of this added number of taxpayers will consist of those who have never filed Federal returns before. They will need more help, and it will take more of the deputies' time.

"To meet this great increase the Bureau has augmented its force of field deputies. However, if the taxpayers wait, as many of them do, until the last minute to file their returns, congestion will result and many persons may not get their returns into the collector's offices by midnight March 15.

"Most taxpayers are able to prepare their returns without assistance, but in the event help is required, the collector's office in this district has a competent staff of deputies trained for this service. They are ready to help any taxpayer make out his return. This service is free. If you would urge the people to use it and to file their returns early, I am sure we can clear most of the income-tax returns promptly and easily and avoid an overwhelming last-minute rush.

"With the income tax the Government this year is also collecting the defense tax, which is an added reason for promptness in filing the return. This tax and the income tax may be paid in one lump sum or in four equal quarterly installments."

The Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

RESOLUTION OF CALIFORNIA STATE ASSEMBLY

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of California Assembly on Social Security Act:

Assembly Joint Resolution 2

Memorializing Congress to amend the Social Security Act with reference to the exempt income rights accorded persons receiving old-age assistance

Whereas it appears by section 2 (a) of the Social Security Act that this State on July 1, 1941, will be required in determining the need of applicants for old-age assistance, to take into consideration any other income and resources of such applicants; and

Whereas this requirement will force this State to amend section 2020 of the Welfare and Institutions Code to remove the right to certain exempt income now accorded to persons receiving old-age assistance; and

Whereas this action will force a reduction in the income of those persons receiving old age assistance who are still able to supplement assistance from the State by gardening or other light labor suited to their age; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to amend the Social Security Act to remove this requirement therefrom in order that this State may be eligible to receive further Federal funds for the financing of the Old Age Security Law of this State without the necessity of amending section 2020 thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States by the secretary of State.

Military Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

RESOLUTION BY NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York:

Whereas the President of the United States in a recent broadcast to the Nation has warned that conditions abroad and lack of military preparedness at home constitute a menace to the safety and security of the people of the United States; and

Whereas the Government of the United States is now intensively engaged in preparation for hemispheric, North American, and national defense, and Congress has appropriated large sums of money for this purpose; and

Whereas an adequate system of military highways over which troops, artillery, mechanized equipment, and other materials of war and supplies may be moved without interruption and with the utmost dispatch is one of the essentials of modern warfare and a necessity in the defense of this country; and

Whereas the State of New York, one of the most important of industrial, commercial, and financial areas of the United States and a section in which arms and munitions are being manufactured and concentrated in enormous quantities, and in which Army posts and military training camps are established, is located, in part, upon the eastern seaboard, while its northern frontiers bordering the Dominion of Canada, a country now at war, are entirely unfortified; and

Whereas, in the event that a hostile power or hostile powers should overcome Great Britain, its naval vessels and transports might steam through the Gulf of St. Lawrence, capture Quebec and Montreal, and, in the latter city, be in a position to strike at the rich industrial and commercial centers of the northeastern United States and hurl its armies upon Albany and New York; and

Whereas, should such events threaten, it would be of vital importance to the United States to be in a position to move troops and military equipment and supplies to our northern frontier in great numbers and in enormous quantities for use in repelling the invader; and

Whereas, if such a situation should develop, the safety and security of our entire country might depend upon the ability of our Government to move defense forces and equipment to our northern frontier, to the Atlantic seaboard, and between strategic points in the State with the utmost speed; and

Whereas our present highways are unsuited to the purpose because many of them are narrow and run through congested metropolitan districts and some are not sufficiently substantial to carry the fleets of heavy transport vehicles, motorized artillery, and other vehicles which would make use of them in the event of war; and

Whereas the joint legislative highway survey committee has recently made a report to this body in which its members assert that, with the present contemplated allocation of Federal funds, at least 4 years will be required to improve the 3,200 miles of New York State highways considered vital for defense purposes; and

Whereas it is the considered opinion of this body that New York State, because of its geographical location and because its entire northern frontier is unfortified, would be among the first to be invaded if Great Britain and Canada should be defeated and there should be an attempt by an aggressor nation or nations to conquer the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby petitions the Federal Government of the United States to make available from funds appropriated, or to be appropriated, for defense purposes a sum adequate to carry out a program of military highway construction to the extent considered imperative for the safety and security of the State and Nation; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That a copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Congress elected from the State of New York.

By order of the assembly.

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

In senate, March 18, 1941.
Concurred in without amendment.
By order of the senate.

WILLIAM S. KING,
Clerk.

Declaration of Independence and Monroe Doctrine Discarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD,

I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of March 29, 1941:

[From The Saturday Evening Post of March 29, 1941]

TOWARD THE UNKNOWN

Looking back to say farewell. Misgivings are forbidden, but let us not on that account be mistaken about what has happened. It is not a new chapter of American history that now opens. It is a new book with a new theme. The story that began with the Declaration of Independence is finished.

We have broken with our past. We have thrown away our New World, our splendid isolation, our geographical advantage of three to one against all aggressors, our separate political religion. There is no longer a New World, or an Old World, but now one world in which the American people have been cast for a part they will have to learn as they go along.

There is no longer a Monroe Doctrine. In place of it there is an American internationalism. We do not yet know what that means.

From now on there is for us no foreign war. Any war anywhere in the world is our war, provided only there is an aggressor to be destroyed, a democracy to be saved, or an area of freedom to be defended.

Our ideas of aggressor, democracy, and freedom are emotionally clear. Unfortunately, as we go forward in this crusade we shall encounter many moral and logical contradictions. These we must learn to resolve. Every Hitler we must crush. That has been made definite. But every Stalin too? For practical and strategic reasons we have just now relieved Stalin of our moral disapproval. That does not necessarily mean that we have forgotten Finland, it does not mean that we shall not in time restore to her that which was her own. It does show how liable we are to be misunderstood and how easy it will be for the world to say that our moral indignation is selective.

It is too soon to be either critical or analytical. Hardly the first page of the new book has been written. What will follow we do not know. How could we? There was never in all human history a story like it. We began it unconsciously. That is to say, we did not know we were doing it. Indeed, we kept saying we were not. This fact, no doubt, will give the historian some trouble. It may restore him to his faith in a mysterious agency that moves people unawares; it may even wreck the wretched theory of pure economic determinism in human affairs.

In August last year the British Prime Minister, speaking of the 50 destroyers he had got from the United States Navy, said to the House of Commons, "Undoubtedly this process means that these two great organizations of the English-speaking democracies, the British Empire and the United States, will have to be somewhat mixed up together in some of their affairs for mutual and general advantage. * * * No one can stop it. Like the Mississippi, it just keeps rolling along."

The American people took this to be rhetoric. They did not know the British Government was announcing American foreign policy.

In October, at Philadelphia, the President of the United States said, "I give to you and to the people of this country this most solemn assurance: There is no secret treaty, no secret obligation, no secret commitment, no secret understanding in any shape or form, direct or indirect, with any other government, or any other nation in any part of the world—no such secrecy that might or could in any shape involve this Nation in any war or for any other purpose. Is that clear?"

He said, "The United States today is at peace and is going to remain at peace."

He said, one rainy day at New Haven, of the draft, "It is just for the same reason that you have got umbrellas up today, so as not to get wet."

And on October 24 he said, "I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party: 'We will not participate in foreign wars'."

On that platform he was elected to a third term. On election day the American people were writing the last line in the old book and did not know it.

Three months later the President announced, "We are committed to the proposition that principles of morality and considerations for our own security will never permit us to acquiesce in a peace dictated by aggressors and sponsored by appeasers."

"We" were the people, suddenly staring at the fact that we had assumed ultimate and unlimited liability—moral, physical, and financial—for the outcome of war on three continents, for the survival of the British Empire, and for the utter destruction of Hitler. Anything less or else would be the first American defeat.

How had we arrived there?

Not by any act of conscious will on the part of the American people, but by will of government. If you say, therefore, the people have lost control of government and such is the end of the American system, that may or may not be true, but you are reading from the old book. Destiny is not legal.

How the people would have voted if the question of taking over war on three continents had been put to them will never be known. The question was not put to them.

We know what the people did vote for. They voted for a President who stood upon his platform saying, "We will not participate in foreign wars." But there, again, make sure to remember which book you are in. Words in the old book were simply understood. In the new book that cannot be so. Why it cannot be so belongs to another essay. Anyhow, what is a foreign war? In that instant when you say, or even think, "This is our war too," it is no longer a foreign war, no matter what you said it was yesterday.

We have said it. Standing in the middle of the world we are saying, "Here is the arsenal of all democracy," meaning by a democracy any nation that will employ our weapons against Hitler. That makes the battle of Britain our battle, too, and the battle of Greece our battle, and the battle of the Mediterranean our battle; and everywhere in the world it is the London-Washington Axis against the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo Axis. Where, then, is a foreign war, strictly speaking?

What if our axis should break? What if Great Britain should fail in spite of us? That could happen. We should then have Hitler on one side and his Japanese partner on the other side, neither of whom has attacked us, both of whom we have challenged, one of them to mortal combat.

For perilous isolation on those terms we are not prepared. Yet we have accepted that risk. It was not a realistic thing to do. You would expect schoolboys fighting on the sandlot to know better statesmanship. But a crusade is above statesmanship. So is any great transaction of the human spirit. Essentially it is heedless of danger and romantic, creating its own political realities. Everything about it is improbable.

But if we speak of the improbable, what could have been more improbable than the story in the first book? Was there ever a more reckless political deed than the Declaration of Independence? Or an outcome more unpredictable than that a few ragged, undisciplined farmers with muskets, and some solitary mountaineers with rifles, should expel the trained armies of Europe from this land in order to create what was not yet imagined and had not even a name—the United States of America? Well, no more can we imagine the end of what now is beginning, nor has it any name. We cannot see the shape of the world to come, not dimly. It is not permitted. We know for sure only that neither the world that was our own nor that world which is round will ever be the same again.

At the beginning of the blitzkrieg, with its revelation of the frightfulness of modern technology turned in full use to the business of killing and conquest, the Post said it was this country against Hitler—simply that, because no other country possessed the strength, the skill, and the resources to create in defense of peace a weapon power equal to this new power of aggression in the hands of a war-loving people. We have never modified that conviction. We say it still.

Our quarrel with the interventionists has been upon other grounds.

Firstly, upon grounds of military and political sagacity, that by taking the war to Hitler we forgo our natural geographical advantage, that the status of a nonfighting belligerent exists only in puerile delusion, that as we strip the American arsenal to put weapons in the hands of others we weaken our own defense, and that by all of this we involve our fate with cards of war that might at any moment be played out of our hands.

Secondly, we have quarreled with them on the ground that they stultify the American motive. They say the battle of Britain is our battle, too; they say that to save ourselves we must save Great Britain, and then they say that by making America the arsenal we may ourselves avoid the battlefield, using the bodies of the British as a bulwark to save the body of every American mother's son. If we had ever believed that, or felt it, we should have been ashamed to say it. We never knew, on the other hand, a true isolationist who was not willing to fight and die for it.

And thirdly, we quarrel with the interventionists still, on the ground that they conceal, or have not themselves the courage to face, what it means for this country not merely to take over the war, but in doing that to assume a role in which it must either go on and on until it has gained moral hegemony of the whole world—or fail.

There is the truth; and there is a sense of grandeur in it. The battle of Britain becomes but a terrible episode. The London-Washington axis is a pontoon. This is our walk with destiny, toward an end we cannot see, and if we arrive we shall have walked most of the way alone, as England did before us.

Opposing Strikes in National-Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM DALLAS MORNING NEWS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the American people are greatly concerned at the delay in our national-

defense program on account of strikes in many plants now engaged in the manufacture of munitions and other products vitally necessary for our national defense.

I am hoping that some steps may shortly be taken to eliminate these delays, either through legislation or through Executive orders, or by the voluntary concent and cooperation of the leaders of the two major labor organizations.

Time is of the essence in our defense program, and there is no subject of greater importance at this time.

The jurisdictional strikes during this crisis seem to me indefensible, and there appeared in the Dallas Morning News of March 24 an editorial which, in a calm and dispassionate manner, discusses this issue, and under leave granted, I submit herewith this editorial:

[From the Dallas Morning News of March 24, 1941]

FEATHER FOR FEDERATION

Nothing in the whole disputed field of labor relationship calls for less sympathy from the general public than the jurisdictional strike during a war crisis. It amounts to placing a private quarrel before the safety of the Nation. So while the cause of the Wright Field stoppage had no merit, the public will heartily approve the sportsmanship of the American Federation of Labor unionists who called off the strike without winning a point for which under normal conditions they would have fought to the bitter end.

The 4 C. I. O. electricians, against whose presence the 400 Federation members struck, may have served the country themselves, however, by winning the generous concession from their bitter rivals. For what leg will C. I. O. majorities have upon which to stand themselves in similar jurisdictional disputes?

Not here, not in many places in America is there any disposition to question the right to strike against intolerable working conditions or for a fair return for labor. Congress, which has already moved to force industry to produce for necessary defense, fails the country if it does not insist that labor shall not interpose petty grievances in the way of the swift industrialization of that defense.

Reclamation of Strategic Defense Materials From Waste Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1941

LETTER OF MISS HELEN E. DOWNS TO GOVERNOR BRICKER, OF OHIO

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, now that a shortage of a number of strategic defense materials is impending, the attention of many students of the situation is being turned to the reclamation of such materials from waste products.

In my district one of our fine ladies long ago perceived that which was coming and under date of October 24, 1940, wrote our Ohio Governor, Hon. John W. Bricker, making a suggestion as to how the women of America could assist the national-defense program. The letter to Governor Bricker was written by Miss Helen E. Downs of 231 East Maple Street, North Lewisburg, Ohio.

I have the honor and the pleasure of herewith, including the letter in this address, that the Government and the people of our country may have the benefit of the suggestions contained therein.

NORTH LEWISBURG, OHIO, *October 24, 1940.*

Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,

Governor of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.

HONORABLE SIR: It has been asked through the American press that tin (such as empty tins) be saved, yet I notice that this request is being disregarded in my community.

Under the blockade England was cut off from supplies of tin, aluminum, and hospital necessities. When the emergency arose the amount available was inadequate.

Would it not be possible for the people of this country to carry out a plan of conservation of the above-named items with as much enthusiasm and organization as it expressed in the work of the Red Cross, the tuberculosis (Christmas seal) work, and other relief programs?

I believe that if this work was begun now, and executed calmly and with determination, as a public service, very little expense would be involved such as would undoubtedly occur during the excitement of an emergency.

Here is a brief outline of my purpose:

1. To divide each State into districts. Each district being composed of one county. Subdivisions of each district being its natural townships with unit leaders at head of each township.

2. To see that these tins and aluminum pieces are sorted, separated (labels removed), and placed in local sheltered base (unused building) which is rent-free.

3. To see that each truckload of tin and aluminum be weighed so that a record of the amount of flattened metal may be ascertained.

4. To see that flatteners operated at minimum expense be placed, one in each township, at local base.

5. To ask that each district and its subdivisions collect also, hospital supplies—such as slightly worn bed linens—from homes, hotels, rooming houses, etc., to be sterilized, torn into bandages, rolled, sealed, and conserved for war-emergency needs.

6. To ask the Government to set a "rag picker's" price on all aluminum that could be collected by vendors and unemployed from city dump heaps, etc. The price, depending upon the percent of pure metal derived from the redemption of old utensils.

7. To ask if the work of this plan could not be carried on by the American Legion and the Auxiliary of its order.

The fifth section of this plan, i. e., the hospital supplies, is based upon the fact that in a recent survey of wars hospital supplies never were adequate. During the World War bandages were removed from the dead and sterilized for new wounds. The same thing is happening in Europe today.

Most hospitals utilize their worn bed linens to a financial advantage. If this same idea were carried out by State over the scope of a nation, think what a saving of Government money would be had when or if an emergency such as war would occur.

The quickest and most efficient way to start the above-suggested program would be to circulate through the school system direct to the individual family mimeographed circulars telling what is desired, where to bring it, designating local sheltered base. At the same time circulars could be passed to all institutions other than schools.

I do not wish to incite war propaganda. I do wish to help in a defense program. The town where I live knows nothing of the fact that I have worked since August on this plan. But I have made a covert invoice of the sentiment of the people of this county. I find that everyone wants to help toward defense. The trustees of my immediate township have promised the use of their trucks to haul flattened metals to county seat or wherever the Government demands within county to nearest foundry. The local hospitals have given me their promise that if this work is started they will do all the sterilization work free of charge, doing it at their leisure. The Red Cross (county) has promised their cooperation and whole-hearted support. Some of the towns have even suggested their own particular way of flattening, etc. to save a bit more because very little expense can enter into a salvaging business. The most of the expense would be gasoline for haulage and flattening. One small city said they had thought of using their big city roller, which would minimize expense to a degree.

In my immediate county we have one of the largest paper factories in the Middle West. I know I can get all the paper for circulars I need (defective sheets), free of charge. Each sheet will make two circulars. I will enclose my suggestion of what each circular might be like. With a following of an enthusiastic, patriotic Nation, I believe this work, under responsible American Legion unit and district leaders, could be successfully conducted without the outlay of much Federal money. Hitler did this 5 years before he started this war. We are a wasteful nation. Let us not wait for a last-minute scramble. The American Legion are our civilian guard. They are quick, alert, and still soldiers . Their wives are the busiest organization for the common good of their respective communities. Furthermore, they are now the parents of soldiers as well. And I, myself, lost my own brother as a result of the World War. I wish to enlist my services.

May I kindly have your reaction to the above plan when the election is over and you are not quite so busy?

Most respectfully,

Miss HELEN E. DOWNS.

DEFEND AMERICA BY SAVING—YOUR HELP IS NEEDED

Tin

It is requested by the United States Government that all new empty tin cans or good tin of any kind be saved in a sheltered place until ready to discard. Then take to your local township base (Doeville). All labels or paper must be removed from cans or tin before sending.

Aluminum

Save all old and unused aluminum utensils. The Government is offering ------ cents per hundred pounds to vendors or unemployed who can gather old aluminum from city dump heaps, etc. Aluminum must be delivered at local township base separately from tin.

Worn Sheets, Pillow Slips

Emergency hospital supplies, such as worn sheets and pillow slips or other white cotton materials suitable for bandages are needed. Take your contribution to local township base.

The Forgotten Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR D. HEALEY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

POEM BY A. C. TAPLEY

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Mr. A. C. Tapley, member of the Middlesex Post, No. 2, Medford Mass., World War Veterans of the United States merchant marine:

THE FORGOTTEN MAN

(By A. C. Tapley)

To-night as my thoughts turn backward, comparing the old with the new,
There is many a somber reflection as the World War comes into view,
Soon after the war's declaration, regardless of creed or craft,
All males between certain ages must register then for the draft.

I didn't claim any exemption as I looked ahead to the day.
And when listing had been completed my name was in class 1A,
So I waited a time with patience hoping to get a call,
'Til spring had turned to summer and summer had turned to fall.

All the bands were turned to music with a patriotic air,
There were strains of Tipperary, Parlez-vous, and Over There,
The boys were dressing in khaki, some were dressed in blue,
I tried to enlist in the Army, I tried the Navy too,
I couldn't make any progress as all that they would say
You'll have to wait 'til your number is called, you're in class 1A.

If my memory serves me correctly there appeared ('bout that time on the scene)
Many posters and much in the papers extolling the merchant marine.
President Wilson had said in his message, to keep this the land of the free,
No greater service could any man give than answer the call of the sea.

He said in words of eloquence in accents loud and clear,
Enlist, young man, that the world may be safe for many a year.
Our Navy is rated the finest, our Army is one of the best,
But we must have ships and seamen to land them safely at Brest.

Select from the best in the Nation fifty thousand men,
Cream of the population and each a citizen,
Young men if you enter this service you will be doing your bit,
We want only men who are able and they must be physically fit,
To those who enlist in this service 'tis absolutely assured
We will grant a release, if accepted, a release from your local board.

So I jacked my job for the life of a gob and bid my friends adieu,
I had to sign on the dotted line till my fingers were askew.
I was directed to get some clothing at the quartermaster's store
And was given a list with orders to get that and nothing more,
Regarding the style of the outfit I'd best have little to say
For I have a faint recollection the neckerchief fitted O. K.

I then crossed Boston Harbor to join the U. S. *Meade*,
There I would get my training, there I would get my feed,
I trotted up the gangplank and landed on the deck,
Then I was given a number and signed again, by heck.

There were boys from Alabama to the point Monomoy,
There were others from Kentucky where the blue grass waves with joy,

One man came down from Sitka town, they came from Kalamazoo,
They also came from Brooklin, Maine, and many from St. Lou,
They came from the shade of Bunker Hill to Frisco's Golden Gate.
From city, town, and hamlet, they came from every State.

They had heard the President's message, and answered the call of the sea,
Now the world would be safer, safe for democracy.
There were plenty of regulations to which we must abide,
We were taught to peel potatoes and we learned about the tide,
We were taught to do our duty, regardless of the station,
We must get supplies to Europe, we were in for the duration.

When we had finished our training those who could pass the test
Were then shipped out with orders to do their best.
To an unknown destination they shipped us down the bay,
Perhaps we would go to London or it might be Mandalay.
We had no choice in the matter, 'twas the will of Uncle Sam.
He could order one to Alaska, another to Amsterdam.

The ships were painted in colors of every design and hue,
Which offered little resistance when mines came tearing thru.
Often we were at the mercy of a hard and ruthless foe,
Ever waiting neath the surface was the dreaded torpedo,
For of all the horrors lurking in the murky depths unseen,
I believe the vilest monster is the German submarine.
Many a ship is missing that sailed across the blue,
They were followed by others, the lucky ones got thru.

After the war was over, after our work was done,
We were discharged with honor and sent home one by one.
After the war was over many heart has yearned,
For at rest on the bed of the ocean is the ship that never returned.
After the war was over at the final call of the roll,
There was many a shipmate missing (his body but not his soul)
Many a mate was missing and the brine has bleached his bones
In a grave that's known to God alone in the locker of Davy Jones.

After the war was over and readjustment came,
Veterans of other branches were readily helped to fame,
The merchant marines were excluded (much to the Nation's shame),
They said tho your face looks familiar, I don't recall the name.
We all remember your service in helping to conquer the Hun,
But you must get recognition from the men in Washington.

Now that the war is over for more than a score of years,
And many a gob has a shiny knob, or gray above the ears,
Any many a tar has crossed the bar (they may be lucky chaps),
But there was no sign of Old Glory, neither a sound of taps.
Should you scale the loftiest mountain, as far as the eye could span,
There would not be a better example of the real forgotten man.

Communist Leadership in C. I. O. Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN DIES
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that Communists have obtained such a stranglehold on many of the unions in the C. I. O. that it is now beyond the power of Mr. Philip Murray or anyone else in the organization's leadership to do anything about the matter. Of one other thing we may be certain, and that has to do with the attitude of the public toward this issue: The American people will not long tolerate the interference of foreign agents, whether they operate in labor unions or elsewhere, with the program of national defense which has the support of the overwhelming majority of our people.

Our committee's records show that a very large proportion of the leadership in many of th C. I. O. unions is a leadership which owes its allegiance to Moscow. The leadership in the C. I. O. to which I refer is one which obediently follows the Moscow "line" in the great issues before the American people. Despite the predicament in which this situation may place Mr. Murray and others in the C. I. O., the American people are no more in favor of appeasing one dictator than they are in favor of appeasing another. The continued toleration of Communists in positions of C. I. O. leadership is a policy of appeasement which has, I am convinced, the emphatic condemnation of the American people.

Today, I submit a list of leaders in C. I. O. unions who have records of following the Communist Party "line" on important questions of national defense. We, as a committee investigating un-American activities, are not concerned with the legitimate problems of labor unions. We are concerned with following the trails of Communists

wherever those trails lead us. It is not our committee's fault that Communists have penetrated the C. I. O. unions, nor is it our committee's fault that non-Communists in the C. I. O. have tolerated this Communist penetration. No abusive retort that we are anti-labor is going to deter us from following the Communist trail into any place where it may lead.

The following list of C. I. O. leaders is made up of persons who are either card-holding members of the Communist Party or fellow travelers whose records show that they follow the party "line" in supporting the party's front organizations:

Meyer Adelman, Steel Workers Organizing Committee.

Sonia Baltrun, Textile Workers Organizing Committee.

Jesse Barnes, State, County, and Municipal Workers of America.

Leonard Berg, Eau Claire (Wis.) Industrial Union Council.

Lewis Alan Berne, Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians.

Leon W. Berney, United Office and Professional Workers of America.

Meyer Bernstein, Kiska Valley (Pa.) Industrial Union Council.

Carl Bersing, Philadelphia Industrial Union Council.

William Black, Aluminum Workers of America.

Harry Block, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America.

Daniel J. Boyle, International Fur and Leather Workers Union.

Harry R. Bridges, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Association.

Walter J. Burke, Wisconsin State Industrial Union Council.

Samuel Burt, International Fur and Leather Workers Union.

Charles Cain, Maine State Industrial Union Council.

Joseph Cannon, Lower Bucks County (Pa.) Industrial Union Council.

W. J. Carney, New Jersey State Industrial Union Council.

Joseph Chandler, Allegheny Valley (Pa.) Industrial Union Council.

Harold Christoffel, Milwaukee County (Wis.) Industrial Union Council.

Philip M. Connelly, Los Angeles Industrial Union Coucil.

Emil Costello, Wisconsin State Industrial Union Council.

Robert L. Cruden, member of committee on press and publicity in the 1940 C. I. O. convention.

Joseph Curran, National Maritime Union.

Harry Deck, Zeigler (Ill.) Industrial Union Council.

Eugene V. Dennett, Washington State Industrial Union Council.

Ralph Dawson, Los Angeles Industrial Union Council.

Forest M. Dickenson, Akron (Ohio) Industrial Union Council.

Jonathan Eddy, American Newspaper Guild.

Kenneth Eggert, National Die Casters Association.

Julius Emspak, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers.

Frank Farrell, United Shoe Workers of America.

Abe Feinglass, International Fur and Leather Workers Union.

Elmer Felhaber, Franklin County, Ohio, Industrial Union Council.

L. H. Fenton, International Woodworkers of America.

Abram Flaxer, State, County, and Municipal Workers of America.

Nicholas Fontecchio, Fox Valley, Ill., Industrial Union Council.

James A. Gaynor, Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians.

Luther German, Vermilion County, Ill., Industrial Union Council.

Dewitt Gilpin, Farm Equipment Workers Organizing Committee.

Angela Gizzi, United Office and Professional Workers of America.

Ben Gold, International Fur and Leather Workers Union.

Louis Goldblatt, California State Industrial Union Council.

Leonard H. Goldsmith, Newark, N. J., Industrial Union Council.

Ben Gudes, United Retail and Wholesale Employees of America.

Powers Hapgood, United Shoe Workers of America.

Don Harris, United Packinghouse Workers of America.

Arthur Hartman, Cincinnati Industrial Union Council.

John Harvey, International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers.

Allan Haywood, New York State Industrial Union Council.

Donald Henderson, United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing and Allied Workers of America.

Ralph Hetzel, United Office and Professional Workers of America.

Austin Hogan, Transport Workers Union.

Michael Howard, United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing and Allied Workers of America.

Clarence Irwin, Shenango (Pa.) Industrial Union Council.

Henry Johnson, United Packinghouse Workers of America.

Joseph Jurich, International Union of Fishermen's and Allied Workers of America.

Milton Kaufman, American Newspaper Guild.

Joseph Kehoe, American Communications Association.

George Kleinman, member of Committee on Press and Publicity in 1940 C. I. O. convention.

George Lane, Bellingham (Wash.) Industrial Union Council.

Richard Shelton Law, Aberdeen (Wash.) Industrial Union Council.

John C. Lawson, Quarry Workers International Union of North America.

Alice Liveright, United Office and Professional Workers of America.

Douglas MacMahon, Transport Workers Union.

James J. Matles, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America.

Timothy J. McCormick, United Truck Operators.

Mary Lucile McGorkey, State, County, and Municipal Workers of America.

Frank R. McGrath, United Shoe Workers of America.

Patrick R. McGraw, Duluth Industrial Union Council.

Howard McKenzie, National Maritime Union.

Lewis Merrill, United Office and Professional Workers of America.

Louis H. Michener, United Automobile Workers of America.

Saul Mills, Greater New York Industrial Union Council.

Samuel Mindel, International Fur and Leather Workers Union.

William Mitch, Alabama State Industrial Union Council.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *March 27, 1941.*

Congressman MARTIN DIES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Since I have shown your charges against the steel workers' organizing committee to be distorted and without foundation, you are now attempting to distort the facts as regards the C. I. O. in similar fashion. Your activities are truly subversive, since you are trying to create confusion and hatred in the Nation through your labor baiting. You are obviously attempting to undermine the morale of the people. It seems strangely significant that your groundless charges against the C. I. O. always come at a time when they can do the most harm. Obviously you are aware of the negotiations now being conducted with the United States Steel Corporation and with the coal operators. I also recall your moving into Chicago last year at exactly the same time that a C. I. O. union was engaged in a Labor Board election at the Armour & Co. plants. Inasmuch as the newspapers say you did not extend me the courtesy of reading my previous telegram to the House, but merely inserted it in the RECORD, I am led to two conclusions—that further communication with you is useless and that your activities at the present time in attacking C. I. O. is just a further effort to grab the headlines and thereby advertise your availability for another series of lectures throughout the Nation, which, I understand, have been very lucrative. I presume it is useless for me to request that you read this telegram to the House.

PHILIP MURRAY,
President,
Congress of Industrial Organizations.

COPY OF CHAIRMAN MARTIN DIES' LETTER TO PHILIP MURRAY, PRESIDENT OF THE CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATION

MARCH 28, 1941.

PHILIP MURRAY,
President, Congress of Industrial
Organization, Pittsburgh, Pa.:

In my telegram to you I asked you a plain and direct question whether or not the C. I. O. is ready and willing to expel from its ranks and from positions of leadership members of the Communist Party. I named some of your leaders and members of your executive board whose Communist affiliatior has been clearly established. You did not give me a plain and unequivocal answer because you dare no. do so. You are unwilling or unable to rid your organization of Communist influences which are doing irreparable damage to the majority of your members who are not Communists and to the Nation as a whole. Not being able to meet the issue squarely and openly you resort to the tactics of abuse and misrepresentation and counter charge. This deceives no one. For 3 years I have tried to

get your organization to expel the Communists who are the greatest enemies of labor in any country. For 3 years you have sidestepped the issue. If your organization is not controlled by Communist influences you will immediately announce a policy of expelling all Communists from your ranks and from positions of leadership and you will follow up this policy of announcement with a wholesale house cleaning.

The laboring people, organized and unorganized, have more at stake in the defeat of Hitler and Stalin than any other group in our Nation. Communists and Nazis are now working in active cooperation throughout the world and in the United States to destroy the rights of labor. In America they are seeking to sabotage our national defense to insure a Hitler victory. Under these circumstances how can your organization in the name of labor continue your unnatural and stupid alliance with the "communazi" enemies of labor and democracy. The issue is squarely before you. The future of the laboring people in your organization depends upon the way in which you meet the issue.

I have already called your attention to the fact that prominent Communist Party members occupy leading positions in your organization and its constituent unions. These persons are publicly-avowed members of the Party. I refer to such men as the following: Donald Henderson, head of the United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing and Allied Workers of America, who was a member of the Committee on Appeals in the 1938 Convention of the C. I. O.; Ben Gold, head of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union, who was a member of the committee on rules and order of business in the 1938 convention of the C. I. O.; Marcel Scherer, national organizer for the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians, who was a delegate to the 1938 convention of the C. I. O.; Kenneth Eggert, strike leader of the National Association of Die Casters, and formerly section organizer for the Communist Party in Toledo, Ohio; and Ralph Dawson, head of the Los Angeles C. I. O. Industrial Council, and communist of public record.

I call your attention to still other communists of public record who hold positions of leadership in the C. I. O. Their records are as follows:

James J. Matles, delegate to the 1938 C. I. O. convention representing the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America and member of the committee on appeals in that convention. In 1933 Matles publicly endorsed the program of the Communist Party. (See Daily Worker, November 6, 1933, p 2.)

Samuel Burt, delegate to the 1939 and 1940 conventions of the C. I. O. Burt was a speaker at the tenth convention of the Communist Party in 1938 (see Daily Worker, May 24, 1938, p. 4), and in 1933 he endorsed the program of the Communist Party. (See Daily Worker, November 6, 1933, p 2.)

Joseph Chandler, delegate to the 1939 C. I. O. convention representing the Allegheny Valley Industrial Council. Chandler reported to the tenth convention of the Communist Party in the same year. (See Daily Worker, May 30, 1938, p. 8.)

Robert L. Cruden, member of the committee on press and publicity at the 1938 and 1940 conventions of the C. I. O. Cruden is a writer for the Communist Party, his contributions having appeared in the Communist, the Daily Worker, and the New Masses.

John Harvey, delegate to the 1939 convention of the C. I. O., representing the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers. Harvey has been a contributor for the Communist Party Press, and in 1930 he made a tour for the Young Communist League. (See Daily Worker, March 3, 1930, p. 2.)

Albert Lawrence Smith, business agent for the C. I. O. United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America. Smith's activities on behalf of the C. I. O. have been so extensive that the complete record would fill several pages. His secretary is the wife of George Powers, recently convicted Communist Party secretary in Pittsburgh and former organizer for the S W. O. C.

George Kleinman, member of the committee on press and publicity at the C. I. O. convention in 1940. Kleinman is an instructor in the Communist Party's Workers School in New York.

John C. Lawson, delegate to the 1938 and 1939 conventions of the C. I. O. and member of committee on appeals in the 1938 C. I. O. Convention. Lawson was a delegate from the Quarry Workers International Union of North America. Lawson was speaker at the Lenin memorial meeting of the Communist Party in 1930. (See Daily Worker, January 18, 1930, p. 7.)

Patrick R. McGraw, delegate to the 1940 C. I. O. Convention, representing the Duluth Industrial Union Council. McGraw was a delegate to the tenth convention of the Communist Party in 1938, representing the State of Minnesota. (See Daily Worker, May 31, 1938, p. 4.)

Samuel Nesin, delegate to the 1938 C. I. O. Convention, representing the International Woodworkers of America. Twice, at least, Nesin has been a candidate for public office on the Communist Party ticket. (See Daily Worker, November 3, 1936, p. 4.)

Charles Palmer, delegate to the 1940 C. I. O. Convention, representing the Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America. Palmer ran for city council in Philadelphia in 1939 on the Communist Party ticket.

Max Perlow, delegate to the 1939 C. I. O. Convention, representing the United Furniture Workers of America. Perlow was a campaigner for Israel Amter, Communist Party candidate for Congress. (See New Masses, November 8, 1938, p. 25.)

Morris Pizer, delegate to the 1940 C. I. O. convention, representing the United Furniture Workers of America In 1933, Pizer endorsed the program of the Communist Party when he was secretary of the T. U. U. L.'s Furniture Workers Industrial Union. (See Daily Worker, November 6, 1933, p. 2.)

Irving Potash, delegate to the 1938 and 1939 C. I. O. conventions, representing the International Fur and Leather Workers Union. Potash endorsed the program of the Communist Party in 1933 (see Daily Worker, November 6, 1933, p. 2), and has been a leading member of the Communist Party in New York.

Robert Robinson, delegate to the 1939 C. I. O. convention, representing the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America. Robinson was also a speaker at the tenth convention of the Communist Party in 1938. (See Daily Worker, May 24, 1938, p. 4.)

William Sentner, delegate to the 1940 C. I. O. convention, representing the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America. Sentner was a delegate to the Missouri-Arkansas convention of the Communist Party in 1938. (See Daily Worker, May 25, 1938, p. 5.)

Regardless of your evasion and abuse, I intend to continue to bring to your attention and to the attention of the House of Representatives and the whole country the situation which the foregoing facts reveal. The welfare of organized labor, to say nothing of our national security, depends upon your meeting the issue of communism in the C. I. O. squarely. The names which I have called to your attention in this communication and in previous communications are only the beginning. I reiterate my question: What are you going to do about communism in the C. I. O.? The Congress and the country are becoming impatient for your unequivocal reply.

MARTIN DIES.

Parity Prices for Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

PETITION FROM FARMERS OF THOMAS COUNTY, KANS.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I have received the following petition from a number of farmers in Thomas County, Kans., urging parity prices for agriculture. The national-defense expenditures are further increasing the disparity between agriculture, labor, and industry and therefore immediate consideration should be given to this petition.

The petition is as follows:

We, the undersigned wheat producers and livestock raisers of Summers Township, Thomas County, Kans., demand that immediate legislation and rulings be made whereby the producer can secure parity prices on his product and be placed on par with labor and industry and that United States markets be preserved for United States producers. We order that copies of this petition be made and forwarded to the President of the United States, the Vice President, Secretary of Agriculture, and to our Congressman for consideration.

August Riedel, H. Riedel, H. P. Marcott, Glenn W. Schiffner, Colby, Kans.; Eldo Franz, Oakley, Kans.; Philip A. Ulirich, J. C. Willems, Colby, Kans.; John Rhea, Oakley, Kans.; Frank Dahl, John Holm, Colby, Kans.; Peter F. Gosser, Oakley, Kans.; John Aschenbrenner, Colby, Kans.; Ralph Rhea, Oakley, Kans.; S. E. Beaver, Monument, Kans.; C. M. Weed, D. S. Dahl, Lewis C. Lewallen, Chas. Carney, Clifford Lewallen, Geo. Herbel, Roy A. Kistler, Heinrich D. Goossen, Colby, Kans.; Gilbert Edde, Albert Nelson, Page City, Kans.; W. E. McMurtrey, Oakley, Kans.; Herman F. Riedel, Colby, Kans.; D. W. Belknap, Monument, Kans.; Abr. B. Goossen, O. H. Goellert, Edward D. Goossen, Colby, Kans.; W. G. Gaeddert, Oakley, Kans.; Fred Walberg, Clifford Ramsey, Guy E. Olson, Lawrence Towns, S. A. Kistler, Geo. L. Theimer, L. C. Keck, Colby, Kans.; Paul Cork, Winona, Kans.; Clarence Wagy, Colby, Kans.; Ernest Weinland, B. M. Reed, Monument, Kans.; C. Rassmussen, Lloyd Bever, R. R. Seymour, Abe Dahl, Colby, Kans.

This is to certify that this is a true copy of an original petition filed in my office at Colby, Kans.

[SEAL] LETA V. SECREST,
Notary Public.

My commission expires April 15, 1943.

Migration of Skilled Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE SIOUX FALLS DAILY ARGUS-LEADER

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Sioux Falls Daily Argus-Leader:

MAYBE YOU'VE HEARD—DEFENSE TAKES MEN AWAY—SHIPYARDS DEMAND MANY—EVEN PAY TO GET NAMES

(By W. A. S.)

A little group of five men left Sioux Falls yesterday for jobs in the Manitowoc Shipbuilding Co.'s yards at Manitowoc, Wis. The men were all apprentice welders: Elmer Erickson and Herbert Krull of Brandon, Alfred Anderson of Worthing, Buster Scheffelbein of Hartford, and Gust Ustrud of Baltic.

It was a small incident on a spring day, the departure of those five young men, but it gets to be a sore subject when the same thing happens day after day, draining this territory of its best machinists, welders, and able workmen in other lines.

The Northern Pump Co. of Minneapolis holds millions of dollars' worth of defense contracts. I do not know whether it is true or not, but workmen who have left here to work for Northern Pump have written back that the company pays its workers $20 for the name of every competent man back home that they turn in.

That's how serious the shortage of skilled men is in defense industry.

There may still be a few small lathes available for sale by South Dakota dealers, but after these are gone private workshops will have to get along till the defense emergency is over. No lathes of any kind will be available because of priority rulings. Most dealers tell you they cannot supply them now.

And—getting back to the worker situation again—local machine shops are so hard up for good men that they are stealing them from each other. Lynn Hill, of the Sioux Falls Machine Works, a fellow who knows as much about the situation as anybody else, says "it's got so we hardly get acquainted with our men any more before they leave."

This shop, biggest in the wide Sioux Falls territory, has a normal working force of 20 to 25 men. Yet it has lost between 15 and 20 workmen in the last 6 months. It has had to fill in the best it could. Other Sioux Falls shops are the Watson Machine Works and Ulberg's. They have had similar difficulties.

Lynn Hill can rattle off names of these departed brethren till it makes you dizzy.

Glen Lyons and Merle Hill have left to work with Northern Pump, Minneapolis; Darsey Likehim has gone to the Brooklyn Navy Yard; Bill Herrit to the Boston Navy Yard; his brother, Steve, to Bethlehem Steel, Bethlehem, Pa.; Joe Van Westerhuyzen to the American Chain & Hoist Co., St. Paul; John Tierney to the Pioneer Engineering Co., Minneapolis; E. A. Renley to Lockheed Aircraft, Los Angeles; George Hill to Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill.; Ray Moline to the Bremerton, Wash., shipyards; Herman Busch to shipyards in Los Angeles.

Many others just blew town, disclosing their destinations only to close friends.

It takes years to train a good machinist, but a reasonably smart lad can pick up the rudiments of welding in a few weeks. Revolving this thought in their minds, "Dad" Hill and his boys started a welding school early in January. Graduates of the 9-weeks' course are already holding down jobs elsewhere.

The big demand for welders is due to this fact: A ship is 15 percent lighter when electric welded than if it is put together with rivets.

The welding school does not pretend to turn out masters of the art, but its graduates have enough stuff to pass American Bureau of Shipping tests, which is all that is required to get jobs in shipyards. They can pick up the fine points later.

Right now the school has an order to fill: 200 men to go to work in a New Orleans shipyard July 1. It hopes to furnish 30 or 40 of this number.

Meanwhile wages of apprentice welders have jumped from the normal 35–40 cents an hour to 60 cents here.

Graduates of the school already at work include Arthur Cook, Sioux Falls, and Ralph Chase, Belle Fourche at the American Shipbuilding Co., Cleveland; Warren Wicks, Dell Rapids; Stephen Papp, Sheldon, Iowa; Ralph Perkins, Sioux Falls; and Ray Reese, Pipestone, Minn., all busy at American Chain and Hoist, St. Paul.

My inquiry into this subject indicates that most married men who have left to get jobs elsewhere have taken their families along. "This defense thing looks like it's good for a few years, anyway," one man wrote back from the East.

That seems to be true especially of shipbuilding. War or no war, Uncle Sam is building himself a two-ocean navy. Fellows who left here 6 months ago have been writing back that they see 7 years of steady work ahead.

Sioux Falls, of course, might get some defense subcontracts. The Sioux Falls Machine Works, for instance, could put on two extra 8-hour shifts. But it wonders where the workmen would come from, with men leaving town every day.

America and Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

ARTICLE BY HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by me, which was published in the New Palestine under date of January 31, 1941:

[From the New Palestine of January 31, 1941]

AMERICA AND PALESTINE

(By Congressman JOHN W. McCORMACK, majority leader, House of Representatives)

The year that has just passed will go down in history as the year of the great enslavement. During this period the totalitarian aggressors succeeded in subjugating almost the whole of the European Continent. First Poland and Finland, then Norway and Denmark, and finally the Netherlands, Belgium, and France have succumbed before the brute force of the mighty military juggernaut. These have been hard blows to the cause of civilization, democracy, and human freedom.

Upon the outcome of this struggle, as pointed out by the President of the United States, depends the future of our civilization. The events have demonstrated that democracy "can take it"—take everything the Axis has to give, and still fight back. Indeed, the fight by the democracies is carried on with added determination inspired by a great ideal.

A people inspired by an ideal can never be defeated.

In Greece and in Africa the tide of the battle is already turning.

Planes and arms are going to Great Britain and her Allies from the United States in an ever-increasing stream. Our entire industrial life is being mobilized with a view to giving the maximum aid possible to Great Britain by making America truly an "arsenal of the democracies."

Aid to England is a part of our own national defense.

While the year 1940 must be recorded as the year of the tragedy, there is every hope that the year 1941 will yet go down in history as the year of the great liberation.

In the present conflict the United States has remained a military neutral. Moral neutrality, however, under the circumstances would have been utterly incompatible with the principles for which the United States has stood since its inception.

AMERICAN SYMPATHY

From the very beginning of the war our Government has indicated in no uncertain terms that its sympathies are with the sister democracies.

America is doing and, I believe, will continue to do everything possible for the purpose of assuring the complete defeat of the totalitarian aggressors.

In doing that, our country is looking to its own defenses, in a practical and realistic way.

It is in no way strange, in fact, it is most natural, that I should be with you here tonight. As a Christian and as an American I have been horrified by the indescribable atrocities that have been perpetrated upon the Jewish people.

But over and above this I have always sympathized deeply with the aspirations of the Zionist movement. In this sentiment, too, I am happy to say I have not been alone among the public men of our country. The legislature of my own State of Massachusetts has on repeated occasions endorsed officially the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine.

STATE RESOLUTION

It is with great pride and satisfaction that I recall the fact that, as a member of the Massachusetts Legislature, together with my lifelong friend, Elihu D. Stone, more than 20 years ago I supported the Palestine resolutions adopted by our State legislature.

My faith then in the future of the Jewish national home has been more than justified.

It was eminently proper and fitting that the State, in which the founding fathers first set foot on Plymouth Rock, should to this day remember that our forebears fled from persecution in Europe, and should eagerly extend the full measure of its sympathy to all those who are being persecuted.

Thus, it was no accident that through the inspiration of Massachusetts, the United States officially endorsed the establishment of the Jewish national home in Palestine by

a resolution adopted unanimously by the United States Congress in 1922.

Subsequently, the mandate over Palestine, of which the Balfour declaration is an integral part, was again ratified by the American Government in a separate treaty with Great Britain in 1924.

Apart from these official manifestations of approval, Jewish aspirations, Jewish sacrifices, and Jewish achievement in the National Home have won the unstinted admiration of every President of the United States from Woodrow Wilson to Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

I quote from one of President Roosevelt's statements: "The American people, ever zealous in the cause of human freedom, have watched with sympathetic interest the effort of the Jews to renew in Palestine the ties of their ancient homeland and to reestablish Jewish culture in the place where it flourished and whence it was carried to the far corners of the world. Two decades have witnessed a remarkable exemplification of the vitality and vision of the Jewish pioneers in Palestine. It should be a source of pride to Jewish citizens of the United States that they, too, have had a share in this great work of revival and restoration."

For the millions of European Jews who are today clinging so obstinately to life, the existence of a Jewish Home in Palestine is the chief source of strength. As long as this homeland exists, and as long as there remains the possibility of escaping from Nazi Europe, they can continue to hope that next year, with God's help, they will be in Jerusalem. And this is far from being an idle aspiration. Palestine has been indeed the chief sanctuary for the European Jewish refugees, having absorbed almost as many as the rest of the world put together.

I understand that from 1933 to 1940 inclusive, 280,000 Jews entered Palestine. Despite the war and the difficulties of migration, the figures for this past year stood at 24,000. This is an accomplishment of no mean proportions.

CHIEF SANCTUARY

To the millions of suffering Jews on the other side of the water, the existence of the Jewish National Home is a source of hope and strength. They find comfort and inspiration in the knowledge that in Palestine there exists a free, thriving, and growing Jewish community.

Because of all these things, I believe that it is more necessary than ever before to sustain and support the Jewish National Home in Palestine.

There is, however, still another reason why the Zionist efforts in Palestine should have the encouragement of Jew and Christian alike. It is a reason of immediate urgency.

BULWARK OF DEMOCRACY

The Jewish people in the Holy Land, with its deeply rooted democratic traditions and its hatred of everything that nazi-ism stands for, constitutes one of the chief bulwarks of democratic defense in the Near East. Thousands of Palestine Jews are already serving in the armed forces of the allied democracies. Many more thousands of Jews in Palestine have volunteered and are waiting to be called.

I am glad to reiterate that the accomplishments of the Jewish people in Palestine have been of truly epic proportions. The Jewish population of the country has risen from 55,000 in 1918 to more than 500,000 today. The total population during the same period has grown from less than 700,000 to a figure of 1,550,000.

In Palestine the Jews have given incontrovertible proof of their ability as excellent farmers.

More than a fourth of the Jewish population, for the most part living in 257 settlements, earns its living from the soil.

Agricultural experts like Dr. Lowdermilk, who was employed as an adviser by the Honorable HENRY A. WALLACE, have been lavish in their praise of the work that is being done in Palestine. According to them the Jewish Palestinian settlement is by far the most successful experiment in mass colonization on record.

With the aid of Jewish capital and Jewish enterprise, Palestine has developed an industrial plant that holds foremost rank among the near eastern countries. Food preserves and clothing, chemicals, and pharmaceuticals, gasoline, fine steel, and reinforced concrete—these are but a partial list of the products manufactured in Palestine today. During the past year alone 63 new plants were established; and, despite the dislocation caused by the war the process of expansion is continuing apace.

Jewish accomplishments have also benefited the native population. The living standards of the Arab masses of Palestine are far and above what they were before the Balfour declaration, and as much above the standards prevalent in the neighboring countries. From a land of Arab emigration before the war, Palestine has today become a land of Arab immigration. Within the country itself the tendency is for the Arabs to congregate around Jewish settlements, or Jewish cities, because here they can find greater prosperity. The various Jewish agencies have made their hospitals and their social services available to Arabs as well as Jews.

THE JEWISH BIRTHRIGHT

In the light of Jewish sacrifices and achievements in Palestine, and because of Jewish tragic homelessness today, it is imperative that opportunities be granted to the tens of thousands of Jewish victims of oppression and persecution to enter Palestine "as a matter of right."

The very designation of "home" implies the complete freedom of entering it without obstruction.

It is the birthright of every Jew, if he so desires, to return to the land of his fathers.

This is the essence of the Palestine mandate.

It is my hope that we of this generation will have the privilege of witnessing the rebirth of the Jewish nation, and of beholding, in the words of Mr. Winston Churchill, "by the banks of the Jordan a Jewish state" which will be a source of inspiration to all mankind.

It is in this spirit that I am happy to be with you tonight and express my profound confidence in the ultimate achievement of the goal of the United Palestine Appeal.

I know that your cause will succeed, because it is worthy of success. And when the day of success comes, as it is bound to in the near future, it will be another day in the history of mankind when justice will triumph.

Judge J. Warren Madden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday March 31, 1941

EXTRACTS OF ADDRESSES MADE AT DINNER IN HONOR OF JUDGE J. WARREN MADDEN

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD the extracts of several addresses made at a dinner in honor of Judge J. Warren Madden. The statements are by Mr. Justice Stanley Reed, Senator George W. Norris, and Mr. Edward Lamb.

The extracts follow:

[Extracts of speeches made by some of the distinguished guests who attended the National Lawyers Guild dinner in honor of Judge J. Warren Madden at Hotel Shoreham, Washington, D. C., on February 22, 1941]

EXTRACT OF SPEECH MADE BY SUPREME COURT JUSTICE STANLEY REED

"I am happy to be here as a guest of the National Lawyers Guild to honor J. Warren Madden, distinguished member of the bar and now an eminent jurist * * *. Those of us who are interested in the progressive development of the law and the viewpoint of liberal members of the bar have looked with satisfaction upon the creation of this organization and its subsequent growth as an important influence upon contemporary legal thought * * *. When Judge Madden first took his seat as Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board he had the confidence of most and later earned the confidence of all * * *. The Nation was fortunate in having a man with J. Warren Madden's honesty and fearlessness in administrating the Wagner Act in the first years of its operation."

EXTRACT OF SPEECH MADE BY UNITED STATES SENATOR GEORGE W. NORRIS

"Wherever he goes, on whatever board or bench he sits he will uphold those American principles of liberty, freedom, and equality to all, without regard to wealth or poverty."

EXTRACT OF OPENING REMARKS MADE BY EDWARD LAMB, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD, WHO PRESIDED AT THE DINNER

"The National Lawyers Guild which represents those members of the bar who believe in civil liberties, the rights of labor and the maintenance and extension of social legislation, is proud to tender this dinner in honor of Judge Madden, a great liberal American."

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

RESOLUTIONS OF THE DETROIT BOARD OF COMMERCE AND THE RETAIL MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions:

RESOLUTION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FROM THE DETROIT BOARD OF COMMERCE

Whereas the State of Michigan is the largest producer of export merchandise in the Unites States; and

Whereas the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project as advocated by President Roosevelt is not only a defense measure but a method to enable the great midwestern industrial and agricultural empire to compete in the post-war program of world trade; and

Whereas we believe it to be in the best interest of the Nation to complete the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project now: Therefore be it

Resolved by the foreign trade committee of the Detroit Board of Commerce, That we do formally and respectfully request the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation which will bring about the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway; and be it further

Resolved, That a formally attested copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States of America and to the Senators and Representatives in our National Congress.

Respectfully submitted.

DETROIT BOARD OF COMMERCE,
R. W. GIFFORD,
Chairman, Foreign Trade Committee.

Approved by the board of directors:

HARVEY CAMPBELL,
Executive Vice President.

Adopted March 14, 1941.

RESOLUTION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FROM THE RETAIL MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION OF DETROIT

Whereas a bottle neck of approximately 48 miles in the St. Lawrence River deprives the people of the United States of vital production and transportation facilities in the Great Lakes area; and

Whereas the President of the United States of America has indicated to your honorable body and the people of the Nation the importance of developing the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and

Whereas all Government surveys indicate that completion of the project will be beneficial to the entire Nation; and

Whereas we believe that the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project will be beneficial to present business and will create new business: Therefore be it

Resolved by the board of directors of the Retail Merchants Association of Detroit, Mich., That we do formally and respectfully request the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation now pending before it which will enable the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and be it further

Resolved, That a formally attested copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, and to the Senators and Representatives in our National Congress.

Respectfully submitted.

RETAIL MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION,
CHARLES E. BOYD, *Secretary.*

Approved by the board of directors of the Retail Merchants Association.

JOSEPH L. HICKEY, *President.*

Adopted March 13, 1941.

The People's Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. O. BURGIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE LEXINGTON (N. C.) DISPATCH

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Dispatch, Lexington, N. C., of March 27, 1941:

[From the Lexington (N. C.) Dispatch of March 27, 1941]

THE PEOPLE'S ARMY

When a detachment of United States soldiers from Fort Bragg was sent to serve as guard of honor and firing squad at the funeral and burial of William Henry Barnes, last surviving Confederate veteran of Robeson County, last Monday, a fine token of national unity was provided. But it was more than that too, for the promptness with which Major General Devers, Fort Bragg commander, acted in the matter gave striking evidence that this new Army of ours is indeed a people's army, gathered to protect and defend a democracy, not to lord over it. It took no administrative red tape unwinding when General Devers was informed that Mr. Barnes had wanted to be buried by soldiers, and the sons of his neighbors belonging to the National Guard had been sent afar for a period of active service.

The American soldiers who fired the final salute of honor over the grave of a gallant and useful American citizen came from a number of States. Some were the grandsons of men who wore the gray in the sixties, others the grandsons or great grandsons of men who wore the blue. Particular sentiment attaching to this act arises out of the fact it is said to be the first occasion known where men out of the National Army were sent to perform such a service of honor to the memory of a Confederate soldier.

The Confederate veterans, now almost vanished, fondly cherished the recollections of the deeds of valor they performed on many battlefields and a grateful southern people have perpetuated their heroism in war and peace alike on hundreds of public squares. But it was quite fitting also that the soldiers of a united America pay honor to one of these for no group of men in the history of the Nation or the Colonies out of which it developed contributed more substantially to its development in substance and growth in spirit than did these. And from nowhere in this broad land today does there come a more united and determined spirit to defend and preserve a united America than from the area over which once waved the Bonnie Blue Flag that William Henry Barnes followed into battle with the immortal Lee.

St. Lawrence Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED F. BEITER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

ANALYSIS OF ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY TREATIES AND AGREEMENT

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1941, through special permission, I inserted in the RECORD an analysis of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway treaty of 1938 and the agreement which is presently before Congress for ratification. Since that time I have been literally besieged with requests for copies of that analysis, and also with inquiries regarding the comparison between these and the original treaty which was before the Senate in 1934. Therefore I have made a further analysis of the three articles—the treaty of 1933, the proposed treaty of 1938, and the agreement of 1941 for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway, setting each corresponding article side by side in order to make the comparison easier for the eye and mind. The analysis follows:

PROPOSED TREATY OF 1938	ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT AGREEMENT OF 1941	GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE DEEP WATERWAY TREATY, 1933
Article I	*Article I*	*Corresponding article and paragraphs*
The Commission: Same as in agreement 1941.	The Commission: Article I of the agreement calls for the establishment of a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin Commission consisting of not more than 10 members of whom an equal number shall be appointed by each Government. By an exchange of notes the Governments may change the number of members on the Commission; provided, however, that an equal representation of each Government be maintained (subpar. 1, 4). The Governments, by an exchange of notes, shall prescribe rules and regulations for conduct of the Commission, and may extend or abridge its powers and duties, and upon completion of its duties may terminate its existence (subpar. 4).	The Commission: The Governments agree to establish and maintain a temporary St. Lawrence International Rapids Section Commission of 10 members, 5 appointed by each Government (art. III, par. 1). The Governments may reduce the numbers of members of the Commission, providing equal representation is maintained. The Commission will be terminated by agreement between the Governments (schedule A, par. J).

PROPOSED TREATY OF 1938—continued	AGREEMENT OF 1941—continued	GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE DEEP WATERWAY TREATY, 1933—continued
Division of work: Same as in agreement 1941.	Divisions of work: The Commission is to allocate construction to the two Governments in such a way that each Government shall construct the works within its own territory or an equivalent proportion in the International Rapids section (subpar. 1–b).	Divisions of work: Same provision (art. III, par. b).
Other duties of Commission: The Commission could prepare plans and specifications in the International Rapids section in accordance with any one of the projects described in the report of the joint board of engineers with appendixes, dated July 13, 1927. It provided, however, that any modifications, which might be agreed upon, of any Joint Board of Engineers' plan, could not increase the proposed total cost of the project as estimated in the aforementioned Joint Board of Engineers' report. This discretionary power differs from the single project (238–242) called for in the current agreement. This article also stipulated the Commission was to serve as an advisory body to the two Governments for the purpose of coordinating all plans for the comprehensive development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin. This is not included in the present agreement. The remaining duties were the same as present agreement.	Other duties of Commission: To prepare plans and specifications for construction work in the International Rapids section, in accordance with controlled single-stage project (238–242) for works in the International Rapids section; to approve all contracts in behalf of the Governments for works in the International Rapids section; supervise construction, and submit annual reports to the Governments, on the progress of the works; to certify to the Governments upon completion of the works, and perform other duties assigned to it, by the agreement.	Other duties of the Commission: To prepare plans and specifications for construction of work in the International Rapids section, in accordance with the final report of the joint board of engineers (two-stage development) and to construct such works excepting powerhouse superstructures, machinery, and equipment required for the development of power, side canals, and rehabilitation works (art. III, par. 1).
The countries further agree: The provisions are the same, with the exception that no mention was made as to the manner of remuneration for general expenses of the general Commission, etc.	The countries further agree: The Commission shall have authority to employ such persons and make such expenditures as may be necessary; may avail itself of governmental agencies, officers, etc., as may be available; that remuneration and general expenses, etc., of its members shall be paid by the respective Governments and that other expenses of the Commission except as provided for in Article III shall be borne by the Governments in equal moieties (subpar. 2).	The countries further agree: The Commission shall have power to establish rules and regulations and to employ persons as may be necessary; that remuneration, general expenses, etc., of the Commission shall be regulated and paid by their respective Governments and all other expenses shall be defrayed out of funds provided under terms of article III (United States funds to carry on work in International Rapids section of St. Lawrence) (schedule A; par. c; e–4; 3–h).
The same provisions were made to cover exemption of immigration laws from customs, excise, and other imposts, whether Federal, State or Provincial.	Both Governments agree to permit entry into their countries within the work areas involved in the agreement—International Section, Niagara River Section—of personnel necessary to carry on the work and to exempt such personnel from the operation of their immigration laws and regulations within those areas. The same thing applies in the case of materials, should the Commission allocate certain construction works for one Government to perform in the territory of the other Government (subpar. 3).	Both countries agreed to practically the same provisions as to exemption of immigration laws, etc. (schedule A; pars. 1–1 and 1–2).
Article II	*Article II*	
Financial obligations of Canada: The provisions were just the same.	Financial obligations of Canada: According to this article, Canada agrees to construct works in the International Rapids section allocated to Canada by the Commission, and to operate and maintain or arrange therefor, works situated within Canada (subpar. a).	Financial obligations of Canada: In this treaty Canada agreed to construct, operate, and maintain works in the Thousand Island section below Oak Point; to construct, maintain, and operate side canals and locks on the Canadian side, and to construct rehabilitation works required on their side of the border (art. I, pars. a to c, incl.). The two countries agreed that the Commission should construct all works of the International Rapids section located within Canada by using Canadian engineers and workmen and materials—or that an equivalent proportion of the total work should be constructed by Canadian forces and with Canadian materials (art. III, par. b). Canada agreed to operate all works located within Canada (art. III, par. 2).
The date of completion was set at not later than December 31, 1949. The proviso for deferment of Canadian work was not included.	Canada further agrees to complete at a date not later than December 31, 1948, the Canadian links in the seaway, including the Welland Canal deepening, providing, however, that war conditions or defense requirements justify a modification of this period of time when Canadian work shall be completed, the Governments may, by exchange of notes, defer or expedite their completion (subpar. b).	Canada declared to complete the wholly Canadian links in the waterway—including the deepening of Welland Canal—at a date not later than that of completion of the International Rapids section works (preamble).
Article III	*Article III*	
Financial obligations of the United States: The provisions were just the same.	Financial obligations of the United States: According to this article, the United States agrees to construct works in the International Rapids section allocated to the United States by the Commission and to operate and maintain or arrange therefor works situated within the United States (subpar. a).	Financial obligations of the United States: The Commission was directed to construct all works of the International Rapids section located within the United States by using United States workers and materials; or failing this, to construct an equivalent proportion of the total works with United States

PROPOSED TREATY OF 1938—continued

In this proposed treaty the United States did not have to pay for the powerhouse superstructures nor the side canals and locks located on the Canadian side as in accordance with the present agreement.

Provisions just the same.

Article IV

Development of power in the international section: The provisions were just the same with the exception that the article stated the Governments might construct powerhouses as well as install machinery at such time as their requirements for power might dictate.

The Governments agree that the Commission shall arrange for engineering services with any agency in either country authorized to develop powe. in the International Rapids section.

Permitted diversions: This article provided that the equal diversion of water for power purposes in the International Rapids section was to be controlled daily.

Control of flow in International Rapids section: The provisions were just the same with the exception that no mention was made concerning the control of flows through the St. Lawrence River International Rapids section so as to not adversely affect power developments in the Canadian section of the St. Lawrence River.

Test period required: No such provision appeared.

Board to control diversions, regulate flows, etc.: No provision for this board or authority.

Provisions for 14-foot canal: Not directly mentioned in proposed treaty but included in the plans of the International Joint Board of Engineers, one of which by terms of the treaty had to be substantially followed.

AGREEMENT OF 1941—continued

The United States further agrees to supply funds for the construction, design, and supervision of all works in the International Rapids section, with the exception of machinery and equipment for the development of power and for rehabilitation works on the Canadian side (subpar. b).

The United States also agrees to complete work in the International Rapids section and in the Great Lakes system above Lake Erie at a date not later than the date of completion of the Canadian links of the seaway (subpar. c).

Article IV

Development of power in the International section: The Governments agree they may install or arrange for installation of such machinery as may be required for the development of power at such time as may be most suitable in respect to their power requirements (subpar. a).

The Governments agree, in view of the need for coordination of plans for the development of power in the International Rapids section, that the Commission may arraige for engineering services in either country with any agency authorized to develop power in that section of the St. Lawrence (subpar. b).

Permitted diversions: Except as modified by article VIII, the Governments agree each country shall be entitled to the use of one-half of the water available for power in the International Rapids section (subar. c).

Control of flow in International Rapids section: The Governments agree that the flow of water through the International Rapids section and out of Lake Ontario shall be so controlled and regulated as to maintain present depths of water for navigation and shipping purposes in the harbor of Montreal and the navigable channel of the St. Lawrence River below that city, and so that power developments in the Canadian section of the St. Lawrence River shall not be adversely affected (subpar. d).

Test period required: Upon completion of the works they shall be operated with the maximum water level held at 238.0, sea level datum, for a test period of 10 years, or shorter period as may be approved by a board or authority established under provisions of paragraph (f) of article IV. Should the board decide the maximum water could practicably exceed 238.0, the Governments may, by exchange of notes, subject to the terms in the notes, authorize an operating elevation exceeding 238.0 (subpar. e).

Board to control diversions, regulate flows, etc.: The Governments may, by exchanging notes, provide for a board or authority to control or supervise the diversion of water in the International Rapids section, to regulate the flow out of Lake Ontario and through the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River, and to report on the feasibility of increasing the head under which the power plants at the International Rapids section may operate (subpar. f).

Provisions for 14-foot canal: During construction of works in the International Rapids section adequate facilities for maintaining existing 14-foot navigation in that section shall be provided (subpar. g).

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE DEEP WATERWAY TREATY, 1933—continued

workmen or materials (art. III, par. b). The United States agreed to operate all works located within that country (art. III, par. 2).

The United States undertook to furnish all funds for construction work in the International Rapids section excepting in this case Canadian powerhouse superstructures as well as machinery and equipment for development of power (art. III).

The United States also agreed to construct, operate, and maintain works in the Thousand Islands section above Oak Point, and a side canal with locks opposite Barnhardt Island; to construct all rehabilitation works on the United States side (art. II, pars. a to c, inclusive) and by declaration to complete all works not later than date of completion of International Rapids section required in the Great Lakes system above Lake Erie. (Preamble.) (The same as 1941 agreement excepting United States did not have to pay for Canadian side canals or powerhouse superstructures.)

Development of power in the International Rapids section: The Governments agreed either could arrange for construction of powerhouse superstructures, machinery, etc., for development of power within their respective territories (art. III, par. c).

The Government agreed the Commission could make contracts for engineering with any agency authorized to develop power; could defer such parts of power works as need be constructed with powerhouses and; and could make contracts with aforementioned agencies for constructing any deferred power works (schedule A, par. g-1).

Permitted diversions: Same provisions excepting diversions were to be controlled daily (art. IV, par. a).

Control of flow in International Rapids section: The provisions were just the same with the exception that no mention was made concerning the conrtol of flows through the St. Lawrence River International Rapids section so as to not adversely affect power developments in the Canadian section of the St. Lawrence River.

Test period required: No such provision appeared.

Board to control diversions, regulate flows, etc.: No provision for this board or authority.

Provisions for 14-foot canal: Not directly mentioned, but included in the plans of the International Joint Board of Engineers, which had to be followed.

PROPOSED TREATY OF 1938—continued	AGREEMENT OF 1941—continued	GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE DEEP WATERWAY TREATY, 1933—continued
Article V	*Article V*	
Ownership of works constructed: Provision is just the same.	Ownership of works constructed: Nothing in the agreement confers upon either Government proprietary, legislative, or administrative, or other jurisdiction in the territory of the other, and they agree that all works constructed under the agreement's provisions shall constitute a part of the territory in which they are situated.	Ownership of works constructed: Provisions were the same (art V).
Article VI	*Article VI*	
Other canals permitted: The same provision was included excepting that approval of the Commission was required.	Other canals permitted: Either Government may construct alternate canals and channels for navigation in the International Section, or in waters connecting the Great Lakes, within its own territory, at any time. Water may be utilized for such purposes.	Other canals permitted: The same provision was included (art. VI).
Article VII	*Article VII*	
Rights of navigation in St. Lawrence River and Great Lakes system: In this article the following quotation appeared: "Nothing in this article or in any other article of this treaty shall be construed as infringing or impairing in any way the sovereignty of the United States of America over Lake Michigan." The remaining provisions as to navigation were included.	Rights of navigation in St. Lawrence River and Great Lakes system: Both Governments agree that the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River system, notwithstanding the provisions for termination contained in any treaties, shall be open for navigation to the citizens or subjects, ships, vessels, and boats of each Government.	Rights of navigation in St. Lawrence River and Great Lakes system: Provision was the same (art. VII).
Article VIII	*Article VIII*	
Diversions: Same provision.	Diversions: Each Government within its own territory must measure the quantity of water diverted from or added to the Great Lakes system. It shall file such records with the other Government semiannually (subpar. a).	Diversions: Same provision (art. VIII, par. c).
Other diversions allowed: Provisions were substantially the same.	Other diversions allowed: Each country has the exclusive right to use boundary waters in quantities equivalent to any waters diverted into the Great Lakes system from watersheds lying wholly within their particular country at all points below the point of entry of such waters added to the Great Lakes system from other watersheds (subpar. b).	Other diversions allowed: Same provision (art. VIII, par. d).
Instead of this section applying to diversions in excess of those permitted on January 1, 1940, it stipulated that water should not be diverted through the Chicago Drainage Canal in excess of the amount established by the Supreme Court by decree rendered April 21, 1930, and that diversion through that canal would have to be reduced to that amount by December 31, 1938. Any diversion made in excess would be considered "emergencies," and in the event the Canadian Government took exception, the matter was to be submitted for final decision to an arbitral tribunal, similar to the provisions proposed in the new agreement. The proposed treaty also stipulated that no diversion of water other than that referred to in connection with the Chicago Drainage Canal would be permitted to another watershed unless approved by the International Joint Commission.	If either Government authorizes diversions—except as permitted in the preceding paragraphs—they agree to give immediate consideration to any objecting representations made by the other Government. It is agreed that should it be impossible to otherwise reach a satisfactory settlement, that the matter will be submitted to an arbitral tribunal which shall be empowered to direct such compensatory and remedial measures as it may deem just and equitable. The arbitral tribunal shall consist of three members—one appointed by each Government and a third, the chairman, selected by both Governments. This applies to any diversion made in excess of that permitted in either country on January 1, 1940 (subpar. c).	Instead of this section applying to diversions in excess of those permitted on January 1, 1940, it stipulated that water should not be diverted through the Chicago Drainage Canal in excess of the amount established by the Supreme Court by decree rendered April 21, 1930, and that diversion through that canal would have to be reduced to that amount by December 31, 1938. Any diversion proposed in excess would be considered emergencies, and in the event the Canadian Government took exception, the matter was to be submitted for final decision to an arbitral tribunal, similar to the provisions proposed in the new agreement. The proposed treaty also stipulated that no diversion of water other than that referred to in connection with the Chicago Drainage Canal would be permitted without approval of the International Joint Commission (art. VIII, pars. a and b).
Compensatory and regulatory works: Provision just the same.	Compensatory and regulatory works: The Commission is required to report upon the desirability of regulatory and compensatory works in the Great Lakes system and should the Governments approve these, prepare plans and specifications for the works and recommend allocation of their costs. The Governments are to make arrangements for their construction through exchange of notes (subpar. d).	Compensatory works: Works in the Niagara and St. Clair Rivers were to be constructed "at the cost of the United States as regards compensation for diversion through the Chicago Drainage Canal, and at the cost of Canada as regards the diversion for power purposes, other than power used in operation of the Welland Canals" (art. VIII, par. e).
Article IX	*Article IX*	
The Niagara Falls project: Provisions were substantially the same.	The Niagara Falls project: The Commission shall prepare plans and specifications for works in the Niagara River, taking into account the recommendations of the Special International Niagara Board. These works are to distribute and control waters of the Niagara River so as to prevent erosion and enhance the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls.	The Niagara Falls project: No provisions for this undertaking were included.
The provisions were the same with the exception that the Governments were required to make arrangements for the construction works. The remaining provisions were substantially the same.	The Governments may make arrangements by exchange of notes for the construction of such Niagara River works, including temporary diversions to facilitate construction. The cost shall be borne in equal moieties.	

PROPOSED TREATY OF 1938—continued	AGREEMENT OF 1941—continued	GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE DEEP WATERWAY TREATY, 1933—continued
Provisions the same.	Notwithstanding amounts specified in article V of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, the United States may authorize an additional diversion within the State of New York, above the Falls, at a rate not exceeding 5,000 cubic feet of water per second, and Canada may, within the Province of Ontario, divert a like amount, upon completion of the Niagara River works.	
The provisions were the same excepting that the Commission was required to report on the equal and equitable diversion for power purposes, rather than just the efficient and equitable as in the present agreement.	The Commission is required to test Niagara River construction works under a wide range of conditions and to certify to the Governments the effect of such works and make recommendations respecting water diversions. In doing so, the Commission shall take special cognizance of scenic beauty of the Falls and rapids, the requirements of navigation on the Great Lakes system, and efficient utilization and proportionment of waters for power purposes. The Governments may, by exchanging notes and concurrent legislation, determine the methods by which these purposes may be attained.	
Article X	*Article X*	
Claims: No provisions made for these claims.	Claims: Each Government agrees that provisions for the disposition of claims and satisfaction of valid ones occurring in the territory of the other in connection with construction by such Government of works authorized by the agreement, shall be made (subpar. a).	Claims: No provisions made for these claims.
Provisions were substantially the same.	Each Government is released from responsibility for damage or injury to persons or property in the territory of the other caused by any action authorized by the agreement other than damage or injury covered in the preceding paragraph (subpar. b).	Provisions were substantially the same (art. IX, par. a).
Same provisions.	The Governments agree that each will assume responsibility and expense in acquisition of lands required to carry out the agreement.	Same provisions (art. IX., par. b).
Article XI	*Article XI*	
Ratification: The treaty shall be ratified in accordance with the constitutions of the two Governments.	Ratification: The agreement is subject to the approval of the Congress of the United States and the Parliament of Canada. Following such approval it shall be proclaimed by the President and ratified by the King of Great Britain. It shall become effective on the day of exchange of the instrument of ratification and a copy of the proclamation which shall take place at once.	Ratification: The treaty shall be ratified in accordance with the constitutions of the two Governments (art. XI).

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

EDITORIAL BY WALTER PARKER

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to introduce an editorial entitled "A Better Way to Spend a Billion Than on the St. Lawrence Seaway," by W. lter Parker, nationally known economist, in the Official Court Record of New Orleans:

A BETTER WAY TO SPEND A BILLION THAN ON THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT

(By Walter Parker)

A sea-level ship canal between the Atlantic and the Pacific, across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, would be of far greater economic value to the United States, to Mexico, and to all Latin America, than would be the St. Lawrence power and seaway project which the President is advocating.

A Tehuantepec ship canal could be easily defended, and it would shorten the shiplane distance between all the North American ports on the Atlantic and the Pacific. It would greatly enlarge the economic opportunities of all Central America as well as of Mexico. It would facilitate commerce between the New World and Asia, and it would go very far in removing the economic handicaps now resting on the entire midcontinent region of the United States.

Were they to consult the economic well-being of the Mississippi Valley—that great region lying between the Appalachians and the Rockies and which is bountifully supplied with natural resources—every Senator and Congressman from the Valleys of the Ohio, the Missouri, the Arkansas, the Red, and the Mississippi Rivers would vote to build the Tehuantepec Canal rather than vote money for the St. Lawrence project.

California, Oregon, and Washington would be greatly benefited were the Tehuantepec Canal opened. They will not be helped by the proposed St. Lawrence project.

A connection between the Atlantic and the Pacific across Tehuantepec would bring the producing sections of the United States many hundred miles nearer western markets than the Panama Canal does.

Ice would never form in a Tehuantepec canal.

Since a sea-level canal at Tehuantepec would materially lower distribution costs, its effect would be to create a new and valuable economic impetus, and in the post-war period the refinement of economy will be required if economic rehabilitation is to come along satisfactory lines.

The only real advantage ever claimed for the St. Lawrence seaway was that it would help wheat exports. But since such claims were seriously made, the United States has lost most of its wheat export markets—not because of the war but because the change by the surplus-producing United States from world debtor to world creditor was not accompanied by any adequate change in the tariff policy which would permit imports on a scale sufficient to offset exports.

Under its tariff policy, the surplus producing United States must change from a producer of surplus raw materials to a producer of the finished articles of world commerce. That is, for its exports it must rely more and more on manufactured articles than on cotton and wheat.

Some day, after Japan shall have grown tired of attempting to subjugate 450,000,000 Chinamen, China will emerge as a vigorous, developing country. It will need machinery and manufactures in great quantities—products which the midcontinent region can turn out in great quantities.

The Panama Canal is almost as near to Europe as it is to the ports of the United States. Not so Tehuantepec. The latter is

just across the Gulf of Mexico from the ports of the United States, and many sea miles would be saved in the process of distribution.

Insofar as the development of hydroelectric power to result from the St. Lawrence project is concerned, power experts are of the opinion that more power, at less cost and at a much earlier date could be developed through the use of steam.

If more power be needed in the St. Lawrence River section—and many people doubt that it is—the use of steam engines would create a larger use for coal, oil, and other fuels, thus enlarging employment in fields of greatest need. The coal miners most certainly need greater opportunities.

Even now, with all the water power available in the Tennessee Valley project, the T. V. A. is reported to be planning the erection of steam-power generating plants to supplement the water-power facilities as a matter of precaution.

Obviously the United States cannot afford to finance all the great projects the brains of men can conceive at one and the same time and prepare for war, too.

Would it not be wise for Congress to weigh the value of great projects and select those which will do the most good to the economic life of the Nation?

Between 5 and 7 years will be required to make the St. Lawrence project available, and to do that between $400,000,000 and $1,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money will be required to do the job.

No more money and no more time would be required to open a sea level ship canal across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec. The Tehuantepec project would prove an everlastingly valuable impetus to trade and commerce in a large way.

The St. Lawrence seaway project is not needed; steam power can be had at less cost than hydroelectric power, and the national defense phase is out because long before the project could be completed the war will probably end because of exhaustion.

Mississippi Valley Senators and Congressmen might well consider these matters before approving any appropriation for the St. Lawrence project.

They might well reach the conclusion that the money could be spent on Tehuantepec to far greater advantage.

Business and Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT L. VREELAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

RADIO DISCUSSION BETWEEN HAROLD JOHN ADONIS AND GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interview between Harold John Adonis, director, New Jersey State Government Bureau of Research, and George E. Stringfellow, president of the Chamber of Commerce and Civics of the Oranges and Maplewood, in one of the forum broadcasts over station WINS on March 29, 1941:

BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT

Mr. ADONIS. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. At the moment, our country has a big job to do—the job of building up our own defenses and extending what aid we can to the countries which are struggling to hold in check the forces that threaten us—it is a job that calls for close cooperation between business and government. It is highly important, therefore, that all of us, as citizens, know how the machinery of government operates and how the relations of government and industry, or government and business, are maintained. Accordingly, we have asked Mr. George E. Stringfellow, president of the Chamber of Commerce and Civics of the Oranges and Maplewood (the "Five Town" chamber), and director of the New Jersey State Chamber, to tell us how this can best be done.

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. That's a pretty large order, Mr. Adonis, but I'll be glad to tell you, as a businessman, how I would go about it.

Mr. ADONIS. That's just what we want to have you tell us, Mr. Stringfellow.

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. The Federal Government is reaching out more and more to control and regulate the conditions under which we live and work. Therefore, if we are to preserve our democratic system of government, it is necessary that the individual citizen be on the alert to anticipate injurious effects of legislation and regulation, and to call them to the attention of his Representative in Congress. If we are to act intelligently, we must know whether Washington is going to do things to us or for us. Every citizen has the responsibility of going to the polls and voting for his public or political representatives. That can be called his constitutional responsibility. But he has another obligation—the obligation of bringing to the attention of his poltical representative pertinent information concerning current legislative problems, in order that they may act judiciously and wisely. That can be called extraconstitutional responsibility. The need of dependable information of this sort has long been recognized by our Government. That is why legislative committees hold hearings on virtually all of the more important legislative subjects coming before Congress. For example, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States was not organized at the suggestion of businessmen. It was organized at the suggestion of the first Secretary of Commerce and Labor, with the approval, of course, of President Taft. It was set up as a vehicle to provide Congress with accurate, mature, and truly representative business opinion regarding proposed legislative measures.

Mr. ADONIS. You mean government asked for it first?

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Precisely. And that suggests this important question: How can the individual citizen keep himself informed as to what Government is doing in order that he may determine for himself whether contemplated legislation is good or bad? The answer is obvious: He can't—not by himself. He wouldn't have time for anything else if he followed closely the activities of Congress, and Congress is only a part of our Government. There are dozens of bureaus, commissions, administrations, and what-not issuing regulations which have the force and effect of law—regulations which bear directly upon our ways of working and making a living.

Mr. ADONIS. It looks, then, as if the individual citizen were stymied.

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Not at all. Since we live in an organized age, the way out is organization. It is the orderly method by which the individual can keep informed concerning public questions which involve his particular interests and express his opinion about them.

Mr. ADONIS. How would you set up such an organization?

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Many already exist, such as (1) farm, (2) labor, and (3) educational organizations. I am speaking now, however, only of business organizations, with which I have had some experience. There are something like 10,000 so-called trade associations, representing various types of trade and industry. There are about 3,000 chambers of commerce and boards of trade in the larger towns and cities of our country, not to mention those in smaller communities; and there are chambers which function on a State-wide basis.

Mr. ADONIS. Just how old is the chamber of commerce idea?

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. The oldest chamber in the United States is the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York. It was established in 1768. Its original charter was granted by King George III. There are much older commercial organizations, the oldest dating back to the fifteenth century. Most European chambers are semi-official institutions. They are appendages of government—organized from the top down. American chambers of commerce, on the contrary, are modeled on the old New England town meeting idea—from the bottom up. They are purely voluntary institutions.

Mr. ADONIS. Just how does a chamber function, Mr. Stringfellow?

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. The efficient chamber of commerce is a vehicle for dealing with community interests. By community interests I mean the things that concern the individual citizens but which the idividual, acting alone, can't do anything about—for example, such things as fire protection or transportation facilities. In many instances, chambers of commerce point the way for action by the authorities. You will find, as a rule, that what we call a "live" town has an active and efficient chamber of commerce.

Mr. ADONIS. Getting closer to home, what are some of the functions of the Chamber of Commerce and Civics of the Oranges and Maplewood?

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. The broad purpose of our five-town chamber of commerce and civics is to safeguard and advance the acknowledged high standard of the Oranges and Maplewood as an outstanding residential community, and to promote the welfare of business and industry located within its area. It is an energetic and progressive organization with a notable record of accomplishments, all of which have contributed to the satisfaction and comfort of living in our community. For instance, an entire new shopping distict has been developed; streets have been widened; trolley lines have been replaced with fast and efficient bus service. Furthermore, new apartment-house developments have set the country an example in twentieth century living without sacrificing the graciousness of one of the most famous residential suburban areas in the country.

Mr. ADONIS. Mr. Stringfellow, I am sure our listeners would like to hear more about the constructive work your five-town chamber of commerce and civics is doing to foster the trade and welfare of the Oranges and Maplewood.

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. To cover the whole range of activities would, of course, be impossible in the time allotted to me. Our major program, however, deals with such questions as community promotion, taxation, transportation, public safety, retail distribution, public health, State and national legislation, community planning, industrial problems, and national defense.

Mr. ADONIS. I can well see how your chamber of commerce, as you have described it, might be very like the old town forum or town meeting.

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. More than that, Mr. Adonis. One must remember that changes which affect us as individuals also affect the communities in which we live. Our interests are wrapped up with the interests of hundreds of other communities throughout the country. We are directly affected by what goes on within our States and within the United States. That is especially true of the last.

Mr. ADONIS. That sounds all right in theory, Mr. Stringfellow, but Washington, to many people, is very far away. How is the individual citizen going to find out what national legislation is contemplated, and how it will affect his interests?

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. That isn't so difficult as it sounds. Let me give you an illustration. In Washington there is the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. It is a federation of some 1,600 business organizations, chambers of commerce, and trade associations. If a bill is introduced in Congress which affects business—and most of them do nowadays—that bill is called to the attention of more than 1,100 so-called legislative committees maintained by local chambers of commerce and trade associations. All of these eleven-hundred-odd legislative committees consider this bill. They may approve or disapprove, or they may take no action at all. If they so choose, as is often the case, they can communicate with their Representatives in Congress, and intelligently indicate their opinion of the proposed legislation.

Mr. ADONIS. How does the Member of Congress take this advice?

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. I have yet to learn of a Member of Congress who did not welcome an honest expression of opinion from his constituents. I say honest opinion. I do not mean artificially manufactured propaganda originating with a few persons who assume, without warrant, to speak for many others.

Mr. ADONIS. What would you suggest in the way of improving relations between business and Government?

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. I would suggest that first the business men interest themselves in their community affairs by joining their local chamber of commerce. That is the starting point. If the businessman does not take an interest in community affairs, it is a safe bet that he isn't going to bother about State or National affairs. The next step is, through his local chamber, to interest himself in the affairs of his own State. There are a number of State chambers of commerce set up for this purpose. For instance, the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, with headquarters in Newark, is one of the most effective chambers in the country. Finally, business men and civic leaders should give more attention to national business affairs by using the facilities of the great over-all organization, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. The main thought to keep in mind is that the effectiveness of business organizations depends upon the initiative of individual business men. Organizations can help them, but they cannot take there place. Business men and civil leaders must supply the motive power. The national chamber is not the parent of the local chambers. It is the offspring.

Mr. ADONIS. How does this affect government?

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. In this way: The best kind of government—the kind we mean when we speak of a democracy—is that which reflects the opinions of a majority of the people. It is not the kind that is imposed upon the people by an arbitrary authority. In a democracy, laws are not really made, they grow—grow out of the consciousness of the people themselves. When the people reach a conclusion that a certain course of action should be followed, this conclusion is expressed in terms of a law and, as we say, Congress enacts it; that is, it puts the conclusion into effect. But the impetus begins out in the grass roots with the individual men and women with whom our national destiny rests. The best insurance we have against dictatorships is the earnest effort on the part of these men and women to inform themselves concerning proposed legislation, to determine in the light of their own convictions whether it is good or bad, and to tell their political representatives what they think about it. Let me say, too, that in all fairness, we ought to be as unsparing of our commendation as we are of our criticism, which unfortunately we are not. We have, as Mr. Adonis said, a big job to do—a job that will demand the closest understanding between Government and business. We have the organization machinery for maintaining and promoting this understanding. It could be more extensively used to the benefit of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. ADONIS. Thank you, Mr. Stringfellow. Ladies and gentlemen, you have just heard an interview with Mr. George E. Stringfellow on the subject of business and government—a subject very much in the minds of most of us at this time. This was brought to you as a public service of station WINS.

Old-Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

RESOLUTION BY THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF HILL COUNTY, MONT.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Board of County Commissioners of Hill County, Mont.:

HILL COUNTY COURT HOUSE,
March 15, 1941.

We, the undersigned members of the Board of County Commissioners, county of Hill, State of Montana, believe something must be done to provide adequate pensions for our deserving senior citizens, and, at our regular meeting have adopted this resolution:

"Whereas the members here assembled believe that a national uniform system of old-age pensions should be adopted throughout the United States of America; and

"Whereas the proposals embraced in the Townsend bill (H. R. 1036) will greatly relieve, if not entirely abolish, unemployment, and will provide to the people the American standard of living; and

"Whereas the various States of the Union are finding it difficult to raise a sufficient revenue to finance the payment of adequate pensions to the aged; and

"Whereas that a universal tax be levied and moneys so raised shall be divided pro rata and paid to all citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 60 years and over: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America to consider the basic principles of the Townsend bill (H. R. 1036) now in committee; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That one copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of the following: The Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee; the Honorable BURTON K. WHEELER, Senator; the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, Senator; the Honorable JEANNETTE RANKIN, Congresswoman; the Honorable JAMES F. O'CONNOR, Congressman."

RAY L. SAND,
Chairman, Board of County Commissioners.
J. C. LUDWIG,
A. J. TIMMONS,
Commissioners.

Our President Has Spoken

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

EDITORIAL BY LUDWIK LESNICKI

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include an editorial of Ludwik Lesnicki, editor and political commentator, from a recent issue of the Alliance Daily, Chicago, and repeated in Courier, Milwaukee, and other dailies, on the speech of President Roosevelt.

The editorial very briefly and accurately expresses the views to which many political writers and commentators fully subscribe.

The editorial follows:

[From the Alliance Daily, Chicago, Ill.]

OUR PRESIDENT HAS SPOKEN

(By Ludwik Lesnicki)

President Roosevelt's speech is a great historic document. It will rank as such in the future.

In no utterance of an American President have the facts been faced more fearlessly.

In no utterance has the logic of those facts been more clearly stated.

President Roosevelt does not disguise the purpose of his message.

That part of his speech is strong meat for strong men and women.

It means the practicable cooperation with the nations that are fighting savages and murderers.

It means the organization and coordination of our material resources.

His statement, "Our democracy has gone into action," is not merely a magnificent gesture.

Every patriotic American will certainly re-echo the President's declaration that—

"There is no longer the slightest question or doubt that the American people recognize the extreme seriousness of the present situation. That is why they demanded and got a policy of unqualified, immediate all-out aid for Britain, Greece, China, and for all the governments in exile whose homelands are temporarily occupied by the aggressors."

If this declaration, indeed, be not the voice of a nation, we are not fit to be a nation.

The President asks that we range ourselves on the side of the democracies of the world and against unscrupulous autocracies, whose continued success and power spells an eternal menace.

Thus the President has spoken.

We are prepared to spend and be spent for those high ideals that neither numbers nor wealth have blotted from the souls of true Americans.

Government Aid for Farm Tenants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF IOWA

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 12

Whereas Iowa was developed primarily as an agricultural State and is at the present time one of the greatest agricultural areas in the Union; and

Whereas farming in Iowa is primarily a way of living which in the past has provided a place for ambitious and thrifty families to live in peace and security and provide for themselves the necessary and desirable things in life; and

Whereas the advent of power machinery and equipment, together with the application of the triple-A program, has made it possible for certain individuals, companies, and corporations to farm ever-increasing areas of good farm land at a profit; and

Whereas this practice is depriving thousands of Iowa farm families from their only way of living and is forcing many of them onto relief rolls; and

Whereas an additional 5,000 families will be deprived of their way of livelihood again this year and will be forced to leave their present homes; and

Whereas through the drifting of these landless farmers from State to State in search of land and homes the solution of this great evil has passed beyond the control of the various States and the problem has become national in character and extent; and

Whereas through governmental agencies aid has been extended to home builders in urban districts by governmental guaranty of loans on such homes; and

Whereas farm homes for these dispossessed farmers are at least equally as important to the tranquillity and security of our Nation as are the homes for urban residents and at the present time no provision has been made to early or adequately relieve this ever-growing cancer in our body politic; and

Whereas it has long been the established policy of our Federal Government to provide homes and homesteads for our farm-minded people to which policy much of our national progress may be ascribed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Iowa (the House of Representatives concurring), That we memorialize the Congress of the United Staes that they by amendment of the Federal Housing Act or by the enactment of new and appropriate legislation make available to farmers, and especially to farm tenants who are without farms, governmental aid equal to that afforded to urban residents in order that they may be able to obtain sufficient land and decent homes in which to live and maintain their families; and be it further

Resolved That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Vice President, and to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress.

The Tax Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JARED Y. SANDERS, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from a constituent, Mr. A. L. Prescott, of Baton Rouge, La., expressing his views on the matter of taxation.

I have long been of the opinion that the people of this country are ahead of the Congress, both in the seriousness of their views of the present situation and in their determination to take whatever steps may be necessary to see this country safely through the present emergency. That we can finance the tremendous program of national defense and the policy of aid to Britain voted by this Congress and approved by the people, without greatly increasing our taxes, is a delusion. Anyone who attempts to tell us that it will not be necessary to increase our taxes is merely trying to fool the people. That the people themselves who must foot the bill realize this is evident.

This letter is merely typical of other letters received, and illustrates the point of view of these splendid, patriotic American citizens who are animated by no thought except the love of our country and of our American ideals.

The letter I refer to is as follows:

MARCH 18, 1941.

Hon. J. Y. SANDERS:

Now that we have the lend-lease bill passed, we want to make it work. I am in favor of a defense tax on all weekly wages from $20 a week up of from 1 percent to 5 percent, with exemption for those under $35 a week that have a dependent family.

I think that everyone wants to help and this is a fine way to pay our way as we go. Besides, if Hitler wins, our money would not be much good, anyway. We want no half-way measures and if we have the cash we will get action.

I make $40 a week. Help get good wages and the people won't mind the tax.

A. L. PRESCOTT,
Baton Rouge, La.

Financing National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. WRIGHT PATMAN, OF TEXAS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over the radio on March 30, 1941:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, during the third week of this month, March 1941, the House of Representatives passed appropriation bills aggregating $11,000,000,000. These bills will soon become a law. Eleven billion dollars is an incomprehensible sum. Divided up among the 130,000,000 people in this country, it means an $85 debt for every man, woman, and child in America. Before the end of this year our Nation will owe $65,000,000,000. This is the equivalent of a $500 per capita debt owed to the Federal Government alone. It does not include debts owed to cities, counties, and States.

$130,000,000,000 (BILLION) DEBT BY END OF YEAR

If we continue what is commonly referred to as the orthodox money system of issuing interest-bearing bonds to obtain the Government's money for the use of the Government, by the time this debt is paid it will have cost the people twice as much as the amount of the bonds, or $130,000,000,000 instead of $65,000,000,000. It is a change in this so-called orthodox money system that I desire to talk to you about this evening which is in support of H. R. 116, now pending in Congress.

GOVERNMENT PAYING BONDHOLDER AS MUCH AS PAID SOLDIERS AND SUPPLIERS

The question of paying interest on our national debt is more serious than many people believe. It means that the taxpayers are required to pay $2 for every $1 that the Government borrows. It means that every time a soldier is paid a dollar, the bondholders are promised a dollar in interest, which is paid later. Every time one who furnishes materials or supplies to the Government is paid a dollar, the bondholders are promised a dollar in interest, which will be paid later. In other words, $2 paid by the Government for every $1 borrowed.

PAYMENTS BY ALL INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXPAYERS NOT SUFFICIENT TO PAY GOVERNMENT ANNUAL INTEREST CHARGE

In order that you may fully realize the significance of this tremendous burden on the people, if all of the money paid by the millions of individual income taxpayers this year is used to pay interest on our national debt, it will not be sufficient. It was not sufficient last year nor the year before. Therefore, if we can eliminate a wasteful expenditure, which amounts to more than all of the money paid by the individual income taxpayers each year, our efforts will not be in vain.

GOVERNMENT-BOND RACKET STARTED TO APPEASE THE RICH

When our Government was founded over 150 years ago, it was the theory of Alexander Hamilton that if the Government needed money, it should issue interest-bearing bonds and sell them to obtain the money. Mr. Hamilton realized it was not necessary for the Government to sell a bond in order to acquire money that the Government itself created, but those supporting the views of Mr. Hamilton insisted that it would be a good thing for the country for the following reasons:

First. By selling bonds issued by the Government to individuals, and especially to rich people, it would cause these rich influential people to have an interest in the new Government, a selfish interest; and in the event of trouble, these people would support the Government because if the Government should fall, they would lose their investments.

Second. It was insisted that if the Government issued interest-bearing bonds, Congress would be retarded from becoming too extravagant; that is if Congress appropriated too much money, and thereby caused

the issuance of an excessive bond issue, the price of the outstanding bonds would go down in value and all the bondholders in the country would be protesting to Congress against the further increase in appropriations so as to protect the value of their bonds. Further, it was said that if Congress became too extravagant, the Government would be unable to sell its bonds and thereby prohibit the Congress from appropriating money, or spending money.

When Mr. Hamilton suggested that the rich people would better support the Government if they owned an interest in the country, a financial interest, there was a very much different situation existing then, compared to the situation now. Then, our Government was in its infancy, had just been established and had not proven itself.

The answer to the contention that the issuance of bonds will retard an extravagant Congress, it can be said now that such an argument is not applicable because banks can now obtain new money on their Government bonds 100 cents on the dollar. Therefore there is no danger of bonds losing their value or becoming unsalable.

OLDEST LOBBY IN AMERICA

It can be truthfully said that Mr. Alexander Hamilton inspired the first militant minority to influence Congress when he caused Government bonds providing for interest payments to be sold to rich people over the country for the purpose of having them exert pressure on Congress at the proper time to keep down governmental expenditures. So the oldest lobby in America is the United States Government bondholders' lobby.

INTEREST BURDEN WILL SOON REACH $2,000,000,000 A YEAR

Our country drifted along for the first 125 years without paying very much interest on Government bonds. A comparatively small amount was paid each year in interest on Government bonds, but not a sufficient amount to cause any concern. During the past 25 years, however, the interest burden has become quite a problem for the Government. In recent years the Federal annual interest charge has increased to over $1,000,000,000, and within the next few months, when our national debt is increased to the debt limit, our Federal annual interest charge will probably exceed $2,000,000,000. This will certainly be true if interest rates are increased as contemplated by those who have so much to do with the control of our monetary system at this time.

UNNECESSARY, EXTRAVAGANT, AND WASTEFUL

It is my contention that it is unnecessary for the sovereign Government of the United States to issue interest-bearing bonds and thereby cause the Government to pay interest for the use of its own credit. I contend it is not only unnecessary but it is also extravagant and wasteful.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS SOLE POWER TO CREATE MONEY

If an individual State or a private corporation needs money, it is proper and right for bonds to be issued and sold for the purpose of obtaining the money. In such a case neither the State nor private corporation has the power to create money. That is not true as to our Federal Government, since it has the money-creating power and certainly should not sell bonds, upon which interest must be paid, in order to obtain money that the Federal Government only can create.

GOVERNMENT SELLS BONDS TO OBTAIN MONEY OF ITS OWN CREATION

I propose that the Government issue its own credit on its own security without paying tribute to any group for the privilege of using its own credit. The Government issues both bonds, which draw interest, and money, which are non-interest-bearing obligations of the Government. Both are obligations of the Government based upon the same security and are printed at the same printing plant here in Washington. It is certainly difficult for many people to understand why the Government that issues both bonds and money must sell bonds and pay interest every year in order to acquire money that the Government itself creates.

BANKS GET MONEY FOR 30 CENTS PER $1,000

Your attention is invited to the fact that our Government is permitting the Federal Reserve Banking System that is owned by private commercial banks to issue money upon the credit of the Nation by paying the cost of printing the money, which is about 30 cents per thousand dollars. These banks take this money, which costs them 30 cents per thousand dollars, and buys United States Government bonds, upon which the Government pays to them an interest charge each year. Private commercial banks also create money and buy United States Government interest-bearing bonds. This does not make common sense.

NO PRINTING-PRESS MONEY SCHEME

It must be understood that I am not advocating what is commonly referred to as a printing-press money scheme; neither am I advocating the issuance of "rubber money" or "baloney dollars." The proposal that many of us are working on in Congress will stabilize the value of money and will safeguard our Nation against dangerous inflation as well as save the taxpayers $2,000,000,000 a year in interest charges that they will be compelled to pay on our huge national debt if the system is not changed.

FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS NOT OWNED BY GOVERNMENT

The Federal Reserve Banking System is not a governmental institution. Every dollar of outstanding stock issued by this system is owned by the private commercial banks of the country. Although the Federal Reserve Board is appointed by the President and confirmed by the United States Senate, the system is privately owned, and the private banks of the country otherwise control the Federal Reserve Banking System. For all practical purposes, our Federal Reserve Banking System, which has the money-issuing power, is owned and controlled by the private commercial banks that are selfishly interested in controlling money and its value.

It would be just as reasonable for the United States Treasury to be operated by private selfish interests as it is for the institutions that create money upon the Government's credit to be owned by private institutions.

BOOMS AND DEPRESSIONS

Throughout our Government's existence we have had booms and depressions one after another. We have abundant proof that can be presented during each decade of our country's 150 years existence to show that a banker-controlled, money-issuing privilege or debt money system is not only wrong but injurious and destructive to the rights of the people.

EVERYTHING MUST BE PAID FOR

It is not proposed that Congress cause money to be issued that will never be paid back. Someone must pay for everything, and in the exercise of the privilege that it has of issuing non-interest-bearing Government obligations, or credit instead of interest bearing, they will have to be paid back; but the payments made each year of an amount equal to what is normally paid as interest will entirely pay off and liquidate the bonds in 25 or 30 years.

Do not overlook this fact, that if we pay 4 percent each year on our public debt, we will have it entirely paid in 25 years, if we are not compelled to pay as much in interest as we pay on the principal of the debt.

RESOLUTIONS SHOULD BE SENT TO CONGRESS

During this critical period, when we are trying to save every dollar that we can for national defense, and to provide for our huge social program, every debating society and open forum should fully and thoroughly discuss this proposal that will save the taxpayers $2,000,000,000 a year. Resolutions should be adopted by different groups and sent to Congress.

DEFINITE PROPOSAL

My proposal is for the Government to acquire the entire ownership and control of the Federal Reserve banking system by paying the member private commercial banks the $138,000,000 they have invested; for a new board to be set up to control the system, obligated to stabilize the value of money and not permit a man-made depression every few years, which causes the rich to become richer and the poor to become poorer; and eliminate private banking control or influence over the issuance of the Nation's credit.

Then when the Government needs money, the Treasury can obtain it without an interest burden in either of two ways:

First. The Treasury can deliver to the 12 Federal Reserve banks non-interest-bearing obligations and have the banks, which will be Government owned, to give the Treasury credit for the amount of the bonds. Checks can then be drawn upon the account and any debt owed by the Government can be paid as at present. No more money will be printed than under our present system.

Second. Or the Treasury can deliver to the Federal Reserve banks interest-bearing bonds and receive credit for them and pay the money out in payment of Government debts; interest will be paid on these bonds to the Federal Reserve banks, but the banks being owned by the Government, the profits from the interest on the bonds will flow right back into the Treasury. The only difference in this plan and the present system is that the Government will not be required to pay interest and no more money will be printed than under our present system. Provisions could be made for the interest-bearing bonds held by the Federal Reserve banks to be sold to the public in the event of danger of inflation.

IDIOTIC SYSTEM SHOULD BE CHANGED

In conclusion, I repeat that Congress should immediately take steps to change this idiotic system, which requires the people to pay $2 for every $1 that is borrowed by the Government. The change suggested will save our taxpayers $2,000,000,000 a year and will enable the Federal Government to entirely pay off and liquidate our enormous public debt in 25 years.

Last, but not least, our proposal embodied in H. R. 116, will prevent dangerous inflation and will repeal the laws, which have farmed out the use and abuse of the Government's credit to private commercial banks and institutions owned by them.

Conservation at the Head Gate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McINTYRE

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

ADDRESS BY R. R. GARDNER, OF GLENROCK, WYO.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, last Friday morning Mr. R. R. Gardner, of

Glenrock, Wyo., a delegate to the national convention of the Izaak Walton League of America, delivered a very able address in which he discussed the problem of conserving fish in streams by screening irrigation ditches. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include his address.

The subject Conservation at the Headgate is unusually difficult and extremely important and deals with the loss of fish through irrigation ditches, reclamation projects, and all man-made outlets from streams and reservoirs.

We, the fishermen, conservationists, and lovers of wildlife, are clamoring for action to stop this fish loss, while the water user is maintaining a determined resistance against the enforcement of the fish-screen laws of the various States, especially in States wherein the user is required to stand part or all the cost of screening.

Taking the Wyoming case as an example, we find that prior to this year Wyoming had a law which provided that the user of water was obligated to construct and maintain fish screens at his own expense. This law was entirely disregarded and never enforced for the reason that it was not workable. However, it presented the problem of public rights in water, and through the efforts of the Izaak Walton League of Wyoming a new law was passed at the last session of our legislature which at least partially remedied the difficulty, and for the purposes of the record I will read it:

"*Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:*

"SECTION 1. That section 122-1204, Revised Statutes of Wyoming, 1931, be amended and reenacted to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 122-1204. The Game and Fish Department of the State of Wyoming may construct and maintain, at or near the point of diversion where the water of any stream or reservoir is diverted by any means of conveyance from its natural channel, some fit and proper device whereby all fish will be prevented from entering said means of conveyance; provided, such device does not obstruct or diminish the flow of water through said means of conveyance; and provided further, that the determination as to obstruction shall be within the discretion of the water commissioner of the district within which such structure is placed subject to appeal to the division superintendent, and from the decision of the division superintendent to the State engineer.' "

I read this only to show the change made in the law and that it may be studied in conjunction with other State laws and with the thought that a more uniform code may be adopted by all the States wherein the same problem exists.

Only through a national organization, such as the Izaak Walton League of America, can the matter be properly studied, and ultimately carried to a successful conclusion.

I would like to suggest a workable plan and make a hero of myself, but I may not be as successful as Paul Revere, who was one of our greatest heroes. He told his wife he was out all night with a horse and she believed it.

I have corresponded with fish and game organizations, with game commissions of the various States, and with the Bureau of Fisheries of the Federal Government; and have compiled a world of data in connection with the subject matter, and after reading all of this information and analyzing it, I still find the subject quite confused and find it difficult to make a definite suggestion.

The subject might be divided, however, into the following subheads:

1. Number of fish lost through irrigation ditches and canals.
2. Conditions of outlets and headgates through which fish migrate.
3. Attitude of water user toward screening headgates.
4. Responsibility of water user to screen headgates.
5. Obligation or duty of our fish and game commissions and Federal agencies to assist in screening headgates, and
6. Proper screens to use in preventing loss.

In studying the various phases of this subject I have reached certain conclusions in connection with each separate phase, and will endeavor to give you the result of these conclusions.

First, I find, upon consulting various water users, that there is a diversity of opinion as to the number of fish that are actually lost annually through headgates and through diversion of water into irrigation ditches and canals. Some are of the opinion that many fish find their way back into the streams when the water runs low, while others are of the opinion that fish will gradually work downstream in a canal, as well as in a flowing stream, in order to find deeper water. No doubt this phase of the question has been studied by game and fish departments and definite information may be obtained on it. However, I have made a personal investigation, and judging from conversations with water users and data obtained in my study of this subject, I am fully convinced that thousands of fish, in fact, millions of fish, are lost annually through irrigation canals and water diversion, and it is incumbent upon our game and fish commissions to make a thorough study of this loss and a study of the ditches and canals through which the greatest number of fish are lost, in order that intelligent action may be taken to curb it.

Certain States have made definite surveys of losses, and I could quote figures to show that the loss is tremendous. For instance, the Federal Bureau of Fisheries made a survey to determine the loss of fish in irrigation ditches supplied by the Yakima River in Washington, and the investigator reported finding 4,000 fish, of which 90 percent were migrating salmon, in a 200-acre tract. For the 250,000 acres then under irrigation this would indicate a loss of approximately 5,000,000 fish at one watering, 4,500,000 being salmon in the first and second years, and for an entire season this figure would have to be multiplied many times. Our own game and fish commission in Wyoming has stated that it has no way of estimating the number of fish that survive after planting, but believe that loss through irrigation laterals is the greatest single waste we sustain. I have personally investigated irrigation ditches and have found many fish stranded. In one instance a rancher found 12 fish in his garden one morning, 4 of which were large trout, approximately 1 foot long. He also informed me that he had seen many large as well as small fish in his ditches and laterals.

Investigations made by various game and fish commissions of the Western States and by the Bureau of Fisheries disclosed that there is a greater loss of small fish through irrigation ditches than of large fish, due to the fact that the young fish is inclined to drift with the current and has no natural instinct to avoid drifting with the current into irrigation headgates and openings. It follows that it is very difficult to check the exact loss of these small fish in laterals and meadows. The fact remains, however, that millions of fish are lost annually through our irrigation ditches, and it presents one of the most difficult problems for our consideration.

It seems useless to spend thousands of dollars each year to hatch, rear, and plant fish only to have them lost in irrigation ditches. It would seem a good business policy to use some of the money expended by our game and fish commissions in the propagation and planting of fish, to properly screen headgates, and thus save a larger portion of the fish planted.

It is estimated by one fish hatchery that it costs 30 to 40 cents per pound to raise and plant fish. Certainly something should be done immediately to prevent the loss of these fish so expensively raised and planted, as well as those naturally propagated. Fish lost through headgates make an excellent but costly fertilizer.

The condition of outlets, that is their various construction, is a matter of common knowledge, and it would be useless to dwell at length on this phase of the subject. I might say however that many of our western ranchers throw a temporary dam across a mountain stream, thus diverting the entire flow and incidentally many of these dams are manure dams which also pollute the water.

With the entire flow of the stream diverted it is easy to understand that many, many fish would be lost through such diversion.

As to our fish-screen laws, it is my conclusion that it is difficult to enforce the present screen laws of the various States. Because of the cost of installation and maintenance of proper screens, I am sure that irrigationists cannot be forced to install screens or to maintain them. It seems to be the general attitude of irrigationists that they are entitled to use the water which actually belongs to the State, but they do not wish to go to any expense in keeping the fish out of the ditches.

The State of Oregon has attempted to enforce a screen law, and I have a statement from the Oregon State Game and Fish Commission to the effect that in one or two instances ditch owners have actually been sued for not complying with the law. The cases were lost. Therefore, I must conclude that our problem is not so much one of law but in securing the cooperation of the irrigationist in working out a plan whereby streams may be properly screened and the expense thereof shared by the State game and fish commissions, or by direct State or Federal appropriations. I might say in this connection, however, that in the State of California action was brought to enforce a screen law and was successfully carried through the State supreme court. This probably is the only instance where a screen law was completely tested and held valid and enforcible.

As a result of this action, however, California amended its law in 1933, by which amendment one-half of the cost of fish-screen installation, operation, and maintenance was assessed to the commission. But this law also failed to meet the needs, and a bill is now pending before the legislature in California, or has been passed, whereby the commission will be permitted to construct, at its own cost, fish screens on ditches where the water is used primarily, and, in the larger portion thereof, for agricultural purposes. All other water users will install screens upon order of the commission at their own expense, and all screens, regardless of how originally installed, will be operated and maintained by the ditch owner. This bill has the endorsement of the American Legion of that State, the conversation or sportsmen's organizations, and the commission itself.

In order that uniform codes may be adopted, a Nation-wide, comprehensive plan must be evolved by which the State game and fish commissions and the various sportsman's organizations of the States will work in harmony and in conjunction with stock growers and farmers associations and with individual irrigationists. A long-range plan should be adopted with the ultimate aim of procuring the passage of laws that are practical, feasible, and acceptable to all parties in

interest, and under which we may eventually screen adequately all the principal irrigation ditches and canals of the States wherein this problem is present.

I have procured about all the data available pertaining to the type of screens used by various States and those which apparently have been most successful, and, I find that a rotary or drum-type screen is probably the best type available. There seems, however, to be some drawback in connection with most of these. The principal of which are:

1. Excessive cost of installation.
2 Troublesome maintenance.
3. Inefficiency of operation.

I have found that the cost of installing one of the better rotary screens is almost prohibitive from the standpoint of the water user, and it appears to me that the only way these screens may be installed is through the cooperation of the water user, the game and fish commission, and Federal agencies. Our game and fish commission in Wyoming has made a study of the types of screens available, cost of installation, etc., and is at the present time looking toward the installation of certain rotary type screens.

After studying this problem from every angle, I feel justified in making the following recommendations:

1. That through proper publicity, the Game and Fish Commissions and the various sportsmen's organizations of the States affected, attempt to build up sentiment among irrigationists in favor of conservation by proper construction and screening of headgates.

2 That special committees be appointed by Game and Fish Commissions to work in conjunction with committees from sportsmen's organizations to ascertain and report on the most economical, feasible, and practical fish screens for use in headgates and other sources of diversion, and to make recommendations as to proper methods of installation and maintenance.

3. That Game and Fish Commissions make surveys of all irrigation ditches and canals of the States affected that take water from the principal fishing streams, and outline a systematic plan for the screening of these ditches.

4. That Game and Fish Commissions make a special study of the streams and of the irrigation outlets and screen those outlets first through which we sustain our greatest fish loss.

5. That each stream selected to be screened be completed in its entirety before work is started on another stream.

6. That the Izaak Walton League cooperate with the Bureau of Fisheries and attempt to procure assistance through Federal appropriations and W. P. A. projects in the installation of screens.

7. That a committee from the Izaak Walton League work in conjunction with committees from the Game and Fish Commissions of the various States to propose a revision of the present State laws relative to screening ditches to provide that all or a portion of the cost and expense of installation and maintenance of screens shall be borne by the game and fish commissions and that power and reclamation projects be compelled to install and maintain their own screens.

In conclusion I would like to leave this thought: That the objects and purposes of the Izaak Walton League of America are not dissimilar to the objects and purposes of game and fish commissions of the various States and that by working in close harmony and conjunction with State commissions we can accomplish much good.

Surely, if we are to maintain good fishing in the Western States, we must work earnestly and diligently to eliminate the fish losses and provide additional means of conservation.

Subversive Activities of Certain Labor Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LELAND M. FORD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

LETTER FROM JOSEPH CURRAN, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL MARITIME UNION, AND REPLY THERETO BY HON. LELAND M. FORD, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

NATIONAL MARITIME UNION
of AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., March 26, 1941.

HONORABLE SIR: The National Maritime Union has been the target of continued slanderous attacks by Congressman Dies, his committee and other anti-labor Congressmen. On Tuesday, March 25, he launched a tirade against the National Maritime Union on the floor of the House of Representatives, calling the union "Communist-controlled" and stating that he had inside information that the union was contemplating a general strike in the event Harry Bridges was deported.

The following is the reply of the National Maritime Union to these attacks.

The fantastic and slanderous charges which Congressman Dies has again repeated on the floor of the House on Tuesday that the National Maritime Union is "Communist-controlled" on the basis of evidence obtained in biased, one-sided hearings, from witnesses who, for the most part, consist of petty thieves, gangsters, expelled members of the union with axes to grind, all willing to lie for personal gain, proves more clearly than ever our contention that this committee is biased and working solely to destroy legitimate labor unions, instead of ferreting out real un-American activities. Congressman Dies is playing on public hysteria which is at a high pitch at this time, to carry out his nefarious work.

His charge that the National Maritime Union is contemplating a general strike in the event that Harry Bridges is deported is so ridiculous that it needs no reply. The constitution of the National Maritime Union calls for secret referendum vote of all members before a strike can be called. The National Maritime Union reiterates, however, its full support of the National CIO program in defense of Harry Bridges.

Very truly yours,
JOSEPH CURRAN,
President.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 27, 1941

MR. JOSEPH CURRAN,
President, National Maritime Union of America,
126 Eleventh Avenue,
New York City, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. CURRAN: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 26 wherein you take exception to certain things that Congressman DIES has said about you and your union and their support of Harry Bridges, particularly where he calls your union "Communist controlled."

It is my opinion that if ever an outfit deserved the criticism that you, Harry Bridges, and other leaders in your union receive, you certainly have earned and deserved it. It is my further opinion that this country is no longer going to judge you and your cohorts by your honeyed, misleading words, but are going to hold you responsible for what you do and your real actions.

Of course, you would not like DIES and his committee any more than a lot of other people whose activities DIES and his committee have thrown the searchlight of publicity upon. This subversive work is best carried on in the recesses of darkness and ignorance and by keeping the ordinary man within your ranks misinformed and misled.

I have always stated that a man can attain a certain high standing by reason of the quality of his enemies. I can therefore say that to me, and to the great majority of the people in the United States, Congressman MARTIN DIES and the members of his committee have attained a tremendously high standing by reason of such enemies as you.

It is my opinion that there is a certain group of leaders in this country who have made a racket out of unionism. These same leaders have, at no time, considered the welfare and well-being of the man in their ranks who is actually doing the work. All that these leaders sought to do was to create strife, dissension, and riots in order that they could have something by which to justify the collection of their tremendous racketeering fees. In addition to these American-born racketeers, it is my opinion that the ranks of the C. I. O. leaders have become filled with subversive foreign-born leaders who would destroy the American form of government and all American labor with it.

I note that you apparently resent the statement that this committee has called your union "Communist controlled"; but as against this, I also note that your union has never expelled the Communist element and has consistently refused to do so.

It is not the legitimate, constructive labor movement that Dies and the great majority of the people in this country object to, but it is the destructive, Europeanized, socialized, Sovietized, Communized, un-American racketeering union leader, who is promoting un-American ideas, that Dies and many of the rest of us object to.

With reference to your statement about the quality of witnesses. Very frankly, I have never known you to throw out of your union, to use your own words, "the petty thieves, gangsters," etc., "with axes to grind" for their own personal gain. It is my opinion that most of these remained within your union and that this is the type of leadership that is hurting the constructive unions, as well as the destructive unions like your own. Of course, occasionally, when those termed by yourself as "petty thieves and gangsters" fight over the spoils that have been taken away from legitimate workmen, somebody will be thrown out when greed manifests itself.

As usual, you do not answer "yes" or "no" about the strike with reference to Harry Bridges. You sidestep the issue and leave it open so that you may strike if you want to, but you have not been straightforward.

I note that your group speaks of persecution, individual rights, individual liberty, freedom of speech, and freedom of action when you want to use these things yourselves, but, by God, how you do scream when anybody else insists upon having his freedom of speech, action, individual liberty, or constitutional rights. When your union uses force to

coerce men to join your union in such instances as this, where stink bombs have been thrown into the homes of men, men's arms have been broken, men's jaws have been broken, property such as automobiles wrecked, industrial plant property wrecked and destroyed, slow-down strikes engaged in, goon squads acting as pickets to beat up men who want to go to work, has it ever occurred to you that any of these men whom you have beaten up, the owners of the property that you have destroyed, the owners of industries, the public at large, have any rights under the Constitution of the United States? Your outfit has violated every one of the principles of decency, has disturbed the peace, become trespassers and destroyers of property, resisted the officers of the land, tried to take the law into your own hands, and now you come running and screaming for these rights that you would deny others.

Your own chickens are coming home to roost and you now have destroyed public confidence in yourself and your unions, and eventually the public will give you what you so richly deserve.

These remarks go only to the racketeering, un-American, subversive leadership, and do not apply to the poor devil who is really doing the work down in the ranks, who has been beaten up into submission and coerced into joining your outfit, and who has been willing to do these things in the days of unemployment in order to give his wife and family something to eat after he has gotten through paying you through the nose both in cash and with his self-respect.

I again honor MARTIN DIES and the Dies committee for the enmity which you bear toward them.

Very truly yours,

L. M. FORD.

Jackson Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 31), 1941

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Jackson Day address delivered by the President of the United States from Fort Lauderdale, Fla., on last Saturday evening, March 29, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am sitting in the little cabin of the little ship *Potomac*, in the harbor of Fort Lauderdale, Fla., after a day of sunshine out in the Gulf Stream. That I cannot in person attend one of the many Jackson Day dinners I regret, but it is good that you are again celebrating the memory of a great American leader who believed, fanatically almost, in the principles of a democracy based on the freedom of the ballot box.

I try to get away a couple of times a year on these short trips on salt water. In Washington, as you know, the working day of the Presidency in these days averages about 15 hours. Even when I go to Hyde Park or to Warm Springs, the White House office, the callers and the telephone all follow me. But at sea the radio messages and the occasional pouch of mail reduce official work to not more than 2 or 3 hours a day.

So there is a chance for a bit of sunshine or a wetted line, or a biography or a detective story, or a nap after lunch. Above all, there is the opportunity for thinking things through—for differentiating between principles and methods, between the really big things of life and those other things of the moment which may seem all-important today and are forgotten by the world in a month. That means that if today the fellow next to you catches a bigger fish than you do, or vice versa, you don't lie awake at night thinking about it.

SAYS TIME CALLS FOR COURAGE

Yes; you recapture your philosophy, but in so doing you do not sit down mentally and become a fatalist. You still seek peace of mind and of spirit—but you come to realize that today you have to work overtime, and work harder than ever before in your life to make that peace possible later on. If we sit down now we may get run over later. And if our kind of civilization gets run over, the kind of peace we seek will become an unattainable hope.

That is why, in the comparative quiet of this week, I have become more than ever clear that the time calls for courage and more courage—action and more action.

That is why it is appropriate today to honor the name of Andrew Jackson—because he was first and foremost a great American, who placed his devotion to country above adherence to party, and provided an ever-living symbol of the rugged, courageous spirit of our people.

Responsibility lay heavily upon the shoulders of Andrew Jackson.

In his day the threat to the Federal Union came from within. It was a sectional threat. More than that, it was a threat which came from Jackson's own people—indeed, from some members of his own party. It was inspired by refusal to recognize the sovereign authority of the United States. And by his actions Jackson placed himself far above section and party.

CITES THREAT TO NATION

In our own day the threat to our Union and to our democracy is not a sectional one. It comes from a great part of the world which surrounds us, and which draws more tightly around us, day by day.

Again, to do this job, we Americans—nearly all of us—have risen above any considerations of party politics.

Long before Jackson became President the two-party system of government had become firmly entrenched as a basic principle of American political life. It had shown its value as a method of obtaining free and open discussion of public issues, formulating new policies to meet new conditions, and fixing responsibilities in affairs of government as an indispensable part of our conception of free elections.

The dictators cannot seem to realize that here in America our people can maintain two parties and at the same time maintain an inviolate and indivisible nation. The totalitarian mentality is too narrow to comprehend the greatness of a people who can be divided in party allegiance at election time but remain united in devotion to their country and to the ideals of democracy at all times.

In dictatorships there can be no party divisions. For all men must think as they are told, speak as they are told, write as they are told, live—and die—as they are told. In those countries the nation is not above the party as with us. The party is above the nation, the party is the nation.

Every common man and woman is forced to walk the straight and narrow path of the party line, as drawn by the dictator himself.

POINTS TO FREE ELECTIONS

In our country, disagreements among us are expressed in the polling place. In the dictatorships, disagreements are suppressed in the concentration camp.

Last year we held an American election, in which the people—Democrats, Republicans, Independents, and others—by secret ballot, and without prodding by the bayonets of storm troopers, voted for their public officers—local, State, and national.

And we are determined so to act that America will go on year after year, holding free elections.

All of the great freedoms which form the basis of our American democracy are part and parcel of that concept of free election, with free expression of political choice between candidates of political parties. For such elections guarantee that there can be no possibility of stifling freedom of speech, freedom of press and the air, freedom of worship.

These are the eternal principles which are now being threatened by the alliance of dictator nations.

Ours is the responsibility of defending those principles which have come to us as our national heritage, ours is the responsibility of passing them on—not only intact, but stronger than ever, to all the generations yet to come.

RECALLS CONQUERED NATIONS

We Americans realize how tenuous would be the existence of our party system, our freedom of election, our freedom of living, if the doctrines of dictatorship were to prevail. For if they were to prevail it would not be in Europe alone.

The history of nations betrayed during the past year, the history of nations conquered during the past year, should show us and the rest of the world what it means to live in a world organized and ruled by the Gestapo.

Let us ask ourselves, frankly and seriously: How long could we maintain our ancient liberties under these terrible conditions? How soon would we have to accept the doctrine that one must fight fire with fire?

How long would it be possible to maintain a semblance of our two-party system, with free elections, in a Nazi-dominated world?

How soon would we decide to imitate nazism and abandon our two-party system and regiment our people into one party—which would certainly be neither Democratic nor Republican?

NONPARTISAN DECISION NOTED

Should that evil time come, we would no longer hold these friendly gatherings, either on Jackson Day or on Lincoln Day.

We Americans have already weighed these questions carefully and thoughtfully. We Americans have announced our determination that, with all our resources and all our power, we shall help those who block the dictators in their march toward domination of the world.

The decision we have reached is not a partisan decision. The leader of the Republican Party himself, Mr. Wendell Willkie, in word and in action, is showing what patriotic Americans mean by rising above partisanship and rallying to the common cause; and now that the plain people of America have spoken their determination, Republicans and Democrats, in the Congress and out of the Congress, are patriotically cooperating to make that determination take positive form.

The enemies of democracy are now trying, by every means, to destroy our unity. The chief weapon they now use against us is propaganda.

GOSPEL OF FEAR ASSAILED

The propaganda comes in ever-increasing quantities, with ever-increasing violence,

from across the seas. And it is disseminated within our own borders by agents or innocent dupes of foreign powers.

It is directed against all Americans—Republicans and Democrats, farmers and bankers, employers and employees.

Propagandists, defeatists, and dupes, protected as they are by our fundamental civil liberties, have been preaching and are still preaching the ungodly gospel of fear. They use insinuation and falsehood. They have tried to shatter the confidence of Americans in their Government and in one another.

We have seen what has happened to the great industrialists of Germany who supported the Nazi movement, and then received their reward in Nazi concentration camps or in death.

We have seen how the workers of France were betrayed by their so-called champions, the Communists. For no matter what Communist lips have to say, their actions have proved that in their hearts they care nothing for the real rights of free labor.

SCORES AGENTS OF NAZI-ISM

The agents of nazi-ism and those who unwittingly help them are still trying to play both ends against the middle. They have attempted to exploit the natural love of our people for peace. They have represented themselves as pacifists when actually they are serving the most brutal warmongers of all time. They have preached "peace—peace!" in the same way the devil can quote scripture.

Of course, the purpose of all this has been to spread terror among us. The effect of it has been only to fortify our determination.

When Abraham Lincoln became President he had to face the awful reality of War between the States. On July 4, 1861, in his first message to the Congress, he presented this vital question:

"Must a government, of necessity, be too strong for the liberties of its own people or too weak to maintain its own existence?"

Lincoln answered that question as Jackson had answered it—not by words, but by deeds. And America still marches on.

We of today have been presented with that same question. We, too, are answering it by deeds. Our well-considered philosophy for the attainment of peace comes not from weakness but everlastingly from the courage of America.

Is This Our War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 31), 1941

ADDRESS BY DAVID A. REED

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech by former United States Senator David A. Reed, delivered before the Hungry Club, Pittsburgh, Pa., on March 23. The subject of the speech is, Is This Our War?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To commence with, my complete sympathy at the present time is with Britain, Greece, and China, as well as Finland, Holland, Belgium, and the other small democracies that have been overwhelmed. I hope to see the Axis Powers decisively beaten.

When we are told that "Britain is fighting our war," let us stop to test that statement by common sense and not by hysteria and emotion. Take first the causes that led up to the revival of German military might and the critical incidents that plunged Europe into the present war. How far was the United States consulted in what took place in the last decade and how far are we to blame for the resurgence of Germany and the outbreak of war?

Germany began to prepare for war at a considerable time before Hitler came into power. I remember that in 1932, in conversation with Prime Minister Herriot of France, I found him excited about the secret preparations that were being made by the German Army and Navy. He told of German orders for submarine periscopes then being manufactured in Holland, of secret stores of arms in East Prussia and of many other details of preparation which had been unearthed by the French military intelligence service. In 1935 the British amazed the world by the announcement of a naval treaty with Germany which allowed the Germans, in violation of the Versailles Treaty, to begin to build up their submarine fleet and allowed a surface strength of 35 percent of the British strength. It has never been pretended that we were consulted about such a treaty. In 1936 the Rhineland was reoccupied by Germany in defiance of the Versailles Treaty. If this had been stopped by France or Great Britain, the 1940 blitzkrieg would have been impossible. Nothing was done because of domestic uncertainties in France and Great Britain. Again the United States was not consulted. When Austria was occupied, the Allies took no action whatever, although the occupation was in violation of Germany's treaty obligations. Again America was not consulted. When the Sudetenland was snatched from Czechoslovakia and surrendered to Germany at Munich, the sole responsibility rested on Chamberlain and Daladier. When the rest of Czechoslovakia was overrun 6 months later, again America had nothing to do with the proceedings. When the integrity of Poland was guaranteed, the United States was not consulted, and when the invasion of Poland began and war was declared, the United States was no party to the treaty, nor was it to blame for the decision to declare war.

Up to that time, certainly no one in the United States considered that the present war was our own, or that in declaring war in defense of Poland, France and England were fighting our war for us. And then came the apparent stalemate during the winter of 1939–40. It was humorously called the sitzkreig, and the late Senator Borah dubbed it a "phony war." Certainly no one in America at that time considered that the war was ours.

In the spring of last year inaction gave way to startling rapidity of movement. The German treaty of nonaggression with Holland disappeared like a puff of smoke and in quick succession Holland, Belgium, and France were invaded and conquered. All the world came to recognize the seriousness of the war.

Overnight in America boredom was replaced by hysteria. Whereas a year ago George Washington's advice against any European alliance seemed still to be sound, now in our emotional excitement we hear a considerable number of Americans calling for union now with Great Britain. They are so excited that they are ready to repeal the Declaration of Independence and the Revolutionary War forthwith. We hear it said in many quarters that Great Britain is fighting our war.

What fertile ground for progaganda is made by this hysteria. Our British friends naturally are taking good advantage of this opportunity. Mr. Churchill is probably the busiest man in the world today, yet he took time off to escort Mr. Hopkins and Mr. Willkie on their sightseeing excursions. Every patriotic Britisher is following his example. I do not blame them in the least. They see a chance to draw us in as an ally and they are only doing their patriotic duty toward that end.

But we owe a similar patriotic duty to our country. It is our duty to examine the situation with clear eyes and clear heads to see whether it is to the interest of our country that we become a belligerent. We must not forget that no act of war has been committed against us by the German-Italian axis. They have not sunk any of our ships. They have not invaded our territory. They have not mistreated our citizens. In short, they have committed no hostile act against us. In Asia it is true that our gunboat *Panay* was sunk, but the Japanese Government made instant apology and paid without a quibble the bill which we rendered for damages to the ship and its crew, making it very evident that the attack was not a matter that had official sanction. Aside from this, the Japanese have been scrupulously careful to give us no cause for a declaration of war.

If no hostile acts against us have occurred, there still remains the question whether we are not in danger of attack on either coast or both coasts if Britain should be defeated. To this question the answer conclusively is, "No." Unless we give away our Navy and utterly neglect our land defenses, no invasion by the Axis nations is possible, whether Britain wins or Britain loses. Every seasoned military man will tell you that. No responsible official of our Army or our Navy would admit for a moment that such an invasion is possible either at the present time or within the reasonably near future.

To me, that answers the question whether this is our war. We have not been attacked and need fear no attack. If we enter the war, it will be a war of aggression on our part, commenced because of our disapproval of the barbarous behavior of the Axis nations. Does America want to start a war of aggression and thus undertake to police the world into behaving according to our pattern of civilized behavior? I do not think that we are big enough to police the world. If that be our duty, we should have declared war when Japan invaded China, when Russia invaded Finland, when Italy invaded Ethiopia, when Germany gobbled up Czechoslovakia.

Jackson Day Dinner Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. HUGHES

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 31), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. MATTHEW F. McGUIRE

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Jackson Day address delivered by Hon. Matthew F. McGuire, Assistant to the Attorney General, at Wilmington, Del., on Saturday, March 29, 1941, on the subject Americans All.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Directly across from the White House, in Washington, on historic Pennsylvania Avenue in a small gardened area known as Lafayette Park, which adds much to the beauty of the capital city, there stands an equestrian statue of Andrew Jackson, on the pedestal of which there is the legend: "Our Federal Union; it must be preserved." Thus, in deathless stone and in deathless phrase for future generations of Americans to read and ponder is the Americanism of Andrew Jackson. To him, as to Jefferson, we Democrats owe the philosophy and the principles of our political faith.

It is said of Jackson that he was the first American in public life to implement the doctrine of party organization and party responsibility in the government of the country. We are proud, here tonight as Democrats and as members of the political party of Jackson, that for the last 8 years the responsibility of government in this country has been confided to that party; that when economic disaster seemed to shake for a moment the faith of the masses of our people in our democratic form of government, when the whole democratic process seemed to have been tried and found wanting, that it was our party that produced the leadership and the leader that lead us out of the abyss of despond back upon the broad highway of hope and faith in our American political philosophy.

I know that you and millions of other Americans this night thank God that the American people have found another Jackson in Franklin D. Roosevelt, and I venture to say that future generations of Americans and free peoples everywhere, long after you and I, and our time and our generation, have disappeared into the shadows of the past, will rise up and bless the name of the present President of the United States

We meet here tonight, not for the purpose of partisan triumph—the hour is too grave for that—but as Democrats and Americans to pledge anew our faith and our loyalty to the principles of Jackson, because they are the principles upon which the wonder that is America has been builded. We meet to pledge anew our faith and confidence in the leadership of the man who is the President today, not of the Democratic Party, but of all Americans, irrespective of party, who is not only the President of the United States but the hope and the voice of free peoples everywhere. As partisans, of course, we rejoice that this great leader has sprung out of our party in an hour of great need and that now in the hour of a still greater need our people have again chosen him to lead them.

No man can say what Andrew Jackson would do today if he were face to face with the crisis that confronts us. We do know, however, that he would never cringe for a moment before the iron fist of force, the veiled threat, or the outspoken challenge. He knew that the way to confound the enemies of freedom was to oppose them with every weapon in its arsenal. While this country, under Franklin D. Roosevelt, has fought and won the fight for a full recognition of the fundamental rights of the individual—for the recognition of the fact that the individual man is a man with a man's dignity and a man's destiny before him, for the right to work and the right to security, the right to think and to speak and to worship according to the dictates of the individual conscience—it now finds that those very rights are challenged and the constitutional government that guarantees and preserves them threatened by the loosening of forces abroad in the world, far more devastating and far more sinister in their objectives since any time in human history, since the barbarians of the north swept down upon the Lombard plains and, with their short fiat swords, conquered the Rome of the Caesars. Yet, when this possibility was first pointed out by the President, he was regarded as a warmonger by some, and was accused of indulging in rhetoric for the purpose of distracting the attention of the people of this country from a frank and realistic examination of their own domestic problems.

But, looking back 5 years to the occasion of that utterance on that June day in 1936 when he accepted his second nomination, we know today it was something more than mere rhetoric. To most of us the possibility of the present world catastrophe was nowhere on the horizon, yet the President, with almost prophetic vision, saw it coming and tried to awaken the people of this country to a sense and a realization of the disaster that was even then approaching with hurricane force. Later, when the conflict seemed inevitable, he did not cease his efforts, but made personal appeals in order to head it off.

Even after its outbreak, and it was called a phony war and one that carried no menace for us, he alone warned us of our danger. It was only after the shambles of Dunkirk, the fall of Belgium, Denmark, and Norway in quick succession, the utter collapse of France and the horror of the opening phases of the Battle of Britain that we were aroused from our lethargy and at last stood face to face, once and for all, with the terrible and awful facts that confronted us. Our people, at last awake, acted quickly, and, shattering precedent, chose for their third time leader the man who saw it all coming. He had led them to triumph over internal dangers—he was the man to lead them against those from without.

The election over, prominent men in the party of the opposition threw partisanship overboard, while the Nation closed ranks and now presents a united front to those who would either challenge its institutions or threaten their destruction. This is the American way.

No thinking person doubts now but that President Roosevelt stated the strong conviction of the American people when he gave voice in protest against the accumulating tyrannies of this new power which but for the valiant opposition of the free peoples of Britain and Greece has all but subjugated the Old World and theatens the New.

The startling change in the political complexion of the European Continent, occurring almost in the twinkling of an eye, has made us realize as never before the menace that confronts us.

A peaceful people, dedicated to the arts of peace rather than those of war, we suddenly find ourslves compelled to take unprecedented measures for national defense, to create and maintain a large standing army drawn from the ranks of our citizenry, and to train that army with all the power and ability that we possess, not only in the rudiments but in the very last lessons of war; to double the size of our fleet, and to turn another great army of men not to the pursuits of peace, but to the task of preparing mighty modern engines of destruction and all the horrible instrumentalities of war in order that we might succor those who hold the battle lines of freedom and protect ourselves.

This sudden transformation of a peaceful people into one who sees the menace that would destroy them at its very doors did not take place overnight. The issues were debated in the democratic and American way, and the American people finally came to the realization that the time for debate had ceased and that the time for action had come. Then it was that the democratic process was vindicated and the world saw, and is now seeing, what a democracy can do if it is put to the test.

America has not taken these steps without estimating the cost. It means sacrifice; it means longer hours of work; it means heavier taxes; it means also that we Americans have come to realize that our Americanism is verily "the pearl beyond price," and that Democrats though we may be tonight, and Republicans though we may have been yesterday, as Americans we face the morrow.

True, we can rejoice, as I have said and rightly so, that in the dark days of 1932 it was our party that produced the leader who has led the country back to the strength and to the courage that is its today, and thank God that in this tremendous hour we can still turn to the same leader, placing in him our country's hopes, its aspirations and its confidence. He did not fail us then, he will not fail us now. No man knows the folly and the futility of war more than Franklin D. Roosevelt No man hates war more than Franklin D. Roosevelt.

This program of defense is not projected merely because it is the politic thing to do. It is forced upon us by forces which menace our very being.

It may seem strange, perhaps, on such an occasion to devote an address almost entirely to a discussion of external affairs. I say to you that these affairs which are external today may be of prime concern tomorrow. These affairs have impinged so much upon our very existence that our domestic concerns seem trivial when compared to them. We live in peace and happiness, while within plane range men and women are dying to maintain the things we take for granted. We cannot view such matters with equanimity any more than we can sit down in the bosom of our family and in the shelter of our homes while a conflagration rages at our very doors which is destroying the homes of others and may well envelop and destroy our own.

A little over a hundred years ago the Battle of New Orleans was fought by Andrew Jackson over 2 weeks after the treaty of peace had been signed in Belgium. We could afford to close our eyes in those days to events of the Old World which seemed so very, very far away. But today—what a different story. News of an event is flashed the world around almost immediately as it happens, and by the flick of a dial you know instantly what has occurred half a world away. There is no such thing as isolationism any more—any more than the people who lived in the town of Gettysburg on those fateful July days of 1863 could be oblivious of the fact that a mighty battle upon which the fate of a nation depended was being waged almost in their own back yards.

I leave with you no note of pessimism. I minimize not the gravity of the moment, but I say to you that as we have met and mastered in the past 8 years, under the leadership of a great President and with the support of a great people, internal problems that had not only dislocated our economy and challenged the workability of the democratic process and of our very system of democratic government, with that same leadership and the same support of a strong and united people, we shall meet and master the graver threat we find challenging us now.

Jackson was a great Democrat; but better, Jackson was a great American. Lincoln was a great Republican; but better, Lincoln was a great American; and today we have another great Democrat who has demonstrated his ability to lead, and that great Democrat, Franklin D. Roosevelt, is a great American. As for you and me, not only for tonight but in all the days and nights that lie ahead, let us remember and let us be motivated by the one all soul-consuming fact—we are Americans.

Post-Emergency Problems

REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the congressional districts of those Members in which the national-defense program is in operation or will be in operation undoubtedly will enjoy a certain degree of prosperity which they have never known before, but with it will come problems which also they have never known before. Some of the problems will bear on the question of relief and taking care of people who have moved into the districts or who have gained a residence in a State from some other State, but are unable to move away or go back to the States from whence they came. It will be the problem of the Federal Government to aid in some manner and provide care for those people.

A very distinguished committee has come from Oakland County, Mich., and has prepared a statement. They are here now in conference with certain committees of this House in an attempt to solve in advance some of the problems which will be created by our national-defense program and which will call for the most careful and serious consideration on the part of every Member of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include that statement as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

Oakland County, Mich., having more than 254,000 population, according to the last Federal census, is the second largest county in the State, being second only to Wayne County in which lies the city of Detroit.

Oakland County is bordered by Wayne County on the south, Macomb County on the east, and Genesee on the north. The great automotive industry, centered in three of these counties, has been or is being called on to perform its part in the defense program. As citizens and governmental officials of Oakland County, we are proud of the opportunity to have a part in the war effort, even if only in a civil capacity. However, we are keenly cognizant of the fact that new problems face us and every other industrial center as a result of the war effort, and it is concerning these problems that we request your attention at this time.

Expansion of our present industrial facilities and new defense plants such as the Chrysler tank plant are causing a shortage of housing and educational facilities and overtaxing public facilities such as sewage disposal, police and fire protection, and bringing an increase in demands for hospitalization.

We are informed that steps are already being taken by the Congress to combat this situation. We are, therefore, primarily concerned with the situation in which we will find ourselves when the war effort is over and the slow-down, the return to normalcy, begins.

Thousands of workers and their families are migrating from elsewhere to Michigan to work in defense or allied industries, and they are presently needed. If the war effort continues for 3 years, practically 100 percent of these workers will have lost their settlement in the States from which they came, will, under the Michigan law, have acquired settlement in Michigan, and become dependent on the relief agencies in the counties in which they live when the war effort ceases. Welfare relief in Michigan is shared by the State and county in variable proportion, depending on the ability of the county to pay. While Oakland County has its own industries, Pontiac plant and Yellow Truck and Coach companies, it is, in addition, a sort of bedroom for thousands employed in Detroit. You can readily see that a serious problem will confront this county when the war effort is over.

Without in any way desiring to shirk or evade our own governmental responsibilities we believe we are typical of many communities in the United States which will be faced with similar problems and believe something should be done now by way of preparation rather than succumb to the problem when it arrives.

We are cognizant of the fact that our legislature could amend our present law requiring 1 year of self-sustaining residence to acquire settlement, to 10 years, thereby spanning the prospective period of war effort and prevent the acquisition of legal settlement in Michigan but we do not believe this is a correct solution. Other States would retaliate with similar laws and our present arbitrary and widely diversant settlement laws would become more chaotic. Uniformity of such laws is to be sought, not discouraged.

We believe that Federal legislation, pointed at uniformity is desirable and could be justified constitutionally. We further believe that provisions should be made for either Federal settlement and reimbursement to local relief agencies for aid extended to persons with a Federal settlement or provide for Federal aid to States who have abnormal increases in settlement due to activities of the Federal Government such as are occurring in the present war effort.

We are not familiar with the tax limitations of other States which would be affected similarly by the war effort but Michigan taxing units are limited by its constitution to 15 mills on the assessed valuation for all governmental purposes, debt service existing previous to December 8, 1932, excluded.

We earnestly solicit your cooperation to the end that this problem may be successfully solved.

ROBERT Y. MOORE.
GEORGE H. BURT.
HARRY M. MERRITT.

Jackson Day Dinner Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 31), 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN, OF MISSOURI

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] at a Jackson Day banquet held on Saturday night, March 29, 1941, in the city of Louisville, Ky.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, Governor Johnson, and Mr. Mayor of Louisville, it is a very great honor for a grandson of Kentucky to be introduced by that great State's distinguished Governor. I appreciate that honor very much.

I am glad to be in the home district of EMMETT O'NEAL, your able Congressman. He is very highly thought of in the House of Representatives at Washington.

Kentucky has two very able Senators at the National Capital. Hon. A. B. CHANDLER is building a reputation for himself as a hard worker and an able Senator.

It is my very great privilege to be one of the followers of the most able majority leader in the Senate, Hon. ALBEN BARKLEY. Senator BARKLEY is an able leader; and I, for one, am glad to follow him. Every Member of the Senate loves and respects him. As long as he is in the Senate, Kentucky and the Nation will be ably represented.

We are here tonight to celebrate a victory of the Democratic Party. We cannot rightly do that without paying tribute to the man who formed and constructed the party visualized by Thomas Jefferson.

Andrew Jackson gave us Democratic government, cemented the Republic, and firmly established the principles on which the Democratic Party is founded. The actual control and management of the Government by the people became a reality under the old firebrand from Tennessee.

Until Jackson, Presidents had the advantages of birth, education, and social standing. Jackson carved his career out of the wilderness of the West. He brought home to the Atlantic seaboard that a very important part of the Nation also lay west of the Alleghenies. The migration into Tennessee, Kentucky, Ohio, and the Northwest Territories had opened up new lands and created new problems, even as the age-old ones were still perplexing the Adams administration. Bank failures, unemployment, and the farm problem were just as lively and perplexing in the days 100 years ago as they are today.

There was a general feeling west of the Appalachian Mountains that the Washington government was a long way off, and not particularly interested in the general welfare of the country as a whole. Presidential candidates were picked at caucuses of the Representatives in Congress. The people were not considered. The era of good feeling under Monroe and John Quincy Adams was rather like the era of prosperity under Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover. The Western States were so far removed from the ideals and political philosophy of the East and New England, that had Burr's attempt for a separate nation in the West been made a few years later it might have succeeded. But Tennessee produced a patriot and a strong man whose influence held the country together for another 30 years, and whose life and actions have continually contributed toward making this great Nation greater, ever greater with each generation. It was the Jackson influence that kept Missouri, Kentucky, and Maryland from seceding in the War between the States.

Jackson was in a class by himself in the history of Presidents. Fatherless in infancy, a prisoner of war at 13 in the Revolution, mourning the loss of his mother, who died nursing American prisoners of war in that war, without rich kin or powerful friends, he carved his own career. He is almost a

tradition in our history. He is credited with more birthplaces than Homer. There are claims extant that he was born in Ireland, in England, on the high seas, in Pennsylvania, in Augusta County, Va., in Berkeley County, Va. (now West Virginia), in North Carolina, and in South Carolina. South Carolina has the best claim.

He grew up in the Waxhaws of South Carolina, is said to have been a good judge of horseflesh and whisky. He studied law, went to Tennessee, became district attorney, judge of the Federal Court, a planter of note, and a leader of the Tennessee Militia. With a body never strong and handicapped by wounds, he wore out the strongest men in the battle of life. Without ever having seen a real army, he moved a mob of undisciplined, ill-equipped, half-starved farmers and hunters over more than a thousand miles of wilderness, and, in a pitched battle, successfully defended a mighty empire and completely crushed the ably led, well-armed veterans of the Napoleonic wars. By winning the Battle of New Orleans he guaranteed the creation of the present United States of America. True, this battle was fought after peace had been made in Europe, but all of us today know that great powers do not give up conquered strategic territory because of the terms written on mere "scraps of paper." If Andrew Jackson had not won that battle 126 years ago, Britain would have controlled the Mississippi, the Louisiana Purchase would have been lost, and the United States of America, if it had survived at all, would have been confined to the North Atlantic seaboard. But great as was his military triumph, it was but a preliminary to his real contribution to our national life. The country general who could defeat world-renowned military experts; the rough backwoodsman, who often refused to be bound by the traditions and codes of a polite society; the savior of New Orleans and the conqueror of Florida entered the complex life of our national politics and indelibly stamped the seal of human rights upon the Government of the United States.

Unfortunately, it is a part of life that those who seem best fitted to help their fellow men too often use every method, fair or foul, to perpetuate their own advantage. So when Andrew Jackson advanced to lead the common people against intrenched privilege, he found the wealth, the respectability, and the learning of the country against him. Big business and big political leaders hated him. The press as a whole joined the barrage of hate. He was called "illiterate," "imbecile," "wastrel," "liar," "atheist," and "dictator." If the terms had been created, he would have been a "Bolshevik," a "Communist," and a "Hitler." The viciousness of intrenched greed can best be illustrated by the filthy attacks upon his wife and family. Then, as now, those who cannot win by fair means do not hesitate to slander, to libel, and to destroy the happiness and even the good names of those whose only offense is to be loved members of the immediate families of our political leaders. Their brutal attacks drove Andrew Jackson's beloved wife to her grave even as he was about to assume his duties as President of the United States. The greatness of Jackson can best be appreciated when we remember that even a broken heart could not swerve him from service to his people.

He crushed the absolute grip of private monopoly upon the throat of our banking system. He brought the capital back from the Biddle Bank in Philadelphia to Washington. He shattered the office-holding clique who regarded a Government job as a private right. Although the "holier-than-thou's" shuddered, he drove into the national consciousness the cardinal truth that "the people rule."

Jackson has been assailed as the father of the spoils system, but what has been overlooked is that every Government position when he became President was filled with a henchman of the old order; most of whom were bound by every tie to those who had used any and all weapons to destroy him and to defeat his policies. The President took the position that he could not effectively serve the people unless he had the support and cooperation of those who must carry out his instructions. Why should he be held up to scorn as an enemy of good government because he sought to make the people's control of government effective?

Andrew Jackson maintained the highest concept of the obligations of the public service. Permit me to quote from a letter to his friend, President Monroe:

"The Chief Magistrate of a great and powerful nation should never indulge in party feelings. His conduct should be liberal and disinterested, always bearing in mind that he acts for the whole and not a part of the community. By this course you will exalt the national character, and acquire for yourself a name as imperishable as monumental marble. Consult no party in your choice; pursue the dictates of that unerring judgment which has so long and so often benefited our country and rendered conspicuous its rulers. These are the sentiments of a friend. They are the feelings—if I know my own heart—of an undissembled patriot."

In spite of his temper of fire his dynamic energy was guided by a heart which throbbed with sympathy for humanity. He hated with an intensity seldom equaled but he acted with a mind single to the common good. He drove men relentlessly to gain an end but he personally led every attack. He gave no quarter to any enemy but he sacrificed himself for any friend. Uncompromising loyalty, unyielding courage, and ceaseless energy were not mere characteristics—they truly were the very life of Andrew Jackson.

The Democratic Party owes its existence to this "Great Commoner." True though it is that Thomas Jefferson shaped its political philosophy, the party had become a formless, loose-knit, almost aimless collection of discordant elements. It had almost lost the capacity to solve problems and to serve human needs. Jackson caught up the smoldering torch and blew it into a consuming flame that has never yet been quenched. Since his day our party has enjoyed the longest continual existence of any party in our national history. It has survived a great Civil War and economic revolutions. It has continued from a frontier civilization on through to the complex industrial and commercial life of today. Perhaps it has not always kept its eye single to the service of humanity, but the memory and influence of Andrew Jackson has been so tremendous that in every time of national crisis it has rallied to a Jackson-inspired leader.

Tilden, Cleveland, Bryan, and Wilson wrote living chapters in each passing age by calling the party back to courageous, vigorous, and unqualified service to humanity. When our party has dared, when it has followed ideals, and when it has led the attack upon organized greed, we have been successful. Whether or not we gain political victories at every election is immaterial; the important result is that in each case we were the agents after Jackson, and his successors, in keeping America upon the high road toward the full realization of human liberty.

In our own time we have passed through another Jacksonian era. We have seen the forward sweep of unholy, uncontrolled, private greed and unscrupulous and indifferent politicians bring us to the very brink of disaster. Once again we have seen another Jackson—not from the frontier, not self-educated, not born to endure poverty—but truly inspired by the same single courage, absolute loyalty, and dynamic power as that which was the very life of Jackson. The Dutch son of New York, college-trained and economically protected in youth, who has produced a new revival of faith in humanity, is the spiritual descendant of Andrew Jackson. We have had a rebirth of human rights and a rededication of government to man under the twentieth-century streamlined Jackson—Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Great as he was, Jackson did not create democracy, but he did raise the people to a reassertion of democratic rights. He did not set up a government of, by, and for the people, but he did force a government to respond to the voice of the people. He did not solve all of the problems of his age, but he did and does inspire us to believe that problems can and must be solved.

We are born into a great political ancestry. Jefferson, Jackson, Tilden, Cleveland, Wilson, and Roosevelt have set the standards. We have a right to pride and glory in our history, but we also have a deep responsibility. If the Democratic Party claims the right to bask in the glory of these leaders, we owe it to their memories to rededicate ourselves to the perpetuation of their ideals. If our party remains true to its leadership, we will join in the toast to that southern-born, western-raised, greatest Democrat our country ever produced, Andrew Jackson, and his great successor, the President of the United States.

Jackson Day Dinner Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 31), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS, OF UTAH

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] on last Saturday at Milwaukee, Wis., on the occasion of a Jackson Day dinner.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is significant tonight that we in honoring the name and memory of Andrew Jackson, the great commoner of the White House, also pay tribute to the courage and leadership of our own President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who has steadfastly maintained those Jacksonian principles of democracy which have kept us free.

In approaching my subject this evening and in entering a discussion of world affairs of today I find myself in about the position of the fine old preacher who announced to his congregation that he was going to expound at length upon a subject about which the Lord had been able to say only a few words. We know that the situation in the world before us is complex. Some magazines like to refer to our being confronted with a second World War. It is not that. There is no choosing of sides in the present war. In the present conflict there is so much chaos, so much confusion, so much revolution that we cannot glibly describe the situation in that way. In fact, there is no easy way of defining it. I do not wish to try to define it. As someone said in ancient times, you can-

not define an elephant, but everyone can recognize one when he sees it. The important thing is that we know that there is disorder and revolution and we stand in a position to be challenged with regard to it.

With the consideration of the lend-lease bill we were faced with the determination of our own American policy with reference to this international conflagration. Congress was called upon to weigh all of the evidence, to evaluate the aid to the democracies program in the light of our national history. This congressional debate was a real threat to the American nervous system; everyone was tense. When time was so important, it was feared that we would just talk and not act while the world was burning, and yet we knew that it was only from talk that planning could come, and action in times like these should only come after planning. During this debate there were many feigned issues and trumped up charges presented. Many said that the all-out aid program was entirely inconsistent with our Monroe Doctrine and our established foreign policy. Others said that we had no foreign policy and that we have, as a result, acted from the standpoint of expediency from day to day. Both of these charges I deny. I believe that the lend-lease bill itself represents a unit in its relation to the history of the United States as it has devolved throughout the 150 years of the past in relation to the position which the United States has taken as a result of its firm, fixed, and settled policy. Those terms are terms which are used in international relations; and if we understand a nation's firm, fixed, and settled policy, then we can understand when we are in harmony with its foreign and internal policy and when we are out of harmony with it.

I have mentioned our Monroe Doctrine, for instance. Administration spokesmen have stated that "there are two things which the American people desire to preserve. One is the peace of this Nation and of this hemisphere. The other is the freedom and independence of this Nation and of this hemisphere. They want to preserve them both at the same time, if this is possible." This, in my estimation, clearly states our position relating to the lend-lease program and our foreign policy. We are all aware that the Monroe Doctrine has been the cornerstone for our international diplomacy and foreign policy for more than 100 years. We usually think of this as a singular pronouncement, but its background and its singularity show us that it is truly an American principle. I know historians talk about the origin of the Monroe Doctrine and refer to the influence of England in the pronouncement of that doctrine. They give John Quincy Adams, the Secretary of State, credit for it, and some say that it had its origin in a foreign country, and so they write on and on. But 12 years before the pronouncement of this doctrine the Congress of the United States passed a resolution which became a law of this country and they then and there by law declared the Monroe Doctrine. The act given forth by the Congress of the United States should have a place in all the textbooks in regard to this great doctrine.

Congress, in 1811, resolved as follows:

"Therefore * * * *Resolved, etc.*, That the United States, under the peculiar circumstances of the existing crisis, cannot, without serious inquietude, see any part of the said territory pass into the hands of any foreign power; and that a due regard to their own safety compels them to provide, under certain contingencies, for the temporary occupation of the said territory. They at the same time declare that the said territory shall in their hands remain subject to future negotiations."

This resolution passed in 1811 became the American policy in law 12 years before Monroe made his pronouncement. In 1812 Madison sent troops in keeping with the rights given him by this resolution to foreign-owned territory in the Americas to defend that foreign territory from attack by another European power. The resolution of 1811 with the action by Madison gives America a 130-year-old precedent for what we are doing today. Congress again has passed such a resolution in 1941. The world has been told that foreign-controlled territory cannot be transferred by force, and America has acted to be prepared so that today we will not have to send troops as Madison did. We have made our declaration. Our people, with our neighbors in all the Americas, stand united in will and in power to see that that declaration is respected.

While we are thinking of the past but with our eyes pinned on the future, let us lay down and make part of our hopes four simple rules for union, rules given us by our own immortal Washington when his thoughts during times of troubles were even on a better world. These simple rules, so effective in the past, may well be the fundamentals to guide the world in the future if union and peace are its aims.

First. There must be an indissoluble union of all the states under a single federal government.

Second. The debts incurred must be paid to the uttermost farthing.

Third. The militia system must be organized on uniform principles.

Fourth. The people must be willing to sacrifice local interests to the common weal.

The first of Washington's principles is now on the lips of many and in the hearts of many more.

The second is sound because it is the only way a certain credit and honest economic system can be assured.

The third has been a long-time dream of many, and in 1910 the Congress of the United States adopted resolutions urging the President of the United States to negotiate for a common world police force.

The fourth is the key to any united effort which proved so successful in our own Federal system, in the British Commonwealth, and in other successful unions such as the old German Empire. In essence it is Jefferson's idea which antedated our Federal organization, a government that would provide that local things be administered locally and that things of common interest be administered by the Government, which represents all those interests.

As I have stated, the Monroe Doctrine represents our cornerstone of American diplomacy—the foundation, or the Magna Carta of our foreign policy, as it were. It is this great doctrine that today is our fixed, firm, and settled policy. Since, we have seen that the origin for our foreign policy emanated from almost the time of the Declaration of Independence, we can in truth say we have been acting with consistency. It matters not whether we formerly thought of it as a unilateral regional policy, today it is a multilateral understanding representing a united Western Hemisphere facing a combined European-Asiatic threat to Democracy. The Monroe Doctrine has evolved into a mutual pact between our Government and the other States of the Americas. That is a tremendous advance. The aspect of turning the Latin American attitude away from that of considering us an aggressive Government of the north imposing upon governments of the south is a constructive change. If the time will come when the British Commonwealth of nations will go further and do their part in our Western Hemisphere by Canada's taking her place in this union of the Americas we shall have accomplished what we have sought for many years. It is the dream of Bolivar come true. I am sure that the citizens of the State of Wisconsin would be overjoyed with the realization of this achievement. I might mention parenthetically that the ratification of the St. Lawrence waterway treaty will be a step in that direction, and again we should pay tribute to our great President for his indefatigable efforts both as the President of the United States and as the Governor of New York in furthering this great project.

With the lend-lease bill now on the statute books of our land, and the establishment of this all-out-aid program as a part of our national policy we can pause a moment in retrospect and look back at the debates of Congress without suffering from nervousness, and we can marvel that such a momentous problem was handled in truly a Democratic manner, and though the debates became heated it is notable that in the exercise of freedom of debate, because there were no clotures invoked debate was carried on in a dignified, and distinguished manner. There was an absence of personal invective and acrimony. Here, at perhaps one of the most important moments in our Nation's history the fact that we can preserve the guaranties of democracy is indeed a real compliment to our scheme of Government. Undoubtedly "Old Hickory" himself said hallelujah when he peered through the portals of heaven to see this sight!

Now that we are once again on a well defined course we realize that our individual jobs have been cut out for us. Our national course has just been chartered and it is for us as individual seamen to see that we have smooth sailing. We all know that our success depends upon what we make of ourselves—and we know that if we resort to selfishness and greed we cannot be free. This is no time for any of us to get fat or to achieve personal or political fortunes—we know that we have a common responsibility to maintain the freedom and independence of this Nation, and we must move toward that responsibility together.

We have heard some say that we must have a dictatorship to cope with a dictatorship. To this I do not subscribe. Nor do I think that the present program calls for dictatorial actions on the part of our President. We are indeed fortunate to have the inspiration and guidance of our great Constitution before us. We know that the first words of article II setting forth the powers of the Executive say, "The executive power shall be vested in a President." This can mean only one thing, that he is authorized to carry forth and administer the laws of our land. Not only is he head of the executive branch of the Government, but he is also Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. There is no other appropriate person than the President who can carry out the will of Congress. What a pitiful spectacle it would be to see the Congress with 531 Members administer a program under a national emergency. Our constitutional forefathers knew of these complications and took the necessary safeguards in writing our Constitution; they had had experience with a parliamentary executive under the Confederation and they knew its weakness. When America speaks to foreign nations she must speak with one voice. Our Constitution provides for that. Debate with ourselves. Yes; for we understand the rules and conflicting opinion is a process of deliberation but when we speak as one nation to another there can be but one voice if we are to be effective. In 1917 our President Woodrow Wilson asked Congress for power that would prove our unity. For power that would show that America speaks with but one voice but it was denied him. Our President then was defeated in his wishes and when he spoke to a wrongdoer among the nations the wrongdoer paid no attention because he thought President Wilson's people did not support him. Had we shown the same unity in peace

as we later showed in war it is doubtful if we would have ever entered the war. If we will remain united in peace today we can avoid war. America united in war is a power that few nations would wish to challenge. America united in peace standing for liberty, freedom, and right is a power that only the mad would rouse to action.

Our country has indeed been fortunate in having great Presidents in time of our emergencies. At such times we should never regret the fact that our Executive is strong and powerful. Being strong and powerful does not mean that he has dictatorial power. It does not mean direction by a single will. It does not mean interference with courts, or elective officers, or the Federal system. Thomas Jefferson in his writings set forth prophetic words on this general subject. He said:

"The last hope of human liberty in this world rests on us. We ought, for so dear a stake, to sacrifice every attachment and every enmity. Leave the President free to choose his own coadjutors, to pursue his own measures, and support him and them, even if we think we are wiser than they, honester than they are, or possessing more enlarged information of the state of things."

Strange as it may seem, the charges of dictatorship leveled at President Roosevelt gave me a feeling of satisfaction. I knew that they were not true, but I also knew from my reading of history that this was an old charge and in most cases was a good omen, because it meant that we had a good, strong President. These are the men who have been charged with wanting to make themselves dictators and kings: Washington, Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson.

At times it looks rather selfish for democracy to give to a few men so many great honors, but democratic governments survive only by being administered by the experienced. It is also significant that our great Presidents have realized it was necessary to magnify their calling during times of stress. Our great Presidents realized that the Government of the United State was never intended to be weak, but was always expected to be strong when it was necessary for it to be strong. Strong and just, it faces the world today. It stands today as it has always stood—strong against the aggressor and ready to aid the victim of aggression.

We all are grateful to "Old Hickory," the American who, as we were reminded by our President last year, "did the big job of saving the economic democracy of the Union for its westward expansion, strengthened in the ideals and practice of popular government." It is significant the President further reminded us "that the people unanimously reelected him in spite of the fact that Biddle and the bank had sought to create an economic depression in order to ruin him."

It is interesting to note that sometimes our Presidents have acted under their own initiative in times of national emergencies without power specifically conferred by Congress. Thomas Jefferson purchased Louisiana without such authority. He was meticulous in his regard for the Constitution; and since he had no congressional authority to act, he took such action under the treaty-making power. The country has not only vindicated him for this act but has praised him for his foresight and genius.

In the spring of 1861 Fort Sumter was fired upon, though Congress did not assemble until the following June or July. It was President Lincoln who, in the midst of an emergency, had exercised a power which no other President has ever exercised. He did this because he thought it necessary to save the Government. Also, before Congress had assembled, he called for 75,000 volunteers on his own responsibility. We, of course, are all grateful for his acts.

We could not let pass in this discussion a reference to the stand taken by Andrew Jackson against the South Carolina nullification. The following passage is perhaps the most important passage in President Jackson's pronouncement: "I consider the power to annul a law of the United States, assumed by one State, incompatible with the existence of the Union, contradicted expressly by the letter of the Constitution, unauthorized by its spirit, inconsistent with every principle on which it was founded, and destructive of the great object for which it was formed." This proclamation voiced the opinion and feeling of the whole country, except the nullifiers in South Carolina and a few of their comrades in other Southern States. The dignified tone of the paper was especially satisfactory. It was the right tone to take to men who had allowed their passionate temper to commit them to unworthy proceedings, and who had sought a remedy for civil grievances in acts which made liberty and security impossible. Jackson found himself a national civil hero. He had already been acclaimed a military hero. He lives in popular memory and tradition chiefly as the man who put down a threat of treason, so it is this act of true leadership, and his ability to assert himself in time of an emergency, though an internal emergency, it is true, that as much as anything gives him a commanding and important position in our United States history books. By his actions he united his people and when he asked Congress to grant him the authority to use force if need be to maintain his stand it was granted to him. Our country remained safe. Our Nation then through unity prevented war. Our Nation today by unity can stay out of war. My plea is for national unity, for come what may we are then better off. One hundred and thirty million people speaking as one—130,000,000 people standing for right—130,000,000 knowing the worth of freedom, the joy of liberty, the right to worship as we wish, think as we choose, speak and write as we will, come and go, buy and sell, own and dispose as we see fit, can unite as one voice, and when that voice is the voice of righteousness who is there to say it nay.

Cardinal O'Connell Says Secret Maneuvers Are Bringing Us Nearer and Nearer to War—Democracy Is Being Betrayed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

STATEMENT BY CARDINAL O'CONNELL, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Cardinal O'Connell, of Massachusetts:

BOSTON, MASS., March 29.—William Cardinal O'Connell, Catholic archbishop of Boston, was quoted today by the Boston Traveler as saying "secret maneuvers behind the scenes of government are drawing us nearer and nearer to war."

The cardinal said, in an interview with the Traveler on his return from a winter vacation in Miami, Fla., that "the trust of the people in their Government is a dangerous thing to toy with."

"There is a distinct feeling," he added, "that things are going on behind the scenes unknown to the people. This is the sort of distrust that brought about revolutions in Europe—the distrust of the people in their government.

"I hope," he asserted, "that this country stays out of war. I know the people want to stay out, but the Government seems to ignore their wishes while still talking of democracy.

"Some sort of secret maneuvers are bringing us nearer and nearer to war all the time. This does not tally with democracy. Everybody is wondering just where we are in this thing. It is not a fair thing for a government calling itself democratic.

"All this mystery that is going on is puzzling to the people and is not fair."

The cardinal, greeting newsmen in his stateroom on the steamer *Boston*, appeared to be in excellent health.

"I'm speaking neither pro nor con the Government," he added. "I'm merely echoing the sentiments of the people from all parts of the United States. Their question is: 'Where are we in this situation?'"

American Manpower in the Balkans and in Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

ARTICLE BY WILLIAM H. STONEMAN

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news dispatch from the Chicago Daily News:

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 26, 1941]

SPEEDY STAFF TALKS BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND BRITAIN URGED IN LONDON—COORDINATION OF VIEWS HITHERTO UNDERTAKEN ONLY HAPHAZARDLY

(By William H. Stoneman, Chicago Daily News Foreign Correspondent)

LONDON, March 26.—Speedy initiation of comprehensive staff talks between the leaders of the American and British armed forces are being urgently, though strictly unofficially, suggested by observers in London.

As far as is known, coordination of American and British views has been undertaken, to date, only in the most haphazard fashion. Droves of military, naval, and air experts have come to London during the last few months and a good many British experts crossed the Atlantic in the other direction. All of them have had specific jobs of investigation to do and the great majority of them have accomplished their missions in a thoroughgoing and satisfactory way.

Most of them, however, have not had any authority to discuss strategy or to engage in the drafting of even the most tentative plans for cooperation.

POLITICAL SITUATION BLAMED

The result is that if the United States went to war any time soon, American and British forces would not be in position to cooperate to the best advantage.

Naval and air forces from the United States could certainly be thrown into action speedily, but even then it would take some time to decide where and when to use them most effectively.

Blame for this unbusinesslike and highly unmilitary situation is laid to the American political situation. The American people, and particularly the isolationist elements, it is said, would be aroused by such an unneutral step as the initiation of staff talks or the creation of a supreme war council. Proponents of the idea answer that the American people have welcomed the dispatch of technical experts to London and that they would presumably have no objections if similar experts discussed other matters.

Even though no promises were made in advance of an American declaration of war, they insist, it would be both possible and extremely helpful for high officials to look over the situation and to decide tentatively what could be done by the combined forces in case the United States took an active part.

TOPICS TO BE DECIDED

Some of the things which might be decided by the panel of experts from both sides would include: (1) The theaters of war in which the United States might operate most effectively; (2) what types of forces would be required for such operations; and (3) the measure of responsibility which each one of the two powers would have for operations in any one sphere.

If, for instance, a great American army would be required for operations in Africa or southeastern Europe, it would be far better to decide so now and prepare for the speedy enrollment and training of such a force before the bell rings. Likewise, if America's chief contribution would be to send large forces of bombers and fighters to Europe, then it would be advisable to concentrate on the production of such units and not waste time, energy, and money on the production of units which will not be needed.

It can be taken for granted that these matters have been discussed unofficially by American and British politicians and special envoys, some of whom have military training. It is still safe to say that no adequate plans have been made and that no real attempts have been made to formulate such plans.

First Conference of the Inter-American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 31), 1941

ADDRESS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL JACKSON

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Robert H. Jackson, Attorney General of the United States, at the first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association in Habana, Cuba, on March 27, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, Mr. Minister, and members of the Inter-American Bar Association, the founding of this association, at a time when so much of the world either has lost or has forsaken government under law, bears witness to our faith in a civilization ordered by reason rather than by force. We are debtors to this captivating country and city, not only for a generous hospitality, but more importantly for an inspiring leadership. We lawyers from the United States value this opportunity to compare our own legal philosophy and institutions with those of other American commonwealths. You have no doubt been impressed with our modest habit of expounding our own law by a recital of some case we won.

Every delegate comes to this council with pride in his own national institution and tradition. No one comes to capitulate to any other. Each of our pioneering peoples of this hemisphere has looked to one or another of the old world civilizations to fertilize its intellectual life. Since communion with Europe has been interrupted we have turned to each other for cultural enrichment. We are rediscovering the Americas. Of course this has its perils. I am told that in Washington the old and the young of both sexes are making a furious study of the Spanish and Portuguese languages. We trust that you good neighbors will bear with your characteristic good humor the punishment that is in prospect for your native tongues.

The easy and fraternal terms on which our profession meets serve to emphasize the discord of the world and above vexing national problems rise grave questions of law relating to our international well-being.

We are haunted by the greatest unfinished task of civilization which is to create a just and peaceful international order. If such a relationship between states is to be realized, we know its foundations will be laid in law, because legal process is the only practical alternative to force.

The state of international law and of progressive juridical thought on the problems of States not actually participating in hostilities is of more than academic interest in a world at war. The United States feels obliged to make far-reaching decisions of policy. I want the legal profession of this hemisphere to know that they are being made in the conviction that the structure of international law, however apparently shaken, is one of the most valuable assets of our civilization. There may be differences of opinion as to some of its particular rules, but we have made conscientious effort to square our national policy with enlightened concepts of the law of nations viewed in its entirety.

It is the declared policy of the Government of the United States to extend to England all aid "short of war." At the same time it is the declared determination of the Government to avoid entry into the war as a belligerent.

The question has been raised whether the two aspects of this dual policy are reconcilable with law, or whether such comprehensive aid, extended to one belligerent party to the express exclusion of the other, is incompatible with the obligations which international law imposes upon a state, not a belligerent in the war.

President Roosevelt in his message to the Congress of January 6, 1941, said that "Such aid is not an act of war."

Secretary Hull and Secretary Stimson have voiced similar conclusions and the committees of both Houses of Congress are committed to the same view.

But weighty names and even heavier texts are found to contend that our only legal alternatives are to enter the war ourselves or to treat all belligerents with impartiality. It has been asserted that international law forbids the United States to exchange overage destroyers for air and naval bases in this hemisphere, and forbids us to render acts of assistance to a belligerent with whose institutions and cause we feel some kinship, and who has been subjected to aggression.

I do not deny that particular rules of neutrality crystallized in the nineteenth century and were codified to a large extent in the various Hague conventions which support this view. But the applicability of these rules has been superseded. Events since the World War have rejected the fictions and assumptions upon which the older rule rested. To appreciate the proper scope of that doctrine of an impartial neutrality, we must look to its foundations. Its cornerstone is the proposition that each sovereign state is quite outside of any law, subject to no control except its own will, and under no legal duty to any other nation.

From this it is reasoned that, since there is no law binding it to keep the peace, all wars are legal, and all wars must be regarded as just.

This doctrine is stated by a standard authority:

"It would be idle for it (international law) to affect to impart the character of a penalty to war when it is powerless to enforce its decisions. * * * International law has consequently no alternative but to accept war, independently of the justice of its origin, as a relation which the parties to it may set up if they choose, and to busy itself only in regulating the effects of the relation. Hence, both parties to every war are regarded as being in an identical legal position, and consequently as being possessed of equal rights." (Hall's International Law, 5th ed., 1904, p. 61.)

It is easy to see how an international law, which holds all wars to be legal, and all warring nations as possessed of equal rights, arrives at the conclusion that neutrals must not discriminate between belligerents.

To the mind untutored in such sophisticated thought it seems to be characterized by more of learning than of wisdom. It does not appear to be necessary to treat all wars as legal and just simply because we have no court to try the accused. That hypothesis seems to justify President Wilson's statement that "International law has perhaps sometimes been a little too much thought out in the closet." Certainly the workaday world will not accept an unrealistic and cynical assumption that aggression, by a state that had renounced war by treaty, rests on the same basis as defense against an unprovoked attack in violation of treaty.

I think it was Henry Adams who complained that he was educated in one century and was living in another. All of us, even some of our international lawyers, suffer the same dislocation of ideas. The difference is that Henry Adams recognized it. Some of our scholarship has not caught up with this century which, by its League of Nations Covenant with sanctions against aggressors, the Kellogg-Briand Treaty for renunciation of war as an instrument of policy, and the Argentine Antiwar Treaty, swept away the nineteenth century basis for contending that all wars are alike, and all warriors entitled to like treatment. And this adoption in our time of a discriminating attitude toward warring states is really a return to earlier and more healthy precepts.

The doctrine of international law in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was based on a distinction between just and unjust wars. From that distinction there was logically derived the legal duty of members of the international society, bound by the ties of solidarity of Christian civilization, to discriminate against a state engaged in an unjust war—in a war undertaken without a

cause recognized by international law. That duty was stressed by the scholastic writers in the formative period of the law of nations. It was voiced by Grotius, the father of modern international law. There was, in his view, no duty of impartial treatment when one of the belligerents had resorted to war in violation of international law. Writing in 1625, he said: "It is the duty of neutrals to do nothing which may strengthen the side which has the worse cause, or which may impede the motions of him who is carrying on a just war."[1]

It may be argued that the nineteenth century and the first two decades of the twentieth witnessed an interlude in international law inconsistent with what went before and also with what was to follow. But if I read history correctly, there has seldom, if ever, been a long period of time during the past three centuries when states, for their own self-defense or from other motives, have been completely impartial in relation to the belligerents. More often than not, at the end of wars, there have been recriminations of such activities, which have thereafter been largely overlooked. The testimony of historians as to the practice of states in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries should not be overlooked by the international lawyer insofar as the real limits of the principles of neutrality are concerned.[2] It is safe to assert that the absolute category of neutrality on the one hand, and belligerency on the other hand, will not square with the test of actual state practice, and that, as judged by that practice, there is a third category in which certain acts of partiality are legal even under the law of neutrality.

Even during the vogue among publicists and text writers of the theory that all wars were just and all neutrality therefore undiscriminating, modern practice—especially American practice—shows instances of discriminating, qualified neutrality. During the World War, after the United States had declared war on Germany, a number of Central and South American Republics formally announced a departure, in favor of the United States, from the obligations of impartiality. Some of them, like Guatemala, El Salvador, and Costa Rica, offered their territorial waters and ports for the use of the naval forces of the United States. Others, like Brazil and Uruguay, expressly modified their neutrality regulations in that direction. Uruguay issued a decree announcing that she would not treat as a belligerent any American nation engaged, in defense of its rights, in a war with states in other continents and Germany did not consider this decree as resulting in a state of war.

Thus, American states tendered to the United States, when in the throes of war, moral and economic support based on a conviction of the justice of our cause and the identification of their ultimate well-being with our success—a generous manifestation of good will for which my countrymen and my government will never cease to be grateful and to reciprocate. In fact the joint resolution of Congress enacting our Neutrality Act of 1939 provided: "This joint resolution (except sec. 12) shall not apply to any American republic engaged in war against a non-American state or states."

The experience of the World War was too much for any doctrine that all war was to be accepted as just.

This doctrine was revised by the Covenant of the League of Nations. That instrument substantially limited the right of war and imposed upon its members certain duties designed to enforce that limitation.

The Covenant of the League of Nations did not abolish neutrality. It did not impose upon the members of the League the duty to go to war with the Covenant-breaking state. But it did lay upon them the obligation to adopt against the responsible state what was therefore regarded as unneutral conduct contrary to international law. To that extent it revived nonparticipation combined with active discrimination against the aggressor and active assistance to the victim of aggression. The attitude of Great Britain during the Italo-Abyssinian war in 1935 and 1936 illustrated clearly the position created by the Covenant. Great Britain did not declare war on Italy. At the same time she insisted that Italy was not entitled as a matter of law to expect from Great Britain the fulfillment of any obligations either of the Hague Conventions or of the customary rules of neutrality. Great Britain thus applied the concepts of international law which logically resulted from substantial curtailment of the right of war. Great Britain and other members of the League of Nations adopted an identical attitude in the course of the hostilities between Finland and Soviet Russia. The British Government supplied Finland with arms and ammunition; it authorized the setting up in Great Britain of recruiting bureaus for the Finnish Army; and it adopted other measures clearly prohibited by The Hague Conventions.

There would be obvious inconsistency in the United States invoking the benefits of a covenant to which it refused adherence, but I cite the covenant because it both evidences and dates the changed position of both war and neutrality in the world's thought. And it was followed by another commitment to which we were a party.

The Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928, in which Germany, Italy, and Japan covenanted with us, as well as with other nations, to renounce war as an instrument of policy, made definite the outlawry of war and of necessity altered the dependent concept of neutral obligations.

The Argentine Antiwar Treaty, signed at Rio de Janeiro in 1933, is one of the most important American contributions to the growth of the law in the last decade. It is in a real sense a precursor of the system of consultation which was started at Buenos Aires in 1936. The implications of consultation are well recognized today.

In 1918, in a letter to Colonel House who was then preparing a first draft of a plan of a league of nations, Elihu Root expounded the fundamental bases for a new international order. He wrote in part as follows:

"The first requisite for any durable concert of peaceable nations to prevent war is a fundamental change in the principle to be applied to international breaches of the peace.

"The view now assumed and generally applied is that the use of force by one nation toward another is a matter in which only the two nations concerned are primarily interested, and if any other nation claims a right to be heard on the subject it must show some specific interest of its own in the controversy. * * * The requisite change is an abandonment of this view, and a universal formal and irrevocable acceptance and declaration of the view that an international breach of the peace is a matter which concerns every member of the community of nations—a matter in which every nation has a direct interest, and to which every nation has a right to object."[3]

The principle stated by Mr. Root has been accepted by practically all states in the Treaty for the Renunciation of War, in the Argentine Antiwar Treaty, and in the replies to Secretary Hull's famous statement of July 16, 1937. That principle lies at the very foundation of our present policy.

Present aggressive wars are civil wars against the international community. Accordingly, as responsible members of that community, we can treat victims of aggression in the same way we treat legitimate governments when there is civil strife and a state of insurgency—that is to say, we are permitted to give to defending governments all the aid we choose.

In the light of the flagrancy of current aggressions, which are apparent on their face and which all right-thinking people recognize for what they are, the United States and other States are entitled to assert a right of discriminatory action by reason of the fact that, since 1928 so far as it is concerned, the place of war and with it the place of neutrality in the international legal system have no longer been the same as they were prior to that date.

That right to resort to war as an instrument of national policy was renounced by Germany, Italy, and Japan in common with practically all the nations of the world, in a solemn treaty which the United States helped to call into being, to which it has become a party, which it has been its proclaimed intention to make the cornerstone of its foreign policy, and whose provisions it has invoked on repeated occasions as expressing a fully binding international obligation. The present hostilities are the result of, and have been accompanied by, repeated violations of that treaty by Germany, Italy, and Japan. It may be noted in this connection that Italy was the first state to adhere to the Argentine Antiwar Treaty after the original signatories.

The Treaty for the Renunciation of War and the Argentine Antiwar Treaty deprived their signatories of the right of war as an instrument of national policy or aggression and rendered unlawful wars undertaken in violation of their provisions. In consequence, these treaties destroyed the historical and juridical foundations of the doctrine of neutrality conceived as an attitude of absolute impartiality in relation to aggressive wars. It did not impose upon the signatories the duty of discriminating against an aggressor, but it conferred upon them the right to act in that manner. This right they are indisputably entitled to exercise as guardians both of their own interests and of the wider international community. It follows that the state

[1] 3 De Jure Belli et Pacis, 293 (Whewell ed., 1853).

[2] In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries it was not uncommon to grant the right of passage to one belligerent only. In particular such one-sided aid was freely extended in pursuance of preexisting treaties promising help in case of war. It comprised not only the right of passage, but also deliveries of supplies and contingents of troops. This admissibility of qualified neutrality, in conformity with previous treaty obligations, was approved by writers of authority, including leading publicists like Vattel and Bynkershoek, who otherwise stressed the duties of impartial conduct. Wheaton, the leading American writer, asserted, as late as 1836, that a neutral may be bound, as the result of a treaty concluded before the war, to furnish one of the belligerents with money, ships, troops, and munitions of war. Kent, another authoritative publicist, expressed a similar view. Distinguished European writers, like Bluntschli, shared the same opinion. Even as late as the nineteenth century, governments occasionally acted on the view that qualified neutrality was admissible. In 1848, in the course of the war between Denmark and Germany, Great Britain, acting in execution of her treaty with Denmark, prohibited the export of munitions to Germany. During the South African War, Portugal complied with the obligations of her treaty with Great Britain and permitted the landing of British troops on Portuguese territory.

[3] Root's letter to House appears in The Intimate Papers of Colonel House, arranged by Charles Seymour, IV, 43. See also Jessup, Elihu Root, II, 376.

which has gone to war in violation of its obligations acquires no right to equality of treatment from other states unless treaty obligations require different handling of affairs. It derives no rights from its illegality.

It is not to be overlooked in this connection that two groups of highly reputable international lawyers have agreed in general with this position. I refer to the International Law Association (especially to the Budapest Articles of Interpretation) and to the research in international law conducted under the auspices of the faculty of Harvard Law School, which, after considering this matter, came to substantially the same view, with the qualification that they might be more exacting with reference to the determination of the aggressor by a method to which the alleged law-breaking states had theretofore agreed.[4] Of course, neither of these bodies spoke in relation specifically to conditions existing today.

Most international lawyers will agree that where there is a specific legal obligation not to resort to armed force, where there has been a resort thereto, and where it has been appropriately determined that one party is the aggressor by a method which the aggressor has agreed to accept, the traditional rules of neutrality need not be applied. The difficulty with this proposition lies in the lack of means for determination of the fact of aggression.

There are compelling reasons why we must not await a judicial or other formal determination of aggression today. In the evolution of law we advance more rapidly with our concepts of substantive rights than with our machinery for their determination. Rough justice is done by communities long before they are able to set up formal governments. And where there is a legal obligation not to resort to armed force it can be effectuated as legal obligations have always been effectuated on the frontiers of civilization before courts and machinery of enforcement became established. In flagrant cases of aggression where the facts speak so unambiguously that world opinion takes what may be the equivalent of judicial notice, we may not stymie international law and allow these great treaties to become dead letters. Intelligent public opinion of the world which is not afraid to be vocal and the action of the American States has made a determination that the Axis Powers are the aggressors in the wars today which is an appropriate basis in the present state of international organization for our policy.

By resorting to war in violation of the provisions of the Kellogg-Briand Pact, or the Argentine Antiwar Treaty, the Governments of Germany, Italy, and Japan violated a right and affected the interests of the United States. It was not a mere formal or theoretical right that was thus affected. The very basis of these treaties was the assumption that, in this age of interdependence all its signatories had a direct interest in the maintenance of peace and that war had ceased to be a matter of exclusive interest for the belligerents directly affected. If that is so—and it is so—then international law provides an ample and practically unlimited basis for discriminatory action against states responsible for the violation of the treaty or treaties.

The Treaty for the Renunciation of War and the Argentine Antiwar Treaty, by altering fundamentally the place of war in international law, have effected a parallel change in the law and status of neutrality, and we claim the wider rights which that change imparts. But, independently of that view, there is another sound basis for our action today.

The legitimate application of the doctrine of self-defense and the implications of antiwar treaties go hand in hand. It is in these fields where, perhaps, the most important developments of international law will take place in the immediate future, and these are the developments which the international community has sorely needed—developments in international sanctions.

We all knew that since 1928 the principle of self-defense has been used as an excuse for internationally illegal action, but we also know that there is a legitimate principle of self-defense in international law, which is one of its most fundamental principles. The standard of action under this principle, as under other principles of law, is that it is to be applied in relation to what the reasonable man (or state) would do under the same or similar threatening circumstances. There can be no doubt that the political, territorial, economic, and cultural integrity of the Western Hemisphere is menaced by totalitarian activities now going on outside this hemisphere. In this situation the principle of self-defense may most properly be invoked, and we in the Americas are invoking it in relation to the facts as we know

---

[4] Almost contemporaneously with going into force of the Kellogg-Briand Pact, and at a time when it was not self-serving, United States Secretary of State Stimson, in 1932, announced his view of the change which that treaty wrought in our legal philosophy: "War between nations was renounced by the signatories of the Briand-Kellogg Treaty. This means that it has become illegal throughout practically the entire world. It is no longer to be the source and subject of rights. It is no longer to be the principle around which the duties, the conduct, and the rights of nations revolve. It is an illegal thing. Hereafter when two nations engage in armed conflict, either one or both of them must be wrongdoers—violators of this general treaty law. We no longer draw a circle about them and treat them with the punctilios of the duelist's code. Instead we denounce them as lawbreakers.

"By that very act we have made obsolete many legal precedents and have given the legal profession the task of reexamining many of its codes and treatises." (The Pact of Paris. Three Years of Development. Address by the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of State, before the Council on Foreign Relations, Aug. 8, 1932. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1932. Supplement to the October 1932 number of Foreign Affairs.)

These codes and treatises have been and are being reexamined as Secretary Stimson suggested they must be, and the legal consequences of the Kellogg-Briand Pact in the matter of neutrality were formulated in the so-called Budapest Articles of Interpretation, adopted in 1934 by the International Law Association. They read as follows:

"Whereas the pact is a multilateral law-making treaty whereby each of the high contracting parties makes binding agreements with each other and all of the other high contracting parties; and

"Whereas by their participation in the pact 63 states have abolished the conception of war as a legitimate means of exercising pressure on another state in the pursuit of national policy and have also renounced any recourse to armed force for the solution of international disputes or conflicts:

"(1) A signatory state cannot, by denunciation or nonobservance of the pact, release itself from its obligations thereunder.

"(2) A signatory state which threatens to resort to armed force for the solution of an international dispute or conflict is guilty of a violation of the pact.

"(3) A signatory state which aids a violating state thereby itself violates the pact.

"(4) In the event of a violation of the pact by a resort to armed force or war by one signatory state against another, the other states may, without thereby committing a breach of the pact or of any rule of international law, do all or any of the following things:

"(a) Refuse to admit the exercise by the state violating the pact of belligerent rights, such as visit and search, blockade, etc.

"(b) Decline to observe toward the state violating the pact the duties prescribed by international law, apart from the pact, for a neutral in relation to a belligerent.

"(c) Supply the state attacked with financial or material assistance, including munitions of war.

"(d) Assist with armed forces the state attacked.

"(5) The signatory states are not entitled to recognize as acquired de jure any territorial or other advantages acquired de facto by means of a violation of the pact.

"(6) A violating state is liable to pay compensation for all damage caused by a violation of the pact to any signatory state or to its nationals.

"(7) The pact does not affect such humanitarian obligations as are contained in general treaties, such as the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907, the Geneva Conventions of 1864, 1906, and 1929, and the International Convention Relating to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, 1929." Report of the Thirty-eighth Conference of the International Law Association, Budapest (1934), pp. 66–68; also, 33 A. J. I. L. (Supp.) 825–826, note 1.

These Budapest Articles did not secure unanimous approval on the part of international lawyers, but they gained support from the majority of them. Even those jurists who felt unable to subscribe fully to the Budapest Articles of Interpretation were emphatic that the Kellogg-Briand Pact effected a decisive change in the position of the law of neutrality. Thus, the late Ake Hammarskjöld, a judge of the Permanent Court of International Justice from 1936 until his death in 1937, in discussing, in the course of the Budapest Conference, the implications of the Kellogg-Briand Pact in relation to neutrality, said, "You will have noticed that, except when the texts compelled me to use the word 'neutrality,' I have been careful to use another word, the status of nonbelligerency. * * * I have chosen the other expression merely because I wanted to underline that the status of nonbelligerency under the Kellogg Pact is not necessarily identical with the status of neutrality in pre-war international law." (Report 38th Conf., loc. cit. at 31.)

The Budapest articles of interpretation were not disapproved by the United States. On the contrary, Secretary of State Stimson, speaking before the American Society of International Law on April 26, 1935, said: "Our own Government as a signatory of the Kellogg Pact is a party to a treaty which may give us rights and impose on us obligations in respect to the same contest which is being waged by these other nations. The nation which they consider an aggressor and whose actions they are seeking to limit and terminate may be by virtue of those same actions a violator of obligations to us under the Kellogg Pact. Manifestly this in itself involves to some extent a modification in the assertion of the traditional rights of neutrality.

"Even in the face of this situation some of our America lawyers have insisted that there could be no change in the duty of neutrality imposed by international law. I shall not argue this. To such gentlemen I only commend a study of the recent proceedings last summer of the International Law Association at Budapest. The able group of lawyers from many countries there assembled considered this question and decided that in such a situation the rules of neutrality would no longer apply among the signatories of the Kellogg Pact, and that we, for example, in such a case as I have just supposed, would be under no legal obligation to follow them." (Proceedings of the American Society of International Law (1935), pp. 121, 127.)

them and as we, in our best judgment, can foresee them in the future. We are today putting content into the principle of self-defense by giving it concrete application which will create important precedents. By this action we are again showing the fundamental soundness of this principle of international law, and are developing its implications at the very moment when we are being charged, in certain quarters, with ignoring or violating the less fundamental rules of neutrality which are, both in fact and in law, irrelevant to the existing situations.

The present implementation of the principle of self-defense did not start with the lease-lend bill in the United States. It began at the Panama consultation in 1939 and was developed in relation to the law of neutrality by the Inter-American Neutrality Committee at Rio de Janeiro, as endorsed by the Consultation of Foreign Ministers here at Habana in 1940. That historic meeting accepted the recommendations of the Neutrality Committee and adopted the Act of Habana for the provisional administration of European possessions and colonies in the Americas. It went further and proclaimed the right and the duty of any signatory to take defense measures if the safety of the continent were threatened.

These events have ushered into international law a basis upon which the United States may legally give aid to the Allies in the present situation. No longer can it be argued that the civilized world must behave with rigid impartiality toward both an aggressor in violation of the treaty and the victims of unprovoked attack. We need not now be indifferent as between the worse and the better cause, nor deal with the just and the unjust alike.

To me such an interpretation of international law is not only proper but necessary if it is not to be a boon to the lawless and the aggressive. A system of international law which can impose no penalty on a lawbreaker and also forbids other states to aid the victim would be self-defeating and would not help even a little to realize mankind's hope for enduring peace.

The principle that war as an instrument of national policy is outlawed must be the starting point in any plan of international reconstruction. And one of the promising directions for legal development is to supply whatever we may of sanction to make renunciation of war a living principle of our society.

The only sanction that seems available in our time is the freedom of the right-thinking states of the world, particularly the states of the Western Hemisphere, to give a material implementation to their moral and nationally official judgments as to the justice of a war. The American States have done this officially with respect to the invasion of Belgium, Holland, and Luxemburg.[5] A public opinion which can express itself only in sermons is not likely to restrain the aggressive propensities of any powerful state. If, however, that opinion may command measures short of war that are likely to prevent the success of aggression, it is certain to have some deference even from the ruthless. Short-of-war measures which enlightened opinion may invoke include all forms of moral censure and diplomatic disapproval, discriminatory embargoes or boycotts, as well as financial credits and furnishing of supplies and material, weapons and ships. These speak a language understandable to those deaf to the precepts alike of Christian civilization and of legal obligation and scholarship.

After an experience that ranged from complete impartiality, through "armed neutrality," and then to war itself, President Wilson in 1919, addressing a group of international lawyers, said:

"If we can now give to international law the kind of vitality which it can have only if it is a real expression of our moral judgment, we shall have completed in some sense the work which this war was intended to emphasize."

The quarter century that followed has in my judgment given to international law that vitality—the League Covenant began the modification of the old concept that all wars were just and legal. The Pact of Paris and the Argentine antiwar treaty completed the outlawry of war. The signatory may now in its policy express its discriminating judgment and its moral convictions.

It is upon these considerations that I have advised my Government in the hope that its course may strengthen the sanction against aggression and contribute to the realization of our aspiration for an international order uder law.

[5] On the initiation of Uruguay, the American states released a joint declaration protesting against the military attacks directed against these states. They declared, in part, that: "The American republics in accord with the principles of international law and in application of the resolutions adopted in their inter-American conferences, consider unjustifiable the ruthless violation by Germany of the neutrality and sovereignty of Belgium, Holland, and Luxemburg." (Department of State Bulletin, May 25, 1940, p. 658.)

America and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 31), 1941

EDITORIALS FROM BUFFALO EVENING NEWS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two editorials from the Buffalo Evening News of March 20, 1941, entitled, respectively, "No Convoys" and "Watch the Drift."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Buffalo Evening News of March 20, 1941]

NO CONVOYS

The immediate succession of Lord Halifax's report that a German U-boat was on its way to American coastal waters, of Prime Minister Churchill's statement that Nazi submarines and battle cruisers had been operating in the western Atlantic, and of the sudden burgeoning of talk about United States naval convoys for ships carrying supplies to Britain doubtless is no coincidence. As far back as last December, the Daily Mail of London came out editorially in a plea for American warships to convoy merchant vessels to within 100 miles of the English coast, and British officials from Mr. Churchill down have scarcely concealed their hope that this would be America's next move in aid of Britain. The Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, many of whose members favor an open declaration of war on Germany by the United States, has just issued another of its manifestoes calling for convoys to see that Britain gets the goods shipped under the Lease Lend Act.

But convoys mean war—the shooting kind of war. Senator GEORGE, leader of the fight for the lease-lend bill, recognized this when he declared: "I have always stood against convoying vessels by the American Fleet, and will stand against convoying vessels by any unit of the American Fleet until and unless the point shall come when I shall be willing to vote for war, because, in my judgment, convoying would lead us into actual war." Hitler's threat to sink any ships attempting to break the blockade hardly can be an idle one since it is a matter of life and death for Germany to enforce the blockade.

The American people approved the lease-lend bill for one reason only—because they believed it was a measure of defense that offered the only chance of keeping the United States out of the war.

There are, in fact, a number of untried measures short of convoys to help Britain solve her admittedly serious shipping problem. Britain today has approximately 13,333,000 tons of ocean-going shipping, at least as much as that at the start of the war. Because of replacements from invaded countries and the United States, the net decline in tonnage has only just begun. Recent sinkings in intensified submarine and air attacks have been serious, but these could be compensated for months to come if the British were to transfer their ships, now plying on African, Pacific, and other relatively safe routes, to the Atlantic, allowing American ships to take their places. By coordination of American and British shipping in this way it has been estimated that 1,000,000 tons could be added to the vital British Isles trade.

WATCH THE DRIFT

Taking it for granted that the American people are honest when they straw vote 85 percent to stay out of war, it is instructive to chart our drift away from neutrality and toward war in the 18 months of the European conflict. As an airplane pilot follows his course he constantly checks for drift, meaning the deviation caused by cross winds. The student of American foreign policy can best check for drift in the statements of the Nation's navigator, the President.

Outbreak of war, radio address, September 3, 1939: "I trust that in the days to come our neutrality can be made a true neutrality."

Eighteen days later, message to Congress to lift the arms embargo, largely to give employment here, and "removal of the embargo is merely reverting to the sounder international practice and pursuing in time of war as in time of peace our ordinary trade policies."

May 16, 1940, message to Congress, and May 26, radio address, while France was falling. Much on defense of the United States, nothing on aid to the allies.

October 12, 1940, after the United States had sent great material aid to Britain, left alone, address to the Western Hemisphere: "No combination of dictator countries of Europe and Asia will stop the help we are giving to almost the last free people fighting to hold them at bay * * *. The people of the United States, the people of all the Americas, reject the doctrine of appeasement."

Preelection. Peace. Hartford, Conn., October 30: "The United States today is at peace and is going to remain at peace." Rochester, N. Y., November 2: "Your President says this country is not going to war." Cleveland, November 3: "The first purpose of our foreign policy is to keep our country out of war."

Postelection. Wartime footing. Radio address, December 29: "We must be the great arsenal of democracy * * *. We must apply ourselves to our task with the same resolution, the same sense of urgency, the

same spirit of patriotism and sacrifice that we would show were we at war."

1941: Theory of aid-Britain expands to refusal to recognize a Nazi victory. Message to Congress, January 6: "We are committed to the proposition that principles of morality and considerations for our own security will never permit us to acquiesce in a peace dictated by aggressors and sponsored by appeasers."

Same address: Theory of aid-Britain dilates to intention to resist aggression anywhere. President backs establishment of four essential human freedoms "everywhere in the world," pronouncing this phrase four times.

March 15: Theory of aid-Britain enlarges to commitment to complete defeat of Axis. Radio address: "And from now on that aid will be increased, and yet again increased, until total victory has been won. * * * Never, in all our history, have Americans faced a job so well worth while."

As events break like machine-gun fire around us, we have become, as a nation, too closely framed in reviews of the week. It is healthful occasionally to make a mental review of a year or a year and a half. When the pilot checks his drift he compares his latest reading with his very first reading to get total variation. What a variation from "true neutrality" to commitment to "total victory"!

Strikes in Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. ANDREWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 31), 1941

SURVEY FROM THE GALLUP POLL

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Gallup poll on strikes in national-defense industries.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC BLAMES UNION LEADERS FOR STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES, GALLUP SURVEY REVEALS

REPORTED THIS WEEK

Do you think America's production of arms, airplanes, and other war materials is going fast enough?

Yes, 30 percent.
No, 53 percent.
No opinion, 17 percent.

(Those saying no): What do you think is the chief reason why production isn't going ahead faster?

Strikes in defense industries, 52 percent.
Politics and red tape, 11 percent.
Shortage of plants, etc., 6 percent.
All other answers, 19 percent.
No answer, 12 percent.

Do you think labor-union leaders are helping the national-defense production program as much as they should?

Yes, 18 percent.
No, 68 percent.
No opinion, 14 percent.

Do you think industrial (business) leaders are helping the national-defense production program as much as they should?

Yes, 51 percent.
No, 31 percent.
No opinion, 18 percent.

Which do you think is trying harder to help national-defense production, labor-union leaders or industrial leaders?

Industrial leaders, 56 percent.
Labor leaders, 10 percent.
Both the same, 16 percent.
No opinion, 18 percent.

Would you favor a law compelling employers and unions to submit their differences to a Federal labor board before a strike could be called in industries connected with the defense program?

Yes, 85 percent.
No, 7 percent.
No opinion, 8 percent.

Henry Ford has refused to recognize labor unions in his plants. Do you approve or disapprove of his attitude toward labor unions?

Approve, 58 percent.
Disapprove, 29 percent.
No opinion, 13 percent.

Westbrook Pegler, the newspaper writer, claims that many labor-union leaders are racketeers. Do you agree or disagree with him?

Agree, 72 percent.
Disagree, 14 percent.
No opinion, 14 percent.

FROM RECENT SURVEYS

Should the Government forbid strikes in industries manufacturing materials for our national-defense program, or should the workers in these industries continue to have the right to strike? (July 1940.)

Yes, 72 percent.
No, 20 percent.
No opinion, 8 percent.

During the next 4 years do you think there should be more or less regulation of labor unions by the Federal Government than at present? (November 1940.)

More, 60 percent.
Less 21 percent.
Same, 19 percent.

Are you in favor of labor unions? (May 1940.)

Yes, 74 percent.
No, 26 percent.

Return of Frigate "Constellation" to Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 31), 1941

EDITORIAL AND ARTICLE FROM THE BALTIMORE EVENING SUN

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Baltimore Sun of March 20, 1941, and an article published in the same newspaper of March 22, 1941, dealing with the subject of the proposed return of the U. S. frigate *Constellation* to Baltimore.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun of March 20, 1941]

OUR NOBLE CAUSE

Nations may rise or fall; there may be wars and rumors of wars; civilization may hang in the balance. These minor incidents have no discouraging effect upon the high purpose of Edward S. King, chairman of the *Constellation* committee of the Gavel Club, which is to bring the frigate *Constellation* back home to Baltimore. He just keeps plugging right on.

The *Constellation*, as everybody ought to know by now, was built in Baltimore, launched from Sterrett's shipyard on Harris Creek, September 7, 1797, and manned in this city. She is the oldest surviving frigate of the United States Navy.

The *Constellation*, recently recommissioned by Secretary Frank Knox, is now tied up in the United States naval station at Newport, R. I. "Kidnaped" is the word employed by Mr. King when he speaks of her present situation. It is Mr. King's ambition to see her brought back to her home port and moored off Fort McHenry "as a memorial to Mrs. Reuben Ross Holloway, that noble patriot who brought about making by Congress the Star-Spangled Banner our national anthem."

Governor O'Conor, at the request of Mr. King, has appointed a committee to wait on President Roosevelt and request the return of the frigate, but the committee hasn't yet waited. "Would that there were some upheaval with Baltimoreans and citizens of Maryland," exclaims Mr. King, "and that they would rise in their might and power and press and press for the return of our birthright."

Baltimoreans are famous for their indifference. They do not upheave readily. But if persistence can do the job—and with due consideration for the persistence of Mr. King—then the *Constellation*—and please don't confuse it with that other noble ship, the *Constitution*—is already as good as here.

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun of March 22, 1941]

MOVE AGAIN BEGUN TO RETURN "CONSTELLATION" TO BALTIMORE—GALA DAY IN 1914 WHEN FRIGATE SAILED UP PATAPSCO AFTER HER LAUNCHING HERE RECALLED

It was a gala day in September 1914 when the U. S. frigate *Constellation* sailed up the Patapsco and into the Baltimore Harbor, exactly 117 years to the day from the time she was launched here.

Since that occasion, when Marylanders were celebrating the birthday of the Star-Spangled Banner, the *Constellation* has never come back to Baltimore, and that is what Marylanders for more than a generation have been complaining about.

SEVENTY-SEVEN THOUSAND SIGN PETITION

Last year, under the sponsorship of the Gavel Club and its president, Edward S. King, more than 77,000 persons signed a petition to bring the frigate—the oldest ship in the Navy—back to Baltimore permanently.

Thursday, doing what they had done before at several previous sessions of Congress, Senators TYDINGS and RADCLIFFE introduced a bill authorizing the restoration and preservation of the ancient warship and moving it to Baltimore.

The last time the *Constellation* came here Baltimoreans did their best to brand it as their very own.

MEMORIAL TABLET

To mark the homecoming they tacked a bronze memorial tablet on one of the walls of the gun deck in the stern which reads:

"This tablet commemorates the return of this historic frigate *Constellation* to her birthplace, Baltimore, upon the one hundred

and seventeenth anniversary of her launching, September 7, 1797. She is one of the first three sister ships of the United States Navy, the *United States*, the *Constellation*, and the *Constitution*.

POMP AND CEREMONY

Little Miss Helen Jackson Preston, daughter of the late Mayor Preston and now Mrs. Benjamin S. Rich, pulled the string which tore away the American flag from the memorial tablet.

Her father was there, standing with Admiral Frank F. Fletcher, Capt. William F. Fullam, Superintendent of the Naval Academy, and other distinguished guests, to give her encouragement, but he took no part in the ceremonies.

Noisy celebration was combined with pomp and ceremony for the few days the ancient frigate lay here.

IS GREETED IN HARBOR

As she came in the harbor at the head of a fleet of warships the whistles of boats and the cries of their seamen greeted her. A Cuban cruiser gave her a five-gun salute and the *Constellation*, having no guns that would fire, had to let one of the accompanying warships answer it.

The guns at Fort McHenry saluted next, and soon afterward the *Constellation* was at pier 6, Pratt Street. The next day, besides the unveiling ceremony, Colonial scenes were reenacted on the lawn in Carroll Park. Charles and Baltimore Streets were roped off for carnival.

CONTRAST NOTED

"A queer, beautiful picture the *Constellation* made among the modern craft in the harbor," said the Sun the next day, "in sharp contrast to the grim, gray iron of the torpedo destroyer *Cummings*, which lay just in her rear, and to the modern warships, with their iron battle towers, out in the harbor.

"The historic waters of Baltimore were the shrines of those who were doing homage to the men who made the history of the country."

As far as the *Constellation* goes, many Marylanders strongly feel that Baltimore waters are the only ones that have a right to be its shrine.

IS MOORED AT NEWPORT

To their most recent efforts to bring this about, they obtained the endorsement of all but one Governor, and that was the Governor of Rhode Island, where the *Constellation* now is moored, at a pier at Newport.

Even leaders of the Maryland campaign admitted the Rhode Island chief executive was in a delicate position.

An earlier effort to bring the frigate here was scotched by President Roosevelt, partly because the Navy asserted it would cost $1,000,000 to completely recondition her.

TERMS ESTIMATE "PREPOSTEROUS"

In Baltimore, James E. Hancock, president of the Society of the War of 1812, said this estimate was "preposterous."

The *Constellation* was designed by Joshua Humphreys and was built at the Canton shipyard of Samuel and Joseph Sterrett. Her name typified the field of the American flag, and there was a tradition that Baltimore women contributed their pocket money toward the expense of building and outfitting her.

YANKEE RACE HORSE

The frigate's first fight, on February 9, 1799, ended in what was described as a "glorious victory."

She met the French frigate *L'Insurgente* near St. Kitts, and after an hour and 14 minutes of hot fighting captured her. The fire was so hot that the men crawled out of the ports to dip up water to pour over the cannon.

Subsequent engagements gave the frigate the nickname among the French "Yankee cheval de course" (Yankee race horse).

A Farmer Writes—Build for the Future—No Jobs for These

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 31), 1941

EDITORIALS FROM WILLISTON DAILY HERALD

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three editorials from the Williston (N. Dak.) Daily Herald, as follows: March 12, 1941, entitled "A Farmer Writes"; March 19, 1941, entitled "Build for the Future"; and March 20, 1941, entitled "No Jobs for These."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Williston (N. Dak.) Daily Herald of March 12, 1941]

A FARMER WRITES

Advice on how best to farm comes most often from those who are not actual farmers, but from students of farming—both professional and amateur—who see what's being done, make comparisons, and offer the results as advice to those actually tilling the soil.

From farmers themselves, however, we feel the best advice on farming should come, but the trouble is that most of them are too busy, and some of them find difficulty in putting their thoughts into words, so as a general thing we get little farming counsel from farmers. There are some, however, whose experiences are fruitful and whose expression of thought is good, and their suggestions are most worthy of consideration. One such is Louis B. Dvorak near Dickinson who recently wrote a letter published in the Bismarck Tribune, from which we take it for quotation here. The letter follows:

"What we need in North Dakota is irrigation. Even though it may be only one-half or one-fourth acre, it will produce enough vegetables for a large family for the winter. The sooner we get this idea in the people's mind, the sooner we will be on the road to self-support in home-grown needs.

"A pump costs money, but when you figure the results it pays for itself in 1 year, and the pump with ordinary care will last a lifetime. This would be one way of having fewer people on relief, because the majority of people, through getting grants the last few years, have lost the desire of self-support. They figure: 'Well, we got by this year; somehow we will make it next year. The Government will feed us somehow.'

"I think John Moses should, in some speech later toward spring, urge people to plant and irrigate a garden wherever possible to ease the burden of the Government, as it has its hands full now for the defense of our country. We will have billions of dollars spent on armaments. And careless people—if the Government has to feed them—will run us way into debt for years to come. Of course, all cannot have irrigated gardens, but there are at least half of the people in North Dakota that can have at least a watered garden, if not more irrigated ground."

Mr. Dvorak's first premise is that farmers won't starve if they have their cellars full of vegetables, and his second is that every farmer should take advantage of whatever natural facilities he has to assure himself of such a supply of food. He admits that probably only half the farmers in North Dakota could irrigate as he suggests, but sees no reason why that half, at least, shouldn't have well watered gardens every year.

We plan and speak and write much about irrigation here in western North Dakota, but most of our effort concerns the big projects such as the Buford-Trenton and Lewis and Clark near Williston. As Farmer Dvorak suggests, perhaps there is even a bigger field of endeavor in helping individual farmers scattered throughout the countryside to put to use whatever facilities they have available so as to irrigate gardens for themselves and for the better feeding of their families.

[From the Williston (N. Dak.) Daily Herald of March 19, 1941]

BUILD FOR THE FUTURE

If the defense program should offer Williston a factory of some kind employing 1,000 persons, but only for a year or two, would we accept it gladly?

That question was asked us recently by one of the city's businessmen and, after some discussion, the conclusion was reached that such a proposal would not be an unmixed blessing, and that the city would probably be better off in the long run if it turned down the factory entirely.

Poor business, you might say, to reject a pay roll of 1,000 men. But looking at the matter with long-range view, how about the years after the proposed plant closed down? What would these 1,000 workers do in our midst after their brief employment ended? And what would the city and county do with the responsibility for caring for these 1,000 workers and their families—a total of probably 4,000 persons? When you're up against questions such as those and can't find the answers, then you wonder if a short-time industrial boom would be a good thing for our city or any other city in the land.

It is with such situations in mind that the men who shape our reclamation program in the West have concluded that they will easily be reconciled to the fact that the Midwestern and Western States get only dribbles from the flow of billions which go out in the defense effort. Reclamationists will try to get additional Federal allocations, but they will seek the money for further reclamation work, not for industrial plants and other endeavors directly concerned with the national-defense program.

The reclamation program is shaping up as a long-term plan to help relieve the country of the post-war dislocations, as well as merely to give Western States more irrigation projects. This trend is prompted by the realization that after the defense-spending spree is over, and after the war in Europe is concluded, the Nation is going to be faced with its greatest crisis of unemployment and economic dislocation. What would have happened to Williston if the 1,000-man factory came to our city for a brief time, actually will be happening throughout our industrial centers on a much larger scale when the defense emergency is over, and then there will be troubled times as great as any seen in our country.

One way of alleviating the difficulties will be by a program of public works to take up the slack in employment. Another way will be to have available farms to which the unemployed can turn, because the first place many of them will want to go when they lose

their jobs will be back to the land from which they went to the factories. The reclamation program can help in both branches of this program.

First, the reclamation endeavor can continue as it has, or even at an accelerated pace, and open up stabilized farming through irrigation on an ever-increasing acreage. This will make available more and more farms on which it will be possible at least to make a living and provide a haven for many unemployed workers when they start searching for the security of the land. Beyond that, however, the reclamation program can speed up its planning and survey work, prepare additional projects to be built with public funds, make ready a fund of jobs on which the Federal Government can draw in a postwar construction program for the hiring of men thrown out of work by the end of the war emergency. And that is one of the present aims of the men who work in our water-resources program.

Thus will the reclamation program of the West help the Nation withstand the shock of economic dislocations which are sure to come in the not-so-far distant future.

[From the Williston (N. Dak.) Daily Herald of March 20, 1941]

NO JOBS FOR THESE

Hundreds of job inquiries, but no jobs to offer.

That's the experience of the Williston office and all other branches of the State employment service these days as the country engages in a tremendous shift of labor population as result of the defense program.

The job seekers in North Dakota are the common labor type of worker, the men on W. P. A. who would like to get back into higher-paying private employment, the odd-jobs men who would like steady work, the men now working who hope to find better jobs under the huge program of national defense.

But there is nothing for these men in the newly expanding industries. Wherever in the industrial East there is construction—and there is plenty of that under the broad program of factory expansion—there is plenty of common labor available. There is, therefore, no need of transporting labor of that kind from North Dakota into the work centers of the East and Middle East, and consequently the job seekers of this State are merely told there is no work for them.

What industry wants is skilled labor—tool and die makers, machinery experts, men who know the ins and outs of modern mass production by machines and assembly lines. The country is being scoured for this type of worker in frantic efforts to build up the production of our factories to meet the needs of the present emergency. There have been a few such workers found in North Dakota—men who were employed during the last industrial boom and came West to find security in farm lands when the bubble broke—and some of them have gone back to the bench and assembly line to contribute their skills to the needs of the day. But there are very few in such a State as ours.

In hearing the report of the employment service that hundreds of North Dakota workers have applied for defense jobs, we find therein cause for praise of our working population. Of these hundreds, a large part undoubtedly is W. P. A. labor—men now employed on public projects but hoping for something better; men who have accepted the help of W. P. A. to tide them over, but who now feel a surge of hope that better jobs are available, and that they can get them. We feel a justifiable pride that these men are eager to better their condition and are applying for these defense jobs, and therefore feel all the more keenly the tragedy of the situation which finds no jobs for them, even though the Nation is now taking an inventory of labor because of a shortage of the kind of workers that are most needed.

Because of the defense program, which is expected to put thousands and millions of men to work, the Government has already begun to cut down on W. P. A. appropriations and cut W. P. A. workers off the pay rolls. That program of curtailment, however, should not be extended to such States as North Dakota, whose workers, even though they apply for these new jobs, can find no place in the defense effort. There is, rather, plenty of argument here for the continuation of a public-works program to keep these men employed on public projects because there is nothing else for them.

As far as we are concerned, the public projects most desirable and useful to this section are those which have to do with irrigation and other water uses—from the huge Missouri diversion project on down to irrigation wells or stock-watering dams on individual farms. Our working population needs them, our farmers want them, and the whole countryside will benefit greatly if they are carried out.

Aid to Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 31), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of March 14, 1941, entitled "Help Greece Now."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 14, 1941]

HELP GREECE NOW

The primary aim of the Lease Lend Act is to safeguard Britain against German attack, because the fall of Britain would be a catastrophe transcending all else. Yet the act's broader objective is to aid the opponents of totalitarian aggression everywhere. And surely none is more deserving of quick and generous assistance than is heroic Greece—a fact specifically recognized by the President when he announced Tuesday that Greece would share in the first shipment of matériel to leave this country after passage of the act.

Greek Minister Diamantopoulos declared yesterday that Greece will hold firm against "all aggression." None can doubt Greece's determination to do this. The exploits of the Hellenic soldiers in Albania are as amazing as were those of the Finns in their dogged resistance to the Russian colossus; and, thanks to British aid, Greek resistance has been more enduringly successful. The punishment inflicted upon the Italians has been noteworthy, both in men and materials. The Greek military authorities estimate that at least 130,000 Italian soldiers have been killed or captured on the Albanian front since the Greco-Italian war started last October, and fresh losses pile up rapidly with every passing day. The Albanian venture has become a chronic ulcer, eating away steadily at Italy's waning strength.

But the military aspect is far outweighed by the diplomatic and psychological services which Greece has rendered to the fight against the totalitarian powers. To estimate the value of these imponderables, it is only necessary to cast the mind's eye back to last autumn and consider how different the situation might have been if John Metaxas had yielded to Mussolini's ultimatum.

Up to that time Germany had gone from victory to victory, while Italy had confidently stepped in on what looked like the winning side. A big Italian army had crossed the Egyptian frontier from Libya, while another large army in Italian east Africa threatened to take Britain's Egyptian base and the vital Suez Canal in the rear. Almost two decades of boastful preparation had given Fascist Italy considerable prestige. At least, cautious critics were willing to give it the benefit of the doubt.

The miserable showing made by the Italians in their invasion of Greece pricked the bubble of Fascist prestige. It may have been largely on the basis of that poor showing, as well as on the acquirement of Greek bases in Crete and elsewhere, that General Wavell determined to risk what looked like a gamble in his Libyan campaign.

The diplomatic and strategic repercussions of the Italian fiasco upon German plans were likewise important. If Greece had tamely surrendered and had been occupied by the Axis, the whole Balkan peninsula might well have followed suit, and perhaps Turkey as well. There is good reason to believe that the Axis general staffs were then planning a gigantic pincer operation against Egypt and the Near East. The progressive collapse of Italian military and naval power sent that bold idea into the discard. Even today, for all the Reich's military advances and diplomatic successes in the Balkans, Germany is there strategically on the defensive, seeking to keep the Balkans at peace and prevent the formation of a Balkan war front. Greece's timely resistance alone made this possible.

Perhaps most important of all has been the electrifying effect of Greek heroism in the realm of the spirit. Everywhere, men have been taught the lesson that patriotic devotion in defense of high ideals goes far to outweigh handicaps in numbers and equipment; that this is not simply a war of machines but of dauntless souls as well. That is Hellas' supreme contribution to the cause which most Americans hold dear. It is time that Greece received from us prompt and generous support in her hour of dire need.

President Roosevelt's Program for Total Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 31), 1941

ADDRESS BY ROBERT M. HUTCHINS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered on the 30th of March by President Robert M.

Hutchins, of the University of Chicago, on the subject of President Roosevelt's program for total victory.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of April 1, 1941]

HUTCHINS TERMS ROOSEVELT POLICY "FALSE PATH TO LIBERTY"—SAYS AMERICANS STILL HAVE CHANCE TO ACT BEFORE PLUNGING INTO WAR

CHICAGO, March 31.—Robert M. Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago, declared yesterday that President Roosevelt's program for "total victory" is a "false path to freedom."

He said the American people want peace. But if the Nation plans for total victory, he said, "it should fight now."

"We are not justified in hoping that the Axis will suffer total defeat without full American participation in the war."

Hutchins spoke at a Sunday morning service at the university's Rockefeller Memorial Chapel. His address was broadcast nationally by the Mutual Broadcasting System.

Hutchins warned that "we still have not lost the power to decide for peace or war."

"We still have a chance to catch our breath, reflect a little, and take a last look around before we plunge into the abyss," he asserted. "The people have never had a chance to express themselves on the issues of war or peace."

PRAISES PRESIDENT

"The President is a democratic leader. One of his greatest qualities is his sense of responsibility to the people. If he is moving toward war, he must be doing it in the conviction that the people want him to. If this is his conviction, he is mistaken."

Recalling that on election eve last November Mr. Roosevelt had said, "We propose and expect to continue our lives in peace," Hutchins discounted the President's remarks of March 15, wherein he said, "Do not let us waste time reviewing the past or fixing or dodging the blame for it."

"I cannot believe that this means that he wants us to forget his promises to pursue a policy of peace," Hutchins said.

Admitting that the people of the United States want to defend the country, "aid Britain, and stay out of war," he reminded his audience that supporters of the lend-lease bill hailed it as a bill to keep the country out of war."

"The passage of this bill gave the President no mandate for war. The people want peace."

He challenged the administration's proposed aid to "embattled democracies," describing China, Greece, and Turkey as dictatorships.

Throughout his speech Hutchins asked: "What are we going to war for?" He accused Britain of failing to set out her war aims or a plan for reconstruction of the European system after the war. And he said President Roosevelt had been vague in stating the purposes of this Government.

RECALLS PLEDGE

"Are we to rush to arms everytime the British Empire is in danger?" he said. "Are we to put down every tyrant that arises in Europe?"

Then, recalling Mr. Roosevelt's four freedoms—freedom of worship, of speech, from want, and from fear—Hutchins said "the President cannot literally mean that we are to fight on till the four freedoms ring everywhere. If we are to be responsible for the four freedoms everywhere, we must have authority everywhere. We must force the freedoms upon people who might prefer to do without them.

"We seek freedom from want, and we impoverish ourselves. We seek freedom from fear, and we terrorize ourselves. We seek freedom of worship and freedom of speech, and we suppress them."

He asserted that capitalism will not survive American participation in the war. But, because "it is the vehicle of the materialism which has brought us to our present pass," he said he was uncertain that it deserved to survive.

ROOSEVELT'S PROMISES

"Things look black," Dr. Hutchins said. "The President now calls for 'total victory' over 'the enemy' and urges upon us the determination needed to win.

"Still there is a chance that these remarks are for foreign consumption and do not mean what they seem to mean. They seem to mean that the British, Chinese, and Greeks are our allies. If this is so, it is immoral to let them die for us while we sit safely at home. We should have been in the war from the start. We should fight now. And if we are actually to press on to total victory, we must fight. We are not justified in hoping that the Axis will suffer total defeat without full American participation in the war.

"Two days after war broke out in Europe the President assured the Nation that he would do everything he could to keep it at peace. He has repeated these assurances again and again. Every speech he made during the campaign contained a pledge to keep the country out of war. The night before the election he said: 'We propose and expect to continue our lives in peace.' Two weeks ago he said: 'Do not let us waste time reviewing the past or fixing or dodging the blame for it.' But I cannot believe that this means that he wants us to forget his promises to pursue a policy of peace.

"Until we are engaged in miltary action we must continue to hope that we can avoid the ultimate catastrophe. We stand on the brink of war. But we have not been attacked. The burden of proof rests on those who claim we are about to be.

"The people have never had a chance to express themselves on the issue of war or peace. The election gave them no chance. Both parties declared for peace. Both candidates declared for peace.

PEOPLE WANT PEACE

"The Gallup poll shows that the people are for peace and that they trust Mr. Roosevelt to keep them at peace. The Gallup question published 10 days ago was, 'If you were asked to vote on the question of the United States entering the war against Germany and Italy, how would you vote—to go into the war or to stay out of the war?' Eighty-three percent of those asked said they would vote to stay out.

"The country wants to defend itself, aid Britain, and stay out of war. We have been told over and over again that we could do just that. During the hearings and debates on the lease-lend bill man after man announced that this was a bill to keep the country out of war. Mr. Willkie said that was why he was for it. Senator GEORGE, who led the fight for the bill, said that was why he was for it. The passage of this bill gave the President no mandate for war. The people want peace.

DOUBT OF DEMOCRACIES

"If we go to war, what are we going to war for? Mr. Roosevelt tells us we are to save the democracies. The democracies are, presumably, England, China, Greece, and possibly Turkey. Turkey is a dictatorship. Greece is a dictatorship. China is a dictatorship. As to England, in 1928 Mr. Anthony Eden, now foreign secretary, speaking in behalf of a bill extending the suffrage, felt it necessary to say to the House of Commons: 'We have not got democratic government in this country today; we never have had it and I venture to suggest to honorable members opposite that we shall never have it. What we have done, in all the progress of reform and evolution of politics, is broaden the basis of our oligarchy.'

RESTORING BOUNDARIES

"If we go to war, what are we going to war for? The British propose to defeat the Axis. What they propose to do then they do not say. They have repeatedly refused to say. Yet the United States is entitled to know. Are we to rush to arms every time the British Empire is in danger? If so, we are entitled to know what the future policy of the British Empire is to be. Are we to put down every tyrant that arises in Europe? If so, we are entitled to know what is to be done to keep each tyrant from being worse than the last.

"If we go to war, what are we going to war for? The only specific statement the President has made on the course we are to pursue after the war is found in two sentences in his last speech. He said, 'We believe that any nationality, no matter how small, has the inherent right to its own nationhood.' To the same effect, he said, 'There never has been, there isn't now, and there never will be any race of people fit to serve as masters over their fellow men.' Do these statements imply restoration of pre-war boundaries in Austria, Czechoslovakia, Danzig, Poland, China, and Rumania? Is this undertaking to be world-wide? If so, how do we induce Russia to restore the pre-war boundaries of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Finland, and Poland?

"We are stirred, but not enlightened, by the great phrase—the four freedoms—which the President has used as the general statement of our aims. Freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom from want, and freedom from fear—if we go to war we go to establish these four freedoms everywhere.

ARMED MISSIONARIES

"The President cannot literally mean that we are to fight on till the four freedoms ring everywhere. If we are to be responsible for the four freedoms everywhere we must have authority everywhere. We must force the four freedoms upon people who might prefer to do without them rather than accept them from the armed missionaries of the United States. This new imperialism, this revised conception of the white man's burden, this modern version of America's manifest destiny is a repudiation of the Presidential teaching that there never has been, isn't now, and never will be any race of people fit to serve as masters over their fellow men."

The Oil Monopoly Stays in the News—Great American Oil Companies Play a Prominent Part in International Relations—Wars and Neutrality Laws Annoy Them Little

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the activities of the American oil monopoly in selling their products throughout the world, have too often been overlooked by the American public. In this connection, some recent newspapar articles should prove of interest. In

the Washington Post of March 20, 1941, Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming was quoted in connection with a speech he delivered at a dinner meeting of the Washington, D. C., branch of the American Association of University Women. Among other things, the Senator discussed certain integral aspects of the oil monopoly and their operations in world trade. I quote:

[From the Washington Post of March 20, 1941]

SENATOR O'MAHONEY ASSAILS AIR LINE IN SPEECH HERE

Charging that the Pan American Air Transport Co., "a creature of the State of Delaware, is doing what the Constitution prohibits the State which created it from doing," Senator JOSEPH C O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, declared last night that "the modern phenomenon of big government seen simultaneously in Europe and America is a result primarily of big business."

Addressing the dinner meeting of the Washington branch of the American Association of University Women at the clubhouse last night, he said that the Senate Committee on Appropriations is now considering the opposition of the Pan American Air Transport Co. to the appropriation of $1,250,000 for the establishment of a competing air service across the Atlantic Ocean.

"Pan American has entered into a contract with the Government of Portgual," he said, "by which it has bound that Government not to grant landing rights to any other American company. The Constitution of the United States provides that no State shall enter into any contract with any other State or with any foreign power without the consent of Congress.

"Pan American has subsidiary corporations in at least 18 or 20 foreign countries, and no agency of the Federal Government has as yet been consulted about the terms of any one of these contracts.

"The War Department and the State Department are today gravely concerned over the problem of oil going to the Axis Powers," he said. "Socony Vacuum Oil Co. has a subsidiary corporation in Hamburg, Germany. The Dutch Shell Oil Co., which through one of its subsidiaries, the Shell Oil Co., delivers and sells gasoline in Washington, is now under the control of Herr Hitler. It has vast oil resources in the Dutch West Indies.

"The Standard Oil Co. of California, which has been shipping oil to Japan from California, and the Texas Oil Co. both own oil deposits in the Bahrein Islands in the Persian Gulf and in nearby Saudi, Arabia. An embargo by the American Government on the exportation of California oil to Japan would not touch either of these Asiatic sources of oil supply," he pointed out.

Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Times-Herald of March 15, 1941, there is a very arresting story concerning the operations of major oil companies in connection with international trade. While we have been told by prominent Government officials and students of international affairs that we have been embargoing the export of high-grade oil to Japan, the facts disclose that we have actually increased our shipments thereof to Nippon. In a subsequent speech, Mr. Speaker, I shall implement this statement with statistical data, having secured it with some trouble and the expenditure of a great deal of effort in the isolated files of Government bureaus. It is an amazing and disturbing fact that we are permitting oil companies operating in the United States to grow increasingly fat upon the annual profits they derive from the sale of very valuable lubricating oil and high-octane gasoline to the Japanese. Actually boycotting the aggressors and thereby assisting the democracies is not the general practice of this country, though we are told that it is. Of what avail is it to loan vast sums of money to the Republic of China while we permit, directly and indirectly, shipment to Japan of 100 octane fuel? To me it is outrageous and cause for an investigation by Congress. Who and what are the mysterious forces at work which are subverting and preventing effective quarantining of aggressor nations? How is it that these great oil companies are so potent in international relations that they can overcome the established and declared attitude of the United States Government in requiring licensing of exports of matériel of war? The article speaks for itself:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of March 15, 1941]

UNITED STATES FIRMS DEFY CURB ON OIL FOR JAPANESE WAR MACHINE—EMBARGO THREAT BOOSTS FLOW TO ORIENT; HEAVY DIVERSION TO GERMANY REVEALED

(By Pat Frank)

Military circles expressed fears yesterday that even if all categories of oil for Japan were embargoed, big American oil companies with fields outside the United States would continue to supply the Axis partner with huge quantities of fuel.

These fears were expressed, despite administration efforts to curb the flow of strategic petroleum products to Nippon and recent indications by President Roosevelt that the country's wide-open policy in regard to oil might be changed, although he has never said when such a change might occur.

UNITED STATES FIRMS INVOLVED

It was pointed out in military circles that if such an embargo came about, sales from foreign fields would be made outside the jurisdiction of Gen. Russel L. Maxwell's export control division.

"When we shut off new categories of fuel to Japan, watch that trade be shifted to the Bahrein Islands," an oil man told this correspondent.

In these islands and in near-by Saudi Arabia the Texas Co. and the Standard Oil Co. of California, the two companies with tremendous interests in the Far East, have opened up immense oil reserves. Together they own the Bahrein Petroleum Co., Ltd., formed for the express purpose of supplying eastern and southern Asia.

OIL STILL FLOWING

Japan with its war machine poised to strike at the Dutch East Indies, Singapore, and even the United States itself, is still obtaining hundreds of thousands of barrels of American oil.

The export-control division set up by Presidential order and military proclamation has succeeded in shutting off the flow of 100-octane aviation gasoline from the United States to Japan. But other fuels—including the oil that powers Japan's battleships—are being shuttled across in increasing quantities.

And Japan still gets its aviation gasoline. It gets some in American tankers from Venezuela, Mexico, and the far-off Bahrein Islands. It gets some from the frightened Dutch East Indies. And it makes some with an American process now in the hands of Germany.

HUGE EXPORT IN JANUARY

In the month of January—the latest month for which figures are available at the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce—the United States sent 647,708 barrels of gas and distilled fuel oil to Japan. This was away over the monthly average for 1940, which was 425,515 barrels. To naval officers this is significant, for it's the kind of oil that operates Japan's fleet.

In January we sent 520,534 barrels of crude oil to Japan, also an increase over the monthly average of last year.

In 1939 we sent Japan 562,230 barrels of aviation gasoline.

In 1940 we sent Japan 527,451 barrels of high-grade gasoline, of which approximately 327,000 barrels was aviation gas. The President halted the export of aviation gas, without license, to all countries outside the Western Hemisphere, effective August 1, 1940.

Since then Japan hasn't been able to get our 100-octane gasoline—not directly.

But Japan employed a clever dodge in continuing to import aviation gas. The 100-octane fuel—the only fuel that will push 400-mile-an-hour fighting aircraft—was loaded into containers at west-coast ports. And into the containers was poured enough crude oil to reduce the rating of the fuel to distillate oil.

When the fuel arrived in Japan it was redistilled and, lo, it was 100-octane airplane gas again.

UNITED STATES HALTS PRACTICE

The aid the great combines have given the Axis is best told by lubricating oil, perhaps. You cannot run fighting planes without high-grade lubricating oil, and the United States produces the best lubricating oils in the world.

Germany's one great weakness is "lube." Germany makes plenty of 100-octane gas through synthetic process. But you cannot make ersatz lube.

In 1938 Japan imported from the United States 307,272 barrels of lubricating oils. In 1939 the Japanese imports jumped to 513,545 barrels. And in 1940 Japan imported 811,499 barrels.

OIL DIVERTED TO GERMANY

In January of this year Japan's imports of lubricating oil reached the all-time high, for 1 month, of 247,982 barrels—about 50,000 barrels less than was imported in an entire year 2 years ago.

Do you think that all that "lube" stayed in Japan?

This is Washington's most explosive secret.

Another secret concerns what happened to the "lube" oil that went to Spain.

In the first 8 months of the war, 296,000 barrels of "lube" went to Spain, contrasted with 99,544 barrels during a comparable period in the previous year.

From an official British source the O. N. A. learned that most of the lubricating oil sent to Denmark, before the invasion of that nation, was diverted to Germany. In the first 8 months of war, Denmark imported 311,718 barrels of "lube," compared with 164,700 barrels in the same period the year previous.

Mr. Speaker, in the Nation, weekly magazine, of March 1, 1941, the well-known writer, I. F. Stone, tells the true story of the sale of gasoline to aggressors. It is an astounding and disturbing story which Mr. Stone tells. Are these oil companies bigger than government itself? Can they defy United States Government? Are they going to be permitted to nullify the accepted policy of our Government—that of quarantining the aggressors? Are profits

more sacred than national honor? I quote the article, and suggest its reading to those concerned with international affairs:

[From the Nation of March 1, 1941]

OIL IS STILL NEUTRAL

(By I. F. Stone)

One need possess no inside information to see that war with Japan is a possibility. Gossip in circles on the Hill which are close to the Army and Navy say "within 60 days." Yet the same patriotic oil companies whose dollar-a-year men dominate the Defense Commission continue to send Japan the oil it needs. During the week ended February 15 we sent Japan 147,044 barrels of crude oil and 137,657 barrels of lubricating oils. We sent Britain 60,000 barrels of crude and 168,986 barrels of fuel oil the same week. Oil is still neutral.

When foreign countries, like domestic consumers become annoyed with Standard Oil, the marines are called for. Otherwise business is business and a yen is as good as a dollar. For all the headlines about oil embargoes, American oil companies are enjoying a boom in exports to Japan. Here is the total value of our petroleum exports to Japan during the past 4 years:

1937	$43,733,000
1938	51,191,000
1939	45,285,000
1940	53,133,000

Lest the reader think these exports have been slowing down I give the figures for 1940 by quarters:

First quarter	$8,584,000
Second quarter	7,717,000
Third quarter	14,160,000
Fourth quarter	22,675,000

Oil exports to Japan are running at a rate almost double any year since the "China incident" began.

The figures for gasoline alone show that we sent Japan three times as much gasoline in 1940 as in any of the 3 preceding years. Aviation gas is a story in itself. The Commerce Department, at the request of the State Department, changed the name of aviation gas last September to "high-grade motor fuel in bulk or containers." This was done, I was told, "so the State Department wouldn't be embarrassed by writers and newspapermen." In 1939 Japan took 628,560 barrels of aviation gas. In 1940 it took 556,703 barrels of "high-grade motor fuel in bulk or containers." The Export Control Division says no aviation gas of higher than 87.5 octane content is going to Japan and that this other gas is inferior gas, not suitable for modern planes. Some authorities say flatly that it is good enough to be used in planes combatting an inferior air force like China's.

It is unfortunate that public attention has been centered on aviation gas, for war with Japan would be a naval war, and fuel oil runs battleships. Japan is being kept well supplied with fuel oil by American companies. Japan and Kwantung together (the State Department insists on separating them, although Japan's possession of Kwantung—the old Port Arthur region in south Manchuria—goes back to 1905) obtained almost 7,500,000 barrels of fuel oil from this country last year. Of basic importance, too, are Japan's heavy imports of crude oil, which amounted to more than 12,000,000 barrels in 1940. In December we exported 2,000,000 barrels of crude, of which half went to Canada, a fourth to Japan. Fuel oil and aviation gas are, of course, manufactured from crude oil. Japan has considerable facilities for refining and cracking, despite oil-company apologetics to the contrary. Latest published figures, which are several years behind, show Japan's refining capacity to be 52,600 barrels a day, as compared with greater Germany's 68,770. Her cracking capacity is 16,250 barrels a day, as compared with greater Germany's 7,290 barrels a day.

Exports to Japan are not the only contributions of American oil companies to the Axis. There are two sources through which Germany and Italy might obtain American oil—Soviet Russia and Spain. The attention paid to these two loopholes is in inverse ratio to the amount of oil going to them. The dollar value of all petroleum products shipped from this country to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics last year was $1,850,000, as compared with the total of $53,135,000 sent to Japan.

Joseph Curran, of the National Maritime Union, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations committee on February 10 against the lease-lend bill, provided a glimpse of Spanish possibilities. He told of the recent trip of a Standard Oil tanker, the *W. H. Libby*. "Not long ago," he said, "she went to Cartagena, Colombia, and loaded up with oil she took to Freetown, West Africa, for British use. Then she hurried back to Carapito, Venezuela, for another load of oil which she took, this time, to Teneriffe in the Canary Islands, where the cargo was transferred to a German and Italian tanker. * * * The crew of the *W. H. Libby* found Teneriffe a busy port, with a steady stream of Standard Oil tankers pulling in and out." In the harbor when the *W. H. Libby* left, were three German and five Italian tankers, the crew reported.

This part of Curran's testimony was given scant attention in the press, whether it was for or against the lend-lease bill. It would have been easy to refute it from Standard Oil and official records. I am told in the Commerce Department that oil exports from this country to Spain are now running about 300,000 barrels a month. But no one knows how much oil is going to the Spanish islands for transshipment to the Axis from American oil companies and refineries in Venezuela and the Dutch West Indies. Japan is obtaining large quantities from American and British oil companies in the Dutch East Indies.

The press has played up every story of Mexican oil going to Japan or the Axis Powers, but pays little attention to American oil bound for Japan, and makes no attempt to investigate how much oil may be reaching Germany and Italy through Spain, although that would be a great story. Mexico has some excuse for her shipments. Standard, Dutch Shell, and the State Department have been doing their best to enforce an unofficial embargo on Mexican oil, as I disclosed in the Nation last fall. The Navy, on instructions from the State Department, chose to pay Standard Oil 10 cents a barrel more for fuel oil rather than buy it from a small American company which manufactured the oil from Mexican crude. The only exception since made is for fuel oil manufactured by Harry Sinclair from crude given him by the Mexican Government in settlement of his claim under expropriation.

Behind the scenes Mexico is now being blackjacked into an agreement whereby Standard and Shell will get back operating control of their properties. The American taxpayer will be asked to foot the bill in the shape of a loan or an appropriation paying off the exaggerated estimates the American oil companies place on the value of their Mexican properties. The excuse will be that we must keep Mexican oil out of Japanese hands. Why not start by keeping American oil out of Japanese hands?

Dramatization of How a Bill Becomes a Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

DRAMATIZATION OF HOW A BILL BECOMES A LAW BY SISTER MARY CONSILIO, O. P.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a dramatization of how a bill becomes a law entitled "How Bill Became John Law, Esquire," by Sister Mary Consilio, O. P. This dramatization was produced recently at Public School No. 47, in the city of Buffalo, N. Y., under the direction of one of the teachers, Mr. Leo Burgoyne. Nine ninth-grade boys played in the cast. The balance of the ninth-grade class and part of the seventh-grade class sat on the stage and made up the "congressional chamber." One of the pupils of the eighth-grade class explained, by use of a slide, the progress of a bill through Congress before the performance.

This drama was published in the Young Catholic Messenger and is of interest to young students who are studying civics and current history. I first included this in an extension of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 29, 1938, and am repeating it at this time by special request.

HOW "BILL" BECAME "JOHN LAW, ESQ."

(A dramatization of how a bill becomes a law, by Sister Mary Consilio, O. P.)

(The bill debated in this drama is fictitious.)

Scene: The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

CHARACTERS

Bill, who later becomes John Law.
Representative Blank, who introduces Bill.
Presiding Officer of the House.
Chairman of Committee on Foreign Affairs.
Clerk.
Representative Dash, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.
Leader of the favorable side.
Leader of the opposing side.
Sergeant at Arms.

(Scene one: The Capitol. Representative Blank enters with "Bill" beside him.)

Representative BLANK. Hurry along, Bill. I want to get you through the House before the session adjourns.

BILL. I'm all nervous about facing that big crowd of men. How many did you say there were?

Representative BLANK. The full roll is 435, but several have died and the State Governors have not yet appointed others to fill their unexpired terms. Don't worry, though, Bill. You'll find lots of friends in the House. I've spoken about you to many of the leaders, and they are quite anxious to have me introduce you.

BILL. Do you think they'll make me change my appearance any? I do like just what I have on.

Representative BLANK. Well, they may put a patch or two on you, but they won't change you very much. The committee will have to see you first in private, and if they think you're fit you will have to come before the House; if the committee doesn't think you'll do, I'm afraid it's the graveyard for yours.

BILL. The graveyard? What graveyard?

Representative BLANK. That's what we say when we mean that a bill has been killed by the House committee. It means that the committee doesn't think it will do, and it fails to recommend it to the House. That "kills" the bill. It never comes before the House in that same form again. But don't worry, old friend. You'll easily get by the committee. I don't expect to see you go to the graveyard.

BILL. It isn't very pleasant there. I don't want them to smother me like that. You don't think they'll do that to me, do you, Representative Blank?

Representative BLANK. I think they won't do that to you, Bill. You see, the last time there was a big war in the world, hundreds of thousands of our soldier boys were sent to Europe, and millions of our dollars were lent to the nations of Europe. Some say it was because many Americans had money invested in foreign nations and they were anxious to have their interests protected. Some rich bankers had lent money to foreign banks to pay for the war, so naturally they didn't want those countries to lose the war. Now if Congress agrees to you, the amount of American investments and loans in foreign countries will be limited and made at the risk of the investors, and the United States will not be mixed up with foreign troubles again because of American investors. But here we are now; I will introduce you.

BILL. What a crowd of lawmakers I see before me. I hope I have a happy fate at their hands.

(Scene 2. Before the House of Representatives. The class may represent the Members of the House.)

Representative BLANK. Mr. Speaker, Representative Blank.

PRESIDING OFFICER. Representative Blank.

Representative BLANK. I wish to introduce my friend Bill to the Members of the House. His full name is A Bill for the Limitation of American Investments and Loans in Foreign Nations. I hope that he will be favorably received by the Members of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER. Thank you, Representative Blank. I shall refer your friend Bill to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I hope that he will live to come up before the body of the House. We shall call your Bill No. 9676543. Now the next business before the House, please.

BILL (aside). Whew! That was short and snappy. Now for the committee room. They tell me the committee work is done in secret and that no records are made of the proceedings. Well, now that I'm on the way, I am anxious to go through with it all.

(Scene 3. Some time later. Outside the committee room. Bill, looking rather wilted, but smiling, follows a member of the committee from the room.)

BILL. Wheeww! That was hot! I feel so wilted that I can't jump around to celebrate my victory. What a lot of mean things those committee men on the left said about me. They said that I would destroy the freedom for which their forefathers died; that I would banish the word prosperity from the American dictionaries.

MEMBER OF COMMITTEE. Hello, there, Representative Blank. Here's your bill we're returning to the House. He was almost smothered in there, but we saved him. The opponents said that if he did pass the two Houses the President would surely veto him, and that if the President failed to do that the Supreme Court would undoubtedly declare him unconstitutional in cases that would be sure to come up concerning this bill.

Representative BLANK. They're not any too comfortable about my bill, are they? How do you feel now, bill? Quite elated?

BILL. Not at all, yet. They tore me apart too much for that. They made some very uncomplimentary remarks about me, but one of the committee stood up and asked: "Mr. Opponent, was your son used as fodder for cannon in the last war? My son lies with thousands of others among the poppies in Flanders' fields." That changed the direction of the wind. They began to listen after that, and here I am now, going back with this gentleman to the House.

Representative BLANK. Well, you're a party bill, so all the loyal members of our party will support the committee's recommendation and vote to pass you to the Senate. I will see you later. Good luck.

(Scene 4: The House of Representatives again some time later.)

CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE. Mr. Speaker, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

SPEAKER. Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

CHAIRMAN. The Committee on Foreign Affairs reports favorably on the bill for limitation of American investments and loans in foreign nations. The committee recommends that said bill be given a place on the calendar to await its turn to come up for discussion before the body of the House. Thank you.

SPEAKER. I recommend the bill to the Committee on Rules, so that the bill may be given a date on which to come up before the House.

BILL (aside). Suspense! Suspense! I wish the Committee on Rules would advance me out of my turn. They do it sometimes to important bills, I hear. I guess that is why the Committee on Rules has been nicknamed "the steering committee." I think I shall rest for a while until my date is called. I've had a strenuous time of late.

(Bill departs.)

(Scene 5: Several weeks later. The House of Representatives again)

SPEAKER. Members of the House of Representatives, we have before us for discussion a bill introduced by Representative Blank and favorably reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We shall now debate this bill in the Committee of the Whole.

BILL (to clerk, beside whom he is seated). What does that mean, please?

CLERK (in whisper). The whole body of Representatives will sit as a committee to discuss you. The Speaker will leave his place and will appoint a Representative to be Chairman of the Committee of the Whole for the time being. There are some sharp debates coming, I think.

BILL. Do you think they'll kill me? Does the House have a graveyard, too?

CLERK. Yes; the House has a graveyard, too. You must be prepared for anything.

BILL. I feel cold and creepy. What's the temperature in here, please?

CLERK. Hush-sh; 84°—in the shade, too!

SPEAKER. I shall appoint Representative Dash to the chair, please, as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole. Representative Dash.

Representative DASH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the Committee of the Whole: We have up for discussion today the limitation of American investments and loans in foreign nations. The Committee on Rules has determined 5 hours as the time limit for the bill's discussion. I shall announce the rules for time limit as set by the Committee on Rules for this debate: The committee appoints 2½ hours as the limit beyond which neither side may continue the debate. The leader of each side of the debate may be allowed 1 hour to open the discussion, but, according to the rules of the House, no Member other than the leader will be allowed more than 5 minutes of speaking time. No one, without the consent of all, may speak twice.

BILL (to himself). I wish the opposing side had only 5 minutes altogether in which to speak. This is terrible. Why don't they start?

LEADER OF THE FAVORABLE SIDE. Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee of the Whole: During recent years much ugly matter has been brought to light bearing on the United States and the World War. I need not review for you the facts in all their ugliness. I need only remind you that the flower of our American youth was lost, that millions of dollars have gone, and that untold suffering has come upon our Nation. Why? The doughboys would have told you then, "To make the world safe for democracy." But what have our recent investigations uncovered? That underlying our principles of democracy, lying concealed as a worm in a core, unknown—unnoticed—by the average American, was the matter of foreign investments and loans. This, the bill up for discussion now, hopes to eliminate by curtailing the amount and kind of investments and of loans, and, if need be, to place a tax upon all such moneys which find their way to foreign nations.

LEADER OF THE OPPONENTS. Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee of the Whole, it will be our aim to bring before this Committee reasons why this bill should not be passed. Does not our Constitution guarantee "the pursuit of happiness" to each of its citizens? Would not this bill curtail such a guaranty? Does not our Constitution guarantee the rights of property? Would not such a bill destroy them? My respected opponent failed to prove his points in which he declared that moneyed interests, rather than democracy, were the motivating principle of our entrance into the World War. Let the opposing party prove the truth of these statements, and then we shall attempt to prove that such a bill for the limitation of American investments and loans in foreign nations would be a violation of the rights guaranteed by the Constitution to its people.

BILL. They both sound like good arguments to me. I wonder whether I'm all wrong? But, no; didn't the Committee chairman say, "Was your son used as fodder for cannon in the World War?" And didn't he add sadly, "My son lies with thousands of others among the poppies in Flanders' fields." * * *

(Several hours later, during which the debate has continued.)

BILL. Well, the debate seems about over. Perhaps they'll patch me up a bit here. I'm rather worn from my rough handling so far.

CLERK (in a whisper to Bill). The Committee of the Whole has just voted favorably on you. Watch, now. The Chairman of the Committee gives his place back to the Speaker, the Committee "rises," and becomes again the deciding body, or the House of Representatives, and the bill will be placed before them for passage. This part will be interesting. They may start some filibustering.

BILL. Filibustering? That sounds like fighting.

CLERK. Well, it isn't fighting actually, but it shows the opposing side has some fight in it. They may call a motion to adjourn, or call for yeas and nays, etc., which would take a long time, or do anything to delay the passage of the bill. They could keep that up indefinitely if the Speaker recognized such "dilatory motions." But the Speaker won't, I'm sure, and if many such motions are made, he will refuse to give the floor—that is, to recognize—anyone whom he knows to be filibustering.

BILL. Suppose the Speaker approves the filibustering and gives that side the floor repeatedly. Then what'll happen to me?

CLERK. Someone may enter a motion of "previous bill," which means that the bill up for discussion before any of the filibustering started must be decided at once if the House says so. Even motions made to adjourn may be declared out of order. The Members then vote yes or no on the bill. This is called the cloture rule. That means the debate has been closed.

BILL. I hope they're ready to close the debate on me. They ought to see I'm good for their welfare.

CLERK. Well, not everyone sees alike, you know. Some think you're a danger to the Constitution.

SPEAKER. We are now about to call for the vote on the bill entitled "A bill for the limitation of American investments and loans in foreign nations." The clerk will now call for ayes and then for nces.

BILL. Here's where I get mine. I'm afraid to look or listen

CLERK Those in favor of the bill will signify by saying "aye."

(Class gives the vote.)

Those contrary, signify by saying "nay."

(Class again votes.)

The ayes have it. The bill for the limitation of American investments and loans in foreign nations has been passed by the House of Representatives.

SERGEANT AT ARMS. Congratulations, old top. I knew you'd make it. Now for the Senate. I hope they give you a good reception.

BILL. Thanks; you are very encouraging. But what'll they do to me there?

SERGEANT. No more than they did to you in this House, except that they may put a patch or two on you and send you back here for an O. K. before you go to the President. Goodbye; there's a long path ahead of you yet, but I hope you make it.

BILL. Thanks, friend. Off to the Senate for mine. Oh, what a thrill to hear that chorus of ayes. Hooray, whoopee, hurrah.

(Scene 6. Several weeks later. Representative Blank meets his one-time friend, Bill, on Pennsylvania Avenue. Bill wears a policeman's cap and badge and carries a stick.)

Representative BLANK. Well, if it isn't my old friend, Bill.

EX-BILL. How are you, Representative Blank? I'm Bill no longer. The President put his signature on me this morning and now I'm John Law, Esq. See my new outfit? Because of the President's approval, I may now go abroad in the land and, believe you me, people will respect me from now on.

Representative BLANK. Do you remember how nervous you were when I introduced you in the House?

JOHN LAW, Esq. I surely do. But I'm not any longer. I've been through a great deal since then. I got into a few minor difficulties in the Senate, but they were ironed out quite satisfactorily and here I am, thanks to you and your friends, the champion of the American Nation, John Law, Esq., on the limitation of American investments and loans in foreign nations.

(The end.)

Gutzon Borglum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

POEM BY EDNA BUTLER TRICKEY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, it was recently my privilege to sponsor a poetry-writing contest on the theme of democracy by offering a prize to the poem selected by the South Dakota Poetry Society as deserving of first place. This prize-winning poem will be featured in the South Dakota Poetry Magazine, Pasque Petals, published in Aberdeen, S. Dak., but because of its Nation-wide appeal in paying tribute to Gutzon Borglum I am taking the liberty of reprinting it here so that it can be available to all America.

This poem, Gutzon Borglum, pays deserved tribute to the sculptor of Rushmore, in South Dakota's majestic Black Hills, and is written by one of the talented young poets of my State who is rapidly making a name for herself in the literary world:

GUTZON BORGLUM

(By Edna Butler Trickey, Aberdeen, S. Dak.)

Now he is one with them—
Washington and Jefferson,
Roosevelt and Lincoln,
Whose faces he has made to live in stone;
Shrine of democracy, Mount Rushmore's miracle!
He consecrated at that shrine his own best gifts:
Deft hands that labored 40 years with stubborn stone,
A mind that matched those rugged hands,
A ripe philosophy, and a fierce love
For men who carved a nation out of wilderness.
Each curve and hollow he designed to stand
One hundred thousand years of storms and weathering;
And now he leaves to us the task
Of holding fast his dream and theirs
Who look down from the mountainside—
"That this America shall ever be,
Henceforth a hundred thousand years, land of the free!"

W. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter on the W. P. A. from a constituent in my district:

GRETNA, LA., *March 21, 1941.*

Hon. T. HALE BOGGS,

Representative, Second Louisiana District.

MY DEAR MR. BOGGS: Thousands of W. P. A. workers throughout the Nation will be released from the rolls within the next 30 days, due to a very unpopular law among the workers. This law to which I am referring provides that all W. P. A. workers, excepting World War veterans and supervisory employees, who are on the W. P. A. rolls for 18 months continuously must be released. Those persons affected are not eligible for recertification until they have been off the W. P. A. rolls for 30 days, then their reassignment on the W. P. A. rolls depends on the demand for workers in their respective classifications; it may be several months before some classes are reemployed, others may never be reassigned. The worker who is affected feels that he is being discriminated against because of the fact that neither the war veterans nor supervisors suffer any interruption of employment due to this law. Usually it will be found upon investigation that the workers affected are among the most needy on the relief rolls.

The Work Projects Administration seems to be in open competition with private industry. The class of work being done in every detail is the same as private industry. The W. P. A. worker is compelled to produce accordingly. The sponsors are today recognizing this fact.

Not a stone has been left unturned by President Franklin D. Roosevelt and his worthy Cabinet to assure the success of our Nation's preparedness program. He has called upon the W. P. A. to be used on defense projects in every corner of the United States, and believe me they are performing their assignments masterfully. A recent tour by Secretary Knox of all Coast Guard and naval defense projects has caused Mr. Knox to praise the W. P. A. for its cooperation.

Bills requesting billions upon billions of dollars to carry on defense programs are daily flooding the Senate. All red-blooded Americans at this "peak hour" have pledged themselves at all cost to do their share toward making the defense program a complete success. Salaries have been increased in private industry, better working conditions also provided, but all seem to forget the man on the relief rolls, especially those over 45 years of age. Why should he be forgotten? Why should he not be given the same opportunity as the veteran or other relief employees? Why should the laws of a nation as great and resourceful as ours be used to discriminate against a willing and capable man's employment, and prevent him from earning a living for his family? The compensation law prevents a man of this caliber from securing employment in private industry because of his age, while the 18-month law deprives him of his employment on the W. P. A. rolls. Many persons over 45 years of age are still capable of serving and benefiting industry.

President Roosevelt in an address before the White House Correspondents Association on March 15, 1941, said he was appealing to the hearts and minds of every man and every woman within our borders who love liberty; he asked them to consider the needs of our Nation at this hour and put aside all personal differences until our victory is won.

The best way to keep down differences, in my opinion, is to remove the cause, if possible.

During these abnormal times, in this land of abundance where billions are spoken of

in terms of pin money, there is no necessity of workers being released from the W. P. A. rolls when they could be placed on defense projects, somewhere, someplace. The 18-month law should be repealed or an amendment passed to care for this emergency.

I have reasons to believe, that, due to the great number of workers affected by this 18-month law, the representative who will interest himself in this worthy cause, will be highly regarded by the people to whom he is responsible.

I am an employee of the W. P. A. over 45 years of age; the father of nine children. I will be affected by this law shortly, however, I am as much interested in the repeal of this law for the benefit of others as I am for myself, therefore, you are privileged to use this letter over my signature to the best advantage. Hoping to hear promptly from you concerning this matter and at the same time assuring you of my fullest cooperation,

I am,

Yours respectfully,

CLARENCE J. HOGAN.

American Journalism Remains the Palladium of Our Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM DETROIT FREE PRESS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following timely editorial from the Detroit Free Press:

[From the Detroit Free Press]

A FREE PRESS

National defense is paralyzed by strikes.

Strike! Strike! Strike! is the cry across the land.

Reactionary managements are taking advantage of a grave national situation to cripple the union-labor movement. Radical union leaders are taking advantage of the same desperate condition to promote their own greedy ends. Moscow and Berlin are helping.

Labor leaders are at each other's throats in the mad scramble for power, stopping production in plant after plant merely to battle for jurisdictional supremacy—who is to rule the men, dominate the factory, and get the dues.

Greed, Hate, Distrust, and Disunity are the Four Horsemen of the American Apocalypse.

Hitler laughs, Stalin jeers, and Matsuoka smiles.

"Democracy the decadent; Democracy the dying! Democracy the stupid and inefficient! It is as we told you, our subjects. The people, the dumb, stupid people are unfit to govern themselves."

Long ago Hitler laid down the Nazi technique on how to conquer a nation without firing a shot or striking a blow. He said to Rauschning: "Mental confusion, contradiction of feeling, indecisiveness, panic; these are our weapons."

It is the technique he used in Austria, in Czechoslovakia, in Poland, in the Scandinavian nations, in the Low Countries, in the Balkans—and, above all, in France.

Already there are those in the United States, alarmed at the prairie fire of strikes sweeping across America, who are seeing in this present situation a parallel with that of France.

France, with the finest army in the world, caved in at the first touch of Nazi pressure, for seeds of greed, hate, distrust, and disunity were long planted there. France collapsed because she was torn with internal dissension.

Shall America go the same way?

Shall we go down the same path along which Britain went unto the eleventh hour?

Such questions are in the minds of men and women everywhere in America today.

The answer is No.

For in the ultimate analysis there is no comparison between the French situation and the American. The similarities are only on the surface.

America will be saved to itself because America has a free and untrammeled press.

France might have been saved, but France never did have a free press.

France never possessed anything but a corrupt, subsidized, and always purchasable press.

Every editor and publisher represented a faction, a group, a party, or some predatory interest. Never did the press of France see its country as a whole with a national interest in its well-being transcending its own venal purposes.

That is not true of America.

Here every newspaper of every shade of political opinion speaks out for a united America and sees this Nation as a whole from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

In France it was a common habit for foreign powers to subsidize certain newspapers to be used to disrupt France.

Apologists for French journalism explain that this had to be because there is very little advertising in France and great institutions of journalism could not be maintained, self-supporting, and profit making, and therefore independent.

That may all be. The point is that the great American press is free and is made free by its diversified advertising and by the immediate reaction of its readers.

And so it is that throughout the United States today all the newspapers of all shades of opinion are rallying to the call for a united people. As a result public opinion is crystallizing so rapidly that both radical union leaders and reactionary business leaders are showing alarm—for well they know the mighty power and the speed with which an aroused American public opinion works.

The laws have been written on the books for mediation.

This lightning-like crystallization of public opinion is neither for the unions nor for management.

It is for production.

And the only way to get production is by mediation instead of violence.

Older unions, such as the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and our own Typographical Union, have no strikes even in peacetime, in depressions, or in prosperity. They have grown older and wiser and know the value of the ways of peace—both men and management.

It is taking nothing from union rights and nothing from management rights to ask—in the name of the Nation's salvation—that they sit in conference and come to a common ground of understanding, as civilized Americans instead of gangsters from the jungles.

That is the task the American press is performing.

It is the task the British press performed before that last fateful hour.

A true democracy cannot exist without a free press and that is why France was never at heart a true democracy. It had the form but not the spirit.

American journalism still remains the palladium of our liberty.

Pogroms Against Labor Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein an editorial from a recent issue of the Tacoma Labor Advocate, the official organ of the American Federation of Labor unions of Tacoma and Pierce County, Wash. This enterprising publication is edited by John McGivney.

In these days when it is the fashion and practice to search for scapegoats upon whom to vent our spleen at and distaste for any inefficiencies or inequities in our national life, organized labor has been sought out for vitriolic attention at the hands of Tories, conservatives, and sincere and honest, but unprofound, middle-of-the-road citizens.

In pre-Nazi Germany, Hitler built up a large following by centering the wrath of the people upon the Jews. His diatribes against organized labor were developed in a major degree after he became Reich Chancelor. It is always easy to fasten the blame for anything we do not like upon some militant group, organization, or individual, and thus exculpate ourselves from responsibility or liability for certain unpopular happenings. For more than a quarter of a century, labor has steadily been adding to its gains, expanding its benefits, and increasing its efforts. Naturally, in the course of that program, it has trod severely upon the toes of those from whom its efforts have extracted better working conditions, shorter hours, and increased compensation. But, like the elephant, these reluctant cooperators with labor did not forget. They have been biding their time. They have been waiting for the hour to reveal their true attitude toward labor. Now behind the protecting cover or cloak of national defense, they are ordering extra supplies of ammunition, and polishing up their arms. Soon they will make an overt attack upon entrenched labor.

In relatively few and isolated instances, there have been some abuses of the privileges and powers of labor, but to turn down all of labor because of these comparatively scarce instances, is analogous to burning down an office building because it was found that there were cockroaches in one of its numerous rooms. I would like to see, Mr. Speaker, some attention paid to those industrialists who are gouging the public in this present hour. I would like these very vociferous champions of the public good to demand the restoration of the legal requirement for competitive bidding in Government contracts. I would like publicity given to their business with the Federal Government, where compatible with the public interest. I would like to

see the torchlight of publicity illuminate the inner workings of corporate bookkeeping.

Who was it who demanded the eradication of all limitations upon all profits with respect to contractors dealing with the Government? Why do we limit in peacetime the profits which may be enjoyed by the contractors, as had been decreed by the Vinson-Trammell Act, with respect to Navy Department purchases and contracts but repeal such legislation in times of national emergency? Why do we remit back to these contractors three fourths of the taxes they would ordinarily have to pay? Mr. Speaker, if Great Britain taxes 100 percent of the war profits of her defense industries, might it not be a good idea for the United States to emulate in that respect the country whose other ideas we are so prone to espouse? Why are we so solicitous about the imposition of corporate income taxes in defense industries in fixing the maximum thereon at 42 percent, when Great Britain imposes a minimum tax on normal profits received by all industrialists at 42½ percent? Is it not fair to expect that labor, which has been deprived of earning power during 10 years of depression, should demand a modicum of the enormous profits about to be received by industries engaged in national-defense projects?

The veterans' organizations, for 20 years, have proclaimed their insistence that we take the profits out of war. The only place wherein we have carried out this edict is that we are sending young men into the draft sections of the Army at a pay of 67 cents a day.

But let the editorial speak for itself.

[From the Tacoma (Wash.) Labor Advocate]

ANTISTRIKE LEGISLATION

Everything these days, whether the making of soup or putting a half sole on one's brogans, is regarded as "a defense measure." And if you ask for more wages from an employer you are guilty of gross disloyalty. And in this hue and cry against labor, there seems to be a perfect alliance between naval and military brass hats, reactionary politicos, and big business and small.

It is not, as a matter of fact, that any of these things are defense industries, whether they are or not. It is that labor must be kept down as is the antilabor fashion of all Fascist-minded folk everywhere fighting democracy.

In the Congress there are being introduced many sumptuary laws, all of which have for their principle the noble task of chaining labor, and it may be noted that many of those are supported by southern gentlemen who owe their seats to the fact that in those democratic States the poor are successfully disfranchised in right valiant but somewhat antiquated style, by means of a poll tax. So knowing who butters their bread and when, naturally they are zealous to serve their masters while the majority of American eligibles are kept from the ballot box by means of a poll tax.

When seeking for some crushing argument against labor, these solons and big business, of which they are more or less efficient stooges, point to the fact that the boys who go forth to serve their country, and if need be to war, must take their chances for $21 a month. And they say how can the American worker refuse to serve, if necessary, for the same pay as the men who are drafted for the Army.

It might be pointed out that that begins, but it doesn't end, a very extensive argument. In the first place the firms against which the workers strike are not engaged in defending anything else but their profits, just as the Congressmen whose own pay is so excessive, whether in the House or the Senate, are, in protesting against labor's reasonable wage demands, not trying to help the class whence come the votes at election time.

If we want to standardize things, then government should own all the profit-making mechanisms, individual or corporative, as well as direct the wages and the living of draftee and the workman, as those solons suggest.

It may be further pointed out to those who oppose strikes that the workers are left to their own sweet selves in seeking and securing work. If there is room for them, very well; if not, well also, if not so well. They must do the best they can. And the workers' experience during the past score years and those years immediately after the last war when in both instances they were left to drift for themselves, is not to be so easily forgotten.

Every worker should receive pay that should sustain him and his family in comfort at all times. That we believe is one of the first duties as it should be one of the first tenets of democracy. Some of these profiteering patriots seem to think that the worker should be grateful for a job and for what money he is given by an employing corporation, whose expansion and whose contracts are written up by the British or the American Governments, and which have little regard in the prices paid to actual production costs.

We have been scanning a list of so-called war industries, and the way they have been soaring upward would make a stratospheric balloon blush with shame. None of them but are raking in the gains in very comfortable shape, but some of them, we also notice, have had trouble with their employees who in turn have had trouble making ends meet.

We dwell upon these facts because any person can see in the making a determined attack upon the workers, upon reform legislation, and upon their freedom to strike.

We have advanced so far on the road to reaction that now it is almost a crime against one's patriotism to quote Abraham Lincoln to the effect that God was to be thanked that we had a system of labor in this country where striking was possible. And we have so far departed from elemental concepts of human freedom that there are men in the Congress ready and willing and eager and anxious to bind labor in chains, hog-tie them past all industrial freedom, and sling them to the profiteers who are once again with us.

Daily in the papers, lists of strikes, some of them correctly given, many more of them certainly very far wrong, are to be noted, and as if to curry favor for its pernicious and most vicious monopoly, the broadcasting chains in almost every news period catalog the list of strikes, new and old, as if part of the contribution of the workers to slow down national-defense programs.

We all know better than that. Those who make that charge were silent as the grave and still are, about the bottlenecks which industry places in the way of production. Not a word is said. But when the worker, hard put to it now when working as when he was unemployed, to secure his daily bread for him and his, has the courage to unite and demand it and to fight for it, he is listed as a malcontent and subversive one who threatens the well-being of his country.

For a new low in conceptions of human freedom and especially of industrial freedom you need only listen to some of these southern solons who are solons by the grace of the poll tax. Their own subservient souls are so overcome with anger when they think of the workers, the producers, the men who toil and labor and fill this bountiful land with beneficial commodities, that they find trouble in expressing their views in denouncing the union workers in such efforts to secure decent remuneration.

New antistrike laws are proposed, and these are proposals which will tend not to promote efficiency, or to increase production to the limits of capacity, but to destroy it altogether. Knudsen is one with Hillman in opposing such legislation. And indeed anyone with any experience in modern industry would know that this is the certain way to detract from efficiency on the job among Americans with their tradition of freedom and their unquestioned right to strike.

Doubtful Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial appearing in the San Francisco Chronicle under date of March 25, 1941:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of March 25, 1941]

DOUBTFUL PROPOSAL

Attorney General Jackson is backing a bill in Congress to permit the F. B. I. to tap wires in subversive and kidnaping cases and to restrict the authority solely to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The proposal leaves us dubious. There is excellent reason behind the present laws forbidding wire tapping by anyone. The reason is the possibility of abuse. Once give any agency that power to be used legally and the door is opened to abuse. We say this in no reflection on the F. B. I.; we think the observation applies as well to any other agency. The proposal smacks too much of opening the way to a gestapo.

Besides, if this authority were to be given to the F. B. I., why withhold it from the Army and Navy Intelligence Services, which also have use for it if it could be used, under law, only legitimately, which we beg to doubt?

Will it not be better to leave the present laws in force, forbidding wire tapping to anybody? Then, if the F. B. I. or the Army or Navy Intelligences should surreptitiously resort to it in an emergency—we do not mean to say they do—one could be sure that it would be only in a serious case and would not be abused.

Lars Eric Bladine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. MOTT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE McMINNVILLE (OREG.) TELEPHONE REGISTER

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, on January 13 of this year a prominent and beloved citizen of my State, and an outstanding figure in its political life, passed quietly

and peacefully to his reward. This citizen was Lars Eric Bladine, publisher of a weekly newspaper, the Telephone Register, at McMinnville, Oreg., in my congressional district.

The people of Oregon are so well acquainted with the biography and with the work and services of Lars Bladine that I shall not undertake to recite them, but as a tribute to a friend and a fellow citizen whose life has made his own community and his State a better place in which to live, I wish to record here what another friend has said about him. And so, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I append the following editorial which was printed in the Telephone Register, and which expresses much better than I can the love of those who knew him best:

[From the McMinnville (Oreg.) Telephone Register]

There is a strange stillness in the office down the hall.

On the desk there are a few opened letters, a small stack of clippings, several folded newspapers. It is the desk of a newspaperman. And in the silent typewriter is a sheet of clean copy paper. It is awaiting an editorial for these columns which will never be written.

Because Lars Bladine is gone.

Just a few short hours ago he was here. He was busy, as always. Telephones were ringing. "May I speak to Lars Bladine?" Visitors, businessmen, friends were coming into the office. "Is Lars in?"

Then another call. He was just preparing to write. The clean sheet of copy paper was in his typewriter, when he went out for a few minutes. He never returned to his desk. For death, as it must to all men, came Monday evening for Lars E. Bladine, publisher of the Telephone Register, less than 2 hours after he was suddenly stricken by a heart attack.

It's hard to realize he's gone. But out beyond there must be some opening for a man with such experience, and such talents as Lars—for a man with a lifetime—50 years—of newspapering to his credit. At 15 he began it, just a boy at an all-engrossing task from which he never turned. He alone could look back over that half century, full of its joys and sorrows, its friendships and battles, its "scoops" and disappointments, but we'll never know all of it now. Up to the very end he enjoyed it. Seldom does one derive so much fun out of friends and out of sheer living as did Lars.

Ability and love of work drew rewards and recognitions. His newspapers were numerous during the years—the Marathon Republic, Albert City Appeal, Webster City Freeman-Tribune, Cedar Falls Daily Record, Clinton Advertiser, and then the Telephone Register. Right was right with him, and many and colorful were his battles to maintain it.

Busy as he was with his chosen profession, Lars Bladine still found time to serve the cause of his country and good government. Born in Sweden, but raised in America, Lars was a real American of the most admirable type. At a time such as now, when the need for him and men like him is keenly felt, it is doubly hard to bid him goodbye. For 14 years he was a member of Iowa's Republican Central Committee, serving once as the State chairman, and when he later came to Oregon he served the same group in this State as its secretary. Nine years as Marathon's postmaster, and another 12 as Iowa's collector of internal revenue also belong on his record.

Yet through it all, and despite the fact that he was often as newsworthy himself as he wished others would be, Lars Bladine was shy. Gruff, kindly, humorous, lovable, he was still boyishly bashful and reticent about any praise or honors. The story is told of him that in 1932 the Republicans of Iowa turned to him as their candidate for Governor. But he refused. "Hell, no," he told them. "I don't want the job."

And then he packed up and came to Oregon and McMinnville, where in a few brief years he found himself once again completely equipped with another State full of friends, to all of whom he was just Lars. Many throughout the Nation were proud and happy to call him friend. He was, we know, an intimate acquaintance of all the Presidents from the first Roosevelt to Hoover, and Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover personally appointed him to his collectorship of internal revenues for Iowa.

It was much as he had written when he first became publisher of this newspaper back in 1928. "Twenty years ago," he wrote then in these self-same columns, "the writer made a bid for this newspaper after spending a week in looking over McMinnville and Yamhill county. He had disposed of a newspaper property in Iowa and remembering Horace Greeley's injunction, came west."

At the same time he stated his hopes for McMinnville, as well as his journalistic creed: "It will be the purpose of the new owners to publish a newspaper that will creditably reflect the spirit of the community, to print the news without fear or favor and so far as it is possible to promote the prosperity and happiness of all deserving people. We have some very definite ideas as to the responsibilities and duties of a newspaper to its constituency. These ideas have come through the school of experience, and we hope to profit by them." As to whether he fulfilled his promise or not, we cannot be judge so well as you, his readers. But it will be remembered that a little over a year ago, in 1939, his Telephone Register was named the Nation's best weekly newspaper.

Those of the newspaper profession, accustomed daily to viewing life in all its manifestations, are sometimes thought to be a hardened lot. Lars, himself, was a poor exponent of that type, with his gentleness and kindness. But at times like this it is difficult to dispel that choking feeling which insists on rising. Words, with which we are supposed to deal with something resembling ease, fail to convey just how we feel. This isn't good enough, Lars. It's nothing to what tribute you deserve, we know. But without your help, the things we feel don't seem to come out quite plainly, in that lucid manner you so often used. And we know you'd never even tolerate anything about yourself in your own columns if you were here. So this will just have to do.

There are lots of things we could say, of course. It is not hard to find things to say in the life of one who has been so intimately connected with life and the news for over half a century.

It won't be the same around here without you, Lars. We're going to miss you—miss you a lot. But we'll stop here, knowing you'd like it better this way. It came time for you, as it will sometime for all of us, for your final "30."

Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES F. McLAUGHLIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. SAM HOBBS, OF ALABAMA

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of the gentleman from Alabama, Hon. SAM HOBBS, in the National Radio Forum, arranged by the Washington Star, March 31, 1941, and broadcast over a network of the National Broadcasting Co.:

Wars were once fought by men. Now men merely operate the engines of death. Martial mechanization is just as essential for successful competition in war as is industrial mechanization necessary in these days of mass production. The shoemaker with his awl and needles could not compete with modern shoemaking machinery. He is extinct. Automobiles can be made by hand but such competition with production and assembly lines is an absurdity.

Forty years ago a great orator loved to talk about a million embattled farmers springing to arms, seizing their shotguns and squirrel rifles, and driving any invaders into the Atlantic Ocean. That may have been a real threat then, but it is a joke now. One tank division, with a squadron of our fighter planes and of bombers, could annihilate a million men, so armed, in an afternoon.

When shotguns and squirrel rifles were weapons of war, quick arming was feasible. But few homesteads have an airplane or a tank in the garage. So preparation for modern warfare is a lengthy operation. It takes years. Four years are required, as a minimum, to produce one battleship. It is a race not only against time but also against the same effort of other nations. It took Hitler 4 years to attain mass production of airplanes. France and England could have retained their dominance in the air by competing then. But they did not. They did not appreciate the fact that modern war is won by doing a better job in the factories producing war matériel. So when Chamberlain went to Munich, he had nothing but an umbrella. France was not conquered in 1940, nor on the field of battle in the spectacular sweep of Hitler's air corps and tanks. She was conquered by the failure of her factories to function efficiently during the 7 years preceding. It was not her Maginot Line that failed but her production and assembly lines.

Ambassador Bullitt testifies as an eyewitness. He says that after France was partially overrun, with many of her major airplane factories in German hands, she produced with what she had left, two and a half times as many airplanes in 1 month as she had ever produced in any month of her history when she had all of her facilities supposedly on the job.

No one disputes these facts, and they should encourage us. The Battle of Waterloo may have been won on the cricket fields of Eton. But the battles of Poland, Holland, Belgium, and France were won in the factories of Germany. Hitler's "fifth column" was powerful. But his "sixth column"—his factories—was omnipotent.

Nowadays wars do not come to nations who are prepared to defend themselves. Aggressors simply count the navies, the supply ships and transports, the supplies of oil, ammunition, food, and the number of aircraft and tanks, and if these equal or exceed their own, there is no war.

This should be right down our alley. We have practically everything—surplus food, clothing, transportation, ingenuity, energy, experience, men, skill, money, plants, raw materials and, thanks to some remaining isolation and the British Fleet, enough time. But not a day to spare. Our experts have on paper an adequate defense program. Total defense, which would if realized, guarantee the peace of our hemisphere.

We have drafted $40,000,000,000 and there has been no strike of a single dollar.

We have drafted 17,000,000 men, plus the National Guard. And there has been no strike.

American farmers work 80 hours a week at 15 cents an hour. As a result our national pantry is full and overflowing. And there has been no strike.

The United States is the paradise for both capital and labor. There are more millionaires in America than in the rest of the world. The salaries of management are the highest ever known. Here labor enjoys the highest wages, as short hours, as ideal conditions, and is provided with as good housing, as much leisure, as good recreational facilities and as good health and hospital care as the world has ever known. The cost of living has not risen materially in this emergency. No wages have declined. No right of labor has been denied or withdrawn. Yet, in the face of these facts and the challenge to prodigious effort flung by our able leaders, selfishness stalks abroad in the land—and time—the most priceless resource at our command—is wasted. While the time worked compared to the time lost makes the loss seem small, yet who can say that we can afford to lose even one day? The summarized history of the defense effort of 14 nations has already been written in two words: "Too late."

Yet, in spite of this repeated handwriting on the wall of recent history, strikes in the United States have caused the loss of more than a million man-days of work in January and February of 1941—625,000 man-days lost in 220 strikes in January, 1,000,000 man-days lost in 240 strikes in February. One million six hundred and twenty-five thousand man-days of idleness in January and February 1941. And the record for March will be worse. In February alone—a 28-day month—we lost the equivalent of a thousand men working a thousand days—more than 3 years. In these 2 months' strikes subtracted from our defense effort the worktime necessary to produce two 10,000-ton cruisers, or seven 1,700-ton destroyers, or 10 submarines, or 222 heavy 4-engine Army bombers, or 541 light Navy bombers, or 1,238 fighting airplanes. In 127 plants listed by the Navy Department, the output of which affected the national-defense program, 3,781 days, or 10½ years were lost during 1940 and the first month and a half of 1941. Of the 7,817,360 man-hours lost in these 127 plants, substantially one-half of this total loss was caused by strikes for a "closed shop." Jurisdictional strikes and organizational strikes accounted for a large percentage of the other half.

But in spite of the horror with which the American people view the actual figures just quoted, showing an average of almost a million man-days a month of strike-enforced idleness during the first 3 months of 1941, the work time actually lost in plants closed by strikes does not begin to tell the whole story. The figures I have quoted for January and February are given by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor. They are accurate as far as they go, but they do not show the time lost in open plants, which should be producing defense matériel which cannot "deliver the goods" because of the lack of ingredients, the flow of which has been stopped from the plants closed by strikes. Mr. Merrill Meigs, of the O. P. M., a witness before the Committee on the Judiciary, testified as to these disastrous consequences in slowing up airplane production. He pointed out that there were some 2,000 parts needed for the construction of aircraft. These basic parts come from many factories, a large percentage of which are small plants, some working only a hundred men, yet the lack of the product of any one of them stops the production of airplanes and bombers just as effectively as though the whole of the huge assembly plant which finally turns out the finished aircraft had been closed. The lack of one kind of casting made of an essential metal stops the assembly line. The failure of the supply of screws of a peculiar and essential kind, when the small plant that makes them is closed by a strike, stops the production of the whole airplane into which they should have gone, though the assembly plant is not closed and is ready to run. Thus a tabulation of the time loss caused directly by strikes cannot give the picture of the full slow-down of our defense effort. Such figures merely give the direct and immediate time loss. The indirect and sometimes remote time loss resulting from the strikes may be even greater.

The strike in a wheel-producing plant closed down not only that plant but had an impeding effect upon the production of tanks, airplanes, bombers, and motor vehicles ordered by the Army from other plants.

The Vanadium Corporation strike is a good illustration. Incidentally, this strike, now tentatively settled after reaching its seventh week, is an outlaw strike, called in defiance of the wishes and orders of the regional director of the C. I. O., who warned the strikers that they had forfeited their rights to C. I. O. protection and were the victims of irresponsible leadership. The Vanadium Corporation is the Nation's largest producer of ferrovanadium, a vital alloy in producing many types of munitions. The direct effect of this strike was merely to close that one plant. But affidavits of American Locomotive Co., Simonds Steel Mills, Union Electric Steel Corporation, Universal-Cyclops Steel Corporation, Vulcan Crucible Steel Co., Worth Steel Co., Bethlehem Steel Co., Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation, Henry Disston & Sons, Inc., Dominion Foundries & Steel, Ltd., Hamilton, Ontario, Erie Forge Co., the Midvale Co., Mesta Machine Co., Lukens Steel Co., Lebanon Steel Foundries, Latrobe Electric Steel Co., Jessop Steel Co., Heppenstall Co., and Crucible Steel Co. of America certify that ferrovanadium on order for each of them with the Vanadium Corporation is impeding the manufacture of materials ordered from them, respectively, for national-defense purposes. The percentage of defense orders thus impeded in these collaterally affected companies ranges from 58 to 100 percent.

The strike in the Vultee airplane plant was never authorized by the vote of any union. The Allis-Chalmers strike in Milwaukee, which has kept 7,000 men idle more than 2 months, still continues. Immediately after it was proven by handwriting experts, and thereafter allegedly admitted by the labor leaders who called it, that the strike was based upon a crooked election in which the ballots of some 40 percent of the workers were forged, the Secretary of the Navy and Mr. Knudsen, in charge of the Production Division of the O. P. M., appealed to both management and labor to reopen the plant and to negotiate a settlement of their differences after production had been resumed. This strike, incidentally, is tying up turbines in several instances practically completed, which are badly needed for the generation of electricity so essential to the production of aluminum and therefore airplanes. These turbines are on order for installation in several dams in the far West and at least five of the turbines are designed for the T. V. A. Yet we read in yesterday's papers that the strikers voted nearly a hundred percent not to return to work and passed a resolution "that Knox and Knudsen be condemned for their conspiracy with the company officials to try and force so-called Government-sponsored back-to-work movement"; and Harold Christoffel, head of the local union, publicly threatened any worker who returns to work with the loss of his job.

The strike in the Galveston shipyard is said to have been caused solely by the demand that one foreman be fired. It is said that only 67 men went out on strike, but that these 67 formed a picket line which none of the other workers would cross, hence the whole plant was shut down for a week. The Bethlehem steel strike is said to have been called solely in an attempt to prevent an alleged company union from holding its regular annual election of officers.

But the story that recurs over and over again is that local union leaders, backed by hired "goons," dominate the members through physical violence or threats thereof. Right here in Washington in a meeting of local union No. 1 of the Bricklayers and Plasterers' Union, evidence before our committee showed that an unarmed member of the union was beaten with weapons into insensibility and caused to spend 6 weeks in hospitals because when called upon he corroborated the assertion of an officer of the local that on the Navy Administration Building job in the navy yard the men did not work after the whistle blew His assailants have since been convicted and sentenced in the United States court. Other evidence was to the effect that a group of members of a local in California raised a purse and sent a man all the way to Washington to appeal to Congress to give the members protection against their own officers. Saturday, in Akron, Ohio, a jury convicted Harry D. Jones, vice president of the Ohio Federation of Labor, on a three-count indictment charging malicious destruction of property. The evidence showed that Jones hired two men to dynamite three construction projects employing rival C. I. O. unionists.

Ninety percent of the leaders and members of organized labor are loyal and patriotic. But the 10 percent have sufficient power to filch from organized labor its good name and to put it under a cloud of suspicion and prejudice. By retaining such leadership, organized labor is committing suicide. This small percentage of false leaders are betraying their constituencies. They are termites destroying the house of organized labor. Many of them are Communists, obeying the mandates of Moscow. They apparently glory in impeding our defense effort.

No wonder our great President, and a sincere friend of labor, Saturday night, in his Jackson Day speech, warned his radio audience against subversive influences. He said: "Propagandists, defeatists, and dupes, protected as they are by our fundamental civil liberties, have been preaching, and are still preaching, the ungodly gospel of fear. They use insinuation and falsehood. They have tried to shatter the confidence of Americans in their Government and in one another.

"We have seen what has happened to the great industrialists of Germany who supported the Nazi movement and then received their reward in Nazi concentration camps or in death.

"We have seen how the workers of France were betrayed by their so-called champions, the Communists. For no matter what Communist lips have to say, their actions have proved that in their hearts they care nothing for the real rights of free labor."

Is our Government impotent? Assuredly not. The same power that can draft 17,000,000 men to be put in uniform and at work for a dollar a day can find a way to keep men at work who are getting a dollar an hour, or more. The Constitution of the United States decrees: "The Congress shall have power to * * * provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; * * * to raise and support armies; * * * to provide and maintain a navy."

There is the unlimited grant of an amplitude of power. Let no one mistake long-suffering patience for impotence.

But no one wishes to exercise this power, nor any other compulsion. We have implicit confidence in our fellow citizens who compose the rank and file of organized labor. We appeal to them to do their part of this job. The rights of labor, as well as of the rest of us must be preserved. We are all in the same boat. The good men in lead-

ership and the ranks of organized labor must rid themselves of unpatriotic and disloyal leadership. They must insist upon the rights of free-born Americans to work and to produce the munitions of war without which our Ship of State will be sunk. We appeal to our friends and fellow citizens, both in the ranks of management and labor, to forget their selfishness and quarrels, till America be fully prepared to defend herself. Congress has already acted to insure the rights of labor. Capital and management have been told in no uncertain terms that they are expected to do their duty. Neither group would have any rights under a dictator.

It is heartening that the executive council of the building and construction trades department of the American Federation of Labor pledged this afternoon "that there will not be any stoppage of work on any essential defense-construction project because of jurisdictional disputes among its member unions"; and "that contractors recognized as fair to organized labor will be allowed to employ nonunion men temporarily on defense projects when its member unions are not able to furnish a full force of union workmen"; and "that no permit or initiation fees would be collected from these nonunion men under such circumstances, except when the men can qualify for membership and have been accepted as members of the unions"; and "that initiation fees shall be the minimum possible."

Both the resolutions making these pledges and the tone of preamble give hope that these reforms may materialize in general practice.

It is fervently hoped that all loyal labor and all loyal capital and all loyal management may accept the challenge of this crisis, purge their respective ranks of the disloyal, and do their job. They are our first and last line of defense.

We must all assert our best selves, and live patriotically, gloriously, heroically, in this great hour when the life of the Nation, yea, the fate of the world are at stake.

Labor and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered recently over the radio:

If there is any one thing that is absolutely vital at this critical period in our history, it is a spirit of unity and cooperation among all the people, whether they work as wage earners or are engaged in management.

The task which we are now striving with our every fiber to carry out—the gigantic job of making our own country impregnable and of supplying the nations which are opposing the dictators—is one which can be swiftly and successfully executed only if all sections of our great Nation work together without discord and strife.

At a time like this, when we recognize the imperative need of maintaining the conviction that all Americans, those who wear overalls and those who sit behind polished desks, must be united in order that our great national effort shall succeed, it is deplorable indeed to see a small but highly vocal minority striving with might and main to destroy this spirit of unity which is absolutely vital.

I refer to the speeches and newspaper articles of recent days in which the labor unions of the country are given no credit for the wonderful cooperation which they have been giving to the national-defense program but instead are denounced in the most intemperate language. I refer specifically to the barrage of publicity with respect to initiation fees and to the cry that legislation forbidding labor to strike, regardless of how the workers might be exploited and abused by their employer, shall be placed upon the statute books.

Insofar as the initiation fee question is concerned, the facts are entirely at variance with what has been published in the public press and are equally at variance with the distorted statements on the subject which have been made, with a typical but deplorable disregard of the truth, by professional labor haters both in and out of Congress.

It is my understanding that one of the first tenets of good American journalism is to get the story right and to get it complete. But on the question of initiation fees, which has received such big headlines during the past few days, the public press has taken this fundamental rule of journalism and of simple fair play and thrown it out the window.

And insofar as the proposals to enact antistrike legislation are concerned, the truth is that there is no need whatsoever of any legislation of this vicious and un-American character and that, further, if any such antistrike bill were to become a law, it would probably do more to wreck the national-defense program than anything that the agents of Adolf Hitler could ever concoct.

Now, first, let us set the record straight once and for all on the initiation fee situation upon which so many words, written as well as spoken, have been used by well-paid columnists hostile to labor and by politicians of antilabor stripe.

The charge is made that the building trades unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor are charging new members who have been put to work on defense construction projects exorbitant initiation fees and union dues. As interpreted by the most viciously antilabor commentators in the press, the labor unions are exacting tribute from workers for the privilege of working on defense projects.

Now, let us hold this charge up to the light and see what then happens to it.

We find, first of all, that the initiation fees are, in truth, being charged the new members coming into the unions, just as new members have paid initiation fees for as long as there has been a labor movement. There is nothing new or of a special nature in the charging of initiation fees.

And we quickly discover that, allegations to the contrary notwithstanding, the initiation fees charged new members now are no higher but in very many instances substantially lower than the initiation fees charged new members during normal times.

Now let us examine the charge that these initiation fees are excessive.

When a worker becomes a member of a long-established, sound, solid labor union, such as the building-trades organizations of the American Federation of Labor, he places himself in a position where a large number of extremely worth-while advantages and benefits accrue to him.

In the first place, he becomes entitled to share in the established union rates of pay for his classification of work and the decent conditions on the job which organized labor has achieved only after long decades of struggle.

And in the second place, the new union member becomes entitled, by the mere fact of having become a member of the union, to the many and valuable benefits of the old-age pension and unemployment insurance and mortuary systems which the older unions have established.

Labor justifiably points with pride to the fact that, during the worst depression years that the country has ever known, the unions met and paid all valid claims, never defaulting. This was done during a period when banks and insurance companies and other huge financial institutions were collapsing left and right.

And, of course, when a craftsman joins the union of his trade he becomes entitled to all the numerous and well-known protections and safeguards—the security against maltreatment by his employer among them—which have impelled millions of patriotic American workers to join together in labor unions for the past 60 years and more.

Considering all the enormous and obvious advantages which a worker receives when he becomes a member of a sound trade-union, I think it is clear that the initiation fees, far from being excessive as alleged, are actually moderate in the extreme.

And, finally, let us expose the shameless falsity of the suggestions made by enemies of labor that the initiation fees represent nothing but tribute exacted by selfish union leaders.

The truth is that these initiation fees are collected in accordance with the provisions of union constitutions, adopted in democratic conventions, and that in accordance with the provisions of the union constitutions the money collected in initiation fees goes into the union treasuries.

And each member of the union, whether he is a brand-new member or a veteran member who has fought and sacrificed in order to help achieve the standards of today, has an equal equity in the funds in his union's treasury. It is his money and the funds are used for his welfare and advancement.

There you have the truth of the matter in regard to initiation fees. The press could have ascertained these facts with no difficulty. But, of course, these facts would have spoiled the stories that have been told in bold headlines, and, unfortunately, the policy of many newspapers seems to be that where labor is involved, the rule that is followed is, "Never let the facts interfere with a good story."

Now, let us consider all the wild and wooly charges that have been flying through the air thick and fast with respect to defense strikes. Let us consider all the ill-considered proposals that all strikes shall be outlawed.

I want to make perfectly clear that I don't approve unwarranted strikes. I condemn arrogant tactics on the part of anyone, whether it be employer or employee.

And it is, of course, not at all desirable from the standpoint of national-defense production that there should be a large number of strikes in defense industries. But actually, despite the great publicity given those strikes which do occur, the number of strikes at any one time in defense work has been extremely small.

Organized labor has demonstrated in the past, and is demonstrating again today, that superiority in efficiency is maintained by voluntary action on the part of labor, not by compulsion.

The question of forced labor was settled by the Civil War. The curtailment of the right to strike is as repugnant to the Constitution as it is abhorrent to the American people. The right to strike is an inseparable part of the bill of rights of American labor.

But apart from the unconstitutionality of forced labor, which is what no-strike legislation would mean, the experiences which Kansas, Colorado, Canada, and New Zealand have had with no-strike laws prove that this

is no remedy whatsoever, but quite the contrary.

I can think of no greater folly than the enactment of the antistrike proposals which are now before Congress. Any such law would immediately cause unrest, strife, and rebellion. It would indicate to the workers of the Nation that they are not considered as partners in the national effort, that the rights of freemen are not for them, that they are to be shackled and driven like slaves, just as workers are shackled and driven by the lash of the Nazis.

Labor has been supporting the national-defense program 100 percent from the very beginning. Labor has been supporting the defense program, first because the patriotism of an American worker is second to that of no one, and secondly because labor realizes more fully than other sections of the community that it has a tremendous stake in the survival of democracy—that free, democratic trade-unions cannot exist under totalitarianism.

Labor's feeling that it has this stake in the victory of the democratic cause is the explanation of why there have been so very few strikes and of why American workers are toiling with such zest and zeal to produce as rapidly as possible the ships and tanks and planes and all the other things that are necessary to the defense of our country.

But if we were to junk labor's democratic right to withhold its labor power—a right which is exercised only as a last resort, generally where an employer refuses to recognize the law of the land and deal in good faith with his employees' organizations—we would, in effect, be telling labor that it no longer had any stake in the national effort.

We would be informing the workers of the Nation that, at this late stage of what is supposed to be a gigantic program of democracy opposing dictatorship, we had decided to heed the muddled and unwise advice of those enemies in our midst who urge that the way to prepare to defend democracy is to abandon democracy and adopt in its stead the hateful methods and policies of the dictators.

It is particularly senseless to advocate no-strike legislation at this time because of the fact that the Nation, through the action of President Roosevelt, has just established a National Defense Mediation Board.

This 11-man board, whose personnel includes outstanding and highly respected leaders representing employees, employers, and the public, has the authority to invoke public opinion against whichever side is at fault in any major labor dispute resulting in a strike or lock-out.

President Roosevelt, in establishing the Defense Mediation Board, has called upon both labor and management to give such sufficient advance notice of any threatened interruption to continuous production as will permit exploration of all possible avenues of settling controversies before they can get to the strike stage.

William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, has pledged the full cooperation of that patriotic organization.

The creation of the Defense Mediation Board represents an important and constructive step toward the promotion of uninterrupted production in defense industries. In view of the powers possessed by the Board, and in view of the caliber of the men named to the Board, I am satisfied that it can and will help labor and management to settle disputes around the conference table. And therefore there no longer is the slightest reason for consideration to be given to any bill proposing the outlawing of the right to strike.

Labor's fight for fair and equitable treatment is as long as the story of the Nation. Labor has made great progress over the years. The rights and conditions it has gained, labor jealously guards. That it should guard these rights and conditions is right, and, in addition, it is highly desirable from the standpoint of the welfare of the entire Nation.

Our country is laboring in the throes of a mighty effort. The Nation is dedicated to a lofty purpose. It would be the rankest form of hypocrisy to plead for the help of labor in America, organized and unorganized, for the achievement of that purpose and at the same time throttle labor by the enactment of restrictive and punitive legislation.

Why Destroy the Urge To Save?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

ARTICLE BY JAMES TRUSLOW ADAMS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, thrift brings many blessings. It is so very fundamental to the social, moral, and economic progress of mankind in his efforts to practice and make effective a high degree of civilization that I, for one, look with concern on many forces now at work in the United States. Mr. James Truslow Adams, recognized as one of our greatest historians, has been so deeply impressed with some of the new forces that are now running in the United States that he has written an article, published in the March 24, 1941, issue of Barron's—The National Financial Weekly—and in which he discusses the subject Thrift and War. His statements are so highly important in this hour, and I believe they should be given wide publicity.

I submit the article for the RECORD:

[From Barron's of March 24, 1941]

THRIFT AND WAR—URGE TO SAVE DESTROYED—TREND TOWARD GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP

(By James Truslow Adams)

Threat of the greatest war in which the United States has ever been involved has suddenly, like a flash of lightning, illuminated our entire mental landscape. It has disclosed vividly the differences between old practices and new theories.

Nowhere has this been more revealing than in the concept of thrift. The confusion of mind of the New Deal with regard to it stands naked to the sight of all. For example, an economic adviser to the Department of Agriculture, Mordecai Ezekiel, recently proposed as his first three points to cure our economic ills that there should be enough Government spending "to counterbalance the excess savings"; "taxation to diminish the incentive to save"; and "procedure so to increase individual security as to diminish the need of savings by the general mass of workers."

Within a week of this utterance, the Under Secretary of the Treasury, Daniel W. Bell, made a proposal which comes in direct conflict with the Ezekiel theory. In view of the Government's obvious necessity for money for war or defense, the Under Secretary of the Treasury urged the issue of Government bonds on such a basis as to induce the people to save in order that the Government should have funds to call upon and that inflation should be avoided.

IMPORTANCE OF THRIFT

Here is a clear divergence of philosophies, and in view of the resulting crisis it may be well to reconsider the theory of thrift. Our whole future, war and post war, may depend on the view adopted by Government and people.

Thrift, which has been so repugnant to many of the New Dealers, new economic thinkers, and new dictators, has been throughout history one of the leading factors, with others such as religion and physical environment, in influencing the character and rise to civilization of mankind. Whatever the future may hold, history teaches that in the past the ascent of man from the savage state, which the philosopher Hobbes denominated as "poor, nasty, brutish, and short," has been due to man's instinctive desire to acquire private property and to his discovery of the advantages of thrift. It is, or should be, needless to point to the role of accumulated capital, whether in the form of stored food, extra arrowheads and implements, a hut instead of a cave, and so on down to our modern forms, in enabling the vast mass of mankind to improve their condition and to create a high instead of a low standard of living for at least the great majority.

The stream of history flows on but forms of government change. Thrift, however, would seem to have a very special role to play in our modern self-governing democracies. Democracy depends for success on the character of its citizens, and character depends, in part, on hard work and the self-respect which a reasonable security self-earned brings to all, human nature being what it is. There have been times when work could not be had by many and when those lacking it were carried as far as possible by those who had accumulations. This was far from an ideal system, as human life is always far from perfect, but under it the belief in the value of thrift persisted.

There have also been brief periods of speculative mania when the belief in thrift, though not that of accumulating personal resources, was temporarily lost. But after such periods the belief in thrift has returned. The years leading to the crash of 1929–32 formed such a speculative period, but in the latter year Roosevelt was overwhelmingly elected President on promises of governmental and personal thrift which might have been heartily approved by Benjamin Franklin. The people again were ready to try saving instead of gambling.

GOVERNMENT GOES IN FOR BORROWING, TOO

Before that, for some years, the lure of quick and easy profits in the market, high pressure salesmanship, the psychological pressure of advertising, and the easy terms offered by installment buying had upset the steady balance of even the most conservative—rich and poor. Since then, however, Government itself has largely discouraged thrift. Disregarding the fact that widespread ruin was largely due not simply to hard times, but to the enormous debt accumulated by stock margins, too heavy mortgages, and excessive installment sales, Government has tried to teach us that even Government can be bought on the same installment plan. Highly critical of business which had brought American living to the highest standard the world had ever known, the administration took over from business as its only lesson the worst blunder business had made, namely, that debt could be incurred recklessly.

Accepting the theory of the English economist Keynes, which the English were too clear-headed to accept themselves, our Government started on a debauch beyond the wildest dreams of the more reckless business leaders. It decided that the way to cure a nation overburdened with debt was, not to save, but to create more debt. It has oper-

ated by colossal annual deficits ever since it came to power. It tried to create jobs in business by attacking and destroying business, and tried to create plenty by a policy of artificially caused scarcity.

But it did more. It set to work to eliminate from men the fundamental idea of saving and thrift. The attack has come from many quarters, and the confusion is growing. Two incentives to save are reasonable security and a reasonable return. We need not here rehearse the story of the attacks on private enterprise—the failure to do anything for the railroads except to pile higher debts on them and to increase their costs and taxes; the unfair Government competition with the public utilities; and now the threat to divert the most conservative investments of the insurance companies into common-stock portfolios; thus injecting uncertainty into perhaps the three greatest investment fields for the public for the past two decades. Even that last asset to which rich and poor cling, a life-insurance policy, has now become a speculation due to what the Government may or may not do. Marketability is a factor in investment, but owing, in part, to the drastic regulation of markets, that is fast disappearing. I noticed the other day that one of the soundest preferred stocks, which always used to have a spread of an eighth between bid and asked, was quoted with nine points between them. The difficulty of marketing holdings in any quantity is notorious.

But there is more than such things as these. The low interest rates forced by the Government have so reduced return from investment as not only to make insurance and annuities more costly and all forms of saving, such as high-grade bonds, savings bank accounts, and others less remuneratively attractive, but also to encourage squandering by individuals and all governmental bodies. Worse than all, underlying all these measures has been a philosophy, believed and preached, that America had oversaved and overbuilt, that it had reached the point of a static economy in which saving would be a curse and not a means of further advance nationally and of attaining self-respect and sufficiency individually.

ALARMING IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIETY

According to the apparent New Deal theory, thrift must be destroyed. The incentive should be taken away from the well-to-do by such taxation as will make saving sterile, and from the poor by assuring them that they will get what they want or need without self-denial and foresight on their own part. We all admit that in a modern industrial society the State must provide more means of social security than in a primitive agricultural one in which each person owns the means of procuring a livelihood under almost any economic conditions. But this new theory of abolishing if possible all effort by individuals to gain security and a better life for themselves by their own efforts has most alarming implications for society as a whole. It is a negation by theorists of all we know about the rise of society in the past and of human nature.

Let us consider the impact of the war on this theory. It has been claimed that America was overbuilt, but now that we suddenly need goods the Government is moving heaven and earth to increase our plant. The capital—goods and money—to do so must come from somewhere. The money, it is said, is to be raised from either taxation or borrowing or both. It is obvious that there can be no property tax if people have not saved in the past to buy property—cars, houses, lands, securities, or what not.

Suppose nobody had saved anything for the past 500 years and was living only on the largess of the Government; would the Government tax its own property and would it get any further than by trying to raise itself by its own bootstraps? Take the income tax. If everybody had been living up to his income, where, according to the new theory, would any tax come from, except in part, possibly, by a tremendous fall in the scale of living even for the poorest? Instead of the one-third now poorly housed, clothed, and fed, the full 100 percent of the population would be so under the oversimplified situation shown above.

It is said that the Treasury intends to pay for the war by tapping savings held by insurance companies, other institutions, and individuals to pay for bonds, and get the rest of the cost from taxes. But if savings and living well within an income are uneconomic and perhaps some day illegal, or so discouraged by Government as to become impossible, then what?

The impact of war, or of the preparation for it in our belated defense program, leads to another question. We have been through some 10 years of depression, greatly accentuated, I believe, by the false economic theories of the Government. There have been millions of unemployed. Even the Government does not know how many, though it has poured out billions to help them. Millions of these recently jobless are now to be at work at high wages. In my section, Connecticut, factories are working 24 hours a day 7 days a week, and young men recently with no means of support except the Government (which means taxpayers like myself and not a Santa Claus on his own), are now getting $60 to $75 a week. In some cases, so strong is the best part of human nature and the desire to feel independent, they are saving, but in all too many they are buying cars and riding high, wide, and handsome. The Government does not give the example of trying to save a cent. The capital of the rich and middle class is levied on. Men are drafted into the armed forces, but labor is highly paid, and striking for more.

When the boom is over and the inevitable post-war break comes, the cry will go up again, for those who have not saved, that "we cannot let Americans starve." The Government realizes that, but its only suggestion is to prepare for a bigger and better Works Progress Administration and to take still more from those who have saved or may still be earning fair incomes. Why should young men save, except by native instinct, when the great Government tells them saving is bad national economics and that they will be taken care of anyway when they lose their jobs, get sick or old?

DIPPING INTO A ROYALTY PAYMENT

But for how many generations can we go on living on the accumulated savings of the former ones who believe in and practiced thrift? How long will those of us, who do not think in terms of a 40-hour week to get ahead and save, go on trying to do it if the whole weight of the Government is used to break us of the habit, and where will the surplus come from then? For a personal illustration, I have just had a small royalty payment from England. Britain taxed it 48 percent. Here, the Federal Government takes 38 percent of what's left. If I invest it in a bond, Connecticut takes from 10 percent up or more, and when I die and leave it to my widow heaven knows what the State and Federal Government will take. How long will one continue to work, to make a taxable income, to build up property which can also be taxed, with those facts in mind, and when being taught by the Government that one is doing the Nation an economic disservice by trying to save?

And when we stop creating income and building up estates, however small, what will there be left for the Government to do but to take over the crumbs from the table of private enterprise and turn itself into a socialistic or communistic State, whatever the difference may be between them ultimately? From one side of its mouth the Government calls for thrift so we can lend money to it; with the other it tells us that thrift is an exploded idea, and its tax collectors demonstrate it to us.

After the Middle Ages, much was heard of the "dead hand" of the Church, but the dead hand of a modern government, with its unlimited power of confiscation, taxation, and killing of private initiative and ambition, may well prove as paralyzing and devastating. Is it yet too late for one government to turn back and to build up, as far as it can, a thrifty and self-respecting citizenry, who may receive at times such governmental aid as the conditions of the new industrial world may demand, but who will still be taught that in democracy happiness and independence come, as Thomas Jefferson was taught by his father, from not asking someone else to do for him what he can perfectly well do for himself?

And, even against the great pressure of government and its heterogeneous crew of volunteer spokesmen, might it not be well for that great portion of the people who are hard-working and saving, and on whom the burden of taxation will fall later, to try to instill the meaning and effect of thrift into those who are now getting high wages and know little about direct taxation?

SOCIALISM THE ALTERNATIVE

Lincoln said that this country could not long endure half slave and half free. Neither can it do so half ambitious, energetic, and thrifty, and half willing to be supported by their hard-working and thrifty fellows. If the Government abolishes saving and thrift, then there can ensue in time—a result which may not be wholly unwelcome to some of the New Deal's more noisy camp-followers—only a socialism or communism which will be the total negation of all we have dreamed of America, and leave most of the 130,000,000 of us at the mercy of the inevitable tiny group at the top who may still, like Hitler, Goering, and the rest, maintain regal state at the expense of an exploited people. Poverty, prison, and the concentration camp will replace the insurance policy and the savings bank, the millions of comfortable homes and the Bill of Rights.

Judging not from a theory of the future but from all the lessons of history, I do not think this prophecy is overdrawn. If we have a choice, we have not overlong to make it, and if we still have the energetic initiative of a living democracy, the task is one to be undertaken by all, employers and employees or solitary workers like myself, and not alone by the irresponsible theorists of the left-wing of a Government which rests ultimately only on the lives and toil of the mass of the rich and poor who make up the Nation.

Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

RESOLUTION BY THE CALIFORNIA STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, due to the recent regulations of the Social Security Board

as those regulations apply to the State of California, and in view of the fact that the California congressional delegation has taken steps requesting the Social Security Board to amend their regulations, I am herewith indicating the interest of the respective legislative bodies of the State of California, manifested by assembly joint resolution No. 2:

Assembly Joint Resolution 2

Memorializing Congress to amend the Social Security Act with reference to the exempt-income rights accorded persons receiving old-age assistance

Whereas it appears by section 2 (a) of the Social Security Act that this State, on July 1, 1941, will be required in determining the need of applicants for old-age assistance, to take into consideration any other income and resources of such applicants; and

Whereas this requirement will force this State to amend section 2020 of the welfare and institutions code to remove the right to certain exempt income now accorded to persons receiving old-age assistance; and

Whereas this action will force a reduction in the income of those persons receiving old-age assistance who are still able to supplement assistance from the State by gardening or other light labor suited to their age: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to amend the Social Security Act to remove this requirement therefrom in order that this State may be eligible to receive further Federal funds for the financing of the old-age security law of this State without the necessity of amending section 2020 thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States by the secretary of state.

Lewis Compton, His Resignation as Assistant Secretary of the Navy a Real Loss to Our First Line of Defense—His Record of Faithful and Effective Service

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the brightest spots in the whole national-defense situation at present is the fact that construction work on America's new and vastly expanded Navy is proceeding ahead of schedule. This has not just happened. It has been, of course, the result of the work of men. My remarks here have to do with the work of one of the most devoted of those men.

This man's name is Lewis Compton, who, until a couple of weeks ago, was Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and who was Acting Secretary during probably the most critical period of all—when the expansion program was being started on its way.

In justice to him, and in order that some public record may be made of his work for the Navy, I am presenting here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an account of that work. It happens, however, that Mr. Compton and the late Representative William Byron, of Maryland, who recently met his death in an airplane accident in Georgia, were very close personal friends. Had Mr. Byron lived, it was, I am informed, his intention to do what I am doing now with regard to Mr. Compton's work. Under the circumstances, I am glad to make it a matter of record that these remarks are not only my own expression but also in a very real sense an expression of our honored colleague, Mr. Byron.

Lewis Compton first came to the Navy Department with Mr. Charles Edison in January 1937, and served as Mr. Edison's assistant during his tenure as Assistant Secretary of the Navy. Mr. Compton's previous naval experience consisted of service during the World War as a Reserve officer in the cruiser and transport force, and 10 years' service after the war in the Naval Reserve as the commanding officer of a fleet division.

Due to the illness of the then Secretary of the Navy, the late Honorable Claude A. Swanson, a great deal of the work of the secretariat fell upon the shoulders of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and, by like token, Mr. Compton assumed many of the duties and responsibilities that were normally those of the Assistant Secretary. It was during this period that the measures were taken that are now reflecting themselves in very materially reduced building times for new naval vessels under construction. An example of the time saved through standardization of design and other measures is the fact that the building time of destroyers has been reduced from 32 months to 18 months. By setting up a procedure to permit private yards to buy the machinery, auxiliaries, and other items for ships to be built at navy yards, Mr. Compton saved a great deal of time and money and assured standardization of equipment in ships of like types. It is estimated that 2 months were taken off the building time of destroyers by this policy alone.

When Charles Edison became the Secretary of the Navy in January 1940, he recommended to the President the appointment of Mr. Compton as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and the appointment was made on February 9, 1940.

During the spring of 1940, in the absence of the Secretary on an extended tour of inspection of Naval Establishments and the United States Fleet, and during the period between the resignation of Mr. Edison as Secretary of the Navy and the appointment of Colonel Knox to that post, Mr. Compton served as Acting Secretary of the Navy. For nearly 3 months he handled all the business of the Secretary single-handed, such as attendance at Cabinet meetings, appearance before committees, signing contracts and official mail, and the signing of numerous other legal documents requiring the signature of the Secretary. It was during this period that the negotiations were consummated for the 11-percent increase in the Navy which was still pending in Congress. It was also during this period that negotiations were started in anticipation of the 70-percent increase which was contemplated. Policies set at that time, in connection with the building of ships and public works have, I understand, generally continued in effect. Mr. Compton was primarily responsible for the policy of diverting shipbuilding and shipbuilding facilities to the gulf coast and the west coast, in order to provide shipbuilding facilities in these strategically important areas for the repair of damaged ships in the case of necessity. The policy was also set at this time, of first employing up to the utmost capacity, and providing necessary expansions in all of the private yards that had prior experience in the construction of combatant naval vessels. After full use of these facilities had been provided for, the policy was established of doing business so far as possible with well-established going concerns, rather than with firms especially organized to take advantage of emergency needs which, in many instances, were underfinanced and required a great deal of governmental aid.

Policies were also established at this time for carrying out the vast program of construction of air bases and the expansion of industrial and shipbuilding shore facilities and other necessary works. Features of the public-works policy included in the negotiation of not to exceed one major contract with any one firm in order to spread the work as much as possible and the making of contracts, wherever possible, with local concerns wherever competent organizations could be found.

By insisting upon the awarding of Navy business to two firms to keep them going, Mr. Compton preserved the availability of these important facilities for the use of the expanding national-defense program. He insisted on the award of a design contract to a firm of naval architects who employ over 500 skilled draftsmen, who were about to lose their jobs because of the lack of work. He also made an award to another firm who had constructed an $800,000 plant without any assurances whatsoever as to what rate of amortization they could expect for tax purposes. Without this plant being kept in commission the Navy today would be without that facility for the mass production of motor torpedo boats.

The foresight used in initiating negotiations on an if-and-when basis, conditional upon the enactment of the authorizations and the passage of the appropriations, resulted in the Navy Department being able to send out letters of award on all of the combatant tonnage authorized and appropriated for under the 11-percent and the 70-percent increase bills, within a matter of a few hours after the President signed these measures. The contracts involved in the 11-percent increase amounted to more than $500,000,000, and those involved in the 70-percent bill amounted to slightly over $4,000,000,000.

It was Mr. Compton who, in May 1940, issued the necessary orders to place the navy yards of this country on the basis of a 48-hour week, with time and half overtime for the additional 8 hours over the normal 40 hours a week.

In May of 1940 Mr. Compton learned that vast quantities of machine tools were being exported out of the country to Japan, Russia, and other foreign powers. As there were already indications that machine tools would constitute one of the most serious bottlenecks in any materially expanded defense program, Mr. Compton, through the machine-tool section of his office, undertook negotiations with the State Department looking toward the refusal of an export license on these tools. The result of this action was that these tools were not exported but were placed in bonded storehouses. In some cases, the tools were actually on board ship, ready for transportation overseas; in others, they were on docks, ready for shipment, or in transit from the manufacturing plants.

This action was taken by Mr. Compton when the so-called speed-up bill was still pending in Congress. There were two clauses in this bill which were needed by the Navy Department to get possession of these tools for use in American shipbuilding, aviation, and other allied industries; namely, the power to negotiate and the power to commandeer. It was not until after the power to negotiate and the power to commandeer was granted by the Congress late in the summer of 1940 that many of these tools became available to navy yards and to American industry. But except for Lewis Compton's foresight and courage they would have been already on their way to installation in the factories of foreign powers. The monetary value of these tools was estimated to be in excess of $10,000,000.

In the spring and summer of 1940 Mr. Compton served with Rear Admiral Reeves on a board of two members appointed by the President to prepare legislation for the Staff Corps of the Navy. The result of this study was the drafting of a bill which will straighten out many of the inequities in the administration of the Staff Corps personnel and be of lasting benefit to the Navy in many ways.

During his term of duty as Acting Secretary Mr. Compton consistently and actively advocated legislation to provide decent low-cost housing for married enlisted men of the Navy and also for industrial workers in congested industrial districts. Such legislation has subsequently been enacted.

At the direction of the President Mr. Compton launched the special program for the training of 5,000 Reserve ensigns. As a result of a vigorous campaign of education including two radio broadcasts given by Mr. Compton on Nation-wide hook-ups, 500 young American college boys were physically examined, enrolled, and at sea on battleships of the United States Fleet for training within 18 days after the directive had come from the President. The entire 5,000 young men were enrolled before the end of the summer.

It was also during Mr. Compton's tenure as Acting Secretary that the so-called speed-up bill was introduced and passed in Congress. One clause of this bill removed the statutory limitations on the employment of Class 4–B personnel—clerks and stenographers. Without the removal of these limitations it would have been utterly impossible for the Navy Department to provide for the rapid expansion that was necessary in the departmental and the field services. This bill also contained a clause which gave the Secretary of the Navy power to negotiate contracts.

Without this power to negotiate, it would have been utterly impossible for the Navy Department to make the splendid record which it did in getting the authorized ships and public works under contract without any loss of time. This measure contained other provisions which are largely responsible for the record of speed being made by the Navy Department in the execution of the naval phase of the national-defense effort. A policy of decentralizing authority and responsibility to naval inspectors in the field was initiated by Mr. Compton and has been enlarged since. By making it possible for decisions to be made in the field, Mr. Compton saved a great deal of time which would otherwise have been lost in trying to put this vast program through one knothole in Washington.

As contracting officer, Mr. Compton has signed, in actual contracts and in letters of award, for over $5,000,000,000 worth of public works and ships. His work has been as vital and important as that of any man connected with the Navy Department for many years and I consider it a privilege to make this brief account of that work a matter of public record. Indeed, I believe it is doubtful whether any executive official, except only the President of the United States himself, has been so largely responsible for the excellent record of pushing forward our naval program as has Lewis Compton, a man who, for reasons rather hard to understand, is no longer an official of the Department.

Arkansas, Kentucky, and Georgia Press Endorse A. V. A.—Arkansas Editor Answers Governor Phillips, of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1941

EDITORIAL ENDORSING PROPOSED ARKANSAS VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House I insert here three splendid editorials endorsing the proposed Arkansas Valley Authority—one of them answering certain charges made by the Governor of Oklahoma:

[From the Southwest American, Fort Smith, Ark., by Editor C. F. Byrns, March 30, 1941]

Gov. Leon C. Phillips of Oklahoma has definitely declared his opposition to the proposed Arkansas Valley authority which would be created by a bill introduced in Congress by Congressman CLYDE T. ELLIS and Senator JOHN E. MILLER of Arkansas.

Appearing Friday before a meeting of the Washita Valley Improvement Association meeting in Chickasha, Okla., the Governor teamed up with the association in support of a resolution opposing the A. V. A.

The Oklahoma Governor's attitude on A. V. A. is understandable. He has been carrying on a one-man war against the Federal Government on the public power front since he took office. He has done battle continuously with the United States Army engineers on the construction of the Denison Dam on Red River. He tried, without success, to stop construction on Grand River Dam, being built by a State agency with Federal funds, because of a controversy over road relocation and rebuilding in the Grand River lake area. It would be most surprising if he should now reverse his well-known position and approve the A. V. A. idea.

The attitude of the Washita Valley Improvement Association is harder to understand. Presumably, it is concerned with doing for the valley of the Washita River in Oklahoma exactly what the A. V. A. bill proposes to do for the whole drainage area of the Arkansas, the White, the St. Francis, and the Red Rivers. If the program of the A. V. A. is ever carried out, the program of the Washita Valley Improvement Association would be a part of it.

Newspaper stories describing the Chickasha meeting reflect the apparent basis for the opposition.

Governor Phillips is quoted as saying to the meeting: "You heard this morning about the proposed Arkansas Valley Authority. We all feel alike about this attempt to further abrogate our rights to develop and control our natural resources. The Supreme Court has set the stage for this kind of legislation. I hope you will do your duty as citizens of Oklahoma in raising your voices against this growing monster."

The news story contains this statement: "Phillips and others favor a system of flood-control and irrigation projects 'designed to hold water where it falls' as opposed to the big dam projects. He supports a system of farm ponds, lakes, and storage reservoirs progressively distributed along tributaries in the general drainage shed of rivers."

It seems to me the attitude taken by the Oklahoma Governor and the Washita Valley Improvement Association needs a large dose of realism.

Without a question, the people of the States have the "right" to develop their own rivers, impound their waters, utilize their energy, prevent floods, provide irrigation, and otherwise make their resources contribute to the public welfare.

Equally without question, the States have not done so, for excellent reasons.

The States have not the legal authority nor the finance to do the job on a large scale, which treats a drainage system as a single entity and takes full advantage of its possibilities.

Practically all the river improvement work or the utilization of stream flow which has been done by the States has been done only when the States could persuade the Federal Government to put up the money. The Grand River Dam is the present outstanding example. The State is doing that, but it is doing it with Federal money. It would never

have touched the job without the Public Works Administration to act as the angel.

Certainly we have the right to develop our own rivers. We have the right also to provide employment for our own unemployed. But we have not been able to do either without Federal help, and there is no prospect that we shall any time in future.

The fundamental idea of the Arkansas Valley Authority proposal is to do on a complete scale, for the drainage areas of four related rivers, exactly what the Washita Valley Improvement Association is trying to do on a very limited scale in Oklahoma.

No State and no combination of States can do the job effectively. The limited efforts they have made in that direction have been handicapped by lack of jurisdiction outside their own boundaries and by lack of financial resources for the large investments which are necessary.

Such progress as we have made in the use of our waters has been made with Federal money in practically all instances and with direct Federal control over the project in most of them.

The A. V. A. simply proposes to substitute a comprehensive, integrated program of water use for the piecemeal development of unrelated and sometimes antagonistic projects which has been the rule and will be the rule until a Federal agency is created big enough to bring it all together into one rational whole.

We need to be realistic about this thing. We can go on having meetings of local improvement associations forever, and we will never get the real job done until we have set up some kind of agency with power that crosses State lines and credit that will command the necessary millions. When we do that our great natural resources will cease to lie dormant; our great rivers will cease to destroy and begin to build, and we shall see the beginnings of a new and brighter day here in the Southwest.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution of February 9, 1941]

THE RIVER AREAS

Full utilization of the Arkansas and Columbia River valleys through authorities modeled after the Tennessee Valley Authority, now being considered in Washington, will further enhance the economic future of these two great areas.

After an initial period of adjustment, not without turmoil, the T. V. A. is beginning to demonstrate the immense potentialities of regional planning—the integration of resources of an entire section under centralized guidance, and the planned development of the economic resources through which the greatest benefits are brought to all citizens of the affected area.

This value particularly has been demonstrated under the defense emergency, in which T. V. A. has been cast in a major role. Planned for peacetime development, little has been required to turn the newly harnessed resources to the task of national mobilization. Under this condition, the reversion to a peace economy will be less difficult than it will be in regions where there has been only piecemeal and decentralized planning.

The Tennessee Valley Authority not only has been concerned with the construction and operation of power facilities but in the rebuilding of farm lands, development of a balanced agricultural and industrial economy, provision of adequate marketing facilities, cooperative purchasing and selling of commodities, the discovery of new methods and products, and the manifold other phases of regional planned economy.

It is this type of authority proposed for the Arkansas and Columbia River sections. The Arkansas area embraces almost all types of land use found in the United States, with fertile sections, drought areas, and flood-threatened lands. It is weak in industrial structure, weak in intelligent use of farm lands, but strong in ambition and ripe for centralized development. The Columbia area comprises almost virgin territory being opened by the construction of the Bonneville Dam.

There will be opposition. It is recommended that this opposition examine the operation of T. V A. and the great advances made possible through it before thoughtlessly opposing a proposal of utmost potential value to the sections involved.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of February 13, 1941]

THE ARKANSAS IS A PROVOKING RIVER

The proposed Arkansas Valley Authority, now before Congress, embraces an area three times the size of the Tennessee's watershed. This fact alone would rebuke the Topeka Capital's disparaging reference to "little T. V. A.'s" if the bill creating the Authority had not provoked a sectional controversy commensurate with the magnitude of the undertaking.

The division on the question is at variance with historical positions. A conference of western Governors at Denver condemned A. V. A. as a menace to State rights, while Arkansas, whose political traditions are steeped in the sacredness of State rights, sponsors the legislation. Perhaps the popularity of watershed development bears a direct ratio to the distance from T. V. A. Arkansas is just across the Mississippi River from it.

Be that as it may, the Arkansas River drains no such comparatively simple geographical unit as the Tennessee Valley. The Arkansas system traverses mountains, plains, prairie, and the lower Mississippi Delta. It presents a complicated series of problems from the main stream's source in the Rockies and New Mexico's arid plateau to the last 200 miles. In its long course the Arkansas drops some 4,000 feet. When it reaches the Mississippi Delta the river ranges in depth from 6 inches to 27 feet; but it can be depended upon to destroy many acres of rich bottom land every year.

This is a serious loss to Arkansas; and, surely, engineers would experience no trouble in satisfying by the same measures both Arkansas' desire for flood control and the upstream States' needs for irrigation.

Churchill to Griffin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE BOSTON POST

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Bill Cunningham, staff writer for the Boston Post, which was published on January 20, 1941:

BOSTON, March 9.—Words spoken by Winston Churchill, now British Prime Minister, to William Griffin, editor and publisher of the New York Enquirer, may "play a major part in shaping the future course of every human being on this earth" in the opinion of Bill Cunningham, staff writer for the Boston Post, and nationally known for his brilliant reporting and comment on personalities and affairs.

Cunningham's story in the Boston Sunday Post deals with the matter of the now famous Churchill statement to Griffin, in which the British war lord criticized the part played by the United States in the World War and observed that the United States should have minded its own business and stayed out.

Dwelling at the beginning of his article on the vital importance the world may one day place on the Churchill-to-Griffin statement, Cunningham writes:

"The focus on the smallest and most inconsequential matters can be changed unbelievably by a shift of events. Words actually spoken by, or falsely accredited to, some individual, considered at the moment too innocuous either to qualify or to deny, may become surcharged syllables of devastating dynamite when recalled after enough sand has trickled through the shanks of the hourglass.

"WHEN IT HIT HOME

"So it is with an interview a New York newspaper publisher maintains he was granted by Winston Churchill in London in 1936. Three years passed before Churchill either heard of it or, if he did hear, figured it important enough to do anything about, but then, with affairs in England rapidly approaching a crisis, with United States friendship an imperative necessity, he branded the entire story of the interview 'a vicious lie.'

"The newspaper publisher thereupon sued Mr. Churchill, by this time First Lord of the British Admiralty, but not yet Prime Minister, for exactly $1,000,000 on the charge of slander, stoutly maintaining that the British leader did grant the interview and did say the things about the United States alleged in the original article, and attaching $20,000 worth of Mr. Churchill's assets in this country.

"SUIT FILED MARCH 1940

"The suit was filed less than a year ago, last March 9, to be exact, in New York, and what has happened since isn't part of the public record. Mr. Churchill, of course, has been extremely busy otherwise. The suit may be still pending, it may have been settled or dropped, but the alleged statements of the British Prime Minister are still so very much alive that they are apt to feature one of the bitterest and most important fights perhaps the world has ever known, the battle in Congress over the presidential plans to aid England to the ultimate."

Incidents on board ship in which the "little fuss-budget of an Englishman" figured in discussions about the war debt with Griffin are described amusingly by Cunningham. He relates:

"The entire story is especially interesting to me because I was accidently close to the start of it. It was one of those stories that came to light during the Olympic games in Berlin and shortly after part of the current literature of that busy period that seemed to be of no particular importance at the time, but which, in the light of things that have followed, has proved to be some of the most important and prophetic news writing of all time.

"WAR DEBT ISSUE HIS

"The newspaper publisher involved chanced to be my cabin mate on the ship coming back from Europe. There were three of us, all strangers, signed on catch-as-catch-can. The other gentleman was a little fuss-budget of an elderly Englishman crossing to the United States on business. He wasn't much fun.

"This other one was. His name was William Griffin, an energetic, two-fisted teetotaler in his forties, with a mind as quick as a steel trap, a potent sense of humor, an impressive

fund of historical and political information, and what seemed to be a burning but still well-tempered belligerence against every European nation that has welched on her war debts.

"In fact, every morning when the three of us woke up in this seagoing cupboard we were sharing as passengers, he used to say, 'Good morning, Mr. Blank,' to the fussy little Englishman, all done up in a flannel nightshirt and ear stopples, 'have you any reason why England hasn't paid her war debts this morning?'

"TOLD OF EUROPEAN TRIP

"His paper was, and is, the New York Enquirer, a weekly published on Sunday in the metropolis, and aimed to plug that gap between Sunday morning and the Monday predates, when the big town is otherwise uncovered journalistically.

"In the course of talking he told me what he'd just been doing in Europe. With the war-debt matter particularly burning his soul, he had made a grand tour of England and the Continent, not forgetting Ireland—he was a grand-nephew of the celebrated Irish poet, Gerald Griffin—and had managed on his credentials to get personal interviews with the heads of practically every government that owed the United States money, and sometime or other before he got through the ceremonies, he had asked them cold turkey why they didn't pay their debts."

Mr. Cunningham was intrigued by the Griffin technique of getting in to see the heads of European governments, as is shown in the following part of the Cunningham story:

"VISITED LE BRUN

"His description of some of this was really funny. There was the case, for instance, of Albert Le Brun, then President of France. Griffin used cards and letterheads featuring himself as editor and publisher of the New York Enquirer, which he was, and, as he explained himself, they didn't know over there but what he headed something comparable to the New York Times, and, as a powerful moulder of public opinion in the world's most important city, he was received with great ceremony.

"In the case of LeBrun, he was escorted with great dignity to Elysee Palace and into the presence of the Chief Executive of France, where all the best interpreters awaited and the usual palaver about sister republics and international bonds was salved on. The usual greetings were exchanged, the usual remarks about the weather, and then M. le Presidente naturally inquired of M. Griffin what he thought of France.

"It looks to be in fine shape to me," is about the way the Griffin reply—typical of those he made to practically every executive in every debtor land—began, "better than I expected to find it, as a matter of fact. Your country looks prosperous. Everybody seems to be working. The stores are busy. People on the streets are well dressed. In view of all this, it's harder than ever for me to understand why you people have welched on your war debts. From all I can see, you've got plenty of money. Why don't you pay us what you owe us, as any honest people would?"

"GREAT GUYS THEN

"Parbleau, what was that?

"Yes! Griffin would go on; the whole world knows that the American Army saved your country from utter annihilation. We were great guys when we came over and did the job, but when it came to getting any of the money back, it looked as if we'd have to go back to the prescription of Andrew Jackson. The man knew his history—a superplentitude of it.

"In Jackson's time, France owed America $5,000,000 for damage done American property during the Napoleonic wars. France tried to laugh it off, but Jackson recalled the United States minister and barred the sale of all French products in the United States. France thereupon paid fast, and with interest.

"But, said M. le Presidente, it was all M. Hoover's fault, M. Hoover asked the world to declare a year's moratorium on German reparations. At the end of the year Germany refused to pay and more so, France couldn't pay any more, either.

"CHARACTERISTIC DODGE

"'A natural and characteristic dodge,' replied Mr. Griffin. 'There is no connection whatsoever between reparations and war debts. When the money was borrowed, payment wasn't made contingent upon reparations. Anyway, we've canceled all debts incurred for actual war purposes. What we are trying to get now is money loaned you after the war, and you've even quit on that. As for not being able to pay, how about all these fortifications, how about the steamship Normandie?' And more and more of the same.

"But, said the harried President, the friendship between the two peoples. * * * Look to all the decorations the French Government had given to Americans. Wasn't that considered an important and significant thing in the United States?

"No, said Griffin, it didn't mean a thing to the average American. In fact, said he, a lot of true-blue Americans considered it exactly un-American."

Griffin's handling of opinions advanced by Lord Robert Cecil regarding the League of Nations appealed to Cunningham, who writes:

"He really gave it to the British, it appeared.

"HIS FIRST 'VICTIM'

"Lord Robert Cecil, then president of the League of Nations, was his first victim. The expansive British peer, greeting the newspaper publisher, said it was a source of great regret to him that the United States wasn't a member of the League and asked Mr. Griffin if he didn't think the League a splendid thing.

"Yes, said Mr. Griffin, it was indeed a splendid and powerful agency—for the preservation of the British Empire.

"But seriously, said the British peer, didn't Griffin feel that warm bond of friendship between the United States and England.

"Yes, said Griffiin, he could feel it. He could feel it despite the fact that England came over here in 1776 and incited all the savages in the howling wilderness to murder the women and children and then hired 30,000 Hessians to shoot at the men. He could feel it despite the fact that in 1812, England stopped our ships on the high seas, impressed our seamen into British service and capped it off by marching into Washington and burning the Capitol. He could feel it despite the fact that during the Civil War England loaned money to the Confederacy in the hope that our Nation would be split into two weaker halves, grabbing the merchant marine supremacy at the same time.

"MORE OBSERVATIONS

"He could feel it now, he said, despite the fact that England had welched on her war debts, but had spent $45,000,000 renovating the naval base at Bermuda, a port in our sphere of influence from which they couldn't fight anybody, but us * * * and so on and on and on some more."

More about the Griffin-Lord Cecil interview and the outstanding joints of the Griffin-Churchill interview are told by Cunningham in these words:

"This particular interview eventuated in Cecil's allegedly saying it was impossible for the British to pay the war debt in money.

"'All right,' said Griffin, 'then why don't you give us the Queen Mary and Bermuda as a down payment?'

"Cecil said that was ridiculous because Bermuda was thoroughly British and was populated by Britons who were already as close to America perhaps as they could stand—he was getting a little testy by this time—and that the *Queen Mary* was a symbol of national pride.

"The Churchill interview, which Churchill has since entirely disavowed with the results explained above, is the only one threatening to come back now with tornadic force, and at the time it was about the most innocuous and least noticed of the entire lot. The reason for that was that Churchill was but a private citizen by that time, and, as such, was apparently to live out his days.

"SAW HIM IN LONDON

"Griffin claims to have seen him in London. There was no particular needling in this visit. Churchill wasn't important enough. He was but a passé politician, a private citizen. He couldn't do anything if he wanted to.

"But Mr. Churchill, according to Griffin, fell to talking about the World War in a reflective mood, and he made a statement about the American participation that sounded at first heretical and startling, but which upon examination seemed to make a lot of sense.

"He said, in effect, that events to follow had proved that American participation was one of the tragic mistakes of the entire history of civilization, the point being that if the United States hadn't come roaring to the rescue of the Allies, the war would have ended with a negotiated peace instead of complete German surrender."

Developing the effect of the Churchill argument the Boston Post writer continues:

"Both sides were plainly stuck when the United States decided to go in, he said. Both were starved, bled white, and completely stalemated. They'd have had to call the thing off more or less by common consent.

"WOULD PREVENT HITLERISM

"If this had happened, he said, both sides would have gone ahead as they were trying to clean up the wreckage, but, specifically—and here was the crux of it all—Germany would have maintained her original form of government, including the Kaiser and all the rest, which would have made completely impossible the rise of a madman such as Hitler.

"In other words, a draw, with the Kaiser, would have been better for the world that was to follow than victory, and Hitler.

"So far as the war debts went, Griffin quoted Churchill as saying they were in all probability a consideration of the past. If America wanted to work the account down to a matter of dollars and cents, Griffin quoted private citizen Churchill, all right, but it took the United States a year to get their soldiers into action, and in that year, while the Allies held the line for us, they lost a million and a quarter men. If we wanted to get it down to a matter of dollars and cents, the bill for ammunition the Allies shot in that year, while they were 'holding the line for us,' should be deducted from the amount we said they owed."

Concluding his article and winding up with the observation again that Churchill's words to Griffin may affect the future of the whole world, Cunningham says:

"ENTERTAINING COPY

"All this—there were many more of these interviews, Lloyd George, Count Ciano, George Bernard Shaw, even a reverent and serious private audience with H' Holiness, Pope Pius—was just entertaining copy at the time, a sort of Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court sort of thing. The idea was pretty clever, the reactions of the various famous gentlemen rather funny. Nothing had been accomplished, but nothing was supposed to be. No interview was ever denied. The entire report was just old newspaper copy mellowing away in the files for 3 years.

"But things were gradually happening to England. The appeals to the United States started making up again—that about friendship and duty and partnership in civilization. Mr. Churchill began to move from private life into the maelstrom. Finally, he became more and more the hope of his savagely challenged nation. He began to stress from the very first that the only hope and salvation of England was this country. We must give, give, give. We might have to take over.

"CALL THEM 'LIE'

"Somebody remembered these words he is alleged to have said about our taking over last time. He denied ever saying them. He called them a vicious lie.

"Publisher Griffin, as explained above, clapped the million-dollar slander suit on him, charging in the papers, 'Mr. Churchill has seen fit to endeavor to destroy my reputation for truth and veracity because at the time he made the above statements to me, he was trying to justify England's failure to pay its immense war debt to the United States.'

"Now starts the real fight over British aid in Congress, and I understand the words of this disputed interview are to be hurled at Churchill's head with all the power and the force noninterventionists can give them. They may be ringing from coast to coast and beyond to the farthest corners of the universe in another month and may play a major part in shaping the future course of every human being on this earth."

The Stars and Stripes and the National Anthem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herein an article from a recent issue of the Washington Times-Herald on How to Show Respect for the Flag and What to Do When You Hear the Star-Spangled Banner.

THE STARS AND STRIPES AND HOW TO SHOW YOUR RESPECT FOR THE COLORS

(By Arthur Mielke)

You'd better get hep. The flag is going to do a lot of passing by from now on and Old Glory today, more than ever, deserves the attention and respect of those who live beneath it.

It's not necessary to go fanatical. The Stars and Stripes represent too much of what we hold to be truly American to need any excess of patriotism. But we should know how to salute it and how to display it.

By way of background, here is the resolution passed by the Continental Congress in 1777 which officially chose our flag:

"*Resolved*, That the Flag of the United States be 13 stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be 13 stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation."

NEW CONSTELLATION

A new constellation! That's what America was then in the heaven of the nations. No nation's flag ever started life under more inspiring circumstances. No banner ever hoisted aloft to express man's hopes, his ideals, struggles, or achievements ever meant more to as many people for as long a time as Old Glory has to us.

Back before the Continental Congress passed that resolution, most Americans recall, is the story of Betsy Ross and the first flag. How George Washington, Robert Morris, and an uncle of Betsy's, a Colonel Ross, came to her upholstery shop on Arch Street in Philadelphia and contracted for the flag. That was in June 1776, a month before the Declaration of Independence.

Perhaps some of you remember more of the details, how Washington submitted a specimen and how after consultation among the several members, the first flag with its 13 stripes of alternate red and white bands and the circle of 13 five-pointed white stars on a blue background in the upper left-hand corner, was decided on.

FLAG DAY

Congress was at that time busily engaged in waging a war against Britain and had little time for flag legislation. However, on June 14, 1777, the new flag was officially approved. This, of course, answers both the foregoing questions for June 14 is Flag Day and the adoption date was in 1777.

As flags go, the Stars and Stripes is one of the oldest standards among the great nations of the earth. It is said that the Danish flag goes back to the thirteenth century—to 1219, in fact.

The Swiss flag is said also to antedate ours, coming into existence in the seventeenth century. The famous tricolor of France was not adopted until 1794, 17 years after our own, while the British flag came into being in 1801. Germany's flag had its beginning after Bismarck had partially unified the country in 1866.

Flag legislation, since the original enactment of adoption of the flag, has been left to the States. Although a bill is pending in Congress called the uniform flag law which would make desecration or abuse of the flag a national offense, there is no national law punishing offenders of the flag. All the States and Territories have their own laws, however.

FLAG LAW

The constitutionality of these laws has often come before the courts. In two cases, in Illinois and in New York, the statutes were held to be invalid. A Supreme Court decision in the Halter against Nebraska case, however, superseded these decisions, when the Nebraska law was upheld. In this case the Court, with Justice Harlan rendering the majority opinion, said: "When a flag is used for purposes of trade or traffic (as in the above case), a purpose wholly foreign to that for which it was intended, it tends to cheapen and degrade the flag."

Along about the end of the nineteenth century agitation for a national flag act reached fever pitch. It seems that whenever there is a war a great tide of popular patriotism comes over our people. In that instance the Spanish-American War had America aroused. An American-flag association, organized in New York City in 1898, was the outcome of this furor. This association consists of the patriotic, civic, and military societies' flag committees throughout the United States.

In 1902 the Commissioner of Patents decided that the "flag may not be used as a trade-mark." In 1903 he went further and forbade the use of a shield, with the American flag on it as a trade-mark. These decrees were a result of the workings of this new flag association.

Popular disgust and repugnance for unseemingly acts toward the flag resulted in what is commonly referred to as the flag code. The flag code states a number of propositions on how the flag ought to be respected and handled, with a corresponding number of "don'ts."

WHAT NOT TO DO

For the civilian, the following "don'ts" ought to govern his relations with the flag:

1. Don't permit others to show disrespect for the flag.
2. Don't display the flag with the union, or star portion, down. This is particularly applicable to flags hung from windows and without a staff.
3. Don't dip the United States flag to anyone or anything. Even the President does not merit this attention.
4. Don't place any State flag or club flag higher than the United States standard. International custom has all nations' flags at the same level. All other flags, however, ought to be placed on a slightly lower level than the national colors.
5. Don't let the flag touch the ground or trail in water.
6. Don't place any object on a flag covering a table on a speaker's platform, other than a Bible.
7. Don't use the flag as drapery.
8. Don't fasten it so that it may be easily torn.
9. Don't fasten it on the hood, top, sides, or back of a vehicle. When displayed on a car, the flag should be affixed to a staff and fastened to the chassis or clamped to the radiator cap.
10. Don't use a flag on a float in a parade except on a staff.
11. Don't cover a ceiling with a flag.
12. Don't carry a flag on a staff horizontally, but aloft and free.
13. Don't use the flag as portion of a costume. It ought not be embroidered on cushions or handkerchiefs.
14. Don't put lettering on a flag.
15. Don't use the flag in any kind of advertising, nor fasten an advertising sign to a pole to which a flag is attached.
16. Don't display the flag in such a way as to cause it to be easily soiled or damaged.

In comparison with the "don'ts," the "do's" are relatively few. Whenever the flag passes, in a parade, for instance, a man should stand at attention and if wearing a hat, place it to his left shoulder with the right hand over the heart.

ARMY RULES

A woman ought also stand at attention and place her right hand over her left breast. At all other times, when the flag is in evidence, a dignified attitude toward it is desirable.

In the Army, handling of the flag is very formal. Whenever the colors, which is what the flag that is used in reviews, parades, etc., is called, is not in use, it rests in a holder in the office of the commanding officer of the post.

When it is to be taken out a guard must accompany the color sergeant who carries the flag. The sergeant, in this ceremony, first salutes the flag, furls it about the staff, and then takes it out of the building to the armed guards.

The guards come to attention and then take their places on either side of the color bearer.

The flag that flies over the encampment is also handled very formally. It is brought out in the morning and pulled up briskly to the top of the mast at sunrise. In the evening, at a ceremony called retreat, the flag is lowered very slowly to the strains of the Star-Spangled Banner.

In receiving the flag the soldier folds it neatly into the form of a triangle with the union outermost. It is then marched into the guardhouse and placed in a locker. The retreat ceremony is among the most beautiful in the Army. It is usually accompanied by the entire post detachment standing at attention on the parade ground.

Our soldiers and sailors know their duty and responsibility toward the flag. Civilians need a bit of a reminder on flag etiquette in days like these more frequently.

AND WHAT TO DO WHEN YOU HEAR THE STAR-SPANGLED BANNER

There aren't any official rules or regulations on whether to rise when the national anthem is played. But the feeling of any audience or crowd usually makes it pretty obvious what to do.

The United States Flag Association, which keeps a weather eye out for the welfare of the national banner, also has some hints of the musical problem.

When walking down the street the association's head, Col. James A. Moss, says one should stop and stand at attention as soon as he hears the national anthem. Men should uncover and women place the right hand over the heart. This is, of course, if the music is reasonably near and not merely a faint sound from afar.

IF IN AN AUTO

If you're riding in an auto, the same rule pretty much prevails, Colonel Moss says. The car should stop, conversation cease, the men uncover, the women place the right hand over the heart. It's not at all necessary to jump out of the car to stand at attention.

The advent of the radio posed a new problem, but the flag association offers this solution: "If it's natural and not forced to stand and uncover then do." Otherwise, no. As examples it says that people in a living room should stand, but if you're talking on the phone or are in the bathtub, it's not necessary.

After all, the problem is one of paying respect to a symbol of the Nation. Common sense should be the guide. And when to play the Star-Spangled Banner? Not at the slightest excuse. Not at every performance of a movie, say some authorities, though in England God Save the King is the finale of every day's performance.

A sound rule is to play the anthem at the close of public ceremonies of importance, or on patriotic occasions, at places and under circumstances which could not be criticized as commercial or in bad taste.

Strikes in Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM M. RUSSELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, in these precarious times all Americans should join in a solid wall of unity on national defense and love for our country. America at our direction is drafting the flower and pick of our youth for service in the Army to better prepare for the defense of our country, paying them the sum of $21 per month, and be it said that many young men are leaving jobs behind which paid them $100 per month and more, and these young men are accepting this call without a murmur.

They are ready and willing to do their part—ready and willing to sacrifice careers and homes for America, and, if need be, for the defense of civilization itself—yes; willing to risk their lives that our civilization might live. Had they remained at home on their respective jobs, their careers, promotions, and hopes would not be jeopardized, yet they go on cheerfully without murmur or complaint.

It is not amiss to compare this group of young men with another group of supposed Americans who, under the guise of union labor are now during these trying times drawing many times the wages that the draftees are drawing, are striking, and by so doing are hampering and stopping national defense.

Striking for what? In most instances, for increases in wages. By their actions these strikers are depriving our country of necessary equipment for the national defense, depriving their brother Americans of equipment with which to defend themselves as well as their country. Has patriotism and love of country become so cheap that it has to be bought with small wage increases? If it has, then God save America. Is this kind of patriotism living up to the grand and glorious words which cause all true Americans' hearts and chests to swell with pride? Have the words "Equal rights to all and special privilege to none" been forgotten?

Is our Government at this time showing equal rights to the boys in uniform with those who are hampering our national defense by engaging in strikes and stopping the manufacture of material for the defense of our country? It is obvious that it is not. It is also very obvious what America's answer will be to these questions.

Are the people who are responsible for these strikes Americans? In many instances, I would say they are not. It has been reported, and I believe reliably so, that many of those responsible for these strikes are Communists, "fifth columnists," and others who are opposed to our form of free government.

Mr. Speaker, we are taught and believe in the old adage that "There are times when patience ceases to be a virtue." From what I can see and from the amount of mail that is coming to Congressmen, the patience of the American people is about exhausted over these, and I say again, un-American strikes, and they are about to issue a mandate to this Congress. In my opinion, if we fail to take action, some of us are serving our last terms as Representatives.

I believe that we should at all times be fair to labor and fair to capital, for neither can exist without the other. Each should be protected, and neither be permitted to crush the other. But these are times when labor and capital should be willing to sacrifice excessive profits and join in this common cause.

The boys who serve as soldiers are in most instances sacrificing, and industry should fall in line.

Tribute demanded by labor organizations should be prohibited, especially on defense projects and in industries which are engaged in the manufacture of defense equipment. Congress should act and act now to stop such un-American activities.

The following letter was written to the President by Mr. Wyatt W. Lipscomb, of Albany, Tex., and expresses the sentiment and feeling of 80 percent of the American people toward these strikes:

ALBANY, TEX., *March 5, 1941.*

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President, United States of America,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR PRESIDENT: You will permit me to express to you frankly, my deep concern over conditions that are becoming increasingly and hourly more disturbing. The patriotic American people who are at all posted on conditions of the world and are capable of reasoning can see the inevitable dangers that are immediately ahead of us and, we are extremely anxious that nothing stand in the way of our preparedness program and all-out aid to Britain, short of nothing. The continued consummation of smaller nations by the ruthless tactics of the Axis nations is alarming beyond measure, and the inevitable result is so vivid that even a fool can see it. We are convinced that you can and do see this danger with a greater degree of clarity than anyone else in America. We are convinced, too, that dangers abroad plus dangers at home complicates the situation and makes it necessary, yea even imperative, that firm action be taken at once to preserve the life, liberty, and property of the American people. We cannot hope to achieve that sacred objective if the Communistic Insidious Organization (C. I. O.) is going to be allowed to render material aid to the enemies of all free men (the Axis Powers) by their increased and unreasonable demands upon industry, and their rights to tie it up in a strike if their demands are not met. It is an insult to the intelligence of the patriotic people of America to say that these strikes are not materially hampering the progress of the preparedness program, and it is an outrage upon their loyalty to allow it to continue.

If there is any justification in drafting our boys for service in the Army and Navy as a measure of preparedness, then there is and there can be no justification for allowing these strikes to hinder the preparedness program. We appreciate your sympathy for the laboring class of people and we sympathize with them too, because the great majority are in that class but, we cannot and do not appreciate the selfish rights of any man or organization of men over the rights of all men, women, and children of America; neither can we understand your tactics in dealing with this serious situation. You are quoted by the press as saying that these strikes are not hindering one-fourth of 1 percent of the preparedness program, but if they are hindering one one-hundredth part of that program, that is too darn much.

The Selective Service Act provides a penalty for the boy who fails to register and present himself for a year's training in the armed forces of the United States Government and, the same Congress that provided that penalty for those boys left the same right to the succeeding Congress to provide a penalty for the strikers. We believe that it is just to them and fair to the boys that a penalty be provided for the strikers to insure the whole preparedness program, and ultimately for the security of our country, the purpose for which the program was inaugurated. We believe that these strikes are fostered by the direct influence of the "fifth columnists" and that many good, unsuspecting men are caught in their vice-like grasp and are intimidated until they are afraid to even try to break loose. They are lied to, lied on, and lied about, until they do not have the courage and the initiative to break away from that unholy influence. We deeply sympathize with the victim of that lying, deceiving propaganda perpetrated by paid agitators, but we cannot condone their action in supporting these unnecessary strikes.

There is no more justification for these strikers to hinder the preparedness program than there is for the smaller nations to surrender to the totalitarian powers without a fight. I have no patience with the excuse that they can do nothing but surrender,

neither do I have any patience with the excuse that these strikers have a right to strike. To h—— with excuses and strikes, too, when the security of our country is at stake. Free men who are not willing to fight and even die with other free men for freedom's sake, are not worthy to be called free men; and free men who are not willing to work with free men for freedom's sake, are not worthy to be called free men. Mr. President, we ask you is it right for loyal patriots to give up their time, talents, and means for the peace and security of our American way of life while the damnable parasites gnaw at the very foundation of our peace and security?

When that minority in the Senate are whipped down and are shown that they cannot force their selfish will upon the majority and the lease-lend bill is belatedly passed, we trust that you will go into action with all the vigor at your command, and we assure you that we will support you with our very all, even our lives if needs be.

Very sincerely yours,

WYATT W. LIPSCOMB.

Shall Our Navy Be Used To Protect Lend-Lease Shipments?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that every day events point to our eventual participation with our Navy in protecting shipments to England.

In my campaign for reelection in 1938, and again last fall, my solemn promise was that all of my votes would be so directed as to keep us from becoming entangled in Europe's quarrels, which would eventually get us into their war. My record of votes on the several important measures will show definitely that I have kept that promise. But in spite of myself and more than a third of the Members of Congress, the majority voted the other way, and we are now at a point where the next step will be, "Shall we use our Navy to convoy shipments of materials made under the lend-lease bill?"

I have kept my people informed of my stand on each one of the several steps that have come before Congress, which have now led us up to the very brink of actual participation. I want my people to tell me whether or not they have changed their minds about keeping out of this war. I do not believe that it is possible to use our Navy to convoy merchant ships and still keep out.

That kind of talk is pure propaganda, and I believe that the people of Wisconsin, who have thus far shown that they are willing to aid England and the other democracies with everything we have "short of war," will not now become hysterical and consent to actual participation. But if they have changed their minds and feel that we should enter this war, which we will do if we convoy, then I want to know it, and my votes henceforth will be accordingly.

Regardless of my own personal feeling on important matters, I try my best to keep in touch with the people in my district by weekly news letters to all the papers and by correspondence, and then vote according to their expressed wishes.

Until recently we have had the assurance of our President, as well as other high officials, including Mr. Willkie, the Republican standard bearer, that we will not use American armed forces or do anything that would force us into this war. Both major parties adopted strong antiwar planks at their conventions, and both candidates pledged to abide by that platform. The first sentence of the Republican national-defense plank reads as follows:

> The Republican Party is firmly opposed to involving this Nation in foreign war.

The Democratic Party likewise adopted a very strong antiwar plank, and starts out by saying:

> We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack.

I believe that is plain unmistakable language. Are we going to invoke attack by convoying, and thereby create the excuse that we have been attacked? Again I am forced to say that those who have forgotten the short-of-war phrase and are telling us now that it is possible to use our Navy to convoy and still not actually participate in this war, know better than that. This proves once more how propaganda can eventually change the people's good judgment and understanding. These same people said that under the lend-lease bill Congress had the question of war in its own hands, because the President could not declare war, only Congress could do that. But everybody knows that once we use our Navy to convoy on the high seas they will be attacked, and then we are in war, whether Congress ever declares it or not.

Now is the time the Ludlow war referendum would be very useful. I wish we could force this bill out of committee this year as we did 2 years ago, when it was defeated because of the administration's strenuous opposition. I believe the people should have something to say about entering a war where we are not being attacked.

Since we have no way whereby the people of the United States can express themselves and advise Congress, I am taking the only possible means open to me to attempt to find the sentiment of the people that I represent on this question. Shall we use our Navy to protect shipments of goods for use in England and other nations from attack by German raiders, submarines, and bombers? The President, under the lend-lease bill, has the authority to do as he pleases, but indications are that he may submit the question of convoy to Congress, and I hope that my constituents will indicate their views on this all-important question to me as soon as possible. That may be done by circulating petitions, by meetings where the question is voted upon, individual letters and cards, or any other way which seems most convenient to the people. I may not be able to answer each communication individually, but I will acknowledge them through my weekly news letter, published in most of the papers in my district.

I appreciate the splendid support I have received, backing me up in my votes against the several individual steps that have now put us squarely face to face with actually using our Navy in this war. Thousands of letters have poured into my office which were nearly 100 percent in favor of the stand I took. I want to continue to represent the majority views of my people on this question of peace or war. Please let me hear from you.

Remember the words of Wisconsin's beloved and immortal Robert M. LaFollette, Sr., who said, "The will of the people shall be the law of the land."

One-Hundredth Anniversary of the Oregon Trail and Civil Government in the Oregon Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the year 1943 will mark the one-hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the old Oregon Trail from Independence, Mo., to the Willamette Valley and the Oregon country. It will also be the one-hundredth anniversary of the establishment of civil government on the west coast of the United States. These events in the historic life of our country were so portentous that we should not allow the year 1943 to go by without a fitting recognition of these important happenings in our national life.

Those of us from this great western portion of the United States are proud of the achievement of those sturdy pioneers of 100 years ago who blazed the Old Oregon Trail across plains and mountain ranges to reclaim and hold for the United States the great Pacific territory. These accomplishments of our pioneer ancestors who trekked their way to this new empire with their many covered wagon trains of that year so long ago are events of great significance to us of the West. This great territory, an empire in its proportions, now constitutes the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri. Today, when the whole world is an armed camp and we are bending every energy to prepare our defenses so that we may ward off the attacks of any nation which may seek to invade our shores, we count ourselves fortunate that we are

protected by the two great oceans, the Atlantic and Pacific. We owe a debt of gratitude to those intrepid pioneers of 100 years ago who constructed the Oregon Trail and followed its course to the Pacific Ocean and there stood guard and claimed for the United States this great country bordering the Pacific and the broad hinterland extending eastward.

These pioneer settlers on May 2 and July 5, 1843, met at Champoeg on the Willamette River in Oregon and formed a provisional government which was the first civil government established in this great western frontier. Champoeg is now set aside, dedicated and maintained as a shrine to civil government in the West. The British Hudson Bay Co. had long monopolized and governed the Oregon country prior to that time. These strong willed and patriotic American traders, missionaries, and settlers who met at the historic meetings on May 2 and July 5 were determined to hold the country for the United States and they wished the Government of the United States to extend over the Oregon country and to form a temporary government until such time as the United States should extend its jurisdiction over them, as they declared in the preamble of the laws which they adopted in 1843. It is true the British considered such assumption of political authority an invasion of their rights procured by existing treaties. The controversy, however, was ended in 1846 when the United States by treaty gained possession of the Oregon country north to the British Columbia boundary.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the Congress of the United States will by appropriate enactment provide for the recognition and commemoration of these historic events which took place in 1843 so that the one hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the Oregon Trail and civil government in the West may be fittingly observed.

I ask to include as part of my remarks the Senate memorial passed by the Legislature of the State of Oregon on March 20, 1941, calling upon the Congress and the States formed out of the Oregon country to provide for the commemoration of these historic events. The memorial follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 8

To the honorable Legislative Assemblies of the States of Washington, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri, and the Congress of the United States:

We, your memorialists, the Forty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in regular session assembled, respectfully request and petition as follows:

Whereas the year 1943 marks the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of civil government in the West, and the blazing of the old Oregon Trail from Independence, Mo., to the Willamette Valley in the old Oregon country by that historic covered wagon train which won an empire for the United States; and

Whereas the migration of 1843 and those which followed made imperishable history for America; and

Whereas all of the States through which the old Oregon Trail passed are rich in the history and traditions of that heroic period: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon, the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein, That we your memorialists, the Forty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, do hereby respectfully request and petition that you join with the State of Oregon in a proper observance of the year 1943, that the heroic deeds of the intrepid pioneers who blazed the trail to the Pacific coast may not be forgotten, and that the name of the old Oregon Trail may be enshrined forever in the heart of America; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon transmit copies of this joint memorial to the legislative assemblies and Governors of all Oregon Trail States, to the President of the United States, to both Houses of Congress, and to each Member of the Oregon delegation in Congress.

For Those Interested in Clean Streams and Pure Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE OUTDOORSMAN, COLUMBUS, OHIO

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the problem of pollution of the public waters of America is growing more and more acute. The attached editorial from the Outdoorsman, published in Columbus, Ohio, and widely read by sportsmen and conservationists throughout America, is concerned with the growing problem of pollution.

[From the Outdoorsman, Columbus, Ohio]

IMPORTANT AS MUNITIONS

It has been said that all wars are won by three elements—men, money, and morale—and that no nation is invincible if it lacks any one of the essential trio. Here in America, in preparation for the defense of our national security, we are giving considerable thought to men—which means manpower—and to money—which means production—and should be equally attentive to fostering a program for creating and sustaining morale.

It long has been known to students of political psychology that one of the most important factors in keeping a populace contented, clean-thinking, and healthy is the opportunity for everyone to participate in wholesome recreations. It is hobbies and recreations which set life above the drab commonplace and add spice to each day's existence. The average man's passion for his golf game, his fishing activities, his hunting trips, or other such hobbies is the thing that makes life so interesting to him and makes him so certain that all's well with his country. Thus it is important for national defense that national recreations be given full recognition in our defense program.

Of our national recreations the two having the strongest appeal to the American people are the sports of fishing and hunting. There are over 20,000,000 active participants in these two sports in the United States, which group embodies the most solid citizens. They and their families have a heritage that's deeply rooted in our soil and in our institutions, and they are quick to defend the American way of living. With their fascinating recreations to consume their leisure hours, they live an interesting, vibrant life—one that has no place for restlessness and dissatisfaction. Exhilarated by wholesome outdoor hobbies they are an emanating source of morale and Americanism.

As a part of our national defense—for the preservation of morale and Americanism—this group should be nourished and extended. Outdoor sports make a healthy contribution to the Nation, and the Nation in return should recognize their defense values and see that they are encouraged.

What is being done to encourage outdoor sports?

How are they faring in our defense program?

The answer, for the most part, is a sorry one. In some instances grave dangers are threatening fishing and hunting because of short-sightedness in our defense policies, and in other instances enemies of sportsmen are seizing upon the present national concern for insidious purposes.

Take the present breaking out of antifirearm bills. As this is written there are many antifirearm bills pending in various State legislatures, plus a continual barrage of agitation for a national law to deprive the American citizen of his constitutional right to keep and bear arms. These bills—paradoxical as it is—are being foisted on the public in some cases in the interest of national defense. What is the meaning of this outbreak?

There is little doubt among informed persons that much of the present agitation to take guns away from American sportsmen arises in Europe. It is part and parcel of treacherous schemes to weaken our Nation and make it more vulnerable to foreign aggression. True, many misguided, chronic reformers and publicity-seeking legislators are sponsoring such legislation without understanding of their acts—but making pawns out of respectable persons is an old art to European dictators.

Aside from insidious attempts to injure these outdoor sports which play such a great part in keeping America healthy in mind and body, there are many discouragements arising directly from the "haste and waste" character of our national-defense program and from pork-barrel schemes that cloak under national defense. Sportsmen are fearful of what may happen to our national forests, our swamp areas, and our streams while public interest is centered on defense production.

Already there has been evidence of a tendency to advocate as defense measures unnecessary and destructive drainage and dam-construction projects. Already there have been bills introduced in Congress to transfer our great national forests and wildlife sanctuaries to the War and Navy Departments for military use. The meager pollution-control laws we now have are already largely scrapped as cities and towns bid for war industry.

Pollution, particularly, is of grave concern. The prevailing attitude is that it should remain an "untouchable" during the defense production period. One even risks being called a saboteur when he intimates that industrial expansion should not be allowed to needlessly destroy our streams. Of course, we want planes, tanks, and other war materials as fast as we can get them, but the word "expediency" is often used to cover a multitude of sins. It should be remembered that there will be industries "after the war." The sport fishing "industry" is in itself of billion-dollar dimensions.

As this is written there is an antipollution bill pending in Congress, H. R. 3778, by Congressman MUNDT. This bill seeks to put the

country on record as regarding pollution a public evil, and would set up regulatory machinery. Should it pass, it would be a step in the right direction, but it would probably be ineffectual in meeting the present pure-streams crisis, since it contains a clause making it null and void whenever it is found to be incompatible with the expediency of the defense program. Stronger medicine may not be obtainable, but stronger medicine is needed.

Depriving Americans of the right to keep and bear arms, the exploitation of our forests and waters, the drainage of our swamps, and the pollution of our streams will never make America strong, but these things will do much to destroy two national recreations that are great sources of national morale. Our State and National legislators should take cognizance of this fact and see that present tendencies are shifted into reverse.

Jackson Day Dinner Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES A. FARLEY OF NEW YORK

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by our former Postmaster General, the Honorable James A. Farley, chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee, at the Jackson Day Dinner, March 29, 1941, held at the Hotel Commodore, New York. His remarks, you will note, are most timely and it is needless to say that those in attendance were deeply impressed:

In 1936, after 3 years' experience as national chairman, I approved a plan submitted by the late Forbes Morgan, treasurer of the Democratic National Committee, to make the celebration of Jackson Day an event that would contribute material assistance to the party. Since then these annual dinners have been the means, not only of providing funds for party activities, but also of promoting party strength and party enthusiasm, and the three together have been in a large measure responsible for party success.

The first of these dinners held in New York was under the chairmanship of the Honorable James W. Gerard, who had the cooperation of the late Daniel H. Skilling as secretary, and Clarence H. Low as treasurer. This is the sixth in the series, and as Democratic State chairman, I want to extend my appreciation and the thanks of the Democratic Party to the dinner chairman, de Lancey Kountze, the treasurer, Clarence H. Low, and the secretary, Albert L. Ward, as well as to all the members of the committee, and to you present who have cooperated so finely in making this another in a series of outstanding Jackson Day accomplishments.

May I also at this time express my gratitude, and the gratitude, I am sure, of every leader of our party in the State; for the able assistance that has been given me and been given you for more than a decade, by my associate and close friend, Vincent Dailey.

These are trying days. No one recognizes more than I, that this is a time when partisanship must be submerged in the interest of national unity. I have recently returned from an extended business tour of South America. Since returning I have been in touch with friends all over our own country. I am definitely satisfied that in this Western Hemisphere the vast majority of all peoples are of one mind, that free democracies, as we know them, must and shall be preserved.

A great part of the friendly feeling toward us so evident in the Latin nations below the equator is due to the patient work done among them by our diplomatic representatives. These are the ambassadors, the ministers, and the consuls who have been the eyes and the ears as well as the emissaries of our State Department. They have performed well the tasks assigned them, and their achievements have been the greater because of the wise planning, the able direction, and the understanding cooperation that have been rendered them, by support, by encouragement, and by personal visits to the southern countries, of that greatest of our long list of great Secretaries of State, the distinguished Tennessean, the Honorable Cordell Hull.

But statecraft in times of conflict and peril must be backed up by national unity and national strength. The American people made their decision last November and since then there have been such evidences of our ability to bury partisan motives that our actions in this direction alone must constitute a source of wonderment and despair to the wishful-thinking dictators.

Couple with this national unity our willingness as a Nation to reconstruct by democratic action our industrial system to the purposes of defense, and our social system to the purposes of manning the machinery of that defense, and you have a complete picture of a determined democratic people willing to risk everything, even life, that the principles upon which our Nation was founded may persevere.

Leadership was never more necessary than now. Leadership we have, and it is the duty of every American to support it. As there can be only one general to the army, one admiral to the navy, there can be only one Commander in Chief in America, and that one is Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In this Empire State we, too, have a far-seeing administration, headed by a great Governor, who is doing all in his power to lend the support of New York to the cause of America. Like him, Governors of other States, regardless of party, are doing the same. Theirs is a position only second to that of the President. We take pride, not only as Democrats but as citizens, in the fact that in this emergency we have at the helm of this greatest of all the State governments such a tireless, experienced, and unselfish chief executive as is Herbert H. Lehman.

As a parting word, may I say for myself that I am deeply grateful for the generous support that has ever been given me in both public and party office. As chairman of the Democratic State committee, I hope to continue my efforts in every way possible for the advancement of the affairs of my country and my party. In these days I assure you that such efforts will be directed wholly toward increasing national unity, to the end that American democracy will carry out its responsibility in a world that needs the support, the example, and the wisdom of enlightened leadership more than ever before in history.

Primary Voting Irregularities in New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

EXCERPT FROM INVESTIGATION OF CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES, 1940

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part of the Investigation of Campaign Expenditures, 1940, having to do with primary voting irregularities in New Mexico. Our former colleague, John J. Dempsey, now a member of the Maritime Commission, is most desirous of bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress.

(c) PRIMARY VOTING IRREGULARITIES

(1) NEW MEXICO

Complaint

United States Representative John J. Dempsey was a candidate for the Democratic nomination as United States Senator in the New Mexico primary election on September 14, 1940. Complaint was made to the special committee alleging irregularities concerning the following matters: Assistance to voters, watchers at the polls, counting of the ballots.

Statement of facts

An investigation of the foregoing complaint was made by agents of the special committee principally in the vicinity of Albuquerque, Las Vegas, and Belen, N. Mex., all located in San Miguel County.

Charges had been made by the complainant with respect to primary practices in four additional counties of New Mexico but a complete investigation was not made by representatives of the special committee in these other counties. The reason for this omission was because the complainant had taken court action therein and the ballot boxes and records in certain precincts had been impounded for recount purposes.

Subsequent to the recount, investigators for the special committee interviewed some of the participants who stated that there had been established a basis for the complaint as to irregularities in the primary election.

Assistance to voters

Investigators reported that the most flagrant irregularity about which complaint had been made related to assistance to voters at the primary. The primary election law consists of one article in the election code of the State of New Mexico. The primary law does not expressly authorize assistance to voters during a primary election.

Section 813 of the Election Code provides in part as follows:

"The powers and duties conferred or imposed by law upon boards and judges and clerks of elections, canvassing boards, and other public officials in connection with general elections, are conferred and imposed upon all such officers of primary elections and shall be exercised by them in connection with primary elections, except as otherwise herein provided or in conflict herewith."

Section 327 provides in substance that any registered elector who declares to election officials that he is unable to mark his ballot because of defective eyesight or other disability of a physical nature is entitled to be accompanied into the polling place by the two poll clerks who may assist him in marking his ballot; no other persons are authorized to render any assistance to such electors. A form of "affidavit of assistance" is specifically set out in the election code. This affidavit must be executed prior to the assistance and the affidavit must be deposited along with the ballot in the ballot box when the vote is cast.

The investigation indicated that affidavits of assistance generally were not filed, although there was considerable evidence to the effect that assistance was rendered to voters at the primary election. County officers construed the election code and formal statements were attributed to them indicating that affidavits of assistance were not necessary at primary elections.

It was also charged on behalf of the complainant that many of the electors in the territory wherein the investigation was made were of such a character that they could readily have been intimidated in the matter of voting. However, investigators reported that evidence in support of this charge was not discovered by them.

Direct evidence of improper marking of ballots during the assistance rendered to a voter was established by the statements of the elector and the person assisting the elector; both admitted that this had occurred during the primary election.

It was also charged, and evidence in support thereof was disclosed, that assistance was improperly given to electors entirely apart from the omission of an affidavit of assistance.

Watchers at polls: Sections 725 and 812 of the election code authorize candidates for nomination as United States Senator to have watchers present in the polling places throughout the primary election and during the counting of the ballots, and watchers expressly are allowed to make permanent memoranda relative to acts of omissions of persons charged with the performance of a duty under the election code.

Investigators for the special committee found that in various sections of New Mexico watchers appointed on behalf of the complainant had been refused permission to enter the polls either at all or not until late in the afternoon of primary day, that such watchers were asked to leave the polls, and in some cases were ejected without reason.

Counting of ballots: Improper counting of the ballots cast at the primary election was disclosed during the investigation. Watchers reported to the investigators that unmarked ballots were filled in by the counting judges over the protest of the watchers. During the recounts it was reported that pronounced similarity of the crosses on a considerable number of ballots was observed, which indicated to the observers that the marks had been made by one person rather than by the different electors whose ballots were being counted.

Conclusions

(1) Every charge made by the complainant was substantiated in at least some degree by evidence disclosed during the investigation.

(2) All irregularities related to provisions of the election code of New Mexico.

(3) The outstanding irregularity disclosed involved assistance to electors improperly and without an affidavit of assistance.

(4) Additional irregularities disclosed involved the illegal marking of ballots and counting of the same by election officials.

Guaranteeing Payment of Life-Insurance Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress have inquired about the progress that is being made in the preparation of the bill providing for the guaranty of life-insurance policies up to $5,000. I announced some time ago that such a bill was being prepared and would be introduced by me.

Those of us who are working on this proposal, including representatives of the legislative counsel, have tentatively agreed on the following:

First. The plan to be voluntary instead of compulsory.

Second. To be administered by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Third. The insurance fund of the F. D. I. C. to be entirely separate and apart from the funds to guarantee the payment of deposits of banks.

Fourth. An insurance fund of $150,000,000 to be provided by the United States Treasury to assure safety and solvency. This fund to be repaid later or when it can safely be done through assessments.

Fifth. The insurance fund may be invested in United States Government bonds; bonds of States, counties, cities, and political subdivisions; preferred stocks and bonds of corporations; and a limited amount in common stocks.

Sixth. The companies voluntarily coming within the terms of the act will be required to pay one-tenth of 1 percent of the premiums on policies up to $5,000.

Seventh. The guaranty to include up to $5,000 life insurance per person per company and also include reserves.

It has not been decided whether the proposal should include annuities or other contracts not involving life contingency.

The bill will probably be ready for introduction in 2 or 3 weeks.

The Panama Canal Should Be Converted Into a Sea-Level Canal for the Permanent Benefit of National Defense

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, some 40 years ago there was a violent dispute about whether the Panama Canal should be a high-level lock canal or a sea-level canal. It is doubtful if the public then or since has clearly understood the essential elements of the question. While national defense was from the beginning an important consideration, it could not in peacetime have had the compelling weight that it would have today. The decision in favor of a lock canal as recommended by a minority of the Isthmian Canal Commission of 1899–1901 was determined by peacetime conditions, and for the sake of economy in time and money.

The advocates of a lock canal stressed the reasons for tidal locks in a sea-level canal because they needed every argument they could muster to swing the decision to a lock canal. As a matter of fact, the tidal effects in a sea-level canal are not a very important consideration. They can either be overcome by tidal locks, or a sea-level canal can be used without tidal control. I have eminent engineering opinion for this statement.

Now do not misunderstand me. On account of the time and money involved, the sea-level canal was doubtless not the best solution of the problem in 1901. The lock canal and everything about it has been highly successful. The men concerned with it have deservedly received great credit and fame for their accomplishment. I would not for anything detract from this fame. However, what was entirely correct 40 or more years ago might not be the best procedure at this time.

Now, bombing from the air has become exceedingly efficient and exceedingly difficult to defend against. We are building a two-ocean navy. It is essential that transfers of naval vessels between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans be as rapid, as easy, and as safe as practicable. The security of the Panama Canal against injury must be absolutely as certain as it is possible to make it.

Now, again, do not misunderstand me. It is obvious that the completion of a sea-level canal will take a considerable time. I express the hope that this war will not last as long as it would take to convert the Panama Canal into a sea-level canal. But we can never have the sea-level canal that our permanent national defense needs unless a start is made to that end. A project for converting the Panama Canal into a sea-level canal is not a fly-by-night scheme that may become obsolete before it is finished. It will be one national-defense effort that cannot become obsolete and will be a lasting benefit both in peace and in war.

Again let us not have any misunderstanding about my proposal. It is simply to design and construct the presently being constructed locks so that they can be used in the conversion of the present canal into a sea-level canal. In order to convert the lock canal into a sea-level canal an intermediate step is necessary. There must be a set of locks with miter sills and floors at such heights that the canal and Gatun Lake can be lowered to about half its present elevation and used

at the lower elevation while the canal is being dug to sea level.

My bill proposes that the design and construction of the additional locks now being constructed be carried out so that these locks can be used for conversion of the canal into a sea-level canal, and the bill will also authorize the conversion of the Panama Canal into a sea-level canal, in order that this important military and naval project may be initiated and prosecuted in an orderly and efficient manner for the permanent benefit of national defense.

In conclusion let me quote from the report of Governor Burgess of the Panama Canal in 1931. This is the last report made by a governor of the Panama Canal setting up a plan for a sea-level canal across the Isthmus of Panama.

The board of consulting engineers for the Panama Canal, appointed by President Roosevelt in 1905 to consider the various plans proposed for the construction of a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, in response to the President's request for its opinion as to the feasibility of converting a high-level multilock canal into a sea-level canal without interrupting traffic upon it, reported, in part:

"That it is practicable from an engineering standpoint to transform any lock canal which it (the board) has considered into a sea-level canal; but that the cost and difficulty of such a transformation would be so great as to render such a change impracticable from a financial standpoint until the traffic should have so increased as to tax the capacity of the lock canal, or until other good and sufficient reasons existed for such a change."

These conclusions of the board are as true today as when they were formulated.

Mr. Speaker, the efficiency of bombing from the air and the irreparable effects to the Panama Canal of such a bombing constitute at this time the " other good and sufficient reasons" referred to above. If the present high-level locks should be destroyed and Lake Gatun drained, the canal would be out of commission for an indefinite time.

De Lesseps started the Canal as a sea-level project. The International Board of Consulting Engineers, appointed by President Theodore Roosevelt, consisting of 13 engineers of great prominence, submitted two reports, the majority being in favor of the sea level. Five members of the Board submitted a minority report recommending a lock canal. The reasons given by the minority were (1) the smaller estimated cost; (2) the shorter time that would be required to place it in operation.

Mr. Taft, the Secretary of War, in submitting the Board's report to the President conceded that the sea-level project would be preferable, but he believed the time and cost of building such a canal would be prohibitive and recommended the lock canal. The sea-level canal was also favored by a majority of the Isthmian Canal Commission and by the chief engineer, John F. Stevens.

Gifts of the Irish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over radio station WBZ at Boston, Mass., on St. Patrick's Day, March 17, 1941, under the sponsorship of the Central Council of Irish Associations of Boston:

With the possible exception of Christmas, there is no day celebrated in so many places in the civilized world as St. Patrick's Day. That is because there is no section of this great globe where the Irish race has not penetrated. During the Dark Ages in Europe when foreign invaders had almost swept away the last vestige of civilization as it was then known, Ireland kept burning the fire of Christianity and learning. For this service alone the whole Christian world is indebted to her.

That is why St. Patrick's Day has been adopted by so many thousands of other nationalities; that is why we of Irish descent are willing to share this day with those of all nationalities who are anxious to do honor with us to the memory of that great man and saint.

This year is the eighteen hundredth anniversary of the arrival of St. Patrick in Ireland. In many places in this country various Irish societies are holding gatherings similar to this. For instance, in Philadelphia the Friendly Sons Society of that city are holding their one hundred and seventieth annual banquet. You will recall that George Washington was a member of that society and attended at least three of its banquets.

While the early history of Ireland was glorious, and we like to recall her great contributions to civilization and learning, the succeeding centuries were indeed sad. It was an unusual race which was able to preserve its identity and civilization during century after century of invasion and oppression. They were ever defeated, and yet undefeated. The Irish spirit would not die. Greater strength and resources made determined efforts to wipe out the Irish completely. The battle and struggle was between manhood and might, and Irish manhood never surrendered. No one has ever questioned Irish courage.

The Irish race, which has found glory on a thousand battlefields and disgrace upon none, has found distinction in every other line of useful human endeavor as well, particularly in America.

At the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Irish began coming to America in vast numbers. In New England, they located in Boston, New Hampshire, and Maine. In 1718 the city of Worcester consisted of 58 dwellings and 200 inhabitants. The Reverend Edward Fitzgerald, a Presbyterian minister, with 50 families settled in Worcester and doubled the population. The town of Concord was founded by immigrants from Ireland. One of the original settlers of Worcester was James McClelland, ancestor of Gen. George B. McClelland, and of a former mayor of New York. It was in New Hampshire that a group of Irish from Londonderry settled and called the new colony Londonderry, N. H.

These immigrants were chiefly manufacturers of linen and they brought their utensils for that purpose with them. The linen wheel or spinning wheel, so familiar in the households of New England, was introduced by this colony. The raising of flax and the manufacture of linen cloth was taken up with great earnestness by the other colonies. It is interesting to note that at this time the Irish also introduced the potato to America.

While we are on the subject of contributions to the material development of America, let me cite the following:

The first daily newspaper in America (1774) called the Pennsylvania Packet, was edited and printed by John Dunlap, who was born in County Tyrone.

The first steam engine built in the United States was by Christopher Colles, who was born in Ireland in 1765.

The first steamboat was built and operated by Robert Fulton, whose father came from Kilkenney, Ireland.

The first reaping machine was manufactured by Cyrus McCormick, of Irish descent.

The first piano manufactured in the United States was by Thomas Grehore, of Irish descent.

These are some of the inventive contributions to America that are very well known.

But there are other contributions that the Irish have made to the world that are even greater.

Take this one for example—I thought of it as I stood and looked at Old Blarney. The English took everything, it seemed, on God's earth from the Irish. They took their churches, they took their liberties, they took the lands they tilled, they took their valleys and mountains, but there was one thing that even tyranny could not take. They could not take the blarney from them—the Irish blarney. What a wonderful thing it is—the blarney of a statesman, the blarney of a politician, the blarney of a lover, or the blarney of the grocery man. It makes a dull day bright. It makes an old woman feel young. It has put more dimples in the face of care than any other thing in all the world.

Blarney! Why, it has been the power that has turned a broken heart into a smile. It has been the power that has helped create laughter sprinkled through the world like shamrocks are sprinkled throughout the Emerald Isle—the blarney that nothing killed and nothing could take from the Irish.

Then there is the song of the Irish—the sweet, sad song of the Irish—carried by her nightingales into every nation on the face of the globe. It sometimes seemed to me that the old land was just a nightingale that sang through her tears, sang through her agony, sang until her song beat up against the heart of the world. Sometimes it was half a laugh and half a sob, but there is no other song in all the world that touches the depths of our souls and strikes the chords of our noblest natures and finds its way to the tears of our eyes.

Then there is the wit and humor of the Irish. They don't know and I don't know where it came from. It was hard for the

exiles to find humor and yet they found it; hard for those driven from the land they loved to laugh at the world until the world laughed with them, and yet such has been one of the golden gifts of the Irish.

Eloquence—you can't speak of orators who moved great masses of people unless you find Irish names sprinkled among them as thick as clan names are sprinkled over Ireland.

Blarney, music, humor, oratory—just the blessed gifts of a people.

Then there comes another gift—that perfect, sweetest of all gifts that ever came to the sons of man. Sometimes I am thinking and swear that it is where all the others came from—the Irish mother. There never was a mother that wasn't almost next to Mary, the blessed.

It has always seemed to me that out of the travail and tears, out of the agony of the hour when her children left her and went from Ireland, and out of the bitter struggle to provide for the children that she took with her to a new land, there came some great gift from God that gave the Irish mother the mighty power to put ambition into the hearts of her sons, to fill them with determination that never died, to keep laughter and song there, and though their pockets were empty, their souls were rich in legends and stories and the golden love of an Irish mother. From her hands they went forth to do the work of the world, tunneling the mountains, spanning the rivers, throwing skyscrapers into the air, spreading the advance of civilization from one seacoast to another.

The Irish mother—mother of men—who gave to them that conquering heritage, the power of leadership, that sent them forth to make a land free and happy, to build its homes, to sing its songs, and make the jest and laughter of the world.

Now, none of this is strange, none of it unusual, when you know the story of how the Irish first came to be made into a people. Do you know how the Irish were made? Shame on you, then, for such ignorance. Let me tell you.

After the great world was made and the good God had sent it rolling out into space, He was resting on the seventh day. The saints were there standing all about him leaning on their golden shovels. The Lord said to them, "Look at all these odds and ends scattered around and left over after the world's making. Take them up and make of them the races of man to people the earth."

So St. George got a great lump of lead, and in the heart of it he placed a piece of gold and sent it bumping and rolling clumsily to earth and called it the English. But sure nobody from looking at it would ever have known that it has a bit of gold in the heart of it.

St. Dennis caught a flying sunbeam and tied it with the bow of a ribbon and added to it the flashing rays of gems and jewels and sent it to earth as the French.

Then St. Michael took a mask of velvet and a poniard of steel, the strings of a mandolin, and a piece of the moonlight and sent it to earth as the Italians.

But St. Patrick, Heaven bless him, had watched them all and noted their mistakes; and he, too, caught a sunbeam and the rays from jewels and the ripple of a brook, and he added to them the sigh of a poet, the heart of a child, a rose out of paradise, and a great golden chord from an angel's lyre. He took them all to the feet of the Master and said, "Dear and good God, to make my gift perfect give me one thing—give me the smile of God"; and God smiled.

St. Patrick sent his gift to earth and called it the Irish. But Satan, watching, said to himself, "Lo, if it ever gets to earth, Paradise will be in Ireland," and so, in envy and malice, he drew his bow against it and shot a poisoned arrow through it. It bruised the stem of the rose of Paradise and twanged against the chord of the angel's lyre.

Now some there are who say that because the devil's arrow bruised the stem of the rose of Paradise, Irish women are always a little sad at twilight; and some there are who say that because it twanged against the chord of the angel's lyre, the best of Irish music is always sweetly and poignantly sad; and still some there are who say that the devil's arrow accounts for the perversity and contrariness in the Irish nature. But, be that as it may, it is the duty of Irishmen everywhere to pluck hard at this arrow until there shall be nothing left in the Irish nature but the heart of a child and the smile of God.

And so, in conclusion, let me say that tonight America is grateful for the Irish men and women of this Nation, because there is writ on the tablets of their hearts a love of liberty and justice so deep that no dictator can ever erase it; no threat can ever cause it to be hidden in fear; and no oppressor, no matter how powerful, can ever take this Nation from its foundations of democracy so long as Irish hearts beat with life. And they shall continue to beat, for the fighting races don't die out, though they seldom die in bed.

So here's thank God for the race and the sod, and good night to you, on this St. Patrick's Day.

The Sincerity, Courage, and Public Service of Lindbergh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

ARTICLE BY GEN. HUGH S. JOHNSON

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, it seems almost axiomatic and nearly automatic that every period of crisis and emergency develops a personality of size and stature commensurate with the degree and intensity of the crisis itself. In my opinion, America's need today for a national voice to balance and counteract the emotional hysteria which is leading and involving us in foreign wars and continuing power politics of the world is being met through the courage, patriotism, and self-crucifixion on the altar of cruel public criticism, articulated by a vocal few, of Col. Charles A. Lindbergh. It is with pleasure and personal satisfaction that I incorporate in my extension of remarks a recent newspaper statement in this regard by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson which will help to balance the record in connection with Lindbergh's position which I have publicly endorsed:

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

This Lindy has guts. I saw and heard him testify before SOL BLOOM's House committee on the lend-lease bill. There were all-out war men in that tribunal who, at first, felt they had him as securely tied to the post, in front of the fires, as was ever a sixteenth-century Jesuit missionary by any savage Huron or Iroquois Tribe of torturers. He was an isolationist, far more extreme than most of the rest. He boldly said that he didn't care which side won in Europe; he hoped neither would; he was interested only in perfecting the defensive strength of the United States which he believed could be done if we concentrated that strength on our own defense and did not fritter it away, attempting to conserve the British Empire.

It was not hard to hear the whinny of the whetting knives on the committee rostrum. A very hostile publicity background had been built up by the defend-Britain committee. People in the packed audience almost gasped at such audacity. When he first started to testify, I thought that he was in for a sort of Torquemada inquisition by the war-minded, whirling dervishes in the committee semicircle, with the encouragement of the crowd.

Nothing of the kind happened. One reason that it did not happen was that Committee Chairman SOL BLOOM—who has frequently been criticized as what, at West Point, is called a gallery boner and in more understandable Americanese a "publicity hound"—wouldn't let it happen.

He was impressed with the statesmanlike necessity, regardless of his own apparent burning conviction, to have this debate proceed, as he said several times, "in order." I have known Mr. BLOOM for years. Under the weight of these great responsibilities, he rises. Woodrow Wilson once said during the World War, "Take an ordinary citizen and subject him to these terrific war pressures and the duty of fateful national decisions, and one of two things happens. He grows or he swells." SOL has grown even majestically.

But there was another reason that you could see—tangibly, even visually—as it permeated both committee and audience through what I shall call by a very fancy but very accurate word adsorption. It was the cool, calm courage, logic, and fearless frankness of this American ex-hero in faith in his convictions—like the Jesuit at the Iroquois stake.

When he left the stand, the largely hostile audience and the overwhelmingly hostile political committee spontaneously stood in silent tribute—and SOL BLOOM was the first to stand. It was a great tribute to Slim, but it was almost as great a tribute to the committee and the usual American way of looking at things.

Now, Lindbergh has taken a similar stand in a long Letter to Americans, and Collier's which apparently doesn't agree with much of it, in a spirit similar to that of Mr. Bloom's committee, has published it. It is important to read it. I, too, disagree with some, but far from all, of its conclusions. But I first met this clear-eyed American when he was a kid flying the mail between Chicago and Kansas City. I knew his father before him. He has no flair or apparent wish for popularity and no sense at all for favorable publicity. He is simply sincere.

In every act of his life, through more than one epochal national and international incident, he has shown a rarely equaled calm, deliberate intelligence and fearlessness—an unexampled fortitude—that, in his prominence, are not merely personal but national assets. He has nothing to gain and a great deal to lose by his attitude. He is seeking no public or private preferment and, by his present stand, is bravely courting the reverse of either.

I don't see how anybody can read his Letter without a conviction that it is time and past time for all of us not only to "stop, look, and listen," but to begin to question the high-power propaganda which is whipping us into one of our greatest dangers—high time to try to stop the current sheep-herding of our Legislature into a headlong hysterical stampede toward an abyss.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

LETTER BY HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE, OF NEW YORK

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by me to the Knickerbocker Press in opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway:

[From the Knickerbocker News, Albany, N. Y., March 27, 1941]

CONGRESSMAN BYRNE SAYS SEAWAY PLAN SAME AS BEATEN IN 1934

(By WILLIAM T. BYRNE, Representative from Albany)

The St. Lawrence seaway agreement which the President recently submitted to Congress is nothing more than a revamping of the proposed St. Lawrence Treaty of 1934. The project is the same basically unsound, pernicious undertaking that was rejected by the United States Senate in 1934. Some provisions of the agreement are less tenable than the revamped treaty proposed in 1938 and now, when every engineer, every skilled and unskilled workman, every ton of steel and pound of cement is needed for our defense program is no time to flit away our energies on glittering but hollow schemes.

In order to induce Canadian acceptance of the agreement, our Government becomes very generous. We agree to foot almost the entire bill in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence, regardless of whether or not the work lies in Canada. This country even agrees to construct—not only the Canadian power-house substructures as before, but the Canadian power-house buildings as well. All they have to do is to install the machinery in their own plants.

In generous moods of previous years, we requested the Canadian Government to pay for the construction of side canals and locks wholly within Canadian territory, but now we agree to pay for these.

ONE SECTION TO COST $266,170,000

According to the estimates presented to Congress with the St. Lawrence agreement, the International Rapids section alone will cost $266,170,000. The United States is obligated to pay over 82 percent of this amount and if Canada fails to proceed with the installation of the machinery for the development of power—as permitted to do under the terms of the agreement—the United States will pay 91 percent of the costs.

In spite of all of this, we agree that about 50 percent of all the work shall be performed by Canadian workmen, with Canadian materials.

The hurried submission of this project is, of course, prompted by the hope that its new dress of national defense will allure enough voters to insure the safe passage in spite of certain storms ahead. These will be raised by citizens all over the country who will not be duped into thinking such a generally ruinous project is essential to national defense. They realize that all of the skills, and labor of all kinds, materials, contracting organizations, and equipment necessary to carry on such a mammoth construction enterprise are sorely needed in our emergency defense program, and the blow the already staggering taxpayer would receive by diverting such a tremendous sum of money as would be required by the seaway.

CITES QUOTATION OF DR. T. H. HOGG

The following is a direct quotation of Dr. Thomas H. Hogg, chairman and chief engineer of the Hydro Electric Commission of Ontario, the Canadian agency which would develop and have at its disposal one-half of the St. Lawrence power:

"It is quite evident that this development (the St. Lawrence project) cannot be classed as a war measure, for even if it were undertaken tomorrow, it would be 6 or 7 years before it could become of use. Yet the project is persistently misrepresented as a war measure which, far from helping, would actually handicap war work."

Furthermore, the project would not even represent good long-range defense planning. There would be eight locks in the Welland Canal and nine in the St. Lawrence River. Each one of these would be vulnerable to aerial attack and sabotage. If any one of them was destroyed, it would close the Great Lakes to the sea for an indeterminate period of time. In addition to the locks, there are great dams and levees which would also form vital links in the seaway. The dam in the international rapids section of the St. Lawrence, if destroyed, would trap all naval and other deeper draft vessels in the Great Lakes for the duration of any war, and might cause grave damage to the port of Montreal and other vital areas between there and the dam.

POINTS OUT SHIPBUILDING POSSIBILITIES

The shipbuilding capacities of the Great Lakes should be fully used for naval-craft construction, but not for the type of vessel which would have to depend upon only one outlet to the sea—the St. Lawrence. The Great Lakes area might well be developed to the point of being the greatest construction area of the smaller type naval vessels in the world.

Here submarines, trawlers, mine sweepers, submarine chasers, torpedo boats, and other similar naval crafts could be constructed and sent to the sea by a number of routes. They could be shipped through the existing St. Lawrence Canal, Hudson River route, or by the way of the Illinois Canal, Mississippi River Channels—the most protected outlet of the Great Lakes to the sea in the entire United States or Canada. Smaller merchant marine vessels could also be constructed in the Great Lakes area and shipped in sections via existing canals, as in the last World War.

Such planned expansion of our inland shipbuilding facilities would then leave the ocean and Gulf yards open for construction of the larger-type vessels, both naval and merchant marine. It would distribute defense work and not hazard the possibility of locking the larger fighting craft 500 miles inland as a result of destroying one of many vulnerable locks or dams.

UNJUSTIFIABLE IN PEACETIME

As a peacetime project, the undertaking is utterly unjustifiable. It is extravagant; it would result in unwarranted increased tax burdens; and if used to the extent indicated by proponents of the measure, it would result in ruinous losses to American labor and industry alike. The seaway would be used primarily by cheap foreign tramp ships operated by undermanned, ill-paid, foreign crews. It would be to these carriers that American labor and enterprise would lose employment and business.

The port of Albany would be one of the chief losers. Construction of the seaway would have a devastating effect upon our city, and as your representative I have constantly opposed this undertaking, and will continue to relentlessly, fearlessly, and vigorously oppose ratification of the new agreement.

[From the Knickerbocker News, Albany, N. Y., March 27, 1941]

LABOR "WARS" ON SEAWAY

(By Francis P. Kimball)

Declaring "war to the hilt" because their livelihood is threatened, State labor groups combined forces today with business and industry in a drive which they promised will sweep the Nation to defeat President Roosevelt's St. Lawrence seaway-power project.

Asserting they will contact every organized labor group in the country, representatives of railroads, longshoremen, harbor and steamship workers, and the State A. F. of L. pledged an "all-out" battle to prevent what they believe will be a major economic disaster for the State and Nation.

Strength of the labor revolt against the seaway was the outstanding event of the emergency conference called by Carl E. Smith, president of the Albany Chamber of Commerce, at the Ten Eyck Hotel yesterday afternoon.

Labor representatives themselves were the first to denounce the project as "wrecking the transportation industry of the country," saying they did not propose to be put out of their jobs by "one man's ambition."

Reports that the national A. F. of L., the International Longshoremen's Association from New Orleans to Maine, and all railroad brotherhoods have joined the battle featured the meeting of more than 70 leaders of civic and commercial groups of the capital district, New York, Buffalo, Syracuse, and other upstate points.

Typical of the attitude of the labor delegates was the statement by John Fitzgibbons, legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, that "we know who would really suffer from this project."

OTHERS SEE DISRUPTION

"Our people," he said, "would be walking the streets if it goes through." He said the feeling was alike among the railroad workers from Chicago to the Atlantic and every worker in the country sympathized with their plight due to the competition the St. Lawrence waterway would create with railroad haul between the interior of the country and the sea.

Other speakers, including Chauncey J. Hamlin, chairman, Niagara Frontier Planning Commission; Cornelius H. Callaghan, manager, Maritime Exchange of the Port of New York; George McCaffrey, Merchants Association of New York; B. J. Lewis, editorial director of the Knickerbocker News; Peter G. Ten Eyck, former Congressman and waterway leader, said it was imperative the Nation "be awakened" to the wholesale disruption of transportation and industry that would be caused by the seaway plan.

Announcing he had reports from Washington indicating while the Senate vote, by States, might be slightly in favor of the

seaway, Mr. Lewis said if the project were submitted now, it would probably be beaten 40 to 50 votes in the House.

SEES PRESSURE ON OPPONENTS

"We must not fool ourselves," he said, "the White House knows this situation as well as we do. What we have to look out for is the extreme pressure that will be exerted upon those who oppose the seaway. It is going to be a difficult fight.

"I believe it is possible by proposing amendments to the measure to clip off votes of those who would favor it. For instance, one of the most serious objections to the whole plan is that American money would be spent to employ Canadian labor on the project. An amendment to require only American labor on it would certainly arouse opposition in Canada, since they are the ones who expect to get the lion's share of benefits."

D. J. Roach, president of D. J. Roach, Inc., Albany stevedoring concern, said while the seaway, if enacted would "drive me out of Albany, I could probably find something else to do. But behind me I would leave 600 or 700 men whose occupations would be washed out, and it would mean their bread and butter."

He and other speakers urged that every public official, industry, and workman in the State be contacted in order to bring home to the public generally the great damage that the St. Lawrence seaway route would cause to American communities, since none of the benefits of the shipping would be returned to this country.

COMMITTEE NAMED

Resolutions declared "entire opposition" to the seaway-power plan and demanded the legislature and Congress repudiate the scheme. It was asserted the "avowed purpose of the seaway is to divert foreign and domestic commerce from the State and to construct a new deep-water route competing with the New York State railroads and barge canal between the Great Lakes and Atlantic coast."

This diversion, it was said, "would threaten enormous destruction of property values in the most populous centers of the State, whose growth, employment, and industry would be impaired and retarded." Since the project could not be completed in 4 to 7 years, it could not "be honestly termed a 'defense measure,'" it was said, and should be defeated as "ruinous" to the State, involving immediate large losses in employment.

A committee was named by Mr. Smith to confer with legislative leaders. It is headed by Truman Cameron, vice president of the Albany chamber, and includes Thomas J. Lyons, president, State federation of labor; Michael J. Powers, assistant secretary, Albany port district commission; Samuel McCochrane, president, Troy Chamber of Commerce; and Frank S. Columbus, Brotherhood of Railroad Enginemen and Firemen.

[From the Knickerbocker News, Albany, N. Y., March 22, 1941]

ROOSEVELT FAILS AT START IN AIM TO PROVE SEAWAY DEFENSE MEASURE

The Knickerbocker News condemned the St. Lawrence seaway project yesterday because it was an attempt by Mr. Roosevelt to do by devious means something he could not accomplish otherwise. In other words, he was avoiding the constitutional course of submitting a treaty for two-third approval by the Senate in order to gain his ends by an agreement that would require only a bare majority of both houses to implement.

It is fundamental that a house built upon sands should fall; it is also true that a project couched in false premises should not succeed. Thus Mr. Roosevelt gets away to a bad start on his device to destroy the commerce of the port of Albany and the Atlantic seaboard by diverting it through the St. Lawrence Channel.

Nor will the major premise of the President that the seaway is necessary to our national defense in the present emergency hold water, a bad pun but permissible in this emergency. The very nature of destructive war these days shortens its duration so that the conclusion may come in weeks or months, while the seaway would take at least until 1945 to finish, by which time the war in Europe will be history. This simple statement of fact should demolish the defense angle of the seaway argument. Then, why doesn't it? For the reason that Mr. Roosevelt believes there is sufficient hysteria over war in our country to prevent clear thinking even on a primary condition. He believes all that is necessary is to say "national defense," and the public will go for anything, from a canal to a new world's fair, and cheer in the doing.

The Executive no doubt is encouraged by the success of the "lease-spend" law on which he knew from the start he had the votes and the public support to put it across. But he had one thing more that he does not have in this instance. He had a sound case which could stand the closest scrutiny without divorcing support from it. In this instance he cannot say, "I've got the votes; we'll fire ahead, come what may," for this time he must marshal reason to back up the action he demands Congress shall take.

[From the Knickerbocker News, Albany, N. Y., March 24, 1941]

WHO WOULD PAY FOR THE SEAWAY?—ALBANIANS AMONG THE HARDEST HIT

With the nonchalance that lets him juggle billions of the taxpayers' money, Mr. Roosevelt estimates the cost of the St. Lawrence seaway at $266,000,000, a mere trifle to a Nation that is well on its way to a national debt of one hundred billions.

The estimate is probably careless of items which tend to expand the resultant bill. Foes of the scheme do not hesitate to say it would cost from five hundred millions to a billion, figured on actual costs. In making such forecasts there should be room for a little reminder the engineers' estimate for the Panama Canal was one hundred and forty-five millions and the cost was three hundred and eighty millions, or 2½ times the estimates. And that was in a day of lower costs. Also, the estimate for the building of the Welland Canal was fifty millions and it cost one hundred and twenty millions, or 2½ times that guess. It is entirely probable that this experience would attach to the seaway. Moreover, it is more than likely because of the prodigality of the President in his outlay of the Nation's gold.

But any figure on construction costs is incomplete because it does not include the losses consequent to the canal's completion. What about the loss in trade to our railroads, to the ports, to the coast-wise traffic? For 300 years we have been building up this trade through the natural ways of commerce. Are we to hurl it away to meet a caprice, to serve internationalism at a terrific sacrifice? We haven't enough tonnage now to fill the railroads, trucks, and waterways between the Atlantic and the Midwest. Why add a medium that would subtract from what we have? Surely it would mean less in wages, jobs, less in prosperity, of which we have not enough.

If you wish to be cold-blooded about the losses, take the world of the Brookings fact-finding institution in Washington that there would be no compensatory economic benefit to our country for the expense involved.

This loss would come very close to home. You can register it in the diversion of the millions of feet of lumber that come annually to the docks in Rensselaer. It can be figured in the eighty-five to five hundred millions that would be New York State's share of the cost, or about $35 for every man, woman, and child in the State. That is not all, of course, for one-third of all the Federal expense is paid in taxes from New York State. Which means that our taxpayers would not only pay the State's share, but a third of the entire Federal expense for the project. It is not a pleasant outlook for a State that is now stirred about economy, a State that is about to create a new division to keep its trade at home. Yet, this deal would send our maritime business to Canada, to the Midwest, eventually to Europe.

It isn't pleasant for Albanians to think they are being made a sucker in this international scheme, but it is forehanded to do so. To a town that gets thirteen millions in rail wages every year the reduction in such revenue is of vital importance.

This has been a discussion of who pays. It looks as if New York State people, and particularly Albanians, would pay terribly for the whimsical ambition of Roosevelt to build a seaway through Canada. And in the discussion, the destruction of our $7,000,000 port has hardly been mentioned.

[From the Knickerbocker News, Albany, N. Y., March 25, 1941]

ST. LAWRENCE AND THE DEADLY PARALLEL

Whither America? How far have we drifted from the basic ideals of our proud nationalism when our President seeks to build a seaway with American money through Canadian territory to destroy the trade of our country? A deadly illustration is afforded in a comparison between some of the basic facts concerning the Panama Canal, built by Theodore Roosevelt, and the St. Lawrence scheme F. D. R. is pushing.

ST. LAWRENCE

The St. Lawrence seaway will cost between $500,000,000 and a billion, possibly more. Most of the expense will be paid by the United States. Half the power developed on the international waterway will be Canada's, although we paid for it. The economic losses in shipping and rail trade are inestimable.

For three-quarters of its distance the proposed seaway would run through Canadian territory, subject to control of this friendly but foreign country. We are committed to the defense of this waterway in any war in which Canada may engage in the future.

The seaway would divert trade from the Atlantic ports and the American railroads to Canada. It not only creates disunity but it is the first overt effort by an American administration to destroy American commerce for the benefit of a foreign state.

PANAMA CANAL

Engineers' estimate on the Panama Canal was one hundred and forty-five millions and it cost two and one-half times that much. It has returned to America—and to us alone—many times its cost in tolls. It is primarily for our trade and our defense. It supplies an all-American route between our coasts that need be shared with no other country.

Under the guidance of Theodore Roosevelt, complete title and control of the Canal Zone was obtained from the Republic of Panama before the rights of the French Panama Canal Co. were purchased by us. There is no danger of any country or people disputing the title.

The Panama Canal opened a commercial route of unquestioned benefit to the trade of our country. It was for the benefit of the United States alone. It gave to our country and our country alone the strategically important control of this only route between the two oceans.

This is a deadly parallel because it shows how the Canal was devoted to the interests of our country alone and how the seaway is not. Our country is supposed to be for Americans

first, regardless of how much we may help other countries. But the scheme is particularly offensive in its emphasis of the drift of administration position from Theodore Roosevelt's America-first policy.

[From the Knickerbocker News, Albany, N. Y., Wednesday, March 26, 1941]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT WOULD BYPASS TRAFFIC FROM ALBANY AND OTHER NEW YORK STATE CITIES

(By Francis P. Kimball)

The St. Lawrence seaway program is described by the chamber of commerce leaders, and by port, city, and county officials as dangerous to this community and to the State at large.

Just what do they mean by this?

Many attempts have been made to make the seaway project appear complicated, but it is not really so. It is a project that, if carried out, may cost the jobs of many residents of this area. It may seriously disturb our railroad service, our harbor traffic, and our industries. It may put Albany and other neighboring cities on a sidetrack, while commercial development turns to another section of the State.

How can the seaway do this?

Look at the accompanying map. The St. Lawrence River is clearly marked on it, running northeastward from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean. You will notice that only a little of the way does this river run through international territory. After passing the northern New York State border, it goes for over 1,000 miles to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, entirely in Canada.

Thus the river carries traffic directly out of the United States to a route 80 percent of whose length is within the Dominion of Canada.

WILL OPEN NEW ROUTE

What the seaway is really designed to do is to open a new route 27 feet deep so that ocean vessels may cruise in from the Atlantic and up the Great Lakes to Cleveland, Detroit, and Chicago without a stop; take on cargoes and sail out again for foreign destinations—all without touching a New York State port.

In this way business is taken from Albany and New York on the east and from Oswego and Buffalo on the west. As shipping is now conducted, ocean vessels arrive from abroad at the port of New York or come up the Hudson to Albany. Cargoes are unloaded and shipments are forwarded by railroad or over the State Barge Canal to western points, including Cleveland, Detroit, and Chicago. This business furnishes vast employment at the docks and terminals, and on the railroad as well; and, the whole operation being conducted within United States routes, benefits this country.

Transportation since the days of the Erie Canal and the pioneer Mohawk & Hudson Railroad has been a major industry in New York State. It has many allied industries such as the manufacture of car wheels, brass journals, car and locomotive building, repair shops, steel fabricators, and many others.

WOULD BYPASS NEW YORK

It is well known that the Port of New York, the country's leading gateway, depends largely for its existence upon foreign trade. The St. Lawrence seaway route would make it unnecessary for ocean ships to call at the port of New York. They could, during the 7 months of the navigation season, lay their course directly for the St. Lawrence and pass up to the interior of America.

Not only would New York harbor find its activity curtailed, but the railroads which carry the loads overland would suffer the deprivation of a large part of their business. For the same reason, Albany would find its young seaport placed in competition with a seaway running "over its back" into the Great Lakes, and would find its development handicapped and impaired.

At the west end of the State, Buffalo, now one of the largest ports in America, would find itself bypassed by the St. Lawrence route. The traffic on reaching Lake Ontario would pass through the Welland Canal into Lake Erie and on up the Lakes. The Welland Canal lies entirely in Canada.

So both at the west and on the Atlantic side, New York State would be detoured by the St. Lawrence seaway. Tonnage would not come into the State and even the boats that carry the traffic abroad would very likely be foreign-owned. It is well known that the foreign governments heavily subsidize their ships, and there are only a few trade routes in the world served by American vessels.

REASON BAFFLES CHAMBER

Why New York State should pay to create such a seaway, when its only possible effect would be to divert its commerce to a foreign route and foreign ships is baffling to the Albany Chamber of Commerce and other groups who oppose the seaway plan.

They cannot understand why President Roosevelt has proposed it. They do not intend to accept his decision.

Just how much damage would result from the building of the seaway no one can properly estimate. The railroads, which face a loss of much tonnage 7 months a year to the St. Lawrence route, have a pay roll in the Albany district of $13,000,000 a year. With traffic diverted to the St. Lawrence a great part of the year they would not need as many trains or employees. They could only curtail, and it is most probable they could not even survive.

The port of Albany, which in the 1935–39 period handled over 200 ships a year, and produced a revenue in wages earned by 500 workers of over $1,000,000 annually, would find itself on a sidetrack. In 1940 the port handled over 200,000 tons of wood pulp, valued at more than $10,000,000. It would have handled even more business, going to paper mills in the Middle West, except that pulp moved down the St. Lawrence canals to Great Lakes cities, carried in foreign steamers that could operate on the 14-foot existing channel.

With the 27-foot ocean channel in the St. Lawrence, all the pulp for the Middle West would move down that route, and there would be a check on further shipments via Albany. That is one practical example of how the seaway may work. Yet the State of New York and the taxpayers of this area would be called upon to pay for the building of the seaway if the Roosevelt plan is adopted.

So far as the power development is concerned, the project is supposed to provide 1,200,000 of horsepower for this State. This more accurately means about 700,000 "firm" power, and steam stand-by stations would have to be built, as well as transmission lines and boosters to get the current down-State.

Besides the $90,000,000 the State would be required to pay for the powerhouse, the State power authority has drawn plans for a $105,000,000 transmission line, and taxpayers would bear one-third of the entire cost of the seaway in Federal taxation besides. Total cost to the State would thus exceed $200,000,000. In return for this there would be some reduction in power bills—how much nobody yet knows. The seaway opponents have said steam plants can be built in much less time and at no greater cost to supply the power needs. The chief power area would be in northern New York.

The question facing Albany and the rest of the State is primarily the disaster that would follow impairment of the existing transportation system which crosses the State. The State's greatest development has occurred along the route from New York City to Albany and Buffalo—and this is the area which would suffer the greatest loss from the St. Lawrence route.

There has never been an adequate study of the economics involved in this project. Even now the development is being pushed forward under the subterfuge of a national emergency, though it cannot be fully completed for 5 or 6 years. The chamber of commerce of the State of New York, which has studied the project carefully for years, has asserted the growth of the great Port of New York would be placed in check by the seaway plan. Obviously, Albany, Buffalo, and the other interior cities along the route cannot expect a better fate.

Defense and Pay As You Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, a rising public debt and heavy taxes go together. No country has ever increased its debt without being obliged also to raise more money by taxation. The public debt should be thought of as a first mortgage on the earning power of the people. Every day in the year is a tax day for all of us. The taxes to serve and pay for the public debt are a first mortgage and fall not only on all who work but on all who eat.

I am wondering if we realize just what the present Congress has spent. May I briefly summarize by giving a list of the major money bills approved by the House and passed or pending in the Senate: British aid, $7,000,000,000; Navy, $3,415,521,750; supplemental defense, $1,980,356,820; independent offices, $1,415,991,838; agriculture, $890,824,037. Major Budget Bureau recommendations awaiting action, and which will be passed: War Department, $5,967,475,809; social security, $894,209,685; Interior Department, $151,087,238. This expenditure will exceed the $65,000,000,000 debt limitation as prescribed by Congress.

In 77 days this Seventy-seventh Congress has spent $25,731,178,957. This represents an outlay of $334,171,155 a day, $13,923,506 an hour, $232,058 a minute, and $3,867 a second.

I am wondering if we realize what this means. This amounts to a debt of $485 per capita, and it cannot be blamed entirely upon national defense. On March 4, 1933, the debt was approximately $20,200,000,000, a Federal per capita mortgage of $163. Compare that with 8 years later and a per capita mortgage of $485. It is the most rapid increase of a debt in a like period that has ever occurred in the history of our country. Please remember, however, that "per capita" means every man, woman, and child. Since the average American family consists of four persons, the debt per capita is four times $485. This means that each breadwin-

ner is saddled with a debt of approximately $2,000.

The people of my district are heartily in accord with an adequate defense program and are willing to pay for it, but they insist that this vast, unnecessary expenditure for departments other than national defense must be immediately stopped. As I stated on the floor of Congress on March 21, the people of my district believe in a pay-as-you-go program, and that is what we are hoping the administration leaders of this Congress will finally agree to.

I again call on the leaders of this administration with this statement:

We are willing at all times to spend and pay for a defense program, but please quit calling on Congress to appropriate money for every conceivable department, labeling it under the guise of national defense.

Bobbing Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1941

ARTICLE BY HUGH S. JOHNSON

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Buffalo Evening News:

[From the Buffalo Evening News of March 22, 1941]

SEAWAY REVEALS PRESIDENT'S KNACK OF "BOBBING BACK"

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

WASHINGTON, March 22.—A principal characteristic of our President, in respect of which his pride is amply justified by the record, is what an observer might call persistence, but what he calls his "Dutch stubbornness." Whatever you call it, it certainly is there. If you look back over the story of what he set out to do and in which he was temporarily frustrated, you will find that the purpose remained and that, through one or another avenue—sometimes after years—the end was achieved.

Perhaps the most uncanny instance of his "bobbing up serenely" to get what he wants in the end is the so-called St. Lawrence seaway. It was advanced first as a navigation project to "bring the great ocean-going vessels of the commerce of the world to the docks of Cleveland, Duluth, Chicago, and all lake ports." It almost certainly would do no such thing.

But the "navigation" ballyhoo was necessary for two reasons. If it could be sold to the Middle West, it was good for political support. More important still, as the Supreme Court decisions then stood, the Federal Government could not develop a waterway for power alone. Its powers were confined to navigation but if, in developing for navigation, power was produced as an incident, that was permissible.

Finally, boundary waters between the United States and Canada had always been subjects of treaties—to be confirmed by two-thirds of the Senate. The then "navigation" argument wasn't good enough, and the President's proposed treaty with Canada for the St. Lawrence seaway was rejected.

Now new elements have entered. First, it is clear that under the Supreme Court, as now constituted, the Federal Government can develop a stream for power—especially if an element of "national defense" can be imagined. We are inclined to do anything suggested for national defense and do it without any debate or back talk. So, Mr. Roosevelt returns with an "agreement" for his "seaway" rather than a treaty—which by some alchemy is not supposed to require Senate ratification.

It is too bad this project can't be debated, at least to make clear whether it can't proceed at one-third the cost and openly as a power project only, which, while probably not yet necessary, eventually will be. When we are apparently going to need all the labor and machinery we can get in the defense program, why bring this up now? The answer is easy. The President's "Dutch is up," and this time he will get his way.

Democracy and the Dignity of Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 31), 1941

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT BEFORE CONVENTION OF B'NAI B'RITH, CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by the Vice President of the United States before the Triennial Convention of the B'nai B'rith at the Civic Opera House, Chicago, Ill., on March 30, on the subject Democracy and the Dignity of Man.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF HENRY MONSKY, PRESIDENT OF B'NAI B'RITH, IN INTRODUCING THE HON. HENRY A. WALLACE, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

B'nai B'rith meets in triennial convention—the culmination of almost a century of service. It has long recognized that the destiny of its people is one with those who seek to maintain human freedom. A harassed and menaced civilization today has made necessary as never before our reconsecration to the preservation of democratic values.

B'nai B'rith stands with the forces of righteousness, justice, and freedom against the forces of evil, violence, and tyranny—unhappily rampant in the chaotic world of today. Jewish opposition to dictatorship long antedated Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin. Centuries before language knew the terms "communism," "fascism," and "nazi-ism," the Jewish people were historically the champions of human liberty.

The Maccabees of old were the predecessors of Washington and Bolivar and of many of those great personalities who have produced the American tradition. To preserve that tradition, we in America are now building our military defenses which must be strong and unconquerable. This is no time for political partisanship, needless economic conflict, or gratification of personal ambitions.

There must be destroyed every vestige of hope by the dictators that this, the greatest democracy of all, may be vulnerable. The whole world now knows that back of our elected leaders stands a united people of free men and free women—determined to remain free, at whatever cost—a people which counts no sacrifice too dear and no service too great if freedom shall prevail.

The security of the Nation has become the paramount responsibility of every American worthy of the name. Whether we be called upon to protect that security by service in the armed forces, by the giving of our technical and professional talents, by the use of our material resources—it is our sacred responsibility to serve with a devotion born, not only of a fundamental loyalty to the welfare of the Nation but of an instinctive determination to keep inviolate the individual rights of free men—rights which are indispensable according to the American concept of life.

Conceived in the deep-rooted tradition of America and the American way and dedicated to the support of the institutions which have preserved that tradition, B'nai B'rith has faith in the future security and welfare of the Nation if the people who enjoy the privilege of our democracy will understand that service at this time and in this crisis is an unprecedented opportunity for meeting the challenge of the times.

This convention of B'nai B'rith proposes to contribute further to our national strength by stimulating a more profound sense of national solidarity. We shall meet, with courage and without defeatism, the present-day challenge to our civilization. Once again we pledge, on behalf of B'nai B'rith and American Jewry, of which it is a cross section, our determination to rise to the present high opportunity for national service.

It is therefore fitting to present to you one who exemplifies that spirit of national service—the Vice President of the United States.

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT WALLACE

It gives me an unusual pleasure to talk to B'nai B'rith, to the Sons of the Covenant, who for 98 years have stood for justice and tolerance regardless of race or religion. I am especially happy to talk through you to Latin America, because most of the countries of Latin America, just like the United States, are inhabited by races for whom the Nazis have the utmost contempt. We of the Americas, North, South, and Central, must band together to maintain the sacred essence of democracy and religion.

The central core of both democracy and religion is respect for the dignity of man. No doctrine of state or church is higher, broader, or deeper than that of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Whether it is the lawgiver speaking in the Pentateuch or Jesus in the Gospels or a defender of modern democracy, we find the essence of all successful statecraft and all religion in the wisdom of the ages: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind and with all thy strength. Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Any civilization, in order to endure, must recognize that every individual has placed in him or her a spark of the divine; we must respect the dignity of man, no matter whether he be Japanese or American, Scotch or German, English or Negro, Italian or Indian, Catholic, Jew, or Protestant. By custom and previous opportunity, the racial and religious groups are apparently greatly different. But by heredity, as distinguished from custom, they are astonishingly alike and are equally the sons of God. The most deadly of all sins is for a majority group to look down on, despise, and persecute a minority group.

Such a sin, which might well be called the sin against God, inevitably brings eventually a terrible penalty.

This evening I propose to speak very briefly on the importance of racial and religious minorities in a civilized democracy. As we ponder on this problem we begin to realise that God in his providence placed different racial and religious groups together in order to teach them tolerance and to awaken them to the infinite possibilities in man. If there were a nation pure in customs and blood it could not long endure as a progressive force in world affairs. The minorities are always needed either as a ferment or for other purposes. In England the Scotch and Welsh have always served a useful role. In Switzerland the French and Italians have lightened up the heavier German outlook. Somehow I can't help feeling that the Swiss experience in reconciling diverse races, languages, religious, and customs has in it a worthwhile lesson for the world of tomorrow.

The contribution of the Jewish group to many nations is too well known to be dwelt on at length. An Einstein in Germany, a Weizmann in England, a Bergson in France, and a Brandeis in the United States are a few of the many names which illustrate the contributions Jews have made working through the medium of various languages to serve the welfare of all mankind.

The Nazis rose to power largely by preaching hatred of the Jews. They propose to eliminate the Jews completely in all of Europe. The methods they have used in their efforts are unspeakable. I know that no person worthy of the name "American" will ever permit himself to take even the first step on that road of racial hatred, the road which carried the Nazis to power, and the road which will lead them to eventual ruin.

One of the most encouraging things to me about B'nai B'rith is the way in which it recognizes the necessity of the minority groups cooperating with the majority for the welfare of the whole. B'nai B'rith knows that no minority group is safe unless each believes and practices Americanism. B'nai B'rith is interested in Americanism and the protection of minorities through enlightened cooperation with the majority not only in the United States but also in a number of Latin-American republics. In some of these republics the Indians form a strong minority group, and in others the Negroes. When we consider that the Negro has been out of slavery for only about 80 years in the United States we are amazed at the contribution which has already been made to the arts and letters. As educational opportunity expands, I am convinced that the Negro contribution to the civilization of the New World will become increasingly important.

The Indians of the highlands of tropical America had an extraordinary civilization before the white man came. They are skilled with their hands and have an unusual sense of color. Above all, they are patient. The Indian element in Mexico has already made some unusual contributions to both the political and the artistic life. But we must remember that less than half of the Indians of tropical Latin America know how to read and write. Their educational and economic opportunities have been of the lowest. But now they are starting on their long trail to recapture the glories of their ancient civilizations and more, too. The Ambassador from Mexico to the United States in a speech at Springfield, Ill., last month, said: "Most of the people in our America have no land, no education, no sanitation, and little or no participation in government, but, thank heaven, they still have hope. Until that hope becomes a concrete reality, the unity and solidarity of the Americas will be merely apparent, a matter of official policy among the governments of this continent, without meaning for the masses below. The general ground of pan Americanism, in the face of world events, is today more than ever a common aspiration. The continental ideal—democracy. Not only formal and political democracy—a democracy of rights—but material and economic democracy, a democracy of duties, as well."

And then the Ambassador goes on to expand the theme which is very dear to my own heart, the doctrine that the political democracy of the nineteenth century, which was based on individual freedom, must be combined with the economic democracy of the twentieth century, which is based on social justice. These two types of democracy, one overly individual and the other perhaps too collective, must go along side by side under the limitations imposed by constitutional democracy. The emphasis of constitutional democracy, which I trust will embrace the whole hemisphere, must be on education and toleration. We must not allow a Gestapo or Cheka to get a foothold anywhere in this hemisphere. We must remember that if England loses, the Nazi scheme of things will, unless proper safeguards are taken, come in control within less than a year in certain of the Latin-American republics. It must be remembered that when Nazi control takes place no one at any time or any place is safe against imprisonment, degradation, torture, and death. Therefore we in all of the Americas will keep our political democracy bright and shining. As Bolivar, the great liberator, said in South America more than a hundred years ago, "More than anyone else, I hope to see formed in America the greatest nation in the world—not so much because of its size and resources, but much more because of its liberty and glory."

Yes; we believe in the dignity of man, the freedom of the individual. But we also believe in economic democracy, in social justice, and in education. In preaching social justice, we must also lay equal emphasis on social duties. Nothing is more dangerous to democracy than the unbridled passion of the ignorant mob led by an unprincipled demagogue. But equally dangerous are pressure groups, economic minorities who try to loot the Federal Treasury or get an unfair grant of governmental power for their own selfish purposes. Most demagogues and "plutogogues" appeal to the sacred name of social justice and in so doing defile it. On this subject, Bolivar spoke with insight when he said: "As long as we remain undisciplined, we are not able to be free, no matter what form of government we may desire."

In the name of efficient constitutional democracy, which in my opinion embraces both political and economic democracy, we must train the next generation to be not only tolerant of the racial and religious minorities but to rejoice in them. To those nations which best learn the art of reconciling minority differences will belong the future of the world. There is nothing so constructive or of more profound significance than that of bringing out the best which is in men of different backgrounds. The differences between men are a strength, not a weakness, to a nation, provided these differences are properly developed. I am sure that B'nai B'rith, when it erected at Philadelphia 65 years ago its statue to religious freedom, had this in mind.

And now in closing I wish to leave in your minds the name of a fourth kind of democracy, which I believe will gradually become more important in this hemisphere—genetic democracy. By genetic democracy, I mean the doctrine that no racial or religious group should be looked on as inferior because of its heredity. A race may be inferior for many years because of lack of education, lack of proper food, lack of economic opportunity, lack of knowledge of customs which are handed down from mother to son; but those inferiorities need not last forever. True it is, they cannot be changed too rapidly without the danger of ignorant clamoring for the impossible and, therefore, the destruction of political, economic, and constitutional democracy. But I do say to the minority groups of this hemisphere that there is such a thing as genetic democracy and its importance will gradually grow in the consciousness of the men of the New World. It must be said, however, that the Nazis hate the doctrine of genetic democracy above everything else. They believe all races but their own to be genetically inferior. They believe all other racial and religious groups should be enslaved. One of the strong reasons why all of us in the New World believe so strongly in hemispheric solidarity for defense purposes is because we know the Nazis look on most of us as belonging to what they call an inferior race.

Nazi-ism is partly religion, partly biology, and partly a doctrine of militaristic imperialism combined with precise economic warfare. With fanatical drive, nazi-ism is endeavoring to dominate the world. Hitler told Rauschning that one of the main objects of his policy was to conquer America. I quote: "We are already training picked young men for it, to whom the rotten Yankees will have nothing to oppose. Our youth will accomplish the task Washington was incapable of performing and which a corrupt democracy has completely neglected."

The cost of the Nazi terrorism in terms of suffering to Europe is great beyond measurement, but we in the New World owe a great debt of gratitude to the Nazis for forcing us to make clear our thinking about the meaning of democracy and the part which racial and religious groups must contribute if democracy is to be worthy of its name. B'nai B'rith, I know, has caught this vision and will work for it wholeheartedly in all of the hemisphere. The New World is a chosen land, not for the Jew or the German or the Anglo-Saxon or the Spaniard or any other one people. The New World is a chosen land in which all of us tolerantly living together can allow the dignity of man to be expressed free from the compulsions of the Old World but with that sense of duty which is necessary to preserve that which is precious beyond life itself—an efficient yet tolerant constitutional democracy free from the Gestapo and a greedy ruling class.

In the America of the future, hemispheric solidarity for defense will be, I trust, the spirit which will continue to animate the 21 republics and Canada. That which we will unitedly defend was well expressed by Morelos on the 14th of September 1813, in Mexico, when he laid down as a part of his 23 points which should be used in the Mexican constitution the following: "That slavery should be forever prohibited; that there should be no distinction between races or economic groups; that there should be less of both poverty and wealth, and that the only distinction between Americans should be that based on their vice or virtue."

And so I call upon you tonight, ladies and gentlemen of the B'nai B'rith, to keep burning within your hearts, like the Everlasting Light, the fire of love for our American land; upon the doorposts of the Nation let there be set up the indelible seal of the God who molds the character and destiny of nations, and within whose sustaining providence alone lies the peace, the happiness, and the security of all peoples; all the while I urge you to remain unyielding and unflinching in your loyalty to the ever-living principles of your faith, until life about us reflects these truths, strong in our hope that the day will come, as indeed it must come, when in the words of the immortal prophet Isaiah, "They shall not hurt nor destroy in all mine holy mountain, for the earth will be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea!"

Conservation of Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 31), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address which I delivered yesterday evening at Pittsburgh, Pa., before the Seventeenth Annual Regional Safety Engineering Conference and Exhibit of the Western Pennsylvania Safety Council. The subject of the address is Our Job—Conservation of Manpower.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Your Honor, the Mayor, distinguished guests, and my friends of the Western Pennsylvania Safety Council, it is a distinct honor to be your speaker today, during this national-defense session of your conference. I come from Washington, the vortex of the political, economic, and social currents, to discuss with you the age-old question: Conservation of manpower; or, putting it another way, How can we save man?

I said it was an old question, because I believe that our common interest in safety and our common concern with the welfare of man is as old as civilization itself. The problem of conserving manpower originated even before man began to associate with other men in groups. But it became increasingly a problem of group concern when the collective security of the group was involved.

And so today, though we are discussing a problem which is as old as mankind itself, we are also discussing a problem which is completely new. I say it is new because the pace of our daily life and the tempo of our industrial activity have created a tremendous and almost unbridled machinery for creating unprecedented havoc, if it cannot be controlled. Five thousand dead in each of the months of January and February 1940. At that rate, 60,000 a year. That's more than Britain has lost in dead and wounded in a year.

I do not expect to discuss the conservation of manpower from a technical standpoint. Each of you here today is a member of the Western Pennsylvania Safety Council, and you are affiliated with the American Society of Safety Engineers. Each of you is a technician and a specialist. Men like your chairman, Ross Leffler, and men like your presiding officer, Mr. E. E. Moore, are much better equipped than I am to discuss the technical phases of conserving our manpower.

As a matter of fact, in a world which is on fire—in a world dedicated to destruction; in a world of hatred and strife; in a world of pillage and privation; in a world of conquest and carnage—it seems almost ironic to discuss the conservation of manpower.

But if there is any place in the world where the conservation of manpower might be discussed with validity, it is still in this land of ours—our beloved America. We are still a republic, and our manpower cannot be ruthlessly slaughtered at the whim of any power-drunk dictator. Our world in America, thank God, is not a world of hatred, slavery, and war.

It is my abiding conviction that the highest obligation of any program dedicated to the conservation of manpower must be the obligation of an insistence that our men will never be sent forth to be slain in any war of conquest. I do not like to prophesy, and I do not believe in making predictions, but I believe we must accept as an inviolate part of the future of the United States the traditional idea that this people will never embark on any war of conquest.

I say this because I believe that the problem of conserving manpower is inextricably interwoven with our ideals and with our concept of morality—individual morality and governmental morality.

I do not know what lies ahead for the United States in this war-torn world, but I do believe that whatever happens, when this people is summoned before the last great eternal Bar of Justice—whatever destruction may have been our lot—no indictment will be written against our purpose, no charge will be leveled against our concepts of morality.

I think that we cannot disassociate morality with the conservation of manpower. The question of occupational diseases is a question that is closely correlated with morality. In an age when industrial morality was at a low ebb and inhuman sweatshop conditions prevailed, occupational diseases were infinitely more common than they are today. This was a problem in light, and sanitation, and good working conditions, but above all it was a problem in morality.

When a reckless and intoxicated driver kills a pedestrian through his criminal negligence, that is a problem involving timing, speed, and brakes, but again it is primarily a problem of morality.

When any grafting city administration embarks on a construction program of jerry-built sewers and sanitation facilities, epidemics naturally follow. That is a technical problem involving drainage and bacteria, but again it is a problem in morality—this time civic morality.

Any phase of safety activity, which you can name involves its technical problems, but it is equally true that each of these phases involves a problem in morality—a problem in social and safety consciousness, a social and psychological integrity, and a mental stability.

And so, in brief, the principal theme of my discussion with you, today, is the idea that the greatest single factor in effecting a conservation of man-power is the level of safety consciousness and social morality, which we may be able to establish.

Your group, the Western Pennsylvania Safety Council, is affiliated with the National Safety Council. I have the highest regard for the work, which this organization has done in the field of safety engineering. The story of the National Safety Council is almost the story of the safety movement itself.

The story of the national council and of your group is an amazing and almost unparalleled story of growth and achievement, emerging from the darkness of ignorance as an organized movement, to capture the imagination of the entire country. Your story is a remarkable story of social integration—the integration of industry, of education, of government, and of private organizations. Your story is the story linked with the broad advances of economic welfare. Your story is one of superior technique and better-trained personnel and a humanitarian social concept, progressively decreasing the accidental death and injury rates.

The first cooperative safety congress, which I can recall, was held in my own State in Milwaukee in 1912. It was attended by a small group of industrialists, public officials, railroad men, engineers, and insurance company officials. These men were conscious of the extent, to which accidents were taking a toll upon American industry.

This little group meeting in Milwaukee, Wis., in 1912 was, in a sense, the nucleus of a program to stop industrial accidents. It was this group which conceived the idea of a national cooperative organization to study accident causes. It was this group which later instigated an active program of accident prevention.

It was fully a year later in New York that the National Safety Council was formed. This council took a leading role in the safety movement in America. It is my understanding that it is a nonprofit, nonpartisan, and nonsectarian organization. I understand that its sole purpose is the conservation of human life.

There are few objectives for any organization which can be more worth while than this, and I believe that the objective becomes even more worth while and even more inspiring when we link that conservation of human life to the problem of lifting the moral level.

We have behind us now more than two decades of experimentation and systematic organized planning to eliminate industrial accidents. These decades have left, as a heritage an outstanding record, though today we are still a long way from the goals which we seek. Your organization and the National Safety Council have become great clearing houses of information on accident causes in almost every field, and similarly your group has become a storehouse of valuable information on the successful and proven methods of accident prevention.

Under the leadership of groups like these the safety movement has been instrumental in saving hundreds of thousands of lives. Your constructive public-safety work has met with outstanding results largely because you have relied upon an integrated program of cooperation. No group can accomplish the objectives of the safety movement alone. Your group has wisely demonstrated the idea of cooperating with many forces—municipalities, civic movements, etc.—in a crusade to conserve manpower.

Since that first safety congress in 1912 in Milwaukee, your movement has grown steadily. I can recall that when Herbert Hoover was Secretary of Commerce he called together the first national conference on street and highway safety in 1924. That national conference, in a sense, marked a milestone in our disheartening record of traffic fatalities. Similar movements in industrial safety have altered our traditional concepts of industrial hazards.

Today accidents are no longer regarded as inevitable. Today we recognize, both from an economic standpoint and from the standpoint of humanitarianism, the absolute necessity for reducing the toll on our manpower.

Mr. Chairman, I notice on your program that this morning session of your conference is designated as the national-defense session.

In my judgment, there are two phases to the conservation of manpower in our national-defense program. One is the technical phase as directed by experts and technicians. The second is a broader phase involving a great many elements and evolving not so much from a technical direction as from the pattern of social consciousness which we create.

Let us speak first very briefly of the technical phase of conserving manpower in national-defense activities. On July 28, 1940, eight outstanding industrial safety experts were appointed by the Secretary of Labor to safeguard the productive manpower of those men in our Nation engaged in defense activities.

This program of activities is a plan designed to prevent the injury or death of skilled workers and to eliminate the loss of worktime, through sickness, accident, and industrial hazards.

The entire program is placed on a voluntary basis, and is designated as the National Committee for the Conservation of Manpower in Defense Industry.

As the United States Department of Labor has pointed out, national defense is the job of the century—a 50,000,000-manpower task.

There is no denying also, as the Labor Department has pointed out, that the manpower of America stands guard over the national security of America, and that that manpower cannot be measured by census figures alone.

It is undeniable, that in order to have an effectual national defense, we must conserve our manpower. It is obvious, that every industrial worker can be utilized in our defense program. There must be no waste of American manpower, through industrial accidents and diseases. Such a waste is always an appalling tragedy, and in times like these—a national calamity.

During 1939, more than a million and a half people, were seriously injured and more than 16,000 men and women were killed. In 1939, accidents and disease meant the loss of a billion and a half man-hours of production. The loss of that much time during this crucial defense period might be fatal.

We cannot afford to repeat the costly experience of the World War, when the increased need for defense orders created an ever-increasing accident toll. If we are to maintain and increase our industrial output, we must have safe working conditions, which will safeguard our manpower.

We talk about industrial priorities, of strategic and essential materials. The most essential material in the Nation is industrial manpower. It is a potent factor in preparedness. Anything which destroys American manpower or interferes with the work-hours of American manpower is a menace to national defense. All of this means that there is today a need for extraordinary precaution to conserve our industrial manpower.

I agree wholeheartedly with the objectives of the national committee. I believe their work offers almost limitless possibilities, and from the outstanding caliber of their personnel, I am convinced that they will do a splendid job.

This committee will be concerned largely with the technical phase of safety work. Let us briefly consider a second and less technical phase of the conservation of manpower.

I am referring now to the fact that this national committee was organized on a voluntary basis. That, to me, is a very heartening sign. One of the saddest lessons of this age is the lesson, that, as a rule, few individuals or groups have been successful in retaining freedom without discipline.

Sometimes that discipline is arbitrarily imposed by government. Sometimes that discipline is intelligently applied by government on the basis of mutual cooperation and helpfulness with the individual and the groups concerned. Sometimes the discipline is entirely applied from within, and this, of course, eliminates the necessity for any governmental control. And sometimes discipline comes from without, causing an awakening.

The problem of freedom for the individual and freedom for the group is closely identified with the safety problem. I do not believe in arbitrary government control of the individual or the group, except as an absolutely necessary last resort. I prefer to see governmental control voluntarily applied on a cooperative basis with the individual and the group; or, even better, I prefer to see individual or group discipline, which is so effective that it eliminates the need for any governmental control.

This last type of discipline, of course, is possible only to a very limited degree. The cooperative type of governmental control, however, is entirely feasible and is infinitely preferable to any type of arbitrary governmental control, however commendable its objectives may be.

As far as I know, the greatest achievements in safety have resulted from the organized efforts of comparatively small groups cooperating with government rather than by arbitrary governmental controls alone. In other words, the greatest advances in safety have resulted from intelligent self-discipline rather than arbitrary governmental control.

No safety record can ever be established solely on the basis of penalties. Such a basis is to a certain degree a bad psychological basis, because it sets up an antagonism. It is a negative approach at best. I believe it is a negative approach at best. program we assert some positive factor, some constructive objective accompanied by social approval, rather than continually pointing to something to be avoided on pain of penalty.

Society itself is an engrossing psychological laboratory, and it is a laboratory in which we may study the unstable mentalities and temperaments, the exaggerated or depressed personalities, the neurotic tendencies, the hyperspeed urges, the mental fatigue—all factors in creating hazardous conditions.

It appears to me that one of the most significant contributions which we can make to safety is to create a better mental attitude in our people, a happier frame of mind, a more secure society, and a more certain social order. I shall refer to this later.

It is our job to bring security to the staccato tempo of the times. It is our job to bring our living up to the pace of our inventive genius. Our job is to bring our mental approach up to the standards of our physical welfare. Our job is to learn how to interpret the advances we have made in our physical welfare.

Progress is a complex business, frequently accompanied by some hazard, because usually the pattern of our conduct is not formed as rapidly as the pattern of our material progress.

I like to believe that ultimately we will be able to lift the level of our ability to live together. I like to believe that ultimately we will be able to utilize our material advances in such a way that our mental and spiritual beings will also be able to advance correspondingly in a program of intelligent and worth-while use of our leisure.

It serves no purpose to speed up production, to annihilate delay, and then—to kill time. By an intelligent use of our leisure time we can do much to eliminate the neurotic, and we can do much to eliminate fatigue in our daily life.

Our problem in a fast-moving machine age, tuned to a machine-gun tempo, is to eliminate some of the hazards which accompany a so-called advanced civilization.

I would like to emphasize that the problem of conserving manpower is a problem closely connected with human ideals, human hopes, and human aspirations. If we are to fight a war, let it be first of all a war against the carnage of peacetime destruction, against the pillage of accidents.

Above all, if we are to increase the pace of our living, let us retain an approach to life which is free from hysteria. Let us seek to demonstrate a mental equilibrium in our lives.

Mr. Chairman, we have talked about conservation of manpower in its narrow sense. Let us, for a few moments, speak of the conservation of manpower within our Nation in the larger sense. In other words, let us think about conservation of America.

You and I know there are two ways for us in America to spend or lose our freedoms—our American values of life, home and property, and liberty and pursuit of the American way.

We can become so weak defensively, that we can go the way of Poland, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Norway, Holland and France, by not preparing against the totalitarian onslaught. But we are preparing in that direction—we are spending billions.

In the last 3 months we have appropriated in Congress sixteen and a half billion dollars. Speaking in Philadelphia recently I stated that fact to a group at luncheon. It made no impression. The mayor of Philadelphia was there and I turned to him and said "What is the assessment of your city?" He said, "About $2,000,000,000." I then said, "In the last 90 days we have appropriated money equivalent to 8 Philadelphias."

My own State has an assessed valuation of something over four billion one hundred million. In the last 90 days we have appropriated the equivalent of four Wisconsins.

That brings me to the second way that we cannot conserve the manpower and values of our Nation. We can keep on muddling our affairs, closing our eyes to realities and creating a condition during or after the present world crisis that would result in our dropping into the financial, social, and political abyss.

I remember when I was a lad attending the public schools that we had a certain school reader. In it was a graphic portrayal of a man who sailed carelessly with the current down Niagara River. Men on shore called out to him, telling him about the falls and telling him to row to the shore, but he paid no attention. He said he had enough time—he would sail along with the current.

I have forgotten the name of the school reader, I have forgotten the name of the author of the article, but I have not forgotten how the tale ended. When the canoeist, in a careless and lackadaisical manner, awoke to the reality of the situation, it was too late; the falls were right below him. He turned with his paddle and attempted to make for the shore, but the swift current carried him over the Niagara into the foaming abyss below.

How can we conserve the Nation? By doing the following:

Insist that Congress pass a realistic tax program that will at least take care of the overhead of government.

In the last 8 years we have run behind about three and a half billion dollars a year. If we keep on appropriating money like we have in the last 3 months, we will run behind twenty billion or more this year.

Second, we can insist that our business managers in Washington cut down on nondefense items.

Third. We can insist that the President require collateral security for the property and credits that he extends to Britain.

Fourth We can insist that the people get value received for the money that they are spending on this defense program.

Gentlemen, when you conserve this Nation intact with its freedoms, its right of property, the right of the individual to sell his labor and collect his wages, you are conserving the power of man.

Basically, if we are to conserve manpower, it will be necessary to conserve the power of man—the constitutional powers of the individual in America.

Mr. Chairman, our human theories, our human wisdom is inadequate for this hour.

We feel, most of us, about the national and international situation as Bobby Burns felt. Did you ever hear the story? Well, here it is—Bobby Burns and the bishop.

Bobby Burns was searching for the answers that we all desire.

Now we are looking out upon this troubled America of ours and we want some answers also.

Here are some of the questions or problems:

How is America to stop strikes in our national-defense work?

How are we to achieve national security and total defense in this war-torn world?

While some folks are willing to die for America, how are we to stop the saboteurs; how are we to stop the exploiters of our national emergency for their selfish ends—the grafter, the chiseler, the pay-roll padders, the profiteers?

Let us, men of America, have unity, loyalty, and selflessness.

Let us, men of America, get rid of greed, dishonesty, graft, and let us get rid of the saboteurs, the fifth columnists, the alien in our midst who is abusing his hospitality.

Hitler said America will destroy itself. We know now what he meant. We have seen how he weakened other countries. He thought that the grafter, the racketeer, the chiseler, the shirker, the men of corruption—men who create class hatred, class "isms," class war—could take over this land.

Are we going to prove that he is mistaken?

Yes; the battleground is here in America. Ignorance, disease, injustice, poverty, hate, disloyalty must go.

Unity, justice, loyalty, security must be wrought out by the men of America for the people of America.

Inter-American Cooperation Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 31), 1941

STATEMENT BY DR. JOSEPH TENENBAUM

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Dr. Joseph Tenenbaum, executive chairman of the committee for inter-American cooperation, which sets forth the aim of Inter-American Cooperation Week.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The good neighbor as defined by President Roosevelt in his initial inaugural address is one who "resolutely respects himself, and because he does so respects the rights of others." This common-sense note has become, ever since, the keystone of our inter-American policy. The principle of collective responsibility as well as collective security has become the cornerstone of all pan-American pronouncements as well as all the acts of the incumbent administration.

A campaign through education can do much to create the basis of mutual understanding and cooperation, which is essential among neighbors who desire to live in peace. It is doubly important today when the peace and security of this country is dependent upon the peace and security of any and all of the 20 Latin American republics and when United States defense means no more and no less than an American defense. This means not only common bases and exchange of military information or pooling of military resources, not only shipment of capital and the dispatching of capital ships, but capital understanding of each other's problems. It implies not only unification of material goods but unity of the spirit as well.

The aim of inter-American cooperation week is to focus attention on this problem by emphasizing the common interests, strengthening the feeling of friendship and mutual respect, fostering the cultural and political ties, cultivating genuine understanding, and awakening us to the need of joint economic solidarity and mutual social security between the peoples of the Americas.

"Our Country, Right or Wrong"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 31), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK DAILY NEWS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Country, Right or Wrong," by the pen of Capt. Joe Patterson, editor and publisher of the New York Daily News of New York City.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Daily News]

"OUR COUNTRY, RIGHT OR WRONG"

We're expecting pretty soon to feel impelled to restore to our editorial masthead the Stephen Decatur toast which has bannered this column off and on for a long time: "Our country! In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong."

There is nothing wrong with the George Washington slogan which we are currently carrying. It is simply that the Decatur toast is more appropriate for a time of war; and we are now about as close to the European war as we could be without being actually in it.

Commodore Decatur was eminently qualified to propose this toast, at a dinner in Norfolk, Va., in April 1816. His life exemplified his words. And it so happens that the big episodes of Decatur's life had to do with places whose names have been prominent in some of the hottest of recent war news.

In 1553 the Turks took Tripoli from the Christian Knights of St. John; and shortly thereafter the Tripolitanian Turks went completely piratical. For centuries they preyed on Mediterranean shipping of all nations. Europe never could compose its own internal discords sufficiently to send a big joint expeditionary force with instructions to stay on the job till the Barbary pirates were wiped out.

The United States paid blackmail to the Barbary pirates from 1796 to 1801, at a rate of about $83,000 a year. In May 1801 Tripoli's pasha tried to jack up the price, and our Government refused. We sent some Navy ships to the Mediterranean to blockade Tripoli.

This adventure turned into a 4-year naval war; and it was in this war that Stephen Decatur, commanding the U. S. S. *Enterprise*, won most of his fame. His greatest single exploit was the leading of a successful sortie into Tripoli Harbor to burn the United States frigate *Philadelphia*, which the pirates had captured.

In this same war, a small American expeditionary force, starting at Alexandria, covered a lot of territory recently traveled by General Wavell's Army of the Nile, and wound up by capturing Derna—taken by Wavell's men January 30, 1941.

Barbary piracy took its deathblow from Decatur and his comrades, though it flickered along weakly until 1830, when the French finally knocked it in the head.

Decatur rounded out his career by figuring gallantly as commodore commanding the New York Harbor squadron in the War of 1812; leading our last expedition against the Barbary pirates in 1815; and getting himself killed at 41 in a duel with a suspended United States Navy commodore, James Barron, whose reinstatement Decatur opposed.

His "Our country, right or wrong" has been a rallying cry for nationalists ever since Decatur uttered it. It has also been as a red rag to a bull to internationalists, pacifists, and kindred serious thinkers.

IN PEACE AND WAR

In wartime, we cannot see how a people which hopes to win can follow any other principle. France is the most recent illustration of what happens to a disunited people when the drums begin to roll.

About peacetime and the "our country" principle, there is some room for argument.

Internationalists had high hopes that after the first World War the League of Nations could be built up into a world-governing body which could produce permanent peace. The same school of thought now hopes that after this war some benevolent combination of nations, armed with enough planes, battleships, and soldiers to keep everybody else under control, can enforce world peace for centuries to come.

We have grave doubts. The only example in history of such a thing is the old Roman Empire—and its ruling clique rolled up records for corruption and general rottenness which have yet to be surpassed. As soon as Rome's rulers began to lose their grip, nationalisms and desires for independence began to crop up all over the Empire.

So we don't know but what "Our country, right or wrong" is as good a policy for a people to follow in peace as in war.

United States Savings Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 31), 1941

ARTICLE BY HUGH S. JOHNSON

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD column by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson, published under the title of "One Man's Opinion" daily in the Washington News. This is a very interesting article relating to investment opportunities.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

A prospectus for an investment security—as neat a bit of selling argument as any I have ever seen after several years' close experience with such literature—came to my desk yesterday. It was signed Henry Morgenthau, Jr., and is issued by the United States Treasury. It tells all about United States savings bonds and is complete with a self-addressed order blank. All you have to do is sign, enclose a check, seal, and mail.

These bonds aren't new; they were first tried in 1935. The attractive blurb says, "Already they have become the most widely held single security in America." They are said to be for "small investors." Corporations and business associations can't have them, but any individual can buy $10,000 worth or less, down to $18.75, of any 1 year's issue—which is not so small in my book.

They don't render much income—and the tract doesn't say they do. In barnyard figuring it is 1½ percent per annum, but $18.75 invested now will be $25, 10 years from now, which is a gain of $6.25, and, while the following isn't the way bankers figure interest, that roughly is 3⅓ percent per annum on your $18.75. That is so because interest on your $18.75 is not paid to you. It is compounded semiannually. There are not many gilt-edge investments available so flexible as to figure so high a rate.

If you don't need the income in the meantime and can afford to put these securities in the box and forget about them—or let the Government hold them for you—while it is theoretically a low rate of interest, it is practically as good as you can get, considering all the other advantages of this remarkably flexible security—the income from which, by the way, is exempt from State and local taxes to the extent of other United States bonds.

The danger of buying the average long-term fixed-income bond in a market threatened with inflation is that the buying power of the small, fixed income may go down tragically as the cost of living rises, and with it will go down the price of the bond. You can then escape far greater loss only by selling at much less than you paid. Not many bonds could offer you an escape from this, but these Treasury bonds do. The Government will redeem them at any time for what you paid for them plus interest, after 1 year, at 1⅓ percent, or, if the redemption is after 7½ years, at interest of 2⅔ percent for the later years. That is as good a protection against inflation as you could have in a bond. Since few strong banks pay as much on deposits, these bonds are a lot better than leaving the money in a bank.

There are some other attractive features. You can use the bonds to purchase a kind of annuity on an installment plan. For example, if you invest $75 a month in these bonds for 10 years and don't redeem, you are entitled to $100 a month for the next 10 years. Your $8,000 investment over 20 years at $75 a month becomes $12,000, or increases 50 percent in 20 years. Lesser monthly investments return the same percentages of benefit. The actuarial calculation of the interest rate in this is too complex to discuss here, but it is a good, sound deal backed by the credit of the United States.

There are many variations and differing options on this and other features of these bonds that make excellent insurance against old age or provision for the future education of children or care of invalids. They can be registered in the name of two people to be the property of the survivor, and thus become a modified kind of insurance policy—probably free from death duties, although this is not certain.

It isn't the business of any column to turn itself into an investment sales-plugging advertisment, but I had never studied these bonds before and their ingenuity fascinated me. There are two good reasons why this column is perfectly kosher on this score. One is that the security here is the Nation. The other is that this is part of the Government's war-financing plan—a vital element of national defense. In the protection which these bonds offer the investor, they are far better than any Liberty Loan, War Savings Stamp, or other financing of World War No. I.

The best recommendation I can write for them is that I am going to buy as many as, under their income restriction, I can prudently afford myself, and so are some of my friends.

Joint Resolution To Define American Intentions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, millions of people around the earth are being misled to believe that America is guided by improper and ulterior motives in respect to international relations and that our part in the world drama is motivated by mean and sordid objectives. Public opinion, though throttled in many lands, is still the most potent factor in the world, and it will be damaging to American prestige and influence to allow these reports to go unchallenged. The Congress and the President jointly comprise the authority that is best qualified to interpret the heart and soul of America, and in order to dispel the false impressions created by propaganda and to make American purpose crystal clear to all of the people of the world I am introducing a joint resolution defining American intentions; and I ask unanimous consent of the House that the full text of this resolution may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I believe it is a sensible and timely resolution and that it should be adopted to clarify American intentions in these trying times.

The resolution is as follows:

Joint resolution to define American intentions in respect to international relations

Whereas propaganda actively in circulation throughout the world is placing the United States of America in the false light of expecting territorial advantage and world dominion as a result of the aid it is extending to the democracies, some of these reports going so far as to allege that it is the aim of the United States to build a world empire on the ruins of the nations now at war: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the United States of America covets no territory it does not possess; it has no plans to extend its territorial domain and no intention of acquiring a single foot of foreign soil by war or conquest; it has no selfish interest in world affairs and no aim but service to humanity; and its supreme and only purpose is to protect, safeguard, and defend the great freedoms which are the basis of the American democracy and of free democratic government everywhere.

Labor Troubles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 31), 1941

ARTICLE BY ERNEST K. LINDLEY

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting article by Ernest K. Lindley appearing in this morning's Washington Post entitled "Sharing the Blame."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of April 2, 1941]

SHARING THE BLAME

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

WISE ADVICE ON LABOR TROUBLES

A temperate but devastating report on the Little Steel strike of 1937 has just been issued by the Senate Civil Liberties Committee. These were the strikes in the plants of Bethlehem Steel, Republic Steel, and the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. (A fourth, in Inland Steel, was settled.) Their cause was the refusal of the companies "to enter into contractual relations with collective-bargaining organizations of their employees," to quote the Senate committee's report.

More than 3 years have passed. But employer-employee relationships in these companies are still "strained" and without adequate collective-bargaining arrangements, the committee adds.

This has a direct bearing on the present defense-strike problem. Many of these strikes, actual or threatening, are in the plants of companies with strong antiunion records. Some have been outstanding violators of the National Labor Relations Act.

Here are some plain and wise words from the Senate committee: "Certain it is that the Nation cannot permit these companies today to take the same attitude they took in 1937 with the same inevitable consequences of interrupted production. Any company which today stands up and flatly refuses to enter into a signed bargaining contract under all circumstances and any employer association which supports and assists it in such a position are endangering the national security. Such conduct not only threatens the vital continuity of production, but it challenges the Nation's domestic authority, weakens respect of labor for the national defense, and destroys the sense of unity and common effort."

One might add that any official of the Federal Government who supports that position is likewise "endangering the national security." There are disquieting signs that some Federal officials connected with the Office of Production Management and the War and Navy Departments do not realize this.

Labor is in a dangerous situation. For that, the short-sightedness of its own leaders is largely to blame. Every poll, every day's mail to Congress shows that the Nation is going to insist that there be an end to strikes in defense industries.

The A. F. of L. leadership has at last waked up enough to begin to try to do something about curbing excessive union initiation fees. Some of the more level-headed C. I. O. leaders quietly have been trying to purge Communists and Communist sympathizers from positions of influence.

But the blame for strikes does not lie wholly with labor. It lies with what the Senate Civil Liberties Committee calls "the conduct of labor relations by management * * * according to antiquated concepts of industrial absolutism."

Bethlehem Steel is a notorious example. In World War I, Bethlehem refused to apply an award of the War Labor Board, headed by former President Taft and Frank P. Walsh. It rejected the War Labor Board's suggestion that it organize a shop-committee system of employee representation.

Mr. Taft was an extremely conservative man. But the stubbornness of Eugene Grace, president of Bethlehem, led him to say:

"This situation is very painful to me, for the reason that what we wish to do is to secure what under our award these workers are entitled to have, and it is very difficult for me to escape the conclusion that the conduct of the company in this matter, the correspondence that has been adduced, the dealings with Mr. Grace, the action by the Board in attempting to help Mr. Grace, and the present attitude * * * color the situation with a sense of injustice that makes one yearn for judicial power to compel justice."

The War Labor Board did not have the power to compel justice. The National Labor Relations Board, established in 1935, is supposed to have it, with the help of the Federal circuit courts. But Bethlehem Steel has not yet been made to conform to the law. A key case involving Bethlehem is still before the District of Columbia Court of Appeals. This case grew out of the Little Steel strike of 1937. It was decided by the N. L. R. B. in 1939.

A prompter method must be found to adjudicate cases involving refusal to bargain collectively. This is recommended by the Senate committee, which suggests that the N. L. R. B. confine itself to salient issues. This might help. But it does not dispose of the big test cases in which the N. L. R. B. has already reached its decisions—in many cases, long ago. They are mired in the courts, usually being fought to the last technicality by the companies found to be violators.

Unless it can compel big employers to obey the law, the Federal Government cannot expect labor to forego its indisputable right to quit work—a right of which it probably cannot be deprived by any constitutional means.

Squeezing the Farmer—Possible Relief

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1941

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the American farmers are in grave danger of being ruinously "squeezed" in the confusions and changes which have been wrought by the wars in other parts of the world, and by the new economic stresses and strains which have been brought about by the hasty—almost hysterical—efforts in the building of our own national defense.

Foreign markets, formerly served by the farmers of the United States, have disappeared and will not exist again in several generations—if ever.

New and vastly heavier taxes face the farmers and there will be no escape from this burdensome taxation, either now or later.

New competition has been created in the labor market which the farmer must meet—and he can meet that competition only by increasing the pay for farm work—and that means increased costs of production. Even then the shorter hours, the overtime, and the excitements of mass work on defense are all conspiring to draw help away from the farms and to the cities, the factories, and the cantonments.

Disparity of prices is growing. The administration promised that the profiteering of 1918 would not be given a chance to repeat, but the newspapers already are noting cases of profiteering, and the administration will be compelled to establish some sort of price controls, because the strong leadership, the effective appeals to public opinion against profiteering have not been in evidence. Of course, rising wages and shortened hours must of necessity increase the cost of production of all those goods and services the farmers must buy. These price rises, coupled with increased cost of labor, the draining off of the most skilled and intelligent farm labor to the factories, the cities, other lines of work, or by the draft into the Army, are all operating to squeeze the farmer. He must get more money for his products; he must look ahead to the time when the national defense has been built and factories go idle; when millions of people may begin again to walk the streets and the highways looking vainly for work, as other millions of soldiers are demobilized from the Army—when the war is over—to compete with jobless civilians in seeking work in a confused and chaotic economic situation.

Because of these grave dangers which now confront the farmers of America, and because the present administration has not, as yet, at least, shown any disposition to do anything more than prepare to apply a few palliatives, the Republican Agricultural Study Committee, which last year held hearings in various parts of the Nation, will resume its work. This committee, under the chairmanship of Representative CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas, ranking Republican member of the House standing Agricultural Committee, has been augmented by the appointment of several new members who came to Congress in the last election. These new members also have special knowledge of farm problems. The enlarged committee will be split up into subcommittees which will study problems confronting different branches of agriculture. The study committee will again hold hearings in various parts of the country from time to time in order to get first-hand "grass roots" information from the farmers themselves. Undoubtedly some of these meetings will be held in Michigan and adjoining States.

The divisions of study which the committee will pursue through its subcommittees are as follows:

Dairying; poultry, eggs; livestock, meats, and so forth; wheat; corn and hogs; potatoes; vegetables and canning industries; wool, cotton, and other southern crops, competition, and so forth; fruits; sugar; farm chemurgy; soil conservation; irrigation; foreign markets; reciprocal trade treaties and their effects; dumping; barter; marketing; production costs; processing, and so forth; tobacco; farm credits; use and effects of food stamps; surplus commodities sales; effects of hemispheric defense and loans on American agriculture.

Fifty-four Republican Members of the House, the speaker among them, will make up the committee. It is believed that the committee will be able to get under way with its studies within the next 3 weeks and continue throughout the sessions of this Congress.

There is no question but what these intensive studies which will be made by this special committee will be of great assistance to the whole Congress in shaping legislation to protect American farmers from these dangers which are rapidly rising to menace the future of agriculture in the United States.

Every competent student of affairs now recognizes that the Nation has been taken into a new and unpredictable era by the administration. No man can foresee future events, but it is imperative that we prepare for all the dangers which can be foreseen and then try to meet the new and unforeseen ones as they arise.

American agriculture must be preserved if free America is to stand.

Going the Extra Mile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1941

ADDRESS BY DR. WILLIAM P. JACOBS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following address which was delivered in the Senate dining room of the Capitol by Dr. William P. Jacobs on the evening of March 27, 1941:

This topic Going the Extra Mile is selected for discussion this evening because it presents a thought which is of utmost importance in our present emergency.

The Golden Rule, long accepted as sound public and private policy, says: "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye

also unto them." Our theme tonight is a sort of streamlined version of the Golden Rule which, in practice, acts as a clincher and positively assures the success of an unselfish policy. It precludes the slightest tinge of selfishness, for through it we go "all out" for the other fellow: "Whosoever shall compel thee to go with him a mile, go with him twain."

In a "gadget blessed" Nation we are fast becoming "softies." Life is too easy. The hard lot of the pioneer is almost forgotten.

Instead of sacrificing and striving against odds we are following the line of least resistance, and in our selfishness and shortsightedness we are seeking something for nothing. This trend is rapidly developing a national fallacy, for in truth there is nothing free in this world. Even salvation, which is often pictured as free, must be accompanied by self-denial, and self-denial is an art which is also becoming extinct in America.

Even in our defense program the hue and cry back home is, "How much can we get out of Washington?" while in reality we should be asking, "How much can we as individuals, corporations, communities, and States contribute to the aid of our country in this emergency?"

You gentlemen undoubtedly feel the brunt of this urge, as your constituents are constantly demanding favors, personal advantages, selfish objectives at the expense of the Government. It is probable that this pressure will continue until we shall develop a counter crusade for the extra mite in America.

At this particular time you are in an unusually strong position to answer selfish demands with an exposition of the extra-mite principle. The ideal is not only altruistic but it is also practical and profitable.

It enables one to benefit from the law of increasing returns and the law of compensation. It develops growth, initiative, self-reliance, definiteness of purpose, an attractive personality, a positive, constructive, neutral attitude, independence, and achievement. If persistently practiced, it can and will become one's greatest asset. It has been the basis of achievement of every successful man and woman in America. Its importance in the operations of groups, corporate structures, and governments is equally vital. Somehow our people must be convinced that really there is no Santa Claus, and that you gentlemen are not miracle workers. The law of compensation inevitably will work in the end.

It is unfortunate that in this emergency men place their personal differences ahead of national security. While no man can deny the privilege of individuals to form in groups for the purpose of advancing the common good, such cooperative effort must be based upon the principle of the extra mite if it it to be of lasting benefit. Short-sighted leadership, which pursues selfish ends and in so doing excites malice, envy, and distrust, defeats the very purpose of organized effort and develops a destructive, un-American menace. By the same token a corporation or government which builds upon selfish aggrandizement or financial profit alone is doomed to failure in the end.

We of the South can thank God that we have a minimum of this destructive spirit in our section. We come more largely from American-born ancestors, from the same original God-fearing stock, speaking the same language and worshipping the same God. It is little wonder, therefore, that we have more of harmony and patriotic cooperation than is true of most of the rest of the country.

Today, when important defense production is retarded by industrial discord elsewhere, there are comparatively no strikes in southern industry. It is to the everlasting credit of southern employers and employees that they have patriotically rallied in the emergency, have buried their personal differences and are working as one in harmony in spite of the disturbing news from other sections and in spite of the agitations of self-seeking agents of discord.

The textile employers with whom I am associated in the South are many of them manufacturing goods which they would rather not produce and for which they were not originally equipped. This they are doing in cooperation with the War Department. Our textile workers have displayed the outstanding spirit of unselfish patriotic cooperation for which they became famous during World War No. 1. They have proven themselves patient, sympathetic, and grateful for the opportunity to thus serve their country in industry and in arms. The employers have granted leaves with assurance of reemployment and just now are voluntarily increasing wages as an evidence of good faith. All this exemplifies the spirit of the extra mile. It is a natural trait of residents of the so-called "Bible Belt." Would that this unselfish, patriotic trait were prevalent throughout America in this emergency.

I appear before you this evening as a sort of hybrid. My personal activities cover a number of fields, but in each of them my prime objective is the gospel of the extra mile.

As a publisher, with my associate Napoleon Hill, I am endeavoring through spreading the philosophy of American achievement to show how our great leaders of the past have built upon the principle of the extra mile.

As president of Presbyterian College, I am trying to teach the potential Christian leaders of the future that the world owes them nothing and that they shall succeed in direct ratio to their willingness to practice the principle of the extra mile.

With this theme in mind it is perhaps timely to say to you that as the public in its short-sightedness and selfishness comes more and more to look to government for education and charity that the church and other sources of private education and private philanthropy are drying up. This trend toward public philanthropy is a bad omen for America. We, as public-spirited citizens, should be unusually alert to check this menacing demand for something for nothing and thus through the spirit of the extra mile retain that bulwark of American strength which comes from private philanthropy. The future of American leadership is dependent upon it.

In my responsibility for the public-relation policies of the cotton-textile industry in South Carolina, my chief concern is to encourage a oneness of purpose between employer, employee, and the public based upon the principle of the extra mile.

All of our industrial imaginary differences would be easily solved if we would practice this principle and we would all unite in a common effort to secure, build, and protect our industrial pay rolls as the life blood of the South.

Incidentally, the textile spindles in place in America have decreased during the past 25 years from 32,840,730 to 24,749,578.

Twenty-five years ago there were 17,525,916 spindles in New England and only 13,261,213 in the cotton-growing States. During the 25 years the New England spindles have decreased to only 5,884,114 and the southern spindles have grown to 17,951,358.

This is an enormous southern growth and reflects more harmonious relationships and more favorable conditions in the South. May this condition continue. We must not lose sight of the fact, however, that our southern spindles have shown a decrease during the past 2 years. If we can emphasize the principle of the extra mile we may hold to our textile gains and safeguard the interests of the southern textile workers and the public at large who benefit from our textile pay rolls.

In the consumption of raw cotton our southern mills consumed in 1915 3,025,000 bales as compared with 6,647,000 bales in 1940, while the New England mills have decreased during the same period from 2,149,000 bales to 918,313 bales.

It should be noted that this past year we consumed over 8,000,000 domestic bales in American mills, the highest point in the history of the industry. Apparently we must depend more largely upon domestic consumption in the future. The development of our own textile industry is therefore more important now than ever before to our farmers, our industrial workers, our stockholders and to the public at large.

In my fourth capacity, and the one which takes most of my time, as chairman of the South Carolina Council for National Defense, I find the principle of the extra mile of even greater importance for in an emergency it is imperative that we go the extra mile.

Our first concern in the southern industry is and necessarily must be to mobilize our resources to give the greatest service in the shortest possible time for defense. I am one who does not complain about the relatively small defense expenditures in the southern States. The condition is perfectly natural. The War Department needs speedy production by industry. The greatest speed is to be obtained where industry is already equipped for the production of war materials. The South is still largely agricultural and it is natural for the War Department to look first to our industrial centers for quick service whether the centers be in Michigan, Illinois, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, or what not. The South comparatively is not yet well equipped for large-scale production of war materials, and that brings me to the most important phase of our southern responsibilities and opportunities.

Our responsibility in industrial defense as the first step is to offer the full mobilization of our industrial capacity and service which is already developed. That we are already doing. It has been my privilege to encourage the changing of specifications and equipment to enable southern mills to participate to the fullest in defense service.

However, as in the South we are largely an area of undeveloped resources and raw products, another and perhaps more valuable function is in the perfection of more of our undeveloped southern resources that they may be more extensively used in this and future emergencies.

I firmly believe that in this step our greatest responsibility lies not only in inducing outsiders to move into the South and build our pay rolls but, what is more important still, in encouraging our own southern people under the defense impetus to awaken and invest their own accumulations which are now invested elsewhere in the financial backing for our own young potential leaders that they may develop our own rich resources and build our own pay rolls.

It is a matter of populating the South with thousands of small locally owned and operated manufacturing plants instead of sitting lazily by and expecting our representatives in Congress to give us something for nothing. Again it is the principle of the extra mile.

In our State we have not even asked the legislature to produce the funds for industrial promotion. Instead we asked the private power companies and common carriers to put up the funds for the development.

We asked the chambers of commerce to assist with the research to determine our resources and opportunities. It is a matter of depending upon our own strength, our own resources, our own initiative. There has been too little of that commodity in operation during recent years. We have become too much a nation of softies seeking a free ride.

The program is working and leading to a sound industrial revival in the State. The heart of the program is in getting our own

people to work for themselves and inducing them to give more than they expect to receive.

I have been astounded by the response and my eyes have been opened by the unusual opportunities which are before us in the South.

1. We have a harmonious people as our greatest asset.

2. We have thousands of young men who have enterprise and leadership ability if we can only induce our local investors to back them.

3. We have great opportunities for hydroelectric-power development. Much has been done in that direction already and its continuation will lead the way for a South-wide industrial revival.

4. We have billions of riches undeveloped in our forest resources. Did you know that great changes have been brought about by the development of plywoods and plastics? It has revolutionized the furniture field.

Michigan, which formerly occupied first place in furniture manufacturing, has dropped now to sixth place. Two Southern States, North Carolina and Virginia, have advanced rapidly to fourth and seventh places, respectively. The center of hardwood growth is in the South and, because of the more rapid growth of softwoods in the South, our section will soon be the center of timber in the United States and can easily become the furniture, plywood, and plastics center.

Of 270,000,000,000 feet of hardwood in the United States, 172,000,000,000 feet are in the South and 28,000,000,000 feet of red gum and 83,000,000,000 feet of oak is included in our growth. The picture for small industries in this field in the South is unlimited.

5. The development of improved processes in food canning, packing, and quick-freezing opens enormous opportunities in the South for the production of the Nation's food. The marketing problem, which handicapped us in the past, can now be easily solved, and we have a splendid opportunity to diversify our agriculture and establish our farm independence thereby.

It is disturbing to study the records of our State agricultural departments and note the number of Southern States which today are importing more farm and dairy products than we export. An agricultural section like the South should boast of thousands of quick-freezing, canning, and packing plants. We should and can feed the Nation.

6. There are hundreds of agricultural products indigenous to our section which can take the place of cotton. They need development. Small manufacturing and processing plants will solve the problem.

7. In minerals the opportunities are tremendous. Large deposits of kaolin, limestone, magnesium, iron, coal, manganese, sulfur, phosphates, petroleum products, and dozens of other minerals in the South await processing. They can give employment to hundreds of thousands.

But need I elaborate further? Suffice it to say that the natural advantages are ours. There has never been a better time for an industrial revival than under the present defense impetus and following our great power developments.

We can and will grow industrially and protect our present industries. We must do it, however, by inspiring the initiative of our own people. We must encourage them with a sound tax policy. If our public expenditures are greatly increased because of the defense program, this circumstance need not discourage industrial growth. You gentlemen can encourage industrial initiative by determining the approximate total cost and setting a firm tax policy for its payment in an orderly fashion over a period of years.

Industry does not need anything so much as knowledge as to what the future will bring. Knowing what to expect, they can confidently build upon that knowledge. It is uncertainty, not high taxes, which discourages industrial development.

But above all essentials in an industrial revival, we need to awaken our own people into action. We must fill them with the desire to do the job themselves. We must inspire them with the spirit of the extra mile.

Inequalities of the Farm Parity Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1941

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, the question of the so-called parity payments is continually before Congress. The approach to parity where only a few crops are subsidized has many times been demonstrated to be unfair and unjust. Note that the farmers of Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island did not receive a single dollar of this money. Thousands upon thousands of these parity dollars have gone to big corporation farmers and small payments have gone to the family-sized farms. Note also that one State obtained over 14 percent of this money for the year 1940. Some States with an assessed value of less than $400,000,000 received from eight to twelve million dollars in subsidy payments, and also that the richest agricultural States, with assessed valuation of from $1,400,000,000 to $2,400,000,000, received from ten to twenty-eight million dollars parity payments in 1940.

In other words, these payments are not based on any constructive agricultural basis and are sectionally distributed, and distributed to crops that represent a small part of the total crops of the United States.

Cotton has had $96,164,550 for the year 1940 and the fiber-cotton crop of 1940 is valued at only $595,000,000. This one subsidy for cotton is over 16 percent of the annual value of this crop cotton, which represents much less than 10 percent of our national farm income. As long as parity is talked in terms of giving one crop 48 percent of the appropriated money, the time has come to have a new definition of parity.

Estimated net payments, 1940 parity payment program

State and region	Cotton	Corn	Wheat	Rice	Total
New York			$151,438		$151,438
New Jersey			22,761		22,761
Pennsylvania			704,179		704,179
Northeast region			878,378		878,378
Illinois	$28,000	$8,772,323	2,055,514		10,855,837
Indiana		3,805,302	1,618,943		5,424,245
Iowa		13,405,756	600,777		14,006,533
Michigan		348,156	861,430		1,209,586
Minnesota		4,299,890	1,713,051		6,012,941
Missouri	2,175,000	2,643,862	1,728,574		6,547,436
Nebraska		5,338,450	3,884,920		9,223,370
Ohio		2,732,115	1,846,491		4,578,603
South Dakota		1,176,513	2,580,622		3,757,135
Wisconsin		977,633	109,678		1,087,311
North Central region	2,203,000	43,500,000	17,000,000		62,703,000
Delaware			119,400		119,400
Maryland			510,900		510,900
Virginia	245,500		289,000		534,500
West Virginia			48,000		48,000
North Carolina	4,429,800		80,100		4,509,900
Kentucky	105,300	308,300	261,100		674,700
Tennessee	3,519,200		143,800		3,663,000
East Central region	8,299,800	308,300	1,452,300		10,060,400
Alabama	8,550,000		669		8,550,669
Arkansas	9,505,000		32,800	$241,000	9,778,800
Florida	218,000				218,000
Georgia	8,100,000		13,193		8,113,193
Louisiana	5,437,000			591,000	6,028,000
Mississippi	12,575,000				12,575,000
Oklahoma	4,996,750		3,415,000		8,411,750
South Carolina	5,797,000		4,100		5,801,100
Texas	24,697,000		3,487,000	280,000	28,464,000
Southern region	79,875,750		6,952,762	1,112,000	87,940,512
Arizona	1,509,000		69,000		1,578,000
California	3,485,000		757,000	248,000	4,490,000
Colorado			1,047,000		1,047,000
Idaho			1,644,000		1,644,000
Kansas	2,000	1,016,000	11,552,000		12,570,000
Montana			3,150,000		3,150,000
Nevada			26,000		26,000
New Mexico	790,000		215,000		1,005,000
North Dakota			7,168,000		7,168,000
Oregon			1,460,000		1,460,000
Utah			353,000		353,000
Washington			2,152,000		2,152,000
Wyoming			244,000		244,000
Western region	5,786,000	1,016,000	29,837,000	248,000	36,887,000
Hawaii				3,000	3,000
Total	96,164,550	44,824,300	56,120,440	1,363,000	198,472,290

Office of the Administrator, AAA, Apr. 1, 1941.

Bonneville Power

REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1941

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, my object in speaking is to announce to the House that cooperative distribution of power developed at Bonneville is making real progress in the Northwest.

I hold in my hand a news release from the Bonneville Power Administration, showing that they have made a contract to sell power developed at Bonneville in the city of West Salem with some extension in Salem, the State capital.

Salem is the most conservative city that I ever lived in. During the time I was commissioned to be Governor of the State and lived in the State capital there was such sentiment against public ownership that they did not own their own water plant. They had to buy their water from a private company. This announcement that I hold in my hand states that the Bonneville Administration has made a contract with the cooperative to deliver electric power in West Salem.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include this release.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I shall not object.

I hope every Member of both Houses will read the statement of the gentleman from Oregon and note carefully the rates in the tables he is inserting. Then they will see what the American people ought to pay for electricity in every State in the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement follows:

The Bonneville Power Administration began delivery of Columbia River power late Friday afternoon, March 28, to the Salem Electric Cooperative under terms of a contract executed less than 2 weeks ago.

The cooperative's distribution line was connected to the power administration's Willamette Valley transmission system at the Government's Salem substation. The cooperative's first member-customers to be connected to its new distribution system in West Salem received power shortly thereafter.

The Salem Electric Cooperative is the seventh such agency, and the twenty-sixth publicly owned system, to execute a contract with the power administration. It comprises about 170 members in Salem and West Salem. Sidney Stephens, of Salem, is president and D. M. Burroughs is vice president. Malcolm Mitchell is secretary and O. E. Snyder and Max Gehler are directors. H. B. Read is manager.

Cooperative officials announced they would distribute Columbia River power to their members at standard retail rates recommended by the power administration.

The rates follow:

RESIDENTIAL

First 50 kilowatt-hours per month, 3 cents per kilowatt-hour.

Next 50 kilowatt-hours per month, 2 cents per kilowatt-hour.

Next 200 kilowatt-hours per month, 1 cent per kilowatt-hour.

Next 900 kilowatt-hours per month, ½ cent per kilowatt-hour.

Excess kilowatt-hours, ¾ cent per kilowatt-hour.

COMMERCIAL

Energy charge:

First 150 kilowatt-hours used per month, 3 cents per kilowatt-hour.

Next 350 kilowatt-hours used per month, 2 cents per kilowatt-hour.

Next 1,000 kilowatt-hours used per month, 1 cent per kilowatt-hour.

Next 13,500 kilowatt-hours used per month, 0.8 cent per kilowatt-hour.

Next 25,000 kilowatt-hours used per month, 0.6 cent per kilowatt-hour.

Next 60,000 kilowatt-hours used per month, 0.4 cent per kilowatt-hour.

Excess above 100,000 kilowatt-hours used per month, 0.3 cent per kilowatt-hour.

Demand charge:

First 10 kilowatts of demand per month, no demand charge.

Excess above 10 kilowatts of demand per month, 95 cents per kilowatt.

The energy charge for use in excess of 360 times the demand shall be subject to a reduction of 0.5 mill per kilowatt-hour from the otherwise applicable rate.

The Relief Problem in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY L. HAINES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1941

LETTER FROM SECRETARY OF THE PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I received today from the secretary of the Department of Public Assistance in Pennsylvania:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE,
Harrisburg, April 1, 1941.

The Honorable HARRY L. HAINES,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HAINES: You are doubtless familiar with the recent recommendation of the Social Security Board regarding establishment of Federal grants-in-aid to the States for general relief as an extension of the Social Security Act's present public-assistance provisions covering the aged, the blind, and dependent children.

The American Public Welfare Association, the Council of State Governments, National Economy League, and numerous other national organizations have urged favorable action on this subject at the present session of Congress.

My purpose in writing this is to advise you specifically of the general relief problem in Pennsylvania, and some of the reasons why an early broadening of the Social Security Act to include general relief is extremely desirable from the standpoint of our own State.

Pennsylvania is virtually unique in the United States in the extent to which the State government has assumed financial responsibility for general relief. Since January 1, 1938, this form of aid (which is available to all needy citizens not eligible for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, or blind pensions) has been 100 percent State financed. Pennsylvanians, regardless of party, have reason to be proud of the State's record of an uninterrupted Statewide general relief program since 1932—a program which has not once been curtailed at the expense of the needy because of the unwillingness of the State's citizens, through their legislators, to provide necessary funds.

Needless to say, provision of relief on this basis has necessarily involved a tremendous drain on State finances, critical tax problems, and a severe test of the ability of a key industrial State to compete successfully with other States in maintaining its industries and employment opportunities.

The following figures indicate the extent of State expenditures for general relief grants and for all public-assistance purposes in the past 8 years, excluding Federal funds expended for work relief or advanced to the State as grants-in-aid:

State expenditures for general relief grants:

1933	$30,476,000
1934	25,318,000
1935	33,982,000
1936	63,444,000
1937	57,813,000
1938	75,979,000
1939	91,646,000
1940	60,923,000

State expenditures for all public assistance, general relief and other:

1933	$38,308,000
1934	35,490,000
1935	54,944,000
1936	87,674,000
1937	83,467,000
1938	109,503,000
1939	130,450,000
1940	102,224,000

At the present time general relief is being provided by this State to 135,000 cases, representing 330,000 persons. In about one-third of these cases, there is no employable member and the need reflects a long-term public responsibility. A great deal of turnover occurs among the cases with employable members and the size of this portion of the general relief load is determined by the extent of both private and W. P. A. employment. In the summer of 1939, when W. P. A. employment was sharply curtailed, the State-financed general relief load reached a record peak of 273,000 cases, representing 1,023,000 persons.

The following, in my opinion, are among the most compelling reasons in favor of the enactment of Federal grants-in-aid for general relief:

1. Experience in Pennsylvania and nearly all other States indicates that Federal assistance is the only answer to the migrant problem. Even before the present defense program, migration of workers across State boundaries was creating a critical situation in many parts of the country. The situation has been intensified by the national-defense program. Pennsylvania, in common with other States, has been compelled to place restrictions around the State assistance which may be given to nonresidents. To do otherwise would place a heavy and mounting burden on the State's taxpayers, due to the wide disparity existing between the adequacy and extent of public assistance in Pennsylvania as compared with nearly all other States. Under present circumstances, lack of residence restrictions would encourage an economically unjustified influx of unemployed and unemployables with

resultant jeopardy to the entire program for needy residents.

A Federal program of grants-in-aid for general assistance to all indigent persons, on the other hand, would permit standardization of the innumerable conflicting State statutes regarding settlement and residence; equalize the burden of caring for migrant workers and their families; and ameliorate the hardships now confronting the worker who migrates for a legitimate reason and becomes destitute. Federal participation in general relief is a much sounder solution than any program of Federal aid for migrants alone, since the latter would tend to encourage migration by making the indigent migrant much better off in most States than the needy residents of these States themselves.

2. A general relief provision in the Social Security Act would ease the heavy burden now shouldered by the few States which, like Pennsylvania, have accepted the responsibility of providing reasonably adequately for all destitute residents not cared for by the W. P. A. or other Federal programs. At the same time it would stimulate States which have disregarded, or been unable to meet, their relief responsibilities to establish general relief programs meeting minimum standards. A variable scale of Federal grants-in-aid, based on State ability to pay in relation to need, would promote a reasonable degree of uniformity in general relief provisions throughout the country.

3. Federal grants-in-aid for general relief would serve to offset the inequitable features of the W. P. A. program. Operation of W. P. A. on a much more extensive scale in some States than in others and fluctuations in national W. P. A. quotas have resulted in situations where either large numbers of the needy unemployed are entirely unprovided for or the States and localities have been forced to assume unforeseen and disproportionately heavy relief burdens. The impossibility of sound State planning and budgeting under such circumstances has been repeatedly demonstrated. By making a definite Federal provision for general relief, the Federal Government could then curtail W. P. A. nationally, or expand it in some areas and contract it in others in keeping with the availability of work projects vital to State and national interest, without the serious results now attendant on such a course.

4. The Social Security Act provisions with respect to old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind affect thousands of families whose need for help does not differ substantially from that of the destitute families not covered by these programs. In addition, there are many instances in which some members of a family are provided for by a type of aid now included in the Social Security Act while the needs of other members who share the same home and eat at the same table are ignored, insofar as Federal provisions are concerned. Federal participation in general relief would encourage State and local public assistance agencies to provide for the needs of families as a whole rather than splitting them into artificial units.

5. The present national-defense program makes it increasingly apparent that reasonable adequate general relief is needed as an underpinning for all of the health, welfare, vocational training and related activities which contribute to the strength and morale of the country. Federal participation in the cost of general relief, accompanied by Federal leadership in establishing reasonably equitable and uniform standards of administration in all States, will alone insure such underpinning.

If I can be of service to you in forwarding any additional information about public assistance and particularly general relief in Pennsylvania, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Meanwhile, it is my earnest hope that you will see your way clear to give maximum support to legislation providing for a broadening of the Social Security Act to include general relief as a fourth and extremely important category of public assistance.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD L. RUSSELL,
Secretary.

So That Washington Post Readers May Also Have This News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, last night in the Senate caucus room, a group of more than 70 Senators and Congressmen held a highly important meeting which may mean much to the peace and happiness of every home in America.

With the exception of the Washington Post, other Washington papers carried an account of this meeting. So that readers of the Washington Post may also have some of the antiwar news, I call your attention herewith to the attached news story from this morning's Times-Herald which is substantially the same story appearing in the Daily News of today and which I am confident will be reported with equal fairness in tonight's Washington Star:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of April 2, 1941]

ANTIWAR BLOC FIGHTS CONVOYS—WHEELER HEADS GROUP FORMED IN CONGRESS

Congressional noninterventionists agreed at a surprise meeting last night to establish a permanent legislative organization to carry on their fight against "involvement of the United States in foreign wars."

One of the 14 Senators who attended said the meeting, described as "nonpartisan," authorized the election of a steering committee to consider and formulate steps to be followed by the group but that no action to set up such a committee had been taken. There was a general agreement among members, he added, to hold further meetings of the group to carry forward their program.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, Democrat, of Montana, who led the unsuccessful Senate fight against the British aid bill, presided. The meeting concerned principally steps to prevent the possible use of American convoys for war supplies to Britain.

In addition to the 14 Senators, 56 House Members were present.

In a formal statement issued shortly after the conference broke up, the group announced it had been decided to raise the question of convoys immediately by pressing for action on the resolution of Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY (Republican), of New Hampshire, and similar House bills to prohibit convoying of merchant vessels by United States warships.

"Various groups are now advocating that the President send to Congress a bill authorizing convoys, but the meeting determined to raise the issue at once by pressing the affirmative resolution of Senator TOBEY and similar resolutions introduced in the House which specifically prohibit convoys.

"The meeting determined that in spite of the defeatist propaganda, being promoted to the effect that war is inevitable, those present would press the fight against any active involvement in war which would take American boys to foreign battle fronts."

There's Something Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. RODGERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ERIE (PA.) DAILY TIMES

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Erie (Pa.) Daily Times of March 27, 1941:

[From the Erie (Pa.) Daily Times of March 27, 1941]

This is an editorial. The sovereign Government of the United States can reach out and with its authority, backed by the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, the courts, and a legion of underofficers, grab a man between the ages of 21 and 36 from a good, steady job or a profession, push him through the ritual of a draft classification, send him through a gauntlet of doctors, induct him into the Army, separate him from his parents, his wife in some cases, send him to camp, and tell him what duties he shall perform. These duties range from latrine, kitchen, sentry, field to clerical. He must obey. He is in the Army. If he disobeys, the guard house, extra duties await him. In wartime if he sits down, strikes, or leaves his post, under the articles of war he can be shot. The Government has shot sleeping, disobedient, and sit-down striking sentries. It is a part of discipline. It has to be done. The young man who left a fine job and comfortable home must take orders. He can't walk out. The Government backs the officer who gives these orders. The young man gets $21 a month.

Back in the selectee's home town there might be an industrial plant engaged completely in producing the necessities of this great national-defense program—just like the Bethlehem Steel Co. is doing. The big plant is making the things of war to supply or back up the young man who was drafted and checked into the Army. In this big plant are men between the ages of 21 and 36 who are earning good money—say $8 per day. They put in 40 hours a week, are home every night with their families. Their jobs are important, for they are producers of the materials that are so essential in the vast program of our defense. They are as important, but no more important, than the young men drafted from good jobs and good homes. Yet, these workers getting good money can strike on the least provocation. They can desert their posts—positions that are keyed to our so-called defense program. Their union bosses can tell them to quit, with the threat of violence if they refuse.

The plant is tied up. The right to work is denied. The Government—the same Government that snatched the young man from a good secure job, and home—sits idly by, entangled in a political hawser that heretofore has been too binding to break. This same Government condones violence, sabotage in the very plants it has designated to back up the soldier and the program of defense. The $40-a-week, 40-hour "soldier" in an industrial plant thumbs his nose at the Government. The $21-a-month draftee would be court-martialed and sentenced if he even suggested such a gesture. There's something wrong.

Nonprofit Organizations Control Huge Corporations, Yet Pay No Taxes on Such Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1941

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, our Government is in need of money to defray the expense of the defense effort. The tax base on incomes has been broadened and will perhaps be further extended. Federal bonds are no longer tax-exempt, and the incomes of State government employees are no longer exempt from the income tax.

Corporation taxes have been raised along with individual income taxes. Efforts have been made to force corporations to distribute their profits so that such dividends would in turn bear their share of taxation.

But there has been overlooked in this category the dividends of corporations paid to various types of benevolent and charitable organizations. Section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code provides for exemption from income taxes of a large number of various so-called nonprofit organizations. That is as it should be, no doubt, as to the original contributions made to such organizations. But it seems to me that the time has come for the Federal Government to look into the question of profits of these organizations. At the moment I am not prepared to say that all types of profits should be taxed, such as interest on bank balances, bonds, rents, and so forth. But I am prepared to recommend to the Congress of the United States that such income as is derived by organizations now exempt under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code from dividends as the result of ownership direct or through trustees of such voting stock, shall be made taxable. I am introducing a short bill in Congress as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code there shall be levied, collected, and paid by all organizations therein listed, a tax upon all income derived from dividends as the result of ownership directly or through trustees, of voting stock in any corporation or corporations not itself exempt under section 101, as follows:

(A) When the percentage of voting stock owned in a corporation is less than 10 percent, a tax of 20 percent on the income from dividends; and

(B) When the percentage of voting stock owned in a corporation is 10 percent or more, a tax of 40 percent of such dividends.

As will be noted the tax would be doubled in case an organization under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code owned 10 percent or more of the common stock in a corporation. I think this is justified as a means of discouraging so-called philanthropic institutions from investing or retaining their funds for the purpose of controlling corporations.

The magnitude of the income now being disbursed by corporations that is going to benevolent organizations and that consequently does not pay taxes on such dividends cannot be determined without further investigation. It must run into the millions of dollars.

In checking the records of the Temporary National Economic Committee I find that in the case of the major oil companies the 100 largest stockholders are shown. From this record I have extracted the following information on holdings of these organizations in these major oil companies:

American Missionary Association, 287 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y., 1,224 shares Sun Oil Co.

The Commonwealth Fund, care of the New York Trust Co., Customers' Securities Department, 100 Broadway, New York, N. Y., 25,000 shares Standard Oil Co. (Ind.).

Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., 1,718 shares Sun Oil Co.

General Education Board, 49 West Forty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y., 123,466 shares Standard Oil Co. (N. J.); 320,800 shares the Ohio Oil Co.

The A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust, 514 Smithfield Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., 352,000 shares Gulf Oil Corporation.

The Frank Phillips Foundation, Inc., Att.: W. C. Smoot, treasurer, Bartlesville, Okla., 4,725 shares Phillips Petroleum Co.

President and Fellows of Harvard College, 24 Milk Street, Boston, Mass., 20,000 shares Texas Corporation; 3,000 shares Standard Oil Co. (Ohio); 71,197 shares Standard Oil Co. (N. J.); 35,100 shares Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc.; 11,000 shares Continental Oil Co.; 50,000 shares Consolidated Oil Corporation; 5,500 shares the Atlantic Refining Co.

The Rockefeller Foundation, 49 West Forty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y., 132,912 shares Standard Oil Co. (Ohio); 1,037,505 shares Standard Oil Co. (N. J.); 691,140 shares Standard Oil Co. (Ind.); 94,684 shares the Ohio Oil Co.; 39,408 shares Continental Oil Co.

The Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, 49 West Forty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y., 123,150 shares Standard Oil Co. (N. J.); 30,000 shares Standard Oil Co. (Ind.); 182,400 shares the Ohio Oil Co.

The University of Chicago, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill., 83,634 shares Standard Oil Co. (N. J.); 35,000 shares Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc.; 45,000 shares the Ohio Oil Co.

Yale University, New Haven, Conn., 30,964 shares Consolidated Oil Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I could go at length into related questions of owners and former owners of some of this stock still exercising the benefits of control. It is the old question of endeavoring to create a perpetuity, or the control of existing institutions from the grave. The law has always endeavored, through statutes of mortmain and others, to put an end to such controls.

I could likewise go at length into the related question of the wisdom of permitting our educational institutions to place their dependence upon monopolistic corporate structures. But that is a long story in itself.

Suffice it to say that in this hour of need for revenue here is an untapped source that should be looked into thoroughly.

As to the organizations mentioned I have checked and find that they are all exempt from income taxation under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code. My exchange of correspondence with the Bureau of Internal Revenue follows:

MARCH 17, 1941.

Hon. GUY T. HELVERING,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Can you advise me whether the following organizations are exempt from the payment of income taxes under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code:

American Missionary Association, 287 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

The Commonwealth Fund, New York, N. Y.

Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

General Education Board, 49 West Twenty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y.

The A. W. Mellon Educational & Charitable Trust, 514 Smithfield Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.

The Frank Phillips Foundation, Inc., W. C. Smoot, treasurer, Bartlesville, Okla.

President and Fellows of Harvard College, 24 Milk Street, Boston, Mass.

The Rockefeller Foundation, 49 West Forty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y.

The Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, 49 West Forty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y.

The University of Chicago, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

What I am anxious to find out as quickly as possible is whether or not these organizations do, or do not, pay income taxes to the Government on their investments.

As a concrete example, the Rockefeller Foundation, listed above is reported in the hearings before the T. N. E. C. as owning the following common stocks: 1,037,505 shares Standard Oil Co. (N. J.), 691,140 shares Standard Oil Co. (Ind.), 132,912 shares Standard Oil Co. (Ohio), 39,408 shares Continental Oil Co., and 94,684 shares the Ohio Oil Co.

All of these corporations, except the last, paid dividends during the past several years. Did the Rockefeller Foundation pay any income taxes to the Government on such dividends, or are they exempt under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code?

Your courtesy in providing this information for me is deeply appreciated.

Very cordially yours,

JOHN M. COFFEE.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 21, 1941.

Hon. JOHN M. COFFEE,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. COFFEE: Further reference is made to your letter of March 17, 1941, in which you request to be advised whether the following organizations are exempt from the payment of income taxes under the provisions of section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code:

American Missionary Association, New York, N. Y.

The Commonwealth Fund, New York, N. Y.

Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

General Education Board, New York, N. Y.

The A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust, Pittsburgh, Pa.

The Frank Phillips Foundation, Inc., Bartlesville, Okla.

President and Fellows of Harvard College, Boston, Mass.

The Rockefeller Foundation, New York, N. Y.

The Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, New York, N. Y.

The University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

All of the above-named organizations have been held to be exempt from Federal income tax under the provisions of subsection (6) of section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code and the corresponding provisions of prior revenue acts, and they have not paid any Federal income tax on their income from any source.

Subsection (6) of section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code provides for the exemption from Federal income tax of "corporations, and any community chest, fund, or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation."

If further correspondence relative to this matter is necessary, please refer to IT:P:T:-1—EAC.

Very truly yours,

T. C. MOONEY,
Acting Commissioner.

Newark, N. J., Opposes St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1941

LETTER FROM NEWARK (N. J.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND REPORTS FROM VARIOUS ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter I received from the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Newark, and I also include a synopsis of reports by commercial organizations, educational institutions, and engineers with comments:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE
CITY OF NEWARK, N. J.,
March 31, 1941.

Hon. ALFRED F. BEITER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BEITER: The President of the United States transmitted to Congress, under date of March 21, 1941, the text of an agreement between the Governments of the United States and Canada, providing for the construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep waterway. This agreement is to be made effective by concurrent legislation of the two governments.

The Chamber of Commerce of the City of Newark, N. J., has given this subject careful consideration, as indicated by the attached detailed report. We direct your attention to the following salient facts:

Excessive cost for power.

Any benefits derived will be restricted to a limited area.

The waterway will be closed 5 months out of the year to transportation.

Every ton of freight moved will cost the taxpayers $3 per ton.

Power would replace 58,000,000 tons of coal per annum, or 13 percent of the total coal output, thereby causing a reduction in employment in mines, railroads, etc.

Utilization of this project for national defense is too remote to be reckoned in the present emergency.

Construction will curtail existing emergency supplies of raw and finished materials, also manpower and transportation.

The economic factors, when properly weighed, establish that the Great Lakes–St. Lawrence waterway should not be given favorable consideration, and we respectfully request that you oppose the passage of legislation that would have for its purpose the United States proceeding with the construction of this project.

Very truly yours,

E. W. WOLLMUTH,
Executive Vice President.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

SYNOPSIS OF REPORTS BY COMMERCIAL ORGANIZATIONS, EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS, AND ENGINEERS, WITH COMMENTS

Description

Proposed development, which covers territory between Lake Ontario and Montreal, includes 25 miles of canal, 8 locks (30-foot depth); 24½-foot serviceable channels (27-foot depth); power development of 5,000,000 horsepower; deepening lake channels; deepening lake harbors; control dams.

Additional changes

Improvements will necessitate additional expenditures for reconstruction of piers and other vessel-handling facilities, dredging of harbors and channels, and changes in cargo-handling machinery, etc., to meet changed conditions at practically all lake ports.

Differences in elevation

The fall from Lake Ontario to Montreal is 226 feet; the fall from Montreal to sea is 20 feet (28-foot draft vessels can now operate from Montreal to sea).

Time to construct

Seven to eight years.

Official estimate of cost

Navigation work	$108,700,000
Work common to power and navigation	141,200,000
Work primarily for power	144,100,000
Total	394,000,000
Additional power proposed	225,000,000
Total	619,000,000

Costs not included

Cost of following items not included:

Interest during construction (estimated)	$65,000,000
Improving channels through lakes (estimated)	45,000,000
Increasing depths of harbors (estimated)	250,000,000
Losses during development period	----------
Amortization and interest	----------
Cost of maintenance and operation	----------
Reconstruction or rearrangement lake ports facilities	----------
Cost to private interests account necessary rearrangements	----------
Loss in tax ratables	----------

Unofficial estimates of cost

The official estimates have been questioned by various engineers and following figures submitted:

E. P. Goodrich, consulting engineer	$1,054,000,000
H. L. Cooper, international engineer	1,350,000,000

Attention is called to the fact that experience and records show waterway estimates are almost invariably exceeded one to three hundred percent or more.

Comparisons

	Estimated cost	*Cost*
Chicago Drainage Canal	$16,000,000	$53,000,000
Suez Canal	30,000,000	80,000,000
Panama Canal	160,000,000	375,000,000
New York State Barge Canal	62,000,000	176,000,000
Welland Canal	40,000,000	128,000,000
Total	308,000,000	812,000,000

Overages, 263 percent.

Carrying cost

If the estimate given by Cooper (who has had wide experience in this line of work; constructed the Keokuk Dam, the only power plant on the Niagara River that has never been shut down by ice; and investigated the St. Lawrence proposition for private interests) are taken, we have the following approximate picture:

$1,350,000,000 at 4 percent interest	$54,000,000
$1,350,000,000 at 2 percent amortization	27,000,000
Operation and maintenance (estimate not Cooper's)	3,000,000
Annual carrying cost	84,000,000

Cost power

Cooper estimates the power will cost $270 per horsepower developed, following this with statement that "It is a well-known fact that no hydraulic development can compete with steam when the initial cost of hydraulic development exceeds $150 per horsepower." Estimated cost of the St. Lawrence development is 55½ percent over this figure.

Considering the annual carrying cost as applied to the gross exports of grain (if power will not pay cost), we find:

Gross tonnage, 1928

In the banner year 1928 there was exported through Buffalo 279,000,000 bushels, and through Montreal 217,000,000 bushels, a total of 496,000,000 bushels of grain.

Gross tonnage, 1922

In the maximum year 1922 the total grain exported through all North Atlantic ports was 462,000,000 bushels (13,800,000 tons).

Cost per ton taxes

If all the grain which was exported through the North Atlantic ports, in the maximum year 1922, passed through the St. Lawrence route, carrying charge to be paid out of taxes would amount to 18/10 cents per bushel or $6 per ton.

Saving per ton

The Department of Commerce estimates saving in transportation cost by the waterway will run 6 4/10 cents per bushel or $3.22 per ton, against above cost in taxes of $6 per ton, or a dead loss of $2.78 per ton.

Loss per ton

In other words the taxpayers would pay $6 per ton, to give the wheat growers a subsidy of $2.78 per ton, if entire saving were passed on to growers.

Cost to New York and New Jersey

If the power will not carry its expense, and the freight will not carry its expense, the whole question resolves itself into one of subsidy for transportation and power at expense of taxpayers with approximate tax on New York State of $25,000,000 to $30,000,000

per annum and on New Jersey of $3,000,000 to $4,000,000 per annum.

A large portion of the entire cost will fall on the States which do not receive any benefit, either directly or indirectly.

Availability

Another serious objection to the expenditure of such a large sum on the development, is that it will only provide for service for a portion of the year on account of closing of lakes and the St. Lawrence during the winter season.

The average open season for past 20 years has been from April 26 to December 9.

Channels and harbors

If the St. Lawrence is deepened to 27 feet it will be necessary to dredge channels and harbors at Lake ports to meet the increased depth, which would mean 13 American and 2 Canadian harbors would have to be dredged from 4 to 8 feet.

Changes facilities

Changes would also be required in Lake water-front facilities and equipment, at staggering costs.

Estimated tonnage

The most optimistic estimate of traffic for this waterway is 24,000,000 tons per annum, which would make the subsidy, or tax burden, $3.50 per ton (estimates of tonnage are almost invariably excessive). Other estimates are as low as 10,500,000 tons.

Reduction demands coal

If power estimated is developed, and used, it will replace 58,000,000 tons of coal per annum, or 13 percent of the total coal output of the United States, with consequent reduction in employment by mines, railroads, Lake ships, and manufacturers of materials, etc., dependent on fuel and transportation activities.

United States will not control

The United States, after spending the enormous sum necessary for completion of the project, would not control the waterway.

Brookings Institution

The Brookings Institution, in its 1929 study of the St. Lawrence waterways, reached the following conclusion:

"(1) The treaty calls for a 27-foot channel. This channel would accommodate only 5 percent of passenger-cargo tonnage in American service, 38 percent of the faster cargo tonnage, 13 percent of tonnage operating out of Montreal and Quebec, 40 percent of grain tramps tonnage operating out of Montreal, 19 percent of east bound intercoastal tonnage, no tankers. To handle usual ships, it would require a 33-foot channel.

"(2) The seasons of navigation on the Lakes average about 6½ months each year; ocean-going boats would have to reduce speed at least one-quarter between Montreal and the Lakes. Leading steamship lines claim first-class lines or regular cargo-liner service would not use the waterway under these conditions.

"(3) Authors estimate total potential tonnage for waterway at 10,500,000 tons, of which grain would account for about 6,500,000 tons; of total, 5,400,000 tons would be American traffic.

"(4) Their estimated cost of waterway is $712,000,000, and with carrying charges and maintenance, the cost to taxpayers would amount to $3.50 per ton or, say, 11 cents a bushel on grain, a saving on grain of 4 cents per bushel, or a cost of 175 percent over the estimated savings."

Canadian editorial

Following is from editorial in Montreal Star:

"The cost to Canada could not well be less.

"We get a half billion enterprise, not counting the expenditures on power plant, for less than forty million.

"The increased trade by the cheaper, safer, and swifter route will practically all be transshipped in Montreal Harbor, giving it greatly increased business.

"The real danger that the wealthy United States might build a deep waterway from Buffalo or Oswego to Albany, and so sidetrack Montreal, will be blown sky high by this treaty. Having put some four hundred million into this enterprise, thus creating a far better route than that by Albany, they would never waste money on the Erie project, and the city on the Hudson will be out of luck."

New York Chamber of Commerce

The New York Chamber of Commerce, in its report of October 6, 1932, states:

"The St. Lawrence canal project is unsound, commercially unwise, and politically inadvisable. Seventy percent of such a waterway would be in Canada and 30 percent in the United States. Is it conceivable that the United States would undertake a high investment in a foreign country under such conditions?

"It should not be forgotten that in the event of the United States being at war with some other country, international law would prohibit England from allowing the United States to use the St. Lawrence channel."

Stanford University

The Stanford University states in its report, prepared by Ford Research Institute, of the university:

"The St. Lawrence seaway would probably not reduce cost of shipments to Europe by over 5 cents a bushel during the season of open navigation, and the weighted annual savings on export wheats would be less. Whatever savings are made would be divided in proportion varying from year to year, mainly between the growers of export wheat affected and European consumers.

"There is little prospect that the net gain to American wheat growers as a whole would be significant. Canadian wheat growers would stand to gain more unless or until the expansion of acreage wipes out the price benefit."

Rochester Chamber of Commerce

The Rochester Chamber of Commerce report, November 20, 1933, states:

"There are ample grounds for requiring that the expense of the project be borne by the interests directly benefiting from the facility. The intercoastal shipping characteristics of the new seaway would justify the application of reasonable tolls the same as applies to shipping through the Panama and Suez Canals.

"It is our opinion that the economic merits and justification of large expenditures 'have not been fully determined' and that the economic justification of the project rests wholly upon studies 'by proponents, 6 to 13 years ago. Under conditions naturally different from those which now confront the United States, or, are likely to prevail during the next decade.' We believe there should be a complete up-to-date, impartial appraisal of the economic considerations involved in the project, from the standpoint of the United States, before the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep waterway treaty is approved by the Senate."

These remarks were followed by recommendation of following resolution by the chamber committee:

"That the Senate of the United States be requested to delay the adoption of the St. Lawrence treaty until an impartial survey can be made by the Board of River and Harbors Engineers, or a commission authorized by Congress to ascertain amount and character of the traffic, which the United States may reasonably expect to move via the St. Lawrence route, to show the savings and the States therefrom; that the board or commission determine definitely the annual costs of operation and maintenance, and the possibility of making the project self-liquidating within a reasonable period of years; also a study of such other factors as are essential to the determination of the wisdom of undertaking this development, under the present economic conditions and trend."

Remarks

There is a great discrepancy in estimates of cost, of main project and lack of information as to costs of maintenance and operation costs of remodeling equipment, harbor and channel dredging, terminal facilities, reduction in tax ratables, etc., and to meet changed conditions, which may very properly amount to large sums, which cannot be assumed by municipalities, and would be prohibitive for private interests, when the doubtful advantage to be derived from such expenditures are considered. No estimate is made of loss in tax ratables.

The actual waterway expenditure might well be a small portion of the total final cost, and from past experience the waterway estimate is likely to be exceeded by several hundred percent.

Before the St. Lawrence waterway project is considered we should examine our past experience with waterway promotions which have been one of the most expensive and perhaps least understood extravagances we have been cursed with by politicians and pressure groups for many years.

Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent in the promotion of ideas in all parts of the country, under the guise of cheap transportation, and when they could not be put through under this pretext the national-defense issue has been brought in, with the hope of forcing them through.

There have been several projects which were justified, such as the Panama Canal, which is partially supported by tolls, and perhaps a few others but a large percentage of the expenditures could not be justified from an economic or any other standpoint.

There is a continual complaint of heavy taxes, by those who realize they are paying taxes, and it is such unsound and ill-advised spending as we have in the waterway and canal developments which is building up these taxes for the present generation, and for all time to come.

The average man seems to feel, if he does not own property he does not pay taxes, that they are paid by the wealthy and the large corporations, he does not realize that every man, woman, and child pays a portion of the taxes.

Those who do not own property or earn sufficient to pay income taxes, pay hidden taxes on everything they eat, wear, drink, or use, and at the present time at least one-fourth of every person's earnings is being taken from him for taxes. If he earns $4 per day $1 is taken for taxes.

A halt to unnecessary waste, burdening the taxpayer, particularly in view of other inevitable tax increases, should be enforced.

A number of organizations of public spirited people throughout the country are spending their time and money in an effort to correct this situation, but they receive little if any support from the public and they will never be able to accomplish important results until public opinion is aroused to a point where all become interested.

We have endeavored to get together some figures, from Government and other records, which will give an idea of how our money is being used on some other similar projects.

The usual manner of procedure of the promoters is to start with the publicity of the imaginary benefits one of these projects will give a local community, showing estimates of cost, which are only a fraction of the real cost, supported by estimates of tonnage which will be handled, exaggerated to as great extent as the costs are understated. By the use of this

combination of erroneous figures a saving is shown by reduced freight rates, etc.

They are very careful not to show the increase in taxes, which almost without exception is several times greater than the alleged saving in freight charges.

They do not explain that while the cost of transportation by water may save $1 per ton, taxes will be increased from $1 to $5 or more per ton, and the cost in taxes alone may well be more than the entire cost of handling the freight by truck or railroad, in some cases more than the goods cost.

In plain words, the consumer pays the transportation out of his own personal pocket as the penalty for following the advice of people who are paid by him to protect his interests.

One of the glaring examples, although not the worst, is the New York State Barge Canal, which has been a political pet for years.

This canal has cost the people of New York in cold cash approximately $400,000,000. Figuring interest 4 percent; amortization, 2 percent; plus maintenance of $1,700,000, makes a total of $25,700,000 per annum, and they are paying around $7.20 per ton in canal freight and taxes for a service they could get from the railroads and trucks for $3.50 per ton; in other words, they are paying an extra cost of several dollars per ton on every ton of freight carried on the canal.

If the canal had never been built, the people of the State of New York would be millions of dollars ahead each year.

Add to the cost of this State project the Federal white elephants, and it is costing the people of New York perhaps $70,000,000 per year for inland-waterway promotions, or $22 for each family in the State, with the bill increasing each year.

According to Government reports, we have well over $2,000,000,000 tied up in canals and waterways outside of our seaports. With interest at 4 percent and amortization at 2 percent, we have a carrying charge of $120,000,000 per annum, plus $100,000,000 per annum for maintenance and operation, or a total of $220,000,000, without considering the additional money that is being poured in each year for new projects.

The States of New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Pennsylvania carry approximately 40 percent of the tax load of the United States, which means these four States pay approximately $88,000,000 of this cost, or over $19 for each family in the four States, for Federal projects alone.

If the St. Lawrence waterway costs the United States $1,000,000,000, and its carrying, operation, and maintenance costs run proportionately to other inland-waterway developments, the initial cost to the State of New York would approximate $210,000,000 and the carrying cost to the State $17,000,000 per annum. The initial investment for the States of New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Pennsylvania would approximate $400,000,000 and carrying costs $32,000,000, in addition to the present amounts shown above.

If estimated costs run true to form as compared with actual costs, they may run two or three times this amount.

The following illustrations will give some idea of costs of handling freight on the waterways:

Cost in taxes to move 1 ton 100 miles

Canals and waterways:	
Chesapeake & Delaware	$1.20
Cape Cod	10.00
Beaufort to St. Johns River	1.90
Beaufort to Cape Fear River	2.20
Cape Fear River to Wingah Bay	5.00
Wingah Bay to Charleston, S. C.	3.00
Charleston to Beaufort	2.50
Below Wilmington Cape Fear River	1.50
Above Wilmington Cape Fear River	1.20
Saco River, Maine	159.00
Taunton River, Mass	46.00
Appoquinimick River, Del	57.00

Cost in taxes to move 1 ton 100 miles—Con.

Canals and waterways—Continued.	
Rehoboth Bay to Delaware Bay (IWW)	$1,660.00
Chincoteague Bay to Delaware Bay (IWW)	10.00
Shrewsbury River, N. J.	51.00
Woodbury Creek, N. J.	57.00
Cold Spring Inlet, N. J.	450.00
Norfolk to Pamlico Sound (IWW)	2.30
Swan Quarter Bay to Deep Bay, N. C. (IWW)	45.00
Channel, Back Sound to Lookout Bight, N. C.	200.00
Oklawaha River, Fla.	1,227.00
Jacksonville to Miami, Fla. (IWW)	6.20
Suwanee River, Fla.	900.00

There are numerous other projects which are as bad or perhaps in some cases worse.

Figures used are from Government reports covering costs to June 30, 1939, and tonnage figures for 1938, which are the latest available. Maintenance costs are from approved estimates, or where estimates are not shown are on basis of 2 percent on investment.

These costs are in addition to canal freight charges. It costs an average of around $1 to move a ton of freight 100 miles on the railroad or trucks, both of which instead of being supported by taxes, pay taxes.

The available data on numerous different waterway improvements do not show a single one handling freight (taxes only) as cheaply as the trucks or railroads.

One of them shows a tax cost of $16.60 for every ton of freight handled 1 mile for an entire year. The business of this waterway for an entire year was 1,385 tons and the cost in taxes $46,000 in addition to the canal freight charges or equal to $7,968 in taxes only for a 40-ton car load through a 12-mile waterway.

This certainly shows the necessity for curbing such promotions and absolutely refusing to approve any expenditures that are not sound beyond a shadow of a doubt.

The proposed development is unsound from economical and practical standpoints according to studies of numerous engineering and business experts which leaves only the rather weak argument of its value for national defense and this seems hardly worth considering in view of the following:

(1) It would not be completed for 5 years or more.

(2) Its construction would require immense quantities of steel, lumber, cement, machinery, tools, explosives, and other materials, and a large number of skilled labor, all of which are badly needed in connection with ship, airplane, and tank construction, the erection of new facilities for their production and manufacture of arms, ammunition, etc., which we all agree are an immediate necessity.

(3) It would slow up our aid to England and our own defense armament.

(4) No evidence has been offered to show it would help our national defense.

(5) Under certain conditions it would operate as a handicap.

(6) In case of war it would be difficult to defend and not difficult to destroy.

(7) Under war conditions, material could not be handled as quickly or safely through the channel and over the open Atlantic to and from our east coast, Gulf ports, and west coast as they could by our present inland transportation systems for several reasons, some of them—

(a) Lack of protection from unfriendly powers.

(b) Time required for movement.

(c) Necessity for light draught ships, which we do not have.

(d) Excess equipment necessary for this special service.

(e) Increased manpower.

(8) A 27-foot channel would restrict vessels to about a 24½-foot draught.

(9) Only about 5 percent of American ships of 2,000 tons or over could be operated through the channel.

(10) Only about 30 percent of foreign ships of this tonnage could use the channel.

(11) Only the small ships of the Navy could use the channel.

(12) It would require years and many millions of dollars to prepare lake ports for more than present services.

(13) Weather conditions would prevent full use of channel for more than 58 percent of the year or about 7 months out of each 12.

(14) On basis of 58 percent or 7 months out of 12, we would only get about 3 percent service out of American vessels and 18 percent out of foreign vessels.

(15) Only 6 percent of the business through the St. Lawrence is handled by American ships, while about 94 percent is handled by foreign ships.

(16) On this basis of each dollar we spent out of our taxes, only 6 percent would be for the benefit of our workmen and shipping and 94 percent for foreign workmen and shipping.

To sum the entire proposition up, it is apparently an unwise undertaking from either a defense, economical, or commercial standpoint.

1. It will interfere with national defense.
2. It will reduce employment in practically every industry in the United States.
3. It will reduce earnings of American workmen millions of dollars each year.
4. It will increase our cost of living.
5. It will increase our taxes millions of dollars each year.
6. It will give a subsidy of foreign workmen, shipping, and factories at expense of our workmen and industries.
7. It will place American workmen and industry in competition with cheap foreign labor, and the American farmer with a foreign grain, which could be delivered at lake ports cheaper than it costs our midwest farmers to produce.
8. It will place a burden on American workmen and industry for all time to come, with no hope of benefit.

Based on experience with previous estimates of cost of construction of waterways, the final cost will probably be several times the estimates, which in this case would mean two or three billion dollars more than now anticipated with consequent further increase in taxes.

As a result of the above findings and recommendations, the chamber of commerce of the city of Newark, N. J., is convinced that the plan is impractical, would result in a dislocation of trade, and in no way could the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway project be justified; and especially is this true in view of the present emergency that exists.

Dated Newark, N. J., March 31, 1941.

Suggested Objectives for Which We Should Strive in This Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1941

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herein a letter

from a valued and very intelligent constituent, who is the secretary of the Pierce County Pomona Grange, No. 16, Mrs. A. S. (Margaret) Pirnie.

In this intriguing epistle, Mrs. Pirnie summarizes the situation as she views it today, and on behalf of the Pierce County grangers, sets forth some constructive suggestions which I commend to all as being eminently worthy of study.

The letter follows:

PIERCE COUNTY POMONA
GRANGE NO. 16,
Spanaway, Wash., March 14, 1941.

Hon. JOHN M. COFFEE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: If the cause is in the liver, then a little caustic salve on the skin eruption can be expected to do little in the way of a permanent cure. Yet those whom we call statesmen—those who are selected as the leaders in solving and guiding our social destinies make a great deal of ballyhoo and fuss about applying a little caustic salve to effect a cure for that convulsive malady known as war.

What is the cause of war? By the remedy which Congress subscribes we should take it that they don't know. If that honorable body would care to pause for a moment and listen to what some of the citizenry who constitute this great nation of ours have to offer as probable causes of war and—especially, the present conflict, they might take their cue from this and evolve remedial measures which would have a beneficial and more lasting effect.

We believe that the causes of this war, and practically all wars, are economic, namely: that one group of people or one or more nations find themselves deprived of and in need of some of the world's natural resources. Like a hungry dog leashed to his home he eventually strives to break the chain in order that he may go beyond the confines and limits of his leash so that he may take what he desires for his sustenance. A hungry nation is like a hungry dog and what Congress proposes to do is but to tie up a nation again—perhaps with a stronger leash. There would still remain a nation in hunger for some of the natural resources of the world necessary for their functioning.

Appeasing a hungry nation may be like appeasing a hungry dog with scraps of meat. It may aggravate and intensify the craving for food. Even a hungry dog would not act normally for some time upon being fully fed after a long fast.

England is trying to tie Germany up. Congress proposes to send England more chain to do it with and at the same time permitting material to go from the United States to Germany indirectly which will be used to blast such chain asunder. We don't propose to be kidded by any such shenanigan and we are forced to come to the conclusion that our national legislative and administrative bodies are remarkably lacking in an understanding of the situation—or are extremely insincere.

We suggest that strict attention be given to seeing that America or Americans do not become or remain hungry. In other words, one of the first things to do is to stop adding fuel to the flames of Europe and attend to our own business.

We might suggest as objectives for the United States—

1. To strengthen our national defense first by distributing sufficient goods and services to every inhabitant of our country that their physical, mental, and moral conditions may be maintained upon a high level.

2. To build our own military structures for our own protection in case of attack.

3. To use our economic and diplomatic influence to bring about world peace at the earliest possible moment.

4. To use our economic and social knowledge to remove the cause of war by aiding in plans for the necessary economic adjustments among nations.

We would like to know what your objectives are concerning world conditions today.

We would be pleased to hear them from you at your earliest convenience.

Very truly,
PIERCE COUNTY POMONA GRANGE, No. 16,
(MRS. A. S.) MARGARET PIRNIE, *Secretary.*

Dr. Hutchins Asserts United States in War Would Lose What It Has of Four Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. STRATTON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1941

ADDRESS BY ROBERT MAYNARD HUTCHINS, PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the text of a radio address made Sunday, March 30, by the great American educator, President Robert Maynard Hutchins, of the University of Chicago, at the regular Sunday morning service in Rockefeller Memorial Chapel at the university:

We hear on every side that war is inevitable, even that we are at war, and that there is nothing we can do about it.

Things look black. The President now calls for "total victory" over "the enemy" and urges upon us the determination needed to win.

Still there is a chance that these remarks are for foreign consumption and do not mean what they seem to mean. They seem to mean that the British, Chinese, and Greeks are our allies. If this is so, it is immoral to let them die for us while we sit safely at home. We should have been in the war from the start. We should fight now. And if we are actually to press on to total victory we must fight. We are not justified in hoping that the Axis will suffer total defeat without full American participation in the war.

Two days after war broke out in Europe the President assured the Nation he would do everything he could to keep it at peace. He has repeated these assurances again and again. Every speech he made during the campaign contained a pledge to keep the country out of war. The night before the election he said, "We propose and expect to continue our lives in peace." Two weeks ago he said, "Do not let us waste time reviewing the past or fixing or dodging the blame for it." But I cannot believe that this means that he wants us to forget his promises to pursue a policy of peace.

PEOPLE DO NOT WANT TO GO TO WAR

Until we are engaged in military action we must continue to hope that we can avoid the ultimate catastrophe. We stand on the brink of war. But we have not been attacked. The burden of proof rests on those who claim we are about to be. We have not lost the power to decide for peace or war. We still have a chance to catch our breath, reflect a little, and take a last look around before we plunge into the abyss. The President is a democratic leader. One of his greatest qualities is his sense of responsibility to the people. If he is moving toward war, he must be doing it in the conviction that the people want him to. If this is his conviction, he is mistaken.

The people have never had a chance to express themselves on the issue of war or peace. The election gave them no chance. Both parties declared for peace. Both candidates declared for peace.

No one should know better than Mr. Roosevelt that the newspapers are not always a reliable index of public opinion. Even if most of the newspapers are for war, it is no more significant than that only a third of them were for Roosevelt in 1936 and only a fifth of them for him in 1940.

The Gallup poll shows that the people are for peace and that they trust Mr. Roosevelt to keep them at peace. The Gallup question published 10 days ago was, "If you were asked to vote on the question of the United States entering the war against Germany and Italy, how would you vote—to go into the war or to stay out of the war?" Eighty-three percent of those asked said they would vote to stay out. The percentage voting to stay out was higher than it was a year ago. On the other hand, when the question has been, "Do you favor aiding Britain at the risk of war?" the majority of those asked have said "yes." We can only infer that the people want peace and that relying on Mr. Roosevelt's promises of peace, they have been willing to help Britain at the risk of war. The risk of war, with Mr. Roosevelt at the helm, was too slight to worry about.

The country wants to defend itself, aid Britain, and stay out of war. We have been told over and over again that we could do just that. During the hearings and debates of the lease-lend bill man after man announced that this was a bill to keep the country out of war. Mr. Willkie said that was why he was for it. Senator GEORGE, who led the fight for the bill, said that was why he was for it. The passage of this bill gave the President no mandate for war. The people want peace.

"THE DEMOCRACIES" WE ARE TO SAVE

If we go to war, what are we going to war for? Mr. Roosevelt tells us we are to save the "democracies." The democracies are, presumably, England, China, Greece, and possibly Turkey. Turkey is a dictatorship. Greece is a dictatorship. China is a dictatorship. As to England, in 1928 Mr. Anthony Eden, now Foreign Secretary, speaking in behalf of a bill extending the suffrage, felt it necessary to say to the House of Commons, "We have not got democratic government in this country today; we never have had it and I venture to suggest to honorable members opposite that we shall never have it. What we have done, in all the progress of reform and evolution of politics, is to broaden the basis of our oligarchy."

There can be no doubt that the people of this country prefer the Government of Britain to the governments of its Allies or its enemies. Britain is a constitutional state and has been the inspiration of many constitutional states. We prefer the Governments of China, Greece, and Turkey to those of the Axis. But we cannot use the word "democracy" to describe every country that is or may be at war with the Axis. If Russia is attacked by Germany, will she be welcomed into the choir of democracies?

If we go to war, what are we going to war for? The British propose to defeat the Axis. What they propose to do then they do not say. They have repeatedly refused to say. Yet the United States is entitled to know. Are we to rush to arms every time the British Empire is in danger? If

so, we are entitled to know what the future policy of the British Empire is to be. Are we to put down every tyrant that arises in Europe? If so, we are entitled to know what is to be done to keep each tyrant from being worse than the last.

WHAT DO WE DO ABOUT RUSSIA?

If we go to war, what are we going to war for? The only specific statement the President has made on the course we are to pursue after the war is found in two sentences in his last speech. He said, "We believe that any nationality, no matter how small, has the inherent right to its own nationhood." To the same effect he said, "There never has been, there isn't now, and there never will be any race of people fit to serve as masters over their fellow men." Do these statements imply the restoration of pre-war boundaries in Austria, Czechoslovakia, Memel, Danzig, Poland, France, China, and Rumania? Is this undertaking to be world-wide? If so, how do we induce Russia to restore the pre-war boundaries of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Finland, and Poland?

If we succeed in reestablishing these boundaries, how do we know they will last? The boundaries we helped lay down the last time fell apart in 20 years. And we tried to lay them down on the same principle that the President proposes now: the principle of self-determination.

And what do we do about the countries which were victims of aggression before 1939? Is everybody who stole anything before that date to keep it, and everybody who stole anything after it to give it up? What do we do about Hong Kong, the Malay States, the Dutch East Indies, French Indo-China, Africa and, above all, India? If there never has been, isn't now, and never will be any race of people fit to serve as masters over their fellow men, how can we tolerate the mastery of the white race over our yellow, brown, and black fellow men throughout the world?

If we go to war, what are we going to war for? We are stirred, but not enlightened, by the great phrase—the four freedoms—which the President has used as the general statement of our aims. Freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom from want, and freedom from fear—if we go to war, we go to establish these four freedoms everywhere.

NEW CONCEPTION OF WHITE MAN'S BURDEN

The President cannot literally mean that we are to fight on till the four freedoms ring everywhere. If we are to be responsible for the four freedoms everywhere, we must have authority everywhere. We must force the four freedoms upon people who might prefer to do without them rather than accept them from the armed missionaries of the United States. This new imperialism, this revised conception of the white man's burden, this modern version of America's manifest destiny is a repudiation of the Presidential teaching that there never has been, isn't now, and never will be any race of people fit to serve as masters over their fellow men.

Of course, we must extend the four freedoms to our allies as well as to our enemies. We must see to it that British possessions throughout the world have them. The hopes held out to India during the last war, disappointed after it, and now held out again, must be fulfilled. China, Greece, and Turkey must reform, too. In the Latin-American countries we shall have no easy task. Few of them have the four freedoms now. From Mexico to Patagonia we must send our legions to convert our good neighbors by force of arms.

The President cannot mean this, for it is a program of perpetual war—war in Latin America, war in the Far East, war in the South Seas, and even war with Britain. Mr. Roosevelt must mean that by defeating the Axis we shall rid the world of those governments at present most aggressive in their attack on the four freedoms. During or after the war we shall have to figure out the next steps: How to establish and maintain governments that believe in the four freedoms. The first step is war. Here, then, is the real issue. Is the path to war the path to freedom?

This war, if we enter it, will be long, hard, and bloody. We do not have the choice between a short war abroad and a prolonged period of militarization at home. The enemy now controls all of Europe and part of Asia, and is not yet driven from Africa. We have no evidence that the totalitarian regimes will fly to pieces when their opponents get superiority in the air, or even that superiority can be achieved.

IS TOTAL WAR THE PATH TO FREEDOM?

Total war for total victory against totalitarian states can best be conducted by totalitarian states. The reason is simple. A totalitarian state is nothing but a military machine. A totalitarian state will be more effective in war than any other kind of state. A democratic state is organized for the happiness of its citizens. But their happiness cannot be considered in total war. Every one of them must become a cog in the military machine. If the United States is to proceed through total war to total victory over totalitarian states, it will have to become totalitarian, too.

Is total war, then, the path to freedom? We seek freedom from want, and we impoverish ourselves. We seek freedom from fear, and we terrorize ourselves. We seek freedom of worship and freedom of speech, and we suppress them.

And when total victory has been won, will the totalitarian administration end? We may find a clue in England. A responsible member of the British Cabinet, Sir Archibald Sinclair, publicly supports a proposal that there shall be no elections in England for 3 years after the war. The reason is clear. Poverty and disillusionment will make democracy dangerous.

What will be America's fate after a long, hard, and bloody war? In times of peace we have had 10,000,000 unemployed; we shall have at least that many again. We shall have an enormous debt. Repudiation and inflation may rid us of that—and at the same time of the middle class. Having exhausted our resources in getting guns, we shall have none for butter, houses, relief, social security, or education. We shall have want and fear, and we may have the maintenance of order by a government scarcely distinguishable from those which we went forth to fight. We may have the kind of freedom proclaimed by one of Napoleon's marshals to the German towns. He said, "My friends, I bring you perfect liberty. But be prudent. I shoot the first man who stirs."

There are those who say, "Of course, if we go to war, we shall have totalitarianism in this country. But if we try to stay at peace we shall have all this and Hitler, too. Unless we go over and get Hitler, Hitler will come over and get us."

Lord Halifax on Tuesday said that Hitler could never invade England. If he can never invade England, he can never conquer the Western Hemisphere. We in America have a chance to save democracy if we build our defenses and stay at peace. If we enter upon total war to total victory, we lose that chance, even if we win the victory.

WAR IS TERMED COUNSEL OF DESPAIR

War, except in self-defense, is a counsel of despair, despair because the world is bad, despair because peaceful change is too slow and hard. It was the counsel of the nihilists, the Russian revoluntionaries described by Dostoyevsky. They believed in progress by catastrophe. Our modern American nihilists want catastrophe because they despair of getting progress in any other way. They think that everything will be wonderful after the war because such things as capitalism, which they dislike, will be destroyed.

I think it fairly certain that capitalism will not survive American participation in this war. And since it is the vehicle of the materialism that has brought us to our present pass, I am not altogether sure that it deserves to. But experience after the last war in Germany, Italy, and Russia does not suggest that catastrophe is the road to something better.

The trouble with the doctrine of progress through catastrophe is that you can be sure of the catastrophe, but not of the progress. So of war as the path of freedom. You can be certain of the war. The freedom is another matter. If we enter this war, we shall lose what we have of the four freedoms. We shall lose the hope of realizing them. What we have, in this country, is hope. War, for this country, is a counsel of despair. It is a confession of failure. It is national suicide.

We have far surpassed most other nations in our advance toward the four freedoms. We and we alone have the hope of realizing them. We must bravely and hopefully face the task of realizing them. We must show the world a nation which understands, values, and practices the four freedoms. This is America's destiny.

We cannot run away from our destiny because it is hard. We cannot avoid it by claiming that we must have the British fleet to protect us. We cannot evade it by pleading fatigue from our futile efforts to meet the depression, suggesting that we would like an ocean voyage to recuperate. We cannot be like Stendhal's hero, who at the age of 16 ran away to join Napoleon to escape from the sorrows that were poisoning his life, especially on Sundays. We must stay here and fight. As Mr. Willkie said so truly during the campaign, "America's battle for liberty is right here at home."

FALSE PATH TO FREEDOM

The path to war is a false path to freedom. It is a false path to freedom for America. It is a false path to the four freedoms everywhere. War is for the sake of peace. The spirit of the peace will be determined by the spirit of the countries which make it. An Englishman, J. Middleton Murry, said of England: "This country, as it is, is incapable of winning a Christian victory, because it simply is not Christian." This general principle is sound. No country can win a democratic victory unless it is democratic. Only those who understand, value, and practice democracy know what a democratic peace would be. Only those who understand, value, and practice justice can make a just peace. Only those who understand, value, and practice the four freedoms can make a peace to establish them everywhere.

Fear and ignorance wrote the last peace; the fear of the French and British, the ignorance of all the nations. From this fear and ignorance sprang a peace that made this war inevitable. There is no less fear and certainly no less ignorance today. Have we the courage and the wisdom to bring the world to a peace that shall establish the four freedoms everywhere? If we have, we should do it, no matter what the cost in blood or treasure. We want to serve humanity, and in her cause we should be proud to sacrifice our fortunes and our lives.

We cannot seriously believe that what we have of the four freedoms we owe to our courage and our wisdom. We owe it rather to the courage and wisdom of our forefathers, who wrote our Constitution, and to the Divine Providence that placed enormous resources at our disposal at a distance from the conflicts of the Old World. Do not misunderstand me. We have accomplished much, but when we appraise our opportunities and our obligations we see that it is only a beginning. We are fearful and we are ignorant. Our fear is the result of our ignorance. Our

fundamental error is the overwhelming importance that we attach to material goods. Money is the symbol of the things we honor. Only in war can we be united by the call to sacrifice billions for the welfare of mankind. Only at such a time could Mr. Jesse Jones say without bitter protest from the taxpayers, "We are preparing for war. When you do that, you must throw money away." We are frightened and confused by our inability to use our vast resources to obtain a constant flow of more and better material goods. We are dismayed by the long depression and the collapse of our attempts to deal with it. We are easy marks for those who tell us that the way out of our troubles is to march to Berlin.

Are we so ignorant that we think the way to defeat a doctrine we hate is to shoot at it? Are we so naive that we believe that rearrangements in the material order—land, mines, and waterways—will solve the problems of the world? Are we so child-like as to suppose that the overthrow of the Nazis will bring a just and lasting peace? Are we so frightened as to think that if only the British Empire can be preserved, if only the Germans can be crushed, all the ills that have beset us will automatically disappear?

FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEMS REMAIN

But if we go to war, and preserve the British Empire, and crush the Germans, our fundamental problems will remain. We do not face our fundamental problems by going to war; we evade them. We do not make a just and lasting peace by writing into another treaty the fear, ignorance, and confusion that have marred our efforts to build a democratic community at home. If we would change the face of the earth we must first change our own hearts.

Hitler was right in holding before the German people an ideal higher than comfort. He knew he could not give them that. He offered them instead a vision of national grandeur and racial supremacy. These are false gods. Since they are false, they will fail in the end. But Hitler was half right. He was right in what he condemned, and wrong in what he offered in its place. It is our task in this country to realize the true ideals of human life, the true organization of human society, the true democracy. It is our task to work out a new order in America, not, like Hitler's, based on slavery and degradation, but based on the premise that society exists to promote the happiness of its members and that happiness consists in the development of the highest powers of men. The good life and the just society—not the luxurious life or the powerful state—these are the goals toward which America must strive.

It is America's destiny to reach these goals. It is her duty to the world to struggle toward them. The war to which humanity calls America is the war against poverty, disease, ignorance, and injustice. We must win this war in America now. We can hardly be content with a society in which almost half the people are living below the minimum level of subsistence. We cannot be proud to learn that 250,000 babies were born last year without benefit of medical care. With one-room schoolhouses, scanty libraries, nonexistent art museums, and undernourished churches, vast stretches of our country are barren cultural, intellectual, and spiritual wastes. And too often American justice is the interest of the stronger written into law. We must fight on if we are to win America's war.

To win this war we must have peace. Edmund Burke said to the House of Commons: "Judging of what you are by what you ought to be, I persuaded myself that you would not reject a reasonable proposition because it had nothing but its reason to recommend it. * * * The proposition is peace."

The proposition has nothing but its reason to recommend it. The war to total victory over poverty, disease, ignorance, and injustice has none of the glamor and draws few of the cheers that accompany a war of mutual extermination. But though tyrants may be put down, tyranny cannot be destroyed by airplanes and tanks. Tyranny can be destroyed only by creating a civilization in which people will not suffer so much that they will trade their liberties for the pitiful security which the tyrant offers. The war to create this civilization is our war. We must take advantage of every day we have left to build a democracy which will command the faith of our people, and which, by the light of its example, will restore the democratic faith to the people of the world.

America has been called the arsenal of democracy. It has been called the larder of democracy. Let us make it the home of democracy. This is America's destiny.

Hon. William M. Colmer and Defense Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1941

STATEMENT OF THE RULES COMMITTEE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, several days ago there appeared in a number of newspapers throughout the country in a syndicated column a story concerning my friend and colleague on the Rules Committee, Congressman WILLIAM M. COLMER, of Mississippi, a story which was calculated to do Mr. COLMER a grave injustice. Mr. COLMER in the time that he has been a Member of this House has by his fair conduct, industry, and ability won the esteem of his colleagues and the respect of all who have come to know him.

Because this article placed him in an untrue and false light the entire Rules Committee, both Democrats and Republicans, in an effort to right this injustice have made the following statement:

We, the undersigned, constituting all of the members of the Committee on Rules of the United States House of Representatives, have had our attention called to an article which appeared recently in the newspaper column known as the Washington Merry-Go-Round concerning the activities of one of the honored members of this committee, to wit, Hon. WILLIAM M. COLMER, of Mississippi. The gist of this article is to the effect that Mr. COLMER, as a member of this committee, held up the consideration of the $150,000,000 defense housing bill for some 10 days for fear that the legislation might adversely affect the interest of an iceman in his district.

While the membership of this committee realizes the futility of attempting to answer false statements made about men in public life, nevertheless the article referred to is so unjust to Congressman COLMER and so distorts the facts that the membership of the committee feels that this brief statement should be made in the interest of truth, justice, and fairness.

During the consideration of this defense housing bill, Congressman COLMER, as a member of this committee, in interrogating a witness before the committee, raised the question of the wisdom of the Government spending the money of the taxpayers in equipping low-cost housing units for defense workers with such unusual appliances as electric refrigerators and electric and gas ranges and stoves while all other citizens have to pay for such conveniences out of their own pockets. It was practically the unanimous opinion of this committee that such policy was wrong, and the committee decided to hold the bill and proceeded for several days to question witnesses, including the highest authorities of the Housing Administration. As a result of this investigation an amendment was unanimously written into this legislation by the House when it reached the floor, prohibiting the installation of these appliances in future projects except in rare instances And no Member of the House spoke against such an amendment.

The statement that Congressman COLMER held the bill in the committee for 10 days is erroneous, unjust, and untrue in its entirety. On the contrary, Congressman COLMER from the very first insisted that defense housing legislation was necessary and should be speedily enacted. And on three different occasions during the consideration of the matter he made a motion to report the rule out, giving the bill the right-of-way on the floor of the House. Moreover, he was the only member who made such a motion, and it was upon his motion that the rule was finally reported out.

The members of this committee, who have been associated and served daily with Mr. COLMER for a number of years, have a deep and abiding faith in his ability, integrity, loyalty, and patriotism, and deplore and condemn this unjust attack made upon him.

A. J. Sabath, chairman, Democrat, Illinois; E. E. Cox, Democrat, Georgia; Howard W. Smith, Democrat, Virginia; Martin Dies, Democrat, Texas; J. Bayard Clark, Democrat, North Carolina; Lawrence Lewis, Democrat, Colorado; John J. Delaney, Democrat, New York; W. L. Nelson, Democrat, Missouri; Jack Nichols, Democrat, Oklahoma; Hamilton Fish, Republican, New York; Leo E. Allen, Republican, Illinois; Earl C. Michener, Republican, Michigan; Charles A. Halleck, Republican, Indiana.

Adjournment of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1941

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want the RECORD to show that I am opposed to the House adjourning at this time. In my opinion the situation of our country is such as to demand that Congress remain constantly in session.

Organized Labor and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE ILLINOIS STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR WEEKLY NEWS LETTER

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Illinois State Federation of Labor Weekly News Letter:

[From the Illinois State Federation of Labor Weekly News Letter, Chicago, Ill., March 31, 1941]

ORGANIZED LABOR AND NATIONAL DEFENSE—OFFICIAL REPORT AND DECLARATION BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD, ILLINOIS STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

To Organized Labor in Illinois, Greeting:

The executive board of the Illinois State Federation of Labor, the official State branch of the American Federation of Labor, is in full accord with the declaration of the President of the United States that there should be no unnecessary strikes.

It is the opinion of the board that strikes should be resorted to only after all other means of obtaining adjustment have been thoroughly tried and have failed.

The President has not asked for any sacrifice of either legal or moral rights.

He has simply requested that such rights be exercised with due regard to the national interest.

His very words, brief, but highly significant, carried an implication of sympathy for and understanding of the problems of the workers.

There are within the borders of the State of Illinois approximately 3,000 local organizations connected with the American Federation of Labor, representing the great majority of organized labor in the State.

The board is confident that all have a keen sense of their responsibility in relation to the present national emergency.

This has been apparent for some time past, to such an extent that the number of strikes in which American Federation of Labor unions have been involved in this State has dwindled to the vanishing point. A. F. of L. members and activities are not hampering the defense production in any part of the State.

An intensive telegraphic survey, made by the officers of the Illinois State Federation of Labor during the past 3 days covering American Federation of Labor organizations in every part of the State, shows that there is not a single case in Illinois in which defense work is being hampered by a strike of American Federation of Labor members.

Not one!

The general policy of these organizations is to seek adjustment of difficulties through channels that do not involve stoppage of work in defense industries.

The Illinois unions are being encouraged in this policy, not only by the Illinois State Federation of Labor, but also by the officers of the American Federation of Labor and of the national and international unions with which they are connected.

This applies to all this great army of workers, cooperating with each other in approximately 2,800 local unions and over 200 central labor bodies and councils. All within the borders of Illinois.

Thus, the American Federation of Labor members work on steadily at every defense task where they can obtain such employment, notwithstanding many instances in which they are subjected to uncalled-for irritations by antiunion corporations that resort to subterfuges, and even disregard of law, to avoid recognition of the unions.

Every thoughtful citizen familiar with psychological effects will, we believe, understand that conditions may arise, in some particular case, in which a short strike may become necessary and wise if there be no other way to relieve a steadily growing discontent and unrest that might interfere with production to a far greater extent than a temporary stoppage of work.

The workers in Illinois, as in all America, are free men and women.

We shall continue to remind those whom we represent that the one great test of freedom is the performance of necessary duties without the application of compulsory law.

It is a glorious fact that under the American flag compulsory service in industry and commerce is a forbidden thing. Thus speaks the Constitution!

The highest point of efficiency in any industrial or commercial undertaking or enterprise can only be reached through the willing service of free men. That is a true application and significance of American life.

We have no illusions regarding the unfortunate attitude of altogether too many reactionary employers, particularly among the larger corporations, who seek to obstruct the workers in their right to organize into trade unions to secure improvements in life and labor.

The working people can respond wholeheartedly to the request of the President without yielding themselves to the arbitrary control of such reactionary groups.

The Congress of the United States has given recognition by statute to the organization rights of the working people. Even the most humble laborer in the plant of even the largest antiunion corporation may have recourse to an established governmental agency if he is discriminated against because of union activity.

The day of the "yellow dog" contract is gone.

The Conciliation Service of the United States Department of Labor is at the beck and call of any group of citizens, including trade-union officials and employers, who may become involved in labor controversies.

There is no need to wait for the service of the Conciliation Division until some pending difficulty has reached the acute stage of a threatened strike. The business of the conciliators is to bring the parties at issue together and to develop negotiations that lead to voluntary agreements. The use of the Service does not involve a single dollar of expense on the part of either the workers or the employer. The Division may be called upon in every sort of labor controversy, including intrastate as well as interstate employments.

The new National Defense Mediation Board, which has been established by an Executive order of the President, furnishes an effective means, we believe, whereby controversies may be adjusted when the conciliatory and mediatory activities of the United States Department of Labor fail to bring about a settlement of controversies in defense industries.

The National Labor Relations Board is charged by law with the duty of preventing unfair labor practices by employers against workers, in accord with the act of Congress giving statutory recognition to the right of American labor to organize in trade unions for mutual aid and protection, including the development of fair standards of work and wages through trade-union (collective) methods of negotiation and agreement with employers.

The officers of the city central bodies of the A. F. of L., located in every industrial center, are available at all times for advice and guidance.

Authorized organizers of the A. F. of L. are ready everywhere to assist in bringing about adjustments of difficulties whenever they arise.

The unorganized workers should join the unions of their respective trades and occupations. They should insist upon their rights as free men and women to participate in the determination of the conditions under which they live and work. This they can do now with greater hope of success than ever before in the history of America, without stoppage of work except where the employer is of such an arbitrary character that all public sympathy will run against him.

The American worker is first of all an American citizen. He does not lose an iota of his citizenship rights or duties or responsibilities when he enters the work shop.

The rights that have recently been declared for American labor through acts of Congress and decisions of the United States Supreme Court are valuable heritages which must be passed on to the coming generations without having been sullied or narrowed and restricted, as a result of careless and thoughtless action.

Rights used without due regard to consequences are easily lost.

The irritations caused by reactionary employing interests must not be permitted to drive the workers into activities which may result in their cause and purpose being misunderstood by the general public.

The formation of company unions, controlled by employers, is prohibited by Federal law.

Independent unions, organized solely for collective bargaining, even though not actually dominated by the employer in a manner susceptible to legal proof, are not independent in any real sense.

Much like the slaves of antiquity, these so-called independent unions are prisoners within the barred gates of the employing corporation.

They mistakenly assume that all is well if they are permitted to engage in collective bargaining with the employer, satisfied to be allowed to talk to the boss.

The members of these independent unions have not yet, apparently, learned that the basic conditions of labor are not the subject of collective bargaining but are determined by public laws and regulations enacted by Congress, the State legislatures, city councils, county boards, boards of education, and other public agencies.

It is a continuous, never-ending process in which the trade-unions are always represented and from which the independent unions are always absent.

At this very moment in the Illinois Legislature there are pending over 150 bills affecting the immediate interests of the working people, organized and unorganized.

The trade-union movement is represented by active legislative committees at the State capital every hour of the day and night during sessions of the State legislature.

But the "independent" unions never engage in these highly essential activities, without which "collective bargaining" is almost useless from the point of view of the interests of the workers

These "independent" unions, we repeat, are not independent. They are imprisoned within the estates of the "masters," and are engaged in the dubious task of persuading their misguided members that for them there is

neither hope, nor duty, nor responsibility, outside the borders of the corporation plant.

The trade-unions, on the other hand, are combinations of freemen, organized on the basis of broad citizenship interests. They give constant attention to not only the needs of their own members, but act for the general welfare of all workers, their homes and families, and also of the communities in which they live and work, and of the great American Nation as a whole.

In conclusion, we present some observations in relation to the creation of jobs and the development of trade skills, which are always matters of importance to working people.

The A. F. of L. unions are cooperating with the Illinois Department of Labor, the Federal Government, and the vocational schools in the registration of skilled and semiskilled workers, unemployed or working at nondefense jobs, whose services will be needed in defense industries.

The vocational training conference of the A. F. of L. local unions in the Chicago area, called by the Chicago Federation of Labor (the city branch of the A. F. of L), and scheduled to be held on April 12, for the purpose of cooperating with the Government and the public-school authorities in the promotion of skills for defense work, clearly indicates that the unions are eager to aid the defense program.

There are many A. F. of L. members and other workers seeking employment. They want work.

It is to be expected that the Federal Government authorities in charge of defense production will naturally be inclined to make the greatest allotment to the area most capable of responding with speed and efficiency. One result in those sections of the country will be increased employment and the raising of standards of life. Illinois, located in the very heart of America, is, we believe, well prepared to proceed with loyalty, efficiency, and speed, to respond to the national need. Great defense projects are already under way in the State. There is room for more.

As a final word before closing this report, the executive board of the Illinois State Federation of Labor urges the workers of Illinois to remain calm and steady, notwithstanding the storm of excited debate now raging throughout America in relation to national and international policies.

It is clear that in all the welter of clashing public opinion there appears to be one significant point of general agreement; namely, that in the present state of world affairs the United States of America is warranted in undertaking the greatest defense-preparedness program in all history.

The progress and security of American workers, as of anybody or anything American, depends upon the security of America itself.

Fraternally submitted.

Illinois State Federation of Labor: R. G. Soderstrom, president; Robert G Fitchie, first vice president; Charles E. Driscoll, second vice president; Charles H. Sand, third vice president; M. J. Whalen, fourth vice president; Wm. L. McFetridge, fifth vice president; Mary McEnerney, sixth vice president; M. D. Cox, seventh vice president; John L. Kinsella, eighth vice president; Fern R. Rauch, ninth vice president.

Attest:

V. A. OLANDER,
Secretary-Treasurer,
Executive Board, Illinois State Federation of Labor.

Control of Tuberculosis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL J. KILDAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF DR. C. J. KOERTH

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks I include the following radio address delivered by Dr. C. J. Koerth, of San Antonio, Tex., outstanding authority on tuberculosis. This address is in support of my bill, H. R. 3492, to confer on the Public Health Service power and authority to control tuberculosis:

Friends of the radio audience, recently when our great leader, President Roosevelt, reminded you of the danger confronting our country and called upon you to support the huge program necessary for the defense of this country, the great masses of the American people arose magnificently in support of this vital plan; and yet, my friends, there moves among us, unnoticed, untrammeled, a far more devastating power than all the dictator powers of Europe, more insidious than the "fifth column," and more ghastly than the most ingenious product of the diseased minds of the mass murderers across the sea. My friends, I am talking about tuberculosis.

On October 16 last 17,000,000 young men registered for national defense. They went willingly, even happily, ready to a man to give their all that we might live decently and without shame. A glorious sacrifice that we pray to God they shall never be called upon to make. Our radios hourly bring us news of the inhumanities in Europe, and we are stirred; our hearts go out to these unfortunate people. That is the American in us, I guess; and yet, right here in our own United States we have with us an enemy more relentless, more deadly than any bomb dropped by the dictators of Europe. There are no air-raid shelters, no warnings, just slow, miserable death, and no indignation by the public when you have been attacked and slain by this foe.

This miserable enemy lurks in the darkness of ignorance and indifference, an alliance more deadly than the well-known Axis.

The problem of health in a city, county, or State is hard and cruel. Cities have grown, people live closer together, and problems of disease grow with the growth in size of the cities. Of course, health problems affect agricultural areas, too, which means public health is also a national question.

Several years ago the Members of Congress saw fit to enact legislation to control venereal and cancer disease. Now, my friends, it has been found that the cancer and venereal bills are great legislation, and are essential to our national welfare—that the grave danger of tuberculosis is underestimated in this country, and the Federal Government should certainly fight it like it does these other diseases. In other words, tuberculosis is a major health problem of serious national proportions.

A land full of public-spirited individuals have recognized the need for combating this menace to our national welfare, and there is now before Congress a fine bill that will establish, extend, and improve measures for the prevention, treatment, and control of tuberculosis, including the provisions of facilities for sanatorium and other care for persons with tuberculosis. This bill is known as Senate bill 195, and its companion House bill, H. R. 3492, which was introduced by our own Representative, the Honorable PAUL KILDAY. The Senate bill 195 is now before the United States Senate Finance Committee, and House bill 3492 is in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House.

Did you know that every single case of tuberculosis represents an economic loss to this country of about $4,000 and, according to the last report, there are 630,000 such active cases in the United States? Can you possibly conceive such tremendous loss? Two billion five hundred and twenty million dollars?

It is true that progress has been made in stamping out tuberculosis. From 200 annual deaths per hundred thousand it has been reduced to 49 over the Nation. That is a fine record. But in some places death is on such a vast scale as to amount to mass murder. Where there are no standards of practice, no facilities, this affects every part of the country, for an infected consumptive goes from one State to another; the disease travels over the Nation. I am not advocating that the Federal Government take over tuberculosis work, but I do believe that the Government should definitely give leadership, as it has in cancer and syphilis.

Now, just what is tuberculosis?

It is a chronic, contagious disease, and one that will attack any part of the body, although it is most frequently found in the lungs, and is caused by a germ. It is a disease that is communicable or "catching."

Tuberculosis is a respecter of no individual, and may attack a lawyer, doctor, minister, rich man, or anyone.

Now, remember, there can be no tuberculosis without a case of tuberculosis in the community, for one case of tuberculosis comes from another. Easily a million people are now suffering with the active disease of tuberculosis who are walking the streets, coughing and spitting, in many cities of our country, and who are not receiving treatment. Why? Is this disease serious? Certainly, for it is the robber of the prime of life. It strikes the greatest number of people in the age group between the ages of 15 and 45, the national-defense age. My friends, it is this period when life is the most precious to the individual and most useful to the family and community.

The saddest part of it all is, that when an individual is stricken with this disease, before he passes on, he will have infected hundreds of people. With the million sufferers infecting others, the misery and pain can only, of course, be estimated.

To fight tuberculosis is not mere humanitarianism, but it is good, sound business.

Tuberculosis will be found in homes, stores, offices, in elevators, kitchens, laundries, nurseries; everywhere in ordinary workaday life these deadly germs are flying like little invisible black birds of death over and about you in busses, schools, moving-picture theaters, churches, sleeping cars, and railroad coaches—and wherever you come in contact with the coughing, hawking, spitting individuals. Some have said that syphilis is the No. 1 health problem, but if you consider how easily tuberculosis is communicated, tuberculosis undoubtedly is the worst. If I am any judge of the information given us by vital statistics, and of what I have seen and do see daily with my own

eyes, public enemy No. 1 to health is tuberculosis.

In the year 1938, the vital statistics records of the United States revealed that 12,000 people died of syphilis, that 30,000 were killed by automobile accidents, while tuberculosis killed 64,000 people, silently and unseen.

Now, here are some ratios taken from the figures I have just given you: Tuberculosis deaths are five times as many as syphilis, and twice as many die of tuberculosis as automobile accidents. By all the records and facts, by emotion and feeling, tuberculosis is the greatest problem, and undoubtedly the most dangerous of contagious diseases.

I can say with truth that there are thousands and thousands of unknown tuberculous people in the United States caused by the tuberculosis dead, and who are in need of treatment but cannot receive it because there are no facilities for the control of the disease.

Now, what is to be done about this?

There must, of course, be local, State, and national action, and I will speak of those phases in order:

Locally, everywhere, the people must wake up to the danger. There must be sufficient facilities. First, public health departments, whose phase will be to a large extent preventive medicine; also there should be visiting nurses, tuberculosis clinics, dispensaries, a lot of education for prevention and care, and, finally, sanatoriums.

That will cost money. All of this and more must be done by all the localities of America.

As to the States: Their work should be generally to assist local units, but also to have State hospitals and other facilities for tuberculosis.

Nationally, the Federal Government should subsidize the public-health features; that is, the preventive medicine. There should be a gigantic national tuberculosis-control plan. It should have its own tuberculosis division with laboratories in Washington, as they have for hogs, cattle, chickens, and animals.

That, roughly, covers the purpose, but the main thing is for Congress to do something about it. Your Congressman will always be glad to get short letters about any subject of a helpful nature, and which letters were written by the citizen himself. So sit down and write a one-page letter and ask them to fight tuberculosis, and vote for Senate bill No. 195, and House bill No. 3492. And don't just ask them to vote for it "when it comes up," but ask them to get the bill on the floor and put it through, for the sake of the people.

I want to read you what a sufferer of tuberculosis has to say about the problem. He is William Garrett Brown, and is widely quoted. He says:

"To protect the public, we (he means tuberculous) must burden ourselves with both expense and trouble."

And I think that this is quite right, for facilities are necessary, and they cost money.

Mr. Brown continues:

"We must constantly take, for the sake of the public, precautions which are disagreeable and costly."

And he then shows how the public neither cooperates nor helps. He says this must be done for their own health and safety.

Then he continues:

"If the public is to continue to be safe from us, if the public is to continue to have our protection from that against which it failed to protect us, then the public must make it possible for us to get it. We do not ask favors, but—the public would get rid of us. The public would pretend, and would have us pretend, that we are nowhere. It thereby insures that we shall be everywhere. It proscribed us, and thereby admits us."

So, I urge you to fight tuberculosis. Fight all diseases, of course, but the war on tuberculosis must be started again, and there must be a hard and persistent fight. What can you do? First, write to your Congressmen and Senators; then, wherever you are, cooperate with your health authorities.

One thing is certain about tuberculosis—it is entitled to as much money as the other major diseases which the Federal Government now helps. Say so; and when you get a solemn sermon on economy, please reply: "Death by preventable disease is criminal, and it should be good economy to prevent it."

Defend America, yes, my friends, defend America, and this means against all of her enemies, disease as well as the dictators in Europe.

Write or wire now, and ask your Congressmen to actively support Senate bill 195 and House bill 3492 for tuberculosis control.

The Government Corrects Pollution—Why Not the Industrial Polluter?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1941

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, many Members may have failed to read the voluminous hearings of the Department of Justice appropriations bill for 1942. For that reason I am asking leave to reprint herewith some testimony found on pages 553 and 554 of the hearings, reproducing a colloquy between James V. Bennett, Director, Bureau of Prisons, and Commissioner of Prison Industries, and Congressman CARTER, of California.

This testimony reveals that the Federal Government is setting a shining example for America as a whole by correcting the pollution of its institutions throughout the country. This is as it should be and the Bureau of Prisons deserves commendation for its public-spirited attitude in this connection.

However, this sensible policy on the part of the Federal Government gives added significance to the need for Federal legislation to control the increasing menace of pollution throughout the Nation as a whole. Why, after all, should taxpayers pay taxes to build pollution-control works for Federal institutions when short-sighted municipalities, backward States, or selfish industrialists dump injurious pollution and raw sewage into the public waters of America? Since Uncle Sam sets the good example, should he not also set the standards which should be complied with by others who are now polluting the country's interstate waters? If pollution is good, why should the Federal Government spend your money to correct it? If pollution is bad, why should the Federal Government hesitate longer about setting up a reasonable and rational program of controlling it?

Mr. Speaker, on March 4, I introduced H. R. 3778, known as the Water Pollution Control Act, which provided a reasonable method for correcting the pollution evil in the public waters of the United States. This bill has the support of all the major conservation organizations in the United States, and leaders of the Izaak Walton League of America were active in helping to prepare this bill. It differs from my previous bill on pollution in that it is more temperate in nature than the bill I introduced in the Seventy-sixth Congress, and provides definite machinery by which a municipality or industry can safeguard itself against any abrupt or drastic application of its provisions to the detriment of such cities or industries. It specifically provides that the bill shall in no way serve to slow down or impede the national-defense-production program. It is as moderate as any legislation on the subject can be and still make definite progress toward correcting the pollution evil; it is probably as rigid as any legislation can be at this time in order to win the popular support necessary to begin the long process of ridding the public waters of America of the menace of unnecessary and unjustified pollution.

SENATOR GILLETTE INTRODUCES COMPANION ANTIPOLLUTION BILL

On March 17, Senator GILLETTE, of Iowa, introduced a companion bill in the Senate to H. R. 3778. Senator Gillette's bill, which is known as S. 1121, is identical to the Mundt bill—H. R. 3778—and it is hoped that hearings will soon be held on this legislation in both the Senate and the House. Those interested in correcting the pollution menace in America are urged to write the Senate Commerce Committee and the House Rivers and Harbors Committee asking that public hearings be initiated on this important legislation. With the Gillette-Mundt antipollution bill written into law, taxpayers will begin getting better value on their money when they appropriate funds to prevent pollution on the part of Federal institutions—they will then not only have set a good example but they will have established a sensible standard for less enlightened and public-spirited groups to follow.

[Citations from House hearings, pp. 553 and 554]

CHILLICOTHE SEWAGE-DISPOSAL PLANT

Mr. HARE. What is the next new item?

Mr. BENNETT. The only new item for Chillicothe is the first increment of $15,000 for the construction of a sewage-disposal plant.

The sewage-disposal plant at Chillicothe was constructed in 1918 by the Army, and was taken over by us. It was not of very permanent design when it was originally built, being merely a temporary wartime camp.

It is now worn out, and the public-health authorities and the local officials have been criticizing us for some time for dumping raw sewage into the Scioto River.

We estimate that, with our own labor, we can rebuild this plant so as to meet proper sanitary and public-health standards for a

total of $35,000, and we are requesting $15,000 for this purpose for the first year.

Mr. CARTER. Will that keep the sewage out of the river?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes; completely.

Mr. CARTER. How many other places do you dump raw sewage into the stream?

Mr. BENNETT. I suppose we dump raw sewage into the stream at four or five other places, but we don't dump raw sewage into the stream where it is the only contamination of that stream.

Mr. CARTER. It would be a good example for the Government to set to clean that up, wouldn't it?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, sir; I should think, Mr. CARTER, that it would be a splendid example. I certainly think that good sewage plants pay a high dividend in health. We have tried to follow the local practices, although I agree with you that we should set a good example by putting in a sewage plant.

Mr. CARTER. We have had a pollution bill before Congress. In fact, there was a pollution bill that passed both Houses of Congress and got into conference and never got out. It died in conference at the last Congress. That was a bill trying to clean up the pollution all over the United States.

But I think it is a good idea for the Federal Government—and I am insisting on it in every building program that I have anything to do with—to put a sewage-disposal system in whatever the project is.

Recently, in my district, we put in a large naval air station there to take care of 1,000 men. They have a plant there that they installed at a cost of about $75,000, which is much less than I thought it would cost when we started on it. But that treats all of the sewage from this plant, where several thousand men are employed and a good many of them housed there also.

Mr. BENNETT. We try to conform to the local requirements. For instance, at Sandstone, Minn., we were dumping our sewage into the Kettle River, the local river there. But all the local people and the game wardens and everybody else complained about it; and we gradually brought that up to standard.

But this plant at Chillicothe is a brand-new one. This is a complete rebuilding of it to serve the existing population.

Mr. HARE. Is that to be constructed with prison labor?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, sir. The other item is $12,500 for a vocational shop. That is the second increment of a project approved last year.

Mr HARE. I understood that the sewage-disposal plant was to cost $35,000.

Mr. BENNETT. It will cost $35,000 ultimately. That includes all the machinery, the chlorinating equipment, as well as the sludge beds and the filtration beds, and so forth.

Mr. HARE. The complete plant?

Mr. BENNETT. The complete plant.

Four Defense Strikes Ended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1941

ARTICLE FROM DEFENSE

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Defense, official weekly bulletin of the Office for Emergency Management:

[From Defense—official weekly bulletin of the Office for Emergency Management]

FOUR DEFENSE STRIKES ENDED—MEDIATION BOARD'S FIRST CASES

Less than 4 days after the National Defense Mediation Board had taken jurisdiction over its first cases, the first of more than 17,000 striking employees were returning to work in all four cases certified to the Board. In three of these cases production was being resumed on defense orders at the request of the Board. In the fourth case the strike was settled in the face of a scheduled hearing before the Board.

The three cases in which production was resumed pending settlement of the disputes by the Mediation Board are Vanadium Corporation of America, Bridgeville, Pa.; Condenser Corporation, South Plainfield, N. J.; and the four plants of the International Harvester Co.—McCormick Works, Chicago; Tractor Works, Chicago; and the plants at Rock Falls, Ill., and Richmond, Ind. In the case of the fourth company, Universal Cyclops Steel Co., of Bridgeville, Pa., within a few hours after the Board had requested settlement, word was received that the dispute had been ended by mutual agreement between the company and the union.

UNIONS AND EMPLOYERS RECEIVE TELEGRAMS

The first four cases were certified to the Board by the Secretary of Labor, in accordance with the terms of the President's Executive order, at approximately 4 p. m. Thursday, March 27. The next morning the Board sent telegrams to the unions and employers in each of the cases requesting, first, "that you agree today to resume production," and second, that both sides come to Washington for meetings with Board panels under the following schedule:

Universal Cyclops Steel Co.—Meeting 10 a. m., March 29. Panel: Frank P. Graham, representing the public; Thomas Kennedy, representing labor; Roger D. Lapham, representing employers.

Vanadium Corporation of America—Meeting, 10 a. m., March 29. Panel: William H. Davis, representing the public; Thomas Kennedy and Roger D. Lapham.

Condenser Corporation of America—Meeting, 10 a. m., March 29. Panel: William H. Davis; George M. Harrison, representing labor; Cy Ching, representing employers.

International Harvester Co.—Meeting 10 a. m., March 31. Panel: C. A. Dykstra, Board chairman, representing the public; Philip Murray, representing labor; George M. Harrison, representing labor; Walter C. Teagle and Eugene Meyer, representing employers.

VANADIUM CORPORATION

The agreement to resume operations in the case of Vanadium Corporation was reached following a short meeting Saturday and a 12-hour session ending at 10 p. m. Sunday night. Under this agreement the Board will hold hearings concerning the issues involved in the dispute, under section 2; paragraph d, of the President's Executive order.

CONDENSER CORPORATION

The agreement to resume operations at the Condenser Corporation plant was reached after a 7-hour conference in Washington Saturday afternoon and night. Under this agreement the company and the union will negotiate their differences while at work, and, in case these negotiations fail, the matter will be submitted to the Mediation Board.

INTERNATIONAL HARVESTER CO.

The agreement to resume operations in the four plants of the International Harvester Co., under terms of a proposal suggested by the Board, was reached before representatives of the union and the company left Chicago for the scheduled meeting with the Board in Washington on Monday.

Gallup Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1941

ARTICLE ON POLL-TAX REPEAL

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note what the Gallup poll has learned through its sampling of the Nation on the subject of poll-tax repeal.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am reproducing his release on the subject. This appeared in the papers throughout the Nation under date of April 1, 1941. The article follows:

THE POLL-TAX ISSUE—FIRST STUDY OF PUBLIC OPINION ON POLL-TAX ISSUE COMPLETED BY INSTITUTE IN NATIONAL SURVEY—SENTIMENT IN EIGHT STATES WITH POLL TAXES IS OPPOSED TO ABOLITION, BUT NATION AS A WHOLE VOTES TO LIFT RESTRICTION

(By Dr. George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., April 1.—One of the political problems being widely discussed throughout the South is the question of abolishing poll taxes, which are still a requirement for voting in eight Southern States.

Campaigns headed by civic and other groups have been started in nearly all of the eight States to repeal the poll taxes, and a bill has been introduced in Congress by Representative GEYER, of California, to bar the poll tax as a requirement for voting in Federal elections.

With public discussion of the issue just beginning to take shape, the American Institute of Public Opinion has conducted a survey to measure first public reaction to the anti-poll-tax campaign, both in the poll-tax States as a group and throughout the rest of the country. The study is the first of a series which will be conducted by the institute in future months to measure the trends of sentiment on this issue.

Today's survey results reveal three facts about public opinion on the poll-tax question:

1. Throughout the Nation as a whole a large majority of voters are in favor of abolishing all existing poll taxes.

2. In the 13 Southern States public opinion is of mixed complexion on the issue. In the 5 Southern States which have already abolished poll taxes, or never had them, a majority wants to see them repealed in the other parts of the South where poll taxes are still in force.

However, in the eight States which still have poll taxes—Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia—majority sentiment is still in favor of retaining the tax.

In those eight States the issue was posed as follows:

"Should the poll tax be abolished as a requirement for voting in this State?"

The attitude of persons who have paid their poll taxes and are eligible to vote is as follows for the eight poll-tax States combined:

Poll-tax States

(Vote of persons who have paid their poll tax)

	Percent
For abolishing poll tax	34
For retaining poll tax	59
No opinion	7

The survey also included, however, persons of voting age who, through failure to pay the poll tax, are not eligible to vote. When they are added to the others who have paid their taxes, the combined sentiment is:

Poll-tax States

(Persons who have paid poll tax combined with those who have not)

	Percent
For abolishing poll tax	35
For retaining poll tax	53
No opinion	12

In interpreting these figures it must be remembered that the percentages apply to the eight poll-tax States as a whole, and are not necessarily typical for each of the States individual. Special studies with larger samples are necessary to report sentiment by individual States.

HOW REST OF NATION FEELS

The next aspect of the question is—what is the sentiment of the rest of the South (the five non-poll-tax States), and of the country as a whole?

Here are the findings of the survey on that score:

"Some Southern States require every voter to pay a poll tax amounting to $1 a year or more before they can vote. Do you think these poll taxes should be abolished?"

Vote in 5 Southern States with no poll tax

For abolishing poll tax, 51 percent; for retaining poll tax, 25 percent; no opinion, 13 percent.

Total United States vote

For abolishing poll tax, 63 percent; for retaining poll tax, 25 precent; no opinion, 12 percent.

Florida, Louisiana, and North Carolina formerly levied poll taxes but abolished them in recent years.

The average tax in the eight States with poll-tax requirements is about $1.75. In some States the taxes are cumulative so that a voter might be required to pay as much as $36 before he could vote.

In the early days of the Republic only people who owned property could vote. Poll taxes were adopted in those days as a means of widening the suffrage. By paying a few dollars' poll tax, persons could vote without having to own property.

Contrary to popular impression, the present poll-tax system in the South is of comparatively recent origin, dating back only to the period between 1880 and the early 1900's. The taxes were levied chiefly as a means of combating the popularity of the Populist Party among poor whites in the South.

ARGUMENTS PRO AND CON

Here are some of the arguments on the poll tax which were stressed by persons interviewed in the South by field reporters for the Gallup poll:

For abolishing the tax

A 76-year-old farmer in Hazen, Ark., expressed his opinion to Institute Interviewer Bess Lay as follows:

"You can't find a man in this whole county that voted for the poll tax in the first place; it was just put on and run over the people."

Over in De Valls Bluff, Ark., another farmer felt the poll-tax system encouraged political corruption. He told an institute interviewer. "It's gotten so rotten the way they purchase those poll taxes that the whole poll-tax system ought to be done away with."

From Knoxville, Tenn., Interviewer Roger Johnson reports the following statement by a timekeeper in a textile mill:

"I don't think it's right to make some people pay a poll tax while others in other States don't have to."

A 37-year-old bookkeeper in the same city expressed his view this way:

"Abolishing the tax would eliminate a lot of election frauds and produce more votes and a more democratic form of government."

For retaining the tax

In Kosciusko, Miss., an institute reporter interviewed a 40-year-old farm wife who had this to say in casting her vote to retain the poll tax:

"Poll taxes help pay for the schools and keep the Negroes from voting."

A 30-year-old insurance agent in Virginia, expressing an attitude held by many voters in the survey, said:

"We ought to keep the poll tax because when you pay a tax you're more interested in the results of an election."

One poor white farmer in the deep South was for retaining the poll tax because he thought there were many people who wouldn't take voting seriously enough to be able to vote intelligently. He said:

"Better keep the poll tax because, if we don't have it, some people will just vote 'cause somebody gives 'em a bottle of whiskey or a dollar bill."

Dr. Mohler Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago an unusual honor was bestowed upon a member of the veterinary profession—Dr. John R. Mohler, Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture. Dr. Mohler was selected by the District Medical Society to deliver the annual Kober Foundation lecture at Georgetown University, an honor usually reserved for members of the medical profession.

Dr. Mohler was selected for this high honor in recognition of a lifetime of service to science and humanity, particularly in the field of animal diseases which affect humans. His accomplishments in this important field have contributed immensely to the health and security of America.

Dr. Mohler, lecturing before a distinguished and enthusiastic audience, discussed one of the most serious of these diseases—brucellosis, more commonly known as undulant or Malta fever. A report of his lecture is contained in the following story from the Washington Evening Star, which I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 29, 1941]

MALTA FEVER RANKS WITH ENEMIES OF UNITED STATES, SAYS DR. MOHLER, ANIMAL INDUSTRY BUREAU CHIEF SPEAKS IN KOBER FOUNDATION LECTURE

Dr. John R. Mohler, Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, declared last night in the Kober Foundation lecture at Georgetown University that the threat of a serious disease and the menace of foreign military powers have much in common as enemies of this country.

"One of the enemies—and a formidable one—is brucellosis, a disease that afflicts man and his domestic animals," he told an audience of doctors and scientists in Gaston Hall.

Brucellosis gets its name from its discoverer, Sir David Bruce, who first isolated the germs in a herd of goats on the island of Malta in 1887. Frequently it is called undulant or Malta fever. The Bureau of Animal Industry imported 65 goats from Malta a few years later and since then the source of the disease has been traced also to cattle and swine.

Dr. Mohler disclosed the fact that during experiments conducted to bring the "appalling ravages" of brucellosis under control, 11 scientists and helpers of the Bureau of Animal Industry had become infected seriously with the disease, which similates typhoid fever.

"The one death to occur was that of a young helper who became delirious and jumped from a fourth-story window," he said.

HONORARIUM PRESENTED

The certificate and $500 honorarium of the foundation were presented to Dr. Mohler at exercises by the Reverend David V. McCauley, S. J., dean of the Georgetown University School of Medicine, in the absence of the Very Reverend Arthur A. O'Leary, president of the university, who was ill. Present were officers and members of the Medical Society of the District, who chose the Government pathologist for the lectureship honor this year.

Father McCauley paid a brief tribute to Dr. George Martin Kober, who endowed the foundation in 1923, when he was dean of medicine at Georgetown. Last night was his birthday anniversary.

Before the "test and slaughter" plan was put into effect in 1934 in conjunction with the Federal program to reduce the number of infected livestock in this country, Dr. Mohler said brucellosis was taking an annual toll of $50,000,000 from the cattle industry. The campaign for complete control may take years, he said, but it will ultimately succeed. Progress has been made to the point, he said, where the disease is now under control in 350 counties.

Dr. Mohler recalled that Dr. Kober and Dr. Lloyd Magruder, then dean of medicine at Georgetown, with Dr. Emil Berliner, inventor and philanthropist, were among the first persons in this country to witness the laboratory experiments because of their interest in milk-borne diseases.

PASTEURIZATION CUTS TOLL

Pasteurization of milk is the preventive measure for humans, Dr. Mohler said, except in those occupational groups whose work brings them into contact with infected animals.

The Government scientist said that control measures are slow. "Nature was not to be hurried," he explained. "By assembly-line methods man has speeded up production of automobiles and airplanes; but in dealing

with the placid cow our anxiety for quick results is of no avail."

Segregation of cows in "maternity stalls" and the vaccination of calves in general were the approved methods of undertaking control, Dr. Mohler explained. A vaccine is being developed for swine, but no report can be made of it at the present time.

Universal Daylight Saving Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD H. McLEAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. DONALD H. McLEAN, OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over the radio on March 23, 1941:

I thank the National Broadcasting Co. for the privilege of presenting to a Nation-wide radio audience the purpose of the bill I have introduced in Congress for universal daylight saving. I say "universal" because the plan for daylight saving now operates in a number of States and localities, while others continue on standard time, and it is the purpose of the bill to do away with this conflict and provide for a uniform system of time throughout the country.

The idea of daylight saving is not new. Benjamin Franklin frequently referred to greater use of daylight. In his autobiography he wrote: "In walking through the Strand and Fleet Street one morning at 7 o'clock I observed there was not one shop open, though it had been daylight and the sun up above 3 hours; the inhabitants of London choosing voluntarily to live much by candlelight, and sleep by sunlight, and yet often complain, a little absurdly, of the duty on candles and the high price of tallow." With these thoughts Franklin suggested the pertinent arguments for daylight saving—the benefits of sunlight, recreation during daylight hours, and the conservation of artificial light and the materials necessary to create it.

The daylight-saving plan is not unique nor fantastic. Its purpose is to save an hour of daylight each day during the summer months. The present-day adaptation of the plan originated with William Willett, a London architect, about 1908. He, like Franklin, noticed how deserted the streets were in the early morning hours, even when fully lighted by the sun, and he conceived the idea of moving the clocks ahead an hour in the summer so that the people could have an hour more of daylight. Innumerable objections were proposed. In the British Parliament the legislation embodying the idea was defeated in 1909 and the 4 succeeding years, but more numerous became those who saw advantages in it, and on May 17, 1916, the measure was adopted. It was afterward adopted in France, Germany, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Portugal, and Australia.

The plan does not propose to change either the laws of nature or the habits of man, but it does seek to alter the conditions under which we work and play. Specifically, the bill I have introduced provides that on the last Sunday of March of each year at 2 o'clock a. m. the clocks shall be advanced 1 hour. On the last Sunday in October of each year at 2 o'clock a. m. the clocks shall be turned back 1 hour, putting them just where they were before. It will create no confusion, but it will give an extra hour of daylight from March to November. It merely means that the day will commence 1 hour earlier to sunrise, and terminate 1 hour further from sunset than at present. We merely borrow 60 minutes of the afternoon and loan them to the morning. This will enable us to do more in the early hours of the day, and have more time for recreation in the afternoon while it is yet daylight. The same amount of time for work and the same amount for recreation will be ours as at present—the only difference being that our work and our pleasure will be consummated in daylight.

It was not until 1883 that any sort of a standard of time was determined upon. Until then each community fixed its own standard, depending largely upon the pursuits of the people and the influences of surrounding communities. In those days when important centers were isolated, people in the East had little concern for the habits of life of the people of the West. The development of transportation extended the sphere of influence and importance of the several communities throughout the country, and made them increasingly more dependent on each other. This created a demand for greater regularity and certainty of communication, and, consequently, for a standard of time.

In 1883 there were 77 different times kept by the railroads of the United States. The resulting confusion was so great that a convention of prominent railroad men was called to devise a remedy. They did this by adopting what is now our present system of standard time. Its use by the railroads had such an influence on the life of the country that it was adopted by common consent, but it was not given official sanction until the act of Congress 35 years later.

The first experiment in daylight-saving time in the United States was in 1918. It was adopted as a wartime measure in the interest of public health, conservation, and production. Time and circumstances have again brought the threat of war to our shores. We can no longer hope to avoid war by observing the generally accepted rules of neutrality. The enactment of the so-called lend-lease bill, and the comments of the President and administration leaders since, have fixed our course, which is to provide for ourselves an adequate national defense, and to aid Britain and the other nations resisting the forces of aggression. Because of these wartime activities, conditions today are comparable to those during the last war, and, all measures adopted then are needful now, and should be enacted at once, including the daylight-saving time.

The original Daylight Saving Act proved its usefulness, and remained in effect until the end of the war. Its benefits were so manifest that when it was repealed permissive or mandatory State laws were enacted. These laws have been in effect for many years, and have been gradually extended. Under them daylight saving was in effect last summer in all or part of 16 States—Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Georgia, Idaho, and Tennessee. Unwards of 35,000,000 people in the United States experienced its benefits, and good sense requires that these benefits should be extended to the entire country. This year cities like Chicago, Philadelphia, New York, Boston, Buffalo, Pittsburgh, and Memphis will observe daylight saving. It is at once apparent that this will affect adjacent territory where the habits of the people are influenced by life in the larger cities. To avoid confusion and inconvenience resulting from the partial observance of daylight saving, Congress should enact a law applicable to all States. Confusion is bound to exist where some sections of the country have adopted the system of daylight saving, and other sections still operate on standard time. One or the other should be adopted, and the popularity of the daylight-saving plan and its benefits in the present emergency recommend it for adoption at this time.

My own State of New Jersey is one of the States that has continued daylight-saving time since 1918. The experience of New Jersey with daylight saving has been satisfactory, and its example might well be followed by other States. New Jersey is a State of widely diversified interests, in manufacturing, agriculture, and horticulture. Our extensive seacoast and mountain lakes afford ideal recreational facilities and attract throngs of visitors annually. Thousands of our people commute daily to their business in New York and Philadelphia. Returning to their homes in the evening, they are glad to have the extra hour of daylight for work on the grounds about their homes and in their gardens. The demand in my State is not only for the present daylight-saving period but that it be extended for 2 additional months, as I have proposed.

We know that daylight work, free from the strain of artificial light, is the most efficient. Accurate studies show that a majority of industrial accidents occur during the closing hours of the day, when artificial light is required. Work in the morning hours in summer is free from the aggravating discomforts that come with the heat of the day. Daylight saving will provide an additional hour of morning coolness and discourage the need for work under artificial light. When overtime work is necessary, daylight saving will permit more of this labor to be performed by natural light, with resulting increased efficiency.

Polls on the subject of daylight saving have been taken among the employees of commercial and manufacturing establishments, and in each instance a very large majority have favored it. Out of 300,000 ballots cast in one survey 95 percent were voted in its favor.

Some opposition to the plan will come from the agricultural districts, the farmers contending that their work is governed by the rising and setting of the sun, but, if the farmers in those States which have already adopted the daylight-saving program have found it possible to conform to the change in hours, it would seem that the farmers elsewhere would not be seriously inconvenienced.

Daylight is free. Artificial light is costly. Daylight saving will reduce the industrial, commercial, and domestic expenditures for artificial light. Imagine the saving in fuel and electric current if all the lights of the country were turned out for 1 hour each day. Based on the statistics available from the experience during the World War, the estimated saving of fuel during the daylight-saving period would be upward of 5 percent, which is an enormous amount in volume of materials and energy when the total consumption is considered. These resources could be advantageously diverted to the national-defense program.

The encouragement I have received from chambers of commerce and other organizations, and from people in all walks of life, indicates a demand for the adoption of daylight-saving time as the standard summer time for the United States. It is fairly calculated to accomplish valuable economies in our national life; it will be of

special value in the present national emergency; it will contribute to the comfort, convenience, and unity of the home life of many millions of our people, and we all know that home life is the life of America and that which has made America great.

No Strike Need Be

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post for today:

[From the Washington Post of April 2, 1941]

NO STRIKE NEED BE

The outstanding fact about the strike in the soft-coal fields is that, with a little patience and good judgment on the part of the disputants, it could have been prevented. The issues are not complicated. Nor had the operators and miners exhausted the possibilities of reaching an agreement around the conference table. Negotiations had been under way for several weeks but the Conciliation Service had not had an opportunity to explore the controversy fully when the workmen laid down their tools. It was not till Sunday that Dr. Steelman, the Labor Department's chief conciliator, went to New York at the request of President Roosevelt and Secretary Perkins to investigate the threat of a coal strike

Most of the responsibility for the decision to fight it out on the picket lines seems to fall upon the operators. At the beginning of the negotiations the United Mine Workers proposed that work should continue after expiration of the contract with the understanding that if negotiations were prolonged beyond April 1, the new agreement would become retroactive to that date. Acceptance of that reasonable offer would have prevented the strike. Now that the walk-out has technically begun, despite the fact that yesterday was a miner's holiday, that proposal still seems to be the best starting point for a hasty settlement. Fortunately there are indications that a back-to-work order on this basis may soon be agreed to.

The resumption of work while negotiations go forward would not imply, of course, that all the miners' demands should be met. John L. Lewis' bid for wage increases of $1 a day seems to be particularly excessive at a time when the administration is attempting to keep economic relationships on an even keel. Adjustment of these differences, however, is a task for the operators and the U. M. W. aided by the Conciliation Service. The public's concern is that the mining of coal to keep defense industries in full operation shall not be stopped or seriously curtailed. Coal mining, like every other industry vital to the armament program, is now affected with a public interest in a very real sense. The Government cannot tolerate any prolonged shutdown. Realization of that fact should bring about an agreement that will send workers back to the mines before another day has passed.

Harrison B. Quigley Post, No. 72, World War Memorial Association, Palmyra, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1941

ADDRESS BY HAROLD E. COCKLEY

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, last year I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks of Harold E. Cockley at the seventh annual banquet of the World War Memorial Association and the Harrison B. Quigley Post, No. 72, of the American Legion, of Palmyra, Pa. Mr. Cockley's remarks at that time were found to be of great interest.

At the eighth annual meeting of the same group held on February 14, 1941, Mr. Cockley gave what seemed to me a very graphic and striking description of the events which are occurring in the world today and of the challenges which these events present to us. His remarks follow:

Comrades of the American Legion, fellow members of the Memorial Association, honored guests, and all our friends, once again I take real pleasure in greeting you and bidding you a cordial welcome. We are glad to have you here. All of you seem to be in a happy frame of mind, and we are going to do our best to keep you that way the entire evening. For the past 8 years we have been meeting together on occasions like these; an evening for which we plan and look forward to with a great deal of interest, for it gives us an opportunity to meet and chat with friends, many of whom we do not see at any other time of the year.

It seems such a short time since we met here just 1 year ago. Truly a year of swiftly moving events at home and abroad, that it is hard to realize so much could actually happen in 1 year's time.

We have seen democratic nations, much like ourselves, desiring nothing but peace with their neighbors, struck down and enslaved by the legions of a war lord crazed with power. We were shocked at the quick collapse of France. We were shocked at how the deadly effects of propaganda and intrigue had poisoned the minds of many of the French people. We saw the courageous stand of the French soldier, fighting with inferior weapons, giving his all, yet knowing he had been let down, sold out by unscrupulous political groups who placed their own selfish desires ahead of love of country, and their liberty loving nation died on the battlefields of Flanders.

Today we see the people of England facing the greatest crisis in all their history, but meeting it with remarkable courage, and amazing fortitude in one common united effort. Today England is not fighting for empire, not fighting for king, not even for the dynamic Churchill, but England is a courageous people fighting for their ideals of social justice, freedom, their way of life, and for this they are taking such punishment as perhaps no other nation could absorb.

We in America continue to enjoy peace but we know that our peace is threatened. Danger signals are ahead, and we are in the midst of a gigantic preparedness program. These are days when we hear much talk of defense and what constitutes our first line of defense. Arguments have been brought out for large two-ocean navies, powerful air forces, highly mechanized armies, but I wonder if our REAL first line of defense is not within our own individual bodies. What is our attitude to all this? Do we have the will and courage to see this thing through? Are we willing to accept our responsibilities? Or are we in favor of this defense program just as long as it doesn't cost us anything or interfere too much with our own personal desires? Surely events of the past several months should tell us that democracy as we know it, is pretty much on trial, and that nations who are not READY or WILLING to defend their liberties may lose them.

Freedom and democracy, like good health, should receive good care. Many of us are not reasonably concerned with our health until we lose it. Then we make frantic gestures, trying to recapture it. Oftimes, too late. We should realize that democracy is not just a trophy or an heirloom handed down to us, stored away and only to be admired on special occasions; but it is a living, vital force constantly exposed to the ever-changing conditions of society, and the contaminating influence of those elements who ever seek to destroy it. We are a people of many privileges, but privilege carries with it responsibility. There is no doubt that we will have to face issues of vital importance. Perhaps it may help if we turn back a few pages in history and note the manner in which those early colonists accepted their responsibilities, of the hardships and suffering endured in their unyielding struggle to live as a free people.

Try to fix in your minds, the suffering of a ragged, starving Continental Army on the bleak and barren hillsides at Valley Forge. Try to fix in your minds the courage and heroism unsurpassed in the terrible human sacrifice at Gettysburg. Today, many monuments mark that historic shrine, outstanding of which is the "Eternal Light," a memorial to peace. It is also a memorial to a very tall, gaunt, careworn man who labored for peace, whose only thought was peace and unity for the people he represented. Receiving word of the third day's fight at Gettysburg, he kneels in the presence of Cabinet members in humble prayer that his Nation would not be divided.

In the great cemetery at Arlington, a sentry paces back and forth in eternal vigilance before a tomb where lies one unknown, who, with thousands of others, some of them companions of our youth, accepted their responsibilities in all that that term implies.

These and many more are stories told of courage, toil, privation, and much sacrifice. It is why we enjoy the priceless privileges we do today. Nor should we forget the thousands of unnoticed, unsung heroes of those early days, such as teacher, preacher, so-called country doctor, tending and helping body and soul, receiving little or no reward, expecting none, theirs a service to humanity. Today throughout the entire land are thousands of research laboratories, modernly equipped hospitals, great universities, and magnificent cathedrals, which are, in truth, fitting memorials to those men, who so unselfishly gave lifetimes of service to the ideals of democracy and, above all else, love for their fellow men.

I daresay all of you here tonight, have at some time or other thrilled to the words from the pen of Irving Berlin, sung by Kate Smith, as only she can sing it, "God Bless America." When we hear that song, let us be ever mindful that we, too, have a duty to perform; that we can and will accept our responsibilities; that we will do our utmost to protect these cherished ideals of justice,

freedom, our way of life. And when called upon we will gladly make sacrifices for the America that we know—for the America we want to keep.

Vermont Federation of Labor Endorses Plumley's Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1941

LETTER FROM VERMONT FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert the following letter:

VERMONT FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Sheldon Springs, Vt., April 1, 1941.

Hon. CHARLES PLUMLEY,
Representative to Congress,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: It is with pleasure that I read in the Free Press this morning of your stand in regards the strikes in our national-defense industries. Now, as president of the Vermont Federation of Labor, I wish to congratulate you, and to say that the Vermont Federation of Labor stands solidly behind the national-defense program, and will cooperate to the fullest.

I wish to state here that I am utterly disgusted with these strikes, as are most of the workers in this State, and from past experiences we know that most of these are engineered by un-American leadership within the ranks of labor; and the quicker they are outlawed the better.

I am a member of the American Federation of Labor, and if they go in for strikes as the C. I. O. are now doing I would denounce them as quick. That is the way I feel. Once again, congratulations. Let us keep Vermont above the rest in Americanism.

Very sincerely,
CARMI G. COMINGS,
President, Vermont Federation of Labor.

Industrial Understanding Is Democracy's Best Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1941

ADDRESS BY RALPH HAYWARD, PRESIDENT, KALAMAZOO VEGETABLE PARCHMENT CO.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the speech Industrial Understanding Is Democracy's Best Defense, delivered by Mr. Ralph Hayward, president of the Kalamazoo Vegetable Parchment Co., at the American Paper and Pulp Association's meeting in New York, February 19. The speech follows:

Industrial understanding is the foundation of sound and permanent industrial relationships. It is even more than this—it is the line of defense against the forces which are trying to attack and destroy our system of free enterprise and democracy.

For many years all the industrialized nations of the world have been passing through a social evolution and an industrial revolution. This industrial revolution has been directed against the theoretical concept of capitalism and free enterprise. Many countries have passed over to state capitalism under various names such as communism, nazi-ism, fascism, etc. It is even possible to adopt these philosophies under the name of democracy.

Along with this has been a struggle by the various countries to control the resources, production facilities, and trade. Back of all this turmoil is an effort by various nationalities to provde security for their people at the expense of the other peoples of the world. The net result of this struggle to date has been the practical destruction of all security for all people, and a lower standard of living than they should enjoy. The last World War and the present one are both outbreaks in this struggle. When the war ends, there is still no assurance that this basic conflict will not continue.

REGIMENTATION DESTROYS DEMOCRACY

This country offers a good example of this paradox. We are spending billions of dollars and training millions of men for the defense of freedom and democracy. At the same time we are moving directly toward complete regimentation of industry and a nationally planned economy. It is not commonly understood that free enterprise, operating under reasonable regulation, is democracy. When you completely regiment industry, you destroy democracy. We are buying a one-way ticket, station by station, on a road leading to an unknown destination. The scenery along the way is beautiful and each station is fascinating. What the ultimate destination will be no one knows; but it may not be entirely to our liking. You can be pretty sure that it will resemble the conditions that are found in some of the foreign countries, where they have already completed the journey.

The control of industry can only be administered finally by control of the press and control of all means of spreading education and propaganda. This leads to restrictions on freedom of assembly, freedom of worship, freedom of the courts, and all other freedoms as we now know them. The experience of every country that has passed through this change shows that it is necessary for the Government to remove these freedoms in order to plan, control, and operate industry.

Nazi-ism and fascism are only the practical, realistic operation of a politically controlled economy where industry is privately owned but completely regimented. In the last analysis the working people suffer most from such a program of regimentation. They not only lose their freedom and security, but also the opportunity of improving their position. The inefficiency that develops results in a lower standard of living for all people.

UNIVERSAL MISCONCEPTIONS

In every country, there is a universal concept of capitalism and free enterprise, which is repugnant to a large majority of the people. This you would expect because it has been the basis of our economic teachings and the foundation of most of our political speeches. Inasmuch as this revolt is against what people think of capitalism, should we not examine this concept and see if it represents conditions as they exist today? What do people think about the capitalistic system and the operation of free enterprise?

First. That capital is an intangible, impersonal, selfish entity that seems to be associated occasionally with a few people controlling unlimited volume of wealth.

Second. That capital controls the raw materials and the equipment for carrying on the production processes.

Third. That industry is operated solely for the selfish interests of capital without regard to any social responsibility that it may have.

Fourth. That there is a perpetual struggle between capital and labor and between capital and the public interests.

Fifth. That the basis of industrial operation is to hire labor at the lowest possible wage, provide working conditions only good enough to insure a high degree of efficiency, and even working conditions that have no regard for the safety of the worker.

Sixth. That men should be worked as hard as possible, as many hours as possible, in order to get the most out of them at the lowest possible cost.

Seventh. That capital hires and fires labor without regard to the social problems that it creates and without regard to individuals.

Eighth. That it takes no responsibility whatever for the older employees, and that it seeks, wherever possible, to employ child labor in order to still further reduce its costs and increase its profits.

Under this concept industry is pictured as selling its products at the highest possible price that the traffic will bear without regard to the public interest, even going to the extent of creating monopolies in order to further this end. After operating the business on this basis fabulous profits are supposed to be distributed to a few stockholders and excessive salaries to the executives of the industries. Industrial leaders are pictured as economic royalists and privileged princes, holding the masses in economic slavery.

A NEW PHILOSOPHY

If this concept were true in its entirety, there certainly would be just cause for an industrial revolution and most of us would be active in the movement. During the past generation, tremendous changes have been made in the operation of industry and a new philosophy has been developed which is not appreciated or understood. It is of vital importance to our company that we modernize our views of the capitalistic system and develop a better understanding of the real functions of industry. If this old concept is not changed in the minds of the people, nothing can stop our passing into a state-controlled economy.

The job of removing confusion from the minds of people is the real battle line of freedom and democracy. If the battle is not won on this front, all will be lost in the end. It is the most important responsibility facing business and industry today.

Will we drift into a totalitarian state by the German route of national bankruptcy? Or by the French route of selfishness, indifference, and corruption? There is not a manager of industry who would not respond to a call to arms to protect America and the American way of living. Will they meet this challenge of defending our country against the destructive forces of ignorance and lust for power, without having the emotional appeal that comes from a united war effort?

During the past few years there has been a tremendous effort on the part of industry to develop a better understanding of the functions and service of industry and its problems of operation. These need to be further analyzed and any abuses that may exist should be corrected. When this is done, an

intensive educational program should be carried on. If the leadership of industry accepts this responsibility, you need have no worry about the future of free enterprise and democracy.

CHANGES IN INDUSTRIAL SYSTEM

What are some of the changes that have taken place in our industrial system during the past generation?

The ownership of industry has spread to more and more people throughout the land. By far the majority of our people have some direct ownership in business. Those who do not own stocks in our industries have an indirect interest through their savings accounts and life insurance policies.

High wages are an asset to our industrial system. This is understood and accepted by industry and is practiced quite generally within the limits of our competitive system. Nearly half of our manufactured products are purchased by the people who produce them. Their purchasing power must be maintained on as high a level as possible.

We must keep in mind that approximately two-thirds of our population are not engaged in industry and that they consume the majority of our manufactured products. Their purchasing power must be kept in balance with that of the industrial worker. If industrial wages and prices are too high, their purchasing power will be limited and the market for manufactured goods will be restricted.

Nearly half of our population are engaged in agriculture. Their purchasing power must be kept in balance with those engaged in industry. Maintaining this balance by taxing industry and subsidizing agriculture seems very cumbersome. International trade also is a limiting factor on both agricultural and industrial prices.

DISTRIBUTION OF INCOME

The ultimate distribution of the income of any company is simple to trace. Generally, 60 to 70 percent has to be paid for materials, supplies, or fixed charges, leaving only 30 to 40 percent to be distributed between employees and stockholders. Of this money available for distribution, employees have been receiving regularly from 65 to 90 percent. If you trace this distribution from the start of the raw materials through the various processes of conversion to the point of ultimate consumption, including transportation, you will find that this same ratio holds at every point.

Labor today is receiving from 85 to 90 percent of the wealth that is created. These figures are confirmed by a study made by the Department of Commerce. The real profits of industry are represented by the money that remains from sales after paying for materials, supplies, and other fixed charges. These profits have been and are now being shared between the employees and the stockholders.

The employees have been receiving 90 percent of these profits with only the risk that comes with the variations in our national economy. The stockholders' share varies from year to year with varying conditions and ranges from nothing up to 15 percent of the real profits, which, on the average, represents a return of 3 to 4 percent on their investment. These facts are not understood by our economists and politicians, so you can hardly expect them to be understood by those employed in industry.

HOURS OF WORK

During the past generation, the hours of work have been consistently reduced. This reduction has been possible because of the intensive mechanization of industry. Labor has shared in this improvement to an equal or greater extent than capital. Although many social organizations claim credit for this reduction, it has, to a large extent, been a voluntary movement on the part of industry. It would not have been possible if manufacturing methods had not been improved. Scientific application of power has reduced most of the drudgery that used to exist and the majority of workmen today are operators.

NEW PRODUCTS

Industry is quite generally carrying on a very extensive research program. The results of this have been the development of innumerable new products and improvements in existing products. New ways are being found to produce these products more economically and they are being made available to all people.

Fear has been removed to a large extent as a means of enforcing discipline in our industrial system. There is still room for improvement in this direction. The use of fear as a means of maintaining order and discipline is not compatible with our democratic system. We need more inspirational leadership on the part of our supervisory force. Security is uppermost in the mind of every individual. Management has been very hesitant about giving assurances along this line.

An examination of the service records of any company would show that a great deal of security has been enjoyed by a great many people. A positive statement of desire and intent from management along this line, with emphasis on the records from the past, would help materially in settling this question in the minds of a great many people. Individual recognition is desired by everyone and everyone likes to feel that he is a necessary and important part of an organization and wants to know more about the part he plays in the operation of a company. You can only obtain the best in workmanship in a friendly, appreciative atmosphere.

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE NEEDED

Has industry not advanced far enough to define and positively state that its purpose is that of a public service? Are we not ready to declare that each company is a cooperative enterpr'se? The stockholders contributing of their resources for the supplying of buildings, equipments, and materials for the manufacturing processes—and the employees contributing of their time and their talent for the converting of these materials into something that will be of service to the balance of society. Each has a common interest in the success of the enterprise. There can be no basic conflict between them. If either tries to profit at the expense of the other, both will lose in the long run.

If this cooperative enterprise is to succeed, it must render a real and valuable service to its customers or the public, so that the rights and privileges of the customers must always be taken into account.

The manager of a company represents the employees as well as the stockholders in every business transaction; first, in directing their efforts in manufacturing and then in selling their services to the public.

In view of the fact that management is the leader of both employees and stockholders, and in view of the fact that there is a question of the distribution of real profits, will not the time come when collective-bargaining negotiations will be carried on between committes representing the stockholders, employees, and the public? Management would then supply all of the facts and figures relative to the operation of the business for all to consider.

MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSIBILITY

It is the job of management to see that justice prevails between these three groups—customers, employees, and stockholders. The permanent life of a business depends upon keeping a perfect balance between these three.

Under this policy manufacturing should be carried on as efficiently as possible, and the product should be sold to the public at a price which would be fair to them and still permit the maintenance of good wages and good working conditions, as well as a fair return to the investors.

There should be some surplus left which can be used for plant improvements in order to continue to give better service to all groups. Plant improvements are of vital interest to both employees and stockholders. Such a program is their assurance of work and income in the future.

If a company accepts the concept that it is a cooperative organization for rendering a public service, it can go before its employees and stockholders with an industrial-relations program that is founded upon bedrock and can build relationships that will stand the test of time. As more companies recognize these relationships a new concept of economics will develop which can be understood by everyone, for it will be based upon fundamental truths.

A GREAT OPPORTUNITY

Cooperative free enterprise, operating in a democracy, can outproduce and outlast any totalitarian state and can provide the best in living conditions that any economy can support. The development of industrial understanding offers management its greatest opportunity of performing a valuable public service. Work in this direction will bring profit to both employees and stockholders. It is of even greater importance than the maintenance and development of equipment and the promotion of sales. The future of freedom and democracy hangs in the balance. Management must accept this responsibility and do the job.

Control of Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3 (legislative day of Monday, March 31), 1941

LETTER BY E. MERRICK DODD

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter to the New York Herald Tribune, written by Prof. E. Merrick Dodd, Jr., of Harvard University, on a plan to eliminate strikes.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 3, 1941]

TO ELIMINATE STRIKES

PROFESSOR DODD, OF HARVARD, FAVORS MEDIATION INSTEAD OF HASTY, REPRESSIVE LAWS

To the New York Herald Tribune:

Although the extent to which our national program of production for defense has been delayed by strikes in defense industries has been exaggerated by many persons, there is no doubt that the problem of strikes in such industries is a serious one. The total number of man-hours which were lost through strikes was lower in 1940 than in any recent year, but the number of strikes has increased substantially during recent months, and some of these strikes have seriously delayed production at

strategically important points. It is essential to our defense program that the production which it requires shall be carried out with all possible speed, and that means that ways must be found of eliminating strikes, or, if that is impossible, of reducing them to a minimum.

The problem is a very difficult one. Although labor in defense industries is doing work which is essential to national defense, it is not working for the Government but for private corporations which are engaged in business for profit. Disputes between such employers and their employees as to the proportion of the employer's total receipts which shall be paid out in wages, as well as disputes as to other conditions of employment, are bound to occur in many plants. When they do occur, labor has no choice (in the absence of provisions for mediation or arbitration) except to surrender to the employer or to put pressure on the employer by a collective refusal to continue at work. An attempt to deal with labor disputes in defense industries simply by outlawing strikes would, if it could be enforced, weaken labor's bargaining position in its disputes with employers to such a degree as to cause grave injustice and bitter and justifiable resentment.

If we are to eliminate strikes, we must find means by which labor's claims will be given a fair hearing before some body or bodies which are more impartial than labor's employers. The problem of setting up adequate machinery for that purpose involves an understanding of what the commoner causes of labor disputes are—for labor disputes are of varied types and it is a mistake to assume that the same methods will be suited to the settlement of all of them. The establishment of the new National Defense Mediation Board is not an attempt to deal with the whole subject of labor disputes. The Board is to act only after other efforts to settle the dispute, including those of the Commissioners of Conciliation of the Department of Labor, have failed. There is much that can and should be accomplished to prevent disputes from reaching that stage.

In many cases in which disputes exist the plant is being operated under an existing agreement between the employer and the union There are two kinds of disputes which arise in such cases—disputes as to whether one or the other party is living up to the terms of the agreement, and disputes as to the extent to which the agreement should be modified when it expires because of changed conditions. Well-drawn labor agreements provide machinery for adjusting grievances of the first type, and the Government should encourage the insertion of similar provisions in all labor agreements in the defense industries. In addition to providing a method for adjusting grievances, such agreements should provide that there will be no strikes or lockouts while the agreement is in force.

The problem of renewals is more difficult. Here the agreement is about to expire and the parties may differ radically in their views as to the terms on which it should be renewed. The Government can, however, use its influence to induce the parties to agree that work will go on while negotiations for a new agreement are pending or while the dispute (if it proves to be incapable of settlement by negotiations between the parties) is being submitted to Government mediation agencies.

The objection sometimes made by labor to such an agreement is that it gives management the power to drag out negotiations and meanwhile to avoid a wage increase or some other change to which labor believes that it is entitled. Arrangements for invoking the services of Government mediators at an early date would adequately meet that objection.

Where a plant is being operated without any agreement with a union a dispute will often involve the issue of recognition of the union, perhaps with an additional controversy over wages and working conditions. The National Labor Relations Act guarantees labor the right to organize, to bargain collectively with the employer through representatives of labor's own choosing, and to be protected against certain antiunion activities which the act refers to as unfair labor practices. The National Labor Relations Board is the governmental agency which has been set up to assure labor that the rights given to it by this act will be respected.

Questions arising under this act are often complicated and, since important legal rights are involved, the employer has the right to appeal to the courts from the decisions of the Board. Such lengthy legal battles lead to impatience on the part of labor, particularly where it believes that the rights which the statute guarantees it have been violated and that the employer's appeal to the courts is a deliberate effort to keep labor out of its enjoyment of its legal rights as long as possible. The situation is one for which it is not easy to find a solution, but in many cases the Labor Relations Board can do a good deal to alleviate the tension by the prompt holding of an election to determine whether the union is, as it claims to be, the authorized representative of a majority of the employees.

Although disputes arising out of labor's attempt to assert its rights under the National Labor Relations Act are a very serious cause of friction in a few important cases, the overwhelming majority of labor disputes are not concerned with legal rights but with the inability of the parties to agree on terms on which they are willing to work together. Government mediators have thus far been able to settle most of these disputes in short order once their services have been invoked. The President's Executive order establishing the National Mediation Board calls upon employers and employees in defense industries to furnish the Department of Labor and the Office of Production Management "sufficient advance notice of any threatened interruptions to continuous production as will permit exploration of all avenues of possible settlement of such controversies so as to avoid strikes, stoppages, or lock-outs."

With this prospect that mediation by these agencies will begin at an earlier stage in future disputes, and with the certainty that the efforts of the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor will henceforth be supplemented by those of the new Mediation Board, which represents labor and management as well as the public, the country has taken a long step forward in the establishment of more effective methods of assuring that stoppages of work in defense industries will be prevented.

No doubt there are many who feel that the new machinery ought to be supplemented by some form of compulsion, that what is needed is compulsory arbitration, or at least a compulsory "cooling" or waiting period, during which strikes are declared illegal. Compulsory arbitration has not been a success where it has been tried and is widely regarded by those who had experience in the settlement of labor disputes as a hindrance rather than a help in bringing about the kind of cooperation between labor and management which we need in order that our defense program may go forward with all possible speed. Although the Mediation Board has no power to compel acceptance of its proposals, pressure of public opinion will generally deter either party from disregarding the Board's recommendations for the settlement of a dispute.

It has, however, been asserted in many quarters that even though compulsory arbitration would be unlikely to be successful a compulsory waiting period should be established so that there would be ample opportunity for settlement of disputes before they resulted in a stoppage of work. The importance of keeping the wheels of the defense industries turning while the mediators are ascertaining the facts and formulating their proposals is obvious. But many of those who have most experience with labor problems believe that this objective is more likely to be attained by seeking the voluntary cooperation of labor union leaders than by a statutory prohibition that would be very difficult to enforce.

It will not contribute to the success of the defense efforts to arouse the fears of labor that defense is being used as an excuse for depriving labor of hard-won rights. The strike is labor's normal method of enforcing its demands for what it regards as fair treatment. Because of the seriousness of the emergency, we are now seeking to substitute negotiation and mediation for the strike as a method of settling disputes. Our present need is to encourage the making of collective agreements between capital and labor and to encourage resort to mediation where the parties are unable to agree. Now that the new Mediation Board has been established, it should be given a chance to win the confidence of capital, labor, and the country without complicating its problems by the injection into the picture of controversial legislation of dubious efficacy.

E. MERRICK DODD, JR.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *April 1, 1941.*

Col. Charles A. Lindbergh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. SMATHERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3 (legislative day of Monday, March 31), 1941

ARTICLE BY BEATRICE M. JONES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I find written in the Winter Haven Daily Chief of Winter Haven, Fla., an article by Beatrice M. Jones, on the subject, Lindbergh—Public Asset or Liability? which so thoroughly expresses my appraisement and opinion of Mr. Lindbergh that I ask unanimous consent to have it published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Winter Haven (Fla.) Daily Chief]

LINDBERGH—PUBLIC ASSET OR LIABILITY?

(By Beatrice M. Jones)

One of the most bitter pills to swallow, man finds, is the realization that his idol's feet are made of clay.

When Charles A. Lindbergh flew the Atlantic in 1927 and arrived at Le Bourget Field, outside of Paris, not only the United States, but the world as well, acclaimed his feat. He became America's favorite son, and on no one has this country lavished greater glory, praise, and affection. After his triumphant return from France, he made an air tour of the

United States, visiting every State in the Union. This was followed by a good will tour to Mexico, upon the invitation of President Calles, and from Mexico the tour was extended to South America. His place in the heart of his country was assured.

NEWSMEN FIRST PIQUED

It was not very long after this that rumors circulated that Colonel Lindbergh was anything but popular with newspapermen. Reporters and cameramen alike spoke contemptuously of his petty vindictiveness, of traits that were unbecoming a man of Lindbergh's position. Because these impressions were confined mostly to the profession, not much of it leaked out to the general public, and what little did was dismissed as envious backbiting. Unfortunately, most of it was true, for the men who were sent to cover Lindbergh's arrivals and departures were men long accustomed to meeting and interviewing great men, and they resented, and properly, the unpleasant incidents that always marked their attempts to secure cooperation from Colonel Lindbergh. "Swelled head" was one of the least opprobrious stickers affixed.

When the Lindbergh boy was kidnaped, and all through the subsequent pain and grief, America mourned with the parents, and well-meaning people cluttered the efforts of the investigation in their genuine desire to help.

In December 1935 Lindbergh decided to shake the dust of America from his feet. Opinion was divided between condemnation and condonation. It was difficult for many people, though, to understand the quirk of character that caused Lindbergh to censure all the American people for the acts of a maniac, and a foreign-born one at that, or for the inevitable publicity the case provoked.

His reasons for leaving were announced by friends 2 days after the ship had sailed from American waters, and, if memory serves us correctly, it was to find privacy and a refuge in England.

ENGLAND WELCOMES HIM

England made him welcome, provided a home for him and his family, and literally gave him the key to the island. How he was to repay that hospitality England was to discover to her sorrow.

In the various aerial trips the Lindberghs made no one could deny the colonel's ability to plan air routes and make proper preparations, reduced their hazards to a minimum. This article is in no wise an attempt to belittle the air pilot, navigator, and technician that Lindbergh undoubtedly is, but is a protest against the assumption that in like degree he knows everything about everything else; in short, that he is an expert. This assumption is as fallacious as the colonel's reasoning on international affairs.

When Colonel Lindbergh visited Russia, France, and Germany, coming events were shaping in Europe, events that were casting their shadows before. He was interested in the air forces of the different countries, particularly of Germany and Russia. And in this connection, we must not forget that wherever he visited he saw only what he was intended to see, no more. Whether he saw all of Russia's aerial might we shall never know, but it is known that he spoke quite disparagingly of Russia's air force to English officials. Many informed observers felt that Russia as a European power would have been included in the Munich Pact and not ignored as she was if Lindbergh had minded his own business. And while this writer holds no brief for Russia, it would have helped the democracies today to have Russia with them instead of with Germany, however nebulous the Russo-German collaboration may be. Yet this same man took to the radio to tell the American people, during the hearings on the lifting of the arms embargo, that the President of the United States was meddling in European affairs. But for an observer, without diplomatic or military status, to so meddle was perfectly all right, we can infer from the colonel's actions. The President of the United States was uninformed, our military attachés were blind, but Lindbergh "knew." Ah, vanity!

NAZIS SOW PROPAGANDA

The most potent weapon of the Nazi machine is its propaganda. There are no "dumkopfs" among the Nazi officials, and the importance of Lindbergh's visit was not lost upon them. They made hay while the sun shone and created a lasting impression upon him. Just as was the Sudetenland, Austria, et al., the United States is on the Nazi agenda, and it was not too early, when Lindbergh paid his visit, for the Nazis to lay the groundwork for future use. Just as in Norway there was a Quisling, and in France a Laval, the Nazis wanted to be sure there would be someone in the United States to preach defeatism, German invincibility, and to caution collaboration with Germany instead of opposition. Also to speak of negotiated peace.

The Nazis have won practically all their triumphs so far, because a few men in positions of importance and trust in each country, assured the public that "Germany cannot be beaten," and it was better to work with the Nazis than to be obliterated by their war machine. It worked with most of them, but it failed with Britain, for the British don't scare easily, and neither do Americans, and we can attribute our similarity of character in this respect to the fact that we are free people, free to think, free to read, and free to speak as we choose.

In his various radio speeches, pleading for isolationism, Lindbergh spoke of the "haves" and the "have nots" of Europe, and made it abundantly clear to all who listened, that his sympathy was with a poor, abused Germany because she did not possess as much as the British Empire, overlooking or more probably, deliberately ignoring the fact that the British Empire is no longer an empire but a loosely knit commonwealth of free dominions that are held together by a symbol, the Crown. And these dominions were colonized and built up by those who settled in these outposts and made them their homes. They were not exploited as were the possessions of Germany and Italy and other countries who drained their colonies dry of their wealth and abused their peoples.

LINDBERGH AIRS VIEWS

In none of his speeches criticizing the President of his country did Lindbergh once criticize the dictators. Never once did he speak of what has happened to freedom of speech, of press, and religion on the continent of Europe. Never once was his voice raised in behalf of the "have nots" of Czechoslovakia, Austria, or Poland. And to this day he has never publicly denounced the invasion of the Low Countries, of Denmark, of Norway.

It seems more than coincidental that Charles Lindbergh, of Swedish origin, should be an isolationist Member of Congress in the first World War, and his son, Charles A. Lindbergh, should follow the same pattern in this second World War, and that the only country unravished today by the Nazis in their swing to the north and east, is Sweden. Is this the kind of collaboration Colonel Lindbergh has in mind for the United States, a lesser satellite in the Nazi orbit? Sweden is theoretically neutral, but so wholeheartedly pro-German that Hitler does not have to go into Sweden to "protect" them. In the first World War, Swedish police and military searched the houses of the people, to take whatever food they could find to ship into Germany to ease the rigors of the British blockade. Certainly Germany then and Germany today had nothing to object to in Sweden's official attitude.

When Lindbergh testified recently before the committee conducting hearings on the lease-lend bill, his Anglophobia was quite evident. When asked whether he cared which side won, he did not have the guts to say he would like Britain to lose, so admitted he did not care, he didn't want either side to win. Rather difficult for most Americans to understand, when all the things that we hold most dear are hanging in the balance, and that balance a British victory, that he does not care which side wins. Evidently the Nazi way of life is not unattractive to him, but to most of us, the thought of Nazi domination of the world is abhorrent.

BERLIN PRAISES HIM

If a man is known by the company he keeps then Lindbergh should be ashamed of the enthusiastic reception every anti-British utterance receives. Berlin praised him quickly, after his testimony in Washington, which would make any other man want an antiseptic bath. It doesn't seem to phase him a bit that every time he has made his position known, he has brought down upon his head the criticism of the vast majority of Americans, from every walk of life.

It has been reported that Lindbergh is sick and tired of being linked with fascist organizations. The answer to that one is obvious. He should not be so ready to join or lend his support to those organizations whose avowed purpose is to prevent aid from reaching Britain in time to help. After unpleasant notoriety each time, he announces that his name has been withdrawn from the letterhead of first one and then another of these un-American groups, as soon as the newspapers have publicized its membership. If he does not want to be linked with fascism, why did he speak at Soldiers' Field in Chicago, under the auspices of the German-American Bund, to which the members had been commanded by a German-language radio program, to be certain to attend?

His testimony before the House committee was peculiar in many ways, and Lindbergh, least of all, seemed aware of the incongruity of his appearance there to criticize the Government while he professes not to care whether freedom of speech is lost to the world by a Nazi victory. Does the colonel think that anyone can publicly criticize the government in Germany?

On what is Lindbergh's "expert" testimony based? Commercial experience? Yes. Combat service? No. Does commercial experience make him competent to say whether Germany shall win, even with our help to Britain? Or is the wish father to the thought?

"Upon what meat doth this our Caesar feed
That he is grown so great?"

CHIEF OF STAFF DISAGREES

Our famous Chief of Staff, General Marshall, was quite brash in testifying the next day, out of the wealth of experience of one world war and over two score years in the service, that Germany could be beaten by our material aid to Britain now, so that American men would not have to fight alone, after a British defeat, against the might of a German juggernaut unparalleled in the world's history. Unless, of course, that we wish to believe that Lindbergh is the expert, and General Marshall the novice, we are more inclined to put our faith in General Marshall.

Lindbergh made several other statements at this hearing which should be analyzed. He said that the United States had nothing

to fear from Germany. We'd like to ask, How does the colonel know that Germany won't bother the United States—inside information? Surely Lindbergh would not ask America to place any credence in Hitler's promises. If he is so gullible, America is not. We have seen the enslavement of a Europe that believed in Hitler's treaties and promises, an enslavement that in the degradation of mankind puts the dark and bloody ages of history to shame. And to believe that, after a British defeat, Hitler would be content to allow the wealth and natural resources of the Americas to elude his grasping hands is to embarrass the ghost of P. T. Barnum.

Lindbergh also stated that, if Hitler has been unable to cross the English Channel, he doubted if he could cross the Atlantic Ocean. Then if Germany is unable to cross the English Channel, why is Lindbergh so certain of British defeat, even with American aid? And if Lindbergh believes in complete defense for the United States, against whom does he expect us to defend ourselves if we have nothing to fear from Hitler?

As Walter Lippmann so dispassionately points out, the colonel reasons in circles. Lindbergh says it won't matter what happens to the British Fleet, an adequate air force is ample protection for the United States, but admits we need bases in South America to complete our defenses. As Walter Lippmann asks, How are we going to supply those South American bases unless we use convoys, and to use convoys we must have control of the ocean, and, if Britain loses and we stand alone, we will never have control of the two oceans so necessary to our defense?

SAID TALKING IN CIRCLES

It is really amazing, but every time Lindbergh makes a public statement or speech America's respect for "Wrong-Way Corrigan" increases.

There must be something radically wrong with Lindbergh's character that the same pettiness would run through all his actions. Because newspapermen asked for interviews and camera shots (all part of their jobs), Lindbergh would delight in having the propeller of his plane throw sand in their faces or smash their cameras. Because he suffered a tragic loss in the kidnaping of his son, it was necessary to go into exile. Other parents have suffered equally devastating experiences but did not hate America for them. And in the same way, Lindbergh's hatred of Britain (or admiration for Germany—no one can be sure which it is) forces him to willingly sacrifice the safety of his country to his petty emotions.

The part that should be of concern to every man and woman in this country is that the cherished heritage that each generation of Americans has passed along to the succeeding generation, and the foundation stone upon which this Nation was so firmly built, our Bill of Rights, means nothing to Colonel Lindbergh. The danger of the United States becoming the last stand of democracy, and in making that last stand, shedding the blood of its manhood in the fight for survival, obviously leaves him unmoved. The tragic part is that we in America raised Lindbergh to the status of a national hero, but with his Fascist leanings and professed indifference to a Nazi victory, he is anything but a wholesome example to hold before the eyes of American youth.

Lindbergh has been a distinct disappointment to the country that made all things possible for him, and he has neither lived up to the responsibilities of his position, nor to the responsibilities of being an American citizen.

Was it not Marc Antony who said, "I had rather be a dog, and bay the moon, than such a Roman."?

The President's Acceptance of the National Art Gallery on Behalf of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3 (legislative day of Monday, March 31), 1941

POEM BY HORACE S. CARLISLE

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a poem written by Mr. Horace C. Carlisle, of Washington, on the occasion of the dedication of the National Art Gallery.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S ACCEPTANCE SPEECH UPON THE OCCASION OF THE DEDICATION OF THE NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

On behalf of the people
Of the United States,
With the real satisfaction
That the duty creates,
I accept these collections
Of real art, so designed
As to live thru the ages,
In this building enshrined.

He who gave us this building,
For refinement's uplift,
Thru his own modest spirit
Has made richer the gift,
With the strict understanding
That his gift shall be known,
Not by his name, but, rather,
By his Nation's alone.

And these other donators
Of the first fruits of art,
Like the gallery's founder,
Have the same sort of heart—
'Tis their prayer and their purpose,
From these walls and these shelves,
To enshrine here the masters'
Works of art—not themselves.

To these gracious collections
We most gratefully add
Loans and other donations—
The best ones to be had—
For their well-wishing owners
Were artistic at heart,
And desired to contribute
To this temple of art.

Many gifts of choice paintings,
In the mem'rable past,
The American people
Have received, first and last,
From the wealthy who'd purchased
Masterpieces which they,
Later on, gave to cities
And to towns, in their day.

The great works of the artists,
Like great men that are gone,
"Now belong to the ages,"
And will live on and on—
They, unnarrowed by limits,
Go about doing good,
Lifting man to a higher
Plain of citizenhood.

Tho there've been many public
Gifts of art in the past,
Few, if any, are worthy
With this gift to be classed—
It presents a relation,
Seen in paint and in stone,
Emblematic of union,
With a peace all its own.

In accepting this building,
With the gifts it contains,
We accept a remembrance
That fades not, neither wanes,
But grows on in its grandeur,
More uniquely sublime,
By the elements mellowed,
With the passing of time.

Our revered common people,
Not so long ago, thought
That the works of the artists
Meant but little, if aught,
Except to the collectors;
But they've learned in late years
That the works of the artists
Are for them, too, and theirs.

Now the great common people
Feel that they have a part
In the cultural beauty
Emanating from art—
And in great art museums
They are happy to find
That a welcome awaits them,
The American kind.

When the people see pictures
Painted now by their own
Sons and daughters, and neighbors,
They want it to be known—
When they found out that making,
And not owning, is art,
Those among them with talent
Began playing their part.

Art's no imported treasure,
From the dead past alone;
It's produced in the present,
And is happily known
As a source of enjoyment
That is second to few,
With its repeating pleasures,
Entertainingly new.

To accept for the people
Of the United States
This unique, philanthropic
Mem'ry-gift generates
A true prayer of thanksgiving
In America's heart
To the God of all wisdom
For the beauties of art.

Howsoever these paintings
Heretofore have been classed,
They now picture the spirit
In the art of the past—
They are symbols of spirits,
In the past, that found joy
In producing what bombers
Ought not now to destroy.

In the third year of struggle—
In our late Civil War—
There, in Washington, gathered
Many, from near and far,
To behold the completion
Of the Capitol Dome,
Where the Goddess of Freedom
Stands enthroned, here at home.

It had been an expensive
And laborious task
To establish this stature,
Thru the ages, to bask
In the sunshines and shadows
Of the vanishing years,
Keeping watch o'er the Nation,
Thru its smiles and its tears.

Tho some people objected,
The great work went ahead—
And when Lincoln heard of it,
He took courage, and said
That 'twould be to the people
A sure sign of the dawn
Of the day when Secession's
Dangers all would be gone.

For our own, we may borrow
From the great Lincoln's thought—
"Must" is vain man's commandment;
God's commandment is "ought."
If we follow our conscience,
We'll let "ought," and not "must,"
Govern us in our actions—
And prove "In God We Trust."

In this war against Freedom,
It's our purpose to give,
With our prayers, our assistance,
That our Union may live,
And preserve the traditions
Of the spirit which made
Us a united nation
That need not be afraid.

Now, with this dedication
Of this gall'ry of art
To a past in whose making
We have all had a part,
And a still greater future,
May God's smile rest upon
Our American people,
Who pray "Thy will be done."

May the Golden Rule ever
Guide our great Nation on—
Matters not what the dangers—
Thru the dark to the dawn;
For the Master told nations
What they, too, ought to do
When He said, "Do to others
As ye'd have them do you."

—Horace C. Carlisle.

Income-Certificate Plan Hearings—Farm Legislation

REMARKS
OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of announcing to the Members of the House that the Agriculture Committee, of which I am chairman, will commence general hearings on major farm legislation on April 22.

I want to take this opportunity of extending an invitation to all Members of Congress, regardless of whether or not you represent a farm district, to appear before our committee for the purpose of giving your views on the present farm program pending legislation, or any helpful suggestions that you may have which would assist our committee in working out a really constructive bill, one that will definitely give to the farmers of the United States actual parity prices for their products, which they have been promised during the past 8 years, and that which would be in line with what the Congress has done for other groups.

My bill, the income certificate plan, H. R. 3378, will be the major bill up for consideration during these hearings. However, we shall be very glad to have the views of all groups and interested parties on the following proposals:

First. Payment of full parity prices on cotton, wheat, tobacco, and rice by appropriation out of the Treasury of the United States.

Second. High loans in the amount of full parity with a further reduction in cotton to around nine or ten million bales.

Third. Actual price fixing.

It may be of interest to you to know that I was the author of the original Agricultural Adjustment Act, passed by Congress in 1933, which carried a processing tax provision. This bill was working admirably prior to the time the United States Supreme Court decided that this act was unconstitutional, based on the grounds that agriculture is a local problem. I feel sure that if the members of the present United States Supreme Court were called upon to pass upon the constitutionality of the old Agricultural Adjustment Act, it would stand up 100 percent under the Constitution of the United States.

During these past years we have had a wrangle in the Congress every year in trying to get an appropriation for the purpose of paying even a part of parity, and I believe that the time has arrived when it is going to be impossible to secure the necessary funds out of the Treasury to make parity payments, especially 100-percent parity.

Still there are those, including the textile mills of the country, who oppose every bill that is offered suggesting that we should secure the money out of the Treasury of the United States.

When the Farm Board was created and the high-loan program placed into operation under the Hoover administration, I stated on the floor of the House that it would be just like putting that much money in a rat hole unless we were able to absolutely control production in line with domestic consumption, and the amount of cotton that we would be able to actually export.

You remember what happened when this program came to an end. We lost millions of dollars. Still today there are those, in Congress and out of Congress, who believe that we can settle the cotton problem by placing a high loan on cotton.

There is a bill pending in the Senate proposing 100 percent loan on cotton with a further restriction in production to the actual amount that we would be able to consume in the United States and the amount that we may possibly be able to export. This would tend to further cut the production of cotton to around nine or ten million bales.

If we do this, naturally, the farmers of the South will be driven into dairying, wheat growing, raising cattle, hogs, and growing all of these crops which are grown in other agricultural sections of the country, not only for the consumption of our own people but for the general markets. This increased growing of all of these crops, especially for markets other than for our own markets, would bring about tremendous competition with every other agricultural section of the United States, which would tend to bring disaster to all of the agricultural sections of the country, including the South.

In the second place, the thing that has been destroying our cotton markets in the United States and in Europe has been the tremendous increase in the production and consumption of rayon and all types of synthetic fibers, including many types of paper products.

This Senate bill referred to would leave our market wide open for a tremendous increase in consumption of rayon and all types of synthetic fibers in that the bill does not carry a compensatory duty on these highly competitive products.

If I were engaged in the cotton warehouse business, naturally, from a purely selfish viewpoint, I would be very anxious to see a high loan bill pass, because it would tend to place additional cotton in the warehouses of the country.

In the third place, it would take a tremendous amount of money to subsidize any amount of cotton that we might be able to export so as to place the price of our cotton on a competitive basis with foreign prices.

Then, there is the price-fixing bill.

Congress has passed legislation in the interest of other groups, actually giving them the right to fix prices, for instance, the Fair Trade Practice Act, which is nothing but a price-fixing act, the Bituminous Coal Price Fixing Act, a tariff policy for industry, and a freight rate making commission, known as the I. C. C. for railroads.

There is the Wages and Hours Act placing a bottom under wages, and I could mention many other pieces of legislation passed by the Congress in the interest of various other groups.

I do not believe, however, that we could work successfully the actual price fixing of farm products unless we could change our marketing and distributing system. There are just too many people handling farm products, all of which would make it impossible to keep a check on price fixing.

My bill, the income-certificate plan, is somewhat similar to the original Agricultural Adjustment Act.

I believe that the passage of this bill will definitely solve the securing of parity for farmers.

Let me give you some definite information about the provisions of this bill:

THE INCOME-CERTIFICATE PLAN, H. R. 3378

The purpose of my bill is to place farmers on a parity with other groups as to prices for their products in line with the prices they have to pay for that which they purchase. This bill represents the first major effort to make the farm program self-supporting since the historical Supreme Court decision 5 years

ago, invalidating my bill, the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and specifically outlawing processing taxes.

In addition to enacting the income-certificate plan, my bill has five other definite and specific aims:

First. The Secretary of Agriculture is to ascertain parity price on cotton, wheat, rice, and tobacco, and at the proper time prior to the planting of these crops, is to announce the parity price for each.

Second. A loan program will automatically become effective. The loans will be based on two-thirds of the parity price. Cotton loans will be computed on a basis of seven-eighth inch Middling cotton.

Third. A compensatory duty will be placed on rayon and other synthetic fibers comparable to the amount of the income certificate placed on cotton to avoid giving these competitive fibers an economic advantage.

Fourth. A duty will also be levied on jute and jute products that are imported from India, a large cotton-growing country, in line with the amount placed on cotton by the income-certificate plan.

Fifth. The difference between the loan price and parity will be paid to the farmer from the funds secured from the income-certificate plan. No money will be placed into the Treasury or taken out of the Treasury to make these payments.

Suppose the Secretary determines that the parity price on cotton is 16 cents per pound. This would automatically mean that a loan of 10⅔ cents per pound basis seven-eighth inch Middling would be made available to the grower of cotton. If the parity were 18 cents, then the loan would amount to 12 cents.

Suppose the parity price on wheat was $1.25. The loan in that case would be 83⅓ cents, and the amount that would have to be paid to the farmer between the loan and the parity would be 41⅔ cents.

This would definitely accomplish two things; first, it would put a bottom under the price of cotton, thereby weeding out speculation; and in the second place, we would definitely know the amount that would have to be raised under the certificate plan to pay the difference between the loan or the price that the farmer received for his cotton and parity.

The bill also provides that the income-certificate plan will be based on a graduated scale, in being applied to the different types of cotton goods, so that it would not work a hardship on consumers who buy cotton goods like overalls, work shirts, and so forth. It would not place anything on cotton bagging and cotton sacks.

For various reasons that I will not take the time to explain at this time, we might just as well make up our minds that our foreign markets for cotton are definitely gone except for a very small degree. Whatever cotton you may be able to export could be subsidized, which would be a very small amount of money in paying the difference between the loan price and the foreign-market price. In the meantime you would be giving the farmer the benefit of this subsidy in connection with my loan program. Farmers will still get their soil-conservation payments.

This plan will give to farmers a larger amount for their product than will the high-loan plan that has been suggested wherein a rate of 85 percent of parity should be made in the way of a loan.

Regardless of this or any other plan, we might just as well make up our minds that unless we can consume several million more bales of cotton annually in this country we will definitely have to cut even the amount of production that we have at this time.

My bill, the cotton-pulp consumption proposal, H. R. 99, wherein I propose to mix a very small amount of lint cotton with wood pulp in the manufacture of paper products, rayon, and other synthetic products, which will enable us to consume an additional 4,000,000 bales of cotton annually in the United States, is the answer to the surplus-cotton problem.

I would be very glad to have the views of my constituents and all others interested in solving the serious agricultural problems of this country on the income-certificate bill. In that farmers are not securing real benefits out of the spending of billions in connection with our national-defense program, like industry and labor, as stated, if we fail to pass proper and constructive legislation during this session of the Congress, agriculture will be in a deplorable condition, especially at the close of the present destructive war which is now raging in Europe.

The Civilian Conservation Corps' Eighth Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the Civilian Conservation Corps was established 8 years ago as an emergency agency to aid the Nation in time of crisis. Its major purposes since its establishment in April 1933 have been to provide work and training for unemployed young men, and to conserve the Nation's great natural resources, wealth of soil, water, and timber, for which there never before was a program of adequate protection.

Today as the corps begins its ninth year of operation it is also engaged, as is the entire Nation, in furthering our national-defense preparations.

On this eighth anniversary of the establishment of the C. C. C. I think we may well pause to look back on its accomplishments and to consider its future usefulness.

During these 8 years since April 1933 there have been great changes in the social and economic aspects of our own country, as there have been throughout the entire world, though fortunately we have suffered no such cataclysmic disasters as have shattered many countries. I think it is very interesting to know that throughout these years the C. C. C. has maintained the high standards of usefulness and service envisioned at its conception, and during the past year has become an increasingly important adjunct of the all-important national-defense activities of the Nation.

TWO MILLION AND A HALF MEN AIDED

For 8 years the C. C. C. has made a tremendous contribution to national security through its conservation and manbuilding programs. It has trained two and a half million men in better work habits, taught them work skills, improved their morale, developed their muscles, improved their health, taught them love and respect for their country and its Government—made them healthier, sturdier, more employable, and better citizens. It has contributed to our national security by advancing conservation projects in every State in the Union—projects such as reforestation of millions of acres of land, the protection of additional millions of acres of farm lands from erosion, the return of grass and water to the cattle-raising lands of the West, the improvement of forests and parks and the development of wildlife refuges and other facilities for wildlife and wildfowl.

The average American citizen was, I think, well acquainted with these phases of the C. C. C. program. Many had boys from their own families who had been in camps and returned improved in health, ready to take a job and do it well. Others had visited camps and seen the corps in action. Others had seen the face of the Nation literally change through the conservation work projects carried out by the C. C. C. enrollees. Trees, bridges, dams, lakes, parks, by the hundreds, by the thousands, by the hundreds of thousands, followed in the trail of the C. C. C. workers. In some cases it seemed like magic. But there was no magic about it. It was the result of careful planning, wise direction, and steady, hard work. All this the country saw, all this it recognized as splendid achievement. But it came as a surprise to many to see how well the C. C. C. fit into preparations which carried the country a step forward from national security into national defense.

There was suddenly a need for developing the physical hardihood of our young men, and for training large numbers of men in skills needed in the advancement of industrial defense. With this need came also the realization that the C. C. C. in carrying out its own program had been converting unemployed young men without work experience into strong, vigorous youth who could drive trucks, and tractors, build roads, bridges, telephone lines, handle explosives, operate radios, draw maps, practice photography, act as expert cooks and bakers, drafting clerks, and welders, and do many other kinds of work, all of aid in the advancement of industrial defense and in the organization and strengthening of the military forces. Through the Nation the corps had been taking boys with no previous job experience and making them into good workers, and good citizens, while at the same time advancing a tremendous conservation program which has added im-

portantly to our natural resource, wealth, and economic preparedness. Such conservation is in itself an important phase of national defense.

The corps was ready, then, in 1940 with its camps, its enrollees, its work projects, its schools, its trained personnel, and it met the problem of 1940 as it had met its problem in 1933.

WORK IS OF DEFENSE NATURE

Not by design, but it is a fact that at least 75 percent of the field jobs in the general run of C. C. C. camps are the same types of work which engineer troops are called on to do, either in peace or war. Enrollees are also trained in many duties performed by members of the Quartermaster Corps, and workers in industries and agriculture behind the lines, so there was no major change necessary in the job and job-training phases of the C. C. C. program to enable it to make a definite contribution in this line to national-defense preparations.

There was, however, a revision of the academic- and vocational-training activities in order that the greatest emphasis might be placed on those phases which contribute the most to national defense. Instructions were sent to all camps directing officials in charge of these activities to see that the training programs were so conducted.

A daily calesthenics drill was instituted which, coupled with the regular work program and the discipline of barracks life, conditions them for whatever service they may be called upon to render to their country. All of the enrollees are required to take the standard Red Cross 20-hour first-aid course, which means that a half million men will have learned proper basic methods of caring for wounded or sick persons.

Every C. C. C. enrollee receives training on the job given by the work supervisor to the men when they are actually at work on the many jobs the C. C. C. undertakes. The supervisors not only see that a job gets done but that the men know how to do it and why they are doing it so every man becomes more skillful—not only in the single job at hand but at numerous related jobs. For example, so simple a job as ditch digging offers the initial and primary instruction in surveying, drainage, hydraulics, and sanitation.

The opportunities for vocational training are numerous and may be divided into five classifications: First, training received while at work, such as truck and tractor driving, blasting, road and bridge building; second, related training, given in camp classrooms after work hours, such as radio, photography, theory of surveying, forestry, soil-conservation work, public-grounds development, and so forth; third, camp shops—here are taught such things as welding, woodworking, motor repair, and so forth; fourth, nearby schools—these offer various vocational-training opportunities for C. C. C. enrollees; fifth, C. C. C. central repairs shops and special schools conducted by the corps.

TRADES ARE TAUGHT ENROLLEES

In expanding the training program, steps were taken to train enrolless at the corps' central motor-repair shops, where the 43,000 pieces of motor equipment used on the conservation-work projects—trucks, tractors, bulldosers, power shovels, and so forth—are sent for overhaul and major repair. Additional cooks' and bakers' schools were established to train cooks and bakers. Increased facilities were provided for the training of truck drivers, operators of the heavy equipment used in the 1,500 C. C. C. camps. Provision was also made to train additional C. C. C. enrollees in radio operation, aviation, mechanics, photography, map making, map reading, and in other fields both in camp and in nearby trade and vocational schools. Schools for the training of subalterns, who serve as assistants to the camp commanders, were established in the various corps areas.

The C. C. C. now has in operation 46 central motor-repair shops, with an additional 8 approved and planned for operation in the near future, and a total of 63 eventually to be in operation.

Enrollees who have shown special aptitudes are chosen for training in motor mechanics at these shops under the direction of skilled automotive mechanics. It is estimated that between 2,000 and 3,000 enrollees can receive training at one time in these shops when all of the 63 planned are in operation. An additional 5,000 or more enrollees are working in the 1,500 camps as maintenance mechanics, performing all types of maintenance and repair duties except those which require the precision equipment and heavy hoists available only in the central repair shops.

The 43,000 pieces of automotive equipment used by the corps require the training annually of approximately 60,000 enrollee operators. They learn to operate trucks, tractors, bulldosers, draglines, power shovels, road graders, and other heavy machinery which are not far removed from the combat cars, tanks, and military-engineering equipment used by the armed forces.

Twenty-nine cooks' and bakers' schools are now being operated by the C. C. C. to train enrollees to staff the 1,500 camp kitchens, and also junior officers—assistants to the camp commanders—who need experience in mess management. The course ranges from 2 weeks to 2 months, and upon completion of these courses the enrollees return to their camps, where they gain further practical training as cooks, bakers, and mess stewards. Approximately 9,000 enrollees receive training in these fields at one time. The demand from private employers and also the armed forces for competent cooks and bakers practically assures the enrollee who has had such training of a job after leaving the corps.

Thirty-one schools for the training of subalterns, who serve as second in command of the camps, are being operated by the corps for the purpose of developing junior officers to fill vacancies caused by the department of C. C. C. camp commanders—who are in most cases Reserve officers called to active duty with the armed forces—and also to give the enrollees an incentive and opportunity to gain promotion within the corps itself. About 649 enrollees are now in training in these subaltern schools—597 are receiving this training in organized schools and 52 in C. C. C. camps. It is interesting to note that leadership and training activities carried on in the C. C. C. camps has resulted in the promotion of thousands of enrollees to administrative and supervisory positions on the camp staffs. A recent survey conducted among the nonenrolled personnel of the 1,500 camps now in operation disclosed that 228 former enrollees are now in command of C. C. C. camps or serving as junior officers; a total of 1,794 former enrollees hold positions as project superintendents or foremen, and 83 are serving as camp educational advisers—this means that many former enrollees have worked up from the ranks, where their base pay is $30, to positions paying in some instances $2,900 a year.

RADIO TRAINING IS GIVEN

Instruction in radio operation and maintenance, both code and voice, is given at many camps. In the West, where camps are far removed from cities and sometimes isolated by weather conditions from contact through telephone and telegraph, the radio has been widely used for reasons of economy and practicability. It also finds a valuable use in the fighting of forest fires and in rescue operations during floods, hurricanes, and other disasters. In the Fourth Army Corps Area, which embraces the Southeastern States, a radio school is conducted at Fort McPherson, Ga., to provide enrollee-operators for the camp stations. These enrollees are required to pass a standard test which qualifies them for positions not only in the corps but with the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and private radio firms. There has been a great demand for C. C. C. trained radio operators by various agencies.

The recent placing of 124 Civilian Conservation Corps enrollees who graduated from the aviation mechanics course at Camp SCS–11, Vista, Calif., in west coast aircraft plants attests to the success of this type of training in the corps.

As you see, there are many jobs or skills related to national defense in which enrollees receive instruction during work hours on camp work projects, in camp administration, in the operation of camp motor-repair shops, in cooks and bakers' schools, and in camp kitchens. The following table taken from a report prepared by Director McEntee shows some of these jobs and skills, together with the number of enrollees receiving this training each year:

Operators of trucks, tractors, power shovels, draglines, etc., and other heavy equipment	60,000
Road-construction workers	60,000
Building-construction men (including workers in concrete, practical carpenters, stone masons, painters, electricians, and plumbers, etc	25,000
Telephone-line construction workers	10,000
Operators of air hammers, air compressors	8,100
Blasters and powdermen	7,900
Bridge builders and bridge-construction workers	7,500
Semiskilled mechanics	500
Maintenance mechanics and mechanics' helpers	5,000
Practical welders	1,500
Practical blacksmiths	1,500

Surveyors, map makers, map readers, and draftsmen	3,000
Axmen, sawyers, saw filers, and sawmill men	12,135
Operators of crushers	975
Pipe-line construction workmen	5,900
Quarry workers	6,200
Clerks	3,200
Warehousemen	3,000
Cooks	4,500
Bakers	2,000
Mess stewards	1,500
Supply stewards	1,500
Hospital and infirmary attendants	3,000
Radio operators	1,600

About one-half of the enrollees supplement the training which they receive on the work project by attending classes in camp vocational shops or nearby trade schools where training is available after the regular camp workday is over. At present more than 26,000 C. C. C. boys are taking special national-defense vocational courses in cooperation with State departments of education.

This camp and trade-school instruction includes courses in bookkeeping, business mathematics, business management, typing, blacksmithing, welding, surveying, drafting, carpentry, radio work, aircraft mechanics, and many other subjects.

Recently Director McEntee found in a survey of the veteran enrollees that a large number of these men were skilled in certain trades and could qualify as instructors for defense-training courses. He has issued regulations permitting these veteran enrollees to be transferred to junior companies to act as instructors for the younger men.

As you know, the United States Office of Education has been allotted $10,000,000 for training the rural youth of the country for national defense. It so happens that in certain rural sections of the country trade schools have not been established. On the other hand, many of the C. C. C. camps have well-equipped training shops and educational buildings. In response to requests from the State departments of education, the Director of the corps has issued a ruling permitting the residents of these rural communities to attend classes in the camp schools and shops.

87,000 TAUGHT TO READ

There is also the opportunity for each enrollee to continue his academic education in the class work held during leisure hours. The only required study is for those boys who cannot read or write and they must attend classes for the elimination of illiteracy. You may be surprised to know that a large number of boys who joined the corps were unable to read or write. Since 1933, 87,103 boys have been taught to read or write. During the past 3 years, 19,116 have completed the elementary grades and received eighth-grade diplomas while in camp, 4,241 have received high-school diplomas, and 254 have received college degrees.

This is the specialized training given in the corps.

However, the biggest and perhaps the most important job of the C. C. C. from a national-defense standpoint is the general training given all enrollees in the corps. Commenting on this phase of the C. C. C. program, Mr. McEntee said recently:

They are taught to keep regular hours and to direct their activities to useful purposes. When on the work project they put in a full day at the jobs to which they are assigned. Some operate jackhammers; others wield shovels, axes, and other tools; others drive trucks or tractors. Whatever they do, they are learning while they work. After the workday ends they have leisure time, with opportunities to attend classes, either in camp or at nearby schools, or to study in the camp library. The great majority of them take advantage of these opportunities.

Each year the C. C. C. turns back into private life approximately 300,000 men better equipped to cope with the problems of modern society. They have learned how to work and how to apply their leisure time to better advantage. They have associated with other men of widely varying temperaments and personalities—a cross section, as it were, of the temperaments and personalities with which they will deal in later life. They have learned to live in barracks, to practice personal and public hygiene. They have acquired a community spirit which makes them feel that they are not an isolated individual in the mass of humanity, but a living, breathing, integral part of our whole complex civilization. If the C. C. C. had done nothing else, this psychological change in the outlook of the enrollees toward life probably is worth the entire cost of the program. It has nullified to a great degree the un-American tendencies that are frequently spawned of unemployment and despair.

The C. C. C. has never been a static organization. It has kept firm its major objectives of employment and training for youth, and the conservation and rebuilding of our great natural resources. But it has constantly sought means of increasing its usefulness and has not hesitated to put changes into effect when they were for the betterment of the program.

One recent change of January 1, 1941, will prove a great incentive to the enrollees, I think. Savings accounts were set up for the enrollees in the Office of the Chief of Finance, War Department, who acts as fiscal officer for the C. C. C. Previously, $22 of each enrollee's $30 a month basic pay was sent to his dependents and the remainder turned over to him for personal spending. Under the new arrangement, $7 each month will be placed in a savings account for him with the Chief of Finance, War Department; $15 will be allotted to his dependents and $8 will be given him for personal use. At the conclusion of his enrollment, the aggregate of his savings account will be given him in a lump sum to provide a "nest egg" until he is earning in private employment.

Another change during the last year opened the C. C. C. rolls to a wider range of applicants. The interpretation of the eligibility requirement, "unemployed and in need of employment" was broadened to include applicants who were unemployed and in need of employment although their families were not necessarily in financial distress.

DIRECTOR M'ENTEE PRAISES C. C. C.

We owe another debt to the Civilian Conservation Corps. There is no doubt but that the Corps has become the strong right arm of conservation in this country. I should like to quote from a recent report of James J. McEntee, Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps, explaining the program of the Corps' conservation activities.

"As a nation in years gone by the United States had taken the pioneer's point of view, to take the best and waste the remainder in the taking," Mr. McEntee said. "Our forests built the homes, the towns, and cities of America, but we pillaged rather than harvested the country's timber crop. We had millions of forest acres, and we gave no thought to future wood needs, had little concern about consequent soil waste and stream pollution, and had little worry about our vanishing wildlife. Federal and State and private conservation agencies had been aware of all this for many years and were doing all they could to halt the despoliation.

"Great progress had been made and plans had been drawn up for restoration, improvement, development, and salvage of our natural resources in forests, soils, water, recreation, and range, but men and money were needed to carry out these plans to make them effective. But it was not until the coming of the Civilian Conservation Corps—300,000 strong—in 1933, that a real start was made on the job of restoring our natural-resources wealth.

"Under capable foremen and technicians the C. C. C. has been working now for over 7 years, all over this land of ours, working to salvage our forest, soil, recreation, and water wealth.

"In cooperation with Federal and State conservation departments the C. C. C. has done a tremendously big job; it is still doing it. It must continue to do it, for even an army of 300,000 young men cannot in 7 years repair and restore the waste of many generations. There are still many years' work ahead for the C. C. C. to do. The conservation agencies still have plans for many years of work yet undone. The national conservation job cannot be done, cannot be completed and wound up in short order. The C. C. C. has increased the natural-resources wealth of this country literally by hundreds of millions of dollars and has contributed in great measure to the national defense. It can and should continue to do both."

Graduation Exercises of the National Police Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3 (legislative day of Monday, March 31), 1941

ADDRESS BY J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, at the graduation exercises of the sixteenth session, National Police Academy, at Washington, D. C., on March 29, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Responsibilities weigh heavily upon all of us today as we meet here to honor this fine

graduating class of the National Police Academy of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The world is engulfed in a tragic war. No man, woman, or child can escape the rigors of such a struggle in which military might, economic pressure, and "fifth column" attacks upon civilian morale are used with equal force. The challenge of twisted philosophies from the perverted minds of vainglorious dictators is too sweeping to be accepted in a single tongue. Right-thinking people throughout the world must arise against this aggression upon the sacred heritage of democracy.

As a Nation, we are now witnessing a crucial period which will determine the future of our civilization. Assailed by encircling forces of totalitarianism, American democracy is the world's last great bulwark of liberty and freedom.

The armed forces of the Nation can be relied upon to defend any attack upon American democracy on land or sea, but the law-enforcement bodies of the land form the first line of defense against any attack that might be launched from within.

Never before has there been a greater need for unity, for calm appraisal of the forces which work against us, for coordination of thought and effort in building an impregnable defense.

A nation faces a desperate moment when its men and guns are called into action. It is in the period before this time, while the enemy is making every possible inroad upon our moral defenses, that the true battle takes place. That battle is now in progress in America.

The United States, rather than becoming the last stronghold of democracy, has become its greatest arsenal.

We are proud that law enforcement has been given the task of protecting this mighty arsenal from the foul schemes of foreign agents who seek to interrupt the flow of raw materials into its giant machines and to slow down the production lines. No greater responsibility has ever fallen upon a profession so young. We of law enforcement must always remain aware that should we fail in our task the life of a peace-loving people could become chaotic overnight. A successful fulfillment is vital.

With hypocritical organizations bearing high-sounding names to appeal to every human want or frustration, with silver-tongued prattlers of class hatreds, with leaflets of poisonous propaganda, renegade espousers of totalitarianism seek to destroy the unity of our people. To meet this threat requires the best of law enforcement. When the history of this era is written the record will clearly show that never before were the peace officers of America better prepared.

Throughout the ages, the maintenance of law and order has been one of the most important of all governmental functions. In any community, in any State, in any nation, it warrants the highest type of personnel and facilities. Based upon this fundamental principle, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been happy to pioneer in the development of the new profession of law enforcement. Increased protection for the citizens of the Nation has been the result. No longer is the public enemy in the ascendency. No longer do the kidnaper and the bank robber maraud with impunity.

The anticipation of the very emergencies which now confront us led to the establishment of the F. B. I. National Police Academy 6 years ago. With the graduation today of this sixteenth session, 553 carefully selected representatives of municipal, county, and State police agencies have received this course of instruction. Our purpose throughout this time has not been to merely improve the ability of 553 officers who already were experienced and capable public servants. A greater goal has been achieved, because the graduates of the National Police Academy have been able to aid in the instruction of members of their departments in the most approved and modern methods of law enforcement.

No field of public service has made more rapid advances than that of the law-enforcement profession. Recent years have witnessed an increasing desire on the part of citizens in every section of the land for more effective aid in law and order. As a result, law-enforcement organizations have been used less frequently as a dumping ground for political hacks and incompetents.

Alertness, good judgment, physical and moral courage, and business efficiency are required by modern departments. Self-sufficiency, petty jealousies, and lack of cooperation are no longer the rule but the infrequent and surprising exception. Unification among agencies has been achieved and today they work together to provide the type of protection the citizens deserve and should expect of their peace-time soldiers. In these changes, the men of the National Police Academy have been a progressive and guiding force.

When the President of the United States called upon the Federal Bureau of Investigation to take charge of all investigations dealing with the internal security of the United States, we were confident of the assistance we could expect. We knew that all law enforcement was prepared to accept the added responsibilities growing out of the emergency.

They were enthusiastic in attending the conferences the F. B. I. called throughout the country for the purpose of fully coordinating all efforts in the prevention and detection of espionage and sabotage. As a result, this work has gone forward thoroughly and efficiently, with calmness and saneness.

Notwithstanding the great and wholehearted support which we of law enforcement have and may continue to expect from the great body of the American people of every walk of life in aiding us to meet our additional responsibilities and duties in this time of national emergency, we must constantly be alert to subtle but viciously dangerous attacks and threats which, while claimed to be aimed only at the forces of law enforcement, are basically directed against the very heart of our democracy and its traditions.

Let me condemn with all the strength of a firm conviction that most vicious of all un-American activities—the scummy slur and innuendo spewed forth from a lying tongue to undermine confidence in duly constituted law enforcement. There are those in this country who have attempted assertions that law enforcement has failed to take every possible precaution to protect this country from the attacks of "fifth column" agents. Such statements can give comfort only to the enemy. They cannot bear the burden of proof. We of law enforcement must challenge any such underhanded attack upon police agencies as an attempt to break down law and order. Every loyal American knows that only the irresponsibility of vigilante action can follow such a break-down.

The vigilante, with his unjust trampling of the rights of innocent persons, must be avoided. This is a time for clear thinking; confusion is an ally of the enemy. There is no cause whatsoever for hysteria, which leads to confusion and irresponsibility. The public has been confident in the ability of trained men to handle a job in which an outbreak of a wave of hysteria would be disastrous. Law enforcement prepared itself to meet the present emergency long before the professional alarmists concerned themselves.

The vilifying attacks of Communists and their allies—the Nazis and the Fascists—too scurrilous and too numerous for repetition, have not escaped us. In their abortive efforts to sow discontent and destroy confidence in every democratic tradition, they paint a picture of double-dealing and treachery around every officer of the law. They know that the Federal Bureau of Investigation, its graduates of the National Police Academy, and their fellow peace officers are their greatest enemies. No lie is too fantastic for them if it will serve to destroy the confidence of the public in constituted authorities. With characteristic lack of decency or scruples, those who would undermine America are quick to accuse the F. B. I. of any disgraceful tactic. They would have our citizens believe the men of this service constitute a threat to the very liberty they themselves ultimately plan to destroy.

The rabble-rousing Communist, the goose-stepping bundsman, their stooges and seemingly innocent "fronts," and last but not the least, the pseudo-liberals, adhere to the doctrine of falsification and distortion. They add and subtract, twist and warp facts with the rapidity of a whirling dervish. Inconsistency is no deterrent when they seek to spread their poppycock propaganda. They seek to weaken law enforcement in every conceivable manner as their first step toward turning law and order into revolution and chaos. Law enforcement will meet these challenges.

At a time when such forces of destruction constitute an ever-present threat to orderly government, it is fortunate that we can graduate from the National Police Academy another class of capable men to instruct in the methods of maintaining internal security. At a time when thorough preparedness means so much to the welfare of the Nation and the life of democracy itself, the Federal Bureau of Investigation is proud of this opportunity to contribute to the strength and preparedness of a vital segment of our defense.

For this reason, we have given you everything we possess in the way of knowledge of law enforcement methods, and now, as you depart, we of the F. B. I. give you the motto which we cherish—fidelity, bravery, integrity. May you carry on with the knowledge that we wish you Godspeed in your every endeavor.

Republican Agricultural Study Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of this country are on the job in connection with the national-defense effort now under way. They are doing their part and will continue to do their part and do it cheerfully, just as they did during the first World War.

Already, however, it is apparent that the war and the defense program are intensifying the grave problems which have confronted agriculture for many years, and for which no real solution has yet been put into effect. Not only are those engaged in agriculture adversely affected by the existing situation, but unless something is done, even more distressing conditions may be expected when the

war ends and the inevitable deflation takes place. It is imperative that attention be given not only to the pressing problems confronting agriculture at this moment but to the situation which will exist when peace comes.

In order that the Republican Party may be in a position to fully meet whatever responsibilities may fall on it in solving this problem, House Republican Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN has recently appointed a Republican agricultural-study committee. This committee is composed of Republican Members of Congress from 22 States reaching from the Atlantic to the Pacific and succeeds a similar committee appointed by Mr. MARTIN in the last Congress.

I am sure that the statement of Mr. MARTIN made at the time he announced this committee is of great interest to all who are interested in agriculture and its problems. Pursuant to permission unanimously granted by the House, I include this statement herewith:

Renewed activity of the Republican Agricultural Study Committee was announced today by Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, of Massachusetts, Republican leader in the House of Representatives. The agricultural study committee, augmented by some of the new Members who came to Congress in the last election, will make an exhaustive, Nation-wire study of farm problems which existed before the involvement of the United States in defense and war activities, and the new and grave problems which have been created by the war. The study committee was originally formed in October 1939 by Minority Leader MARTIN, with Representative CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas, ranking Republican Member of the House standing Committee on Agriculture, as chairman. Mr. HOPE retains the chairmanship of the enlarged committee.

Mr. MARTIN, in announcing the appointment of the study committee, said:

"The gravity of the many conditions involved in the depressed and unhappy condition of American agriculture at the outbreak of hostilities abroad has been tremendously increased by these foreign wars. The factors which have operated to reduce agriculture to its present plight have arisen from conditions which extend not only throughout the economic structure of America but of the whole world. Some of these conditions have been due to alterations in the mode of life and habits of entire peoples, including those of America, and are permanent. Other factors involve loss of foreign markets, danger of agriculture being 'squeezed' between opposing conditions arising from defense and war work, increasing disparity between agricultural and other prices, rising costs of farm production and scarcity of farm labor, rising taxes, and the very grave condition of deflation, which will be sure to strike what could be a fatal blow at American agriculture when the defense activities cease and the wars end, unless careful and sound plans for cushioning that shock are made far in advance of the time when the blow comes.

"The ills of American agriculture had not been cured when these new defense activities and war dangers arose. Effective remedies had not been applied. Only temporary expedients which had little permanent value had been employed. The Republican study committee, under the chairmanship of Representative HOPE, will see to it these grave dangers which face American agriculture are not obscured and neglected in the false and temporary boom conditions of national-defense and war activities.

"The first prerequisite to an intelligent effort to solve these problems confronting American farmers is a careful study of each problem and its relationship to the others. In order to achieve the most comprehensive study of agricultural problems from the standpoint of working out permanent solutions, I have added to the original committee several new Republican Members of the House of Representatives who also have a special knowledge of the various phases of agriculture and the dangers confronting American farmers. To encompass the wide range of study and analysis necessary, this study committee will be divided into subcommittees, each of which will study one phase or problem.

"The divisions of study fall into the following categories:

"1. Dairying, poultry, eggs, etc.
"2. Livestock, meats, etc.
"3. Wheat.
"4. Corn and hogs.
"5. Potatoes.
"6. Vegetable and canning industries.
"7. Wool.
"8. Cotton and other southern crops, competition, etc.
"9. Fruits.
"10. Sugar.
"11. Farm chemurgy.
"12. Soil conservation.
"13 Irrigation.
"14. Foreign markets, reciprocal trade treaties and effects; dumping, barter, etc.
"15. Marketing, production costs; processing, etc.
"16. Tobacco.
"17. Farm credits.

"These subcommittees will hold hearings from time to time in various parts of the country to get 'grass root' views and information directly from the farmers themselves.

"It is imperative we work out an affirmative and constructive approach to the rescue of agriculture from these dangers which menace the farmers. It is one of our gravest problems, and upon our efforts in behalf of the farmers will depend in a large measure the future prosperity—if not the very safety and security—of the whole Nation."

The enlarged Agricultural Study Committee will be composed of the following members:

Clifford R. Hope, Kansas, chairman; Leo E. Allen, Illinois; H. Carl Andersen, Minnesota; John Z. Anderson, California; August H. Andresen, Minnesota; Leslie C. Arends, Illinois; Philip A. Bennett, Missouri; Stephen Bolles, Wisconsin; Clarence J. Brown, Ohio; Ushur L. Burdick, North Dakota; Frank Carlson, Kansas; Francis Case, South Dakota; J. Edgar Chenoweth, Colorado; Cliff Clevenger, Ohio; O. S. Copeland, Nebraska; Fred Crawford, Michigan; Francis D. Culkin, New York; Paul Cunningham, Iowa; Carl T. Curtis, Nebraska; Everett M. Dirksen, Illinois; Henry C. Dworshak, Idaho; Frank Fellows, Maine; Bertrand W. Gearhart, California; Fred C. Gilchrist, Iowa; George W. Gillie, Indiana; Edwin A. Hall, New York; William S. Hill, Colorado; John Jennings, Jr., Tennessee; Ben F. Jensen, Iowa; Anton J. Johnson, Illinois; Noble J. Johnson, Indiana; Samuel H. King, Hawaii; J. Roland Kinzer, Pennsylvania; Harold Knutson, Minnesota; Gerald Landis, Indiana; Thomas E. Martin, Iowa; James W. Mott, Oregon; Karl E. Mundt, South Dakota; Reid F. Murray, Wisconsin; Daniel A. Reed, New York; Edward H. Rees, Kansas; Ross Rizley, Oklahoma; Chas. R. Robertson, North Dakota; John M. Robsion, Kentucky; Robert L. Rodgers, Pennsylvania; Dewey Short, Missouri; Karl Stefan, Nebraska; William H. Stevenson, Wisconsin; Miss Jessie Sumner, Illinois; Henry O. Talle, Iowa; William H. Wheat, Illinois; Earl Wilson, Indiana; Thomas D. Winter, Kansas; Roy O. Woodruff, Michigan.

How Shall We Make Available Materials Provided for in Lease-Lend Bill?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, how shall we make available the materials provided for under the lend-lease bill to Great Britain? Radio stations, newspapers, and citizens throughout Ohio are asking this question. No question more vital to the welfare of our country could be asked. It was a problem from which the best minds of the present National Government steered clearly away throughout the congressional debate on the lend-lease bill. They were afraid of it. They knew that it was packed with dynamite, and that the implications of this question would be enough to rouse national protest.

Boiled down to simple terms, here is the issue we are discussing: Shall we furnish convoys to Great Britain or not?

I say that we owe it to the American people to do everything within our power to keep this country at peace. We are still nonbelligerent. No matter how strongly our sympathies may lie with the British, the Greeks, the Yugoslavs, and the Chinese, we still regard ourselves as nonparticipants in the war. I believe that the American people want to remain out of the war. I agree that we have a definite interest in maintaining democracies and free peoples against aggressors. To assist those people who are fighting for their independence, we are ready to furnish food and materials of every kind. We must draw the line at furnishing men.

If we embark upon a program of convoys half way across the Atlantic, or all the way across, we shall be committing an act which must be regarded as a clear act of war. International lawyers tell me that an act of war is whatever a belligerent nation chooses to call an act of war. But the temptation to attack and to sink any vessel convoying materials to Great Britain, must be recognized. Surely, none of the fighting nations would hesitate to destroy any vessel engaged in convoying materials to their enemies. Out of such an incident there rose the tremendous clamor which caused in no small part our entrance in the last war. I do not believe the American people are ready for another *Lusitania*. Let those nations with which we sympathize come to our shores to get the materials we furnish. We make them available. That is our part. With the British Fleet still in command of the Atlantic Ocean and the Mediterranean Sea, it should be able to protect the sea lanes to see that the goods we have begun to produce are delivered.

The administration leadership played a very evasive part in discussing convoys during the recent congressional debates.

They were never pinned down. They were willing to accept a meaningless amendment providing that nothing in the lend-lease bill could be construed to permit the convoy of ships across the ocean. But they refused to insert anything like a blanket prohibition.

Today the issue is becoming all the more important.

I believe that we must not take the last step, the step which may precipitate our entrance into this war. I am fearful that convoys may prove to be one scene beyond the last act short of war. I am concerned lest such an act plunge us into the European conflict. I for one do not propose that we shall sacrifice more American boys for the questionable gains of a bloody war.

We furnished money, materials, and men in 1917.

We must not make the same sacrifice again. Money and materials are ready. Let us keep our men at home.

Airplane Crashes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3 (legislative day of Monday, March 31), 1941

LETTER BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY HINCKLEY

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Robert H. Hinckley, to the editor of the Chicago Daily Tribune, on the subject of airplane crashes.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITOR, THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: On March 9 your paper carried an article by Wayne Thomis headed "Flying experts blame crashes on rule revision—Change lifts curb on trips to icy areas." The article said:

"Aviation experts believe that a recent amendment which political appointees of the Civil Aeronautics Administration in Washington, D. C., made to civil-flying rules is one of the basic causes of the four most recent airline crashes. The amendment permits air lines to dispatch planes to destinations where they know the ships will accumulate ice. This is the first time passengers and mail were allowed to be flown into such conditions. The amendment, No. 51 of the air-carrier section, was written into the rules 5 months ago."

Every statement above which relates to air safety is completely false.

The recent amendment, No. 51, was made on May 17, 1940, by the Civil Aeronautics Authority, some 6 weeks previous to the reorganization. It, therefore, has been in effect 10 months instead of 5. The "political appointees" to whom you refer, then, were the five members of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, under whose regime the unparalleled safety record was achieved.

I was chairman of this body at the time, and I state unequivocally that the amendment constitutes no relaxation of the regulations regarding flight into icing conditions. It does not in any way approve flights into icing conditions with unapproved deicing equipment. I reprint here the original language on the left, the amended language on the right.

BEFORE AMENDMENT	AMENDMENT NO. 51
61.7113. Icing conditions: No aircraft shall be dispatched in scheduled air-line service into any known or probable icing condition unless equipped with approved propeller and wing de-icing equipment.	15. By striking sections 61.7113, 61.7700, and 61 7701 and inserting in lieu thereof the following new section:
61.7700. De-icing equipment (not approved): When an aircraft not equipped with approved propeller and wing de-icing equipment is engaged in scheduled air-line operation and encounters or, in the knowledge of the pilot, may encounter any icing condition, the pilot shall immediately so alter the course or altitude of the flight as to avoid or withdraw from the icing condition. If any icing condition is encountered, the pilot shall, if possible, immediately notify his company radio ground station.	"61.7700. Icing conditions: No air carrier or employee thereof shall dispatch or operate an aircraft in air transportation into any known or probable icing conditions unless the aircraft is equipped with approved propeller and wing de-icing equipment adequate to assure the safety of the flight under the particular conditions to be encountered. When an icing condition is encountered in flight the pilot shall, if possible, immediately notify his company radio ground station of such fact and the company shall immediately relay such information to the nearest office of the United States Weather Bureau in accordance with paragraph 61.733."
61.7701. De-icing equipment (approved): When an aircraft equipped with wing and propeller de-icing equipment is engaged in scheduled air-line operation and encounters an icing condition, the pilot shall so alter the course or altitude of the flight as to withdraw from such condition if, in his opinion, it appears that the icing condition may be of such duration or severity as to otherwise endanger the safety of the flight. The pilot shall, if possible, immediately notify his company radio ground station.	

In either case, if a plane is equipped with approved de-icing equipment, the continuance of the flight is left to the discretion of the pilot; and this, also, is in complete conflict with statements in your article.

This article is such a complete series of errors in fact that it would be comic except that it deals with stark tragedy. Every important element in it being factually untrue—the identity of the agency which made the amendment, the date on which it was made, the nature of its contents, and the nature of the regulation it supplanted—I herewith request that this reply be given equal prominence in your columns to the original article.

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT H. HINCKLEY.

The Revolution Has Started

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, with the confession of Governor Heil of Wisconsin that the law-enforcement officials of that State are unable to cope with the horde of Communist-led strikers at the Allis-Chalmers plant just outside of Milwaukee, even the blindest of our citizens should be able to see the red flag of those who take orders from Stalin waving in the forefront of the revolutionary battle being carried on here in America.

Hiding behind the cloak of unionized labor, boring from within, those Communists, who advocate the overthrow of our Government by force; who, as disclosed by the Dies committee, take their orders direct from Moscow, joined by radical labor leaders and by racketeers who are in the movement solely because of the money which they can collect, are now out in the open.

Long have they worked in secret. Long has the administration not only tolerated but acquiesced in their undercover movements. High Government officials have closed their eyes to the open, violent assaults upon the civil liberties not only of employers, of citizens generally, but of employees as well.

When the President called the National Guard away from the States, it left our towns, our cities, and our States without adequate police protection from these subversive groups.

For months the C. I. O., now headed by Phil Murray, has been determined to secure, at any and all costs, a monopoly of the job-selling prerogative, to attain a position where if a man would work he must first buy his job of the C. I. O. and then continue to pay whatever dues might be assessed against him each week or month.

This practice has been known to the President of the United States, who frequently has said that every man should be secure in his job; that no man should be denied equality of opportunity; but who has consistently and persistently aided in denying those privileges to hundreds of thousands of citizens.

The violence at the Allis-Chalmers plant, where the car of the Governor of Wisconsin was stoned and damaged as the Governor sought to quell the violence, the sit-down strike in the Ford plant at Detroit, are the direct and natural results of the President's support of Sidney Hillman and radical C. I. O. leaders.

The President knew or, if he had common sense, he should have known when he appointed Sidney Hillman, a paid official of the union, a vice president of the C. I. O ., to the National Defense Council that he was openly throwing his support to the side of those who intended to drive from the Ford motor plants all who would not pay the C. I. O. for their jobs.

When the administration denied the Ford Motor Co. national-defense contracts, because it would not acknowledge the rule of the C. I. O., it gave notice to all that it was more interested in obtaining political support than it was in national defense.

The Communists never sleep. They never cease to work and, for that reason, patriotic citizens who chose to believe that they were secure because their forefathers won freedom must now pay the price for their carelessness.

Nor do the Communists confine their activities to any one class. They seek to undermine our Government, not only by violence, but by more peaceful means and, in this latter procedure, they have the support of self-seeking politicians, who again place party loyalty before patriotism.

This peaceful attempt, through the use of legal means, to undermine our Government is glaringly apparent at the present time in the city of Detroit. It would seem as though those in power in the State of Michigan, those charged with the government of Detroit, in view of present happenings, would realize that the future of the great industrial city of Detroit, the welfare of the State, is being threatened by the Communists and those acting in conjunction with them at the present time.

Just how long do the people of Detroit think industry will attempt to carry on the battle if the citizens of the State, of Detroit, fail to protect it in its efforts?

If this strike at Ford succeeds; if R. J. Thomas, the Reuthers and others who think more of themselves, of their drive for power, of the collection of dues, are permitted to defy the law, to corrupt the courts, by the election of judges with leftist views, what do the citizens of Detroit think the future of that city will be? How long do they think that the men who have invested their money in Detroit, who are giving hundreds of thousands of jobs at higher wages than were ever paid before anywhere in the world, will continue the uneven battle?

There are other places in this country where the citizen will give protection to those who want to provide jobs. There are places in the country where our people believe in law and order; where those who, like Thomas and Frankensteen and Reuther and Addes would bring civil strife, will be met by legalized authority which will convince them that they have no license to carry on civil strife.

Unless the President backs up the State authorities, as he is authorized to do by the Federal Statutes, in case of civil strife, it will be necessary for the cities and the counties to organize home-guard defense units to protect their citizens and the industries engaged in national-defense production.

No one wants to see that done, but it will be done if the President violates his constitutional oath to protect the citizens of the country.

There are communities in this country of ours, there are communities in the State of Michigan, where leaders like Thomas and the others named, if they conspire to bring about riots, to incite violence, will be tried for those violations of the law and thrown into jail, where they can indulge in all the sit-downs they may wish.

It is a disgrace to the State, to the county of Wayne, that men, so-called labor leaders, who day after day conspire to violate the law, escape without even being prosecuted.

If the citizens of Detroit wish to drive all industry from their community; if they wish to see a complete break-down of all semblance of authority; if they want to destroy the effectiveness of our laws, the integrity of our courts, they will have the opportunity to go one step farther on election day, April 7.

We have a conscription law. We have a great national emergency. We are, if the President has his way, about to take part in the fighting of World War No. 2. Knowing his record, the people of Detroit have nominated, as a candidate for judge in their city, Maurice Sugar, a man who did his part in the first World War to destroy the efforts of our people to prepare for that war.

Maurice Sugar, who is a candidate for judge—think of it!—a candidate for a judicial position where he would be charged with the interpretation of the law—in 1917 was twice convicted on his plea of guilty of what might well be termed "disloyalty" to the Union. He was first convicted of a conspiracy to induce others to violate the Conscription Act. Later he was convicted and sentenced to a year's imprisonment for a violation of that Conscription Act.

It was only because he was pardoned in 1934 by President Roosevelt that he now can be a candidate for this office.

What kind of a judge will a convicted criminal make? What sort of a judge will the man who, when the fate of the Nation was involved, flaunted her laws, conspired to induce others to evade them, make?

No wonder the Communists are supporting Maurice Sugar. Will the decent, law-abiding people of Detroit select as one of their judges a candidate of the Communists—a man who has served time in her own Detroit House of Correction?

Sugar expressed some of his views while he was serving in the Detroit House of Correction. Then—and he may still have the same views—he apparently was a believer in an international union, in the theory of a "universal brotherhood." He then had words of praise for the Soviet Government. He then thought that "one big union" might be a good thing for America. Apparently, he now, as then, while in the Detroit House of Correction, is a believer in the "international identity of interests of the workers" throughout the world.

Do the workers of Detroit realize that if Sugar and his kind have their way they will drag down the workers of America to the level of those of Russia and other countries cursed with the practice of the things in which Sugar evidently believes?

Are the present strikes in industry, but actually against this Government of ours, but another front on the battle which Sugar and those who believe with him are waging at the present time? Do the Communists and Sugar believe that if they elect him judge they will have a legal method of supplementing the violent one which they use to prevent men from aiding in national defense?

Do the workers of America, the men who work in the factories of Detroit, want to join hands with the workers of Russia? That apparently was Sugar's theory, his doctrine, his belief, when he was confined in the Detroit House of Correction. It apparently is his belief and the belief of those who would close the Ford Motor plant at the present time.

The citizens of Detroit should look into Maurice Sugar's record.

In 1915, he appeared before a committee of the Detroit Board of Education and strenuously opposed any military training in the schools of Detroit. That was about the time the R. O. T. C. was being set up there. In the course of his argument, he made the flat statement that "soldiers are not good citizens."

Sugar continually opposed United States participation in the World War and refused to register for the draft, as stated. He was convicted before Judge Tuttle, and, on March 8, 1918, was fined $500 for subversive writing and speaking against draft. He was also sentenced to serve 1 year in the Detroit House of Correction for failure to register.

This conduct in the first World War is of a piece with his present conduct, for, on Friday, February 28, 1941, he signed, as the official representative for the U. A. W.—C. I. O.—a notice to the President of the United States and Governor of Michigan of intention of the C. I. O. to call a strike in the Ford plant, now so largely devoted to defense work.

The John Reed Club is a front for the Comintern, or Communist Internationale. In 1932, Maurice Sugar was a delegate from the John Reed Club at Detroit to an Internationale convention in Amsterdam, and, on January 16, 1933, the Detroit News reported some of his speeches praising Russia and the Soviet system.

In 1935, the school board barred him from use of school buildings on the ground he was a Communist, and he sued John Webster, a member of the school board, for $100,000. This case has never been tried.

On April 16, 1937, Sugar was quoted in the Detroit News as having said:

> The sit-down strike is legal to millions of workers.

And, further—

> The sit-down strike now being held illegal should be held legal.

In 1939 a pamphlet was distributed around the Northern High School, where Sugar was scheduled to make a speech. This pamphlet purported to be an ap-

peal of the Communist Party for support for Comrade Sugar in his candidacy for election to the common council.

On April 12, 1939, Maurice Sugar signed a warrant for criminal libel against Raymond Tessmer—Recorder's Court File No. 8890—, alleging that Tessmer, by circulating those pamphlets—

did falsely and maliciously accuse, attribute, and impute to Maurice Sugar the commission of certain crimes, felonies, and misdemeanors, to wit: Advocacy of criminal syndicalism and infamous and degrading acts, viz, advocacy of murder, fomenting of racial hatred between Negro and white race, advocacy of the forced closing of churches and destruction of religious worship, denial of the existence of God, and insulting generally priests of the Catholic Church and ministers of the Protestant Church.

Attached to this complaint was a copy of the pamphlet.

The defendant pleaded justification; that is, that the charges were true. The case was tried by jury before Judge Cotter, who charged the jury that Maurice Sugar had testified that he was a member of the Friends of the Soviet Union and of the John Reed Club and that there was testimony tending to prove that Maurice Sugar was closely identified with active Communist leaders; that he was present at meetings open only to officials of the Communist Party and participated therein; that he took orders from the Communist Party and that he "voluntarily assembled with officers and members of the Communist Party, a group founded to teach and advocate doctrines of criminal syndicalism; and that, if the jury found that Maurice Sugar was a member of the Communist Party at the time of the circulation of the pamphlet, February 25, 1939, then he was guilty of the acts attributed to him in the circular and that Raymond Tessmer was not guilty of criminal libel."

On June 30, 1939, after 5 days' trial, the jury found Tessmer not guilty. This means that the jury found Sugar guilty of being a Communist and advocate of criminal syndicalism, and so forth.

The Detroit News, November 8, 1923, announced that Judge Ira W. Jayne had reinstated Maurice Sugar to the practice of the law in Michigan courts. The petition has disappeared from the court files.

In January 1941, at a banquet given in honor of Judge Ira W. Jayne, George F. Addes, in a prepared statement announced the U. A. W.-C. I. O. endorsement of Judge Jayne and attacked most of the other members of the circuit court, announcing that the C. I. O. was out to defeat them.

The Michigan C. I. O. News, February 14, 1941, announced the C. I. O. endorsement of Nicholas J. Rothe for the circuit court and Maurice Sugar for the recorder's court.

On November 4, 1935, the Detroit News reported a police raid on Communist headquarters at 5969 Fourteenth Street, in which the police seized cards advocating Sugar for election as judge of the recorder's court, together with pictures of Lenin, Trotsky, Mooney, and Sugar.

In Odyssey of a Fellow Traveler, by J. B. Matthews, printed in 1938, is found on page 188 the statement by Matthews:

In 1935, I addressed mass meetings of the Friends of the Soviet Union, in Milwaukee, Chicago, and Detroit. * * * In Detroit, Maurice Sugar was running for judge of the recorder's court. Sugar's campaign was the first of Communist Party's efforts to launch a labor party in this country.

Who wants a Communist judge?

Yes, some may say, what interest have we in out-State in what the people of Detroit may do or not do? The people of Michigan, outside of Detroit, have been proud of the great industries which have been established and carried on there. We are proud of the record as an industrial city that Detroit has made.

We know that hundreds of thousands of men have been given employment in Detroit; that they have received wages which have enabled many of them to purchase homes for themselves and their families, to educate their families, and by their own efforts to establish security for themselves in their old age.

Anything which affects Detroit affects the whole State, and if we of out State have our way, we do not propose to see the Communists, the radical labor leaders, the racketeers, the leeches, and the parasites destroy industry in that city.

If Detroit does not herself take care of the situation, sooner or later the State of Michigan, through the legislature, through a Governor who has courage—and if not the present one, then one to succeed him—through its State police, will reestablish respect for law and order in the city of Detroit.

We of out State know that the patriotic and loyal citizens of Detroit, the patriotic and loyal workers of that city, if they have protection from those officials who have sworn to uphold the law, will do their own housecleaning without any help from without.

It remains to be seen whether the citizens of Detroit will on April 7 indicate that they intend that Detroit shall be ruled by law and not by men.

Henry Ford and the Ford Motor Co. have hundreds of thousands of friends throughout the State of Michigan, millions of friends throughout the Nation, and they do not propose that he or the Ford Motor Co., or those who are employed by it, shall be deprived of their civil rights just to fatten the pocketbooks of the C. I. O. or to gratify the ambition, further the cause, of those who serve Soviet Russia.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, nationally we have never known our Gethsemane so well before.

The fishing trip ended just in time for April Fool's Day.

Is the die cast with the rank and file? At Seneca, Kans., March 28, 300 assembled human beings voted "No"—300 to 0.

"Buy British" is the new slogan here—from whiskey to clothes for women and children. Argentine had the call last week.

If the British Empire should lose its present world position, whom would you rather see dominate Europe—Russia or Germany?

The Quartermaster Corps has bought 50,000,000 pairs of socks. The $90 saddle rode the taxpayers, but now we plan to "sock 'em."

A St. Louis Post-Dispatch cartoon features Mr. John Q. Public behind the fence stripped naked and warbling "Roll out the barrel."

Washington County, Kans., would like to have a Ludlow resolution vote on toleration of strikes in defense industries.

Toward the Unknown, Saturday Evening Post editorial for March 29, takes its place alongside of Mark Twain's forecast of how all future wars for a thousand years would start.

This is the anniversary of Fort Sumter, Lee's surrender, Lincoln's death, opening of war to free Cuba, of war to end all wars and save democracies, and the crucifixion. Let's hurry by.

Allocation of Defense Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

ARTICLES FROM THE KNOXVILLE NEWS-SENTINEL AND AN EDITORIAL FROM THE NASHVILLE TENNESSEAN

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include two illuminating and instructive articles from the Knoxville News-Sentinel and an editorial from the Nashville Tennessean. The news articles were written by John Montoux, who has carefully analyzed the subject matter. They follow:

[From the Knoxville News-Sentinel]

NEW JERSEY GETS AS MUCH DEFENSE WORK AS DO 32 OTHER STATES COMBINED

(By John T. Moutoux)

WASHINGTON, March 20.—"I am afraid that in the defense effort to date we have followed the same pattern of regional concentration that was followed in 1917 and 1918."—Chester Davis, member of the National Defense Advisory Commission, in a speech last Saturday before the Southern Governors Conference at New Orleans.

One State—New Jersey—has been awarded as many dollars' worth of national-defense contracts as 32 States and the District of Columbia combined.

Six States have been awarded as many dollars' worth of national-defense contracts as

the remaining 42 States, the District of Columbia, and all the United States possessions.

Defense contracts awarded by States between last June and the first of this month ranged from $1,359,051,132 given to firms in New Jersey to $534,359 awarded to firms in North Dakota.

Because of the difference in population among the States of the Union, a comparison of awards given to each State does not present the picture so well as a per capita expenditure in those States.

It was this latter state of affairs that Chester Davis had in mind when he warned against the practice of concentrating the industries in one or two sections and thus compelling the workers living in the other sections to move to the favored areas in order to work in defense industries.

The per capita expenditures by States ranges from $326.68 per person in New Jersey to 83 cents per person in North Dakota.

The average per capita expenditure for the 48 States and the District is $74.40; 17 States are above that average; 31 States and the District of Columbia are below the average. Only 2 Southern States—Virginia and South Carolina—are among the 17 above the average. South Carolina just got under the wire as No. 17, with a per capita expenditure in that State of $75.40.

Virginia is the only Southern State with a record to be proud of. It is fifth in total contracts awarded to that State and second in per capita expenditures. The main reason is the presence at Norfolk and Newport News of vast defense projects, chief of which is the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co.

Alabama ranks seventeenth in the amount of contracts awarded and twentieth in per capita expenditures made in that State.

This is how the States stack up in contracts awarded since the defense program got under way last June to the first of this month:

1.	New Jersey	$1,539,051,132
2.	New York	1,323,475,986
3.	California	1,267,070,109
4.	Pennsylvania	1,005,426,800
5.	Virginia	852,896,486
6.	Massachusetts	832,143,984
7.	Michigan	722,880,512
8.	Washington	505,282,172
9.	Indiana	418,858,433
10.	Ohio	416,649,197
11.	Connecticut	358,586,420
12.	Missouri	335,533,904
13.	Maryland	319,836,392
14.	Illinois	297,831,428
15.	Texas	228,712,454
16.	Maine	178,698,862
17.	Alabama	164,118,188
18.	South Carolina	143,248,286
19.	Colorado	128,508,003
20.	New Hampshire	96,377,203
21.	Wisconsin	91,004,567
22.	West Virginia	78,074,408
23.	Florida	61,758,999
24.	Kansas	59,382,745
25.	Iowa	57,313,901
26.	Tennessee	56,096,850
27.	North Carolina	54,124,763
28.	Oregon	50,531,263
29.	Rhode Island	47,541,282
30.	Georgia	45,726,068
31.	Kentucky	41,821,596
32.	Louisiana	34,796,512
33.	Delaware	25,745,186
34.	Nebraska	20,805,224
35.	Mississippi	19,117,512
36.	Minnesota	16,886,499
37.	District of Columbia	16,465,407
38.	New Mexico	10,791,904
39.	Oklahoma	9,702,586
40.	Utah	8,897,040
41.	Arkansas	6,116,679
42.	Arizona	5,518,144
43.	Nevada	3,362,112
44.	Vermont	2,293,619
45.	Wyoming	2,282,563
46.	Idaho	1,842,459
47.	Montana	1,134,240
48.	South Dakota	678,633
49.	North Dakota	534,359

These figures include all expenditures made for national defense—new plants as well as war materials.

As a rule, expenditures are found highest in coast States, because of the huge naval orders received by shipbuilding yards in those States.

The per capita ranking that follows shows how much defense money has been poured into each State for every man, woman, and child in the State. This listing starts and ends with the same States as the listing just given, but it varies in respect to a number of the other States. This list follows:

1.	New Jersey	$326.68
2.	Virginia	318.50
3.	Washington	291.03
4.	Maine	210.92
5.	Connecticut	209.80
6.	New Hampshire	196.08
7.	Massachusetts	192.77
8.	California	183.44
9.	Maryland	176.72
10.	Michigan	137.53
11.	Indiana	122.20
12.	Colorado	114.40
13.	Pennsylvania	101.56
14.	New York	98.11
15.	Delaware	96.60
16.	Missouri	88.65
17.	South Carolina	75.40
18.	Rhode Island	66.64
19.	Ohio	60.32
20.	Alabama	57.93
21.	Oregon	46.38
22.	West Virginia	41.57
23.	Illinois	37.71
24.	Texas	35.65
25.	Kansas	32.97
26.	Florida	32.55
27.	Nevada	30.41
28.	Wisconsin	29.01
29.	District of Columbia	24.83
30.	Iowa	22.58
31.	New Mexico	20.30
32.	Tennessee	19.24
33.	Utah	16.17
34.	Nebraska	15.81
35.	North Carolina	15.15
36.	Louisiana	14.72
37.	Kentucky	14.70
38.	Georgia	14.64
39.	Arizona	11.05
40.	Wyoming	9.10
41.	Mississippi	8.75
42.	Vermont	6.40
43.	Minnesota	6.05
44.	Oklahoma	4.15
45.	Idaho	3.51
46.	Arkansas	3.14
47.	Montana	2.03
48.	South Dakota	1.05
49.	North Dakota	.83

[From the Knoxville News-Sentinel]

Defense Industry Massing Blamed on Army and Navy

(By John T. Moutoux)

WASHINGTON, March 22.—The more you study the figures the worse they become—for the South and the West.

I refer to the amount of the defense money that has gone to the different States since the program got under way last June to the first of this month.

Earlier this week I reported that one State—New Jersey—received as much as 32 other States and the District of Columbia. In fact, $6,450,332 more. The figures are: New Jersey, $1,359,051,132; the 32 States (including most of the South and West) and the District of Columbia, $1,352,600,800.

Just to see what that really means, let us make two comparisons. Let us compare New Jersey's area with that of the 32 States and the District. Then let us compare New Jersey's population with that of the 32 States and the District.

Here are the figures:

New Jersey has an area of 7,514 square miles.

The 32 States and the District have an area of 2,036,862 square miles.

New Jersey's area is less than one-fourth of 1 percent of the total area of this country.

The 32 States and the District's area is 67.3 percent of the total area of the country.

JERSEY IS VULNERABLE

Of course, one might say that the area of a State should not be the governing factor. Maybe not, but it is, or should be, an important factor nevertheless. In the case in point, it means that defense industries are highly concentrated in one State, at a seaboard State at that, where they are highly vulnerable to attack by air, sea, or land. When they are thinly scattered over the 32 States that form the great interior of our country they are least vulnerable to attack.

But if it is population rather than area that is to be considered, on the ground that it would be foolish to locate defense industries in regions where there is not an ample labor supply, let us look at the population figures.

New Jersey has a population of 4,160,165.

The 32 States and the District have a population of 51,099,654.

What does that mean? It means exactly what Chester Davis, member of the National Defense Commission, told the Southern Governors Conference at New Orleans—that if new industries required under the defense program are not located in areas where existing industries are not now concentrated, it will mean "uprooting families and shifting them thousands of miles into communities where ebbing of their armament effort would leave them stranded."

That is, if the bulk of the defense industries are to be located in New Jersey and other Eastern and Northern States, men and women from the South and West will have to go to New Jersey and other Eastern and Northern States to supply the necessary manpower, and then when the war is over and the defense industries are no longer needed they will be left stranded there.

THREE STATES GET MORE THAN 40

New Jersey isn't the only State that has been given a monopoly on defense industries and defense contracts. I singled it out because it led the list. New York and Pennsylvania are also near the top—New York second, Pennsylvania fourth. California is third.

These three Eastern States—New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania—have received $3,949,597,227 in defense industries and contracts.

That's $42,289,337 more than was received by 40 States and the District of Columbia.

These three States have an area of exactly 100,000 square miles, which is 3½ percent of the total area of the United States.

The 40 States that received less defense money than the 3 Eastern States have an area of 2,545,471 square miles, which is a fraction over 84 percent of the total area of this country.

These same three Eastern States have a population of 27,539,487, which is 21 percent of the country's population.

The 40 States and the District of Columbia have a population of 89,909,503, which is 64.5 percent of the country's population.

Here is a list of the 40 States that have received less defense money than the 3 Eastern seaboard States: Indiana, Ohio, Connecticut, Missouri, Maryland, Illinois, Texas, Maine, Alabama, South Carolina, Colorado, New Hampshire, Wisconsin, West Virginia, Florida, Kansas, Iowa, Tennessee, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Delaware, Nebraska, Mississippi, Minnesota, District of Columbia, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Arkansas, Arizona, Nevada, Ver-

mont, Wyoming, Idaho, Montana, South Dakota, and North Dakota.

RESOURCES ARE IN INTERIOR

One other comparison could be made, but there is neither time nor space for it here. Moreover, the results of such a study are so obvious as to make it unnecessary. I refer to a comparison of the natural resources—the things out of which guns, powder, etc., are made—found in the 48 States involved in the comparisons just made.

New Jersey, we know, has practically nothing in the way of such resources. It is chiefly a parasite State. Raw materials from the South and West are brought into that State, converted into manufactured products, and then shipped back to the South and West with the profit remaining in the East.

New York and Pennsylvania aren't quite in the same category, but almost so. More natural resources are found in a number of the 40 States already referred to than in all 8 of the Eastern States put together.

For instance, it has been said that a third of this country's natural resources used in the production of defense materials is found in the seven Tennessee Valley States. (If my memory is correct that statement was made by the Defense Commission itself in asking Congress for an additional appropriation for the T. V. A. to increase the defense power supply.)

And the bulk of all the remaining two-thirds is found in the great country west of the Mississippi River and east of the Sierras, all of which is included in the 40 States which have fared so poorly thus far.

What is the trouble, and what is the cure?

As for the trouble, I quote from a United Press dispatch from New Orleans: "The Southern Governors' Conference took a slap at Army and Navy officials in the selection of national-defense sites, demanding that civilians be given a major voice in this selection."

The conference charged that Army and Navy officials "frequently make selections without regard to long-range planning."

I think the southern Governors hit the nail on the head.

Now, as to the cure. I imagine Chester Davis' blast at New Orleans had something to do with it. At any rate, a press release from the O. P. M. 3 days after Mr. Davis made his speech began as follows:

"Appointment of a Plant Site Committee to review and approve proposals for location by Government agencies of additional plant or facilities required for national defense, has been authorized by the Office of Production Management, it was announced today."

Elsewhere in the release was found this significant statement:

"In reviewing proposed plant locations from funds hereafter to become available under the new production program, the committee will, insofar as possible, with primary emphasis on expediting defense production and appropriate military factors, facilitate geographic decentralization of defense industries and full employment of all available labor."

Army and Navy officials will continue to suggest site locations, but this new civilian committee will have to approve them.

Maybe the Army and Navy brass hats will take the hint.

[From the Nashville Tennessean]

THE SOUTH'S SHORT END

There's no getting around the figures presented by Chester C. Davis, official of the Defense Advisory Commission, to the Southern Governors' Conference at New Orleans showing that only about 7 percent of all the national-defense contracts let up to March 1 were placed in the South. The unlovely fact has been noted before. It is becoming notorious.

Of course, we of the South understand that where emergency production is required such production must be expected where manufacturing facilities exist. It so happens that by far the greater part of the Nation's plant is located north of the Ohio River. Nevertheless, here is a time when new facilities are being added with a great rush, and it is in the strategic defense areas of the South, with their unlimited resources of manpower and materials, that this new plant should be placed. That this is not happening is something the South should be talking about loud and long.

Said Mr. Davis, "The time has come for the southern people to join together and start on the hard route industrializing themselves. Nothing short of the most vigorous and positive efforts to achieve recognition of your labor reserves and resources will suffice."

That is so true it hurts. It hurts because the South even till now has not discovered a way to stand together and with unity expend vigorous and positive effort in its own behalf. Mr. Davis points out that only in the region served by T. V. A., where for the past 7 years provision for cheap power and cheap water transportation has been made, has there been an appreciable access of new industrial plant. This is recognized here, and this region is duly beholden to the good groundwork of T. V. A. But the truth is the tremendous resources of the South have hardly been tapped, and other sections down here, equally capable of industrial development, are waiting for crumbs to fall from the table. That, says Mr. Davis truly, will be a long wait—unless our people get up and go after the manufacturing facilities they need.

Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

ARTICLE IN THE SUGAR REVIEW

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the following statement indicates that at last certain New York financial interests have awakened to the desirability of preserving our great sugar-beet industry.

Today the press gave considerable prominence to a statement attributed to Miss Harriett Elliott, consumer commissioner of the N. D. A. C., respecting sugar. She was quoted as saying, in effect:

(a) That basic factors underlying the sugar situation have not changed adversely since last month when she stated that predictions of sugar shortage, or sugar rationing, and price increases were not warranted by the facts.

(b) Recent advances in refined- and raw-sugar prices, attributed to anticipated shipping shortage, are not justified in view of the basic sugar situation.

(c) That the Consumer Division has been assured by the Maritime Commission that enough tonnage will be available to move in from offshore producing areas sufficient quantities to safeguard normal sugar consumption in this country.

(d) That stocks of sugar readily available to consumers in the United States remain larger than usual; that Cuba has large surplus stocks currently on hand; and that there are more than sufficient supplies available from offshore areas to supplement domestic production.

Miss Elliott also stressed the adequacy of powers available to the Government to prevent the sugar situation from getting out of hand, and indicated that the Consumer Division is proceeding actively to bring these powers into operation to assure full supplies at reasonable prices to consumers.

This statement caused further price unsettlement on the opening of the exchange, profit-taking and hedge-selling carrying prices down to 3 to 4 points by closing time.

* * * * * *

We consider the pause in prices as not only normal but healthy. In the main we endorse the statements of Miss Elliott as true. We do not fully agree with the reported statement that price increases have not been warranted by the facts. There is no denying that the market started off late in 1939 at a very low level, and that freight rates have absorbed a very large part of the subsequent advance. To this extent advances not only have been justified but forced, if we were not to have actual declining f. o. b. values in the face of war conditions, increased demand, improved statistical situation, etc. No reasonable person can quarrel with the sugar trade up to date on the basis of the record.

Last December, when raws were selling at 2.95 cents and refined at 4.40 cents, we stated that "a duty-paid price of 3.15 cents for Louisiana, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines, with a refiner's price of 4.75 cents and a beet price of 4.55 cents would not, after taxes, provide anything more than a reasonable return for most producers." On the basis of recent prices the raw market has advanced 30 points and cane refined 35 points above the levels we mentioned. We did not then envisage such a drastic increase in tonnage rates, which has absorbed all the advance above the prices that we then thought were fully justified. Cuban freight rates, for example, have gone up about 30 points, Philippine rates considerably more, and Puerto Rican rates somewhat less.

At present levels we reiterate that we do not consider the market unjustifiably high, and it may easily be that some at present unforeseen future developments will justify a higher price level. To say that the market has reached the top, or to predict material declines at this point would be foolish, indeed. There are too many intangibles to reckon with: war, tonnage supply, increased wages, and general costs, increased consumption, buyer psychology, rising commodity prices, possibility of inflation to a greater or less degree, etc.

On the other hand, to talk the market higher at this time without justification statistically, or on the mere assumption of higher costs later, is equally foolish. Speculation is thereby encouraged, hoarding increases, and a buying panic can easily result. We would greatly deplore a hysteria that would carry prices up to a point where drastic Government action would be taken. Extraordinarily large quota releases, or a complete suspension of quotas, forced by the action of buyers who insist on deliveries of a 6- to 9-months' supply within 3 months, would not be in the best interest of the industry as a whole. The delicate balance that has been built up among the various producing areas over the past 5 or 6 years would suddenly be upset, with loss or ruin for many. On the termination of the war, or cessation of the emergency, the industry would be faced with even more aggravated

conditions than prevailed after the brief 1939 spree.

Available tonnage, of course, remains the basic factor governing prices. There is no question of the adequacy of supplies of sugar. With normal demand spread out over the year, we believe sufficient tonnage will be made available; but, as pointed out before, the abnormal movement in sugar during the first 3 months has aggravated the situation and contributed to the scarcity of space. Freight operators have been quick to take advantage of the situation, and have, in the opinion of many experienced steamship men, demanded and obtained higher rates than were justified at the time. With a lull in the raw market, some temporary easing in freight might be experienced. There has been much talk of "lack of tonnage," when, as a matter of fact, 100/150,000 tons more offshore sugar has been received in the United States up to the present time than was received in the corresponding period last year. These boats are still in the trade, so that any cessation in the abnormal demand for sugar might easily find boats looking for freight, and the competition lowering rates in this trade—the safest and most desirable perhaps in the world today.

Another factor that may have a very important bearing on subsequent market values, particularly if a quota suspension were forced by runaway prices, is the very active fight now being waged by domestic interests for the removal of restrictions on beet sowings for the coming crop. Under the circumstances, it seems that the Secretary of Agriculture cannot find any justification whatever for denying the plea of the domestic sugar producers who are trying to safeguard the sugar supply of the country and prevent the development of a situation that the Secretary himself now appears to be desirous of avoiding. Continental supplies are not subject to the hazards of ocean transportation, and in limiting such production the administration is in effect saying that the tonnage situation will not become more acute within the next year or 18 months. If the beet-sugar farmers and processors are willing to produce, finance, and indefinitely carry an indeterminate supply of sugar there seems little reason why they should not be permitted to do so. Better an ample supply in the case of need than the taunt of having "killed off all the little pigs in the time of an emergency." It does seem a trifle inconsistent that one department limits production within the United States, another department is forced to warn the public that there is no scarcity, and still another department through financial aid encourages Cuba to produce 400,000 tons for which there is now no apparent demand.

National Defense and the Air Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

STATEMENT BY C. R. SMITH, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN AIRLINES, INC.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, recently I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD certain timely comment contained in a well-written and thought-provoking newspaper advertisement, carried over the signature of C. R. Smith, president of American Airlines, Inc. I am having printed today another of these advertisements.

This afternoon on the House floor we heard the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] tell the membership of the increasing importance of aviation. What he said was true. In this time of national-defense plans it is well to value the part our air-transport system plays in the preparedness program. In this connection I include the following presentation of the subject by Mr. Smith:

National defense overshadows all other responsibilities. All else may be futile without the attainment of that objective.

The welfare of the individual citizen or the individual business is not dissoluble from the welfare of the Nation.

We must have combat air power. You recognize the need for that. But victory cannot come from supremacy at the military front alone.

Right here, in the arsenal of democracy, an important battle is being waged—the battle of the home front: Production. Men, metals, and machinery are of urgent importance. But more important is time.

The tempo of national defense is attuned to the speed of the airplane. An increasing number of persons engaged in national-defense undertakings must schedule their work according to the time-saving advantages of air transportation.

It is self-evident that the importance of air transportation increases in ratio to the need for it. Men must travel by air, delivery of matériel must be expedited by air express, communication must be accelerated by air mail.

It follows logically that the air lines will receive the aid of the Government—in personnel, aircraft, and matériel—not only to maintain the high standards of yesterday but actually to exceed them.

The effective operation of the air lines is a "must" in our Government today. Resources have been charted, requirements of the Army, the Navy, and the air lines have been weighed and proper allocation is being provided for the balance necessary for maximum effectiveness in this period of crisis. All three will be maintained at top-notch efficiency.

With personal pride you look upon the Army and the Navy as your Army and your Navy. Now it's your air lines, too.

By the same token, your air lines have the compelling necessity to deserve an even greater public confidence.

There will be a world after the war and there will be generations after our own. We cannot plan for today alone.

Priceless as combat planes are for defense, they protect but do not create national wealth.

But the transport planes of the air lines do aid in the creation of national wealth, by expediting modern commerce between cities and between nations.

The accelerated tempo of today will be carried over to the period which will follow. Military warfare will be replaced by economic rivalry.

The airplane is dominating the military effort of today; it will dominate the economic effort of tomorrow. The "old days" of slower tempo have gone over the horizon and they will not come back to us.

The pressure of war has hastened immeasurably the design of more effective aircraft. Production has been increased manyfold. Pilots, mechanics, and other skilled technicians are being trained by increasing thousands.

We shall not want, after the war is over, to close the doors of our engine and airplane factories, nor to lose the experience of those men skilled in the design, construction, and operation of aircraft. These things we have worked for, bought and paid for. We have the requirement that they continue to be utilized in the national interest.

The world of tomorrow will be a world of the airplane. Distances have forever lost their old meanings. Africa will be our next-door neighbor. Europe will be but hours away.

First things first. National defense overshadows all other requirements now. But in our responsibility to concentrate upon the requirements of today, let us permit some measure of time for the plans of tomorrow.

After the war is over, the air lines of the United States must continue to lead the world in utility and effectiveness and the American flag must fly over the oceans of the earth.

It is largely to aviation that we must look for our security and our leadership in world affairs from now on.

Why Should God Bless America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE METHODIST WOMAN

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article from the March issue of the Methodist Woman. This article on Why Should God Bless America? was written by Dr. Peter Marshall, minister of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, of Washington, D. C. The article is splendid, and I trust that the entire membership of the Congress will take time to read this sermon:

[From the Methodist Woman of March 1941]

WHY SHOULD GOD BLESS AMERICA?

(By Dr. Peter Marshall)

Why should God bless America? Why should we be blessed of God more than Germany, or Poland, or France, or Great Britain, or Denmark, or China? Have we any racial superiority, or rare intelligence, or moral excellence? Are we more deserving in the sight of God? Are we better than other nations? Are our morals higher?

Last September the Nation was called to "pray to Almighty God for His blessing on our country and for the establishment of a just and permanent peace among all the nations of the world." The President urged "the people of the United States of all creeds and denominations to pray on that day in their churches or at their homes, on the high seas, or wherever they may be, beseeching the Ruler of the Universe to bless our Republic, to make us reverently grateful for our heritage and firm in its defense, and to grant to

this land and to the troubled world a righteous, enduring peace."

Now, it was a splendid proclamation, and we are glad the President issued it. But we could wish that in it the President had called us to acknowledge our sins, national and individual, had urged us to repent and to return to a humility we have lost. We wish the President had stated openly that we, too, have our shortcomings and that we, like other nations, have been unworthy of God's blessings.

Ambassador Bullitt sounded a note that is urgently needed today in his great speech at Philadelphia on August 18: "When are we going to wake up? When are we going to tell our Government that we want to defend our homes and our children and our liberties, whatever the cost in money or blood? When are we going to give the lie to those who say that the people of the United States no longer care about their liberties, that they look upon the United States just as a trough into which to get their snouts and not as the greatest adventure in human freedom that this earth has known? When are we going to let the world know that, in spite of all the efforts of all the propagandists who call the propaganda 'debunking' and try to teach us to fear even truth, we still know that when anyone tries to debunk the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount he prepares for himself hell in this world and in the next? When are we going to let legislators in Washington know that we don't want any more politicians who are afraid of the next election and scared to ask us to make the sacrifices we know are necessary to preserve our liberties and our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution? When are we going to tell them that we want to know what are our duties—not what are our privileges? When are we going to say to them that we don't want to hear any longer about what we can get from our country, but we do want to hear what we can give to our country? When are we going to stand before God and say that we know a human being is worthy of freedom only when he serves the ideal in which he believes?"

We are enjoying the greatest freedom the world has ever known—a freedom that staggers all who will consider it, for we are free in these days to ignore the very things that others died to provide. We are free to neglect the liberties we have inherited, and surely there can be no greater freedom than that.

MUCH IS WRONG IN AMERICA

I am one of those who believe that there are some things worth fighting for, and worth dying for, if need be. The trouble with our age is not so much that it cannot believe there is anything worth dying for, but that it is not so sure that there is anything worth living for.

As a Christian—and a Christian minister—I find myself on the horns of a terrible dilemma. We all hate and abhor war, we detest it, we denounce it. It is worthless and contrary to all the principles and ethics of Christ. Nothing we can say about war is too condemnatory, no language is too strong. And yet, at the same time, I feel that there are certain qualities, certain principles, certain heritages, certain liberties, for which man should be willing to fight and even dare to die. I cannot reconcile these two positions. I will not even try.

I only know that with all that is wrong with our beloved land, we must show our love for her in a deeper way. Much we know is wrong with America, seriously, deeply, and gravely wrong. Her declining faith, her forsaken altars, her armies of criminals, the unchecked ravages of the liquor traffic, the oft-lewd manuscript of her literature, the corrupt government of her cities, the hosts of the jobless in spite of unparalleled riches and resources—all this is wrong, deeply and dangerously wrong.

But there is so much that is right in America, so much that is good, and true, and fine.

But our Republic, if it is to endure—our democracy, if it is to survive—must be willing to make some voluntary sacrifice and to bear some self-assumed disciplines. It may mean doing without some luxuries, or even for the time being curtailing our supply of life's necessities. We must show the world that the genius of a God-founded democracy is the desire of its people to give rather than to get, to seek supremely the public good rather than private gain. Liberty's greatest enemy today is the old enemy, human greed and selfishness.

FRANCE PAID A BITTER FEE

As France slowly and painfully tries to pick up the pieces of her shattered national life, perhaps the most remarkable change her new government is ordaining is the introduction of a puritan way of life. Cabinet officers have been appointed whose first and principal duty is to attack the evils of alcoholism, marital laxity, and divorce, lewdness in the theater, commercialized vice, and all forms of self-indulgence. Hard work, sobriety, moral earnestness, and religious observances are being preached as the necessary means to a revival of French strength and dignity. Especially is the new order to be applied to youth. There is more than regimentation for a Fascist society in all this. Behind it lies the recognition born of catastrophe, that moral laxity produces a sort of softness which is as suicidal for nations as for men. France had to pay a bitter fee to learn this lesson. We in America must learn it before it is too late, before we, too, pay in tears and humiliation.

John Curran, in 1790, said: "It is the common fate of the indolent to see their rights become the prey to the active. The condition upon which God hath given liberty to man is eternal vigilance; which condition, if he break, servitude is at once the consequence of his crime and the punishment of his guilt."

A columnist in our daily press wrote:

"America needs a general disposition to rate the Ten Commandments as more important than any 11 radio talks.

"America needs immediate agreement on the meaning of free speech with a view to determining if it means that a bunch of Moscow or Berlin agents enjoying the liberties of American life must be permitted to work over the radio for the destruction of the American system.

"America needs a drive to convince the youth of America that the defense problem would be helped immeasurably if they had the same intense love for the Constitution and the American system as the Nazi youths have for Hitler and the Nazi system.

"America needs an extension of the drive to awaken voters to the high importance of selecting Representatives, Senators, and other public officeholders on a basis of character, courage, high purpose, and personal integrity; and not on a matchless record for muddleheadedness, a loud voice, a fair radio style, and an aversion to study.

"America needs more faith in prayer than in telegrams to politicians, and a willingness to give at least as much time to church as to any double-feature movie.

"America needs a wider appreciation of the relative importance of an altar in the home as compared with a de luxe radio, portable bar, and a rumpus room."

The current philosophy of indifference to what is happening abroad is too shallow and too stupid to be American. It is too selfish to be Christian. It is not the voice of this great Republic, but simply the superficial, wise-cracking selfishness of the cynic.

Some of our intellectuals in their concern for the fate of democracy are calling the Nation back to God. Many of our newspaper columnists are turning over new leaves in their attitude toward religion. They declare that the Nation can be saved only by a return to religious faith.

A REPUBLIC UNDER GOD

The idea may be abroad in some quarters that democracy is the thing that must be preserved, and that God is brought in as its servant. We must not get the cart before the horse. The plea of the church today is not that the people shall call upon God to return to our democracy and bless it, but rather that we shall together cause our democracy to return to God and be blessed.

Let us remember that we are a republic under God. Let us remember that on each of our coins we have stamped a statement which must not be permitted to become a lie or an infamous blasphemy. "In God we trust"—so speak the coins that rattle in our pockets. What does it mean to trust in God? Certainly no conception of trust in God can make any sense which assumes that He will prosper our ways or bless us until our ways begin to be His ways and we begin to keep the conditions He has laid down for national blessing.

And thus I come to my text, II Chronicles vii: 14: "If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sins and will heal their land." These are the conditions of God's blessing.

And these conditions were ignored by the President in his call to prayer to seek God's blessings upon this land. He did not call upon America to turn from its wicked ways, nor has the Nation shown any such inclination. We were admonished by the President to ask of God "to grant to this land and to the troubled world a righteous and enduring peace." Can we do that as a nation with the blood of China on our hands? Can we ask for peace for ourselves while we continue to supply the ingredients of war to Japan, as we have been doing for the past 3 years, in its pitiless assault upon a defenseless nation whose friend we have advertised ourselves to be?

I wonder if the President would have changed the wording of his proclamation had he read the words of Isaiah in the first chapter. "Hear ye the word of the Lord, ye rulers; give ear unto the law of our God, ye people. * * * When ye spread forth your hands I will hide mine eyes; when ye make many prayers I will not hear; your hands are full of blood. Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doing from before mine eyes. * * * Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord; though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool. If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land; but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."

PROPHETIC VISION OF LINCOLN

The great heart of Abraham Lincoln expressed itself on this subject with saintly and prophetic vision:

"It is the duty of nations as well as of men to own their dependence upon the overruling power of God; to confess their sins and transgressions in humble sorrow, yet with assured hope that genuine repentance will lead to mercy and pardon; and to recognize the sublime truth announced in the

Holy Scriptures and proven by all history, and these nations only are blessed.

"And inasmuch as we know that by His divine law nations, like individuals, are subjected to punishments and chastisements in this world, may we not justify fear that the awful calamity of civil war which now desolates the land may be but a punishment inflicted upon us for our presumptuous sins, to the needful end of our national reformation as a whole people? We have been recipients of the choicest bounties of heaven. We have been preserved these many years in peace and prosperity. We have grown in numbers, wealth, and power as no other nation has ever grown; but we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand that preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior virtue and wisdom of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us.

"It behooves us, then, to humble ourselves before the offended Power, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness."

If that were true in 1861, how much more true is it now? We can sing God Bless America until we are blue in the face, but unless we do what God has indicated, His blessings will be withheld.

HUMILITY, PRAYER, AND FAITH

The path of humility is not familiar to the American people. Humility itself is a strange virtue to which we are all unaccustomed. We have far too long been riding on balloon tires of an inflated ego.

Nothing can more quickly humiliate us than for us to reflect as we sit in this holy place on our own personal sins, to meditate upon our own shortcomings, to reflect upon the meanness of our own character, and to remember all the things that are wrong in our own city and throughout the land.

The second condition is that God's people must pray. The art of prayer has almost become one of the church's lost secrets. The impotence of the church today is expressed by the fact that the church has ceased to pray. We must not wait for Presidential proclamations to have days of prayer. The conditions must be observed by God's people everywhere—the Jew and the Gentile alike, the Catholic and the Protestant, the rich and the poor—we must all pray.

And the third condition is that we shall seek God's face. And that means a return to God, an effort to find God's will for our lives, His guidance for our conduct, His standards for our ethics, and His help in order that we may walk in His way.

We must get rid of the idea that we can adopt a confession of faith and repeat a creed and then go out and do as we please. Let us not fool ourselves. We have to turn from our wicked ways.

We may as well confess that we have wicked ways, that we do things that we know perfectly well we ought not to be doing, that we say things that we have no right to say, that our dispositions are not those of children of God. We cannot fool God * * * let us not be deluded into thinking we can fool ourselves.

But God says: "If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways: then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land."

Jackson Day Dinner Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3 (legislative day of Monday, March 31), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. TOM CONNALLY, OF TEXAS, AT RICHMOND, VA.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an exceedingly able speech delivered by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] on the occasion of the Jackson Day dinner at Richnmond, Va., on March 29.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am profoundly grateful to Senator BYRD for his generous and flattering words of presentation to this distinguished gathering of Virginia Democrats. It is always a matter of pride to speak in the great old Commonwealth of Virginia—a Commonwealth with glorious history and traditions—the State of Washington, Patrick Henry, James Madison, James Monroe, and Thomas Jefferson, political philosopher and founder of our party. It gave many other great and illustrious statesmen and soldiers to the service of our country. I am happy to break bread with and to hear the utterances of your distinguished and able Senators CARTER GLASS and HARRY BYRD, and to sit at the same board with many of the Virginia Members of the House of Representatives. With an experience of more than 20 years in the Congress, I can say that no State in the Union is represented by men of finer conception of public service, or of superior quality to the representation of Virginia in the House and Senate of the United States.

Annual tribute to the memory of Andrew Jackson has, by the common law of our party, become the rallying point for the forces and principles of our party and a time of rededication of Democrats to our precepts and fundamental policies.

Andrew Jackson was the man of action. He was a militant and aggressive leader. While embracing the theories and principles of Jefferson, he gave to their enforcement the rugged and aggressive qualities of the frontier. With a fundamental concept and understanding of the principles of democracy and free government, his life and experience on the frontier in the establishment and maintenance of civil law and order in his own State, and his heroic conduct in maintaining the authority of the United States over turbulent and lawless Indian tribes and against the conspirators and plotters of foreign nations on our southern frontier, climaxed by his dazzling military triumph at the Battle of New Orleans, he was prepared for that remarkable political career in the United States Senate and in the Presidency, which marked an era in the history of the United States, brought into all branches of the Government a vivid and vibrant democratic concept and left indelibly upon the pages of our history the heroic record and the towering figure of Andrew Jackson. We honor him tonight as a great Democrat, as a symbol of democracy, as an outstanding President of the United States, and as a heroic, courageous, and faithful servant of the great masses, not alone of his own generation but of all those who have followed and who have been served by the stimulation and vitality which he gave to the principles of democracy and free government under our constitutional system.

We gather, however, tonight in no narrow partisan sense. While our party, in the recent national elections, achieved a substantial victory and again elected our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and is now in control of both the executive and legislative departments of the Government, we meet in no spirit of selfish exultation.

By the force of events, our party is charged with a high responsibility, not alone with respect to normal domestic problems, but at this fateful hour in the world's history with titanic problems in our foreign relations and in the tasks of democracy in the larger and broader sense everywhere in the world. These are heavy responsibilities. They affect something more than our temporary comforts of a day. They reach down below issues of economic policies at home and they tower above routine governmental transactions in times of calmness and peace.

The United States of America, through no spirit of boastful pride, may well claim to be the preeminent champion of democracy in the modern world. When we speak of democracy, we have in mind a concept of constitutional government by freemen. We have in mind a governmental structure, created by freemen and under their own sanctions, guaranteeing its fundamental principles, rights, and privileges set forth not in letters of sand but in the clear and luminous language of the Constitution itself, preserving and guaranteeing to every citizen through the process of courts and the judicial system created to serve the humblest citizen and his rights as well as those in places of power and authority.

Democracy is not license. Democracy is not the rule of the mob. Neither is it government by an oligarchy of industrial or commercial or moneyed groups. True democracy is ordered liberty under law. The processes of democracy are not automatic nor self-propelling. The preservation and implementation of democracy under our Government or under any government requires the constant and unremitting endeavors of our people and of those in the Nation's councils who are devoted to its maintenance. Democratic principles under our Government or under any other government may be abused or improperly employed by selfish groups who may attain power. However, the people always have a remedy, if their efforts are properly directed under capable leadership. It is the duty, the lofty duty of our party and of all of those of our people who believe in a broad and constructive democracy, to ever remain alert and watchful that its principles may be applied in the constant and never-ending struggle over governmental policies. That struggle must go on during all the years. That is a part of the history of democracy—a long, toilsome effort throughout the centuries for the common man to attain liberty and to have voice in the government that shall rule over him. That struggle has not yet ended. It cannot end and must go on as long as man desires to be free. That is the supreme challenge to our party. The necessity to maintain the contest is the justification for the existence of the Democratic Party, and its success in such a contest will be its everlasting glory.

Democracy cannot be purchased in a department store. There is no modern gadget or labor-saving device which embodies its

principles and relieves us of the responsibility for its operation. Democracy and free government in the United States were not ready-made. They cost our people blood and tears and sacrifices and suffering through the long years. They cost us the American Revolution and the loss of the patriots who lost their lives or shed their blood. They cost us the trying days under the Articles of Confederation, when the individual States, harassed and annoyed with their domestic and international problems, were forced to find a way out of their difficulties. They cost us a struggle over the adoption of the Constitution of the United States. Here were the forces of democracy at work. Here were men striving toward free government and ordered liberty over a constitutional struggle of our own making, arguing and contending and giving utterance to their concepts respecting the problems which faced them.

Democracy and free government cost us the War of 1812. That war brought us face to face with foreign problems and foreign relations. We had become a nation. No longer were we 13 weak and wavering Commonwealths. The War of 1812, with its sacrifices and sufferings, had a part in stiffening the national fabric and in congealing the divergent and discordant factions among our people.

Democracy must be earned and deserved. America, during 150 years of national existence, and even during the preceding 150 years of colonial history, in which the thirst for freedom and democracy was being surely, if slowly, generated and stimulated, has earned and deserved democracy and constitutionalism. They are ours. We have paid for them in blood and treasure. We shall surrender them neither to domestic miners and sappers nor to any attack by foreign foes.

The existence of democracy and free government anywhere in the world is now under attack by the most brutal and ruthless group of dictators that have cursed the world and stained its soil with the blood of its innocent victims since Genghis Khan and his Mongol hosts swept out of the Gobi Desert in the thirteenth century, and by conquest and pillage, by fire and sword, ravaged and destroyed civilized lands and crushed their people under the heel of barbaric invasion. Democracy is threatened everywhere. For the moment it is assailed by armies in other parts of the earth, but the flaming dreams of the conquerors reach out to our own land and other lands in the western world—to all lands where free government dares to exist. Hitler and Mussolini have subjugated peaceful and neutral nations in Europe, and scourging their enslaved people with the lash of the master, have proclaimed their intention to establish a "new world order." The United States is a part of the world. It is within the scope of their plans and purposes. This compact of aggression and conquest is a bayonet thrust at the security of the United States and its people.

Great Britain, with heroic gallantry and with blood dripping from her wounds, is standing, sword in hand, upon the ramparts of her own freedom and upon the fortresses of her own life, seeking to hold back this tidal wave of conquest. In resisting the aggressors she is defending the right to free government in behalf of civilization.

Little Greece, with a courage as sublime as that of the Greeks at Marathon and recalling the classic martyrdom at Thermopylae, has aroused the admiration of an amazed world by her granitelike resistance to invasion and conquest.

In the face of the arrogant decree of the dictators that free government and democracy will be destroyed wherever the armies of Hitler and Mussolini can march, wherever their navies can float, and wherever their swarming fleets of the skies can fly, the United States and Americans have determined that we shall give of our substance and of our arms and of our equipment and of our cannon and of our machinery of war, to the brave nations, the brave peoples, who scorning the demands of the dictators, dare to fight for their lives and the life of democracy in the world.

Evidencing that determination, the lend-lease bill, to provide for leasing, lending, or giving to the countries resisting aggression and whose defense is vital to the defense of the United States, has been enacted. Already seven billions of the Nation's treasure has been pledged to carry its terms into execution.

The pages of history reveal no more fundamental struggle in the history of mankind than that which faces the world today. Democracy and free government must and shall not be butchered by the barbarism and savagery of Hitler and Mussolini who plot the assassination of liberty throughout the world

For our own country and people, our task is gigantic. Never have we faced a similar challenge. We are standing at a momentous period in the fate of the human race. All the lights of history are beating down upon us, all the mighty upheavals of the centuries, all the stirring chapters of man's groping and struggling toward liberty and self-rule come ringing down to us through the years with a commanding challenge. The blood of our fathers commands us to hold the line. We shall, by God's help, hold the line.

Our sacrifices and our efforts in this supreme task are accompanied with difficulties and with problems.

The staggering sums which we have appropriated within recent years to build a two-ocean navy, to expand and maintain the Army, to provide equipment and aircraft and all of the enginery of war for national defense, and the sums which we shall now expend in the campaign to aid Britain, will require, not alone sacrifice in service by our people, but will demand much heavier and more burdensome taxes. The Congress will be compelled to levy very substantial increases in tax rates throughout the entire tax structure, but it is believed that our people are willing to bear these added burdens, are willing to shoulder these new and heavy responsibilities in order that America, in order that our country may save, not only itself, but the world, in the most tragic hour in modern times.

The expenditure of large sums of Government money for national defense and for armament and equipment must be administered without scandal and without waste. At a time when sacrifice is demanded of every citizen, we must not tolerate swollen war profits by industry or by large financial interests who have and will secure Government contracts. In addition to care and prudence in the making of such contracts, taxation must be employed to guarantee that in the hour of the Nation's peril, no interest shall make an undue profit at the expense of the Nation's need. If industry extorts an undue profit because of speed and the Nation's need, it must be recaptured by taxation.

Industry owes a duty to the Nation, just as every citizen owes a duty to the Nation. It must not shirk. It must not be permitted to shirk. When we recall Andrew Jackson's struggle with the Bank of the United States, we know that he would not permit industry to shirk or exact unfair profits.

Men who work in building Army and Navy camps, and Army and Navy plants for the production of munitions and arms, also owe a duty to the Nation. Men who work in national-defense industries owe a duty to the Nation. The program of production of war supplies and munitions has already been delayed and hampered by strikes and labor disputes. Strikes in national-defense plants must stop. I hope they may stop through voluntary action, but stop they must, if necessary through governmental action. Labor, of course, is entitled to a fair wage and fair working conditions. Governmental agencies have been provided to secure these rights. Labor has no right, however, to strike against the Government of the United States in the hour of the Nation's peril. We know what Andrew Jackson did at New Orleans to control those who hindered his operations.

As one who has for a lifetime sympathized with labor organizations, I solemnly warn organized labor that strikes and disturbances that delay the production of national-defense materials will surely and inexorably result to the disadvantage of labor unionism and the advances which it has made through the years.

It is all right to belong to a union, but in time of national emergency there is one paramount union, there is one supreme union and that is the union of these 48 States—the United States of America. That Union must rule or democracy must perish.

The United States owes to democracy and free government her glorious past and what we hope to be her more glorious future. Its conception gave us liberty. It gave us the Constitution of the United States. It gave us that great document, the Bill of Rights, which contains those fundamental privileges and guaranties that distinguish American Government. It gave us trial by jury, so that no potentate, no dictator, may consign a citizen of the United States to prison until his own countrymen and his own peers pass upon his guilt in a court of law. It gave us the right to free speech—not simply the right to think but the right to utter those thoughts without the censorship of any monarch or master. It gave us freedom of the press—freedom to print the truth, without the supervision of any bureaucrat or of any master. It gave us the right of free worship—the priceless privilege of erecting our own altars, irrespective of any ecclesiastical authority. We owe a tremendous debt to democracy and free government.

Now that its life is challenged throughout the world, we trust that with our aid the fortitude and the fighting spirit of Great Britain and Greece and other democracies under attack may, with God's sanction, hurl back the wild beasts that would ravage and destroy the institutions of liberty and the principles of democracy throughout the earth. The great God of battles will not permit these impious vandals to pollute and profane the altars of freedom and the sanctuaries of democracy.

4–H Clubs—Democracy at Work

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress should read an article that appeared in last week's Saturday Evening Post, and which I am inserting as a part of my remarks, on the subject of the 4–H Clubs of America—Democracy at Work.

Those young people "down on the farm" are not only being educated in the academy of common sense but they are training themselves for life. Unlike the overeducated and undertrained "parlor pinks" with which we are so often annoyed, they realize that it is much more decent to have dirt on your hands than it is to have it on your mind.

They are the people who fight the Nation's battles in times of war and sustain its institutions in times of peace.

They are not afraid of work. They appreciate the dignity of honest toil.

In our fight for rural electrification, we have had the enthusiastic support of the 4-H boys and girls in every section of the country. They know what it means and they know how to apply it.

They are helping to electrify their homes and to equip them with the necessary appliances, such as electric irons, fans, radios, vacuum cleaners, washing machines, refrigerators, ranges, water pumps, feed grinders, and hot beds, and to provide their communities with cold-storage facilities.

As this article points out, they are improving their homes and beautifying their surroundings, making them more pleasant and more attractive places in which to live.

They are really rebuilding America in the American way. There are no Communists among them. They are all Americans who speak and think American. They believe in God and their country, and exemplify their beliefs in a thousand ways.

Every American should be proud of them and of the record they are making. It is to such people as these that we must look for the future safety and progress of our country. [Applause.]

I am inserting at this point the article to which I referred:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of March 29, 1941]

HERE'S HOW THEY KEEP 'EM DOWN ON THE FARM

(By Robert H. Reed)

Once a year 1,500 farm boys and girls who belong to the 4-H Clubs—one of the few youth groups on earth whose members are willing to sweat in productive labor—meet in Chicago for the annual club congress. They represent 1,500,000 boys and girls back on the farm in all the 48 States.

Held in December in conjunction with the International Livestock Exposition, the congress gives the boys a chance to show their project calves, pigs, and lambs in competition with one another and with the best that America's stockmen and agricultural colleges can produce. They match judging skill on animals and meats. The girls bring their jars of fruits, vegetables, and meats; they model the dresses they have designed and sewed; they demonstrate their skill in cooking, baking, and home decoration.

Health champions are crowned. Leadership and achievement awards are made. College scholarships by the dozen are handed out to competitive winners.

Here is the harvest of their fat things and the pay-off on the year's club work. When Federal and State leaders totted up the 1940 records they found that the 4-H Club boys and girls had produced an estimated $30,000,000 worth of farm products during the year. The 1,500 who attended the congress in Chicago had bank accounts averaging over $350.

The middle-aged fugitives from a walking plow who now inhabit the canyon walls of the cities probably will hoot in disbelief the statement that the 4-H Club youngsters are finding adventure in those same drudging daily tasks they themselves fled from years ago.

But to substantiate it, there is the testimony of the million and a half who are carrying projects. The phenomenal growth of the clubs verifies it.

The skeptics should know Fred Sumners, of Alabama, who has just turned out of his teens: "In November of 1936 the assistant county agent came to Tallassee to organize a 4-H Club. The work was new in this section of Elmore County.

"For the first year I chose as my one project 1½ acres of cotton and, following the cultural directions of the club leader, I made a yield of 750 pounds of lint, which nearly doubled that made by my father.

"Before I became a 4-H Club member we did not have any registered livestock. We had grade hogs and cows and home-raised chickens. I brought home the first purebred animals our farm had ever seen. My parents now see the advantage of purebred livestock. They have cooperated with me in changing our farm to one that has only purebred pigs and chickens, and we are changing to purebred Jerseys as fast as possible. Ours was once principally a cotton farm, operating at a loss; now we have a successful, profitable farm.

"For my projects"—this is 4 years later—"I have selected hogs, beef cattle, pasture, potatoes, dairy cows, corn, cotton, orchard, garden, and chickens."

Casually considered, this southern boy has related nothing more than a minor success story in a cotton patch. But he's done more than that, for he can be multiplied thousands of times across the country.

These 4-H Clubs, starting humbly some 40 years ago on the primitively simple theory that the best way to learn a thing is to do it, have now grown into a benign colossus that is rapidly taking control of American agriculture. With this cheering result: In making the conquest of the farm, the boys and girls themselves have become contented captives.

There may be a bit of mystery to the city dweller about this unique school of citizenship which has sprung up and thrived beyond the city limits—a school that has no tuition, no classrooms, no textbooks, no compulsion, little precept, and lots of practice. It deserves a close examination.

The H's denote the objective of training the head, the heart, the hand, and the health. Any rural youngster between the ages of 10 and 21 may join. There is no compulsion about joining and there is no penalty for dropping out. There is the ratio of 3 girls to 2 boys in the million and a half membership. They are grouped into 80,000 individual clubs, every farm county in the United States having one or more clubs. Hawaii and Alaska have 4-H clubbers, and Canada is following the pattern set in the States.

Sponsoring the movement is a cooperative set-up of the Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, the 48 State agricultural colleges, and the 3,000 county farm agents. Funds for the work have been provided by acts of Congress. The Smith-Lever Act, in 1914, when there were fewer than 100,000 members, gave impetus to the movement, as did the Capper-Ketcham Act in 1928 and the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935. These acts have made possible the hiring of club leaders in almost all of the counties where farming is a major enterprise. Helping these paid leaders are 150,000 volunteer leaders, mostly graduates of the "school." The clubs have no formal connection with the public-school system; their individual campuses are the home and the farmyard. In the past quarter century more than 8,000,000 farm boys and girls have been members. These are the ones who are moving into the driver's seat. Today about 60 percent of the strictly farm youngsters are taking a hand in the work.

PICKING THE PROJECT

The business end of the 4-H Club is the "project." There are more than 50 of these, and a boy or girl may undertake 1 or a dozen. The leadership lays only a light disciplinary finger on the members. A boy may decide to raise a farm animal, he may grow an acre of corn or potatoes, he may plant a garden or an orchard, he may wire for electricity his parents' home and farm buildings. He has all the research of the United States Department of Agriculture and the State agricutural colleges right at his elbow, through the county agent and the county club leader.

The boy is strictly on his own with his project. If he wants to take up a livestock project, he must pay for the animal, even to the point of signing a note to his father or to the bank. Rural bankers, incidentally, rate the clubbers as an A-1 risk. If the animal dies, it is the boy's hard luck—a second project often brings him out of the hole. The boy must do all the work on the project himself, keep a complete record, and report regularly to his club leader.

THE INCENTIVE

But—and this may explain the popularity and success of the 4-H Clubs—when the accounts are balanced up, the boy gets and keeps the profits. It is no longer "son's pig and dad's hog."

Last winter, during the international, a State club leader was speaking of this point. "Let's ask the first club boy we come across."

He happened to be a tall, slender boy of about 15, whose freckles overlaid a ruddy outdoor complexion. He was studying a meat display in the huge exposition building. On his coat lapel was the 4-H Club emblem—a four-leaf clover with an "H" on each leaf.

"Son," the club leader addressed him, "would you mind telling us about your club work? Have you made some money out of it?"

"Suh"—he was obviously from somewhere down South—"I have $700 in the bank, and I'd have more, but I had hard luck with my hawgs. They got the cholera."

Kenneth Disch, 15, of Evansville, Wis., who won the junior championship at Chicago with his trio of lambs, has been in club work for 5 years. He is frankly proud of the results. "This year I made $410 and won a lot of additional prizes. In my 5 years of club work I have earned about $1,500 in cash. I now have $311 in the bank, own a cow, three pairs of silver foxes, a riding horse and saddle, sheep, and have $100 out of the bank."

Kenneth is frank about another matter too. "I don't know if I will go on to college, as I don't like school."

The distaff side of the 4-H Clubs more than holds its own. The girls are inclined to undertake more projects, stay in club work longer, and, as noted, they hold the bulge in numbers. Their long suits are cooking, canning, baking, sewing, home decoration and the purely feminine pursuits, but—to the slight annoyance of the boy, members—some of the girls, possibly with a touch

of the tomboy, like to feed out and show farm animals. And some of them have made show history.

On Wednesday afternoon of the last international in the arena of the show building, a crowd of several thousand farm folks sat with their eyes fixed intently on a tall sun-and-wind-burned man who rocked back on his heels, wrinkled his brow, as he studied the breadth and conformation of a row of butterfat beef animals before him.

Finally he laid a hand upon a white-faced Hereford steer, as marceled and polished as a debutante at her coming-out party. A little Illinois farm girl, dressed in high-laced boots, a plaid skirt and a sweat shirt, looked up at him again to make sure she hadn't misunderstood.

The tall man smiled and nodded reassuringly, and the girl burst into tears and the crowd into an ecstatic roar. That nod meant that this supreme court of stockdom had decided that her pet, Sargo, was the grand champion, the finest beef animal of the international. Evelyn Asay, 18-year-old daughter of an Illinois tenant farmer, had won the show's most coveted honor over the country's greatest stockmen and agricultural colleges, who are, presumably, incomparable as molders of the animal form.

A day or two later Evelyn's Sargo sold at auction for $3,498, which dried the last of her tears. Added to her other 1940 show winnings, this brought a club income of $4,333 to this petite Cinderella.

The auction price of $3,498—which is $3.30 a pound, and an uptown price for beefsteak even from a grand champion—is not a record for the international. Back in 1929 a coal-black steer, fitted and shown by a 4-H Club boy, sold for $8.25 a pound, which is the all-time record. Evelyn Asay is the second club girl to win this top honor; Irene Brown, an Indiana girl, stormed the walls into man's domain in 1938 to win the grand championship with her sleek black animal. In 1939 a Texas club boy carried off the honors. The 4-H clubs have copped the grand championship six times.

Evelyn is the daughter of Donald Asay, who rents and operates a 240-acre farm near Mount Carroll, Ill., and specializes in feeding cattle for the Chicago market. Evelyn wanted to go to the Frances Shimer Junior College in Mount Carroll; then she hoped to go to college and prepare herself as a primary teacher. She didn't ask her family to finance this education, for she knew a way to do it for herself.

In her neighborhood there is the Prairie Edge 4-H Club. She joined and decided that she would raise a beef animal as her project. When a shipment of 150 Hereford calves came to the Asay farm from the Colorado range, Evelyn made her selection and paid her father $50 she had scrupulously saved for college tuition.

A BOVINE GLAMOUR BOY

"I picked the smallest calf in the lot," she said, "but I thought he was the smoothest." From then on through the next year the calf was the club girl's full responsibility. She was required, under club rules, to feed and water the animal. This meant that she had to get up at 6 o'clock in the morning to do her chores before starting off to school, and to work long after dark each evening. But Sargo thrived under her ministrations and begin to win county and State honors; Evelyn kept pointing him for the international, the biggest stock show in the country.

Sargo almost didn't make it. Last November the 150 tons of hay that stuffed the capacious Asay livestock barn began to heat, an almost certain result when the hay is put into the mow with a high moisture content. The family examined it carefully and decided to play safe. They moved out the livestock; Evelyn led Sargo to a dilapidated old chicken house. "It was a terrible place," she confesses, "but Sargo survived."

The barn caught fire that night, destroying the 150 tons of hay and 2,000 bushels of steer-fattening grain. But Sargo was born to a more distinguished fate. He missed the fire and survived a long ride to Chicago in an open truck, heavily swathed in blankets to protect him from the winter wind. That, plus a series of knock-down contests with several hundred other butterball beef animals, was Sargo's career up to the final victory—17 months over all. Somewhat like the mule, Sargo had pride of ancestry, but no hope of posterity, and his only destiny, ordinarily, would have been the dinner table. But again fate was good to Sargo. An industrial firm—the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.—outbid all others and took the grand champion on a tour of the country to show club boys and their elders what perfection is in beef cattle.

The determination of the 4-H Club boys not to waste time with scrub stock, their insistence on good blood, is paying off. Harvey Johnson, of Arizona, who has been in club work for several years, has built up a herd of registered Ayrshire dairy cattle to a point where, this past year, he excelled his father, who is regarded as one of the best dairy-cattle breeders in the State. At the State fair the son bested his father in a battle for blue ribbons. This club boy, checking up on his career, found that he had sold $4,908 worth of products, had won $349 in prize money, and had an inventory of stock worth $13,625—a total for club work of $18,882. Boys who almost duplicate this phenomenal record can be numbered in the thousands.

They are, of course, the headline makers of the 4-H Clubs. A better evaluation of club work on farming might be made on the thousands of farms, some of them isolated and poverty-ridden, where a youngster of thirteen or fourteen is struggling through a project, trying to raise a calf or lamb, the family watching with mild curiosity at first and with increasing interest as the boy turns his profits into pure-bred stock and demonstrates its superiority.

Almost beyond belief is what can be done by a sturdy little farm girl with her sleeves rolled up. In the Barber home, in South Carolina, the family of twelve is fed the year around with the meats, vegetables, and fruits canned by club daughter Catharine Elizabeth. It is an exception rather than the rule where 4-H Club girls don't handle most of the food problems in their homes. The five girls who won the $200 college scholarships in 1940 put up the almost incredible amount of 26,380 pints of food in their collective club years, and these five girls illustrate how evenly club work has developed over the country. Mildred Maassen, 18, is from Oregon; Dorothea Nixon, 18, from Massachusetts; Marie Fletcher, 17, from Florida; Virginia Pollard, 17, from Nebraska; and Ruth Childress, 17, from Louisiana.

The achievement girl—and "achievement" is a gross understatement—was Nawatha Krebbs, of Eufaula, Okla., who completed 59 projects in her 7 years of club work. She raised 1,441 chickens, prepared 127 recipes, 2,263 lunches. She canned 4,737 quarts of food and taught 27 women of her neighborhood how to can. She sewed 160 garments, made 68 flower boxes, planted and cared for 42 trees and shrubs, had a flower garden each year. She made over and painted much of the furniture in her home, made the curtains and slip covers; helped to remodel the windows of her home and rebuild the floors. She raised 5,515 pounds of vegetables and fruit. During her 3 years of leadership she supervised the work of 55 members in a club which was judged the model for her county.

Outside of this club work, Nawatha had little to do from 13 on except to keep at the head of her class in school. Nawatha's project work is valued at $3,484.

Many of the club leaders, themselves a modest and self-effacing lot, feel that the spotlight and the publicity are taken up too much by these spectacular champions, though the club leaders do not belittle their ambition and accomplishments. They feel that a look should be given to the foot soldiers in the ranks, ones whose bank accounts are nothing to boast of, ones like Eloise Hinson, 16 years old, of Alamo, Ga.

A YOUTH MOVEMENT FOR SELF-HELP

Alamo is just a dot on the Georgia map, and the road that runs out of it might be Tobacco Road. Somewhere along that road, 3 years ago, this new 4-H Club member faced a problem. The home was an old log house. Close by were the sheds and the barn—not the big red barn of memory. It was a tumbledown affair like the house. The home stood in a barren field, with no fences around it.

So Eloise chose as her project home beautification. Her first step was to level the yard, to have it spaded deeply, fertilized and seeded to grass. A fence was built around the home, this demoniacal clubber driving her family as hard as she drove herself. Then she went into a frenzy of planting. Pecan, peach, apple, pear, fig, and other trees—81 in all—as well as grapevines, climbing roses, annual and perennial flowers. The barn and woodpile were moved back out of sight, according to her plans.

A club leader, telling of this girl's project in Chicago, quietly refused to put a cash valuation on Eloise's 4-H Club work.

Club work definitely has been a mental stimulant to the youngsters. Besides the development of extracurricular activities, such as dramatics, music, nature study, community service, tours, summer camps, it has pointed a larger number of farm boys and girls toward college.

Iowa State's distinguished dean of agriculture, H. H. Kildee, estimates that 80 percent of the agricultural students at his college have been 4-H Club members.

"I have observed," said Dean Kildee, "that most of them have set up objectives and goals for their life work, and that they come to college with a determination to make good. A study which we have been conducting for several years shows that former 4-H Club members rank higher in initiative, leadership ability, grades, participation in worth-while activities, and in success after graduation than those who have not had the benefits of 4-H Club experience."

The farms, as could be expected, are losing a few of these 4-H Club graduates. Many of them are studying engineering, which may eventually lead them to the city. The Soil Conservation and Forest Services beckon to some of them. One delegate to the recent Club Congress is aiming at the Harvard Medical School, and at 14 he confidently expects 4-H Club work to pay all the bill.

Baseball reached out and plucked from a dairy farm one of the 4-H Club's prize-winning members—Charlie Keller, the hard-hitting outfielder of the New York Yankees. Keller, however, is only on leave from agriculture, for his savings are going into a Maryland dairy farm.

Elizabeth Karr, who was good enough at feeding beef animals to show at the International, and who is shown on page 16, combing the forelock of her Hereford steer, has her eyes on the clouds. Immediately

after the International she turned the rest of her livestock over to her father on a partnership basis, and went into nurse training. She wants to be an air stewardess on the completion of her training.

But the overwhelming majority are staying on the farm, thus solving themselves one of agriculture's greatest problems. The stream of rural youth to the city, which used to run creek-bank full whenever farming was in the doldrums, seems definitely to be choked off at the source.

The physical effect of the 4-H Clubs on farms is tremendous. This work means better livestock, better methods of production, better living. And historians may note another change with the coming of the clubs.

In the late 80's and early 90's, which today are reckoned as eventful rather than gay years in the buffalo-grass regions of the West, Mary Elizabeth Lease, La Pasionaria of the Populist movement, could always bring her grim-faced Jayhawker audiences to a bubbling boil with the flaming preachment that "farmers should raise more hell and less corn."

Whatever the other attainments of "Mary Yellin'," as she came to be known, for she had a powerful voice, her memory is greenest for this one line. And if that gives the lady a somewhat slippery hold on fame, she did have the satisfaction of knowing that her idea took root and flourished. In her day and in the 40-odd years that have passed since she first hauled out the great red dragon of Wall Street for a public horsewhipping, there have been numerous small but noisy farm groups intent on not raising corn.

Her devotees, however, are dwindling, and it seems likely they will go the way of the old sod houses that once housed them, for these 4-H clubbers who are taking over are fiercely devoted to raising more and better corn and kindred farm products, and not at all interested in raising old Harry.

The 4-H Clubs form a spirited little democracy at work—hard work!

Distinguished Soldiers of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

TRIBUTE TO GEN. JAMES A. HAGGERTY

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, the State of Connecticut has had distinguished soldiers in its history. On Sunday, March 2, the Yankee Division honored one of the outstanding heroes of its glorious war annals—Brig. Gen. James A. Haggerty, who was born in Hartford and moved to New Haven where he gave unstintedly of his time and services to that city. I am happy to say that my colleague the Honorable JAMES A. SHANLEY was a member of the One Hundred and Second Infantry Connecticut National Guard from 1928 when he surrendered a captaincy in the Field Artillery Reserve to enter the National Guard as a private. He was adjutant of the First Battalion at the time of his election to Congress in 1934.

I include, as part of my remarks, a tribute to Gen. James A. Haggerty at the unveiling of his memorial tablet in Goffe Street Armory, New Haven, Conn., March 2, 1941, by Capt. Philip H. English. Also two sermons delivered on the same day.

TRIBUTE TO GEN. JAMES A. HAGGERTY AT THE UNVEILING OF HIS MEMORIAL TABLET, GOFFE STREET ARMORY, NEW HAVEN, MARCH 2, 1941

(By Capt. Philip H. English)

Mrs. Haggerty, honored guests, members of veteran and active service organizations, and citizens of Connecticut, to present the career of a beloved leader in a few brief moments is a difficult task. I am forced to limit my tribute to those deeds which brought him his greatest honors.

James A. Haggerty was born in Hartford, Conn., May 10, 1880. An orphan at the age of 6, young Jim made his home with relatives in New Haven, where he graduated from our New Haven High School in 1894. His entire business life was connected with building and contracting operations, which resulted in his later erecting some of our outstanding public structures, notably the children's community center, the Spireworth School, and that impressive church—St. Brendan's. His civilian record was marked by friendliness to his associates, by strict integrity, and by his ability to carry every undertaking through to successful accomplishment. These characteristics made him an outstanding military leader.

His desire to serve his State aroused by the events of the Spanish War, Jim enlisted in C Company, Second Connecticut Infantry, on March 1, 1899. He advanced rapidly through noncommissioned ranks to become a lieutenant in 1903 and to earn his captain's bars in 1906.

Ten years later came the sudden call to Federal duty on the Mexican border at Nogales, Ariz. At this time occurred the greatest disappointment of his career. After 16 years of patient preparation for active duty, Jim was told by the doctors that his blood pressure was too high. On July 21, 1916, when his fine company was on duty on distant mountain and desert, Captain Jim became again Mr. Haggerty.

Far from discouraged by this hard blow, Jim listened to the rumblings in war-stricken Europe, while hopefully awaiting another chance to join his beloved regiment on its return to New Haven.

On January 26, 1917, Pvt. James Haggerty answered roll call as the most recent recruit in Headquarters Company, Second Connecticut Infantry. Time forbids details of rapid promotions which allowed him to sail for France in the autumn of 1917 as a first lieutenant in Company G, One Hundred and Second United States Infantry Regiment, A. E. F.

At Seicheprey, in the morning mists of April 20, 1918, this gallant regiment repulsed a vicious raid by 3,000 German storm troops and suffered heavy losses from the concentrated fire of 200 enemy guns. Found by a friend caring for many wounded in this battered sector, Lieutenant Haggerty remarked scornfully, "High blood pressure! Bosh!" In May 1918 I was glad to have the chance to give him a set of captain's bars which I had purchased in anticipation of his well-earned promotion.

Moving to the Second Battle of the Marne, we find C Company, under Captain Haggerty's able direction, taking a leading part in the historic American counterattack in the rolling hills east of Belleau Wood. The Yankee Division was the southern spearhead in this surprise attack, which was to throw the German forces into a retreat, terminated only by the November armistice.

On July 22, 1918, Jim's troops formed with D Company the leading waves in a desperate advance to pierce concealed enemy defenses at Epieds and Trugny. Many present today saw him calmly deploy his men at dawn and lead them off through a storm of machine-gun fire to storm these red-roofed villages. We recall the flash of those bright bayonets as 900 men and 21 officers of the first battalion by heroic effort overcame a veteran enemy's strong position. Three days later the effective strength of this group numbered 162 men and 3 officers, including the acting battalion commander, Captain Haggerty. Deep in the shell-torn LaFere Woods they continued the pursuit of the Kaiser's forces. Under inspired leadership neither wounds nor death could halt these dauntless troops.

Two personal citations rewarded such leadership. The first from General Edwards read as follows:

"The division commander takes pleasure in citing in orders Capt. J. A. Haggerty for marked gallantry and meritorious service in the capture of Torcy, Belleau, Givry, Bouresches Woods, Hill 190 overlooking Chateau Thierry, Etrepilly, Epieds, Trugny, and LaFere Woods to the Jaulgonne-Fere en Tardenois Road during the advance of this division against the enemy from July 18 to 25, 1918, in the second Battle of the Marne."

A second citation signed by General Pershing, Commander in Chief, A. E. F., read: "Capt. James A. Haggerty, Company C, One Hundred and Second United States Infantry, for distinguished and exceptional gallantry at Chateau Thierry, on the 20th of July, 1918, in the operations of the American Expeditionary Force, in testimony thereof and as an expression of appreciation for his valor, I award this citation."

Another promotion and a change of duty soon returned Major Haggerty to the United States for assignment to the Twelfth Division of the Regular Army at Camp Devens, Mass. The armistice was signed just as this command was to sail for France. He terminated his war duties by assuming the direction of the convalescent center at Camp Devens, where he brought comfort and cheer to many thousand sick and wounded soldiers homeward bound from France.

Following important duties in organizing our present National Guard, Jim Haggerty became a colonel on January 1, 1922, and took command of a new One Hundred and Second Infantry Regiment in February 1924. In 1925 he was appointed brigadier general in command of the Eighty-fifth Brigade. He led the Forty-third Division during the Pine Camp maneuvers in 1935. On July 15, 1940, while discussing coming battle practice with his staff associates, he died suddenly at Hartford.

Of Jim's character his close friend, our former chaplain, Daniel Strickland, has recently written the following lines:

"The outstanding force in his career was determined persistence. He never preached any sermons on morale, but by sheer example and cheerfulness held his officers and men to a very high level of endurance. Excellent tactical judgment gave him faultless skill in estimating a situation. He had the ability, above any officer I have known, to mix freely with his men and to maintain their respect."

May this bronze memorial serve to keep his spirit alive and active as a guiding beacon to the regiments of the future. Wherever they go he is with them. His spirit is marching on.

[Sermon of the Reverend Father Martin F. Doran, former chaplain of the One Hundred and Second Infantry, March 2, 1941]

DEPARTURE OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND SECOND INFANTRY

"The just man liveth by faith," Romans 1:17.

In the great economy of the world today trouble and adversity have a large place.

God made man in a perfected state; a mind of vast intelligence, a soul shining in the supernatural of divine grace, and power of his own free will to direct his actions for good or for evil. Man destroyed his perfected nature, and through the malice of sin has bequeathed to us his progeny, trouble, adversity, evil, sin, and death. By the measurement of years in which man has progressed so, too, commensurate with those years has been the heritage of trouble, ill-will toward fellow men, and the hatred and denial of Almighty God. Let St. Paul express it for us: "For professing themselves to be wise, they became fools. And they changed the glory of the incorruptible God into the likeness of the image of corruptible man, and of birds, and of four-footed creatures, and of creeping things. Wherefore God gave them up to the desires of their hearts, unto uncleanness, to dishonor their own bodies among themselves. Who changed the truth of God into a lie; and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator who is blessed forever."

A sordid world indeed had man made for himself, desolate with desolation had man been left to himself, but God's love for man resplendent from the cross on Calvary's hill has kept alive that spark of faith, has rested man's destiny securely on the virtue of hope, and nurtured a doctrine of love for God and for fellow man that has been the astonishment of the world. "Greater love than this no man hath that he lay down his life for his friend."

That doctrine of divine love, purchased by the sacrifice of Calvary's cross, has found its way into the hearts of millions of people and borne fruit in the faith of God and of justice toward men. The world of that day had turned from God and it was bargained for and bought through the sufferings, self-effacement, and death of Jesus Christ. As then, so now, the world today has gone out from God; let St. Paul again express it for us: "There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. All have turned out of the way. Their throat is an open sepulcher; with their tongues they have dealt deceitfully; the venom of asps is under their lips. Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness. Their feet swift to shed blood; destruction and misery in their ways. And the way of peace they have not known. There is no fear of God before their eyes." Nineteen hundred years ago St. Paul wrote this condemnation of tyranny, tyrants, and of the incredulous of God. Man of no faith, man of evil works, man a law unto himself.

But all is not lost. Thanks be to God, to all this heathenish savagery there is the counterbalancing of the force and of the power and of the influence of religion. There are men and women today inclined to the principles of religion; men and women who respect the laws of morality; men and women who direct their lives on a basis of justice and of equality; men and women who love peace and tranquillity; men and women who have faith in God and by that faith direct the actions of their lives to a supernatural end.

On such a faith was founded this glorious Commonwealth of the State of Connecticut. On the seal of this great State its escutcheon bears proof of faith in God and confidential hope in His Divine Providence; for we read, "He who brought us over safely shall sustain us." Religion, faith in God, have been the cornerstone of this Commonwealth, carrying that light from generation to generation by good and noble deeds, by honesty and integrity of individual lives, until every mile of this great State gives monumental testimony in churches, synagogues, houses of worship, to a faith and trust in the living God. That faith in God has engendered itself into the lives of its citizens a love of righteousness that has produced in every decade men and women of heroic devotion, self-sacrifice, personal suffering, and to insure its unity and preservation have made the supreme sacrifice of death.

And not least in its great lineage stands forth, the illustrious regiment of the One Hundred and Second Infantry. Its past entombed with its great dead enriches the glories of our State written in the valor, and courage, and sacrifice of noble deeds. Truly its past lies dead, and its great men of the past are dead but their spirit and tradition have been enthroned upon love and influence, that know no death and that furrowed deeply into the minds and hearts and souls and lives of succeeding generations who have caught up, where they laid down. In panorama before my eyes this morning I see glorious figures of the living and of the dead; men who have standardized the traditions of the One Hundred and Second Regiment; Shanley, Isbell, Parker, Haggerty, Field, Oberlin, O'Connell, Strickland. These were men of strength and bravery, men of ideals, men of troubles and temptations that chisel out character, men of religion, our standard bearers, "For God and for Country."

And in this vision of the heroic dead, if I may be permitted, I see one who has climbed the ladder of success from an obscure private to an honored general; and that by persistent toil, by devotion to duty, by intelligent application, capable, kind, patient, understanding, never disconcerted, one who loved army detail more than all else in life, deeply religious in his love of God, severely subservient to civil authority, a man whom we all love, a man who knew how to be and was himself a gentleman; my tribute to the sweet memory of Gen. Jim Haggerty. And if he has left his footprints on the sands of time I see also another who followed so closely the ideals and traditions of this great regiment; a true soldier of the highest intelligence, a capable disciplinarian who knew how to teach because he first had learned to serve, who knew the weaknesses of man and could advise and sympathize yet never an offender himself; a genius of military tactics, yet humbly refusing the coveted position to command; who loved conversation of God and the infinity of His guiding providence; a true soldier, a loyal friend, the perfect gentleman—Maj. Fred Oberlin.

May I echo back over the long vista of time to these glorious dead that the lessons you men have taught have not been wasted on the desert air, but have been recognized by your successors and that torch of light, and of fidelity, and of courage, is securely grasped and selfishly guarded by the officers and the personnel of the One Hundred and Second of today. And knowing this no mother, sister, or sweetheart need to crush their hearts with moments of anxiety, fear, and worry, because your boys are in safekeeping under the protection of a paternal and efficient officers' corps; and the heavenly protection of Our Blessed Father smiling sweetly down upon them and lovingly guarding your chosen and dear ones.

I know whereof I speak, and I know the care that is first sought for the boys to insure their safety, their comfort, and their health. I know of no other regiment that has the men in superior positions of the heart and of the unselfish spirit as battalion commanders Houley, Horrigan, Linddauer; and no regiment the country over that can boast of the executive Quinn, that inexhaustible force of power, and of goodness, and of energy, and of intelligent capabilities. These illustrious men both living and dead have well merited their honored places in the history of the State of Connecticut; by example given, by tradition set, by deeds accomplished; and if these be requisites whereby a successor may be chosen, then the lot has been well cast upon the commanding officer whom we all revere, a man extremely capable, a born leader, a refined gentleman—Col. Earnest L. Novey.

Thus, the tradition of this great regiment carries on, and you, by choice selection, are a vital and integral part which in simple interpretation, connotes honor with responsibility, credit for service well done, protection for adherence to obedience, security in your allegiance toward God, compensation in your justice toward men.

In a few short weeks these walls of the old drill shed will echo and reecho once again to the strains of the One Hundred and Second March: The steady rhythmic pulsation of boots, boots, boots marching up and down, and you shall go forth with strength and courage, light-hearted and gay, the blood of youth coursing warmly in your veins to serve—to serve God and country. And God's blessings will be with you and the prayers of all will keep you. Your physical wants will be amply supplied, your spiritual care entrusted to capable hands of devoted chaplains; that will be your staff, for through these men you will find a dependence upon God that will rectify your lives in accordance with the teachings of Saint Paul, that "Just men live by faith." But you will come back again, every one, none shall be left behind, and if tears and sadness enshroud the hearts of your beloved ones who bid you today a fond farewell, it is only nature which demands the price of sorrowing for the love it gives. You shall find duty not always too pleasant, and if the post you guard in the midnight silence appears to have been transplanted to the nearest graveyard and rows of the sheltered sleeping take on the aspect of giants of other days, waiting, as it would appear, momentarily to engulf you; and your step becomes slow and weary and your heart pounds and the tick of your watch in that awful silence beats like the sepulchral tom-toms of the forest jungle; dread, despair, fear never, for your mother walks by your side, your buddies without number are your support, and the spirit and tradition of that galaxy of noble men shall light your way, and the God who bore you shall raise you up.

You are entering into a combat that is not a fight against flesh and blood, but against the powers and principalities of an unseen world and your success shall be measured only insofar as you return the life and living of our great democracy to a more enlightened service of God, and to a greater dependence upon his providential care. For already I have seen stepping forth from the Book of Revelations four horsemen; and one rides a red horse, significant of war personified today by a man who would conquer the world and he must fail because he needs no god; and the second horse is black, significant of death, and that rider must fail because he has ridden death into the lives of

innocent people, brushing aside the doctrines of God; and the third horse is pale in color, significant of famine and pestilence, ridden by an incarnate fiend who too must fail because he has ridden out the lives of millions of suffering and starving people and has blotted out the name of God; and the fourth horse is white and pure, and riding him is the Prince of Peace, who came to love and to die for man that he might bring concord and peace among all nations and righteousness into the hearts of men. I would exhort you to model your lives and I would pray that our great Nation follow closely him who is the rider of the white horse; for today he is the white father, Pius XII, glorious reigning, whose guidance I am so willing to make the standard of my life and whose way of peace and love of humanity I would ask our Nation to adopt, if not the doctrines of his teachings at least his leadership for justice, for civilization, that may honor God and respect man. That is your contest, that is your struggle, that is your reward of honor.

May God bless you every one and watch every step of the way and bring you back safely and permanently to the ones you love and to the ones who love you.

[Extracts from a sermon preached at the field service before the One Hundred and Second Infantry Reserve Sunday, March 2, 1941, at the Goffe Street Armory on the occasion of their last field service before departure for a year's training at Camp Blanding, Fla., by Capt. William H. Nicolas, chaplain, One Hundred and Second Infantry Reserve]

"There is no discharge in war." It may seem odd that a chaplain should choose for a text in times like these words which on the surface seem to be quite contrary to our present and past experiences. If they meant actual combat with armed forces of another nation, it would not be true, for we know that members of our families have been honorably discharged after valiant service in past wars, but the man who wrote these words, often calling himself the Preacher, was wiser than most of us think. He speaks of the continuing triumph of righteousness over evil, and it is here that he gives the watchword for the day because there is no discharge in the war of right against wrong, of righteousness against the powers of darkness. We realize today that we are in actual combat against those forces that would destroy us. They are not always personified in the mind, or in a name, or in a nation, but many times in a philosophy, the way of life that would take from us the things that we hold dear and substitute in their stead things that would allow our conquerors to own us body and soul.

Perhaps unconsciously we are afraid of these things even though they may not come beyond the periphery of our consciousness, and under the sway of this fear we seek absorption into our background. We are apt to become ancestor worshippers thinking thus to protect ourselves. Nature provides very well for the lower animals that they might be absorbed into their background, protecting them from their natural enemies and foes. Travelers in jungle lands and waste places bring us tales of animals peculiarly colored to blend into the background and many times cannot be seen because of their protective coloring. The polar bear on arctic ice blends his white fur with the whiteness of the ice and cannot be seen by his enemies. Even the brown rabbit in the New England woods is colored the same as the leaves and the bushes in which he hides and we have thought that by looking like and pronouncing the names of Washington, and Lincoln, and Grant, and Lee, and all the rest of the founding fathers that we too might be protected from the things that would do us harm, but we have come face to face with the realization that these things are not so. We face a vital challenge, with eternal vigilance which still is the price of freedom. Born in travail, nurtured in trial, reared in tempest, and grown into manhood's estate through tribulation, we realize the path of liberty and freedom is never an easy one. One is reminded of the delightful story so often told to children of Brer Rabbit and Brer Fox and it seems to speak to us today. Brer Fox had captured the rabbit and intended to eat him but before eating him intended to torture him and thinking up nothing bad enough himself sought to make the rabbit name his own torture. So the rabbit said his skin was tender and his flesh was soft and his eyes were delicate and he thought of nothing worse than to be thrown into a briar patch. This the fox did. No sooner was the rabbit thrown into the briar patch when he shouted with glee and joy, "Brer Fox, I was born in the briar patch! I was reared among thorns! I have lived among the hard places and now I am free!" We were born in the briar patch. We were reared among thorns. Plymouth and Jamestown, Massachusetts and Virginia, Connecticut, and all the early colonies were not flowery beds of ease. The founding fathers were men who were strong and true, whose hearts were firm and who were not afraid of hardship. With such ancestry as this, we face today the obligation of carrying on despite any external hardships that we may be called upon to suffer.

Amid all the hubbub of preparation for national defense there comes to the thoughtful mind the question as to whether we are preparing too late. We are not pessimistic on the actual preparation of armaments and armed men because our men are responding so favorably—manufacturer and soldier alike, engineer and enlisted man, capitalist and officer—to bring forward to a speedy consummation the full protection of our land, but if we depend upon this external preparation in armament alone then we are not prepared at all. The billions of dollars expended by France on its Maginot Line and all the rest of its fortifications was to no avail. Instead of the cement and steel which made the Maginot Line, France would have been protected just as adequately if her boundaries had been smeared with butter, because she had not made the moral preparation that was necessary. We are minded of the story of Father Damien, the great apostle, to the lepers and his marvelous work among these people inflicted with this dread disease. He, together with his helpers, had seen many a man lose an arm, a leg, or an ear, and realized that the most pathetic thing about the dread disease was the fact that there was no pain connected with it. Ordinarily, we would say that we would be thankful that there was no pain, but pain is a symptom, the result of something that is wrong, letting us know there is something wrong. Many of the men who went with Father Damien had been stricken with this dread disease and lost arms and legs, and had even died, and yet he was spared, not even having skin lesions. Until one day while working in the kitchen a cauldron of boiling hot water was spilled over his legs and his feet and he felt no pain. He knew then that he was inflicted with this dread disease, but it was too late. Today many of us have no feeling of pain, no feeling of sympathy, not even a feeling of creature horror at the wrongs and evils that are being committed in the world against men and against civilizations, and it may be that with some of us it is too late. Yet we realize that the entire process of becoming and being free men is one that requires the efforts of the leaders and the cooperation of the masses if it is to become a truth in our lives.

We have taken our liberty and our freedom too lightly and all too much for granted. We think of St. Paul, himself a Jew, educated among the rabbis, trained in Hellenic philosophy, a Roman citizen by virtue of his father's citizenship before him, entitled to trial before the Caesars because of his citizenship, at one time talking with a Roman centurion who was his guard. This centurion was born a slave and was proud of the fact that through diligence in business, through energetic efforts, he was able to amass sufficient funds to purchase his freedom and become a free man and to St. Paul he said with pride, "With a great price obtained I this freedom." And St. Paul answered him, "But I was born free." We have looked with sorrow upon the masses of men in distant lands and have realized that they have been born in bondage and many of them have been taken into bondage when they reached maturity and we have said to ourselves and to our neighbors, sometimes with a false pride, "But we were born free." This was true yesterday and last month and perhaps even this morning, but from now on we cannot say it. We have to say what the centurion said, "With a great price obtained I this freedom." The price of sweat, blood and sacrifice, preparation, pain and sorrow. For in our hearts we realize that this thing we have grown to call the American way, this philosophy of freedom, this power of liberty, is so vital and so valuable that we are willing to give our all that those who come after us might enjoy the fruits of this freedom which we now have. It is then we realize what this ancient writer speaks to us as clearly as on the day he did years ago, that in the war against the forces of darkness there is no discharge.

Our Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB E. DAVIS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

POEM BY A CONSTITUENT

Mr. DAVIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following verse written by a constituent, Col. Roger Wood, of Leesburg, Highland County, Ohio:

OUR FLAG

Symbol of freedom
Battle scarred
Hallo'ed by heroes' blood
Who gave their all
That you might wave
Triumphant.
Your crimson stripes
Emblematic of
The courage of those
Who have ever rallied
To your defense;
A challenge to those
Traitors who would
Betray their heritage.
Your blue field
And white stars
Typify a Nation
United and fearless
Ready and willing
To fulfill its destiny.

Your heaven-bleached bars
Of virginal purity
Signify the
White-hot fires
Of inspired patriotism
And a reverence to
The Living God.

Flag of our pioneer forefathers,
Flag of our valiant Army,
Flag of our naval brave,
Flag of our martyred Presidents,
Flag of the mothers who bore us,
Flag of the Nation's dead—
We proudly stand and salute you
And renew our allegiance pledge.

St. Lawrence Waterway Enemies Caught in Their Own Trap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. PAUL DISPATCH

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, this morning I inserted in the RECORD a news item which gives the facts in regard to propaganda now under way for the purpose of defeating the St. Lawrence Waterway project. It speaks for itself.

In an editorial in the St. Paul Dispatch for April 1, 1941, the enemies of the St. Lawrence Waterway project are given an opportunity for a lot of explanation. This editorial, with great force, indicates that they are caught in their own trap. It is as follows:

[From the St. Paul Dispatch of April 1, 1941]

THE BLUNDER OF 1934

While opponents of the St. Lawrence Waterway are arguing against the improvement on the grounds that it has no value, they belie their own words by the tremendous lobby that they have set up in Washington to defeat the legislation soon to be placed before Congress to start the project on its way.

So impressive a phalanx of special and selfish interests has rarely been brought together at Washington for the defeat of the national welfare as has been done to form this lobby. Every commercial and port interest that makes a rich living by levying various glorified toll charges against the landlocked Middle States is represented. The Pioneer Press has printed the names of just some of the organizations which are represented in this formidable lobby, and it makes a list of solid type more than a half column long. The composition of this lobby is itself the answer to the argument that the seaway would be an economic dud.

They are much the same interests that fought the previous seaway proposal in 1934, except that this time to defeat the improvement they will have to muster a majority in at least one branch of Congress, whereas they only needed one more than a third of the Senate when it was presented in the form of a treaty for ratification. Had national instead of selfish interests prevailed in 1934, the waterway would be in operation now, needed power would be available for defense industries on both sides of the boundary, and the shipyards of the Great Lakes would be available for turning out vitally important vessels that cannot be built with existing coastal facilities.

The men who defeated the seaway in 1934 are the last who have a right to come forward now and argue that it is too late to do what should have been done 7 years ago. The fact is that if the seaway were to be started this year it will be completed before many of the most important warships on the present program. The ships could be under construction simultaneously with the seaway.

This country and Canada, moreover, must look ahead to the possibility of a naval race in the future that will require every shipbuilding asset that the two of them can find. If the outcome of the war should be such that North America must try to match the shipbuilding capacity of all Europe and Asia, we shall need the seaway desperately. Will we then look back and say to one another, "Would that we had started the seaway in 1941, for now it is too late." It is the duty of Congress to provide so that in future years we shall not have a blunder of that kind to regret a second time.

Building and Construction Trades Department of American Federation of Labor Determined to Cooperate in Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1941

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES DEPARTMENT OF AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as evidence of good faith and a determination to cooperate in the national-defense program, the executive council of the building and construction trades department of the American Federation has adopted two resolutions which I believe should be brought to the attention of all Members of Congress. I ask unanimous consent to include these resolutions in my remarks:

Resolution 1

Whereas our Federal Government has embarked on an extensive program of national defense; and

Whereas world conditions of today are of such a serious nature that the rapid and uninterrupted completion of the national-defense program is absolutely essential for the preservation of our democratic system of government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Building and Construction Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor, its officers and members solemnly pledge themselves that there will not be any stoppage of work on account of jurisdictional disputes between any of the building and construction trades on any building or construction project essential to the speedy and successful completion of the national-defense program; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions as adopted be sent to the President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House, Secretary of War, Secretary of Navy, Secretary of Labor, both chairmen of the Office of Production Management and the Defense Mediation Board.

Resolution 2

Whereas there have been many newspaper articles of criticism and condemnation directed at the building and construction trades organizations of the American Federation of Labor in relation to the collections of permit moneys, privilege dues, and initiation fees on defense construction projects; and

Whereas this volume of unfair and unjust propaganda is a reflection on the integrity of the building and construction trades department of the American Federation of Labor and has been the cause of creating doubt as to the integrity of our organizations in the minds of the general public, Government officials, and many Members of Congress: Be it

Resolved, That in the event of any of our building and construction trades employers who are recognized as being fair to organized labor secure contracts for the building and construction of defense projects; be it further

Resolved, That where any and all of the building and construction trades organizations are unable to supply a full force of building tradesmen to man such projects, each and every organization affiliated with this department agrees that such union employer shall be privileged to employ other than members of the various building and construction trades affiliated with this department until such time as the various organizations affiliated with the department are able to replace these nonunion men with members of their organizations, or until such nonunion men are requested to become members of their respective unions; and be it further

Resolved, That where such conditions exist no permit or privilege moneys shall be collected under any circumstances. No initiation fees or other union obligations shall be collected from these nonunion men except where they can qualify for membership and have been requested to become members of their respective organizations and have been accepted; be it further

Resolved, That when such applications are received that the initiation fee shall be the minimum possible in view of the benefits received in such organizations, and that reasonable time will be granted for the payment of such initiation fees.

Editorial Interpretations of Current Events

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE AMERICAN HEBREW

Mr. KOPPLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave given me to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the Appendix an editorial from the American Hebrew of February 21, 1941:

[From the American Hebrew of February 21, 1941]

INVICTUS

It is midnight in Washington. The President has spoken and the people have given utterance to their desire. A Congress riven by divisive opinion succeeded at last in writing the will of the Nation into law.

Let us try and think clearly. The barbaric hakenkreuz floats over proud and lovely

Paris; since the 15th of June the steel-helmeted columns of Hitler's armies have rumbled down the Champs Elysees; the savage sons of the Nazi gospel in their robot attire look upon the gracious and beautiful capital even as Alaric's Visigoths once looked on Rome.

But Paris is not alone in her travail. Prostrate alongside her lie Vienna, bleeding and silent as death; Warsaw, her life snuffed out; Prague, the hollow shell of a city; Bucharest, now resounding to the marching goose-step of hatred on the move; Brussels, Amsterdam, Copenhagen, Riga, Kaunas, Tallinn—yes; and Rome—all have become memories and, to millions who are in chains, symbols of hope.

It is midnight in Washington; not midnight for America, for we are the children of liberty and we are the men of the future. It is midnight, but the lights are burning in the White House and the men who guard our freedom are vigilant. Midnight—and the sentry counts his paces to and fro before the military encampment: Upton, McCoy, Eldridge, Beauregard, Dodge, Battle Creek, Tobyhanna, Pine, Plattsburg, Dix, MacArthur, McClellan, McDowell.

Midnight—and the silence that shrouds Europe is broken by the dull, sickening thud of bombs dropping over the cliffs and shores and cities of England; the crackle of anti-aircraft guns; the terrible roar of battleships going into action; the small, still voice of a man weeping over the shattered bodies of his loved ones.

So Paris has died, and in the Place de la Concorde and the Rondpoint, before the Opera, on the Seine quays, and in the gardens of Tuileries the barbarians celebrate their triumph. But across the Channel the common people of England are manning their guns and stand ready at their parapets to fight and to die so that liberty may live and conquer.

From the "arsenal of democracy" has been unleashed a power that will sound the knell for the force that holds Europe in subjection. Munitions-laden ships are ploughing through the sea on their way to England—already the British feel the weight of the help from America.

So it is midnight in Washington, and a soundless cry of hope pierces the still ether from the Continent in chains, and the tyrant knows that the game is soon up.

The Aims of the National Aeronautic Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1941

STATEMENT BY THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, there are many worth-while groups working for the advancement of aviation in this country at the present time. In the forefront we find the National Aeronautic Association. I herewith include a statement of the aims of that organization as set forth in the Washington Newsletter of Friday, March 28, 1941:

Frequently it is asked by those not fully familiar with the National Aeronautic Association: What is the N. A. A.? Does it represent the aircraft manufacturers? The air lines? The private flyers? What are its aims? Is N. A. A. proadministration or anti-administration? Who are its members? Who fixes its policies?

In a few words, N. A. A. is a nonprofit, nonpartisan membership organization founded in 1922 to encourage the advancement of all phases of aviation. With diversified membership in all parts of the country and in all branches of aviation, its policies follow the purposes which are common to all and are not dominated by the interests of any individual or group.

N. A. A.'s general aims, which have been set in its constitution and bylaws, are focused upon public education and upon cooperation both with aviation groups and with the aviation activities of nonaviation groups. The bylaws direct N. A. A. to encourage such development as air transport, airports, education, research, private flying, youth activities, and air defense.

At the national conventions and forums of N. A. A. more specific aims are stated by resolutions in the shaping of which the entire membership is free to participate. Resolutions adopted at the Denver air congress last July placed stress on such subjects as air defense, air reserves, airports, the strengthening of the C. A. A. organization, and air-safety measures such as improved weather-reporting services and airport zoning.

Between conventions, the supervision of N. A. A.'s affairs, within the field set by its bylaws and resolutions, is in the hands of a board of 21 directors and 6 N. A. A. officers representing all regions and aviation activities. The board meets quarterly and an executive committee appointed from this group meets monthly.

The national headquarters of N. A. A. carries out the instructions of the directors and acts as a central clearing house to circulate information on national matters affecting aviation, working as a service unit for the entire membership.

To secure cooperation of many able leaders in aviation there is an N. A. A. national council acting in an advisory capacity. N. A. A. has a national counselor in each State and Territory and 18 counselors at large. Local chapters are an important supplement to individual membership and facilitate community action.

Provision is made for affiliation with N. A. A. of other groups whose chief purpose is the general development of aviation or some related phase. N. A. A., moreover, is the American representative of the Federation Aeronautique Internationale, the governing body for sporting aviation throughout the world.

N. A. A. is strictly nonpartisan, recognizing no party lines. It seeks full cooperation with established organizations and agencies in the aviation field. In this way the guiding purpose of N. A. A. is to promote solidarity in the public interest throughout the ranks of aviation.

Denies Being a Member of Communist Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

LETTER FROM ALLAN S. HAYWOOD, DIRECTOR OF ORGANIZATION OF THE C. I. O.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., April 2, 1941.

Hon. NOAH M. MASON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MASON: Congressman DIES has used the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to make false charges against me. These charges were made without any notice and without first affording me an opportunity to answer.

I am not, and never have been, a card-holding member of the Communist Party, or a fellow traveler, nor have I ever followed the party line by supporting the party's front organizations, or in any other way. My cousin was killed in a Hitler bombing raid over England. My nephew is in the Royal Air Force fighting for England. I am opposed to dictatorships and to those who condone their aggression.

The only membership I have is in the United Mine Workers of America. I have worked in the coal mines for 16 years, and have been an officer of the mine workers for 23 years. The only principles I follow are the principles of this country. The only organizations I have ever supported are the trade-union organizations of the American workers.

Congressman DIES has made equally false charges against a man who cannot speak for himself, in accusing William J. Carney of being a Communist and fellow traveler. Mr. Carney is dead. As a dear friend of Mr. Carney during his lifetime, I deny Mr. DIES' false charges. Bill Carney was a devout Catholic whose only faith was in his religion, and who gave his life working for the cause of American labor unions.

I would appreciate it if you would have this letter inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

ALLAN S. HAYWOOD,
Director of Organization.

The Central Valley Project of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

STATISTICS COMPILED BY THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the facts and figures herein presented were supplied by the Bureau of Reclamation of the United States Department of the Interior:

Under the intriguing title "We Are Moving the Rain,"[1] a writer in a nationally circulated magazine a year ago described major features of what is one of the greatest reclamation dramas in the history of water conservation and irrigation.

Centering on the Central Valley project in central California, he dealt with the plans and the progress the Bureau of Reclamation is making to rescue threatened areas from the paralysis of aridity and salinity and from the menace of floods. Today he would doubtless have placed emphasis on what the project will do toward averting a threatened shortage of hydroelectric power in an area

[1] Magner White, Saturday Evening Post, April 27, 1940.

where national-defense industries are striving to meet the country's needs in ships, processed minerals, airplanes, and other arms.

In the regions to be served by the project are one and a quarter million persons on irrigated farms faced by deficiencies in water supplies and in 83 cities and towns dependent on these farms. Almost directly affected are three-fourths of the population of the entire State of California and what affects 5,000,000 people in California concerns the country at large.

The Central Valley project has been described as a major maintenance job on the water and power resources of one of the Nation's most important agricultural areas. Primarily it involves the conservation and regulation of the waters of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers for the following purposes:

(1) Improvement on an all-year basis of inland navigation on the Sacramento River, on which steamboats formerly were able to ply.

(2) Increased flood protection, required to combat the ravages of spring floods from the melting snows of the Sierra Nevadas.

(3) Supplemental irrigation for producing crop lands now largely dependent on underground water and threatened with reversion to the desert by lowering water tables. This will be accomplished largely through diversion of the surplus waters of the Sacramento to the San Joaquin Valley where a critical deficiency in rainfall exists.

(4) Salinity control in the Delta region, whereby salt-water intrusion from San Francisco Bay will be repelled and the destruction of the fertility of rich lands will be halted.

(5) Improved industrial and domestic water supplies for industrial areas of the upper San Francisco Bay region.

(6) Electric power development, whereby surplus waters of the Sacramento will be put to work to avert serious deficiency in the power supply of San Francisco and northern California, which the Federal Power Commission finds is threatened by 1943.

(7) Facilities for protection of salmon and other fish.

The facilities which are to bring about the accomplishment of these objectives may be described as follows:

Shasta Dam, the key structure on the Sacramento River above Redding, will have a reservoir capable of storing 4,500,000 acre-feet of water and a power plant of five generating units with a total capacity of 375,000 kilowatts designed to generate one and one-half billion kilowatt-hours of electric energy annually.

Keswick Dam, 6 miles below Shasta, for regulation of the stream, protection of fish, and generating power through three units of 25,000 kilowatts each, or a total of 75,000 kilowatts.

Cross channel from the Sacramento River to the San Joaquin through the edge of the common delta near Stockton, Calif.

Contra Costa Canal, 40 miles in length, already in operation, carrying water from the delta to a point near Martinez, to provide irrigation, domestic and industrial supplies for agriculture, homes and factories at and in the vicinity of Pittsburg, Calif., and nearby cities.

The Delta-Mendota pumping canal, 110 miles in length, raising water from the delta to Mendota, west of Fresno, on the San Joaquin River.

Friant Dam and Reservoir of 520,000 acre-feet capacity on the San Joaquin River near the town of Friant, and about 20 miles from Fresno.

Madera Canal, 37 miles in length, from Friant Dam to Ash Slough, near Chowchilla.

Friant-Kern Canal, 160 miles in length, from Friant Dam to the Kern River, near Bakersfield.

Facilities for natural and artificial propagation of salmon.

The power to be generated at Shasta and Keswick Dams will be transmitted through double-circuit line of 300,000 kilowatt capacity to a substation at Antioch, Calif. Plans of the bureau of reclamation contemplate a steam standby and firming plant of an eventual capacity of 200,000 kilowatts at Antioch to insure a ready supply of energy for all purposes. Stub transmission lines will carry power to load centers up and down the valleys.

Progress on the construction of the Central Valley project since the first dirt was turned has been as rapid as available funds would permit. By the end of the current fiscal year practically all of the $73,200,000 of Federal funds provided for the project will have been spent. Consequently, there are grave fears that the $25,000,000 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for the next fiscal year will not be sufficient to advance the work in accordance with the exigencies of the situation.

The additional power requirements, I understand, will be largely responsible for increasing the over-all costs of the project until recently estimated at $228,010,000. These added features, it is estimated, will raise the over-all costs to something like $261,400,000. The additional outlays will be for the steam standby and firming plant at Antioch to make the Shasta power more valuable; extension of the transmission system, a fifth unit at Shasta Dam, and three units at Keswick Dam not included in previous estimates.

The current Interior Department appropriation bill provides only $25,000,000 for advancing construction of the project.

Since the Federal Treasury has already advanced nearly a third of the ultimate cost of the undertaking, it would seem good business, aside from other considerations, to make the project facilities fully effective as quickly as possible. Return of the Government's investment from irrigation will not begin in earnest until water is carried from the Sacramento to the San Joaquin Valley. The sooner the power facilities are installed the quicker the return from this source will start.

From other standpoints, revolving around social and economic considerations and the national defense, advancement of construction of the project is supported by cogent reasons, which may be summarized thus:

Receding water tables have already forced the abandonment of large acreages in the San Joaquin Valley and retrogression to the desert of other areas is threatened unless the water supply is supplemented as planned by the Central Valley project. More than 800,000 acres in the San Joaquin Valley face an acute irrigation crisis.

In the delta area, the productivity of another 400,000 acres is menaced by intrusion of salt water. Abandonment of large areas has already been forced.

Municipalities in the upper bay region having manufacturing and processing plants with an average annual production of more than $100,000,000, are suffering from saline contamination of their fresh water supplies.

Large acreages, particularly in the Sacramento Valley, are menaced each spring by floods which will be controlled by Shasta Dam.

What the maintenance of agriculture, the backbone of the Central Valley area, means in dollars and cents has been summarized by the Graduate School of Business of Stanford University. A survey by its experts shows that the population of 300,000 on the farms and three times that number in the cities and towns have a wholesale purchasing power worth $700,000,000 principally to the metropolitan areas of San Francisco and my own city of Los Angeles.

And since a substantial part of this wholesale business results in purchases from manufacturing and processing plants east of the Rocky Mountains, there is direct national significance in the maintenance of this purchasing power.

The impact of the heavy migrations of farm families from the Great Plains and other areas has been felt most severely in the Central Valley. The increase of 30 percent in the population over the last decade is indicative of the pressure that has been built up in the area. With agricultural opportunities constricted by water conditions, there is no alternative but for these newcomers to turn to the Federal and State relief rolls.

Conservative estimates are that from 40,000 to 50,000 new families, practically all with a farm background, sought succor in the Central Valley from 1930 to 1940.

Hydroelectric power is the keystone of national-defense industrial activities not only in the Central Valley area but in southern California. The imminence of the shortage in power which the Federal Power Commission has found with respect to northern California, finds confirmation in the increasing demands in the metropolitan area of Los Angeles. But for Boulder Dam on the Colorado River, another project constructed and operated by the Bureau of Reclamation, southern California would in all probability have found itself facing a similar crisis. Although Boulder's power production is years ahead of schedule, it is being hard pressed to meet the demands on its capacity and additional generators are being installed and planned in anticipation of a continued increase.

As it is, Boulder Dam is now supplying more than 50 percent of the power requirements of southern California, central Arizona, and southeastern Nevada. Despite the dire predictions of the spokesmen for the private utilities and other interests which opposed the action of the Federal Government in building Boulder Dam, the project has already demonstrated its immense value to the Nation, to southern California, and especially in stabilizing the municipal power systems of the city of Los Angeles. When water stored in Boulder Dam is carried to the cities of the coastal plain through the aqueduct of the metropolitan water district, Boulder Dam will make an even greater contribution to the community, the State, and the Nation.

The example of Boulder Dam is cited as an answer to any objections that may be raised to acceleration of the power development in connection with the Central Valley project. Power from Boulder, which has been furnished the San Francisco region under an interchange arrangement, will unquestionably be required in southern California where the pressure of population and expansion of national-defense industries are adding to the requirements.

The 20 counties which will be directly benefited, the entire State of California, and the country at large need the Central Valley project and the manifold blessings it will bring. It should be speeded to completion by adequate appropriations for both the power and irrigation features so urgently needed.

Aid to Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

RESOLUTION OF POLISH ARMY VETERANS OF AMERICA

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of

the Polish Army Veterans of America with respect to aid to Poland:

Resolved, That the Polish Army Veterans of America strongly recommend that the President of the United States, under the broad powers granted him in the Lend-Lease Act, do all within his power to obtain the friendly cooperation of Breat Britain in forwarding a plan whereby those in Poland and the other small invaded countries of Europe, now occupied by Germany, may be furnished life-sustaining foodstuffs.

The Polish Army War Veterans urge that in the extension of relief, the following terms and safeguards be adhered to:

1. That an international commission should be set up to manage shipping, to import, safeguard, and distribute the food.

2. That Germany undertake that none of the imports or domestic supplies of these occupied nations should be taken by the Germans.

3. That the equivalent of any supplies already taken by the Germans should be returned by the Germans to these people.

4. That the amount of food and supplies on hand at any time be so limited that, in the event of violation of the agreement and seizure of the food and supplies by Germany, it would not be sufficient to feed the German Army for more than a single day.

5. That Germany relax her blockade against these people so as to permit the commission to import food from Russia and the Balkans if possible.

6. That the belligerents should not attack ships carrying supplies.

7. That no United States shipping be employed.

8. That the entire cost of the purchase and distribution of this food and supplies shall be borne by the Governments of the peoples benefited, without expense to the United States or to its citizens.

9. To assure these guarantees the British would be free to stop the supplies any moment these guarantees were not fulfilled by the Germans.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

RESOLUTION BY THE DETROIT REAL ESTATE BOARD

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

RESOLUTION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

Whereas a bottleneck of approximately 48 miles in the St. Lawrence River deprives the people of the United States of vital production and transportation facilities in the Great Lakes area; and

Whereas the Detroit industrial area is the largest producer of export merchandise and likewise the State of Michigan produces more goods for export than any other State; and

Whereas the deepening of the St. Lawrence channel as advocated by President Roosevent will enable us to make our full contribution to the present needs of our Nation and to participate in the post-war program of world rehabilitation and stabilization; and

Whereas the people of Michigan and the States adjacent to the Great Lakes possess a natural right to transport their industrial products, agricultural, and mining commodities to the markets of America and the world in the most economical manner; and

Whereas our national defense requires full utilization of the potentialities of our 21 active shipyards on the Great Lakes; and

Whereas the midwestern section of our Nation, which is a part of the Great Lakes region, produces more agricultural commodities and has more industrial production than any other section of the country; and

Whereas the Detroit industrial area and the State of Michigan are a part of the great midwestern section of our country in which 40,000,000 people live; and

Whereas the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project is not only a defense measure but also a means of bringing a new era to the country's most important agricultural and industrial region: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Detroit Real Estate Board Seaway Committee, That we do formally and respectfully requests the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation enabling the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project by removing existing barriers; and be it further

Resolved, That a formally attested copy of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Representatives in our National Congress.

Respectfully submitted.

DETROIT REAL ESTATE BOARD.

By its Public Affairs and Seaway Committee.
MARCH 24, 1941.

The Passage of H. R. 99 Would Be Disastrous to the Wage Earners, Consumers, and All Investment in the Field of Pulp and Paper Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS D. CULKIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

LETTER FROM E. W. TINKER, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE AMERICAN PULP AND PAPER ASSOCIATION

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 99 introduced by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] proposes a new adventure by the Government in the manufacture of pulp and paper products in America. Its passage would scrap the sixth largest manufacturing industry in the United States. It would seriously jeopardize, if not destroy the welfare of 264,000 contented, well-paid wage earners whose annual earnings are in excess of $300,000,000. The industry is an important one in both the North and the South.

The purpose of H. R. 99 is to compel the manufacturers of pulp and paper to use the cotton carry-over in their manufacturing processes. It is to my mind a bold and brazen attempt to handicap and perhaps destroy a great industry which is furnishing an important commodity to the American people at reasonable cost.

I recently received a letter from Mr. E. W. Tinker, executive secretary of the American Pulp and Paper Association which furnishes a fair and impartial discussion of the devastating effect of H. R. 99 on the pulp and paper industry of the United States.

Pursuant to the permission of the House I append the same hereto with the suggestion that the Members of the House take time out to read and ponder it.

Mr. Tinker's letter follows:

AMERICAN PAPER & PULP ASSOCIATION,
New York, March 18, 1941.

Hon. FRANCIS D. CULKIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN CULKIN: There has been introduced by Representative HAMPTON FULMER into the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress H. R. 99, entitled "A bill to provide for forest conservation of timber used in pulp; to provide for the eventual elimination of artificial market control of cotton; to use the surplus carry-over of cotton; to improve the quality of cellulose pulp; to provide a standard of cotton content in pulp; and for other purposes."

The United States paper and pulp industry respectfully submits its position to the effect that this bill is fundamentally unsound in all its aspects and is definitely opposed to the well-being of the consuming public, the paper and pulp industry, and those industries which are dependent upon paper as a material for further processing.

The pulp, paper, and converted paper-products industries when considered together rank in size among the first 6 manufacturing industries in the United States. The annual value of wood pulp, paper, and converted paper products is in excess of $2,000,000,000. There is dependent upon these industries some 264,000 wage earners whose aggregate annual wages are in excess of $300,000,000. The consumers of paper and paper products are distributed through all parts of the United States and through all walks of life. To a great extent the economic and cultural development of a Nation and its people are dependent upon abundant and low-priced paper.

H. R. 99 seeks to substitute a high-cost for a low-cost raw material. The data, separately submitted, show that the bill would increase the cost of raw materials used in paper from 20 to 32 percent. The paper industry operates upon a margin of profit which is extremely small; seldom have the earnings of paper companies reached 5 percent of net worth. The distribution of costs in the paper industry is such that raw materials and manufacturing expense, exclusive of labor cost, average about 60 percent of the net sales dollar. It requires only a small increase in raw-material costs to raise this 60 percent to a figure that would ruin the industry unless the higher costs are immediately passed on to the consumer in the form of increased prices. It is obvious that any such increase in costs as would result from enactment of H. R. 99 could not conceivably be absorbed by an industry but would of necessity be included in the price paid by the consumer.

The paper industry has an unbroken record of increasing efficiency and decreasing prices for its products. The tremendous production and consumption of paper has developed on an economic philosophy predicated upon low prices and progressively increasing efficiency of operation. The average price of paper, for example, was 37 percent lower in 1939 than it was in 1926,

whereas general wholesale commodity prices were reduced only 11 percent during this same period. The growth of paper consumption which has rested to a great extent upon this decreasing trend of paper prices has enabled the paper industry to expand and increase its employment and to make available to the people of the Nation, paper and paper products which have contributed substantially to an increased standard of living. H. R. 99 seeks to reverse this sound economic trend and move backward two or three decades the progress which the paper industry has made.

The geographic location and expansion of the paper and wood-pulp industry has rested largely upon the most feasible combination of the locations of raw materials and markets for the finished products of each individual company. Depending upon the kind and quality of paper made, the companies have established themselves close to urban centers where good markets exist or close to the great forest where abundant raw material supplies are to be found. By no conception of economic or ethical precedent under a democratic form of government can the Federal Government require a paper company or any company to cease using a raw material which is close to its doors in order to purchase a higher priced raw material, supplies of which are distant, for the benefit of one particular region of the United States or of one sectional group, such as the cotton farmer. To do so, would penalize the industry, the consumers and the taxpayers of the entire Nation. Such a measure cannot be based upon a plea of being vested with a public interest for it merely seeks to shift a burden from a minority group to the entire population. Furthermore, the forced utilization of a technically unsuitable and higher priced raw material than that to which the industry is accustomed would be grossly unjust as an unwarranted interference with business judgment to which each businessman is entitled. This proposal would in fact distort the planned distribution of the industry based on sound economic judgment and the experience of 100 years.

The members of the paper and pulp industry in their capacity as private citizens of the United States, and aside from their role as individual businessmen, are opposed to House bill 99 as involving useless expenditures of the taxpayers' money. The proposal, while ostensibly an economic project on the part of the Federal Government, could only result in a great financial loss to the public which would have to be paid for from the Treasury of the United States.

The surplus cotton held by the Federal Government has been acquired and stored at an average cost of at least 12 cents per pound. Data on conversion operations indicate that direct conversion costs from cotton fiber to cotton pulp—and it is proposed by House bill 99 that the Federal Government will undertake this operation—would raise the total cost of the cotton to the Government to at least 15¾ cents per pound. It is proposed to sell this cotton pulp to paper mills at 7¼ cents per pound, involving a direct loss of 8½ cents per pound to the Federal Government. Since House bill 99 proposes that 2,000,000,000 pounds are to be sold annually, the aggregate annual loss of public money would amount to $170,000,000 per year; additionally, a tremendous investment would be required by the Federal Government to erect and equip the necessary plants for converting the new cotton fiber into pulp. This would require an immediate outlay of public funds to the extent of at least $100,000,000. The uncertain nature of such an enterprise renders it extremely unlikely that the investment would ever be amortized.

Aside from the loss to the Federal Government, the increased cost of raw materials to the paper industry would amount to at least $160,000,000 per year. Thus, there would be passed on to the taxpayer and the consumer a total burden of some $330,000,000 per year. The fact that large sums of public money have already been expended to subsidize the cotton grower offers no logical reason for pouring additional public funds into the processing of surplus cotton for a purpose which is economically and technically unsound, particularly during the national-defense program.

It should be recognized that the paper industry of the United States, or in fact of any country of the world, has never found it technically feasible to process cotton into paper. Aside from the high-cost aspect, new cotton fiber, by virtue of its technical properties, is not suitable, under processes currently used or known, for use as a raw material in the manufacture of most papers. During the year 1940 the rag-content paper mills, constituting some one-half of 1 percent of the total capacity of the paper industry, undertook the subsidized experimental manufacture of paper using new cotton as a raw material. This was the first known major attempt of the paper industry to use new cotton for this purpose even in those papers which are normally made from cotton rags. Even the rag-content paper mills, with long experience in the processing of cotton rags, could not undertake the manufacture of expensive grades of paper from new cotton except experimentally and with cotton on a subsidized price basis from the Federal Government. The Surplus Marketing Division of the Department of Agriculture is well acquainted with this program, which was based on voluntary cooperation of this branch of the paper industry with the Federal Government. The rag-content paper mills possess the only equipment in the paper and pulp industry which is remotely adaptable to the processing of cotton fiber.

The remaining portion, or 99½ percent of the productive capacity of the paper and pulp industry, includes equipment for the processing of wood and other fibers. This equipment is in no way adaptable to the processing of new cotton for use in the manufacture of paper. Nor is it likely that even the equipment in the rag content paper mills would be available since it necessarily exists for the production of the regular grades of rag pulp necessary to the business. Serious and unwarranted problems would be faced in the further processing of cotton pulp into paper. Paper-manufacturing equipment, such as beaters, refiners, and paper machines, have been developed for the processing of certain specific fibers into paper. New and different fibers cannot be arbitrarily substituted without serious disruption and dislocation of the manufacturing process and in many instances complete shut-down of the paper mills.

Wood and other fibers move through the entire cycle of pulp and paper manufacture in from 6 to 12 hours. Cotton fiber would require at least 24 hours, and in many instances a longer period to complete the cycle. It is obvious that the use of cotton fiber would constitute a serious bottle neck in the mass-production methods in use in the paper mills today.

The bill would be particularly serious to the paper-consuming industries. The effect upon such industries as printing and publishing, business machines, cigarette manufacturers, etc., would be serious in all cases, and disastrous in particular instances, for it is doubtful that satisfactory papers to meet the requirements of these industries could be made for many years to come if the use of cotton fiber was compulsory. Rigid specifications covering the physical and chemical qualities of paper for use by the paper consumers have become firmly established. Such equipment as high-speed printing presses, business machines, and a multitude of other paper-products machines have been built and geared to these rigid specifications and quality of paper. The addition of a new and different fibrous raw material to the paper would, of necessity, affect these rigid specifications, the uniformity of which are so vital to the consuming industries. It is extremely unlikely that many industrial consumers would refuse to accept any paper which varies from or falls below the accepted standards to which they are accustomed. In many instances they would be forced to do so because their equipment would not be usable.

The program proposed by H. R. 99 would require the use of large quantities of vital materials and equipment. Imposing tonnages of steel plates and girders for the erection of the mills would be immediately necessary. Electric generating equipment, steam equipment, and machinery would have to be provided for. Even more important, a substantial part of the labor and technical force required for national-defense work and construction would be needed for the erection and operation of these plants. It is extremely unlikely that either the material or the personnel could be obtained for unnecessary construction for the duration of the national-defense program.

On the economic side of the picture there can be no justification for unnecessarily increasing the costs of a non-durable-goods industry at the present time. Furthermore, with the tremendous volume of paper required under the national-defense program, the industry must be left unhampered to meet all defense and civil needs for its products.

In the field of foreign commerce, the American manufacturer of paper has difficulty, under normal conditions, competing with the paper manufacturers of other countries in common world markets. This is because both raw material and labor costs are, in general, lower in other countries than they are in the United States. The American paper industry has made a determined effort to capture and maintain foreign markets, particularly those of South America. A forced use of new cotton in paper would vitiate any possibility of the American manufacturer competing in foreign markets, for it is a practical impossibility for the manufacturer to produce paper for his export orders separately from domestic orders.

H. R. 99 provides that there should be levied upon the paper mills, as an alternative if no new cotton is used, a processing tax ranging from 50 percent down to 12 percent of the value of pulp included in the respective papers.

It should be recognized that such a tax would increase the cost of paper making tremendously and consequently the cost to the consumer. Nearly all paper made would be subject to section 5 (a) (2) of H. R. 99, or 50 percent of the value of pulp ranging between $5 and $119 per ton, minus one-third of 1 percent for each dollar by which such value exceeds $5 per ton. Since most wood pulps average about $65 per ton in value, the tax would amount to 50 percent (sixty multiplied by one-third), or 30 percent, or $21.66 per ton. This would raise the cost of this material by over 33 percent.

H. R. 99 offers a strange process of reasoning. It involves the expenditure of more public funds to consume the surplus cotton than would be required to purchase and burn it; it proposes the practical wrecking of a vast industry for the benefit of a sectional problem; it anticipates the solution of technical problems not solved over the past 100 years; and, most important, it liquidates by Government fiat the democratic processes that have been the mainspring of American business enterprise since its inception.

Very truly yours,

E. W. TINKER,
Executive Secretary.

Feeder Air Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

ARTICLE BY KEITH KAHLE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to include a very complete article on feeder air lines, written by Mr. Keith Kahle, western representative of the Southwest Feeder Air Lines, Inc., of Oklahoma City, and published in the magazine Oklahoma. For a number of years Mr. Kahle has been editor of the aviation magazine, Taxi Strip, and has been active in aviation affairs of the Southwest.

[From the Oklahoma magazine of February 20, 1941]

FEEDER AIR LINES WILL BE THE NEXT GREAT STEP FORWARD IN TRANSPORT BY AIR

(By Keith Kahle)

Magic is the term "feeder air lines." Its aureole for the past 6 years has laid over the Nation like the delightful smoke of a pipe around your desk. Feeder air lines is the one gem in aviation that businessmen remember. From its glow they would like to warm their hands from the service it offers in a business way. It is the one thing that business remembers from all of aviation's "hellabaloo"—it is the one thing that business in smaller cities and towns desire from aviation. It is very concrete; it is lasting. It will help business directly and indirectly.

For 6 years I have studied, read, worked, heard, and thought about feeder air lines and the future they hold for business from the public-service standpoint. For 2 years I have been sold on the idea that feeder air lines are fundamentally right and sound.

I am of the firm opinion that feeder air lines will be to air transportation exactly what bus lines are to surface transportation today.

It is immensely pathetic to hear some state that feeder air lines are years away. Every indication at Washington—where the ball is—every rumble, every sign points to the fact that feeder air lines are very near at hand.

There are a lot of definitions for feeder air lines—but in plain English, without any lace, most expert thinking is along the following lines: A short air-route operation which gives air-mail, passenger, and express service or air-mail and express service to cities and towns not now enjoying scheduled trunk-line service by a domestic carrier; that such a short air-route operation offers a morning dispatching schedule to the cities and towns along the route and an afternoon pick-up schedule. Both will originate and terminate at an air-terminal point having scheduled trunk-line service.

Hence the word "feeder"—meaning to furnish mail, passengers, and express to trunk lines.

Only a handful of companies over the Nation have as yet been formed for the express purpose of offering feeder air-line service. Only one of these companies, All American Aviation, Inc., has had its case heard before the Civil Aeronautics Board. The company was successful.

PLANNING THE ROUTES

All new air-line routes—trunk line or feeder—are determined and laid out on the basis of their value to the public from a convenience and necessity standpoint.

New techniques are being developed in laying out feeder air-line routes. Ideas that will flash out front are in the making.

Indications are already out as to whether the route should be a circle route, a straight line, or zigzag route; such points are vital to those planning feeder air lines and following through on their efforts. This information, for some reason, never seems to find its way to the Southwest and Midwest in a noticeable fashion.

From the reams of Government figures that are available to everyone, routes can be determined or found by careful study and planning. The Government demands exactness in showing the need for new routes.

The convenience and necessity of new routes have their edges sharply defined. Such data take endless hours of work and study to compile and put into statistical picture form. It is on this unromantic work that feeder air lines are awarded. Cold facts and no hay.

Airport facilities should not be what some local group of businessmen's committee desires. They should be what the air carriers and the commercial fliers need, all subject to check by the airport section of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. Too little regard is given to this vital matter. As a result, many of the smaller and bigger airports today are sloppy jobs due to the trembling, uncertain hands of poor early planning.

PORTS ARE ESSENTIAL

The "hot" communities that are supporting new air-line routes in a short time will have a feeder source of income to their business that will mean more black ink on private ledgers.

The need of more airports from a commercial and national-defense standpoint can well be understood when a businessman chills over the fact that in Poland all airports were wiped out by one 2-hour bombing flight. As a result, Poland's air force and air lines were paralyzed on the ground.

An airport for feeder air-line operation will not necessarily require concrete runways, but instead the field should be well sodded and well drained.

SOME OPERATING ANGLES

The modern version of the actual operation of feeder air lines now is going in two ways, with a third in the offing.

The feeder lines of all American aviation in the East are now being operated with single-motored high-wing monoplanes equipped with a pick-up device. This patented device is mounted within the fuselage of the plane. It is a winch, bolted over a hole in the bottom of the plane, which allows a steel cable with a hook on the end of it to move in and out freely. The cable breaks at a pull of slightly over 1,000 pounds. On the ground, at the point of pick-up, is the station consisting of two poles about 40 feet high and some 60 feet apart. Stretched between these poles is rope from which hangs a mail bag. The plane flies low over the station, and the suspended unreeled hook on the cable catches the rope. Rope, mail bag, and all are reeled up into the plane. The mail is dispatched by simply dropping a pouch out of the plane at low altitude—about 100 feet. The plane is flying at 100 miles an hour when the pick-up is made. The entire operation, of course, is made from a plane in flight. In an official year-end report of the C. A. A. one finds these remarks: "An important development in the air-mail field during 1940 was the approval of pick-up and delivery service which is being carried on over five routes in the States of New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and West Virginia. Through the operation of this service small cities which do not have airports sufficiently large to accommodate air liners or other facilities for huge passenger-carrying aircraft are afforded the advantage of air-mail service." It is important to note the word "important" in this official report.

Another method of operation is that of using dual-motored lightweight airplanes. Such operation is dependent entirely on suitable airports for its operation. The method will offer mail, passengers, and express service. Feeder air lines are eventually going to have to offer passenger service, and wherever possible they should start operating as such.

The third type of feeder operation, which has yet to develop, will be a combination of the above two. That is a dual-motored airplane carrying mail, passengers, and express fitted with a pick-up device. Such a combination will offer mail, passengers, and express service to those cities that have suitable airports for landing, and mail and express pick-up service to those points without airports.

The difficulty with this operation is one of passenger psychology. It is an unknown quantity as to how passengers will react to a plane swooping down low over a pick-up station and receiving mail.

SOLVING PERSONNEL PROBLEM

There is much bogey-beat wailing these days over the question, "Where will feeder air lines get personnel?" Acute observers of aviation know that the files of every existing air line and every new air line in the Nation are full of applications, from qualified men and women wanting various jobs, from pilots on up and down. Manpower is available now. To say what will be the condition in 6 months is like predicting how the market will close tomorrow afternoon. But, the American way has always found an answer to such matters.

WOULD AID DEFENSE

Although the expression "national defense" has not been defined in an official way, one may use the expression "national defense," too, in thinking of feeder air lines' value to the armed forces.

The Army considers only 60,000 miles of our highways can be accepted as of military value. This is only a drop in the bucket compared to our total mileage of 3,000,000. Of this 60,000 miles, only 26,000 miles is marked for priority development.

But the matter of the Army getting from point to point still remains vital.

Germany has shown that troops, guns, and supplies can be moved in large and small numbers by air. Aviation writers in this country have been "telling them that down at the office," about this for years—but it took a warring nation to convince a bruised world of this fact. To move manpower and supplies takes all types of planes—from the "big berthas" of the airways down to the "puddle jumpers"—the latter blessed with the ability to get in and out of small fields with vital supplies and manpower.

Since the Army has only 26,000 miles of roads marked for priority development, it is simple main-line thinking, from the layman's viewpoint, that they have some other things in mind for transportation and communication.

Of course, no one is foolish enough to say that feeder air lines will be a cure-all answer to this problem, but aviation observers point out that feeder air lines are definitely an aid to the national defense set-up.

Feeder air lines could aid the Army in case they had to mobilize at El Paso, Miami, Buffalo, Seattle, Brownsville, Los Angeles, etc. Planes of feeder lines could carry key officers, medical supplies, small arms, ammunition,

general supplies, confidential reports—they would be the homing pigeons of the Army. Feeder planes are small targets.

Feeder air lines can provide a means whereby the military air arms of the Government can keep a great mass of pilots and ground men in training—not measured in hundreds, but in thousands. European countries used gliders to keep their pilots in training—the American way might well be feeder airplanes.

RATE OF PAY

Feeder air lines must be a profitable business to the commercial operator. It is so written in the law. In simple words, the law provides that any domestic air carrier, holding a certificate of convenience and necessity for any air route, must show a fair and reasonable profit on capital investment. That is iron-clad law. A rate of mail pay is awarded the carrier to insure this. Any fixed base operator knows that the type of planes now being used on feeder routes, or contemplated to be used, can be operated for a very small amount, on a per-mile basis, as compared to the cost of operating the big air liners of today.

To show the heartening progress being made by air lines, here are some facts worth table-top tapping: On January 1, 1939, there were 81,000 miles of air-line operation in the Nation. Today this has been increased to 92,600 miles. Air-line revenue-passenger miles, and those are the ones the stockholders study, increased 31 percent during 1940.

Such gains are solid. On January 8, 1941, President Roosevelt sent his Budget to Congress. This document included $21,280,327 for a "moderate expansion of the Air Mail Service." Such is an increase over that requested last year. It definitely indicates that this Nation's air lines will continue to expand their route miles.

There are many good feeder routes open for development. The surface has not even been ruffled.

WHAT CAN BE DONE

What can your community do to get feeder air-line service? My suggestions are not complex—very homespun in their simplicity.

1. Stop talking around the luncheon table and go get the job done. Action is needed—not words.

2. Assemble all the facts possible regarding your community's desire for feeder service and show why such is needed. Kill all "general statements" as they are so much wasted words, paper, time, and energy. Let the route win or lose on factual information. Make a survey of business firms and determine, as far as possible, how much air mail, passengers, and express local firms will put on a feeder route once the service is installed. For example, on one new feeder route that I know of, a certain firm has stated that they will furnish one and one-half passengers per week to the route. They will send 2 pounds of air mail daily. Such information is vital—it shows facts—that the service is needed. The Government must have facts.

3. Be sure to get this data in the right hands of every existing and new air-line company in the Nation. Submit such to the Post Office Department and to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

4. Confer with nearby communities that would be on a proposed route and assemble facts on the needs of the route as well as your own community's individual needs.

5. Provide an airport or assure the prospective commercial operators and the Government that such will be built if feeder service is provided.

6. The work should be done by a man who knows his stuff. The man should be well versed in economic studies, their build-up, assembling, presentation, and should have a working knowledge of air transportation.

Feeder air lines have a great service to give businessmen—it is up to the businessmen to see that they get this service.

Are We Following France?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the United States is now engaged in a program to defend itself against enemies from abroad.

With a wave of strikes in the defense industries of the Nation affecting most seriously the effort of our Government and people to produce the weapons of defense which becomes more apparent day by day that the greatest danger to our Nation and our country is the enemies who are within our own borders.

France is a prostrate nation. She is on her knees. Her people have been bowed with the humility of defeat. The dagger that struck her in the back was the enemies that lived within her own borders. Communists and labor racketeers influenced by them are seriously threatening the peace, tranquillity, and every effort on the part of our Government to maintain itself at home and abroad.

Every indication here points to the fact that step by step we are following in the footsteps of France unless the President takes a determined and definite stand to overwhelm and control the subversive elements in our midst. This mighty Republic, with the hope it has held out to the distressed people of the world, may suffer the same fate as the Republic of France. Eternal vigilance is still the price of freedom.

We have read in the public press of the modified sit-down strike designated by certain union leaders as a slow-down strike, in the seizure of the River Rouge plant of the Ford Motor Co.

We have all read, Mr. Speaker, the last few days in the public press of the stoning of the chief executive of the State of Wisconsin and the closing of the Allis-Chalmers plant, after it was reopened upon the insistence of our national-defense directors.

As further proof of my statement that Communists in labor unions are deliberately sabotaging our national-defense efforts, I cite the testimony taken before the Smith investigating committee, to the effect that Communists in labor unions were protected by the National Labor Relations Board.

The records of the Labor Board prove that trial examiners refused to permit attorneys to question Communists about their party activities and beliefs.

As further positive proof, last week the attorney for the Ford Motor Co., appearing at a hearing before the National Labor Relations Board in Detroit, requested subpenas of certain individuals for the purpose of proving that they were active in the Communist movement and that the purpose of their so-called labor efforts against Ford were in furtherance of the Communists world mass revolution, which is to control vital facilities of industry, commerce, and transportation. The subpenas for these men were not issued by the Labor Board.

The Ford Motor Co. is engaged in the national-defense effort. As further proof that Communists in labor unions are deliberately sabotaging the national-defense effort, I cite the present strike in the Ford plant, started despite the fact that the National Labor Relations Board only last week conducted a hearing regarding plans for an election in the River Rouge Plant at the request of the C. I. O. I cite also the fact that the Ford River Rouge plant was seized, roads leading to it blocked, and workers attempting to go to their jobs were assaulted.

If this is not an attempt to sabotage, why was the strike called now? Why did they not await the decision of the Labor Board? If this is not an attempt to sabotage, why did they not await the action of the Government's constituted authority?

Now, Mr. Speaker, permit me to point to you the parallel situation in France. For months after the fall of France the American people had the wool pulled over their eyes by stories of treachery among French generals and weird, sensational stories of bridges being deliberately jammed with civilians who blocked soldiers. The tragic thing about all that propaganda was that it covered up the real story.

And the real story is that Moscow did even more to beat France than did Hitler.

At last the President, in his Jackson Day speech, put the blame where it belongs when he said:

> We have seen how the workers of France were betrayed by their so-called champions, the Communists. For no matter what Communist lips have to say their actions have proved that in their hearts they care nothing for the real rights of labor.

What really did happen in France?

Instead of a general statement about Communists selling the workers of France down the river, I am going to give you, chapter and verse, the details of what actually happened.

During the world depression in the early 1930's the voting tide swung leftward in France, and Socialist Leon Blum became Prime Minister in 1936.

The Communist's first move there was political. Their second was industrial.

On the eve of taking office, Blum made this pledge to the Socialist Party—

> Capitalism is doomed; we are now going to try to assure passage from a capitalist to a Socialist state. The time has passed when it is no longer possible for the middle-class bourgeois to save their society.

Although Leon Blum was a Socialist and not a Communist, he, too, had smart

ideas about political subterfuge. When he came into office he told his brother Socialists that—

For the present we must work within the capitalist regime, while you, through propaganda, work to prepare men's minds for the coming of that Socialist system which is our aim.

With Germany stepping up mass tank and airplane production, Mr. Blum did not have time to listen to the French military experts. He was too busy thinking about textbook socialism, and so he brushed aside French military with this statement—

The peace we want is a disarmed peace. We shall do everything possible to make out of this victory of the popular front the first victory of socialism.

At that point the 72 Communist deputies went to work on Mr. Blum; and to get their votes he had to fall in with their plans.

It was the Communists who invented the sit-down strike. In France they called it the stay-in strike. In both cases it was a subtle step in the Communist program to sabotage productive facilities.

Coudron Aircraft Factory was the first to have a sit-down strike. It spread to Renault Motors, where the workers hoisted the Red flag and locked out 3,000 other workers who wanted to go in to their jobs.

What is happening here today? One of the first moves of the extremists who seized the Ford Motor Co. River Rouge plant was physically to drive workers from their places and then block off, with barricades of automobiles, the roads leading into the plant. Workers who wanted to work were beaten.

At the Michelin tire plant in France 7,000 Communists and Communist-inspired workers struck in protest against the dismissal of a "red" agitator, who spent full time agitating and no time working.

According to press dispatches, the labor leaders gave the alleged dismissal of agitators as a cause of the strike at the Ford Motor Co. River Rouge plant.

It is significant that Prime Minister Blum made no move against these Communists holding the Michelin plant; but when rightist workers forced the Communists out of the Claremont-Ferrand plant he sent troops to evict the rightists and leave the Communists in control. This continued to be his policy as the left wing took over industry.

While German factories continued to hum, the French strike spread to the aviation works at Villa Coubay, the Farmand airplane factory at Boulogne, the Bregnet and Block aviation plants, the Ferrodo, Lockheed, and Gnome and Rhone aviation plants.

Barricades were thrown up around the Hotchkiss motor works.

The Communist workers took over the important metallurgical works at Marseilles and the French unit of the Goodrich Rubber Co.

Ten thousand workers demonstrated in support of the Communists outside the Valenciennes metal factories. If workers had no strike in their own factory, the Communists inspired them to stop production in what were called sympathetic strikes.

On Saturday, March 29, 1941, handbills were passed out in Chicago to C. I. O. workers not employed at the Harvester plant to assemble in such numbers at the Harvester plant that it could not reopen.

In the meantime the French radicals had gone after the navy and the merchant marine at the great Mediterranean naval base in Toulon. The Communists drove the citizens indoors, then marched through the streets singing the Internationale. They stormed the naval works and left more than 200 casualties in the streets.

In western France they stormed the naval arsenal at Brest. The arsenal had to close down, but the guards were successful in defending the mighty battleship *Dunkerque*, then under construction. A strike tied up the great liners *Normandie*, *Paris*, and *Ile de France*, the methods being not unlike those employed by Harry Bridges on our own west coast. At St. Nazaire—a port modernized during the World War by millions of American dollars—five navy yards were flying the red flag as employees occupied the plants.

In our own country Marcel Scherer, a Communist, has attempted—with how much success, I do not know—to get his C. I. O. union into our navy yards and control that union. He is the organizer of the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians. In a letter sent to the Secretary of the Navy, then Mr. Charles Edison, and in a telegram sent to Mr. Roosevelt, on April 10, 1940, this organization defended its claim to the right of collective bargaining in American navy yards. Scherer joined the Communist Party while he was at City College in New York in 1931 and was Communist candidate for alderman in Brooklyn.

In Marseilles, Communist sailors struck and tied up and seized 60 French merchant vessels. Everywhere on wharves and warehouses flew the blood-red flag of the Communist Internationale.

When patriotic Frenchmen began to hoist the flag of France in opposition, the Blum government tried to avoid conflict by forbidding stores to sell the national emblem.

Leon Jauhaux, head of the French Confederation of Workers, was a patriot who never wanted strikes to go to a length where they would hurt his country.

He did what some of our own labor leaders and politicians have been tempted to do in order to get a vote majority for themselves—to accept the cooperation of Communists and their sympathizers. They think they can use "reds" while they need them, and then put them on the sidelines.

It did not work in France. It will not work here.

But there is still time for the people of the United States to take heed of the mistake of France.

The first thing we need to do is to ferret out these Communists in the labor movement. We must not be hindered in this by governmental agencies. We must let the workers themselves understand the true conditions.

We must let the workers know we are not going to permit these Communists to threaten them into submission and at the same time sabotage a defense program on which America depend: and on which we are sacrificing billions of dollars.

Congress Must Act Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, instead of getting better, the strike situation is growing steadily and alarmingly worse. Every day the newspapers record in glaring headlines the story of riots and stonings and work stoppages in our defense-production machinery, and all this time the President sits idly by, without lifting a hand to put an end to these violations of law and order—the same President who, in a public address but a few short weeks ago, declared that the United States defense program was not a "part time job"—that "the concepts of business-as-usual must be forgotten," in our all-out effort to become the arsenal of democracies fighting the aggressor.

The tide of public opinion is rising in all parts of the country against these labor leaders who have deliberately set out to sabotage our defense machinery by unjustified strikes. Since the President has refused to take executive action in this grave crisis, it remains for Congress to step in and do the job. The people expect Congress to do that job with vigor and dispatch. Half-way measures will no longer be tolerated.

This Congress has given the President everything he has asked for in national defense. We have appropriated billions of dollars to set this vast program into motion. The die is cast. Our course is set, there can be no turning back. We must go forward in the spirit voiced by Stephen Decatur when he said:

My country, may she always be right, but my country, right or wrong.

We have supported the President in good faith and we have the right to expect that he will keep faith with us, and with the people of this Nation in seeing to it that the effectiveness and the progress of this program shall not be destroyed by industrial strikes called on flimsy pretexts and without just cause. The time has come to end strife within our borders. The time is past when we can afford to play politics with patriotism. Strikes in defense industries have no place in America at this grave hour.

After this Congress has done everything it has been asked to do, after mil-

lions of our boys have been called to sacrifice a year of their lives in military training camps, it is indeed a sad commentary upon our intelligence that we permit a handful of irresponsible agitators to block our defense preparations. The President proclaims this America as the arsenal of democracies. He speaks in strong words to all the world, but he has failed to rise above politics at home. He has spoken out in vigorous language against appeasers abroad; yet he is trying to appease a labor despotism here at home.

I have no quarrel with labor. I want it to have a square deal, and I am willing to fight to see that it gets a square deal, but certainly if any economic group in this country owes allegiance to this administration, it is organized labor. I believe that the rank and file of organized labor is willing to pledge that allegiance; is anxious and willing to go to work in this great patriotic effort which calls for the united strength of all of us. Why then have not we, as Members of Congress, met this situation on the same emergency basis that we have dealt with other situations. Are we afraid to do the right thing in this hour of danger? Are we afraid to really serve the whole people of the United States, the best interests of this Nation, or are we content to temporize and play politics?

This Congress has called our American youth into military service. It has called upon American industry to expand its plant and increase its production. It has permitted the farmers of America to continue to produce foods at prices less than 70 percent of parity. These sacrifices and many more are being made, gladly and patriotically. How then can we countenance a disruption caused by all these strikes and walk-outs, many of which cannot be justified even by the staunchest friends of union labor? We have no time for quarreling and bickering at home while we prepare to defend from abroad. Remember the story of Nero and Rome. Remember the story of France—a France torn by dissension and strife, fiddling while Hitler armed.

The President can end these strikes in 5 minutes if he will only give the word. He has refused to interfere, and it is now the plain duty of Congress to take immediate action. When I say action, I mean more than mere investigation. I mean more than the mere adoption of a resolution, such as was discussed on this floor yesterday, to start an investigation into defense industries. We already have too many investigatory bodies and mediation boards and conciliation boards, who confine their efforts merely to holding one conference after another with the result that strikes continue and nothing is done.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the time is past for temporizing. The American people demand that unjustified strikes in defense industries be outlawed. They ask us as Members of this Congress to do our plain duty in seeing to it that the program of defense is not halted; in recognizing that this is a real emergency and not a part-time job, but a job that calls for the united effort of every liberty-loving American.

Elimination of Slums—Expansion of U. S. H. A. Program Would Contribute Immeasurably to the Strength of Our Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, for many decades the evil of slums and blighted areas has been recognized as one of the most troublesome of all social problems. Both in time of depression and time of prosperity, in time of peace and in time of war, bad housing has always been with us and has always brought in its train a long series of concomitant evils—disease, crime, fire hazards, shattered realty values, and broken morale.

Until recently, however, there was no systematic approach to a solution of the problem. Social reformers and welfare workers groped in the dark. City and State governments tried to prevent new slums from coming into existence by setting up legal standards for new construction, known as building codes. A few philanthropists built model tenements and garden developments, some of which were themselves little better than slum housing and most of which were too expensive for slum families to live in.

But today we have found out how to solve this problem. Through the program of the United States Housing Authority we have learned how to clear slums, how to build good homes at low costs, and how to achieve rents that families in the lowest income groups can afford to pay.

Today more than 500 slum-clearance and low-rent housing projects are already under way or completed and more than 200,000 men, women, and children are already living in public housing. These may sound like big figures. In a way they are big figures, for the United States Housing Authority and the local housing authorities set up to build projects with United States Housing Authority funds have been progressing at a fast rate of speed. But, compared to the total housing need in this country today, they are very small figures indeed. I have been told that when all the families have moved into all the slum-clearance projects now being built under the present United States Housing program, considerably more than 90 percent of our slums will still be standing.

Speaking as a citizen of the State of Iowa, I am especially conscious of the urgent need for expansion of the U. S. H. A. program. At the present moment we have no State enabling legislation in Iowa, and our cities and towns are not yet permitted to set up local housing authorities legally empowered to participate in the U. S. H. A. program. But that does not mean that we will not soon have such legislation. Our State legislature is meeting this year, and I am confident that the necessary enabling laws will be enacted.

There are many people, nevertheless, who feel that enacting these laws will not help us one bit. They are discouraged by the fact that no new authorizations for the U. S. H. A. have yet been approved by Congress. Of course, the U. S. H. A. still has a small amount of money left. I have been informed by U. S. H. A. officials that savings brought about by reduction in interest costs have yielded a few million dollars that may be allotted to local housing authorities in those States that enact housing legislation this year. Yet there is no assurance that much of this money, if any at all, will be available for Iowa cities. And even if it were all earmarked for Iowa, I know that it would not be enough. It is therefore especially important to the people of Iowa that this Congress expand the U. S. H. A.'s lending powers, so that the cities and towns in Iowa can take part in this great rebuilding of the Nation.

Let no one think that Iowa does not need Federal aid for slum clearance and low-rent housing. The Eastern and Southern States are not the only ones that suffer from slum conditions. Let me quote a few lines from The Forgotten House, a booklet issued by the Iowa State Planning Board:

> Although Iowa slums are not characterized by jungles of congested tenements and perhaps are not as impressive in their magnitude or appearance as the slums in the larger eastern cities, there is a problem of overcrowding fully as serious a menace as in the tenements of the metropolitan centers. * * * Some of the social and physical conditions resulting from the gross overcrowding and "doubling up" which occur in the miserable shacks of Iowa's slums are beyond description.

And this is only part of the story. Aside from the overcrowding there is a large amount of sheer physical deterioration and complete absence of sanitary facilities.

The effects of such conditions are obvious: Higher rates of sickness and disease, more crime, more fires, damaged realty values, decreased revenue from local taxes, and increased local expenditures.

The State planning board has measured these effects. In Dubuque—to take but one example—approximately 10 percent of the population live in areas of slum and blight. Yet, between 1924 and 1934, 70 percent of Dubuque's juvenile delinquents came from these areas, as well as 60 percent of all persons convicted of major crimes. Over 30 percent of all fires and 25 percent of all communicable diseases were reported from the same areas.

Naturally, low-rent housing projects alone would not completely wipe out crime, disease, and other social evils that are so accentuated in the slum areas. But they would tend to relieve conditions considerably. Moreover, they would provide a valuable stimulus to business and industry. Without competing in any way

with private enterprise, they would mean new contracts for the businessmen and new jobs for the workingmen of Iowa.

In conclusion, I would like to go on record as stating my firm conviction that the elimination of slum conditions in this country is a vital element in national defense. People who live in broken-down, unhealthful homes and run-down, unwholesome neighborhoods cannot possibly give their best to the country. Bad environment injures both morale and physique. On the other hand, no one will leap more quickly and energetically to the defense of his country and his country's institutions than he who lives in a home that is really worth defending. For this reason I believe that an expansion of the U. S. H. A. program would contribute immeasurably to the strength of our democracy.

Safety of Life at Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE J. CONNERY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the Congress is sincerely interested in protecting the lives of those who travel aboard ships. We all realize that in case of a fire at sea there is no fire department handy, and the possibilities of the loss of life are great.

Following the *Morro Castle* disaster and the exhaustive investigation made of that disaster, the Congress enacted a law making it mandatory for the installation of automatic-sprinkler systems aboard passenger-carrying ships.

The report on the *Morro Castle* disaster specifically stated that "in this particular case the proper functioning of the automatic-sprinkler system might have saved the vessel." There was no automatic-sprinkler system aboard the *Morro Castle*.

This subject of the safety of life aboard passenger-carrying vessels is especially pertinent at this time in view of the fact that only a few days ago it was disclosed that the Government has taken over the steamship *Manhattan* and is converting that ship into a troop ship.

Naturally, every member of the Congress seeks to protect the lives of those American boys who may travel aboard troop ships. We are all familiar with the possibilities, yes, the dangers of sabotage.

What will the American people say if and when, which we all hope will not happen, we have another *Morro Castle* disaster?

While the Congress has done its duty it will interest members of the House to learn that our efforts to protect the lives of those who travel aboard ships at sea has been sabotaged by the brass hats we have unfortunately entrusted with discretionary authority. The legislation which the Congress enacted unanimously, without a dissenting vote, reads in part as follows:

> Every passenger vessel with berthed or stateroom accommodation for 50 or more passengers shall be equipped with an automatic sprinkler system. All enclosed portions of such vessel accessible to passengers or crew shall be protected by an automatic sprinkler system. * * * *Provided*, That if after investigation the Bureau of Navigation and Steamboat Inspection finds in the case of a particular vessel the application of this act unnecessary properly to protect life on such vessel an exception may be made.

You will note that this legislation made mandatory the installation of automatic sprinkler systems, except in those particular cases where a governmental agency finds "in the case of a particular vessel the application of this act is unecessary properly to protect life on such vessel."

I find, on page 513 of the independent offices appropriation bill, the following testimony by the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, in answer to a query from our colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]:

> Mr. LAND. All new construction with which the Maritime Commission has had anything to do are considered fireproof by the Bureau of Navigation and Steamboat Inspection.
>
> Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is it a fact that the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation has O. K.'d all ships built as being fireproof?
>
> Mr. LAND. It is a fact that we not only comply with the American Shipping Bureau's specifications but also the regulations of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation. We also comply practically with Senate 184.

You will note that Chairman Land states that "we also practically comply with Senate 184," which is the legislation specifically making it mandatory for the installation of automatic-sprinkler systems aboard passenger-carrying ships.

I note on page 171 of the hearings on the appropriation for the Department of Commerce, released yesterday, that Commander Field, Commissioner of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, stated in response to our colleague from Iowa [Mr. HARRINGTON]:

> I have made the statement that there is no such thing as a fireproof vessel. If you put this new vessel out there and do not put anything in it, it is fireproof; but, as soon as you put stores and your furniture and the passengers' luggage in it then you have got things that will burn.

We are more concerned about protecting lives than we are about protecting stores, furniture, and passengers' luggage. Congress enacted legislation seeking to protect lives aboard ships. Despite Commander Field's admission of possible fires aboard passenger-carrying ships, the intent of Congress is openly ignored.

Continuing further, Mr. HARRINGTON asked:

> Wasn't there some discussion—it might have been prior to that time that you were director—relative to the sprinkling systems on these vessels?
>
> Commander FIELD. Yes; there was an act passed, I forget now the title of that act, but it was along in 1936, which requires that on all passenger vessels with stateroom accommodations for 50 or more passengers there shall be maintained a sprinkler system.
>
> Mr. HARRINGTON. Fifty passengers, I believe.
>
> Commander FIELD. Yes; the sprinkler system should be provided, and they put a proviso in there, which in my opinion was an unfortunate proviso, that if the Director of the Bureau should find in the case of a particular vessel that the sprinkler system was not necessary properly to protect life that an exception might be made. If I remember correctly, some 110 vessels were excepted due to other things which had been provided.
>
> Mr. HARRINGTON. I had particular reference to that because 110 were older vessels.
>
> Commander FIELD. Yes; they were in existence at that time. Many of them have now passed out of service.
>
> Mr. HARRINGTON. But any new vessels that have been constructed since that time have been built fireproof insofar as you can fireproof them?
>
> Commander FIELD. Yes; and the result is that in the construction of these new vessels nobody ever thought of putting in a sprinkler system. It was not regarded by the designers or the inspection service or anybody in the profession as being desirable or necessary. To be perfectly frank, I think the British rely more on the sprinkling system than we do.

The above will indicate, first, that the intent and purpose of the legislation which the Congress enacted for the purpose of protecting the lives of those who travel aboard ships at sea and which the Commissioner of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation openly admits is mandatory has been set aside because shipbuilders and designers who opposed this legislation before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries do not regard it as desirable. Of course, we might add that undoubtedly some of these persons would like to look upon Congress as only a necessary agency through which the moneys are to be appropriated with which to pay salaries and make possible exorbitant profits out of vessels constructed.

You will note that Commander Field makes reference to the fact that the British rely more on the sprinkling system than we do.

Is it possible that the fact has been overlooked that the British operate or did operate the largest fleet of oceangoing vessels of any nation in the world? Is there no significance in that as a result of the vast experience they have had they have found the installation of automatic sprinkler systems of great value in protecting the lives of those who travel at sea?

Is it not significant that the Commissioner, who the Congress has entrusted with discretionary authority, states to the Congress, through the Appropriations Committee, that the placing of such discretionary authority was unfortunate?

Naturally, the Congress, unable to foresee the future and wishing to be fair, provided such discretionary authority in the belief, as was plainly intended, that such exception would be made only in case there was developed a vessel that was fireproof and wherein the installation of such system was wholly unnecessary.

The other devices on which the commander relies for the safety of those who travel aboard ships at sea, I understand, were on the *Morro Castle* and yet did not protect the lives of those aboard that ship.

Surely such an admission on the part of the head of a Government bureau that the placing of discretionary authority in administrative agencies is unfortunate is a reflection on the Congress.

I realize that because of the rules of the House we cannot legislate on an appropriation bill. However, I do believe that the chairman and the members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, which committee unanimously recommended the enactment of the mandatory installation of automatic sprinklers aboard passenger-carrying ships after extensive hearings, should take cognizance of the violation of the plain intent of the Congress.

We enacted legislation which we have every reason to believe would protect the lives of those who travel aboard ships at sea. Those entrusted with the enforcement of this legislation, unable to influence the Congress at public hearings held by the committee, now tell us that because we unfortunately entrusted them with discretionary authority their will and not the will or intent of Congress will prevail.

Strikes in Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. GIBSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I am wondering where the courage of we Americans has found its place of peace so dear that it resists not the great threat that has arisen as a monster among us. At a time when our national life and honor is in the balance, we sit idly by and let Communists and those of communistic ideals place their poison fingers about the throat of the Republic we love so dearly, and we only cry aloud, but dare not act.

I refer to the so-called strikes that are running mad in our country today and delaying our defense program, when we admit that time is the determining factor in the preservation of our way of life. Yet we have permitted these strikes to cause the loss of 1,000,000 working days in January of this year alone in industries given wholly to the manufacture of articles necessary to defend the lives and homes of our mothers and babes, as well as the right to live in a free democracy.

We appropriate billions of the taxpayers' money for defense, millions for the Dies committee to investigate subversive and communistic activities. Yet as servants of our people and our commonwealth we stand childishly by and let those of avowed communistic faith shut down our industries and destroy our property before our very faces and accept it as weaklings, I should say unworthy of the heritage of true Americanism if we do not rise equal to the demand upon us, and crush these enemies for all time to come. Do not misunderstand me, I favor full defense preparation and appropriations, and the Dies committee, I think it is doing great work, and the American public will remain in lasting gratitude to its able chairman, Hon. MARTIN DIES, and its full membership; but please tell me why we should spend millions to go bear hunting and then let the bears eat our arms and ammunition at our very door before we leave our home; are we working to an end or merely shadow boxing? If the latter, for God's sake let us quit appropriating the public's money. Will we accept the challenge thrust at our national security and honor or sleep peacefully on until our system of life has been burnt from out our very hands? We must answer our own questions.

We must be fair and we must be positive. There is no means by which the administration can shift the responsibility of this great threat and national disgrace, it is clearly in its lap. Our great leader has stated that no legislation was needed to properly handle these strikes. If this be true why in the name of peace and safety have they been permitted to continue, why were they not stopped at once? Has it forcefully presented itself to you that in sections of this great Commonwealth we are today permitting warfare to be waged on a big scale and forces denying to citizens the right to manufacture defense articles are engaging in bloody battles with the peace officers of certain States in direct defiance of America's right to defend herself from the forces of dictators abroad? If we permit this to continue, we must admit that we have become soft and can never boast again of the courage of a true American.

Picture thousands of mothers crying after their sons who constitute the noblest youth of our great country as they gladly send their sons away to fight in the shadows of death for $21 per month to defend not only their homes but the very life of our democracy; as we permit others in civilian life to strike for more money when they make this sum in 2 days in the safety of life and the love of home and friends. Suppose these young sons should strike, I ask you what would be their fate? Are we still Americans?

We are sought to be pacified by the advice that a Mediation Board has been appointed to adjust these matters. I know those enemies of freedom of life laugh aloud when they find that Philip Murray, the successor to John L. Lewis, is one member of this Board. We must admit that John L. Lewis is the greatest single threat to the flower of American liberty, a short study of his past record is all that is necessary to convince anyone of this fact. It is but natural that this party will follow the distorted ideas and poison dictates of Lewis. How long can we expect the American public to pour the earnings of their investments and labor into the Government Treasury to be squandered in waste as the result of the work of these enemies of free government, and in the very face of a pretext so obviously a gesture.

I am proceeding to make a statement, which I am happy will be recorded in the proceedings of this great body and which I predict will live when I have witnessed the last sunset of life. I say to you that Hitler is no greater threat to the eternal peace, love, and tranquillity of American life and liberty than John L. Lewis. If we remain reposed in that state of blindness we have slumbered in so long, spending billions and the blood of our noblest youth to crush dictators abroad and leave his hands clutched at the throat of our democracy, then my words will come true, and my children and yours will be witnesses to this fact, if, in fact, it does not come while we are yet on the stage of life.

Let us be fair to all. It is possible that industry has had its faults and that labor generally has had its, but the greatest responsibility must rest on the shoulders of those leaders who would destroy our way of life and who have become fat at the expense of American labor. It is our duty to place the fault and crush it at its source, regardless of where it may rest.

I want to go on record as congratulating the American Federation of Labor for its true patriotism, as exemplified by resolutions recently adopted by that organization, in which it incorporated just, fair, and reasonable restrictions on strikes. If one is fair to labor he must admit that the provisions of those resolutions are all that could be demanded of labor, which is surely and truly entitled to unite for its own protection. It has been seen in the past that you cannot turn industry loose on labor, and I do not advocate that. I worked for 7 long years, and truly they were long, in a railroad shop with the various craftsmen, and I always found them reasonable in their demands and just in their convictions. Truly, the American Federation of Labor has through the years championed the cause of the American working public, and I have found it to adhere to true American principles of government. We have permitted the C. I. O. to go so far until it has been hard for the American Federation of Labor to stay within reasonable bounds and yet maintain its membership and standing with the various crafts, not at its fault, but at the fault of those representing our people. We have permitted the C. I. O., under the leadership of John L. Lewis, to demoralize the progress of our commercial life, and to place on it and the American workingman shackles that will be hard to free ourselves from.

I have been closely associated with the membership of the American Federation of Labor of my section of Georgia and let it be said to their credit that there is no class of Americans living that are truer in their loyalty and patriotism to our Government, and this I say without fear of contradiction by anyone who is informed. They will go as far as you or I to defend our flag and all the purity for which it stands.

I place the responsibility for the deplorable conditions that exist in our defense program today in the breast of those leaders of the C. I. O. who would

destroy American democracy, and are being permitted day by day, month by month, and year by year, to eat the very marrow from the backbone, and the sinews from the body of our beloved democracy, wrought by the blood and brains of those patriots who formed the cradle of American liberty in our Nation's child hour, and who, through their strong characters and noble hearts, planted the seed that grew into the most beloved land ever occupied by a peace-loving people. Their spirits must stand trembling behind the golden gates today when they see the foundation rock of American life gradually converted into crumbling sand by the avowed enemies of our form of government, led by John L. Lewis, who for years has been given the green light. May the God who gave us this great land now give us courage and wisdom with which to save it and the rights of its people.

Pius L. Schwert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this occasion to pay tribute to the memory of my late colleague and good friend the Honorable PIUS L. SCHWERT. His untimely death has brought sorrow to all those who knew him.

PIUS L. SCHWERT took his seat as a Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the Forty-second District of New York on the 3d day of January 1939. He served only a short time in these Halls, but during this period won for himself a place of distinction with his colleagues. His fidelity to his trust and to the commission with which the people of his district had entrusted him caused him to ignore the warnings of his physician to take a rest from the active and exacting work of his office. There is no doubt but that his devotion to his duty hastened his death.

Born and raised in the district which he represented in Congress, PIUS SCHWERT was but 48 years of age at the time he was stricken. He had been actively engaged in the banking business for many years, and served as county clerk in Erie County, N. Y., from 1933 until he was elected to Congress in 1938. He served in the United States Navy as a yeoman and later as an ensign during the World War.

Congressman SCHWERT sought tirelessly to promote the general good. With sympathetic spirit he tried to bring aid to those who came to him in their distress. To guide those who sought his counsel, he explored every available avenue of knowledge. For 20 years I have known him intimately, and I know he met each task of life as a brave soldier meets his duty on the battlefield.

To many of us who sat with him here on the floor of the House in daily session, "PI" SCHWERT was a warm friend as well as a brilliant statesman. He took an interest in the problems of the unemployed and served as an active member of the unofficial committee of the House formed to study this important subject. He was concerned about the needy aged and often discussed with me the need for additional legislation to provide for this group. His heart cried out for all those who had met adversity. He learned to know his constituents and to understand their psychology. He made it his business to learn their problems and to share them.

He enjoyed the good will and the close friendship of the postal employees of the country for his untiring efforts in their behalf. As a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads he was always interested in the affairs of the Post Office Department and the postal workers throughout the State and the Nation looked to him for leadership. He never let them down.

PIUS SCHWERT will be remembered, too, by many thousands of baseball fans who knew him as a big-league ball player in the days of his youth. He loved to attend the games held here in Washington, and although he could not often find the time he did plan each year to appear at the ball park for the opening game. He was interested in the youth of the Nation and in outdoor activities of all kinds. His influence will continue to be felt in many circles and most of all by the youth he has befriended.

"PI" SCHWERT is no longer with us, but his kindliness, his faith, his unfailing friendship, will always be remembered. We will remember him as a plain, simple man with fine ideals and a rare courtesy. And as one who always looked upon his fellow man with tolerance and affectionate regard.

We mourn with his beloved widow and tender to her our deep sympathy.

Newspapers and Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN BOLLES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

STATEMENT BY A GROUP OF NEWSPAPER REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement issued by a group of newspaper executives representing national, regional, and State associations at a meeting held in New York at the call of the directors of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, as follows:

1. That the newspapers recognize their primary obligation to further national defense in every possible manner.

2. That the newspapers also recognize their essential duty to furnish complete and accurate information compatible with military necessities.

3. That the newspapers in the performance of these obligations bespeak the cordial consideration and cooperation of Federal and State authorities concerned with national defense.

Those present:

American Newspaper Publishers Association: Walter M. Dear, David W. Howe, Linwood I. Noyes.

American Society of Newspaper Editors: M. V. Atwood, N. R. Howard.

National Editorial Association: R. B. Howard, Howard Palmer.

Inland Daily Press Association: Clinton F. Karstaedt.

New England Daily Newspaper Association: Wm. Dwight, Frank E. Phillips.

Pacific Northwest Newspaper Association: Don J. Sterling.

Southern Newspaper Publishers Association: Enoch Brown, Jr., George C Biggers.

New Jersey Press Association: Hugh N. Boyd.

New York State Publishers Association: Henry M. James, James E. Stiles.

Ohio Newspaper Association: Roy D. Moore.

Pennsylvania Newspaper Publishers Association: John E. Person, Wm. N. Hardy.

Opposition to St. Lawrence Seaway Project Exposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, friends of the St. Lawrence seaway project have taken too much for granted. They have repeatedly been advised that the opposition in Congress to the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway project has been both powerful and active. Every selfish interest which puts its own advantage ahead of the public welfare has been tireless for weeks in devising ways and means to prevent ratification by Congress of the agreement between the United States and Canada. The method of operation is effectively described by Mr. Alfred D. Stedman, prominent Washington newspaperman. In his column in the St. Paul Pioneer Press for Tuesday, April 1, he describes the fight against the seaway as follows:

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press of April 1, 1941]

GIANT LOBBY SET UP TO FIGHT SEAWAY—POWERFUL OPPOSITION ENDANGERS PROJECT, BACKERS REPORT

(By Alfred D. Stedman, Pioneer Press staff writer)

WASHINGTON.—One of the greatest legislative organizations ever formed has been set

up by eastern railroad, shipping, harbor, and financial interests to fight enactment of St. Lawrence seaway legislation, which is scheduled to be recommended to Congress by President Roosevelt in a few days.

Described as a giant lobby by backers of the St. Lawrence waterway, the organization calling itself the National St. Lawrence Project Conference has set up offices in Washington and has launched an attack on the project among Members of Congress. According to its officers, it is growing every day.

The Association of American Railroads, the New York State Chamber of Commerce, New England harbor interests, lake carriers, eastern coal interests, and more than fourscore other commercial organizations having a direct competitive interest in blocking the waterway are affiliates of the organization. They are largely centered in the East, but a smattering are included from the Midwest and South.

Federal officials supporting the seaway said Monday that the fight against the St. Lawrence project will be even more terrific than those waged by the utilities against the Tennessee Valley project, Boulder Dam, or Grand Coulee Dam.

While the administration hopes to win, the result in the face of the opposition of such a powerful aggregation of hostile interests is in doubt, officials admitted.

OFFICES OPENED

The anti-St. Lawrence conference is headed by Frank S. Davis, manager of the Maritime Association of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, as chairman.

The Washington offices were opened at 808 Seventeenth Street, in charge of Thomas J. McGrath, Washington attorney formerly of St. Paul, member of the Minnesota House of Representatives for three terms and later counsel for the railway trainmen.

While proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway allege that the opposition organization is also backed by the electrical utilities, which have fought all the other great regional power projects sponsored by the New Deal, its officers deny any hydroelectric support. The organization has a board of directors of 20 men, but their names have not been announced.

While efforts are being made in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and other States to revive the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Association, which for years conducted a vigorous fight for the seaway project, Congress is being circularized with literature that sets forth the disadvantages of the project to those interests which would be competitively affected by affording Minnesota and other interior States a direct water transportation link with the ocean.

FACILITIES NEEDED

The facilities of the 22 active shipyard firms and 22 inactive shipyards on the Great Lakes would have been fully available to build naval craft now if the seaway treaty had been ratified instead of being defeated in 1934 under pressure from the same interests.

If the seaway is completed, all but the biggest liners, all freighters, and every warship up to and including the new battle cruisers of about 25,000 tons can be constructed on the Great Lakes and be floated to the ocean.

The Great Lakes shipyards facilities are so desperately needed by the Government now that 10 large submarines are being built at Manitowoc, Wis., and, with great expenditure of time and money, will be floated practically dismantled through the Chicago drainage canal, down the Illinois River and to the Gulf of Mexico.

With the war becoming a battle of ships, the 1934 defeat of the seaway treaty depriving the Government of anything like full use of Great Lakes shipbuilding facilities may already have jeopardized the national safety, administration spokesmen say.

The present fight against the seaway legislation is being waged on the ground that it cannot be completed in time to help the national-defense program.

CHARGES DENIED

Administration spokesmen contend that, with completion possible within 3 years, almost half of the defense program will remain to be completed after that. Moreover, they assert construction of warships could be started at once, and the seaway could be completed by the time the ships are ready to float to sea.

Charges by seaway foes that the project would divert men and materials needed for defense were categorically denied Monday by Adolf A. Berle, Assistant Secretary of State.

Berle said there is no shortage of the materials required and there is an abundance of the type of labor needed.

Midwest organizations joining with eastern interests to fight the seaway include the Mississippi Valley Association, and the American National Livestock Association whose leader, C. J. Abbot of Hyannis, Nebr., is vice chairman of the antiseaway organization.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the foregoing newspaper item, there also appears in the Pioneer Press a story which lists the various organizations that are reported to be in opposition to ratification of the agreement between the United States and Canada. This list is as follows:

LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSED TO SEAWAY

WASHINGTON.—The following organizations, representative of business, transportation, shipping, and production, are among the members of the National St. Lawrence Project Conference, which is fighting legislation for the St. Lawrence seaway:

Allegheny Regional Advisory Board, Akron Chamber of Commerce, Altoona (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce, American Mining Congress, American National Livestock Association, American Shortline Railroad Association, Anthracite Institute, Association of American Railroads, Atlantic States Shippers Advisory Board, Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association, Aurora (Ill.) Chamber of Commerce, Beaver Falls (Pa.) Board of Trade, Bluefield (W. Va.) Chamber of Commerce, Borough of Queens Chamber of Commerce, Boston Chamber of Commerce, Boston Grain and Flour Exchange, Bridgeport (Conn.) Chamber of Commerce, Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, Bronx Chamber of Commerce, Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, Butler (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce, Charlotte (N. C.) Chamber of Commerce, Chelsea (Mass.) Chamber of Commerce, Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, Central Mercantile Association of New York, Dayton Chamber of Commerce, Elmira (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, Gloucester (Mass.) Chamber of Commerce, Hampton Roads Maritime Exchange, Illinois Chamber of Commerce, Inland Water Petroleum Carriers' Association, International Longshoremen's Association, Johnstown (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce, Lake Carriers' Association, Lima (Ohio) Chamber of Commerce, Lockport (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, Long Island Association, Maritime Association of the Port of New York, Maritime Association of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, Merchants Association of New York, Merchants' and Manufacturers' Traffic Bureau of Muskogee (Okla.)

Merchant Truckmen's Bureau of New York; Mississippi Valley Association; New Bedford (Mass.) Board of Commerce; New England Shippers Advisory Board; New England Coal Dealers Association; National Association of Shippers Advisory Board; National Coal Association; National Conference of Investors; New Orleans Association of Commerce; New York Board of Trade; New York and New Jersey Sandy Hook Pilots Association; New York Produce Exchange; New York State Waterways Association; New York State Chamber of Commerce; Niagara Frontier Planning Board; Norfolk Association of Commerce; Norfolk Port-Traffic Commission; Ohio Coal Association; Ohio Chamber of Commerce; Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce; Philadelphia Board of Trade; Philadelphia Bourse; Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce; Port of Newark; Port of Portland Authority (Maine); Propeller Club of U. S. Port of Boston; Propeller Club of Cleveland; Propeller Club of Portland (Maine); Propeller Club of St. Louis; Propeller Club of Wilmington (N. C.); Providence Chamber of Commerce; Rochester (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce; Sapulpa (Okla.) Chamber of Commerce; Seacoast Regional Development Association of Portsmouth (N. H.); Shippers Conference of Greater New York; Southern States Industrial Council; State Port Authority of Virginia; Suffolk (Va.) Chamber of Commerce; Syracuse Chamber of Commerce; Transportation Association of America; Virginia Peninsula Association of Commerce; Warehousemen's Association of the Port of New York; West Side Association of Commerce of New York; Wilmington (N. C.) Port Traffic Association.

Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been greatly interested in the activities of the Boy Scouts of America. This organization has proven so wholesome and so constructive that it has become an integral feature in the boy life of America.

Emerson, in his delightful essay on self reliance, says:

> Every true man is a cause, a country, and an age; requires infinite spaces and numbers and time to accomplish his destiny, and mankind seems to follow in his footsteps like a train of clients. A man, Caesar, is born and for ages after we have the Roman Empire. Christ is born, and millions of minds so grow and cleave to his genius that he is confounded with virtue and the possible of man. An institution is the lengthened shadow of one man.

If Emerson is right, and I firmly believe he is, then the Boy Scout organization of America is the lengthened shadow of William D. Boyce, just the same as the Boy Scout organization of the world is the lengthened shadow of Robert Stephenson Smyth Baden-Powell. Lord Baden-Powell was born in England February 22, 1857, and from his earliest childhood loved the woods and the out-of-doors. During his school days he practiced many of the arts of scouting, and began to inculcate in the minds of others around him his love of nature.

When Lord Baden-Powell died on January 8, 1941, at the age of 83, universal sorrow was manifested throughout the

world of Scoutdom. President Head and Dr. West, president and Chief Scout Executive of the Boy Scouts of America, sent the following cable on January 8 to John Skinner Wilson, director of the Boy Scouts International Bureau in London:

The Boy Scouts of America, on behalf of the more than 9,000,000 present and former members, expresses grief in the passing of Lord Baden-Powell. His genius and leadership in the creation of the British Boy Scouts Association served as the foundation for the development and spreading of Scouting throughout the world. His many visits to America as well as his inspiring messages at our various conferences and jamborees and in our regular scouting publications have contributed vitally to the development and extension of the effectiveness of scouting here in America. We join with brother Scouts through the world in paying tribute and acknowledging our gratitude to this great world leader, who since the organization of International Scouting has been recognized as the Chief Scout of the world.

When William D. Boyce, Chicago publisher and big-game hunter, was in London many years ago, an English Scout said to Mr. Boyce:

May I be of service to you, sir?

Those words uttered by that English Scout really marked the first step in the development of the Boy Scouts of America, because on his return to America, William D. Boyce immediately took necessary steps to legally incorporate the Boy Scouts of America.

It was my privilege on the 15th day of March to have the pleasure of addressing the 6th Annual John Philip Sousa Memorial Service, held in Washington, D. C. Among the relatives of John Philip Sousa who were present at the service, were Mrs. Hamilton Abert, daughter, of Port Washington, Long Island, and Osmond Varela, a nephew, of Washington, D. C. Senator ARTHUR CAPPER of Kansas, a friend of John Philip Sousa, and who introduced in the Senate a bill providing for the construction of the Sousa Memorial Bridge, and also the naming of the bridge, was present. Troop No. 10, of Washington, D. C., with their Scoutmaster, L. L. Sherfey, had charge of the service.

This memorial service originated with Lawrence J. Bach, who is the real founder of the Sousa Scout Memorial Service, the first of its kind ever to be held in the National Capital. Mr. Bach first became acquainted with John Philip Sousa at the time Mr. Sousa presented to Boy Scout Troop No. 2, Detroit, Mich., a troop flag. This presentation made such an impression upon the mind of Mr. Bach that he formulated the plans for an annual observance of John Philip Sousa's death.

It is very fitting that the Boy Scouts should pay tribute to the internationally known bandmaster, composer, and musician. Just as long as America continues to exist as a free country, just that long will we always be thrilled by his famous march Stars and Stripes Forever. The Boy Scouts of America are doing a wonderful work in building up the physical, mental, and moral qualities in boyhood. They are also doing a wonderful good when they establish memorials to great Americans, such as that established for John Philip Sousa.

The U. S. S. "Washington"—New Battleship Named After the State of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

LETTER FROM REAR ADMIRAL S. M. ROBINSON, UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I recently received several inquiries from public-school officials in my district in regard to the new battleship *Washington* named after our State, and which is to be commissioned for service in the near future. Our people take a justifiable pride in the fact that this new vessel named after our State will share the honors as our newest and largest battleship at present with the United States Fleet, the equal of any in the world.

By unanimous consent of my colleagues, I desire to place in the RECORD at this point a communication which I received from Rear Admiral S. M. Robinson, United States Navy, dated March 20, 1941, which sets forth authentic factual information in regard to the U. S. S. *Washington*, and which is as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF SHIPS,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 20, 1941.*

Hon. MARTIN F. SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SMITH: In reply to your letter of March 14, 1941, in regard to the battleship *Washington*, the following information is furnished:

The U. S. S. *Washington* was named after the State of Washington and is the sixth ship of the Navy by that name. The last Washington was also a battleship, never completed, which was destroyed in accordance with the terms of the disarmament conference.

The present vessel was launched on June 1, 1940, at the Philadelphia Navy Yard, at which time she was christened U. S. S. *Washington* by Miss Virginia Marshall, a descendant of former Chief Justice Marshall. The ceremony to which you refer is the commissioning at Philadelphia, now scheduled for May 15, 1941, at which time the crew will take her over. Her present final date of completion is July 30, 1941.

Her dimensions are about 729 feet in length with a beam of about 108 feet and, with the U. S. S. *North Carolina* completing about the same time, she will share the honors as our newest and largest battleships at present with the fleet. These ships compare with H. M. S. *King George V*, recently in this country from England. She is classed as a 35,000-ton vessel.

The date of her contract is given as August 1, 1937, and her keel was laid on June 14, 1938. Her contract price for hull and machinery was about $60,000,000. She will be a powerful addition to our fleet.

Trusting that the above information will properly answer your query, I am

Sincerely yours,

S. M. ROBINSON,
Chief of Bureau.

Convoys—The Indirect Route To Direct War!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I introduced in this House, House Joint Resolution 155, to prohibit the use of ships in the United States Navy or of merchant ships in American registry from being used for convoy purposes to belligerant nations. My reason for introducing this legislation is that it is the universal opinion of all high authority on the subject from the President on down that convoys mean war and on the fateful subject of peace or war the American people and this Congress have the right and the duty to speak in simple, direct manner without resorting to subterfuge of any kind. I hope it can never be said of the United States that its people were one time led to war because neither they nor the people representing them knew what they were doing or had ever had the opportunity for a clear-cut decision on the most important question which any nation can decide. I hope the Hitlerian concept of one-man government has not secured such a firm hold on our Republic that here, too, as in the case of dictatorial countries the peoples' desires are discounted or ignored and the "yours but to do or die" order becomes their cold comfort as individual citizens of a sovereign country.

If we are to avert the double tragedy of war and denial of expression of the popular will in government in the United States it is necessary that public issues be discussed with honest candor and that the Government not be committed to actions which result in something far different from the motives indicated when the actions are inaugurated. It is in this attitude of complete candor and supreme sincerity which we should approach the decision of whether or not to commit this Government to a policy of convoying supply ships to belligerent nations or into war zones where hazard to American life and property would inevitably be enhanced.

ROOSEVELT SAYS "CONVOYS MEAN WAR"

Washington is rife with rumors these days that the President is scheming to promulgate a program of using convoys despite the desire of the country and the Congress to keep out of the war. These rumors would have it—and many of the rumors are undoubtedly instigated by members of the war crowd with whom "the wish is father to the thought"—that President Roosevelt does not plan to come to Congress for the necessary legislative authority to put this country into war by the convoy route, but that he intends to defy public opinion and legislative authority and first involve us in war by using convoys and then demand that Congress legalize the fait accompli.

Personally, Mr. Speaker, I doubt the authenticity of these rumors. I cannot believe that the President has reached the stage where he would usurp the war-making power of Congress completely by making certain our involvement through using the convoy method of thrusting America into a war which its people and its Congress do not want. This would seem especially true since he himself has said, "Convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war."

Thus the President, above all others, knows that if he should order convoys, he would be taking unto himself the specific responsibility for violating his many, many public pledges to keep America out of war, and he would be doing so in the deliberate knowledge that by his own words he has stated that convoys are tantamount to actual, active war. As for me, I refuse to believe that President Roosevelt would so flagrantly betray his public trust and so brazenly repudiate his own specific promises as to do by indirection that which he and his party have repeatedly pledged they would not do by direction; that is, to put America into this war either by the convoy route or some more circuitous method.

The war-making power remains with Congress, and with Congress, therefore, remains the decisions concerning steps which might subject us to attack or compel us to attack others and either alternative means outright, shooting war. Any American President who would use his office to put this country into war by executive action would rival the methods of Hitler and Mussolini and would reduce our constitutional governmental functions to the status of a hideous mockery and a hypocritical sham on the European level.

THOSE WHO SAY "WE ARE ALREADY IN" EITHER DECEIVE THEMSELVES OR ARE ONE WITH THOSE WHO WOULD DECEIVE THE PEOPLE

Mr. Speaker, strangely enough most of those who now advocate the use of convoys are the same people who are shouting "We are already in the war," and thus they would justify additional steps toward war by telling the public that we have gone so far down the road to war that our actual involvement in the fighting is now inevitable. This cunning camaraderie between those who would now start using convoys, those who have urged all preliminary steps leading from strict neutrality to near belligerency, and those who now reiterate "We are already in," is not hard to understand. You can call the roll of one group and find therein the same individuals, the same organizations, the same interventionists as you find in the other two with the sole exception that here and there an "innocent at home" among those who oppose war has been deceived by propagandists into repeating in gullible naïveté the fatalistic fiction "We are already in." A moment's reflection convinces all who think that as General Hammond recently said in his brusque military manner, "There is a hell of a lot of difference between where we are and where we would be if we were actually in a shooting war."

THE WAR CROWD KNOWS THAT WE ARE NOT "ALREADY IN"

While here and there a well-intended opponent of war may carelessly mouth the defeatist doctrine of the disciples of the God of Mars who would "fifth-column" us into war by dulling the senses of America as to its fearful consequences through conditioning it with the phrase "we are already in," a sober second judgment shows the error of such easy generalization. No Americans are being shot, or gassed, or bombed, or captured. No American ships are being sunk, no sailors are being drowned, no cities are being bombed, no transport ships are leaving our harbors with cargoes bound on the one-way voyage to death. No American armed forces are throwing shot or pitching shells into the vitals of opposing armies of human beings. No new generation of Gold Star American mothers are being created as sad memories take the place of pleasant associations with their loved ones and the sorry sequel of innumerable families of widows and orphans is not now being written in the columns of our daily press. No, Mr. Speaker, we are not in the war.

America is not in the war today, and America will not be in the war until we either attack some belligerent or are ourselves attacked. We ourselves hold the future of this country in our own hands insofar as its peace or war is concerned. If we prepare and preserve our own defenses we will not be attacked unless we deliberately send forth our nationals to points where attack becomes inevitable as would be the case with convoys. As for attacking others first, our whole American history is repugnant to the idea that we should provoke a war upon ourselves by moving into the orgy of our own devices as a moth flies hopelessly into the flame. So America is at peace. And while a nation is at peace is the proper time to weigh the costs of war and to evaluate the responsibilities and advantages of peace. On this subject America has spoken many times through letters to the editors, by letters to Congress and the White House, by every poll taken by every fact-finding agency which takes them—from 80 to 90 percent of our people persistently, patriotically, and purposefully register themselves for keeping out of war. It would be a unique and weird popular government of self-determining destiny, indeed, which would thumb its nose at a majority viewpoint like this and push itself into a war which the people so overwhelmingly oppose.

Mr. Speaker, if here and there some ready-speaking fellow gives circulation to the lie that "we are already in the war," let me point out that those who would really have us in the fighting know what less purposeful men may sometimes forget—they know that we are not in the war. While they seek to condition America to the horror of war by assuring it that war has already come, with the hope that the final, fatal step from actual peace to active war might in that way be more easily taken and more quickly made, since its shocking consequences would seem that much less severe, they see very clearly that we still remain at peace, that we are not "in," and so they continue to crusade for further steps to take us past the breaking point. Unwilling to oppose head-on the vast majority in the country and the Congress who oppose war, they choose the less honest method of urging the use of convoys, the sending of pilots, the repetition of incident-producing acts, the accumulation of provocative steps until, at last, they know that either we shall be attacked or we shall attack somebody, and then, and only then, will their crusade be ended and will America be really in another foreign war which for a quarter of a century it has vowed and protested would never be its state again. And so the torrents of propaganda flow on, and, first by one act and then by another, those who would have us in the war suggest indirect methods for putting us where the people have resolved we shall never again go by our own direction. It is to the eternal credit of the common people of America that they have thus far withstood the greatest campaign of propaganda ever devised to put a peaceful people in a fighting war. If this stamina to hold out against the siren calls of highly financed propaganda continues and America averts the calamity of war, historians will point to 1941 as the year when America became of age and finally showed the world that government of, by, and for the people can be depended upon to sustain and exert itself against an avalanche of prejudicial propaganda, and that here, at least, democracy has proved its claim of being the supreme goal in the art of government. Will America meet this test? The next 90 days may provide the answer, and the decision with regard to convoys may provide the acid test.

CONVOYS NOT NECESSARY FOR MATERIAL AID

It should be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that aid to Britain is in conformity with our prevailing national policy of providing her and her associates material aid in the gallant fight which is being waged against the dictatorial forces. Such material aid—unless it is proposed to send American boys in another expeditionary force—can be provided in a legal way under existing law and in a manner to avoid our involvement in the war; it can be provided by the simple, legal expedient of transferring to British, or

Greek, or Chinese registry such ships as we can spare—merchant ships or fighting units—and permitting these vessels to convoy or convey materials to belligerent harbors and through blockaded waters. Thus, ship for ship, and fighting unit for fighting unit, America can aid as much by the system of transferring to foreign registry the available bottoms for foreign service which we have as America can aid if we were to man such ships with our own men, sail them under our own flag, and thus throw ourselves voluntarily into the most devastating war of history. I say, Mr. Speaker, we can get our products from our harbors to foreign harbors as readily by one policy as the other unless, of course—and here is the crux of the whole problem—unless we propose to go to war. Unless we propose again to send our American boys to foreign graves and to accompany our convoys with transports of troops, one method of using American ships is as helpful to Britain as the other. It is only those who would take America into war by the trickery of proposing convoys rather than the candid, courageous method of asking for a yes or no vote on a declaration of war, who insist on convoys with American men instead of conveying our available ships by transfer to our foreign friends. The difference between these two programs is the total all-out difference between war and peace. It is the difference between going to war and remaining at peace. It is the difference between sending men which even Churchill recently stated "We do not need, and we shall not request," and the matter of following our adopted policy of supplying materials.

THE REAL QUESTION

Yes, Mr. Speaker, when America answers the question and I repeat, sir, it is a question for the people and the Congress of America to answer and not one for the President to solve by a solution dictated from the White House, when America answers the question of whether or not to convoy, I say, America answers the question of whether or not to send its sons to die on foreign battlefields. It answers the question, too, of whether to send transports of troops to Europe as I can think of no more cowardly or dishonest Government action than that which would single out a few American sailors to sacrifice on convoys in belligerent waters unless and until this country is ready to place the full force of its armed might to keep them from becoming senseless and useless sacrifices in the watery wastes of ocean waters. If we were at war, we would convoy our ships to protect our sailors and soldiers—I simply cannot understand the selfish complacency of groups and individuals who urge a Nation at peace to send convoys when it knows that in so doing it is sending innocent and dutiful sailors and marines to sacrifice their lives in support of a program which is not war and which would not be peace. America will never countenance such a ghastly misuse of the sovereign power of government and that is why every man who thinks knows in his heart and—if he is candid with himself and his associates—voices from his lips the simple fact that convoys mean war. I repeat, that must be why the President pointed out so vividly the glaring truth when he stated, "convoying means shooting, and shooting means war." And that is why those advocating convoys should in simple honesty and honest candor tell America that in so doing they are advocating that America go to the war. Then we would have a clear-cut issue which all could understand and which Americans through their congressional Representatives are ready and able to decide.

STATEMENTS OF AUTHORITATIVE AMERICANS ON THE SUBJECT OF AMERICAN CONVOYS

Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House I now insert in the RECORD some illuminating statements by well-informed Americans on the important subject of convoys. Before listing individual comments, I shall enclose herewith the official news release prepared by a committee headed by Senator TAFT, of Ohio, reporting a meeting held last Tuesday night and attended by 14 Senators and 56 Members of the House. This meeting met for the sole purpose of considering the best methods for keeping America out of war and since the pressure of other news kept this full statement from appearing in some newspapers I think America will be interested in reading this news story. May I add that further meetings are planned by this group and many others who sent regrets that they could not attend the caucus Tuesday night—the fight to preserve the peace of America and to vindicate the statements of the two major political parties to keep America out of war will go on. It is hoped that all America will awaken to the challenge of the hour and that citizens will urge their Senators and Representatives to attend these no-war, no-convoy meetings, and to support in the Senate and the House the no-convoy bills which have been introduced by Senator TOBEY, by Congressman CURTIS, by your sepaker, and by several others at both ends of the Capitol. I now call your attention to the following official report of the meeting last Tuesday night.

[Press release—Morning papers, April 2, 1941]

Seventy Senators and Congressmen opposed to the involvement of the United States in foreign war met this evening in the Senate caucus room to consider methods of making impossible the use of convoys. Speakers emphasized the statement of President Roosevelt that "convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war." The meeting was bipartisan. All major political parties are pledged to keep America out of foreign wars. Since only Congress can declare war, Congressmen said they do not intend that the President shall involve the country in war indirectly through convoys or otherwise. Various groups are now advocating that the President send to Congress a bill authorizing convoys, but the meeting determined to raise the issue at once by pressing the affirmative resolution of Senator TOBEY and other resolutions introduced in the House which prohibit convoys. The meeting determined that in spite of the defeatist propaganda being promoted that war is now inevitable, those present would press the fight against any active involvement in war which would take American boys to foreign battlefields. Senator WHEELER, of Montana, who presided at the meeting, said, "I appeal to the overwhelming majority in America who are for keeping out of war to make their demands known in Washington, both in Congress and the White House."

Mr. Speaker, the following authoritative statements on the subject of convoys are particularly significant at this crucial time.

The first statement is from William Allen White's now famous letter of December 23, 1940, to Roy Howard. Mr. White, as you recall, was national chairman of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies until its policy became so belligerent and veered so close to war that he could no longer serve it conscientiously, so he resigned the position.

William Allen White:

The story floating around that I and our committee are in favor of sending convoys with British ships or our own ships is a silly thing, for convoys, unless you shoot, are confetti and it's not time to shoot now or ever.

Still one more charge: It is not true even remotely that we favor repealing that portion of the Neutrality Act which forbids American ships to carry contraband of war into the war zone. That would be leading us to war and our organization and I, personally, are deeply opposed to it.

The next statement comes from Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, whose rigid respect for honest statement compelled him to make the following statement which is found on page 1892 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 6, 1941:

Senator GEORGE. As plainly as I can, I have always stood against convoying vessels by the American Fleet, and will stand against convoying vessels by any unit of the American Fleet until and unless the point shall have come when I shall be willing to vote for war, because, in my judgment, convoying would lead us into actual war.

Not directly on the point of convoys, but since convoys is virtually but a bisyllabic manner of stating war itself, the following quotation from an editorial in the Saturday Evening Post is thought-provoking:

MANDATE FOR WAR FROM THE PEOPLE?

How the people would have voted on the question of taking over war on three continents had it been put to them will never be known. The question was not put to them. We know what the people did vote for. They voted for a President who stood upon his platform saying, "We shall not participate in foreign wars."

Mr. Speaker, these citations of authority could be piled one upon another almost endlessly but I shall add only one more to the list. The really eloquent thing about this matter is the fact that not a single creditable authority of any weight is willing to argue the point and to uphold the view that convoys will not lead to war. Thus the issue is drawn clear. Sending convoys means sending the American ship of state into the bloody oceans of Europe's endless wars.

Congress has already expressed itself in disapproval of convoys so that if he seeks the advice of Congress on this subject, the President already has it. When the lend-lease bill was being debated, some Members feared there might be read into

it some right or power to convoy ships under one or another of its highly comprehensive clauses. For that reason, both Houses adopted an amendment definitely registering their disapproval of the use of American convoys and specifically exempting such authority from any powers conveyed in the bill. I quote the exact language of section 3, subsections (c) and (d) of the Lend Lease Act.

In section 3, subsection (c) of the lend-lease bill, is the following language:

(c) Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize or to permit the authorization of the entry of any American vessel into a combat area in violation of section 3 of the Neutrality Act of 1939.

Section 3, subsection (d), contains this language:

(d) Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize or to permit the authorization of convoying vessels by naval vessels of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, fellow Americans, I hope that my resolution specifically prohibiting convoys or some similar legislation will soon be enacted into law. I am sure it speaks the great voice of America. I am certain it is the candid thing to do. Tomorrow the House starts a 10-day recess. As one of those who opposed this recess and voted against taking it at this time, let me say in closing that one reason for my opposition was the fact I felt some action should be taken without delay to prohibit convoys by legislative mandate and also, I might add, because I felt Congress should stay on the job and help iron out the delay being caused to our national-defense program by the unfortunate labor difficulties which are presently plaguing the country.

I am 100 percent for national preparedness and I want it to proceed full speed ahead, but I am equally firm in my opposition to utilizing American convoys as the diabolic device for plunging this country from where it is, squarely into a shooting war in Europe, Asia, and Africa.

Cultural Relations, Our Ideals and Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, among the major accomplishments of this administration in the field of foreign policy has been the constant improvement and strengthening of the relations of the United States with the 20 other American republics to the south of us. During the first few years of what has come to be felicitously termed the "good-neighbor policy," the emphasis was primarily upon removing from our political relations with certain of these republics some of the conditions which have been sources of friction in the past. More recently the attention, both of the Government and of the public in general, has been directed toward the desirability of broadening the basis of mutual understanding and sympathy through approaches along certain nonpolitical lines. I refer particularly to the matter of cultural relations, and to the undertaking in conjunction with the other American republics of certain cooperative projects.

In the summer of 1938 the Department of State, responsive to growing demands, established a Division of Cultural Relations for the purpose of taking charge of the official activities of the Department in this direction. These activities are directed in part at assisting and advising the private initiative in this field. There has been a tremendous growth of interest, particularly in the past few years, on the part of institutions and individuals in this country in making contact with similar institutions and individuals in the other American republics. The Division of Cultural Relations has endeavored to guide and direct such activities into the most fruitful channels.

The Division of Cultural Relations has also engaged upon a certain number of activities of its own. Distinguished intellectual leaders have been brought from the other American republics to the United States for the purpose of meeting with and consulting with officials of this Government and private individuals and institutions. Similarly, some of our own leaders have been able to make extensive and highly valuable visits to the south. The exchange of students and professors is growing from year to year, with the result that there is a steadily increasing group both in the United States and in the other American republics having detailed knowledge of and appreciation for the cultural life of the continent as a whole.

The Division of Cultural Relations has promoted an exchange of educational motion pictures and is endeavoring to stimulate the production for exhibition in the other American republics the type of motion pictures that will accurately picture the life of Americans and its ideals. The cooperation of American companies engaged in radio broadcasting has been enlisted and progress has been made toward the development of radio programs which will not only be of interest to the people of the other American republics but which will bring to the masses of these people an understanding of the American way of life and of our genuine feeling of friendliness toward them.

The Division of Cultural Relations has also endeavored to promote the establishment of more and more generous scholarships and fellowships by our private institutions. Gratifying results have been obtained in this direction. Progress has also been made in encouraging greater attention to the study of Spanish and Portuguese which are the languages used in the other American republics. It is possible to report that the study of English has been at the same time intensified in the other American republics. In many of our universities and colleges special institutes and summer schools have been held devoted to subjects of inter-American interest.

At about the same time the Division of Cultural Relations was established, that is to say in the summer of 1938, there was established at the initiative of the President, the Interdepartmental Committee on Cooperation With the American Republics. This is a body upon which some 17 or 18 United States Government agencies are represented. Its obvious objective, as its name indicates, is to examine the subject of cooperation with our neighbors and to work out a definitive program of projects which is then submitted to Congress with requests for the necessary appropriations.

These projects cover a range of mutual interests carefully selected from this Government's broad range of activities and facilities, and the Congress has implemented the work of the interdepartmental committee by the passage of legislation which authorizes the detail of officials of this Government to assist the governments of the other American republics when requests for such assistance may be received, and also to authorize appropriations to make use of the facilities of the different services of this Government whenever it appears that by so doing substantial and welcome assistance can be rendered to any of our sister American republics to the south.

The projects now submitted for your approval cover the same general fields of economic, scientific, and cultural endeavor as those which are already being carried forward successfully on the basis of appropriations granted for the present fiscal year. Included in this program are fellowships for public-health experts, surveys of strategic minerals, studies for the conservation of flora and fauna, tidal investigations, cooperation in the fields of maternal and child health, and the social and economic welfare of working women, and a number of others having similar objectives.

Generally speaking, the majority of these projects will, if approved, mean that to a greater or lesser degree officials of our Government will be working in close collaboration with officials of the governments of the other American republics in fields of mutual interest. The projects themselves will lead to specific advantages, but I would like to stress at this moment my own belief in the long- and short-range value which this personal association has for the cause of international understanding. Our whole experience over the past 8 years, during which time numerous inter-American conferences have been held, leads to the conviction that particularly in the case of the countries with which we are now concerned, personal friendship and sympathy based upon first-hand knowledge is invaluable.

And in leaving this phase of the program may I add that the projects and undertakings that have been approved and for which funds are recommended in each instance involve a mutuality of interest between this country and the other American republics and that the amounts recommended have been restricted to those amounts which are not

only modest, but which experience has shown may be successfully and effectively employed under present circumstances. We probably all agree that many of these steps should have been taken years ago, but we are not allowing this to tempt us into an overzealous and hastily conceived plan. On the contrary, we are undertaking only what can be done well and with due regard to the viewpoint and the wishes of the people of the other American republics.

The time is past when there is any further controversy with regard to the correctness of the so-called good-neighbor policy. It may now be regarded as a permanent and accepted policy of this Government. Not only is this true, but there is a general realization throughout this country that the time has come when this policy must be developed in a concrete rather than in an abstract form. The activities for which funds are recommended for the Division of Cultural Relations and for the cooperative projects which I have described, represent a truly American approach to the carrying out of this policy. They are in keeping with all the ideals and practices of this Government. I mean by this that we are offering to the American republics, not a program based upon propaganda for the purely selfish interests of the United States, but a program which is adapted to the needs of solidarity in this hemisphere based on mutual respect and mutual helpfulness in the light of our respective resources and facilities.

Jackson Day Dinner Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 4, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. THEODORE G. BILBO, OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask upnanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by me at the Jackson Day Dinner at Minneapolis, Minn., on the 29th of March.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies and gentlemen, fellow Democrats, fellow Americans, it is a grand and glorious privilege to be here with you tonight as we celebrate another Democratic victory, an epochal victory, the greatest victory any political party has ever had occasion to celebrate. I most heartily join you in this victory-day dinner and in the deferred observance of another Jackson Day anniversary to pay homage to the memory of Andrew Jackson, the invincible Old Hickory, who translated into reality the Democratic Party conceived by Thomas Jefferson, the Sage of Monticello.

I was very happy when I received your invitation to participate with you tonight. I have always held a deep and abiding admiration for your section of our country. That feeling of esteem was enhanced when I made a series of speeches in the Northwest for the Democratic Party during the recent Presidential campaign. The close association enjoyed with the splendid people of this region gave me a marvelous opportunity to know more about your people, and it was pleasant. I regretted that my itinerary did not bring me into this immediate vicinity; so I am delighted to be one with you tonight as the stalwarts of Minnesota Democrats assemble for your annual round-up in commemoration of Democratic ideals.

As a Mississippi Democrat, from the land of the deep South, where not to be a Democrat is to be ashamed of yourself, I bring warm greetings to Minnesota, land of beautiful lakes and rivers; to beautiful Minnesota, the always bright and shining star of the North. I am inspired by the beauty of your country and the progressiveness of your citizens. My heart is warmed by the gracious hospitality accorded me here in Minneapolis, where "the Falls of Minnehaha flash and gleam among the oak trees, laugh, and leap into the valley."

As a son of the deep South, where my people have lived through many generations, I was made very happy to be your invited guest tonight. Your invitation had a profound and significant meaning to me—to me it is proof conclusive that in the minds and hearts of the good people of the North there no longer lingers any feeling, resentment, or prejudice against my people of the South on account of the unpleasant and ever-to-be-regretted differences of the years long ago. It is sincere proof to me that since the sons of the Blue and the sons of the Gray in the War of 1898 and the World War fought side by side in the defense of Old Glory and our common country that the commingling of their blood on many a battlefield has cemented us into one great brotherhood. There is no longer a North, a South, East, or West. Thank God, we are all Americans now, united forever. United we will stand, no matter what the future may hold for our country.

You know there are close ties of common interests binding your State and mine. Both States bear Indian names or alliterative similarity. The pioneers of Mississippi hewed their way through long-leaf yellow-pine forests. Your rugged pioneering fathers carved a civilization out of a white-pine forest. Your white pines and our yellow pines have furnished important industrial enterprises to our respective States. Your wheat and corn farmers have been faced with problems akin to those of Mississippi's cotton farmers. Your farmers, like ours, have participated largely in the New Deal program for the restoration and extension of farm prosperity. A long time ago someone said that if you scratch a Wisconsin farmer you find a Georgia planter. I think we might well paraphrase that axiom a little bit and say that if you strike a Minnesota grain farmer you find a Mississippi cotton farmer. The variety of your products is different from ours, but our problems have always been parallel.

You have your fishing industries and we have our gigantic sea-food industry on our Mississippi Gulf coast, where we can more and better shrimp and oysters than any other seaport on earth.

Then, too, we share the big river which has played a so important role in the history, tradition, and commerce of our States. On the mighty Mississippi, which springs from your Lake Itasca, the State of Mississippi rests her head and bathes her right hand in its turgid waters as the river wends its sinuous way from Lake Itasca to the limpid waters of the Gulf of Mexico, where Mississippi bathes her feet.

Then, again, our respective sections are similar, because yours is also noted for its charming and beautiful women. It may be of interest to you to know that one of Mississippi's Governors traveled 1,500 miles to this region, and after much wooing and persuasion carried one of your wonderful and beautiful girls back and made her the first lady of the State of Mississippi.

Now, it may not be of interest to any of you charming and lovely ladies present, but, strictly confidentially, I am in the market myself, and I want to assure the committee in charge of this banquet that I'm not going to pad my expense account for this trip to Minneapolis, because I am making this visit out here somewhat of an inspection tour for my own personal benefit; being unattached, I'm noting good prospects as I travel along.

But the relation that brings us closer together tonight is the prideful fact that now your State, like mine, helps elect Democratic Presidents. Oh, I realize that Minnesota stayed out of the Democratic fold for 75 years but you, like the thinking people of nearly all the other Republican States, had the wisdom and courage to change your political affiliations when you were convinced beyond every doubt that the G. O. P. was a closed corporation, and that its real manipulators were operating and directing the policies of the Government in the interest of the "favored few." A Government of "equal rights and special privileges to none" must be our great objective and be made a positive and living reality, if this Republic is to survive and to fulfill its mission as announced in the Declaration of Independence, and given form and force in the Constitution ordained by the founding fathers. Do this and we will yet lead all the nations of the earth into the ways of peace, prosperity, and happiness.

I know you are proud of the fact that your State, like mine, helped to accomplish the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt—once, twice, three times, all in a row.

The opposition said that a third term for a President was unthinkable, unprecedented, dangerous. It was something that just shouldn't happen. With forensic frenzy they marched out the ghosts of tradition and quoted history—not well nor wisely—until their throats were dry and their listeners' ears were numb. But while they were quoting history, by the Eternal, as Andy Jackson would have said, we were making history.

Our Republican contemporaries are probably saying all sorts of ugly things about us this very moment, as they do every year when we hold our Jackson Day dinners. They say we get together to crow and that we capitalize on these occasions to raise funds for the Democratic Party. We do not plead guilty to their charges. We rightfully deny that the rooster, as one of our party emblems, is indicative of crowing proclivities on the part of the Democrats. Rather, we say that the rooster symbolizes the chanticleer's clarion call, heralding the daybreak when the Democratic Party became a reality and brought into action a Government not only of the people and for the people but by the people.

It's our business what we pay for our plates at these little table-side gatherings. We pay our party's bills with dollars honestly and openly contributed by Democratic people and not with the big folding money of a few high-powered monopolistic overlords. Besides, it is worth every cent we pay just to be in such good company.

No, my friends, we have not come here to crow but to reaffirm our faith in the democratic way of life fostered by our party and to rededicate ourselves to the perpetuation of these ideals. It is good for our collective soul to get together at least once a year for a revival; for a bit of retrospection and introspection. It is proper for us to assemble for

these annual table-side chats and take stock of our stewardship. It is essential to our vitality, lest we grow lethargic and cease to be vigilant of our responsibilities as a party. Certainly it is desirable as a means of keeping a clearly defined line of cleavage between the parties. Competition is the spice of life in the body politic, no less than in any other phase of life. The people's interests are best served when the compelling force of competition is kept alive. The funmakers say that two major parties are necessary so that one crowd can watch the other crowd and keep each other from stealing everything that isn't nailed down when in power. But that's just in fun, of course. We certainly do not by word or innuendo imply that there is wholesale dishonesty among our opposing party.

Every party should be able to give a reason for its platforms, and every citizen should be able to give a reason for the faith that is in him. Alas, I am afraid that there are far too many who cannot advance their reasons. On this point, I am forcibly reminded of a little incident I beg leave to relate. It centers around the Presidential campaign of last year. It was somewhere in the East—either Maine or Vermont or Connecticut—I'm not just sure. A history teacher was quizzing her pupils on the subject of political parties. She challenged her class with the proposition that she would give to the pupil who could most clearly explain his political faith, the box of luscious plums which she had on her desk. A young Republican arose and declared that he was a Republican because his father was a Republican, his grandfather was a Republican, and his great grandfather had been one. Another chap, a studious, intelligent fellow he was, arose and announced that he was a Democrat because the Democratic Party champions the rights of all the people and seeks to promote equal opportunities for all, and so on. Still a third youngster stood up and wanted to be heard. He had been listening to the proceedings and watching the teacher's reaction. He said he was a Republican. The teacher asked him, "Johnnie, tell me why you are a Republican?" Swift as a flash, rang out Johnnie's answer, "Because, teacher, I want that box of plums."

My friends, that's just the way it is with our Republican brethren. The majority of the Republican leaders are chiefly interested in the plums—the whole box—all the plums. They aren't willing to pass them around. As Democrats, we believe in dividing, so that everybody will have a chance to taste the plums. This explains why the Republicans are so dead, right now, while the Democratic Party is gathering strength with each passing year. The people can't be fooled. They know they are entitled to their share of the plums and that the Democratic Party can be trusted to pass them around.

When Thomas Jefferson enunciated his principles of democracy, he planted the seed and stirred the ground for the Democratic Party, which Old Hickory cultivated and brought to flower. But he was opposed and maligned on every front by the privileged class which ran the Government in those days. It was the age of aristocracy. Social and political leadership belonged as a matter of custom to the well-born, the large land owners, the merchant princes, the clergy, and the professional classes. Only men possessing property were allowed to vote and the right to hold office was further restricted to those who owned a larger amount of property than the ordinary voters. Seats in meeting houses, places at table and in processions, even at school, were governed by the rule of social distinction. It is said that John Adams, who later became the second President of the United States, was fourteenth in a class of 24 when he attended Harvard University. Let's see now, that made John Adams, well, just "middling" aristocracy, I suppose.

The first really official denunciation of caste rule recorded in profane history was promulgated in the Declaration of Independence on that memorable Fourth of July 1776. The preamble to this sacred document is, without question, the most eloquent and solid defense of democratic ideals to be found anywhere in any language, save in the Holy Bible.

At this crucial time when power-mad maniacs are strewing death and destruction over half the globe, when the world is shaken at its very foundation, when a dozen nations already have fallen victim to the worst tyranny the world has ever known, the meaning of that hallowed document takes on newer and deeper significance. We hold very dear our freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of press, and the right to worship God at our own altars according to the dictates of our own hearts.

However, it was one thing to officially gain these precious liberties bought with the blood and sacrifice of our Revolutionary forefathers. Quite another thing to apply them in actual practice under social conditions then existing in America.

Thomas Jefferson set his heart to this task, in the face of opposition and denunciation on every front by the privileged class. Let us take a peep behind the curtain of academic history and read from the archives some of the undemocratic utterances of certain leaders of the Federal Constitutional Convention which assembled in Philadelphia in 1787. Some of these founding fathers threw up their hands in horror at the suggestion of a popular government. The Honorable Gouverneur Morris, a rich and highly "cultivated" New York statesman of national and international prominence, held out that there was no more reason to entrust the vote to the ignorant and dependent common people than to children. The Honorable Roger Sherman said he thought that the people directly should have as little to do as possible with the running of the Government. The Honorable Elbridge Gerry declared that in his opinion—and I quote him—"the evils we experience flow from an excess of democracy." The Honorable Edmund Randolph seconded Mr. Gerry's statement and said that he believed, too, that the evils of the country had their origin in the turbulence and follies of democracy. The renowned Alexander Hamilton, who had always bragged on the British form of government as the best in the world, spoke his piece to the effect that the common people were too turbulent and changing, and that they were seldom capable of judging or determining right.

This gives us a slight idea of the sentiment Jefferson had to deal with when he went into office a few years later as the third President of our great Nation. The landed gentry, the merchant princes, the Napoleons of high finance beat upon their breast and shed crocodile tears over what they termed the fate of civilization if the masses were allowed to vote and if the farmer and laborer were allowed to acquire an education. Why, these obstructionists even opposed Jefferson in consummation of the Louisiana Purchase. They said it was unconstitutional. If they could have, they would have prevented what was later to be recognized as the greatest single achievement of the Jefferson administration. They had a reason for it, and it was largely a selfish reason on the part of most of these right-wingers. They foresaw in the expansion of the West a healthy competition that would (and did) eventually bring about a decentralization of the eastern oligarchy. Minnesota, in the main, was included in that territory acquired by the Louisiana Purchase. I believe you will agree with me that Jefferson drove a fine bargain. Do you not agree that Minnesota alone was worth more than the $15,000,000 we paid for the Louisiana Territory?

Jefferson passed from the scene of action before his noble dreams of a true democracy, as he had conceived it, were fulfilled. But his influence lived on. He had kindled in the breasts of men the surging spirit that was destined to put democracy to work.

It was no mere accident that within a third of a century there strode upon the scene a man of steel and spirit to translate Jefferson's dreams into reality. Andrew Jackson, the border captain who rose from the obscurity of his log-cabin origin to the victorious leadership of his country's armies, was drafted by the people to champion the inalienable rights of the people. Andrew Jackson, the people's President, the Democratic Party's President, if you please.

This child of adversity first saw the light of day on the remote frontier of South Carolina. Born in a cabin of an Irish emigrant mother still mourning for her husband whom she had just buried, untutored and untamed, he emerged from the western hills with the indomitable spirit and colossal integrity that launched him on the amazing career that blazed its way to everlasting renown.

Marquis James, the popular modern biographer, has fittingly said that the story of Andrew Jackson is the story of an almost fantastic courage, an unawed, lightning nerve, a stupendous will that was capable of astounding exploits, and that animated his followers to deeds beyond their strength, a burning patriotism, and a hairtrigger sensitiveness to social justice and personal honor.

All the way through the story of Andrew Jackson is a story of action, action, action. It is a story of relentless courage and righteous conviction, but always human.

At the tender age of 14 Andy was alone in the world, and he was already a war veteran. He had fought in the battle at Hanging Rock and had known illness and hunger in prison. He had sustained the saber wound of an officious British officer whose dirty boots Andy refused to clean.

By the time he was 18, he had somehow managed to read enough law to hang out his shingle. He fared forth to Nashville, which was then only a frontier settlement. At 21 he became the public prosecutor for the district which later constituted the State of Tennessee. He helped to frame the State's constitution. The people of Tennessee were now a commonwealth and entitled to send forth a man to represent them in Congress. With one accord they selected the greatest leader among their leaders to represent them in the halls of Congress. They sent Andy Jackson. The love and confidence of his people followed him to the Capitol, and he had served but a single term in the Lower House when he got a promotion. He was elected to the United States Senate, of which Thomas Jefferson was at the time the presiding officer.

George Bancroft, perhaps the greatest historian of the Jacksonian period, said of Andrew Jackson's career in Congress:

"Jackson showed his deeply seated, innate, intuitive faith in human freedom and in the institutions which rested on that faith. He was ever, by his vote and opinions, found among those who had confidence in humanity, and in the great division of minds this child of the woodlands, this representative of forest life in the West, appeared modestly and firmly on the side of liberty. It did not occur to him to seek to give durability to popular institutions by conceding to government a strength independent of popular will. From the first he was attached to the fundamental doctrines of popular power and of the policy that favors it."

There we have a thumb-nail sketch of the kind of statesman that he was.

During his period of service in the Senate, Jackson was commissioned as major general by the brigadiers and field officers of the militia of Tennessee.

Upon his resignation as a United States Senator, he was made judge of the supreme court in law and equity in Tennessee; such was the confidence in his clearness of judgment, his vigor of will, and his integrity of purpose to deal justly among the turbulent who crowded into the new settlements of Tennessee.

In recognition of his skill in crushing the Creek Indians, he was made major general in the Regular Army.

Of his climactic and immortal military victory in the Battle of New Orleans, the event we commemorate on Jackson Day, not enough can be said. I agree with Bancroft that time would fail and words be wanting, were we to dwell on the magical influence of his appearance in New Orleans. His presence dissipated the gloom and dispelled the alarm; at once he changed the aspect of despair into a confidence of security and a hope of acquiring glory for his country. Every man knows the tale of the sudden and yet deliberate daring which led him on to precipitate his little army on his foes in the thick darkness before they grew familiar with their encampment, scattering dismay through veteran regiments of England, defeating them and arresting their progress with a far inferior force.

"Who shall recount the counsels of prudence, the kindling of words of persuasion that gushed from his lips to cheer his soldiers, his skirmishes and battles, until that eventful morning when the day at Bunker Hill had its fulfillment in the glorious Battle of New Orleans and American independence stood before the world in the majesty of triumphant power?"

This victory won and peace restored, Old Hickory longed to return to his plantation and spend the remainder of his life in agrarian pursuits, leading a quiet domestic life with his beloved family. But this was not to be, for the southern Indians were on the warpath again. They were not appeased by the peace with Great Britain. Jackson was called forth again, this time to restrain the cruelty and treachery of the Seminoles. And, in the words of Bancroft, "It was in the train of events of this war that Andrew Jackson placed the American eagle on St. Marks and above the ancient towers of St. Augustine."

After this daring conquest we find that Andy's health was failing and he was borne on a litter across the swamps of Florida toward his home, supposedly to die. Through the tender, faithful ministrations of his devoted wife, he was spared from the grave. He reiterated his intention of retiring to private life forever but the people would not have it so. It was only natural that an awakened people who had found in this pioneer of the wilderness a true and tried champion of equal rights and opportunities for all should seek to place him in the highest office in the land. They sought him out as their candidate for the Presidency. In answer to their urgent solicitations, he said, in great modesty and sincerity, "No, sir; I know what I am fit for. I can command a body of men in a rough way, but I am not fit to be a President." The people wouldn't take no for an answer. They pursued him saying: "Nature never designed that your powers of thought and independence should be lost in retirement. We want you for President, and we won't accept a substitute." In modern parlance, they sent up a loud yell, "We want Jackson; we want Jackson."

You see they simply drafted Old Hickory for their candidate in the same way that we Democrats drafted President Roosevelt in 1940 to serve for another term, a third term.

The privileged powers put up one of the nastiest and bitterest political battles known to civilization in their frenzied effort to keep Jackson out of the White House. They nosed him out in the first round by a narrow majority, but 4 years later, in 1828, Old Hickory defeated John Quincy Adams with 178 electoral votes to Adams' 83. He was reelected in 1832 with 219 votes to 49 for Clay.

The Jackson administration stands out in American history as the Era of Good Feeling for the people as a whole, but for the monopolistic interests it was something of a reign of terror, a headache, a nightmare if you please. He had come into office with the expressed determination to turn the rascals out.

The Government had resolved itself into a machine for the enrichment of a powerful and avaricious minority. The United States Bank—the Biddle Bank—call it what you will—was under the virtual control and was in fact the tool of one plutocrat who held the less privileged under his thumb. With the same fierce determination and virile courage that had subdued the Indians on the frontier and repelled the British in the Battle of New Orleans, Old Hickory pitched a battle royal against the Biddle monopoly. His battle against the Biddle Bank was a battle of wits against the forces of conspiracy and intrigue. In the end, Andy won. He broke up the vicious monopoly of the Biddle Bank, turned the rascals out as he had sworn to do, and paid its debts. Yes; by the eternal, he drove the money changers out of the temple.

To Andrew Jackson is attributed the philosophy, "To the victor belongs the spoils"; but when we closely examine the facts we find that dividing the spoils among the victorious had not to do so much with distribution of patronage as with the free circulation of social justice and economic opportunity. Moreover, we find that a good many of the ejected officeholders had been guilty of varying degrees of malfeasance and dishonesty in office.

After breaking up the eastern oligarchy, Jackson turned his attention to the development of the West. Under his land-grant policy this great section where we are tonight grew by leaps and bounds. He collected from France a long outstanding debt and placed our country's financial affairs on a sound, practical basis. A smart practical statesman was Old Hickory, as well as a great humanitarian.

Historians are rather well agreed that Andrew Jackson enjoyed the unique distinction of going out of office as popular as when he went in. His influence pervaded not only our Nation but encircled the globe. Truly Andrew Jackson, the rugged frontiersman, lifted the American Nation to a new glory and the eyes of mankind to new horizons.

His tomb, beside that of his beloved Rachel, in the hallowed soil of his Hermitage garden, is a shrine where patriots of many kindreds and many tongues pay homage to his memory.

He left to the world a legacy beyond valuation, and we, the Democratic Party, are the foremost guardians of that heritage. He bequeathed to us the responsibility of preserving the democratic tenets of a true democracy. It was his will that all people should enjoy not only the basic freedoms of speech, assembly, press, and religion but that they likewise enjoy freedom of industry, commerce, and of universal action; freedom unshackled by restrictive privileges; freedom of economic creativeness unrestrained by the thraldom of monopolies. In brief, Jacksonian Democracy is a true democracy, the American way of life at its best.

The Democratic Party has had its "ins" and its "outs," its "ups" and its "downs." But, by righteous Providence, it always seems to have a renaissance when a despairing people needs it most. At the crucial moment some great Democratic leader appears on the horizon to retrieve and lift the Nation out of the slough of despond.

Time does not permit a review of the course of events between Jackson's time and now. Suffice it to say that after Lincoln's death the Republican Party passed gradually but ever more surely into the hands of the monopolistic interests that sponsor special privileges. It disregarded the farmer almost completely for about a half century. In fact, it got to the point it did not even mention the farmer in its platforms. It was only after the World War, with an aftermath of disastrous consequences for agriculture, that the Republican Party again realized that the farmers' interests are the basical interests of our country and that there was a farm problem. In 1920 the Republicans were frightened at the prospect of losing the farm vote, and the G. O. P. convention extolled the farmer as "the backbone of the Nation." At long last the "big boys" behind the scenes who were directing and manipulating the privately owned Republican machine acknowledged and ostensibly accepted the truth of the beautifully expressed sentiments of Lawrence Porcher Hext in his noble poem The Man Behind the Plow:

"The bards have sung no songs of him; no glory has he sought;
Nor for the spoils of victory has he life's battles fought.
There are no glowing stories told of deeds that he has done,
And on his breast he wears no badge, no trophies has he won.
Upon the page of history, no mention of his name
Is there inscribed, nor is he known within the Hall of Fame;
But tho' no sweet rewards are his, no laurels deck his brow,
He is the flower of the field—the man behind the plow.

"He wears no gaudy uniform, no buttons made of brass;
No shoulder stripes command salutes from others, as they pass;
Upon his sleeves there are no stripes of gold or silver braid;
No garb that he possesses could be worn in dress parade;
His name is not upon the rolls; he draws no monthly pay,
But on his rugged form he bears the mark of many a fray;
He fights his battles all alone, he struggles hard with toil,
This private of the commonwealth—this soldier of the soil.

"He is a loyal patriot, although he does not brag,
Nor boast of deeds that he has done to shield his nation's flag.
He does not hawk his chivalry about the city's streets;
He begs no man to lift him from the dust of his defeats.
He is a son of liberty—his country and his God
Are cherished and revered by him—the hero of the sod.

"The world is prone to buffet him with sneers and ridicule,
Society to laugh at him and herd him with his mule;
But what cares he for ridicule, society may laugh;
His storehouse holds the garnered grain, his stall the fatted calf.
He knows that with his brawny arm he sways the universe;
He knows that much depends upon the fullness of his purse.
And tho' he be uncouth and rude, we all must need allow,
There'd be no world at all without—the man behind the plow."

Yes; the G. O. P.'s got scared. They saw that the farmers were beginning to organize more thoroughly and pay closer attention to governmental affairs. Realizing the political power of the farm groups, the Republicans pledged the party to take steps to bring about

a balanced condition between agriculture, industry, and labor.

This sudden attachment for the farmer on the part of the G. O. P. was very amusing. It reminded me of a certain hero I want to tell you about. 'Way down South two Negroes, an old one and a young one, were sitting on the same log fishing. The young one became very drowsy while waiting for the bite that never came. He kept nodding and nodding, until finally he lost his balance and fell into the river. A kind-hearted white farmer who just then chanced to pass that way was delighted to see the old Negro fling down his pole and line and plunge into the river to rescue the boy. The white man said to the old Negro, "That was a noble act of yours to save that boy's life, Uncle Mose; is he a son of yours?" "Oh, no," said the old Negro, "he ain't no son ob mine." "But why, then, did you take such an interest in saving the boy's life?" asked the white man. The old Negro scratched his woolly head for a moment and then meekly replied, "Waal, de fac' am, massa, dat boy's got all my bait in his pocket."

So you see, my friends, it was that way with the G. O. P. in 1920. The farmers had the bait, that is to say, the votes, and the Republicans had to make promises to the farmer. Empty, idle, shallow promises they proved to be, for during the ensuing 12 years, representing three successive terms of Republican rule (or misrule) our country headed into the darkest depression of all time. As long as memory lasts the depression that was highlighted in the big crash of 1929 will remain green in the memories of us all.

Before the end of 1932 we witnessed a prostrate agriculture, with farm prices at rock bottom. The inevitable result was disaster for our whole economic structure. Banks were failing throughout the Nation; thousands of business concerns were going under. Depositors and investors bereft of their life savings were frantic with despair. Multiplied millions of people were unemployed. Hunger and distress stalked the land.

The people were clamoring for a new deal—a square deal. They had been ruined by the raw deal of the old deal, and they knew it. That's where we, the Democratic Party, entered the picture again to reshuffle the cards, straighten out the mess, clean up the debris, and pull the country out of the bog.

Fortunately, we found among us another Andrew Jackson, a twentieth-century Jackson, the gallant and courageous Franklin D. Roosevelt. We knew him to be a man of action, vision, and ability, with courage and integrity to match. We knew him to be wholly dedicated to the principles of social justice and equal opportunity for all. We knew him as a humanitarian of deep human understanding and forceful personality. It was fortunate indeed that he was the man selected to lead us in a time of direst emergency.

It is not necessary to reiterate the sad state of affairs that Mr. Roosevelt found when he entered the White House in 1933. Neither is it necessary, before this highly enlightened audience, to recite the effective methods adopted to straighten out the banking and financial situation and provide safeguards against recurrence.

You are familiar with the far-reaching New Deal programs put into effect to relieve want and suffering and to promote the future well-being of the Nation as a whole.

You are well aware of the fact that our President, for many years has been warning us against dangerous elements from without and within that threaten our democracy and our American way of life. He has fought relentlessly against the "isms" and "wasms" that seek to undermine our democratic institutions. If the obstructionists had not blocked him, our national-defense program would have been launched long before it was.

We do not claim that the record of the administration has attained perfection. But we do look with pardonable pride at what has been accomplished. We had a Herculean task before us and we have come a long way in the performance of that task. We do not claim that all of our programs are without blemish, but no one else has been able to come forward with anything better. We fully realize that there is work yet to be done—rounding out the curves—remodeling a little here and a little there—making alterations or extensions as conditions may warrant and as God gives us light to see and power to do.

By our votes last November 5 we made known to the world that we believed President Roosevelt had kept faith with the people. By those votes we said, in effect, that Franklin D. Roosevelt had done a satisfactory job in administering the affairs of our country under most trying circumstances and has sought to lead us into a new era of justice, liberty and social enlightenment through reforms in the governmental system designed to guarantee the right of people to jobs, to security in private employment, and in old age; the right of security of savings; the right to adequate pay; the right to a decent home; the right of security of home and family; the right to an education; the right to sell agricultural products at a fair price; the right to a fair share of the Nation's resources and the right to protection against exploitation.

By our votes we said that President Roosevelt was the best qualified to deal with national and international problems in this dark hour and to lead this Nation during these critical times.

It would be stepping on ashes in which the fire is not yet extinguished to dwell on the recent campaign. I'm sure that your ears still ring with the resounding echoes of the battalions of high-pressure speakers sent out by the opposition to tell the people they should not reelect the Democratic President. They said we had bungled the job; that we had had a discreditable inning and ought to let somebody else take the bat. Oh, to be sure, they had to agree with the wonderful objectives of the programs inaugurated by the Roosevelt administration but we had gone about it the wrong way they said. They purported to do all these fine things for the people lead us out of the wilderness and save the Government money besides. Inconsistency, thou art a synthetic jewel! They didn't say how they would do the job, however, or what they would use for money. So their glittering generalities did not fool the people.

But let us not dwell further on the campaign. It is not pleasant dinner conversation and it would not be good sportsmanship on our part to fan the flame in the ashes of the vanquished. To the victor belongs magnanimity as well as the so-called spoils.

In these times, when national unity is so much to be desired, we plead for cooperation from the right wing. In all fairness, we must acknowledge and express gratitude for the cooperation we have received from a small percentage of these gentlemen, who have voted for New Deal measures in the face of carping criticism from others of their party. For the obstructionists, we ask forgiveness. They know not what they do. True democracy demands that we be not too intolerant of minorities.

The recent bitter fight in the Senate over the lend-lease bill amply demonstrates that we need not expect full coordination, but we do most earnestly hope and pray that all American people shall stand united as we defend ourselves against the possibility of aggression by tyrannical dictators who seek to crush all democracies.

I am sure you heard the President's masterful address over the radio the other night. That message was broadcast throughout the world in 14 different languages, and England's Prime Minister has said, "At such a moment in such an ordeal, the words and acts of President Roosevelt and the people of the United States come to us like a draught of life and they tell us by an ocean-borne trumpet call that we are no longer alone."

You have heard the President's earnest plea for unity. You have seen by his fine spirit of nonpartisanship that he wants us to treat our party differences as a family row and join hands now to make and keep America strong against the common enemy of democracy. All of our people must realize, too, that defense does not consist of military defense alone but defense against all the things that human beings fear.

We are the very arsenal of democracy, the hope of a despairing civilization. When dictatorships shall have been vanquished and peace reigns again undoubtedly we shall play a large part in the reconstruction of a war-torn world.

A great responsibility rests upon our shoulders, especially upon the broad shoulders of the Democratic Party. Constant vigilance and personal sacrifice is the price we must pay for victory over the tyrannies that threaten us. Let us keep our lamps well filled and the wicks well trimmed. The eyes of the world are upon us. It is our sacred obligation to defend and preserve the American way of life bequeathed to us by Jefferson and Jackson.

To us is given the opportunity and the responsibility of diffusing to stricken mankind the bright light of our democratic institutions.

May we let our light so shine that groping humanity may see Jeffersonian-Jacksonian democracy as the lifeblood of the priceless liberties we cherish. May we show forth by precept and example that of this kind of democracy social justice to all is the handmaid, freedom its child, peace its companion; that safety walks in its steps and victory follows in its train; that it is an emanation from the Christian gospel, embodying the attributes of the Man of Nazareth who has taught us that we are our brother's keeper.

May we ever guard our cherished heritage so that, as long as the earth endures, this kind of democracy shall not pass away.

In conclusion, my friends, let me impress you with the fact that to be a free, true, and genuine American citizen in these days of growing despotism and totalitarianism is the greatest privilege ever given to man or woman. It is a possession for which we should gladly sacrifice our all, even life itself, if necessary, so that our children and our children's children might enjoy the freedom and blessings of such a great Government.

It is almost as great an honor and privilege to be a Democrat. We are proud to be affiliated with a party that, with one or two exceptions, has conceived and sponsored the great social and progressive reforms of the 150 years of our Nation's life—reforms that have caused our Government to function in such a way as to give the people a greater freedom and protection. It has been the Democratic administrations from Jefferson to Roosevelt that have driven the "money changers from the temple" and made a representative democracy function more and more for the average man by giving equal rights to every citizen, rich and poor, great and small alike.

The Democratic Party sponsored the election of United States Senators by vote of the people, taking this right away from the legislatures of the States where the corporate and monopolistic manipulators found it so easy to elect their "sympathetic friend" to the United States Senate. The Senate is now more responsive to the needs and welfare of the people than to the "favored few." The Democratic Party sponsored the Federal Trade Commission to protect the masses from unholy monopolies and combinations that robbed the people by controlling and fixing the prices of the necessities of life.

The Democratic Party was responsible, in the main, for the income-tax law that compels every citizen to pay and support his Government according to his ability to pay,

as God has prospered him in this great free country, this land of matchless opportunities and boundless resources.

It was the Democratic Party that sponsored the just and democratic cause of giving the women the privilege to vote. The Democrats first discovered that a woman was a citizen, and had as much sense and as just a right to help run the Government as a man.

The Democratic Party has been the uncompromising friend of the farmers of the Nation, and the New Deal has rendered greater service to the cause of agriculture than all other administrations combined since Washington's administration. The Congress has just passed the greatest appropriation in the history of the Nation to give relief to the farmers in the present world emergency. The bill carries an appropriation of $1,340,000,000.

The cause of labor got its first break under this administration—the right to strike, the right of collective bargaining, increase in wages per hour, limitations on hours, and the National Labor Board has been given to labor—and more besides. It is true we are having some temporary troubles on the labor front today, but I believe the rank and file of the laboring people of the Nation are satisfied, and I can assure you all these troubles will be shortly and equitably adjusted.

With so great and so glorious a record of achievements for equitable and human government, let us resolve to go forward from this night and convince every man and woman in Minnesota that they owe it to themselves and to their children and their children's children and to the cause of good government to enlist under the Democratic banner.

Now, before I say good night, please let me extend a sincere invitation to you and to all the people of Minnesota to come to the land of sunshine and flowers, the land of untouched resources and limitless opportunities.

Horace Greeley may have been right when he said, "Go West, young man," but if he lived today, after the West has been taken, exploited, and in many cases exhausted, he would surely say, "Now, young man, go South." I can assure you that a royal welcome awaits your coming. And when your eyes behold this heavenly paradise you will exclaim:

"O Southland, loveliest land beneath the bright blue bending skies;
O land most passionate this side the gates of Paradise;
A sense of gladness unconfined was mine when first I set my foot upon thy flowery sod.
It lingers with me yet."

Come, come, come, I plead with you; I urge you; I beg you to come to God's favored clime. I mean for you to come. Just the other day I introduced a bill in the Senate to build a streamlined four-lane highway from the Great Lakes region through the heart of the Mississippi Valley to the Gulf of Mexico.

I invite you to visit me personally, provided you don't all come at once and sojourn in my dream house beside the road, nestling beneath the sighing and murmuring pines on a sunny dale not far from the Mexican Sea.

Come, eat, sleep, and enjoy real southern hospitality; sit with me on a broad southern porch, fanned by the gentle breezes from a southern sea; and together we will listen to the hum of the honeybee as she gathers her daily load in the clover field nearby. In the eveningtide we will listen to the tinkling bells as my cows wend their way homeward. We will thrill to the plaintive call of the whippoorwill and be lulled to sleep by the singing of a southern mockingbird, as he pours forth the sweetest music in all the world.

Again I urge you to come to the land from which God has removed the chilling and killing blizzards of the North and blessed it with eternal sunshine.

Come to a land where the American citizen is the freest and enjoys his freedom most—a land where human rights are placed above property rights; where we prize human beings above the almighty dollar.

Come and you will better understand why we are all Democrats and why the South has given to the Nation such great Democratic leaders as Jefferson, Jackson, and Wilson.

The spirit of the land and our people could fittingly be expressed in the prayer of another, who said:

"I'd rather be a far-flung star
And shine in the midnight sky,
Than a sun eclipsed by the side of the road,
Where the race of men go by.

"I'd rather be a desert rose
And sweeten the desert air,
Than bloom in a heavenly paradise
And shed no fragrance there.

"I'd rather be a drop of dew
And sparkle with mirthful glee,
Than boast my size before man's eyes,
A stale and stagnant sea.

"I'd rather be a plumeless lark,
And sing in a meadow one day,
Then don forever the gayest plumes
And hide myself away.

"I'd rather be a humming bird
And sing a tune of love
Than a mighty bird with dreadful shriek
Like the eagle that soars above.

"I'd rather plant in the garden of love
The flowers of kindly deeds
Than sow with pleasure in the largest field
A crop of worldly seeds.

"I'd rather be least in the Kingdom of God,
Is the sum of all the things I tell,
Than first of all the surging hosts
Of a merciless devil's hell."

Sale of War Materials to Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 4, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ARTHUR CAPPER, OF KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio address broadcast by myself over station WINX, Washington, D. C., March 8, 1941, discussing the sale to Japan of war materials which are being used in their war of conquest against China.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends of the radio audience, I am here tonight as a long-time friend of the people of China. I feel that China needs our help and is in every way worthy of that help.

In considering the moral aspects of our far eastern policy, let me first review the facts both concerning the history of Japanese aggression and the United States policy in the Far East.

Prior to the present conflict, and beginning with the Sino-Japanese War in 1895, Japan has annexed consecutively Formosa, Korea, Manchuria, and the north China provinces. An effort to seize Shantung during the World War was thwarted by the world powers.

The Japanese aggression since the World War has been in violation of the Nine Power Treaty and the Kellogg-Briand Pact, both of which Japan had signed. As the world powers did nothing to prevent her invasion of Manchuria, Japan assumed that she could continue her aggression against China with impunity.

In July 1937 Japan started the present war, and as a result she now occupies all of the industrial area and the large seaports of China and controls the highways and waterways of the flat agriculturally productive areas in eastern China.

In order to carry on a war such minerals as iron, copper, and petroleum are necessary and Japan has negligible deposits of these. To feed her factories and manufacture arms and ammunition, Japan has been forced to import such minerals—chiefly from the United States. The Japanese also lack the skill and equipment to manufacture all of the products needed to carry on a war. Such articles as machine tools for their factories, special steels and similar products, and automobiles and trucks had to be imported; again, chiefly from the United States.

In 1939, the United States supplied Japan with $163,000,000 worth of war materials. I have been informed that the United States supplied Japan with 54 percent of her war materials in 1938 and 56 percent in 1939. It appears that in 1940 we may have furnished Japan with as much as 70 percent of these war materials. This increase has taken place despite so-called moral embargoes and licensing restrictions. We have recently been sending more petroleum and petroleum products, manufactures, steels, copper, and machine tools than ever before.

The United States is also the largest market for Japanese exports, since we buy about 50 percent of the total exports from that country. Silk is the most important item, as we buy 90 percent of all Japanese exported silk. Our Government has also purchased large amounts of gold and silver. The latter has unquestionably been looted from the occupied portion of China. Now we find the proceeds of all sales in this country are used by Japan to buy war materials.

On the other side of the scales, to be sure, the United States has made loans to China in the amount of $170,000,000. China is not on this account compensated, because the Japanese invasion is only made possible by the materials which the United States supplies Japan.

These are the facts which establish our policy. Whether this aid to Japan is due to the shellfish acts of private citizens or official acts of the Government is only a question of academic interest, since the Government has the power to restrain these citizens and the majority of the people may make the Government responsive to its wishes.

The war which Japan is waging against China with our material aid is counter to all our American ideals of justice, humanity, democracy, universal friendship, and peaceful development. As I see it, it is an unjust war, because Japan merely found an excuse to carry through to completion her plan for the conquest of China. I say it is inhuman, in that men, women, and children are being ruthlessly slaughtered, maimed, starved, and oppressed by the Japanese.

This war is against democracy, because it would enslave a great democratic people and use them to extend the imperialist plans of Japan. It would destroy the prospect of friendly relationships in the Far East and the peaceful development of the Chinese. Instead China's resources would be developed and the Chinese people exploited for Japan.

Now, the Japanese cannot violate our ideals for us. It is we who are violating our ideals.

In all probability the Japanese could not carry on this war without our material aid. It is our trucks which carry the Japanese into China; it is our iron which blasts the Chinese to pieces; it is our oil which drives their tanks and airplanes, and it is our factory tools which manufacture their armaments.

Another moral question involved in our far-eastern policy is our honesty and good faith. The United States is also a signatory to the Nine Power Treaty, and under article I of that treaty is obligated to "respect the sovereignty, the independence, and the territorial and administrative integrity of China." The proclamation by the President caused the treaty to be made public, "to the end that the same and every article and clause thereof may be observed and fulfilled with good faith by the United States and the citizens thereof."

In spite of this treaty and proclamation, United States citizens are exporting materials to be used in an assault on China's independence and sovereignty, and they are being permitted to do so by the United States Government. If anyone doubts the power of the administration to prevent such trade, I need only refer him to article VI, section 2, of the Constitution of the United States, which states that "all treaties made, or which shall be made, under authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land"; and which also states that the President "shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

However, the President has recently been given additional legislative authority for stopping these shipments in the Defense Act of 1940, which provides that the President may prohibit or curtail the exportation of war materials of the kind now being shipped to Japan

The export of war materials which are used to carry on a war of aggression in China is at least a moral violation on our part of the Nine Power Treaty, and no rationalization concerning the money value of this trade or technical interpretations concerning our legal obligations under the treaty can remove the stigma which attaches to our conduct or relieve our consciences.

In the course of the war in China, there have been many official pronouncements by spokesmen for our Government, which have not failed to denounce Japanese aggression and to offer encouragement to China as the victim of aggression. A recent pronouncement indicated that it was the policy of the Government to withhold aid from aggressor nations and to extend it to the victims of aggression. Why then, I ask, are we still giving aid to the Japanese aggressor?

Finally, I wish to discuss the relation of our far-eastern policy to peace. I have been a lifelong advocate of peace and have always been opposed to any policy which is likely to cause wars or the spread of wars. In the Far East we have been providing Japan with materials which enable her to make war on China—but we have been doing much more than that. We have been promoting Japanese imperialism and building up the armaments of Japan. Fired by success in China and with the armaments which we have provided, the Japanese imperialists are likely to extend the war to other parts of Asia. They are now extending the war to that part of Asia immediately south of China. With the Philippines, Alaska, and Hawaii vulnerable, it is possible we might ourselves become embroiled in a war with Japan and have the armaments which we have furnished her used against us.

Let me say that if we are to live up to our American ideals and if we wish to avoid promoting the spread of war it would seem to me we should stop supplying Japan with war materials. The shipment of these materials may be prevented by direct legislation of Congress or by the administration, under authorities already granted. We believe the Government will respond to public pressure. We know that the public is overwhelmingly in favor of stopping these shipments. However, those who are responsible for the policies of the Government have not had enough evidence that the public is not only for stopping these exports but is definitely aroused over the situation.

Now, I have been a friend of the people of China for a quarter of a century, but I want to make it plain that nothing I have said tonight; or at any other time, should be construed to mean that I am advocating that the United States go to war with Japan. Neither am I advocating that the United States do anything that would force Japan to make war against the United States.

I am opposed to the United States trying to get into wars anywhere. I am totally opposed to the United States intervening in other peoples' wars. That is the reason I opposed, with every power I possessed, the passage of H. R. 1776.

Ever since Japan started its war of aggression against China I have been urging that the United States Government act to prevent the shipment of war supplies and war materials to Japan. I believed at that time, and I believe now, that the policy of the United States Government in selling war supplies to Japan has encouraged, whether intentionally or not, this dreadful war in the Far East.

My objections to H. R. 1776, the so-called lend-lease bill, recently before the Congress—entirely aside from my objections to granting any one man the broad powers provided in that measure—were largely due to the fact that I felt that its enactment would be a long step toward war.

I am opposed not only to Government policies which encourage wars abroad—as I believe the policy pursued by our Government has unintentionally done in China—but I also am opposed to Government policies that threaten to involve the United States in the war in Europe.

During the months and years since Japan started its invasion of China I have consistently urged that the United States Government refuse to be a party directly or indirectly to that invasion. A most effective way in which this country can work for peace in the Orient is to shut off at once and completely war supplies for the Orient. I am in favor of doing that now. We should have done it long ago.

Mr. President, I shall continue to do everything in my power to keep the United States at peace and to have the United States use its powers and influence for peace, and not for war, in the rest of the world. I hope that the powers of our Government shall be used for peace and not for war, and that our Government will promote a policy that is fair and just to China.

The Fight Over Beef

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY B. COFFEE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE OMAHA WORLD-HERALD

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I am inserting a very timely editorial taken from the Omaha World-Herald. This editorial correctly reflects the attitude of the Nebraska livestock grower on the issue of purchases by the Army and Navy of Argentine canned beef. The editorial follows:

[From the Omaha World-Herald]

THE FIGHT OVER BEEF

The proposed purchase of 20,000,000 pounds of Argentine canned beef for the American armed forces is not in itself an important matter. But the principle involved is important, and the argument of those who favor the purchase is a little frightening.

It runs something like this:

"If we are to maintain the good-neighbor policy and build hemispheric solidarity, we must trade with Latin America. We must become a better customer of the Latins than the dictator nations ever can be. We must sell them the things they need, and we must buy what they have for sale."

Buy South American! Smash Hitler! It sounds grand and very, very logical.

But let's examine the situation a little closer.

What does South America want to buy from us? Mainly manufactured goods—things that are produced in our industrial East and Great Lakes region. That would be fine for our industrialists.

And what does South America want to sell? A little coffee. Some metals. Possibly, in years to come, a little rubber. But mainly meat and grain—the very staples that the American farmer already produces to excess.

It is obvious that both the American continents are preponderantly agricultural. They both have vast, fertile midlands, and it is inevitable that their people should cling to the soil. But if the planners at Washington have their way, the two continents will develop an interlocking economy. The people of South America will remain farmers and cattle growers, while the people of North America become, mainly, machinists' helpers and Government clerks. If that idea were carried to its conclusion, perhaps the Middle West would become a vast playground and recreation area, with "No cattle allowed" signs posted in the sandhills.

There is one way the trend can be stopped. The United States Congress can put its foot down firmly and say, "There will be no tinkering with our basic industrial balance. We will save the American market for the American farmer, and we will also, to the best of our ability, help him to sell his products abroad in competition with other countries."

You think such a policy would be too hard-boiled toward our good neighbors? Then ask yourself whether they aren't entirely hard-boiled and realistic in fighting for the welfare of their citizens.

Of course they are. That's one thing we like about them.

Hydro Power and Irrigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 4, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN C. PAGE

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD an address

on hydro power and irrigation, delivered by Hon. John C. Page, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, at the nineteenth annual convention of the Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C., on March 28, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My subject, in leading off this symposium on public rights in water, is Hydropower and Irrigation.

The generation of hydroelectric energy and the irrigation of arid land have proven themselves natural working partners in the development of our western resources. Nearly 30 years of experience in constructing irrigation systems in the West have demonstrated to the Bureau of Reclamation that power and irrigation frequently form the most efficient combination possible in this work. On every irrigation project where they have been combined they have supplemented each other in attaining the ultimate objective of the reclamation law under which the Bureau of Reclamation operates.

The ultimate objective of the reclamation law is the creation of new homes and opportunities for a westward-pushing American population through the construction of irrigation works to make available a supply of water to fertile but arid lands in 17 Western States. Operations under the law have been highly satisfactory. Nearly a million people on 40 reclamation projects can thank this law for their homes and livelihood. About one-quarter of them cultivate irrigated farms which produce a hundred million dollars' worth of crops annually. These crops consist mainly of forage to feed livestock—the major industry in the West. Other main crops are vegetables, fruits, and specialties. The remainder of the project people live in the 258 cities and towns which have sprung up or expanded in the wake of project development. They work in stores and other business activities of the towns, and in the hotels, the feed mills, and the factories.

These million persons provide an annual market for more than $200,000,000 worth of manufactured articles and processed goods. This purchasing power forms a stable backlog of business for American industry greater in value in normal times than any foreign market except the United Kingdom, Canada, Japan, and France.

The taxable property created or protected by these 40 reclamation projects is valued at more than $4,500,000,000.

This entire beneficial investment with its consequent profit to the rest of the Nation owes its creation to this twin combination of land development and power development. In the first place, energy was required originally for the physical construction work necessary to build the irrigation projects, such as the erection of dams and the excavation of canals. Hydropower provided this necessary energy. Second, on many projects energy was required for pumping water to arid land higher in elevation than the reservoir or stream from which it was drawn. Here, again, hydro plants produced the necessary power. And, last, hydropower has helped irrigation projects meet their cost of irrigation construction, which must be repaid by the recipients of the water. As a matter of fact, in a number of instances hydropower made the construction of the project possible, for without the anticipated additional income from power revenues the project could not have been found economically feasible. A finding of economic feasibility is a requirement of the reclamation law before project construction may be started.

An example of this dependence on hydroelectric power is the Boulder Canyon project in Arizona-Nevada. Power revenues will pay the greatest share of the cost of construction of this great multipurpose project, so vital to the welfare of the Southwest.

Naturally, playing this large and helpful role in the permanent settlement and development of the West, hydroelectric capacity on reclamation projects has shown tremendous increase. The first small beginning was a power plant with a capacity equivalent to 975 kilowatts, built in 1906 on the Salt River Valley reclamation project in Arizona. This small power development has been multiplied nearly a thousandfold. Today the 24 power plants operating on reclamation projects have an installed capacity of 873,655 kilowatts, and an ultimate capacity much greater. When power plants now building and others planned for construction are completed, the total power available on reclamation projects will attain the impressive figure of four and one-half million kilowatts—practically equalling the entire present hydro development in the western half of the United States.

The increased use of hydroelectric energy in the expansion of the West, and the interdependence of hydro power and the irrigation of arid lands, are therefore obvious. In the work of the Bureau of Reclamation they can be said to be mated for life. Although irrigation of waste desert land and protection of closely settled irrigated areas are primary in the water conservation of the Bureau, the generation of electric energy is indivisibly the chief byproduct. Irrigation and power generation in the West complement each other.

I have stated that power is the chief byproduct of reclamation construction in the West. You who are assembled here this morning to forward the fine work of conserving the woods, waters, and wildlife of America are no doubt more interested in another reclamation byproduct—the conservation of wildlife and the creation of recreational facilities.

Irrigation construction has converted more than 3,000,000 acres of nearly worthless desert land, where once a jack rabbit could barely eke out a living, into a livable habitat for wildlife. Irrigation projects in the wide, arid West are about the only places where certain game birds can be found. Feed and cover abound on the irrigated farms along the canals and ditches and around reservoirs.

Twenty-nine reservoirs on reclamation projects have been set aside as national wildlife refuges by Executive order of the President. These havens for game extend from the southern California Salton Sea refuge in the extreme Southwest to the Okanogan refuge in Washington in the extreme Northwest. They extend east to the Lake Minitare and Lake Alice refuges in Nebraska. Additional wildlife refuges will be created by reclamation projects now under construction.

The importance of these game preserves is unquestionable. The Fish and Wildlife Service points out, for example, that the recently established Havasu Lake refuge at Parker Dam is strategically located about halfway between Lake Mead and the great waterfowl wintering area on the Colorado River delta in Mexico. It will form an important link in the chain of national wildlife refuges. Large numbers of ducks, geese, and other waterfowl, such as waders and shore birds, are expected to use the area during migration flights and during the wintering period. The lake will also offer a safe watering place for the quail and the mountain sheep of the uplands.

Of the 165 dams built by the Bureau of Reclamation many are valuable aids to fish life. All the reservoirs in accessible localities have been stocked by the Fish and Wildlife Service or State agencies. Many are among the most popular fishing spots for miles around.

The Bureau's construction work has actually created fishing opportunities. The Colorado River is a good example of this. Like most other large western streams, it was a muddy, silt-laden stream, a very poor habitat for fish, before Boulder Dam was built. Now the Colorado runs cold and clear as a mountain rill for 40 miles below the dam. A perfect habitat has been created for the trout being planted there. This section of the river is expected to become one of the best trout streams in the West.

As for Lake Mead itself, Boulder Dam's reservoir, most of you are no doubt familiar with stories of the magnificent large-mouth black bass being caught there. These tall tales are actually true. They have been proven with photographs of 10-, 11-, and 12-pounders.

The conservation of wildlife, waterfowl, and fish is an integral part of reclamation project planning. For instance, plans for the Colorado-Big Thompson project now under construction in Colorado were modified to insure a sufficient flow of water at all times in the mountain streams so that they would continue to offer choice fishing.

At Grand Coulee Dam, whose great hydroelectric power plant began operating last week, a sweeping program was launched by the Bureau for the conservation of the migratory salmon and steelhead trout of the Columbia River. The Fish and Wildlife Service is cooperating with Reclamation in carrying out the greatest single fish-conservation scheme ever undertaken. Thousands of large salmon and steelhead trout are being trapped and transplanted for spawning to tributaries entering the Columbia below Grand Coulee. Scientifically ice-cooled trucks are used for the job. Hatcheries have been built for artificial propagation. Also, as part of this program, a 2,500-foot tunnel was drilled through a spur of the Cascades to tap a mountain lake 250 feet below its surface so as to provide cold water all year around for the holding ponds and hatchery constructed by the Bureau at Leavenworth, Wash.

The newer reservoirs of the Bureau are all designed to retain carry-over storage so that they cannot be drawn too low for fish life. The field force of the Bureau is under orders not to empty reservoirs which lack this protection except in extreme emergency. When this becomes absolutely essential, State and Federal fish and game authorities are advised so that the fish may be salvaged.

With the disappearance of some species of wildlife from their natural habitat, with floods and dust storms in the western parts of the country, public opinion has awakened to the support of a broad conservation program for American wildlife. The Bureau of Reclamation today is making a substantial contribution to this program. In the Bureau of Reclamation's water-conservation work in the West, hydropower and wildlife conservation go forward hand in hand with other byproducts of irrigation toward a better and more satisfying country to live in for all of us.

The American Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 4, 1941

EDITORIAL BY JUDGE ALBERT W. JOHNSON

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial

entitled "Our Democracy—The Most Efficient Government in the World," written by Judge Albert W. Johnson, of the middle district in Lewisburg, Pa., and which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer of Sunday, March 16.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR DEMOCRACY—THE MOST EFFICIENT GOVERNMENT IN THE WORLD

(By Albert W. Johnson)

A world war is now being waged by the dictator nations, led by Germany, to destroy the democratic governments and set up a new order in the world. We are again engaged in a great struggle testing whether the democratic nations can long endure. The issue involved between freedom and slavery cannot be compromised; the tyranny which would enslave the whole world must be destroyed.

The life of our democracy, the most powerful nation on earth, is involved, and we must render every possible aid—not short of war, but with war, if necessary—to the other embattled democracies if we are to live and exercise influence in the world now and in the future. In this terrific struggle the allied democracies must win a decisive victory and thus save liberty and Christian civilization.

We must now consider the strength of our democracy and its contribution to victory. Faith in our democracy comes from the wisdom of its builders and the character of their work. Of the 55 Delegates to the Constitutional Convention 31 were lawyers, 12 educated in the best universities of England and Scotland; 39 were Members of the Continental Congresses, and 8 had assisted in framing their State constitutions; at least 22 were college graduates—9 of Princeton, 3 of Yale, 2 of Harvard, 4 of William and Mary, and 1 each from the Universities of Oxford, Columbia, Glasgow, and Edinburgh. Among them were James Madison, called The Father of the Constitution; Alexander Hamilton, author of The Federalist; Benjamin Franklin, the most versatile genius of the eighteenth century; and George Washington, the greatest man who ever stood at the forefront of a nation's history. They had studied every known form of government and were familiar with the classics of all times on the subject. Their work is summed up by Mr. Gladstone: "The American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

The Constitution is both ideal and practical; more ideal than Plato's Republic or Moore's Utopia, providing for the most advanced ideas and visions of a great people, and more practical and stable than any other form of government that has ever existed, being the oldest form of government of any great nation now existing. The storms which have destroyed other forms of government have left almost untouched the fabric of ours. In its construction the ideal of Washington expressed to the convention was followed: "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and just can repair. The event is in the hand of God."

Our Government, made by such men, is not only a good but an efficient and powerful government. This will appear more fully in the Preamble to Constitution and the history of 153 years of our democracy.

"We, the people of the United States * * *." This is democracy, a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Such government has been the dream of the ages. DeTocqueville in his Democracy in America, tells us that the spirit of democracy is irresistible, because it is the most uniform, the most ancient, and the most permanent tendency found in history, and that we shall scarcely meet with a single great event, in the lapse of 700 years, which has not turned to the advantage of equality, and that in America men are seen on a greater equality in point of fortune and intellect than in any other country in the world, or in any age of which history has preserved the remembrance.

Montesquieu, in his Spirit of Laws, tells us that the love of a state is peculiar to a democracy and that government is like anything else; to preserve it, we must love it.

Back of the great democratic movement, down through the ages, is the power of God which is irresistable. This explains the spirit of the American people in their great accomplishment in times of peace and in times of war. In our democracy the people enjoy liberty; they love their Government, and they are willing not only to live for it but to die for it; such spirit is invincible and cannot be found in any other form of government.

"In order to form a more perfect union." A federal republic or democracy of this kind, an indivisible union of indestructible states, is able to withstand a powerful external enemy, and at the same time to enjoy all the advantages of smaller democratic states.

"In order to establish justice." The Constitution establishes a Federal judiciary. The establishment of justice for every person and every State in the Union is the sublime purpose of the Constitution. All are equal before the law and enjoy the right of trial by jury, and no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. These rights are not secured in any of the dictator nations. The Constitution has succeeded so well in this purpose that the Supreme Court of the United States is the most respected court in the world both by Americans and foreigners.

"In order to insure domestic tranquillity." Our Constitution gave to the Government the power to keep peace and good order throughout the Union. The promise of the preamble in this respect has been well executed. Outside of the Civil War, waged to save the Union, and test the strength of the Constitution, internal peace has reigned and property and life have been secure from the adoption of the Constitution to the present day. This result has not been accomplished under any other form of government.

"In order to provide for the common defense." For 153 years the Union has met every emergency. It not only stood the strain of the great Civil War when half of the States of the greater Union of 1861 attempted to destroy it but it has protected us from external attacks from the War of 1812 to the present time. In the greatest civil war in the history of the world, following the worst depression in our country, the Northern States alone during a period of 4 years raised a magnificent army of over 2,000,000 soldiers to preserve the Union. In the great World War our Nation in 2 years raised an army of 4,000,000 soldiers, of whom 2,000,000 were transported across the ocean to the battlefields of France, where they met and put to rout the best trained soldiers of the German Empire. Our democracy has never lost a war.

"In order to promote the general welfare." Our democracy has come from a population of less than 4,000,000 to a population of 130,000,000; from a state without money or credit to the wealthiest nation on earth, offering to every person the greatest opportunity in the world. Poor boys have become the heads of business, leaders of the professions, legislators, Governors, judges, and Presidents of the Republic. In America there are more and better homes, more and better hospitals, more miles of railroads and highways, more labor-saving machines, more automobiles, higher wages, and more conveniences of life than in any other country on earth. In no other country is there so much happiness and contentment as in these United States of America.

"In order to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." Here we have a guaranty of individual liberty by constitutional limitations. Each individual as a responsible moral being has certain "inalienable rights" which neither the state nor the people can take away, among them, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This liberty, the gift of the gods, banished from the dictator nations, is the precious jewel of our democracy.

In conclusion, our fathers ordained a Constitution having no parallel in human history to form an indivisible union of indestructible free States; to establish justice; to insure domestic tranquility; to provide for the common defense; to promote the general welfare and to secure the blessing of liberty for themselves and their posterity. Thus they formed the last, the noblest, and the best government on earth.

"Sail on, O Ship of State!
Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!"

Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 4, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK DAILY NEWS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an interesting editorial from the columns of the New York Daily News of New York City and reprinted in the Times-Herald, of Washington, D. C., entitled "The Revolution Is On—Stop It Who Can."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Daily News]

"THE REVOLUTION IS ON—STOP IT WHO CAN"

We can't learn from Bartlett's Familiar Quotations or other source books who made the above remark. Maybe Danton, maybe Jack London—we don't know. But it is a pat remark for these times.

Some kind of revolution happened in Yugoslavia yesterday, on the heels of the previous Yugoslav Government's signature of a nonaggression treaty with Germany. Young King Peter II is in power as we go to press, with a lot of new faces in the Cabinet, the Yugoslav Army reportedly backing the King and anxious to get going against Hitler and Churchill trumpeting from London that Yugoslavia has "found its soul."

Belgrade telephone communications were down throughout the coup, and most of the news came from Budapest, London, Rome,

and Bern. It is possible that the Nazis will use this upset as a pretext for a swift military occupation of Yugoslavia to "save it from Churchill." If Hitler is to blitz Greece, unimpeded use of the easy Vardar Valley route to the Greek-Yugoslav border is almost essential to him.

In Syria the natives are staging bigger and better riots daily, with the situation nearing revolutionary intensity. Whether this coming revolution is against the Vichy French Government, which technically owns Syria, or against Berlin, which owns Vichy government, we are unable to make out.

FROM ARGONNE TO DAMASCUS

The ironic part of the whole mess seems to us to be the fact that Syria is owned by France at all, and why. Syria belonged to Turkey before the last war. It was awarded to France after the Allied victory. So our boys of the A. E. F., though they didn't know it at the time, were treading a road to Damascus, so to speak, as they slogged through the Argonne. They were helping to make Syria safe for the French.

We take it that President Roosevelt, empowered by the War Power Act to give aid to all friends of democracy, will presently discover that the Syrians are democrats under the skin and deserve our help. A Washington promise to help them against aggression went to the Yugoslavs yesterday.

WILD BILL SUGGESTS

As to probable increases in our help to Great Britain, we think a reliable tip-off was to be found in Col. William J. (Wild Bill) Donovan's striking and dramatic radio speech night before last. Wild Bill was one of the brightest ornaments of the first A. E. F.—a fierce and fearless fighting man—and he knows his way around the present-day world, too.

In this speech, delivered as a report of his recent "unofficial ambassador" trip through all the war theaters, Wild Bill hinted broadly that we'd better begin furnishing United States Navy convoys for shipments of war supplies to Britain. That, of course, was something the administration wanted said.

We think the Navy will be doing such convoy work before long; and that in the process some Navy vessels are highly likely to be sunk. In such case, we'll be much deeper in the war than we are now.

RUSSIA AND THE PEACE

The logical climax of all these increases in United States aid to Britain would be the sending of an A. E. F. II to make up for the fact (according to the available data) that Hitler has about twice as many soldiers as Britain has.

We're on this path; the decision has been made, and is now being acted upon. Another nation is pursuing the policy which we've thought all along would be the wise policy for the United States—a policy of keeping out of the fight, conserving its resources and building up its fighting powers, and planning to be strong enough at the finish to dictate much of the peace.

That nation is Russia. At the end of this war, Russia bids fair to be the strongest nation in the world. And the peace arrangements bid fair to bring forth a world order much closer to communism than any order now existing outside Russia and Germany. Ernest Bevin in Britain is already talking vaguely but vigorously about such developments.

All of which gives special aptness to the crack: "The revolution is on—stop it who can."

Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MON C. WALLGREN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 4, 1941

EXCERPT FROM BROADCAST BY FULTON LEWIS, JR.

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the broadcast of April 2, 1941, by Fulton Lewis, Jr., over station WOL, at Washington, D. C., describing his flight from Seattle to Washington, D. C., and indicating the strides that aviation is making in drawing the Pacific coast and Alaska closer to Washington, New York, and the Atlantic coast generally.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It may seem just a little startling to you—broadcasting from Seattle, Wash., last night, from a shipyard there, and getting into Washington here this afternoon in plenty of time to prepare this broadcast for this evening; but that's the magic of aviation.

As a matter of fact, to make a little confession, I had a secret desire to do my broadcast of last evening from Ketchikan, Alaska, which, I told you on Monday, is less than 3 hours from Seattle, and then this evening to say something very casually—just off the cuff, so to speak—about "last night, from Alaska, I told you thus and so," and "this afternoon, here in Washington, I checked further on it and found out this and that," and then just let it lie, without saying anything more, and it would have worked, too, so far as the total time was concerned, but the regular schedules refused to fit in.

However, coming across the country last night and this morning on Northwest Airlines, which runs just inside of the Canadian border, and into Chicago, I found out that that company now has an application pending to put in direct service from New York and Washington to Fairbanks, Alaska. You would leave here, say, late in the afternoon and arrive in Fairbanks the next morning. So you see the whole Northern Hemisphere is shrinking—not just the continental United States. That might be a tremendously important national-defense project, incidentally, because it would mean, of course, the establishment of a great many commercial airfields all across Canada, and it would serve to make a roadway of the air between the main continental United States and the all-important territory there at the gateway to Asia.

Inter-American Bar Association Conference, Habana, Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 4, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM F. CULBERTSON

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled the "Reign of Law," delivered by the Honorable William S. Culbertson, formerly professor, Georgetown University, vice chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, American Minister to Rumania, American Ambassador to Chile, before the first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association, at Habana, Cuba, on March 26.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REIGN OF LAW

(Address before the First Conference of the Inter-American Bar Association by William S. Culbertson,[1] vice chairman, delegation, Pennsylvania Bar Association, and delegate, American and Federal Bar Associations, Habana, Cuba, March 26, 1941)

I

In our more than 20 countries in the Americas we find a baffling diversity of laws, which are often in conflict. Statutes and decrees have multiplied in untold numbers. Precedents have been laid down by thousands of judges; interpretations have been declared by thousands of officials. Volumes of decisions and volumes of comments have been written. The laws of the countries which we represent seem to have the variety of the Amazonian jungle, the transitoriness of a mirage on the Chilean pampas, and a barrenness of the morasses south of the Beagle Channel.

What unity is there in this mass of legal fact and fiction?[2] Is justice merely a shifting concept that changes under the influence of time and place? Or are there some principles which underlie all the conflicting scenes of legal life? Are there ultimate norms and standards hidden in our array of nationalistic laws?

The ancients were troubled by these question. Men in every age have sought to know the origin and the nature of law. We, too, are seekers. The search which we, the delegates to this meeting of the Inter-

[1] Of the law firm of Culbertson & LeRoy, Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. Professor, Georgetown University. Formerly vice chairman, Tariff Commission; American minister to Rumania; American Ambassador to Chile. Home: Charmian, Pa.

[2] Cp. Lon L. Fuller, The Law in Quest of Itself, Chicago, 1940.

American Bar Association, are to institute is not merely an intellectual venture appealing to our reason, but a practical work which, if successfully accomplished, will lay the secure foundation of inter-American understanding and strengthen our influence in the post-war world. My emphasis then today will be, not on laws, but on law.

II

A paradox of our times is the decline of law in the midst of the enactment of many laws. Laws have multiplied under the impact of narrow nationalism, class politics, and personal ambition for power. No country in the Americas (or in the world, for that matter) has escaped the evil effect of these tendencies nor are lawyers in a position to disclaim a fair share of the blame for them. The result is that, overburdened by mountains of laws, law itself is breaking down.

Let me enlarge a little on these tendencies which are world wide in their influence. They have, in the first place, affected national law. We have witnessed the infiltration and spread of ideas in derogation of civil rights and the rights of private property.[3] It is a curious development that these ideas seem to have become more effective politically in countries which are economically immature or in countries which are suffering from abnormal economic conditions. In the Americas, as well as elsewhere, the collectivism of Marx and Lenin has its defenders.

I would be the first to agree that law without orderly social change becomes tyranny. But reform without due process of law, reform by force and confiscation, is retrogression. It begins, as a rule, with an attack on private property. Then follows inevitably an attack on personal rights. The interrelationship between human rights and property rights is often not realized until encroachment by government on the former begins. In fact, it usually happens that the very groups in the population for whose benefit property rights are attacked are the groups whose personal rights are in the end most seriously infringed. It is for this reason that the laboring classes in Great Britain have rejected the doctrines of Lenin and are the uncompromising enemies of Hitler.

The violation of law by a government does not nullify law.[4] It merely controls by force a particular situation. The greatest menace to civilization is a government which considers itself above law.

Contributing also to the break-down of national law is the assumption of heavy economic responsibilities by governments without a corresponding development of judicial control and administrative efficiency. Frequently there is not an adequate appreciation of due process of law and fundamental rights guaranteed by an independent judiciary. In many cases there are legal forms and phrases which are nullified by political realities. Under the inspiration of nationalistic and socialistic ideas, governments minimize the place of the individual in the social order and preach their own omnipotence by propaganda.

III

The tendencies which are breaking down law have, in the second place, affected international law. They have resulted in some cases in the virtual denial of the existence of international law, especially the law of diplomatic protection. Governments seek to avoid responsibility for their unjust acts by the argument that national law is always superior to international law. They deny all protection against the collective force of the State. In part this situation results from a failure to distinguish between the substantive and the procedural aspects of international law. It can be shown, I believe, by the great mass of authorities, writers and findings of international tribunals, as well as by the decisions of national courts, that there are accepted principles of substantive international law which protect and guarantee the personal and property rights of aliens who cross frontiers.[5] Here and there differences of interpretation exist, but no serious dispute exists over basic principles which fix the responsibility of nations with respect to the property and personal rights of aliens within their borders.[6]

It is when we turn to the question of procedure that the political element enters and law begins to break down. This is due to the fact that nations have not set up adequate courts, tribunals, or commissions for the purpose of applying to particular cases the accepted principles of substantive international law. Therefore, the only resort, once there has been a denial of justice in the offending country, is a political appeal to that Government either directly or through the diplomatic channels.

Obviously, this procedure may not be satisfactory. Foreign offices are burdened with a variety of issues, and their views with reference to the merits of a particular case may be colored by other matters which may seem for the time being more important. Nevertheless, it is an accepted principle that the nationals of a country are entitled to the support of diplomatic interposition for the purpose of protecting under international law their personal and property rights in foreign countries, and the ineffectiveness of this procedure in some cases does not modify one jot the substantive rights of an injured alien under international law.

IV

War follows in sequence the break-down of international law. Somewhere in Plutarch we read that the laws speak too softly to be heard in the noise of war. In war the laws are silent.[7] Unhappily they are not only silent; they are forgotten. Men learn the immediate advantage which may come to favored groups from the use of force. Conceptions of justice, order, and impartiality are repudiated and law is set at naught.

Forces of destruction have been loosened by the present war—forces which are not only destroying material things but which are undermining the social and political restraints which are the accumulated results of civilization. They are giving impetus, if not sanction, to the above-mentioned destructive tendencies. They are ignoring principles of law and weakening respect for law.

We live then in an age which has forgotten first principles. Even lawyers seem to have forgotten first principles. Laws are like raw clay in our hands which we seem unable to mold into the useful pottery of our everyday life. We have no philosophy of law to guide the shaping of a new social order.

V

We should again reaffirm and give life to the simple truth that the reign of law is supreme both over individuals and over governments. W. A. Robson in his book, Civilization and the Growth of Law, says (271–273):

"There are many different conceptions of the nature of juridical law. 'Each shows us a picture of some ultimate basis, beyond reach of the individual human will, that stands fast in the whirl of change of which life is made up. This steadfast ultimate basis may be conceived as the divine pleasure or will or reason, revealed through a divinely ordained immutable moral code. It may be put in the form of some ultimate metaphysical datum which is so given us that we may rest in it forever. It may be portrayed as certain ultimate laws which inexorably determine the phenomena of human conduct. Or it may be described in terms of some authoritative will for the time and place, to which the wills of others are subjected, that will deriving its authority ultimately and absolutely in some one of the preceding forms, so that what it does is by and large in no wise a matter of chance.'

"The liberation of the human mind from the cramping influence of religious assumptions respecting the nature of the universe; the destruction of authoritarian dogmas concerning the sanctity of law and behavior of physical matter; the banishment of sprites, demons, angels, gods, witches, and wonderworkers of all kinds to the realm of myth and legend; the substitution of rational analysis for a belief in supernatural intervention and miraculous interference in the affairs of daily life; the awakening of a spirit of patient and impartial inquiry into the processes of nature; the belief that the behavior of all phenomena is subject to the operation of known or knowable causes and effects; the recognition that the laws of man are what men make them and the laws of nature what men discover them to be; all this constitutes a supremely important movement in the evolution of the human race. It forms, one may say, the most essential step toward freedom and knowledge and power that the human mind has yet taken.

"No less impressive is the craving to discern some ultimate foundation of truth and certainty on which to rest the laws of nature and of man. All through the ages and still today men have sought a rock upon whose stubborn sides the waves of doubt and disbelief could beat in vain and on whose surface the ravages of time would leave no mark. To discover by the light of reason a substratum of ultimate and unchanging truth, and to know, again by reason, that it would stand for all time impregnable against the assaults of reason; such was the aim of the ancient Greek philosophers who lived and held their discourse more than 2,000 years ago. Such is still the aim of those who hold aloft the torch of reasoned thought today."

Scholars in the ancient world and in later times scholars trained in both the Anglo-American and civil systems of law have discussed the origin and nature of law. Law, they severally tell us, comes either from God or from reason or from experience.

---

[3] Cp. Maine, Ancient Law, on property rights in primitive communities.

[4] Cp. E. Schwer, Catholic Social Theory, translated by B. Landheer, St. Louis, 1940, on the theories of Thomas Aquinas and Saint Augustine.

[5] Grotius was the first one to stress the possibility of a supernational law which was based upon the community of states.

[6] Except, naturally, in case of nations which deny fundamental individual rights altogether.

[7] "Silent enim leges inter arma," Cicero, Pro Milone, 4.

First. God: Plato began his "laws" with a reference to the divine origin of law.[8] Even when we have rejected the sacrosanct conceptions of law which controlled when the human spirit was subservient to magic and fear of the supernatural, we find persisting with tenacity the belief that the universe is governed by a moral force; that we live in an ordered world; and that any elimination of the divine from law leads to the unpleasant conclusion of an atheistic world.[9] In our sophisticated age, we like to avoid the question whether there is a universal reason or a universal moral law. Personally, I find no inconsistency between the recognition of a divine law-giver and the acceptance of a rational system of law. Moreover, I doubt whether from a purely practical point of view man can, especially in this age, dispense with the moral or religious[10] element in the administration of law.

Second. Reason: In the first century Cicero said:[11] "What is more divine, I will not say in man only, but in all heaven and earth, than reason? And reason, when it is full grown and perfected, is rightly called wisdom. Therefore, since there is nothing better than reason, and since it exists both in man and God, the first common possession of man and God is reason. But those who have reason in common also have right reason in common. And since right reason is law, we must believe that men have law also in common with the gods. Further, those who share law must also share justice; and those who share these are to be regarded as members of the same commonwealth."

"In civilized countries," says Roscoe Pound,[12] "men are compelled to administer justice by formulas. These formulas are designed to express ideas of right and justice and as a means to promote right and justice. But there is always danger that we forget those ideas and lose sight of those ends and treat the formulas as existing for their own sake. Since the time of the stoics men have appealed to Nature to save ethical, political, and juristic thinking from this danger; and by Nature they have meant reason and general principles of right. The appeal to reason and to the sense of mankind for the time being as to what is just and right, which the philosophical jurist is always making, and his insistence upon what ought to be law as binding law because of its intrinsic reasonableness, have been the strongest liberalizing forces in legal history."

Blackstone believed that the human mind could subjectively discover, so far as they are necessary for the conduct of human relations, "the eternal immutable laws of good and evil."[13] Jeremy Bentham poked fun at Blackstone's law of nature, but he was quite as abstract and as dogmatic on urging his objective test of right and wrong in law and legislation; namely, "the greatest happiness of the greatest number."[14] Both of these writers had implicit faith in reason's ability to discover the ultimate standards of law and to apply them to human society.

I could not in a volume, much less a speech, review the literature[15] on natural rights and law of nature. I may be called old-fashioned for even mentioning them. But "natural rights" played a mighty role in the creation of the American States. A mere sense of gratitude should impel us to respect their memory, and it might even invite us to consider whether we have achieved the social ideals which were the promise of the days of the great liberators and patriots who found their inspiration in the law of nature. Should we yield to the new ideologies, less adapted to our social and economic needs, before we give reality to principles which were written into our republican constitutions?

Third. Experience: The historical school of law undertakes to discover the principles of justice and right from human experience. It was a reaction against the codification movement and its arbitrary rules which lacked a sufficient historical foundation. Principles of law, it argues, have become established through the trial and error of history. The pendulum of experience has, as it were, finally come to rest at standards of conduct which the community accepts as right. Conclusions of right and wrong expressed in custom and in the cases decided by judges throughout the years are the rules which mankind recognizes as law. We associate with this school such names as Friedrich Karl Savigny[16] and Sir Henry Maine.

Fourth. Other theories of law are current—philosophical, historical, and analytical.[17] Some of them are products of nationalistic and socialistic movements and are to be judged for what they are worth as part of the propaganda of these movements and as attempts to give a philosophic basis to economic or political programs. I am not willing to classify as a philosophy of law the suggestion that laws are merely a working basis of human existence and that justice is determined by the pragmatic test of whether or not it works. Nor do I accept as a philosophy the materialistic concepts of law that law merely reflects the system of production and economic power relations which exist in a society in any given time.[18]

The mechanical positivist theories of law have had considerable vogue.[19] They have been sharply criticized and the German jurist Bergbohm has even shown that they have taken over parts of the theory of natural law. The sociological theory of law also has its followers. It at least has the merit that it aids us to discover the inadequacy of positive law. Moreover, the results of its analysis supplements the vagueness of natural law.[20]

In seeking a theory of law we sooner or later come back to the conception of freedom. Immanuel Kant thought that he gave us an adequate answer. Freedom, he argued, is not the antithesis of law; it is the highest expression of law. Man is free as an ethical subject, but he is governed by a system of law imposed upon himself.[21]

VI

Necessarily my review of the theories of law has been sketchy. I will be content if it has served to help to stimulate thought and discussion among the lawyers of the Americas. I do not expect agreement. For some lawyers one theory will be more persuasive than others. In my opinion, those thinkers have the best of the argument who hold that there are laws—great principles of human relationships—which men in civilized countries obey whether there are sanctions or not. They include at least a workable respect for civil and property rights and for contract obligations; also due process of law not only in suits between man and man but also in suits to which government is a party. The application of these principles change; they themselves do not change. They define the relation of man to man; of government to man and man to government, and of government to government. Nationalism, socialism, or capitalism do not modify the approach which they compel. Nationalistic, communistic, or inidividualistic creeds or systems can distort them but they rise above restraints and abuses and finally triumph. Legislative law should seek to proclaim these fundamental rules of conduct and to apply them to the changing needs of our time. No difference how far short of the ultimate standards of justice the authorities of our different countries fall, we need

---

[8] "ATHENIAN STRANGER. Tell me, strangers, is a god or some man supposed to be the author of your laws?

"CLEINIAS. A god, stranger; in very truth a god * * *." (Jewett's translation, Dialogues of Plato.)

[9] O. Willmann, Geschichte des Idealismus, second edition, Brunswick, 1907.

[10] I, of course, do not mean ecclesiastical influence.

[11] De Legibus (Loeb translation), p. 321. Cp. sec. 1 of the Institutes of Roman Law by Gaius, translated by Edward Poste (Oxford, 1904):

"The laws of every people governed by statutes and customs are partly peculiar to itself, partly common to all mankind. The rules established by a given state for its own members are peculiar to itself, and are called jus civile; the rules constituted by natural reason for all are observed by all nations alike, and are called jus gentium. So the laws of the people of Rome are partly peculiar to itself, partly common to all nations; and this distinction shall be explained in detail in each place as it occurs."

[12] Scope and Purpose of Sociological Jurisprudence. Harvard Law Review, June 1911, p. 608.

[13] Cp. Sir William Blackstone, Commentaries on the Laws of England, vol. I, introduction, sec. 2:

"Human law must not contravene nature. This law of nature, being coeval with mankind, and dictated by God himself, is, of course, superior in obligation to any other. It is binding over all the globe, in all countries, and at all times: no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this; and such of them as are valid derive all their force, and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original."

[14] Leslie Stephen, The English Utilitarians, Putnam's Sons, 1902, vol. 1, p. 235 et seq.

[15] Carleton Kemp Allen, Law in the Making, Oxford 1931; W. R. Inge, Liberty and Natural Rights, Oxford 1934; George Douglas Campbell, eighth Duke of Argyll, The Reign of Law, London, 1867; Roscoe Found, Introduction to the Philosophy of Law, Yale University Press, 1922; John Dickinson, Administrative Justice and the Supremacy of Law in the United States, Harvard University Press, 1927; C. H. W. Johns, The Relations Between the Laws of Babylonia and the Laws of the Hebrew Peoples, Oxford, 1915; Charles Foster Kent, Israel's Laws and Legal Precedents, Scribner's Sons, 1907; O. von Gierke, Johannes Althusius und die Lutwicklung der Naturrechtlichen Staatstheorien, 4th ed., Breslau 1929; J. Charmont, La Renaissance du Droit Naturel, Paris, 1927.

[16] Karl Savigny, Of the Vocation of Our Age for Legislation and Jurisprudence, London, 1831.

[17] Modern Theories of Law, Oxford University Press, 1933.

[18] Ferdinand Lassalle, Ueber Verfassungswesen (1862), cp. Chang, the Marxian Theory of the State, Philadelphia, 1931.

[19] In Europe Kelsen was one of the main exponents of a legal positivism (cp. his Reine Rechtslehre, 1934), and John Austin for the common-law world (Lectures on Jurisprudence, London, 1869).

[20] Ehrlich, Fundamental Principles of the Sociology of Law, Cambridge, 1936, and Nicholas Sergeyevitch Timasheff, An Introduction to the Sociology of Law, Cambridge, 1939.

[21] Kant, Fundamental Principles of Morals (the Harvard Classics, vol. 32):

"As a rational being, and consequently belonging to the intelligible world, man can never conceive the causality of his own will otherwise than on condition of the idea of freedom, for independence on the determining causes of the sensible world (an independence which reason must always ascribe to itself) is freedom. Now the idea of freedom is inseparably connected with the conception of autonomy, and this again with the universal principle of morality which is ideally the foundation of all actions of rational beings, just as the law of nature is of all phenomena." Cp. Article on Kant in Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Macmillan Co. (1932).

the guidance of these ultimate standards to make efforts toward improvement in the social order worth while.

VII

Whether we like it or not we are destined to live in a world of many laws. Government is playing and will play an increasingly important role in the regulation of human activities. This tendency can be, but need not be, destructive of ultimate principles of law in an enlightened society. In fact, government can and should become a force, not destroying as it is doing in many places today, but preserving and protecting the realm of individual right in which law reigns.

Unfortunately, the great principles of law, even when accepted in theory, are often distorted in their application. Personal and political factors intervene. Law is a human institution. Public officials in dealing with both national and international questions often seek an excuse for not applying principles of law to a particular case when they would readily admit the soundness of the principles in the abstract or even in the particular case if their political objectives called for the support of the principles.

We are here in Habana to compare laws. Let us compare, not our bad law, but our good laws. We are also here to seek in our systems of law a common basis for living in peace and in cooperation. The civilization of a community of human beings can be measured by its laws. I do not mean merely the statutes which it enacts or decrees from time to time but also its acceptance and enforcement of those minimum standards of conduct for men and governments which reason and experience in all nations and in all ages have been wont to associate with an enlightened society. Not only individuals but governments violate at their peril these ultimate standards of justice, impartiality, and fair dealing.

Dr. Albert M. Justo, of Argentina, observes in the introduction of a recent work: [1]

"Comparative law shows the way to arrive at an understanding of the world's great juridical systems. This method enables us to get away from the regionalism or the conservatism in which, as a rule, the law-making process unfolds.

"Far from favoring a unilateral conception of the law, we think it indispensable, in this period of international confusion, to fight for a reciprocal understanding of the systems in force in the American countries in order to orientate the legislative reconstruction toward a frontierless juridical order."

Can we ever realize a juridical order without frontiers? If we look superficially only at laws, we cannot. But if we look behind the laws we will find the unity of law, a unity of principles which gives life and power to both Anglo-American and civil law and which give us a common frontier in the universe of our hopes and aspirations.

VIII

I have tried to speak today, not as a citizen of the United States, not as a citizen of the Americas, but as a citizen of that commonwealth of men everywhere in which law should reign. Even if we should succeed in discrediting the theories of law which condemn law to slavery under nationalistic and socialistic creeds, we will still hear plausible arguments for regional or inter-American law. We should not yield to this temptation. Isolation is no more an intelligible policy for the hemisphere than it is for a nation.

I recognize the contributions which jurists and statesmen throughout the Americas have made to the clarification and development of law, and this effort should be encouraged; but at times in former conferences of the American states attempts have been made to have local and specialized conceptions of law proclaimed as inter-American law. We will not fall into this error if as such cases arise we remind ourselves that fundamentally there is no such thing as a system of inter-American law as distinguished from law in and among all nations; that the principles of justice which we may proclaim and codify do not differ from the principles which apply to human relations in all the continents.[2]

Political and military leaders on continental Europe and in eastern Asia are today seeking unity through force. Instruments of power and empire! Force has been systematized and organized. It has been provided with a philosophy and its disciples are legion.

Even in these uncertain times when many hesitate, awaiting the outcome of battle, we at least should not falter in giving our answer. Our answer to unity through force is unity through law. It is a unity as old as the Hebrew prophets and as young as the hopes and aspirations which spring up daily in the hearts of the millions who love peace with justice. It comprehends in its ample scope not only the peoples of the hemisphere but all the nations of men. It offers security and prosperity within nations; understanding and peace among them. If it be said that I am visionary, if it be said that tanks and bombers do not permit us now to dream of a better world, I reply, "'Tis not what man does which exalts him but what man would do."

[1] Perspective de un Programa de Derecho Comparado, El Ateneo, Buenos Aires, 1940.

You Answer Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 4, 1941

ARTICLE BY FRANK C. WALDROP

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, Mr. Frank C. Waldrop is the foreign and political editor of the Washington Times-Herald, of Washington, D. C. Daily he writes a column for that newspaper. Several days ago I ran across a most interesting column by his pen entitled "You Answer Him." I respectfully ask unanimous consent that this be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[2] Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, said at the Eighth International Conference of American States, Lima, Peru, December 10, 1938:

"Nor has the earnest search for world order under law been confined to any one portion of the globe. The developments which have taken place in the Western Hemisphere have been a part of a mighty stream of new ideas, new concepts, new attitudes of mind and spirit, which has coursed and ramified, with differing degrees of vigor and success, throughout the world. We have made important contributions to that stream, and have, in turn, been nourished by it."

Cp. Mr. Hull's address on the Spirit of International Law, Nashville, Tenn., June 3, 1938.

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

YOU ANSWER HIM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

A young lawyer flourished his draft registration card the other day and said:

"You see this? I had a high number in the draft, and they called me up months ago. I was perfectly healthy, so they were all set to send me off to camp when they found I am still going to school.

"I have my law degree, but I am studying for a final degree. They told me I would be deferred until July so I can get it.

"So now I'm studying and trying to make a living on the side, too.

"But I'm not getting very far. I can't take any cases worth having, because I'll be drafted before I can get 'em to trial. I can't get a job, because I will have to go off to camp just about the time I know what I am hired to do.

"What's provided in this country for guys like me?"

It's no good telling anybody as smart as that fellow he is just supposed to fight and be proud of the chance. That's too unsophisticated an answer for a lawyer, any lawyer, to swallow.

It's no good saying that his generation has a rendezvous with destiny. He doesn't want a rendezvous with destiny. He wants a rendezvous with a rich client in the United States Supreme Court. And why not, after all?

And it's no good calling him names. He has made up his mind about that.

"I'm going to do my part," he says. "I'm not scared and I'm sure I'll make a good soldier.

"But what I want to know is how come I must give up my career and be a military day laborer at $21 a month—and that's what I'll be—while a carpenter, doing day labor on a powder mill, will be making nearly that much every day, 5 days a week, and time and a half over the week-end?"

A very embarrassing question. Try to answer it if you doubt that. Remember, you're dealing with an educated and angry young man who isn't fooled by flag waving. He's going to fight, and fight hard, because that has to be done. Die if necessary. But he's not going to be soothed by phony talk. You'll have to give him and his kind a straight answer, so be thinking about it.

In the meantime, you can issue a point of fact for carpenters and all others to consider. If you switch a young lawyer into a soldier, you put ideas in his head that he never would have got hanging around the Supreme Court in a swallow-tailed coat.

One idea he already has: That he doesn't like "these strikes."

"How is it," he wants to know, "that a soldier can't strike but a man making things with which the soldier must fight, can strike?"

"How is it," he also wants to know, "that the Government can commandeer a man's business—shut it down, take it over, tax it to bankruptcy—and yet the Government can't do anything about the employees of that plant?"

He had particularly in mind the aluminum pot and pan industry of Ohio, which was told a few days ago by the Office of Production Management that it will have to quit because the aluminum is needed for airplanes.

"The workers in that plant," observed the young lawyer, "will get jobs because the Government has plans for them. But what happens to the owners? The stockholders? What happens to the people who put that plant together and made it tick? All they get is a big bill for taxes."

This young man has a curious turn of mind, obviously. He isn't looking at things the way so many of the people have become accustomed to. It has almost become a habit in some quarters to assume that a strike is a sacred right and never to be challenged either

as to its wisdom or as to its inalienable authority.

But that's not going to last. You don't have to be a young lawyer whose career is about to be busted by the draft to see that.

In the office of the Under Secretary of War there hangs a chart on which is marked up every day the rising total of man-hours of defense labor lost through strikes.

It is a startling thing to see. Somewhere on that chart there is an X point, at which you can expect the War Department to take action. Heads will be cracked, whether they are heads of management or of labor.

The young lawyer by that time will undoubtedly be in uniform and sweating through bayonet practice at $21 a month. The only question is how many high-priced carpenters and others will have driven themselves right into his class by shortsighted behavior.

Temporary National Economic Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 4, 1941

CATALOG OF PUBLICATIONS OF TEMPORARY NATIONAL ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a catalog of various publications of the T. N. E. C. This catalog shows the prices for which the publications may be obtained at the office of the Superintendent of Documents. There has been so much interest in the publications of the committee that I feel it desirable that the complete catalog be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the catalog was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DESCRIPTION OF HEARINGS AND MONOGRAPHS OF THE TEMPORARY NATIONAL ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

HEARINGS

Part 1, Economic Prologue, December 1, 2, and 3, 1938. Wasted resources; production of commodities in prosperity and depression; employment and pay rolls in depression; cost of depression to Government; business population growth; extent of corporate activity; size of enterprises measured by employees; measures of concentration by employees; size of enterprise measured by assets; growth of large enterprises; problems of the individual businessman; shifts in importance of industries and trades; measures of concentration; fluctuations in business conditions; unemployment and the labor supply; basic assumptions of American competitive capitalistic system; problems confronting Temporary National Economic Committee.

Superintendent of Documents, 25 cents.

Part 2, Patents, December 5, 6, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16, 1938. Automobile industry: the policy of free licensing, the cross-licensing system, the license-royalty system; the glass-container industry: control of an industry through patents, patents in the glass-container industry, the largest glass producer in the world, litigation and licensing, the fruit-jar producers, the control of the lehr, the elimination of a Texas independent, refusal to license in Detroit, record of an independent, the specialty glass field, glass fiber and wool.

Superintendent of Documents, 75 cents.

Part 3, Patents, Proposals for Changes in Law and Procedure, January 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20, 1939. Examination of the patent laws and operation of industry under them; rate of filing of patent applications; distribution of ownership of patents; procedure in examination of patent applications; reform in patent procedure sought; assignment of patents to corporations by employees; "suppression of patents"; patent pools; recommendations of the Science Advisory Board on patent reform; need for scientific advisors in patent trials; value of patent system in reducing unemployment; need for single court of patent appeals; value of scientific research; value of patent protection to industry; patent infringement litigation discloses evils in present patent system; comparison of provisions of foreign and United States patent systems; licensing of patents; effect of abolition of patent system on competition.

Superintendent of Documents, 35 cents.

Part 4, Life Insurance, February 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, and 17, 1939. Introductory statements and comment on size and importance of legal reserve life-insurance companies; growth, income and expenditures, and general comparisons; assets and investments; Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.; Management aspects: selection and attendance of directors in Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.; election of directors, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., New York Life Insurance Co., Acacia Life Insurance Co., Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York, analysis of recent elections in major companies; transactions of Mitchell D. Follansbee, director, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.; growth of New York Life Insurance Co. and the selection and attendance of its directors; transactions involving interlocking directors and directors' affiliations: New York Life Insurance Co.; Mutual Life Insurance Co.; selection of directors—Home Insurance Co.; New York law governing conduct of life-insurance directors; transactions of Charles D. Hilles, director, New York Life Insurance Co.; transactions of Hendon Chubb, director, Prudential Life Insurance Co. of America; the Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., election and selection of directors, duties, and standards of directors' conduct and policyholders' committee.

Superintendent of Documents, 50 cents.

Part 5, Monopolistic Practices in Industries, Development of the Beryllium Industry, February 28, March 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, and 14, May 8 and 9, 1939 Monopolistic practices in industries: tendency toward monopolistic control of industry; relation between monopoly and depression; simplification of corporation set-up proposed; adequacy of antitrust laws as legal implements; causes of failure of present economic system; proposed economic reforms; representative cases of monopolistic and restraint of trade practices; respondent's right of appeal under Wheeler-Lea Act; section 7 of the Clayton Act; section 6 of the Federal Trade Commission Act; section 8 of the Clayton Act; financial structure, practice, rates, and returns of public utilities; financial accounting practices of utility companies; Federal incorporation or licensing of corporations; the basing-point system as practiced in steel industry; economic consequences of basing-point system; importance of sulfur and sulfuric acid; sulfur prices and profits; profits of sulfur companies; development of the beryllium industry; importance of beryllium; production and physical qualities of beryllium alloys; patent control in the industry; patent control over beryllium processing machines; reduction in price of beryllium sought to increase sales volume; "follow the leader" policy of pricing; cooperation between firms in price fixing of beryllium products; uncertainty as to amount of beryllium ore existing.

Superintendent of Documents, 75 cents.

Part 5–A, Federal Trade Commission Report on Monopolistic Practices in Industries, March 2, 1939. Résumé of formal action in restraint of trade cases, except sections 7 and 8 of the Clayton Act and the Robinson-Patman Act, July 1, 1930, to date; discussion of court decisions and summary of formal action in cases under sections 7 and 8 of the Clayton Act; informal investigations under section 7 of the Clayton Act; available economic material; agricultural implement and machinery industry; agricultural income inquiry; chain stores; competition and profits in bread and flour; cooperative marketing; house furnishings industries; household furniture, household stoves, kitchen furnishings, and domestic appliances; milk and milk products; open-price trade associations; packer consent decree; petroleum industry—prices, profits, and competition; premium prices on anthracite; price bases inquiry, portland cement, range boilers, utility corporations.

Superintendent of Documents, 15 cents.

Part 6, Liquor Industry, March 14, 15, 16, and 17, 1939. Presentation of conditions in the liquor industry; state systems of liquor control; the Federal Alcohol Administration Act; production by four largest units compared with total production; amount of whisky held in bonded warehouses by four large companies in comparison with whole industry's stocks; advantage of holding company set-up to producer; banking arrangements of the Schenley Corporation; bankers loan agreements with Schenley and Seagrams; distribution of liquor in "monopoly" states; effect of fair-trade laws on whisky prices; price concessions to distributors in "open" states sought by "monopoly" states; operations of D. C. L. and its subsidiaries in marketing Scotch whisky; typical sole agency contract; inception and operations of Distilled Spirits Institute.

Superintendent of Documents, 40 cents.

Part 7, Milk Industry, Poultry Industry, March 9, 10, and 11 and May 1, 2, and 3, 1939. Milk industry: problem of better distribution of wealth in dairy industry; suggestions for improvements in milk distribution system; retail and price received by farmer for fluid milk; need for protection to farmer; "cash and carry" method of distribution; proportion of purchase price of milk received by producer; "spread" between price paid to producer and that paid by consumer; The Borden Company's position in the milk industry; suggestions for improvement of conditions in the industry; establishment of cheese price by one exchange; percentage of milk and dairy products controlled by two major distributors; concentration of dairy production in North Central area of United States; desirability of Government control in fixing sound price basis; return to National Dairy on invested capital; effect of large holding companies on milk industry; per capita consumption of milk in various countries compared with United States. Poultry industry; monopolistic practices in the poultry industry; effect of labor unions in the poultry industry.

Superintendent of Documents, 75 cents.

Part 8, Problems of the Consumer, May 10, 11, and 12, 1939. The consumer movement; typical American consumer; inadequate consumer information; United Conference against the High Cost of Living; mislabeling of consumer goods; brands not a standard for quality; need for standard sizes; price not a guide to quality; confusion of brands, sizes, and prices; consumer credit; price fixing; consumer services and organizations; commodity rating services provided by commercial agencies; consumer "educa-

tional" material supplied to schools by commercial agencies; consumer organizations sponsored by commercial agencies; problem of marketing new consumer products; need for standard ratings in marketing household equipment; functions and activities of National Bureau of Standards; use of standards in purchases of consumer goods by public agencies.

Superintendent of Documents, 25 cents.

Part 9, Savings and Investment, May 16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26, 1939. The flow of savings and the flow of investment; effects of changes in the volume of capital formation on the size of the national income; factors responsible for the prosperity of the twenties; relation of savings to investment; outlets for savings, 1921–38; composition of total expenditures offsetting savings, 1921–38; effect of Government action on the volume and flow of the national income; contribution of Federal Government to income-producing expenditure; sources of capital funds—United States Steel Corporation, 1921–38; sources of capital funds—General Electric Co.; sources of capital funds—Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Co.; sources of capital funds—General Motors Corporation, 1921–38; significance of internal financing; social consequences of hoarding; growth in the volume of savings held by selected savings institutions, 1910–38; geographical concentration of assets of savings institutions; volume of public construction—Federal, State, and local, 1920–38; role of public works in solution of investment problem; role of legal list in directing flow of investment funds; effect of expanding the legal list of flow of investment funds; function and development of capital credit mechanism; increasing credit facilities available to small businessman; proposal for creation of capital banks with Federal credit for public works; the double budget—increasing importance of expenditures for investment in the total outlay of the Federal Government, cautions on use of a double budget; proposal for setting up institutions to finance small business; major difficulties encountered by small business seeking new capital.

Superintendent of Documents, 75 cents.

Part 10, Life Insurance, June 6, 7, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, and 21, 1939. Intercompany agreements; the Group Association, nonparticipating rates, annuities, settlement options, surrender values and surrender charges, medical information bureau, "jumbo risks," replacement agreement, reinsurance, terminations of life insurance—ordinary and industrial; theory of life insurance; lobbying and legislative activities—association of life insurance presidents; savings-bank life insurance—opposition of insurance interests; savings-bank life insurance—description.

Superintendent of Documents, 75 cents.

Part 10–A, Life Insurance, February 12, 1940. Operating results and investments of the 26 largest legal reserve life insurance companies domiciled in the United States, 1929–38.

Superintendent of Documents, 35 cents.

Part 11, Construction Industry, June 27, 28, and 29, July 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, and 14, 1939. Construction employment; volume of construction; available housing and housing needs; factors of housing costs and need for lower costs; effect of reduction in capital cost as compared to similar reduction in interest rate, the economic purpose of antitrust enforcement in removing restraints of trade in building; summary of the principal restraints of trade in the building industry; economic effect of removal of restraints in the building industry; procedures now available to attack restraints of trade in the building industry; necessary procedural amendments; "yield insurance" as a stimulant to low-cost housing; the "Lambert plan" for low-rental housing; effect of technical research on housing costs; interest rates and service charges; where home ownership savings can be made.

Superintendent of Documents, 75 cents.

Part 12, Industrial Insurance, August 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, and September 5, 6, and 7, 1939. Purpose and characteristics of industrial insurance; profits of companies writing industrial insurance; Monumental Life Insurance Co., history and description, transformation from mutual to stock company; Prudential Insurance Co. of America, operations of industrial department; industrial insurance policy terms; laws applicable to industrial insurance; adjustments of insurance holdings; Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.; Western & Southern Life Insurance Co.; cost of universal death benefit system; agency practices.

Superintendent of Documents, 75 cents.

Part 13, Life Insurance, September 11, 12, 13, and 22; October 26 and 27; December 7, 8, 14, 15, 20, 21, and 22, 1939. Travelers Insurance Co.; Shenandoah Life Insurance Co.; sales and agency practices; reinsurance and rewriting.

Superintendent of Documents, 75 cents.

Part 14, Petroleum Industry, September 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30, 1939. Importance and economic significance of petroleum industry; percentage of ownership or control by major companies in various branches of the petroleum industry; proration; effect of proration on price; decline in price of petroleum products compared with general price decline of commodities; investment and income of 24 oil companies; petroleum industry income and the national income; the industry's transportation systems; keenness of competition in retail marketing; contractual relationship between integrated companies and retail marketers; cracking process patents; pipe-line transportation, rates of return, and the economic results; similarity in finished gasoline; excessive marketing costs in distribution of gasoline and oil; sponsorship of the Connally Hot Oil Act; pipe-line profits and rates of return; conservation differentiated from proration; cost of production; price posting and question of price leadership.

Superintendent of Documents, 75 cents.

Part 14–A, Petroleum Industry, Economic Outline and Data Relating to the Petroleum Industry, September 25, 1939. The industry in general: world production and consumption of petroleum; the petroleum industry in the United States; the twenty major oil companies: position of the twenty major oil companies in the various branches of the industry; crude-oil activities; transportation; refining; marketing; total assets and capital employed by major oil companies; earnings, dividends, and changes in surplus of major oil companies.

Superintendent of Documents, 75 cents.

Part 15, Petroleum Industry, Section II, October 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, 1939. Forces "squeezing out" the independent operator; rail rates lower on short than on long hauls; use of pipe lines denied the independent; effect of pipe-line profits on competition; suggestions for improvement of economic conditions in the industry; administration of proration in Texas; rapid progress of trucking as means of petroleum transportation; effect of pipe-line transportation on competition in the industry; advantages and disadvantages of integration; description of processes of modern refinery; percentage of various products obtained from a barrel of crude; cost of operating modern refinery; cost of producing gasoline; reserves of crude oil and percentage held by 20 largest companies; shifting position of 16 largest companies in the industry; existence of competition in retail marketing; reduction in gasoline price from 1920 to date; jobbers' profit margin; present market control; report on marketing practices in the industry; inducements offered to retailers for becoming exclusive dealers; jobber contracts; acquisition of jobbing businesses by major company; publication of tank-car and service-station prices; loaning of equipment to dealers and its effect.

Superintendent of Documents, 75 cents.

Part 15–A, Petroleum Industry, Report on Marketing Practices in the Retail Distribution of Motor Fuel and Motor Lubricant Products, Saturday, October 7, 1939.

Superintendent of Documents, 35 cents.

Part 16, Petroleum Industry, Section III, October 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 16, 1939. Costs of marketing and the difficulties of independent marketers; divorcement of marketing recommended for integrated companies; effect of proration on the independent; inducements offered jobber to become exclusive dealer; price structure of regular gasoline in various representative cities; basing point system in the petroleum industry; efforts of integrated companies to discourage competition from independent brands of Pennsylvania oil; absorption of retail outlets by major oil companies disclosed by marketing survey; discrimination, through price differential, between exclusive and "split" dealer and its effect on price to the consumer; interest and objectives of Petroleum Retailers Association; the "blockade" method and other practices; four types of retail outlets; Federal Trade Commission report on marketing practices in the industry.

Superintendent of Documents, $1.

Part 17, Petroleum Industry, Section IV, October 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, and 25, 1939. Conditions peculiar to the industry in the Rocky Mountain States; importance of Wyoming as an oil-producing and refining State; aims and activities of the National Association of Petroleum Retailers; conservation of oil and gas pools; engineering aspects of conservation; unit operation; economic aspects of conservation and waste in oil production; naval oil reserves; Bureau of Mines' estimates of national demand and methods used in calculation, costs, profits, ultimate prices; ability and integrity of corporate management; opportunities for the independent in producing; opportunities for the independent in refining; profits and losses in marketing by Standard Oil Co.; opportunities for the independent in marketing; the Iowa plan; crude oil, posted prices, conservation; question of Government intervention and regulation of conservation; relation of optimum production to price.

Superintendent of Documents, 65 cents.

Part 17–A, Petroleum Industry, Replies of Oil Companies to the Committee Questionnaire on Financial Data and Related Topics, October 20, 1939. Restatement of capital stock and revaluations of assets; accounting practices and policies; comparison of compensation paid to officers and directors, net earnings applicable to common stock, and dividends paid on common stock; summary of companies reporting that surplus was credited for part of the proceeds received from the original issue of capital stock; analysis of shares of capital stock voted at stockholders' meetings; replies to question 32 of Temporary National Economic Committee questionnaire pertaining to costs of gasoline and costing policies; analysis of consolidated assets and consolidated income classified by branches or departments.

Superintendent of Documents, 30 cents.

Part 18, Iron and Steel Industry, Iron Ore, November 1, 2, and 3, 1939. History and background of the iron ore industry; the major iron ore producers; financial connections between ore companies and steel companies; acquisition of stock in Oglesbay, Norton Co., by Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Co.; Cyrus S. Eaton project for Midwestern steel merger; stabilization and competition; formation of the National Steel Corporation; the Rowe Mine; Pickands, Mather-Butler Bros. ore contract; the "United Front" policy; the Lake Erie base price; price rigidity; iron ore pricing; establishment of the base price; variations from the base price; effect of cutting the market price; limited market for ore sales; price discussions; significance of ore prices to integrated and nonintegrated steel producers; lake freight rates on iron ore; question of

modification of existing laws to allow more freedom for businessmen; iron ore reserves.

Superintendent of Documents, 30 cents.

Part 19, Iron and Steel Industry, General Price Policies, November 6, 7, 9, and 10, 1939. Iron and steel prices during World War I; the present situation; foreign and domestic demands; supply conditions; expectations of buyers and sellers; structure of United States Steel Corporation; the 1936 price increases; steel prices in 1937 and first half of 1938; the June 1938 price reduction; reasonable prices"; the Birmingham differential; Pacific coast prices; "extras"; change in extras in May 1938; price changes; government bids; Bethlehem's price-announcement policy; establishment of new basing points by Bethlehem; tin-plate prices; question of stabilization; operations of National Steel Corporation; price policy for steel industry suggested by Mr. Weir; development of the continuous rolling mill; continuous rolling mill license agreements.

Superintendent of Documents, 35 cents.

Part 20, Iron and Steel Industry, Price Policies on Specific Products, Pacific Coast Problems, Steel Export Association, November 8, 13, 14, and 15, 1939. Price relationship between finished and semifinished steel; tin-plate prices; contracts for the sale of tin plate; contracts for the sale of cans; employer cooperation in the British Isles and in the United States; tubular products; question of selling pipe f. o. b. the mill; competition between lap-weld and seamless pipe; lap-weld price discussions in August 1938; pricing of seamless pipe; Pacific Coast steel fabricators' problems; fabrication in transit; the Steel Export Association of America; the problem of nonmembers' shipments; possible effect of cartel control on home markets; question of eliminating the American nonmember.

Superintendent of Documents, 35 cents.

Part 21, War and Prices, December 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, 1939. Effect of wars on prices; price trend, 1913 to 1922; prices, at the beginning of the World War, in present war, since August 1939; American foreign trade during the World War; inventories and production during the World War period and since August 1939; present price trends as viewed by an industrial purchasing agent; the problem of adequate supplies of commodities controlled by belligerents; present price trends as viewed by a municipal purchasing agent; price problems viewed by an institutional purchasing agent; automobile manufacturers compare present automobile prices and operating costs with those of 20 years ago; effect of lower costs on prices and volume of demand; average price increase on automobile materials since outbreak of war; effect of European war on American economic system; evaluation of trade agreements and other sanctions as effective controls of wartime trade; present price trends as viewed by a large retailer; information concerning productive facilities and their use, market conditions and inventories useful in preventing runaway prices; problems of the small merchant when prices change; relationship between mark-up on cost and profit on sales; state price control laws; proposed organization for prevention of unjustified price increases.

Superintendent of Documents, 65 cents.

Part 22, Investment Banking, December 12, 13, and 14, 1939. Brown Brothers Harriman & Co.—Harriman Ripley & Co., Incorporated, stock ownership by Harriman family in Brown Harriman & Co., Incorporated, the Banking Act of 1933; financing of Chicago Station Co., agreements among investment banking houses on participations in Chicago Union Station Co. financing, the 1935 refunding—Effects of the Banking Act of 1933; financing of Pacific Gas & Electric Co., the benefits of position in advertising, realignments in investment banking business—1933–1934; Charles E. Mitchell—Blyth & Co., Inc., return of "the Morgan people" to the investment banking business, utility holding companies to which Morgan Stanley & Co., Incorporated, had succeeded J. P. Morgan & Co. as banker, competition in investment banking, the telephone group, value of opening deposit account with J. P. Morgan & Co. to an investment banking house, Morgan Stanley & Co. "survey of street conditions."

Superintendent of Documents, 50 cents.

Part 23, Investment Banking, December 15, 18, 19, and 20, 1939. Financing of American Telephone & Telegraph Co.—J. P. Morgan & Co., percentage interests of original contractors in 1906 and subsequent syndicates, investment banking as a profession, distribution of spread on Telephone issues, competitive bidding as an alternative, telephone financing subsequent to the Banking Act—activities of George Whitney, the Illinois Bell Telephone syndicate, former members of Telephone group affected by Banking Act of 1933, alternative methods of selling securities; financing of railroad maturities, 1935, function of J. P. Morgan & Co. in refunding operations; relations of J. P. Morgan & Co. to Morgan Stanley & Co., analysis of business done by Morgan Stanley & Co., Incorporated, enumeration of former accounts of J. P. Morgan & Co. underwritten by Morgan Stanley & Co., Incorporated; accounts not underwritten, partners' interests in J. P. Morgan & Co. in relation to their preferred-stock interests in Morgan Stanley & Co., Incorporated, proposal by Mr. Leffingwell to abandon policy of tax exemption on certain Government obligations, tax-exempt income to J. P. Morgan & Co. and its partners.

Superintendent of Documents, 65 cents.

Part 24, Investment Banking, January 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12, 1940. Goldman, Sachs & Co.—Lehman Brothers, competitive bidding, agreement of 1938, financing of Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Co., composition of underwriting syndicate, the commission earned, meaning of underwriting and the Banking Act of 1933; Glore, Forgan & Co., agreement on leading positions in future financing of Indianapolis Power & Light and Utilities Power & Light, agreement on future financing of Associated Gas & Electric Co. and subsidiaries—1937; Smith, Barney & Co.—Kuhn, Loeb & Co., professional character of investment banking, competition in investment banking, agreements for future financing between underwriters and between issuer corporations and underwriters, relation of the investment banker to the issuer and the investor; Standard Gas and Electric Co., agreements between underwriters and corporations issuing securities, agreement with respect to future financing of Standard Power & Light Co., holding company of Philadelphia Co. utilities, March 1926; Shell Union Oil Corporation, formation of the 1936 syndicate, desire for "a solid front," the operative effect of the 1936 Dillon, Read & Co. underwriting agreement, criteria used in determining the amounts reserved for underwriters, notification to underwriters relating to amounts of debentures reserved for offering to dealers and for their own retail distribution, performance records of dealers kept by other investment banking firms; concentration in the management, underwriting, and sale of registered bond issues.

Superintendent of Documents, 75 cents.

Part 25, Cartels, January 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19, 1940. Definition and functions of cartels; cartels in Great Britain; growth of cartels in Germany; compulsory cartelization in France; the number and scope of international cartels; the international rubber agreement; incandescent electric lamp cartel; compulsory cartelization and the growth of international combines; benefits and weaknesses of cartels; principal copper producers, their integration and organization; the copper industry's part in securing passage of the Webb-Pomerene Act; Copper Export Association, 1919–23; pool of refined copper, 1921, and the curtailment of production, 1919–21; price policies of the Copper Export Association; relation of export price to domestic price; Copper Exporters, Inc., 1927–31; movement of copper prices under Copper Exporters; international agreement on production control, 1935–39; profits and costs in the copper industry; foreign investment and control in American enterprises; trade associations as cartels; compulsory cartelization under the N. R. A.; cartels in the United States before and after the N. R. A.; business self-government.

Superintendent of Documents, $1.50.

Part 26, Iron and Steel Industry, January 23, 24, and 25, 1940. Summary of United States Steel Corporation Studies; effect of price reductions; cash costs; the corporation's analysis of cost in relation to volume; significance of the cost study in pricing policy; United States Steel Corporation's analysis of demand for steel; significance of concept of demand for industrial price policy; discussion of United States Steel Corporation studies; relationship between prices, demand, and costs; analysis of operating costs; analysis of Dr. Yntema's statement concerning prices, volume, costs and profits; failure of high prices to promote business; question of concerted action to expand production; United States Steel Corporation analysis of costs in relation to price decision-making; examination of United States Steel Corporation analyses.

Superintendent of Documents, 65 cents.

Part 27, Iron and Steel Industry, Distribution and Pricing of Selected Steel Products, the Basing Point System, January 26, 27, 29, and 30, 1940. Analysis of distribution of selected steel products; fabrication-in-transit rates and price cutting; relationship between steel prices and production and general activity; Federal Trade Commission's analysis of United States Steel Corporation's report on the basing point system; the basing point system in the steel industry and deviations from it; effectiveness of commercial resolutions since N. R. A.; policy of price announcement since spring of 1936; freight rate book of the Iron and Steel Institute; N. R. A. code provisions continued after N. R. A. invalidation; freight rate compilations by the Iron and Steel Institute; comparison of Pacific coast and Birmingham prices; prices in the Detroit area; development of the Pittsburgh-plus system; price discussions among competitors; identical bids in the steel industry; excess capacity in production of sheets and hot-rolled strip; comparison of costs and prices at Pittsburgh, Chicago, and Birmingham; identical bids received by the Navy Department; Federal Trade Commission's summation of the monopolistic characteristics of the basing point system.

Superintendent of Documents, 75 cents.

Part 28, Life Insurance, Operating Results and Investments, February 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20 21, 26, 27, 28, 29, and March 1, 1940.

Superintendent of Documents, $1.25.

Part 29, Interstate Trade Barriers, March 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23, 1940. Status of the trade-barrier question among the several States; general economic and social aspects of the trade-barrier question; analysis and classification of present state laws having trade-barrier effects; agricultural barriers, weights and measures in fresh fruits and vegetables, domestic fats and oils, oleomargarine and oleomargarine taxation, the dairy industry, the nursery industry, trade barriers relating to state problems of finance, highway construction and maintenance, and public safety; the consumers' interest in trade barriers; trade barriers in relationship to direct selling; trade barriers in relationship to transacting business by mail; experiences of a New York wine producer with trade barriers; trade barriers in relation to motor transportation industry; trade barriers in relation to national sales executives; legal appraisal, analyses, and summary.

Superintendent of Documents, 55 cents.

Part 30, Technology and Concentration of Economic Power, April 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16,

17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26, 1940. Report on the depression of 1873; invention of the art of invention; why are innovations introduced?; important types of technological change; labor-saving devices; how measure the impact of technology?; new industries created by technology; distress to laborers caused by machines; productivity of labor; increased capital per unit of product; shortened working hours; the mining industry; the national labor force; the potential working force; the efficiency of capital; technology and the business cycle; does industry need more capacity?; who benefits from technology?; how many are now employed?; average cost of production; nonproductive workers; technology and modern business empires; technology and pressure groups; technology and war; America unlimited; modern industrial research; government research expenditures; fields for further research; research in General Motors; patent policy of General Motors; government aid to research; mass production and mass purchasing power; effect of patents on invention; low-priced automobiles; cost of labor within the Ford plant; proportion of skilled to unskilled workers; a $500 automobile; technology and migration of industry; cost of production as measure of effect of technology; decentralization in Ford Motor Co.; trivision for X-ray purposes; problems of financing development of trivision; changes in productivity since 1928; effect of the "speed-up"; effect of shortened hours on productivity; production and employment since 1929; regularity of employment; effect of mechanization upon skill; effect of continuous strip mills on age of workers; operation of continuous mills at Middletown; production in American Rolling Mill Co.; labor costs for steel production; causes of increased volume; displacement of other industries by sheet steel; financing of new capacity; lack of investment as cause of unemployment; National Association of Manufacturers' study of older workers; provisions for displaced employees; ghost towns; cost of production in mechanized mills; mergers and consolidations in steel mills; greatest change in employment after 1936; extent of mechanization cost borne by labor; interindustry competition; problem of new entrants to labor force; proposed regulation of mechanization; technological change in the railroad industry; future progress in railroads; mechanization and wage changes in railroads; details of labor displacement by mechanization on railroads; resistance to technological change; introduction of dial switchboard in telephone companies; qualifications for employment in American Telephone & Telegraph Co.; progress of dialization after 1933; possibilities of expansion; analysis of effect of displacement; displacement in the Boston area; dial service versus manual service; earnings of employees; unionization in the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.; employee attitude toward the dial; technological change in telegraphy; labor displacement in the telegraph industry; concentration of ownership in American Telephone & Telegraph Co.; reduction of employment; employee policies in the Bell System; separation pay; union attitude toward mechanization; suggestions for cushioning displacement; leveling of skills; technology and economic recovery; International Business Machines' share of the business machines industry; advantages of business machine; direct and indirect International Business Machines' employment; effect of mechanization upon earnings; physical and social effects of mechanization; training for reemployment; prospect of foreign markets; responsibility of industry to displaced workers; provision for unemployables; the growth and composition of white-collar group; industrial urban concentration; earnings of white-collar workers; changing status of clerical workers; the introduction of the clerical machine; machine displacement of clerks; unemployment—secular or technological; union contracts and technological change; technological change in the textile industry; technological advances in cotton textiles; technological advances in synthetic yarn; shift from silk to rayon; shift of production away from silk mills; labor displacement in silk mills; technology in agriculture; labor force on the farm; earnings for farm laborers; productivity in agriculture; prospects for increased employment in agriculture; effect of mechanization on farm investment; farm ownership and operation; prospect of great technological change on farms; increase of corporate farm ownership; effect of tenant farming on mechanization; cost of mechanizing a small farm; credit policy of International Harvester Co.; origin of migrants to the west coast; mechanization in the Wheat Belt; Corn Belt mechanization; expansion of holdings after mechanization; agricultural concentration by States; future of family-sized farm; recommendations to eliminate displacement of farm workers; increase in occupational training; mobility of labor; productivity of trained labor; training to reduce unemployment; American Federation of Labor attitude toward dismissal wage; retraining for the employed and unemployed; how a larger vocational program should be established; efficacy of vocational guidance; need for economic literacy; use of education for recovery; competition of coal and gas; workers' education; industrial recovery after depression; advantage of size in mechanization; work-creating technological change; labor and capital saving change; changes affecting raw materials; social accounting faulty; displacement and the young and old worker; displacement costs paid by workers; displacement costs chargeable to society; cooperation of employment agencies.

Superintendent of Documents, $1.75.

Part 31, Investments, Profits, and Rates of Return for Selected Industries: Investments, profits, and rates of return for tobacco processors, iron and steel manufacturers, principal steel companies, United States Steel Corporation, farm implements and farm machinery, cement companies, and rayon companies.

Superintendent of Documents, 40 cents.

Part 31–A, Supplemental Data Submitted to the Temporary National Economic Committee.

Superintendent of Documents.

MONOGRAPHS

1. Price Behavior and Business Policy, by Saul Nelson, Senior Industrial Economist, and Walter G. Keim, Statistician, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Price behavior and business policy; price flexibility; nonprice competition; the electric-equipment industry, an illustrative case; measures of price flexibility; conventional price lines; statistical data; types of geographic price structures; geographic practices in American markets; retail markets; distributive margins.

Superintendent of Documents, 419 pages, 45 cents.

2. Families and Their Life Insurance. Donald H. Davenport, Special Economic Consultant, Insurance Section, Securities and Exchange Commission, and Gerhard A. Gesell, Special Counsel, Insurance Section, Securities and Exchange Commission. Description of the areas covered in the survey of 2,132 families reported; life insurance in force; annual cost of life insurance; miscellaneous problems; case studies, summary and conclusions.

Superintendent of Documents, 168 pages, 25 cents.

3. Who Pays the Taxes? by Gerhard Colm, Fiscal Expert, Department of Commerce, and Helen Tarasov, Industrial Economics Division, Department of Commerce. Scope and main results; procedures, consumer income, and consumer patterns in 1938–39, value added by manufacture, tax classification, allocation, shifting; final tax patterns; the Defense Tax Bill; tax capitalization; distribution of taxes on real estate by type of owners.

Superintendent of Documents, 55 pages, 10 cents.

4. Concentration and Composition of Individual Incomes, 1918–37, by Adolph J. Goldenthal, Economic Analyst, National Income Division, Department of Commerce. Summary of statistical findings; the concentration of income, 1918–37; the composition of income, 1918–37; the concentration of purchasing power, 1918–37; relief and veterans' adjusted-service payments.

Superintendent of Documents, 112 pages, 15 cents.

5. Industrial Wage Rates, Labor Costs and Price Policies, by Douglass V. Brown, Assistant Director, Industrial Relations Section; Charles A. Myers, Instructor, Industrial Relations Section; and John A. Brownell, Assistant, Industrial Relations Section, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; John T. Dunlop, Instructor, Department of Economics, Harvard University; and Edwin M. Martin, Economist, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor. Summary; the shoe industry; the paper industry; the cotton-textile industry; the agricultural-implement industry; price determination and price policy; the movement of wages and labor costs; changes in technology.

Superintendent of Documents, 172 pages, 25 cents.

6. Export Prices and Export Cartels (Webb-Pomerene Associations), by Milton Gilbert and Paul D. Dickens, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce, and members of the staff of the Federal Trade Commission. A sample study of differences between domestic and export pricing policy of United States corporations; earlier studies, scope of field study, problems involved, comparison of export and domestic price policies, determining economic factors; direct foreign investments in American industry, 1937; operation of the Export Trade Act (Webb-Pomerene Law) 1918–40, background, administration, procedure, future of the Webb-Pomerene Law.

Superintendent of Documents, 310 pages, 35 cents.

7. Measurement of the Social Performance of Business, by Theodore J. Kreps, Professor of Business Economics, Stanford University, and Kathryn R. Wright, Associate Economist, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor. Tests of social performance; social performance of twenty-two industries; groups of industries; social performance of individual companies; all corporations; the economic system; patterns of social performance; a bureau of industrial economics.

Superintendent of Documents, 207 pages, 30 cents.

8. Toward More Housing, by Peter A. Stone, Coordinator, Construction Studies, Temporary National Economic Committee, and R. Harold Denton, Economic Analyst in Housing, Department of Commerce. Some economic aspects of housing: Construction and the general economy; trends in nonresidential and public construction; market factors and needs in residential building; operation of the building industry; housing costs; housing finance; land, taxes and building codes; technical trends; public aid to housing; the relation of productivity to low-cost housing.

Superintendent of Documents, 223 pages, 30 cents.

9. Taxation of Corporate Enterprise, by Clifford J. Hynning, Department of Commerce, and Gerhard Colm, Professor of Economics, New School for Social Research. Taxes, public receipts, and governmental expenditures; Federal taxation of corporate profits; magnitude of Federal taxes and corporate profits, 1916–37; Federal taxation of

corporate income: statutory rates, exemptions, and deductions; Federal tax treatments of holding companies and related forms of intercorporate affiliation (consolidated returns); intercorporate dividends and interest on governmental securities; Federal taxation of "excess profits" and undistributed profits of corporations; Federal corporate income taxes paid by corporations of varying size, 1931–37; Federal taxation of monopoly profits: a negative record; equity versus creditor capital in Federal corporate income taxation; variable-cost taxes; fixed-cost taxes; conclusions.

Superintendent of Documents, 216 pages, 60 cents.

10. Industrial Concentration and Tariffs, by Clifford L. James, Associate Professor of Economics, Ohio State University; Edward C. Welsh, Instructor in Economics, Ohio State University; and Gordon Arneson, Junior Economist, Temporary National Economic Committee. Industrial concentration and tariffs; reduction or removal of tariffs and industrial concentration; sample study of industrial concentration and tariffs, foods and related products, textiles and allied products, wood and paper products, chemicals and allied products, rubber and leather products, stone, clay, and glass products, nonferrous metals and products, iron and steel products, agricultural and automotive machinery and related products, machine tools and equipment, electrical machinery, equipment, and related products; the gypsum industry; the flat glass industry; the borates industry; softwood lumber of the United States and the trade agreements; consumers' cost from import restrictions, sugar and rayon yarn.

Superintendent of Documents, 326 pages, 35 cents.

11. Bureaucracy and Trusteeship in Large Corporations, by Marshall E. Dimock, Assistant Secretary of Labor, Department of Labor, Professor of Public Administration, University of Chicago, and Howard K. Hyde, Research Analyst and Consultant, Temporary National Economic Committee. The development of giant corporations; the diffusion of ownership; the separation of ownership and control; the characteristics of bureaucracy; structural causes of bureaucracy; personnel causes of bureaucracy; structural methods; personnel factors; the requirements of trusteeship; securing and enforcing trusteeship.

Superintendent of Documents, 144 pages, 30 cents.

12. Profits, Productive Activities, and New Investment, by Martin Taitel, Senior Consulting Economist, Work Projects Administration. The corporate system; the character of profit measurements; dollar volume of corporate profits; the rate of return; the profit margin; internal and external disposal of profits; the distribution of dividend receipts; the relative degree of dividend concentration; the effect of dividend concentration on the distribution of income; the relation between the savings and the income level of individuals; the measurement of savings out of dividends; savings out of dividends; total savings out of profits; comparison of private income and total private savings with corporate profits and savings out of corporate profits; the effect of the concentration of savings out of corporate profits on the concentration of wealth; savings created, savings absorbed, and investment expenditures; leakages between savings absorbed and investment expenditures; dissavings and reductions of corporate equity capital; measurement of the rate of return; consolidations, mergers, acquisitions, etc.; relation between profit and asset expansion rates: oil producing and refining corporations; measurement of the rate of investment in property; the nature of investment expenditures; relation between profit and property expansion rates: oil producing and refining corporations; relations between profit and property expansion rates: steel corporations; relation between profit and property-expansion rates: corporations in other industries; the flow of funds in the economy; major determinants of the income level; the availability of funds; the importance of profits; the importance of the concentration of wealth and income; concentration and shortages of consumer purchasing power; further effects of concentration.

Superintendent of Documents, 188 pages, 25 cents.

13. Relative Efficiency of Large, Medium-sized, and Small Business, by Federal Trade Commission. Individual company cost tests, tests for groups of companies, individual plant cost tests, tests for groups of plants, tests based on table of rates of return on invested capital earned by individual companies, tests based on tables of rates of return earned on invested capital by groups of companies; cement cost tables; iron and steel cost tables; farm-machinery cost tables; petroleum cost tables; beet- and cane-sugar cost tables; milk and milk-products cost tables; wheat-flour and bread cost tables; high degrees of integration versus a less degree of integration; fundamental disabilities in size from the standpoint of efficiency; case studies of three mergers; critics of the first merger movement in American business; size in American business today; growth in the size of business units within a single industry, conglomerates; multiple directorships; where does responsibility for efficiency begin in giant corporations?; directors who do not direct finance; managerial responsibility in government; the problem of size in American business; study of Pennsylvania-Dixie Cement Corporation and predecessor companies—the merger and its effect on operations; historical development and merger motives of Bethlehem Steel Corporation; the fundamental principle of efficiency in mass production, by Dr. Frank Fetter.

Superintendent of Documents, 449 pages, 50 cents.

14. Hourly Earnings of Employees in Large and Small Enterprises, by Jacob Perlman, Chief, Division of Wage and Hour Statistics, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Variations in the wage structure in general; measurement of earnings; industry approach to the wage structure; earnings and methods of wage payment; geographical differences; variations by size of community; differences between union and nonunion plants; the occupational wage structure; variations in earnings by size of company; variations in wages by size of establishment; the radio-manufacturing industry; the explosive industry; the soap industry; the meat-packing industry; the fertilizer industry; cyclical stability of employment in large and small companies in 10 industries.

Superintendent of Documents, 94 pages, 15 cents.

15. Financial Characteristics of American Manufacturing Corporations, by Charles L. Merwin, Jr., Economic Analyst, National Income Division, Department of Commerce; under the supervision of Robert R. Nathan, Chief, National Income Division, Department of Commerce. Profits of American Manufacturing corporations; profitability and size; large corporations, small manufacturing corporations; dividends of American manufacturing corporations; all manufacturing corporations, large manufacturing corporations; working capital of American manufacturing corporations; all manufacturing corporations, large manufacturing corporations, small manufacturing corporations; fixed capital of American manufacturing corporations: all manufacturing corporations, large manufacturing corporations, small manufacturing corporations; fixed capital of American manufacturing corporations: all manufacturing corporations, large manufacturing corporations, small manufacturing corporations; source and disposal of corporate funds: sample of large manufacturing corporations, 1935–38; principal sources and uses for 47 industries; two samples of small manufacturing corporations, 1927–36; small baking corporations, small men's clothing companies, small furniture manufacturers, small stone-clay companies, small machine-tool companies; comparison of large with small companies.

Superintendent of Documents, 442 pages, 40 cents.

16. Antitrust in Action, by Walton Hamilton, Professor of Law, Yale University Law School and Irene Till, Social Science Analyst, Temporary National Economic Committee Staff. The task of industrial regulation; the charter of freedom; the current ways of restraint; administrative procedures of antitrust; big act little stick; the law reflects the agency; the origin of the suit; building the case; antitrust in the courtroom; the efficacy of sanctions; the reach after new weapons; a program of action; streamlining the act; toward an administrative base; antitrust faces the future.

Superintendent of Documents, 146 pages, 20 cents.

17. Problems of Small Business, by John H. Cover, Chief Economic Analyst, Department of Commerce; Nathanael H. Engle, Assistant Director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce; Earl D. Strong, Head, Department of Economics, Grinnell College; Peter R. Nehemkis, Jr., Special Counsel, Securities and Exchange Commission, and William Saunders, Harold Vatter, Harold H. Wein, Industrial Economics Division, Department of Commerce. High mortality—facts and factors: business mortality in retail, craft, and service enterprise; business mortality in manufacturing; comparison of mortality experience of various types of business; change in business population; birth rates compared, tendencies in business growth, failures, short-period movement, cycles of failure; business migration; factors in industrial movement, managerial competency as a factor in business mortality; training and experience, age of manager, personality, accounting records, adequacy of capital; fraud, investment, source of capital, use of capital, control of assets and liabilities; control of costs of operation; overhead costs, overhead and sales, rent, rent and sales, pay roll, pay roll and sales, proprietor withdrawals and sales, costs and prices: margins, inventory, control of sales, of markets, and of product; credit as a factor in business mortality; personal affairs complicating management difficulties; government regulation as a factor in business mortality; purposes of government regulation, types of regulation, government aid to business, market security, and price stability (some phases of competition in distribution): the struggle for marketing control; changing channels, nature of the struggle, effect of the struggle on size, trends in size of retailing establishments, new developments in types of retailing, profits in manufacturing, wholesaling, and retailing, resale price, maintenance—an economic summary; why proponents want legalization of resale price maintenance, economic and social reasons for resale price maintenance, arguments against resale price maintenance, resale price maintenance laws in the United States, difficulties and limitations encountered in the practice of price maintenance, adequate long-term and short-term financing: capital and credit problems of small business; the financial position of small business, the economic position of small business, banking policy and the needs of small business, present governmental aids, suggested aids, the financial problem of small business.

Superintendent of Documents, 412 pages, 40 cents.

18. Trade Association Survey, by Charles Albert Pearce, Department of Commerce. Trade association membership; trade association income and staff; extent of incorporation; financial bases; trend of trade association organization; scope of activity: manner of performance; staff, management organizations, federations; trade practices: mutual

restraints of competition; trade association attitudes toward public policy; actions of the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice against trade associations and other groups; elimination of price competition; elimination of competitors; elimination of design "piracy"; trade-practice activities of the sugar institute: the sugar-refining industry; formation of the sugar institute; trade-practice activities of the sugar institute; control of distribution; terms and conditions of sale; proposed code of fair competition; nature of trade statistics compiled by trade associations; administration of the trade-statistical service; dissemination of trade statistics; objectives and uses of trade statistics; price information; bid information; statistics of the Southern Pine Association, statistics of the National Container Association and regional affiliates; statistics of the Envelope Manufacturers Association; uniform accounting, cost statistics and studies: uniform accounting; methods for computing and combining elements of cost; cost and price estimating formulas and services; cost studies and cost statistics; uses of cost studies; development and promotion of the accounting program; objectives of accounting programs.

Superintendent of Documents, 501 pages, 50 cents.

19. Government Purchasing—An Economic Commentary, by Morris A. Copeland, Director of Research, Division of Statistical Standards, Bureau of the Budget; Clem C. Linnenberg, Jr., Associate Economist, Division of Statistical Standards, Bureau of the Budget, and Dana M. Barbour, Assistant Economist, Division of Statistical Standards, Bureau of the Budget. Scope and characteristics of Federal purchasing: materials, supplies, and services, other than personal, purchased; distribution of purchasing by departments and independent establishments; geographical pattern of Federal purchases; legal limitations on Federal purchasing; types of purchasing procedure; development of centralized control; notes on State and local purchasing; indications of disorderly timing of Federal purchase orders; indications that some prices paid are unfavorable to the Government; the problem of war procurement: experience during the World War—disorderly purchasing; attempts at centralized control; contracts and prices during the World War; general characteristics of the war economy; criticisms of the World War procurement system; requisites of adequate procurement preparedness; steps toward preparedness; establishment of the Army Industrial College; improvements in procurement organization in the Army and Navy and in the information available as to wartime requirements; designation of strategic, critical, and essential materials; stocking of selected strategic and critical materials; standardization and development of specifications for equipment; allocation of domestic facilities for the production of needed articles; educational orders; experimentation with various forms of contract; supervision of British-French military procurement; cooperation with State and local governments in procurement; greater flexibility in procurement arrangements; Federal antitrust laws and other Federal regulatory devices as aids in procurement; advance planning of procurement; selected bibliography on governmental procurement: diagrammatic representation of fundamental routings governing Federal purchasing; distribution of bids and bidders by Federal agencies in Washington and in the field; distribution of dollar volume of Federal purchases by classes of the Federal Standard Stock Catalog, by reporting agencies, by months: December 1937 through November 1938; distribution by Federal agencies of experience with identical bidding; data on the practice of identical bidding, by industry groups and subgroups; Federal Trade Commission activities arising out of Government purchasing.

Superintendent of Documents, 330 pages, 35 cents.

20. Taxation, Recovery, and Defense, by H. Dewey Anderson, executive secretary, Temporary National Economic Committee. The dynamics of our economy, the problems of idle men and machines, idle capital, foreign trade, the economic situation, and modern tax theories, tax theory, and the preparedness program; the needs of Government, an analysis of Government expenditures; the American revenue system; trends in tax revenues; sources of Federal revenues; the social-economic effects of the revenue system, who pays the tax bill, shifting and incidence of taxes, the rate structure and its effect, tax evasion and avoidance, tax exemptions, does the tax system retard recovery, is the revenue system inadequate, the balanced Budget, the preparedness program and taxation, tax recommendations; the economic structure of the United States, production and distribution, consumption, the organization of economic activities.

Superintendent of Documents, 374 pages, 35 cents.

21. Competition and Monopoly in American Industry, by Dr. Clair Wilcox, professor of Economics, Swarthmore College. The nature and significance of competition and monopoly; the nature of monopoly, duopoly, monopsony and duopsony, the classification of markets, the significance of competition, the significance of monopoly, competitive markets; extractive industries, manufactures, wholesale and retail distribution, service trades, other aspects of competition, monopolized markets: those in which one or two firms control nine-tenths or more of the supply; firms approaching complete monopoly in America before the first World War, firms approaching complete monopoly in America since the first World War, pairs of firms approaching complete duopoly in the American market, monopoly and duopoly in other markets, monopolized markets: those in which a few firms control the whole supply and those in which one or a few firms control a major part of the supply; concentration of production, price leadership, price agreements, delivered price systems, patents, competitive practices of dominant firms, market sharing, intercorporate relations, market dominance, local markets, monopolized markets: those in which several firms pursue a common policy; cartels, pools, trade associations, limitation of competition through trade associations, control of prices through trade associations, allocation of markets and customers through trade associations, allocation of production and sales through trade associations, trade association boycotts, cartels in the American market, the N. R. A. codes, legalized restraint of competition, local markets, the occurrence of competition and monopoly; concentration of business activity, uniformity of prices, rigidity of prices, areas of competition and monopoly, the instability of competition and monopoly, is monopoly inevitable?, the persistence of competition and monopoly.

Superintendent of Documents, 344 pages, 40 cents.

22. Technology in Our Economy, by H. Dewey Anderson, Executive Secretary, Temporary National Economic Committee; Lewis L. Lorwin, Economic Consultant, Temporary National Economic Committee; John M. Blair, Economist, Temporary National Economic Committee; assisted by Ruth Aull, Technical Assistant, Temporary National Econimic Committee. The problem of technological unemployment—a historical survey: nineteenth century backgrounds; early statements; the classical debate; John Stuart Mill on machinery and the stationary state; the Marxian analysis; pioneer inductive studies, 1886–99; twentieth century problems: neoclassical theory and its critics; prosperity and technological unemployment in the United States; technological change and the depression, 1929–33; recent studies and reports, 1934–40: productivity, prices, and employment; the measurement of reemployment opportunities; technology and economic balance: the change in labor productivity; the extent of the change; types of labor-saving techniques; power and energy development, materials, processes, individual, single-function machinery, management methods, the effects of labor-saving technology: technology as a cause of unemployment; technology and the displacement of skill; technology and labor's demand for goods; technology and the employed worker; technology and the compensatory forces: the reduction in hours; the development of new industries; the reduction of prices; technology and the concentration of economic power: the concentration of industry; concentration and operating efficiency; concentration and industrial research; concentration and patents; corporate size and earning power; measures of labor productivity: production and man-hour indexes; the National Research Project indexes of labor productivity in manufacturing industries; the reduction of varieties through standardization; wages as a percent of value added by manufacture; types of plastics and their uses, 1940; effect on labor of specified technological changes in two tire-manufacturing plants; labor productivity and industrial prices: the concentrated industries; the nonconcentrated industries; employment in industries classified according to the amount of electrical energy used per man-hour in plants of varying size, 1937; technical progress and economic welfare (an outline of topics for study).

Superintendent of Documents, 313 pages, 35 cents.

23. Agriculture and the National Economy, by Albert L. Meyers, Senior Economist, United States Department of Agriculture. The agricultural situation; concentration of control in agricultural production; factors tending to increase concentration of production; factors tending to retard or reduce concentration; control of production by means other than ownership; control of production by Government agencies; concentration of control on marketing agricultural products; concentration of control at local shipping points; credit control and market freedom; restrictions on trade in terminal markets; barriers to internal trade in farm produce; concentration of control in food processing; concentration of control in retail outlets; concentration of control in supplies purchased by the farmer; methods of reducing the farm market spread; the farmer and the national economy.

Superintendent of Documents, 48 pages, 10 cents.

24. Consumer Standards, by Samuel P. Kaidanovsky, Technical Director, Consumer Standards Project, Consumers' Counsel Division, Department of Agriculture; assisted by Alice L. Edwards, Consumers' Counsel Division, Department of Agriculture; under general supervision of Donald E. Montgomery, Director, Consumers' Counsel Division, Department of Agriculture. Standardization, inspection, and labeling activities of the Federal agencies; United States Department of Agriculture; Central Housing Committee; United States Department of Commerce; Federal Alcohol Administration; Federal Loan Agency; Federal Security Agency; Federal Trade Commission; Federal Works Agency; United States Government Printing Office; United States Department of the Interior; United States Department of Labor; United States Navy Department; United States Tariff Commission; United States Treasury Department; Veterans' Administration; United States War Department; standardization and labeling activities of private

agencies; standardization activities of individual companies; standardization activities of trade associations; standardization activities of technical and professional societies; certification of products by trade associations and technical and professional societies; standardization and simplification of products as affected by State legislation; standardization and simplification of fertilizers; sanitation and labeling requirements for new bedding and upholstery; methods and procedures in government purchasing; procurement methods and procedures of the Procurement Division, United States Treasury Department, procurement methods and procedures of the United States Navy Department, procurement methods and procedures of the United States War Department; State purchasing methods and procedures; county purchasing methods and procedures; municipal purchasing and procedures; independent purchasing agencies and testing laboratories; commodity testing and rating agencies; independent purchasing agencies; testing laboratories; commodity testing and rating agencies; consumer buying and the extent and character of commodity information available; value of standards, grades, and informative labels to consumers and their effect on merchandising; recommendations and policies of various organizations relating to consumer standards, grading, and labeling; nomenclature of standards; grade terminology of food products.

Superintendent of Documents, 433 pages. $1.

25. Recovery Plans, by Arthur Dahlberg, Vice President of the Institute of Applied Econometrics; Hon. Robert G. Allen, of Pennsylvania; Hon. Thomas R. Amlie, of Wisconsin; Hon. Jerry Voorhis, of California; George B. Galloway, Field Representative, National Economic and Social Planning Association; Irwin S. Joseph, Joseph M. Lurie, Sterne Morse, and Sam D. Schearer. Recovery plans—an analysis: major types of recovery plans and their economic background; a framework for the plans: the economic mechanism they premise; monetary revision: governmental injection of new purchasing power; government spending: problems and methods of financing; summary: appraisal of compensatory spending—its justification and limitations; the "Townsend plan"; the "ham and eggs plan"; stimulation of private spending of idle funds; taxing money into circulation; motivation of private spending by "restoring confidence"; abolishing or penalizing debt as a form of contract; planning for abundance; employment and economic progress; debt and economic stagnation; a proposed remedy; capitalistic system to fit present needs; a method for controlling unemployment and increasing physical production; the Cleveland plan.

Superintendent of Documents, 260 pages, 30 cents.

26. Economic Power and Political Pressures, by Donald C. Blaisdell Economic Expert, Temporary National Economic Committee, and Jane Greverus, Technical Assistant, Temporary National Economic Committee. The dynamics of Government; control versus power; characteristics of the struggle; pressure groups: characteristics of the contestants; staying power, cohesion, invisibility, resources, technology a major resource of business; business outposts in Washington; Chamber of Commerce of the United States; the American Bar Association; public policy and group aims; public problems; public opinion; political pressure groups; the lobby and its technique; the lobby and the political parties; contacts with Government: Congress and the Executive; Congress—the focus of group attention; the President's role; administration; the courts; industrial relations; channels of business pressure; organization of the National Association of Manufacturers; organized labor; labor relations the area of conflict; labor and industrial management come to grips; National Industrial Recovery Act, labor-disputes bill, National Association of Manufacturers' activity subsequent to passage of act, National Association of Manufacturers supports limiting amendments, allies of the National Association of Manufacturers tariffs and taxes: Nation committed to Tariff protection; taxes; Government expenditures; fiscal policy dominated by business; banking and insurance; commercial banking; investment banking; the life-insurance lobby; business and Government share the banking field, utilities and railroads: public regulation; shaping public policy; banker control of the railroads; Association of American Railroads, cooperation with the Interstate Commerce Commission; other pressure on the Interstate Commerce Commission; relations with labor; public utilities attempt to shape public policy; the general welfare and utility lobbying; shipping and air transport; agriculture and distribution; farm political power partially offsets economic handicaps; distribution and legislation; unequal bargaining power of agriculture and distribution; the need—to relax business control advisory councils; strengthen planning; improve Government administration; bring lobbies into the open.

Superintendent of Documents, 222 pages, 25 cents.

27. The Structure of Industry, by Willard L. Thorp, Adviser on Economic Studies, Department of Commerce; Walter F. Crowder, Chief, Special Research and Analysis Section, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce, and associates. Trends in the scale of manufacturing operations; general trends in the size of manufacturing establishments; trends in the scale of operations in selected industries; general trends in concentration of operations among manufacturing establishments; extreme changes in establishment concentration by industries; establishment concentration patterns of selected industries; the integration of manufacturing operations; extent and significance of central-office operations: the structure of central-office groups, simple and complex central-office combinations, uniform functions, divergent functions, convergent functions, successive functions, unrelated functions, the merger movement; the history of concentration in seven industries; the concentration of production in manufacturing; extent and areas of concentration; leading producers; number, type, and frequency of appearance; relation of concentration to various product characteristics; changes in concentration, in quantity produced, and in average realized price from 1935 to 1937; behavior characteristics of products in periods of recession and recovery, the product structures of large corporations; the importance of the largest 50 manufacturing companies; the product structures of the largest 50 manufacturing companies; the role of the largest 50 manufacturing companies as leading producers; the causes of product diversification; the economic significance of multiproduct production.

Superintendent of Documents, 759 pages, $1.

28. Study of Legal Reserve Life Insurance Companies, by Gerhard A. Gesell, Special Counsel, Insurance Section, Securities and Exchange Commission, and Ernest J. Howe, Chief Financial Adviser, Insurance Section, Securities and Exchange Commission. Size and growth of legal reserve life-insurance companies; control of legal reserve life-insurance companies; self-perpetuation in office of directors of mutual companies; directors of stock companies; interlocking directorships; failure of directors to attend board meetings; activities of directors and officers for personal gain; change of plan of company operation to benefit personal interests of officers and directors; responsibilities of life-insurance company directors; salaries and profits; company retirements—reinsurance and failures; intercompany agreements to eliminate competition: the group association; rate agreements for ordinary insurance; hunter conferences; other intercompany agreements and anticompetitive understandings; the life-insurance company lobby; classes and types of life insurance sold; policy terminations, agency practices: the drive for new business; training and selection of new agents; turn-over of agents; compensation of agents; contrasting methods of agency operation; cost of ordinary life insurance; industrial insurance: size and growth of industrial companies; duties and compensation of agents; the pressure for new business; turn-over of agents; maldistribution and overloading of policies; lapse; cost; confusion of the industrial policyholder; advisory services for industrial policyholders; the future of industrial insurance; savings-bank life insurance; reports to policyholders and accounting; operating results: income and disbursements; annuities; disability benefits; assets and investment practices: mortgages and real estate; cash; bonds; general investment considerations.

Superintendent of Documents, 466 pages, 50 cents.

29. The Distribution of Ownership in the 200 Largest Nonfinancial Corporations, by Raymond W. Goldsmith, Assistant Director and Chief of the Research and Statistics Section, Trading and Exchange Division, Securities and Exchange Commission; Rexford C. Parmelee, Research and Statistics Section, Trading and Exchange Division, Securities and Exchange Commission; Irwin Friend, James Gorham, and Helene Granby. The distribution of ownership of American corporations: types of stockholders, number of stockholders, relations between income and stock ownership, number of shareholdings, relations between income and number of shareholdings, concentration of stock ownership, concentration of stock ownership in individual corporations, trends in the distribution of ownership; the size distribution of ownership of the 200 largest nonfinancial corporations: comparison of 200 largest nonfinancial corporations with all domestic corporations; number and value of shareholdings; the value distribution of shareholdings; distribution of total shareholdings by size of individual holding; concentration of ownership; the holdings of officers and directors in the stocks of the 200 largest nonfinancial corporations: aggregate holdings of officers and directors; the size of individual holdings of officers and directors; proportion of individual issues represented by combined holdings of officers and directors; the holdings of principal stockholders (20 largest record holdings): extent of the 20 largest shareholdings; frequency distribution of ratios of holdings by 20 largest owners; types of ownership control among the 200 largest nonfinancial corporations: instrumentalities and types of ownership control; ownership control over the 200 largest nonfinancial corporations; relationship between ownership and management; family spheres of influence among the 200 largest nonfinancial corporations: the du Pont sphere of influence; the Mellon sphere of influence; the Rockefeller sphere of influence; implications; foreign holdings in the 200 largest nonfinancial corporations: foreign holdings in all 200 corporations; differences in the proportion of foreign holdings; the control aspect of foreign holdings.

Superintendent of Documents, 1541 pages, about $2.

30. Survey of Shareholdings in 1,710 Corporations With Securities Listed on a National Securities Exchange, by Helene Granby, Research and Statistics Section, Trading and Exchange Division, Securities and Exchange Commission; Raymond W. Goldsmith, Assistant Director and Chief of Research and Statistics Section, Trading and Exchange Division, Securities and Exchange Commission,

and Rexford C. Parmelee, Research and Statistics Section, Trading and Exchange Division, Securities and Exchange Commission. Distribution of the 1,710 corporations by size of assets and industry of issuer; distribution of the 2,381 common- and preferred-stock issues by listing status, asset size, and industry of issuer, and market price; number and value of shareholdings; the distribution of total shareholdings by estimated value of individual holding; the distribution of total shareholdings by size of individual holding; the comparative distribution of shareholdings in closely held and widely held common- and preferred-stock issues; comparison of closely held and widely held common-stock issues; comparative distribution of shareholdings in closely held and widely held common-stock issues by estimated value of individual holding; comparative distribution of shareholdings in closely held and widely held common-stock issues by size of individual holding; comparative distribution of shareholdings in closely held and widely held preferred-stock issues.

Superintendent of Documents, 258 pages, 35 cents.

31. Patents and Free Enterprise, by Walton Hamilton, Professor of Law, Yale University Law School. Salute to invention; function and question, the art belongs to the artisan, technology swaps masters, the Government assumes an obligation; in the old country, across the Atlantic, and into the Constitution; the ages of letters patent; alternative paths for the law; the grant as shield and sanction; maintenance of the corporate estate; the poles of trade practice; the glass container—the patent as police, the automobile—and aloofness; the creation and validation of sanctions; a policy for the national economy; improvement and betterment, to promote the industrial arts, the peril to free enterprise; wanted: a policy for technology, the release of creative resources.

Superintendent of Documents, 175 pages, 25 cents.

32. Economic Standards of Government Price Control, by Ben W. Lewis, Professor of Economics, Oberlin College; Warren C. Waite, Professor of Agricultural Economics, University of Minnesota; Don S. Anderson, Associate Professor of Agricultural Economics, University of Wisconsin; R. K. Froker, Associate Professor of Agricultural Economics, University of Wisconsin; Ellery B. Gordon, formerly Chief of Economics Division, Consumers' Counsel, Bituminous Coal Commission; William Y. Webb, formerly Assistant Economist, Consumers' Counsel, Bituminous Coal Commission; Donald H. Wallace, Professor of Economics, Williams College; Aryness Joy, Chief of Temporary National Economic Committee Studies Section, Bureau of Labor Statistics; Edward S. Mason, Professor of Economics, Harvard University. The Wisconsin public service commission, the level of rates, the rate structure; the Illinois Commerce Commission, the level of rates, the rate structure; the New York Public Service Commission, the level of rates, the rate structure; the Tennessee Valley Authority, the level of rates, the rate structure; Federal price fixing in milk markets, history of milk markets which have been under Federal control, giving type of instrument in effect; regulation of fluid milk marketing in Oregon; regulation of fluid milk marketing in California; provisions for prohibiting distributors from engaging in unfair practices; basis for price determination; state control of milk prices in Indiana; tables giving data on milk prices in Indianapolis and Evansville, Ind.; state control of milk prices in Wisconsin; standard of fair practices in selling of milk by distributors; tables giving data on milk prices in Milwaukee, Wis.; governmental control of milk prices in New York State; tables giving data on milk prices in New York City and Buffalo, N. Y.; economics of the bituminous coal industry in review; legislative history of bituminous coal; regulation of bituminous coal under the 1937 act; the background of public control; the level of prices and incomes—objectives and standards; the level of prices and incomes in electric utilities; the level of prices and incomes under Federal milk control; the level of prices and incomes under milk control in five States; the level of prices and incomes under the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937; the structure of prices—objectives and standards; the structure of prices in electricity, milk, and bituminous coal; prices in relation to general depression and recovery—objectives and standards; price control in relation to depression and recovery in milk and electricity; price control under the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 in relation to depression and recovery.

Superintendent of Documents, 514 pages, 55 cents.

33. Geographical Differentials in Prices of Building Materials, by Walter G. Keim and Associates, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor. Areas of production; concentration of production; market structure; geographical pricing practices, quantity and functional discounts, cash discounts and terms, protection against price changes, other allowances, channels of distribution, price levels and trends; insulation board; plaster; asphalt roofing; cement; hydrated lime; paints and varnishes; white lead; linseed oil; turpentine; Douglas fir; oak flooring; yellow pine; Ponderosa pine; white pine; doors; windows; heating equipment; range boilers; plumbing supplies; structural clay products; window glass; sand, gravel, and crushed stone; ready-mixed concrete.

Superintendent of Documents, 459 pages, 55 cents.

34. Control of Unfair Competitive Practices Through Trade Practice Conference Procedure of the Federal Trade Commission, by the Federal Trade Commission. Legal objectives; actual operation extends through 20 years; public interest of primary concern; industry conference; public hearing; approval and promulgation of rules; requirements for approval of rules; classification of rules and enforceability; industries and types of trade practices covered; illustrations of effective treatment of difficult industry problems; some distinctive advantages of the trade practice conference procedure; constructive accomplishments as indicated in expressions of members of industry, trade organizations, and from authoritative writings.

Superintendent of Documents, 65 pages, 10 cents.

35. Large-Scale Organization in the Food Industries, by A. C. Hoffman, Principal Agricultural Economist, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture. The technological basis of big business in the food industries; mass retailing of food products; large-scale organization in the meat-packing industry; large-scale organization in the dairy industry; combination in the flour-milling and bread-baking industries: flour milling; the baking industry; fruit and vegetable canning; the handling of fresh fruits and vegetables; miscellaneous food corporations; mass distribution and marketing efficiency: efficiency in retailing; chains versus independents; the integration of grocery wholesaling and retailing; economies in the integration of processing and distribution; advantages of grocery chains over other types of large-scale handlers; economies at the producer end; the duplication of marketing services and facilities; monopoly in food distribution; concepts and criteria; concentration of control; profits and financial tendencies of the leading food corporations; buying and selling policies of mass food distributors; large-scale organization and price flexibility; patent control in the food industries: patents affecting the dairy industry; the quick freezing of food products; patent control for breakfast cereals; flour-milling patents; patent control in other food lines; legislative and judicial policy toward a new public policy.

Superintendent of Documents, 174 pages, 20 cents.

36. Reports of The Federal Trade Commission by The Federal Trade Commission. Report on natural gas and natural-gas pipe lines in the United States of America: importance of natural gas as a natural resource, prosperity of the nation depends on natural resources, size, and importance of the natural-gas industry; concentration of control of natural-gas pipe-line mileage; ownership by large industrial and utility interests; prices and price spreads; pipe-line profits; important features of particular gas pipe lines; spreads in natural-gas average or class prices as indicators of control; efforts of natural-gas producers to obtain outlets and markets; opposition of dominant interests to independent natural-gas pipe lines; wastage of natural gas; other specific monopolistic evils and practices; efforts by states to regulate the natural-gas industry. Report on agricultural implement and machine inquiry: agricultural implement and machine industry, beginning of the industry, conditions of agriculture, concentration of the industry, wholesale distribution system, retail sales system, retail associations, farm-equipment institute, prices in the industry, profits in the industry, the farmer's dollar, corrective measures taken by leading companies, prices of agricultural implements, increase in farm implement and machine prices from 1933 to 1938, price reductions for agricultural implements following publication of the Commission's report. Report on motor-vehicle industry inquiry; concentration in the motor-vehicle industry, competition in production and prices, competition among motor-vehicle dealers, "padding" new- and used-car prices, dealer price-fixing activities, legal aspects of used-car valuation or appraisal bureaus, unfair methods of motor-vehicle manufacturers in their relations with their dealers, manufacturers' treatment of dealers, abuses of installment financing, itemized invoice needed for consumer protection, deception in charges for transportation of motor vehicles, sale of driven cars as new cars, voluntary improvements made by the manufacturers, abuses in finance charges, greater accuracy in price advertising, manufacturer-dealer contracts.

Superintendent of Documents, 275 pages, 35 cents.

37. Saving, Investment, and National Income, by Oscar L. Altman, Senior Economist, National Resources Planning Board. Saving, investment, and national income; the problem, the materials, the flow of income, consumption, investment, and national income, volume and components of saving; concentration of the components of the savings stream, concentration, taxation, and saving, the flow of savings; the flow of savings through capital markets, internal financing of business investment, recent trends in the capital markets, volume, direction, and control of investment; investment, consumption, and productive capacity, volume and direction of investment, concentration of business investment and investment decisions, factors governing the level of investment, factors responsible for the prosperity of the twenties.

Superintendent of Documents, 135 pages, 20 cents.

38. A Study of the Construction and Enforcement of the Federal Antitrust Laws, by Milton Handler, Associate Professor of Law, Columbia University School of Law, and Assistant to the General Counsel, Treasury Department. Substantive law; direct price-fixing; control of output; sharing markets; collection and dissemination of trade statistics and open price systems; degree of market control; price uniformity and identical bids; price leadership; miscellaneous practices; mergers and consolidations; sugar trust, Northern Securities case, oil and tobacco trusts, terminal case, railroad cases, shoe machinery

trust, steel corporation, Anthracite coal cases, Anaconda merger, International Harvester Consolidation, recapitulation; antitrust enforcement; the inadequacy of appropriations and personnel, complexity of antitrust litigation and the inadequacies of procedure, existing concentration of industry; implementation of the statute.

Superintendent of Documents, 100 pages, 15 cents.

39. Control of the Petroleum Industry by Major Oil Companies, by Roy C. Cook, Expert, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice. The extent of corporate control, ownership, and control by branches of the industry, the competitive advantages of integration, the American Petroleum Institute; production; crude-oil transportation; refining; gasoline transportation; marketing: geographical distribution, ownership of marketing facilities by the majors, control over jobbers, the use of basing-point systems, Ethyl Gasoline Corporation agreement, price leadership and division of territory for posted prices, control over service-station operators, uniform sales contracts to jobbers, exclusive contracts and price differentials, elimination of trackside stations, the effect of Nation-wide credit cards.

Superintendent of Documents, 101 pages, 30 cents.

40. Regulation of Economic Activities in Foreign Countries, by Agnes Roman, Economist, Temporary National Economic Committee; Louis Domeratsky, Chief, Division of Regional Information, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; Rudolf Callmann; John H. Cover, Chief Economic Analyst, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; Nelson A. Miller, Acting Chief, Marketing Research Division, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. Recent trends in British industrial reorganization: British problems of economic reorganization; pre-war economic structure; post-war industrial problems; reorganization of British coal industry; reorganization of the British cotton industry. Germany—history of the extent and control of concentration of economic power in Germany: economic development of the concentration movement; before the World War, the World War, after the World War, rationalization, extent, special industries, legal development of the concentration movement; the German Temporary Economic Committee; combination movement in private industry, cartels, regulatory experience in Germany under national socialism: cartel legislation since 1933; the structure of German economy under national socialism; control of imports and foreign exchange; control of industrial prices; control of the capital market; regimentation of labor; taxation; company law; appraisal of the German control system. France—regulatory experience in France: history and character of the French cartel movement; government monopolies; government organizations. Argentina—government control over economic activities in Argentina: the nature of Argentine economy; government policy toward business; antitrust law, promotion of meat industry, aid to agriculture, foreign exchange control, regulation of public utilities, insurance control, economic wartime measures, regulation in the petroleum industry. Brazil—government intervention in Brazil: regulation of basic agricultural industries; Brazil's coffee defense measures, the Cocoa Institute, the Sugar and Alcohol Institute, extension of government intervention to other commodities, government credit to agriculture, the National Economic Council; nationalization; antitrust legislation; economic wartime legislation. Chile—state regulation in Chile: objectives of state intervention; government in business; public utilities, the nitrate industry, international nitrogen cartel, other forms of governmental participation in industry, creation of fiscal corporations, the law fixing overproduction, supervision of foreign trade and exchange control, government and credit, the commissariat general of subsistences and prices, proposed monopolies. Mexico—regulatory experience in Mexico: the Mexican revolution; antimonopoly legislation; the 6-year plan; recent measures to control economic activities; nationalization.

Superintendent of Documents, 177 pages, 20 cents.

41. Price Discrimination in Steel, by John M. Blair and Arthur Reeside. The data and the analytical techniques; graphic presentation of the data; the significance to the concentration of economic power; the significance to the Government; the significance to the economic arguments of the steel industry.

Superintendent of Documents, 54 pages, 10 cents.

42. The Basing Point Problem, by the Federal Trade Commission. Monopoly and competition in steel; visible effects of identical delivered prices, implications of identical delivered prices, indicators of monopoly, effects of identical delivered prices, effects of partial competition, monopoly leads to government control, competition, some factors in the pricing of steel; the demand for steel, characteristics of demand, the supply of steel, characteristics of cost in the industry, the dynamics of the market for steel, the basing-point method of quoting delivered prices, relation of competition to profits, capacity, and costs of distribution, the basing-point method of quoting delivered prices in the steel industry; the operation of the basing-point method, historical material, criticisms of the basing-point method, the proposed alternative to the basing-point method, an anlysis of the basing-point system of delivered prices as presented by United States Steel Corporation in "exhibits nos. 1410 and 1418."

Superintendent of Documents, 151 pages, 30 cents.

43. The Motion Picture Industry—A Pattern of Control, by Daniel Bertrand, Administrative Assistant, Temporary National Economic Committee; W. Duane Evans, Senior Economist, Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor; E. L. Blanchard, Member, Temporary National Economic Committee Staff. The pattern; the issues; block booking, blind selling, and the forcing of shorts, designated play dates, other practices affecting distributor-exhibitor relationships, overbuying, selective contracts, clearance and zoning, unfairly specified admission prices, other practices affecting relationships between exhibitors, the eight major companies; the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America, Inc., or the Hays organization; the consent decree.

Superintendent of Documents, 92 pages, 15 cents.

FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS—FINAL REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

Final Report and Recommendations of the Temporary National Economic Committee: Recommendations of the Committee to the President and the Congress of the United States Verbatim record of the public sessions of Committee members, containing the statement of the chairman, Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney; progress report of the executive secretary, Dewey Anderson; statement of Thurman Arnold, Assistant Attorney General of the United States; Corwin Edwards, economist of the Department of Justice; W. T. Kelley, chief counsel of the Federal Trade Commission; James A. Horton, chief examiner of the Federal Trade Commission; Wayne C. Taylor, Under Secretary of Commerce, Department of Commerce; Paul C. Truitt, chairman of the interdepartmental committee on interstate trade barriers, Department of Commerce; Frank Bane, executive secretary of the Council of State Governments; A. H. Martin, Director of the Marketing Laws Survey; Frederick V. Waugh, head, Division of Marketing Research, Department of Agriculture; Conway P. Coe, Commissioner of Patents, Department of Commerce; Louis H. Bean, counselor, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture; Carl S. Taylor, head, Division of Farm Population and Rural Welfare, Department of Agriculture; Mordecai Ezekiel, economic adviser to the Secretary of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture; Donald E. Montgomery, Director, Consumers' Counsel Division, Department of Agriculture; Sumner T Pike, Commissioner, Securities and Exchange Commission; Senator James M. Mead; Isador Lubin, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor; Willis J. Ballinger, economic adviser to the Federal Trade Commission; Joseph J. O'Connell, Special Assistant to the General Counsel, Department of the Treasury; final statement of the chairman, Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney. A Brief History of the Temporary National Economic Committee. A Financial Statement of the Committee's Operations.

Superintendent of Documents.

Final Report of the Executive Secretary to the Temporary National Economic Committee on the Concentration of Economic Power in the United States. A staff volume prepared under the direction of Dr. Dewey Anderson, Executive Secretary of the Temporary National Economic Committee, and Dr. Theodore J. Kreps, Economic Adviser to the Committee and Professor of of Business Economics, Graduate School of Business, Stanford University, assisted by Ruth Aull, Technical Assistant to the Committee. Competition and monopoly in American industry; concentration of production; managed industrial prices; controlled production and sales; trade associations and cartels; technology in our economy; interstate trade barriers; concentration of corporate assets, earnings, and profits; concentration of ownership; concentration of savings; concentrated control of investment policies; investments and the insurance industry; stimulating investment; investment in the housing industry; small business; consumers; fiscal policy and taxation.

Superintendent of Documents.

United States Against the Cooper Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 4, 1941

OPINIONS OF SUPREME COURT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have before me the opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of United States of America, petitioner, against the Cooper Corporation et al. These opinions deal with the question of the rights, if any, of the United States under the Sherman Act. I wish to call particular attention to the very able dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Black. I ask unanimous consent to have the opinions printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the opinions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Supreme Court of the United States. No. 484.—October term, 1940. The United States of America, petitioner, v. The Cooper Corporation, et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. March 31, 1941]

Mr. Justice Roberts delivered the opinion of the Court.

We took this case because it presents the important question whether the United States may maintain an action for treble damages under section 7 of the Sherman Act.[1]

The complaint charged the respondents had illegally combined and conspired to fix collusive prices of articles purchased by the United States; alleged the money damage inflicted upon the United States thereby, and sought judgment for three times that amount. The district court granted a motion to dismiss the complaint on the ground that the United States is not a person as the term is used in section 7 of the Sherman Act.[2] The circuit court of appeals affirmed the judgment.[3]

Section 7 provides:

"Any person who shall be injured in his business or property by any other person or corporation by reason of anything forbidden or declared to be unlawful by this act, may sue therefor in any circuit court of the United States in the district in which the defendant resides or is found, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover threefold the damages by him sustained, and the costs of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee."

The United States is a juristic person in the sense that it has capacity to sue upon contracts made with it or in vindication of its property rights. The Sherman Act, however, created new rights and remedies which are available only to those on whom they are conferred by the act.[4] The precise question for decision, therefore, is whether, by the use of the phrase "any person" Congress intended to confer upon the United States the right to maintain an action for treble damages against a violator of the act.

Since, in common usage, the term "person" does not include the sovereign, statutes employing the phrase are ordinarily construed to exclude it.[5] But there is no hard and fast rule of exclusion. The purpose, the subject matter, the context, the legislative history, and the executive interpretation of the statute are aids to construction which may indicate an intent, by the use of the term, to bring State or Nation within the scope of the law.[6]

The Government admits that often the word "person" is used in such a sense as not to include the sovereign but urges that where, as in the present instance, its wider application is consistent with, and tends to effectuate, the public policy evidenced by the statute, the term should be held to embrace the Government. And it strongly urges that all the considerations which moved Congress to confer the right to recover damages upon individuals and corporations injured by violations of the act apply with equal force to the United States which, as a large procurer of goods and services, is as likely to be injured by the denounced combinations and monopolies as is a natural or corporate person. We are asked, in this view, so to construe the act as not to deny to the Government what public policy is thought to require.

Decision is not to be reached by a strict construction of the words of the act, nor by the application of artificial canons of construction. On the contrary, we are to read the statutory language in its ordinary and natural sense, and if doubts remain, resolve them in the light, not only of the policy intended to be served by the enactment, but, as well, by all other available aids to construction. But it is not our function to engraft on a statute additions which we think the legislature logically might or should have made.[7]

The recent expressions of this court in *Tigner* v. *Texas* (310 U. S. 141, 148, 149), warn that it is not for the courts to indulge in the business of policy making in the field of antitrust legislation. Congress has not left us at large to devise every feasible means for protecting the Government as a purchaser. It is the function of Congress to fashion means to that end, and Congress has discharged this duty from time to time according to its own wisdom. Our function ends with the endeavor to ascertain from the words used, construed in the light of the relevant material, what was in fact the intent of Congress.

1. Without going beyond the words of the section, the use of the phrase "any person" is insufficient to authorize an action by the Government. This conclusion is supported by the fact that if the purpose was to include the United States, "the ordinary dignities of speech would have led" to its mention by name.[8] It is supported also by the collocation of the phrase in the section. The provision is that "any person" injured by violation of the act "by any other person or corporation" may maintain an action for treble damages against the latter. It is hardly credible that Congress used the term "person" in different senses in the same sentence. Yet, unless it did, the United States would not only be entitled to sue but would be liable to suit for treble damages. The more natural inference, we think, is that the meaning of the work was in both uses limited to what are usually known as natural and artificial persons, that is, individuals and corporations. In addition, the concluding words of the section give the injured party, as part of his costs, a reasonable attorney's fee—a provision more appropriate for a private litigant than for the United States.

2. The connotation of a term in one portion of an act may often be clarified by reference to its use in others. The word "person" is used in several sections other than section 7. In sections 1, 2, and 3 the phrase designating those liable criminally is "every person who shall," etc. In each instance it is obvious that while the term "person" may well include a corporation it cannot embrace the United States. In section 8 Congress attempted to make clear that the term "person" is to include a corporation. The provision is "that the word 'person,' or 'persons,' wherever used in this act shall be deemed to include corporations and associations existing under or authorized by the laws of either the United States, the laws of any of the Territories, the laws of any State, or the laws of any foreign country." The very fact, however, that this sweeping inclusion of various entities was thought important to preclude any narrow interpretation emphasizes the fact that if the United States was intended to be included Congress would have so provided expressly. We may say in passing that the argument that the United States may be treated as a corporation organized under its own laws, that is, under the Constitution as the fundamental law, seems so strained as not to merit serious consideration. It is fair to assume that the term "person," in the absence of an indication to the contrary, was employed by the Congress throughout the act in the same, and not in different, senses.

3. The scheme and structure of the legislation is likewise important to a proper ascertainment of its purpose and intent. Sections 1, 2, and 3 impose criminal sanctions for violations of the acts denounced in those sections respectively. Section 4 gives jurisdiction to the Federal courts of proceedings by the Government to restrain violations of the act and imposes upon United States attorneys the duty to institute equity proceedings to that end. Section 5 regulates service in such suits. Section 6 authorizes seizure, in the course of interstate transportation, of goods owned under any contract or pursuant to any conspiracy made illegal by the statute.

Thus far the act deals in detail with the criminal and civil remedies of the Government in vindication of the policy of the legislation. There follows section 7, the only other substantive section, giving a civil action for an injury to property rights.

It seems evident that the act envisaged two classes of actions—those made available only to the Government, which are first provided in detail, and, in addition, a right of action for treble damages granted to redress private inqury. If this be the fair construction of the act, the Court's task is finished when it gives effect to the purposes of the law, evidenced by the various remedies it affords for different situations. Though the law gave a remedy by way of injunction at the suit of the United States, we were pressed to say that a private person should have the same remedy. We were compelled to answer that Congress had not seen fit so to provide.[9] For the like reasons we cannot hold that since a private purchaser is given a remedy for his losses in treble damages, the United States should be awarded the same remedy.

4. Supplemental legislation lends support to the view that Congress had in mind the distinction between public and private remedies and did not intend to confer a right of action on the United States by the use of the phrase "any person" in section 7. The antitrust provisions of the Wilson Tariff Act[10] follow the same pattern as the Sherman Act. Section 73[11] denounces combinations and agreements between parties importing articles from a foreign country and declares that every person guilty of violation of its terms shall be punished. Section 74 confers jurisdiction upon the Federal courts and authorizes proceedings in equity by the United States to restrain such acts. Section 76 provides for seizure and forfeiture of property imported into the United States contrary to law and section 77 gives an action for treble damages to any person against any other person or corporation in the exact words of section 7 of the Sherman Act.

---

[1] Act of July 2, 1890, ch. 647, 26 Stat. 209, 210.

[2] 31 F. Supp. 848.

[3] 114 F. (2d) 413.

[4] *Wilder Mfg. Co.* v. *Corn Products Refining Co.* (236 U. S. 165, 174); *Fleitmann* v. *Welsbach Street Lighting Co.* (240 U. S. 27, 29); *Geddes* v. *Anaconda Copper Mining Co.* (254 U. S. 590, 593).

[5] *United States* v. *Fox* (52 N. Y. 530); Id. (94 U. S. 315, 321).

[6] See *Levy* v. *McCartee* (6 Pet. 102, 110); *United States* v. *Freeman* (3 How. 556, 565); *Ohio* v. *Helvering* (292 U. S. 360, 370); *Nardone* v. *United States* (302 U. S. 379).

[7] *The Pedro* (175 U. S. 354, 364); *Dewey* v. *United States* (178 U. S. 510, 519, 520); *Pirie* v. *Chicago T. & T. Co.* (182 U. S. 438, 451); *White* v. *United States* (191 U. S. 545, 551, 552); *Ebert* v. *Poston* (266 U. S. 548, 554); *Helvering* v. *Oregon L. I. Co.* (311 U. S. 267, 272).

[8] *Davis* v. *Pringle* (268 U. S. 315, 318).

[9] *Minnesota* v. *Northern Securities Co.* (194 U. S. 48, 71); *Paine Lumber Co.* v. *Neal* (244 U. S. 459). The act was amended to authorize suits for injunctions by private litigants. See the Clayton Act of October 15, 1914, ch. 323, sec. 16, 38 Stat. 730, 737; 15 U. S. C., sec. 26.

[10] Act of August 27, 1894, ch. 349, 28 Stat. 509, as amended by act of February 12, 1913, ch. 40, 37 Stat. 667; 15 U. S. C., sec. 8.

[11] 28 Stat. 570, 37 Stat. 667.

The antidumping provisions of the Revenue Act of 1916 [12] make it a criminal offense for "any person" importing articles from a foreign country to sell, or cause to be imported or sold, such articles within the United States at substantially less than the market value of such articles at the time of exportation in the principal markets of the country of production, etc. They further declare that any person injured in his business or property by any violation may sue therefor in the United States courts and recover threefold damages and costs, including a reasonable attorney's fee. It must be obvious that the United States cannot be embraced by the phrase "any person" there used.

When Congress came to supplement the Sherman Act by the Clayton Act,[13] it included in the latter a significant section bearing upon the question under consideration. Doubts had arisen as to whether issues adjudicated in a criminal proceeding or a suit in equity brought by the United States should be taken as concluded in an action for treble damages subsequently brought by an injured party. By section 5 of the Clayton Act it was sought to give such adjudication that effect. The section provides:

"A final judgment or decree hereafter rendered in any criminal prosecution or in any suit or proceeding in equity brought by or on behalf of the United States under the antitrust laws to the effect that a defendant has violated said laws shall be prima facie evidence against such defendant in any suit or proceeding brought by any other party against such defendant under said laws as to all matters respecting which said judgment or decree would be an estoppel as between the parties thereto: *Provided*, This section shall not apply to consent judgments or decrees entered before any testimony has been taken."

Immediately following this provision the section continues:

"Whenever any suit or proceeding in equity or criminal prosecution is instituted by the United States to prevent, restrain, or punish violations of any of the antitrust laws, the running of the statute of limitations in respect of each and every private right of action arising under said laws and based in whole or in part on any matter complained of in said suit or proceeding shall be suspended during the pendency thereof."

Here again it seems clear that Congress recognized the distinction between proceedings initiated by the Government to vindicate public rights and actions by private litigants for damages.

It should be noted that section 1 of the Clayton Act again defined the term "person" exactly as it was defined by section 8 of the Sherman Act, and section 4 again enacted that any person injured by a violation might recover treble damages together with a reasonable attorney's fee.

5. There has been a considerable body of judicial expression to the effect that section 7 authorizes an action for damages only by private suitors and not by the Government.[14] While none of the cases presented the exact question here involved, the statements bearing on the subject exhibit a uniform opinion contrary to the Government's present contention.

6. The legislative history is persuasive that the Sherman Act was not intended to give the United States a civil action for damages. Senator Sherman, on March 18, 1890, introduced a bill which, in section 1, provided that the United States might bring various civil actions and, in section 2, that "any person" should be entitled to sue any "person" or "corporation" for double damages.[15]

In the discussion of the bill it was pointed out that section 1 authorized the United States to bring civil actions, including those for simple damages and that, under section 2, private parties were entitled to sue for double damages. Senator Sherman stated that section 2 gave a right to sue for double damages only to private parties and not to the United States. He stated that the civil suit by the United States authorized by section 1 might be for an ouster of the power of the corporation, for damages, or in quo warranto, and added: "But the second section provides purely a personal remedy, a civil suit also by citizens of the United States." [16]

As is well known, after Senator Sherman's bill had been amended, Senator Hoar rewrote most of the bill. In so doing he eliminated section 1 with its provision for civil suits by the United States and substituted sections 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6, specifying the remedies, civil, criminal, and by way of forfeiture, available to the United States. In that revision he retained, with slight change, section 2 of the bill, increasing the recoverable damages to treble instead of double, and renumbered the section as section 7. In this form the bill was adopted.

As already stated, the language of section 7 of the Sherman Act was repeated in later statutes extending the antitrust laws although in the meantime this and other courts had expressed the view that the section accorded the Government no right of suit for treble damages. When the Clayton Act was before the Senate, Senator Culberson, chairman of the committee which reported the bill, enumerated the usual types of action prosecuted under the Sherman Act—criminal prosecutions, suits in equity, and actions for damages, and stated with respect to Government suits under the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act: "There is no suit authorized by any of these statutes except a criminal prosecution or a suit in equity. The United States does not bring a suit at law for damages." [17]

In 1926 the Attorney General, in response to a Senate resolution asking for information with respect to cases instituted under the first seven sections of the Sherman Act, wrote: "Under section 7, which gives to private persons the right to sue for injuries arising under the act, a number of actions have been instituted. The United States, however, under the statute is not a party to suits under that section." [18]

Senator O'MAHONEY has introduced a bill, which is pending as S. 2719, prepared jointly by him and by the Assistant Attorney General in charge of antitrust matters. On June 28, 1939, the Senator stated that the purpose of the bill was to provide more effective civil remedies. In the course of his statement he said: "There is only one other remedy worth mentioning available under existing law to the Department of Justice—the civil action for an injunction. In addition there is the action in damages by a private person who has been injured. Neither of these remedies is effective." He further stated: "The bill permits the United States, in effect, to bring a suit for damages against an offending corporation and against its individual directors and officers." [19]

7. It is significant that, in the light of the expressions by the courts, the supplemental legislation, and the legislative history, no action has ever been brought by the United States under section 7 in the 50 years during which the statute has been in force until the present action was instituted. Down to the close of the year 1937, 428 criminal prosecutions and suits in equity had been instituted by the Government.[20] Down to December 1939, 103 civil suits had been instituted by private persons, including corporations.[21] In the meantime the World War intervened with the Government a purchaser of enormous quantities of material and supplies. Then, as now, the complaint was prevalent that agreements and conspiracies existed to fix and maintain prices of materials needed by the Government. And throughout the life of the legislation able and vigilant officials devoted to enforcement of the policy of the Sherman Act have not been wanting.

In these circumstances the conviction that no right to sue had been given the Government, rather than a supine neglect to resort to an available remedy, seems to us the true explanation of the fact that no such actions have been instituted by the United States.

In summary, we are of opinion that the text of the act, taken in its natural and ordinary sense, makes against the extension of the term "person" to include the United States and that the usual aids to construction, taken together, instead of inducing the contrary conclusion, go to support the view that Congress did not use the word in the sense for which the Government contends.

The judgment is affirmed.

Mr. Justice Murphy took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

---

[12] Act of September 8, 1916, ch. 463, 39 Stat. 756, 798; 15 U. S. C., sec. 72.

[13] Act of October 15, 1914, ch. 323, 38 Stat. 730.

[14] *Pidcock* v. *Harrington*, 64 Fed. 821, 822; *Lowenstein* v. *Evans*, 69 Fed. 908, 911; *Greer, Mills & Co.* v. *Stoller*, 77 Fed. 1, 3; *City of Atlanta* v. *Chattanooga Foundry*, 101 Fed. 900, 904; *Standard Sanitary Manufacturing Co.* v. *United States*, 226 U. S. 20, 52; *United States* v. *Patterson*, 201 Fed. 697, 714; *General Investment Co.* v. *Lake Shore & Michigan So. Ry. Co.*, 260 U. S. 261, 286; *Glenn Coal Co.* v. *Dickinson Fuel Co.*, 72 Fed. (2d) 885, 889, *Quemos Theatre Co.* v. *Warner Bros. Pictures*, 35 Fed. Supp. 949, 950; *Tigner* v. *Texas*, 310 U. S. 141, 148.

[15] SECTION 1. * * * And the circuit court of the United States shall have original jurisdiction of all suits of a civil nature at common law or in equity arising under this section, and to issue all remedial process, orders, or writs proper and necessary to enforce its provisions. And the Attorney General and the several district attorneys are hereby directed, in the name of the United States, to commence and prosecute all such cases to final judgment and execution.

SEC. 2. That any person or corporation injured or damnified by such arrangement, contract, agreement, trust, or combination defined in the first section of this act may sue for and recover, in any court of the United States of competent jurisdiction, without respect to the amount involved, of any person or corporation a party to a combination described in the first section of this act, twice the amount of damages sustained and the costs of the suit, together with a reasonable attorney's fee.

[16] 21 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 2563–2564.

[17] 51 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 13898. Statements by members of the House Judiciary Committee indicate a similar view: 51 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 9079, 9490. Representative Webb, the chairman of that committee, mentioned the civil remedies available under the bill as treble damage actions by persons, suits by the Federal Trade Commission, suits by the United States for injunctions, and similar suits by persons. He then said, "Certainly the remedies are cumulative. The remedies pile up, and all of the remedies are open to the individual in a suit." 51 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 16275. But obviously he meant that the remedies given the public and the individual, respectively, were cumulative, as they clearly are; for it is plain the remedy given the Federal Trade Commission is not afforded to the individual.

[18] S. Doc. No. 79, 69th Cong., 1st sess., p. 1.

[19] 84 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 8192.

[20] Federal Antitrust Laws, published by the Department of Justice, January 1938.

[21] 49 Yale Law Journal, 296.

[Supreme Court of the United States. No. 484.—October Term, 1940. United States of America, petitioner *v.* The Cooper Corporation et al. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. March 31, 1941]

Mr. Justice Black, dissenting.

In order to give purchasers of goods an opportunity to buy them at prices fixed by competitive trade, the Sherman Act made it illegal to fix prices by combination or conspiracy. It is difficult for me to believe that Congress did not intend to give equal protection to all purchasers similarly injured. In my judgment, no language of that act, nothing in its history, and no argument now presented for our consideration makes necessary the conclusion that Congress intended to discriminate in favor of some purchasers and against others. It would require clear and unequivocal statutory language to persuade me that Congress intended to grant a remedy to all except one of those who were injured by trust prices—the "all" including every natural and artificial person, every corporation and association [22] foreign and domestic, and the single exception being the United States, which buys more goods and services than any other single purchaser.[23] No such clear and unequivocal statutory language exists. And no plausible reason has been hazarded to prove that the Government as a purchaser of goods needs less protection from unlawful combinations than do other buyers.[24] Many deplorable instances in our history, in fact, indicate the contrary. Congress, no doubt stimulated to action by these historical occurrences, has by numerous enactments recognized the urgent necessity for safeguarding governmental purchases of goods and services against unfair and collusive price-fixing. To that end, competitive bidding as a prerequisite to Government contracts has been the general statutory rule over a long period of years, and combinations to deprive the Government of the advantages of such competition have been made criminal. It is therefore strange indeed that the Sherman Act, the greatest of all legislative efforts to make competition, not combination, the law of trade, should now be found to afford a greater protection against collusive price fixing to every other buyer in the United States than is afforded to the United States itself.

So much for what seems to me to be the logical approach to the problem, and the one that should cause us to say that the Government can sue for damages. If, however, we apply familiar canons of construction, I think we are led to the same result. For it is a primary principle that a law should be construed so as to carry out its purpose, in the light of the evil aimed at and the protection intended to be afforded. Here, among the evils legislated against was price-fixing by combination, and among the remedies afforded was the giving of a right of action to purchasers injured by prices so fixed. The result of this case—denying to the largest single purchaser of all goods manufactured and sold in the Nation the protection afforded by this legislation—is to restrict the remedy in such way that the evil aimed at is less likely to be supressed. For the construction given the Sherman Act, insofar as sales to the Government and civil damages are concerned, enables those guilty of violating it to elude its provisions, escape its consequences, and defeat its objects.

Nor do I believe that the previous failure of the Attorneys General of the United States to bring actions similar to this should be deemed a persuasive reason to read the Government out of the act's benefits. The 1926 statement of the Attorney General to the effect that "the United States * * * is not a party to suits under" section 7 does not supply such a reason. For in the quoted statement the Attorney General did not take the position that the Government lacked the power to sue for civil damages; apparently what he had reference to was the fact that the Sherman Act did not make the United States a party to actions for civil damages by private persons against private persons. We do not know and cannot possibly determine why no prior suits were instituted for the benefit of the Government. To assign reasons for such inaction is but to guess. And the guesses would doubtless vary almost in accordance with the preconceived notions of the guessers. But whatever might have been the reasons behind the Government's failure to sue, sure it is that the Attorney General is not the purchasing agent of the Government. He cannot be assumed to have constant knowledge of the manifold problems that face those who buy the Government's supplies. In the final analysis, it is probably true that even an Attorney General who might zealously desire to enforce the criminal provisions of the Sherman Act would not likely be stimulated to institute civil proceedings for damages unless his attention was directed to the point by keenly alert and diligent purchasing agencies. To attempt to construe the Sherman Act by a vain effort to appraise the reasons responsible for the nonaction of Attorneys General is a journey into the realm of imponderables I find it unnecessary to take. I would simply read the act from its language and manifest purpose as giving all purchasers of goods a right to sue if they have been injured as the result of prices held up by those types of unlawful combination condemned by the act.[25]

The principle of strict construction now adopted in this case, resulting as it does in denying to the Government the benefit of section 7 of the Sherman Act, is a radical departure from a long-established policy under which the courts have construed laws most liberally in order to declare the Government entitled to their benefits.[26] And certainly it can hardly be denied that the language of the act, giving all persons a right of action, should if liberally construed be held to justify suit by the United States. For in *Cotton* v. *United States* (11 How. 229, 231), decided 40 years before the Sherman Act was adopted, this Court said in speaking of the United States: "Every sovereign State is of necessity a body politic, or artificial person, and as such capable of making contracts and holding property. * * * It would present a strange anomaly, indeed, if, having the power to make contracts and hold property as other persons, natural or artificial, they were not entitled to the same remedies for their protection." And, speaking in similar vein in *Helvering* v. *Stockholms Enskilda Bank* (293 U. S. 84, 92), after having cited Blackstone for the proposition that the sovereign is a "corporation," and after having gone even beyond this to hold that the statutory word "resident" included the United States, the Court said: "This may be in the nature of a legal fiction; but legal fictions have an appropriate place in the administration of the law when they are required by the demands of convenience and justice." [27]

These particular cases are but facets of a general rule that has long been accepted—the United States can exercise all of the legal remedies which other persons, bodies, or associations can exercise, both at common law and under statutes,[28] unless there is something

---

[22] A 1940 report to the Senate, made by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to a Senate resolution, revealed that the Federal Government was transacting part of its business through the medium of at least 1,489 Government corporations. S. Doc. No. 172, 76th Cong., 3d sess., pt. 1, p. 4. The judgment here does not foreclose such corporations from suing for damages under section 7, or so I assume. If I am correct in my assumption, the result is that as to those purchases made by its corporate agencies, the Government is protected by the Sherman Act, while as to those purchases made by its noncorporate agencies, it is not so protected. A process of statutory construction which results in giving to Government corporations a right denied to constitutionally authorized Government departments seems to me to conflict with the frequently declared rule that a statute should not be interpreted in such way as to produce an unreasonable or unjust result. See *United States* v. *American Trucking Associations*, 310 U. S. 534, 542–543; *Sorrells* v. *United States*, 287 U. S. 435, 446.

[23] For a recent study, see Government Purchasing—An Economic Commentary, Monograph No. 19 of the Temporary National Economic Committee (1940).

[24] An argument is offered to the effect that the Government has no need of a right to damages, because it has the power to bring criminal and injunctive proceedings. But the right to bring those proceedings is given to the Government for the protection of the public, rather than for its self-protection as a purchaser. Further, criminal and injunctive proceedings, whatever their efficacy, do not achieve the object of section 7, which is to indemnify all injured purchasers.

[25] Though the act is all-inclusive in naming those who may sue for damages, it is not equally all-inclusive in describing those acts which may be regarded as unlawful combinations. This is true both because of the original language and objects of the Sherman Act itself, and because of subsequent legislation. The most notable example of such subsequent legislation is that portion of the Clayton Act which provides: "The labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce. Nothing contained in the antitrust laws shall be construed to forbid the existence and operation of labor, agricultural, or horticultural organizations * * * or to forbid or restrain individual members of such organizations from lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof; nor shall such organizations, or the members thereof, be held or construed to be illegal combinations or conspiracies in restraint of trade, under the antitrust laws" (38 Stat. 731, 15 U. S. C., sec. 17. See *Apex Hosiery Co.* v. *Leader* (310 U. S. 469)).

[26] It is argued that if the Government can sue for damages it may also be sued for damages. That question is not before us and need not be decided. Other principles will be material if such a question ever should be presented. See *United States* v. *Sherwood*, this day decided; *Nardone* v. *United States* (302 U. S. 379, 383–384); *United States* v. *Knight* (14 Pet. 301, 315). Among these principles the most important is that of sovereign immunity. "The sovereignty of the United States raises a presumption against its suability, unless it is clearly shown; nor should a court enlarge its liability to suit beyond what the language [of the statute in question] requires." *Eastern Transportation Co.* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 675, 686); *Price* v. *United States* (174 U. S. 373, 375–376); *United States* v. *Sherwood*, supra.

[27] To this statement the Court added: "If to carry out the purposes of a statute it be admissible to construe the word 'person' as including the United States [cases to that effect having previously been cited], it is hard to see why, in like circumstances, it is inadmissible to construe the word 'resident' as likewise including the United States." *Cf. Ohio* v. *Helvering* (292 U. S. 360, 370–371); *Stanley* v. *Schwalby* (147 U. S. 508, 517).

[28] See *Dugan* v. *United States* (3 Wheat. 172); *United States* v. *Gear* (3 How. 120);

in a statute or in its history to indicate an intent to deprive the United States of that right.[19] In this case, nothing in the Sherman Act itself and nothing in its legislative history makes necessary the conclusion that Congress intended to withhold from the United States a remedy given to all other purchasers.[20] Under these circumstances it is my opinion that the judgment below should be reversed.

Mr. Justice Reed and Mr. Justice Douglas join in this dissent.

Jackson Day Dinner Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE L. HERRING

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 7, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. CLYDE L. HERRING, OF IOWA

Mr. HERRING. Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an address delivered by me in Des Moines, Iowa, upon the occasion of Jackson Day entitled "Andrew Jackson, Symbol of American Democracy." I am informed that the 1,373 who sat down to dinner upon this occasion were the largest in point of attendance at any similar occasion in the United States this year.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Years before those present tonight were born, Americans set apart a day known as Jackson Day, that we might not forget the man who carried the torch of democracy and freedom in the early days of the Republic. The day set aside was the anniversary of the Battle of New Orleans, fought and won 2 weeks after the Treaty of Ghent was signed, and tonight we have had the great privilege of listening to another great American—a streamlined 1941 model of Andrew Jackson.

It is more fitting, perhaps, today than upon any previous anniversary that we should pause to pay our tribute to that great man whose life and deeds stand as a symbol of American democracy. They provide both the inspiration and the challenge to us, the living, to preserve and defend not alone the democracy for which he fought and for which he was ever willing to die, but our American way of life.

Because what this great American represented and did is so vital to us today, I think it is worth while that I take time to revive in your memories something of the background and history of Andrew Jackson.

His biography, a saga of American patriotism, relates that his Scotch-Irish parents, Andrew and Elizabeth Hutchinson Jackson, and their two sons migrated to America in the year 1765 to escape the poverty and oppression in Ireland.

After a hazardous journey, which consumed months, they finally arrived at the little frontier settlement of Waxhaw, in South Carolina, and with limited provisions and most meager tools they set about the task of clearing a piece of ground and building a log cabin.

A linen draper by trade, Andrew Jackson, Sr., was unequal to the hard tasks of a pioneer, so less than 2 years after his arrival, and but a few days previous to the birth of the son, who was to bear his name, and make that name famous, he sickened and died.

He left scant provision for his young widow and only the bounty of Providence provided her with a place, wherein to bear her child, who arrived on the 15th of March 1767; yet two sovereign States, North and South Carolina, were later to set up claims to his nativity, still a subject of dispute.

Andrew Jackson owed his genius to his courageous and liberty-loving parents, and his career to the time and country into which he was born.

Possessed of an indomitable will, a supreme faith in God, the ability to make the best of a bad situation, and the willingness to work hard, Jackson's mother managed to eke out a livelihood for herself and her little brood by keeping house for a relative and his invalid wife.

Realizing that she could not hope to educate all of her children, crude and limited as were the means, she decided to concentrate her efforts on her youngest born. After the manner of the mother of Samuel, the great prophet, she consecrated him to the service of God, and set about the task of saving the pennies needed to educate him for the Presbyterian ministery, one of the most influential as well as most noble callings of the time and place.

The outbreak of the Revolutionary War on March 13, 1775, intervened to put an end to her dream and to change the course of her ambition.

The spirit of independence, ever burning brightly in her heart, caused her to counsel her sons to support the Revolutionary cause. By the time the war had been in progress 5 years, although none of her sons were grown, all three had volunteered their services to their country.

Those were dark days indeed for General Washington and the Revolutionary armies, and more particularly for the poverty-stricken but heroic Jackson family.

Hugh, the eldest son, died as a result of his part in the Battle of Stono.

Robert and Andrew were taken prisoners by the British. A British colonel ordered Andrew to clean and polish his boots. The spirited young prisoner defiantly refused, and demanded to be treated as a prisoner of war, not as a personal servant. Enraged, the testy colonel struck him over the head with his saber, knocking him to the ground. But he did not polish the boots. He bore to his grave the heavy scars of the encounter, and did not overlook the opportunity later afforded him to avenge the wrong.

He and his brother were marched off to a prison camp at Camden, S. C., 40 miles away, without even having their wounds dressed. They covered the distance somehow, on foot, and were herded into a huge stockade, wholly lacking in sanitation, and without bedding, adequate equipment, food, or medical supplies, and already overcrowded by 250 other unfortunates, many of whom were wounded or ill with smallpox and fever.

It was not long before they, too, were taken sick. By a miracle, the news of their plight trickled through to their courageous mother, who was ingenious enough to secure the promise from a Whig bushwhacker to exchange 13 British prisoners for her 2 sons and 5 other Revolutionary soldiers.

What a ghastly spectacle confronted that poor woman upon arrival at the prison camp; her son Robert was all but dead. Andrew was racked by a terrible fever. Nevertheless, they set out for home, Andrew barely able to drag one foot behind the other; his brother, too ill to walk, too weak to ride, had to be held on his horse, while their mother got on another mount and, accompanied on foot by Andrew and the other soldiers, they started bravely on their journey.

Almost within sight of home they were overtaken by a terrible downpour of chilling rain. The smallpox was driven in, and 48 hours lated Andrew was raving in delirium, whilst his brother lay dying. Afflicted by her new sorrow, the mother dared not stop to mourn. She had to save Andrew. How she managed to do it even he never knew, but one suspects it was her homespun common sense, augmented and sustained by her resolute faith in God.

There was to be but one more magnificent scene in the epic of the Joan of Arc of the new democracy.

Having become familiar with the dreadful conditions prevailing in the prison camps of the British, she sought out, and volunteered her services to the American hospital ship at Charleston. She helped care for the sick and wounded and was herself taken ill with ship fever, from the effects of which she died at the home of William Barton, and was buried in an unmarked grave out on the open plain beyond Charleston.

What a magnificent example of heroism; what sublime patriotism; what a superb portrayal of the noble sacrifices and limitless devotion of motherhood.

All mothers are exceptional women, but Elizabeth Hutchinson Jackson was an exceptional mother. With Abraham Lincoln, Andrew Jackson could say: "All that I am, and all that I ever intend to be, I owe to my angel mother."

His family wiped out by war, he stood friendless and alone, in the midst of a conflict still raging, the outcome of which was yet to be determined.

Loyal to the cause of freedom, he concealed his grief and carried on somehow until the war ended.

Life was hard and cruel. It meant enormous sacrifice—not to succeed—but to survive.

At 15 the harrows of hell had passed over him, and forever after—he was a grim realist, assuming, at that age, the full responsibilities of a man, to which he ever after measured up.

The only gift the Revolution gave him was freedom. The only advantage the times provided was opportunity.

Contrast, if you will, the situation confronting this young man and the adolescent youth of today.

Two years after the close of the war he began to read the law, and 4 years later he mounted his horse and rode off into a new territory that was opening up for settlement, there to begin the practice of the little law which he had learned, and where he was soon to demonstrate his one great talent—the ability to influence men and win decisions.

The West of 1788 was as primitive and wild as our West of 100 years later; its people, plain, unlettered—even rough.

The ability to fight was the measure of a man's strength, and the dependability of his word was the index to his character. Fortunately for Jackson, he possessed both the ability to fight and the honor to keep his commitments. "Make friends by being honest. Keep them by being steadfast," were his mother's last words to him, a lesson never forgotten, and he took this with him into the wilds of what was later to become the great State of Tennessee.

Cotton v. *United States*, supra. Cf. *Dollar Savings Bank* v. *United States* (19 Wall. 227); *United States* v. *Chamberlin* (219 U. S. 250).

[19] Cf. *Davis* v. *Pringle* (268 U. S. 315).

[20] The legislative history of the Sherman Act is not enlightening on the question now before us. At best, all that can be said of the very few and scattered statements that were made on the subject during the debates on the Clayton Act is that they look both ways.

At the age of 21 he was named solicitor, or public prosecutor, of the new Territory.

Young Jackson had served a hard apprenticeship long before reaching his twenty-first birthday, which well qualified him for his new duties. Danger was to him a commonplace. Hardship was his inseparable companion. The frontier suited his temperament quite as much as his ability to take care of himself suited the frontier.

During that period began the development of the philosophy of democracy, which was to become the essential part of his life and being. His faith in the common man, the average citizen, was not arrived at after the manner of Thomas Jefferson and other liberals, who, while believing in the abstract theory of democratic self-government, associated almost exclusively with the aristocrats and the scholarly men of the time.

Andrew Jackson knew the frontiersmen and the backwoodsmen. His belief in their ability to govern themselves was founded upon experience. They came to have an even greater faith in him.

When, in 1796, Tennessee became a State, Andrew Jackson assisted in modeling the constitution and helped to develop the political organization for the establishment of its State government.

He was elected as the first Representative in the Congress from the new State of Tennessee, and a year later resigned to accept the appointment of the State legislature as United States Senator, serving only about a year, when he again resigned. With the exception of Henry Clay and one or two others, Andrew Jackson, appointed at the age of 29, was the youngest man ever to occupy a seat in the United States Senate.

It is a matter of record that Andrew Jackson resigned from every public office he ever held except the Presidency of the United States. He resigned the office of Governor, the office of Member of the House of Representatives, a supreme court justiceship, a major generalship in the Army, and three times he resigned his membership in the United States Senate. In fact, he holds the all-time record for resignations, having spent about as much time and effort in getting out of the United States Senate as most men have spent trying to get in.

His temperament was wholly unsuited to the duties of a United States Senator. He could not endure endless argument and debate, accompanied by long and unnecessary delays—an attitude with which many of us have developed a renewed sympathy during recent months.

The first time he resigned from the Senate he opened a small mercantile business to meet with little success other than to grow in popularity and in the affection and esteem of his companions, which probably resulted in his being appointed judge of the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee. At the same time he accepted a commission as major general of the State militia.

When the Creek Indians made war upon the white settlers in 1813, Andrew Jackson raised a volunteer army of 3,000 men and won a final victory on March 27, 1814, a date which marks the decline of the Indian race in the eastern part of this continent. The leadership accepted by him during the Indian wars was never repudiated by his followers and never forfeited by himself.

As a result of his part in the Indian wars he left "a broad highway, free of enemies, from the Tennessee River to the Gulf of Mexico," and made secure the right of the United States to occupy all of the territory between the Ohio River and the Gulf, having also effectually driven the British from that region.

Desiring peace so much that he was willing to fight for it, he accepted a commission as general in the United States Army in the War of 1812. He went to the defense of New Orleans, and on January 8, 1815, a date ever to be remembered by American patriots, he successfully defeated General Packenham. His military deeds captured the public imagination and gained for him the unrivaled popularity which ultimately was to make him President of the United States.

With the acquisition of Florida he was made military governor, a post which he also resigned, having determined to seek permanent retirement at his country estate, the Hermitage, at Nashville, Tenn., in the development of which he had taken a profound interest and had invested a substantial fortune.

Strangely enough, the hour which he picked for retirement was the very hour chosen by fate for the commencement of his real career: the Presidency of the United States.

Unlike many candidates, he received the call to the Presidency quite without personal solicitation. And not until he had learned of the political intrigue which brought about his defeat in the House of Representatives in 1825, following an election which had failed to elect a President, but which had revealed him to be the popular choice, did he get his "dander up" and resolve not alone to become President but to expose the unwholesome "deal" by which Henry Clay was promised the secretaryship of State in exchange for his vote for John Quincy Adams.

Not unlike other political campaigns, however, some within our memory, Jackson found himself the choice of the people, whilst the press, business, high finance, and so-called society were opposed to him. His nomination and election in 1828 marked the beginning of real democracy in the United States. Andrew Jackson served as the link between the old order which was passing and the new order which was forming. He knew and respected George Washington, the first President of the United States, and he was destined to live long enough thereafter to become the seventh President.

He arrived at the Presidency under circumstances not at all creditable to his opponents. His heart seared by the bitterness of an acrimonious and vilifying campaign, conducted not alone against himself but against his wife, and his head bowed by the grief of her untimely passing, he entered upon his duties as President singularly free of fear and ambition.

Fear he had never known. Ambition died with the woman whom he had cherished and in defense of whose honor he had killed in a duel the greatest pistol shot in Tennessee. But for that very reason the spirit of the warrior burned the more brightly.

Regarded as a rank outsider by the worldly and scholarly men of the day, he set about the tasks of the Chief Executive with the same farsightedness and cool determination to win which had characterized his military successes.

One by one he met and adroitly overcame his most powerful adversaries, many of whom were self-chosen. Among them were such outstanding leaders as Henry Clay, John Quincy Adams, Daniel Webster, Francis Biddle, and John C. Calhoun.

Profoundly respectful of the rights of others, he demanded similar consideration for himself. Impressed with the importance and dignity of mankind, his career was marked by the studied determination to do that which he conceived to be fair and right, even in the face of tremendous opposition, and to give to every man an equal opportunity to be and to do his best.

Confronted as are we today by the necessity to make vital and fearless decisions, he had the courage to return to the Congress without approval measures which had been passed by large majorities, and he lived to see his vetoes sustained by popular opinion as well as by wisdom and justice. He thus won the respect and admiration even of his enemies.

He served his country as President during a period when economic and social problems were relatively as difficult and as numerous as those with which we have been confronted. The success of his administration was due in large measure to the vast popular support which he received from the general public despite the organized opposition of hostile minorities.

Few Presidents have made the enduring impression upon our country and its institutions which was made by Andrew Jackson.

He, quite as much as Thomas Jefferson, helped to shape national policy away from the Federalist concept toward the democratic ideal.

Jacksonian democracy, the essence of popular self-government, he applied and encouraged its fullest expression. It embodied hostility to aristocracy, tyranny, and oppression, and affirmed the capability of the common people to rule by direct participation in government. The extension of the suffrage to citizens who did not own property became politically effective through strong pioneer groups of the South and West, the vitality of which was felt by the opponents of democracy.

To the challenge of nullification and State's rights he made the mighty answer, "The Union—it must be preserved," and thereby put far into the future their ultimate settlement—one of the results of the Civil War.

He was responsible for the "Kitchen Cabinet," the name given by his opponents to his unofficial advisors, whose power and influence were believed to be greater than those exercised by the memers of his Cabinet. There is no doubt that while he enjoyed the benefit of their counsel, the decisions which he ultimately made were his own decisions—those of the Chief Executive.

Efforts have been made to detract from his glory by charging that he was the originator of the spoils system. Senator Marcy, of New York, coined the phrase, "to the victors belong the spoils of their enemies," which happened to catch the popular fancy, as descriptive of Jackson's policy.

The practice of rewarding one's friends for political favors was well established long before the administration of Andrew Jackson, however, and, I may add, the example afforded him has not been overlooked by his successors.

He simply extended his patronage to the little fellows, hitherto ignored or overlooked. To the credit of Andrew Jackson, he appointed able and competent men, and their qualifications and their sympathy with the objectives of the administration were a condition precedent to their being chosen. His action was consonant with that of any conscientious Chief Executive.

His outstanding achievement was the peerless demonstration that democracy could be made to work.

He retired from public life before his personal popularity had reached its zenith, and he left the Nation's Capital expressing but one regret, that he "had not hanged Henry Clay and shot John C. Calhoun."

Despite his retirement, he remained, up to the time of his death, a potent influence in every important matter affecting the political destiny of this Nation.

An essential part of Jackson's philosophy was that a people must demonstrate by their ability to overcome obstacles and conquer conditions, their fitness to survive. He had no patience with the policy of appeasement.

Andrew Jackson symbolizes all for which American democracy stands. He was the living embodiment of the new freedom, a fair justice, an outstanding military general, a great statesman, and a profound believer in humanity and liberty.

At this critical hour in the life of mankind, it is imperative that the people of the United States rededicate themselves to the

American ideals of liberty and freedom, which his life so certainly represents.

The challenge of the present crisis, infinitely more grave than that which confronted the founders of this Nation, demands that each and every one of us take stock of ourselves, and prepare for the tremendous test of strength, which events are forcing upon us.

Everything for which Andrew Jackson fought, and which, in essence, is the American way of life, is challenged by forces rampant throughout the world. There are few among us so foolhardy as to believe that the free life and the free economy of all other nations in the world can be destroyed; yet the people of the United States of America and the rest of the Western Hemisphere can remain untouched—our institutions unchanged—our liberties unaltered.

The national unity which was ours only a few short weeks ago has been seriously impaired, and since our national solidarity is an impregnable wall protecting the liberty and the good which are ours, that unity and solidarity must be restored, and vigilantly maintained.

A division within our own ranks has been brought about by repeated attempts on the part of opponents of the administration to link up the last World War with the present world revolution. They have cast aspersions upon the reasons which forced us to enter the World War, and they attempt to repudiate our Government for having done so.

Our leadership of the World War period has been spoken of with derision and some of the noblest utterances and most heroic acts of that great President, Woodrow Wilson, have been held up to public ridicule.

Would that the historic facts might be burned into the minds and hearts of all Americans.

On February 26, 1917, President Wilson came before the Congress and asked authority to arm American merchantmen and recommended that we adopt a policy of armed neutrality. In response the House of Representatives by a vote of 403 to 13, appropriated $100,000,000 for that and kindred purposes, but in the Senate a small number filibustered against the measure and the session closed without a vote.

It was necessary then, as it has been necessary recently, to call a special session of the Congress, at tremendous cost to the taxpayers and involving delays fraught with grave danger, to enable the Members of Congress to take the action necessary to protect the rights of the United States of America.

Then, as now, the peace of the world was menaced by pan-Germanic ambitions in the Balkans and the Orient looking toward world domination. Then, as now, the grave problem confronting the United States was what to do about its rights as a neutral power—whether to defend or surrender them.

Woodrow Wilson acted in absolutely good faith, just as President Roosevelt has done, when he went before the American people for reelection based upon his achievement that he had kept this Nation out of war. Woodrow Wilson did not change. The conditions which he was required to face changed. They grew increasingly worse until he was forced to take action. It was Germany's ruthless declaration of unrestricted submarine warfare by the Imperial German Government, which compelled us to take up arms to protect our very lives and to safeguard our American democracy.

A more unselfish statement of war and peace aims has never been recorded than Woodrow Wilson's famous Fourteen Points. This Nation, and Woodrow Wilson, kept that solemn covenant to the letter. We fought a war "to make the world safe for democracy," and let it be observed, democracy is the only living philosophy safe for the world.

We asked not one additional square mile of territory, not one dollar in punitive damages. Woodrow Wilson went to the peace conference at Versailles with motives so noble, so generous, so far above the comprehension of the minds of little men, that he was bound to be misunderstood by the giant pygmies, observing his influence, enviously, from afar and thinking, as small-minded men are prone to do, how much better they could have done the job.

The Versailles Treaty, like the Bible, is often discussed but seldom read. How many of its critics realize that its first provision was for the establishment of a League of Nations, that its second provision was for the establishment of a world court. Successive provisions were based upon the "doctrine of self-determination of nations," enunciated by Woodrow Wilson, and under whose inspiration seven independent and free republics were set up in central Europe for the express purpose of restoring the rights and the freedom of those peoples, who had been subjugated in times past by military conquest.

Is there a man or woman among us who dares quarrel with that purpose and the achievement of that objective?

Yet those very countries are today ground under the heel of a military despotism and subjected to an economic slavery infinitely more terrible than the plight from which they were rescued by an Allied victory and the terms of a peace which sought to make Germany harmless and to enable those poor peoples to live again as free men and women.

Nor do these new nations lie prostrate alone. The same desperate tyranny has destroyed the ancient freedoms of Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Luxemburg, and France as well.

As for the matter of reparations, let this be remembered, Germany was not asked to pay punitive damages but merely to repair the actual physical damage which she had done in the territories of the countries which she invaded, and for the property and lives which she had destroyed.

In 1932, a new treaty was negotiated with Germany under which she was committed to an eventual payment of only $714,000,000, but no action whatever has been taken under the terms of that agreement. Therefore, it is but the voicing of propaganda, repeated either out of ignorance or maliciousness, to charge that the Versailles Treaty is responsible for Adolf Hitler.

Rather, it is now plain that had the terms of the Versailles Treaty been strictly enforced Adolf Hitler could not have risen to power. He would have been stopped with his initial attempt to reoccupy the Rhineland on March 7, 1936. The military force of Germany would have remained a negligible quantity, without challenge to the peace and safety of the world. Nor would Germany have been permitted to develop her pocket battleship fleet, implemented by her air force and an ever-increasing number of submarines, which now prove to be her most deadly weapons.

An attempt strictly to enforce the terms of the Versailles Treaty has never been made from the time of its adoption to the present hour.

The British and the French made one concession after another to Germany from the acceptance of the peace down to the heartless invasion of Poland.

So much did Great Britain and France desire peace that they were willing to risk their national safety in order to maintain peace. They shrunk from the necessity to rearm adequately, long after they were possessed of definite knowledge as to the tremendous progress which Germany, Italy, Russia, and Japan were making in building vast war machines and gearing their entire industrial production and economic life to militaristic governmental policies.

What a price France has already paid! What price will Great Britain be required to pay?

Bound by a solemn covenant to respect the neutrality of Belgium in 1914, Germany turned her back on that obligation and marched her armed forces into Belgian territory.

Great Britain and France, bound by an equally solemn covenant to defend Belgian neutrality, entered the World War to fulfill that obligation.

In 1925, under the terms of the Locarno Treaty, Germany obligated herself to respect the territorial integrity of Poland, and was signatory, with Great Britain, France, Italy, and Belgium, to a nonaggression pact. Great Britain and France obligated themselves to defend Poland, if she should be attacked.

On the 1st of September 1939 the mechanized army of Adolf Hitler moved upon Warsaw and liquidated the western portion of Poland, whilst Russia seized the opportunity to take the "bear's share" on her eastern flank, together with a very large bite out of little Finland.

Great Britain and France, in fulfillment of their solemn treaty obligations, came to the assistance of bleeding and beleaguered Poland.

Since that date events have moved with kaleidoscopic swiftness. Today all but a remnant of the territory of Europe is under the complete military and economic domination of the Nazi-Fascist war machine or Communist Russia.

Freedom has completely disappeared from those occupied territories. Famine, pestilence, and slavery are the order of the day. Hope is gone; faith is broken. The present is black with despair. The future holds no promise.

Yet there are those among us, seeing the picture as clearly as you and I, who dare insist that it would be possible for the United States of America to treat with the terrible force that has brought this dreadful situation about; that we can expect an ultimate peace when Mr. Hitler is through changing the map of Europe and Japan has completed its aggressions in Asia; that then our cultural, trade, and spiritual relationships with the rest of the world can be restored and we, meanwhile, will have remained whole.

To remain aloof from those conflicts and to keep war away from these shores has been the constant hope and aim of this administration, the American people, and their representatives in the Congress, and it was in pursuance of this policy that the defense measure was enacted by the Congress, and $7,000,000,000 with which to carry out its purposes was appropriated.

It was our desire for peace which caused us to adopt the Neutrality Act of 1935 and to later amend it, giving up rights for which we had fought at various times during 100 years.

We voluntarily relinquished fundamental rights, which we had so deeply prized that we fought no less than six major wars to establish and maintain them. First among these rights were the freedom of the seas and the right of our nationals to travel unmolested throughout the world.

We cannot afford to overlook the important fact that Hitler's aggression outside Germany have been subsequent to the passage of our Neutrality Act.

The time has come, however, when the American people must realize that we cannot longer ignore the possibility of an attempt on his part to do to the republics of Central and South America and ourselves precisely what he has succeeded in doing to the independent nations of Europe.

The defense measure which we have just passed enables us to make effective our determination to defend ourselves in every way possible.

It is not merely a question of enabling England, Greece, and China to live. It is imperative that we give them the physical equipment with which to win. There is in-

finitely more at issue, moral, physical, and political, than many of our people realize.

We, like the democracies of Europe, are several years late in our program of national preparedness and defense. We must exert our every ingenuity to make up for lost time. In carrying forward the immense program which is now under way, we must speak as with one voice and act with but one purpose, to perfect and accomplish an adequate national-defense program.

In Andrew Jackson's day, the great question was whether the brave souls who had populated the seacoast of this great continent were willing to make the sacrifices necessary to become free men. Our great question today is, Are we willing to make the sacrifices to remain free men? Today the great question confronting this generation is, Are we courageous enough to preserve to ourselves and to our posterity the great freedom which is ours?

In my mind, there is no doubt America will meet the challenge to democracy.

Common Council for American Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSH LEE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 7, 1941

ADDRESS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL ROBERT H. JACKSON

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, on April 3 the Attorney General of the United States, Hon. Robert H. Jackson, delivered a very able and patriotic address to the Common Council for American Unity at New York. I ask leave to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Propagandists of unfriendly foreign powers have said that a conquest of the United States could be an inside job, to be done by playing race against race, religion against religion, and class against class. Such strategy has been vindicated by dramatic successes in Europe. The American's natural first reaction has been a wholesome demand for intensive and critical examination of our own society to expose sources of possible treachery.

I am convinced that the time has come when we should no longer concede the initiative to enemies of our way of life or rely solely upon defensive measures against foreign penetration.

The advantage of a confident, instead of an apprehensive, attitude and of a constructive program instead of a merely defensive one are especially significant in our relations with immigrant aliens. Foreign propagandists specialize in spreading fear that the large number of our foreign born makes the United States an easy victim of their divide-and-conquer strategy.

We all realize that the fact that we are not a distinct and separate race, but rather a mosaic of races, introduces into our public life emotional cross-currents that are often unfortunate. We know, too, that their very diversity tends to make them cancel each other, and so, while we often disagree on foreign policy, we have never failed to achieve a working unity, especially in the presence of any danger from without.

It will help us to appraise the present threat from abroad to divide our society by reflecting that this is not a new strategy, but is an old and discredited one. Twenty years ago Emperor Wilhelm 2d planned the same kind of inside job on America and boasted to Ambassador Gerard that he could induce an uprising of such elements in the United States. He counted on certain organizations, such as the German-American Alliance, which was then more influential than the bund is today. He counted on the help of radicals, who were then organized under the I. W. W. and were comparable to present-day Communists. He, too, used secret agents, spies, and propaganda. The Kaiser finally got an American uprising, but it was not of the kind he planned. American unity was not seriously disrupted, but, on the other hand, democratic propaganda did make such inroads on German morale that in spite of rigid censorship and suppression, the Kaiser lost his throne as well as the war.

Since the Kaiser's attempt backfired, the proportion of aliens to our total population has diminished, until it is today only about one-half of what it was then. In World War days we had about seven and one-half million aliens in a population of 105,000,000. Today we have only about 5,000,000 aliens in a population that has grown to 130,000,000. The proportion of alien population has decreased from about 7 percent in World War time to approximately 3½ percent now.

It should also be reassuring to recall that the Government is now much better prepared to deal with any disloyal groups than it was in 1917. The country then had neither legislation nor administrative experience appropriate for combating subversive activities. It had a very limited military intelligence service, and the Department of Justice had only an embryo division of investigation. Today we have effective intelligence divisions in both Army and Navy, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, with a trained personnel of approximately 5,000 men, operated under a substantial body of tested legislation.

Alien control is a conspicuous example of improvement in governmental technique. We have just completed, with excellent cooperation from the aliens themselves, the first real working inventory of our noncitizen population. The registration will soon be classified and tabulated and we will know who our aliens are, where they live, whence they came, and we will be able to sift out those with criminal records. Moreover, we will be able in a matter of hours to identify aliens of any particular nationality, in the whole Nation or in any locality, and specify those with military experience or of any selected occupation.

These detailed individual records enable the Government to deal with any alien problems on the basis of individual merits, and they take away any excuse for indiscriminating dragnet procedures or mass action.

I do not underestimate the dangerous possibilities nor the sinister purposes of certain subversive groups which have many alien adherents. These groups, as a whole, require proper policing. They were equally aggressive during the World War. That aliens did not contribute a disproportionate number to such disaffected groups appears from the fact that during the World War, with nearly twice the present number of aliens in this country, it was found necessary to intern only about 2,200 of them.

In the light of these facts, has the time not come for the American people to supplement the psychological defensive with a real psychological offensive? Should we not now take up constructive measures which would enable our loyal foreign born better to serve the cause of democracy?

A first step is to modernize our immigration laws to permit a firmer but more flexible alien control. Deportation of undesirable aliens has broken down in practice because transportation to most countries has become impossible and because many countries refuse to accept their return. But the law still commands us to issue deportation warrants for many causes and to conduct long and costly proceedings which now usually end in deportation orders that cannot be carried out. Over 6,000 persons have been ordered deported who, because of conditions beyond our control, cannot be gotten out of the country. Such a situation breeds contempt for law and government.

I have called this situation to the attention of Congress and have asked, in lieu of deportation, that an independent board, after hearings, be allowed broad discretion to intern dangerous criminal aliens and to condone mere technical violations of law which would now subject aliens of good character to deportation. This would assure the country of protection against the vicious, which it cannot get from present procedure, and would regularize the status of decent and loyal aliens.

I am speaking only of immigrant aliens who have already cast their lot with us. Our policy must distinguish sharply their situation from the case of visiting foreigners or future immigrants. Present conditions require sharp scrutiny of all visitors, at least those from beyond our own hemisphere, restriction of visiting permits to persons and purposes clearly of advantage to our own country, and prompt return when temporary permits expire. Some of these visitors develop a sudden attachment for us that is not reciprocal. The tide of immigration has, of course, been largely arrested by war conditions. It seems probable that the easy migration which characterized the past two centuries throughout most of the world is at an end. Certainly our immigration policy will need to be reconsidered and recast to meet the needs of our own society as it appears in the light of the war and post-war conditions.

But whatever discrimination or selection we see fit to make in our future policy, immigrant aliens who are already in the process of assimilation into our society must be given opportunity to be self-supporting and self-respecting members of our community life. It is vital to any program of Americanization that there be no general discrimination against aliens in employment. We do not want to create a class of refugees from work. The dictators would quickly seize upon such mistreatment of aliens here to convince their kinsmen and countrymen abroad that democracy offers them no hope.

Foreign propagandists and domestic fearmongers deceive themselves when they discount the deep-seated good will toward our institutions which has led the immigrant to tear himself up by the roots and transplant all his worldly hopes to this country. It is difficult for minds conditioned by European environment to understand the voluntary nature of the relationship of our aliens toward America. They cannot visualize a society made up of successive waves of migrations all bound together by a unifying American dream of liberty and opportunity. Among immigrants, of course, are about the usual run of scamps and traitors, but I see little reason to believe that any threat to our national unity today either originates or is predominantly supported by noncitizens.

I think most Americans, because of their defensive attitude of mind toward the so-called "fifth column," have failed to realize that real vulnerability to the "fifth column" is Hitler's, not ours. His overextended domain now includes millions of alien and unwilling subjects—full of revenge and on the verge of insurrection. These are Czechs,

Poles, Danes, Norwegians, Hollanders, Belgians, and French. They are held down only by the machine gun and disciplined by the concentration camp. They constitute the greatest "fifth column" opportunity in history.

Hitler's aliens are a sorry contrast to our aliens—other Czechs, Poles, Danes, Norwegians, Hollanders, Belgians, and French—yes; and Germans and Italians, too—the overwhelming majority of whom eagerly became subject to our laws and are devoted to the free institutions they have voluntarily adopted.

Aided by these loyal recruits to our democracy we can, if we will, take the propaganda offensive, out-"fifth-column" the master "fifth columnist" himself. And if we are to attack this menace at its source, we could have no more effective weapon than the good offices of the alien. In the Old World his testimony as to the advantages of democracy over dictatorship will carry more weight than that of native Americans.

Given the help of our immigrants from the recently oppressed countries, we could send in Europe's own tongues from her own native sons messages of their progress and happiness under free institutions that would stir new vitality for democracy in every occupied community of Europe. Loyal aliens are not intruders to be merely tolerated. They are priceless assets for the defense of democracy if we have the wit to cultivate them.

Every person in the reach of my voice owes his presence on this free continent, either remotely or immediately, to the impulse to migrate. Some, like myself, are products of migrations so far back that we have lost any sense of European origin. But that is no excuse for losing our understanding also. Those who stem from the earlier migrations can render no more timely service to our national defense than to join hands with later immigrants to make our common lot of American freedom completely and permanently secure.

Flying Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 7, 1941

ARTICLE BY HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by my pen entitled "Flying Farmers." This article was published in the April 1941 issue of the Southern Agriculturist.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Southern Agriculturist for April 1941]

FLYING FARMERS

(By Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, of North Carolina)

Aviation is now referred to as the new right arm of agriculture. But that's not because there are large numbers of flying farmers. As a matter of fact, there are not many flying farmers as yet, but the number is increasing all the time. It's because the airplane has established itself as a useful farm weapon for fighting forest fires, boll weevils, grasshoppers, and so on. The airplane has also proved its worth to the farmer in spotting high-flying spores that cause crop diseases, and in helping to locate tree ailments, such as the Dutch-elm disease.

The reason that the flying farmer is not a common sight today is due largely to the cost of planes. It's only in the last year or so that a plane has been manufactured at a price the farmer could afford to pay. Last year, for example, American airplane manufacturers constructed less than 3,000 of what is commonly called "flivver" planes, with motors of less than 70 horsepower. Lowering the horsepower without lowering the efficiency of the plane brought about a lower price. So today you can buy a brand new "flivver" plane for around $1,200.

That may sound high to the person driving a low-price automobile. But you have to remember that the price of automobiles has not always been as low as it is now. When automobile manufacturers were turning out 3,000 cars a year the "horseless" buggy sold for considerably more money than it does today. An expanded market and mass production—the two factors which brought the price of automobiles down—are undoubtedly having a similar influence on the price of small planes. And it isn't at all rash to predict that farmers will take to the new air flivvers just as they took to the automobile when the price is within their reach. As a matter of fact, the farmer is about the only person of moderate means who could afford to own and operate a landing field. Of course, he would have to subsidize the enterprise by running a few cows on his airport while he isn't taking off or landing, but that would probably prove to be an asset instead of a problem. And the farmer's knowledge of machinery would also aid in this new venture.

Now let's take a look at one of these new flivver planes and get a little better acquainted with some of its features. To begin with, most of these small planes are powered with a single motor which develops from 36 to 70 horsepower. They are graceful, streamlined ships with the comforts of an enclosed cabin and without a doubt among the safest ships in the air today. They can cruise along at from 70 to 90 miles an hour, and if necessary may be throttled up to 100 or 130 miles per hour. All of the present-day flivvers are what is called one- or two-place machines—that is, pilot alone or pilot and one passenger.

THEY'RE ALMOST FOOLPROOF

The Federal Civil Aeronautics Authority considers these planes as nearly foolproof as engineers can make them. They can take off and land on small fields, glide well with an idle motor, and are very reluctant to go into the dreaded tail spin. Experienced pilots putting these planes through their tests say it is hard to get them into an intentional spin. The C. A. A.'s civilian-pilot-training program, started last year in the Nation's colleges, focuses attention on the safety of these air flivvers. Students spent more than 400,000 flying hours in training with but one student fatality. That is 30 times better than any previous record, and it could not have been accomplished without good ships.

While the flying flivver is new to the farmer as well as to the rest of the people yet the farmer has been acquainted with airplanes generally for quite a while. Since 1918 when the first airplane was used to observe Texas cotton fields infested with pink boll worms the airplane has developed into a useful implement for the farmer. On April 30, 1919, the airplane was first used for crop reporting when Field Agent J. L. Cochron made a survey of spring plowing in Montgomery County, Ohio. The results suggested camera crop surveys—a work which has since developed on a large scale. Various action programs of the United States Department of Agriculture which are now stressing the wise use of land and the conservation of water resources, have used aerial pictures rather extensively in recent years. No doubt the fields of many of the readers of Southern Agriculturist have been measured by airplanes for performance under the triple-A program. Aerial pictures aid the Soil Conservation Service in its fight against erosion on privately and publicly owned land, and in the retirement of submarginal land that is unsuited for farming.

Reports from the Department of Agriculture indicate that this one agency has spent more than $7,000,000 on this work, and photographed more than 2,000,000 square miles of land or a little more than two-thirds of the entire area of the country. These land photographs can be used for a great many purposes. The Forest Service has long maintained a fire patrol over the great tree-covered regions and is pioneering now in fire-fighting equipment which can be dropped from the air. The latest method involves men parachuting to the earth near the fire. Their fire-fighting equipment follows in another 'chute. These men are equipped with small portable 2-way radios which they carry down with them and can establish radio contact with the circling pilot in 10 minutes after they land. The Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine has a fleet of 10 planes used in its work to help control Dutch-elm disease and in scouting for the gypsy moth. In the isolated regions of the far West the Soil Conservation Service is reseeding range land to grass from the air. A 2-section ranch was reseeded in 3 days at a cost of less than 50 cents an acre, much less than the cost of hand seeding. The seed was dropped from the plane flying about 300 feet above the ground at an average speed of 80 miles an hour.

"AIR TRUCK" MAY BE NEXT

Seeding land with an airplane is not only fast farming, but it points the way to a changing condition in the handling of agricultural commodities. As the pleasure motorcar was the forerunner of the present highway truck so the new flivver plane may be the forerunner of the "air truck." The use of long-distance, short-time delivery that the airplane can bring about may have beneficial influence on sections which produce perishable commodities. I can think of cut flowers as a good example. Six-hour delivery of freshly cut flowers from Gulf coast gardens to New York or Chicago might interest gardeners in the Gulf coast area. It might even mean a new winter industry for the South.

So let's not laugh at the idea of using airplanes in agricultural work. They can't be used on all farms, but they can be of service on many. It's not only a new venture, but a very interesting one. Let's watch it grow.

The People's Brake on War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, there is a sharp revival of interest in the proposal for an amendment to the Constitution which would give the people the right to decide whether or not our boys shall be

sent into the hell of foreign wars. The subject is being debated once more with keen interest and zeal around the base burners in country stores, in high-school debating circles, and wherever people meet in knots and groups to discuss the war. One ardent proponent of my war-referendum proposal recently had a large number of petitions printed, addressed to Congress, to be circulated among mid-western citizens for signatures, but he has had to withdraw the petition temporarily for, in his hurry and zeal, he described the wrong bill! The awakening of interest in the war referendum is noticeably widespread and there is every indication that it will become still more far reaching and will increase in tempo the nearer we get to the brink of war.

What is the cause of this renaissance? Why are many persons who had apparently dismissed the subject from their minds as a noble but unattainable objective when my resolution was beaten down in the House in 1938 again talking about it? In seeking an explanation I think we should take cognizance of one basic fact and that is, that speaking by and large, at least 95 percent of the American people are opposed to sending our American boys into foreign wars. I think that statement is conservative. Along the eastern seaboard where the war jitters have taken strong hold, the percentage favoring armed intervention may be higher, but taking the country as a whole I would say that the proportion of those who oppose sending our troops to foreign shores, to participate in the settlement of quarrels of foreign origin, is nearer 98 percent than 95 percent; but let us say 95 percent.

Let there be no misunderstanding in regard to the position of this 95 percent of our people. They sympathize with the democracies and they want Congress to extend immediate aid to the democracies but always with one reservation. The proviso which they insist upon is that whatever aid is given to the democracies must not drag us into the war.

For many weeks Members of Congress have noticed strangely contradictory advice in the letters that pour in at their offices on the war situation. I have received hundreds upon hundreds of these paradoxical communications. The writer usually starts out by adjuring the Congressman to do everything that he can to see that assistance is extended to Britain and the other democracies, and then winds up in short order with this peremptory finish: "But don't get us into war."

It appears that lately there has come over the people more of a realization of how close to the chasm of war we really are and an outcropping determination that if it comes to a proposition of sending our boys to fight in foreign wars in Europe, Africa, or Asia the people shall have something to say about it.

The people have seen day by day a trend of events that points more and more to the involvement of our manpower on foreign battlefields, and with the realism of that prospect before them they are looking more and more to the war-referendum resolution as the people's brake on war. That, I believe, is the true reason why the war referendum is now appearing again in the forefront as a subject of public discussion and consideration.

It has been more than 6 years since I introduced in Congress the resolution for a referendum on participation in foreign wars. I thought then that the adoption of this noble democratic principle was a long way in the future; that it would have its up and downs in the forum of debate; but that ultimately it would become a part of the Constitution, as important as any guaranty of the Bill of Rights. I still have faith in that vision.

On the opening day of the present session I reintroduced the war-referendum resolution, as I have done in every Congress since it was first presented, and it fell heir to a very distinctive position in legislative annals as House Joint Resolution No. 1 of the Seventy-seventh Congress. On February 25 Senator CAPPER, long a sincere advocate of the war referendum, introduced an exactly identical resolution in the upper Chamber, and it is Senate Joint Resolution No. 47 of the Seventy-seventh Congress. It would be pleasing to me and, I hope, to Senator CAPPER if the proposal might be known hereafter as the Ludlow-Capper resolution, as I take pride in being associated with the distinguished Senator from Kansas in a campaign to vindicate the people's right to a vote on the greatest issue that can ever confront them and their families and firesides. The Ludlow-Capper war-referendum resolution would insert the following provision in the Constitution:

> Except in case of invasion by armed forces, actual or immediately threatened by an approaching military expedition, or attack upon the United States or its Territorial possessions, or by any non-American nation against any country in the Western Hemisphere, the people shall have the sole power by a national referendum to declare war or to engage in warfare overseas. Congress, when it deems a national crisis to exist in conformance with this article, shall by concurrent resolution refer the question to the people.

If this provision were adopted as a part of the Constitution, the people would decide whether American boys shall be sent into the slaughter pens of overseas wars, women having equal voting rights with men. And why should not women have a vote on war? They go down into the shadow of the valley of death to bring our boys into the world. Why should they not have something to say as to whether their flesh and blood shall be hurled into the shambles of a foreign conflict? In Congress, where the war power is now lodged, only 7 of the 531 Members are women, so you see how pathetically impotent women are in giving expression to whatever viewpoint they may have on any particular war proposal.

It will be noted that the Ludlow-Capper resolution in no way, shape, or form interferes with our national defense, and that it fully recognizes our obligations under the Monroe Doctrine, for under the terms of the resolution, if the United States or any other country in the Western Hemisphere should be attacked or invaded, the referendum would not apply. Everybody knows that if America were attacked our people would rise en masse in its defense and a referendum would not be needed.

The stock argument so often advanced by opponents of the resolution that loss of time in taking a referendum would place America at a disadvantage in dealing with a foreign enemy power has been so effectively exploded by obvious facts that it hardly needs to be referred to here. It is now patent to everybody, I think, that wars between countries with vast oceans separating them are not begun in a day, and that in any conceivable circumstance there would be time not only for one referendum but for several referendums. Furthermore, if the referendum should be adopted, the General Staff of the Army would set up the machinery whereby a referendum vote could be taken on the shortest possible notice. The time argument has been shot to pieces by the logic of the cold facts as everybody now understands them.

Boiled down to its final essence, therefore, the Ludlow-Capper resolution simply means that when it comes to sending our boys overseas to fight in wars of foreign origin, against merciless forces that have done nothing but train for war since time immemorial, the people of America who have to suffer and die and to bear the unspeakable burdens and costs and griefs of war shall have something to say about it. What could be more elementally just than that? And is it to be wondered at that the people are becoming aroused on this most vital and intriguing subject?

Can I say to citizens of my district, "You have sense and intelligence and information enough to vote for me for Congress, but you do not have sense and intelligence and information enough to have a vote on sending your boys into the shambles of Europe, Africa, and Asia?"

Certainly I cannot. In these days of quick communication by radio and telegraph the citizen is in touch with the world and he has ample information on world affairs and is well qualified to make up his mind on the greatest issue that can possibly affect him and his loved ones. He knows that fundamentally and as a matter of absolute justice he has a right to express himself on participation in foreign wars and that explains why the proposal introduced in the Seventy-seventh Congress by Senator CAPPER and myself is being revived for extensive study and evaluation as the war clouds darken the international horizon.

New Uses for Agricultural Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 7, 1941

ARTICLE BY DR. HARRY E. BARNARD AND ARTICLE FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, because Wisconsin is a great dairy State, I am

naturally concerned with anything which would increase the extent of the market for dairy products. Furthermore, we are all concerned, at this time particularly, with preparations to use every raw material which we grow on our land.

The most valuable crop in the land is milk, with a cash value of nearly $2,000,000,000, and constituting nearly 20 percent of the total farm income.

Now, more than ever before, I believe we must be concerned with utilizing the byproducts of milk, and in this connection I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Textiles From Milk," by Dr. Harry E. Barnard, director of research, National Farm Chemurgic Council, as printed in the Kiwanis magazine of April 1941.

In the same connection I ask to have inserted with Dr. Barnard's article an article from the Christian Science Monitor of April 2, 1941, entitled "Laboratory Seen as Farmers Hope to End Surplus Crops."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kiwanis Magazine for April 1941]

TEXTILES FROM MILK

(By Dr. Harry E. Barnard, director of research, National Farm Chemurgic Council)

We are a wasteful people; even in these strenuous times, when we should be preparing to use every raw material we grow on our land and which the warring world will be unable to buy when peace comes to troubled Europe. Our most valuable crop is milk—milk made from hay and grain by some 25,000,000 cows. All this milk has a cash value of nearly $2,000,000,000, or some 20 percent of the total farm income. Our milk production approaches the combined value of cotton, wheat, and tobacco. But we only use part of all this milk. We still think of the butterfat it contains as its important value. And we throw away or feed to young farm animals about 50,000,000,000 pounds of skim milk every year. No more than 20 percent of all the skim milk we produce is made into dairy products, and in some States, because of the popular prejudice against it, skim milk cannot legally be sold.

It is this enormous quantity of skim milk which concerns us in a discussion of milk byproducts, for, although much of this milk is dried and sold as skim-milk powder, and a still larger amount finds use on the farm for the feeding of pigs and calves and to a lesser degree poultry, the huge quantity of skim milk, which contains everything but butterfat present in the original material, goes to waste as far as human beings are concerned. Today's usage runs about as follows:

Over 700,000,000 pounds of the skim milk at creameries or milk plants is used in making cheese. Some 4,000,000,000 pounds is reduced to dried skim milk, and 1,700,000,000 pounds goes into buttermilk and other beverages, much of which is fed to farm animals either in its natural condition or in a semisolid or dried form. The latest available figures show that we are making nearly 50,000,000 pounds of milk casein. Some 120,000,000 pounds of whey from the cheese factories are used in the manufacture of lactose and a small quantity—not more than 5,000,000 pounds—is fermented into lactic acid.

Manufacturing processes which use skim milk frequently produce, of themselves, a waste product which has very important values. For example, in the making of casein from skim milk billions of quarts of whey, rich in milk sugar, find no use at all. For the most part it is wasted material.

It may be important to discuss the chemical raw materials in milk byproducts. The first of these is the protein content or milk casein. We have used milk casein for many years in making such plastics as buttons and dress ornaments, and in providing the essential material for the sizing of paper. Milk solids contain from 26 to 28 percent of protein—more than alfalfa, and nearly as much as linseed meal. A considerable quantity of casein is used as a basic ingredient in the glue industries. Several years ago a casein paint of uniform viscosity was developed, and this point is now being made in considerable volume. Casein paint is well adapted for interior surfaces. It has considerable decorative values and is noted for its high light reflectivity and nonyellowing property, and for its delicate color effect in pastels. More recently it has been used for exterior surfaces of concrete, brick, and Masonite, and as a paint for marking highways.

But while we are using much of our skim milk in these ways, we are still importing enormous tonnages of milk casein from the Argentine. Inquiry as to the reasons for these imports suggests that many users prefer imported to domestic casein because, as they explain, the domestic product is not as good. This is undoubtedly due to the fact that milk casein has been made in plants having no technical control and producing a product ununiform in character and frequently of a condition described as "specky." However, modern production methods now being adopted produce an excellent milk casein. It is to be hoped that, in spite of the apparent effort to furnish a market in this country for foreign-produced materials, we shall continue to expand our casein business until all of this important byproduct of our most important industry finds profitable use.

The possibilities in using the plastic properties of casein in the manufacture of a spinnable fiber are very great. Several years ago the Italians developed processes for making what was first described as a synthetic wool from milk casein. This product, the trade name of which is lanital, is chemically almost identical with natural wool. It contains 53 percent of carbon, while wool contains 49.5 percent; 7 percent of hydrogen as against 7.57 percent in wool. The oxygen content is 23, while that of wool is 23.66 percent; the nitrogen is 15.50 as against 15,56. The important chemical difference is in the sulfur content—but 0.7 percent, while 3.66 percent is found in wool.

But we are not interested in Italian processes. We have our own method of making fiber from milk casein. Several patents have been taken out by research workers of the United States Department of Agriculture, and our great milk companies have supported research which points to the practical and valuable use of much of our surplus skim milk in the next few years.

The process of converting casein into a textile fiber was first patented in Germany by Dr. Todtenhaupt in 1904. His process consisted of dissolving casein in an alkaline solution and extruding this solution through fine openings into a precipitating bath containing acid, formaldehyde, and alcohol, but was unsuccessful commercially, principally because the individual fibers stuck together and were brittle.

Casein fiber is practically entirely casein, 1 pound of casein producing 1 pound of fiber. The modifying agents added in the manufacturing process add only a negligible quantity to its weight. It has an ultimate composition closely approximating that of wool, the chief difference being a less sulphur content. Because of this small sulphur content the material takes up much more color than does wool when dyed with acid colors in dilute acid baths. The fiber is faintly yellow in color, has a fine kink, and resembles in appearance a thoroughly washed and carded good Merino wool. Unlike wool fiber, which has a scaly surface, casein fiber is smooth, and does not shrink as much as wool. Casein fiber may be made either soft or harsh to the touch. The softer grades have the advantage over wool that the knitted fiber may be worn next to the most delicate skins which cannot tolerate knitted wool. A peculiar feature is that the silkier the finish the weaker the product. Conversely, the harsher the feel the stronger the fiber.

The fineness of casein fiber may be regulated to be constant to any denier, down to three, which is the value for fine wool. Any desired length of staple may be produced. When wet, casein fiber swells, has greater stretch, and breaks more easily than when dry. In the dyeing process particularly, the fiber becomes very soft and tends to aggregate together due to its comparatively low strength, but when dry it resumes its normal strength.

The conversion of casein to fiber is accomplished by softening the casein in water and dissolving it in a solution of caustic alkali. The viscosity of this solution is carefully adjusted by aging, addition of modifying agents, and dilution. The solution is then extruded through multiple spinnerets of the type used in the rayon industry and precipitated and hardened in an acid bath containing formaldehyde and modifiers, or the precipitation and hardening may be brought about in two stages. Subsequent treatments are similar to those used in the manufacture of rayon.

This process modified and improved is now successfully used by a subsidiary of the National Dairy Products Corporation, which in its Rhode Island plant is gradually expanding production of the various types of milk fiber. Three creameries in Ohio and New England are drying and grinding skim milk into casein of the proper consistency for the spinnerets. One interesting use of the fiber is in felt hats. Our felt hats have been made from European coney and hare skins, and every year we have imported great quantities of rabbit fur from Australia. Now skim milk is taking the place of rabbit fur and many of the felt hats made for our use this year contain a considerable portion of this new casein fiber. The president of one of the great hat companies has recently said, "Some day we are going to have a felt hat that will be 100-percent casein fiber. The casein is a standardized product which can be made under mechanical control and so it is always uniform. The fiber is more velvety to the touch than rabbit fur."

The textile industry is keenly interested in this new wool-like fiber which is readily handled on the machines now in use. Since the fiber is a solid rod instead of a hollow tube as is the case with wool fiber, it does not have the insulating value of wool and so is better adapted for summer clothing. We are promised a cloth for summer suitings which will possess the qualities we most desire—qualities of softness and at the same time an ability to withstand wrinkling when mixed with other fibers, as is now necessary because the synthetic product still possesses less strength than natural fibers. It is dyefast and durable. In these years when new fibers are now being made from so many things, from soybeans and corn, from whale meat and almost every kind of woody fiber, this new casein product is, full of promise, not as a competitor of cotton or wool, but as something which has its own intrinsic value, and which in the years to come may provide the farmer a profitable market for the great volume of skim milk which now has little use. Artificial wool, or milk casein fiber, is an outstanding achievement of chemurgy.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of April 2, 1941]

DAY FOR FARM PRODUCTS—LABORATORY SEEN AS FARMER'S HOPE TO END SURPLUS CROPS

CHICAGO.—The industrial research laboratory, first a collegiate institution, then an activity of big business, is now going rural. It was pictured as the farmer's hope at the seventh annual chemurgic conference here when businessmen, farm-organization leaders, chemists, and other interested in the farm problem came together to study new uses for agricultural surpluses.

Farmers have had, it is true, the benefit of one type of research in the State college experiment stations for some two or three decades. But this research has amounted to only about one-seventh of 1 percent of the total annual value of farm products, speakers noted. In contrast they cited the sums spent by manufacturers. The chemical industry, they said, spends from 2 to 4 percent of its gross sales on research.

CHANGE OF EMPHASIS

What's more, industrial research is pointed at finding new markets, while agricultural research has been focused largely on increasing productivity. Change the emphasis and great things will result for the farmer, the conference was told by a representative of a business famous for its research activities, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

"In the past, 95 percent of the funds expended on agricultural research have been used to increase production and only 5 percent to find new uses for farm products," said Mr. L. F. Livingston. "I have every faith that when a sufficient expenditure and effort is made to discover what to do with these products, the answers to many important agricultural questions will be found.

"The fruits of research are revolutionizing every field of industrial effort. Continued work along agricultural lines will lift the economic plane of the American farmer and will provide untold benefits for the American people."

But farmers should not expect quick results from research effort, this speaker pointed out. "In the du Pont company," he said, "the average is 7 years from the time a research project starts in the laboratory until a product is put on the market."

A new day for agricultural research in the United States Department of Agriculture has dawned with the opening of four regional research laboratories this year. These laboratories, built at a cost of $4,000,000, are setting experienced research men to work searching for new industrial uses for surplus crops, explained Dr. Henry G. Knight, chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry of the United States Department of Agriculture.

SEARCH FOR NEW USES

Searching for industrial uses for farm products has heretofore been "sort of a side line" of Department of Agriculture research, said Dr. Knight. In these laboratories it is to be a major project. Further, pilot plants to check on the commercial possibilities of laboratory products are being established in connection with these research stations. They mean to carry studies far beyond the "test-tube stage."

Hearty approval of the type of work to be carried on in these stations was expressed by Philip R. O'Brien, president of the Board of Trade of the City of Chicago and by C. J. Strike, president of the Idaho Power Co., of Boise, Idaho. New uses for farm products mean, in the opinion of Mr. Strike, "finding a way to aid agriculture in adjusting its operations to the end that they will produce those things for which there is a demand and a satisfactory price."

Farm cooperatives, through which rural people pool their buying and selling efforts, are encouraging research into new uses for farm products, said Mr. H. E. Babcock, director of the G. L. F. School of Cooperative Administration at Ithaca, N. Y. They are steering research activities in the colleges and providing fellowships for special studies, said Mr. Babcock.

America's Second Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1941

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT BEFORE THE FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, on April 8 last, in New York City before the Foreign Policy Association, the distinguished Vice President of the United States, Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE, delivered a noteworthy and interesting address which well merits perusal. The address is entitled "America's Second Chance." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The responsibility which was offered to us following World War No. 1 we declined. We didn't realize that, while we might evade our duty for 10 or 15 years, the time would inevitably come when our growing power and position in the world would force us to accept the responsibility of such power and position for the sake of the Western World and eventually for the sake of the entire world. We of the United States can no more evade shouldering our responsibility than a boy of 18 can avoid becoming a man by wearing short pants. The word "isolation" means short pants for a grown-up United States.

Tonight we are not greatly concerned with the past except insofar as it furnishes a lamp to guide our footsteps in the future.

The United States now has her second opportunity to make the world safe for democracy. During World War No. 1 and the 15 years which followed our intentions were of the highest, but our judgment was not good. From the depths of our hearts we responded to the idealism of Woodrow Wilson. Our boys enlisted to save the democracy of western Europe and the New World from encroachment by the imperialism of a militaristic Prussia. Our boys thought they knew what they were fighting for. That is why they fought so well.

In World War No. 1 we fought well, believed profoundly, and produced tremendously. Aside from that our record was not so good. When the peace came we refused to accept responsibility for the world we had helped to create. We turned our back on Europe and said we were isolationists. During the war prices, taxes, and wages had doubled. When the war ended consumers wanted lower prices, employers wanted lower wages, and everybody wanted lower taxes. Therefore everyone talked about getting back to normalcy.

The desire of the American millions for normalcy and for isolation caused our people to refuse to accept the world responsibility which had been brought to them by World War No. 1. The United States of the 1920's thought that we, a creditor nation, could create prosperity by exporting more goods than we imported. Laboring under that illusion, we raised our tariff in 1922 and again in 1930. The destructive effect of these high tariffs on our exports did not come home to us until we stopped loaning money to foreign countries. We learned by hard experience that a creditor nation which cultivates a high-tariff policy and an isolationist psychology is certain to bring disaster on itself and the rest of the world as well. Yes; after World War No. 1 we were offered responsibility but instead of accepting it we gave to the world high tariffs and isolation. We thought by employing high tariffs and isolation we could protect ourselves and avoid the responsibility which our creditor position, our geographical situation, our vast natural resources, and our trained population have so clearly marked out for us at this stage of world history.

Those who preached isolation and normalcy were skilled in their political insight. They appealed successfully to the blind prejudices of the people who were disillusioned when the war excitement stopped, when taxes went higher, and prices fell and unemployment increased. The people were hungry for isolation, high tariffs, and normalcy—the very things which would make our problem worse. Looking backward, we can afford to be charitable toward the isolationists and high-tariff men of the 1920's, but we cannot feel so kindly toward those mistaken men as to encourage others in the future to repeat their mistakes.

As we have pondered on the lessons of the World War No. 1, our desire to remain at peace has increased. But at the same time our study of the aggressor nations has led us to realize that the greatest likelihood of remaining at peace is to make these ruthless, treaty-breaking nations understand that the American people are ready to go to war if their rights are transgressed at any vital point. It is one of the rights of the American people to defend democracy by helping Britain, China, Yugoslavia, and Greece to the limit with planes, ships, munitions, and food.

A second right of the American people is to defend the multilateral revision of the Monroe Doctrine as defined at the Habana conference. Bismarck called the Monroe Doctrine an impudence, and the Nazis use stronger language. The Germans look on Latin America as their eventual happy hunting ground, and therefore we may be sure that as soon as they have the power they will so push us around politically and economically as to force us into war. With the situation as it is today, I believe the United States can stay out of war if the nations of the world know we are ready and willing to give all possible aid to the democracies. The passage of the lease-lend bill, for example, has already aided the movement to bring back peace to the world. England dared, because we have dedicated ourselves to the task of providing arms to the democracies, to land in Greece and with the Greeks to establish a line from which Yugoslavia can be supported in its fight for freedom.

Thanks to the ever-normal-granary program, we have great quantities of feed grain, which we shall now turn into livestock products with the greatest speed possible. We are in a much stronger food position today than 25 years ago and can use surplus food as an aid to our declared purpose of supporting the democratic principle in those areas where freedom of action still exists.

Today we know more about psychological warfare than we did 25 years ago. We know that the Nazis start carefully planned psychological warfare against a nation long before the tanks, planes, and submarines get into action. The Nazis in 1933 began their psychological warfare upon the United States, not only in our own country but also in Latin America, Asia, and Europe. This

warfare has been greatly intensified since the fall of 1939, and especially during the past few months. It is my belief and hope that the United States will not be forced into this war in a military sense. But in a psychological and economic sense we would be foolish not to realize that we have been the object of fierce German attacks for several years. The Nazis have pursued their policy of undermining the morale of nation after nation as a means of "softening it up," as they phrase it, for conquest. And what is this "softening up" process? It is simply to stir up prejudice, discord, conflict, and confusion in the population. For the Nazis know what too many of us are likely to forget: that the real inner strength of a people is its unity of purpose; its devotion to certain basic principles of justice, truth, and democracy which are beyond dispute. If doubts are raised regarding these principles, political action is short-circuited, and impotence and chaos can result. By promoting prejudice, by turning men of different faiths against each other, by capitalizing on every political and economic controversy, a nation can be so weakened that its resistance to military aggression is destroyed.

We have done some counterattacking in speeches, books, magazines, and newspaper articles. As that counterattacking becomes more vigorous, it is important that we use ammunition of a sort which will leave us intellectually strong and able to shoulder the burden of our responsibility to ourselves, the Western Hemisphere, and the New World when the peace comes.

In order to win the psychological war, the battle of nerves, it is vital to define the difference between nazi-ism and democracy in such a way that the young people of the United States are wholeheartedly with us. The issue must be drawn not in terms of a short-time propaganda, but as an everlasting reality. We must believe in the worth-whileness of that for which we are now fighting and that for which we intend to fight with even greater passion when peace comes.

The Nazi youth, led by evil men, are fighting with all the intensity of their souls. Our youth must fight with an even greater intensity. Today the battlefield for our youth is only on the psychological and economic front. Only by doing a thoroughly good job there can we avoid fighting on the other fronts. But if young men of good American background, serving unwittingly as tools for the Communists, the Nazis, and defeatists, are able to weaken our efforts at psychological and economic defense, we shall inevitably get into military warfare.

The very heart of nazi-ism is the belief that the German race has not only the right but the positive duty to dominate all other races and to control and manage the entire world for the benefit of the German race alone. The present-day Nazi gangsters are worse than the old Prussian rulers because they are more thorough in their use of economic and psychological warfare and more brutal in their use of deceipt, violence, and physical torture. They send carefully trained men into all the countries of the world to carry on ideological warfare. Their monetary control is so tight that no one can leave Germany to travel unless he or she agrees to act as a spy, a propagandist or an investigator. True it is, the Germans, even under Hitler, have a fanatical devotion to duty. They are passionately eager to put their all at the service of the state. Yet it is certain that in any long-drawn-out conflict the German psychology will crumble. It thrives on success but it cannot stand up against even temporary failure because the basic Nazi principles of lies and deceit outrage the fundamental interests of the human soul.

In strengthening our youth against the Nazi lie, we must make their faith glow in the truth, which is that the essence or democracy is belief in the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, and the dignity of the individual soul. Democracy so defined is almost identical with religion. Hitler has no concern whatever for the individual soul, and boasted to Rauschning: "To the Christian doctrine of the supremacy of the individual conscience and personal responsibility, I oppose the emancipating doctrine that the individual is nothing and survives in the immortality of the nation. I reject the dogma of man's redemption by the suffering and death of a Divine Savior, and I put in its place a new dogma of the communication of merit, namely, that individuals are redeemed by the life and action of the new lawgiver and leader who delivers the masses from the burden of liberty."

The Nazi gradations of authority are imposed by fiat. Democracy, of course, also has gradations of authority, but the authority is derived from the free choice of the people and is not exercised ruthlessly in complete disregard of the rights of the individual soul to freedom of speech and freedom of worship. The Nazis drive their people like cattle to the slaughter. The democracies, if they are to survive, must work out some way which, while holding fast to human rights, will at the same time permeate the individual souls with a feeling of responsibility so that the citizens of a democracy will be as willing to give wholehearted, unselfish service as the citizens of a totalitarian power. This we can do if in addition to holding firmly to our Bill of Rights, which this year is exactly 150 years old, we formulate a bill of duties. Under the Bill of Rights and Duties we can have a flexible structure into which each citizen may make his productive contribution to the general welfare. Youth now has a more intense desire to serve. Our governmental and business leaders must make it a No. 1 business of the peace to give our youth the opportunities to work and serve under the bill of duties, so that they may enjoy the privileges of the Bill of Rights.

Properly equipped with a bill of duties, the United States can shoulder her responsibility to the world in the peace that is to come. Without such a bill of duties, I fear peace will mean world chaos. With such a bill we can help build a pax democratica which will bless us and the whole world for a century to come.

Modern civilization, in order to continue, must have order. Under the Nazi scheme of things, order is imposed from above. In a democracy, most of the order must and should come from the individual human heart. The most perfect order in the world will eventually be obtained whenever the citizens in a democracy recognize instinctively and fully in all of its implications the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, and the dignity of the individual soul. Individuals who have meditated on the full meaning of these fundamental principles which characterize both religion and democracy will treat their fellow human beings in such a way that the entire state can serve with power as a unit on behalf of the general welfare, and especially so in any time of crisis. In time of crisis, special education is needed. Above everything else right now, we in the United States and in all of the western world need a counter-offensive to correct the lies about the degeneracy of democracy which the Nazis are so busily spreading over the air, through the press and through their American-born tools.

Every young man, his sweetheart, and his parents should realize the difference between the various types of peace. A Nazi victory in Europe means a peace which is not a peace—a peace which is preliminary to either slavery or war for this hemisphere. A Nazi victory and a Nazi peace are unthinkable. To avoid such a calamity, we will help ourselves through helping England by all methods short of war. Britain will win. Only defeatism on the psychological and economic front in the United States can prevent it.

After the victory, what of the peace? Let us consider the world which will emerge from the war, and of our place in that world. President Roosevelt said in his speech of a few Saturday nights ago: "When dictatorships disintegrate, then our country must continue to play its great part in the period of world reconstruction."

We cannot, once the present menace is overcome, trust again to the blind forces of chance, to the oceans that have shrunk, to wishful thinking and illusions based on a false reading of history, to escape our responsibility.

The battle of the peace will be more difficult to win than the battle of the war. All Europe will be a mad swirl of chaotic forces. Unless we are prepared to help in the reorganization of a shattered world, these forces will leap from continent to continent and destroy even the United States. Our help must be of such a nature that neither a madman nor a mad nation will ever again have the opportunity to kill millions of people and destroy tens of billions of dollars of property. The Nazi ideology with its belief in violence and deceit, its hatred of non-German races, and its denial of the rights of man must be so crushed that it can never rise. The peace, if it is to be a lasting peace, must also make certain that neither the barbaric philosophy nor the militaristic imperialism of Prussia will ever again have the opportunity to find incarnation in the person of a leader possessed of devils in the biblical sense.

But the battle of the peace is far more than protecting the fine people of Germany from their heritage of deceitful Prussian statecraft. There must be worked out an international order sufficiently strong to prevent the rise of aggressor nations. We must not let the next peace be such as to force the defeated nations to engage in economic warfare by the use of controlled currency, impossibly high tariffs, and bilateral trade agreements. The victor nations must also refrain from economic warfare. We must remember that we cannot compel a defeated nation to pay an impossibly high indemnity and at the same time forbid such nation to export by means of high tariffs employed by the victor nations. The next peace must take into account the facts of economics; otherwise it will serve as the seed bed for aggression. The next peace must give the defeated aggressor nations the opportunity to buy raw materials and sell manufactured goods without discrimination as long as they do not produce offensive weapons, engage in economic and psychological warfare, or treat their labor unfairly.

Labor and agriculture in the United States will demand jobs and security from the next peace. They can have jobs and security provided the peace is such a real one that private initiative feels safe to move again as it did from 1860 to 1910. Here is Latin America to the south of us ready to go through during the next 50 years what the United States went through from 1860 to 1910. Opportunities will not be lacking.

Here in the United States we have tremendous reserves of unused capital, technical understanding, and trained labor eager to cooperate with our brothers to the south in the development of a hemisphere. It is vital to the welfare of both Latin America and the United States that the industrial expansion south of the Rio Grande should not only be rapid, but that it should avoid the mistakes we in the United States made. We have made great strides industrially, but we have had depressions and unemployment with resulting slums and malnutrition. We believe that industrial expansion in the Western Hemisphere is possible without these mistakes, and we stand ready to

help our neighbors avoid them. I am sure that a real peace will unleash such an expansion as the world has never seen. But such an expansion will require the most understanding cooperation between private and governmental capital in planning to take care of what otherwise will be a most serious unemployment problem. Peace will bring world-wide chaos unless the United States furnishes positive leadership.

Before we have the right to talk so very much more definitely about the foundations of a just and democratic peace, we must put our backs under the job of defeating the forces of evil. These forces are immensely stronger than most of us realize. Jesus, recognizing the devilish efficiency of the dark forces, said, "the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light." At the moment most of us in the United States are overconfident. We are not working hard enough. We do not realize that our very lives are at stake and that speed now may make the difference of millions of lives in this hemisphere. I myself am confident of the final outcome because I know in the long run that that which is good will triumph over that which is evil. I know that democracy has a tremendous reserve of material and spiritual strength. We have the labor, capital, resources, and brains to do the job.

A generation ago the United States missed her first chance to serve the world in a big way because of a naive belief in such catch words as "isolation" and "normalcy." Our second chance is now with us. There are those who will wish to make the same mistakes again. There are none so blind as those who will not see. As for us, we are wide awake. We shall make this hemisphere safe for peace and prosperity. That is why we shall strain every nerve right now to help England, Greece, Yugoslavia, China, and all other victims of aggression.

God grant that we may now have the wisdom to write democracy's new testament in a bill of duties, a testament which in no way will deny the old testament with its Declaration of Independence, its Constitution, its Bill of Rights and its Gettysburg speech. The new testament of democracy will fulfill, not deny, the old. But to fulfill, there must be a sense of interdependence as well as independence—a sense of duties as well as rights—a feeling of responsibility commensurate with our power.

Industrial Development and Interregional Freight Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1941

ADDRESS BY DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by David E. Lilienthal, Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, at Lincoln, Nebr., on the occasion of the third annual transportation conference of the University of Nebraska on April 7, 1941.

I should like to call the attention of Senators, especially from the West and the South, to this address. It is one of the ablest discussions of the transportation question, particularly as it affects the West and the South, that it has been my privilege to read. I know that it will receive the candid and careful consideration of every loyal citizen who will devote enough time to the address to read it.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The people of this midinterior region and the people of the South have a common interest that is fundamental. You of the midinterior and we of the South alike do not have a fair opportunity to develop our resources to the fullest measure of our skill and enterprise. Man-made rules and not the limitations of nature are responsible for this denial of equal opportunity. This inequality has produced acute economic problems for both our regions. Since at this conference we are particularly interested in transportation, I shall concentrate my discussion upon the interterritorial freight-rate structure of the United States as one of the major causes of this unequal development of the midinterior and of the South compared with other regions.

We will all agree, I believe, that for a nation to attain its fullest productive strength, every region must make the fullest contribution for which it is fitted by its natural and human resources. The healthy, natural development of every region is required for national prosperity in ordinary times; in times like the present it is required for national defense as well.

THE BROTHERHOOD OF AMERICA'S REGIONS

Handicaps on a region's productiveness will be felt first by the region itself, and to that extent they are regional problems. But they will also be felt, and most painfully, by the country as a whole. The shackling of any region puts fetters upon the strength of the whole Nation. I want to discuss the handicap of interregional rates upon the interior regions of America as a national problem.

We think of America today more than ever before not as a group of sections but as a nation. We are in truth one people defending the fires of freedom that the most sacred traditions of this new land commit to our stewardship. We realize that our country cannot be at the zenith of its strength either for peace or for defense if any one of the great regions that compose it is moving toward the precipice of poverty or the bankruptcy of its resources, nor if its people are weighted down by a feeling of hopelessness and despair.

And so it was appropriate that in May of 1933 the National Government took action to meet the problems of the great region of the South. Under this conception of interdependence among regions, it is not difficult to understand why a former Governor of New York State and a Senator from Nebraska should have been the men who sponsored the Tennessee Valley Authority. And since 1933 Congress has appropriated substantial funds to the T. V. A. not simply to provide opportunities for southern people, but to serve a national purpose. The development of the Tennessee River for navigation has provided a water highway not for the South alone; for corn and wheat from the fields of this mid-interior region are also moving on those inland lakes. The creation of a huge supply of power and the industrial research of the T. V. A. are likewise yielding dividends to every region of the country. For T. V. A.'s power is energizing the major supply of aluminum for aircraft; T. V. A.'s industrial research has led to discoveries of practical defense value. The munitions plant built at Muscle Shoals in 1918 has been expanded by T. V. A. and soon will begin the production of high explosives, not merely for the South but for the armed forces of the whole Nation. T. V. A.'s production of concentrated phosphate fertilizer goes to farms all over the country—much of it to your region—for the upbuilding of America's soil. And what has been going on in the Tennessee Valley to stop the gullies on eroded hillsides has meaning and value to the whole country, for all of America has a stake in every acre of America's basic resource of soil.

There is fittingly a national concern about the problems of the South. And similarly, the whole Nation has a stake in the development of your region and the problems of your people. For you, too, have great difficulties to face. In many respects the midinterior is faced in the early stages with some of the very conditions which in their later and acute stages we find in the South today.

Take the matter of farm tenancy. Everyone knows that a high degree of farm tenancy is the symptom of an unhealthy condition. We in the South have a very high tenancy rate. In Georgia and Alabama it is about 60 percent, and even higher in Mississippi. The percentages here in the midinterior are not, of course, nearly so high as these. But the alarming thing is that they are increasing and increasing rapidly. Tenancy has not increased materially in the South in the past generation, and in the past 5 years it has declined—markedly in Tennessee, Alabama, and Georgia. But in Nebraska the percentage increased from 38 percent in 1910 to 52.8 percent 30 years later; in Kansas from 37 percent to 44.9 percent; in Iowa from 38 percent to 47.6 percent. You may not realize that farm tenancy has grown to be as severe in several midinterior States as in several Southern States.

And similarly you have a serious problem of soil conservation and fertility. The tragedy of wind erosion of the soil in the western part of this region is a parallel of the devastating water erosion on the hillsides of the South. After all, we can hope for no industrial development or any other kind of growth if the very foundation of life itself is undermined and destroyed.

The midinterior and the South have yet another grave problem in common. I refer to the loss, the draining out of both our regions of our human resources, and especially our young men and women, who after they have been trained find better business and professional opportunities in other regions of the country, especially the industrial North and East.

But the chief similarity between your problems and ours in the South lies in this: That we are both lacking in an adequate industrial development to balance our reliance upon agriculture. We both rely too greatly upon the production of raw materials, because we do not have the facilities for processing our raw materials into goods of higher value and greater income return. And here, as many people believe, is the nub of our economic difficulties.

MIDINTERIOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT HAS LOST GROUND

Industrial development in the midinterior—the production of income for your people through manufacturing—has lost ground in the past generation. This region has not kept up with the country as a whole in the growth of income from manufacturing. This is the most important single economic fact about this region—the most important to you and to the country. Take the State of Nebraska, for example. If Nebraska had grown industrially as fast as the whole Nation did from 1909 onward, its manufacturing income in 1939 would have been double what it actually was. This would amount to $70,000,000 additional income in wages, profits, rents, taxes, insurance premiums, etc.; and we can only guess how many additional millions it would have brought

Nebraska farmers and other producers of raw materials used in industry.

Nor is Nebraska an isolated example. Kansas, Iowa, Minnesota, North Dakota, and even Missouri have all failed to keep pace in the last generation; and South Dakota remains greatly deficient industrially.

The 7-State region of Nebraska, Kansas, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, and the 2 Dakotas has a little over one-tenth of the national population. But it has just over one-twentieth of the manufacturing income. By simple arithmetic this makes the region about one-half as industrialized as the whole country. The section is barely over one-third as industrialized as the region of 17 States east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio and Potomac.

The southeast is in the same boat. So is the southwest. These two southern regions combined have more than 28 percent of the population and less than 12 percent of the manufacturing income. That means that we in the South have achieved an even less favorable industrial position relative to the whole country than has the midinterior.

HOW MANUFACTURING MULTIPLIES A REGION'S INCOME

A region that relies predominantly upon agriculture or the production of raw materials for a livelihood suffers under a lower standard of income than a region that engages to a greater degree in processing or manufacturing those raw materials. Let us take a specific case: here in your region—or at least not far to the west of you—there are great droves of cattle. Where there are cattle, there are hides. Where there are hides, there can be leather. Where there is leather, there can be shoes. And where there are people, there is a heavy demand for work boots and dress shoes.

The cattle and the hides, as raw material, do provide an income; but only a fraction of the income that comes if that raw material can be transformed from low-value cattle to high-value boots and shoes right here in the midinterior. The illustration is commonplace, but without the trimmings of technical jargon it contains the essential truth upon which you and I must work.

I have tried to estimate, as well as I can from available information, what would happen to your income if hides were made into shoes in your region. Suppose we started out with a tannery or group of tanneries, purchasing $100,000 worth of raw materials a year—that is, mainly hides. In the tanning process the hides become leather, and they rise in value to $151,000. That means a gain of $51,000 to divide among the tannery owners and their workmen, their bankers, their landlords, the agents and companies that write their insurance, the tax collector for use on highway construction, public education, etc.

Having gained $51,000, we go on to the next step—that of converting the leather into what the trade calls boot and shoe cut stock and findings. In that conversion you gain another $57,000, also available for wages and profits, and so forth. Then you come to the last step and make up the boots and shoes themselves, adding this time another $192,000.

Summing the whole thing up, you have started with $100,000 in hides and wound up with $408,000 in shoes. That is, you have $308,000 more income than if you rely on raw materials alone.

I took boots and shoes as an example because it is so logical an industrial development for this region where the raw materials are to be found. If I had chosen business machines instead, your original $100,000 of unfabricated material would have gained not $308,000 but $415,000. But I wanted to fix on something that has the soundest of reasons for locating in your region.

What actually happens is far from the pretty picture I have painted. The hides raised on these plains move out of the region. In distressingly larger proportion, the hides are moving out on the backs of the live animals that grew them—as witness the declining position of your Omaha meat-packing industry. When you buy shoes you pay someone else that $308,000 or $408,000 that you might have paid yourselves. And because agriculture cannot provide enough jobs at a good living, people are moving out of the region as the 1940 Census shows. If that $308,000 of added income had come to the people of this region they could have bought more of the manufactured articles of other regions that are best made in other regions. All commerce would have been multiplied and the whole country benefited.

Why is the midinterior not getting its share of national income from industrial activity? Why is it losing ground? There are a number of reasons, of course. One of the more important is the relative lack of industrial research in this region; here again the same is true of the South. New industrial processes these days usually come out of large research laboratories. These require major expenditures and can only be undertaken by huge enterprises. Those large industries are chiefly in the northeastern region. When we remember that 72 percent of industrial income is produced in that one region of the United States, we can understand why most industrial-research facilities are likewise concentrated in that region. We do not have in the interior regions and in the South adequate industrial research, because, for the most part, industry that fathers such research and pays for it has become concentrated in other regions. As one result the technical investigation of our raw materials looking toward their processing by new methods lags and lags badly. The T. V. A. and its cooperating agencies have taken practical action to remedy this lack of technical research. It is a story of interest to you because your problems are similar, but there is not time to discuss it tonight.

INTERREGIONAL RATE LEVELS AS A BARRIER TO MIDINTERIOR DEVELOPMENT

The barrier to industrial development I shall discuss with you tonight in this transportation conference is the system of interterritorial freight rates which govern the transportation of manufactured products, the so-called class rates of the American railroads.

These interregional freight rates deprive the interior regions of the country of an opportunity to develop their natural resources through manufacturing on an equal footing with the more highly industrially developed region east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio. And as a consequence the whole Nation suffers.

I wish to introduce what I have to say on this subject by calling attention to a wall map of the United States I have set up here; a smaller reproduction I am attaching to my paper for filing with your proceedings. On this map are shown the various regions of the country with the names by which each region is called in railroad rate parlance: Official or eastern territory, which is, of course, the area east of the Mississippi River and north of the Ohio; southern; southwestern; mountain Pacific; and then the region in which we are meeting here tonight, the western trunk line. Each of the four other than the eastern or official territory is shown in such a way as to compare graphically the level of class rates in that territory with the level in official territory.

This is a kind of class-rate relief map of the United States, and it shows that the level in all parts of the country is higher than in official territory. As the key points out, class rates are on the average nearly 50 percent higher here in your western trunk-line territory than they are in official territory, embracing Pennsylvania, Ohio, etc. The comparison with southwestern is even more favorable to the eastern area.

To see how this inequality of rates for the same distance works out in actual practice, let us take boots and shoes as an example. As I pointed out a few minutes ago, it seems only good sense that cattle grown in the western part of your region should be slaughtered here in the region, the hides tanned, the leather made up into boots and shoes, partly for you, partly for the market of high purchasing power east of the Mississippi River. It is good sense, for one thing, because almost the whole process moves in the one direction from west to east; there is no wasteful back-tracking. It is more sensible than shipping your cattle hides a thousand miles east and having the shoes you wear shipped a thousand miles west back to you.

But here is what the inequality of interterritorial freight rates will do if you go into the shoe-manufacturing business in this territory. Suppose your factory is in Topeka, Kans. One of your salesmen is trying for a 10,000-pound order of shoes in, say, Mansfield, Ohio. In his weekly report to the office he mentions that a firm in Brockton, Mass., is also after the order. You start out figuring your bid. You find that you are the same distance in rail-miles from Mansfield as the Brockton plant. Your traffic manager tells you that the Mansfield dealer will have to pay $141 transportation charges if he buys the shoes from your Massachusetts competitor. You ask if $141 will get your shoes to Mansfield since you are the same distance from Mansfield as is Brockton. And you find that it won't. It will get them only as far as Springfield, Ill., which is less than halfway. To get them on into Mansfield will take $55 more. You pay 40 percent more for the same distance. This wall map will serve to illustrate what I have been saying.

The chances are that in the long run that extra $55 and all other similar extras will come out of your operating margin, because you are not often going to find customers who are willing to pay a premium for the privilege of doing business with you when they can be as well served by someone else.

I am aware, of course, that shoes are branded merchandise and that the situation is not as though your product and the Massachusetts product could not be told apart. But on the whole, brand preferences are as likely to favor your competitor as much as they favor you, so that in the end you are still left with the freight differences to meet.

Nor should one get the idea that $55 extra on 10,000 pounds of shoes is a negligible thing which you can easily bear. It is true that the extra transportation charge is a very small percentage of the retail or even the wholesale value of the goods. But the value of the goods is not the thing to look at. It is rather the vital margin between what it costs you to make shoes and what you can get for them when you sell them. Extra transportation charges may amount to only 2 percent of the wholesale value, but the same charges become 20 percent of the profits in a business which runs on a 10-percent margin, as many competitive manufacturing businesses do.

The inequality of freight rates for equal distances is not the whole reason for the lack of shoe manufacturing in this region; I understand that. But that it is an important factor seems to me clear.

Let us take another example, the case of two paint factories, one in Detroit, in official territory, and the other in Omaha, in western trunk territory. In Peoria, Ill., a prospective purchaser of a carload of paint asks for prices. Peoria is the same distance in rail-miles from Omaha as from Detroit. And yet that carload costs $39.60, or 29 percent more, to ship to Peoria from Omaha, in western trunk territory, than the very same distance from Detroit to Peoria. What the Detroit manufacturer must pay, $136.80, to get his paint all the way, will only pay freight bills for the Omaha concern to Ottumwa, Iowa, 167 miles short of Peoria. This map will illustrate what I have said.

The paint being equal in quality, the man in Peoria will not pay extra for the privilege of using Omaha paint. This means that the Omaha paint manufacturer can secure that Peoria order only if he can somehow make up the $39.60 out of his own pocket or the pay envelope of his employees. Lower wages mean lower purchasing power. Industry cannot thrive and grow here under this kind of handicap.

And here is a final illustration, also on a map, that I submit only to show that the Southeast suffers under the same kind of rate handicaps that you do. Chattanooga, Tenn., and Auburn, N. Y., are the same distance from Fort Wayne, Ind. But for the amount of transportation charges which will carry a carload of agricultural implements weighing 24,000 pounds from Auburn to Fort Wayne, a carload from Chattancoga will get only to Lexington, Ky. To cover the rest of the distance, the charges are $48, or 43 percent more than those incurred by the producer in the low-rate region.

As transportation people, you will, of course, realize that these examples are not hand-picked for effect. It is true that some commodities and certain traffic movements would depart widely from them; and there are even perhaps a few isolated instances in which southern and western manufacturers have rate advantages rather than rate handicaps. But on the whole the examples I have exhibited are fair and representative. There are many, many more examples, with some of which you are doubtless personally familiar.

CONCENTRATION OF PURCHASING POWER AND THE INTERREGIONAL RATE HANDICAP

These cases demonstrate the extra cost of getting to market from a rate-handicapped region such as western trunk-line territory or the southern territory. They point to the fact that the transportation dollar carries goods farther in official or eastern territory than it does for you here or for us in the South or Southwest. But these charts alone do not make clear, perhaps, another unfair consequence of the interregional rate discrimination. I have set up here still another map that is needed to bring out in full the unfairness and the sterilizing effect of the interregional rate status upon the industrial development of these interior regions.

This is the same map I referred to earlier as a class-rate relief map of the country, but with one important difference: Here the various States, regions, and rate territories are shown not in proportion to their geographical area but in proportion to their purchasing power; that is, an area representing $4,000,000,000 of purchasing power on this map would be twice as long and twice as wide as an area representing $1,000,000,000. From the table in the lower left-hand corner of this chart you see that the purchasing power in official territory, in the industrial region east of the Mississippi, is greater than that of all the other territories put together—amounting to almost $6 out of every $10; also that purchasing power out here in western trunk-line territory is very little over one-fifth as great.

This map shows, of course, that the largest national market is concentrated in official territory. Industries or prospective industries in your region must sell a part of their output east of the Mississippi River in official territory if you are to create a robust industrial development. In much of this market in official territory your industries expect to have to pay higher transportation charges, simply because your goods must move greater distances. In other words, there is a large part of this concentrated market that is too far from midinterior manufacturers even if the midinterior producers were granted parity mile for mile in their freight rates. You are out of that market, or most of it.

But what of that part of this great market that you are closer to than producers enjoying official territory rates? The astounding fact is that as a result of the interregional rate system your producers here are actually required to pay a higher rate than manufacturers in eastern territory, who are farther away from that market. If the freight-rate differential were removed your industries could enjoy a much larger share of the markets in official territory than at present, and this the chart plainly shows.

Referring to the map that illustrates the shipment of boots and shoes, you will see that in the entire zone between Springfield, Ill., and Mansfield, Ohio, a shoe manufacturer in Topeka is actually closer to Mansfield than is the producer in Brockton, Mass. If he were not required to pay a greater freight rate mile per mile than the Massachusetts producer, the Topeka manufacturer would actually have an advantage.

If the purchasing power in the United States were distributed evenly over the entire country, it would be a handicap to you if you were required to pay a greater freight rate per mile than was exacted of some other region. In view of the actual concentration of purchasing power, so startlingly shown in the final map I have submitted, the differential against you is a burden almost fatal to the decentralization of American industry.

I am not advocating, and no one I know of is advocating that rates be adjusted to offset your disadvantage of distance. The nub of the case against the interregional-rate system is that it requires producers in the West, the Southwest, and the South to pay more for the same distance; in short, the case is not built upon a desire for favoritism but rather for equality of opportunity.

NATIONAL BENEFITS IN CORRECTION OF INTERREGIONAL DISCRIMINATION

The restoration of equality of opportunity by a correction of this situation would, in our opinion, not only be beneficial to the South and the West, would not only tend to conserve natural resources, raise purchasing power in those regions, give midwestern and southern businessmen an opportunity to show the skill and resourcefulness they have, but would be a great regenerative force for the Nation. These "Chinese walls" of freight rates between sections of our common country have a depressing and sterilizing effect on the whole Nation. It is sound economics and sound public policy to remove every barrier to a free flow of commerce within the United States.

The T. V. A. Board of Directors a few months ago instituted another study now approaching completion that we feel will throw further light on this crucial issue. This report, like the one we made in May 1937 (known as the Alldredge report), will be made to the President of the United States. We are now seeking to discover the consequences, in practical terms, of interterritorial freight rate inequality upon the economic development in the interior regions.

Industrial possibilities in the processing and marketing of the South's raw materials will be studied, and the effect of such regional inequality upon economic well-being is being investigated. I believe this report will also contribute to a better comprehension of the factors that make for national well-being. In the preparation of this report our staff is consulting and cooperating with other interested and qualified agencies in various parts of the country, including this midinterior region.

INTERREGIONAL FREIGHT RATES AND THE LACK OF DEFENSE INDUSTRIES IN THE INTERIOR REGIONS

The country is now in the midst of the greatest industrial-production effort ever undertaken in any land at any time. The collective energies of a nation of 130,000,000 people, the greatest industrial nation the world has ever seen, have been geared to a monumental task. This industrial acceleration and expansion will inevitably influence, if it will not indeed determine, the economic pattern of this country for many, many years to come. It is no wonder, therefore, that the people of the Midwest and of the South look with the greatest concern upon the undisputed fact that thus far only a small, a very small, proportion of the defense industrial expansion has taken place in these regions. Defense production has intensified the already nationally unwholesome concentration of industry in the area known in railroad parlance as "official territory." And for this situation the interregional rate system must share responsibility as one underlying cause.

The distribution of defense contracts, I am confident, was in no sense dictated by willful discrimination against the West and the South. Speed was absolutely essential. Many of the industries required for defense production already existed in the North and northeastern regions. Experience and trained skills were available there. Existing plants could be expanded. The "know-how" of industrial matters was there. The men who had the responsibility of decision in defense production had naturally enough acquired a habit of thinking chiefly in terms of our largest producers; these, as we know, are concentrated in one region. There are other factors, but it is chiefly due to such as these that the West and South are losing out. And the Nation loses out, too, for defense production could do much to decentralize industry through the country.

And it still may do so. It is not too late. For it is agreed within the Government that the Nation would be better off if a greater share of defense production would be carried on in the West and South. Only a few days ago the National Defense Advisory Commission reiterated the principle of decentralization in a report from that Commission directed to the Plant Site Committee of the Office of Production Management. These words were used:

"On the (defense production) sites which are selected depends not only the strategic security of our defense industries and much of their efficiency for defense production but also important and permanent consequences for the economic life of different parts of the Nation. Experience gained during the past 10 months would indicate that the immediate ends of national defense are largely consistent with the longer-run objective of a better-balanced industrial economy."

The report states further that the following principles should be observed in plant locations:

"That every possible preference be given to locations where large reserves of unemployed or poorly employed people are available and where industrialization during the defense period will contribute to a better long-run balance between industry and agriculture. These conditions are particularly acute in many areas of the South and West.

"That the proper location of new plants, the wider distribution of defense contracts, and an aggressive policy to promote the subcontracting of the larger defense orders held by private contractors all be considered essential parts of a well-rounded program to obtain larger use of the human and material resources of the country in the defense effort."

Merely to protest against the distribution of defense contracts is not enough, for that will not remedy the underlying regional inequities that have contributed so largely to the concentration of industry; and it is the concentration of existing industry that, in turn, accounts largely for the present inequality in distribution of defense production. The more constructive position is to set out to change those underlying inequalities. And the Interstate Commerce

Commission inquiry into interregional rates is one such step, and an important one, if it is concluded with reasonable celerity.

WE MUST BE READY WHEN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IS RESTORED

A change in the interregional freight-rate situation, however, is not a panacea either for the problems of the Mid-Interior or of the South. I trust that my emphasis upon the importance of this barrier to our future development has not given that impression. There are other equally important matters to concern us. We must not only remove barriers; we must go even further and see that when the walls are leveled and equality of opportunity restored we will be ready. We must make ourselves ready with industrial knowledge generally, be ready with the skills and with backlog of industrial research upon which modern industry so greatly depends. This is vitally important to you in this region as it is in the South. If there were time, I should like to describe to you what the Tennessee Valley Authority and its cooperating State institutions have actually accomplished in the way of industrial research. That program of research has resulted in new private industry based on materials and skills of the southern region itself. And as recent experience in the Tennessee Valley has demonstrated in a practical way, for industrial development we need, too, to continue to develop our rivers so that they will furnish us great blocks of cheap electricity as well as water control for navigation, flood control, and irrigation. To progress industrially the interior and the South must press for more and more electricity, for we are only on the threshold of the age of power.

More than this, it seems to me, we must actively support and promote every effort, State and Federal, public and private, strengthening the conservation and wise utilization of our natural resources. We are only as strong as the foundations upon which we stand are strong. Those foundations we find in our soil and minerals and forests and streams and in the skills and energies and spiritual qualities of our citizens.

A PROPOSAL THAT MIDINTERIOR, SOUTH, AND SOUTHWEST JOIN IN PRESENTATION BEFORE I. C. C.

On July 29, 1939, the Interstate Commerce Commission instituted its class-rate investigation. That inquiry can be epoch making. The Commission has set aside funds for research into costs and other factors and has given indications that this investigation will become one of the high points in the work of this transportation supreme court of the United States. To those of us who live in the West and the South the importance of this investigation can hardly be exaggerated. It will stand as one of the landmarks of economic history, taking its place with us with such dramatic events as the invention of the cotton gin, and for the West with the first transcontinental railroad.

The Transportation Act of 1940 made rate discrimination as among regions unlawful—that is, unjust discrimination. The Interstate Commerce Commission is now engaged in the early stages of its investigation to determine whether unjust discriminations do exist, and if they do, where they are and how much they amount to. The Commission is concerned with unjust discrimination, not with mere differences in rates. Those of you who are transportation students and experts are, of course, familiar with this distinction. It is inquiring into rate differences not justified by regional differences, such as the cost of furnishing the service or other factors. And at the risk of laboring a point obvious to you who know the field, let me point out that the burden of proving by the facts that present inequalities such as I have recited are unjust rests on those interests, communities, and regions that feel they are being unjustly treated. You know, too, that the Interstate Commerce Commission is a quasi-judicial body that will base its conclusions only upon facts put into the record before that body, and hence, in a form acceptable under the Commission's rules of procedure. In other words, proponents of interterritorial rate reform must present their case to the Commission in its hearings, must present it ably and convincingly.

You probably know that numerous petitions have been presented to the Interstate Commerce Commission requesting that the class-rate investigation be abandoned or postponed, chiefly on the grounds that it would interfere with the task of national defense. Fortunately, the Commission has denied these petitions. Those who are enjoying special advantages under present rate structures are exerting every effort to continue those privileges, and they are able and diligent in that effort.

It is my personal view that the regions now handicapped, that is, the South and West, could well join hands in preparing and presenting the case for equality of opportunity. It occurs to me that such a joining of hands in presentation might also be of aid to the Commission. In working out the grounds on which cooperative action can be based, I believe you will find that the fundamental interests of Mid-Interior, Southwest, and Southeast are the same, and that we have common interests in a great many more respects and in much more important respects than we have divergent or conflicting interests.

To sum up:

The industrial future of the interior and southern regions depends upon:

1. Restoring economic equality between all the regions of America.
2. Conserving our resources, human and natural.
3. Industrial research by public and private agencies to further new industry and industrial "know-how."
4. Developing our power and water assets to the fullest.

Trade With South America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1941

INTERVIEW WITH HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an interview which Mr. John F. Coggswell had with Hon. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General. The interview was published in the Boston Post of Sunday, March 16, 1941.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Sunday Post of March 16, 1941]

JIM FARLEY PREDICTS BOSTON SHIPPING BOOM—HUB NEAREST MAJOR UNITED STATES SEAPORT TO BRAZIL AND ARGENTINA—BUENOS AIRES HAS CLOSE SOCIAL, RACIAL TIES WITH NEW ENGLAND—NOTED POLITICAL LEADER, JUST BACK FROM SOUTH AMERICAN BUSINESS SURVEY, SAYS NAZIS' INFLUENCE DECIDEDLY ON WANE

(By John F. Coggswell)

The Honorable James A. Farley, big, glowing with health, affable as ever, just back from a 9-week "best vacation without a care in the world that I ever had," during which he visited nearly every nation in South America, left the shelter of the big desk in his New York office, came round front and sat down beside me.

"One of the greatest assets these United States have in South America and one which your port of Boston should find it especially easy to cash in on," he told me, "is the colony of nearly 100,000 Irish, among them an especially high percentage of business and cultural leaders, that I found in Buenos Aires.

"The very existence of this great colony from Eire was a surprise to me, something of a blow to my pride in being a student of the achievements of the Irish in the New World."

CONSORTING WITH PRESIDENTS

Mr. Farley had been consorting with Presidents and other high Government officials, ambassadors and ministers, big-shot business leaders, the great and near-great down there, all of whom persisted, according to the news dispatches, in viewing him as a looming national figure in spite of his return to private life.

He has come back full of enthusiasm for the war-sent opportunity of these United States to tie ourselves to Latin America with commercial bonds that will make us independent of European trade, establish a "hemispherical solidarity" that will leave both continents free and prosperous, no matter what the outcome of the war in Europe.

And that is especially important to Boston, as the nearest important American port to eastern South America, he assured me. It will probably mean a doubling, quadrupling, and more of the already tremendous and constantly increasing trade that is moving out of and into the port of Boston, in one of the finest, most modern fleets on the seas today.

But the famous Democratic leader simply had to tell me about that Irish colony in Buenos Aires before he expanded upon our glowing trade prospects below the Equator, told of the big men he had met and their attitude toward the United States, even before he chuckled over his meeting with Louis Firpo, the immortal Bull of the Pampas, whose iron fist sent Jack Dempsey catapulting over the ropes one memorable evening at the Yankee Stadium; Firpo, who had parlayed his ring winnings into affluence as a rancher, a real-estate promoter, and all-around businessman.

Quite evidently his discovery of that prosperous, public-spirited, internationally minded settlement of Irish down in Argentina interested Mr. Farley more than anything else he encountered on his long trip. I give you the story of the discovery, though, not as the great American told it to me, but as a representative of the weekly Southern Cross reported it in his paper, under the heading "Mr. James Farley comes to town—a great Irish-American."

This reporter, J. B. Sheridan, native of the Emerald Isle, came into the Plaza Hotel, Buenos Aires, called the Farley suite over the house telephone. It happened that Mr. Farley answered the call himself. Sheridan named his paper, explained that it was published in the interests of the 100,000 Irish Catholics in the city.

"What! One hundred thousand Irish in Buenos Aires! A paper published just for them in English!" the astonished Democratic leader ejaculated. "Man, you come right up here."

Sheridan got his interview all right, but if he came to get a message from one of our leading Irish-Americans to Irish-Argentinians it didn't get into the paper. It is illuminating to find that he took up nearly all his space writing of Mr. Farley's personality. It wasn't until near the end of the interview that he thought to ask a question that has been worrying the Irish of Buenos Aires ever since the lend-lease bill got into the United States Senate.

"Is Senator BURTON WHEELER, who has been so vitriolic in his diatribes against President Roosevelt, of Irish descent?" the reporter wanted to know.

"I tell you definitely, Mr. Sheridan," Mr. Farley replied, "BURTON WHEELER hasn't a drop of Irish blood in his veins."

That was a comfort to the Southern Cross writer, and he was sure it would be, too, "to men of Irish blood in this southern land, who have felt somewhat ashamed that a man with Irish blood in his veins would attack the Bayard of democratic ideals in America."

Tomorrow being St. Patrick's Day, a couple of paragraphs which Mr. Farley pointed out to me on the front page of the Southern Cross will be of interest to all Boston, especially those of Catholic faith.

"A great many churches and chapels in Argentina possess altars or statues dedicated to St. Patrick," the item stated. "In many localities flourishing communities will gather at the feet of the patron saint on his feast day; in other, the Gaels have moved on.

"We know a certain camp town where the parish church boasts a splendid altar of St. Patrick. On St. Patrick's Day, the solitary remaining member of a family of long Irish-Argentine lineage never fails to have the altar profusely illuminated and bedecked with flowers."

It was only natural that Irish colony in remote South America should have proved one of the high points of interest in Mr. Farley's trip south of the Equator. He spent a great deal of time delving into their history, meeting the leading members of the community, and prizes as much as anything else brought back with him a book, The Story of the Irish in Argentina, written by the Reverend John S. Gaynor, P. S. M., editor of the Southern Cross.

SAME AS BOSTON IRISH

"The Irish of Buenos Aires are just the same sort that settled in Boston and spread out all over the United States," Mr. Farley told me. They're descendants of pioneers, many of whom migrated to South America three and four generations ago. Why, that weekly paper, "The Southern Cross," was established in 1875 and has flourished ever since.

"Just as has been the history of Irishmen in the United States, men whose grandfathers and great grandfathers came from the old country, one finds Irish names in positions of leadership all through Argentina—leaders in public life, in business, in the professions, in education, and the arts. But they're still just as full of love for Eire as are our own Irish-Americans. And it made me sort of homesick to hear an Irish accent, way down there, among those more lately from the other side.

"One day, I went to see a party of four-generation Buenos Aires Irish. None of them could speak English and an American newspaper correspondent was acting as interpreter. I saw him smiling and wanted to know why.

"'It's the first time I ever heard Spanish with an Irish accent,' he replied.

"And those South American Irish are just as important as they are interesting to us of the United States. One after another, they asked me about cousins, relatives to the *n*th degree in Boston, New York, all the large cities of the United States, wondered if I had ever met them.

"They seem to have almost as great a love for our country as for the home land. They're all violently antagonistic to Nazi propaganda and strong advocates of closer relations between Argentina and the United States. They're a power down there, too, and their attitude should be of great value in establishing better trade relations."

Everything that Mr. Farley had to say regarding the Irish of South America indicates that they may prove to be our ace in the hole in establishing closer relations with the South American country that has been the slowest to respond to the good-neighbor policy.

The former Postmaster General believes that that should be especially important to Boston, in view of the increasingly great tonnage of traffic to and from South America moving through Boston Harbor. He was amazed at the commercial potentialities of all our neighbors to the south, believes that trade opportunities have hardly been touched, is sure that by wise methods an interchange of products can be developed that will give us new ideas of commercial development.

"Like most citizens of the United States, it is only lately that I have become South American conscious," he told me. "And this trip has been an eye opener."

He points out that we even failed to develop the business down there that we grabbed off during World War I, let it slip out of our grasp when Europe settled down, and began looking for export business again. But now we have an opportunity for commercial development even greater than during the last war, now that Europe has gone out of the exporting business altogether.

"Mine was a business trip," Mr. Farley said, "and I rather hurried along, but I had plenty of time and opportunity to make observations. Right now South America is just about in the same stage of development that the United States was at the time of the Civil War. It's a continent of tremendous undeveloped natural resources.

"What they need more than anything else is aid in developing these resources and transportation facilities to make them accessible. Give them these and at the same time they'll be given a higher standard of living, greater purchasing power, the ability to buy from us what they can't now.

"It's time we got practical in South America. Too long our professional idealists and educators have been talking down to, patronizing the South Americans. That sort of talk doesn't go across with them at all.

"The administration's 'good-neighbor' policy has done a great deal to improve cultural relations. But culture alone doesn't buy bread, or automobiles, or machinery, or any of the thousands of things that South Americans would buy from us if they had the money, or goods to exchange.

HOW TO BE PRACTICAL

"By getting practical down there, I mean more of such projects as the recent loan of $25,000,000 for the building of a steel mill in Brazil. Anything we do to enable them to develop their natural resources will not only foster friendship but give us a big cash profit.

"I'm in hopes that some method will be developed that will enable us to take some of the surplus Argentine beef, without seriously handicapping our own cattle raisers. Conversations in Argentina lead me to believe that we could import approximately 100,000 tons of their beef a year, without any severe effects upon the market for the domestic supply.

"But the purchase of even that relatively small amount would make a great and favorable change in their situation and develop a friendly feeling toward the United States in the country where it is most needed.

"We must remember that reciprocity is not a one-way street, that we have no right to expect South Americans to fall over themselves rushing to buy our goods, unless we reciprocate, make some sacrifices, too, to buy their products. They are particularly in need of our patronage, now that the war has cut off all their European markets, save Britain. And the difficulty of getting goods across the Atlantic makes that market a precarious one."

On the whole, Mr. Farley believes that most of South America is strongly in favor of fostering trade relations with the United States. The business leaders with whom he talked hold that such relations offer the greatest assurance of permanency, the soldiest foundation for hemispherical well-being. That's their cold-blooded business view of the trade situation.

The man on the street—and always trust a man with James Farley's political experience to get close to the folks who cast the votes—he wants goods produced by the United States, feels that in them he gets most for his money. The inclination of the common people, too, is tinged by a feeling of friendliness and respect for North America such as they have never had before.

And government officials realize that in a changing, upset world their only hope lies in a strong economic tie-up with the United States. They are developing a real desire to cooperate.

"Leaving the dollar mark out, which idea seems to be going over the stronger down there, our 'good neighbor' policy or Nazi-Fascist propaganda?" I asked.

Mr. Farley pressed a buzzer button on his desk, asked his secretary to bring in clippings from the newspapers telling of his visits to various cities in representative countries. It was a big envelope chock full of the clippings with translations attached.

"My impression of the newspapers down there was that they are honest, sincere in their desire to reflect the opinion of the people, to bring their readers sound editorial opinion, to work for the things that are best for the Nation," the Democratic leader turned businessman told me.

"Maybe these editorial opinions will give part of the answer to your question."

Those newspaper writers certainly went to town on Mr. Farley's visit, refused to view him as anything save a great American public figure instead of a businessman on business bent. An editorial from Rio de Janeiro's Correio da Manha is typical, displays the tie-up with North American traditions with which South American newspapers are combating propaganda from abroad.

It happened that Mr. Farley landed in Rio on the first day of their celebrated carnival; it was also Washington's Birthday and the North American was wearing a picture of Washington on his lapel.

"The representative of a great free nation," the Correio da Manha editor wrote, "could not have worn a more appropriate symbol on coming in contact with the people of another nation who love liberty, George Washington, Simon Bolivar, San Martin, Jose Bonifacio—names that are remembered as of yesterday in these uncertain times when dictators are trying to destroy the freedom that great, inspired liberators founded in the Americas. * * *

"James Monroe, another leader whom civilization will consecrate when we are rid of those who still wish to rule on the theory of hate and ambition, created the structure of what we celebrate today as one of the most perfect realizations of the age: The neo-Monroeism that received its final touches at Lima, Panama, and Habana."

That's typical of South American newspaper opinion when balancing North American against totalitarian ideologies. Mr. Farley brought out another point, seldom considered when viewing the undoubtedly large German and Italian populations in some South American countries.

"Some sections do have large populations of descendents of Axis people," he said. "But everywhere they are gathered in close, compacted colonies. They herd by themselves, and have little to do with other citizens. Their very isolation, insularity reduces the effectiveness of their efforts in behalf of Hitler and Mussolini."

Mr. Farley was especially impressed with the friendliness toward the United States demonstrated at every turn in Brazil. He had long visits with President Getulio Vargas and with Dr. Oswaldo Aranha, long-time Brazilian Ambassador to the United States, now Vargas' right-hand man. With the government heads, our Democratic leader went to an "esado" or barbecue, given in his honor by the President of the Bank of Brazil, at Petropolis, Rio's summer resort.

Prominently displayed were Brazilian and American flags, side by side, at the entrance

to the hacienda. President Vargas removed his hat, stood long silently gazing at the flags, then said that he prayed that they'd always be that way—side by side.

LEADERS IMPRESSED

"I've been coming in contact with men in public life for more than 30 years," Mr. Farley told me. "I believe that I have become a judge of men especially of men of prominence in government. And I'm happy to say that these leaders impressed me with their sincerity, their desire to advance their countries, and their people.

"President Vargas is modest and unassuming and like most big men I've met, easy to approach. I felt he was a kind of man one can know on short acquaintance. I'm in hopes that he can find time to pay a visit to the United States, so that our people can see what a really fine friend we have in him."

All down the west coast of South America, Mr. Farley found an intense friendship for the United States, evidenced not only by desire to do business with us, but also by tremendous enthusiasm for a united hemisphere against European ideas.

He attributes this happy situation to two interlocking developments—the wiseness of businessmen from the United States in getting and caring for orders on the west coast and the facilities for rapid transportation that the Pan American-Grace Airlines have afforded since they took over from the German-controlled lines in Bolivia and extended service to the other Pacific nations.

"The planes are always crowded," Mr. Farley said. "They enable American firms' representatives to get around swiftly, keep in contact and these representatives are in truth real ambassadors of good will for our nation."

He did find plenty of evidences of Nazi activities all through South America, but he found no evidence of such efforts having any effect upon Government leaders.

"Government officials," he told me, "all realize that their interests are identical with ours and that close relations must be kept if this hemisphere is to go on in freedom and happiness; that European ideologies have nothing to offer us.

"We are particularly fortunate, too, in our Ambassadors and Ministers to all South American capitals. Norman Armour, in Argentina; Jefferson Caffery, in Brazil; and Claude G. Bowers, in Chile, are doing exceptionally fine jobs and enjoy the fullest confidence of the governments to whom they are accredited. It is hardly fair, though, to single out any particular representatives; all of them are doing great work.

"All in all, I think that the whole South American attitude toward attempts to influence thought toward nazi-ism or fascism were pretty well summed up in an editorial run during my visit by the Diario Carioca in Rio: 'All the nations of America feel that the moment is grave and that only together can they keep to the road that they have set for themselves.'"

Steel Scrap and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1941

ARTICLE BY HON. JAMES J. DAVIS, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which I wrote on steel scrap in national defense, published in the Philadelphia Inquirer on April 6, 1941.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 6, 1941]

STEEL SCRAP VITAL, SENATOR DAVIS SAYS—EARLY COLLECTIONS TO BEAT PRICE RISE URGED FOR DEFENSE

(By Senator JAMES J. DAVIS)

WASHINGTON, April 5.—Since the World War the United States has been the world's reservoir for metals.

Export of steel scrap has loomed large in the public mind; but for every ton of scrap exported 10 tons have been consumed at home. Much of the scrap that is exported originates along the seacoasts. About one-quarter of all exports moves through the port of New York and an equal amount leaves Gulf ports. Only about one-fifth leaves Pacific coast ports.

STEEL SCRAP IN SPOTLIGHT

As we move forward in our national-defense program, steel scrap holds the center of attention. It has been estimated that the steel mills of the country will purchase approximately 30,000,000 tons of scrap iron during 1941. Railroads, automobile factories, and large industries will provide approximately 13,000,000 tons of this amount.

The remaining 17,000,000 tons must be produced by collectors scattered throughout the country, who no only collect the scrap but prepare it and transport it to the steel-producing centers. Your junk dealer is now the key man in the national-defense program.

IN REMOTE AREAS

Approximately 5,000,000 of the total 1941 requirement of 30,000,00 tons is located in remote areas—places so far removed from steel-making centers that the cost of freight to the consuming market is prohibitive.

In addition to this remote scrap, there is dormant scrap; that is, steel and iron products that have outlived their usefulness but have not been prepared or made ready for the scrap market. These difficulties of collection will have their inevitable influence on price levels.

URGES AID OF AGENCIES

In order to get much of the dormant scrap to the markets, it will be necessary to enlist the good offices of interested Government agencies, the R. F. C., W. P. A., and the municipalities. Dormant scrap should be made available at the present time when prices are at normal levels. Voluntary national-defense activities should include aid in the collection of this vital defense metal.

It is conservatively estimated that in the Eastern States (New England, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia) there are approximately 300,000 tons of tee and girder rails remaining in streets from abandoned street railways. W. P .A. labor can remove the rails and resurface the streets, while the scrap dealer can clean and prepare the material for markets.

In these same Eastern States there are approximately 300,000 tons of scrap in railways, bridges, and equipment of short and branch lines, applications for whose abandonment are now pending before the I. C. C. One mile of railroad laid with 90-pound rails, plus fastenings, equals 156 gross tons.

In Ohio there are thousands of tons of scrap in abandoned streetcar lines and old blast-furnace dumps. In the upper peninsula of Michigan much scrap will be found in abandoned mines. In West Virginia one-time flooded mines now abandoned will yield large quantities.

IN ABANDONED MINES

Kentucky has scrap in abandoned mines blast-furnace dumps, and some quantities of light scrap. Indiana has between 30,000 and 40,000 tons of scrap in abandoned streetcar and interurban lines, most of which is now being liquidated.

Wisconsin has about 40,000 tons in unused equipment in sawmills and lumber camps. The Rocky Mountain region has approximately 200,000 tons in abandoned mines. Steel mills are adjacent to all of these areas prepared to use this scrap.

CARRY EXCESS RESERVES

Nation-wide we find that railroads, municipalities, and States are all carrying excess reserves of parts for equipment which should be returned to circulation. The R. F. C. and municipalities have taken over old buildings for taxes and default on loans which are a loss without tenants and should be scrapped.

Many corporations are carrying old industrial plants for which there is no use in the defense program.

National defense now calls for their demolition, not only for their scrap value but for other materials that can be salvaged. Altogether, some 1,200,000 tons of dormant scrap can be realized in this way if the national-defense needs for this vital metal shall have the right-of-way.

I have been informed that 18 months ago the city of New York paid a contractor in excess of $100,000 to raze the Ninth Avenue Elevated, which contained approximately 60,000 tons of scrap plus other useful materials. Three months ago New York City received from a contractor $40,000 for the privilege of razing the Second Avenue Elevated, which contained only 20,000 tons of scrap.

These instances illustrate how wide-awake citizens regard the importance of scrap. Scrap now brings $20 a ton. While this price can be obtained, now is the time to act.

As a boy I would have jumped at the chance to get such a price for the old iron I collected. Now national-defense duty is combined with the price to call the youngters to do well their usual job of feeding their back-yard collections to the junk man.

As James E. Earle, of the United States Bureau of Mines, has well said, "The service performed by the secondary metal industry in collecting the metal objects discarded by the population and returning them to use is perhaps the most real contribution to conservation actually being accomplished today."

Tolerance in Time of Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1941

ADDRESS BY CHIEF JUSTICE MARVIN B ROSENBERRY, OF THE WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, because in these trying times particularly it is vital that we exhibit a spirit of tolerance which will make for unity, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD an address on this subject by Chief Justice Marvin B. Rosenberry, of the Wisconsin Supreme Court.

This is Justice Rosenberry's inaugural address, and it is entitled "Tolerance in Time of Crisis."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We meet today formally to induct into office the constitutional State officers chosen at the recent November election for the ensuing 2 years. For each of these officers it will be a continuation of a service to the people of the State, begun 2 years ago. After 2 years of service they are thoroughly familiar with the duties of their respective offices and the obligations which they will assume and continue to discharge upon the taking of the constitutional oath, which I shall shortly administer to them.

Under the circumstances it would not be fitting for me to comment upon matters that are much more within their experience than mine and I shall therefore address myself briefly to the general public upon a matter which it seems to me is, especially at this time, an appropriate subject for the consideration of every thoughtful citizen.

The shadow of a great world conflict has fallen across our land. Our young men are being called to the colors, our material and spiritual resources are being mobilized to repel a threat to our democratic way of life. While there is a difference of opinion as to the reality and seriousness of this threat, it is apparent that a decisive majority of the people of this country accept it as genuine and think we should prepare for the future accordingly.

All thoughtful people will agree that if we are effectively to resist this threat and maintain our way of life we must have unity of purpose and coordinated and harmonious effort in every field of national endeavor supported by a like unity of purpose and effort on the part of each of the several sovereign States. Both in the State and the Nation the personnel for carrying on for at least 2 years more has already been chosen. You who are about to take the oath of office are a part of that personnel. The power of decision both in the State and the Nation is now committed to these chosen officers. There are, however, within the body politic individuals and groups who passionately disagree with the plans and proposals of those to whom the reins of government of presently entrusted.

In this situation the question arises, How far may these persons and groups go in opposing and frustrating the plans made by those who are charged with the responsibility of directing our national effort? Already one may feel the rising tide of resentment of the majority group toward those who question the soundness of or the necessity for the steps which the Government is taking and is about to take in preparation for future contingencies. The right to discuss and debate public questions is one of the vital principles of democracy, a right specifically protected by the Constitution. Are there then no limits to this right, and if there are limits are they altered by the fact that at a particular time our whole way of life, including our constitutional system of government, may be threatened by subversive forces both from within and without? It should be said at this time that the standards which obtain in politics are widely different in their nature and applicability from those which obtain in the field of art or in the domain of the spirit, including religion. In these spheres tolerance has an entirely different connotation.

In a democracy the essence of tolerance is the recognition of the fact that those who entertain views opposed to the dominant group are not necessarily lacking in intelligence, in honesty, or sincerity of purpose or that they do not seek to serve the common good. Tolerance implies no abandonment of the soundness of well-considered views and no compromise with principle. Its function is to temper the tone of opposition, to substitute political discussion for invective, to the end that such constructive suggestions as the minority may submit shall be fairly considered and if found useful fitted into the program of the majority. Tolerance tends to produce on the part of the majority group such reasonable concessions as make valuable additions to or modifications of the majority program. By this process democracy is made to work more perfectly because the matured and final plans will be the result of a composite judgment and in the end will be more readily and promptly accepted by the group as a whole. Judgments arrived at by such a process must in the majority of cases be sounder than that of any individual or of a limited group.

Tolerance is in the main related to the process by which decisions upon public questions are reached. When decisions have been made as to plans and objectives and the executive officers of the State and Nation are putting them into effect, does tolerance require that the minority be permitted to use such means as are within its power to thwart the will of the Government? In other words, does there come a time when tolerance ceases to be a virtue?

The use to which the word "tolerance" is put in another field may aid us in answering this question. In mechanics there is an allowable amount of variation in the dimensions of a machine or its parts which is called tolerance and is, according to some authorities, one four-thousandths of an inch. In machines of precision it is reduced to one ten-thousands of an inch or even less. When the limits of tolerance are exceeded in a machine the usefulness of the machine is impaired and if the allowed tolerance is greatly exceeded the machine will go to pieces when put to work.

It will break up because the play of part upon part is so great that the power which would otherwise be spent in doing the work the machine was designed to do will be lost in internal friction and dissipated by lack of coordination of its parts. It is destroyed from within because of too much tolerance. Upon the same principle, when a nation is required to put forth a maximum effort to maintain its life, it cannot endure internal strife or tolerate discord and lack of unity among the people beyond certain limits. The point where the right of free speech ends and overt acts of obstruction begin is difficult of definition. In this address no attempt will be made to do more than indicate that there is such a point. Harmonious as well as vigorous action in accordance with an established plan is absolutely essential to self-defense in a democracy just as it is in an autocracy or in any other form of government.

One of the principal weaknesses of democracy in a time of crisis is that so many proposals are made that valuable time is lost in coming to a decision and in bringing discordant elements in the body politic into harmony with each other and with the government. Lack of power in the government to compel obedience and conformity makes it necessary to convert the public to one way of thinking. This consumes valuable time. Impatience upon the part of those who quickly recognize the need of action with those who are hesitant or unconvinced often leads to what we call intolerance. However, we must not forget that in such situations there are always present those who are not actually in doubt but are really in determined opposition. They obstruct the government not for the purpose of gaining insight and understanding, but for the purpose of defeating its ultimate aims.

To illustrate, two groups of men may appear to be equally anxious to put out a fire. If they disagree as to how the fire shall be extinguished, that is one thing; but if, as a matter of fact, one group delays and interferes because it does not want the fire put out at all, that is a radically different thing.

Naturally, the greater the crisis the less time there is for debate and the greater the need for unity the less tolerable opposition to the Government becomes. When under such circumstances antagonism to the methods and objectives of the Government has reached a point where it halts or substantially interferes with the Government it can no longer be tolerated, and we have reached the point where tolerance has ceased to be a virtue and has become a source of weakness.

It is one of the paradoxes of democracy that in the preservation of its life necessity may compel it for a time to limit or even to deny the liberties which it was created to preserve. In order to maintain itself in a world of conflict a democracy must make use of those procedures and weapons which are best calculated to defeat its enemies. It is as true of governments as of other organisms that survival is the first law of nature. Liberty as we know it can live only in the framework of a democracy; if democracy dies, what we call liberty dies with it.

How is the average citizen to determine when and under what circumstances his right to loyal opposition ceases? It must be admitted that this is a difficult thing to do.

In the course of preparing for and putting forth a supreme effort by the Government it is inevitable that many difficult and delicate situations will arise as to which there may be honest differences of opinion. There is no rule of thumb by which the true answer can be found in every case. We shall not be able in every case to distinguish between opposition and disagreement as to method. One thing is certain—in the solution of these problems we should not permit passion to usurp the function of reason. Individually and collectively we should be slow and careful in our judgments and act only when we are certain that action is called for. We should not be too ready to condemn those who disagree with us and the hurling of epithets and insults will do our cause more harm than good. On the one hand, we cannot be too tolerant, on the other, we should not be too dogmatic and bigotted. We will not have much difficulty in determining the proper course to pursue when the moment for decision arrives if we give the conduct of others that deliberate open-minded consideration which we would like them to give us under the same or similar conditions. It is true that we ought, as far as we can, to forget our differences, political, religious, and racial, and unite our energies in the interest of the common good. We will accomplish more by pursuing a common plan even though it is not the best possible plan than we can accomplish by a diversity of plans however excellent they may be.

It may well be that within the year now beginning we, the people of the United States, and that means each and every one of us, may be called upon to decide anew whether we really and genuinely believe in a government ordained and established to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. Most of us are willing to talk for our Government, but what we may have to decide is whether we are willing to sacrifice for it, to fight for it, and if necessary, to give our lives for it.

Japanese-Russian Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1941

EDITORIALS FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES, BALTIMORE SUN, AND NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in

the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials commenting on the Russian-Japanese pact and its effect on America. I think the pact is one of the more important recent happenings, and I think it wise that the people of this country should have some idea of what this particular pact means.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 14, 1941]

THE JAPANESE-RUSSIAN PACT

From the Japanese side there is little mystery concerning the reasons for the neutrality pact with Russia. The interests of Japanese aggressive expansion have shifted to the south. Before she can attempt to seize or make demands upon the rich colonies of the Netherlands Indies and Malaya, or to undertake any bold move in the South Pacific, such as an attack on Singapore, she must do everything to minimize the possibility of a Russian attack from the north. Many Japanese militarists, therefore, have long wanted such an agreement. It has been reported that among the secret clauses of the tripartite pact is one under which Germany agrees to use her "fullest political and diplomatic good offices" to help effect the conclusion of precisely such a non-aggression pact with Russia. This would go far to explain what Japan got out of the pact with Germany.

The reasons why Stalin has signed the new treaty with Japan are less obvious. Coming immediately after Russia has signed a friendship pact with Yugoslavia, has scolded Bulgaria for capitulating to the Germans, and Hungary for attacking the Yugoslavs, the Japanese agreement looks at first sight like a baffling reversal. Certainly, it is a jolt to all those who hoped that, with the German menace to her own security growing every day more near, Russia's diplomacy would emerge from the fog of ambiguity that has hung over it for the last 2 or 3 years, and that she would unmistakably line herself up against the Axis Powers. From this standpoint the one crumb of comfort that can be extracted from the pact is a hope that it may have been done to free Russia from a Japanese attack in the east if Stalin should at last decide that he was forced to defend his country against German aggression from the west.

Against this hope the new pact definitely imperils the position of China. Even if there should be no immediate division of China into Russia and Japanese spheres of interest, the agreement may free more Japanese ships and men for the attack on China, at the same time as it may deepen the division within China between the Communists and the Chungking Government. The agreement will also force the British to maintain as much strength as possible near Singapore. It creates a problem for the United States regarding how much of our naval strength must be kept in the Atlantic or the Pacific. On the surface, in short, the new pact is a new diplomatic victory for Hitler, though with at least a possibility that it could prove the reverse.

[From the Baltimore Sun of April 14, 1941]

THE RUSSO-JAPANESE PACT AND AMERICA'S POSITION

Russia's conclusion of a pact of "neutrality and nonaggression" with Japan is a development of major, it may be of critical, importance. But it cannot be considered a surprise. Japan's efforts to adjust its relations with the Soviet have been many and persistent. And from the moment that it became known that Foreign Minister Matsuoka would sandwich his visits to Berlin and Rome between discussions in Moscow, it was apparent that the clinching of an arrangement with Russia might be his primary mission.

Now that arrangement has been made. The significance of the new undertaking is to be inferred from the background of recent events rather than from its own terms. Of course, it need not be more binding than any of the agreements into which dictator states have entered, and recent history is littered with their wreckage. But as it stands today it could have either of two results. On the one hand, it could serve to free Japan's hand in the Pacific and South Seas. On the other, it might remove Russia's anxieties over her Siberian backdoor and thereby free the Soviet's hand in western Europe.

The background indicates that the first of these two possibilities must be considered far more seriously than the second. Russian policy is wholly enigmatic; Japanese policy, while obscure in some details, seems reasonably well defined within the framework of the triple Axis alliance. Japan has openly staked its ambitions and destiny on the success of Germany and Italy. Moreover, Mr. Matsuoka has just concluded talks with those powers, and no reports of his visit have pointed to any rift between Berlin and Rome and their far eastern partner.

It seems distinctly unlikely, then, that Japan has suddenly reversed its policy and undertaken to support a Russian move looking to collision with the Axis in Europe. Rather it is more probable that Japan has sought a stabilization in the Far East that would permit of a more active Japanese cooperation with the Axis in the one region where Japan could play its part—the Pacific.

Yet Russia would hardly have signed a pact to serve this end unless it was under pressing need to do so or unless it was promised something in return. What need exists; what price could be paid? There is no question but that Germany is now deeply entrenched in the area that Russia once regarded as a vital security zone. Russian reaction has been vague and timid, but the reproach to Bulgaria, the pledge of benevolent neutrality to Turkey, the friendship pact with Yugoslavia, and the warning to Hungary have been construed as signs of anxiety and maybe of changing policy.

On the other hand, it is probable that Stalin has been greatly impressed by the latest demonstration of Nazi military power. The chance that Moscow is preparing itself to oppose Germany is, therefore, much slighter than the chance that she is striving to maintain an uneasily peaceful position in the hope of sharing in some division of spoils as a reward for good behavior.

But while the Russian course defies prediction, Japan's interpretation of the pact is highly meaningful. Tokyo calls it an agreement to prevent "extension of war." That means that it regards the pact as a way of strengthening Japan vis-à-vis the United States and thus softening American policy in the developing world crisis. It hardly need to be said that on this matter Japan's calculations are incorrect. American policy will be affected no more than it was affected by the Japanese-Axis alliance last fall. For likelihood of a Russian-Japanese pact must have been fully considered by Washington when our basic policy was formulated.

Doubtless we shall watch the Pacific with greater vigilance and concern. That does not, and cannot, imply that we shall cease to support our own interests and safety by increasing aid to Britain or by such other moves as events may require.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 14, 1941]

THE RUSSO-JAPANESE PACT

From the German and Italian propagandists we shall undoubtedly be hearing for many days to come that Mr. Matsuoka's negotiation of a neutrality pact with the Soviet Union is a great diplomatic triumph for the Axis Powers. Certainly it is as much as Germany has been trying to get from Moscow for Japan, for 6 months past, and lately with little prospect of success. It is certainly all that the Japanese press has been clamoring for, ever since Mr. Matsuoka set out for Europe. In some respects it seems to cover more ground than the simple nonaggression treaty for which the Japanese have been asking. It provides very interesting food therefore for speculation; but whether or not the Axis will derive from it all the advantages which will now be claimed depends upon the circumstances under which it was signed, and the use that Japan is prepared to make of it.

Axis spokesmen will assure their peoples that this pact, which not only pledges Soviet Russia to respect Japan's territories (including Manchukuo, according to the supplementary declaration) but binds her to neutrality if Japan is involved in hostilities with one or more other powers, now frees Japan to launch ventures in the Far East which will divert American attention from Europe, make it impossible for the United States to move much of the Pacific Fleet into the Atlantic for convoy purposes, and may even limit the percentage of war supplies which can be spared Great Britain. It will be suggested that Mr. Matsuoka and his nation needed nothing but the assurances from the Kremlin which this pact now gives them to enter into active cooperation with Japan's European partners. If this were true the pact would be very important indeed; but we are inclined to doubt that it is wholly true.

Japanese opinion lately has seemed averse to making trouble in the Far East which might challenge the attention of the American fleet. We doubt that Mr. Matsuoka had authority to promise Hitler and Mussolini that Japan would make that kind of trouble, whether Stalin adopted a neutral attitude toward it or not. It has been our impression that Japan has been keenly anxious to get nonaggression pledges from Stalin, so that if the trend of events made it certain that Germany would defeat Britain and put the United States on the defensive Japan could reap her South Sea harvest with an easy mind. It would therefore be our guess, for what it is worth, that Matsuoka has secured these comforting pledges without binding himself in any quarter to take immediate advantage of them.

If this guess is anywhere near the truth, the Axis Powers may not only have little reason to crow over this diplomatic victory but may on second thought have some reason to feel that Japan has just given comfort to a potential Axis victim. The Kremlin has been openly critical of German policy in the Balkans, reprimanding Bulgaria, encouraging Turkey, congratulating Yugoslavia on her anti-German coup, and scolding Hungary for a breach of faith with Yugoslavia. The Kremlin evidently fears a German drive into the Ukraine. Here the Kremlin has a pledge from Japan that, should Russia become "the object of hostilities on the part of one or several third powers," Japan will not take advantage of her involvement to attack Siberia or Outer Mongolia, but will maintain her neutrality and give no aid to her European Axis partners. It can therefore be said with as much justice that Japan has given Soviet Russia freedom to conduct a more aggressive anti-German policy as that Russia has made it safer for Japan to conduct a more aggressive anti-British and anti-American policy.

It may, of course, be objected that if this pact prompts Japan to adopt a policy which will immobilize the better part of the American Navy in the Pacific, it may make a decisive German victory over Britain shortly possible and thereby make the German threat to Russia imminent and very serious indeed. But how then was Stalin persuaded to sign this pact, after stolidly resisting all German efforts

to get it for Japan during the months when Russo-German relations were at least ostensibly friendly and cooperative? We don't know, and we don't expect to know for quite some time; but we find it hard to believe that Mr. Matsuoka got his pact by persuading Stalin that it would forward the German cause in Europe and be a diplomatic victory for the Axis. It must always be borne in mind that if the Kremlin thought that a little encouragement would send Japan to her swift ruin and thence prompt a wholesale American withdrawal from the Pacific to the Atlantic, leaving the Far East to Russia, such encouragement would be a logical policy.

Committee Jurisdiction of Civil Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 1941

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, now and then a suggestion is made that the House create a standing committee on aviation. Some suggest that it be given separate jurisdiction over both Army and Navy aviation, and others suggest the committee have jurisdiction over Army, Navy, and civil aviation. In the debate on the resolution to investigate air safety on the 6th of March a couple of the Members of the House suggested a special committee on civil aviation to have jurisdiction over that subject now exercised by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. It was freely admitted that this committee, which now has jurisdiction, has done a good job in legislating on the subject.

In my judgment, the President made a mistake when, by an order of reorganization, he changed the set-up of the regulatory body from that established by Congress. Under that legislation civil aviation had attained its greatest and unquestioned success from the standpoint of accomplishment, expansion, and safety. The reorganization order was an attempt to improve a 100-percent safety record. That was an impossible thing to be accomplished, regardless of the reasons that may have occasioned the change.

Before we make any changes in legislative procedure, and take jurisdiction away from that committee which has successfully handled it for 14 years, we should carefully consider what we may expect to gain by such a change.

It was suggested that members of a general committee are not experts on aviation matters. It takes an expert man to operate airplanes, and experts are needed to carry out the details of regulatory authority. Legislation, however, deals not with these details but with the policies that are to control the administrative agencies. Committee responsibility calls rather for common sense, reasonable ability, and industry. A broad background of experience and a proper conception of the perspective of legislation are much more important than expertness.

Any substantial criticism of the lack of progress in civil aviation or administration has never been directed at the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House. Its members are not without experience in this subject of which they have jurisdiction.

In 1922 the gentleman from New York, Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, then a Senator and now a member of this committee, introduced a comprehensive regulatory bill. The first measure introduced in the House for the regulation of civil aeronautics was by the then chairman of this committee, Hon. Samuel A. Winslow, in 1923. The Air Commerce Act of 1926 came through this committee. The chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was a member of the War Investigating Committee and served on the subcommitteee which had charge of air safety in the war period. He was a member of the special committee appointed by Congress to investigate aircraft matters in 1924. A former chairman of this committee was a member of the Morrow committee of 1926. The chairman of this committee was a member of the subcommittee which reported the bill that finally became the Air Commerce Act of 1926.

Members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee gave much time to the Civil Aeronautics Act, under which aviation has made distinctly the best progress in civil aviation in this or any other country.

On December 4, 1795, the House of Representatives created a standing Committee on Commerce and Manufactures. That committee was the original predecessor of the present House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This committee was 91 years old when the Interstate Commerce Commission was created and is now in its one hundred and forty-sixth year. It has been the primary committee on transportation during that whole period.

Civil aviation, from the Government standpoint, primarily involves a problem of transportation. The airplane is becoming an important agency of our transportation system. In recent years we have made an intelligent, consistent effort to unify the regulation of our transportation agencies with a view of coordinating them into an efficient national transportation system. All branches of domestic transportation have been placed under the jurisdiction of this one committee. All these agencies, except air transportation, are under a common regulatory body—the Interstate Commerce Commission. While all these agencies are under the jurisdiction of one committee, we deliberately created a separate regulatory body for civil aviation primarily on account of two considerations. Air regulation involves two features of special importance as contrasted with other types of transportation. One is the promotion feature of aviation and the other is its problems of safety.

Civil aviation still operates largely on a subsidized basis. It is still in a progressive stage of development. Its development is essential for military purposes and of growing importance from the standpoint of civil transportation. For this reason we have the subsidization and promotive features of the Civil Aeronautics Act. The effectiveness and utility of the airplane from the beginning has been limited by its transportation cost and its factor of hazard.

The utility of the airplane compels national interest in its advancement.

This committee reported legislation which established a civil air-pilot training program. A large number of schools distributed throughout the country furnished instruction and primary flying training. The system does not contemplate finished flyers, but rather widespread basic instruction and knowledge of air operations.

Nothing that has been done has laid a better or a broader foundation for airmindedness, which promotes widespread, intelligent, and growing interest, and knowledge of air transportation than will result from intelligently following out this program for some years to come. Thousands of young men have taken these primary flying courses and several thousand of them have entered our Army and Navy training forces.

This primary course serves to weed out many young men who are not qualified to become expert flyers.

The training course under the Civil Aeronautics Administration costs only a few hundred dollars per student. Since the initiation of these flying courses our military situation has changed the training picture. The plan, however, without further legislation is by administrative cooperation readily adapted to the more pressing need of military training.

Legislation as to safety does not require a committee of experts. Any idea that Congress is going to assemble a committee of 21, or any other number of real experts on aviation, is encouraging a hope of the impossible. The suggestion of giving such a specialized committee control over air transportation ignores the fact that we would thereby break up the system of coordinating transportation that we have been carefully developing and sacrifice the growing air transportation need to the supposed advantage of military or safety regulation. Military aviation has no place in controlling civil aviation, although the latter should function so as, in the face of necessity, to serve military needs.

SPECIAL STANDING COMMITTEES

My observation in Congress has been that the fewer special standing committees we have, the better is the quality of legislation. There are few specialized activities of so large import that they should be handled by a committee of limited jurisdiction. A special standing committee, with jurisdiction only as to a specialized subject, as distinguished from a general subject, is like a hen with one chick or a lawyer with one case.

One characteristic of specialized committees is the inclination to become subservient to and expressive of group interests. Men seek membership because of particular interest. The membership of the House Committee on Interstate

and Foreign Commerce is not selected with a view of any particular class of legislation over which it has jurisdiction. We have jurisdiction over a large number of important phases of Government activities. Our membership is widely distributed geographically, and, in my judgment, a committee so constituted is better prepared to bring in well-balanced legislation than any special standing committee which deals only with one subject.

Civil aviation does not require extensive and continuous legislation. The basic act being now well established, it will hereafter be only intermittently that changing conditions and experience will require legislation of importance. There is no prospect of any such volume of legislation as justifies or requires the appointment of a special standing committee.

On the 12th of October 1925 Hon. Martin B. Madden, then chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House, appeared before the President's Aircraft Board, at the request of that committee, to give information concerning the question of improving the air service of the country.

In answer to a question if he thought there should be standing committees in both House and Senate on aviation, Mr. Madden replied:

No; I do not.

Mr. Madden said:

A committee, I presume, for example, the Naval Committee of the House, could have a subcommittee on aviation, and has, and the Military Committee of the House would have a subcommittee on aviation, and I presume it has, and they are the responsible legislative agents of the Congress on that subject; but to make a special committee, here is what you do: The less specialization you have in committee work in Congress the better the country is off. They deal with only one subject, and then they find themselves with not much to do a great deal of the time, and not having much to do, they are trying to find some way they can spend a little more money, and they work out some legislation, no matter how much it is going to cost, and then they say, "You know we ought to get consideration of this, because we have devoted ourselves to the consideration of this problem for a year." It is not a question of merit. It is a question of such gentlemen wanting to be recognized for the work they have done. The gentleman sitting on your right understands that thing very well.

We can reasonably expect that the time is coming when civil aviation will be on an economic self-supporting basis. When that time comes special promotion in its behalf will become unnecessary. As time goes on experience and improvements will minimize hazards which are now civil aviation's particular problem. Therefore it is going to become increasingly important that the regulation of civil aviation be under that committee which has experience, background, and training to help coordinate air commerce with our other transportation agencies. Every year the need and importance of coordinating our various transportation agencies and developing them into a consistent system of national transportation becomes of increased importance to the country. To lift air transportation out of the picture and give it a separate and perhaps conflicting status would be a backward step.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, what the strikes need is a Grover Cleveland.

How to stop strikes and when to start convoys are perplexing.

Settling these strikes and settling them right are two alternatives.

My people are praying that the President will see a new light on Easter.

Just a year ago the first Willkie Club was started. It has now gone to Halifax, too.

Seizing Danish ships and then offering to buy them does not make the heart grow fonder for us there.

A constituent suggests that the Chief is holding off the war till May just to break another precedent.

A church belfry on April 18—a horse and rider. Paul Revere, the Germans may be coming now, but the redcoats are already here.

Following seven billions to keep war away from our shores, a British ship with a black eye comes in, announced by Secretary Knox as a secret. The rearing convoy should take a good look.

Ocean Air Cargoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1941

ARTICLE BY GROVER LOENING

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article of value to the Congress in developing its aviation policy. It is entitled "Ocean Air Cargo in the 'Predictable Future'," by Grover Loening, appearing in the April 1941 issue of National Aeronautics, the official publication of the National Aeronautic Association.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From National Aeronautics of April 1941]

OCEAN AIR CARGO IN THE "PREDICTABLE FUTURE"

(By Grover Loening, B. Sc., A. M., C. E.)

Fourteen years ago this May, Colonel Lindbergh demonstrated to the world that he could carry one-tenth of a ton (himself and some supplies) at an average speed of between 90 and 100 miles an hour, on a couple of hundred horsepower, a distance of 3,500 miles, which was enough to fly him nonstop from New York to Paris.

By May 1941 the Douglas B–19 will be in the air. While the exact figures on its performance are not yet available, and probably will be kept secret when tested, we all know enough in a general way to say that it will demonstrate that aeronautical science has advanced in these 14 years to a point where the same distance traversed by Lindbergh 14 years ago can be negotiated with an aircraft that will carry 20 tons of load at well over 200 miles an hour on 8,000 horsepower.

Let us stop a moment and realize that in these 14 years the load capacity that can be carried in the air this distance will have increased 200 times. The speed will have increased over twice. The ton-miles will have increased, therefore, over 400 times—and what is more important, the ton-miles per horsepower-hour will have increased 10 times. It is in the latter figure that significant economy comes, particularly when we realize that accomplishment of this mission by the 1941 aircraft requires half the time that it did in 1927.

In the face of these figures, Colonel Lindbergh stated in his testimony before Congress in connection with the lend-lease bill on January 28, 1941, "An air invasion across the ocean is, I believe, absolutely impossible at this or in any predictable future. * * * Aircraft alone are not capable of carrying a sufficient quantity of material."

GROUNDS FOR OPPOSING LINDBERGH

It just so happens that despite the respect one continues to have for Colonel Lindbergh as an aviation technician (and incidentally as an observer of world conditions due to his wide air travel in all nations) there is ground for complete disagreement with his statement. This goes for Al Williams and anyone else who scoffs at the ability to develop aircraft in the immediately "predictable future" to carry sufficient cargo tonnage to figure as a transport medium for invasion.

Let us see what we are reasonably justified in assuming will be the progress in the next 14 years—that is, by May 1955 (which is a short "predictable future," according to what we have seen since Lindbergh first opened the air lanes of the Atlantic).

1. There will be without any question the development of boundary layer control, which will reduce the drag of aircraft and greatly increase the lift. An increase in lift alone can conservatively be estimated at 50 percent at least. If a development similar to the *B–19* weighs around 70 tons, an increase in lift of 35 tons is likely. Assuming that 5 tons of this increase in lift will be necessary for increased structural strength and provision for boundary layer control mechanism, we finish up with a net increase on this exactly similar plane of a cargo load (no military fixings or seats) to 50 tons for a 3,500-mile range.

2. The boundary layer control development will also decrease the drag and there will be further refinements in shape and surface smoothness—all tending to increase the speed very materially.

3. In addition to the above, we have in the immediate offing the introduction of a jet-propulsion system to recover lost power from the exhaust. We have further improvements in fuels. Obviously, further improvements in propellers are within reach. We have also constant improvements in power-weight ratios of engines.

4. Taking any of the charts showing the increase in speed by years and the increase in the speed of load carrying aircraft that we have seen in even the last 3 years, we can safely predict that this same general B-19 type, which will cruise presently at 200 miles an hour, will find itself cruising at well over 300 miles an hour within the next 14 years.

5. We have still other untapped sources of increased load carrying for aircraft—for example, catapulting will allow heavier loads than the above by assisted take-offs either on water or land. We have completely ignored possible changes in structure which are certain to come and materially decrease the dead weight of aircraft.

AIR CARGO VERSUS SURFACE CARGO

The 1955 version of the 1941 B-19 will, therefore, be an 8,000-horsepower airplane which will carry a load of 50 tons at 300 miles an hour with ample range to fly nonstop from New York to the continent of Europe. The speed of this aircraft means that such a trip will take about 12 hours and that a round trip can be made in 2 days with ample time for maintenance and 3 round trips can be made in a week—or 150 round trips can be made in a year and still leave a period of some 60 or 70 days for yearly overhaul.

Now, the reasons one can differ with Colonel Lindbergh and anyone else who does not think that aircraft are going to carry tonnage and cargo can only be appreciated if we delve with a cold and appraising eye into the merchant marine, and the freight ship, and look at what they actually do. The average freight ship of 10,000 tons will carry about 6,000 tons of cargo.

These ships average anywhere from 10 knots for the old ones to 18 knots for the new ones, but it appears that they go across the Atlantic under war conditions in convoys. This little matter of convoys means that a freighter to Europe takes anywhere from 15 to 30 days to get over. First, the convoy has to be assembled in some place like Bermuda or Halifax. Next, it takes a very zig-zag course. Then it has to wait to unload because of the limited port facilities due to bombing injuries to harbors.

So let us face the facts. And the facts are (as anyone can verify who wants to go into the matter with men in the shipping world) that the average freighter, under present war conditions can only make about 8 round trips a year. Let us give this a benefit of improvement and say that the average is 10 trips a year. This means that the freighter carries to Europe in a year a total of 60,000 tons.

COMPARISON AND CAPACITIES

We can forget ton-miles; we can forget the great gaping maws of the huge holds of the freighter; we can forget its obvious large capacity in taking on 6,000 tons at one filling, because what interests us, essentially, is how many tons it gets to Europe in a year.

Now, let us take a look at that "predictable" 1955 aircraft. It can carry 50 tons of load to Europe 150 times a year, which, by anybody's arithmetic, is 7,500 tons a year. As shocking as it may be to shipping men, it happens to be a fact that only eight of these little 1955 aircraft would be required to carry the pay load of one freighter in a year!

Placed in quantity production by 1955, this predictable plane should cost about $300,000 apiece; and since the 10,000-ton freighter costs about $2,000,000, there is no great discrepancy in first cost.

The 8 aircraft would each be run by a crew of not over 4 men; probably only 3—pilot, copilot, and mechanic—any one of whom can use the radio, and 2 of whom can navigate. So to carry this same load the aircraft cargo operation needs 24 men. Giving about 100-percent allowance for reserve crews, say 50 men in all, we still have a total that is less than the crew of the freighter. To be sure, they get paid more, but maybe by 1955 everyone will be in the employ of the Government, and pay will not count any more.

It is not proposed in this short study to go into full details of a comparison of these operations but only sufficiently to say that when Colonel Lindbergh made a statement "that in the predictable future * * * aircraft alone are not capable of carrying sufficient quantities of material" he apparently was talking through his hat.

It has always been interesting to note in the last thirty-odd years in which some of us have seen this dizzy aviation business grow from nothing to what it is now that in many cases the least imagination and appreciation of the progress in their own field is frequently shown by the very people in it. Why this is so one does not know, except that aviation, like other fields, develops its crabby old men.

The military mind today reflects ponderously as to whether Germany can or will invade the United States by air.

This is called air defense. But for the real defense of America against this aggressor this is not the question at all. The first and foremost question to be considered at once is, Can America invade Germany?

With enormous and skillful aviation development, it is our great Nation itself that can shrink the Atlantic to a lake, and for our security we should set about building an air force to do this now. This is an absolutely sure way of scaring off Germany or of being completely ready to eliminate her or any other transoceanic troublemaker when the time comes.

AIR CARGO THE LIFE LINE

Envisioning such a future for our prestige and protection, it is important that everyone realize that the development of cargo carrying is the foundation of air-fleet operations exactly as has been the case in merchant-marine operations. No matter how many fighting planes we have we cannot conduct our offensive operations overseas, which we must be able to do to live in the world to come, without being able to supply our advance bases by air and we cannot do this without laying the foundation in this country by the development to the utmost of any and all kinds of air cargo carrying, whether they pay or not.

If early in 1918 we had said, "Let us not build any merchant ships or even encourage them because Germany has none and cannot invade the United States" where would we have been in that war? I fail to see why the supporters of the theory that we do not need air-cargo carrying now would not be making as great a mistake in this war and certainly in any war of the more distant future.

Not only can disagreement with Colonel Lindbergh's view be stated with ample justification, but a consensus of really far-seeing voices would go further and say:

That in the immediately "predictable future," transportation of most armament materials, of all troops and personnel, and practically all light or heavy loads of destructive munitions, will have to be transported and deposited by air in order to win a war across the Atlantic.

And it will take a real air force to do it.

Meanwhile, we still do nothing about real air-cargo carrying.

The People of Belgium Are Eating Cats and Dogs—Christians, What Are We Going To Do About It?

REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1941

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the people of Belgium have been reduced to such a stage of starvation that they are eating cats and dogs. With the tightening of hunger's grip even the supply of cats and dogs is getting scarce in Belgium. For a time sea gulls and sea-gull eggs partially satisfied the ravenous hunger of the starving Belgians, but of late they have been forced to eat cats and dogs. This is not a mere assertion on my part but it is based on authentic information received by the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies, of which Herbert Hoover is the head, and communicated by a member of that committee to me.

Does the fact that the good people of Belgium are so far on the road to starvation that they are compelled to eat cats and dogs mean anything to us?

Does the fact that at this moment little children by the thousands in Belgium and other subjugated countries of Europe are crying for food mean anything to us?

Does the fact that 37,000,000 defenseless, noncombatants in Belgium, Norway, Poland, and Finland are face to face with dire hunger and starvation mean anything to us?

If we can contemplate with composure the condition of these poor, unfortunate, suffering human beings and the fate that awaits them the coming winter, then I say, What in God's name, has become of our Christianity?" We profess that we are a Christian nation, but if we are, how can we enjoy our big square meals and repose peacefully on downy pillows at night while our fellow beings are enduring such extreme agony? I would think that the food would stick in our mouths and that we would rise in the morning fatigued by restless, wakeful hours when warm covers and downy pillows failed to drive away the haunting horror of wan and pleading faces across the sea.

That is to say, if we were real Christians.

If we were real Christians, we would be thinking of what Christ would say in the circumstances. Nearly 2,000 years ago there was written what He would say:

Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven.

For I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and you took me in;

Naked and ye clothed me; I was sick and ye visited me; I was in prison and ye came unto me.

Verily, I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto me.

Let us evaluate the conditions among these starving peoples and our duty in respect to them in terms of Christianity, or else let us cease to boast that we are a Christian nation. Let us vignette on the surface of our memory, where it will never fade, the wan, pinched, pale, pleading faces of the little children of Belgium, Norway, Poland, and Finland many of whom, according to well-authenticated reports, are too weak from hunger and malnutrition to go to school.

When I contemplate this awful specter of mass starvation my first thought is of the little children. I could not get them out of my mind, even if I wanted to. Have you ever seen emaciated little children looking up to you with pleading eyes, begging for something to eat? Herbert Hoover has. He fed the Belgians once before when starvation stalked in their land, and he knows what hunger is.

The sweetest smile I ever saw on the face of a human being was a smile that lighted the wan features of a little girl in a restaurant in Habana, Cuba, when I was visiting there last fall. My wife and I were eating at a popular Chinese restaurant on one of the main thoroughfares. Time after time we were interrupted by children who came in off of the street to ask for money. I had already responded to three separate "touches" of this kind by boys, when a little girl appeared, shabbily dressed, pale, and evidently from the ranks of the very poor. Coming the last, she fared the worst, as I had only a small piece of change left. I gave it to her, and she vanished into the kitchen of the restaurant. I had forgotten all about her when she reappeared, and as she walked rapidly out of the restaurant she turned toward me, and with a smile of thanks and gratitude I never shall forget she held up in her little hand for my inspection the food my trifling contribution had enabled her to purchase—about a dozen slices of stale bread. Slowly the sad consciousness came over me that I owed that little one something more than some slices of stale bread that probably were left-overs at the best. Her smile radiating thankfulness over such a little favor had captivated me, and I rushed out to overtake her, hoping to learn something about her, but she had disappeared in the milling throng. I shall never see her again, but that smile will linger with me forever. And when I think of that smile I can visualize how gratefully the boys and girls of Belgium, who are forced to eat cats and dogs, would smile just now if they could only have a little stale bread.

Surely it is our duty, our Christian duty, to feed the starving people of the subjugated countries; who are starving through no fault of their own, and especially the children.

If we would use part of our bountiful surpluses to relieve starvation in these stricken lands we would truly justify our claim to the role of "good neighbor" and would broaden and strengthen our moral influence throughout the world. If the great United States, the greatest Nation in the world today, and almost the last citadel of Christianity, were to go farther in extending its ministrations of love, we would not need so many battalions and battleships. There is no starvation in Germany. As a matter of fact, the children of Germany do not need any aid and, of course, would not receive any from the United States. Hitler, merciless despot that he is, has been farsighted in looking after German interests. He has been cannily preparing for war for a long time, and, while plotting his ruthless course, he has built up the food reserves of Germany so that the food situation in that country is the best among all of the nations that have been affected by the European debacle. Germany has enormous potato surpluses at this time. The Dutch also have been very careful in the conservation of their foodstuffs, and they have some food reserves. It is in Belgium that the most awful conditions of hunger and starvation exist, and next to Belgium the food problem is most acute in Norway and Poland. During the last few weeks limited amounts of food have gone into Finland, due to a modification of the British blockade, but the blockade is still rigidly enforced against the subjugated countries of continental Europe.

The wisdom of the Anglo-American policy in reference to the blockade that is keeping food away from the starving people of Europe may well be questioned. The people who are suffering are the friends of Britain and the friends of America. Their blood relations in the United States comprise a large cross section of our people, estimated to be 15,000,000 of our population, at least. If we get food to the starving, we will be saving the lives of our friends, for which they will be eternally grateful. It seems to be increasingly evident that if Britain insists on enforcing the blockade, it will run counter to the public opinion of the world, build up needless odium against the democracies, and play into the hands of Hitler, who is already trying to impress upon the subjugated countries that Britain, by refusing to let food come in, is prolonging and magnifying their misery. It should be obvious, it seems to me, that if Britain and America save these countries from their awful plight, Britain by releasing the blockade and America by shipping in food, the cause of democracy will be immeasurably strengthened throughout the world.

To those who make the point that charity begins at home; that we should look after our starving people first; and that we should not tax the already overburdened taxpayers at home to provide relief for those abroad, the answers are plain. In the first place, nobody in the United States is eating cats and dogs. Our worst conditions here are like heaven compared with those in Belgium.

In the second place, we have ample supplies of food to care for our own and at the same time assist other hungry people. The Commodity Credit Corporation in the United States owns or holds under loans 283,000,000 bushels of wheat; Argentina has 175,000,000 bushels in storage; and Canada has a surplus of 672,000,000 bushels. Argentina and the United States between them have 1,160,000,000 bushels of corn. We also have a surplus of pork, lard, fresh fruits, milk products, eggs, and meats. This should prove that we can afford to send some food to Europe without causing hardship to our own people. And in addition, our farmers are well prepared to raise far more food than we could possibly use ourselves.

In the third place it would not cost the taxpayers of the United States anything to furnish this relief, as the afflicted countries have enough frozen assets in this country and other resources to pay for every pound of food we would send to them. A plan of delivery has been prepared which gives complete assurance that all of the food shipped from America would go to the subjugated countries and no part of it would reach Germany.

In the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies we have an organization set up and ready to function for the relief of our distressed friends across the sea. If we furnish the aid their tragic situation calls for, these peoples will be more than friends; they will be bound to us with hoops of steel. In the field of relief Herbert Hoover is an administrator without a peer, who demonstrated his capacity to cope with colossal problems of this character in the wake of the first World War. He is a great humanitarian whose sympathies are as far-reaching as humanity itself. His plan to succor starving millions is about the grandest vision of humanitarian service the mind of man ever conceived, and in his devoted, unostentatious efforts to carry it into execution he deserves the sympathy and support of every American citizen.

The Public Debt and the New Deal's Program for Financing Defense

REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1941

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have requested time to recapitulate facts heretofore presented to the House relating to the loose fiscal policy of the New Deal and to give the membership some new facts which may be useful in the formulation of a new revenue bill.

It may be that even in the face of our national debt, present and prospective, some comfort may be found in the assurance of Thomas Babington Macaulay that:

No ordinary misfortune, no ordinary misgovernment, will do so much to make a nation wretched as the constant progress of physical knowledge and the constant effort of every man to better himself will do to make a nation prosperous.

It has often been found, said Macaulay—

that profuse expenditure, heavy taxation, absurd commercial restrictions, corrupt tribunals, disastrous wars, seditious persecutions, inundations have not been able to destroy capital so fast as the exertions of private citizens have been able to create it.

I hope Macaulay's philosophy can stand the test of the New Deal spending machine, which has spent $59,000,000,000 in 7 years, of which only $6,800,000,000 has been used for national defense. I shall go more into detail with reference to these expenditures in the course of my remarks.

We all know that a rising public debt and heavy taxes go together. No country has ever greatly increased its debt without being obliged also to raise more by taxation. It has also been true, particularly in our own national history, that taxes have been reduced as the debt was redeemed.

One reason for this relationship becomes clear if the public debt be thought of as a first mortgage on the earning power of the people. Every day in the year is tax day for all of us. The taxes to service the public-debt first mortgage fall not only on all who work but on all who eat.

How much is this Federal debt mortgage? On March 4, 1941, it was $46,132,000,000. This was $10,000,000,000 more than the total value of all farm land, buildings, and livestock as reported in the farm census of 1935. If all of the property in all of the States west of the Mississippi River could be sold today for its assessed value, as last reported by the Census Bureau, the total amount realized would not pay off all of this debt mortgage.

The interest on the Federal debt mortgage in 1941 will be about $1,100,000,000, or more than $300,000,000 in excess of the total ordinary expenditures of the Federal Government in any fiscal year prior to 1916. To pay this interest bill in 1941 will require almost all of the revenue that will be collected during the year from all of the following taxes: Liquor, capital stock, and estate taxes.

The Federal debt has increased rapidly in the last 8 years. On March 4, 1933, the total was approximately $20,200,000,000. This was a per capita Federal debt mortgage of about $163. Eight years later, on March 4, 1941, the per capita debt was about $352. In the first 8 years of the present administration the per capita debt has increased by 116 percent. This is the most rapid increase of debt in a like period during peacetime that has ever occurred in our own country or in any other country not afflicted by an uncontrollable inflation. That fact, as the President would say, "deserves a headline."

This is not all. In addition to the direct Federal debt of $46,130,000,000, the Government has guaranteed bonds and notes issued by its corporations and credit agencies to a total of $5,937,000,000. Under existing laws these corporations are authorized to issue a total of $14,900,000,000, which will carry this guarantee. None of these obligations are included within the statutory debt limit of $65,000,000,000.

There is yet another chapter in the story of the public debt. To the Federal debt must be added the State and local debt. On June 30, 1932, the State and local debt was $19,576,000,000, representing a per capita of $155.78. As of June 30, 1940, the total was $20,000,000,000, equal to a per capita of $150. Thus, in 1932 the total public debt represented a burden on each man, woman, and child of $312.42, but 8 years later this burden was $502. The per capita increase has been caused almost entirely by the growth of the Federal debt.

This debt is a first mortgage against every citizen. All actually pay taxes, whether they realize it or not. Every baby born in the United States begins life with a public-debt charge of $502 against his future earnings. Every couple that marries starts housekeeping with a public debt of $1,004 in addition to what they may owe on the furniture. Every family with three children is carrying the equivalent of a mortgage of $2,510, or enough to pay for a modest home.

We had already accumulated this tremendous national debt when, on May 16, 1940, President Roosevelt finally informed Congress that additional expenditures for national-defense purposes were a dire necessity. At that time the President believed that the national-defense requirements could be met by an additional appropriation of but $1,500,000,000 for that year, and that the total cost of the emergency defense effort would be only $4,000,000,000. But at least three additional requests for national-defense funds were made by President Roosevelt before the Seventy-sixth Congress adjourned.

The total amount of money appropriated for national-defense purposes for the fiscal year 1941 was $8,000,000,000, plus $4,000,000,000 of contract authorizations. Of this sum, $8,600,000,000 was for the Army and $3,400,000,000 for the Navy. In the President's Budget for the fiscal year 1942, that was submitted to Congress on the 8th of January 1941, it was estimated that the total cost of the defense program for the fiscal years 1941, 1942, and 1943 will be approximately $28,000,000,000. It was estimated that $6,464,000,000 will be spent in the fiscal year 1941; $10,811,000,000 will be spent in the fiscal year 1942; and the balance (approximately $12,000,000,000) apparently would be spent in subsequent years. As a consequence of the defense program, the cost to the Federal Government for the fiscal year 1940 was $9,127,000,000; for 1941 the estimate is $13,302,000,000. For 1942 it will reach the startling figure of $17,585,000,000, according to the last Budget message. Thus, in the 4-year period from 1938 to 1942, the cost of the Federal Government will have increased from $7,526,000,000 to $17,585,000,000, or 133 percent.

But this is not all. After Congress passed the lease-lend bill and it became law on March 11, 1941, President Roosevelt asked Congress for $7,000,000,000 of additional funds for national defense and aid to England in the period ending June 30, 1943. This, of course, is in addition to the $28,000,000,000 that was considered in the Budget message of January 8, 1941. Thus, despite the fact that President Roosevelt has repeatedly said that he has seen this defense emergency coming for years, he has failed to make financial plans to meet the situation. For first the New Deal believed that adequate defense would cost only $4,000,000,000, then $28,000,000,000, and now $35,000,000,000, all within a period of 10 months. One can well wonder whether the estimate will not be further increased in the next few months.

Undoubtedly we are confronted with a real emergency in the field of national defense. The present unsettled world situation makes it necessary for us to engage in vast defense expenditures in order to insure our own safety. Both political parties are agreed on that. We are confronted with a real emergency for which the New Deal has not adequately prepared the country financially. Financial preparedness for the current emergency is in many ways as important as preparedness in terms of armaments. The New Deal during 7 years has been engaging in a long continued spree of spending. Every year since the New Deal came to office there has been a deficit. The total expenditures of the Federal Government under the New Deal increased from $6,011,000,000 on June 30, 1934, to $9,636,000,000 on June 30, 1940. The revenues have increased from $3,115,000,000 to $5,703,000,000. In fact, in 1938 they reached $6,241,000,000, the highest tax collection in any peacetime year. Nevertheless, the Federal Government accumulated a total deficit of $22,662,000,000 during 7 years, or an average of slightly more than $3,000,000,000 a year. As a consequence, during 7 years the public debt has increased from $20,000,000,000 to $42,000,000,000; that is, it has more than doubled. Now it is actually in excess of $46,000,000,000.

On what did the New Deal spend $59,000,000,000 in 7 years? Almost 50 percent of this amount, or $29,000,000,000, went for purposes of recovery and relief, so-called, including agricultural benefit payments. Only approximately $6,800,000,000 went for national-defense purposes. In fact, in 1929 national defense accounted for 20.5 percent of the total expenditures of the Federal Government; whereas in 1936 national defense accounted for only 9.3 percent of the total expenditures of the Federal Government; and despite increases in defense expenditures in recent years, in 1940 expenditures for this purpose were but 16.34 percent of the total expenditures. According to the Budget, expenditures for national defense in 1941 will constitute 47 percent of the total expenditures of the Federal Government, and for 1942 they will constitute 63 percent of the Federal Government's expenditures.

President Roosevelt has proudly boasted that he saw this defense emergency coming for years ahead. In the light of his unusual foresight, and despite the fact that he believes we have a tremendous problem of spending money at home for the sake of spending it—supposedly to provide for relief and to

bring about recovery—one would imagine that a large part of such funds would have been utilized for defense purposes. Funds were made available by Congress for utilization for relief that could have been used on defense undertakings. This was especially true of the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933 making available $3,200,000,000 of public funds, the emergency Relief Act of 1935 making available $4,880,000,000, and the Public Works and Relief Act of 1938 making available about $1,800,000,000 worth of funds. Other acts made small sums available for the same purposes. Only $253,411,000 of such funds were allocated to the Army for defense purposes, and $427,721,000 were allocated to the Navy, or a total of $681,132,000 was allocated for defense purposes. The New Deal spent for public works and relief approximately $22,000,000,000. Thus, of all of the funds to be spent by the President practically at his free discretion for public works and relief only 3 percent was utilized for national-defense purposes.

Over a year ago, and several months before President Roosevelt gave vocal evidence of his awareness of a national-defense emergency, the study committee on national defense of the Republican conference of the House of Representatives pointed out the need of financial preparedness as an integral part of military preparedness. This statement declared relative to this matter:

> Such a possibility should convince us that the most serious weakness in the armor of our national defense today is the existence of a national debt of $44,000,000,000. There it stands, towering, ominous. Much as we should like to, we cannot consider our problem solely in terms of soldiers and sailors, of divisions and battleships.
>
> To deny that a healthy economic condition is vital to our national defense would be absurd. Our ability to mobilize and maintain the resources of the country in a major effort depends fundamentally upon the strength of our national economy. True, we need soldiers and sailors, divisions and battleships, with adequate modern equipment, but to secure their effectiveness in a long, gruelling struggle, and at the same time to preserve our institutions, we must mend our ways.
>
> It will not be an easy task. We have acquired a habit difficult to cast off. Many of our people, thoughtless of the consequences, laugh at debt and demand that spending shall go on. But it must be curbed, for we cannot go on this way and be secure in this troubled world.

STEPS TAKEN BY THE NEW DEAL TO FINANCE DEFENSE

What specific steps has the New Deal taken to finance the defense program? In June 1940 Congress enacted legislation which increased the debt limit from $45,000,000,000 to $49,000,000,000. This legislation provided for the issuance of $4,000,000,000 worth of United States Government securities to be repaid within a period of 5 years. Through the sale of these securities it was at that time naively believed that the entire national-defense program could be financed. In order to pay the interest on the securities and to amortize their retirement internal-revenue taxes were increased approximately 10 percent for a period of 5 years. It was believed that these taxes which were earmarked for the retirement of the previously mentioned bonds were to continue for a period of 5 years, and it was estimated that they would yield approximately $900,000,000 a year, or a total of $4,500,000,000 during the period they are to be in force. The second step that was taken was the enactment of an excess-profits tax in October 1940. This tax was enacted for two purposes: (1) to increase revenue, and (2) to tax the excess profits resulting from the defense program. It is estimated that this tax would yield between $300,000,000 and $400,000,000 on earnings made during the calendar year 1940, and twice that on those for 1941.

The third step that has been taken by the New Deal was in February 1941. This was to increase the debt limit from $49,000,000,000 to $65,000,000,000. It was said that this legislation was required at the present time because by May of this year the present debt limit of $49,000,000,000 would be exceeded. It is estimated in the Budget for 1942 that at the close of the fiscal year 1941 the total public debt in the United States would be $49,130,000,000, and by the close of the fiscal year 1942 it would be $58,367,000,000. Thus, of the total increase in the public debt that occurred in February 1941 all but $6,633,000,000 will have been taken up by the close of the fiscal year 1942. Of course, as was said earlier, all these figures are based on the 1942 Budget which was submitted previous to President Roosevelt's request for $7,000,000,000 to be spent under the so-called lease-lend bill. How these added expenditures will affect these debt estimates depends on the speed with which this money is spent. There has not as yet appeared any official estimate of the rate of expenditures under this bill.

WHAT IS THE NEW DEAL'S PROGRAM?

The three pieces of legislation that just have been mentioned do not by any means constitute a program of defense financing. They only meet a small part of the problem. What does the New Deal really contemplate doing about it? This is still largely a matter of conjecture, and it will continue to be so for several weeks to come, for the Treasury Department will not present its suggestions for additional revenue to the House Ways and Means Committee until after April 1. There is some evidence tending to indicate what is actually the New Deal's plan for financing national defense. Before this is examined a few fundamentals of national-defense financing ought to be considered.

SOME FUNDAMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

It should always be remembered that whatever way the defense program is financed, the costs will be borne by the present generation; it cannot be shifted to the shoulders of a future generation. Whatever devices are used the defense program will be paid for by goods and services produced at the present time. The defense program will require extensive reallocation of the Nation's producing capacity. This will result in a reduced real income for some groups in the community or a reduction in capital accumulation for other groups. The devices used to finance the program are important because they largely determine what groups in the community will pay for the defense program.

Primarily there are four ways by which the defense program can be financed. These four methods are reduction in ordinary nondefense expenditures, increased taxation, borrowing, and inflation. These four methods cannot be considered as completely separate and unrelated. Obviously, with the defense program of the size we have at present it could not be financed entirely by reducing the normal nondefense expenditures of the Government, for the defense program is much larger and much more costly than the total ordinary nondefense expenditures of the Government. Financing the defense program through borrowing would have a distinctly inflationary tendency on several grounds. If the borrowing was done through banks, the Government securities could be used as the basis for additional note issue by the banks that invest in the bonds. This is the easiest way to proceed. Any form of borrowing, wherein the money borrowed does not come out of current savings, would tend to be inflationary. The reason for this is that the amount of circulating medium will tend to be increased faster than production, and as a consequence prices would increase.

If the inflationary tendencies are to be minimized, several things would have to be done. Normally when a large portion of the national income is being diverted to the production of munitions and similar defense articles there would be a tendency for the production of consumers' goods to decline. If the amount of money in circulation tends to increase and the amount of consumers' goods produced decreases, there will be a strong tendency toward inflation. Consequently it is necessary either to take away through taxation a large part of the additional money coming into the hands of consumers through increased total wage bills, or to attempt to increase the production of consumption goods at the same time that the production of goods for national defense is also increasing. From the standpoint of the Government it is much more painless to insist upon duce the added supply of consumers' goods than to levy a tax upon the consumer to remove his added purchasing power. For thereby the consumers' enmity toward the Government would not be incurred. The taxpayer would not be disturbed, and if industry fails to produce the added supply of consumers' goods while still producing necessary armaments, industry can be attacked by government for failing to do its part. This is one of the simplest methods so far as the Government is concerned and is one of the most disastrous for the national economy as a whole.

Another method of financing part of the defense expenditures is through decreased expenditures for nondefense purposes. President Roosevelt in his Budget message for the fiscal year 1942, said that this was being done, but, as will be pointed out, the estimates do not bear him out. Likewise in a press conference on November 26, 1940, he urged the need for

economy. This portion of the press conference was reported in the New York Times, as follows:

WASHINGTON, November 26.—President Roosevelt said today that all public-works expenditures except those directly connected with munitions production would be cut to the bone.

Nonmilitary projects were being eliminated so far as possible from the next Budget, the President stated at a press conference, because the Government expected that by spring the defense program would employ a great number of those who are now unemployed.

Remarking that the Government was spending large amounts of money for defense and must economize somewhere, he made clear that he would not permit the defense program to act as a shield for carrying on domestic-works projects. He was establishing a strict rule that national defense meant munitions and not other developments, such as roads.

Under the rule, he said, the Government will shelve many types of programs which have consumed large parts of the Federal Budget—river and harbor improvements, highway construction, public-land acquisitions, additions to national forests, and other projects of a similar nature. * * *

The President said that he was enunciating his Budget principles at this time because by doing so he would clarify a point which certainly was of interest to Members of Congress.

Indicating his belief that some Members of Congress will try to push projects for their districts, Mr. Roosevelt asserted that if a Member from the Chesapeake Bay region wanted a creek deepened 4 to 6 feet to let oyster boats through, all kinds of briefs would pour in to prove that the project was vital to the national defense.

Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau, in testifying before the Senate Finance Committee on February 12, 1941, on the bill to increase the debt limit, declared:

Our whole economy and effort should be concentrated on national defense. I once again want to urge economy in Federal expenditures. I believe, therefore, that all Federal nondefense expenditures should be reexamined with a magnifying glass to make certain that no more funds are granted than are absolutely essential in the existing circumstances. (Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Finance, U. S. Senate, 77th Cong., 1st sess., on H. R. 2959, February 12, 1941, p. 4.)

When he applied the magnifying glass, with the aid of the Bureau of the Budget, to his own Treasury Department, he found it was necessary to increase expenditures by $7,000,000 from 1941 to 1942, and not reduce them.

Total expenditures for non-defense purposes in 1941 will be $6,839,000,000 as against the Budget estimate of $6,772,000,000 for 1942 for such purposes, or a reduction of only $67,000,000. The only sizable decrease in the estimates is for work relief (the need for which will be reduced by more than 50 percent) where the 1942 estimate is $1,034,000,000 against $1,477,000,000 for 1941. This amounts to a reduction of $443,000,000. Since the net reduction of nondefense expenditures is estimated to be only $68,000,000 it is evident that there were many other bureaucrats who applied their magnifying glasses with results similar to those of Secretary Morgenthau.

Another way that at least a part, if not all, of the added national defense expenditures could be financed is through increased taxes. To what extent the New Deal is going to use additional taxes as a method of financing the added expenditures is far from clear. But, as will be pointed out later, President Roosevelt in his Budget message for 1942 is not greatly interested in this method of financing the increased expenditures. Secretary Morgenthau in testifying before the House Committee on Appropriations in December 1940 said that he believed that at least two-thirds of all the expenditures of the Federal Government should be financed through taxation and no more than one-third through borrowing. When he was pressed to be more specific in the Senate Finance Committee hearings on the bill to increase the national debt (February 12, 1941) he said that revenue should be increased by $3,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1942. According to the budget, $1,600,000,000 of this would come from increased yields of present taxes as a result of the increased national income. Secretary Morgenthau refused to be at all specific as to what new taxes would be used to produce this additional $1,400,000,000. Even on this basis total revenue would be only $9,675,000,000 as against $17,483,000,000 expenditures. Taxes would be only 55 percent of expenditures and not 66 percent as the Secretary said he desired.

Of course, another method of financing the defense program would be through direct inflation. The New Deal has plenty of devices at its command to enable it to use this method. For example, Congress in 1933 conferred upon the President the power to issue $3,000,000,000 of greenbacks without any security. The President could further devaluate the dollar to 50 percent and make some money. The present silver stocks could be monetized and devalued, making a great paper profit. All told, President Roosevelt has at his command devices whereby he can increase the currency by no less than $11,000,000,000. Of course, such an inflation would absolutely ruin the national economy.

THE NEW DEAL'S PLAN FOR FINANCING DEFENSE

The New Dealers have what they regard as a slick plan for financing defense. The President does not directly state it, but it is implicit in his Budget message. Here, in commenting on the need for new taxes, he said:

There is no agreement on how much of such an extraordinary defense program should be financed on a pay-as-you-go basis and how much by borrowing. Only very drastic and restrictive taxation which curtails consumption would finance defense wholly on a pay-as-you-go basis. I fear that such taxation would interfere with the full use of our productive capacities. We have a choice between restrictive tax measures applied to the present national income and a higher tax yield from increased national income under less restrictive tax measures. I suggest, therefore, a financial policy aimed at collecting progressive taxes out of a higher level of national income. I am opposed to a tax policy which restricts general consumption as long as unused capacity is available and as long as idle labor can be employed.

We cannot yet conceive the complete measure of extraordinary taxes which are necessary to pay off the cost of emergency defense and to aid in avoiding inflationary price rises which may occur when full capacity is approached.

However, a start should be made this year to meet a larger percentage of defense payments from current tax receipts. The additional tax measures should be based on the principle of ability to pay. Because it is the fixed policy of the Government that no citizen should make any abnormal net profit out of national defense, I am not satisfied that existing laws are in this respect adequate.

I hope that action toward these ends will be taken at this session of the Congress. (Message transmitting the Budget, Jan. 3, 1941, p. xi, xii.)

Supposedly the defense program is to be financed primarily through added borrowing. Additional Government expenditures resulting from the national-defense program will increase the national income. The additional national income that will be produced in a year or two thereby will yield a higher return on the present taxes. Consequently, in later years it is alleged that the additional national income will yield higher taxes and thus ultimately some time in the future national defense will be paid for. This is simple and painless, for it will not require the taxpayer to bear an added burden resulting from defense in the form of higher taxes. In this above-mentioned quotation the President is adhering to nothing but the same New Deal policy of deficit financing that we have had during the depression. It is essentially based on the premise that through Government spending additional income can be produced; additional national income will yield higher returns from the present taxes and enable the Government to pay off the debt. This is nothing but the old pump-priming theory.

That this is the policy of the New Deal is evident from a quotation of Mr. Jerome Frank, then Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, before the Army Industrial College on April 6, 1940. This quotation is as follows:

Until the stage of full employment of resources is reached, we should give preference to those methods of war finance which induce a net increase in production, not merely a shift in production. In that period, as I see it, we should not, therefore, seek to cover the cost of armament by new taxes or forced loans, but mainly by borrowing, primarily from the banks and from the idle reserves of individuals. Under such conditions, it is even conceivable that we might finance part of the cost of armaments by issuing additional currency without inducing more than a moderate rise in the level of prices—a most important consideration as I shall presently indicate.

The situation is quite different, however, once the level of practically full productive capacity is reached. Then armament expenditure should be financed largely through taxes or through loans placed outside of the banking system, if we are to avoid a rise in the price level. A rise in prices in such a situation obviously would not lead to a further increase in production. (In Time of War Prepare for Peace, Jerome N. Frank. Address before the Army Industrial College, Washington, D. C., April 8, 1940.)

Dr. Gerhard Cohm, principal fiscal analyst in the United States Bureau of the Budget, expresses a similar view in the March 1941 issue of the Annals of

the American Academy of Political and Social Science. Here he even contended that the defense program will not cost us anything really, for our national income will be increased more than the total cost of the defense program.

These expenditures have stimulated the use of idle resources to such an extent that production for civilian consumption has increased in addition to the increase in defense production. * * *

It seems reasonable to assume that within 1 or 2 years national production can be stepped up to at least $90,000,000,000 (in terms of 1940 prices). That would be an increase of almost $20,000,000,000 over and above the annual rate of the national income in the first 6 months of the calendar year 1940. If such an increase in national income should be achieved and if the total defense program should absorb as much as $15,000,000,000 in that year, it would still leave an increase of $5,000,000,000 for consumption and investment over and above the level of the first 6 months of the calendar year 1940. (The Cost of Arming America, The Annals, March 1941, p. 11.)

For this theory to work successfully and not involve inflation at the same time that industrial production of goods for national defense increases tremendously there must also be an increase in the production of consumers' goods. If industry is to accomplish both of these objectives, there must be a tremendous plant expansion. After 8 years of uncertainty of the New Deal it would not be surprising if industry will fail to expand its plants as the New Dealers contend it should. If, instead of producing this added increase in the real national income, inflation should result, the industrialists will be blamed for the failure of the program. The President has definitely shown repeatedly that he has believed that increased production could go hand in hand with the defense program. In his speech of May 26, 1940, he said:

And, finally, this emergency demands that the consumers of America be protected so that our general cost of living can be maintained at a reasonable level. We ought to avoid the spiral processes of the World War. The soundest policy is for every employer in the country to help give useful employment to the millions who are unemployed. By giving to those millions an increased purchasing power, the prosperity of the whole country will rise to a much higher level.

And, according to the New York Times at a press conference held on May 28, 1940, the President expressed a similar view:

The President said that there was no reason for the country to become "discomboomerated" in apprehension of what may come to pass. The women of the country would not have to give up their cosmetics, lipsticks, and chocolate sodas in consequence of the preparedness program. It was the intention not to upset the normal trends of American life any more than necessary.

It is quite fashionable among New Dealers to point out that Germany has rearmed and is carrying on a war without inflation and supposedly with an increase in the national income. Thus the Annual Report of the Secretary of Agriculture for 1940 said:

Germany got ready for war without inflation, with prices and wages under strict control and with all surplus materials and labor taken for arming (p 34).

The German statistics on production and national income are open to question as to their accuracy. It is generally known that German statistics under Hitler have been most inaccurate. Further, Germany has most extensive and rigid controls over the national economy that would tend to limit inflation.

This same annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture also presented the New Deal theory of financing defense as above outlined:

How the defense program affects prices and the demand for farm products and the extent to which it does or does not promote inflation will depend largely on the methods used to finance it. We might avoid inflation altogether. This would require heavy consumer taxes to restrict consumption and the buying power of consumers, and possibly other means of stabilizing wages and prices. In fact, in recommending the preparedness program the President recommended an increase in taxes.

As we go ahead with fiscal measures of this type, however, it is important not to increase the tax rates too rapidly. With millions of men still idle and with great factories only partially active, we can produce great quantities of tanks, airplanes, armaments, and munitions without reducing our production of food, clothing, or other articles for civilian use. As long as we have unused labor and plant capacity the danger of inflation is not imminent.

Eventually, however, competition may begin between the Government and the consuming public for labor and materials. The danger of inflation will begin at that point. We shall need a carefully worked out fiscal program which will maintain the purchasing power of the low-income groups and yet not encourage excessive civilian consumption. It will be difficult to hit the golden mean between production for defense and production for civilian use. Failure to hit it, however, will either prolong the unemployment or cause inflation. Hitting the mark will obviate both perils (p. 35).

Dr. Cohm does envisage that a tax program would have some place in this system. His tax program is outlined in a monograph published by the Temporary National Economic Committee entitled "Taxation, Recovery, and Defense." This program of taxation is set forth in the following quotation from that monograph:

1. The beginning period: This is characterized by the present economic conditions of widespread unemployment, large unused resources of material, plant, and equipment. In this period, while the entire economy is still operating on a peacetime basis and with its attention focused on peacetime needs, the center of attention is shifted to military preparedness, and the demands of the peacetime civil sector of the society become secondary.

This initial period necessitates making great sums of money immediately available for plant expansion; part payment of industrial orders; reorganization of the military services; continuation and expansion of public works vital to preparedness, and for which, later on, no surplus manpower will be available; large-scale projects for training skilled workers; and adjustments between the preparedness program and the requirements of the civil sector of the economy.

Neither the present tax system nor any proposed revisions which could be made immediately effective would bring in sufficient current revenue to meet the cost of initial expenditures for the preparedness program. * * *

Borrowing becomes essential to meet the immediate needs of the preparedness program. In the present capital market such borrowings can be made on most favorable terms. The debt limit must be raised substantially to make this possible.

During this period of change-over to a preparedness economy, when full employment has not yet been attained, an increased excise-tax program adversely affects the buying power of the people. * * *

2. The second period: This second period, dependent upon several incalculable factors, is characterized by a very substantial measure of employment and use of our resources, principally for preparedness purposes.

In this stage of developing the preparedness economy a large proportion of its costs should be paid for out of taxes in income and wealth. Care should be taken to avoid undesirable social consequences resulting from wartime profiteering and millionaire making without setting up any barriers to the attainment of the central purpose of an adequate preparedness program.

Specifically, the rate structure of the personal income tax should be revised, with well-graduated rates, and the loopholes removed. Such loopholes seriously impair the income tax, and particularly in such a time of national emergency cannot be defended. * * *

3. The third period: In this period of the preparedness economy full employment will have been achieved, the preparedness or actual war program will be under way, and the maximum resources of the economy will be in use, and incipient or actual scarcity will be noticeable. In this phase of the economy the pressure for price rises and inflation are to be expected.

Consequently the fiscal policy and tax program should be made to fit these changed economic conditions as nearly as possible.

The personal income tax should be altered once more, broadening the tax base by lowering exemptions and increasing rates.

Depending on the economic situation at this time the excess-profits tax should be revised to curtail profits drastically.

A selected list of commodities, including such things as automobiles, radios, gasoline, refrigerators, etc., which can be safely dispensed with, should be subjected to high excise taxes definitely intended to curtail mass luxury consumption, and the limitation of supply would beneficially affect the efforts devoted to the preparedness program.

A general "turn-over" tax should be enacted, based on the "value added by manufacture," with tax credits allowed for Federal and State pay-roll taxes in force, and tax exemptions for the necessities of life. The proposed tax rate is 4 percent to begin with, but if more money is needed to supplement other revenues, then the rate should be advanced to obtain the required sum. * * * (pp. 247-248.)

Of course, for such a program to work according to its proponents, the various taxes contained in it would have to come into operation at exactly the right time or it might have undesirable results. The author of this monograph, Mr. H. Dewey Anderson, pointed out that for Dr. Cohm's plan to work, Congress would have to give up its power to the President, for only he would have enough intelligence to carry it out:

The fullest effect of this somewhat complicated tax program and fiscal policy cannot be achieved, providing vast sums of money as

needed and preventing undesirable effects on the economy, unless the program is closely geared to the entire administrative policy and defense program. As this must necessarily be under the supervision of the executive branch of Government, which is in the best position to know the needs of the moment, it seems desirable to have the Congress empower the Executive to apply one or another of these taxes and fiscal controls as they are required (p. 249).

Thus, in order to provide for defense, according to this theory, it would be necessary to sacrifice our democratic institutions.

A report of the Study Committee on National Debt of the Republican Conference of the House of Representatives in May 1939 reached the conclusion that the similar pump-priming program that the New Deal had adhered to for 6 years had failed; its conclusions were:

We have now had 6 years' experience with the New Deal pump-priming or spending theory. We believe that this is sufficient time to test any theory, especially a theory the validity of which has always been questioned, and which, if invalid, can result in economic disaster. As a result of a careful and thorough study of all factors we reach the conclusion that a spending program as such has no place in a well-grounded and general recovery plan. Our condemnation is complete and emphatic.

The best proof that spending has failed to promote recovery is the fact that eleven to twelve million unemployed American workers are looking for jobs. In the face of this alone, it is folly to contend that spending has worked, for in the words of the President, "to put people back to work" was the one purpose of the first spending bill as well as every bill that has since been passed.

It is equally evident that the stimulation of consumption-goods spending has not led to a revival of capital-goods spending. While there is no doubt that some stimulation of capital expenditures may be accomplished in this way, whatever amount has occurred has not been sufficient to promote a sustained recovery. Statistics contained in a study published recently by the National Bureau of Economic Research indicate that while total expenditures for durable goods and for private construction dropped from about 14.5 billion dollars in 1939 to 3.3 billion dollars in 1933, that they increased to only $6,000,000,000 by 1935, after 2 years of heavy spending. The figures in this study only go through 1935, but if one allows for a further increase of capital-goods spending from 1936 to 1938, it is clear that the total still remains far short of the amount spent before the depression.

By merely drifting we are adopting the slick New Deal method of financing defense on the basis of the discredited pump-priming theory. Now it is highly doubtful if it will work because it is generally realized that the production of consumers' goods cannot be increased as fast as purchasing power in the hands of the consumer is increasing. This failure will constitute the groundwork of inflation unless price-control mechanisms are developed. If we have runaway inflation it means that the cost of defense was borne by those patriotic persons who bought Government bonds.

The Shelterbelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1941

EDITORIAL ARTICLE FROM THE MAGAZINE AMERICAN FORESTS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, when the proposal to construct shelterbelts in the Prairie States was made a few years ago it met with a great deal of skepticism. There were many who went further and denounced it as a wild, harebrained scheme which had no possible chance to succeed. I must confess that in the beginning I was one of those who doubted its practicability, although conceding its great value if it could be made successfully.

Now, beginning the seventh year, this project has become a notable conservation effort and one of the greatest forestry projects ever undertaken in this or any other country. It is stating it mildly to say that the success of this program has far exceeded the expectations of its proponents and has astonished those who were sincerely skeptical in the beginning.

My district is one of those included in the area of shelterbelt plantings. I have watched the progress closely from the very beginning. I have seen it develop in an amazing way. It is a success from every standpoint.

In carrying on this project the Forest Service, with its usual skill and thoroughness, has done a piece of pioneering work in a superb manner and under very adverse conditions. It must be remembered that the 6 years following the initiation of this project were among the most unsatisfactory from a climatic standpoint ever encountered in the plains country. No worse years could have been selected for beginning a project of this kind. Furthermore, the Forest Service has no regular appropriation for this work, but has been compelled to rely upon W. P. A. and other emergency funds. The restrictions surrounding the expenditure of these funds have made it extremely difficult to operate in many instances. Furthermore, in the beginning it was not always easy to secure the cooperation of farmers and local officials, because they doubted the practicability of the program. Suffice to say, however, that since the results of the program became apparent the cooperation of farmers and local officials has been splendid and this cooperation, of course, has had much to do with its success.

Notwithstanding the fact that every obstacle up to date has been met and overcome, the place has now been reached where the work will be severely handicapped unless a regular appropriation for its continuance can be made. Such an appropriation is authorized under the Norris-Doxey Act passed a few years ago. The Senate has recently adopted an amendment to the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill providing $300,000 for the shelterbelt during the coming fiscal year. I do not know of any way by which $300,000 can be better spent for conservation than this.

In the April number of American Forests, published by that splendid conservation organization, the American Forestry Association, appears an editorial entitled "Prairie Tree Banks." I believe that Members of Congress will be interested in reading this endorsement of the shelterbelt program by such a high authority in the forestry world. For that reason, I include it herewith:

[From the American Forests for April 1941]

PRAIRIE TREE BANKS

Within a year after Franklin Roosevelt was first elected President he proposed, among other conservation measures, the planting of trees on a large scale in the Prairie States of the Middle West. His thought was that belts of trees properly located and spaced would protect farm lands against droughts and wind erosion and would help make farm life more secure. The proposal was a daring and imaginative one. Immediately it became a target of wide criticism and ridicule. The idea of gridironing the prairie with strips of trees from the Canadian border to Texas was branded as idealistic, impracticable, and a waste of money. Nevertheless, the President designated the United States Forest Service to formulate and initiate the project as a cooperative undertaking with the farmers. This it did in 1934 with a million dollars made available from Federal emergency funds.

During the 6 years which have intervened, the project has been carried forward, although subjected from year to year to uncertainty of Federal operating funds. The results shown are impressive. By study and selection of planting sites and of species of trees adapted to prairie conditions, foresters and farmers working together have successfully established belts of protective trees on over 22,000 prairie farms. Joined together, these shelterbelts would extend for nearly 14,000 miles and would embrace 110,000,000 living trees. Some of the early plantings are now affording adjacent croplands protection against the blowing away of soil and planted seed and thereby yielding the farmers substantial benefits. In addition, the trees are holding moisture in the surrounding soil, protecting stock from winter winds and summer heat, providing wood products and recreation areas for the rural community, attracting wildlife, and in general making the prairie farm more hospitable, livable, and dependable. They are indeed a bank on the farm, paying interest not only to the farmer and his family but to the whole community.

The Prairie States planting project is no longer an impractical scheme. By its own showing and results after only 6 years, it ranks as the most notable example of forestation to be found in America. It has redeemed the faith of the President in trees and in the ability of American foresters to

make trees grow under adverse conditions. The weakest point in the undertaking today is uncertainty of its continuance. From the beginning, the Federal Government's share of costs has been provided largely from W. P. A. funds, which may be curtailed or cut off any year. In the light of the demonstrated services which these shelter forests are rendering in making more secure the economy of the Prairie States and through them the economy of the Nation as a whole, a sounder and more permanent method of financing seems now justified. Otherwise, the full potential benefits inherent in the project may be lost.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS, OF TEXAS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over the radio on April 10, 1941:

People of America, comrades in a great responsibility, I come to you tonight as one who wants to be useful in this tragic hour of the world when our Nation faces the gravest perils in its history, and in some of its major attitudes is following in the footsteps of so-called democracies which tonight no longer exist.

For 28 years I have been a Member of the Congress. I have some familiarity with our present situation and of the tragic developments abroad. All my life I have been interested in the facts rather than in the theories of things. I have studied your business here while my people have taken care of the politics of our relationship. I have not been distracted by any concern for prestige or position because I have, I believe, a fairly accurate notion of the relative values of things. I believe I know something of the nature of government—how it operates, what happens when certain things are done to it, the natural laws which govern it, and I know human nature as it is related to government. I have searched for a knowledge of this business in the experience of the ages, not in the theories of men. Having been deprived of the opportunity of institutional education and thrown upon my own resources, I have developed, I trust, some capacity for examining the facts of things and how things work. I have no delusions about human greatness nor craving for hero worship. Only God is great in this great economy. These things I state to persuade your consideration of what I shall say to you as one of your "watchmen on the tower."

Immediately following the World War we, and the other democracies, swung rapidly from a high peak of unselfish patriotism, to the other extreme—the distinctive characteristics and inevitable consequences of which were clearly discernible then to any detached student of current developments. I tried to make our people realize what we were doing then and the inevitable results, but nobody could be bothered. People listened only to what they wanted to hear. It was the grand age of the jazz—jazz music, jazz literature, jazz philosophy, and jazz statesmanship. Each of the developments which followed, one after the other, was equally visible but the people would not listen. They would not see, they would not be warned. The historian of the future will probably classify that period as the most freakish, the most nonunderstandable part of the history of our culture and civilization, ending for others already, and for us certainly, in the greatest tragedy of the ages, unless we in America, now as a united people, will be warned by the experience of others and by common sense before it is too late; unless we equip ourselves quickly—physically, morally, patriotically, and in every other way, to meet the impending test of our ability to endure we will fail at the test unless we do. Such a preparation, such a fitness, might prevent us from having to meet the supreme test. Nothing short of it can. Don't permit anyone to fool you about that. A soft people internally weak, looking for opportunities for profits and gains rather than for sacrifice and service, unwilling to pay the price of liberty, cannot survive in these times.

With great rapidity we are moving toward actual fighting contact with this World War, unprepared either to win or to defend ourselves. Wars are won or lost in the factories now. Frenchmen in the factories of France were winning the war for Germany long before the Maginot Line broke. These people now conquered and enslaved, finally came to realize that fact, but it was too late.

The things we are promising to one group of the belligerents, which groups are one by one being conquered, and our challenge to the other group, constituting the most thoroughly equipped and efficient fighting machine the world has ever seen, considered in the light of what we are doing to make good our promises and preparing ourselves to meet the challenge if we are attacked, do not make sense. That is what I am trying to get across to the American people, and I am having difficulty in doing it. When I tender the services of the Committee on the Judiciary to the executive agencies of the Government, I am charged with trying to "put them on the spot." When I try to get an acceptance of the attitude that nobody ought to profit from the necessities of his Government in the time of its greatest peril, there is no general reaction. When I try to separate the great bulk of loyal labor from individuals who are not, to protect labor against the loss of public opinion, through these paralyzing strikes I am called a labor baiter. When I try to arouse the States to a sense of their responsibility and duty, I am charged with trying to "pass the buck." When I try to arouse the people to a sense of their responsibility, their duty, and their power, and their peril, I am told that it is the Government's business. I am trying to get every agency, every influence aroused and conscious of our danger, solidified by that consciousness and unitedly on the job, before it is too late. I want your cooperation and your help, because in this country public opinion is our supreme law.

We are all in the same boat. We face the same dangers—laborers and capitalists, the people in the factory and the people in the office, the people in the field—everywhere. Promising planes to Yugoslavia, promising planes to Greece, promising things to England, and needing with great urgency everything for our own defense that we can produce by working 24 hours per day every day; and all the while having factories idle or slowed down does not make sense. For American citizens, whether owners or operatives, who are sharing in the common peril, actually to be stopping the wheels of industry, the operation of which is absolutely essential to make good our promises to people whom we have induced to resist aggression, and absolutely essential in order to give us even a substantial chance to escape the common disaster of the democracies of the world, does not make sense. This paralysis of productive energy, however, is not the fundamental thing—not the fundamental cause. I want to talk to you about that now. I am one of your watchmen on the tower reporting to you tonight what I see. The cause lies deeper. We have to examine deeper than merely making munitions of war and getting factories into operation. We have been doing too much talking about preserving the gains of labor and the profits of business. That is about all we have heard for a long time. We have not been hearing much about service and sacrifice, preparation for the supreme effort, in the present situation when only a people willing to give all if necessary, willing to die if necessary in order to preserve those things which make life worth living, have a chance to survive. There come such times. Such a time has come to America. It is now. It came to France. They responded to the challenge, but it was too late. The Maginot line had been broken.

In America each group is looking at its own perfections, looking to see what is wrong with the others. If each would turn the spotlight upon himself it would help. "What is wrong with me?" "What is my attitude?"

It is unbelievable when we really look at the situation we are in, that any American citizen in this tragic hour in the history of all time, in this time of his Nation's, his own, his children's greatest peril, would be considering "What advantage can I personally get out of this situation directly or indirectly from my Government?"—willing to make merchandise of his own interests, the perils of his Nation and the hope of peoples to have a chance to be free. It does not make sense.

We have but one business in America today, and that is to save this country as a place where men may remain free. What business do they have now in England and in many other parts of the world? Just one business. If they had attended to that business when they should have done it, they would be living in peace instead of in the midst of dread and ruin and death. They got on the job too late. If we will attend to that business now, we may not have to go through what they are going through on the other side. That is our only chance to escape. Has anybody little enough sense not to know that? In this country at this time is centered the hope of the ages for all the world. It does not make sense what we are doing. As a people we are not under the solidifying influence of a consciousness of our common danger, the shadow of which grows thicker each day as we move closer and closer toward the battle line of this war, utterly unprepared, spiritually, patriotically, or physically to win the war or to defend ourselves. What I am saying may not be agreed to now—I will be misquoted and misunderstood now, but I would wager my life that if we do not agree upon these things essential to our security now when we can do it, we will wish we had before we get through. We have not a chance to do what we are doing and escape attack unless we can back it up with a military preparedness so complete, a people so powerful in their union, high purpose, courage, unselfish devotion and patriotism, that nobody will risk the attack. We have been making noises like an eagle but we ought to be doubly certain that we are not strutting our stuff like a fat chicken before as hungry a hawk as ever swooped to the kill.

Great epochs come to the world which try the souls and test the fiber of people. This is such a time. We are not going to escape the test. We are not going to escape the consequences of our failure to meet it, either, if we fail. I know that. That is why I am driving so hard these stressful, dangerous days, doing everything I can to arouse, unite, and prepare my people before it is too late.

I am convinced that if the American people should become conscious of the facts of

our situation we could do the job. We would not be fighting for profits and advantages now. They quit fighting for profits in England, but it was too late for them to escape the rain of death from the skies. The French people quit, everybody did, employers and employees; they worked until they dropped, men, women, and children, but the Maginot line was broken. It was too late. We are going to be willing to give all we have to our Government before this thing is over. The things we are fighting for now will seem mighty insignificant before we get through. The French people can tell you. The English people can tell you. The blood-soaked lands of the world can tell you. The vision is before our eyes; the warning is before our eyes. We are now walking in their footsteps toward the same doom. It does not make sense. We have our Maginot line, too—a thin line of battleships afloat upon the seas. What if it should break. There is no margin of safety still left for us to squander.

We have to swing away from selfish, self-centered, group-concerned, short-sighted self-interest, which now, unfortunately, is blighting our souls and making us unfit to win. I am not singling out labor. All of us equally. The fuller life we have heard so much about has not been a greater courage, a greater patriotism, the greater fitness to be free, greater fitness to live, but the fuller of gasoline, moving-picture shows, prize fights, and things of that sort. Such a people cannot win. It is not written in the book of destiny that such a people can hold the line against the combined influences of the world that challenge today the right of men to be free.

We have been doing a lot of mighty big talking considering what we are prepared to back up, telling everybody to stay out of the Western Hemisphere or fight. From the tip of Cape Horn to the frozen seas of the north we say to the rest of the world, "stay out." Besides this hemisphere, we are having much to say about what is happening in every corner of the earth today, in the conflicts in Europe, in Africa, in Asia—all over the world. I state this not in criticism but as a fact which an intelligent people cannot afford to ignore in this world aflame with the passions and the horrors of war. Everything we have or can hope for we put at stake in this world at war.

We must reach and solidify through the realization of a common danger and a common interest the loyal patriotic people of this country in the factories, in the fields—everywhere. We must agree that we have but one business that is now worthy of consideration and that is the preservation of this country as a place where people will still have a chance to be free. We must agree that we will see to it that any just grievance of labor will be attended to and that some better method than that of paralyzing these plants necessary for our security must be resorted to. We must agree that this Nation shall not be left impotent in the presence of its enemies. We must agree that its young men who are being called to the colors shall have the best equipment which a grateful people can provide for these young men who are preparing to give their lives if need be for their country—for the rest of us. It shall not be allowed by the people, by the Federal Government, or the government of the States that these boys in uniform shall be deprived, by strikes or lockouts in the factories, of the best that the genius and effort of a people fit to live in the same world with these young men, can give, to insure a national preparedness most calculated to prevent any attack, or if attacked, the best equipment to protect themselves and defend this country. Anything less than that will not long be tolerated by any people fit to win. I warn the Nation that the morale of these boys in uniform cannot stand the strain of such spectacles as we have been seeing in this country lately. Their hearts cannot sustain, their courage cannot survive to inspire the supreme sacrifice for a government which stands by passively permitting those who will not operate these factories necessary to equip these boys, beat up and prevent those who would.

I absolve the rank and file of labor. The things some of these leaders are responsible for is more unfair to the loyal, patriotic laboring man than to anybody else. Their boys are in uniform the same as anybody else. Their stake in this Government, in its security, in the opportunity to escape being driven as a slave by a dictator is as great as that of anybody else. In addition to this, their hard-earned support of public opinion, the thing which they have earned through years and years of struggle and upon which they must depend, is being driven away from them by these leaders who recklessly disregard what the people think or will stand for or ought to stand for—people whose boys are in uniform.

My time is about expired. I discussed these matters more fully in a recent speech in the House under the title "Strikes in Defense Industries—What They Did to France—What They Are Doing to Our National Security—What They Are Doing to Labor," including the testimony of William C. Bullitt, recently Ambassador to France, and of Merrill C. Meigs, Chief of the Air Division, Office of Production Management. If you will send me a postcard, with your name and address plainly given, I will send you a copy of it—HATTON W. SUMNERS, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

In this closing minute will you pledge with me, each one, that so help me God, insofar as I can make it possible, regardless of the cost, this country of ours shall remain one place where people have a chance to be free. I wish to thank you and the National Broadcasting Co. for affording me this opportunity.

National Old-Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. U. S. GUYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE KANSAS SENATE

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact a law which will provide for national old-age pensions, adopted by the Senate of the State of Kansas on April 2, 1941.

Senate Resolution No. 26

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact a law which will provide for national old-age pensions

Whereas no provision is made for the retirement income for those who have reached retirement age, or who will attain that age, who have, as farmers, business or professional men, or in other capacities, created jobs for themselves and others, nor for those who have been employed on farms, in homes, churches, public offices, or in other employment excluded by the Federal Social Security Act, except by submitting to poverty registration of themselves and all of the members of their family, while retirement income and widows' pensions are made available to all employed in business and industrial establishments without question as to their economic status; and

Whereas there is an adequate need for old-age pensions for aged persons in this country; and

Whereas it would be more practicable for persons to be paid on a national basis rather than on a State basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas, That we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to enact some legislation which will provide adequate old-age pensions on a national basis; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be made a permanent record in the proceedings of the senate, and the secretary of the senate be directed to have copies of this resolution sent to each Member of the Kansas delegation in the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States and to the Vice President of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Adopted April 2, 1941.

CARL E. FRIEND,
President of the Senate.
CLARENCE W. MILLER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Resolutions of the Japanese - American Citizens League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1941

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I have been requested to insert the following:

Whereas in these times of unrest and uncertainty because of world conditions it is vitally necessary for the national welfare to have national unity; and

Whereas national unity is not possible when American citizens are discriminated against on grounds of race or color: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Japanese-American Citizens League go on record as being unalterably opposed to any form of discrimination against any group of citizens based on race or color, and that every effort be made to bring about national unity of all American citizens in order to be able to face any emergency or crisis from within or without.

Whereas in the cause of national defense it is the duty of every able-bodied citizen to be willing and ready to sacrifice his life for the defense of his country; and

Whereas American citizens of Japanese ancestry are always ready and willing to do their utmost for the welfare of their country; and

Whereas it has been called to our attention that unnecessary rules and regulations have been set up to discriminate against citizens of Japanese ancestry to join the Nation's armed forces, thereby making it impossible for them to fulfill their duties and responsibilities as American citizens for the defense of their country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Japanese-American Citizens League call to the attention of the President and the Congress in order that such unnecessary and restrictive rules and regulations be eliminated in order that American citizens of Japanese ancestry may prove their loyalty to the United States and be enabled to participate in the defense of their country by being able to enter any branch of the armed forces necessary for national defense; and

Whereas American citizens of Japanese ancestry, by unanimous thought and action, are loyal citizens of the United States; and

Whereas it is the desire of all American citizens of Japanese ancestry to show their allegiance to the United States: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Japanese-American Citizens League in general assembly in Portland, Oreg., this 2d day of September 1940, reaffirm without any reservation our allegiance to the Constitution of the United States and to our American ideals and institutions.

A Practical Peace Measure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE FORT WAYNE (IND.) NEWS-SENTINEL

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel, of April 11, 1941:

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of April 11, 1941]

A PRACTICAL PEACE MEASURE

Representative GEORGE W. GILLIE, of the Fourth Indiana District, and Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, of New Hampshire, in the House and Senate, respectively, are sponsoring a joint resolution of high national importance, which calls for "prohibiting the use of the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft for transporting, delivering, or convoying articles or materials to all belligerent countries."

Here is a definite, concrete measure upon which the people can register anti-war sentiment in letters and telegrams addressed to Representative GILLIE, Senator RAYMOND E. WILLIS, Senator FREDERICK VAN NUYS, and President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Washington, D. C.

This Gillie-Tobey resolution, designated as House Joint Resolution 158, has been referred to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; and it will slumber there forever unless the people immediately rise up and demand that it be brought out for debate and enactment.

The Gillie-Tobey resolution provides that—

"Except in a time when the United States is engaged in war, hereafter no part of the land or naval forces of the United States, and no vessel documented, or aircraft registered or licensed, under the laws of the United States, shall be used, directly or indirectly, beyond the limits of the territorial waters of the United States and its Territories and possessions, to transport or deliver, or in connection with the transportation or delivery of, or for convoy purposes in connection with the transportation or delivery of, any articles or materials to or for the use of any foreign country with respect to which the President has issued a proclamation under section 1 of the neutrality law of 1939, or which is engaged in actual hostilities with one or more foreign countries even though a state of war has not been declared or recognized in any such proclamation."

That resolution is short, simple, plain, explicit.

It gives clear expression to the opposition to convoys. And its enactment is the only means by which the people, through their Congress, can now possibly stay the hand of anybody in the executive branch who may be interested in precipitating war for this country by resort to a system of American convoys and deliveries.

In order to expedite consideration and enactment of this extremely important legislation, every interested citizen—and what citizen is not interested?—should immediately send letters not only to the President, their Representative, and their Senators, but also to Representative SOL BLOOM, of New York, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and to Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Representative GILLIE has urged all his constituents to continue sending him expressions of their views on all major issues. He has rightly stressed the importance of such public participation in the democratic processes of translating public sentiment into public law.

He deserves your cooperation in this practical Christian undertaking to implement the preponderant will for peace in the form of your expressions endorsing the resolution which he and Senator TOBEY have drafted to prohibit courses of action which will render peace impossible.

Accordingly, The News-Sentinel now urges both those who have previously written to Washington and those who for any reason have heretofore failed to write, to do so this very evening, without another hour's delay.

The St. Lawrence Seaway As a National-Defense Project Is a Myth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include therein an address delivered by me over the red network of the National Broadcasting Co., April 3, 1941, entitled "The St. Lawrence Seaway As a National-Defense Project Is a Myth":

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. For months America has been engaged in the greatest defense effort in the history of this Nation. Tonight we have under arms 1,400,000 men, while our defense industries are working day and night in a gigantic effort to reach peak production so that our national-defense program may be made effective to meet any emergency.

Despite the fact we are at peace with all nations, Congress has appropriated since September 1939 approximately $40,000,000,000 in the name of national defense, while during the World War our actual defense expenditures were only $19,000,000,000.

The American citizen is conscious of the fact that the legal debt limit has been raised to $65,000,000,000 to meet the problem of national defense, and that it is freely predicted the debt limit may exceed $100,000,000,000 in the near future. It is common knowledge that this increased cost of Government will be paid through the medium of taxation.

The American people are proud of their heritage and no sacrifice is too great on their part to insure continuance of liberty and freedom. To those of us who have been elected as Representatives of the people, it is our duty to closely scrutinize every proposal that is labeled as necessary for our national defense.

While we are quick to recognize legitimate defense measures and support them wholeheartedly, as revealed by the overwhelming approval given appropriations requested as necessary, we are loathe to put our seal of approval on pet ideas that have been tagged as necessary defense legislation when their alleged usefulness to national defense is an insult to the intelligence of the American people.

Since the beginning of the present war in Europe priority rights have been given numerous projects on the assumption that they were necessary to our national defense. Such measures were recognized as purely domestic, and while their relation to national defense may have been questionable, many of us gave our approval because of the resulting benefit to the Nation as a whole.

When the President of the United States on March 21 sent a message to Congress telling of his intention to ask approval for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project as necessary to national defense, Congress immediately recognized the return of a political pet idea defeated by the Senate in 1934 and now garbed in new regalia—the armor of national defense.

The St. Lawrence seaway is not a new idea. Since the turn of the century it has raised its head many times only to be subdued by calm deliberation and sound reasoning. On March 19, 1941, after 5 years of negotiations, President Roosevelt authorized the signing of a treaty with Canada for the construction of a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep waterway and the development of the hydroelectric resources of the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River.

We are told that the St. Lawrence seaway project, which cannot possibly be completed and in operation before 1947, 6 years hence, is a necessary adjunct to our defense of the Western Hemisphere.

In the same breath, industries within the Great Lakes region are promised cheap power; Great Lakes shipbuilding yards are promised huge contracts to build oceangoing vessels, inland cities, such as Duluth, Chicago, Cleveland, and Detroit, are to become great inland ports, and the midwestern farmer is offered cheap transportation rates for his products.

The treaty contemplates that the project be divided in two parts, one for the construction of dams on the St. Lawrence River to be used in the development of new sources of cheap hydroelectric power subsidized by the Government, and the other for the construction of a 27-foot channel from Montreal to the head of the Great Lakes, a distance of 1,200 miles, 90 percent of which is wholly within the Dominion of Canada, and at an eventual cost of $1,200,000,000.

The initial appropriation to be asked from Congress will be applied to the construction program for the International Rapids section. For this section alone the combined cost of both the navigation and power development

programs will amount to approximately $267,000,000, the United States paying $206,000,000, since Canada is to be given credit for the cost of construction of the Welland Canal, which will be a component part of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

The average American is being led to believe that the St. Lawrence project is being wholeheartedly accepted by not only this Nation but likewise by our Canadian neighbors. On the contrary, it is common knowledge that not only high-Government officials in Canada but the people in general have opposed this project for years as being economically unsound.

This is evidenced by the following statement made by the Canadian Minister of Finance to the House of Commons on February 19, 1941, when he said, "The St. Lawrence Waterway Project is beyond the realm of financial possibility so far as Canada is concerned."

Canadian opposition to the St. Lawrence Waterway Project has become stronger since the Dominion of Canada became engaged in the present war. They frown upon this project since it will be the means of depleting their finances and dividing their efforts to win the war.

Despite the wild assertion by the advocates of the St. Lawrence Seaway that Canada recognizes such a project as necessary to their national defense, let me read you a direct quotation from Dr. Thomas H. Hogg, Chief Engineer of the Hydro-Electric Commission of Ontario, the Canadian agency which would develop and have at its disposal one-half of the St. Lawrence power. Dr. Hogg stated, "It is quite evident that this development cannot be classed as a war measure for even if it were undertaken tomorrow it would be 6 or 7 years before it could become of use. Yet the project is persistently misrepresented as a war measure which far from helping would actually handicap war work."

We can well appreciate the position the Canadian people have been forced to take on the St. Lawrence seaway project. Were it not for the American program of aid to Great Britain our Canadian neighbors would be as militant in their opposition as millions of Americans who recognize this project as a destructive influence because of its devastating effect on the economic stability of both nations.

It is not difficult for us to agree with our Canadian neighbors that the proposed St. Lawrence seaway is of little value and cannot be justified as a national-defense measure. Since we as a Nation are building our own defenses and engaged in a superhuman effort to aid Great Britain the digging of an international ditch and putting the Government of the United States in the power business on a larger scale and at a cost of over $1,000,000,000 is not only ridiculous when Great Britain needs ships and implements of war, but it is likewise an undreamed-of folly.

It has been repeatedly pointed out that this seaway and power project will require at least a period of 7 years before it can be placed in operation. During the construction of the locks, dams, and generating plants and after completion the entire project, both from a power and seaway standpoint, will prove an easy target for enemy bombers or "fifth columnists." Even the ships using the seaway would be open to attack from the air.

Little has been said of the gigantic task facing the United States in defending the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Military experts predict that it will cost over a billion dollars to erect and maintain suitable defenses since the St. Lawrence seaway from the mouth of the St. Lawrence River to Duluth, Minn., at the head of the Great Lakes will require military posts at strategic points.

Keeping in mind that this so-called national-defense project will require at the utmost 7 years of intensive effort to insure completion let us consider the argument that our defense industries are in immediate need of additional electric power.

If we are in immediate need of electric power, tomorrow may be too late. At this moment the Adams Electric Plant at Niagara Falls, N. Y., is standing idle because of a treaty between Canada and the United States regarding the diversion of water. Revision of this treaty can make possible the operation of the Adams plant overnight, and immediately generate 307,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity. At Oswego, N. Y., a plant is being constructed to provide 80,000 kilowatt-hours, which is capable of being increased to 160,000 kilowatt-hours within a year.

It is beyond contradiction that existing water and steam generating plants both on the American and Canadian side of the Niagara River can be expanded within a 2-year period to enable generating 3,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity. In addition steam generating plants can be constructed within a period of 2 years adjacent to coal mines in coal-producing States, such as Pennsylvania at one-third the cost of hydroelectric plants and not only provide millions of kilowatt-hours of electric power but likewise give steady employment to thousands of good Americans.

To further prove that the St. Lawrence seaway as a national-defense project is a myth, let me call your attention to the fact that this seaway which is intended to provide a 27-foot channel from the head of the St. Lawrence River to the head of the Great Lakes will be closed to navigation for 5 months of each year, since the St. Lawrence River is ice-bound and the surfaces of the Great Lakes are solidly frozen.

This seaway will cost the American taxpayers millions of dollars and will be open for navigation only 7 months of each year. During this 7-month period foreign tramp vessels manned by foreign crews and paid a scale of wages far below the standard of American shipping will carry their cargoes to inland ports instead of discharging them at Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston as is the present custom. Thus millions of tons of traffic will be diverted from the American transportation systems.

As previously mentioned, industries within the Great Lakes region are promised cheap power; Great Lakes shipbuilding yards are promised huge contracts to build ocean-going vessels; inland cities such as Duluth, Chicago, Cleveland, and Detroit are to become great inland ports, and the midwestern farmer is being lulled into silence by glittering promises of the rich harvest he will reap in cheap transportation rates.

Were these fanciful dreams to come true, the nonbenefiting citizens of our country will pay 85 percent of the cost of this project which I have already stated will be in excess of $1,000,000,000. In addition, the annual maintenance cost will be $15,000,000 on the seaway alone, which will mean that every ton of freight estimated by the advocates of the seaway will be subsidized by the Government at a cost of $2.50 per ton.

Do you realize that from the reports of American life-insurance companies, it is revealed that one-fourth of the assets of these companies are invested in Ameriacn railroad securities and other utilities and as a result the St. Lawrence seaway will affect every life-insurance policyholder in the United States?

Yes, there is much idle talk about these so-called benefits from this St. Lawrence seaway and power project. On the other hand, there is a strange silence over the thousands of American citizens who will be driven to the relief rolls of the Nation by the destruction of their jobs.

What is to become of the coal miner whose job will be destroyed by hydroelectric power and the importation of cheaply mined foreign coal?

How about the railroader whose job will vanish when millions of tons of freight are carried to Great Lakes cities by foreign vessels?

What about the plight of the American seaman whose ships will be idle while foreign tramp steamers carry cargoes diverted from American vessels?

What about the employees of the shipyards on the east, west, and Gulf coasts of our country, who, with thousands of stevedores, in times of peace have always found it difficult to exist because of part-time employment?

Time will not permit me to enumerate the number of jobs in related industries destined to feel the devastating effect of this economic monstrosity known as the St. Lawrence seaway.

Ladies and gentlemen, this attempt to saddle the American taxpayers with an unnecessary expenditure of public funds is a direct challenge to every American citizen.

In the name of those men whose jobs are destined to be abolished as a result of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, I ask you to join with us in Congress in opposition to this politician's golden dream and the taxpayer's hideous nightmare. Your assistance can best be rendered by joining us in revealing this project in its true light as economically unsound.

A letter to your Congressman and Senator stating your opposition to this project will merit the prayers of thousands of men, women, and children whose means of livelihood will be seriously jeopardized.

Public Demands Action on Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1941

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS REGARDING STRIKES IN NATIONAL-DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are becoming aroused over strikes in national-defense industries. They are not satisfied with the policy which the national administration has followed on such matters up to date. They are not satisfied with the attitude of some of the leaders of organized labor. They do not think it right or proper for the Federal Government to draft hundreds of thousands of young men into the service at $1 per day and at the same time permit well-paid workers in defense industries to strike over jurisdictional and other technical questions. They have a feeling that many of these strikes are inspired by Communists and other subversive elements and are called for the purpose of undermining our national defense.

During the past few days I have received many letters on this subject from the good people in my district. These people are not opposed to organized

labor. They know that the overwhelming majority of the working people of this country, both organized and unorganized, are loyal, patriotic American citizens who want to do their part in carrying out the national-defense program. They believe, however, that in many cases the leaders of these organizations do not fairly represent the splendid rank and file comprising their membership.

I am submitting herewith as a part of these remarks extracts from some of the letters I have received on this subject. I am personally acquainted with the writers of practically every one of these letters. They are fine, outstanding American citizens, representative of the best in their communities. I do not subscribe to all of the views which are expressed in these letters, but I am submitting them because I think they express the viewpoint of the great majority of the people of this country. These letters indicate that there is an end to the patience of the American people, and that until organized labor cleans its house of some of its false and unpatriotic leadership, there is likely to be a reaction which will deprive labor of many of the privileges and rights to which it is entitled, and which have been won through struggle and sacrifice over a long period of years. I believe that this is a time for all of those who are interested in the welfare of organized labor to consider the results which may follow a continuation of the present unwise policies.

The extracts from the letters to which I have referred follow:

We are amazed at the policy of the administration regarding strikes in the defense industries. So far the administration has simply surrendered to the labor unions, allowing them to dictate the defense policy. The unions are making hay while the sun shines. They strike for higher wages. For any extra time they, of course, demand their time and a half. They hold up defense industries with impunity and all for their own selfish ends. It seems to us that no government worthy of the name can tolerate that sort of thing in a crisis such as this.

I saw the other day a statement which seemed to be reliable to the effect that just shortly before France fell the labor unions there were demanding a reduction of the workweek from 36 hours to 30. At that time the German workers were putting in 72 hours per week. Some of the recent acts of our labor unions are a sad commentary on their patriotism.

Compare these things with the status of the American farmer. Only 3 weeks ago the Ford Co. published figures showing that during 1940 the company gave daily employment to a little more than 113,000 men. The average yearly wage paid these men was $1,629. You know that there is not a farmer in all your district that can afford to pay more than one-fourth of that amount for the 8 or 9 months of the year during which he might employ men. Yet the unions and the Government are after Ford.

The real honest to God American citizens of Kansas are getting awful tired of these strikes. Can't understand how it is the Government can take their boys out of $75 to $150 jobs and put them in the trenches at $30 a month and can't stop strikes.

Personally, I don't know who is at fault in the present struggle between labor and capital, but I do know that I speak the sentiment of this community when I say, "They had better get together and get busy on orders."

In the previous World War I was one of the several million Americans who served our country at a considerable financial sacrifice. In the present war I am examining draftees without remuneration. Why do our efforts have to be nullified by the selfishness of the un-American labor unions? I am for as drastic legislation against them as you can propose.

We are also much concerned about the strike situation in defense industries. It is high time that the members of these industries do their share of making all-out efforts for defense a success, even if it is necessary for the Government to step in and get them started in the right direction.

I have intended to write you many days ago, but just couldn't find the right time. I am speaking for my entire community, and if you prefer I'll mail you a petition to this effect. Stop these strikes by introducing a bill giving the strikers the raise they ask with vacation pay. But no closed shops whatsoever. (Others may want a job.) If he refuses to work, raise the draft age to 55 years and take everyone into the Army, give him $1 a day and his board and clothes along with the rest of our native boys. This run through the legislative hopper will stop strikes in 48 hours.

It is my opinion that if you would contact other Representatives and Senators in Congress and get together and pass a law making it a criminal offense for laborers to strike on defense projects and contracts, then you would do the people of the entire United States a good service. The strike situation certainly should be attended to at once before the strikers rule the United States of America.

This strike situation bids fair to get out of hand, doesn't it? I see where they called a strike on Ford "not because of wages or working conditions but to get recognition." I thought wages and working conditions were the only legitimate needs or excuses for union organizations to be in existence.

I am about to join the Socialists or any other "ists" on aiding a bigger and better raid on the Treasury for us poor, sick, groveling farmers, on the theory that if the hogs are at the trough we shoats had better get in there, too. Labor tactics are pulling the plug out of the money barrel by striking to make wages higher on these Federal profit-guaranteed projects to the point that a common man couldn't pay off on. It seems to me as fair to draft labor if necessary at about $30 a month if it is fair to subject the youth of our country to a year in the Army.

I believe that public opinion is quite definitely aroused against defense-industry strikes.

In labor unions and collective bargaining, but not in those unions controlled by radicals and enemies of the democratic form of government.

That the C. I. O. is controlled by Communists and should be outlawed by Congress, because it has been either unwilling or unable to expel them, and should, therefore, be considered an enemy of the United States. You notice that they did not comply with the Mediation Board's order without delay, and some at this writing still have not done so.

That industry has not had a square deal under the N. L. R. B. and that communism has been promoted or at least allowed to grow unrestricted by this Board.

That labor should be willing to forego the 40-hour week for the sake of national defense, and it has shown no willingness to do so.

That the $1-per-day soldier who wants ammunition and equipment is interested in getting them and not in whether the workmen who produce them get the same pay as he or $10 a day. He expects his supplies and is entitled to them. A little sacrifice is in order for the ranks of labor too. I believe that labor is much more insistent than industry in demanding its "pound of flesh."

I think there should be something done to halt the strikes in the factories that are making war materials. I believe in good wages and working conditions, but are we going to let laborers and the factories halt or slow up the defense program? I think that you have given this a thought, but I think something should be done at once if possible. The people are wondering why something isn't done about the striking men or the factory owners. I think that Mr. DIES should have more cooperation from Congress and try and get rid of all the "isms" in the United States of America.

Strikes Must Stop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1941

ADDRESS BY JACOB ARK

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Jacob Ark, former Monroe County, N. Y., commander, American Legion, at Rochester, N. Y., April 5, 1941:

Headlines, news flashes, news reels, commentators, magazines, daily newspapers and by the spoken word, we are not permitted to forget that nations are in the maelstrom of war. Systems of government are directly challenged and free peoples overnight have been forced into bondage. Modern science and invention have become instruments of destruction and the tools of brutal aggression. No nation that wants to keep invasion from its people or its right to maintain its own way of life can be oblivious or indifferent to the outcome of the present conflict.

The fruits of constructive minds are now the vehicles of destructive ideas. The airplane and radio have forcibly brought home to us that we have a direct and vital stake in the defeat of those who physically enslave human beings by military might, and morally poison men, women, and children by ideologies repugnant to the free institutions of free people.

It is our national policy, and our insurance policy, as a nation and as individuals, that America literally arm to the teeth, so that we may successfully combat foreign arms and alien philosophies of government. It is also our declared intention that our men, material, machinery, and money, blended together, be a reservoir for those who would keep enlightened civilization from disappearing from the face of this earth. In the words of the President, "We become the arsenal of democracy."

Much has been said of the compelling necessity of national unity in the present emer-

gency. We are now at war against an idea, and if we don't hurry, hurry, we are certain, sooner or later, to be at war with men and guns and ships and planes.

National unity can mean but one thing. The cooperation between and among all of our citizens. Our resources are meaningless unless we mine our coal, build our tanks, airplanes, and ships. It requires the uninterrupted teamwork of the manual laborer and the mental worker, the employer and employee. No American is free from this responsibility. Lip service cannot replace brains, brawn, and muscle.

Plants which should be working at maximum capacity turning out the sinews of war—the only symbols that dictators can recognize—remain idle during these precious days and hours.

We of the American Legion take no sides in industrial conflicts. We do, however, insist that we shall not go unprotected as a nation because either capital or labor may seek an advantage by reason of our immediate and urgent need for life-sustaining defense.

The right to strike has been the invaluable right of labor. The proper exercise of this economic weapon has brought about untold benefits to American labor and has directly improved the standard of living of all our people.

The make-up of the American Legion is typical of our Nation. This means that most of our members work for a living—on the farm, in the shop, and in the office. Yet we do demand that present strikes must stop. Every instrument of defense that goes unmade is the exact equivalent of its destruction by those who would destroy us.

If employer and employee cannot agree, Government must step in. Let no one be fearful that if this happens our social gains will disappear. If vital national defense industries do not work, there will not only be no social gains to speak of, but society as we know it, may be but a memory to both strikers and the owners of strike-bound plants. The great tragedy would be that in that process the inncent bystanders—the great majority of the American people—would be the real victims.

One plant alone which affects one-third of all national defense has been strike-bound for many weeks. Yesterday, the President admitted that Communist activity was impeding vital defense orders.

Wake up, employees. Wake up, employers. Wake up, Congress. An aroused American people want special privilege for none and equal service and sacrifice by all.

St. Louis Government Returns to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1941

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly of interest to the Members of this House to learn that the municipal government of the city of St. Louis has returned to the freely elected representatives of the people, hence to the people whence it came.

The city election campaign was unquestionably one of the most heated in the history of our great city. It attracted some national attention. The Republican Party elected every candidate on their ticket. The great national machine of the Democratic Party is beginning to decay. It has lost one of its greatest strongholds. The people, by their votes, rolled up a majority which overcame padded registration lists, fraudulent voting, machine delivery, and coercion.

The issues in this campaign were deep, an attempted governorship steal, crooked voting, machine fraud, corruption of the courts, Federal pressure to dictate municipal elections, antiwar feeling, and a general growing resentment not limited to St. Louis against the whole national, State, and local set-up of war, waste, and false promises. This election is in a measure indicative of the coming political storm in 1942. Other parts of the country have shown similar trends.

There is always hope for the country as long as the people have the courage to demonstrate their rights as they did in this election.

The following is an editorial from a very courageous weekly, not published in St. Louis, but instead, in this case, a public-spirited onlooker from St. Louis County—the Watchman Advocate:

[From the Watchman-Advocate of April 4, 1941]

JUDGE BECKER'S VICTORY

The face on the barroom floor is redder, the race horse has been retired to the green pastures, the battle cry of "bunk" has lost its savor.

Last Tuesday the city of St. Louis had an election. Last Tuesday the voters of St. Louis elected a mayor. They chose between a man who has held that office for 8 years and a newcomer so far as city management is concerned. They chose the new man—a former judge—a Republican. They chose William Dee Becker.

There must have been some reason beyond the campaign for the upset of a presumably strong machine. Surely a machine as powerful as the one operating in St. Louis could not have been upset between the time Judge Becker decided to run for the office of mayor and last Tuesday. There are some other reasons behind the vote.

The man Judge Becker defeated has never been able to divorce his name from the attempted steal of the Governor's office. He earned the nickname "Race-Horse Barney" when he raced from city hall to airport and back again to show "the Little Flower" his lordly characteristics. He suffered the handicap of having some of his campaign speakers threaten the people of St. Louis with President Roosevelt's disfavor if they did not vote for him.

Poor sportsmanship in politics, a nickname that is more truth than poetry and a threatening attitude were all that were needed to defeat Dickmann; but, not satisfied to allow just those things to do the job, his campaign advisers went a step further and answered fact with one-word sarcasm. In their advertising copy and over the air waves they used the one word "bunk" to answer a sensible well-put question. The public saw the intended insult to their intelligence and they responded with one mark on their ballot but so far as the machine was concerned, the voters put it in the wrong column.

We congratulate the people of St. Louis on what we consider a wise choice. We congratulate the Republican Party for choosing Judge Becker as their standard bearer and the men who made the race for aldermen. The election of all of these candidates indicates how well they were chosen. We congratulate the city of St. Louis for its courage and its ability to lay down a challenge to those who infer that President Roosevelt will be mad now that Barney is no longer the jockey.

We congratulate the State of Missouri, not that the State as a whole had anything to do with the election, but on the grounds that its interests can be probably better protected and served by the new mayor of St. Louis than it was served under the man whose race track was the highways, whose support of Larry nearly made him Governor and whose battle cry was "bunk."

Lastly, we congratulate Judge William Dee Becker, Republican, gentleman and scholar, and here is a wish for a successful and noteworthy administration.

The Panama Canal Is Not Safe Under the Precepts in Vogue 40 Years Ago During the Spanish-American War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1941

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when we remember the heated controversies of 35 years ago as to whether the Panama Canal should be a high-level lock canal or a sea-level canal we should also remember that the decision for a lock canal was based solely on the fact that the lock canal could be built more quickly and at much less cost.

For either type of canal the control of the floods of the Chagres River is necessary. The Madden Dam has already been built with flood control as one of its major assets. Comprehensive plans contemplate another flood-control dam at Gamboa near where the Chagres River enters the canal. The Gamboa Dam is an ultimate need for the lock canal as well as for a sea-level canal. Both of the dams referred to are to be used to store water for the operation of the lock canal. A sea-level canal would need no such water supply, and the dams could be used more effectively for flood control if they do not have to be used for storing water for the use of a canal.

The slides at Culebra Cut were the result of too much earth pressure on steep slopes. They have been eliminated by the gradual removal of sliding earth, which, of course, means that nature has come into equilibrium by a natural reduction in slopes. The estimated costs of a sea-level canal amply provide for the removal of enough earth to produce slopes so that they will not slide.

In talking about conditions 35 or 40 years ago, one should be careful not to lapse into a reactionary point of view. If all the technical and scientific improvements that have been developed in the last 40 years are to be ignored, we will certainly go backward instead of forward. The offensive features of air warfare are developing much faster than the defensive features and as yet we do not

see much evidences of air defenses catching up. There must be planning for dispersion and avoidance of the dangers from offensive air warfare until we see more chance of effective defenses than is conceivable now. The populations of the cities of Europe have no sure and safe remedy at the present time except migration to the country.

Our preparations for defense would be in a sad plight if they were confined to the measures that were considered satisfactory in the Spanish-American War, when our concentrations of troops were decimated by typhoid epidemics. Our artillery consisted of old 3-inch cannon. The only rapid movements and reconnaissances we had, was by the use of horse cavalry. Think of depending upon such operations nowadays.

It is only a short time since many of us and even some of our most intelligent Army officers were ridiculing the damages that might be inflicted on naval vessels by air bombing. Now we know that every day air bombers are accomplishing a great deal more destruction than the most enthusiastic airmen were claiming as feasible only 2 or 3 years ago.

Let us not make the mistake of adopting a complacent attitude with respect to the interoceanic canal across the Isthmus of Panama. It is unthinkable that anything physically possible should be left undone for its security, because its constant use is essential to peacetime prosperity and for the passage of our naval vessels in wartime in order that they may defend the Nation both in the Atlantic and in the Pacific Oceans.

National-Defense Mediation Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1941

LETTER FROM WILLIAM GREEN

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter sent out by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., April 7, 1941.

(Sent to city central bodies.)

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: As you have already learned through the daily press, the President of the United States, by Executive order established the National Defense Mediation Board in order that all work necessary for national defense should proceed without interruption and with all possible speed. This action was in line with the recommendations of the executive council at its February meeting.

I urge upon all unions genuine and prompt cooperation with this and other defense agencies. Our unions must not only demonstrate their ability for responsible leadership but must be prepared to present labor's interests and welfare to defense agencies and to the public. Enemies of labor are losing no opportunity to discredit our unions or to use the mistakes or bad judgment of individuals as an excuse for repressive policies or legislation to penalize all workers.

With equal solemnity I remind you that the trade-union movement is the bulwark of democracy. Unless we maintain a free-labor movement democracy becomes meaningless to millions. Upon all union executives and union members rests a heavy responsibility and trust. The strike is our ultimate defense. The right to quit work is the inalienable right of all free workers. Let us show ourselves worthy of our rights by the wisdom and discretion with which we use them. Days of responsibilities and crucial tests lie immediately ahead. Maintain your rights as free men. Do not tolerate strike breaking by any defense or governmental agency. You have a right to contracts reached by collective bargaining specifying terms and conditions. That right carries with it the obligation of responsible, constructive, and prompt action by all unions. Mediation must provide for orderly adjustment of the causes of labor disputes, for only by eliminating the causes of injustice can we hope to maintain sustained, maximum production and unions have essential functions in achieving that objective.

Labor confidentially expects this Board will use all existing agencies and channels—public and private—for adjusting disputes so issues like minority strikes will be decided through the National Labor Relations Board and will not prevent the Mediation Board from performing its primary function.

As the final appeal in all matters is to public opinion, we owe it to our movement and our democratic institutions, to get Labor's case before the public in terms that adequately present our aims and purposes.

The American Federation of Labor is represented on the Board by George Meany, secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Labor, and George M. Harrison, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks. The Secretary of Labor is authorized to certify to this Board any controversy which threatens to obstruct defense production and which the Conciliation Division of the Department of Labor has failed to adjust. The Board is authorized:

(a) To make every reasonable effort to adjust and settle any such controversy or dispute by assisting the parties thereto to negotiate agreements for that purpose;

(b) To afford means for voluntary arbitration, with an agreement by the parties thereto to abide by the decision arrived at upon such arbitration, and, when requested by both parties, to designate a person or persons to act as impartial arbitrator or arbitrators of such controversy or dispute;

(c) To assist in establishing, when desired by the parties, methods for resolving future controversies or disputes between the parties, and to deal with matters of interest to both parties which may thereafter arise;

(d) To investigate issues between employers and employees, and practices and activities thereof, with respect to such controversy or dispute; conduct hearings, take testimony, make findings of fact, and formulate recommendations for the settlement of any such controversy or dispute; to make public such findings and recommendations whenever in the judgment of the Board the interests of industrial peace so require;

(e) To respect the National Labor Relations Board in any controversy or dispute relating to the appropriate unit or appropriate representatives to be designated for purposes of collective bargaining; to expedite as much as possible the determination of the appropriate unit or appropriate representatives of the workers.

President Roosevelt specifically requests the parties concerned give to the conciliation service and to the Office of Production Management:

(a) Notice in writing of any desired change in existing agreements, wages, or working conditions;

(b) Full information as to all developments in labor disputes; and

(c) Such sufficient advance notice of any threatened interruptions to continuous production as will permit exploration of all avenues of possible settlement of such controversies so as to avoid strikes, stoppages, or lock-outs.

Fraternally yours,

WM. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

The Drift Toward War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE, OF INDIANA

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over the radio on April 10:

Ladies and gentlemen, friends of the radio audience, Congress has been in session so much of the time for the past 2 years, dealing with grave, history-making problems concerned with our national defense and foreign affairs, that it is an unusual and surprising pleasure for me to be at home among my friends at this time.

My visit to Fort Wayne was made possible by the action of Congress a few days ago in approving a resolution for a 10-day recess. Some have described it as a "cooling-off" period—a vacation from the heat of debate over crucial issues—an opportunity for Members of Congress to return to their home districts to check on sentiment among their people.

I think you will agree with me that it is a healthy thing for Congressmen to keep in close contact at all times with the citizens they represent—especially now when we are facing, under an unprecedented third term, problems that may make or break our democracy.

It is the sworn duty of your Congressman to be truly representative, and to carry out this responsibility it is necessary for him to know what you think about war, billions for defense and for aid to Britain, taxes, strikes, and other important policies.

We learn what you think about these problems through several channels, one of which is our daily mail. And I want to emphasize that it was never more important for you to express your views to Congress, for it is only through a genuine voicing of opinion that a true democracy can function. You may be very certain that there are tremendous minority pressures brought to bear upon your representatives in the Congress. This renders it especially desirable for the great rank-and-file majority to give to Congressmen continuous expressions of views on major issues.

During my brief visit in the fourth district, I am attempting to consult with representative citizens on the issues of the hour. Unfortunately it is not possible for me to talk

personally with all of you. Through the medium of the radio, however, I am able to reach a large cross section of my constituency in the eight counties of northeastern Indiana. And through this medium I wish to convey to you the earnest hope that you will fulfill your duty in the democratic process by favoring me freely with your views and comments on legislation before Congress. I wish that every citizen would write to me.

There were many questions troubling my mind when I left Washington last week end to return for this welcome sojourn among my people. I left a capital laboring in the throes of war hysteria—ominously reminiscent of the World War days; a capital verging on an extravagant war boom; a capital seething with unrest and with loose talk about total victory, about stopping Hitler at all costs, about steps no longer short of war.

Congress had just passed the lease-lend bill, launching America on an uncharted course of intervention in the European conflict, and had voted a gigantic $7,000,000,000 "war chest" for Great Britain and her allies.

The President had ordered the seizure of German, Italian, and Danish ships in American ports, and administration leaders had begun to actively promote the use of American warships to convoy war materials to Europe.

War was in the air, and talk of war was on the lips of everyone.

As I left the Capitol and started for Fort Wayne I wondered to myself: Is this hysteria limited to Washington or has it already extended west across the Alleghenies to the very heart of America—to Indiana and the Middle West? I could not believe that it had.

This belief, I am happy to report, has been sustained since my arrival.

The people of Indiana and the Fourth Congressional District do not want war. There is no question that our sympathies lie with Great Britain. But there is also no question that we do not want to permit our emotions to actively involve us in another war across the seas.

The will for peace is still strong here in Indiana and throughout the Nation. Let us hope that it will spread from the people to their elected representatives and through them to the leaders of our Government in Washington.

Keeping in mind this strong will for peace in America, so clearly indicated in every straw vote on the subject, it is revealing to chart our rapid drift away from neutrality and toward war in the months since the start of the European conflict.

This drift has been most rapid during the last few weeks, and can best be charted through the statements of the Nation's navigator, President Roosevelt.

During the heat of the third-term campaign, on October 24, he said, and I quote him:

"I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party: 'We will not participate in foreign wars.'"

Again at Hartford, Conn., on October 30, he said:

"The United States is today at peace and is going to remain at peace."

At Rochester, N. Y., on November 2:

"Your President says this country is not going to war."

At Cleveland, Ohio, November 3:

"The first purpose of our foreign policy is to keep our country out of war."

On the strength of these pledges, President Roosevelt was elected to a third term.

Less than 2 months later, with campaign promises apparently forgotten, we learned for the first time that we were to be the "great arsenal of democracy." We were advised that "we must apply ourselves to our task with the same resolution, the same sense of urgency, the same spirit of patriotism and sacrifice that we would show were we at war."

And in a message to Congress on January 6 we learned further that "we are committed to the proposition that principles of morality and considerations of our own security will never permit us to acquiesce in a peace dictated by aggressors and sponsored by appeasers."

Then came the "total victory" speech of March 15, in which the President said:

"And from now on that aid will be increased, and yet again increased, until total victory has been won."

What a change from peace and "no foreign wars" in the campaign of 1940 to "total victory" in the spring of 1941.

I now read from a newspaper dispatch from London, dated March 24, 9 days after the "total victory" speech:

"For the first time a London newspaper today urged the United States to convoy war supplies to Britain, in view of the menace of the German spring sea offensive. The newspaper was the Daily Sketch.

"'We need every enemy neutral ship that now lies idle in an American harbor,' said the Sketch. 'We need every American ship that America does not need for herself. We need every American captain, every American ship, every American seaman who can be spared from America's own war effort.

"'We cannot afford to wait for public opinion in the United States to mature while Germany acts with such concentrated force on our maritime resources.

"'What we need most urgently is American convoys for American supplies.'"

This newspaper story was the signal for interventionists in Washington to start an active campaign for the convoying of war supplies by American warships, the last certain step toward war.

The convoy campaign, which has the backing of high administration officials, gained headway so rapidly that President Roosevelt told his press conference last week that the question of convoys was under consideration, and had been under consideration for a year and one-half.

He made this admission in the face of a previous statement by himself that "Convoying means shooting, and shooting means war."

Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, made a similar statement during debate on the lease-lend bill. He said, and I quote him:

"As plainly as I can, I have always stood against convoying vessels by the American Fleet and will stand against convoying vessels by any unit of the American Fleet until and unless the point shall come when I shall be willing to vote for war, because, in my judgment, convoying would lead us into actual war."

I agree, with President Roosevelt and Senator GEORGE, that convoying is the surest, swiftest path toward war for America. Convoying is war. And if that is what our leaders in Washington want, they should be honest about it and ask for a declaration of war. They should not attempt to push us into this conflict through the back door.

Recognizing, as everyone must, that shooting is inevitable if convoys are resorted to, and opposing as I do the participation of this country in a foreign war, I have introduced in the House of Representatives a resolution designed to prohibit the use of American warships and aircraft for the convoying of war supplies through belligerent waters.

This measure, House Joint Resolution 158, has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with the request that it be given prompt consideration.

A similar resolution, sponsored by Senator TOBEY, of New Hampshire, is pending in the Senate.

It is already evident that these measures have the support of large numbers of American people.

If they have your support, you may assist in bringing about their enactment by writing to me, to your Senators, and to the President, telling them of your views. Such letters have more influence than you may imagine. There should be more mail going to Washington every day.

In conclusion, I wish to state that I owe allegiance to only one country. I intend to discharge my duties in Congress at this time on that basis.

The highest duty I can perform in good faith to the people who have honored me by sending me to Washington is to preserve, protect, and defend my own country from enemies within or from without.

I shall vote with enthusiasm and with all my heart and soul for every appropriation that will build up our own national defense on land, in the air, and on the sea. I will do that for my country, and gladly.

I will vote and I will act in every way to make our arms invincible from an invading enemy.

I have pledged myself to my people, however, that not with my vote will their American sons be required to follow down the same bloody path of sacrifice that they did in the last war by participating needlessly in any foreign conflict which constitutes only an extension of Europe's centuries-old imperialistic rivalries.

This is my covenant with you. With divine help, I intend to keep it.

Thank you, and good night.

A Tribute to Clara Maass, Who Gave Her Life for All Mankind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1941

ADDRESS BY DR. C. C. PIERCE

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker—

Come at once. We need you.—Gorgas.

When this telegram came to Miss Clara Maass, a young Spanish War nurse recovering at her home in East Orange, N. J., from a service-connected illness in October 1900, she immediately answered the call and was soon at the side of General Gorgas, then leading the fight against yellow fever in Habana, Cuba. Some months later Miss Maass was requested by Dr. Gorgas to volunteer for the dangerous experiment of permitting herself to be bitten by a known-infected mosquito. She died as a result, a martyr to the cause of science.

On Palm Sunday this heroic sacrifice was commemorated at services in the Mountain View, N. J., Community Church with the dedication of a memorial window, Hoffman's conception of Christ in Gethsemane, the gift of a sister, Miss Emma Maass of Mountain View. The window was accepted by Mr. Stanley Styles and the Reverend Edgar B. Rohrbach presented Dr. C. C. Pierce, Medical Director of the United States Public Health Service, who was active in the fight against yellow fever and 90

miles away from Habana when Miss Maas died. He spoke as follows:

It is a privilege to participate in this beautiful service to honor the memory of Clara Louise Maass. It is particularly fitting to hold this service on Palm Sunday, commemorating the triumphant entry of Jesus into Jerusalem, from which He departed 5 days later to lay down His life for all mankind.

Clara Louise Maass, born at East Orange, June 28, 1876, the oldest of nine children, grew to be a charming, animated, and ambitious girl. Being one of a large family, forced her at an early age to become self-supporting. At the age of 15 she left school and went to work in the Newark Orphans' Asylum at board, room, and $10 a month. Early in childhood she showed an unusual spirit of service which constantly grew, which led her into nursing. She entered the Newark German (Memorial) Hospital at the age of 16 and graduated in 2 years.

When the Spanish-American War was declared, she promptly volunteered and was sent to Jacksonville, Fla., and later to Savannah, Ga., and then to Santiago, Cuba, from October 1898 to February 1899, when she was honorably discharged and returned home and resumed private nursing. In November 1899 she went to the Philippines as an Army nurse and endured the hardships of the veteran soldier for 8 months, including an attack of breakbone fever (dengue). She came home to recuperate in May 1900.

Late in 1900, Miss Maass returned to Cuba as a nurse for the sanitary department of Habana, Cuba, being operated by the United States Army Military Government of Cuba and was assigned to Las Animas Hospital.

Yellow fever was very prevalent in Habana that year and there was a greater death toll from this disease than that of war. The Cubans looked upon yellow fever as inevitable, but the United States military government waged a constant fight to alleviate the suffering it caused, and appointed a commission of Army doctors to study yellow fever and to determine the cause and method of spread of this dread disease which, for four centuries, had caused death and devastation in Cuba, Central America, and the Southern States of our own country.

Some work had been done at an earlier date to determine the method of spread of yellow fever by Dr. Carlos Finlay, a Cuban doctor, who in 1891 published an article in a medical journal in which he stated that he had reason to believe that yellow fever was spread by the bites of mosquitoes. Dr. Finlay's work was not controlled scientifically nor did it at that time receive much consideration from the medical profession, but now Cuban stamps are canceled with the legend "Finlay liberated the world of yellow fever." Dr. Finlay's theory was investigated by the Yellow Fever Commission established in Habana in 1900 by Gen. Leonard Wood, who was the military governor. Incidentally, when General Wood was sick he was nursed by Miss Clara Maass. Maj. Walter Reed, an Army doctor, was in general charge of this Yellow Fever Commission work, and the other members were Drs. Carroll, Lazear, and Agramonte.

This commission made an investigation of Dr. Finlay's theory about mosquitoes spreading yellow fever. A number of soldiers volunteered to sleep in the beds made vacant by the death of persons with yellow fever to see if the generally accepted theory that the disease was contagious had foundation. These men were thoroughly exposed to all sorts of material infected with yellow fever, but mosquitoes were very carefully excluded from the rooms they occupied. None of the men developed yellow fever. This work proved that it was not possible to transmit the disease by contact with materials soiled by the discharges from yellow-fever patients.

Experiments were also conducted by the Yellow Fever Commission to transmit yellow fever by letting mosquitoes that had previously fed on the blood of persons sick with yellow fever bite other persons. Drs. Carroll, Lazear, and several other persons were bitten by these infected mosquitoes without result, so that the theory of mosquito transmission was gradually being discredited, until Dr. Carroll fell sick on August 30, 1900, but he did not know that he had yellow fever. Drs. Lazear and Agramonte suspected that Dr. Carroll had yellow fever and decided to test the mosquito that had bitten Dr. Carroll by having this same mosquito bite a known nonimmune, which was done, and the man promptly developed yellow fever. Dr. Lazear also became infected through the bite of an infected mosquito and died of yellow fever on September 25, 1900. (This yellow-fever experimental work is described in S. Doc. No. 520, 66th Cong., Yellow Fever Commission.)

The next year, 1901, additional experiments were conducted by Drs. Gorgas and Guiteras at the Las Animas Hospital in Habana. This work was done under the auspices of the sanitary department of Habana rather than those of the United States Army Medical Board, over which Major Reed presided, but the value of the work was recognized by the Army group, as is shown by the following quotation from a report of the Committee on Pensions of the House of Representatives, Fifty-eighth Congress, second session, No. 1865, dated March 23, 1904:

"The sanitary department of Habana in 1901, the year following the experiments of the Army medical board, had established at Las Animas hospital an inoculation station with the expectation of biting nonimmunes with the infected mosquitoes, giving them yellow fever and thus rendering them immune, much as was formerly done by inoculating smallpox before the discovery of vaccination. The great success in entirely eradicating yellow fever by mosquito control work was not at that time thought probable. Nonimmunes were invited to apply for inoculation and several of the employees about the hospital responded to this invitation, Miss Maass among others. She was bitten, had a severe case of yellow fever, and died as a direct result of the intentional mosquito bite.

"While these cases were not directly connected with the experimentation of the Army board, they had much more effect in the city of Havana in convincing the physicians and people generally that yellow fever was conveyed by the mosquito than did the work of the Army board."

Miss Maass was requested by Dr. Gorgas to volunteer for the dangerous experiment of permitting herself to be bitten by a known infected mosquito and in volunteering for this service, she became a martyr to science. Others who allowed themselves to be bitten by infected mosquitoes were eight Spanish immigrants and one Englishman. Of this number, two of the Spanish immigrants and Miss Maass died.

Miss Maass knew the danger she was incurring from what she had observed of the experiments with the Yellow Fever Commission in 1900, and before submitting to this test, she wrote to her mother and said, "Do not worry, mother, if you hear that I have yellow fever. Now is a good time of the year to catch it if one has to. Most of the cases are mild, and then I should be an immune and not be afraid of the disease any more." Dr. John W. Ross, of the United States Navy, who was in charge of Las Animas Hospital, said that Miss Maass was one of his very best and most faithful nurses. She knew she would be more useful as a yellow fever nurse if she was to become immune so her young life was given from a high sense of duty. Miss Maass died on August 24, 1901, and was buried in Cuba. Her sister, Miss Sophie Maass, also a nurse, who had left for duty in Cuba, was at sea when Clara Maass died, but she arrived at Habana in time to attend the military funeral of her sister.

Clara Maass' body was returned to the United States by the Government and interred at Fairmount Cemetery, Newark, N. J., on February 20, 1902.

In 1912, a room was set apart in the Newark German (Memorial) Hospital to the memory of Miss Maass. A portrait of her was hung in the nurses' home at the hospital and at the unveiling of this portrait, the late Dr. Edward Stachlin made an address from which I quote:

"We admire the hero who falls in battle, but he is urged on amid countless numbers to the tune of martial music to fight the cause of the oppressor's wrong, hopeful ever of being spared. We admire in any walk of life the one who succumbs to duty's call, yet the outcome here is usually unlooked for and rarely anticipated. They are all hallowed endings, but not to be compared with the ending of the one who solitary and alone avows a cause whose issue brings self-destruction for the benefit of all posterity. So toil the workmen who repair the world."

In May 1930, Miss Maass' grave was marked by a beautiful, unpretentious, dignified memorial of polished pink Milford granite, with a bronze plaque bearing an excellent likeness of this heroic nurse, and a suitable inscription showing that Miss Clara Maass laid down her life for science and humanity.

We honor her memory today and throughout the future by this beautiful memorial window, in a building dedicated to the service of our Master. Reproduced from one of the great paintings by Heinrich Hoffman, born in Darmstadt, Germany, in 1824, and died the year following Miss Maass' sacrifice. Heinrich Hoffman painted many scenes from Christ's life, all showing refined beauty and harmonious coloring and delicacy.

Miss Maass gave her life for her country in the turbulent period following the war. We of this country are now in a more disturbed condition and inclined to meet greater problems than confronted those who were trying at that time to make the world a better place in which to live. The present period of world history now demands a national preparedness unprecedented in any other war or threatened war in which this country has ever been involved. Nothing should be done at this time which does not contribute in some way to the strength of our country and no resource or skill which we have in store should remain unused if it can be made by any means to contribute to our security and our liberty and our American way of life.

One of the risks to national unity of action lies in the idea that defensiveness alone is all we need to preserve our form of government, yet our liberty is a thing we must constantly fight for. All recorded history shows that no nation has arisen to strength, as we have, or remained strong, as we hope to, no human rights have been established or liberties maintained without dynamic, aggressive action. St. Paul and the Apostles were not defensive when they established the Christian faith. All of us have seen how the perversion of the physical and chemical sciences has brought more brutal, more rapid, more devastating destruction, both on unprepared armies and unarmed civilians, but we have not yet seen how the developments of science must be made to contribute toward building up our national strength so that we will not be as helpless as were the other countries which have been overrun by the dictators.

To develop this national strength, upon which the entire effectiveness of our other defense efforts depends, we must build up the physical fitness, the morale, and mental stamina of all the people of this country so that they will be physically tough, mentally sound, and morally strong. It is on the home

front where the danger is greatest in these days of modern total war.

Fundamentally, the deficiencies that exist in this country do not depend upon any serious lack of material resources. The deficiencies exist among our human resources and are physical, intellectual, educational, and spiritual defects, though each is in some degree dependent upon the others. The spiritual aspect of our population is the one now most in need of stepping up. We have seen the spirit overcome severe physical handicaps. We have seen it overcome the difficulties of lack of educational opportunities, of poverty and environment, and it is a primary concern of ours to elevate the spiritual concepts of the people to whom we give service. It is our duty as citizens of this Republic and, above all, as servants of our country to intensify the efforts that all of us should make at all times, but particularly in these times of stress.

A field of activity in which each one can participate to some degree is in strengthening the morale and protecting the physical and moral health of young men called up for military training. Not only should we interest ourselves in these men who are wearing the uniform of the Army or Navy, but we must also bear in mind the physical and spiritual needs of those thousands of men and women who are engaged in defense activities in industrial occupations.

During all wars and all periods of preparation for military effectiveness one of the great problems has been to protect armed forces and civilians from the devastating effects of venereal diseases. These infections can be prevented to a great extent through the provision of wholesome recreational facilities in the vicinity of concentrations of population and through the regulation of the abuses of alcohol, and by preventing vicious and immoral persons exploiting our armed forces and industrial workers. The most effective control measures for these diseases is the development in the men themselves of that attitude which prevents infection. The records of the last World War showed that the factors that were most important were inherent in the men rather than in the antivenereal campaign. Factors such as character, religion, love, loyalty, and self-respect kept the men in France in 1918 and 1919 from exposing themselves to diseases which would render them incapable of performing service to their country. It is obvious that here is a field in which every one of us can play some part.

None of us can avoid our responsibility to do our part in this phase of national-defense work by claiming to be civilians and not responsible for the welfare of the armed forces. Patriotism is not a matter for the military forces alone. Courage is not displayed only on the battlefield; witness Clara Maass. The maintenance of our form of government depends upon each one of us giving all of what we have to give. By giving the best that is in us all the time we help to make our American way of life worth while, something to live for and, if need be, something to die for. Clara Maass gave her life for the betterment of all mankind.

Strikes in Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1941

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, you will never know how much I appreciate this opportunity which has made it possible for me to be presented to and to speak to this legislative body.

I think I have a new appreciation and a better understanding of your legislative problems than I have ever had before, and this is true, I think, because I have just been entrusted by the voters of my district with the responsibility of representing them in the United States Congress, and when I take my place in that body my troubles and problems, at this time will be identical with those which confront the entire Nation.

It is not my purpose to make a speech—a long speech—here, but I do want to take advantage of this opportunity, and make a few remarks concerning what is, in my opinion, the most vital and pressing problem of the day: The problem of defending our homes, our liberties, and our lives. I say with all sincerity that strikes and labor disturbances ought not be permitted to disrupt our program of national defense, and that the rights of organized labor ought to be subordinate to the welfare of the whole Nation.

Those of you who know me understand that I am just a plain ordinary workingman myself, and that I can truly say, and with all sympathy, that I understand and sympathize with the man who toils for a living. I believe the workingman who produces the Nation's wealth is entitled to a living wage. I am a firm believer in the right of labor to organize, to collective bargaining, but just as firmly believe that such organization and right of collective bargaining should not ever be permitted to endanger the lives and liberties of the American people as a whole. The American laborer is the most loyal worker to his country of any place in the world.

When labor goes so far as to stop production of defense weapons which are necessary to defend our homes, liberties, and lives, then, I say that labor has gone too far, and its power ought be curbed by appropriate legislation.

In order to make sure that our defense industries operate at top capacity and produce the very maximum amount of defensive weapons possible with which to defend ourselves, if such becomes necessary, I am going to introduce a bill in Congress which will provide for the setting up of a national industrial and labor arbitration board which will have complete and absolute power to settle all disputes which might arise between industry and labor. Under the provision of this bill all industrial plants producing defensive weapons or munitions of war which fail to comply with the ruling of the arbitration board shall be taken over and operated by the Government for the duration of the emergency, and any employees in any such plants who refuse to comply with the ruling of the board, and go out on strike, or do anything else to retard the production of such materials shall be deemed guilty of felony.

This, in my opinion, is the only absolute way to stop needless strikes in our defense industries. Such legislation would find no support anywhere or at any time were it not for the general emergency confronting the Nation. We ought to continually remind ourselves of the existing world conditions which endanger not only the freedom and liberties of our people but which endanger and threaten to destroy all democracies in the whole world. This danger is manifest in the mightly mechanized army led by the power-crazy Hitler who has set himself up as a dictator with the determined intention of destroying all the democracies on the face of the earth in order that he might conquer and rule the world. We should remind ourselves daily of the sweeping successes of his mighty army. We should remind ourselves that Great Britain is fighting a stubborn and dogged fight with her back to the wall. That victory or defeat for Great Britain will depend entirely upon our ability to manufacture the necessary munitions of war in this country and send them to her. If we really cherish the ideals and principles of liberty which we preach, then we should be willing and able to make any sacrifice necessary to sustain them. Ask yourself what might happen in this country if, through our failure to furnish Britain with the necessary implements of war, she should go down in defeat and we should be left alone as the only democratic nation to face the mighty and combined armies of the totalitarian states. If Britain should lose as the result of our failure to manufacture and furnish the necessary munitions and machines of war, then I feel that the rain of bombs now falling upon and destroying English towns would start all too soon falling upon American cities. For this Nation to overcome such a combination of military might it would require that the lives of millions of our young men should be sacrificed on the field of battle; that the lives of many of our women and children would be snuffed out. God forbid that such a thing should come to pass. What happens to me is not important; what happens to my friends is important.

We, in this great land, should never let the selfish interests of a few come before the general welfare of all. I am convinced that many strikes in our defense industries are the result of direct sabotage, instigated by leaders friendly to foreign governments for no other purpose than to delay and weaken the defenses of this Nation.

We must have legislation that will stop the foreign-born un-American racketeers from calling strikes and stopping production of defense weapons and war munitions which England must have if she is to be victorious and thus keep the war from coming to this hemisphere.

This is a war of deadly machines and if we make every sacrifice necessary to produce a sufficient amount of machines of war to supply the demands of England, then we will never have to send our own men across the ocean to fight on foreign soil. I think it is wrong to permit workers in vital defense industries to strike and stop production of defense weapons at a time when our Government is drafting young men into the Army to serve at $21 a month and at a time when the heads of W. P. A. families get work 16 days a month; their families are not striking, they get just as cold and hungry the last 14 days of the month as they do the first 16 days. Furthermore, our little

farmers are not striking, and in my opinion agriculture is vital to industry and defense. Furthermore, the small businessman is bearing his portion of the defense burdens and responsibilities and he is not on a strike.

If it should become necessary in the future for us to fight, thousands of our soldiers now living might be sacrificed simply because they were not properly armed because of strikes in our defense factories. Remember, every strike which hampers the production of defense weapons is a blow for Adolf Hitler. Every strike is a stab in the back of our American institutions. Let us outlaw such sabotage. Let us declare by the law of the land that this liberty-loving people in the United States will go forward in united effort, and that no blows will be struck except blows in defense of liberty.

I have a complete and abiding faith in President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and as a Member of Congress I will back him and support his program in every possible way, for I am sure that his efforts will bring peace to the world instead of bringing war to our doors.

In conclusion, may I say to you that I, as a young man, will humbly assume the responsibilities which have been entrusted to me and will continue to rely upon you gentlemen and other friends I have in Oklahoma to help me and advise me. Experience will come to me, of course, with time, but as I go along as a new Member of Congress I must be guided by the wisdom and the experience of others. I hope that you will always continue to consider me as your friend and feel free to extend to me your advice and your help. Thank you.

Peace or War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HENRY J. BERQUIST, OF THE WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a radio address by the Honorable Henry Berquist, assemblyman from my district. Mr. Berquist has served in the Wisconsin Legislature for several terms and is considered one of the most active and influential members of that body.

I feel certain that the sentiments expressed in his radio speech regarding our beloved America becoming embroiled in this World War, are the sentiments of the overwhelming majority of the people in Wisconsin. I agree with him and I hope most Members of this House will find time to read it.

The address follows:

The crucial showdown for America has come. Shall it be peace or war? This country of ours, this country which provided our ancestors with a haven of protection against the recurring bloodshed and intolerance of the Old World—this country of ours stands on the threshold of momentous decision. How we resolve the issue will determine the course of our lives and the lives of our children for years to come.

For myself, I stand firmly and unflinchingly against American involvement or intervention in the ghastly bloodshed of Europe, Asia, and Africa. As a progressive, I stand shoulder to shoulder with the leaders of my party, Bob and Phil La Follette, in their crusade against dragging the American people into warfare three to six thousand miles from our shores.

Their position and their leadership has been endorsed by an overwhelming majority of the American people. The most recent Gallup poll shows that in spite of tremendous propaganda in the press, over the radio, and in the movies, 83 percent of the people of this country are opposed to going to war overseas.

Perhaps the most tragic phase of the reckless foreign program on which the Government of this Nation is launched is the deception and trickery which have been practiced on our people. Everytime the interventionists like the William Allen White committee or the war makers in Washington have tried to sell the American people a new war move, they have first concealed that move as a way to stay out of war.

Most of us remember that only a year and a half ago we were urged to repeal the arms embargo on the fallacious assumption that it would make us more neutral. Now we can see the truth of what progressive leaders pointed out then—that such a move was only an entering wedge—that it was the first step down the road to war.

During the 1940 campaign both the old parties assured us that their foreign policy was based fundamentally on the proposition of "step short of war." The Republican platform read: "The Republican Party is firmly opposed to the involvement of this Nation in foreign war." The Democratic platform read: "We will not participate in foreign wars and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack. The direction and aim of our foreign policy has been and will continue to be the security and defense of our own land and the maintenance of its peace."

These official declarations in the platforms of the Republican and Democratic Parties were supplemented over and over again by the speeches of their respective Presidential candidates. If anything, in the closing days of the campaign, President Roosevelt was more emphatic in his promise of peace than was Wendell L. Willkie.

But soon after the ballots were counted, they embraced each other and joined forces in a program of all-out cooperation with Great Britain. The campaign slogan of "steps short of war" was thrown into the ash can. In its place came slogans like "all-out effort" and "all-out victory" and "a bridge of ships." The administration wrote its philosophy into the lend-lease bill when it hooked up the defense of the United States with the defense of any nation which the President, and the President alone, decided was vital to our own. For the first time in our history we were announcing to the whole world that we could not stand on our feet, that we were dependent on the British and the Greeks and the Chinese to fight our battles for us.

After the passage of the lend-lease bill, our Congress was presented immediately with an appropriation measure calling on the citizens and taxpayers of the United States to put up $7,000,000,000 to underwrite the provisions of H. R. 1776. And this is only a starter. Many more billions will be required before we can deliver to Great Britain, Greece, and China the all-out victories which the President has promised them.

Now that the administration has had its way in the lend-lease bill and the $7,000,000,000 appropriation, it is beginning to break ground for the next and most dangerous step on the road to war—convoy of British shipping by American naval vessels manned by Americans.

The President himself has admitted that convoys come awfully close to shooting and shooting comes awfully close to war. And yet the advance agents for the administration's foreign policy, the William Allen White Committee and the interventionist editors, are yelling for convoys today. Everyone must be alert and on our guard to voice our opposition to convoys at every possible opportunity.

Meanwhile hysteria, intolerance, and bigotry are growing by leaps and bounds in our country, all in the name of fighting a war to preserve liberty. Red-blooded Americans of all faiths and all races who dare to stand up against the rampant hysteria of the warmakers are insulted as Nazis, Fascists, Communists, traitors, etc. The La Follettes have already taken more than a taste of the abuse and vilification which was heaped upon their great father during our last effort to make the world safe for democracy. Because of my stand, backing my campaign pledge, opposing war, I, too, have been attacked. Good Americans, whose only crime is that they do not want their children slaughtered in a foreign war, are being cowed into silence by the blustering, Nazi-like tactics of politicians and editors beating the drums for war. The urban workers of America, whose only crime is that they want a little more in wages to meet the skyrocketing cost of living, are denounced as saboteurs and traitors and "reds."

Here in our State the Republican legislature and the Republican administration are passing and signing bills to suppress political freedom and to start a series of witchhunts—and all this, too, is being done in the name to preserve democracy.

Two years ago, over these same stations, I discussed this vital issue with the people of Wisconsin. Five more nerve-wracking months were to pass before war finally broke out in Europe, but I should like to recall now what I said then. I said:

"All about us in the world we see arising the awful specter of another world war. This war promises to be the most savage and costly of all. We can little realize the ultimate judgment which the new war may bring to civilization.

"We have hardly recovered from the disastrous effects of the first war to end war. Our convalesence from that catastrophe has been slow and tortuous. We spent the best blood and resources of the Nation in an obviously futile attempt to keep democracy alive on the Continent of Europe.

"However, idealisitc those principles which led us into Europe's first World War may have been, the cold, sober realism of the after years has shown us our mistake in intervening in Europe's ruthless game of power politics. We know now that we took a pretty bad beating despite our military victory.

"Let us hope now that we can profit by our lesson of the first World War and remain out of Europe's broil and build a better democracy here at home." That is the end of the quotation.

Yes; there is the challenge for America—to build a better democracy here at home. Like the overwhelming majority of Americans, I despise the foreign isms which have impris-

oned the people of Europe—nazi-ism, fascism, and communism. My sympathy goes out to the valiant, wherever they may be, who stand so ocurageously against aggression and invasion. But I am convinced with the leaders of my party that we in America cannot rectify the mistakes of a generation of Tory leadership in Europe—a leadership which, by and large, is still in control.

The disease which has ravaged Europe cannot be cured by military victory. Their isms are but symptoms of fundamental illness in the economic and social body of Europe. That illness will not be cured until the leaders of the countries of Europe come to grips with the basic unsolved problems which gave the world its Stalin and Mussolini and Hitler.

We in America have a magnificent opportunity to crush Hitler and Hitlerism, not by force of arms three to five thousand miles from our bases, but by showing to the downtrodden peoples of the world that democracy is the only way of life that satisfies mankind's craving for both freedom and economic security.

That is the job we are equipped to do. We have the men, the money, and the materials to smash the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty and to show the whole world that democracy can meet the problems of our complex society.

This is the progressive position. This is the position of Bob and Phil La Follette. This is the position of the three Progressive Congressmen in Washington. This, I feel sure, is the position of the overwhelming majority of the plain people of Wisconsin and America.

Decentralization of Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1941

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, some weeks ago the Temporary National Economic Committee, in a special report to Congress, asserted that the Office of Production Management, set up to mobilize and organize the productive resources of the United States for national defense, was "an instrumentality of economic concentration the like of which the world has never seen."

The T. N. E. C. has spent many months studying the business and economic structure of the United States. Its main conclusions have been that the basic cause of business ills and economic disturbances is to be found in the concentration of power within a few organizations and corporations and within a comparatively limited area.

Defense contracts awarded during 1940 equalled more than half of the output of all manufacturing industries in 1939, yet these contracts, totaling more than $13,000,000,000, have been concentrated in a small area on the Atlantic coast, the Great Lakes, and the far West.

The report points out that 3 States—Idaho, Montana, and North Dakota—have not received a single contract and 32 States, including the District of Columbia, have received only 12.69 percent. Meanwhile, 4 States—California, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York—got 38.70 percent of the defense work.

The report says in part:

Far from detracting from the importance of economic reconstruction the events of the past year have served only to emphasize the need for readjustments after the present crisis is over. It is quite conceivable that the democracies might attain a military victory over the aggressors only to find themselves under the domination of economic authority far more concentrated and influential than that which existed prior to the war.

Our investigations offer ample evidence of the dangers of size and concentration of plants and industries. We therefore submit to all public and private bodies responsible for industry location the desirability of decentralizing industry to the end that the maximum economic benefits can be secured from plants operated at their most efficient size, the depressing aspects of the factory system prevented, and the American way of life preserved.

Suffering most from this economic concentration has been the South. Up to January 31, only 7 percent of all defense orders had been placed in 11 Southern States. Of a total of 302 new plants, only 24 were located in the South.

The policy of centralizing these contracts and industries in a few powerful interrelated corporations located in the congested areas of the East will inevitably result, as the Southern Governor's Conference recently pointed out, in the movement of a large labor supply from the South to the areas which are already suffering from a shortage of housing, create bottlenecks in transportation to and from the congested areas, and create vast plant and production facilities in areas already overcrowded which will become idle and useless when defense production is at an end.

The South offers an abundance of loyal, well-trained labor, the necessary raw materials, an excellent system of transportation, adequate housing, and ideal climatic conditions. In addition to this the economy of the South has been more adversely affected by the war than that of any other area due to the almost complete loss of our foreign cotton market. This offers a pressing reason for necessary industrial adjustments to compensate for this loss.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that my own city of New Orleans and the other Gulf port areas, in addition to the general benefits to be found throughout the South, offers probably the most ideal place in America for the establishment of defense industries.

Some months ago the United States Army prepared a map showing the safety zone for munitions making in the United States. It includes the Mississippi Valley down to northern Louisiana and Mississippi. That map is certainly out of date today. It was prepared before we acquired a string of naval and air bases extending from Trinidad through Puerto Rica and the Panama Canal Zone to the southern coast of Florida. Completion of these bases puts New Orleans farther from sea or air menace by an enemy fleet than are the Great Lakes, and certainly makes the Gulf Coast and the Mississippi Valley the most protected area in America.

I quote from a recent editorial which appeared in the New Orleans Item in connection with and in explanation of a large map showing the protected Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean Sea:

[From the New Orleans Item]

America's mare nostrum, the safest sea in the world—that is the body of water formed by the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean Sea. The panorama above shows how the West Indies, swinging southeastward from Florida to the South American mainland, all but wall in these waters, and how naval bases, old and new, add further protection to that already given by nature of these favored waters. The bases, marked by American flags, are located strategically near the main passes between these islands.

The smaller map shows in white the safest area of the United States, located snugly on the safest sea. New Orleans' position at the mouth of the Mississippi, at the head of America's mare nostrum, well indicates the importance the city should have in trade and in defense. But protected sea lanes to important countries to the south and protection against hostile navies and airplane carriers from the east and west are not all New Orleans has. Supplies from the great rich hinterland of the United States come to New Orleans over inland routes through the safest part of the continent, the Mississippi River Valley.

It follows that this great port is a logical supply and repair base for the fleet as well as for inland military operations.

A protected supply and repair base is vital to any navy. Prime Minister Winston Churchill, of Great Britain, is reported to have told American representatives that the problem of naval repairs is now a vital one for England and it is no secret that Nazi warplanes have damaged ships under repair in English shipyards, causing even further delay in resumption of service. This could not happen to ships in repair in New Orleans, as the city is over 1,500 miles away from the closest point from which an enemy could launch airplanes. And so it is that New Orleans, America's safest port on America's mare nostrum, offers her services to the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the writer might have also pointed out that New Orleans is the ideal and logical point of embarkation and debarkation of both men and supplies for the new bases which have been established in the Caribbean. Military authorities have informed me that troops trained in Louisiana and Mississippi have been transported to San Francisco and New York to be sent to these bases. Such a course is equivalent to going from Washington to New York by way of Chicago. The long haul down the Pacific and Atlantic coasts is unprotected, yet this has been the route taken, despite the complete protection and the shorter distance of the Gulf and the Caribbean.

I have been informed that 18 or more new powder plants must be constructed along with a score or more shell-loading plants. Do we propose to establish these plants in the overcrowded industrial eastern seaboard, thus adding to the difficulties of labor, housing, and transportation, or will the authorites scatter these plants throughout the South? Already there is a great flow of skilled labor from the South to the East.

The necessity for the development of the South and Southwest was recently recognized by the National Resources Planning Board. I am including herewith an article which appeared in the New Orleans Times-Picayune on April 9:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune of April 9, 1941]

HUGE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN SOUTHWEST SEEN—PLANNING BODY FORECASTS ERA OF PROSPERITY FOR SECTION

WASHINGTON, April 9.—A bright future for the Southwest, both financially and socially, if a planned development is followed, was today forecast by the National Resources Planning Board.

Although long lacking in industrial development, the southwestern area, comprising the States of Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Oklahoma, can become one of the major industrial sections of the Nation, the Board reported.

The area contains all of the requirements for industrial activity, but certain obstacles must be overcome and natural facilities developed before it takes its proper place in the industrial world, in the opinion of the Board.

How this can be accomplished was outlined in the lengthy report submitted to President Roosevelt today by the planning agency. Thirty pages of the national report recommending regional planning for the entire country were devoted solely to the southwestern region including the four States.

Glowing terms were used by the Board in its conclusions on the future of the Southwest.

MINERAL RESOURCES

"Its abundant mineral resources, its extensive areas of land that are still good for crops, forests, and grazing, its climate, and excellent recreational areas both developed and potential, all coupled with its relatively youthful and staunch population capable of assimilating a good education, which the region can afford to provide, for economic and social assets, which, if planned for, developed, and controlled, must inevitably make this region one of the most wholesome and prosperous areas in the Nation," the board declared.

The board, however, counseled the people of the area not to expect an overnight miracle.

"The attainment of that objective will be slow, costly, and at times disheartening, but it can be reached," the board declared.

"One can foresee in the future," the report said with respect to the industrialization of the area, "industry, recognizing the abundance of skilled labor provided through a comprehensive vocational education system, and desiring to locate near the source of raw materials, will have become blended in the economic life of the region."

The major obstacle standing in the way of real industrialization of the area is the discriminatory freight rates which block the movement of traffic into and out of the four States, the board declared. Although development of water transportation in the Southwest has relieved this condition to some extent, further elimination of the discriminations are necessary before industry can locate there in the extent to which the area is entitled.

FREIGHT RATES

"One of the outstanding obstacles militating against the industrialization of the region," the board said, "is the unreasonable freight rate differential, and once this difficulty is adjusted, the opportunities for industrial development will be greatly enhanced."

The region must take and fulfill six major steps if this industrialization is to be achieved, the board reported. They are:

1. Secure equitable freight rates.
2. Extend research facilities to develop new products, new uses, and new processes.
3. Disseminate authentic information and impartial advice to prospective industries.
4. Extend such facilities as electric power, gas, communication, water, fuel, transportation to areas suitable for industrial expansion.
5. Construct modern low-cost housing for industrial workers within easy access of suitable industrial areas.
6. Train native workmen in the special skills necessary to new production methods.

EVIDENCE OF FACILITIES

As evidence that the region does not have the manufacturing facilities which it deserves, the report pointed out that the four States have approximately 10 percent of the Nation's population, but has only 5 percent of the industrial establishments, 3 percent of all the wage earners in manufacturing establishments, and produces only 4 percent by value, of all the manufactured products.

Recommendations by the board on the various problems of the region, briefly, are:

Land: Take additional land out of cultivation of various sections of the region and plan for the future use of all the land in accordance with its best utilization. "There is immediate need," the report stated, "of a survey of the entire region to determine what lands are available that can support additional population and how many people such lands can support on a reasonable plane of living."

Soil conservation: Intensification of the work now being done by the local districts in the four States and the creation of additional districts to cover areas in which no planned soil conservation work is now under way.

Forests: Expand State and national forests in the area and provide for preservation of existing forest lands. Also make survey to determine what lumber supplies for commercial purposes are still available in the region and how they can best be utilized.

Farm tenancy: Additional legislation to promote better relationships between tenants and landlords and stabilize rural population. Also financial assistance should be immediately extended to between 40,000 and 60,000 tenants in region.

WATER RESOURCES

Water resources: Continuation of irrigation, flood control, and navigation projects in area now under construction or study. More adequate State water laws are needed in the region to protect and conserve underground water supplies for irrigation purposes. The urgent situation in the Grand Prairie rice area of Arkansas is a striking example of this need. Serious stream pollution of virtually every river in the region should be corrected through Federal and local cooperation.

Energy resources: Increase the facilities for water-power generation in the region, so that exhaustible supplies of petroleum, gas, and coal can be conserved. Unit operation of the oil fields in the area, resulting in a greater potential production from each pool. Existing primary transmission lines should be extended and interconnected so that there will eventually be a regional network of main transmission lines connecting all power resources and load centers.

TRANSPORTATION

Transportation: Construction of additional regional highways to completely connect all centers by good highways. Expansion of the airways network in the four States and construction of at least 200 more good airports. Secure reductions in railroad freight rates and elimination of differentials. Extension of natural gas pipe lines to provide gas in eastern and central municipalities not yet supplied with the gas produced in the area. Provide navigation on various streams penetrating the interior of the region.

Rural electrification: Extension of present program to provide electric lines for every farm in the region where electric service is economically possible.

Housing: Provide housing facilities through Federal, State, and local cooperation in both urban and rural areas.

Health: Wider distribution of hospital and clinical facilities. Health educational programs by the State and local authorities. Construction of sewage-disposal plants and elimination of stream pollution.

Education: Relocation of many schools to make them more available to all children in vicinity. More and better transportation facilities for students in rural areas. Establishment of more public libraries. Expansion of vocational educational facilities, which has been neglected in the region in the past.

Recreation: Complete the acquisition and development of the Big Bend National Park and the Palo Duro State Park in Texas. Develop the Mississippi River parkway. Develop a Gulf coast parkway between the Mississippi River and the lower Rio Grande. Develop the Texas Gulf coast beaches and lagoons for comprehensive public recreation. Create additional park units in the Ozark-Ouachita Mountain region. Develop the Arbuckle Mountain-Lake Murray-Platt National Park area in Oklahoma.

Wildlife: Expand wildlife refuges in the region. Preservation of Louisiana tidal marsh for primary wildlife area. Establish more and more migratory waterfowl areas in lower Rio Grande Delta. Establish a migratory waterfowl refuge in Texas Panhandle.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House know that we can ill afford to increase the economic ills of America. Yet a policy which results in the further concentration of resources, management, and industry is bound to result in chaos when the emergency period has ended.

With the established plants now operating at full capacity, the defense program offers an excellent opportunity for the decentralization and distribution of American industry. Within such a program lies the future of American security, the solution of the economic problems of the South, and the general prosperity for the Nation. I urge southern Congressmen to unite so that this program may become one of our major objectives.

Hon. Henry Tiegan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1941

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I knew Henry Tiegan intimately for more than 25 years. When I first became acquainted with him he was operating a newspaper at Minot, N. Dak., and I greatly admired him for his fearless stand in the interest of the people as a whole. I never had occasion to change my favorable opinion of him as I came to know him better and as I saw him in action as a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Minnesota.

Henry Tiegan was a thorough student of our economic life and had no ambition except to make this Government better than it is and to make this Gov-

ernment what our forefathers intended it to be. He, on many occasions, spoke of the evils existing in the Government and the seriousness that would result from leaving this situation unattended, but his purpose was always to right the wrongs and maintain a Government guaranteeing "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" to all our citizens.

It very frequently happens that when any individual in public life points out the evils of our ways with the intent to correct them, he is falsely charged with attempting to destroy the old system of government. Those who are well grounded in the economics of our entire social life understood Henry Tiegan, but those "super-patriots" who only live in the present and are only satisfied when they are making profits, misunderstood him. Sometimes these false patriots wave the flag and shout and drown out the voices of the real friends of a free government. For these reasons Henry Tiegan was misunderstood by a great many people, but admired and loved by millions of others who would give everything they possess, even their lives to make this Government stay on the track outlined by the Constitutional Convention.

While a Member of Congress Henry Tiegan was serious and diligent and never lost an opportunity to do more than his part in the interest of a free government. I deeply regret the loss of Henry Tiegan just at this time because if this Government is to be preserved, which every true patriot prays it shall, it will remain for the rest of the honest thinkers of America to guide the ship of state through the troubled waters of a muddled economic life and avoid both Scylla and Charybdis.

Relation of National Defense to Agricultural Products and the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1941

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF IOWA

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of Iowa:

House Concurrent Resolution 33

Whereas our Federal Government has recognized the necessity of placing the control of the production, manufacture, and distribution of many of our products under the supervision of a council of national defense; and

Whereas there has been established a division of this council of national defense known as the Consumers' Division; and

Whereas in a recent report of this Consumers' Division, a statement was made that recent increases in food costs were due mainly to a rise of 4 percent in meat prices, and advice was given in this same report that the consumers of this Nation would do well to look for cheaper cuts of meat and for meat substitutes, and to secure available information on the preparation of well-balanced meatless meals; and

Whereas the Honorable Mark G. Thornburg, secretary of agriculture for the State of Iowa, has already very properly recognized that such statements from a Federal office will result in decreased consumption of Iowa farm products and has in a letter to Miss Harriet Elliott, Consumers' Commissioner of the National Defense Council, voiced his objections to such statements on the grounds that—

1. The total amount of meat in storage in the United States is 25 percent over the 5-year average and 9 percent greater than the amount in storage on February 1, 1940;

2. Hogs are now selling for less than 79 percent of parity and more than 1,000,000,000 pounds of pork and pork products are in the various storage plants of the country;

3. During the last days of 1940, an article concerning a Washington release was printed in newspapers throughout the Corn Belt, which, in effect, assured the farmers that the defense program now being inaugurated with all its new employment would more than make up for the foreign market which the Corn Belt farmers have lost. (We have lost a foreign market for 140,000,000 pounds of lard annually.)

4. It is not with satisfaction that the Iowa farmer watches a Federal department in 1 year plow under crops and destroy livestock, and in another advise increasing hog production at a time when stocks of pork and pork products in storage are abnormally high, and then hears of another Federal department suggesting meat substitutes and well-balanced meatless meals; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has recently enacted the lend-lease bill, which contains a provision whereby Great Britain could buy or borrow farm products as well as armaments: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Repreentatives of the Forty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Iowa (the Senate concurring), That for the reasons stated in the preamble of this resolution the membership of the Council of National Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and the Administrator of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, be respectfully requested to so coordinate their programs as they affect agriculture so that the farmers of the Nation will have adequate recognition of their problems and that surplus farm products will be more readily consumed by the consumers of this Nation and will be made available to the people of the democratic nations of Europe; be it further

Resolved, That all sections of the Council for National Defense be respectfully requested to consider the advisability of starting from the premise that the farmer is one of the most vital factors in our national-defense program and that the important place of agriculture in national defense be recognized; be it also further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; the Honorable Henry A. Wallace, Vice President; the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture; the Honorable William K. Knudsen, Chairman of the Council for National Defense; the Honorable Milo Perkins, Administrator of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation; and to the two United States Senators and the nine Congressmen who now represent Iowa in the National Congress.

Adopted by Forty-ninth General Assembly, State of Iowa, 1941.

A. C. GUSTAFSON,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives, Forty-ninth General Assembly, State of Iowa.

A Message to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE OXFORD (N. Y) REVIEW-TIMES

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from a recent issue of the Oxford (N. Y.) Review-Times:

[From the Oxford (N. Y.) Review-Times]

A MESSAGE TO THE PRESIDENT

The average American citizen, Mr. President, is somewhat disillusioned by the halt in defense production by striking members of the C. I. O. incited and abetted by members of the Communist, Nazi, and Fascist groups within our country.

Your continued urge for greater production and statements that time is the all-important element do not make sense with these strikes. If the emergency is so acute, if time is so important, why are these strikes allowed? Is it possible that you have led your fellow citizens astray, that the emergency is not so acute as you have indicated and that next year or the year after will be soon enough to keep Britain, Greece, Yugoslavia, and other democracies from falling prey to the Hitler hordes?

If these strikes can be tolerated, Mr. President, why is it so necessary to hurry our boys off into the Army, which won't have equipment enough to train them properly unless production keeps up full tilt? And, Mr. President, we don't anticipate with any pleasure the Government's great campaign to sell bonds to the little fellow to finance this defense effort, as long as that effort can be stood on its head, so as to speak, by strikes.

We know, Mr. President, that labor trouble is a knotty problem, but we feel this baby is yours, nursed and cherished for the past 8 years, and that, if you haven't entirely spoiled him, you should be able to make him behave. You have been very stern, Mr. President, with your elder son, capital. He has been made to walk the straight and narrow path and is becoming accustomed to such treatment from you. We don't say that he didn't need plenty of parental guidance, and you haven't, by any means, overlooked him in this respect.

But this baby of yours—labor—seems to be cutting up a bit and we think you should show him a little more discipline, especially if you want the American people to go along with you in that matter of all-out effort in aid of democracy.

We expect you, Mr. President, to prevent these strikes. We understand that in taking away the right of labor to strike in emergency you are robbing the workingman of his only weapon for securing fair wages and enforcing good working conditions, and that under such

circumstances it is an obligation of the Government to establish fair wages and good shop conditions by law if that be necessary.

You have lost considerable prestige, Mr. President, during recent weeks while these strikes have been raging. The American people have been with you in this defense business and we'll still be with you if you'll settle this strike business once and for all. You must do that, you understand.

America, Be on the Alert!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT L. VREELAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. STYLES BRIDGES, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by Senator STYLES BRIDGES at the Essex County Country Club on the occasion of the dinner sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce and Civics of the Oranges and Maplewood on February 13, 1941:

This Nation is today engaged in a great effort to prepare itself for any eventuality. The people have recognized the prevailing threat to their present and future security and through their representatives in the Government have accepted the task of placing their military forces in order. Billions of dollars are being appropriated for expenditures incident to the expanding program of the Army and Navy of the United States. This year and for several years we are taking upon ourselves the burden which is a consequence of this dire necessity. We do so with the hope that by shouldering this burden, we shall be relieved of even the fear of entering into a state of human bondage.

Commendable as is this effort, it is not enough. Americans possess a characteristic which in normal times is one of their greatest assets but which in such a critical time as that through which we are now passing has a tendency to become their outstanding liability. The characteristic of which I speak is the mutual trust which marks the personal and group relations of the people who comprise our population. Most Americans have such an abiding love for their country and such a firm belief in its infinity that it is impossible for them to conceive of any person or group of persons within its borders possessed of an urge to render its system of government impotent. Hence it is not difficult to understand the indifference with which they have regarded the appeals of those individuals and agencies conscious of the presence of persons who have pledged their allegiance to philosophies of government foreign to our own. Neither is it difficult to understand how persons exercising vicious influences upon our way of life have been able to effectively here espouse their respective causes.

People are indifferent either when they are not informed or when they are misinformed. It is the duty and the privilege of the many patriotic and informed Americans to hail the attention of their fellows to every existing danger to the perpetuation of our representative government. We who are aware of the truth that among us are many intent upon subversive activities and utilizing our guaranteed liberties to nurse their alien plans should accept the task of rousing all the people from their sleepy hollow and enlisting their energies in the fight against such influence. For it is also characteristic of the American people that once aroused to the need for action, their efforts are immediate and decisive.

I am convinced that we of this Nation can be as cunning in detecting the hostile activities of foreign agents and their allies as they can be in discovering our weaknesses and attempting to prosecute their program. I am convinced we can repel their acts without insulting or injuring those who have made their subscription to our democracy above reproach. I think we all agree that reason should set the pace of our attack upon the "fifth columnist"; that we should not allow our emotional reaction to his reprehensible movements to destroy the effectiveness of our counterconduct or embarrass loyal Americans. Yet in such an emergency as now exists our citizens are the essence of discretion and tolerance. We realize we have a difficult assignment and that in seeking to destroy a vicious influence it is not always possible and practical to make the treatment delicate. Prompted by such an understanding, the American people will refuse to accept as a violation of their inalienable rights temporary infringements incident to the struggle to make their future secure. We who are loyal will not complain if our toes are stepped upon by those whose assignment it is to crush the plan by which they who are afflicted with the "isms" would destroy our entire physique. Americans would be unwise to refuse the blessing of such understanding. Any who doubt its viciousness and thoroughness and the need for unrelenting action against it need only to listen to Hitler's description of his method to have reason to cast their doubt aside.

In 1933 Hitler had this to say to the then President of the Danzig senate:

"What is war but cunning, deception, delusion, attack, and surprise? What is the object of war? To make the enemy capitulate. Why should I demoralize him by military means if I can do so better and more cheaply in other ways? * * *

"When I wage war, troops will appear, let us say, in Paris. They will wear French uniforms. They will march through the streets in broad daylight. Everything has been thought out and prepared to the last detail. * * * The unlikeliest things are the surest.

"We shall have enough volunteers, men like our Storm Troops, trustworthy and ready for any sacrifice. We shall send them across the border in peacetime. Gradually. No one shall see them as anything but commercial travelers. * * * We shall have friends who will help us in all enemy countries. * * *

"Mental confusion, contradiction of feeling, indecisiveness, and panic—these are our weapons. * * * Our strategy is to destroy the enemy from within, to conquer him through himself."

In 1933 that was Hitler's plan. Today we know it is what he has done; it is what has accelerated his victories and made them so complete. In every nation he has attacked he has found traitorous citizens willing to barter their patriotism for his promised glittering treasures. If there be such in America we want to root them out and let their obnoxious spirits die under the shining submergement.

Edmund Taylor in his Strategy of Terror, describes well Hitler's new technique of total war—"to confuse by propaganda, to divide by corruption, to paralyze by intimidation, and then to destroy by blitzkrieg."

It is an accepted fact that this technique is already being employed in America. Witness of volumes of German-inspired books, magazines, and pamphlets passing through the United States mails every week. Witness the German Library of Information in New York. The Dies committee and the F. B. I. are hard at work trying to determine just how extensive corruption in favor of German ideology is.

This land has been and shall continue to be one of opportunity for peoples of all races, all colors, and all creeds. Some of our greatest patriots have been and are the sons and daughters of those who previous to this time escaped from their servitude to autocratic rulers of Europe. They are grieved by their knowledge of the conditions which prevail in their native lands. Today more than ever before they love and serve this country. They are our fellow loyal Americans and they should never be deprived of our fellowship and help. It must ever be understood that our distaste is for those who have embraced nazi-ism and communism, whatever their present or past nationalities. For those of German blood who are constantly refusing to be intimidated by Nazi agents, we have admiration. For those of any blood who today work for Nazi and Communist domination of this Nation we can find no treatment too harsh.

No less an authority than the German Foreign Office checks closely and keeps records on the daily activities of loyal Germans and friends of Germany. Personal information files are kept not only on persons of German blood but for America's public officials and prominent citizens. There is hardly a home in the United States that has not received directly or indirectly literature proclaiming nazi-ism. Outright espionage is included in the program. Camps are established as recreation centers and used to train troops. A careful study is made of social, political, and idealistic ambitions of individual citizens and groups. Wherever there is dissatisfaction Nazi agents and friends of Germany are on the ground to foment all possible trouble and create uprising if possible. There is every indication that at the present time Hitler's friends in the United States are doing all in their power to undermine the national-defense program and to foster political, class, and racial disputes. This is their program for America today. This program of the Reich involves much expense, but it is considered worth the price; and when we consider how successful it has been in the countries Hitler has already subdued we cannot but agree that such an investment pays dividends.

The Nazi program is one that has no ending. It is carried over into actual warfare, as an account of the struggle in Europe indicates. Just before the march against a nation is begun, Germans, specially trained, are sent to take charge of those within the nation who have been carefully instructed as to their part in the movement. Through the air and over the road they travel, some as businessmen, some in winter sports costume, some in the uniforms of neutral powers. Strategic points are seized, all possible ways of confusing the military and civil population are utilized, people are terrorized by false reports and false orders. Men and women who have in the years previous lived or visited in the country about to be attacked are sent back for the dual purpose of allaying suspicion and guiding the movements. The most glaring example of this can be found in the story of the attack upon Norway.

When the military forces of Germany moved into Norway, the people of that country could not understand the presence of many German officers and soldiers who spoke the Norwegian language fluently. After the blitzkrieg was over, this story could be told.

You remember that at the close of the last war there were many German children wasting away for lack of proper food and care. The people of Norway were much disturbed by that condition and, prompted by a sym-

pathy natural to them, they invited the German Government to send these children to the homes of Norwegian families. The invitation was accepted. Norse mothers and fathers nourished and reared these German youngsters at their own expense and as if they were their own flesh and blood. The German boys and girls became as brothers and sisters to the children of free and sympathetic Norway. They learned the language and customs of the Norwegians and when they reached manhood and womanhood they were sent back to their homeland.

Just a few months before the day of the German attack many of these befriended citizens of Germany were sent back to Norway ostensibly to visit the people who had made possible their health and their happiness. Norway accepted these visitors as a human gesture of appreciation. Suspicion of the real purpose of the return of these "friends" was, therefore, not aroused. When the signal was given, those who had gone into that little nation of the north as visitors turned on their benefactors and did much to expedite the German attack. That is the vicious method of assault used by Germany against a people who had been kind to them.

It is my thought that we in America should not be as tolerant as were the Norwegians of those who accept our hospitality and take advantage of our free way of life to espouse their cause.

The agents of nazi-ism are one menace to our freedom and form of government. Another, just as vicious and just as persevering, is that created by the agents of communism. Stalin is today playing a clever game. It is his hope that the cards are being stacked in his favor; that those nations fighting now will exhaust themselves and give the Communist bear the opportunity to move in and take things over. The Soviet leader is not one to be trusted. He is no more a sympathizer of representative government today than he was before the outbreak of hostilities. He is unalterably opposed to the democratic way of life, and his efforts within our borders are just as relentless as those of Hitler. The people need to be reminded of this, lest they allow the immediate threat of nazi-ism to becloud the sure threat of communism.

The Dies committee and the F. B. I. have established the fact that the Communist Party in the United States is an integral part of the international Communist movement being guided by the Moscow leaders. Like the Nazis, the Communists have a definite program. It has, unfortunately, been prosecuted in this country with some success.

In the beginning it was the policy of the Communists to establish their own labor organizations. That is the practice no more. They have found that it is more advantageous to gain admission for sympathizers to the established labor unions of the country and there, by the process of boring from within, elevate themselves to positions of control and then apply their destructive ideas. You know what the results have been. Not a few of the labor disputes and strikes have been brought about by the Communist agitation. When persons engaged in subversive activities strike at our industrial plants they strike at the heart of our national defense effort and to long tolerate such activities will jeopardize our chance of remaining secure.

The existence of front organizations for the Communist movement is a matter of common knowledge. It is unfortunate that many loyal Americans were duped into joining these groups. Yet that is no reason why we should refrain from condemning them and refuse to seek their expulsion from the American scene. The names of most of these groups are already familiar to you.

Alien philosophies are being impressed upon the minds of our young. To embitter them without reason in their early years is to guarantee their opposition to our way of life when they reach maturity. That is a common practice of the Communist. It is a common practice of the Nazi. They like to get young recruits and steep them in the doctrines of hate and destruction of moral and spiritual values.

All boring from within by Communists is not done in front organizations or labor unions. They bore within other political parties and by influencing the activities of another party influence the policies of our Government. There can be no doubt in the minds of informed people that the Communists in this country have had a measure of success along this line. Call the roll of Government officials and employees and you will find hundreds who consciously or unconsciously have sympathized and supported Communist doctrine and practices.

Communism has made a place for itself in many of our schools and colleges, public and private. In some State universities persons professing communism are employed as teachers and professors.

The most shocking evidence is that which establishes the fact that Communist influences have penetrated some of the churches of the Nation. I think it should be plain to even the least devoted Christian that a preacher who embraces communism casts Christianity aside.

I often hear patriotic and intelligent citizens say this: "Well, what of it? There are 130,000,000 people in the United States and only a very small percentage of these are in any way engaged in preaching alien doctrines. There is nothing to worry about. Those who do the shouting are merely 'red baiters' or 'Nazi baiters.'" I wonder if they realize that it is more advantageous for nazi-ism and communism to have a small number of followers in a given country. A small number can be highly trained and completely devoted. And those are the essential prorogatives to effective action whenever such is called for. The following are the words of Lenin—his description of the organizations which should be what he calls the "vanguard of the proletariat":

"Such an organization must of necessity be not too extensive and as conspiratorial as possible."

And listen to the words of Dr. Matthews, long connected with the Communist movement in the United States:

"We had an almost perfect trick for silencing any critics who suspected or knew the Communist nature of our united front. All we had to do was cry 'red baiting'! This cry of 'red baiting' is the best trick ever invented, short of a firing squad, for making short work of anybody who dares to object to Communist theories or practices. If he isn't effectively silenced, he is at least thoroughly discredited in that vast flock of citizens who like to think of themselves as liberals. A twentieth century American liberal would rather face the charge of slapping his grandmother than to be accused of 'red baiting.' And so the cry of 'red baiting' enabled us to carry on the work of Moscow in this country with little or no molestation from knowing critics."

In another well-remembered troubled time, the State of New Hampshire gave to the country a man whose memory is immortal. His life is emblematic of the service which true Americans have always desired to render to their country. Perhaps it is fitting that we here should now recall the pledge of loyalty to America Daniel Webster made. It is a pledge which every American citizen should take today. It is a pledge that any public official should take pride in repeating. In this hour when our national security is faced with its greatest threat, I count it a privilege to take the pledge made by that noble servant of the people whom I now represent.

These are Webster's words:

"I shall know but one country. The ends I serve shall be my country's, my Gods, and truth's. I was born an American. I will live an American. I shall die an American, and I intend to perform the duties incumbent upon me to the end of my career. I mean to do this with absolute disregard of personal consequences."

The work of the F. B. I. under the direction of J. Edgar Hoover deserves the commendation of every patriotic American. The agents have been carefully trained in the methods of combating subversive influences and activities and as a result of the efforts of these diligent servants of the people we have every reason to believe that at no time in this crisis will the dangers of sabotage, confusion, and division be as great as they were in previous crises.

The F. B. I. has a definite program by which it is proceeding to combat the efforts of alien agents. The industrial plants of the Nation have been surveyed and methods devised to afford them adequate protection from physical and political dangers. The leaders of subversive groups and their associates and followers have been indexed and their activities are being checked closely. All police agencies of the country have been mobilized and their combined efforts in this trying time is a heart-warming exhibition of the spirit of the true America. Known or suspected foreign agents are being watched closely. The F. B. I. is keeping a close liaison with all other similar agencies.

Yet it is not enough to pursue and apprehend spies and saboteurs. Work such as that which the Dies committee has been doing should be continued and augmented. The committee has been doing an excellent job in investigating and listing those persons engaged in subversive activities in this country. The accomplishments are a real asset to our Government today and will be of great value should the possible crisis materialize. Loyal Americans are indebted to Congressman DIES and his committee for their efforts in our behalf.

I think it is useless to appropriate and spend billions for armaments in the name of national defense and our future security if every possible and effective means of rooting out the enemies within our own borders is not employed. The F. B. I. and the Dies committee and any other branch of the Government devoted to such a worthy effort should be given whatever moral and financial support is necessary to make their work successful.

Further, when the investigations of these groups disclose glaring defects in the set-up or personnel of the Government, remedial steps should be taken without hesitation. Today there is a definite need for the dismissal of some Government officials who are in sympathy with alien philosophies of government and who serve in advisory positions to the groups who expound those philosophies. It may be necessary to tighten our immigration laws to prevent entrance into the country of additional adherents to the repulsive forms of government which exist on yonder shores. Our deportation laws need to be more strictly enforced and undesirable aliens expelled from the country. Public registration of their affiliations should be required of those who join political parties which seek to give organization to subversive activities. The custom of diplomatic immunity should not be construed as to permit Nazis and Communists to loose torrents of propaganda upon the American people. This loophole should be plugged. As long as it is open to use by those determined to rid the world of government by the people, citizens of the United States will be subject to an effectively bitter channel of influence.

The "fifth column" in this country is the first line of attack of Nazis and Communists against our form of government and precious

way of life. Our fervent desire and hope for the perpetuation of our democracy and the freedom it guarantees to us demands that we deprive those groups of that influence upon our future prosperity and happiness. In the effort to satisfy that demand every citizen must share. The cooperation between local and Federal law-enforcement agencies must be continued. There must be support for their efforts from the public and its Treasury. The same support must be given those agencies which seek to reveal the dangers which prevail as a result of the work of the "fifth columnist." Those of our number now informed as to the seriousness of the situation and conscious of the need for action must work diligently to educate those whose reactions are hesitant, and thus bring about a united front against the small but determined minority of our population.

Ridicule and unjust criticism against those who combat evil influences upon our people should by this time be familiar. Its source has long since been identified. The same forces against which these agencies work are the forces which seek to ridicule and thus eliminate them. We must make the people aware of this truth and keep them from falling into the trap being so cleverly set by the "fifth column." There is a definite need for every agency which can reveal and destroy any part of the "fifth column." Neither distrust nor false pride nor malice nor jealousy should be allowed to take root in the relationships between these agencies. That is what the Nazis and the Communists desire. It is unpatriotic for us to so accommodate them.

Employers should by careful investigation establish as fact the patriotism of all men they hire. The added expense which such a process will make necessary is as nothing when compared with the injury that an unvouched-for worker can do to the plant and thus to the country. Employees should exhibit a reasonable interest in the activities of their fellows and quickly report to their superiors any movement which casts legitimate suspicion upon another. A citizen should not seek to investigate any matter himself. He must remember, whether he be an employer or an employee, that the local, State, and National Governments have men trained for that job and who can do it well.

There is a dire need for a revival of their interest in the practice and teaching of Americanism by the Nation's schools, churches, patriotic, fraternal, and civic organizations. Every American should so conduct himself as to make his life an attractive example of the goodness which our way of life bestows. Such conduct and such an example will be an inspiration to the young men and women born under the flag of a democracy. No effort to extol the virtues of our representative government will be wasted. No vigilance on the part of the American people will be in vain.

We should start now to do what we can to extinguish the class lines which have been drawn in recent years. Nothing can more effectively breed distrust, nothing can more effectively prevent cooperative effort when such is badly needed than the segregation of our people into classes and races and religions. I feel that it is my patriotic duty to call that important truth to your attention. Some will say it is the cry of the politician. I tell you that it is the cry of the soul of America.

The spirit which has made our country great has been nourished by the American doctrine of the equality of all men of all circumstances. No person or group of persons, for a political or any other purpose, should risk the destruction of that spirit, for if it should die our way of life would be buried with it.

We who are loyal to our country are alert. We shall pass through this troubled time without making more than a minimum sacrifice of our traditional liberties. But we must remember that democracy's attributes are for those who make an offering toward their preservation. J. Edgar Hoover has rightfully said:

"Intellectual freedom is American. Intellectual license and debauchery is un-American." We should be so informed that we shall be able to distinguish the two and do what is in our power to eradicate the latter:

Lincoln once said:

"At what point, then, is the danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reaches us it must spring up among us. * * * If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher."

For men and women who utilize their freedom to make that blessing their exclusive possession, there should be no sympathy. The wails of the persons who cannot see through the acts of the unfaithful to the true light of their efforts should not receive a considerate audience. Remember that it is your job and my job, as patriotic Americans, to put down and keep down persons who seek to substitute for our glorious heritage of freedom and justice a way of life obnoxious to every principle of decency and honor. It can be done. We will do it.

Jackson Day Dinner Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSH LEE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 15, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND, OF ARIZONA

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and brilliant address delivered by the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] at the Jackson Day dinner in Phoenix, Ariz., on March 29, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am deeply appreciative of the high honor and privilege conferred upon me by your Jackson Day Committee in extending to me the invitation to address you on this auspicious occasion honoring the memory of that great American and great Democrat, Andrew Jackson.

We Democrats usually ascribe to Thomas Jefferson the title of founder of the party, but Jackson was no less its champion and defender. It is fitting and proper, indeed, that on this day when democracy is being challenged the world over, we should hold this dinner in honor of one who, more than anyone else, helped to make our Nation the world's greatest democracy. The sentiments and aspirations of liberty and democracy of which Jefferson dreamed, Andrew Jackson made real.

Born on March 15, 1767, in the lean backwoods of the Waxhaw, in South Carolina, his father dying shortly before his birth, Jackson was forced to endure many hardships which gave him an understanding and preparation for leadership in later life. The Revolutionary War broke out when he was a mere lad. His brother, Hugh, lost his life in this war in 1779, and on the 29th day of May, the same year, Andrew and his brother Robert took part in the battle of Hanging Rock. He was then a boy of only 13 years. He and his brother were later captured by the British and Robert died from disease contracted in the prison camp. While a prisoner, Andrew was struck down by a sword in the hands of a Brititsh soldier whose boots he refused to black. His mother, while on a mission of service at Charleston, nursing prisoners from the Waxhaws, contracted yellow fever and died. At the successful end of the struggle of the Colonies, we find Andrew Jackson, a mere lad of 15, alone in the world, an orphan of the Revolution.

This early life of misery, poverty, and hardship made Jackson a true knight of the frontier. After completing his schooling, he began the study of law. In 1787 he was admitted to the bar in North Carolina and soon afterward wended his way westward to Jonesboro, now in Washington County, Tenn. There he played an important part in the early history of that State. He learned more from life than from books. He was a rugged individualist, always ready for the call of his country, either to fight her enemies in the field or to serve in the guidance of her destiny.

His life is a picture and inspiration for our youth of the possibilities in this great democracy. Although from the most humble beginning, he became not only a great warrior and a great soldier who led our country to victory in the Battle of New Orleans, but he was Attorney General, judge, Member of the House of Representatives, Senator, and twice President of the United States. He believed in his country and its Constitution and the guaranty of that Constitution to the masses of its people and to the minorities. He did not propose to see that guaranty impaired. When the Bank of the United States sought to control the politics of this Nation, Jackson had the courage to grapple with that great enemy and, by overthrowing it, made himself the idol of the people and reinstated the Democratic Party in public confidence.

I do not intend tonight to dwell at length upon the life and history of Jackson; I am sure that the details of his glorious record are as familiar to every patriotic American as they are to me. But I would make one point from his history: If I were to ask each one of you what quality or virtue of this hero, more than any other, endeared him to Americans and perpetuated him in our memories, the answer would come back quickly and unanimously—courage. His courage to face facts, disagreeable and discouraging as they might be; his courage to proclaim the right as he saw it, without regard to public favor and in the face of slander, vilification, and abuse; his courage to fight for the right, to the bitter end regardless of the cost or sacrifice.

On this occasion, when we are gathered to do honor to the memory of this great patriot, it is my fervent hope and prayer that we Americans of today will have during the troubled days through which we are passing, the courage of Andrew Jackson. It will be needed; and it may be our salvation.

I need not tell you that today America faces one of the gravest crises in her history. We have seen men gone mad come to leadership in nations across the sea. We have seen these men strike down and destroy by brutal might and force their weaker neighbors. We have seen the lights of liberty and freedom go out one by one in the Old World, until today there is left but the faltering flame that still burns in Britain. We have seen these things and we have asked ourselves, What is the future of America in this war-crazed world? And when we face the facts and consider this question courageously, unflinchingly, we come to some rather distressing conclusions.

I think all of you will agree with me when I say that it is my firm conviction that the people of our State and of our country want

the United States to live at peace with the rest of the world. But by "peace" I mean a peace that is consistent with the continuance in this Nation of liberty and freedom of thought, freedom of speech, and freedom of conscience; a peace that is consistent with our national honor and our rightful place among the nations of the world. I cannot envisage the acceptance by my countrymen of a peace at any price, a peace such as exists in France, Denmark, Holland, Norway, and the rest of the conquered and occupied nations of Europe.

With this hope and ideal of peace for our country, let us see what our position will be if England falls in the struggle that is now raging in Europe.

If the Axis Powers prevail, it is not alone a warlike and vengeful Germany that we face, but a hostile or dominated alliance of a large portion of the world. The original Axis partnership, Hitler and Mussolini, will be in control of all of Europe and Africa; the junior partner, Japan, having taken what she wants in the Pacific west of Hawaii, will be the undisputed master of the East. Picture, if you will, the military might of this unholy alliance, with the resources and manpower of the conquered nations forcibly driven to the task of producing implements of war, with hordes of soldiers flushed with the wine of long-awaited victory, with a navy double the size of ours and shipways of a capacity seven times those in our possession, with an air force of a size and potency never dreamed of by man—picture that array and tell me if you can see in it the prospect of our living at peace with the world. Does the history of the past several years, does the memory of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the others, does the whole flaming record of Hitler, permit us to believe that with such might as I have mentioned at his command Hitler will permit us to escape his plan for world domination?

We have no need to speculate about this proposition; we have the word of Hitler and his cohorts as to the inclusion of America in the Axis plan for remaking the world.

In the New York Times for December 10, 1940, there is a report of a speech by the German Minister of Agriculture, Walter Darre, which was made at the request of Hitler, to a group of Nazi Party leaders. I quote:

"We will introduce in our new 'living space' completely new methods. All soil and industrial property of inhabitants of non-German origin will be confiscated without exception and distributed primarily among the worthy members of the party and soldiers who were accorded honors for bravery in this war. Thus a new aristocracy of German masters will be created. This aristocracy will have slaves assigned to it, these slaves to be their property and to consist of landless, non-German nationals."

Then Herr Darre describes this form of slavery, and we only have to look at the slavery now imposed upon the Poles to understand what he meant. I quote further:

"I have been asked about my opinion of America, especially the United States and the danger of this psuedo-democratic Republic's possible attempts to hinder us in our historical development. * * * We Germans have accounts which must be settled with this country. The United States also will be forced by Germany to complete and final capitulation."

He further described how, under the Nazi industrial system, the United States would have, not seven million, but thirty or forty million unemployed, and stated:

"Mr. Rosefeld will then beg the fuehrer on his knees to purchase from the United States not manufactured products, but raw materials, at prices which we will dictate. The United States is at present so demoralized and so corrupted that, like France and England, it need not be taken into consideration as a military adversary."

Now, from Rauschning's book, Voice of Destruction, let us see what Hitler himself says:

"I guarantee that at the right moment a new America will exist as our strongest supporter when we are ready to take the stride into overseas space. We have the means of awakening this Nation in good time. There will be no new Wilson arising to stir up America against us."

These statements and their past record should be sufficient to convince us of their intentions to include the United States in their plans.

But even if we could convince ourselves that an attack upon us would not certainly follow an Axis victory, are there any among us so foolish as to believe that we would not have to prepare as never before for war? I have not found anyone, even among the most rabid pacifists, who does not agree that if Hitler wins the United States will necessarily be, for untold years to come, an armed camp.

Let me show you just what this means. I shall pass over the dismal picture of a national morale developed while we are literally sitting on a powder keg; I will not dwell upon the curbing of personal rights and liberties which a constant threat of war will certainly bring about. These are horrifying, it is true, but I pass them and point out only the economic aspects of the matter. We have just begun to prepare ourselves for the threat of war; our present emergency is nothing compared to what it will be if Hitler wins and we are surrounded by his might; but we are already spending billions yearly for national defense. These billions are not produced, as are Hitler's, by the exploitation of conquered nations, the enslavement of people, the destruction of liberty; we in this country are traditionally pledged to meet even the gravest emergencies with honor, without the regimentation of our people, and without the destruction of our standards of living.

Today the Federal Government is taking one-eighth of the national income in taxes and yet is not paying its current bills. The States and local governments require sufficiently more to make a total of 20 percent, or one-fifth of the national income. It is inescapable that if we are ever forced to live at swordspoints with a victorious Hitler, the military machine we would build up would consume, with other Government costs, from twenty to forty billion dollars annually—from one-third to one-half of our national income. That is an appalling prospect; but to the most optimistic it is the best that we can expect if England falls.

Very recently our President and our Congress were called upon to decide what we were going to do about the situation which we have been discussing—the future of America. The question presented itself in the form of the decision to be made on the lend-lease bill. It was a momentous decision for anyone to be called upon to make. The advocates of "the easy way," the way of postponement and of hoping for the best and of appeasement, were organized in their effort and loud in their clamor that we adopt the policy of pretending that the dogs of war were not loose, as if by ignoring them we could escape their lust for blood and butchery. To differ with these people was to earn for yourself the name of "war monger" and "king lover" and other names not nearly as flattering.

I am happy to announce that when our leaders answered, they did so with courage. They accepted the challenge fearlessly. They told the world in no uncertain terms that America stood with the cause of freedom and liberty and justice; and that democracy embattled in other parts of the world would have at its back the strength and resources of the most powerful nation on earth. I am happy, also, to tell you that, in my opinion, this courageous answer will do more than anything else possible to keep us out of this war.

I believe that if we render effective aid to Great Britain she can turn the tide of this war and either overwhelm Hitler or force him to a reasonable peace. I believe that if we render effective aid to Britain we can keep alive the hopes and courage of the French, the Belgians, the Danes, and other conquered peoples for the day when they can throw the strength and resistance of which they are capable into the battle on the side of democracy. I believe that if we render effective aid to Britain, we can morally strengthen the resolve of the Greeks, the Turks, and the remaining free peoples of Europe not to surrender to the Axis juggernaut. I believe that if we render effective aid to Britain, even if the worst happens and she eventually falls in spite of our aid, we will have purchased invaluable time for the preparation of our defenses while the Axis has been exhausting its manpower and resources in the struggle with Britain.

This, then, is the picture which we have up to date. America has courageously faced the facts. The responsibility of leading us out of this crisis is upon the Democratic Party, and I think properly so, for our party has always stood for liberty, justice, with equal rights to all and special privilege to none. Before us lies the duty of throwing into the fight for the preservation of these democratic principles all of the strength and power of which we are capable. It is a task which will grievously try us. If we are to succeed in it, each one of us will have to make sacrifices. Each will have to give a little more than his accustomed effort. Each will have to take a little less of material gain than he has learned to expect. Those of us who have been quick to criticize must learn to be tolerant. The spirit of party unity exhibited here tonight is proof we will meet the test. We will hold the torch of democracy high. We will be proud of the principles of democracy given us by Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, those hardy pioneers who were willing to endure hardships and even die if necessary that we might have this Nation of freedom and tolerance where the will of the people reigns. We will give this job the very best that is in us and make the effort worthy of the price at stake, the American way of life. We will, by our conduct, reiterate the sentiment which more than 100 years ago Andrew Jackson put into words, "The Federal Union; it must be preserved."

Freedom and Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 15, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN, OF VERMONT

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] at Valley Forge, Pa., on April 6, 1941. The topic of the address is "Freedom and Unity."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is an inspiration and a challenge for Americans to meet at this historic spot today. As we here give thought to the traits of men whose love of liberty was greater than love of comforts, or even life, it is timely and fitting that we also give sober reflection to the great challenge to our thinking, our ideals, and our concepts of life which is facing us today.

This is a most fitting place to give consideration to these things. We are here in one of the most historic spots of all America. We are here at the place where the heart and soul of a new and untried and even an unformed nation was put to a test, the result of which meant freedom or loss of freedom to the people of what has since become the greatest nation on earth.

On Washington's Birthday it was my great privilege to address a large gathering in New York City. In that gathering were hundreds of people who had recently become new citizens of the United States. Those people were embarking upon the great adventure and the responsibility of becoming Americans.

In addressing them I said, "The greatest test for Washington and his men came during the winter spent at Valley Forge. They could have given up at that time. They could have gone to their homes and surrendered their struggle to found a new and independent government of the people on the western shores of the Atlantic.

"They could have done so, secure in the knowledge that for a few years at least they would have had greater luxuries, as luxuries were known in those days, than if they continued fighting against cold, disease, hunger, and attacks by their enemies. But they knew too well that these greater comforts secured by surrender would be short-lived. They preferred to face temporary hardships for a few years than to endure permanent slavery.

"They faced the facts. The freedom of a people forever depends upon their willingness to face the facts and to make sacrifices. That was true in 1776; it is true today."

The victory which the American men won in the winter of 1777 was a spiritual one to an even greater extent than it was a material one. It is important for us today to realize that the things of the spirit are still paramount and most important. It is particularly essential for us to remember this at a time when we hear constantly of industrial production, materials of war and planes and guns and international intrigue and power politics and starvation and disease and death.

Our great Nation of 130,000,000 souls has been committed to a policy of world-wide involvement in the affairs of many nations and many people. It is entirely possible, and I fear probable, that we will engage in military strife and naval warfare extending to the far, far corners of this earth.

We may become involved for many years. Should we do so, I believe that we will eventually emerge among a galaxy of weakened and chastened nations with a victory of arms. But I want to say to you today that military supremacy and victory are empty and meaningless honors if won at the cost of things that really matter most.

It is inevitable in the evolutionary processes of the world that nations are born amidst suffering and hardship and sacrifice. These nations grow great and in consequence assume leadership among other nations until with time they wax soft and indolent and selfish and fall before younger and more powerful people not so far removed from hardships and sacrifices. Though nations and governments may rise and fall, yet there are ideals and principles which never age and upon a people's adherence to these ideals and principles, the life of their government may depend.

Far greater than the military conquest of a continent or of a world is a victory that is the victory which retains for us and our posterity the spirit and ideals of our democratic way.

When I think of today's challenge to democracy, then I think of the motto of my own State of Vermont, a State that was an independent republic for 14 years before it became, 150 years ago this spring, the fourteenth State of the United States. The motto of Vermont is "Freedom and Unity." The implications of this motto are pertinent at this very moment.

We are hearing incessantly the pleas for unity in this country of ours. I would not decry the advisability of unity as the shadows of war fall lengthening across our land. But unity alone is not enough for free men and free women. I would not say that unity is the most important thing for us to achieve. I would not even say that unity alone is the most necessary thing to achieve in our defense preparations.

Let us remember that if there is any country on the face of the globe where there is national unity today, that that country is Germany. Yet there is no freedom for the people there. Regardless of whether Germany wins or loses in a military strife, her people will have lost because Germany has unity without freedom.

The fundamental value of democracy is freedom to think our own thoughts, to disagree with our neighbors, or even our Government, without fear of persecution.

Let us remember that in the greatest democracy of all, the Kingdom of God, where rich and poor, the humble and the great are all alike welcome, that freedom and individual approach to the Almighty is the goal and the privilege of all.

In these trying times which remind us in their intensity and gravity of the trials at Valley Forge 164 years ago, we are going to disagree on the best methods of aiding nations, which seem most friendly to us and our ideals.

We are going to disagree on the best methods of financing and paying for the astronomical cost of our interventions in the wars of the world.

We are going to disagree on how we can best keep our country at its fullest and most complete productive capacity, with issues like strikes and subnormal income for agriculture and the proposed St. Lawrence seaway among the things which we must settle collectively in a democratic way.

Not just the President, not just the Congress, but in the last analysis the people of America must have their say in mapping the future course of our destiny.

As a people we are united as to the kind of country we want to live in. We want justice, equality, opportunity, parity, and security for all.

I believe, more firmly and more sincerely than I believe almost anything else in this world, that to unite to make secure a future for our country that includes well-being and self-respect for all people and all groups is the most important phase of our national defense. It is vastly more important that we do this than to win military victory in Africa or to sink the ships of the enemy in the Indian Ocean.

Last summer I received a report issued by the American Youth Commission. It was a fine report. It contained one sentence which I never can forget. This sentence is the keynote to the great problem which we face today. It reads: "This country can only be defended enthusiastically by people who expect just treatment from it."

As we travel along life's highway we encounter many branches to the road. It will be all too easy in the gathering dusk of confusion and propaganda and hysteria to take the wrong road. We must guard against it and to do this must preserve to ourselves independence of thought, of voice, and of legitimate action. To this end we must have unity. We must unite in the common purpose of defending the intangibles of democracy, the freedom and justice for which our ancestors paid a price in blood and hardship beyond any since paid for democracy on these shores. Unless we succeed in this, all our efforts will have been in vain.

But if we do awaken to the realization that we are defending more than trade routes, territorial boundaries, foreign investments, or international prestige; if we vow that this undertaking of our Nation is in the name of justice and humanity for the common people of this world, then we will succeed—because we will have touched the great fundamental truth and reason for man's being on earth.

Ohio Farm Bureau Mutual Insurance Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 15, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. GEORGE. D. AIKEN, OF VERMONT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] at Columbus, Ohio, on April 4, 1941, at the annual meeting of the Ohio Farm Bureau Mutual Insurance Co.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In all the gatherings that I have addressed during the last few years, I don't believe that I have spoken on a more important subject than my topic for today. I am positive that I have never spoken at a more critical period in American history. I believe I am speaking to a group whose influence for good can scarcely be excelled.

You people here represent an activity of a great farm organization upon which it is possible that not only the future of American agriculture may depend but one by which the future of America itself may be tremendously influenced. You representatives of the Farm Bureau Insurance Cooperative represent successful agricultural endeavor and typify the ability of American farmers to do things rightly and successfully for themselves.

I am not a calamity howler. I submit there is a silver lining to nearly every cloud, and I submit that there are imperfections in all the best laid plans of men. But during the last 3 months I have participated in the deliberation of the United States Senate on matters involving the happiness, welfare, prosperity, even the liberty of every American man, woman, and child. I realize fully that there are being written today what may prove to be the darkest pages of American history. Or, perhaps, by a turn of the wheel of fortune, what seems dark today may turn out to be the brightest. Only time can give us the answer.

Only constant and concerted effort can spin the wheel of fortune that will throw the bright light of success and liberty upon these

pages now being written in gathering darkness.

In these days when the shadows of war are ever lengthening, when the Government of the United States has committed 130,000,000 people to a policy of involvement in the world-wide struggle of power politics and all it forbodes, we look back ever wistfully upon the brighter periods of our years and plan and scheme and hope to recover those things which we now realize to be precious.

There stands out among the years which most of us remember well, the period from 1910 to 1914. During these years a balance in the purchasing power of different American groups was reached and for a time maintained. The farmers' dollar bought a dollar's worth of industrial products. The industrialist's dollar bought a dollar's worth of labor. Labor's dollar bought a dollar's worth of food, clothing, and shelter. We call those years the "parity years." Since that time it has been the constant dream of agriculture to again attain by some means this stability which satisfied and secured us at that time.

We had a well-balanced national economy then, and only then, for the wheels have been spinning erratically for American farmers since 1915. For a brief period of 2 or 3 years we again attained or excelled parity prices for farm produce but most of the 27 years that have passed since 1914 have spelled discouragement and uphill fighting for us all.

America began to lose the safe balance between rural and urban population. The industrial population and industrial development of America increased. As industry became more and more influential in legislative halls, it has sought more and more protection for itself and given less and less regard to the welfare of rural America. Apparently it has not realized that its greatest market rests upon the purchasing power of the American farmer.

Tariffs have been raised against importation of foreign industrial goods until a stone wall of trade barriers keep goods manufactured in other countries from the American market The same wall effectively prevents the great American agricultural surplus from finding its way to the market of industrial nations abroad. When a new trade treaty is devised it is agriculture that pays the bill.

Our trade has been shifted from the industrial nations of the world to the agricultural nations. American economists, American financiers, American promoters have actually been engaged in developing in foreign nations new sources of farm production that are further and continually crowding the products of American farms not only out of the markets of the world but out of the markets of our own country as well.

It has been a short-sighted policy on the part of certain powerful American industrial and financial interests. To secure a dollar's worth of trade in the Antipodes, they have sacrificed several worth of agricultural purchasing power here at home, for no nation can buy our wheat, our cotton, our pork, or our apples unless it can sell us some of its manufactured goods in return to provide the necessary international exchange.

The dollar which the American farmer receives turns over many times. It goes to buy new clothes and education and boots and farm machinery and paint and a thousand things that the American farmer should use and which yield profit to many others besides the manufacturer himself.

The dollar received from foreign exports by American industrialists goes into the bank from which only a portion is withdrawn for the purchase of raw materials, which themselves may come from other countries.

It is safe to say that a dollar of purchasing power of American agriculture is worth to the Nation $4 from the export trade.

This stone wall of protection which American industry has built around itself is almost wholly responsible for the accumulation of farm surpluses and the depressed condition of American agriculture today.

Our Government knows it, our Congress knows it, and many others know it. Yet nobody is willing to undertake to remedy this situation which is causing distress not only in America but throughout the world today.

If people of foreign industrial nations could buy our farm products, there would be less surplus commodities in America today and fewer wars throughout the world. Economic strangulation has driven many a nation to take up arms. Propaganda places before the public everything but the truth.

Today approximately 20 percent of the population of America lives on farms. This 20 percent of the population receives much less than 10 percent of the national income. This condition must not be tolerated, and yet, what can we do about it?

Money is controlled in the hands of a few. Markets and consequently prices for farm products are under the unhealthy and unwise influence of those who do not know agriculture and through ignorance, lack of foresight, or pure greed, year after year destroy further our rural prosperity.

On the one hand we have big business concerned principally in becoming bigger. On the other, there is big government with an inordinate desire for power. Government today is throwing crumbs to American farmers in the form of subsidies, conservation payments, and outright relief. It is throwing these crumbs to us just as we would throw crumbs from the table to the chickens in the yard.

Big government does not seem much disturbed over the 70-percent parity prices which we receive. Labor, with 150 percent of parity, is receiving more attention from Government than is agriculture. Big business, which is receiving in many cases nearly 200 percent of parity, receives infinitely more Government attention and consideration.

Even in times of crisis when we have been committed to a policy which may eventually pit us alone against all the rest of the world in defense of our liberties, the top men in Government don't lie awake nights worrying about agriculture, except that it must be kept alive enough to produce crops for domestic consumption. They know if loyalty to flag and country should vanish from all the rest of the United States, it would still be found a dominant trait on the American farm.

I don't say this as any reflection on any other group. I simply say it because it is the incontrovertible truth that ownership of or control over acres of earth breeds a feeling of responsibility for and loyalty to orderly government.

Our farmers have been the most patient people on earth, but there comes a time when patience ceases to be a virtue. We have been too patient, not only for our own good but for the good of our country, of whose economic system we are the most important, though a diminishing part.

For the good of our country and our families, we can't go on any further complacently letting other groups in America constantly acquire advantages at our expense, if we are to escape a permanent condition of peasantry and charity.

How can we avoid this?

Twice before in the history of our country aroused farmers have settled crises and secured the liberty and solidarity of the United States. In 1776 it was the people who lived on the land, led by General George Washington, a farmer himself, who wrested the Thirteen Colonies from a tyrannical overseas empire and made possible the formation of the greatest nation the world has ever known.

In the middle of the 19th century it was the farmers, whose patience was exhausted after 20 years of lack of consideration and unfair competition, that met in a little white schoolhouse in Ripon, Wis., and organized a great political party. They chose as their leader a man bred and raised on the farm, and through him preserved the union of the States.

The crisis today is no less critical than those of the days of Washington and Lincoln. We must be no less in earnest in meeting and overcoming those things which will destroy us if we go on blindly ignoring the facts, living for today only and failing to look ahead to tomorrow.

All right, you say, maybe we are in a crisis, but what are we going to do about it? Everyone of us in this room knows that when the agriculture of a nation fails, the nation itself fails also. History is replete with instances of this kind.

The answer to our present problem is to be found in this room today. The answer is organization—or as we know it—cooperation.

Here is the Farm Bureau Mutual Insurance Co., an outstanding example of what cooperation can do for a group Here in this room is basic evidence that through cooperation we can adjust ourselves to almost any temporary economic condition and through our own efforts, if we are united and stay united, bring stability, prosperity, and security to those outside our own group.

This is not the only farm cooperative that has given such a demonstration. Up in my own little State of Vermont, which I think is as cooperatively minded as any State in the union, we have demonstrated to the fullest the value of concerted action.

Vermont is the greatest dairy State for its size in the United States. We produce over 400 gallons of milk per capita. This is many times the national average.

A few years ago conditions among our dairymen reached a point where milk producers could receive at the most less than the cost of production. The city markets were closed to them except as their products might be sold through designated channels of trade at prices fixed by the milk board of the consuming State.

Hundreds of our farmers were either sold out at auction or were preparing to sell. Thousands of them saw the time approaching when they could no longer hold on. We were about 56 percent organized then. That percentage wasn't high enough.

The proprietary dealers undertook to play one group against another, and the unorganized producers against all.

Organization continued, however, and the time came when, forced by adversity, over 70 percent of our dairymen, mostly those represented by cooperatives, voted for a Federal milk order which eliminated the closed market at one end and the open-buying field at the other. The establishment of a Federal milk order for the Boston area was a striking example of cooperation between organized agriculture and Government.

It was not forced upon our dairymen, but it was a legitimate function of government established by request of 70 percent or more of the producers.

The price became stabilized, and auction sales dropped off. Farmers' children again had decent clothes to wear to school. Our farmers are doing comparatively well today, although their purchasing power is still far below that of many other groups.

Organization has continued. Those independent producers who had been the willing or unwilling instruments of dealers in depressing the producer's price, saw the wisdom of organizing themselves. Today over 90 percent of the dairy products sold in Vermont are sold through farmers' own organizations.

Opposition to farm organization from the city dealers has diminished because they, too, now recognize the advantage of having a regular supply of high quality products at a fair price.

Cooperation is giving the milk producers of my State millions of dollars a year.

I have given you this example of what cooperation has done in my State because it is an outstanding example, but is not the only one.

Not many years ago we farmers were buying fire insurance at a rate of about $1 per hundred. A small group of farmers got together and organized cooperative fire-insurance companies. Today over half of all the fire insurance written on Vermont farms is written through cooperative organizations at a rate of approximately 45 cents per hundred.

You know what the Farm Bureau Mutual is doing in Vermont for the farm automobile owners. You know it has cut the rate practically in half.

There is no need to tell you, although I think we should all make it our business to tell the world, what farm purchasing cooperatives have done not only for our farmers but for all the people as well.

We remember not so far back when the fertilizer we purchased was largely dirt, or filler, as they called it. We remember when our grass seed contained a large percentage of weeds. We remember when some of our dairy rations were of a quality which we wouldn't have around the barn today. Through cooperation not only by organization ourselves, but with our experiment stations and other farm organizations, we have raised the quality of all these things.

We have reduced the price and made it possible to increase production and quality of the things which we sell to American consumers. We can't limit the benefits of cooperative organization to our membership. In many sections farm cooperatives fix the standards of quality and prices to all purchasers whether members or not.

I think I am safe in saying that when 15 percent of any commodity is handled efficiently through cooperation, that that 15 percent has a greater regulatory effect upon the market as a whole than do statutory laws and regulations. It is economic control with teeth in it.

Cooperation today is the protection which we have standing between us and domination either by big business or by big government.

We have demonstrated that if we will work together we can handle our economic affairs safely. We must also realize that we can do the same thing in a social and political sense.

A thoroughly organized agriculture can be the most powerful force in America. Without agriculture, commerce and industry would stagnate. But we must be on our guard today as we never have been before. Powerful forces are ever at work seeking to destroy farm organization and to corrupt its influence.

We must not let those who would profit by our disunion do this. So long as they can play one group against another, one section against another, one race against another, just so long will a large percentage of our rural population remain in a state of modified peonage and humiliation due to necessitated governmental charity.

We must not let them play agriculture against labor. Of course, there are rascals in the ranks of labor. We have them ourselves, but we must not hold all labor responsible for the acts of its worst elements. We would not want them to do that to us.

We must not let them pit the great farm organizations of this Nation against one another. Agriculture must be united. We must be united to safeguard our own livelihood, to safeguard our own Government by the people, which is fast slipping away from us. And we must be united to safeguard our country in the field of international affairs.

God knows that some force is needed in America to take the leadership in keeping a few men with power and authority from gambling all our resources, including men, in the world's great poker game.

We have the political strength to do this, and we should utilize that strength as a united force to stop the devastation of American wealth and desecration of American liberty.

Farmers can put this country on its feet again politically and economically, but we've got to get to work, and get to work fast. In unity there is strength and in strength there is safety. This applies to a nation as well as to individua's.

I personally believe that every American farmer should protest by voice and ballot against the sell-out of American farm markets and the dissemination of American armed forces over the waters of the seven seas and the lands of the five continents in an attempt to take upon our country the regulation of everybody's business throughout the whole world.

I believe our people and our country come first. I would like to see this group take the initiative in arousing the farmers of America to such concerted action that every power-mad politician and every money-mad industrialist and financier would not dare to gamble with the happiness and the security of all America.

Third Annual Conference of United States Attorneys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. BANKHEAD 2d

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 15, 1941

ADDRESS BY THOMAS D. SAMFORD

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Thomas D. Samford, president of the United States Attorneys' Association, before the Third Annual Conference of the United States Attorneys held at Washington, D. C., March 13, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The perilous period through which we are passing must give us pause and make us ponder.

Must give us pause, if you please, to contemplate the seriousness of the situation which confronts this country and threatens the free institutions of this Republic, and how best to obviate these dangers if possible and how to meet them and defeat them as they arise.

And make us ponder, too, the priceless heritage handed down to us by our forefathers—the founders of this Nation.

We naturally, of course, read and talk and think of our Palladium—the Palladium of our liberty, if we prefer the redundant expression for emphasis. The Constitution of our Republic, the fundamental law of the land, which guarantees to every citizen life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—that foundation upon which is builded all the superstructure which safeguards and guarantees to us all those things which we most dearly prize and most highly value in our social economic, and religious lives and relationships.

From and by this priceless inheritance, of course, we enjoy all those things guaranteed to us and safeguarded in the amendments comprising the Bill of Rights.

We should remember and guard well this sacred instrument "the most wonderful of its kind ever struck off in a given time by the mind of man." Not the least of the blessings provided by this wonderful document in our judiciary system. Of this we, of course, are a vital and component part.

The highest and truest exponent of the civilization of any people is, and always has been, an incorruptible, upright judiciary. It was true of Israel, of Greece, of ancient Rome, and has been the glory of the English speaking people for centuries. It is by this arm of the Constitution we are taught that every man must be a law-abiding citizen.

Let there be a Nation-wide campaign of education to teach every citizen that his highest duty is obedience to law and constituted authority. For this purpose we should utilize every family unit, for truly the hearthstone is the cornerstone of the Republic.

We should utilize every school in the land, every college, every university—teach every youth in the land that he must proudly proclaim, "I am a law-abiding citizen." Preach the doctrine from the pulpit. Print it in the press—the daily papers, the weeklies, the magazines—use the film screens and the radios. This stream of crime which threatens to deluge society and pollute our entire social system cannot be dammed up at the mouth—the source and course of the stream must be guarded and directed.

I take it to be a part of your duty and my duty, as law-enforcing officers to contribute as much as possible to such a campaign.

But I find myself digressing, taking a detour from the main thought in my mind, in fact, from the paramount purpose of this conference.

The provisions of the Constitution, the application of the principles of the Bill of Rights, and the proper administration of justice through the courts are, indeed, a very precious part of our inheritance. Nevertheless these relate mainly to the internal dangers which lurk from within and threaten our free institutions. These are perils, of course, to be reckoned with if our Nation and form of government is to last, and it is your duty and my duty and the duty of the Department of Justice to guard the home base—the "Ramparts We Watch" within.

But we are thinking now mostly of external forces which loom above the horizon to challenge and threaten this country from without. In so doing we ponder that other document, so dear and sacred to every American; that companion document, the product of the pen and thought of that pioneer prophet and apostle of democracy. We call it the Declaration of Independence. It is certainly a part of our rich inheritance. It is but a fuller expression of the sentiment proclaimed in the eloquent outburst of Patrick Henry: "I know not what course others may choose, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

It was signed by only 56 patriots, which prompted Benjamin Franklin, that laconic philosopher, to exclaim, "We must all hang together or we will all hang separately." The document contains only 1,359 words. The Declaration itself is contained in the last paragraph and is composed of only 159 words; the other 1,200 words are employed in the indictment against a crazy and tyrannical king.

For the purpose of these remarks, and applicable to the spirit of this conference, and appropriate to the "perilous period through which we are passing," I emphasize the last sentence, just 31 words: "And for support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge, each to the other, our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

And those pioneer patriots sealed this sacred pledge with a baptism of fire and blood for 7 long years.

This they gave to posterity—to you and to me. What are we going to do about it? Mighty armies are now making the earth

tremble beneath their march on three continents. The sea and air are resounding with bombs and death-dealing instruments of modern warfare. The priceless products of centuries of civilization are crumbling under the cruel assaults of savage despots actuated by the demons of hate and greed.

I know what you are thinking about. I know what we all are thinking about; whether awake or sleeping we are face to face with the greatest peril which has ever threatened this Republic. I repeat, what are we going to do about it? Have we forgotten the wreckage of empires and republics along the shores of time during the centuries that are passed? Are we unmindful of the fate of Finland, of Poland, of Czechoslovakia, not to mention Norway, the Netherlands, Denmark, and poor, bleeding France, China, and Ethiopia? Greece, with her art and ancient glory, I fear, is doomed to fall a prey to these monster war lords. Where is the end? What is the fate of civilization? No man can tell.

I know we are prone to undervalue what is given to us without any effort on our part. We too often fail to appreciate our inheritance—what is given to us—what is handed to us. Men do not grow strong on doles. We value what we work for, what we strive for, what we sacrifice for, what we fight for.

Have we grown fat and flabby on idleness, indolence, and ease? Have we grown weak on opulence and luxury? "Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey, where wealth accumulates and men decay." God forbid that we should forget the sacrifices of our forefathers, the founders of this new nation, who bought this priceless privilege with their blood.

If this Nation is ever again attacked—God forbid—if we should become involved in war, which we fervently pray to the God of Nations to avert, we shall remember our debt to the dead as well as our duty to the living. How fitting are the inspiring words of Marco Bozarus as he cheers his brave band:

"Strike till the last armed foe expires,
Strike for your altars and your fires,
Strike for the green graves of your sires,
God and your native land."

Are we willing to take the oath and make the pledge to maintain this sacred inheritance with "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor?" What is life worth without liberty? What is fortune without freedom?

I have confidence in the patriotism of our people. I believe in the bravery of our men. I have faith in the courage and wisdom of our great leader and his aides. I have hope inspired by the spirit of Longfellow, when he wrote the concluding lines of the Master Ship Builder, which begins—

"Build me straight, O worthy master,
Staunch and strong a goodly vessel,
That shall laugh at all disaster,
And with wave and whirlwind wrestle."

And concluding—

"Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State,
Sail on, O Union, strong and great,
Humanity with all its fears,
With all its hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate.

"We know what masters laid thy keel
What workmen wrought thy ribs of steel,
What anvils rang, what hammers beat,
In what a forge and what a heat,
Were laid the anchors of thy fate.

"Sail on, nor fear to breast the sea,
Our hearts, our hopes, are all with thee,
Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,
Our faith triumphant over our fears,
Are all with thee, are all with thee."

Let us remember the words of Rudyard Kipling:

"Lord God of Hosts,
Be with us yet,
Lest we forget, lest we forget."

In an early year of the last century a great battle was fought off the coast of France—the battle of Trafalgar. The Spanish Armada had joined with the French Fleet to challenge Great Britain in its supremacy of the sea. The fate of Great Britain and almost of the English-speaking people for perhaps a century, was at stake. Lord Nelson had retired from has command as admiral of the English Navy, but all hearts turned to him again for leadership. He again donned his uniform and took command. As he sailed forth to meet the combined fleets of the enemy, and as his ships were drawn up in battle array, he used his code and wagged this inspiring and historic message to the men under his command: "Today England expects every man to do his duty." The battle proceeded, of course, and the God of battles fought with Nelson, and a great victory was won. Today our great leader and commander says to free men of America, "In this hour of great crisis, the Nation expects every man to do his duty," in the air, on land, and on sea.

Are we willing to pay the price to preserve our inheritance—that "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth"?

The Late Dr. Annie J. Cannon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. HUGHES

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 15, 1941

ASSOCIATED PRESS ARTICLE

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an account of the life, death, and services of Dr. Annie Jump Cannon, who in 1929 was listed by the National League of Women Voters as one of the 12 greatest living American women.

Dr. Cannon was born and raised two doors from where I reside in Delaware. I knew her very well in her girlhood days, and later, on her many visits to her home in Dover. Dr. Cannon was a great astronomer—in fact, one of the greatest the world has produced. She is credited with having classified over 400,000 stellar bodies. At the time of her death she was engaged in the work of her lifetime at Harvard Observatory. While I stood in awe of her profound learning, I greatly admired her for her simplicity, kindness, and cheerful outlook. Like others who knew her as a friend and neighbor, I loved her.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. ANNIE J. CANNON, NOTED ASTRONOMER, DIES AT AGE OF 77—SCIENTIST AT HARVARD CLASSIFIED MORE STARS THAN ANY OTHER PERSON

(By the Associated Press)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., April 14.—Death has ended the career of Dr. Annie Jump Cannon, 77, world-famed Harvard astronomer, who refused to give up her work even though she had been officially retired.

The gentle, silver-haired scientist who had classified by their spectra more stars than any other person in the world, died last night at a hospital from a sudden relapse of a month-long illness.

She was retired by Harvard last September, after 44 years of service, because she had attained the compulsory retirement age. She had been working at the Harvard observatory on a special astronomical mission from Yale up to a few weeks ago.

In her life work at Harvard she was credited with the classification of almost 400,000 stellar bodies according to their spectra.

DISCOVERED 300 VARIABLE STARS

She also was the discoverer of more than 300 variable stars, 5 novae, and 1 spectroscopic binary, or double star.

A native of Dover, Del., she was interested in astronomy as a child, and made observations with the aid of a smoking candle from a candelabrum, which even today rests in the living room of her tiny residence—Star Cottage—close by Harvard Observatory.

She was the first woman ever to receive an honorary doctor's degree from Oxford University and was the first woman ever to be elected an officer of the American Astronomical Society.

In 1929 she was listed among 12 "greatest living American women" chosen by the National League of Women Voters.

WON HENRY DRAPER MEDAL

Her greatest single achievement was the classification of a quarter of a million stars to make up the famed Henry Draper catalog for international use—a work that won her the Henry Draper Medal of the National Academy of Sciences in 1931.

Miss Cannon since has worked on the extension of that catalog, and in her most recent work for Yale was engaged in a "wholesale" classification of stars in a selected zone extending all around the heavens.

A graduate of Wellesley in 1884, she came to Harvard as an assistant in 1897.

She was stationed at Harvard Observatory in Arequipa, Peru, for a time, and in 1911 became curator of astronomical photographs at Harvard. In 1938 she was named William Cranch Bond astronomer.

St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 15, 1941

MEMORANDUM BY H. E. KETNER, COMMERCE COUNSEL OF THE VIRGINIA STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an able document prepared by Mr. H. E. Ketner, commerce counsel of the State corporation commission of Virginia, in opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence waterway. The opinions expressed by Mr. Ketner are endorsed by the entire State corporation commission of Virginia, composed of Hon. Thomas W. Ozlin, chairman; Hon.

H. Lester Hooker; and Hon. William Meade Fletcher.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION,
Richmond, March 27, 1941.

Memorandum to the Commission:

This refers to the St. Lawrence waterway project which is now pending in Congress.

I have read and studied several pamphlets and surveys made by various parties respecting this proposed project. Even though it is stated in a survey made in 1940 under the direction of Hon. Jesse H. Jones, Secretary of Commerce, that "every national administration since the time of President Woodrow Wilson has been in favor of proceeding as expeditiously as possible with plans to construct a seaway for oceangoing vessels from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic," and "President Coolidge and President Hoover were particularly active in promoting the cause of a seaway," and "the new administration which took office in 1933 was equally desirous to see the seaway constructed," I am unable to see that the project would be beneficial to this country. I think it would be most unfortunate to undertake a project of this kind at the present time when all of our efforts, cash as well as skilled labor, are urgently needed for national-defense purposes.

There appeared in the March 26, 1941, issue of the Richmond News Leader an article headed "Defense needs to hold up last leg on James (River) project." The article read, in part, as follows:

"The projected completion of the last leg of the 12-year project for straightening and deepening the James River channel below Richmond gave way tentatively to national-defense measures today when the War Department notified Congress that no new rivers and harbors work could be undertaken in Virginia during the fiscal year beginning July 1."

Testimony had been submitted by Public Works Director Gamble Bowers that the completion of the James River project was considered essential to the preservation of the river for large ships. In the annual report of the Chief of Engineers, recently sent to Congress, it was stated that $280,000 profitably could be expended during the year for the James River improvement, but it was excluded because of national-defense needs. From the beginning of the advocacy of the St. Lawrence waterway project, more than four decades ago, transportation was given as the principal benefit to be derived from the construction of the project. If the defense needs are to hold up the last leg of the James River project, the value of which has been demonstrated, certainly the same needs should preclude the beginning of the St. Lawrence project which would be, to say the least, of doubtful value.

Even the advocates of the project do not contend that it would be beneficial to the States located along the Atlantic Seaboard, including Virginia and the other southern, southwestern, and western States. It is stated in a pamphlet recently released by the National St. Lawrence Project Conference, of Washington, D. C., that 85 percent of the cost of the project to the Federal Government would, in all probability, be paid by taxes collected from those living in an area which would receive no benefits and would even be damaged by its construction. Virginia, with her coal mines, large and important coal-carrying railroads, important ports, shipbuilding facilities, etc., falls within the latter category. That is, taxes would be collected from Virginians to help build a project that would be peculiarly harmful to the State. I have in mind particularly Virginia's ports, coal-carrying railroads, coal operators, and shipyards.

During the year 1940 coal dumpings at the Hampton Roads ports amounted to 19,941,874 tons. More than 16,000,000 tons of this traffic was coastwise movement, principally to New England, and approximately two and one-half million tons was export coal. While it is impossible to give actual figures showing the probable effect that the St. Lawrence project would have on the Hampton Roads ports or on the Pocahontas Lines, it is obvious that the construction of the project would affect the coal tonnage handled by the Pocahontas Lines, both as the result of the generation of cheap power in the affected area and by the importation of coal through the proposed canal to the territory served through the Lake Erie ports. Not only would the Virginia ports and the Virginia railroads be adversely affected by the construction of this project, but the Virginia coal operators would likewise be adversely affected because a considerable portion of the coal moving through the Virginia ports is produced in Virginia, although the greatest portion of it is produced in West Virginia. In addition the construction of the canal would, in my opinion, affect the amount of tonnage of numerous commodities that now move through the Hampton Roads ports to or from the area which would be served by the canal. For example, a substantial tonnage of imported wood pulp has been moving through the Hampton Roads ports and over the Virginia railroads to industries in the Miami and Kalamazoo Valleys located in central territory. The other imports that would most likely be affected are ores, iron and steel products, and crude rubber. Also, a substantial volume of coffee has been shipped by water-and-rail from the port of New York through the Hampton Roads ports.

As to exports, it is my opinion, which is concurred in by the representatives of the Pocahontas lines, that overseas ships using the canal would find potential tonnage in agricultural implements, grain and flour, and iron and steel articles, as well as other numerous commodities which now move through the Hampton Roads ports, and/or other north Atlantic American ports. To the extent that tonnage would be diverted to the canal, it would be at the expense of the Hampton Roads ports and other American ports.

The three main points made by the advocates of the project are: (1) Navigation—transportation; (2) power; (3) national defense—shipbuilding on the Great Lakes.

All of these questions are answered in a convincing way by those who oppose the project. They contend, first, that during 42 percent of the year the St. Lawrence seaway could not be fully utilized due to the fact that the route would be closed because of ice conditions, and that even during the summer months, when the route would be open, 95 percent of the passenger-cargo ships engaged in overseas trade could not use the channels because of navigation limitations, nor could 81 percent of the American cargo vessels or any of the tankers engaged in intercoastal trade; that of the total world tonnage, only 30 percent could navigate the seaway, and that of this 30 percent only 5 percent would be United States tonnage. The reason for these low percentages is that the channel would not be deep enough to take care of the great majority of the large ocean-going vessels.

Second, that ample power is available at the present time on contract and more could be had in a short time by a much smaller expenditure of capital than would be necessary under the project. Third, there is plenty of room on the seacoasts to build all of the ships the United States can build; there is no difficulty in finding room at the seacoasts to build the ships and there is no difficulty in getting parts and materials to the seacoast shipyards. Further, that ships which are built at seacoast yards can reach the seas in which they are to sail without having to navigate 2,000 miles through channels which would be blocked with ice for nearly half of each year, and which might be blocked during the rest of the year by a bomb, whether dropped from a plane or planted by a saboteur at any one of a score of critical points among the dams, locks, spillways, and sluice gates upon which the maintenance of the channel would depend; that the ships America needs, she needs on the seaboard, not at places where one attack or one act of sabotage might bottle up whole fleets 2,000 miles from the sea; and that she needs them now, not in 1947 or 1948 or 1949 when the project would be concluded, if undertaken in the near future.

Of all the literature I have read dealing with this project, I consider that the major findings made by the Niagara Frontier Planning Board which appear in a pamphlet released by that Board in 1940 entitled "the St. Lawrence Seaway Project," are the most complete and the best of any that I have read. A copy of these findings is attached hereto, marked "Appendix A."

CONCLUSION

It appears that through widespread propaganda, composed mainly of generalities, unsupported statements, misleading and irrelevant statistics, the St. Lawrence Waterway project was made so popular that it was regarded as one way for political success in a rather large section of the country. It has received support from both political parties, but if the project is approached from a plain common-sense point of view one must inevitably reach the conclusion that it is economically and otherwise unsound.

Its construction might conceivably unjustly benefit a few citizens both in the United States and Canada, but at the expense of the country at large. I believe that the greatest advantages which would result from the project would go to foreign interests, namely, shipping interests and the importers to this country and Canada of such commodities as coal, pulpwood, wood pulp, ores, iron and steel products, and crude rubber. And in this connection it must not be overlooked that this country now sells many millions of tons of coal to Canada each year. This business would be imperiled by foreign competition with the opening up of the St. Lawrence Canal. The principal damage would be suffered by American labor, agriculture, and capital. I cannot escape the conclusion that the construction of this project would be an outright waste of public funds, at a time when the national debt is higher than it has ever been and increasing all the time.

The project, in my opinion, has no merit either as an economic or defense measure.

Respectfully,

H. E. KETNER,
Commerce Counsel.

APPENDIX A

MAJOR FINDINGS

General conclusion: This economic survey of the St. Lawrence seaway and New York State-Ontario power project conclusively demonstrates the proposed development, considered in its entirety as an undertaking which includes navigation as well as power works to be unsound. The seaway would be so generally ruinous to American commerce and industry, labor, and capital that its Nation-wide deleterious effects would far exceed whatever claimed advantages might redound to certain special interests from the waterway or to New York State and the Province of Ontario from the power plan. The following findings tell why:

The minimum total cost of the whole St. Lawrence project for both the United States and Canada would be $1,120,588,000. This figure is founded on Government estimates. It is about three times the cost of the Panama Canal.

The St. Lawrence project, on the basis of experience with similar works, probably would cost more than the $1,120,588,000. A total of $375,000,000 was spent on the Panama Canal, although it had been estimated to cost only $160,000,000; the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal cost $53,000,000 instead of $16,000,000; and the Suez Canal cost $80,000,000 instead of $30,000,000.

At least 85 percent of the United States' share of the project's cost would be borne by American taxpayers who would be the victims of unfair discrimination: These taxpayers live in the region which could not be benefited by the St. Lawrence seaway even if claims of proponents were valid.

American labor, transportation, and industry, on the Government's estimates of probable seaway traffic, would lose $109,647,000 a year: Diversion of business from American transportation systems to foreign carriers, diversion of Canadian export grain movement from the United States, and loss to American coal producers account for this figure.

The net loss to the United States would be $76,595,000 each year on the basis of the Government's estimates of seaway traffic: This sum represents the difference between two factors: One is the loss to established American commerce and industry plus the expense to American taxpayers; the other is the possible rate saving by shipping via the St. Lawrence.

During 42 percent of the year the St. Lawrence seaway could not be fully utilized. The route would be closed because of ice conditions.

The American farmer would not gain from the St. Lawrence seaway. Export grain would be the chief American agricultural product to be shipped through the waterway. Even if a possible maximum saving of 3 cents a bushel were realized, this would be absorbed by the foreign purchaser and vessel owner.

American manufacturers who have cultivated this country's great inland market would be seriously damaged by foreign competition resulting from the St. Lawrence seaway. Alien tramp steamers would dump cheaply produced commodities on this currently protected Great Lakes market.

Foreign tramp ships would have almost exclusive use of the St. Lawrence seaway. American-owned vessels of sufficiently shallow draft to ply the proposed waterway comprise only 5 percent of the world's merchant ship tonnage.

No route for more profitable trade between American ports would be offered by the St. Lawrence seaway. The location of the St. Lawrence is such that no appreciable coastal or intercoastal commerce would occur.

The St. Lawrence seaway would not carry the volume of traffic nor bring the savings in shipping rates to the exaggerated degree cited by many proponents. They have set the probable tonnage at 11,496,000 and the probable savings at $45,516,000 annually. The more accurate estimate is 3,873,000 for tonnage and $8,822,000 for savings.

The net loss each year to American commerce and industry and to the American taxpayer, on the basis of more accurate figures for estimated tonnages and savings, would be $42,233,000. The United States investment in the St. Lawrence waterway would result in lower earnings and higher taxes.

Maintenance of wholly cordial relations between the United States and Canada might be endangered by the St. Lawrence seaway. Serious questions could arise as to responsibility for defense of the waterway in times of war and as to preservation of water levels in Canadian harbors on the lower St. Lawrence River.

Surrender of United States sovereignty over Lake Michigan would result from any treaty which, like the proposed treaty of 1938, limited the withdrawal of water from the lake at Chicago. It would prevent further development of the Great Lakes-Gulf of Mexico waterway by the United States.

The proposal for restoration of Niagara Falls beauty and for further power generation there has been inexcusably made contingent on the whole St. Lawrence project. There is no engineering demand for tying up the needed Niagara Falls project with the St. Lawrence development.

The United States would subsidize Canadian power to the extent of $48,860,000. This figure is reached by taking the minimum cost ($90,000,000) for the Canadian share of the power, under the least expensive plan yet advanced and deducting costs strictly chargeable to power ($41,140,000) under the present plan.

It is perfectly practical to divorce the seaway and power portions of the general St. Lawrence plan. There is no justification for burdening the proposed power development with the unsound seaway proposal.

The amount of power which would be created on the United States side of the river for $206,065,000 under the present St. Lawrence scheme could be produced for only $90,000,000 without the navigation project. The St. Lawrence Power Development Commission set $90,000,000 as a reasonable cost of power works on the American side of the International Rapids section.

Whatever power benefits might result from the St. Lawrence project would affect only the State of New York and eastern Canada. The St. Lawrence plan does not envision sale of United States power beyond the confines of New York State.

Neither New York City nor western New York is a practical market for St. Lawrence power: Under existing delivery conditions, power from nearer sources is more practical and economical for these areas.

Previous estimates of increased power demand in New York State are too optimistic: The Niagara Frontier Planning Board finds that the demand in 1952 probably will not exceed 21,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

Overdevelopment of hydroelectric power is a dangerous policy to pursue: When generating plants are built without an adequate market for the power, the capital charges accumulate to such an extent that the project never pays.

Adequate and economical power potentialities, apart from the St. Lawrence River, exist today in New York State and eastern Canada: Two outstanding examples are the Ottawa River in Canada and Niagara Falls.

Progressive development of Niagara Falls power potentialities independent of the seaway and in step with power needs is the most practical plan: This would eliminate economic hazards to the new developments and to existing plants.

Bruce Barton Writes About War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1941

ARTICLE BY BRUCE BARTON

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the other day one of my constituents sent me the following article by Bruce Barton, of New York, on the timely subject of the endlessness of war. Those of us who had the pleasure of serving with Bruce Barton when he was a Member of this House and a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee recognize how faithfully Mr. Barton's activities in Congress conformed with his public statements as an author and speaker. Bruce Barton was a Congressman who ably practiced what he ably preached.

It will be recalled that Bruce Barton was one of the leaders in the fight against repealing the arms embargo, as he predicted it was the beginning of an organized attack upon the neutrality of the United States. He frequently warned Congress and America that pursuing a course of steps short of war toward involvement of this country in foreign wars might result in war shortly for America. He consistently stood for making the defenses of this country impregnable and for maintaining the twofold policy of the Monroe Doctrine by keeping foreign influences out of the Western Hemisphere and by declining to meddle ourselves into the endless wars and political intrigues of the Old World.

It is fortunate for this country that even though Bruce Barton no longer serves in Congress his speech and writing still echo through the land in defense and support of protecting and preserving representative government in this Republic and in opposition to those who would force America into sending another expeditionary force into foreign theaters of war and destruction.

The article follows:

UNKNOWN

(By Bruce Barton)

From the grave of the Unknown Soldier the crowds melted away. The great men of the nations, who had stood there bare-headed, stepped into their cars and were whirled back to town. The music of the bands grew faint and ceased.

All afternoon little parties of curious, reverent folk came and stopped, and went on again, until finally only the guard remained. The day ended. Night came silently and threw over the grave the healing mantle of darkness.

Then a strange thing happened.

Three dim figures from nowhere gathered and stood uncovered beside the tomb. No word of greeting passed between them; they seemed to know each other well. Slowly, one after another, they stooped and read the freshly carved inscription. Then the oldest spoke.

"Things are improving a bit for us Unknowns," he said. "I fought with Leonidas at Thermopylae. We fell side by side, we and the other two hundred and ninety-nine. Our bones are mingled with the dust and rocks. No one marked our resting place. Our names have perished, but we held the pass.

"My mother wept when I failed to return," he continued. "Night after night she waited at the window, until it was foolish to hope any longer. Then she, too, wanted to die. But the neighbors came in and cheered her. 'You have given a son to save your country, to save your country,' they cried, 'the Persians are driven back, and Greece is freed. He died, but he left us a better world!'

"So my mother took courage and held her head high. It was fine to have given a son to make the world a better world."

The Unknown paused for a moment; his voice grew dull and hard.

"The Romans swept over the Greece that I died for," he said. "The barbarians swept over Rome. I sometimes wonder whether it

was worth while to die at 28—to sleep at Thermopylae, unknown."

"I fought with Charles Martel at Tours," the second soldier said. "We turned back the Arab hosts; we saved Europe from Mohammedanism; we kept it a Christian continent.

"'It is splendid,' they said to my mother, 'splendid to sacrifice a son on the altar of peace and good will.'

"That was 1,200 years ago," the second soldier said. "And where is the peace that we died for? Where is the faith? The good will?"

The third Unknown had stood with Wellington at Waterloo. It was a high enthusiasm that had carried him there—the vision of a world free from tyranny and wrong. He fell and was buried in a trench, under a rude cross marked Unknown.

"We thought it was to be the world's last great battle," he said. "There would be no more wars, no more youthful lives snuffed out, no more mothers waiting and weeping at home.

"But a century went by, and there came a war beside which ours seemed a little thing. Our friend over whom the bands played today was one of millions who gave their lives. Men have heaped honors on him such as we never had. Do the honors mean that the hearts of men have changed, I wonder: They broke faith with us; will they keep faith with him?"

The three dim figures disappeared. The moon stood guard above the silent grave. In the East the first rays of the morning crept into the sky. They reached out vaguely, hesitatingly, touching the city of Washington, where men were to gather that day to speak of peace—touching an inscription which a Nation had cut in the stone above the body of its Unknown Soldier. A solemn inscription; a nation's promise that he who lies there dead shall not have died in vain.

The world has made that promise before; all its unknown dead have died in that faith. And the promise has died with them.

Will it die again? That is the question for you and me to ask ourselves beside the soldier graves on this Memorial Day.

We told that boy when he marched away that he was fighting a war to end all wars. He fell, believing; and we have buried him and carved an inscription over his tomb.

But the real inscription will not be written on any stone; it will stand in the dictionaries of the future. Only by writing it thus can the world keep faith with the long, sad procession of its unknown heroes whom it has lied to and cheated and fooled.

This will be the inscription: "War—an armed contest between nations, now obsolete—unknown."

Present and Proposed Legislation Regulating Labor Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1941

ADDRESS BY LEE PRESSMAN

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. Lee Pressman, general counsel, Congress of Industrial Organizations:

Before we can intelligently approach the problem of analyzing proposed legislation regulating labor relations, we should examine the facts pertinent to labor relations. This method of approach is rarely adopted by those who write the headlines for newspapers or by many of the alleged representatives of the people in Congress.

At the present time there are three acts of Congress which are of vital importance to the working people of the Nation. They are the National Labor Relations Act, the Wages and Hours Act, and the Walsh-Healey Act. Their provisions are undoubtedly quite well known to those assembled at this conference this afternoon. The National Labor Relations Act, in addition to providing machinery for the holding of elections among the employees, also restrains employers from committing certain specifically designated unfair labor practices which in any way interfere with the right of workers to organize into unions of their own choosing and to engage in collective bargaining.

The Wages and Hours Act provides for a minimum wage and for the payment of time and one-half for work performed in excess of 40 hours per week. The Walsh-Healey Act simply provides that all employers receiving Government contracts in excess of $10,000 must pay the prevailing minimum wage for the industry as determined by the Secretary of Labor and time and one-half for work performed in excess of 40 hours per week.

At no time since its enactment has the National Labor Relations Act or its administrative agency been permitted to operate in peace. This legislation and the National Labor Relations Board has been subjected to a constant barrage of vilification, denunciation, and litigation in courts, legislative inquisitions and congressional attacks, including the attempted destruction, through serious cuts in administrative appropriations. For 2 years the employers of the Nation, upon the advice of the kangaroo court of corporate lawyers, simply flouted the law openly and flagrantly by stating that the statute was unconstitutional. After the Supreme Court humbly disagreed with these outstanding corporate attorneys, the large corporations in the Nation did not hesitate to continue their flagrant violations. Lower courts and the Federal judiciary have openly disregarded the express provisions of the act and have substituted in judicial opinions their own interpretation as to what they thought Congress should have adopted for that which Congress enacted in the National Labor Relations Act. Several of these courts had to be severely admonished by the United States Supreme Court in highly critical opinions.

For weeks and months legislative committees consumed the time, energy, and money of the National Labor Relations Board. Newspapers cooperated in printing the most unfair and non-factual criticisms that were leveled against the Board in these hearings. Accurate facts which disproved the accusations never received the attention of either those who wrote the headlines, or those who censored the news columns or the editorial writers.

Consistently the Labor Board has been accused of misinterpreting the law and the members of the Board have been charged with severe dereliction of duty and with flagrantly violating the provisions of the act. However, the record of the Board before the courts of the Nation, including the United States Supreme Court, has not been surpassed by any administrative agency.

To the contrary, those who did the accusing have actually been the law violators. I cite one specific example: The New York Times, which has been most fervent in its denunciation of the Labor Board and the Labor Act at the present time is charged with violations under the act in having interfered with the freedom of its employees to choose their own union.

The large corporations of the land are still refusing to obey the law. The Ford Motor Co. has been found guilty by the Labor Board not only in one but at least half a dozen cases of having violated practically every provision of the Labor Act. The United States Supreme Court has upheld the order of the Board in the case involving the largest Ford plant at Dearborn, Mich. But is the Ford Motor Co. complying with the law? It is not. At the present time, since the Supreme Court sustained the conviction of the Ford Motor Co., it still continues to discharge its employees because they dare to join the union. Frequently discharge is not the only punishment meted out to the employees. The punishment includes beatings, tar and feathering, and in one Ford case in Dallas, Tex., gouging out a man's eye because he dared to believe that he had the right to join a union.

I refer to this background of abuse and vilification directed against the Labor Board and the Labor Act in order that we might be in the position to evaluate the charges of those who claim that the Labor Act has worked so unfairly and might prove to be so burdensome in our national-defense program. I say that where the Labor Act has actually been permitted to operate it has made one of the greatest contributions toward the establishment of peaceful relations in our economy. It is in the very situations where the Labor Act cannot operate because of the flagrant, lawless violations by the corporations, that we have the threat of industrial strife with its resultant dangers to our national-defense program. I shall subsequently analyze this point in greater detail.

The Walsh-Healey Act was enacted in 1935 in order to afford relief to those employers who desired to bid for Government contracts and who were establishing fair labor standards. Their competitors, who were imposing substandard conditions through low wages and long hours, were thereby enabled to underbid their competitors and assume an unfair share of the Government contracts. The Walsh-Healey Act has placed all business competitors on an equal basis as far as labor standards are concerned. Such legislation is not solely for the benefit of labor but also serves to aid businessmen in assuring them decent and fair competition.

The Wages and Hours Act cannot be attacked on any basis of decency or logic. It never has been. Prior to its enactment it was stymied in Congress by being buried in committee. A group of reactionaries from southern States where wages were horribly low, placing employees on a starvation basis, were sufficiently powerful in Congress to prevent the Members of Congress from voting on this legislation. Finally, over the opposition of this sit-down strike by the Southern Tories, the bill became law. It does not place any maximum prohibition upon the working hours. This point is extremely important to note. The act simply compels an employer, if he chooses to work his employees longer than 40 hours in any one week, to pay time and one-half. This penalty was intended to cause a greater sharing of the available work in order to absorb many of our unemployed. In addition, it has been recognized by all intelligent leaders in industry and finance, as well as labor leaders, that the efficiency of workers in industry decreases as they are required to work longer hours. The work week established in the Wages and Hours Act sought to prevent this evil, thereby bringing to a maximum the efficiency of the American worker.

These three acts represent the legislative protection which labor has received during the past 8 years. When analyzed they really do not present outrageous burdens upon industry. They merely succeed in doing the following:

(1) Permit the workers of the Nation to join any union they choose, free from interference from their employers. This is merely

intended to give back to the American workers the economic freedom which was intended to be established under our American Constitution.

(2) Prevent employers bidding for Government business from entering into cutthroat competition at the expense of the workers.

(3) Establish a minimum wage, which at present is 30 cents per hour, and in several years will reach 40 cents per hour, and a maximum workweek of 40 hours, with provision for only time and one-half for work performed in excess of this limitation.

It would appear that these standards are reasonable and not too much for American workmen to expect and anticipate from industry. But about a year ago our Nation entered a new phase. We were compelled because of events abroad to begin thinking of our own national defense. In the spring and summer of last year this defense program was formulated and initiated by Congress. A large-scale program was initiated for the production of guns, tanks, and airplanes.

Immediately from certain sources arose the hue and cry that national defense required the elimination of our labor standards and the repeal and destruction of our labor legislation. The enemies of labor, who for 8 years had sought to accomplish this end, but to no avail, because of the decision of the people at the polls, grasped the opportunity afforded by the hysteria of national defense to accomplish their desired end.

For instance, in the first bills submitted to Congress on behalf of the Army and Navy departments for certain enabling legislation in connection with the national-defense program, the attempt was made to eliminate the Walsh-Healey Act so far as contracts executed by these two departments were concerned. No economic justification was offered. No evidence was adduced that the Walsh-Healey Act was in any way hampering the effectiveness of industry. Only through the forceful opposition of organized labor and the intervention of the President of the United States was this antilabor attack prevented. The proposed legislation had to be amended in order to safeguard the meager protection afforded by the Walsh-Healey Act.

While this was going on, industry itself was demonstrating that certain of its leaders did not have the national-defense program at heart. When the national-defense program was first formulated by the President of the United States, and the people of the Nation urged to give their fullest cooperation, what kind of response did we receive from industry? The people of the country were advised that manufacturers in many industries were refusing to take Government contracts until Congress passed legislation to give greater leeway in regard to tax-amortization provisions, and to repeal then-existing legislation which limited the profits that could be received under Government contracts relating to shipbuilding and aviation. For several months American industry refused to take Government contracts until this legislation was enacted, regardless of the effect that such delay might have on the execution of our national-defense program. This information was given to the Nation by representatives of our Army and Navy departments before congressional committee hearings. It would appear that certain portions of our American industry were far more interested in their profits and in their financial returns than they were in national defense.

When these same individuals or corporations who sabotaged national defense in this cold-blooded manner seek to repeal or set aside labor and social legislation under the guise of protecting national defense, labor is fully justified when it questions the motives and intent of the demands. But of even greater importance, labor challenges the social wisdom of any such antidemocratic program and states categorically that it would result in undermining the very institutions which all Americans now seek to preserve and safeguard against attack.

Prior to concentration of public interest in national defense, and when domestic issues were being considered carefully and searchingly by the American people, the democratic forces of the Nation proved to be highly successful in preserving and extending our labor and social gains. Slowly but steadily labor was increasing its strength and influence in public affairs. Labor and social legislation was being enacted both in the Federal Congress and in the several States. The social security, health program, and housing programs, were receiving the attention of the American people and opposition to these socially desirable ends was being slowly but surely stricken down.

Unfortunately today a national hysteria is in the air. Enemies of democracy and of labor are fully prepared to damn any institutions or individual as an enemy of national defense where this might further their end.

The problems of labor relations which have been given the greatest degree of publicity and the repressive legislation which has been suggested and furthered to meet these problems might be said to fall in the following categories: (1) The imposition of excessive dues and initiation fees by unions upon those who work on national-defense projects; (2) the elimination of strikes through the curtailment of the present rights of labor through various means such as imposition of "cooling off" periods, compulsory mediation, compulsory arbitration, elimination of the right to strike, repeal or emasculation of the National Labor Relations Act, and the elimination of closed or union shops in national-defense industries; (3) enactment of legislation to allegedly prevent sabotage, but which actually seeks to deprive labor and other progressive groups of their constitutional rights and civil liberties.

These numerous suggestions are contained in several bills, a few of which I shall attempt to summarize.

Congressman SMITH has introduced a bill to amend in several respects the National Labor Relations Act. This bill incorporates the same provisions which were enacted by the House of Representatives at the last Congress but which received no action in the Senate. These provisions were described by the two minority members of the Smith investigating committee as "ripper amendments," in that they would completely emasculate the basic provisions and purposes of the National Labor Relations Act. These provisions were also vitriolically condemned by Senator WAGNER, the father of the legislation.

Congressman DIRKSEN has introduced a bill which would outlaw the union hiring-hall system in the maritime industry, thus breaking down the standards won by the maritime unions and going back to the conditions in the maritime industry which existed before the organization of the Maritime Union. A cooling-off period before strikes or lock-outs can be called in the maritime industry is provided for. The bill would require maritime workers to carry a "continuus discharge book" which is a record of employment filled out by the employer with space for comments, including, of course, notes on union activity which might well become a compulsory blacklist.

Congressman COX has introduced a bill which makes illegal any union or closed-shop collective-bargaining contract in a plant which has national-defense orders. Of course this bill also applies penalties to anyone encouraging or discouraging members in a labor organization.

Congressman SMITH has also introduced another bill which would practically destroy the basic rights of labor to organize and bargain collectively. This bill seeks to amend the criminal code so as to curb strikes in defense industries by imposing a life sentence on those who interfere directly or indirectly with national defense which would undoubtedly include strikes. It also makes it unlawful to change wages, hours, or working conditions until 30 days after written notice to the Secretary of Labor. A waiting period of 30 days is provided for strikes in plants having defense contracts. Unions must accept compulsory mediation and arbitration by the Department of Labor. Closed shops in industries connected with national defense are made unlawful with criminal provisions to be imposed for violation.

Congressman VINSON has introduced a bill which provides for compulsory mediation of disputes in all industries under the control of the Navy. Compulsory waiting periods are imposed before unions may strike. Mediation machinery is established which contemplates the imposition of compulsory arbitration.

Congressman HOFFMAN has introduced a bill which provides up to $5,000 fine, 5 years' imprisonment, or both, for any person, union, or other organization which induces persons working in any industry connected with the national-defense program or financed by the Government to join any organization as a condition to being employed. This is aimed to eliminate the union or closed shops.

Another bill of Congressman HOFFMAN provides that all persons employed in any place where anything is being produced for use in national defense shall enter into a contract of employment with the Government. Likewise, all persons engaged in employment in any place where any such product is being produced for any private enterprise shall enter into a contract with that enterprise. Such contracts are to fix hours of work, wages, and the duration of employment. They shall also provide that the terms of the contract may not be altered without the consent of the other party to the contract. This bill, of course, deprives all defense workers of the right to strike or even to attempt to improve their conditions.

Congressman HOFFMAN has introduced a third bill which repeals the National Labor Relations Act outright and sets up new machinery which incorporates all of the worse provisions of the Smith amendments, together with more drastic restrictions upon labor.

One Congressman has introduced a bill which would subject any person engaging in a strike in a national-defense industry to a penalty of death. One must express deep appreciation for his restraint in not including "quartering."

Considerable publicity has been directed against the alleged abuse of imposition of excessive dues and initiation fees upon persons seeking work on defense projects. Recently Senator NORRIS addressed a communication to President Green of the American Federation of Labor and President Murray of the Congress of Industrial Organizations pointing out this fact and calling upon labor to eliminate this abuse if it existed in order to avoid the enactment of repressive legislation which would have a far-reaching effect upon organized labor.

Mr. Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O. replied to Senator NORRIS on the same day that Senator NORRIS' letter was published in the press, and even before it was received by Mr. Murray. His reply was to the effect that we challenge anyone to point to a single instance in which a C. I. O. union has been accused of imposing any excessive initiation fees or dues. That challenge has not been accepted by anyone in this entire Nation. The reason for it is that the C. I. O. unions do not engage in this practice.

It is undoubtedly true that the building trades-unions of the A. F. of L. are indulging in a most reprehensible practice of imposing excessive initiation fees and dues. This, however, is not a recognized practice on the part of bona fide labor unions. It is merely

part of a vicious racketeering practice on the part of the A. F. of L. building trades-union officials who should not be identified with bona fide labor organizations.

However, this abuse should not be eliminated through repressive legislation. Any such attempt would involve the Government in the internal affairs of voluntary organizations such as labor unions which would establish a very dangerous precedent in our Nation. This would necessarily be followed by further and further entanglements by Congress with the internal affairs of labor unions which would lead us inevitably down the path of labor fronts under the Nazi regime instead of democratic American labor unions.

However, it should be brought to the attention of all Americans as to exactly how this vicious abuse continues. The Departments in our National Government which are involved in construction work have definite understandings with these very A. F. of L. building trades unions that prevent contractors from entering into agreements with any other labor organization. It is with the aid of our own Federal officials that the building trades union officials of the A. F. of L. are permitted to continue this most vicious and reprehensible practice. This abuse can be eliminated within 24 hours if our own Federal officials would release the contractors who are doing the construction work for the Federal Government and permit them to enter into agreements with the United Construction Workers Organizing Committee of the C. I. O., which carries out the standard policy of the C. I. O. unions that initiation fees and dues are to be at a very minimum in order to best serve the interests of our members. Certainly, this would be a far more simple method to attain the desired end than complicated and dictatorial legislation.

The various legislative proposals to restrict the rights of labor are justified under the claim that strikes are rampant and industrial strife has reached the point of endangering our program of national defense. Let us examine this charge under the piercing light of cold facts.

The growing acceptance of collective bargaining in the basic industries reflects itself in the increased stability of industrial relations and the decreasing number of stoppages.

The United States Department of Labor recently published material showing that strikes in 1940 were substantially fewer than in 1937, 1938, and 1939. A continual decrease in the number of strikes from 1937 is shown by the following table:

Year	Strikes	Workers	Man-days idle
1937	4,740	1,860,621	28,424,857
1938	2,772	688,376	9,148,273
1939	2,613	1,170,962	17,812,219
1940	[1] 2,450	575,000	6,500,000

[1] Estimated.

The same downward trend is apparent in the number of workers involved and the number of man-days idle, except for the year 1939 when the great coal lock-out caused more than 7,000,000 man-days of idleness. This indicates increasing stability of industrial relations in almost exact ratio to the increase of established collective-bargaining relationships

A most significant comparison can be made between the year 1940, a period of growing intensity of defense preparation, and the year 1917, when this Nation was at war. In 1917 there were 4,450 strikes, compared to 2,450 in 1940. In 1917, 1,227,254 workers were involved, while in 1940 only 575,000 participated. This occurred in spite of the fact that there were 22 percent more workers employed in nonagricultural pursuits in 1940 than in 1917.

It is axiomatic in labor relations that during periods of rising production it is usual to have many more difficulties in industrial relations than in periods of stable production and employment. This is due to the fact that during such periods workers see the opportunity of improving their conditions in line with improved industrial conditions. One would expect, therefore, in the period of great rises in production of the first 6 months of the defense program, beginning June 1940, there would be corresponding increase in industrial disputes. However, the number of man-days idle due to strikes was only half as great during the first 6 months of the defense program as in the corresponding period for 1939.

This record is a testimony to the effect of collective bargaining on stabilizing industrial relationships. It is particularly important to emphasize the fact that nearly three times as many workers are now under collective-bargaining agreements in 1940 than in 1917. This is the principal cause for the excellent record of uninterrupted bargaining relationships.

The production losses due to strikes are insignificant. Stoppages of work due to industrial disputes are a very minor cause of lowered production. C. I. O. economists have calculated that during 1940 only one-tenth of a day per worker was lost through strikes. Much more serious, indeed, was the loss of approximately 5 days per worker due to injury and about 8 days per worker through illness during the same year.

Put another way, these figures mean that 130 times more man-days of production were lost through injury and illness last year than by strikes. There is 130 times more justification for concentration on the reduction of injury and illness than upon reduction of strikes.

Of course, the most serious losses in production arise from the inefficient use of our present productive facilities and labor, and from our vast unemployment. For example, there was an average of 10,280,000 unemployed during 1940. If each of these workers had been employed an average of 250 days, the country could have had 2,570,000,000 additional man-days of work. This amount of lost production is substantially more serious than the loss of 6,500,000 man-days through strikes.

Mr. Knudsen a short time ago estimated it would take 18,000,000,000 man-hours of work to complete the national-defense program. This is approximately 9,000,000 man-years of work. About 10,280,000 man-years of work were lost through unemployment in 1940, more man-years of work than will be required to complete the national-defense program.

One proposal which is made for legislation with regard to strikes is that there be required by law a 30-day notice or waiting period before strikes.

This is clearly unrealistic since most of the defense industries that are organized sufficiently for any union to be held responsible already are operating under contracts which provide for advance notice of any changes in the contract and also for an extended period of negotiation of from 30 to 90 days. Furthermore, most of the contracts provide that there shall be no stoppages of work during the life of the contract, and that all grievances and differences should be made a matter of arbitration. As the following paragraphs will show, most of the workers in industry now especially concerned with national defense are working under such contracts.

In plants where such contracts are in effect such legislation is useless and superfluous. In plants where there are no collective bargaining relationships and collective unions, the 30-day waiting period is completely ineffectual since there is no effective organization of the workers to be held responsible for enforcing it.

It is my estimate that more than 2,000,000 workers in the coal, steel, rubber, automobile, electrical, radio and machine manufacturing, men's clothing, and shipbuilding industries are working under contracts which have provisions for extended periods of negotiation and for the elimination of stoppages during the life of the contract. This includes the major portion of American defense production.

More than 600,000 coal miners producing nearly 100 percent of America's bituminous and anthracite coal operate under contracts which provide for an extended period of negotiation before the contract terminates and which prevent stoppages during the life of the contract. More than 500,000 steel workers are working under contracts with similar provisions to those in the coal industry. A typical clause in the contract is that in the agreement signed with the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Co., which reads:

"SEC. 7. Adjustment of grievances. Should differences arise between the corporation and the union or its members employed by the corporation as to the meaning and application of the provisions of this agreement or should any local trouble of any kind arise in any plant, there shall be no suspension of work on account of such differences but an earnest effort shall be made to settle such differences immediately in the following manner * * *."

Nearly 500,000 workers in the automobile industry work under contracts which have these same provisions. These contracts cover the major producers in the industry except, at the time this was written, Ford.

The men's clothing industry is almost completely organized under similar contracts. The major producers in the electrical, radio, and machine manufacturing field have agreements with like provisions with a C. I. O. union. One hundred similar contracts covering maybe 65,000 are in effect in the rubber industry.

Prohibition upon the free process of collective bargaining would not only have a serious adverse effect upon the morale of labor but also would be economically unsound. Free collective bargaining is the one way in which Americans have to raise their wage levels. Both a rapidly falling labor cost in industry and a rising cost of living for workers make it imperative that the wage share of the American workers be increased during this period. As the national income has risen during the past 8 years, a continually decreasing percentage of the national income produced has gone to wages and salaries. The percentage in 1932 was 77.2; in 1936 it had decreased to 60.6; it rose slightly in 1938; and has now turned downward, according to preliminary figures, to between 60 and 61 for 1940.

This falling percentage of national income going to workers as the national income rises is most significant. It indicates that with a rising national income the capacity of the working people to consume what is produced declines progressively. Only by maintaining a much more substantial ratio of the national income going to wages and salaries can we have a stable national economy, an economy safe from terrible depression. One of the essential ways to maintain this ratio of workers' income to national income is by extensive wage increases.

The profit records of the major corporations in 1940 already indicate clearly that the coming year will be one of fantastic profit levels in spite of some increases in taxation. Very substantial wage increases can be given workers without reducing these profits below reasonable levels and without necessitating price increases. For example, the United States Steel Corporation has reported a profit of one hundred and two million for 1940—100 percent higher than in 1939. This rate has

occurred in spite of the fact that very unusual amounts have been set aside for tax purposes.

The General Motors Corporation has announced a profit of $195,500,000 for 1940 after deducting $125,000,000 for taxes. The company employed on an average some 220,000 employees. At the rate of profit announced each worker earned for the company an average profit of $890 in 1940.

Certainly out of these profit levels it is possible to pay substantial wage increases without any price rises.

The National City Bank has estimated that the 1940 profit rate of 390 leading industrial corporations was 10.2 percent compared to 7.8 in 1939. The 1940 figure would obviously be much bigger. It is clear that these major industrial corporations can pay substantial wage increases out of profits.

One of the things that has occurred and will continue to happen in the various industries is the steady fall of the labor cost. An example is the steel industry. It has been recently computed that the index of output per man-hour in that industry rose from 96.8 in 1938 to 121 in 1940. As a result the index of labor costs per unit of output fell from 112.8 in 1938 to 92 in 1940. At the same time the index of hourly earnings rose 2 points. However, hourly wages in 1940 would have had to have been 20 percent above those of 1938 to make the wage costs in the 2 years equal.

This drop in wage costs will be even more noticeable in the coming year, when the operation of the steel industry will be near capacity. Capacity operations greatly reduce the wage cost below levels prevalent when the industry operates at 50 or 75 percent. Substantial wage increases are necessary to offset this tendency.

Any interferences with the right of free collective bargaining would prevent the proper wage adjustments from being made and would thus intensify a situation of exorbitant profits that is wholly contrary to announced administration policy.

One of the most serious causes of strikes in the past has been the refusal of employers to recognize the genuine collective bargaining agencies of their employees. For example, it may be very properly assumed that where the National Labor Relations Board has held elections to determine the proper collective-bargaining agencies, and also where it has otherwise certified such agencies that had this machinery not existed there would have been sooner or later strikes at these plants. Up to September 1, 1940, 3,492 elections, in which 1,261,130 valid votes were cast, had been held by the N. L. R. B. An additional 6,459 requests for certification covering 1,715,768 workers have been filed with the Board. These cases have been disposed of through certification, consent, dismissal, or withdrawal. Thus, if such an agency for the peaceful determination of collective-bargaining representation had not existed, sooner or later a great part of the 9,951 requests for certification, covering 2,976,898 workers, would have been strikes for recognition.

Progressive organizations and labor particularly are justified in greeting with suspicion the hue and cry over the danger of sabotage. Under this hysteria Federal antisabotage legislation has been enacted and at the present time a model Sabotage Prevention Act has been tendered to the 44 State legislatures now in session. This type of legislation is pregnant with the most serious danger for organized labor and other progressive organizations.

At the last Congress the World War Sabotage Act was supplemented by legislation to cover similar crimes in peacetime. While this bill was going through Congress, John L. Lewis, then president of the C. I. O., submitted to certain Members of Congress an amendment that "Nothing in this act shall be construed so as to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike." This amendment was rejected, with Senator TAFT specifically stating that the bill under consideration was intended to provide that the right of labor to strike in defense industries should be restricted. However, generally, labor was assured that this legislation was not aimed at its existing rights. No sooner did the bill become law than Chairman Sumners, of the House Judiciary Committee, stated publicly that the act could serve to prevent strikes in national defense and therefore practically all industry.

The model Sabotage Prevention Act, which is under consideration in all State legislatures now in session, makes it a criminal offense for anyone to—

"Impair or interfere with real or personal property with reasonable ground to believe that such act will undoubtedly delay or interfere with the preparation of the United States or any of the States for defense."

Further, the bill provides that—

"Whoever intentionally * * * omits to note on inspection any defect in any article or thing with reasonable grounds to believe that such article or thing is intended to be used in connection with the preparation of the United States or any of the States for defense"

shall be subject to criminal penalties.

Further, the bill permits the closing and restriction of the use of streets and highways upon which property used in defense production abut.

This bill is probably the most serious attack ever directed against organized labor. The enforcement of this legislation by innumerable States and local officials presents the greatest danger of abuse. Even if we are to have this sort of legislation, certainly it would seem to be much more advisable to have the control over its enforcement centralized in the Department of Justice at Washington. The experience of the Federal Government in the first World War in the enforcement of the Espionage Act, the treason statute, and in dealing with alien enemies confirms this view.

The proposed bill does not in any way give a reasonably definite description of what is meant by "sabotage" of national defense. Who is there that can determine beyond a reasonable doubt just when one will impair or interfere with property with reasonable grounds to believe that such act will interfere with the preparation of the United States for defense? The closing down of a plant impairs the property right, frequently enunciated by the courts, of operating a business, of making profits.

The provision regarding the intentional omission to note upon inspection a defect in an article virtually renders the ordinary worker a warrantor of the fitness of the product for use. An antilabor employer can use this threat against unorganized workers and assure himself freedom from any union in his plant.

Consider the threat to basic liberties which this bill holds. The attempt to embrace within the vague and sweeping language of the foregoing prohibitions any possible act which any person might concede to be detrimental to what is currently accepted by some persons to be national defense of necessity encompasses so many innocent acts that these sections really make for an ideal frame-up and witch-hunt statute.

There is also the unconstitutionality of the provision prohibiting the use of streets and highways. Recent Supreme Court cases, starting with the Hague case, have attempted to recreate for Americans the enjoyment of elementary constitutional rights and liberties. It is now proposed to circumvent these decisions by State legislative action which would open the door to the very practices which have been declared unconstitutional. In other words, we are being offered a model "denial of free speech, free press, and freedom of assembly" bill which will insure a rich harvest of local Hitlers.

The bill attempts by means of the provisions of one section to safeguard the rights of labor. The provision was taken bodily from the language of the National Labor Relations Act and provides that "nothing in this act shall be construed to impair, curtail, or destroy the rights of labor and their representatives to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing and to engage in concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection."

This protection is completely illusory. The model bill menaces fundamental rights such as the right to strike, to picket, and to assemble. This menace is not eliminated by the foregoing provision. Even assuming that after many years of litigation appellate courts might wring from this section some protection to labor, such decisions would be of small comfort in the immediate situations out of which they arise. In labor disputes the immediate availability of basic civil rights may be a matter of life and death to the organizations involved. Often, as a result of the denial of these rights, a union may be destroyed and unable to carry an appeal to the courts.

CONCLUSION

The basic problem in considering any legislation affecting labor relations should be whether it is conducive or detrimental to the defense of the Nation. All reasonable arguments and facts would seem to point to the conclusion that the proposed legislation which I have discussed are menaces to the defense of the American people.

Labor peace and the resultant steady flow of production can best be achieved through fair dealing, not repressive legislation. Legislation proffered in good faith but capable of perversion is at least as dangerous as laws avowedly aimed at curtailing labor's freedom. Our experience during the first World War with attempts to prevent labor from striking indicates that such attempts tend only to bring on strikes. It should be clear to any patriot that the defense potential of our people is not raised by the reduction of their living standards, through confiscation of their bargaining weapons, and the stealing of their basic liberties. Defense demands diametrically opposite policies and programs.

What, then, should be embraced in a program of defense legislation? The C. I. O. supports fully a proper defense program. We are also in favor of legislation which will effectively carry out such a program. We agree with the proponents of the legislation criticized by us that the continuance of production is essential to defense. Our effort, however, is to discover the basic causes for interruptions in production, with a view to eradicating them.

Impartial investigation over many years has indicated that the refusal of industry to permit labor to organize into unions of its own choosing and to bargain collectively has been the most frequent cause of strikes; this truth is embodied in the declaration of policy in the N. L. R. A. There can be no doubt that violations of this right, as well as of others guaranteed by that act, are being committed daily and by leading figures in defense industries. This is the first and most important form of sabotage of national defense which must be disposed of. And what would be more effective and more in the interests of national defense than the enactment of legislation, adding criminal penalties for violations of the N. L. R. A.? With one stroke we should thereby have created the legal machinery whereby we might really put a stop to the sabotage of defense on a colossal scale. This done, we could add a further ounce of prevention through the Presidential issuance

of an Executive order denying Government and defense contracts to such violators.

Other changes to further the defense of the Nation might include vigorous enforcement of antitrust laws to keep prices down; extension of the application of the wage-hour law and the Walsh-Healey Act; furtherance of work relief and youth training; extension of social security and public housing; passage of the Coffee National Guard bill prohibiting use of the National Guard for strike-breaking purposes; and revival of the quiescent Civil Liberties Unit of the Department of Justice. And with the enactment of the La Follette oppressive labor practices bill outlawing the use of industrial spies, guns, and munitions by employers against their employees, we should be so far on the road to industrial peace as to have a practical assurance of uninterrupted defense production.

We feel confident that with the effectuation of the program of legislative and executive action outlined, the American people can be assured of safety from attack from any source.

Decentralization in Shipbuilding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1941

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, recent newspaper items prompt me to comment on the so-called decentralization of industry, about which there was much discussion last fall. At that time we pointed out to responsible Government agencies what would happen if various industries filling orders in the national-defense program were to be permitted to expand. We indicated that skilled labor would be taken from the Midwest and located in overcrowded areas and that irreparable damage would follow such development.

In the State of Minnesota, the decentralization program has been lacking 100 percent in the location of new war industries. Skilled workmen are being taken elsewhere and the communities stand to suffer.

Take the shipbuilding program, for example, and you will find that Minnesota has been completely overlooked. Responsible Government officials who insist that they are following the decentralization program may have good intentions, but I am afraid that is all. I note in a recent newspaper item a statement that 65,500 tons of ships had been sunk by planes and submarines of the Nazis. I also note that the Navy Department had awarded $100,000,000 in contracts for small craft on the Great Lakes. It is only a question of time until all available facilities will have to be used. With unemployment at its highest point in Minnesota, and with no new war industries being located there, the people whose district I represent in Congress are entitled to ask questions and they have justification for complaints against expanding industries now located in the East or elsewhere, which program is directly contrary to the decentralization plan.

It has also been pointed out that private industry has a duty in the national crisis. Further, it is not giving consideration to the unemployment problem or to the fact that the Midwest is entitled to consideration. I quote the following interesting editorial written by Walter B. Brown, Sr., publisher of the Tribune-Herald of Chisholm, Minn. Mr. Brown says:

The Pittsburg Steamship Co. has placed contracts for construction of five of the largest ore freighters ever built on the Great Lakes. The boats are to cost $2,000,000 each and two of them will be built at River Rouge, Mich., and the other three will be built at Lorain, Ohio.

Not one of these mammoth vessels will be built at the head of the Lakes, but they will be paid for out of "tax earnings" now in the process of becoming effective by special-privilege legislation before the State legislature.

So here is $10,000,000 in boats to increase the transportation facilities for Minnesota high-grade iron ore, which is rapidly reaching the depletion stage and that the State would lower taxes on to pay for the boats to haul it, and the State labor does not even have an opportunity to build one of the boats.

His discussion of the problem of building ships is a most interesting one and furnishes much food for thought and leads me to ask the question, What is industry doing in efforts to bring about a decentralization so that products needed in national defense may be made in the Midwest?

The Encirclement of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 15, 1941

ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD an article by Walter Lippmann entitled "The Encirclement of America," which should be of interest to every thoughtful citizen.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW—THE ENCIRCLEMENT OF AMERICA

(By Walter Lippmann)

It would be reassuring to be able to deny that in the Soviet-Japanese pact the Axis has won a diplomatic victory which prepares the way for some exceedingly dangerous developments in the Pacific Ocean. In form, the pact seems to say that if Russia is at war with Germany, the Japanese will not attack Russia in Siberia and that if Japan is at war with Britain and the United States, the Russians will not attack Japan. But while this looks like a kind of equalized arrangement which might become inconvenient for Germany, in fact Russia has gained nothing and has done exactly what the Axis wants most to have her do.

For Russia in Siberia was in no real danger of an attack by the Japanese Army. The Chinese are engaging so much of the Japanese Army that another war on land would be as pointless as it would be costly for the Japanese. But the Japanese Navy is not involved in the China war; it cannot be used against Russia; it can, however, be used most dangerously against the British-Dutch-American position in the Netherlands Indies, Singapore, and the Philippines. Whereas Russia had nothing to fear from Japan, there was every reason why Japan should fear Russia. The Soviet air force at Vladivostock is a menace to Japan; the Russian Army in Siberia is a menace to Manchukuo; the Russian support of China is a menace to Japan. It is too early to say whether Stalin's declaration of "neutrality" in Asia means that he will now abandon China, or even disrupt her by internal Communist revolt, and then partition China with the Japanese. But at the very least, Stalin has assured Mr. Matsuoka that Russia will not intervene if Japan goes to war in the Pacific.

This assurance, like the Stalin-Hitler pact of August 1939 is certain to strengthen the Japanese war party of which Mr. Matsuoka is a leader and to weaken greatly the more moderate party in Japan. The risks of Japanese aggression in the Pacific are sure to seem less in Tokyo, now that Russia, the nearest neighbor to Japan, has been neutralized. We must expect, not perhaps an immediate frontal attack upon the British or the Dutch in the southwest Pacific, but a rapid concentration of Japanese power for such an attack, and a series of aggressive moves designed to test the defenses of the region, to test the will to resist, and to undermine the power to resist. This Soviet-Japanese pact removes one of the chief practical and psychological obstacles to Japanese participation in the world war.

The fact that Japan has also promised not to help Hitler attack Russia means nothing. For Japan cannot help Hitler attack Russia and Hitler does not need Japanese help anyway. Whether European Russia is to be conquered by Hitler or forced to capitulate or driven, like Hungary, to help Hitler, are questions which will be decided in Europe and in the Middle East. The fact that Stalin has made it so much easier for Japan to enter the war against the Allies can only weaken him still further in Europe. He has gotten nothing out of this agreement except an even greater isolation in the face of the Nazis. He is not safer merely because the Japanese, who never meant to attack him, have said they will not attack him, and he is much weaker because he has seriously increased the pressure upon Great Britain and the United States.

That this pressure is being exerted according to a well-considered plan devised by Tokyo and Berlin is less than ever open to serious doubt. As the Nazis move into Africa toward Suez on the one side and toward the Atlantic ports on the other, the Japanese are moving toward the South Pacific. If the two operations succeed, and if concurrently the assault on Great Britain can be carried forward or even intensified, the totalitarians will have cut to pieces the Anglo-American position in the world. They will have done on a grand scale what they have done on a smaller scale in their Polish, their French, and their Balkan campaigns.

By their Asiatic campaign they will have isolated China, India, Australia, the Netherlands Indies, and the Philippines, and rendered impossible any effective resistance. By their African campaign they will have isolated Russia, Turkey, and the French Empire, and from Dakar and Casablanca they will have isolated North America from South America. By their campaign against Great Britain in the North Atlantic they will have isolated North America from the British Isles.

This is the strategical plan, now plainly in actual operation, for the domination of the world. It is not a new plan. It has been

the plan for years—since the conclusion of the so-called Anti-Comintern Pact of 1936—and it has been carried out step by step under the eyes of the whole world because the free peoples could not and would not believe that a plan of conquest which took time and did not therefore touch them immediately would ever touch them. They have preferred not to believe the evidence: to say while the peril was distant, that it did not exist, and when it became imminent, that it was too late to do anything about it.

The fact of the matter is that the European war is expanding into a world war, and that in 1941 it is going to be decided at Singapore, in the Mediterranean, and West Africa, and finally in the battle of the Atlantic, whether the United States, cut off from Asia, from Europe, from Africa, from South America, and from the British Isles, is to be left alone, entirely isolated, incompletely armed, and encircled by the world-wide totalitarian alliance. To say that the President's measures and gestures are moving the United States into this world war is the exact contrary of the truth as it is actually being disclosed. This world war is closing in on the United States from all directions, in the north Atlantic, in the south Atlantic, and in the Pacific.

How ill-prepared are our people to grasp what is happening is demonstrated by the approval which the isolationists have given to the commitment to defend Greenland. Because that land is within the imaginary limits of the Western Hemisphere, they approve the project to place American troops in Greenland and the pledge to defend it. Yet, if they will look at a map, or better still at a globe, they will see that Greenland can be defended if the fortress of the British Isles and the might of the British Navy and Air Force stand between Greenland and Europe. But if they do not stand, then the troops we send to Greenland will be placed in deadly jeopardy and the pledge we have given to the Danes can be carried out only by one of the most difficult and dangerous operations it is possible to imagine.

Anyone who approves the occupation of Greenland and does not redouble his willingness to give support to Britain is too innocent to have learned the elementary facts of life. And in their state of dangerous innocence, the people are given false assurance that we have another "base" from which to defend the Western Hemisphere and, in consequence, are encouraged once more to believe that they can be satisfied with the existing plans and the existing tempo of the American production and of the American mobilization.

In fact, the situation is much more critical than the administration has yet dared to say, and the prospects for 1941 are much more serious than the President has as yet made plain to the people of this country.

Something About the Strike at Ford's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE LEGAL COURIER, DETROIT, MICH.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, the following is quoted from the Legal Courier, published at Detroit, Mich., on April 4, 1941:

INSULT AMERICAN FLAG—FORD RIOTING STRIKERS, BY ATTACKING THE NAVAL SCHOOL, A FEDERAL TRAINING UNIT, BESMIRCHING THE NATIONAL COLORS, SHOWED THEIR COMMUNISTIC TRAINING

Just a few weeks ago, when high-ranking officials came to Detroit to accept the training school Henry Ford had built for the education of mechanics for the airplane service and presented it to the Government, it was heralded as the greatest gift of any American to the present defense program. Here more than 1,000 young men, selected by the Government, and an official unit of the Navy, are housed and educated at the Rouge-Ford plant.

During the wild rioting of the Hitlerized unit of the C. I. O. on Wednesday this school was raided, the American flag town down and trailed in the mud, while rioters stormed the buildings with bricks and stones. The hundreds of young men who have sworn to defend their country with their lives were vilely insulted by these rioting C. I. O.-ers led by rank Communists and "reds."

When this great gift to the Navy was accepted by Secretary Frank Knox, he pronounced it the most valuable and beneficial to the defense program of any Federal unit. The C. I. O.-ers, insulting the young Americans of its personnel, were told that when the Ford-Rouge plant was under their control, these boys now training to defend the Nation would not be allowed inside. They were termed "scabs."

Less than 8 percent of the Ford employees at the Rouge plant participated in the strike. More than 5,000 loyal workers remained at their posts during all of the internal rioting and are still inside. Some of the fiercest fighting was inside the plant and occurred when strikers attempted to wreck machinery.

The Ford plant will be opened and the big defense manufacturing for the Nation in the present war crisis will be resumed just as soon as the Michigan highways and public roads are opened for traffic. So far Governor Van Wagoner has made no attempt to clear the highways and protect the public.

The Federal Government will come to the rescue of the munitions plants in this State only upon request of the Governor. The strike situation and plans to seize property and wage civil war could not have been any secret to the Governor, as he had been invited to secret meetings, at which the plans were fully discussed, and the thugs, a majority of whom never were Ford employees, were told how to create street riots, block highways, and assault the women and children.

When the State police did arrive in Dearborn no attempt was made to clear the highways. This apparently was orders and showed conclusively that Van Wagoner had gone sled length for the Hitler program to curtail the defense production in Michigan. Probably, on the eve of an election, it was too much to expect that Van Wagoner will suddenly turn American.

If there is any spot around the Ford works that the C. I. O. hates worse than the Navy training school it is the Ford trade school. Here high-school boys are given jobs and educated in industrial work along the lines in which they show the most interest. Thousands of workmen in Detroit industries came from the Ford trade school. So it was evidently the part of the C. I. O. thugs to beat up and slug these lads who were getting a chance to start life with both feet on the ground. In the brutal language of the underworld these boys were told to "get the hell out" and warned never to come back.

To prove their loyalty to not only the Ford Co. but to their country, all members of A. F. of L. units not only remained at work but have notified the company that they are ready to return to their jobs. Many of the A. F. of L. workmen tendered their services to Mayor Carey as special policemen.

What really started the final effort of the C. I. O. to take over the Ford Rouge plant? Well, a couple of weeks ago eight men were reinstated at the direct request of Mediator Dewey of the Federal Government. They were known Communists and agitators. These men never went back to work, but inside the plant just raised hell and secured stoppage of machinery whenever possible. They were fired.

"What is more," it is explained by Mr. Bennett, "they never will be employed again at any plant of the Ford organization."

All A. F. of L. units, some of whom have had members in the Ford plants for years, are out getting new members during the C. I. O. riots. President Green has not only his secretary, but also key organizers, in Detroit, just to keep posted and also take advantage of the situation.

Evidently aiming to aid and assist the C. I. O. in its illegal and stupid acts, it was Governor Van Wagoner who ordered the Ford-Rouge plant closed. The company under the Wagner Act could not shut down due to its heavy defense commitments. The Federal authorities on the job call the act of the Governor stupid.

The Governor ordered 350 State police to Dearborn but they are not in charge of law enforcement. The State police take their orders from the C. I. O. This is not stupid; it is asinine.

Now the C. I. O. leaders are putting up a howl that the Government take over the Rouge plant and start production of war material. This the Government has the right to do under the law and such a step probably would not be contested.

There are in round numbers 90,000 men employed at the Rouge plant. Of this number less than 15 percent are employed in defense work. That is all that would be employed under Government operation. Under the law all private jobs would be dropped. The other 75,000 men would be idle for an indefinite period.

These facts are well known by Mr. Knudsen.

The less than 15,000 employed in turning out defense jobs are veterans in Ford service, two-thirds World War veterans which means that they are not affiliated with the C. I. O.

The American Federation of Labor has quite a staff of its field men in Detroit. They have been carrying on a persistent drive for weeks in all Ford units. The bludgeon, gangster system, was not used. The A. F. of L. has had locals in Ford plants for years. John J. Murphy, national chief of staff of the A. F. of L. drive in the auto industry, this Friday made the following statement:

"We now have 30,000 members in the Ford-Rouge plant. All of our craft unions are represented. The American Federation of Labor is entitled to full credit for the benefits the workers of America now enjoy. If the A. F. of L. wins the bargaining rights at the Rouge plant, the public and the employees have my assurance that the federation policy will be diametrically opposed to the strike method used so disastrously by the C. I. O."

Members of the Michigan Legislature went home for the week-end and the election, to check public pulse in regard to labor legislation. Right now they are ready to put teeth into the Michigan labor laws. Here are some of the probable results of the Ford-Rouge riots and closing down of the super arsenal of the Nation in its defense program:

Law to compel all labor unions to become duly incorporated so that they would have legal responsibility; be under State control, making reports as to membership and finances.

Outlaw the check-off system in payment of dues.

Restrict pickets to plant employees and men desiring to work must be protected.

Bar unemployment compensation for workmen involved in strikes.

Truth About Former President Hoover's Action In Connection With Bonus Marchers in 1932

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1941

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, at times and on occasions since the unhappy visit of the bonus marchers to Washington in 1932, inaccurate, if not malicious, statements have been made by some writers and speakers concerning the participation of former President Hoover in that unfortunate affair.

On March 23, 1941, the American Forum of the Air discussed the question Shall the Small Invaded Nations Be Fed? One of the speakers upholding the negative side of the question was a Mr. Rex Stout. In the discussion, and in an apparent effort to discredit former President Hoover, who advocates the feeding of the small invaded nations, Mr. Stout repeated these incorrect statements concerning Mr. Hoover and the bonus marchers.

On the American Forum of the Air program of April 6, 1941, the Mutual Broadcasting System, in a spirit of fairness and truth, caused its announcer to make a statement to the American people in an effort to correct any erroneous impression made by Mr. Stout's statement. Therefore, pursuant to the permission granted to me by the House, and in the interest of accuracy and fair play, I include the statement of the Mutual Broadcasting System, which is as follows:

The Mutual Broadcasting System regrets the attack made upon the character of former President Hoover by Mr. Rex Stout, on our American Forum of the Air, on March 23, 1941.

Mr. Stout stated that under the order of former President Hoover Federal troops met with bullets and bayonets a horde of hungry, homeless Americans who visited Washington in 1932. The records shows that an aggregation of many thousand ex-service men and others marched on Washington to prevail upon Congress to appropriate some $2,500,000,000 for bonuses. Congress refused to make the appropriation, and adjourned. Before adjourning Congress had made provision to pay the transportation of the bonus marchers to their homes. After the adjournment of Congress a number of bonus marchers and alleged radical agitators remained in Washington. On the morning of July 28 the civil authorities of the District of Columbia, acting through the police department, requested the bonus marchers to evacuate certain old buildings which they were occupying in the vicinity of Pennsylvania Avenue and Tenth Street. This the bonusers declined to do. A riot ensued in which 1 policeman and 1 bonus marcher were killed and more than 50 people were injured. Thereupon the Commissioners of the District of Columbia advised the President that a riot was in progress, and that the District of Columbia police were unable to maintain law and order, and requested the President to assist in reestablishing civil authority by bringing Federal troops to the scene of the riot.

In the afternoon of that day, while the riot was still in progress, the President, through the Secretary of War, did bring Federal troops to the scene of disorder. After the arrival of Federal troops, although tear gas was used not one shot was fired, not one person was bayoneted, not one person was seriously injured. If Mr. Rex Stout intended to imply that the facts were otherwise, he was in error.

Fallacies of Propaganda Against St. Lawrence Project Exposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE DULUTH (MINN.) HERALD

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, across the water the nations of the earth are now engaged in a program of destruction. Here in America we are engaged in a program of national defense, which calls for constructive development of every project that will contribute to greater efficiency and to the welfare of our people. Within this category the agreement between Canada and the United States to utilize the St. Lawrence for power and navigation purposes becomes paramount. The foes of the St. Lawrence are busy, however. Many of their objections are noted and answered in an editorial in the Duluth Herald, of Duluth, Minn., for Tuesday, April 1. The editorial is as follows:

[From the Duluth (Minn.) Herald]

THE FOE'S BIG GUN

Probably the ablest arguments against the St. Lawrence waterway that we can expect to see come from the New York Times. The Times argues that the completion of the seaway make take longer than the President thinks it will; that the President exaggerates our need for power and minimizes the other sources of it; that the construction of the waterway will use labor, materials, and power in huge quantities; that there are immense engineering difficulties; that Great Lakes harbors must be improved at staggering cost before those ports can build ships for the oceans of the world, and that those now guiding the destiny of Britain would probably prefer more planes, more ships, more guns, and more direct material aid if they could choose between that alternative and the seaway.

To begin with, the President and many others who have studied this project believe that it is an indispensable part of any long-range program of national defense. The longer the job, the sooner we should begin it, in their opinion. Millions can see the need of the seaway now who could not see it in 1934. All may be able to see it in 1945, even the people in New York and the editors of the Times. And by that time it may be too late to complete the seaway in time to use it as it should be used in national defense.

The President is thinking of our need of power next year and the year after that, especially if this proves to be a long war. The Times talks of the present power situation, of surpluses that may be wiped out in a few months.

Of course, there will be engineering difficulties and a great expenditure of labor, materials, and power in building the waterway; but this at most could be only a tiny fraction of our potential national effort, and we could be sure of getting that back many times over when the waterway was completed.

As to those Great Lakes harbors, many of them could build fair-sized merchant and fighting ships today with little additional dredging if only there were some way to get them from Lake Ontario to the sea. After all, New York Harbor needs a little dredging now and then, too.

Oddest of all the Times' arguments, though, is the implication that construction of the seaway will mean fewer ships, fewer guns, and fewer planes for Britain. The evidence is all the other way; that in the end it will mean more ships, more guns, and more planes, and that for the time being it will not mean one ship, one gun, or one plane less for Britain. But the Times comes close to hinting that the seaway might be a subtle Nazi plot.

Unfortunate, too, is the Times' hint that such great decisions as this might be referred to those directing Britain's war effort. The Americans and Canadians are doing a great deal to help Britain and preparing to do a great deal more, but they are not quite ready to have a little group in London decide whether the hour is right to begin such a great improvement. And to their credit those men in London have not, so far as anyone knows, attempted to interfere with this natural development of the western world.

The Cotton Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1941

STATEMENT BY I. W. DUGGAN

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks I include a statement delivered by Mr. I. W. Duggan, Director, Southern Division, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, on a transcribed radio program with Members of the Arkansas congressional delegation, Friday, April 11, 1941, entitled "The Cotton Outlook":

THE COTTON OUTLOOK

The cotton situation can be summed up briefly in this fashion:

We have on hand a tremendous world supply of American cotton—25,000,000 bales at the beginning of this season. We are going to end this season on July 31 with one of the largest, if not the very largest, carry-over in history—about 14,000,000 bales—which will mean an even larger supply next year if a normal crop is raised. This will be due in large measure to the sharp curtailment of our exports because of the war abroad. There is, however, one bright spot in the cotton

picture. That is, that this year our domestic consumption is expected to be the highest on record. It is expected to run more than 9,000,000 bales.

We are consuming more cotton at home because our vast national-defense program is giving more work to more people and they have more money to spend for cotton goods. The increase in domestic consumption, as helpful as it is, still lacks a lot of making up what we have lost through the temporary disruption of our foreign trade. In addition, farmers should bear in mind that the increase in cotton consumption at home is due almost entirely to the general business activity brought about by the defense program. They should not be too optimistic about holding all of this increased domestic consumption after the war is over.

With a continuation of the present defense program and a consequent increase in consumer purchasing power, it is anticipated that the present high rate of consumption will continue through the 1941 season and possibly longer. In January of this year, domestic mills consumed more cotton than has ever been consumed in this country in any single month in the past. The daily rate of mill consumption was even higher in February.

The high rate of mill consumption is very gratifying to all cotton farmers as it means that we are using more and more of our surplus cotton. However, there is one angle of this phase of the cotton situation that is puzzling to farmers and that is the sharp increase that has taken place in mill margins while the cost of raw cotton has shown only a very slight advance. The mill margin, as most of you probably know, is the difference between the price the mill pays for cotton and the price for which it sells the manufactured cloth. The constant widening of this margin, with no comparable increase in cotton prices, apparently is causing serious concern among cotton farmers—and I think justifiably so. If the price of cotton had increased as much as the mill margin has in the last year, cotton would be above parity for the first time in 17 years.

Now that we have had a brief look at the cotton situation, suppose we try to see what the average cotton farmer can do to offset the temporary loss of his foreign markets and to try to make a go of it in spite of the fact that the things he buys are likely to increase in cost. Most people familiar with the southern situation probably would agree that one of the best things the cotton farmer can do at a time like this is to produce on his own farm as much of the things he needs at home as it is possible to do. We all know that's an old story—this business of living-at-home—but this year more than ever before cotton farmers are going to find it a wise thing to do. They are going to need that home-grown food and feed very much because when the time comes to buy, they are going to find that it will take more and more cotton to buy less and less food and feed. In other words, the world situation is such that the price of things cotton farmers buy are very likely to increase faster than the price of the cotton they sell.

The Department of Agriculture, and the State land-grant colleges and extension services, are doing everything possible to help farmers increase production of the things they need at home.

The Department recently announced a program designed to increase the supplies of hogs, dairy products, chickens, and eggs. An increase in the production of these products is being asked in order that we may have ample supplies for the United States, Great Britain, and the other democracies. Under the expanded program, the production of these products is being stimulated through the support of prices at or near parity levels for a period extending through June 30, 1943.

These changes in no way affect the provisions of the triple-A farm program in Arkansas. For cotton, wheat, and rice, it is still necessary to limit the production to present acreage allotments in order to give price support to these crops.

These new developments, however, do remind us of the urgent need for every producer in Arkansas to make full use of the provisions of the present triple-A program. They serve to put additional emphasis on the importance for every farmer to produce enough home-grown food and feed to take care of all of his own needs on his own farm.

The triple-A program from the very beginning has encouraged the production of food and feed for home use in the South. In 1940 the program was broadened to include a small garden payment. That payment, $1.50, is barely enough to pay for seed, but it serves to call attention to the value of the home garden, and we believe it has helped considerably in getting home gardens in the South. A farmer may be broke, but with home-produced food and feed, there is no need for him to be hungry.

A few weeks ago the Department announced a supplementary cotton program as an addition to the existing triple A farm program. The supplementary program encourages additional voluntary reduction of cotton in 1941, plus increased consumption of cotton goods, by compensating cotton farmers for their additional acreage reduction with cotton stamps which can be used to purchase cotton goods. Each family participating in the supplementary cotton program also is eligible to earn a special payment of $3 in addition to the regular garden payment for carrying out a specified food-production-for-home-use practice.

We hope that Arkansas farmers will take full advantage of all of the provisions of the triple A program, particularly those which encourage production of food and feed for use at home. In this way they can work with their Government to partially offset, for a while at least, the effect of the temporary loss of foreign markets due to the war.

Has Unemployment Been Solved?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1941

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a self-explanatory newspaper dispatch, printed in a Pacific coast daily, which indicates conclusively that unemployment is still an acute and formidable problem in our midst. It is said that he who runs may read. Let nobody be deluded into the erroneous conclusion that because of our huge national-defense effort the unemployment problem has been solved and there is no need for a further program of public works, such as the W. P. A. What are we going to do for the widows and spinsters, particularly those over 40 years of age? Shall we close up the W. P. A. and precipitate them back into the nonexistent soup lines? Shall we cut the tenuous thread by which the Sword of Damocles of insecurity, worry, and want is suspended over their graying heads? What are we going to do for the men of 45, who have been dumped upon the economic scrap heap by the efficiency experts and technological improvements of modern industry?

It has been said that the Rhine or the British Empire is our first line of defense. I venture the suggestion that the morale of the American people is our first line of defense. We should restore or inculcate a burning faith in democracy in the hearts and minds of all the American people without exception. The most effective way to do this is to eliminate want and insecurity, and forever eradicate the specter of unemployment.

The clipping is as follows:

7,000 WAIT IN LINE FOR $14.42 A WEEK JOBS

NEW YORK, March 11.—"Wanted: 1,000 laundry workers and hospital helpers. Salary: $14.42 a week."

When New York's Municipal Civil Service Commission advertised those jobs, some 24 hours before the board was due to take applications the line-up of job seekers started forming outside its Long Island City office.

By 9 a. m. the day applications were taken the line blocks long had at least 7,000 men and women waiting.

First in line was 32-year-old Charles G. Rubin, a chemist graduate of City College, who shamefacedly told reporters:

"It is a sad commentary of conditions when a college man has to apply for such a job. But I have to eat."

Decentralization of Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWT V. MILLS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1941

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it would appear the President of the United States and the members of the National Defense Council should take into consideration the necessity of decentralization of industry in the interest of national security.

FOR THE GOOD OF THE NATION

We, the Governors of the Southern States, call to the attention of the President and others in authority the dangerous and unwarranted centralization of national-defense production in the older and more congested industrial areas.

Up to January 31, seven and one-half billions of national-defense contracts (excluding ship building) had been let, of which only 7 percent were placed in 11 Southern States. Of a total of 302 new plants, only 24 were located in the South.

Of the eleven and one-half billions of prime contracts awarded up to February 15, a total of 80 percent has gone to 62 companies or financially interrelated groups of companies. This short-sighted policy of centralizing national-defense contracts is dangerous to the welfare of the Nation because it will inevitably result in—

1. A shortage of labor and therefore the movement of large labor reserves out of the

South into highly industrialized areas, making for more congestion and creating vast economic problems when the emergency is over.

2. Create intolerable bottle necks in transportation of both raw materials into the congested industrial areas and in the shipment of finished products.

3. Create vast plant and production facilities in areas already overbuilt industrially, which will become idle and useless when the need for defense production is at an end.

We believe that it is to the best interest of the Nation to decentralize production for national defense, to establish plants where raw materials supply and loyal labor are readily available, where power and transportation facilities are ample, where climatic conditions are most favorable for year-round production, and where such plants will be needed for other production uses when the needs of national defense have been fulfilled.

The South offers these and many other industrial advantages and is ready and willing to use its full resources for national defense.

The best interests of the Nation can be served only if full use is made of the South's resources by industrial plants established in this area. And the same holds for other sections of the country where resources and labor are plentiful and where industrial congestion is not a liability. We further believe immediate steps in this direction are necessary.

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE DETROIT NEWS AND LETTER FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Detroit News, Detroit, Mich., entitled "Unsound Opposition," as well as a letter in the public press written to the New York Times, on the St. Lawrence seaway project, showing its value as an aid in after-war competition:

[From the Detroit News]

UNSOUND OPPOSITION

One of the arguments made by Senate opponents of the St. Lawrence seaway is that before its construction is completed the defense emergency will be over.

It is a sufficient answer to point out that the seaway's contribution to national efficiency will be great in either war or peace. Even if Britain wins the war, as we hope and trust, this great waterway, admitting ocean ships to the heart of our continent, will be needed. The competition in world markets will be no less keen, certainly, than it has been in the past.

However, there is another answer, which President Roosevelt himself has made on at least two occasions. The United States, he said, is building and planning to build war vessels that will take longer to complete than the seaway. If they are justified—and no one questions that—how can it be said the seaway would take too long?

It might be added, moreover, that unlike war vessels, which become obsolete, the seaway would remain as a defense asset as long as the Great Lakes remain.

We think, however, that we already have said enough on this point to demonstrate the complete fallacy of the argument in question. It is not, in truth, an honest argument, sincerely made, and in that respect it shares the character of all other arguments we have seen in opposition to the seaway.

The reason is that, as we pointed out the other day, the real objections of those opposing it will not bear inspection. The source of this opposition, now as always, is the utility and rail interests primarily and their satellites, their motives wholly selfish.

We do not admire those who front for these private interests, helping to cloak their narrow selfishness in pretended concern for the national welfare. For 40 years every Government inquiry, every statement by the Presidents, every military report on this subject has held the seaway vital to the national welfare. Were it not for the above-named opposition, the seaway would be open now, available for defense.

SEAWAY VIEWED AS ASSET—ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT HELD VALUABLE AS AID IN AFTER-WAR COMPETITION

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your recent editorial on the proposed St. Lawrence seaway hinges on a premise on which there appears to be general misunderstanding, largely because late information has not yet been made generally available. Your premise is that too many years would be required to complete the seaway for effective aid to come from Great Lakes shipyards to the benefit of England in our present program.

You observe that President Roosevelt places 1945 as the probable date of completion, which you say other competent engineers place at 1947 or 1948. This time element was adequately dealt with by Pierrepont Moffat, United States Minister to Canada, who early in March stated that "if the full burden of our expanding ship construction must fall on seaboard shipyards, the time required to complete the vessels themselves must, in many instances, be increased by the period necessary to construct new shipyards and facilities. With this in mind, it is apparent that the deep waterway could be completed in time to provide an outlet to the sea for many of the new vessels included in the present program."

WORK FOR SHIPYARDS

Navy officials also point out that Great Lakes yards could take over the long-range phases of the construction burden, freeing seaboard facilities for concentration on the type of craft for which there is an immediate and urgent need.

Great Lakes shipyards could not only be building fighting craft for convoy duty but cargo ships to sail within those convoys. The capacity of the Great Lakes yards would allow for the present handling of a billion dollars of defense materials if the seaway were assured. Today less than a tenth of that capacity is being utilized for either fighting or cargo ships. One Wisconsin firm is building submarines, but unless a deepened St. Lawrence channel offers free passage to the sea, the submarines will have to be cut into sections and reassembled at a seacoast port.

Another impression readers of your editorial may have obtained is that the St. Lawrence project is new. It is not. It seeks to modernize an existing channel outmoded by the demands of present-day ocean-going commerce. Ships with not more than 11-foot draft can now get through in increasing tonnages every year. The project calls for deepening the channel to 27 feet, which would admit all but the largest liners.

Large liners do not carry cargo in volume, which is the main purpose of the St. Lawrence project. We want to get our merchandise out to the sea at low cost so that we will be in a favorable competitive position in the world's export markets after the war. Beyond question, whichever side wins, competition will be intense, and if we can help the automobile and related industries in the Midwest to better their competitive position in world markets, we will benefit all America.

ICE HANDICAP DISCOUNTED

Your editorial also touches on a familiar argument advanced against the seaway—that it will be ice-bound for several months of each year. So it will. But so is the St. Marys River, connecting Lakes Superior and Huron, one of the northernmost points on the entire St. Lawrence route. Despite the ice, the St. Marys River in one season handled the same approximate tonnage as the Panama and Suez Canals and the ports of London and Liverpool combined, and this before the present war cut into world tonnages. What can be done on the St. Marys can be done throughout the seaway.

I commend to the attention of every one sincerely interested in the seaway the results of Government studies made under Dr. N. R. Danielian and published within recent weeks by the Department of Commerce. If there is a single specious argument against the seaway not factually answered in those studies, I have yet to hear that argument.

To me the most convincing generalization in favor of the seaway is the fact that every President—Republican and Democrat alike—in the past 30 years has endorsed it. In fact, it was sponsored in a plank in the Republican platform of 1932. Our Presidents have seen it from the large perspective of national welfare, above sectional and political prejudices.

W. C. COWLING,
Chairman, Detroit-Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway Committee.
DETROIT, MICH., *April 4, 1941.*

Resolution Against War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1941

RESOLUTION VOTED AT DETROIT ANTI-WAR RALLY

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, 5,000 American citizens gathered in an America first committee antiwar rally in Detroit April 7, voted unanimously to respectfully submit the following resolution to Members of Congress as a sincere indication of their earnest desire to keep the United States out of war:

Whereas Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in seeking election as President of the United States for a third consecutive term, made the following specific pledge to the American people: "The United States today is at peace and is going to remain at peace," and also "I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party: 'We will not participate in foreign wars' "; and

Whereas the people of this country, in reliance upon that assurance, reelected President Roosevelt to the Presidency in November 1940; and

Whereas the course of events since that time, certain public statements of the President, and the attitude of the administration have given just cause for grave apprehension respecting the intention of the President to abide by this solemn engagement with the American people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, The people of this country, as appears from repeated polls and tests of public opinion, are overwhelmingly opposed to involvement in the present European war. We therefore insist that this administration has no legal or moral right to risk our involvement in that war by acts which would invite or provoke an outbreak of hostilities: Be it further

Resolved, That we commend the Members of Congress who, by their activities and their votes, have truly reflected this desire for peace, and we pledge to them our continued support and allegiance.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. MEYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1941

LETTERS AND STATEMENT RELATIVE TO ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters and statement:

BALTIMORE ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
Baltimore, Md., April 2, 1941.

The Honorable JOHN A. MEYER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MEYER: The Association of Commerce, acting for the commercial and maritime interests of Baltimore, is opposed to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence navigation and power project, which has been submitted to Congress in the form of a United States-Canadian agreement.

The attached statement describes our position and gives supporting data. We believe the project is unsound on a national basis, opposed to the best interests of Baltimore and Maryland, and unjustified as a national-defense measure.

We hope that you and the other members of the Maryland congressional delegation will oppose the ratification of this agreement, and that you will advise us of your intention to vote against it. In our opinion this project would have adverse effects of a far-reaching character on the welfare of this city and State.

We would appreciate hearing from you on this subject, and will be glad to furnish any additional data you may require.

Very truly yours,

G. H. POUDER,
Executive Vice President.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT—STATEMENT IN OPPOSITION BY THE BALTIMORE ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE

1. POSITION OF BALTIMORE

The commercial and maritime interests of Baltimore are opposed to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence navigation and power project. They regard it as economically unsound on a national basis and as extremely menacing to the future welfare of the port and city of Baltimore. They believe that this project, which has lacked economic justification through the years and is now urged as a defense measure, is contrary to the real and immediate needs of national defense.

2. STATUS

A United States-Canadian treaty to effectuate the seaway was defeated by the Senate in 1934. Now, 7 years later, with every resource of the two countries strained to meet vital emergencies of the present, it is again advanced. On March 19, 1941, at Ottawa, the United States and Canada signed an agreement for the development of power and navigation facilities in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence waterway, and this was transmitted by the President to Congress on March 21. Ratifying legislation is to be introduced, involving the appropriation of funds. The agreement has been referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and it is hoped will be referred later to specialized committees for handling in orderly process. Although the agreement appears to be a treaty in everything but name, it does not require the two-thirds Senate consent necessary for treaty ratification.

Congress will thus be asked for the authority and the funds to inaugurate a waterway with channels of minimum 27-foot depth and 450-foot width, over a distance of 1,300 miles between Montreal and Duluth, including 67 miles of canals and 18 locks. Involved will be an increase in depth of the St. Lawrence River in Canada and along the border of the United States, the deepening of the channels and canals connecting the Great Lakes and the installation of hydroelectric plants on the St. Lawrence. A Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin commission, with the two countries equally represented, would be established.

The President on October 17, 1940, appointed a St. Lawrence Advisory Commission, and allocated $1,000,000 from emergency funds to the Corps of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission to undertake preliminary investigations and surveys. A St. Lawrence survey was set up shortly thereafter by the United States Department of Commerce to conduct economic studies, under the direction of Dr. N. R. Danielian. By the end of March several reports dealing with various phases of the project were issued, and others will follow. No attempt is made in this statement to refute the arguments in behalf of the proposal which are advanced in these documents. The statement is also confined largely to navigational and transportation aspects.

3. BACKGROUND

The feasibility and desirability of constructing a deep-draft waterway between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean have been debated for 45 years. Many commissions and boards have discussed possible plans, and much of the study has been theoretical and produced little practical data usable for sound conclusions. Opinions of commercial engineers have varied widely regarding technical aspects of costs, routes, dams, locks, etc. Throughout the period there has been continued and growing opposition from civic and business interests in the United States and in Canada. This is now widespread, based particularly on the danger of diverting needed war funds to a vast project of uncertain value which cannot under any circumstances be applied to present defense needs, and which would injuriously affect the future of United States industry, seaboard harbors, and transportation agencies.

The United States Senate in 1934 defeated the St. Lawrence Seaway Treaty by a vote of 46 ayes, 42 nays, 3 paired, and 5 not voting. Both Maryland Senators opposed the project. The treaty required a two-thirds affirmative vote and thus failed of ratification.

4. COST

The actual total cost of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project is unknown. Previous proponents have estimated that it would involve expenditures of at least $550,000,000 divided between the two countries, and with Canada receiving credits for improvement work already performed. The total cost of the project in the International Rapids section is now estimated at $266,170,000 to provide for the 2,200,000-horsepower power project and waterway improvement in that section. The necessary expenditures in other sections are not specified.

It is likely that the final cost would reach $1,000,000,000 and possibly more. Past experience has shown that the actual cost of waterway construction is usually greatly in excess of the estimates. The Panama Canal cost $375,000,000 and was estimated at $160,000,000. The Suez Canal, $80,000,000; estimate, $30,000,000. In all events the seaway cost will be astronomical, and a large part of it will come from taxpayers of the United States, who will be adversely affected.

5. NATIONAL DEFENSE

The St. Lawrence project is being currently advocated for national defense. The principal arguments are: (1) Construction of ships in a protected inland area; (2) development of hydroelectric power for emergency needs and processing of strategic materials.

By the lowest estimate of time, the project would require from 5 to 6 years for completion. The present requirements of national defense, particularly those involving ship construction and power production, could not be held in abeyance for that period, nor is it conceivable that our pressing needs for preparedness could in any way be supported by this project. Meantime, vast sums of money which is essential for defense measures now possible of accomplishment, and skilled labor vital to the present defense program, would be diverted. The construction itself must be considered highly vulnerable in war, for the intricate system of locks and dams would offer bombing and sabotage objectives, with resultant closing of the route and bottling up of ships and cargoes.

New construction of large additional shipyard facilities are now under way at United States seacoast ports, including a sizable program at the port of Baltimore. Existing facilities, and those now contemplated at such ports, would seem to be adequate for the Nation's normal and emergency shipbuilding requirements.

Dr. T. H. Hogg, chairman of the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission, is quoted as saying, "It is quite evident that this development cannot be classed as a war measure, for even if it were undertaken tomorrow it would be 6 or 7 years before it could become of use. Yet the project is persistently misrepresented as a war measure, which, far from helping, would actually handicap war work."

6. USAGE

Because of prolonged ice conditions on the St. Lawrence River and canals, the proposed seaway would be closed to navigation for approximately 5 months of the year, from December 1 to May 1.

Foreign- and domestic-vessel traffic, the launching or movement of vessels built or repaired, and all similar marine operations would be suspended during this period. For the handling of this 5-months traffic the railroads would have to maintain year-round facilities and equipment, which might be forced to operate far below capacity during the 7 months of open navigation. Atlantic and Gulf ports would be similarly affected.

The extent to which the long and tortuous St. Lawrence seaway route, with frequently

adverse weather conditions, would be used by regularly scheduled deep-draft cargo vessels is unknown. The hazards of the voyage and the time element, when placed beside the value of ships' time and the need for safe and expeditious handling of vessels and cargoes, would probably influence insurance cost and ocean rates, and in some cases might bring them to prohibitive levels. But foreign-flag vessels of the tramp type, engaged in the movement of bulk cargoes where the time factor is not controlling, would employ the facility and would undoubtedly divert large tonnages from established United States and Canadian transportation agencies and ports. While the seaway's limited field of attraction for certain ships and cargoes reduces its national economic justification, the volume of bulk freight which would be diverted presents a serious issue for American railroads and their investors, and for ports such as Baltimore, which specialize in such cargo and have built up expensive facilities and services to handle it.

It has been said that millions of tons of freight annually would be diverted from existing transportation routes to this waterway. Seaboard ports and American transportation agencies have made tremendous investments in order to provide facilities for handling the business of the central industrial and agricultural sections which are described as the project's tributary territory.

7. EFFECTS ON BALTIMORE

The port of Baltimore, and this city's maritime, transportation, financial, and industrial activities would be adversely affected by the proposed seaway.

While actual traffic diversions from this port cannot accurately be estimated, they would unquestionably be in large volume. A national undertaking, for which the citizens and business interests of Baltimore would pay proportionately in taxes, would penalize the initiative which has been displayed and the capital which has been invested through many years in developing seaboard harbor facilities to handle the interior freight tonnage now proposed for seaway routing.

As the closest port geographically to the interior cargo areas of the United States, with economical through-shipping costs for rail-and-water freight, and modern and diversified handling facilities and equipment, Baltimore has long been a principal seaboard service harbor for the central west. Much of the total of $155,000,000 invested in facilities and equipment in this port has been based on this through-shipping business, originating in or destined to the interior. This applies particularly to the investment of $100,000,000 in water-front terminals and warehouses. In shipyards, harbor craft, and miscellaneous equipment there is an investment of $35,000,000. Baltimore City has invested $15,000,000 in piers, and $3,000,000 in channels, and the Federal Government has spent $16,000,000 for the dredging of channels and anchorages, largely based upon the handling of interior business as economic justification.

Of the port's present annual commerce of about 20,000,000 tons, valued at a billion dollars (of which 10,000,000 tons, valued at $300,000,000 is foreign trade), a substantial percentage is inland rail-haul business. The Government collects approximately $10,000,000 yearly here in customs duties, based to an appreciable extent on goods shipped to interior points. Four thousand deep-sea ships visit the port yearly, their operations involving average revenue to Baltimore of over $20,000,000, and their calls here are influenced largely by inland traffic movement.

The port employment factor is of tremendous local consequence. Approximately 15,000 port workers in many classifications gain their livelihood directly from harbor activity, and the needs of interior traffic movement. Many more probably are indirectly dependent on the port and its steady operation. A large number of port jobs are at stake in the St. Lawrence proposal.

Special local groups, contributing to the welfare of the community and its surrounding area, such as those handling grain, coal, and other specialized commodities would be directly penalized, and the results of diverting any appreciable volume of interior traffic would in some measure be reflected in every field of Baltimore business.

As specified earlier, many low-priced, nonperishable basic commodities moving by slow freight might be lost to the seaway. These include basic imports such as wood pulp, sulfur, coffee, and sugar, which are now handled in large volume at Baltimore, and furnish extensive harbor employment. The present routing of much export tonnage in wheat, corn, iron, and steel via inland waterways indicates the possibility of further loss to the seaway in important port commodities of this character.

There is little question that the port's rail differential structure to and from the Middle West would be partially nullified in practical effect, by the operation of the proposed seaway.

Baltimore's manufacturers would find increased competition in the Middle Western market from economic changes brought about by the seaway as proposed. Attraction of plants to Baltimore would be rendered more difficult if the port situation were weakened. The association's studies have developed potentially adverse effects on Baltimore manufacturing plants, and on State natural resources, such as coal.

8. CIVIC ACTION

On December 20, 1940, the Board of Directors of the Baltimore Association of Commerce reaffirmed the organization's previous opposition to the seaway. This action was taken on recommendation of the administrative committee of the association's export and import bureau, which has long considered this matter from the aspects of national policy and port welfare.

On March 20, 1941, the board of directors of the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, a long-established grain, flour, and maritime exchange of Baltimore, stated in a resolution that "The passage of the proposed Canadian-American plan to deepen the St. Lawrence River—so-called St. Lawrence waterway project—will eliminate Baltimore as a shipping port for much of its present foreign commerce, especially in grain, packing-house products, steel, steel materials, and many other commodities."

On January 4, 1941, the Propeller Club of the United States Port of Baltimore, by resolution opposed the seaway project as detrimental to the maritime interests of this harbor.

On March 26, 1941, the executive committee of the Baltimore-Maryland Coal Exchange opposed the project as harmful to the industry they represent. The Georges Creek & Upper Potomac Coal Association, representing 90 percent of the coal operators in that district, took similar action in March.

Many other Baltimore groups, business establishments, and individuals strongly oppose the seaway undertaking, as do hundreds of national and regional organizations located in the eastern, southern, and middle western areas of the United States.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 8, 1941.

MR. G. HARRY POUDER,
Executive Vice President, Baltimore Association of Commerce,
22 Light Street, Baltimore, Md.

DEAR MR. POUDER: This will acknowledge with thanks your letter of April 4 relative to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project and enclosed statement in opposition by the Baltimore Association of Commerce, which I have read with much interest.

Complying with your request for an expression of my views on this subject, I should first like to state that I have been gathering all available information and data on the proposal over a period of several months, and after careful analysis of this material, am convinced that this project should be opposed.

In reaching this conclusion, I considered largely the tremendous scope of the defense program which we are now undertaking, and the vast burden of debt and taxes the citizens will be called upon to assume for these noncontroversial measures.

It is imperative that expenditures on nondefense activities be curtailed and consideration for projects which are not immediately necessary to the National Defense or vital to the domestic economy be deferred until such time as the proposals can be studied from the standpoint of their actual economic advantages or disadvantages.

A study of the St. Lawrence seaway and power-project proposal and available reports of the St. Lawrence survey fails to justify such expenditure as necessary to national defense and, in my judgment, it is perfectly clear that the enormous sum of money required could, if appropriated, be invested to much better advantage in other directions for more pressing and immediate objectives, such as the necessary defense requirements of the great ports along the Atlantic seaboard.

Other grounds for objection to this project are well argued in the statement you have submitted and indicate with what thoroughness the situation has been reviewed. I am especially concerned by the thought that skilled labor, material, and machinery so vital to the present defense program might be diverted from work on facilities urgently needed; and in viewing the proposal in a more restricted sense, I am wholeheartedly in accord with your opinion that transportation, financial and industrial activities of the port of Baltimore would be adversely affected. Only recently I stated in a letter directed to you that it is my sincere desire to protect in whatever way I can the interests of our port and its industries.

It has been my policy during this emergency to lend my support to those measures which tend to strengthen our country economically and build up its defenses and to oppose any reckless pouring out of money on less essential measures—this because I realize that we cannot spend these enormous sums building up our defenses and at the same time make additional expenditures without weakening our national structure.

The proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project has been presented before on its merits and defeated. Its proponents now urge it upon us as a "necessity" to national defense. I can see no justification for reviving this project as a defense measure, and am happy to assure you and the distinguished members of the Baltimore Association of Commerce that you may count on my vigorous efforts toward defeat of this project.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. MEYER.

[From the Baltimore Sun of April 10, 1941]

ST. LAWRENCE PLAN OPPOSED BY MEYER—REPRESENTATIVE PLEDGED TO FIGHT AGAINST WATERWAY PROJECT—SEES NO JUSTIFICATION FOR REVIVING PROGRAM AS DEFENSE MEASURE

Representative MEYER yesterday pledged his opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project in a letter addressed to G. Harry Pouder, executive vice president of the Baltimore Association of Commerce.

The association is on record against the project and has issued a brief summarizing its attitude.

Representative MEYER said he has been gathering all available data on the proposal

over a period of several months and, after careful analysis of this material, is convinced the project should be opposed.

CITES PREVIOUS DEFEAT

"The proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project has been presented before on its merits and defeated," Mr. MEYER's letter said. "Its proponents now urge it upon us as a 'necessity' to national defense.

"I can see no justification for reviving this project as a defense measure and am happy to assure you [Mr. Pouder] that the distinguished members of the Baltimore Association of Commerce that you may count on my vigorous efforts toward defeat of this project."

Representative MEYER declared that, in studying the project, he took into consideration the "vast burden of debt and taxes the citizens will be called upon to assume" in the carrying out of the "noncontroversial" defense program.

URGES ECONOMIC FACTOR

"It is imperative that expenditures on nondefense activities be curtailed, and consideration for projects which are not immediately necessary to the national defense or vital to the domestic economy be deferred until such time as the proposals can be studied from the standpoint of their actual economic advantages or disadvantages.

"A study of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project proposal and available reports of the St. Lawrence survey fails to justify such expenditure as necessary to national defense and, in my judgment, it is perfectly clear that the enormous sum of money required could, if appropriated, be invested to much better advantage in other directions for more pressing and immediate objectives, such as the necessary defense requirements of the great ports along the Atlantic."

EFFECT ON PORT OF BALTIMORE

In this connection the Maryland Congressman expressed his agreement with the position taken by the Baltimore Association of Commerce that the project would have an adverse effect on the economy of the port of Baltimore.

"Other grounds for objection to this project," he said, "are well argued in the statement you have submitted and indicate with what thoroughness the situation has been reviewed. I am especially concerned by the thought that skilled labor, material, and machinery so vital to the present defense program might be diverted from work on facilities urgently needed.

"And in viewing the proposal in a more restricted sense, I am wholeheartedly in accord with your opinion that transportation, financial, and industrial activities of the port of Baltimore would be adversely affected."

According to Mr. Pouder, Representative MEYER is the second Member of the Maryland congressional delegation to express his opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Representative SASSCER already has announced his opposition.

According to the statement of the association, all Members of the Maryland congressional delegation have been circularized on the matter.

POINTS TO GREAT COST

The association charges that the cost of the project would "involve expenditures of at least $550,000,000," divided between the United States and Canada, with Canada receiving credits for improvement work already done.

"The total cost of the project in the International Rapids section now is estimated at $226,170,000, to provide for the 2,200,000-horsepower project and waterway improvement in that section," the statement declares.

"In all events, the seaway cost will be astronomical, and a large part of it will come from taxpayers in the United States who will be adversely affected."

Distribution of Surplus Commodities in North Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWT V. MILLS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1941

LETTER FROM DONALD C. GALEHOUSE, DIRECTOR OF THE INTAKE AND CERTIFICATION BUREAU, BATON ROUGE, LA.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, as a result of excessive rains in 1940, northeast Louisiana had practically a complete crop destruction, and as a result we were forced to call upon the Federal Surplus Marketing Administration and they were kind enough to extend direct food recognition to my section, for which we are very thankful.

The following is a letter showing number of families served during January 1941:

INTAKE AND
CERTIFICATION BUREAU,
COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION DIVISION,
Baton Rouge, La., February 15, 1941.

Hon. NEWT V. MILLS,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MILLS: This acknowledges your letter of February 11 with reference to the highest number of families receiving commodities during the winter season 1940–41.

We have had an unprecedented monthly increase in the number of certified recipients since September 1940. In the congressional district which you represent the peak was reached in January 1941, and almost without exception each parish in the district had a larger number of eligible cases in that month than in any previous month since the inception of direct distribution of surplus commodities in Louisiana.

For your information, I am glad to list the number of families, by parish, that were served during the month of January 1941:

Union	2,792
Richland	4,657
Concordia	2,797
Catahoula	2,018
La Salle	1,488
Caldwell	1,427
Franklin	5,288
Tensas	3,420
Morehouse	4,023
Ouachita	4,657
Jackson	1,799
Madison	2,640
East Carroll	4,467
West Carroll	3,456
Lincoln	3,275

Since the average family is represented by approximately 3.9 persons, you can readily realize that a large proportion of the general population in each parish is eligible to participate in direct distribution.

In the event you may wish more detailed data or further information on any phase of our operations, please do not hesitate in letting us hear from you.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD C. GALEHOUSE,
State Director.

Labor and the National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE PROVIDENCE (R. I.) VISITOR

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Providence (R. I.) Visitor of Thursday, March 27, 1941:

WHO IS ON STRIKE?

The stories about industrial strikes in various sections of our country are justifiable ground for suspicion that labor's recent gains are in danger. The stories, we repeat, and not the strikes. A nation which is being geared up to high-speed production of war materials might easily be turned against labor by an unfriendly press. To prevent this calamity both capital and labor must do a part, and they must do it quickly.

Where is labor itself at fault, and what must it do? The racketeer and Communist must be outlawed. The first because he is not interested in the workingman. He is a profiteer who takes advantage of the present trying situation to exploit skilled and unskilled workers who finally have a chance to make a decent week's pay. He is not striving to better their condition but solely to enrich himself. The Communist must go because he is a troublemaker by profession, a man who will never be satisfied that labor receives its due until capital is destroyed. Such men will never bring anything but disorder and confusion into labor's ranks. At all times but especially now they are a menace.

We hasten to add, however, that this phase of the situation, labor's faults, has been exaggerated and overdone. While there are racketeers and Communists and strikes, all three are scarcer than they were, and union leaders are making an effort to make them fewer still. And as far as the strike as a technique is concerned we must not forget that it is not essentially unlawful. Nor is it unlawful or unpatriotic or anything else even in the present emergency as long as it is justifiable. To say that this emergency makes the worker's right to strike invalid is to use the vicious argument that the end justifies the means.

An able economist, Rev. John F. Cronin, S. S., of St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, writing recently on this problem points out that labor's present strikes are not half as detrimental as the "sit-down strike" staged by capital ever since Federal legislation gave the workingman a decent share in the profits of his labor. On this point the press has been singularly silent, thereby presenting only one side of the story.

Where, therefore, is capital at fault and what must it do? The industrialist must stop whining because the laborer wants a fair return for his work. The old days are gone and the facts might as well be faced. The man who puts up the money must not take advantage of the current crisis to reap abnormal and excessive profits. If sacrifices are to be made, the capitalist is to make them as well as the worker. What the present situation needs more than anything else is good will. Both sides must show it. But, in all fairness

to labor, it must be said that capital's "sit-down strike" of 1940 and earlier makes us suspicious, to say the least, that the industrialist is not now entirely blameless or as holy and magnanimous as the public has by journalistic inference been led to believe.

Dedication of Federal Post Office Building at Alvin, Tex.

REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1941

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a post-office building was dedicated at Alvin, Tex., with impressive ceremonies on December 28, 1940. My colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD], delivered the dedicatory address. Alvin is situated in Brazoria County, in which was located the capital of Stephen F. Austin's colony, the first American settlement in Texas. It is also within a few miles of the imposing monument marking the battlefield of San Jacinto, where Texas independence was achieved, in one of the most brilliant victories ever won upon a field of battle. The address of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] makes reference to the early postal history of Texas, which is of general interest. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD to include the ceremonies of dedication, as published in the local newspapers—the Sun and the News—on January 3, 1941.

The matter referred to follows:

[From the Alvin (Tex.) newspapers, the Sun and News, of January 3, 1941]

CONGRESSMAN MANSFIELD DEDICATES NEW ALVIN POST OFFICE—LARGE CROWD ATTENDS IMPRESSIVE CEREMONY HERE SATURDAY

Alvin's attractive new $70,000 post-office building was dedicated here Saturday afternoon by Congressman JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD at impressive ceremonies attended by an unusually large crowd. Postmaster Ben Borskey served as master of ceremonies and introduced Congressman MANSFIELD, whose influence was largely responsible for the construction of the fine brick building.

Following the invocation by Dr. F. G. Deis, of the Episcopal Church, Maj. E. H. Rackley, commander of the American Legion of the Ninth District, officiated in flag-raising ceremonies. A salute to the flag and singing of the national anthem followed. Postmaster Borskey was presented with a plaque bearing a picture of the flag and the pledge of allegiance by Major Rackley.

Mayor E. C. Kimmons then delivered an address of welcome to the visitors, which was followed by a patriotic reading by Miss Nan Strickland.

Among the guests and visitors introduced by Postmaster Borskey were W. S. Watkins, postal inspector, of Houston; Robert I. Cohen and E. S. Holliday, of Galveston Chamber of Commerce; Louis Eibert, publisher of the Galveston News-Tribune; W. J. Aicklen, Galveston; Fred C. Pabst, collector of customs, Galveston, and Sam T. Zinn, assistant collector; Mayor Carl Nessler, of Texas City; John Dunlop, postmaster, Houston; A. R. Rucks, of Angleton; Raymond A. Stewart, postmaster, Galveston.

A historical sketch of Alvin's first post office as of 1881 was given by D. Lee Slataper. Mr. Slataper stated that among the original patrons of this boxcar post office still living here were Mrs. Alice Morgan (widow of Theodore Savell), the Thomas and Uzzell families.

In his address dedicating the new post office, Congressman MANSFIELD pointed out the geographical advantages enjoyed by Alvin and the many advantages enjoyed by this community in oil, sulfur, industrial, agricultural, and other developments. His speech in full follows:

"Mr. Mayor, Mr. Postmaster, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen: I wish to express my appreciation for the privilege of being with you today to take part in the dedication of this splendid building which marks another milestone in the history of your Postal Service. I had planned to be with you at the laying of the cornerstone of this building, but official duty in Washington at the time prevented.

"I am advised that the Alvin post office was established April 12, 1881. As a coincidence, that happened to be the day I first arrived in Texas from the State of West Virginia. The lifetime of your post office and town being simultaneous with my residence near you for many years has afforded me every opportunity to observe your material progress and development.

"The records in the Post Office Department show that domestic money-order business was established in the Alvin post office January 2, 1893, and international money-order business about 9 years later. The records also show that rural-delivery service was inaugurated March 15, 1900, and that the carrier received a salary of $400 per annum. The postmaster for the fiscal year 1883 received the munificent sum of $35.04 for his services. A caretaker now usually receives an average of more than that for a single month's service.

"The small amount of compensation paid to the postmasters in the early period of your postal history shows conclusively that the office was conducted primarily for the public benefit and that the postmasters were simply performing a patriotic service, practically without compensation.

"From your modest beginning 59 years ago, your community, with its postal service, has grown to enormous proportions. You now have a population of 3,500 with a substantial commerce, a high-school enrollment of 1,040 pupils. Your postal receipts, constituting the best possible barometer of business generally, have increased enormously, giving you the advantage over many other places in the allocation of funds for the construction of this splendid building.

"In my early days in Congress, I was a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. This was during the World War period. I then introduced a bill for a post-office building for Alvin and secured a favorable report of the committee, but our Government expenses for national-defense purposes were so great that it was found to be impossible to obtain money for public buildings.

"For about 15 years following the World War, Congress made no appropriations for post-office buildings. Finally, a public building program was inaugurated and kept in operation until some 2 or 3 years ago. Alvin, on my recommendation, was allocated funds for the construction of this building. It is understood, of course, that it may be many years before another post-office building is erected, as our preparedness program will require enormous expenditures.

"Since the establishment of your post office in 1881, eight persons have been appointed and served as postmaster:

"Alvin Morgan, April 12, 1881.
"Samuel N. Richardson, March 26, 1883.
"William S. Hart, June 5, 1891.
"Richard H. King, February 10, 1894.
"Bert I. Osgood, December 20, 1898.
"Marion G. French, February 19, 1903.
"R. H. King, May 22, 1913.
"Scott F. Benson, April 18, 1922.
"Benjamin A. Borskey, January 25, 1935.

"From the dawn of history, postal service in some form has been in operation in nearly all or quite all countries of the world. In the United States, it dates from the colonial period. Benjamin Franklin was placed at the head of the system and served until his removal by the British Government at the outbreak of the Revolution. He was again placed in charge by the Americans in the revolutionary period and served until appointed Minister to France, when he was succeeded by his son-in-law, Richard Bache.

"Speaking of the American colonial administration of Mr. Franklin, the Encyclopaedia Britannica pays him the following compliment. It says:

" 'In the American colonies, postal improvements may be dated from the administration of Franklin, who was virtually the last colonial postmaster general as well as the best.'

"When the Constitution was adopted in 1789, a provision was inserted, authorizing the construction of public buildings and public roads for the Postal Service. While we all adore the Constitution, that provision should be especially endearing to the hearts of the people of Alvin. It is the same authority under which you were granted this beautiful and useful building, these splendidly paved highways, and the excellent postal service you now enjoy.

"I am advised that the first piece of mail carried through our mails after the adoption of the Constitution, was dated October 3, 1789. We then had 75 post offices, and approximately 1,800 miles of post routes, consisting principally of dirt roads, trails, and horse paths. We now have more than 45,000 post offices, and over 250,000 people employed.

"Mail is now carried over nearly 200,000 miles of railroad; 265,000 miles of star routes; more than 21,000 miles of powerboat routes, and 63,000 miles of airplane routes. Our air mail now extends across the Atlantic and Pacific and to Alaska, Central and South America. The Department also sends mail by ship to all ports of the world.

"Every known method of transportation is brought into service in the movement of our mails, which now consist of more than 20,000,000,000 separate pieces in the various classes. Airplanes, pneumatic tubes, steam and electric railroads, ships and motorboats, busses, trucks, automobiles, wagons and buggies, horses and saddles, snowsleds and dog trains. Wherever there is need for mail service for the enjoyment of the American people, some appropriate method of transportation will be found for its systematic movement.

"Our Post Office Department now constitutes perhaps the largest business enterprise in the world, public or private. The cost of its operation is more than three-fourths of a billion dollars annually.

"Besides its particular functions of collecting, distributing, transporting, and delivering mail, various other services are performed by the Department. It maintains a Postal Savings System, deposits in which increased $80,000,000 from 1933 to 1937. It conducts a money-order service for the transfer of

money for its patrons from one point to another. It insures and registers valuable mail. It is a sales agency of the Treasury Department for United States savings bonds. It was the agency through which the Government handled the payment of the veterans' bonus. It was the agency through which the Social Security Board registered more than 29,000,000 workers and aged persons throughout the country. It has recently been charged with the registration and fingerprinting of all aliens in this country.

"The postal history of Texas is different from that of other States of the Nation. Though Texas has at various times paid allegiance to six different flags, it was not a part of our colonial system. Neither was it in the Union at the time of the adoption of the Constitution and establishment of our national postal system.

"Texas fills a unique place in history. It was long claimed by both France and Spain by right of discovery. In 1763 it was ceded by France to Spain. Spain ceded it back to France in 1800. It was claimed by the United States under the Louisiana Purchase from France in 1803, but all our rights, if any, were quitclaimed to Spain in 1819 in part consideration of the purchase of Florida. Texas became a part of the Mexican Empire under Iturbide in 1821 and of the Mexican Republic in 1824.

"Texas became an independent republic in 1836 and a State in the American Union in 1845. In 1861, Texas seceded and shared the fate of the Southern Confederacy. From the close of the war in 1865 it was under the military rule of the United States until 1870, when, complying with the requirements of Congress, it was readmitted to statehood.

"Notwithstanding its varied history, Texas remained practically unsettled and undeveloped until the establishment of Austin's colony in this good county of Brazoria, at a time almost within the memory of men still living.

"So far as we know, neither France nor Spain ever made any material efforts as to colonization of Texas, and no postal service was ever established here by those countries. Only a very crude system, if any, was possible during the period of Austin's colony under the Mexican Government.

"Under the Texas Republic, every possible effort was put forth to establish a practical postal system. President Houston and the Congress of the Republic had great difficulties to contend with, chief of which was how to raise money enough to pay the cost of operation. In his message of November 21, 1839, President Houston said:

" 'Heretofore, difficulties insuperable were presented to the establishment and regular conveyance of the mail, but by indefatigable attention and labor the Postmaster General has been enabled to give efficiency to the department, and hereafter, with suitable aid from Congress, there will be but little difficulty in the regular transmission of mails and the circulation of intelligence throughout the Republic. It is not to be expected that any revenue can arise to the Government from this department, but it is thought that a higher rate of postage might be established without oppressing any portion of the community, but with advantage to the revenue, as it will be seen by a report of the department herewith submitted.'

"In his message of June 27, 1842, President Houston complained as follows:

" 'A matter of the liveliest interest to the community is the regular transportation of the mails; but, for the want of appropriations by the last Congress, their transportation throughout entirely ceased. Communication between the different sections, and the circulation of intelligence, have been wholly obstructed. On account of this state of things, the Executive has found himself greatly embarrassed in dissemination, as well as receiving, correct and speedy information, for he had not $1 at his disposition for the employment of expresses, even under the most urgent circumstances.'

"In his message of December 1, 1842, President Houston caustically stated:

" 'Nothing is better calculated to present the deplorable financial condition of Texas than the situation of our post-office and mail establishment. * * * For the service of the present year Congress appropriated only $5,000 in exchequer bills, without making any allowance for their depreciation, nor did they leave any discretion with the Executive to sustain this important branch of the Government. Texas, at this time, furnishes the singular fact of a government without the means of conveying intelligence, or distributing the laws throughout the Republic. It is, doubtless, the only community on earth at this time purporting to be a nation that is similarly situated.'

"The Texas Republic met with the same difficulty that has perplexed our American Government * * * that of trying to make the Postal System self-sustaining, without detriment to the public interest. The matter was referred to more than once by Mr. Houston when making recommendation for additional postage rates and appropriations.

"The cost problem under our present system was graphically referred to in a radio address by Mr. Farley on August 25, 1937. He said:

" 'Congress has provided free use of the mails for the various departments and agencies of the Government, for Members of Congress, and has extended to newspapers free use of the mails for delivery of their papers in the county of publication. Also, the law extends free use of the mails to certain matter for the blind, and preferential rates to newspapers and periodicals.

" 'These free and below-cost services, together with the losses in handling second-, third-, and fourth-class mail, result in an aggregate annual loss of more than $150,000,000.

" 'For the fiscal year 1936 there was an excess of cost over revenue of $90,000,000 for second-class mail, $23,000,000 for third-class mail, and $18,000,000 for fourth-class mail.'

"First-class mail, consisting of letters and post cards, is the only class that has been self-sustaining. If consistent with the public policy to charge rates on a cost basis of second, third, and fourth classes of mail, then letter postage could be materially reduced without loss to the Government.

"Under the Southern Confederacy, Texas was given the best postal service possible under existing conditions of war. John H. Reagan, the Postmaster General under the Confederacy, was a distinguished Texan, of great ability, whose constructive achievements were not limited to his records as Postmaster General. In later years he, as a Member of the United States Senate, was the author of the law creating the Interstate Commerce Commission, still in force for the regulation of interstate commerce. He was also the first chairman of our State railway commission, under the appointment of Governor Hogg.

"Alvin is most strategically located in the heart of the commercial South. You have splendid rail and highway connections, and in close proximity to the ports of Houston, Galveston, Texas City, and Freeport, where approximately 50,000,000 tons of commerce are annually handled. Within a few miles of your doors a very large proportion of the world's sulfur is produced, and the oil production is enormous. Agricultural products are also in great abundance.

"This building is in keeping with the life and progress of your city and surroundings. Not only as to your business and material growth and development, but as to your social and cultural advancement as well. Your churches and your schools have kept pace with your industrial pursuits, and Alvin is today as much noted for its religious and educational activities as for its commercial progress. It is especially appropriate that the Federal activities here should be housed in a building commensurate with the times and place * * * a structure of dignity and character, combining utility and convenience with beauty and symmetry of architectural design. Such a building you now have. I am pleased to announce that this edifice is now dedicated to the purposes for which it is intended, for the use, benefit, comfort, and enjoyment of the people of Alvin and surrounding territory."

Sports for Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE JACKSON (MICH.) CITIZEN PATRIOT

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I desire to include an editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot, relative to the need of recreational facilities at Fort Custer, Mich. The editorial follows:

[From the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot]

SPORTS FOR SOLDIERS

One of a series of questions answered by selected service men at the reception center in Fort Custer or any of the other similar Army posts concerns sports. Has the selectee participated in baseball, football, basketball, wrestling, boxing, or any other similar sport? That suggests a recreational program in keeping wih the accepted conviction that a better Army morale is accomplished when men are permitted to go in for sports and to support company, regimental, or post teams.

But the difficulty, so far as Fort Custer is concerned, is that there are no adequate facilities for many of these sports.

The Fort Custer basketball players must play in a Battle Creek auditorium. The hockey players must do the same, and likewise the wrestlers and boxers. There is no gymnasium or field house suitable for such sports.

Fort Custer now has been made a permanent Army post. That is the significance of the change in name from "camp" to "fort." Such being the case, it becomes obvious that some facilities are required for all-year indoor sports. All military authorities appreciate the value of such diversion.

Of course, everyone realizes that the defense program has been hurried. Barracks, mess halls, and hospitals are far more important than recreational buildings; but the War Department or the congressional committee should make a memorandum of the need at Fort Custer and should see that the necessary facilities are provided as soon as more urgent needs are met.

Sons of Italy, a Patriotic American Organization, Praise Speech of Hon. Joseph E. Casey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. ELIOT

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE SONS OF ITALY MAGAZINE

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include portions of a very fine article which appeared recently in the Sons of Italy Magazine. The article is noteworthy not only because of the merited praise which it gives to one of our distinguished colleagues, but also because it emphasizes the very important fact that the Italo-Americans are loyal citizens of this country who have made, and are making, great contributions to the industrial, cultural, and social life of the United States. The article follows:

[From the Sons of Italy magazine for March 1941]

CONGRESSMAN JOSEPH E. CASEY—OUR JUNIOR DIVISON ORATOR

(By Augustus Loschi)

Congressman JOSEPH E. CASEY, of Clinton, addressed the members only recently at one of its most important affairs and delivered an address that will go down in the annals of the Sons of Italy of Massachusetts as one of the best and most appreciative talks that it has ever been the privilege of the order to hear.

All of us Italo-Americans who heard the speech of the distinguished Congressman were edified and felt satisfied that it took the sting out of the abuse and hard feeling we have been subjected to at the hands of our fellow Americans for the something that is happening in Europe over which we Italo-Americans or Americans of any other race have no control.

Faneuil Hall in Boston has been the scene of the most outstanding events in the history of the American Nation. It was there that the men of Boston, the leaders in the movement for independence, held their meetings, day after day, night after night, listened to the foremost patriots of the time, and finally charted the course that led to the freedom of the country. It was appropriately named the Cradle of Liberty. Ever since it has been a forum for the discussion by free people of political, patriotic, and social matters.

It was there also that on February 23 of this year took place perhaps the greatest meeting ever held by the Massachusetts branch of the Sons of Italy, a meeting that will remain in the history of our order as the most momentous and most highly successful one ever sponsored by it. The occasion was the tenth anniversary of the foundation by the order of the junior division.

The day before at the Statler Hotel the junior division had put on its finest exhibition in its years of existence. Thousands were in attendance, applauding and marveling at the precision and grace of the different drill teams in competition. The competitors showed how well they had profited from the instructions given them by their drillmasters.

The next day the scene shifted to Faneuil Hall. The metropolitan press of Boston covered the meeting and gave ample space in their papers in reporting it. To them the meeting was very important and the result very satisfactory. It inspired the Boston Post to print the following editorial in its issue of February 24, 1941:

"ITALO-AMERICANS

"Not in any one thing, but in the tone and content of the whole, the 2-day celebration just ended of the tenth anniversary of the Junior Division, Grand Lodge of Massachusetts, Order of Sons of Italy, was a heartening demonstration of loyalty and character. There was hardly a moment in the proceedings when the warmth and unadulterated goodness of these American citizens of Italian birth did not manifest itself in expressions of devotion to their country. It is no credit to certain groups of American citizens that those of Italian origin here have been made to feel on the defensive during recent months. But the answer which the Italo-Americans are giving by their conduct, their intelligent restraint, and such meetings as that of the Order of Sons of Italy cannot possibly be excelled."

Those who heard Congressman CASEY'S speech over radio station WBZ on Sunday, February 23, 1941, are witnesses to the splendid delivery and eloquence he possesses. It is regretted that there is not enough space available in this issue to print the entire speech for the benefit of those who did not hear it.

The Congressman showed much familiarity with Italian history, its great men, and their contributions to the art, industry, and social life of the United States. To him they were not men of a past day. They are men who live in spirit today—men whose living works form a part of our everyday life. The high light of the speech was his plea for tolerance:

"We are all tolerant," he said, "in times of peace and calm; then we are wont to state that America's greatness is due to the combined contributions of not one particular people but all the races of mankind that have come to these shores. Today I want the people of Massachusetts to keep repeating that sentiment, because now is the time to practice what we have preached. Today there seems to be a movement to place Americans of Italian extraction in an unfavorable light. Sometimes this is done in a subtle manner by extolling the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon over the southern European. Let us be done with suspicion and false propaganda. Our job is to prove to the world that men of all races can live together and work together in peace and security under a democratic form of government. I am pleased to be at this assembly this afternoon, because I believe that now more than ever is the acceptable time to acquaint all Americans with the splendid contributions of the Italo-Americans to the greatness of our country."

Congressman CASEY is a member of the House Navy Appropriations Committee and recently returned from an inspection trip to the west coast, where he found the construction program for the defense of America proceeding in the most satisfactory manner. His years of experience in the House of Representatives and his qualifications practically necessitated his appointment to that committee. He is also a member of the Dies committee investigating subversive activities in the United States.

Ever since the days of Lincoln the district represented by Congressman CASEY had been served by a Republican. The voters were conservative and chose a conservative Congressman. CASEY, in 1934, campaigning as a Democratic and Progressive candidate, caused a sensation when he defeated his Republican opponent. It was the outstanding achievement of the campaign in Massachusetts. In the House, CASEY has continued his progressive program and has been a leader in the passage of legislation which led to the many social reforms we now enjoy.

Congressman CASEY was born in Clinton, Mass., December 27, 1898. He is the son of John Edward Casey and Winifred M. Casey, and the seventh child in a family of seven, consisting of five brothers and one sister besides himself. He attended the Clinton public schools, and from high school immediately entered Boston University Law School, from which he graduated in 1920 with the degree of bachelor of laws. In the same year he passed the bar examination and entered the practice of law in his native city of Clinton. His education was interrupted during the World War, in which he served as a private.

* * * * *

The popularity that CASEY won in Clinton spread rapidly through Worcester County, and, next to DAVID I. WALSH, he is the biggest political power of that county. With the wonderful record he has so far established as a Member of Congress, his popularity has spread throughout the State.

Much has been said about the loyalty of the Italo-Americans, with the implication that they are not loyal. The Italo-American needs no defenders against this underhand slur. Yet Congressman CASEY answered that mean charge in his speech in the following manner:

"Wars in which America has been engaged since its birth found the Italo-American outstanding in his loyalty and devotion to America. Ever since the days of Lexington and Concord they have contributed more than their share, in proportion to their population, in winning America's battles. During the Revolutionary War many Italians enlisted under George Washington and served the cause of freedom. They served in the Army and Navy in the War of 1812. During the Civil War hundreds of Italians enlisted in the Union Army and distinguished themselves for valor and sacrifice.

"The role played by Italian-Americans during the World War may be best stressed by the fact that the Italians were awarded a much higher share of Distinguished Service Crosses than their number in the United States would warrant. Most of the decorations were awarded to privates, corporals, and sergeants.

"As a member of the Dies committee, I can state that there has not been a single act of sabotage or, indeed, any other subversive action by either natural-born Americans of Italian descent or by naturalized citizens born in Italy. Of course—and quite understandably—there have been expressions of sympathy for Italy, the land of their ancestors. These expressions do not detract from their loyalty to America and its democratic ideals, which are as much a part of the Italo-American as they are of any other group.

"The Stars and Stripes is his flag as surely as it is the flag of any citizen. He will follow it whether he be rich or poor, to the death if need be, when he is called upon to prove his fidelity. He must not and will not forget that prejudices can be most surely confounded by conduct that may defy the barbs of slander.

"To the people of Massachusetts I say, in this time of high-pitched emotions, we ought to prove to not only the other States in the Union but to all other countries of the world that men of many races can live and work together in peace and security as freemen.

"We are proud to be Americans upon the stage of life at this time. Between our entrances and our exits may be only a brief period of time, but it is ours long enough to do our part to make democracy work at home and make it beloved and respected abroad."

We feel we have deserved those kind words. We are going to prove that Congressman CASEY did not exaggerate. At the same time, we are not going into the business of hating anyone. British, French, Greeks, Germans, Spaniards, all are our friends, no matter what the propagandists will say.

Congressional Headlines and Bylines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES S. DEWEY

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES S. DEWEY, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered on April 2 before the Chicago Association of Commerce:

From the dictionary of the press I deliberately borrowed the title for these remarks. What I have in mind to say today pertains not only to Washington events now headlining the news; but also, by way of a byline, I think you will be interested in general comments on the manner in which the machinery of Congress operates. Out of these operations momentous decisions are reached, news is made and history is written.

I do not intend to go into the intricate details of the formal rules and practices of the House, which are patterned after the English Parliament and amended over the years to suit the American personality. It would serve no useful purpose to take the time to explain how and when a point of order may be made, what is meant by the House Calendar, the Union Calendar, and the Consent Calendar, or to outline the circumstances under which a Member may rise on a question of personal privilege and be recognized by the Speaker for an hour. You may well leave those things to your Congressman, as you would leave to your attorney the technicalities of procedure in court.

However, I think it would be of some assistance, particularly if you ever have any specific business before Congress, if I point out the importance of the committees that make up the organization of the House. The function and power of the committee unit, each handling a particular type of legislation, cannot be too strongly emphasized. It is the most important phase of the whole legislative machinery.

The oratorical noise and give-and-take of debates on the floor of the House quite naturally appeal to the public imagination. Oratorical controversies have color. We all enjoy a good fight, the matching of skill and wits, whether it be with gloves, a pigskin, or with words.

I do not mean to imply that the debates on the floor of the House are unimportant. They are very important, particularly for the molding of public opinion for or against a proposition. But it may very well be that the battle was won or lost when it was quietly fought out in committee some time before the legislation came before the House as a whole.

Any Member may introduce a bill on any subject. He simply drops it in the little box attached to the Speaker's rostrum. The Speaker immediately refers it to the proper committee. Sometimes a controversy arises between committees as to which should get some particular bill. Such a controversy arose between the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Military Affairs over the so-called lease-lend bill. Each claimed jurisdiction. The one on the ground that it pertained to foreign policy and the other on the ground that it pertained to defense.

After a bill is introduced and referred to the committee having jurisdiction over its subject matter, it may there remain, as so frequently happens, quietly and peacefully. There it gracefully dies or will die unless proper pressure is brought upon the chairman of the committee, who is always of the majority party, to give it consideration. You will note that I said "proper pressure," not just "pressure" that is brought to bear. You know the complexion of Congress and its temper; and I leave to your imagination as to what constitutes "proper pressure."

Suppose our bill has the "proper backing" and the chairman calls the committee into session. Witnesses appear before the committee and they are examined by the members. Upon a basis of this evidence, always with due regard for the executive recommendations, the committee acts on the bill. It may amend it. It may vote to table it. It may vote to report it adversely. Or it may vote to report it favorably.

The important fact to bear in mind is that as a general rule the House accepts the bill in the form reported by the committee. At any rate the position taken by the committee members when the bill comes before the House exerts considerably more influence on the House as a whole than the position taken by some one individual Member not a member of the committee handling the specific bill. The House membership feels that the members of the committee which heard the testimony and had the opportunity to examine the witness know much more about the subject than any other Member.

You may not think so but I am giving you a very valuable tip. Whenever you find yourself in the position where you feel the provision of some pending bill should be changed, the first question that should come to your mind is, What committee is handling that bill and what Member from Illinois has a seat on that committee? He is the party to contact, either directly or indirectly through your own Congressman.

Our bill is reported and placed on the appropriate calendar. There it may remain for weeks, months, or maybe for an entire session of Congress. The House has another committee which is in the nature of a traffic officer in directing legislation. It decides what legislation gets the right-of-way and what does not. I refer to the Committee on Rules.

Let us assume that my committee, which happens to be the Committee on Banking and Currency, reports our bill. It is on the calendar. The next step is for the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency to go before the Committee on Rules and ask its permission to bring the bill up on the floor of the House. If it is granted, the Committee on Rules will report a resolution, sometimes called a rule, for the special consideration of the bill. The rule will stipulate the number of hours of debate and whether or not any amendments can be made to the bill on the floor.

On the day assigned the rule is presented to the House by the chairman of the Committee on Rules. For 1 hour the House debates the rule. If approved by a vote of the House, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency or some other committee, as the case may be, moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House for consideration of the bill made in order by the rule just adopted.

The Speaker appoints a Member from the majority side to preside as chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and the debate follows with the time controlled, one-half by the chairman of the committee reporting the bill and the other half by the ranking minority member of that committee. If a Member wishes to speak for or against the bill, he must go to either of these gentlemen in control of the time to ask that he be given so many minutes. One may ask for a half hour but only get 5 minutes. After all, there are 435 Members, and now and then each wants to speak his piece.

Just a few days ago I heard one of the gentlemen in control of time say: "Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from North Carolina the remaining 15 seconds on this side." The gentleman from North Carolina rose in his place and said: "Mr. Speaker, I think my reputation for brevity in the House is such that the gentleman has put those 15 seconds into perfectly safe hands."

Great formality is observed during the debates, but sometimes there is some good-natured repartee between the Members. I recall that during the debate on the lease-lend bill two old cronies got into an argument near the microphone in the well of the House, whereupon a third good friend rose in his place and said:

"If the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts and the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey would get out of their huddle I could hear what they were saying."

The gentleman from Massachusetts promptly retorted, "If the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota would extend his ears to their fullest extent our conversation would be quite audible to him."

Upon the conclusion of the general debate on the bill it is then read for amendment under what is known as the 5-minute rule. Any Member may offer an amendment. He is recognized for 5 minutes to explain it and to urge its adoption. Likewise, a Member may rise in opposition to it. The presiding Chairman, incidentally, always tries to recognize the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill whenever he seeks recognition If he states, "The committee accepts the amendment," the House will invariably adopt it. If, on the other hand, he should vigorously oppose it, the House will invariably reject it. Here again is an illustration of the power of a committee and its chairman. And it is hardly necessary to tell you that the party in power has a majority on every committee of the House. It controls the entire legislative machinery.

But it must not be forgotten that the minority, however small it may be and however much of an "underdog," so to speak, it may appear to be, plays a very vital part in the functioning of this legislative machinery. Indeed our system of government could not properly operate without a minority party. It can be demonstrated that it would be better for the Nation as a whole if the majority in Congress were not so overwhelming. The best laws are those which are hammered out on the anvil of legislative debate and not rushed through with a chorus of "yeas."

An overwhelming majority makes for indifference on the part of the majority Members. They are inclined to absent themselves from meetings, making it a point to be present only when a vote is to be taken. They feel so secure in their positions that they are inclined to ignore the suggestions of everyone except those that come from their own leadership, not even taking the time to inquire into the merits of a proposal that may be offered. Too large a majority makes for both indifference and arrogance. An effective check is lacking.

It is the role of the minority to serve as this check. As I conceive the proper function of my party in Congress, it is dual: On the one hand, to oppose; and on the other hand, to propose. I do not believe in opposition simply for opposition's sake. But I do believe that it is the duty of the minority to point out mistakes, to serve as a warning to the people of the dangers of any suggested policy or course of action. Not only is it the duty of the minority to point out mistakes and to warn the people. It is also our duty, as I see it, to propose an alternative course, to be cons ructive.

The basic issue between the majority and the minority is on the centralization of

power in an ever expanding bureaucracy. If you analyze all the arguments for and against every major piece of legislation that has come before Congress in the last 8 years you will find that the question of delegation and centralization of powers has been the central point at issue.

Generally speaking, this was the dividing line between the proponents and the opponents of the so-called lease-lend bill. It was not so much a question of extending aid to the democracies at war as it was a question of whether our country should enter upon such a program without anyone being prepared to say how far we would be able to go and without the people's representatives in Congress having any effective control over what is done.

Today our people are willing to approve policies and methods of carrying out those policies which only a short time ago they would have most vigorously opposed. Through their representatives in Congress they have given their approval of the program by which this country becomes the arsenal of the democracies of the world under the sole direction of the Chief Executive. They have approved a program which the administration has characterized as an all-out program.

Let us consider for a moment what this "all-out" program may mean. I think we should be realistic about these things. Indeed, I think we should be intelligently selfish. That is to say, we must prepare ourselves now to meet a very trying future. We must prepare ourselves now for tremendous sacrifices. We must recognize that we are entering upon a program which may mean complete bankruptcy and possibly the destruction of our own democracy. It is an "all-out" program. At the very least, we are setting in motion economic forces certain to cause a complete dislocation of our economy and certain to confront us with a difficult period of readjustment. But no one seems to give much thought to where we are going. we simply say, it is an "all-out" policy.

I do not want to be understood as addressing myself here in opposition to the "all-out" program. That is now the committed policy of our Government. I merely desire to contribute whatever I can for some appreciation of what this may mean to all of us.

Last week I sat in the Congress during the debate upon 2 bills, 1 in connection with the storage of some 6,000,000 bales of cotton taken into ownership by the Government in connection with loans to farmers by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The arguments concerned a possible saving of $1,825,000 by a reduction of storage rates. The debate lasted 3 days, and at all times a large percentage of the Members were in attendance.

The second bill was the fifth supplemental defense bill, representing appropriations totaling $4,073,810,074. The arguments on this bill were concluded in one afternoon of not more than 4 hours.

The figures mentioned in connection with our national defense are just too fantastic to be digested by the human mind. Congress and the man on the street can appreciate a million dollars, but when it comes to a billion it is just an expression without meaning.

I do not wish to clutter your minds with figures, but I feel it a duty to try to translate into some understandable form the sums that are being expended in order that the United States may become the arsenal of the world.

The total sums appropriated and in the process of being expended for national defense since January 1, 1940 (15 months), amount to $31,554,000,000. To this must be added the seven billion appropriated under the lease-lend bill, making a sum of thirty-eight billion five hundred and fifty-four million. And to this sum must also be added $8,000,000,000 for the ordinary nonmilitary expenses of running the Government during the period in question, making a total of $46,554,000,000.

Such an astronomical sum means nothing to me, but I shall by comparison try to translate it into items of our national wealth, with which we all have some familiarity. The figures I now present were compiled by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress and represent the classification of national wealth in 1937.

I refer again to the figure of forty-six billion dollars of defense and ordinary Government expenses for the past 15 months. That you may appreciate what this means, let me point out that all of the agricultural property, including farm dwellings, were valued in 1937 at about the same amount, namely, forty six and eight-tenth billion dollars. Take another comparison—all of the household goods, including private automobiles. These were valued at $45,000,000,000. All of the railroads in the United States were valued at only $27,000,000,000. All of the public utilities were valued at twenty-six and one-half billion dollars. And the total wealth of the entire country was $323,000,000,000. Thus the forty-six and one-half billion dollars which we have appropriated in only 15 months is 14.7 percent of our people's national wealth. And the end is not yet.

Let us look at it another way. It is estimated that the national income of the United States in the next year, due to defense activities, may increase to $90,000,000,000. This sum of forty-six and one-half billion now appropriated is equal to 50 cents out of every dollar earned by our fellow citizens and the country at large. And I again remind you that the end of such expenditures is not in sight. What does 50 cents out of every dollar mean to the average man? Each one of you take his own case and think it over.

At no time has the administration given us the slightest indication of how far we might go without completely bankrupting our Nation and impoverishing our people. At no time has any of our Government heads suggested a sound comprehensive fiscal policy and tax system to support this "all out" program. It is to this that I urge serious thought. A strong defense necessarily depends not alone upon men, tanks, guns, and ships. It also depends upon our having a fiscal policy that will enable us to finance the defense machinery.

There are only three ways by which our Government can handle this increasing burden on our economy: (1) By inflation; (2) by a capital levy, and (3) by taxation. Of course, there is a possible combination of all three.

It is hardly necessary to discuss the matter of inflation. All of us are familiar with what took place in the countries of Europe following the exhaustion of the World War. It is recorded many times in history that inflation impoverishes a people. Prices rise so rapidly that men are unable to buy the mere essentials of bread and butter for their families. Wages in terms of dollars may be greater but in terms of prices are less.

The beneficiaries of insurance policies suffer. While their policies are paid in dollars, the dollars received on the policies may have but a fraction of the purchasing power of the dollars paid as premiums. Endowed institutions, such as hospitals and colleges, would also suffer because of a decline in the purchasing power of their income. Inflation is like a drunkard who, having started on the course of dissipation, is hard to control and cannot control himself.

The second possibility is what I referred to as a capital levy. This has already taken concrete form in a bill, H. R. 3105, introduced by Congressman B. FRANK WHELCHEL, of Georgia. In his bill, pending with the Ways and Means Committee, he proposes a graduated tax from 5 to 75 percent on net wealth. It is not a tax on net income that he proposes; nor is it a tax on gross income. It is an expropriation of capital.

Wealth is generally the source of income, but there are many forms of wealth that are unproductive. Take a piece of machinery producing shoes; both the machine and the shoes are wealth. But the one is productive and the other unproductive.

The bill I refer to is obviously intended to compel every citizen to participate in the "all-out" program by what amounts to a direct gift to the Government. A census of individual gross wealth will be taken. Then the President will establish what offsets are to be allowed to arrive at a figure of net wealth, and the citizen will either pay to the Government a certain percentage in cash, depending upon the particular tax bracket in which he falls, or will give a mortgage bearing 6-percent interest to the Treasury Department. These mortgages are to serve as a basis for a currency issue, which, together with the cash received, will help defray the cost of the "all-out" policy.

This type of legislation is nonsense, but to be taken seriously. There have been many examples of capital levies in the financial history of the world.

The third way by which our Government can meet these extraordinary expenditures is by greatly increased taxes. This we cannot avoid. No one seems to be much worried about it at the present time but when we do begin to meet the costs we will then appreciate how far we have gone and what sacrifices must be made.

There are a number of proposals presently being considered in Congress. For instance, it has been suggested that the income tax be changed from one on net income to one on gross income. That would eliminate all exemptions and all deductions. Having recently filed your income-tax returns you can readily appreciate what that would mean to you personally and to your business. It would also mean that every man who earns a dollar would be obliged to pay a tax on it, in addition to the hidden taxes he now pays on items he purchases.

It is also being seriously proposed that a flat tax of 5 percent be placed on all pay rolls under a "check-off system." This levy would be handled in somewhat the same manner as the social-security taxes are handled and would naturally be in addition to that levy. A man who received $20 a week would have another dollar deducted each week by his employer for payment to the Federal Government.

As you may know, there are immediate prospects of a sharp increase in the corporate excess-profits tax to apply to all business whether or not that business is actually engaged in defense production. And there are immediate prospects of a sharp increase, as high as 50 percent, in the excise taxes on such commodities as tobacco and liquor and possibly all down the line.

Every citizen and the head of every business should bear in mind that even if we are fortunate enough to escape what is popularly known as a shooting war, there is not one of us—from the lowliest workman to the highest-paid executive, nor one mother of a family—who will not bear their share of the fantastic financial burden that will be ours.

I have this advice to offer. When you hear or read of any proposal to spend Federal funds for other than absolute routine services of the Government or for our national defense, protest. Protest not once but con-

tinually. Write your Congressman. Write your Senator, and if you are sufficiently interested—and I hope you will be—write the President.

There are and there will be many pet projects of politicians which, having been heretofore rejected, have now donned the uniform of a defense measure and paraded as being a vital necessity. Because of our intense loyalty to the cause of defense, such projects may become an additional load on the necks of the taxpayers unless we scrutinize their real purpose and true worth.

The St. Lawrence-Great Lakes ship and power project is a perfect example of this. It will cost about $1,000,000,000, and cannot possibly be completed before 1947. Yet this project is now being pushed on the basis that new shipyards can be developed on the Great Lakes for the construction of ships to supplement the hard-pressed English mercantile fleet.

Defense projects should be classified as to their importance and none should be brought to the Congress for appropriation of the people's money that do not serve an immediate and vital purpose. Only in this way can we, in our sincere desire to help other democracies, forfend the dangers of destroying our own.

If we of the minority in Congress accomplish nothing more, we will have served our country well if we continue our fight for an orthodox financial policy and make the people of America aware that there are grave dangers ahead. This is an "all-out" program. By all means be realistic about it. Calculate the costs. Remember that it is your wealth and your standard of living that are being jeopardized. Be practical. Demand that the administration and the Congress be practical. In this way only can we do our duty to ourselves and to civilization.

Distribution of Defense Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LE ROY D. DOWNS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1941

ARTICLE FROM DANBURY (CONN.) NEWS-TIMES

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following article which appeared in the Danbury News-Times, Danbury, Conn.:

[From the Danbury (Conn.) News-Times]

DISTRIBUTION OF DEFENSE INDUSTRY

Representative LE ROY D. DOWNS has a grasp of the defense situation. He has presented Danbury and Norwalk as sites especially suited to defense industries.

Mr. DOWNS says that additional defense plants ought to be distributed to cities which are not heavily engaged in defense production. Danbury falls into this category and is a city rather difficult to get at from the air. The principle of wide distribution of defense industry has been worked out in Great Britain under pressure of experience and necessity.

The R. E. A. Program

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the Rural Electrification Administration is holding its sixth annual staff conference in Washington this week. The 200 field men and women of the R. E. A. are meeting with the Washington staff for another of those yearly interchanges of information and ideas that have done much to make possible the phenomenal progress of the R. E. A. program of making central-station electric service available to unserved areas of rural America.

The R. E. A. was set up in the spring of 1935. At that time, only about a tenth of the farms in this rich and great country had electric service. The electric-power industry had been in existence since 1882, and during all those years—more than half a century—the best that it had done was to get service to a tenth of American farms. During the 6 years since the start of the R. E. A. program, electricity has gone into the American countryside so rapidly that today, instead of a tenth of our farms having electricity, a third of them have it. And more than half of the farms connected during the last 6 years are served by R. E. A. lines. In other words, the R. E. A. alone has made one and a half times the progress toward electrifying rural America in 6 years the private utilities had made in more than 50 years.

Nor is that all; most of the new rural lines that the private utilities have built since the spring of 1935 would not have been built if it had not been for the stimulus provided by the R. E. A. program and for the demonstration by the R. E. A. that it is possible to build safe, sturdy rural electric lines at costs well under half of those prevailing in the pre-R. E. A. days.

The R. E. A. program was conceived primarily as a means of helping the American farmer to attain parity with his urban cousin—parity in the comfort and convenience of his home, parity in the educational opoprtunities open to his children and in the social and recreational opportunities open to his whole family, parity in economic well-being. During the 6 short years of its life, the R. E. A. has made substantial progress along these lines. Its experience thus far has shown that even in the humblest farmhouse electricity is a necessity and not a luxury. Of course, the field of electrified farming has barely been scratched; but even so, it is already possible for a surprisingly large proportion of farmers, even in the lower brackets of farm income, to make electricity pay its way and invariably yield a profit. This condition will become increasingly general as further progress is made in bringing about lower prices for factory-built electrical equipment and, perhaps even more important, in preparing simple plans from which farmers can build simple electrical devices at home.

The application of electricity to farm operations is a fascinating subject. There is scarcely a type of farming practiced in the United States today to which electricity cannot be applied to advantage. And new uses are constantly being developed by specialists of the R. E. A., the T. V. A., the research bureaus of the Department of Agriculture, and the various land-grant colleges.

But it is not merely the farm family that benefits when a new R. E. A. cooperative electric-power system goes into operation. The whole agricultural community is revitalized and strengthened, both socially and economically. Electricity makes it possible to provide rural schools with running water and modern plumbing, as well as with efficient, up-to-date laboratories for classes in shopwork, vocational agriculture, and home economics. It makes rural schools, churches, and halls more effective community centers. It makes possible the modernization of rural stores, blacksmith shops, garages, and filling stations.

One of the most important contributions that the more than 700 R. E. A. cooperatives are making to the well-being, not only of their own communities but of the Nation itself, is found in the extent to which they are facilitating widespread decentralization of industry. By running electric power lines into the open country the cooperatives are freeing many types of industry of the need for locating in urban centers. The result has been a distinct trend toward returning the processing of many commodities back toward the communities that produce them.

The R. E. A. cooperatives are providing power to several thousand small industrial plants scattered all over the country. And the number is increasing constantly. During the present emergency, many of these plants are producing materials vital to national defense—ramrods, precision tools, engine parts, and many others. Oil-well pumps and coal-mine machinery are being operated by R. E. A. power. In Arkansas, a group of cinnabar mines, from the ore of which mercury is produced, have been reopened, thanks to the availability of R. E. A. power, and are contributing to relief of the mercury shortage which was threatening to hamper our national-defense effort.

As the R. E. A. program continues to expand, it will contribute still further to decentralization of industries vital to defense in the present emergency and adapted to strengthening the economic foundations of the rural community when normal times return. And, as I said, this program is expanding, and expanding rapidly. Let me quote a few

figures to show the progress that has been made since July 1, 1939, the day that the R. E. A. became an Administration within the United States Department of Agriculture.

On July 1, 1939, allotments made by the R. E. A. totaled $227,800,064; by March 1, 1941, they totaled $362,011,621. The increase was $134,211,557. Funds advanced totaled $122,337,824 on July 1, 1939; on March 31, 1941, they totaled $266,337,824, an increase of $144,029,807. R. E. A. systems were operating 115,000 miles of line on July 1, 1939; on March 1, 1941, they were operating 281,231 miles, an increase of 166,231 miles. The number of consumers connected to R. E. A. lines on July 1, 1939, was 268,242; on March 1, 1941, it was 709,578, an increase of 541,336 consumers.

These figures indicate that approximately 40 percent of the allotments made by the R. E. A. to date have been made since July 1, 1939. Approximately 54 percent of all the funds advanced to R. E. A. borrowers have been advanced during the same period. Approximately 60 percent of the total number of miles of lines energized by the R. E. A. to date have gone into service since July 1, 1939. Approximately 76 percent of all the consumers now connected to R. E. A. lines began taking service since the R. E. A. entered the Department of Agriculture.

These figures, of course, are no reflection upon the able and devoted men who guided the R. E. A. while it was an independent agency. They recruited a staff of alert and enthusiastic men and women. If they had not done so, difficult, indeed, would have been the task of Robert B. Craig, who guided the R. E. A. through the trying summer of 1939, when new relationships with the Department of Agriculture were being developed and uncertainties vexed the organization; and even more difficult would have been the task of Harry Slattery, the present Administrator. As it was, when Mr. Slattery took over the direction of the R. E. A. in the autumn of 1939 he found an organization that knew whither it was heading, and that was intent on moving straight toward its goal in spite of obstacles and opposition. As a result, freed of the need for building an organization, Mr. Slattery, veteran of every power and conservation fight since the days of Theodore Roosevelt, was able to devote his attention to speeding up the program and to planning new advances from the positions already consolidated.

It is well for the American farmer—yes; it is well for all Americans—that guidance of the R. E. A. program is in the hands of an able, devoted, and incorruptible Administrator backed up by an alert and understanding Secretary of Agriculture. For the task ahead of the R. E. A. is greater than that behind it. A third of American farms are now served; a pleasing contrast with the mere tenth that were served only 6 years ago. But the unserved two-thirds present a challenge to the R. E. A. and to all friends of its program. To make the benefits of electricity available to them will tax the ingenuity of the engineers who have been constantly reducing the over-all cost of building lines; it will tax the ingenuity of operating technicians who have done wonders in reducing maintenance and operating costs; it will tax the ingenuity of agricultural engineers to devise new ways in which even the lowest-income farmers can make electricity pay its way, so that service will not be an additional drain on their meager resources.

In the years that lie ahead I am confident that the development of small rural industries to which I have referred will be important to the development of the R. E. A. program and, even more important, to the rebuilding on a sound economic basis of the depressed areas of rural America. Such industries are important to national defense; they will be, if anything, more important to the economic reconstruction of rural America after the emergency has passed. They can provide farmers with markets close to home. They can provide full-time employment for hundreds and thousands of farm boys and girls whom the land itself cannot adequately support. They can provide part-time employment during slack seasons for many, many more farm people, thus contributing to increased farm income and hence to conservation of our two most valuable natural resources—the soil from which springs the supply of food and fiber, without which we could not subsist, and the rural manhood and womanhood on which, to an increasing extent as the vital statistics show, depends the future growth and strength of all America, urban as well as rural.

Through the R. E. A. program, we have embarked upon a great adventure in democracy. It is an adventure in which we are using our natural resources of falling water, coal, and oil to develop electric energy not for profit but for service. It is an adventure from which there can be no turning back. We must electrify every farm home in America.

It is an adventure that demands, and that in increasing measure will demand, the earnest and intelligent efforts of every true patriot. It is an adventure the end of which is not yet in sight; an adventure that will not end even with the stringing of an electric line to the last farmhouse in America, because rural electrification is a means, not an end. The lower we can bring the cost of electricity, and the more practical uses we can find for it in the home, on the farm, and in the rural community, the greater will be the return that America receives from its investment in the R. E. A. program—a return measured partly in dollars and cents, but measured also in the improved health, alertness, and well-being of the rural men and women who are, and always have been, the backbone of America.

One-Hundredth Anniversary of the Establishment of the Oregon Trail

REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1941

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a joint resolution authorizing and directing the Postmaster General to issue a stamp to commemorate a notable celebration which will take place in 1943 in the Pacific Northwest. This event has real national significance. It is the one-hundredth anniversary of an event momentous in the Northwest and to the Nation. It marks the one-hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the provisional civil government in the far West, the opening of the old Oregon Trail, and the great immigration of a thousand men, women, and children into the Northwest. Starting in the spring of 1843 from the banks of the Missouri, going on up the Platte and over the Continental Divide across the Green River, up the valley of the Snake to the banks of the Columbia, it took 6 months for the trip which was one of the greatest migrations in all history—2,000 miles without roads, over mountains, fording rushing rivers—what hardships they encountered.

That was a wonderful group of people. It was my pleasure when I went into Oregon almost 60 years ago to meet many of the men and women who were a part of that migration of such significance to the whole country and in building the era of the Pacific.

I include, as a part of my remarks, the following editorial of February 2, 1941, from the Oregonian:

1943 CENTENNIAL

Those who have taken part in the initiation of plans to make 1943 a year of centennial celebration for Oregon, are being delighted and reassured by the manner in which the idea catches on and spreads. It should catch on and spread, without limit. The facts are clear enough that 1943 will be the year of all years for Oregon from the historical standpoint. It was in 1843 that the first wagon train reached the Columbia, rumbling down the Blue mountains under the Applegates, Martin, McCarver, and Nesmith; it was earlier that same year that the settlers divided on the line which old Joe Meek drew in the dust of Champoeg, and so brought into being the provisional government; it was later that same year that Lieutenant Fremont led his exploring party through the Deschutes and Klamath country to California.

It would be impossible to find another year in which so much of moment happened. And these happenings were well spaced over the present State—along the route of the trail, in the Willamette Valley and through

central Oregon. It is a matter of obvious logic that Oregon should celebrate, and that its celebrations should be well scattered rather than concentrated in anything resembling a central exposition.

Yet some times even the obvious does not win quick support. This time it has. Leading citizens throughout the State have signed the incorporation papers eagerly; and Governor Sprague, who long has had the possibilities of 1943 in mind, announces that he will address a special communication to the legislature approving State support. It is a program that deserves State-wide enthusiasm. We can make ourselves a greater future by such a united celebration of our past. And we seem to be getting under way.

The St. Lawrence Waterway—The Proponent's Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1941

STATEMENT PREPARED BY JOSEPH WINTERBOTHAM, OF BURLINGTON, VT.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Honorable Joseph Winterbotham, of Burlington, Vt., I am inserting a statement which he has prepared, covering and favoring the St. Lawrence waterway project.

As the radio announcers say: "The opinions expressed are his own, and not necessarily those of his sponsor."

Mr. Winterbotham's statement follows:

There is an agreement, signed between the United States and Canada on March 19, 1941, providing for a cooperative development and utilization of the water of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River basin for navigation and power. An exchange of notes preceding the agreement revealed that the construction of this project is regarded as directly associated with both the power supply and shipbuilding phases of our national-defense program, including the plan for defense of the Western Hemisphere and the determination to supply all possible aid to Great Britain, the members of the British Commonwealth, and their allies.

This agreement is of vital importance to New England farmers and industry.

During the past several years I have given almost my entire time to a close study of the conditions prevailing throughout New England with the hope that in my limited way I could get behind and support anything that would advance its interests.

NEW ENGLAND INDUSTRY

In my studies and visits throughout New England, I find that industrial New England, long recognized as the beehive of industry in the United States, is in a complete state of demoralization and decay. During the last year I have traveled over every State and almost every county of every New England State, and what do I find? An increasing number of factories of every character closed down, absolutely idle. In a great many instances machinery has been dismantled. In some instances it has been sold as scrap and in others, doors are closed, windows boarded up, with machinery going to rack and ruin.

No New Englander can travel the New England States as I have and not come away thoroughly heartsick at the industrial picture there presented. The industrial loss of New England since 1919 has been terrific. The following table taken from the United States Census reports of industry and manufacture show the fearful loss that New England has suffered in its greatest asset:

Decline of New England's manufacturing, 1919–39

Year	Number of wage earners	Wages paid	Value added by manufacture
1919	1,351,000	$1,436,000,000	$3,231,000,000
1929	1,098,000	1,346,000,000	3,235,000,000
1933	798,000	685,000,000	1,603,000,000
1939	953,000	1,024,000,000	2,430,000,000
Loss, 1919 to 1939:			
Amount	$398,000	412,000,000	801,000,000
Percent	29	29	25

In the 20 years since the war, 400,000 jobs have been lost; $400,000,000 in wages; $800,000,000 in values not created in our factories. At the same time, New England's people have increased by a million, from 7,401,000 in 1920 to 8,437,000 in 1940.

Every State in the region has shared in this loss of industry. In the two decades wage earners in Maine's factories declined 1 in 7; in Connecticut, 1 in 5; in Rhode Island, 1 in 4; and in New Hampshire, Vermont, and Massachusetts by the even larger proportion of 1 in 3.

These declines in New England far exceed those for the Nation as a whole. While wages and wage earners in our New England factories fell by 29 percent, the drop in the entire country was only about 13 percent, or less than half. Where values created in our factories declined about 25 percent, in the United States they remained substantially undiminished. And for the first time in history, in the year 1939, the States of the South Atlantic region surpassed New England in the number of wage earners.

Symbolic of New England's industrial plight was the recent failure of the world-renowned Amoskeag Co. I have visited Manchester, N. H., and I have seen row upon row of enormous brick buildings lying idle. The sight of this catastrophe was appalling.

What are the reasons for this industrial decadence? Is it that our citizens no longer are industrious? Has the New England trader, famed for his trading ability since the beginning of this country, lost his cunning, or has New England individually and collectively developed a lackadaisical ennui with reference to industrial activity? I believe that none of these conclusions are the proper solution of their problem. During the last year, in addition to my own study, I have employed the best talent available to try and find out what is wrong with New England industrially. Reports from these men, all expert in their respective fields, say New England industry is suffering from the following causes:

1. New England is geographically located too far from the center of the United States population (consuming area).

2. New England industry must bring in its raw products and ship out its finished products. Long distances and high transportation costs must be absorbed against competitors more favorably located.

3. New England freight rates have advanced from 50 to 100 percent since 1917, all of which has increased absorptions and made successful competition impossible.

A fourth factor, discussed below, might be added at this point—the urgent necessity of New England for lower rates on electricity.

All of the men who have participated with me in my study agree that the depression has been a factor in New England's loss of manufacture, but likewise all of these men agree that New England is really suffering from the three reasons outlined, and that New England's industrial supremacy is doomed unless something can be done to relieve the obstacles referred to hereinbefore.

Our study indicates that there is only one cure available that will insure a continuation of our industrial prominence. A way must be found whereby New England industry may secure its raw products for manufacture more cheaply and a way must be found under which New England industry may serve a wider consuming territory at a cheaper transportation cost with its finished products.

The cheapest mode of transportation yet developed is deep-draft water transportation. There are two water projects now under consideration by the United States Government. Both of these, if completed, will have a very material effect upon the rehabilitation, preservation, and continued growth of industrial New England. I have reference to the St. Lawrence waterway development and to the development of the so-called Hudson-Champlain cut-off. Development of these projects will not only reduce transportation costs for New England industry, but they will widen the territory which New England industry may serve with its finished products. From my study the development of these two projects furnish the only logical solution for the dilemma now facing New England industry.

OPPOSITION TO THE PROJECTS

The opposition to these projects comes largely from two sources, viz:

1. Private power interests.
2. The railroads.

PRIVATE POWER INTERESTS

Coupled with the improvement of navigation for oceangoing bottoms, the St. Lawrence project includes one of the largest power developments in the world. This is of vital interest to every New England State, for every child in our schools has been taught that cheap power once lay at the foundation of our region's industrial supremacy. But today, in the intense sectional competition for new industry—with cheap electricity the keynote—what do our New England States have to offer? The highest residential, commercial, and industrial rate structure in the entire Nation.

St. Lawrence electricity will be the cheapest in the world to generate. New England will receive this electricity—every one of her States is within transmission distance. Drawing stimulus from the example of the St. Lawrence project, it is today within the opportunity of all New England once again to enjoy among the lowest rates in the Nation.

It is a well-known fact, however, that the private power interests of the United States have combined to fight the St. Lawrence project, and more particularly to fight the ratification of the St. Lawrence agreement before the United States Congress. These private power interests not only object to public

production of electricity for public consumption but they stand in the way of lower power rates so vitally necessary for New England's prosperity.

If New England's statesmen should oppose the St. Lawrence agreement because of the electricity created, it is clear that in so doing they would be taking a position in direct conflict with the welfare of the people whom they serve. Such opposition would place New England in alliance with an entrenched combination of power companies which have fought the public interest in the St. Lawrence for nearly a quarter of a century, and which today are once again marshaling their forces to defeat the public interest in the project.

THE RAILROADS

The railroads of the United States object to the development of these two water projects, namely, the St. Lawrence and the Hudson Champlain Cut-Off. Originally the record showed that the western railroads favored the development of the St. Lawrence. However, the records further show at a meeting of the Association of Railway Executives held November 20, 1930, in New York City the railroads as a unit declared their policy to be in opposition to the development of any water development. Since that time the railroads have consistently opposed the development of any waterway project, regardless of its merit and regardless of the beneficial effect it might have upon the communities which it is intended to serve. With this unified declaration of policy, no individual railroad is permitted to speak its own mind; consequently the railroad opposition may not be classified as individual—it may not be classified as the result of individual study of the effect upon the communities served, but it must be classified as the result of its master's voice, Wall Street.

CONCLUSION

It is evident that as the population of this country moves farther west New England industry will be put to greater disadvantage with respect to transportation. Further waterways are needed by New England to insure reasonable transportation costs, not only for bringing in raw products for manufacture but for the distribution of the finished products to a wider consuming area. No one can familiarize himself with New England's industrial debacle and not be fully convinced that New England's interest, first, last, and all the time, is to throw its shoulder to the wheel in favor of any project or projects that will tend in any way whatsoever to bring back New England's industrial supremacy. No New Englander can afford to take up and support the selfish monopolistic desires of the private power interests of the United States any more than can he afford to take up the petty fights of the railroads of the United States at the expense of his own community. After all, self-preservation is the first law of nature, and it is the patriotic duty of every inhabitant of industrial New England, whether he be United States Senator or ordinary layman, to lend every effort within his power to rehabilitate New England industrially.

It is a notable fact that the farmers of New England through their national organizations—the National Grange and the American Farm Bureau Federation—have endorsed these waterway projects and are pressing for their development. It seems unusual that the balance of New England, that portion of New England which is most vitally interested in the continuance in full vigor of its industries, seems to be the only portion of New England that is asleep to the importance of the development of these projects.

Speaking as a New Englander, I am convinced after the most intensive study, that it is the duty of every New England Senator and Representative not only to support the development of these two waterway projects by his vote, but it is his patriotic duty to his section to use his influence in the United States to insure ratification of the St. Lawrence agreement, for it is only in this way do I see any possible chance for New England industry to maintain its place in the sun in competition with the balance of industrial United States.

JOSEPH WINTHROTHAM.

Federal Reclamation—Need for Thorough Survey and Development Program in Southwest Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. MARTIN F. SMITH, OF WASHINGTON, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me April 16, 1941, before the Committee on Appropriations:

STATEMENT BY HON. MARTIN F. SMITH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

As there are no Federal reclamation developments in my district, I feel that my viewpoint represents the sentiments of the widespread areas directly benefited by Federal irrigation projects, and which look to this program for relief at the source of many of our own problems.

First, let me call your attention to the population pressure that has been built up in the Pacific Northwest in the last 10 years as a result of migrations from the Great Plains and other States. Experts of the Department of Agriculture agencies on the basis of surveys estimate that 460,000 persons came into this region from other States from 1930 to 1939. Most of these sought farm land on which they could become self-supporting. Without sufficient irrigated land and only a limited area of cut-over land on which they could settle, far too many of these newcomers were forced to join the ranks of the migratory farm laborers seeking to eke out an existence by uncertain means.

Second, the result of this situation has been an increase in the Federal relief expenditures in this territory. The Work Projects Administration alone in the 7 years from 1933 to 1940 expended a total of $439,000,000—an amount more than the total cost of the power and irrigation features of the Grand Coulee project.

While industrial employment incident to the national defense has provided some relief, temporarily at least, in the cities of the Pacific Coast, the rural areas continue to be confronted by the problem of absorbing migrant families seeking means of livelihood. When the construction work on the Army camps is completed, there will again be a demand for settlement opportunities in the farming areas and the need will be even greater when there is a recession from activities in the coastal cities.

Had the Grand Coulee or Columbia Basin irrigation project been ready to receive farm families who have come into the Pacific Northwest in the last 10 years, thousands who are now and who will be forced to continue on relief would have been in a position to become self-supporting. I am not suggesting that all of the migrant farm families could or should have been settled in that area, but I believe the country as a whole, this section, and the individuals themselves would have been far better off had the opportunities been afforded.

March 22 marked the generation of the first power at Grand Coulee Dam. Because of the linking of Grand Coulee power with the Bonneville Project in my district, I have a direct interest in its future. I hope that within the next few years we will be able to celebrate the passage of irrigation water through the first canals of the Grand Coulee Project so we will begin putting to full use the facilities included in this great project.

I am sure I need not point out to this committee that a modern reclamation project cannot be built overnight. Neither can construction be started until the Bureau of Reclamation has made a thorough investigation. For that reason, I believe the Bureau should have a good deal more than half a million dollars annually for surveys and investigations.

Incidentally, many well-posted men in the Pacific Northwest and particularly in my district in southwest Washington, believe that the rich soil in our cut-over timber lands can be utilized for settlement of newcomers at relatively low cost. The work of the Bureau of Reclamation should be enlarged to cover this phase of reclamation, certainly to the extent of being provided with funds to investigate thoroughly the feasibility of developing cut-over lands into productive farms, and certainly to irrigate the farm lands in southwest Washington which are already in production.

For the reasons that I have cited, the Federal reclamation program not only must be continued, but it must be financed with sufficient funds to speed the completion of existing projects that are now badly needed. By providing farms for the settlement of families where they can support themselves, there will be a permanent reduction in Federal relief expenditures; substantial steps will be taken toward stabilizing areas now disturbed by conditions beyond their control; and the country as a whole will be benefited.

I am very hopeful that as a result of the recent visit to my district of Investigating Engineer C. C. Fisher, of the Denver regional office of the Bureau of Reclamation, steps will soon be taken to carry forward a real and valuable reclamation program in my southwest Washington district and other sections of the State of Washington.

Fourth Monthly Report of Government Finances, 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1941

REPORT OF TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under authority of the House given on February 3,

last, I am presenting the fourth monthly report on Government finances. The first of these reports, for the month of December 1940, was printed in the RECORD of February 3, 1941, pages 480 and following; the second report, for the month of January 1941, was printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, pages A536 and following; and the third report, for the month of February 1941, was printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, pages A1063 and following. The report herewith presented brings these statements down to the end of March 1941. Members will find in the reports tabular matter prepared by the Treasury Department in summary form data relative to receipts, expenditures, the public debt, and so forth, for the fiscal year 1940, complete; the fiscal year 1941, now in progress; and the fiscal year 1942, the ensuing fiscal year:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 8, 1941.

Hon. EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
Chairman, House Committee on Appropriations,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: By direction of the Secretary and in accordance with the arrangements made with you as outlined in his letter of January 31, I am enclosing herewith the following statements:

Statement No. I, General Budget Summary—Receipts and Expenditures, comparing (1) Budget estimates for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942 and actual figures for the fiscal year 1940 and (2) actual figures for the first 9 months of each of the fiscal years 1940 and 1941.

Statement No. II, Effect of Financing the Deficit on the Public Debt, showing (1) Budget estimates for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942, and actual figures for the fiscal year 1940; and (2) actual figures as of March 31, 1940, and March 31, 1941, respectively. This statement shows the extent to which the net deficit has been met through borrowings and reductions in the Treasury's cash balance. It also shows the debt at the beginning and the close of the period.

Statement No. III, Statutory Debt Limitation, showing the amount of the debt outstanding which is subject to the debt limitation and the balance of the borrowing authority, i. e., the amount of additional debt which may be issued pursuant to existing limitations.

Statement No. IV, General Fund Balance, showing an analysis of the general-fund balance and the changes therein during the period. This statement sets forth the balances at the beginning and the close of the period classified as to working balance, increment on gold, and seigniorage. It shows how the general-fund balance was affected by (1) borrowings, (2) excess of receipts or expenditures in trust accounts, etc., and (3) the net deficit as set forth in Statement No. I.

Statement No. V, Obligations of Corporations and Credit Agencies Guaranteed as to Principal and Interest as of March 31, 1941. This statement shows the contingent liabilities of the Government, i. e., the outstanding securities issued by corporations and credit agencies which are guaranteed by the United States as to principal and interest.

Statement No. VI, Combined Statement of Assets and Liabilities of Governmental Corporations and Credit Agencies, as of February 28, 1941, based upon the latest official reports received by the Treasury. This statement shows the total assets of such corporations and agencies, the liabilities (including reserves), and their net worth. The liabilities are segregated according to obligations guaranteed by the United States and obligations not so guaranteed. The net worth is also classified as to the amounts of the Government's proprietary interest and of the proprietary interests not owned by the Government. It is also analyzed to show the portion thereof representing interagency interests.

Very truly yours,

D. W. BELL,
Under Secretary of the Treasury.

I. *General Budget summary—Receipts and expenditures*

[On basis of daily Treasury statements, i. e., checks paid by Treasurer of the United States. In millions of dollars]

Classification	Full fiscal years			July 1 to Mar. 31	
	Budget estimates [1]		Actual, 1940	Actual, fiscal year 1941	Actual, fiscal year 1940
	1942	1941			
Receipts:					
Income tax	4,509.5	3,055.0	2,125.3	[2] 2,415.3	1,573.7
Miscellaneous internal revenue	3,029.3	2,871.0	2,344.6	2,203.6	1,789.6
Taxes under Social Security Act	816.4	755.9	712.2	585.4	538.1
Taxes upon carriers and their employees	144.9	135.3	121.0	101.5	88.5
Customs	295.0	302.0	348.6	263.4	267.8
Return of surplus funds from Government corporations		360.5	53.6	135.2	9.8
Other	176.6	173.5	219.5	143.4	169.3
Total receipts	8,971.7	7,653.2	5,924.8	5,847.8	4,436.8
Less net amounts transferred to Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund	696.3	640.3	537.7	475.7	402.8
Net receipts	8,275.4	7,012.9	5,387.1	5,372.1	4,034.0
Expenditures:					
Departmental	841.5	879.5	800.9	612.2	604.8
Agricultural program	1,078.6	1,149.9	1,430.5	955.5	1,144.2
National defense:					
Navy	3,402.4	2,086.3	891.5	1,412.9	618.8
War	5,915.1	3,766.1	667.1	2,156.8	474.0
National defense funds for the President	229.6	185.8		61.2	
Selective Service	32.0	21.3		10.7	
Other agencies	232.2	304.4	[3]	[3]	[3]
Supplemental items [4]	1,000.0	100.0			
Total	10,811.3	6,463.9	1,558.6	3,641.6	1,092.8
Interest on the public debt	1,225.0	1,100.0	1,040.9	686.4	657.3
Federal Loan Agency	8.5	9.3	14.2	6.4	10.3
Federal Security Agency	873.1	846.0	799.3	715.3	605.6
Federal Works Agency	1,239.0	1,688.5	2,007.3	1,275.0	1,528.8
Tennessee Valley Authority	40.0	40.0	39.1	34.0	29.6
Veterans' Administration	568.6	565.1	556.7	414.6	416.7
Transfers to Trust Accounts	274.6	216.2	107.9	216.2	184.4
Return of surplus funds from Government corporations		[5] 339.5		[5] 203.0	
All other	517.3	583.4	533.8	372.4	406.4
Total expenditures [6]	17,485.5	13,202.3	8,998.2	8,726.0	6,681.9
Net deficit (excess expenditures over receipts) [6]	9,210.1	6,189.4	3,611.1	3,353.9	2,647.9

[1] 1942 Budget.

[2] In comparing actual receipts and expenditures for parts of a fiscal year with estimates for the full fiscal year, consideration must be given to the fact that moneys are not received and expended evenly throughout the year. For example, the larger amounts of income-tax payments are received in March and June quarters of each fiscal year. While certain expenditures occur evenly from month to month, some are seasonal and others vary according to circumstances.

[3] Actual expenditures under this item are included under "Departmental" and other appropriate classifications.

[4] Expenditures from supplemental items will be distributed during the fiscal years 1941 and 1942 to the classifications applicable.

[5] Credits, deduct.

[6] Exclusive of debt retirements pursuant to sinking fund and other appropriations.

II. *Effect of financing the deficit on the public debt*

[On basis of daily Treasury statements. In millions of dollars]

Classification	Full fiscal years			July 1 to Mar. 31	
	Budget estimates [1]		Actual, 1940	Actual, fiscal year 1941	Actual, fiscal year 1940
	1942	1941			
Net deficit (statement I)	9,210.1	6,189.4	3,611.1	3,353.9	2,647.9
Changes in cash accounts during period:					
Add: Increase in general fund balance during period	37.8	41.2	[2] 947.5	824.3	[2] 324.6
Total	9,247.9	6,230.6	2,663.6	4,178.2	2,323.3
Deduct: Excess of receipts over expenditures in trust accounts, etc., during period	37.8	41.2	135.6	[2] 27.2	222.9
Total financed by increase in public debt	9,210.1	6,189.4	2,528.0	4,205.4	2,100.5
Add: Public debt at beginning of period	49,156.9	42,967.5	40,439.5	42,967.5	40,439.5
Public debt at end of period	58,367.0	49,156.9	42,967.5	47,172.9	42,540.0

[1] 1942 Budget. [2] Decrease, deduct. [3] Excess of expenditures, add.

III. *Statutory debt limitation*

[Under sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended as of Mar. 31, 1941. In millions of dollars]

Limitation		65,000.0
Deduct:		
Gross public debt outstanding March 31, 1941	47,172.9	
Unearned discount on United States savings bonds (difference between current redemption value and maturity value)	1,019.6	
	48,192.5	
Less: Debt outstanding not subject to statutory limitation	581.6	
Total		47,610.9
Balance of borrowing authority		17,389.1

IV. *General fund balance*

[On basis of daily Treasury statements. In millions of dollars]

Classification	Full fiscal years			July 1 to Mar. 31	
	Budget estimates [1]		Actual, 1940	Actual, fiscal year 1941	Actual, fiscal year 1940
	1942	1941			
Balance in general fund at beginning of period:					
Working balance	1,178.4	1,162.7	2,159.5	1,162.7	2,159.5
Increment on gold	143.3	142.8	142.4	142.8	142.4
Seigniorage (silver)	610.2	585.2	536.3	585.2	536.3
Total	1,931.9	1,890.7	2,838.2	1,890.7	2,838.2
Increases:					
Borrowings—net increase in public debt	9,210.1	6,189.4	2,528.0	4,205.4	2,100.5
Net receipts, trust accounts, etc	37.8	41.2	135.6	[2] 27.2	222.8
Total	11,179.8	8,121.3	5,501.8	6,068.9	5,161.5
Decrease: Net deficit (statement II)	9,210.1	6,189.4	3,611.1	3,353.9	2,647.9
Balance in general fund at end of period	1,969.7	1,931.9	1,890.7	2,715.0	2,513.6
Analysis of general fund balances at end of period:					
Working balance	1,195.8	1,178.4	1,162.7	1,970.3	1,794.0
Increment on gold	143.7	143.3	142.8	143.1	142.7
Seigniorage (silver)	630.2	610.2	585.2	601.6	576.9
Total	1,969.7	1,931.9	1,890.7	2,715.0	2,513.6

[1] 1942 Budget. [2] Decrease deduct.

V. *Obligations of corporations and credit agencies guaranteed as to principal and interest*

[As of Mar. 31, 1941. In millions of dollars]

Corporation or agency	Limit of Authority	Obligations outstanding [1]		
		Total	Matured [2]	Unmatured
Commodity Credit Corporation	1,400.0	696.2		696.2
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	2,000.0	1,269.6	0.2	1,269.4
Federal Housing Administration	[3] 4,100.0	16.1	.1	16.0
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	[4] 4,750.0	2,610.5	10.7	2,599.8
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	5,655.7	1,097.0		1,097.0
Tennessee Valley Authority	61.8			
U. S. Housing Authority	[5] 800.0	226.2		226.2
U. S. Maritime Commission	[6] 200.0			
Total		[7] 5,915.6	11.0	5,904.6

[1] Exclusive of obligations owned by the Treasury.

[2] Funds have been deposited with the Treasurer of the United States for payment of all obligations guaranteed by the United States, representing outstanding matured principal amounting to $11,000,000 and interest of $2,500,000.

[3] Limit of authority to insure mortgages. Debentures may be issued and tendered only in exchange for insured property acquired through foreclosure.

[4] The Corporation was authorized to issue bonds for an amount not to exceed $4,750,000,000 to be exchanged or sold to obtain funds for financing home mortgage loans or for the redemption of any of its outstanding bonds. Its authority to make loans expired on June 13, 1936, and the above limit may only be increased for the purpose of retiring its outstanding bonds by an amount equal to the amount of the bonds to be retired, which would not affect the net amount outstanding after June 13 1936.

[5] Represents gross limit of borrowing authority. The Corporation has issued obligations totaling $376,256,000, leaving a balance of borrowing authority amounting to $423,744,000.

[6] Limit which may be outstanding at any one time with respect to the insuring of mortgages and the issuance of debentures.

[7] The total amount of assets of these corporations and agencies is in excess of the total amount of liabilities, including obligations guaranteed by the United States. See statement VI.

VI. *Combined statement of assets and liabilities of governmental corporations and credit agencies*

[As of Feb. 28, 1941. In millions of dollars]

Corporation or agency	Assets [1]	Liabilities [1]		Excess of assets over liabilities (proprietary interest) [1]	Interagency assets (+) or liabilities (−)	Net worth of organization
		Obligations guaranteed by the United States [2]	All other (including reserves)			
Commodity Credit Corporation	904.9	697.7	110.6	96.6	----------	96.6
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	1,523.4	1,281.7	44.6	197.1	+2.9	200.0
Federal Housing Administration	75.2	12.8	5.5	56.9	----------	56.9
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	2,699.6	2,628.4	48.3	12.9	+100.0	112.9
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,628.5	1,098.7	332.9	196.9	+497.5	694.4
Tennessee Valley Authority	374.9	----------	15.5	359.4	−55.9	303.5
U. S. Housing Authority	368.9	226.5	5.3	137.1	----------	137.1
U. S. Maritime Commission	256.5	----------	105.7	150.8	+10.4	161.2
Federal Land Banks	2,229.0	----------	1,807.5	421.5	+8.4	429.9
All other	3,386.1	----------	931.7	2,454.4	−115.6	2,338.8
Subtotal	13,437.0	[3] 5,945.8	3,407.6	4,083.6	+447.7	4,531.3
Deduct:						
Net worth privately owned:						
Federal land banks	----------	----------	----------	−217.4	----------	−217.4
All other	----------	----------	----------	−200.7	----------	−200.7
Proprietary interest of the United States	----------	----------	----------	3,665.5	+447.7	4,113.2

[1] Exclusive of interagency interests.
[2] Includes principal and accrued interest.
[3] Excludes $275,200,000 held by the Treasury.

NOTE.—The foregoing figures are compiled from latest reports received by the Treasury Department from the respective corporations and agencies. The amounts covering obligations guaranteed by the United States differ from those shown in table V for the reason that they are stated in this table as of February 28, 1941, instead of March 31, 1941, and include accrued interest.

Amendment of the Constitution Relative to Taxes on Incomes, Gifts, and Inheritances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED C. GILCHRIST

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1941

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF IOWA

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa:

House Concurrent Resolution 15

(By Johnson of Linn)

Memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Constitution of the United States, relative to taxes on income, gifts, and inheritances; and providing limitations on taxes so levied; and repealing the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Whereas there is now pending in the current session of the Congress of the United States proposed legislation to repeal the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and to amend the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances; and providing for a limitation of taxes thereon; and

Whereas the people of the State of Iowa are greatly interested in the passage of such legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Iowa (the Senate concurring). That the Congress of the United States be memorialized as follows:

That application be and it is hereby made to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

ARTICLE

SECTION 1. The sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration: *Provided*, That in no case shall the maximum rate of tax exceed 25 percent.

SEC. 3. The maximum rate of any tax, duty, or excise which Congress may lay and collect with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of death or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after or by way of gift, shall in no case exceed 25 percent.

SEC. 4. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the 31st day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on incomes for any period ending on or prior to said 31st day of December laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

SEC. 5. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight on the last day of the sixth month following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States to collect any tax on any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of section 3 laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect: Be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide, as the mode of ratification, that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States: Be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is, directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States and to each Iowa Member thereof.

I hereby certify this to be a true copy of House Concurrent Resolution No. 15 as passed by the forty-ninth general assembly.

A. C. GUSTAFSON,
Chief Clerk.

H. R. 3871

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN BOLLES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1941

LETTERS FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein four letters which I have received from the University of Wisconsin in reference to H. R. 3871, a bill which prevents animal experiments of any kind on living dogs. These letters thoroughly explain the attitude of the medical profession through the investigating schools and biochemical professions in the University of Wisconsin.

The letters follow:

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
Madison, Wis., April 14, 1941.

The Honorable STEPHEN BOLLES,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOLLES: My attention has been called to the fact that you are a member of the District of Columbia Committee, which has or will have occasion to pass upon bill H. R. 3871. As I have been informed that this bill has for its purpose imposing restrictions on the use of dogs for experimental work in medicine I want to ask you to use your good offices in the defeat of this bill. There isn't any question whatsoever that a vast array of facts of the greatest value in practical medicine has been and is being obtained by the use of dogs as well as other animals of widely differing types. It so happens, however, that the dog by virtue of its size, as well as because of other factors, is one of the most valuable animals available for the physiologist and pathologist. I have made use of dogs repeatedly with my work in connection with vitamin D and irradiation of food substances to make them antirachitically active. Recently my colleague, Professor Elvehjem, has similarly used dogs in connection with his epoch-making work on pellagra which once and for all has determined the cause of this widespread malady. Every time that I hear people plead in the interest of the dogs I am impelled to appeal even stronger in the interest of mankind in general. And in this latter capacity the dog can serve to excellent purpose.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY STEENBOCK,
Professor of Biochemistry.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
Madison, Wis., April 11, 1941.

The Honorable STEPHEN BOLLES,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have been informed that there is a bill before Congress, H. R. 3871, which is

designed to prohibit the use of living dogs for experimental purposes. To pass a bill of this kind would seriously hamper nutrition work in medical schools and departments of biochemistry.

Almost all the progress that has been made in the field of experimental medicine and nutrition has centered around the use of laboratory animals, including the dog. For example, the South of our own country, as well as other countries, has suffered for years from a disease known as pellagra, due to the use of a poor diet. When this diet is fed to dogs a disease analogous to pellagra, namely, black tongue, develops. It was through the use of the dog in the development of black tongue that the solution of the problem of pellagra was worked out. That was done in our own laboratory by Dr. Elvehjem, and today there is a definite remedy for this disease which may affect a half million people in the South.

Is it better to learn how to correct human ailments, or is it better to prohibit the use of the dog in furthering the study of disease? This bill should be decisively defeated.

Very respectfully,

E. B. HART,
Chairman, Department of Biochemistry.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
Madison, April 11, 1941.

Congressman STEPHEN BOLLES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOLLES: My attention has been called to the introduction of bill H. R. 3871, which has been referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, of which you are a member. This bill prevents any animal experiments of any kind on living dogs. It is the same bill that has been introduced in our Wisconsin Legislature for many years. The result of this bill would be to prevent a great deal of valuable medical experimentation. I need only to call to your attention that insulin for diabetes would never have been discovered without the use of dogs. Also that the discovery of nicotinic acid as a relief from pellagra, which was made by Dr. Elvehjem in one of our own biochemistry laboratories, depended upon experiments on dogs. Such a bill, if passed, would thwart a great deal of advancement in all of the Federally supported medical laboratories in the District of Columbia. I trust for these reasons you may find it possible to oppose the passage of this bill. If desirable, I should be glad to amplify my reasons at any time.

Very sincerely yours,

WALTER J. MEEK,
Professor of Physiology.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
STATE OF WISCONSIN
GENERAL HOSPITAL,
Madison, Wis., April 11, 1941.

Hon. STEPHEN BOLLES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOLLES: H. R. 3871 is a piece of vicious legislation almost identical with the bills that have been introduced in and defeated by the Wisconsin Legislature during the past two or three sessions.

As a true dog lover, I am opposed to such legislation because it first of all is backed by people who, though well meaning, are totally ignorant of the manner in which dogs are used experimentally and who, for some reason or other, fail to appreciate the important advances that have been made and are now in progress, leading to discoveries, based upon animal experimentation, for the benefit of the human race.

I hope you will use your influence against this bill and any similar legislation that may be proposed.

Believe me,

Very sincerely yours,

J. S. EVANS,
Professor of Medicine.

The Local Livestock Sales Barns Are a Valuable Community Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1941

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, those of us who live in rural areas, where there are the local community livestock auction barns, know their real value. These sale markets or barns are a real asset to a community. They provide a market that is close to the farmer, it is a competitive market, and gives to the farmer the best possible avenue for marketing his livestock.

There is no demand made by farmers for legislation that would destroy the livestock sale barns. The farmers not only appreciate the services that the livestock sale barns render to them, but they welcome that weekly sale where the farmers of the community gather and exchange their ideas.

In addition to providing a market for livestock, oftentimes these sale barns are places where farmers and others may sell all sorts of miscellaneous articles. During periods of drought and depression this has meant a great deal to farmers to have a place where they turn some equipment that is not needed, or other surplus personal articles into cash. Because of the sustaining volume of livestock business that is done, these sale barns are able to accommodate both sellers and buyers in these miscellaneous transactions.

If legislation is passed that destroys the livestock auction market, the regular weekly community sale will disappear.

From the standpoint of the businessmen and townspeople the local sale barn means everything. Any businessman will tell you that "sale day" is the best trade day in his community. To destroy the livestock sale barns, in some instances, will mean practically destroying the town. A fine, enterprising, and self-sustaining community will dwindle away and the farmers will be forced to sell their products in a far distant terminal market.

Mr. Speaker, I contend that we have no right to enact legislation that would destroy the lawful business of any individual or any group. In the case of the sale-barn men we are not dealing with an outlaw group or a monopoly. I happen to know many of the sale-barn operators in the State of Nebraska. Those men are honest and fair and conduct a business that is a credit to the community wherein they reside.

There is now pending before Congress a proposed amendment to the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921. This amendment if enacted into law would completely eliminate all local livestock auction markets or sale barns. That proposal should not be passed. I wish to enter my protest against it and I urge that it be defeated.

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE EXCHANGE CLUB OF HIGHLAND PARK, MICH.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Exchange Club of Highland Park, Mich.:

To the Congress of the United States:

Whereas a bottleneck of approximately 48 miles in the St. Lawrence River deprives the people of the United States of vital production and transportation facilities in the Great Lakes area; and

Whereas the deepening of the St. Lawrence channel as advocated by President Roosevelt will enable us to make our full contribution to the present needs of our Nation and to participate in the post-war program of world rehabilitation and stabilization; and

Whereas our national defense requires full utilization of the potentialities of our 21 active shipyards on the Great Lakes; and

Whereas the deepening of the St. Lawrence channel could be completed in time to aid the present defense program, and reliable investigations reveal that the proposed deepened channel could permit passage of all ships except battleships and aircraft carriers; and

Whereas engineering surveys made by our Government have approved the feasibility of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project and forecast a benefit to the entire Nation; and

Whereas the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River provide an unparalleled natural highway of over 2,350 miles from the heart of our Nation to the Atlantic Ocean; and

Whereas a deep waterway from our great inland industrial, mineral, and agricultural region is vital to our Nation and a bulwark of strength to our defense; and

Whereas the people of Michigan and the States adjacent to the Great Lakes possess a natural right to transport their industrial products, agricultural and mining commodities to the markets of America and the world in the most economical manner; and

Whereas the midwestern section of our Nation, which is a part of the Great Lakes region, produces more agricultural commodities and has more industrial production than any other section of the country; and

Whereas the Detroit industrial area and the State of Michigan are a part of the great midwestern section of our country in which 40,000,000 people live; and

Whereas the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project is not only a defense measure but also a means of bringing a new era to the country's most important agricultural and industrial region: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Exchange Club of Highland Park, Mich., That we do formally and respectfully request the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation enabling the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project by removing existing barriers; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States of America, to the Secretary of State of the

United States, to the Senators and Representatives in our National Congress.

Respectfully submitted.

THE EXCHANGE CLUB OF
HIGHLAND PARK, MICH.,
DON E. MAYHEW, D. D. S.,
President.
J. EDGAR FINLEY,
Secretary.

Oregon Banks Lead Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE OREGONIAN, PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the record made by the banks of my State in cooperating with agricultural attainments. It has established a record in this respect for 12 consecutive years, which has not been attained by any other State, I am advised. Mr. Elwain H. Greenwood, secretary of the Oregon State Bankers Association, was recently advised by Dan H. Otis, agricultural commission director of the American Bankers' Association, of the outstanding record achieved by the banks of Oregon. As a part of my remarks I include an article appearing in the Oregonian April 1, 1941, with respect to the matter:

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of April 1, 1941]

OREGON BANKS LEAD NATION—COOPERATION WITH FARMERS "TOPS"

(By Leon B. Baketel, financial editor, the Oregonian)

Oregon continues to lead all States in the Union for bankers' agricultural attainments. It has done this for 12 consecutive years, a feat no other State has been able to equal, although Georgia is pushing hard, having won its full 1,000 points for 11 years and North Dakota for 10 years.

Announcement of Oregon's accomplishment was received Monday by Elwain H. Greenwood, secretary, Oregon Bankers' Association, from Dan H. Otis, agricultural commission director of the American Bankers' Association, who sent along a highly complimentary letter.

OREGON OVER TOP

The 1,000-point rating is based upon fulfilling the commission's requirements of banker-farmer cooperation. These include bank participation in 4-H Club work, cooperation with county agricultural agents, attendance at agricultural meetings, a minimum expenditure per bank in farm work, selection of key bankers for farm work in each county of the State, and a successful record of encouraging specific farming projects.

Oregon went over the top in each of these things, Mr. Otis said, and is 1 of the 28 States reaching or maintaining its high record. "Oregon," said Mr. Otis, "shares with the other States the reputation of having once reached the goal has maintained it thereafter."

In executing the program of banker-farmer activities, the State committee and the county key bankers have had the cooperation of the extension agents, specialists, and officials of O. S. C.

TIDY SUM EXPENDED

During 1940 the items and number of farm people contacted totaled 12,269, while special activities embraced exhibits, shows, contests, prizes, scholarships, speaking at agricultural meetings, credit files maintained for farmers and the like totaled 10,284 and attendance at agricultural meetings totaled 846. In addition the banks contributed $11,089.34 to this work, but Mr. Greenwood stated this sum represents only a part of what was actually expended and that $20,000 would come nearer to it.

The plaque to be awarded Oregon will be presented either to C. E. Williamson, Bank of Albany, or O. A. Hougium, of First National, Eugene, at Hot Springs, Va., on April 28.

Views of Southern Coal Operators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZEBULON WEAVER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1941

STATEMENT FROM THE 13 BITUMINOUS-MINE OPERATORS' ASSOCIATIONS IN THE SOUTHERN FIELDS.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

The southern coal operators submit the following as a statement of facts:

1. That there is a distinct shortage of coal in many plants and industries today.

2. That while it is probably statistically true that there is 28 days' supply of coal above ground, it is being used up at the rate of 1,500,000 tons per day. It is not evenly divided among consumers; some consumers have 6 months' supply; a few have as much as 6 weeks' supply; many have 3 or 4 days' supply; and some are already without coal.

3. Seventy-five percent of the manufacturing and transportation industry of this country depends upon coal for its fuel.

4. It requires from 1 to 3 weeks from the time the mines are started to get coal delivered from the mines to the consumer.

5. The Southern Coal Operators' Wage Conference was formed for the purpose of breaking a deadlock in the coal strike and to bring about the resumption of mining in both the North and the South. Southern coal operators have no conditions to impose upon the North, but an irremediable breach has been made between the North and South, and it is not possible nor desirable that they try again to negotiate or arbitrate their problems in a common conference or hearing.

6. The southern coal operators produce three-quarters of a million tons of coal per day going into most defense territories and markets. In their anxiety to get the mines to work and to get production back under operation on the 3d day of April they made an offer to the U. M. W. A. to increase wages by 8 to 10 cents per hour or on the average of 11 percent for both day and piece workers and have further offered to negotiate or mediate all further matters of controversy between them and their employees.

7. There is no question of union recognition, collective bargaining, dual unionism, or any other similar matter in dispute between the operators and the miners.

The southern operators in this conference employ approximately 150,000 men and produce approximately 150,000,000 tons of coal per annum.

In the opinion of the southern operators, there is not only a present danger but there is a general danger of a coal shortage throughout the country this year and no time should be lost in getting the mines back into production at the earliest possible moment.

In order to bring this about it is going to be necessary for the public to understand from proper governmental authorities that there is a serious and critical situation confronting the country; that delay is dangerous to both ordinary and defense industries and to our general lot; that the statements being given out to alleviate public anxiety are detrimental and untrue and are hindering the bringing about of the resumption of mining.

NEW YORK CITY, *April 12, 1941.*

Mr. JOHN L. LEWIS,
President, International Union,
United Mine Workers of America,
New York City.

DEAR SIR: We hereby notify you that the Southern Coal Operators' Wage Conference, representing the high- and low-volatile mines in districts 7 and 8, has been organized to deal with problems of wages and hours for the 13 southern contracting districts in West Virginia, Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee. The officers are as follows: L. Ebersole Gaines, chairman; L. E. Woods, vice chairman; Harry S. Homan, secretary; Stanley C. Higgins, treasurer.

After Monday you can reach us through Mr. John Luse, secretary, Bituminous Coal Producers' Board for District No. 7, Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

Our committee and the producers we represent in our 13 local contracting districts are anxious to enter into a contract with your organization, representing the 150,000 employees in those districts, the majority of whom are members of your organization. The purpose of forming this organization was to hasten the bringing about of resumption of work in the South and the flow of coal to the homes and industries of our Nation.

We now propose to you that these men be returned to work on Monday, April 14, 1941, on the basis of the contract expiring March 31, 1941, plus a wage advance of 60 cents per day of 7 hours, and an equivalent advance in tonnage rates, and that once the mines have resumed work that we negotiate any further differences that remain between us. If you are interested in this proposal and will so notify us by 1 o'clock today, we will arrange for our negotiators to devote any or all of Saturday and Easter Sunday to the work of negotiating the details with your organization. If we can reach such an agreement by 3 o'clock Sunday, we can have our mines operating Monday morning.

As you know, we have asked the National Mediation Board to assist in bringing an end to the suspension in coal mining in the southern districts. We are not withdrawing our request to this Board by this suggestion to you that we resume work with an immediate wage advance of approximately 11 percent, but in the interest of the Nation which is threatened with a serious coal shortage, we are making this proposal to you with the hope that you and we as a patriotic duty will allow these men to return to work pending final mediation and negotiation of our problems.

We are forwarding a copy of this communication to the Honorable Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor.

Respectfully yours,

SOUTHERN COAL OPERATORS'
WAGE CONFERENCE,
By L. EBERSOLE GAINES, *Chairman.*

STATEMENT FROM THE 13 BITUMINOUS-MINE OPERATORS' ASSOCIATIONS IN THE SOUTHERN FIELDS

The 13 mine operators' associations in the southern bituminous coal fields this afternoon (Tuesday) issued the following statement:

"Today marks the beginning of the second week of idleness in the southern bituminous coal mines. Already the defense program has lost irrevocably about 12,000,000 tons of coal which, especially in the late summer and fall of this year, will be sorely needed. It is our pressing desire to get the mines back into production at once.

"As the accredited representatives of 13 districts which produce 150,000,000 tons annually, or about 50 percent of the total commercial production represented in the Appalachian Bituminous Conference, we on last Thursday (April 3) submitted the only proposal coming from any group of bituminous operators which definitely and unequivocally provides for immediate resumption of work at the mines.

"This proposal reads as follows:

"'*Resolved*, That all mines resume work immediately and continue at work pending negotiations until a contract is agreed upon, under all the terms and conditions of the Appalachian contract and the district agreements which expire March 31, 1941, except as follows:

"'*Wage-rate increases*

"'Short-wall machine-mining rates shall be increased 7.2 cents per net ton, 6.6 cents of which shall be added to the existing rates for loaders and 0.6 cent shall be added to existing short-wall cutting rates.

"'The pick-mining rate shall be increased 7.2 cents per net ton. Where tonnage, footage, or yardage rates are paid on conveyors or other mechanical loading devices, the percentage of increase to be added to such rates shall be the same percentage of increase as is applied to the basic loading and cutting rates.

"'Rates for all regular classifications of inside and outside day men shall be increased 60 cents per day; 45 cents per day for trappers and partially handicapped old men.

"'Negotiations to develop a contract to expire March 31, 1943, shall continue without prejudice to any element in the controversy due to the adoption of this resolution.'

"Stated simply, this provides for an increase of 11 percent, effective the day of resumption of operations. Acceptance of this proposal provides for negotiations to continue on such other matters as may be before the conference, and such acceptance would result in immediate resumption of work.

"A coal shortage is now threatening. We are again urging that no further time be lost in completing negotiations and getting the mines back to work. That was a vital consideration in making our proposal without any contingent guaranty from the Government that it would underwrite an increase in coal prices prior to signing a wage agreement.

"Our proposed advance represents an increase of wages in various groups in the South of from $10 to $15 a month to over 150,000 men, or a total advance of $1,500,000 to $1,800,000 per month.

"Any implication that the southern operators are obstructing or delaying a proper settlement to get men back to work is wholly unfounded. This is evidenced by the fact that our offer to go to work and pay the advanced wage still stands."

The associations uniting in the above statement are: Greenbrier Coal Operators Association, Winding Gulf Operators Association, Pocahontas Operators Association, New River Coal Operators Association, Upper Buckhannon Smokeless Coal Operators' Association, Kanawha Coal Operators Association, Operators' Association of Williamson Field, Big Sandy-Elkhorn Coal Operators Association, Harlan Coal Operators Association, Southern Appalachian Coal Operators Association, Virginia Coal Operators Association, Hazard Coal Operators Association, Logan Coal Operators Association.

Need for Navy Yard in Midwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1941

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, if administration officials mean what they say, there should be and will be a decentralization of industry so that activities in connection with the national-defense program will be carried on in the Midwest, as well as on the Atlantic seaboard.

In furtherance of this program, I introduced a bill providing for the establishment of a navy yard at or near the city of Duluth, Minn.

This bill provides:

That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to acquire, on behalf of the United States, by gift, purchase, or otherwise, a site in or near the city of Duluth, Minn., which he deems suitable for the establishment of a navy yard, and shall proceed to establish thereon a navy yard equipped for the construction, overhaul, repair, and fitting out of ships and providing housing and messing facilities for crews of ships undergoing overhaul, repair, and fitting out, and quarters for officers.

SEC. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

In my opinion, it is important that Congress devote itself to the necessary steps which will bring about a decentralization of industry in conformity with announcements made by administration spokesmen some months ago.

We can very well make a beginning in connection with this program by constructing a navy yard at Duluth, Minn., There is a shipyard plant known as the Riverside yard at Duluth, Minn., which built many boats in World War No. 1. This yard is still available and with very little trouble or expense can again be put into operation.

With the heavy demand for shipbuilding and repair facilities for both merchant and warships, the yards now located on both the Atlantic and Pacific seaboards will be unable to continue a program of shipbuilding. Just recently a newspaper item indicated that Great Britain is sending her crippled ships to our yards for repairs. We also have the announced policy of expansion of the Navy shipbuilding program, both for this country and for Great Britain. This means that all available yards will be overtaxed.

Now is the time for administration officials to be looking for new locations for an expanded shipbuilding program.

I submit that this problem should have immediate consideration by Congress and by Government officials charged with responsibility in our national-defense program.

The St. Lawrence Waterway—Vermont Legislature Opposed Thereto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1941

JOINT RESOLUTION OF THE LEGISLATURE OF VERMONT

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I desire to insert a copy of a joint resolution recently adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Vermont in opposition to the St. Lawrence waterway project:

Whereas the President of the United States has announced that he will propose to the Congress of the United States that it take the necessary action to authorize completion of the St. Lawrence River seaway development as an international project; and

Whereas the claim that the United States needs the St. Lawrence seaway for defense is not supported by the facts but has inspired the charge that the military, naval, and air hazards involved in the seaway project are out of all proportion to any industrial or commercial benefits that might accrue from the project; and

Whereas competent authorities have pointed out that the waterway would be icebound 5 months of the year, that no provision for tolls is contemplated; that free use of the waterway for foreign shipping would injure New York State and New England economy, ruin our railroads and our seaports on the Atlantic coast; and that the Great Lakes area would be deluged with cheap products of foreign countries to the injury of American industry, labor, and agriculture; and

Whereas, during the navigation season the comparatively narrow ship channel of the St. Lawrence would make vessels easy targets of bombers and afford abundant opportunity through sabotage or bombing to destroy the locks and dams in the St. Lawrence, thus gravely interrupting traffic; and

Whereas in view of the existing urgent national-defense production needs it would appear most unwise to divert men, money, materials, and machinery to construct a waterway which would be in disastrous competition with New York State's canal system and New England railroads; and

Whereas the United States should concentrate now upon the construction of airplanes, ships, guns, tanks, and other munitions, and not waste public funds, material resources, and effort on a waterway project against which so many seriously important and valid economic objections have been raised; and

Whereas the President's assertion that the United States "needs this great landlocked sea as a haven in which it will always be able to build ships and more ships in order to protect our trade and our shores" has been sharply challenged; and

Whereas it would seem an act of national folly to dissipate labor and resources on a

project not vitally necessary and which could not be placed in operation before 1948: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the people of the State of Vermont, represented in the general assembly, therefore affirm their opposition to use of the St. Lawrence River for establishment of a deeper seaway and hereby record their opposition to the construction of a St. Lawrence River seaway as highly unwarranted in the present national crisis; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent forthwith by the secretary of state to Vermont's Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

The Country Needs a Strong Opposition Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS OVER THE COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM ON THURSDAY, APRIL 3, 1941

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Republican leader of the House and chairman of the Republican National Committee, over the Columbia Broadcasting System, April 3, 1941, which follows:

Fellow Americans, I want to have a heart-to-heart talk with you tonight concerning some matters which, in my considered judgement, are vitally necessary to the welfare of our country, if we are to continue as a nation of liberty, a nation of opportunity in which every man and every woman can receive equal justice. While this discussion will be in the interests of a strong Republican Party, it is not given in a partisan spirit, but because of a deep and profound belief that a strong Republican Party is absolutely vital to our American way of life.

We all want national unity wherever and whenever national unity aids in the preservation of America and the security of our people. No one wants, or should want, national unity in any policy or action injurious to the best interests of the Nation; in any policy which would destroy the two-party system of government in America.

Time and experience have demonstrated the two-party system of government to be the only system which will preserve the American way of life. It has built a strong America. It will preserve a free America.

There is a vital need today for a vigorous, virile Republican Party. We are in the midst of a great national crisis. Vast and unprecedented powers have been given to the Chief Executive. Bewildering sums are being spent for defense—and in the name of defense. Enormous taxes are soon to be imposed upon our people. We stagger along in the direction of war. We face the possibility of national bankruptcy.

This picture is not a pleasant one, but it is the realistic one. This is no hour for "echo men." It is a time demanding courage and honest thinking. Our first thought must be the welfare of our country.

A vigorous, courageous Republican Patry is essential to police and audit the New Deal administration as it revels in the spending of thirty or forty billions of dollars, and in the possession of vast and unparalleled powers granted it only because of the urgent needs of national defense. We must police and audit the New Deal administration to protect our country from financial, political, and social bankruptcy.

We must police these great powers granted the President to assure, as far as possible, their wise administration. We must be ready to fight to restore those powers to the people's representatives when the emergency has ended.

We must police the bureaus and the men to whom the fate of the Nation has been entrusted. Their work must be done efficiently, honestly, economically, and on a nonpartisan basis. We must audit those who have been entrusted with the handling of sums so vast they are beyond comprehension. Our national debt is already enormous. Today the debt is $47,000,000,000 in contrast to one and one-quarter billions when we entered the last war. We cannot tolerate extravagance or dishonesty. Racketeering must have no place in our national defense.

We Republicans in Congress must perform the thankless but patriotic and essential task of policing and auditing those in charge of our national defense.

We all recall the extravagance and inefficiency in the first World War. Billions wasted in faulty and misdirected shipbuilding, inefficient and extravagant airplane construction, graft, and corruption. We can remember the vast amount of goods purchased which never could have been honestly used. I say to you, my fellow citizens, the scandals of 1918 must not be repeated.

A grave responsibility rests upon us all, whether we be Republicans or Democrats, employer or employee, public official or private citizen. We must unselfishly contribute all we can to our national security. Those who may seek to take advantage of this perilous hour to exploit the Nation's needs to their own profit or to advance their own selfish interests will, sooner or later, find themselves condemned as traitors and outcasts by the power of public opinion.

This is no time to reward political henchmen with juicy contracts or luscious loans. Such acts would be just as dangerous to American security and freedom as a gun aimed at the breast of an American soldier. Profiteering, contract racketeering, or partisan spending will not be tolerated by a people who see their very future menaced.

This is no time for strikes or lock-outs which prevent us from achieving the earliest possible adequate national defense. No honest American workman wants to defeat the security of his country. No American worker wants to imperil the welfare of his people. Honest workers are just as unselfish and patriotic as any other class of citizens. Under honest, patriotic leadership, American workers will respond to the call of their country as readily as those men who serve under arms. Waste of time, waste of money, waste of men—these are the fatal mistakes which could end the glorious reality of free America.

The Nation demands production and more production. It demands efficiency and patriotism above selfishness. The call is imperative. As Americans who love their country; who prize its priceless liberties, privileges, and advantages; as Americans determined to remain free, let us press forward with our defense program. Let our fervent prayers be that we can avoid having to send millions of our boys to the trenches. Let us never for a moment lose sight of the suffering and the perils which would come with our participation in another world war.

We Republicans have a vastly important function in this national emergency. The safety and perpetuity of our Nation are at stake. We must guard them against mistakes and against excesses of power or excesses of spending.

We must, of course, have national unity in our defense plans. Republicans, Democrats, and independents must stand together to make our Nation invincible against any assault, whether it should come from the outside or the inside of the country. Events abroad must not be permitted to distract us from the vigilance required at home. Our greatest danger is still from insidious inside forces. That fact will be apparent to every American as we proceed with the defense program.

The Nation, my fellow countrymen, is confronted by two great dangers. The first is some groups may seek to make use of our present emergency and the great burden of debt we are piling up to destroy our economic and political system. The second is the Republican Party, suddenly returned to power through reaction against the New Deal, might lack a carefully prepared program of action.

As to the first danger, a New Dealer recently said, in private, the public debt probably could be increased to as much as $140,000,000,000, at which point the public credit probably would break and the Government would then step in and nationalize everything.

As to the second danger, any party called upon in 1944 to meet the grave problems which the New Deal administration has for more than 8 years left unsolved will have an extremely difficult task. We Republicans are busy studying those problems now. We will be well prepared for the task that lies ahead.

We must preserve the American way of consideration and respect for the rights and the views of the minorities.

When we Republicans speak of the rights of the minorities, and when we demand respect for the views of the minorities, we are not referring only to small groups. We mean also a minority amounting practically to half of the citizens of the United States. The Republican minority in the last Presidential election polled more than 22,000,000 votes. No impartial judge would deny this was a good majority of the free votes in the Nation.

The great objective of the last campaign must continue to be the objective of the Republican Party. Truth and justice will eventually triumph. As patriots banded together in a great cause, let us go forward to the battle to retain the American way of life and to build a finer and better America.

We Republicans realize that millions of Americans of every political belief are looking expectantly to us. We will justify their faith.

Colorado-Big Thompson Reclamation Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1941

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I have in my district the largest reclamation project ever undertaken in the State of Colorado—the Colorado-Big Thompson Project. The authorization for the

investigation of this project was given by Congress in 1935 and the construction was authorized in 1937. In the past 4 years there have been appropriations totaling $8,050,000 of the $54,000,000 estimated cost of completion.

In order that the major features of the project may be completed so that delivery of water will be assured by the summer of 1945, it is necessary that a larger annual appropriation be made. It is not sound economy for either the Government or the water users to incur severe losses that will eventuate if the ultimate construction of this project be unduly delayed. The full cost of this project is repayable—the power portion with 3-percent interest. The power features will be installed only when needed to serve available power markets.

The district is now suffering an annual crop loss of $7,000,000 due to water shortage. This curtails the income of business in the district which is now taxing itself about $50,000 a year to repay the project. It is, therefore, evident that continuance of this unbalance by an unnecessarily prolonged period of construction is poor economy. It is advantageous for the Government to see early operation of this project so that the money derived therefrom may be returned to the revolving reclamation fund. As the costs on accelerated construction remain about the same, the overhead costs on the whole project will be reduced. I am informed that the progress in the boring of the tunnel is almost twice as great as anticipated. It is encouraging that plans are made to commence the construction of the Granby Dam unit this next fiscal year, but there are also canals and three reservoirs to be constructed on the eastern-slope portion of the project plus the necessity of acquiring additional rights-of-way. Unnecessary delay in the completion of the project will result unless money is soon made available to start this portion of the work.

While northern Colorado is primarily interested in the Colorado-Big Thompson improvement, the country at large is interested in the maintenance and development of the agriculture of this area. Studies show that for every dollar of farmer income, $7 are added to the Nation's income through channels of trade. On that basis, the country has been losing $49,000,000 a year for 10 years through the shortage of water supplies in this district. The aggregate amount of this loss is nearly 10 times the over-all cost of this project, and may I point out that the crops of this area are specialty crops, such as sugar beets, livestock feed, and other crops that fit into the agriculture economy of the Rocky Mountain area without interference with the agricultural products of the rest of the Nation.

Colorado, who has always consistently supported the Federal reclamation program, fully realizing that the life of the State, as well as the entire West, depends on the conservation and economic utilization of the limited water resources of the arid and semiarid regions, now asks the support of her request for an increase in the annual appropriation for the Colorado-Big Thompson project.

Parity Payments for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWT V. MILLS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1941

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, like other Representatives from the agricultural section of this Nation, we are always thankful and happy for any extended agricultural recognition. I have contended and worked hard for parity payments on all basic commodities since becoming a Member of this honorable body.

Presently, billions of dollars are being appropriated for national defense and rightly so; however, the outlook for an appreciable price increase for cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and tobacco is not very encouraging, as we find a tremendous supply of cotton in the world today—approximately 25,000,000 bales of American cotton. Previously, one-half of our cotton and a considerable quantity of wheat has been exported; however, this has been reduced to almost nothing, as the British have declared practically an embargo upon shipping space against wheat, cotton, and tobacco.

We ought to do something more for the farmers than merely spend our time talking about the needs of the farmers. Other groups throughout the country are now enjoying prosperity, the like of which they have not known for many years. Why, the farmers' income is entirely out of proportion. The farm income, 1939, per capita in Louisiana was $155, whereas in the United States $266 per capita. Colleagues, this is pathetically low, and I particularly rise at this time calling upon each Member of this body to support the Russell amendments.

If the Russell amendments are adopted there will be available for parity payments for this year, 1941, $362,000,000 when we include the $212,000,000 voted last year and already available. In addition there will be available $300,000,000 for parity payments in 1942.

If we increase the farm income as proposed by the Russell amendments we will only be approximately guaranteeing the cotton farmer 74 percent parity; corn, 86.9; wheat, 74.1; rice, 83.2; and tobacco, approximately 84.9. Surely no Member of this body would vote against giving the tillers of the soil, the man who places his trust entirely in hope, part of a chance that life may be made a little more encouraging.

Veterans in National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT CANNON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1941

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves all of one opinion in our anxiety to insure a national-defense program conducted and maintained free of sabotage.

The most of us believe that in and around our national-defense plants it will become necessary to use civilian guards, and in some cases undercover guards; and if we are correct in our assumption, it necessarily follows that those guards must be of the highest type of patriotic citizenry, and we can under no circumstances use untried men; and, indeed, their sympathies toward this Government, as well as every other government, must be well known.

It is obvious to me that the surest safeguard we may have in this connection is to use veterans of World War No. 1, as surely none of us can doubt their patriotism and their sympathy, and their flag is surely well known.

It is possibly unfortunate that in the majority of cases, the group to which I refer is no longer fit for active combat duty because of advanced age or physical infirmities directly traceable to active duty experienced by them in World War No. 1.

It is known to all of us that this group above all other groups is interested in the defense of this country and in saving it harmless from another curse that we call war. This group is well-founded in democracy and its workings and they have seen our country develop and wrest itself from the throes of national and international upheaval. And now they find ourselves, according to the belief of too many Americans, on the threshold of new and additional world controversies.

I, for one, believe that this country has done too little and cannot do too much for this group—particularly when it is a matter of common knowledge that more than all others, they represent true Americanism.

If I may speak of my own State in this regard, I would like it known that upward of $2,000,000 monthly is being spent in defense work under our W. P. A. program in Florida, and our able W. P. A. administrator for the State of Florida, who happens to be a veteran of World War No. 1, has advanced the theory and put into practice that in all of the key positions, such as supervisors and guards, veterans of that war should be used for the reasons above set out. As for me, it is a pleasure as well as a duty, to insist, insofar as I may, that veterans of World War No. 1 be utilized in this connection.

A Vital National-Defense Project—The Proposed Puget Sound, Grays Harbor, Willapa Harbor, and Columbia River Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1941

ARTICLE BY REAR ADMIRAL LUTHER E. GREGORY, C. E. C., UNITED STATES NAVY (RETIRED)

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I recently sponsored a resolution which was adopted on March 26, 1941, by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors for a review by the Corps of Army Engineers of previous reports pertaining to the proposed Puget Sound, Grays Harbor, Willapa Harbor, and Columbia River Canal. This project is clearly essential to our national defense and is worthy of serious study and favorable consideration at this time. Of course, it would also be a great aid to commerce and shipping, but first and foremost, it is of real strategic military importance. The cost of one battleship would build the canal and it would materially strengthen our defense of the entire Pacific Northwest. All these facts, and many others, are set forth in an article prepared by Rear Admiral Luther E. Gregory, C. E. C., United States Navy (retired), which reads as follows:

A DIGEST OF FACTS CONCERNING THE PROPOSED CANALS CONNECTING PUGET SOUND, GRAYS HARBOR, WILLAPA HARBOR, AND THE COLUMBIA RIVER—A PROJECT OF VITAL IMPORTANCE IN THE INTEREST OF NATIONAL DEFENSE, COMMERCE, AND INDUSTRY

(By Rear Admiral Luther E. Gregory, C. E. C., United States Navy (retired))

FOREWORD

The proposal to connect Puget Sound with the Columbia River by ship canal is not a new idea. This was first proposed by Jefferson Davis, while Secretary of War, about 1856. It was suggested as a military measure, as well as an aid to commerce.

From time to time the proposal has been revived, only to be pushed aside, as the magnitude seemed to be too great as compared with the needs of commerce. Until recent years no real study had been made of the project. Some calamity was required to bring it to the fore. That came in the form of serious unemployment and therefore extreme losses in the industry of the southwest part of the State of Washington.

Consequently, there was passed the canal act by the 1933 session of the legislature of the State. A commission was appointed to study the economic feasibility of these canals. It submitted a favorable report on June 7, 1933. The Governor of the State, the Honorable Clarence D. Martin, approved this report July 6, 1933. It has at the present time, therefore, the status of an approved project to be constructed as soon as the financial arrangements can be made. It is of vital importance to our national defense.

LOCATION AND ROUTE OF THE WATERWAY

There are three sections, as follows:

Puget Sound to Grays Harbor canal: Leaving Puget Sound at Olympia by way of Budd Inlet, thence by way of Percival Creek through Black Lake, Black River Valley to the junction of Black River and the Chehalis River, thence down the Chehalis River valley into Grays Harbor. Length, about 50 miles.

Grays Harbor to Willapa Harbor: Leaving the channel of Grays Harbor at South Bay, passing in a general southerly direction close to the foot of the bluffs, and on the westerly side thereof, for a distance of about 9 miles, entering Willapa Harbor on the northerly side of the Tokeland Peninsula.

Willapa Harbor to Columbia River: Leaving Willapa Harbor near Bakers Slough, thence in a general southerly direction along the easterly edge of the bogland and close to the foot of the bluffs for about 5 miles, thence in a general southeasterly direction, entering tidewater at the northerly end of Bakers Bay.

The routes and locations were surveyed and determined by the Canal Commission of the State of Washington.

SIZE OF CANALS

The commission recommended the construction of a lock canal from Puget Sound at Olympia to Grays Harbor with locks of not less than 60 feet by 600 feet; a depth of 14 feet over upper miter sills, and having a total lift of approximately 90 feet above mean sea level; minimum bottom width of canal section to be not less than 90 feet for light-draft seagoing ships and capable of future enlargement as tonnage develops.

The Grays Harbor to Willapa Harbor and to the Columbia River canals are recommended on a sea-level basis, with a minimum bottom width of 120 feet for light-draft seagoing ships drawing 13 feet in salt water and capable of future development as tonnage increases.

FAVORED BY UNITED STATES ARMY ENGINEERS

Several years ago the Corps of Engineers for rivers and harbors in their report to Congress recommending 1,600 projects, totaling an estimated cost of $8,000,000,000, included this canal project as meritorious.

COST OF CANAL

Careful calculations of various factors to be considered, with full allowance for the requirements of the act creating the Canal Commission, which declared its purpose to provide the greatest amount of individual employment, results in an estimate of $33,921,638 as the cost of the entire project. The cost of one battleship would build the canal.

PROTECTION FOR LIGHT-DRAFT VESSELS

There are about 30,000 craft of various classifications registered at ports along the Northwest waters—Puget Sound, Grays Harbor, Willapa Harbor, and the Columbia River.

There are more than 10,000 fishing vessels, many tugs and barges, light-draft cargo vessels, and thousands of pleasure craft which will use the waterways for business and pleasure. In time of bad weather the fishing fleets will find a safe passage through the canals.

VITAL NAVAL AND MILITARY USES

The naval forces at the Puget Sound base are at present limited to the Straits of Juan de Fuca for ingress and egress. The proposed waterway would permit more than half the commissioned vessels of the Navy to enter and depart by the canal, declares Rear Admiral Gregory, who also says that the two lower canals would accommodate three-fourths of the registered ships of the Navy with the tide a mean sea level.

The sea-level canals would allow submarines to operate from that base through either Grays Harbor, Willapa Harbor, and Puget Sound, in addition to the Columbia River entrance, and come to the relief or support of any naval unit engaged in battle at the straits. Vessels moving from Puget Sound would have three other exits into the ocean if the canals were constructed. The navy yard at Bremerton is becoming a principal base for construction of cruisers, destroyers, and such craft, and for fleet repairs. The proposed waterways would enhance its value to the Nation.

One of the largest military bases on the west coast, Fort Lewis, is a principal center of military concentration, together with Camp Murray and McChord Air Field. The safe and rapid transport and transfer of heavy ordnance and munitions between defensive points along the coast is now impeded by highway bridges of light capacity and highways which are inadequate.

The Boeing airplane factory at Seattle, one of the largest such plants in the country, produces large numbers of fighting ships. This national-defense industry deserves the extra protection a canal would give.

At Dupont is situated one of the largest powder plants in the country, and Hogum Bay, near Olympia, is a storage plant of the Giant Powder Co. These industries will provide huge war supplies in case of conflict—supplies which can best be moved by water transportation. With the canal completed, transportation would be facilitated.

The cost of one battleship would build the canal, and in the time of national danger the existence of the new waterway might easily be worth a fleet of battleships in its strategic value.

COLUMBIA RIVER AREA—BONNEVILLE

It would afford necessary protection to the growing industrial area on the Columbia River resulting from the Bonneville Dam hydroelectric project, in which the Federal Government has invested $75,000,000. It is needed to protect the new national-defense industries of the Aluminum Corporation of America and General Chemical Co. of America, at Vancouver, and the Reynolds Metals Co., at Longview. It is estimated that 30 percent of all the aluminum required for the airplanes being manufactured as part of our national-defense program will be turned out by these plants, representing an investment of many millions of dollars in this area.

ESTIMATED REVENUE

Studies made by the Canal Commission indicate a present and prospective annual revenue from tolls for the two coastal canals of $464,000 with a reasonable forecast of increased tolls to $682,000 within a period of 10 years. For the Puget Sound to Grays Harbor Canal the immediate prospective toll would be $1,585,000 with a reasonable increase to $2,560,000 within 10 years.

METHODS OF FINANCING PROJECT

By terms of the legislative act creating the Canal Commission the waterways cannot be paid for from State funds.

It is the purpose of the sponsors of the canal project to have it adopted as a Federal project and paid for by direct Federal grants of money. It is the policy of the Federal Government to assume the entire cost of waterways as development work necessary for national welfare and defense. All waterways are now owned, operated, and maintained by the Federal Government.

Revenues to be derived from tolls (as mentioned above) should in time pay the entire cost of the waterway project. These revenues will accrue to the National Government, as it is the purpose of the association

to have the Federal Government take over the entire project from start to finish.

The law of the State forbids any tax levy. There can be no cost to the taxpayers of the State for this construction program; yet the benefits to be derived will be theirs directly.

BASIC PURPOSE OF THE WATERWAY

To connect the inland waterways of Puget Sound and northern waters of Alaska to the inland waterways of the Columbia and Snake Rivers. The present barrier to inland waterway communication from the Snake River to Juneau is the natural obstacle the canals would remove, creating the greatest inland waterway in the world.

BENEFITS ASSURED BY THE PROJECT

Construction of the waterway as outlined will provide at once the greatest amount of diversified employment, especially for skilled craftsmen, offered by any national-defense project now before the Federal Government.

There will be about 60 miles of extended and correlated workings, exclusive of dredging, which will offer a job for every type of workman.

A brief outline of the tasks provided would be about as follows:

Concrete locks would employ about 2,000 concrete workers, laborers, carpenters, steel workers, hoist and pump engineers, and allied craftsmen.

Spillway construction, mostly concrete masonry, would employ an equal number of the same type of workers.

Excavation would employ large numbers of ordinary labor and men who live by the various types of water-front activity—tugboat and launch men, riggers, loggers, swampers, pipe handlers, firemen, ship carpenters, and deck hands.

Simultaneously several thousand men would be employed in clearing rights-of-way, building temporary roads, crossings, and relocating logging roads, and preparing piling and cribbing of many kinds. The formation of canal berm and the subgrading for roadways along the canal would employ many teams and tractors. The bridges to be erected constitute a major operation, employing at least another 2,000 men. A vast amount of hand labor would be used in the riprapping and protective work on the canal banks. Supplementary road building would utilize the labor of many hundreds of men.

In addition, as many more men would be indirectly employed in industries supplying steel and concrete, lumber and machinery, and other materials and equipment needed in the canal project. It is not exaggerating to say some 20,000 men would be given work, directly and indirectly, during the period of construction.

FARMERS WOULD BENEFIT

Northwest farmers would benefit directly by the project, for requirements of foodstuffs for the multitude of persons working on the project would stimulate the demand for eggs, butter, meats, flour, and produce. Clothing supplies, medical, and personal needs of the workers would also be supplied by Northwest firms in large amounts.

Supervision and direction of all these workers would absorb large numbers of technically trained persons now unemployed.

This project is so located near to centers of population that many men could work on it and still be home part of the time, their homes undisturbed, and their families intact. Simple camp accommodations will be sufficient for men at work. This project is needed to relieve unemployment; the country needs the completed canal to join two great waterways. The money paid out in wages will go into circulation rapidly, stimulating trade and industry in the Northwest.

COMMERCIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WATERWAY

Effect on tariffs and transportation was developed before Colonel Sturdevant, United States district engineer, when it was shown that for a 20-mile haul by rail the cost per thousand feet of logs is from $2.50 to $3, depending on weight. The same haul by water would be from 50 to 75 cents. Comparative tariffs on general freight would show similar contrasts. With an annual package and merchandise movement of 450,000 to 500,000 tons flowing between Columbia River and Puget Sound points, the readjustment of tariffs would result in a big saving to shippers.

Prospective traffic through the waterway will be greatly increased as the opportunities of water shipment increase. Vast undeveloped natural resources of adjacent regions will be developable with cheap water transportation available. Known deposits of manganese, iron ore, and phosphates in the Olympic Peninsula, coal regions all along western Washington, logging, lumbering, fishing, and similar activities now existing will all respond to a cheapening of transportation when the waterway is completed.

It is proper to assume that limestone; coal; fuel; ores of all kinds; fish and fishing vessels; sand, gravel, and cement; pulpwood, pulp, and paper; logs in rafts and on barges; sulfur, phosphates, and acids; pleasure craft, tugs, scows, and mixed-cargo vessels will use the new waterway as an inside passage in preference to the outside route. For many products present high transportation rates prevent development and exploitation.

Grain transportation from the interior to the coast by way of the Snake and Columbia Rivers, along the new waterway to Columbia River and Puget Sound ports, will be increased as the waterways are improved. The records show three and one-half million tons of grain moved from the inland basin territory of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho to the coast in the 10-year period just closed. In the opposite direction would move a continuous flow of coal and other fuel, seacoast products and commodities, and imported goods to Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana at greatly adjusted and cheaper transportation rates.

Canadian Government subsidized carriers are helping to build a great port at Vancouver, B. C., through cheapening transportation of grain and other products from the interior to the coast. Anything that can be done to remove obstacles to transportation and commerce between United States cities will iron out inequalities between cities and sections and will bring growth and prosperity to west-coast cities of the United States.

The use of any improvements for navigation in the Columbia Basin will be denied full value until the obstructions between the Columbia and Puget Sound are overcome. With the proposed canals built, and not before, will the waterway from the inland empire to Alaska function as a whole.

Improvements on the Columbia are going forward, through construction of the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams. The proposed canals are the connecting link between the Columbia and Puget Sound, necessary for the movement by water transportation of products from the inland empire to Northwest cities.

Log and timber movements will be facilitated. Logging is increasing in cost, due to limited and controlled logging roads. In addition to merchantable timber there are vast stands of pulpwood timber around Grays Harbor and Willapa Harbor, with pulp mills operating to both the north and south. The canal would make interchange of logs and pulpwood easy and cheap. Logs from this area could move to Puget Sound and Columbia points cheaply, without the danger of towing by sea or costly rail shipment. The canals will provide the needed safe and cheap means of transportation of these raw products to mills.

Coal and iron deposits would be developed with the waterway furnishing cheap transportation. The only hard-coal deposits in the Northwest which compare with eastern anthracite are found easterly of Bellingham. The gas coals of Washington are being used all along the coast. The coking coals produce the highest percent of coke per ton of coal for any State in the Union. If these fuels are to be made available, along with high-grade soft coal of the Bellingham and Seattle territories, cheap transportation must be provided. The proposed waterway is the answer to this need.

Industrial development will follow the construction of the canal. The Bonneville and Grand Coulee power dams will furnish an abundance of electrical energy at low rates for industrial uses. Raw materials in abundance are to be found in the area reached by the waterway. Where cheap transportation and raw materials abound and cheap power is available, industry develops. It is no dream to say that in the immediate future, with the canal connecting Alaska and the inland empire, the development of multiple industries in this area will be certain.

THE CHALLENGE OF TODAY

Mr. Speaker, no more opportune time for construction of this waterway could be found.

There is no question of the national-defense need, no question of the economic need, no question of the vital part the waterway would play in Pacific Northwest development. Capable engineers have found the project feasible. As a work-making project it is unequaled in the Pacific Northwest, for actual construction would be started in a few weeks and thousands could be given jobs almost at once.

The progressive development of the Pacific Northwest demands the canal. Industrial centers now established, and others certain to spring up in the territory when the waterway is completed, will furnish work for thousands, markets for vast quantities of products, and bring renewed life to west-coast activities.

The clarion call of opportunity is sounding, calling for action. The defense and future of the Pacific Northwest sways in the balance.

Thrift and War—Urge To Save Destroyed—Trend Toward Government Ownership

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1941

STATEMENT BY JAMES TRUSLOW ADAMS IN BARRON'S NATIONAL FINANCIAL WEEKLY

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Mordecai Ezekiel recently expressed a philosophy held by many of the so-called left-wing New Dealers when he proposed "taxation to diminish the incentive to save."

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article which appeared in a recent issue of Barron's Na-

tional Financial Weekly by the famous historian James Truslow Adams, which points out that civilization was built up on saving and that there can be no progress without saving.

The New Deal administration, Mr. Speaker, in countless ways, is practicing the theories which men like Ezekiel are constantly preaching. At the same time the Government refutes this philosophy by drawing upon the accumulated savings of the past in the present national-defense effort.

In the article by Mr. Adams it is pointed out that if savings are discouraged or prevented, there can be only one result, and that is Government ownership in the form of communism or socialism. It seems to me that it is time for those who believe in America, and its republican form of government, to challenge the irresponsible theorists of the left wing of the New Deal. In my opinion, the following article by Mr. Adams is a real challenge. The article follows:

THRIFT AND WAR

(By James Truslow Adams)

Threat of the greatest war in which the United States has ever been involved has suddenly, like a flash of lightning, illuminated our entire mental landscape. It has disclosed vividly the differences between old practices and new theories.

Nowhere has this been more revealing than in the concept of thrift. The confusion of mind of the New Deal with regard to it stands naked to the sight of all. For example, an economic adviser to the Department of Agriculture, Mordecai Ezekiel, recently proposed as his first three points to cure our economic ills that there should be enough Government spending "to counterbalance the excess savings"; "taxation to diminish the incentive to save"; and "procedure so to increase individual security as to diminish the need of savings by the general mass of workers."

Within a week of this utterance, the Undersecretary of the Treasury, Daniel W. Bell, made a proposal which comes in direct conflict with the Ezekiel theory. In view of the Government's obvious necessity for money for war or defense, the Undersecretary of the Treasury urged the issue of Government bonds on such a basis as to induce the people to save in order that the Government should have funds to call upon and that inflation should be avoided.

IMPORTANCE OF THRIFT

Here is a clear divergence of philosophies, and in view of the resulting crisis it may be well to reconsider the theory of thrift. Our whole future, war and post-war, may depend on the view adopted by Government and people.

Thrift, which has been so repugnant to many of the New Dealers, new economic thinkers, and new dictators, has been throughout history one of the leading factors, with others such as religion and physical environment, in influencing the character and rise to civilization of mankind. Whatever the future may hold, history teaches that in the past the ascent of man from the savage state, which the philosopher Hobbes denominated as "poor, nasty, brutish, and short," has been due to man's instinctive desire to acquire private property and to his discovery of the advantages of thrift. It is, or should be, needless to point to the role of accumulated capital, whether in the form of stored food, extra arrowheads and implements, a hut instead of a cave, and so on down to our modern forms, in enabling the vast mass of mankind to improve their condition and to create a high instead of a low standard of living for at least the great majority.

The stream of history flows on but forms of government change. Thrift, however, would seem to have a very special role to play in our modern self-governing democracies. Democracy depends for success on the character of its citizens, and character depends, in part, on hard work and the self-respect which a reasonable security self-earned brings to all, human nature being what it is. There have been times when work could not be had by many and when those lacking it were carried as far as possible by those who had accumulations. This was far from an ideal system, as human life is always far from perfect, but under it the belief in the value of thrift persisted.

There have also been brief periods of speculative mania when the belief in thrift, though not that of accumulating personal resources, was temporarily lost. But after such periods the belief in thrift has returned. The years leading to the crash of 1929–32 formed such a speculative period, but in the latter year Roosevelt was overwhelmingly elected President on promises of governmental and personal thrift which might have been heartily approved by Benjamin Franklin. The people again were ready to try saving instead of gambling.

GOVERNMENT GOES IN FOR BORROWING, TOO

Before that, for some years, the lure of quick and easy profits in the market, high-pressure salesmanship, the psychological pressure of advertising, and the easy terms offered by installment buying had upset the steady balance of even the most conservative—rich and poor. Since then, however, government itself has largely discouraged thrift. Disregarding the fact that widespread ruin was largely due, not simply to hard times but to the enormous debt accumulated by stock margins, too heavy mortgages, and excessive installment sales, government has tried to teach us that even government can be bought on the same installment plan. Highly critical of business which had brought American living to the highest standard the world had ever known, the administration took over from business as its only lesson the worst blunder business had made, namely, that debt could be incurred recklessly.

Accepting the theory of the English economist Keynes, which the English were too clear-headed to accept themselves, our Government started on a debauch beyond the wildest dreams of the more reckless business leaders. It decided that the way to cure a nation overburdened with debt was not to save but to create more debt. It has operated by colossal annual deficits ever since it came to power. It tried to create jobs in business by attacking and destroying business, and tried to create plenty by a policy of artificially caused scarcity.

But it did more. It set to work to eliminate from men the fundamental idea of saving and thrift.

The attack has come from many quarters, and the confusion is growing. Two incentives to save are reasonable security and a reasonable return. We need not here rehearse the story of the attacks on private enterprise—the failure to do anything for the railroads except to pile higher debts on them and to increase their costs and taxes; the unfair Government competition with the public utilities; and now the threat to divert the most conservative investments of the insurance companies into common-stock portfolios, thus injecting uncertainty into perhaps the three greatest investment fields for the public for the past two decades. Even that last asset to which rich and poor cling, a life-insurance policy, has now become a speculation due to what the Government may or may not do. Marketability is a factor in investment, but owing, in part, to the drastic regulation of markets, that is fast disappearing. I noticed the other day that one of the soundest preferred stocks, which always used to have a spread of an eighth between bid and asked, was quoted with nine points between them. The difficulty of marketing holdings in any quantity is notorious.

But there is more than such things as these. The low interest rates forced by the Government have so reduced return from investment as not only to make insurance and annuities more costly and all forms of saving, such as high-grade bonds, savings-bank accounts, and others less remuneratively attractive, but also to encourage squandering by individuals and all governmental bodies. Worse than all, underlying all these measures has been a philosophy, believed and preached, that America had oversaved and overbuilt; that it had reached the point of a static economy in which saving would be a curse and not a means of further advance nationally and of attaining self-respect and sufficiency individually.

ALARMING IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIETY

According to the apparent New Deal theory, thrift must be destroyed. The incentive should be taken away from the well-to-do by such taxation as will make saving sterile, and from the poor by assuring them that they will get what they want or need without self-denial and foresight on their own part. We all admit that in a modern industrial society the State must provide more means of social security than in a primitive agricultural one in which each person owns the means of procuring a livelihood under almost any economic conditions. But this new theory of abolishing if possible all effort by individuals to gain security and a better life for themselves by their own efforts has most alarming implications for society as a whole. It is a negation by theorists of all we know about the rise of society in the past and of human nature.

Let us consider the impact of the war on this theory. It has been claimed that America was overbuilt, but now that we suddenly need goods the Government is moving heaven and earth to increase our plant. The capital—goods and money—to do so must come from somewhere. The money, it is said, is to be raised from either taxation or borrowing or both. It is obvious that there can be no property tax if people have not saved in the past to buy property—cars, houses, land, securities, or whatnot.

Suppose nobody had saved anything for the past 500 years and was living only on the largesse of the Government, would the Government tax its own property and would it get any further than by trying to raise itself by its own bootstraps? Take the income tax. If everybody had been living up to his income, where, according to the new theory, would any tax come from, except in part, possibly, by a tremendous fall in the scale of living even for the poorest. Instead of the one-third now poorly housed, clothed, and fed, the full 100 percent of the population would be so under the oversimplified situation shown above.

It is said that the Treasury intends to pay for the war by tapping savings held by insurance companies, other institutions and individuals to pay for bonds, and get the rest of the cost from taxes. But if savings and living well within an income are uneconomic and perhaps some day illegal, or so discouraged by Government as to become impossible, then what?

The impact of war, or of the preparation for it in our belated defense program, leads to another question. We have been through some 10 years of depression, greatly accentuated, I believe, by the false economic theories of the Government. There have been millions of unemployed. Even the Government does not know how many, though it has poured out billions to help them. Millions of these recently jobless are now to be at work at high wages. In my section, Connecticut, factories are working 24 hours a

day, 7 days a week, and young men recently with no means of support except the Government (which means taxpayers like myself and not a Santa Claus on his own), are now getting $60 to $75 a week. In some cases, so strong is the best part of human nature and the desire to feel independent, they are saving, but in all too many they are buying cars and riding high, wide, and handsome. The Government does not give the example of trying to save a cent. The capital of the rich and middle class is levied on. Men are drafted into the armed forces, but labor is highly paid, and striking for more.

When the boom is over and the inevitable post-war break comes, the cry will go up again, for those who have not saved, that "we cannot let Americans starve." The Government realizes that, but its only suggestion is to prepare for a bigger and better Work Projects Administration and to take still more from those who have saved or may still be earning fair incomes Why should young men save, except by native instinct, when the great Government tells them saving is bad national economics and that they will be taken care of anyway when they lose their jobs, get sick or old?

DIPPING INTO A ROYALTY PAYMENT

But for how many generations can we go on living on the accumulated savings of the former ones who believed in and practiced thrift? How long will those of us, who do not think in terms of a 40-hour week to get ahead and save, go on trying to do it if the whole weight of the Government is used to break us of the habit, and where will the surplus come from then? For a personal illustration, I have just had a small royalty payment from England. Britain taxed it 48 percent. Here the Federal Government takes 38 percent of what's left. If I invest it in a bond, Connecticut takes from 10 percent up or more, and when I die and leave it to my widow, heaven knows what the State and Federal Government will take. How long will one continue to work, to make a taxable income, to build up property which can also be taxed, with those facts in mind, and when being taught by the Government that one is doing the Nation an economic disservice by trying to save?

And when we stop creating income and building up estates, however small, what will there be left for the Government to do but to take over the crumbs from the table of private enterprise and turn itself into a socialistic or communistic state, whatever the difference may be between them ultimately? From one side of its mouth the Government calls for thrift so we can lend money to it; with the other it tells us that thrift is an exploded idea, and its tax collectors demonstrate it to us.

After the Middle Ages much was heard of the "dead hand" of the church, but the dead hand of a modern government with its unlimited power of confiscation, taxation, and killing of private initiative and ambition may well prove as paralyzing and devastating. Is it yet too late for one government to turn back and to build up, as far as it can, a thrifty and self-respecting citizenry, who may receive at times such governmental aid as the conditions of the new industrial world may demand, but who will still be taught that in democracy happiness and independence come, as Thomas Jefferson was taught by his father, from not asking someone else to do for him what he can perfectly well do for himself?

And, even against the great pressure of government and its heterogeneous crew of volunteer spokesmen, might it not be well for that great portion of the people who are hard-working and saving, and on whom the burden of taxation will fall later, to try to instill the meaning and effect of thrift into those who are now getting high wages and know little about direct taxation?

SOCIALISM THE ALTERNATIVE

Lincoln said that this country could not long endure half slave and half free. Neither can it do so half ambitious, energetic and thrifty, and half willing to be supported by their hard-working and thrifty fellows. If the Government abolishes saving and thrift, then there can ensue in time—a result which may not be wholly unwelcome to some of the New Deal's more noisy camp-followers—only a socialism or communism which will be the total negation of all we have dreamed of America, and leave most of the 130 millions of us at the mercy of the inevitable tiny group at the top who may still, like Hitler, Goering, and the rest, maintain regal state at the expense of an exploited people. Poverty, prison, and the concentration camp will replace the insurance policy and the savings bank, the millions of comfortable homes and the Bill of Rights.

Judging not from a theory of the future but from all the lessons of history, I do not think this prophecy is overdrawn. If we have a choice, we have not overlong to make it, and if we still have the energetic initiative of a living democracy, the task is one to be undertaken by all, employers and employees or solitary workers like myself, and not alone by the irresponsible theorists of the left-wing of a Government which rests ultimately only on the lives and toil of the mass of the rich and poor who make up the Nation.

William Jennings Bryan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY B. COFFEE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1941

ADDRESS OF WILLIAM RITCHIE, OF OMAHA, NEBR.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House I am inserting an address by William Ritchie, of Omaha, Nebr., in commemoration of Nebraska's illustrious statesman, William Jennings Bryan. The address was delivered at 1941 Bryan birthday banquet, Cornhusker Hotel, Lincoln, Nebr., March 19, 1941. The address follows:

At the Bryan memorial breakfast, held last July in Chicago, during the 1940 Democratic National Convention, I was asked to speak a few words on behalf of Nebraska, and I opened my remarks with the following statement:

"Nebraska glories in the fact that from her broad plains and fertile fields, from the travail and hardships of her pioneers, the gay spirit of a young man, just come from Illinois, soared to the heavens with the song of a lark. Nebraska is proud of the fact that she gave William Jennings Bryan to the Nation, to humanity, to the ages."

William Jennings Bryan was a Democrat in the true sense of that word. Many a nation has boasted that it is a democracy when, in fact, the only democracy that it possesses is a democracy for the aristocrats or for the plutocrats. The conception of democracy which many Americans have today is a democracy for the plutocrats or for the intellectuals or for the bureaucrats; not a democracy in which the common man shares equally in opportunities and advantages with all other citizens. Bryan believed that democracy should grant to every individual, rich or poor, high or low, well educated or otherwise, an equality of opportunity and an equality of justice, and equal consideration in the framing of the economic and social policies of the Nation. William Jennings Bryan was the kind of Democrat who knew that there is no true democracy where there is an autocracy of either the classes or the masses; and he told the American people time and again that a centralization of power in the Federal Government and a destruction of local self-government spelled the doom of democracy, no matter what the immediate objective might be.

In the 1927 Encyclopedia Americana, the article on the Democratic Party was written by William Jennings Bryan. In the concluding paragraph of that article, Mr. Bryan summed up his theory of democracy and of the purposes of the Democratic Party. He said:

"There is today and will continue to be an imperative need for a party thoroughly committed to the defense of the inalienable rights of the individual and to local self-government, and jealous of the encroachments of Federal power. Even when such a party is not in power, it exercises a potent influence in molding public opinion and in restraining excesses, because it is very quick to champion the cause of an individual whose rights have been trespassed upon, or the cause of a community whose rights have been ignored. In proportion as the organization is true to the principles promulgated by Jefferson and defended by Jackson, it may hope to appeal to the confidence of those who seek neither favoritism nor privilege, but are content to enjoy the blessings of a government in which the individual is protected in the enjoyment of life and liberty and in the pursuit of happiness."

This article was written 16 years ago, shortly before the death of the Great Commoner, and is a clear-cut statement of the ideals which motivated and controlled Bryan's life career.

In the party platform of 1896, which was framed by Mr. Bryan and his friends, we find the following:

"During all these years the Democratic Party has resisted the tendency of selfish interests to the centralization of governmental power, and steadfastly maintained the integrity of the dual scheme of government established by the founders of this Republic. Under its guidings and teachings the great principle of local self-government has found its best expression in the maintenance of the rights of the States and in its assertion of the necessity of confining the general government to the exercise of the powers granted by the Constitution of the United States. * * * We demand a return to that simplicity and economy which befits a democratic government and a reduction in the number of useless offices the salaries of which drain the substance of the people.

"We denounce arbitrary interference by Federal authorities in local affairs as a violation of the Constitution of the United States and a crime against free institutions."

In the platform of 1900, which Mr. Bryan practically drafted, appears the following:

"We denounce the doctrine that an Executive or Congress, deriving their existence and their powers from the Constitution, can exercise lawful authority beyond it or in violation of it."

And in the platform of 1908, which was drafted by Mr. Bryan, appears a demand for economy in administration and a reduction in the number of officeholders.

Mr. Bryan always put those principles to which he was devoted above self-advancement. He was never an opportunist. Although young Bryan lost the Presidential

election in 1896, his campaign made the people of the country aware of the true principles of democracy, and caused them to realize and understand that this country can never claim to be a true democracy until it devotes itself to the principle of denying favoritism and special privilege and granting to each individual a fair share in the Government and a fair consideration in the formulation of the economic and legislative policies of the country.

Mrs. Henry Cabot Lodge, wife of the United States Senator from Massachusetts, who was long a Republican Party leader, had the insight to realize that, although Bryan had lost for himself, he had won for his principles. Following the 1896 election, Mrs. Lodge, writing to Cecil Spring-Rice, long-time British Ambassador to the United States, said:

"The great fight is won. It was a fight conducted by trained and experienced and organized forces, with both hands full of money, with the full powers of the press—and of prestige—on the one side; on the other, a disorganized mob at first, out of which burst into sight, hearing, and force one man—but such a man. Alone, penniless, without backing, without money, with scarce a paper, without speakers, that man fought such a fight that even those in the East can call him a crusader, an inspired fanatic, a prophet. It has been marvelous. * * * His speeches spoke to the intelligence and hearts of the people. He almost won."

The opening and the closing words of the great oration which Mr. Bryan delivered at the 1896 Chicago convention show clearly the forces which controlled his life and made him one of the great leaders of the democratic forces of the world. When he appeared upon the rostrum the convention was in a bedlam. Renowned Democratic leaders who were famous orators had been unable to throw their voices into the convention hall so that they could be heard. Mr. Bryan, then only 36 years old, stepped before that vast assemblage and his first words were: "I think if you will be quiet I can make myself heard." And did he make himself heard! Those who remember that great voice, with its marvelous tone and tremendous carrying power, know full well that he told that convention the truth when he said they could hear him, and the convention found this out to its astonishment and pleasure. But it was not only that powerful voice which caused the people of America to listen to Mr. Bryan's message. That voice alone would have been as tinkling cymbals and sounding brass if there had not been behind it the spirit of an evangel—the burning passion to make the people see and understand, first, what were their inalienable rights, and, second, how they might obtain them; and this spirit—this purpose—was summed up by Mr. Bryan in the final words of this great oration when he said:

"You shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns; you shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold."

Here was a great poet, a great crusader, an inspired leader. And from then on, Bryan's powerful voice and his great message commanded the attention and ultimately the respect of the American people.

In the hindsight of a half century of history, it is now clear as crystal that William Jennings Bryan was the John the Baptist of the outstanding political and social advancements made in America by the present generation. Followers of few world statesmen can boast so proud a record.

Let us review this record, briefly. In 1896 the people of the country were plagued with discriminatory and unjust freight rates, with a railroad political machine which was corrupting public officials and legislative bodies. Many small commercial and manufacturing enterprises were forced out of business by rate discriminations in favor of companies in which railroad officials were personally interested. Railroad securities were juggled, great issues of watered stock were sold, to the profit of the financial buccaneers, to the loss of the public, and with a resulting increase of railroad rates which placed such a burden upon the farmers that agriculture was prostrate. Mr. Bryan challenged this great power. In the 1896 platform appeared this statement:

"We demand the enlargement of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission and such restriction and guaranties in the control of railroads as will protect the people from robbery and oppression."

In the platform of 1900, Mr. Bryan wrote:

"Any attempt by railroad corporations to interfere with public affairs of the people or to control the sovereignty which creates them should be forbidden under such penalties as will make such attempts impossible. * * * We favor such an enlargement of the scope of the interstate commerce law as will enable the Commission to protect individuals and communities from discriminations, and the public from unjust and unfair transportation rates."

As a means for securing fair transportation charges for agricultural products, one plank in the Democratic platform of 1896 (and Governor Weaver will be particularly interested in this) reads:

"The Federal Government should care for and improve the Mississippi River and other great waterways of the Republic, so as to secure for the interior States easy and cheap transportation of tidewater. When any waterway of the Republic is of sufficient importance to demand aid of the Government, such aid should be extended upon a definite plan of continuous work until permanent improvement is secured."

This same plank was reiterated in subsequent Democratic platforms which Mr. Bryan helped to frame. When these principles were enunciated by Mr. Bryan as a young man, they were looked upon with horror, as revolutionary, and socialistic. Today the principle of equal freight rates and no special privileges to any shipper or community are an integral part of the policy of the Federal and State Governments. Today the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission have been extended so as to prevent the jugglings of the railroad securities and unfair and burdensome freight rates. Today the great river systems of the interior have been improved with the resulting decrease in freight rates for agricultural products.

In the 1896 platform appeared the following statement:

"Gold monometallism is a British policy, and its adoption has brought other nations into financial servitude to London.

"We declare that the act of 1873 demonetizing silver without the knowledge or approval of the American people has resulted in the appreciation of gold and a corresponding fall in the prices of commodities produced by the people; a heavy increase in the burden of taxation and of all debts, public and private; the enrichment of the money-lending class at home and abroad; the prostration of industry and impoverishment of the people."

The world has finally come to Mr. Bryan's monetary theory. And no one calls those who insist upon the enforcement of that policy, radicals or socialists, as such people were called in 1896.

In the platform of 1900, which Mr. Bryan drafted, appears the following:

"Private monopolies are indefensible and intolerable. They destroy competition, control the price of all material and of the finished product, thus robbing both producer and consumer. They lessen the employment of labor, and arbitrarily fix the terms and conditions thereof, and deprive individual energy and small capital of their opportunity for betterment. They are the most efficient means yet devised for appropriating the fruits of industry to the benefit of the few at the expense of the many, and unless their insatiate greed is checked all wealth will be aggregated in a few hands and the republic destroyed.

"We pledge the Democratic Party to an unceasing warfare in Nation, State, and city against private monopoly in every form. Existing laws against trusts must be enforced, and more stringent ones must be enacted providing for publicity as to the affairs of corporations engaged in interstate commerce, requiring all corporations to show, before doing business outside the State of their origin, that they have no water in their stock."

In the platform of 1908 Mr. Bryan demanded that corporations engaged in interstate commerce should be required to take out licenses and be prevented from issuing watered stock, and that there should be a law compelling such licensed corporations to sell to all purchasers in all parts of the country on the same terms, after making due allowance for cost of transportation.

By bitter experience the public has finally come to appreciate Mr. Bryan's wisdom and foresight, and securities laws have been enacted by State and Federal Governments to prevent evil acts which in the nineties were matters of common practice. The Federal Trade Commission was established and given powers against unfair trade practices, and laws have been enacted by the Federal Government, and in many States, which require chain stores to sell at the same price in every store, making due allowance only for cost of transportation. And yet, when Mr. Bryan proposed these measures he was called a dangerous man.

In the various democratic platforms which Mr. Bryan drafted appear appeals for closer friendship with the Central and South American countries. When Mr. Bryan was Secretary of State he did more than any man before him to build up a spirit of friendliness and cooperation between all the nations of the Americas. During one of the pan-American conferences attended by Mr. Bryan, the Minister from Ecuador asked Mr. Bryan for his autographed picture. In complying with this request, Mr. Bryan wrote on the photograph, "The Lord has made us neighbors, let justice make us friends." This sentiment so touched the hearts of the people of Latin America that the picture with this autographed sentiment was sent from chancellery to chancellery in all of the South and Central American republics, and finally was returned to the State Department at Washington, where it now hangs. This sentiment is the keynote of today's pan-American good-neighbor policy, and it was the first pronouncement of this kind by an American statesman.

At the time Mr. Bryan was first nominated for the Presidency wages were low, working conditions intolerable, long, and unreasonable hours were the rule. In his 1896 platform Mr. Bryan said:

"We believe that the most efficient way of protecting American labor is to prevent the importation of foreign pauper labor to compete with it in the home market."

A quarter of a century later this became a fixed policy of the Government. Again Mr. Bryan said:

"As labor creates the wealth of the country, we demand the passage of such laws as may be necessary to protect it in all its rights."

Note in this that Mr. Bryan did not advocate that labor be given more than its share or more than its right, but only that it should be protected in all its rights, and he concluded his program for labor by saying:

"We are in favor of the arbitration of differences between employers engaged in interstate commerce and their employees, and recommend such legislation as is necessary to carry out this principle."

The present administration is now learning from sad experience what Mr. Bryan realized 45 years ago was necessary to protect labor, industry, and the public. And steps are being taken today to meet the demands which Mr. Bryan made nearly half a century ago.

Mr. Bryan foresaw the needs of the present day in the Pacific. In the Democratic platform of 1900 he wrote:

"We favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to give the Filipinos, first, a stable form of government; second, independence; and, third, protection from outside interference, such as has been given for nearly a century to the republics of Central and South America."

The present Philippine independence bill embodies the first two of these principles but neglects the third; and we are now learning that, in the interest of America and in the interest of democracy, we must adopt the third principle enunciated by Mr. Bryan 41 years ago.

In the 1900 and 1908 platforms Mr. Bryan denounced huge political contributions from corporations and from individuals and demanded that no corporation should be permitted to contribute to a campaign fund, and that contributions from an individual should be limited to a reasonable amount. Laws attempting to curb these evils have been passed in every State of the Union and by the Federal Government.

The 1908 platform demanded a Federal income tax, which has since been enacted; demanded legislation to promote the development of an American merchant marine, and such legislation is now on our books; demanded the organization of a National Health Bureau, and such a bureau is now functioning efficiently for the benefit of the people. Mr. Bryan also demanded the popular election of Senators, and that is now written into our Federal Constitution.

In his later life Mr. Bryan turned his attention to the corruption of public morals caused by an arrogant and uncontrolled liquor traffic. Throughout the length and breadth of the land Mr. Bryan preached temperance and prohibition. He realized that the degradation of the people was due in no small measure to what then was a Nation-wide scandal, and he attacked political power and greed which was built upon this human wretchedness. Mr. Bryan's remedy was national prohibition. Some who believed in the purpose of his attack upon the liquor interests did not agree with his method of attacking the evil, but none who admired high principle and good morals questioned his integrity and good intentions. Largely due to his preachments throughout the country, national prohibition became a part of our Federal Constitution. While subsequent events indicated that this was not the right solution for this problem and national prohibition was ultimately repealed, the so-called noble experiment taught those engaged in the liquor business the need of applying sound morals to their traffic and destroyed this corrupting influence upon the political life of the Nation, and the people of America learned to frown upon intemperance, and the morals of the people of America and the political life of the Nation were definitely raised.

This story would not be complete without mention of the Scopes trial. Here again Mr. Bryan braved public ridicule for the sake of principles which he held dear. Here again history is teaching that he was not far wrong. In this famous trial Mr. Bryan protested against those cynics who scoffed at the Bible teaching, that God made man after his own image. Bryan knew that if this concept were once destroyed, and if the theory, that man was descended from the ape and from the gorilla, took its place, the strongest spiritual influence to hold man to a higher course and keep him from degradation would be destroyed. At the time of the Scopes trial, under the guise of teaching evolution, some textbooks stated that man is descended from the ape, and some scientists were then looking for the missing link. Mr. Bryan knew better and protested against this, as he protested against any form of human degradation. Subsequent events have proved that Mr. Bryan was right. The greatest scientists of today now say that man was not descended from the ape and that there is no such thing as a missing link. And I, for one, prefer Mr. Bryan's position, for it gives me a sense of dignity and a belief in the future of the human race.

By a technical ruling Mr. Bryan was not permitted to give his side of this controversy, and he died 2 days after the trial as the result of the strenuous efforts which he made; so, unfortunately, the cynic and the prankster was left with full command of the field, and Mr. Bryan's position in this matter was never fairly and honestly presented to the American people.

Time will not permit a recitation of all the things which Mr. Bryan advocated in his fight for Democratic principles and of the final success of that fight. Some of the things which he advocated, however, have not yet been fully appreciated by the American people. In the 1900 and 1908 platforms, which Mr. Bryan wrote, he pronounced against the misuse of patronage on the part of the President, in favor of economy in administration, and for a reduction in the number of officeholders. Mr. Bryan always held that there is an imperative need in America for a party thoroughly committed to the defense of the inalienable rights of the individual and to local self-government and jealous of the encroachments of Federal power. These matters, Mr. Bryan knew, would be a cause for constant struggle and would require unremitting vigilance on the part of those who love true democracy.

There are many people here today who knew Mr. Bryan intimately at the beginning of his career. I did not have that privilege. I was a boy of 10 when Mr. Bryan was first nominated for the Presidency. I remember that nomination very well. I remember the pictures in the Chicago papers of Bryan the young man, his right hand uplifted, standing before a great gathering, uttering the immortal words:

"You shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns; you shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold."

That statement thrilled me to the core and made me always a supporter of Mr. Bryan. In 1900 I was a freshman in high school. When Mr. Bryan was nominated for the Presidency the second time, we lived in a strong Republican suburb of Chicago. There were 3,900 Republican votes to 300 Democratic, and most of the Democrats were so-called gold bugs. I was so enthused with Mr. Bryan's appeal for equality and justice and for honesty in government and business that I bought a pin with his picture fully 3 inches in diameter, stuck it upon the lapel of my coat, and went to school, with the result that I was ridden on a broomstick around the schoolhouse and jeered while the Republican teachers looked on with approval.

In 1908 I was county superintendent of schools in Cheyenne County, Nebr., and accepted a position as secretary of the Democratic County Committee and of the Bryan Volunteers of that county. During the campaign, one of the Republican leaders in Sidney, well and affectionately known as Paddy Miles, became infuriated at my enthusiasm for the Bryan cause and sent out a letter denouncing me for using the office of county superintendent to promote political propaganda. He ended his letter by saying, "We believe the boy ought to be spanked." Well, the voters of the county did not spank either Mr. Bryan or "the boy."

My first meeting with Mr. Bryan was in the fall of 1909, when I was in debating class with William, Jr., at the State University and was occasionally invited to the Bryan household for dinner. I never will forget my first impression of Mr. Bryan's voice. One afternoon he was on the second floor of his house and William, Jr., and I were in the basement, when suddenly we heard booming throughout the house, "William, William." The house was filled with the resonance of the call, and Mr. Bryan had hardly raised his voice at all. He simply used the volume which was there.

In the fall of 1911, I was selling school textbooks down in the Ozarks of southwestern Missouri. I visited with one of the members of a county school board which was going to adopt textbooks. I found that he was a strong friend of William Jennings Bryan, and, of course, I boasted of the fact that I had been a guest in the Bryan home at a number of meals; in fact, I was relying upon this as my strongest argument for having my books adopted in that county. Upon my return to the county seat before the day of adoption, my friend Mr. Lamar advised me that we would have a chance to see Mr. Bryan, because he was going to speak on the Chautauqua platform that afternoon, and Mr. Lamar had bought a ticket for me. I had serious qualms, as I feared Mr. Bryan might not recognize me way down in southwestern Missouri. I had only been in his home when he was present a half dozen times, and what attention or notice he had given to me, I did not know. Of course, Mr. Lamar wished a special introduction to his hero, whom he had always worshipped from afar. So after the Chautauqua was over, we went up to the platform in a long line of people who were shaking hands with Mr. Bryan, and I perspired and trembled for fear I had lost my county textbook adoption. To my surprise and great pleasure, as I came up to him, Mr. Bryan reached out his hand and said, "Why, Ritchie, what are you doing down here?" This was the proudest moment of my life, and one of the happiest. I introduced Mr. Bryan to my friend and, needless to say, sold every book I had to offer to that county school board.

My next distinct recollection of Mr. Bryan is at the Baltimore convention where I heard him use his marvelous voice to still the crowd and bring about the nomination of Woodrow Wilson. Many people at that time questioned Mr. Bryan's sincerity and insisted that he was not trying to nominate Mr. Wilson but was endeavoring to defeat Champ Clark so that he might obtain the nomination for himself. I know that such accusations were false. I was an alternate delegate at that convention from the first district of Nebraska. After the nomination, returning to the Hotel Belvedere, I found myself in an elevator alone with Mr. and Mrs. Bryan. I said to Mr. Bryan, "Well, sir, how do you feel now?" Mrs. Bryan beamed and spontaneously replied, "This is the happiest moment of our lives." Mr. Bryan joyously acquiesced. No one who saw and heard Mr. and Mrs. Bryan then could doubt but that they spoke from the bottoms of their hearts.

Looking back at that convention, I remember the bushel baskets full of telegrams that poured in upon the delegates after the Thomas Fortune Ryan speech was made. And I marvel now when I realize that Bryan's great voice and magnetic personality were confined to the walls of that auditorium. Yet his spiritual appeal, his stand for principles, was so great that cold print aroused the country to a magnificent response. How history would now be changed, if radio had been discovered and developed in Bryan's day.

My next recollection of Mr. Bryan is the day he left Lincoln to become Secretary of State. I was out at his home with William, Jr. As I left, Mr. Bryan stood in his shirt sleeves, having helped move out some of the furniture, and said good-bye to me. As I shook his hand, I said, "Mr. Bryan, how happy you must be." His reply was, "I don't

know. I am approaching this position with a realization of tremendous responsibilities." Two years later, shortly before Mr. Bryan's resignation from the Cabinet as a protest against the administration's policy of insisting upon the right to send our ships into war zones, I met Mr. Bryan, then Secretary of State, in his office in the State Department. Mr. Bryan looked tired and worn and indicated then to me that he was about to resign. He said that no one could have been more gracious and considerate of him than Mr. Wilson, but that his views and Mr. Wilson's views were so far apart on the question of sending our ships into war zones that he felt it was necessary for him to resign in the interest of peace. He said then that he feared that the course which Mr. Wilson was following would lead inevitably to war. Mr. Bryan's prophecy came true, and his policy of exercising self-restraint and withholding our ships from war zones has now been adopted by the American people as a proper principle in the interest of maintaining the peace and security of the Nation.

Mr. Bryan was always an advocate of peace. His treaties with 30 nations whereby for the first time the principle that there must be a time for negotiation before a war could be started is a principle that some day you and I know will be demanded by the peoples of the world, and some day will head off such wars as are not the product of evil-minded would-be world conquerors.

At this time it is well for us to remember the famous answer which Mr. Bryan gave, when he was Secretary of State, to the Japanese Ambassador. The Legislature of California had passed a most vindictive piece of anti-Japanese legislation. The situation was acute. The Japanese Ambassador to the United States called on Mr. Bryan and asked, "Is this final?" Mr. Bryan answered, "There is nothing final between friends." Mr. Bryan immediately took the train to California and pleaded with Governor Hiram Johnson to veto the measure, which the Governor did. Bryan's answer, "There is nothing final between friends," should be the answer of the American people to the people of Japan. It may not be appreciated, however, by the Japanese militarists, but if the Japanese people can understand that the American people take the same position as Mr. Bryan takes, it may be that the problems in the Far East will be settled by peaceful means.

Fellow Democrats, I for one still follow the Bryan flag. I, as a Democrat, still believe that the centralization of Federal power will ultimately lead to the destruction of democracy. I for one agree with that plank of Mr. Bryan's 1896 platform which announced that a third term for the President might result in the establishment of a precedent which would lead to the destruction of our free institutions. The people of this country have passed upon that question for the moment; but history demands that sooner or later that question be settled right. In the stress of emergency, in the demand for relief from pressing evils, we may have forgotten the precepts of some of Mr. Bryan's teachings. We may have failed to recognize that Federal power must be kept within constitutional bounds, and should be extended only where necessary to protect the principles of true democracy. I for one believe that all legislation which has been passed in the past few years which countervenes these principles, will ultimately be considered to have been but emergency legislation, and that the principles advocated by William Jennings Bryan will ultimately triumph.

I say this with due respect for President Roosevelt and many of his reforms which have marked great advances in the development of truly democratic government, but also with an appreciation of the fact that it is human to err and that all great men being human make some mistakes and it is not fair to the principles of democracy if we do not oppose legislative measures and administrative acts which we believe will lead to a destruction of our free institutions.

Fellow Democrats, I love to think of Bryan's great spirit, wiser now that it is freed from the burdens of the flesh, hovering over us today, his eighty-first birthday anniversary. I gain inspiration from his memory to take heart and courage to do my duty here as it hath vouchsafed God to show me the Way and the Light, not as an opportunist, but as a follower of democratic principles; and I am sure that with the inspiration of our great departed national leaders, Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Wilson, and Bryan, we will ever stand firm for the principles of liberty, justice, and democracy, announced by them, and for the safety, security, and perpetuation of our great Republic.

Eighth Anniversary of the Civilian Conservation Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. BUTLER B. HARE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to address the enrollees and many of their friends at a meeting celebrating the eighth anniversary of the Civilian Conservation Corps at Table Rock State Park, Pickens, S. C., on April 10, and by unanimous consent of the House to extend my remarks I am including a synopsis of this address. It is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, misfortunes do not often befall an individual or a nation unless someone, somewhere, at some time is able to find some virtue or compensation arising therefrom. Ten years ago we were in the midst of what proved to be a world-wide economic depression. It was of such magnitude that millions of people were without employment and the income from those employed was growing less year by year. There was more or less suffering throughout the world. The problem was one that commanded the most serious reflections of all the people in practically every nation. Industry was at a standstill. Agriculture was a downhill business, both from standpoint of production and prices. Of course, the problem of production was not a new one. It had been observed for many years that productive lands were decreasing in area, forest lands were approaching the exhaustion point and no solution of the problem had been reached although the necessity for it was known by all.

The depression and unemployment had their compensation in that they furnished an opportunity for a solution of the growing agricultural and forestry problem. It afforded the opportunity for our Government to try and kill two birds with one stone. The Civilian Conservation Corps was provided. The law providing for it was one of the first acts passed under the present Democratic administration. It was not sponsored by any of the many pressure groups. I understand it was the President's own plan in an effort to solve a great problem. It was to serve two purposes—one to afford employment to many people and the other to afford a type of work designed largely to assist in the solution of the one great farm and forest problem. The selection of young men as enrollees in the Civilian Conservation Corps was not a mere accident. From the standpoint of relief, it may have been just as well to have selected older men, but it was decided to select young men where the family was without employment and in need. However, they were not selected solely for this reason. There was another thought involved. It was known that the problem would not be solved within a year or decade, or even a generation. It was thought that a large percentage of the young men would be drawn from rural or farm life, and the further thought was that they would be engaged in a line of work that would serve as object lessons to farmers in preventing farm erosion and preserving their forests. Then the added thought was that these young men, having obtained training and experience in this work, would in the course of time find their way back to the farm, where they would become leaders in adopting plans for better conserving their lands and forests, their farms in turn to become object lessons to their less-fortunate neighbors and furnish concrete information which would enable them to conserve or restore the forests and the productive area of soil.

It will not be my purpose at this time to discuss farming or agriculture, but in order to give some sort of a background upon which this project was predicated, we are told by our soil experts that at the beginning of our civilization in the United States there was on an average of about 9 inches of what we now refer to as topsoil and contained what we know as plant food. In other words, our crops, regardless of what they may be, obtain their plant food for supporting the plant, fruit, or grain thereon from this topsoil. Following the removal of our original forests we all know that rains have descended and floods have been coming for two or three hundred years, and much of this topsoil has been washed from the fields and our soil experts now tell us that the average topsoil in the United States does not exceed 5 inches, or just about half of what it was when we began two or three hundred years ago. This has been observed for several years, and close observers say that if this continues for another century, many of our farms will be so depleted of topsoil the growing of crops will be practically impossible. This has already occurred in many localities and sections of our country. Prosperous farm lands of fifty or a hundred years ago are now practically worthless for crop-production purposes. Men are failing today to eke out a subsistence on lands where their grandparents grew rich. It is easy to see, therefore, that with a decreasing production and an increasing population the time must come when the production on a farm will be too small or too limited to support a family, unless a planned policy or program is inaugurated that will not only prevent further erosion but conserve all of the plant food now available and endeavor to increase the supply. Soil conservation, therefore, is probably our greatest national problem.

I am not certain but what it is greater than the extension or marketing services previously created, especially when we take into consideration the time it will take in a permanent and successful solution. Its necessity is emphasized when we consider that agriculture has always been and will ever be the basis of our national wealth and security of our civilization. It was probably designed this way by the Creator in the beginning, for we do not find any other industry or occupation of man upon which the seal of God's approval was more definitely fixed than that of agriculture. Our first

parents, Adam and Eve, at the very beginning were placed in the Garden of Eden and commanded to dress and keep it. Abraham, a man who talked and walked with God, was rich in cattle. Jacob, another patriarch, was well versed in the practical science of stock raising. Pharaoh, the wicked King of Egypt, dreamed of seven good ears of corn on one stalk. Moses, divinely chosen to lead His chosen people out of bondage, sang of the increase of the field, the butter of kine, the fat of lambs, the kernel of wheat, and the pure blood of grapes. And Ruth, the most lovable character of sacred history, dignified and glorified farm labor when she followed the reapers and gleaned in the fields of Boaz.

The Civilian Conservation Corps or the Soil Conservation Service was inaugurated to preserve this great and indispensable asset to our national life. Lost land is not restored within a year or decade. We are told it takes a hundred years and more to restore an inch of topsoil. Forests are not restored within a year. It takes from 25 to 100 years to grow a good tree. The length of time in either case will depend upon the plans and methods adopted. The creation of the Civilian Conservation Corps, as we have said, was not an accident but the economic depression referred to afforded our Government an opportunity to inaugurate it. The men who are selected to enroll in this great program can be congratulated from a number of standpoints. One is that you are physically and otherwise qualified under proper instructions to assist in the solution of this great national problem. You are further to be congratulated in that it affords you an opportunity to learn early in life the very best way of conserving and improving farm lands and forests which assure you a much better chance of effecting a fair living from the soil and contributing to the education of others who may have not had such an opportunity.

Of course, there are many other privileges that may be recounted. Here you learn the value of cooperative effort. You learn the value of forming regular habits that are conducive to developing strong and sound bodies. You have the opportunity of getting the ideas of others who may be more or less fortunate. You are afforded an opportunity to learn better and more of the functions of government and the obligations of citizens.

And let me stop long enough here to say that good citizenship is the greatest civic virtue in our national life, whether it be social, political, or economic. Unfortunately, if the shadows of today are the forecasts of coming events, our country is threatened by foes more insidious and more dangerous than those ever marshaled upon a battlefield.

Any loyal and patriotic citizen has the legal right to refuse the exercise of his suffrage rights by refusing to vote or take any part in our elections or political affairs but it will be a sad day in this country when people who claim to be patriotic and loyal citizens fail and refuse to exercise this right. Any individual has the legal right to refuse to identify himself with or contribute to support of any religious institution, but it will be a sad day when the church doors of our Nation are closed. A man may have the legal right to quit work or strike, if you wish to call it that, but it is a sad and dangerous situation for people who claim to be patriotic and loyal citizens to exercise such a right when engaged in a program to meet a national emergency. This day seems to have arrived, and I apprehend that more drastic action than that usually found in a democracy will be necessary to correct this situation.

You can by appropriate legislation punish open disloyalty, but you cannot legislate good citizenship. This is a product of training and practice. It is no argument against education to say history shows that a democratic system of government is safer in the hands of a less tutored but patriotic citizenry than in the hands of a more highly trained citizenry that is willing to sacrifice the welfare of a nation in time of pending danger for wholly selfish ends, whether it be employer or employee. This point is well illustrated in your own section of the country at this time where it has been said from time to time that we are a poorly trained people. We do not admit the charge, although it may be true to some extent, but it is an outstanding tribute to our industry and labor that the present national-defense program has not been halted here 1 minute by strikes or lock-outs. This is not an accident either. It is the product of our philosophy of life and government. It is a distinct compliment to the character and patriotism on the part of employer and employees in industry. I would say that employees are primarily entitled to the credit for preventing foreign Communists from coming into our communities and spreading their nefarious and subversive teachings and doctrines among our people, and they deserve the lasting gratitude of the American people; and it is my opinion, if this country is to survive, it will be saved through that type of patriotic philosophy demonstrated in this section of our Nation.

Outside of our homes and schools I know of no better place to secure training in good citizenship than in the Civilian Conservation camps. Every enrollee may congratulate himself for being afforded an opportunity for the development of that type of citizenship which will enable him in civil life to make a valuable contribution to the welfare of his country. The problem of strikes in time of emergency may be met and solved within a very short time, but the removal of the underlying causes, regardless of what they may be, will take a generation or longer, provided they are to be solved by a democracy.

You have here an opportunity for learning a thousand and one things that enter into the life of every individual and will contribute to some extent to his success or failure. You will be able to profit by these lessons. Others will be able to profit by your example in later years if you are successful. We could enlarge upon these thoughts and multiply the many contributions the Civilian Conservation Corps in making for the betterment of American life not only in agriculture and forestry, but in practically every other activity.

It is appropriate, therefore, and highly fitting that this hour has been set apart for the purpose of celebrating the anniversary of this agency, and I congratulate those responsible for this meeting. And permit me to say in conclusion, I appreciate more than I can express the honor and privilege of being one of your guest speakers on this occasion.

Tennessee-Tombigbee and St. Lawrence Inland Waterway

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the railroad monopoly and the power trust have combined to prevent the development of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway, the St. Lawrence inland waterway, the Columbia, the Arkansas, the Savannah, the Connecticut, and all other similar river development projects throughout the country.

They seem bent on the economic strangulation of the South and West, and of fastening upon this Nation the exorbitant rate structures under which we are now suffering, and which no country on earth could continue to bear.

This railroad monopoly, which, in my opinion, is operating in flagrant violation of the antitrust law, is bending every effort to prevent the development of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway, using a few railroad employees in other sections of the country as cats'-paws to pull their chestnuts out of the fire, knowing full well that they do not represent the railroad laborers in the area affected.

The Tennessee Valley is the very heart of what President Roosevelt has called "the citadel of national defense." To this area we must look for the bulk of our aluminum supply for airplanes, as well as for nitrates for explosives, to say nothing of the other materials produced there that are absolutely essential to our national defense.

Unless this Tennessee-Tombigbee cut-off is constructed, this material produced in the Tennessee Valley, traveling by water, will have to go approximately 900 miles out of the way, going around by way of Cairo, Ill., and the Mississippi River to its mouth and then across the Gulf of Mexico to reach the city of Mobile.

It would have to go 650 miles out of the way to reach the Gulf of Mexico at any point. In other words, it is 650 miles farther from any point on the Tennessee River above Pickwick Dam to the mouth of the Mississippi River than it would be down this inland waterway to the Gulf.

All points on the Ohio River up to Pittsburgh, Pa., and all points on the Allegheny and the Monongahela Rivers, as well as all points on the Cumberland, will be more than 200 miles closer to the Gulf when this waterway is constructed.

All that vast area in the Tennessee Valley, the Cumberland Valley, the Ohio Valley, including the Allegheny and the Monongahela, will be tributary to this new route to the sea, which will save every shipper from 200 to 900 miles on every load that goes out or comes in.

In addition to that, it will furnish a slack water route for ascending traffic, that in addition to saving from 200 to 900 miles in distance, will provide an additional savings in transportation costs in that it will furnish a slack water route instead of the present one against the terrific current of the Mississippi River.

The construction of this canal is absolutely necessary from every standpoint of national defense, as well as every consideration of navigation and transportation; and it is just as sure to be constructed sooner or later as the night follows the day. It should be constructed now.

But the representatives of the railroad monopoly now tell us that the war will be over before either the Tennessee-Tombigbee or the St. Lawrence waterway could be finished. Just when they intend to stop the war, I do not know; but the indications are now that this emergency will last for years, and every available inland waterway that would furnish protection from attack by bombing planes released from airplane carriers at sea

will need to be developed and put into operation.

But even if this emergency should end, these projects could be used to absorb the unemployment that would necessarily follow. Then we would have them for transportation purposes in times of peace as well as for future national defense.

If we are going to let the railroads and other selfish interests destroy this Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway with their vicious propaganda and keep the Tennessee Valley area bottled up, and also permit the West and Northwest to be bottled up in the same way, then we might as well put a stop to all rivers and harbors development and say to the people of the South and West, "You are doomed to economic strangulation."

Jackson Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable JOSEPH E. CASEY at the Jackson Day dinner at Boston on Saturday, March 29, 1941:

It is always good to get home. It gives me an opportunity to meet old friends. I am especially glad to attend this Jackson Day dinner. It is an opportunity to renew our loyalty to our party and to awaken our memories to all that America means.

Our life as a nation has been short. A span of 150 years comprises only the infancy of a race. In that century and a half, we have made progress that has amazed the world. From a meager group of people on the edge of a vast and practically unknown continent, we have grown into the most powerful of all the nations.

The party which Jefferson founded has lived through 140 years of turbulent history. It is almost as old as the Republic itself. It has had periods of prosperity and lean years of adversity. The party has made mistakes and at times it has been torn by discord and internal dissension—the usual fate of a political organization. But in the main the Democratic Party has been the bulwark of popular government in this country, and the greatest champion the common man has ever known.

In the days of Andrew Jackson, the party fought for the welfare of the country against the fury and hate of a small oligarchy which tried to secure a strangle hold on the Nation's financial life. It won that struggle. In our day, under the Wilson and Roosevelt administrations, the party has consistently adhered to the principles of liberal and progressive government. Because of this and because the Republican Party has never been liberal, the Democratic Party is in the majority today and it is, in a greater measure than ever before, the true American party. Oh, I know that the Republican Party has a fringe of idealists and liberals who strive constantly to convert the party to progressive principles and to bring it in touch with the needs and aspirations of the average citizen but they have been disappointed in the past and are being disappointed now.

I know that the Republicans say at election time that they approve of the social gains and social objectives of the last 8 years, but I say to you that I have not seen any evidence that they even understand what these social gains and social objectives have been, much less advocate them. They are not leaders in the true sense. They are merely following the drift because they feel it is the only safe political course at this time.

We must all shudder to contemplate the depth to which the failure of the Democratic Party to win the 1932 election would have plunged the country. From 1932 down to the present day, our Nation has been confronted with crisis after crisis. Under Democratic leadership, we have taken each in stride and today we are the envy of all the people of the earth. All we know about food rations and interference with the natural rights of free people is what we read in the reports of conditions abroad.

Today, the Nation, under the leadership of the Democratic Party, faces the greatest crisis in all its 150 years' existence. Across the water in other lands, the very same races of people who live in peace and concord here in America, are at each other's throats. On the one hand are the great dictator states controlled by one man, glorifying the doctrine of blood and iron and seeking to expand. On the other hand is a wealthy and powerful democracy guarding jealously its vast possessions and fearful of losing any of them. This struggle has become so vast and so titanic that it threatens to engulf the world. It is a vision that chills the heart—that moves one to icy terror; this lovely fruitful earth, overflowing with plenty, riven from end to end by hate, aggression, and brutal cruelty, which, if unchecked, must surely crumble civilization to the dust. And less than a quarter of a century ago, 9,000,000 of the world's finest men yielded up their lives to save humanity.

Here in this country the effect of this cataclysm has already been felt. Where formerly we were concerned with the problem of unemployment, making the lot of the old people more secure, flood control, and, in general awakening the social consciousness of America, we now find ourselves mainly concerned with defense preparations. In my own case the change has been equally startling. As a member of the subcommittee on naval appropriations, the duty has devolved upon me to inspect, check, and report on developments in our shipbuilding and airplane-building program. I have visited practically every large shipbuilding yard and practically every bombing plane manufacturing company in the country. I have talked to the men in charge of the shipbuilding program in all of these yards and to the men in charge of building airplanes. There have been inevitable delays in a program so vast—delays in the supply of materials, for instance, caused by bottlenecks. It can best be explained by imagining what would happen if everyone in the city of Boston decided to take the subway at the same time. But tonight I am happy to report that the program is well under way. Designs for ships and planes have been frozen, and both are really in production. It is an answer to the scoffing of Hitler at the unwieldiness and impotency of democracy. Tonight there is one thing that he fears more than anything else, and that is the tremendous production capacity of this virile country. Tonight there is one figure on the world horizon whom he fears more than anyone else. It is the figure of a man chosen by the plain people of this country to lead them during this crisis, a man of indomitable courage, a man of resourcefulness and intellect—who loves freedom—the figure of the great head of the Democratic Party and our Nation, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He is fighting and we are fighting with him to keep this Nation prosperous and at peace. True, we are sending materials, but we are fighting to keep our people out of foreign wars and to keep foreign wars out of our hemisphere, and, with God's help, we shall be successful.

While the Democratic Party, nationally, is riding high because it has the courage and ability to meet tremendous responsibilities, here in Massachusetts we have fallen on lean days. And why. In Massachusetts, the leaders of the Democratic Party, from their earliest beginnings in public life have given encouragement and support to measures and policies designed to promote the greatest good for the greatest number. And so when I look about for a reason, I can best illustrate it by telling a story.

Last night I had the pleasure of dining with the Irish Minister, Mr. Robert Brennan. One of the stories he told which I think is particularly appropriate, was this one: During the Trouble, he was in a jail in England and with him was a doctor who is now one of the most prominent surgeons in Dublin. Each morning, they and other men were marched out in front of the jail and the big English warden would give them always the same monotonous orders, "Extend your line" and regardless of whether or not the line was straight, or crooked, he would continue, "Back on the left, forward on the right" until one day Mr. Brennan turned to his good friend and said, "Doctor, can you explain to me how a wooden-headed people like the English ever got control of Ireland?" The doctor said, "Why, that's very easy. You take twenty Englishmen, put them in a room and if one of them, by the Grace of God, has an idea and the ability to express it, he becomes the leader. There's no competition. On the other hand take twenty Irishmen, put them in a room and each one of them has his own individual, unyielding idea, and the ability to express it." And what competition.

We Democrats in Massachusets are surfeited with talents. Instead of it being a blessing, it has caused discord. Rugged individuals all and sometimes a little selfish. There is room within the Democratic Party of Massachusetts for all groups and all factions and all leaders. We can have our primary contests with free discussion but when the voters of the party have spoken and chosen as candidates, men who will administer the affairs of our State in harmony with the larger ideals of our national administration, let all of us support those candidates unqualifiedly, enthusiastically, and militantly.

I invite, all of you, to make the fight, without bitterness, but with all the enthusiasm you possess, for a return of the government of Massachusetts to the party whose candidates stand for liberalism and progress.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, on April 2, 1941, I explained to the House the provisions of H. R. 3962, which has for its

purpose the establishment of a uniform system of promotion for Reserve officers of the Army. I now understand that the War Department will announce in the immediate future the promotion of all Reserve officers who have served the years in their respective grades required by existing regulations and who possess their certificates of capacity for the next higher grade but have not been promoted because of the lack of a vacancy. A total of 1,424 Reserve officers will be promoted en masse under this policy. No doubt this change in the long-established policy of the Department is intended to stop the rapidly rising interest in my bill. However, these promotions constitute nothing more than an admission that the conditions my bill is designed to eliminate do in fact exist. The new policy is no solution of the problems involved, and every reason previously stated still exists for the adoption of H. R. 3962. I propose to press energetically for the adoption of the bill.

Railway Labor Opposes St. Lawrence Seaway

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on April 15 at Philadelphia, before a group of representative businessmen of eastern Pennsylvana, New Jersey, Maryland, and Delaware, Mr. J. G. Luhrsen, executive secretary, Railway Labor Executive Association, in speaking for 21 railway brotherhoods, said, in part:

The St. Lawrence waterway constitutes a subsidy, pure and simple; no profits will ever accrue to our Nation, and it only means another burdensome and unnecessary tax on our people.

Continuing the discussion, Mr. Luhrsen made the following significant statement:

I was not merely authorized, but instructed on behalf of the Railway Labor Executives Association, of which I am the executive secretary, to oppose the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway project.

According to statistics compiled as of July 1, 1940, there are 1,146,515 railroad employees in the United States, and with the upward trend in business incident to the national-defense program it is expected as a natural sequence that the above number will be increased in an appreciable number by the recall of many furloughed employees.

The St. Lawrence seaway project is a definite threat to the jobs of the railroad men of America, and, as aptly described by Mr. Luhrsen, is a menace not alone to the railroads and their employees but likewise to the coal industry and their miners, with a resultant adverse effect on large and small industry and a detriment to the American farmer.

Mr. Luhrsen's address is as follows:

I am certain that all of us gathered here today have experienced many, many times the truth of the old adage, "Haste makes waste."

In contrast to this, history tells us that Napoleon of Europe declared, "Delay means disaster," and his haste proved his own downfall.

Personally, I prefer to reason with respect to the former adage by reconciling and combining opposite views, because that will prove the best approach for a solution of correctness. Only through diversified opinion is there a chance of fair play to all sides of the truth.

Fifty-two years ago today a prominent writer was born, only a few squares away from Independence Hall in this great city. A little more than 2 years ago this writer had this to say:

"Sometimes the unfolding paradoxes of human ambition, human aspiration, and human ideals have been crystal clear; sometimes they have been befogged by my own sense of inadequacy. Too often the impetuous hand of the daily pen has done injustice; too often the infallible judgments of immaturity have sketched the news not with the objectivity of reasoned impartiality but in the irritable moods of faction or bias."

Those were the words penned by a Philadelphian, David Lawrence. The title of that article was "The Light That Never Fails." If you have not read his recent article The Return of the Exile in the April 11 issue of the United States News, then I suggest that every one of you read that article, because I think it, too, touches the keynote of what is lacking too much in the world today.

Now with that approach to the subject which I have been asked to talk on today, I trust my sincerity of purpose will not be subject to criticism.

I was not merely authorized, but instructed on behalf of the Railway Labor Executives' Association, of which I am the executive secretary, to oppose the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway project.

It is generally a sound policy to rely on the advice and counsel of those of the past who were criticised when in power, but whose works later are lauded and highly praised and whose guiding influences left with the future posterity unshakable structures for our present-day needs. Lincoln said:

"The true rule whether to reject or embrace anything, is not whether it have any evil in it, but whether it have more of evil than of good."

So let us start with the application of that principle to this waterway project. No matter how hard I have tried to find some good in it for us, the answer is always nil. On the contrary, it is simple, in fact, spontaneous to realize the complete overshadowing of evil for us which accompanies this project.

It is inconceivable how the application of the yard-stick of national emergency measures correctly the real definition of those two grave and important words. To be national it must pertain to the Nation as a whole, living under a single independent government. To constitute an emergency, it must represent an unforeseen combination of circumstances which calls for immediate action.

This project will not and cannot benefit the Nation as a whole by reason of its location and will, as the future shall prove, be discriminatory, and therefore cannot be national. It does not constitute an emergency since no immediate action can be obtained since it cannot possibly be completed for a period of 7 or 8 years.

The pseudonym applied to national emergency falls on the weight of a correct definition.

The most important and immediate question for us to decide is whether the manpower and materials necessary for this project shall be utilized for the ever-increasing crisis at hand now, thereby giving greater fortification to our safety and protection today and the immediate tomorrow, or shall we release both men and materials to a project which will be of no value until 8 years hence?

Is there any doubt in any man's mind as to the correct answer? It requires no superwisdom nor even much intelligence to distinguish between the evil and good on that point. Certainly the answer must be, do the first things first, and our President himself has approved, if not coined, that sound phrase.

Much like the League of Nations idea, a real representative vote as between the two nations directly responsible for this project is very much overbalanced in favor of one as against the other, when we contrast the 130,000,000 people of one nation with that of the other with only about 11,000,000. We assume the larger load of the cost yet have only an equal vote as between the 2 nations. We shall pay the larger proportion of taxation even though, according to statistics, we shall make but little use of the transportation facilities as contrasted with other nations having a preponderant larger merchant marine. You must remember that this is not going to be a 4-track waterway through the smaller water channels; someone is going to have to take the siding, someone is going to be held back. If, therefore, we find 6 or 7 foreign vessels to 1 of our own utilizing this waterway, our speed will be impaired just that much when endeavoring to compete with them. No matter how you look at it, the net results will be that we will be the inferior in rights in both directions on a single-track operation.

Not only the railroad employees will lose the rail haul of coal going into Canada, but thousands of miners in the United States will be found idle, not only because of the water haul by boats other than our own, but because of imports of coal not only to Canada but to the United States as well.

During the last World War coal was hauled 3,000 miles across the ocean to this country and the reason therefor appears obvious. In 1919 our balance of exports over imports was a little over $4,000,000,000 and in 1920 it was $2,950,000,000. These boats could not come back to us with goods other than what would serve principally as ballast considering the vast export balances.

If we, therefore, exercise any prudent forethought whatsoever considering what appears inevitable, will not our export balances for years exceed our imports and we shall be flooded with cheap heavy goods and materials serving as ballast and this very waterway will be the means of transportation inland to the very heart of our Nation.

With a Europe in need to supplant untold destruction, rebuilding of everything that has been dynamited, bombed, and shattered, her demand on us must of necessity create a surplus export of billions of dollars in excess of imports, and the foreign boats will not return, as we in the railroad vernacular call "caboose hops" meaning light, but with such heavy commodities as coal, steel, cement, etc., serving principally as ballast and yet destroy our own markets and employment.

We, as employees on the railroads and railroad managements, when making agreements endeavor to anticipate every possible contingency that may arise under these agreements in the future. If any safeguards have been placed in the agreement with respect to the St. Lawrence waterway which assures protection for America in its fullest sense, they have gone unnoticed by me and not because I did not read the provisions of the agreement which I have so far seen. What will happen to the railroad employees? What will happen to business, industry, and

the peoples of this Nation with such grants, or subsidies or whatever admitted advantages it will give such nations as will utilize this waterway? Certainly this is not the time to forget our senses, our domestic interests, and give away the future.

We are already battling among ourselves as to the survival of the fittest with respect to an overabundance of transportation. This administration has repeatedly and quite boldly declared that there is more transportation today than needed. The Interstate Commerce Commission, the House and Senate, and everyone who has any conception of our transportation facilities has agreed that we have too much now.

You realize what it means to have too much of anything? The market goes down, income diminishes, consumption decreases, stabilization goes by the wayside, and everyone suffers, including the Government, which means the Nation as a whole.

We want decentralization one day and then sponsor a project which will centralize. What will happen particularly to our Western, Southwestern, and Southern States far removed from this project? They will be compelled to pay their share of taxes and constant upkeep, yet they not only do not share in any benefits but will have arbitrarily imposed on them all the detriments which will follow. No one should be forced to accept the responsibilities without sharing some of the privileges, if in any event, there ever be any from this project.

Consider seriously the effect of still another competitor, this waterway project. In 1937, if my memory serves me correctly, our total ton-miles were about 589,000,000,000 for all transportation. Divided among the various competitors, the railroad, 390,000,000,000; the Great Lakes, 93,000,000,000; the pipe lines, 45,000,000,000; the highways, 43,000,000,000; inland waterways, 17,000,000,000; electric lines, 697,000,000; and airways, 2,000,000 ton-miles; all except pipe lines eking out a bare existence. There you see your already overly exercised competitive field of transportation. But not satisfied with this overabundance of transportation, still another quite stupendous transportation facility is to be inaugurated to add to the dilemma already existent.

The railroads are our most valuable and outstanding inland defense, and we must see to it that they shall be able to survive for all time in the future. They are the only instrumentality that can handle both weight and size of larger dimensions better than any other means of transportation. When the real emergency confronts us, think of the speed on the St. Lawrence waterway as contrasted with that of the railroads. We were told only recently that what we needed was speed and more speed. The railroads have greater speed today than ever before, and we should utilize them to the fullest extent in preference to a speedy construction of a project that will only speed the capitulation of the railroads so essentially necessary right now as well as in the future.

Government grants and subsidies in one field of transportation are of necessity unfair to such modes of transportation as do not share in such philanthropy. The St. Lawrence waterway constitutes a subsidy pure and simple; no profits will ever accrue to our Nation, and it only means another burdensome and unnecessary tax on our people.

When you subsidize one form of transportation at the expense of another, you are subsidizing one shipper at the expense of another; you are subsidizing one community or section of the country at the expense of another. You cannot continue such an unjust and uneconomic policy without diverting traffic from the taxpaying and self-supporting railroads—the backbone today, as they have been in the past, of our great national transportation system. If this waterway project actually were cheaper transportation and benefited the Nation at large, there would be little complaint. It exists solely through Government bounty, and that will be the case, but even on a much larger scale, with the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway.

Let me give you a few figures and facts as they will affect your great Keystone State, Pennsylvania. No State has more at stake in the rise and fall of railway employment, the distribution of pay rolls, the payment of taxes, and the purchase of railway materials and supplies. As these earnings fluctuate, the economic balance of the Nation fluctuates also.

Practically every State is a purchaser of Pennsylvania products. The railroads spent $172,001,935 in Pennsylvania in 1940 for fuel, materials, and supplies, and $40,176,550 within the State for new equipment. The vast army of railway employees in Pennsylvania—and their number was far in excess of any other State in the country, 118,718 last year—received in the aggregate $217,530,965 in wages; and as for railway taxes, which last year amounted to $405,000,000 throughout the country, were the most for any year in American history, and Pennsylvania also paid its just share. Certainly the railroads are not the "frozen asset" which we would have on our hands for some 5 months of the year if we permitted the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway, the subject of our conference here today.

The proponents differ in their opinion with the opponents to this waterway as to the number of months it will be closed by the winter season. The proponents argue this seaway can be utilized 7 or 8 months or even more during each year. For sake of argument let us grant it; nevertheless, it still leaves a very discriminatory and unfair situation imposed on the railroads. The latter are expected to so equip themselves with facilities of all kinds so that they must be able to handle everything that is offered during the closed season, regardless of how many months each year this waterway is closed. Who pays for this extraordinary or additional equipment which is naturally compelled to lie idle when the St. Lawrence waterway is functioning? Surely not those nations who will use it most and who have yet to pay both principle and interest of the last war.

We may fairly assume that anything produced in the United States will, if this waterway cannot complete such transportation to final destination, be turned over to the United States railroads for the final haul. Logically, we must apply a similar assumption to all commodities produced elsewhere, and foreign nations using this waterway as far inland as possible will divert final rail haul to all western points to Canadian lines to the Pacific coast along our northern boundary.

Canada imported from the State of Pennsylvania last year approximately 2,643,000 tons of anthracite coal. In case of bituminous, the imports from this country are even greater, approximating some 17,000,000 tons annually for the past several years. Much of this will be diverted by the waterway; and when we add to this the displacement in bituminous tonnage due to the hydroelectric developments in the International Rapids section—and the latter is the alleged defense necessity at this time—you can begin to comprehend and visualize the final consequences.

In conclusion, we may summarize that whatever ill effects this waterway will have upon the railroads, their employees, the coal industry, and their miners, it will not differ with respect to both large and small industries, the farmer, and everyone else. Any possible advantages and benefits which may result from the construction of this seaway will be enjoyed by exclusively by foreign interests instead of American interests, notwithstanding that it will be principally American dollars that will be used to finance it and continued American dollars to maintain the upkeep.

The more recent and most unfavorable developments in Europe only the last few days justifies patriotic America to utilize every dollar, all materials, and manpower, for what is self-evident is an immediate and urgent necessity, and strikingly more important than playing with tops and doll houses for either pleasure or use in the distant future.

Federal Reclamation and Water Conservation and Utilization Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK CARLSON, OF KANSAS, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made in support of Federal reclamation and water conservation and utilization programs before the Subcommittee on Appropriations dealing with these problems, Thursday, April 17, 1941:

Mr. Chairman, the future prosperity of a large part of the State of Kansas, and particularly areas like my district that are subject to drought, is dependent upon water conservation. To my mind, that means the control of floodwaters and water run-off that have wrought so much damage in Kansas in years gone by. It means that we must conserve this water for irrigation and the recharging of the water table in our State for our productive lands that do not receive sufficient rainfall.

Nature came to our rescue, at least temporarily, by a fairly adequate rainfall in 1940, but the deficiency of moisture in the subsoil averaging more than 3 inches annually over the last 10 years is going to be difficult to overcome. Some of our experts have predicted that it will take 50 years of normal rainfall to restore the range in some sections of Kansas and Nebraska.

Thousands of acres of land in the western half of our State should be returned to the original native sod. This is going to require a long time and a well-planned program.

It is not with any degree of pleasure that I call your attention to what the drought has done to the stability of Kansas in the last 10 years. Ninety of our 105 counties had a net loss in population, and the exodus of farm families has not ceased. The number of farms in the State decreased by 10,000, and in 1939 the harvested area was 6,500,000 acres less than in 1929. Crop failures in the State increased from 967,000 in 1929 to 5,370,000 acres 10 years later.

The following comparisons are very interesting and taken from the 1940 census material on Kansas statistics dealing with agriculture:

	1930	*1940*
Number of farms	166,042	156,327
Percent tenant operated	42.4	44.9
Average acreage per farm	282	308
Average value per acre	$48.56	$29.51

Similarly, the number of livestock has undergone some interesting changes. The change from horsepower to machine power reduced the number of horses and mules in 1940 to about one-half the number in 1930. Hog numbers in 1940 also were approximately one-half of the number in 1930. The number of chickens decreased about one-third during the 10-year period. Numbers of cattle decreased slightly. Sheep and lamb numbers, on the other hand, showed a large gain in Kansas from 1930 to 1940. The increase in this class of livestock was more than 50 percent.

On the flood-control side, it is estimated that the raging waters of 1935 caused losses of $11,000,000.

If Kansas alone was affected by the drought situation, we might be expected to work out our own salvation, but the country as a whole has directly and indirectly felt its effects. The Federal Treasury, largely as a result of the drought, expended in 7 years $161,578,000 in Kansas through the Work Projects Administration and its predecessor agencies.

From Kansas there went to California from 1930 to 1939, at least 4,892 families who are accounted for and probably many more would be included if a complete check were made. To the Pacific Northwest, there went perhaps as many families as have been checked in California. Other States to the westward have been called upon to absorb Kansans who have been driven from our farms or from the cities and towns that are dependent on agriculture for their support.

Even with improved climatic conditions, the abandonment of farms has not ceased and the migrations westward are continuing. California is receiving from 25 to 30 families a month from Kansas, most of them practically destitute.

There is only one course to pursue that offers a reasonable chance of stabilizing a considerable part of northwestern Kansas, which I have the honor to represent, and that is through water conservation. The Federal reclamation program, including the water-conservation and utility projects which will rehabilitate existing agricultural areas, is the logical instrument for this purpose, and the waters of the Smoky Hill and Republican Rivers are awaiting control and utilization.

The importance of advancing complete studies of these streams is so urgent that I was disappointed when I saw the Budget Bureau had reduced the estimate for investigations from $625,000 to $500,000. It seems to me the Bureau of Reclamation should have at least a million dollars annually to advance its inventory of water resources if we are to make prompt plans to meet conditions that I have described.

Then, I notice there is only $3,500,000 in reimbursable funds provided for water-conservation and utility projects in the Great Plains and other States. Once the Bureau's investigations are well advanced, any such amount as this will be wholly inadequate to rehabilitate areas subject to drought. This would be true even when it is supplemented by extensive contributions of the Work Projects Administration and Civilian Conservation Corps labor. The idea of using this type of labor for permanent constructive work involved in water-conservation and irrigation projects appeals to everybody as a sound and logical development.

The Sixth Congressional District of Kansas is a part of the drainage area for the Missouri River system. The Republican and Smoky Hill are the main tributaries of the Kansas River. They, together with their tributary streams, cover our entire section. We have a large number of available sites for impounding water for irrigation and for general utilization purposes in this area. This particular section of the State is especially adapted for projects that can be constructed under the provisions of the Case-Wheeler Act. At the present time the Bureau of Reclamation is making extended surveys on these projects, and I sincerely hope they will soon be in a position to recommend the construction of some of them to Congress.

It is not necessary for me to impress on this committee also the importance of providing irrigated land for the settlement of migrant families who have fled westward from the Great Plains. The need for speedy completion of reclamation projects under construction for this purpose must be apparent.

The St. Lawrence Seaway and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1941

ARTICLE FROM MARINE PROGRESS

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the April issue of Marine Progress. This organ is a business monthly of the marine industry, one of the oldest trades of our country. If any group in America is conversant with conditions which might warrant the expense of an additional inland waterway to the sea via the St. Lawrence, this is the group. The demand and supply of merchandise for export and import, the demand and supply of ships to carry that merchandise, and the adequacy of present port and terminal facilities is not guesswork with them; they know these facts from the ground up.

Therefore the remarks in this article are important and pertinent to the subject of building the St. Lawrence seaway under the guise of a measure of national defense. Through their experienced eyes this seaway project would be an unnecessary expense as far as shipping is concerned; as a link in our national-defense program, they point out that it would be useless at this time since it will take at least 4 years to complete it, and "a lot can happen in that time." I believe my colleagues will find this article of particular interest.

The article follows:

[From Marine Progress of April 1941]

NATIONAL DEFENSE?

We, the American people, seldom do things by halves. It is axiomatic that when we take up a cause, it is always a case of going all the way.

Today, the overwhelmingly popular theme is national defense. Aside from labor troubles, which we hope will be straightened out pretty soon, nothing is allowed to stand in the way of the defense program. And almost any proposition can get enthusiastic support and endorsement if only the national-defense label can be tagged onto it somewhere.

Please do not misunderstand us. We're for national defense 1,000 percent. We always have been. So far as ships are concerned, we have always advocated a strong, adequate American merchant marine as being as much an instrument for defense as for the transportation of our commerce.

For many years the St. Lawrence seaway proposal has been before the public. First it was advocated as a means of enabling the Midwest farmer to save money in shipping his grain abroad—but it has been shown pretty conclusively that the buyer, and not the grower, of the grain would reap the benefit if, indeed, anyone would profit at all.

Then the proponents of the seaway sought to secure popular approval on the theory that it would be a means of enabling oceangoing ships to penetrate thousands of miles inland, saving the cost of rail or other transportation of goods from the seaboard. But the project still limits the size of ships because of the relatively shallow draft contemplated by the plan, and a seaway that would be closed by ice for 5 months out of every 12 could not help but disrupt other forms of transportation which operate the year around.

And then the St. Lawrence seaway was advanced as a hydroelectric power project, but its value as such has been disputed by able engineers who believe that electricity can be generated just as economically in separate plants more strategically located within our own boundaries.

In 1934, the St. Lawrence Seaway Treaty failed of ratification in the Senate by the necessary two-thirds vote, which was taken in accordance with the procedure required by the Constitution. As a result of that rejection most people thought the proposal was dead, but they have since found out differently.

Now the St. Lawrence seaway plan has again been brought up. On what grounds?

National defense.

Why national defense? Well, if the St. Lawrence River were deep enough and the present locks were wide and long enough, we might build seagoing ships on the Great Lakes. We might even construct battleships—or at any rate, destroyers. Further, the electrical power generated would come in handy in factories making war materials and equipment.

But if work started tomorrow, the immediate project which, by the way, is only the beginning, couldn't be completed in less than 4 years. A lot can happen in that time. If we need electrical power so badly, numerous steam or Diesel plants can be built and placed in operation in less than 1 year.

How much will the St. Lawrence seaway project cost? The immediate project contemplated is in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River. The cost of this is estimated at $255,170,000, but the total eventual estimated cost is placed at more than $500,000,000.

And who is going to pay for it? Canada? Oh, no! The United States!

This time the St. Lawrence seaway proposal doesn't come before the Congress in the form of a treaty, which would, according to the Constitution, require a two-thirds affirmative vote by the Senate. It comes in the form of an agreement negotiated between President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Mackenzie King, of Canada. For some reason, although the agreement closely resembles the previously rejected treaty, it isn't a treaty at all, and can be approved by a majority vote by both Houses of Congress.

Of course, this smacks of subterfuge. It will, if adopted, create a dangerous legislative precedent.

But nothing must be permitted to stand in the way of national defense!

Watch out for a revival of Passamaquoddy and the Florida yacht canal!

Labor and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE SIGN MAGAZINE

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from The Sign on labor and national defense:

(An article taken from the Sign magazine, vol. 20, No. 9, April 1941, entitled "Strife and the Worker—A Discussion of the Labor Situation That May Shock the Reader Out of Many Preconceived Notions on the Subject," by John F. Cronin, S. S.)

There is no serious labor trouble in the United States today.

In 1940 there was a strike of capital more menacing to defense than all the labor strife since the war began in September 1939.

Relatively speaking, there are fewer strikes today than in any comparable period in our history. In fact, man-days lost through strikes in 1940 were less than one-fourth those lost in 1937, and about one-third of those lost in 1939.

Racketeering and communism are not major issues in the labor union of the present day.

These four statements may seem to most readers to be distortions of the truth. Yet they are probably a more accurate picture of actual events in March 1941 than the story often given through the newspapers and the radio. It is likely that a person well informed concerning the entire picture of American industry would find them substantially correct. But even if they are but half true, it follows that the American public has been misled on a vital problem. It has been stirred up to a state of almost hysterical condemnation of labor activity in general and strikes in particular. Such a situation is serious, when national unity is so badly needed. So much depends upon the good will and cooperation of labor that sheer expediency, apart from justice, demands that workers be not embittered by slander and calumny.

To understand the labor front in America, it is necessary to survey the entire picture. It is a fatal mistake to generalize from isolated instances. Thus, for example, it was stated that the strike of capital has set back defense far more than any strikes of labor. This statement, if true, naturally affords an entirely different perspective on the industrial situation. This assertion is true. During 1940 essential defense industries in large numbers refused to expand plants, sublet contracts, train skilled labor, or even to accept Government orders. They staged a sit-down strike until defense bids were given on their terms.

Their first demand was the permitting of a 5-year period of amortization out of current earnings for all new buildings constructed for defense purposes (with plants still remaining property of the manufacturers after the Government had thus paid their full cost). Their second requirement was repeal of the 8-percent-profit limitation on armaments contracts, with the substitution of a mild excess-profits tax in its place. After long delay the Government capitulated and industry released the patriotism so successfully held in check. Then, after a delay of 6 to 9 months or more, the defense program really commenced. Now the industrialist working on defense contracts may be leasing a Government-owned factory. He may have built his own with the Government guaranteeing repayment of his costs in 5 years. This is the "bankable contract"; after 5 years the Government owns the factory and the operator has the option of purchasing it at "fair value." Finally he may have built at his own risk, amortizing costs within 5 years and retaining ownership. The operator chooses the type of contract most advantageous to him. The net result is that the Treasury takes the risks and industry the profits.

Even today hundreds of millions of dollars worth of plants are in partial or total idleness, not because of industrial strife but simply because big firms are unwilling to sublet contracts. Many companies are so gorged with orders that they will not fill them for years, while others with idle capacity do not have a single defense contract. Here is a cause of delay far more menacing than all the strikes of recent months. Regarding such delays, however, there seems to be a conspiracy of silence.

It may be claimed that the strike of capital was justified. It is asserted, for instance, that industry has no right to risk stockholders' money in new investments which may be useless after 5 years. Such claims may well be partial justifications of the sit-down, although informed persons such as the business editor of the New York Times have expressed skepticism on this point.

It is held, often correctly, that businessmen today are showing a spirit of generous cooperation with government. In the present context, however, arguments for or against the situation are beside the point. What is important is that Americans, who hear incessant reports of minor delays caused by scattered strikes, knew little or nothing of this major delay. Columnists grow indignant over the closing of a single plant, but they remained silent over the blocking of appropriations for a vital dam and the consequent impeding of a necessary aluminum expansion project. (Even the plea of Mr. Stettinius for immediate passage of this bill did not prevent a delay inspired by certain business interests.) When capital obstructs defense, excuses are offered, and heard. But when labor obstructs defense, its repression is demanded.

One further instance of our double standard may be cited. The following statement represents the testimony, under oath and thoroughly corroborated, given recently against one of the largest companies in the United States. There is not the slightest doubt that it represents the organized policy of this firm (the Supreme Court has unanimously upheld a ruling against this corporation, yet practically nothing about it has appeared in the newspapers.

"The company organized a strong-arm squad designed, as F— P—, its leader stated, 'to put the fear of God' not only in any union outsider who might appear in ———, but also in any employee with a sympathetic attitude toward a union of ——— workers. * * * They were supplied with blackjacks which were manufactured in the plant; later, as their work progressed, they acquired whips, lengths of hose, and similar weapons. They were stationed at different vantage points throughout the city; were given free use of company cars; and were afforded free access to the plant at all hours."

The writer has seen certified photographs of one man murdered by mistake by this group (they wanted his brother) and of another who was tarred, feathered, his eye gouged out, and left to die (this was also a mistake; he was a union organizer, but in another type of industry). Our picture magazines, which did not find the cremation of Trotsky too ghoulish, found no place for these illustrations.

The conditions here described are not presented in any attempt to show that labor is always right and its employers are always a group of exploiters. It is admittedly a partial and one-sided portrait. But the silence of our press on these matters does reveal its leanings and its biased and partisan treatment of labor relations. This condemantion is written advisedly and with full deliberation. From the average newspaper today one cannot obtain a correct picture of the labor scene. In general, it portrays the faults of labor and the virtues of capital. It is definitely class conscious, probably not through any overt pressure of advertisers, but rather as a result of the superior power of one group to present its side of the case.

One-sided reporting of necessity foments class struggle and class hatred. It divides a nation at a time when it can least afford division. Capital and labor can get along splendidly once it is acknowledged that an overwhelming majority in each group are decent, God-fearing Americans. But before such a mentality can prevail, the public in general must realize that the story of labor strife which they have been hearing in recent months is certainly not the full truth, and many times not even partially true.

Given an open mind, the labor problem is not insoluble. Unquestionably, labor strikes hold up the defense program, but not half as much as they did in 1917, nor any more than they do in England, which is actually at war. Industrial accidents are at least four times as great an obstacle, and sickness among workers over eight times as great. But, nevertheless, they do impede defense, just as the strike of capital impeded defense. Since in the case of industry, excuses were found to justify its action, it may be that the same may be done for labor. For example, unless we hold that the end justifies the means, we may not maintain that protests, even against injustice and exploitation, are not to be tolerated in defense industries. With this in mind, it may be well to inquire into some of the causes of recent strikes.

Some strikes are caused by disputes between unions, either A. F. of L. versus C. I. O., or jurisdictional strife within one of these organizations. The public has little sympathy for walkouts of this type. Yet, supposing that this position were conceded to be completely right and all such strikes were condemned, then one would indict considerably less than 5 percent of the workers on strike at any given time. If another source of public irritation, the demand for the closed shop, were added to this list, the total of both would be about one-tenth of the workers engaged in industrial disputes. Practically all other disputes concern wages, hours, working conditions, or the formation of unions to correct injustices or inequalities in the factors just mentioned. Nearly 90 percent of labor disputes concern objectives which, everybody concedes, may be legitimate.

What if such strikes hold up defense? The answer is: Remove the conditions which provoked them. When a country is invaded in the modern manner, by undeclared war, it may declare war against the aggressor. Is it to be blamed for the strife which follows? Clearly, the responsibility lies with the invader. Likewise in many modern industrial disputes, the blame really lies at the sources of the trouble, that is, poor wages, insufferable working conditions, or violent campaigns against the God-given right of workers to organize for their own betterment. Costs of living have risen sharply in many areas, while industrial profits have reached staggering totals. (One giant corporation reported net profits of almost two hundred millions; its total wage bill was four hundred millions—several hundred thousand workers

receiving only slightly more for their year's labor than a few thousand stockholders for their ownership.) In other cases, the source of irritation may be of longer duration, but effective action against it is possible only in times of business activity and relative labor shortage. It is axiomatic that labor makes its gains during periods of prosperity. Here is labor's only chance to achieve justice.

It is often said that the same results could be obtained by arbitration or other means similar to those used in a court of justice. But the experience of all Europe, Australia, and New Zealand where some form of this method has been in practice for decades, shows its limitations. In general it has been found successful in disputes over rights, such as difficulties about the interpretation of a contract or the observance of an agreement. But it has not been successful in disputes over interests, such as claims concerning wages, hours, and working conditions (problems of union recognition did not come before labor courts, since during the twentieth century practically all civilized nations, save our own, recognized in theory and in practice labor's right to organize). In these cases mediation has been more successful, but when it failed the economic pressure of the strike was often invoked. Accordingly, even where arbitration machinery existed, it had at times to be discarded in favor of technique similar to those used in the United States today. Revocation of the right to strike would mean industrial peonage. It would be introducing totalitarianism under the guise of saving democracy.

It is not assumed, of course, that all strikes for wages and the like are morally and economically justified. There can be unjust claims in this field and, in spite of public disfavor, there can be justifiable sympathy, jurisdictional, and closed-shop strikes. Each case must be judged on its merits. What is asserted is that labor is not morally to blame for defense delays when it is using its only available means of defense against injustice, discrimination, and other abuses. Where labor has a real claim, and the employer is recalcitrant, there is no other completely effective method of obtaining results. Mediation is highly desirable, but it presupposes good will on both sides. Arbitration calls for equally fine dispositions and is inherently limited in its application. At times results can be had by publishing the facts and letting public opinion force justice.

In the past, labor's side of the case has not always been put before the public. It would be possible to ask labor to bear with injustice for the sake of the general welfare, but such a request should not be made lightly.

The labor situation is more complex and confusing than is commonly assumed. Facts are not always available to the average citizen. But it is better for such a person to be diffident and uncertain about a problem, than to be cocksure and wrong. Truth comes to those who seek it diligently, not to the casual reader of headlines. In serious matters, deeply affecting national security, it is not unreasonable to ask for a modicum of thought and investigation. The thoughtful citizen today might well consider it his duty to read such a valuable book as R. R. Brooks' When Labor Organizes. He might invest a dollar a year in that moderate publication, Labor, or 50 cents in the National Home Library Foundation's Do You Know Labor?, by James Myers. Both are published in Washington, and they are not the least thoughtful utterances on the question emanating from that city. Finally, he can get many solid pamphlets in the social-action series and other pamphlets jointly published by the National Catholic Welfare Conference (Washington) and the Paulist Press (New York).

A final vexing question in relation to unions arises from the problem of racketeering and communism in these organizations. Racketeering is found in large city unions, often connected with A. F. of L. building trades organizations. Some claim that excessively high initiation fees should be called a form of this evil. Communism is more likely to be found in the C. I. O., mainly in four large unions.

These evils exist, although they affect only a small segment of the labor movement. But the fact they are localized in this manner might lead one to suspect that they spring, not from workers' organizations as such, but rather from special conditions in certain forms of business. Racketeering, for example, is found in sick industries, such as the construction industry. Many times it originates from extra-legal attempts by both employers and labor to enforce what they consider standards of self-preservation, on noncooperative employers, "chiselers." Other times it represents invasion of the labor movement by gangsters whose energies were released from bootlegging by the repeal of prohibition. In still other cases, when either capital or labor employs thugs to protect themselves against the hired "goons" of the other side, the "guards" simply take over both parties and exploit them both. In many cases labor is equally with other members of the community a victim of the racketeer.

Communism is likewise tied up with economic issues. Where communism is strong in a union, one almost invariably finds a prehistory of exploitation and abuses which made the soil fertile for the doctrine of the class struggle. Furthermore, one cannot dismiss lightly the stand taken by the heads of both great groups against these abuses. Murray and Hillman, in the C. I. O., are outspoken opponents of communism, and both are in positions today to enforce their viewpoints. Dubinsky, in the A. F. of L., is equally vigorous in fighting racketeering, and his efforts are bearing fruit. When labor is trying to clean its own house, it is neither charity nor common sense to reward the effort with brickbats.

There is more to be said for labor than is being admitted in our press today. This article attempted to bring out a few of these points. As such it is in a sense partisan and incomplete. Some of labor's blunders, particularly those arising from the tragic cleavage in the labor movement, were not mentioned. It is sincerely hoped that impartial publicity, mediation machinery, and the like will be available to achieve justice without recourse to strikes.

The honest claims of labor will not suffer from the National Mediation Board which is being proposed as this article goes to press. On the contrary, such fact-finding attempts will aid the public to separate the wheat from the chaff. They will prevent all labor from suffering because a Communist-led minority ties up the bus service of the great metropolis, or a blindly selfish group refuses to work with other unionists and delays vital airport construction, or another group defies their national officers and holds up the supply of vanadium products. If we show deserved sympathy to the just claims of labor, then we will be in a better position to warn labor against the few leaders whose allegiance is to foreign powers and who may be expected from now on to use every means to sabotage defense. But blind condemnation of all strikes by one side will lead to an equally blind justification by the other. For this reason discrimination and justice in judging labor disputes is one of the highest forms of patriotism today.

The Tide Has Turned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STRATTON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of April 4, 1941:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of April 4, 1941]

THE TIDE HAS TURNED

The first Tuesday in April saw local elections in St. Louis, a metropolitan city; in Duluth, one of the great ports of the world; in Peoria, the second city of Illinois. All along the line the Republicans won. At the same time they carried the elections in many smaller communities. Quincy, which had been Democratic for 8 years, went Republican. So did Bloomington. Republicans were victors in three judicial elections in Illinois.

The Democrats carried St. Louis last November with 40,000 votes to spare. The Republicans carried the city on Tuesday by as wide a margin.

Duluth had gone Democratic in the last two Presidential elections. Bloomington gave its Republican mayor a majority 15 times as large as he had obtained 4 years ago against the same candidate.

The significance of these Republican victories will not escape any one who is politically astute. They indicate that the people of this country and of the Middle West in particular are aroused. Such overturns do not just happen. Today we have startling proof that the Democrats cannot carry the industrial cities which have been their stronghold in the North for decades and for the last dozen years in particular.

Last November the Democrats promised peace and a majority of the people took the platform and the candidate at their word. Now the people know that the promise was a vote catcher and nothing more. They have seen the country advance closer and closer to the war. They have seen the outbreak of civil disorder. They recognize that the Democratic Party is the party of war abroad and war at home. The people abhor both tendencies. In Tuesday's election the voters seized the first opportunity they have had to express their opinion.

The pendulum is swinging fast. Public opinion at last is recognizing the kinship between the New Deal and communism, between the New Deal and all forms of totalitarianism. The voters are expressing their opinion of an administration whose foreign policy, dictated by Park Avenue pushovers, is colonial groveling and whose domestic policy is industrial anarchy and national bankruptcy.

* * * * * * *

Men and women who have saved something do not want to lose it in an inflation.

The results of these elections have their explanation in the widespread sense that the party now in power in this country has betrayed the Nation with false promises and is leading it swiftly into war, domestic strife, and economic chaos.

We have had our first large referendum since the lease-lend bill was passed. The people have given their answer. They want to save their Republic.

The Other Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE MARITIME FEDERATION OF THE PACIFIC

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is always a good thing to look at all sides of our problems. I present here a letter that gives a side of the picture that the press, radio, and public speakers seem reluctant to give us.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a letter from the secretary of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific. According to the letterhead, this organization represents several thousand persons in several organizations. The organizations are: International Longshoremen's Union of the Pacific Coast; Alaska Fishermen's Union; Alaska Cannery Workers; Marine Cooks and Stewards' Association of the Pacific; Pacific Coast Marine Firemen, Oilers, Watertenders' and Wipers' Association; Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association; American Communications Association; International Association of Machinists; International Brotherhood of Boiler Makers, Welders, Helpers and the Inlandboatmen's Union of the Pacific.

The letter follows:

MARITIME FEDERATION OF THE PACIFIC,
San Francisco, Calif., April 3, 1941.

Representative LEE GEYER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: There are several matters with which we are deeply concerned and which, in our minds, have been magnified particularly since the passing of the lease-lend bill.

We were vigorously opposed to the lease-lend bill because we felt that it was purely and simply a war measure; that it would plunge this country into actual warfare. A majority of the Senators and Congressmen in Washington assured us this fear was groundless, and now we find that the bill is being used for the very purpose we feared when we opposed the bill.

First of all, 2 weeks ago President Roosevelt asked for an appropriation of $7,000,000,000 for national defense, $629,000,000 of which to be used for buying or building ships, vessels, boats, watercraft, supplies, materials, spare parts, and accessories to Britain—$7,000,000,000 more burden upon the backs of American taxpayers; this in spite of the fact that living costs have risen but not wages correspondingly.

We are dubious and reluctant to believe that in order to save democracy we must give "all-out aid to Britain" or that Great Britain vitally needs these ships and vessels in order to carry on her part of the war. Lloyds of London (a world authority on shipping) in their recent report stated that Great Britain at the beginning of the war owned and controlled 8,977 ships with a tonnage of 21,001,925 tons. In addition, when Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and France were overrun, Great Britain secured from these countries additional tonnage amounting to 12,320,685 tons, which makes a total of 33,320,610 tons. This does not include the millions of tons Great Britain has built herself since the war began, nor does it include the million tons she has received from the United States.

We are fully aware that all of this tonnage is not being used to carry on the war but is being used by Great Britain for regular business and the carrying on of strictly commercial and money-making shipping; it is being used in direct competition with American shipowners and taking the jobs of American seamen. For this, the American people have been asked to pay $7,000,000,000.

We have further been informed that under the $7,000,000,000 gift to Britain, 400 ships will be built in America for the British and that shortly, 50 more merchant-marine vessels will be sent to Britain.

Under this program, we are depleting our merchant fleet to such an extent that we cannot transport raw materials needed in our own commerce and national-defense program, at the same time that British shipowners are extending their control over the world's trade routes. This program means the "bread and butter" of our American seamen.

In view of the recent activities of the Army and Navy Departments, we are also concerned over the obvious plans of the Army and Navy to transport enormous numbers of troops outside of the United States. On March 25, Secretary Stimson appointed Col. Theodore H. Dillon as transportation chief of the Army. The Army Transport Service, which Dillon will direct, includes 30 large troop transports and freighters, besides numerous smaller craft. We note that on the same date that Colonel Dillon was appointed, the Army chartered the 24,000-ton steamship *Washington* and that the steamship *Roosevelt* has recently been acquired by the Army which will carry some 1,500 men. We are further informed that the Navy contemplates chartering other large vessels, including the steamship *Manhattan*. The Associated Press on March 11 reported that the Government is gathering "a vast transport fleet that in a national emergency could move more than 250,000 soldiers at one time to any point in the Western Hemisphere or beyond" and stated that the Government had at that date already acquired passenger ships totaling 270,000 tons, with a capacity for 75,000 men.

Are we still naively to believe that the lease-lend bill is not a war measure; that American soldiers will not be sent outside of the United States to fight in a foreign war and that American ships will not be used as convoys to deliver the huge ship orders to Britain? We find nothing to indicate that this is true. We find quite the contrary.

We are told that we must give "all-out aid to Britain" for the cause of democracy. We see no semblance of democracy in Great Britain nor in the countries which she controls where millions of people live in virtual servitude and we see no semblance of democracy in the moves which have been consummated by our own administration during the past few months. We want to maintain and build our democracy, not become part and parcel of the imperialist camp in Europe.

Since the war emergency arose, labor and industry have been asked to sacrifice alike for the cause of national defense and what do we see today? Statistics show that the profits of United States Steel leaped from a $7,000,000 deficit in 1938 to a $102,000,000 profit in 1940. General Motors jumped from profits of $102,000,000 in 1938 to $195,000,000 in 1940. Profits of Bell Aircraft increased by 3,000 per cent in 1940 over 1939. Bethlehem Steel increased 97 percent; Douglas Aircraft, 275 percent; General Cable, 235 percent; General Steel Casting, 19,560 percent; Lehigh Coal & Navigation, 5,700 percent; Vultee Aircraft, 1,370 percent; and so on down through practically every American industry.

We have not forgotten that in the last World War, the number of known millionaires increased from 7,500 before the war to 25,000 after the war, including quite a few billionaires.

We see Members of Congress repeatedly giving lip service to the needs of the merchant marine as a means of securing higher profits for money-making shipbuilders and operators. As the shipbuilding industry reaches boom heights unparalleled even in World War No. 1, congressional floor leaders plead for still higher returns.

On March 17 the House passed H. R. 3252, a bill to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to enter into negotiated contracts rather than open-bid contracts for the construction of merchant ships. The bill guarantees a direct profit of 10 percent aside from profits that can be made on materials and other factors. The premium granted builders of nonmilitary vessels under H. R. 3252 exceeds even the bonus allowed for construction of naval vessels under present law. This bill is plainly part of the drive to throw the open bid out the window. Government practice has always been to award contracts to the low bidder. Competitive bids are being gradually eliminated in all defense agencies.

In speaking on this bill, from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, we notice that Representative DWORSHAK, of Idaho, asked, "Is it not true that all the profits accruing under this bill would redound to the benefit of private individuals and private corporations rather than to the Government, as under provisions involving the Army and Navy construction?" The answer was "Yes."

Along this line we find more and more that the United States Maritime Commission is actively engaged in activities which are a disgrace to the United States Government. In the words of the Temporary National Economic Committee, in speaking of shipping subsidies, "For many years shipping policy has been framed and administered in a way highly lucrative for shipping and shipbuilding interests." This in spite of the fact that several years ago the investigations of Senators NYE and Black strongly urged that a thorough investigation of the United States Maritime Commission's activities be made. This in spite of the fact that for years labor has urged for an investigation.

Are we to unquestioningly accept these huge profits on the part of industry and the close collusion of the United States Maritime Commission with the shipping interests to promote higher profits as sacrifice on the part of industry?

It is ironical when compared to what is and will in the future be expected of labor in the way of "sacrifice." For the past few months labor has continuously been attacked, both in the legislative bodies of Washington, D. C., and in the individual State legislative bodies. Labor has been requested to work longer hours, refrain from striking regardless of what conditions prevail. In many cases even the very fundamentals of labor organization itself have been attacked—the right to collective bargaining and the hiring hall. Various attempts have been made to place the men who sail our merchant marine under the jurisdiction of the shipping commissioners which would virtually wipe our organizations out of existence. Such attempts were made 2 years ago in the Northwest, and we find these same attempts being made today in H. R. 2662, introduced by Congressman

DIRKSEN. In fact, every single effort possible is being made today to put the American seamen and longshoremen back under the conditions which prevailed before the 1934 strike; the shape-up method of hiring which invited discrimination and graft, poor working conditions, dangerous gear, and poor living conditions aboard ships; even the shanghaiing of seagoing men.

The issue is clear cut. Industry's "sacrifice" is a hoax, for who can point to one thing they have actually been asked to sacrifice? Labor, on the other hand, is being asked to "sacrifice" with the very lifeblood of its organizations.

During the past 2 years we have seen the same events which are taking place here happening in Germany and France. We saw labor's rights curtailed, dictator control, civil liberties abandoned, and the living standards of the people lowered from excessive taxes. Such is not democracy—it is the very foundation of fascism and we are opposed to it.

When billions of dollars are appropriated not as a gift to foreign nations but for the welfare of the American people and when the efforts of the administration are directed toward bettering the living conditions and the future of the American people, then we shall have true democracy. We shall have and enjoy true democracy when the democratic rights of the people are upheld by our representatives in Congress. They include—the right to strike, collective bargaining, hiring halls, the right to freedom of the press and speech, and the protection of civil liberties. These are the rights guaranteed to the American people under the Bill of Rights—they are the essence of democracy and we shall fight to preserve them.

Very truly yours,

JAY SAUERS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Forcing a Labor Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MANKATO (MINN.) FREE PRESS

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mankato Free Press:

[From the Mankato (Minn.) Free Press of April 3, 1941]

FORCING A LABOR CRISIS

It should be evident to the most casual observer that a definite decision on the method of controlling industrial disputes in defense industries cannot be postponed much longer. The rush of events in the last few days and the increasing confusion will force a show-down.

Even prejudiced observers must admit that the increase of unnecessary shut-downs and the refusal of the unions to employ the mediation machinery, such as it is, provided by the Government before striking are advancing the day when Congress may take drastic action. What radical labor leaders want, of course, is control of industry by the Government, and it is important to the future of the Nation that this scheme be thwarted. Radical labor leaders believe that with industry in the hands of the politicians, the plunder would be even greater for them.

During the last fortnight no responsible official has repeated the optimistic handouts of a few weeks ago that labor tie-ups are so fractional as to be unimportant. The facts refute such a conclusion.

The new National Mediation Board has been given its first assignments. In four separate cases the regular means of conciliation have failed, and Secretary Perkins has called in the Mediation Board. How effective this agency can be, with power only to recommend, not to order, remains to be seen. In case its suggestions are rejected by either party, it is highly unlikely that its one weapon—publicity—will be sufficiently potent to prevent most lost time.

President Roosevelt is naturally reluctant to declare a national emergency if it can be avoided. But a number of Washington correspondents have dropped hints that the continuance of industrial disputes is pushing him closer and closer to such an expedient. By such action, industry—not the labor leaders who are responsible for the shut-downs—would be the sufferer. But day after day finds production restricted by an epidemic of strikes and the whole defense program dislocated in its most vital joints.

In the meantime Congress does nothing, because its Members, while privately expressing their views of the matter, are afraid of the labor vote.

Should the Mediation Board fail in its efforts, the only alternatives are stern legislative measures or Federal control of industry by Executive edict, under which the guilty would achieve their purpose and the innocent and the Nation be made to surrender.

St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

LETTER FROM PHILIP A. BENSON, PRESIDENT OF DIME SAVINGS BANK, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein a letter addressed to me by the Honorable Philip A. Benson, president of the Dime Savings Bank of Brooklyn, N. Y., a very distinguished and respected member of our community. This letter deals with the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

The letter follows:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *March 31, 1941.*

Hon. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HEFFERNAN: I have given considerable thought to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project, and after thorough study am convinced that it is not only unnecessary but economically unsound. Furthermore, I believe it is particularly injurious to the city of New York.

If we need more electric power, the necessary plant for it can be produced in a very much shorter time and at a fraction of the cost. The project can hardly be called a defense measure, inasmuch as it will take 5 years or longer to complete, and we are confident the war will end long before that.

We do not need the Great Lakes for shipyards. There is plenty of room for them on the seaboard. Because of ice and fog conditions, we could use the waterway only a portion of the year, and it would mean a long journey for American vessels through a foreign country. The use of the waterway to any great extent would reduce the need for shipping and transportation facilities in the port of New York, entailing a tremendous loss to American labor.

The argument recently advanced that development of the power projects on the St. Lawrence would bring industrial activity to the northern part of the State is fallacious. In the first place, there is plenty of power there, or it can easily be developed or created there for present and prospective industry, and why should New York favor a visionary idea that is bound to hurt the interests of the people of its greatest city?

I appeal to you as a Representative of this State in Congress to do all you can to oppose the measure and prevent its enactment.

Sincerely yours,

P. A. BENSON.

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE OPTIMIST CLUB OF HIGHLAND PARK, MICH.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Optimist Club of Highland Park, Mich.:

Whereas the people of Michigan and States adjacent to the Great Lakes possess the natural right to ship agricultural and industrial products from their ports to the markets of America and the world in the most economical manner; and

Whereas a bottleneck of approximately 48 miles in the St. Lawrence River deprives the people of the United States of a direct outlet to the ocean; and

Whereas the deepening of the channel in the St. Lawrence River will enable us to make our full contribution to the needs of our Nation and to participate in the post-war program of world rehabilitation and stabilization; and

Whereas a deep waterway from the heart of our industrial, mineral, and agricultural region is vital to our Nation and a bulwark of strength of our defense; and

Whereas engineering surveys made by our Government have approved the feasibility of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project and forecast a benefit to the entire Nation; and

Whereas President Franklin D. Roosevelt in his message to the seaway conference called the attention of the American people to the importance of completing the St. Lawrence seaway as soon as possible: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Optimist Club of Highland Park, Mich., That we do formally and re-

spectfully request the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation enabling completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway by removing existing barriers; and be it further

Resolved, That a formally attested copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States of America, to the Secretary of State of the United States; to the Senators and Representatives in our National Congress.

Respectfully submitted.

OPTIMIST CLUB OF HIGHLAND PARK, MICH.,
By FLOYD M. BENTON, *President*.
WILLIAM A. DOYLE, Jr., *Secretary*.

Adopted April 10, 1941.

What's Behind the Strikes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW ULM (MINN.) JOURNAL

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Ulm Journal:

[From the New Ulm (Minn.) Journal]

WHAT'S BEHIND THE STRIKES?

Usually strikes occur when the cost of living rises faster than wages. Today, we have the strange experience of strikes when there is an urgent need for defense speed-up and when the wages paid are very high and the cost of living has not risen greatly.

What is the reason for all these strikes?

Radical leadership largely. When the Nation began to rearm, these radical labor leaders saw a golden opportunity. They insisted that none but union members be permitted to work as carpenters building Army barracks. Then they collected large initiation fees and heavy dues. Down at Gary they are picketing the steel plants although there are no strikes there. The pickets insist upon checking each worker to see if they are behind in their dues and to be certain that they pay up.

For a number of years these radical leaders have had much encouragement in Washington. They have been able to get their friends in high positions in the Capitol, and they have wielded an influence far out of proportion to the numbers they represent. Then when the C. I. O. was organized, John L. Lewis tied up with scores of Communist Party organizers because they were hard workers and they understood the technique of mass organization and unionization. They did their job of building up the C. I. O. very well, so well that they almost worked Mr. Lewis clear out of the entire C. I. O. organization. He lost his control over them, and the administration seems unable to manage the wild boys of the labor and political movements.

In the present defense movement the Communists find little in common with the administration's program. They are against going to war and they are not even interested in building American defenses. All they do seem concerned about is getting higher wages, shorter hours, greater initiation fees, and higher dues. Naturally this runs counter to the defense program as well as the pro-war movement.

Naturally, anyone interested in the defense of this country deplores these strikes and efforts to slow up and stop our rearmament program. It it wasn't so tragic at this time we might be tempted to point out that it is useless for the present administration to complain about the color of the child's hair, because, after all, it is their baby. They planned it this way back in the days when they flashed the green signal to the radical and Communist labor leaders.

Plattsburg Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

PLATTSBURG IDEA OF TRAINING CAMPS LAUDED BY GENERAL DRUM

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting excerpts from the text of an address by Lt. Gen. Hugh A. Drum, commanding general of the First Army, before the National Emergency Committee of the Military Training Camps Assocition held in New York City Tuesday, March. 25, 1941:

Twenty-six years ago the founders of the Military Training Camps Association rallied the forces of American democracy in defense of justice and liberty for free men. As individuals, who knew that eternal vigilance was the price of liberty—as citizens, who cherished the system of government by consent of the governed—as patriots, who revered the traditions of an independent nation; these men strengthened the spirit of America and aroused the slumbering forces of the Nation in defense against the threats to our security. * * *

Prior to the outbreak of the World War in 1914, it can be clearly stated that for the greater part our American people were concerned principally with local, national, and international policies looking toward peace, and the promotion of the good things of life. No one wanted war. Few anticipated that war was just over the horizon. And fewer still were insistent upon the initiation of a program looking toward the organization and extension of American national defense.

On May 10, 1913, Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood, then Chief of Staff, suggested to university and college presidents throughout the country the idea of having students from recognized educational institutions volunteer to attend military training camps during the summer of that year. * * *

The President of the United States, in an address to Congress in December 1914, said: "We should encourage such training and make it a means of discipline which our young men will learn to value." This opinion, a clear reference to the success of 1913–14 camps, was an opinion which the President afterward expanded to include his approval of an American system of "universal voluntary training." In 1915 four more camps were held. The largest was at Plattsburg, N. Y., with an attendance of 615; one at San Francisco, Calif.; one at American Lake, Wash.; and a fourth at Ludington, Mich. The idea of military training for civilians was rapidly growing to be an accepted principle throughout the country. By this time, the progress of the war in Europe had gone far beyond the limitations of all those Americans who earnestly hoped to remain isolated from the effects of a European conflict.

It was in May 1915 that the *Lusitania* was torpedoed and sunk with a great loss of American lives. No event could have produced so profound and indignant a resentment throughout the country. If anything had been needed to crystallize the desire or will to act, this incident was the spark which aroused the Nation to serious consideration of the dangers which lay ahead. Two days after the great liner had been submarined a group of patriotic men in New York City telegraphed to the President their earnest desire for prompt and adequate measures to secure the Nation against future violations of American rights. I know that there is more than one member present in this room today who remembers the telegram and whose signature was attached to it. Mr. Grenville Clark, your chairman, was one of the group, and also Colonel Wickersham, now on duty with me at the headquarters of the First Army. Out of this group a small committee of three, consisting of Mr. Grenville Clark, Mr. Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., and Mr. Philip A. Carroll, actively engaged in the preparation of a definite plan looking toward improvement in our national defense. They drew up a plan for the first Plattsburg training camp to be held in August 1915 at Plattsburg Barracks, N. Y. Major General Wood gave his hearty cooperation, and within a few weeks several hundred volunteers had enrolled from New York City alone. The complete success of the enterprise was assured. Efforts were made to spread this enthusiasm to other cities. Similar planning committees were formed in Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore. The net result of these developments was that when the first Plattsburg camp opened on August 8, 1915, 1,200 volunteers assembled, representing wide geographical distribution throughout the country.

The Plattsburg movement was under way and its success stimulated the growing enthusiasm throughout the country and crystallized the opinion of all patriotic citizens that, as citizens, Americans were prepared to assume their obligations to defend the Nation. The distinguishing feature of this whole movement was the demand on the part of its sponsors for immediate action and personal voluntary service. * * *

At the beginning, there were no provisions for pay, travel, uniforms, or subsistence. The average expense for an individual was at least $100. The men who attended voluntarily, gave up their vacations or cheerfully interrupted their business and professional activities. These circumstances accounted for the high quality and irrepressible enthusiasm of those who did attend the camps. Their example of personal sacrifice confirmed in the minds of all citizens the sincerity and seriousness of their interests. The vitality of the movement flourished and grew on the sound evidence that these men practiced what they preached.

At the close of the first Plattsburg camp, officially known as the Military Training Camp for Business and Professional Men, your present chairman, Mr. Grenville Clark, introduced a resolution which was accepted by the men who had attended. That resolution was "that the members of this camp hereby form an organization for the purpose of encouraging a system of military training camps thrcughout the Nation, and of assisting to provide a reasonable amount of military training for the citizens of the United

States." With great foresight, he later referred to the Plattsburg idea in these words:

"We well know that a system of reasonable military training can be worked out under our (American) institutions without the slightest danger of militarism or its evil results, and we know that far from being undemocratic, such a system may well be the very salvation of our democracy." How vividly that prophesy rings true today. How completely it expressed the spirit of the small group which fostered the idea of military training throughout the country and through their efforts created the great spirit of citizen-obligation which this Nation knew in the years 1915–1916. As Mr. Clark has stated, the first camp was not conceived only as an emergency measure. It was a genuine national impulse. It was a living thing with substance and power of growth. It represented sound judgment, able foresight and a prevision of the emergencies then pending. It was a clarion call which stimulated throughout the country a prudent readiness to face probable events. All the underlying ideas which gave rise to the creation of the Plattsburg movement were systematically promoted by the Military Training Camps Association.

Out of the first training regiment in December 1915 the plan forming the association was drafted and adopted in January 1916. It was a national organization with the declared purpose "to encourage reasonable military training for the citizens of the United States by promoting a national system of training camps and by such other means as may be advisable."

As a result of these continuous efforts in 1915–16, section 54 of the National Defense Act of 1916 established not only the authorization for the continuance of Plattsburg camps in 1916 but also the system of the great officers' training camps of 1917.

During the winter of 1916–17, the Military Training Camps Association continued its promotion of training camps for 1917. Final plans for the 1917 camps were not completed at the time of our declaration of war, the association, in conjunction with other patriotic societies and in consultation with military and congressional leaders, urged upon the Government the prompt adoption of proposals looking toward the expansion of larger numbers of military training camps and, further, serious consideration for universal military service. At the congressional hearings on December 1916, Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood said about the Plattsburg movement, "Plattsburg was the only thing I ever knew that fused the American people. It was a voice to the slumbering people of the country. * * *"

As the Secretary of War said, in 1917, "Accepting the Plattsburg experiment as the basis and using funds appropriated by Congress for enlargement of the Plattsburg system of training, the (War) Department established a series of training camps on May 15, 1917."

It was in these camps that America produced most of the junior line officers for our overseas force during the World War. When we consider today that at the outbreak of the World War our immediate needs for officers numbered some 200,000, a figure equal to the whole number of both officers and enlisted men then in the Army, we see clearly what a profound contribution the Military Training Camps Association made to our national security. * * *

My principal message to you, and through you to those who work with you and who are affected by you is this: Let us recreate in the hearts and minds of all Americans today the vital, overwhelming spirit of civilian obligation which carried us to the top during the war years and is essential to our success in these days of national emergency.

I emphasize with all the force at my command the profound necessity for recreating this deep abiding faith and purpose within our American people. No one knows better than I do how our modern Army needs the machinery of war and all the supplies and material to train for and, if need be, engage in modern combat. I would have you carry to every American in this country my personal conviction that all these material things are useless unless the human factor is prepared and stands ready for service. Back of every gun, standing behind every man in uniform, is the solid reassurance that all Americans are united in spirit and in active support. That has always been the lesson of our American history; that is the lesson which we must learn again today.

Nearly fourscore years ago Abraham Lincoln sought to arouse the spirit of our American people, faced with the realities of war between the States. In December 1862 he said, "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. No personal significance, or insignificance, can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass shall light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the last generation. We shall nobly save, or meanly lose, the last best hope of earth." He could repeat that sentiment to our American people today without changing a syllable.

Today the unpredictable future which lies ahead is as imminent as tomorrow's headline or the next radio bulletin. Time is telescoped, and the pressure of events limits our choice of action. It takes time to think, yet we must be warned that today events move faster than thought. There is a time to endure, and there is the inevitable time when all must suffer. These are the realities which we face. These are the realities which our American people must strengthen themselves to accept. For to all of them we must carry the message that ours is the cause of the right, and they must know that the better cause must be made the stronger.

The enemies of democracy can prevail, not only by physical violence but by mendacity, by corruption, by sowing the seeds of internal dissension, by dislocating economy, and interrupting the peaceful pursuits on which democracy depends. Democracy is not a static or limited principle, either of government or of a way of life. It is a vital and fluid characteristic. It is never attained in full measure. It must be supported, or it dies.

You and your fellows have again a call to reach out to the hearts and minds of our American people and re-create the spirit of obligation which will renew that support to democracy which democracy must have in the present world crisis.

St. Louis Labor Union Adopts a Sensible Plan To Deal With Labor Disputes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

RESOLUTION BY THE CENTRAL TRADES AND LABOR UNION OF ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said on the floor as well as in the press in reference to the serious labor disturbances throughout the United States caused by strikes which have impeded the progress of the national-defense program.

The majority leader, Mr. MCCORMACK, well said:

Labor, as a whole, should not be condemned for the acts of a few.

Of course, I join with all in condemning unnecessary strikes, some of them resulting from unwise action by labor groups and others due to an unreasonable attitude taken by some employers.

The Central Trades and Labor Union of St. Louis and vicinity has taken a lead which I commend to all labor organizations throughout the United States. This outstanding organization which has been in existence over a long period of years affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, believes that the organized-labor movement should stand united for the purpose of trying to prevent strikes in defense industries.

Recently when I was in St. Louis, I talked to Joseph P. Clark, the president of the Central Trades and Labor Union, upon the subject of strikes in defense industries. I am in a position to say that no one regrets some of these unfortunate strikes more than does Mr. Clark and, of course, being president of this union, he had a great deal to do with the passage of a resolution by his organization on April 13.

In this morning's mail I received from W. M. Brandt, the secretary of the Central Trades and Labor Union of St. Louis and vicinity, the resolution which I include as part of my remarks.

The resolution follows:

At the last meeting of this central body, a brief discussion was had on the importance of bringing strikes, especially in defense industries, to an irreducible minimum in this era of great national emergency. It was voted to take up the subject matter at this meeting as a special order.

Your executive board—while meeting to consider a number of other matters referred to it—decided to submit, as a means of facilitating agreement upon a program, the following as a possible basis:

Today this Nation, in which the working people enjoy the highest standard of living in the world, is necessarily engaged in high-speed activity to produce materials with which to fortify our country against the threat of ruthless, inhuman totalitarianism which is rapidly engulfing nations abroad. Continuous, uninterrupted, and maximum production is imperative.

Labor is the largest stockholder in democracy. The record shows that among the first acts of European despots, when they gained power, was to smash the unions, confiscate their funds, and enslave labor. The men and women of toil would be the first and worst sufferers should American democracy fall.

While labor must insist upon its right to strike as a last and final resort, we should exhaust every reasonable process at our command before causing any stoppage of work in an industry related to national defense. Our Central Trades and Labor Union is a voluntary organization and, therefore, cannot command, but merely recommend; the following is recommended:

That any union contemplating a strike in any industry engaged in the production of war materials or indirectly related in a major degree to such production, first confer with the executive board of the Central Trades and Labor Union, for assistance and conciliation in an effort to compose differences between

workers and employer without a strike. Should such intervention and conciliation from the Central Trades and Labor Union executive board fail, said executive board shall promptly apply to the National Defense Mediation Board for conciliation with a view to adjustment of the dispute.

If and when the above extended efforts for peaceful settlement fail, then this central body will aggressively support the aggrieved union in such further steps as are necessary to secure justice. In the absence of unusual circumstances, however, the differences between union and employer should be submitted to arbitration.

Copies of our plan should be submitted to the St. Louis Building Trades Council, Molders Conference Board, Machinists District Council, and all other councils, and also to such other crafts not covered by these councils as are engaged in defense industries, and their cooperation therewith invited.

Unanimously adopted at meeting of Central Trades and Labor Union held April 13, 1941.

National Gallery of Art Dedication Ceremonies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

ADDRESSES BY CHIEF JUSTICE CHARLES E. HUGHES AND PAUL MELLON

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following two brief addresses; the first by Chief Justice Hughes and the second by Mr. Paul Mellon, on the occasion of the dedication of the National Gallery of Art:

REMARKS OF CHIEF JUSTICE HUGHES, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, this treasurehouse, now formally presented to the Nation, is at once a memorial, a symbol, and an opportunity. It is a memorial to an eminent benefactor, whose patriotic ardor and love of art prompted the conception of this plan for public enrichment, now happily brought to fruition. This building, so admirably suited to its purpose in beauty of design and perfection of practical adaptation, does not bear the name of Andrew W. Mellon, as he requested it should not, but it will nonetheless always be a memorial to his public spirit as it is a fitting crown of his public services.

Taking its place as one of the world's great galleries, this palace of art becomes a symbol of the cultural aspirations of the people, increasingly recognized and served at the Nation's Capital. With its facilities for research, its laboratories of experimentation, its collections of masterpieces of art now crowned by this Gallery, Washington attests the high aim of democracy to afford the people the freest scope for all their abilities and thus to encourage them to rise to these realms of endeavor which give to human life its highest dignity.

This building presents a distinct opportunity for those who possess art collections of great importance. Nowhere can they be so admirably housed and exhibited. Mr. Mellon's gift has already prompted other great donations. And we may expect this Gallery to be enriched by many treasures which can here find their best repository, where donors may feel that what they have collected with such loving and absorbing interest will give enjoyment and cultural advantages to millions of their fellow citizens.

This building is a memorial, a symbol, and an invitation.

Mr. Paul Mellon will now make the presentation of the Gallery and Mellon collection on behalf of the trustees of the A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust.

REMARKS OF PAUL MELLON AT THE NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART DEDICATION CEREMONIES

This building, which we are dedicating tonight, is the realization of a plan formed by my father many years ago, soon after he came to Washington as Secretary of the Treasury.

He felt the need of a national gallery in Washington, with a collection of art which might serve as the nucleus of a great national collection. He saw in his imagination a building adequate to contain that future, great collection.

He hoped that the gallery would become a joint enterprise on the part of the Government, on the one hand, and of magnanimous citizens, on the other. That hope is already being realized.

Mr. Kress, with extraordinary generosity and self-denial, has given his important collection of Italian paintings and sculpture, which you see here tonight. We know of other gifts that are coming in the future, such as the great Widener collection.

Some of the most distinguished American painters of our earlier period are already well represented in the gallery which will in time, of course, acquire the greatest available works of our later painters and sculptors, as they become eligible for the permanent collection. Mr. Chester Dale most kindly has loaned a group of splendid examples of American painting, augmenting the present collection.

Through the generosity of Miss Ellen Bullard and three anonymous donors, the Gallery has been given a collection of prints which forms the nucleus of a very important print collection.

In addition, it is expected that this building will contain eventually a library of books and photographs available for students, in order that it may serve more fully the cause of education in art, and become a center of scholarship in this country. For it was my father's hope, and it is ours, that the National Gallery would become not a static but a living institution, growing in usefulness and importance to artists, scholars, and the general public.

It has been a great privilege for all of us, who have been associated in this work, to have had the opportunity of carrying out my father's plan.

To you, Mr. President, we are particularly grateful, as my father was, for all that you have done to make the task easy, both in establishing the gallery and in securing for it the continued support which it must have, if it is to fulfill its highest function.

May I express also our sincere thanks to the Senators and Members of Congress, whose sympathetic support made possible the necessary legislation;

To the Commission of Fine Arts;

To the National Park and Planning Commission;

To the late John Russell Pope, the distinguished architect, and to his associates, Mr. Otto R. Eggers and Mr. Daniel P. Higgins, who have ably carried on the architectural work;

To Mr. Percy S. Vermilya, president of Vermilya-Brown & Co., and his associates, the general contractors;

And to the thousands of craftsmen who contributed their skill to the erection of this building;

And finally to the staff of the gallery, which has labored with untiring devotion to bring into this building the beauty and harmony of arrangement and decoration which you see all about you.

This building is the product of many minds, intent on giving America their best; and we are happy to turn it over to you, Mr. President, with my father's collection, to be dedicated forever to the use and enjoyment of the people of the United States.

The World Digs Up Its Gold, the United States Buys It and Then Hides It in the Ground Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HAROLD M. FLEMING

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, with the United States hiding the world's gold in the Kentucky mountains and stationing heavily armed soldiers over the mounds which conceal it, our citizens are beginning to make a good many sensible inquiries about the whys and wherefores of this procedure.

On April 1 of this year Harold M. Fleming, well-known economist, made some observations on this subject in a radio broadcast carried over the Mutual network. His address was entitled "Profit and Loss" and under the unanimous consent granted me, I submit it for the consideration of this body:

One of the most curious things about this topsy-turvy economic world of ours today is the mountain of gold we're piling up in Kentucky. Last week a Government bureau reported that in 1940 we imported something like $5,000,000,000 of gold; that's more than we ever had until 1934. Two months ago the United States Treasury mailed about $5,000,000,000 from the overcrowded New York vaults to Fort Knox for safe keeping; the postage alone was $1,440,000.

The stuff is buried 40 feet in the ground behind 25 inches of steel armor plate and concrete, with a division of mechanized cavalry near at hand, in a desolate spot approachable only by a single-track railroad through mountain passes and over ravines. A couple of years ago the American Institute of Banking held a convention at Louisville, and about a thousand bankers took the day off for an excursion to Fort Knox—but they weren't allowed so much as a squint at the buried metal on which their whole banking structure is supposed to be based. All they saw was the gleam of sawed-off shotguns.

There are more questions stuck to that pile of gold than there are pegs on a hatrack. First, is the question: why the world digs up its gold and then we bury it; and the second is: what would happen if it disappeared and nobody knew it was gone.

Then there's the question of why we say our money and banking structure is based

on this gold. (Try that question on your favorite economist.) When we say that bank deposits are based on money, we mean that you can get money for them; but money can't be based on gold in that sense, because you can't get gold for your money. Our money-and-credit system is a set-up of golden promises of which nobody is allowed to ask golden fulfilment. We're on the gold standard only in a sort of mythological sense. Gold holds up our credit structure only as old Atlas used to hold up the earth.

There are other curious ideas circulating about money. One is that we aren't on gold but on a "managed standard" of money. "Managed standard" is a contradiction of terms, like "rubber yardstick." A standard is something that stays put, so that other things can be measured by it. To manage it means to jiggle it around. And a few years ago some economists actually did think that by jiggling the price of gold up and down, the Government actually cou'd jiggle the cost of living up and down. Wall Street economists laughed when the administration sat down at the financial piano and tried to play a tune on the cost of living by juggling the price of gold—and they were right—it didn't work. But the idea wasn't really so very much different from the old-fashioned notion handed down by generations of bankers and economists that by holding the price of gold steady you could hold the cost of living steady. That never worked either. England and America, financial man and boy, have tried, since the days of William the Conqueror, to use precious metals as a standard of value, by which to hold the cost of living steady; and the periodic wrecks of that hope are strewn down money history every generation from the Hundred Years' War to Shakespeare, and every 15 or 20 years from Shakespeare down to today.

In the first of those periods, when gold and silver were actual currency, the coinage wore out so fast it had to be reminted about every 35 years and with every reminting the weight of the coins had to be cut to avoid a disastrous deflation. In the last of those periods (which means the whole of capitalist history), while there has been a credit-debt system, about every 15 or 20 years people suddenly came to distrust the golden and silver promises in which business was done, asked to see the color of their money, and socked it away in the old sock—and business came to a disastrous standstill until the panic was over.

There is an idea around that the gold standard functioned pretty well until the last 10 years, but history doesn't bear it out. In only two out of the last eight centuries have people been content to leave it alone. Sir Isaac Newton, the man who watched the apple drop and figured out the law of gravitation, fixed the mint price of gold in England around 1700 and people stood for it until 1931; but those are the only two centuries in English history when people have been willing to let the standard alone. It hasn't had even that good a record in this country. One of the reasons for the American Revolution was the effort of English merchants to impose hard money on the Colonies, and one of the reasons for the writing of the Constitution was a rebellion of farmers up in Massachusetts who objected to a hard-money law passed by Boston. One of the side skirmishes that led to the Civil War was the effort of Alabama and Mississippi planters to set up unsound-paper-money banks; for 19 years after the Civil War the country refused to go back to the gold standard, and got along on greenbacks; 10 years later the silver movement broke out; during the World War we had to suspend gold payments, and 15 years after it was over we suspended them again—and they're still suspended. We never had that much trouble with any other standard of weight or measure.

Last year we imported four and three-fourths billion dollars' worth of gold. That was more in dollar value than the total of all our imports and exports of everything else put together. It was 4 or 5 times the value of all the airplanes we hope to export to England this year, and nearly 100 times the value we'll probably export in cotton.

Most of that gold was "flight capital." It wasn't in payment for American exports. It was sent here for safekeeping from the shadow of the European war. The volume has increased steadily in recent years until last year's flood. But now the flood is abating. Practically all the world's gold reserves have been drained to this country. That goes for Britain, Canada, France, Japan, South America—name any country. Our Federal Reserve Board now reports the gold holdings of the Bank of England, guardian of the gold standard for over a century, at $1—a rather nominal sum. So now there's no more gold to come to this country except the newly mined gold.

Now, many economists think that this is just due to the war, and that after the war we can go back to the old gold standard and that somehow perhaps the gold will be distributed round again. But there's been a great change in the last generation in the world's habits and attitudes toward gold. Economists still talk about gold's having "an appeal to fundamental human instincts," but the fact is that people have lost practically all interest in gold except to talk about it. There's not an industrial country in the whole world today, within the fringes of civilization, in which gold still circulates. And that's not because in the last 10 years every government has banned its circulation. People just got tired of it. They found paper money more convenient. Big bankers tried over and over again to pump gold back into circulation, but people wouldn't use it. It wears away. It burdens the pocket. Large sums in gold are cumbersome. Five-dollar gold pieces roll under the bureau and get shoved in the jitney box in place of a nickel. People dropped the habit of using it, lost interest in it, and only wanted it at Christmas. So far as that mythical "fundamental human instinct" goes, we have had prohibition for the last 10 years, as far as gold coin is concerned, and there hasn't been any repeal movement yet.

Also, the habit of relying on gold as a basis for money or credit has died away. One of the most revolutionary steps taken by Great Britain since the war started came in the first month, when the entire gold reserve behind the British currency was turned over to the exchange equalization fund. There's practically no gold today behind any important currency in the world, and nobody but economists cares. During the last World War every nation took drastic steps to keep its gold at home. During this war every nation that had any gold, except the United States, has seized the chance of getting $35 an ounce for it from us.

And this isn't all. A lot of people have got out of the habit of using gold for its original purpose—for decoration, eye appeal, and appeal to pride of ownership. In the 1920's about half the world's annual gold production used to go into the arts—that is, into the making of rings, statehouse domes, plates, cups, dental work, and so on. Now only about one-twentieth goes into such use. For display purposes people now use costume jewelry, new plastics, and metal alloys, and shiny motor cars. You have to go clear round the world to India to find people still using gold for decoration, and even the East Indians in recent years have been exporting out of their hoards and decorations. This all means that another widespread change in people's everyday habits has been made to the disadvantage of gold. All over the world governments have, as we did, raised the price of gold sharply. The result has been the same as happens whenever the price of anything is artificially lifted. Production has increased; use has decreased. The world used to mine 20,000,000 ounces of gold a year and use 10,000,000. Now it mines 40,000,000 and uses 2,000,000.

It's curious to go over the economists' discussions of recent years about what we should do with our golden mountain. Everything has been suggested, and everything rejected. We can lower our buying price, but that would upset foreign exchange and make it so much the harder for the British to pay something on armaments, because they control most of the world's gold mines. We can raise our price, but the present price is already enough of a magnet to drag gold from all over the world, and raising the price would also upset our Treasury's bookkeeping. Some of the bankers want us to try to force some of it into circulation, but people don't want it, and we'd be lucky if half a billion out of the twenty-two billions went into coin use. We can lend it to foreign countries, but that's something like a consistent winner at poker offering to lend indefinitely to the steady losers. We can stop buying, but that, too, would upset foreign exchange and hurt the British, and we can continue to buy—but that's where we came in, to this discussion.

So it looks as though we're stuck with the gold, as the Malay States were stuck with the rubber 15 years ago when they tried to hold up the price, and as Brazil was stuck with her coffee, and began burning it in locomotives. Perhaps at some future time we may be willing, as a Nation and a Government, to take our loss, and perhaps try to encourage the popular use of gold for ornament, by offering it to the jewelers for $10 or $15 an ounce. But it looks as though the problem of how to get our money back on this mountain of noble metal, or noble mountain of metal, is going to turn out, after the war, to be very much like the problem we worried through in the 1920's, of how to collect the war debt. We never did collect it, and we finally had to take the loss.

The real trouble seems to be that gold was never cut out for a good currency except in rough and disorderly times, like the Middle Ages, where its extraordinary hoardability was really a virtue. When capitalism came along, with its credit structure, nobody knew any better than to make the structure of promises a structure of golden promises, and this hoardability of gold became a curse every 15 or 20 years. Few people really wanted to hoard it, but everybody knew that, in a pinch, it couldn't be turned out, like iron or copper, and that society had made a whale of a lot of promises to produce the one thing that couldn't be produced in a pinch. So people figured they better hurry and get their gold before the other fellow asked for his.

And another thing. In the day of doubt they always rushed their gold from the doubtful spots to the safe spots. First it used to go from the weak goldsmiths to the strong; then from the shaky banks to the reliable; then from the uncertain cities to the safe ones; and then from the doubtful countries to the secure. Gold just naturally gravitates, in any times of doubt, from where it's most frantically wanted to where there's already plenty of it.

And the urge to get it out of danger also varies from time to time as well as from place to place. People's interest in it has varied every 15 or 20 years from complete indifference to frantic desire. That's the business cycle. Despite what some economists say, it might have been better if the credit system for the last 300 years had been based on something like iron or copper, more reliable and less hoardable—however bulky—instead of on gold.

And now, so long, folks, and I hope this series of Profit and Loss talks has been profitable to you.

Will We Have Inflation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

ARTICLE BY HARRY SCHERMAN

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks by including an article written by Mr. Harry Scherman, entitled "Will We Have Inflation?" appearing in the Saturday Evening Post of April 12, 1941. The article follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of April 12, 1941]

SHALL WE HAVE INFLATION?

(By Harry Scherman)

The old fable could be altered slightly and provide a good new moral. The little boy was right in the end when he called, "Wolf! Wolf!" Had his elders checked up on him, they might have found he was right all the time, that again and again he did see wolves skirting around in the distance.

The American people are in this position now. "Inflation! Inflation!" has been called many times in the past 8 years. Perhaps the alarmists have been right in seeing packs of wolves venturing ever nearer. The average person has found this hard to check because the alarms have been given in a language few can understand. They have been in economic lingo, one of the most confusing means of communicating ideas used by human beings today.

A good example is at hand. On the last day of 1940 the most responsible monetary officials in the Nation called "wolf" in economic lingo. They were the 6 members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the 12 presidents of the Federal Reserve banks, and 12 members of the Federal Advisory Council. They issued a joint report to Congress—something never before done. The meticulous care with which it was prepared can be imagined. The next day this report appeared, or news of it, in every newspaper in the land. If you read it through—a thousand to one you didn't—were you aware it was saying: "Wolf! Wolf! Inflation is ahead! We must prevent it, and thus-and-so is what should be done". Yet a few days thereafter it was followed by statements of Secretary Morgenthau and Secretary Jones, saying in effect: "Pooh! Pooh! We have heard this before." How can the ordinary man in the street be anything but confused? Yet it is his flocks, his little property, his whole future, which are at stake.

For the ordinary person, it seems to me, this matter of understanding inflation is much like seeing the Gibson Girl in the moon. When you first try, you make out nothing but a blur. Then perhaps you identify the pompadour, the eye, or the uplifted chin; suddenly the whole tilted head is unmistakable. With inflation, too, first you see one thing clearly, then another related to it, and all of a sudden the seemingly impossible happens—you understand, for example, what the Federal Reserve officials were talking about in the statement above referred to.

To begin with, there is at least one easy identification mark in this Gibson Girl head. You know—everybody does—that inflation of the type usually feared involves a highly uncomfortable rise in the prices of practically everything. This rise is erratic and uneven—that is, it does not affect all kinds of goods at the same time—and it takes place over a comparatively short period. As a result, great groups within the population have all the circumstances of their lives thrown askew. Who?

Two immense obvious groups, numbered by the tens of millions, are savings-bank depositors and life-insurance policyholders. The face amount of the debt owed to these two groups—hold your seat!—is in the neighborhood of $144,000,000,000. Assume an inflation that raised the price of everything to an average of double what it now is. Your savings deposits would then buy half of what may be vitally necessary in the emergency you have been fearful of. In the event of your death, the insurance money your widow and children would receive would do just half the job of protection you have figured is advisable.

A third immense group, also now numbered by the tens of millions, are those who have been paying part of their wages and salaries regularly into the Government old-age and unemployment trust funds. No money is held in these funds; as it comes in, every penny is borrowed by the Treasury and spent. The Government merely owes these sums to the millions of old people and wage earners of the Nation. As each one receives his specified share in dollars—as he surely will—should all prices be double what they now are, what he gets in food and living necessities will be just half what it would now be.

In like situation are those—probably again numbering several millions—who are relying for a good part of their income on interest payments from Government and corporation bonds and small mortgages, or on little regular payments from a pension or annuity.

LITTLE PEOPLE ALWAYS PAY

All these are forms of what is called by the economists "long-term debt." The savings-bank deposits, though they can in practice be demanded at any moment, are in actuality long-term debt, because in almost all cases the money lies for a long time undemanded. All long-term creditors are ruinously damaged by the kind of price rise caused by inflation. Thoughtlessly, it is sometimes assumed that it is the rich people who are principally the long-term creditors of the Nation. No fallacy is more socially pernicious. Most of the outstanding long-term debt of the Government is owned by banks, insurance companies, and other fiduciary institutions. Only a minor proportion of the total is owned by individuals. True, those who do own such bonds are likely to be rich. But it is also true that rich people are ordinarily well advised in financial matters. If they want to own debt at all, they shift from long-term to short-term debt when an inflationary rise in prices is seen actually to be imminent. The bonds then gravitate to the only place they can go—largely, the banks and insurance companies. Should we see a great inflationary price rise, it can be said with certainty that the long-term creditors who will be damaged will not be rich people, but principally those who are poor or moderately well off—the creditors of the savings banks, insurance companies, and like institutions.

This, however, is less than half the story of how little people pay through the nose for inflation. If there were a doubled price level, what you could buy with your wage or salary would also, of course, be cut in half, unless your wage or salary itself were doubled. Measure the chance of that happening in your particular situation, whatever it may be. Incomes from wages and salaries always lag—the economic term—in periods of inflation. In some cases it takes long years before the increased wage or salary catches up with the increased cost of living.

It is instructive again to identify the groups that get hurt most in this way. An obvious one is all Government employees. There are now a million of them being paid salaries by the Federal Government alone, and in the States and municipalities several million more—policemen, firemen, teachers, court attendants, clerks, etc. It is most realistic to think of these as millions of little families, not individuals.

Millions of office workers—predominantly young women—are in pretty much the same boat; also the millions of clerks and other employees in our countless retail stores. And the great army of unskilled workers of the Nation straggle along with them way in the rear of the cost of living. Professional people are no better off—doctors, dentists, lawyers, either cannot increase their charges quickly or if they do their business declines. Necessarily their income must lag along with that of the tens of millions of others who, in the main, pay for their services.

The wages of union labor lag also—merely to a lesser degree. While some industries can adjust their selling prices immediately to increased costs, most cannot. As an example, take railroads and public utilities, where rates are fixed by law. How can doubled wages be paid, in the supposed case of a doubled price rise, until the income of such enterprises is adequately increased by a Nation-wide change in the legally fixed rates? That takes time—and fight. Again, take those thousands of enterprises which sell branded goods to consumers at a fixed price. It is not so easy, after accustoming women, particularly, to a fixed price for a branded line of goods, to raise that price substantially. The salaries and wages paid by such enterprises—and they are legion—necessarily lag. Agitation and strikes can speed them up, true, but never so fast as the price rise itself.

What this all spells out in general terms is plain: This speedy and uneven rise in prices caused by inflation necessitates a complete readjustment of all business activities in the Nation to one another. Let's overlook the political and social troubles inevitable with such a quick compulsory readjustment. Looking only at the personal consequences, it will be seen that it is the tens of millions of little people who almost necessarily must be the principal sufferers.

WHAT IS INFLATION?

This comparatively speedy, uneven, ruinous price rise is itself popularly referred to as "the inflation." One will see the Gibson girl in this moon better by identifying it as the mere necessary consequence of inflation. As the word is used by most economists, it means a quite definite condition of affairs—a money supply in the Nation that is being more and more fully used by the people and that is increasing fast—faster than the goods and property that are already on the market to be sold or that are being currently produced. It is in this single sense, stripping it of the many loose popular associations it has acquired, that the word "inflation" is used in this article.

"Money supply" is economic lingo. What is the money supply of a nation? You have, of course, some of it in your pocket or handbag—dollar bills and coins. Add what you own to what is in the momentary possession of all our 130,000,000 citizens, add further what is in the banks and in the cash drawers of all the business firms of the country, and you have just a portion of our total money supply. This part of it is usually called money in circulation. At the moment of this writing it totals close to $9,000,000,000.

Besides the money in your pocket, you say you have money in the bank. That, of course, is nothing but debt owed to you by a bank. When you want to make a substantial payment for goods or for a piece of property, you write out a check—an order to the bank to fulfill its promise to you by paying as you

direct to the person named. But this promise is seldom fulfilled by paying out dollar bills or coins. It usually remains an unfulfilled bank promise, merely a promise of a different bank to a different person. It would be too lengthy a procedure to analyze in detail what happens here—I have done it in previous articles in the Post—but the ultimate situation is this: There was a total of around $50,000,000,000 of these commercial-bank deposits in the Nation, not including the savings-bank deposits, on June 30 last. But there are very few actual dollar bills behind them. For instance, in the 6,339 banks of the Federal Reserve System there were at the end of last year only $789,000,000 cash in their vaults, and no more was needed. More than 90 percent of the buying and selling of the Nation is done by merely transferring bank promises among depositors. This inconceivable total of transferred bank promises is almost 100 percent a bookkeeping affair, ending up, most of it, in the 12 Federal Reserve banks of the Nation.

If one defines money—and it is a good pragmatic definition—as anything that is instantly and commonly accepted in exchange for goods or labor performed, quite plainly our money supply is composed of what is called money in circulation, plus the total of all these bank promises to pay dollars. For this is actually what is used to effectuate the multitudinous transfers of property and labor that go on every day in a society like ours. Sometimes these two items lumped togethed are referred to by the economists as our "circulating media," sometimes as our "currency supply," sometimes as our "money supply." To avoid confusion, it is perhaps necessary to say that throughout this article the last term only is used.

It is highly important—for a reason which will later appear—to understand why savings-bank deposits are not included by the economists as part of this total money supply. Nor, for that matter, are time deposits in the commercial banks ordinarily included. It is because these are in actuality not used in carrying on our daily buying and selling. True, any tiny portion of these savings-bank deposits or time deposits in the commercial banks can very quickly be transformed into a checking deposit if the owner draws out the money, spends it and it then gets deposited in a demand deposit of a commercial bank. For that reason, savings-bank deposits and time deposits in commercial banks are best conceived of as quick potential additions to the total money supply of a nation. But so long as this particular kind of bank promise to pay dollars actually remains unused by the creditors—that is, the depositors—it is ordinarily not included by economists in measuring the size of the money supply at any one time.

HOW MUCH IS MONEY USED?

This matter of the degree to which the money supply of the Nation is used is all-important in understanding inflation. Indeed, if one misses seeing this item in the Gibson girl's head, one can never see the full picture clearly, only tantalizing glimpses of it. Suppose $1,500,000,000 in silver cartwheels were tomorrow added by the Treasury—as they can be—to the Nation's money supply and were all immediately hoarded by foolish people. There should be no more effect upon prices than if there had been no increase at all in the money supply. Yet the figures of money in circulation would show up as being $1,500,000,000 greater than the day before

Put this in a different way. Suppose the Nation had a total money supply—money in circulation plus demand deposits—of $50,000,000,000 and for all the business transactions going on in the country it were used—that is, turned over—40 times a year. Suppose, on the other hand, its total money supply were $100,000,000,000 and this turned over only 20 times a year. The influence of the total money supply on the prices of goods, the economists say, should be about the same in both cases—assuming everything else, particularly the available supply of goods, remained the same.

Thus the "velocity of circulation"—the economic term for this phenomenon—is all-important in understanding inflation. It is particularly important for one reason—governments can do a great deal about the size of the money supply. They can increase or decrease it, in ways we shall see. But in a free society—a free society, mind you!—they are practically powerless to do anything about the degree to which the people as a whole use their money. If a situation arises where governments are obliged to control this element of inflation, they can do it effectually in only two ways—either by taking much more money from the people in taxation, so that they just haven't got it to use, or by forcing the people to lend money to them. This forced-loan system is being used in Germany and Italy to prevent inflation, and it has been proposed in Great Britain by J. Maynard Keynes, but it has not been adopted there.

The velocity with which our money supply is used can be measured reasonably well through our banking system. Endlessly, cash flows into and out of every bank. Also, obviously, banks have a record of every single check drawn, in their so-called "debits to individual accounts." Add these all up, say for a month, divide the enormous sum by the total amount of demand deposits for a month, and you can get the "velocity" with which these checking deposits were used in that month.

With it you get something else, almost the best answer obtainable to the never-ending question, "How's business?" when that question is asked of the Nation as a whole. For, plainly, checks are made out only for goods or property delivered and services performed. The varying speed with which such payments are being made must necessarily be a close reflection of the business activity of all of the people.

PRODUCTION IN WARTIME

Take a look now at the total of goods and property on the market ready to be sold at any moment, and the Gibson Girl's eye, it might be said, begins to gleam. If these purchasable goods keep pace, by increased production, with an increased money supply and an increased use of it as shown by the turnover, nothing untoward may be expected, the economists say, in the realm of prices. Let's not get confused by the highly complicated economic phenomena that may or may not cause such an increase in the production of consumer goods. Let's take something, for purposes of comprehension, that is sure. Such an increased volume of goods purchasable by civilians seldom takes place in times of war or large-scale preparation for war.

At that time, quite obviously, the Government itself is absorbing a steeply increased share of the total of goods being produced. Total production of goods can increase; it usually does. But the share of that total which can be purchased by civilians either remains stationary or may even lessen. But in the meantime, observe, this situation with regard to goods may be faced up against an increased money supply turning over faster. This is almost the classic state of affairs in wartime, and is the reason why wars are invariably asociated with an inflationary rise in prices.

Apply these general principles to our present situation. What has been happening in recent years to our price level, to the size of our money supply and its velocity of circulation, and what's the present situation with regard to consumption goods?

Taking the year 1923 as a base for comparison—using the National Industrial Conference Board index—up to the end of 1940 the price of everything included in the cost of living was still roughly about 15 percent below that year.

WHY HAVE PRICES NOT RISEN?

In the meantime our total money in circulation plus demand deposits has swollen enormously. It is at least $30,000,000,000 greater than in 1923. It is, in fact, 50 percent higher than it ever has been.

Why is it, with this enormously swollen money supply, that there has been no great price rise? The reply of most economists is that it has simply not been used, a fact revealed when you look at the velocity figures. I can give only those having to do with checking deposits, but since 90 percent of our business is done by checks drawn against demand deposits, this will give an excellent picture of the situation.

Using the figures of the Econograph Corporation, which have some advantages over others, in 1923 the checking deposits only—not time deposits—in 101 leading cities of the country turned over 29.6 times a year. In 1940 our then total turned over only 14 times a year, less than half.

The running record is fascinating, for it provides a swiftly moving panorama of the course of business activity of 130,000,000 busy people during these crucial years. Here's the picture:

	Times a year
1923	29.6
1924 down to	29.2
1925 up to	31.5
1926 up to	33.5
1927 up to	36.3
1928 up to	42.9
1929 up to	50.0
1930 down to	35.0
1931 down to	26.0
1932 down to	20.6
1933 incomplete data.	
1934 no uniform basis.	
1935	21.07
1936 down to	21.02
1937 down to	20.5
1938 down to	17.8
1939 down to	16.1
1940 down to	14.3

The record is clear—since 1929, down, down, down to a figure in 1940 which is by far the lowest velocity we have had since the records have been kept.

But suppose now we should have a definite change in this long trend. We saw that this velocity rate is not an independent economic phenomenon. It is a mere reflection of something basic—the total business activity of our 130,000,000 people. Actually, this velocity rate has begun to rise.

Since the latter part of 1940 we have been in a period of greatly increased activity. With the new billions that must be spent for a long period on our armament necessities, the expectation of practically all businessmen and economists is that this will be no short-lived spurt. The Federal Reserve officials, for example, said in their statement: "The volume of physical production is now greater than ever before and * * * is certain to rise to still higher levels."

Put together the various elements of this picture. First, a money supply 50 percent higher than ever before. Second, for the first time since it has been increased, it is turning over faster and faster, with a prolonged improvement in business activity expected. Third, a war condition under which the Government is obliged to absorb a greatly increased proportion of the actual goods produced, with the likelihood that the share available to civilians will either become stationary or at any rate not increase so fast as the other two crucial factors. That is a fair statement of the situation we are now in. It is also, as we saw, a quite exact classic description of a stage fully set for a wartime inflationary rise in prices.

From these keys it is easy to see what was in the minds of the Federal Reserve officials in issuing their momentous report—the dangerous concurrence in full swing of these three factors, coinciding with still another—that the means of still further enormously increasing our money supply are at hand and not easy to control under our present banking and monetary laws.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized, however, that these officials were not alarmists in their warning. They did not say: "Inflation is inevitable," or even likely. On the contrary, they pointed out most specifically what could be done to drive away the wolves they saw in the distance. Panicky buyers and sellers, therefore, who are sure an inflation era will soon be upon us, make two unwarranted assumptions: First, that the supply of purchasable consumption goods will not greatly increase even alongside our war efforts; and second, that measures such as the Federal Reserve officials suggested, and others which they hinted at, will not be taken.

HOW THE MONEY SUPPLY SWELLS

The latter is a possibility, surely, since, unfortunately, the entire management of this matter is sadly mixed with politics. But should the administration and Congress fail to take the necessary precautionary measures, they will be assuming a fearful responsibility for the future; and it is hard to see, in the end, how statesmanlike counsel such as that of the Federal Reserve officials will not prevail, particularly with an informed public opinion aroused to make it prevail.

What precise measures did they suggest, and how would they do the job? That can be satisfactorily understood only by seeing how a nation's money supply gets swollen, as ours has been, to its now unprecedented volume.

There are six pipe lines—they might be called—through which added money and checking deposits can be flooded into the reservoir of our total money supply. Every one is necessary to know about to get the full picture.

The first pipe line is through the introduction of new gold into our monetary system. Gold comes to the United States Treasury through the 12 Federal Reserve banks directly or through commercial banks. For each ounce of pure gold it receives, the Treasury gives a Federal Reserve bank $35 in gold certificates. Out in the banking system, the original owner of the gold—whether a foreigner or an American owner—has received a deposit in some bank. That bank promise to pay dollars—created when the gold was handed to the bank, which was its first step on the way to the Treasury hoard—became a portion of our total money supply. Each new ounce of gold that has been added to the Government's great hoard has added $35 in new checking deposits to those already existing in the Nation. The total amount of usable bank deposits created from this source since 1934 has been about $14,000,000,000.

GOLD AND SILVER PIPE LINES

This pipe line can be stopped up—and the Federal Reserve officials advised that it be done—by an ingenious financial device called "sterilizing gold." As new gold comes into the country, this procedure calls for the Treasury to borrow an equivalent sum to pay for it—let's say $1,000,000. If this has been borrowed from an individual and not a commercial bank—an important "if" that must be explained later—it is not represented somewhere in the banking system by a newly created $1,000,000 checking deposit.

To explain why would mean going into the mechanics, which would only be confusing to the average person, unless done at length. But it is a fact that no new additions to the total money supply are created by the procedure, although it does increase the Federal debt by so much.

A second way our money supply has been increased has been through the purchase of silver since 1934. In these years the Government has bought about 2,500,000,000 ounces of silver. Just how has this increased the money supply any more than the purchase of wheat and cotton and other agricultural products? The Government is always the owner of bank promises to pay dollars, just as you are. Through checks it transferred bank deposits to the former silver owners. This was part of the Nation's money supply and remained a part of it. It was simply now at the disposal of the silver sellers. If the Government had then held the silver unused—just as it holds the millions of bushels of wheat and bales of cotton—there would have been no increase in the existing money supply in the Nation. But it doesn't do this. What it does is to issue silver certificates—dollar bills, of which you will find some in your pocket—against the silver it buys. It has issued some $1,900,000,000 of this paper money since 1934, and is in a position, under our present monetary laws, to issue about $1,500,000,000 more on the silver profit it has gained.

The Federal Reserve officials advised that this second pipe line to a great extent, though not wholly, be choked up in this crisis. They recommended that no more paper money be issued against silver bought from foreigners, and most of the silver bought since 1934 has come from foreign sources, not domestic. Equally important, they recommended that the power of the Treasury to issue silver certificates, paper dollars, against the profit the Government makes on its purchased silver—the co-called seigniorage—be rescinded by Congress.

The President's personal power to devalue the gold dollar nine points further than was done in 1934 is a third big pipe line through which our money supply could be increased—to a degree few people appreciate.

That power allows Mr. Roosevelt to decree that our gold dollar, instead of being 13 71 grains of pure gold, shall be 11.61 grains of gold, roughly. The Government owns $22,000,000,000 worth of gold. If the President utilized this power, overnight that hoard would be said by law to be $26,000,000,000, roughly. There would thus be a so-called profit, of $4,000,000,000. Against this profit, without increasing its holding of gold one ounce, the Treasury could issue $4,000,000,000 of gold certificates to the 12 Federal Reserve banks, establishing that amount of bank deposits there. It could then issue checks against these new deposits, in daily payment for the supplies it is receiving, and soon the total bank deposits of the Nation, used every day by businessmen, would be $4,000,000,000 more than they were before.

The Federal Reserve officials recommended that this power of the President to devalue which expires June 30, 1941, be allowed to lapse; and there are even better reasons for doing this—as we shall see—than to stop the possible enormous increase in our money supply from this source.

WHY NOT PRINT MORE MONEY?

A fourth way to increase our money supply is by outright printing of dollar bills. As the Government needs goods, and the labor of its 1,000,000 employees to carry on its functions, why bother citizens to pay for them? Why take away our precious money and bank deposits through taxation? Why not simply print the needed number of dollars yearly, and pay all bills and all salaries with them? There are at present—and have always been—advocates of this simple-minded procedure in the Congress of the United States. What is more, amazingly there is a law on our statute books, passed in 1933, giving the Treasury the power to issue $3,000,000,000 of such printing-press money.

It is this printing of new money in ever-increasing floods that is popularly associated with a runaway inflation. The canny Lenin used it at the beginning of the Russian revolution, with the object—as he put it—of having "money commit suicide." That is, an all-out deliberate currency inflation was one of Lenin's principal reliances in bringing about revolution in Russia. A great flood of paper money was also, as everybody knows, the distinguishing feature of the great German inflation of the twenties. There is no space here to examine—for those who are not aware of them—the theoretic monetary fallacies at the root of such proposals. For our particular purposes of comprehension here, it is apparent that this is certainly one easy way to increase our money supply. The Federal Reserve officials recommended that the perilous preparatory step already taken in this direction—the authorization to the Treasury to print $3,000,000,000 in greenbacks—be repealed by Congress.

It is most unlikely that we shall see—without carelessness that is hard to imagine—a paper-money inflation on the German or Russian pattern in this country. But one hears often of a bank-credit inflation. If you have ever been confused by the term, a good deal of its mystery is dispelled when you realize that it merely means an increase in the total checking deposits of the Nation brought about by increased lending on the part of the banks.

There are few things more important for the average citizen to know about than this, but if you examine your own personal experience and tie that up with some facts easily learned about banking procedure, the mystery disappears.

Let's say that by some happy chance you come into possession of $10,000 cash. You take your windfall to the bank and deposit it. The bank has the cash, you have its mere promise to pay dollars, which, however, you can transfer to other people for whatever you want to own. Now don't leave the bank, stick around. A half hour later a businessman comes in and asks the bank president to lend him $8,800 on a promissory note. He's a successful and respected citizen; you know him. The banker says, "What a coincidence! I've just got a new deposit of $10,000 from your friend, Mr. Bilkins, over there. As you know, I'm required by law in this particular town to keep 12 percent of that as a reserve, but I am allowed to lend eighty-eight hundred dollars of it to you, and I'm happy to." He then writes "$8,800" in the businessman's passbook, just as half an hour before he had written "$10,000" in yours.

Something hits you! The banker said—you heard him—that he could lend 88 percent of any new deposit. Would that not be true of another bank? Suppose the businessman pays a bill of $8,800 to another businessman in your town. He deposits the check in his bank. That bank then has a new deposit of $8,800 with which it can lend $7,744—88 percent—to a second borrower. This process plainly can go on, from bank to bank, until your original $10,000 bank deposit has been multiplied into, roughly, $66,000 of bank deposits—if the average reserve requirements are 15 percent.

The upshot is this, as you cogitate about it—the lending by one bank increases the deposits of another. And these recurring increases in total bank deposits, by means of lending, can potentially go on through the entire banking system until the average reserve requirements puts an end to the pyramiding.

BANK-CREDIT INFLATION

The average reserve requirement of our 6,339 member banks of the Federal Reserve System is now 15 percent. They have excess reserves—which are best understood as the sums they are free by law to lend or invest—of roughly $7,000,000,000. By the process described above—the lending of one bank increasing the deposits of another—these

excess reserves could be transformed, should lending and investment opportunities arise, into about $47,000,000,000 more checking deposits than we now have.

This would constitute bank-credit inflation—the term you hear so often. This fifth way of magnifying our money supply the Federal Reserve officials also recommended be blocked. They proposed, first, to increase once again the legal reserve requirements—this has already been done several times—and to give the Board power, if this should later prove necessary, to double these then increased requirements. Their idea was to be in a position to wipe out these excess reserves entirely, if in their discretion they decided there was ever any danger of a vastly increased addition to our money supply from this great pipe line.

Finally, there is a sixth—a crucially important—way of increasing the Nation's total money supply—increased borrowing of the Government from the commercial banks. This is similar—but more pernicious, because hidden—to the issuance of printing-press money.

Possibly you had a momentary twinge of alarm a little way back in reading about the $3,000,000,000 in greenbacks which the Treasury has been empowered to issue but has refrained from. The Treasury has, through this more hidden pipe line, gradually pumped at least $11,000,000,000 into our money supply since the beginning of 1931. This is the increase since 1931 in Government debt owned by the Federal Reserve banks and member banks. It is represented by checking deposits used by all of us, not dollar bills, but it is in not the slightest respect different from $11,000,000,000 of new greenbacks being passed around among us. It is merely not seen and doesn't scare the people—and greenbacks, of course, would.

When a Federal Reserve bank or a commercial bank buys a Government bond, precisely the same thing happens as when the banker, whom you watched, extends bank credit to a businessman. New bank deposits are created in the same way, and the Government proceeds to distribute them for use throughout the country by paying its bills with them.

What's more, the bank-credit currency so created remains permanently in existence so long as some commercial bank somewhere owns the Government securities purchased. This, it should be observed, is different in a crucial respect from bank credit extended to business concerns. The new checking deposits created by the latter automatically go out of existence when the original loan by which they were created is paid by the businessman. Not so with credit extended by the Federal Reserve banks or commercial banks to the Government. The new bank deposits thus created represent a permanent addition to our money supply—just like so many greenbacks flooded into it—so long as they remain owned by the Federal Reserve banks or commercial banks. An extremely vital feature of modern society is necessary to be understood at this point. This flooding of our economy with what one Senator has called "greenback deposit currency" does not occur when the Government borrows from individuals and business houses and institutions other than commercial banks.

WILL INFLATION BE AVERTED?

Buy a $1,000 Government bond yourself, examine carefully what happens, and you will see that this doesn't occur. You get a be-scrolled piece of paper and put it away in a safe place. You give your check for it. But this is an already-existing bank promise to pay dollars, merely being transferred by you to the Government for its use. There has been no addition to the total money supply. Yet the Government gets exactly what it does in the other case, and has given exactly the same thing—a piece of paper promising to pay $1,000 with interest in the future.

The Federal Reserve officials, in their statement, recommended that this sixth huge pipe line into our money supply, too, be stopped up. How? By the procedure just indicated—by selling the enormous new supply of Government bonds and notes, necessary for our war finance, to individuals, firms, and institutions other than commercial banks.

Go back now and survey all those recommendations of the Federal Reserve officials. It will be seen that every single one of them has precisely the same purpose—to block any further additions to our existing money supply, already 50 percent greater than it has ever been. This in the main—although not wholly—is how the economic lingo of this momentous Federal Reserve statement can be translated for the average citizen.

If put into effect, would these proposals avert inflation?

No one can responsibly give a flat "Yes" or "No" answer. For this economic field of what causes great changes in the general price level is far too complex for exact prophecy—particularly when the predictions extend well beyond the immediate future. Nevertheless, a reassuring answer can be given. In the opinion of the informed, judging from all past experience, these purely monetary measures should avert any serious general inflationary rise in prices. Particularly if they were accompanied, as they surely would be, by pressure from the great buying agencies of the Government against price rises, unjustified by increased costs, on the part of large producing groups. Such pressure is already being widely and cautiously exerted.

THE WORST KIND OF INFLATION

Yet this assurance—it should be sharply noted—is for only a comparatively short period. One serious criticism has been leveled against these particular Federal Reserve proposals, that they do not go nearly far enough, that they are merely patching up a battered financial Uncle Sam so that he can stay in the ring without collapsing during the next 2 or 3 crucial years. How about afterward? As a matter of fact, although curiously it seems to have been little noticed, the Federal Reserve officials themselves raised this question in one small guarded paragraph.

In asking this question, tough-minded economists who have less political reason to be tactful are worried about something too often regarded as a sacred cow—the eventual collapse of the Government's credit if the administration's fiscal philosophy is not completely changed.

An inflation caused by such a collapse would be far more serious than one of the type considered so far in this article. The latter envisages a price rise caused by a redundancy of money, being turned over faster, against a supply of goods for consumers limited by wartime necessities. It could be bad enough—as we saw in the beginning of this article—but it could be kept within some bounds, and might at least be expected to go down later. But should the Government's credit ever collapse, the kind of price rise we should see would be, at some time, explosive in character and could conceivably go far beyond a 100-percent increase in the general price level. Moreover, the level might be expected never thereafter to go down, gradually or otherwise.

This is really the type of price rise that is in the minds of most people when they use the word "inflation." The fear can, of course, be traced to not very exact popular knowledge of what happened in Germany, Russia, France, Italy, Austria, and other Central European countries as an aftermath of the last war. It is really a justified distrust of the paper money currently being used among a people. Because of what they come to consider its certain and permanent decrease in purchasing power, people prefer to own goods and property rather than money or long-term debt. Thus, the demand for goods of all kinds increases as the demand for money lessens. This, in a vicious spiral, causes the supply of money itself to increase. For the Government, being unable at such times to borrow as much as is necessary, then is forced to begin to use printing-press money increasingly to pay its bills. In other words, the flood of paper money usually comes as the culminating crisis of this type of inflation. It is neither the beginning nor the cause of the price rise, which is the usual popular conception. The beginning of inflation nowadays is the way we have begun—by a government borrowing from its banks, thus increasing the checking deposits its citizens use. We are now actually about $16,000,000,000 along this road.

The long-visioned economists who want to avert this really dread type of inflation have their eyes on one thing: The fact that the Federal debt is continuing to increase by leaps and bounds, with no end in sight.

The appended qualification is all-important. It is not the size of the Federal debt that is the crux of the matter; it is the never-ending increase of debt. This is so, because that increase, as our survey shows, can take place only by actual additions or potential additions to our money supply, to a final point where that money supply may become so huge that a distrust of the dollar would become justifiable. There is only one protection against a runaway inflation in such an event: Complete control by the central government, such as exists in Germany, of all prices, production, and wages. This would be the end of the free-enterprise system. In other words, if we ever see totalitarianism in the United States, it can be pretty safely predicted that it will come rumbling down this road.

What, more precisely, is the picture of the future these Jeremiahs see? Remember that Jeremiah proved to be right. And what do they propose should be done about it?

Since June 1932 our Federal debt, direct and guaranteed, has increased, roughly, $31,000,000,000, an average of more than $3,600,000,000 a year. This has occurred without war. The rise for this fiscal year, it is estimated, will be $6,000,000,000. Next year, it is estimated, it will be $9,000,000,000. That, however, is merely a sure lower limit. It does not include one vast item—the billions of dollars, which few of us grudge, that the Government must borrow to help Great Britain.

THE ROLE OF FEDERAL DEBT

This takes us actually only 15 months away. Is it reasonable to expect that the Federal debt will stop increasing June 30, 1942? What is magic about that date? Certainly it will not stop if the war is still going strong. Even should it end before then, our military expenditures will continue to be enormous. Assume—and it is not an unfair assumption—that the same fiscal philosophy continues to prevail as during the past 8 years. How, one can hear it being asked even now, can we then dare risk deflation by cutting down too much on Government expenditures? All the political pressure, as heretofore, will be to keep up and not reduce the level of Government spending. While this is happening, how about Government receipts from taxation? Perhaps, in this war boom, we shall go on to even a $90,000,000,000 total national income, far above any we have ever had. But can it be expected we shall long stay at this level of national income, with all the annals of business cycles before us, and particularly the record of depression aftermaths that, soon or late, follow every war? Even if total Government expenditures on armament are radically cut whenever the war ends, tax receipts, soon or late, must also

fall from their high levels of the next few years. In such circumstances the debt can go only in one direction—up.

But where are all these new billions, with no end year after year, to come from—above and beyond the money taken from the people in taxes? The reasoning of those who wish to avert an inflation over the long pull must be followed closely here, if one is to decide how much weight to give to it.

We saw six pipe lines, small and huge, through which new money is pumped into the existing money supply. There is a seventh which in several ways is more important than any of the others. This is the one only guardedly hinted at in the Federal Reserve officials' statement, a hint that only the most informed would detect.

THE SAFETY RESERVOIR

There exists at all times, in every modern nation, what can be conceived of as an enormous reservoir of potential money supply alongside of the actual one. It consists in this country of the past savings of the people that have been invested in the Federal Government's debt, plus the time deposits in commercial banks and savings banks. Directly and indirectly, the American people's savings have been invested in direct and guaranteed Federal Government debt up to a total of at least $26,500,000,000. This represents the portion of the total publicly offered Federal debt which is not owned by the Federal Reserve banks and member banks. In addition, there are time and savings deposits totaling around $26,000,000,000. Thus in this great safety reservoir—as it might be considered—there exists a total potential money supply of around $52,500,000,000. This does not include the past savings of the people invested directly and indirectly in other long-term debt, represented by State and local debt, corporation bonds, and mortgages.

Refer back to that great potential money supply that the Federal Reserve officials are principally concerned about—the $47,000,000,000 that could be created by bank lending to businessmen. This can change from a potentiality to an actuality only gradually, only as new borrowers are found. But here is a larger potential money supply, and one already in existence. How much common sense is there in fearing the one and ignoring the other, particularly when, in the second case, the potential money supply can change into actual money supply not gradually but swiftly, explosively, at that moment when confidence in the Government's future intentions with regard to its debt can be justifiably questioned?

There are immediate and close connections—sluices, they might be considered—between this great ignored reservoir of potential money supply and the existing one daily being used. Think back, and you will recall how the continuous flow between them occurs. When a savings-bank depositor demands cash from his bank, spends it, and the recipient deposits the money in a commercial bank, it becomes a commercial-bank deposit—part of the existing money supply being daily swapped by businessmen for goods. The same thing happens, we saw, when an individual takes a Government bond out of his strongbox—indeed, any bond—and sells it to a commercial bank. He receives for the piece of paper a bank deposit—a bank promise to pay dollars—which at his will he can swap for goods and which remains part of the Nation's total money supply as long as any commercial bank owns the bond.

One of the things the Federal Reserve officials recommended was that every attempt be made to divert the new Government debt that must be created by war necessities into this great safety reservoir. At a minimum, this new Government debt will amount to $15,000,000,000 within the next 15 months; and after that, if there is no change in the Government's fiscal philosophy, billions more, year after year.

But here a burning question is raised by the long-visioned economists, whose views I am here presenting. How much potential money supply can the walls of this great safety reservoir stand before finally there comes a calamitous flood into the actual money supply? More specifically, with ever-new additions yearly, how long will all this privately owned Government debt be held?

Suppose the Government's continued financial excesses, year after year, with no end, finally make one fear justifiable—that there will arise an irresistible political pressure to get rid of this great incubus of national debt, to repudiate at least a good porton of it. This could be done swiftly under present circumstances by writing up the value in paper dollars of the Government's great hoard of gold.

POSSIBILITIES OF DEVALUATION

Under such circumstances, who can be the buyers of this old Government debt which would then flood wholesale upon the market? Only the 12 Federal Reserve banks and the thousands of banks below them, and they would be obliged to buy. For if the value of the Government securities they now own is allowed substantially to drop, all their capital and surplus would be wiped out as a result of the loss. Thus the market value of Government bonds must be "supported"—as the term is—by the Federal Reserve System, and it can be supported only by purchases of them.

But in that case there you are, right back to the situation which the Federal Reserve officials are aiming to avoid. For the banks could absorb this sudden flood of old Government debt only by, in effect, extending new credit to the Government. But we saw that this simply would mean enormously increasing the checking deposits which all of us use every day.

In other words, this great present reservoir of potential money supply, represented by privately owned Government debt and time and savings deposits, would have to be transformed suddenly into actual money supply. There is the danger.

It is helpful to distinguish sharply the role of gold in such a situation. In two articles that appeared in the Post last year, entitled "The Real Danger in Our Gold," I showed that there is only one means which modern governments use to wipe out part or all of their debt—by devaluing their paper money in terms of gold. The main point of these articles was that by its monopolization of the greatest hoard of gold in history, now $22,000,000,000 worth, our own Government was in a historically unique position to benefit by such a program. By calling a gold dollar—which it can do by law overnight—4.5 grains of pure gold instead of 13.71 grains, it can pay off roughly $45,000,000,000 of its debt, and not relinquish an ounce of gold.

But what would happen in such circumstances? The Government could issue $45,000,000,000 of gold certificates against the new "profit" it would acquire. It would deposit these in the 12 Federal Reserve banks. It could then issue checks against this to the bond owners. Its debt would thus practically all be wiped out. But the excess reserves of the banks would then be increased literally by billions, and so, too, the checking deposits we all use as part of our money supply. Thus, surely enough, our Government can wipe out its debt by this means overnight. But it can also, by doing so, insure a runaway inflation overnight.

Here then is the long-term, as distinguished from the short-term, view of what can bring about a really serious inflationary rise in prices. The nub of it is this: The threat of inflation over the long term rests in one fact only—that our Federal debt has increased without a stop for 10 years, is continuing to increase faster than ever, and there is no visible end without a complete about-face in fiscal philosophy.

The economists who in general hold this view believe that specific measures like those suggested by the Federal Reserve officials can be helpful in deferring an inflationary rise in prices over the short term, but in the end they must be futile unless something much more drastic is done. That something is to tax, tax, and tax—and on the other side to cut, cut, and cut expenses, all to one final end: that the debt itself stops rising. This can be done—one responsible group has pointed out, the National Economy League—without impeding even such vast war expenditures as we are now engaged in.

The time to stop this rising debt, they aver, is now; not that future Micawber date which for 8 years the administration has set, "When we are able to." The Nation will never be able to meet its expenses in full, they say, until one date—when it decides to. Anyone who is inclined to consider this position the mere habitual plaint of die-hard Budget balancers owes it to himself to read attentively the document analyzed all through this article. Certainly our present Federal Reserve officials cannot be accused of being antiadministration. They say: "There cannot be any question [note the positiveness of this] that whenever the country approaches a condition of full utilization of its economic capacity, with appropriate consideration of both employment and production, the Budget should be balanced." But prior to that they also say: "The volume of physical production is now greater than ever before and * * * is certain to rise to still higher levels." Doesn't that mean—and what newspaper reader needs even these experts to tell him?—that we are right now approaching "a condition of full utilization of our economic capacity"? Add two and two. Were these men, or were they not, warning in as guarded a way as they could, politically, that the long uninterrupted rise in the Federal debt must at last stop?

The Gibson Girl in this inflation moon must be now fairly well delineated to anyone who has followed this survey. The ordinary man asks a simple question about inflation: "Are we going to have one in this country?" He can himself give the answer with these keys. But he must be careful to give it both for a short period—of, say, 2 or 3 years—and for a longer period—of, say, 10 or 12 years.

For the short period, the most judicious answer is: "It depends." It depends almost wholly on Congress and the administration. If the purely monetary precautions suggested by the Federal Reserve officials are taken, the answer is probably no inflationary rise in prices. If they are not taken, the answer must be yes, even for the short period, unless the production of goods purchasable by consumers rises greatly, in spite of the increased share of the total production the Government is obliged to take for war needs. No one is in a position to predict whether this latter happy event can or will happen, and certainly, from all past experience, prudence would dictate that we dare not count on its happening. It would almost be pure luck.

THE CRUCIAL ROLE OF GOLD

For the long period, also, the judicious answer must be: "It depends." Here it depends upon whether the rise in the Federal debt is soon seen to be permanently ended. This certainly will avert the more serious type of inflation because it will be clear at that moment, and never before, that eventual repudiation of part or all of the debt—by writing up the value of our gold hoard—will never be resorted to by the Federal Government. If this eventuality need never be feared, our Government's securities—as they always should and always have been in the

past—would remain over the long run the saftest investment for anybody to own. The walls of that great safety reservoir of potential money supply—privately owned Government debt, and time and savings deposits—will never crumble suddenly like those of Jericho.

To avert this dreadest form of inflation it is just as imperative that the Government end its monopolization of gold as that it put an end to the uninterrupted increase of the debt. The two are inseparable as part of the same purpose—that the credit of the Government for all time be put above questioning.

The common notion that Government ownership of gold is necessary to help our farmers and manufacturers meet lower prices in foreign markets is wholly without validity. The Government's monopolized hoard of $22,000,000,000 of gold actually now serves no purpose save one—it enables the Government, by another develuation, to use the resulting "profit" to wipe out part or all of its debt.

This puts the Government in a strange position. It asks us all—and who will refuse?—to lend it money in this true crisis of our history. Yet it retains the means, in a quick crisis and with little notice, to make the Government debt we all own, directly and indirectly, far less valuable and, should it so decide, even worthless.

It must be apparent to any thoughtful citizen that the men responsible for running the Government cannot possibly have in mind any such ultimate purpose of taking advantage of tens of millions of citizens in this way—all the little savings-bank depositors, the life-insurance policyholders, the future beneficiaries of its old-age and unemployment trust funds, the owners of United States savings bonds, and all the wage earners of the Nation.

But since it can have no such purpose of calling $22,000,000,000 of gold $44,000,000,000 or $66,000,000,000, or points between or beyond, and since its monopolization of gold serves no single purpose other than that, why should the administration not demonstrate to the people by action that it does not intend, now or ever, to use its hoarded gold for this purpose? The final bedrock of credit is deeds, not words. Such a valuable demonstration can be given by the administration and Congress in an extremely simple way—by restoring gold to circulation.

This procedure does not merely mean the rather unimportant matter of coining gold and letting anybody own gold coins who wants to. It means something infinitely more vital. It means ending the Government monopoly ownership of gold. It means canceling most of the gold certificates, returning the gold—as the certificates promise—to the 12 Federal Reserve banks and to the cash drawers of the thousands of banks, whenever they want to ask for it. If the Government isn't the owner of the $22,000,000,000 of gold, obviously it can't profit overnight by arbitrarily writing up its value in paper dollars. In short, without owning the gold, it cannot repudiate its debt by means of another devaluation; and that's really the only effectual way it can repudiate its debt.

THE RETURN TO NORMAL

It may be asked, would not gold then be hoarded by some citizens in the hope that later on they will benefit? The answer is that, if the Government never devalues, it is just as senseless for an individual to hoard gold dollars as silver cartwheels or the Federal Reserve notes we all use. No one, foreigner or citizen, can "unjustly enrich" himself at the expense of the American people by hoarding gold dollars, unless the United States Government itself by a further devaluation enriches him. And that is precisely what the Government, in ending its monopoly ownership, will then be demonstrating it will not do.

There would be nothing abnormal about the monetary situation then existing. On the contrary, it would be a return to a historic normal. Never before in our history, before 1933, was all the gold in the Nation owned by the Federal Government. For 144 years prior to that time—through every one of our wars and all our numerous depressions—practically all of the gold in the Nation had been owned by the banks and by the citizens of the Nation, not by the Government.

But would it not be possible at any time for Congress to reenact this law, requiring all gold again to be turned over to the Federal Government? If so, how would a present end to Government monopolization of gold establish that necessary permanent confidence in the long-future intentions of the Government?

The answer is, "Of course, this can happen." But it is by no means the full answer. An entirely different situation would then exist, as compared with 1933, when in a time of panic this historically unique law was passed and when the gold in this country amounted to only $4,000,000,000. The mere proposal of it would be notice to literally tens of millions of little Government creditors, direct and indirect, of what was afoot. It is they who would have to pay the piper. Never before in our history have there been so many millions of them. Never before, also, are they so widely aware—it can be ventured—of the great personal stake they have in keeping the Federal Government from an eventual bankruptcy procedure, which this action would really represent.

It can easily be imagined that later on there may be political pressure to have the Government once again monopolize the ownership of gold preparatory to devaluing the dollar radically. But with the ownership of so much gold, this would actually be a proposal that we should seriously consider a Federal bankruptcy procedure, and politically, except under panic, would not be easy to carry through, and certainly it should not be. There is a good alternative always to be offered for national discussion—that we tax ourselves still more, up to a third or even two-fifths of our national income, if necessary. European governments at war are doing even more, and we have far more leeway than they. In other words, if ever it should be seriously proposed to reenact this law after it had been repealed, this could and should take place only after the kind of Nation-wide, thorough discussion that such a measure as dollar devaluation, involving a national-bankruptcy procedure, should have. In that discussion, the best interests of all groups in the population would be properly considered.

What can an ordinary citizen do about inflation? His normal reaction, in my own opinion, is about as unwise as it can possibly be. He thinks only of protecting his own personal future. His instinct is, as he puts it, to try to "beat inflation." He buys this, he sells that, he hoards the other, intensifying the general price rise by every action he takes, and merely piling up more trouble in the future for himself and everybody else.

For, in that type of inflation caused by distrust of a nation's money, all the historical records show that it is only the nimblest and shrewdest speculators, hopping from the ownership of one thing to another as circumstances change almost daily, who can in the end hope to save themselves from great loss. Both the political and economic changes are so incalculable that, in fact, practically everybody loses. And this is inevitable. For, in the larger sense, an inflation of this type really means that the people as a whole are finally taking their losses as a result of previous fiscal excesses. A great readjustment of the ownership of property is occurring, the final result of which is to determine who are to stand the losses which inexorably must be assumed. And, as we saw, in the end it is always the tens of millions of little people of the Nation who have to stand the greater part of the loss, both as long-term creditors and as wage earners.

Yet there does exist one simple way for the individual to "beat inflation" of this dread type—namely, to help avert it.

If everybody concentrated upon that public objective, instead of worrying about his own little sensitive skin, he would be acting with real intelligence. It is actually the only effectual thing the individual can do to beat inflation caused by distrust of a nation's money. Personal efforts at protection are in almost every case futile in the long run.

What, specifically, can every one of us do?

First, to the limit of our ability, we can each one of us lend all he can to the Federal Government. That will keep our present huge money supply from dangerously rising.

Second, we can every one of us hold on to that debt, relinquishing it only to meet the direst personal emergencies.

Third, as a corollary to this patriotic action we can insist upon a demonstration, on the part of the Federal Government, that it will never repudiate this Government debt we hold by again writing up the value of gold. This demonstration must be by action, not words. It must consist of the restoration of gold to circulation by repeal of the law, passed in 1933, setting up for the first time in our long history the monopolized ownership of gold by the Government.

Fourth, we can demand of our congressional representatives—in order to avoid an inflationary price rise over the short term—that all the carefully considered proposals of the Federal Reserve officials be enacted into law.

Fifth, we can insist upon, and every one of us be ready to bear, greater and greater Federal taxes. This would tend to stop the dangerous continuous increase in the Federal debt, which, as we saw, was the real key to inflation over the long term.

Sixth, as a matter of justice, if we are all willingly paying far more to the Government in taxes, we can insist that every possible cut in nonmilitary expenditures be put into effect at once, and that no political obstacles be allowed henceforth to prevent this.

Seventh, as members of pressure groups—and there are millions of us who are—we must change the direction of our pressure. We must exert it not upon Congress but upon our own misled leaders, demanding that they cease herding the Government blindly along the road to a bankruptcy procedure. Every little portion of pork we get from the Federal Government as a member of a pressure group we shall surely pay back later with usurious interest in the loss we shall sutain in an ultimate inflation. Members of pressure groups are direct and indirect long-term creditors, like almost everybody else, and predominantly belong to the classes who are most hurt by inflation.

IT'S TIME TO BE ADULTS

What this all spells out, quite plainly, is sacrifice on the part of everybody without exception. But it is merely being adult to recognize that for the individual war means nothing but sacrifice. We are in a world era of war and have to stand the gaff, whatever our opinions may be, whether we like it or not, and whether we get into the actual conflict or not.

We can either meet and stand these necessary personal sacrifices with open eyes, paying for them no matter how it hurts, or, misled by politicians who think we cannot be treated as adults, the sacrifices can be ostensibly deferred. Ostensibly! For we, not our children, will pay the great bill for this war era just the same. In that case we will pay it, probably within a decade, by an inflation—with all the ominous disorder that will entail.

There is no out for this, if we do not make up our minds as a really intelligent democracy to pay, to know we are paying, and to be willing to suffer all the inconveniences of paying, as we go along.

Reclamation Possibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. CARL T. CURTIS, OF NEBRASKA

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement made by me today before the Appropriations Committee:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE CARL T. CURTIS, OF NEBRASKA, BEFORE THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON APRIL 17, 1941

Gentlemen, I wish to speak to you briefly concerning the appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation. I am interested in the Case-Wheeler program and the regular reclamation work and investigation activities of the Bureau.

First, in my statement to you last year, I remarked on the value of the North Platte Federal reclamation project to the people of that area, as contrasted to those areas without irrigation which suffered severely from the drought. It will interest you to know that while 77 of the 93 counties in Nebraska showed a decrease in population from 1930 to 1940, Scottsbluff County, which depends on the North Platte project, had a gain of 18.3 percent. Practically every irrigated county, whether in the Great Plains or to the westward, showed an increase in population. In the Great Plains, more than 500 counties out of 650 showed losses in population while to the westward where irrigation and water conservation prevail, only 32 counties out of 309 showed a loss.

Second, it was estimated by competent observers that 350,000 families in the Great Plains were uprooted during the 10-year period, largely due to the drought. About half of these moved westward seeking new opportunities for a livelihood and disrupted the economy of the States to which they fled.

Third, testimony at several hearings, confirmed by subsequent information, indicates that the dislodgment of farm families in the Great Plains is continuing. Farms in Nebraska and Kansas, and perhaps in other States, are being advertised for sale and these uprooted families are generally moving westward.

My attention has just been called to the report of the California border patrol. This report shows that in December 1940 the number of Nebraskans entered California in need of manual employment was twice the total for December of 1939.

Weather Bureau reports, while showing improvement in climatic conditions in some sections of the Great Plains, indicate that the drought has not been broken in some sections of Nebraska and other States.

The uprooting of Great Plains families and their migration westward is peculiarly the problem of the States directly affected, but the unfortunate effects are national in scope. I would call your attention to the relief expenditures by the Federal Government in 7 years of two and one-half billion dollars in the 17 States of the arid and semi-arid region. These expenditures were like putting a barrel under a leak in the roof. So far, other than the limited appropriations that have been given the Bureau of Reclamation and a few other agencies, no constructive steps have been taken toward a permanent solution of the problem. Few of these areas affected by the drought, or to which migrant farm families have fled, offer opportunities for employment in national-defense industries. In fact, those few who will get work in these industries are mostly unskilled, except as farmers, and, when the emergency is over, they will again be a part of the relief problem.

Another phase of national significance is the loss of the buying power that comes from self-sustaining farm families. Well-posted economists advised our committee that for each irrigated farm at least two families were stabilized in nearby towns and cities through the distribution of the farm income. Midwestern, eastern, and southern manufacturers, who are interested in maintaining a home market for their products should take heed.

This committee is aware of the work of the Tolan Committee for the Investigation of the Migration of Destitute Persons. That committee has found that a great portion of the homeless families on our highways today come from the area of the Great Plains States. I wish to refer to some of the findings and recommendations of that committee.

Specifically, the committee which conducted exhaustive hearings in eight cities of the country, recommends anchoring families in their present locations through continuance and extension of the water conservation and utilization program in the Great Plains and elsewhere, and of the supplemental water developments of the Bureau of Reclamation. It also urges return to the land of agricultural migrants now in the West through settlement on reclamation projects now being brought in.

Recognition is accorded the fact that at the present rate of appropriations, the reclamation program can provide for only a small part of the migrant families. The program is, however, singled out as one of the very few constructive methods now being offered for combating conditions that contribute to migrations and to the continuance of the hopeless wanderings of several hundred thousand families in the West.

The report filed on April 4 urges steps—

(1) "To care for potential migrants in agriculture" by the continuance and extension at as rapid a rate as feasible of water conservation and pump irrigation under the Wheeler-Case program, the water facilities program, and the provision of public aid in construction of reclamation projects.

(2) "To care for migrant families—now in the West—who are trying to get a new start, and for whom a return to their point of origin is not a feasible solution" by providing an opportunity to return to independent farming, to the limit of the facilities now available, on reclamation projects now opening up, and through the Farm Security and other aid.

In support of the recommendations, the committee headed by Representative JOHN H. TOLAN of California, quotes copiously from the testimony of Commissioner John C. Page, of the Bureau of Reclamation, at a hearing in Lincoln, Nebr. On the first recommendation, Mr. Page reported that in 10 years, if appropriations are maintained at the current rate, Bureau of Reclamation projects will be able to accomplish these results:

Eighty-five thousand farm families now facing water shortages will be made secure in their present locations, while cities and towns with three times the rural population will be stabilized.

Twenty to twenty-five thousand families remaining in the Great Plains and similar areas, who otherwise would be forced to migrate, will be rehabilitated.

The committee observes that this work of anchoring farm families in their present locations is additional to the reclamation projects' offer of new settlement opportunities. It urges construction of these latter projects "to provide for as many agricultural migrants as possible an opportunity to return to independent farming."

Commissioner Page is again quoted as testifying that if appropriations are continued at present rates for 10 years, the Bureau of Reclamation may be expected to provide 40,000 to 50,000 new farm homes on irrigated lands where settlers will be self-sustaining. From 75,000 to 100,000 additional families will be supported in cities, towns, and villages that will rise or expand in the wake of irrigation developments.

With these few observations, as a Member of Congress from a State that has suffered heavily from drought and lack of water conservation, I urge this committee to go the limit of its judgment with respect to financing the Federal reclamation program. In particular, I address myself to two specific items:

First, the need for adequate funds to permit the Bureau of Reclamation to advance its surveys and investigations. Before we ask that money should be spent, we must know about the engineering and economic feasibility of proposed reclamation developments. There should be a million and a half dollars for investigations.

Second, I urge this committee to give serious consideration to increasing the recommended appropriations of $3,500,000 annually for water conservation and utilization projects in the Great Plains and other established agricultural areas. This amount is too small to advance projects in the Great Plains, let alone those in other States to the westward which are now sharing in its program. I urge six million for the Case-Wheeler program.

I feel that you are well aware of the importance of speedy completion of projects under construction. There are ample reasons for advancing this work. Irrigated land is necessary to settle families now in the West, and supplemental water supplies which may be provided in Colorado, California, and other States are vital to the maintenance of established agricultural communities.

I Am the Cherry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

POEM BY GUY BOGART, BEAUMONT, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following poem by Guy Bogart, of Beaumont, Calif.:

I AM THE CHERRY

I am the Cherry.

My red wealth wings from white petals beneath blue skies—
I am the Spirit of America.

Mine the redeeming red:
Red lips of mother-kiss and red roses of home garden;
Red rim of rainbow arch of promise;
Red mammalial blood linking continents and eons;
Red stripes of Old Glory;
And my rich red greeting—

I am the Cherry.

I am sunlight incarnate,
Wedded to earth elements;
My blood crystal-dropt from heaven's bowl,
Through soil and sap to nectar'd miracle—

I am the Cherry.

For ascetic and epicure
My lure.
I was companion of America's pioneers.
George Washington knew me as a child.
F. D. R. ate of my fruit in youth.
I have come through the ages—across seas and centuries.

I am the Cherry.

I am home in the East;
I rejoice in mid-empire by lakes and rivers titanic;
I am known in the mountains;
I am Queen in the West.

I am the Cherry.

Eat me for contentment;
Eat me for health.
From the heart of the orchard,
From the heat of the oven,
My vitamins greet you.

I am the Cherry.

American am I.
Red is my maturity;
White is my Easter Dawn;
Blue are the skies above me.

I am symbol of freedom—
I am the Cherry.

—*Guy Bogart.*

Importation of Livestock and Agricultural Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

RESOLUTION BY THE KANSAS LEGISLATURE AND TABLE BY THE TARIFF COMMISSION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including House Concurrent Resolution No. 10 approved by the Kansas Legislature on March 14, 1941, in opposition to the purchase or admission to this country of any livestock or agricultural commodities in competition with our own. I am also including a table furnished me by the United States Tariff Commission giving the value of the agricultural imports for 1938, 1939, and 1940.

House Concurrent Resolution 10

Concurrent resolution relating to the importation of livestock and agricultural products from foreign countries into this country

Whereas livestock is the most important branch of our agricultural industry and a decisive factor in national defense, both with respect to adequate sustenance of our people and as a source of income to defray increasing Federal expenditures, and it is highly important that the country's livestock business enjoy whatever degree of prosperity may come from preserving the American market for American producers, a protection to which it is fairly and justly entitled; and

Whereas recent press dispatches from Washington inform that the United States Government proposes to purchase greatly increased supplies of livestock products from countries other than our own; and

Whereas American producers are abundantly able to meet American requirements: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the Senate concurring therein), That we are unalterably opposed to the purchase or admission to this country of any livestock or agricultural commodities from other lands that compete with the crops and livestock produced in the United States, until and unless it is clearly apparent that the American producer is incapable of supplying home needs; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and to the Members of the Kansas congressional delegation in Congress.

Summary of values of United States imports of agricultural products, 1938–40

[Value in thousands of dollars]

Commodity imported	Calendar year		
	1938	1939	1940
Supplementary [1] agricultural products:			
Sugar	130,421	124,649	113,253
Wool, excluding free for carpets	10,046	23,945	53,481
Hides and skins	29,398	46,631	49,532
Dairy products	12,095	14,143	9,082
Oils, seeds, and vegetable oils expressed	93,228	84,123	89,216
Grains, grain products and feeds	11,841	23,923	27,506
Tobacco leaf	34,622	34,595	35,198
Other supplementary	154,994	174,083	165,545
Total supplementary	476,645	526,092	542,811
Total complementary [1]	478,875	591,701	742,535
Grand total imports of all agricultural products	955,520	1,117,793	1,285,346

[1] In the classification of agricultural imports into supplementary and complementary groups, all those similar to agricultural commodities commercially produced in the United States and all others that are interchangeable in use to any significant extent with agricultural commodities commercially produced in the United States are considered supplementary. The remaining agricul tural imports are considered complementary. They consist largely (about 95 percent) of the 8 following commodities: Rubber, coffee, raw silk, cacao beans, bananas, wool for carpets, tea, and spices.

Source: Foreign Crops and Markets Supplements, U. S. Department of Agriculture: 1938 data, pp. 567–579 of supplement dated Apr. 30, 1940; 1939–40 data p. 190 of supplement dated Feb. 12, 1941.

Railmen in War on Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD today a news story from Labor recording the fact that the Railway Labor Executives' Association has endorsed the Geyer-Pepper anti-poll-tax bill and has urged the Members of Congress to sign discharge petition No. 1 to bring the bill to the floor.

The association is the spokesman for 22 railway labor organizations with nearly 3,000,000 members. They are the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Order of Railway Conductors, Order of Railroad Telegraphers, National Organization of Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America; International Longshoremen's Association, National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, American Train Dispatchers' Association, International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers, and Helpers, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Brotherhood of Stationary Firemen and Oilers, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, International Association of Machinists, Sheet Metal Workers International Association, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, and Helpers of America; Order of Sleeping Car Conductors; Brotherhoo dof Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America; Switchmen's Union of America; and the Railway Employees' Department, American Federation of Labor.

Below is the article:

RAILMEN IN WAR ON POLL TAX—CHIEF EXECUTIVES URGE ENACTMENT OF GEYER-PEPPER BILL FREEING FRANCHISE

The Railway Labor Executives' Association, representing all the standard railroad labor organizations, has renewed its endorsement of legislation now pending in Congress wiping out the requirement that voters must pay their poll tax before they can vote for President, Vice President, or Members of the House and Senate.

The legislation is sponsored in the House by Congressman LEE E. GEYER, of California, and in the Senate by Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida.

WILL FREE FRANCHISE

It would not interfere with a State's right to insist on the payment of a poll tax as a requisite for voting for State or local candidate's, but it would make it illegal for election officials to use the poll tax as a means of depriving voters of the privilege of participating in Federal elections.

In an effort to get his bill before the House, Congressman GEYER has prepared a petition discharging the committee from consideration

of the measure. Two hundred and eighteen signatures are required.

In addition to endorsing the Geyer bill, the railroad unions are urging Members of the House to support the petition.

Timetable of Europe's Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, while we are confused today as to whether we are going to convoy or not going to convoy, it would be wise to pause before we reach that slippery path toward complete war.

There are many of us here who are still old-fashioned enough to hark to the admonitions of our founding fathers. We feel that George Washington uttered the deeper truths of history which should guide us in these confusing and grave moments. His words should be carved in the minds and hearts of every Member in this Congress. I quote briefly from that historic address:

> Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, or caprice?

We have been guided by that policy from 1789 to 1917. I am sure the people whom I have the honor to represent in this Congress do not wish to deviate from that American policy.

That the RECORD may be kept straight, I here include a timetable of Europe's wars:

1801 The old German Empire breaks up, and all territory on the left bank of the Rhine is ceded to France.
1802 French aggressions in Holland, Italy, and Switzerland.
1805 England declares war on Spain. France fights Austria.
1806 Napoleon enters Berlin.
1807 Napoleon defeats Russia.
1808 Napoleon invades Spain.
1810 France annexes Holland. Turks driven out of Balkans.
1812 War starts between United States and England.
1812 Napoleon declares war on Russia.
1814 France invaded from all sides. Napoleon to Elba. British seize and burn Washington.
1815 Napoleon leaves Elba, is defeated by British and Germans at Waterloo, then sent to St. Helena for life.
1816 Holland annexes Belgium.
1817 British wars in India.
1822 Greeks and Turks at war. Civil war in Spain.
1823 French Army enters Spain.
1824 British battle for Burma.
1825 Russia wars on Turkey.
1826 Russia invades Persia.
1827 Turks driven from Greece.
1828 Russia overruns Rumania.
1829 England and Austria intervene against Russia.
1830 Revolution in Poland and France. Belgium revolts from Holland.
1831 Prussia and Austria aid Russia against Poland.
1832 Egypt revolts against Turkey.
1838 French bombard Mexican ports. Debt collection, old style.
1839 Britain wars on China.
1846 War between United States and Mexico.
1848 Schleswig-Holstein fights Danish annexation.
1849 Danish-Russian war.
1850 Britain blockades Greece. Prussia and Austria war.
1854 France and England war against Russia.
1856 British war on China and Persia.
1861 Civil War in United States. British blockade runners supply South.
•1864 Germans defeat Danes.
1866 War between several German states. Austria wars on Italy.
1868 Britain invades Abyssinia. Spanish revolution.
•1870 Franco-German War.
1871 Alsace-Lorraine goes to Germany. Back to France in 1918 and back to Germany in 1940.
1874 Spanish civil war.
1876 Balkan wars.
1877 Civil war in Japan. Russia wars on Turks.
1879 British war on Zulus.
1880 Boers and British battle.
1881 France wars on Tunis.
1882 Britain wars on Egypt.
1884 Japan wars on Korea.
1885 Russia wars on Afghanistan.
1887 Balkan wars. Italy wars on Abyssinia.
1894 Japan wars on China.
1895 Belgium seizes Congo State.
1898 Spanish-American War.
1899 Britain wars on Boers.
1900 Boxer war in China. United States returns Boxer indemnities.
1904 Russo-Japanese War.
1910 Japan takes Korea.
1912 Balkan wars.
•1914–18 Russia, France, Britain, Italy, United States, Japan, Rumania, Serbia, Belgium, Greece, Portugal, and Montenegro, 12 nations, battle Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, and Bulgaria.
1917–18 The United States of America participated in the World War.
1920–30 A breathing spell and period of disarmament conferences, which obviously disarmed no nation except the United States. European and Asiatic powers destroy League of Nations ideal.
1931 Japan seizes Manchukuo.
1932–33 Europe repudiates all World War debts to United States ($12,000,000,000).
1934 Italy takes Abyssinia.
1937 Japan develops an "incident" in China.
1938–39 Germany takes Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. Russia invades Poland. France and England declare war on Germany.
•1940 Russia takes part of Finland. Germany seizes Denmark and defeats Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France. Italy joins war against England.
1941–?? Germany and England at war. Russia, Italy, Rumania, and Japan, against Germany in 1914, like the figures of the year, have reversed their positions and are with her in 1941. Bulgaria, Turkey, Greece, and Yugoslavia involved in conflagration. Starvation general throughout all Europe.

Labor Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

RESOLUTION BY THE CENTRAL TRADES AND LABOR UNION OF ST. LOUIS AND VICINITY

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I have today received from the Central Trades and Labor Union of St. Louis and vicinity—A. F. of L.—the following report of their efforts to prevent strikes in defense industries. I believe their resolution commendable and express the hope and confidence that they will vigorously prosecute these efforts:

ST LOUIS, MO., *April 13, 1941.*

At the last meeting of this central body a brief discussion was had on the importance of bringing strikes, especially in defense industries, to an irreducible minimum in this era of great national emergency. It was voted to take up the subject matter at this meeting as a special order.

Your executive board—while meeting to consider a number of other matters referred to it—decided to submit, as a means of facilitating agreement upon a program, the following as a possible basis—

Today, this Nation, in which the working people enjoy the highest standard of living in the world, is necessarily engaged in high-speed activity to produce materials with which to fortify our country against the threat of ruthless, inhuman totalitarianism which is rapidly engulfing nations abroad. Continuous, uninterrupted, and maximum production is imperative.

Labor is the largest stockholder in democracy. The record shows that among the first acts of European despots, when they gained power, was to smash the unions, confiscate their funds, and enslave labor. The men and women of toil would be the first and worst sufferers should American democracy fail.

While labor must insist upon its right to strike as a last and final resort, we should exhaust every reasonable process at our command before causing any stoppage of work in an industry related to national defense. Our Central Trades and Labor Union is a voluntary organization and, therefore, cannot command, but merely recommend; the following is recommended:

That any union contemplating a strike in any industry engaged in the production of war materials or indirectly related in a major degree to such production first confer with the executive board of the central trades and labor union for assistance and conciliation in an effort to compose differences between workers and employer without a strike. Should such intervention and conciliation from the central trades and labor union executive board fail, said executive board shall promptly apply to the National Defense Mediation Board for conciliation with a view to adjustment of the dispute.

If and when the above extended efforts for peaceful settlement fail, then this central body will aggressively support the aggrieved

union in such further steps as are necessary to secure justice. In the absence of unusual circumstances, however, the differences between union and employer should be submitted to arbitration.

Copies of our plan should be submitted to the St. Louis Building Trades Council, Molders' Conference Board, Machinists' District Council, and all other councils, and also to such other crafts not covered by these councils as are engaged in defense industries, and their cooperation therewith invited.

Unanimously adopted at meeting of central trades and labor union held April 13, 1941.

Filipino People Stand With America In Present Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the Philippines are under our flag. They are a part of the territory which we will have to defend in the event of war. Their population is 16,000,000. The Filipinos could be an asset or a liability. There has been much talk that they, especially the political class, are not really grateful for what our country has been trying to do for them in the last 41 years. This talk is belied once and for all by the expressions of their government leaders in these days of crisis and emergency. The following such expressions are by President Manuel Quezon, Vice President Sergio Osmena, Speaker Jose Yulo, Finance Secretary Manuel Roxas, and Resident Commissioner Joaquin M. Elizalde. No less impressive and very welcome are the statements of two distinguished Filipinos in private life. They are Generalissimo Emilio Aguinaldo, of historic fame, speaking for the Filipinos who actively fought our armed forces in the Filipino-American War, and Mr. Vicente Villamin, lawyer and economist, expressing the thoughts of Filipinos outside of the government, particularly the 120,000 who are in America, and those who have received their education in American schools and universities.

Hon. Manuel L. Quezon, President of the Philippines:

It behooves us, therefore, to assure the Government of the United States of our loyalty and devotion which have grown deeper and stronger in the perspective of the many years of unselfish American endeavor to serve the best interests of the Filipino people.

In this critical moment I wish again to pledge to America in behalf of our people our unstinted loyalty and our fullest cooperation in the promotion of the ideals of justice and liberty and in the safeguarding of the legitimate rights and interests of both the United States and the Philippines.

We want the Government and people of the United States to feel that we are bound to them not merely by the presence of the American flag in our country but by the nobler and stronger ties of gratitude and affection—bonds of sentiment that are born of the human heart and which transcend the obligation of allegiance implied in the presence of that flag.

More recently, addressing the National Assembly, President Quezon said:

The Philippine Commonwealth is fortunate in that it is still free from the armed conflicts now raging in several parts of the world. Let us hope that we may be spared the destructive effects of such conflicts. But our fate in this respect is linked with that of the United States. We are placed in that position not only by the very nature of our political relationship with that great Nation, but by our common faith in democracy and by every noble impulse that animates our people.

In these times of stress, our national security is naturally the greatest concern of our Government, and we are doing all we can in this respect. But it must be admitted that with our own resources alone we are not now in a position to defend ourselves.

The Government of the United States has embarked upon a program of national defense which, we earnestly hope, includes the Philippines; for the defense of our country remains primarily the responsibility of the United States. This is as it should be, because as long as we are under the American flag it rests exclusively with the United States, and not with us, to determine whether we shall be at peace or at war. The Filipino people, desirous of cooperating with the United States in the execution of this defense program, are ready to bear their full share of that responsibility. To this end, I have assured the Government of the United States in behalf of the Commonwealth, that the entire Philippines—its manpower and material resources—are at the disposal of the United States in the present emergency.

Hon. Sergio Osmena, Vice President of the Philippines, has expressed himself repeatedly along the same lines as President Quezon's utterances, but none of his statements is available in Washington for reprinting in the present symposium. His pro-American sentiments have grown from year to year and today, expressing himself eloquently in English, he is one of the strongest expounders of American ideas and ideals. The Quezon-Osmena ticket for reelection has been announced recently and it is expected that it will sweep the field in an overwhelming fashion.

Hon. Jose Yulo, Speaker of the Philippine National Assembly:

It is our common hope, of course, that the United States may not be forced actually to go to war, that she may continue, and our country with her, to live in peace. But the future does not flatter the brightest hopes of peace that we hold, and it would be dangerous to ignore any contrary possibilities. We must face the possibilities realistically, and be prepared to stand side by side with the American people when the day of reckoning shall come. We shall then not only be true to our inheritance and loyal to our obligations; we shall be true and loyal to the enduring principle which alone gives meaning to such things as popular government, self-rule, and constitutions.

Hon. Manuel Roxas, secretary of finance:

The world is going through a painful crisis, and the Philippines, although not directly involved in the armed conflict, is, nevertheless, suffering from its harmful consequences. * * * True, the Philippines is still the one bright spot in this part of the world. We are completely surrounded by warring nations, and yet we live in peace, practice democracy, and maintain individual liberty under the American flag.

The international situation, however, is filling us with misgivings as to the future. We see danger signals ahead, and we are impotent to face possible emergencies were they to eventuate in the near future. We are anxious to cooperate. We are determined * * * to place our men and material resources at the disposal of America when the bugle call of defense is sounded. We would be glad to fight for every inch of our land against invasion if we are given the opportunity and the means to meet that ordeal.

We do not expect American soldiers to shed their blood in the Philippines. We claim that duty as our own. We have now approximately 150,000 trained men for the defense of our territory. We have an adequate framework. We have intelligent leadership. We have patriotism and determination. What we need are more arms and ammunition, more airplanes and other equipment essential to modern warfare. These, I believe, the United States can supply us while, at the same time, safeguarding our communication with continental America with her powerful fleet. It cannot be the plan to leave the Philippines to its fate and permit it ruthlessly to be overrun by an invader.

That would be inhuman. It would be repugnant to American honor and traditions. It would destroy 40 years of American altruistic efforts in this country. * * * We Filipinos do not believe that American pride and prestige would allow such a thing to come to pass. We believe that the conscience of America would revolt against it. We believe the American people will fight to prevent the desecration here of the American flag and to stop the invasion of this American territory.

It is the considered judgment of qualified observers that if the United States should today make herself strong in the Philippines that alone would tend to forestall her involvement in a war in this section of the globe. Our present insecurity is a source of great danger to the peace of America. I make this assertion because of my loyalty to America, because of my fervent wish that she may continue to live in peace, and because of my deep concern for the safety of my country. (Note: President Quezon approved this speech of Secretary Roxas which was broadcast from Manila to the United States.)

Hon. JOAQUIN M. ELIZALDE, Philippine Resident Commissioner: He has expressed himself from time to time in favor of cooperation with the United States in national defense as well as in other matters of mutual interest and advantage. Recently in a statement in a magazine he said:

It is our belief that the Philippine Commonwealth, its affairs and problems, are of great and vital interest today, and have a peculiar significance in the cataclysm which is going on about us. In the Far East today Filipinos and Americans together man the treacherous ramparts, and keep joint watch on the Pacific frontiers. * * * We Filipinos feel that the welfare of America, as well as the welfare of the Philippines, can be promoted by a better realization and closer acquaintance with recent developments in that sector of the world; it is our hope to foster a more conscious relationship between our two peoples and countries. * * * The United States, we expect, will always remain our closest friend and confidant.

Generalissimo Emilio Aguinaldo, addressing the convention of Filipino veterans:

It appears that because of unsettled conditions throughout the world as a result of the wars in Europe and Asia, dark clouds are gathering on the far horizon and are threatening to cast their shadows over the freedom of our country. There is no gainsaying the fact that the longer these wars are fought the more serious our problem becomes and the greater will be the sufferings of all peoples on earth.

Personally, I shudder whenever I think of the dangers that may disrupt American-Japanese relations and precipitate both countries into war. Of course, there is no reason why we should feel panicky, for as you all know, our defense is in the good hands of the United States. I may state that in view of its tremendous power and strength, it would seem that any outside help would be unnecessary.

However, it becomes our bounden duty to stand by America in these critical days and show the courage of our people in defending our rights and interests. There is no doubt that in the event of a conflict with Japan, victory will be America's, especially as the Land of the Rising Sun has been greatly weakened on account of the war being waged against China.

Mr. Vicente Villamin, lawyer and economist, expressing the views of Filipinos in private life and addressing himself particularly to the 120,000 of his compatriots in the United States and Hawaii:

We Filipinos are with America loyally and proudly in the present emergency. Her flag we honor, we love. We are eager and ready to defend it with all our might.

Two primal instincts steel us to this determination: First, our soulful gratitude to the American Nation for their goodness and helpfulness to our country during the last 41 years; second, our sense of national self-preservation in the face of probable aggression from a country which has willfully proved that she is a neighbor to be feared and distrusted.

The American flag flies serenely over our country. Under it we have civil liberty and individual freedom; we have self-respect and self-government; we have democracy and equal opportunity; we have security and tranquillity; we have progress and prosperity. We should be willing to perish in combat before we permit the Japanese banner to take the place of the Stars and Stripes in our beloved native land. We must remember, too, that China has been fighting for all the peoples of the Far East to tame the wolf of east Asia, and heroic China commands our sympathy and gratitude.

We are giving our heart and hand to America cheerfully and voluntarily. The beauty of it all is that America does not ask us by law, not even by moral appeal or by indirection, to serve under her flag. She respects our local autonomy and self-government even to the partial impairment of her international defense policies. And withal she will defend our country with all her resources from foreign aggression. What could be our response but total collaboration with this noble nation—now, anytime, anywhere, and in any and all circumstances?

Around the American flag, therefore, we will rally. The 16,000,000 Filipinos could be of some help in carrying that flag to victory when war comes; and that victory would be a victory over oppression, over brute force, over greed, and over unreason. It is the sanctifying victory that the human soul covets in these weary and restless years.

Commodity Prices Under Two Governments—a Comparison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note the difference in the cost of the necessities and commodities of life between two governments, one under the control of communism and dictatorship and the other under the control of the people themselves:

After 20 years of communism

Commodity	Unit	Price	
		Moscow	United States
White bread	Pound	$0.15	$0.09
Coffee	Pound	4.37	.26
Tea	Pound	10.21	.72
Sugar	Pound	.34	.05½
Macaroni	Pound	.46	.13
Rice	Pound	.59	.08½
Beef roast, rib	Pound	.87	.35
Veal cutlets	Pound	.96	.43
Pork chops	Pound	.96	.42
Chicken, first quality	Pound	1.00	.34
Ham, smoked whole	Pound	1.63	.32
Bacon	Pound	1.45	.38
Corn, canned	Pound	.18	.13
Tomatoes, canned	Pound	.32	.09
Potatoes	Pound	.04	.02½
Cabbage	Pound	.15	.03
Onions	Pound	.15	.04
Milk, fresh	Quart	.30	.12
Cream, fresh	½ pint	.29	.15
Butter, first quality	Pound	1.81	.38
Eggs	Dozen	1.32	.35
Smoking tobacco	¼ pound	.57	.12
Cigarettes	20	.36	.14
Suits, men's		50.00	21.05
Overcoat		66.90	20.10
Underwear, cotton knit		6.40	1.20
Socks, rayon and cotton (rayon only in Moscow)		1.23	.25
Socks, cotton		.45	.21
Hosiery, women's rayon		3.20	.30
Shoes, men's work		34.85	2.83
Shirt, cotton		7.74	.96
Sheet		3.00	1.53
Tablecloth, linen		8.00	3.45
Hats, men's felt		8.00	2.74
Cap, wool		9.20	.91
Gloves, men's leather		3.74	1.19

Source: National Industrial Conference Board. Figures are for year 1937.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker—

It seems to me that the administration has reached the point where it must do one of two things. It must either recognize that our aid to Britain will go no further, except as to quantity of materials, or else it must directly call for the risk of some loss of life. I think we have got down to the bedrock question.

The above paragraph was written by Raymond Clapper in his April 5 column. Step by step like a death march to the execution chamber we have been led, blindfolded, to the very rim of the abyss. We have been told, by administration leaders, that we can play this game of war without becoming involved in anything worse than dirty name calling across the ocean by radio. We have been bombarded by the intelligentsia of our own country until only those who have schooled themselves in the art of independent thinking have not fallen completely under their spell, and those that could not be persuaded by guile have been singled out for a special treatment of ridicule, carried even to the point where their patriotism has been questioned.

Sane, clear-thinking men and women have not been blinded to the extent that they could not see the eventual destination of nations who insist on playing the game of international poker, where the chips are human lives and the jackpot is the destiny of nations. Now that the blindfold has been ripped from the eyes of the masses, now that the stark naked, red, raw specter of war beckons to us with its bloody hands, now that we are invited to participate in the bombing of homes and open cities, in the killing and maiming of small children, of women and old men, of hospitals and schools and churches, of the sick and helpless, of women giving birth to babies, of people paralyzed with fear and as helpless to protect themselves as dumb animals, and not to forget, to have this same thing happen to our own homes and dear ones, are we ready to embark on this course?

Is it not time for cool heads to look around and count the cost before it is everlastingly too late? Is it not time to balance the cost against the profit and let common sense, instead of passion, seek a solution?

It is admitted that the economic cost of a war cannot even be approximated at this time. Total war sweeps away all past standards. The winners cannot win without complete sacrifice of every vestige of that which we in America hold most dear, and have spent the past 165 years building up. The losers will be reduced to the status of beggars who are dependent upon the mercy of others for continued existence.

All parties will sacrifice thousands and perhaps millions of their young manhood. Mothers will die from broken hearts, wives and sweethearts will turn drawn, tear-stained faces away and try to be brave. Children will grow like young animals without the benefit of home life. Old men and women, and men and women not so old, will see the accumulations of a lifetime swept away and be reduced to abject poverty in the sunset years of their lives.

This, men and women of America, is what you are looking at now, this minute. You have been led to believe that this ordeal will pass you by. Let no one tell you that our present course leads you any other place than into the inferno that is raging across the sea. Let no one tell you that you can win anything now, or in the future, by going to war. Win, lose, or draw, the jack pot will contain only the stinking, rotting flesh and bones of the human chips which we have to feed into its maw. The grinning skulls of the dead, and the hollow, lusterless eyes of the maimed and the broken, will haunt and curse us forever if we falter in our efforts to keep our land at peace.

To ask the blessing of God on our efforts of destruction is to mock and deny the Prince of Peace and the sacrifice he made on the Cross of Calvary. To fail to go all out in our efforts to preserve peace in our country is to fail in our service to God and man.

A Distinguished American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE HOOSIER FARMER

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I desire to include a notable editorial from the April issue of the Hoosier Farmer paying a deserved tribute to one of the most useful men in the Nation today.

The editorial follows:

Each halt in the march of human progress has brought forth leaders in whom men placed confidence and followed. It has ever been true that rising from the ranks, armored with their own oppression and that of their fellow men, these leaders have pressed into definite action. From the gentle hills of Virginia came a man to lay the foundation of the world's greatest nation. He loved the good earth. Torn to shreds years later, the tattered fragments of democracy were gathered and rewoven into a fabric everlasting by another man whose feet never left the clay. Now, midst the tottering ruins of economic stability, there rises another, whose stature of mind and understanding casts a protecting shadow over the homes of American farm families—Edward A. O'Neal.

The Southland gives this true American, a farmer, whose grace and determination charm all who know him, to lead in these days of distress. Casting aside the choice of careers less hazardous, he stands today in the wake of criticism from the multitude of those who would grind agriculture into the dust of submission. The memory of great leaders grows in the light of their enemies. American farmers, through the knowledge and perseverance of Mr. O'Neal, have the password to the council chambers of the Nation. Though bitterly denounced by his enemies, he commands a respect seldom attained during life's span. His words carry weight because never has he shaken the dust of his cotton fields from his feet.

Future historians will write of the great period of economic adjustment, with which the present generation is so well acquainted. Shafts of stone and marble will reach to the sky, commemorating the deeds of great men, and tradition will march our posterity past these markers. This is as it should be. Not one, but millions of monuments will rise to agriculture's present great leader. In the gleam of brightly lighted homes, rich in the experience of equality, where contented people daily go about their tasks facing a world with hope and courage, will grow in the fertile and educated minds of American farm folk the monument everlasting to the efforts of the man who today enjoys a fight for the love of his people—Ed A. O'Neal.

The future of agriculture is not dark, dreary, and without promise. Quite to the contrary, never before has the light of organized agriculture shone so brightly and with such telling effect. With the knowledge to understand, and the power to act, no barricade remains to block the forward march of agriculture, save the stubbornness within. As guardian and preserver of man's most essential vocation, let every man lay his hand to the building of great cooperatives and educational organizations as citadels, where the passing parade of future generations may place a wreath of praise, commemorating the faith of those who make possible their daily repast. Our support gages accurately the successful efforts of our leaders.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

LETTER BY BUFORD C. TYNES

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a letter written by my friend, Mr. Buford C. Tynes, to the Huntington Advertiser, of Huntington, W. Va.:

[From the Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser of March 18, 1941]

EDITOR, THE ADVERTISER:

Alighting from the FFV this morning, after several days' absence in the East, I hied me home to read and enjoy the current issue of the Herald-Advertiser, sans, as I hoped and expected, the fulminations that it had been carrying during the last 8 or 9 months against first, candidate Roosevelt's, then candidate Willkie's, and now the recently become (by the overwhelming nonpartisan vote of the Congress and with the well-nigh universal approval of our people) studied and irrevocably fixed policy of our Government as respects the world conflagration and its implications. But, no.

Far be it from me to deny to others the same latitude in voicing their personal views on public questions that I demand for myself. In this connection, permit me to say that The Reader Speaks letters and accompanying editorials on freedom of the press, which recent issues of the Herald-Advertiser have been carrying, have in principle, certainly, met with my entire approbation. Nor is it my purpose to draw a distinction between the dissemination of the private views of reader-correspondents and the presentation, through the quasi public medium with which you have entrusted and endowed and the public has tolerated him, of the personal views on public questions of one of your editors. In passing, one cannot but indulge the reflection that our much-vaunted and highly prized but as yet, thanks be, un-Hitlerized freedom of the press, has more to fear from the abuses of liberty upon the part of some of our editors and publishers than from undue restraint at the hands of a provoked governmental authority.

When, Mr. Publisher, one finds on the front page of section 1 of his not last year's, not last month's, not last week's, but today's Sunday newspaper, in a boxed italicized editorial captioned This Means War, phrases borrowed from the text of the address (found reproduced at page 7 of section 4) delivered last night by the President of the United States before the White House Correspondents' Association and edited in such a way as to give them a meaning wholly different from that obviously (to one who takes time to read both) intended and inescapably accorded them by the context from which lifted, one fears not so much for the freedom as for the integrity of the press.

To cite, by way of illustration, but two of the numerous distortions and misstatements found in that editorial:

Says the editorial, at the end of the first subdivision, in using a directly quoted phrase from the President's address:

"Never before has the American public been warned that 'no divisions of party' would be tolerated in an existing or approaching crisis."

This to support the innuendo, reserved for the closing paragraph of the editorial, that the President will out-Hitler Hitler in ways despotic and barbarous.

What the President actually said in this connection was:

"There will be no divisions of party or section or race or nationality or religion. There is no one among us who does not have a stake in the outcome of the effort in which we are now engaged."

At the close of the second subdivision of the editorial, where the writer again employs a phrase directly quoted from the President's address, we read:

"He (the President) said that all critics of his policies were either powerful enemies abroad or * * * small selfish groups or individuals at home, and we don't believe that statement is honest or fair."

Honest or fair indeed! What the President actually said was this:

"Upon the national will to sacrifice and to work depends the output of our industry and our agriculture. * * *

"Upon that will depends our ability to aid other nations which may determine to offer resistance.

"Upon that will depend practical assistance to people now living in nations which have been overrun, should they find the opportunity to strike back in an effort to regain their liberties.

"This will of the American people will not be frustrated, either by threats from powerful enemies abroad or by small, selfish groups or individuals at home."

"Never before," if we may be permitted to paraphrase and correctly apply the vitriolic language of the impassioned editor, "has language so violent and so inflammatory come from the pen of a responsible editor," be the object of his unbelievable attack President or policeman.

When, upon turning to the further editorial found on the editorial page proper, captioned "Make no mistake, we are in the

war," one reads such levity—such words, words, words as—

"At long last";

"So, brother, take it from a principal advocate of leasing and lending";

"The great bulk of American citizens (our Congressmen and Senators included?) * * * never took the trouble to read" the lease-lend bill;

"That Mr. Roosevelt would be able—by some sort of mumbo-jumbo incantation—to keep us within the limits of theoretical neutrality";

"Drag us into World War II through the back door";

"Looking at the conflict through rose-colored glasses";

"Have their cake and eat it, too";

"Mr. Roosevelt has asked for a cool seven billions to plunk (sic) down as first payment on the obligation we have just undertaken to help the British beat Hitler." (So, that is where the shoe pinches?)

"You ain't seen nothin' yet";

"Conscription of capital and labor are coming," without saying whether under unexpected contingencies, he approves or disapproves such a national policy;

"So is illegalization of strikes," again without saying whether, under the same contingencies, he would approve or disapprove such;

"So is compulsory (sic) purchase of war bonds," without saying whether he will or will not voluntarily purchase such;

"So is new and unprecedently severe tax legislation," without saying whether he approves or disapproves even a partial pay-as-you-go policy; and, finally—

"Unless Britain shows a strength and versatility beyond anything she has produced to date, she can't 'beat Hitler' without our active participation"—thus demonstrating the correctness of his wishful premise, that the passage of the lease-lend bill will inevitably lead to such participation upon our part and that its defeat would have just as inevitably led to our nonparticipation and to our continued peace and freedom, one wonders whether our Sunday newspaper is going to be an asset or a liability in promoting that unity of purpose—that universality of sacrifice—so needed in carrying out our fully debated and duly enacted national policy.

In a still further editorial, appearing on the editorial page proper of today's issue, under the caption, If you don't ask, you don't get, apropos the building of a new city auditorium coincidentally with the building of an adequate Western Hemisphere defense, we find this capstone of levity and inconsistency:

"If Uncle Sam can send seven billions to England (ad, the rub again) he might be induced to divert a few thousands down this way."

Verily, as the President said last night:

"Loyalty * * * springs from the mind that is given, and that is receptive to, the facts, that retains ancient ideals and proceeds without coercion to give support to its own government."

And again:

"Loyalty cannot be bought."

And, finally:

"This will of the American people—not to impose our own democratic ideology upon other nations, but to prevent the self-constituted dictators of other nations from imposing economic, political, and social slavery upon us—will not be frustrated, either by threats from powerful enemies abroad or by small * * * individuals at home."

Please, Mr. Publisher, give us a virile, patriotic Republican or patriotic Democratic Sunday editorial page. We shall be in sore need of such in the trying days, yes years, mayhap, ahead.

Yours respectfully,

BUFORD C. TYNES.

MARCH 16, 1941.

Sugar Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

LETTER FROM MAYOR OF NEW YORK

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the mayor of the city of New York:

CITY OF NEW YORK,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
April 9, 1941.

Hon. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: It has been brought to my attention that because of the expiration this year of the present sugar quotas, legislation will be necessary to renew or change existing quotas affecting the volume of sugar refining in the port of New York.

Although the protection at present granted the domestic producers is costing the consumers of New York City about $15,000,000 a year, I realize it would be too much to expect legislation increasing the volume of sugar refining in the port of New York.

I would be highly gratified, however, if I could secure your cooperation in opposing any legislation which would change the existing quotas to reduce that volume, because such reduction would add substantially to the already tremendous load upon the consumer in New York City, resulting from protection of the domestic beet-sugar refineries.

I should like further to point out that, at a time like this, when we all are interested in promoting pan-American relations, legislation which would have the effect of expanding the western beet-sugar refineries and other domestic sugar refineries, while contracting the Cuban and Puerto Rican "off-shore" refineries in New York City and elsewhere on the east coast, should be discouraged.

I should like to quote to you the recommendation on the matter made by the Mayor's Business Advisory Committee, pointing out the detrimental effect to the citizenry of New York in the event of passage of legislation reducing the volume of sugar refining in the port of New York and again urge your cooperation in this matter. The extract from the committee's report follows:

"We recommend, therefore, that you place the city on record as opposed to any rearrangements of quotas that will tend to increase prices to industrial or household consumers. As a practical matter, this will mean placing the city in opposition to the further expansion of the beet-sugar quotas at the expense of offshore as well as continental producers and refiners, for it is the protection granted to the beet producers that is mainly responsible for the high price of sugar in New York City and elsewhere in the United States, compared with the world price."

Sincerely yours,

F. LAGUARDIA,
Mayor.

Jewish National Workers' Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 18, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. HAROLD L. ICKES

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Hitler's Unconscious Tools," delivered by Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, at a dinner sponsored by the Jewish National Workers' Alliance of America for the benefit of the Jewish National Fund, at the Masonic Temple, Chicago, Ill., on April 13, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In these days of world-wide wars, when civilization stands uncertainly and precariously at the edge of the abyss, it is heartening that some people have the courage and the vision to look to the future; to carry on in their efforts to make this world a better one in which to live.

That the Jewish people have the courage and the vision to continue in their efforts for the reclamation of a well-nigh wasted land, a land wherein the oppressed might find refuge, indicates the strength of your faith in the ultimate triumph of democracy, in the final return of sanity and justice in international affairs. A man of little faith, a pessimist, a defeatist, does not plan for the future when the present is dark and lowering. Today we identify as appeasers men who lack faith in themselves, as they lack faith in the institutions of which they are a part. These are puny men who would meekly stretch out their necks for the collar of their master because they lack either the vision to see or the will to resist.

You, who support the Jewish National Fund, have demonstrated your faith that right and justice, within the compass of the principles of democracy, will triumph. Lacking that faith, you would not now be planning for the future of that ancient land which you have reestablished as a sanctuary for your people. For you must know that no dictator will permit you to realize that dream if he can prevent it; its fruition depends upon the victory of democracy. Your presence tonight demonstrates your faith in that triumph.

Faith was a quality of your forefathers.

By faith they passed through the Red Sea by dry land.

By faith the walls of Jericho fell down.

Descendants of an ancient race in which the aspiration of justice and freedom has never failed, you will persevere in your determination to rebuild the homeland of your fathers in Palestine. You are continuing your notable work in trying circumstances, against grave handicaps, despite great dangers. For the tyranny that has burst the bounds of Germany and is threatening to drown the world has its threat for Palestine, the land of your ancestors, just as it has for the United States, the land of you choice. If you will need to expend your love and courage for Palestine, you will need to expend them, perhaps in even greater degree, for our own land.

Because America, too, is in peril. Our institutions, based upon Magna Carta, the Declaration of Independence, and the Bill of Rights, are in such danger as they have not been since we became an independent Nation. The hordes of Hitler, singing their hymn of hate, are on the march. Brave England, gallant Greece, and valiant Yugoslavia, are fighting in the front-line trenches, fighting not only for their own liberties but for yours and mine, for the liberties of all of those men and women everywhere who prefer death to the chains of slavery.

Worse even, and more dangerous than Hitler's cruel hordes, is the deadly poison of Goebbels' lies that make the air that we breathe as fatal as carbon monoxide gas. Since the English people became immune to noxious propaganda, their main concern has been to defend their shores from actual invasion. In our own land we are still in the first phase of the deadly conflict. Thus far the enemy cannot even be sighted from our shores, although we know that he is looking in our direction with malignant eyes. But his poisonous propaganda, his thinly veiled lies, make our air fetid.

We are being assailed from within. If our danger is not a visible one, it is all the more to be guarded against because it is insidious. The fall of France and Belgium and Holland and Norway, due not so much to the "blitzkrieg" of Hitler as to the corrupting words of Goebbels, is a warning to us to be on guard against the enemy within our gates. Hitler has made no secret of his designs upon us. He has declared his intention to prepare the ground before his armies come by destroying our morale and setting the hand of neighbor against neighbor so that we may fall as easy a prey as did once mighty France. Listen to what Hitler said to Rauschning in discussing the United States of America:

"There will be endless confusion, but for a long time I will have had contact with those men who will direct the new government—a government that suits my purpose. We can always find such men. We can find them in every country. We do not even have to buy them. They will come to us of their own accord. Pride, confused thinking, political animosity, and egotism are their chief motives."

Who can doubt that Hitler may boast that, with reason, he has in America today men and women eager to help him? Not only has he willing aides, he has unconscious tools as well, who serve him to better purpose than those in his actual pay. Such constitute our real danger. Tonight I shall talk to you about Hitler's unconscious tools—Nazi fellow travelers—Fascist stooges—stupid cat's-paws.

It may be confidently predicted that the career of Hitler will be similar to that of other ruthless men who have preceded him. All of the tyrants of history—the Pharaohs, the Ivans the Terrible, the Genghis Kahns, the Attilas—have been unable to stamp out of the human heart the love of freedom that God gave it. One by one dictators, pursuing a seemingly irresistible course, have fallen because, just as today, enough men have had faith and have been willing to die for that faith. We, too, can be certain of ultimate victory because we love freedom so much that we are willing to die for it, and in President Roosevelt we have a great leader. Our confidence in him is all the greater because he is the object of the savagely bitter attacks both of Nazi fellow travelers and of Hitler's unconscious tools.

Every great American President has had to contend with appeasers, whatever their current name may have been. Every major crisis in our history has been aggravated by men of little faith and even less courage, by evil men and by stupid men. Let me quote to you what Tom Paine, in his Common Sense, had to say on American appeasers during the Revolutionary War. Paine's words are still as descriptive as they were when he wrote them 165 years ago:

"I am inclined to believe that all those who espouse the doctrine of reconciliation may be included within the following descriptions:

"Interested men who are not to be trusted, weak men who cannot see, prejudiced men who will not see, and a certain set of moderate men who think better of the European [Axis] world than it deserves; and this last class, by an ill-judged deliberation, will be the cause of more calamities to this continent than all the other three."

Into Paine's categories our contemporary appeasers fit perfectly.

Abraham Lincoln was likewise plagued by a bad lot of appeasers, even in the North. There was a powerful secret society that was determined to promote slavery and to destroy the Union. This group was known as the Knights of the Golden Circle, and consisted of appeasing Democrats and Copperheads who discovered a perfect consanguinity in their bitter opposition to President Lincoln. In 1863 there were as many as 40,000 of them in Indiana alone. In that year they attempted an uprising in that State. After they were disbanded by a long-suffering and patient democratic Government they reorganized as the Order of American Knights, and finally as the Sons of Liberty. Like our own present-day appeasers, these Sons of Liberty were no lovers of liberty. They hated liberty, and collected hand grenades and arms to destroy both freedom and the Republic. In the end, President Lincoln's government ferreted out the leaders and suppressed the Copperheads before they could strike at the life of American democracy.

I do not say that our appeasers and Nazi fellow travelers are precisely following the pattern developed by those in Lincoln's day, but it is true that they are acting from motives and for purposes that Hitler well understands. Perhaps some of our native-born appeasers with an eye to the future are already organizing "The Society of Hitler's Unconscious Tools," which, after our American habit, we may initialize into the H-U-T's and colloquialize as the "HUTS."

The American "HUTS" are following Hitler, who has nothing to offer to the world but evil.

He has his fifth columnists.

But they are nothing new. The activities of fifth columnists in George Washington's day were responsible for the order "Let none but Americans be placed on guard tonight."

He has his concentration camps. Every tyrant in history has had them.

He has his Gestapo. But the methods it employs were already old in the days of the Spanish Inquisition.

He has his slave labor and his conquered nations. So had Attila, the Hun, and Genghis Khan.

Fifth columnists, Trojan horses, concentration camps, Gestapos, slave labor, and conquered nations—old, all old, old as the human race.

If Washington and the Revolutionary patriots had yielded to the appeasers, this country would never have become an independent democracy. Washington and his fellow patriots insisted upon establishing liberties which the descendants of both patriots and appeasers have enjoyed ever since. If Lincoln had listened to the appeasers when secession was attempted, he would, as he was urged to do, have "let the erring sisters depart in peace." But Lincoln and the men and women of his generation to whom the solemn covenant that we call the Constitution of the United States meant something more than "a scrap of paper," insisted on preserving our liberties for both their own descendants and those of the current appeasers.

President Roosevelt and patriotic Americans who gladly and proudly follow his leadership, will carry on the tradition of Washington and Lincoln. They will preserve our American institutions and for so doing future descendants of present-day appeasers will call them blessed, just as present-day descendants of Tories and Copperheads now call Washington and Lincoln blessed.

No, Hitler has developed nothing new. But in adapting old techniques to his evil purposes, he has made Dante's Inferno read, in comparison, like winter-resort literature.

Let us consider the amazingly clever Nazi method of getting other people to do a large part of Hitler's dirty work—people even in countries that Hitler has boasted that he has marked for destruction.

You will remember that up to the Hitler-Stalin pact there were in this country, as well as in Europe, liberals, pacifists, and people of good will generally who joined organizations which had, ostensibly, peace, justice to labor, international good will, or similar lofty objectives as their goal. Frequently people belonged to them without knowing that they were run by Communists for their own ends. The non-Communist members of such camouflaged Communist groups came to be known as Communist fellow travelers. The Nazis have been quick to seize upon this Communist technique, particularly in the United States. So now we have Nazi fellow travelers. And they are much more numerous and dangerous than were their Communist prototypes.

We have the phenomenon of Americans, some of them men of distinguished position and of good will, who, sometimes innocently and sometimes deliberately, have adopted the Nazi viewpoint. These Nazi fellow travelers and members of the society of Hitler's unconscious tools, have been propagandizing and propagating the Nazi ideology throughout the United States.

An outstanding example is Charles Lindbergh. Only the future will demonstrate whether he is a Nazi fellow traveler, as he appears to be, or one of Hitler's unconscious tools. Another, apparently a fellow traveler, is Gen. Robert E. Wood.

They are a queer assortment, these Nazi fellow travelers. For instance, in this group you find good old liberals, such as Oswald Garrison Villard; decent Socialists, such as Norman Thomas; well-meaning laborites, such as A. J. Muste. In the same group you also find pathological Nazis, such as Joe (McNazi) McWilliams; the notorious Robert Edward Edmondson; and anti-Semites, such as Edward James Smythe. Naturally, the Communists are also there. A strange and weird assortment, indeed.

Recently the America First Committee, which has been described as a Nazi transmission belt, and which should more aptly call itself the America "Next" Committee, held a meeting in New York at Mecca Temple. And what happened at this meeting at Mecca Temple? Joe (McNazi) McWilliams packed the hall with his own Nazi-Fascist-Coughlinite followers, and they began to shout, "Jew! Jew! Jew! Jew!" In the audience there were Nazis, Communists, Fascists, and "Huts."

The Bundists, the Ku Kluxers, and the Communists have taken up the ideas and the publications of the America Next Committee, and have distributed them among their own followers. We find that the Lindberghs and their pro-Nazi ideas are frequently praised by the most notorious reactionary Nazis, Fascists, and anti-Semites in this country.

The Nazi fellow travelers are organized and well subsidized, but they do not like to tell from where their money comes. Their immediate and most-pressing aim is the same as that of Hitler—to defeat Britain and Greece and Yugoslavia by hindering American aid. They also carry on insidious pro-German and anti-British propaganda. Of course, they try to hide their propaganda

behind blinds of pacifism and alleged patriotism. I know of no better way to describe them to you than by recalling Aesop's fable of the wolf who covered himself with a sheepskin when he engaged in "fifth column" activities. Like Hitler, the members of the society of Hitler's unconscious tools say that they are anxious to keep America out of war. What they will in fact do if they succeed in their purposes will be, not to keep us out of war, but out of Hitler's way until he stamps out one country after another. Then America really will be next.

You remember Verne Marshall, the editor of a middle western newspaper. He organized a so-called No Foreign War Committee, which was a pro-Nazi organization with anti-Semitic undertones. This Don Quixote of the Iowa cornfields rolled up his sleeves and challenged everybody to a fight who was ready to fight Hitler. His antics finally lost him the backing of the more responsible pro-Nazis. The last heard of him was when he said, on February 18, before the Inland Press Association that within 2 weeks the administration would declare a censorship of the radio with the man who is speaking to you tonight as the censor, and that at the end of another fortnight the same censor would be telling the newspapers what to print and what not to print. My comment then was the same as it is now, Marshall doesn't need a censor; he needs a nurse.

Take another appeaser, Maj. Al Williams. This gentleman is hysterical about the American way of life being threatened if we should dare to aid Britain. You will appreciate Major Williams' notion of the American way of life when you understand that he is a great admirer of that other great lover of democracy, General Franco, of Spain.

Still another Nazi fellow traveler and one who at least has the courage of his convictions, is Merwin K. Hart, of New York. To that gentleman, the Fascist destroyers of Spanish liberties were heroes whom he publicly defended in this country. Merwin K. Hart is now devoting himself to the task which he considers of paramount importance to the country. I quote: "It is time to brush aside this word 'democracy' with its connotations." Hart says that democracy is a "Communist invention."

In no place other than a democracy would a man like Hart have the right to talk in the manner that he does. What would happen to him if he lived in Germany and undertook to oppose nazi-ism as he does democracy in America? If he were a German citizen and expressed opposition to the "Wave of the Future" he would find himself carried to a concentration camp on that same wave.

But at least some of these Nazi fellow travelers are intelligent and support Hitler with open eyes because they prefer his nazi-ism to our democracy. In this category I place Lawrence Dennis, the philosopher of American fascism. Dennis appears to believe that fascism has a future while democracy is on the way out.

What Mr. Dennis overlooks is the fact that democracy is but the present-day expression of the age-old yearning of mankind for freedom. The passion for freedom has never died. It will never die. Democracy is not on the way out. On the contrary, democracy will come through this trial by fire cleaner, purer, and revitalized to perfect what perhaps we have been taking too much for granted. You can no more kill democracy than you can destroy the spirit of a people like the Jews who have survived persecution and attempts at extermination for almost 2,000 years.

The No. 1 United States Nazi fellow traveler is Colonel Lindbergh, not because of his experience in affairs of state or his knowledge of history or political science; not because of any native ability aside from that of a clever and daring aviator—an ability which we admire—but simply because he was the first American to raise aloft his standard of pro-Nazi-ism. He is the proud possessor of a Nazi decoration, which, it must be sadly admitted, has already been well earned.

The Nazis have taken Lindbergh up and are distributing his speeches more widely even than those of Hitler. You may recall that last autumn the Nazis nominated him for the Presidency of the United States in their rump convention at Los Angeles. Colonel Lindbergh's speech of May 19, 1940, was given to all of the customers of the Nazi Germania Bookshop in New York. The Brooklyn unit of the Christian Front issued a special bulletin, headed "To All Americans Who Think: Colonel Lindbergh Is a Patriot."

Well, maybe he is a patriot; maybe he is sincere. But maybe he is merely a misguided, mistaken, and gullible young man who has got himself into bad company. He is a "Wrong-way Corrigan" when it comes to reading the compass of public affairs.

The Nazi publication, the Deutscher Weckruf und Beobachter, organ of the German-American Bund, greeted Lindbergh's speech with a 7-column banner. Father Coughlin's publication, Social Justice, backed Colonel Lindbergh for the Vice Presidency of the United States, and the German-American National Alliance, which is a pro-Nazi organization, over Station WHIP announced:

"I bring pressing summons to all members and to all listeners to the United Front radio hour to do their duty by attending the great mass meeting in Soldiers Field."

At that mass meeting Lindbergh was the chief speaker. At a political rally in New York, Joseph (McNazi) McWilliams said that in 1944 "I and Lindbergh" would run the country. McWilliams, with his "I and Lindbergh" line, strikes an old but familiar note. Maybe he's mixed up, too. Maybe he thinks that he's the old Kaiser of "Me und Gott" fame; or an American Hitler. "Me, I, myself, the state." It is heady wine that these Nazi fellow travelers are drinking.

Lindbergh said before a congressional committee that he saw absolutely no difference between Britain and Germany. He pretended that he was indifferent whether England or Germany won this war, but every act of his and every word, including even this transparent statement, proves that he wants Germany to win. It would seem that he prefers fascism to democracy; that he is indifferent to liberty, agrees with Hitler that Christian civilization is decaying, and condones, if he does not actually applaud, the brutalities of which the Nazi ideology has already been guilty. Apparently he perceives no difference between international ku kluxism and respect for the rights of others. I wonder if anyone has ever heard Lindbergh deplore the wretched fate of Czechoslovakia or Holland or Belgium or the Netherlands or Norway—peaceful democracies all—where Lindberghian "statesmen" assured the people, as he assures us, that no war would come to them if they remained neutral and unarmed. I haven't.

Lindbergh's wife has written a book, which, as you know, has now become practically the Bible of every American Nazi, Fascist, bundist, and appeaser. I would like to quote to you a few selections from Wave of the Future. In one place Mrs. Lindbergh writes: "I cannot see this war, then, simply and purely as a struggle between the forces of good and the forces of evil. If I could simplify it into a phrase at all, it would seem truer to say that the 'forces of the past' are fighting against the 'forces of the future.'"

I quote again:

"There is no fighting the wave of the future, any more than, as a child, you could fight against the gigantic roller that loomed up ahead of you suddenly."

Thus the wife of the No. 1 Nazi fellow traveler and appeaser regards the butchers and killers and torturers and terrorists of the Third Reich as representing the "forces of the future" that she seems to look forward to with happy anticipations. To this pair of fellow travelers and appeasers, English democracy, American democracy, Scandinavian democracy, are nothing but half-decayed forces of the past inspiring only contempt and deserving to be destroyed by those great Lindberghian heroes, Hitler and Mussolini. It is no wonder that the notorious Hitlerite, Robert Edward Edmondson, said:

"Col. Charles Augustus Lindbergh is a true patriot."

We may thank God that the average American does not measure patriotism by the same standards as does Robert Edward Edmondson.

Let us look into this Nazi "wave of the future" for which our American fascists and appeasers are ready and eager to sacrifice that American democracy for which our forefathers fought, not reckoning that free soil could possibly breed those who would betray what they would not have had the courage or the strength to take.

The Nazis claim that they are building a new order. This new order, which, according to its devotees, is floating—I might say, parenthetically, like scum—floating on the "wave of the future," consists of six major objectives. First, the complete elimination of the British Empire and of British institutions from the world. Second, the organization of a new Europe under the Germanic "master race." Third, the abolition of Christianity. Fourth, the physical destruction of the Jews in all parts of the world. Fifth, the liquidation of the small nations of Europe. And sixth, the destruction of democracy everywhere.

And to forward such a program, our Lindberghs, and our Woods, and other Nazi fellow travelers would place in jeopardy the liberties that we have won under Magna Carta, the Declaration of Independence, and the Bill of Rights.

They may believe that the Nazi new order and the doctrines of Hitler are superior to democracy, but you don't think so and I don't, and the people of England don't, and the people of Greece and Yugoslavia don't. Nor does any sane citizen of the United States think so, save only our appeasers and members of the "Society of Hitler's Unconscious Tools."

And what do you suppose the people of conquered Norway, of Poland, of Holland, and other Nazi-dominated countries think? Can there be any doubt that, except for the Quislings and the Lavals and other appeasers and Nazi fellow travelers, all of the people of such countries who have experienced at first hand the vaunted glories of the Nazi new order prefer democracy?

In place of democracy and national independence there would be, under the Nazi new order the German master race. A handful of Germans would sit in the saddle, and everybody else, Jew and Gentile, Czech and Pole, Frenchman and Norwegian, Dane and Bulgar, Englishman and American, and even freedom-loving Germans themselves would be slaves working for the Nazi overlord. Such is the avowed objective of Hitler's new order; such is the wave of the future proclaimed by the Lindberghs.

Hitler's new order, which our Nazi fellow travelers are supporting, whether they know it or not, is the repository of other notions and purposes. Let me quote from Dr. Robert Ley, the head of the German labor front:

"The German race * * * has higher rights than all others. The German laborer is worth more than an English lord. He has the divine right to rule and we shall assure ourselves of that right."

Here is arrogance for you, but note particularly the words "divine right." Don't they have a familiar ring? Kings and emperors, in other days, proclaimed that they

possessed a divine right—a right granted by God—to rule other men.

In the past democracy—the right of men to rule themselves—challenged, and challenged successfully, the doctrine that kings ruled by divine right. In America we are dedicated to the proposition that the right to govern is derived from the consent of the governed. We believe that "the voice of the people is the voice of God." In the past we vigorously rejected the theory that kings ruled by divine right. Today we reject just as emphatically the spurious philosophy that Nazi gangsterdom possesses a divine right to rule.

What blasphemy! A Nazi claiming anything as a divine right. As well might the wolf that leads the pack proclaim a leadership based upon divine right.

Here is some more Wave of the Future idealism. I quote from Dr. Ley:

"War is not in contrast to peace, but simply another form of expression of the uninterrupted battle of nations and men. It is an expression of the highest and best in manhood. In this war lies the rebirth of our Nation. Every war demands a blood sacrifice from the men of the nation. They should give their blood gladly, for thus they equalize that which every mother gives at the birth of a child. In nations living in eternal peace manhood dries up and all the virtues that make man lovable to woman degenerate. One cannot demand of mothers that they uninterruptedly give the nation children without man bringing his blood sacrifice. Therefore war is not the wrath of God but a blessing of God."

When the Nazis admit God they endow him with hideous and satanic aspects.

What kind of a man is it that can speak in such a manner? War, hideous, cruel, terrible—war a blessing of God? Only a man who worships the false god of nazi-ism could speak in this manner.

Listen to another Nazi, Dr. Hans Frank, a member of Hitler's Cabinet and the Governor General of tortured and famine-stricken Poland:

"The maxim, 'right is whatever profits a nation, wrong is whatever harms it,' marks the beginning of our legal work. * * * Pale phantoms of objective justice do not exist for us any more."

This, then, is the Lindberghian Wave of the Future.

In a recent speech, Hitler declared that this is a world conflict between two universes—democracy an nazi-ism. He is determined that democracy shall be destroyed, and he is certain that it will be.

We accept the challenge. We say Hitler and nazi-ism, and all that they stand for, must be destroyed if civilization is to survive.

Let those who believe that nazi-ism and democracy can exist in the same world read again Lincoln's House Divided speech:

"A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe that this Government cannot endure, permanently, half slave and half free. * * * It will become all one thing or all the other."

It can be said with even greater truth today: "A world divided against itself cannot stand. I believe that this civilization cannot endure, permanently, half Nazi and half democratic. It will become all one thing or all the other."

Hitler knows this even if his abject followers, our Nazi fellow travelers, do not.

Hitler said: "I believe that one of the two worlds must break in pieces."

We Democrats say to him: "It will be the monstrous Fascist world that will 'break in pieces'."

One of the songs of the Hitler Youth reads, in part:

"Today we own Germany,
And tomorrow the whole world."

Is it necessary to repeat that "the whole world," which the Nazis propose to conquer, includes the United States? Hitler and his men make no secret of their ultimate aim to disrupt and to crush the Western Hemisphere, in order that the German "master race" may carve out for itself a new feudal system of world proportions—a feudal system based upon and supported by slavery. Last May, Richard Walther Darre, Hitler's Minister of Agriculture, delivered what was intended to be a secret speech to a select group of big Nazi officials. Neither the North American Newspaper Alliance nor Life magazine, which published the speech, has divulged how it came into possession of Minister Darre's amazing address, but its authenticity has never been successfully denied.

After saying that the Germans were the superior nation "predestined to rule the whole world," Darre proceeded to explain their plans of conquest and rule. Briefly, the idea is that the "master race" will turn all of the conquered nations into chattel slaves, as has already been done in Poland and elsewhere.

What is of particular interest to us is Minister Darre's views of and plans for the United States. Listen to what this Hitler henchman had to say about us:

"I have been asked about my opinion of America, especially the United States, and the danger of this pseudo-democratic Republic's possible attempts to hinder us in our historical development. There is no fear that this demoralized country will mix in this German war. In the first place, as in France and other countries, also in the United States we have many of our compatriots and even more friends among the citizens of the United States who are favorably disposed toward us. Many of the latter hold the most important positions in political and economic life and will not permit public opinion to allow something as senseless and insane as war against Germany. * * *"

Could Herr Darre have been thinking of Lindbergh or General Wood or, perchance, others as the ones in "most important positions" here who, knowingly, or unknowingly, are favorably disposed toward Hitler and his cause?

Isn't it about time that some of these fellows should wake up to the fact that they are playing Hitler's game; that they are either Hitler's conscious tools or dupes; that they are lending aid and comfort to the enemies of democracy—to those who would enslave them and theirs?

After insisting that our Nazi fellow travelers and appeasers will not permit America to do any harm to their friend Hitler, Minister Darre proceeded to explain the fate that threatens the United States after Hitler has conquered them. I wish that the more honest and intelligent appeasers in this country would engrave the following words upon their memories. Listen to Herr Darre:

"We Germans have accounts which must be settled with this country (the United States). In this war, not to mention the last war, the United States holds all the gold of Europe, which indisputably is our property. * * * The gold alone is practically of no value to us, but the insulting fact that something which God intended for us, which we were robbed of and which is intentionally withheld from us must not remain unpunished."

Again the "Me and Gott" motif. At least we cannot complain that the Nazi brigands have not warned us.

But listen further:

"The United States also will be forced by Germany to complete and final capitulation. Our superior industrial products will be sold at very low prices to the whole world, which will cause the United States to have not 7,000,000 but 30,000,000 to 40,000,000 unemployed. Mr. Rosefeld [sic] will then beg the Fuehrer on his knees to purchase from the United States, not manufactured products, but raw materials at prices which we will dictate. The United States is at present so demoralized and so corrupted that, like France and England, it need not be taken into consideration as a military adversary."

Even though the Nazis may pretend to have a low opinion of the fighting qualities of our men, or the flying range of our planes, or the firing power of our ships, or the deadliness of our bombs, they are taking no chances. They are working hard to weaken our will to resist by cultivating doubt and fear among our people. This is where the appeasers and fellow travelers come in.

Here are Darre's concluding words:

"We have in the United States a police organization operating with the same exactitude as in Berlin or Prague, and we have no fear of any activities on the part of the United States. * * * The only purpose of our offensive against the United States is forever to get rid of another bulwark of plutocracy, to regain what belongs to us, to establish order, to distribute property proportionately, and to teach America to respect Germany."

I wonder how many of the members of the Society of Hitler's Unconscious Tools have read this speech of Darre.

Our Nazi fellow travelers have well learned the Goebbels technique of spreading confusion, fomenting misunderstandings, and appealing to race and religious prejudices. They not only take positions that are helpful to the Nazis, especially in international politics, they express views that are identical with those of the Nazis.

Moreover, they have their own organizations, probably the most important of which is the America "Next" Committee. Its aims and activities are such that, if they should succeed, America would be without a single friend in the world and consequently would have to fight the hungry Nazi wolves alone. In other words, America next.

Among the active supporters of the America "Next" Committee are such men as Hugh S. Johnson, Hanford MacNider, Ernest Weir, and Gen. Robert E. Wood. I suppose that it would be difficult to find a collection of worse reactionaries than these. The America "Next" Committee attracts anti-Democrats, appeasers, labor baiters, and anti-Semites. Whatever you or I may think of this America "Next" Committee, Hitler is enthusiastic about it. Recently this Attila redivivus has cited Gen. Robert E. Wood by name and noted with approval his activities as acting chairman of the America "Next" Committee. This is a conclusive reason why Americans should be suspicious of this Nazi transmission belt. And Hitler's complimentary references to General Wood should be sufficient to make that gentleman get down on his knees and search his soul. I agree with the charge made by the Reverend Dr. Birkhead, of the Friends of Democracy, that the America "Next" Committee is a device for feeding the American people the vicious propaganda of Adolf Hitler. How anyone who claims to be an American can stomach such nauseating stuff as is dished up by the America "Next" Committee is beyond my comprehension.

The tie-up between the America "Next" Committee and professional Fascists and anti-Semites is clear and scandalous. Edward James Smythe is a case in point. Smythe is a columnist for the anti-Semitic, Nazi newspaper Fublicity. He is a professional anti-Semite. According to Smythe's own boast, it was he who arranged the joint meeting of the Ku Klux Klan and the German-American Bund at Camp Nordland in New Jersey several months ago. What a hell's broth must have been brewed on the occasion of this fellowship.

Recently, on December 16, 1940, this admirer of Hitler spoke before the National Legion of Mothers and Women of America in Philadelphia under the auspices of the America "Next" Committee.

Little wonder that Hitler approves of General Wood and his America "Next" Committee.

The current issue of another official Nazi publication praised General Wood when the latter made the truly remarkable statement that "there is as yet no reliable evidence or proof" that Hitler plans world conquest.

There is none so blind as he who will not see. General Wood undoubtedly is convinced that France is still a land of liberty and fraternity; that Poland is free and happy; that Belgium is not being ground under the iron heel; that Yugoslavia and Greece are cheerfully going about their customary peaceful pursuits, and that Norway is not starving. General Wood is probably convinced that Hitler is merely joking when he talks about organizing the world for a "new order" in which the humane and gentle Nazis will ride herd on all the rest of us. No wonder Hitler likes General Wood and approves his beneficent activities.

But why does the General like Hitler?

Giving them the strained benefit of every doubt, it is probably true that there are members of the "America Next" Committee who are sincere and patriotic Americans. However, it must be said that their credulity is more to be marveled at than their intelligence. It may be that they are being taken advantage of, just as the Communists used to take advantage of liberal and pacifist fellow travelers in their midst. The sooner decent and patriotic Americans repudiate the "America Next" Committee, the healthier the atmosphere will be all around.

An American publication that expresses the views of the "America Next" Committee is Scribner's Commentator. This journal follows the Nazi Party line, especially in foreign affairs. Its contributors in the December 1940 issue also included Colonel Lindbergh and General Wood. Among later contributors have been Hugh S. Johnson and other appeasers. As might have been expected of a Nazi Party journal, Scribner's Commentator denounced Dorothy Thompson, H. V. Kaltenborn, Robert E. Sherwood, President Conant of Harvard, Walter Lippmann, William Allen White, Archibald MacLeish, and, in general, all men and women of sincere democratic faith who are fighting Hitler and all his works.

I have spoken of General Wood as a prominent Chicagoan who is, wittingly or unwittingly, stooging for Hitler. But I must not overlook the worst of the lot—the mourning colonel who publishes the most malignant newspaper in America. I am referring, of course, to Robert R. McCormick, of the notorious Chicago Tribune.

I do not propose at this time to go into the black record of the Tribune—its contempt for the truth, its perversion of the news for its own base purposes, its looting of the school fund of Chicago by means of an unconscionable lease, or its base hatred of everything that is fine and decent in American life. I wish to confine myself to the bushwacking of the Tribune against the President's foreign policy and its bitter campaign against aid to Britain.

It will not surprise you to hear that the Chicago Tribune is hailed with joy both in Berlin and in Rome, and with good reason. One of its recent editorials discussing aid to Britain and the fighting democracies sounded exactly as if it had been written by Goebbels. It contained every ingredient that goes into a Nazi editorial compound—mendacities, viciousness, chauvinism, and unscrupulous anti-Semitism. Listen to parts of it and judge for yourself:

"The list of names on the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies is so long as to make adequate identification of the suggested influences a difficult research problem. Glancing through the list, we come upon the names of four J. P. Morgan partners. * * *

"When we look further into the list we see such names as James Warburg and Frank Altschul. Mr. Altschul is a member of the firm of Lazard Frères, investment bankers. * * * Mr. Warburg (was) born in Hamburg, Germany. * * *

"These two gentlemen are representative of great banking families in Hamburg and Paris which were influential in the finance and politics of Europe for a hundred years. The European properties of the families have been confiscated and their relatives and coreligionists have been subjected to an oppression greater than that under which the Irish suffered in their island. If these families could look at the world situation with an eye single to America's interest they would be lacking in natural affection. * * *"

In other words, the Tribune is saying exactly what the Nazis are saying—that wicked Jewish bankers are fighting Hitler, that poor little beggar on horseback. The Tribune also hinted broadly that these Jews cannot be loyal to America.

This amazing editorial was hailed in Berlin and hailed in Rome. Hitler's Volkischer Beobachter quoted from it and Mussolini's Popolo di Roma paraphrased it. Popolo di Roma said that the Chicago Tribune's diagnosis coincides perfectly with the official views of the Fascists. General Wood may have one accolade from Hitler, but Colonel McCormick has one from Hitler and another from Mussolini. It appears that we are dealing not with an Axis but with a triangle.

The Nazi fellow travelers are an assorted package. By and large, there are very few friends of democracy among them. The one characteristic that they have in common is their dread of the prospect of a Hitler defeat. Pretend as they may, jointly or severally, they wish to see Hitler successful and victorious. This is why they oppose our aid to Britain. This is why they bitterly object to our giving any help to the democracies that are fighting Nazi-Fascist brutality and aggression.

Do you know why they do not wish to see nazi-ism defeated? Because they fear that a defeat of nazi-ism would mean a resurgence of true democracy throughout Europe and the world. And a true democracy means a society based upon social reform, economic security, decent labor conditions, justice, equality, and equal opportunity. None of our appeasers, none of our fifth columnists, none of our labor baiters, none of our Nazi fellow travelers likes the prospect of such a democracy. They would rather be a Fritz Thyssen in a German concentration camp, as many of them will be if their hero should win, than share the blessings of American liberty on a basis equal to that of their fellow Americans. Therefore, they will do everything within their power to prevent the defeat of Hitler by Britain. Apparently they have forgotten, if they ever knew, that the Fritz Thyssen of today's brutal concentration camp is the same Fritz Thyssen who so admired Hitler when the latter began his struggle for political power in Germany that he dipped his hands deep into his wealth to help Hitler.

Doubtless other Nazi fellow travelers with a lust for power are toying with the hope that they may become "the man on horseback" for the United States. Doubtless even there are men among us who would be the Quisling of America. There is no nation that does not harbor potential traitors ready to sell out their country at the first opportunity. A British defeat would mean a tremendous victory for appeasers, Fascist racketeers, and Nazi fellow travelers. A British defeat woud jeopardize American unity with all of the dreams and hopes and promises of American democracy. Such a situation as might develop in this country, if Britain were prostrate and Nazi pressure were directed against us, might indeed offer the right opportunity that some ambitious "man on horseback" is looking for.

Some say that this is not our war; that it is an imperialistic war. This is the most insidious propaganda ever spread among the American people. But it is propaganda that the intelligent rank and file of the American people understand and reject. The people know that, in very truth, this war is our war. They recognized it as such by the enactment of the lend-lease bill. They underscore their awareness that this is our war every time that they approve the passage of a bill voting huge sums of money for aid to the brave peoples fighting Hitler and for our own defense. They know that this is a war to defend our oceans, a war to protect our shores, a war for our security. The American people know that if the British Fleet should be destroyed or captured by Hitler, we would be, as he has threatened, his next objective. Not only would we not be safe from the outside, we would continue to be exposed to domestic Nazi propagandists—both foreign and native born—who would deliberately preach disunity and spread hate and prejudice against religious and racial minorities, until the very fabric of our democracy would be rent and torn.

And what of the economic consequences of a Hitler victory?

Mr. Wendell Willkie has stated this as clearly as anyone. He said:

"Thus, if Germany wins, the United States and Canada will find themselves almost surrounded by governments hostile to our form of government and to our methods of trading with other people. And in that situation we shall have two choices, both equally fatal.

"We may choose to trade with those hostile governments. However, we must remember that our system is based upon competition between individuals. The totalitarian system is based on competition between States. Individuals cannot compete against States. Hence, if we choose to trade with totalitarians, we ourselves will have to adopt totalitarian methods. * * * Instead of that, we might choose not to trade with any nation. We might try to live within ourselves. But this, too, would be fatal. * * * We would lose our freedom in the very processes of trying to save it. And finally, if we were thus virtually surrounded by powers whose principles were hostile to ours, we would have to keep on almost indefinitely building colossal armaments. * * * And under that burden our democratic system would surely collapse."

For this patriotic and truly American stand, the Chicago Tribune has had the effrontery to attempt to read Wendell Willkie out of the Republican Party. Undoubtedly this has greatly added to the prestige of Mr. Willkie in the area in which the Chicago Tribune circulates.

But let's have done with these Nazi fellow travelers for tonight. We know who they are—at least some of them—and what they seek to accomplish. We shall continue to watch those whom we know and expose others whom we discover lurking in the dark places. We shall continue to throw the white light of publicity upon them and their activities. We must continue to do this for our own security. We must expose the facts to the clear view of the American people, in full confidence that if they know the truth they will not be misled by the Nazi fellow travelers, lulled into a feeling of false security by the appeasers, nor confused by the lies that roll off of Hitler's transmission belt in this country.

There is another important phase of the present situation about which I wish to talk briefly. It has to do with the peace which will follow this dreadful war, wantonly inflicted upon the world by Hitler.

We know that a negotiated peace is impossible now. We know that a peace imposed on the democracies by Hitler would be horrible to contemplate. The only peace that can be real and lasting will be one established by the democracies. To give the world real peace, the democracies must lean backwards in order to recognize justly the rights even of those who would have destroyed the democracies and Christian civilization with them.

So it is necessary that we begin to think about the terms of the peace that will be forced by the cooperation of the democracies. Without being distracted, even slightly, from our first and most important duty, that of all-out aid for Britain and the other gallant peoples who are fighting in the first line for their liberties and ours, we should give thought to the basic principles that should control the peace conference.

We, of my generation, have witnessed two world convulsions. We should be in a position to know the mistakes that were made after the first great World War, and knowing them, we should be determined that they will not be repeated. Further, we must guard carefully against new mistakes.

It is often said that we learn from history that man learns nothing from history. Let us now determine to learn from history. Let us now determine that the peace that will follow the triumph of the democracies will be a just peace—just not the least to those who today are so unjustly riding amuck in the world, threatening those very rights which they insist they must have for themselves. Let us neither create nor endure conditions that will permit the rise of another Hitler in the aftermath of the current war. We should now determine that the next treaty of peace will be a fertile seed out of which will grow the brotherhood of man. We have had enough of peace treaties that, even before the ink is dry upon them, become the spawning grounds for more wars, more men on horseback, more poverty and misery for humankind.

A lasting peace cannot be based on hate—nor on revenge—nor on inequality—nor on intolerance.

Peace, if it is to be lasting, if it is to be permanent, must be grounded on a recognition of the inalienable rights of all mankind.

A peace that includes a dismemberment of nations, or one that does violence to just geographic, economic, and ethnologic considerations is no peace at all.

The peace that the democracies shall advocate and strive for must embody guarantees of those four essential freedoms that President Roosevelt outlined in his address to the Congress on January 6. These are: freedom of speech and expression, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear.

Men of reason and good will must work out a peace along the lines that have been indicated, if the dreadful experience through which we are passing is not to be repeated again and yet again. But before we can have this sort of peace, or any kind of peace at all for that matter, the principles of democracy must win on the field of battle. It is our prayerful hope that that victory will be won without actual involvement on our part. It can thus be won if we have the will and the ability to supply arms and planes and ships at such times and in such quantities as they may be needed by those who are fighting the good fight for us as well as for themselves—by the British, by the Greeks, and by the Yugoslavians.

The situation in which we are involved today is something that is much more portentous and fateful even than the most gigantic war in all history. The fact is that we are involved in a world revolution. It is all right for the appeasers to tell us, as they told Austria and Czechoslovakia and France and Belgium and so on down the list, that it takes two to make war; that neutrality on our part will merit and receive respect from Hitler. The trouble with those hapless countries was that they did not realize that a revolution was about to engulf the world. There was no anchor that would hold the ship safe in the tossing waves of a revolution. One cannot calmly sit and watch a revolution rage by. Not even with the best will in the world can we do this even if we continue to be successful in keeping free of the actual clash of arms.

But if America cannot keep out of a world revolution, it can at least take steps to mitigate its effects upon our own country. We must put and keep our house in such order that none who dwells therein would prefer another roof. To do this we must continue to conduct our affairs in accordance with democratic principles, but with ever greater consideration and understanding and justice. We must not only keep the social gains that we have won, we must consolidate and increase them. This is the only true, as it is the only safe, course for America in a time of world revolution. We should unite not only in fact, but in spirit, if we would make a safe harbor.

Here lies the path of genuine statesmanship.

Editorial Tribute to the Late Senator Sheppard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 18, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE FORT WORTH STAR-TELEGRAM

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD an editorial written for the Fort Worth Star-Telegram and published on Thursday, April 10, in honor of the late Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of April 10, 1941]

A NATIONAL LOSS

The untimely death of Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD, who for 39 years had represented Texas in Congress, constitutes a well-nigh irreparable loss to the Nation, a loss which is shared by his home State, the administration, and the Democratic Party. The deficit created by the removal of the wisdom of experience from national councils is not made up by election of a man to the place of the dead leader.

The initial blow falls upon the vitally important Senate Military Affairs Committee, of which Senator SHEPPARD was chairman, and which has been vitally employed in recent months in defense planning and enactment. Senator SHEPPARD's dominant position in the Senate has been a large factor in the distribution of Army camps and defense plants according to a system of decentralization which promises greatly increased efficiency of defense. The Texas Senator held other important congressional posts, among them being membership of Senate committees dealing with commerce, irrigation and reclamation, manufactures, and various economic activities. He long had been an active proponent of rivers and harbors improvement, and was a strong supporter of the Trinity watershed development program.

Senator SHEPPARD's 39 years in Congress brought to him the title of "Dean of the Senate." To that valuable element of seniority were added the maturity of judgment and settled wisdom that come best with years. He was a prodigious worker, who stayed at his task from early morning till past nightfall. Among his preemergency accomplishments were his sponsorship of the suffrage amendment, of national prohibition, and maternity aid. Senator SHEPPARD had the ear and respect of all classes, from national leaders to the humblest worker. To legitimate appeals of all classes, he gave equal attention.

As one of the few trustworthy leaders remaining of the previous war Congress, Senator SHEPPARD's experience fitted him peculiarly for service in the present defense emergency. He was both a wise counselor and useful aid of the President and the military department of the Government. In him were summed up the virtues of the good citizen, the patriot, the statesman, the national leader, and the efficient public servant.

Senator SHEPPARD's unwavering loyalty stood out in the current period of national conflict. He was faithful to his country, its Government, his State, his party, his friends, and his family. In the intimate grief of the last, the Nation extends its sympathetic affection.

The Nation has lost a stanch servant who, at the same time, was endowed with the highest qualities of leadership. To the multitude of Senator SHEPPARD's friends and admirers, his death brings a feeling of personal loss as well as realization that a blow has fallen upon the country as a whole.

Tribute to the Late Frederic William Wile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 18, 1941

TRIBUTE BY HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS, OF INDIANA

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief tribute to the life and work of the late Frederic William Wile, a fellow citizen of the State of Indiana, who, for many years, served with distinction in the Press Gallery of the United States Senate.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, already, in my limited experience in the United States Senate, I have been impressed with the dependence that Members of the Congress place upon newspapers and upon the men engaged in the newspaper profession for information upon

current affairs, both in the Nation and in the world.

The Members of the Congress probably never will reach that frame of mind in which they will use the oft-quoted expression of the late Will Rogers, "All I know is what I read in the papers." There is made manifest, however, day by day, the amount of information which they gather from the newspapers and upon which they rely heavily to chart their positions on public questions.

Within the past decade the journalistic profession has added to the mere recording of events a discussion of the portents of these events with relation to national and world affairs. It is highly essential, therefore, that the men charged with the responsibility of reviewing these events be able, conscientious, and, above all, patriotic.

It is heartening to know that so many who are engaged in collecting the news and in writing the review of the news have a full sense of this responsibility. Such men are rendering a valuable service to our country.

One of these men—my native neighbor in up-State Indiana—a columnist, news commentator, foreign correspondent, and pioneer in radio news broadcasting, went back home for the last time last Wednesday, April 9.

Frederic William Wile, truly a gentleman and a great reporter, must have looked forward often to returning to the placid Hoosier farm lands after the nerve-racking experience of covering both the Boer War and the World War. But his body was taken for burial into a different La Porte, Ind., than that which he remembered—a La Porte whose thousands of acres of farm land are now being transformed into a huge Government shell-loading plant. It has become an ironical resting place for one who served so long on the war fronts of Europe and Africa, bringing news of war to his American readers. He was 67 years old when he died.

Frederic William Wile was faithful to his profession from his early boyhood, when he edited the Wile Evening Journal, until his last days when he wrote his autobiography, News Is Where You Find It, and continued his newspaper articles.

Other books which Mr. Wile found time to write are: Men Around the Kaiser, 1913; The Assault, 1915; The German-American Plot, 1915; Explaining the Britishers, 1918; The Life of Emile Berliner, 1936; and A Century of Industrial Progress, 1928.

The last correspondent with British affiliations—he was then working for the London Daily Mail—to leave Berlin before the declaration of war in 1914, he was always loathe to admit that his job was done. As the Washington Star said on April 8, "Mr. Wile was not content merely with getting the news and writing it well. His job, as he saw it, was not done until the story was in the paper, and the painstaking effort that he would put into last-minute revisions to keep his story, an editorial, or his column, as the case might be, abreast of the latest developments was the true mark of the master craftsman."

It was only a short time after he obtained his first full-time newspaper job on the Chicago Record in 1898 that he became a foreign correspondent for the Chicago Tribune, Chicago Daily News, and the New York Times. He served as lieutenant colonel in the military intelligence after the entry of the United States into the war. He was later to collect $6,000 from the German Government as reparation for false arrest as a spy.

His writing continued voluminously here in Washington after the war. During that time, he worked hard to attain the voting privilege for residents of the District of Columbia. He called the lack of District suffrage "scandalous." Paradoxically, 1936 was the only year in which he ever cast a Presidential vote of his own.

The Nation and the world, and Indiana in particular, mourn the passing of this capable member of the great band of Hoosier writers.

Use of American Vessels for Convoys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 18, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. RUSH D. HOLT

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address recently delivered over the radio by a former member of this body, Hon. Rush D. Holt, on the use of American vessels for convoys.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is with pleasure that I accept the invitation of the No Foreign War Committee to talk to you tonight on the subject of convoys. Twenty-four years ago tomorrow the United States declared war. Remember the war? I am sure the parents and friends of the boys who lie buried in France remember it. That was called a war to make the world safe for democracy, but it wasn't. Boys died for that fine ideal, but those who made the slogans lived on. Today others are making slogans for your boy or your friend to die in another war for democracy. The slogan makers and the planners will tell the soldiers why they should die while they stay 3,000 miles from the battlefield. Yes; that was called a war to end all wars, but it wasn't. Again led by the President and others, we are given a 1941 version of that slogan that there will be no peace until there is total victory. But those who are taking this country in war won't die in the deserts of Africa, or drown in the beautiful Pacific, or be torn to pieces by shrapnel trying to land in Europe. Your son will do that. These men will live on to make new slogans for another generation.

Now, after 24 years, the administration is heading straight into the war. We are being tricked into going in. We are going into an undeclared war. At least in 1917 the President of the United States had the courage to ask for a declaration of war. Today the move is to take our great country into the conflict through the back door, by forcing an incident so that they can hypocritically say we have been attacked and therefore our national honor is at stake. That is why the convoy issue is being brought to the front now. They have tried time and time again to force the Axis Powers to declare war on us. They have committed what they admit to be "acts of war" against countries with which we are supposedly at peace. These countries have not seen fit to declare war. Now they want to take our ships, our sailors, into the war zones and force the issue, force it in such a way that the decision will not rest with the dictators but with those in Washington who have been sold on war as a means of covering up their failures to solve our own domestic problems. They do not want peace, because peace would mean that the facts would come out into the open and the most despicable diplomacy in American history would be shown in its horrid nakedness of our part in starting and our part in continuing the war now raging in Europe.

Step by step we have gone closer and closer to war. Not once since war broke out on the first day of September has the President done one thing for peace. Every step, every action, every speech, has been to get us farther into the conflict until today we are in the war in every way except from a military standpoint. All that remains is to send your boys into another one of Europe's many wars. They say we do not intend to go to war unless we are attacked. But how do they want to force that attack? It is easy. Just have our battleships escort our merchant ships into the war zones. Everyone with any common sense knows that Germany will sink every ship she can under such circumstances. Then our battleships are to protect and the shooting begins, but before that shooting ends, your sons will be killed by the thousands, yes, by the tens of thousands. That will be the attack and then in all hypocrisy, they will say they went to war because we had been attacked. Everything is being done to force the issue so as to have the excuse to get in. By subterfuge and dishonesty, the American people have been taken to the very precipice of war. Officials in Washington have not told the truth. They have been preaching peace while preparing for war. They talk about defense as they get ready to create another American expeditionary force.

Now, the implement of propaganda is at work to sell the American people the necessity of convoys. The Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies has already started the propaganda drive going for convoys but that is to be expected. By the way, if you want a copy of my exposé of this outfit, just write me, Rush D. Holt, Washington, D. C., and a copy will be sent. You will see why they want convoys.

From the beginning you haven't been told the truth about our foreign policy. You have been given untruths and half-truths to sell you war under the label of peace.

Why did they say they wanted the Neutrality Act passed? You remember—to keep our ships out of the war zones. Let me quote the words of SAM RAYBURN, now Speaker of the House, on November 2, 1939, during that debate:

"What would be the reaction in a great conservative country like yours and mine, in which, as I stated, 99 percent of the people are praying that they may stay out of this war, if an American ship were sunk and 100, 200, or 500 innocent boys were sent to the bottom of the ocean. I tremble to contemplate what might be the reaction of this country to the sinking of ships and destruction of American lives * * *" and then Speaker RAYBURN continued in these ominous words: "I saw this country, and I was a Representative in the Congress of the United States at that time, when there occurred the loss of lives and the violation of rights we then claimed—I saw this country converted from a peace to a war mind in 60 days."

Yes, Speaker RAYBURN, you did see that change. That is why the war crowd wants convoys. They want some incident created by which this country can be plunged into that terrible mass slaughter of Europe. You know, Speaker RAYBURN, although you will favor convoys if the President tells you to do so, that the sentiment may change in this country in 60 days when American boys are sent to their watery graves.

I want to recall to you the speech of the majority leader of the Senate, Senator BARKLEY, when he cited ship after ship sunk in 1915–17 as the reason for our entering the war. Shall we duplicate that period? We will if we start convoys.

Also note these words of Senator WAGNER, strong administration supporter on October 7, 1939:

"There is only one realistic course for America to follow if it wants to avoid the causes of war and at the same time maintain its dignity and self-respect. This course is for the American Congress absolutely to prohibit American ships from carrying American passengers or American goods of any

kind to any belligerent nation, or to proceed through any combat areas."

What did SOL BLOOM, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, say of the danger? I quote from a speech of October 31, 1939, when he said:

"Where a part of the world has gone mad, where laws and rights are trampled upon, it is folly for the United States to expect its ships and citizens to be safe in exercising their rights. They will not be safe. They will be slaughtered. The United States would go to war as a consequence and in that war thousands of other lives would be sacrificed."

Much has been written about Senator JAMES BYRNES, one of the Presidential advisers. What did he say about the danger? Let me quote from a speech of October 1939:

"Under the administration proposal (the cash-and-carry proposal) we sacrifice our right to sail the seas. By the cash requirement we sacrifice the right even to send American property on the ships of other nations into the zone of war. By this sacrifice we remove the cause of our entering the World War and the cause most likely to result in our entering another war."

President Roosevelt gave us the solemn assurance, and I quote, "This Government clearly and definitely will insist that American citizens and American ships keep away from the immediate perils of the actual zones of conflict."

How can we convoy without entering the war zone?

But let us not try to fool ourselves. Convoying means war. War means the death of American boys.

Why is it that every single individual in this country who wants us to actually declare war advocates convoying? Because they know it is the absolute, sure way of getting this great country into war. They have thought that this step and that step, advocated in the past, would force the Axis Powers to declare war on the United States. They have not seen fit to do so although we have committed acts of war against them. Now, they can hardly wait to get into the battle, not loaning money, not leasing ships, tanks, guns, and implements of war, but actually in the shooting, killing part of war. They want to send American ships into the war zones, knowing full well that they will be sunk, that American boys will die, that the American flag will sink, and that would provide the excuse for our declaring war against the Axis. We would be attacked, and then the President would say that we would have to defend our honor, our citizens, our rights, and, therefore, war would be the only remaining course; not the kind of war we are now conducting, but the kind that kills our boys on the battlefields, sinks them into the ocean. That is the kind of war convoying means.

What do convoys mean? Let me tell you what three spokesmen for the administration's foreign policy say convoys mean.

First, let me call upon the words of that distinguished and able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator WALTER GEORGE. Here are his words:

"As plainly as I can, I have always stood against convoying vessels by the American Fleet and will stand against convoying vessels by any unit of the American Fleet until and unless the point shall come when I shall be willing to vote for war, because, in my judgment, convoying would lead us into actual war."

Of course, it would lead into the shooting, killing part of the war. But let me proceed with the words of Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, in reply to two questions on convoying. He was asked: "You stand much opposed to the idea of convoying merchantmen across the Atlantic?" He answered, "Yes." Then he was asked, "You do look upon it as an act of war?" Again he was direct in his answer with the plain word, "Yes."

However, the last authority is the most important because if convoying is done, he and he alone will be the responsible man for it. He has the power to do so. What did President Roosevelt say convoys meant, and I quote:

"Convoying means shooting, and shooting means war."

Well, Mr. President, do you want convoys which mean shooting, which in turn means war? You have taken action after action toward this war. Shall you take the one that will cause the shooting to start? I fear because of your record of the past 2 years, not a record of peace.

What can you do? I'll tell you. Write tonight to your Congressman and to your Senators against convoys. You may think that is useless, but do not be deceived by the war crowd's propaganda to discourage letters to Congressmen. Had not millions of you written letters against steps taken toward war, we would have been in actual total war today. Your letters and your protests have kept this country out of the shooting. They can keep it out if you are interested enough in our country to spend a few moments advising your Congressman and Senators that you do not want convoys, that you are against another A. E. F., that you want peace.

Opening Dinner, 1941 Campaign, Greater New York Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 18, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on Monday, April 14, 1941, Hon. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General, delivered an address at the opening dinner of the 1941 campaign to raise a fund for the welfare and health services operating in Greater New York. I ask unanimous consent that this address by a distinguished citizen and former official be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. FARLEY. This is a thrilling occasion. In this room are men and women whose energy and vision and organizing ability have helped to make this city the business center of the world. Here, too, are men and women whose skill and strength and steadfastness are the foundation on which the city's business has risen to greatness. Some of us are white of skin, some dark; some pledge allegiance to one creed, some to another; but all of us—employer and employee, capital and labor, Catholic, Protestant, and Jew—are united tonight by concern for one common cause, the Greater New York Fund, whose fourth annual campaign opens today.

We have fallen into the way of saying that the Greater New York Fund is an appeal to business firms and employee groups on behalf of some 400 great welfare and health services. I say to you that this is an appeal for something far more fundamental than support for these 400 organizations. It is an appeal for the American way of life. It is an appeal for the future of 2,000,000 of our fellow New Yorkers. It is an appeal that could only be made in a city like this, and a country like this, where we are free—free to express our good will for each other, free to live and speak and worship as we will, free to help each other as we will, without a question asked as to politics or race or faith.

That's an appeal worth answering, in these troubled times. While we sit here in friendship, men and women are fightng and suffering and dying in other parts of the world. Bitter prejudice and discrimination and intolerance have bred a war that is crushing peaceful towns and green valleys and once-prosperous cities. Many of us have known these cities and towns and quiet valleys in happier days. We have friends and relatives there. From those countries whose names are in all the headlines have come men and women who have enriched the life of this Nation in countless ways.

Our hearts are heavy as we think of the destruction that is going on, and we should not be Americans if we were not quick and generous in our efforts to relieve the widespread suffering abroad.

But there is suffering in our own city of New York; here, too, are men and women broken in body and spirit; here, too, are children hungry and helpless.

These are our people. You have seen their faces in the fund motion picture. You know—after seeing the picture—that these New York neighbors of ours are no different from ourselves. There are no visible scars to mark them as casualties in the battle for health and well-being. We should not recognize them if we passed them on the street outside of this hotel, or sat next to them in the subway train going home. We might truly say, "There, but for the grace of God, go I."

Suppose that came true next week, next month, next year.

If that happened, I'd want to know there'd be another chance for me and mine. You'd want that chance, too—for yourself—for your wife or child—for the man who runs the little shop where you have your shoes repaired.

Well—it's up to you and me.

The Greater New York Fund is our chance to give a chance, to our own people, here at home. It's home defense; and if there were time I could cite instance after instance from the records of draft boards all over the country to prove to you how vital to our national defense it is that these welfare and health services be—not maintained—but strengthened. We're paying a price right now because in years past we have given too little attention to the day-in, day-out struggle against undernourishment and sickness and discontent.

For 3 years now the Greater New York Fund has called on us for this vital defense.

For 3 years you and I, who work and do business in this city, have not made good.

The need which the fund gave us a chance to meet year by year during the last 3 years totals $30,000,000. The business firms, corporations, and employee groups of the greatest and richest city in the world raised $11,000,000. Business has not raised as much as $4,000,000 in any one of these years to give a helping hand to the people who need a break in a city where business prospers as it does nowhere else in the world.

When I say that the need is $10,000,000 a year, that is not a guess. A committee composed of businessmen and women, social workers, public-spirited and philanthropic citizens, worked for several years in the middle thirties analyzing the city's health and welfare services and how the demands on them had increased, and estimating from their financial statements their immediate and future needs.

In 1938 the Greater New York Fund was formed. Its purpose was twofold: First, to raise new and additional money to eke out the rapidly dwindling total of philanthropic contributions; second, to obtain this needed additional support from the source that had thus far given least—the business concerns and employee groups of New York City.

The fund offered business a simple method making one contribution once a year to help social welfare and health agencies meet their budgets. Thus business not only was relieved of sifting hundreds of appeals each year from individual agencies but obtained a channel by which it could merge into one donation all its giving to the important welfare and health services that participate in the fund. The fund plan offered assurance that business enterprises which contributed would receive no further appeals from fund agencies. It guaranteed the distribution of the money raised without waste, and with something more—the certainty that for the first time in New York's history the distribution would be scientific, well organized, aimed to help forgotten groups and neglected areas.

How did business respond to this?

Let us look at the record.

In 1938 the amount raised fell short of the need by $8,600,000. In 1939 the shortage was $5,800,000. In 1940, again there was a deficit of $6,800,000.

That is water over the dam now. This year—today—we are faced with the fourth campaign of the Greater New York Fund.

What is New York business going to do about it?

I am counting on raising not less than $5,000,000.

We can do this. We can do much more than this—if we go about it in the right way.

First, we must believe in the Greater New York Fund. We can't sell anything that we don't believe in.

Second, we must show our prospects—the businessmen into whose offices we go—that by this one gift to the fund they cover their contributions to 400 agencies.

Third, we must break down the all-too-frequent opposition by firms to permitting their employees to be solicited as groups. Employees have just as much right as their employers to a chance to do their duty to community welfare.

Fourth, our campaign must be short and vigorous. A long campaign means wasting money.

Fifth, we must see our prospects in person. It isn't enough to write. It isn't enough to telephone. We'll have to wear out shoe leather on this job. Nothing takes the place of a personal interview.

Sixth, we must follow through on solicitation of employee groups. We must stimulate interest among employees, not only in our own companies but wherever we have business connections. In small firms where there are no company chairmen, this is especially important.

That is our strategy—conviction, speed, face-to-face appeal—and the greatest of these is conviction.

Over a million employees now are organized into contributing groups. Many of these groups have never been so organized before. Pledges are already coming in and the increases are striking—for instance, the trucking section, which raised $3,500 last year, is working on a goal of $20,000 from the drivers to be matched by a similar gift from the trucking employers.

Labor is backing the fund. Over the air and in union meetings the appeal has already been presented to scores of groups of organized workers.

The business women of the city are behind us, the churches, public-spirited civic organizations. Ten thousand volunteers have been working day and night at fund headquarters, in the boroughs, in factories, and stores and offices, forgetting their personal profit, their convenience, and their comfort. Tonight I pay tribute to them all. Their hard work is one of the two important factors in the success which I am confident I shall be able to report to you 6 weeks from this time.

The second factor in our success is the quality of the service for the support of which we appeal. Listen to this letter, written to one of our fund organizations:

"Do you suppose any of your contributors have ever stood outside the door of a social agency, licked in body and soul * * *. I was in that position a year ago. * * *

"I had been led to expect that social workers took a fiendish glee in prying into one's past, ruthlessly tearing down every defense, until you felt as naked as the day you came into the world, but since you were asking for charity you'd have to take it.

"But to my surprise this social worker I talked to did no such thing. She didn't ask one embarrassing question. * * * And unexpectedly I found myself pouring out the whole pitiful story, the succession of nervous shocks, the severe illness that had necessitated a year in bed under the most trying conditions, and that had drained me of every scrap of physical strength and emotional stability, the shortness of funds that wouldn't even cover my meager food needs during convalescence, and the difficult struggle back to health and normalcy which just didn't seem worth the effort. * * *

"I left her an hour later with funds enough to meet my most pressing needs and with the firm conviction that here was one person who was interested in me and who really cared what happened to me. In all the months since that time I haven't changed my mind. * * *

"There has been plenty of financial help, what with two more operations and another long convalescence. But somehow, it just hasn't felt like charity; certainly not when she came to the hospital both times and sat with me through the last difficult hour before going to the operating room."

I haven't time to read the rest of that letter, but let me ask you this question.

Are you willing that such help should end? That it should even be curtailed?

I am not, but the record tells me that in these last 3 years the shortage of money has forced some organizations to cut entire services and others to help fewer people or do less for those they have helped. Sometimes emergency service only has been given, where long-time preventive work was needed.

Don't count the cost of such reduced services in money only. Dollars alone can't measure the loss when a summer camp, fully equipped to care for 200 children a season, has to be closed for 4 years; when a hospital has to deny free care to 400 sick people who need it; when there is less medical and dental service in a neighborhood center; when unmarried mothers can no longer be helped to keep their babies with them and are thus deprived of their greatest incentive for rebuilding their lives.

Let me say one thing more.

I believe in the Greater New York Fund.

Wherever I go in this city that I am proud to call my home, I see evidences of the fine work that the fund is helping to support. I have seen one organization where men and women who were being shut away from life by the loss of hearing were being helped to break down the silence that was walling them in. I have seen another organization where children—eager, talented, courteous—were busy and useful and happy in a clubhouse set like an oasis in the midst of a drab neighborhood once notorious as the breeding place of criminals.

And when I was there I noticed that the dingy walls of the houses adjoining the playground were hidden by a tremendous painting illustrating a fairy tale we all know—Jack and the Beanstalk. There was the famous beanstalk—four stories high, growing out of the concrete-covered soil of New York—and there was a small boy, climbing determinedly to the top. I looked at that painting, and I looked at the boys and girls crowding around me to welcome me to their club, and I thought that the Greater New York Fund was something like that pictured beanstalk—giving boys and girls, men and women, too, for that matter, not something to cling to, but something to climb by—to climb to health, to usefulness, to happiness and independence.

An organization that does that is worth working for.

A city that supports such an organization is a good city in which to live or make a living.

And so tonight, as our campaign opens, I give you this challenge:

Let's stand together.

Let's work hard.

Let's give the Greater New York Fund's 1941 campaign support that is on a par with the vast trade and activity of our city.

On the wall of this room is the magnificent poster which is Miss Neysa McMein's contribution to the fund. That little girl might be your child or mine. She is, literally, one in a million—a million young people in this city against whom the doors of fund welfare and health organizations must not close.

Ladies and gentlemen, I call on you to do more than work—go out and fight to make this campaign succeed. We must win. The stake is that look of faith and hope on the face of a child.

Four Million Irishmen Against Forty Million Englishmen and Forty Million Englishmen Against Eighty Million Germans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of April 19, 1941:

[From the Saturday Evening Post]

In a letter to the London Daily Herald, George Bernard Shaw writes: "England has held her hand very hard. No other country in the world would have accepted the situation. Mr. de Valera is asking Mr. Churchill to imperil his 40,000,000 people for the sake of the mere paper neutrality of 4,000,000 hostile Irishmen. Mr. de Valera wants to make Ireland another Switzerland, but it can't be done. He says those ports belong to Eire, but the day is gone when any race of people can call land its own. These ports belong to Europe, to civilization. * * *"

If 4,000,000 Irishmen have no rights that 40,000,000 Englishmen are bound to respect, what rights have 40,000,000 Englishmen that 80,000,000 Germans are bound to respect? If

the day is gone when people may call their land their own, what is England defending and what is the war about? Thirdly, if this is liberal ethic and liberal thinking, then liberalism of this cult, as we have suspected before, is morally and intellectually bankrupt.

Debunking "An Odorous Comparison" Concerning the Los Angeles Light and Power System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, newspapers throughout the country are being flooded with canned editorials prepared by utility propagandists for the purpose of discrediting public ownership and operation of light and power facilities.

A few days ago a copy of one came to my desk, which reads as follows:

AN ODOROUS COMPARISON

In Los Angeles a municipally owned electric-utility system serves the densely populated urban area, the cream of the market, and a private corporation, the Southern California Edison Co., operates in the outlying territory. Here is how their operations stack up:

Southern California Edison Co., calendar year 1939—

Operating revenue	$45,785,983
Taxes paid	$7,936,956
Ratio taxes to revenue (percent)	17.33

Municipal light bureau, fiscal year ending June 30, 1940:

Operating revenue	$30,173,456
Taxes paid	$112,086
Ratio taxes to revenue (percent)	0.37

Although the private company was taxed 47 times as much on each dollar of revenue as the favored municipal plant, its average rate was 1.54 cents per kilowatt-hour compared with 1.95 cents for the city-owned utility. Federal corporation taxes were increased from 18 to 24 percent, effective in 1940, which would have made the disparity even greater if the Edison Co.'s year had coincided with the city light bureau's fiscal year.

I was somewhat familiar with the facts, and was shocked to think that such false and misleading propaganda would be sent throughout the country and published by unsuspecting editors.

I therefore addressed a letter to Hon. E. F. Scattergood, advisory engineer in charge of the Bureau of Power and Light of the City of Los Angeles, with which I enclosed this article. Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting his reply:

[Department of Water and Power, City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Power and Light]

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 10, 1941.*

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
Member of Congress,
Room 358, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RANKIN: Responsive to your request of March 15, 1941, there is enclosed for your consideration and use, as you may see fit, comparisons between the financial operations of the Bureau of Power and Light and those of the Southern California-Edison Co., and also those of the average of the half-dozen larger cities east of the Mississippi River.

From these you may pick out the basis of comparison which will loan itself best to your purposes. All these comparisons are on a fair and meaningful basis, and not deliberately deceptive, as in the case of An Odorous Comparison, copy of which you sent me and which is being returned to you along with a copy of your letter to me.

The Southern California-Edison Co. sells approximately one-half of its total energy at wholesale rates, at transmission voltages, to the electric railways of the Los Angeles metropolitan area, both the Los Angeles city railways and the interurban railways of the Pacific Electric Co. A comparison, therefore, with the average rate per kilowatt-hour is utterly meaningless and, undoubtedly, deliberately deceptive. The Bureau of Power and Light has no such wholesale power deliveries to railways or anything corresponding to it. Even excluding the electric railways deliveries of the Edison company, the company has a far greater percentage of large industrial consumers.

The only true basis of comparison of sales rates per kilowatt-hour can be made by assuming one utility's gross earnings on the assumption that its sales were made by use of the rate schedules of other utilities. The set-up shown shows clearly that if the power bureau had used the Edison company rate schedules it would have collected, during the year in question, $37,241,034 in operating revenue instead of only $30,152,242, showing the Edison rates to average approximately 23 percent greater for the classes of consumers connected to the Power Bureau line.

It is evident that with the increase of more than $7,000,000 in revenue through the use of the Edison rates, the Power Bureau could have paid full corporation taxes in excess of what it would transfer to the city in lieu of taxes, and still be approximately $3,000,000 to the good, over and above the actual net earnings which it would make.

I hope this will serve your purposes and that you will be able to use it, as I know you desire to do, in a manner that will be greatly to the public interest.

Sincerely yours,

L. F. SCATTERGOOD.

LOS ANGELES MUNICIPAL BUREAU OF POWER AND LIGHT

TAXES PAID IN CONTRAST WITH PRIVATE UTILITY TAX BURDENS

In considering the taxes paid by municipal utilities and reflecting on the smallness of the item, the matter of cash contributions to local government and for civic benefit, as well as the equivalent thereof through free or partially paid for services rendered, is generally ignored, or lightly passed over. These items, as revealed through the surveys made by the Federal Power Commission, are not inconsiderable, at least in many instances. This is true, particularly, if the burden of bond amortization on the municipal utility is taken into account.

This matter of cash contributions, amortization of bonds, and rate savings to the municipal customers is often dismissed by the skeptic with the idea that the municipal utility would fail if it were to pay taxes on a basis equivalent to that under which private utilities operate. That this is not the case is revealed by a comparison at hand, which shows the earnings and profit that the Los Angeles municipal enterprise would make on a private-utility basis of operation, and measuring such earnings and profit in the same manner that a private utility would. For purpose of comparison, we will consider the results of the operation of the Southern California Edison Co. for the year 1939:

Gross revenue	$46,246,573
Operating revenue	45,785,994
Taxes paid (local, State, Federal, social-security, etc.)	7,936,956
Gross earnings (total after all expense but before interest)	19,468,704
Net income (available for dividends)	12,701,917

The results of the operation of the municipal Bureau of Power and Light of Los Angeles for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, were as follows:

Gross revenue	$30,173,457
Operating revenue	30,152,242
Taxes paid	112,086
Net earnings (total after all expense but before interest)	11,247,655
Net income	6,783,994

It should be noted that although it would appear that the tax burden on the bureau was only $112,086, that it transferred $1,018,000 to the city treasury out of its net income, and, similarly, in the previous year it transferred $1,124,300. For the current fiscal year it is contemplated that the transfer will be substantially greater. However, we have not yet answered the question as to what would happen if the bureau paid taxes on a basis equivalent to private-utility operation.

If the municipal enterprise of Los Angeles would pay all taxes—local, State, and Federal, inclusive of employee social-security taxes, etc.—the results would be as follows:

Gross revenue	$30,173,457
Operating revenue	30,152,242
Tax requirement	4,530,582
Gross earnings (total after all expense but before interest)	6,829,159
Net income	2,265,498

Note that this net income is on the basis that the bond interest requirement would be increased over that of municipal operation and practice, because of the nonamortization of bonds, similar to private-utility practice, and that therefore the net income would be less than if the interest requirement were not so increased.

Since the municipal rates in Los Angeles are substantially lower than the rates applied by the Southern California Edison Co., and even more so with respect to rates of eastern cities, the following two presentations are on the basis of such prevailing rates and the taxes that would relate to such increased revenue:

Municipal Los Angeles operation at Southern California Edison Co. rates

Gross revenue	$37,262,249
Operating revenue	37,241,034
Tax requirement	5,876,015
Gross earnings	12,572,518
Net income	8,008,857

Municipal Los Angeles operation at rates averaged for 6 private utilities in the East

Gross revenue	$44,257,569
Operating revenue	44,236,354
Tax requirement	7,305,540
Gross earnings	18,138,313
Net income	13,574,652

Now that we have the earnings-and-profits picture before us, it is appropriate to measure these factors on the same basis that a private utility would. "Gross earnings" is usally measured by private utilities and regulatory bodies in terms of a rate of return on rate base, and for comparative purposes such earnings are compared here on the basis of average capital (investment in plant and equipment, without deduction for depreciation), as follows:

Gross earnings as a return on average capital

	Amounts	Rate of return on capital
Southern California Edison Co. (1939):		
Average capital (undepreciated)	$354, 103, 537	Percent
Gross earnings	19, 468, 704	5. 50
Los Angeles B.P.&L. Municipal Plant (1939–40):		
Average capital (undepreciated)	203, 305, 637	
Gross earnings—actual	11, 247, 655	5. 53
Gross earnings under private utility tax burden:		
At B.P.&L. rates	6, 829, 159	3. 36
At Southern California Edison rates	12, 572, 518	6. 18
At 6 eastern cities average rates	18, 138, 313	8. 92

"Net income" is profit available for dividends, according to private utility practice, on the capital-stock ownership. For a municipal system, the factor equivalent to stock ownership is the citizens' equity in the enterprise, whether it be by investment of the citizens, through taxes, or whether, as in the case of the Los Angeles enterprise, the equity does not represent investment by taxation but represents investment through accumulated profits, obtained, largely, as a result of the policy followed as to amortization of outstanding bonds. "Net income" is usually measured in terms of the return on the stock-ownership investment, and comparison is made as follows:

Net income available for dividends on capital stock

	Amounts	Rate of return on stock
Southern California Edison Co. (1939):		
Capital stock ownership	[1] $166, 989, 917	Percent
Net income available for dividends	12, 701, 917	7. 61
(Dividends actually paid)	(11, 133, 881)	(6. 7)
Los Angeles B. P. & L. Municipal plant (1939–40):		
Citizens' Equity in Enterprise	[1] 74, 788, 850	
Net income, actual	6, 783, 994	10. 47
Net income under private utility tax burden:		
At B. P. & L. rates	2, 265, 498	3. 50
At Southern California Edison rates	8, 008, 857	12. 36
At 6 eastern cities average rates	13, 574, 652	20. 95

[1] At beginning of year.

Summary of income, expense, and earnings comparison under municipal and private utility tax and rate conditions

[Based on detailed analysis of tax items under various revenue bases]

	Southern California Edison Co.: Actual for calendar year 1939	Bureau of Power and Light, city of Los Angeles			
		Actual operations for fiscal year 1939–40	On private utility tax bases—various rate conditions		
			At actual rates of Bureau of Power and Light	At rates of Southern California Edison Co.	At eastern United States rates (average for 6 utilities)
Approximate rate base (average capital undepreciated)	$354, 103, 537	[1] $203, 305, 637	[1] $203, 305, 637	[1] $203, 305, 637	[1] $203, 305, 637
Equity investment (capital stock or citizens' equity) (beginning of year)	166, 989, 917	64, 788, 850	64, 788, 850	64, 788, 850	64, 788, 850
Gross revenue (operating plus net nonoperative)	46, 246, 573	30, 173, 457	30, 173, 457	37, 262, 249	44, 257, 569
Expenses (before interest):					
Taxes (local, State, and Federal, including social security)	7, 936, 956	112, 086	4, 530, 582	5, 876, 015	7, 305, 540
Other expenses (including depreciation and employee benefits)	18, 840, 913	18, 813, 716	18, 813, 716	18, 813, 716	18, 813, 716
Total expenses (before interest)	26, 777, 869	18, 925, 802	23, 344, 298	24, 689, 731	26, 119, 256
Gross earnings before interest	$19, 468, 704	$11, 247, 655	$6, 829, 159	$12, 572, 518	$18, 138, 313
Rate of return on capital in operation (rate base)—percent	5. 50	5. 53	3. 36	6. 18	8. 92
Net interest (including amortization bond premium and expenses)	$6, 766, 787	$4, 463, 661	[2] $4, 563, 661	[2] $4, 563, 661	[2] $4, 563, 661
Net income after interest (available for dividends)	[3] $12, 701, 917	$6, 783, 994	$2, 265, 498	$8, 008, 857	$13, 574, 652
Rate of return on equity investment—percent	[3] 7. 61	10. 47	3. 50	12. 36	20. 95

[1] Inclusive of property acquired from Southern California Edison Co. as of beginning of year, in order to show proper comparisons with earnings.
[2] Interest item for Bureau of Power and Light increased $100,000 under basis of private utility operation, in consideration of fact that Bonds would not be amortized in such case.
[3] Of net income for 1939 there was appropriated, for dividends, the amount of $11,133,881 (amounting to 6.7 percent on capital-stock investment).

I repeat what I have said before, Mr. Speaker, that the Bureau of Power and Light of the City of Los Angeles is worth untold millions annually to the light and power consumers in the Western States, and especially in the State of California.

If it were not for the example set by Los Angeles in providing electricity to the people of that great metropolitan area at reasonable rates, I dare say the overcharges for electricity to the people of California alone would run far above $100,000,000 a year.

Yet, instead of giving Los Angeles credit for its great accomplishments in this respect, or maintaining a decent silence, these hired propagandists continue to flood the public with such false and misleading statements.

It is time for the American people to wake up, follow the lead of Los Angeles, follow the lead of the T. V. A., follow the lead of Tacoma, Wash., follow the lead of other public-power agencies and see that the consumers are supplied electricity at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution in every corner of every State in the Union.

That would reduce their light and power bills on the present load by more than $1,000,000,000 a year.

Railway Employees Face Death Struggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1941

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL RAILWAY ASSOCIATION

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway are loud in their denunciation of the railroads of America as monopolists in a feverish attempt to follow the administration in saddling American taxpayers with such an impractical and economically unsound political brain child.

In attempting to draw a red herring across the trail by pointing an accusing finger at the American railroads, the protests of railway employees continue to be heard as a mighty chorus in opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

Realizing that their jobs are in jeopardy and that the St. Lawrence Seaway is destined to drive thousands to the relief rolls, the plaintive appeal of men, women, and children faced with destitute conditions is fast exposing the St. Lawrence seaway as a glittering hoax and a fraud on the American people.

The following resolution adopted by retired railway employees is another voice in the clarion call of railway labor that the St. Lawrence seaway be recognized in its true light as a menace to the future welfare of every railroad employee and coal miner in the United States.

The resolution referred to is as follows:

To the Honorable Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Seventy-seventh Congress of the United States:

The International Railway Association, of St. Petersburg, Fla., organized in 1923, and with a present membership of 736, representing 53 railroads in the United States, at their regular meeting in St. Petersburg, Fla., on Monday, April 7, 1941, unanimously adopted the following resolution:

The prosperity of the railroads means more employment on the railroads; more employment in the thousands of industrial plants, large and small, that supply the railroads

with their many items of supplies; more prosperity for the local businessman in the hamlets, towns, and cities, and more taxes paid into the treasuries of the local towns and States.

The agreement which has been entered into, between the Governments of the United States and Canada, providing for the cooperative development of the St. Lawrence project, and now before your honorable body for consideration, and, as we understand, for prompt favorable action, is of such vital concern to the future prosperity of so large a group of outstanding industries, including the railroad industry, that we urge and respectfully plead that your honorable body take such action as may be necessary to defeat the project.

The membership of the International Railway Association is composed mostly of retired railroad employees, whose homes are located in the northern section of the country, and we realize fully what can be reasonably expected, if the St. Lawrence project becomes a reality, and foreign-owned tramp steamers begin to make the Great Lakes section the dumping ground for cheap products of foreign countries, including cheap foreign coal and foreign iron ores, seriously affecting railroad labor, American seamen, and thousands of high-type American workingmen, whose opportunity for profitable employment will be practically lost for all time.

We have faith in our Representatives in both the Senate and in the House of Representatives, that they will safeguard the essential interests of our Nation, and pray that final action on the St. Lawrence project agreement will insure its defeat.

F. H. ANDREWS,
President.
J. A. NESBITT,
Secretary.

Nazi Methods of Finance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH H. BALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 18, 1941

ADDRESS BY BERNARD H. RIDDER

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a partial text of an address delivered by Bernard H. Ridder, publisher of the St. Paul Dispatch and Pioneer Press, St. Paul, Minn., before the member banks of the Ninth Federal Reserve District at Minneapolis on March 8, 1941.

In this speech Mr. Ridder analyzes the methods by which the Nazis have financed their military efforts.

There being no objection, the partial text of the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The outline of the world revolution that has been going on for the past 7 years is beginning to take shape. The war is only one phase of this revolutionary movement, the purpose of which is to destroy the heritage of a great civilization. This revolution has been given different names—in Germany it is called national socialism, in Italy it is fascism, in Spain it is falangism, and in Japan it is nameless but not without meaning.

Revolutions are no longer fought out behind barricades in crowded cities, for the technique of revolutions has changed. The leadership in revolutions comes now from above and not from the masses below, for governments direct revolutions. As Trotsky said, "Insurrection is an engine which technical experts are required to start, and even they cannot stop it."

The Nazis believe that humanity has to be kept constantly stirred up by a never-ending revolution so that men will become pliable clay in their hands to shape anew the destiny of a harried world. Hitler once said, "The revolution cannot be ended. It can never be ended. We are motion itself. We are eternal revolution." Or again "externally, I am the revolution, but internally it goes on just as we store up our hate and think of the day on which we will cast off the mask and stand revealed as those we are and eternally shall remain."

This revolution took Europe by surprise, which, to me, seems so very surprising. What has been called the English ruling class remained completely blind to the real nature of nazi-ism. Months after the war came there was still, and probably still is, an utter failure of comprehension of the true nature of the revolution that is sweeping the world. Recently I read Sir Neville Henderson's Failure of a Mission. These were the memoirs of the British Ambassador to Berlin during the dangerous years when he succeeded Sir Eric Phipps. "Though he knew all the main characters in the play, he knew absolutely nothing of the social forces operating behind the scene. The fact that Hitler has been able to conceal the universal revolutionary aims of his movement and sell it as an insurance of profits for vested interests in every country is probably the major achievement of his fantastically successful career." These were the words of the Czech writer Mach in assessing Henderson's work in Berlin.

It is an idle but interesting question if the British could have stopped this revolutionary movement in its beginning. Had the statesmen of Britain and France the courage to make small sacrifices while there was still time to make them, by giving up a little in order to save all, they might not have been forced to give up all to save even a little.

It is fitting before this audience of bankers to call attention to the German financial program of the last 7 years, a program which is both revolutionary as it has been successful. When Hitler launched his vast public-works and armament program in 1934 and 1935, economists generally believed that he would bankrupt Germany by this mad program. The truth is otherwise. As Dal Hitchcoke in the February Harper's says, "The facts stand incontrovertible that instead of being bankrupt, Germany has actually created vast public improvements, expanded her industry, and built her unparalleled war machine in the course of 6 years, the greatest enocomic triumph of the times. All this has been done in a nation that, at the start, was debt-ridden, impoverished, and deep in depression." All this has been possible in Germany because for the first time a planned economy was attempted and operated in a nation that had both its complete mechanical equipment as well as the human mechanics to create sufficient production to prevent the operation of the laws of inflation, and furthermore because the government had ample power to control both wages and prices and, in addition, was able to manage the technical machinery which makes the financial system go.

At the start Hitler did what all governments have been doing during the last 20 years, namely, he issued short-term obligations to pay governmental expenses. The German banking system absorbed these obligations, discounted them, and gradually they became a form of liquid investment by individuals and corporations. The Government and the Nazi Party saw to it that these Government obligations did not drop below a fixed price but neither the arrogance nor brutality of the methods employed was solely responsible for the success of their price-fixing method.

With the proceeds of the Government's securities the Nazis had ample funds with which to begin their program. Up to this point there is nothing new in this financial method. In fact, our own Government is operating under a similiar system today. Hitler and the Nazis have been preaching for 10 years that labor is the only wealth of the country and that modern capitalism and the plutocratic democracies were unable to use either all the labor available or, if available, unable to give it an adequate return. Hitler has achieved and sustained full employment.

The checks and controls which the Nazis established, with which you are probably more familiar than I, are nevertheless interesting to discuss. The first danger to such a governmental financial system is undue expansion of bank deposits, a process now under way in the United States. These bank deposits are a source of great danger if left to remain in the hands of banks or the individuals and corporations to which they flow. The Nazis have discovered a new method of getting these bank deposits out of the banks after they have performed their initial service. After the Government has spent the money the individual corporations and individuals themselves throughout the country come under the watchful eye of Nazi inspectors who determine how much cash balances each company is permitted to retain, and suggestions are made that their excess cash balances be used to buy governmental securities. These suggestions are necessarily heeded, and so they reverse the order and wash the slate clean for the renewed flow of Government moneys. All these transactions come within the structure of capitalistic financial procedures, retaining the profit motive as the stimulus for private enterprise, and, as Dal Hitchcock says, "It is an astonishing demonstration of the vitality of that beleaguered institution called capitalism. This method brings the volume of banking deposits in Germany under the absolute control of the Nazi machine. Furthermore, it allows the profit motive and individual enterprise to function in German economic activity."

Finding that the control of bank deposits could be accomplished so easily they next set out to control the volume of currency. Fortunately for them there was no demand for German currency in the outside world. During the period from 1933 to 1939 the British leaders, men of property and successful capitalists, were by their very background and experience the most liable to miscalculate the effects of the Nazi financial innovations. They felt instinctively that the Nazi method would have failed in England. What wouldn't work in Britain, however, worked marvelously well in Germany because of the willingness of the German people to accept an economy of coercion in a time of peace. While the British during this period were attempting an economy of prosperity and of social reform, the Germans were ready to sacrifice everything of today for the national promise of tomorrow; just as in the Middle Ages the church promised in exchange a happy future life for the mortal life of misery and the masses of the people of Europe accepted that promise of the hereafter and willingly suffered the social inequalities of the time, so Hitler held before German eyes a future world order of prosperity in return for his economy of slavery, and once again future profits appeared more attractive than present misery.

The control of currency and bank deposits solved another problem for the Germans which is a disturbing factor in our present economy. Each month in the United States we find the pool of capital securities grow-

ing less and opportunities for the investment of capital growing smaller, because we have found no means of completing the circle which begins and ends with Government securities issued and paid. The Germans learned how to make government securities and bank deposits circulate.

The theory that savings are bad and that spending is good is one of the craziest assumptions that has been prevalent in this country during the past 8 years and is precisely the opposite of the German financial system. The Nazis believe that saving is good but they control these savings and use them either by liquidating them or converting them into governmental securities. They control and prevent the accumulation of bank balances. They prevent the hoarding of currency and they prevent the formation of idle capitalistic pools which normally stop production. The German economy has therefore avoided the major mistakes that we have made because the German Government was in a position of deciding where the current of saving would flow and was able to direct its economy to keep the full flood of productivity at work.

There is a fundamental difference between the National Socialistic viewpoint of economy for the welfare of the state instead of our conception of an economy for the welfare of the individual. Hitler works on the principle that what eventually will help the state may raise the standard of living of those who live in the state, but he does not consider it very important to raise the standard of living as an end in itself but only as an accident in his economy of force. We are all wondering today whether democracy and the philosophy of force can live together happily in one small world. The differences are so fundamental that it is difficult for a believer in democracy to understand the Hitler system. Whereas we have always believed that the highest end is to be achieved through the development of the individual, the Nazi idea holds that the individual is only a tiny fraction of a race or state. Mussolini once said, "Fascism, the more it considers and observes the future and the development of humanity quite apart from political consideration at the moment, believes neither in the possibility nor the utility of perpetual peace. War alone brings to its highest tension all human energy and puts the stamp of responsibility upon the peoples who have the courage to meet it." I wonder to what heights of responsibility the Italian Army has risen in its war test of the last 6 months. Perhaps this philosophy does not work in Italy.

The Nazis are fond of quoting from Nietsche, especially where he says: "For the present we know of no other means whereby the rough energy of the camp, the deep, impersonal hatred, the cold-bloodedness of murder with a good conscience, the general ardor of the destruction of the enemy, the hollow earthquakelike convolution of the soul, can be as forcibly and certainly communicated to enervated nations as is done by every great war. You shall love peace as a means to new wars, and the short peace more than the long. You I advise not to work but to fight. You I advise not to peace but to victory. Let your work be a fight; let your peace be a victory." For years Hitler kept a copy of Machiavelli's Prince at his bedside, and often quoted the following: "It is much safer to be feared than loved, because men are generally ungrateful, fickle fools and cowards."

If the philosophy of force should triumph, then the belief in a society of free and equal men and women will perish. Our civilization has believed in an international order based on a common conception of international law, while the other system has no international order and can be only power and dictation by the strongest. Under Hitler's conception, the people should serve the government, also in the sphere of economics, and therefore there can be no free people nor a free economy. It is folly to expect that men can have even a remnant of economic freedom under a totalitarian dictatorship.

The British leaders knew that in England's free economy the national debt is of tremendous importance, but in Germany's economy of force it was of relatively small importance because human values did not matter and welfare was no aim. The Nazi leadership exacted a claim on the hearts and minds and bodies, the possessions and faith of every man, woman, and child in Germany, and the result was and is political slavery. Imagine the billions of man-hours of labor represented in this German production without any real increase in the people's acquisition of personal possessions, for the comforts and the conveniences of life. Therein lies the answer to how Germany could have completed her immense rearmament program without bankrupting Germany. The labor ingredient was a contribution of the German people for which they were not paid and may never be paid. Under this economy there can be no such thing as real ownership of property or control over one's work, one's thought, one's speech, or one's religion. Confiscation is inherent in the system itself, but the German economy is not likely to fail.

Is it any wonder that the British miscalculated the effects of this kind of a slave system in our modern twentieth century civilized world. They overestimated the German people's interest in their own individual lives and own freedom. They did not realize that Nazi inspectors could check successfully upon personal bank accounts and corporation balances, upon savings accounts, and confiscate them either through taxation or through enforced exchange of governmental securities. That is the irony and the tragedy of the British miscalculation. While an individual corporation cannot constantly capitalize its losses, a national economy as a whole can capitalize losses at one point to facilitate economic activity at other points. The important question we must ask ourselves is, Can these financial methods be utilized so that a governing people determined to preserve individual freedom and anxious to make full use of individual initiative could make private enterprise and private capitalism better serve the purposes of democracy? We must find the answer to that question in the coming years.

* * * * *

I am indebted to the New York Journal of Commerce, one of my family newspapers, and to its editor, Dr. Bogen, to articles of Dal Hitchcock and Stewart Nelson, and to some German magazines for the material in this address. As it was made extemporaneously, I have forgotten exactly where credit is due, and I am adding a paragraph which is the most recent information that I have received from Germany on the present condition of the German financial system:

* * * * *

On February 9 Fritz Reinhardt, the Assistant Minister of Finance in Germany, stated that the German national debt has more than doubled since the outbreak of the war in September 1939. The excess borrowings of Germany amounted to 3,000,000,000 marks a month. The servicing of the present debt of Germany requires 4,000,000,000 marks a year, while the Government income through taxation and other regular avenues amounts to 30,000,000,000 marks per year. Dr. Schmidt, of the Deutsche Bank, pointed out recently that the key to Germany's economic policy is not financial, as bankers formerly understood it, but rather the direct management of the national economy. Through restricting consumption by a far-reaching system of rationing and price controls, the mass of the population is left with a large surplus of cash which it cannot spend as it wishes to. All this cash is then absorbed by the government either through taxes or government loans. The Nazis therefore determine what proportion of the national productive capacity shall be allotted for consumer needs so that all personal incomes are reabsorbed by the government.

The essential framework of this economic system closely resembles that of Soviet Russia, although the Russians have never been able to make their control plan function with even a remote resemblance of the smoothness and efficiency that characterizes the German controlled economy. It must be perfectly plain that only through force and continued force can an economic system such as the Nazis survive.

Address by Pearl S. Buck Before Writers' Committee Dinner of United China Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 18, 1941

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Pearl S. Buck, well-known author and authority on oriental affairs, delivered at the Writers' Committee dinner of United China Relief at the Waldorf-Astoria, New York, March 26, 1941.

While I have the floor, permit me to state that I endorse the United China Relief Committee's program and hope the American people will respond to the call for assistance for the distressed Chinese. I know that every dollar subscribed for this fund will be well and carefully and helpfully expended, and that it will save many lives and alleviate much suffering. I realize that the call upon Americans for aid to other nations is heavy these days; but surely in the plight of the Chinese people, good friends of America at heart, they are worthy of such assistance as individual Americans feel they can contribute.

I send the address to the desk for publication in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The hour is late for relief to China. The war has been going on for 3½ years and now soon it will be 4. Three million Chinese have already lost their lives. A third of China's territory lies under the nominal control, at least, of the Japanese. For all this there can now be no relief.

Relief must be for the future. China is not going to lose this war. With some help she can perhaps end the war this year, if not victorious, at least with the balance of victory in her favor. Unready as she was for modern warfare, unwilling as she always has been for any war, believing as she always has that war is the occupation of fools, she has, in spite of all her losses, steadily gained in strength during these terrible years, not only in military strength but in other ways. In these few years the Chinese people have been compelled to know and to realize the

world in which we are all living together. They lived, actually, before this war began, in a sort of splendid isolation, wrapped around by the glory of their own history. Even though revolutions were taking place and changes being made it was at their own pace, in their own way. They felt no need to imitate any other nation or to hurry their modern development. Modernization in China was not designed as any catastrophe of change. It was to be an evolution founded upon and flowering from their own civilization.

But this war has taught them that in our world no nation can live in isolation, however splendid, and that civilization, however lofty, protects none from the attacks of the ruthlessly uncivilized. China's civilization has held and it will hold, but it will change. China at this very moment is at a crossroads. She is ready to make alliances.

Which way will she take? China knows that in the future world, perhaps the very near future, it will no longer be possible for any nation to live alone. Nations will be compelled, for mutual protection and to guarantee the world they want, to live in groups with others of like mind and wish. With whom will China choose to live? Naturally, with her friends.

But who are China's friends today? That is what she is trying to discover. Be sure that there are those who are telling her that the United States is not her friend, we who with such incredible blindness not only to humanity but even to our own interests, have been furnishing Japan with the instruments of war year after year. Actually we have helped Japan more than Germany has, and in so doing have wounded China, not only in the millions dead and the territory lost, but in the very heart of that great people we have put deep distrust of America. Can Americans be our friends, Chinese are asking, when they have, for profit, gone on selling to our enemies those things without which this war could not have gone on?

Be sure that Germany is keeping this distrust constantly alive in Chinese minds. Germany knows that in the Far East of the future it is China that is important, not Japan. Japan has nothing that Germany wants—a handful of fiery ambitious people living upon a handful of volcanic islands. If Germany wins the European war, Japan will sink to a third-rate power. Today Germany is directing her real friendship to China. China is more important to her than England. She will not try to conquer China. She will try to win China's friendship. The Germans appreciate the Chinese.

But the Chinese have always liked the Americans. And now, in spite of the wounds we have dealt them, in spite of our callousness and indifference, in spite of our preoccupation with England and our unwillingness to realize that China has fought and suffered far more and far longer even than England has in this same war, the Chinese wish for our friendship if it can be had. If it cannot be had, if we continue callous and indifferent and preoccupied with Europe, they are a realistic people, and they will accept what friendship they can get, knowing that in the world of tomorrow, and of a tomorrow nearer than we think, they must have friends.

But in that world all must have friends, and we, too, must have them. It will not be enough in that world for us to have England alone as our friend. We need another, upon our Pacific coast. England is weak in the Pacific. She holds only by force a rebellious, discontented India. England and the United States must have China with them, if democracy is to prevail in the world. We cannot do without China. I believe that China is at this very moment a pivot nation. Who has her friendship will rule the future; who loses it, will be lost.

And yet I am not willing to put upon the basis of self-interest alone our friendship for China. It is to our interest, to our supreme interest, to cement our friendship with China. We ought, for self-interest alone, too, to send her our aid as swiftly and strongly as we are sending aid to England. To help China defeat Japan would be to defeat Hitler in the East, and 50 years from now it will be far more important to have defeated Hitler in the East than in Europe.

But I will not speak of self-interest alone. I will speak rather of our genuine liking for the Chinese. We do like them and they like us. We admire their old civilization and their courage in this modern day. The Chinese are a great people, worthy of all we can give them, and worthy of our loyal friendship. With them we can make the sort of world we want. There are peoples in the world whose ideas and desires are so different from ours that we cannot with them make the world we want. But the Chinese people are our kind of people, democratic, individualistic, liberty-loving, humorous, and brave. We need them for the future and they need us now, they need relief from us and swift help of every kind. Let us make and keep them our friends.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, China's magnificent resistance to armed aggression is now in its fourth exhausting year. Every American who reads the newspapers knows of the brave struggle against overwhelming odds, the long retreat, the final determined stand, the mounting toll of famine and exposure, the urgent need of medical supplies. Every American knows of the spunk the Chinese people have shown during a period when in Europe one country after another has fallen under the heel of the Axis; and every American who has thought the situation through, whose imagination has been stirred by Chinese ability to "take it and go on," who has come to realize our tremendous stake in successful Chinese resistance, wants to help China to see it through. The only question is how to do it best. Heretofore, the seven agencies that do the bulk of Chinese relief and rehabilitation have been conducting separate appeals. Now these agencies are combined in a united, Nation-wide campaign for $5,000,000—United China Relief.

I know that few of us can boast any expert knowledge with regard to China. Most of us have never been to China. Yet we know that China is struggling to be free, and I believe that in the perspective of history this struggle will go down as one of the decisive battles in mankind's long fight for freedom and for a better life.

Under their leader, Gen. Chiang Kai-shek, the Chinese, about a decade ago, embarked upon a program of industrial, political, and educational development to raise the standard of living of their people and to integrate themselves as a nation. Scores of new factories were founded. New and beautiful buildings were erected. New railways, new highways, new air lines were established. Hundreds of technical advisers and experts were imported from the western world.

But the new China was too young, and too little integrated, to withstand aggression. Before the most brutal and inhuman invasion of modern history she was forced to abandon her coastal cities and to retire over the mountains and rivers into the interior.

In that trek to the interior millions of men and women transported, mostly on human backs, the equipment of 353 factories, including a hundred and fifty thousand tons of machinery.

These men and women have withstood bombings the like of which not even the people of Britain have had to endure. Their economic system has been paralyzed by the capture of large areas of Chinese territory. Yet they have borne it all with a courage and a cheerfulness that has won the admiration and respect of brave men everywhere.

United China Relief presents an appeal that leaves no doubt as to the most effective means of translating American sympathy and admiration for China into concrete measures of assistance. A National Advisory Committee of United China Relief has been formed with Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt as honorary chairman. I have the honor of being a member of the national committee, and am intensely interested in a successful climax to the campaign to raise $5,000,000 for relief and reconstruction of war-torn China. Therefore, I desire to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statements regarding the purposes and program of United China Relief.

The agencies which have united in the $5,000,000 appeal include:

American Bureau for Medical Aid to China, which is helping to remedy the frightful lack of anesthetics and to furnish medical supplies urgently requested by the Chinese Red Cross, and which supports emergency aid stations in Chungking, epidemic-control programs, and training centers for physicians;

China Emergency Relief Committee, organized last year to raise funds for this and similar work;

China Aid Council, also active in meeting special medical needs, and, through its affiliated agency,

American Committee for Chinese War Orphans, active in rescuing, maintaining, and training thousands of orphaned children.

Church Committees for China Relief, serving as the official agency of the United Protestant Churches of America for providing direct relief in bombed and famine areas, food and shelter and medical relief for the destitute, and work projects for men and women—all this largely through missionaries and Christian Chinese associates without regard to religious belief;

American Committee for Chinese Industrial Cooperatives, operating 3,000 "vest-pocket industries" supporting some 500,000 refugees in a vast, expanding, self-owned, self-help project to rehabilitate themselves and replace the destroyed productivity of Chinese industry;

Associated Boards for Christian Colleges in China, representing 13 colleges with an enrollment of nearly 8,000 students, 11 of which institutions have been forced by the war to transfer their teaching and research activities as far as 1,500 miles inland.

Thus, the campaign is not an additional appeal, but rather a coordination of the seven existing appeals to make possible relief and rehabilitation in China on a greatly broadened scale.

The executive board of United China Relief is comprised of James G. Blaine, president of the Marine Midland Trust Co., of New York, chairman; Eugene E. Barnett, general secretary of the National Council of the Y. M. C. A., vice chairman; and Artemus L. Gates, president of the New York Trust Co., treasurer.

Directors include Pearl S. Buck, former Ambassador William C. Bullitt, Paul G. Hoffman, Thomas W. Lamont, Henry R. Luce, John D. Rockefeller 3d, Col. Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., David O. Selznick, Robert G. Sproul, president of the University of California, and Wendell L. Willkie.

Four points to be remembered about the United China Relief campaign are:

First. The Chinese deserve and have earned help; they have helped themselves.

Second. Their need is appallingly great; one-ninth of China's population of 450,000,000 men, women, and children are refugees today.

Third. Facilities for relieving the need exist right now in the agencies for which United China Relief is raising money.

Fourth. Money goes farther in China than anywhere else in the world. As a "bargain" in relief it is unique.

Here is an opportunity for Americans to aid decisively in laying the foundations for the modern, democratic new China which can and must come out of the war. Let us face that fact and give generously both in work and in dollars now—while we are still in time.

Planned Treason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of April 19, 1941.

[From the Saturday Evening Post of April 19, 1941]

THE FETISH OF INDEPENDENCE

"Good times would come back. Taxes would be reduced. Armaments could be cut tremendously, and the Union would still be stronger than any possible combination of enemies. The Union's stable, reliable money would start new enterprises rolling, ending depression and unemployment. * * * The greatest political and economic opportunity in history * * * lower automobile prices * * * revival in shipbuilding and railroads * * * benefits to agriculture * * * an end to world war. * * * Dictatorship of every kind and the many forms of intolerance that thrive on depression would cease."

This is from the printed propaganda of Federal Union.

It leaves us but one thing more to wish for this side of the true millennium. We wish it might then be possible for those who sweat with the conviction of a noble idea to present it entirely for what it is and trust it to sell itself, instead of to stultify it with salesmanship as if it were a piece of merchandise.

In a much less heedless assault upon susceptible American emotions, the League to Enforce Peace was making that same mistake 25 years ago. There was immense enthusiasm for that idea—for a war that was to end war, and for a world peace that was to come after, enforced by the just and peace-loving nations forever. Those who opposed it were worse than infidels; they were sinners against the light. At the head of 50 eminent Americans who promoted this evangel was William Howard Taft, the former President, who said: "I am supporting the League to Enforce Peace; and if the Republican Party ever abandons that idea, I shall resign from that party, giving my resignation all the publicity and scandal possible."

Yet when President Wilson returned from Versailles with the beautiful idea on parchment, all signed and sealed, requiring only the consent of the United States Senate to make it the new law of the world, the American people rejected it. They not only declined to embrace the League of Nations; they went on to make a separate peace with Germany.

Were they fickle? Had they changed their minds? No. The explanation is that the evangelists had presented to them only that shining surface of the idea in which their fervent, innocent desires were reflected. When it was reduced to hard writing they realized for the first time what it meant. In the field of foreign relations they would have to surrender American independence, and that they were passionately unwilling to do. Much confusion and political bitterness might have been avoided if that choice had been made clear to them in the beginning.

Reading further in the printed propaganda of Federal Union we come to this: "No new powers would be given to the Union Government. A few powers (the ones that are now being used inefficiently or at cross-purposes) would simply be moved away from the present national governments and put in a new and more advantageous place. In other ways, the present governments would be left just as they are. There are five powers which could be transferred to a Union Government with great benefits to the individual citizen's safety, prosperity, and freedom. They are: union citizenship, union defense force, union money, union free-trade area, union postal and communications system."

We cannot imagine that a more disingenuous statement could be composed out of the common materials of language. What is concealed is the truth that national sovereignty consists in these "few powers" proposed to be transferred, not this time to a League of Nations, but to a world government, with a constitution of its own, a parliament of its own, a paramount military power, and sovereignty above that of any individual nation in the economic sphere.

Imagine putting it that way to the American people: "For all these blessings of Federal Union that we enumerate, are you willing to surrender American independence?"

To all Federal Unionists in this country—taking their emotional sincerity for granted—we recommend the intellectual integrity and freedom from self-deception of the British mind as it acts upon the same idea. These rare qualities appear in the proceedings of a round-table conference on Federal Union held in London last year.

To bring such a thing to pass—call it Federal Union, World Union, or United States of Man—it will be necessary first to overcome the human prejudice in favor of national sovereignty and treat independence as a fetish. The British enthusiasts have the moral courage to face that violent fact.

Sir Norman Angell said, "If we are ever going to put over either a covenant or a Federal Union, this very issue of independence has to be fought out. * * * But independence is an antisocial claim. * * * See what this emotional demand for independence is doing in Scandinavia at this moment—how bitter is becoming the relationship between those states—how the moral confusion gives encouragement to aggression, and how it adds weight to the argument of the Germans, who will be able to say, 'This idea of a united Europe is perfectly hopeless and unattainable save by the domination of one great power.' If we cannot reply to that by proving a capacity for cooperation, we are lost, and we cannot have that capacity for cooperation unless we banish from our vocabulary such words as 'independence.'"

Harold J. Laski, the extreme advocate, was not present at this round table, but he has written a book, saying: "There can be no peace without international organization which abrogates the sovereignty of individual states."

We challenge the Federal Unionists here to set that honest, forthright statement at the top of the propaganda with which they are flooding the country.

Many Americans who are reacting emotionally to their unreal description of the near-perfect world do not know what the question is or what the price will be. Are they willing to surrender the national sovereignty? That is the question.

To those who do see it and have resolved it for themselves in favor of world citizenship above American citizenship, we have nothing to say. With what is not in them it would be folly to argue. They have that right. They may say, as some of them do, that the War of Independence was a civil war and a mistake, and we ought to forget it.

But the obsequies are still a problem. Have they thought as far as that? The Congress of the United States of the World might appoint a day of self-celebration, and we might contribute the Liberty Bell to sound the joyous knell of American history. But should we build a crypt in place of a shrine for a piece of paper called the Declaration of Independence? And what should we do with such a thing as the Bunker Hill Monument? We cannot imagine the ceremonies. There is no precedent. Never has it happened that a mighty people recanted their own history.

Some Things to Watch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1941

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago, on January 13 to be exact, there was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled, "The United States Is Not a Democracy But a Republic," written by Catherine Curtis, national director of Women Investors of America. It is so significant

that it seems to me that it requires comment, for I am convinced that it represents the point of view of a certain reactionary group in the United States, which frankly admits that it does not believe in democracy and holds substantially to the idea, once expressed by conservatives in the period of the American Revolution, that government should be by "the rich, well-born, and the able." The main charge made in the article by Catherine Curtis is that wherever a nation has achieved democracy in the sense of majority rule, terrible consequences have followed and eventually a dictatorship of some sort has been set up. I challenge this thesis and believe it in fact to be one of the most dangerous ideas that can be advanced, for in it is certainly contained the fundamental basis upon which a Fascist form of government can readily be built to replace government of the people, by the people, and for the people. It is important to recognize this.

The article by Miss Curtis does not quite say so, but it certainly points to the inevitable conclusion that the writer and others who agree with her are of the opinion that certain definite limitations should be placed upon democracy and that, indeed, we have too much of it in the United States today. She cites examples from Russia, Hungary, Germany, Mexico, Italy, Austria, Spain, and France in an attempt to show that wherever what she calls democracy was established it was followed by a break-down of constitutional government and then by dictatorship. Without going into too much detail, it certainly can be pointed out that not one of those nations except France ever has had a truly democratic government and that in every one of them the fundamental facts have been: First, that the economic problems of the people were for one reason or another left unsolved; second, that, as a consequence of this, powerful group, seeking the establishment of dictatorship, either Communist or Fascist, arose; and third, that except in the case of Mexico, one or another of these movements was successful. At this point, however, it is necessary for Americans to determine very definitely what course they are going to follow. Are they going to hold that we should turn to some modified form of fascism ourselves, thus making possible a limitation on the efforts of the people to achieve economic security and a solution of such problems as unemployment? Or are we going to continue to hold the faith that has always been America's fundamental faith and believe that the cure for the ills of democracy is not less democracy but an extension of it in such manner that greater equality of opportunity will be open to all our people? Upon our decisions in this matter will depend the whole future of our country. I think it most important for those of us who do really believe in constitutional democracy to recognize the fact that there are those in our Nation who are frankly saying that they believe constitutional democracy is wrong and that they prefer a system which will better guarantee the perpetuation of monopolistic privilege.

It is, of course, true that it is important for us to accomplish our progress as much as possible without the extension of governmental controls and regulation over the lives and activities of our people. But this has nothing to do with the basic value of political democracy or with the importance of securing as broad a participation in such political democracy by all the American people as it is possible to obtain. The danger for us is not that we have too much democracy but rather that our faith in it may be undermined. Should this happen, it will not be because of any fault in constitutional democracy as a form of government but rather because reactionary forces succeed in blocking economic and social progress and thus bringing on a situation where the economic problems which destroyed democracy in these other nations can become the cause of its destruction here.

Evidence that definite plans have been developed by the Congress and the administration for assuring full employment and preventing depression at the close of this period of crisis would do more than anything else I know of to build the morale of our Nation and its people. Measures to give us a sound, scientific monetary system—one which would make inflation and especially deflation impossible, should be the first and central ones to be undertaken. The time is now.

The one thing upon which Fascists and Communists will always agree is that the thing they desire most is social conflict and what they call a revolutionary situation. And one method they have always employed is the method of ridiculing constitutional democracy, distorting the facts about it, and attempting to keep it from solving its problems in united fashion. Against such defeatist ideas, too, we must be on guard.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the sun never sets on the United States Treasury.

The steel strike settled down on the taxpayer.

When we opened the Red Sea last week we spread the blues.

It is not because Easter has just passed that we are interested around the Holy Land.

The queen of the cherry blossoms was convoyed across the Tidal Basin. The name Japanese has been dropped.

After feeling 12 summer days now and having felt the drop to zero in Kansas, November 11, we know the world is out of joint.

The Chief, while avoiding the German measles at Warm Springs, developed a little African fever down Pennsylvania Avenue way.

It was a radio voice from far away America that pleaded with the Yugoslavs to fight. Now thousands of them lie dead and their homes devastated.

Lifting the embargo on planes to dear old Russia prevented no new pacts between the "Bear" and the Axis. While we play the Soviet we should pay Finland back.

Is it worth sending 35 marines to protect Winant in London? Halifax does all the business. However, the 35 may prove the entering wedge for 3,000,000 and that may be the purpose.

If we can sink a good anchor in Greenland and another in the Admiral Byrd land near the South Pole and string an electrified barbed wire on buoys between the two we will be sitting pretty.

Seniority is as much recognized here as the law of the Medes and Persians, and if the powers that be can prevent Senator REYNOLDS from succeeding to the military chairmanship recently made vacant by death, it is the last proof of dictatorship.

Is National Unity Desirable?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CINCINNATI TIMES-STAR

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cincinnati Times-Star for April 15, 1941:

[From the Cincinnati Times-Star of April 15, 1941]

IS NATIONAL UNITY DESIRABLE?

When a people are in as great danger as we are of involvement in one of the most deadly wars of history, it is obvious that national unity is a thing that should be desired, prayerfully, by all patriotic men and women.

Administration orators have referred occasionally to their desire for national unity. But other administration spokesmen do not help the cause when they say, as Secretary Ickes said in Chicago Monday, that men like General Wood and Colonel Lindbergh are "Nazi fellow travelers." A smear campaign like that might work if Wood and Lindbergh stood alone. As a matter of fact, they have far too much company to make the use of such epithets any more promising than it is decent.

A far greater cause of dissension among Americans is the idea held by millions of our people that the administration plans to send American expeditionary forces to many parts of the world. This impression is based upon many things—talk about an Army expanded far beyond the size contemplated when the draft bill was originally under discussion; Mr. Roosevelt's oratory about an all-out war, joined up with the proposal to establish his

four freedoms, apparently by force, "everywhere in the world"; the ultra warlike attitude of Washington in the face of an obvious increase in the opposition to war in other parts of the country.

The greatest thing Mr. Roosevelt could do to bring national unity to the United States in the obviously dangerous and critical situation which confronts us would be to give the American people definite assurance that he is not going to endeavor to police the world, that he does not mean to try to crush Hitler on the Continent, that the American Army, definitely and positively, is not to be used in service abroad.

If such assurances were given, we believe that a very large proportion of Americans who are now opposed to war would be willing to go along in a program of common action, based on sea and air power, for the defense of the English-speaking peoples.

That is a program that makes sense. It is a program which can be carried out within the limits and the spirit of our democratic institutions. The plain fact is that the English-speaking peoples have not amounted to much in organization for land fighting on the continental scale for a good many centuries. On the sea they have been supreme and should be able to more than hold their own there against all competition.

The American people have an inevitable interest in standing against the conquest of the English-speaking world by Hitler. By the English-speaking world we mean our own country, Canada, the British Isles, Australia, New Zealand, and, if her people want to go along, South Africa. With these countries free at the end of the war, the world would still be a decent place for Americans to live in. With them conquered, the prospect would be desolate indeed.

Talk to ordinary men and women on both sides of the war issue, and see how many of them will agree with you on a program limited to common action for the defense of the English-speaking peoples back of sea power. If Mr. Roosevelt is as anxious for national unity as he should be in times like these, why wouldn't the outlining of such a program offer America greater safety and his own administration a larger chance for final success than either possesses in these days when Washington talks only of all-out war and the establishment of our ideas and form of government "everywhere in the world?"

Strikes in Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE PLAUCHÉ

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1941

RESOLUTIONS BY LOUISIANA ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. PLAUCHÉ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions:

[Resolution unanimously adopted by the police jury of Beauregard Parish, April 10, 1941]

Whereas it is common knowledge that labor unions with leaders of questionable authority and jurisdiction are fomenting trouble and causing delay on the construction of Camp Polk, as well as Army camps and other defense projects throughout the Nation; and

Whereas exorbitant union dues are being charged workers on many defense projects, and in numerous instances dues are collected, but the worker given no guaranty of a job. In many cases no job is given. In many other cases the worker is permitted to work until the full union dues are collected and is then discharged, ostensibly to make way for a new "member"; and

Whereas this police jury does not question the right of workers to organize for the purpose of legitimately and peacefully promoting their common interests but does condemn the anarchistic uprising that is apparently taking over the Nation's industries at a time when all should cooperate in our Nation's defense even to the extent of personal sacrifices: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Government be, and it is hereby, petitioned to immediately take such action as is necessary to protect the rights of both labor and industry as guaranteed by the Constitution, thereby furthering the cause of national defense, in which we are so intensely interested.

Certified a true copy:

LEE NICHOLS,
Secretary-Treasurer,
Beauregard Parish Police Jury.

Whereas President Roosevelt has proclaimed that our country has become the arsenal for all the democracies;

Whereas contracts for national defense aggregating billions of dollars have been let, and work thereon is being delayed because of strikes and labor troubles and shutting down of the plants, causing a serious menace to the safety of all the democracies; and

Whereas irrespective of the merits of the strikes, we declare that national safety demands that drastic steps be taken immediately by the Government to put an end to this destructive condition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Jennings Business Club, That we condemn the delay in national defense caused by shut-downs of the plants with contracts for the Air, Army, and Navy, we deplore the delay in carrying out these contracts, and we demand that our National Government order these plants to start work at once upon these contracts, and that it fix the responsibility for these strikes and shutdowns, and deal most severely with those responsible therefor: Be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to President Roosevelt, our two Senators and our Congressman, and to the press.

Unanimously adopted Monday night, April 7, 1941.

W. H. ADAMS, *President.*
J. W. LANDRY, *Secretary.*

A true copy:

J. W. LANDRY, *Secretary.*

Whereas the Legionnaires of the American Legion, Robert Turner Post, No. 129, at Eunice, La., cheerfully rendered their services to the cause of democracy in World War No. 1; and

Whereas they are ready, able, and willing to again sacrifice their personal interests in response to the call of the President of the United States in the interest of national defense; and

Whereas in compliance with the request of the Honorable Sam H. Jones, Governor of the State of Louisiana, they have offered to form the Home Guard, in the absence of the National Guard of the State of Louisiana; and

Whereas members of the American Legion are now neglecting their own personal businesses to serve on the local selective service boards without any remuneration whatsoever, but solely and only in order to comply with their duty to their country; and

Whereas the Selective Service Act has drafted the most able men of the Nation from every walk of life to serve in the armed forces of the United States as well as in many civilian activities necessary to the proper administration of the said act; and

Whereas these men who have been so drafted do not utter any complaints relative to salary, hours, etc., but have gladly answered the call of their President and, if necessary, these men would lay down their very lives for the cause of democracy; and

Whereas time is of the essence in that a new type of warfare known as blitzkrieg has been inaugurated by the inventive genius of the military leaders of Nazi Germany; and

Whereas the attitude of organized labor is vicious in nature, detrimental to the cause, and uncalled for in this period of national emergency in that organized labor has demonstrated its unwillingness to play its role in national defense, as evidenced by the various strikes throughout the Nation; and

Whereas southern labor has been preyed upon by organized labor in the various cantonments of the Army in the following manner, viz:

Employees are employed at the Army cantonment, and as a prerequisite to employment they are compelled to join the union and as a result thereof pay an exorbitant fee. One or two weeks thereafter the same employees are discharged and new employees are employed and discharged in the same manner, to the end that organized labor is now practicing a system of profiteering upon southern labor;

Whereas during the first week of April 1941 an unauthorized strike was called by organized labor at Camp Polk, Leesville, La., curtailing the erection of housing and shelter for selectees and other members of the armed forces of the United States; and

Whereas in the interest of our national security the strikes existing throughout the Nation should be condemned and abolished and future strikes prevented by appropriate congressional legislation, and the unjust and unfair labor practices of organized labor in the South should be entirely eradicated: Be it, therefore,

Resolved, That the Honorables JOHN H. OVERTON and ALLEN J. ELLENDER, United States Senators from Louisiana, and the Honorable VANCE PLAUCHÉ, Member of Congress from the Seventh Congressional District, be and they are hereby urged to introduce or sponsor legislation in Congress condemning, abolishing, and prohibiting strikes throughout the Nation, and, further, that they immediately take the necessary steps to eradicate the unjust and unfair practices of organized labor in the South; be it further

Resolved, That the Honorable SAM H. JONES, Governor of the State of Louisiana, be furnished with a copy of this resolution and that he be requested to communicate with our entire representation in the Halls of Congress urging the said Representatives to do all in their power to obtain an immediate solution of these problems; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to State headquarters and to every post of the American Legion; to the mayor and town council of the city of Eunice, and to the local organizations of the city of Eunice urging them to adopt like or similar resolutions, and that a copy also be furnished to the press.

Adopted this 7th day of April 1941 at Eunice, La., by the Robert Turner Post, No. 129, of the American Legion.

LOCAL COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL DEFENSE.
F. QUIRK, *Chairman.*
A. E. TYSON, *Member.*
C. J. DIRBES, *Member.*

[Resolution adopted at a regular meeting April 7, 1941, of the board of directors of the St. Landry National Farm Loan Association, having a membership of 347 farmer borrowers and loans of about $1,000,000]

Whereas the United States is making a serious effort to put itself in a position for

total defense and to help other countries resisting aggression; and

Whereas many labor leaders and unions appear to be obstructing our defense efforts unnecessarily and unreasonably, and, in many cases, we believe, treasonably, by striking, although from reports it appears that all union men are already getting very high wages and working very few hours; and

Whereas many thousand young men have already been called to the colors and perhaps another million will be called next year and they receive $21 per month and are subject to no minimum-hour limit: Be it hereby

Resolved, That this board go on record as condemning the present strike tactics of various labor unions; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress be urged to take necessary steps to end such practices; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the following: Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; Hon. Henry Wallace, Vice President of the United States; Hon. Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House; Hon. Allen J. Ellender, Senator; Hon. John H. Overton, Senator; Hon. Vance Plauché, Representative; Hon. Sam Jones, Governor of Louisiana; Dr. R. L. Thompson, president of the Federal Land Bank of New Orleans.

P. P. HIDALGO,
President.
FRANKLIN R. WRIGHT,
Vice President.
EMAR LAFLEUR,
Director.
JAMES H. WARE,
Director.
J. O. BROUSSARD,
Director.
R. D. LAMSON,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Urge Enactment of Legislation To Provide Funds for Educational Facilities for Communities Adjacent to Defense Establishments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1941

RESOLUTION PASSED BY MICHIGAN STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a resolution passed by the Michigan State Legislature urging the passage of legislation to provide funds for additional educational facilities in communities adjacent to Army establishments and defense industries.

The resolution follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 31

(By Mr. Fisher)

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide funds for educational facilities in the communities where Federal funds are to be expended for housing of defense workers

Whereas the Congress of the United States has appropriated the sum of $150,000,000 to be expended through the Office of Production Management on housing of defense workers, which in Michigan would result in an acute lack in educational facilities in such communities, and the inability of the taxpayers in those communities to provide sufficient revenue to build the needed school buildings, supply the needed equipment, and furnish the required number of teachers to take care of the additional school enrollment; and

Whereas, in keeping with the defense program, the education of the youth of today, the citizens of tomorrow, in the true principles of democracy is imperative; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Michigan Legislature respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for educational facilities in the communities where Federal funds are to be expended for housing of defense workers; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Congress.

Adopted by the house of representatives March 13, 1941.

Adopted by the senate April 3, 1941.

MYLES F. GRAY,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.
FRED I. CHASE,
Secretary of the Senate.

Treatment of Selective-Service Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1941

STATEMENT AND ARTICLES BY JOHN A. HEFFERNAN, OF THE BROOKLYN EAGLE

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement of Mr. John A. Heffernan, well-known columnist for the Brooklyn Eagle, regarding suggestions for adjusting numerous complaints of the treatment accorded selectees; also contents of three newspaper articles by Mr. Heffernan on this subject:

I present these remarks because of the numerous complaints of the treatment accorded the selective-service men in their introduction to military life. The process of selection brings into the Army of this country the very cream of our young manhood. They are selected for their excellent qualities—mental and physical. No one expects that the treatment they receive shall not be rigorous; soldiers are not made by pampering. But Americans, free men as they are, conscripted under the Selective Service Act should not, in the very vestibule of an honorable service to their country find themselves the victims of petty and contemptible graft and corruption, the prey of cheap profiteering inside and outside the service.

I believe a committee should be established which will be able now to stop these despicable practices, make it a criminal offense for civilians or organizations to discriminate against soldiers off duty and outside camps, and oust from such camps all persons and groups of persons who are not prepared, voluntarily and without recompense to furnish aid and entertainment to the soldiers. Also, I hope that all laundry work, sanitary service, clothing, and toilet articles will be furnished free to them.

I feel that when we constrain these fellow citizens to sacrifice their normal lives, interests of free Americans—and it may be their blood or their lives for us—we should see to it that those of whom we ask so much should be given full and free service within the Army.

Following are the texts of various articles by me, which have been published in the Brooklyn Eagle, dealing with this vital subject:

[From the Brooklyn Eagle of March 19, 1941]

HEFFERNAN SAYS: IN '17 THEY SMILED BUT BOYS ARE SERIOUS TODAY

This Republic registered 17,000,000 potential soldiers in a day. It has run through the mill and inducted into service more than a million of the registrants.

This process has taken many months. Consequently I must assume that the long column of men I saw detrained at Camp Upton on Friday last were the pick of the crop, the very flower of American manhood, and I want to say right here and now that what I saw on Friday afternoon makes me wonder if our Government at Washington has gone completely haywire.

You see, I listened attentively to the arguments in favor of the enactment of the selective training law. I heard Colonel Hershey—I think that was his name—tell on behalf of the Army General Staff how well the trainees would be treated; what provision would be made for their health and wholesome entertainment; what precautions would be taken for their protection against the harpies and camp followers that seek their illicit and unclean profits on such occasions. And the most conspicuous sign that greeted my eyes in a ride through Camp Upton was this:

Boxing tonight; admission, 25 cents.

And the thought in my mind was this:

Cannot a government that is spending 39 billions for national defense and all-out aid to Britain provide a free boxing show for the men who may have to do the fighting and the dying?

ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT

I know that the conversion of a free people into an army is rough business. And I know that it is easier for me to sit in my comfortable home and criticize than it is for staff officers to improvise in a short time proper accommodations for these new soldiers of the Republic. And still I think better provision could be made and should be made. For this is what I saw on Friday afternoon:

On both sides of the main road were wooden barracks, post headquarters, hospital wards, and also the old, weather-blackened remnants of the camp of 21 years ago. Muddy side roads. Men in khaki, in squads, and in loose groups. And columns of men in civies, carrying suitcases and bundles and marching over the muddy roads, with a uniformed corporal in front and uniformed men on the flanks of each group.

PROCESSING

At the northern end of the camp the tents of the Delaware One Hundred and Ninety-eighth Artillery were neatly arranged. I chatted with a soldier of that command, who stood at the intersection of the main road with the road leading from the railroad station.

"Four trainloads are being detrained now," he said, pointing to the long columns of uniformed marching men, marching down the road. "They are being processed—given some idea of infantry work and their uniforms. It'll take 4 or 5 days before they fall into

their stride. Our command is to move on to Massachusetts."

SMILES MISSING TODAY

Twenty-odd years ago I saw the draftees move into that camp, for the most part laughing and light-hearted, the "We're in the Army now" spirit beginning to take hold. But on Friday I didn't see a single smile. Not only the new arrivals but the men already on the job looked sober and glum.

Presumably this will pass. And I hope the many small impositions and cheats that robbed the boys of '17 of their small pay will not be repeated; that they will get their smokes and wholesome entertainment free, and that Upton—and other camps of its kind—will soon look less like a Prussian concentration camp for prisoners than it did last Friday afternoon.

It is, of course, a clearing station but for the young men entering it it is the vestibule to military service under the flag of the United States, and it should not be made repulsive.

[From the Brooklyn Eagle of March 30, 1941]

HEFFERNAN SAYS: "LET US ALL PITCH IN TO HELP OUR OWN ARMY"

There is a singular thing about our war effort that I never noticed during the World War. Letters come to me from aid-to-Britain societies asking for subscriptions. An old friend, a lady, who visited us not long ago, was knitting some worsted affair. She said it was for the British soldiers, and she asked me for the British royal colors so that she might get appropriately colored worsteds. Another lady holds a bridge party, the proceeds to go to a society aiding the British soldiers.

I can understand that. In England they are already under fire. And Britain's suffering, Britain's heroism, Britain's danger are stressed in the most powerful propaganda of the hour.

What startles me is the fact that there is so little of all this with respect to the members of the rapidly forming American Army. And I think that if we are really going the whole way in our effort to save the British Empire, this is a pretty serious defect. For if we want real enthusiasm in the Army which may in the final analysis be called on to determine the issue of the conflict, it might be well to pay a little attention to the young men who are putting on Uncle Sam's uniform.

My article on conditions at Camp Upton has brought response from readers. From Mrs. Harriet E. Quackinbos of Southampton, who spent the World War period in Europe, comes this comment, "Your article in the Brooklyn Eagle March 19 was read with much interest, especially the description at Camp Upton and more especially the line 'Boxing Tonight! Admission 25 cents.' To charge these boys 25 cents for a boxing match, or entertainment of any kind, is little short of disgraceful, and the other conditions you speak of are worse. Here we are, pouring our billions to help England and are asked to make sacrifices and even go on rations. Lavishly we are giving and haven't even decent accommodations for our own. Is this fair to our splendid sons and the American people? Billions are being given and given and our boys haven't a decent cot to lie on and are taken from clean homes and given a place to live not fit for a pig. I saw by the papers they had 400 cases of flu in 1 camp. What they need is a thoroughly reliable businesswoman at the head of these camps. One who will see the boys have clean beds and bedding and other arrangements for eating and comfort if they are to survive. There is no excuse for anything else."

H. A. Hay, of 855 President Street, says:

"Concerning the serious faces of 'the very flower of American manhood,' you noted as they detrained at Camp Upton recently, compared to our men of 21 years ago, it is quite one thing to enlist in the service of one's country under a great ideal and—as President Roosevelt will find—another to be dragooned into giving of services under lost ideals."

Val Bauer of Jamaica writes:

"It indeed was a pleasure to read an article with some sense to it. Yes; you hit the nail on the head. Most writers are sidetracking the truth. They write with rose-colored glasses, but the real truth is known by 75 percent of the people—so they can still write their bedtime stories and get paid for it

"Yes; I was one of those 24 years ago. We had an objective; we had plenty of morale; we won or helped win the war. I was doing ambulance work in the A. E. F."

Mr. Bauer is particularly indignant about the insurance charge which he says cuts into the meager wage of the soldiers.

I wrote of what I saw. I've heard much more. Of this I can only ask if it is true that the draftees find their dunnage bags short of shirts, socks, towels, etc., and complaints to the commissary department are answered with the statement that the soldier must pay for the missing articles?

In 1917 the draftees were light-hearted because they were to fight for an ideal. Don't let the present generation have forced on them the notion that they are fighting for a racket.

[From the Brooklyn Eagle of March 31, 1941]

HEFFERNAN SAY: WITH A FEW CHANGES ROOKIES COULD GET AN HONEST BREAK

In the year 1917 a fine American officer was in command at Camp Upton. He had seen hard service as an Indian fighter and in the Spanish war, and hoped to go overseas with the men in training amid the scrub oaks at Yaphank. They looked like good material, healthy faces and sturdy figures, a laughing million crowd of fellows who were being gluttons for work.

One day the general observed a young fellow standing on the road. The lad's face was sober. The general returned his salute and then placed a friendly hand on his shoulder. "What's the trouble, son?"

A GENERAL TALKS TO A RECRUIT

I knew the soldier, he lived home in Flatbush, and he told me about it later.

He said to the general that he didn't approve of fighting abroad; that he was perfectly willing to die for his country, but considered our policy one of intervention and had no heart for it. "Son," said the old general, "for many years I have been, as you are now, an American soldier. Day by day I've stood at attention when that flag up there was broken out in the morning and when it came down at night. I've come to regard any place where that flag flies as my country. I feel as badly today as you do. Do you know why? Today I had a medical test and am informed that I may not have the privilege you do not want of following the flag in service overseas. Soldier, shake hands with me, and good luck to you, boy."

So spoke Maj. Gen. J. Franklin Bell to a new recruit.

SPIRIT OF A. E. F.

In that spirit the A. E. F. was organized. If that spirit is not in our new Army now, something is wrong somewhere. When I was at Camp Upton a few weeks ago, I did not notice that spirit. Now, I have a letter from Fort Bragg, N. C. It is from a private, and I'm going to publish his kick and keep his name in confidence. He hasn't asked that, but—well, here is his story:

A TRAINEE WRITES

"I'm taking this opportunity," he says, "to write you a few things about the Army. After seeing your swell column the other day we know at least one person sitting back home knows the real low-down. We are a bunch of boys from New York, and, as you said, we don't do as much smiling as did our predecessors. Mr. Heffernan, we wouldn't mind this life at all if it were done a little bit different. None of us here, I assure you, would mind it a bit if we were here purely for defense purposes, but every officer we come in contact with has the same line. 'Come on, you fellows, put something in it because in a few months you'll wish you had when you're up against those Heinies!' They automatically discourage us; instead of building morale, they actually break it. We have to pay for every petty thing that happens."

HIS COMPLAINTS

His items of complaint are:

1. Canteen prices—25 cents for tooth powder, shaving cream, and other necessities that can be bought at the local stores for 10 cents.
2. Two dollars a month for laundry, whether sent in or not. Many of the boys would prefer to do their own washing. (Note: That may be a sanitary measure, but the fee is unconscionably high.)
3. Bus round-trip fare to nearby Fayetteville 40 cents, when 10 would be reasonable.

SOMEBODY'S GOT OUR RADIO

"In our company," continues this soldier, "we saved a few hundred dollars in a company fund by cutting expenses in the mess hall, chipping in and stuff like that, for a recreation room. Well, they bought a beautiful radio for it, but we don't use it because it's in the orderlies' room with the top kicks' and captain's desk. We have a few old tables and desks and some old magazines lying around. We built one old ping-pong table for 200 men and they want to charge us 5 cents a game if they put in a pool table, and here on the R. R. we are treated like bums or cattle. We pay full fare but they stick us in unventilated cattle cars.

"Well, Mr. Heffernan, we will survive, but with a few changes it could be swell."

AWAY WITH PETTY GRAFT

No one expects the Army life to be a bed of roses or a cantonment to be a hotel de luxe. But these men, the selectees, the cream of the crop of American manhood, shouldn't be subjected to the petty grafts. They're "in the Army now," but don't open their military career with the idea that it isn't a cause but a racket for which they've been drafted.

"With a few changes it could be swell."

These Things Are Ours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1941

ADDRESS OF MATTHEW F. McGUIRE, ASSISTANT TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Matthew F. McGuire, the Assistant to the Attorney General, at the annual banquet of the Boston University Law School Association, Wednesday,

April 16, 1941, Parker House, Boston, Mass.:

There is a view in the city of Washington, which to Americans should be one of the most inspiring in all the world. It runs, straight as the crow flies, for a distance of over 2 miles, beginning at the Capitol, down across a beautiful landscaped Mall, past the Washington Monument and the famous reflecting poo., to the Lincoln Memorial, thence across the Potomac to the storied heights of Arlington, with Lee's mansion overlooking the river, to the rolling hills of Virginia beyond.

At the Capitol end, with the books of the law cradled in his arms and his juridical robes about him, stands Marshall, the soldier who fought with the men of Virginia in the great struggle that culminated in the achievement of our independence—Marshall, the jurist, who as a great Chief Justice welded the Colonies into the Federal Union.

At the other end, looking toward Marshall, sitting alone and in simple yet majestic state, is the solitary and melancholy figure of Lincoln, looking out not now upon the work of Marshall tumbled into ruin, or upon the smoke of battle rising out of the Shenandoah and over the hills of Arlington, nor upon States broken and dissevered about him, but upon a country united as never before, exceeding even his fondest dream, and risen to the heights of the heritage that is ours.

We as lawyers should be proud of that heritage, for while laymen contributed in an immeasurable degree to the achievement of our independence, it was lawyers who led the way, and the great names of the period read like a roster of the American Bar.

Public life, then as now, seemed to be the lawyers' natural forum.

They took the democratic idea and convinced the American people of its inherent wisdom, translated it into objective reality, laying the foundation for the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States and of our American commonwealth which was builded upon them.

They were the inheritors of those fundamental liberties which antedate the common law, which are written in the heart of every man by the Almighty Hand of the Great Law Giver.

They were the inheritors, too, of a common intellectual tradition and of a norm of private and public morality which, despite the religious upheaval of the sixteenth century, came down to them practically intact, so that when they said—as they did say—in our Declaration of Independence: "All men are created free and equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights," they gave practical and concrete evidence of their belief in the overlordship of God and the spiritual kinship of man.

There were very few debunkers in those days. Men still clung to the fundamentals and the eternal verities, and although we may smile at the manners and customs of the period there was a substance to it and a fiber in it that somehow today we sadly lack.

Out of these fundamental concepts have sprung those things which are ours: Freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of conscience—the right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own heart—those fundamental freedoms which we take for granted.

If the democratic idea is to survive, and the constitutional government in America which has been predicated upon it is to be maintained, then our devotion to it must be something more than mere lip service or casual allusion.

For, despite anything that we may have done or failed to do, we find it threatened today by forces more sinister in their objective than any in human history since the day when Charles Martel overcame the hosts of Mohammed upon the field of Chalons.

A peaceful country, we suddenly find ourselves compelled to create a large standing army and to train it with all the ability and all the power we possess, to double and even triple the size of our fleet, to turn great numbers of our people to the production of instruments of violence because there are those who threaten not only our peace but our very way of life, who openly proclaim there is no God but Caesar, that the altar of the omnipotent state is the only shrine before which every head must bow and every knee must bend.

This philosophy of force is the new Alpha and Omega and must be the first and last concern of men who too long have labored under the delusion that human liberty and the God-given rights that spring from it is the foundation stone of civil society.

This conflict is not a mere struggle of armaments. It is not the revolution of a free people to determine a change in their government. It is the spawn of that atheistic culture and philosophy that stems from Nietzsche, Marx, and Engel, the matriarch of all those other "isms" that have sprung from generations of irreligion, the repudiation of fundamentals, false liberalism and the pursuit of the cult of pleasure, that reduce men to automata, that explains history by economics, and wages this war, not against armies only but against our very concept of society, against women and children, destroys homes, separates mothers from fathers and children from both, and holds over all the stark terror of the concentration camp and a slavery more terrifying from the Siberia of the czars and the galleys and the salt mines of ancient Rome. Such—this so-called total war.

How can we then be indifferent to this thing which is happening in Europe. It isn't a question of liking the British Empire, or disliking it. It is a question of meeting a menace that defies all pattern. It has leaped all barriers and like a tidal wave sweeps all before it.

Not so many years ago Europe seemed so far away. Within our lifetime the genius of the human mind has brought to us the knowledge of events as quickly as they have occurred, making them as near as though they happened at the doors. Giant clippers leave New York and in a few hours bring their shining hulls down upon the bay at Lisbon—distance no longer lends enchantment.

We cannot be indifferent any more than the people of this city and this commonwealth could be indifferent to what happened at Lexington and Bunker Hill, or any more than the people of this country could be indifferent to what happened at Waterloo, although the knowledge of the event was not brought home to them until long after it occurred.

This America of ours—under the providence of God, for it cannot be explained in any other way—has been designed to be the one shining oasis in a desert of darkness; it has been the haven of those pilgrims of human liberty who came here from many lands and in many Mayflowers to achieve it.

Go to the graves at Plymouth—see the terrible harvest of that first winter here in the old bay colony, and you will get a slight picture of what the achievement of liberty meant in America.

Go over to Charlestown and see the shaft that marks the battlefield of Bunker Hill and you will get some small idea of what the achievement of that liberty was to mean in blood—that you and I might enjoy it.

Go to Gettysburg and see what sacrifices were demanded of the generation that preserved it, and look about you on every side of this great country of ours, at its marvelous cities, its peaceful towns and villages, its rolling hills and fertile valleys, vibrating with the pulse and stuff of life, and you can see that it was not only blood but sweat that made America.

Nor do I need to remind you, whether your forebears came here in the first *Mayflower* or in the thousands of other *Mayflowers* which followed it, in the creaking barks and clippers of the forties, with their dark and reeking holds, or in the steerage of those ships of the latter era, of what we owe them for their contribution in sweat and tears to the wonder that is America. These things are ours. We have known their cost; so we should be neither Jew nor Gentile, Irish or English, French, German, or Italian, or any other composite or amalgam, but Americans, and resolve that the hates and prejudices of the older world cannot abide in the new under the bright light of a new day and the flaming splendor of a new sun. What we need to do is to never forget that fact.

You can depend upon it, to paraphrase the words of the great Edmund Burke, that the lovers of freedom will be free. Have no doubt about that.

What we need, however, is to recapture some of the idealism, some of the practicality and some of the spirit and the devotion of the founding fathers. What we need is to purge out the old leaven and to reaffirm our belief in the Fatherhood of God and in the fact that men exist, not for their stomachs or their purses, nor as the pawns of others, but for a destiny that is eternal, and that governments exist not as the instrument for the privilege of the few but for the greatest good of the many.

"Sursum Corda"—"Lift up your hearts," should be our battle cry, while presenting the phalanx of a united democracy against those who hate the name and would root out and erase, if possible, the very word from the hearts and minds of men.

It will mean sacrifices, sacrifices upon the part of labor and upon the part of capital; upon the part of those in high places and low; it will mean longer working hours and heavier taxes, all a small part which we are asked to pay to preserve the liberty that we now enjoy and the philosophy and the way of living it has engendered.

To us as lawyers, it is the call to a high emprise. To us as Americans, the call to a new crusade.

It means that this liberty of ours shall not be enshrined, as has been said, like the Roman gods of old, in cold and impersonal marble in some lone temple, on some lone hill, but a living, vital, vibrant thing—sprung from the Hand of the Author of all Good—and enshrined forever in our hearts and those of our children.

The Responsibility for the Just Treatment of the American Indians Is Now Up to the Democratic Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1941

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present to the membership of this House the situation with respect to Indian claims. For 6 years I have sat here in Congress and closely observed how Indian matters are handled, and I am

forced to state that no class of our citizens is as unjustly treated as are the Indians. We hold up our hands in horror when we see a powerful nation in Europe overrun the territory of a weaker nation and impose the will of the stronger on the weaker. The principle involved in such action is abhorrent to our sense of justice. This Congress has already passed legislation which will require us to appropriate $40,000,000,000 to assist democracies in their fight for existence.

Mr. Speaker, are we as a great democratic nation free from guilt—have we as a powerful nation over-ridden a weaker one—have we by sheer force imposed our will on a weaker nation? Have we taken territory by force and driven the native inhabitants off the land? It seems to me that St. Matthew 7: 3 ought to start us taking an invoice of our own actions. This reads:

> And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?

Robert Burns put this in another way when he saw a louse running up the hair on an exacting lady's head. Here are the lines:

> O wad some pow'r the giftie gie us
> To see oursels as others see us!

This continent was inhabited when our first settlers arrived. For thousands of years the natives had roamed the valleys and the hills and brought home the game and fruit that a bountiful nature had provided. There was no want or suffering among the red men. There was plenty for all. No Indian claimed more land than he could use. There were no land offices and no homestead laws, but for the Indians' use the title extended back for generations. If one will turn to the early maps of North America, those published before this Government was established, it will indicate just where each tribe was located and time immemorial sets the date of their first settlement.

Then came the white men. They landed on the shores of a new continent and each explorer claimed the land for his king who never had any claim whatever to the land except the mere landing on ground that belonged to others. Spain, France, and England each laid claim to those portions of the continent which their subjects happened to visit, and, as they said "discovered."

It never occurred to the white visitors that it was necessary to make any arrangements with the natives for the use of the land. When the Indians objected to the visitors remaining, trading began, and the Indians, being children of the forests, were attracted by the brilliance of the white man's articles of merchandise, and for little or no consideration, the Indians were induced to give up their land. In many instances the title was obtained by the trading of intoxicating liquors—anything to cheat and defraud the Indian. When trading failed, the Indian was hunted down and killed. Whenever the Indian was provoked into fighting and went on the warpath and killed the whites, it was called an Indian massacre.

Not all of the colonists treated the Indians in this fashion, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island being noted exceptions, but as a rule the Indian was literally driven off his land.

Later on treaties were entered into between the Indian tribes and the United States, but in the greater number of cases the treaties were either broken by the Government or so interpreted that the Indian was the loser in 95 percent of all cases arising under treaty agreement.

To add insult to injury the Indians were taken out of the homeland and herded into Indian Territory or cooped up on smaller reservations. The sorrow of Longfellow's Acadia was enacted in every State in the Nation where Indians lived. They were forced to leave the land of their fathers and move into a country with new and strange surroundings.

The Government, then, upon its own motion, placed itself as guardian over the lives and property of the Indians. The Government said, in effect, that the Indian could not take care of himself and that a great altruistic Government would give him protection. In this position the Indian became helpless. Then opened up a great orgy of treaties entered into when the Indian was incapacitated and while the Government pretended to be his protector.

The Indian signed what the Government put in front of him. He had no suspicion that the Government which had placed itself over him as guardian would ever enter into an agreement that was misunderstood, or would be couched in slippery language, or would not be kept. But in this the Indian was doomed to disappointment. These treaties, for the most part, were not explained, or, if explained, were fraudulently explained, or contained language that eventually robbed the Indian of his rights under the agreement. If this did not happen, the agreement was simply ignored.

I have not time here to give the many, many examples of bad faith. I will cite one glaring example. In the treaty of 1868 at Fort Rice, Dakota, the Sioux gave up all title to their lands on the east side of the Missouri River, except established reservations, and in return the whites were to recognize the Sioux title to the lands west of the Missouri River. Within this territory was the Black Hills. As soon as gold was discovered in the hills, the whites rushed in, mined the gold, and took the land, and to this day the Sioux have never received payment for either the gold or the land, which the treaty established in definite terms as theirs. The case is still pending, and under our present policy will probably pend "as long as the grass shall grow."

In this case all the Sioux have ever asked is a chance to take their claim before the courts and prove their case. That is all any tribe or band of Indians asks—to go before the courts and prove its claims.

Here is where Congress gets busy. Congress will not permit them to go before the courts—Congress denies them the right—Congress is afraid they will prove their claim. Congress cannot bear to see any money paid on these claims because Congress wants to save the taxpayers the terrible burden of paying these claims. Congress is careful with public funds.

The Court of Claims was established 86 years ago and up to the present time claims amounting to a little over $2,000,000,000 have been filed, but the recovery had by the Indians on all of these claims has amounted to less than $40,000,000, or about one-half the cost of one battleship.

Under the House rules Indian bills come up usually under the consent rule, if they come up at all. That means that one Member can rise in his seat and object and that ends the Indian legislation. Congress always has a few Members who seem to just hang around waiting for Indian day. In fact these Members are actually proud of what they are doing, because such repeated objections confer on them the false title of "watchdogs of the Treasury." These same "watchdogs" would vote $40,000,000,000 to involve us in a war that is none of our concern.

Realizing that nothing could be done in Congress for the Indian unless public opinion was first created in his favor, I caused to be presented to both the Democratic and Republican conventions in 1940 an Indian plank that would cure this situation. The Indians had many friends in both conventions and both conventions placed an Indian plank in its platform.

The Democratic Convention took the matter seriously and passed a plank that, if enacted into law, will cure the situation. The Republican Convention put in just enough to catch a few Indian votes, but not enough to do the Indian any good.

The Democrats said:

> We favor and pledge the enactment of legislation creating an Indian Claims Commission for the special purpose of entertaining and investigating claims presented by Indian groups, bands, and tribes, in order that our Indian citizens may have their claims against the Government considered, adjusted, and finally settled at the earliest possible date.

The Republicans said:

> We pledge an immediate and final settlement of all Indian claims between the Government and the Indian citizenship of the Nation.

Examining now the Democratic pledge, it means something, and, since the Republicans were defeated, it does not make much difference what they said. The Democrats are in power, and it is up to the administration now to make good on this promise and pledge.

To carry out this promise in good faith, Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma has introduced a bill in the Senate, S. 1111, and Congressman O'CONNOR, of Montana, has introduced the same bill in the House, known as H. R. 4339.

I am reliably informed that the Attorney General's Office is against this bill, and I presume the Bureau of the Budget will be against it—this Bureau is usually against anything that is right—but that should make no difference. This bill should be passed, and, as one Republican, I will do more than my full part in passing it.

All of the Democratic "watchdogs of the Treasury" will be against the bill, and since the bill is a Democratic promise and pledge, we may rest assured that many Republicans will be against it; all of the Republican "watchdogs" will be against it, but that should make no difference. The bill should be passed. This is now the responsibility of the Democrats, and I am just wondering how they are contriving to side-step the issue. How will the Democrats avoid their promise? What can the Democrats say if they do not redeem their pledge?

There is only one way out for them and that is to say, as Wendell Willkie said, "Oh, that was just campaign talk." That explanation was to be expected from a phony candidate placed before the people by the House of Morgan, but it will hardly do for honest men to try it.

Importance of Speedy Appropriations for Federal Reclamation Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON, OF NEW MEXICO, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me April 17, 1941, before the Committee on Appropriations:

STATEMENT BY HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

In discussing the Federal reclamation program and the need for expediting completion of projects it includes, it should be noted that New Mexico, from 1930 to 1940, showed a growth in population of 24.9 percent. The rate of gain was second to only one State—Florida—and the pressure of population makes it more necessary than ever that our limited water resources be conserved and put to productive use through irrigation for the support of the more than half a million people within our borders.

Although less than a third of the State's harvested acreage is under irrigation, the irrigated land produces more than half of the crop values. You will, therefore, see the importance of irrigation in the life of New Mexico, especially in those areas which border on the drought region and have suffered from deficiencies in rainfall.

The one project in the reclamation section of the Department of the Interior appropriation bill to which attention is directed is the estimate of $450,000 for the Tucumcari development, which will bring under irrigation some 45,000 acres in Quay County in my State. This project will develop the only intensively farmed area on the railroad between Kansas City and the Rio Grande Valley. Water, as you know, will be secured from Conchas Dam constructed for flood control on the South Canadian River. It will be carried through a 75-mile canal to fertile lands that need only an assured supply of water to make them productive.

The Tucumcari project will make available for settlement over 300 farmsteads. It will produce hay and grain for the support of the livestock industry that needs stabilization of forage supplies, and other products will be consumed by the increasing population in the State. Many large holdings, now running as high as 1,700 acres, will be subdivided into family-size farms for the settlement of newcomers in eastern New Mexico.

But if this project is to be of service in providing settlement opportunities there must be more speed in advancing its completion, and speed calls for larger appropriations. With $3,946,000 required to complete the undertaking after the fiscal year 1942, it will require nearly 10 years to bring water to all of this land if appropriations are continued at the rate proposed in this bill—$450,000. Since the Federal Government has already invested $4,000,000 in the project, it would seem to be good judgment to make this money produce results as soon as possible by completing the necessary facilities without delay.

New Mexico knows of the beneficial results that have come from the construction of the Carlsbad project and the Elephant Butte district facilities of the Rio Grande project. Tucumcari will contribute as much proportionately to stabilization of an agricultural area and in creating a market for manufactured products of the Midwest and East as the Carlsbad and Rio Grande projects have done.

There is another phase of the reclamation program in which New Mexico is interested along with all the arid and semiarid States. And that is in advancing surveys and investigations looking to the utilization to the fullest of the available water supplies in this area. Reports indicate there are about 430,000 acres in New Mexico which can be brought under irrigation if water is conserved.

Of greatest personal interest to me are studies and investigations which the Bureau of Reclamation has under way on the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, where flood control and supplemental water supplies are of the greatest concern to an area that has long been irrigated as a private undertaking.

The Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District is located in the valley that has been continuously irrigated for 300 years. We have every sort of a problem in that valley. It needs the care and attention of the Reclamation Service. It needs to have the Reclamation Service devote a lot of time to a study of how far it can go in the solution of present problems.

These problems include the control of floods, the control of silt and the responsibility which the Government owes to Indian population along the river.

I do not want to take the time of the committee to do more than outline some of these things. I just want the committee to remember that millions of dollars of Federal money are invested in the Elephant Butte Dam and Reservoir and that the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District embraces in its territory the mouth of the Rio Puerco River. This Rio Puerco stream probably dumps more silt into the Elephant Butte Reservoir than all the rest of the Rio Grande system. If the Reclamation Service and the various other agencies now involved can stop this deposit of silt in the Elephant Butte Reservoir they will thereby protect huge investments which this Government has already made.

Secondly, the conditions in the valley constitute a recurring flood menace. The bed of the Rio Grande through central New Mexico is rapidly building up. It is, for example, several feet above the city of Albuquerque, although it borders that city. It is not a situation which should be allowed to continue without Government attention.

All through the area are the homes of the Pueblo Indians. They are wards of the Government. Their lands include many thousands of irrigated acres. It will be cheaper to take care of their interests now than to wait until the problem becomes aggravated.

I recognize that the possibility of the transfer of this project to the Reclamation Service is not before your committee. I am greatly interested in it, and I only mention it at this time to urge this committee to make available to the Reclamation Service ample funds for the pressing problems which require immediate investigation and study and which prudence demands shall not be allowed to drift.

People are moving in search of the sun. Florida and New Mexico and California—these are the three fastest-growing States in the Union, and in every one of them the lure has been outdoor, sunny living. If the population of New Mexico continues to increase—yes; if we are to feed and support decently the present numbers within its borders—more irrigated land is needed, and quickly. No good end will be accomplished by sending these people on to other States or returning them to the drought and other areas from which they have fled. The Bureau of Reclamation should have more than $500,000 annually for this purpose.

The investigations will doubtless uncover areas in New Mexico which can qualify under the water-conservation and utilization program for the irrigation of small projects or the rehabilitation of existing water supplies. For that reason, the State is concerned about the adequacy of the $3,500,000 appropriation of reimbursable funds. Spread over the Great Plains and States to the westward, this amount will not go far enough to provide speedy rehabilitation for areas threatened with retrogression by drought or shortage of water supplies.

No Adequate Defense Against Air Offensive Warfare Yet Discovered—Vulnerability of the Panama Lock Canal

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1941

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the news about the war in Europe is illuminating with respect to offensive and defensive warfare in the air. We read that German bombers attacked London from dark until dawn and that four or five German planes were brought down. In Greece they say that waves of German bombers precede the German infantry and tank attacks to perform the same functions that were formerly performed by artillery. Now, instead of infantry attacks being preceded by an artillery barrage, they are preceded by barrages from the air. If the Allies in Greece have been able to shoot down any appreciable number of attacking bombers, the newspapers do not tell anything about it.

Apparently any defense against air attacks at night directed against a large

target, fixed in location, is woefully inadequate. In the daytime air attacks may be beaten off by defending fighter planes, but even then some bombers appear to slip through any defense. Obviously, bombers high enough in the air can fly over a fixed target either in the daytime or at night; and if the target is large enough, hits are likely to be scored. As yet we have heard of no defense that can prevent this.

The lock canal across the Isthmus of Panama includes one double set of triple flight locks on the Atlantic side and two double sets of locks on the Pacific side. There are also two or three dams holding the lock pool 80 feet above sea level. If a dam or one set of lock gates should be breached, the pool would drain out. If the pool should be drained, the canal would go out of operation for a long time, perhaps for several years.

The existing situation makes me extremely apprehensive for the safety of the Panama Canal. It should be converted into a sea-level canal as soon as practicable.

Stabilization With Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1941

ARTICLE BY WILLIS OVERHOLSER

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Willis Overholser is, in my opinion, well worth the careful reading and consideration of Members of the House. I have therefore asked permission to have it printed herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STABILIZATION WITH PENSIONS—FINANCING BY A COMBINATION OF TAXATION AND NEW CURRENCY

(By Willis A. Overholser)

I have heretofore reviewed the two leading pension bills pending in Congress. These bills both provide for financing pensions solely by means of increased taxation. As I stated in effect in a previous issue, I believe that it is a mistake to confine the financing of pensions solely to increased taxation. The chief economic need for an old-age-pension system is to increase the actual circulation of buying power and aid in the correction of a deflationary condition. Of course, there are other good reasons for an old-age-pension system, such as the social need of restoring millions of old people to some state of economic decency, who have been impoverished by social causes—for example, by the great economic collapse of 1929.

However, returning to the economic need of increasing buying power in actual circulation, it should be apparent that financing the payment of pensions solely by means of increased taxation may fail miserably to aid in fulfilling this economic need. Thus, if money is taxed from some and turned over to others to spend, those who pay the taxes will have as much less money to spend as those on the receiving end will have more to spend.

VELOCITY OF MONEY

Some contention is made that this will increase the velocity of money—that is, increase the turn-over of our existing money supply—and thereby increase business activity and production. To the extent that the money is taxed out of the hands of people who are already spending, or investing back into circulation, all of their respective incomes as fast as they receive them—and this includes a very sizeable proportion of our population—this contention is obviously erroneous. In such cases the velocity of money actually will be retarded to some extent. On the other hand, to the extent that money is taxed out of the hands of people who are not spending or investing back into actual circulation all of their incomes as fast as same are received, this contention may be correct. However, even this would not necessarily, under all circumstances, be true, since increased taxation of such persons often causes them to cut down in the rate of their spending and investing. Furthermore, during extreme deflationary periods, the incomes of most wealthy persons are greatly reduced along with the incomes of the rest of the population.

Thus, in general, increased taxation is deflationary in character and retards instead of increases the velocity of money. I am quite sure that most leading economists will agree with this statement. It, therefore, seems to me, that the ideal pension system should provide for financing pensions partly through an increased supply of Government money and partly through taxation, on some balanced basis, and in the remainder of this installment I shall call attention to the general provisions of a plan which I believe would provide such a balanced basis.

INCREASED GROWTH REQUIRES MORE MONEY

In this connection it should be noted that with an increase in population and with a normal and healthy increase in industrial growth, there is a constant need for a proportionate increase in our money supply. Some people will talk about making up for some of this needed increase by an increase in the velocity of money. However, the velocity of money is not something that can be regulated like volume. Furthermore, there is a limit to the velocity of money, just like there is a limit to the velocity at which an automobile can travel. When velocity of money does not increase, it is necessary to increase the volume of money to take care of increased needs.

Most of the increases in volume of money during recent history have been increases in bank-credit money. Increases in that type of money, however, are based on increases of interest-bearing debt. As a result the country has gotten badly mired in debt. It is terribly unsound to try to depend upon debt-based money to meet our needs for increases in the volume of money. The general need for such increases, being social in character, should be met by increases in constitutional debt-free money issued by the Government, and an old-age pension system would provide an excellent channel for getting such needed increase into actual circulation.

ADEQUATE SAFEGUARDS AGAINST INFLATION

Such increases, of course, can and should be supplied in a manner which will provide adequate safeguards against harmful inflation. Both inflation and deflation are reflected in changes of the general commodity price level. In fact, while the rise or fall in the prices of individual commodities (except in the case of monopolistically controlled prices) is governed by the supply and demand for those commodities, respectively; nevertheless, the general rise or fall of prices in general is largely governed by the supply and velocity of money as compared to the demand for money.

Thus, a general lowering of prices is indicative of an insufficient volume and velocity of money, and reveals a need for increasing the volume of money in actual circulation. On the other hand a general rise in prices—except in cases of general scarcity, such as is produced by war—is indicative of too large a volume of money, and reveals a need for a withdrawal of a part of the volume of money from actual circulation. We have at Washington in the Department of Labor a Bureau known as the Bureau of Labor Statistics which collects and records the changes in prices of over 800 different commodities. By weighting the various commodities according to their importance in trade, the Bureau arrives at an index number for ascertaining the relative level at any time of general prices. In this manner the relative position or changes in the general commodity price level is traced from week to week, month to month, and year to year. This, of course, reveals what the purchasing power of the dollar may be at any time, and records from time to time the changes therein.

GENERAL PRICE LEVEL GAGE

In financing pensions on some balanced basis, partly with taxation and partly with increases in the money supply, the general commodity price level should be used as a scientific indicator. In this manner both harmful inflation and deflation can be avoided, and the purchasing power of money can be stabilized. It would be necessary for Congress to determine at what level money should be stabilized. I make no proposal in this respect, but will say that the most common suggestion made is the 1926 level, which would involve a slight rise in the present price level.

Also, I offer no exact proposal as to the amount of the monthly pension that should be paid to those of retirement age. The Gallup Poll indicates that there is wide support for a $30 to $60 per month pension. Whatever pension is paid should be fixed, instead of fluctuating, in amount in order to provide greater stability. Neither is it necessary for the purpose of revealing the important distinguishing features of this plan to suggest the exact type of taxation that should be used. Other proposals have embraced a transaction tax, a gross-income tax or an excess-profits tax. The important thing is that the tax when levied should be levied and collected on a monthly basis.

SALIENT PROVISIONS

Under the plan herein suggested new United States legal tender currency would be issued and used in paying the first month's pensions. This should be repeated during subsequent months until the general commodity price level reaches whatever level is adopted as the standard level, assuming that a level, higher than the existing level, is adopted as the standard for stabilization purposes.

If the price level goes above the standard during any month, then a 1 percent tax (of whatever type is determined upon) automatically should go into effect and be collected throughout the country during the ensuing month. The revenue derived from the tax should then be applied toward the payment of the next month's pension, and if the proceeds of the tax prove insufficient for the full payment of that month's pension, then the deficiency should be provided for by the issuance of new currency. If the price level does not return to the standard level during the next month, then the tax should be increased to 2 percent, and so on until the full amount to be paid in pensions is raised by taxation. In this manner adjustments should be made between the tax and new currency so as to maintain a stable dollar. If other checks on inflation are desired, provision can be made for prohibiting

banks from using the new currency as fractional reserves for credit expansion purposes, or provisions can be included for increasing bank reserve requirements generally. These latter provisions, along with the general provisions of the plan above proposed, would provide a greater bulwark against harmful inflation than has ever yet been established in this country. I realize that all these matters involve many questions in regard to money and banking. In future issues I intend to embark upon a series of articles on our money system, including matters involving certain banking laws and practices.

Humanity Is Threatened With Universal Bondage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1941

ARTICLE BY HON. PRENTISS M. BROWN, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Senator PRENTISS M. BROWN, of Michigan, which was published in the Detroit Jewish Chronicle of April 11, 1941.

[From the Detroit Jewish Chronicle of April 11, 1941]

HUMANITY IS THREATENED WITH UNIVERSAL BONDAGE—SENATOR BROWN POINTS TO PASSOVER LESSON AS SUPREME EXPRESSION OF MORAL CODE IN THE PRESENT FIGHT FOR LIBERTY

(By the Honorable Prentiss M. Brown, United States Senator from Michigan)

A distinctive feature of our times is our forced return to first essentials. Principles that once aroused inspiration and enthusiasm, for which men and women once fought and died and that in more recent days had become trite, slightly commonplace formulas thoughtlessly repeated by a somewhat bored humanity, have once more come into their own. "Equality of the citizens before the law," "All men are born free and equal," "Inalienable rights of mankind," were long subject to indifferent observance and trivial breaches alike. Now that a gigantic effort has been made to divorce humanity from these principles, to abrogate the Ten Commandments after 4,000 years, we are shocked into a rediscovery of the fundamentals.

After an age-old matter-of-fact acceptance of these eternal truths as self-evident, the world suddenly finds itself face to face with a brazen attempt to overthrow them. Faced by this danger, the world rises in their defense. As of old, as in the days when the ideas of equality, of tolerance, of physical and spiritual freedom were first proclaimed amid a glorious fight against primeval shackles of primitive humanity, these ideas proved once more that they are capable of arousing devotion and sacrifice. We discover that our traditions of democratic government are the technique by means of which these eternal truths are translated into political and social terms. Viewed from this angle, the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, the fourteenth amendment, are a restatement of the moral code of democracy and of religion at once.

This awakening is proceeding apace the world over, albeit in many countries under the heavy hand of oppression. But nowhere has the shock of awakening come with an impetus stronger than that experienced in this country. Indeed, more than any other country of the modern world does the American Nation owe its existence to the prevalence of the moral code of democracy.

Discovered by refugees from the Inquisition of Spain, settled in turn by puritanical refugees from England, by Catholic refugees from Ireland, by liberal refugees from Germany after 1848, and again in our days, by millions of poverty-ridden Slavs and Jews, Italians and Greeks, Scandinavians and Orientals, America, as we know it, is a monument to the equality of races, to the freedom of the individual, and to the essential unity of mankind despite political and religious differences. A long succession of placid days has permitted us to forget our true character and task.

The stormy days we live through now compel us to take stock of essentials and to rededicate ourselves to their service.

All this is peculiarly apt to be recalled by my Jewish cocitizens on their ancient festival of Passover, the holiday of liberation from slavery. It was the darkest hour of Israel's history, the hour of Egyptian bondage, that led to the supreme expression of the great moral code which has been laid down on Sinai and has remained the cornerstone of civilization ever since.

At present it is not one race alone that is faced with the revival of slavery. It is humanity as a whole that finds itself threatened with universal bondage. Together we shall face the danger, together we shall overcome it, and together we shall vow allegiance to our old American dream—the dream of a free society of free and equal and mutually tolerant men.

Movie Producers, Think of American Interests First Before You Disseminate Dastardly War Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE MILWAUKEE SENTINEL

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, the motion-picture producers of today are seemingly reenacting the war propaganda role played by the movies prior to the last war. Why is it that these men who through cinema art mold so much American public opinion, cannot or will not follow the pleas of those who were tools or dupes in the same field before the last war? It is my hope that the movie producers of America will see the wisdom and have the courage to act in the interests of American blood and treasure. Members of Congress and the country might gain a new insight into movie war propaganda by reading the following newspaper article. It details the part regretfully played by Lillian Gish in propaganda films before the last war. Members of Congress have had their sleep disturbed and have been filled with remorse because they followed the crowd, were fooled, and voted for war in April 1917. Let us pray to God that this may never happen again.

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel of Wednesday, April 2, 1941]

LILLIAN GISH DEPLORES HER ROLE IN PULLING NATION INTO WORLD WAR THROUGH PROPAGANDA PICTURES—AMERICA FIRST PARLEY URGED TO OPPOSE INVOLVEMENT—BRITISH, FRENCH BACKED FILMS INTENDED TO SWAY UNITED STATES

CHICAGO, April 1.—How do you go about it to put to sleep a nation's natural aspiration for peace and to create in its place a million-voiced scream of hate and a clamor for war?

A formula for the performance of this trick was told today by one who learned it from an expert—and wishes she hadn't. She is Miss Lillian Gish, star of stage and screen. And she told the secret in the grand ballroom of the Hotel Sherman at a rally sponsored by the Chicago chapter of the America First Committee.

PROPAGANDA FILMS

A quarter of a century ago Miss Gish was making powerful propaganda pictures, directed by David Wark Griffith, for the purpose of luring the United States into a war "to make the world safe for democracy." She was very young, and she believed she was doing right. Today she told how it all happened:

"Mr. Griffith was approached by Lloyd George, Lord Beaverbrook, and the heads of the British and French propaganda departments about making films to interest Americans in fighting for them * * * and I found myself on a boat bound for France.

"We got 86,000 feet of film, with everyone working for us, from the King and Queen of England to the French and British common soldiers, before we sailed for home. From this material we made three pictures."

GIRL LOSES MIND

"You may recall scenes from one called Hearts of the World, the story of an English girl who was about to be married to a French boy when the war broke out. She sees her home and mother and grandfather blown to bits before her eyes, loses her mind, goes roaming along the battlefield, hugging all that is left of her wedding veil, stumbles upon her fiance, wounded and unconscious, and she goes to sleep peacefully at his side.

"In another scene three children, left alone in a dugout with their dead mother, dig her grave and bury her without help.

"These were effective scenes, calculated to stir the emotions of Americans so they would be willing to fight and die for the cause.

"The other pictures we made were The Great Love, a story of English bravery under Zeppelin attack, and The Greatest Thing in Life, the story of an American snob who finds himself in a shell hole, holding in his arms a dying Negro soldier.

"These were good stories, deeply moving. But when we ran them again a few years ago, long after the war was over, the scenes that showed the Huns, as we called them, and the 'Beast of Berlin' as we called the Kaiser, brought only laughter. * * * But now, with propagandized hysteria at its present peak, who knows but that those who laughed might take them seriously again. * * *"

PROPAGANDA REVEALED

"I remember that people asked us if it was true that the Germans cut off the hands and

legs of old people and crucified children. Sir Philip Gibbs afterward admitted, in the twenties, that such stories were sent out for propaganda purposes—propaganda that made our people talk and think like idiots.

"I am not proud of the part I played in spreading hatred. Hate is like a boomerang. It seems to me that this is a time when Americans must decide whether they love some other country better than their own. Those who do should go to that country and offer help. But those who love this country most should do something to keep it out of ruinous war, if only by sending a penny postal card of protest to their Congressmen and Senators."

Another speaker at the rally was Gen. Thomas S. Hammond, former head of the Illinois National Guard, whose chief point was that, even though the lend-lease bill has become the law of the land and must be loyally accepted as such, there is still a task for wise leadership in the problems which arise under that law.

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1941

STATEMENT ENDORSING SEAWAY

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a statement which came to my desk in relation to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway entitled "A New Frontier for America":

A NEW FRONTIER FOR AMERICA

The St. Lawrence seaway and power project proposes a direct route to the Atlantic through the St. Lawrence Channel, providing a minmum depth of 27 feet as contrasted with the present limit of 14 feet through the existing canals on the St. Lawrence River.

Studies by the Federal Government indicate that this new channel would accommodate more than half of the world's cargo tonnage and would open up a vast new inland empire benefiting 40,000,000 of our people and about 20 States on or near the Great Lakes.

The effect of the seaway would be to create a new frontier in America and open up vast channels of trade not now enjoyed by the great inland empire. Studies by the United States Department of Commerce indicate that it would not only be a tremendous aid to defense but that it would have incalculable benefits from a lasting long-range standpoint.

From the large perspective of national welfare, the seaway project has received the enthusiastic endorsement of every single President since William Howard Taft. A plank in the Republican Presidential platform of 1932 endorsed it. A Republican President negotiated a treaty with Canada in 1932 and a Democratic President supported it in Congress.

Opposition comes principally from powerfully organized local groups such as power interests in New York State, the railroads, certain Great Lakes carriers, and Gulf, Atlantic seaboard, and a few Great Lakes ports now collecting tolls for the transshipment of goods for the export market.

They say the project would be wasteful, impractical, a threat to present communications systems, and that ice and fog would cripple the open ocean route for much of each year.

They imply that the project is new, whereas it is simply a modernization of existing facilities. Traffic has moved through the St. Lawrence canals consistently for over a hundred years in constantly increasing amounts, particularly since the opening of the Welland Canal in 1932. In 1938 more than 8,000,000 short tons of lake freight moved through these canals eastward to tidewater. So the navigation phases of the project are not new. They seek simply to modernize outmoded channels which have reached the limit of their carrying capacity.

Of the more than 2,000 miles of lake route from Duluth to the sea, only 48 miles of rapids and shoals stand in the way of ocean-going commerce. This hindrance blocks the stretch between the outlet of Lake Ontario and Montreal.

As early as 1911 the Aluminum Co. of America, on whose output hinges the speed of aircraft production for defense, recognized that dams for hydroelectric power development in the International Rapids would also aid navigation. Today the Aluminum Co. buys much of its power from Canada. Canadian defense industries may soon require this reserve power. The power phase of the St. Lawrence seaway project can develop 2,000,000 horsepower a day, half of it for American consumption, with the cost self-liquidating. In the national-defense effort, it can obviate a bottleneck; in peacetime, it can bring cheap power to domestic consumers, farmers, and businessmen in New York State.

Other phases of the seaway call for dredging and new lock construction in other sections of the route, principally in boundaries contiguous to Michigan.

Government authorities estimate the total cost to the United States at $256,170,000, including all the channel improvements from Lake Superior to Montreal, of which $90,000,000 would be borne by the State of New York, leaving $166,170,000 as the cost to the Federal Government. This is the approximate equivalent of the cost of two battleships.

In return for this cost, seaway proponents cite figures to show that Great Lakes shipyards, now largely idle while coastal yards are booked solid 2 years ahead, could handle a billion dollars' worth of ship contracts—if the ships could be moved to the sea.

Completion of the seaway will enable all types of fighting ships except battleships and airplane carriers to move through to the Atlantic. If construction of the project started the same day as the keel were laid for a heavy cruiser in a Great Lakes shipyard, the channel would be ready by the time the cruiser was ready to move out to its place in our new two-ocean navy. It would take longer to build a cruiser at tidewater today because, since all shipyards are already busy with defense work, new ways would have to be built, and this in itself would take a year and a half, in addition to the time it takes to build a cruiser.

This defense aspect of the St. Lawrence project moved President Roosevelt to say of it: "It is now a vital necessity * * *. The United States needs this great land-locked sea as a secure haven in which it will always be able to build ships and more ships in order to protect our trade and our shores.

"It (the seaway) means a more secure nation. It means a continent protected and served by the additional shipping built in inland shipyards. It means more industries, both defense and domestic, thriving on the cheapest power in history. It means more comforts in the homes of many cities and rural areas. It means more work for the ordinary citizen in shipyards, factories, and other transportation services connecting the center of this continent with the great highway to and from our national and international market."

After the defense effort is ended the Great Lakes shipyards can help meet the maritime needs of the world. Before the outbreak of the present European war America had less than one-seventh of the world's total ship tonnage. If this country is to aid in world rehabilitation, ships will be needed far beyond the present building capacity of coastal shipyards. It is also agreed by traffic experts that after the war competition among nations for world trade will be intense and low transportation costs will be a vital factor. This will be particularly important in neutral markets such as South America, where strong-arm methods of commercial competition by totalitarian countries has already undermined the market for American products. Cheaper transportation costs will make it possible for this country to compete with cheap labor costs of other countries without reducing the standard of living of American workers.

Opponents of the seaway say that it would bring to the Midwest a flood of cheap European goods in competition with American products. The mere fact that this has not happened on Atlantic coast ports, which are closer to Europe and on which transportation costs of cheap goods would be even cheaper than into the Great Lakes area, is proof enough of the fallacy of this argument.

Rather than cheap foreign merchandise, in-bound cargoes would consist of the much-needed raw materials for the great manufacturing plants of the Midwest. The automobile industry alone now imports 300 different commodities from 56 foreign lands. Raw rubber would come in for the great tire plants of Ohio. Principal in-bound cargo through the limited way of the Welland Canal in 1939 was wood pulp for paper making, of which there is a shortage in America. Lower transportation costs on all these needed raw materials would tend to reduce costs of finished manufactured articles, and greater consumption invariably follows lowered costs and prices. This would be true of the domestic market for cars, tires, newsprint, etc., as well as of the export market. More than 800 industries in Michigan have a stake in foreign trade, and one-seventh of Michigan pay rolls depends on it. The story is the same for western New York and Pennsylvania, for Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. Each of these areas would benefit by the cheaper cost of incoming and outgoing cargo.

Opponents say the seaway would offer fog and ice hazards and would be closed 5 months of each year by reason of climatic conditions. A recent Government study discloses that fog conditions from Lake Ontario to Montreal are relatively better than in New York Harbor.

The accident experience on Great Lakes canals is better than on the Panama Canal. Admittedly the St. Lawrence would be closed for a minor part of each year by ice. The same thing is true of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal and locks connecting Lakes Superior and Huron, one of the northernmost points on the entire route. Yet the Sault locks in 1 year carried 100,000,000 tons of shipping, the approximate equivalent of the combined tonnage of the Panama and Suez Canals and the ports of London and Liverpool (before the present war). The seaway in the open months of the season would be one of the busiest ship routes in the world.

Government engineers say that the deeper channel would have a potential of 25,000,000 tons of cargo a year. This will permit 16,000,000 tons of new traffic over the present movement over the 14-foot channel.

As important as the savings in transportation costs is the relation of cheap transportation to the building abroad of American factories with American capital and at the expense of American pay rolls and American

industrial activity. Yet Michigan manufacturers have found it necessary to build extensive foreign plants in order to get costs down to a competitive basis in world markets. Several plants built in Europe by Michigan industry would not have had to be built, and would not have been built on the direct testimony of the operators had the cheap transportation of a deep St. Lawrence seaway been available.

So, not only is lack of a deep sea channel holding the great Midwest back from its full potential development but it has forced emigration overseas of American capital and manhours of labor through lack of completion of only 3 percent of the entire St. Lawrence route.

The pros and cons of the Great Lakes seaway boil down to this: Sectional selfishness as contrasted with national welfare. Opponents have raised specious claims unsupported by facts. Every single valid negative argument has been answered by factual data compiled by surveys carrying the full weight of the authority of the United States Government. Lacking factual arguments, those who would kill this plan for the betterment of the country have fallen upon the familiar devices of trying to scare labor into opposition and of rattling political skeletons.

Every official survey shows that labor would tremendously benefit, including miners, railroad workers, farmers, and many others.

The political bogey is answered by the record. President Roosevelt enthusiastically endorses the project. He was preceded in this attitude by ex-Presidents Hoover, Coolidge, Harding, Wilson, and Taft. Republicans and Democrats alike have put the St. Lawrence seaway above party politics. They have seen it as a great boon to America.

They have seen it in the statesmanlike perspective of true national welfare—the means of opening a great new frontier for the enrichment of all America.

Social Security Program Inadequate for Aged Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1941

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I receive letters which constitute real evidence of the failure of the social-security law to benefit aged persons. Under the present set-up, the amount of funds which one of our pioneers can receive is determined by the State or its municipal subdivisions. They call it old-age assistance. If a State does not carry out its responsibility, then the aged people suffer.

One of the best bits of evidence that I have received, showing the need for a national old-age pension law, is contained in a letter which came to my office today.

I have had many other letters of a similar character. I do not here use the writer's name because I have not had permission to do so, but the facts as set forth in his letter to me are as follows:

A large number of my friends and neighbors, who know my circumstances, have convinced me that I should write to you and explain my problem.

I am an elderly man of 74 and have received old-age pension for the past 4 years. The sum has been $20. This money was supposed to buy my clothes and pay my board, but out of this amount I have tried to take care of my wife.

Others have received clothes and such and then again there are many more who could not get these things through their local relief.

I have no way of getting to town or having my groceries hauled out without paying for it so this takes a small amount of my pension, too.

But it is this that I wish to tell you about. In January of this year my wife became 65 and upon that date made her application for old-age pension. On April 1 this year we received our checks, her first, and instead of her getting a small additional check, my pension was cut in half and we each received a check for $10, no more than I alone received.

We are both eligible to draw a pension because we have no one who has enough to take care of us. One son, however, furnishes us with a small house and gets our fuel. But $20 won't buy our food and clothing. Right in the same community there are other couples living under much better conditions than which my wife and I live in, and they are getting from $15 to $22 each, with extras for medicine and arrangements for purchasing false teeth. Neither my wife nor I have teeth and do not expect to get any. All we ask for is enough to eat and wear.

There are pending in the House of Representatives various national old-age pension bills. I do not here undertake to favor one bill at the expense of another, but I want to point out that all of this talk when the Social Security Act was passed about doing something for the old folks was just talk, and there is still a duty to pass effective legislation which will permit our aged pensioners to have some of the comforts of life in their old age.

This case of a man 74 years of age with a wife 65 years of age and getting the magnificient sum of $20 a month clearly illustrates the failure of the present social-security law. It is an appeal to Congress to do something, and the way to handle this problem, in my opinion, is to pass a national old-age pension law.

The A. A. A.'s Expanded Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1941

EDITORIAL BY BERRY H. AKERS, EDITOR OF THE FARMER, ST. PAUL, MINN

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the expanded A. A. A. program as recently announced by the Department of Agriculture must be studied very carefully as to its effects upon prices farmers should receive for their commodities, produced to feed our Nation, and needed also by other nations today.

The announced program has for its purpose—and I agree heartily with that purpose—the encouragement of the production of food products for those nations facing starvation as a result of the European war. By its purchase power the Government proposes to hold up the price of hogs at Chicago to $9 per hundredweight; that of butter at 31 cents per pound; and that of eggs at 22 cents per dozen—all Chicago prices.

These assured prices are all below parity. What the farmer is interested in knowing is whether these prices shall prove to be a ceiling or the floor of the farm-price structure.

A very able editorial on this subject appears in this week's issue of The Farmer, published in St. Paul and edited by Mr. Berry H. Akers. This editorial, entitled "The A. A. A.'s Expanded Program," gives much food for thought as does also one entitled, "Would Keep Prices Down," published in a previous issue of The Farmer.

May I request of the Members of the House that you take the necessary few minutes to read both of these editorials, printed herewith under permission accorded me:

THE A. A. A. EXPANDED PROGRAM

The A. A. A. is expanding its ever-normal granary program into a food program which has two objectives: First, to assure us, Great Britain, and her allies an adequate supply of pork, dairy, and poultry products; second, to safeguard the income of the producers of these products.

To accomplish the first objective, farmers are being asked to increase pork production by raising more hogs and feeding them to heavier weights; by milking more cows and feeding cows more grain; by raising more chickens.

To accomplish the second objective, the Government will peg the prices of these products. It agrees during the period ending June 30, 1943, to keep the price of hogs at Chicago at least $9 a hundred; butter, 31 cents a pound; eggs, 22 cents a dozen; and chickens, 15 cents a pound. Prices in other markets will be subject to the usual trade differentials. They are based on existing price relationships. The assumption is they will be raised if the prices of things farmers buy rise.

The net result to date has been an increase in the price of hogs to around the $9 level at Chicago. Butter, chickens, and eggs were selling at Chicago above the Government "peg" prices when the program was announced.

The Government will support the price level by buying in the open market for British needs and for relief distribution. Whenever prices fall below the Government's pegged-price level, the Government will step into the market and buy to bring them up to that level. But if natural demand should cause prices to rise above the pegged-price level, the Government will not interfere unless prices become unduly high. Then the Government will become a seller in order to, quoting Secretary Wickard, "stabilize prices and maintain them at reasonable levels." This is not price fixing, since prices can go above and not below the assured levels.

The vital part of the new plan is its purpose to assure ample quantities of feed. The A. A. A.'s corn program has been revised, al-

lowing producers in commercial areas to increase corn acreage up to their usual acreage (about 40 percent over the 1941 allotments). The proposed corn marketing quota referendum for next fall has been abandoned and there will be no marketing quotas on the 1941 corn crop. Government-owned corn will continue to be available to feeders who wish to buy it at existing prices. There are around 150,000,000 bushels for sale at 65 to 69 cents a bushel. The corn-loan program will be continued for 1941 and 1942 at the existing 61-cent level. There are no promises to increase the loan rate, and the A. A. A. is not supporting in Congress measures designed to increase the rate.

The catch in the revised corn program is this: The grower who exceeds his allotment cannot get a loan on his 1941 corn, and he will forfeit his corn parity and corn diversion payments on his entire crop. He will, however, receive conservation and practice payments if he stays within his total soil-depleting allotment.

Here is an example how the revised corn program will work. We'll assume that you have a corn allotment of 40 acres; that the normal yield is 40 bushels. If you plant within the allotment, you will receive a parity payment of 5 cents a bushel and a diversion payment of 9 cents, a total of $5.60 an acre and a grand total of $224. If you overplant your allotment you will not receive this $224, and in addition will forfeit the right to get a corn loan. You can plant up to 140 percent of the allotment, or 56 acres, and still receive other A. A. A. payments if you stay within the total soil-depleting allotment. If you plant 56 acres, you are betting that the corn produced on the 16 acres above your allotment will be more valuable as hog feed than the $224 in payments you will forfeit, not to mention the loss of the right to borrow on your corn.

This change in the corn program has received a mixed reception from farmers. It is a question whether the net income from growing more hogs to feed the corn produced on extra acres will offset the loss of special benefit payments and the assurance of price stability through the loan program. Each farmer must figure this out as it applies to his particular situation, but our guess is that most corn farmers outside of "cash corn" and drought areas will stay within their allotments. This is the wish of Secretary Wickard, who said in his official announcement that "because of the ample feed supplies on hand, most producers should plant within their corn allotments."

The A. A. A. has already begun a drive to induce farmers to plant within their corn acreage allotments this year. This drive, coupled with the fact that the revised program penalizes the farmer who increases acreage, leads one to wonder whether the A. A. A. actually wants more corn, except in deficient areas. Probably the desire is to first use up supplies on hand.

The food program is a compromise between factions in the administration favoring low prices and those favoring higher prices. The ill-advised statement of Secretary Knox, to which we referred last issue, that cheap food keeps the working man happy, and similar outbursts by other Government officials, brought widespread protests from farm sections. To satisfy those who want low prices, assurance was given the consumer groups that if prices rise unduly the Government will see that they are put back down to fair levels and that farmers will increase production of corn, hogs, milk, chickens, and eggs.

The present parity price for hogs is $9.24 (around $10 at Chicago); 35 cents for butterfat; 14.6 cents for chickens; 21.8 cents for eggs, all at the farm. The assured prices are all below parity. The question now is whether the assured prices will be the ceiling or the floor of the price structure. If they prove to be the ceiling, farmers will protest with all their might. They have not sought inflated prices, but they are entitled to, at least, parity prices.

WOULD KEEP PRICES DOWN

One of the notions which just will not die is that, regardless of how high wages go, how high taxes go and how high other prices go, food should be cheap. Much progress has been made in recent years in correcting this notion, but that it isn't dead is indicated by the desire of many high officials in Washington, especially within the Navy and the Army, to prevent the cost of living from rising.

Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, recently told Congress: "I was tremendously gratified, when back in Chicago recently, to find that food prices have gone down, which is the best thing in the world to keep labor satisfied. What I would like is to see wages stabilized and prices kept down; because you cannot keep wages stabilized if the prices of the things the man is buying are going up."

How about keeping the farmer satisfied? He is contributing to defense in low prices, long hours, and efficient and abundant production. If it is essential to provide workers with low-cost food to keep them satisfied, it will be necessary to increase Government subsidies to farmers, not to keep them satisfied but to enable them to hang onto their farms and remain out of bankruptcy. The farmer can't be expected to make all the sacrifices, even in the name of national defense. Until farm prices reach parity, the cost of living should go up enough to reimburse farmers for the increased cost of the things they will need to buy.

Wages paid to labor before defense activities started were the highest in peace-time history. Many increases have been granted since our industry began going on a war-time basis. Strikes involving higher pay, shorter hours, and changed working conditions which increase manufacturing costs, have tied up scores of industrial plants, many of which are producing materials for our defense. Two of the largest farm-equipment plants are involved in strikes. Without judging the merits or demerits of the workers' demands, we all know that strikes are costly and that increased costs mean higher prices. Farmers who buy will have to pay the higher prices.

The cost of farm products which enter into living costs are only a small part of what employed workers spend. The wheat farmer gets only about 1 cent from a loaf of bread that sells for 8 or 9 cents. The tobacco farmer gets only a cent and a half of the price of a package of cigarettes. Parity prices, therefore, would raise only slightly the cost of food, assuming that processing costs were stabilized. Often the worker who cries loudest about the cost of food will pay, without a groan, higher prices for luxuries which increase his joy of living.

Farmers are not expecting boom prices, knowing that in the long run they do more harm than good. But they have the right to expect parity of income with other groups. The Government's promise of parity prices is still a promise, and, instead of expressing gratification over the low cost of living, all Government officials should be striving to make good the promise.

Iowa Leads the Nation in Many Fields of Endeavor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE HAMPTON (IOWA) CHRONICLE

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared recently in the Hampton Chronicle, of Hampton, Iowa:

[From the Hampton (Iowa) Chronicle]

DO YOU KNOW IOWA? HERE ARE SOME FACTS—LEADS THE NATION IN MANY FIELDS OF ENDEAVOR

Although Iowa ranks sixteenth in population and twenty-third in area of land, the State ranks:

In value of corn, oats, horses, hogs, and poultry, first.

In value of farm lands and buildings, first.

In combined value of livestock, first.

In total value of farm property, first.

In farm land improved (95.6 percent), first.

In value of farm machinery, first.

Twenty-five percent of all grade 1 farm land of the United States is within the State of Iowa. Seventy-five percent of all grade 1 farm land of the United States is within 250 miles of the center of Iowa.

The farms of five Iowa counties (Sioux, Crawford, Shelby, Kossuth, and Plymouth) exceed in value the farms of either Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, Wyoming, New Mexico, or Utah.

The farms of 10 Iowa counties (Cedar, Clinton, Crawford, Jasper, Kossuth, Marshall, Polk, Plymouth, Shelby, and Sioux) exceed in value the farms in any one of the States of South Carolina, Maryland, Florida, Idaho, Maine, New Hampshire, Delaware, New Mexico, or Utah.

Iowa has one of the finest road systems in the Nation with over 40,000 miles of surfaced roads. The State is seventh of all States in paving and fourteenth in total surfaced roads.

Iowa's soil produces more wealth each year than all of the gold mines of the United States.

The wealth of Iowa is over $10,000,000,000.

One-tenth of all the food products in the United States come from the State of Iowa.

But she does not only produce food; the factories of Iowa in 1937 had an output worth $709,458,428.

Iowa's grain products for 1939 totaled 698,190,000 bushels. This amount divided by Iowa's number of square miles—55,586— gives an average of 12,560 bushels per square mile. No other State begins to equal these figures.

The per capita wealth for Iowa is $4,322. The per capita wealth for the remainder of the United States is $2,685.

The farms of Iowa are worth more than the combined farms of the 11 States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts,

Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Iowa has 221,986 farms. The average size of each is about 155 acres, and the value of these farms and the property thereon is over four and a quarter billion dollars.

No point in Iowa is over 12 miles from a railroad, and no one walks to the railroad station, as Iowa has a total of over 670,800 cars.

The value of the farm products produced in Iowa in one year is greater than all the gold that has been produced in Alaska in the 69 years since the United States purchased Alaska.

Norway Continues Brave Struggle for Freedom, Popular Government, and International Decency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1941

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER OF NORWAY, HON. WILHELM MORGENSTIERNE, ON THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE INVASION OF NORWAY, APRIL 9, 1941

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent granted by my colleagues, I desire to insert in the RECORD the statement by the Minister of Norway, Hon. Wilhelm Morgenstierne, on the anniversary of the invasion of Norway, April 9, 1941. The American people will endorse and applaud this courageous expression of the hopes, ideals, aspirations, and heroic struggle of the people of Norway to retain and regain her freedom and independence and the fact that Norway, in the words of Minister Morgenstierne, "fights now for freedom, popular government, and international decency."

The statement referred to is as follows:

A year ago today there was perpetrated an act which will go down as one of the most dastardly crimes of history. In the dark, early hours of April 9, Nazi Germany, without warning, without the least provocation on our part, attacked peaceful Norway.

We could not immediately grasp that such brutality, such deceit, could really happen. We thought the German people were our friends. But there they were, their warships in our harbors, their wings over our heads, their tourists and spies and "fifth columnists," posing as friends, in our midst.

In spite of the suddenness and overwhelming force of the attack, King Haakon and the Government of Norway did not waver or hesitate. They turned down indignantly the humiliating terms submitted to them by the Nazis and made known their determination to fight to the finish for the freedom and independence of our country. The Norwegian people then, as always before, preferred to die on their feet rather than live on their knees.

After a heroic fight of 2 months on Norwegian soil, King Haakon and the legal Norwegian Government took up temporary residence in England from where they continue to direct our war of independence.

The central fact today on this solemn anniversary is that Norway is formally and actually at war with the country which fell upon us. Our soldiers, sailors, and pilots are training in Norwegian camps in Great Britain and Canada. Our warships are fighting side by side with our friends and allies, the British. Our great merchant marine of about 4,000,000 tons and 25,000 sailors is sailing the seven seas under the Norwegian flag and Norwegian management, carrying supplies to our common battle front.

We shall stay in this great fight until victory has been won, until we have accomplished our irreducible war aims; first to clear Norwegian soil of every foreign invader, then to join with our friends and allies in muzzling permanently the ruthless aggressors, which for some time have been running amuck in the world challenging the peace, freedom, and very existence of civilized peoples.

In spite of the tragedy which has befallen our Nation and our beautiful land and which on this day fills us with peculiar bitterness, we feel deeply grateful that our leaders and our people from the first moment chose the path of honor and resistance; that today Norway is definitely and prominently amongst the nations which did not submit, but challenged the aggressor and fought—and fights now—for freedom, popular government, and international decency.

Not only the free Norwegians abroad but our hard-pressed countrymen at home, who are standing up so magnificently against the Nazi terror, realize with deep satisfaction that we are on the right and winning side in this World War of liberty—the most momentous crusade in human history. As sure as day follows night, men of good will in all lands shall repel the onslaught of the powers of barbarism and darkness against all that civilization means and is.

Our heart goes out in this hour to the people of Norway under the iron heel of the oppressors, but whose spirit is unbroken and marches on. It goes out to the British and their inspired leader and all their Allies, who today, with unsurpassed valor, are bearing the brunt of battle. Our gratitude and admiration go out to the President of the United States, who, with extraordinary vision for years, has perceived and understood the deadly threat facing the world today and who, with unequaled clarity and force, has given expression to the thoughts and aspirations of free men and women everywhere.

The Hopkins Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON (MASS.) POST, AN INDEPENDENT DEMOCRATIC NEWSPAPER

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston (Mass.) Post:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Post]

THE HOPKINS APPOINTMENT

Harry Hopkins, friend and confidant of the President, has had a career which will make historians gasp many years from now.

The country has probably never seen such a meteoric rise from humble beginnings. Mr. Hopkins, with none of the qualities which we commonly consider as necessary adjuncts to greatness, now occupies one of the most important positions in the Government in one of the most important epochs of our history.

He was yesterday appointed supervisor of the purchases in the greatest spending program of all time. He comes to this job with none of the training commonly required for even a far less important position.

He will regulate vast buying of war materials, yet he never has been either a purchasing agent or a soldier. He will allocate contracts for some of the mightiest war machines ever conceived by man, and he probably has not the faintest idea of their construction, their functions, or their eventual employment.

Mr. Hopkins represents more than a mere political freak, to our way of thinking.

He is a representative of a class of people who have succeeded in becoming, in war and in peace, one of the most influential single factors in modern government. They have literally ridden to power on the shoulders of the poor. They have found, much to their surprise, that they can outshine the gaudiest politicians, the most impressive men of finance, the most astute lawyers, and the sagest generals and admirals.

This class is that of the social-service worker, comparatively new in the professional field, yet one which has changed the face of America and the conception of the relationship of government to the people, in the short time that it has been in authority.

Mr. Hopkins was an obscure social-service worker back in 1928, acting as director of a tuberculosis association.

He came to New York from a little college in Iowa and got his first experience in the world running a camp for underprivileged boys.

He had his ups and downs. His salary was small. Yet he managed to rub elbows with rich and socially prominent people who were interested in uplift. How well he took advantage of this opportunity might well be read by every schoolboy in the country.

Mrs. Roosevelt "discovered" him and she saw to it that he met the right people. One of these was Franklin D. Roosevelt, a social-minded man himself. The rest of the story is well known.

Washington has long considered that his amazing luck in rising to astronomical heights in the country's affairs was due to his ability to be a "useful man" to the most powerful Presidential character that we have seen in modern times.

But it is hardly conceivable that such a brilliant man as the President could entrust Hopkins with, for example, the political maneuverings of the 1940 convention, the liaison with Winston Churchill in England, and the present herculean task of war purchases under the lend-lease plan if he were merely a "useful man."

He certainly wields an influence and the mystery of it has long bewildered the thinking people of the Nation.

Nazi Occupation of Norway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 18, 1941

ADDRESS BY MINISTER OF NORWAY BEFORE MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Wilhelm Morgenstierne, Minister of Norway before the Minnesota Legislature at St. Paul, on April 10, 1941, in which he describes the Nazi occupation of Norway and what has happened subsequently.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

I want to thank you sincerely for inviting me to address this joint session of the Legislature of Minnesota. When I first came to St. Paul in 1911—30 years ago—then a young secretary at the Norwegian Legation in Washington, it never entered my mind that such an honor would come to me.

You see, Minnesota is a name very close to Norwegian hearts. Thousands upon thousands of my countrymen and their descendants have taken a part, yes; a very significant part in making this great State what it is today. They have found a warm welcome and happy homes here and a spirit of freedom and democracy congenial indeed to every Norwegian man and woman.

It did me good to see the statue of my old, fatherly friend Knute Nelson, outside this building. Perhaps, some day, he will be joined by Leif Eriksson.

Yes; I am happy to be with you. I shall tell you the facts and the truth about the Norwegian situation. I am not interested, and I am sure you are not interested in anything else. I do not believe in propaganda—in the sense in which it is sometimes carried on these days. But, I do believe that in a democracy it is a fine thing and a necessary thing that facts from all the world should be presented to the people in order that they may be in a position to make up their own mind on every important issue.

It sometimes used to be said that Norway was a very beautiful, but a poor country. The latter may have been true in earlier times, but only in the sense that we had not fully developed the possibilities of our soil, and forests, mines, waterfalls, shipping, fisheries. We discovered gradually that Norway was potentially a rich country offering possibilities of a secure and even comfortable livelihood for our 3,000,000 people. Particularly since the turn of the century we had made great strides toward the full utilization of our natural resources.

Hand in hand with this development went efforts to secure a fair distribution of the things with which Providence had blessed Norway. We tried to build a democracy which would give the people, all the people, not only political rights and freedom, but also the economic basis necessary for true freedom and a fuller life.

It is not possible for me here to go further into this phase of our national life, describing our social insurance systems, our school system, housing policies, our cooperatives, the building of hospitals, and other institutions for the welfare of the people. Suffice it to say that we had succeeded through a series of economic and social reforms and State activities—made possible by the steady development of our natural resources—to reach a rather high level of national life and general well-being. Though, of course, we had not reached perfection by any means, we felt that we were on our way.

Together with this development in Norway went a devotion to and belief in international cooperation and peace. The Norwegians were among the pioneers in the field of international agreements to secure peace and understanding between nations. The great Swedish industrialist and benefactor, Alfred Nobel, who donated a very large sum of money from which the annual Nobel prizes are being paid, left it to a committee appointed by the Norwegian Parliament to distribute the Nobel Peace Prize.

For 126 years the Norwegian people had not known war; our little war with Sweden in 1814 was hardly more than some frontier skirmishes. We had gradually come to feel that anything as cruel and inhuman and senseless as war—mass murder of fellow beings—could not happen to us who only wished to live in peace and brotherly relations with all other nations. We in Norway were thinking that the well-being and the cultural and spiritual development of the people, all the people, was the thing that really mattered. That schools and hospitals and decent homes for happy human beings were more important than a fortress or a warship. We were rather proud, I hope not too much so, to have given to the world leaders in many fields of human endeavor: Ibsen, Bjornson, Sigrid Undset, Fridtjof Nansen, Roald Amundsen, Grieg, Sinding, only to mention a few. Some people will say now that we erred, that we were too optimistic. Perhaps we were. In spite of everything which has happened, however, I am not convinced that the ultimate verdict will not be that it is better to error on the side of civilization and humanity than on the side of ruthlessness.

When the war between Germany and the Allies broke out in September 1939, it came as a terrible shock to us—as to everyone else. We were determined to remain neutral. We believed that, wanting nothing from anybody, we had a right to demand that our neutrality be respected. We so informed the warring powers. And from then on we scrupulously maintained an absolute neutrality, without fear or favor. We hoped and prayed that in this way the war would pass by our door, and that when the skies cleared we should be allowed to continue our peaceful development toward a happy future for our people.

Then suddenly, on April 9, 1940, in the dead of night, Nazi-Germany attacked us, without warning, without the least provocation on our part. We could not understand it. We thought the German people had friendly feelings for us. But now, suddenly, their war ships were in our harbors, their wings over our heads, their tourists, and spies, and fifth columnists, posing as friends, were in our midst.

Our towns, and villages, and farmhouses were bombed and burned, our men, women, and children were ruthlessly machine-gunned.

Naturally our people were dumbfounded. It took a little time to realize that such brutality, such deceit, could really happen. But soon, very soon, the Norwegians rallied and fiercely defended themselves against the invader.

I shall not here give any detailed account of the war in Norway.

Unfortunately, as you may remember, certain reports immediately following the invasion created a very unfavorable impression. We still meet and have to combat some of the allegations made at that time. It appears now that those who sent such reports were no doubt in good faith, but unfamiliar with Norwegian conditions and with the characteristics of the people. It was said that the population of Oslo was indifferent to what happened, that they stood silently gazing at the German troops marching through the streets of their city. Now, what would you expect? Oslo was an absolutely open city. There were no soldiers to defend it. The people were told over the radio—which was in the hands of the Germans—that the Government had decided that there should be no resistance.

The people could have been no more surprised, if the people of Mars had descended upon them. They did what the unarmed, civilian population of Prague had done before them, what the unarmed, civilian population of Brussels and Paris did after them—they watched in silence and consternation—but certainly not with indifference—the enemy marching into their city. If you look at the photographs taken in the streets of Oslo on April 9, you will see that the faces of old and young express deep resentment and contempt, against those who at night broke into our peaceful city and country.

And as soon as the actual situation became clear to them, thousands upon thousands of men managed to escape from Oslo and joined the Norwegian forces which were being organized north of the capital.

I do not believe that either the extent or the valor of the fighting in Norway during April and May last year have been generally recognized. Do you all realize, for instance, that about one-third of the entire German Navy was destroyed in the Oslofjord, outside Kristiansand, at Narvik, and in other places along the Norwegian coast?

We have no absolutely authentic figures about the number of German soldiers who lost their lives in the Norwegian campaign. Some very high figures have been mentioned. I believe I make a conservative statement, however, when I say that about 20,000 Germans lost their lives in warships and transports on their way to Norway, and that additional 40,000 soldiers were killed in action on Norwegian soil. This I think will show that there was some real fighting going on, and that the Norwegian adventure was not the walk-over for the Nazis which some people mistakenly may have thought.

There was also at the time of the invasion a great deal of talk—based upon erroneous reports from Oslo—about treason among the Norwegians. This, of course, has been shown again and again not to be true. But in case any lingering doubt should remain in this respect, I want to state here definitely and explicitly that apart from one or two conspicuous and well-known exceptions there was no such treason by our own people. It was the invaders, the Nazis who were themselves responsible for all the deceit and trickery which took place.

There has been a tendency to compare the Norwegian war unfavorably with the wars of the Finns and of the Greeks. Now, I do not believe that anyone could admire more than I do the splendid, epic fights of those two nations. They will go down in history among the great fights of small courageous nations to defend their liberty and independence.

But it should be remembered, in all fairness, that the circumstances which the Finns and the Greeks had to face were different in two very important respects from what the Norwegians had to face. In the first place neither the Finns nor the Greeks were attacked by the Germans—but by certain other powers.

In the second place Finland and Greece had had serious divergencies with the respective powers and critical negotiations had been going on for many weeks. When war came it was more or less expected. The Norwegians on the other hand had no reason to foresee any clash with Germany, and the attack found us, as I said before, absolutely unprepared and unmobilized.

In spite of this, the Norwegian people refused to be overwhelmed, to give in. They would rather die on their feet than live on their knees. By their own record the Norwegian people have taken their place definitely among those nations which stood up and fought the aggressors. They belong with the Finns and the Greeks, and those other nations which valiantly resisted. They belong also, I am happy to say, definitely among those nations which may benefit by the provisions of the Lend-Lease Act. And let me emphasize in this connection that the assistance which the President and Congress of the United States have decided to extend to countries resisting aggression, yes, the assistance which goes to our friend and ally, Great Britain, now, is also assistance to Norway and the Norwegian people. Our fate and future and freedom is bound up intimately with a victory for Britain and her allies. Without such victory we, too, are doomed. Your assistance brings nearer the day when your friends, the Norwegian people, shall regain their beautiful country and be masters once more in their own house. Then they shall be able to continue their interrupted forward march toward the realization of those ideals which we share with you and other free democratic nations. Yes; aid to Britain is aid to Norway.

After 2 long months, from April 9 to June 7, last year, during which the Norwegian people fought stubbornly and almost singlehanded against the overwhelming forces of the enemy, we were at last forced to give up temporarily the fight on Norwegian soil.

Subsequent events have proved, and history will record, I am sure, the wisdom and courage of King Haakon and the Nygaardsvold Government in choosing the path of resistance and honor instead of submitting to the slave terms offered by the invaders. Experiences of other countries have shown only too clearly what it means to negotiate with an adversary without the elementary notions of decency and fair dealing. To enter into negotiations with Nazi Germany is to give your little finger to the evil one—to invite penetration, deceit, and ultimate absorption—without even the moral satisfaction of going down fighting.

King Haakon, Crown Prince Olav, and the legal Norwegian Government are today carrying on the fight from England. This is in full accordance with the Norwegian Constitution, as well as with the explicit authorization of the Norwegian Parliament, voted at its last meeting on April 9, 1940.

The free Norwegian Government in London is today fully recognized by every government in the world except the one which attacked us, and its puppets.

Under its direction, about 90 percent of our merchant marine—about 4,000,000 tons and 25,000 sailors—is sailing the seven seas under the Norwegian flag.

The Norwegian foreign service is functioning all over the world, and taking an active part in the preparations for the day when we shall all return to a free Norway. In Washington, for instance, the Norwegian Legation is larger than at any time in its history. Our personnel is four times what it was in April 1940, and we have had continually to enlarge our premises.

Norwegian training camps have been established in Great Britain and in Canada, and Norwegian units will soon be in the thick of the fight at the side of our Allies. Norwegian ships are already actively cooperating with our friends the British.

The Norwegian Government carried to safety our gold, thus preventing it from falling into the hands of those who broke into our country. It is being safeguarded for the Norwegian people until the day when they shall once more be master in their own house.

Norway has never as yet defaulted on any foreign loan, and true to that tradition the Norwegian Government even today is paying every cent due as interest on our dollar loans and other foreign obligations.

Yes, the legal, free Norwegian Government, temporarily residing outside Norwegian territory, is a going concern, a government in being, paying as it goes, carrying on politically, financially, and in a military way.

Around this Government, around our great King Haakon, all Norwegians at home and abroad are rallying, determined to work and fight until we have regained the country of our fathers—and of our children.

In the meantime an unceasing, determined fight is going on in Norway between the foreign invaders and a handful of Norwegian traitors on one side, and a practically unanimous Norwegian people on the other. It is not a fight with arms—because my countrymen do not have any. You cannot fight mechanized barbarism with your naked fists or with flower pots.

But it is a fight with all the weapons of the spirit and of the will and love of country.

It is a fight of immeasurable bitterness, because the Norwegian people are witnessing the enemy pulling down everything that with love and care we have been building through generations.

Many of our Americans friends have visited Norway and have seen with their own eyes how we tried and partly succeeded in building a society, based on democracy, social justice, freedom, security, and equality under the law, economic well-being, and intellectual and spiritual development for all the people.

Today, there is hardly a vestige of these things left in Norway. Popular government has disappeared altogether. Freedom of speech and of the press does not exist. One of the cornerstones of a civilized society: the integrity of the courts, has been brutally destroyed. There is no security, no justice, no protection. The members of the Supreme Court of Norway resigned in a body as a protest against the arbitrariness of our temporary masters. People are arrested, imprisoned, and tortured without cause, without legal proceedings. No one is safe in his own home. Gangs of young boys are being armed, called guards, and allowed to terrorize the population. In vain—as far as immediate and outward results are concerned—the seven bishops of Norway unanimously and indignantly protested against this anti-Christian, brutal terror.

Now, here is something open for all the world to see and contemplate. Here are no pros and cons—only one-sided brutality. We are facing not a theory, not an ideology, but an actual situation and a comparison.

Peaceful, progressive, friendly Norway, as we knew it, as the world knew it a year ago, and Norway today under the iron heel of the Nazis.

This is the new order, not an abstraction, not a blueprint, but the new order in deadly practice. To anybody with ears to hear and eyes to see, it is plainly and blatantly a return to dark, barbaric ages.

With these facts in our minds and hearts every waking hour, it will be appreciated, I am sure, how difficult it is for us Norwegians to understand the contention that there is no difference between the methods and the aims of the nations opposed to each other in this war. The contention that it is immaterial whether the gangster kills his victim—or vice versa. I wish that any person so thinking might see with his own eyes the work of destruction now going on in Norway, the distress of the people, and hear the heartbreaking cries of those innocent men and women who are being tortured by the Gestapo.

Against these things, against the enemy which broke into our country and is now trying with appalling ruthlessness to reduce the Norwegian people to the level of nazidom, we are now fighting with bitter determination on several fronts. There is the military front to which I referred. Then there is the home front—the magnificent, mostly silent, but extremely effective struggle of resistance which a practically united Norwegian people are today waging against the strongly entrenched invader. Every day messages from the other side unfold a story of how national calamity and common hatred of oppression have brought forth a stronger, finer, and more united Norwegian people than ever before. It is as if the overhanging threat of losing our country, our freedom, and all that we hold dear, has stirred the people as they were never stirred before and has created a national unity, a common purpose, and an almost fierce love of country, which confounds the enemy, and in the end will thwart his designs on our freedom. There has come to the surface reserves of strength, courage, and a spirit of sacrifice which in days of peace and plenty must have lain dormant deep in the soul of the Norwegian people. To those of you who are of Norwegian birth or descent, let me say that today, at least, you have reason to be proud of the nation from which your fathers came.

On the fronts mentioned all true Norwegians are today fighting as one man for our irreducible war aims. The first of these aims, of course, is to clear our beloved country of the German invaders and make it once more the home of a free, progressive, happy people.

But in order to make secure the future for our own as well as for other freedom-loving peoples, we have this additional war aim: To join with our friends and allies in muzzling permanently the aggressors which for some time have been running amuck in the world, challenging the peace, freedom, and very existence of civilized peoples. We deeply believe that the world cannot and will not remain half slave, half free.

I sometimes wonder whether, in spite of all, we yet quite realize the extent, the deathly seriousness of the threat facing the civilized world today. A large country, Nazi Germany, has for some years been concentrating all her resources, all her genius of organization, on building up a military machine stronger and more ruthless than any the world has ever known before. It has attacked or threatened into submission, one by one, practically all its neighbors.

Who attacked Czechoslovakia? Was it England, was it France? No; it was Germany. Who attacked Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, Luxemburg, France? Was it England? No; it was Germany. Who threatened Rumania and Bulgaria into submission? Was it England? No; it was Germany. Who tried to bully Yugoslavia into submission? It was Germany. Who stood up against Hitler and refused to be bullied? The Yugoslavian people.

Nazi Germany has been trying to tell the world that all these countries have joined the New Order. But what is the fact? Not one of them has willingly joined it. They are

held by force, every one of them. They will use the very first opportunity to throw off the yoke of their hated temporary masters. And that opportunity will come perhaps sooner than we now think. As an indication of what the subjugated people think and feel, take what happened a few weeks ago at Lofoten Islands. When given a chance to get away and to join King Haakon and his free Norwegians in England, the young men of the island, more than 300 of them, without a moment's hesitation, grasped the opportunity. The same thing would happen in other countries under German domination. The people burn to escape and join Britain in the fight against those who raped their countries and stole their freedom and happiness.

Perhaps some of these countries to some extent were to blame themselves for their misfortune. I am afraid that may be the judgment of history. Perhaps they were too complacent, too blue-eyed, too secure in the feeling that freedom was theirs for keeps, too unwilling to cooperate with others against the common threat to their existence. Perhaps they had been apt to forget that we are only permitted to keep the things for which we are willing to fight and to die.

But even if we admit this let us not permit such things to confuse the main issue. And the main issue in Norway, in Europe, in the world today, is freedom against oppression, popular government against dictatorship, civilization against mechanized barbarism.

What we are witnessing is not only the conquest by brutal force of free, civilized peoples. What is equally serious is the breaking down of international morality, of all codes of honor and truth between the nations of the world. We had advanced quite far toward higher international standards, toward respect for international obligations and the pledged word, when the Great War broke out in 1914. We remember, many of us, what a tremendous impression it made on the civilized world, how profoundly shocked we were, when Germany broke her solemn pledge to respect Belgian neutrality and broke into that peaceful, progressive democracy. The cynical attitude of the then German Chancellor, his statement that the treaty in question was nothing but a scrap of paper, struck the civilized world as an ominous descent to barbarism. Today, I'm afraid, the air is so filled with "scraps of paper" that we can hardly see the sun. So often have the dictators broken their word and their solemn treaties that the world was on the point of giving up in despair.

Thank God, under the epic leadership of Great Britain, the civilized world is gradually rallying to the defense of fair dealing and decency between men and nations. Slowly but surely the democracies, the freedom-loving peoples of the world, have awakened to the tremendous issue at stake—the biggest and most far-reaching for which any war in the history of mankind has been fought: the issue of whether to be forced back unredeemably to barbarism and darkness or regain the foothold and take up once more the forward march of humanity toward a fuller life.

Democracy is not perfect. It has revealed many weaknesses. It has much to learn in order to be as effective in practice as it is sound and eternally true in theory. Only, democracy cannot, and must not, as some maintain, learn from the totalitarians. It is not the effectiveness of the safebreaker that is needed. Not the discipline of the slave quarters or of the concentration camps. What democracy needs is the inner, spiritual discipline deriving from high ideals and mutual respect and good will among men.

The "wave of the future"—is that the totalitarian dictatorship? How could that be? What is the future if it is not spiritual growth, progress, beauty? How can anyone associate the future with a strutting dictator, haranguing the world with cascades of angry, hateful words? Is there anything more totally lacking in spiritual quality and meaning?

The people of Norway refuse to associate the future with totalitarian dictatorships. From their cruel bondage, under the heel of our temporary masters, they defiantly profess their undying faith in the words and the example of the man who said: "God must have loved the common people, he made so many of them." We believe that when the present appalling nightmare of man's inhumanity to man has passed by, the world shall once more revert to the spirit expressed in the beautiful words of the prophet of old: "To do justice, to love mercy, to walk humbly with thy God."

Yes, to us the future is associated with the spirit of your great, kind man of Illinois, personifying for the ages the virtue of humility, true democracy, the dignity of man, high or low, neighborly helpfulness, and brotherly love. The spirit of Abraham Lincoln, to us, is the always recurrent wave of the future.

Japan and Russia Fabricate a Treaty Out of Synthetic Friendship

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1941

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, as we recoil from the contemplation of the dripping carnage in the Balkans, we witness a strange scene of Russians and Japanese fraternizing for 10 fleeting minutes in the Kremlin in Moscow and announcing that they have ordained that officially—only officially—a friendship existed between them. A Russo-Japanese pact, as ponderous as the cracked bell of Moscow and as useful as a dead Japanese samurai, has come into being and the world gasped in satirical amazement.

An avalanche of comments, columns, editorials, and speeches followed the Russo-Japanese diplomatic deliverance. Among them, I believe, the analysis by Attorney Vicente Villamin, a Philippine economist and writer of world-wide contacts and experience, is one of the most logical and penetrating, and certainly stands out as the most original in conception and reasoning. The article is syndicated in many newspapers throughout the United States.

Among Mr. Villamin's arresting conclusions are that the pact does not bar Russia from declaring war on Japan while Japan is at war with the United States; that Russia gave Japan nothing because despite her high nuisance value to Japan she got nothing; and that Japan is really interested in seeing the defeat, not the victory, of Germany, because a victorious Germany would prevent Japan from realizing her program of territorial expansion, as Germany herself will enter the Far East and Asia as a colonial power as she used to be before the first World War.

I strongly urge Members of Congress to read Mr. Villamin's lucid, logical, and thought-provoking discussion.

"The Russo-Japanese pact is a mutual neutrality, not a mutual nonaggression pact—and does not bar Russia from declaring war against Japan while Japan is at war with the United States. Russia gave nothing because she got nothing. Japan has more things in common with the United States than with Germany, and Japan would be interested in the defeat, not the victory, of Germany."

The heart of the Russo-Japanese pact of April 13, 1941, is in the following words (Art. 2): "Should one of the contracting parties become the object of hostilities on the part of one or several third powers, the other contracting party will observe neutrality throughout the duration of the conflict."

So far as it concerns the United States, the pact is actually harmless if it is not potentially lifeless. Under it and by it Japan has not gained anything appreciable in her tactical international position vis-a-vis the United States.

It is a pact of mutual neutrality and not of mutual nonaggression. There is a world of difference between the two. If it were a nonaggression pact it would be a relief to Japan and it would embolden her in her attitude toward the United States in the present tense situation. In both cause and effect the pact is static and not dynamic.

Let us see how the mutual neutrality pact would work in realism. If Japan goes to war with the United States, Russia will be neutral under the agreement. There is nothing new or significant in that. The United States does not expect Russia to be her ally. And Russia would not join the United States if otherwise she has no reason of her own to do so. If the United States and Russia each have causes to go to war against Japan, those causes are not identical with each other and they have nothing to do with each other. They would conduct their respective wars as independent enterprises. This would be true also as to China, now already a belligerent against Japan. Of course, if two or more nations are at war with one and the same nation at the same time their general staffs would very likely put their heads together so their fighting men wouldn't be in each other's way when hammering on the common foe.

The point to be underlined is this: The pact does not bar Russia from declaring war against Japan while Japan is at war with the United States. Russia is still free to go to war against Japan and select the time to do it. Japan has not acquired the right to bind Russia against declaring war on her and declaring it at the wrong time—to Japan. Putting it succinctly, Russia can be neutral in a Japanese-American war and at the same time be an active belligerent on her own account and for her own cause against Japan. That is the long and short of the whole thing.

Russia gave nothing because she got nothing. Russia knows she has at present a mighty high nuisance value to Japan as she knew 2 years ago that she had some nuisance

value to Germany. She received from Germany a goodly slice of Poland for that nuisance value, but cautious Japan has not yet come across with her votive offerings. Russia would give real satisfaction to Japan if she receives some valuable acreage or beneficial concessions, but Japan so far has proved tight-fisted because, forsooth, she knows only too well the brittle quality of a Russo-Japanese treaty.

Of all the major nations today, Russia is the most calm and collected. Her geographical location and the wondrous shrewdness of her leaders are responsible for this. If her fighting forces have not amazed the world with their effectiveness, her sinuous diplomacy has been bringing home the bacon. And certainly Japan is not the intellectual Delilah to befuddle the mighty Russian Samson.

Still smarting under the humiliation of defeat which she suffered at the hands of Japan in 1904, Russia is not aiding Japan to become a stronger nation, neither is she raising a finger to keep Japan from going the slippery way of disintegration. Practical and prescient Russia is depending not only on her own strength but also on the weakness of her potential enemies, and the leading one of them outside of the Teutonic penumbra is the Imperial Japanese Empire.

Concerning China, the pact and secret understanding that probably accompanies it, if indeed there is one, would affect her adversely if Russia has consented to cease as a source or a passageway for war materials for the Chinese people. This remains to be seen. Here again Russia would not do a favor to Japan for nothing. In fact, from China's capital has already come the word that Russia has given assurances of the status quo in that connection. Press dispatches seem to show that while Japan is making the pact the occasion for a grand political ballyhoo Russia is keeping the driver's seat of the diplomatic tallyho.

Commentators and editorialists as well as wishful thinkers and witless dopesters harp upon the theory that Russia signed the now-famous pact to keep Japan neutral if and when Germany tries to annex the Ukraine and thereby becomes Russia's enemy.

The theory is predicated on the proposition that Germany is too stupid to realize that she was digging her own grave when she induced Russia as a favor to Japan to conclude a pact of some kind with her historic enemy. It is logical to suppose that it was through the urgings of Germany that Russia played the prize 1941 diplomatic game of promise-and-break-it-at-will with a Japanese Government that was known to be tottering at its foundation. Then, too, Russia could not have been so dense as to antagonize Germany with a synthetic friendship with Japan at a time when German arms and German diplomacy must have been profoundly impressing the Russians with their frightful efficiency. Already both Russia and Japan are protesting that they have not the slightest purpose of preparing themselves againt Germany.

It is not improbable by any means that to earn the applause of the world, including those that she has vanquished, Germany, besides extending her dominion, might crack down on Russia to blast communism and sovietism from the face of the earth. In that event it would be infinitesimally unimportant to Russia whether Japan is a neutral or a belligerent.

Yosuke Matsuoka, Japan's Foreign Minister, went on his pilgrimage to Berlin and Rome presumably to explain why Japan had not harassed more the United States and Great Britain in the Pacific; and on the rebound, coming back home, he deftly picked up at Moscow the diplomatic bagatelle that he got, a mutual neutrality pact, and not the formidable instrument that he coveted, a mutual nonaggression pact.

So after the shouting has died down and the good people of Japan have started to meditate upon the verities of the day, they will realize more clearly and more calmly that between Japan and the United States there are great elements of beneficial harmony while between Japan and Germany there are vital interests in sharp conflict with each other.

Outstanding among these conflicts of interests between Japan and Germany are the following: First, stategic—while Germany wants the American Navy in the Pacific, Japan wants it in the Atlantic; and so, while it is in the Pacific, the Japanese wouldn't want to see the Panama Canal sabotaged, because it would immobilize that Navy in the Pacific bearing down upon Japanese territory; second, economic—Japanese-American commercial and financial relations have infinitely greater possibilities of mutual benefit than Germany could ever offer; and, third, political—while the United States has no plans to extend herself territorially in the Far East and on the Asiatic Continent, Germany is preparing to reenter that region where Japan expelled her a score of years ago as a trader or a colonial power, and that would impinge upon the Japanese program of expansion.

Parenthetically, the German reentry in the Far East and Asia, which is the home of over half of the world's population, would deflect thither much of the expected German activities in the Western Hemisphere, to its great relief. The Netherlands East Indies and French Indochina alone have as many people between them as the entire Latin America, and are possessed of as vast and varied natural resources. Being colonies of German-dominated Holland and France, Germany technically has some color of claim to them, where Japan has none. Japanese empire builders consider those rich colonial possession as an integral part of the region which they are organizing as Oceanic Japonica. Germany primarily, and not the United States or Great Britain, would render it difficult if not impossible for Japan to achieve her expansionist aspirations—that is, if Germany should prevail in Europe either by a victory, a stalemate, or by the Wilsonian formula of peace without victory. It is thus but logical to conclude that Japan would wish the defeat, not the victory, of Germany.

The victory of Great Britain—and the United States—over Germany would serve to revive and revitalize the principle of the freedom and independence of nations, big and small, powerful and weak. That would render more certain the complete independence of the Philippines in 1946 and possibly promote the independence or autonomy of colonies in the Far East, in the same way that the last World War was followed by the birth of many small nations in Europe which have since disappeared. The prospective independent nations in the Far East, particularly the Philippines, would become an easy prey for Japan. Their peoples should remember this obvious possibility as they survey today their foreseeable future.

Japan and the United States have not been at war with each other in all their history. To inaugurate or not a war series between them is the serious responsibility of American and Japanese statesmanship. The continuation of an honorable peace between the two nations would illumine the vast Pacific with hope, help rationalize the Japanese code of right and wrong, ameliorate the abysmal poverty of the Asiatic peoples, and lead eventually to an honorable settlement of the Chino-Japanese unpleasantness. But men must be just and understanding and reasonable before a worth-while peace could be achieved. The Pax Japonica must be something infinitely more delectable than the terrifying screed that it is today. The Asiatic peoples would have nothing less and would struggle to the bitter end otherwise.

Lakes-to-Gulf Highway—H. R. 4444

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt has appointed a committee to work out plans for the creation of a transcontinental highway system in the interest of national defense, and in line with that suggestion, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 4444, for the construction of such a highway from Chicago, Ill., to Mobile, Ala., along the old Lakes-to-Gulf Highway, which follows Route 49 from Chicago to Kankakee, Ill., and Route 45 from Kankakee to Mobile.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, this bill certainly drew an appropriate number for this four-lane highway. You will notice it is referred to as H. R. 4444.

This is the shortest route from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico. There is already a 40-foot, 4-lane concrete highway from Chicago to Kankakee, a distance of about 60 miles, and a 2-lane, or 20-foot, concrete highway from Kankakee directly south to Mobile, Ala.

This is not only the shortest route from the Great Lakes to the Gulf, but it is a level route that is unobstructed by mountainous or broken terrain; and not 1 foot of it will be interfered with by floods at any time.

One of our greatest handicaps is our inadequate north and south transportation facilities. If war should come, and this country should be threatened with invasion, that threat would undoubtedly come first to the territory bordering on the Gulf of Mexico, because of its proximity to islands and territories belonging to so many foreign countries that might be used for air bases.

In such an emergency this four-lane Lakes-to-Gulf highway, along the shortest route from the Lakes to the Gulf, would be a prime necessity. Mechanized equipment of all kinds could be transported over it at the highest possible speed.

If the emergency should end we would still have this splendid four-lane highway for commercial and domestic use and as a guarantee of our protection in case of future emergencies.

More than 10 years ago we organized a Lakes-to-Gulf Highway Association for the purpose of securing the construction of this Lakes-to-Gulf highway along this route, which, as I said, was found to be the shortest available route from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico. Sometime ago the Highway 45 Association was organized for the same purpose. These two associations should be coordinated and every possible assistance given by chambers of commerce, county and municipal organizations, and other civic

bodies to promoting this vitally important project.

It is only 885 miles from Chicago to Mobile along this route, which is the shortest possible route across the continental United States; and, as I pointed out, it does not cross any mountains or traverse flooded territory. Mechanized equipment could move from the Great Lakes area to the Gulf in the course of a day if an emergency required it.

This route traverses or touches 23 congressional districts in the 5 States of Illinois, Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, and Alabama. It passes through no large congested centers, and therefore would be unhampered by congested urban traffic.

As I said, there is already a 40-foot concrete highway from Chicago down to Kankakee on Route 49, and then a 20-foot concrete highway from Kankakee to Mobile, down Route 45, which would greatly reduce the costs.

If we are going to prepare this country for defense, we must improve our north-and-south transportation facilities, and especially these hard-surfaced highways that will carry motorized equipment. This is the most important piece of highway construction yet proposed.

Regulation of Administrative Agencies

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1941

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, at the last session of the Congress there was passed a bill designed to regulate the activities of various of the Federal agencies. At the time that Congress passed this bill the question involved was being considered by a committee that was appointed by the Attorney General of the United States. Strangely enough, when this committee reported it was almost equally divided. It is significant, however, that specific recommendations for legislation were made in the reports. I have had prepared an analysis of the two recommendations made by the Attorney General's committee, together with an analysis of the bill the Congress passed, and I include them in my remarks at this point:

COMPARISON OF PROPOSED BILLS TO REGULATE ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES

1. Walter-Logan bill.
2. Proposal of Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure (S. 675).
3. Proposal of minority of Attorney General's Committee (S. 674).

This comparison is divided into three headings following the proposals of the Attorney General's Committee: I. General provisions; II. Administrative rule making; III. Administrative adjudication.

Since the Walter-Logan bill contains no provisions relating to the first subject, section I consists of a comparison of the majority and minority recommendations of the Attorney General's Committee.

I. GENERAL PROVISIONS		
	ATTORNEY GENERAL'S COMMITTEE BILL	MINORITY BILL
Statement of policy	Administrative powers affecting private rights should be exercised through established procedures designed to effect declared policies of Congress and to protect private rights and which assure due notice, adequate opportunity to present and meet evidence and argument, and prompt decision.	Similar to committee statement.
Delegation of authority	Authorizes routine, preliminary, informal, and minor matters to be delegated to individuals or subordinates, subject to review and final responsibility of agency. Provides for publication in rules of such delegation or decentralization. Wherever superior authority in agency reviews any matter same opportunity for conferences or submission of arguments to superior as with subordinates is preserved.	Similar to committee proposal.
Appearance and representation of parties	Every person appearing or summoned in any administrative proceeding would be allowed the assistance of counsel.	Any interested person may appear in person or by representatives. All reasonable facilities for information, negotiation, or determination of issues or cases are to be afforded. Every person appearing or summoned may be accompanied and advised by counsel.
Office of Federal Administrative Procedure	Office to be established, consisting of: 1. Director, appointed by President; term, 7 years; salary, $10,000. 2. An associate justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia (ex officio without further compensation). 3. Director of Administrative Office of United States courts (ex officio without further compensation). Personnel and staff: Board may appoint executive secretary, attorneys, investigators, and experts regardless of civil service. Other employees subject to existing employment laws. Director may, with consent of any agency, use personnel or facilities of that agency.	Similar to committee proposal with this additional provision: "No employee may practice before or have private professional relations with any agency or court of the United States, except the Office may utilize personnel of an agency with consent of that agency."
Duties of Office of Federal Administrative Procedure	Investigation of agencies. Recommendations to and maintaining liaison with agencies to improve and regularize procedure. Investigation of complaints against agencies. Investigation and regularization of practice of attorneys and others before agencies. Appointment and removal of hearing commissioners. Annual report to Congress.	Investigation of agencies. Establishment of liaison with agencies. Dispensing information regarding administrative functions. Recommendations to Congress and agencies to secure efficient and uniform procedure. Investigation of complaints. Studying possible improvement of the bill. Regularizing rules of pleading and evidence.
Advisory committees	Director to designate those administrative establishments which are "agencies." Director to designate advisory committee from members of agencies (one from each) named by agencies, and other Government officers or members of public. Agencies have duty to furnish director all information requested and to assist him by all possible means.	No provision.
General restrictions on agencies	No provision.	Bill sets standards of conduct for all agencies and administrative officers: The grants of authority or limitations of administrative power provided by the bill would be mandatory and binding on all persons exercising administrative powers and upon the courts in reviewing the exercise of such powers. Violation would be subject to disciplinary action which might include discharge from public service. Investigation procedure: Investigations to be conducted so as to disturb personal privacy and private enterprise as little as possible. Required reports are to be simplified. Requests beyond the statutory powers of the agency would be forbidden. Informal procedure encouraged. Compulsory process to be used only when necessary. Investigating powers not to be used to effect purposes

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S COMMITTEE BILL

MINORITY BILL

or policies not expressly authorized by statute.

Subpenas: Where subpenas are authorized by statute, they are to be issued only on reasonable showing of grounds, necessity and scope and are to be issued to private parties as freely as to representatives of the agencies.

Publicity: Matters of record, except confidential personal data authorized to be kept secret by statute, are to be made available to all interested persons. Publicity to be withheld in contested proceedings during preliminary or investigative periods. Publicity is to be impartial and is to be limited to documents of public record.

Suspension of provisions of bill

No provision.

Suspension of provisions of bill

The President may suspend application of particular provisions upon recommendation of any agency and of the Office of Federal Administrative Procedure, suspension to last until end of next succeeding session of Congress but may be made indefinite by renewals unless Congress acts. Congress may confirm or revoke suspension or make substitute provisions.

II. ADMINISTRATIVE RULE MAKING

WALTER-LOGAN BILL

Statement of policy

None.

Exceptions

Nothing contained in the act shall apply to or affect any matter concerning or relating to—

1. The Military or Naval Establishments, including the Council of National Defense and the Advisory Commission thereto, the Priorities Board, and any other agency or authority hereafter created to expedite military or naval defense.
2. The Federal Reserve Board.
3. The Office of the Comptroller of the Currency.
4. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
5. The Railroad Retirement Board.
6. The National Mediation Board.
7. The National Railroad Adjustment Board.
8. The Interstate Commerce Commission.
9. The Civil Service Commission.
10. Federal lending agencies.
11. The Federal Trade Commission.
12. The Department of State.
13. The Department of Justice.
14. Any matter concerning or related to the internal revenue, customs, patent, trademark, copyright, personnel, or longshoremen and harbor workers' laws.
15. The Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, including any amendments or supplements thereto.
16. Grading services in connection with purchase or sale of agricultural products.

Certain provisions of the bill would be inapplicable also to the General Accounting Office; and no right of review could be exercised during the construction of any public building or public-works project as to any decision, ruling, or order made with reference to the prosecution of the work.

II. ADMINISTRATIVE RULE MAKING

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S COMMITTEE BILL

Statement of policy

None.

Exceptions

No provision.

II. ADMINISTRATIVE RULE MAKING

MINORITY BILL

Statement of policy

To require all administrative agencies to issue rules and regulations of the types specified by the bill in order to give all interested persons all possible information regarding administrative organization, policy, law, and procedure.

To require formulation of such rules by the procedure specified herein which is designed to extend the legislative process by securing the participation of all interested parties.

To have each agency encourage rule making to reduce the necessity for case-by-case determination.

Exceptions

Where any agency expressly finds it contrary to the public interest, the provisions of this title (rule making) would not apply to military, naval, or defense functions, including procurement of materials for the armed forces, nor to conduct of diplomatic affairs outside the territorial limits of the United States.

WALTER-LOGAN BILL

Adoption of rules

All rules under statutes hereafter enacted are to be issued within 1 year from the date of enactment of the statute.

Rule-making procedure

Notice must be published in the Federal Register and a public hearing held before any rule or amendment of a rule can be issued. No rule is to be effective until published in the Federal Register, unless the President declares a public emergency to exist.

Petition for change of rules

Within 1 year after passage of the Walter-Logan bill, any person substantially interested in the effects of any administrative rule which has been in force less than 3 years may petition the agency concerned for reconsideration of the rule. The agency would be required to publish notice, hold a hearing if requested, and to decide thereafter whether the rule should be continued, modified, or rescinded.

Reports on rules to Congress

No provision.

Liability for reliance on abrogated rule

No one to be penalized for any act or omission in good faith in conformity with any rule which has been rescinded or declared invalid, unless notice of rescission or adjudication was

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S COMMITTEE BILL

Adoption of rules

Every agency shall promptly make available and currently maintain a statement of its internal organization, specifying its officers and types of personnel, its subdivisions, and the places of business, duties, functions, and general authority or jurisdiction of each.

Every agency shall make available to the public all general policies and interpretations of law adopted; rules, regulations, and procedures; and prescribed forms and instructions with respect to reports or other material required to be filed.

Rule-making procedure

No regulation hereafter promulgated by an agency shall take effect until 45 days after publication in the Federal Register. The 45-day rule shall not apply (a) where the regulation or the governing statute provides a longer period; or (b) where the agency certifies and publishes in the Federal Register that stated circumstances require the effective date to be advanced.

Every agency shall designate subagencies or employees to receive suggestions and expedite the making, amendment, or revision of rules, subject to the control and supervision of the agency.

Petition for change of rules

Any person may at any time file with an agency a petition, in such form as the agency may prescribe, requesting promulgation or amendment of any rule in which the petitioner has an interest.

Reports on rules to Congress

Every agency shall report annually all rules promulgated by it, together with explanatory material, and shall also include a summary of requests for rules or amendments received during the preceding year, and the reasons for its refusal of such requests as may have been refused.

Liability for reliance on abrogated rule

No corresponding provision.

MINORITY BILL

Adoption of rules

Organizations and procedures of the agency are to be published promptly on approval of the bill without going through the rule-making procedure prescribed.

Rules are required: Every agency is directed to formulate and publish rules, including all rules specifically authorized or required by statute to carry out particular legislative provisions. In addition, rules would be required to contain:

1. Statement of policy.
2. Interpretations of statute under which agency operates and which will be relied on by agency in its administration.
3. Regularly available procedures, formal or informal.
4. Instructions for statements, reports, examinations, and so forth.
5. Each agency is permitted, but not required, to prescribe the forms to be used by those having business with the agency.

Form, content, and publication of rules: Rules are not merely to repeat legislation. Rules are to be kept complete and current. No agency is to act on unpublished rules (except staff instructions or general instructions regarding internal management). Rules must be published in Federal Register, and in addition, in pamphlet form. Rules are to state expressly organization, practice and procedure, and substance.

Rule-making procedure

Each agency would be required to publish a regular procedure for the making of rules and to designate an existing unit within the agency to receive suggestions and expedite rule making.

Preliminary private investigations before starting the rule-making procedure would be required to formulate issues or proposed rules.

Where practicable, rules are to be published in advance of effective date to permit comment, argument, and revision.

When agency proposes to make a rule, notice would be required to be published wherever practicable to give interested persons opportunity to be heard.

Agencies authorized but not required to use (and may dispense with them in emergencies)—

1. Written views submitted by interested persons.
2. Conferences.
3. Informal hearings.
4. Formal hearings.

Rulings: Rulings in specific cases by agencies are not to have the effect of rules unless the prescribed rule-making procedure is used. Rules are to have no effect against third persons unless published or reproduced in leaflet or bound form.

Petition for change of rules

Any interested person may petition any agency at any time to issue or change rules. Agencies are required to report to Congress on nature and disposition of such requests.

Reports on rules to Congress

Each agency is to report to Congress all rules promulgated during preceding year with explanation of their substance and procedure utilized in their formulation, together with a statement of requests received for issuing or changing rules and the disposition made of such requests.

Liability for reliance on abrogated rule

When rule is abrogated, there is to be no liability for conduct conforming to the rule unless publication of withdrawal of the rule has been made for 30 days.

WALTER-LOGAN BILL

published in the Federal Register 30 days before the act or omission referred to.

Judicial review of rules

United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia would be given jurisdiction to hear and determine whether any rule is in conflict with the Constitution or the statute under which the rule was issued. Any interested person may file petition within 30 days of publication of rule. Rules to be defended by the Attorney General. Decision to be declaratory judgment of validity or invalidity. (This appears to provide for judicial review of rules in the abstract.)

This does not prevent determination of valadity or invalidity by courts in suits or appeals involving a rule.

III. ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUDICATIONS

WALTER-LOGAN BILL

Statement of policy

None.

Exceptions

See exceptions under section II.

Miscellaneous provisions, notices, etc.

None.

Declaratory rulings

No provision.

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S COMMITTEE BILL

Judicial review of rules

No corresponding provision.

III. ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUDICATIONS

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S COMMITTEE BILL

Statement of policy

None.

Exceptions

The procedure with respect to appointment, appearance, and duties of hearing commissioners shall not be applicable to the following:

1. Proceedings in which a hearing for the purpose of receiving evidence is held before the agency tribunal, or before one or more individual members of an agency tribunal; or

2. Proceedings which, pursuant to a law of the United States, are conducted before an officer of one of the States; or

3. Proceedings which precede the issuance of a rule, regulation, or order involving the future governance or control of persons not required by law to be parties to the proceedings; or

4. Matters concerning the conduct of the Military or Naval Establishments, or the selection or procurement of men or materials for the armed forces of the United States; or

5. The selection, appointment, promotion, dismissal, discipline, or retirement of an employee or officer of the United States, other than a hearing commissioner as provided hereinafter in this title; or

6. Matters relating to the patent or trademark laws.

Miscellaneous provisions, notices, etc.

None.

Declaratory rulings

Each agency tribunal shall have power to issue declaratory rulings concerning rights, status, and other legal relations within its purview. The purpose of such declaratory rulings is to terminate controversies or remove uncertainties. The agency tribunal may therefore refuse to render a declaratory

MINORITY BILL

Exceptions: In emergencies rules may be rescinded effective immediately upon publication. Rules may be modified in particular cases with consent of persons affected or upon reasonably adequate notice to them.

Judicial review of rules

Any rule may be judicially reviewed upon contest of its application to particular persons or subjects or upon application for declaratory judgment. Declaratory judgments are to be limited to cases where rule or threatened application interferes or threatens to interfere with constitutional or statutory rights or immunities, but controversies as to the application of the rule to any person or state of facts are to be determined under title III, "Administrative Adjudications."

III. ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUDICATIONS

MINORITY BILL

Statement of policy

Administrative adjudications should be by procedures which assure to all persons affected:

1. Specific notice of issues and procedures at all stages.
2. Adequate opportunity to present and meet evidence and argument.
3. Prompt decisions by impartial officers.
4. Full relief authorized by law.
5. Restricting of penalties to those authorized by statute.
6. Opportunity for judicial review.

Exceptions

This title is not to apply to:

1. Administrative determinations made by any court or by any independent administrative tribunal based on a trial de novo.
2. Military or Naval Establishments, including procurement for armed forces.
3. Personnel matters within agencies.
4. Arbitration and mediation, as distinguished from adjudication.
5. Fiscal operations of the Treasury.
6. Public works.
7. Procurement or disposition of public property.

Miscellaneous provisions, notices, etc.

Agencies may make informal disposition of cases with consent of the parties.

All notices, orders to show cause, moving papers, and so forth, issued by an agency are to be specific.

Persons involved in proceedings must have access to the record, the identity of persons appearing against them, and reports of statements of such persons, together with adequate opportunity to rebut.

Formal adjudicatory procedure is required where informal procedures do not dispose of the case.

Declaratory rulings

Upon petition of any interested person every agency must issue declaratory rulings when necessary to terminate a controversy or remove substantial uncertainty as to application of statutory authority or administrative rules. Such rulings not to bind persons who are not parties to proceeding.

WALTER-LOGAN BILL

Separation of prosecuting and deciding functions

No provision.

Hearing or deciding officers

In any controversy arising out of the activities of any independent agency it may be provided by rule that such controversy may be heard in the first instance by one of its trial examiners Written record shall be made, and, together with findings of fact and proposed decision, filed in the agency. Copy shall be furnished the aggrieved party, who shall have 30 days within which to file objections. If no objections filed, the agency may enter an appropriate decision. If objections are filed, the agency shall accord a public hearing before members of the agency. If the agency has less than three members, the hearing shall be before an intra-agency board.

Other than this, there is no corresponding provision for hearing officers nor for regulating the procedure of formal hearings. However, interagency boards of appeal are provided for, which see.

Disqualification of a hearing commissioner

Prehearing procedure

No provision.

Rules of evidence

No provision.

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S COMMITTEE BILL

ruling where that result would not be accomplished or where the tribunal may for other good cause deem the rendering of such ruling premature or otherwise inexpedient.

When a declaratory ruling is sought all persons shall be made parties who have or claim any legal interest which would be affected by the declaration, and no declaration shall prejudice the rights of persons not parties to the proceeding.

A declaratory ruling issued by an agency tribunal shall, in the absence of reversal after appropriate judicial proceedings, have the same force and effect as a final order or other determination of that agency tribunal.

Declaratory rulings may be reviewed by the courts in the same manner and to the same extent as final orders or other determinations of an agency tribunal, except that nothing herein shall be deemed to modify existing provisions of law applicable to closing agreements concerning internal revenue tax matters. Refusal of a request for a declaratory ruling shall not be subject to review in any manner.

Separation of prosecuting and deciding functions

Separation of prosecuting and deciding functions is evidently contemplated, and perhaps impliedly provided for through the designation of hearing commissioners, but such separation is not positively provided for as it is in the minority recommendation.

Hearing or deciding officers

Hearing commissioners to be appointed by Office of Federal Administrative Procedure on nomination of agency, not under civil service; no political qualification permitted.

In agencies having five hearing commissioners, one is to be designated chief hearing commissioner.

Salaries: $5,000 to $8,500.

Term: 7 years.

Grounds for removal:

1. Certification by Director, upon recommendation of agency, of lack of business or insufficiency of appropriation.
2. Malfeasance.
3. Neglect or inefficiency.

Powers and duties of hearing commissioners are enumerated, and are to be similar to those of judges in courts.

Chief hearing commissioner has same powers and duties as other hearing commissioners, and in addition acts as a clearing house or traffic control in regard to the assignment of commissioners to hearings, making recommendations for additional or temporary commissioners, etc.

Disqualification of a hearing commissioner

Provision is made for disqualification in any particular case of a hearing commissioner upon the filing of a meritorious affidavit filed by any party to the proceeding. A hearing commissioner is also required to withdraw from any case in respect of which he deems himself disqualified for any reason.

Prehearing procedure

Prehearing conferences are provided for to simplify issues and expedite disposition of cases.

Rules of evidence

No provision.

MINORITY BILL

Separation of prosecuting and deciding functions

Prosecuting and deciding functions of an agency are to be completely separated.

Hearings are to be held by presiding officers. Such presiding officers are to be head of agency or member of group constituting highest authority of agency or else an appointed hearing commissioner.

Hearing or deciding officers

Hearing commissioners: Each agency may have as many hearing commissioners as necessary.

Appointment without regard to civil service by Office of Federal Administrative Procedure or nomination of agency.

Salary from $3,600 to $9,000.

Term: 12 years.

In emergencies temporary hearing commissioners may be appointed for terms of 1 year, subject to renewal.

Grounds for removal:

1. Certification by agency of lack of business or insufficiency of appropriation.
2. Malfeasance.
3. Neglect or inefficiency.

Powers and duties of presiding officers are enumerated and are to be similar to those of judges in courts.

Disqualification of a hearing commissioner

Provision for disqualification of presiding officers similar to committee proposal.

Prehearing procedure

Provision similar to committee proposal.

Rules of evidence

Strict rules of evidence are not required to be observed, but the basic principles of relevancy, materiality, and probative force recognized by the Federal courts in equity proceedings are to govern the proof of questions of fact. Reasonable cross-examination is to be permitted in the discretion of the presiding officer. Agency is authorized to simplify hearings regarding stipulations and the submission of technical evidence and generally undisputed data.

Decisions as to matters of fact are to be based entirely upon the record.

WALTER-LOGAN BILL	ATTORNEY GENERAL'S COMMITTEE BILL	MINORITY BILL
Enforcement of process and orders	*Enforcement of process and orders*	*Enforcement of process and orders*
No provision.	Where any person disobeys or resists any lawful subpena, order, or process in connection with an administrative proceeding or is guilty of misconduct during a hearing, the agency may certify the facts to the district court which is summarily to hear the matter and compel compliance or punish for contempt.	Provision similar to committee proposal.
Decision of agency in first instance	*Decision of agency in first instance*	*Decision of agency in first instance*
No provision.	Unless otherwise provided in the act, when the evidence has been heard by a hearing commissioner he shall afford the parties an opportunity to request findings of fact and conclusions of law and to file briefs or argue orally in accordance with the procedure prescribed by the rules of the particular agency. The hearing commissioner shall find the facts, formulate the conclusions of law, and enter a decision in the case. Such findings, conclusions, and decision shall be stated in writing, served upon all parties in interest, reported to the agency tribunal, and become part of the record; but in any case where the commissioner deems it appropriate to do so, he may announce his decision orally on the record and shall reduce his findings, conclusions, and decision to written form only if requested to do so by a party or by the agency tribunal. Hearing commissioners may certify to the agency any questions of law for instructions and the agency is to give binding instructions of the questions certified, or else may take over the case for its own decision.	The presiding officer who hears the case is to render a decision, including findings of fact, conclusions of law, and appropriate order or other form of decision. All decisions are to be written and to include separately stated findings of fact and conclusions of law accompanied by a statement of reasons. Deciding officers may have aid of law clerks or assistants, but otherwise are not to receive recommendations or advice of other employees of agency, except on written notice and with consent of all parties, or upon open hearing. The decisions which are regarded by the agency as valuable to the public or are to be relied upon as precedents are to be published. The presiding officer may certify to the agency any questions of law or policy, and agency is to give binding instructions on question certified, or agency may take over case for decision. Penalties and benefits: Penalties and conditions are not to be imposed beyond those authorized by statute. Rights and benefits authorized by law are not to be denied. The effective date of any action is to be deferred for a reasonable time to permit persons affected to adjust their affairs or to seek administrative regulations or judicial review.
Agency review of decisions	*Agency review of decisions*	*Agency review of decisions*
Head of each agency to designate three employees for service on intra-agency boards. Members of such boards to have regular duties in the agencies from which appointed, when not engaged in hearing and determining administrative appeals. No member of a board who has participated in a particular case or in the preparation, draft, or approval of any rule which may be involved, is to sit in appeal of the case or application of the rule. Each board member to take oath to act impartially without regard to the position of the Government as a party in interest, and to decide matters upon their merits in accordance with law and the evidence presented.	Provision is made for appeals from decisions of hearing commissioners to the agency tribunals, and the procedure to be followed in such appeals is set forth. In the absence of an appeal from the decision of a hearing commissioner within the time fixed by the agency tribunal, the decision shall become final, and enforcible or reviewable to the same extent as though it were the decision of the agency tribunal. In any case, the head of the administrative agency may, on his own initiative, review the decision of a hearing commissioner.	If the presiding officer is not the head of the agency or a member of the highest authority of the agency, the parties would have the right of appeal to the agency itself. After review or in the absence of review or appeal, the decision becomes final. Final decisions may be subject to rehearing or review to the extent authorized by the legislation under which the agency operates, except in preliminary or intermediate matters authorized by statute no action is to be taken except on final adjudication.
Reopening of hearing commissioner's decision	*Reopening of hearing commissioner's decision*	
Any person aggrieved by a decision of any agency or employee thereof may notify the head of the agency within 20 days and have the matter referred to an intraagency board. Such board shall give prompt, full, and fair hearing, receiving into the record the testimony and any documents or objects relating to the appeal. Any person having a substantial interest may intervene. Record to be reduced to writing, and a copy furnished the aggrieved person on request at actual cost. Within 30 days after closing of evidence and arguments, board required to make written findings of fact and decision thereon, subject to written approval, disapproval, or modification by the head of the agency or his representative. Copy of the findings and the decision to be filed in the agency as part of the record, and copy to be mailed to the aggrieved person and to the intervenors, if any.	Any agency tribunal may reopen and alter, modify, or set aside any decision of a hearing commissioner which has become final, to the same extent as such tribunal may reopen or review its own final decision.	
Court review of agency decisions	*Court review of agency decisions*	*Court review of agency decisions*
Any party aggrieved by a final decision or order of any agency may, within 30 days after receipt of copy of the decision or order, petition the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, or the Circuit Court of Appeals within whose jurisdiction the aggrieved party resides or maintains his principal place of business, or in which the	Procedure is provided with respect to the form in which matters shall be presented to the courts in any proceeding for judicial review, restraint, or enforcement of an administrative order or other determination. It shall not be necessary to print the complete record and exhibits in the case unless the court so orders.	It is contemplated that all administrative adjudications may upon proper procedure be reviewed by the Federal courts. All present statutory provisions affecting judicial review applicable to agencies not inconsistent with the provisions of the bill are to remain in effect. Unless otherwise specifically provided by law or excepted from the

WALTER-LOGAN BILL

controversy arose, for review of the decision.

The petition shall state the alleged errors committed. The Attorney General is required to provide for defense of the Government's (agency's) case. The agency is required to file with the clerk of court the original or a complete transcript of the record.

The appropriate court shall have jurisdiction of the matter and to grant such temporary relief as it deems proper. The court may affirm or set aside the decision or order the agency to modify it. A case may be remanded to the agency for further evidence. Cases of this nature may be expedited by creation of special sessions of the court having jurisdiction.

Grounds for setting aside the decision or order of any agency shall be:

1. That the findings of fact are not supported by substantial evidence;
2. That the decision is not supported by the findings of fact;
3. That the decision was issued without due notice and a reasonable opportunity for full and fair hearing;
4. That the decision is beyond the jurisdiction of the agency; or
5. That the decision infringes the Constitution or statutes of the United States.

Judgments of the courts under this section or the section providing for court review of administrative rules shall be final, except that they shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon writ of certiorari or certification.

Where the cause of action is otherwise within the jurisdiction of the United States Court of Claims, the aggrieved party may elect to file his petition for review in that court.

Where a circuit court of appeals or the Court of Claims finds itself in disagreement on any question of law with a previously rendered decision of another court having jurisdiction under this act, it shall certify the question of law to the Supreme Court for further proceedings.

Courts authorized to impose damages where appeal is for purposes of delay: The courts are authorized to impose a reasonable penalty as part of the costs in any case where the decision of the agency is affirmed and the court finds there was no substantial basis for the appeal.

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S COMMITTEE BILL

Where a party makes a mistake as to procedure or as to the court having jurisdiction to review an administrative order or determination, the court may, instead of denying relief:

1. Proceed, if it has jurisdiction, as if the proper remedy had been sought; or permit or direct such amendment, rehearing, or remand to a lower court, as it deems appropriate, for a proper review of the order; or
2. Permit transfer of the case to a court having jurisdiction to review the order.

MINORITY BILL

operation of the bill, any person adversely affected by any final decision of any agency is to be entitled to judicial review in equity or by a writ of mandamus in the appropriate Federal court regardless of whether the subject is one of constitutional or statutory right or immunity. All court decisions in such cases are to be reviewable by the Supreme Court in accordance with present certiorari procedure.

If a court finds that a petition for review should have been filed in some other court it is to transmit the record with its statements of reasons to such other court and the other court is to permit any necessary amendments and proceed with the determination.

All final administrative orders directing action, assessing penalties, or denying claimed rights under the Constitution or statutes shall be subject to court review. An order may be final even though no request for rehearing or reconsideration has been presented to the agency.

Scope of review: The reviewing court is to decide all questions of:

1. Constitutional rights.
2. Statutory authority and jurisdiction of the agency.
3. Lawfulness and adequacy of the procedure.
4. Findings and conclusions of fact unsupported by substantial evidence.
5. Arbitrary or capricious administrative action.

Record: Printing of the complete administrative record is not required unless the reviewing court orders it.

Garrett Whiteside

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1941

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, March 4 of this year marked another milestone in one of the most unique careers in the legislative history of this country. On that day Garrett Whiteside, of Nashville, Ark., finished 34 years of continuous secretarial service in the Congress of the United States and launched upon his thirty-fifth year of such service and as though it were but another day. He is the oldest in point of service of any man in the legislative branch with the exception of Hon. A. J. SABATH, of Illinois.

Coming to Washington on March 4, 1907, as secretary to the late Congressman Ben Cravens, of Arkansas, he has remained here continuously in that and similar positions to others both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. He has served, in succession, the late Otis T. Wingo, of Arkansas; the late Senator T. H. Caraway, of the same State; and is now with the present senior Senator from Arkansas, HATTIE W. CARAWAY. During those years many exciting experiences have been encountered to enliven the routine of congressional and senatorial offices. Within the span of years he has seen the duties of congressional life expand from one requiring but a few months a year, dealing with but a few limited subjects, to one of full-time service, embracing nearly every phase of human activity. When he arrived Washington was a comparatively small city. He has seen it grow to its present large, congested proportions. He has seen the leisurely, horse-drawn carriages on its streets give way to a horde of fast-moving, motor-driven vehicles.

Garrett Whiteside arrived a bridegroom; he has remained to become a grandfather. Older, yes, in years, but in spirit and activity unchanged.

From a standpoint of dramatic interest, perhaps the outstanding event in Garrett Whiteside's career is the writing of this country's declaration of war against Germany in 1917. Working late one night at his office, after President Wilson's war message to the Congress, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House looked into the office, looking for someone who could type. Garrett Whiteside volunteered, and before he knew it he was typing the historic document as dictated by Chairman Flood, of the Foreign Affairs Committee—the document later adopted by the Congress and which constituted one of the landmarks in the history of this Nation.

Quiet, retiring, unassuming, Garrett Whiteside probably knows and is known by more people in the Capitol and congressional offices than any other person. Those places have been his workshops for

34 years. There he has seen history made, and he has helped make it. There he has seen joys and disappointments, victories and defeats, but through it all remained his true self, loyal and looking forward to the tasks of tomorrow and those, we hope, of many more years to come.

Stabilizing Farm Prices and National Defense Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, OF MINNESOTA

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me Saturday, April 19, 1941, over WMAL and associated stations of the National Broadcasting Co. from Washington, D. C., in the program of the National Grange during the Farm and Home Hour:

For more than 8 years the people of the United States have lived and worked under a series of political and economic emergencies. Fantastic and uneconomic schemes, costing billions of dollars to all Americans, have failed to solve our domestic problems of unemployment and distressed agriculture. These problems remain with us, still unsolved, and when the second world war comes to an end—as it must—our domestic situation will be aggravated to the breaking point in all lines of American activity.

And now, we are in a new and gigantic world emergency. Unsolved domestic problems have been forgotten. The active participation of our national leaders in the intrigue of old-world politics, has brought our country to the brink of entering another European war. Our country has been committed to the policy of giving material aid, short of war, to the warring democracies and other countries engaged to oppose the forces of conquest and dictatorship. This program can and must be carried out without the need for sending our young manhood to again fight on foreign soil.

All Americans favor a strong national defense to protect our country from any enemy. The people are anxious to pay any bill for this purpose and to make other sacrifices to keep us free and safe. But the people are becoming disgusted and tired with the activities of certain individuals and groups in this country who are conducting their rackets to sabotage and delay the achievement of a complete national defense.

The President of the United States, under the Constitution, is required to administer and enforce the laws passed by Congress. Under authority conferred by Congress upon him, the President has ample power to summarily deal with those in our midst who seek to jeopardize or sabotage the national-defense program. The calling of unjustified strikes and the exaction of exorbitant fees from those who seek the right to work in essential defense industries, should not be tolerated by the public or the Government.

The President also possesses an abundance of legislative authority to promptly deal with the subversive elements within our borders who undermine and scheme to destroy our Republic. Real Americans everywhere are aroused and they demand action now from both the President and Congress so that we may speedily prepare for whatever is to come.

President Roosevelt has called upon the American people to make sacrifices. The vast majority are willing to make every sacrifice to save our country. However, one or two groups should not be called upon to make all of the sacrifices to assure success in a common program. Industry, labor, agriculture, and men and women in every walk of life should share alike in our joint effort for a common defense.

Let us for a moment examine the situation to ascertain who has been called upon to make the sacrifices up to the present time. We first think of nearly a million young men who have been drafted into military service. Several million more will follow as they are called in the draft and they will receive $21 a month for being compelled to sacrifice their lives, if need be, in the event of war. They are making a real sacrifice. They have been forced by law to leave their homes and families and to give up their lucrative posts in industry, labor, agriculture, and profession. Should they attempt to strike or in any way sabotage the defense program, that would be treason and imprisonment would follow. Another group of splendid Americans who are willing to serve without compensation is to be found in more than a million women who have volunteered their services with the American Red Cross.

The only other group of which I have knowledge, now being called upon to make a sacrifice for the cause of national defense, are the 6,000,000 farm families, whom the people look to for an ample supply of food and fiber. And I now want to briefly discuss the problems confronting them today.

For the past 8 years Congress and the administration have been talking about giving farmers parity prices for farm products. Scores of laws have been passed and billions of dollars spent to accomplish this objective. But the goal has never been reached, and most farm products are selling for less than 75 percent of parity. The experiments to save farmers have nearly ruined them.

The administration has now abandoned the objective of securing parity prices for farm products. Leading Cabinet members and others in charge of your affairs at Washington are urging cheap food to make the people happy. They fail to recognize that nearly 40 percent of our population is directly dependent upon agriculture for a livelihood. They also fail to recognize that due to rising wage and other costs in industry, farmers are compelled to pay up to 25 percent more for the things they must buy for use on their farms.

The President has just appointed Leon Henderson to the position of Price Control Administrator. Mr. Henderson has taken a definite stand against any material increase in the price of farm products, and threatens to take drastic action should there be any substantial increase above the prices recently fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The new Government plan to hold farm prices down was announced by the Secretary of Agriculture on April 3. It provides that on the basis of Chicago prices, and for the next 2 years, the Government will peg the price of hogs at $9 per hundredweight, dairy products (based on butter) at 31 cents per pound, chickens at 15 cents per pound, and eggs at 22 cents per dozen. The Government will buy at these prices in Chicago, which means that the prices received by farmers will be materially under the pegged Government price at Chicago, when we take into consideration transportation costs and grades.

The prices set by the Government are all below parity, and on the day the Government announced its price-fixing program, Chicago prices on butter, eggs, and poultry were all substantially above the Government prices.

The present parity price on the farm for hogs is $9.24—at Chicago it would be around $10. Parity price for butterfat on the farm is 35 cents per pound. Parity for poultry is approximately 15 cents, and for eggs 22 cents a dozen.

The Government prices are all below parity, and the question now is whether the pegged prices will be the ceiling or the floor of the price structure. If they prove to be a ceiling, farmers and others interested in agriculture will protest with all their might. Farmers have not sought inflated prices, but they are entitled to, at least, parity prices.

The Secretary of Agriculture states that he will maintain the pegged price for the next 2 years, and we may therefore justly fear that such price may be both a floor and a ceiling. In other words, the Secretary and Mr. Henderson may decide to freeze the prices at the present figures and wholly disregard the increasing spread in prices between agriculture and industry and labor.

During the past 30 days the Government has purchased double its food requirements. The excess will be added to and held as a price-controlling factor—to be dumped on the market if prices go above the figures set by the Secretary of Agriculture, or, the excess may be delivered to Britain or other warring countries.

The farmers will favor an emergency program to place a floor under farm prices, but they are against Government dumping to hold prices down below parity. I want to again mention increased costs of the things which farmers have to buy as complete justification for their demand to receive parity prices.

National Industrial Conference Board statistics show that the average worker in manufacturing industry has enjoyed a 13-percent rise in his weekly pay check since February 1940. I am not criticizing justifiable increase paid to labor. I maintain, however, that farmers are entitled to receive equality of consideration and not be compelled to accept a freezing of prices below parity.

During the past 8 years American farmers have been called upon to make many sacrifices for the common welfare. They bore the brunt of the burden under the reciprocal trade program which gave a material part of our home market to cheap foreign production, in addition to low prices and general distress.

In the present critical emergency American farmers will be called upon to make further sacrifices in order to aid foreign farmers living in the Western Hemisphere who are engaged in competitive production. I just read a report in the press where it stated that our Government had placed an order for 22,000,000 pounds of beef in Argentina. Scores of other competitive products are also being purchased from our southern neighbors in the name of good will and good neighbor, and when the present war ends, unless we change our present policy, this country will be used as a dumping ground for all types of foreign production to the detriment of domestic agriculture, industry, and labor.

The new farm policy urges our farmers to produce greater supplies of hogs, dairy products, poultry and eggs, and encourages farmers in the Corn Belt to plant more corn for feed. But, in the same breath, the Secretary of Agriculture states that if farmers plant corn in excess of the allotted corn acreage no corn payments will be made and there will be no loans for those who follow the Secretary's advice. Such a policy seems inconsistent to me, and I have therefore requested Secretary Wickard to remove this penalty when farmers plant additional corn for silage and fodder purposes in order to

increase the production of dairy and pork products

If the Secretary fails to comply with this request, I will immediately introduce the necessary legislation in Congress to remove the penalty against farmers who plant corn for silage and fodder to be fed on the farm in excess of the soil-depleting acreage allotment.

American farmers are willing to make sacrifices for their country in time of need. All that they now seek is a square deal. They will not go on a strike. They will cooperate wholeheartedly to make America strong and impregnable. They will fight to defend America from all enemies, as they love their country and its way of life. Those of us who represent them in Congress will join with them in fighting for an honest deal and a united Nation in this critical hour.

The Labor Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1941

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, today and every day several gentlemen arise to criticize, as is their habit and custom, the President, the administration, and Madam Secretary of Labor Perkins, and to ask what is being done on the part of the administration to prevent strikes. I am more than satisfied that their action was prompted and their voices raised solely for political reasons and in order to create prejudice against the administration and labor organizations.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] wanted to know whether I condoned activities that he cited from a police court in Detroit, Mich., where one policeman had been attacked, and further cited the violence allegedly used by C. I. O. strikers and the unjustifiable high initiation fees charged by a few of the affiliated A. F. of L. unions. I answered him then and I say to him now, to the House, and to the country that I do not condone such activities as described, but I also do not condone the attacks upon the two great labor organizations, the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations. Not only that, I do not approve or condone such activities, but I have criticized them and am definitely opposed to them. On the other hand, I do not condone industry hiring exprize fighters, professional strike breakers, and gunmen as sluggers to slug and kill peaceful strikers, as happened in the Republic Steel plant and other plants. Conveniently these labor baiters do not call attention to those abuses and they are blind to such unfair and brutal methods employed by many of the industries.

Mr. Speaker, the question raised today, especially by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], as to why we have not passed legislation to eliminate strikes, has been answered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], who stated, in effect, that such action would actually deter the defense program. However, he did fail to mention that the United States Chamber of Commerce went on record 2 or 3 weeks ago against such proposed legislation, and yet despite the opinions of men high in the business world and that of Members of this House who have soberly studied the situation that legislation is not warranted at this time, still we find a few Members day in and day out urging the enactment of such legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has insinuated that I am trying to defend the actions of the C. I. O. Well, he and all of you know that it is very seldom that I rise to protect or excuse those who have viciously assailed the President. They should know that John L. Lewis, Harry Bridges, and Mr. Browder violently assailed and opposed the reelection of the President and have cooperated with his arch enemies, Tom Girdler, Weir, and others, who have charged for years that the President was destroying the industrial structure; yet the financial reports of their companies show that they have doubled and trebled their profits. Therefore I hope that in the interest of unity these gentlemen will desist in their unfair charges and criticisms and in placing me in the category of those so strongly opposed to the President's policies. I know there are very few of you here who would give credence to such ridiculous charges.

Mr. Speaker, time and again I have appealed from this floor to the leaders of both of these labor organizations to urge some of their local unions to desist and stop improper practices and abuses, else it would be bound to be detrimental to the cause of organized labor. I have done so because all my life I have pleaded that labor has the same right and the same privilege to organize as industry. I remember the antagonism and attacks against the railroad labor organizations in years gone by. I recall the Pullman strike in Chicago in 1884, the Big Four, and many other railroad strikes. And later the same opposition was leveled at lower-paid railroad employees when they endeavored to organize. The same criticism and attacks on the part of railroad officials and the press were made then just as they are being made today. I recall the strenuous opposition of the railroads and industry to every bill proposed to safeguard not only the lives of the employees but of the public. So, Mr. Speaker, these attacks against labor organizations are nothing new.

Mr. Speaker, no one will dare say that I am not heart and soul for the expeditious carrying out of the national-defense program, but labor as well as industry has its rights and, I say, when the profits of all industry are doubling and trebling and running into the millions, I feel that labor is entitled to a fair share of these tremendous gains and profits. The laboring man should not be forced to work at a wage which makes it impossible for him and his family to live decently, especially in view of the increased cost of living. A few days ago the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] read the message of Thomas Jefferson to the House, and while I feel that most of the Members are familiar with it, I believe that many fail to give consideration and thought to his urgent appeal when he said:

> We should not take from labor bread that it has earned.

Furthermore, he advocated, as we know—

> Equal rights to all and special privileges to none.

So over 140 years ago it became necessary for the President of the United States to call attention to the fact that labor was being exploited; and please remember it was at a time when our country was not the great industrial Nation of the world, when we had no foreign-born in our midst, and when the population was only a little over 5,000,000, less than 5 percent of the present population. Yes; my own State of Illinois alone has 50 percent greater population than the entire United States had at that time.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of our country and its defense, I hope that any and all strife between labor and industry will be eliminated. That great progress has been made in that direction in the past 2 weeks should be recognized and acknowledged by the labor baiters. I feel that it is manifestly unfair that some Members should charge that the President and the administration have not done anything in the matter of the adjustment and settlement of these strikes. The facts are that under the leadership of our President we have provided laws to eliminate strikes and strife. We have passed the Fair Labor Standards Act, providing for collective bargaining and agreements. Can it be justly charged that labor has not lived up to the law? Is it not a fact that the large industrial czars feel that they are above the law? Have they not refused to comply with the laws of the land? Did we not pass an act creating a Mediation Board, and did not the President only 3 weeks ago appoint a super National Defense Mediation Board composed of 12 members, 4 representing industry, 4 representing labor, and 4 members thereof acting for the consumers? This Board within a short space of time has rendered splendid service by bringing to an end 4 of the most annoying labor disputes. And still there are some Members who refuse to take cognizance of this great move and act of the President to bring about closer cooperation for the best interest of all concerned. Oh, I appreciate that the remarks of some of the Members are made for home consumption, but I feel we have reached the time when general baiting should cease and to realize that it is our duty to cooperate with the President, who has done and is doing all humanly possible to strengthen our defenses so as to preclude any danger from attack. If some of these gentlemen would read what the Nazis, Fascists, and Communists are doing to undermine and destroy our form of government, I feel in my heart that instead of attacking, assailing, criticizing, and harassing the administration they

would join hands as real Americans and aid in the unity that is essential and needed and prove that the interest of our country is just as near and dear to them as it is to all of us, and, above all, that we are a united Nation.

The State of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. NOAH M. MASON, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Hon. NOAH M. MASON, of Illinois, at the annual meeting of Ohio Federation of Women's Clubs, at Dayton, Ohio, Thursday evening, April 17, 1941:

Madam President, ladies, and gentlemen, I want to paint for you people tonight two word pictures: First, the state of the Nation concerning the possible or probable danger to the Nation from without; second, the state of the Nation concerning the real danger to the Nation from enemies within as uncovered by the Dies committee. As an introduction to these two word pictures on the state of the Nation, I want to quote for you the words of Lincoln, taken from a speech he made in the Illinois Legislature at Springfield, Ill., on January 27, 1837, in a discussion on the probable dangers to our free institutions:

"At what point shall we expect the approach of danger? By what means shall we fortify against it? Shall we expect some trans-Atlantic military giant to step across the ocean and crush us at a blow?

"Never. All the armies of Europe, Asia, and Africa combined, with all the treasure of the earth in their military chest, with a Bonaparte for a commander, could not by force take a drink from the Ohio or make a track on the Blue Ridge in a trial of a thousand years.

"At what point, then, is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reaches us, it must spring up among us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of free men, we must live through all time or die by suicide."

With Lincoln's words as a background, let us paint, first, the situation this Nation faces today, more than 100 years later, as to the possible dangers to our Nation and to our free institutions from without:

POSSIBLE DANGER FROM WITHOUT

We are living in troublesome, trying, heart-searching, soul-stirring days. The words best fitted to describe the critical period through which we are passing today are the words of Thomas Paine, uttered during the dark days of the Revolutionary War: "These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will in this crisis shrink from his duty. But he that stands it now deserves the love and praise of men and women." Fitting words for Paine to utter then; fitting words for us to repeat today.

This Nation has already passed through three great national crises. The first, of course, was the Revolutionary War period and the period immediately following the Revolutionary War, when the foundations of this Nation were laid—foundations upon which has been built the greatest Nation on earth. The second great national crisis occurred during the dark and trying days of the Civil War, when brother fought against brother, when the North and the South had to endure all the horrors and heart rendings that seemed necessary before we could amputate, or cure for all time, that inward cancer, slavery, that threatened our very national existence. The third great crisis was the World War period, a war which up until a year ago we called the greatest war ever fought—greatest in number of countries involved; greatest in number of men used; greatest in number, kind, and destructiveness of war machinery used; greatest in the loss of life and destruction of property; greatest in the issues that were supposed to be at stake, "making the world safe for democracy," a "war to end all wars"; and greatest in the world-wide economic and social dislocations that resulted from that war, dislocations that this Nation hasn't recovered from as yet.

Now we are facing our fourth great national crisis, another World War. We are entering upon this crisis saddled with a debt of $50,000,000,000, on top of which we have already authorized $35,000,000,000 more for defense. This fourth great national crisis finds us again unprepared, woefully unprepared. Not only do we lack essential war materials such as manganese, rubber, tin, etc., but we lack war planes; we lack pilots to operate such war planes; we lack an adequate armed force trained in modern warfare; and we lack practically all the equipment necessary for such an armed force. Not only that, but the moral fiber of millions of our people has been weakened, if not destroyed. Our people have been taught to look to the Government for support rather than that the Government should look to the people for support. In other words, we are rapidly becoming a Nation afflicted with the modern disease commonly known as "the gimmies," a Nation of people expecting hand-outs. Not only that, but in the name of social experiments we have placed upon the statute books laws that handicap, shackle, cripple industry, so that industry cannot do the job that now confronts industry and that only industry can do.

Ford hit the nail on the head when he said, "In 6 months, if left alone, I can revamp my factory so that I can turn out 1,000 fighting planes per day." "If left alone"—those are significant words. They could form the text for many sermons or speeches by industrial leaders. What did Ford mean when he said: "If left alone"? Did he mean that he wants to reduce wages and thus violate the wage-and-hour law? No; because Ford has always paid high wages and has taken the lead in setting high wage standards. Did he mean that he wants to increase the working hours per day and thus violate the wage-and-hour law? No; because Ford had instituted in his factories an 8-hour day long before it became the law, and he has always insisted that a short working day meant greater efficiency in the factory. What then did Ford mean when he used those significant words, "If left alone"? I believe Ford wanted to serve notice upon the country, and upon the administration, that American industry was not only ready but it was fully able to take care of every defense need; that American industry could and would rectify the shortsightedness of our Army leaders, our Navy leaders, and our administration leaders in connection with America's preparedness program; that American industry could and would speed up the production of necessary war materials in order to make up for the almost criminal negligence on the part of those responsible for our present unpreparedness predicament; that American industry can and will remove all "bottlenecks" now hampering production of necessary war materials; "If left alone."

All that I have said so far has to do with a preparedness program against possible dangers from without—danger from external enemies. It has to do with the obstacles to that preparedness program and the removal of those obstacles. It has to do with the materials needed for that preparedness program, and the part that industry must play in the days ahead. But what about our danger from within—danger from the enemies within our gates? Having served on the Dies committee for a little over 2 years, I know something about the danger that threatens from within, and I believe that, great as the danger from without might be, we face greater dangers from within. I want briefly to sketch those dangers for you tonight, also, so that you will have as complete a picture as possible of "the state of the Nation."

REAL DANGERS FROM ENEMIES WITHIN OUR GATES

The totalitarian nations of Europe, personified in Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini, have plunged that continent into a war that threatens to black out not only all democracy in Europe but all civilization in Europe as well. All American people are interested in the European mess; we have our deep-seated sympathies; but a great majority of our people have wisely decided that the European mess is not our particular kettle of fish, it is not our direct affair.

However, these same totalitarian governments of Europe have had their agents, their Fritz Kuhns, their Earl Browders, their Pelleys, and others, going up and down this broad land of ours sowing the totalitarian seed of discord, seed that has sprung up into crops of race hatred and religious hatred, crops that have no business on American soil. These agents of foreign governments have cultivated, fertilized, and watered these un-American crops with money that was sent here for that purpose direct from Moscow and from Berlin. That, my friend, is our affair; that is our kettle of fish; too long we have ignored the situation and have done nothing about it.

Nearly 3 years ago the so-called Dies committee was set up. It was authorized to investigate these subversive and un-American activities, to throw the spotlight of publicity upon them, and to point out to the American people the subversive activities that are being carried on in our midst, practically unnoticed.

In spite of obstacles deliberately placed in the way of the committee, in spite of ridicule heaped upon the committee by high Government officials, in spite of the fact that the committee was denied the help and cooperation of the Department of Justice that had been promised the committee, help in the shape of legal counsel and trained experienced investigators, the committee has done a fairly good job of uncovering and exposing these foreign agents and the various subversive groups that have been at work trying to undermine and destroy our Government. I propose to tell you about that work.

The average American, when told about the dangers of communism, invariably shrugs his shoulders and says: "It can't happen here." Leaders of the American Legion and leaders of the Catholic Church of America have been very much concerned over the rapid spread of communism in this country during recent years, but they have met with the inevitable shrug of the shoulders and the statement: "It can't happen here." That was my attitude and that was my answer until 3 years ago, when the sworn testimony presented and the written evidence filed with the Dies committee changed my opinion on the situation confronting this Nation, and I say now just as emphatically as I can, "It is happening here," and I propose to present evidence to substantiate that fact.

One of the chief witnesses before our committee made the statement: "Communism

has made more progress in the United States during the last 5 years than it had made in the 50-year period previous to that time." When asked how he accounted for this rapid progress he gave four reasons. I offer them for your consideration.

"First," he said, "this so-called depression has lasted so long that it has brought about mass discontent, and mass discontent makes fertile soil for communistic crops." That statement is easily understood; it does not need explanation. Our job is to put men back to work in private industry at decent wages and do away with this mass discontent.

The second reason the witness gave for the rapid spread of communism was: "High Government officials, through speeches, radio addresses, and written statements, have deliberately created or engendered class hatred in this country of ours, and class hatred makes an excellent seed bed for communistic seed."

If you will review the speeches made during the past year or two by Ickes, by Jackson, by Hopkins, mouthpieces of the President, and the name callings that they have been spreading over this country of ours, such as economic royalists, princes of privileges, Tories, Bourbons, etc., deliberately creating class hatred, indicting a whole group or class of people, our industrialists, by the phrase "economic royalists," when it only applies to about 1 percent of the group, you will know what that witness meant when he said high Government officials have been creating class hatred in this land of ours. These same men decry race hatred and religious hatred, but they deliberately set about creating class hatred. Class hatred is a twin brother to race hatred and religious hatred, and there is no place in this land of ours for any of these hatreds. Where one is created it inevitably engenders the other. Our investigators all over this country report that there is a surge, or upsweep, not only of class hatred, but of religious hatred and race hatred in this country of ours, plenty of evidence of it. And so those who sow the wind must expect to reap the whirlwind.

The third reason that the witness advanced for this rapid spread of communism was, "High Government officials have not only sympathized with but they have actually encouraged Communist leaders in their activities in this Nation of ours." When asked for evidence upon which he based that statement, he smiled, and said, "What about this man Bridges on the west coast? He is an alien, a guest, as it were, in this country of ours. He is a Communist and your committee has his Communist membership card in your files. He has preached the overthrow of this Government by force from public platforms, and you have sworn statements to that effect; and preaching the overthrow of this Government by force under our present law by an alien is a deportable offense. He has been picked up twice to face deportation proceedings. The first time the proceedings were canceled by the Secretary of Labor, and the second time they were indefinitely postponed awaiting a decision of the Supreme Court in the so-called Strecher case. The Strecher case was not a parallel case. It was based upon past membership in the Communist Party while the Bridges case was based upon present membership and also preaching the overthrow of this Government by force. The Federal judge before whom the Bridges case would ordinarily have been tried, had ordered aliens deported under similar conditions. Special Judge Dean Landis of the Harvard Law School, was selected to try the case. Because he could not go beyond the evidence presented to the court, much of which was of doubtful value, and also because a great deal of real evidence was omitted by the prosecuting agents in presenting the case against Bridges, the judge, under the law, could do nothing else but render a decision clearing Bridges of the charges brought against him. Wouldn't you say that was not only sympathizing with but encouraging Communist leaders in their activities?" If that is not enough, what about the former Governor of Michigan, who, when the sit-down strikes were started in Michigan, called out the State Militia to protect the sit-downers in their illegal possession of property and to prevent American citizens, 75 percent of the workmen who wanted to work, from going in and pulling the sit-downers out by force. Wouldn't you say that that was sympathizing with and encouraging Communist leaders in their activities, particularly when the sit-down strike technique was first used in France by the Communist leaders there, and it worked so successfully there, that the Communist leaders of the C. I. O., adopted it and used it in those strikes in Michigan.

The fourth reason that the witness advanced for the rapid spread of communism in this Nation of ours was: "Federal funds have been generously used to advance the cause of communism in the United States." This statement was backed up by 3 days of testimony from the W. P. A. officials of the Federal Theater Project of New York City, testimony which proved conclusively that the Workers' Alliance of New York City, a Communist outfit, controlled, dominated, and directed the Federal Theater Project of New York City. They had been writing, preparing, and presenting communistic plays in the city of New York, presenting them on high-school platforms and public platforms, and copies of the same were filed with our committee. I will sketch one, because it is a sample. This one is called The Revolt of the Beavers. The word beavers is synonymous with workers.

This is a synopsis of the play:

A little boy and girl about 9 years of age get tired of school, play hooky; go out into the woods and play around until they get tired; fall asleep; in their sleep they dream, and in their dream they are transported by the North wind to some imaginary country near the north pole called Beaverland. When they get to Beaverland they discover the poor, down-trodden, hard-worked beavers, forced to work long hours at very little pay, poor food, bad working conditions, while the chief beaver lives in all the luxury possible, and is supported in his control over the workers by his trained army. A beaver professor organizes a revolt, imports arms, overthrows the government by force, the workers take over, and then they have heaven on earth in Beaverland, with frequent references to the situation in Russia and to what has been going on in Russia during the last 15 or 20 years. Would you not say that is a Communist propaganda play? Yet that is the kind of stuff that has been produced by the Federal Theater Project of New York City at our expense.

Then there is the play called "The Class of '29," built around eight or nine college graduates who went out in the world, could not find jobs; became radicals. Free love is preached all through the play. One of the girls suggests to one of the young men that they live together without the blessings of matrimony, because of the situation. The play makes fun of religion and of home life, and ridicules most of the things we have been taught to hold dear. That is what our money was being spent for, and I believe it is high time the American people woke up to that fact. I am very glad to say that as a result of our investigations and findings, backed up by the findings of the Woodrum committee, the Federal Theater Projects are no more, and Federal funds are not being used for their support.

Documentary evidence, acceptable in any court of law, has been filed with our committee to prove that the slimy trail of communism has penetrated into four phases of American life and society:

(1) The schools of our Nation.

(2) The American labor unions.

(3) The churches and pulpits of the Nation.

(4) Various departments of our Federal Government.

Communists and Communist sympathizers occupy key positions in several departments of the Government. The Department of Labor is honeycombed with them; you will find them on the pay roll of the Labor Relations Board; you will find them as assistants in the wage-and-hour law set-up. The practice of providing berths in the Government departments for "reds" should be done away with.

The strategy of the Communist leaders as explained to our committee is what is commonly referred to in Communist ranks as "the Trojan-horse method." The aim is to get Communist leaders planted on the inside of legitimate organizations, such as labor organizations, youth organizations, Y. M. C. A.'s, and then to begin the process of boring from within. At present the program has been changed somewhat by the Communist leaders. They now organize and set up legal organizations that work within the law as a part of the Communist united front. Within these legal organizations, front organizations, or transmission belts, as they are called, they set up a holding company, or illegal organization, that works in secret, outside the law, in an underground manner. These front organizations always have desirable objectives that serve as window dressing to attract and win the support of decent people; but behind this attractive window dressing is the illegal organization that carries out the Communist line, unknown and unsuspected by most of the membership.

The American League for Peace and Democracy was perhaps the best and most widespread example of a united-front organization, a transmission belt. It had about 4,000,000 members, most of whom were entirely innocent of its communistic origin, its communistic activities, and its communistic objectives. I want to discuss this organization because it is typical of all organizations that are part of the united front.

The American League for Peace and Democracy had its origin in Moscow in 1933. Stalin called a meeting of the executive committee of the International to discuss what should be done to head off the new menace to communism—fascism. Japan had just seized Manchuria. Hitler had come into power in Germany. Mussolini was rattling his sword in Italy and looking around for conquests. Moscow foresaw a military showdown with fascism in the near future, so Stalin decided he would need allies in the coming conflict.

Out of the deliberations of that meeting in Moscow in 1933 came the decision to set up a popular-front government in France and a popular-front government in Spain. The United States was not ready for a popular-front government, so they decided to set up the American League Against War and Fascism, as the first step toward a popular-front government in the United States. Earl Browder, America's representative at the Moscow meeting, brought the orders back here and commissioned Dr. J. B. Matthews to set up and head the new organization.

There are four classes of members in the American League: Communists, who occupy the strategic places of power and do most of the work; fellow travelers, who believe and act as Communists, but who do not carry membership cards for strategic reasons; stooges, often called dupes or decoys; and innocents, who constitute the great bulk of its membership.

The present objectives of American Communists, as given to our committee by former

leaders of the American Communist Party are:

First. Destroy the party in power—the Democratic Party—by driving a wedge between the left wing and the right wing of the party. We on Capitol Hill know that the wedge is nearly half through now and that the purge program of the President actually played into the hands of the Communists and gave great impetus to the wedge that the Communists are driving.

Second. Established the Farmer-Labor Party as the party in power, because Communist leaders occupy the strategic places in that party and will use those places of power and influence, once that party is in the saddle, to destroy the capitalistic system and to bankrupt the Nation.

Third. A receiver will then be required to take over the bankrupt and chaotic National Government, which receiver, by the very nature of the case, will be the highly organized, militant, small group known as the American Communist Party. Then, according to their leaders, "We will establish heaven on earth in America, as our brothers have established it in Russia."

All I can say is, God save us from that kind of heaven; I want none of it for mine. "Fantastic," you say, "It can't happen here"? I say it is happening here.

I have been asked, "What should be done about the spread of communism in the United States and how can it be checked?" My answer is: "The best way to stop the spread of communism would be to transplant all Communist leaders, pink intellectuals, parlor advocates of communism to 'red' Russia, and compel them to live there in the midst of communism for a period of 3 to 5 years. If this were done, I guarantee that 999 out of every 1,000 thus transplanted would be permanently cured of the disease." Of course, there are other things that should be done to check the growth of this "red" menace, such as:

1. Put the unemployed back to work in private industry at decent wages and thus remove the mass discontent, the fertile soil in which communism thrives.

2. Stop spreading class prejudice and hatred, which makes such an excellent seedbed for Communist seed.

3. Bring about a better and more equitable distribution of the products of labor.

4. Cultivate, encourage, develop the one crop we need in America—Americanism, patriotism, or whatever you want to call it.

If we will put forth our every effort toward the production of a real crop of Americanism, there will be no room for these foreign isms. Americanism, or patriotism, is so well defined and expressed in the little poem entitled, "The Best Land" by Edgar Guest, that I close with his words:

"If I knew a better land on this glorious
world of ours,
Where a man gets bigger money or is working
shorter hours,
If the Briton or the Frenchman had an easier
life than mine,
I'd pack my goods this minute and I'd sail
across the brine,
But I notice when an alien wants a land of
hope and cheer,
And a future for his children, he comes out
and settles here.

"Here's the glorious land of freedom. Here's
the milk and honey goal
For the peasant out of Russia, for the long-
subjected Pole.
It is here the sons of Italy and the men of
Austria turn
For the comfort of their bodies and the
money they can earn.
And with all that men complain of, and all
that goes amiss,
There's no happier, better nation on the
world's broad face than this.

"So, I'm thinking, when I listen to the wails
of discontent,
And some foreign disbeliever spreads his evil
sentiment,
That the breed of hate and envy that is sowing
sin and shame,
In this glorious land of freedom should go
back from whence it came.
And I hold it is the duty, rich or poor, of
every man,
Who enjoys this country's bounty, to be all
American."

Is the New Deal Betraying Us?—A Veteran Apparently Would Like to Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from a New York City veteran comes this letter enclosing an article by George Rothwell Brown. The veteran writes:

Read this article and if possible have some of those New Deal Congressmen read it. Mrs. Roosevelt could be taught something also if she took time out to read it.

How long in trying times like these must we stand for a misfit in our Government like "Old Lady Perkins." Wake up, America.

The Communists boasted they would start strikes all over our country when we started making war materials. Have they not made good? Again, wake up America.

Sincerely,

_____,

A veteran with two sons making $21 per month in an Army camp.

The article is as follows:

THE POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

Now that Mr. Roosevelt finds himself confronted by the ugly fact that the international Communist Party is waving civil war against the United States, what is he going to do about it?

It is all very well for the President, as in a recent speech, to castigate the Communists for what they did to France in the betrayal of that unhappy country, as well as of French labor.

What he must deal with is not an historical fact in France, but an immediate fact on the domestic labor front right here at home.

The Communists, some of whose associates the New Deal has petted and coddled and put into places of power and responsibility in the very Government itself in Washington, are inspiring, organizing, and leading the strikes which are crippling America's war efforts.

This leadership is treasonable, and has been denounced in Congress as treasonable.

When is Mr. Roosevelt going to deal with treason?

The identical pattern of betrayal which led France to her doom is being followed in the defense strikes in this country, inspired and promoted by alien enemies, by misguided labor leaders, and by out-and-out labor racketeers.

If you would understand the similarity between what happened in France and what happens today in the United States, read the testimony given by former Ambassador William C. Bullitt before the House Judiciary Committee. It can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 27, page 2682.

Mr. Bullitt does not refer to the popular front government, which sold France down the river to Hitler, as the French New Deal, but that is what it was. It may be added, in passing, on the responsibility of this writer, that this French New Deal was copied in this country—even down to the sit-down strike technique.

Speaking of the reforms of the French New Deal—under the Blum Government—but, as stated, not calling it that—Mr. Bullitt said:

"They did reduce enormously French production, because French industry was not organized suddenly to drop hours of labor greatly, and also lots of the manufacturers were very much frightened by these reforms. In fact, in some cases they closed their factories.

"The result of this was we had a diminution in production in France just when we needed a greatly increased production to meet this rising German threat.

"There was also another curious development which was this—that in the factories even working a 40-hour week, in many of the most important factories, especially those around Paris, where there were a great many Communists, that the workmen did not do much work during the 40 hours. They dragged their feet a good deal and did not turn out so much.

"But that was under the influence of a different sovereign, a sovereign in Moscow, and was not the attitude of the really patriotic Frenchman.

"It was just a case of the country not waking up to the fact that modern wars are won or lost before they are begun by the preparations that you make, and the analogy, to my mind, between the attitude in France and the attitude in this country during the past few months has been very, very striking."

Any reader of American newspapers today, as he follows the disheartening reports of strikes in industrial plants holding Government war contracts, knows that the pattern of French betrayal is being followed by the traitors and slackers and misguided fools on the labor front of our own country.

We have nurtured the Communist reptile, and now he turns and bares his fangs.

What is the New Deal Government, which has molly-coddled communism, going to do about it?

Mr. Speaker, the answer to which has been that the New Deal will do nothing about it except to encourage the wreckers.

Today it is a little difficult to learn whether John L. Lewis or F. D. R. is Mr. Big. The President says we must have coal. Everyone knows that if the steel makers are to continue in production, we must have coal. We know that the northern operators and Mr. Lewis have agreed; so why do they not dig coal? Why does not the President insist that coal be dug by the northern miners, there no longer being disputes between the mine operators and the miners?

Mr. Lewis says there will be no coal dug until the southern operators comply with his wishes. If coal is not dug, there will be no steel made, and if steel is not made, there will be no munitions and there will be no aid to Britain.

How about it, F. D. R., are you or Mr. Lewis, Mr. Big? And how do you like the aid which Mr. Lewis and the northern operators are giving to Mr. Hitler?

We Americans Must Reappraise Our Ideals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. BEN F. JENSEN, OF IOWA, BEFORE JOHN LYON POST, 3150, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. BEN F. JENSEN, Representative from the Seventh Congressional District of Iowa, delivered on the evening of April 18, 1941, before the John Lyon Post, No. 3150, Veterans of Foreign Wars, at Arlington, Va.:

Mr. Toastmaster, veterans of foreign wars, and ladies, more than a fifth of a century ago—and that sounds like a long time—you veterans, then young men, virile, vigorous, facing life, your future before you, laid your life, the happiness of those who love you, your all on the altar of your country. The impelling motive which caused you to don the uniform and to march forth to whatever the hell of war might hold for you was a soul-deep conviction that you were going out to fight to defend the American way, American customs, American justice, the American philosophy of life, of culture, the Bill of Rights, the constitutional Government itself. That was all summed up for you in those days when you faced life at its full tide by the slogan "to make the world safe for democracy."

You marched forth in those days, and you are members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars now because you marched forth in those days to fight to maintain those American ideals of liberty, of free enterprise, of equality of opportunity, all of those tenets to our American philosophy which we sum up when we say the American way.

It was a bitter thing, and I thank God that you survived it with your souls unseared, when you came back to find that you had not been fighting to make the world safe for democracy.

I thank God here today that even that bitterness did not sear your souls and blind your feeling of love and patriotism for your country.

It seems to me that the hour has struck when we Americans must reappraise our ideals; when we must again define the kind of government that we are ready to live for and, if necessary, to die for.

I can define it no better for you than it was defined away back in the year 1500 by a philosopher named Spinosa. Let me read you his definition of government which I think the most perfect definition of the American way that has ever been written in any language:

"The last end of the state is not to dominate men, nor to restrain them by fear; rather it is so to free each man from fear that he may live and act with full security and without injury to himself or his neighbor. The end of the state, I repeat, is not to make rational beings into brute beasts and machines. It is to enable their bodies and their minds to function safely. It is to lead men to live by, and to exercise, a free reason; that they may not waste their strength in hatred, anger, and guile, nor act unfairly toward one another. Thus the end of the state is really liberty."

That is the kind of government, my friends, that you went forth 24 years ago to protect. Today we are considering sending our young men away from their business and their homes to carry four great freedoms to every corner of the world.

The purpose of our involvement in the present wars in Europe and the Orient is to carry freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear to everybody everywhere in the world.

Now, let us reduce this to plain lay language and see what it means. It means, as someone recently pointed out, that in order to establish merely the first two items—freedom of speech and freedom of religion "everywhere in the world"—the United States will have to conquer, subjugate, and govern Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia, China, the Balkans, and most of the rest of the civilized and uncivilized world. Why, my fellow citizens, such a situation could be established if it were possible at all only by fire and sword. How would we establish freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear among the hordes of India without first subjugating the British Empire?

Let us, as good American citizens, get down to brass tacks and find out what our real responsibilities are and what we actually must do to maintain the American way.

There was a very wise and humble Man who 2,000 years ago taught amid the hills and vales of Galilee. He propounded a great truth when he asked this question: "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

I want in all reverence to paraphrase that question tonight and ask you, What shall it profit America if we seek to establish these four great freedoms everywhere else in the world and lose our liberty at home?

Some of these freedoms that it is now proposed we shall carry, if necessary, on the muzzle of American guns and the points of American bayonets to the far corners of the earth. Have we in America achieved freedom from want for our own people? Have we achieved freedom from fear for our own people? I venture to say to you, my friends here tonight, that more people are fearing for the future of America in this hour than have feared for the future of America at any time since the great civil conflict which rent the country in twain.

God knows, it would have been so much better if we were going to attempt any such globe-encircling crusade as is proposed that we had sent these people bread instead of bullets.

I said a moment ago that we must face our responsibilities and we must define what they are. Our first responsibility is to maintain and perpetuate the American way. Our second responsibility is to guard against the un-American groups within this Nation which would produce, if they could, chaos in our economic structure, disintegration of our governmental structure and consequent utter confusion of our social structure when they like unclean vultures may feed upon the spoils of a once glorious and free nation.

Our responsibilities, Veterans of the Foreign Wars, is to see that the very substance of our own Nation is not given away and dissipated, reducing us to that grinding poverty here at home that foreign nations have made us fertile fields for sprouting some destructive ism. The surest and most certain protection against fascism, communism, nazi-ism, and any form of totalitarianism so abhorrent to the American mind is to give the American way a chance to work here at home.

Must we have a little dictatorship now to enable us to free the other nations of the world from dictatorship? Which means to say, my fellow Americans, that we must drink from the cup of poison that we would strike from the lips of others. It is a false doctrine, and no man who approaches it can possibly be honest with himself or with his fellows because there is not an atom of truth in it.

Say these proponents of this crusade to carry these four freedoms to the uttermost parts of the earth, if we do not carry this crusade into the jungles of Africa and the stacks of the chimneys of Britain and the Valley of the Rhine, this great dictator across the seas will come over here and subjugate us.

Oh, that we had more of that spirit of Lincoln when he said:

"At what point shall we expect the approach of danger? By what means shall we fortify against it? Shall we expect some trans-Atlantic military giant to step the ocean and crush us at a blow? Never! All the armies of Europe, Asia, and Africa combined, with all the treasure of the earth (our own excepted) in their military chest, with a Bonaparte for a commander, could not by force take a drink from the Ohio or make a track on the Blue Ridge in a trial of a thousand years."

It is our responsibility to guard against the danger from the point where Lincoln saw it when he said:

"At what point is the danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reaches us, it must spring up among us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen, we must live through all time or die by suicide."

My fellow Americans, honored as you are by the badge of the service you offered upon the altar of your country; honored as you are by the undying record of the age in which you were willing to march forth and to lay your lives and your all on the altar of an ideal, the price of liberty.

It is our responsibility, yours and mine, to see that we do build, practically, efficiently, and economically, a defense which will be impregnable against any assault which any nation or any group of nations might in future seek to commit upon us. But in building that defense we must also build our defenses against economic chaos. We must build our defenses against a debt which will bankrupt us. We must build our defenses against a condition which might so discontent our people that they would in a moment of dispair and blindness, listen to the false lure of some alien doctrine. It is our great duty and our great privilege, my fellow citizens, to constitute ourselves the protectors of those unborn millions who are not here to speak for themselves or to defend themselves. We must protect them against a staggering debt, against a ragged social structure.

We are not the originators nor the owners of this rich estate; we are the trustees vested with a life interest.

Yes, by all means, let us build a national defense. By all means let us succor every people we can, but let us not impoverish our own to do it.

Freedom, my fellow Americans, is not something you legislate. It is something you live and deserve. Freedom is not something that can be handed to you. You can only be given a chance to make yourself free.

Of course, we are not going to carry on any crusade to establish these four freedoms everywhere in the world. The great responsibility overshadowing all others that confronts you here this day is to be alert; to guard against politics being played with your national defense. A nation can thrive only as its people save and use their substance wisely and well.

The greatest field for squandering the people's substance ever known in history has been the field of war. Before last November 5 both major parties, both major candidates, made solemn covenant with the people of this Nation that we would be kept out

of war. It is your responsibility and mine to see that covenant is kept, and if it is broken we will be able to say to the betrayed people of this Nation yonder stands the man or men who broke their sacred promise to you.

Nothing has happened since November 5 to change the terms or weaken the demands of the covenant, but much has happened to render us uneasy that the covenant may be broken unless we are vigilant.

In conclusion, let us preserve our own free America first of all; let us preserve our own constitutional form of government first of all; let us unite as one people to create our national defense, but let it be a national defense. Then let us make known to the world that we will defend our liberties and our honor.

Let us give such succor as we can to the rest of the world, but in God's name let us keep our own strength and our own sanity and our own integrity in order that we may in a later time succor a world that will be exhausted and prostrated from war—in a time when it might well be that in America alone of every nation of the world there will still burn that beacon of hope to all men the torch of freedom, as proof to the world that our way, the American way, is the right way.

Food for the Small Democracies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTON F. MACIEJEWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1941

RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF POLISH-AMERICAN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. MACIEJEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Believing that the lives of millions of children, women, and men in conquered European countries can and must be saved from the impending famine and pestilence which confront them and that renewed hope may be given them in the ideals of mankind, we, the undersigned, indicate our sympathy for and pledge our support to the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies and its efforts to (a) urge agreements by the German and British Governments with an international organization of American and other neutrals by which the domestic food supplies of Finland, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and Central Poland can be protected from the occupying armies and authorities; (b) by which supplemental supplies can be imported through the British and German blockades; (c) to secure the efficient operation of such a neutral organization.

Approved by Council of Polish-American Professional Organizations at a meeting held December 12, 1940.

PAUL FOX, *President.*
THADDEUS SLESINSKI,
Secretary.

The Council of Polish-American Professional Organizations embraces Polish Engineers' Club, Polish-American Pharmacists, Polish-American Optometrist Society, Polish Dental Society, Polish Medical Society, Polish Lawyers' Association, Polish Teachers' Club, Polish Arts Club, University Friends of Poland.

Our Natural Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1941

ADDRESS OF JAMES P. POPE, DIRECTOR, TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address by the Honorable James P. Pope, Director, Tennessee Valley Authority, before the Des Moines Public Forum, Des Moines, Iowa, March 10, 1941:

Men born on this earth have a natural heritage. They inherit not only their bodies and minds, their institutions, their customs, and traditions, but they also inherit the natural resources of their country—the land, the water, the air, the soil, the minerals, the vegetable and animal products. The very existence of man depends upon this natural heritage. Certainly fortune has smiled on us in the bestowal of this birthright. The greatness of America rests on the greatness of her resources.

Five hundred years ago, when America was discovered, a billion acres of tillable land and 850,000,000 acres of timberland spread across the continent. No more fertile soil and no more luxuriant forests were to be found anywhere in the world. The earth abounded in coal, oil, and phosphates of incalculable value. Great herds of buffalo roamed in the West. Forests were filled with game. The streams were alive with fish and rivers of wild fowl flowed through the air. Millions of beavers swarmed along streams which formed the upper reaches of the great rivers. For a hundred years men who landed on the Atlantic coast faced a natural paradise.

THREE STAGES

It might be said there are three broad stages in the history of man and nature.

In the first stage, people live from their herds and move from place to place for pasturage, as in the case of the nomads of early times. Or they live by hunting and fishing, as did the American Indian. In either case, they live in harmony with the laws of nature. They do not destroy the natural resources of the country.

In the second stage, people live by tilling the soil, mining, and manufacturing. They use and exploit their natural resources. This process is pleasantly termed progress—civilization. To satisfy greed, man is prone to squander, destroy, neglect. In time the fertility of the soil is gone, minerals are exhausted, forests disappear, and the wildlife of the country is decimated. Many countries have gone through this stage.

The third stage—if it is reached—is that of restoration and conservation of natural resources.

Archaeologists are now telling the story of countries that never reached the restoration stage. Ancient cities are being unearthed. On the island of Crete, for instance, vast ruins of ancient palaces are being uncovered 43 feet below the surface. There are relics of luxurious dwellings, workshops, altars, and temples. There is evidence of great natural wealth. This was the Golden Age of which Homer sang: "There is a land called Crete, in the midst of the wine-dark sea, a fair, rich land, begirt with water, and therein are many men past counting, and 90 cities." Today most of Crete is barren land; its cities are few, and small, and its people are poor. This story has been repeated in many other ancient nations.

ALL STAGES IN THE UNITED STATES

In the compact history of the United States all of these stages may be studied. In fact, within 200 years, sometimes even within a generation, the whole cycle has been completed. Recent attempts to restock the streams of the Northwest with beaver offer a good illustration of what I mean. This industrious little animal up until 150 or 200 years ago had worked throughout the ages without interruption. By damming up thousands of creeks that are later joined into mighty rivers, he had helped to maintain a balance in nature of which he was unaware. Then came the trappers, urged on by inefficient business enterprises—both French and English—whose sole interest in the beaver was his hide. Fur trading became a major industry and one of the causes of the French and Indian War. Never were there so many beaver hats and coats in the world. Every English soldier had a beaver cap and every French lady a beaver coat. Within 50 years the beaver was almost extinct.

Five years ago I was in Idaho when the Department of the Interior began restocking the small mountain streams with beaver. Several hundred had been trapped and brought out there as the beginning of a Nation-wide program to restore the beaver to his once high estate. They were not being restored for their fur but for their teeth, for they were to be allowed to engage in their time-honored work of dam building—to hold back at the source the precious waters needed on the land below. The value of each beaver for this purpose was estimated to be $300 and his cost $8. Here, in the story of the beaver, we have the whole cycle of the relationship of man to his natural resources.

GHOST TOWNS

When I was a very young man I taught in a country school in Winn Parish, La. Morning and evening, listening to the soughing breeze in the treetops, I walked 2 miles through one of the finest forests of longleaf pine that ever grew. But the days of these big trees were numbered. For soon came the timber cruiser, walking through the forests with his notebook. He left with a blueprint of the forests' ruin. Behind him came the sawmills and lumber camps. The timber was bought for a song. The big trees were cut; the small trees were cleared by the swampers or left standing, bent and broken. Slash was piled high, a standing invitation to the lightning, the locomotive spark, or the careless match. Thousands of acres were burned. Of almost a billion acres of original forest land in the United States, only one-half, or approximately 460,000,000 acres, are now capable of producing timber. Nearly all of the finest forests are gone.

In the wake of such operations throughout the country came ghost towns, deserted villages, and desolate country. One lumber town in Louisiana had 5,000 people in 1917, with churches, schools, paved streets, and parks. In 1927, with all the timber gone, the town had one inhabitant. The grass was growing along the edges of the pavements, and the houses were occupied by bats and wild animals.

The present generation down in that section of the State talk about the time when they used to have the big trees. New trees are now being set out, and coming generations may again see the big trees. There, too, the cycle is being completed.

VANISHING LANDS

A similar story could be told of the farm lands of the country. Farming did not possess the lure of profit of the fur industry or the timber industry. It did not attract great corporations in pursuit of immediate riches.

Nevertheless there was widespread waste. Out of economic necessity farmers were forced to widely exploit their soil resources. They were unable to hold the topsoil and preserve its fertility. In the South cotton farmers took possession of the land along the south Atlantic seaboard and then moved farther and farther west. Cotton was the money crop which they planted year after year on the same land. Because they left their sloping fields exposed to erosion by water, tons of the best topsoil washed away with every big rain.

As a boy I lived next to an old pre-war plantation that had been owned by my grandfather. It had been worked to death, abandoned to scrub pine. There were gullies on it from 10 to 15 feet deep. Field after field had been cultivated for a few years and then "thrown away," as they say, and new land cleared. There were thousands of acres of this sort of land in almost every community in the South. In the Tennessee Valley area alone, of the 8,500,000 acres in crops and pastures, about 1,000,000 acres have become totally unfit for cultivation, another 2,000,000 have lost half of their topsoil, and about 4,000,000 additional acres have suffered appreciable erosion.

As to the country as a whole, listen to Stuart Chase:

"One hundred million acres of formerly cultivated land has been essentially ruined by water erosion—an area equal to Illinois, Ohio, North Carolina, and Maryland combined—the equivalent of 1,250,000 80-acre farms. In addition, this washing of sloping fields has stripped the greater part of the productive topsoil from another 125,000,000 acres now being cultivated. Erosion by wind and water is getting under way on another 100,000,000 acres. More than 300,000,000 acres—one-sixth of the country—is gone, going, or beginning to go."

To haul away the rich farm soil that is washed out of the bleeding fields and pastures of America every year, he says, "would require a train of freight cars 475,000 miles long, enough to girdle the planet 19 times at the equator."

The National Resources Committee has estimated that soil erosion has cost the country at least $20,000,000,000 in the last 50 years. What has been the cost in human misery? Mr. Jay Franklin has summarized it this way:

"Our enemies are of our own household. Cornfields running down the river—cotton-fields draining into the Gulf of Mexico—wheatlands on the Great Plains dyeing the Missouri or powdering the cities of the distant East—forests cut down and gullies eating farms like cancers—poor whites and croppers—chiggers and hookworm, malaria, ignorance, bewilderment, apathy."

DUST STORMS

Some years ago caravans of settlers again moved west along the old Oregon trail into Idaho, Oregon, and Washington. This time they piled all their belongings in old Ford cars instead of covered wagons. They had left the horrors of the Dust Bowl, the fields that had blown away, cattle that had starved, and homes that had been ruined. Where buffalo grass had once grown waist high, millions of acres of sod had been plowed up and the fields cultivated. Now the wind had carried away literally billions of tons of the finest soil on earth. I was in Washington, D. C., during the worst of these storms, and I saw the air filled with dust and the sun hanging like a lead dollar in the sky. Far out into the Atlantic Ocean these clouds hung for days. This was nature's exact and terrible retribution.

One could go on with the story. It could be applied to coal and oil and other mineral deposits. It is not a pleasant task to tell of this tragic side of the history of our American earth, but it is necessary to tell it and to continue to sound sharp warnings from one end of the country to the other. The people must not be permitted to forget what has happened and what is still happening to their natural assets.

THE OTHER SIDE

It is time, however, to look at the other side of the picture, to tell of what has been and is being done on the constructive side. We are entering, perhaps in a feeble way, upon the third stage of our history. Within the last quarter of a century we have been awakening from our slumber. We are at last becoming conscious of what has been going on.

About 30 years ago President Theodore Roosevelt aroused the country by calling a conference of the Governors of all the States at Washington to discuss the problem of conservation. Since that time we have been talking about it, and some things have been done about it.

The problem of conservation is one of immense complexity. It requires education, understanding, practical programs of action, and large sums of money. Although vast tracts are owned and are being conserved by the National and State Governments, the great bulk of this Nation's land is divided into relatively small holdings and is owned by the people themselves. Conservation programs therefore must be adjusted to the economic condition of the millions of owners of farming, timber, and grazing lands.

WILDLIFE RETURNING

In the first place, let us see what is being done for the vanishing wildlife. Federal and State protective laws have been passed. Some 275 wildlife refuges have been set up by the Government, covering about 14,000,000 acres. Wildlife is also protected in national and State forests and parks throughout the country. Fish hatcheries are being established in all the States. And it is said that the herds of deer in Pennsylvania are almost as large as those of colonial days. Even the Vice President of the United States is reported to have killed a deer in that State 2 or 3 years ago.

RESTORING THE FORESTS

As for conservation of forests, here, too, something real is being done. The Federal Government has established about 160 parks, monuments, and reservations, covering more than 20,000,000 acres of land. And more than 1,600 State parks containing over 6,000,000 acres of land have been created by the States. In addition to that, at the end of 1939 the national-forest area covered about 229,000,000 acres. In all these lands the natural resources in forests, grazing lands, and mineral deposits are being protected and conserved by the Government. Selective cutting of the timber is required. Fire-patrol service is being constantly improved, and these practices are also being followed to a very large extent by the private lumber companies on their own lands.

In the year 1938 about 25,000 acres of range lands were re-seeded. Small dams are being built, wells drilled, and natural springs developed. Literally billions of seedlings are being planted on the timberlands of the country. In the Tennessee Valley area alone, from the nurseries of the Tennessee Valley Authority, more than 110,000,000 trees have been planted within the last few years.

TIMBER BELTS

One of the most interesting projects undertaken is the planting of tree belts on the prairies and plains of the West. Within 5 years about 14,000 miles of effective tree barriers, 100 feet wide, have been planted. From 90 to 95 percent of the belts that were planted are effective, and the trees have grown from 4 to 8 feet each year. Some of them are now from 35 to 40 feet high. When this project was first proposed, it was ridiculed by many a skeptic. But the results in reducing moisture loss, in protecting cultivated crops, and in making the surroundings more livable and attractive have now silenced all criticisms. These shelterbelts are now found in Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, and the Dakotas.

The work of reforestation is by no means finished. It has really only been started. The progress that has been made, however, indicates that the American people are on their way toward the restoration and preservation of their forest resources.

REBUILDING THE SOIL

Now as to the tremendous problem of the Nation's soil. During the last decade an attack upon this problem has been made in earnest. The Agricultural Adjustment Administration deserves much credit for its work. It is operating in more than 3,000 counties in the United States. Of the 9,000,000 farmers in this country, about 6,000,000 are cooperating in the program. These farmers have diverted some 30,000,000 acres from soil-depleting crops to soil-building crops. Something like 5,500,000 tons of soil-conserving lime and fertilizer have been applied to croplands. Cropping systems have been changed. Terracing of hillside is going on at a rapid rate; contour cultivation, furrowing, strip cropping, and other better farming methods are being applied. Substantial sums are beng paid to the farmers to enable them to carry on these conservation practices.

Another branch of the Government, the Soil Conservation Service, with which you are familiar, is carrying on a widespread program in selected areas to demonstrate the best methods of soil conservation.

There are a number of other Federal and State agencies such as the C. C. C., the Farm Security Administration, and others that are doing fine, constructive work.

TENNESSEE VALLEY PROGRAM

In my section of the Southeast, in addition to the foregoing work, the Tennessee Valley Authority, in cooperation with the land-grant colleges, has set up a far-reaching program with which you are probably less familiar. This effort revolves around the manufacture and demonstration of concentrated phosphate fertilizer. About 310,000 tons have been distributed since the Authority was established in 1933. Forty-seven States and two territories are using T. V. A. fertilizer for testing and demonstration purposes. The A. A. A. has distributed it as an aid to an educational and conservation program. In 23 States of the Union there are over 32,000 test-demonstration farms. About 24,000 of these farms are located in the Tennessee Valley States.

You may want to know what a test-demonstration farm is, how it is selected, and what is done about it. Groups of farmers organize themselves by communities to make the most effective use of the phosphate for soil improvement as a basis of a higher standard of living. They select a farm in the community for demonstration purposes. The owner of the farm agrees to comply with the practices prescribed—i. e., he and his neighbors work out a program for his farm based on the findings of the experiment station and based on his needs. This usually results in more acres of cover crops and legumes and less acres in row crops. He receives through the association whatever amount of phosphate fertilizer is required to carry out this program. He pays transportation costs of the fertilizer and the added costs of making the readjustment to his farm. He keeps careful records of the results obtained.

There are over 5,000,000 acres in these demonstration farms, more than 4,000,000 of which are in the Tennessee Valley States. The practices being carried out on demonstration farms are also being adopted by many of the 900,000 farmers participating in the associations.

Within the last few months I have visited a number of these demonstration farms.

This is what I found: Increased acreage yields, decreased erosion, reduced acreage in row crops, and enlarged acreage in winter cover crops, more and better livestock, reduced indebtedness, and increased income. I saw new houses, barns, and fences. I found enthusiasm among the farmers, increased interest in all community activities, and a new confidence in their future. Many of these benefits cannot be measured in dollars and cents.

PRINCIPLES OF CONSERVATION

At this point, an important principle of conservation should be mentioned. There are three different kinds of natural resources. The first consists of exhaustible resources like minerals. The second type includes agricultural, forest, and animal products, which are renewable resources. In the third category are the inexhaustible resources of air, water, and sunlight.

One of the great principles of conservation is that by using comparatively small quantities of some of the exhaustible resources in the right way we can make available for man's use and enjoyment larger quantities of the renewable resources. This is the principle that is being followed in the widespread use of phosphate fertilizer. A comparatively small amount in the soil makes possible the growing of legumes and grasses which hold the soil. These legumes at the same time capture from the air far more nitrogen than the phosphate used. In fact, for each pound of phosphorus used there are from 5 to 6 pounds of nitrogen captured. This nitrogen enriches the soil for the growth of other plants necessary for food and fiber.

It is not always possible, however, for farmers to manage their businesses in a way that will best conserve and build up their soil. They must have sufficient cash income to meet their obligations. Unless they can receive as much income from following conservation practices as by disregarding them, they cannot carry on their part of the program. It is necessary, therefore, that the income of the farmer be maintained, if not increased, if he is to be a working partner in the great enterprise of conserving the soil.

IMPROVING THE FARMER'S INCOME

The T. V. A. is trying in many ways to increase the cash income of the farmer who, while participating in the conservation program, allows a portion of his farm lands to recuperate from overwork. To this end, the T. V. A. maintains a group of research engineers who are constantly working at the job of finding ways to develop new tools, new farm equipment, new products, and even new markets.

Not long ago a new type of barn hay-drying equipment for use in areas of heavy rainfall was devised under T. V. A. auspices. Formerly, hay-drying equipment cost from $3,500 to $10,000. The new hay drier can be installed for about $300. The lower amount is within the financial reach of a good many farmers. It will encourage cover crops that conserve the soil and increase income.

A furrow seeder, devised and now in commercial production, plants grain and distributes fertilizer at the same time in furrows on hillsides without disturbing the matted root system between the furrows. This device again helps to conserve the soil while increasing income through higher yields of diversified crops.

A community refrigerator has been adapted to use by farmers. This refrigerator, accommodating about 60 families, affords an opportunity to store meat and other perishable products for home use or for the market. There are about 25 of these refrigerators now in use in Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi. At one refrigerator located in Etowah County, Ala., during the first 12 months of operation 57 families stored 17,500 pounds of produce. Moreover, a recent study reveals that a community refrigerator pays for itself in less than 3 years.

In a community near Nashville, Tenn., the use of a freezer locker plant resulted in an increase in beef consumption of 8 to 10 times in 1 year. The importance of this result is apparent when it is remembered that only 5 pounds of beef per person has been consumed annually on the farms of Tennessee as compared with 40 pounds in Ohio.

A method for curing sweetpotatoes, using electric heat, has been devised. This reduces the loss in curing from about 25 percent to 5 percent, and usually increases the return to the farmer from 10 cents to 15 cents per bushel. This method is being used in many places in the valley.

A ¼-horsepower motor, costing from $5 to $18, can now be plugged in and put to work, churning, shelling corn, freezing ice cream, grinding sausage, sharpening knives, and doing a multitude of other things.

The results of the use of these new devices by farmers are gratifying. The files, which contain pictures, financial reports, and records of the individual farmers, tell the story of better incomes and improved farms. And they are chock full of human interest.

These T. V. A. research engineers are also working on minerals, timber, and other products in the Tennessee Valley area. There are projects for using scrap mica in plastic products, vermiculite in lieu of cork for insulation, kaolin for fine chinaware, sawdust for coal briquets, cull timber for panels, olivine and dolomite as new sources of magnesium, flax for making parachute webbing, and common clay as a source of alumina.

IMPORTANT IN NATIONAL DEFENSE

The importance of this work as a conservation measure must be clear to everybody. In addition to that, some of these projects hold promise of great national-defense value. Those for obtaining magnesium and aluminum from minerals of which there is an abundance in several States, and for obtaining parachute webbing from flax, are of especial importance to national defense. And these processes are now fairly well proven. At present our aluminum comes largely from bauxite mined in South America. We are also deficient in magnesium, an element highly important in processing aluminum. Last year we produced only 3,600 tons of magnesium while Germany produced 40,000 tons.

Such new processes, and the plants that utilize them, are of value to the country both in times of peace and of war. In this respect they are like T. V. A.'s ammonium-nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals, Ala., which produces a product that can be used for explosives in war and for fertilizer in times of peace. Thus they are of major importance on two vital fronts—conservation and national defense.

CONSERVING WATER RESOURCES

The T. V. A. has, of course, been engaged in other more widely publicized phases of conservation. It is conserving water for navigation, flood control, and electric power. These are the other major functions of the Authority. Their importance as conservation measures is everywhere recognized. Cheaper and more abundant electricity makes easier innumerable tasks in the home and on the farm, and at the same time stimulates the industrial economy of the whole area. Through greater efficiency, more employment, and larger pay rolls, this public resource is not only buttressing an important conservation program on the land—it is also making possible substantial increases in the value of the Nation's entire annual output of goods and services. More important still, at this particular time, it is playing a vital role in the country's national-defense program. We know already that the hundreds of millions of kilowatt-hours of electric energy that are now being used for national defense will, when the emergency is over, be used in peacetime pursuits.

CONSERVATION DURING NATIONAL EMERGENCY

The importance of carrying on our conservation program during this emergency cannot be overemphasized. During the last World War, under the slogan, "Plow to the fence for national defense," about 40,000,000 acres of grass were uprooted. Most of these lands were unsuited to farming, especially in areas of inadequate rainfall and high winds. The Dust Bowl calamity was the result. During the last few years more than 32,000,000 acres of this land have been shifted back to grass and pasture, and large supplies of grain and cotton have been stored to meet any emergency demands. If still larger supplies of foodstuffs become necessary, they should be supplied by stepping up production on lands suitable for increased yields. There must be no repetition of the disastrous performance of the last World War—plowing up marginal lands, wasting soil suitable only for pasturage or timber.

LONG PULL AHEAD

The task of restoration and conservation is a gigantic one. It may take a hundred years, on many fronts, to do the job. Certainly there is a long, hard pull ahead that will require all the energy and creative genius of the American people. It will require the awakening of our social conscience and a reconquest of our land. If we succeed, we will not only have preserved our natural heritage, we will have struck a mighty blow in defense of our democratic way of life.

Jackson Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. CLAUDE R. WICKARD, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, at the Jackson Day dinner at Nashville, Tenn., Saturday evening, March 29, 1941:

Here in the shadow of the Hermitage, it may seem presumptuous for a native of Indiana, an outsider, to praise Andrew Jackson. There must be many here tonight whose ancestors knew Old Hickory personally and among you there probably are some who are kin to the Jackson family.

But Democrats cannot come together on Jackson Day without praising Jackson. And all of us share in the pride we feel for one of the truly great men of the Nation.

Furthermore, I feel that I understand how Tennesseeans feel about Old Hickory and about their State. I have some of that same feeling myself.

One reason for that feeling is my regard for Cordell Hull, my Cabinet colleague. He is a great American, one of our greatest, and all of us also share in the pride the Nation feels for him.

My mother's people, the Carnells, moved to my native Indiana from Tennessee. My grandfather's name was Andrew Jackson Wickard. My father's name was Andrew Jackson Wickard. I don't know why they changed the family custom when they named

me. I have always wished that my name had been Andrew Jackson Wickard, too. I would have carried the name proudly. For to me and to millions of other Americans the Jacksonian tradition and influence express many things that live in the American spirit and which must live on if we are to continue as a democracy.

The very essence of the American spirit is the freedom which belongs to the individual. Certainly nb one defended that freedom more fiercely than did Andrew Jackson. As a boy, he refused to clean an enemy officer's boots and received a sword cut across the head for that refusal. From that time on, he upheld on every occasion the worth and dignity which belong to free men.

There is in the world today a philosophy of life and government very different from Andrew Jackson's philosophy. The totalitarian leaders assert that men are not equal, but are of two kinds—master and slave. The totalitarian leaders say that man has no freedom, that he belongs to the state.

We challenge that concept today as Andrew Jackson, in his day and time, challenged any assault upon his individual freedom, or his worth and dignity as a man.

Americans are not serfs of the state. They do not belong to the state. The state belongs to them. This is the American spirit. This spirit has manifested itself as the occasion has demanded. Back in Jackson's day it manifested itself in meeting the challenge of the frontier.

One of Jackson's biographers called him The Border Captain. The name was a good one. America got very little military glory out of the War of 1812. On land there would have been practically none had it not been for Old Hickory. Jackson had physical courage that stood out in a time of remarkable physical courage. He had also the rarer qualities of leadership, military skill, judgment, and determination that was as strong as the finest of steel.

His letter to a Governor of Tennessee during the Creek campaign in 1813 is a model of fiery admonition to the wavering and doubtful. The Governor had suggested retreat and Jackson's letter in reply almost set the paper cn fire. Among other things, Jackson wrote: "Believe me, my valued friend, there are times when it is highly criminal to shrink from responsibility, or scruple about the exercise of our powers. Is it good policy to turn loose upon our defenseless frontiers 5,000 exasperated savages to reek their hands once more in the blood of our citizens? What! Retrograde under these circumstances? I will perish first."

His capacity for decisive action stood him in good stead during political campaigns; during the fight with Nicholas Biddle and the bank; in relationships with other nations; and in stating boldly his conviction that the rights of the Nation overshadowed the rights of any State.

The wilderness frontier of America is tamed now. We are a nation of 132,000,000 people. We possess the greatest abundance of the world's resources. We are strong in the men and the skill and the equipment to produce. We are a democracy, and yet the challenge we face is as great, or even greater, than the challenge which faced Jackson and his followers.

The frontier that challenges us now is not the frontier of land or space. The challenge now is for our people to push out onto the great plain of the world, as once they pushed through the Cumberland Gap and on that great plain to meet and conquer the threat to our way of life.

I do not speak merely of defending ourselves in a military way. We must, of course, be prepared to do that. I am talking about the part America must play in the world; the part it must play upon economic and social frontiers as the world reorganizes itself after this war. In that reorganization we must play a part worthy of this United States if the world of the future is to be an orderly and decent world.

Jackson helped to conquer economic and social frontiers as well as the physical frontier. The common people rose behind Old Hickory. Some of us remember Jackson's military victories and forget his fight with the special privilege of his day. Just as Franklin Delano Roosevelt has alarmed the Tories of his day, Jackson alarmed the die-hards of his time during his struggle with Nicholas Biddle and the Bank of the United States.

Jackson felt that Biddle and the bank had been given, or had grasped, the power to make some men richer and some poorer, without regard to the energy or industry of the men in question. This was domination and neither he nor the common people wanted any of it.

In the veto message that broke the Bank's power, Andrew Jackson stated the case against special privilege better than I can hope to do. This is what he said:

"Equality of talents, of education, or of wealth, cannot be produced by human institutions. In the full enjoyment of the gifts of heaven and the fruits of superior industry, economy, and virtue, every man is entitled to protection by law. But when the laws undertake to add to these natural and just advantages, artificial distinctions, to make the rich richer and the potent more powerful, the humble members of society—the farmers, mechanics, and laborers, who have neither the time nor the means of securing like favors to themselves—have a right to complain of the injustice of their Government. Its evils exist only in its abuses. If it would confine itself to equal protection, and, as heaven does its rains, shower its favors alike on the high and the low, the rich and the poor, it would be an unqualified blessing."

This struggle to insure equality of opportunity did not end by one magnificent victory like that of Andrew Jackson over the bank. The challenge of unequal opportunity is before us in every generation.

Under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, as great a Democrat in his way as Jackson was in his, the common people have won other battles as significant as the victory of Jackson over the bank. There are many victories yet to be won in the United States and elsewhere in the world.

We must find some way to end war. Unless we do our civilization will destroy itself.

We must find some way to use our resources so that we can get rid of unemployment and give security to the average man. Economic freedom is just as vital as political freedom.

We must find some way to preserve the freedoms we in the United States have taken for granted—the freedoms of speech and worship and freedom from want and fear. Otherwise, we are slaves.

These are the challenges of our new frontiers. To conquer those frontiers will require leadership as determined and courageous as that given by Andrew Jackson.

We have that leader. His name is Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

To conquer our present-day frontiers will require a people worthy of our leader. The average American today is just as good a man as the average American of Andrew Jackson's day. Pecple said the British had grown soft but people—including Hitler—have changed their minds about that. The American people will conquer new frontiers just as they conquered the old.

The American people simply aren't going to stand for a world dominated by dictators. Until Hitler and company tried to force their way upon the universe, the United States wanted to go its own way and mind its own business. But we couldn't. The dictators wouldn't let us. And now, just as the pioneers of Andrew Jackson's day wouldn't stand for outlaws loose in a community, we aren't going to stand for outlaw nations loose in the world. The United States has taken its position in no uncertain terms. In this period of world crisis, to do otherwise would be unworthy of Andrew Jackson and the other men and women who have helped make America great.

The times ahead of us will not be easy times. They may require sacrifices as great as any made by the pioneers. The hardships will be just as real. Nevertheless, our people have never yet failed to follow dynamic leadership. They have never failed to respond to a fight against aggression and tyranny.

Franklin Roosevelt has tried in every way he knew how to help the average citizen, the common man. He has helped the small businessman, labor, and agriculture, and in helping them has helped everyone. He has led our people in a united effort to save democracy in the United States. Now he is leading us in an all-out struggle to save democracy in the world.

I can speak with first-hand knowledge of some of the things done by this administration. Until 1933, I farmed in Carroll County, Ind. I made my living by farming. I had no other source of income.

During the depression I lost money. I lost money on corn, on hogs, on cattle, on almost everything that I raised. At the same time, other farmers were losing money—wheat farmers, dairy farmers, cotton farmers, and tobacco farmers—farmers paid for the privilege of feeding and clothing the country.

Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Democratic majority in the Congress reversed the spiral of depression and started us on our way upward again. They helped start agriculture on the upward path by approving national farm programs. Since May 1933, farmers have used these programs to protect themselves.

Before Franklin Roosevelt, the farmers wanted national farm programs, but the men then in the White House blocked them. Farmers were told that national farm programs were unconstitutional. They were told that farmers were sectional in viewpoint and that they just wouldn't work together. The claim was made that the programs would violate fundamental laws of economics and a lot of other things. Farmers knew that the arguments came from other groups that had their heads in the trough and wanted to keep them there. But farmers couldn't do anything about the situation until they got a friend in the Executive Mansion at Washington.

We had the surplus problem to wrestle with in 1933. We had too much corn, too much wheat, too much cotton, too much tobacco, too much of almost every farm product. If we had any way of getting surpluses to the people that needed them there wouldn't have been too much. We had no way then of doing that and the more farmers raised, the cheaper their prices and the harder the times. Farmers were busy digging their own economic graves.

Since 1933, the farm programs have protected farmers from surpluses. Instead of letting them crush the life out of prices, the surpluses have been stored as reserves. We have set up an ever-normal granary as insurance against scarcity.

Today, these reserves are one of the Nation's greatest assets. It is true that we still have too much cotton and too much tobacco. I wish I could tell you that I saw some prospect of using up the stocks of these crops we have on hand during the next year or two. I can't. But I do think that pretty soon we'll need to draw on the reserves of other farm products and we're going to have to expand the production of some of them. We are going to need increased supplies of certain foodstuffs to meet the demand here and abroad.

The second World War has not followed the pattern of the first World War. After about a year of that struggle, the Allies began to draw on us for almost every agricultural commodity we had. They took our wheat, our cotton, our tobacco, everything. The demand has developed more slowly during this struggle and, as a matter of fact, the British demand for large quantities of wheat, cotton, and tobacco hasn't developed at all and doesn't seem likely to in the near future. The demand from Britain for foodstuffs from the United States is developing, however, and developing rapidly. Some of the reasons are no secret. British sources of supply on the continent are cut off. The shipping situation makes short hauls necessary and with the passage of the lease-lend bill, funds are available here for British purchases.

Within the next few months, we are going to supply the British, and perhaps other friendly nations too, with meats, dairy products, eggs, powdered and condensed milk, as well as other foodstuffs and commodities.

These products are just as vital to the British as guns and planes, and we will supply them just as willingly. We'll see that the British get food. We'll have to if they are going to withstand Hitler.

So you see why I'm not worried about the feedstuffs we've piled up. Our carry-over of corn is about 700,000,000 bushels. I think of it as pork, beef, eggs, and other food for ourselves and the other democracies.

We've got ample supplies of other feedstuffs too and, for the most part, our current supplies of almost every farm product are ample too. I wish we had a few more hogs. Last year the price of hogs was so low that farmers cut down on their production somewhat. But by feeding the hogs on hand to heavier weights we can produce the pork and lard that we need. Farmers will increase their hog production rapidly if hog prices make production profitable. The country is likely to need more dairy products and more poultry products in the not too distant future. Given fair prices, production of these commodities will be stepped up quickly.

Farmers want to produce more. I never saw a real farmer that didn't like to expand his production. All that American farmers ask is a fair price and they'll feed this country, Great Britain, and anyone else that should be fed. They'll do it at prices that are fair to consumers too. By using our farm programs and our productive capacity in the right way we can keep down unwarranted increases in the prices of food. I don't think our consumers need to worry. During the months ahead, if consumers can get other things as reasonably as they can farm products, I think they'll be pretty well off.

After this war ends, I foresee something approximating starvation over wide areas of Europe and perhaps other continents as well. Our reports are that foundation herds and flocks of Europe are being depleted and that the reserves of all kinds of food are steadily diminishing. The belligerent countries are rapidly eating into these reserves of food and the war is reducing food production. Sooner or later these hungry people will look to America for food. During the war food will be one of our strongest weapons, and after the war it will be one of our strongest weapons too.

It is about time to dust off an old slogan, "Food will win the war." I would change it a little and make it read this way, "Food may win the war and decide the peace, too."

We are still suffering from the mistakes of the first World War. Then we urged the farmer to plow up the hillsides, the plains, and to grow more and more. We did not bother about consequences after the war ended. The country sent agriculture up in a balloon but neglected to send along a parachute—and the balloon burst.

There is no reason to make those same mistakes twice. Since 1933, we've stored up a lot of fertility in our soil. It's like money in the bank. The United States can raise all it needs without impairing soil fertility. Our boast has been that we could use the national farm programs to grow more if ever we needed more. Now, we can make that boast good. These programs are adjustment programs. Farmers will grow more of what we need and less of what we do not need.

I think American agriculture is well prepared for whatever comes during the months that lie ahead.

Much of the credit for that preparation is due our President. During the past 8 years, he led the Nation out of the depression. Franklin Roosevelt balked at a do-nothing policy. He had to fight every step of the way. Now we are beginning to realize the extent of his wisdom and foresight. The programs he planned to meet the threat of the depression are being used now to meet the threat of the dictators. The T. V. A. is only one example of the foresight of Franklin D. Roosevelt. But it is a good example. If the President had not insisted upon utilizing this magnificent natural resource in the interests of all the people, T. V. A. would not now be one of the strongest links in the national defense chain. In this fight, as in many others, Franklin D. Roosevelt insisted upon public good over private gain and time has proved his wisdom.

During the depression, some people advised us to do nothing. They said the storm would pass and anything we did might make matters worse. Such a policy was not worthy of Andrew Jackson, or of the United States, or Franklin D. Roosevelt. The Nation followed the President when he rejected that counsel.

Nor is a do-nothing policy in the face of the world crisis worthy of the spirit of Andrew Jackson or the United States today. Once again Franklin D. Roosevelt has rejected a do-nothing policy. Under Roosevelt leadership, ours is a policy of action, a policy that Andrew Jackson would have approved.

More and more, the people of the United States are realizing that democracy cannot exist in this country if democracy dies elsewhere over the earth. More and more, the people are realizing that war elsewhere is a constant threat to peace here. The people of the United States want a world in which there is freedom and security. They cannot have this kind of a world by isolationism and by refusal to defend democracy in its fight against totalitarianism.

Today the United States is the most powerful nation on the face of the earth. This country has realized the dream of Andrew Jackson who fought to make America great. If it intends to remain great, this country must act like a great nation.

The choice has been made. It was made when they reelected Franklin D. Roosevelt for the third time. That broke precedent, but now, as in Jackson's day, the American people will break precedent swiftly and gladly if it is in the best interests of the United States.

Let me repeat, the choice has been made. It was made in H. R. 1776, the lend-lease bill. Every Democrat in the Tennessee delegation voted for the passage of that measure—and in so doing voted for the defense of democracy.

For the defense of democracy demands more than words and wishes. It demands action. It demands the dynamic leadership of our President. We are getting action under his leadership.

The defense of democracy demands a just peace, one that will prevent another world calamity like this war. One that will promote good will among the nations of the world; one that is shaped by the ideals of Franklin Roosevelt, H. A. Wallace, and Cordell Hull.

The defense of democracy demands the elimination of widespread unemployment and poverty in the United States. We must not repeat the mistakes we made after the last war. We must avoid national policies that result in deflation, unemployment, poverty, and collapse. During the last 8 years this country has learned that the United States needs only to use its abundant resources in the right way to give its citizens security. If we have the same kind of leadership after the defense effort ends that we have now, we will use our resources to bring about a better way of life for all Americans.

The choice has been made. Our people will insist upon a nation in which freedom, democracy, and peace can exist undisturbed, a nation of which Andrew Jackson would have been proud.

Amount of Money in Lieu of Taxes Paid By T. V. A. to States and Counties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1941

STATEMENT BY GORDON CLAPP, T. V. A. GENERAL MANAGER

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement showing the amount of money in lieu of taxes paid to States and counties in the Tennessee Valley area by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

This statement, in my opinion, answers for all time the charge that this great publicly owned utility is enabled to charge low rates for electric energy because of its being exempted from taxation.

The statement, which follows, should make interesting, if somewhat irritating reading, for the enemies of this great public enterprise:

The Tennessee Valley Authority in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, will pay to 6 States and 111 counties a total of $1,499,417 in lieu of taxes on the basis of final computations, Gordon R. Clapp, T. V. A. general manager, announced today.

The amount to be paid exceeds by $495,630 the 2-year average of State and local ad valorem taxes previously paid under private ownership on utility properties and on reservoir lands allocated to power, now owned by the Authority.

The Authority has been making monthly payments in lieu of taxes since last July on the basis of preliminary computations subject to adjustment. The payments are made in accordance with section 13 of the T. V. A. Act, as amended by Congress last June. This section provides that the Authority in the fiscal year 1941 shall pay 10 percent of its revenues from power sales of the preceding year, excluding sales to Federal agencies, to the States and counties in which it owns property and sells electricity.

The section also provides that the minimum payment to any county or State shall be the 2-year average of ad valorem taxes on utility properties acquired by the T. V. A. and on the 40 percent of reservoir lands allocated to power production. Because of the operation of this minimum provision, the total payments of the Authority exceed 10 percent of power revenues by $51,175.

Tax data on which the final computations were based have been submitted to the officials of the counties concerned and, in ac-

cordance with his request, to a representative of the Governor of Tennessee for checking and verification, Mr. Clapp said. All questions raised by either State or local officials relative to the tax computations have been answered and, insofar as is known, settled to their satisfaction.

The final computations were based on an exhaustive study by the Authority's staff. After passage of the Norris-Sparkman amendment to section 13 of the T. V. A. Act, conferences were held with State officials in Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Tennessee—the States in which the Authority has constructed dams or purchased power property from the private utilities. Methods proposed for caculating the amount of the Authority's payments in lieu of taxes were explained in detail and met with general approval, Mr. Clapp said.

T. V. A. staff members visited 70 of the 111 counties in connection with the collection of required tax data and checking of final figures with local county officials.

One half of the $1,448,242 representing the percentage payment is apportioned among the States in the same ratio as the book value of the power properties of the T. V. A. located in each State; the other half is apportioned in the same ratio as the sales of electric power within the States.

In the States of Georgia and Mississippi and in the 111 counties involved, the payments are determined by the minimum provision of the act for replacement of ad valorem taxes. In the other 4 States, Alabama, Tennessee, North Carolina, and Kentucky, these amounts are less than the amounts required to be paid in lieu of taxes on the basis of percentage of gross revenues. The payments in these 4 States, therefore, exceed the minimum of State and local ad valorem taxes.

The figures announced today apply only to the Authority's payments in lieu of taxes; they do not involve in any way the taxes and tax equivalents provided by municipalities and cooperative associations distributing T. V. A. power, which are now being paid in an amount in excess of $1,800,000 annually.

T. V. A. payments in lieu of taxes by States are presented below:

Average annual ad valorem tax paid prior to T. V. A. acquisition [1]

State	Power property	Reservoir land (40 percent)	Total	Computed payments
Alabama	$15,112.18	$30,866.61	$45,978.79	$321,799
Georgia	64,841.01		64,841.01	64,841
Kentucky		3,278.64	3,278.64	28,096
Mississippi	46,905.82	1,267.77	48,173.59	48,174
N. Carolina		3,749.51	3,749.51	33,889
Tennessee	799,017.96	38,747.21	837,765.17	1,002,618
Total	925,876.97	77,909.74	1,003,786.71	1,499,417

[1] The above data do not include an estimate of former business taxes.

T. V. A. payments to individual counties for the year ending June 30, 1941, are as follows:

Tennessee Valley Authority

PAYMENTS TO INDIVIDUAL COUNTIES, YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1941

Tennessee (12 months):	
Anderson	[1] $16,282.70
Bedford	5,621.75
Benton	[1] 896.38
Bledsoe	15,984.89
Blount	9,304.49
Bradley	[1] 32,408.97
Campbell	[1] 19,817.22
Cannon	7,174.84
Carroll	24.35
Claiborne	[1] 3,656.65
Clay	56.94
Cocke	3,024.00
Coffee	$2,715.92
Crockett	186.12
Cumberland	1,034.95
Davidson	11,078.41
Decatur	5,470.56
De Kalb	106.55
Dickson	1,551.97
Dyer	284.76
Fentress	39.15
Franklin	9,405.85
Gibson	543.87
Giles	2,143.52
Grainger	[1] 1,013.40
Grundy	5,209.01
Hamblen	803.85
Hamilton	[1] 41,413.26
Hardin	[1] 4,970.48
Hawkins	997.30
Haywood	1,347.43
Henderson	2,408.42
Henry	718.07
Hickman	13,062.19
Houston	54.60
Humphreys	[1] 2,629.38
Jefferson	6,929.55
Knox	17,885.36
Lake	36.37
Lauderdale	1,045.86
Lawrence	2,300.74
Lewis	11,067.02
Lincoln	3,464.26
Loudon	[1] 16,243.55
Madison	1,923.74
Marion	[1] 81,699.52
Marshall	8,463.20
Maury	10,221.20
McMinn	[1] 42,330.23
McNairy	2,600.91
Meigs	[1] 3,414.20
Monroe	22,901.53
Moore	1,376.66
Morgan	3,801.21
Obion	419.04
Perry	1,549.42
Pickett	13.40
Polk	112,315.00
Putnam	1,287.43
Rhea	[1] 4,495.61
Roane	[1] 9,648.18
Rutherford	15,246.81
Sequatchie	7,375.42
Sevier	7,923.79
Shelby	8,091.61
Smith	2,502.79
Sumner	704.14
Tipton	1,486.06
Union	[1] 8,472.75
Van Buren	9,108.76
Warren	37,895.47
Wayne	18,791.95
Weakley	1,596.03
White	33,497.61
Williamson	5,410.04
Wilson	7,090.90
Total	756,069.52
Georgia (12 months):	
Fannin	54,501.66
Murray	26.00
Total	54,527.66
Mississippi (12 months):	
Alcorn	4,442.27
Chickasaw	1,408.72
Choctaw	777.88
Clay	5,221.09
Itawamba	877.95
Lee	5,332.94
Lowndes	3,215.45
Monroe	2,306.84
Neshoba	1,171.58
Noxubee	791.01
Oktibbeha	2,610.53
Prentiss	1,333.91
Tippah	$15.17
Tishomingo	[1] 2,759.14
Union	10.47
Webster	738.65
Winston	1,479.59
Total	34,493.29
Alabama (12 months):	
Colbert	[1] 3,465.06
Franklin	730.48
Jackson	[1] 3,551.36
Lauderdale	[1] 6,713.98
Lawrence	[1] 1,709.78
Limestone	[1] 4,020.06
Madison	[1] 681.58
Marshall	[1] 4,793.10
Morgan	[1] 4,176.63
De Kalb	[1] 2.00
Total	29,844.01
Kentucky (12 months):	
Calloway	[1] 372.28
Livingston	[1] 382.06
Lyon	[1] 366.23
Marshall	[1] 1,956.15
Trigg	[1] 69.23
Total	3,145.95
North Carolina (12 months):	
Cherokee	[1] 3,449.59
Grand total, 111 counties	881,530.02

[1] Includes reservoir properties.

Tennessee Valley Authority—Continued

Tennessee Valley Authority—Continued

[1] Includes reservoir properties.

A Bigger W. P. A. Program for Fiscal Year 1942

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1941

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the unemployment problem is still with us and will remain with us until we meet it realistically. There was a time when the unemployment problem seemed too vast and too complex for us to solve. Right now, with the added stimulus given employment by all these defense activities, we can solve it.

If W. P. A. employed between 2,000,000 and 2,500,000 workers during fiscal year 1942, the unemployment and relief situation would be well in hand. As it is, W. P. A. will employ slightly more than 1,000,000 on the basis of the Budget figure. This is far too low.

Defense stimulation will cause unemployment to average about 2,000,000 less in fiscal year 1942. This means that unemployment will average about 5,000,000 if we use the most conservative unemployment estimates. The unemployed in need will average about 2,500,000 during fiscal year 1942. If W. P. A. employed all these needy unemployed there would still be about 2,500,000 unemployed who would not be on the W. P. A. program.

A program of this size should be the minimum. There are two major reasons why this is the lowest possible figure that would permit the W. P. A. to handle the job adequately. First, the estimate of average unemployment for fiscal year 1942 is based on a projection of the lowest unemployment estimate of National Industrial Conference Board. A higher estimate, the C. I. O., would give us 2,000,000 more unemployed in fiscal year 1942. Therefore, viewed statistically, a figure of 2,000,000 to 2,500,000 workers eligible for W. P. A. is on the conservative side.

Second, the estimate of average unemployment for fiscal 1942 assumes that the labor force will increase by only the normal amount—that is, by 600,000. It is practically certain, however, that more than the usual number will crowd into the labor force. There are some 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 surplus potential workers in the rural areas. Women who normally do not look for jobs, and youths who are in school because no work is available, are potential workers. Such persons are not counted in present unemployment figures because they have not been looking for work. When industrial jobs open up, however, many of these people will apply. This occurred in 1917–18 when the labor supply showed an abnormal increase of about 3,000,000. Many of these new workers will get the jobs that open up during fiscal 1942, so that unemployment will not decline as rapidly as employment increases. This is another reason why our unemployment estimate is on the conservative side.

For these reasons a W. P. A. program of from 2,000,000 to 2,500,000 is needed. There would be plenty of available people to put on a program of this size. This would in no way interfere with the defense effort.

Modification of the sponsors' contribution provision is essential for a program of this size. Defense projects at present require no sponsor contribution. The W. P. A. could expand its defense projects in the coming year to employ 1,000,000 workers; the remaining 1,000,000 to 1,500,00 could be employed on other useful projects with the help of sponsors' contributions. A satisfactory program could be operated for about $2,300,000,000.

Are the projects available? The need for expanded defense work is apparent. As military posts are increased in size and number, the work that W. P. A. is well adapted to do is also increased. As industrial areas expand, because of defense contracts, more community facilities and services are needed. In spite of the vast amount of local public works that W. P. A. has carried out in the past, there is still no community, whether it is a defense area or not, that does not need further public improvements.

National defense has become the Nation's dominant objective. It requires the maximum utilization of all economic resources—labor, capital, and management. For 10 years this country has wasted enormous labor reserves through idleness. We cannot afford to continue this course. Millions of workers will stand idle the next fiscal year in spite of the defense program. W. P. A. can put much of this idle labor to work on necessary defense activities. Any other course is a national waste.

The country needs increased defense work. The unemployed need jobs. Public policy and common sense require that these two needs be put together. A bigger work program can do this. A W. P. A. program of 2,000,000 to 2,500,000 workers would round out a program of full employment and full defense in 1942.

Urge Passage of School-Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1941

PETITION OF CITIZENS OF MICHIGAN

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a petition urging prompt action in the passage of the proposed Lanham bill to extend aid to school districts now being seriously affected by the expansion of military establishments and defense industries. This petition is signed by executives of various civic organizations in the community adjacent to Camp Custer, Mich., and indicates the seriousness of the school problems in hundreds of like communities in the United States. In fairness to the schools, citizens, and children of such communities, the Lanham bill should be reported and passed without further delay.

The petition follows:

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., *April 17, 1941.*

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SHAFER: A number of active community committees and associations, whose presidents have signed below, realizing that the Federal housing reservation, now consisting of 250 homes in our school district, will bring to our schools approximately 500 children in addition to our increases from our own building program, and being aware that the Lakeview School and the Prairieview School are now overcrowded, feel that if appropriations contemplated under the Lanham bill, now before Congress, are not forthcoming in the very near future half-day sessions for our children, as well as the children from the Federal housing reservation, will be inevitable.

We therefore respectfully petition you to urge prompt action on whatever legislation is pending which may help relieve our school situation and properly aid in the defense program of the United States.

Very truly yours,

Lakeview Board of Education, by Raymond Gerald, president; Lakeview Parent-Teacher Association, by Mae J. Kikstadt, president; Prairieview Parent-Teacher Association, by Virginia S. Stadle, president; Battle Creek Township Board, by Walter Betterby, president; Battle Creek Township Improvement Association, by James S. Creighton, president; Metropolitan Auxiliary Spirit '38, by Pearl West, president; Battle Creek Township Service Committee, by Jane L. Penty, vice chairman; Lakeview Community Council, by Glenn O. Hoffimes, president; Metropolitan Club of Battle Creek Township, by Clarence West, President; Lakeview Sunshine Circle, by Eliza Hurdelbrink, president; Lakeview Alumni Association, by Donald Slighly, president.

Congress Should Pass National Old-Age Pension Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM RANGE FACTS, VIRGINIA, MINN.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the people of my district realize that the present social-security law is a failure so far as the aged folks are concerned, and they are supporting efforts to have Congress pass a national old-age pension law at this session, so that our pioneers, now in the sunset of life, may have enough help from the Government to guarantee to them food and clothing and the comforts of life in their old age. I have just received in today's mail from Martin Stram, secretary of one of the clubs, at Grand Rapids, Minn., a petition with 1,023 signatures. Under our Constitution these people petition the Congress that they have elected for redress and relief. I shall ask that this petition be referred to the Ways and Means Committee of the House. This is the committee before which proposed legislation for national old-age pensions is pending. I shall urge that the committee take favorable action.

In this connection, I call to the attention of the House an editorial in Range Facts, a weekly newspaper, of Virginia, Minn., on April 17, 1941. This is by George A. Perham, the editorial writer, who has long been a student of old-age-pension problems. Mr. Perham believes in the justice of a pension based on age. His editorial is as follows:

ARE WE GETTING NEARER?

For several years this column has from time to time carried arguments for a universal old-age pension—based on age alone—but not at 65 yars of age, because that would take more funds than could be made available. At a higher age, there would be fewer to pay. How much money could be made available would have to be estimated, while vital statistics should make it possible to determine where to place the age limit provided there could be some agreement on what would be a reasonable old-age pension. A process of adaptation would be necessary.

Until now we have seen nothing to indicate any other newspaper editor was thinking

along this line. Therefore it was with some surprise and gratification that in a Duluth News Tribune editorial discussing mainly what $30 a month means in terms of an investment at 3 or 6 percent, we read this paragraph:

"A great many people must be wondering about these things today. It might be more wholesome if we forgot all about need and paid every person above a certain age a fixed income, just for being that old. It would end all this business of liens and investigations and compelling relatives to help out. And it would give some people who had exercised a little thrift the feeling that they were getting something back after a lifetime of paying taxes from which others were the chief beneficiaries."

Perhaps some day the justice of an old-age pension for all will be generally realized and it will come about. But it will have to be purposely and solely for the benefit of the aged, not a scheme for correcting economic inequalities that always have and always will exist.

Morris Sheppard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1941

POEM BY REV. S. P. GILMORE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem written by a constituent of mine, Rev. S. P. Gilmore:

IN MEMORY OF HON. MORRIS SHEPPARD

He built his name in halls of fame,
His memory lives on;
To him his duty was the same,
As honors great he won.

No mortal man was found more true,
To home and church and state,
Than he whose honored life we knew,
And live to mourn his fate.

Though fate as mortal man may say,
Is but the passing time,
He stopped here for a passing day,
And looked for things sublime.

He then beheld them in his work,
Those summits strove to reach;
His life, his duty, did not shirk,
Great lessons true did teach.

And though his lessons were his life,
Each day a lesson gave;
His messages were for the right,
To help each other live.

No greater honor can man know,
No greater gift can give,
Than faithfulness to live and sow,
That others here might live.

That honored, noble, stalwart man,
Our Morris Sheppard, friend;
For nations' rights he took his stand,
Was faithful to the end.

He wrote not just in halls of fame,
Nor just with word or pen,
But with his life he built a name,
T'will live in hearts of men.

—*A friend, Rev. S. P. Gilmore.*

Decentralization of Industry Essential to National-Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1941

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, in order to keep the record straight, we now have the Office of Production Management and, following that, a plant-site committee under that office. They are charged with the responsibility of really doing something about the problem of decentralizing industry, so that throughout the United States localities where no orders have been placed for making of war materials in our national-defense program may be properly considered and recognized. We are also told that these agencies are to work with the Army and Navy in this program.

I was very much interested in the announcement under date of March 26, 1941, by Robert W. Horton, Director of Information in the Office for Emergency Management. This announcement and the document therewith by the National Defense Advisory Commission clearly indicates a total failure in the past, and gently hints that the Army and the Navy and the Maritime Commission will in the future give some consideration to the question of decentralization. In Minnesota, for example, no consideration whatever is being given to the economic problems of the people, if other localities are to build war industries and continue to expand. Of course, the people of Minnesota will continue to furnish soldiers and continue to pay taxes, while their people remain unemployed, and while their skilled workmen are taken from home to the eastern shipyards and factories. There is no use kidding ourselves. That is what is taking place day by day. In the meantime, in Canada, at Fort William and Port Arthur, on the shores of Lake Superior, one of the Great Lakes, in case you never heard of it, they have an airplane factory going full speed ahead, and they are building ships, with thousands of men employed. This is taking place just a few miles beyond the boundary line that separates Minnesota from Ontario.

The announcement is as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D. C.

To All Members of Congress:

Realizing the extreme interest shown by Members of both the House and Senate in the location of new plant sites as a part of the national-defense program, I wish to call your attention to the resolution adopted by the National Defense Advisory Commission relating to policy in connection with further choice of new plant locations, a copy of which is attached.

If there are any further questions in regard to this release, please feel free to contact this office.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT W. HORTON,
Director of Information.

[Office for Emergency Management, National Defense Advisory Commission, immediate release, March 26, 1941]

A statement of policy on the location of new defense facilities was adopted today by the National Defense Advisory Commission

Following its adoption, this policy was transmitted to the Office of Production Management for reference to the recently established Plant Site Committee.

The statement of policy follows:

"The National Defense Advisory Commission regards the selection of locations for the new industrial facilities required by the defense program as a task of outstanding importance. On the sites which are selected depends not only the strategic security of our defense industries and much of their efficiency for defense production, but also important and permanent consequences for the economic life of different parts of the Nation.

"Experience gained during the past 10 months would indicate that the immediate ends of national defense are largely consistent with the longer-run objective of a better-balanced industrial economy. To reach these objectives it has become apparent that the following principles must govern the location of new industrial facilities:

"'1. That sites be avoided in cities or regions where defense orders are absorbing or are likely to absorb the available labor supply, or to congest housing, transport, or other facilities.

"'2. That every possible preference be given to locations where large reserves of unemployed or poorly employed people are available and where industrialization during the defense period will contribute to a better long-run balance between industry and agriculture. These conditions are particularly acute in many areas of the South and West.

"3. That where facilities must be located in the present industrial areas, special attention be given to regions which have suffered a decline in their peacetime industries or to cities which have not been heavily engaged in defense production.

"4. That the proper location of new plants, the wider distribution of defense contracts, and an aggressive policy to promote the subcontracting of the larger defense orders held by private contractors, all be considered essential parts of a well-rounded program to obtain larger use of the human and material resources of the country in the defense effort.

"A plant-site committee has recently been established in the Office of Production Management. Upon this committee will fall the main responsibility for seeing to it that the principles listed above are carried out. Except as specified by statute, the responsibilities of the National Defense Advisory Commission in the location of plants will be superseded. The Commission recommends that the new plate-site committee be provided with a technical staff capable of giving detailed study to proposed defense locations and that it work closely with the Army and Navy at all stages in the consideration of new sites. The experience of the Commission with the earlier program suggests the desirability of a systematic review of the complete plans of the War and Navy Departments for new facilities at the earliest possible date. This should be with a view to seeing that the programs as a whole are

developed in accordance with a broad policy of decentralization as outlined above. It is also desirable that the committee, on the basis of appropriate study, be able to recommend specific locations for different types of defense production. Finally, it should be so staffed that it is able to investigate and give sympathetic consideration to the resources and facilities of communities which are asking for consideration as sites for defense plants."

Seek Action on Legislation To Improve Conditions for Custodial Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1941

RESOLUTION BY LOCAL NO. 17, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POST OFFICE CUSTODIAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution passed by the legislative committee of Local No. 17, of the National Association of Post Office Custodial Employees, asking enactment of legislation now pending in Congress. The resolution follows:

DETROIT, MICH., *March 31, 1941.*

The Honorable PAUL W. SHAFER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: At the last meeting of Local, No. 17, National Association of Post Office Custodial Employees, members voted that our legislative committee appeal to you legislators in Washington for your help in passing any legislation that will give us relief from the condition we, as custodial employees, find ourselves burdened with.

The cost of living has gone up much higher and the largest majority of these employees have families to support and children to educate. They find it impossible to meet these obligations without lowering their standard of living.

Employees in custodial service do not receive an automatic increase which is granted to other postal employees. Some employees in our building have been in service for 13 years with one $60 raise and none receive the maximum rate of pay. We seem to be the forgotten men of the Post Office Department.

There is never any money appropriated for us. There has been in the Federal building here in Detroit enough money saved in wages before vacancies were filled to give half the employees a $60 raise. These employees had to work harder to keep up the building, but the money saved went elsewhere. This being a first-class post office, with so many square feet of space to take care of, we feel we should receive the maximum rate of pay for work done, while at present we only receive pay equal to about a second-class post-office rating.

We, the legislative committee, are appealing to you in behalf of the custodial employees to do all in your power to relieve this situation. New legislation or appropriate money for our maximum rate of pay would help.

We call your attention to the following bills: H. R. 603, H. R. 2232, H. R. 2075, H. R. 1851, H. R. 1057, S. 474, S. 675, S. 220.

Respectfully yours,
JOHN SCHMIDT,
HENRY HIGGINS,
JESSE PETERS,
Legislative Committee,
Local No. 17, N. A. P. O. C. E.

J. Adam Bede and the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1941

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents who has a clear vision of the good that will result from the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway project is J. Adam Bede, of Duluth, Minn. Mr. Bede is a former Member of this House, and served on the Rivers and Harbors Committee. He was then an ardent advocate of the seaway. Upon his retirement from the House his activities in its behalf have continued. In an issue of Bede's Budget, a magazine which Mr. Bede published many years ago, he pointed out how transportation has developed on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence.

In most effective language he said, in one of his articles:

In 1854 one man with a horse and a cart transferred all the commerce between Lake Superior and Lake Huron, more than a mile and a half, around the rapids of the Ste. Marie River, now popularly known as the Soo. One day some men with vision decided it would facilitate transportation to channel the rapids, and let the ships go through without unloading at this half-way point. But the owner of the horse and cart opposed the movement, and declared its advocates had hysteria. However, the dream came true; the horse and cart and their obstreperous owner, long in restraint of trade, have returned to dust, and a hundred tons of freight pass through the Soo in a single season.

These observations by Mr. Bede, made many years ago, are in point now, in connection with the St. Lawrence development. Those who are opposed to the project represent the horse and cart type of alarmists' ideas. On October 16, 1940, President Roosevelt established the St. Lawrence Advisory Committee, and on October 16, 1940, he advised Congress that the need for power was urgent, and that the project should be undertaken now. Since that date you are acquainted with other developments. Now is the time to pass enabling legislation, unless, in the language of J. Adam Bede, you want to continue to use "horse and cart" methods. I prefer the President's program of accomplishment.

Will Old King Coal Take Another Beating?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1941

ADDRESS OF JOHN D. BATTLE, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NATIONAL COAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, honeyed words and glib phrases used by advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway cannot dispel the cold fact that approval of such an economic monstrosity is bound to cause the gaunt specter of unemployment to raise its ugly head and visit untold sufferings on many coal miners, railroaders, and employees in kindred industries.

The coal industry has been waging a heroic effort to rehabilitate itself. Thousands of American coal miners, despite their hazardous occupations, of necessity must follow their vocation to provide a livelihood for their women and children. They are eager to go down into the bowels of the earth and eke out an existence in order to keep them from the relief rolls of the Nation and their families from privation.

The St. Lawrence seaway, despite efforts to garb it in the attire of national defense, stands revealed as a classic example of a political parasite being foisted upon the American people under the guise of patriotism. Well may we join the coal miners of America and thousands of employees in every walk of life in exclaiming, "Oh, national defense. What sins are committed in thy name!"

Recently Mr. John D. Battle, executive secretary of the National Coal Association, delivered an address at Philadelphia before the eastern regional conference on Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway and power project.

Mr. Battle expounds the views of his association and discloses the devastating effect the St. Lawrence seaway is destined to have on employment conditions in the coal fields of America. Devoid of any glib phrases and minus the patriotic thumping of breasts, Mr. Battle has calmly analyzed the St. Lawrence seaway and exposes it as a delusion and a snare. Yet the proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway would have the American people regard it as a dream highway to the seven seas. Mr. Battle's address is as follows:

I shall be brief. There is no need for any lengthy exposition. The position of the National Coal Association and of the entire coal industry, producers and mine workers alike, in opposition to the St. Lawrence project is well known. The reasons for that position and the nature of our objections have been widely advertised.

Our opposition is not new. It dates from the inception of the St. Lawrence project

many years ago and has been renewed whenever the proposition has come to the front. We had hoped that we had heard the last of it when the Senate, in 1934, rejected the St. Lawrence treaty.

But the President has clung to it with the same tenacity as a dog with a bone and, now, under the broad cloak of national defense, is attempting to revive the project and to obtain the assent of Congress to a new St. Lawrence treaty that will permit immediate commencement of this undertaking.

We think the defense program is being done a serious injustice by injecting these political projects into it. If more electric power is needed for national defense, it can be had without further straining the credit and resources of the country by this proposed waste of taxpayers' money.

The administration contends, in advocacy of the St. Lawrence project, that "a new source of cheap power for national defense must be developed immediately."

Surely there can be no need for devising new sources of power so long as the Nation's premier power medium and greatest natural resource—bituminous coal—remains close at hand in virtually inexhaustible supply.

There can be no disputing the fundamental proposition that the cheapest and most immediate way to provide additional electric power, if needed for national defense, is to construct additional coal-burning steam plants.

There can be no escape from the self-evident truth that the only way that the St. Lawrence hydro project and seaway can be brought into being with any degree of immediacy—that is to say within 5 or 6 years—is by diverting to its construction men and materials in huge amount—now needed in present shipbuilding, present aircraft production, present munitions plants, and other things in these categories. It means sacrificing immediate and super urgent construction in order to embark upon a long-range project which is, by no means, so feasible and so advantageous as is now made to appear.

Congress will not have far to seek for complete proof that the St. Lawrence hydroelectric power facilities upon which the President is so insistent will cost twice as much and take three times as long to get ready as coal-burning, electric-generating plants of equivalent capacity. The immense steam plant for national defense, now being built by the T. V. A., affords a striking object lesson, and, since it is a Government enterprise, it is a yardstick that the administration cannot disavow.

The T. V. A. steam plant, started last August, will be finished and in operation next December, or sooner—total elapsed time 16 months, or less. It will have cost less than $15,000,000 and have a capacity of 180,000 kilowatts.

The time to complete and the over-all cost of the St. Lawrence hydro project are debatable questions, but, at the speediest, it will be 3 or 4 years before any electric power becomes available and, obviously, it will be much longer than that before the seaway becomes a reality. As for the cash, one point is clear, namely, that the New York Power Authority, a State agency borrowing the funds on the State's credit, is to be called upon to chip in $90,000,000 as its share in the enterprise, and is promised hydroelectric generating facilities stated to be 1,100,000 horsepower capacity.

Congress and the citizens of the State of New York have the right to assume that the New York Power Authority, if so minded, can build coal-burning steam plants for the generation of electric power in the State of New York just as expeditiously and just as economically as the T. V. A. is now doing in the State of Tennessee. If that be true, then it follows as a matter of elementary arithmetic that the New York Power Authority could build a series of strategically located steam plants with a total installed capacity equal to the 1,100,000 horsepower of St. Lawrence hydro power for $68,000,000, as compared with $90,000,000 outlay budgeted as one—and only one—of the items in the half-a-billion-dollar St. Lawrence scheme.

Aside from this initial saving of more than $20,000,000 in capital investment, a saving which would accrue to the taxpayers or the electric power consumers, or both, in the State of New York, this new increment of electric power, which the administration asserts is so needful for national defense, would become available early in 1942 instead of late in 1944 or 1945.

In the light of these facts, to undertake the St. Lawrence project would be a tragic blunder.

The coal equivalent of the hydroelectric power encompassed in this first stage of the St. Lawrence project is in excess of 5,000,000 tons' loss annually. This represents 5,000,000 man-days of employment in coal mines, the railroads, and related industries which would be wiped out each year. This is no time for further unsound experiments.

But to the basic objections which have been inherent in the St. Lawrence project from its inception, the present considerations of national defense and war perils afford further reasons for its rejection.

The St. Lawrence hydro power development runs counter to the cardinal national-defense policy of decentralization of supply bases. It would be an easy and vulnerable target for enemy bombers or sabotage. The superior advantages from the military standpoint of a dozen steam plants at widely separated points and independently operated is self-evident.

Furthermore, the National Defense Commission has clearly indicated an intent to locate war plants away from the Canadian border and the Atlantic seaboard, wherever possible.

The proponents of the St. Lawrence project have now trumped up a new alibi, and they are attempting to justify the waterway feature as an aid to national defense on the ground that it will permit the construction of ocean-going merchant ships and fighting ships on the shores of the Lakes, which is claimed are exposed to less dangers than shipyards on the seacoast.

But if we are thinking of this matter in terms of war, who would dare to build ships for war service in an inland sea with the risk that access to the Atlantic might be cut off by a few well-placed bombs in the locks at the International Rapids section?

And when we talk about the seaway in terms of national defense and war, let us not lose sight of the fact that the Great Lakes and cities of their shores are immune today from attack from the sea; but convert them to ocean ports, as it is claimed by the proponents that the St. Lawrence seaway will do, and the problem of their defense and safety in time of war becomes a seaport proposition with the extra risks and the extra defenses. When we develop the Mississippi, it is a truly inland waterway and we control its mouth to the sea. We do not control the mouth of the St. Lawrence nor important spans in this seaway from the Lakes to the Atlantic.

In the light of all of these considerations the obligation upon Congress to curb the President's intentions with respect to the St. Lawrence is abundantly clear. The producers of bituminous coal are of one mind in a resolve to leave no stone unturned to arouse Congress and the country to a realization of the folly of this undertaking before it is too late.

The President's unwillingness to submit the St. Lawrence project to the Senate for ratification as a treaty is significant of the fraud of the national-defense argument as applied to the project.

The Senate, in its present mood, can certainly be counted upon to ratify any treaty in very short order if the treaty is really a national-defense measure. A United States treaty with Mexico was submitted to the Senate a week or 2 ago, ratified within a few days of its submission, and debated on the Senate floor in less than an hour.

The designation of the St. Lawrence treaty as an "agreement" is manifestly for the purpose of avoiding the constitutional provision wherein the President is authorized to enter into treaties only with the advice and consent of the Senate and the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators present.

The Constitution contains no definition of the word "treaty." There was no need to do so. Its meaning in the realm of international law has never been in doubt. The American colonists, the framers of the Constitution, were entirely familiar with treaties. They had made them with the Indians. They had seen them between Britain and France with reference to the lands on this continent.

Now, under the Roosevelt administration, some international agreements continue to be labeled "treaties" and to be submitted to the Senate for ratification, but not all. We now have the so-called reciprocal trade agreements which for all practical purposes are treaties but which are executed by the President and become effective unless both branches of Congress, by concurrent resolution, veto them.

Recently we witnessed the making of an international agreement between the United States and Great Britain in respect to naval bases. This was a treaty in everything except its name. Nevertheless, it was not contingent by any ratification by the Senate or any concurrence by either branch of Congress. The President merely sent Congress a copy of the agreement for their information. Now comes the St. Lawrence agreement which, although popularly referred to as a treaty with Canada, is, in fact, an agreement between the United States and His Majesty the King of Great Britain and is to become operative after it is approved by concurrent resolutions of the House and the Senate and after approved by the Canadian Parliament. The effect of this is to substitute a majority vote of both branches of Congress for the constitutional requirement of two-thirds vote by the Senate.

Canada is in a difficult position on this proposition. The President of the United States is insistent that Canada consent to the initiation of the St. Lawrence project, and Canada, under all the circumstances, cannot very well afford to go counter to the President's wishes. Now let me revert to the question of the St. Lawrence seaway as it relates to the coal industry. It may be that we are in for a long war, a war of many years. But we know that it cannot go on forever and that when hostilities come to an end international trade on some basis or other will be resumed, and in our present consideration of the St. Lawrence project we must not lose sight of its long-range effect in a post-war economy. The St. Lawrence project, if it eventuates, would almost inevitably destroy the present outlet for American coal in the Canadian market. Canada in years past has taken as high as 17,000,000 tons of bituminous coal from the United States. Currently our sales of bituminous in the Canadian market amount to around 10,000,000 tons annually.

American coal in recent years has to contend with a 75-cent per ton Canadian import tax, a 40-cent per ton tariff differential in favor of British coal, and subventions in the form of freight rebates which Canada grants to her own coal producers. But, even with these handicaps, our Canadian market is still a substantial item in our own annual production.

The basic contention upon which the St. Lawrence seaway rests is that ocean freight carriers will move in and out from all the Lake ports to Europe, affording a cheap all-water transport for our export grain and other

commodities. Not so much is said about what kind of cargoes these vessels will bring in to the Lake ports from overseas. There will be no point in their coming in empty.

There is wide divergence of opinion among trade and transport experts as to the probable course of events and volume of trade and diversions of traffic from rail to water if the seaway materializes, but virtually complete agreement that one of the most promising inbound cargoes will be coal from Britain, Russia, and other countries.

Canada and Great Britain, under the system of Empire preference, encourage the import of British coal into Canada. Coal from Canada, or Britain, or Russia enters the United States duty free.

Taking all of these factors into account, it will be seen that there is sound basis for anticipating that foreign coal in the long run, after the war, would displace American coal in the Canadian market and then enter in our domestic markets at Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, Duluth, all large coal-consuming centers or adjacent thereto.

A similar situation will be presented with respect to the inflow into our markets of foreign petroleum oil, crude and fuel oil, from Venezuela and other Central-American points. This imported oil has been coming in at Atlantic and Gulf ports at the rate of 50,000,000 barrels annually.

This foreign oil does not now invade inland American markets, but in Atlantic seaboard territory is a serious menact to coal and is resulting in considerable displacement of coal. The St. Lawrence seaway, upon its completion, exposes the Lake ports and adjacent territory to a flood of foreign oil with resulting disruption of coal markets in large areas now immune from this destructive competition.

The displacement of coal by St. Lawrence hydropower, the loss of the Canadian market for American coal, the impairment of our own domestic markets for coal by the inroads of foreign coal, and foreign oil brought into the Lake ports on cargo vessels, all mean less coal for our own railroads to carry, less freight revenues, less train movement, less railway-fuel consumption.

Summarizing the foregoing in terms of coal displacement, there is the prospective loss in annual tonnage by St. Lawrence hydropower ranging from five to thirty-five million tons; the prospective loss of our Canadian market of upward of 10,000,000 tons annually; the further inroads of foreign coal and oil upon our domestic market, impossible of accurate forecast but which might easily amount to another 20,000,000 tons annually; and, added to all this, the resultant shrinkage in railroad-fuel conumption.

To visualize the consequences of any such displacement of coal, the loss of markets and decline in output, it need only be said that every million tons of coal displaced subtracts nearly $2,000,000 annually from the gross revenues of the coal producers, and 60 cents, or more, out of every dollar received by the producers goes to labor in the form of wages. It subtracts more than $2,000,000 annually from railway freight revenues and 44 cents out of every railway dollar goes to labor in wages. Every million tons of coal lost represents the loss of 1,000,000 man-days in work and wages for those employed in the mining, transportation, and sale of coal somewhere along the line.

The producers of coal, for whom I am authorized to speak, are as militant as ever in their opposition to a project that is a dagger aimed at their heart. They are not misled by this false claim that the St. Lawrence, either in its hydropower or its waterway aspects, is essential to national defense. They know that it is not. Their task today is to make the Congress and the country see that the national-defense claims for the St. Lawrence project are a fraud and that, instead of helping our national-defense efforts, its initiation would hinder these efforts. This job of acquainting the Congress and the country with a true picture of the matter is going to require individual work. The mere sending of resolutions is not enough. It is the kind of job that requires each person concerned to do something personal about it.

It can be done. Thank God, we have not yet been deprived of the right to speak our mind. Now is the time to exercise that right before it is too late.

Fellow Traveling Doesn't Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE RICHMOND (IND.) PALLADIUM

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a very enlightening editorial which appeared in the Richmond Palladium, of Richmond, Ind., on the 18th day of April 1941. I hope every Member of the House will read this very terse editorial, which speaks to the American people in unmistakable language. History has given to us the result of the action of the "reds" in many foreign countries which have fallen before the Axis Powers. It is the duty of the United States of America to awaken before it is too late.

The editorial follows:

[From the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium of April 18, 1941]

FELLOW TRAVELING DOESN'T PAY

The nonaggression pact just signed by Russia and Japan is another slap in the face for President Roosevelt, who has been wooing Red Joe Stalin for over 8 years.

It began shortly after Roosevelt was first elected President. Due to his insistence, our Government recognized the Communist government of Russia and permitted a Communist Ambassador to come to Washington. At the time it was understood between the two countries that the Russian Communists were not to take advantage of their right to circulate freely in the United States to use propaganda for the spread of communism here.

That understanding was soon broken, a fact that did not seem to bother Roosevelt. On the contrary, he appointed to Government office many who have been found to be fellow travelers with the Communists. He criticized Representative DIES, who has been turning up and exposing the "reds" and near "reds" in office and out of office but actively engaged in trying to overthrow our free institutions.

Now that Mrs. Roosevelt is not so thick with the "reddish" American Youth Congress—and whether this is real reformation or only expediency time alone will tell—there is hope that the President also will grow further away from Moscow.

He calls for unity in the Nation. God knows we need it, too, in the face of the Hitler menace, which is a combination or partnership of Hitler, Stalin, and Japan. Roosevelt calls for unity. He had better lead the way to that unity by himself, first breaking clean with Stalin and Stalin's fellow travelers in the United States.

The "War-for-Profit" Myth Is Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1941

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, war fever in Washington has happily subsided very noticeably in the past few weeks as Members of Congress and other Government officials have come face to face with what war might mean to this Republic and as citizens throughout the country have registered their vigorous opposition to any program—including convoying—which would plunge this Nation into a shooting war.

AMERICA'S SOBER SECOND JUDGMENT IS ALWAYS SOUND

The history of this Republic amply demonstrates that the sober second judgment of our citizens is thoroughly reliable and sound. It is only when this country blindly follows its impulses or emotions rather than its realistic judgment that it acts in ways likely to jeopardize its liberties, bankrupt its finances, or destroy its basic forms of government. The composite judgment of 130,000,000 Americans can be depended upon to point a rational and realistic national and international policy if this judgment is permitted to "jell" and if public officials will follow the desires of the people as a whole rather than the dictates of pressure groups representing fractional portions of our citizenry. It is the impact of this composite desire of the people to keep out of war and to prevent convoys by the American Navy which has contributed so largely to the very substantial increase in opposition to our entrance into war which is presently apparent in Washington. This revived and reinforced opposition to war is especially noticeable among Members of Congress, many of whom were elected on solemn pledges to their people to keep America out of the war.

NOW IS THE TIME TO ANALYZE THE FACTS

Mr. Speaker, now that reason is replacing hysteria in Washington and throughout the country, it is a good time to analyze the arguments and assertions used by the war crowd as they have sought by first one ruse and then another to put this country into a position where the sending of expeditionary forces of American boys to Asia, Africa, and Europe would become inevitable. It is a good time, now, to look realistically at the arguments which war propagandists have been using in their well-financed drive to involve American boys in the fighting overseas.

We recall, of course, that the first argument of those who would have us declare war now either by congressional declaration or by the extra-legal method of using convoys without sanction and against the opposition of the people's representatives was the scare campaign that this country could not defend itself and that we would be an easy victim of aggressor nations if they should force us to defend our interests in the Western Hemisphere. We do not hear so much of this argument any more because military experts and realistic analysts have demonstrated that a well-prepared America, located in our advantageous geographical position, can make itself invincible now that we are aroused to the need of modern machinery of war. With each passing month revealing the increasing reluctance of the Nazi armies to try to invade the British Isles over 22 miles of water and against a population half their number and with repeated demonstrations of the difficulty with which well-equipped armies can attack an entrenched army from the sea, it is becoming more and more clear that the powerful United States can defend itself against any possibility of attack. The defeatists who used to urge our entrance into a war 3,000 miles away on the thesis that we are too weak to defend ourselves have discovered that America still has the valor and resourcefulness which enabled us to carve out this greatest of all nations from a wilderness and that this country cannot be scared into entering a war which we do not need to fight.

Then, came a new attack from the war crowd. Dropping the effort in large part to convince the people that a country too weak to defend itself when fully prepared was strong enough while unprepared to send armies to invade continents 3,000 to 7,000 miles away, those who ask for our entrance into a shooting war revived the slogans of 1917. Here, they said, is a war to make the world safe for democracy; here is another war to end war. Our late lamented attempt to court the support of Russia conflicted rather badly with the first of these revived slogans and the good memories of people who remembered the days of 1917 and 1918 rejected the second slogan. Before entering another foreign war to save democracy or to outlaw war, citizens insisted on knowing in advance just how these highly desirable objectives which were sought and lost last time in a winning war could be secured this time. The failure to supply an answer to this question soon projected a hollow sound into the slogans of the war crowd and new arguments were sought for building up a war sentiment in this country.

SO NOW WE ARE ASKED TO GO TO WAR FOR BETTER BUSINESS

Mr. Speaker, we are now in the third phase of this war propaganda. Dropping the mantle of righteousness and piety and discarding the device of scare stories, the New York City crowd which is the fountain head for war propaganda in this country now outlines the unique theory that unless we send our boys and our resources overseas to enter another war, business will be difficult for America. It is pointed out by these disciples of the "war-for-profit" philosophy that an Axis victory would reduce business profits in America, would hurt our import-export trade, would force us to compete with chattel labor in Europe. Trump card played by the New York bankers and others who subscribe to the theory that it is better to lose the lives of American soldiers in foreign wars than to lose the profits from American trade in foreign lands is that if Britain, Greece, and China do not win the war our trade with South America will be decreased. The no-more-profits-from-South-American-trade bugaboo is the most frequently repeated argument of the business minds who urge our entrance into war as a boon to American business. It is an argument which is as heartless and mercenary as it is fallacious.

I ABHOR TOTALITARIANISM

Mr. Speaker, I hope that England wins this war. I abominate the whole totalitarian philosophy; I dislike nazi-ism, fascism, communism, and militarism with equal venom. I decry centralization of Government in the hands of one man or one clique in Europe or Asia and I oppose all tendencies toward statism in our own country. I believe in the philosophy of democracy and I am convinced that it will survive because it is best adapted to satisfy the yearnings of human beings throughout the world for liberty and justice. But democracy cannot be superimposed upon a people by war. It is a way of life which must be evolved by a people capable of operating it and experienced enough in its rudiments to appreciate its value. Wars do more to stultify and destroy democracy than they do to spread or to develop it. Our activity in making democracy work in America can do more to make democracy available to all the world than can our armies fighting on the foreign battlefields of Asia, Africa, or Europe. So abhoring totalitarianism and admiring democracy as I do, I submit that our first big duty is to protect and preserve our way of life in our sphere of influence. To do this effectively we must stop short of entering a shooting war in our humanitarian desires to give aid to countries defending territories governed by systems most similar to our own.

Mr. Speaker, the idealistic appeal to lend our strength to free men everywhere, very frankly, makes a deep impression on me. I wish that we were strong enough or miracle men enough to wave a wand or shake a gun and cause all the world to adopt the American system of self-government. But, as realists, we must recognize the fact that even though we were to sacrifice the lives of several millions of our best young men and spend our country into hopeless bankruptcy we have no assurance that we could project democracy to the four corners of the earth. We cannot give the four freedoms to four continents merely by offering our sons as living sacrifices on altars of the God of Mars which might be constructed on these continents. And when our leaders talk of forming an alliance with communistic, atheistic Russia in order to make the world safe for democracy it smacks too much of forming a partnership with Satan in order to fight a war on sin. And, since the fight-because-you-are-frightened argument defeats itself in logic and belies itself in fact I oppose our entrance into a foreign war as a problematical procedure for averting a possible war in the future by plunging into a positive war at the present. And as for the argument of the small clique of bankers and their associates who are directed by the economic philosophers of New York City, I deny that the war-for-profit argument is any more candid than it is Christian.

WHO WOULD MAKE THIS PROFIT OUT OF WAR?

Mr. Speaker, just who would make this profit out of war which we are now given as a reason for fighting another foreign war? What business opportunties are so great and who would reap their harvest that we should follow the siren call of interventionists and send our convoys and our troops to death for "better business"? Just what are the basic facts in the theory that some men must fight so that other men might earn an easier dollar? How logical is the contention that the United States must get a corner on South American trade even if we have to send 6,000,000 men into foreign fighting to secure this coup? And just what we would sell to South America and what would we accept in return if our American economy is to be based on the premise that if Europe and South America become too much the producer and purchaser to each other, America will operate in the red?

Mr. Speaker, if it is proposed to build our American post-war prosperity by precluding Europe from trading with South America we must ourselves purchase what South Americans produce. If we are to supply her needs, we must accept her products. In other words, if the profit-from-war dream of the New York crowd were to come true and South America becomes almost exclusively a North American trading post, it would mean that a vastly greater supply of South American farm products must be purchased by the United States. True, this might mean that manufacturers in this country could sell more to South America, but under such a system the already underpaid farmers of the United States, who comprise one-third of our population, would be driven from their farms. Bankrupt American farmers cannot buy the products of American factories, so by substituting South American products for North American products we simply sell our manufactured items below the Rio Grande instead of north of it, and even those who hope to profit from a monopoly on South American trade are dreaming of fool's gold. We should develop the largest possible trade with South America on a mutually profitable basis, and in a form which will not displace American farm products in our domestic markets, but any plan to make the South American republics our private trade territory ignores the basic elements of productivity in the two hemispheres.

EVEN THE NEW YORKERS DOUBT THEIR OWN CONCLUSIONS

Mr. Speaker, the other evening at a dinner of some 30 Congressmen I heard one of the high administration officials,

recently brought to Washington from a New York bank to aid in the defense program, voice his opinion that we should immediately follow the convoy route into a shooting war. He admitted this country had nothing to fear from a military attack, he wasted no time with the make-the-world-safe-for-democracy approach, but he frankly said that unless we won the war for England we would be faced with serious economic problems in maintaining our trade with South America.

Asked by Congressmen from farming areas how he proposed to consume the vast South American agricultural surpluses in view of our domestic farm surpluses, he frankly admitted it could not be done without forcing restricted production and reduced farm incomes in this country. As an alternative he proposed that the United States enter a post-war program of serving as "brokers" for all South American trade any place in the world. By making brokerage profits on all South American transactions with all other countries he argued we could control and direct trade of our southern neighbors, and profits could be used by American businessmen to develop South America, build railroads, construct great public works, and so forth. Typifying the New Yorker viewpoint of aid to American farmers he stated in substance, "Our great American agricultural regions were developed, after all, by transactions handled through New York brokers who made a small profit on all farm produce going out and all factory products going in and this money helped to build our cities and finance our great developments." Any farmer could have added the corollary, however, "This process has also served to deprive the American farmer of a full price for his products and has added to the cost of his purchases so that today our farmers are still operating at far below parity prices and their distress is the basic reason for the long-continued depression and unemployment in the United States."

Mr. Speaker, I deny the theory that this country should ever fight a war to establish a brokerage control of South America. I deny, too, that business profits stemming from all the world could compensate for the heartache and misery caused by sending mothers' sons to die in foreign wars so that other men might make a more-ready profit from international trade.

If America goes to the war, let it go for a nobler purpose than a stimulus to business, let our soldiers march to more stirring music than the jingling of cash registers, let our motive be more worthy than either greed or fear. America has nothing to fear except its own short-sightedness. America can and should gird herself so well that none will venture to attack this hemisphere. America, too, can meet whatever economic challenges may come from the war or its post-war aftermath. A prosperous, well-protected, free America can better cope with trade challenges or military threats than a bankrupt, disillusioned, directed-from-Washington America recovering from another venture into foreign war.

Mr. Speaker, our job is to be the friendly protector of the Western Hemisphere, and not the financial broker for all South American transactions. Our job is to help reconstruct a world at peace in terms of a peace-protecting adjustment after war, and not to participate in the war for a purpose so vague that if we had the victory in our hands today we would not know what to do tomorrow to mend the woes which gave rise to the fighting.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by attaching an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of this morning, which gives cause to hope that even here in the East there is coming a realization that a war fought for profit or for trade with South America is a folly which the facts will never justify:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of April 21, 1941]

SOUTH AMERICAN TRADE AFTER THE WAR

REASONS OFFERED

Several main arguments are advanced by our more outspoken interventionists for American entry into this war. Advanced in private or semiprivate conversation, that is, not in print or over the radio to any great extent as yet.

There is the plea that Britain is fighting our battle, and the battle for democracy everywhere in the world, and that we owe it to ourselves and to democracy to get all the way into the fight.

There is the talk about how Hitler, if he conquers Britain, will come over here and subjugate us after a more or less bloody and horrifying invasion. How this invasion is to be achieved is seldom specified. But the argument still circulates.

We are also told that it will be more practical to send our men and ships to fight on the advanced British and European fronts than to wait till we have to fight a defensive war on our own shores.

BUSINESS ARGUMENT

All these arguments are pretty much in the emotional zone; you believe them or you don't believe them, and few people can be reasoned into changing their views one way or the other.

However, there is another argument for our early entry into the war which is aimed at the old American practicality and business sense that most of us like to think we have. This one is the argument about what will happen in South America after the war if Hitler wins.

Hitler, according to this reasoning, will sew up the South American market for himself and freeze us out of it. By inference, if the British win, they will generously let us have a big piece of South American trade for keeps, and we'll have no trouble keeping it.

CUT-THROAT COMPETITION

We believe this argument is provably an economic fallacy; that it simply will not pan out that way. Our expectation is that a lot of South American trade will be lost to the United States soon after the war, no matter who wins, and that therefore this is no argument for our entering the war.

Before the war, Japan was shouldering us out of the South American market—because Japan's costs of production were so much less than ours. We have a high standard of living, with a minimum wage of $16 per 40-hour week as our ideal, and with millions of our workers' wages far above that minimum.

British and German workers alike are now working long hours for bare subsistence wages. The rest is going into the war. After the war, whoever wins, Europe will be so broke that it can be counted on to put up the fiercest sort of competition for foreign trade.

To meet that competition, we can go in for export subsidies, or we can cut our workers' wages to the bone. We shall in all likelihood not do the latter. After the other war we tried the former. Refusing to take South American goods in exchange for our goods, and demanding gold, we loaned the South Americans the gold, and they in large measure defaulted on paying it back.

OVERLAPPING PRODUCTION

The reason why we refused payment in goods was that South and North America produce so many of the same things—cattle, wheat, cotton, wool, oil, etc., etc.

Senator WHEELER, of Montana, once observed that you cannot convince Montana cattle raisers that Montana stores should sell Argentine beef instead of United States beef—or that the United States Navy should eat Argentine beef instead of United States beef.

That's the political objection to this argument, and an objection that we believe nobody can overcome. The economic objection to it is that Europe needs the foods and raw materials which South America produces, and after the war can barter finished products for those materials at much better rates than we can sell our high-cost finished products to South America.

A South America-Europe economic hook-up is a natural; a North-South America one, save for coffee, novelties, and specialties, is an unnatural.

We're never going to get rich swapping our cattle, wheat, oil, etc., for South America's any more than the proverbial laundresses could get rich taking in one another's washing.

Oil Compact Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1941

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, on March 24, 1941, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I included a speech of J. Hendrix Alphin, in a State-wide oil and gas conservation hearing on March 21, 1941. Mr. Alphin is a member of the Oil Compact Commission, as a representative of the State of Arkansas, and it was stated in the transcription of his remarks that the Oil Compact Commission is composed of representatives from the States of Arkansas, California, Colorado, Illinois, Louisiana, Michigan, Nebraska, New Mexico, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming. Mr. J. A. Smith, president of the Independent Petroleum and Consumers Association of California, has called attention to the fact that California did not belong to the commission and wishes to have the RECORD corrected. I desire to include a portion of a letter that I received from Mr. Alphin, which clarifies and corrects this statement. It is as follows:

By reference to your letter of April 2, 1941, which concerns an address I made before a State-wide oil and gas hearing before the Ar-

kansas Oil and Gas Commission at Magnolia, Ark., on Friday, March 21, 1941, I would like to make this observation.

Undoubtedly, the stenographer who transcribed my remarks at this hearing failed to do so correctly. My notes disclose that I said, "The Oil Compact Commission is composed of representatives from the States of Texas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Michigan, Colorado, Arkansas, and Illinois. It is hoped that by legislation now pending the full list of the Compact Commission will read as the States of Arkansas, California, Colorado, Illinois, Louisiana, Michigan, Nebraska, New Mexico, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming. These States contain over 97 percent of the known oil reserves of the Nation and are now producing over 95 percent of the Nation's daily supply of oil."

As is my habit, my notes were made in pencil and I had not, until you called it to my attention, checked any of the press reports of my address.

Food for the Small Democracies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTON F. MACIEJEWSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1941

RESOLUTION OF POLISH WOMEN'S ALLIANCE OF AMERICA

Mr. MACIEJEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Believing that the lives of millions of children, women, and men in conquered European countries can and must be saved from the impending famine and pestilence which confront them, and that renewed hope may be given them in the ideals of mankind:

We, 70,000 members of the Polish Women's Alliance of America, indicate our sympathy for and pledge our support to the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies and its efforts to urge agreements by the German and British Governments with an organization of Americans and other neutrals: (a) by which the domestic food supplies of the conquered European countries, including Poland, can be protected from the occupying armies, and (b) by which supplemental supplies can be imported through the British and German blockades, and (c) to secure the efficient operation of such a neutral organization.

HONORATA B. WOLOWSKI,
President, Polish Women's Alliance of America, Chicago, Ill.
ADELE LAGODZINSKI,
Vice President.
MARYA A. PORWIT,
General Secretary.
VICTORIA M. LATWIS,
Treasurer.
Dr. F. B. KAPUSINSKI,
Medical Examiner.
HARRIET KARLOWICZ, *Editor.*
BARBARA A. FISHER,
General Counsel.

Board of directors: Gertrude Potocki, Albina Damsz, Bernice Wolnik, Maria Lopacinski, Bernice Jakubowski.

DECEMBER 19, 1940.

Annual Meeting of Associated Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JESSE JONES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered April 21, 1941, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, by Hon. Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, who was the guest speaker on the occasion of the forty-first annual meeting of the Associated Press. This great news-gathering organization has a membership of 1,264 daily newspapers in the United States and 749 daily newspapers in South America and other countries. I am a member of the Associated Press and have been attending its annual meetings for 35 years. At these meetings I have listened to great addresses by many distinguished Americans. It was my privilege to hear Secretary Jones, and I am glad to say that his patriotic and eloquent remarks made a most favorable impression upon the fine audience addressed by him. I think the address delivered by him is well worth a place in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As much as I appreciate the invitation to address the Associated Press, I am sure Mr. McLean and my other friends among your directors did not invite me to speak solely as a fellow publisher. Possibly your invitation came because today is Texas' birthday, the one hundred and fifth anniversary of the Battle of San Jacinto, where Sam Houston won independence for Texas.

Whatever the reason, I am honored by the invitation. It is a privilege to meet with you and discuss informally some of our current problems.

Publishers everywhere in America are probably asking themselves two fundamental questions: First, like all patriotic citizens, they want to know about the defense program and how well it is getting along. Second, they want someone to essay the rcle of prophet and give them a glimpse into the future after the war. They would like answers to many perplexing questions. We all would. Some are concerned about the freedom of the press. When they contemplate the disasters which have befallen the press in some other countries, the more pessimistic are afraid that the same fate might be in store for them here. I have no such fear.

I am not so naive as to assume that I can come before you and speak with authority as a publisher. I have not given a great deal of time to the Houston Chronicle, although I would regard it a high privilege to be primarily a publisher and an editor. It is a role worthy of the ambitions of anyone. It affords an opportunity to be of service to one's community, and to one's country.

That this privilege is sometimes misused or carelessly and thoughtlessly exercised does not warrant condemning the entire press. Fortunately, most publishers and editors of American newspapers can be depended upon for a high order of integrity and patriotism. Fortunately, in America the people have the services of such agencies as the Associated Press, which strives to search out the news and report it impartially and completely.

As for the freedom of the press, in my view, and as President Roosevelt told the newspaper editors last week, we will never abandon the high ideal that the press should be free to seek out and to print the news and the truth, unless temporarily certain items having a military bearing might better go unpublished.

Despite any of our shortcomings, it is safe to say that in no other part of the world is so much information so well presented. I might add, parenthetically, that over the years the Associated Press has made a great contribution toward this achievement.

Here in the United States the press has reached its greatest height. To realize that, one need only compare American newspapers with those of any other country. In their news coverage, in the wide variety of it, in the character of its presentation, the newspapers of this country are unequaled. The very freedom of our press and the place it occupies in our lives gives it vast power.

But we should not forget that with that power goes responsibility. The greater the freedom, the greater the necessity that it always be exercised wisely and in the public interest.

It is by recognition of that responsibility that the American press will best serve its own future, and the cause of a free press everywhere in the world.

The careless or unreliable publisher or writer or news agency not only performs a disservice to his country, and its defense in times like these, but he performs a direct disservice to the newspapers of America.

If there should ever be censorship of the American press, it would be brought on by those shortsighted few who blindly and stubbornly refuse to recognize the responsibility that inevitably goes with freedom. But as a Government official I am glad to be able to say that I have never seen any indication that anyone in Government wanted to do any censoring, unless it be information which might aid those who are not America's friends. Freedom of the press is a part of the heritage of every free-born son of this democracy. It is a vital fundamental of our way of life. It is through the press, the dailies, the weeklies, and the magazines, that America speaks.

When editorial opinion strays widely from American thought, publishers might well afford to take stock of themselves and try to ascertain why. We should not bring about any lessening of our freedom or our influence through our own failings. Let's keep our standards high.

May I suggest that you check and double check the more sensational angles of stories which involve relations between this Nation and other countries. Resolve any doubts in favor of the nonsensational approach. To do so may help the men who are wrestling with our foreign relations.

Our press has never had a greater opportunity to serve our country than it has today. First, in printing impartially all the news that should be printed and, second, in arousing the people to the realization that our safety and our way of living are growing less secure by the hour; that hundreds of millions of people are at war destroying life and property and fine things inherited from many generations; that civilization is having a severe test and will be fortunate to survive.

I shall not embark upon any path of prophecy. Only a year ago at your meeting here, you had several war correspondents who talked like people from a strange world.

Little did any of us realize then the situation we would face today. How, then, can we foretell tomorrow? But without getting into the realm of speculation, if the aggressor nations are successful, our generation is apt to see little of tranquillity. We will probably not be able to maintain our way of life. We will certainly not be able to maintain our high standard of living. Our economy cannot compete with slave labor—and the great mass of the people of the Axis Powers and their captives are little more than slaves. They must live and work as they are told. They must accept such reward for their services as an all-powerful and ruthless state sees fit to give them. They may have butter only when guns are not needed.

And that brings me to the progress of our defense program.

One need only recall our lack of preparedness when you met here a year ago to see how far we have come. We did not even visualize the possibility of defense activity on anything approaching the scale on which it is now organized. It is not easy for a peace-loving people like ours to change overnight from purely peacetime pursuits to complete all-out effort at arming, even for defense.

This is particularly true because we have always had faith in the protection of the oceans, and have always believed that no power could invade us.

Maybe we can't be invaded, but we might become isolated economically, and that would inevitably lead to war. Trade outlets are the cause of most wars.

In the period of these few months more than 14,000 separate prime contracts, and probably more than 100,000 subcontracts, have been let for the manufacture of everything from a corporal's chevrons to bombers and battleships. These contracts call for the expenditure of more than $12,500,000,000. Seven hundred and eighty-four new defense plants costing more than $2,100,000,000 have been built or are under construction by the War and Navy Departments.

In addition to these, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is building or financing more than 100 defense plants at a cost of $650,000,000. All of these plants are for the manufacture of war supplies.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is accumulating reserve supplies of copper, tin, antimony, chrome, asbestos, zinc, graphite, manganese, tungsten, rubber, wool, and a few other items of strategic materials. Most of these materials come from foreign countries.

R. F. C. has made commitments for the expenditure of more than $1,500,000,000 for defense, all in cooperation with the War and Navy Departments, O. P. M., and other defense agencies. This is in addition to war and navy contracts. No day is dull in defense activity.

Anyone who thinks that this is not progress doesn't know what he is talking about. Negotiating this many contracts involving in round numbers $16,000,000,000 is progress, and production is getting well under way. No doubt some mistakes have been made and some delays occasioned. It could not be otherwise. But we have capable men from industry and Government in charge of defense work in addition to the regular staffs of the Army and Navy. And don't think these service men are not capable. They have spent years in studying our military needs and know how to meet them. General Marshall told me only 2 days ago, after visiting camps and cantonments throughout the country, that we have a million and a quarter as fine men in training as he has ever seen, and that he had never seen higher morale in any army.

I am fairly close to defense activity. I have seen it in the sprouting stage, and now I see it bearing fruit. Its progress is not satisfactory in all respects, but under the circumstances I think it is better than good.

I am afraid, however, that as a people we have not yet realized the imperativeness of our defense necessities, that we have not yet been shocked. There is no room in America today for complacency. There is no place for indifference. Certainly there is no place for obstruction and it should not be tolerated. No matter how fast defense production climbs, it will not be fast enough to meet the need nor to satisfy our state of mind—our anxiety. There is no place in the crucial world of 1941 for any delay or any excuses.

There is no room for selfishness, whether it be the selfishness of industry seeking undue profits, or of labor seeking unjustifiable wage increases, and endeavoring to utilize the emergency to fight jurisdictional and internal battles. There is no place for profiteering of any kind. And there is no time for any stoppage of vital work to argue about the terms on which it is done. There must be but one selfishness, the selfishness of all of us for the protection of American democracy. It must not be sacrificed.

The time is rapidly approaching when each of us will be called upon to measure our patriotism, our love of freedom, and our devotion to the democratic way of life in terms of individual sacrifice. We will be fortunate if this sacrifice represents only a temporary doing without some of the things to which we have become accustomed—a little personal inconvenience.

We are too inclined to take it for granted that aid to Britain and the other democracies, and even our own defense, mean only the training of a few soldiers and sailors, and the appropriation of a few billions of dollars, followed by orders for airplanes, guns, ships, and tanks.

Our defense expenditures are now running at the rate of nine to ten billion dollars a year. The end of the year will undoubtedly see this rate stepped up to as much as $15,000,000,000 yearly, possibly more. To most of us, the difference between a million and a billion dollars is whether you spell the word with a "b" or an "m", but spending a billion dollars or $10,000,000,000 is a real undertaking.

It is impossible to understand fully the meaning of these huge appropriations of money until we translate them into labor and material.

Fifteen billion dollars is more than all the wages and salaries paid by all the manufacturing plants in the United States in any one year. It is twice the value of all the agricultural products produced in the United States in any recent year by our 6,000,000 farm families.

Some people seem to think that this colossal effort at defense need not interfere with business as usual. The European war might now be over if some of the democracies involved had not taken just that view in the beginning. And experience should teach us that anything short of a maximum effort—maximum aid to Britain and the other democracies, and maximum preparation for the defense of the Western Hemisphere—may be worse than no effort at all.

If we are to get ready to defend ourselves, let's be sure that we do a good job of it. That means we must give up some of the things we have been used to, when actually we will have more money in circulation from the Government spending all these billions for defense. With the expenditure of these billions, we must guard against inflation and run-away prices. We may have to submit to price controls to make sure that the defense effort is not impeded. A Government agency has been set up to guard against run-away prices. We should support that effort, and we should adopt a program of taxation which will pay a large part of the defense cost currently.

We are in the most momentous period in modern history. Whether it will be a grim, tragic tale of long and arduous struggle, or will lead to a peaceful and better world, depends upon the military outcome.

Putting first things first, the war must first be won. We are helping the democracies because we believe the survival of democracy is essential to our civilization. We should not underestimate the task. We will be called upon to pay dearly for something we would like to have avoided, something unnecessary and inexcusable. But when outlaws are at large and our future is at stake, we have no choice but to prepare to defend ourselves against aggression from any source. If we would preserve the kind of life we have been accustomed to, and want to continue to enjoy, we must lay gun on gun until every threat to our security has been met.

The Citizens' Part in National Defense and Aid to Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered before the Philadelphia Board of Trade on April 18, 1941, on the subject of the Citizens' Part in National Defense and Aid to Britain.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great honor to appear before the Philadelphia Board of Trade this afternoon. My friend and colleague, the able senior Senator from Pennsylvania, JIM DAVIS, informs me that the Philadelphia Board of Trade is one of the largest organizations of its kind in the country.

Your existence dates from a meeting held at Wade's Hotel on October 15, 1833, which was called "to consider the propriety of forming an association by means of which the commercial and trading community in the city might be enabled to act with united efforts on all subjects relating to their interests."

I am honored to speak to a group which has so long a record of outstanding public service as this organization.

I am honored to speak to this group because I know that from the time of its inception in 1833, its membership has been made up of outstanding leaders, but I am primarily honored in appearing before your group because from your very inception you represented an ideal, which I hold to be vital in these chaotic days.

ACT WITH UNITED EFFORT

As I said a moment ago, your organization was called into existence so that you might "act with united efforts on all subjects relating to their interests."

That is the underlying theme of my discussion today of the citizens' part in national defense and aid to Britain. Today, as never before, there is a grave necessity for a sub-

mergence of group interests in a united effort for the preservation of those great values, spiritual and material, which we hold in common.

A businessman recently told a story about his young daughter. He was reading the Sunday newspaper. His little daughter kept interrupting him with questions, and finally, in order to give the little girl something to occupy her attention, he tore out one of the pages of the newspaper. There was a map of the United States on that page. He cut it into a jigsaw puzzle and then asked the little girl to put it back together again.

She took the pieces and in a remarkably short time she returned with the map completely and accurately assembled. He was startled to see her perform this difficult task so quickly, and he asked her how she did it. She said, "Why, Father, it was very easy. On the other side of the map there was a big picture of a group of men and women and children, and when I put that picture back together the United States was put together on the other side."

UNITED PEOPLE UNITED IN COMMON CAUSE IS INVINCIBLE

That brings me to the bedrock of our discussion today. When we are a united people, united in the common cause, with a common bond, we are invincible. No system of totalitarian efficiency is equal to American efficiency under the American system.

It is all very well to talk of mobilizing machines in defense, but I would much rather talk of mobilizing men and morale. When we have succeeded in mobilizing men and morale we have created the front line of American defense. That front line is found in the hearts and minds of the American people.

As long as we can submerge our petty differences, our racial intolerances, our self-seeking interest, our class consciousness, and our economic defeatism in a united front, our way of life will remain inviolate—bombproof to military and economic and propaganda dive bombers.

In speaking to you gentlemen today I feel the responsibility of my position. You do not ask a Senator of the United States to come to you to bring you entertainment. You are a thinking group, a serious-minded group. You are a responsible cross-section of our economic society, and you have for your purpose the promotion of the economic health of the Nation. I am sure in this troubled world you are sensitive to your responsibility. You know that the steps we take in this country now, politically, economically, and socially—the steps we take today will, in a large measure, determine our course tomorrow.

WE HAVE AN OBLIGATION AS TRUSTEES

Consequently, at the outset of my remarks let me suggest that the obligation each of us owes to this Naton, to our concept of government, to the future of this Nation that we are at present the trustees of, demands that you and I be fit—fit "soldiers" to meet whatever emergency may arise.

Fitness nowadays calls for clear thinking, a balanced intellect. It calls for vision, judgment—it calls for casting out intolerance and class hatred. It calls for perspective.

NEED PERSPECTIVE TO SEE NATIONAL PICTURE

With this quality of perspective, now let us look out upon the national picture. We are 131,000,000 people. The national indebtedness is about $46,000,000,000 plus an additional $9,000,000,000.

We are the richest nation in the world. We have the greatest ability for production. No groups of nations can be as self-sufficient as this Nation can be.

Until the war broke in Europe we went on our way smug and complacent. As a Nation we were unaware of the great world changes that were about to take place and were taking place. We were unaware of the dangers to our form of life, our form of government.

CALLOUSED TO NEGLECT OF THRIFT AND INTEGRITY

We had become calloused as a people to a neglect of the principles of thrift, industry, and integrity. For 7 years our Government had gone into the red approximately three and one-half billion dollars a year. That didn't dent us. We just sailed on. Our unemployment problem was approximately as large as ever.

A large segment of our society, about 80 percent of the farmers, were not getting cost of production out of their products. Pressure groups were dictating legislation in Washington to the President and to the Congress.

DEFENSE HAD BEEN NEGLECTED

We had no defensive air arm. We had no equipped Army. While we had a fair Navy it had no coordinating air arm, and the ships were not constructed to meet new conditions in war. Money by the billions was remaining idle because the investor had no place to go. Enterprise and initiative and invention were at a low level. Government was swollen by a bureaucracy such as our country had never seen before.

Still there was no awakening because Government pap was fed out in a thousand channels. We saw leaners and chiselers and grafters come into being. And very little was said about it. It was considered as part of the order of the day. The doctrine of Cleveland that the Government should be sustained by the people instead of the people sustained by Government was entirely reversed. In one sense a creeping lethargy seemed to have affected our people.

DOMESTIC PROBLEMS UNSOLVED

We had forgotten that the political leadership which took over in 1933 had promised the people to reconstruct America, to rebuild her financial bulwarks, to vitalize her morale, to build her strong. Yes; we had forgotten the platform and the promises. You will remember the job to be done was—

First. A drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices and eliminating extravagance.

Second. A Federal Budget annually balanced.

Third. The restoration of agriculture.

Fourth. The removal of Government from fields of private enterprise except where necessary to develop public works and natural resources.

Fifth. No interference in the internal affairs of other nations.

Sixth. The creation of jobs for the unemployed.

HITLER SHATTERED AMERICAN LETHARGY

Then Hitler came. He struck with lightning. Nation after nation went down before his blows and an awakening took place. History will probably say of him, "He woke the democracies to a sense of the danger they were in. He tumbled them out of their beds of ease and caused them to realize something of the real value of their freedom by making them appreciate that this freedom and way of life were in danger, liable to be snuffed out like they were in Denmark, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Norway, Belgium, Holland, France, Rumania, Bulgaria."

While this occurred fully in Britain, it is very evident our own people in this country, at least part of them, have not come to the realization of the imperative need of national unity. What do I mean? I mean we have not had the coordination between labor and management and Government in our defense program that we should have had. An indication of that is the present strike situation.

The question for our discussion today is, "The citizen's part in national defense and aid to Britain."

WHAT IS THE CITIZEN'S PART IN NATIONAL DEFENSE?

I. Citizen can create unity through tolerance

His part is to create unity through a spirit of tolerance and understanding. This is not time for wild-eyed intolerance—soap-box ranting.

This is possibly the bitterest social era the world has ever known. The part of the citizens today must not be to add to the world's bitterness, but to create a spirit of tolerant understanding.

It is written in Isaiah "They helped everyone his neighbor; and everyone said to his brother, 'Be of good courage'."

This land of ours was founded in the belief that it was vital to rid ourselves of intolerance, hatred, bigotry, and persecution. We have not always been successful in that ideal. There have been periods of witch-hunting in American history; there have been periods of intolerance, sectionalism, and racial and religious rioting.

Lincoln lived in such a period and he saw its dangers. In his message to Congress on December 1, 1862, he said:

"That part of the earth's surface which is owned and inhabited by the people of the United States, is well adapted to be the home of one national family, and is not well adapted for two or more. * * * We shall nobly save, or meanly lose the last hope of earth. Other means may succeed; this could not, cannot fail."

And, it was Lincoln also who said on December 10, 1856, in Chicago:

"Can we not come together for the future? Let everyone who really believes and is resolved that free society is not and shall not be a failure, and who can conscientiously declare that in the past contest, he has done only what he thought best—let every such one have charity to believe that every other one can say as much."

And, it was Lincoln again on February 27, 1860, in his famous Cooper Institute speech, who said:

"Even though much provoked, let us do nothing through passion and ill temper."

And, again, on March 5, 1860, at Hartford, Conn., Lincoln said:

"Our portions of this confederacy should act in harmony and use careful deliberation."

Mr. Chairman, I can think of no greater appeal to the people of the United States, in these troubled times, than those words of Lincoln's, and, so I say to you, that the first part which the citizen can play in national defense is a tolerant role—a role which seeks to mend the social fabric, rather than tear it asunder by creating class castes.

II. Citizen can reaffirm allegiance and faith in American ideal

The citizen can play a part in our defense program by reaffirming our allegiance, and our faith in the American ideal, possibly in the words of the American creed:

"I believe in the United States of America as a Government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a Republic; a sovereign nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

"I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies."

In other lands youth is bludgeoned into a dreary acceptance and finally into a fervently fanatical subservience to totalitarian

philosophy. How much more inspiring will our crusade be to create in every boy and girl of this land an intense loyalty to our way of life.

Our way of life—that is a term that is greatly abused. I have never heard it defined. I do remember, however, that James Truslow Adams called it "the American dream." He wrote about:

"That dream of a land in which life should be better and richer and fuller for every man, with opportunity for each according to his ability or achievement. * * * The American dream that has lured tens of millions of all nations to our shores * * * has not been a dream of merely material plenty, though that has doubtless counted heavily. It has been much more than that. It has been a dream of being able to grow to fullest development as man and woman, unhampered by the barriers which had slowly been erected in older civilizations, unrepressed by social orders which had developed for the benefit of the classes rather than for the simple human being of any and every class."

III. Citizen can prepare to sacrifice

The average citizen can do his part in national defense by being prepared to sacrifice.

I hold no brief for those politic l goldbrick salesmen who evade their responsibility by letting the American people believe that we can retain our way of life without sacrifice.

These supersalesmen, these glib-tongued prophets of economic self-indulgence, are literally playing politics with American lives and American homes when they refuse to tell the American people that they are facing sacrifices unprecedented in American history. I think this is the time to be prepared for a big jolt.

As a nation we have been weakened by a decade of economic leaf raking. This last decade of boondoggling has crippled our economic reserves and our national credit.

Your organization was founded in 1833. When your organization was a little more than half a century old, in 1890, the average worker gave 1 day's work out of every 14, to government. Most of us do not realize it, but recently, before the current emergency, government was taking the economic output of 1 out of every 4 working days. Naturally, this has drained our economic bloodstream.

We Will Have To Meet Staggering Bills With High Taxation

All of this means that we are in for a period of sacrifice. We are going to have staggering bills with higher and more painful taxation.

The banks are loaded with savings but the interest rates are set at starvation levels. There will be tremendous changes in bank financing of the defense program here and abroad. There will be a sharp demand for money and credit, and don't you forget that Uncle Sam himself will be standing at the head of the line-up, waiting for loans.

IV. Citizens will have to make group sacrifices

But it is not alone the average citizen who will have to make sacrifices in terms of higher taxes, and possibly a lower standard of living—there will be group sacrifices, and the most obvious application of that kind of sacrifice today is the sacrifice involved in the labor problem.

Labor Policy of Day-to-Day Expediency

Let us be honest. Thus far during this critical period the labor policy of this administration has been written in the shifting sands of day-to-day expediencies. In recent weeks it has been a labor policy of chaos and calamity.

After the declaration of war in April of 1917, the United States tried to get its industrial work done without a clearly defined labor policy. During that time, and for almost a year, the Government urged conciliation. The public frowned upon strikes but strikes persisted and grew in number.

Finally, President Wilson began a decisive labor policy. He set up boards to define a labor policy and to mediate disputes. Strikes and lock-outs were banned for the period of the war. It was decided that the status quo in any plant had to be maintained (that meant that the closed-shop question was eliminated as a basis of dispute).

The right of collective bargaining was upheld, and these decisions and this policy settled the labor problem throughout the war. Strikes ended, and throughout the summer and autumn of 1918 there was a spectacular rise in industrial production.

We Can't Play Politics With the Labor Problem

There is a parallel here. By May of this year it will be just a year since we began to be definitely conscious of a possible menace to the United States. Since then we have rolled up our shirt sleeves and voted billions upon billions. We have drafted men and we have drafted industry.

But now, as in 1917, we are playing politics with the labor problem. This administration has pussy-footed on the labor issue and has adopted no clear-cut decisive policy which would define the relationship of industry and labor.

Our policy has been strictly a crazy quilt of day-to-day decision, and we have had the same results that a similar vacillating policy had in 1917.

Two Alternatives Have Confronted Administration in Its Labor Problem

Broadly speaking, there have been two alternatives which have confronted this administration. One of them was to adopt a decisive realistic policy which would consider the rights of both parties, which would guarantee the right of labor to enjoy the American standard of living at a fair wage, and which would, at the same time, underwrite the right of capital to enjoy the use of its property for a reasonable investment return. That is the policy to which your group subscribes.

The other alternative was to pile one board on top of another board without giving any of them any genuine power. We had a National Labor Relations Board, we had a Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor, we had a labor set-up in the Office of Production Management, and none of them prevented or decreased labor disputes, and that, after all, is the test of whether they were doing the job. Now, my friends, we have a Defense Labor Mediation Board whose creation is so recent that we cannot completely evaluate its work.

I do not criticize these agencies. I do not criticize their personnel or their policies. I do not criticize their functions or their objectives.

Administration Has Not Given Labor Boards a Foundation

But, my friends, I indict this administration for not giving them a foundation. This administration has still failed to write a decisive labor policy. No conciliation board conciliates on the subject of the closed shop. That issue is beyond their province. If strike votes are fraudulent, there is no decisive Government policy which meets the situation.

I believe it is the duty of the administration and the duty of Congress to write a labor policy. I do not want to see such a policy written by the enemies of labor—I do not want to see a policy written which will slaughter the hard-won rights which labor has achieved. I want to see those rights preserved in an intelligent program which also preserves the rights of industry—and the rights of the third party, the public. Such a program will undoubtedly call for sacrifice, understanding, and vision.

In Connection With a Labor Policy, I Believe—

There are several points I would like to make clear in connection with the labor problem.

First. There is a growing disposition in Congress to write legislation directed at this problem.

Second. Congress alone cannot stop strikes. Representative SUMNERS, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, makes the statement that strikes cannot be prevented by an act of Congress, because Congress can do only 10 percent of the job—90 percent of the job would be up to the administrative officials who would be required to enforce the law. In other words, there will be no definite stoppage of strikes until the Chief Executive takes a more decisive stand.

Third. Most Washington officials feel there should be a definite testing period for the defense Mediation Board because it is generally agreed that the Chief Executive will not subscribe to a more decisive labor policy until the Board has had a trial.

Fourth. I believe it is highly desirable for industry to seize every opportunity which it has to show that it has clean hands and that it is not receiving a disproportionate share of the payment for defense. If industry can do this, it will do much to allay labor's suspicion.

Fifth. Similarly, labor should welcome every opportunity and every investigation which may demonstrate that labor has a capacity for reasonableness. I believe that this is moderation's middle way.

Sixth. In any labor policy the rights of the public must be considered.

Seventh. I do not believe that government, except as a last resort, should take over and operate plants where defense work has been halted by labor difficulties.

Complete Governmental Control of Plants Undesirable

I regard this as the first step in what might eventually be the destruction of both unionism and private enterprise. We know that in the totalitarian countries government controls everything and the right of workers to organize independently has been taken away from them. I do not want to see that in America.

I do not want to see our system of private enterprise eliminated by a system of Government controls. I do not want to see Government management of everything. I do not want to see a commisar or a fuehrer or a duce running all enterprise in this country.

I do believe, however, that Government should be strong and should adopt a decisive policy in these labor problems. If we have any stake in the present conflict, it is primarily a stake represented in the preservation of our way of life. That is our vision, and the way we will secure it is not by extremes on either side but by moderation.

V. Citizen can aid in curbing inflation

I believe that the citizen can play a dominant part in national defense and aid to Britain by doing everything in his power to curb inflation. If the average citizen does everything he can to prevent inflation, he will be making an outstanding contribution on the economic front.

I don't believe that the question of whether or not we have inflation is entirely dependent upon government policy. I believe the individual can do a great deal toward maintaining stability. Probably the most obvious way in which the average citizen can help maintain stability is by deferring satisfac-

tion of some of the wants which they are now able to gratify.

The average citizen can also make a contribution toward stability by saving and by refraining from going into debt. We know that the demands on the market will be heavy enough, without adding any demands based on abnormal borrowing.

In the past we have had booms because of debt making. We have had depressions intensified by debt paying. The tremendous increase in our Government debt and the possibilities for private debt in our defense program involves very serious dangers. That makes it all the more necessary that the average citizen should resist the temptation to expand the individual debt.

Citizen Can Avoid Going Into Debt

That means that the average citizen may have to buy out of current income instead of on the deferred-payment system. That means less credit and more cash purchasing. We know that it is easy to borrow at the present time, but if this borrowing is not conservative, it may involve dangers to both the borrower and the lender, particularly in times of rising prices. Thrift is still a virtue. Debts still have to be repaid. The Government has not set a good example, but that does not alter the fact that the individual should. I believe, also, incidentally that business can join with the citizen in a policy of exercising restraint in inventory accumulation.

We Can Anticipate Problems of Post-war Readjustment

These suggestions, by the way, will do much to anticipate the problems of post-war readjustment. Your organization should readily agree with such policy because you know what these problems are. During the years following the World War, your group was engaged in trading reconstruction work, and I recall that at that time you urged upon Congress the necessity of a reconstruction commission to study post bellum conditions. I believe that was an excellent suggestion, and I feel that today we must even now begin to anticipate the aftereffects of the present conflict.

Daniel Webster once said:

"There are persons who constantly clamor. * * * They carry on a mad hostility against established institutions. They would choke up the fountains of industry and dry all its streams. In a country of unbounded liberty they clamor against oppression."

Against these subversive forces the average citizen can wage an effective battle. When the average citizen joins in a spirit of unity with his fellow citizens, their combined voice is the voice of public opinion—a force sometimes more potent than government itself.

John Milton once said: "Awake, arise, or be forever fallen."

Gentlemen, are the American people awake to all of the dangers which menace our way of life, the dangers from without and the dangers from within?

I believe that recognizing these dangers the American people will answer the challenge they present, answer them individually and collectively in the ways we have discussed this noon.

It is my fervent hope that out of the gethsemane ahead, the United States and our way will emerge strengthened and revitalized, both to a recognition of our opportunities and our obligations.

I believe that our republican democracy is a dynamic, living thing. That is may continue to work—and to grow—and to live—each citizen must dedicate his highest efforts.

Gentlemen, in this period we must be like Nehemia—too busy rebuilding the wall to be enticed from our work—our work is to build America strong; build her ramparts durable for a thousand years.

Keep your convictions and balance. If folks malign, abuse you, and this would tend to take your attention from your job—be strong—stick to your job.

Do not return hate for hate—the walls of America must be rebuilt. These walls have been sabotaged by years of loose thinking and living, by false economics, Government pap, and easy living.

Let nothing divert you from the master builder's job of rebuilding the walls. It takes men with courage and foresight—who exemplify honesty, thrift, industry, morality, and honor.

It appears difficult at times, especially if, for example, one of the privileged class, a newspaper editor or columnist, abuses his position and trust and indulges in misrepresentation or mud slinging instead of relating the facts—the real news.

But if you persist, you will be twice victorious—first, over the law of the jungle, which would return evil for evil; and, secondly, you will find the road "to satisfactory living with self." Bitterness, wrath, malice, and evil speaking will not be in your make-up. Your vision will be unimpaired—not blurred.

Oh, how America needs straight-thinking and straight-seeing men, now—men who possess tolerance and love of their fellow Americans.

Another Easter has come and gone—in the midst of our difficulties and perplexities. It suggests that we possess the power to rise above them. Easter is a season of hope. The first Easter dawned like this Easter upon a discouraged, distressed, and fearful world, but the first Easter restored to the followers of Jesus, faith and courage and gave them power to carry on in a victorious manner. Why? Because Easter gave to His disciples the answer to Job's question: "If a man die, shall he live again?"

Yes, we must be strong. We must not lose our nerve or faith. This is no time for the craven soul, the doubter of the American way—the defeatist.

Let us revive the patriotism of our fathers. Show up, for what they are, the self-styled intellectual pinks who would mock our faith and our free way of life.

Love of country is a noble thing. Our way of life, contrasted to that of the totalitarian way, is the difference between freemen and slaves. Onward then, in the task to make America safe by rebuilding her walls.

The Easter Message of Pope Pius XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE CATHOLIC REVIEW

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Easter message of Pope Pius XII.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Catholic Review, Baltimore, Md., April 18, 1941]

PIUS XII ASKS PRAYERS FOR EARLY, UNIVERSAL PEACE

VATICAN CITY, April 13.—Herewith is presented the official English translation of the Pope's Easter message Urbi et Orbi, which was broadcast by radio throughout the world:

We most cordially greet you all, beloved sons and daughters of Rome and of the entire world, in the spirit of Alleluia of Easter morn, in the joyful spirit of the resurrection and peace in Christ, after the desolation of His divine passion; but unfortunately, there has been no resurrection, no restoration, of peace among nations. In our joyful greeting to you there must be intermingled that note of distress which was the cause of great sadness and continual sorrow to the heart of Paul the Apostle while he was preoccupied about his brethren who were his kinsmen according to the flesh (Romans IX:12).

APPEALS TO BELLIGERENTS

In the lamentable spectacle of human conflict which we are now witnessing we acknowledge the valor and loyalty of all those who with a deep sense of duty are fighting for the defense and prosperity of their homeland; we recognize, too, the prodigious and, in itself, efficacious development made in industrial and technical fields; nor do we overlook the many generous and praiseworthy gestures of magnanimity which have been made toward the enemy; but while we acknowledge, we feel obliged nonetheless to state that the ruthless struggle has at times assumed forms which can be described only as atrocious.

May all belligerents, who also have human hearts molded by mothers' love, show some feeling of charity for the sufferings of civilian populations, for defenseless women and children, for the sick and aged, all of whom are often exposed to greater and more widespread perils of war than those faced by soldiers at the front.

FEARS MORE TERRIBLE INSTRUMENTS

We beseech the belligerent powers to abstain until the very end from the use of still more homicidal instruments of warfare; for the introduction of such weapons inevitably results in their retaliatory use, often with greater violence by the enemy. If already we must lament the fact that the limits of legitimate warfare have been repeatedly exceeded, would not the more widespread use of increasingly barbarous offensive weapons soon transform war into unspeakable horror?

In this tempest of misfortunes and perils, of afflictions and fears, our most powerful and safest haven of trust and peace is found in prayer to God, in whose hands rests not only the destiny of men but also the outcome of their most obdurate dissensions. Wherefore we express our gratitude to Catholics of the entire world for the fervor with which they responded to our call to prayer and sacrifice for peace on November 24.

ASKS PRAYERS FOR EARLY PEACE

Today we repeat that invitation to you and to all those who raise their minds and hearts to God, and we beseech you not to relax your prayerful vigilance but rather to reanimate and redouble it. Yes; let us pray for early peace. Let us pray for universal peace; not for peace based upon the oppression and destruction of peoples but peace which, while guaranteeing the honor of all nations, will satisfy their vital needs and insure the legitimate rights of all.

We have constantly accompanied prayer with our own endeavors. To the very limit of our power and with a vigilant consciousness of impartiality in spirit, and in our apostolic office we have left nothing undone

or untried in order to forestall or shorten the conflict, to humanize the methods of war, to alleviate suffering, and to bring assistance and comfort to the victims of war.

SEES LITTLE HOPE OF JUST PEACE

We have not hesitated to indicate in unmistakenly clear terms the necessary principles and sentiments which must constitute the determining basis of a future peace that will assure the sincere and loyal consent of all peoples. But we are saddened to note that there seems to be as yet little likelihood of an approximate realization of peace that will be just, in accordance with human and Christian norms.

Thus our supplications to heaven must be raised with ever-increasing meaning and fervor, that a new spirit may take root and develop in all peoples and especially among those whose greater power gives them wider influence and imposes upon them additional responsibility; the spirit of willingness, devoid of sham and artifice, that is ready to make mutual sacrifices in order to build, upon the accumulated ruins of war, a new edifice of fraternal solidarity among the nations of the world, an edifice built upon new and stronger foundations, with fixed and stable guaranties, and with a high sense of moral sincerity which would repudiate every double standard of morality and justice for the great and the small or for the strong and the weak.

INVOKES ARMS OF SPIRIT

Truth like man has but a single face; and truth is our weapon just as prayer is our defense and strength, and the living sincere and disinterested apostolic word inspired by fraternal affection, our entry to the hearts of men.

These are not offensive and bloody weapons but the arms of spirit, arms of our mind and heart. Nothing can impede or restrain us from using them to secure and safeguard just rights, true human brotherhood, and genuine peace, wherever the sacred duty of our office prompts us and compassion for the multitude rekindles our love.

Nothing can restrain us from repeatedly calling to the observance of the precept of love those who are children of the church of Christ, those who because of their faith in the divine Saviour or at least in our Father who is in heaven are very near to us.

PEACE IN SHADOW OF CROSS

Nothing can impede or restrain us from doing all in our power in order that, in the tempest of surging waves of enmity among the peoples of the earth, the divine ark of the church of Christ may be held firmly by the anchor of hope under the golden rays of peace—that blessed vision of peace which, in the midst of worldly conflicts, is the refuge and abode and sustenance of that fraternal spirit, founded in God and ennobled in the shadow of the cross, with which the course must be set if we are to escape from the present tempest and reach the shore of a happier and more deserving future.

However, under the vigilant providence of God and armed only with prayer, exhortation, and consolation, we shall persevere in our battle for peace in behalf of suffering humanity. May the blessings and comforts of heaven descend on all victims of this war, upon you who are prisoners and upon your families, from whom you are separated, and who are anxious about you; and upon you refugees and dispossessed, who have lost your homes and land, your life's support. We share with you your anguish and suffering.

HOPE IN GOD NEVER FAILS

If it is not allowed us—as we would honestly desire—to take upon ourselves the burden of your sorrows, may our paternal and cordial sympathy serve as the balm which will temper the bitterness of your misfortune with today's greeting of the Alleluia, the hymn of Christ's triumph over earthly martyrdom, the blossom of the olive tree of Gethsemane flourishing in the precious hope of resurrection and of the new and eternal life in which there will be neither sorrows nor struggles. In this vale of tears there is no lasting city (Hebrews 13: 14), no eternal homeland.

Here below we are all exiles and wanderers; our true citizenship, which is limitless, is in heaven, in eternity, in God. If worldly hopes have bitterly deluded you, remember that hope in God never fails or deceives. You must make one resolve—not to allow yourselves to be induced, either by your sad lot or by the malice of men, to waver in your allegiance to Christ.

Prosperity and adversity are part and parcel of man's earthly existence; but what is of the utmost importance, and we say it with St. Augustine, is the use that is made of what is called prosperity or adversity. For the virtuous man is neither exalted by worldly well-being nor humbled by temporal misfortune; the evil man, on the other hand, being corrupted in prosperity, is made to suffer in adversity.

To the powers occupying territories during the war we say with all due consideration: Let your conscience guide you in dealing justly, humanely, and providently with the peoples of occupied territories. Do not impose upon them burdens which you in similar circumstances have felt or would feel to be unjust.

Prudent and helpful humanitarianism is the commendation and boast of wise generals; and the treatment of prisoners and civilians in occupied areas is the surest indication and proof of the civilization of individuals and nations. But, above all, remember that upon the manner in which you deal with those whom the fortunes of war put in your hands may depend the blessing or curse of God upon your own land.

Contemplation of a war that is so cruel in all its aspects and the thought of the suffering children of the church inspires in the heart of the Common Father and forms upon our lips words of comfort and encouragement for the pastors and faithful of those places where the church, the spouse of Christ, is suffering most; where fidelity to her, the public profession of her doctrines, the conscientious and practical observance of her laws, moral resistance to atheism and to de-Christianizing influences deliberately favored or tolerated, are being openly or insidiously opposed and daily in various ways made increasingly difficult.

FOLLOWERS OF CHRIST SUFFER

The records and artifices of this generally secret but at times even public martyrdom, which insidious or open impiety makes followers of the Crucified suffer, are multiplying daily and constitute as it were in an encyclopedia of many volumes, annals of heroic sacrifices, and furnish moving verification of the words of our Divine Saviour: "The servant is not greater than his Lord. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you" (John xv: 20).

Is this divine warning not a source of tender comfort on that sorrowful and bitter way of the cross which you are following because of your fidelity to Christ? To all of you who are walking so sadly along this way, priests and religious, men and women, and particularly you young men, pride and joy of your families, who are called upon to bear the burden of these merciless and bitter days—whatever be your origin, language, race, social condition, or profession—all you upon whom the seal of suffering for Christ is stamped so clearly, a sign no less of suffering than of glory, as it was to the great Apostle Paul, you are numbered among those privileged intimate who are nearest to the Cross of Calvary and by this very fact nearest also to the pierced heart of Christ and to our own.

Oh that we were able to make you appreciate how profoundly our heart has been pierced by the cry of the Apostle of the Gentiles "Who is weak, and I am not weak?" (II Corinthians xi: 29).

SHARES THEIR SORROWS

The sacrifices you are called upon to make, your suffering in mind and body, your concern for your faith and still more for the faith of your children, we are aware of them, we share them with you, we lament them before God.

And yet withal, on this day we greet you with joyful Alleluia; for it is the day of Christ's triumph over His crucifiers, open and secret, ancient and modern. We convey that greeting to you with the voice and confidence with which, even in the days of the persecution, the early Christians exultantly sang that Alleluia.

Perhaps you do not recall the words of our Lord to Martha: "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in Me shall not die forever" (John ii: 25: 26). The certainty they were assuring themselves of resurrection made of martyrs heroes of Christ and faithful unto death.

You enjoy that same certainty. Imitate them and with the greatest prophet of the New and eternal Testament raise your eyes to that heavenly Jerusalem where Christ gloriously reigns and rules and, while rewarding His good and faithful servants, proclaims the mystery and splendor of their triumph in the shining whiteness of their garments, in the indelible inscription of their names in the Book of Life, and in decreeing that they be exalted before His Father and the heavenly court, with admirable words which you in your perilous trials must never forget: "He that shall overcome shall thus be clothed in white garments and I will not blot out his name out of the Book of Life but I will confess his name before My Father and before His angels" (Apocalypse iii:5).

IMPARTS APOSTOLIC BLESSING

Beloved sons and daughters: To Jesus Christ, "Prince of Kings on earth, Who hath loved us and washed us from our sin in His own blood" (Apocalypse 1:5) raise your eyes while, as pledge of that heavenly peace which He alone can give to us and which we implore of Him in superabundant measure for all humanity, we impart to you, to pastors and faithful, to your families, to your children, that Christ may protect and keep you in His grace and love, to those who in the fulfillment of duty are fighting on land and sea and in the sky and especially to all those who have been so severely lashed by the scourge of war with heart overflowing with love, our paternal apostolic benediction

May the blessing of Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, descend upon you and remain forever. Amen.

Labor Relations and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

REMARKS BY PROF. ALEXANDER HAMILTON FREY

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

Appendix of the RECORD a memorandum of remarks made by Prof. Alexander Hamilton Frey at a symposium on labor relations and national defense conducted by George Washington University Law School at the United States Chamber of Commerce Auditorium, Washington, D. C., Thursday, March 27, 1941.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Memorandum of remarks of Prof. Alexander Hamilton Frey at a symposium on labor relations and national defense, conducted by George Washington University Law School at the United States Chamber of Commerce Auditorium, Washington, D. C., Thursday, March 27, 1941]

A bargaining situation exists between a buyer and seller if each is in a position to force upon the other some concession, some abandonment of a preferred position. For the seller to be able to obtain a price at all, there must be some degree of scarcity, some limitation upon the supply. This is the first essential of bargaining power. If the seller is offering something for which the buyer is willing to pay a price—i. e., which it is advantageous to the buyer to purchase at some price—the ultimate price which the seller receives, whether he controls all or only a fraction of the supply, depends upon the respective resources with which each of the parties can withstand a deadlock. In other words, if the seller has no capital, if he must sell to live, then—even in the extreme case where he controls the entire supply—he must accept the best terms offered, however much below what he regards as a fair price. Without some resources at the seller's command there is no element of give and take in the situation. This is the second essential of bargaining power.

Workers are sellers of labor, and today most of them, acting individually, lack either one or both of these essentials of bargaining power. With thousands still seeking employment, the labor of unskilled workers—who are in the vast majority—has little or no element of scarcity. Moreover, whether skilled or unskilled, the individual worker normally has no capital with which to withstand a buyers' strike. Furthermore, labor cannot be preserved and held for a more favorable market; a worker cannot tomorrow sell today's unexpended labor. Nor does the labor of an individual worker have the fluidity that attaches to most commodities or to credit seeking a market; a workman in Philadelphia does not have the resources with which to avail himself of an opportunity for employment that may exist in Chicago or even in Pittsburgh. He and his family are effectively bound to a limited geographical area of job opportunity; and within this area the job opportunities may, as in many a mill town, all be controlled by a single employer.

This unfavorable bargaining position of the individual worker has been greatly accentuated by the phenomenal growth in the use of the corporation as a device for conducting business enterprises, both large and small. In the commercial world the corporation has become much the most important employer of labor. Many persons, however, are still accustomed to think of labor problems in terms of the relations between an individual small businessman and his few employees. One so conditioned is very apt to overlook the most significant factors behind the current labor movement, factors arising out of the present commanding and expanding position of the modern corporation in national affairs.

In any large-scale enterprise, and especially if such enterprise is incorporated, the ultimate product is the resultant of the contributions of a number of groups among whom the benefits or losses of the joint endeavor are eventually distributed. First, there are those who contribute what is termed "capital," that is, money or property permanently dedicated to the enterprise; such persons are most frequently designated as the "owners" or, in the case of corporations, the "shareholders." Secondly, there are those who contribute money or property for a temporary period; such persons are normally designated as "lenders" or "creditors"—they are the ones who are said to have lent money or to have sold goods on credit or to have leased property to the enterprise. Thirdly, there are those who contribute labor; such persons may be skilled or unskilled workers, and their labor may be primarily physical or primarily mental or a combination of both. Finally, there are those who manage, who are at or near the top of the hierarchy of those who direct the activities of others; such persons are in the main the directors and principal executive officers of corporations. These four categories are obviously neither all-inclusive nor mutually exclusive. They may well overlap as in the case of a financial institution that lends a large sum to a corporation on condition that it be accorded significant representation on the board of directors. Nevertheless, for an adequate understanding of modern labor problems, it is essential that one bear in mind that various divergent interests (whether they be the ones just enumerated or others) contribute to the ultimate product of the enterprise and participate in its eventual distribution.

Obviously there must be some process whereby a decision is reached as to what each of these groups shall contribute to the enterprise and be entitled to receive in return. This is a matter of bargaining—bargaining, in the final analysis—between each of the first three groups (capital, credit, and labor) and the fourth (management). Shall the corporation attempt to obtain more capital? This the management determines. If so, upon what terms? Shall it issue common or preferred shares, par or no par, voting or nonvoting, convertible, redeemable, cumulative, participating, etc.? As to these terms the management bargains. But with whom? With the individual prospective shareholders? Rarely, if ever, in the case of a stock issue of any magnitude. The bargaining is with a group having at least as much bargaining power as the corporation itself, with a financial institution which will make a considerable capital contribution if the terms are satisfactory, with bankers or brokers who will underwrite certain types of issues on certain conditions, with the management of another corporation which will merge or consolidate only pursuant to an approved plan.

If the management determines to borrow funds for the corporation, it negotiates as to the terms with virtually the same powerful bargaining groups as in the case of an issue of stock. If the management determines to buy for the corporation raw materials or machinery or other property, today it bargains for the most part with another corporation. Although the law conceives of a corporation, for many purposes, as an entity, as a single fictitious person, it is patent that the influential corporations are in fact huge combinations of persons strongly equipped for bargaining purposes on all fronts.

But when the management seeks to obtain labor for the corporation (not the results of labor in the form of raw materials or processed goods), it does not bargain with another group. In the absence of an effective labor union, it deals with the individual worker, who, as we have observed, has no bargaining power. If four groups each contribute to a joint enterprise and only three of the groups participate in the determination of how the joint product shall be divided, the inevitable result is that the fourth group receives a disproportionately small share. And this is precisely what has happened and is happening in areas where labor unions are not permitted to flourish.

Labor unions are far from being panaceas for all social ills, but they can do much to remedy this particular abuse. In the first place, they provide a medium for concerted action by which the supply of labor available to an employer may be restricted so that even unskilled labor in an era of unemployment will have some scarcity value. Secondly, they constitute a potential source of that minimum of capital which the individual worker must have if he is to be able to resist at all when deadlocked with his employer over terms and conditions of employment. Labor unions have other values such as building up the morale of the individual worker and improving his knowledge and judgment with respect to labor and other matters. For the present, however, it is sufficient to emphasize that they do furnish the individual worker with at least a measure of the two essentials of bargaining power set forth above.

When an individual worker joins with his fellow workers in striking (as distinguished from picketing, boycotting, and other forms of labor activity) they are merely, by such concerted cessation of work, creating that element of scarcity without which a bargaining situation with respect to terms and conditions of employment does not exist. To take away from workers the right to strike is, therefore, to destroy the possibility of arriving at terms and conditions of employment in the established American way, namely, by a bilateral bargaining process. It may be that in the interest of national defense a decision to curtail in some way the right to strike may eventually have to be reached, but I sincerely hope that this will not be so; and in any event, such a conclusion should not be arrived at lightly, for if Government is to deprive workers of the capacity to bargain, it must then be prepared to determine for both sides all the terms and conditions upon which both capital and labor shall operate. Thus far the Federal Government has elected to put its faith in the ability of labor and capital voluntarily to reach agreements that in the long run will be in the best interests of society; and I pray that the day may never come when the American Government will attempt by legislative or administrative fiat to force upon both employers and employees prescribed wages, hours, prices, and other standards.

ALEXANDER H. FREY.

The Tennessee Valley Authority and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

STATEMENT BY THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement of the Tennessee Valley Authority on national defense.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

T. V. A. AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Faced with the immediate and pressing task of carrying through a national-defense program on a modern scale, the people of the United States today are reaping in rich measure the fruits of their peacetime investments in the Tennessee Valley Authority project.

Since it was established in 1933, the Authority has been engaged in a broad program of regional development contributing much to the peacetime strength of the Nation and giving it stamina for emergency efforts. It has constructed great multipurpose dams on the Tennessee River to produce a vast supply of electric power, provide a modern navigation channel for the movement of commerce, and reduce the ravages of floodwaters.

It has carried on large-scale experiments in the production of phosphatic plant foods and demonstrated the value of concentrated phosphates in development of a permanent agriculture. It has carried on engineering researches to develop new farm tools and machinery and new methods of processing agricultural products. It has made great strides in promoting the conservation of natural resources of soil, forests, and water.

Its technicians in many fields, industrial, chemical, and mechanical engineers, and geologists, have canvassed the stores of raw materials of the valley and have developed new and improved old methods of putting them to practical use for the enrichment of human living. From its efforts have come new basic processes of great value, such as a method for extracting alumina, the raw material of aluminum, from certain clays found throughout the United States. It has made advances in construction of low-cost housing.

In its diversified program for the development of the region, it has cooperated with and coordinated the efforts of a wide range of agencies—Federal, State, and local units of government; cooperative organizations and private business; educational institutions and experiment stations. In the T. V. A. program there has been developed a technique for unification of efforts toward common ends, a democratic process for getting things done.

All of these things, from the projects and plans accomplished to the method of getting them done, are of basic importance to a democratic nation engaged in peacetime pursuits; when faced with an emergency in a hostile world, their value increases manyfold.

AN AGENCY FOR TOTAL DEFENSE

It has become increasingly clear that to buttress the Nation against the threats of totalitarian aggressors calls for no halfway measures; the need of the hour is for total defense.

Security is no longer obtained by maintenance of an armed force, a "standing army" organized as a kind of appendage to the body politic backed by a reservoir of citizen manpower that can be given guns and whipped into a fighting force in time of emergency. Armies must be equipped with a huge number of complicated machines and weapons whose operation calls for men with a high degree of technical skill and adequate training. Massed behind the armed forces must be a vast industrial machine capable of turning out rapidly not only tanks, guns, powder, and ships but an almost countless variety of products whose manufacture calls for skilled workmen, precision machinery, and capacity to produce in tremendous volume. Transportation systems, carrying raw material and finished goods, must be adequate to care for increased burdens. Basic to all must be a soil whose fertility has been built up and maintained to stand the stress of supplying food for the armed forces and the civilian population and providing raw materials for industry. All this must be bound by a unity of aim and effort.

Organization of defenses on this modern scale is a vast and complex task. The Tennessee Valley Authority, as it has developed since 1933 under the direction of the Congress, is peculiarly fitted to shoulder its share of the burden of mustering such a total defense. During its existence it has been the task of the T. V. A. to look at regional problems not singly but as a whole, to see the economic life of the region in perspective, to canvass its resources, and to plan and coordinate the most effective use of these resources.

ORGANIZATION AND PLANS

The Tennessee Valley region is well fitted to contribute to the national defense; it is an inland region, sheltered from attack by distance from the coast and by intervening mountains; it has vast resources of raw materials, some of them of critical or strategic importance to military defense. The history of the T. V. A. stems back to the national-defense development at Muscle Shoals in the first World War, where strategic reasons of safety, power, supply, and transportation dictated the location of a huge nitrate plant. Of nine sites recommended for such plants in 1917, it is significant that eight were in the Tennessee Valley. Construction of Wilson Dam, nucleus of the T. V. A.'s present multipurpose system, was commenced in 1918 as a defense measure.

The Congress, in establishing the T. V. A., placed upon it definite responsibilities for defense in case of need. It was given charge of the World War nitrate plant with instructions to keep it in stand-by condition. The Secretaries of War and Navy were given the right to call upon T. V. A. for manufacture of munitions or nitrogen ingredients of munitions. The T. V. A. Act provided that all its properties, in case of need, might be devoted by the Government to manufacture of explosives or other war purposes.

In carrying out the peacetime purposes of the T. V. A. Act, the Authority assembled a staff of competent engineers, technicians, and experts in many fields and welded them into an efficient, close-knit organization.

During the years since 1933 this organization has not only constructed dams, manufactured and tested phosphatic fertilizers, carried forward measures for conservation of soil and forests, guided research in many fields, and devoted itself to the day-by-day advancement of effort in many fields, it has looked into the future and laid plans which are now bearing fruit in terms of action.

When new supplies of electric power became an imperative demand, T. V. A. engineers were able, without loss of time or efficiency, to speed up construction schedules on existing projects and to undertake construction of a new dam and steam-generating plant in record time. When the Secretary of War called for reopening of the nitrate munitions plant the Authority was able to commence immediately, in accordance with plans already worked out, to adapt the plant for production. These same plans permitted the continued use of a part of the plant for production of phosphates essential to maintenance of the soil.

T. V. A. had at its fingertips a wide variety of detailed information for defense officials and private business about location, amounts and costs of raw materials; about transportation facilities and costs; about industrial water supply, markets, labor supply, and housing. Thus T. V. A. was in a position to save urgently needed time, providing short cuts around costly and time-consuming independent investigations. When the emergency arose the results of T. V. A.'s investigations were immediately available.

Because it had a trained and experienced supervisory staff seasoned and organized, the Authority was able quickly to expand its effort in response to the need for national defense. It was able to expand the number of employees from 13,000 to more than 18,000 within a period of 6 months without loss of time or efficiency. The requisite plans and the requisite technical personnel were available when the need for expansion arose.

Only recently the Tennesse Valley Authority, with a backlog of information to work from, has been called upon to make a survey of the industrial plants available and the kind and quality of products they can produce in the defense effort. This information, to be obtained in cooperation with the Defense Contract Service, Office of Production Management, will provide a basis for "farming out" or subcontracting certain parts of defense orders held by large firms and thus advancing the defense effort by making use of all the available industrial capacity.

Thus, through organization and planning, the T. V. A. has been able to swing into the defense effort without loss of time or energy. The chief requirement was a redirection of emphasis in the work that the Authority had been conducting since its inception. At the same time it has been able to continue its program for the general development and peacetime strengthening of the Nation.

POWER FOR DEFENSE

To produce for defense, industry demands great quantities of electric power. This point was dramatized a few months ago when it was realized that the production of aluminum in the Nation was inadequate to supply the demands, particularly for the manufacture of airplanes. It takes 10 to 12 kilowatt-hours of power to produce a pound of aluminum; the average amount of aluminum required per plane is 5 tons.

In the Tennessee Valley lies one of the major plants of the Aluminum Co. of America, which, since 1936, has been supplied large amounts of electric power from the new plants constructed by the Tennessee Valley Authority. More important still, the Nation found the Tennessee Valley Authority ready with plans, organization, and manpower to meet quickly the new demand for power; Tennessee Valley Authority was able to undertake the construction of new facilities in 18 months to add 300,000 kilowatts of capacity for national-defense use in industry.

Since 1933, under the direction of Congress, the T. V. A. has added more than 500,000 kilowatts of new installed capacity to the power supply of the Southeast. In the powerhouses of six great dams built since 1933—Norris, Wheeler, Pickwick Landing, Guntersville, Chickamauga, and Hiwassee—and in other plants acquired by purchase or lease, the T. V. A. now has an installed capacity of 1,049,600 kilowatts and is producing power at the rate of nearly 6,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year.

This power is flowing directly from the T. V. A. system to great industrial plants like that of the Aluminum Co. at Alcoa; the Monsanto and Victor Chemical plants in middle Tennessee; the Electro Metallurgical Co. plant at Muscle Shoals; the Tennessee Copper Co. plant producing copper and sulfuric acid. Through the systems of 113 municipalities and cooperatives, T. V. A. power flows to scores of other plants whose products are useful in defense—an airplane factory at Nashville, an electro-manganese plant at Knoxville.

These facts vindicate the judgment of Congress in providing for the development of power in the Tennessee Valley, despite the opposition which contended that no use could be found for the vast amount of power to be made available by the multipurpose system.

This power is now at work, and more power—much more power—is demanded.

The country finds the T. V. A. able to supply it.

When the Council for National Defense disclosed an impending shortage of aluminum for airplanes and other defense uses, it concluded that the logical place for a quick expansion of aluminum production was in the Tennessee Valley where the T. V. A. could build new facilities swiftly and efficiently to supply expanded production facilities of the Aluminum Co.

Gano Dunn, one-time consultant for utilities opposing T. V. A., declared in a report for the Defense Commission:

"From the point of view of national defense an increase in power for production of aluminum can be best obtained by an increase in the capacity of the Tennessee Valley Authority."

Foreseeing new needs for power, the Authority had speeded up the construction schedule for Watts Bar Dam by almost a year. To supply another 300,000 kilowatts of installed capacity, earmarked for defense use, Congress authorized the construction of the 90,000-kilowatt Cherokee Dam, a new steam plant at Watts Bar with 120,000 kilowatts of capacity, and nearly 90,000 kilowatts in new units for Wilson and Pickwick Landing hydro projects.

The authorization was approved on July 31. The next morning, August 1, T. V. A. construction crews broke ground on the Holston River for Cherokee Dam under the fastest construction schedule ever attempted for a project of this size. Now, 8 months later, construction is proceeding on schedule; 18 months from the start of construction, about one-half the time required for a project of similar size, Cherokee Dam is expected to be ready to impound water.

A storage project similar to Norris, Cherokee will be more than a mile and a quarter long and 175 feet high; it will impound 1,600,000 acre-feet of water which will not only turn the three 30,000-kilowatt turbines at the 90,000-kilowatt Cherokee powerhouse, but add to the power capacity of the six main-stream plants now in operation, as well as Watts Bar Dam, which will be completed next year. Already 80,000 kilowatts of the additional power have been contracted for by the Aluminum Co.

Furthermore, because of the power to be made available from these plants, the Reynolds Metals Co. has commenced construction of a new aluminum plant at Muscle Shoals, to use 20,000 kilowatts of primary and 40,000 kilowatts of secondary power. Both these contracts were approved by the Defense Commission. Now the Authority, keeping its fingers on the pulse of power demand in the region, is in a position to increase the capacity of the new steam plant to 180,000 kilowatts by adding a third 60,000 unit, and to advance the construction schedule for Fort Loudoun Dam by a year. A congressional conference committee has approved this action and it is now awaiting passage.

This swift response to the Nation's need for power and more power was made possible by the fact that T. V. A. had in existence a skilled, seasoned organization with a record of achievement behind it, and that it had planned ahead. When the demand came, the Authority was able to say where and how more power could be obtained in the shortest space and able promptly to construct the necessary facilities.

NITRATES FOR MUNITIONS

Again, when national defense made imperative the speeding up of munitions production on a large scale, the Authority had available the plans and the requisite force of chemical and construction engineers to prepare immediately for the operation of the nitrate plant No. 2 at Muscle Shoals, one of the largest such plants in the country.

When the T. V. A. was organized in 1933 it was given charge of this World War nitrate plant, with instructions to keep it in stand-by condition for use when called upon by the Secretaries of War and the Navy. In the intervening years, in collaboration with the War Department, the T. V. A. worked out plans for modernizing the plant against the time when its use might be necessary.

On November 1, 1940, the T. V. A. was notified by the Secretary of War to prepare to reopen the plant. The plans went from the blueprint to the operating stage at once, and before long the plant will be able to produce 300 tons per day of ammonium nitrate, a munitions ingredient. Involved in reopening the plant is the construction of a new and modern synthetic ammonia plant to supplant the World War method of production of ammonia by the cyanamide process. This new unit is rising rapidly, while the ammonium nitrate portion of the plant is being put into shape.

In record time T. V. A. was able to put 500 men to work on the construction phase of nitrate-plant preparation; soon 1,000 men will be turning out munitions ingredients from the plant.

PHOSPHATES FOR THE SOIL

No nation is stronger than its soil. In the First World War, the soil of the United States was overworked, its fertility sapped, to meet the wartime demands for food and raw materials.

During the last few years the T. V. A. has devoted a portion of the nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals to the experimental production of concentrated phosphate fertilizers. It chose phosphates, on the advice of agricultural authorities, because phosphorus is the key of the mineral elements of life, and most soils are deficient in it. New and improved methods of producing phosphates in concentrated form have been developed, and 300,000 tons of concentrated superphosphate fertilizer have been manufactured and distributed to farmers through cooperative programs with the land-grant agricultural colleges and through the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. More than 32,000 farmers in 26 States are proving its value in actual farming operations.

The value of phosphates in concentrated form has recently been emphasized by the request of the British Purchasing Commission that the United States supply 40,000 tons of triple superphosphate to fortify Britain's soils in her war effort.

The British asked for concentrated superphosphates because transportation of the same amount of plant food in this form would require less than half the number of ships as compared with ordinary commercial superphosphate fertilizer. This same economy of shipping, handling, and bagging which is of importance to the British when shipping bottoms are at a premium, demonstrates a significant point for American agriculture, since about 50 percent of the cost of superphosphate fertilizer to the farmer is represented by handling, bagging, and shipping charges; the cost to the farmer on the land is materially reduced by high concentrations of plant food.

Important to agriculture in ordinary times, the cheapening of fertilizer and the lessened requirements on the transportation systems to carry it assume even greater significance in emergency; it is imperative that the fertility of the soil be maintained.

The Nation now experiences a shortage of production capacity for concentrated phosphates, due largely to the increased demand resulting from the demonstration of the advantages of such fertilizers through the demonstration programs of the T. V. A. and the extension services of the several States and the educational efforts of the A. A. A. in its soil-conservation program. As compared to the present capacity of some 346,000 tons annually, of which 100,000 tons is that of T. V. A., it is estimated that more than 750,000 tons annually will be needed by 1945.

To help meet this impending shortage, the T. V. A. recently was authorized to construct a new electric furnace at Muscle Shoals to increase the Authority's capacity by 50 percent, to 150,000 tons annually of triple superphosphate or its equivalent.

The plans for ammonia and ammonium nitrate production involve no disruption in the manufacture of phosphates in a portion of the plant; here again, by planning ahead, the T. V. A. has been able to carry on a vital service to American agriculture without disruption by the emergency demands of defense; indeed, phosphate production is an essential element in the defense program.

Hand in hand with the use of phosphates in the program of the T. V. A. and United States Extension Services has gone a program for improved agricultural practices, reduction of erosion by planting of cover crops and by engineering works such as check dams, encouragement of livestock farming, particularly in the South, to replace single-crop agriculture. At the same time, the T. V. A. has taken a leading part in reforestation activities not only on its own lands, surrounding its reservoirs, but by providing seedlings from its two big nurseries for planting by C. C. C. camps and by cooperating owners. Thus the two resources of soil and forests are being strengthened through the T. V. A. program.

HOUSING FOR DEFENSE

The defense program has placed a heavy burden upon housing facilities and has made expansion of housing imperative in many communities where new defense plants are going up. Over the period of existence, the T. V. A. has gained experience in the construction of housing facilities in connection with its project; now it has been called upon to use this experience in the construction of homes for defense industrial workers at Muscle Shoals.

The Authority, for the Federal Works Agency, is now carrying forward the construction of 250 low-cost residences in three cities in the Muscle Shoals area to house workers in defense plants in that area. Besides the T. V. A. nitrate and phosphate plants, a large metallurgical plant is already operating in the area and a new aluminum plant is nearing completion.

Within the last few days the T. V. A. completed a group of six small cottages by factory assembly line methods. Built in sections, three or four to a house, depending on the size, the houses were moved by truck from the shop at Muscle Shoals to Pickwick Landing Dam. There, with the electric and plumbing fixtures already in place, the sections were bolted together and the houses were ready for occupancy within 4 hours. The T. V. A. reported:

"It is thought that the methods used in building these portable cottages may have an especial value in connection with defense or emergency housing, since large groups of low-cost houses built in this fashion could be quickly and easily moved from a location after the need for them had been satisfied, and made available to areas where housing deficiencies existed or where housing was below standard."

NAVIGATION AND DEFENSE

Although still incomplete, the multipurpose system of the Authority has added an important link to the transportation system of the country. There is now available for commercial use throughout the year a continuous navigable channel of 464 miles on the Tennessee, from Paducah, Ky., to Chattanooga, Tenn. The significance of this development is apparent when it is remembered that the first World War heavily overburdened the transportation systems of the country.

With the recent completion of a full 9-foot channel to Minneapolis and St. Paul on the Mississippi, the T. V. A. navigation development assumes even greater importance.

Waterways, of which the United States has 5,700 miles of 9-foot depth and 3,700 miles of auxiliary channels, are adapted to moving heavy bulk materials in large quantities, thus lessening the burden on other transportation facilities in times of emergency.

Already the Tennessee system is becoming widely used, although the controlling depth below Pickwick Landing Dam is only 6 feet during low water. By 1945, 9-foot navigation from Paducah to Knoxville, Tenn., will be provided. An estimated 110,000,000 ton-miles, 20 percent more than 1939, which was a record year, moved on the Tennessee in 1940.

New traffic on the Tennessee, since its improvement, includes gasoline, of which 80,000,000 gallons have been shipped since April 1938. Grain shipments, aggregating 55,000 tons since late 1939, have moved to the Tennessee Valley by water from St. Louis, Mo.; Muscatine, Iowa; and Minneapolis, Minn., and still further increases in grain traffic are in sight.

Pig iron from Birmingham, Ala., transferred to barges at Decatur and Sheffield, Ala., is moving down the river toward defense points in the Midwest; since 1939 about 24,000 tons have been transported, about 10,000 tons during the first 2½ months of 1941. Another significant movement has been that of automobiles, commencing in December 1940; a total of more than 600 cars have been shipped so far.

The most recent shipment of new materials was 1,300 tons of soda ash from Lake Charles, La., moved to Sheffield, Ala., via the Gulf Coast Intercoastal Canal, and the Mississippi, Ohio, and Tennessee Rivers, for the aluminum plant of the Reynolds Metals Co. This large shipment is only a part of the many thousands of tons of soda ash that will be required annually by the plant in processing alumina, the raw material of aluminum.

Besides providing electric power and navigation facilities, the T. V. A. multipurpose system is contributing toward the control of floodwaters; one has only to remember the ravages of the 1937 flood, with its disruption of economic life, its damage to industrial plants, transportation facilities, and farm lands, to realize the value of reduction of flood hazards to a nation in an emergency effort such as the defense program.

T. V. A. AND RESEARCH

The T. V. A. has advanced research in many fields, either in its own laboratories or in cooperation with State engineering and agricultural experiment stations and geology departments in the T. V. A. area. Many of these research projects, carried on in the interest of peacetime development of industry and agriculture, are found now, in the national-defense emergency, to be clothed with new significance.

About one-third of the strategic and critical minerals important for defense purposes are present in the Tennessee Valley in commercial quantities; during its 8 years of existence, the Authority has gathered much information as to location of deposits, costs of processing, and so on. It has done research in the use of Tennessee Valley resources; a striking example is that of olivine, an ore which contains 20 to 30 percent magnesium, more than any other common commercial mineral. A quarter billion tons are available.

The T. V. A. is concentrating its efforts, with considerable promise so far revealed, on this ore as a practical source of magnesium compounds from which magnesium can be obtained. This metal, lighter than aluminum, is highly important in defense; it is used in alloys for airplane construction, is an ingredient in incendiary bombs, and has many other uses. Thus T. V. A. research, carried on in peacetime, turns out to have special significance in emergency. In 1939, the United States produced some 5,300 tons of this metal, compared to an estimated 18,000 tons in Germany.

Another T. V. A. development of particular promise in view of the emergency is a process for extracting alumina, from which aluminum is made, from certain clays found in quantity in the United States. Laboratory tests have indicated the feasibility of the process, and the T. V. A. is preparing for pilot plant operation.

The significance of this development is obvious when it is remembered that most of the bauxite ore, present source of alumina, used in the United States is imported from South America. In times of emergency, a native source of alumina, eliminating long ocean shipments, is a contribution to the national safety.

Research and developments carried on by the T. V. A. in cooperation with the University of Tennessee engineering experiment station have developed a more automatic method of cooking cottonseed to produce an improved grade of cottonseed oil and to increase the effectiveness of small rural mills and thus indirectly encourage the return of cottonseed meal, containing vital plant foods, to the soil; and this cooperative research has also developed improved refrigeration methods for use in rural communities which have great possibilities for bettering the diet of rural people and increasing the profitableness of agriculture. T. V. A. research has also developed a furrow seeder designed for planting grains and fertilizer on sloping grasslands in the fall to protect the soil against winter erosion and to add an extra crop. There is a very considerable list of results from T. V. A. research which might be mentioned; these advances, while conceived as peacetime projects, are found to contribute to the Nation's basic strength in its national-defense program.

Thus the T. V. A., due to its achievements during the past 8 years, its program for the economic development of the Southeast, its well-coordinated organization, and its long-range planning for the future, finds itself in the forefront of the present effort to make the Nation safe against any foreign aggressor.

St. Lawrence River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM RICHLAND COUNTY (N. DAK.) FARMER-GLOBE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an editorial entitled "We Want That Waterway," published in the April 8, 1941, issue of the Richland County Farmer-Globe of Wahpeton, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richland County Farmer-Globe, Wahpeton, N. Dak., April 8, 1941]

WE WANT THAT WATERWAY

(Benson County Farmers Press)

Not so long ago we noticed an editorial in a North Dakota weekly, a good substantial paper it was, too, opposing the St. Lawrence waterway. The objections to the passage from the Great Lakes to the sea was that it would provide another great publicly operated power set-up.

Very evidently the article was one of many releases by a newspaper bureau operated and subsidized by the public-utility companies of the country. If the editor didn't have time to prepare his own stuff he really should look into the background of the propaganda that he does run.

It is hard to see how the public manufacture of electrical energy can be such a drawback to what, in effect, will move our prairies a thousand miles nearer the ocean. The chief objection is that it might create another Tennessee Valley Authority. That would be terrible if the Midwest could have cheap and abundant power without paying tribute to private companies, if we could have the electricity to process our own raw materials at low cost.

Any North Dakotan who opposes the St. Lawrence waterway cares little for the progress of this section. It makes no difference to him how much of an effect the distribution costs have on the producer's price. He cares not if our export outlet is at Duluth or Buffalo or New York. If shippers can whack 20 cents a bushel off their cost of delivering wheat in foreign ports, then it means that this section can compete with low-cost wheat from other areas of the world. Why oppose that because some power company doesn't like the idea of competition and public ownership?

Use of Convoys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. SMATHERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

LETTER FROM W. R. CUNNINGHAM, OF NEWARK, N. J.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in the course of the past 2 or 3 days a communication from Mr. W. R. Cunningham, of Newark, N. J., on the subject of no convoys has come to my desk.

I think the letter is so replete with wisdom, so full of good sense and logic, that I ask unanimous consent to have it published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRUDENTIAL LIFE INSURANCE CO. OF AMERICA,
Newark, N. J., April 17, 1941.

Hon. W. H. SMATHERS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SMATHERS: In the press and over the air we are every day being importuned to demand that this country, our United States of America, be kept out of war. The proponents of this cause, like the ostrich that sticks his head in the sand, refuse to see what current history has written in blood over Europe, that the issue of war or peace lies not with ourselves but with the madman Hitler.

Now this country, with the approval of the vast majority of its people, has undertaken to supply the enemies of the totalitarian powers

with the wherewithal to wage war in their own defense, and I think we here in America are sane enough to realize that the democracies in fighting for themselves are beyond question fighting for us, too; fighting that we may have time to arm to the teeth and be strong enough to resist any possible attack.

Now, all this preparedness for ourselves and munitions of all kinds for the democracies is going to add up to a tidy bill, which bill people like myself will be called upon to meet in the form of higher and ever higher taxes. This being the case, I feel it incumbent upon myself to give expression to the opinion that if American labor and American money is going into the production of armaments to be shipped to England, Greece, etc., it is our bounden duty to see that these things for which we are paying are delivered to those whom we wish to benefit. It is utterly unreasonable for America to spend $7,000,000,000 manufacturing war supplies and then permit the Germans and Italians to send a substantial part of this to the bottom of the ocean. Any step, convoy or otherwise, should be taken to prevent this.

The convoying of our merchandise to belligerent countries will not get us into war. We will get into war when Hitler makes up his mind that he is ready to take us on. If he disposes of Great Britain, it will not take him very long to reach out for the largest plum in the world, and a great number of people, through wishful thinking, would make his job in this country easier than we imagine.

Let us face the fact that the question of war or peace does not rest with us, and that whatever we wish will have little bearing on the final result unless we translate this wish into accomplished facts. Let us do all within our power to keep war from these shores; and since we will provide the democracies with the sinews of war, let us underwrite the delivery of these sinews.

Very truly yours,

W. R. CUNNINGHAM,
Supervisor.

Federal Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAN GURNEY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM SIOUX FALLS (S. DAK.) ARGUS-LEADER

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Daily Argus-Leader of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., of April 18, on the subject of the proposed increase in Federal taxes.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader]

NOT ENOUGH

The administration in Washington and leaders in Congress of the Republican and Democratic Parties have agreed to endorse a tax program that would produce $3,500,000,000 in additional funds.

This isn't enough.

On the basis of expenditures as currently contemplated the total tax collections on the revised basis would be only about two-thirds of the proposed expenditures.

And we have a feeling that the expenditures will be substantially larger than the estimates.

It is entirely possible that the suggested increases combined with the existing taxes may produce only about 50 percent of the actual expenditures.

The American people are not children. They know that the defense program is enormously expensive. And they are willing to pay until it hurts for the security it is scheduled to provide.

Common sense points out, too, that our Government must be kept in a solid financial condition to withstand the shocks that are to be expected in the next few years.

In fact, solvency is one of the foundation stones of an adequate defense. Without it all our guns, airplanes, battleships, and ammunition may amount to little.

The preservation of the internal structure of our Republic rests importantly upon a strong Treasury.

The advantages of a pay-as-you-go policy are numerous. It will soften the inevitable headache that follows a war. It will contribute much to the suppression of inflation by reducing the available spending power of the people. It will serve indirectly as a brake on profligacy, extravagance, and profiteering.

We erred gravely during the World War in failing to recognize the realities. Though taxes were increased, they did not produce sufficient funds to match the expenditures. In consequence, domestic buying continued at an accelerated pace, with prices rising rapidly due to the buying pressure imposed on the markets. After the war we faced the dual complexities of dwindling activities and increased tax payments. How much better it would have been if we had paid for the war in full as we could have done quite easily.

The error at that time may be excused due to our inexperience. But today we have the lesson of 1917 and 1918. There are many men in Washington who can recall that period through personal recollection. They should be among the first to insist that the taxes be increased today to cover expenditures in full.

Such taxes will, of course, be onerous. They will compel the taxpayers to dig deeply into their pockets and to make some personal sacrifices. But these sacrifices are trifles compared to the troubles to which the people of many other nations have been exposed.

Let's be frank and sensible and adopt a real pay-as-you-go policy, thus demonstrating to the dictators that we as a Republic have the understanding and the courage to adopt voluntarily a program that they are required to force upon their people.

Operations of A. A. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM WILLISTON (N. DAK.) DAILY HERALD

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A. A. A. Hurts Some," published in the Williston (N. Dak.) Daily Herald of April 7, 1941.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Williston (N. Dak.) Daily Herald of April 7, 1941]

A. A. A. HURTS SOME

Small farm operators are being deprived of their lands, squeezed out, pushed down even below the levels at which they have operated in the past.

That's no surprise, you say; it's been going on for years. But there are many who will be surprised to learn that in many cases it is the A. A. A. program which contributed to the misfortune. The A. A. A., whose sole purpose and primary endeavor is to help the farmer, is today being found guilty of doing just the opposite in a few cases. It's no indictment of the whole program, but the situation has already started a movement for slight changes to remedy the injustice.

The difficulty arises from the fact that the A. A. A. has in large measure taken the gambling out of wheat farming. The money paid out by the Government is enough, usually, to take care of the cash outlay of putting in a crop. With the cost of planting taken care of, a farmer can enter his spring work with the confidence that if he gets a crop worth harvesting, whatever he receives for his wheat will be gravy, while if it isn't worth the cutting, he at least will have his planting costs taken care of by A. A. A. payments.

The tendency under such a subsidy is for the man who has a large acreage to get still more land to farm. If last year's crop was fair to good, he probably has enough cash on hand to pay the down payment on another quarter or two—or perhaps even enough to buy the land outright. So he goes to the county or to an insurance company which owns land near his, and buys some more. He increases his holdings with the confidence that he can sow wheat this spring without gambling much money, and if he gets a crop he'll show a profit at harvest time. In this way, large-scale operators can get more and more land until they own two, three, four, or five sections.

But how does this hurt the little fellow? Suppose a man is farming three quarters—which isn't enough out here, because the information gained from most careful studies is that a farm family should have at least a section. Of these three quarters, say he owns two and rents the third—has rented it for years. He'd like to buy it, but all the money he gets from his three quarters is hardly enough for family support, so he continues to rent. Comes now the big operator, however, and buys that quarter, taking from a small farmer one-third of his land to add another quarter to a string of 10 or 15 or 20. The small farmer didn't have enough land before, but now he has only half enough and his situation is worse than it ever was.

It doesn't happen very often, but it has occurred enough times in the last 2 or 3 years so that farm leaders are taking note of it and are starting to think of remedies which might be made in the A. A. A. program. Easiest remedy would be to reduce still further limitation on A. A. A. payments. Now, no farmer can get more than $10,000 from A. A. A., which is a lot of money to us in this wheat-farming section. If the limitation were reduced (some say to $1,000), the big farmer wouldn't be subsidized indefinitely by the A. A. A. program but after his expansion had reached a certain point he'd find he'd have to go the rest of the way on his own, not on Government money. This, it is thought, would act as a curb on expansion of big farms, thus protecting the holdings and leases of the smaller ones.

No one proposes junking the entire A. A. A. program because of this fault, but the suggested remedy will be strongly advocated.

Observations on Strike Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. THOM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. PAUL V. McNUTT, FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present herewith the text of a Jefferson Day address delivered Saturday night, April 19 last, before the National Democratic Club of New York City, by the Honorable Paul V. McNutt, Federal Security Administrator:

In the short year that has elapsed since we last paid tribute to the founder of the Democratic Party, momentous and fateful things have happened.

It is as if the sands of time had run out and the hourglass were turned upside down. A full page in history has been turned.

Four years ago the President of the United States, with that insight into events which has made him one of the great leaders of all time, told the American people that this generation had a rendezvous with destiny.

The time is now at hand.

The mightiest combination of forces in all history is now mobilized with the avowed purpose of wiping out every shred of decency and humanity which the race of man has acquired over centuries of struggle.

The slate is to be wiped clean.

The world remade.

There are still a few who purport to see in all this some great, irresistible force of the future; the future, we are told, bearing down on us like a wave. A new and virile organization of society replacing a decadent one. And because it is said to be new, because it is change, it is intimated that it must be good.

At least, it is inevitable, and so we had better make a deal with it.

Imagine making a deal with an irresistible wave.

The truth is, the whole argument is both false and vicious.

Totalitarianism is not the future.

It is a collection of the very dregs of the past—the cruel, ignorant, savage past from which men had prayed they were forever free.

Neither is it a wave.

It is the surging flood of intolerance, bigotry, and fear.

And, finally, it is not new.

It is older than man himself. It is the brutality and ruthlessness of the jungle.

And if the unshakable determination of the free peoples of the world can prevent it, it is not inevitable or inescapable.

But let no one be deceived.

The struggle will be a struggle to the death.

There can be no "deals."

Totalitarianism and democracy cannot live side by side.

The one must be destroyed or the other will perish.

Once again, it is a house divided against itself. The world cannot survive half free, half slave.

As the Nation rallies its forces and mobilizes its strength to keep democracy's flame burning in Europe and the East, may we not pause in our tribute to Jefferson to strengthen freedom's cause on the home front.

It has been said that this is a struggle between two conflicting ideologies.

The war therefore must be carried on with ideas as well as with battleships and guns.

Let us not only save democracy, let us improve it. Indeed, I have the feeling that you cannot preserve it anywhere unless you expand it.

Let us, then, have more of it.

This is a war to defend the bus drivers of Brooklyn, the sharecroppers of Louisiana, and the auto workers of Detroit. May we not guarantee the authenticity of the cause by improving their condition? It will give point to the issue. And it will increase and perfect the unity of freemen everywhere in their struggle against oppression.

It would, I should think, be illogical and in bad taste for us to strive so hard to save democracy abroad while letting it slip at home.

On the other hand, we must liberate the full spiritual and physical forces of democracy.

We have made a mighty effort to achieve a society based on the principles of equality and justice. In a death struggle with the forces of evil, we are unlikely to advance our cause by compromising with inequality and injustice.

Therefore we must never agree to give up any of our hard-earned social gains, as we are sometimes asked to do, on the theory that it is necessary to defense.

Dictators will not feel bad if we cut the budget of the Social Security Board. And the Nazis would certainly not be frightened if we were to reduce the monthly payments to old men and women and to dependent children.

It is just the reverse.

By extending social security and increasing our relief of humanity, we put iron into our democracy and prove all over again to both democrats and totalitarians what we stand for. We show we mean it.

And the same thing goes for what is sometimes referred to as our labor problem.

Astounding suggestions are being made in Congress and elsewhere. Strikes must be outlawed. Strikers punished. It is a choice, we are told, between defense and the closed shop.

After a hundred and fifty years of effort to insure labor against the worst abuse of the capitalistic system, we are now told we must give those efforts up because we can't have them and defense too.

I don't believe it. The argument starts from the wrong assumption.

It cannot be that one man's democracy is another man's poison.

After all, there are about 8,000,000 members of labor unions in this country. They have another 15,000,000 dependents whom they are supporting and another 40,000,000 workers who benefit by their efforts.

That's 63,000,000 people—half the population of this country. I don't think they would enjoy being pushed around to defeat a country where they don't have a free labor movement.

The real issue involved here is what kind of labor policy will bring about the maximum production of materials essential to the national defense.

Will a free labor movement, protected by the law of the land, be more productive than slave labor? Or are we caught in a dilemma in which we must either adopt Nazi tactics or succumb to Nazi domination?

The mere statement of the proposition is its answer.

I will never believe that a nation can preserve its strength by giving up its freedom—that the things which made us different from Hitler's Germany have to be pushed aside in order to insure his defeat.

I can never believe that free enterprise and free labor cannot outproduce slave labor and regimented management—with one hand tied behind it.

And here is a demonstration.

Only last Monday, one of the largest industries affecting the defense preparations of the Nation completed an agreement with one of the largest unions, without a single man-day's loss of time.

Negotiations had been begun between union and management 2 weeks before the expiration, on April 1, of the old agreement. On its expiration, the parties were not yet in accord. The old agreement was extended for 1 week. Negotiations continued. At the end of the week, the previous agreement was again extended. At its end, the new contract was signed by both parties.

This shows what happens when management accepts the principle of collective bargaining, as required by law, and union representatives meet in a spirit of cooperation.

No need here for harsh laws depriving citizens of what Jefferson would certainly call their natural rights.

Not even a government mediator was necessary.

Here is your "cooling-off" period working at its best—voluntarily accepted by both sides to the controversy. A "cooling-off" period before the expiration of the existing agreement—not after it.

The only government policy which is compatible with a democratic society is to insure to both labor and management complete protection of their rights under the law, and emphasize to both their respective obligations under a government which follows the teachings of Thomas Jefferson.

It is to be remembered that any unusual situation raises its problems.

In the readjustments made necessary by the defense program, some people find themselves better off—some, worse.

Under the American system, the fellow who finds himself squeezed is entitled to raise his voice in protest.

When defense contracts are offered to industry, some employers find themselves in a precarious position.

They have the privilege of dickering with the Government so that they won't get hurt. We permit them to strike. Democracy gives them that privilege.

Labor is entitled to the same privilege.

We believe that, in the long run, we make more progress by allowing to all a reasonable latitude for working out their troubles.

Thus we crack down neither on management nor labor because of what they do to the defense program. We accord to both reasonable freedom of action because of what they will do for the defense program.

And the results justify our faith.

Fascists and Nazis purport to believe that strikes are threatening the disruption of our efforts.

But strikes in America are not placing the Nation in peril, totalitarian propaganda to the contrary notwithstanding.

The benefits of letting both management and labor ease themselves into the harness have far exceeded any slight delay in production.

As Justice Holmes once said, strikes are democracy's safety valve. But it is not to be supposed that dictators would understand such a phenomenon.

Far more of a threat to defense production than strikes, either by labor or capital, is the loss of man-days in industry resulting from sickness and accident. For the year 1940, loss of labor power was several times greater from these causes than from strikes.

The point is that we should show several times the concern about the health of industrial workers as for the relatively few strikes which plague us.

The bottleneck is not strikes. It's human health.

It is my business to tackle this problem.

That's why I am so concerned to divert your attention from unimportant to vital aspects of American defense. As usual, they turn out to be the health and welfare of the average citizen—the man most entitled to the blessings of a democratic society. This essential truth was recognized a century and a half ago by the man who, ever since, has been the moving spirit of the political party to which we owe allegiance. It was the central thread of Jefferson's entire philosophy.

We should never forget that we have taken, in the affairs of the world, what is in substance a strictly ethical position. We are staking our shirts on the principles of decency and justice.

We are bound, therefore, to observe all the decencies of our own position and accord justice to all.

Decency is as decency does. We are fighting nazi-ism with democracy; not an imitation of fascism.

Otherwise we will be wide open to logic—and to some of those dirty tricks which history sometimes plays on nations which assume a holier-than-thou attitude—like France.

France seemed strong—internally and externally. Lulled into a mistaken feeling of security, she let her democracy slip. She abandoned, one by one, her great social reforms. The land which was once the cradle of liberty, equality, and fraternity, became hard and calloused. When the danger became apparent, it was too late for the lightning readjustments which were necessary. The hand of reaction had a death grip on the body and the soul of unhappy France.

In contrast to this tragedy are Britain's gallant efforts to defend the birthright of Englishmen and to rededicate itself to the democratic way of life. England, too, had all but forgotten about democracy. The liberal England of the early twenties had given way to a selfish, hardboiled land of appeasement. But when the blow fell the reaction was immediate. England began to look after her democracy.

Right now she is giving all-out attention to a housing problem—the problem of housing men, women, and children under the ground in public bombproof cellars, free to all alike.

The Government was making feeble efforts to house its underprivileged citizens before the war.

But it is doing the job now. And the great miracle of the century is that the morale of the English working classes is unscathed under the merciless rain of death from the skies which characterizes total war.

Before the war the British Government took little interest in what its working people ate.

But now it is a matter of grave concern to the Government. Large central kitchens all over London are serving good, nourishing meals at prices all men can afford to pay.

Democracy is interested in what people eat and how they are housed and whether they are sick or well, miserable or happy.

This, too, has contributed to the maintenance of the morale of a people harassed by the danger of invasion by a foreign foe.

It all goes to prove how devotedly the people will protect and how courageously they will defend democracy when democracy looks after their well-being.

I'm glad America didn't wait until enemy bombers droned overhead every night before taking stock of some of the all-important details of the democratic way of life.

I'm glad we started, back there in 1933, to get serious about unemployment and old people in poorhouses and farmers losing their land, and working men their jobs, and investors their money.

I'm glad we had in this country a political party with the vitality and drive to organize the dynamics of democracy and direct them against the forces which threatened to snuff out the flame of freedom for Americans.

I'm glad we had citizens who could respond immediately and effectively to a crisis in the life of democratic man by strengthening and extending his democracy and thereby making him stronger in every way.

And today, as democratic man the world over is facing an even graver crisis, let us meet it in America by responding in the same way—by securing and extending the democratic process, making it a living, driving force in the lives of the people for whose benefit it was invented.

In 1933 when the political heirs of Thomas Jefferson became charged with responsibility for the Nation's destiny, our democracy faced a crisis, in many respects as acute as the one we face today. The blind fury of unbridled economic forces had wrought such havoc as we had never before known in our century and a half of national life. There were, at that time, close to 45,000,000 hungry American citizens.

Hungry men do not make good citizens.

They began to carry shotguns to foreclosure sales. They took ropes to court houses to hang the judges.

There were food riots and hunger marches.

The ominous rumble of social unrest could be heard in cities and villages from Maine to California. Subversive talk was whispered on every side.

Men were losing faith in a democracy that stood idle and helpless while the people perished. Only a spark was needed to stir the smoldering passions of starving and bitter men into the flame of revolution.

You know the rest of the story.

It is one of the stirring pages in the history of the Nation and the Democratic Party.

With what fearless energy did the people's government give direction to the stream of events during the frantic weeks and months that ensued. Unprecedented problems were met with unprecedented solutions. Fear gave way to hope and hope, in turn, to confidence. The people regained their faith in liberal government. Once again, the common man held high his head and the miraculous powers of democracy were unleashed. And once more ordinary men began to accomplish the most extraordinary achievements.

The thing was done. The crisis met. The party of Jefferson and Jackson had guided the Nation safely through a storm that had threatened to shake it to its foundations.

What our party has done before, it can do again.

We know not what the future may hold.

No eye can penetrate the mist.

But one thing we know.

Secure and unyielding in the faith of our fathers, America faces the angry and evil forces which throb up and down the world, with a steadfast courage and a united will.

We are not afraid.

Leadership of C. I. O. Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

LETTER FROM FRANK R. McGRATH

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to me by Frank R. McGrath, president of the United Shoe Workers of America:

UNITED SHOE WORKERS OF AMERICA OF THE C. I. O.,
Washington, D. C., April 22, 1941.

The Honorable JAMES J. HEFFERNAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a registered Democrat, living at 429 Bergen Street, Brooklyn, in your district.

Once again, in an effort to prevent trade-union activity, Congressman MARTIN DIES has published a list of alleged Communists who are active in the leadership of various C. I. O. unions.

In a list he included March 31 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD there appears my name. He also included Frank Farrell, of New York, and Powers Hapgood, as members of this organization.

No one of the three that he included as members of this organization at any time have had any request for any information or to appear before his committee. Thus, once again, he has perverted traditional rights guaranteed under the Constitution of the accused to have an opportunity to defend themselves or meet their accusers.

That he erred is obvious from the fact that he included Powers Hapgood as a member of the United Shoe Workers of America of the C. I. O., though he has not been connected with this organization since January 20, 1940.

I have known Frank Farrell as an ardent, sincere trade-unionist who has devoted his life and energies to the cause of the underpaid workmen. Frank has been known to me for about 20 years, and never once in all my acquaintance with him has any action or statement which he has made led me to question the patriotism and loyalty to the American way of life on the part of Frank Farrell.

As for myself, I am not and never have been a card-holding member of the Communist Party, or a fellow traveler, nor have I followed the Communist Party line by supporting the Communist Party's front organizations or in any other way. I am opposed to dictatorships and to those who condone their aggression. The only principles I follow are the principles of this country; the only organizations I have supported are the trade-union organizations of the American workers.

In all fairness to me, I feel you should place this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Respectfully yours,

UNITED SHOE WORKERS OF AMERICA, C. I. O.,
FRANK R. McGRATH, *President.*

Questions and Answers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER STEARNS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the

following article from the Christian Science Monitor of April 21, 1941:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of April 21, 1941]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

A young midwestern professor of government called at the office last week. Taking a busman's holiday from his duties on the campus, he was making the rounds of a number of newspaper bureaus in the Nation's Capital. He was asking correspondents the questions which, he said, were most frequently asked him by his friends, by his colleagues, and his students.

Now, frankly, a correspondent—at least a Washington correspondent—likes nothing better than to be questioned. He likes to be asked questions by his visitors and by his readers. Almost invariably—not always, to be strictly honest—he would rather discuss what his readers want to know than what he thinks they ought to know.

This young professor's queries were not a scholar's questions; they were an intelligent layman's questions—and all the better for it. He touched on matters which for the most part, have been covered in these messages, but despite the fact that he was no doubt confirming or checking his own conclusions, it was evident that Washington writers often take too much for granted, should be careful to relate day-to-day developments to basic trends and to write with as much directness and simplicity as one puts into conversation.

"Is the United States nearer war today than 2 months or 6 months ago?"

That was his first question. He meant, of course, active military belligerency. The answer is, "Yes." With the passage of the Lend-Lease Act the United States discarded the letter, spirit, and substance of neutrality. It is today a nonbelligerent ally of the defending democracies.

In fact, it is only technically accurate to say that the United States is a nonbelligerent ally. Actually, the United States is an industrially belligerent ally and is literally fighting the Nazis with its factories and its finance. The only reason Germany doesn't make war on America is that she doesn't want America fighting her with anything more than she is using already.

The United States is nearer the war because the war is nearer the United States. Mr. Churchill recently warned, and accurately, that the battle of the Atlantic was moving westward. That battle of the Atlantic may well be the decisive battle of this war. It will determine whether American aid shall reach the British shores. Unless it does, Britain, every British and American authority agrees, cannot prevail. Because Britain's survival is more acutely at stake than at any previous time, the United States is nearer the war.

"Is President Roosevelt deliberately trying to put the United States into the war?"

The answer I gave was an unqualified, "No" and this was the reply which my questioner received from other correspondents.

The basis of the President's guiding policy is that he is trying to avert the crisis which would make war for the United States virtually inevitable. That crisis is Hitler domination of Europe, the United Kingdom, Africa, and Asia. To forestall this fate, in which free America would be seeking to live and breathe in a world suffocated by tyranny, the President is acting to give total, maximum, all-out, immediate, urgent, and unstinting aid to Britain.

Even in the circumstances, war may confront the United States as a wiser alternative than a Nazi-dominated world, but it is only fair to say that the President has been seeking to make participation unnecessary.

Opponents of the lend-lease bill, many of them affirming their support of the objective of aid to Britain, have argued that this measure was but a preclude to convoys, accused Mr. Roosevelt of urging one step and holding the next in the background.

Convoys may well prove to be the crucial issue on which America will determine its role in the war, but the critical need of convoys does not spring from the method of aiding Britain through the lend-lease bill; it springs from the very policy of aiding Britain at all, which even critics of the bill embrace.

Aid to Britain which doesn't reach Britain is no aid at all. That is the reason the issue of convoys arises, not because the President has willed it. That is why the battle of the Atlantic is decisive.

"Can Britain win? What does Washington honestly think?"

There is no casual optimism. There are dark moments when doubts arise. But what appears to be the most careful, informed, and realistic judgment is this:

The present unshakable, unshatterable morale of the British people is the most powerful single factor insuring Britain's survival. But that will not be enough. Britain will only be in a position to prevail when American industrial power can give Britain air dominance and sea dominance.

But production will not be enough, and this is the heart of the problem.

Every naval or military authority I have talked with is convinced that Britain cannot win the war without the assistance of the American Navy in the North Atlantic nor obtain American war materials without the aid of the American Navy.

In a word, the most candid and informed opinion in Washington is that Britain can win only with American planes and American arms in unlimited volume and that these supplies can only reach Britain with the assistance of the American Navy in one form or another. How the Navy shall render that aid is the crux of America's role in the war. How America decides this question will very likely decide the war itself.

Free Postage for Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to point out that I have been approached by many of my constituents who have complained that they get very little mail from the boys in the service. I have made a study of this situation and find that there is a greater contributing factor for such neglect than mere indifference on the part of the enlisted men in the service of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

I find that the small amount of pay received by the enlisted men leaves them very little money for postage, which is of course, 3 cents per letter. I understand that bills have already been introduced at this session of Congress to grant soldiers, sailors, and marines the privilege of free postage, and I will support such legislation.

We all realized that our Government, through its various legislative and executive agencies, is doing everything possible to make the men in the service physically comfortable, leaving nothing undone toward that end. I am mindful that the social-welfare agencies have been doing, and will continue to do, all that is possible along social lines, taking in the matters of entertainment and recreation to keep the men in a happy frame of mind.

Nothing has yet been done to any extent, however, to make it easier for the soldiers from a monetary point of view to write more often, and I feel that our Government should make a contribution to the men in the service of franked mail, or in other words, free postage. Such action would go far toward increasing the number of letters that would be sent home to the dear and loved ones of these men who are very much concerned as to their well-being and health.

Some may say that putting such legislation into effect will cause a large expense to the Government, but the entire cost of furnishing the soldiers with free mail will be no more than the cost of a small battleship. This matter of postage is something that cannot be passed over lightly. We should make it easier for men in the service and give them the incentive to write often. A happy and contented soldier is one who will defend his country even if it means his life.

We must bear in mind the fact that the parents and loved ones of these men are much concerned with how their loved ones are, and certainly we who are members of this great legislative body should think of the families of these men as well as the men themselves.

Proper housing, proper food, proper equipment, proper supervision, and proper health facilities are all definitely important in their respective places. Letter writing and the inducement for writing on the part of these men who are far from home must be given a place as important as the matters referred to. We owe it to those unselfish citizens who are proud to have their husbands and sons engaged in a vital part of our national defense.

I know that the bills introduced to solve the service men's postage and mailing problems will be favorably received by the men in the service and their families at home. I trust they will be equally well received by the Congress.

More Taxes, Less Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, our people are faced with the imposition of taxes which are heavier than they have heretofore known. The spending of vast sums in the past and before we stated our national-defense program created a debt of approximately $45,000,000,000, which was the largest debt our country has ever known. Large amounts of that money, expended before we began our

defense program, was squandered and wasted. The President launched upon a program of spending when he assumed office, and that policy has continued throughout his administration. He did not consider that the proverbial rainy day would come.

But that day did come, and when the Treasury is bare, we are faced with the very great necessity of developing our national defense in order that we may defend ourselves in case of an attack. The huge sums which have been appropriated for our national-defense program have created an enormous debt and this debt must be paid by our people. Therefore, we find that there is a necessity to impose taxes upon the people which are higher than we have ever known. I am confident our people will fully realize that "pay day has come" when they have these tax burdens to bear. They will realize that they are starting to pay for the folly of the Roosevelt administration, which has been the most spendthrift administration this Nation has experienced. It is a sad future for the children of our country, and it is a sad moment when we reflect upon the startling waste of much of the money which was spent and which created this very dim future for the children of our Nation. It is high time for this Roosevelt administration to about face and to cease the plan of foolish spending of money; every nonessential plan of spending money should be eliminated, and we should proceed with the development of our national-defense program. We have reached the point at which every group in our country should forget about subsidies and think of our national defense. The spending of money, today, should be limited to the preparation of our program of defense in order that we may defend our people, our institutions, and our country in the event we are attacked.

Mr. Speaker, when we consider the weighty question of imposing more taxes upon our people, and I do not know how the people will be able to pay those proposed taxes, we must consider the waste of money which has developed in our defense preparations. For every dollar which is spent, the administration now in power should see that we receive $1 in value. The great waste of money has been observed in almost every department of government, and this waste has been called to the attention of the President and his agencies, but nothing has been done about it. The waste of money in the construction of camps, for equipment and supplies and war material has been discovered, but no action is taken. New and novel projects have been proposed by this administration which will cause the expenditure of huge sums of money and which will not be helpful to our defense program. The St. Lawrence waterway project, which the administration now proposes, will cost untold millions of dollars, and it will not aid our national-defense program. This, as well as all other proposals which are not strictly within the realm of our defense program, should be defeated. We have one goal—that goal is our national defense. Let us meet the challenge; and let us stop the waste and the foolish spending of money before the crisis comes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein a very timely editorial which appeared in the Indianapolis Star, of Indianapolis, Ind., on the 19th day of April 1941, which editorial follows:

MORE TAXES, LESS WASTE

Much as the people dislike heavy taxes, American common sense will applaud the proposal to add $3,500,000,000 to the sum to be levied in the next fiscal year. Even that vast addition to the total that is being raised will be only two-thirds the Government estimates of its expenditures for the fiscal year beginning July 1. It is essential, however, that as much as possible be raised in taxes and as little as possible be obtained by borrowing. The credit of the Nation must be maintained and that cannot be expected if we continue, as in the last few years, borrowing billions with little apparent thought of the day of reckoning.

No definite announcement has been made as to the way in which the additional billions will be collected, but everyone will have to pay a part. The unfortunate feature in such cases is that those in the lowest-income brackets are hit hardest, in proportion to ability to pay. They may not have to make an income-tax return, but they pay just the same. If the $3,500,000,000 were to be distributed on a per-capita basis, every man, woman, and child in the country would pay approximately $27, which would be in addition to all money now contributed.

The citizens of this country who are called on to put up an extra $3,500,000,000 because of the preparedness and defense emergency should insist in no uncertain way that every cent possible be saved on nonmilitary expenditures. Along with the proposal to saddle an extra $3,500,000,000 there has been no evidence of any disposition anywhere along the line to cut down on the hundreds of millions appropriated annually for a long list of items that are still in the experimental stage or were inaugurated to get the country through the depression emergency.

The taxpayer will do his part patriotically for what is necessary. He should not be called on to finance nonessentials. There is, for example, the proposal to spend hundreds of millions on the St. Lawrence power project, along with other hundreds of millions on a Florida canal, an Arkansas Valley Authority, and a Columbia River undertaking. This is no time even to talk about such expenditures. The taxpayer is justified in losing patience with those who refuse to economize where economy is needed. The voters should see to it that any Member of Congress who would vote $1,000,000,000 for waterway and power projects, or is not for economy on nonmilitary items, is not returned to Washington.

National Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an address delivered by me at the annual communion breakfast of the Holy Name Society of the United States Customs Employees at the Hotel Astor, New York City, Sunday, April 6, 1941:

I consider it a great honor and distinction to be invited to address the members of the Customs Service at your annual communion breakfast. No other organization has a biblical background such as yours, for it is recited in the New Testament that our Lord called Matthew from "the receipt of customs." Matthew was the first customs guard that history records, and afterward apparently received the O. K. of his county leader and was made collector of the port in the Sea of Gallilee.

From that time on we have had the tax gatherers with us. Saint Paul, who was something of a warrior in his day, was also a diplomat, because he advised the Romans to "render custom where custom is due," which isn't bad advice even today. Our Customs Service wants what is right and correct. It wants no more, but try to get it to accept less. Be it said, however, that it is the only known service in government that will voluntarily notify you and refund any amount which you have paid in excess, without any claim being made, which in itself is no mean distinction.

Your Service has been in existence in this country for 152 years. On June 1, 1789, George Washington, as first President of the United States, signed the first piece of legislation of the First Congress. I do not know whether the first filibuster took place immediately thereafter, but suffice to say that it wasn't until July 31, 1789, that President Washington signed the second law of the First Congress, which had to do with the creation of the Customs Service, and lo and behold, the boys went to work the next day without having to give a thought to civil-service examinations. From that day to this the United States Customs Service, whose unwritten motto is, "Efficiency in service, loyalty to the Service, and courtesy to the public," has developed a personnel that is second to none in importance as an investigating and policing agency of the Government, as well as the nucleus of our source of revenue.

In the century and a half existence of the Customs Service, vast changes have come over the world, but happily enough, the fundamental principles of our Government have remained for the most part immutable. Within that time the flag of every other country in the world has changed, but there has been no change in our flag, except that more stars have appeared in the firmament. Though our flag and fundamental principles of government have remained unchanged, our country, under our democratic form of government, has not failed to progress. Its forests fell before the onward sweep of civilization; its great prairies became the agricultural center of the world; its mountains yielded their ores so that cities of steel and iron might be built and to our shores came thousands upon thousands of immigrants seeking a haven from religious persecution in their homelands, or looking forward with longing eyes to a land where they might give to their children advantages which they themselves had never enjoyed.

So the cycle of time went on, and our democracy founded upon the principles enunciated first by the Jesuit Cardinal Bellarmine and vitalized and immortalized by Thomas Jefferson, that "all men are created equal" and that "government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed," became the greatest country in the world.

Devoted to peace, isolated from the rest of the world by vast oceans on our east and west, our country for more than a century and a quarter was able to keep free from the wars of Europe. But the progress that had

been ours and the inventions of our scientists, brought us nearer to the Old World and to the wars that have scourged Europe through the centuries.

Where 152 years ago the Atlantic was sailed in a month, today it is spanned in hours; the word spoken today in New York is instantaneously wafted over the air waves to Berlin, Paris, Rome, or London; undersea boats, which once existed only in the imagination of Jules Verne in Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea, today are pirates of the deep that strike in the darkness of the night and send their victims to watery graves without a warning; the skies, where God had placed the sun to warm the earth and the clouds whence came the rain and the stars to guide the mariners at sea, are now filled by man-made machines that hurl their thunderbolts of death and destruction at fellow men upon the earth beneath.

It is in such a world we are living today, Catholic men. It is in such a world that the Catholics of America must realize that if they are to survive they must prepare to defend themselves and the country which they love. All Americans, Catholic, Protestant, Jew, or nonbeliever, must unite and be ready to defend those principles which the fathers of our country called self-evident, that "all men are created equal" and "government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed." The principles of American democracy are irreconcilably opposed to the tenets of the totalitarian governments of the world, whether those tenets be disguised in the cloak of nazi-ism of Germany, fascism of Italy, communism of Russia, or the militarism of Japan. Let me make this observation—that the sooner we put into concentration camps those in our country who would destroy our democratic form of government and foist upon us the totalitarian system of Hitler, Mussolini, or Stalin, the better off we will be. And don't forget that only about 3 years ago the pink Board of Education of the City of New York, which today is paler, more through fear of public opinion than conviction, refused to prohibit the use of public-school buildings for meetings of the Communists. The communistic groups still may hold their meetings in our public schools, but the Board of Education doesn't look upon them with such favor today, not because the Board of Education loves America more than it did 3 years ago, but, in my opinion, because it loves Stalin less since he became a partner of Hitler and Mussolini.

Catholic men, America needs you today—needs you more, perhaps, than ever in her history. She needs you because you are Catholic men; she needs you because she knows that you are members of that church which has been preaching like a "voice crying in the wilderness" against the deification of the state; she needs you because, as you are Catholic men, you believe that "all men are created equal" and "government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed"—that is true catholicism and true Americanism. It was Cardinal Bellarmine, the Jesuit, and Thomas Jefferson, the free thinker, who rightly interpreted the words of Christ, "Go forth and teach all men." He didn't say to teach only Aryans. He said "all men." You will remember that question in the catechism the good nun would ask when you first went to school, "Why did God create me?"—and your answer, "God created me to know Him, to love Him, and to serve Him in this life and to be happy with Him forever in the next." It made no difference whether prince or pauper, white or black, the answer was the same—and before God they are the same. If all men are created equal, then their rights are equal and king, dictator, or government has no more power than the people they govern give to them.

To preach such doctrine in the totalitarian countries of the world is treason, yet those are the principles of democracy, the foundation upon which our great country has been built. Those are the principles that the great President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, has proclaimed in his denunciation of the aggressor nations of the world, which have ruthlessly disregarded the inalienable right of the peoples of small nations to be ruled by the government of their choice.

There are some Americans who are afraid to proclaim these principles, but, thank God, there is one who fearlessly and defiantly hurls back the challenge of totalitarianism; there is one who is unafraid to proclaim his belief in American principles of democracy, and he is the President of the United States. Around him in this hour of crisis, let Americans, regardless of race, color, creed, or political affiliation, rally. Let us show to the world that we are in truth "one Nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." The more united we are in our common purpose of defense, the more distant will the threat of war become.

America is unused to privation, but today, though at peace, we are in the shadow of war and America now calls for sacrifice in the real hope and expectation that the sacrifices that are made now will be the means of preventing greater sacrifices in the future.

I recall when the Seventy-sixth Congress had the selective-service and training bill under discussion, the letters I received. Many of the writers couldn't see the need of preparation; many of them, unwilling to make sacrifices themselves, suggested that our military and naval services be recruited from the unemployed, but the Congress of the United States declared, in no uncertain terms, that "all men are created equal"; that they have equal rights and, by the same token, they have equal responsibilities for the preservation of those rights and, in the American way, the youth of our country are responding to the call.

I well remember when the Seventy-seventh Congress had, only a few months ago, under consideration the lend-lease bill, I received letters expressing opposition to it; and the majority of those who then wrote were the same people who had opposed the military training of our youths. They charged Congress with abdicating its power; they accused the President of the United States of seeking to become a dictator; they had deafened their ears to words of reason, closed their eyes to the events of the time, blacked-out their minds to the cold, hard facts that confronted us and filled their hearts with Old World hate rather than with love of the country that had given them succor when they were in need, homes when they were homeless, and the protection of our democratic Government, which guaranteed to them and to their posterity freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom to worship their God according to the dictates of their conscience.

Sacrifices must be made, not only, however, by the flower of our American youth, who have given up their homes, their jobs, and, perhaps, their careers to wear the uniform of their country, but sacrifice must be made both by capital and labor, so that our boys in the camps and on the seas may get the things they need and that the flow of materials might continue uninterruptedly to those countries that are fighting the aggressor nations of the world, so that the war may be kept from the Western Hemisphere. This is no time for a war in the United States between capital and labor. It might be well for the captains of industry to realize that there are to be no exorbitant war profits, and it might be well for the leaders of labor to realize that the American people are beginning to lose patience with strikes that halt production in essential defense industries. It is time for industry to sit down with labor at the conference table and to determine, not what is most advantageous to capital and what is most advantageous to labor, but what is best for the United States of America. The American people want to be fair to both capital and labor; Congress wants to be fair to capital and labor; but the American people and Congress want capital and labor to be fair to the United States and to the boys who are in service. There is no captain or group of captains of industry bigger than the United States Government; there is no labor chief or group of labor chiefs bigger than the United States Government. I have faith in the patriotism of the businessmen in this country; I have faith in the patriotism of labor in this country; and I feel that neither will let their country down in these dark days. I feel that the common sense of both, the love of country of both, will cause them to settle down and resolve their disputes in an amicable way, without the stoppage of production, and put their shoulders to the wheels of industry so that the flag of our country might continue to fly over a peaceful and liberty-loving people.

Democracy cannot fail when we have the will to make it prevail. And the American people have not only the will, but the fortitude and determination, that it shall prevail. No Hitler, Mussolini, or Stalin can ever change that determination; no totalitarian state will ever arise upon the ashes of our democratic institutions; our children will never be regimented slaves of the state, but the sacrifices that are made today by our youth, by capital and by labor, and by all Americans, will toughen the fiber, steel the heart, and discipline the mind of America, so that, united behind our President, the United States of America will proclaim to the world, either in the sunlight of peace, or the shadows of danger, or the darkness of war, that "all men are created equal" and that "government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed."

The National Safety Demands a Sea-Level Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHAPEL HILL (N. C.) WEEKLY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Chapel Hill Weekly, of Chapel Hill, N. C., commenting upon the bill recently introduced by me to convert the Panama Canal into a sea-level canal.

[From the Chapel Hill (N. C.) Weekly of April 18, 1941]

THE NATIONAL SAFETY DEMANDS A SEA-LEVEL PANAMA CANAL

People whose memory goes back 40 years recall the argument about whether the waterway across the Isthmus of Panama should be a lock canal or a sea-level canal. The decision for locks was made because the method of construction was cheaper.

In those days there were no airplanes, and even long after the coming of airplanes nobody ever dreamed of such a weapon as the modern long-distance bomber. Nobody

thought that the Panama Canal could possibly be attacked except by land and sea forces, and against them one type of canal could be defended about as well as another.

The American people as a whole do not appear to be giving much thought to the danger of the Panama Canal from attack by air, but there are a company of men in Washington—in the Army Engineer Corps, in the Army and Navy staffs, in Congress—who are keenly alive to this danger. The leading spokesman of this company at present is Representative JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, of Texas. He is urging upon Congress the necessity of converting the lock canal into a sea-level canal. He knows the facts, and his reasoning from the facts is absolutely convincing.

"If all the technical and scientific improvements that have been developed in the last 40 years are to be ignored," he said in Congress this week, in support of the bill that he recently introduced "we will certainly go backward instead of forward. The offensive features of air warfare are developing much faster than the defensive features and as yet we do not see much evidences of air defenses catching up. There must be planning for dispersion and avoidance of the dangers from offensive air warfare until we see more chance of effective defenses than is conceivable now.

"Our preparations for defense would be in a sad plight if they were confined to the measures that were considered satisfactory in the Spanish-American War. Our artillery consisted of old 3-inch cannon. The only rapid movements and reconnaissances we had, were by the use of horse cavalry. Think of depending upon such operations nowadays.

"Let us not make the mistake of adopting a complacent attitude with respect to the interoceanic canal across the Isthmus of Panama. It is unthinkable that anything physically possible should be left undone for its security, because its constant use is essential to peacetime prosperity and for the passage of our naval vessels in wartime in order that they may defend the Nation both in the Atlantic and in the Pacific oceans."

This is sound sense. With all that is going on across the seas to absorb people's attention in these days, it cannot be expected that public opinion all over the country can soon be aroused about the defense of the Canal. Congress ought not to wait for that. Mr. Mansfield's proposal is backed by the highest authorities in engineering and in military and naval strategy, and Congress should enact it without delay.

America's Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

ADDRESS BY REV. E. STANLEY JONES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, what part should America play in this world crisis?

I recently had the privilege of listening to Rev. E. Stanley Jones, the world-famous missionary to India. The subject of his talk was What's America's Role in This Crisis? Here is found a statement of a great Christian thinker—a statement which cannot be brushed aside by saying it is the result of prejudice or one-sided, loose thinking. Here is to be found the vision of a man who is looking beyond the present, who is sensing that if we of this generation are to do a real job we must find the solution to war.

All may not agree with what this great thinker says, but those who will read his address, found in the Christian Century, will be cognizant of the fact that they have met up with an idea.

It was Emerson who said, "Beware when a thinker is let loose; he may turn the flank of any science or knowledge."

Mr. President, I request that this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Century of March 19, 1941]

WHAT IS AMERICA'S ROLE IN THIS CRISIS?

(By E. Stanley Jones)

The question as to what should be the role of the United States in this world crisis haunts many minds. Many are inwardly dissatisfied with the statement of President Roosevelt that our national role is to be "the arsenal of democracy." We feel that God has some greater role than that for us to play in human affairs. Apart from the question of a divine vocation, it seems cheap that we should manufacture instruments of war with which other people are to fight what many believe to be our battles for us. And yet that is the position we are fast coming to occupy in the world mind. A Hindu chairman introduced me in India as "a man from that country which is supplying munitions to the rest of the world." I inwardly squirmed.

Just what is our national role? There are three possible roles. First, we can be a participant in the war. Second, we can be an arbitrator. Third, we can be a mediator. Which is it to be?

LESSONS OF EXPERIENCE

We can be a participant. This role I cannot accept. Our participation last time was disastrous to everyone concerned. It would have been far better to have had "a peace without victory," for drunk with victory we laid the foundation of this war in the Versailles Treaty. There is no reason to believe that our participation again would be any less disastrous. If we get into the war there will be one unexhausted nation at the close, and that will be Russia, and Russia will therefore decide and dominate the peace. And everyone will be too exhausted to object. And the probabilities are that the common people, seeing Russia as the only nonbelligerent, will turn to her as the messiah to lead them out of this recurring hell of war and depression. America should be unexhausted at the close of this war—that is, if she would have any decisive influence in the future of the world.

That leads us to the second possibility, that of arbitrator. The large majority of people think this is the role of America, namely, to stay out of the conflict, but to decide the right and wrong of the dispute and then throw her resources, short of war, to the side of right. I disagree, for this presupposes that right is on one side and wrong is on the other. The facts seem to point otherwise. There is no completely black and completely white in this war. If Hitler is the immediate cause of this war, the Allies are the remote cause. We laid the foundation of it in the Versailles Treaty and refused to modify it at any stage except under compulsion.

Lord Lothian, late Ambassador to the United States, said in an address given at Chatham House on March 24, 1937, "If another war comes and the history of it is ever written, the dispassionate historian a hundred years hence will say not that Germany alone was responsible for it, even if she strikes the first blow, but that those who mismanaged the world between 1918 and 1937 had a larger share for the responsibility of it." If so, then how can we take the role of arbitrator and decide one is right and the other is wrong? They are both right and they are both wrong. I do not decide the relative right and the relative wrong—that remains for a later stage.

THE MEDIATOR'S TASK

That leaves the third possibility, namely, mediation. I believe this to be our role. A man who is very successful in settling labor-capital disputes told me he prefers to be called in as a mediator rather than an arbitrator, for as an arbitrator he has to decide between two positions, both of which may have some wrong and some right in them, but if called in as mediator it is possible to get each to change and thus come to a third position, beyond each and yet gathering up the truth in each. In doing so, he usually lays the foundations of a lasting peace, whereas in arbitrations he often lays the foundations of another clash, since the party decided against feels its truth is not recognized and plans revenge.

When this war began a verse of Scripture became luminous for me and provided a guiding star amid the gloom. It has held good all through and I believe it to be valid as a guiding principle for the present. It is Ephesians ii: 15 (Moffatt), "To make peace by the creation in himself of a new man out of both parties." This principle Paul applied to the clash between Jew and gentile. He saw that if the Jews conquered the gentiles or the gentiles conquered the Jews, the foundations of a new clash would be laid. On the other hand, if neither conquered the other, but God conquered both, then out of the two would emerge a new man, different from each, but embodying the truth of each and eliminating the wrong of each. The emergence of that new man would create peace, a lasting peace, for the new man would be a cooperative man. The hope of the future is to produce that new man.

PEACE WITHOUT VICTORY

I am persuaded that if Britain conquers Germany, or if Germany conquers Britain, then in both cases there is laid the foundation of another war. So the thing see-saws back and forth down through the exhausting centuries. Do not ask me which I would prefer to have win, for obviously my sympathies are with Britain. I would prefer that Britain win, for I would prefer to have the British spirit rather than the Nazi spirit dominant in the world. Far rather. But as a Christian, I am not content to have the British spirit dominant in the world. As deeply appreciative as I am of the British spirit, I am no more content with it than the finest among the British themselves are. For the British spirit has often manifested itself in imperialism and selfishness which no one can justify. I no more desire the dominance of the British spirit than I want the dominance of the American spirit, for I am too conscious of the wrongs in the attitudes and spirit of my own Nation. When Hitler says that we say we are fighting for democracy when we are only fighting for plutocracy, I know that isn't the whole truth, but there is enough truth in it to make it sting.

Frankly, I do not want any existing national spirit to be dominant in the world. I want a new spirit—a third something out of each. That new spirit will be a cooperative spirit. Impossible, you say? Well, all right, then I shall give myself to the impossible. For I see that the opposite is not only impossible; it is ruinous. But is it so impossible? You reply that it is, as long as Hitler is there. I agree. But there are two

ways of getting rid of Hitler—smashing him from without and undercutting him from within. The smashing him from without method has produced a united people behind him. For our attempts to smash him only verify his central thesis—that the Allies are out to crush Germany, and have been from the beginning.

Upon that resentment Hitlerism feeds. Take that away and you cut the root of Hitlerism. It withers for lack of sustenance. There is only one way to get rid of Hitler and that is to get him out of the hearts of the German people. You can do that by righting the wrongs against which he protests, plus going beyond in a sincere offer of making a new world in which the Germans will play an equal, unhampered part along with others. If they were offered that, and sincerely offered it, would they prefer to hug the Hitlerian bonds of suppression and fear? I doubt it. He is their messiah, because they see nothing else. We must offer that something else.

A COOPERATIVE WORLD AT BIRTH

But that "something else" is just what is struggling to be born. This world crisis is meaningful. The thing that is struggling to be born is a cooperative order. All the great answers to the world need are going in one direction—the direction of cooperation. That is the one hopeful thing on the horizon. Fascism attempts to enlarge the area of cooperation, but stops within the limits of the state. Within the state they have a cooperative order, a national socialism. Nazi-ism enlarges the area of cooperation, but stops within the limits of the race. Within the superior Aryan race there is a national socialism, a cooperative order. Communism enlarges the area of cooperation, but stops within the limits of the class, the class of the workers. Within the limits of the class of workers there is socialism, a cooperative order. It is true that they say they are going on to a classless society, but in the meantime there will be a dictatorship of the proletariat, the class of the workers. Communism stops within the limits of the class with its cooperative endeavor.

I repeat that all the great answers are going in one direction—cooperation. If all of these are going in one direction, why is there chaos and confusion and war? For the simple reason that if you stop with cooperation within the limits of the state you lay the foundation of clash between states, as now. If you stop within the limits of the race, then other races will combine against you, as now. If you stop within the limits of the class, then other classes will combine against you and there will be class war. All of these try to found life on a partial truth, and hence they will break down.

The Christian is the one person who has no limits to his application of the principle of cooperation. His unit of cooperation is the last man of every state, every race, every class. "One is your Father, and all ye are brethren," sums up the Christian position—the world a human family, with God as our Father. But the family is the one cooperative order in human society. Were it based on competition, then it would not hold together for 24 hours. If every meal were a scramble as to which could get the most and pile it around his plate, without regard to his own needs or the needs of others, the home would be broken up in 24 hours.

A CHRISTIAN WORLD ORDER

And yet we expect the economic world to hold together on that basis. It cannot be done. So the next step forward is in the direction of a cooperative order. The competitive principle has made its contribution and has run its course. We are now at the end of an era. The Malvern Conference of the Church of England saw this clearly and frankly stated the first plank in the new order for Europe to be a cooperative commonwealth.

That cooperative commonwealth must not be merely European; it must be world-wide. Detached as America is, she is in a position to be the mediator of that new world order. We ourselves are the epitome of it. We have welcomed to our shores the have-nots of all nations and have given them a place in our national life and a share in our national wealth. And, deeper still, those of us who welcome the have-nots are ourselves have-nots; we are a nation of have-nots. We are, therefore, constitutionally on the side of the under dog. It is our natural role in life. And that is the secret of greatness—the servant of all becomes the greatest of all.

If we abandon that role and become militaristic and imperialistic, either on our own or in the defense of imperialism, then we have repudiated our part, abandoned our role, and have failed the world. For the world needs nothing so desperately as one detached, disinterested friend of all. We could be that friend of all.

It is not yet too late to stop this descent to Avernus. Our role is not to take sides and go to war in behalf of one side or the other—ours is to get both sides to change and to produce out of them a new man, so making peace.

STEPS TOWARD MEDIATION

In order to get both sides to change we should show our sincerity by making at least the following changes in ourselves. I hesitate to give specific steps for the reason that if those steps do not appeal to some they may reject the central thing I am pleading for, because they do not like the steps to that end. That would be unfortunate, for while I believe the central thesis to be sound, there may be a better set of steps. I venture to give these because they center around one idea, namely, equality of opportunity, for I believe that equality of opportunity is the keynote of the future. Anything less than that is bound to be unstable and is bound to crumble.

Equality of opportunity would build the future on enduring foundations. Note that I do not say, "equality", but, "equality of opportunity, for while we are not all equal in endowment, there should be equality of opportunity given by society. If the individual or the nation does not take advantage of that equality of opportunity, then the fault lies on them and they must take the consequences. These are the steps I would suggest:

First, we will undertake to give equality of opportunity to everyone within our own borders. Two classes are disinherited among us: those who haven't a white skin, and those who haven't wealth, inherited or acquired. We will wipe out those two disabilities by giving equality of opportunity to all. Democracy means equality of opportunity—social and economic as well as political.

Second, we will undertake to give equality of opportunity to all to come to our shores. That would mean putting the Asiatic peoples on the same quota basis as the rest of the world, 2 percent of those in the 1890 census, which would mean only about 250 people from all Asia. This would take the sting out of our relationships with Japan.

Third, we will insist on the redistribution of the raw materials of the world to all on the basis of equality of opportuntiy.

Fourth, we will insist on the redistribution of the land opportunities of the world. Peace is precarious as long as 26 percent of the earth's surface is held by one nation, Great Britain. It would be a happier and more prosperous Britain if she should divide some of the land space of the world with the have-nots. To that many Britons themselves agree.

Fifth, we will insist that all subject nations or peoples be given a free, unhampered opportunity to choose their own destiny.

Sixth, we will agree to enter a federal union, based upon a limitation of national sovereignty, with all nations of good will, whatever their particular type of government.

Seventh, as evidence of our good faith we will cancel all debts owing to us. Further, we will place at the disposal of this federal union the gold we have buried in our vaults, provided it is used for purposes of world reconstruction on the basis of need, apart from race or nationality.

I have said nothing about disarmament for I feel that if we take these steps then these huge armaments will drop off as a dead leaf before the rising sap of a new life.

If the reply is made that our nation is not willing to do this, then my duty is clear. As a Christian I shall stand for it, whether my nation is prepared to stand for it or not. I can wait. For the future belongs to some such move. We are in a position to make that move. If we do not, then we as a nation will play truant from our destiny.

The President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. EATON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann, from the New York Herald Tribune for April 19, 1941:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 19, 1941]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

THE PRESIDENT

In this tremendous time the American people must look to their President for leadership. They are not getting leadership from the President. They are not being treated as they deserve to be treated and as they have a right to be treated. They are not being treated as men and women but rather as if they were inquisitive children. They are not being dealt with seriously, truthfully, responsibly, and nobly. They are being dealt with cleverly, indirectly, even condescendingly, and nervously. They are asked to put their trust in the President, which indeed they must, for he is the President; but in return they must have his trust, and they must have his confidence, and they must have his guidance.

Only the President, because he is the Chief Executive, is in a position to know all the facts. Only the President and his advisers are in a position to weigh all the facts. Therefore, the President alone can lead the country. It is impossible for the country to lead the President. The newspapers do their honest and their courageous best to report the facts. But they are obstructed by an almost impenetrable censorship in all the critical quarters of the world. Editors, orators, writers do their best to discern the significance of the facts which happen to be available to them. But the policy of a government in a time of supreme crisis cannot be shaped by such partial judgments on insufficient evidence. Yet that is all that can come from private committees, from mass meetings, edi-

torials, and speeches. The policy of the Government must rest on the support of the Nation. But the Nation must first be informed, and always it must be dealt with squarely.

There is not the slightest reason to doubt that the American people will in the future as they have in the past do whatever they are convinced they must do to preserve their independence, their liberties, and their honor. Once convinced, they have authorized expenditures for defense which in fact are limited only by the country's capacity to produce. Once convinced, they have adopted conscription. Once convinced, they have committed themselves to aid their friends. Once convinced, and as soon as they are asked, they will pay taxes, they will save, they will forego business as usual and their luxuries and conveniences. They are working, and they will work harder, and they will forget petty differences—once they are convinced and are seriously asked to do so.

This people is made of better stuff—is more ready to face the truth, more ready to rise to the occasion—than the President implies by his cleverness and his maneuvers and his devices and his casual comment on great issues. Because the President is underestimating the American people, he is separating himself from the American people, denying to them the guidance which is their right and depriving himself of the support of the people's convictions which is the Government's indispensable need. In the presence of such momentous events—involving momentous decisions whatever may be the course of events—there is no substitute among free men for lucidity and courage and the simplicity of a noble spirit.

The President of the United States cannot administer the whole effort of the Nation. The reason why Mr. Roosevelt is failing to inform the people and guide them, and is thus becoming separated from them, is that he is exhausting his energies on tasks that no one man can possibly do well, and that no President in such a time as this ought to attempt.

It is absurd, for example, for him to think he can decide, as he did the other day, whether the steel capacity of the country is sufficient. It is absurd for him to think that he can, as is now proposed, settle the coal strike in the southern fields. It is absurd for him to think that the lend-lease program can be administered personally from the White House. Yet if he attempts all these things, and a thousand others besides, he will never have the time or the nervous energy or the physical strength to do well the great things a President must do—to anticipate the future, to determine the great issues of policy, to select the right men to execute the policies, and never to cease explaining to the people—directly and publicly and also privately and continually through their chosen leaders what the Government is doing and why.

If the President is to do the things which only the President can do, he will have to give up doing the things that others could do better, and would if they had the chance. He must trust the people, must guide them, and depend upon them. And he must trust individuals in the vast undertaking of the Government, and if there are men who cannot carry the responsibility, they must be replaced and others found who can carry it. Instead, Mr. Roosevelt is playing with the people, and in his own administration he will not give adequate authority to the competent and he takes upon himself the unnecessary burden of carrying along the incompetent.

That is not the way to make democracy work and prove itself in the greatest test to which it has ever been subjected. To fail to inform the people, waiting for them to lead him, is not democracy but demagogy. To act as if the people had to be manipulated is to deny the very virtues on which rests the hope of democracy; it is to think that free men will shrink from the truth and flinch in their duty. To fail to call into his councils men of all parties and factions is to cut himself off from the sources of wisdom and to close the only way to that union which is a nation's strength. To refuse to displace the incompetent, to hold back from giving authority to the efficient, to clutch in his hands so many strings that they must become tangled is to deal in a trivial fashion with a great occasion.

The Brighter Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK DAILY MIRROR

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Daily Mirror.

I was so impressed with the article by Damon Runyon that I could not resist asking for the unanimous consent of the House to have it reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is refreshing to read the views of Mr. Runyon on the problems of our President and I hope other writers will follow his example by presenting the constructive side of the picture.

The following is the article:

[From the New York Daily Mirror of April 22, 1941]

No one ever seems to think of the terrible mental strain under which Mr. Roosevelt must be laboring. No one ever seems to think of the sleepless nights and the disturbing visions that must be his. We read more words of criticism than of sympathy for him, though it seems to us that he should have the deepest sympathy. You might judge from some of the comment that his critics think he is enjoying himself, when the truth of the matter is he is probably one of the saddest of men.

Mr. Roosevelt is flesh and blood and heart and soul. He is one of the great humanitarians of history. He will be so rated in the years to come. It is inconceivable that a man of his mold would not have tremendous feeling in this hour, one of the most critical ever faced by a Chief Executive of the United States. It is our guess that he prays nightly that God give him guidance in the decisions he must make and which will affect 130,000,000 Americans.

Mr. Roosevelt is normally a folksy sort of man, though he was born to money, to fine living, and to social position. He is a man who likes to laugh, who enjoys a good story, who dabbles in stamps and ship models as hobby, who finds pleasure in putting on old clothes, and going fishing, and who smokes cigarettes by the dozens, and gives his pals odd nicknames, and who loves to see those around him happy and contented.

He is still able to turn his familiar, reassurring, and warming smile on his people on occasion, but within him his heart must be as heavy as lead. It is not in human nature that a normal man could contemplate the dismal prospects of the days ahead without foreboding and sorrow, and Mr. Roosevelt is one of the most complete human documents the world has ever known. If the fellow in the street feels depressed, how must Mr. Roosevelt feel?

We think it cruel and unjust to suggest that Mr. Roosevelt wants to lead his people into war, which is the constant cry of his critics. Why would he? He knows the horror of war. He has seen the devastated cities and the homeless women and children and the crippled and blind men that result from war. His own sons would be in the fighting line with the sons of his old neighbors and friends and the sons of the little people he loves.

He has manifested that love time and again. In return the people have given him the greatest distinction ever bestowed upon a man in the history of the Republic. What a wicked thing it is to say that a kindly man like Mr. Roosevelt would want to sacrifice the lives of these people in war. We think that anyone who believes that Mr. Roosevelt would wantonly betray the confidence of the people is a fool, but too many forget that this confidence imposes upon him certain responsibilities, first and foremost of which is the preservation of our free life.

And with this threatened, as it is, Mr. Roosevelt would be derelict in the oath he took in the name of his Maker to defend the Constitution of the United States, did he not take steps to avert the threat wherever those steps might lead. He would stand before the bar of history as an incompetent and a traitor to the American ideals and to humanity. That is why today he occupies the most trying position of any man alive, probably torn by conflicting emotions and his days darkened by dread. It is strange that his critics cannot see that this greatest of human beings must be suffering in this hour of trial.

Well, we are going to have a little bet on Mr. Roosevelt to win the war for Britain without getting us involved in actual hostilities. We admit that this looks like a hard trick to perform but we have seen him accomplish miracles before and this may be another. In any event, we have always found it a good idea to string with the champion until he loses one.

It is said that from the White House he can see the majestic pile raised to the momory of another man whose life was made sorrowful by the burdens placed upon him when he was President, and, possibly, as he views that tribute of a great people to one of its great leaders, Mr. Roosevelt finds comfort and courage in the words of Abraham Lincoln:

"Let us have faith that right makes might; and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

An Appeal to German-Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

LETTER OF HANS SCHMIDT FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been directed to a letter

signed by one Hans Schmidt appearing on page 9 of the Sunday, April 19, edition of the New York Times. It carries suggestions that should appeal to German-Americans with few exceptions. It is an appeal to German-Americans to organize to perpetuate our form of government and to champion liberty and freedom of peoples. I have been so struck by its logical forcefulness that I cannot resist asking unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I do not know Mr. Hans Schmidt but his letter indicates that he is a sincere and intelligent citizen and I hope he will find great support for his proposals among the German-Americans in our country.

The letter follows:

[From the New York Times of April 20, 1941]

ANTI-HITLER MOVE—FREE GERMAN GROUP URGED HERE TO COMBAT NAZI-ISM

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Last Autumn the suggestion was made in these pages that a representative body of free Germans be created in the United States. While at that time many may have doubted the wisdom of such a move, today the vital need for a central organization of free and patriotic anti-Nazi Germans should be obvious to everyone.

The present world conflict is not mainly a struggle between nations for supremacy; it is a world civil war waged between the forces of a revolutionary nihilism, as symbolized by Hitler, and the forces of western Christian democratic and progressive civilization centered about the Anglo-Saxon effort to stem the tide of Nazi despotism. In this struggle the real battle lines do not follow national boundaries; they cleave through the bodies of nations; they cut through the soul of the individual.

The real task of this war, I contend, is to reconquer Europe and with Europe the German people for the cause of western Christian and democratic civilization. Until this eminent purpose with all its implications is fully grasped in the Anglo-Saxon democracies and translated into concrete and fearless action Hitler will continue to reign supreme on the continent of Europe.

FREEDOM INDISPENSABLE

Nothing could demonstrate more clearly the real character of this war as a world civil war and the readiness of democracy to launch a powerful spiritual counter offensive than the creation of a free German center in the United States. A "free Germany" appears indispensable not only for the destruction of Hitlerism but also for the preparation of a better and finer order to be enjoyed by western peoples after the war.

Though the position of the Germans in this war is not identical with that of the Poles, the Czechs or the French—they resemble the hammer in Hitler's hand rather than the anvil—nevertheless the fact remains that the Germans too are a conquered people, conquered by a weapon more terrible than guns—by chains that enslave their very souls. They have wrought the misery of serfdom upon themselves as they have wrought it upon others. They will have to produce the spirit and the tools that will break these chains.

We should not waste time in accusing or in excusing the guilty; but in the interest of all humanity and a better age to come we should do everything in our power to help Germany break her Nazi chains before all of Europe lies in ruins, and become a free and peaceful partner in a free and peaceful community of peoples. How weighty a contribution to this general purpose could be made by a free German center in the United States becomes evidence when we survey some of the major functions that would fall to it.

MEANS OF EXPRESSION

1. A free German center could provide the considerable but inarticulate anti-Nazi forces within Germany with assistance for the extermination of Hitler and his fellow bandits. The overthrow of the Nazis can come only from within Germany. But it cannot come without assistance and guidance from abroad. To be effective, this assistance should be centered in the hands of patriotic anti-Nazi Germans. To mention but one example, radio propaganda to Germany can be made effective only if the listeners are convinced—which at present they are not—that the messages they hear over the B. B. C. or via short wave from America are not enemy propaganda, but voices of trusted and respected compatriots who are working for the restoration of a prosperous and free Germany in a peaceful European community.

Only from a firmly established free German center abroad can the millions of workers, peasants, and craftsmen be reached, the soldiers and officers, Catholics and Protestants, the former Social Democrats as well as the liberals and conservatives—the many millions of German men and women who today are possessed of a deep and irrepressible but unfulfilled yearning for positive alternatives to Hitler.

2. A free German center would do much, by its mere existence, to prove to the Anglo-Saxon peoples that nazi-ism and Germany are not one and the same thing. While Hitler's envoys represent the brutal tyranny that today is official Germany, a free German center would serve as a mouthpiece for those many silent and decent Germans who cannot speak up for fear of the Gestapo, or because they feel themselves caught in a hopeless moral dilemma between their hatred of Hitler and what they conceive to be their duty, in time of war, as loyal citizens.

INSIDE INFORMATION

There is much information available about internal conditions in Germany that could and should be brought to the attention of the American and British publics through authentic channels. Germans abroad could perhaps render no greater service to the future of Europe and, incidentally, to their own homeland than steadfastly to uphold the banner of a free Reich as against Hitler's swastika in a world that, quite naturally in the heat of battle, tends to confuse the two.

3. A free German center could help, in collaboration with English, American, French, and other organizations, to prepare for a post-war settlement on a just and durable basis. It could study and prepare for those vital problems of internal and educational reform, of political and economic reconstruction whose solution is prerequisite to the rebirth of a Christian and democratic Europe.

It should not be forgotten that totalitarian control today deprives the German people of all those media, such as opposition parties, independent unions, or a free press, which after the collapse of Imperial Germany in 1918 prevented chaos and bolshevism.

There are many more tasks that a free German organization could undertake. If war should break out in the Pacific, it has been suggested that a battalion of free Germans be formed or a free German air squadron to fight jointly with the American, British, and Dutch forces against Hitler's "Nordic" Axis partner in East Asia.

Two major prerequisites exist for the functioning of a free German center in this country. First of all, it is essential that public opinion and the authorities both in the United States and in Great Britain approve of it and take an encouraging attitude toward it. No public recognition would be necessary in the sense in which recognition has been granted by Britain and the United States to the so-called governments in exile. Nevertheless, a free German center, even if conceived as an entirely private organization, is so eminently political in character that it could not function properly without the moral support of leading civic institutions and of the governments of both Anglo-Saxon countries.

The problem of American and British moral support for a free German center in the United States involves, of course, the much wider problems of peace aims; it involves the willingness on the part of the democracies to reach a just and durable peace settlement with a de-Nazified Germany. On this score the recent statements by Lord Halifax and Wendell Willkie and President Roosevelt's proclamation of the four essential freedoms laid a comprehensive and encouraging basis.

BROAD BASE ESSENTIAL

It is indispensable, furthermore, that a free German organization, in order to be effective be conceived on the broadest possible foundation. The old political parties of the pre-Hitler days are dead in the memory of the German people. But this does not mean that out of the ruins of Weimar could not rise a new and stronger bastion for a free German spirit.

To lay out its groundwork, men must, and can, be found who combine experience with courage, and who are trusted and respected by Americans and Britons as well as by Germans. To work against Hitler and not be considered traitors to Germany—to work for a free Germany and not be branded as "fifth columnists" by Americans—this must be the unalterable goal of these free Germans. They must be truly free, loyal to their cause, and responsible only to their conscience—not merely a conglomeration of Quislings, conscious or unconscious tools in the Allies' or in Hitler's propaganda service.

I have presented the problem of a free German organization because I sincerely believe that through its solution the war could be brought one step nearer to its end, and a just and lasting peace one step nearer to reality. Let those who rely merely on guns and tanks and propaganda machines to smash Germany have their say. Let those who suspect ulterior motives behind a proposal simply because it is unconventional express their suspicions. But whether Hitler wins or loses this war, let nobody say that there were not patriotic Germans who were ashamed of his dastardly doings and willing, according to their best abilities, to help free their country and all of Europe from his tyranny.

HANS SCHMIDT.

CHICAGO, *April 17, 1941.*

The Bituminous-Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. FLAHERTY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

TELEGRAM FROM EDWARD PAGE, PRESIDENT OF NEW ENGLAND COAL & COKE CO.

Mr. FLAHERTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following telegram:

BOSTON, MASS., *April 21, 1941.*

Hon. THOMAS A. FLAHERTY:

Referring correspondence regarding bituminous-coal strike, our New England situation is becoming critical. Our railroads and many of our vital industries will be obliged to curtail operation unless mines resume within next few days. Your help is urgently needed to effect immediate resumption of operation.

NEW ENGLAND COAL & COKE CO.,
EDWARD PAGE, *President.*

H. R. 1057—To Establish a System of Longevity Pay for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN F. SMITH
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

STATEMENT BY LICAL PARK, LEGISLATIVE CHAIRMAN, WASHINGTON STATE FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I vigorously supported the legislation introduced in the last Congress to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees, because I considered it to be just and meritorious. I am again supporting such legislation in this Congress, and it was my privilege this morning to appear at the hearings before the House Committee on Post Office and Post Roads and to urge favorable action on H. R. 1057. I read into the record of the committee hearings a statement sent to me by Mr. Lical Park, legislative chairman, Washington State Federation of Post Office Clerks, which sets forth facts and arguments in favor of this legislation which to me appear to be unanswerable. The statement reads as follows:

WASHINGTON STATE FEDERATION
OF POST OFFICE CLERKS,
Seattle, Wash., March 24, 1941.

Hon. MARTIN F. SMITH,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In behalf of the post-office clerks of the State of Washington may I request you to appear in favor of H. R. 1057 at the hearing on longevity pay for Government employees, to be held April 3 by the Post Office and Post Roads Committee of the House?

This bill, as you know, provides for a maximum salary for postal employees of $2,600 per year, to be arrived at by increasing the present pay by an additional $100 per year for each 5 years of service, beginning with the tenth year and continuing to the thirtieth.

It is a just and equitable measure not only from the standpoint of the worker but also for the Postal Service and the public.

First. Under present laws practically all chance of promotion or raise in pay ceases for the average employee after his fourth year in the Postal Service. This means to the career worker who enters the Service at 18 or 20 years of age that at 25 all chances of advancement are ended for him; whereas with increased experience, ability, and knowledge of the work should come increased pay.

Second. With the absorption of unemployment which is so rapidly taking place, the opening of new opportunities and the rapidly rising wage scales Government reports show, the young man of ability, such as the Government needs, will not enter or remain in such "dead end" work. Experience in the past proves this. On the other hand, experience also proves that increased wages as well as improved working conditions bring increased productivity. This for two main reasons: (1) Improved morale; (2) the more capable employees attracted by the better opportunities.

Third. With the increasing age of the worker comes increased expenses to him on account of the growing families and mounting responsibilities. The new social consciousness demands that employers, public and private alike, recognize such needs and meet them. The Government, especially, should encourage a normal human life among its employees by enabling them to provide for it.

Fourth. Increased pay is needed to meet the rising cost of living and increased taxes. In this city the rise is especially noticeable in rents and in all mechanical work, repairs, etc. Five dollars per month rise in rents takes 60 percent of $100. The State sales tax, which will be raised to 3 percent May 1, absorbs 65 percent of $100, figuring on a basis of $2,200 expended.

Fifth. Pay increases benefit the general public as well as the individual directly affected. Practically all the increase goes directly into business channels through the increased spending it makes possible. Thus it benefits all lines of business and builds up living standards and the morale of the country.

For these reasons, as well as others which will no doubt occur to you, the passage of H. R. 1057 will be of advantage to the Government, employee, and the public alike.

With grateful recognition and appreciation of your past assistance to the postal employees in improving working conditions, as well as your careful attention to all our national problems, I am,

Respectfully yours,

LICAL PARK.

Cane Sugar Refining Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY NEW YORK LEGISLATURE

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution recently adopted by the Legislature of the State of New York:

Senate Resolution 76

Whereas the preservation of the cane-sugar refining industry in the State of New York is of extreme importance for the protection of the millions of consumers in the State of New York from an artificial sugar shortage and from exorbitantly high prices; and

Whereas there is sufficient sugar on hand, or in the nearby tropical islands, to meet any demand that the consuming public of the State of New York, or the consuming public of the United States may make; and

Whereas any change in the existing law that would grant additional millions of dollars to the already heavily subsidized beet sugar industry would further increase the heavy burden that the American consumer and taxpayer has to carry in order to continue the production of beet sugar: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That Congress be, and it is hereby respectfully memorialized, urged to oppose any change in the existing law that would add additional burden on the American consumer, cause further unemployment in the State of New York, or disrupt in any way our good-neighbor policy with South and Central America; and be it further

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the present Congress from the State of New York, and that they be urged to use their best efforts to accomplish the purpose of this resolution.

By order of the Senate.

WILLIAM S. KING, *Clerk.*

In assembly April 3, 1941.
Concurred in without amendment.
By order of the assembly.

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

Undermining Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. FLAHERTY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

Mr. FLAHERTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of yesterday:

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 21, 1941]

UNDERMINING DEFENSE

The soft-coal strike, now in its fourth week, has reached a point where a choice must be made between vigorous governmental action to bring about the reopening of the mines and acquiescence in a situation which, without any real justification, will result in the progressive undermining of the national-defense program.

As matters now stand, an agreement has been reached between the northern operators and the United Mine Workers. This agreement covers about 80 percent of the mines and 250,000 of the 400,000 miners on strike, and if mining operations in this field could be resumed much of the threat to the Nation's security would be eliminated. From all available evidence, however, neither the northern operators nor the miners want to reopen any mines until the southern operators accept the terms of the contract, and this stand is maintained despite a direct appeal from Secretary of Labor Perkins that operations be resumed under a tentative arrangement.

The issue between the southern operators and John L. Lewis, president of the United

Mine Workers, concerns the maintenance of a wage-rate differential in favor of the southern producers. Mr. Lewis says that the differential, which is based on a disparity in freight rates, must go, and that the southern operators must pay the straight $7-a-day wage that the northern producers have accepted. Until that is done, he says, no coal will be dug, for the northern miners would not care to work while their southern brothers continue to starve. The wage differential in the past has amounted to 40 cents a day, and the producers in the southern fields say they cannot operate at a profit unless it is maintained. This is not a dispute which should cause serious trouble, however, for the facts can be readily ascertained from the Interstate Commerce Commission, which has ample facilities for weighing the freight-rate question.

Meanwhile, the strike is having increasingly serious consequences in industrial plants engaged on defense work. The steel mills, key to the whole defense effort, are expected to operate this week at less than 95 percent of capacity, although they had been working on virtually a 100-percent basis. At least 15 of the country's 228 blast furnaces are said to have shut down because of the lack of coke, and others are operating on curtailed schedules. This will not be a static condition, but is one that will grow progressively worse as long as the mines stay closed.

As of the moment, there seem to be two main avenues of approach to the problem. One is to get the northern mines open, and it is possible that the President may issue a direct appeal to both the miners and the operators to that end. The other is to bring about a resumption of negotiations between Mr. Lewis and the southern operators. At present they are at a stand-off, the operators insisting on resuming discussions in Washington and Mr. Lewis refusing to meet anywhere except in New York.

If this attitude is persisted in, there remains the possibility of referring this phase of the strike to the National Mediation Board. The only obstacle to the taking of this step is Mr. Lewis' open hostility to the Mediation Board, which he has called a strike-breaking agency, and his assertion that the miners would not tolerate its intervention. The Board has proved its worth and its impartiality in other knotty cases, however, and it is not to be supposed that Mr. Lewis, under the circumstances, would carry his defiance to the point of actually refusing to permit this Federal agency to take a hand in his own deadlocked negotiations.

The Shelterbelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN MAGAZINE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of the Country Gentleman magazine there is included a short article on the shelterbelt on the page entitled "Washington Round-Up," by Ed Hadley. I am submitting this article herewith as further evidence of the wide recognition of the good job which the Forest Service has done in connection with the shelterbelt project and because of the deserved reference to Mr. Paul H. Roberts, who has been in charge of this work since its beginning. Although frankly an experiment in the beginning, the shelterbelt is being acclaimed a success by practically everyone who has had an opportunity to learn what has been done.

SHELTERBELT IN DANGER

The Plains States forestry project, generally known as the shelterbelt, is in danger of being discontinued. Beginning as something of an object of derision, it has become one of the most popular of all Roosevelt undertakings.

This tree-growing program has been carried on largely through funds provided by the W. P. A. Though directed by Forest Service experts, it has had no specific appropriation of Department of Agriculture funds to sustain it. With W. P. A. appropriations being sharply cut the difficulties of of carrying on the shelterbelt work pile up. What is needed, those supporting the project say, is a specific appropriation to complete the work with skilled help.

Opinion generally is that Nebraska's ranch-born Paul H. Roberts and his force have done one of the remarkable jobs of our time. The shelterbelt project was carried on during the most unfavorable weather period in the known history of the Plains. Yet thousands of acres of thick tree growth now attest its success. And it has all been done at a cost of little over 6 cents a tree.

The Roosevelts Were Large Property Owners in Superior, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

ARTICLE BY RAYMOND G. CARROLL

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission given me to extend my own remarks, I wish to include an article which appeared in different papers recently, entitled "Ships Are in Roosevelt Blood."

Superior, the largest city in my Congressional District is the twin port of Duluth, Minn. This great twin port is second only to New York in tonnage received and sent out. Eighty percent of the Nation's iron ore is shipped to the smelters in steel centers from the head of Lake Superior. I was told some time ago that the President's father and other relatives had owned some property in Superior, but never got the real facts. So I wrote a letter to Mr. Oyaas, who is president of the association of commerce, and he immediately located Mr. Stratton, who handled nearly all the Roosevelt property deals in Superior, even disposing of the last piece for the President's family not long ago. Mr. Stratton was active in the real-estate business in Superior all his life. He is as hale and keen of mind today as he ever was, and remembers every little detail, some of which happened many years ago. It is interesting reading, and I am sure the people up at the head of the Lakes will be very much interested to get and preserve the facts contained in this story.

The article follows:

WASHINGTONIA

SHIPS ARE IN ROOSEVELT BLOOD; INSPIRATION THAT HAS MADE F. D. R. THE SAILOR PRESIDENT—ROOSEVELT'S FATHER, THE LATE JAMES ROOSEVELT, PLOTTED SUPERIOR AT THE HEAD OF GREAT LAKES, AND HIS GREAT GRANDUNCLE, NICHOLAS J. ROOSEVELT, WAS "FATHER OF INLAND WATERWAYS"

(By Raymond G. Carroll)

WASHINGTON, April 19.—F. D. R., the sailor President. The extent to which the Roosevelt family has indulged in forward-looking with respect to waterway transportation is strikingly shown by two of its members: The late James Roosevelt, stern-visaged with side whiskers and straight as a reed, who plotted and built the business section of Superior, Wis., at the head of the Great Lakes and who was the father of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the late Nicholas J. Roosevelt, dreamy-eyed and mechanical-minded, who invented side-paddlewheels for river steamboats before Robert Fulton did, and aboard his own steamboat, the *New Orleans*, sailed from Pittsburgh for the delta of the Mississippi River in the fall of 1811 and heralded for the up-river towns along the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers the dawn of a new era and who was the great-granduncle of F. D. R.

It is this waterway-minded ancestry of President Roosevelt that is held responsible for his realization of the present urgency of ship building and the maintenance of the bridge of ships across the Atlantic. Mr. Roosevelt, before he was 14 years old, made eight trips to Europe with either his father, or mother, or both. There have been five Roosevelts who have been Assistant Secretaries of the Navy. The other four were desk men. F. D. R. alone knows the beam ends of a ship from its lee scuppers.

Superior, Wis., is the twin port of Duluth, Minn., separated only by the Bay of St. Louis and the St. Louis River. There are 2,350 miles of waterway from these two cities to the entrance of the St. Lawrence River at Belle Isle, near Newfoundland.

Philip G. Stratton, veteran real-estate dealer of Superior, on April 7, 1941, gave the following account of his relationship with the late James Roosevelt in a letter to Richard J. Oyaas, president of the Superor Association of Commerce:

"You ask me to tell of Mr. James Roosevelt's investments in Superior; to whom his real estate was sold; and how it is now used. I have had the public records in the Register's office examined and it is reported to me that James Roosevelt took mortgages on Superior real estate during the years 1888–99 amounting to more than $250,000. At that time he also held stock in a bank here and in a mortgage-loan company.

"In June 1890, he bought the corner of Twenty-first Street and Ogden Avenue, and built the 3-story, 11-house building still called 'the Roosevelt Terrace,' and in March 1893, he bought what was then called 'the Watkins Block' and is now known as 'The Normandy,' a 4-story store and office building on the northwest corner of Tower Avenue and Belknap Street. And he acquired other real estate I will speak of later. During those years a considerable number of other very substantial New York men invested in Superior; Thomas F. Oakes, president of the Northern Pacific, Frederick Billings, Warner Van Norden, the Duryeas, who were in the starch business that later became the Corn Products—to name only a few. Grain elevators, coal docks, and ore docks were building and lumbering was active. Mr. Roosevelt and the others came here summers to

supervise their investments. It happened I was the youngest employee of the mortgage loan company already spoken of, at the time of one of Mr. Roosevelt's later trips to Superior and was introduced to him and asked to assemble certain information for him. It was flattering to be the one to deal with so large a stockholder, and I took pains to get what he wanted and report it carefully and he was appreciative and my report led to a number of letters between us.

"James Roosevelt died in December 1900—his will is on file here since he had real estate interests in Superior at the time—and later one of the executors appointed by the will, Mr. Warren Delano, Jr., wrote me he had found my letters among Mr. Roosevelt's papers, and he asked me to call on him in New York. By then I had gone into real estate business, and was an officer of the mortgage-loan company Mr. Roosevelt held stock of. I stopped at Poughkeepskie, where Mr. James R. Roosevelt (half brother of President Roosevelt) and one of the executors of his will met me and drove me to Hyde Park, and I spent a considerable part of the day with him and met him and Mr. Delano in New York the following day. They asked me to act as agent of the James Roosevelt estate, and I was glad to accept the appointment.

"The Roosevelt estate owned 'the Roosevelt Terrace' and 'the Watkins Block' already mentioned; the southwest corner of Tower Avenue and Winter Street, a business location; 3 other business cites, 11 lots; and 90 residence lots. The executors wanted to dispose of the Superior assets—Mr. Delano was the executor I dealt with—and during the next few years the properties were sold. Mr. Delano, he is no longer living, was a most orderly and efficient businessman and it was a pleasure to act for him. One or two small matters remained after Mr. Delano's death, and Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt, whom I never met, had them in charge.

"You asked who bought the Roosevelt real estate and how it is now used. The Terrace, a building of the highest grade of construction, is owned by 11 individuals—there are 11 houses—who own the heating plant and run it jointly. The Watkins Block, now the Normandy, has changed owners two or three times and is used for mercantile stores and offices. The corner of Winter and Tower has a store building and gas service station on it and is owned or leased by the Northwestern Oil Co. The G. H. St. John Co.'s grain and feed business, corner Eighth and Hammond, uses one property. A location on Tower Bay Slip was sold as part of the site for a building-stone company that supplied Lake Superior sandstone for this district but is now unused. The 90 residence lots were variously bought and many of them have homes on them. They were principally between Twenty-fourth and Twenty-eighth Streets. Sara Delano Roosevelt, the President's mother, owned 10 lots in Superior that I had to do with. There were houses on some of them. Four of the lots have had houses built on them since Mrs. Roosevelt sold them and two now have the synagogue of the Hebrew Brotherhood Association on them, the corner of Sixth and Hammond."

It might be here restated that all the Roosevelt holdings in Superior have been sold, so that President Roosevelt's desire to transform that lake port into a seaport by the completion of the St. Lawrence waterway is dictated wholly by sentiment, national-defense requirements, and his effort for the economic good of two friendly nations.

Just about three centuries ago the first Roosevelt arrived from Holland and settled on a farm on Manhattan Island. The first Roosevelts traded with the Indians, furs and skins. Later the Roosevelts became bankers, businessmen, and farmers who occasionally turned to politics when they had made their money. They built sugar mills, and operated ships. Two became President.

Nicholas J. Roosevelt, who married Lydia Latrobe, daughter of the leading architect and engineer of the country in 1800, had a passion for steamboat building. He got together $38,000; some he borrowed and some he inherited, and with it built the *New Orleans*, which steamed out of Pittsburgh in 1811 with himself and his wife aboard beside the crew. Two years before, also with his wife he had made the trip to New Orleans in a flatboat. He bore letters of introduction to be used at all the more important river towns and appears to have been received as a sort of amiable lunatic, whose design, magnificent and useful, was regarded as impossible of fulfillment. Practical men who knew the inland rivers, said the currents would prevent boats from ascending against them, steam or no steam.

But the dreamer Roosevelt had his laugh and triumph. His boat was about 116 feet long, with a beam of 20 feet. Its carrying capacity was rated at 100 tons. It was propelled by a stern paddle wheel—although Roosevelt was the inventor of side paddle wheels—but it carried masts, as well as sails so as to use the wind whenever possible. The boat made New Orleans, the very first steamboat down the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, and once in the lower Mississippi it became a Natchez packet, until in 1814 it was destroyed.

Nicholas J. Roosevelt never got his money out of his steamboat but until his death and long afterward he was one of the most famous men in the United States—the "father of inland waterways."

Ships, shipyards, steamboats, yachts, cruisers, rowboats, submarines, destroyers, icebreakers, ferryboats—they are in the Roosevelt blood. That is why F. D. R. is so understanding about the importance of ships and more ships to the island of Great Britain.

The Role of the Brooklyn Public Library in the National-Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF J. VINCENT KEOGH, MEMBER, BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF BROOKLYN PUBLIC LIBRARY

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take pleasure in including the radio address delivered by J. Vincent Keogh, member of the board of trustees of the Brooklyn Public Library, over station WBBC, Brooklyn, N. Y., on April 18, 1941:

In the Brooklyn Public Library bulletin of this month, Dr. Milton James Ferguson, the chief librarian, wrote the following:

"War is tragedy—tragedy for both victor and vanquished. It is difficult, therefore, to put one's finger on any one spot and say, 'Here alone irretrievable loss was suffered.' In comparison with the life of a single small child, of whom large numbers have already been blotted from the face of the earth, a book by the rarest genius may be as nothing. However, no one thing can rightly be considered by itself; civilization is a combination of elements which, inextricably woven together, formed the world we yesterday thought destined for noble flight. And books filled with their message of courage and good cheer and aspirations to mankind may have a soul more alive and more important in the final judging of values than that of many a creature with slanted brow. War means destruction of books no less than of men.

"British libraries have been blown up and become as dust; British book stores, the source of supply of many a treasure for American readers, have vanished and are no more. When one soldier of a brave nation falls, two more take his place and carry on the fight. I believe that books, too, are valiant warriors in liberty's cause, and that, though they be cut down by regiments and divisions, they will arise again and press on to victory."

Books are not only valiant warriors in liberty's cause but they are more than ever, these days, brilliant defenders of the homeland. It is instinctively to books that the scientist, inventor, artist—yes, even the general—turns for facts and knowledge to assist in the great program that has become the first calling of millions of Americans, namely, the program of national defense.

After having heard, particularly in the past year, so much about the importance of national defense, you may be interested in learning what it means to you, to you as an individual citizen. The entire program, of course, was inaugurated, developed, and is presently being consummated not for some unknown generation but for the present living generation, for you, each one of you.

If you think of some apparently insignificant activity in which you engage, let us say taking a walk or going for a drive, and then realize that the present defense program seeks to defend your right to engage in that activity, you will have a greater personal interest in the matter. You have the unquestionable right to ask, not only of your Federal Government but of your local government and its agencies, What is presently being done to defend my personally enjoyed rights and activities? Further you may properly ask, What is such governmental agency as the Brooklyn Public Library doing to assist in the program?

In general, the Brooklyn Public Library has cooperated in the national-defense effort by making available to the public all its books dealing with defense problems, from the theory of democracy to machine-shop practice; by adding greatly to its books on these subjects; and by publishing lists to guide the public in the selection of such reading matter.

Last fall the Brooklyn public library took part in the Nation-wide cooperative effort to inform the National Defense Committee, through the Library of Congress, of holdings in all classifications bearing upon the defense program. It was stated at that time that the collection of technological books was meager but was being augmented as fast as limited funds permitted. The general scheme of interlibrary loans was agreed to and the Brooklyn Public Library offered to make all its resources available to anyone connected with the national-defense administration.

In the last year your library has made increasingly large purchases of new books dealing with the European and Asiatic wars and their potential dangers to the peace and safety of the United States; of books on military science and tactics; and books on engineering and machine-shop practices. Each month its bulletin has listed recent accessions in these fields. At the present time a special six-page book list is being prepared entitled "Men and Machines," which will list and describe briefly the best of the holdings in all branches of machine-shop work, so vital to the defense program. Previously a book list on aeronautics listed the best of the works available in that important subject.

This list is divided into such subjects as history and biography, which includes That's My Story, by Douglas G. Corrigan, the "wrong way" flyer; Flight, under which is found, among others, We, by Charles A. Lindbergh, and Listen! The Wind, by Anne Morrow Lindbergh. Other books on the list are on technological aspects, military aviation, and aviation as a career.

Not only are books sought at the library, but, in connection with the defense program, people seek pictures. The use of pictures may at first seem slightly irrelevant. Let me tell you in what way they contribute to our present "first calling."

A landscape architect assigned to design air-base camouflage came for air pictures of foliage of trees and wooded hills. An architect required air views of factories today and pictures of camouflaged factories during the last war.

Artists making recruiting posters ask for wireless and field telephones, regimental colors, life in the Army, parachutists, and ski troops.

Illustrators of technical articles and governmental publications asked for "earliest forms of protection from fire in Manhattan," allegorical pictures showing tl function of the War Department in the security of the United States, pictures of 105-millimeter howitzers, Army tents, Army scout cars, mosquito boats, color of the insignia of the marines; of Columbia; boats of the Coast Guard; modern Spitfires; capitals of South America; war-savings posters, British and American.

The protective coloration of birds, animals, and fish are called for constantly in the teaching of camouflage methods and in the actual preparation of camouflage drawings.

Methods of housing defense workers and types of men employed on national defense to be used in designing defense posters.

We answered an urgent call asking us to find the color used by the Free French forces to camouflage white Arabian horses during warfare.

An engineer asked for details showing the direction and extent of damage in bombed buildings after air raids in Madrid, London, etc.

The citizens of Brooklyn are very proud of the New Central Building adjoining Prospect Park at the Grand Army Plaza. This building, dedicated to the memory of the late borough president, Raymond V. Ingersoll, might be described as the nerve center of the efficient service afforded to all who are seeking further knowledge in subjects related to defense. The building represents what is regarded as one of the greatest surgical operations in American architectural history. It was built out of a building erected 20 years before.

It wasn't merely a face lifting that was done on the old library wing—that pigeon roost of recent fame—it was a major operation, with practically all the limbs and organs involved. Even the bones were scraped a bit. In the end the Italian Renaissance Palace became a streamlined twentieth-century library home; one whose sweeping lines have evoked exclamations of admiration from artists and whose functional arrangements have made visiting librarians emerald with envy.

When such a knowing critic as Lewis Mumford can say, as he did recently in the New Yorker, "Put alongside the Widener Library at Harvard, the Yale Library, the Harkness at Columbia, the Congressional, or the New York Public Library, Brooklyn's new one is tops." Brooklyn, which waits with undimmed hope year after year for the Dodgers to win a pennant and the Fulton Street El to come down, figures the new library center was well worth waiting for.

The Brooklyn Public Library, in opening its new central building, dedicated March 29th of this year, is making available not only the most modern of library buildings but also a streamlined library service to its readers. To speed up the process of obtaining books and also to give, with a friendly and interested though woefully small staff, all that personal help so necessary in a large library, the following organization and methods are being put into effect in Ingersoll Memorial:

A collection of popular contemporary books and a duplicate pay collection are maintained in the alcove at the rear of the circulation hall.

The remainder and greater proportion of the collection consists of reference and circulation material constituting six subject divisions: Art and music, science and technology, language and literature, history, biography and travel, social science, philosophy and religion, and general reference.

The loan period for new books has been extended to 14 days and for older books, not so much in demand, to 28 days. As this extension of time automatically replaces the old and troublesome renewal system, no book may be renewed after the loan period has expired.

The number of books that may be drawn at one time is governed by the reasonable needs of the reader and the material on hand.

Borrowers are asked to write their card numbers on the book cards before taking books to the charging desk. This method of self-charging saves the time of the borrower, as it eliminates long lines of people waiting for the librarian to write card numbers.

As recently as March of this year there was published in the Brooklyn Public Library Bulletin a list of new books which are available at any branch. This collection is entitled, "The Defense of America," and contains such pertinent titles as "A Study of Air Bombardment," "Housing for Defense," "Flight Training for the Army and Navy," "Your Year in the Army," "National Defense," and many other volumes dedicated to that "first calling" of our country—national defense.

It is encouraging to know that our Brooklyn Library system is functioning in the present for the future welfare of our citizens. Remembering that national defense is a concern of each one of us personally and individually, I urge you to explain to your friends and neighbors that our Brooklyn Public Library system is ready and able to give assistance to whomever seeks it, not only, of course, in the field of national defense, but even in this presently important field.

Trading in Futures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, futures trading is somewhat of a puzzle to me. I would not even know how to trade in futures should I so desire.

It has always been my opinion that the futures market was a market place where one contracted for future-date delivery of actual wheat or corn as the case may be.

The following clipping from the Washington Post of April 14, 1941, if substantially correct, certainly disillusions me:

[From the Washington Post of April 14, 1941]

TRADING IN FUTURES

In view of the fact that great public problems accumulate upon us and continue to remain unsolved, many people naturally assume that there has been a serious failure on the part of education. Educators, on the other hand, point out that imputations of their failures are usually made in terms both vague and general.

It is possible, however, to be specific.

The problem of ruinously low agricultural prices is no doubt the result of definite causes. If our educators have discovered what those causes are, they have failed to make their findings public. They have not neglected, however, in their departments of economics, to support the present racketeering method of fixing low prices by means of the device of futures trading, to treat the farm problem as insoluble, and to advocate, as a necessary alternative, the giving of Federal subsidies to the farmers.

Economists, copying from each other, and on each other's authority, have definitely agreed on a false definition of the futures contract, as a result of which the weight of the authority of the schools has been thrown in favor of the market racketeers. That false definition, copied from Gemmill's Fundamentals of Economics, is as follows: "A futures contract may be defined as a contract for the sale of a stipulated amount of a specified grade of some commodity at a fixed price at a future date."

The following facts, well known to futures traders, show how false is that definition:

1. Those who buy wheat futures contracts, for example, as a matter of customary practice think alone in terms of price differences, not in terms of wheat of a specified grade.

2. The wheat-futures contract does not permit the naming of a specified grade of wheat.

3. One who buys a wheat-futures contract has nothing to say, when on rare occasions delivery is made, about what kind or grade of wheat he shall receive.

4. The determination of what kind or grade of wheat is to be delivered, under a futures contract, is at the option of the seller of the contract, resulting often in the delivery of a "skin grade" of wheat, fit only for chicken feed.

5. Deliveries of wheat of any grade, under wheat futures contracts, are negligible.

6. Those who wish, in good faith, to buy a specified grade of wheat, either for spot delivery or for delivery to arrive, buy it in the cash merchandise market, not in the futures market.

Any self-respecting economist, with a fair sense of professional pride, might be expected to meet the challenge of these facts. None of them, however, have ever been known to do so. It is no wonder that our so-called civilization is a confused mess, since our intellectual leaders do so sadly fail to face the facts.

ERNEST D. MACDOUGALL.

WASHINGTON, *April 10.*

Writings of George Washington, of Particular Moment in Our Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the great weight of the words of George Washington has rightfully been felt time and again in the shaping of American policy.

The strength of his counsel is reflected in the strength of this great Nation. Now, in our time, it is equally important that we school ourselves in the careful logic of that matchless leader who holds first place in American hearts.

I desire to call to your attention excerpts from the Writings of Washington, as collected by Worthington Ford, and edited by Stephen Bonsal of the Washington Post:

In his address to both Houses of Congress on December 3, 1793, President Washington said:

"As soon as the war in Europe had embraced those powers with whom the United States have the most extensive relations, there was reason to apprehend that our intercourse with them might be interrupted and our disposition for peace drawn into question by the suspicions too often entertained by belligerent nations.

"I cannot recommend to your notice measures for the fulfillment of our duties to the rest of the world without again pressing upon you the necessity of placing ourselves in a condition of complete defense and of exacting from them the fulfillment of their duties toward us."

In addressing his "fellow citizens of the Senate and the House" on January 8, 1790, Washington said:

"Among the many interesting objects which will engage your attention, that of providing for the common defense will merit particular regard. To be prepared for war is one of the most effective means of preserving peace. A free people ought not only to be armed, but disciplined; to which end a uniform and well digested plan is requisite; and their safety and interest require that they should promote such manufactories as tend to render them independent of others for essential, particularly for military, supplies."

"Knowledge is in every country the surest basis of public happiness. In one, in which the measures of government receive their impression so immediately from the sense of the community, as in ours, it is proportionably essential. To the security of a free constitution it contributes in various ways; by convincing those who are intrusted with the public administration, that every valuable end of government is best answered by the enlightened confidence of the people; and by teaching the people themselves to know, and to value their own rights; to discern and provide against invasions of them; to distinguish between oppression and the necessary exercise of lawful authority, between burthens proceeding from a disregard to their convenience and those resulting from the inevitable exigencies of society; to discriminate the spirit of liberty from that of licentiousness, cherishing the first, avoiding the last, and uniting a speedy but temperate vigilance against encroachments, with an inviolable respect to the laws."

Writing to President John Adams from Mount Vernon on July 4, 1798, Washington said:

"At the epoch of my retirement an invasion of these States by an European power, or even the probability of such an event happening in my days, was so far from being contemplated by me that I had no conception that that or any other occurrence would arise in so short a period, which would turn my eyes from the shades of Mount Vernon. * * * In case of actual invasion by a formidable force, I certainly would not intrench myself under the cover of age and retirement, if my services should be required by my country to assist in repelling it. And if there be good cause, which must be better known to the Government than to private citizens, to expect such an event, delay in preparing for it might be dangerous, improper, and not to be justified by prudence."

Without waiting to learn his wishes, on July 2, 1798, President Adams sent the following nomination to the Senate, where it was unanimously confirmed: "George Washington, of Mount Vernon, to be lieutenant-general and commander in chief of all the armies raised and to be raised in the United States."

Not the least applicable to the present situation are the lines that Washington sent Henry Lee, Governor of Virginia, upon receiving the Governor's congratulations on what he had done for "the peace and happiness of this country." This letter was written in Philadelphia and is dated July 21, 1793:

"But were the case otherwise, I should not be less inclined to know the sense of the people upon every matter of great public concern; for, as I have no wish superior to that of promoting the happiness and welfare of this country, so, consequently it is only for me to know the means to accomplish the end, if it be within the compass of my powers."

"That there are in this as well as in other countries, discontented characters, I well know; as also that these characters are actuated by very different views; some good, from an opinion that the measures of the general government are impure; some bad, and if I might be allowed to use so harsh an expression, diabolical, inasmuch as they are not only meant to impede the measures of that government generally, but more especially (as a great mean toward the accomplishment of it) to destroy the confidence which it is necessary for the people to place (until they have unequivocal proof of demirit) in their public servants."

Writing at this time (January 20, 1799) to his neighbor, Lord Fairfax, Washington denounced the "open violations of treaties and the laws of nations that were taking place." He adds:

"But by the adoption of vigorous measures for self-defense the People with one voice have made a tender of their lives and fortunes to repel any attempts which may be made on the Constitution or the Government of their Country. * * * Notwithstanding the Spirit of the People is so animated that party amongst us who have been uniform in their opposition to all measures of Government * * * hang upon and clog its wheels as much as in them lye and, with a rancor and virulence which is scarcely to be conceived. * * * I have always believed and trusted that Providence which has carried us through a long and painful war with one of the most powerful nations in Europe will not suffer the discontented among ourselves to produce more than a temporary interruption to the permanent Peace and Happiness of this rising Empire."

Mr. Speaker, all too readily for our comfort do we find application for Washington's words in the world picture today. Apprehension for the way of life that characterizes freedom and democracy is justified. There is work to be done, much work, if our strength is to be a match for the strange forces that are rampant in the world. Totalitarianism and its "fifth columns" mock our institutions. Preparation, infinite preparation—both physical and moral—are required of us. Individually and as a nation we must steel ourselves in faith. Americanism must be made bigger than any threat which can confront it.

Blitzkrieg: A Warning to Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

ARTICLE BY ROBERT GERARD

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Robert Gerard, formerly a lieutenant in the French Army. The article, which was recently published in the Christian Science Monitor is entitled "Blitzkrieg: A Warning to Americans." This article, among other things, brings out the definite fact that 120,000 well-equipped, well-armored German soldiers conquered all of France. They made up 12 mechanized German Panzer divisions supported by a few thousand airplane pilots. The remainder of the huge German Army simply followed and occupied the territory.

This article also brings out a serious criticism of our Army tanks. I hope that the tank technicians of our country will pay attention to this criticism. The article states that the tanks of the United States Army are high, of outmoded design, and have many sharp angles instead of rounded curves which permit shells to slip off their surface.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of April 19, 1941]

BLITZKRIEG: A WARNING TO AMERICANS

(By Robert Gerard, formerly lieutenant in the French Army)

(Germany started its blitzkrieg against Yugoslavia and Greece just before this issue went to press. The Nazi rapid war of movement, using tank corps and other armored and motorized divisions, supported by dive bombers, is following, so far as terrain permits, the same method as that used against the French. This gives double significance to the following article, written by a French second lieutenant of the Tank Corps during the invasion of France, and condensed by permission from the Bulletin of the Harvard Business School Alumni Association. Robert Gerard's report provides to the free peoples of the Western Hemisphere a warning to be prepared with an equality of force that will render ineffective any possible threats by dictator countries.)

Except for the last few months of 1918, the World War was waged on the basis of position. Attacks were made by waves of men spread over the entire front, one succeeding another. The line of entrenchment, although breached at many points during the 4 years, was always reestablished. This kind of attack required a large amount of time and many human lives; the Germans wanted to avoid that kind of warfare. They knew that Britain and France had greater industrial resources and the Germans could not give those countries the time to convert their resources into weapons. They developed the blitzkrieg.

The blitzkrieg is a war movement made possible by the tactics of infiltration in attack. What does that mean? It means that the attack and subsequent advance is not made by waves spread out on a long front, but, rather, by little columns thin as needles which avoid the strong points in the enemy's defense and penetrate the weak points. Instead of spreading its fire power over the entire front, the attacking force concentrates all its fire on selected definite points. These tactics of infiltration in attack are speeded up by the use of two new technical weapons, the tank and the airplane. These are the essentials of the Nazi blitzkrieg. Let us see how these tactics work.

From the newspapers one can imagine hundreds of German tanks rolling wave after wave across the country, sweeping everything before them. Except in a very few instances, no such thing ever occurred. Each time I saw the German Army advancing it consisted of a small mechanized column, oblivious to what was going on to the left or right of it. Its attention was focused on the roads, not on the open fields, for in the modern war of movement roads are the most important thing. France was defeated by a series of raids through the French lines by small German mechanized units, preceded and backed by dive bombers.

In Rouen our group met one of these advance guards, which consisted of about 10 light tanks and 50 medium-size tanks, with a few side cars and 88-millimeter artillery guns. That advance guard, which was 60 miles ahead of the main body of German troops, had easily broken through the French lines south of the Somme River and had carefully avoided the remnants of the French motorized army, the only troops equipped to fight them with the same weapons. When this advance guard arrived in Rouen, it was well received by our four antitank guns posted in front of the bridges and by our 10 tanks, most of them operating on the northern side of the river.

The Germans lost 15 tanks and we lost all the equipment on the northern bank. That battle was like Dante's Inferno. The big oil tanks and oil refineries were bombed, flames rising into the sky, which was black with fumes. The Germans had been fooled; they thought the forces on the French side of the river were much stronger than they actually were and that the forces on the northern bank were weak. It is important to note that the Germans, according to blitzkrieg tactics of avoiding strong points and going around them, did not insist. They never tried to cross the river at Rouen, even though our 250 men, who had lost practically all their equipment in the battle, could not have prevented them from doing so.

Another striking instance of the infiltration technique which I witnessed was near Mayenne, halfway between the Somme and Loire Rivers. The French divisions had been broken everywhere; my group had lost all its tanks and antitank guns, and over a hundred of our men had been killed and wounded. A few sidecars and trucks with four machine guns were all that we had left. We found ourselves on the morning of June 18 in the center of a triangle, formed by three German motorized columns on three different roads surrounding us. From 6 o'clock in the morning to 4 o'clock in the afternoon we watched one of these columns pass. We had stationed a volunteer near the road to signal any interruption in the German column so that we might attempt a crossing. That column was endless, an entire Panzer division, so sure of victory and of the disorganization of the French forces that it was not even concerned with the protection of its flanks. We finally got the signal and started to cross. Half our group got by and the other half was completely smashed by the terrific fire of the oncoming German tanks.

How can an adequate defense against blitzkrieg tactics be established?

What is required is an active defense—defense by superior fire power which can in fact become a counteroffense.

Two weapons used extensively in this German blitzkrieg are the tank and the airplane. Against the tank it was thought that a good antitank gun would be effective. My experience makes me very skeptical about this. The old French 37 mm. and the new 25 mm. antitank guns proved too light to pierce the armor of the German medium tanks. The new 47 mm. antitank guns and the 75 mm. field artillery guns were extremely effective against most German tanks, as witnessed by my own eyes. But these latter guns have serious disadvantages. It is unusual if they are given the chance to shoot more than a dozen shells. They are very easily detected and even if they blow up one or two tanks they will be destroyed by others.

Big ditches can be used to stop tanks, but in a war of movement the troops do not have time to dig ditches everywhere. We had some success with land mines, but it is impossible to carry as many mines as would be necessary if they were to be laid on the terrain where the tank attack might be made.

The best way and the only way to stop tank divisions is to use a larger tank division. A good tank has a 44-mm. or a 75-mm. antitank gun mounted in it. This gun can pierce an opposing tank's armor and stop it. The gunners within the tanks behind these guns are better protected than those manning a simple antitank gun. Furthermore, the tank has mobility; once detected, it can zigzag, or rush into the enemy, or retreat, or take any other action dictated by the circumstances.

In contrast with the infantry, the French motorized forces showed admirable spirit and courage, mainly, I think, because they were able to give the Germans a dose of their own medicine. These few thousand men, who fought under terrific odds against an army superior in numbers, were the only ones to offer serious resistance. They used the same weapons that the Germans used and knew their tanks were better than the German tanks. On the average, each tank in our group destroyed seven German tanks before it was put out of use, but the German tanks outnumbered ours to such a degree that we lost our tanks one by one under the relentless pressure of an endless stream of German tanks.

The bulk of the French Army was quickly demoralized, because it soon realized the hopelessness of the defense. Trains had carried the French infantry divisions to the front, but they had to retreat on foot. Their rifles and machine guns were useless against German tanks, and their antitank guns were so few that they were soon overrun and destroyed by the German forces.

So much for the mechanized troops. Now the airplane.

I do not know of a time in my life when I was more scared than I was when the German dive bombers exercised their skill on our motorized column for the first time. The terrific noise of the siren installed in their tails and the lightning firing speed of their machine guns upset my nerves. On this first occasion we had several soldiers stationed on the tops of our cars and trucks looking in all directions, with a whistle to give us the alarm when the German planes showed signs of attacking on the road. Suddenly four planes came low from behind a hill and their bullets pierced the windshield of our car as we were jumping out onto the road. The pilots soon noticed that we sought protection in the ditches along the side of the road and they returned after bombing to machine-gun the ditches and caused many casualties.

There is little one can do against airplane attacks upon troops in the field. Dive bombers operate at too low an altitude to use aircraft batteries against them. The only effective active defense against a plane is another plane. If the Germans had not had such a superiority in the air, our troops would not have been submitted to such continuous destruction.

Much has been said about another aspect of the blitzkrieg tactics—the use of the "fifth column." On June 8, at 4 p. m., a French officer presented himself to my captain, showing a regular identification card, and said that at 4:30 p. m. 14 tanks would arrive on their way south to defend Rouen and that we should let them pass. The tanks would be recognized by the fact that their turrets would be open and that white flags would be waved. My captain was a very suspicious fellow. He told me to have everything prepared in case an emergency should develop. I arranged to have a subordinate officer go to meet the commander of the tanks when they were sighted. Half an hour later the 14 tanks arrived, turrets opened and white flags waving. My underofficer advanced along the road on a motorcycle to identify the commander. He suddenly turned and came back. At that moment the flags disappeared, the turrets closed, the swastika flag was raised, and a terrific barrage opened up. My underofficer was killed. Our antitank guns fired. They were German tanks.

Modern war requires perfect coordination of all armies. The German Army advanced and worked with the regularity of a high-precision clock. I observed a certain pattern in all attacks the Germans made upon our group: (1) A very few hours after our arrival in a village which we were to defend, an observation plane circled slowly above us. There was no use in shooting at it, the plane was armored. (2) One or two hours later dive bombers paid us a visit, systematically destroying everything. (3) Several hours later we were subjected to artillery fire. The use by the Germans of light, movable artillery on the front lines was very interesting. They had a three-purpose 88-mm. gun—antiaircraft, antitank, and field artillery—it was a beauty. They used no heavy guns whatsoever, for this type was too slow to move. Instead, they employed the dive bombers. (4) As soon as the artillery shells ceased, the tanks would arrive. The cooperation between the German motorized force, the artillery, and the air force was simply amazing. To insure coordination they integrated many different arms into one single unit.

Psychological effects of the blitzkrieg tactics are terrific. There was no continuous line of fighting. Germans were making motorized raids 50 miles behind our lines, and this lack of contact with the enemy oftentimes produced mass hysteria. False news spread at a tremendous speed, and we never knew where or when the Germans would arrive.

What does the experience of France mean to the United States? Moral, political, and military causes account for the collapse of France. How can we prevent such destruction in this country?

The need for a huge defense program to prevent a military debacle is evident. Everything possible should be done to speed up the defense program. One supreme factor should be remembered: It took only 120,000 well-equipped, well-armored German soldiers to conquer all of France. They were the fighting men in the 12 mechanized German panzer divisions supported by a few thousand airplane pilots. The rest of the huge German Army simply followed and occupied the territory which these mechanized troops had taken.

We want a defense system appropriate to our continent. The United States is too large a country to wage a war of position once an enemy debarks, for example, around Hudson Bay or near the St. Lawrence River. Such an attack would take the form of a war of movement, for, unlike Albania and Greece, where the lack of roads makes the

waging of a motorized war difficult, the strategic industrial areas in this country, mainly around the Great Lakes and along the Atlantic seaboard, are supplied with one of the finest networks of roads in the world. Excepting the Appalachian Range, the country is rather flat and ideal for motorized warfare. With a sufficient armored force, the United States could concentrate swiftly all the fire power of its army against the points where the enemy succeeded in debarking.

Not only is the armored force which the United States has planned too small, but the quality of its equipment is not overwhelming. It is true that our modern tanks with their rubber tracks have ground pressures below, and operate with less noise than either German or French tanks, but American tanks are armored with face-hardened, rolled armor plates which can be worked only flat in contrast to the French and German homogeneous cast armor which permits the use of rounded shapes. The French 22-ton "Somua" tank, the best that I have yet seen, has a beautiful functional design; it is low, thickly armored, and does not have a single angle on it, with the result that antitank shells tend to slip off its surfaces. United States tanks, on the contrary, are high, of outmoded design with many sharp angles instead of rounded curves. Furthermore, even though this country is manufacturing some medium tanks, it is concentrating on light 10-ton tanks. Actual experience under fire has shown that light tanks fare very badly; they cannot resist even light antitank weapons. The Germans really concentrated on 25-ton tanks mounting a field gun of about 3 inches which had a terrific armor-piercing power. I cannot help feeling that there is still room for improvement both as to the future size of the United States armed forces and as to the equipment which they shall use.

Americanism-Legislative Program of the Military Order of the Purple Heart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STRATTON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

LETTER FROM COL. FRANK HALEY AND RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the Americanism-legislative program of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, together with a letter from Col. Frank Haley, the Americanism-legislative chairman, whose headquarters are at 815 Fifteenth Street NW., in the city of Washington:

THE MILITARY ORDER
OF THE PURPLE HEART,
Washington, D. C., April 21, 1941.

Hon. WILLIAM STRATTON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. STRATTON: Enclosed herewith is a copy of the Americanism-legislative program of the Military Order of the Purple Heart.

As you are aware, the Order of the Purple Heart was established by Gen. George Washington at Newburg, August 7, 1782. The War Department, on February 22, 1932, issued General Orders No. 3, which reestablished, out of respect to the memory and military achievements of General Washington, the Purple Heart—the badge of military merit of the Continental Army.

Some 70,000 Purple Heart Medals have been issued by the War Department. The Military Order of the Purple Heart is the only national organization composed exclusively of veterans wounded in action under conditions that entitle them to wear a wound chevron or who were awarded the meritorious citation certificate for valor, by the Commander in Chief of the A. E. F.

Your continued support of our program will be gratefully appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

THE MILITARY ORDER
OF THE PURPLE HEART,
FRANK HALEY,
Americanism-Legislative Chairman.

AMERICANISM LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Be it resolved, That the National Executive Committee of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, in executive session in the city of Washington, D. C., on this, the 28th day of February 1941, pursuant to a call by National Commander Capt. Herbert A. Church, do hereby unanimously adopt the following Patriot's Creed:

"I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign nation of many sovereign States; a perfect union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

"I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies."

Whereas the reports of the special congressional committee on un-American activities reveal that fifth column activities, alien "isms," and insidious foreign propaganda threaten the destruction of our American democracy; and

Whereas radical activities, having the destruction of constitutional government and all of its privileges as their ultimate objective, are increasingly common throughout the Nation; and

Whereas radical agitators and their agents strive most diligently to corrupt the moral and social belief of the youth of our Nation; and

Whereas these activities are supervised, directed, and financed by subjects of other nations and find easy converts and enthusiastic supporters of violent revolutionary doctrines; and

Whereas the free democratic institutions—home, school, church, and state—cannot survive unless the American people are awakened to the imminent dangers threatening the very existence of these institutions; and

Whereas these institutions and free government can be preserved only by combating all subversive doctrines through legislation and education; and

Whereas a loyal and patriotic citizenship is necessary to the preservation of the Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the following legislation and education programs be and hereby are adopted:

LEGISLATION

We hereby instruct our Americanism legislative chairman in Washington to promote and diligently work for the enactment of legislation to—

1. Outlaw every political organization which is shown to be under the control of a foreign government.

2. Compel deportation of aliens advocating any basic change in the form of government.

3. Make mandatory the deportation of spies and saboteurs.

4. Require all employees and officials of the Federal Government to be American citizens.

5. Withhold all Federal financial aid from any educational institution which permits members of its faculty to advocate to the student body communism, fascism, or nazism as a substitute for our own form of government.

6. Halt all immigration from foreign countries that refuse to accept the return of their nationals found under American laws to be deportable from this country.

7. Restrict distribution of totalitarian propaganda when that distribution involves any cost to the American taxpayers and/or when such propaganda emanates, and is shipped, from foreign sources.

8. Extend to at least 10 years from date of issuance that statutory period during which citizenship papers may be revoked.

9. Extend from 3 to 7 years the statute of limitations period during which persons can be prosecuted for traveling under false passports.

10. Make it mandatory for every instructor in our schools—elementary, high school, and college—to take an oath of alegiance to our flag and our Constitution, similar to the oath which our young citizens are required to take when they are inducted into the armed forces of the United States.

Be it further

Resolved, That Congress be urged to make sufficient appropriations for the carrying out of such activities.

EDUCATION

We hereby advocate the teaching of sound Americanism in the American schools and in the American homes and dedicate ourselves to the promotion of patriotic educational activities, patriotic youth activities, and patriotic community activities. It is our belief that the greatest need at this particular time is the enlightenment of our people to the menace of communism and other alien "isms." American citizens must be informed of the many ways in which communism and other alien movements bore from within. They must know of the many subsidiary and cooperating organizations and their activities.

It is vitally important for the patriots to keep in mind at all times the fact that the Military Order of the Purple Heart is not a law-enforcement body; that our mission is an educational one. It is to acquaint the public with the growth of subversive activities, to recommend and support a legal cure, to reveal to the public that communism and other alien "isms" are attempting to undermine our Government; that these foreign philosophies of government are reaching into the schools, the church, agriculture, and, in fact, into every phase of American life.

The first requirement of dictatorial government is the disruption of belief in God. The first principle of democracy must be the perpetuation of belief in God. We do not believe that Americans can serve their country well unless they bring into account most conscientiously, sincerely, and reverently the will and spirit of the one supreme Architect of the Universe. "In God we trust" must be our inner life.

Whereas the Military Order of the Purple Heart is vigorously opposed to the communistic and Nazi youth movements, especially as expressed in the summer camps for children and the existence of similar clubs in our schools and colleges; and

Whereas the relentless enemies of our American institutions are poisoning the mind of our youth, beckoning them with sporty uniforms, snappy salutes, exciting drills, and mysterious secret societies; and

Whereas if millions of our youth are to be won for the American way against the encroachments of foreign influence a strong pro-American education program must be carried on: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we recommend to the American schools, youth clubs, homes, and libraries the patriotic material distributed by the Military Order of the Purple Heart, Division of Americanism. This material consists of:

(1) Progress of Nations, in 12 volumes, containing a complete survey of the social, economic, religious, industrial, and political development of man from the dim dawn of civilization down to the present time; a publication designed to teach the obligation of citizenship through a better understanding of historical movements, and to instill into the minds of all liberty-loving Americans a full appreciation of the priceless heritage of democracy, in defense of which the members of the Military Order of the Purple Heart earned their honored decorations.

(2) Forward March, the photographic record of the World War and its aftermath, in two portfolios, a work designed to combat subversive doctrines and insidious foreign propaganda by exemplifying that evolution, rather than revolution, in government will insure the perpetuation of the free democracy which took root and flourished on American soil.

(3) The Modern University Plan of Personalized Education, consisting of 40 lectures on the humanities and social sciences, by Dr. Marcus W. Jernegan and Dr. Arthur P. Scott, department of history, University of Chicago. These lectures unfold step by step the story of man's struggle for seven centuries; of man's fight for the things we have always carried nearest our hearts; for democracy; for the right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience; for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their government.

Through the universal use of these patriotic publications, lectures, and the Americanism documents we hope to stimulate a true appreciation of the priceless heritage of the American citizen so that the ideals and principles upon which this Nation is founded and for which our patriots fought and died shall not perish; be it further

Resolved, That we adopt as a national policy the following program, to be put into effect as soon as our finances will permit:

1. Nation-wide broadcasting of anti-communistic, anti-Nazi, and other antisubversive programs.

2. With the cooperation of the motion-picture industry, to arrange for the release of patriotic pictures for the use of schools and patriotic gatherings.

3. To arrange for patriotic speakers to present to educational institutions and public gatherings the true facts of the menace threatening America.

Be it further

Resolved, That we, who have been decorated by a grateful Government with the Medal of the Purple Heart, adopt the above program in fulfillment of the pledge contained in the preamble of the constitution of the Military Order of the Purple Heart:

"We, veterans of the wars of the United States, in order to perpetuate the principles of national patriotism and justice, do hereby ordain and establish the Military Order of the Purple Heart, an organization of those who saw active service in such wars and who, because of their valiant service, have been awarded the Order of the Purple Heart, founded by Gen. George Washington in 1782. We pledge ourselves to sponsor those principles of liberty, justice, and general welfare that have made the United States the great Nation that it is today. We further pledge ourselves to perpetuate those principles which are the very foundation of our national life."

Promulgated by order of the national commander, February 28, 1941.

Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN, OF ALABAMA, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS, THURSDAY, APRIL 3, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a very able and informative statement made by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama, Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN, before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors on the subject of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway.

The matter referred to follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ALABAMA

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not an expert on these matters. I know you have been hearing from some expert witnesses. But I believe I do understand this matter from a practical standpoint and from the interest of my people. I have a prepared statement.

The headwaters of the Tombigbee River rise within 20 miles of the navigable Tennessee River above Pickwick Dam, and the narrow divide separating the two watersheds is relatively low. The feasibility and desirability of connecting these two important basins so as to provide a navigation route to the Gulf of Mexico has long been recognized by leaders interested in the development of this Nation's natural waterways. From time to time, over a period of more than 100 years, the construction of such a waterway has been vigorously supported by various interests. In 1939 the culmination of this interest came with the recommendation of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors that the United States undertake the construction of a waterway to connect the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers.

The area tributary to the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers has a population of over 3,000,000 and is rich in natural resources. Cotton is the principal agricultural crop, but tobacco, grain, and vegetables are also produced in large volume. Forests of merchantable timber are extensive, and lumber is an important product. Deposits of coal, iron ore, limestone, phosphate rock, marble and other building stone, copper ore, zinc ore, clays, sand, and gravel are found in the Tennessee Valley and, except for coal and phosphate rock, in the Tombigbee Valley. The area is generally rural and agricultural, but urban and diversified development is being accelerated throughout the Tennessee Valley and an important steel-producing industry has grown up about Birmingham, which is served by the port of Birmingham, on the Warrior River. Many railroads and improved highways serve the area. In addition to the region immediately tributary to the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers, the Ohio Valley, the middle and upper Mississippi Valleys, and the Missouri River Valley would also be concerned, as the water route from the Ohio above Paducah to the Gulf of Mobile would be 200 miles less than via Cairo to New Orleans, while for points on the Mississippi above Cairo the corresponding reduction would be 108 miles. Water haul from points on the upper Tennessee River to the Gulf of Mexico would be shortened by some 650 miles.

Great as the estimated peacetime benefits are for a waterway connecting the Tennessee River directly with the Gulf, they are still greater when considered in connection with the defense program now under way. Emphasizing the favorable recommendation that has been made, I invite your attention to the fact that the area which would be served by such a waterway is located in the very heart of our "Citadel of national defense"—a zone abounding in industrial plants and great natural resources. Those authorities responsible for planning our defense have wisely located essential defense industries within this area and we should with equal wisdom authorize the Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway that would be so beneficial at this time and in the future.

It is fitting for me to enumerate some of the defense projects that would be served by this waterway, in order that you may visualize more clearly the importance of the improvement. One of the largest plants of the Aluminum Co. of America is located at Alcoa, Tenn., just off the Tennessee River a short distance southwest of Knoxville. The ore for this plant is received at Mobile after shipment from South America. At Mobile the ore is subjected to a primary reduction process and this partially reduced and deliquescent ore known as alumina is shipped in special cars to Alcoa where it is reduced to pig aluminum. The Alcoa plant has also a rolling mill where both aluminum sheet and structural aluminum shapes are produced. With the Tombigbee waterway in operation, the original ore could be shipped over a relatively short all-water route to Alcoa where both stages of reduction could be accomlished. This would provide a much safer location for the entire vital process of producing aluminum than exists at the present time, where one essential part of the process is on the relatively vulnerable Gulf coast. Alcoa is protected from the main directions of attack by mountain ranges.

The Reynolds Metals Co. is now building a large plant at Sheffield, Ala., for the production of aluminum, and they are also constructing there a rolling mill. The annual output of aluminum anticipated for this company, which will be ready for opening in the next few days, is 60,000,000 pounds of aluminum, and the rolling mill will roll the same quantity.

Mr. PITTENGER. Is this in your district?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; this is in my district.

Mr. PITTENGER. What is the largest town?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The area is generally referred to as Muscle Shoals. In a radius of about 10 or 15 miles are the towns of Florence, Sheffield, Tusucumbia, and Muscle Shoals. There are really four towns in what they call the Muscle Shoals area.

Mr. PITTENGER. And that is in your district?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. The Reynolds Metals Co. is getting its ore, and they have been shipping it in for some time already from South America. It is brought in through Mobile and from there in trainload lots to Sheffield.

Mr. PITTENGER. Is that iron ore?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; it is bauxite. The Reynolds Co. is also buying bauxite in Henry County, Ala. I will indicate on this map, if I may, about where Henry County, Ala., is. It is right in the southeastern part of Alabama and lies on the Chattahoochee River, which runs into the Apalachicola, which in turn flows into the intracoastal waterway system. That ore is now being shipped by trainload lots to Muscle Shoals. A complaint has been lodged against the rail rates that are being charged on it. If the Tombigbee Canal should be built, it could come down the Chattahoochee and the Apalachicola and across to

Mobile, and by a water route up the Tombigbee. The plant is just east of Sheffield between Wilson Dam and Wheeler Dam. There are two T. V. A. dams right at the plant which is on the south side of the river. The terminus of this proposed canal back of Pickwick Dam is about 20 miles west of the location of this plant.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Sparkman, I think last year, or the year before, there was testimony here that that water route would put all of these railroads out of business. Do you want to talk about that?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am not an expert on that, but I believe the testimony shows that is not a fact; that experience in the past has shown, as a matter of fact, that it increases their business. I believe, if you will look at the statistics, you will see that the Southern Railroad has not suffered as a result of making the Tennessee River navigable.

Mr. SMITH. Is there any other county in Alabama where bauxite is found?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not of this grade; it is found in several counties, but this ore in Henry County is of a better grade than in the others, and naturally they go after the better grade.

Mr. SMITH. Do you happen to know if this is the county from which bauxite is sent out to the State of Washington for the Aluminum Co. in Washington?

Mr. SPARKMAN. If you are getting any from Alabama, that is where it is from.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; they are getting some from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If it is not from that particular county, it is from right in the immediate territory.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH] there is also a bauxite field in northeastern Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH. We are getting some from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; you are getting some from Mississippi. It extends all the way from the Tennessee line down to about even with Macon, in Mississippi.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And, of course, there are extensive deposits in Arkansas.

Mr. SMITH. The same firm referred to by Mr. Sparkman, the Reynolds Metals Co., is constructing a new plant at Longview, Wash., which also happens to be in my district, and undoubtedly the bauxite they will use there will come from Alabama or Mississippi.

Mr. DONDERO. Is that ore similar to iron ore; is it mined?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; bauxite is more of a clay. As a matter of fact, all clays contain aluminum, or contain a substance from which aluminum is made. It is a matter of reducing it. The thing we refer to as "bauxite" is a clay-like product containing a high degree of the aluminum product and, therefore, is more easily processed.

Mr. DONDERO. Is it processed the same way they process ceramic clay?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know; I am not an expert on it. As a matter of fact, the entire Tennessee Valley contains deposits of clays with some aluminum in them. In addition to that, the T. V. A. has recently developed a process of reducing ordinary clays into aluminum. The process has not been perfected and they are still studying it; but, if it is perfected, we can go out anywhere and dig out ordinary clays and make aluminum out of them. They are now making a ton a day of alumina at Muscle Shoals out of ordinary clays in the Tennessee Valley.

Mr. SMITH. Do you happen to know how many pounds are required to make a ton of aluminum out of ordinary clay that is being used in its manufacture now?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think 10,000 pounds.

Mr. SMITH. I think it is 8,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I know it is somewhere in that neighborhood, but I am not sure.

Mr. PITTENGER. To get back to the transportation angle: Is it your theory that the development of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Canal we have been hearing about in the testimony here will increase the industrial development and increase tonnage, not only for the railroads, but also for the water?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the experience in the past has been to that effect. I think our past experience has shown that is the logical result.

Now, in this same area, the Muscle Shoals area, the T. V. A., at the request of the War Department, is now enlarging, expanding, and rehabilitating nitrate plant No. 2 for the purpose of manufacturing ammonium nitrate, which is a basic material used in explosives, I believe, sometimes referred to as amatol. That plant is being reconditioned and remodeled to turn out synthetic ammonia for the use of the Government in the manufacture of explosives. In addition to that, the Electro Metallurgical Co. in the last few years has built a completely new plant at Sheffield. They originally started with one electric furnace; a few weeks ago they broke in a second electric furnace, and now they are starting on a program of building two more electric furnaces—in other words, quadrupling their production over what it was a few months ago. They are making ferro-alloys. The principal product they make now is ferrosilicon, which, I believe, is used in the manufacture of steel. I am not sure of that, but it is used in our manufacturing processes.

Du Pont is building a $48,000,000 powder and bag-loading plant at Childersburg, Ala., on the Coosa River, and its product could be transported by all-water routes to the interior. The Landsdown Steel & Iron Co. is building a shell-forging plant at Gadsden, Ala., which is 25 miles from Guntersville, a Tennessee River port. The Tombigbee waterway would provide a short all-water route for shells and matériel to Mobile, a port that would become one of embarkation should trouble develop at the Panama Canal or in the Caribbean area. In addition to that, Birmingham is making shell casings and making other defense items using steel and steel products.

Procter & Gamble are building a $14,000,000 shell-loading plant at Milan, Tenn., which is about midway between the Tennessee and Mississippi Rivers in west-central Tennessee. Both the materials to be used therein and the finished products of this plant could use the Tombigbee route to advantage. The Solvay Process Co. is building a $11,000,000 anhydrous ammonia plant at Henderson, Ky., which is on the Ohio River. The du Pont Co. is building a $74,000,000 powder plant at Charlestown, Ind., and a $3,000,000 bag-loading plant is under construction by the Goodyear Engineering Corporation at the same city.

Wright Aeronautical Corporation is building a $37,000,000 plant at Cincinnati, Ohio, which will produce engines, and the Tombigbee Waterway provides a short and essentially all-water route to Maxwell Field, Ala., Pensacola Naval Air Base and many other Army and Navy air fields completed or under construction in the southeast. The United States engineers of the Cincinnati district have just finished a searchlight-mirror plant which is to operate at Cincinnati and all-water shipments in connection with this activity could be made to and from Mobile for ocean shipment to Panama and the New Atlantic bases.

The Hercules Powder Co. is building a $36,000,000 plant at Radford, Va., which could ship via either the Ohio or Tennessee system after a short rail or truck haul and the same is true for their $9,000,000 bag-loading plant at Pulaski, Va. The Carnegie-Illinois Co. is building a $5,000,000 ordnance plant at South Charleston, W. Va., which could use the Kanawha River and enter the same navigation system.

The Nashville Bridge Co., of Nashville, Tenn., and the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corporation, of Decatur, Ala., which is likewise in my district, on the Tennessee River, as well as other inland shipyards on the Ohio River system, are participating in the Navy program of small-ship construction. Also a naval ordnance plant is in operation at Louisville, Ky. The Tombigbee waterway would constitute another means of egress for these small craft and would make additional repair yards for small craft readily available.

Mr. PITTENGER. What is the distance they would have to travel there?

Mr. SPARKMAN. From Decatur, Ala., the distance to Mobile would be shortened by probably 800 or 900 miles, or approximately the rail distance from Chicago to Washington, D. C.; to the Gulf, it would be shortened by about 650 miles.

Mr. PITTENGER. It is located where?

Mr. SPARKMAN. On the Tennessee River, at Decatur, Ala.

Mr. PITTENGER. At Decatur?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is right.

In addition to the industrial plants enumerated, which concern only the more important new defense projects, there are the established industries of this area, whose activities are increased by the defense emergency and whose transportation requirements are greater than usual. The Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway would lessen the strain on any single form of transportation, and it would facilitate the movement of bulk supplies to the many cantonments, troop receiving centers, and military airfields that are being located in this general area.

There is a large and growing tonnage of petroleum products on the Tennessee River, shipment in part being made from the Illinois oil fields. At present few if any pipelines exist in this area. The Tombigbee waterway would greatly extend the area served by the Illinois oil fields and would relieve railroads of an increasing burden in the area most heavily occupied by our new Army. Further relief to existing transportation facilities would result from movement of grain via the Tombigbee from the Missouri River and the upper Mississippi grain ports. An increasing number of automobiles are being shipped by barge from Ohio River points to Guntersville, Ala., for distribution from there to the South and East. The same procedure could be followed with Army and Navy motor transportation destined for the southeast cantonments and troop centers to a greater and much more favorable extent if the Tombigbee waterway were to be constructed.

The Tombigbee waterway will provide a slack-water route for much of the present upstream tonnage on the Mississippi River, where I understand cut-offs delay upstream navigation at times by making it necessary to divide tows into two or more parts, which must be pushed individually through a reach having excessive slopes and water velocities. After the construction of the Tombigbee waterways, tows traveling from the Ohio and upper Mississippi Rivers downstream to New Orleans by way of Mississippi River will be able to carry their return loads by way of the Tombigbee with savings both in time and cost. Similarly the proposed waterway would provide an alternate all-water route during extreme high- or low-water periods on the Mississippi River.

The Board of Engineers recommends connecting the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers by way of the East Fork of the Tombigbee River, Mackeys Creek, and Yellow Creek,

provide a channel of not less than 9 feet in depth, a minimum bottom width of 170 feet in river and canal sections and 115 feet in the divide cut, and with locks approximately 75 by 450 feet inside dimensions. The plan of improvement consists of a summit cut to carry the pool of Pickwick Dam through the divide generally following the course of Yellow Creek and Mackeys Creek; a lateral canal skirting the east edge of the flood plain to bypass numerous sharp bends in East Fork and the upper portion of the Tombigbee, and canalization of approximately 180 miles of the Tombigbee River above Demopolis, Ala., by construction of eight dams.

Mr. DONDERO. Do you mean to say the canal section is 180 miles long?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, no; the canalization of the river, widening and channeling the river, is 180 miles.

The CHAIRMAN. That is from Demopolis up, is it not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is above Demopolis, Ala., yes. From Demopolis down, it is all improved as part of the Warrior system.

Mr. RANKIN. By the way, I will say to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] that formerly this river was navigable and boats plied all the way up to the confluence of Brown and Mackeys Creeks, which is just about 25 or 30 miles from the Tennessee River.

Mr. DONDERO. Why has that condition changed?

Mr. RANKIN. As on a great many other rivers, they let a lot of sawmills go in there and float logs on that river and unloose a great many of them and blocked it to where they could not get through. That is one thing. Another thing is that the railroad competition has eliminated some of it. I believe there is still a 7-foot channel up to Columbus. Besides there was no connection with the Tennessee River.

The CHAIRMAN. That has been the case all over the United States—elimination by railroad competition.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. To maintain the summit pool, a dam would be built across East Fork at the Narrows and the bottom of the cut through the divide would be carried to elevation 396 to assure a minimum depth of 12 feet with Pickwick Pool at its minimum controlled elevation. For the lateral canal section, 10 locks would be required. Water for lockages would be supplied by gravity from the pool of Pickwick Dam, and spillways, drainage ditches, and levees would be provided as required to take care of local drainage and protect the canal.

This waterway would be a valuable addition to the transportation facilities of our citadel of national defense. By the way, in this connection, I want to remind you gentlemen that during the World War one of the greatest problems we had to confront was our transportation problem.

Mr. DONDERO. In spite of the fact that the Government took over the railroads?

Mr. SPARKMAN. As a matter of fact, the Government, as I understand it, took over the railroads because it was felt necessary to do so in order to organize the system better and correlate the efforts.

Mr. RANKIN. And to facilitate transportation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. They had about 140,000 carloads tied up between here and New York that they could not get to shipside because of the congestion.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. With the largest concentration of troops ever known in this area in peacetime and with normal requirements mounting day by day, the railroads and highways are certain to become overtaxed. Troops, convoys, supplies, and new motor transportation being shipped in for military and naval use must be given the right-of-way, but it is essential that the normal activities of the area be continued with as little interruption and confusion as possible. The Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway would relieve the railroads and highways of bulk freight and, in addition, would fill the need for expansion of transportation facilities for defense industries and defense projects.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are some other features I would like to discuss, but I do not want to run over your time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Sparkman, there are two items that you overlooked. One of them is the fact that in that area, especially northeastern Mississippi and southern Tennessee, a large number of milk condensers and cheese plants have been built. They are shipping more condensed milk and cheese than any other area of its size in the South. Another one is the fact that there are millions of tons of asphalt, what they call Kentucky rock asphalt, right there within a few miles of this canal which needs this outlet.

Mr. PITTENGER. And without this improvement, none of that development can take place?

Mr. RANKIN. That material could not be shipped out by rail, because the cost would be too great. I am talking now about Kentucky asphalt.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There are a good many things that are subject to water transportation on that system that I did not discuss. For instance, there are immense deposits of limestone and rock asphalt. In my own district, there is one of the largest rock asphalt deposits to be found in the world and on the Tennessee side are large deposits of phosphate rock.

Mr. PITTENGER. I will say none of us wants to develop one form of transportation so as to destroy another, and I think from now on the witnesses ought to emphasize that feature of the situation. There was testimony last year, or the year before, that the railroads serve that territory amply and any development here would take away from them and put them out of business. Now, I do not want to put them out of business; on the other hand, I do not want their shortsighted executives to stand in the way of industrial development that can only be possible with water transportation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly agree with the gentleman from Minnesota on that statement. I would not argue for anything that would put the railroads out of existence, because I think the railroads are essential for the welfare of the country.

Mr. PITTENGER. I agree with you.

Mr. DONDERO. You have to have them in your area, just as well as in other areas.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly. I think we would be lost without them. But there are certainly certain types of freight that can move more efficiently and more—not expeditiously, but more economically on water than they can on railroads. There are some types of freight that you just simply cannot haul on the railroads.

Mr. DONDERO. That would include grain, copper, iron ore, on the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly am glad to hear the gentleman's (Mr. DONDERO's) statement in that regard. I am expecting to hear a great deal of argument from him and others in favor of that seaway.

Mr. PITTENGER. It includes all heavy products.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is true.

Mr. ELLIS. And right on that same point, and in line with what you say, Mr. PITTENGER, is it not true, Mr. Sparkman, that today you are developing bauxite and having it brought in from British and Dutch Guiana into Alabama for the manufacture of aluminum?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have testified about that.

Mr. ELLIS. And they do that only because to bring it over from Arkansas to Alabama would be more expensive?

Mr. RANKIN. That traffic will all go by water on the Tennessee, Mississippi, and Ohio, whether this canal is constructed or not; but, going down through this canal, would bring a sufficient saving to justify its construction, would it not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly think so. And I would like to have an opportunity at some time to discuss that particular phase of it.

I want to say this, that the only way we can judge what would happen is by what has happened, and I would like to discuss something about the navigation increases we have seen on the Tennessee River, even in its uncompleted present condition.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. SPARKMAN, if you would like, you can add those features to your statement.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has made a splendid statement, for which we are all grateful.

The CHAIRMAN. We will have to adjourn now.

(The committee thereupon adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.)

The Vinson Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. SCHULTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

EDITORIALS FROM WASHINGTON NEWSPAPERS

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

THE VINSON BILL

It is a welcome sign of our national common sense that, despite the provocation of the strike situation, the opposition to the Vinson bill has assumed formidable proportions. Organized labor has taken a united stand against the measure, and many Congressmen are skeptical of its provisions. Although Secretary Knox endorsed its general principle, the House Naval Affairs Committee failed to adjust the bill to the voluntary basis suggested by Mr. Knox and many others. As it stands, therefore, it invites opposition from thoughtful students of the strike problem.

Representative Vinson's bill is patterned after the Railway Labor Act. Yet it departs from the theory of that act in such vital particulars as to make the ultimate effect of the two incomparable. Each provides for what is popularly known as a cooling-off period. Each prescribes various steps that disputing employers and unions should take before resorting to dismissals or changes in working conditions on the one hand or strikes on the other. But the Railway Labor Act gains its force solely from the pressure that may be brought to bear upon the disputing parties by the National Mediation Board and public opinion. The Vinson bill resorts to criminal penalties.

Obviously this is a critical defect. Notice of intent to strike or to change conditions of work which might result in slowing down or stopping defense production would be required. It would be unlawful to strike without giving such notice or without giving Government conciliators and mediators a chance to settle the dispute. And violators of this provision could be imprisoned or fined not more than $5,000. The obligation placed upon employers and employees to settle their differences around the conference table is constructive. But the moral effect of establishing such an obligation is undercut when a penalty is attached to any misstep from the prescribed path of amicable collective bargaining. The spirit of compromise cannot be encouraged by fines and prison terms.

Fortunately, no penalty is attached to that section which outlines a policy of keeping open shops open and closed shops closed during the national emergency. The question here is whether Congress should attempt to write such a delicate policy into legal form. On the ground that no group should take advantage of the emergency to press demands that might curtail defense production, the closed shop issue may well be laid aside for the present. Still there is a question as to whether the national policy on this subject should be left more flexible than a statute can ever be.

The Vinson bill is in need of a careful pruning. It doubtless could be revised into a sound and reasonable approach to the problem of strikes in defense industries. As it stands, however, it is too drastic for enactment. If the House proceeds with consideration of this bill without careful modification, there is danger that the cause which it is intended to serve may suffer an unnecessary set-back.

HOW TO PROTECT LABOR

It was not wise for A. F. of L. President William Green to say that organized labor faces "vicious" legislation by Congress "because of the C. I. O.'s unfriendly attitude toward national defense."

Both pot and kettle are well smudged with blame for the present feeling of Congress. If C. I. O. unions have called more and bigger strikes in defense industries, A. F. of L. unions have outraged public opinion by jurisdictional work stoppages and extortionate "initiation fees."

Congress, in our opinion, does not desire to be "vicious" toward organized labor—certainly not toward the great patriotic majority of organized labor's membership. But if Congress has come to feel that drastic legislation is necessary to protect the defense program from unwise labor leadership, that is hardly remarkable.

How could it be otherwise, when those who head the factions of labor continue to wage their own civil war at the expense of true national unity, and hurl at each other uglier charges than most outside critics would care to make?

We hope Congress will at least greatly modify the pending Vinson bill, approved by a majority of the House Naval Affairs Committee. This measure has not received sufficient consideration in committee. Those who object to its provisions have not had chance enough to be heard. It goes much too far in several directions—especially in imposing fines and prison terms for strikes or lock-outs during the "cooling off" periods it proposes. If it were practicable, it would be foolishly wrong to attempt to jail men for refusing to work in private employment at any time.

But we fear Congress won't be much impressed by the fact that Mr. Green and C. I. O. President Philip Murray for once agree, and that both oppose the Vinson bill.

Public opinion is the force that can protect organized labor from unsound legislation, and it will work to that end—if, but only if, labor displays a real sense of its responsibility and a proper regard for public rights. And there are encouraging signs.

The willingness of unions and managements to settle their quarrels, once they are referred to the President's Defense Mediation Board, is one such sign. Another is the agreement by Pacific coast shipbuilders and workmen to adjust all disputes by arbitration, with neither strikes nor lockouts during the defense emergency. It may well become, as President Roosevelt hopes, an example to the rest of the Nation. Still another—especially if it forecasts similar action by other C. I. O. affiliates—is the expulsion of two officers of a Baltimore shipbuilders union on charges of communistic activity.

Every step by labor toward self-discipline and genuine cooperation in the defense program will help to defeat extreme legislative curbs on labor's rights.

Extra United States Judge for Northern Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. THOM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, I am today supporting the Senate bill for the creation of another Federal judgeship for the northern district of Ohio.

I come from the city of Canton, which is one of the seven cities in the northern judicial district of Ohio, having a population of more than 50,000 people. The entire district embracing the northern half of Ohio contains 40 counties with a population of about 4,000,000 people. The district now has 3 judges, 1 of whom sits at Toledo, and 2 at Cleveland. The present judge at Toledo is a former distinguished colleague of ours, the Honorable Frank Kloeb, who has written me strongly endorsing the addition of a judge to the Federal courts of the district.

I believe a case for this bill is made, as the lawyers say, by the statistics of cases filed. In 1923 the cases filed per judge was 955. In 1940 it was 1,642. In both years 3 judges were on duty. This district is particularly noted for the number of bankruptcy cases that come into the Federal court, due to the heavy business and manufacturing interests located in the territory. Also, for the same reason, the court is confronted with much litigation involving patents.

May I make the observation that after all, our courts will gain respect not by the number of cases they dispose of, but by the quality of their decisions. Where there is a heavy docket, we ought to be mindful that, after all, we want care and competency exercised in the disposal of litigation, and this demands that the judges shall have adequate time, and not be under pressures because of the volume of litigation.

In support of the need for an extra judge, may I quote Judge Robert N. Wilkin, one of the three judges now provided for the district:

There is enough criminal work in this court to keep one judge busy all the time.

The admiralty and patent work would keep another judge busy continuously.

The civil business, consisting of jury and nonjury cases, is more than one judge can attend to.

There is, in fact, a real need for two more judges in the northern district, instead of one as asked in the pending bill.

Under date of February 24, 1941, Judge Elmer D. Davies, United States district judge, of Nashville, Tenn., who is temporarily assigned for trial work in the United States District Court at Cleveland, Ohio, wrote Senator BURTON, of Ohio, as follows:

I wish to state that in all sincerity and frankness, it is my unqualified opinion that there is an urgent need for the appointment of an additional judge for the northern district of Ohio.

It is my understanding that by reason of the high capability of these two courts and the district attorney, this district has been selected quite frequently by the Attorney General for the purpose of instituting prosecutions in cases of first impression under newly enacted statutes and others involving prosecutions of intricate and comprehensive schemes to defraud.

For instance, during the 5 weeks I was privileged to hold court there, I succeeded in disposing of only approximately 35 cases, more than 3 weeks of my time being occupied by the trial of an important mail-fraud case involving two defendants who were operating from Denver, Colo. It is my understanding that Judge Darr, who is now sitting in Cleveland by designation, has been engaged for the past 2 weeks in the trial of a similarly large mail-fraud case. It is also my understanding that there is on the docket a case under the Sherman Act, involving a large number of members of the plumbing industry, located in different parts of the country, which will require several months for trial.

Parity for Whom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the 1942 agricultural appropriation bill has now gone to conference. Since this measure passed the House on March 6, several changes have been made in it, and at least two of them are deserving of special consideration at this time. One of these changes is an increase in the amount of funds appropriated for parity payments and the other is the restoration of $35,000,000 for the removal of surplus crops.

As the bill passed the House it contained an amount of $212,000,000 for parity payments. This is the same amount as was provided for parity during the present fiscal year. The Senate has seen fit to add another $238,000,000 for parity payments, which makes four hundred and fifty millions in all for this specific purpose.

Now, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the percentage of parity achieved by the basic commodities for the last 2 years is as follows:

	1939	1940
Cotton	55.0	60.6
Corn	58.4	71.8
Wheat	56.6	65.3
Rice	66.7	69.1
Tobacco	87.7	96.2

As I pointed out to the House on March 3, the basic commodities represent approximately 21 percent of the annual national income from agriculture in the United States. Under the present farm program the producers of these commodities are presently receiving approximately two-thirds of all farm-benefit payments. This fact is best illustrated by the following table, which was compiled from information furnished by the budget section of the A. A. A.:

	Surplus Marketing Administration under sec. 32, expenditures—fiscal year 1940	1939 agricultural conservation program	1939 parity program Agricultural Adjustment Administration	Total
Cotton and byproducts thereof	$55,108,186	$118,817,000	$96,195,000	$270,120,186
Wheat and wheat flour	32,179,539	83,941,000	53,614,000	169,734,539
Corn and byproducts thereof	7,711,615	89,791,000	60,131,000	157,633,615
Rice	3,071,410	1,536,000	1,801,000	6,408,410
Tobacco		6,949,000		6,949,000
Total	98,070,750	301,034,000	211,741,000	610,845,750

Total expenditures Surplus Marketing Administration	$193,803,423
Total 1939 agricultural conservation program	497,311,000
Total 1939 parity program	211,741,000
Total	902,855,423

How long is Congress going to continue this policy of appropriating the lion's share of Federal benefit payments to the so-called basic commodities and the crumbs to the rest? As the representative of a district that is devoted largely to the production of agricultural crops, I would be the last person in the world to argue against parity for any farmer. However, it appears to me that the only fair method to follow is one that provides equal benefits for all. Let us proceed on the basis of full recognition for the American farmer, not just for particular farmers who are producing certain crops.

Speaking of parity calls attention to a table placed in the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate by Milo Perkins, Administrator of the Surplus Marketing Administration:

During the calendar year 1939 approximately 70 percent of the farmers' total cash income from the sales of farm commodities came from the sales of milk and dairy products, poultry and eggs, meat animals, and fruits, vegetables, and nuts. Except in the case of beef, veal, and lambs, prices received by farmers for their 1940–41 production of the numerous commodities included above have been substantially below parity. The percentages of parity prices which farmers are receiving for these various commodities are given in the following table:

Commodity:	Percent of parity
California oranges [1]	56.8
Florida oranges [1]	44.4
Florida grapefruit [1]	39.8
Texas grapefruit [1]	31.0
California lemons [1]	65.1
California Bartlett pears [1]	53.8
California winter pears [1]	18.8
California plums [1]	90.9
United States apples [1]	61.0
Northwest apples [1]	52.6
Walnuts [1]	67.6
Raisins [1]	65.9
Commodity—Continued	Percent of parity
California dried prunes [2]	57.9
United States onions [1]	86.5
United States cabbage (for market) [1]	79.2
United States tomatoes (for market) [1]	82.1
United States fresh peas (for market) [1]	70.2
Peanuts [2]	55.6
Potatoes [2]	62.3
United States dry edible beans [2]	62.0
Seedling pecans [2]	58.0
Improved pecans [2]	45.0
United States peaches [2]	63.0
United States pears [2]	64.0
Eggs [2]	68.0
Butter [3]	78.0
Cheese [3]	78.0
Evaporated milk [3]	72.0
Hogs [2]	78.0
Beef cattle [2]	125.0
Veal calves [2]	117.0
Lambs [2]	125.0

[1] For the season 1940–41, as of Mar. 10, 1941.

[2] As of Feb. 15, 1941, or most recent quotation available.

[3] For the 10-month period May 1940 to February 1941.

Mr. Speaker, from these figures it is apparent that many farm crops, other than the basic crops, are bringing prices that are substantially below parity. Here is where the Surplus Marketing Administration comes into the picture. As pointed out in the second table listed above, all of the parity payments go to the producers of five crops. These same crops receive about three-fifths of the conservation payments, and in the fiscal year 1940 these same five crops received over half of all the funds appropriated for the surplus-removal program.

I maintain, and I think I am fully justified in so doing, that more of the funds allocated to the S. M. A. should be devoted to the nonbasic crops. Last year Congress appropriated approximately $135,000,000 to the Surplus Marketing Administration in addition to the revenue funds that are provided under section 32 of the A. A. A. This year the House approved an appropriation of only $100,000,000, in addition to the revenue funds, and the Senate has seen fit to increase this amount by $35,000,000. No matter what the conferees decide to do to other provisions of the agricultural appropriation bill, that $35,000,000 should most certainly stay in; in fact, it should be increased. The Surplus Marketing Administration affords the only real relief to the producers of the nonbasic commodities.

Harvard Acts on Race Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KEAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

ARTICLE FROM NEWARK NEWS AND A LETTER OF HON. ROBERT W. KEAN, OF NEW JERSEY, TO THE SUPERINTENDENT OF THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Newark (N. J.) News for April 20 and a letter written by me to the Superintendent of the United States Naval Academy upon the subject referred to:

[From the Newark News of April 20, 1941]

HARVARD ACTS ON RACE ISSUE—TO ALLOW NO DISCRIMINATION BY OPPONENTS

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—Harvard's director of athletics, William J. Bingham, was ordered by the Harvard Corporation today to advise all athletic opponents the university would countenance no racial discrimination. Bingham had asked the corporation for a statement of policy after the barring of a Negro lacrosse player, Lucien A. Alexis, Jr., of New Orleans, from the Harvard team in a recent game with the Naval Academy brought protests from several quarters.

In a letter to Bingham, the corporation expressed the opinion "in the future the athletic committee should make it plain to other institutions with whom we are competing that it is Harvard's principle there be no racial discrimination among our students."

ALTERNATIVE OF FORFEIT

After the game with the Naval Academy, which Harvard lost, it was stated Harvard first had the alternative of benching Alexis or accepting a forfeit from Navy. Rear Admiral Russell Willson, Superintendent of the academy, said his institution drew no racial lines in sports, but admitted he had sent a telegram to Bingham saying Navy should have been advised about the situation in advance of the game.

However, Alexis did not play, and Bingham later explained, "We were guests of the Naval Academy and had no choice in the matter. Had the game been played at Cambridge I would have insisted he be allowed to participate."

Navy is scheduled to play Harvard on the football field this fall, and Harvard has a Negro player on the squad, Ray Guild, of Cambridge.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 23, 1941.

Admiral RUSSELL WILLSON,
Superintendent, United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.

MY DEAR ADMIRAL WILLSON: I note in the enclosed article, which appeared in the Newark Evening News of April 20, that the lacrosse team of the Naval Academy refused to take the field against Harvard when one of the members of the Harvard team was a Negro. I cannot understand such an un-American attitude by the authorities of the Academy.

At a time when we are conscripting into the armed forces of the United States all boys of military age, without regard to creed or color; when many Negro young men are volunteering their services, to die if necessary, in defense of their country; when the Negro people are called upon to do their part in meeting the tax burden which now confronts us, including the maintenance and support of the Naval Academy, the action of the midshipmen and the authorities of the Naval Academy in raising the question of color comes with ill grace and is subject to the severest criticism.

When I was attending Harvard there were a number of outstanding Negro athletes there, and I had the privilege of playing on a team with a Negro boy. At no time was there any friction among teammates or the student body, and I can conceive of no justification for the action displayed by the Naval Academy in this instance.

I most strongly protest against it, and respectfully request a full explanation.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT W. KEAN.

Military Service Recommended for War Advocates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. STRATTON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

LETTER PUBLISHED IN MORRIS (ILL.) DAILY HERALD

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which was published in the Morris (Ill.) Daily Herald of April 16, 1941:

[From the Morris (Ill.) Daily Herald of Wednesday, April 16, 1941]

VOICE OF PEOPLE

DEAR EDITOR: Why is it often the case that the ones who advocate our entrance into total war have ample excuses to protect their own hide in the event that ghastly time comes? These individuals represent mainly two classes—the old women of both sexes and the victims of sour stomachs, weak eyes, low blood pressure, and anything else which can be a claim for deferment.

The great tragedy of war is that it wounds, maims, and kills, the healthy, youthful, and red-blooded specimens of humanity, while the weak saplings are left behind to become a more serious charge upon society.

I have no objection to the system of deferment under the draft law, nor do I make any criticism of the way it has been administered, but it seems to me that in consideration of the 85 percent of the American people who oppose the final leap into war the present law should be amended to the effect that anyone who advocates our total participation as a fighting belligerent should automatically be subject to military service regardless of age or physical condition. Such a policy would be fair and just and without a doubt would silence them who enjoy fighting wars with their mouth only.

A VETERAN.

Eighteen Reasons Why the St. Lawrence Seaway Should Be Defeated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, national defense is now the rallying cry. Every citizen has adopted the policy of preparedness and fully supports all Government undertakings to that end.

The proponents of the seaway project, defeated in the past when the project has stood upon its own merits, have now placed it in the column as a necessity to our national defense, endeavoring to secure its approval. It is recognized that to so place this project as a necessity to our national defense is a breach of faith of the American people.

It is fully realized that our efforts toward preparedness must be fully realized within the next year and that immediate aid to Britain is of foremost importance. The St. Lawrence project cannot be completed until 1946. Therefore its use as a defense project cannot possibly be considered.

The proponents advance the argument that the power development is most vital to our defense effort. Yet as previously stated, only New York benefits from this phase of the project, and the action of the Defense Commission has been to place factories manufacturing articles necessary to military preparedness at widely scattered points west of the Appalachian Mountains. Such has been done to lessen their vulnerability against possible bombing. Therefore there is no justification for the project from the standpoint of time or power development as aiding our national-defense effort.

The project will most certainly hinder our efforts rather than accelerate them. Important adverse effects to our national defense are as follows:

First. It will slow up our aid to England and our own defense requirements by directing to the project enormous quantities of steel, lumber, cement, explosives, and other material now so urgently needed for the production of ships, airplanes, guns, tanks, and other "musts" of military defense. Newspaper reports on January 7, 1940, said that steel industry had already reached 97 percent of its capacity.

Second. It will slow up our aid to England and our own defense armaments by creating shortages of the materials which are necessary for defense housing, and the necessary expansion of factories and buildings now required for production of arms and ammunition, and other implements of war.

Third. It will slow up our aid to England and our own defense armaments by diverting manpower so urgently needed for essential industry at this time.

Fourth. In the event of a war invasion it will be difficult to defend.

Fifth. Under war conditions material could not be handled as quickly and safely through the seaway into the open Atlantic and down the Atlantic coast to our own Atlantic Gulf ports and west coast as they could by our present inland methods of transportation, for the following reasons:

a. Lack of protection from unfriendly powers.

b. Time required for movement.

c. Necessity for light-draft ships which we do not have.

d. Excess equipment necessary for this special service.

e. Increased manpower.

Sixth. Only 5 percent of American ships of 2,000 tons or over could be operated through the seaway.

Seventh. Only about 30 percent of foreign ships of 2,000 tons or over could use the seaway.

Eighth. Only the smaller ships of our Navy could use the seaway.

Ninth. In this time of strain upon our national finances it will require millions of dollars to prepare the lake ports for this new form of navigation service.

Tenth. Weather conditions will permit the use of the seaway for only 8 months of the year.

Eleventh. Out of the moneys spent of our tax dollars only 6 percent would be for the benefit of American workmen and shipping, and 94 percent for foreign workmen and shipping.

Twelfth. It will reduce employment in many of the major industries of the United States.

Thirteenth. It will tend to reduce the earnings of American marine workmen millions of dollars each year.

Fourteenth. It will increase our cost of living.

Fifteenth. It will increase our taxes by millions of dollars each year.

Sixteenth. It will give a subsidy to foreign workmen, shipping, and factories at the expense of the American workmen and industries.

Seventeenth. It will place American workmen in competition with cheap foreign labor.

Eighteenth. It will place an intolerable burden on American workmen and industry for all time to come with no hope or benefit.

National defense is not served at this time by uneconomical practices. The expenditure of money and the use of labor and materials in the construction of

water power and navigation facilities in the St. Lawrence River which cannot be available for several years is a detriment to the national-defense program.

Dairy Leaders Call Emergency Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

NEWS RELEASE OF THE NATIONAL COOPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a news release from the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation entitled "Dairy Leaders Call Emergency Meeting," which sets forth the manner in which the American dairyman is being discriminated against. I commend its reading to each Member of the House:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 21.—Closing a 3-day meeting the executive committee of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation today called an emergency meeting of dairy farmers at Chicago, Ill., May 1 and 2 to consider the effect of the national-defense program upon dairy farmers and to propose steps for immediate action. In connection with the call, the committee released the following public statement:

"To Dairy Farmers of the United States:

"We face a crisis. Eight years of economic depression, followed by vast internal changes incident to the national-defense effort, have placed dairy farmers in a serious plight. Our farms are being drained of labor into industrial plants and the Military Establishment. Industrial prices are spiraling upward to our disadvantage. City wages are skyrocketing and forcing us to pay farm labor more than our price returns can sustain. We are being injured by the slow-down of manufacturing operations incident to strikes accompanied by violence and resulting in the maiming and killing of people and the destruction of property. The time lost by these industrial shut-downs can never be recovered.

"Such unseemly and unpatriotic disturbances make the procurement of dairy equipment precarious and enhance their prices beyond our capacity to pay except at great sacrifice. Such manifestations of noncooperation materially hinder and handicap our Government in its defense effort designed to keep democratic institutions from perishing on this earth.

"Now, despite these ills from which we suffer, dairy farmers are being asked greatly to increase our national production of milk and its products on the presumption that this can be done without adequate recompense either for current production or for extra capital, which in most instances must be invested to achieve the desired results.

"On the other side of this picture defense industries are being adequately compensated for plant expansion. Labor's wage increases are neither curtailed nor restrained, and yet there is no essential difference between a dairy farm and an industrial plant. Both are factories, equipped to produce essentials of peace and war.

"In the immediate future, unless dairy farmers demand a constructive policy, we can see no break in the clouds of our adversity. We can look forward only to a tightening of economic pressure.

"We are confident that dairy farmers, as always, are willing to do their part. They are willing to make sacrifices for the common good. But they cannot do otherwise than resent a policy which calls for oversacrifice from a part of the people and allows other parts to reap great rewards in profits and wages.

"The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation is the largest and oldest commodity federation of farmers in America. Because of this fact, it has had to assume a leadership position in behalf of all dairy farmers of this Nation. It first exercised this leadership during World War I, when it fought for fair dealing and compensatory prices under conditions not far different from those in which we now live. It has held steadfast to this trust in the subsequent years.

"The time is now at hand when this leadership must again be raised and this great responsibility to our people and to the Nation must be renewed. To that end we are calling on all member associations to send representatives to a special national meeting for the purpose of appraising the situation and instructing the federation's board of directors with respect to proposals for a sound national program as to dairying in relation to our national defense. This meeting will be held May 1 and 2 in the Congress Hotel, Chicago, Ill."

All members of the committee signed the call. They were: N. P. Hull, Lansing, Mich., president of the federation; M. R. Moomaw, Canton, Ohio, president, Stark County Milk Producers association, Inc.; John Brandt, Litchfield, Minn., president, Land O'Lakes Creameries, Inc.; George W. Slocum, Milton, Pa., director, Dairymen's League Cooperative Association, Inc.; Clarence A. Brody, Constantine, Mich., president, Midwest Producers Creameries, Inc.; W. S. Moscrip, Lake Elmo, Minn., president, Twin Cities Milk Producers Association; Fred H. Sexauer, Auburn, N. Y., president, Dairymen's League Cooperative Association, Inc.; R. C. Mitchell, Southbury, Conn., director, Connecticut Milk Producers Association; A. H. Lauterbach, Chicago, Ill., general manager, Pure Milk Association; and Wendell P. Davis, Boston, Mass., general manager, New England Milk Producers Association.

Rural Cooperation Well Grounded—Greatest Adult Educational Movement in World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

ARTICLES FROM THE EXTENSIONER, COLLEGE STATION, TEX., AND THE PROGRESSIVE FARMER

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Extensioner, published at College Station, Tex., February 1941, there is an editorial concerning the progress of the cooperative movement among farmers in Texas. It is as follows:

[From the Extensioner, College Station, Tex., of February 1941]

The story that begins on the next page reflects the impression of the writer that the ideal and practice of cooperation are well grounded among the rural people of Texas.

Cooperation among farm people to control in as large a measure as possible their economic well-being is at once the weakest and the strongest motive of mass effort. It is weakest because the effort is supported voluntarily, but is strongest because it is maintained by self-interest, one of the most powerful of human forces.

The background of farm cooperatives is a succession of attempts since pioneer days to find a lasting working method. So many movements have had their moments in the history of agriculture since the colonists practiced getting together to talk about farm problems that the multiplying totals of cooperatives today give weight to a theory that there is a time for everything. It cannot be hurried or delayed.

FARMERS WELL INFORMED

The greatest contribution to the maturing of cooperatives is the national-mindedness of farm people themselves. World trade, tariffs, transportation rates, raw materials, and national economy have become realistic to them. Men are to be found in any community capable of talking constructively on these topics. Another high-ranking factor is the extension service at A. and M. College, which maintains a specialist who gives his full time advising with cooperatives.

HISTORY OF FARM-COOPERATIVE MOVEMENT

But in distributing honors for today's realization of a practical cooperative plan, farm organizations that now are little more than memories call from the shadows for recognition. The Grange, still a large influence in agricultural circles, brought the cooperative store into Texas in the late 1870's. The town of Granger in Williamson County is a permanent marker to the Grange movement because it took its name from this organization. The Grange also progressively agitated the establishment of A. and M. College.

The Farmers' Union, which followed the Grange, contributed its bit by preaching cooperation, especially the establishment of cooperative cotton warehouses. One such building still exists at neighboring Bryan but is not now operated cooperatively. The Farmers' Alliance also had its day in the prolonged effort to achieve the economic independence of farmers. A later attempt at cooperation was the Farm Bureau Federation, which directed its activities primarily at cotton marketing.

SOURCES OF FARMERS' CREDIT TO BE FARMER OWNED

Experience being selective, no doubt much that was constructive in the early day movements was salvaged for the day of permanent achievement. Among weaknesses of pioneer efforts were the absence of flexible credit, power machinery, and rural electrification, and the lack of a suitable State law for cooperatives. All these are not only available to farmers now, but they are moving toward control of their sources of credit through ultimate ownership of the Bank for Cooperatives.

GREAT ADVANCE

A backward look along the thorny pathway of trial and error shows how far farmers have advanced toward control of the processing and marketing of their products. This is well illustrated in figures compiled by C. E. Bowles, extension cooperative marketing specialist.

During 1940, 75 new farmers' cooperatives were chartered, bringing the total of such business organizations in Texas to some 840.

One-half of the 22 cooperative freezer food locker plants in the State were established in 1940.

The achievement of the people of Midlothian in establishing a cooperative gin, freezer-locker plant and cotton warehouse, and with a creamery and cheese factory in prospect, forecasts what the future holds for farmers.

Historians may well call the developments of the past 70 years the greatest adult educational movement ever achieved in the world.

A COUNTY AGENT'S FARM PHILOSOPHY

Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared a very interesting article in the Progressive Farmer relative to the farm philosophy of a county agent. It was as follows:

[From the Progressive Farmer]

Live and help live.

Sell your feed on the hoof.

Be very proud that you are not proud.

Do as the woodpeckers do: Use your head.

A winner never quits, and a quitter never wins.

The garden is the best-paying acre of the farm.

Just pretending to be rich keeps some folks poor.

Recipe for long life: Do not exceed the feed limit.

Borrowing trouble is the worst kind of debt.

You can absolutely depend on luck if you put a "p" in front of it.

A small jack can lift a car, but it takes a lot of "jack" to keep it up.

The money the other fellow has is capital; getting it from him is labor.

A husband is like an egg: If kept too long in hot water, he becomes hard-boiled.

The world owes every man a living, but every man must do his own collecting.

The man who is cruel to dumb animals would be cruel to folks if he were not a coward.—"Uncle Tom" Marks, in the Progressive Farmer.

Thomas Jefferson—Tammany Sachem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. ALEXANDER I. RORKE, ATTORNEY AT LAW, OF NEW YORK CITY

Mr. EDELSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on April 19, 1941, the National Democratic Club gathered to celebrate the one hundred and ninety-eighth birthday of Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic Party.

From the very establishment of our country in 1789 Thomas Jefferson began the fight for the realization of the principles which are so ably summarized in the phrase "Jeffersonian democracy." His stanchest and strongest supporters in the fight against the efforts of plutocracy to entrench itself were the members of the ancient and honorable Society of Tammany, or the Columbian Order. Jefferson and the Society of Tammany fought for the principles of true democracy, to obtain the franchise for all, to provide a free education for everyone, and to give each person an equal opportunity to achieve economic security. Nor did they forget that equality in a democracy leaves no room for intolerance and oppression. It was the efforts of Tammany which made New York City a haven for all immigrants, whether they sought a chance to make a living or to find a refuge from political persecution. Nearly all of the progress of New York City was made under the Democratic Party of New York County, popularly known as Tammany Hall.

Today, when so many shout "Jeffersonian democracy" without knowing, or even caring, what it really means, it is indeed a pleasure for me to incorporate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address of Hon. Alexander I. Rorke, a prominent attorney of New York City, whose address at the Jefferson Day banquet of the National Democratic Club so succinctly and admirably presents both the principles for which Jefferson stood and the important part in the advancement of those principles played by Tammany Hall:

Hon. Edward J. Flynn, chairman, members, and guests of the National Democratic Club, ladies and gentlemen, tonight, amid these patriotic decorations and music, in the presence of so many outstanding Democrats of our country, our State, and the five boroughs of our municipality, and under the auspices of the National Democratic Club of New York, it is my assigned privilege to speak on behalf of the steadfast leaders and the stalwart rank and file of the Democratic political organization of New York County—affectionately known to all good, true, and sundry men as Tammany Hall—on this, the 19th day of April 1941, on which you commemorate a famous birthday which, by coincidence, is the one hundred and sixty-sixth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington; in honor of Thomas Jefferson, the first Democratic President of the United States, a patriotic rebel, who helped precipitate the American Revolution, who succinctly crystallized and declared its causes in the Declaration of Independence; who risked life, liberty, and honor with others in order that the ideals of freedom and equality set forth in that document might be realized in America; and who laid the foundations of that Jeffersonian Democracy which has always been the inspiration of Tammany—the custodian and expounder of the ideals and principles of the third President of the United States.

It is most fitting that the Democratic Party of New York County should express here its appreciation of the Master of Monticello, because no political organization in America ever rendered greater service, truer loyalty, or more steadfast adherence to Thomas Jefferson and to candidates who believed in his principles than the Democratic organization of New York County, whose political roots reach back, through the Society of Tammany or Columbian Order and the Sons of Liberty to the men of the American Revolutionary period upon whom Jefferson relied so confidently for support to secure for all men and their posterity that life, liberty, and happiness with which Almighty God had endowed them, without regard to race, creed, color, or condition.

He favored, as did his fellow Democrats in New York, the utmost of free speech. While he differed from many in their opinions, yet he always insisted they had a right to express them.

In this connection—and by way of digression—many Americans today have noted a growing tendency to suppress the legitimate expression of thought. Political partisanship, taking its cue perhaps from European systems, or influenced perhaps by foreign propaganda, has intolerantly endeavored to prevent its opponents from setting forth their arguments.

This intolerance was evident at times in the last national political campaign, when even candidates for the Presidency were subjected to indignities by those who hurled various objects at them, or hissed and booed as they traveled in automobiles or as they addressed their fellow Americans.

At a recent Town Hall meeting of shabbily aristocratic intelligentsia in New York City, historic quotations from George Washington and Thomas Jefferson were received in a chilling silence that was intended as a deliberate insult to their memory.

At present the question of what the United States may, or may not, do in connection with the wars of Europe has developed an intolerance which Jefferson and Jeffersonian Democrats could never countenance.

Labeling has become a most vicious vehicle for silencing free speech. An American who would have his country armed to the teeth and prepared for war against any and all aggressors is labeled an "isolationist." If he believes in furnishing aid to any European country he is branded an "interventionist." If he advocates reposing absolute power in the office of the Presidency, he is plastered a Hitlerite or a Stalinite. If he opposes too much power in that office he is branded an obstructionist or an unpatriotic Republican. Would he keep America from foreign wars?—Out with him—"the son of a pacifist." Does he want peace without further shedding of blood?—Down with the yellow "appeaser defeatist." Would he send American soldiers into a foreign conflict?—"Mark the bloody warmonger." If he suggests that this is a war for democracy which we should join, he is a munitions profiteer. Should it be his opinion that this is a war for trade—"Jail the spy of the Axis Powers," but if he claims—

"There is no flag in any land,
Like our own Red, White, and Blue."

shoot him on the spot—he must be a "fifth columnist" for someone, or a Benedict Arnold at least.

All this is bad, as indicating a tendency to suppress free speech; but, bad as it is, Americans today may well thank God and Thomas Jefferson that they are able to exercise the right of free speech contained in Jefferson's declaration and maintained by those who are Jeffersonian Democrats.

Jefferson and the Society of Tammany, or Columbian Order—which was founded on May 12, 1789, a few weeks after George Washington's inauguration as first President of the United States, to perpetuate democratic principles and institutions—very early incurred the enmity of the Tories and the large landowners in New York and other States.

During the revolutionary period the Tories had been in the majority, the Revolutionaries a minority. The slogan of the Tories had been merely "Taxation without representation is tyranny." They were willing to be taxed, provided they were permitted to sit in Parliament and determine the amount of taxes to be imposed on the Colonies; but the Revolutionaries, particularly those who stemmed from the north and south of Ireland adopted a better slogan: "These Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent."

When the Revolutionary War was won the Tories, seeking to profit by the victory, organized the Cincinnati that endeavored to exclude from public office in the Army, Navy, and Civil Government the democratic men who by their sacrifices had brought the United States into existence. The wealthy landowners of New York procured laws excluding the Revolutionaries from voting in public affairs unless they possessed land or a large sum of money in the bank.

Against these un-American elements who sought to cheat the patriots of their birthright Jefferson and the Society of Tammany bent their efforts. They declared that the men who had risked their lives to create the country were good enough to vote and to hold any office in it.

When Jefferson was nominated for the Presidency Tammany stood by him to a man. He was elected. The Federalist Party was broken and with it the power of the tory aristocracy.

In 1826 Tammany, inspired by Jefferson's ideals, secured complete manhood suffrage.

Tammany elected Jefferson an honorary great grand sachem of its society. As such he is an immortal, as are his fellow grand sachems George Washington, John Adams, James Madison, John James Monroe, John Quincy Adams, and Andrew Jackson. Each eagerly accepted the honor.

Jefferson attended Tammany's banquets, inspiring its members to keep the democratic faith, and in turn being inspired by the sentiments of its members to carry on in his efforts for the welfare of America.

So great was the admiration of the society for Jefferson and his achievements that on every recurring Fourth of July Tammany has caused the Declaration of Independence to be read in public mass meeting in order that Americans would not only recall the ideals for which the colonists fought and the freedoms which they won, but cleave to them, lest through their neglect or indifference our democratic government should perish from the earth.

Jefferson was solicitous of foreigners who desired to become citizens of the United States, particularly those whose political opinions and religious beliefs had driven them from their native land. So, too, were his Tammany associates. Those intrepid Jeffersonian Democrats, tooth and nail, fought the Tory elements that sought to exclude the aliens and they demanded that the gates at American ports be kept open to admit all foreigners who came here with a heart full of love and affection for the principles and institutions of our country.

For that stand Tammany was damned from Hell Gate to Golden Gate and from Pontchartrain to Champlain by political enemies who sneered that Tammany wanted to make the scum of Europe citizens of the United States.

Many who sit in this august assemblage tonight and still believe that ours is a fine country in which to live can thank God that through the efforts of Tammany their ancestors were permitted to enter the United States.

The so-called scum of Europe justified the efforts of the Jeffersonian Democrats who stood by them. In the Civil War, when Abraham Lincoln, Republican President, was at his wits end the Tammany Board of Aldermen of New York City, sons of foreigners, appropriated a million dollars—mere chicken feed today, a colossal sum then—to aid the North in its efforts to preserve the Union. Incidentally that appropriation was made on Patriot's Day—April 19, 1861. On hearing of that act President Lincoln said to Gen. Daniel E. Sickles, one of the sachems of Tammany:

"Sickles, I have here on my table the resolution passed by your aldermen promising to do all in their power to support the Government. I have also their resolution appropriating $1,000,000 toward raising men for the war. When they were handed to me I felt my burden lighter. I felt that when such men break their party lines and take this patriotic stand for the Government and the Union all must come out well in the end."

The patriotic Jeffersonian democracy of Tammany during that war, at its own expense, equipped an entire regiment—the Forty-second New York Infantry—sent it to the front, where it engaged in 36 battles and engagements. Its loss of 18 officers and 325 men killed and wounded justified the imposing memorial on the Battlefield of Gettysburg that marks its achievements.

Tammany always was patriotic, courageous, liberal, nonsectarian, and tolerant. Jefferson hated religious intolerance and discrimination against the foreign born.

His doctrine in this respect was not lost upon the Democrats of Tammany, who almost single-handed fought and wiped out the bigoted "know nothings," the A. P. A.'s, and the Ku Klux Klan, who directed their venomous attacks against Catholics, Jews, Negroes, and foreigners—particularly those aliens who came from the south of Europe.

Many had feared that the United States might have difficulty from the commingling among us of the various races, creeds, and nationals of Europe.

In their homelands they had fought and killed each other from eras that antedated by centuries the holy birth that occurred in the reign of Augustus Caesar and in the satrapy of Herod, King of Judea. Not a quarter of a century from that time to this has passed, although living alongside each other, border to border, and frontier to frontier, that has failed to see them rise in arms, invade and slaughter each other, and take each other's territory either for the love of God, the love of country, the love of liberty, or the love of king and womankind.

It was feared that the racial hatreds that had been so deeply bred in their bone in Europe would come out in their flesh here in the United States; yet Tammany, perhaps by the grace of Providence as well as by its equitable dealing with them, in less than 75 years accomplished in New York City the greatest miracle of modern times—it molded the minds and the hearts of New York's more than 50 races to such a degree that they lived here in peace, in harmony, and in brotherly helpfulness, and prospered under the flag and the democratic institutions of America, an achievement that Europe, with all its boasted systems and cultures, has not yet accomplished in 2,000 years of continued racial, religious, political, and national jealousies, hatreds, and wars.

But here in this cosmopolis, under the principles of Thomas Jefferson as practiced by Tammany leadership, Irishmen and Hebrew, Pole and Italian, Kurd and Armenian, Bulgar and Serb, Lett and Finn, German and Slav, Scot and Englishman, Catholic and Protestant, Jew and Mohammedan—white, black, yellow, brown, and red men—were held to be alike in the fatherhood of God, in the brotherhood of man, and in the equality of Jeffersonian Democracy.

From their immortal political valhalla, the shades of Jefferson, Jackson, and their Democratic successors showered success upon Tammany that reared the magnificent structures of New York City which tower into the clouds, that installed the railroad tunnels which burrow under the ground, beneath the rivers, and transport our teeming cosmopolitan populations and commerce, that fostered our schools, factories, shops, parks, streets, and hospitals.

Tammany grew powerful, won the confidence of the people, the loyalty of its members, and the good will of the nonpartisan population of the city.

Politically it obtained control of Manhattan; it united the five boroughs into a solid Democratic phalanx that spread its influence throughout the State, elected several Governors, and nominated one of their own for the highest office in the gift of the people.

Future historians will record the high tide of Tammany's success in following Jeffersonian ideals.

Today Tammany, the inheritor of the principles of Jefferson, contemplates with patriotic satisfaction its achievements in keeping the torch of democracy burning in New York in every decade since 1789. Its leaders and followers possess the blessing of all citizens who appreciate its battle for the oppressed, for the immigrant, the suffering, the dispossessed, the poor, the aged, the widow, the orphan, and the laborer, as typified by liberal immigration laws, old-age and widows' and children's pensions, social-security laws, workmen's compensation acts, and its personal donations of money to relieve the sufferings of the Jews who survived the massacre of Kishinev, the Messina and San Francisco earthquake sufferers, the flood sufferers of Johnstown and Galveston, and its financial assistance to the cause of Cuba libra and to prevent the foreclosure on the home of Charles Stuart Parnell.

No Democratic organization in America equals it in the continuity of its existence, in its service to America, and its devotion to Democratic ideals, its patriotism, its courage, and its dogged persistence.

As the Democratic parent of the boroughs of New York City, which labored from 1789 to 1932 for the welfare of its children, it was entitled to some brief respite from its labor. It has been resting recently while some of the younger members of its political family have tried their hands at the arduous labor of providing for our 7,000,000 urban population who have begun to think that it's now about time for the head of the family to go to work again, take over, and continue to provide properly for their general welfare.

And in this connection—would you believe it? Only last night the shade of Thomas Jefferson appeared to me, thanked me courteously for my address to be delivered in his behalf, and assured me he would not forget my interest in him, and showed me a copy of Ginn's History of the United States, wherein—at page 185—it is writ that the Revolution, which started on April 19, 1775, ended on April 19, 1783, when the Army was disbanded—exactly 8 years to a day.

Will someone kindly page a Democratic astrologer who can tell, or foretell, what, if anything, those 8 years may presage?

I care not what others may think about it; but as for me, it means that a thousand years from now, when all the cruel wars of today—foreign as well as domestic—will have been forgotten, and when Gabriel blows his angelic trumpet and the dead arise and move toward the golden gates, and the portal custodian, Thomas Jefferson, eagerly asks, "Who was in political control of Manhattan when the trumpet blast set the wild echoes flying?" the joint reply from the Pilgrims outside the gate and from the seraphim and cherubim within will be—

"The Jeffersonian Democrats. Hallelujah."

Shakespeare's Birthday

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, we often pause to call attention to the birthdays of distinguished men, or the anniversaries of great events.

Today, April 23, is the greatest birthday anniversary in all the secular annals of mankind. It is the anniversary of the birth of William Shakespeare, the rarest genius and the richest soul "that ever lived and loved and wrought of words the statues, pictures, robes, and gems of thought."

He was the greatest intellect of all time. He was the greatest dramatist and the greatest poet, as well as the greatest philosopher, the world has ever known.

He raised the literary level to the highest plane it has ever reached.

As Victor Hugo once said, Shakespeare is "an intellectual ocean that touches all the shores of thought." Toward it, as someone else has said, "all rivers run and from it we receive our intellectual dew and rain."

It bears upon its placid bosom the literary commerce of an enlightened world, and will probably continue to do so throughout all coming ages, "to the last syllable of recorded time."

A Tempest in the Topeka Teapot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON POST, EDITORIAL FROM THE McPHERSON (KANS.) REPUBLICAN, AND AN ARTICLE FROM THE WICHITA (KANS.) BEACON

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, Public, No. 379, known as the Social Security Act amendments of 1939, was passed during the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress and was approved on August 10, 1939, after the Congress upheld the Social Security Board's recommendation "that State public assistance plans be required, as one of the conditions for the receipt of Federal grants, to include reasonable regulations governing the custody and use of its records, designed to protect their confidential character."

The Kansas State Legislature has taken no action toward meeting the requirements of the act and, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include interesting press comments on the situation now prevailing in my State, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of April 21, 1941]

$5,000,000 AT STAKE IN TEST OF KANSAS FUND PUBLICITY LAW

(By the Associated Press)

TOPEKA, KANS., April 20.—Kansas must decide by July 1 whether the luxury of a bloodless rebellion against the Federal Government is worth $5,000,000 a year.

At stake is an 82-year-old Sunflower State tradition of open publicity for all expenditures of public funds.

Five million dollars is the amount Washington pours into the State annually to pay half of each assistance check for the needy aged and other relief recipients. The Federal Social Security Board has stated bluntly that this flow of cash will halt July 1 if Kansas continues to publish names of assistance recipients and amounts of grants after that date.

The 1941 legislature put the issue up to the citizenry at large by refusing even to introduce a secrecy law, although the ultimatum from Washington came before the lawmakers went home April 6.

Gov. Payne Ratner said he would call a special session in the summer to consider the question unless the Federal board changes its position. The executive indicated he hardly expected any backing down.

Leaders in the legislature and in the Ratner administration took the position that the people should decide so important a matter.

"We felt we should obtain the reactions of the people and then could proceed to do whatever is necessary," explained the Governor. "It seems to me that the Federal Government is seeking to destroy the last vestige of the sovereignty of the State of Kansas."

Congress put the nonpublication provision in the Federal social-security statutes recently, acting on the theory that needy persons should be spared as much humiliation as possible.

The legal impediment to compliance with Washington's request is embedded in the Kansas constitution, adopted in 1859. The section reads:

"An accurate and detailed statement of the receipts and expenditures of the public moneys, and the several amounts paid, to whom, and on what account, shall be published, as prescribed by law."

Kansas counties publish each month, in the official county paper, long lists of all their expenditures down to 5 cents for a cake of soap at the jail. Nearly all counties include in these lists payments to those on relief.

The constitutional requirement fits in with a Kansas tradition of "laying all cards on the table" in governmental matters.

A lot of the legislators and the State's militant editors believe the tradition is worth fighting for, even if the foe is the Federal Government.

[From the McPherson (Kans.) Republican of April 9, 1941]

IT IS NOT JUST SPUNK

The fact that the Kansas Legislature completely ignored the threat of losing Federal welfare funds must not hastily be charged to pique on the part of a Republican legislature over the threatening words of a Democratic official appointed by a Democratic President.

Naturally Republican lawmakers do not like to be told by Democratic officials what laws to pass, but that is not the main reason. Kansas lawmakers are Kansans, and as true Kansans they refuse to be driven to desperation. Whether they think, or even are conscious, of per aspera, they instinctively know that when someone says a thing cannot be done that is just the time when the Kansan gets to work to show it can be done.

Perhaps the overzealous Government official didn't interpret his law right and thereby read into it too much wishful thinking. Perhaps he raised his children by constantly threatening to take away their sticks of candy and naturally thought Kansas lawmakers were like his kids. Whatever promoted the situation, it would have been wiser to poke around in a hornet's nest.

Kansas lawmakers cannot be threatened or bought by a 5,000,000 stick of candy. They believe Kansas will still live if the candy is taken away. Indeed, it might even be doing better if it didn't have so much candy. So there you are. Kansas refused to move and it is still the Government's move.

[From the Wichita Beacon of April 20, 1941]

BLUNDER MAY COST STATE FIVE MILLION

(By Betsy Jager, Wichita Beacon staff correspondent)

WASHINGTON, April 19.—An extraordinary blunder by the Kansas State Legislature may cut in half after July 1 the amounts now being received by Kansas people under the old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to dependent children programs.

That blunder was in not considering legislation during the session just ended that would safeguard the confidential character of public-assistance lists and records, as suggested to all State agencies administering approved public-assistance plans by the Federal Security Agency in a letter sent out to the various States on November 15, 1940, in ample time for the required action.

Kansas is the only State in the Union that has not taken steps to comply with the Federal law which was enacted in 1939, having been passed in the Senate by a vote of 57 to 8 and in the House by a vote of 361 to 2. The Kansas delegation in Washington, composed of 8 Republicans and 1 Democrat, with the exception of 1 Republican Representative who was paired against the bill, voted for the bill. This fact seems to have been overlooked, or ignored, by the present predominantly Republican Legislature of Kansas.

MAY LOSE FIVE MILLION

Unless the State legislature resorts to the expensive procedure of holding a special session within the next few months so as to comply with the Federal law, the Federal Government will be forced to withdraw the approximate $5,000,000 the State has received annually for assistance to the aged, the blind and dependent children.

In 1940 Kansas received from the Federal Government $4,020,989.13 for the public assistance programs, and to date the amount received by Kansas totals $12,722,049.31. When the next quarterly budget, which will be ready in July, is prepared by the Social Security Board, the Board must, under the law, find that the State's plan is in conformity with Federal regulations if the State is to receive the Federal contribution. It is not a happy outlook for the aged, the blind, and the dependent children of Kansas.

The Social Security Board, and the Congress, held that the fact that personal and confidential information is of a privileged character does not in any way restrict the State agency in using it for purposes directly connected with the administration of the program. Such purposes include establishing eligibility, determining amount of assistance, and providing services for applicants and recipients of public assistance.

GENERAL DATA AVAILABLE

That general information given to the public not identified with any particular individuals, such as total expenditures made, number of recipients, and other statistical information and social data contained in general studies, reports, or surveys of welfare problems, would not fall within the class of material to be safeguarded.

The Board and the Congress believed that the provision in the Federal law prohibiting the publishing of names of individuals and amount received by each was necessary for efficient administration, and that it was essential in order to protect beneficiaries against humiliation and exploitation, such as resulted in some States where the public has had unrestricted access to official records; that experience has proved that publication of this information does not serve the avowed purpose of deterring ineligible persons from applying for assistance; and that the public interest is amply safeguarded if this information is available to official bodies.

The Board found that candidates of both major parties for local, State, or National office in at least eight different States have obtained lists of old-age assistance recipients and have canvassed such persons requesting their votes. In more than one instance, there has been an implication, if not an actual statement, that recipients would have their grants increased, "if they voted right."

The publishing of lists of public assistance recipients has, in some instances, meant the solicitation of the recipients by organizations promoting aged and blind pension plans or increased grants for money with which to finance newspapers to build up the organizations.

It is difficult for Washington officials to see why the Kansas Legislature held out against the Congress of the United States and acted contrary to measures taken by 47 States. It will also be interesting to hear the explanations of its membership to the aged, the blind, and the dependent children, of Kansas, if and when payments are cut in half in July.

You Can Defend America Through Moral Rearmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

ARTICLE BY GOULD LINCOLN

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago I placed in the RECORD an article by Mr. Gould Lincoln, which was published in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., in which he reviewed the book Come Wind, Come Weather, by Daphne du Maurier, describing the moral rearmament movement in England.

I now desire to place in the RECORD another article by Mr. Lincoln, which was published in the Evening Star yesterday, April 22, 1941, in which Mr. Lincoln reviews the booklet entitled "You Can Defend America." This important document emphasizes the urgency of mobilizing our Nation spiritually and is deserving of the serious study and consideration of every American citizen.

The article referred to reads as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 22, 1941]

"YOU CAN DEFEND AMERICA" BOOKLET MAKING THOUSANDS THINK OF NATION'S DESTINY

(By Gould Lincoln)

The most challenging document produced in America since war broke in Europe and forced an emergency upon this country is a booklet entitled "You Can Defend America." It is already making thousands of Americans think. Once people really thing, they begin to act.

The booklet presents a program—not a legislative program except insofar as each individual American acts as his own personal legislature. The program is sound and simplified, not simple. It calls for sound homes as a first line of defense. As the second line of defense it demands teamwork in industry, and as the third line, a united Nation. You cannot have the weapons and supplies needed for total defense in these days of piping warfare unless you have all three.

So highly did Gen. John J. Pershing think of You Can Defend America that he wrote the foreword carried in it. He said: "No patriotic citizen can read it without feeling its inspiration. * * * I commend its message to every American." Since its publication last week, the little volume, which can be read in a dozen minutes, has been praised by Governors of States, among them Governor Saltonstall, of Massachusetts; Governor Sewall, of Maine; and Governor Schricker, of Indiana. Labor leaders, industrialists, and mayors of the country's big cities have joined in the recommendation that it be widely read and that its suggestions be followed.

CITES "WALLS" THAT FAILED

Succinctly the booklet points out that "once China built a wall," that "yesterday France built a wall," and that "today America builds a wall, a ring of steel, ships and planes and guns." The walls of China and of France proved of no avail against invading enemies—not because they were not stout walls. There had been neglect of essential morale and unity among the people back of those walls. Obviously if America should lack—or does lack—what China and France lacked, its "wall" will go the way of their walls.

The cardinal weakness among peoples who have proved unable to defend themselves has been selfishness of the individual, which inevitably results in "softness," an unwillingness to go the route. That kind of selfishness too often communicates itself unhesitatingly to groups of people who believe they have a common bond.

So "you can defend America" starts with the American family, the home, to pound more "guts" into the people as a whole. It is there they must find the courage needed, if anywhere. "Why don't the nations get along like one big family?" the booklet asks, and rather cynically it answers, "The trouble is they do!" Too many Americans, it says, like to sing "Home, Sweet, Home"—when they are away from home. It urges, then, that homes pull together, as the first line of defense.

"If we perspired more in time of peace, we would bleed less in time of war," the booklet quotes from Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, to help make its point that teamwork in American industry today is vital to national defense.

STRIKES COURT DISASTER

The country, through Congress and the President, is engaged at present in an effort to make the country strong by law. Laws are being framed and passed to raise the needed money, to expend that money, to keep industrial plants engaged in national-defense production constantly at work, to weed out "fifth columnists," Communists, and Fascists. Back of any law, however, must be the will and the belief of the people, or the law becomes a mere nothing, a matter of no substance. It is obvious that a law which merely keeps men in industrial plants will be of little avail if the men themselves have no heart in their work. It should be just as obvious that management hamstrung on every side, by Government and by labor, will have no heart in turning out vitally needed weapons and supplies.

Strikes in this country in the last year have been extremely costly to national defense. Anyone who believes that all the strikes which have occurred have been unjustified—or that all of them have been justified—is a fool. But, more particularly, anyone's a fool who does not realize in this day of crisis that all strikes—stoppages of work—are harmful and court disaster. The arguments advanced in "You Can Defend America" for adjustment are appealing. They go back to the selfishness of all groups, capital and labor. They are the kind of thing that should make the work of conciliators and mediators much easier and more effective.

Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O., commenting on the booklet, said, "It brings us back to fundamentals. It charts in brief compelling outline a practical program for home, industry, and Nation."

William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, said, "It should do much to lift our people to a sustained level of self-giving patriotism. It will, in my opinion, help toward that teamwork in industry and general morale which are essential if our armed forces are to have the backing they deserve, and if the spirit of our Nation is to be united in support of what we hold dear."

The group which prepared the booklet is the same which has supported moral rearmament in this country and in England. "Human nature is the bottleneck in the production of national morale," it wrote, and then proceeded with its formula for the eradication of the bottleneck, which, boiled down, means that the people as a whole must return not only to a belief in God, but to His guidance.

The New Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

ADDRESS BY JUDGE T. W. DAVIDSON

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, United States District Judge T. W. Davidson, delivered a very interesting and instructive speech on The New Order before a joint session of the Texas Legislature at Austin, March 4, 1941. It is as follows:

Mr. President and members of the Texas Legislature, the walls of this chamber are sacred to me. As time rolls by they will become so and more so to each of you. As we walk by the portraits of Sam Houston, of Stephen Austin, of O. M. Roberts, of James Hogg, and those who have guided this ship of state for a hundred years, we feel that we are in the house of our fathers.

Our minds turn even further away to the land from whence they came—to the Hermitage, to Monticello, to the old House of Burgesses at Williamsburg, to Stratford, to Mount Vernon, to Arlington, and other shrines of America's patriotic devotion. When we behold these pictures we are conscious of the golden age of American patriotism and southern chivalry.

Our fathers raised the torch of liberty. Symbolically it stands in New York Harbor, enlightening the world. The spirit of Washington was caught up by Bolivar, Mirandi, and Martin, and its benign blessings spread from Canada to Cape Horn. It spread across the seas. The thrones of tyrants toppled and liberalized governments appeared.

We love the men who ushered in this regime. It is sometimes referred to as the old order, but many of us are proud of this heritage from our noble fathers: we are proud of the greatness of our country; and we understand the meaning of the poet when he said:

"Breathes there a man with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said
This is my own, my native land."

THE NEW ORDER

Over the radio we hear that all that is left of France, the great European republic, is being encouraged and coerced into becoming a part of the new order. Rumania has accepted her place in the new order. Bulgaria, without firing a gun, like the children of

pacifism, is accepting her place in the new order. Denmark awoke with the coming of the morn and found that she had accepted the new order without knowing it, even in the night. Norway, Belgium, Holland, each in turn, has accepted the new order. The new order was tendered to Finland; she gallantly defended her conception of civilization and justice.

But what is this new order that is to reorganize Europe and shape civilization? Briefly stated, by a survey of the European situation, and especially from the acts and doings of those that command in that unhappy continent, the new order is state socialism, backed by military rule. It is the rule of the absolutist. The judiciary, with its safeguards, has been submerged beneath the waves of fascism, nazi-ism, and communism. These are the triplets born to Father Greed and Mother Hate.

Let us descend from the heights of more lofty platitudes and, staying away from any unkind remarks, examine the new order in Germany, the source of its military power, which seeks, like the sword of Mohammed, to bring under its shadows the civilized world. In my young manhood it was my pleasure to know a plain but highly educated old gentleman from Germany. He was a Jew; he could trace his ancestry back to the House of Levi. His children entered into all that was America and America's—blessed and embraced it with open arms. One of his type remained behind in the fatherland. A friend of his journeyed to see him. He had been the head of a great banking house—the banking house was closed. He had owned a palatial home—the visitor found strangers there. He procured the address of its former owner and occupant, and found him, his wife, and five children living in a dungeon where not even the sunshine could penetrate. Strange to say, he was still cheerful. He believed in Jehova, the God of the universe.

What wrong had this man done? No law had he violated; he was simply a member of a race that the world of nazi-ism saw fit to hate and to persecute. It was a part of the new order. Hate is the essential element of the religion of the new order. Someone must be hated, and this man was the victim.

But let us turn to Austria. We are told that Austria became a part of the German Reich by her own election and free will. The man who was guiding the ship of state of the Austrian Nation, Mr. Schusschnigg, had committed no crime, yet for the past 4 years the bayonets of the German Army have stood at his chamber's door. He may not write, as you and I. He may not speak over the radio nor to the passing stranger. He may not travel about into the lands where freedom of speech and freedom of press prevail. His only sin is entertaining different political views, and for this sin he is imprisoned and his liberty is gone.

How different is it here in the land given us by our fathers. When Governor O'Daniel beat Mr. Hines and Ernest Thompson in the election, everybody took up the threads of his life the next day and went happily along, including Ernest and Mr. Hines. When Franklin Delano Roosevelt beat Wendell Willkie for the Presidency, Willkie is allowed to travel over the face of the earth and boldly proclaim the same foreign policy as the man who defeated him, not subject to coercion, but privileged to say, to think, to write, to travel. How different.

But what of the new order in Russia? There it has had 22 years to crystallize and show just what it is and how it is and how it would operate. Still a military despotism; still no courts of justice—the temple of God and the temple of justice alike are closed to the petitioner.

Stalin wields the scepter over a hundred and sixty million people. Every confederate, every associate, that sat by his side and rolled into power with him has disappeared. When they had aspirations or political convictions of their own, they went down the chute, called the blood purge, where their heads rolled into oblivion, and none heard of their passing.

The artist, the poet, and the historian for the past 200 years have told us much of the Cossacks as the heart and center of the great Russian Cavalry. But where is the Cossack today under the new order? His politics were not right. He didn't fall into the new secret political organization that dominated the land for which he had fought for hundreds of years. He is no more. The only group of Cossacks that we know about now is a band of traveling musicians over here in the United States who are afraid to go home The rest of them, hundreds of thousands, have gone down into Death Valley for no offense other than loving their country well enough to entertain different political views from Mr. Stalin—from Mr. Stalin, whose secret hand is so powerful and whose power is so insidious that he can dictate the death of a man across the Atlantic in his quiet retreat in Mexico. The new order has its agents over here as well as elsewhere.

But we are told that all this will change when the democracy of Old England goes down and when Britannia no longer rules the waves. How will it change? In that respect we are not advised. Military despotisms never change until a more powerful hand hurls them into oblivion. It has been left alone for almost a quarter of a century in Russia, and there you have an opportunity to see what it will do if left to its own initiative. Sufficient is it to say that in the land of the Russians there is no independent judiciary or court of justice as we know it. Sufficient to say that the church and the temple of worship are closed and are used for profane purposes, or have become the habitat of bats and owls.

The gory and fiendlike story follows communism and State socialism into Spain. As a matter of propaganda it was stated often in this country that Spain was a democracy. She was not a democracy any more than Russia is a democracy. Franco's regime was inclined more toward the Fascists of Italy, and the existing regime then in power was borrowed from Russia. England took no choice between the two—it would have been a choice between two bad actors.

When the Spanish Civil War was at its bloodiest I met Judge Martin Traviesco, of Puerto Rico, an American of Spanish birth, born in Puerto Rico, educated at Cornell, and in the territorial courts under the appointment of President Roosevelt, a very scholarly and splendid gentleman. He told me that his brother was run out of Barcelona by the Communists, or those in power, and that he passed into France just one day ahead of a death trap; that the following day the train on which he passed through was halted in the tunnel under the Pyrenees and every male passenger required to get off, where he was shot. He told me that his sister lived in Madrid; that a government committee of inspectors raided a house next door to where she was living; that the stork was visiting the house that night at the time of the raid. He said that his sister was in the house because the lady was her friend; that an eminent Spanish physician went down and met the government's examiners and explained to them the situation and asked them to wait. They did wait, and when the doctor came down to depart they took him, overpowered him, stretched his arms across a block, and chopped off his hands with a meat ax, and then remarked to him that he would never live to help another rich man's wife give birth to a child.

Those things are so brutal they sound impossible, but no one who talked with Judge Traviesco could question his integrity or his veracity. Hatred is the religion of this particular brand of state socialism. The fiendishness with which they do their work in taking from those that have is not unlike that of the highwayman who holds you up, takes your wallet, and then snuffs out your life.

Thirty thousand Spanish priests were said to have been slain during this bloody war. They were not slain under arms, but slain because they were priests and it was open season among the adherents of Russian communism for anything that bore the name of Christianity and for any man that wore a white collar and had property. Judge Traviesco further stated that the secret political societies that dominated the courts and to which the landowners were probably ineligible included his hired help and servants; that they were taught to be disloyal to him and constituted a secret force that reported the doings, the comings, and goings into his household to a government committee.

In one locality they may hate the Jews, in another the property-holding class, and in another the church, but somebody must be hated and destroyed wherever state socialism in its present form spreads its branches.

So much for the new order, as it stands out in full-fledged power of war and might and regulates the affairs of nations according to its dreams.

THE "FIFTH COLUMN"

Over the radio and in the columns of the press we learn that our Government has in the past 4 months destroyed at ports of entry 15 tons of subversive literature from Communists, Nazis, and Fascists seeking to turn us away from the old order and to teach us to accept the grandeur (?) and beauty (?) of the new. Thirty thousand pounds of reading matter, or 15 tons, in a few weeks for the consumption of the American reader, many of them youths.

The attorney general's office of Oklahoma recently convicted a young man under the laws of that State. In his possession had been found great quantities of this literature, much of it printed in Moscow. He had fallen a victim to the "fifth column" and became a champion of the new order.

From Oklahoma City hails a man by the name of Oscar Ameringer, born in a German village, an organizer of socialism, an antagonist of former Postmaster General Burleson, of our own State, a student of Marxism and all that the new order stands for. On the 19th of last April Mr. Oscar Ameringer, by invitation, addressed several hundred of our young people upon the university campus of this city. The burden of his song was socialism, the immediate purpose was to cut off aid and sympathy from the United States to Great Britain, who was holding up the standards of free government. "Let us starve the war," was his slogan. He knew that Germany was getting nothing from American markets, he could not have meant starving Germany; he meant to starve England. He declared, according to press reports, that the world was "suffering from a hangover of nationalism," and compared the United States to a "jackass standing knee-deep in a field of grass starving to death because he can't eat it all." His remarks were cheered by our children—yours and mine, by the sons and daughters of Texas.

I, too, subscribe to the theory that this is a land of free speech and free press. I know that many of our great institutions of learning encourage the youth to accept nothing as true, but to prove it to his own satisfaction, and to build up his own standards of thought and action. The great danger is that in this formative period the standards selected may be those of the militant Nazi, Oscar Ameringer.

I do not accept everything that my father thought or believed, but I do accept from him two things and will hold to them until I find

something that is better. One is the tenets of the Christian civilization and the other the American Constitution and the government it created.

Every man, every boy, every woman, every girl must, if we would attain any success in life, have a standard, a goal, and an objective. When a government better than the American form of government has been devised and tried I am ready to accept it. If a faith or a creed better than that of Jehovah and Jesus Christ could be proclaimed, I would be ready to accept that. Patrick Henry said, "My feet are guided by the lamp of experience," and my course will remain under the standards of law and order, of justice and mercy.

This "fifth column," this propaganda, being on the offensive, being a militant, going concern, like any offensive, tends to succeed and create new adherents. The man or the principle on the defensive is the one that must suffer. This socialistic offensive attacks us in a well-organized way, where we are most vulnerable. It attacks the youth, who has not yet formulated his conceptions of life, nor his course of action. It attacks labor, and whispers in his ear that he is the victim of capital, and sows the seed of hate between employer and employee. And in the form of Grapes of Wrath, and other texts, it appears upon the screen. A large percentage of those who saw, for instance, the production entitled "The Grapes of Wrath" didn't realize the deductions that it brought forth as the seed of discord, planted in the mind of the youthful observer. What are these deductions? Religion is a subject of ridicule, the funeral a burlesque, the landowner a brute, the officer of the law a tyrant, and only one spot of peace could be found for the weary soul, and that was where the sheriff and the police and the hand of the law was supposed never to come, a paradise of communism, where nobody owned anything in separate.

The approach of the "fifth column" is not unlike the early tactics of the Apostle Paul in spreading the blessings of the Christian faith. He took his believer where he stood and led him from there into his own doctrine. The "fifth columnist" takes the isolationist and makes use of him as far as he can go. If he can keep American influences at home, then nazi-ism can conquer the rest of the earth. The "fifth columnist" approaches the pacifist and tells him that there is nothing worth fighting for. He tells him to forget the words of the great preceptor Thomas Jefferson, who said:

"Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God."

This "fifth columnist" joins himself readily and most insiduously to the industrial laborer and teaches him that his employer is an enemy and an object of hate; that he has a right to strike against his own government when the Government doesn't do what he thinks is right. He teaches him to disregard the old American maxim:

"My country, may she always be right, but right or wrong, my country still."

It seeks such champions as Harry Bridges and Earl Browder to carry the mission of dissatisfaction among those who have real or imaginary wrongs at the hands of their employers.

When I was Lieutenant Governor and presided in this chamber, my rooms and my offices were headquarters for representatives of labor. Some of the most wholesome measures for the protection of labor and for the safety of employees were drafted by my hand in the Lieutenant Governor's quarters. I am glad to remember those men as patriots, and to know that most of them that are living now are sailing under the banners of the American Federation of Labor, men who, unlike Oscar Ameringer, are not willing to toss all nationalism into the scrap heap, but are willing to stand by you and me and say, "My country."

What is the effect of this great volume of literature, and these speakers of the Oscar Ameringer type? As I entered this building I paused to observe the painting, The Capture of Santa Anna at San Jacinto, where freedom triumphed over a military dictator. Among the characters whose faces appear in that picture is one whose collateral descendant lately returned from a great university (not a State institution) and grieved his father by disclosing that he had embraced state socialism and communism. The greatness of Texas, the wonder of the American Government, is forgotten by him, and he is ready to follow the disciples of Oscar Ameringer, of Karl Marx, and Stalin. I can see the tears that came into the eyes of that father when he learned that his son, in whom his hope and ambition centered, had departed from the faith of his fathers.

The effect of this propaganda is not so readily observed by the average man or woman when dosed to the youth of the country, but when you hear them weeping over the loyalists in the late Spanish contest; when you hear them declaring that Sacco and Vanzetti were judicially murdered; and when you hear them say the American Constitution is old and antiquated, you know that the "fifth column" is getting in its work.

I would not have my remarks interpreted as criticizing our institutions of learning. They are yours and they are mine. We, too, use the thought of the great philosopher, cannot step out and with one full sweep pull the tares from among the wheat. We must grow them out and teach them out. A man cannot write in his will, when he would disinherit John, "I will and direct that my son John take nothing from my estate, unless he gives his estate to somebody else, so that there is none left for John." Otherwise John comes in for his share. If he would disinherit John, he must will all of his estate to his daughter Jane, or to others, and leave none for John. We can probably not eradicate subversive thought from our educational system by any bill or measure of this body. We can direct it into different channels. We can put ourselves upon the offensive and by militant organizations, like the Boy Scouts for the little fellow and the American Legion with the large ones, produce the type of men that Sam Houston, John H. Reagan, and James Stephen Hogg would have us to bring forth.

I would like to see a chair of American Government and History installed in every State school of Texas, where those who are preparing to teach are being tutored. I would make it a part of every teacher's course of study, and there the struggles of our fathers for freedom would be taught. There the background of our system of government would be painted and brought forth. There American history would be taught again to mature minds and not to those of the lower, intermediate grades alone.

The personnel of these chairs should be chosen by a select body, one of whom should be recommended by an institution like the American Bar Association, like the American Legion, and like the American Federation of Labor, and then, of course, by your Governor and your Supreme Court.

We should not stop by forcing this course into the schools, because for some it might seem distasteful, but it should be made attractive. How many of you have ever enjoyed for a week the Davis Mountains of our own State? How many of you have been to Fort Davis, where clean, cold water bubbles from the ground beneath the palisades of rock of wondrous beauty? How many of you have seen the oak groves and the group of giant sycamores that cluster around these springs? How many of you have seen the rock homes that still stand there, with the barracks and quarters of the soldiers of the early period of our State? How many of you have slept under its delightful climate, where it is not so cool as to give you a cold, but where you can sleep under a blanket every night, just 1 mile high? I should acquire a spot like that and upon it I would build a school, or a lecture hall; we might call it a Chautauqua, or a school of Americanism, where the best teachers and speakers upon law and government would lecture, and during the summer vacation of the school teachers of Texas I would provide for them a free course, at least every third year, where the beauties of the stories of one's native land would be made to live again in the minds of those that teach the youth. There they might be taught the philosophy of Moses and of Christ, Himself, that man is rewarded according to the deeds done in the body, that he is punished for his evil doings, and blessed for his righteous acts. There they might be taught the words of Jefferson:

"Let us found a government in which there will be no extremely rich and no abjectly poor. Then let us say to every man, 'With the gifts God has given you—your brain, your brawn, your energy—work out your own fortunes under a just government and an equal jurisprudence.'"

To the youth I would say, in the language of the very wise man:

"My son, hear the instruction of thy father and forsake not the law of thy mother."

And I would let them hear the intonation of that hymn:

"Faith of our fathers, keep our country true and free,
Faith of our fathers, holy faith, we will be true to thee."

Presentation of South Dakota State Flag at Valley Forge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

ADDRESS OF MRS. JOHN H. CUMBOW, SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take pride in including in the permanent archives of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks of Mrs. John H. Cumbow, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., in connection with the presentation of the South Dakota State flag to the Valley Forge Association on April 10, 1941.

Mrs. Cumbow is the State regent of the South Dakota Daughters of the American Revolution.

The address follows:

From the sunshine State of South Dakota I bring greetings and sincere cooperation in this undertaking in preserving Valley Forge as a national shrine to the memory of our first patriot, Gen. George Washington.

The locality of our State is geographically the center of North America. Agriculture and farming are the main pursuits in the eastern and central parts of the State, and in the western section mining and grazing are the chief occupations.

At Lead is located the second largest gold mine in the world, and only 2 miles from

historic Deadwood. The country here is mountainous. Harney Peak is over 7,000 feet in height. The mountains are covered with beautiful pine trees, and kinnikinnick grows profusely on the ground. Deer are often seen in the mountains and along canyons and sparkling streams.

The Black Hills abound in minerals—tin, beryl, rose quartz, coal, manganese, mica, and felspar. I have watched with interest the development of Mount Rushmore National Monument, comprising the busts of four great Americans carved from solid gray granite—George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Theodore Roosevelt, and Abraham Lincoln—which are visible at 60 miles. The head of Washington is 60 feet from forehead to the point of his chin.

South Dakota takes pride in its many churches in all localities, and its schools and colleges.

At Yankton is buried a real Daughter, Charlotte Warrington Turner, whose father, William Warrington, was a bodyguard of Washington when the Continental Army camped at Valley Forge.

It is a joy and privilege for the South Dakota organization of the Daughters of the American Revolution to present the South Dakota flag to the Valley Forge Association.

MY STATE—SOUTH DAKOTA

Mine is a State of prairie loveliness,
Tree-fringed lakes, or river, cliffed and bold;
Of centuried buttes and granite spires that press
To skies beyond their pregnant lodes of gold;
A land where coyotes howl and wild ducks wing,
Of forest-sheltered buck and antelope;
A land of drought—or rain abundant spring—
Of sun and wind and snow—of toil and hope.

Mine is a State whose varied loveliness
My soul enthrall. Oh, when days are fine
And I can see uplifted, motionless,
Miraged—a ranch, spruced streams, a smokestacked mine;
I hear God speak in loving majesty,
The dauntless language of eternity.

—*Roberta Robertson*, from Pasque Petals.

Spiritual Defense of America by Moral Rearmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, without a mobilization of our spiritual forces in the present national emergency, military and naval strength will prove to be empty and wholly inadequate. This vital fact is pointed out in the booklet entitled "You Can Defend America," which stresses the need and value of the moral rearmament of our people. The moral rearmament movement has contributed richly to the building of national morale in England and will do the same in America.

Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent of my colleagues, I insert the article by Mr. David Lawrence, which appears in the current issue of the United States News, Washington, D. C., entitled "You Can Defend America," reading as follows:

YOU CAN DEFEND AMERICA

(By David Lawrence)

A booklet comes to hand. In it is a foreword by General Pershing, who "commends its message to every American." It is a penetrating declaration that emphasizes the importance of spiritual defense in the world crisis.

We have been thinking a good deal in terms of military rearmament. We are asked now to consider moral rearmament as an indispensable factor in the building of national morale. Without it we cannot face the exacting tasks that face us.

Today America is building ships, planes, and guns. "But," it is asked, "is this enough? Does America have total defense? Does she build character? Spirit? The will to sacrifice? Does she build men? Men who pull together? We in America ask, 'What can I do?' What can 130,000,000 Americans do? Plenty."

Then follow three lines of defense:

"Sound homes.

"Teamwork in industry.

"A united Nation."

Pointing out that America "needs guts as well as guns," and that "national character is the core of national defense," the pamphlet declares, "Congress can't vote it. Dollars won't buy it. It's your job to build it."

The plea is a simple one. The booklet can be read in a few minutes. Some of its passages are reproduced here in part:

"Human nature is the bottleneck in the production of national morale. We need a new spirit in the country. But to get it we must start with a new spirit in every citizen. And that means you.

"Either you sacrifice your personal selfishness for the Nation, or you sacrifice the Nation for your personal selfishness.

A NEW SPIRIT FOR THE HEART AND MIND

"America needs a change of heart. We must live the American way.

"Americans are honest, unselfish, neighborly, clean, and free.

"Or are they? Always? Are you? All the time?

"If not, what can you do about it?

"A new spirit can grip your heart and mind and muscle—if you are willing. You can change. How?

"The first step is to face the facts. The facts about yourself. Honest? Unselfish? Neighborly? Clean? Free? At home? In industry? In politics?

"Our fathers looked to God for their direction. We've looked about every place else.

"We still print 'In God We Trust' on our money. Everybody carries the idea around in his pocket. Is it just an idea? Or is it the main point?

"William Penn said: 'Men must be governed by God, or they will be ruled by tyrants.'

"What are you governed by? Your wife? Your husband? Your desires? Your pocketbook? Fear of losing your job? Personal ambition?

CHANGED LIVES ARE NEEDED NOW

"Only God can change human nature. When you decide to be governed by God, then the change comes.

"It's like joining the Army. You decide there's something worth fighting for. You enlist. You put yourself under orders. Then you are given new equipment. You find new comradeship. Your way of living changes. And your whole outlook on life.

"To be governed by God means to listen to a wisdom beyond your own. And obey.

"George Washington listened at a time of conflict—and gave a nation freedom.

"Abraham Lincoln listened at a time of crisis—and preserved a nation's unity.

"Lincoln said, 'I have so many evidences of God's direction that I cannot doubt this power comes from above. I am satisfied that when the Almighty wants me to do or not to do any particular thing He finds a way of letting me know it.'

"You don't have to be President to do as Lincoln did. When you take time to be quiet and listen, God will guide your thoughts. He will give you orders. And a plan. Directions how to put things right. Creative ideas about yourself, your home, your job, your community, your nation.

"Musket and powder horn once hung over the door of every American home. Our fathers were not afraid to use them. The minute men at Lexington and Concord seized them and ran to defend their country. Not a man in America would hesitate to do it again if invaders threatened his homeland.

"But America has already been invaded. Like parachute troops in the night, fear, hate, and greed have slipped into our homes, our industries, our communities. Like termites they are eating away our national character.

"The fight is on. The fight against our softness, graft, laziness, extravagance, buck passing, materialism—allies of the "fifth column." The battle line runs through every home, every office, every factory, every farm.

"It is a daily battle. It takes courage. Imagination. You've got to be tough inside. You've got to think hard, and live clean.

"You and 130,000,000 other Americans can enlist today in this fight. You don't have to wait to be put into uniform. You're in the Army now.

"First lick the enemy inside yourself. Then get the next fellow to join you in this battle for a new America. Get your newspaper, radio station, and movie theater to fight for a new morale.

"Fight to make your home and community a pattern.

"Fight to bring teamwork in industry.

"Fight to unite the Nation.

"Then America will have what ancient China lacked. What modern France lacked. She will have total defense."

Then there's another striking passage which says:

"America does not need to be divided and quarreling at home just to prove she is a democracy—any more than husband and wife need to get into an argument just to prove they have minds of their own.

"A crack football team isn't all made up of quarterbacks. Every man has his part. Each depends on all the others. So with the Nation. Unless we have national teamwork someone is likely to take the ball away from us.

THE WAR INSIDE OURSELVES

"Nations in Europe have gone down because they were at war inside themselves. Their people couldn't get together. They refused to face facts. They were caught unprepared. Even as the storm broke, men fought to get more for themselves.

"National unity is the heart of national defense. If a nation is united, no "fifth column" can slip through and sabotage its strength.

"A united people will have the spirit which no disaster will shake and no danger will weaken.

"Unity is more than agreeing on what we like or whom we hate. Teamwork cannot be built by high talking and low living; by fine ideals and selfish lives.

"'Teamwork,' said Knute Rockne, 'is a combination of self-sacrifice, brains, and sweat.' It means working together for America. Honest teamwork between Government

and business, labor and management, union and union, Republican and Democrat, city and farm.

A UNITED PEOPLE FREE FROM FEAR

"A united people will build the new America. A Nation set free from fear, hate, and greed. A Nation that holds the secret of the new world.

"Friction between men slows up work more than friction in machines. If employers or workers destroy teamwork by their selfishness, then America is in danger. And the gains each fought for will be swept away.

"The defense of the Nation demands that all rise above self-interest. It means each faces up to his own mistakes. It means we join forces for the common good.

"Then our industries will run at capacity. Our manpower will be put to work. Together we all will produce the materials and morale to make America strong."

I have quoted the pamphlet at length because I believe its wide distribution at this time is in the public interest. Copies of the pamphlet, which is entitled "You Can Defend America," can be obtained by writing to Moral Rearmament, Judd & Detweiler (printers), Washington, D. C., or to Moral Rearmament, Fairmont Hotel, San Francisco, Calif. The pamphlets cost 10 cents each for quantities of less than 1,000. All profits have been waived by printers and paper manufacturers. Two million copies have been printed already.

It may well prove that this booklet will become the basis for the national philosophy of total defense for America. Newspapers could help by reprinting it, radio stations by broadcasting it, ministers, speakers at luncheon clubs and civic organizations by reading excerpts from it, and, last but not least, individuals can derive inspiration by reading and rereading it and asking themselves in the meditative quiet of conscience whether the message doesn't really go to the heart of the effort we must make for military and spiritual rearmament.

The Position of Farm Groups With Other Groups and Pending Legislation Before the Congress of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, BEFORE THE ATLANTIC COTTON ASSOCIATION, GREENVILLE, S. C.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a copy of an address delivered by me before the Atlantic Cotton Association in convention at Greenville, S. C., on Friday, April 18, 1941.

I deeply appreciate the fact that at this moment the great thought in the minds of the President, the Members of Congress, and the American people concerns the ruthless and destructive war that is now raging in Europe, and the building of our national-defense program as speedily and efficiently as possible.

However, I want to call to the attention of the administration, the Congress, and the American people that we cannot have a well-balanced and successful national-defense program unless we have a well-balanced and prosperous agriculture. During the period ahead when the defense program reaches a peak, agriculture must be economically strong if it is to do its part in national defense and if farmers are to have living standards comparable to those of the people in the cities. To have less is to impair defense. In other words, a successful agriculture is a major part of any successful national-defense program.

A major portion of the farm problem is based upon the disparity which exists between the agricultural dollar and the industrial dollar. It is caused by the fact that prices for major agricultural commodities are established by speculators whose major consideration is not domestic but world crop conditions and the fact that those prices are established without any consideration as to production costs and in the imposition of which the producers have absolutely no voice. This, with the consequent failure of tariff to protect domestic agricultural markets, condemns the American farmer to sell virtually at world-price levels.

LOW FARM INCOME

The most important problem facing the southern farmer today is that of low income. It is not just a matter of uneven distribution. There is not enough total agricultural income in the South to support the region's extremely dense farm population. In fact, the South has the lowest income of all the major farming regions of the United States; its per capita return from the land is the smallest.

These figures, secured some days ago from the Department of Agriculture, may be of interest to you:

In 1909, farmers' percentage of the national income amounted to 16.4 percent; in 1917, 1918, and 1919, it amounted to 19 percent, and in 1932, 3.7 percent, and in 1940 to 5.9 percent.

INCOME OF INDUSTRIAL GROUPS

Let me give you some interesting information and figures contained in a statement issued some days ago by the National City Bank, of New York, quoting:

"A tabulation of reports of 2,590 leading corporations shows combined net profits, less deficits, of approximately $4,253,000,000 after taxes in 1940, compared with $3,565,000,000 for the same corporations in 1939, a gain of 19 percent.

"Net profits of the following industries, as reported after depreciation, interest, taxes, and other charges and reserves, were charged off as follows:

	Percent
"Lumber	76.8
Paper products	73.8
Agricultural implements	67.2
Meat packing	12.4
Cotton goods	77.4
Knitted goods	33.3
Printing and publishing	22.6
Fertilizer	13.0
Iron and steel	98.8
Building equipment	50.5
Electrical equipment	45.1
Hardware and tools	39.8
Machinery	72.5
Oil and gas	19.6
Department stores	28.3
Construction	68.6"

You will note from this statement how cotton mill margins have advanced while the price of cotton has remained the same. Had it been the other way around, with mill margins constant, present cloth prices would mean that cotton would now be selling for 19¾ cents per pound instead of 11½ cents. In the meantime, this great industry is opposing every effort that may be made to increase the farmers' income from cotton, unless we secure the cash from the Treasury of the United States. It is interesting to me, and should be to you, to note how the textile mills and industry generally are able to pass on to the consuming public high, fixed tariff rates, increased wages, and fixed prices, but when it comes to the suggestion of issuing certificates to be purchased by the textile mills of the country, to be passed on to the consuming public, according to their statement, "This would ruin the whole industry."

Looking beyond the immediate future to the conclusion of the present hostilities and the tapering off of the defense program, we can see that the problems of agriculture are likely to be more acute than they have ever been, and that the need for a strong farm program is going to be greater than ever. The Nation will then be faced with the problem of absorbing into other employment large numbers of people who have been employed in defense industries. With such employment there will be a diminishing national income with accompanying decline in farm income.

A great many people stress the importance of regaining our foreign markets.

If we will face the real facts, you can come to no other conclusion than that our cotton market for export is definitely and permanently reduced.

I do not mean by this that we will not continue to export some cotton, but we should face the facts and endeavor to work out some constructive program whereby the cotton industry of the South may be able to continue as one of the most important industries of the United States, an industry that affects the lives of millions of people, one that has a determining factor in many lines of business, including yours.

What are the real facts?

New extended uses of cotton, on a large scale, have failed to develop over a period of many years of extensive and expensive research.

During the 12 years beginning in 1926 and ending in 1938 foreign consumption of foreign-grown cotton increased from 10,000,000 to 16,000,000 bales, while in the United States during the same period our consumption remained steadily around 7,000,000 bales annually.

However, this is not the whole story, for during recent years production and consumption of synthetic fibers have increased by the equivalent of about 2,800,000 bales annually.

In 1938 alone the world output of synthetic fibers totaled the equivalent of about four and one-half million bales of cotton.

Synthetic output in the United States increased 20 percent in 1940 and it is estimated to be 480,000,000 pounds. Ten years ago American production totaled only 127,000 pounds. The most sensational developments in the field of synthetic fibers such as spun rayon, nylon, and vinyon are only in their first stages of commercial exploitation and promise revolutionary increases in the near future. The paper trade has likewise enjoyed a tremendous degree of technical improvement. It not only threatens to take from cotton its use as a material for bags, but likewise is encroaching upon the use of cotton in the home in the form of towels, table covers, napkins, window shades, curtains, and even bed sheets and pillow cases. Newly developed plastics are also increasing the pressure placed upon cotton consumption.

In normal years pulp-consuming countries import nearly 6,000,000 tons. Canada succeeded in increasing its exports, practically all coming to the United States duty-free, in 1940 to 1,068,000 tons from 706,000 tons in 1939. The consumption in the United States established an all-high at 9,751,000 tons in new pulp in 1940, compared with 8,880,000 tons in 1939.

The annual import of newsprint, practically all coming from Canada duty-free, amounts to around 3,000,000 tons annually.

In 1938, the most recent year for which complete statistics are available, the United States consumed 13,388,000 tons of paper, an average of 206 pounds per person.

According to figures that I have secured from the Department of Commerce, during the year 1938 we imported into the United States, duty-free, newsprint, wood pulp, and pulpwood equivalent in pulpwood cords to the total amount of 15,157,000 cords. Prior to the war these imports were coming in from Germany, Russia, Scandinavia, and Canada. At this time these imports are coming in, duty-free, from Canada, and it may be of interest to you to know that Canada is buying considerable cotton from Brazil. It can be said, according to these figures, that now normally about 50 percent of the wood used to meet our paper requirements is imported duty-free.

We all know that we have too much cotton at this time, and the only way the cotton problem can be solved is to get rid of the surplus cotton.

Not only that, but we must create an outlet for all future surpluses, so that the country may be spared the jitters every time God is good to the South by giving us a bountiful cotton crop.

It is very sad, but nevertheless true, that up to this good hour no constructive solution has as yet been submitted which will solve this surplus cotton problem.

The question—what to do about it—what is the solution?

In that, as stated, an emergency exists, apparently there is but one visible remedy for the dilemma, and that is a large substituted use of our cotton.

We consume colossal quantities of wood pulp, of which we have only a limited domestic supply. Both cotton and wood pulp are basically cellulose.

A joint consideration of these two economic problems should develop the answer to the crisis.

Preliminary experiments in the use of cotton for pulping have indicated technical feasibility, and it is now planned to conduct a number of commercial experiments to develop further technical and increase cost information.

Paper manufacturers using raw cotton under the 1940 Department of Agriculture program found that the preliminary treatment of raw stock was less expensive than that for other materials, that the treatment required smaller quantities of chemicals, that the cooking process required less time, less power was consumed and that the quality of the finished paper was generally satisfactory, and in some cases superior.

It may be of interest to you to know that I had the Bureau of Standards research laboratory at Washington to pulp a bale of cotton for the purpose of ascertaining the feasibility and possibility of using cotton in mixing with wood pulp and synthetic fibers. I am quoting from a paragraph contained in the report submitted to me by the Bureau of Standards:

"Raw cotton can be used satisfactorily from a technical standpoint in the manufacture of paper. To have raw cotton suitably pulped for use in papers now made wholly from wood pulp, however, it would be economically advantageous to have the raw cotton converted to paper-making pulp or half stuff on a large scale near the source of supply for sale to the paper industry. This would not be necessary in the case of mills now using rags and preparing their own half stuff, provided the raw cotton is free from foreign material."

We have held several very successful conferences on my bill, H. R. 99, with technical men from three or four of the departments, and with several technical men representing the pulp and paper industry. I believe we have made wonderful progress. Even the representatives of the pulp and paper industry frankly admit that cotton can be used in mixing with wood pulp, but they state that it will take about 2 years to install proper machinery and that they are fearful that the extra cost will ruin their industry. It is interesting to me to note how the various industries of the country are able to pass on to the consuming public high fixed tariff rates and increasing wages from day to day, but when it comes to legislation that would be helpful to agriculture, we find practically all of these industries are fearful of the result of such legislation.

My bill provides for an internal-revenue tax on pulp products, not containing a small proportion of cotton, in percentages fixed under the act.

The percentages are as follows:

Five percent in newsprint and paper board.

Ten percent in other paper.

Fifteen percent for rayon, cellophane, and plastic.

If you will read this bill very carefully, you will note that the administration of same will be very simple and inexpensive in comparison with every other temporary proposal.

In using the small percentage of cotton, as provided for in the bill, we would be able to use 4,000,000 bales of cotton annually, and, as recovery advances, naturally the amount of cotton for this purpose would increase as the years go by.

As to the effect on the pulp-products industries, this proposal would not unduly hinder sales for the reason in supplying surplus cotton at reduced prices to pulp converters who seek exemption from the excise tax the Government shares in the additional expense incurred, and the surplus cotton at reduced prices would be consumed in this country.

About 2 years ago, at the suggestion of the President of the United States, a special congressional committee composed of five Members of the House and five of the Senate was appointed to investigate the forest problems of the United States. As vice chairman of this committee, I had the privilege and the pleasure of holding hearings and visiting in the various sections of the United States, and if you will secure a copy of our report which includes our recommendations, you will find that according to our findings our forests, one of the greatest national resources that we have, are being ruthlessly destroyed and the prices that are being paid to farmers and small private landowners are nothing short of highway robbery.

I believe you will agree with me in that we would be able to consume an additional 4,000,000 bales of cotton annually under this programs, as well as being placed in a position to properly preserve and utilize our own forest resources, that this bill should receive prompt and favorable consideration. I contend that this bill will definitely solve our cotton problem in the South, which is really a national problem; therefore its passage should be of the greatest interest to the people of every section of the United States.

The Agriculture Committee of which I am chairman will commence hearings on major farm legislation on April 22.

My bill, the income certificate plan (H. R. 3378), will be the major bill up for consideration during these hearings. However, we will give consideration to other bills including appropriations out of the Treasury of the United States for 100 percent parity payments, bills proposing high loans in the amount of full parity with a further reduction in cotton to around nine or ten million bales, and bills proposing actual price fixing.

It may be of interest to you to know that I was the author of the original Agricultural Adjustment Act, passed by Congress in 1933, which carried a processing tax provision. This program was working wonderfully prior to the time the United States Supreme Court decided that this act was unconstitutional, based on the grounds that agriculture is a local problem. I feel sure that if the members of the present United States Supreme Court were called upon to pass upon the constitutionality of the old Agricultural Adjustment Act, it would stand up 100 percent under the Constitution of the United States.

During the past years we have had a wrangle in the Congress every year in trying to get an appropriation for the purpose of paying even a part of parity, and I believe that the time has arrived when it is going to be impossible to secure the necessary funds out of the Treasury to make parity payments, especially 100 percent parity.

Still there are those, including the textile mills of the country, who oppose every bill that is offered, and the only suggestion they have is we should secure the money out of the Treasury of the United States.

When the Farm Board was created and the high-loan program placed in operation under the Hoover administration, I stated on the floor of the House that it would be just like putting that much money in a rat hole unless we were able to absolutely control production in line with domestic consumption, and the amount of cotton that we would be able to actually export.

You remember what happened when this program came to an end. We lost millions of dollars. Still today there are those, in Congress and out of Congress, who believe that we can settle the cotton problem by placing a high loan on cotton.

There is a bill pending in the Senate proposing 100 percent loan on cotton with a further restriction in production to the actual amount that we would be able to consume in the United States and the amount that we may possibly be able to export. This would tend to further cut the production of cotton to around nine or ten million bales.

If we do this, naturally, the farmers of the South will be driven into dairying, growing wheat, raising cattle, hogs, and producing all of these crops which are grown in other agricultural sections of the country not only for the consumption of our own people but for general markets. This increased production of all of these crops, especially for markets other than for our own markets, would bring about tremendous competition with every other agricultural section of the United States, which would tend to bring disaster to all of the agricultural sections of the country, including the South.

In the second place, this Senate bill would leave our market wide open for a tremendous increase in consumption of rayon, jute, and all types of synthetic fibers in that the bill does not carry a compensatory duty on these highly competitive products.

If I were engaged in the cotton-warehouse business, naturally, from a purely selfish viewpoint, I would be very anxious to see a high loan bill pass, because it would tend to place additional cotton in the warehouses of the country.

In the third place, it would take a tremendous amount of money to subsidize any amount of cotton that we might be able to export so as to place the price of our cotton on a competitive basis with foreign prices.

You will note that under the income certificate loan program the loan will perhaps be about 2 cents per pound above the world price; however, this will subsidize the farmer to this extent instead of Europe, and it will not call for much money out of the Treasury for the purpose of subsidizing any cotton that we may be able to export to Europe.

Then there is the price-fixing bill. In that Congress has passed numerous price-fixing bills for various groups, there is a very strong sentiment in Congress and out of Congress for actual price fixing for our major farm products. I do not believe, however, that we

could work successfully the actual price fixing of farm products unless we could change our marketing and distributing system. There are just too many people handling farm products, all of which would make it impossible to keep a check on price fixing.

I want to warn you, however, that unless you want to see legislation passed proposing a high loan or actual price fixing, you had better become interested in and active for the passage of legislation along the lines proposed under the income certificate bill.

My bill, the income-certificate plan, is somewhat similar to the original Agricultural Adjustment Act. I believe that the passage of this bill will definitely solve the securing of parity for farmers.

Let me give you some definite information about the provisions of this bill, the income-certificate plan, H. R. 3378:

The purpose of this bill is place farmers on a parity with other groups as to prices for their products in line with the prices that they have to pay for that which they purchase. This bill represents the first major effort to make the farm program self-supporting since the historical Supreme Court decision 5 years ago invalidating the bill, the Agricultural Adjustment Act and specifically outlawing processing taxes.

This bill has eight definite and specific aims:

First. The Secretary of Agriculture is to ascertain parity prices on cotton, wheat, and tobacco, and at the proper time prior to the planting of these crops, is to announce the parity price for each.

Second. A loan program will automatically become effective. The loans will be based on two-thirds of the parity price. Cotton loans will be computed on a basis of ⅞-inch middling cotton.

Third. A compensatory duty will be placed on rayon and other synthetic fibers comparable to the amount of the income certificate placed on cotton to avoid giving these competitive fibers an economic advantage.

Fourth. A duty will also be levied on jute and jute products that are imported from India, a large cotton-growing country, in line with the amount placed on cotton by the income certificate plan.

Fifth. The bill also provides that the income certificate will be based on a graduated scale, in being applied to the different types of cotton goods, so that it would not work a hardship on consumers who buy cotton goods like overalls, work shirts, etc.

Sixth. Cotton bagging, cotton bags, cotton twine, unspun cotton articles would be exempt from the marketing certificate requirements of the act.

Seventh. The difference between the loan price and parity will be paid to the farmer from the funds secured from the income certificate plan. No money will be placed in the Treasury or taken out of the Treasury to make these payments.

Eighth. A provision authorizing an appropriation for the subsidizing of cotton for export. Suppose the Secretary determines that the parity price of cotton is 15 cents per pound. This would automatically mean that a loan of 10 cents per pound, basis ⅞-inch middling would be made available to the grower of cotton. If the parity were 18 cents, then the loan would be 12 cents. The loan program would definitely accomplish two things: First, it would put a bottom under the price of cotton, thereby weeding out speculation; and in the second place we would definitely know what amount would have to be raised under the certificate plan to pay the difference between the loan or the price the farmer receives for his cotton and parity.

My committee reported a bill some days ago which will come up for consideration next week. This bill carries a provision increasing the loans on wheat, cotton, and tobacco to 75 percent of parity. This would place the loan on cotton at about 12 cents per pound. This bill is more or less an emergency bill, having for its purpose being helpful in connection with this year's crop, pending the passage of a real, major parity farm bill. If we are able to pass this bill, and if we are able to retain the Senate amendment in the appropriation bill, which will come up in the House within the next few days for consideration, we will then be in a position to pay farmers practically parity prices on this year's crop.

It may be of interest to you to know that I have a bill pending which proposes the placing of a duty on the importation of fats, oils, starches, and jute. Estimates of the quantities of cotton that will be used if jute and hard fibers were replaced entirely by cotton amount to 2,250,000 bales of cotton, as follows:

Jute	*Bales of 478 pounds net*
Bags:	
Mill feed	248,000
Fertilizer	74,000
Sugar	62,000
Potatoes	56,000
Wheat	50,000
Flour (all kinds)	19,000
Other	111,000
Total	620,000
Bagging for wrapping bales of cotton	135,000
Textile wrapping	90,000
Wool carpets and rugs	95,000
Twine and cordage	75,000
Other	85,000
Total	480,000
Grand total, jute	1,100,000
Hard fibers	
Binder twine rope	550,000
Other (mostly twine and cordage)	600,000
Grand total, hard fibers	1,150,000
Grand total, jute and hard fibers	2,250,000

I consider it a shame and a disgrace to have our farmers plow under and cut their production of cotton, while, in the meantime, we are permitting India, a large cotton-growing country, to ship into the United States duty free, jute and jute products, pound for pound, taking our own cotton market to the extent of one and a half million bales of cotton. Just stop and think for a moment. Farmers are hauling their fertilizer, grain, rice, mill feed, wheat bran, and cottonseed meal in jute bags at a time when they are stacking up millions of bales of cotton in the warehouses of the country covered with old, heavy, wasteful, and disgraceful jute bagging, costing the taxpayers in interest and storage around $50,000,000 annually.

No other country in the world, not even India, where jute is grown, uses this old, heavy, wasteful, and disgraceful jute bagging.

If you will make a thorough investigation, getting the real facts from those who are actually acquainted with just what they are doing in foreign cotton-growing countries, you will find that they have made wonderful strides along the line of increased production per acre, quality of cotton, every bale properly graded, in the method of baling and marketing, having installed a high-density gin compression, net weight selling of cotton, all of which we in the United States have failed to do, costing the cotton farmers and the cotton industry millions of dollars annually.

It is a well-known fact that this is one of the major reasons why we are losing our cotton markets.

Japan used to buy our cotton, but today Japan is the largest producer of rayon in the world, producing about 550,000,000 pounds annually. Japan does not use a yard of cotton manufactured in Japan. The citizens of Japan are using goods made out of synthetic fibers and Japan is exporting her textile goods to other countries, much of which has been coming into the United States. If Japan succeeds in getting hold of a large slice of good lands of China, she will not need to buy anybody's cotton.

I appreciate this opportunity of speaking to you. I hope that the information given will be helpful, and I am hoping that your organization will become active in line with other groups in helping to pass legislation in the Congress to take care of the cotton industry of the South.

The Vinson Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under permission given me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a timely editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of April 23.

This editorial contains sound logic, and I am in complete accord with the view that "the spirit of compromise cannot be encouraged by fines and prison terms."

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Post of April 23, 1941]

THE VINSON BILL

It is a welcome sign of our national common sense that, despite the provocation of the strike situation, the opposition to the Vinson bill has assumed formidable proportions. Organized labor has taken a united stand against the measure, and many Congressmen are skeptical of its provisions. Although Secretary Knox indorsed its general principle, the House Naval Affairs Committee failed to adjust the bill to the voluntary basis suggested by Mr. Knox and many others. As it stands, therefore, it invites opposition from thoughtful students of the strike problem.

Representative VINSON'S bill is patterned after the Railway Labor Act. Yet it departs from the theory of that act in such vital particulars as to make the ultimate effect of the two incomparable. Each provides for what is popularly known as a "cooling off" period. Each prescribes various steps that disputing employers and unions should take before resorting to dismissals or changes in working conditions on the one hand or strikes on the other. But the Railway Labor Act gains its force solely from the pressure that may be brought to bear upon the disputing parties by the National Mediation Board and public opinion. The Vinson bill resorts to criminal penalties.

Obviously this is a critical defect. Notice of intent to strike or to change conditions of work which might result in slowing down or stopping defense production would be required. It would be unlawful to strike without giving such notice or without giving Government conciliators and mediators a chance to settle the dispute. And violators of this provision could be imprisoned or fined not more than $5,000. The obligation placed upon employers and employees to settle their

differences around the conference table is constructive. But the moral effect of establishing such an obligation is undercut when a penalty is attached to any misstep from the prescribed path of amicable collective bargaining. The spirit of compromise cannot be encouraged by fines and prison terms.

Fortunately, no penalty is attached to that section which outlines a policy of keeping open shops open and closed shops closed during the national emergency. The question here is whether Congress should attempt to write such a delicate policy into legal form. On the ground that no group should take advantage of the emergency to press demands that might curtail defense production, the closed-shop issue may well be laid aside for the present. Still there is a question as to whether the national policy on this subject should be left more flexible than a statute can ever be.

The Vinson bill is in need of a careful pruning. It doubtless could be revised into a sound and reasonable approach to the problem of strikes in defense industries. As it stands, however, it is too drastic for enactment. If the House proceeds with consideration of this bill without careful modification, there is danger that the cause which it is intended to serve may suffer an unnecessary set-back.

National Defense and Some of the Domestic Problems Involved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK, OF GEORGIA

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under the authority granted, I print herewith an address delivered by me on April 11, 1941, at a dinner devoted to discussion of national-defense problems, which the Atlanta Woman's Club sponsored:

The United States is today engaged in a program for national defense that dwarfs any effort in its entire history.

The Congress has already appropriated for this program more money than was expended during 1917 and 1918.

In April 1917 our Army comprised 200,000 officers and men, of whom 67,000 were federalized National Guard men.

In April 1941 we have an Army of more than a million—Regulars, guardsmen, and selectees brought into the armed forces by the operation of the only selective service law ever adopted by this Nation in a time of peace.

In April 1917 we had 9,000 officers in the Federal service, of whom 3,200 were National Guard men. We had 3,000 Reserve officers.

In April 1941 we have 14,000 Regular officers, 16,000 National Guard officers, and 38,000 Reserve officers on active duty, a total of 68,000. Beyond this is a reservoir of 86,000 Reserve officers of all categories.

In April 1941 we have approximately a million and a quarter civil employees of the Federal Government, or almost twice the number we had in 1917. Almost 300,000 of these have been recruited since last July.

Most of the new civil employees are engaged at navy yards, arsenals, and in other defense activities.

Yet in the face of this colossal undertaking a large percentage of our people apparently do not feel the urgency of the situation.

This state of mind—this failure to understand the seriousness of the task we face—is the cause of many of the domestic problems which now beset our people.

After many weeks of consideration, our country has adopted a course of action committing the United States to aid for those countries who oppose aggression.

If we are to be successful in this course of action we must have the united support of all our citizens. We can no longer take things as usual, but must subordinate individual rights to the general welfare.

Until the necessity for such unusual effort and such united action is understood, we cannot hope for maximum results.

The success or failure of this program depends largely upon the cooperation of certain groups. We must have an all-out effort on the part of industry, labor, the armed forces, and civilian personnel.

At this point in the effort we are getting splendid results from those subject to the draft, from the National Guard, and the Organized Reserves, and from the civilian personnel.

We are not getting the cooperation we should have from some labor groups, nor from some in industry.

Before we can successfully cope with the situation and achieve the maximum production of things needed for national defense and for carrying on the policy of aid to England and other countries we must bring home to all groups the urgency of the situation.

SOME FAILURES TO COOPERATE

At the beginning of the defense program the Federal Government faced an absolute refusal for several months on the part of some corporations to expand facilities. As a result the Government is paying for much of the plant expansion either directly or through tax amortization.

The National Economic Committee recently said, "Speaking bluntly, the Government and the public are 'over a barrel' when it comes to dealing with business in time of war or other crisis. Business refuses to work, except on terms which it dictates. It controls the natural resources, the strategic position in the country's economic structure, and its technical equipment and knowledge of processes. The experience of the World War, now apparently being repeated, indicates that business will use this control only if it is 'paid properly.' In effect, this is blackmail, not too fully disguised."

Dorothy Thompson recently wrote: "There are still many persons who would rather defeat Roosevelt than defeat Hitler and rather defeat labor than defeat nazi-ism. The defense program gives them an opportunity to seek the suppression of labor on the ground of a national emergency."

Miss Thompson, referring to some employers, also said: "For some of them, the defense program is just a colossal boondoggle of Government investment in capital goods that can be dressed up in the Star-Spangled Banner."

Samuel Grafton, in the New York Post of April 5, 1941, said: "We are ready to defy powerful nations in order to establish equal justice, under law, but are we too weak to make an outstanding American industrialist, Henry Ford, take an equal place under labor law with that accepted by his competitors, General Motors and Chrysler?"

Another writer has said: "Many of these labor baiters seem to feel that it is the part of labor to meekly join the Army, recruited 95 percent from wage earners, or meekly produce material for the Army, while prices and profits march merrily on."

SOME MISTAKES OF LABOR

The quotations I have given are critical of employers and of management, but there is fault on the other side also. I recently said in a newspaper interview: "I'm absolutely certain that the House will pass restrictive legislation unless the unions themselves put a stop to two things: (1) Strikes in national-defense operations, and (2) exaction of high initiation fees from workers on defense-construction projects in cases where the union has been unable to furnish the necessary employees from its own ranks."

The New York World-Telegram commended that statement and commented in part as follows: "We welcome Mr. RAMSPECK's statement, because for months, we have been saying the same things and precisely with the same friendly motive of desire to save labor from doing irreparable damage to its own great cause. We, too, have fought for the rights of labor. We have always known, and said, that labor must accept the greater public responsibility that should go with increased power, or eventually see its gains become losses. Management is more to blame than labor for some of the strikes. There is need for an impartial method of clearly fixing the blame on management when it belongs there. We hope the President's new mediation board will supply that method."

The same article goes on to criticize labor for its initiation fees, jurisdictional strikes, outlaw strikes, and failure to exhaust other methods before resorting to strikes.

Dorothy Thompson, in the article to which I have referred, also points out that labor has in its ranks some of the gangsters, racketeers, and other crooks produced during the prohibition days. She also says that there are some Communists in the ranks of labor.

Another writer says that "organized labor is not perfect. It can be tough and greedy."

Walter Lippmann, in a most thought-provoking article, recently recorded the fact that no single plan would prevent stoppages of work. He says: "In the soft-coal industry there is an old, well established system of collective bargaining. Yet production has been stopped. In the Ford plant there is an old, strongly established system of nonunionism. Yet production has been stopped. At the Allis-Chalmers plant there are in operation the machinery of the Wagner Act, plus many State and Federal agencies for conciliation. Yet production has been stopped."

WHAT IS THE ANSWER?

I have alluded to these critics of both labor and management for the purpose of bringing to your attention the fact that we are faced with a difficult and delicate situation which vitally affects the national defense of our country.

These well-known commentators seem, as I see it, to agree that there is blame on both sides—that the answer to the problem does not lie in any simple plan nor in any one plan.

I am just as much concerned as you are with this problem. Perhaps I am even more concerned. I have been sympathetic toward labor. I have fought for its right to organize and bargain collectively. I deeply regret its failures in the present emergency, but I am positive that 95 percent of those in the ranks of labor are just as patriotic as you and I. The trouble in the ranks of labor is caused by a small minority and by a few leaders with selfish aims.

Some of the trouble is caused by Communists who have worked their way into some of the unions.

We must help labor rid itself of the Communist, the racketeer, and the selfish leaders who care nothing for the rank and file membership.

We must require that employers live up to the law of our land, and must provide that labor shall have a fair share in the wealth it produces.

LEGISLATION

Demands are coming to the Congress for legislation to prohibit strikes. Is it wise to enact such legislation?

England has not done so and its situation is certainly more dangerous today than that of our country. We did not do so in 1917 and 1918.

France did prohibit strikes last year, but the result was a disappointment. Ambassador Bullitt told the House Judiciary Committee that after such a decree was issued there was a general strike and the order was rescinded within 24 hours. Mr. Bullitt says the workmen went back to the factories for their allotted number of hours but they did not produce. Their hearts were not in it. It was not until the Germans broke the French lines, and were on the way to Paris, that the French workers really began to give maximum production. Then it was too late. In the last month of the war, with part of their plane factories lost to the Germans, the French workers actually produced two and one-half times as many planes as in any previous month. At last they were convinced of the need for maximum production. But it was too late.

France was defeated because its people could not become convinced of the urgency of the situation until it was too late. They were betrayed by corrupt officials and mislead by Communists. Theirs is a tragic fate. We must not repeat their error.

Mr. Bullitt says that the tragic truth is that the French people did not become really conscious of the danger to their country until after the Germans had broken through the Maginot line.

Some of our people are just as hard to convince today as to the urgency of the situation facing the United States.

That statement applies to some in all groups—to those in labor, those in the employer class, to those in other walks of life. We must convince them—before it is too late.

There are those who earnestly believe we have made a mistake in the policy we have adopted. They say this is not our war. I agree with them that it is not our war, but I disagree with their opposition to the policy of aiding England and the other countries resisting aggression.

I would not have voted for the policy simply to aid England. I voted for it because it seems to me the most effective defense of our country and our beliefs. Both, I believe, would be immediately endangered if Germany should win.

I believe we should exert every effort to bring the facts of the present situation to all groups of our people. We must not be too late, as was France. We must realize that time cannot be regained once it has been lost.

If we are to avoid being too late, we must mobilize the productive capacity of this Nation as we have never done before. If we can get all groups to realize the urgency of the hour, then they will lay aside everything else—just as soldiers do, they will compromise their differences, adjust their difficulties, because they feel themselves enlisted in the common cause.

We in the South must realize that we are more of a unit in support of this policy than is any other section of the country. Therefore we must have patience with others and do our part to show them the need for total support of the defense effort.

None of us wants war, and most of us believe that our best chance to avoid it is to give every possible bit of material assistance to those who fight for the things we hold dear—to those who believe in right rather than in might; to those who uphold God and the family; to those who practice freedom.

The United States faces its greatest test. Victory will be ours if we—each and every one of us—place our country and its welfare before all personal and selfish interests. With such unified effort we cannot fail.

Dr. Frank Graham, of Chapel Hill, N. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

LETTER OF DR. GRAHAM TO JOSEPH LEIB, AND A LETTER WRITTEN BY STEPHEN DUGGAN, DIRECTOR OF THE INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, Dr. Frank Graham, of Chapel Hill, N. C., is president of the Greater University of North Carolina and is now a member of the mediation board. His democracy has been questioned. I have known Dr. Frank Graham for over 30 years. In the long list of truly great and useful men who have served North Carolina, I doubt if anyone has been more useful or surpassed and held a closer place in the confidence, respect, and love of our people than Dr. Graham. His entire life has been full of useful service to church, State, Nation, and our democratic way of life. He is a Democrat without partisanship, bitterness, and narrowness. Living with him in a college community for the past 30 years has caused us to have a common interest in many matters of a public nature, and I know, by intimate association, of his loyalty to democracy and our institutions. He is truly a leader without show and has lived by that principle that what we do for ourselves will die with us, but that which we do for others is eternal and will live forever.

APRIL 19, 1941.

MR. JOSEPH LEIB,
National Press Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LEIB: I did not understand that you had asked me in your first letter what my personal attitude was toward the war. I would have replied then as I reply now: Full aid to Britain and the democracies at whatever cost and risk. I have reread your letter and find that you did not ask me what my personal attitude was, but asked me whether the American people were ready to declare war on the Axis Powers. I replied to you that people whom I knew differed on this question. Some were opposed to America going into the war under any circumstances; some were for full aid to Britain even at the risk of war; some were for full aid to Britain without war; and yet others were in favor of our going into the war at once. I was at that time in the midst of a legislative session and had neither the information nor the time to get the information to make any classification of the proportions of these several groups. It seems to have offended you that I did not make some uninformed assertions and generalizations. I stand by my statement of a lack of authoritative information acknowledged in my first letter.

In answer to your question in your letter of April 17, I say, what everyone who knows me knows, that I have never been and am not now a member of the Communist Party, that I have never been and am not now a Communist, that I do not believe in the principles and activities of the Communist Party, and that on more than one occasion I have clashed with those who have been suspected of following the Communist Party lines. I have been called a Communist by some reactionary industrialists, and I have been called a spokesman for the capitalists by Communists. A newspaper publisher told me that in the same week he came across materials, in one case, in which a paper published in the interest of southern industrial development attacked me by implication as a pro-Communist enemy of southern industry, and, in another case, in which the Communists attacked me as a tool of the southern mill barons.

I am an independent southern Democrat who political, economic, and social platforms are included within Christianity and democracy, now so desperately at stake in the world. As vice chairman of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, I have been called a warmonger and other names for this stand, which I have maintained from the beginning. I am on record for aid to all the democracies from China to Britain, including Spain and Finland. I have been for the organization of the nations for peace since the days of Woodrow Wilson, and devoutly hope that America this time will not only aid the democracies to win the war but will follow through for the organization of the nations for the prevention of war and for the establishment of a just and humane peace.

With regard to being a member of the University of Moscow board of trustees, the closest I have ever been to Moscow is France. I was a member of the advisory committee to the board of directors of the Institute of International Education, 2 West Forty-fifth Street, New York City, which had as its program the establishment of university student centers and summer schools in many parts of the world for the purpose of promoting international understanding and good will among all the peoples of the world. This project was a part of the purpose of a great foundation to prevent war in the world. After America recognized Russia, Moscow was simply another strategic center included in this program of international education and understanding. However, the Soviet Government prevented carrying out the project at Moscow. As I recall it, Mr. Thomas W. Lamont, Mr. Dwight Morrow, Mr. John Bassett Moore, Dr. Alvin Johnson, Miss Virginia Gildersleeve, and other such representative Americans were members of the board of directors of the Institute of International Education, and our advisory committee was compcsed of about a dozen American university presidents. In reply to his question, I told your newspaper acquaintance over long distance that Dr. Stephen Duggan, director of the Institute of International Education, could give him first-hand information regarding this matter. I know that Dr. Duggan and all the members of the board of directors and the advisory committee will consider the charge with its implications as fantastic.

With regard to the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, I know that the first chairman and executive officers and the overwhelming majority of its members are as true southerners and loyal Americans as any of the citizens of our Southern States. I also know that during my term as the second chairman, the Southern Conference for Human Welfare was not a Communist transmission belt. An inspection of the treasurer's books and the names of the officers and board of directors would reinforce this statement. It may be true that a handful of Communists attempted to make it a transmission belt, but the overwhelming majority of us have stuck by the southern conference to prevent such a misuse of the conference and to carry out its real purpose in American democratic ways in behalf of justice to organized labor, tenant farmers, Negroes, unorganized work-

ers, and the forgotten millions. I have been assured by those who have checked the rolls that there are not more than a dozen Communists out of 1,200 members. Regardless of claims, 12 can hardly dominate 1,200. It is not our purpose to drive even the dozen and their allies, if any here, or anywhere, underground, but to meet them and defeat them in the open in a free and democratic struggle through open discussions, education, religion, legislation, and humane good will, as against subversive violence, hate, irreligion, and a blind allegiance to the party line of any foreign power. I am simply one of a number of devoted southerners, white and Negro, who are determined that Negroes, tenant farmers, and the struggling millions shall not become the prey of false fanatical activities, but that through interracial cooperation and understanding we work together to make our freedom more secure and our democracy more democratic, under the United States Constitution, the laws of our States and our Nation, and the American Bill of Rights. It is my opinion that there are no more loyal citizens anywhere than American Negroes. Some of the present leadership of the conference is too isolationist to suit a number of us, a number which has grown, I believe, to an overwhelming majority in recent months. Yet I respect the sincerity of the isolationists and also have faith in the sincerity of their assurance that their isolationist pacifism springs, not from communism but from Christianity as they interpret America's role and opportunity.

I have always been a participationist and try to win others to this view, but this fact does not prevent me from respecting the sincerity and patriotism of the isolationists.

I realize that in the many stands which I have taken in my own South in the midst of tense social situations I have been called a Negrophile in attempting, along with an increasingly large number of our southern people, to be fair to the Negro, and in the midst of strikes I have been called a tool of the capitalists by some Communists and a tool of the Communists by some capitalists. To those who know me I do not have to say that I am neither. I simply try, on the basis of the facts in each situation, to be fair to both capital and labor, management and the workers. Both have their rights and duties under the Constitution and laws of the land, especially in this hour, critical with the humane hopes of mankind. I do not claim to have the final answers to any questions. I am simply trying to do my part, realizing that it is a very small part, to make my State, my section, and my country a little better place in which to live.

I also have a deep conviction that freedom and democracy crushed anywhere in the world means that freedom and democracy are hurt everywhere in the world, and that we Americans, instead of dividing and miscalling each other names, should give ourt utmost aid to imperiled freedom and the stricken democracies in this, the world's darkest hour.

At the call of Woodrow Wilson I enlisted as a private in the United States marines. For that I have no apology. At the call of Franklin D. Roosevelt I will do my little part now, whether that part be in the back lines or the front lines in our total struggle in behalf of religion and the precious things of the human spirit, in behalf of the freedom and democratic organization of the peoples of the world, including the German people, for justice and peace.

With good wishes to you, I am

Sincerely yours,

FRANK P. GRAHAM.

INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION, INC.,
New York City, April 16, 1941.

Prof. RALPH MACDONALD,
Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C.

DEAR PROFESSOR MACDONALD: This institute was organized for the purpose of diffusing a knowledge of American civilization and culture in foreign countries and a knowledge of foreign civilization and culture in the United States. Its board of trustees, given on this stationary, is a guaranty of the character of its work. Since the date of the summer session in Moscow several of the former members, including Dwight Morrow and President Livingston Farrand of Cornell, have died.

One of the institute's functions is to act as the representative of summer sessions in other countries. For example, until this war broke out it was the representative of the summer session at Oxford and Cambridge Universities in England, of the University of Paris and Grenoble in France, of Berlin and Munich Universities in Germany, of Perugia and Florence in Italy. Since the outbreak of the war it has retained its place as the representative of San Marcos University in Peru and the University of Chile in Santiago. There is nothing new about this function; it has existed for a great many years.

When the institute is requested to represent a summer session which it has not represented previously it is customary to organize a board of sponsors. For example—to come near home—when it was requested last summer by the University of San Marcos to organize a winter session for Latin-American students, it formed a board of sponsors. The session was held at the University of North Carolina, whose distinguished president received the suggestion with great enthusiasm. I may say that that summer session for Latin-American students—their summer, our winter—was remarkably successful. The students were delighted and received a splendid education in American culture and civilization. It has had great repercussions throughout the whole of Latin America.

Similarly, when in 1935 I was requested to advise in the organization of a summer session at the University of Moscow, I formed a sponsoring committee. The list of sponsors is appended. You will note that the committee consists of educators exclusively, most of them very distinguished educators. May I hasten to say that no one of them had anything to do with the administration of the Moscow summer session nor taught in it nor appeared at it. No one could appear at it for the simple reason that it was called off before the date of its initiation. Why the University of Moscow called it off I have never been able to learn. The ways of the Soviet are very mysterious.

I am sending you under separate cover a copy of my Annual Report for 1938, which contains the most complete description of the work of this institute. You may wish to refer to it.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN DUGGAN,
Director.

If Ships, Why Not Groton?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. FITZGERALD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE HARTFORD (CONN.) COURANT

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hartford Courant of Wednesday, April 2, in reference to the reopening of the Groton Iron Works, at Groton, Conn.:

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of April 2, 1941]

IF SHIPS, WHY NOT GROTON?

We have undertaken to make ourselves the "arsenal of the democracies" and our energies are being diligently applied to the manufacture of implements of war for our own defense and for the use of those nations that are resisting the Axis Powers. But except for our own purposes it does no good to turn out planes, and tanks, and guns, and munitions of all kinds, unless these weapons can reach those countries that are standing off the aggressor nations. "Cash and carry" no longer applies to the situation. The beleaguered nations have all but run out of cash, and even if they had quantities of it they haven't enough available merchantmen to come and get what we are more and more being able to furnish them.

Dr. Arthur J. Marder, in his article published in yesterday's Courant, made it unmistakably plain that if we are to render Britain alone the assistance she so greatly needs we will somehow have to supply her with ships, so heavy has been the toll taken of her shipping by Nazi submarines and bombers. Moreover, to insure the safe delivery of our lease-lend cargoes he says that we shall in all probability have to convoy the ships with our naval vessels. "If the crisis in the Atlantic is as serious as available statistics suggests," says Dr. Marder, "then there is no time to lose. We are committed to saving Britain as essential to our own security. No policy is worthy of the name if a state is unwilling to employ the means essential to the realization of that policy."

On the same day that we printed Dr. Marder's illuminating article the New York Times carried an editorial in which it said that thus far more than 5,318,000 tons of British and neutral shipping have been sunk, and the prospect is that from 3,500,000 to 5,500,000 more tons will be lost this year. Against this Britain and the United States combined are expected to produce not more than 2,100,000 tons of new shipping. A total of 451 merchant vessels is now under construction, or contracted for, in this country and under the emergency program of the Maritime Commission this number is expected to be doubled. "But this will necessitate," says the Times, "the building of additional shipyards." Very likely it will, but that is no excuse for not utilizing to the fullest extent such shipyards as we already have.

Here, for example, is the Groton Iron Works in this State now lying idle. Six concrete and steel shipways are available there, to say nothing of buildings that could be utilized once the necessary machinery had been installed. The Maritime Commission, we understand, considered utilizing the facilities that this well-located shipyard affords, but finally rejected the idea because it professed to believe that the proximity of the Groton Iron Works to the plant of the Electric Boat Co. might interfere with employment at the latter concern. Furthermore it questioned whether sufficient housing was available to take care of the influx of new workers. But also the Commission may have felt that the New England area is already getting more than its fair share of the defense business and that for political reasons it might be desirable to pass up the development of the Groton Iron Works and favor some other community.

This is not a matter into which political or geographical considerations should be permitted to enter. If cargo-carrying ships are the most vital need of the moment they should be built wherever they can be constructed in the quickest possible time. To revamp an idle shipyard and take full advantage of the facilities it already has would

seem to be the thing to do. Connecticut stands in no need of this industry from the point of view of the spending program, but it has something to contribute at Groton with respect to shipbuilding facilities, and that is the main consideration if it is important to get ships off the ways with the least possible delay.

Last Call

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

AN EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following thoughtful and timely editorial from the Washington Times-Herald for April 20, 1941:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of April 20, 1941]

LAST CALL

It is not certain, but it is possible, that this United States could make a better peace for itself now than it could after the war which it seems about to enter all the way.

PEACE NOW OR LATER?

It is also not certain, but it is also possible, that our friends, particularly the British Empire, could make a better peace now than after the war.

It is not certain, but it is also possible, that our enemies—that's almost the official name, now—could make a better peace now than after the war. Hitler is an astute man, and he must know this.

THE WAR CAN'T GO ON FOREVER

This war will end some day.

We know it is not certain, but we also know it is possible, that it could be ended on better terms for all parties to it, including ourselves, by negotiations, in the near future, rather than by fighting it to a finish, which military experts believe will take not less than 5 years and perhaps as many as 10.

We think this possibility should be explored before we plunge all the way into the war.

In regard to the small nations and the racial minorities, for whom this war allegedly started, it is possible that a better deal could be made for them now than could be made for them years hence, after they have been invaded, torn, harassed, and exiled all that time by the devils of war.

We know the main interventionist arguments against such proposals as this.

NO PEACE WITH HITLER

It will be said, for one thing, that the United States cannot make a peace with the monster Hitler; that he must be first destroyed before there can be talk of peace.

It is not certain that we can destroy Hitler because it is not certain that we and the British can get more and better soldiers on the Continent of Europe at one time than he will have. This is not defeatism. It is simply history that a great war machine, ably officered, cannot be beaten except by a better war machine and a great deal of bloody fighting.

We have had a peace with Stalin ever since the first Roosevelt administration recognized the Soviet Government. Stalin and Hitler are two of a kind.

ARMED TRUCE

It will be further objected that any peace concluded now would be only an armed truce.

True enough. If a peace conference should leave Hitler first power in Europe, Stalin and Japan sharing control of most of Asia, the United States supreme in the Western Hemisphere, and Great Britain holding most or all of its present empire, it would be nothing but an armed truce.

At least we hope the United States would have sense enough this time not to sink a lot of battleships and chop its Army and air forces down to skeletons. All the great powers would be wise to keep their arms just in case any one of them should try to start something. Until one government for all the world is organized by some as yet undiscovered genius, any peace will be only an armed truce.

But that has been true throughout recorded history, except for the 400 years or so of the Pax Romana. Peace in this world is an interval between wars, meaning it always is an armed truce. But far fewer young men get killed and much less real wealth is destroyed in an armed truce than in a fighting war.

PEACE PANIC

It will also be objected, though not out loud, that a sudden peace now would bring on a serious, probably world-wide depression.

Also true. Big war orders make a certain kind of boom. Postwar readjustment, while the defense industries are retooling for peace production and writers are again beginning to label our defense industries "merchants of death," is bound to throw a lot of people out of work for a while.

But we know of no comeback to this proposition: That the longer this war goes on, meaning the more real wealth is tossed into its far-flung and ever-growing furnaces, the worse the postwar slump will be. If it goes on long enough, we shall all sink together into communism or a new dark age.

Baltimore C. I. O. Union Ousts Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE BALTIMORE NEWS-POST

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Baltimore News-Post of today:

[From the Baltimore News-Post of April 23, 1941]

PROBE MARITIME "REDS," SAYS D'ALESANDRO—PRAISES C. I. O. UNION FOR OUSTING TWO COMMUNISTS HERE

WASHINGTON, April 23.—An F. B. I. investigation into the communistic situation on Baltimore's waterfront is to be asked by Representative THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr., of Maryland, Mr. D'ALESANDRO announced today.

In issuing a statement praising leaders of the C. I. O.'s Marine and Shipbuilding Workers' Union for expelling two Baltimore officers of a local union found guilty of fomenting communistic disturbances, Representative D'ALESANDRO said:

"Recently I called the attention of the Dies committee to the activities of Communists in Baltimore.

"TIME IS RIPE"

"Not much was done about it, probably because Representative DIES was swamped with information of a similar type from many other places.

"I think the time is ripe now for an investigation into the situation in Baltimore by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

"In this connection I want to congratulate William Smith, a general board member of the International Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, for his patriotic spirit in exposing the activities of two officers of the local union who were expelled on charges of communism.

"PRESSED FOR ACTION

"The national leadership of the C. I. O. and the I. U. M. S. W. A. also should be commended for their prompt action in expelling these men.

"I think it is now time for Mr. Smith to go before J. Edgar Hoover, of the F. B. I., and give him what information he has about communistic activities in Baltimore and on Baltimore's waterfront."

I Am An American Day

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt, on March 29, proclaimed Sunday, May 18, as I Am An American Day, to be observed "in recognition of our citizens who have attained their majority or who have been naturalized within the past year."

The proclamation requested Federal, State, and local officials, and patriotic, civic, and educational organizations to join in exercises "calculated to impress upon all our citizens, both native-born and naturalized, the special significance of citizenship in this Nation."

There is no question that we are now living in one of the most crucial periods in our history. Democracy and civilization throughout the world are being challenged. Hitler has called democracy a failure.

We must all unite to revive patriotic enthusiasm. The I Am An American Foundation must be commended for arousing such enthusiasm throughout the country, which has been possible through the efforts of its able president, Edward Arnold, well-known actor, and the committee composed of distinguished Americans of our great country. The objective of the Foundation is to reawaken patriotism and love of country in defense of liberty; to rededicate ourselves to service in defending our ideals of a free democracy; to encourage those who have reached the age of 21, and

aliens who have become naturalized Americans to enter the estate of full citizenship, with a determination to assume individual responsibility in holding aloft the torch of freedom under the Constitution. The Foundation pledges itself to the national observance of May 18 as I Am An American Day to honor native-born citizens who have reached voting age, and aliens who have received their final naturalization papers within the past year, impressing them with the seriousness of their responsibilities as full-fledged Americans. I heartily commend the leadership for its vision in this fine undertaking, and I urge all the communities in my district, and throughout the country, to formulate community-wide sponsor groups to carry on the high purposes of the I Am An American Foundation. Such cooperation is needed more today than at any time in the history of our democracy. I feel certain that genuine Americans who love their country and its beautiful heritage will not fail.

Gen. Martin Witherspoon Gary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. BUTLER B. HARE, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Martin W. Gary, an outstanding young lawyer of Edgefield, S. C., and a major general of the Confederate States Army, was the owner of a colonial mansion located on a 40-acre estate in the town of Edgefield at the time of his death in 1881. A number of years later this estate, by inheritance and purchase of the interests of others, became the property of General Gary's nephew, the Honorable John Gary Evans, a former Governor of South Carolina. This estate is one of the most attractive and historic spots of the State. A few months ago Governor Evans and Mrs. Evans offered to convey this property to the town of Edgefield to be held as a memorial to General Gary and maintained as a public park for the recreation, pleasure, and enjoyment of the citizens of Edgefield County. A deed to the property was delivered by Governor and Mrs. Evans at a formal dedication service in Edgefield, S. C., March 12, 1941.

It was my privilege and honor to be one of the guest speakers at this memorable exercise, and, having obtained unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks by including the address delivered on this occasion, which is as follows:

Edgefield County may well congratulate itself upon being the beneficiary of as many history-making achievements as any other section of our State. Its long line of illustrious leaders, both from a military and civil standpoint, have made and bequeathed to posterity accomplishments which should be cherished and revitalized by every succeeding generation. Your meeting today is an index of gratitude and a public expression of your obligations to perpetuate the ideals wrought and fought for by your historic leaders. Time will not permit me to call the roll and recite the accomplishments of the many men and women who have made conspicuous contributions to your local and national life.

The thoughtful and generous action of Governor and Mrs. Evans in dedicating this memorial to General Gary is an outstanding recognition of the services he rendered his county, his State, and Nation. His contributions to society and the welfare of his country were not the products of an accidental career. They were the fruits of a life bedded and nurtured in an environment pregnated with positive conceptions of what constitutes the obligations of a good citizen to his community, his State, and his God.

General Gary's ideals and convictions were not subject to compromising and subversive influences. He inherited a type of culture and a conception of duty which rebelled at the suggestion of surrendering a conviction or sacrificing an ideal merely to avoid a conflict between such ideals and forces calculated to weaken or destroy those patriotic virtues so essential to our American conception of life, liberty, and freedom. It would take too long to pay appropriate tribute to his character and his signally strong intellect, and I will not undertake to describe in any great detail his conspicuous actions in war and in peace.

As a citizen, we would characterize him as one who developed in early life those virtues that stand for positive integrity and courage in both private and public conduct. These virtues were well demonstrated in many ways, and his older friends present can bear testimony of his action following the War between the States, in 1870, when he refused to subscribe to a coalition movement between conservative white and patriotic colored men, although there were a number of strong and courageous men who did subscribe to the idea with the hope that it would bring peace and harmony between the then warring factions in the State. His position was that peace and harmony at the sacrifice of the political and social ideals of his State would be a peace that would not only lower the dignity of the people but could only be a temporary and an uncertain makeshift. That is, the price of uncertain harmony would be too much to pay for the experiment. His vision in this respect was a rare and far-sighted virtue. It does not prevail in all leaders or in all countries today. There are many at this particular moment who want peace at any price, and there are a number of countries that have already made a supreme sacrifice and received but little in exchange. That is, they have surrendered their ideals of government, their ideals of life, and even their ideals of God in order to obtain what they may think is peace. Mart Gary was not of that type. He knew that peace, happiness, freedom, and liberty throughout the ages have been bought and paid for at a price and rarely obtained at a reduced rate.

No student or patriotic citizen can forget the price paid for liberty and freedom in our own country and the part paid by citizens of your county who followed Gen. Andrew Pickens, Sr., of the Pendleton District, father of Col. Andrew Pickens, Jr., of the War of 1812, and grandfather of F. W. Pickens, one of our Civil War Governors, both of whom were from Edgefield County. General Greene, in describing the battle of Eutaw Springs, one of the decisive conflicts of the Revolutionary War, and referring to the part Gen. Andrew Pickens, Sr., and his copatriots took in that encounter, said that after exhausting their supply of ammunition they met the enemy and fought hand to hand with the barrels of their rifles and then with sticks and bare hands and came out of that glorious conflict "as naked as they were born." Think of the price they were willing to pay for the peace and liberty we have enjoyed for 150 years and more. Their action is another illustration that real peace is never purchased with compromising arrangements and we know that no one was more conscious of this fact than Gen. Martin W. Gary, the great hero of the peaceful revolution of 1876, that leader who succeeded in lifting South Carolina out of the "burning mire of a political hell unparalleled in all history."

It would be a great inspiration to the citizenry of your county and State if they could at the beginning of each day march to the tomb of General Gary and at the rising of the sun lay hold of his marble hands, turn their faces heavenward and pray that their lives be rededicated with a philosophy of life and government that actuated him in the discharge of every private and public duty.

General Gary was born in the Cokesbury district of South Carolina in 1831 when the political atmosphere was almost overflowing with difference of opinion among the leadership of the Nation as to the wisdom of the policy recently established by the passage in Congress of another protective tariff act which was violently opposed by both John C. Calhoun and Robert Y. Hayne of our State. Mr. Gary's father was a student of politics and government, and no doubt the lad imbibed very early in life the difference in thought that was soon to develop between the North and the South on the rights and powers of the Federal Government as contrasted with those reserved to the several States under the Constitution.

Regardless of the conception of others and the tempered notions that may have existed among his contemporaries, he had strong convictions about the constitutional rights and powers of the several States as contrasted with those of the Federal Government. I regret that I will not be permitted to dwell upon this point, but let it be said that in view of recent political thought there seems to be a revival and widening sentiment to the effect that General Gary was eminently correct in the political philosophy to which he subscribed.

He located in Edgefield when 24 years of age and began the practice of his well-chosen profession. At the age of 30 he made one of his first speeches in the State legislature urging the withdrawal of the State from the Federal Union. Soon after the ordinance of secession was adopted in 1860 he enlisted in Company B of the Hampton Infantry. He distinguished himself as a leader shortly afterward in the first battle of Manassas when Col. Wade Hampton was severely wounded and Col. Johnson killed he took command as senior officer and captured a number of guns, the first to be taken by the Confederacy.

History records that he participated in every engagement in which the Hampton Legion was involved. He was at Sharpsburg when 56 men out of the 77 of his company were either killed or wounded. He became a brigadier general in 1864 and a major general in 1865. Upon the surrender of General Lee at Appomattox he passed through the lines of the opposing army and joined President Jeff Davis, at Greensboro, N. C., and escorted him to the home of his mother in Abbeville, S. C., where the last cabinet meeting of the Confederacy was held and, according to tradition, the seal of the Confederacy was thrown into the Savannah River the following day. It is said that he never surrendered and never missed a fight in which his company was engaged.

As a leader in battle he was fearless without daring and courageous without ostentation. He not only rendered conspicuous military service for the Confederacy but he was equally great in the discharge of his obligations as a true American citizen during the trying days of reconstruction.

He played a prominent part in organizing the red-shirt democracy and restoring political order out of the chaos which prevailed for 10 years following the War between the States. Probably no man in the State during the hectic days of 1876 contributed more in arousing the people to a sense of duty and responsibility than did Gen. Martin W. Gary.

Edgefield County is not only rich in a history of which it may be justly proud but the manner and extent to which her people have gone to emulate the life of her past leadership is highly commendable, and your continued efforts to emphasize and perpetuate the lives and character of the great men and women of the past is evidence that the patriotic and civic virtues which demonstrated themselves in the citizenry of the past are still alive and are now exhibiting themselves equally as great. I could give illustrations of daily occurence to verify this statement but your presence here is sufficient evidence to justify this observation. The spirit which prompted the Governor and Mrs. Evans to present this memorial to commemorate the virtues we have referred to in the life of General Gary is nothing more or less than a reappearance of the same virtues in the life of these honored citizens of our State. However, this is not the first evidence we have in support of this conclusion. For half a century the life and conduct of Governor Evans as a private citizen and as a public servant illustrates that great virtues may be inherited as well as acquired, and I take this opportunity of saying that it is my prediction the next generation in its program to maintain and perpetuate the example set by this meeting will include the name of the Governor as one who has brought honor and distinction to his county, contributed much to the advancement of his State, and whose life has been an inspiration to many young men and women throughout the Nation.

I am sure he will pardon my personal allusion but I am glad to testify personally to the fact that his life has been an inspiration to many of our people, for I well remember as a younger man his positive, courageous, and progressive administration when he was chief executive of this State. I want to thank him for affording me this opportunity to give expression of my personal gratitude for the inspiration he has been in my life.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I want to express to you and others my sincere and personal appreciation for the honor and opportunity of being one of your guest speakers on what I consider a most momentous occasion. I join with you in paying tribute to the leadership of your county—paying tribute to the men and women who have been such an inspiration to many of us in the past. I would like to say further that this meeting is not wholly due to the past leadership of your town and county but is in a large measure due to the men and women whose patriotic virtues are just as great and would have proven or would now prove to be leaders as great as those of the past if opportunity and provocation should afford.

I, therefore, congratulate those who are responsible and made provision for this meeting. I congratulate those who have been glad to join with others interested in demonstrating the same virtues and the same philosophy of life which give rise to this occasion.

The President's Fault

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ATHENS (OHIO) MESSENGER

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have included therewith an editorial which appeared in the Athens Messenger, a paper published at Athens, Ohio, in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent.

I think that the Athens Messenger is probably the most widely circulated and largest paper published anywhere in the United States in a city of the size of Athens. Mr. Gordon Bush is publisher, editor, and general manager of this paper, and his editorials are widely read, because they are clear and pungent and exhaustive of the subjects which they treat. In this editorial Mr. Bush discusses the political situation as it relates to the present outlook for war. The editorial follows:

[From the Athens (Ohio) Messenger]

IT'S PRESIDENT'S FAULT

President Roosevelt complains of the "apathy" of the American people relative to their danger from the war going on all over Europe.

President Roosevelt complains that we, in the middle back country, are not excited enough.

We wondered just when the President would wake up to the fact that he has kept the people from knowing anything more than generalized scores, voiced by himself and his associates, from Bullitt to Knudsen?

Secret arrangements with Great Britain have been going on for over a year. Congress has been shocked and forced by administration men into submission, into appropriating billions for this and that without knowing any more why or how much the action is needed, than do the people—being allowed to know only the vague warnings that "if England falls we will be in a tight spot."

Just why, just how, and what we are supposed to do about it, outside of rearming ourselves, has never been told straightforwardly to the American people.

Enumeration of the instances in which Mr. Roosevelt has run the war show for this country single-handed, and exactly as do the dictators he condemns in Europe likewise run their countries, is too commonly known to all of us to need rehearsing.

All through the 1940 campaign Roosevelt, realizing the American aversion to getting into European troubles, said time and again he would not lead us to war; he would not send American boys to fight in foreign countries; that he hated war; that our foreign policy was safe with him.

But he never told us why, and the millions voted faith in him, while just as many millions voted against him, because they saw too clearly how much the President did not say.

Now these same blind followers of a secret foreign policy are getting alarmed and asking what this is all about that has been stewing and brewing for so many months. They are not going all out with the administration because they are suddenly, belatedly, alert to the fact that Mr. Roosevelt has been long conducting our participation in foreign wars in the good name and credit of the United States, and without taking the people into his confidence.

He declared in wrath at Madison Square Garden, when his stock was most threatened during the campaign, that no one had any right to doubt his sincerity; nor to question the right of his actions; that he could answer every charge of warmongering, but that none were in order.

That went swell as a campaign speech. Following his election, he went all out again for every plan of participation in a war which many Americans still fail to understand until it has now gotten right down to forthright, seeable, shooting participation.

Suddenly he ruffles at the fact that his American followers are not at his back, with pitchforks and clubs, raging to fight in the best traditions of the American Revolution. He has led America a long way to war, and many are willing enough to go, but unity of purpose and full agreement with the course chosen for us is not present, for the simple reason that Roosevelt has not been honest, open, nor fair with the American people.

Washington's Near Horizons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

ARTICLE BY JACOB SIMPSON PAYTON

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am glad to include therein an article written by Mr. Jacob Simpson Payton, who is the Washington correspondent for the Christian Advocate. The Christian Advocate is the official paper of the Methodist Church and represents that great, militant organization. Dr. Payton's articles are read by millions of people each week, and his views concerning national events that center in and around Washington are respected by all who read them and accepted by many who read them.

[From the Christian Advocate]

WASHINGTON OBSERVATIONS—WASHINGTON'S NEAR HORIZONS

One cannot see far from Capitol Hill. Out of the north the towering spires and roofs of Washington march down from the wooded hills. Eastward Maryland offers but a grudging glimpse of her historic countryside. To the south the majestic Potomac soon swings out of sight. Westward the eye wanders to sad Arlington where "taps" has sounded many times.

And yet from these hill-encircled lowlands this impersonal thing, called the Government, is supposed to see all and know all. From this point of limited visibility the plight of sharecroppers, migrant workers, job hunters, and other unfortunate Americans by the millions must somehow be seen and given

sympathetic consideration. From here also the sleepless eyes of the Department of Justice must range the land for those enemies of our liberties who congregate in the hideaways of great cities. From Washington, at the head of tidewater, the gimlet-eyed House Committee on Ways and Means must detect where the least discernible objects known to governments may be found—the purses of individuals and corporations.

These domestic problems, in varying size and urgency, have always haunted the lawmakers. To date they have never been too big nor complex for solution. At present, however, the eyestrain follows the attempt to peep beyond the hills that rim Washington to read the destiny of America in far-off places—Berchtesgaden, Rome, Tokyo, Singapore, Vichy, London, Sofia, Moscow.

The Census Bureau has just announced that the center of America's population has shifted from Linton to Washington, Ind., 30 miles distant, during the last decade. This change of direction southward instead of westward, a fact unique in our national history, passes without comment. Why? Americans are absorbed with a larger question: Where will the center of the world be—its military might, its sea power, its commercial strength, its commanding voices, its financial ascendancy—when one of the two mightiest forces ever engaged in conflict falls exhausted to its knees?

That is why Washington stands on tiptoe and gazes anxiously into the future. Who are the illusioned? Who follow only beckoning mirages? Who see more bears than there really are? Who are listening to false oracles? Are they the isolationists or the interventionists? If America only knew.

—*Jacob Simpson Payton.*

We Must Have Action Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend remarks, I desire to include two timely utterances by men whose broad humanity and devoted service to their fellow men have endeared them to the American people.

The first is a brief excerpt from a speech on national defense by Chester C. Davis, member of the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense, delivered before the Association of Commerce at St. Paul, Minn., April 15, 1941.

Mr. Davis said:

Nearly two decades have passed since the long fight for equality for agriculture began. I recall vividly the early leadership and sponsorship which this organization and the people of this city and the Northwest provided. We sought to establish the principle that the farmer's income was determined by the relation between his costs and his prices, and that he was entitled to get and keep a fair relation between the two. That principle has been accepted as the law of the United States.

It has not been easy or possible to apply that principle with uniform success in the market place. But current tendencies to regard it as outmoded and obsolete disturb me. The formulas may need revision, technological changes may need to be taken into account, but the policy that accepts and seeks to attain for agriculture a fair standard of relationship with industrial wages and industrial prices should not be cast aside and need not be apologized for. I see altogether too pronounced a tendency to do both in the present agricultural picture. There is no equity and but little foresight in a philosophy that accepts and justifies every wage increase organized labor can wring out of the present crisis, and exonerates increasing industrial prices as necessary because of rising costs, while denying the same kind of accounting to the American farmer.

We have many and difficult adjustments ahead of us. The defense program means that we shall have unequal pressures on different markets. Some farm supplies may be difficult to obtain. Costs may rise and many farm prices will continue to reflect the loss of foreign markets. The principle of fair parity in farm income and farm outgo must be maintained—if for no other reason than because the farm plant must remain healthy and solvent for national defense itself.

The second is an arresting comment from the trenchant pen of Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Federation of the Farm Bureau, appearing in the current issue of the Nation's Agriculture.

President O'Neal admonishes:

If the Farm Bureau, in all of its history, ever faced a period in which action was needed, that time is now. Unless the farmer does get into action, and soon, he will become the forgotten man of this critical period in our national life.

It has been said that every citizen must make sacrifices in the national interest during this period. But, in fact, what do we find? Policies are being followed which will permit labor and industry to make more, rather than less, out of the national emergency.

Efforts have been made to keep the price of steel and other essential commodities from running away, but recently the steel workers have won an increase of 80 cents a day in wages, the coal diggers are to get a dollar a day more, and innumerable pay increases in many lines have taken place. Just as surely as day follows night, the cost of everything the farmer buys is going to go up. His labor costs have already gone up, and serious farm-labor shortages have already begun to develop. His taxes will go up and up. These things happen with creeping insidiousness, and before he knows it the farmer is out on a limb and in imminent danger of having the limb cut off.

Let me quote a few statements made by that distinguished friend of agriculture, Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, during the debate recently on the agricultural appropriations bill. Among other things, he said:

"The farmer should not be the only sacrificial offering. He has not yet had a single cost-plus-fixed-fee contract. It has not been necessary to repeal any limitation on his profits, for the producers of many commodities are selling below the cost of production. He has no farm board as the equivalent of the Labor Relations Board to protect him against speculators, unfair trade practices, and decreasing income. He has never gone on strike in an attempt to starve the consumer into higher prices. He has no floor under his wages nor ceiling over his hours, but in the nature of things toils unremittingly from daybreak until setting sun.

"He pays his share of the cost of legislation to afford security to other groups without enjoying that security. He has received the lowest income and enjoyed fewer of the benefits and blessings of modern-day civilization than any other group in the United States. Despite this, he is still the bulwark of the Nation and is impervious to the subversive influences which cause trouble and confusion in some other groups."

The farmer was and is ready for any emergency. Stored up against the day of need are mountainous stock piles of every farm commodity, available in nearly all cases at prices that represent only about 75 percent of fair exchange value—the parity promised to farmers for so long. Because he had always practiced a philosophy of abundance, food and fiber, the sinews of war, are on hand in enormous volume.

Where is the industrial counterpart of agriculture's stockpile which at last harvest time held 23,000,000 bales of cotton, more than a billion bushels of wheat, more than three billion bushels of corn, countless tons of lard, pork, dairy products? Industrial leaders assured us last year that there would be plenty of steel, aluminum and other essentials. Even though industry made frantic attempts to increase production, shortages did develop and priorities have been imposed in order to keep the defense effort from breaking down completely.

We were told that the labor situation was well in hand. Labor has its wages-and-hours law and its National Labor Relations Board to keep order on the labor front. As the emergency became more critical, we were told that production of material for Great Britain and for our own defense is vital to our national interest; but in spite of that, industrial strikes have been allowed to go on, some of them for months, in plants that were engaged in 24-hour-day efforts to produce implements of war and defense.

During all of the confusion, agriculture was ready, and was taken for granted. It has received little consideration, and its spokesmen were relegated to the background of the inner national councils, while consumer representatives were moved up to the front row.

Considering assurances given industry and labor, could not we fairly expect that farmers would be assured of prices based on fair exchange values? Parity will penalize no consumer because it is simply fair-exchange value.

But price goals have been announced on some farm commodities, and these prices are not tied to parity. Farmers are willing to feed the hungry in the democracies, if necessary, but in increasing their efforts they expect to receive the same considerations that other groups are getting.

Many farmers consider the modifications of the farm program already announced to be an outright invitation to abandon their corn adjustment program. Furthermore, Government-owned corn will be offered for sale to hold the price at approximately 75 percent of parity. The announced hog price is nearly a dollar under parity price. Farmers were amazed and confused. It was hard to understand why the administration, after 8 years of trying to raise prices to parity, should apparently reverse itself and attempt to keep some prices from reaching the parity goal. If additional supplies are needed, why not simply gear up our national program to greater capacity, and assure farmers of parity prices, instead of encouraging farmers to increase production indiscriminately?

The only way out for the farmer is to take the battle to Congress. Bills to give the farmer parity are awaiting action by House and Senate. It is now or never for the farmer. I pledge you here and now that the American Farm Bureau Federation will demand of the President and Congress, of Republicans and Democrats, a definite legislative action to give the American farmer full parity at this session of Congress. You are the ones who elect your Congressmen and Senators, and you are the ones who must tell them what you want. Let every farmer who can hold a lead pencil write to the men who represent him in Washington and ask them when they are going to redeem their pledge of parity to the farmer. They are in Washington to serve you in this emergency. They will respond if you will do your duty. We must have action now.

War Experience and Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE SUGAR BULLETIN

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Sugar Bulletin of April 1, 1941:

[From the Sugar Bulletin, New Orleans, La., April 1, 1941]

WAR EXPERIENCE AND SUGAR

(By C. J. Bourg)

We are passing through a history-making period. The value of the continental sugar industry to the consumers of the United States is being demonstrated again. The first World War proved to the American people the importance of having a constant supply of sugar at home and available. It was only after the war, when domestic supplies of sugar had become exhausted, that foreign producers enjoyed a profiteering period which cost the American consumer upward of 25 cents a pound for sugar.

If the first World War taught a lesson in regard to sugar, it was that continental production of sugar in the last analysis becomes the most effective safeguard of adequate supplies at reasonable prices which the consumers of sugar in the United States should have at all times. Every nation in the world has sought to make itself self-sufficient in sugar since 1918, excepting the United States, where there has been only a restricted partial attempt at self-sufficiency.

For years the American Sugar League has sounded the warning that the voice of experience should be heeded by the United States Government and that American farmers should be permitted to produce more sugar, as a cash crop for themselves and as a protection to the consumer in supply and in price. Even some of our friends have at times felt that the matter was being overemphasized, based upon that "It can't happen here" feeling which has existed with regard to national defense as well as with regard to sugar supplies. But gradually the restrictions of war in all parts of the world are bringing about the emergency about which we have warned so many times.

The price of sugar has risen progressively in the past few months. The increase in price has not yet reached the levels which can honestly be termed abnormal or excessive. True enough, there have been increases from the low levels of 1940, when several national records were established on sugar prices—raw refined, and retail. There has been a restoration of prices toward normal levels for raw sugar and refined sugar, and so far the retail prices of sugar to the ultimate consumer continues to be fair and reasonable and acceptable to the housewife.

Getting right down to the bare facts, everyone who is informed on the sugar market knows that the recent increases in prices on raw and refined sugar have been brought about almost exclusively by corresponding increases in the rates of ocean freight and insurance, and because of the scarcity of cargo vessels. In the case of the Philippines, there is the prospect of no facilities for transporting sugar across the Pacific Ocean. What is stabilizing the United States sugar market and keeping it from running away? It is the existence of supplies of sugar within the United States, sufficient to meet ordinary emergencies until the 1941 new-crop sugars become available. It is the domestic sugar industry which is the protective insurance policy.

One buys fire insurance year in and year out, even though no fire occurs. Often when the fire-insurance premium becomes due, the insured hesitates to pay the premium. It seems so unnecessary because there has been no loss by fire. But good common sense and business judgment establish the value of fire insurance on the basis of the law of averages. The same reasoning is applicable to any nation protecting itself against a shortage of essential foods, both in the volume of supply and in the price of the food. There is no necessity for any elaboration of this discussion, as the facts are clear and the conclusions inescapable with respect to the value and importance of the domestic sugar industry within the United States.

Freedom and Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. ROBINSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

EDITORIAL BY DR. J. W. AIRD

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial written by Dr. J. W. Aird and published in the Utah Valley News, a newspaper published at Provo, Utah.

For a number of years Dr. Aird has been one of the outstanding physicians and surgeons in the State of Utah, but, notwithstanding his busy life in his chosen profession, he has written a number of forward and thoughtful articles on our economic problems.

The editorial follows:

(By Dr. J. W. Aird)

There are two things that are uppermost in the minds and hearts of the civilized world today, namely, freedom and security.

There is unlimited talk and much concern about our freedom, but comparatively little is said about our security. The reason for this, no doubt, is due to the fact that most of us sense that there is a real threat to our liberty, while it is the minority who sense that there is a threat to our security.

The fact, however, is that as social and economical conditions exist today there is no security for any of us, even the most wealthy. Therefore our great concern should be to arrange for our security. If people become dependent, they automatically lose their freedom. Our craving for security is much stronger than our craving for freedom. The reason why dictators flourish and attain power is that they offer security. People are willing to sacrifice their freedom for security with the hope that sooner or later they will regain their freedom. This has been demonstrated very recently in France.

Our Constitution is supposed to guarantee life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; but, as I view it, it is very evident that we cannot guarantee liberty unless we guarantee security, as liberty is entirely dependent upon security. Therefore our Constitution should guarantee security as well as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The names of the statesmen or leaders who can secure freedom, together with social and economical security to the human race, will go down in history for unknown ages to come.

The world as we see it today—half slave and half free—cannot long endure. The world has become too small for that. Social and economic intercourse between nations, together with our dependence upon each other for a normal and decent existence, calls for a similar order the world over. Therefore, either slavery or freedom must prevail. My judgment is that it will not be slavery, providing the free nations will, in the meantime, establish economic and social security for their citizens.

The fact that the desire for security is greater than the desire for freedom should give us our cue, as it were, to at once arrange for security, so that we may maintain our democratic form of government and freedom.

In the Salt Lake Tribune of March 20, and again on March 29, 1941, there appeared two splendid articles written by Dorothy Thompson, dealing with this subject. I hope they were read by millions of people.

Miss Thompson, and in fact the whole world—thinking world—realize that a new order must be established. The new social and economic order she is looking forward to, can only be one of two types. It must be either the one she refers to as "the one we have already mentally rejected"—the one the dictators are now fighting for—or it must be one similar to the one I have envisioned. No doubt Miss Thompson has envisioned a similar order.

The new order I have envisioned is one that retains our democratic form of government and freedom, coupled with some technique of government that will insure social and economic security to each and every citizen. The security must be one that insures a decent living to all. We already have democracy and freedom. It remains for us to supply the security. If that were supplied there would be no citizen but that would fight to the bitter end to preserve it.

Such an order we have not, so far, mentally rejected; nor must we reject it either mentally or in fact; for if we do there is nothing left for us but dictatorship, which can mean nothing but depriving us of our freedom and subjecting us to slavery with all its attending misery for some years to come.

It is a splendid feeling to know that force cannot govern our thoughts and reasoning powers, even though it may govern our actions for a time.

Surely all thinking people recognize that a new order is in the making and that it must come. If this be true, why do we not set about to see that this new order is one that will retain our democratic form of government and freedom, coupled with some technique of government that will insure economic and social security to all? This can be done by the adoption of some such plan as outlined in a booklet entitled "A Plan To End Widespread Unemployment and To Care for the Unemployed and Unemployables." I postulate that our present Security Act falls far short of accomplishing the desired end.

However, I think the reasons are as Miss Thompson has so well stated. She says, "I am sure that the basis of our fear is our reluctance to acknowledge the necessity of a change" (although we all sense it is approaching) "and our reluctance to plan that such a change shall come about by a clear-eyed act of our democratic will, rather than through chaos and destruction."

Think it over.

We Do Not Want Another A. E. F.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEWIS D. THILL
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE SENTINEL

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Sentinel:

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel of April 22, 1941]

A "FEELER"—SECRETARY STIMSON HINTS AT FOREIGN SERVICE

Coming events cast their A. E. F.'s before. Secretary of War Stimson said before the Senate committee investigating defense contracts:

"Our forces must be prepared for the possibilities of war in many and varied terrains, it being quite uncertain in what part of North, South, or Central America, or even possibly other regions, it ultimately may be necessary to use them in the defense of this country and its possessions."

Note that the Secretary says "possibly other regions."

"Other regions" than "North, South, or Central America" means either Europe, Asia, or Africa.

What Secretary Stimson seems plainly to hint at is Europe or Africa.

To send an American Army to England or to the continent of Europe would be a violation of the solemn pledges made by President Roosevelt to the American people in the last campaign that no American soldiers would be sent to fight on foreign fields.

But less than 3 months after the inauguration of the President, his Secretary of War says that it is possible that our forces will be sent overseas.

This plainly is against the wishes of at least 90 percent of the American people.

The American people gladly acquiesced in the administration's selectee act—an act by which millions of our young men were to be trained for 1 year to be soldiers.

They approved because they believed the word of President Roosevelt that this was to be a defense army—

That it was to be used only to defend the United States and its territories against aggression—

That it was an army for America and not to be used in foreign wars not of our fomenting.

But this promise apparently is to go into the same wastebasket that already contains mounds of the administrations' promises made to the American people in 1932, 1936, and 1940.

It is true that "circumstances alter cases." But nothing has occurred between November 1940, and April 1941, that would cause us to send an army to Europe or to Africa.

It would merely add to the slaughter over there and would in no way materially help England.

Secretary Stimson put out a "feeler."

That "feeler" may develop into a fact.

That fact will be the sending of hundreds of thousands, maybe millions, of American soldiers to graves in Europe or to the bottom of the sea.

England has repeatedly said that she does not need more manpower.

We are aiding her in her fight against Hitlers' hordes in a rational way.

To send an army abroad, therefore, would be worse than a blunder—it would be a crime—a crime against our sons and brothers and their mothers.

War Veterans' Hospital at Aspinwall, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission and the consent of the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD with reference to the War Veterans' Hospital at Aspinwall, Pa.

Accompanied by John T. Walsh, former inspector general of the V. F. W. of the State of Pennsylvania, McKeesport, Pa.; Myrtle Byers, past commander of the Ladies' Auxiliary of the State of Pennsylvania; Mrs. Marie Cothery, past commander of the ladies' auxiliary; Corp. Carl A. Everett, V. F. W. Post No. 514, McKeesport, Pa.; Mrs. Kane, officer of the Ladies' Auxiliary of the V. F. W., McKeesport, Pa.; Gerald Firth, president of the Firth-Stirling Steel Co., McKeesport, Pa.; and Howard McDevitt, past commander of the V. F. W., McKeesport, Pa.; I toured the War Veterans' Hospital on Friday, April 11, 1941. I am now firmly convinced that no undertaking of the United States Government deserves more commendation than the construction of this splendid institution at Aspinwall, Pa.

The first impression one gets is that they have highly competent administrative leadership in the persons of Dr. Robert C. Cook, hospital manager; Dr. K. A. Carroll, head of the medical staff; assisted by Dr. Miller and a group of splendid and cooperative physicians and medical men, all distinguished physicians who served in the last World War and who know the problems of the veterans. This is one of the prime requisites of any successful administration, and it is quite evident after discussing the affairs of the hospital with these distinguished leaders.

I was extremely impressed with the cleanliness of the hospital. After traveling from one building to another and through every subway and passageway, I found the hospital to be spotless. The employees are efficient and very cordial, and I discovered that all foods, especially the meats, to be of the highest grade and character that could be purchased. Everything was kept in a most sanitary condition. They have a splendidly managed and conducted bakery, expert dieticians, and every convenience required in any hospital to give to the inmates and the veterans of the last World War all necessary services, which Congress by the act of 1925 and subsequent amendments thereto intended to give to the veterans.

Last, but not least, I interviewed dozens of veterans, many of whom are suffering from severe injuries, wounds, and gases of the last World War. In the spirit of humanity, they admit that the United States Government is attempting to make life pleasant and less burdensome for them, and that it is actually trying to rehabilitate them so that they can go out into a very competitive world at least in an improved physical condition.

Above all, the veterans, in my brief interview, had nothing but praise for both Dr. Robert C. Cook and Dr. K. A. Carroll for the splendid human treatment accorded them. The World War Veterans' Administration must be complimented for the leadership chosen to conduct with humanity and efficiency this splendid institution.

From the records at this hospital as of April 1, 1941, there were 760 inmates, though the capacity of the hospital is in excess of 1,000. It is my earnest wish that every Member of Congress, at some time or other, visit the veterans' hospital in Aspinwall, Pa., or any other veterans' hospital similarly conducted. I am certain each Congressman will be seriously impressed with the Government's tremendous task and the splendid manner in which it is attempting to rehabilitate the war veterans through highly efficient personnel and in maintaining a thoroughly equipped modern institution.

The hospital in Aspinwall, Pa., is a monument to the World War Veterans' Administration, and I know of no private hospital anywhere in this land that can excel the veterans' hospital in Aspinwall, Pa.

Will Rogers Warned Against Involvement in Europe's Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

QUOTATION FROM SAYINGS OF THE LATE WILL ROGERS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a few words of wisdom from a collection of quotations of the late Will Rogers:

Europe tells us they want our moral leadership and moral responsibility and tells us we're so big, and so strong, and so wonderful, and so marvelous. But they're the same folks that call us Uncle Shylock and money grabbers and blatant and ill-mannered, and all the time talkin' about how we won the war. I don't see how them two ideas work out together. I think we should be sympathetic toward European nations and all that, but we don't have to marry Europe. And when the country finds itself married to Europe there ain't none of this divorce in Reno by noon. Say, listen, you're tied up and goin' to find it hard to break loose. And then they'd sue us for nonsupport.

Anthony Foucher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of the membership of this body to the fact that on July 22 of this year the people of Indiana, and especially those of the Catholic faith, will pay tribute to the memory of one who is entitled to recognition for what he did for the advancement of religion and education among the pioneers who developed the Indiana Northwest Territory. That man was Anthony Foucher.

Anthony Foucher was born at what is now the city of La Fayette, in the State of Indiana, on July 22, 1741, and appears to have been the first white child born in that territory, of which history has record, who later entered the sacred ministry. He was ordained to the priesthood at Quebec, Canada, on October 22, 1774, and those who have made a study of his life state that he had the distinction of being the first American-born person to be so ordained west of the Alleghenies. In this connection a letter received from Msgr. Paul Bernier, chancelor of the archbishopric of Quebec to the La Fayette Deanery Union of Holy Name Societies, at La Fayette, Ind., will be of interest. Following is a copy of the letter as translated from the French:

BISHOP OF QUEBEC,
THE CHANCELOR,
Quebec, November 25, 1940.

LA FAYETTE DISTRICT DEANERY,
The United Holy Name Society,
La Fayette, Ind.

REVEREND FATHER: I am very happy to give a reply to the letter which you addressed, on November 20, to His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Quebec.

According to our registers of ordination, the Abbé Anthony Foucher (or Fouché) was born "at the Post of the Weas in the land of the Illinois," July 22, 1741, of the legitimate marriage of John Baptist Fouché and Mary Louise Lefebvre.

He received tonsure in the Chapel or Church of the Seminary of Quebec on the Ember Saturday before Trinity Sunday, June 2, 1773, and received the four minor orders at the same time.

He was promoted to the subdeaconate October 24, 1773, to the deaconate May 17, 1774, and finally to the priesthood October 30, 1774.

I believe that you are not interested in anything besides the possession of an authentic copy of these different acts of ordination, all of which are signed with the hand of Msgr. John Oliver Briand, bishop of Quebec. These you will find enclosed.

Msgr. Cyprian Tanguay, in his General Report of the Canadian Clergy (Montreal, E. Senecal & Son, 1893), mentions the following:

"Foucher, Anthony, born at the Post of the Weas, State of Illinois, July 22, 1741, son of John Baptist Foucher and Mary Louise Lefebvre; ordained October 30, 1774; 1778, curé of St. Henry of Mascouche; 1795, of St. Anne of Pocatiére; 1806, of Lachenaie; he died at Lachenaie, June 1, 1812, at the age of 71 years, and was buried at St. Henry of Mascouche on the third of the same month."

I cannot at present verify in the archives everything recorded by Monsignor Tanguay. But if the matter interests you I could make the desired researches.

Please believe in my devoted respects in Our Saviour.

PAUL BERNIER, *Pretre.*
(Msgr.) PAUL BERNIER,
Chancelor of the Archbishopric of Quebec.

As a tribute to this early native, the members of the La Fayette Deanery Union of Holy Name Societies, I am informed, are making plans to observe the bicentenary of his birth with fitting ceremony in the Purdue University field house on June 29, 1941. They also contemplate the erection of a monument to his memory in the nature of a religious foundation near the place of his birth. Dignitaries in high administrative offices of both State and Nation, as well as hierarchy, will be invited as guests for the occasion. It is also suggested that the clergy of the La Fayette deanery plans to erect a tablet at Fort Ouiatanon, the Post of the Weas, which was his actual birthplace.

Fox Hunting on Kings Mountain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, AND NEWTON B. DRURY

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am placing in the RECORD copies of correspondence between Hon. Newton B. Drury, Director, National Park Service, and myself in connection with the proposed order prohibiting fox hunting in the Kings Mountain Military National Park, York County, S. C.:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 4, 1941.*

Hon. NEWTON B. DRURY,
Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DRURY: Following up my personal conversation with you and the filing with you on my part of an oral protest against an alleged move by officials of the Kings Mountain National Military Park, York County, S. C., to prohibit fox hunting in that area, to impound any hounds found hunting there, and to prosecute the owners of the hounds criminally, I submit this letter as an additional protest against such action if same is seriously contemplated.

Now, having done some fox hunting myself, knowing something of the nature of the fox hunter, and being a lover of the old hound dog as one of our country's finest institutions, I am very much concerned about this report because, if it is true, I can readily see that another battle of Kings Mountain is in the making and that, in all probability, the old battle would prove to be a pink tea compared to this one. The old battle was fought for liberty, and this one, too, would be fought, as the Constitution says, for "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Mr. Director, please tell me, pray, what harm could a red fox chase do to the Kings Mountain Military Park? No guns are used on a fox hunt, no visitor to the park would be hurt or disturbed, no vegetation would be destroyed, not even a flower; the red fox does not even climb a tree—he goes in the ground when hard pressed.

The people around Kings Mountain are imbued with the same love of liberty that the pioneers believed in and fought for during the Revolutionary period. The Battle of Kings Mountain would never have been won if it had not been for the fact that Sevier, Campbell, Shelby, Williams, and Cleveland were hard-riding, hard-fighting huntsmen, who, I am informed and believe, were fox hunters themselves. The love of the chase, long hours spent in the saddle, intimate knowledge of woods and paths and the self-reliance bred only in God's great open spaces were the main factors in their being able to catch up with Ferguson at Kings Mountain and destroy him.

Now a new generation has come and the bones of the patriots who fought and died at this historic spot have long ago crumbled into dust. That fight for freedom was heard around the world and the citizens of the Kings Mountain area have rejoiced with us that, at long last, proper recognition has been given by a grateful government to the men who fought and died there that liberty might live. The old pines towering over the landscape there today, whose whisperings mingle with the murmurings of the spirits of the departed, will inform you, Mr. Director, if you listen, that the warrior dead always welcome the music of the hounds echoing up the mountain side.

For generations many people in this area have been fox hunters. I don't know whether you know much about fox hunting, but, if you have never heard a pack of dogs in full cry behind the fox, you still have something to live for. I heard the great military band that played at Kings Mountain when that park was dedicated by President Hoover, I heard there a splendid string band on another celebrated occasion, but I venture to say that no note of music was ever wafted through the trees there to excell in sweetness the melodious voices of fox hounds eagerly bent on the chase. There is something about this melody that, once it gets you, always holds you and no other music can take its place. That's what makes the fox hunter a good citizen. Love of good music, love of liberty, love of the chase and competition, and love of the trees and the flowers and the fields and all growing things, blended together, usually go to make up a pretty good type of humanity. If you ever have the chance, take in a fox hunt; get up early on a cold, crisp morning, about 2 hours before day, get a good cup of coffee, listen to your crony blow his fox horn, get on a horse and ride down the country road looking up at the stars, turn your head and listen for the voice of old Thunder or Ring striking a trail over the hill; you will really know then what this country means to you, because you are close to the things that make it great.

Many a fox chase has taken place around Kings Mountain long before the park was established there. For a hundred years or more that section has been the habitat of the red fox, to the joy of the hunter and breeder of good hound dogs. I might say that there are two types of fox in our neck of the woods—red fox and gray fox. The two do not get along very well together and therefore do not breed well in the same area. The red fox usually selects his place of abode and multiplies there year after year, and often he drives the gray fox out. Now you might ask, why do the hunters have to run foxes in the Kings Mountain Military Park itself, as there are plenty of foxes in other

sections of that county? That is very true—there are gray foxes there, too, but the gray fox does not run very far, usually in a 1- or 2-mile radius. But the red fox—you just don't know how far he is going to run—that's what makes a red-fox race something to remember. He sometimes runs 20 miles on a dead stretch, and, if the dogs push him too closely, he often heads for the battle-ground area and one of his old dens there. Even the best pack does not always catch him. So you can see, even though the hunter does not select the Kings Mountain area as the territory for his hunt, very often his dogs follow the fox into this area, as they have been doing for decades. Now, it appears that some military park official is going to catch these dogs, or shoot them, and criminally prosecute the owner for hunting on this Government property, when the owner could not help it. Is it any wonder, then, that the fox hunters are up in arms?

The average fox hunter doesn't care as much as most other citizens about earthly luxuries. As a rule, he has no fine automobile and doesn't care much about fine clothes. He doesn't care much about picture shows and the music of fine orchestras. He has not so much of the worldly goods, but his pack of hound dogs and the music that they give are the apple of his eye. The average fox hunter is usually a good family man and, though he may not admit it, he is usually dominated by his wife, except when it comes to his dogs; then, he asserts himself. Now, the wife doesn't care much about hound dogs. They are not pretty to look at and they lie around the house and eat a good bit of bread that she thinks should go for food for the children. The fox hunter keeps his counsel, won't enter into any argument with his wife about the dogs, but he keeps them just the same; he believes in peace, but not at any price. When he gets up early in the morning and blows his horn and goes out to the chase, maybe for all day, he knows he's going to get a verbal lashing when he gets home, but he keeps his dogs just the same. You can see that if a man is willing to invite the wrath of his wife by keeping hound dogs, he is not likely to sympathize much with a governmental order calculated to deprive him of his main pleasure in life.

Now, I know something about foxes and something about dogs. The old hound dogs I used to own didn't lay much store by pedigree, nor, so far as I know, did they belong to any particular strain; sometimes we didn't even know who their pappy was, but they were good runners just the same and had something to do with proving, to my satisfaction at least, that heredity is not everything. But in late years two breeds of dogs have come to the front in the Kings Mountain community. One strain is known as the July dog, and the other is the Walker dog. Men have been known to fight about the relative merits of these two strains. I am not going to get involved in that, because I know that the scars of an argument over the relative merits of hound dogs often remain, and I have too many constituents on each side of the question. My old friend, Uncle Dan Lattimore, of Hickory Grove, says the July dog is the best, but somehow or other most of the people in York County cling to the Walkers. My father and uncle in Kershaw County, both fox hunters for 50 years now, like the Walkers but don't go in for strains much; they just believe in hound dogs of any kind if they can run and carry a sweet tongue. My friends, Solicitor W. G. Finley and Dr. C. H. Douglas, of York, seem to be leaders of the Walker-dog band wagon in York County. In fact, they had one old prize hound dog—confidentially, I never saw him run and doubt if he was any good—that won several medals in national competition and is the grandpappy or great-grandpappy of a good part of the Walker dogs within miles of Kings Mountain. Now, the Walker dog is pretty good at running red foxes. They pack close together, and they stick on a long race, and they love to run around Kings Mountain. If the proposed order stopping fox hunting goes into effect, what are the hunters in that section going to do? Are they going to kill their dogs because they are afraid they will run across the Kings Mountain area? Are they going to keep them shut up to get fat and lazy? Or must they dispose of them to lucky hunters in other sections of the country, where there is no national park to rob the fox hunter of his chief pleasure in life? Or must they degenerate into just rabbit hunters because a rabbit runs only a few hundred yards from where you jump him?

I beseech you, therefore, Mr. Director, to relieve the fox hunters of York County from this dread threat. When you do, you strike a lick for freedom, the fox hunter, and the hound dog of America—the old red fox himself does not care much, because he usually gets away anyway to run again another day.

If, on the other hand, you determine that this order must go through, then I can only say with Madame Roland before the guillotine: "O Liberty, Liberty, how many crimes are committed in thy name!"

Very sincerely,

J. P. RICHARDS, M. C.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington, April 14, 1941.

Hon. J. P. RICHARDS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. RICHARDS: Referring to your letter of April 4 and our telephone conversation regarding the hunting of foxes in the neighborhood of Kings Mountain National Military Park, the National Park Service certainly does not want to impose unreasonable restrictions.

We have no desire to penalize hunters who, after starting a fox at a distance from the park, are led by the course of the fox to enter the area. We have requested our field officers to look into the situation to determine if important values of the park might be endangered by fox hunting. We fully understand that the foxes are not killed; but we want to check the possibility as to whether deer and wild turkeys might not be discouraged from frequenting the area as a result of the fox hunting.

It is expected that the investigation can be made within a few weeks, and we will communicate with you further when the report is received. You may be sure that we do not intend to be unreasonable or arbitrary, and I hope that satisfactory arrangements can be worked out.

Sincerely yours,

NEWTON B. DRURY,
Director.

Canada Will Build Ships for Us While Our Facilities Remain Idle

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I was startled to read in today's newspapers an item quoting Secretary of the Navy Knox as being in favor of a program whereby the United States will have Canadian shipbuilding companies build vessels in that country instead of the United States. I hope this report is not correct. On the Great Lakes we have idle yards and we have shipbuilding facilities which ought to be put to work. We have unemployed people and certainly the first duty of our Government is to make it possible for its own citizens to be furnished with jobs.

In spite of this situation, Mr. Knox is supposed to have said at a press conference that such a program would relieve our facilities and would help secure more vessels of a smaller type for Great Britain.

Specifically, he said:

> We would be very glad to have this work done in Canada.

He then commented upon the fact that this would solve the exchange problem between Canada and this country.

Mr. Speaker, so far as I am concerned, this proposed program does not make sense and ought to have vigorous opposition from Congress. Not only has the proposed decentralization of industry become a dream, if this announced policy of the Navy is true; but it becomes to my mind a huge joke on the people of the United States. If this Government is to finance the building of boats for Great Britain, then we ought to be able to depend upon administration officials to give American workmen an opportunity to work and American businessmen an opportunity to do the work.

No Member of Congress has been more cooperative than I have been in connection with the national-defense program. My cooperation, however, stops when I face this nonsensical problem and policy. I think it time for Congress to serve notice on every agency of the Government that there will be no more appropriations if money is to be expended in this way.

In connection with funds which have already been appropriated, I think emergency legislation should be passed for the protection of our people against outrageous and ludicrous schemes which entirely ignore the fact that we are building primarily for national defense. We do not know what world developments will come or how quickly they will come which will make national defense a paramount question in the United States. We do know that one way to prepare for national defense is to increase our shipbuilding facilities here at home rather than in some other country. I think some of the legislation we have already passed, and this is in connection with appropriations, should be modified and changed so that a committee of Congress may have something to say about how this money is to be spent. If by chance the time should come when this country faces danger, it strikes me that I would be remiss in my duty now in not pointing out the fact that additional shipyards in the United States would be needed, and now is the time to build them and to make use of facilities already existing. I believe this article in the Times-Herald for today is worthy of the serious consideration of every Member of Congress. I

do not believe the time has come for any foreign government to modify or shape our national-defense program so that it becomes of subordinate consequence.

There is too much talk in some of the departments about building small boats, for example, on the Great Lakes, and not enough action. Then, to add insult to injury, this suggestion that the Great Lakes have a part in the shipbuilding program is apparently to be disregarded, and the boats are to be built in Canada.

Federal Reclamation and Water Conservation Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1941

STATEMENT OF HON. USHER L. BURDICK, OF NORTH DAKOTA, ON DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made before the House subcommittee on the Department of the Interior appropriation bill in behalf of Federal reclamation and water-conservation programs:

Mr. Chairman, a year ago I appeared before your committee to urge inclusion of an appropriation for continuance of the Great Plains water-conservation program designed to rehabilitate drought-stricken areas in North Dakota and other States. Today I am here to support the estimate in the present bill of $3,500,000 recommended by the Budget Bureau; also to urge that the amount be increased so that these projects can be advanced not only in the Great Plains but that the reclamation program be speeded up in other States to the westward, where population pressure is severe due to migrations from the drought regions.

At the same time more money is necessary to provide for investigation of water resources in the Western States. The Government is committed to a policy of irrigation development, because this is the only way to stabilize these arid regions, and the Bureau of Reclamation should have adequate funds for surveys so that no money will be wasted and every dollar may bring the maximum return.

A third item which concerns North Dakota is the proposed appropriation in the pending bill to bring Fort Peck power to our State. It is good news that this work is to be started. That power is needed for irrigation pumping from the Missouri River for the Buford-Trenton project, under construction, and for other projects we hope to see constructed, so that we can utilize water that is now wasting away to the sea.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], at the hearing in February 1940, inquired how many families would be supported by the projects proposed for North Dakota under the Great Plains program. I gave him a preliminary figure of 82 on the Buford-Trenton project, but I am now informed I was far too low. The Farm Security Administration, which is cooperating in the settlement of this project, estimated that the 13,400 acres being put under ditches will rehabilitate 150 families within the project and will stabilize conditions for 115 additional families in the range area nearby.

When you realize that these 265 families to be benefited will for the most part be taken off the relief rolls, and that work on a permanent improvement for 300 laborers for more than 3 years will be provided, you get some idea of the widespread benefits that will follow this program. Compare the overall cost of the Buford-Trenton project of $1,500,000 with the average drain per worker in North Dakota on the Federal Treasury through the Work Projects Administration and its predecessors during the last 7 years. The amount has totaled from $5,000 to $6,000 for each worker or head of a family. The cost for supporting 265 families for 7 years without contributing to a permanent solution of their problem is just about equivalent to the total cost of the Buford-Trenton project.

You will note, of course, that of the $1,500,000 to be invested in the Buford-Trenton project, $630,000 is to be repaid by the water-users who will be made self-sustaining. The remainder of the cost is represented by contributions of W. P. A. labor, which otherwise would be paid for work of a less constructive nature.

There is no more effective way by which we can combat the long-time effect of drought, which continues despite the improved climatic conditions in some parts of North Dakota. For each 100,000 acres, to be irrigated under this program, we can rehabilitate 1,800 families who otherwise will have to leave the State and become a burden on areas to the westward. We can give employment during construction on permanent work for the wage earners of an equal number of families. For every irrigated acre in the cow country, from which I come, we can stabilize from 20 to 30 acres through provision of winter feed for the livestock industry.

The members of this committee from the Pacific coast know what it means for families from the Great Plains to come into their communities destitute and seeking work or a place to settle. California, I am told, has more than 40,000 families from the Great Plains country. Of these nearly 2,000 were from North Dakota. The Pacific Northwest received an even larger number from my State, the records show.

North Dakota has 10,000 fewer farms than it had in 1929 and 5,000,000 less acres in cultivation. I need not point out what the loss in buying power for the manufactured products of the Midwest, East, and South is represented in these figures.

Since there are no defense industries in my area, the people are dependent on agriculture, and permanent agriculture in western North Dakota is dependent on irrigation. This program must go on.

The only Federal reclamation project now operating in the State is the part of the lower Yellowstone development in McKenzie County of 19,000 acres.

Under construction is the Buford-Trenton project of 13,400 acres in Williams County, under the Great Plains program, which will rehabilitate 150 families within the area and stabilize 115 more in the surrounding range. It will cost $1,500,000, of which $630,000 is reimbursable by water-users and the remainder is contributed by W. P. A. It will give employment to 337 workers for more than 3 years.

Authorized is the Bismarck project of 4,800 acres in Burleigh County. It is designed to stabilize about 90 families. It will cost $590,000, of which $250,000 is reimbursable by water users. The remainder will be contributed by W. P. A. through employment of 300 workers for 2 years.

The Department of the Interior appropriation bill, now before the committee, provides for appropriations of $62,800,000 for the fiscal year 1942, compared with a total of $78,614,000 appropriated for 1941. Specific items mentioned are:

For investigations, $500,000, compared with $625,000 last year.

For water conservation and utility projects, $3,500,000, the same amount as provided last year, compared with $5,000,000 in 1940.

For Fort Peck power system, $500,000 to begin construction of transmission line to western North Dakota.

There is only one issue raised concerning this entire appropriation of $3,500,000, and that issue is this: Help the people in the Dust Bowl to help themselves. As a matter of bookkeeping, it is good business, because every family that can be connected with one of these irrigation projects must produce two results: First, the Government will be repaid their investment from the project itself; and, secondly, the family will be removed from the relief rolls.

Suppose we reverse this proposal and do not appropriate money for the investigation and the establishment of these irrigation projects. This would mean that on the debit side of the ledger there would be a large amount of public money expended for the maintenance of these families with no items on the credit side of the ledger.

As I recall it, the cost of maintaining a family per year in the Dust Bowl is about $750. On the Buford-Trenton project alone with 150 families reestablished means a saving of $112,000 annually.

This should be obviously apparent to anyone that it is good business to help the people to help themselves.

Davy Jones' Locker, Eh?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER PATRICK

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1941

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I arise today to have a few words with this House regarding whether or not we should undertake to deliver our merchandise to our embattled friends across the Atlantic by convoy. We have called upon American labor and American manufacturers to turn out vast armament production with the purpose to deliver it into the hands of those who fight against the new order that has declared war on democracy. That it is a world movement no man can deny. Neither can it be denied that its world-wide threat is daily becoming more menacing. We wonder why the European nations that could have been banded together to defeat Germany have each stood back so Germany could schedule them and bowl them over one at a time, and while we are filled with this wonder we are according them the same accommodation. Here we stand with the opportunity of a century—the opportunity to deliver supplies while it is not yet too late—to deliver supplies that may be used by the forces that are fighting a battle that we must fight if these

forces lose, whether we shall be brought to fight it on the battlefield or otherwise we have been fully and properly warned as to what confronts us in the event the Axis Powers win the conflict now being waged in Europe. None but the willfully blind can fail to see the truth written across the dark clouds.

The news from Europe is so bad today we do not like to read it, but we do not change matters by turning our head away from the news. The bloody march continues, and we are fools if we do not accept the fact that every advance of that march brings closer to us that ruthless menace. Surely we are by now fully aware of the spirit of the movement. Have we not heard war declared on democracy? Wherever the German language may be interpreted, have we not heard the statement that democracy is outmoded, unworkable, and must be discarded from the earth? Have we not heard the voice of the Axis Powers denouncing us and confidently stating that our hour will come and we shall be spoken to, and not with words? The success of rolling mechanical divisions, supported by fanatic and highly trained soldiers, has increased the arrogance of that spirit.

It is true the Germans cannot win the war by merely winning in the Balkans, but the success they are having there makes the already increasing danger to us greater. It is not a matter of helping England or of helping any, but is a matter of sane and timely defense for the United States of America. We have already recognized this and have put our hand to the plow—but how firmly? Does Uncle Sam mean business?

What are we doing? We are turning things inside out around here at home. We voted seven billions at one swoop—seven billions dedicated to all-out aid, aid to the cause that must not fail if our democracy is to be kept secure. Now it appears that the U-boat menace is sinking bottoms faster than the Allies can replace them. Open shipping will not offer any degree of assurance of satisfactory delivery. What about it? Davy Jones' locker is no place for the essence of the sweat, toil, sacrifice, and results of this all-out-aid program that we have so earnestly set ourselves to carry out. Certainly America has not snapped into it to see the fruits of its labor, sacrifice, and prayer strewn along the bottom of the deep sea. It is but a matter of simple and plain logic, reasoning from syllogism to conclusion. And the conclusion is inescapable. We must see that this vast wealth of fighting stuff, this stuff from the arsenal of the world, gets across the North Atlantic. Unless safer shipments are found, that means convoy—nothing less. It is our natural job, and the sooner we face it the better off we will be in this world. To quibble is to waste valuable time and bring the arrogance of the new order nearer to our door. We must deliver it into the hands of the Allies while they still have the strength to strike heavy blows. To do otherwise will be too late. To those who shout, "To convoy means war," I want to state that if anything can save us from war, it is quick, effective delivery of what we have announced that we have and will have to deliver. I thank you.

Senator Wheeler's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Chicago Tribune:

[From the Chicago Tribune]

SENATOR WHEELER'S MESSAGE

The success which has attended Senator WHEELER's speech-making tour on behalf of America First is easily explained. He is telling his audiences something which they have been waiting long to hear from their public men.

Mr. WHEELER is not anti-British or pro-Hitler. As he told his Detroit audience, he has only admiration for the wholehearted patriotism of the British. He wishes that American public officials were equally devoted to the welfare of their Nation and their people. If our policies were as rationally related to our interests as British policies are to British interests our Government would not be rushing toward a war which was started without consulting us and the aims of which have never been stated except in the vaguest terms.

The success thus far of the propaganda for war can be explained in large part by the fact that the people of this country have been distracted by an administration which for 8 years has been inventing and promoting emergencies and crises. The consequence of all this effort to frighten the American people has been to shake their confidence in free government, in a free economy, and more especially in themselves. They have been told so often that they are the miserable victims of circumstances beyond their control that many of them have come to believe it. Eight years of agitation against constitutional restraints, 8 years of financial irresponsibility, 8 years of promoted unrest, have left their mark. Courage, confidence, and buoyancy have been replaced by timidity and dread. Ours is the strongest country in the world but its affairs are being conducted as if it were weak and dependent.

Divisive forces have been encouraged for the sake of political advantage. In a country such as this, in which only the Indians are more than a few hundred years removed from a foreign attachment, the folly of promoting hyphenism ought to be manifest. To the extent that it succeeds it can only transplant to our shores the age-old feuds which periodically rip Europe to pieces. Yet in official opinion today those who climb into the imperial bed to bundle with Britannia are the best Americans. Such men as Colonel Lindbergh, who first exposed the strength of the German air force and who now demonstrates that America has nothing to fear from any nation or any combination of nations, are reviled by the bundlers as "fifth columnists" and defeatists.

This county has been weakened also by the encouragement which official Washington has given to the spread of communism in this country. The people have seen the pictures of rioters armed with baseball bats and lengths of iron pipe which were being used to crack the skulls of men who wished to work on armament orders. News of the destruction of intricate and costly machinery has become commonplace. Public officials have accepted such incidents as if they were inevitable. The fact is that these acts of violence in the armament industries have taken place because the administration has deliberately encouraged Communists to gain control of great armies of workmen. Official Washington and official Moscow have chosen opposite sides in the war, but the Communists here are now so strongly entrenched in the labor movement and in the Government that our Government, even if it had the courage to do so, could not easily free American labor from the control which has been fastened upon it.

The American people have been waiting long for a leadership which will tell them that their country can be strong and that divisive forces should not be allowed to weaken it, and at the same time to betray it into war. Senator WHEELER, as a spokesman for the America First Committee, is performing a most useful service. The enthusiasm with which he is being greeted wherever he goes is evidence that there is need in this country for a pro-American movement dedicated to the preservation of our peace, our independence, and our liberties.

Proposed Plans To Have Canada Build Ships for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1941

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I called the attention of the House to an announcement by Secretary of the Navy Knox of a new plan in connection with the policy of aiding Britain. As I understand Secretary Knox's statements to the press, he would have this Government order a small type of boat built in Canadian shipyards. This Government would then purchase those boats out of money appropriated by Congress, and then, under the lend-lease bill, would work out a procedure to transfer such boats to Great Britain. I have given some thought to where such developments might lead us. In another newspaper item, Mr. Knox is quoted as saying the British need long range anti-aircraft guns. This newspaper article by inference would indicate that probably this country would engage Canadian factories in the manufacture of such a gun which would in turn be purchased by the United States and paid for out of funds appropriated by Congress, and then, under the

lend-lease law, delivery would be made to Great Britain. I may not be correct about this, but there would appear to be just as much reason for such procedure as there would be in connection with the building of ships. By the same analogy, it would be logical to have Canada expand her facilities for building airplanes or erect new factories and then sell the planes to the United States and pay for the same out of money appropriated by Congress and then transfer the same to Great Britain. I could suggest several other types of war materials where the same procedure could be followed.

It seems to me that Congress ought to indicate its opposition to any such a program. Materials that are to be transferred under the lend-lease bill ought to be made in the United States. This would furnish employment to idle shipbuilding facilities on the Great Lakes. Of course, these shipbuilding facilities for small craft ought to be utilized by Government officials who are building ships, and I do not care by what name those officials are designated, or what agency they represent.

As I pointed out yesterday, entirely apart from the wrongful effects of this proposed plan to have Canada manufacture goods for the United States, there is a national-defense angle involved. At the same time that we are aiding Great Britain, we should look to the future of our own national defense. This means that we should be ready to use our own shipyards in an emergency. We should build those shipyards now, just as we are building powder factories and other national-defense industries.

In this discussion, I bear no ill will toward Canada, our good neighbor to the north. I have high admiration for those people and for the fine spirit of loyalty which they possess. But our first duty is to look well to our own national-defense problems and program.

Yesterday's newspapers also announced that the British shipping interests were going to abandon the use of convoys and construct a new type of boat which could carry foodstuffs and other materials across the Atlantic singly. In other words, these boats would travel alone. The Great Lakes can furnish ample facilities for the construction of such boats, and it ought to be done in this region.

Fiftieth Anniversary of College of the Ozarks, Clarksville, Ark.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID D. TERRY

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. W. F. NORRELL, OF ARKANSAS

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Hon. W. F. NORRELL, of Arkansas, on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the College of the Ozarks, at Clarksville, Ark., on April 16, 1941, at which time he was given the honorary degree of doctor of laws:

Mr. President, members of the faculty, board of trustees, fellow students, and friends of the College of the Ozarks, may I first have the privilege and honor of conveying to you my very sincere thanks for extending me the opportunity of once again visiting with you, for the invitation you so graciously extended me to visit this great educational institution, for the chance of renewing friendships and reviving fond sentiments in connection with my school work here, and for the very great honor that you do me by bestowing upon me the degree of doctor of laws. For all these things I am truly grateful, and that gratitude shall continue so long as God permits me to live. Within these sacred walls a few years ago I was a registered student, I sat at the feet of our great, efficient, and consecrated faculty. No better teachers ever graced any college than these. I am glad that it was my privilege to attend this church college. May I say I am glad that I attended a small college, as this, because in a small college there is something to which an individual may belong. It gives him a permanent mooring that is lacking on metropolitan sidewalks or in the universities of enormous enrollments. There is something real American about the small colleges. We need not feel that our college or other small church colleges may soon vanish from these United States, because they are destined to continue to be the backbone of education in America, and they shall stand as a guide post in the future for educational institutions.

Someone has asked the question, What is missing in the liberal education of our day? The answer is religion. The church college is an institution of the Bible. America must thrive as long as her pulpits, press, schools, and colleges are free, and her church colleges are a part of that freedom and an arm of that Christianity so essential to our Government.

Church-related colleges need not make apologies for their existence in this modern changing America. These colleges are not necessarily of today, and of yesterday, in their origin or in their services to God and country; they are ancient and honorable.

We are all, during these times very gravely concerned about the future of our country, whether or not our Government can survive, when practically all the rest of the world is waging such an aggressive warfare upon our form of government. Can it be said the country is looking to Congress to lead this Nation through the storms and to preserve our democratic form of government? There is an agency that is more potent than Congress. Education has been, in a practical and modern society alike, an important instrument in the transmission of culture, political, and otherwise.

Russia is directing her program of education for the specific purpose of creating a new collective social order. More recently, Italy and Germany have consciously and deliberately controlled education, in creating a new social order and a new civilization, and while the totalitarian States and proponents of the political philosophy of dictatorship have been advocating totalitarianism, we still claim that we must not advocate democracy in our schools. Thus while education, in a democratic society, aims to develop the individual in his relationships to the groups so that the welfare of society as a whole may be advanced, we are told in effect that it is pedagogically incorrect to use the steps necessary to achieve our goal. If our form of government is to continue our schools must play an increasing and important part in securing its preservation. We ought to equip our students with ideas, attitudes, and habits which will enable them to solve the problems of modern life in a democratic way and by democratic means. Has the American school failed in its important task of developing a citizenry adequately trained to live and perpetuate a democracy? Theories opposed in spirit to the nature of democracy are finding supporters among the very people trained in our so-called democratic schools. Since the success of democracy depends ultimately upon the morality of its citizens, it is here the church-related colleges can and do make an important contribution to the preservation of democracy. In developing character, the church-related college supplies the very lifeblood of democracy, nourishes it, and sustains it. Democratic behavior is moral behavior.

The Declaration of Independence which concisely expresses the spirit of democracy in America, contains in essence the basic ethical and moral principles which must become the reasoned convictions of the masses of intelligent men and women if democracy is to live, "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal, that they are endowed with certain inalienable rights; that amongst these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Ours is a great government made so by our pioneer Christian fathers of the ages, acquiring their original basic ideas from the first house constructed on American soil, on the coast of Virginia, used by our forefathers as a place of worship and learning. Although we have grown in strength as a nation, we must continue these same high ideals and principles, if we are to be sustained in the future.

Four hundred years ago, proud Spain was the undisputed monarch of all Europe and none dared dispute her sway. Not even today is there a country so extensive or possessing such supremacy as was true of the great empire of Charles V. It was but yesterday that you and I saw Spain sink into national suicide. Not in 100 years will Spain emerge from her present condition. It is fearful enough to see a government disintegrate down but it is even more alarming to behold ideals and religious convictions, that have been held as sacred and eternal, disappear almost overnight.

In 1914 the great Russian Empire was devoutly a religious country, holding to the philosophy of the Greek Catholic Church. Every competent visitor to Russia testified that the Russians were unusually religious people. Not 30 years have elapsed but in this short period of time we have seen the largest nation on earth forget religion, abolish church-supported schools, and her citizens become infidels.

We have seen Germany, the home and birthplace of the great modern universities, the leaders in inventions and chemistry, turn from a fairly liberal monarchy to a form of nazi-ism, which seeks to make its subjects slaves to the state and deprive them of all individual rights, including the right to worship the God of their choice.

We have seen artistic and musical Italy suddenly shift from an easygoing nation into an intense regimentation of extremely brutal fascism.

Time forbids a continuation of this thought, but from the four corners of the earth come corroborating evidence that changes are taking place all around us. Why do I bring these things up? It is because we need to revalue our own form of government; we need to analyze our own national philosophy. If other countries are suffering disastrous changes, we also may suffer from them. Is

American democracy in danger? My answer is, "It can happen here."

Where should the private denominational school come into the picture as a defender of American democracy? Due to the decline of religious training in the home, it is more and more being left to the denominational or church schools to give to the individuals the fundamental concepts of democracy.

To be brief, our citizens are the product of the school, and the school therefore is the one institution that we must rely on for the maintenance of our institutions. May I quote Professor Einstein, who was exiled from Germany because of his convictions: "Being a lover of freedom, when the revolution came in Germany, I looked to the universities to defend it, knowing that they had always boasted of their devotion to the cause of the truth; but no, the universities were immediately silenced. Then I looked to the individual writers who as literary guides of Germany had written much and often concerning the place of freedom in modern life, but they, too, were mute. Only the church stood squarely across the path of Hitler's campaign for suppressing truth. I never had any great interest in the church before, but now I feel a great affection and admiration because the church alone has had the courage and persistence to stand for intellectual truth and moral freedom."

What Einstein has found true in Germany has been found true in other countries. Whenever it has been in the interest of those in charge of governmental framework to change its form and deprive men of religious liberty and other essentials of democracy, they found it necessary to oppose the church and the church schools.

This college for the past 50 years has played its part in the work of church colleges throughout this Nation in maintaining our form of government and religion. It has lived one-third the life of our great Nation, and its influence radiates throughout these United States, and I know that its former students have taken their places in our democratic religious society and that they have exerted every effort to sustain the standards of this great religious educational institution, and that I bespeak their sentiment today when I say that this college is sacred to us. Its walls, is faculty, its students, and the very soil on which we now stand shall always be honored and held sacred in the memory of all who have gone this way before.

H. R. 968

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

LETTERS OF HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY, OF NORTH CAROLINA, AND HON. CHARLES R. CLASON, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted to extend my remarks and to include certain letters, I am placing in the RECORD communications from my Democratic colleague from North Carolina, the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, and from my Republican colleague from Massachusetts, the Honorable CLARENCE R. CLASON.

The letters follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 1, 1941.

Hon. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY,
205 House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: I just want to congratulate and commend you upon the splendid speech you made in opposition to the Fulmer net weight bill, H. R. 968. You made a fine and forceful argument which actually assured the defeat of the measure.

I am convinced that the bill, if enacted, would have completely paralyzed industries now engaged in manufacturing jute bagging which for more than a hundred years has been used by cotton farmers and even in my district, by closing a small jute bagging factory, it would have taken away the jobs of approximately 600 breadwinners. The proponents of the measure were apparently perfectly willing to sacrifice the entire industry, but, thanks to you and the others who helped lead the fight, the proposal has now been defeated. The manufacturers and employees of your district should be, and I feel sure that they will be, deeply grateful to you for your courageous and effective efforts in their behalf.

With cordial good wishes and kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD D. COOLEY.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 2, 1941.

Hon. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: I certainly want to thank you for the most effective work you did this week in connection with the defeat of the Fulmer bill to require cotton wrapping on baled cotton. I know that if it had not been for the very active part which you played the bill would undoubtedly have passed.

This is not the first time I have had your splendid cooperation in matters affecting the jute industry and the many workers employed in it. It is always a pleasure to work with you, for I have found that your aid is always extremely valuable.

Had the Fulmer bill passed, the jobs of many hundreds in the jute industry would have been lost. It must be a source of great satisfaction to you, as it is to me, to have saved the livelihood of a great many people.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES R. CLASON.

Guaranty of Life-Insurance Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1941

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the bill providing for guaranty of insurance policies has been tentatively prepared and will be introduced in a few days.

TRUST FUND

The bill proposes to create a trust fund, to be known as the insurance reserve fund, in the amount of $100,000,000, which is to be available to guarantee the reserves of legal reserve life insurance companies. The fund is to be created through a loan from the Treasury in the amount of $100,000,000. This loan is to bear interest at the prevailing rate of interest for Government obligations and is to be repaid out of amounts collected through a semiannual assessment on premiums collected by participating companies after provision is made for maintaining the fund at a level of $100,000,000.

F. D. I. C. TO ADMINISTER

The fund is to be administered by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation as trustee and is to be invested by the Corporation. A departure is made from existing practice in permitting the investment, with certain limitations, of this fund in high-grade industrial securities, including preferred and common stock.

VOLUNTARY

The benefits of the fund are to be made available to life-insurance companies who voluntarily apply for participation and who meet certain qualifications relating to the solvency of the company.

ASSESSMENTS

Each participating company will be subject to a semiannual assessment of one-tenth of 1 percent of the total amount of premiums collected during the preceding semiannual period. The Corporation is given power to enforce the collection of any assessment which becomes due. Any participating company may withdraw, or, if the Corporation finds that the practices of the company are unsound, it may cancel the certificate after complying with a specified procedure. The guaranteed status of a participating company will continue for a period of 2 years after withdrawal or cancelation of the certificate except where the withdrawing company provides for the reinsurance of all its risks in another guaranteed company.

EXAMINATIONS

There is conferred upon the Corporation such additional powers, including the power to make examinations and require reports and to act as receiver, as are necessary to enable it to perform the functions conferred upon it by the bill. No attempt is made to amend the bankruptcy laws, but rather a method of cooperation with the States in handling the receivership of guaranteed companies is proposed.

RESERVES TO BE GUARANTEED

The bill proposes to guarantee the reserve behind life-insurance policies—including those life-insurance policies having disability and accidental-death provisions—annuities, and certain supplementary contracts not involving life contingencies. The amount of the reserve of any policy, annuity, or contract which is guaranteed is determined by the amount of the reserve which the company is required to keep with respect to such policy, annuity, or contract under the laws of all the States in which it operates or by the amount of reserves specified in the contract itself, whichever is the greater. The maximum amount of the reserve guaranteed, however, is limited to $5,000, except

in the case of a group policy where the reserve may greatly exceed $5,000, but in which case the equity of any participating certificate in such policy will, under existing practice, seldom, if ever, approach that amount.

INDIVIDUAL POLICIES NOT GUARANTEED

No attempt is made to guarantee any individual policy. Because of the numerous types of policies, methods of payment, and other variable factors in life-insurance policies and annuities, it was thought infeasible to base the amount of the guaranty upon face values. The only constant factor behind all policies being reserves, this factor is used to determine the amount guaranteed.

HOW LIABILITY DETERMINED

The guaranty is to be made good upon the participating company's going into receivership under State law. The Corporation will then determine, in cooperation with the receiver, the liability of the Corporation as guarantor, and upon the presentation to the Corporation by the receiver of a plan for the reorganization, reinsurance, or liquidation of the guaranteed company which is approved by the Corporation, the Corporation shall, if such plan provides a method by which the amounts paid by the Corporation will be used to make good the terms of the guaranty, including the $5,000 limitation, pay to the State receiver the amount of the guaranty.

SIMILAR TO INSURANCE OF BANK DEPOSITS

The plan, in general, attempts to apply the principles applicable to the insurance of bank deposits to insurance reserves and other contracts closely approximating bank deposits. The powers conferred upon the Corporation under the bill closely follow those which the Corporation has with respect to the insurance of bank deposits. The guaranteed fund for insurance policies is to be administered separately, however, from any other funds which the Corporation may have on hand.

Manganese Iron Ore Available in Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE MINNESOTA STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota:

Resolution 4

Concurrent resolution calling attention to the supply available in Minnesota of manganese iron ore

Whereas Minnesota possesses the only large source of manganese iron ore, which is so vitally needed in the development of the national defense in the present hour of prophesied national danger of invasion; and

Whereas other States of the Union are far ahead of Minnesota in the expansion of their industries and defense facilities; and

Whereas the Federal Government is spending billions of dollars in the way of loans, grants, and other assistance necessary to the upbuilding and expansion of wartime industries, all located away from our State and placing our State at a disadvantage in the national-defense program; and

Whereas money is now being expended in Brazil to secure manganese so vitally needed in our national defense, thereby making necessary the transportation of such manganese over hazardous ocean routes; and

Whereas the development of a manganese plant in Minnesota would release these badly needed merchant ships for other necessary purposes; and

Whereas it has been conclusively proven that manganese can be produced in Minnesota at a cost comparing favorably with other sources of manganese: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the Senate concurring), That this situation be called to the attention of the various Government officials who are engaged in the work of advancing the national-defense program; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to forward copies of this resolution to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Minnesota to the Congress of the United States; to Hon. Donald M. Nelson, at the division office of Production Management, in the Munitions Building, at Washington, D. C.; to Judge Patterson, Under Secretary of War, at the Army Building, in Washington, D. C.; to Under Secretary of the Navy Forrestal, at the Navy Building, in Washington, D. C.; and to Mr. Miller, of the Minnesota Resource Commission.

LAWRENCE M. HALL,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
C. ELMER ANDERSON,
President of the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives the 28th day of March 1941.

HARRY L. ALLEN,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Passed the senate the 17th day of April 1941.

H. Y. TORREY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Approved, April 21, 1941.

HAROLD E. STASSEN,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

Filed April 21, 1941.

MIKE HOLM,
Secretary of the State of Minnesota.

The Danger of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1941

TELEGRAM OF MICHIGAN CITIZENS PROTESTING AGAINST WAR

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram to President Roosevelt:

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., *April 21, 1941.*

The Honorable FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.:

Referring to your statement that the American people failed to realize the danger of immediate war, the undersigned, native-born Americans, all of Christian faith, are sufficiently intelligent to realize this danger, also to realize who is responsible for it, but still hope that you will not plunge our country into a war not of our making and to keep the solemn pledge you made to us before being elected as our President.

M. G. Llafet, Tilleda Shaffer, Evalyn Hansen, B. T. Schall, L. B. McCourt, J. H. Zoerhof, Gerrit Schuur, Wayne Leak, Edward Rusche, E. Jenkins, Margaret Hughes, Jayne Sobczak, Kay McIntyre, G. Honholt, Fred Kuemmerle, Norma Paesens, Helen Kurths, Stanley J. Piskun, Chester Carlson, M. S. Bonney, Pearl Rietsma, R. R. Drake, Patricia Putra, L. A. Spind', George B. Smith, B. J. Frenzer, Pearl Horan, Martha Dros, E. H. Gorsuch, F. F. Slack.

Redistricting in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WORCESTER (MASS.) TELEGRAM

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of April 23, 1941:

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of April 23, 1941]

REDISTRICTING PLAN DENOUNCED—CONGRESSMAN MCCORMACK CHARGES PROPOSAL BEFORE STATE LEGISLATIVE GROUP WOULD SLASH DEMOCRATIC HOUSE SEATS FROM 6 TO 2

WASHINGTON, April 22.—Massachusetts Democrats raised a storm of protest tonight against a proposal for redistricting the State which Representative MCCORMACK (Democrat of Massachusetts) said would cut Democratic House seats from 6 to 2.

Referring to a plan he said was submitted to a special Massachusetts legislative committee considering redistricting and the elimination of 1 of the existing 15 districts, the House majority leader declared:

"They have carved up the districts of Democratic Congressmen FLAHERTY, HEALEY, and CONNERY so as to put the three of them into one district. That is a diabolical political plot."

CONFER WITH BURKE

MCCORMACK's statement was issued after a conference of the six Bay State House Democrats with State Democratic Chairman William H. Burke, Jr.

The plan they said was being considered by the Republican-controlled legislative committee, if approved, would force HEALEY, CONNERY, and FLAHERTY to run in the same district if they sought reelection in the district where they resided.

WOULD ELIMINATE TWO

By placing ward 4, of Somerville, HEALEY's residence, and ward 6, of Lynn, CONNERY's

home, in the same district with FLAHERTY, at least two sitting Democrats would be eliminated.

As outlined by MCCORMACK, the plan would leave the First and Second Congressional Districts held by Republicans TREADWAY and CLASON, respectively, unchanged.

The plan would add to FLAHERTY's present district wards 1 to 5 in Somerville, Revere, Winthrop, Nahant, and 28,123 of the population of the lower part of Lynn. This would bring to 338,028 the number of residents in his district.

AVERAGE 308,337

The preliminary study the Congressmen saw estimated the average number of seats for each district would be 308,337.

The only change in MCCORMACK's district would be giving him the whole of ward 8 in Boston, making the district one of 313,244 population.

ELIOT (Democrat, Massachusetts) would have 292,832 population, with the entire city of Cambridge and with Belmont added to the district in place of Lincoln, Weston, and Wellesley.

MCCORMACK asserted the plan, if enacted into law, should be called "an act to prevent the reelection of four sitting Democrats and to so divide the State as to assure the election of State Senator Angier L. Goodwin, president of the senate, to Congress."

"GOODWIN DISTRICT"

The proposed "Goodwin district" would split Lawrence, giving 44,323 of its population to the new district with Representative ROGERS (Republican, Massachusetts) taking the northern half of the city. Other communities from the Healey and Connery districts would be Andover, Reading, North Reading, Lynnfield, Wakefield, Stoneham, Saugus, Melrose, Medford, Malden, Everett, and wards 6 and 7 of Somerville, with a total population for the district of 331,507.

But MCCORMACK declared the plan did not represent the views of the Republican Members of Congress and said, "The people of Massachusetts, in any event, will deeply resent such a vicious gerrymandering of the State.

STATE 50–50

"It constitutes the intention on the part of certain Republican leaders to limit Democratic representation in Congress to two Members, despite the fact the State as a whole is about 50–50 on a congressional vote. This, in effect, will deprive hundreds of thousands of voters throughout the State from being represented as they desire in Washington."

The only seats the Democrats believed they could hold under the proposal were those of MCCORMACK and FLAHERTY, while the changes in other districts were believed sufficient to elect Republicans.

CASEY'S PROPOSED DISTRICT

CASEY's proposed new district, the Congressman said, went Republican by 15,000 votes last year, as did the district planned for ELIOT.

CASEY's new district would have the following cities and towns: Ashley, Townsend, Boxboro, Stow, Hudson, Marlboro, Maynard, Sudbury, Framingham, Lincoln, Wayland, Natick, Waltham, Weston, Dover, Needham, Wellesley, Harvard, Bolton, Berlin, Clinton, Lancaster, Lunenberg, Princeton, Fitchburg, Lecminster, Sterling, Ashburnham, Westminster, Winchendon, Gardner, Hubbardston, Rutland, Templeton, Oakham, Phillipston, Petersham, Barre, Hardwick, New Braintree, Ware, Brookfield, East Brookfield, West Brookfield, North Brookfield, and Warren, with a population of 304,179.

OTHER DIVISIONS

In Representative TINKHAM'S (Republican, Massachusetts) district, ward 22 of Boston, in the Brighton section, would be added.

Representative GIFFORD (Republican, Massachusetts) would have added to his district the city of Brockton, now represented by Representative WIGGLESWORTH (Republican, Massachusetts), and would lose Cohasset, Bridgewater, and Hingham to Representative MARTIN (Republican, Massachusetts), House minority leader.

MARTIN'S AREA

MARTIN's proposed district would run for the first time to the ocean. He also would get Weymouth, Holbrook, Avon, Stoughton, Bridgewater, Middleboro, Lakeville, Dartmouth, and Hull from the present Gifford and Wigglesworth districts.

The Thirteenth District, that of WIGGLESWORTH, would run from Quincy to Southbridge, taking in Dudley, Webster, Douglas, Northbridge, Uxbridge, Millville, Bellingham, Milford, Hopedale, Medway, Millis, Medfield, Norfolk, and Wrentham.

Dropping Brockton and Natick, WIGGLESWORTH's district would keep only Quincy and seven towns from the original district.

MRS. ROGERS' DISTRICT

Mrs. ROGERS, who has protested against losing Melrose, residence of Goodwin, and adding the northern part of Lawrence, would get upper Lawrence and drop Melrose.

She also would lose Belmont and would have added to her district Pepperell, Shirley, and Methuen.

BATES (Republican, Massachusetts) would have his district extended to the entire city of Salem, Peabody, and a large part of Lynn, giving him a population of 331,918.

HOLMES (Republican, Massachusetts) would pick up 13 towns, 11 from CASEY, and lose 5 in the lower end of the present district to WIGGLESWORTH, giving HOLMES 292,817 persons to represent.

New Tax Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN T. TREADWAY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post for today:

[From the Washington Post of April 24, 1941]

NEW TAX PROPOSALS

In view of the enormous volume of defense expenditures to which we are committed, the Treasury's proposal to raise $3,600,000,000 additional from new taxes can be regarded only as an essential safeguard against inflationary types of deficit financing. The Nation must be prepared to shoulder a greatly increased burden of taxation to maintain the Government credit on a sound basis and to enforce economy upon the civilian population. However, the Government should see to it that the new taxes do not bear with undue weight upon any particular class of our people, or relieve other groups from assuming a fair share of the burden.

The program which the Treasury has outlined to the House Ways and Means Committee appears to be open to criticism on both counts. It would drastically increase the income taxes payable by individuals in the low and middle taxable brackets, while permitting the great body of our citizens either to escape payment of income taxes entirely or else to turn over a negligible percentage of their income to the tax collector. The Treasury also proposes to extract additional sums from already heavily taxed industrial corporations without relating the amount of the imposition to the profitability of their undertakings. As we have often stated, the income tax as applied to corporations is basically defective in that it fails to graduate taxes with reference to rates of profit. Some highly profitable corporations—small as well as large—could afford to pay a good deal more to the Treasury. Others in receipt of large absolute returns may have poor earning records in relation to the amount of invested capital. The proposed surtax levy of 6 percent, which follows the usual pattern, is said to be designed to reach income from investments in Federal securities exempt from normal taxes. This tax, together with recommended increases in the excess-profits taxes, would add nearly $1,000,000,000 to the tax bill of industry without provision for needed adjustments along the lines indicated.

Undoubtedly individuals in the lower and middle income brackets ought to pay much higher taxes than they now do. Analysis of income-tax returns shows that little additional revenue can be obtained by jacking up the excessively high rates in the topmost brackets. It would, however, be very questionable procedure suddenly to raise the taxes of the lowest taxable income groups to over six times present amounts in some cases, while leaving untouched incomes below the present exemption limit. Of course, it may be said with truth that an American in moderate circumstances is lucky by comparison with an Englishman in similar circumstances. An English family with two children—even before the last increase in rates—paid approximately $1,200 on an income of $5,000. But we should not overlook the fact that the British rely much more heavily than we do upon income taxation as a source of revenue.

The further recommendation to boost excises on a limited number of articles would not produce revenues such as could be realized from some kind of general sales taxation. Nor can such levies act as a brake upon consumption in the way that a general sales tax would. The great weakness of the Treasury program lies in its avoidance of taxes that would tap new sources of revenue. What we should do is to spread the burden over a wider area instead of merely putting new taxes atop of present ones—taxes, moreover, that act to some extent as a deterrent to savings and a brake upon industrial enterprise.

Americanism in an Hour of Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1941

ADDRESS OF JAMES M. BULLMAN, WINNER OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA INTERCOLLEGIATE ORATORY CONTEST

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed proud of the young man who has been declared this year's winner of the

South Carolina intercollegiate oratory contest, for he is both a constituent and neighbor of mine. This champion is a student at Furman University, Greenville, S. C. The excellence of young James Bullman's theme and style of expression commends the reading of his speech by every Member of this House. I request unanimous consent for the insertion of this speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address follows:

I realize that most people think of such subjects as "true democracy," "our great American Constitution," and others of a more or less patriotic nature as being literally worn threadbare and only fit for some stuffshirt orator to recite on the Fourth of July. Nevertheless, I stand here today to declare that I am of the firm conviction that never before in the history of these United States has there been greater need for our Government to be defended than during this present hour; for this is certainly a time when democracy is on the defensive and when its enemies are rampant on every hand.

With any kind of government there is to be found difficulty of some nature. And even though we delight in praising with the powers of our fullest expression the glories of American democracy, yet we must face squarely the fact that there are snares within the principles of its operation.

In the charter of our Government there are enshrined certain liberties inalienably extended to all. Among these is the right to free speech, which allows a man to stand up and proclaim freely his philosophy in spite of powers and principalities. Now, this liberty, along with others, is often abused; and particularly so during the past few years, for much talk has abounded throughout this Nation that is diametrically opposed to our form of government. The question is—and it is a most important question—for the future of all that America embodies may be decided by it, "what is to be done when these liberties are used in a manner which is destructive to the stability of our Government?" When such privileges as free speech are used by the sworn enemies of our Constitution to strike at the very fundamentals of democracy, what should be done? If they be prevented from speaking, it means the abandonment of one of the rights essential to the life of democracy; whereas, if they be allowed to continue, it means that democracy is being dealt sledge-hammer blows with its own weapons. Truly, it seems that either alternative is defeating to the maintenance of our democratic way of life. It is a problem of fearful magnitude.

In order to arrive at an answer to this vital question it is first necessary to survey briefly the extent of growth of un-American activities in this country.

In recent years undermining doctrines have developed with such immensity that no one even remotely familiar with the facts can deny that the permanence of American democracy is seriously endangered. It is shocking to think of how the germ of communism, taking root in godless, heathen Russia not much more than 20 years ago, has stretched its contaminating tentacles across the broad expanse of the Atlantic Ocean to bring so many of our American institutions under the clutches of its octopus grasp. It is equally terrifying to contemplate how the Nazi swastika, the emblem of a despotic Germany, has cast its dreaded shadow upon the helpless millions of Europe and now begins to shed the darkness of its fearful form upon our peaceful shores, threatening to extinguish the glorious light of freedom which has shown forth in undiminished splendor for over 150 years.

An idea of the emergency of the situation can be gained from the fact that there are actually more Communists in New York city today than there were in all of Russia in 1918 when the powerful Czarist regime was overthrown. It is the Communists who are especially active in this country as they work in a seemingly untiring manner, by visiting hospitals, prisons, and even religious societies, where they pass out their corrupt literature as well as resort to other means for implanting their un-American program in the minds of our citizens. One of the most deadly means for the advancement of communism is that of taking children whose parents are too poor to support them to health camps, where their growing minds are fitted into the mold of poisoning Russian influence. More than that, many of our northern colleges and universities have been found upon Government inspection to be rotten to the core with undemocratic infections. Also numerous colleges, as well as high schools, of the Southland have been found to be greatly subjected to such influence. And when the German-American Bund, an organization of avowed Nazi affiliation, is allowed to have its thousands of members of what is virtually an army train unhindered within the borders of our country, it's time for something to be done.

In view of these facts, what should be the proper American attitude toward them? Of course, it could be reasoned that to deny anyone such privileges as free speech and other liberties granted by our Constitution is but to rob this Government of its very essentials. Yet just because there is such a thing as free speech doesn't mean that one has a right to get up and speak slanderously of another without being subject to punishment by law. If this be true in regard to individuals, why should one be allowed to speak slanderously of our Government with such perfect freedom? Why should the very liberty which our Constitution grants be used as an agency to promote the program of Hitler and Stalin in America? Certainly it isn't undemocratic to protect the principles of democracy, and even if it were undemocratic it still shouldn't endanger the stability of democracy, for in time of war we would resort to a dictatorship anyway. England today, although fighting to defend its democracy, has temporarily adopted a dictatorship to do this.

How on earth can we expect democracy to grow if we allow it to become so weak that it can't protect itself? The whole thing is but a question of self-preservation, and why we should allow this country to hang itself on the noose of its own rope just doesn't make sense.

Certainly to use force against extreme un-American activities is in accordance with that which is democratic, for when anyone takes the foundation stones which make up the bulwark of our Government and starts hurling them at its very structure, then it's time to resort to drastic measures. If these un-American agitators like the Governments of Russia and Germany so well, then why not send them back over there where they will get all of them that they can hold? Better than that, it would be the greatest blessing to America for every last one of these Russian and German propagandists who menace our Constitution to be banished, starting tomorrow morning, to the great Sahara Desert, where the wind shall bury them beneath 10 feet of sand and where not one passing caravan for the next 500 years will bring back one miserable bone of their carcasses.

In the center of Furman's campus there stands a memorial for which that university has a just right to be proud. It is a monument to the heroism of its men during the last great war. As did many others, in that hour when their country called they answered in a united body. And I know that should a foreign force today launch an attack upon these shores that there isn't any loyal American but who wouldn't rise up and defend with all his might the freedom of this Nation. But today there is within our own gates an enemy that is just as dangerous as an invading army, and we are asleep—asleep as was Samson of old, who, while slumbering unconcerned, was having the very source of his strength severed from him. And unless we beware, soon we, too, like Samson, will be grinding helplessly in the enemies' prison house.

It was on a dark night in the War of 1812 when Francis Scott Key peered into the blackness of the distant scene of battle, wondering if that blessed flag of this Nation still waved amid the shot and shell of the foe, that he asked that classic question, "Oh, say, does that Star-Spangled banner yet wave?"

And today, as we view the growing opposition surrounding democracy on every hand, still we can gladly say that the old red, white, and blue banner continues to wave above the White House dome, although some would like to see it torn from its honored position and have the flag of Moscow or the swastika of Berlin unfurled in its place.

Yes; it still waves, and by the grace of God and by the combined strength of the red-blooded manhood and the red-blooded womanhood of America it will keep on waving, and not one stripe will lose its luster and not one star will have its brightness to fade.

Let us keep it waving, so that this will always be "the land of the free and the home of the brave."

And Now More Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

[From the Washington Daily News]

AND NOW MORE TAXES

Those loud cries of anticipatory anguish are from people who had thought the big national-defense and aid-to-the-Allies program wasn't going to cost anybody anything. They have just read the new tax proposals.

Income-tax payers, of course, are the ones who feel the pain most, for come next March 15 they will have to meet the tax collector face to face and lay their money on the line—some of them five or six times as much as they paid last March 15.

Yet some of the most drastic new taxes proposed are hidden excises on certain goods and services and will come indirectly out of the pockets of all the people who buy those goods and services, regardless of whether they are fortunate enough to have incomes in the taxable brackets. This is known as painless taxation, because the people who pay never see the tax collector. They're just charged higher prices. In our opinion these consumption taxes are far less justified than the levies on incomes.

After all, income-tax payers belong to a select group in this country. They number around 6,000,000 now, and with their families represent about one-sixth of the population. Whatever they pay, they're still better off than

the other five-sixths. What right have they to complain of higher taxes?

Indeed, when our Government needs revenue so desperately, what right has any American to complain of higher taxes—anyone who stays at home, enjoys a civilian life easier than the rigors of camp life, and has security provided by young men drafted into military service at $21 and $30 a month?

But it seems to us our income-tax structure, which is supposed to be the backbone of the Federal revenue system, rests upon too narrow a base. Those who already pay income taxes should be required to pay more. But in seeking still more revenue, why not also reduce the exemptions to bring a much larger number of citizens into the select group of income taxpayers, and take from each according to his ability to pay?

Even if exemptions were so lowered as to double the number of income taxpayers, the select and fortunate group enjoying the privilege of personal contact with Federal tax collectors would still represent only the economic upper one-third of the population.

If this is not done, it will be because the Congressmen who are always voting appropriations, and the politicians of the executive departments in Washington who do the spending, are afraid to let such a large number of voters find out how much their Government and defense cost.

Organized Labor and the Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1941

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, there is much discussion in the cloakrooms and on the floor of Congress expressing sharp criticism against organized labor for holding up defense production. No doubt legislation will be introduced to line labor up and prevent workers from suggesting better conditions and better wages. If the stoppage of defense production can be fastened upon labor, such legislation will, in all probability, pass.

In charging labor with the slowness of defense production, it remains for Members of Congress to carry on some investigations of their own to see who is at fault. So far as I have been able, thus far, to get the facts, I can state definitely that strikes in organized labor are insignificant compared to other causes blocking defense production. Contracts for defense production, as a rule, are given to large corporations, and these, in turn, will not let the smaller corporations in on the contracts.

Pearson and Allen's column in the Times-Herald for March 17 contains this startling statement:

> The cold facts are that although 200,000 firms are available for defense contracts, 90 percent of the orders awarded during the last half of 1940 went to 600 large firms. One hundred and fourteen of these got 95 percent of all contracts over $100,000, amounting to $6,668,800,000.
>
> Despite the frantic pleas of defense officials for speed, a number of these orders have clauses forbidding subcontracting without permission of the primary contractor.

These facts prove that 199,400 corporations capable of turning out defense materials have no chance to do so, and another 486 firms are getting only small drips in orders, and 114 firms are trying to hog the whole defense program. It is estimated on reliable authority that at least 50 percent of machine tools in the country are either idle or working less than 8 hours per day.

Here are some facts found in the statistics of the Bureau of Internal Revenue:

> Ownership of corporate assets: Of all corporations reporting from every part of the Nation, one-tenth of 1 percent of them owned 52 percent of the assets of all of them.
>
> And to clinch the point: Of all corporations reporting, less than 5 percent of them owned 87 percent of all the assets of all of them.
>
> Income and profits of corporations: Of all the corporations reporting from every part of the country, one-tenth of 1 percent of them earned 50 percent of the net income of all of them.
>
> And to clinch the point: Of all the manufacturing corporations reporting, less than 4 percent of them earned 84 percent of all the net profits of all of them.

If the "big boys" are to have their own way in this matter—and it appears likely that they will—half of the potential machine production in the United States will not be utilized.

Just compare this strangulation of our potential productive power with the damage that may be caused by a few strikes. The fact is the "big boys" know that they are at fault for the belated progress in defense production, and that it is not due, except in a slight degree, to strikes. This being the situation, it is obvious to the most prejudiced against organized labor that labor alone cannot be charged with delaying defense.

The real fault lies with the privileges granted to large corporations who want to hog it all. In order for these few corporations to hog it all, a strike in one of these plants is labeled as a plan of the workers to hamstring production. What about the labor in the idle plants? If all of our potential production plants were in operation and had contracts to fill, the few strikes here and there would not affect, in any perceptible degree, the output of defense production.

If all laborers are to be summarily dealt with by a law of Congress, it will fall upon 95 percent of honest, loyal American citizens, who have a right to protect their own interests. The number of laborers in the United States who deliberately intend, by their action, to hamstring production, is extremely small and those cases are being dealt with by organized labor itself.

If we intend to have a united front in this country, organized labor, as a body, must be given the protection to which they are entitled under the law. To now slap the whole organization in the face, when neither the organization is at fault nor the actual number of strikes is responsible alone for the slowness of production, would be an act which would spread disunion among a whole people who should be united.

Constant reference is made to the fact that labor is regimented in Germany, and there are no strikes; that production of war materials goes forward without a hitch. That may be one side of the situation, but what about the other side? The capitalist is also regimented, and if that were all, the capitalist would not fare so bad, but at the first sign of disagreement with the war policies, the capitalist is sent to a concentration camp, his property confiscated, and in many instances his life is snuffed out either through neglect, sickness, or other means of liquidation.

If we are to copy Germany with respect to labor, why not go the whole way and regiment capital. If the people of this country know what they are doing—and sometimes they do not—we will keep our American way of operation and treat both capital and labor justly. That is the duty of this Government in our present situation—demand that labor and capital shall operate together, fairly, justly, and for the common good of the Nation.

There should be a wider distribution of war contracts to the end that all of our productive capacity may be utilized—a handful of men should not control our production and, above all things, these men should be prevented from repeating the war profits of the first World War. A fair distribution of the common efforts of capital and labor will do two important things at this critical time. It will prevent strikes and prevent a few men from reaping unconscionable profits from a situation which the people cannot now avoid.

Why I Favor the Overton Formula, With the Amendment Suggested by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, As the Fiscal Policy for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1941

REPORT BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH, HOSPITALS, AND CHARITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the special subcommittee on public health, hospitals, and charities of the District of Columbia to investigate the public-welfare institutions, I am happy today because the District of Columbia Committee adopted a favorable report which will take care of not only all of the welfare institutions that are badly in need of improvements but also the central library, sewer system, Gallinger Hospital, Georgetown Hospital, health centers, public-welfare center, which would

be a combination of the various institutions, such as Blue Plains, and so forth, improvement in the tuberculosis sanatorium, incinerator, new west wing of the Municipal Center, consolidation of the old eight-room schools, some of which are now over 70 years old, Wilson Teachers College, Abbott Vocational School, and the water supply.

I understand the Federal contribution would be approximately $9,300,000, or about 21 percent of the general fund, but the amendment suggested by President Roosevelt provides that out of the total amount appropriated by the regular annual District of Columbia appropriation bill for each fiscal year, there shall be made available for capital expenditures an amount at least equal to the amount herein required to be appropriated by such bill as the annual payment of the United States for such fiscal year.

The following is a report of our investigation of the institutions of the Board of Public Welfare, which will show the need of this legislation, and, therefore, I respectfully ask the Members of the House to act favorably on H. R. 3490, with the amendment suggested by President Roosevelt.

INVESTIGATIONS OF INSTITUTIONS OF THE BOARD OF PUBLIC WELFARE

(House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Public Health, Hospitals, and Charities of the Committee on the District of Columbia, Washington, D. C., Friday, March 8, 1940)

The Subcommittee on Public Health, Hospitals, and Charities of the Committee on the District of Columbia respectfully present the following report to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt on January 26 and 31, 1940, made a statement in the newspapers that she visited Blue Plains Home for the Aged and the Infirm and the Receiving Home for Children and she reported the conditions to be shocking.

The acting chairman of the subcommittee introduced House Resolution 370, which reads as follows:

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, on a recent visit to the Home for the Aged and Infirm, at Blue Plains, D. C., found conditions at the institution to be shocking; and

"Whereas no steps have yet been taken looking toward a correction of the conditions complained of by Mrs. Roosevelt: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the House direct its Legislative Committee on District of Columbia affairs or a proper subcommittee thereof, to make a thorough investigation to find out the exact nature of the conditions existing at the institution, and what remedial steps should be taken; and also whether the District Commissioners, the Board of Public Welfare, which has immediate jurisdiction over the institution, or the Congress of the United States, is responsible for the conditions complained of by Mrs. Roosevelt."

At the request of the chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia and the members of that committee, Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr., was named acting chairman.

The acting chairman immediately called a meeting of the subcommittee and asked Dr. Tenerowicz to make an inspection of the institutions. The acting chairman immediately made a visit to Blue Plains and the Receiving Home for Children and asked Dr. Tenerowicz to do likewise the following day, which he did. After making one visit to Blue Plains the acting chairman made a second visit with Dr. Lynne A. Fullerton, who was asked to testify before the subcommittee.

On January 31 the acting chairman wrote the following letter to Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt:

JANUARY 31, 1940.

MRS. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROOSEVELT: As a member of the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives, I have been keenly interested in your recent visits to the institutions of the city. I was particularly amazed at the horrible conditions that you discovered at the Home for the Aged and Infirm at Blue Plains.

It caused me such concern that I believed it my duty to introduce a resolution in the House of Representatives calling for a congressional investigation of the existing conditions.

Shortly thereafter I was appointed acting chairman of the Public Health Subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee for the investigation. Coincident with my appointment I learned that you visited other District institutions and found that situations existed that should be rectified.

In order that I may proceed in this investigation in the most orderly and efficient manner, I am asking that you will do this subcommittee the great honor of appearing as the first witness.

I believe that in the interest of selecting a time that might be agreeable to you and not interfere with your daily tasks, Saturday evening would be a convenient time.

My interest in having you appear as the first witness is simply that since your visits brought the matter to the attention of Congress, I believe that your suggestions for bettering conditions at these institutions would be of great value to the subcommittee, and in turn to Congress, in their consideration of any remedy that might be suggested.

Therefore, in view of these circumstances, I await your pleasure in calling the subcommittee for your appearance.

Sincerely yours,
THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr., M. C.,
Third District, Maryland.

The following reply was received:

"THE WHITE HOUSE,
"*Washington, February 1, 1940.*

"MY DEAR MR. D'ALESANDRO: I have your letter of January 31, and I deeply regret that I cannot be present on Saturday evening as I am leaving tonight for New York City and Hyde Park.

"Do you think the whole group would care to come to tea with me next Wednesday at 5:30 at the White House?

"If so, I will ask the District Commissioners, Mr. Bondy, and the Director of the Budget. By that time you may have seen some of the institutions, and I would suggest if you are planning to visit any of them, that you do not announce it beforehand.

"I shall be back in Washington late on Sunday night and here in the White House on Monday.

"Very sincerely yours,
"ELEANOR ROOSEVELT."

This invitation was accepted and on Wednesday, February 7, 1940, Mrs. Roosevelt received the three Commissioners, Hon. Melvin C. Hazen, Hon. George C. Allen, and Col. David McCoach, Jr.; the Director of the Budget, Hon. Harold Smith; Mr. Frederick W. McReynolds, chairman of the Board of Public Welfare; Mr. Robert E. Bondy, director, Board of Public Welfare; Judge Fay L. Bentley, judge of the juvenile court; and Hon. Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., acting chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Health, Hospitals, and Charities of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

At that meeting Mrs. Roosevelt agreed to testify before the subcommittee.

After the conference at the White House the acting chairman announced that there would be a thorough investigation of all the institutions under the Board of Public Welfare in the District of Columbia.

The first witness was Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Then there was Dr. Lynne A. Fullerton, from the United States Public Health Service; Mr. Robert E. Bondy, Director of the Board of Public Welfare, District of Columbia; Frederick W. McReynolds, chairman of the Board of Public Welfare, District of Columbia; a report of Congressman Rudolph G. Tenerowicz, a member of the committee, who resigned; Dr. Arthur N. Meloy, physician, Home for Aged and Infirm, Blue Plains; Frank B. Haskell, superintendent, Home for Aged and Infirm, Blue Plains; Judge Fay L. Bentley, judge of the juvenile court; Miss Elsa Castendyck, Director of Division of Delinquency, Children's Bureau, Department of Labor; Mr. Grady Leonard, superintendent; and Mrs. Grady Leonard, Receiving Home for Children; and Mrs. Spencer Gordon, chairman, Child Welfare Committee, Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia.

Following the last public hearing the acting chairman accompanied by Robert E. Bondy, Director of Public Welfare, visited the following institutions:

The District of Columbia Reformatory at Lorton, Va.; the District of Columbia Workhouse at Occoquan, Va.; the District of Columbia jail; the National Training School for Girls; the Industrial Home School; the District Training School at Laurel, Md.; and the Industrial Home School for Colored.

At each institution the superintendent and staff were interviewed and the respective institutions inspected to determine the program, the needs, and the conditions prevailing.

During the investigation the acting chairman received many letters of inquiry and complaints. Matters in those communications affecting the care of inmates in the various institutions are being cared for through arrangement with the Director of Public Welfare.

Various organizations have supplied the subcommittee with ample reports and suggestions and have throughout the investigation emphasized their desire to be helpful.

The investigation has revealed that shocking conditions exist at many points and at most institutions conditions were found that call for correction.

In connection with each institution the subcommittee found that recommendations to the Board of Commissioners by the Board of Public Welfare have generally been reduced, both for personal service and maintenance and capital outlay.

In some instances some Budget estimates were further reduced by the Bureau of the Budget and in many instances the final appropriations, approved by the Congress, represented further reductions.

The net result over the years has been that the needs of the institutions as recommended by their superintendents and by the Board of Public Welfare have not been met.

The committee found that the Members of Congress and the Board of Commissioners over a long period of years have rarely visited these institutions and therefore have not become directly acquainted with the conditions and needs at the institutions.

Generally speaking, the staffs at the institutions are not adequate in number to render good service; the maintenance funds are inadequate, and funds for repair and building extensions have not been sufficient to keep pace with the growth of the National Capital and the needs of the inmates. Within the funds that are available the superintendents of the institutions have been rendering notable service.

The investigation discloses that the Board of Public Welfare has been aware of the unsatisfactory conditions and has repeatedly made recommendations in its annual budget requests to meet these needs of staff, maintenance, and buildings.

The committee further have found that various studies and surveys by experts have

been made and the findings calling for improved service presented to the Board of Public Welfare and the Board of Commissioners.

It is clear, therefore, that the mounting needs of the welfare institutions of the District of Columbia have been known to public welfare officials and that recommendations to meet them have been made.

Instead of more surveys the welfare institutions of the Nation's Capital can be brought to a basis of adequate care and service if the Members of the Senate and House would visit these institutions and see the human needs of additional facilities which are necessary to adequately take care of each institution.

It seems to the committee that Washington should set an example for the Nation in providing proper care for the aged and infirm, children and adult delinquents, the feeble-minded, and others requiring institutional care.

Model welfare institutions in the Nation's Capital would serve to raise the standard of similar institutions throughout the Nation.

The committee feel that Robert E. Bondy, the Director of Public Welfare since September 16, 1939, inherited the heavy burden of the Public Welfare program that is behind the times. He has visited each institution with the committee and in his testimony before the committee and in other connections has demonstrated that he knows the needs and the conditions of each institution and is well qualified to administer the broad program of public welfare.

The committee present the following findings of needs at the various institutions:

HOME FOR THE AGED AND INFIRM (BLUE PLAINS)

1. The committee requested the Board of Commissioners and the Director of Public Welfare to make a survey to determine whether the best possible medical care is being given within the existing funds, whether any inmates in the institution should be transferred for care in other institutions, and whether persons handling food may be diseased and thereby endangering the health of other inmates. The committee asked that within present resources everything possible be done to improve the feeding of the inmates and their general care. The committee after making these suggestions returned to Blue Plains and found progress being made in these matters.

2. The committee feels that the condition of the buildings at Blue Plains are horrible and suggests that a 5-year building plan be adopted because of the lack of adequate facilities.

3. The committee commends for attention recommendations in the report of Dr. Lynne A. Fullerton on medical care, including the need for a full-time medical officer, for graduate-nurse service, for an adequate staff of orderlies in the infirmary, and adequate medical supplies and equipment. Adequate medical care at the institution would also include a working arrangement with Gallinger Hospital and other local institutions. Medical care of inmates requires a well-equipped infirmary.

4. More adequate provision for food, clothing, medical supplies, and furnishings were indicated as needed.

5. The institution should in general be used for the care of aged persons who cannot be cared for in family homes. Provisions for chronics, convalescents, acute medical and surgical cases, mental cases, and epileptics should be made in other institutions.

RECEIVING HOME FOR CHILDREN

1. Every effort should be made through child-welfare service and adequate public assistance to keep families together and prevent circumstances arising that cause delinquency and neglect.

2. The committee suggests that through close cooperation between the police department and the juvenile court the number of delinquent boys and girls held for court action can be reduced.

3. Dependent children and those coming before the police or other agencies because of neglect in their homes should receive temporary care in special foster-family homes until suitable plans in the interest of the child can be made. Such children should not be placed in the Receiving Home for Children, where they will be forced to associate with delinquent boys and girls.

4. Delinquent children held for court action should have temporary care in a modern receiving home for children. The present institution is entirely inadequate and unsuited for that purpose. It is clearly a makeshift. A new institution providing proper segregation, medical-care facilities, play and activity facilities, and adequate provision for food and clothing, with a suitable staff, should be provided.

INDUSTRIAL HOME SCHOOL

1. The Board of Public Welfare is now studying plans for the future of the Industrial Home School, including a proper location and type. Until these plans are decided upon, the present institution should be kept in reasonably adequate repair. The present institution is old and the buildings have been allowed to deteriorate unduly. Some equipment is needed.

INDUSTRIAL HOME SCHOOL FOR COLORED

1. This institution is of the cottage type. Its principal needs are: An educational building for educational and recreational purposes, and educational staff provision for school and shop instruction.

2. There is no District of Columbia industrial home school for colored girls. The committee suggests that the Board of Public Welfare study this matter and make appropriate recommendations.

DISTRICT TRAINING SCHOOL AT LAUREL, MD.

1. This is the only institution for the care of feeble-minded in the District of Columbia. In addition to the approximately 600 inmates at the institution, the committee find that there are about 450 additional feeble-minded in the District of Columbia who should have institutional care at the District Training School, but for whom facilities at the school do not exist. The committee believe there is an urgent need that should be met during the next 5 years for the provision of additional buildings and staff facilities to care for these feeble-minded persons. An institution should be built to care for 1,200 inmates. Most of these 450 feeble-minded in the District of Columbia will profit by training and be capable of rehabilitation and return to the community. An adequate institution will make possible segregation of ages, sexes, race, and mental ability.

2. As the District Training School is a training and educational institution primarily, a suitable school building should be provided to replace the inadequate basement and other rooms now used for class and occupational and shop instructions.

3. Additional building requirements during the coming 5-year period should include a laundry building, adequate water supply, and an employees' residence building. Provisions for landscaping and road building should be made.

The institution is now understaffed. Additions are needed in medical officers, parole officers, matrons, and certain other personnel.

NATIONAL TRAINING SCHOOL FOR GIRLS

1. The present appropriation limiting expenditures to $500 per inmate annually places a premium on delinquency as it forces the maintenance of the institution's population at a minimum figure rather than permitting parole and rehabilitation into the community. The committee believes that the limitation should be lifted.

2. As the purpose of the institution is to train delinquent girls to life in a community, provision should be made for a parole service.

3. More adequate provision should be made for the maintenance items of food, clothing, repairs, and general maintenance.

4. Provisions are needed for teachers for academic and vocational instruction as well as for engineer and watchman services.

5. The Board of Public Welfare should continue its study of the proper location and type of institution for a National Training School for Girls.

6. The committee suggests that the Board of Public Welfare consider the cottage type of institution in a suburban location.

PENAL INSTITUTIONS

1. The committee is impressed with the well-planned and farsighted administration of the District of Columbia penal institutions. The personnel, maintenance, and buildings planned are well mapped out in advance.

2. Personnel is the primary problem. Additions have been made but additional requirements exist to assure safe custody, complete classification, industrial and educational programs, and proper medical and nursing care.

3. At the workhouse and reformatory regular annual provisions should be made for buildings to relieve present overcrowding, to complete the women's division building facilities, to replace the temporary infirmary building at the workhouse, and to carry out certain other features of the existing building program. Building construction should go forward regularly but gradually so that the services of the inmates may be utilized in construction work.

4. In the plans for completion of the building program at the jail the committee strongly recommends that provision be made for hospital facilities at the jail to be operated in conjunction with the staff at Gallinger Hospital.

Respectfully submitted.

THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.,
Acting Chairman.
WILLIAM T. SCHULTE,
RUDOLPH G. TENEROWICZ,
PAUL W. SHAFER,
ALBERT L. VREELAND,
HARRY SANDAGER,
Members.
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Chairman, District Committee,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Ex Officio Members.

National Pension Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1941

ADDRESS OF WILLIAM H. McMASTERS, PRESIDENT OF NATIONAL OLD AGE PENSIONS, INC.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks, analyzing the tax proposal in National Pension Act (H. R. 4013) filed by me on March 14, which were part of an address delivered by William H. McMasters, president of National Old

Age Pensions, Inc., before Somerville, Mass., pension group No. 4, at their regular weekly meeting in American Legion Hall on Tuesday, April 22. The remarks of Mr. McMasters touch on the present tax situation of our National Government, and are as follows:

It is interesting to note the many suggestions that are being offered along the lines of national taxation. H. R. 4013, National Pension Act, filed by Congressman CASEY of Massachusetts a month ago, will meet the present taxation emergency better than any proposal so far offered. In this plan to raise the revenue to make our national-pension program self-sustaining, it says in section 2: "There is hereby levied a tax of 2 percent upon the gross dollar value of all business transactions consummated for profit within the United States."

With that inclusive provision as our tax base, I am confident that the turn-over in business on which taxes are to be levied will produce approximately $1,000,000,000 per month. I stress the fact that it is far easier to collect $1,000,000,000 per month than it would be to collect $12,000,000,000 per year. At the present time, I doubt if more than 6,000,000 persons, of those over 60 years of age, will come under the provisions of the national-pension system that the act will set up. Our maximum calls for only $75 per month per annuitant, and the total requirement will be $450,000,000 per month. This will leave a tax surplus of $550,000,000 per month to be added to the general funds of the Treasury.

To many persons these figures may appear fantastic, but they are only fantastic when considered in terms of a long-departed political economy. In the light of the economy of today in our country, they are far more rational than a tax base of 1 percent of that total would have seemed to the economists of a few decades ago. Under the needs of the hour, a great nation goes forward. Taxes and progress go hand in hand. Our real problem is to equalize the national-taxation program. If we can maintain equity through an absolute balance, the productive forces of our society can carry the load and never know it. That is why this proposed act does not try to favor one income group or productive force as against another. Every transaction, whether wholesale or retail, whether initial or final, is used as a means of collecting revenue.

When the entire economic system is used to defray its own cost of maintenance, there is developed a perfect balance as evenly distributed as the universal pressure of air or the pull of gravitation itself. The whole question comes on a proper legal translation of five simple words, introduced for the first time in a national tax proposal. These words are, "business transactions consummated for profit" and briefly I wish to offer my interpretation. Immediately we eliminate every religious activity, fraternal and cooperative activity, inheritances or any transaction that is governmental in character. It must be a transaction of a business character in which a gain or profit or advantage is secured by both parties because of the exchange in values.

The need for national production to apply part of its increase of wealth to the general and safe conduct of its continued existence is one of the incidents of the economic world in which we live. It is about time that we establish a tax system that leaves the entire economic structure in a perfect balance. Under H. R. 4013, the proposal will not only meet the national pension requirements and thus add greatly to the morale of our people, but it will furnish practically all the revenue needed to carry out the defense program of the Nation. I hope to see this measure considered by the Ways and Means Committee of the Congress very soon.

Speak for Us, Mr. President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1941

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in these trying times, with intolerance, passion, and hysteria filling the columns of so many newspaper commentators and editors in the metropolitan press, it is my conviction that we would all be better off if we would take a little time out each day to read the more measured statements appearing in the religious papers and magazines of this Christian, peaceful Nation.

To the eternal credit of the churches of America and their outstanding leaders it should be noted that the Christian leadership of this country is dedicating its efforts to the preservation of our American peace and our ordered way of life on this hemisphere. If this courageous patriotism and constructive Christianity continues to dominate the religious leadership of this country, I am convinced that after the ordeal in Asia, Africa, and Europe is over the church of the world will find new strength and hope from the fact that in this country the light of sanity and reason, the hope of brotherhood and peace, have been held aloft by Christian leaders and will be ready at the first sign of peace to mend the wounds and temper the passions of the victims of this awful war.

ROY L. SMITH PETITIONS THE PRESIDENT

Under leave granted me by the House, I am attaching to these remarks an editorial from the latest issue of the Christian Advocate, outstanding religious publication of the Methodist Church. In this editorial Roy L. Smith calls upon the President to assume a world leadership for better living such as came from the mind and heart of Woodrow Wilson when he proposed his famous 14 points as a basis for the termination of one war and the elimination of future wars. The repudiation of those 14 points planted the first seeds of the power politics which today has given rise to the dictatorships and military machines which have brought havoc to the homes of innocent people in more than half the nations of the world. The time is once again at hand when some inspired world figure can immortalize his name and serve humanity by proposing a public formula for a peace without vengeance and a world without either oppression or suppression.

Mr. Speaker, whether the wars now raging in three foreign continents raining down upon the British Isles from the air last another month or another decade, they must be finally closed at a meeting around a conference table and not at the point of a gun on a bloody battlefield. A formula for peace and sanity and economic order must follow the war and it is easier now for minds to meet in the development of such a formula than after destruction and exhaustion have taken further tolls. Woodrow Wilson's 14 points went far toward hurrying the termination of the World War by creating objectives for which men in all countries were seeking. If some world force today could offer the people of every land a formula for permanent peace, for freedom from want, for a self-determining mode of life, no man can predict how early a war-weary world might advance its desire to save its sons from further slaughter and its civilization from additional wreckage to the point where it would prove a more forceful impulse than desire for aggression or ambition for a total victory over a completely conquered and prostrate adversary. It seems apparent that a first step toward peace must be a program offering all those whom we would deter from further fighting a basis for future living which will appeal to them so compellingly that the war leaders will be forced to heed the heart-sent pleas which the people of the world will send out for a cessation of the fighting.

WHAT WOULD YOU HAVE FOLLOW THE FIGHTING?

Neither this country nor any other nation or influence in the war or out of it can effectuate a peace until and unless we have in mind what we would write in a document to end the war. This time the world must win the peace, since it is already obvious that no belligerent in it will win this terribly destructive war. Here America has a chance to serve the people of every country in the world; here we have an opportunity, through our constructive thinking and our vast influence, to work out the outline of a permanent peace which will have no vanquished victims, but which will have hopeful people in every land eager to lay down their arms and to pick up the implements of Christian brotherhood again. Roy Smith rightfully presents a thrilling challenge to our President. It is to be hoped that along with our necessary and desirable defense activities to make this country invincible to foreign attack, we can also put to work another segment of our national brain power forging practical suggestions based on equity and justice with which to appeal to the people of every fighting land and every conquered nation that through this course and through our cooperation in helping to develop it there lies more hope and happiness for each of them than could come to any of them by following this war to its ultimate conclusion amidst the crimson ruins of a civilization which too long refrained from revealing its answer to the question, "What would you have follow the fighting?"

Mr. Speaker, I hope that all America will join with Roy Smith in his petition to the President. I fervently pray that the President will exercise his vast influence, now, to set in motion the formation of a plan of peace which will offer an appealing answer from the standpoint of all warring nations to the greatest unanswered question of the century: What would you have follow the fighting?

[From the Christian Advocate]

SPEAK FOR US, MR. PRESIDENT

The people of the world are, without a single exception, desperately concerned in the

outcome of the wars that are waging everywhere. Confused thinking, bewildered peoples, conflicting claims, and poison propaganda combine to harry the souls of men.

In the midst of World War I, an American President, Woodrow Wilson, cleared the air and simplified the issue by the announcement of his 14 points which were adopted by the Allies as the essential statement of their war aims. The fact that those 14 points were largely ignored at the Versailles conferences is responsible, in considerable part, for the bitterness that developed later and for the present world tragedy.

If President Wilson's leadership had been followed at that time, as he expressed himself in the 14 points, we would have had an entirely different world. But the failure to follow that declaration of principles did not, in the least, invalidate the righteousness of their position.

In this dire moment of conflict the world is in need of another such statement which shall become the basis of an enduring and just peace. We know of no other living human being who is in such a position to make such a statement as President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The United States of America is not yet officially at war. This fact makes it possible for our President to make a declaration of our aims, which will be free from the questions that would arise if we were to be an actual participant. His strategic position is unrivaled. He is in a position to render a service to the people of the world which no other living man can render. His great skill in expressive speech and his relation to the conflict make it possible for him to serve humanity as can no other man of his generation.

Such a statement, conceivably, might bring about an end of hostilities, a result devoutly to be prayed for. But at least it would serve as a declaration in behalf of the conscience of the American people who desire nothing more, and nothing better, than to live at peace with all men in the full enjoyment of the rights with which they have been endowed by their Creator. The Christian Advocate believes that President Roosevelt has an opportunity never before granted to any man, within easy reach.

GENERAL JOHNSON ASKS THE QUESTION, TOO

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, just in case that there be war-minded people in our land or obdurate skeptics who see no end for any war but complete victory for the one and total collapse for the other, let me point out that Roy L. Smith is not alone in his plea that President Roosevelt or some other outstanding figure of the current world scene rise to the greatest challenge ever to confront living men and exercise his powers to bring an ordered peace out of what threatens to be an all-out catastrophe for all the nations in the war. Roy Smith has but put into public print what is echoed in the hearts of millions of Americans and Europeans, Asiatics and Africans, people throughout the world. Let those who would toss his suggestion aside as but the well-intentioned dreaming of a man of God read the following quotation from Gen. Hugh Johnson's syndicated column printed in the Washington Daily News of today. I quote the words of General Johnson which appear as part of his description of the world-wide havoc being wrought by the bombing and counter-bombing of civilian populations and historic cities:

Is there nowhere on earth any disciple of the Prince of Compassion sufficiently impartial to be accepted with confidence on both sides as a mediator in this kind of prehistoric slaughter of innocent noncombatants? Couldn't both sides agree not to attack nonmilitary objectives? And couldn't some neutral arbiter—the Pope, for instance—be accepted as an observer and guarantor of the good faith of both?

Mr. Speaker, from Roy L. Smith, the preacher, and Hugh S. Johnson, the hard-boiled military man, comes a startling similarity of suggestion. We have in this country today an organization openly asking America to send its sons to fight and die on foreign battlefields in another expeditionary force which this time might be spread over three continents abroad. It is asking for the immediate use of American convoys while very properly and honestly stating, "this means war." Since President Roosevelt's public statement that "convoys mean shooting and shooting means war," in fact, few, if any, men in responsible positions any longer attempt to deceive the people by classifying convoys as a step short of war—it is almost universally agreed today that convoys by American ships would also mean sending transports of American boys to enter the shambles of three-dimensional fighting on the battlefields of foreign soil and seas.

WE WON A WAR BUT SATAN WON THE PEACE

However, Mr. Speaker, those who are frantically using every device from intimidation to invention to push this country into war omit a most significant segment in their program. They, too, even though they would shove us into the fighting, do not propose an answer to the question "What would you have follow the fighting?" Their only answer, if they answer at all, is "We must win the war." But America won a war on foreign battlefields a quarter of a century ago, but America and all the world lost the peace. The war to end war became a war to precede a mightier and an uglier war, and the war to make the world safe for democracy became a war to nourish nazi-ism and conceive communism. Yes, Mr. Speaker, trading American lives for a peace without promise may be a tradesman's notion of good economics, but it can scarcely serve again to provide good ethics as a basis for our national policy.

If America went to war tomorrow, and won the war the following day, Mr. Speaker, what would we put in a treaty of peace to prevent a recurrence of the wickedness and tyranny which has given rise to the conflict? Until the answer to that question is before us let us make certain to keep out of the fighting and let us continue to prepare this hemisphere to be sure that the pattern of friendly peaceful living which we have here is not sacrificed or stultified through failure to preserve what we have by seeking to solve a riddle which we do not comprehend.

The United States and the World Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 25, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. CORDELL HULL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State and president of the American Society of International Law, to the members of that society, on the occasion of its thirty-fifth annual meeting at the Carlton Hotel, Washington, D. C., on April 24, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow members and guests of the American Society of International Law, on the occasion of this our thirty-fifth annual meeting I shall undertake to discuss briefly certain acute phases of the world situation which are of vital interest to all of us.

We are in the midst of desperately serious days which involve all peoples and all nations. Unfortunately, many people fail to grasp the nature of this world-wide crisis and its meaning to our country.

Too many people assume that the present struggle is merely an ordinary regional war, and that when it comes to an end the side which is victorious will collect indemnities but otherwise leave the defeated nations more or less as they were before the conflict began. This assumption would prove entirely erroneous should the aggressor powers be the winners. As waged by them this is not an ordinary war; it is a war of assault by these would-be conquerors, employing every method of barbarism, upon nations which cling to their right to live in freedom and which are resisting in self-defense.

The would-be conquerors propose to take unto themselves every part of every conquered nation: the territory, the sovereignty, the possessions of every such nation. They propose to make the people of each conquered nation into serfs; to extinguish their liberties, their rights, their law, and their religion. They systematically uproot everything that is high and fine in life.

Such is the movement which is extending rapidly throughout the world.

If experience shows anything, it shows that no nation anywhere has the slightest reason to feel that it will be exempted from attack by the invader any more than in a town overrun by bandits the wealthiest citizen might expect to be free from attack.

Every thinking man can answer the question for himself by simply calling the roll of the wretched victims of world aggression who are now in a condition of semislavery and whose every hope of again enjoying the blessings of civilization depends only on the defeat or failure of the movement of conquest. So it is in Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Albania, Luxemburg, France, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia. Many right-thinking people have not been able to conceive that this

would happen. To them it has seemed incredible. Yet the physical facts are now before our very eyes, and the agony of the period through which the world is passing is marked by the most terrible events. As the armies of invasion move on they bring with them blasted houses, families driven out to starve, civilian dead in the fields. When fighting is over the administration of the invader offers no relief. Homes are plundered; families are separated; churches are closed; food is denied; semislavery is introduced. Military frightfulness is merely replaced by civilian terror. Every resource of organized fiendishness is set to work to subjugate and cow the individual and to use the conquered territory as a springboard for new aggressions.

The conclusion is plain. Now, after some 15 nations have lost everything that makes life worth living, it is high time that the remaining free countries should arm to the fullest extent and in the briefest time humanly possible and act for their self-preservation.

Some among us, doubtless with the best of intentions, still contend that our country need not resist until armed forces of an invader shall have crossed the boundary line of this hemisphere. But this merely means that there would be no resistance by the hemisphere, including the United States, until the invading countries had acquired complete control of the other four continents and of the high seas, and thus had obtained every possible strategic advantage, reducing us to the corresponding disadvantage of a severely handicapped defense. This is an utterly short-sighted and extremely dangerous view.

Events have shown beyond possible question that the safety of this hemisphere and of this country calls for resistance wherever resistance will be most effective. In my judgment, our safety and security require that, in accordance with the declared policy of the legislative and executive branches of the Government, aid must be supplied without hesitation to Great Britain and those other countries that are resisting the sweep of the general conflagration. This policy means, in practical application, that such aid must reach its destination in the shortest of time and in maximum quantity. So ways must be found to do this.

You and I are familiar with the questions sometimes raised when we speak of aid to other nations. Why, it is asked, should we interest ourselves in the defense of other countries? Surely the answer is terribly clear.

Those nations that are making resistance are primarily seeking to save themselves, their homes, and their liberties. Great Britain, for instance, is acting primarily for her own safety. The United States, both in its direct defense effort and in the aid which it extends to the resisting nations, is likewise acting primarily for its own safety. As safety for the nations that are offering resistance means security for us, aid to them is an essential part of our own defense. Every new conquest makes available to the aggressor greater resources for use against the remaining free peoples. Our aid to the resisting nations is not the mere crusading of a world benefactor. It is based on the definite knowledge that every free nation anywhere is a bastion of strength to all the remaining free peoples everywhere.

Sometimes the same confusion of thought is expressed in a different question. Why, it is asked, should we care who wins? Is not this merely the traditional and recurrent struggle for power? Does it make any difference to America? What difference does it make to America?

It makes a fateful difference. In a world which was, in the main, devoted to the cause of peace and in which no nation had designs upon the Western Hemisphere, we could, perhaps, take a detached attitude. But evidence has been piling up over several years which makes it perfectly plain that one group of powers actually does have designs both upon the New World and upon the principles, the possessions, and the way of life that are ours. All the military movements and official acts and utterances of these powers have confirmed the knowledge that we, too, are included in their plans for world domination. Our freedom and our wealth inevitably make us magnets for their machine of force.

Yes; it makes a difference who wins—the difference whether we stand with our backs to the wall with the other four continents against us and the high seas lost, alone defending the last free territories on earth—or whether we keep our place in an orderly world.

Again, it is asked, how are we in danger? Are not these idle fears? Since one warring nation cannot successfully invade Britain across 20 miles of the English Channel how can any nation invade us from across 3,000 miles of the Atlantic?

The reason why the English Channel has not been successfully crossed is that the British have maintained control of that Channel. Forty million determined Britons in a heroic resistance have converted their island into a huge armed base out of which proceeds a steady stream of sea and air power. It is not water that bars the way. It is the resolute determination of British sea power and British arms. Were the control of the seas by the resisting nations lost, the Atlantic would no longer be an obstacle—rather, it would become a broad highway for a conqueror moving westward. Our protection would be enormously lessened.

Those Americans who, in effect, are saying that a British defeat would not matter to us, signally overlook the fact that the resulting delivery of the high seas to the invader would create colossal danger to our own national defense and security. The breadth of the sea may give us a little time. It does not give us safety. Safety can only come from our ability, in conjunction with other peace-loving nations, to prevent any aggressor from attaining control of the high seas.

Some, hoping that this crisis may end, ask whether some sort of peace cannot be made—a peace which will end the struggle in Europe and which will permit us to resume our normal life. I wish this were possible. But one obstinate fact stands in the way. One of the contending groups not only does not wish peace, as we understand peace, but literally does not believe in peace. That group uses the word, it is true—as it was used by the aggressor at the time of the Munich arrangement in 1938. Peace to that group is merely a convenient cloak for a continuing undeclared undercover war, as France and many other nations to their misery have discovered. Behind the deceptive protection of the word "peace" the rulers of that group accumulate vast striking forces. They infiltrate shock troops disguised as peaceful travelers and businessmen. They set up organizations for spying, sabotage, and propaganda. They endeavor to sow hatred and discord. They use every tool of economic attack, of bribery, of corruption, and local disturbance to weaken the countries with which they are at "peace," until a military movement can easily complete the task of subjugation. That kind of peace is nothing more than a trap—a trap into which many nations fell in earlier phases of this movement for world conquest when its true nature was not understood. Indeed the dictator nations make no secret of their plans. They scornfully state their ideas, arrogantly confident that the law-abiding nations will not take them seriously—until it is too late successfully to resist them.

Finally, there are those who sometimes wonder whether aid to freedom-loving nations, and a vigorous policy of defending our interests will not irritate some aggressor into attacking us. This theory assumes that a lawless invader will become irritated if its intended victim dares to defend itself at the most effective stage. Under this theory, the only way to avoid giving such irritation is to submit.

No nation is going to attack us merely because it is our policy to defend ourselves. Neither, for that matter, are any aggressors going to let us alone merely because we attempt to placate them. In the philosophy of the conquerors, an attack is justified whenever and wherever it looks easy and convenient and serves their purposes. There is no possible safeguarding our security, except by solid strength, placed when and where it is most effective.

The best, indeed the only way, of allaying the fears and doubts and questions of those who are in anxiety is for us, 130,000,000 of Americans, to rise in our might and proceed as one man in the Herculean task of equipping this Nation to the fullest for its self-defense. These preparations should not be for a month, or for a year, but they must continue as long as our safety is threatened.

The countries that have set about to impose their rule upon the world have turned their backs upon all the ordinary peacetime ways of work and living. They dreamed of force, they have created force, and they are now using it to the full. In their preparations and in their warfare they have demanded everything of their peoples. Ordinary family life, leisure, personal enjoyment, pursuit of private interest—all of these have been swept aside. Everything has been given over to the creation and use to the utmost of force.

For us, the task of safeguarding our security requires the full, continuous, patriotically inspired effort of each and every one of us. The energies of those who control the operation of our factories and their machines, together with the labor of those who make and operate the machines, must be devoted to the attainment of maximum production. Each and all must work with a sense that what they do or do not do is important in determining whether this country shall be secure. Every part of our vast productive machine that can serve to produce military supplies must be put to that purpose. The desire to continue ordinary ways of business must yield to the needs of the crisis. Individuals and groups have no right at this time to think or act primarily in terms of their personal interest to the detriment of the general national good.

What we do in the production of the fighting instruments needed by ourselves and by the free countries of the world now becomes a measure of our intelligence.

There are those who are too easily discouraged when the news is temporarily unfavorable. Powerful propaganda machines endeavor to spread that discouragement. It is not the tradition of those who love liberty to yield to discouragement. That is not the American tradition. Our country owes its place in history to the fact that the people become more resolute and determined as danger and difficulty increase.

There can be no temporizing with lawlessness or with disregard for the elemental rights of nations and peoples.

Although the task is huge, though time is pressing, and though the struggle may continue for a long time, I am confident that at the end there will come a better day. We are at work not only at the task of insuring our own safety but also at the task of creating ultimate conditions of peace with justice. We can help to lay a firm foundation for the independence, the security, and the returning prosperity of the members of the family of nations. I have absolute faith in the ultimate triumph of the principles of humanity, translated into law and order, by which freedom and justice and security will again prevail.

America and the World Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 25, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. FRANK KNOX

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, last evening in the city of New York the Honorable Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, delivered a very unusual and most interesting address before the Bureau of Advertising of the American Newspaper Publishers Association. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies, and gentlemen, I feel a very natural gratification over the opportunity to address you. My satisfaction flows not alone from the honor you have done me but because of the opportunity which this rostrum affords for a frank discussion of the situation which confronts us all. If I could have my choice among all the audiences which might be assembled, I should have unhesitatingly chosen this audience for what I have to say. Of course, that feeling is a very natural one for me, since I am a member of the same profession as yours, and hold that the free press of America, which you represent, wields a greater influence upon our national destiny than any other single agency in our complex modern society.

Having thus made confession of my sense of indebtedness to you for this opportunity, may I express also the deep sense of personal responsibility I feel in coming before you, as a lifelong member of your profession, who for the moment is charged with a grave public responsibility. This sense of gravity is increased when I remember that my official responsibility has to do with the maintenance and swift enlargement of the Nation's first line of defense in a world devastated by war—war whose dark shadows gather in threatening clouds upon our horizons.

From me, my fellow craftsmen, you have a right to expect utter frankness; and from me, as Secretary of the Navy, engaged in constructing the greatest Navy the world has ever seen, you have a right to expect the sober truth.

OPPOSED TO CENSORSHIP

Because I am a newspaperman as well as a public official, may I say that I have a very lively interest in the establishment and maintenance of the friendliest and frankest possible relationship between the Navy and the press. As a newspaperman, who has known no other occupation, and who feels a great sense of pride in his profession, I am utterly and unreservedly opposed to any form of compulsory censorship, especially in time of peace. In time of war, necessarily, there must be certain vital military information which no loyal and patriotic newspaperman would want to publish anyway, withheld from publication; but even in time of war, with this single qualification, I am opposed to censorship.

I believe the end desired can be achieved by a purely voluntary cooperation between the War and Navy Departments and the newspapers. To the establishment of such a relationship, I am already bending my efforts and shall continue to do so as long as I continue to serve as your Secretary of the Navy. In a democracy, in time of grave national peril, unity is imperative. You do not achieve unity, whether in the field of labor, of capital, or of public relations, when you resort to compulsion. Unity may be achieved only through the processes of mutual understanding and close cooperation.

While the relationship which should exist between those charged with the national defense and the various organs of publicity is of the gravest importance, I would turn your thoughts tonight to a far graver question. I am going to ask you to survey with me the world situation. If our survey is to be of use, it must be utterly realistic and objective. It should savor neither of destructive pessimism nor blind, unreasoning optimism. When grave danger threatens to all that we cherish, we can afford to indulge in neither wishful thinking nor in cowardly defeatism.

As Secretary of the Navy, of course, I do have access to intimate details of information, from all parts of the world, that are not available to all, but this larger and more intimate knowledge in nowise changes the general aspect of the world situation as it is set forth daily in your publication and mine.

ENCIRCLED BY ENEMIES

What we all see is an America which is gradually becoming encircled by military powers whose ideals, institutions, and methods are all of them irreconcilably antagonistic to our ideals, institutions, and methods. These same powers have also openly and repeatedly proclaimed themselves our enemies, and these openly avowed enemies have joined themselves together in a pact which they do not hesitate to say is aimed at us, and at us alone.

The only reason that this hostile pact, admittedly aimed at us, has not resulted in open warfare upon us has been because it does not suit the present purpose of these powers to engage in war with us. Whenever, in the judgment of the Axis Powers, it better suits their purpose to begin hostilities, hostilities will begin, and nothing that we can do, save prostrating ourselves in abject surrender, will change this.

For months there has been almost complete suspension of all direct contact between the United States and all of Europe, save Britain alone. Across the course of the ships that ply this single route have been flung an enlarged fleet, no one knows how numerous, of submarines—submarines which, due to scientific discoveries, are vastly more effective than they were in the last war. The seagoing range of these submarines has been immensely increased, and the field of their activity steadily expands westward, far over the line which divides the Atlantic between Europe and America.

Possession of convenient bases on the French coast has added a whole fleet of surface raiders—ships of high speed and some of them of great gun power—which prey disastrously upon the commerce between Britain and America. Finally, from bases in northern Norway and western France huge fleets of heavy bombers circle back and forth to add terror from the skies to the dangers that lurk along the sea lanes leading to a beleaguered England. Steadily the toll of lost ships mounts far faster than replacements can be made.

To the southwest of conquered Europe lies the Mediterranean, an accustomed highway for our ocean commerce in times of peace. Today the Mediterranean is forbidden waters. On its bosom ply only the craft that carry supplies to fighting armies, and the British and Italian men-of-war who fight for its control. Gone is all of our contact with the nations that border that sea.

The great continent of Africa, itself a field for contending armies, offers no ports for our merchantmen's trade. Its western coast, which thrusts itself half way across the Southern Atlantic, affording an excellent base for operations against the southern half of the Western Hemisphere, is denied our commerce. Whether we swing eastward around the Cape of Good Hope or to the westward through the Straits of Magellan, we find enemy raider-infested seas. At the end of our journey, go we westward or eastward, we encounter an Axis partner who openly proclaims he entered that partnership in an effort to prevent us from interfering with their policies of ruthless military aggression.

The latest link in this chain of encirclement that is being forged by the Axis powers, is the recently announced agreement between Russia and Japan.

Russia was not in any peril of attack by Japan. Japan not only has her hands full, and more than full, in her attempt to subjugate southern China by force of arms, but her aspirations are not northward. They are southward. Japan imperatively needed assurance that she would not be attacked in the north while she was pressing her designs in the south. Just how much assurance Japan feels that her Manchukuo border is safe, I do not know, but whatever that assurance may be it enhances the likilihood of an expansion of hostilities by Japan into a region which is one of the sources of critical war materials for both Great Britain and ourselves. The conclusion of this pact is certain to strengthen the hand of the war party in Japan.

Japan's promise, on the other hand, not to help Hitler if Hitler should attack Russia, is an empty promise. Japan could not help Russia in Europe if she wanted to, and Hitler does not need the help of Japan for such a purpose.

The end, therefore, of this deal between Russia and Japan which tightens the circle around us, leaves Russia quite as likely an object of attack by Hitler as she was before the deal was made, and leaves Japan free from any Russian interference in the Far East. Summed up in military terms, the Russo-Japanese agreement makes Japan more secure as she pursues her dream of domination of all Eastern Asia and leaves Russia no stronger in the event of an attempted Nazi seizure of the Ukraine.

NAZI DOMINATION SEEN AIM

Thus, everywhere as we estimate the situation the world around, the pressure on us grows—through Libya; through Egypt and the Suez; through Yugoslavia and across to the sea; from the western coast of Africa to South America; through the Pacific to the Dutch Netherlands, and, most vital of all, across the broad North Atlantic from German bases in France and Norway now to Greenland, German strategy—world strategy, carefully planned and efficiently executed—is becoming clearer each day. German aspirations for world dominion can no longer be mistaken. The jaws of the Nazi trap are closing.

How long will we remain bemused and stupified while the Axis Powers press their plans for our isolation and ultimate defeat? Wherein lies the difference between what Germany has done to her earlier victims and what she is doing to us? First, the bland and hypocritical assurance that she has no hostile plans. That is what she told Poland when she signed the Polish nonaggression pact. Then, the organization of a skillfully integrated information service that would lay bare our weaknesses, our internal divisions, and our vulnerable spots just as she did in France; and then, the organization of her

"fifth column," not yet loosed to the maximum but sufficiently active to warn us unmistakably of their presence, just as she did in Norway. Next, a steady encirclement and seizure of vantage points from which to launch her attack, just exactly as she has just done in Yugoslavia. Why, we even emulate the Axis victims in our psychology. We think we can escape while all the rest of the world suffers. We keep alive a wretched partisanship when a united patriotism should characterize our thinking. We refuse to believe that the Axis Powers even intend to attack us, or could be successful if they did. We refuse to face the realities of the situation in South America, the protection of which from successful invasion is a primary condition of our defense.

In that great region to the south of us, readily available as a base for an attack upon us, there is neither the military nor naval power to resist against invasion. In our fatuous complacency we ignore that in the present economic set-up, the tug of self-interest comes from Europe and not from North America. We fail to give due consideration to the size and significance of the subversive, pro-Nazi elements in many of the countries in that region—subversive elements that would speedily promote revolutionary chaos to the advantage of the Axis itself.

Many of us fail to face what it will mean to our security if the Axis Powers once gained a foothold close to our borders. We ignore what that might mean to the safety of the Panama Canal, the most vital line of communication under the American flag. Too few of us realize, and still fewer acknowledge, the size of the disaster to American hemispheric safety if Germany, already the conqueror of France, should establish herself in Dakar, a French colonial possession. From there, with her surface ships, submarines, and long-range bombers, a victorious Germany could substantially cut us off from all commerce with South America and make of the Monroe Doctrine a scrap of paper.

Finally, some of the very blind among us refuse to see what will be the inevitable result if the final link in the chain of our encirclement is forged and the battle of the Atlantic is lost and England succumbs, with her fleet sunk or captured.

This is but a partial, withal a brutally blunt, summary of the strategy of encirclement of which we are the victims.

Before we attempt an inventory of the measures we could take to meet this growing menace, this obvious encirclement, let us thoroughly digest this fact: Suppose this should happen—that our encirclement and isolation was complete and England had fallen, we then will be given but two choices—the choice of surrender or the choice of fighting. We won't surrender and we will fight. No one who knows about America and Americans doubts that. Consequently, we must fight ultimately unless we find and put into effect measures that will enable Britain to win without our fighting.

COURSE ALREADY OUTLINED

We have already gone far in this direction. We have declared that the fight that England is making is our fight. We have likewise affirmed that the enemies she is fighting are our enemies. We have denounced, without reserve, Axis aggression, Axis faithlessness to treaties, Axis brutal and murderous disregard of international good faith, and we have said, with an overwhelming public approval of this statement, that we are in the fight to stay until victory for human liberty, for justice, and for good faith is won.

We have made our productive facilities available to those who are fighting the Axis. We have loaned them much of our military equipment, although we had insufficient for our own defense. We have passed the lease-lend bill and appropriated $7,000,000,000 to implement that bill by an almost unanimous vote of our Congress. We have opened up our yards and docks for the repair of British men-of-war and merchantmen. We have assumed protection of Greenland. We have removed restrictions on American flagships sailing to zones where fighting is so that we might relieve Britain of the burden of supplying the armies fighting in that theater.

We have gone a long way, and all of it with the support of an overwhelming public opinion. Incidentally, the latest test of public opinion discloses the American Nation to be approximately 70 percent for aid to Britain even at the risk of war.

Having gone thus far, we cannot break down. There is no retracing our steps. We have committed ourselves in this world struggle. If we should attempt to back down now, England would go down to catastrophic defeat and we would face a world-wide victorious Germany and her allies whom we should have to fight alone.

We have declared that the aggressor nations must not be permitted to win. We have irrevocably committed ourselves to see that that is prevented. We have put all of our resources into the scales to bring defeat to those who would rule the world by force. We have acknowledged that our destiny just as much as the destiny of the British Empire and the ultimate destiny of the conquered peoples of the Low Countries of Scandinavia, of France, and of the Balkans are at stake.

Having gone thus far, we can only go on.

Hitler cannot allow our war supplies and food to reach England—he will be defeated if they do. We cannot allow our goods to be sunk in the Atlantic—we shall be beaten if they do. We must make our promise good to give aid to Britain. We must see the job through. All of this is needed for our own safety and our future security. This is our fight. The American people have recognized the catastrophic quality of a totalitarian victory and by overwhelming majority they have endorsed every step along the progress we have made to our present posture.

Proclaiming, as we do, our faith in the ultimate victory of the good over evil, our devotion to the cause of human liberty, our century and a half of the pursuit of justice between men on terms of equality, we can no longer occupy the immoral and craven position of asking others to make all the sacrifice for this victory which we recognize as so essential to us. Our manhood and our self-respect demand that we shall assume our part of the burden.

The Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 25, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE, OF MARYLAND

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by me on April 7, 1941, on the subject of the merchant marine.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For a few minutes I want to discuss several aspects of our merchant marine. What do we mean by our merchant marine? There probably are more opinions as to what it is than there were colors to Joseph's coat. Possibly no definition of the term would be quite satisfactory but I will refer to a few aspects of it. For instance, we know, naturally, that our merchant marine concerns primarily methods of transportation by water—not by land. We know it embraces really more than ships—the small ones as well as big ones. In its largest sense it includes men, organizations, policies, activities, and the many other elements which make the industry function.

The word "merchant" in the term "merchant marine" is somewhat misleading. The operations of the merchant marine are not, as we know, necessarily restricted to merchants and merchandising. Naturally, nearly every kind of industry might at times function with it.

Ordinarily, ships of a merchant marine are engaged in private commerce, but they may be used to help battleships or other forms of armed agencies whether on land, on water, or in the air. The merchant marine has duties, very important, in connection with our defense program. It is an invaluable adjunct in time of war. A navy, and often an army or air force would be practically impotent if it did not have as handmaidens, auxiliary vessels to carry troops, fuel, ammunition, and various other materials, and to assist in many other ways.

The United States approaches our present problem in ship construction and operation with historical precedents and helpful traditions in spite of serious mistakes at times. The history of our shipping is an interesting one.

The first immigrants to this country came by water. They were to a very considerable extent, especially in colonial days, a seafaring people. The water in many parts of the country in colonial United States was the chief means of transportation. This fact helped greatly in the development of our country in colonial days and in the conduct of the Revolutionary War. In the War of 1812 our Navy played a role much more effective than our Army. The people of Maryland furnished at least half of the American ships which fought in that war and as large a percentage of their crews. While Napoleon, like Hitler, was planning to invade England, his brother, Jerome Bonaparte, great grandfather of Charles J. Bonaparte, once Secretary of our Navy, married Betsy, the daughter of William Patterson, a big shipowner of Baltimore, whose operations carried him to the four corners of the earth.

Following the War of 1812 there was a dramatic and glorious development of our shipping. This was so in New England and along the Atlantic coast. The Baltimore clipper sailing vessels became known all over the world. *Anne McKim*, most famous of Baltimore clippers, had a world-wide reputation for speed, beauty, and efficiency which was richly deserved.

In those days there seemed to be no limit to the opportunities offered to American shipping industry, inland and on the seas. Canals were being built and soon in time began the industry of the great railroads.

This is not the place to dwell upon the glories of American shipping or the decline which came to it. Our shipping became relatively unimportant. Our exports and imports were more and more in foreign bottoms.

The World War brought us sharply to the realization of our grave lack of necessary ships. The necessity of building ships as

quickly as possible was acutely obvious. The result was a tremendous stimulation in the building of ships in America, mainly by the Federal Government, but from this program with all its energy, not a single new ship of ours reached the other side before the armistice. Vessels built in this country for the Allies did, but the vessels undertaken in the huge expansion program of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, did not.

After the World War our American shipping again began to fall into relative insignificance but later events demanded we again build ships. We did not ignore that need until the present war in Europe began. Before that we had taken steps to increase the number of American built and owned ships. For instance, in 1936 we passed legislation which launched us again upon a shipbuilding program.

In doing so we realized difficulties arising from the fact that other nations could construct and operate ships cheaper than we could. We tried then to solve this problem by providing for grants of money from the Federal Government to equalize the differences in cost of production and operation. This act of 1936 stated that this merchant marine, while providing shipping service on trade routes essential to our foreign commerce, should be "capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war of national emergency."

The Maritime Commission, created by that act, has reestablished our merchant fleet on a solid basis. There had been no new dry cargo ships built for foreign trade since 1922 until the *Donald McKay*, the Commission's first freighter, was launched at Chester, Pa., in April 1939.

Shipbuilding in the United States had reached a low ebb and there were only six building yards capable of constructing merchant ships. By 1941 the Maritime Commission had increased the merchant shipbuilding yards from 6 to 16. Instead of being located within a small area on the northeast Atlantic coast, these yards were spread over three coasts, the Atlantic, the Gulf, and the Pacific. In the Commission's long-range building program for the twin purposes of commerce and defense, 196 vessels have been started. Of those, 102 have been launched and all but 29 of those 102 completed, delivered, and now in operation.

These vessels are considered by naval architects and marine experts the finest of their type ever built. They have become well known everywhere, as the C-types; the C-1, a small but efficient freighter; the C-2, a medium-sized fast freighter with extraordinarily economical engines; and the C-3, the large, fast freight ship which also has been designed for carrying passengers.

Twenty-seven of these new vessels built by the Commission have already become naval auxiliaries. They have been acquired by the Navy for such diverse purposes as ammunition carriers, seaplane tenders, submarine tenders, and supply and repair vessels. Among the finest of the group are 12 19-knot tankers, the fastest of their kind in the world today. These ships were undertaken by the Commission at a time when normal, commercial tanker speeds were 10 to 11 knots. With the cooperation of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey these 12 ships were built and every one is now serving our naval forces.

To a battle fleet, tankers are a symbol of freedom of action. They mean that the fighting vessels will not be tied to their land bases. These 12 tankers will carry more than 72,000,000 gallons of oil at a speed which will enable them to keep up with the battle fleet. On the basis of the rate of fuel consumption of the battleship, they will enable vessels of our fighting fleet to steam a total of more than 800,000 nautical miles without putting in at a naval base.

The quickness with which these vessels were built and converted into naval auxiliaries testifies to the careful planning of the Maritime Commission's program. A complete understanding was had with the Navy Department from the inception of original building-plan basis of cooperation. Fortunately President Roosevelt appointed Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, former Chief Constructor of the Navy, as chairman of the Maritime Commission in 1938. That appointment has been a most fortunate one. Admiral Land and his associates on the Commission are justifying fully the confidence placed in them.

Designs for vessels were made with Navy needs in mind and were approved by the Navy. Gun locations, accessibility of cargo space and compartmentation were all planned for Navy use. The care which went into this designing and building is proving itself entirely warranted.

Also the value and the necessity of freighters and tankers to maintain the foreign commerce of the United States is beyond question. This fact has been demonstrated over and over again in normal peaceful times. It is being doubly proven at present when our American ships are bringing in load after load of rubber, tin, manganese, and other raw materials, which are being converted into instrumentalities of defense.

As chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee of the Senate Commerce Committee, I am in close touch with developments in the Commission's building program.. Recently the Commerce Committee of the Senate reported favorably on legislation which will further facilitate the building of first-class naval auxiliaries. That committee and the Maritime Commission believe in competitive bidding. However, The Army and Navy now want the negotiated-bid system for quick deliveries. The Maritime Commission has asked for similar authority and will doubtless get it, which will be used only when competitive bidding is apparently not feasible or sufficiently expeditious.

The United States is in a position to make effective use of sea power. Our battleships are supported by one of the largest merchant fleets in the world. This fleet aggregates more than 7,000,000 tons. More than 1,200 ships are engaged largely in domestic commerce. The American people more than any other people in the world use ships to transport goods from one portion of their country to another. The fleet of American ships sailing in foreign trade is also substantial. More than 300 vessels of various types are carrying the burdens of foreign commerce of the United States.

The United States in many respects is as well equipped as any other country to be self-sufficient. Some commodities essential to us must, however, be imported. No nation has ever really thrived which did not engage regularly in foreign trade. No isolationist today is going to claim that we can forego foreign trade without serious danger of stagnation.

In addition to our heavy imports, an important export movement is in our defense program. The Army has advised the Maritime Commission that more than one and one-half million tons of supplies must be moved to Army bases such as the Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines. The Navy lists more than 500,000 tons to be transported to naval bases. It is the job of our merchant marine to see that all of these materials are carried and carried quickly.

The Maritime Commission, which is operating the preference or priority system for ship cargoes, knows what must be moved for the Army, for the Navy, and for the Office of Production Management which is coordinating the needs of the defense-production program.

The Office of Production Management has determined the amount of imports which must be made during the calendar year 1941. Its list includes such obvious items as manganese and tungsten, also other items not generally realized as vital in the national emergency as for instance, teakwood for the decks of naval vessels, tanning materials, pulpwood for newsprint, sugar, and coffee.

The amounts of these and other important defense materials have been totalled and for the year 1941 reach the astonishing figure of more than 19,000,000 tons. On the basis of the average capacity of a freight ships, this represents approximately 2,500 shiploads of material which must be brought in during the calendar year from overseas.

Although we are not convoying our ships or sending them into war areas, we are exporting many articles of various kinds to certain nations, especially to Great Britain and its allies but these articles are carried in ships other than those belonging to the United States or its citizens.

The scope of war activities, ever broadening, is stressing the necessity for the use of materials which were practically unknown to warfare years ago. So the interpretation as to what is contraband of war has broadened so much that it includes now almost all kinds of fuels, metals, crops, manufactured or mechanized products, and other commodities of countless varieties.

Even before Mahan wrote his immortal book on the subject, it was realized that sea power is a controlling factor in the life of a nation. It is almost indispensable to the existence of a nation which is not an inland one, and all inland nations suffer for lack of its own channels for water transportation. The inability of Germany and her allies to use the seas freely during the World War was a grave and never-ending menace to them. Today, Germany, although having conquered much of Continental Europe is seriously restricted because of her very limited use of the Atlantic Ocean and the Mediterranean Sea. Although possessing the western coastline of Continental Europe, Germany is encountering trouble in efforts to secure certain metals or other commodities which she could easily get if the oceans were open to her. She suffers from a lack of prevailing sea power.

Sea power has a dual nature; it consists of war vessels which seize and hold the power; and merchant vessels which use the power. Yet the sea power of the battleship and airplane would be useless if not accompanied by the sea power of the merchant fleet. The effectiveness of British resistance in this war has lain largely in its ability to use successfully the seas as a source of strength.

We have, as you know, transferred ships to Great Britain and her allies. More than 200 American ships with a gross tonnage of more than 750,000 have gone to them. These ships have been of priceless value to the British in her efforts to keep sea lanes open. Five millions of tons of shipping through hostile sinkings have occurred it is said.

The additional number which may be transferred is a matter for the President to determine under the terms of the so-called lease-lend bill.

The 3,000 or more miles of water which separate us from the continents of Europe and Asia have been and will remain invaluable in helping to protect us from aggression. However, everyone knows that certain modern methods of warfare, as exemplified by the airplane and the submarine, have lessened materially the security which these oceans afford us. We have recently acquired naval and aviation bases, in some cases hundreds of miles from the boundaries of the United States. Modern methods of defense require

such stations. To safeguard our own shores we must go many miles beyond them to secure and use naval and aviation bases. Do not forget, however, that these naval and aviation bases would be of little use to us if the oceans of the world were dominated by a combination of naval powers hostile to us. It is needless to add also that the Monroe Doctrine in its friendly developments of cooperation among the republics of North and South America would be outmoded.

The vessels now in the American merchant marine are being used steadily. Likewise, there are reservoirs of ships such as those in use in coastwise and intercoastal trade which could be tapped in case of need.

The 212 ships announced by the President are in addition to the 200 emergency ships already under construction, the 60 ships now building in American yards for the British, and the 124 vessels of the Maritime Commission's regular long-range program.

Our Government has undertaken the building of 300 simple, slow, but efficient freighters. They have been called "ugly ducklings." The name is certainly not flattering but these ducklings will doubtless do their job well. These ships will cost considerably less than the ships of the Government's regular long-range building program. They will be capable of mass production on a prefabrication basis.

Engines, machinery, navigation, equipment, and supplies will be acquired from plants all over the country. These will be shipped to the building yards at tidewater and there assembled. Seven new shipyards are now being built to assemble these parts into finished ships. The Maritime Commission is handling this program which is going ahead steadily.

As far as possible new facilities will be created and materials for the ships acquired without interference with defense production for the Army and Navy. Ships will be built at Baltimore in a new shipyard on Curtis Bay. They will also be constructed in Wilmington, N. C., in Mobile, New Orleans, and Houston; likewise on the Pacific coast in Portland and Los Angeles. In every case these new shipyards will be sponsored by existing well-established shipbuilding organizations. This arrangement justifies confidence as to rapid construction and workmanlike product.

One hundred and twelve of these newly authorized ships are to be of the "ugly duckling" type and the remainder of standard designs of the Maritime Commission, including C-type cargo ships and tankers. This will be done by expanding existing yards on all three coasts. This means a shipbuilding program of great magnitude. But it is a program which our experts in the Commission are confident can be accomplished.

What about the operations of the vessels which this country owns? Are they being used in the interest of the United States as a whole rather than that of a few shipowners? The answer undoubtedly is "yes." Shipowners of the United States have voluntarily coordinated the operations of their vessels through the Maritime Commission which has created a Division of Emergency Shipping headed by experienced ship operators, to see that American vessels are used with the highest efficiency obtainable.

In normal times American ship lines operate as individual business enterprises. They carry cargo available on their own trade route only. As a result ships are not always used to capacity in normal times. Nowadays ships are being rerouted and reassigned to carry strategic materials to this country and supplies to our defense bases.

As an example, ships bring copper ore from the west coast of South America to the port of Baltimore. Then they used to discharge and return in ballast to Chile. In normal times this would be a shipping operation sufficient to meet cargo conditions. Recently the Maritime Commission arranged for certain ore carriers, instead of returning in ballast after discharging their cargo, to proceed from Baltimore to New York and there take on a load of supplies and equipment for our enlarged Army posts in the Canal Zone. After delivering these materials in the Canal Zone, the vessels again go to the west coast of South America to pick up copper ore.

By this means the carrying value of those ships to the country has been almost doubled. It is believed that this voluntary cooperation between the shipowners and the Government will be sufficient to insure suitable and adequate movement of the materials which are essential to our defense program.

Strikes by labor have not seriously interfered with the construction of our ships. It is imperative in our defense program that such delays should not occur. Occasionally sabotage is suggested as a danger to our shipbuilding and ship-operating activities. We know that such crimes would anger the American people as few other offenses could do and would meet with summary and severe punishment.

You will recall that the President of the United States, in a recent speech, quoted certain well-known lines from Longfellow, which begin:

"Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State!
Sail on, O Union, strong and great!"

He was using the word "Ship," of course, in a figurative sense as referring to this Government of ours and these United States. Especially in these days it is pertinent to emphasize the vital importance of "Ship" in its material or normal sense. We have the need to strive for peace—to take such steps by way of preparedness as seem possible to protect this country from the horrors of war on this continent. We are creating a big army and providing military training for civilians. We are building ships of war. We are developing an airplane industry immeasurably greater than was contemplated even a year or so ago. We are trying to do effectively the things in industry which are needed to meet dislocations in our agricultural, industrial, and general economic life caused by war conditions.

We have the will and the purpose to try to reckon with the harrowing conditions existing in the world by taking such steps as seem necessary for our welfare. Our efforts will be grossly inadequate if we do not have suitable and adequate facilities for transportation and defense upon the water. Our "Ship of State" cannot "sail on" unless we have in addition to many other things, necessary vessels and other craft of wood and steel.

Award Dinner of National Traffic Safety Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 25, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. HAROLD H. BURTON, OF OHIO

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, several evenings ago I was a guest at the Mayflower Hotel at the annual convention of the National Safety Council. At that time it was my privilege and pleasure to listen to a most able address delivered by our colleague the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] which provided me with much information regarding the Nation's Capital and the general traffic situation in America. I requested permission of him to ask the Senate that this very excellent and timely address be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I now make that request.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Never before has traffic safety been so vital to the welfare of our Nation.

Every community represented here feels the steadily increasing traffic.

The Nation is on the march. Our battle of production and transportation is reaching our highways. Our traffic problems are part of our defense program. The casualties suffered are as tragic and real as any on a battlefield.

The responsibility for meeting the rising traffic problem of today falls upon public officials and safety leaders, such as are met here. You and they must lead the way to traffic safety.

The protection of life and property on American streets and highways has become primarily an official function. It is an especial privilege to meet with you as the leaders in this field of human and governmental endeavor and to congratulate you upon your work, well done in 1940.

The problem of 1941 is even more grave. Many cities already have seen its effect in increased fatality records in the first few weeks of the year. It is my deep conviction as a public official, speaking to other public officials, and based upon my experience of 5 years as mayor of Cleveland, that if you but lead the way the people will be willing and glad to support every intelligent traffic-safety effort. They are more anxious to do it than most of us even yet imagine.

As I was reminded when asked to speak here tonight, it was my privilege in this room two years ago to receive the National Safety Council's award for the city of Cleveland. One year ago that award again went to Cleveland.

It is a privilege to join here tonight in recognizing the progress of the city of Washington, and to congratulate it upon winning first place in 1940. At the same time, on behalf of the city of Cleveland, I wish also to express appreciation of the honorable mention it received from the National Safety Council for its continued safety program in 1940.

I have been asked to say a word as to how the program of strict enforcement and of emphasis on traffic safety was received in Cleveland, and especially to comment as to whether or not there was a hostile reaction to traffic arrests and insistence upon payment of traffic fines.

It is my pleasure to report that the people of Cleveland responded cordially and enthusiastically to these policies, as being policies for their benefit. Public sentiment at every point has sustained the traffic safety program. The people have made the program their own. They have taken pride in it. The public relations bureau of the Division of Police of Cleveland has been a most important factor in bringing about this cooperation.

In Cleveland an overwhelming majority of the people have shown themselves to be strongly in favor of and proud of steps taken to reduce fatalities, to reduce injuries, to secure reduction of liability insurance premiums, to improve traffic facilities, to improve the standards of driving, to better the safety records of public utility and commercial vehicles in competition with one another, to establish safety records for the respective wards of the city in competition with one another,

and to improve the fairness and the universal enforcement of the law against all offenders without favoritism.

Among the greatest influences moving the American public are those to protect their children and aged from injury * * * to earn deserved recognition in competition between groups or wards or cities * * * to receive cash dividends for civic virtue in the form of reduced insurance premiums, and to know that the law is enforced with even-handed justice for the benefit of all, with privileges to none.

Insofar as public approval of a city administration at the polls may measure approval of any one of the many policies which jointly make up the record of a city administration, I am glad to testify that the vote in our municipal elections reflected strong support for, rather than opposition to, the traffic-safety program that had won national recognition.

It is especially fitting that we congratulate Washington upon winning first place in its division. And, with your indulgence, I should like to devote most of my remaining remarks to the conditions, and how we all can derive universal Nation-wide benefit from the traffic needs of Washington.

I do this with full appreciation of the remarkably fine achievements of the grand award winners among both States and cities who perhaps can lay claim to even greater prestige than Washington. But I select Washington for three reasons:

First. Because we all have a share in it and a pride in it as our Capital;

Second. Because it is facing extraordinary increases in its volume of traffic; and

Third. Because with proper Federal understanding of the opportunity, I believe it can become a traffic-demonstration city of great value to all of us as well as to itself.

It is the natural traffic-safety capital of America. Its recent traffic achievements provide an extraordinary opportunity to make it a primary national asset to the cause of traffic safety.

All Americans take a deep, natural interest in Washington. They feel differently toward it than toward any other city. It is exclusively their National Capital. The want it to be the incarnation of their ideals. They want it to be the most perfect city in the world. The beauty of its public buildings, memorials, and parks is an inspiration to all Americans.

The interest and pride of the Nation in Washington, however, is not limited to its public buildings, memorials, and parks, or even to the Federal Government as administered there. The interest and pride of the Nation extends to the whole city, because it is distinctively the Nation's own Capital City.

In contrast to every State capital, and, as far as I know, in contrast to every other national capital, the city of Washington has been created by and is governed by its National Government. To a degree greater than is generally understood the people of America for 150 years, through their National Government, have created, planned, developed, and governed the entire community of Washington. The National Government has direct responsibility not only for the Federal buildings and Federal business in Washington, but also for the local government and welfare of the people living there, down to and including the traffic regulations and stop lights on the street corners.

As a technical legal matter, there is no city of Washington. Washington is merely an appropriate and convenient name for the community that occupies the District of Columbia. The Constitution of the United States provides that: "The Congress shall have power * * * To exercise exclusively legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States * * *" (art. I, sec. 8, clause 17).

Today the District of Columbia consists of about 70 square miles, of which about 10 are under water. This area was ceded to the Federal Government by the State of Maryland.

It is independent of any State or local government. It is controlled entirely by Federal legislation. Washington is the eleventh city in the United States in population and it is the center of a metropolitan area of about 1,000,000 people. It is about the size of Pittsburgh.

Residents of the District do not vote for either Federal or local officials.

The executive authority of the District is vested in three Commissioners. These are appointed by the President of the United States. One must be an officer of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, who is detailed to that duty by the President. They have broad administrative powers. The legislative authority, however, remains in the Congress of the United States, which operates largely upon the recommendations of the Senate and House of Representatives Committees on the District of Columbia.

The judges of the local courts, even of the police court, having jurisdiction over traffic violations, are appointed by the President of the United States.

There is no State or county government. The District of Columbia exercises, itself, the functions usually found in State, county, and city governments, including the government of the schools.

The funds for the government of the District are appropriated and its taxes are imposed by Congress with the approval of the President.

Recognizing the large amount of tax-free land owned and occupied by the Federal Government, and recognizing the countless ways in which the life of the community is adjusted to serve the Federal Government, the Congress appropriates, in its discretion, a sum from national taxation to help meet the needs of the District.

The District is almost exclusively a residential community. There are substantially no manufacturing industries within or near it. The principal employments of its residents are those of service in Federal departments and those relating to the care of transient visitors. These activities have developed large commercial enterprises well suited to a metropolitan community of substantially a million people. These characteristics also produce a high proportion of motor vehicles in relation to the residential population.

This presents a completely unique situation on traffic control. Although traffic safety in Washington, as everywhere else, is a vital concern of the permanent residents of Washington, who are subjected daily to its risks as motorists and pedestrians, the ultimate legal responsibility for its regulation rests not upon them, but rather, in the last analysis, upon the people of the United States as a whole, speaking through their Congress and their President.

This unique relationship has certain advantages and disadvantages. It also suggests an extraordinary and appropriate opportunity to make of Washington a unique national asset in the cause of traffic safety—both for its own benefit and that of the Nation.

Consideration is being given to various measures that may grant to local residents a more direct share in the responsibility for the government of the District. Whatever decisions are reached on those proposals will not affect my suggestions of this evening.

I wish to capitalize upon the additional opportunity which exists in Washington to make use of the advantages of Federal interest in the city, whatever may be the form of the local government.

As it stands today, the Federal Government not only has the opportunity to render a great national service here, but because of its complete control of local governmental policies, it has a full responsibility of deciding whether or not to act.

Among the special advantages which Washington enjoys from the traffic standpoint are the following:

First. Washington is by far the largest planned city in America. While its outlying neighborhoods have grown up in an irregular manner, not unlike those of other cities, its central area is an outstanding example of carefully thought-out long-term planning. The Nation and the community are indebted beyond measure to President George Washington and Maj. Pierre Charles L'Enfant, and to their successors, who appropriately located the future points of interest, provided for extensive parks and ornamental spaces, for regular city blocks, and for broad avenues connecting all important parts and entrances to the city.

Second. Washington has benefited from continuing programs of planned development. While Washington has suffered from time to time from failure to carry on a continuing plan of development, it has had in recent years the benefit of highly competent advisers especially assigned to its planning. The result has been the restriction of maximum heights of buildings in proportion to the width of adjacent streets; competent approval of the design of monuments, governmental buildings, and even of private structures adjacent to certain governmental areas; the establishment of zoning regulations; and the recent preparation of regional plans for the metropolitan areas surrounding the original city.

Third. Washington has a radial system of avenues, with many circles and squares at intersections. These were inserted as contributions to the beauty and accessibility of the city. They have helped to handle efficiently a far greater volume of traffic at far greater speeds than was anticipated. While they probably postponed the crisis in traffic in Washington, yet they have not been able to prevent congestion under modern conditions.

Fourth. Washington has an unusual concentration of administrative, legislative, and judicial control in the hands of a single system. This is in contrast to the usual separation of these functions between the State, county, city, and school governments. On the other hand, this consolidated control has been placed in the hands of the Federal Government, which, in turn, has so many other interests that it is difficult to secure sustained personal attention to the traffic and many other local needs of the District by the Federal officials having final jurisdiction over these questions. The District administration also is complicated by the fact that the National Capital Parks Service of the Department of the Interior rather than the Commissioners of the District has sole jurisdiction over all parks and reservations in the District, even in the center of the city and however small.

Fifth. Washington has separated its government from local politics and elections. This has been done, however, by placing the ultimate control in the hands of elected Federal officials who are elected and who will be reelected or defeated on issues having no relation to the District and by the votes of people knowing nothing of the needs of the District.

Sixth. Washington, theoretically, has available the relatively unlimited Federal resources for financing its needs. This is in sharp contrast with the rigid legal limitations usually restricting municipal, county, and State financing. Here again, however, a lack of personal familiarity by the Congress with the

local needs of the District has largely destroyed the apparent high value of this relation to the Federal Treasury.

Seventh. Washington has good weather. Washington generally is free from the hazards of extended severe winter weather, coupled with those of steep and icy streets. Washington does, however, have highly changeable weather, probably resulting in a more general attempt to drive in dangerous weather than is the case in cities where such conditions are long continued.

Because of such advantages there has been some suggestion that Washington should be an utopia of local self-government and traffic regulation. Such a suggestion comes readily from a casual consideration of its broad, straight streets, its freedom from the political pressures of local politics, and its apparent access to Federal financial resources. This, however, is the same kind of observation that makes a neighbor's field look greener than one's own, because the neighbor's field is seen only from the side and at a distance, while one's own is seen from the very midst of its imperfections. In fact, Washington faces such handicaps in its traffic regulation that its success in winning first place among the large cities in the national traffic safety contest is a substantial tribute to the District officials who made this possible.

It is the very presence of certain handicaps in Washington, coupled with opportunities for overcoming them, that makes Washington so valuable as a point of national demonstration.

Some of the special difficulties facing traffic in Washington are the following:

First. The many broad avenues intersecting the entire city diagonally to an unusual degree create many acute angles and other intersection difficulties. These call for unusual engineering solutions in the form of circles, special routing, traffic lights, underpasses, improved street lighting, and pedestrian regulation. For example, at Dupont Circle, in a crowded apartment-house area, there are 10 street entrances or exits from a single traffic circle, to say nothing of the presence of street cars swinging to the left against the normal flow of motor traffic.

Second. Many of the monumental parks and squares cause unnecessary congestion, requiring special treatment.

Third. Public transportation: The streets carry street cars, busses, and great numbers of taxicabs. The proper regulation of the fares, competition, speed, and safety standards of these vehicles is a major necessity.

Fourth. The beautiful trees heavily lining the sides of certain avenues increase the street lighting problem, especially in the summer. The breadth of the avenues themselves also make this problem one of especial importance, plus the fact that there is a large Negro population which increases the hazards from poor lighting.

Fifth. Parking is difficult. Much of the city was built with no provision for parking on private property and without space for later construction of garages. The width of some streets has permitted unusual freedom of parking, but the increasing use of apartment houses and automobiles and the need of parking near points of public assembly or of employment call for constructive planning to meet this need.

Sixth. Diplomatic immunities exist to an exceptional degree. Certain treaties exempt persons connected with foreign embassies or legations from prosecution, in the usual manner, even for traffic violations. Related to the problems of diplomatic immunities is that arising from the great number of public officials in Washington, engaged in important public business and who, in the interests of the public, need every possible privilege to permit them to carry out their governmental assignments quickly.

Seventh. Washington has concentrated rush hours. While Washington does not have an industrial population creating congestion during changes of industrial shifts, it has an extraordinarily large number of Government office employees, creating congestion when going to or returning from their offices. It is an ideal place to test the efficiency of staggering office hours, as has been recently ordered.

Eighth. Washington is full of transients. These include not only tourists driving through the city, but many people who come for a few days or months on official business from all parts of the Nation or world. They bring with them their local driving habits and have little opportunity to learn Washington rules. Out of about 250,000 motor vehicles on the streets of the District each day, over 80,000 are from the adjoining States outside of the District, and about 9,000 others are from more distant places. This makes it especially necessary in Washington that every traffic solution be as obvious and easily understood as possible.

Ninth. Freeways: While freeways would be a welcome solution of many traffic problems in such a community, the structure of the city, the absence of undeveloped areas, and the wide distribution of the many points of interest of business make it especially difficult to establish freeways. This calls for a high degree of engineering skill in developing such freeways as are possible and for careful routing of one-way traffic.

Tenth. Public interest: One of the greatest difficulties in meeting traffic problems in Washington has been that of maintaining a keen continuous public interest in safety standards and in carrying on a continuous public educational program. This difficulty is due, in part, to the many visitors who do not feel responsible for community standards; in part to public officials who regard themselves as entitled to special traffic privileges; and to the difficulty of securing public attention to matters of local concern in a community that is engrossed in the consideration of international and national events.

Washington thus presents traffic problems common to the Nation, but in many ways, under conditions making them especially difficult of solution. The successful solution of them in Washington, under these circumstances, would all the more readily point the way to their easier solution elsewhere.

There is also a natural incentive from the point of view of national interest and national pride for the Nation to insist upon the best solution of these problems in Washington, so that the Nation may find in such solutions a reflection of the Nation's best thought and experience.

The natural opportunity for experimentation and demonstration at the Nation's Capital, if properly seized upon, will attract the Nation's best traffic engineering skill. The opportunity for national demonstration also justifies the expenditure of whatever funds may be needed to concentrate such experience in something in the nature of a national traffic research bureau dealing with concrete problems of the District. The present highway planning survey being conducted in cooperation with the United States Public Roads Administration by District authorities covering highway planning, parking, and traffic within the District of Columbia is a step in this direction.

The availability of adequate Federal resources would make possible not only research into but demonstration of the most modern engineering solutions. In view of the resulting savings to numberless local communities, the result should be one of widespread constructive economy.

The National Capital is the natural place not only for such leadership to originate for the benefit of the Nation but also a natural place from which to distribute information of the progress made. Not only is Washington easily publicized because of wide interest in the Nation's Capital but there are constantly gathered there leaders of thought who naturally assume leadership in transmitting to their home communities their personal experiences with the handling of traffic in Washington.

Safety of traffic enters so much into the personal life of nearly everyone that it is certain that progress in highway planning, street ligting, traffic engineering, traffic routing, policing, etc., will be reported from Washington quickly throughout the Nation.

The presence in Washington of numerous public agencies having a related interest in road traffic, such as the Public Roads Administration, Highway Research Board, National Park Service, and many others, again suggests the reasonableness of making Washington and its environs a national center of traffic study and demonstration.

While there are special difficulties in developing and sustaining a general program of public traffic education in Washington, these very difficulties emphasize the need for special study of such a program. No safety program can reach full success without the constant and cooperative effort of all the people concerned to promote public safety.

A safety minded community, with a marked interest in safety, extending from the highest official to the neediest pedestrian and the smallest school child, is the best guaranty of safety. Where there are many strangers, the local residents need all the more to set them a good example and to find means of calling the safety program to their attention.

As possibly offsetting this handicap of strangers, Washington offers one opportunity for an educational program that exceeds anything like it in any other city of America. This is the opportunity for a constant, cordial, well-planned safety education campaign, under the leadership of the President, among the Federal employees who make up such a large part of the Washington population. The value of such a program to the employees themselves as well as to the community, is clear.

With all these elements in mind, there is an extraordinary opportunity now open to the people of the city of Washington, to the Nation, and to the National Safety Council which springs from the award that Washington has earned for itself and is receiving tonight. Having attained in 1940 first rank among the large cities of the Nation, Washington has a priceless opportunity to capitalize upon the psychology involved in winning this rank. Attainment of this rating is one of the greatest single encouragements for continued safety practice and advancement that can come to any community.

This award should be the occasion in Washington, as well as in every other winning city, for an immediate and enlarged educational safety campaign. It also should be the occasion for the Federal Government and the National Safety Council to recognize this excellent start made by the people and officials of the District, toward realizing upon the natural opportunity for Washington to become the traffic safety capital of America.

Traffic safety is an administrative, rather than a legislative, problem. There is no law that can be passed to solve it fully or permanently. It is, however, a subject of great public concern. Improved roads and increased traffic safety mean large public dividends in lives saved, tragic injuries avoided, property damage prevented, liability-insurance premiums reduced, and time saved in countless ways. Improved and safe highways, inside, between, and arcund cities are important both for commerce and for na-

tional defense. Improved traffic safety is a public service that is economical, valuable, and popular.

Speaking concretely, I venture to suggest that the National Safety Council would be well justified in assigning to a special committee, familiar both with the national and the local aspects of the problem, the responsibility of submitting a recommendation to the President and Congress of the United States and to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, a thoroughgoing and continuing study and control of the traffic of Washington. This would develop here, solutions of immediate value to the people of Washington, of immediate value to the Federal officials and employees serving in Washington, of immediate value to every tourist and visitor to Washington, and of ultimate value to every metropolitan city in America.

It would be the duty of such committee of the National Safety Council, in the preparation of its report, to consult with all Federal and District officials concerned and, if some such plan be found feasible, to recommend not merely its objectives, but the necessary form of organization needed to make it effective as a continuing governmental agency.

The officials of Washington, by winning first place in the National Traffic Safety Contest among the large cities of America, have earned the right to be recognized as competent to serve the Nation, as well as the District. The officials of the Nation will do well to seize this opportunity to develop a new plan of constructive value in this field of traffic safety which involves the finances, the safety and the lives of the people of all America.

Now, as never before, America needs leadership in its effort to increase traffic safety. You who are here tonight have demonstrated your leadership in this field. America is grateful not only for your service but for the examples you have set. Civic agencies, State and local governmental officials, and as I have suggested tonight, the Federal Government itself, will do well to follow your example. Traffic safety is an everlasting economic and human responsibility of great local and national concern.

The Congressional Mail Bag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 25, 1941

RADIO DISCUSSION BY A GROUP OF SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the radio discussion participated in by a group of Senators and Representatives on April 24, 1941. The discussion was held in connection with the program, Congressional Mail Bag, devoted to a discussion of congressional problems.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Speakers: Senator Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire; Senator Clyde Herring, of Iowa; Representative James Wadsworth, of New York; Representative Harry B. Coffee of Nebraska, and Royce Powell, Committee of Americans]

ANNOUNCER. In these times of world-wide stress and pressing domestic problems, what are Mr. and Mrs. America thinking? What better way to find out, than to see what they are writing to their Senators and Representatives in Washington? The National Broadcasting Co. brings you a program presented by the Committee of Americans which has been interpreting public opinion since 1935 based on canvasses of hundreds of thousands of its members. Tonight the Committee of Americans will open the Congressional mailbag to obtain a picture of what the folks back home are thinking—as mirrored in their letters to the Seventy-seventh Congress. Presiding over the letter opening is Mr. Royce Powell, of the Committee of Americans.

Mr. POWELL. This is Royce Powell in Washington, about to open the Congressional Mailbag. Tonight we have with us four Members of the Seventy-seventh Congress who will tell you about their daily mail and answer—I hope—a few questions. With us here in the studio are Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican of New Hampshire; Representative HARRY B. COFFEE, Democrat of Nebraska; Representative JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Republican of New York State, and Senator CLYDE L. HERRING, of Iowa. Before going any further, I would like to ask one of these gentlemen his opinion about this mail from back home. Mr. WADSWORTH, you've served in both Houses of Congress and over a period of some 20 years do you not consider the Congressman's daily mail a pretty good barometer of the public temper?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do, indeed, Mr. Powell, These letters are of vital importance to Congress as a guide to the people's wishes even though these wishes may vary with the sectional interests of the part of the country from which they come. Of course, there is a part of our mail which obviously has taken longer to write than we will take to read it. But I will have something to say about that later, if I may.

Mr. POWELL. Thank you, Congressman WADSWORTH. And now for the opening of the Congressional Mail Bag. We will pick at random from typical letters recently received on Capitol Hill from the States of New Hampshire, New York, Nebraska, and Iowa. Senator BRIDGES, what are New Englanders from your State writing to you about?

Senator BRIDGES. My mail varies, like that of my colleagues in both Houses and of both parties, with the changing news front. Right now people back home are extremely concerned with the strike situation in defense plants. Secondly, I would say their interest has to do with the mounting costs of the emergency, and thirdly, with matters that peculiarly affect our part of the country.

Mr. POWELL. Such as—?

Senator BRIDGES. Well, such as, the proposed development of the St. Lawrence waterway and power development. First, let me read you a few excerpts from the mail dealing with the labor situation. Here's a typical, hand-written letter from a small businessman with two sons registered under the draft. I quote: "It is with very righteous indignation that I ask you gentlemen of Congress to see to it that there are no more strikes in plants which are engaged upon Government orders for munitions * * * more needed now than soldiers."

Mr. POWELL. If I may break in a second, Senator BRIDGES, I would like to ask whether the bulk of your mail in this line is mainly from men or women?

Senator BRIDGES. Probably 60 percent is from men. However, women are becoming increasingly vocal politically in matters that affect the general welfare. Here, for instance, is a letter from a mother who feels very seriously about the strike situation because she herself is making immediate sacrifices and ready to make more when the pay-up day comes along. It's a bit long. Shall I read it, Mr. Powell?

Mr. POWELL. Please do, Senator.

Senator BRIDGES. This letter is from a woman back home whose son has just been drafted. I quote:

"DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: As one of the folks back home, I am writing to tell you that I feel terrible about the strikes that are going on all over the country.

"If there is a national emergency—and I guess there must be, because one of my boys has already been called into the Army and another one expects to go in a few weeks—I think that the men who run the factories and the workingmen of the country should get together and cooperate. My boy is serving his country as a soldier for a dollar a day, while the men who are supposed to be building the guns and airplanes and ships that the United States needs so badly are getting a dollar an hour, and I don't think they are being patriotic when they go out on needless strikes. I think something should be done to stop them from putting us all in danger like that, because when they stop working it means we have to wait that much longer before we will be safe, and it's going to be long enough as it is.

"The people back here are pretty sick of seeing labor racketeers and Communists and Nazis doing everything they can to make a mess of the defense program. We think it's time something was done about it and an end put to all of these strikes."

Mr. POWELL. That's quite a letter, Senator BRIDGES. Would you say it's typical? That is, is it representative of New England public opinion?

Senator BRIDGES. I would say so emphatically. Also, I happen to know the town where this woman lives and a little about her.

Mr. POWELL. Incidentally, have you answered the letter, Senator?

Senator BRIDGES. No; but I'm going to right now, and I hope the writer is listening in. My answer is that I agree with her, generally speaking, * * * that in this troubled time when we have such need for national unity and for hard work on the part of every person, cooperation between management and labor is highly essential. If we are going to be strong enough to defend ourselves against the dictator outlaw nations, then it is absolutely necessary that our defense program be pushed forward without interruption by uncalled-for strikes or any other cause. In answering this woman's letter on the strike problem, I should like to make myself thoroughly clear and state that we on Capitol Hill have no quarrel with the large rank and file of workingmen and employers who are real Americans. But something has got to be done to get rid of the fifth columnists who are seeking to deny us security today and over the years by bringing about some of these unwarranted strikes in the principal defense industries of the country.

Mr. POWELL. Thank you, Senator BRIDGES. If I may interrupt for a moment I would like

to ask a Midwest Democrat, Representative COFFEE, whether his mail, like the New England Senator's, is equally denunciatory of strikes.

Mr. COFFEE. Yes; it is and presently I would like to read you some excerpts from it.

Mr. POWELL. Very good, Mr. COFFEE. And while we are on the subject, I would just briefly like to ask Democratic Senator HERRING, of Iowa, and Republican Congressman WADSWORTH, of New York, whether their mails also reflect an impatience on the part of the public with the strike situation. Senator HERRING, what do you find?

Senator HERRING. Mr. Powell, the majority of those writing to me express a growing resentment at the number of strikes in defense industries, particularly those strikes which have been called over purely jurisdictional matters, or where the labor-union officials have attempted to turn the defense industries into collection agencies for union dues.

The demands for wage increases are no doubt in some instances just, but for the most part the people of Iowa feel that this is a crisis in which all of us not only should be willing, but should be required to make some sacrifices. They realize that every wage increase means an additional burden upon the taxpayers, which is no more fair to them than it is to the boys whom we are asking to accept $30 per month for the time spent in military training under the selective service. The greatest tragedy of the whole situation lies in the loss of man-hours, which cannot be retrieved, and which it is now clear was the very extravagance primarily responsible for the downfall of France and the inadequate preparedness of Great Britain.

The people of Iowa are determined that we shall not make the same tragic blunder.

Mr. POWELL. And Mr. WADSWORTH, what say your constituents?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I won't go into it in any detail but I must say that a few misguided people must have misinterpreted the old proverb about "striking" while the iron is hot. And if you don't think so, you ought to read a few hot letters from some cool young men who have joined the "Union," but not the union we hear so much about.

Mr. POWELL. Well, gentlemen, you may be of opposite parties and from various parts of the country, but apparently you represent a unanimity of opinion. We will want to hear more about this, but first I want to ask Senator BRIDGES another question, and it has to do with what the Senator described as matters which peculiarly affect certain sectional interests. In this connection, Senator, you mentioned the perennially proposed St. Lawrence waterway and power project.

Senator BRIDGES. Yes; I did. But I would like to say this proposal for developing a series of canals and channels from the Great Lakes through the St. Lawrence River to the sea only seems sectional. Its fulfillment would have a far-reaching national consequence, although the people up my way, naturally, view it from the standpoint of local interest. Here is a letter typical of the feeling against the proposed St. Lawrence waterway. It is from a worker in a railroad roundhouse and it contains a very amusing postscript. Perhaps I should read that part first. After urging me to vote against any appropriation for the project, this railroad worker says, and I quote: "Say, incidentally, what ever became of the Florida ship canal?" Now, shall I read the full letter?

Mr. POWELL. By all means, Senator.

Senator BRIDGES. "Dear Senator BRIDGES: I don't often write to our Congressmen and Senators, but, frankly, Senator, I'm kind of steamed up about this St. Lawrence waterway and power project that the President is trying to push through.

"You know what the story is as well as I do. The President has always wanted that project put through; and even though the people don't want it and the Congress wouldn't approve the treaty a few years ago, he seems bound to keep on trying.

"He says it would mean a lot to the ordinary people. He's right. Take me, for instance. I'm an ordinary citizen; I work in a railroad roundhouse. We've been having a pretty hard time, but things look a little brighter now, and I don't want any more hardships like the St. Lawrence waterway put on the railroads. It would put me and thousands more like me out of work; and, frankly, Senator, we ordinary people don't like the relief rolls. Another thing, Senator, the St. Lawrence waterway and power project just can't take that national-defense label. That wouldn't make sense. It won't be finished till 1947 or 1948."

I acknowledged this letter and told the man I agreed with his protest. But I would like to add something to my letter. It is this: If the St. Lawrence project should be completed at the taxpayers expense, thousands of workers throughout the United States employed by established transportation system and shipyards would lose their jobs. The seaway would be used almost exclusively by vessels flying foreign flags and manned by alien seamen. Wages that are today being paid to American workmen would be paid to foreign labor and would be spent for the upkeep of foreign homes. We have enough unemployment in normal times without spending the taxpayers' money to throw more men out of work. We have reason to believe that if the project were to be approved the cost would be about a billion dollars before the job would be fully completed. There is no need for such an expenditure, for our established ports have the capacity necessary for the defense program, and the existing electric companies are expanding to meet the demands of the present emergency and the future.

Mr. POWELL. But do you agree with the letter writer that the proposed waterway does not come under a defense classification?

Senator BRIDGES. I most certainly do because I doubt whether it could be finished and in operation before 1948. Further, it is just another step toward the elimination of private enterprise. This is a very troubled time through which we are passing, and we need to concentrate all available men and materials and money upon the building of ships and guns and tanks and airplanes. Those are the materials we would need if attacked and those are the materials that Great Britain and her allies need in defending themselves against the dictator outlaw nations.

Mr. POWELL. Thank you, Senator BRIDGES. We have just dipped into the mail of Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, and heard his comments upon it. Let us now open the mail bag from Nebraska, and hear from Representative HARRY B. COFFEE. You said awhile ago, Mr. COFFEE, that your part of the country is as resentful of heedless strikes as are the people in New England.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. That is correct, Mr. Powell. While I represent a large agricultural district and most of the mail concerns the farm problem, it is now very evident that the rural areas are growing extremely bitter toward the labor racketeers. Here are a few excerpts from letters taken at random from my files.

This one is from Chadron, Nebr.: "Can national unity be achieved by asking part of the Nation's population to shoulder all the sacrifices by permitting another segment to fatten off those sacrifices, to grow and entrench their positions at the cost of national safety by the use of strikes in defense industries?"

Here is another from Sidney, Nebr.: "How much longer do we Americans have to wait until Congress eliminates this communistic control of our rearmament program?"

This next comes from Mitchell, Nebr.: "The people in this country are very much burned up about the way some labor agitators are slowing up war-material production. We realize there is not much that you men representing rural areas can do about it."

A letter from Omaha states: "Most people are convinced that the rank and file of union men are not in favor of this practice, but, of course, it is a field day for the organizers and racketeers many of whom are not citizens of the United States. Many are 'fifth columnists'." This correspondent suggests Congress enact legislation requiring a cooling-off period of 30 days before any strike can be called in any defense industry.

I quote from this letter from Alliance, Nebr.: "Are grossest selfishness and greed to dominate the union leaders while the rest of the country is making the supreme effort for the Nation's welfare? Must the people and the Government stand helpless before a small group of disloyal men? Let us keep the union if we can—but let us keep America first.

Mr. POWELL. One of your correspondents urged that Congress enact legislation requiring a cooling-off period of 30 days before it would be permissible to call a strike. Does not that refer to the Vinson bill, Mr. COFFEE?

Mr. COFFEE. Yes; the Vinson bill will come before the House, I expect, next week, and I predict its passage in the House.

Mr. POWELL. Do you consider this a drastic bill, Mr. COFFEE?

Mr. COFFEE. No. It is merely a step in that direction. Recently, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, HATTON SUMNERS, wrote the Secretaries of Labor, War, Navy, and the Attorney General, asking what new legislation, if any, was needed to cope with the strike situation in our defense industries. Surprisingly enough, the replies were that no new legislation was needed.

Mr. POWELL. In face of this, what is Congress likely to do, Mr. COFFEE?

Mr. COFFEE. Aside from action on the Vinson bill, Congress may defer taking any drastic action until the executive departments, which must administer and enforce the laws, recommend some remedial legislation, or—and I emphasize this—until it is evident they are unable to cope with the situation. And if and when Congress does take severe action it will know the public is solidly behind it. The people of this country are not in any mood to temporize with either racketeers or profiteers. They are willing to pay the price for national defense but they want to know they are getting national defense for their money.

Mr. POWELL. Do you believe, as some of your people back home have stated, that the Communists are to a large degree to blame for present labor unrest?

Mr. COFFEE. Yes; the Communists are the best organized of any of the subversive elements in this country. They have wormed their way into key positions, especially in the C. I. O. unions, in our national-defense industries. I am fearful if we don't find a way soon to stop these communistic labor racketeers, we may lose our democracy at home while trying to preserve it abroad. The rank and file of organized labor are loyal and patriotic citizens, and it is up to them to purge their own organizations of communistic labor leaders if they want to avoid drastic labor legislation.

Mr. POWELL. Thank you, Mr. Coffee; that was very interesting. What else are people concerned about out your way in connection with the defense picture?

Mr. COFFEE. Well, as much as Nebraskans are committed to our huge defense program, they are fearful of our getting into war through the convoying of vessels into the war zone. I would say 95 percent of my letters protest against convoying British ships.

Mr. POWELL. And what answer do you make to these convoy protests?

Mr. COFFEE. My position and blanket answer is that I am definitely opposed to the

use of American vessels as convoys. In my opinion it will be the final step involving this Nation in the war.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Coffee, I understand you are a member of the House Agricultural Committee and that you were recently elected head of the so-called sugar bloc in the House.

Mr. COFFEE. That is correct, Mr. Powell.

Mr. POWELL. Well, in that connection do you get any mail from consumers who a short while ago feared a sugar shortage?

Mr. COFFEE. Yes; but mostly these letters are not from my district of the West.

Mr. POWELL. That's all right. Let's hear about it anyway.

Mr. COFFEE. Here in the East I find the consumers are apparently very fearful that we may have a sugar shortage with runaway prices similar to what happened in the World War days when sugar sold for 25 cents a pound. There can be little justification for these fears at the present time. We are not as dependent for our supply on offshore areas now as we were during the last war. At present the domestic sugar-beet processors have on hand several hundred thousand tons of beet sugar that was produced in excess of their market quota under the law.

Mr. POWELL. Thank you, Mr. COFFEE. In other words, as long as we have coffee, we'll have sugar.

Mr. COFFEE. If you mean that impersonally; yes. But the important thing to remember is that, given the opportunity, the beet-sugar grower of America can stave off any emergency that may confront the consumer.

Mr. POWELL. And now what about the mail from New York State. I would like to call on Representative JAMES W. WADSWORTH.

If you were summarizing your most recent mail, what would you say was a predominant note in it?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Well, Mr. Powell, I would say the mail, despite reflecting a belief in spending for defense, also reflects an intelligent concern about the fiscal policies of the Government. And apparently the public no longer regards finance and taxes as a dry, dull subject. A great many writers view with general alarm the piling up of our huge national debt.

Mr. POWELL. But that doesn't mean——

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; it doesn't. Mind you, these people are not opposed, as I said, to the national-defense program—in fact all of them support it—but they think it is being very unwisely financed. They express their dread that when this international situation is cleaned up our debt will be so great, and the dislocation of industry so severe, that we shall plunge into a terrible economic collapse.

Mr. POWELL. How do these writers think such a depression can be averted, or, let's say, cushioned?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They are very realistic. They urge more taxing and less borrowing. They admit that heavier taxes are going to be tough on everybody, but they insist that it would be better for us to suffer the hardship for the present than to pursue a course which will bring a gigantic catastrophe later on. Many correspondents propose new or altered methods of taxation.

Mr. POWELL. Are any of the writers at all specific?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Some of them; yes. Here's a letter that reminds me that Canada, which, considering her population and wealth, is carrying on a wartime expenditure far in excess, proportionately, than is the United States in its defense program—that Canada is raising 60 percent of the cost by taxation, where we are raising only about 50 percent of expenditures through taxes.

Mr. POWELL. In other words, there seems to be a tendency on the part of many to say, "Let's have the bad news now and not live in a fool's paradise." Well, it looks as though the so-called bad news has been handed out.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes, Mr. Powell; the announcement of the Treasury that we will have to raise three and a half billion dollars in new taxes is part of the day of reckoning.

Mr. POWELL. How do you think the public will take it?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Judging from my mail, and that of my colleagues, the country at large will not whimper. But the people will watch to see how it is spent. Americans are not pinchpenny but they have a critical facility of asking, "Why." I, consequently, must agree with Senator BRIDGES about the spending of a billion dollars or a half-billion on any doubtful and nonessential project such as the St. Lawrence waterway. When this measure gets to Congress, I predict a flood of mail that will wash this administration "pet" into limbo.

Mr. POWELL. That's very interesting, Mr. WADSWORTH. Incidentally, could you tell us something about the volumes of mail received by you and your colleagues?

Mr. WADSWORTH. You mean in general or at the present time?

Mr. POWELL. Well, both ways.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Actually the total amount of mail, in volume and weight, received by any of us on the Hill is staggering. Right now, in comparison to the lend-lease days, the volume of letters has fallen off considerably.

Mr. POWELL. I suppose the next peak will develop when the new Revenue Act for 1941 gets into the news.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I wouldn't wonder. But between these peaks and valleys of real earnest letter writing on the part of our constituents back home, there is constant and enormous flood of pamphlets, bulletins, and all sorts of printed matter. We get marked copies of magazines of every kind and description, marked copies of daily newspapers and weekly newspapers. A very large number of civic, industrial, professional, scientific, and labor organizations put out publications of their own. We even get mimeographed copies of circular letters. We get bound volumes on economic, social, and military questions, most of them 200 pages in length.

Mr. POWELL. I would rather suppose, Mr. WADSWORTH, this would require a little reading between the lines.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Indeed it does. If I should do nothing but read for 24 hours a day, I could not hope to keep up with this mass of literature. But the mail which we can identify as coming from back home gets our first attention.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Wadsworth, while it is true that you represent a rural district in western New York, not directly interested in the problems of industry and finance, perhaps you get something in the mail about those things, not only from your district but from other parts of the country. How about it?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; the fact is, I have even invited correspondence on this subject of late and it is coming in heavily. You see, one of our troubles for the past 6 or 7 years has been that new capital is not flowing into industry. When industry does not expand, unemployment increases. There is a tremendous sum of idle money piled up in the banks, money belonging to depositors. It is obvious that if it could be put to work in industry we would not have as many idle men. Idle men and idle money go together. So I have had correspondence with a great many people who have had experience in trying to finance the expansion of industry through sale of securities.

Mr. POWELL. May we assume, Mr. Wadsworth, that this correspondence is partly responsible for the new legislation which you have drawn up calling for modification of the procedures of the Securities and Exchange Commission * * * that is, the S. E. C.?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes, Mr. Powell. The information I have gotten through this correspondence has led me to propose some amendments to the securities laws to make it easier, especially to the small manufacturer, to arrange for the selling of his securities to the public. This correspondence has convinced me that in some respects our security laws are far too severe, and that some of the regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission impose such a heavy expense upon these businesses that they simply do not attempt to look for the idle dollars.

Mr. POWELL. You might say, then, Mr. Wadsworth, that these dollars have been scared out of their cents or something.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I wouldn't know about that, Mr. Powell, but these dollars which should have been productive have gone into hiding, and I am hoping that we can relieve the situation with appropriate legislation without in any way opening up the door to fraudulent practices. To my mind this whole incident, which grew out of letter writing between the people and their chosen representatives, demonstrates how valuable well-considered letters can be.

Mr. POWELL. Well, thank you, Mr. WADSWORTH, for it appears from Nation-wide newspaper comment that your proposed legislation affecting the S. E. C. will have far-reaching consequences. And now to hear from Senator CLYDE HERRING, a Democrat, of Iowa, and former Governor of that State. Senator HERRING, when you look into your daily mail, what do you see?

Senator HERRING. When I look into my daily mail I do not see a United States mailbag or a rural free delivery box or even a mail carrier making his faithful rounds. Rather I see in my daily mail the earnest, sincere faces of the men and the women who open their hearts to me and strive to be helpful by their counsel and their willingness to serve in this critical emergency.

They realize that upon these shores democracy has reared the great tabernacle of the faiths of all humanity—faith in God, faith in liberty and freedom and justice, faith in the ability of the people to govern themselves.

They recognize that there are forces unloosed in the Old World which seek to make of God a fugitive, and which would, if they could, destroy freedom's last citadel. Instead of striving to create and perpetuate the values which civilization has prized, these forces of evil seek to reduce to rubble, not alone the historic landmarks which have stood through the centuries but they seek to destroy the very soul of humanity itself and the principles of godliness and justice upon which our institutions of democracy and freedom are so surely founded.

They know the forces of democracy are striving against unparalleled odds to hold the line in Europe, whilst we in the United States endeavor to create an arsenal sufficiently great to provide for their needs, as well as our own.

The majority of my people, viewing the world situation realistically, have taken a new resolve that our Democracy shall stand.

My mail reflects an almost complete unanimity among the people of Iowa in support of our defense program. They are aware that our efforts to prepare should have been started 2 or 3 years ago. They want it carried forward with the utmost dispatch and cooperation.

The following excerpt from the letter of an Iowa packer is typical, and I may add, most encouraging:

"It is hardly necessary for the writer to state that he is a keen admirer of the stand you are taking on international affairs and only wishes your attitude were unanimous in the Congress."

Mr. POWELL. But tell me, Senator HERRING, what do your people write you about convoying?

Senator HERRING. Mr. Powell, the opinion is divided, as is to be expected. The majority

I believe favor action consonant with the demands of the situation. A representative view is expressed by a lawyer from Mason City:

"In my way of looking at things, we should be sufficiently realistic not to deceive ourselves into thinking that we can avoid the effects of the gigantic struggle going on in the world by attempting to shut ourselves up behind a wall of isolation. So far as my own attitude is concerned, I look at the question in this way. Since we have adopted the policy that the safety of America requires the success of the British and other peoples fighting nazi-ism, we may well, because of the necessities requiring America to be protected, ultimately have to use our naval, military, and air strength to insure the defeat of the Nazis. If that means war, we should have, as Americans, the same courage that other generations in the past have had when they faced the same issues."

Mr. POWELL. Well, no one can say that this mid-westerner is an isolationist.

Senator HERRING. Our people on the whole are practical. They are not going to appropriate vast sums of money to provide war materials for the nations fighting to hold back the forces which threaten to engulf us, without having the wisdom and courage to meet the question of how to get the material over there, if that becomes necessary. At the present time, grave as is the news, I do not believe that convoying is required, but no one can say what may be demanded of us tomorrow.

Mr. POWELL. What is the attitude of your boys toward the draft?

Senator HERRING. Naturally, at first there were some protests and objections, particularly from young men who were just starting in what they hoped would be their life's career, but when it became evident that the act was to be fairly and justly applied to all who came within its terms, this opposition disappeared, and many have written me asking assistance to be placed in the service; particularly is that true of those who have served as Reserve officers or who have previously served in the National Guard. It is difficult to explain to these men who are physically qualified, trained, and experienced why Army regulations will not permit them to again take up service for their country. The following letter from a young lawyer in Des Moines is typical:

"I have repeatedly attempted to renew my commission in the Cavalry Reserve so that I could be receiving training for the mobilization which without doubt will be coming within a very short time."

This young man, like my own sons and countless others, stands ready to do his part. They are not unmindful either of the enormous sacrifices which they may ultimately be called upon to make.

Mr. POWELL. From what you say, Senator HERRING, I would gather that Iowa's young men are ready for whatever comes.

Senator HERRING. Yes, my mail reveals that the patriotic spirit of the people of Iowa is such that we could, if desired, recruit a voluntary Army.

The people of Iowa realize that only through complete national unity and unprecedented cooperation in every phase of our national life can we hope to meet the forces which threaten us with destruction.

They have implicit faith in our ability to meet this crisis, but they entertain no illusions. They recognize that the greatest weapon in Hitler's hands is the unity of the German people—obtained by duress to be sure, but nevertheless effective.

They realized that we must have complete national unity, arrived at by common consent, if this Nation and its free institutions are to survive. They are determined that unity shall prevail and that this democracy shall be preserved.

Mr. POWELL. Senator HERRING, from what your mail has to tell, I would say that the Middle West is thoroughly aroused about this country's peril.

Senator HERRING. It certainly is and should be.

Mr. POWELL. Senator BRIDGES, you indicate you would like the floor. We recognize the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Senator BRIDGES. Mr. Powell, I would like to turn this forum about face for a moment and ask you a question.

Mr. POWELL. O. K., Senator; fire away.

Senator BRIDGES. While we on Capitol Hill are thoroughly familiar with the good work of the Committee of Americans in spreading the gospel of prudent spending and taxation, how does the committee feel about the present big spending program?

Mr. POWELL. Senator, the committee is 100 percent for the defense program but it is also in accord with the general tenor of the mail here this evening, namely, that we have billions for defense but not one cent for frills.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa, Senator HERRING.

Senator HERRING. May I take this occasion to express to you, Mr. Powell, my thanks for the outstanding work which the Committee of Americans has undertaken in bringing about a clearer understanding and a greater appreciation of our Democratic institutions of free government.

Mr. POWELL. That is very kind of you, Senator. And on behalf of the committee's chairman, Dean Roscoe Pound, its president, Berkley Thomas, and their associates, I wish to thank all of you here tonight for making possible this unique program, the Congressional Mailbag.

There being no further business before the Senate and House, the Congressional Mailbag stands adjourned. Good night all.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the fellow who invented "all aid short of war" had less than a woman's accuracy for distance.

There will be no slackening of the flow of supplies to Great Britain.—F. D. R. That must mean convoys.

For us to enter this war over there now would be to gamble the life of America on a bet that England will win.

It took George Washington 8 years to get us out of the British Empire. Now, after another 8 years we are nearly back in.

Shakespeare and Hitler had birthdays this week. Is the pen mightier than the sword? We still think so, in the long run.

As the coal strike is allowed to thicken, the morale of the people is lowered to where they are wondering if we could whip even the Portuguese.

The Vinson cooling-off bill to regulate labor will be frozen in the Capitol before it gets hot enough to get to the White House.

In the old days when breaking wild horses from Wyoming it was common to put buckshot fishline sinkers in their ears when they balked. A thought for some similar treatment of defense strike leaders.

At a recent departmental birthday banquet the British Jack was displayed between two of the Stars and Stripes as they closed with the national anthem. The usual soprano of my Mrs. choked.

Lincoln said, "That part of the earth's surface which is owned and inhabited by the United States is well adapted to be the home of one national family and is not well adapted for two or more."

The Lewis and Clark Expedition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN THOMAS

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 25, 1941

ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Richard L. Neuberger entitled "Our Greatest Exploration," published in the Reader's Digest. The article gives a splendid account of the Lewis and Clark expedition, which secured the Northwest country for the United States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Reader's Digest]

OUR GREATEST EXPLORATION

(Condensed from the American Legion magazine)

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

From St. Louis, the edge of American civilization, Sgt. John Ordway, of the United States Army, wrote to his father and mother in New Hampshire: "Honored parents, I am now on an expedition to the westward with Captain Lewis and Lieutenant Clark, who are appointed by President Jefferson to go through the interior of North America. We are to ascend the Missouri River and then go by land to the great western ocean."

A courier went through the camp collecting such messages from men who were not sure they would ever be heard from again. Then, late on the rainy afternoon of May 14, 1804, the 29 members of the party embarked in 2 long, trim rowboats and a 55-foot bargelike bateau. They were voyaging into the unknown.

At St. Louis geography ended and myth began. The Indians whispered of the Shining or Rocky Mountains that scraped the sky. Was this merely one of their legends? Jefferson, when Minister to France, had heard mariners who sailed with Captain Cook on his Pacific voyages describe evergreen forests as boundless as the oceans and peaks high as the Alps, to be seen on America's western shore. Were their tales true? Jefferson's lively imagination had been fired and thenceforward he dreamed of sending brave men to "explore the great wilderness beyond the Mississippi and form a line of communication from sea to sea."

As soon as his envoys had bought from Napoleon for $15,000,000 the million square miles of territory that France claimed on the sundown side of the Mississippi, Jefferson asked Congress for $2,500 to finance its exploration. "And let us search out even that which lies beyond," he urged.

To lead the expedition the President selected his private secretary, 29-year-old Meriwether Lewis, believing that this young Army captain had a determination that nothing could conquer. Such a man was needed; there might be more than dangers of the wilderness to face and temptation: to turn back might be many. A race for empire was in prospect, for the British were talking of sending men to hoist the Union Jack at the mouth of the Columbia.

Jefferson suggested that Lewis select an alternative commander and Lewis named his best friend, William Clark, a 34-year-old artillery lieutenant.

They were in strong contrast. Lewis's thin countenance, with defiant jaw and slate-gray eyes, had an eagle-like intensity. He was taciturn, almost gloomy. Clark, red-headed, red-faced, was never stern or silent. His cheerful chatter often had revived the spirits of troops weary on the march. He liked to dodge officers' mess to eat with the men; he hailed colonels and corporals alike by their first names. He got along with Indians better than anyone else in the Army, possibly because he treated them as equals.

Clark went from post to post on the frontier, asking picked men if they wanted to plant their country's flag on the western ocean. Lewis arranged for supplies, which included presents for the Indians—mirrors, red cloth, needles, beads, calico shirts.

Men picked for the journey were enlisted in the Army at $10 a month for privates, $15 for the three sergeants, $80 each for Lewis and Clark, and as a bonus they were promised parcels of land. Whether any of them would survive to enjoy these rewards was doubtful. Their eventual destination was so indefinite that Jefferson gave them papers bespeaking the good offices of "our consuls in Batavia, in Java, and at the Cape of Good Hope."

As they rowed up the sluggish Missouri, under the flag with 15 stars, the party was a cross section of the expanding Nation. The oldest was Patrick Gass, 33; the youngest, John Colter, was 16. Alongside Kentuckians chosen for their woodcraft, were hunters from Virginia, farmers from Vermont, carpenters from Pennsylvania. There were Irishmen, Scots, Dutchmen, and Frenchmen. Near Lieutenant Clark in the first boat crouched his brawny Negro servant, York.

The explorers had not gone far before they realized that the map the President had supplied was useless; it did not even indicate the correct direction of the river. All they could do was to follow the Missouri to its source. From there dead reckoning might take them to the sea.

For the first few months it was an idyllic journey—comfortable camps at night, days uneventful save for sightseeing. By firelight the two leaders worked painstakingly on their journals, for the President and Congress wanted complete reports on plants, trees, beasts, birds, and Indians. One evening Lewis wrote: "In addition to the common deer, which were in great abundance, we saw goats, elk, buffalo, antelope, blacktailed deer and large wolves." They counted 52 herds of bison in one day.

Three months out of St. Louis, the adventurers had voyaged 850 miles and were not far from what is now Sioux City in Iowa. The going got harder. The clumsy bateau repeatedly lurched aground on sandbars. One man collapsed from sunstroke. Sgt. Charles Floyd died of colic in the choking heat of an August afternoon. They buried him on a high bluff, the first American soldier to die west of the Mississippi. The boats went on, the men silent, Lewis wrapped in thought. A man dead, many sick, the real perils just begun.

That night, instead of appointing a new sergeant, Lewis told the men themselves to elect a successor to Floyd. Amid much oratory three soldiers were nominated. Grizzled Patrick Gass was chosen. Next morning the party took to the boats with renewed zeal; Lewis had turned the men's minds from brooding over the loss of their companion.

Misadventures multiplied. Nineteen-year-old George Shannon, on scout duty, got lost and almost starved. A riverbank crumbled and nearly destroyed the precious supplies. Lewis, habitually scouting ahead, had several narrow escapes from stampeding buffalo.

Most of the Indians they met were friendly, grunting with pleasure over trinkets and delighted with whisky dealt out in judicious doses. Whenever possible, chiefs of nearby tribes were summoned to pow-wows under a sailcloth canopy, the flag flying, and told about the Great White Father in Washington to whom they now owed loyalty. Council Bluffs takes its name from one of these pow-wows.

A lazy half-breed, Toussaint Charbonneau, interpreted. The party had picked him up along the route. With him was his 19-year-old Indian wife, Sacajawea, slender in figure, with long braids and dark eyes. Six years before she had been stolen from the Shoshones by marauding braves, and Charbonneau had won her in a gambling bout. A woman on the expedition? Lewis and Clark had hesitated, but they desperately needed Charbonneau. Besides, Sacajawea's tribe was said to dwell beyond the high mountains. Maybe this Indian girl would know the way.

Meadows and prairies gave way to rolling hills, the hills stiffened into plateaus. But the horizons still were land. Where did it end? Where was the western ocean?

The first heavy snows fell in November, trapping the party near the site of Bismarck, N. Dak. In the half year they had made 1,600 miles, all up the Missouri. A few traders had been thus far, but no white man had ever gone farther. They built a stockade, calling it Fort Mandan for the friendly Mandan Indians, and here during the long, dreary winter a baby boy was born to Sacajawea.

April 7, 1805, the last ice having drifted down the river, Fort Mandan was left behind. So was the bateau, too big for the narrowing Missouri and no longer needed for the dwindling supplies. Six canoes made of buffalo hides and willow branches took its place.

The country grew wilder, the landscape less hospitable. Mosquitoes and gnats were a curse. Buffalo were scarce and, without buffalo hide for patching, clothes and moccasins began to shred.

But the ragged frontiersmen now were unlocking the secrets of the continent. They came upon huge, ferocious grizzly bears that it took half a dozen musket balls to kill. They spent weeks of back-breaking toil portaging goods and boats past thundering cataracts which they called the Great Falls of the Missouri. And on May 26, a Sunday, Lewis, who had been scouting ahead as usual, came back to camp excited. He had glimpsed majestic mountains.

Independence Day, 1805, was celebrated at the foot of the Rockies, 2,500 miles and 14 months from St. Louis. Wistfully they drank the last of their brandy. Other supplies, too, were running low. Lewis wrote in his journal: "We all believe that we are about to enter upon the most perilous part of our voyage."

Only the Indian girl, her baby strapped to her back, had the vaguest notion where they were. From out of the memories of her childhood Sacajawea recognized a creek at which her people had collected clay for painting their war parties. When the dwindling Missouri abruptly forked into three branches her memory again helped. She sent them up the swiftest fork, which they named Jefferson River.

The stream twisted through a labyrinth of volcanic walls at which it clawed with white-capped talons. Sometimes the boats upset and their loads were swept downstream. The men waded through the glacier-fed water, pulling their leaky craft on long ropes, for they could not walk on the steep banks. "The men by being constantly wet are becoming more feeble," the captain noted. Sharp stones cut to pieces what remained of their moccasins and drops of blood flecked the stream. They had journeyed as close to the crest of the continent as water would take them. Wherever they looked the skyline was a jagged row of pinnacles, "mountains piled on mountains," such peaks as Americans never had seen. Each ridge surmounted brought a glimpse of a ridge higher still. Eventually they reached the region where now Montana joins Idaho, where the Rockies and the Bitter Root Mountains run parallel in a vast maze. Lewis sent scouts scattering to find some way across. They came back baffled, four of them nursing injuries from falls.

By now Lewis realized that he must find the Shoshones or give up the expedition. His fatigued men could not drag themselves over those summits, let alone carry burdens; they must have horses. Rations were low and they could not survive a Rocky Mountain winter. Soon the snows would start and it would be too late even to go back. They had not seen an Indian for 4 months though Sacajawea insisted that she twice had seen the smoke signals of her people.

Lewis chose three men and pushed on ahead. Every morning when they broke camp they left beads and mirrors as tokens of friendliness to any Indians who might stumble onto the dead fires. At last, ragged and exhausted, they crawled to the top of a high ridge and looked down the Pacific slope of the Rockies. Here, on the Continental Divide, they unfurled the flag. They had two pounds of flour left.

As Chief Cameahwait and 60 mounted Shoshone braves jogged over the crest of Lemhi Pass late in the afternoon of August 13, they saw tottering toward them a tall, ragged stranger with pale skin. In his right hand he carried a cloth of red, white, and blue. Half a hundred paces to the rear were 3 other strangers with long black sticks.

"Tabba bone (white man)," the hollow-eyed stranger said.

"Ah hi e (I am much pleased)," the young chief replied gravely. There on the roof of the continent the feathered savage and the Virginia gentleman embraced and slapped each other on the back.

Game had been scarce that year, and the Shoshones were hungry, yet they shared with the white men. The captain's pulse quickened when the chief offered him roast salmon—salmon from the sea.

Lewis bartered ornaments, coats, blankets, and knives for 38 horses, which were sent back to bring up the main party. A dramatic incident marked the reunion of the two parties. Sacajawea, meeting Cameahwait, greeted him with affectionate cries. They were brother and sister. Nevertheless, when the party went on, Sacajawea chose to stick with her husband rather than return to her people.

A withered old Shoshone, whom Clark christened Toby, volunteered to act as guide. He was not much help. They wandered in the Bitter Root Range like men in a rock-bound fortress, while snow began to plug the passes. Provisions ran out. They had to kill some of the horses, which were starving, too, with ground bare of fodder. One day there

was only a brace of pheasants for 32 mouths to eat. They scraped the bed of Hungry Creek for crawfish; they grubbed for roots. One wretched night they ate a timber wolf Lewis shot. Lewis gave up his mount to one of the men and struggled ahead on foot. A horse loaded with winter coats slipped, screamed in terror, and vanished over a precipice.

Finally they reached open country. They looked like skeletons, and now even the inexorable driver, Lewis, collapsed. While he lay ill beside the Clearwater River, the others trimmed pine logs and burned out the cores to shape rude canoes. The work was hard for exhausted men and it went slowly.

In the canoes they floated down the Clearwater and into the Snake, at the spot where Lewiston, Idaho, stands. They paddled down the Snake and about the middle of October came to a mighty river which surged out of the north and bent westward. This was the Columbia, the "Great River Oregon," which for two generations adventurous souls had dreamed of exploring.

For three weeks more they stroked the bulky canoes between mountains and grassy meadows and fir forests. One quiet night a soldier heard a far-off roar. Soon long swells rolled up the river from downstream. Gulls flew overhead. The water was full of salmon. There was a tang of salt in the air.

Fog cloaked the Columbia on the morning of November 7, 1805, but around noon it cleared and in the distance a wide expanse of tossing breakers was visible. For a moment the men looked out to sea in silence. Then they cheered. In his queerly spelled diary Clark scrawled: "Ocian in view! Oh, the joy! We are in view of the ocian, that great ocian which we have been so long anxious to see!"

For the first time Americans had spanned the continent they would one day inhabit from coast to coast. On that lonely shore, the flag flapping at his back, Captain Lewis thanked the soldiers in behalf of President Jefferson. They had reached their goal ahead of any nation with rival ambitions, covering 4,100 adventurous miles in a year and a half. Just 125 years later one could board a plane at St. Louis after daybreak and be in Portland before dark.

Near present-day Astoria the expedition built a stockade, Fort Clatsop, that sheltered them during the second winter, and in the bark of a tall pine that overlooked the sea Lieutenant Clark carved this record:

Wm. Clark December 3d
1805 by land from the U.
States in 1804 & 5

Late in March of 1806 the expedition began the long trek homeward. It required only a third of the time consumed in traveling west, for now they had landmarks. Again Sacajawea was invaluable, riding at the head of the column with Lewis, unerringly pointing the way. "She has equal fortitude and resolution with any member of the party," Lewis wrote. They arrived in St. Louis on September 23, 1806, 6 months to the day after abandoning Fort Clatsop.

The Nation had given them up for dead. They had been gone 2 years and 4 months. Cheering crowds escorted them through St. Louis. Jefferson wrote his congratulations and triumphantly informed Congress of the expedition's success. They had traveled 8,000 miles through the wilderness, had reached their objective and returned, had lost only one man. People were amazed by the information brought back: Fierce bears which weighed 1,000 pounds, mountain ranges three times as lofty as the Alleghenies, buffalo herds measured by horizons, wild sheep with horns shaped like cornucopias, goats that leaped from crag to crag. The New York Gazette predicted that the region would probably never be traveled through again, but President Jefferson visioned "a great, free, and independent empire on the Columbia River."

The Lewis and Clark Expedition still stands as the most important ever undertaken by the United States, clinching our title not only to the vast Louisiana Territory but later to the Oregon lands as well.

Lewis was appointed Governor of Louisiana and Clark was named Indian agent for the region and promoted to the rank of brigadier general. Lewis, always a lonely man, was unhappy in political office. In the autumn of 1809, on his way to Washington to answer criticism of his administrative methods, he stopped for a night at an inn near Nashville, Tenn. Shortly after midnight a pistol shot waked the household, and the tavern-keeper found the 35-year-old explorer on the floor with a gaping wound in his side. He died at dawn. Jefferson, stunned with grief, always believed the captain had committed suicide. Tennessee folk maintained that he had been murdered. The mystery has never been satisfactorily solved.

Not far from where Lewis died a granite shaft stands, graven with the words of the President who sent him westward:

"His courage was undaunted. His firmness and perseverence yielded to nothing but impossibility."

Trees overhang the grave, and on stormy nights the wind roars through them like breakers crashing on the Pacific's distant shore.

Hemisphere Solidarity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 25, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM WILMINGTON (N. C.) DAILY NEWS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Members of this body to an editorial entitled "Hemisphere Solidarity," which I clipped several evenings ago from the editorial columns of the Wilmington Daily News, a newspaper published in my State at Wilmington, N. C., and edited by Mr. Rye Page. The editorial relates to that most important subject in which we are all vitally interested, namely, the subject of bringing about American solidarity among the peoples of North, South, and Central America.

In that connection, Mr. President, several afternoons ago I had the pleasure and honor of meeting for the first time Mr. Nelson Rockefeller, who was designated by the President to bring about, as far as possible, friendly relations between the 125,000,000 people to the south of the Rio Grande and the population of our country. I was tremendously impressed by Mr. Rockefeller. I had heard many complimentary things concerning the work he is doing for my Government. Therefore I was more than happy to have the opportunity of meeting him; and I wish publicly to congratulate our Government upon having in its service a young man of his type and energy, who seems to be thoroughly familiar with the problems with which we in the Western Hemisphere are confronted.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wilmington (N. C.) Daily News]

HEMISPHERE SOLIDARITY

Practical evidence of a new hemisphere solidarity has been given by two events in 48 hours. Conclusion of negotiations for a defense agreement between Mexico and the United States providing for reciprocal use of air fields and bases is, of course, a matter of major importance. It opens up for American military planes a land route from this country to the Panama Canal with the right to use Mexican fields for repairs and refueling. This will be a great convenience in getting short-range interceptor and pursuit planes to the vital Canal area in time of emergency.

At the same time the action which numerous countries in Central and South America have taken against German and Italian shipping in their harbors offers additional evidence that these countries are acting in close concord with the United States.

All of these nations have the same interest in seizing vessels in their harbors as the United States. They are short of shipping, as we are, and could make good use of idle vessels. And the constant possibility of sabotage has made the ships a potential and in some cases an immediate menace to port facilities.

But it was no easy matter for these countries, almost powerless in a military sense, to risk an affront to Germany and Italy. Many of the nations, in addition, have large and influential Nazi and Fascist population groups. It is only lately, under American encouragement, that an attempt has been made to throw off the economic domination which the Axis has exerted.

The mere fact that so many of these countries are now following American leadership and looking to this country to set the example is an encouraging fact. Since we have made ourselves responsible for their defense there is every reason we should expect cooperation. But it is only by slow steps and under the pressure of events abroad that we are gradually attaining the kind of solidarity which will make that defense a feasible undertaking.

Editorial from Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 25, 1941

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD an editorial appearing in the April 22 edition of Labor entitled "This Will Make You Feel Better."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS WILL MAKE YOU FEEL BETTER

If you are inclined to think the world is going on the rocks and the human race is reverting to savagery, read the following:

Two years ago in Philadelphia, Benjamin Mason, a Negro on relief, and his wife, Pearl,

scraped together $2.50 and bought a ticket in the Irish Sweepstakes. They won a prize of $150,000. Of course, they were flabbergasted by this good luck, but what do you think they did with the money?

They invested $100,000 in a slum-clearance project, the first of its kind to be privately financed in the vicinity of Philadelphia, and borrowed an additional $50,000. This week the building was completed, and tenants began moving in. There are 50 apartments, modern in every way, including air conditioning; in addition there are lawns and a fountain, play rooms in the basement for children, a gymnasium and bowling alley, a reception hall for social affairs and a chapel for religious services. Rents are $30 a month for three-room apartments and $39 for five rooms.

It's a good business proposition says the Philadelphia Housing Authority, and Mason remarks: "I am glad to be able to do something for my people."

That he has the "right stuff" in him is demonstrated by the fact that as soon as the money came in from Ireland, Mason returned to Uncle Sam the $3,000 he had received as relief.

Yes; the world is in a bad way, but the situation isn't hopless so long as among us are men like Mason, whatever their race or color may be.

Propaganda, Then and Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN THOMAS

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 25, 1941

ARTICLE BY VARDIS FISHER

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Vardis Fisher, published in the April 20 edition of the Idaho Sunday Statesman, entitled "Propaganda, Then and Now."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Idaho Sunday Statesman of April 20, 1941]

PROPAGANDA, THEN AND NOW

(By Vardis Fisher)

The past week has seen events which seem to have amazed official Washington; and two glib, pontificating "experts" whom I heard on the Chicago Round Table just after Germany invaded Yugoslavia must be silent today. It appears that the English can make the Italians run, but that Churchill's boys are also good at long-distance sprinting when the Germans get after them. It should at last be clear to our war enthusiasts that the Germans have a war machine led by ruthless and very competent gents who know exactly what they're doing. Our President has given a pledge to destroy Hitler. In the last week I hope he has been looking at his hole card.

It seems, too, that this Nation, according to the polls, is ready to be taxed senseless, but is not ready to fight. The President's job now is to get it ready. Propaganda will do that job. In the last war propaganda for American consumption would have outraged the intelligence of an Australian bushman, but we swallowed it by the yard. The Germans were represented to us in the news and cartoons as ogres and ghouls and fiends. We were told that they had committed every atrocity that history has recorded. They despoiled everybody except the great-grandmothers, they lopped the arms off children for the sadistic fun of it, and they fried their enemies to render out the lard. There was nothing the paid liars could think of that was not spread across the front pages.

We learned afterward that we had been infamously duped, and propaganda today is, in consequence, much subtler. They can't tell us now that the enemy is melting the fat of Belgian kidneys to lubricate their war machine. We're too smart to believe that, but we're not smart enough to see through the more sophisticated hokum they're giving us. Still, even though the propaganda is pretty adroit and sly this time, much of it is as easy to read as the wrinkles in an old face.

Let's start off with that paragon of blood and sweat and tears named Winston Churchill. He is, in plain truth, the mouthpiece and right-hand Johnny of that gang of parasitic and fox-chasing Tories who rule England and are asking us to keep England safe for the foxes. On the basis of his utterances in the past, he has no more sympathy for democracy than I have for communism; but right now he is blessing it and leading it toward kindly light because he knows that Americans love democracy next to chewing gum. His tall, gaunt, and cold-blooded "yes man" over here—the fox-hunting Lord Halifax—was recently given a big spread in the New York Times. He was quoted as saying: "We say that we are fighting for freedom and democracy." Well, he just about has to say that if he wants our help. He also said that India "has grown in an atmosphere of freedom and has developed the principle and practice of self-government." He expects everybody to believe that who knows nothing about India, and I suppose everybody will.

What did Churchill and Halifax say before they needed our help? What did they do? Why, bless you, his lordship, known as Lord Irwin when he was Viceroy of India, so enthusiastically approved an atmosphere of freedom in that land that he threw a hundred thousand Indians into jail at one time; and of the Lord's devotion to democracy, Churchill had this to say January 30, 1931: "This Viceroy has had to enact more repressive measures and inflict more punishments and make greater curtailments of liberty and imprison more thousands of people than has ever happened before in India."

Churchill didn't like Halifax in those days but don't think he was mad because democracy was having a tough time in India. On December 12, 1930, he had said: "The truth is that Ghandi-ism and all it stands for will, sooner or later, have to be grappled with and finally crushed. It is no use trying to satisfy a tiger by feeding him cat's meat."

Poor Ghandi! What a ferocious and devouring tiger he is and has been. But what Mr. Churchill really had in mind was England's investment of $7,800,000,000 in India, and the dividends of $900,000,000 sent back home to the fox hunters. Sir James Grigg, a member of the Government of India, has recently said that the average per capita income in India today is a daily wage of from a penny to a penny and a quarter. It is well known to those who know anything about India that there are tens of thousands of slaves who toil on an average of 12 years to get out of a debt imposed on them by their enslavers, and earn for themselves about 9 cents a year in pound exchange.

When I looked at the Christian kindliness in Lord Halifax's face and then read of his profound and passionate interest in democracy, I just broke down and bawled. When, further down the column, I came upon his brave words that India has for years grown in an atmosphere of freedom and has developed the practice of self-government, I could have hugged Winnie Churchill for sending so noble a man to enlist our aid. I should have known long ago that Ghandi, sitting around in a bed sheet and living on a handful of nothing, was hiding a man-eating tiger behind that saintly mien. I should have realized that a man isn't worth his salt if he can't learn the principles of democracy on a cent and a quarter a day.

My cynical soul told me that when President Roosevelt broke all precedents and sailed out to meet Halifax he could have achieved the immortality he craves if he had thrown the gaunt hypocrite into the sea. But that is no way to feel. We'll never get into the war unless we believe that Halifax is a living, breathing symbol of democracy and loves democracy next to foxes and wants to take our timid and deluded hands and lead us to Europe and show us how beautifully English democracy has worked in India. Next time I hear Halifax's honest old voice over the radio I'll probably go over and yank that loin cloth off Ghandi and tell the fraud he'll have to stop eating altogether because England has no cat meat to spare.

In the Statesman the other day there appeared a cartoon showing the enemy as a gorilla-like monster with gore dripping from his whiskers and his opponents as frightened little fellows waving banners of charity and peace and good will toward men. One of them looked like a Serb who had decided to stop kicking the Croats around. But most of our propaganda is not like that. We have sensibilities, and though we don't mind being fooled, we're like a homely woman on whom a Romeo is breathing ardent love: It must be plausible and it must sound nice.

Personally, I'm going for Time and Life in a big way—because, in their pro-war attiture, their propaganda is so craftily hidden. Luce does a long editorial in Life, telling us that our President is a man of destiny and that it's time we became the godfather and big brother, as well as the banker, of every nation in the world. A couple of weeks later, the letters column contains about 15 resounding shouts of approval and not a single dissent. Time does it with a little more finesse. It runs three well-written letters asking for armed intervention, and follows with an illiterate one in opposition. You just have to admire propaganda as cunning as that.

Or take that half-witted book by a crackpot. I mean the one called Germany Must Perish in which an incredible zany proposes the emasculation of the whole German race. Time gave that book nearly two columns. Time pointed out that the gentleman is "not afraid," is "no Nazi," and worked so hard getting his masterpiece in the mails that he "cut his hands with twine." In the letters columns a woman has since protested all the space given to that "mephitic" book, and Time replies editorially that it was news. I suppose Time means that all lunacy is news in a nation getting ready for war.

And I like, too, the President's finesse as a propagandist. He does a nice slick job of it. Have you forgotten his terrifying picture of us on an island "a helpless nightmare of a people without freedom, a people lodged in prison, handcuffed, hungry, and fed through the bars every day by the contemptuous unpitying masters of other continents"? More recently he did even better. "Never in all history," he said, "have Americans faced a task so well worth while. May it be said of us in the days to come that our children and our children's children rise up and call us blessed."

My cynical mind tells me that Lincoln's job was just a shade worthier than the preservation of the fox-hunting estates of English Tories. But I'll not quibble. The propaganda this time is as slippery as elm bark, but I think it will do the trick. I think we need only another six months of it to change the

Gallup and other polls. And I wonder if historians, digging the whole thing out, will ever come upon the illiterate letter in Time. "Any nation which declares war on any other country does not deserve help England would never have declared war on Germany if they had not expected France to do the dirty fighting for them now let England finish it."

Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. SMATHERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 25, 1941

LETTER FROM DE WITT D. BARLOW

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. De Witt D. Barlow, of Plainfield, N. J. The letter is self-explanatory.

It amazes me to find from this letter that one of my Senate colleagues is endeavoring to stir up in my State of New Jersey a Lindbergh "invincible Nazi" viewpoint, which does not exist in New Jersey.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, *April 18, 1941.*

Hon. WILLIAM H. SMATHERS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am in receipt of a letter from Senator NYE, in which he enclosed a reprint of Colonel Lindbergh's letter published recently in Collier's. The Senator asks me to write to you on the subject.

I am totally opposed to Colonel Lindbergh's and Senator NYE's point of view. The issues in this war are, as far as I am concerned, not economic. I do not want to live in a world dominated by Nazis, and it is my hope that the civilized world will band together to destroy them. Colonel Lindbergh's facts are inaccurate, but, even were they not, I would not concur in his reasoning for the reason stated in this letter, that I prefer to be guided by principle and not expediency.

Yours sincerely,

DE WITT D. BARLOW.

People Over 45 and Physically Handicapped Receiving More Consideration for Government Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1941

LETTERS FROM WM. C. HULL, EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to revise and extend my remarks and include therein two letters I have recently received from Mr. William C. Hull, the Executive Assistant of the Civil Service Commission. One of the letters pertains to the policy of the Civil Service Commission relative to employing those people who are physically handicapped, and the other letter pertains to the policy of the Civil Service Commission in regard to employing those people who are 45 years of age or older.

For years people who have reached 45 years of age and people who are physically handicapped have found, when seeking employment either with the Government or with industry, many obstacles to their receiving employment. Few of the barriers to the employment of those 45 years old or older and the physically handicapped have been removed heretofore; however, quoting a part of one of the letters—

In order to meet the emergency employment needs created by the national-defense program, the Commission has, in a number of recent instances, secured the concurrence of appointing officials in advancing the maximum age limit beyond the normal point.

The very fact that the maximum age limit has been and is being materially advanced by the authorities of our Government in order to obtain needed people is evidence that a great reservoir of employable people has, to a certain extent, been unutilized. This is true, in my opinion, despite the fact that we are all aware of the great and added responsibilities which usually devolve on the shoulders of people over 45 and people physically handicapped. Parents at 45 years of age generally find, because of the need of funds with which to send their children to school and because of other expenses attendant thereto, that the need of a reasonable income is perhaps more pronounced than ever. In the case of the physically handicapped, frequently not only the handicapped person himself, but his relatives have expended much money to sustain his life, to rehabilitate him physically, or to prepare him to make a living. How disappointing as well as often disastrous it is for these two classes of people to find themselves unable to procure work.

I have always contended that a man or woman has not outlived his or her usefulness when he or she reaches 45 years of age, and I have never been able to agree that one who is physically handicapped is without the realm of usefulness.

The contents of both letters I am putting in the RECORD are encouraging and tend to justify and substantiate the desire of many of us to see more liberality and generosity characterize the consideration of the applications of those who are just as anxious to be self-supporting as are the young and physically strong. The man who has the will to work should be encouraged by his government and its policy, and in my opinion the two letters to which I refer lend some encouragement. Let us trust that this evidence of relaxation of rigid regulations heretofore characteristic of the Government in employing people over 45 and people physically handicapped is the forerunner of other fair and favorable relaxation of regulations which have mitigated against these two groups who are anxious to be self-sustaining.

The letters follow:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., March 29, 1941.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I have your letter of March 4 in which you express your interest in the extent to which those who are physically handicapped can qualify for civil-service employment.

The field of Federal employment is a broad one, with a large proportion of jobs of the office type, such as clerk, typist, or professional or scientific work. To these examinations the handicapped are freely admitted, persons who have lost an eye or a limb, or who must use crutches, cane, or braces to enable them to replace lost function, etc. The duties of the position sought determine the type of defect which may be regarded as acceptable. For example, a person who has lost a leg or has atrophy of the leg or legs as a sequel to disease, necessitating the use of cane or crutches, is admitted to desk-duty positions generally but cannot properly be admitted to an examination for a position as messenger, guard, or laborer, or to positions where the duties involve continuous walking or standing. There are many examinations to which a person with but one eye is admitted, but for the position of operator of a motor vehicle or for duties of a police character this defect would not be acceptable. For technical, professional, or scientific office or laboratory positions the physical standard applied is a liberal one. For trades or laboring positions the nature of the defect and the degree of disability govern the action.

The Commission does not have available for distribution a list of positions for which crippled persons, persons with one arm, persons with one leg, and persons with vision in only one eye, can qualify. In passing on cases of persons who suffer from crippling conditions, the Commission studies them individually, taking into consideration the nature and severity of the condition and the duties of the position. The person must be able to perform the duties of the position and must not be an undue hazard under the employees' compensation and disability retirement statutes.

The enclosed Form 2313 will also show that the basic physical requirements are low and will for appropriate positions admit cripples, the deaf, or persons who have lost one eye.

The enclosed Forms 1786 and 1786a show the many examinations to which the deaf and the hard of hearing are admitted. The Commission for many years has cooperated with the United States Bureau of Education in its work of rehabilitation and has offered, when "rehabilitory" training of a person is under consideration, to give suggestions as to whether an individual with the proposed training, considered in connection with the stated disability, would be admissible to an examination for a similar type of duty in the classified civil service. Rehabilitation from a disability may be accomplished by the efforts of the individual or through some established agency, and equal consideration is given to persons who have been rehabilitated under either method.

With respect to persons who are handicapped by blindness, the problem is a more difficult one, as there are few positions in the classified service where a person who requires the services of someone else to assist him in performing the duties of a clerk or similar position can be employed. Three examinations open to blind persons have been conducted by the Commission in recent years, and announcements of the examinations for assistant clerk-stenographer (for the blind) and rehabilitation specialist for the visually handicapped are enclosed. The register of eligibles established from the examination for administrative officer has expired and announcements of this examination are not available for distribution.

This Commission, under the authority conveyed by the civil-service laws and rules, can

go so far as to admit the handicapped person to a competitive examination. The individual must pass all the tests as to education and experience, or in assembled examinations the written tests, in competition with others who are entitled to enter the examination chosen. He must secure a relative rating in the competition sufficiently high to entitle him to be certified to an appointing officer as one of the highest three eligibles who from their relative standings in the examination must be considered in filling an existing vacancy. The appointing officer to whom the three names are certified has by law the right of choice among the three and is not required to give his reasons for exercising this choice (with an exception as to persons entitled to preference by reason of military service). Thus the admission to competition is only one step toward the securing of a position, but the Commission has taken this step whenever it is consistent with the considerations stated above, the employing officers being consulted before the physical standards are established.

In private employment there are elements which are not present in Federal or other governmental employments where the salaries or wages for positions are fixed. The private employer is not required by law to appoint through competition between all citizens and can therefore permit sympathy to dictate a selection. An individual who, because of orthopedic defect or general physical frailty, can only partly perform the work of a position, may be employed on a part-time basis, or possibly for work to be performed at home, or he can be employed at a reduced compensation in proportion to the output. In the Federal service under classification acts the compensation is fixed on a basis of a normal performance of duties, and the appointing officer must have regard to this in making selections of persons to do his work.

If any of your constitutents who are interested in employment in the classified civil service are physically handicapped, the Commission will endeavor to advise if there are examinations for which they may be considered so far as their handicap is concerned if they will inform the Commission of the nature of their handicap, the extent to which it is disabling, and will refer to any education or experience which they may have acquired.

There are a great many physically handicapped persons employed in the classified civil service, especially in Washington, D. C. No census has been made on this matter nor would one be accurate, as it would hardly be practicable to persuade many of the employees to state their defect and any returns would therefore be an understatement of the situation.

Sincerely yours,

WM. C. HULL,
Executive Assistant.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., April 21, 1941.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: The Commission is glad to have your letter of April 2, requesting information concerning maximum age limits. I believe it may be of interest, in this connection, to explain in some detail the Commission's general authority and present policy with respect to examination age limits.

The problem of determining suitable maximum age limits for admission to competitive examinations involves the consideration, and if possible, the reconciliation, of many diverse and sometimes conflicting interests. Under existing practice, age limits are determined in accordance with section 4 of civil-service rule V, which provides in part that: "The Commission may, with the approval of the proper appointing officer, change by regulation the existing age limits for entrance to the examinations under these rules, * * *." It is evident that, under this provision, the Commission shares concurrently with the department or agency affected, the determination of examination age limits. Within its authority, the Commission has been guided in establishing maximum age limits for admission to examinations for positions in the classified service by the policy laid down in the Retirement Act of 1920.

This statute specifies retirement ages for three groups of positions respectively at 70, 65, and 62 years. It further provides that in order to be eligible for retirement at such ages, the employee concerned must have had at least 15 years of Government service. It is apparent that, in establishing the retirement ages mentioned for the several groups of positions, the statute expresses a policy as to the maximum age at which employees in such groups should be retained in the service. Such retirement ages, coupled with the requirement of 15 years of service for eligibility for retirement benefits, clearly contemplate that, except in very unusual circumstances, only those persons who are able to serve 15 years prior to reaching the retirement age should be admitted into the service. In conformity with this legislative policy, the Commission generally has established, in concurrence with the agencies affected, maximum age limits at fifteen years below the applicable retirement age, with an addition in certain cases of 2 years to allow for holding and rating the examination and a reasonable period of eligibility on the resulting register.

The Commission is fully aware of the employment problems of older workers throughout the country, and is in entire sympathy with all feasible means of alleviating their difficulties. Thus, the Commission has, within the limits of its authority, endeavored for many years to establish examination age limits at the highest level consistent with statutory policy, the necessity for effective performance of the duties involved, and the general efficiency of the Federal service, with which, of course, the entire country is vitally concerned.

In order to meet the emergency employment needs created by the national-defense program the Commission has, in a number of recent instances, secured the concurrence of appointing officials in advancing the maximum-age limit beyond the normal point, 15 to 17 years below the applicable retirement age. In these cases the Commission has believed the considerations previously mentioned to be outweighed by the pressing demands of the defense program. For example, the Commission's policy has been to extend maximum age limits for any of the skilled trades or occupations in which shortages exist, and in which an extension of age limitations would possibly make available a reserve of skilled workers between the maximum age limits normally prescribed and the retirement age. Shipfitters, loftsmen, coppersmiths, machinists, toolmakers, and instrument makers are among the large number of positions in the artisan class for which the maximum age has been extended to 62 years, the retirement age for mechanics in the naval establishments. Coincidentally with the extension of the age limitations the Commission has directed modifications in the physical standards formerly required, in recognition of the definite relation between advancing age and the appearance of physical impairments. It was realized that in a very large proportion of the cases affected by raising age limits the services of many persons would be lost to the service if there was not a corresponding adjustment in physical standards.

The extension of the maximum age limitations has not been confined to the artisan class of workers. Among the professional and subprofessional positions for which advanced age limits have recently been established may be mentioned the following: Assistant to principal naval architect, and marine engineer, 70 years; inspector of engineering materials, and inspector of ship construction, 65 years; marine surveyor, radiosonde technician, and professional engineer positions of various grades and options, 60 years. Further, the Commission has given authorization to its district managers, where a shortage of defense employees is anticipated, to extend the maximum age beyond the customary limitation, in any case in which such an extension would not contravene administrative regulations of the department concerned, with respect to age limits. In cases of this nature it is necessary, as I have previously explained, that concurrence of the department be obtained. I am enclosing two of the Commission's forms which will give more detailed indication of the extent to which age limits have been raised during the present emergency.

In considering the subject of examination age limits, it may be further observed that such limits are in nearly all cases waived for persons entitled to military preference, and that in any event a distinction must be made between entrance into the service and retention therein. In the classified service there is in no sense discrimination against older employees through their discharge in later years as is sometimes the case in private industry. On the contrary, under the Retirement Act, the Congress has provided an orderly means for the compensation of employees who have reached the retirement age.

I believe you will agree that the policies outlined above provide in full measure for consideration of the interest of both the older members of the population, and the national welfare during the present emergency. I can assure you that the Commission, within the limits of its authority, will continue to establish maximum age limits at the highest feasible levels.

Your interest in the Commission's problems, and your courtesy in extending an opportunity for comment are greatly appreciated.

By direction of the Commission.

Very respectfully,

WM. C. HULL,
Executive Assistant.

Keep America Out of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1941

LETTERS FROM CONSTITUENTS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

PORTAGE, MONT., *April 21, 1941.*

MR. JAMES F. O'CONNOR,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'CONNOR: I wish to inform you that here is one more opposed to convoying material to Europe with our boats and boys. If we were going to war why didn't we declare war. No! The people were not ready for war and they still are not. Industry is so desirous of profit that they won't let the working man have a living wage increase when his cost of living goes up. We cannot produce with conflicting conditions of this kind existing. We are striving to retain democracy, not to bring profit to the man that owns stock in war-defense industry. Let's steer clear of war until things are clear as to where we are going to fight and for what purpose.

I also ask you to vote for the income certificate bill for agriculture. If Congress fails to appropriate parity payments some of these days we'll be hungry and hungry people are hard to control.

Sincerely,

MELVIN E. GOOD.

PORTAGE, MONT.,
April 20, 1941.

Mr. JAMES F. O'CONNOR,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'CONNOR: I feel it is my duty, as a citizen, to write you regarding the problem confronting us today, namely, our entry into this European war.

Do you feel we are well enough prepared to take an active part?

If we should enter and win (?) how could we handle the subdued countries, when we have such a perplexing problem of trying to make our present system work for the good of all?

Have we any plan of defense or attack? We went blindly into the last war. It seems that lesson should teach us our place is at home spending our time getting our people more thoroughly educated so our democracy will work.

Can we afford, at this time, to sacrifice our young men for a cause (which the radio and newspapers) seem to think is a just one?

Senator TOBEY's anticonvoy bill and the resolution by Senator NYE, both seem gravely important measures for your consideration.

We feel sure you will keep faith with the millions of common working people, and do all you can to keep our boys at home.

Very truly yours,

MRS. MELVIN GOOD.

Say Good-bye to Your Boots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune:

[From the Chicago Tribune]

SAY GOOD-BYE TO YOUR BOOTS

Mr. Morgenthau of the Treasury is giving the American citizens a preview of what is to come. The other day one of the New Deal congressional leaders said that the new taxes would lift the people out of their boots. Mr. Morgenthau's preview would indicate that the boots will be taken away along with the shirt. The Secretary of the Treasury seemed almost happy about it. The taxes, he said, would be the greatest ever imposed in America and as a proud American he added that they might be the greatest ever imposed in the world.

Pay day is coming after 8 years of peacetime spending in an idiot's paradise of funny money and funny ideas about debts and deficits. Upon a mountain of peacetime debts is piled a mountain of war debts, and the period of the idiot's delight has come to an end. Everybody will now turn his pockets inside out and hand the contents over to the internal-revenue collector.

Mr. Morgenthau hopes everybody will be very glad to increase the Government's take out of his earnings and it is forecast that every method known to the tax collector will be employed.

The high-bracket taxpayers have become accustomed to giving up the larger share of what they take in. Mr. Morgenthau will not be able to get very much more out of them. Even if he took everything they earned he wouldn't get far in meeting his bills. He will put the squeeze on the fellow of average means and upon the wage earner. The little taste of high taxes contained in the current year's boost was known to be nothing at all, and even the new taxes which are to lift the citizen out of his boots will be only a sample of what is yet to come.

Before the New Deal and the New Deal's war are liquidated the American people will know what it is to pay for reckless government. Their purchasing power will be diminished and their economists tell them that they will be in unexpected luck if prices do not skyrocket on them. With budgets reduced by Government exactions they may find themselves giving up habits, commodities, and articles which they have been accustomed to enjoy as a matter of course. The American standard of living will come down to a new low level as American taxes go to a new high.

Importance of Federal Reclamation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, OF IDAHO

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following statement made before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on the subject of irrigation and reclamation, as follows:

Before discussing individual appropriations, in which I am interested, I desire to call the attention of the committee to two important phases of the Federal reclamation program. As chairman of the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, I have given some study to the significance of the reclamation developments from a national standpoint under both normal and emergency conditions. The stabilizing influence of these projects on the West, their contribution to the national welfare, and the groundwork they lay for the future security of the growing population of the West should not be overlooked.

But in view of the emergency that confronts the country, it is of vital moment that we also consider what this program, if adequately financed, will contribute to the national defense through power for industries and food for our armed forces and the Nation at large.

From surveys made by the Idaho State Planning Board of incoming and outgoing shipments from the Boise project in my State of Idaho, where more than 300,000 acres are watered by the Federal program, and other authentic information, I am able to summarize certain facts as follows:

1. Federal reclamation projects as a whole have created and maintain a market worth a quarter of a billion dollars annually to the manufacturers and farmers east of the Rocky Mountains.

2. For every dollar's worth of farm products shipped eastward from the Boise project, a typical development located west of the Great Divide, there is received $6.50 worth of manufactured products and food supplies from the Middle West, the East, and the South.

3. The facts are against suggestions that Federal reclamation creates competition for the farmers of other sections of the country. In 1939, out of 10,000 carloads of agricultural products shipped from the Boise project, only 134 carried wheat and corn. Most of these, along with 65 percent of the outgoing products, went to Pacific coast and Intermountain points. Shipped eastward were potatoes, lettuce, onions, and some fruits which can be marketed in eastern areas only when the farms near the great producing centers are not in season. High freight rates must be paid on east-bound shipments.

4. While the outgoing farm products from a typical project like Boise have an average value of $400 to $500 a carload, the incoming shipments of automobiles, machinery, household equipment, electrical supplies, etc., from east of the Rockies range in value from $2,000 to $3,000 a carload.

5. You are familiar with the fact, no doubt, that no tobacco is produced on irrigated land. Cotton is grown on only a few projects to the southward. The amount of wheat and corn produced on all irrigated land in the West would not be sufficient for the needs of the immediate areas, based on the average per capita consumption of these commodities.

6. A few years ago a detailed survey of purchases by settlers on the Boise project showed that 75 cents out of every dollar they received was expended for commodities produced east of the Rocky Mountains. About 70 percent of the incoming shipments to the Boise project, so far as value is concerned, originate in the Middle West, East, and South.

7. To illustrate that the figures from the Boise project are not that of an isolated development, well-authenticated reports show that on the Salt River project in Arizona, 80 percent of the wholesale purchases was of commodities originating east of the Rocky Mountains. The Washington State Planning Board reports that more than 50 percent of the income of the settlers in the Yakima Valley goes for commodities produced or processed in the East.

By way of illustration, I may point out that in 1939, the industries of Ohio shipped 130 carloads of manufactures material to stations on the Boise project. The Pennsylvania factories dispatched about 74 carloads of machinery and other supplies. New York State sent us 63 carloads. From Oklahoma we received more than 50 carloads of oils and miscellaneoues products. As the purchasing power originating on the Boise project is about 5 percent of the total resulting from reclamation developments, multiplication of these figures gives you some idea of the value of the markets created by this Federal policy.

Compare this market with our foreign trade. Its value exceeds that of the Nation's normal foreign trade with more than any of 50 nations, including any in Latin America.

So much for the normal commercial value of Federal reclamation.

A sound logical expansion of the Federal program on a much more effective scale than is proposed in the appropriations outlined in the pending bill will produce national benefits commensurate with the additional investment the Federal Government makes. Since the census figures show that the West is increasing in population at a rate twice the national average, the normal demand for irrigated land is increasing.

We know that the national-defense industries located in the industrial centers cannot furnish employment for the thousands of unskilled wage earners among the migrant

families from the Great Plains and elsewhere who know nothing but farming. We also know that when the surge of national-defense employment is ended that the demand for farm land in the irrigated West will be even greater.

The expenditures from the Federal Treasury for relief in the 17 western States of more than two and a half billion dollars in 7 years are significant. We know this huge outlay has been due in a large part to the inability of the West to settle any considerable part of the migrant farm families who have moved into the region in the last 10 years on land where they could become self-sustaining.

Whatever may come, the conclusion is inescapable that Federal reclamation must move forward at a faster pace.

I am sure I need not remind this committee of what happened during World War I. Our vast agricultural resources proved inadequate to meet the country's needs just as we are finding it necessary to expand our industrial machinery in order to provide arms and ammunition and ships in the present emergency. We also know that the private utilities were unable to furnish the country with all the electric power needed 23 years ago.

If we are in for a war or for an emergency as great as the strenuous preparations we are making for national defense indicate, then we must look to our sources of food supplies. It is only through adequate provision for maintenance of irrigation water supplies that we can assure the country of the contribution to which it will look to the West to make.

And in speaking of Federal irrigation or reclamation developments that can be brought about by adequate appropriations, I have in mind three types of projects, each of which is vital in its respective field. On many of these projects the power to be brought in is vital to the national defense.

First. The maintenance of established agricultural areas through supplemental water supplies that can be provided through speeding the construction of such projects as the Central Valley in California, the Colorado-Big Thompson in Colorado, Provo River in Utah, and the Anderson Ranch development of the Boise project in my own State of Idaho. A logical expansion of this type of project would include the badly needed Grand Valley project on the Upper Snake River to insure better power and water supplies for southeastern and southern Idaho.

Second. The completion of projects under construction that will provide opportunities for the settlement of newcomers to the West and for the younger generation already there who are seeking irrigated farms of their own. I mention projects like Grand Coulee in the Columbia Basin, the Payette division of the Boise project, the Deschutes project in Oregon, and the Tucumcari project in New Mexico.

Third. Sufficient reimbursable funds to permit the Bureau of Reclamation to advance the construction of water-conservation projects, with the cooperation of the Work Projects Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps. These small projects are designed to rehabilitate established agricultural areas where drought or water shortages not only threaten the stability of farmers and townspeople dependent on agriculture in the area, but may drive them to join the migrants already in the West.

Still another phase of this situation has to do with the appropriation of adequate funds for surveys and investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation. If we are to have projects ready for the employment of hundreds of thousands of industrial workers who will be out of jobs when the present defense activity recedes, the Bureau must have a backlog of projects ready for presentation to the Congress. Thorough investigations of the water resources of the 17 Western States cannot be made with the limited funds that have been at the disposal of the Bureau in the past.

In this connection, I believe the Bureau of Reclamation should be provided with funds to investigate the possibility of reclaiming cut-over lands which have rich soil and are capable of being converted into productive farms. Expansion of irrigation and the utilization of the cut-over lands, wherever found feasible, should go hand in hand.

Now as to the specific items in which my district is interested:

Payette division of the Boise project: The half-million dollars provided for principally continuing construction of the irrigation system will not permit advancing work on Cascade Dam as rapidly as needed. The entire 52,000 acres in this division can be settled as soon as water is available. At the rate appropriations are proposed in this bill, it will be 6 years before all of the land will be available for settlement.

We should have at least $1,500,000 for the Cascade Reservoir for fiscal year 1942 in order that construction may be completed in the shortest possible time.

The Cascade Reservoir will store more water than required for the Payette Division of the Boise project. This surplus will be later allocated by the Secretary of the Interior for irrigation of adjacent lands. Commissioner Page has therefore suggested that the following language be inserted in the appropriation item for the Payette division of the Boise project:

"Provided, that such part of the storage capacity of the Cascade Reservoir, and the costs thereof, shall be reserved for other irrigation or power developments in and adjacent to the Boise project, as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Interior."

Anderson Ranch (Arrowrock division, Boise project): If we are to maintain production on a long-established area to afford purchasing power in peacetime and additional food in emergencies, supplementary water must be provided for 160,000 acres in the Arrowrock division of the Boise project. This reservoir will also make possible the installation of a power plant to produce 20,000 kilowatts of power badly needed for irrigation pumping and commercial purposes.

Investigations and surveys: $500,000 has been proposed by the Bureau of the Budget for this purpose. This is entirely too small an item to cover the needs of the 17 States of the arid and semiarid region. The Bureau of Reclamation estimates that not less than $1,500,000 is necessary to carry on this work and prepare reclamation projects to be included "in the shelf of projects" which President Roosevelt has stated must be ready for construction when the peak of the defense program has been passed.

Water conservation and utility projects: When you consider that more than 300,000 families were driven from the Great Plains in the last 10 years by drought and that half of these migrated westward, you can get some idea of the importance of anchoring farm families in their present locations. At least $6,000,000 in reimbursable funds is necessary annually for these projects. Idaho needs 15 of these projects and an allotment of at least $500,000 for construction of small reservoir projects during the fiscal year 1942.

The pending Department of the Interior appropriation bill carries a total of $62,800,000 for Bureau of Reclamation construction compared with $78,614,000 appropriated by the last Congress.

The principal reduction is $11,000,000 in the appropriation for Grand Coulee.

The amount for investigations and surveys is reduced from $625,000 to $500,000.

The appropriation of $3,500,000 for water conservation and utility projects is the same as last year.

Idaho items are as follows:

Minidoka power plant: $50,000 to complete work in connection with an additional unit which will increase the capacity of the plant to 16,000 kilovolt-amperes. The original cost of this unit was estimated at $500,000, but certain additional work was necessary.

Boise project, Payette division: The appropriation of $500,000 will make a total of $5,334,000 provided for the development which will cost $8,847,000. It will irrigate about 52,000 acres and provide farmsteads for 800 to 1,000 families.

Boise-Arrowrock division (Anderson Ranch Reservoir): This development is to provide supplemental water for 160,000 acres already irrigated in the Boise project. It will provide flood control and 20,000 kilowatts of electric power. The $750,000 carried in this bill will make a total of $1,500,000 provided for the project which will cost $13,100,000. Of the construction costs, $5,050,000 has been allocated to flood control; $3,400,000 to power development; and $4,650,000 to irrigation. The irrigation costs will be repaid by the irrigation districts of the Boise project.

Student Peace Meetings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein my speech recorded for the occasion of the student peace meetings held throughout the country on Wednesday, April 23, 1941:

I greet the students of America on this occasion on which they have met to speak out for peace and freedom. It is encouraging to know that the students of these United States have refused to sacrifice their right to talk as free men and free women today in exchange for the unenviable privilege of whining as slaves tomorrow. It is heartening to know that the students of America are uniting and fighting not only for the freedom of their universities but for the peace and freedom of our Nation.

Those of us who are engaged in the struggle to pull America out of war and to preserve and extend our democracy are not appeasers nor the spokesmen for any foreign group or capital. We take orders neither from Moscow, Berlin, Rome, Downing Street, or, specifically, from Wall Street. In a sense, however, we do take orders. In fact, we follow dictates, the dictates of a conscience which exists in the unity of the masses of the American people. Those who have been following a course of plunging our country into war cannot say the same. They are taking orders. They are following the dictates of a new axis, the Wall Street-Downing Street Axis, an axis which had been entered into secretly, without the knowledge or consent of the American people, prior to the beginning of the second World War, and which was partly reduced to writing by the lease-lend bill—this axis, like the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis is an axis for empire, profits, more profits and more exploitation of more people. Due to the weakness of Downing Street, Wall Street has become the senior partner in this new imperialist axis. We who believe in freedom repudiate both of these axes, for both are repugnant to every concept of our American way of life. We refuse appeasement to both the Hitler-Rome-Tokyo-Berlin Axis and the Roosevelt-Churchill-Wall Street-Downing Street Axis. We repudiate both and we unite to struggle for the defeat of both. We the people shall live up to that trust which the great tradition for peace and

freedom have reposed in us. You the students of America will not fail.

The spokesmen for the Wall Street-Downing Street axis have found in the people of the United States a formidable, uncompromising and historical resistance to this war. Therefore, their conspiracy to ensnare the people of the United States into the orbit of imperialist war had to be and has been marked by fraud and deception from its very beginning. It has been carried on by fraud and deception, and now they are seeking to complete it by fraud and deception. The history of this conspiracy is the history of a crime. Every step in this conspiracy has been sold to the American people as an overt act for peace when in reality it was a covert act for war. A program of $40,000,000,000 for war armaments was launched on our country as a national defense in June 1940 as defense against invasion. In December, in January, and in March of this year, the President dropped the mask of national defense against invasion, and brazenly admitted that these armaments were to constitute our Nation into an arsenal, an arsenal for one side as against the other, an arsenal as carried out in the lease-lend bill, not for democracy, but for imperialism—thereby from a standpoint of armaments, deliberately placing our country into war. Fifty destroyers were transferred by an intellectually dishonest opinion of the Attorney General, also in the name of national defense, despite the fact that now we know that this step technically further plunged us into war. In September conscription was given to the American people under the guise of peacetime training for America's youth. Today we learn that not a single person in the War Department or in the camps has the temerity to repeat such a falsehood, for it is universally accepted that our boys are being trained for war. The people of these United States were forced to go through a Presidential election which was a fraud and a mockery of democratic government, perpetrated by the selfsame Wall Street-Downing Street axis, its agents, and its dupes. The President was given an opponent who offered him no opposition to his war program, neither on conscription nor on aid to Britain short of war, which incidentally has only shortened the distance between war and peace.

Despite the crafty character of this plot, both candidates were compelled to pledge to keep America out of this war, due again to the resistance of the American people against participation in this imperialist holocaust. Yet despite this preelection pledge to keep us out of war, the President in his address to the Jackson Day diners and to the Washington correspondents, not only incited for a legislative lynching of the Bill of Rights and for the persecution of those who are genuinely opposed to both axes in their fight for peace, but said that we must win this war. Today the curtain is lifting and in the corridors of Congress and throughout Washington we are told that we are in war, that we must win this war, and that we must support every action toward making this war a success. This is the new line of the Wall Street-Downing Street axis, its agents, and its dupes. In America, people today ask whose war is it, this war that the President said we must win. It is the President's war, it is the war of the Morgans and the Du Ponts, of the economic royalists, and of the enemies of democracy. It is not a war of the American people. This war, the President's war, the economic royalists war, the Wall Street-Downing Street-axis war, is an undeclared war, without the consent of the American people. It is the duty of every patriotic American not to support this war, but to repudiate it, not to plunge further into it, by convoys or by other stealthy means, but to pull our Government out of it.

America's democracy can be saved and will be saved, against Hitler's Rome-Tokyo-Berlin Axis, as well as against the Wall Street-Downing Street Axis, its agents and its dupes. This will be and must be done by collaborating with the democratic people throughout the world, by feeding the 52,000,000 shrunken bellies of America, by making our democracy live, by bringing it to every home, farm, mill, factory, school, and university, by abolishing the poll tax, and guaranteeing in practice the Bill of Rights, for everybody in America, including political minorities; to see to it that no exceptions shall be placed in the proposition of our Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal. Let us fight for these things, not by becoming the victims of either one of the two axes, not by plunging further into this war, but by getting our Government out of this war and staying out of this war. Let us have faith in the masses of America. Not the economic royalists, not the agents and dupes of the Wall Street-Downing Street axis, not seduced labor leaders, and not the President will save America. The American masses will save America. They saved our Nation in 1776. They defended and extended its democracy in 1860, and they will save America, its peace, its freedom, and its institutions in 1941.

Huey Pierce Long

REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWT V. MILLS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1941

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, we hope in dedicating the statue of Huey P. Long to this and the generations yet to come to play a little part by showing our appreciation of a beloved Louisianian who gave the entirety of his life to his country, that others may live in more abundance.

His life story is fantastic, for it seems incredible that any man could have accomplished so much in the few years allotted him, however, in Louisiana may be found monuments practically in every community that keeps the memory of Huey burning in the hearts of his countrymen.

His keen perception of human nature, his shrewd understanding of psychology, and his impeccable politeness sometimes caused his antagonists, and even his supporters, to lose sight of the steely strength, the fixity of purpose, and the daring which won for him so many objectives. Of no man could it more truly be said that even those who vied with him in debate or in political strategy felt naught but the highest admiration for his attainments. He was a man of brilliant parts and one of the most eloquent orators of his generation. I have heard him speak upon almost every kind of an occasion and he never failed to captivate his audience. He possessed one of the most exact and copious vocabularies of any political leader and his language was chaste and beautiful; however, shortly before his death he gave a better characterization of himself, which follows:

Mr. President, I am not undertaking to answer the charge that I am ignorant. It is true. I am an ignorant man. I have had no college education. I have not even had a high-school education. But the thing that takes me far in politics is that I do not have to color what comes into my mind and into my heart. I say it unvarnished. I have not colored my own. I know when I am right in my own conscience. I do not talk one way in the cloakroom and another way out here. I do not talk one way back there in the hills of Louisiana and another way here in the Senate. I have one language. Ignorant as it is, it is the universal language of the sphere in which I operate. Its simplicity gains pardon for my lack of letters and education.

Without regard to geographical location, I believe the Nation recognized Huey P. Long as a great humanitarian and that he possessed a keen mind which was always his chief weapon. I think we will all admit the Nation lost a profound philosopher and statesman, as he was gentle, kindly, and beloved by all those who intimately knew him and we say: It is true others have come since he has gone, but he cannot be held responsible for what they have done. So peace to his soul and expanding glory to his influence and to his memory among all the millions in America who admired and knew him. Louisianian, O Louisianian, the champion of the poor, we knew you for the love of the underprivileged and remember the poem you so loved.

Out of the night that covers me,
Black as the pit from pole to pole,
I thank whatever gods may be
For my unconquerable soul.
In the fell clutch of circumstance,
I have not winced nor cried aloud;
Beneath the bludgeoning of chance
My head is bloody but unbowed.
It matters not how strait the gate,
How charged with punishments the scroll,
I am the master of my fate:
I am the captain of my soul.

Our friend was more than a Republican or a Democrat—he was a leader, and injured innocence always resorted by giving him confidence. Huey had known the bitter sorrows that come to men, but his fine optimism could not be crushed. Disappointments only whetted his determination to achieve. Delays only strengthened his patience. Opposition only refined his courage. Is it any wonder Louisiana loved him so?

His useful life, his interest in the poor have identified him among the immortal statesmen who have boldly proclaimed the true object of life is to live for others.

As shadows cast by cloud and sun
Flit o'er the summer grass,
So, in Thy sight, Almighty One,
Earth's generations pass;
And as the years, and endless host,
Come swiftly pressing on,
The brightest names that earth can boast
Just glisten and are gone.

Convoys to England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1941

ASSOCIATED PRESS ARTICLE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

I include the following Associated Press report from Montgomery, Ala.:

LABOR NOT APPREHENSIVE ON CONVOYS, GREEN SAYS

(By the Associated Press)

MONTGOMERY, ALA., April 22.—William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, said today labor is not apprehensive regarding the possibility of United States convoys to England because President Roosevelt gave assurance they wouldn't be used.

The lease-lend bill, Mr. Green said, had the support of the A. F. of L., and while it was pending Mr. Roosevelt gave the Nation assurance that convoys would not be used.

Referring to the Vinson labor regulation bill now pending as bad, Mr. Green said its passage would create discontent and rebellion among men now in a fine frame of mind.

Ireland's Neutrality—Why Should Ireland Suffer at the Hands of the Roosevelt Administration Just Because England Continues To Dominate Our Foreign Policies and Relations?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1941

LETTER FROM JOHN O'CONNOR, OF NEW YORK, FORMER CHAIRMAN OF THE RULES COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE, TO A PROMINENT CITIZEN OF NEW YORK, WILLIAM GRIFFIN, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER OF THE NEW YORK ENQUIRER

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very timely and interesting letter written by the Honorable John J. O'Connor, our former colleague, and former chairman of the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives, touching upon the relations of the United States, England, and Ireland.

The excerpts from a recent radio broadcast by Prime Minister Eamon de Valera in his address to the people of the United States, which Mr. O'Connor includes in his letter, gives a conclusive answer to those warmongers who, without justification, criticize the Irish Free State for failure to turn over certain strategic sea bases in Ireland recently restored to that country after centuries of illegal control by England.

From the best of my information, there are at least 60 Members of the present House of Representatives and 12 Members of the United States Senate who are of the first, second, or third generation of Irish-born parents. There are many more Members of the present Congress from Scotch and Welsh parents, who know what democracy means better than the aggressor nations. Many of these public servants voted for the lend-lease bill to aid Great Britain in the present crisis. No one questions their American patriotism, but it remains to be seen what their actions will be in coming to the assistance of the Irish nation, whose contribution of blood and treasure to the creation of our Republic is not excelled by any nation on God's earth.

The letter follows:

WASHINGTON, *D. C., April 17, 1941.*

Since when did it come about that the sole concern of our people is for Dear Old Mother England to the neglect of all the other "mother" countries, which have contributed so much to our own land?

Specifically, I have in mind the outrageous treatment now being accorded Ireland at the hands of the administration, which is wholly subservient to Downing Street.

For some time Ireland has been beseeching the United States to sell it food, and a slight amount of munitions, to prevent its people, your relatives and mine, from starving. Eire is not asking for the lend or lease or gift of anything. She is willing to pay for everything she can get, but the English Foreign Office and the English Embassy in Washington have turned thumbs down on the plea—while Winston Churchill, who told you frankly about what he thought of America butting into the last World War, is all thumbs up—whistling in the dark to keep his courage, but ready at any moment to make a separate peace with Germany and toss overboard all England's allies, including the "all-outers" in the United States.

Prime Minister Eamon de Valera, in a recent broadcast to the people of the United States of America, said:

"When the present war broke out, agreements were made with Great Britain of mutual advantage in regard to the purchase of foreign exchange and the chartering of ships whereby Ireland could look ahead to receiving a reasonable supply of the commodities she was likely to need. The reserves we had accumulated and the supplies we received under these agreements enabled us to come through the first 18 months of the war without any very grave dislocation of our economic life. It is only within the last couple of months that serious shortages have begun to be felt. Both sides, in blockading each other, were blockading us, and first imports of petrol, then tea and coal, began successively to diminish to the point when rationing became necessary—rationing which is almost certain to become more and more severe as time goes on.

"A shortage of wheat is, however, our principal cause of concern. We have been endeavoring with intensifying effort to get our acreage under wheat doubled so as to meet our full requirements, but the weather has not favored late sowing of winter wheat and it is almost certain that we cannot now make up for the shortage by a sufficient increase of spring wheat. We are, then, in grave danger of being short of our bread supply, which will be a grievous hardship to children and the poor unless we can import sufficient wheat to fill the gap. That is a very considerable quantity, many tens of thousands of tons. It is to try to arrange for this import and for the import of some other essential raw materials that Mr. Aiken, our Minister for Coordination of Defensive Measures, has left for the United States. I am confident that all old friends there will give him whatever aid lies in their power.

"We seek only facilities to purchase. We shall pay for what we receive. We are, as is well known, a creditor country. The excess produce which we have sent to Britain over years has resulted in our building up in that country claims entitling us to goods from her in return amounting to some two or three hundred million pounds sterling, say $1,000,000,000 to $1,500,000,000.

"These claims are, owing to the war, not now to any substantial extent realizable in dollars. Temporary dollar credits may accordingly have to be arranged.

"Some American publicists have said they fear our country may be used as a base of attack against Britain. We have pledged ourselves that this shall not be. We are determined that no one of the belligerents shall use the territory of our State as a basis of attack upon another. For us to permit such things to be done would be to involve ourselves in the war.

"Last summer, when it seemed that we might be in special danger, we called for volunteers for our defense forces. Within 3 months 200,000 of our men, the equivalent of some 8,000,000 men of the population of the United States, answered the call. They are not unarmed, but we want to arm them with the most modern and best weapons available.

"Part of Mr. Aiken's mission is to purchase, if possible, such weapons in the United States. All who would render services to Ireland will help him.

"It has taken an effort of centuries to win back the independence we have got. We are determined it shall not be lost again."

The Honorable Frank Aiken is now in the United States but there is a feeling around Washington that he may be hoodwinked, by jovial conferences at the State Department and lunches at the White House, into falling into the trap deliberately planned for him of agreeing to a quid pro quo, the surrendering of part of Eire to the British Empire for bases, to fight Germany now—and the Irish later.

Shades of those martyrs of Easter Monday, just 25 years ago, who fell before the British firing squads that Ireland might be free. Is this galaxy of Irish patriots looking down on what is going on today, with hardly a protest from their kinfolk in America?

What are they thinking?

Thomas J. Clarke, the fighting patriot, who had known the squalor of English jails for 15 years; Thomas MacDonagh, the scholar; Padriac H. Pearse, the renowned writer; Eamonn Ceannt, of The Volunteers; James Connolly, the champion of labor, who, although wounded, was strapped to a chair and placed before the firing squad; Joseph Plunkett, the diplomat.

Speaking now for them and their colleagues, who faced the British firing squad, is the young troop commander of that historic revolution, Eamon de Valera, the last man to surrender at Ringside, Dublin. Luckily for the Irish and for the world, he has survived the British sentence to death and its commutation to penal servitude for life.

Just recently it was brought to my personal attention that a group of New York citizens, interested in saving Ireland from starvation, proposed to purchase a ship to carry foodstuffs—no munitions or contraband of war—to Ireland.

Because England still claims control of the seas, nothing can move out of our ports, at least headed East, without England's permission. For some time they required a navicert, a document certified by the British Embassy, before an American ship could sail from an American port, bound for Europe. Now it is a warranty that must be obtained. In this particular instance, no warranty has been issued, despite the vehement intercession of a distinguished United States Senator who championed the lease-lend bill. The only interest evidenced by the British Embassy was in trying to find out the name of the ship so it might be bought by the British Government for its own purposes of conveying munitions.

That English policy of letting every other nation starve was settled long ago by England's adamant refusal to let ex-President Hoover and his committee transport food to starving Belgium, Holland, and France, even though Germany agreed to permit the foodstuffs to reach their intended recipients.

Just who is running this world of ours?

If France alone had been fighting Germany, would we ever have had all this hullabaloo about all-out aid to France?

If the present situation were reversed and we were alone fighting Germany, would we be getting all-out aid from the British Isles? History records quite the opposite on every similar occasion. England always aided our enemy.

I dare to ask these questions, despite my every hour wish for the defeat of Hitler and his ilk and everything they stand for, because I am concerned first with the welfare of my own country, the United States; but if we are going to violate all our traditions of not sticking our nose into foreign affairs, we ought to play the game fair and see that every nation gets a fair break, including Ireland.

It remains to be seen what our Representatives and Senators in Congress who voted for the lend-lease bill, especially those from our big cities, will do about this touching appeal of Eire.

Bainbridge Area Farmer and His Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BAINBRIDGE (N. Y.) NEWS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bainbridge (N. Y.) News:

[From the Bainbridge (N. Y.) News]

BAINBRIDGE AREA FARMER AND HIS PROBLEM

The Bainbridge area and similar rural sections throughout the State have suddenly been brought face to face with a problem which must be solved and solved quickly. Ever since the national-defense program started factories humming, the shortage of farm labor has increased alarmingly until now it is a real problem—a problem acute to the point of gravity.

Only too evident in this section is the fact that farm workers are quitting their jobs to accept positions in plants engaged in national-defense work. Perhaps the outstanding example in this vicinity is the huge and still-expanding Scintilla plant at Sidney. Considering their action in an unprejudiced light, we can easily detect the element of logicalness which leads to the farmhand's eventual decision. The farmers are unable to prevent this wholesale evacuation for they cannot possibly compete with the factories either in wages or hours of labor. To add to the farmer's problem, the capable men who do not yield to the lure of quick money in industrial plants are demanding higher wages. However, the crowning blow to the hapless farmer is the gradual increase in farm-production costs. Feed prices are up, farm machinery and other equipment prices are advancing, and it is inevitable that taxes in general will soar. Bainbridge area farmers have joined in the general head scratching over this problem of producing milk with present milk-production costs, selling at present prices, and still remaining solvent.

It is now apparent that the only hope the farmer has of keeping out of the red is by obtaining a substantial increase in the selling price of his milk.

A mass meeting to which every farmer in Delaware County, regardless of creamery or organization affiliations, will be invited is to be held in Delhi or Walton in the near future. This mass meeting will constitute an effort to coordinate Delaware County dairymen in a united drive to obtain a better price for milk. Bainbridge area farmers hear with interest of the ringing speech delivered recently by John V. Johnson, of Oneonta, editor of the Dairy Farmer union paper, as he told county union members they could choose to ride along with the slow workings of the Federal milk marketing order or they could unite and demand a higher price for May and June milk. Mr. Johnson said "Demanding a better price for milk is a serious decision to make, but when you do demand that price back it up with everything the threat implies. If the farmer says, 'Pay or else,' and they don't pay, we will have the worst fight ever seen in this milk shed."

Until the price of milk is increased there appears to be little chance of alleviating the farmer's problem of labor shortage caused by factory appeal and selective service. It is interesting to note in today's news the shortcuts to save time and labor that the farmers have adopted. One farmer, instead of plowing his old cabbage fields before sowing oats, merely harrowed deeply with a three-section spring-tooth harrow. The harrow stirs the soil to a depth of 4 or 5 inches and the grain drill can do a good job of covering. Many dairymen plan to put hay in the silo when weather is unfavorable for hay making. Others are repairing machinery to insure its usefulness for the coming season and some are purchasing new machinery, but for the most part purchase of new farm equipment this year is expected to dip sharply.

Area farmers are lime conscious this spring for orders to date are far in excess of orders of last year at this time. Possibly a careful consideration of the farm labor shortage has influenced them to use what help is now available to apply lime before the rush of other work. Prices for superphosphate and other fertilizing materials this year are relatively cheap but it is very probable that the labor shortage; rather than the lower price, is responsible for the early purchasing.

We have briefly reviewed the present problem of the Bainbridge area farmer and the highlights of the situation that we have mentioned are probably very similar throughout the State.

In searching for a solution to the present problem we have developed the theory that agricultural and milk prices must follow current trends. Our farmer cannot be expected to adhere to an outdated price structure when costs of all kinds are soaring.

Increased Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE PLAUCHÉ

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE LAKE CHARLES (LA.) AMERICAN PRESS

Mr. PLAUCHÉ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial written by Hon. Frank Smith, editor of the Lake Charles (La.) American Press:

[From the Lake Charles (La.) American Press]

TAXES WANTED

Congressmen are in a very unusual position with regards to the enactment of tax bills. Possibly never in the history of our Nation have the people seen so clearly the need for increased taxation and have been as willing to pay higher levies.

Everyone is conscious of the fact that our national debt is already very huge. The people know, too, that the defense spending is going to raise the debt sharply even if there are more taxes levied, and they realize that if our national credit is to be maintained we must make a greater effort to pay as we go. The majority of people fear a period of rapid inflation which they know is possible if our national debt gets so high it is uncontrollable. Citizens remember what happened in Germany and France after the last war, and they want none of it. They don't want their savings swept away by inflation.

In consequence, the taxpayers are actually anxious to see Congress enact tax measures that will hold the national debt within limits that can be controlled.

Greater Reclamation Development Is Essential to Idaho's Future Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK, OF IDAHO

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I made on April 18, 1941, before the House committee considering appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942:

Mr. DWORSHAK. Gentlemen of the committee, it is a real pleasure to appear before you to make a brief presentation in the interest of Idaho reclamation. I say that advisedly because I realize, as was intimated a few moments ago by several members of the committee, you are all sympathetic and friendly toward reclamation development in the arid States of the West. And I regret my colleague, BOB RICH, is not present because I wanted to refer briefly to the statement he made on the floor of the House about 3 weeks ago during a debate on a certain appropriation bill.

We all recall that Mr. RICH has been somewhat opposed to some of the appropriations which have been recommended by your committee in the past. But he stated at that time that, because of the huge appropriations being made which were not reimbursable, he had changed his mind in regard to reclamation; and was willing to admit now that, if we are to expend these huge sums in our country and elsewhere, possibly reclamation should be deserving of greater consideration, because the Government has a good chance of recovering practically all of the money

appropriated and expended in behalf of the reclamation projects. I wanted to say that particularly for the benefit of the committee, because I believe that it is a significant statement in view of the attitude of Congressman RICH in the past years.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. DWORSHAK, I want to ask you if it is your deliberate and considered judgment that these reclamation projects now under way and those that are feasible and in immediate prospect should not be carried forward at the most rapid rate consistent with sound construction and sound economy, rather than carried out over a period of 20 or 30 years, as they will have to be if we limit it by taking money only from the revolving fund?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I should say that is true, particularly in view of the crucial situation confronting our country; and, because of the recent expediting of construction of multiple-use projects in the Northwest, there is an extremely urgent need for additional sources of power. And I believe also that, because of the influx of people into the northwestern area—and I speak specifically of the Northwest because that is the area in which I live, representing the State of Idaho—it is essential that we provide facilities for the building up of homes, rather than continuing the policy of spending huge sums for relief which is temporary in nature.

I have resided on one of the outstanding Federal reclamation projects of Idaho during the past 17 years, so I am thoroughly conversant with the benefits and with the contribution which reclamation makes to the development and the building up of the arid sections of the United States.

In urging this committee to give most serious consideration to proposing substantial increases for certain items in the Bureau of Reclamation section of the Interior Department appropriation bill, attention is directed to certain outstanding facts:

POPULATION INCREASING

First. The population of the 11 States of the Mountain and Pacific group, which are almost wholly dependent on irrigation, increased more than 14 percent in the 1930–40 decade. Idaho gained 17.6 percent.

Second. The uprooting of more than 300,000 farm and other families in the Great Plains, and the migration of more than half of them westward, contributed largely to Federal relief costs, which in 7 years exceeded two and one-half billion dollars in the 17 arid and semiarid States.

Third. Records show that a large part of the Federal relief outlay was due to the migration into the State of more than 20,000 families. Only a few of these were settled where they could become self-sustaining; some moved on to add to the problems of other States in the Pacific Northwest or to California. Those remaining are seeking to eke out a precarious existence by limited farm work available, but are to a great extent still dependent on relief.

Fourth. National-defense activities have not reduced unemployment in Idaho.

Fifth. The Federal Power Commission has reported a prospective shortage of power in the Idaho-Utah area. It is only through advancing Federal reclamation projects with multiple purposes that this shortage can be met. At the same time, we can provide supplemental water supplies for irrigation and flood control.

PERMANENT RELIEF

With this factual showing, the need for Federal reclamation developments in Idaho would seem to require no emphasis. The need is there to give employment in lieu of relief expenditures on far less permanent activities; it is there to provide opportunities for settlement where newcomers to the State who are qualified can become self-supporting; it is needed so that our irrigated farms can be in a position to contribute to the food supplies of the country in the national emergency with which we are confronted.

When I appeared before your committee last year, attention was directed to the fact that, out of nearly half a billion dollars expended for reclamation in the last 8 years, only a few million dollars—less than 2 percent—have been spent in Idaho. Yet this State and its increasing population are almost wholly dependent on irrigation.

I now suggest that, instead of merely scratching the surface by Federal relief work, some of the W. P. A. funds be put to work on water-conservation projects, and Federal relief funds spent on irrigation.

Specific suggestions I have for the consideration of the committee may be summarized thus:

The three Idaho items in the pending bill are all right as far as they go. Of course, there will be no objection to the $50,000 provided for completion of the additional unit to the Minidoka power plant. The $500,000 for the Payette Division of the Boise project will not advance that development as rapidly as the land is needed; and the $750,000 for the Anderson Ranch reservoir of the Boise project will not permit work on this unit to go forward and will not bring supplemental water, flood control, or power as quickly as all three of these developments are needed.

SURVEYS ARE NEEDED

Attention is directed to the item of $500,000 for general surveys and investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation. The meagerness of funds for this purpose over a long period of years has hampered the Bureau in making an inventory of water resources and in presenting worthy projects to the Congress. Not less than a million dollars a year is adequate for this purpose.

The limitation of $3,500,000 on the small projects under the water conservation and utility program should be removed and at least $5,000,000 provided for this purpose. There are 14 projects of this type that can qualify under this program and every other State in the West doubtless has many sections where this type of development is needed.

There is one project in my district which has long been planned and which will fill a critical need. I refer to the Grand Valley project on the Upper Snake River in eastern Idaho. Investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation have demonstrated the feasibility of this undertaking. It is needed to provide supplemental water for established agricultural areas that are the support of a large part of the population of southeastern Idaho. It is needed for flood control; and the power development, when brought in, will meet a threatened deficiency in electric-generating capacity that the Federal Power Commission has reported is already imminent in the Utah-Idaho area. Last month the Grand Valley project was approved by the army engineers' board. Not only is there an urgent demand for power in eastern Idaho, but electricity is also required for the development of the vast phosphate deposits in that area. Idaho has the largest deposits of phosphates of any State, and the early development of this resource is of vital concern to the Nation.

GRAND VALLEY RESERVOIR

The following preliminary estimates of this project have been prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation:

Physical features of dam: Location: About 50 miles east of Idaho Falls on the South Fork of the Snake River. Type: Rolled earth embankment with rock fill at downstream toe. Height above stream bed: 260 feet. Crest length: Approximately 2,400 feet. Grand Valley Reservoir: Total capacity: 1,420,000 acre-feet. Active capacity: 1,300,000 acre-feet. Storage allocation: Top, 500,000 acre-feet, primarily for flood control; intermediate, 800,000 acre-feet, primarily for irrigation; bottom, 120,000 acre-feet, dead storage for maintaining power head. Surface area: 16,450 acres. Power plant: Location: Downstream toe of dam. Capacity: 30,000 kilowatts. Transmission line: Location: Plant to Grace, Idaho, for power distribution in the Salt Lake region. Length: 85 miles. Capacity: 132,000 volts.

Estimated costs

Dam and reservoir	$18,125,000
Power plant and transmission line	2,811,000
Channel rectification	734,000
Total	$21,670,000

	Allocation of costs	*Annual benefits*
Flood control	$8,165,000	$355,000
Irrigation	7,794,000	400,000
Power	5,711,000	410,000

CONTRACT NOT COMPLETE

On July 15, 1935, the Fremont-Madison Irrigation District (composed of 41 canal companies) and the United States executed a contract to provide supplemental water for farms on the North Fork of the Snake River. Principal features of the project include the Island Park Dam and Reservoir; the Cross Cut Canal and Diversion Dam near Chester, Idaho; and the Grassy Lake Dam and Reservoir. These developments have been completed, but there remains the Teton and Squirrel Meadows unit, which should receive consideration in order to complete this contract with water districts on the North Fork of the Snake River.

Idaho has not participated greatly in the national-defense program, but as one of the outstanding agricultural States of the Union, it is deserving of consideration which will permit it to develop its resources to the fullest possible extent in order to make its vital contribution to the present crisis as an unfailing reservoir of foodstuffs and electrical energy. Because of the limited reclamation development during the past decade, Idaho is deserving of more generous treatment at the present time, and I urge your committee to give careful consideration to the presentation which I have made today.

Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE POST

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Post of April 23, 1941:

[From the Milwaukee Post of April 23, 1941]

SENATOR WHEELER CHOOSES TO IGNORE

Yesterday morning a representative of the Post delivered directly to Senator Wheeler the following letter:

"DEAR SENATOR: Will you be good enough, during your address tonight, to make answer to the following questions:

"1. On which side are your sympathies in the present world war?

"2. Do you think England can win the war without all-out aid from America?

"3. Do you believe the United States faces no military danger if Hitler becomes dominant in the Old World?

"4. What would it mean to our democracy if totalitarian Hitler has Europe conquered?

"5. If you favor a negotiated peace, what assurance have you in Hitler's past conduct that he will carry out the terms of that peace?

"6. What should be the American policy toward Hitler if he rejects your suggested peace proposal?

"Respectfully

"MILWAUKEE POST."

At his meeting in the auditorium, Senator Wheeler failed to answer a single one of those questions.

Had Senator WHEELER taken up all or even any one of those questions, he would have delivered a far better address than he did, more in line with the questions and fears that are in the minds of the American people, and less like a soap-box oration to catch the popular ear by the turn of a phrase or the utterance of a jibe. As it was, Mr. WHEELER's address was in no wise different from those he had been delivering in the other cities of the country, and a keen disappointment to the thousands of people, whatever their reasons for being there, who made up his splendid audience. He refused utterly to come to grips with the major questions besetting the American mind.

What Senator WHEELER failed to recognise, and so omitted from consideration in his address, is that while some Americans can complacently meet to listen to digs aimed at the head of an administration struggling with an international problem of greatest moment to the safety and the security of our Nation, Herr Hitler and his Nazi legions are digging deeper and deeper into the vitals of Europe until they and their known anti-democratic ideology will have a continent at their command and be on a fair start toward the "world order" which they have openly and avowedly set as their objective.

Nor is Senator WHEELER even fair in his assaults. There is no war party in America, no matter how often the Senator repeats the phrase. And certainly the President is no warmonger. There is a strong recognition of our danger should a different idea of government by force of arms prevail in the world. And all that sincere Americans want is to see that that does not happen.

Nor does that mean that any American thinks more of Britain than he does of the United States. Not even Senator WHEELER can make that stick. All he can honestly say is that Americans think more of Britain than they do of Hitler. Is Senator WHEELER ready to say that he does not? How much sooner that will have come than was supposed?

Nor can the Senator invoke the name of the elder La Follette and 1917. He does not know how the senior La Follette would have reacted in 1941. Knowing that American and his love of liberty and his hate of oppression there is good ground for feeling that if alive he would not now be doing a Wheeler with an amalgam of different interests on the platforms of the country. And if Senator WHEELER still has any doubts he might look at Senator NORRIS.

Neither is there any historical accuracy in Senator WHEELER's "No nation can depend on some other country," citing the small nations dependent on France. Since when can any nation hope to withstand the combined opposition of a group of nations, in subjection or in free alliance? Does America want that cost? Is Senator WHEELER ready to vote it?

No, Senator WHEELER did not make any converts last night. It wasn't the well-reasoned address grounded on honest assumptions and proving our fears to be without base. Senator WHEELER has delivered his long speech, but our fears remain. "We are still going to defend the United States, no matter who wins the war in Europe," said the Senator. Of course, we will. But there will be no need for it if Hitler does not win.

National Defense: Its Necessity, Our Policy and Spiritual Values

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I submit herewith copy of a speech delivered by me in Corsicana, Tex., on the evening of April 20, 1941, at the opening of the Fifteenth Annual Convention of the East Texas Chamber of Commerce.

The theme of the convention was "National Defense," and the theme of the session at which I spoke was "Spiritual Values in National Defense."

At the time of its delivery, the speech was broadcast by station KAND, Corsicana, Tex., and station KGKO, Fort Worth, Tex.

The speech follows:

It is good to be home again in the bluebonnet season, to breathe the pure Texas air, to bask in its balmy sunshine, and inhale the fragrance of its flowers. Only one who has been absent and returns can enjoy and appreciate to the full the beauty and glory of Texas in the springtime.

Since the adoption of the twenty-first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which eliminated the adjournment of Congress on March 4 in alternate years theretofore prevailing, my congressional duties have kept me almost constantly and continuously in Washington and this is my first glimpse of Texas at this season for a number of years.

I am indebted to the program committee of East Texas Chamber of Commerce for inviting me to address this mass meeting at their fifteenth annual convention. That the convention was to be held in my home city, and that its theme was to be national defense were two of the impelling reasons of my acceptance. One reason being based on sentiment, and the other occasioned by the grave emergency now confronting our country and about which I wanted to talk face to face with those whom I represent in Congress, and also others who live in the great empire of Texas where patriotism and unalloyed Americanism still lives and moves and has its being.

It is appropriate that this meeting should be held on Sunday night for nothing is more sacred than the preservation and well being of our country. The churches of Corsicana are to be commended for canceling their night services and joining in this patriotic mass meeting held on the eve preceding the one hundred and fifth anniversary of the Battle of San Jacinto.

I am advised that the theme of this evening's session is "Spiritual values in national defense," and I hope that I may be pardoned if I may be permitted to discuss the need of national defense and the policy of national defense of our Government at this time as a prelude to and a part of the spiritual values of national defense, since all are related, and the significance and importance of one cannot be understood without knowledge of the other.

WARS IN EUROPE AND ASIA THREATEN OUR SAFETY

National defense in any of its phases cannot be discussed or intelligently considered without full knowledge of the actual facts and conditions confronting our country at this time. For as Grover Cleveland once said, "It is a condition and not a theory that confronts us."

Ignorance of these facts and conditions, in my judgment, is responsible for much of the loose talk, reckless and undeserved criticism of our Government, all of which is calculated to promote disunity and inspire a lack of faith of the citizen in his government.

Our country is in danger. To those who do not agree with that statement it is a waste of time to talk about the necessity of national defense. Those who think that the war in Europe and in Asia is just another one of those so-called boundary disputes, just an effort of some country to correct an injustice growing out of another war; that the prevailing wars and those fomenting and directing them have no designs upon America, and that their outcome will not affect America regardless of who wins—those who entertain such views have not been thinking or have been listening to the sophistry of some of the short-sighted critics whose hatred of the President of the United States and of England has obscured their judgment and beclouded their vision.

A few days after I had spoken in Congress on the lend-lease bill, in which I sought, as I thought, in a calm and dispassionate manner, to clearly and accurately present the facts concerning the danger to our country; facts which I had learned from an extensive hearing before the Foreign Affairs Committee of those favoring and opposing the bill, and also in executive session, information of a confidential nature from the Chief of Staff of the Army, and the Chief of Naval Operations, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of State. I had a letter from some woman in a Midwestern State who said that she had read my hysterical speech, in which I had tried to frighten the American people and that she was ashamed of me. The poor, deluded soul, whose only knowledge of existing conditions was likely based on some radio speech which she had heard, did not realize that she was putting her judgment against the military and naval experts of our own country, who are charged with its defense and whose knowledge is based upon information gleaned from many official sources and the accuracy of which could not be challenged.

Yes, America is in danger. War is raging now on every continent of the earth, save the Americas and Australia. These are not isolated and detached wars, but are inspired and carried on by a combination of the Axis Powers of Germany, Italy, and Japan, whose declared and avowed determination is the destruction of all democracies and the subjugation and domination of the world. Germany has the mightiest and most powerful army and military machine the world has ever known, and the head of this Axis Power is as cruel, as despotic, and as ambitious as any ruler ever recorded in the annals of history. Supplementing the view of my woman correspondent, I was surprised to read in the Dallas News in its department Letters From Readers a few days ago a Texas man, who said "Our fear of Hitler is purely the result of political trickery; he has no notion of attacking us at any time." Since there may be others who think that I am hysterical, and that political trickery is responsible for statements concerning our danger, let me read you statements made last year by Hitler and also his Minister of Agriculture as to their aims regarding America and the world:

STATEMENT BY HITLER'S MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AS TO HIS AIMS IN CONQUERING THE WORLD

In May 1940, a group of leading Nazis were called together in Germany to hear a speech made at Hitler's instance by Walter Darre, Reichminister of Agriculture in the Hitler government. He said to them, among other things:

"We are going to win this war, and here are our aims."

He forecast the invasion of the Low Countries and the penetration of the Balkans.

"It will then be our duty," he said, "to organize economically the territories gained, which gradually will be included in the German area."

"Before autumn," he said, "we shall be the absolute masters of two continents, with the exception of Soviet Russia."

He went on further to say: "We shall introduce into our new living space completely new methods. All soil and industrial property of inhabitants of non-German origin will be confiscated without exception and distributed primarily among the worthy members of the party and soldiers who were accorded honors for bravery in this war. Thus a new aristocracy of German masters (Herrenvolk) will be created. This aristocracy will have slaves assigned to it, these slaves to be their property and to consist of landless, non-German nationals.

"Please do not interpret the word 'slaves' as a parable or as a rhetorical term. We actually have in mind a modern form of medieval slavery which we must and will introduce because we urgently need it in order to fulfill our great task. These slaves will by no means be denied the blessings of illiteracy; higher education will, in future, be reserved only for the German population of Europe.

"We have selected this form of slavery for several reasons."

Continues Herr Darre:

"The most important is that we are abolishing the gold standard and replacing it by work. This work must be as cheap as possible in order that our economic conquest may spread extensively and rapidly. Our future generation must, even in peacetime, be educated in such a manner that, in case of necessity, they may be fit to defend strongly and energetically what we acquired."

Then Reichminister Darre expanded mentally and geographically, as follows:

"I have been asked about my opinion of America, especially the United States, and the danger of this pseudo-democratic Republic's possible attempts to hinder us in our historical development.* * * We Germans have accounts which must be settled with this country. In this war, not to mention the last war, the United States holds all the gold of Europe, which was and indisputably is our property, Germany being the successive state of subjugated nations. The gold alone is practically of no value to us, but the insulting fact that something which God intended for us which we were robbed of and which is intentionally withheld from us must not remain unpunished.

The United States also will be forced by Germany to complete and final capitulation. Our superior industrial products will be sold at very low prices to the whole world and will cause the United States to have not 7,000,000 but 30,000,000 to 40,000,000 unemployed. Mr. Roosevelt will then beg the Fuehrer on his knees to purchase from the United States not manufactured products but raw materials at prices which we shall dictate. The United States is at present so demoralized and so corrupted that, like France and England, it need not be taken into consideration as a military adversary."

Speaking of the kind of slavery they intend to impose, Darre said this:

"Here, too, the form of slavery mentioned above will prove its worth. German masters, accustomed to command and, in case of necessity to strike inconsiderately where striking is necessary, will be fine pillars to uphold Germany's rule of the world."

I wish to quote here from Hitler himself, as set forth in a book by Rauschning, entitled "Voice of Destruction":

"We shall soon have an S. A. in America"—Says Hitler—

"We shall train our youth. We shall have men which degenerate Yankeedom will not be able to challenge. National socialism alone is destined to liberate the American people from their ruling clique and give them back the means of becoming a great nation."

These statements emanate from Adolph Hitler, of whom it is said, he never kept a promise; and never failed to execute, or tried to execute a threat.

OUR ISOLATION WILL NOT SAVE US

Well, there is another group of critics whom I would term the complacent type, who think that regardless of the aims of the Axis Powers that our isolation insures our safety. That all that we have to do is to stay out of Europe, attend to our own business, and all will be well. That the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans are complete barriers for our defense. They tell us very glibly that if England, separated by only 20 miles of water from the Continent, has not yet been taken, why should we fear. England, thank God, has not yet been conquered, due to her indomitable spirit, but the English people have suffered death and destruction from air raids and bombing, such as no other people have ever endured. These critics forget that aviation has reduced the size of the world and made the oceans only ponds. Would they be willing to suffer bombings in the air? New York is only 13 air hours from Berlin, only 12 from Paris, only 11 from London; 8 hours from the Azores and 8 hours from Iceland. Seattle, Wash., is only 16 air hours from Tokyo. They forget that South America, which under the Monroe Doctrine and also under conventions had between our Government and the other 20 American Republics, we are pledged to their safety, as well as our own, to defend, are vulnerable to attack from within and without. Brazil is only 6 air hours from the west shores of Africa, where Germans are now being mobilized, and within many of these South American countries Germans and "fifth columnists" are already active and spending large sums of money in propaganda in support of the Axis Powers. As someone has well said, Hitler has already invaded South America.

OUR OWN DEFENSE REQUIRES IMMEDITE AID TO ENGLAND

The third and last group of critics which I shall mention are those who concede our danger but condemn our policy of giving aid to England and other democracies under the so-called lease-lend bill. Let us analyze briefly the position of these three groups of critics, remembering that it is easy to criticize and those who know the least are sometimes the most critical and the most vocal in their criticisms. No. 1: No danger: Hitler likes us and has no designs upon us; No. 2: We are too far removed, and no one can harm us; and now I come to that group, who admitting our danger, claim that we are not concerned about what is happening in the rest of the world until we are actually attacked. International hijackers can kill and murder, that we are not our brother's keeper, and that our best bet is figuratively speaking, "load up old betsy, keep our powder dry, and stay home and wait for the hijackers to come after us." They contend that it is a matter of supreme indifference to us who rules in the rest of the world or what happens, so that it is not happening on this hemisphere. Let me say in reply that we have learned from history that our country is concerned, and vitally concerned, about what is going on in the rest of the world.

During the last World War, even before our participation in it, I recall having said there is no spot in the world where you can go to escape this war and its effects. It reaches unto the uttermost parts of the earth.

War between major countries, or any war that assumes world-wide proportions, upsets not only the countries involved but the peace of the world, the commerce of the world, the transportation of the world, and the security and safety of all countries.

This war is different from the last. The Kaiser had no designs on the United States. Unlike Hitler, he had made no threats to conquer the world. But today we have a ruler like Napoleon, who not only dreams of world conquest but plans for world conquest, and is already carrying those plans into execution, having already conquered practically all of the countries of Europe, and we know from his own declarations that the subjugation of Europe will not satisfy his lust for power.

So what are we to do? Sit down and watch him kill and conquer all of his other victims, when we know that we are next?

Suppose in the early days of Texas, in the San Jacinto period, a settlement of colonists should have received word that a neighbor colony situated only 11 hours distant (the air distance between London and New York) was being attacked by a tribe of savage Indians, and an appeal was made for guns and ammunition with which to repel the attack? Do you think the reply would have gone back, "No; we are not getting mixed up in anybody else's fight. We will do nothing until they attack us."

Would that have been the spirit of those sturdy pioneers who carved out this great empire, and by their suffering and their sacrifices, built the civilization which we now enjoy?

Those early Texans never turned a deaf ear to the cry of humanity, but even had they been cold and cynical, actuated by sordid selfishness, they would have known as practical men, that if they could supply the weapons enabling their neighbors to defeat the Indians, it would inure to their safety. Indians killed innocent women and children. So does Hitler. And the Indians were no more treacherous and perfidious than Hitler in breaking treaties and agreements solemnly made and entered into.

Looking at our own situation at this time, in purely a cold-blooded and selfish way, we are vitally concerned that England shall not fall. We are menaced both from the Atlantic and the Pacific. We have a one-ocean Navy with two oceans and two continents to defend; while we are building a two-ocean Navy, it will be 1946 before it is ready. So long as the British Navy is undestroyed and uncaptured, it will guard the Atlantic and we can keep the major portion of our Navy in the Pacific as we are now doing, but if the British Navy is destroyed or captured, then our situation becomes immediately grave and critical. If England wins, we will not be attacked, but, even if she should fall, which God grant that she may not, by helping her to stand we will have gained precious time in preparing for our own defense.

Secretary Hughes once said: "The Monroe Doctrine rests upon the right of every sovereign state to protect itself by preventing a condition of affairs in which it will be too late to protect itself." That is the basis of our right in passing the lend-lease bill, and I think the Congress of the United States acted wisely and with prudence, and based upon the necessity of our own self-defense in enacting that legislation.

Two serious and perplexing problems have arisen since the passage of that act which handicaps its effectiveness. Strikes in national-defense industries and the sinking of ships carrying defense articles to England

and other democracies, both of which threaten, if not stopped, to nullify that law by slowing down production until it is too late, and by sending to the bottom of the ocean the munitions and planes we have decreed shall be sent.

Both of these constitute a menace to our national defense and must be stopped. Strikes in national industries affect not only aid to Britain, but also the production of defense articles for our Army and Navy.

The strike situation seems to be clearing, but steps must be taken, either by consent agreements, executive, or legislative action, to prevent further slowdowns in the national-defense industries. If drastic action is required, I am ready to support it. Munitions are as essential as men, and if the youth of America can be drafted to fight, means must be devised to draft both industry and labor, if required, to equip these men for the defense of their country.

The defense of America is paramount in importance to the rights of any individual or any group of individuals, be they capitalists or laborers.

Likewise the defense of America is paramount in importance to the will of any submarine commander, or the will of any dictator of any nation or group of nations.

Under international law, the high seas belong to all countries alike, and our ships have the right, under international law, to sail the seven seas and carry such cargoes as they will to any country, whether at war or peace, except where an effective blockade has been established by a belligerent.

By our neutrality law, which is a domestic law, self-imposed, concerning which no other country has any voice whatsoever, we have forbidden our ships to carry passengers or any articles or materials to any country theretofore designated by the President as being in a state of war. We can repeal that law at any time that we like without the consent of any other nation on earth, and then our own ships would be as they are now, free under international law to go where they will and carry such cargoes as they please.

But without repealing that law the President of the United States, under the Constitution, as the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, has the right, without authorization of Congress, to use all or any part of our Navy in accompanying or convoying ships when he deems it necessary for the defense of our country. The President is hesitant to exercise this power unless it is absolutely necessary so to do and until all other means have failed, but if the time comes, and it may, that that is the only way to secure the transportation of planes and munitions we are sending to England for their defense and our defense, I believe that he will and should take this step. I believe furthermore the American people will follow the leadership of the President of the United States. He does not want war. The American people do not want war, but I think that they prefer the preservation of America at any cost rather than peace at any price. Let not our fear of war jeopardize or deter us from taking every step necessary for our preservation as a nation in this the most critical period of its history.

We believe that everything we hold dear is threatened. We feel the dangers to our civilization, to our way of life, to our cherished liberty. We prate a good deal about democracy and freedom and our inalienable rights—we did not buy them, we did not fight for them—others did that; others were willing to fight and suffer and die. We inherited them; you and I got them very cheap. So cheaply did we get them that some of us hold them cheaply now. Too great a price has been paid for them, and they are too precious to lose now.

But let us not deceive ourselves—we must make America strong. It is not enough to sing God Bless America. It is not enough to build a two-ocean navy, to spend billions for munitions and planes and ships, and to train millions of our young men in the art of modern war. That is not enough. As was said recently by one of America's leading divines:

"To do that and that only, would be like insulating the roof of your house, buttressing the walls against the winds outside, making your windows and doors secure, building up your fences, and making strong your gables, when all the time termites were eating away your foundation."

This Nation will never be strong until she strengthens her foundations, until she makes strong her spiritual and moral forces. There is where rearmament must begin. The character and moral fiber of our soldiers are more important than the type of gun and the military training we give them. We must make sure that the men of Yankeedom are not degenerate as charged by Hitler. They must be strong physically and mentally. They must be well trained and armed with the most modern equipment, but, over and beyond that, they must have character and an indomitable will to win, which only comes when their lives are grounded in the moral and spiritual forces that make men strong.

The old saying that man's extremity is God's opportunity is again being revealed as true. In this perhaps the darkest hour in the world's history, more and more men, like David of old, are looking unto the hills from which cometh their help. They are thinking of things eternal and spiritual.

Recently in Washington at the National Press Club, it was my privilege to hear 5 radio commentators who had just returned from the battle fronts in Europe and Asia in an open forum where they answered questions asked them. One of them, a young man of about 25 years (Ben Robinson, of South Carolina) was at Dunkerque and witnessed the evacuation of 300,000 British soldiers, one of the most marvelous feats of all times, and I asked him to tell us about it and he said, "God saved those men," and the moderator smilingly said, you mean, "God and ships," and he says, "No, I speak reverently. No one who has been through what I have, would speak lightly of the Deity. I mean what I say, God saved that British Army. For 2 days the English Channel, ordinarily the roughest and most turbulent body of water, was as smooth as a lake, and even the skiffs and rowboats that came from England to transport these men, sailed in safety." A few weeks later I heard an address by Lord Halifax, and he told of a prayer service held in Westminster Cathedral in London 5 days before the evacuation which was attended by the King and a vast multitude, and he said at that time it was thought that not more than 50,000 of these men could be evacuated, and that the prayers of the British people were answered when 5 days later 300,000 were saved.

The churches of America and other moral and spiritual agencies have resting upon them a tremendous responsibility. We must have unity among all classes, churchmen and nonchurchmen alike, and I appeal to Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, and all who believe in God and derive their inspiration from religion, to work against subversive forces that would array class against class, race against race, or religion against religion. In this crisis we must all be one against Hitlerism in all its forms.

America needs, as never before in its history, a reawakening of patriotic devotion, of unity, and religious fervor.

We need to turn reverently to the faith of our fathers—the faith that has never failed us in the 165 years of our Nation's history.

The greatest enemy of mankind has always been fear, and fear is one of Hitler's favorite weapons. The only antidote for fear is faith, which we need now.

Faith in ourselves, faith in our country, faith in our God. If these abide America will survive. If they vanish America is lost. God bless and save America.

Latin-American Relations—Some Further Observations on a Realistic Modus Vivendi Between Brazil and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1941

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, as the strategic key to the Western Hemisphere, Brazil is not merely our most exposed flank. She is also a vast potential frontier for cooperative development by American capital and commerce. This cooperative development and defense must be a popular, democratic movement involving the peoples, economies, and governments of this country and Brazil. In the forefront are the Inter-American Development Council and the Office for Coordination of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the American Republics, under Nelson A. Rockefeller.

BRAZILIAN-AMERICAN PARTNERSHIP FOR HEMISPHERE DEMOCRACY AND DEFENSE

Brazil is the part of the New World most open to German penetration—economic and propagandist—and to Nazi blockade or invasion. Vast, disorganized, and illiterate, Brazil is vulnerable to Nazi-fomented civil war. She lacks the transportation, industrial, and military means to defend herself in a world where no nation so rich in little-developed lands and resources can afford to be weak.

UNITED STATES SECURITY AT STAKE

If Hitler wins Europe and Africa, and the war news indicates this may happen much sooner than was anticipated, German penetration of Brazil will inevitably menace our security. Nazi economic and military control of South America would be terrible and a dilemma costly to us—costly not only in commerce but in terms of armaments and possible war to prevent our being isolated and threatened in our own hemisphere. This danger to American and Brazilian security colors every phase of our relations. I have already discussed certain aspects in my speech Brazil, Our Most Exposed Flank, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1171.

More immediately, this Government must try to head off any German effort to create civil war in strategic southern Brazil. We cannot afford to divert the ships and arms, so desperately needed by Britain, to Brazil. The idea of sending part of the United States Army, Navy, and Air Corps to Brazil is unpleasant. We can obviate the need of doing so by acting now.

Brazil has about 5,000,000 healthy, literate, and vigorous Italians and Germans concentrated in her dominant southern states. They may outnumber non-Fascist Brazilians able to participate in mechanized war. The million Germans are tough. They own and can use guns and motor vehicles. Most other Brazilians are easy-going and have little talent for war. Some 70 percent of them are illiterate, undernourished, and physically unfit. The Brazilian Army and air force are small and lack sufficient equipment.

Another immediate concern, as Duncan Aikman has just said in three articles in the newspaper PM, is the need to put first problems first. We must concentrate on things which cannot wait if we are to keep Brazil on our side, namely, help Brazil with her economic difficulties of huge agricultural surpluses and her need for certain shipping and production priorities from us. Essential trade goods must keep moving between the United States and Brazil if they are to be linked by mutual self-interest. It is a terribly tough problem that faces Nelson Rockefeller and he needs wide help and encouragement.

What are some of the other basic things we should do about Brazil, our best friend in Latin America?

WE MUST WIN BRAZIL TO THE DEMOCRATIC CAUSE

Possibly the quickest and cheapest tactic is to sell Brazil's generals and ruling class the idea that the Anglo-American, democratic cause is best, and cannot lose even if the war ends in a stalemate, with Hitler in control of Europe and Africa. We had better move fast to persuade the influential military bureaucracy and certain powerful businessmen and coffee and cotton planters that, despite a partial German victory, we and the British group of nations can continue to be Brazil's best customer and supplier of her needs. We must convince those who own, operate, and defend Brazil that their best interests lie with us.

The United States must quickly convert the Vargas regime to a belief in the possibility and advisability of hemisphere cooperation in democracy, defense, and trade. The Brazilians are worrying about German submarines, raiders, and bombers cutting Brazil off from our ports by dominating the 1,600-mile "strait" between the bulge of Brazil and west Africa. Presumably there will be talk of United States "protective custody" for Dakar, French West Africa's other ports, and the Portuguese Atlantic isles if Germany starts to move on Portugal and through North Africa toward the Atlantic. These may be the next moves in the chess game for Brazil, the key to Latin America.

THE UNITED STATES MUST HELP BRAZIL

Brazil can be made defensible and our security strengthened only if we help Brazil build railroads, highways, schools, hospitals, and factories. This is an expensive and long-range program, but it can and must be started now. Only if Brazil feels that she is to be aided cooperatively and fairly will she be won to the American way and the Anglo-Saxon side. Only as Brazilians gain better standards of living and overcome disunity, illiteracy, and ill health can they attain democracy. The cooperation we seek of Brazil in forging hemisphere solidarity and defense will come more quickly if we now announce that after the war there is to be no imperialism in the New World.

Brazilian-American partnership is so vital to both, that even at the risk of overcomplexity we must not neglect any possible channel of cultural exchange and understanding. For example, Brazil and the United States, as the two most populous nations of this half of the globe, have the largest number of Catholics. Also, we have between us nearly 30,000,000 citizens of Negro and part African ancestry. The long article on Brazil by Charles A. Gauld in the Negro History Bulletin for February 1941 lists ways in which Brazilian-American relations can be augmented among Negroes and Catholics. Our two countries have much to teach each other. Our cultural and commercial interchange must be a balanced, two-way process.

Invaluable prestige can be gained by the United States and for democracy by wise use of the press, books, and the radio to tell Brazilians in Portuguese of the problems, progress, and reforms of this country. As Prof. W. R. Sharp has lately written, German news stories and radio propaganda may sharply increase if Hitler seems to be winning. We must face this issue and insist that our case reach the Brazilian people and not merely a small urban group.

BRAZIL NEEDS DEMOCRACY

We must sell Brazil on democracy. It can be argued that with so many problems, Brazil cannot get democracy for decades. Nevertheless, the number two New World nation should be helped and encouraged to strive for democracy as her best defense against fascism—internal and external.

If the ignorant and poverty-stricken majority of Brazil's 43,000,000 people know we are honestly helping them, they will be more inclined to resist fascism. Brazil badly needs to be opened up by roads so her people can become unified and ship out their products and buy from us.

DEMOCRATIC UNITED STATES-BRAZILIAN COOPERATION AND LABOR

This can only come under a post-war system of democratic partnership between us, free of exploitation and imperialism. Only thus can we together defend the Americas. United States loans, both private and governmental, and American firms investing in Brazil's economic future must keep clearly in mind the rights and welfare of Brazilian labor. It is labor which will be producing goods and guns for defense. It is Brazilian workingmen, rural and urban, who may yet be called on to do the fighting and dying if war crosses the narrow South Atlantic and imperils freedom—ours as well as Brazil's.

LABOR MORALE IS VITAL

The importance of labor morale to hemisphere defense cannot be overemphasized. The morale of workers, Brazilian and American, must be preserved at all cost—even at the sacrifice of corporation profits. This continent cannot be kept free for democracy by big business alone. It will most certainly be defended by the Brazilian and United States working people if their way of life is made worth defending, but not otherwise. The fall of France shows what happens to the strongest armies and forts when the morale of the people is destroyed, along with their liberties and stake in the economic system.

MAKE PAN-AMERICANISM A POPULAR MOVEMENT

Brazilian-American partnership must not be an artificial process confined to officials and businessmen. To be broadly effective, it must be made a democratic, popular movement. It should reach the working people, not with words, but with concrete plans and benefits.

War and fascism cannot prevail against nations where democracy works.

SUCCESS DEPENDS ON UNITED STATES SINCERITY

Brazil may hesitate to cast in its lot with the United States if the liberties and standard of living of our workers are sacrificed in the name of profits and defense. If that happens, Brazil will know we are entering a period of exploitation at home and of imperialism in Hispanic America. And if that occurs, the ruling class and their Army relatives may choose totalitarianism for Brazil and economic deals with Germany.

Brazil and Spanish America took the "good neighbor" policy and democracy of the United States seriously only when we won labor rights and basic social and economic reforms under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Brazilian confidence in us will slip the minute these reforms go. It will increase if we show a desire to help Brazil win some of the same reforms, and if we help Mexico consolidate Cárdenas' gains.

Another immediate concern of the American republics is to prepare for the impacts of the war and aftermath of war. The economic front must be built up through markets, new industries, arrangements now to grant Brazil priorities in goods and shipping to prevent immediate and grave economic dislocations. Mordecai Ezekiel recently elaborated on these factors in international conciliation. He further believes there is a strong need for a whole series of social programs to increase Brazilian productivity through health and education.

Brazil's pro-Axis minority of planters, merchants, and officers fears Germany is going to win. A semicolonial nation dependent on selling its tropical, agricultural, and raw products to manufacturing countries cannot afford lightly to take sides against a possibly victorious Germany, which would rival us as the world's premier industrial country and market for Brazil. Then Brazil would be faced with choosing between cynical and ruthless totalitarian trade and penetration and what we might offer in commerce and aid. A triumphant Germany could exert terrific political and economic pressure on Brazil.

The Office of Coordination should lose no time in putting such trained observers and specialists as we have to work studying every phase of United States-Brazilian trade and solidarity. We must prepare for the Nazi impact. Yet the fellowships and grants of the State Department and foundations are still being given to persons uninterested in this crisis and denied to intellectually alive liberals keenly interested in hemisphere democracy and defense. Who is responsible for this? It is up to Mr. Rockefeller's agency and committees to correct it.

OUR RESPONSIBILITY AND OPPORTUNITY

At this time, as J. I. B. McCulloch states, it is both startling and chastening to see how we have fallen heir to the cultural, commercial, and military influence of Europe in Latin America. Our businessmen, professors, bankers, and defense missions have a unique opportunity. It is to be hoped the Congress will appropriate more generously for the inter-American program of the Office of Coordination than it did for the Department of State.

This Republic has assumed an enormous responsibility. As Librarian of Congress MacLeish has warned, we cannot afford to fail. We must try to solve first problems first in trade and economics. And we should try to carry out a sound program of labor and cultural relations. This may cost us five or six million dollars now. But it may save us vast sums later, along with our very security. Therefore let us establish firmly a true partnership for defense and democracy between the two biggest countries in the Americas.

Reduction on Nondefense Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN T. TREADWAY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1941

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the Secretary of the Treasury appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and proposed an increase of three and one-half billions in Federal taxes to meet, in part, at least, the heavy obligations under the national-defense program. It is estimated that existing taxes will yield approximately nine billions in the fiscal year beginning next July 1, whereas expenditures are estimated at nineteen billions. The Secretary feels that we should pay currently at least two-thirds of our total expenditures, or approximately twelve and one-half billions. To do this will necessitate increasing existing revenues by three and one-half billions.

It requires no great stretch of the imagination to realize that this is going to mean an extremely heavy burden upon all of our people. Taxes will have to be increased very sharply, all along the line. The people will of necessity be required to forego many things they now enjoy in order to have sufficient funds to meet the increase in taxation which is contemplated. I am sure they will do it willingly, so long as they know that by so doing they are helping to make America strong, both from the military and fiscal standpoints. However, they have a right to expect that if they are to be called upon to "tighten their belts," the civil agencies of the Government should be required to do likewise.

Secretary Morgenthau, in his testimony before the committee yesterday, recommended a reexamination of our nondefense expenditures, and suggested that we could easily save $1,000,000,000 by so doing. I am glad to commend the Secretary for this recommendation, which is in accord with what I have long been urging. At the present time, there is pending before the Rules Committee a resolution which I introduced in behalf of my Republican colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee, calling for the creation of a joint fiscal committee of the Congress, to be composed of members of the revenue raising and appropriation committees of both branches, which would be charged with the duty of coordinating Federal revenues and expenditures.

It seems to me that until we set up some such a committee to go into the whole fiscal program of the Government and lay down a broad general policy regarding the amount of money we are going to spend and how we are going to pay the bill, we will not be able to take any effective action to put the Nation on a sound basis financially. Unfortunately, I have not been able to secure action upon my resolution, but I may say that I have had a very favorable response from the country. The people are demanding that the nonessential and nonmilitary functions of the Government be curtailed, and under the rules of this body the duty to take action along that line rests with the Committee on Appropriations.

I am sure I speak the sentiment of the great majority of the members of the Ways and Means Committee when I say that we are insistent that an economy program be instituted in connection with any revenue bill which we may report out. We do not think it is fair to the taxpayers of this country to continually call upon them for more and more taxes when neither the administration nor the Congress has made any substantial effort whatever to reduce nonmilitary expenditures.

Whether my resolution is adopted or not, there is nothing to prevent the Ways and Means Committee and the Appropriations Committee from having a joint meeting to thresh out this problem and come to some agreement. The Ways and Means Committee is powerless to act on appropriation matters, and any item we might include in the tax bill calling for a reduction of expenditures could be eliminated from the bill on a point of order. Of course there is a method by which it could be done, namely, by securing a rule from the Rules Committee making the appropriation item in order, but I am sure the Ways and Means Committee does not wish in any such manner to infringe upon the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee. It would be much better if the Appropriations Committee would act on its own initiative, and I hope that some tangible results will occur within a short time—at least by the time the revenue bill is ready.

The time has come for action. There has been much talk in this House about the necessity for economy, but like criticisms that are made of the weather, nothing is ever done about it. When the people are staggering under the tax load which must inevitably be imposed, the bitter pill they will have to swallow will taste much sweeter to them if they know that the Government itself is cooperating by reducing expenditures. Otherwise, they may reasonably feel resentful.

Federal Reclamation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. WALTER M. PIERCE, OF OREGON

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I include the following statement made by me in support of Federal reclamation program before House subcommittee on Department of the Interior appropriation bill:

I have frequently heard the question asked: "Why construct more reclamation projects in the West when we have a surplus of agricultural commodities?"

About the best answer is the record, and I want to cite the experience of Malheur County, in my district in Oregon. The Owyhee and the Vale projects, completed in the last few years, have provided successful farm homes for 2,000 families, most of whom came from the Great Plains drought areas. Without the opportunities for settlement on the irrigated land provided by these projects, they would have joined the never-ending stream of migrants who are wandering through the West seeking chances for a fresh start in life, with many landing on the W. P. A. in the big cities.

Malheur County is an outstanding example of the value of Federal reclamation in providing homes for newcomers to the West. From 1930 to 1940 the population of the county increased from 11,269 to 19,766, a gain of more than 75 percent.

There can be no doubt but that the construction of the Vale and Owyhee projects contributed to the growth of the county's population and that as time goes on these 2,000 farms will create an ever-increasing purchasing power. They will require machinery and other manufactured products from the Middle West and East, and their crops will be consumed by the expanding population of the West.

With the example of what reclamation development has done for Malheur County, there is every reason to urge prompt completion of the Deschutes project in Deschutes and Jefferson Counties, where 50,000 acres to be irrigated will provide settlement opportunities for 1,000 families. Long-continued droughts have had a depressing effect on the population of Jefferson County, which showed a loss of 11 percent in its population from 1930 to 1940. On the other hand, a population pressure has been built up in Deschutes County, partly in anticipation of irrigated land being made available for settlement. This county showed an increase in its population of more than 25 percent in the last decade.

The Deschutes project will cost about $8,400,000, of which $2,000,000 will be represented by contributions of labor by the Civilian Conservation Corps, which has been doing excellent work on the project. Unless the allowance of $400,000 in the current appropriation bill is increased, $4,394,000 worth of work will have to await future appropriations. We are asking that the appropriations for the Deschutes project be raised to $600,000, an increase of $200,000.

At this rate, $400,000 annually, it will take more than 10 years to complete the Deschutes project. In all frankness it may be asked, Is it good business to string out this construction work for another decade and deprive hundreds of worthy families of an opportunity to become self-sustaining?

Another feature of this appropriation bill relating to reclamation projects is the allowance for the water-conservation and utilization program. The small projects this program is designed to reach carry a particular appeal because they are designed to rehabilitate established communities in danger of contributing farm families to the migrations which are already a big and expensive problem for the country. It is well that this program is being applied not only to the Great Plains but to intermountain areas. Two projects of this type in my district are tentatively listed for consideration under the program. They are the Crooked River development in Crook County and the Clear Creek in Wasco County.

The point that must be made in connection with these projects is that the proposed appropriation of $3,500,000 of reimbursable funds for this program is not sufficient. The amount should be increased to at least $5,000,000.

I hope the reduction in the appropriation for Grand Coulee Dam will not delay the installation of generators which will be badly needed to supply national-defense industries in the Northwest with electric power. For years I have urged the necessity for speeding the completion of projects like Bonneville and Grand Coulee and of adequate transmission-line facilities despite the opposition of the private utilities. The judgment of those of us who have been on the firing line—I refer to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY]—is now being fully justified. I feel the more confident in urging today that the reclamation program, which will be implemented by the appropriation now under consideration, be given the impetus it requires if its splendid work is to reap the best results.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR BONNEVILLE POWER PROJECT

I seek your indulgence again for time to speak briefly on the Bonneville items now before you. Your good judgment on previous occasions should not be passed over without appropriate comment. When I first appeared before you 4 years ago, the opposition was crying, "there will be no market for Bonneville power." They were asking that appropriations be curtailed. A few of us, like you, who were familiar with such matters, saw otherwise. Your past actions in providing transmission facilities have been a lifesaver in these critical times.

It takes a kilowatt operating for 1 year continuously to produce 1,000 pounds of light metal required for the essential air arm of our defense. In 1940, about 415,000 kilowatts of electric capacity were at work in the United States producing light metals. Reliable estimates show that Hitler has and has taken over in seized territories, about 1,000,000 kilowatts of such capacity. This shows that our light-metal production needs considerable augmentation if we are to have adequate defense.

Let us now measure what your previous Bonneville appropriations have accomplished. In early summer of this year Bonneville power will be producing at the approximate rate of 225,000,000 pounds of light metal per year. This is 54.5 percent of the rate that the entire country was producing last year. It will approximate one-third of such metal required for our air, Army, and Navy defense plans. You know as well as I do that it takes 2 to 3 years to construct such facilities. Therefore it is evident that your early foresight has accelerated this component of the defense program by at least 2 years. This, I contend, is a worth-while accomplishment made possible by the exercise of rare judgment when so many of our people were being misled by false prophets.

Today Bonneville has executed contracts for 279,000 kilowatts, with at least 225,000 kilowatts going into defense. More will follow, as the economics of the situation will require the utilization of the last drop of such available low-cost energy. The modern metallurgical processes require large amounts of current, with delivered costs below 3 mills.

I covered this general situation in a speech on the floor of the House, Friday, March 3, 1939. In this speech I pointed out the power shortages during the last war and by analysis I demonstrated 2 years ago that the defense power reserves on the Columbia should be 250,000 kilowatts. Today, through your efforts, we see 225,000 kilowatts of such capacity at work for the most essential part of our defense program. The exercise of such foresight merits the fullest commendation when so many doubting Thomases were willing to throw rocks at those who could interpret and use power statistics. A great deal of credit is also due to the Budget Bureau and the early few of the Bonneville staff for line locations and estimates that placed these initial facilities in strategic positions, so important at this time. Larger possibilities lie ahead and I trust that the two great plants will secure the heaviest industries as close to the busbar as is physically possible, with due consideration being given to mature sources and transportation. Such an approach will not only build up a great region but will turn out to be good business. I have stressed passing the benefits of this Federal construction as widely as is economically possible, but have also realized the industrial and defense possibilities and necessities, as is evidenced by my presentation before the Rivers and Harbors Committee in 1937 and my speech of March 3, 1939.

Bonneville items appear before you in two estimates. The first is the regular estimate sent up with the printed Budget and amounting to $12,958,500. The second estimate is a supplemental sent to Congress in early March. After Senate action on the supplemental, the residue items amounting to $9,900,000 are now before you. I need not go into the details, as full justifications have been presented by the administration. However, it should be noted that approximately 96 percent of the regular estimate and 87 percent of the supplemental estimate cover facilities absolutely needed to meet defense-load requirements. These large percentages also cover construction that fits into the general scheme of wider distribution. The remaining 4 percent of the total amount in the regular appropriation and 13 percent of the supplemental estimates will provide facilities to meet the preferential loads designated in the organic act, such as rural loads and service to public bodies. These small residual amounts will provide lines into territories which will later develop worth-while defense industries.

Last year and the year before, I presented justifications for the Pendleton line. This line is now under construction and will serve an airport and an ammunition dump. There is one particular item to which I wish to call your attention, and that is the Pendleton-La Grande line. It is not detailed in the regular Budget submission but the Administrator has included it in his justifications for the $1,500,000 feeder-line item of the first estimate. La Grande is in Union County, Oreg. The county last November voted to go to public power and to negotiate for the purchase of the lines of the private company. This line is needed to serve a territory which has decided by a fair referendum to become a customer of Bonneville Act, and I trust that your committee will see fit to specify this line in your committee report. It will be a comparatively small item, in the neighborhood of $350,000 and will be amortized, thus paying its way.

I make this suggestion so that the farmers, who to date have had the least benefits, will know that Congress is considering their expressed wishes and well-being in this large defense program. The people in the Deschutes Valley have similarly voted, and I trust that a portion of the advanced survey funds will be used to survey the economic possibilities for this service as was specifically covered in last year's appropriation. I understand that preliminary surveys have been run, but further work is required. I wish to thank you for this opportunity to make a few general remarks. I know that the 17 major items of these two estimates will, because of defense considerations, receive your full attention. Therefore I do not feel that it is necessary to go into the details that make up these amounts that cover construction outside of Oregon. I know that Oregon will share equally in the benefits of these expenditures, as the nature of the lower river terrace is such that lines serving this part of the Oregon country have to be routed along the Washington side of the line. You will find on analysis that the executed contrasts occurring between the dates of the two estimates more than justifies the supplemental estimate. These lines are all a part of a comprehensive grid. No one can be left out unless we wish to have idle and therefore nonusable plant capacity on hand during such a critical period, when every kilowatt should be put to work.

Why Not Think of Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald:

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

WHY NOT THINK OF PEACE?

Why not think of peace at Easter time? Why think of nothing but war—and of continuing the war through some indefinite

period to some sadly definite end of utter destruction and complete prostration?

In the very beginning the genuine military experts of England declared that no war could be brought to an entirely victorious conclusion unless the military strength and manpower of one side were 3 to 1 as compared with the other side.

In the Napoleonic wars this proportion of 3 to 1 existed on the side of England.

In the World War the same proportion prevailed on the English side.

In this war those proportions do not exist.

In fact, the proportions are nearly 3 to 1 against England unless the United States actively intervenes.

And then the proportions would be about equal.

Equal proportions of military strength and manpower mean an interminably protracted period of war—of mutual destruction and world-wide demoralization.

There have been protracted periods of war in Europe before.

The Napoleonic Wars lasted over 20 years.

Then there was the Thirty Years' War and the so-called Hundred Years' War.

English statesmen now declare that the present war is likely to last 10 years.

We, people of America, are cordially invited in to fight the war for Europe.

To what termination?

For what beneficent purpose?

To save democracy?

Bosh!

There will not be a shred of democracy left anywhere in the world at the end of a 10-year war.

There is mighty little left now in this country and less in England.

Will England in the end gain commercial supremacy over Germany?

What good will that do England or ourselves if in the meantime all commerce is destroyed and all purchasing power dissipated and all peoples prostrated, physically and financially—and all utterly demoralized, socially and politically?

Perhaps you do not think this will happen.

Well, my friends, the war has been going on for a year—and we have not yet actively participated.

Think what has happened in that year and multiply it by 10.

We have raised the national debt by $15,000,000,000—in 10 years that would mean by one hundred and fifty billions.

And, of course, the Nation would be bankrupt long before it reached that point.

In the last year we have conscripted 1,000,000 of our fine young men.

We are already talking of 2,000,000.

In 10 years it would be 10,000,000 at the least.

Nor would the 10,000,000 all stay in this country if we were actively in the war.

More than half of them—much more than half of them; probably nearly all of them—would be sent abroad.

We would have not only to keep the Germans and their European allies out of England, but we would have to drive them out of Europe—their Europe.

Could we do that with 5,000,000 men?

Could we do it with 10,000,000 men?

Those European people have 10,000,000 men or more strongly entrenched on their own soil.

Can we defeat them on their home grounds?

Can we dislodge them?

Can we reconstruct them?

Can we ever tell them what to do and how to do it, and will they continue to do it, any more than they did after the last war?

Can democracy ever be established in Europe?

Is not communism far more likely to be established in America?

With all our 10,000,000 men and our $150,000,000,000 and our misery and our bankruptcy and our loss of liberty what beneficent result can we actually accomplish in Europe?

What can we do that will warrant and justify all our sorrow and sacrifice?

What can we achieve by protracted and destructive warfare that cannot better be achieved by peaceful negotiation?

Poland could have been saved by peaceful negotiation.

And if Poland had been saved, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and Bessarabia would never have been endangered.

Norway and Denmark and Holland and Belgium could have been saved by the peaceful negotiation which the Queen of Holland and the King of Belgium and the Kings of Norway and Denmark earnestly and repeatedly urged.

France and all her empire—England and all her empire could have been saved by the same insistence upon peace that was exerted to create war.

Poland was told to refuse peace.

That she would be given support in war, and the brave little country heroically and recklessly went to war.

Norway was told she would be given support.

Holland and Belgium were pledged undying aid and alliance and told to hold out to the last man.

France was given every sacred vow of fraternal affection and military support.

But while the breath of the pledge was still warm, while the ink on the pact was still wet, the masterly retreat from Dunkirk was being accomplished and the continental Allies, the brothers in arms, were left to suffer alone the impact of Hitler's mechanized divisions.

The help promised came "too late or too little" or not at all—or if it came it stayed too little a while or not at all—and went right back to defend the right little, tight little isle, leaving the brothers in arms at the mercy of the foe.

Doubtless that was a natural and reasonable result.

Self-preservation is the first law of Nature.

All obey it except the saps and Uncle Saps.

So there is no use calling England "perfidious Albion."

There is no use branding Germany as forsworn and faithless.

There is no use calling France mercurial and undependable.

It is better to realize that all these nations were thinking in terms of war when they should have been thinking in terms of peace.

The world should have been thinking in terms of peace.

The world should be thinking now not in terms of continued warfare and unending destruction but in terms of peace and recovery and reconstruction.

The public of any nation—the dear, good, and dumb public—has been likened to a man riding backward in a train who never sees anything until it is passed.

Well and good.

We in America believe in the public.

We believe in the high purpose of the public.

We believe in the superior wisdom of the public.

We have a country which is the greatest on earth, and which has been built to greatness by this same dear, dumb public.

We are perfectly willing that the public shall not see anything until it is passed—if it only sees it then.

If it only shall profit by what it sees and what it experiences. We are satisfied if we do not repeat the mistakes of the past.

We are happy if we learn from them as we see them from the train window and watch them disappear in the distance.

When we look into the future we may think we are right in our opinion, but we cannot be sure.

But when we see clearly what is passed we know we are right if we only have the wisdom to learn by experience.

The world was eager for war when it should have been anxious for peace.

Perhaps all the people of the world, having learned by experience, are wisely desirous now not for a continuance of the war but for permanent and prosperous peace.

Of course, you have heard the old story of the Englishman and the Irishman who were having a fight.

And the Englishman said (and the Irishman agreed) that when either one was beaten he should shout "sufficient," and that would end the fight.

The two were strong and brave and they fought long and hard until both were battered and bruised and weak and worn.

And then the Englishman leaned against a post and said faintly, "Sufficient."

"Glory be," said the Irishman. "I have been trying to think of that word for the past half hour."

It may be that the embattled nations are trying to think of a word now—and that word is "peace."

It may well be that they are weary of war and only want an opportunity to negotiate peace.

The Pope, in his marvelous Easter message, said:

"Nothing can impede or restrain us from doing all in our power in order that, in the tempest of surging waves of enmity among the peoples of the earth, the divine ark of the church of Christ may be held firmly by the anchor of hope under the golden rays of peace.

"That blessed vision of peace which, in the midst of worldly conflicts, is the refuge and abode and sustenance of that fraternal spirit, founded in God and ennobled in the shadow of the cross, with which the course must be set if we are to escape from the present tempest and reach the shore of a happier and more deserving future."

What a glorious thing it would be for the great peace-loving people of the United States to labor in harmony with the Pope's noble ideals and strive to bring a Christian Easter peace to a war-weary world.

Objectives of Belligerents in the Current World War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF BISHOP FRANCIS J. McCONNELL

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, recently Bishop Francis J. McConnell, of the Methodist Church of the United States, delivered an instructive and provocative address over a Nation-wide hook-up of the National Broadcasting Co., before a luncheon of the People's Lobby in the National Capital. The speech was reprinted in the People's Lobby Bulletin. It contains factual data and persuasive arguments which I deem eminently worthy of incorporation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The People's Lobby, the executive secretary of which is Benjamin C. Marsh, has been carrying on a persistent and aggressive fight against the possibility of our involvement in World War No. 2. Bishop F. J. McConnell is one of the outstanding liberal divines in the country. As the president of the People's Lobby, he has been a staunch protagonist of legislation designed to improve the lot of organized labor. He has unfailingly inveighed against bills designed to limit or circumscribe civil liberties. He has demanded the retention of the democratic process. He has resisted proposed legislation which embraced tactics of alien baiting, Negro baiting, Jew baiting, and "red" baiting. He is not frightened by the war hysteria inspired bugaboo of the Red menace. He does not suspect the presence of a metaphorically long-haired, bewhiskered, bomb-carrying sycophant of Moscow, under every bed or chair in every building he visits.

McConnell has his feet on the ground and his eyes are clear and alert. He is capable of looking straight ahead. He cannot be coerced. He is not a fair-weather progressive. He does not trim his ideological sails to conform to every transitory breeze. We need more of his caliber in the clergy and in public life.

His speech is as follows:

I stand as a representative of, I think, a great body of American citizens who simply want light on some questions and are becoming a good deal puzzled as to why they can't get any light, in the way of a formal statement. I refer to the apparent unwillingness of the leaders of Britain to state, even in a general way, the peace aims. I want it distinctly understood that I'm speaking now simply from the standpoint of one asking for information. I'm not here as an absolutist conscientious objector. I never have been one. I'm not talking from that point of view. I'm not here standing as an opponent of giving whatever aid I can give in any way to Britain. That doesn't happen to be the question just now, except that Britain is seeking and is receiving aid from the United States. I am simply asking a question I think Americans ought to ask, each of them for himself and seek for an answer somewhere.

BRITISH PEACE AIM

What is to be the peace aim of the leaders of Britain, or the British Government? And I do not expect by that any statement in detail as an answer. I'm simply talking about the general aim.

Of course, Mr. Churchill has said if we stop fighting you'd soon find what we were fighting for. But that's not quite an answer to the question. The question is, after this war is over, what is the aim of the British people, and aside from the mere matter of self-defense of the Empire or of the Nation, on what grounds are they asking for aid from the American people.

There are some very disquieting things which keep creeping up in reports from England, repeated here in the United States. For example—the militarists, and the militarists now, of course, have to be listened to in England—the militarists are saying that the war won't really begin for 2 or 3 years yet, and then will have to end by a knockout blow by armies administering the blow in Germany itself. Well, now, if that's a statement of policy, we ought to know about it. If that's just the opinion of the military experts, of course, that's a different matter. These experts are specialists. They have their own use, good or bad, but if that in any sense represents the point of view of the British leaders, we ought to know about it for the simple reason that England hasn't herself enough troops to do that, and inasmuch as she hasn't enough troops to do that, where are the troops to come from? And inasmuch as we are concerned in the matter of giving aid to England, that becomes a very pertinent question to us.

If it means, on the other hand, going far enough to convince the entire German people that they cannot dismember the British Empire, or rather, put the whole British Nation out of business, that's an entirely different matter. But on as fundamental a point as that, there's been no clearing up at all. And inasmuch as we are being asked for aid on such large scale, it seems that there might be some answer to that question.

BRITISH CHURCHMEN'S VIEW

Now it's only fair to say that in England there is already another group of persons representing a point of view about which they are willing to speak, but it's a good deal of a puzzle that this does not get any larger representation in the press. You take, for example, the attitude of the Archbishop of York. He was one of the principal men speaking at the recent Malvern Conference, and that Malvern Conference went quite a distance in the way of stating the basis on which England must establish or reorganize society after the war is over. I can't go into detail about their program, it's a very advanced program. I do say it's very remarkable that it hasn't been given wider circulation in this country. I looked for a long time to find it and found it finally in the Information Sheet of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America.

WHO DETERMINES BRITISH POLICY?

I was utterly amazed to see how far a group under the leadership of an Archbishop of the Church of England is willing to go. I don't want to say that their platform is the platform of the British Labor Party, because I'm not familiar with any statement of that platform since about a year ago, now, May 1940. But it represents an entirely different point of view.

Now, is there any way of our knowing, will anybody tell us how far these matters are being considered? There seems to be a conspiracy of silence in hushing the whole matter up. It makes a very vast difference as to whether this is just a group of persons on their own, talking in a small circle or whether there is a growing sentiment on the part of England itself which will finally influence the leaders as to what the final peace aims are.

GETTING TO GERMAN PEOPLE

Of course, it can be said that if you talk this way, why then you give the impression, especially to Germany, that you're of a defeatist attitude. I haven't any spirit of defeatism at all. Only we keep hearing all the time that is is to be a war of public opinion. We're being told that Hitler's success depends not on Hitler, he's just an individual, but he struck his note at the right time so far as the sentiment of Germany is concerned.

In spite of all the restrictions on receiving messages in Germany, certainly there'd have to be some way of getting across to Germany these peace aims, if they are of the kind I'm talking about, looking toward a larger reorganization of society, looking toward a better chance for the ordinary man, looking for the dawning of a new day, and the rehabilitation of the world on some kind of sounder economic and social bases than we've ever known.

What broke the morale in 1918 of the German people were the fourteen points of Woodrow Wilson. Of course, they were not lived up to, but then people thought they would be lived up to, when they were uttered. And I imagine well enough it's easy to say in Germany the points now would not be lived up to.

But that's a good deal wiser policy, especially if it's sincere on the part of the people, than to keep talking about knockout blows which nobody can really define. Knockout blow might mean a victory of the sea, it might mean this other thing, the military conquest of Germany, which simply would be impossible, if civilization is to endure at all on the continent of Europe.

So I say there is every reason why we should keep insisting upon this. And there's another thing, we simply have to stand and ask the question—think what we're doing.

We're moving on, now, a nation of a hundred and thirty million, carried on with tremendous speed, and one criticism of the present social system is just this, that there has been such a swing away from the old individualistic opportunity for the expression of opinion to these massive movements, and these massive expressions in which the individual is not allowed to ask any questions at all.

So, as I say, without sympathizing with anything in the way of the German aim at all, I simply say that as an American citizen, I have the right to raise this question and insist upon it, and in spite of all the objections keep insisting, "What is the aim of Britain in this great conquest?" And the right of it, not because we want to interfere with any other nation's duties or activities, but a right come simply in this, that we are being called upon to make such tremendous sacrifices, and the most simple and the most reasonable requirement that we can make, is simply to insist upon a statement of what the final aims are to be.

It seems to me that's wise strategy and wise tactics, and certainly it's wise Americanism and wise social morality.

Wheeler's Appeal to Emotionalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of April 23, 1941:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of April 23, 1941]

WHEELER'S APPEAL TO EMOTIONALISM

One thing was significantly missing in Senator WHEELER'S speech at the auditorium. It was that clincher the isolationists were using only a short while ago in their assumption that this country has nothing to fear from Hitler. It ran like this:

"If Hitler hasn't been able to invade England over 22 miles of water, how can he attack this country across 3,000 miles of ocean?"

Aren't the isolationists so sure now that Hitler will not be able to land troops in England? Are they beginning to suspect what others have been thinking, that the German aggressor is using a subtle strategy—hammering the British Empire to pieces bit by

bit while making feints at the English island, thus keeping immobilized there huge forces of men and masses of war machines, the lack of which brings defeats to the British elsewhere?

Or have the isolationists, the WHEELERS and the LA FOLLETTES and the NYES concluded that it is a bit silly to keep talking about Hitler's not being able to land troops in England when the island is slowly being pulverized anyway by bombs from the sky?

Have they also been looking at pictures of that long-distance plane our Army is testing, a plane designed to fly the round trip to Europe? If we can build that kind of bomber, Hitler can, too.

Events have moved so rapidly to discredit the shallow arguments of these isolationists that they have to shift their ground rapidly. They have been shifting constantly ever since the late Senator Borah, then their leader, stood up in the Senate to answer President Roosevelt's warning in the fall of 1939 that a world war was likely to break out soon.

Borah declared flatly that there wasn't going to be another world war. He knew better than the State Department. And the echo of his words had hardly died away before the cannon began to roar.

Then the isolationists had a lot of us believing and saying that it was just a "phony" war. Remember? They aren't saying that any more either. In fact, they have been tripped up so often by their own shortsightedness that there isn't any reason why anyone should put any faith in their judgment any more.

So Senator WHEELER simply assumes without argument that there is nothing to be worried about, that nobody is going to hurt us if President Roosevelt doesn't force us into war, and that if anybody does attack our shores every man will rush to the mantel and take down the old musket, and if the men don't thus spring to the defense of this country he is sure the women will.

A Senator of the United States actually said that.

Perhaps this was a lame attempt to be humorous, but that kind of talk isn't funny in these grave days. Oh, yes; the Senator, as do all the dissembling isolationists, declares himself for arming this country to hold off any power or any combination of powers that might be so foolhardy as to attack us. And then he blisters the administration for acquiring land in Bermuda and sending 5,000 American troops, to that defensive outpost. What kind of muddled reasoning is that?

The prospect of the vise this country will be in, if Great Britain falls, with Japan pushing one pincer down into Singapore and Hitler pushing the other pincer into North Africa, apparently has not entered Senator WHEELER's horizon.

An idea of what may be shaping up for us with Hitler and his Axis partners, masters of millions of people embittered, who may even in the poverty of their war wreckage turn on us for self-survival, apparently has never given WHEELER pause for thought.

That Hitler has proclaimed a crusade of the "have nots" against the "haves," imbuing his followers with the zeal of fanatics, apparently gives WHEELER no concern. Even though we are the world's largest storehouse of riches, the Senator assumes that we could deal with Hitler, although the whole course of Nazi philosophy belies any safety to any country which puts its trust in Von Ribbentrop agreements.

So the Senator drones on for the better part of an hour and a half, venting his anti-British sentiments, indulging his anti-New Deal animosities, playing skillfully upon the desire and the hope of all of us that in some honorable way—and we stress the word "honorable," although the Senator does not—that we shall escape the holocaust that is sweeping all the rest of the world. So he drones on, ad libbing vicious jabs which do not appear in the text he gives newspapers for publication.

As a demagogic appeal, we presume, Senator WHEELER's campaigning would be considered a masterpiece. But his perspective of this tragic world convulsion extends no further than the end of his nose. And the harm of it is that it may persuade some emotionally high-strung but well-meaning citizen to do something that may get him into serious trouble with his Government.

Latest Gallup Poll Reports Big Majority Against Any Further "Steps Toward War"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STRATTON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the attached reproduction of the latest complete Gallup poll as printed in the Baltimore Sun this week merits the close study and analysis of every thinking American who believes in the principle of majority rule in this country.

It will be noted that in addition to the 83 percent of Americans who oppose our entrance into the war as reported in the last Gallup poll on that question, the current poll reveals the even more significant fact that vast majorities of Americans oppose any more steps toward war, whether it be sending a part of our Army, a part of our air force, or a part of our Navy for use in convoys. In fact, the South is the only section of the country which gives as much as a 30-percent vote favorable to any of these steps and in not a single instance, even in the South, is a vote of over 40 percent recorded for any of these steps smacking of active participation in the war.

[From the Baltimore Sun]

THE GALLUP POLL—TREND OF AMERICAN THOUGHT ON SENDING NAVY AND AIR FORCE TO EUROPE

(By Dr. George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N. J., April 19.—How are the American people reacting to the latest events in the European war?

As part of its continuous soundings of American public opinion on the war, the institute has put a series of questions to men and women in every corner of the American Republic, in order to answer the following urgent questions and others:

Have recent reverses for Britain and her allies increased or decreased the American public's desire to help?

What has been the trend of United States thinking on convoys?

How have the average American's views of the length and probable outcome of the war been affected by the latest events? And how much sentiment is there now for active intervention as in 1917?

Nation-wide tests of American public reaction were begun the moment Adolf Hitler's panzer divisions swung into Greece and Yugoslavia, and succeeding reports in this series will chart the resulting picture.

Meanwhile new studies begun just before the German blitzkrieg in the Balkans and North Africa reveal that many Americans are making an important distinction between entering the war with an A. E. F.—as we did in 1917—and waging a war limited to warships and air forces only.

While the institute's survey finds that a majority of voters are opposed to fighting even a "limited" war in Europe, probably no picture of United States thinking is complete today which does not take the following phases of public opinion on the war into account:

SEND PART OF ARMY?

First and most important is the attitude on sending an army—another A. E. F.—abroad to fight.

From a score of surveys the institute has found that the term "entering the war" generally means only one thing to the American public—the dispatch of men as in 1917. And on this question majority American opinion continues to register an overwhelming "No."

Opinion on the question has been remarkably stable so far, no matter what events have occurred in Europe. It is true, of course, that Americans have thus far been able to find numerous measures "short of war."

Yet even at the height of Hitler's blitzkrieg in the west last spring—and at the peak of his raids on London in September—the institute has never found quite a fifth of the voters of the country in favor of a "shooting war" with troops.

SEVENTY-NINE PERCENT ARE OPPOSED

The newest institute tests show that this attitude has been holding firm. "Do you think the United States should send part of our Army to Europe to help the British?" men and women in a cross-section of the voting population were asked.

Replies from every State in the Union show the following results:

	Percent
Favor sending part of Army	17
Oppose sending part of Army	79
Undecided	4

While most voters show by their comments that they are opposed to sending troops on principle, many who oppose it in today's survey indicate their opinions might be subject to change later. These are the men and women who say "we shouldn't send troops abroad now," or "not at this time," or "Churchill and Roosevelt both say the British need guns and tanks—not men."

PLANES AND WARSHIPS

But Washington observers and military writers have mentioned the possibility the United States might wage a "limited war" on the Axis, using either warships manned by American seamen, warplanes with American pilots, or both.

How would the public respond to such proposals?

The results of the institute's survey indicate that when the idea of American participation is limited to part of our air force, the 17 percent willing to send men increases to 24 percent.

When participation is limited to "some of our warships," the 17 percent becomes 27 percent.

Here are two important phases of the public's attitude hitherto unrevealed:

Do you think the United States should send part of our air force with American pilots to Europe to help the British?

	Percent
Favor sending part of air force	24
Oppose sending part of air force	69
Undecided	7

Do you think we should send some of our warships manned with American sailors to Europe to help the British?

	Percent
Favor sending some of our warships	27
Oppose sending some of our warships	67
Undecided	6

VARIED INTERPRETATIONS POSSIBLE

The foregoing attitudes will give American observers new material for reflection, and doubtless individual commentators will interpret the results in different ways. Some will stress the fact that American public opinion remains preponderantly against armed intervention by the United States even in a "limited" war.

Others will stress the distinctions the public seems now to be making between the use of the Army and the other services. The institute's only purpose in this, as in all other surveys, is purely one of finding the facts about the public's attitudes.

What new trends of thinking have been set in motion by the events in North Africa and the Balkans will be reported in four further articles this week.

SOUTH 40 PERCENT FOR WARSHIPS

Noteworthy in today's tests is the division of opinion in different sections of the United States. The Midwest remains most noninterventionist, while the relatively belligerent South votes 25 percent for sending part of the Army, 36 percent for sending air squadrons, and 40 percent for sending United States warships manned by American sailors.

The sectional vote:

SEND PART OF ARMY?

	Yes	No	Undecided
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
New England, Mid-Atlantic	15	81	4
East Central	16	80	4
West Central	13	82	5
South	25	68	7
West	19	78	3

SEND PART OF AIR FORCE?

New England, Mid-Atlantic	22	71	7
East Central	21	72	7
West Central	20	73	7
South	36	56	8
West	26	67	7

SEND PART OF NAVY?

New England, Mid-Atlantic	24	71	5
East Central	27	68	5
West Central	21	72	7
South	40	54	6
West	29	66	5

Congressional Apportionment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

STATEMENT BY PROF. EDWARD V. HUNTINGTON, OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Prof. Edward V. Huntington, of Harvard University:

THE ROLE OF MATHEMATICS IN CONGRESSIONAL APPORTIONMENT

(By E. V. Huntington, Harvard University)

In regard to methods of apportionment in Congress, Government officials have three times appealed to scientific bodies for technical information. Since one of these bodies is the Harvard Department of Mathematics, of which I happen to be now the senior member, I beg the privilege of explaining briefly the role which mathematics has to play in this situation.

This role has been much misunderstood. The picture of a "long line of mathematicians" filing by, each trying to sell his own pet scheme to the committee, is a fantastic travesty. A mathematical theorem is not a matter for proponents and opponents to wrangle over as if it were a river-and-harbor bill. A new mathematical theorem has just one essential property: It is either true or false. If it is true, it is simply accepted as one more step in advance in the natural growth of this rapidly growing science. If it is false, that fact will be speedily discovered by competent critics. No personal or political motives, inside or outside of Congress, have anything to do with the truth or falsity of the theorem.

What mathematics has done in the present instance is to establish, in 1921, a new theorem called the theorem of equal proportions, through which the whole problem has been enormously simplified.

For over a century Congress had been trying to find a mathematical method of apportionment that would put each State as nearly as possible on a par with every other State, in accordance with the Constitution; but the mathematical tools then available were not far enough advanced to supply a solution. All kinds of complicated theories about things like "sliding divisors" and "fractional remainders" were argued pro and con without leading to any satisfactory conclusion. The new theorem came like an answer to prayer, supplying precisely the kind of simple and self-explanatory test that Congress had long been seeking.

The simplified theory is thoroughly realistic. It takes up the situation at precisely the point where Congress itself takes it up in each decennial debate—at the point, namely, where an actual apportionment bill is presented for discussion. Every Congressman who examines such a bill begins by figuring out the average numerical size of the congressional districts in his State (by dividing the population of the State by the number of Representatives assigned thereto). If the average district in his State comes out larger than that in some other State, he very naturally and properly raises the question whether a seat should not be transferred from that other State to his. The size of the House being fixed, the debate always comes down, in the last analysis, to this question: "Should or should not such a transfer be made?" As the most natural commonsense answer to this question, the modern theory offers the following simple test:

TEST OF EQUAL PROPORTIONS

A proposed transfer of a seat from one State to another State should be made when, and only when, the percentage inequality between the congressional districts in the two States would be reduced by the transfer.

For example, suppose State A demands the transfer of a seat from State B. If, before the transfer, the A district is 11.02 percent larger than the B district, while, after the transfer, the B district is 11.26 percent larger than the A district, then, under the test of equal proportions, the transfer should not be made.

By this simple test, any dispute between two States in the matter of apportionment can be settled immediately by the most elementary arithmetic. The only data required are the populations of the two States directly concerned and the number of Representatives assigned to each. It is no longer necessary to compute any "exact quotas" or any "fractional remainders." All the controversial items in the earlier debates simply drop out of the picture.

It should be observed that this test of equal proportions merely gives precise expression to an aim which has always been upheld by Congress, namely, the desire to equalize as far as possible the congressional districts among the several States. The only point at which any real mathematics is involved is in the proof that the test can be successfully applied to every pair of States. (It is not immediately obvious that an improvement in the relation between two States, A and B, might not upset the relation between one of these States and some third State, C.) This point is covered by the following theorem:

Theorem 1. There is a process of computation, well known to the Bureau of the Census, the result of which will always satisfy the test of equal proportions for every pair of States simultaneously.

The truth of this theorem is vouched for by the unanimous report of the Census Advisory Committee, requested by the chairman of the House Committee on the Census in 1921, and by the unanimous report of a committee of the National Academy of Sciences, requested by Speaker Nicholas Longworth in 1928; and the technical process referred to in the theorem is clearly set forth in many places. But the details of the process of computation shed no new light on the fairness of the method and need not be repeated here. The fairness of any method can be tested only by examining the resulting actual apportionment. In this game the test's the thing.[1]

The current debate in Congress turns on a choice between two methods. The role of mathematics in this debate may be summed up as follows:

Theorem 2: If Congress desires to equalize the congressional districts as far as possible among the several States, the method of equal proportions will always give a better result than the older method of major fractions. The method of major fractions cannot be counted on to equalize the congressional districts on any basis whatever.[2]

---

[1] As far as the process of computation is concerned it is the same in all the methods, except that a different "table of multipliers" is used in each case. There is no difference whatever in the amount of time or labor involved in the computation. For further information, see E. V. Huntington's A Survey of Methods of Apportionment in Congress, printed for Senator DAVID I. WALSH as S. Doc. 304, 76th Cong., 3d sess., 1940; or Dr. Schmeckebier's book on Congressional Apportionment, published by the Brookings Institution in Washington, 1941; or Dr. Dedrick's statement on behalf of the Bureau of the Census, printed in the hearings on H. R. 2665, held before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Commerce, February 28, 1941, p. 44.

[2] In order to meet a certain unsound criticism, the following somewhat stronger theorem may be noted: Theorem 3: The method of equal proportions is the only method which will apportion a given number of Representatives among the several States, so that the ratios of population to Representatives, and also the ratios of Representatives to population, shall be as nearly equal as may be among the several States.

To a layman the information contained in these theorems 1 and 2 may seem a useful service for any science to perform.

Not so in the eyes of professional politicians. The Gathings equal-proportions bill (H. R. 2665), which passed the House on February 18, 1941, by a vote of 210 to 142, was blocked in the Senate by a small group in the Senate Committee on Commerce. Members of this group, largely influenced by Professor Willcox, of Cornell, sharply resent the intrusion of mathematical theories in a field which they regard as purely political, not at all mathematical. Professor Willcox flatly rejects (or, more accurately, deliberately ignores) the mathematical theorems cited above, replacing them by statements which he holds to be free from mathematical taint. Thus in 1928 he stoutly upheld the following thesis:

WILLCOX STATEMENT OF 1928

The only method which makes the congressional districts in small and large States as nearly equal as possible is the method of major fractions.

In 1940 he replaced this statement by the following, which he believes more accurately reflects the political wishes of Congress:

WILLCOX STATEMENT OF 1940

If the main purpose of apportionment is to make the congressional districts as nearly equal as possible, that purpose is best secured by the "method of smallest divisors."

These two statements, we are to understand are purely political and therefore entirely immune from mathematical attack. The fact that both of them, no matter how they may be labeled, are definitely false appears not to worry their author in the least.

In fairness to Professor Willcox, however, it must be noted that his opposition to the method of equal proportions is based primarily on a different thesis, namely, that no one in Congress can understand it. This is perhaps the first time in history that advocates of any measure have openly accused the Congress of the United States of being unable to multiply and divide. And yet the ability to follow these most elementary rules of arithmetic is all that is needed to understand the exact meaning of the test of equal proportions and to apply it successfully in any given case. The only difficulties that have arisen are due to the persistent inclusion, by the opponents of the method, of superfluous and irrelevant complications that it was the purpose of the new method to remove. By consistently refusing to place before their readers any correct citation of what the test of equal proportions really is, the opponents of the modern theory stamp themselves as 20 years behind the times.

George Washington, whose first veto concerned an apportionment bill, and Daniel Webster, whose eloquent appeal for a just apportionment represented the best thought of his day, would have welcomed eagerly the mathematical tools which are now available for achieving their goal. The goal remains the same: To make the congressional districts as nearly equal as possible among the several States. Senator CARAWAY, of Arkansas, is endeavoring to revive the equal-proportions bill with a perfecting amendment. According to theorem 2 above, a vote to reject this amendment and to retain the method of major fractions would be tantamount to a complete abandonment of the goal of equalization of districts. Do the present-day leaders in Congress really believe that a deliberate abandonment of that goal would be a sound political policy?

The following note is added for convenience of reference: Under the 1940 census, for a House of 435 Members, the apportionments by the method of equal proportions and the method of major fractions differ in respect to only two States. A comparison between the resulting congressional districts in these two States is shown as follows:

(Size of House: 435)		Method of equal proportions		Method of major fractions	
State	1940 population	Number of Representatives	Congressional district	Number of Representatives	Congressional district
Michigan	5,256,106	17	309,183	18	292,006
Arkansas	1,949,387	7	278,484	6	324,898
Absolute difference			30,699		32,892
Percentage difference			11.02		11.26

Thus the inequality between the congressional districts (whether absolute or relative) is smaller under the method of equal proportions than it is under the method of major fractions.

This example, which is typical, illustrates the main argument in favor of the method of equal proportions as against the method of major fractions.

Increase of Gasoline Tax in the District of Columbia

REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in the House of Representatives today a bill (H. R. 4549) to levy an additonal gasoline tax of 2 cents per gallon upon motor-vehicle fuel sold in the District of Columbia. This bill is exactly like the one introduced by the gentleman from West Virginia, the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH, who is the chairman of the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives, which he introduced on August 4, 1939, except that I have changed the tax stipulated in his bill from 1 cent to 2 cents. This will make the total gasoline tax in the District of Columbia 4 cents per gallon, which is exactly the same as it is in my State of Indiana, and brings it practically to the average of the gasoline tax paid by our constituents in the several States. This average is 4.2 cents per gallon.

When my bill becomes law, the total gasoline tax for the District of Columbia will be 4 cents per gallon, exclusive of the Federal tax. The Federal tax is added to the State tax in all jurisdictions.

When the gentleman from West Virginia, Chairman JENNINGS RANDOLPH, introduced his bill known as H. R. 7526, on August 4, 1939, in the Seventy-sixth Congress, he made the following remarks which are contained in his extension of remarks appearing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 84, page 3858, which I quote:

After due consideration of these principles, I believe the fairest means available is the levying of an additional 1-cent sales tax per gallon on gasoline * * * and which could be collected with very little administrative expense.

I hope every Member of the Congress will take the time to read the excellent presentation of this subject as contained in the gentleman from West Virginia's [Mr. RANDOLPH'S] remarks.

This bill, H. R. 7526, of the Seventy-sixth Congress, was referred to a special subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives, of which the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable W. R. POAGE, was chairman. This special subcommittee conducted extended hearings upon this subject of increasing the gasoline tax in the District of Columbia, and secured valuable data and information from the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, Col. D. McCoach, Jr., and then the chairman of the special subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable W. R. POAGE, for and in behalf of his special subcommittee, submitted an exhaustive report on the necessity of imposing an increased tax on the retail sale of motor fuel in the District of Columbia. I feel this special report submitted by the gentleman from Texas, Chairman W. R. POAGE, is one of the finest and most convincing reports which has been given to the Congress on this distressing subject. I hope every Member of the Congress, as a service to his or her constituents, will read this report of the gentleman from Texas, Hon. W. R. POAGE, chairman of this special subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives. If you do, you will learn how your constituents are being imposed upon by this unfair gasoline tax situation which has prevailed in the District of Columbia too long.

On page 7 of the Poage report, you will find that during the 15 years of operation of the gasoline tax fund in the District of Columbia, it has lacked over $42,000,000 of meeting the expenses required for the proper maintenance of streets, highways, bridges, and traffic control in the District of Columbia. The Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, Col. D. McCoach, Jr., has repeatedly officially informed members of the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives that urgently needed street, highway, and traffic improvements cannot be made without much additional road-improvement revenue.

The Honorable WILLIAM T. SCHULTE, of Indiana, who is the chairman of the streets and traffic subcommittee on the

District of Columbia, making recommendations of remedial traffic measures, has recently filed the report of his subcommittee known as Traffic Investigation Committee 5-Year Gasoline Tax Increase. Mr. SCHULTE's report recommends an additional gasoline tax of 2 cents, which would raise the total gasoline tax in the District of Columbia to 4 cents. I hope every Member of the Congress will read this splendid report of Chairman SCHULTE's subcommittee.

This bill which I have just introduced accomplishes the results recommended by Chairman W. R. POAGE's report, and the report by Mr. WILLIAM T. SCHULTE's traffic committee.

I can see no good reason why our constituents in Indiana, Texas, and West Virginia must pay an average 4-cent gasoline tax to maintain their roads, and then be required to contribute through a Federal tax donation to the District of Columbia road fund to keep up the streets and bridges and traffic police in the District of Columbia, and at the same time the District of Columbia motorists pay only 2-cent gasoline tax. If the District of Columbia did not need the additional road, street, and traffic-control money, it would be a different story, but when 2-cents-a-gallon gasoline tax will not maintain the streets, bridges, and traffic control in Washington, D. C., it is decidedly unfair to our own constituents to collect only a 2-cent gasoline tax in the District of Columbia, and then ask our own constitutents who pay 4-cent gasoline tax to maintain Indiana roads, to also make up the deficit caused by this low, discriminatory, special-privilege gasoline tax in Washington, D. C.

I know that the Capital Traction Co., which buys many thousands of gallons of gasoline and collects 10 cents per ride from its passengers, wants to buy gasoline at the expense of our Indiana, Texas, and West Virginia constituents and at the expense of the constituents of every Member of the Congress, but that is no reason why we Members of the Congress should permit this to be done.

I know the big oil companies are against this bill, and are always against any tax on petroleum products. They have appeared before committees of the Congress considering bills of this character at various times in the past in vigorous opposition and they have signified no change of mind. I know there are owners of large fleets of automobiles and trucks doing business in Washington, D. C., who care nothing for our Indiana, Texas, and West Virginia taxpayers, but that does not justify we Members of the Congress permitting a condition to exist where the District of Columbia needs all of the revenue a 4-cent gasoline tax will produce, and then only levy a 2-cent tax, and make up what the other 2 cents would produce by dipping into the Federal Treasury maintained by our constituents.

Our Indiana constituents contribute to the Federal Treasury through Federal taxes of various kinds, they also maintain their own roads, through an average of a 4-cent gasoline tax, and it is only fair to our own constituents to demand that the motorists and operators of large fleets of cars and trucks in the District of Columbia pay a like gasoline tax for the maintenance of roads, highways, streets, and traffic-control purposes, before asking the Congress to appropriate money contributed by our own constituents and your constituents to make up the deficit we allow to prevail in Washington, D. C., by permitting a gasoline tax far below the average of the States.

If our constituents contribute to a deficit in road, highway, street, and traffic control funds in the District of Columbia and at the same time keep up their own roads, they are being definitely discriminated against. There is no reason why residents of Washington, D. C., should not pay as much gasoline taxes as do the constituents of every Member of the Congress. It is a privilege to live in Washington, D. C., the Capital of our Nation, but it is not the kind of a privilege that requires the Congress to permit its inhabitants to pay less gasoline tax than do their own constituents and then appropriate large sums of money to help Washington, D. C. I am in favor of helping the people of Washington, D. C., when they have paid as much gasoline tax as the average of the States; then if they need more money the Congress should provide it. It should not allow motorists in the District of Columbia to pay less gasoline taxes than our Indiana, Texas, and West Virginia constituents do, and then ask the Congress to make up a deficit caused by the District of Columbia very low gasoline tax rate. Ordinarily I am against any increase of tax in any tax field unless it is absolutely necessary. In this instance human life is at stake in the District of Columbia, and I want the District of Columbia to bear its just share of the cost of solution.

I know that the failure to provide road, street, highway, and traffic control gasoline tax money is costing many human lives; many persons have been killed and injured in the District of Columbia whose fatalities and accidents could have been avoided by purchasing proper safeguards in the way of traffic personnel and highway and street improvement. Does the District of Columbia expect to have only a 2-cent gasoline tax when the State average is 4.2 cents per gallon gasoline tax and still ask the Congress to make up the deficit this low gasoline tax causes in road funds in order to save lives and limbs?

If there are those selfish interests or selfish individuals who are so unfair as to demand a very low gasoline tax when their District of Columbia government needs the money to solve its murderous traffic problem, and then ask the Congress to make up the deficit in road funds caused by this very low gasoline tax in the District of Columbia, I am ashamed of such selfish persons, and their selfish wishes and desires must be completely ignored by the Congress.

I hope that in view of the fact that extensive hearings have already been held as to the merits of increasing the gasoline tax in the District of Columbia to 4 cents per gallon, which will be practically the average of all of our States, and that two very fine reports have been filed recently by congressional committees recommending that the gasoline tax in the District of Columbia be raised to 4 cents per gallon, that the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives will report this bill out without further consideration, and at its next meeting, with the recommendation that the bill do pass at once.

I appeal to my colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, not to permit this disservice to longer prevail against our constituents.

Help Those Who Were Young Yesterday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit an article prepared by Richard L. Neuberger which was printed in the Progressive on March 29, under the heading, "Help those who were young yesterday":

HELP THOSE WHO WERE YOUNG YESTERDAY

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

In the present drive to rearm America everyone is thinking about young folks. Young men are needed to man warships, fly bombing planes, and work in factories. Young women must be nurses and must take the place of men behind the lines.

But what about the old folks? They are still American citizens. They are the people who were young folks yesterday. Tomorrow their counterpart will represent the boys and girls who are young today. In the emphasis on youth and on the national-defense program, we must not forget the old people and the social-security program.

The entire social-security set-up, good beginning though it is, sadly needs revision. Some States pay reasonable pensions. Some States pay pensions which cannot keep body and soul together. There should be a uniform national pension. My own State of Oregon pays average pensions of $21 a month This is a disgrace in view of the fact that Washington, to the north of us, pays $40 and California, to the south of us, pays $38.

"A MATTER OF RIGHT"

A few days ago I read a speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Congressman COMPTON I. WHITE, of Idaho. He recommended a pension on a Federal basis, the same pension throughout the Nation. He pointed out that such a plan is "winning new support in the populous industrial sections of the country." Why shouldn't it? In the high pressure of modern machine manufacture, men are

thrown on the scrap heap before they are 50. Often old-age assistance is their sole support.

A newspaper in Washington—the Daily News—has reported that President Roosevelt soon will propose a flat Federal pension of $30 a month, a pension to be paid regardless of need and regardless of State pension systems. Let us hope that the President does not permit the international situation to divert him from this worthy purpose. Such a proposal would be one of the high lights of the New Deal. No one must overlook for 1 minute that until Mr. Roosevelt entered the White House, the words "old-age pension" were not included in the vocabulary of the Presidency. The aged people of the country owe Mr. Roosevelt an undying debt for that.

The report from our National Capital declares that the President intends to pay a pension as a matter of right, rather than as a matter of need. Millions of elderly people will bless him for that too. At the present time men and women over 65 are penalized if they have children who might support them. Little or no consideration is given the financial status of those children. As like as not, they may be as hard up as their parents.

Case workers now investigate the people who apply for pensions. They snoop and pry into the old peoples' private lives. They search their financial problems. Frequently these case workers are young and sophisticated. They have scant understanding of what 65 years of toil and struggle might mean. They are hardboiled and tough. They try to make a record for themselves by keeping the pensions as low as possible. They have an idea that the goal is to save money. They forget that the purpose of the social-security program is to end suffering and ameliorate poverty.

ELIMINATE THE BUSYBODIES!

Making pensions a matter of right rather than need would totally eliminate these case workers. There would be no further use for them. Any elderly person over 65 and out of employment would be eligible to receive old-age assistance. His private life and the life of his children would not have to be pried into. I am glad that I helped promote in the recent session of the Oregon Legislature a bill to pay old-age pensions to people regardless of the status of their children. Unfortunately this bill clashed with Federal law. The Federal law in this respect ought to be changed.

No group of men and women has been fooled more often than the old people. In the meeting of our legislature, I saw men who had promised the old folks everything, vote again and again against taxes proposed to increase old-age assistance. One legislator who constantly assured the elderly people of his support scarcely gave a second thought to a measure some of us introduced providing for a privilege tax on dividends. This measure was patterned after the law enacted in Wisconsin by the Progressive Party. Its adoption would have helped to raise additional money for pensions.

It is the duty and obligation of liberals in America to think of the old folks in the present emergency. I am sure the enthusiasm of young men for our great democratic form of government will increase if they see that democracy takes care of men too old to work. Now that the Nation as a whole has accepted the idea of social security, we must labor to improve the set-up.

The pensions paid in some States are mere pittances. They must be increased. We must hope that President Roosevelt, who launched the social security program, will make it stronger by proposing a $30 national pension to all elderly citizens as a matter of right, a pension not conditioned on poverty or paupers' oaths or any other humiliating terms.

Letters Pertaining to Present Power of Federal Government To Prevent Delays in National-Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

LETTERS FROM PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT AND SECRETARY OF LABOR PERKINS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to incorporate in the RECORD two letters I have recently received pertaining to the authority now possessed by the Federal Government to terminate delays resulting from industrial disputes which the Conciliation Service and the National Defense Mediation Board are unable to settle. One of these letters is from the President of the United States and the other letter is from the Secretary of Labor. The letters follow:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 19, 1941.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: I have your letter of April 9, 1941, inquiring as to the authority now possessed by the Federal Government to terminate delays resulting from industrial disputes in the event the Conciliation Service and the National Defense Mediation Board are unable to effect a settlement.

I have asked the Secretary of Labor to go into this question and to reply to your inquiry.

Sincerely,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 23, 1941.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: The President has referred to me for reply your letter dated April 9 inquiring as to the authority now possessed by the Federal Government to terminate delays resulting from industrial disputes which the Conciliation Service and the National Defense Mediation Board are unable to settle.

I have asked the Solicitor of Labor to go into this matter and as soon as his investigation is completed I shall be glad to communicate further with you.

Sincerely,

FRANCES PERKINS.

Mr. Speaker, it was conceivable at the time the National Defense Mediation Board was established that the Board might not be able to settle all disputes referred to it. The press indicates this morning that the National Defense Mediation Board has been unable to settle the controversy which involves the mining of coal so essential at this time to the production of steel for national-defense purposes.

Since my letter of April 9 has not yet been answered by the Solicitor of the Labor Department, I have this day again submitted an inquiry to the Labor Department, which I herewith quote:

The Secretary of Labor wrote me a letter April 23, stating that she referred to you a letter which I wrote the President April 9, inquiring as to the authority now possessed by the Federal Government to terminate delays resulting from industrial disputes in the event the Conciliation Service and the National Defense Mediation Board are unable to effect a settlement. In view of the fact that the National Defense Mediation Board, according to the press this morning, has given up effort to end coal stoppage, I am particularly interested in receiving an answer to my inquiry. Thus far I have received no answer. For your aid in this connection I shall be very grateful.

In conclusion, it occurs to me the time has come when we should have definite knowledge as to what power our Government has to prevent delays in our national-defense program.

Sauce for the Goose Is Sauce for the Gander

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of April 26, 1941, which should be closely read and taken to heart by the officials of certain branches and agencies of our Government who propose to spend additional huge sums of the taxpayers' money in the name of national defense but not in the actual furtherance thereof:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 26, 1941]

ECONOMIZE AS WELL AS TAX

If the shock of the proposed enormous increases in income and luxury taxes results in focusing attention on the possibilities of economizing in the nonmilitary side of the national Budget, a distinct gain will have been made. However much we may quarrel with the particular form of taxes which have been suggested, few persons will question the wisdom of adopting the policy of paying for as much of the emergency expenditures as possible out of current revenues. Even if this is done, the additions to the national debt will be staggering. This makes all the more imperative the need for reducing to a minimum those expenditures which are not exclusively or primarily for purposes of national defense. Unfortunately, the politicians' philosophy, as expressed in both Houses,

appears to be that the preparations for war have brought about a gigantic spending spree, and that as many persons as possible—the taxpayers excepted—should be given a substantial share of the hand-outs.

That this philosophy is as fatal as it is unjust must be apparent to all thoughtful students of financial and fiscal problems. Nothing is gained by seeking explanations why the country has so easily accepted the theory of piling billions on billions, or by attempting to apportion blame for the unwisdom of trying to spend our way out of the depression. Rather, is it now necessary to accept the extreme urgency of concentrating on spending for national defense and of making the burden of these expenditures less onerous by cutting all nondefense items that can possibly be reduced or eliminated.

As a matter of fact, the Government's task is very much the same as that which it is planning to impose on the taxpayers. If the Treasury Department's present schedule is adopted, Uncle Sam will say to John Q. Taxpayer: "You have got to pay me two (or three or four) times what you paid me last year, and you must do this even if you have to cut out many expenditures and reduce others." What John Q. Taxpayer has the right to say in return is, "O. K., Boss. I'll pay you more, but in order to meet the burdens of defense you will have to cut out many expenditures and reduce others. You do your part and I'll do mine."

What that would mean would be that farm subsidies would have to be cut instead of, as is now proposed, increased by several hundred million dollars; that relief payments would have to be pared to the bone; that elaborate ventures in Government construction would have to be halted or abandoned; that a substantial part of the army of persons on the Government pay roll would have to be dropped; that every possible saving on nondefense items would have to be made, regardless of the political consequences.

The American people will shoulder the burden of national defense, however much it may hurt. But they have a right to expect that the administration in Washington will adopt a policy of drastic economy in all other fields so that more money will be available for defense purposes. The very urgency of spending for national defense makes the need of saving on other items more imperative than ever.

The Petroleum Industry in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

ADDRESS OF R. E. COLLOM, PRESIDENT OF CALIFORNIA OIL & GAS ASSOCIATION

Mr. ELLIOTT of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of R. E. Collom, president of the California Oil & Gas Association, delivered at the annual dinner meeting of the association held in the Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles, April 3, 1941:

Although somewhat delayed, this is the annual meeting of the members of the California Oil and Gas Association. Ordinarily on this occasion, but closer to the first of the year, you would have a fresh crop of officers, at least a new president, to induct into office. Everyone was so busy, however, in the last few months of last year, listening to political speeches, casting ballots and answering summonses, that your present officers were practically declared in by default.

California Oil and Gas Association has 30 directors. These men are representatives of integrated companies; of independent producers, refiners, gas companies, and a few supply companies. Subject to these directors, the affairs of the association are administered through Managing Director F. E. Foster and staff and a number of standing committees. The roster of directors appears on your program.

The more important of the standing committees are: Tax committee, fire committee, automotive, marine, advisory, ordinance, safety, defense, and the wildcats. They are all active in the respective field which their names suggest, and some of them are promoting real, measurable economices.

Speaking of economies, you know we have to hold our own against the sometimes too great enthusiasm of the tax extractors. Over 200 types of taxes are levied upon petroleum products and operations. Approximately $1 out of every eight received by the 183,000 Federal, State, and local taxing jurisdictions in the United States is contributed by or through the petroleum industry.

As I have said before, if there ever was a goose that laid golden eggs, it has an economic counterpart in the petroleum industry. Sales taxes on gasoline and petroleum products are levied and collected almost painlessly, and State and Federal legislators have acquired the habit of going to the oil goose for golden eggs. During the 6 years 1935–40 State and Federal taxes of all kinds extracted about seven and one-half billion dollars from petroleum and its products. In some years the total tax receipts were much greater than combined oil company income. In fact, there have been years, such as 1932, when only governmental agencies made any money out of the oil business.

You know what happened to the fabled golden goose and we are not expecting a similar early demise but the comparison should give pause and perhaps a warning to those who think that Government ownership or even Government control is the more efficient and conservative way to run the oil business.

To turn to the California petroleum industry we should like our guests tonight to know something about what the business represents to them, to the State, and the Nation. Also to give to you of other industries a brief idea of the degree of our interdependence. The requirements of preparedness and war now dominate our efforts and control our destinies.

Many of the present-day conditions are in marked contrast with conditions that prevailed in the early part of the last World War. At that time industrial activities related to war effort were confined to the Atlantic coast for a long time and moved westward very slowly. California oil companies, however, began very promptly to profit by war conditions. Now the situation is just reversed. Munitions maufacture on the Pacific coast has sprung promptly into the forefront of national importance with mounting backlogs of war orders, whereas California oil companies have suffered a decline in total consumption due to curtailed offshore shipments although there has been a substantial increase in both the fuel-oil market and local gasoline consumption.

California's crude oil production of 100,000,000 barrels per year during the period of the previous World War, with all wells producing to capacity, was less than half of the present yearly production from the severely curtailed output of an unpredictable but no doubt very large composite potential. Overall storage now is nearly 5 times greater than the 37,000,000 barrels of that time. Fourteen gravity crude, fuel grade, was $1.60 per barrel then—now 65 cents.

Many trainloads of gasoline were brought in from the Mid-Continent and gasoline was rationed from service stations. The price then was 25 cents, without tax, as against 10 cents, without tax, for approximately comparable qualities of gasoline.

In that time the California petroleum industry was in good shape to operate profitably in a heavy sellers market but not particularly well set up for extraordinary demands of defense. Today there is not much question of what we'd do with a profit if we made it and certainly no question as to the industry's ability to meet any demand whatsoever for civilian or war requirements.

In short a picture of the petroleum industry in California today is about as follows:

Raw products, crude oil, and wet gas, are derived from over 15,500 wells in various fields of the State, with some 4,700 wells shut in. The crude oil is gathered and shipped through pipe lines, tank ships, and trucks to the refineries. The wet gas is processed in natural gasoline plants and converted into natural gasoline, other liquefied petroleum products and residue gas. Liquefied petroleum gas, such as isc-butane, is used as charging stock in the refinery alkylation plant for the manufacture of high-octane aviation gasoline. Part of the residue gas is used as fuel in the field, and most of it is sold to the utilities for domestic, commercial, and industrial fuels. The natural gasoline is blended with refinery gasolines.

The refiners, by processes known as straight-run, cracking, alkylation, polymerization, hydrogenation, etc., turn out the gasoline, lubricating oils, fuel oils, and hundreds of other products which run your automobiles and trucks, fly planes, bunker ships, fuel trains, lubricate everything, and generally meet the needs of the consuming public at price indexes consistently lower than the price indexes of all other commodities.

To resort to statistics, I should say that current production under voluntary proration is about 600,000 barrels of oil and 1,000,000,000 cubic feet of gas per day. The State produced 224,000,000 barrels of crude oil during 1940, valued at $211,000,000, and 343,000,000,000 cubic feet of gas, valued at $22,000,000.

There are about 100 refineries in the State with a combined crude capacity of 950,000 barrels per day, and about an equal number of natural gasoline plants with a daily capacity of over 2,000,000,000 cubic feet of wet gas. These refineries range in capacity from two at 100,000 barrels per day each, three at 60,000 barrels per day, down to plants of less than 1,000 barrels daily capacity.

According to the United States Bureau of Mines crude runs to refineries could be increased at least 80 percent over the present level of 485,000 barrels daily without installing additional equipment.

The transportation of these various products requires some 6,000 miles of pipe lines, 60 oil tank ships, 8,014 tank trucks, and several hundred tank cars. In addition nearly 23,000 miles of pipelines are utilized in the hauling of natural gas.

As to the natural gas, largely residue gas after natural gasoline extraction, it is interesting to note that the gas companies

had 1,800,000 customers at the end of 1940. The total requirements for December 1940 were 23,600,000,000 cubic feet of gas, of which about 10,000,000,000 was for industrial use. This latter use is in competition with fuel oil and conceivably the business could be increased to such a volume that it would seriously hamper proper distribution of gas for domestic purposes, depress the price received for gas, and occupy a market which naturally belongs to fuel oil.

In order to serve the consuming public with products of the industry, there are about 16,000 service stations in California doing an annual business of some $250,000,000, in which, in addition to the gasoline which "starts quicker" and the lubricating oil which "puts the purr in the pearl," one may buy tires, batteries, cigarettes, and other accessories, not to mention the accommodations of some excellent sanitary rest rooms. These are all available to the style and tempo of our American way of life.

When you tell the service-station attendant to "fill it up," which I hope that you do, you are obtaining the end product of a great chain of highly technical operations. The oil business is one of intense specialization. I wish that I had the ability to describe to you some of the details of all the various technical steps from finding crude oil to filling your tank, of the geophysical crew that shoots off charges of dynamite and by the seismos reflections from various subterranean strata searches out and localizes the favorable oil-bearing structures; of the drilling crew that manipulates with professional ease the hundreds of tons of steel that penetrate the earth's crust in deep well drilling (one hole has been drilled in California to a depth of 15,004 feet) of the especially designed equipment to handle flush well pressures of as high as 3,500 pounds per square inch. There are geologists, geophysicists, petroleum engineers, chemists, research engineers, refinery engineers, and numerous types of other technologists employed in every kind of job from roughneck to president. Altogether there are about 85,000 persons employed in the California petroleum industry, a very large proportion of whom must have specialized experience and training to some degree in order to do their jobs.

Here, then, is a trained staff making available day in and day out an army of hydrocarbons to meet any peacetime or national-defense need. For example, the United States produces almost all of the world's 100- and higher-octane aviation gasoline, which gives enormous advantages in maneuverability, cruising range, lifting power, and speed to airplanes with engines designed for this grade of fuels. Production of 100-octane gasoline outside the United States is almost entirely concentrated within the British Empire. No other nation or combination of nations can remotely approach the technical refinements that have been developed in the American petroleum industry for designing certain combinations of hydrocarbons for specific and advanced superior uses, including many derivatives necessary for explosives.

After all, the adequacy of preparedness in airplanes, in mechanized equipment, and in naval operations hinges upon the production, adaptability, and availability of this array of hydrocarbons. All related civilian endeavor is likewise vitally dependent thereon.

I have already stated that California refineries have a capacity which would permit an increased throughput of about 80 percent without additional equipment. For the backlog of raw products to supply these refineries there is some difference of opinion as to what the 20,200 wells of the State could produce if they were all operated to capacity for, say, 6 months. Let me assure you, however, that no one is afraid that we can't produce enough oil. The figure, depending to some extent upon the degree of optimism of the estimator, will vary from 900,000 barrels per day to 1,500,000 barrels per day. The oil administrator carries the total potential capacity of the State at 3,485,000 barrels per day.

This potential capacity is backed by an estimated reserve, crude oil in natural underground storage, of 3,300,000,000 barrels as of January 1, 1941. In addition there is stored above ground 37,000,000 barrels or about 70 days' supply of refinable crudes, 22,000,000 barrels or 100 days' supply of gasoline, and 57,000,000 barrels or 220 days' supply of fuel oil.

Fuel oil always has been an important factor in California. Out of California's crude comes a large part of the fuel oil, Diesel oil, and lubricants necessary for successful operation of the Navy. Also the oil industry operates a fleet of over 60 tankers in and out of California's harbors, many of which have been built to United States Navy specifications and are of fleet quality.

Altogether the oil fields, pipe lines, refineries, tidewater outlets, tankers, bunkering facilities, tank trucks, tank cars, bulk plants, technical and research personnel, hundreds of executives who have grown up with the business, and thousands of skilled and willing workmen are a most important factor in America's defense economy. The petroleum industry operates on a 24-hour basis every day in the year, and all it needs is a green light. The California petroleum industry is really prepared to go.

Now, having said all this, candor and a sense of responsibility to the common cause require me to repeat that the petroleum industry is prepared to meet any national emergency. We are ready to produce anything in our line that is needed, in any quantity and for any use. All we hope is that those who are talking most about the petroleum industry's relation to defense are really thinking about defense and that they let those who know how and are trained for it continue to run the oil business.

Inter-American Cultural Center, St. Augustine, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HENDRICKS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

JOINT RESOLUTION OF THE FLORIDA STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I wish to call your attention to a resolution which was introduced on February 17, 1941—House Joint Resolution 119—to provide for the cooperation of the United States of America in the plans of the St. Augustine historical program for the establishment of a permanent Inter-American Cultural Center in St. Augustine, Fla. The St. Augustine historical program has been organized and undertaken under the leadership and sponsorship of the city of St. Augustine, the State of Florida, the Carnegie Institution of Washington, the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Philosophical Society, the United States Department of the Interior, the National Park Service, and other distinguished national organizations and individuals for the purpose of studying, preserving, and developing the rich materials relating to the Spanish colonization of St. Augustine and the region of which it was the historical capital.

For some months now we have had a very distinguished and intelligent gentleman heading an organization for the sole purpose of cultivating the friendship through economic and cultural relations of the South American republics, the Honorable Nelson Rockefeller. And, incidentally, I would like to say that he is doing a very splendid job. It would be well for all the Members of the House to make a study of the work that Mr. Rockefeller is doing and his accomplishments.

I feel that the adoption of this resolution for establishing an Inter-American Cultural Center at St. Augustine, in the State of Florida, would go a long way in reestablishing the cordial relations of the Latin-American republics with the United States and creating stronger bonds of friendship. Therefore, I will appreciate it if the Committee on Foreign Affairs will give this resolution its earnest consideration and if the Members of the House will give me their cooperation in getting it passed. I would like to insert here a memorial passed unanimously by both the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Florida relative to this subject.

To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress of the United States, assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Florida, in legislative session assembled, do most respectfully memorialize and petition the President and Congress, assembled, as follows:

Whereas the St. Augustine Historical Program has been organized and undertaken under the leadership and sponsorship by the city of St. Augustine, the State of Florida, the Carnegie Institution of Washington, the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Philosophical Society, the United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, and other distinguished national organizations and individuals for the purpose of studying, preserving, and developing the rich materials relating to the Spanish colonization of St. Augustine and the region of which it was the historical capital; and

Whereas the State of Florida, by reason of its discovery by Ponce de León and later colonization by Spain, became the cradle of American civilization and is today the cross road of all the Americas; and

Whereas the St. Augustine Historical Program recognizes the significant contribution of Spain to the processes of American civilization, and provides as its primary purpose for the creation in St. Augustine and in the region associated with it, through the development of important historic sites and buildings, of a national shrine commemorating this important period in the history of the United States; and

Whereas there is to be established in St. Augustine, Fla., as a part of the general plan of the St. Augustine Historical Program, a permanent inter-American cultural center to commemorate the founding of St. Augustine; and

Whereas the cultural relationships between the United States and the other American republics are of paramount importance; and

Whereas the Inter-American Cultural Center and the St. Augustine Historical Program will afford an opportunity for the advancement of these relationships; and

Whereas such a cultural center in relationship to other elements of the general plan of the St. Augustine Historical Program is worthy and deserving of the support and encouragement of the United States; and

Whereas the State of Florida has already gone on record as approving and sponsoring the St. Augustine Historical Program and to that end has appropriated $50,000 for the carrying on of said program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That your memorialists do respectfully memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States, in order to accomplish the foregoing purposes, to authorize by suitable legislative enactment the proper agency or agencies of the Federal Government to establish at St. Augustine, Fla., an Inter-American Cultural Center to be maintained permanently thereafter to commemorate the founding of St. Augustine and particularly for the advancement of the cultural relationship between the United States and the other American republics: Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Florida.

Col. D. W. Seigler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

NEWSPAPER ARTICLE CONTAINING LETTER WRITTEN IN 1892

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an article about Col. D. W. Seigler, one of the best-known Confederate veterans living in the State of South Carolina.

Colonel Seigler lived for many years in my district. Men of his type are fast passing away, and the incoming generation will miss the life and character of men of the type of Colonel Seigler.

The article follows:

COL. D. W SEIGLER HAS FALL; IS DYED-IN-WOOL CONFEDERATE

Col. D. W. Seigler, one of the best-known Confederate veterans living in the State, and the last survivor of the Battle of Rivers Bridge, suffered a severe injury to his left leg and hip recently at the Confederate home. His condition is fair.

The colonel has had a long life of church and civic activities that has made for him many friends. His correspondence reaches from California to many of the Northern States, most of it from persons he met on reunion trips.

The clerk of the First Baptist Church at Aiken recently visited him and carried a letter the colonel had written August 5, 1892. It was written when Colonel Seigler and his family were moving from Aiken to Greenville, and follows:

"To the superintendent, officers, teachers, and Sunday school:

"With this afternoon my Sunday-school work in your midst closes. After a period of 14 years of continual work in your church and Sunday school I must resign as vice superintendent. Though unworthy as I have been, I feel that my work has not been in vain. I have often met with you feeling depressed in spirit, but from the cheerful songs you'd sing and the promises of God's word I have been strengthened and better prepared for the Master's work.

"Again let me say to my fellow laborers, be faithful, be earnest, be constant, always abounding in the fear of the Lord.

"To the children of the Sunday school, I want to say that this may be my last time to admonish you to seek the security of the Master's hand in life—it's the only goal worth striving for in life's little while. This is my prayer.

"Yours in Christ,

"D. W. SEIGLER."

A dyed-in-the-wool Confederate and fond of poetry, Colonel Seigler often quotes When, by Sally Washington Maupin:

"When trumpets sound and the dead arise
I want to wear up in paradise
My old gray jacket that all may see
I fought for the right under General Lee.

"When reveille is heard no more,
And tents are struck on the greener shore,
On my breast let the cross of honor be
To prove I served under Robert E. Lee.

"When taps are blown and for me all's well
I want to give just one rebel yell,
That all may hear and know and see
I'm one of the men of Mars' Bob Lee.

"When furlough ends and at God's command,
With the ranks of the gray I take my stand;
The Confederate flag shall wave over me
While I salute our chieftain, Robert E. Lee."

Price of Domestic Copper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

ARTICLE FROM HOUGHTON (MICH.) DAILY MINING GAZETTE

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Daily Mining Gazette of Houghton, Mich., for April 22, 1941:

[From the Daily Mining Gazette, Houghton, Mich., of April 22, 1941]

COPPER PRICE IS TERMED "UNFAIR"

NEW YORK.—Several stockholders attending the annual meeting Wednesday of the Miami Copper Co. expressed disappointment in the Government's decision to freeze the domestic price for copper at 12 cents a pound. They believe it will handicap the company which is operating ore bodies with the lowest copper content of any mine in the world. The 12-cent ceiling, they said, is an unfair hardship on producers that for the past decade have been barely able to stay in business because of depressed prices.

The management, answering questions regarding payment of dividends in 1941, stated that even with the Government paying the 4-cent tariff on South American copper, consumers in this country have been able to obtain only immediate requirements. With a further shortage of shipping a greater demand for the metal may develop, and thus effect higher prices. Another possibility would be adoption of a double standard for domestic copper producers, with the high cost operators to be subsidized with differentials in order to equalize competition between low- and high-cost mines.

In describing complications facing Miami Copper's management in its efforts to build up its cash reserves so that it may be able to pay dividends, E. H. Westlake, vice president, reminded stockholders that the company still has $104,904 of deferred taxes that must be paid, and that it was desirable to increase working capital above present figures. The company, according to Mr. Westlake, is able to make some money with copper at 12 cents a pound.

Stockholders amended the company's bylaws to provide indemnification for officers and directors and reelected the retiring board.

Sugar Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

RESOLUTION BY THE CALIFORNIA STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following California Assembly Joint Resolution No. 28:

Assembly Joint Resolution 28

Joint resolution relative to encouragement of sugar-beet production in the United States

Whereas there is imported into the United States more than two-thirds of the sugar which is consumed therein; and

Whereas California is one of the large beet-sugar producing sections of the country, with many sugar refineries employing many people at good wages, thereby assuring prosperity in sugar-beet growing sections of the State, not only to the refineries and their employees but also to the farmers growing the beets for the refineries; and

Whereas movements are on foot to bring about a curtailment of sugar production in the United States which, if accomplished, would have a tendency to disturb the balance of trade, to the disadvantage of this country, would bring unemployment to thousands of working people, and would tend to cause overproduction in other lines of agriculture; and

Whereas it appears reasonable that the Government should encourage the production of such commodities as sugar when there exists such an unlimited market therefor: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Congress of the United States of America be

memorialized to take such steps as may seem best to encourage a greater production of sugar and sugar products in the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the Governor be requested to forward copies of this resolution to the President and to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States.

Developments in American Airplane Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, having recently made a trip to the Pacific coast with the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the purpose of looking over naval-expansion projects and airplane factories, I found most interesting developments, specifically as it applies to the airplane industry.

The Douglas airplane factory located at Santa Monica, Calif., is producing the largest airplane that has ever been built in the history of man. It is known as the Douglas B–19, which has a wing spread of 210 feet and a cruising range of 7,000 miles, with an all-over load capacity of 28 tons.

My colleagues and myself made a very thorough inspection of this plane and its development, which is indicative of what American ingenuity can produce. We have heard many comments on the floor of the House relative to ability and inability to produce airplanes in this Nation. But after the recent survey made by my colleagues and myself I feel the aviation industry of this Nation is capable of producing some of the finest airplanes that can be produced anywhere in the world.

I found an article published in the Washington Post under date line of April 23 pertaining to planes manufactured in the United States being used by England. This article was written by J. Reagan McCrary, of the International News Service, as a special correspondent. I am advised that Mr. McCrary is considered an outstanding observer and writer on topics which he covers.

The following comments by Mr. McCrary are offered for the information of the House membership. I am sure they will find this article extremely interesting. I call your specific attention to that portion of his article which refers to the Lockheed Hudson type nicknamed by aviators as the "old boomerang." Also the last comments in the closing lines of Mr. McCrary's statement in which he quotes the Eagle Squadron, which is composed of Americans who are fighting in the R. A. F., in which they definitely state, "Give us American planes":

[From the Washington Post of April 23, 1941]

ONLY 890 UNITED STATES PLANES ACTUALLY USED IN COMBAT BY ENGLISH

(By J. Reagan McCrary)

NEW YORK, April 22.—Out of all the American aircraft flown or shipped to Britain only about 890 are operational—in actual combat or patrol service.

America has sent some 570 Curtiss P–40 fighters to Britain, where they have been christened with a good American name, Tomahawks. Of those 570 planes, only about 18 were operational when I left.

The rest were in storage "somewhere in England."

There seems to be little doubt that there is a definite, carefully planted prejudice inside England, sponsored by certain British aircraft manufacturers, against American aircraft. The "brains" of this clique has been Charles Grey, former editor of the technical journal Aeroplane. It was under his direction that the offending caption, "The United States has decided to support the war financially to the last Englishman," was published in the semiofficial volume All the World's Aircraft.

Lord Beaverbrook, Britain's fiery little pro-American Minister of Aircraft Production, has already taken care of Mr. Grey.

NEED BETTER ASSEMBLAGE

It is only fair to say, however, that in a certain sense American aircraft manufacturers have played into the hands of their critics by not having enough skilled men over in England to see to it that their "babies" are carefully assembled and tested after arrival in England.

There has also been a lack of systematic coordination by the British in seeing to it that the American planes are tried out and any lack of armaments quickly pointed out to the manufacturers so that speedy corrections could be made in American factories.

I must hasten to add, however, that Mr. Averell Harriman, the new industrial expert sent over by President Roosevelt to coordinate such things, and Generals Scanlon and Harmon, United States Army air attachés, in London, are cleaning up this mess as rapidly as possible. I know. I saw them in action at close range, saw them use tact when necessary, and forcefulness when that was the right medicine.

Last week, 14 combat pilots of the United States air force landed in Britain as observers; those men know how to handle the P–40's as well as other American fighting ships, know how to get the most out of them. Beginning this week they'll demonstrate that our aircraft can hold their own with Britain's Hurricanes and Spitfires.

SAYS AIRACOBRA TAKES BACK SEAT

But this I must add: There is no fighter now in production in America that can touch the Hurricane III's and the Spitfire II's, the Tornadoes and Whirlwinds, that are already in action in Britain.

The Bell Airacobra is the best fighter we've got; its speed is topped by the Hurricane III, which carries more armor and air cannon in the wings as compared to one in the nose for the Airacobra.

Prediction: Before November, Hurricanes will carry eight air cannon in the wings.

Nor do I believe that any bomber now in production in America can equal the bomb-carrying capacity or the speed or the armament of Britain's three new bombers, the Stirling, the Manchester, and the Halifax.

But now to sweeten the brine with praise for two American aircraft that are doing a superb job:

LOCKHEED HUDSON IS TOPS

First, the Lockheed Hudson, which looks like a transport, except for the twin-gun turret sticking out of its spine like a bump on a log.

"Old Boomerang," the boys call them, because they get you there and they get you back.

I had a run out of the north of England in one of them. The pilot that day was a boy who had flown them over Dunkirk:

"Listen, Yank, this is the greatest kite in this show. I've flown them as dive bombers. Look, here's how they handle when you're dive bombing. See that neck of water down there; here we go."

He aimed his Hudson as you would aim a gun, then over we went, Voooooom! with every rivet screaming, "Take it easy, old boy, I can't stand much more." Down and down.

"And then you flip the Mickey Mouse"—that's the bomb switches—"and then you pull it out before you get down to 800 feet."

It felt as though we'd swallowed a billiard ball when he pulled "Old Boomerang" out of the dive; he just laughed: "That's not half these Hudsons will do."

USED AS FIGHTERS

And then he told us how they'd used them as fighters over Dunkirk, knocking down the Junkers 87 dive bombers. And there was the time a flight of three Hudsons whammed right into a squadron of 12 Messerschmitts, scattered them like pigeons:

"I got an air cannon shell right in the air screw. She never stopped grinding. Right on, like that geyser you call Old Faithful."

That's the Hudson. There's another that the British boys swear by and not at—the Douglas DB–7, built first for the French as an attack bomber. All instrument panel markings are still in French. It was first rechristened "Boston" by the R. A. F., and now it's been converted for night fighting and rechristened "Havoc."

I have never seen such an ominous aircraft, soot black and frightening. Three-placed as a bomber, it carries only two now—the pilot, who operates a whole battery of forward-firing wing guns from the teat on his stick, and behind him, where a gunner used to sit, now sits the man who operates the secret device that searches the night skies for the Jerry raiders.

The whole life of a Havoc is "blacked-out"—the pilots wear dark glasses all day and eat carrots because their vitamins improve night vision.

And when the Havocs roar up into the dark skies at night they are completely blacked out. Not even the glow of a light on the instrument panel to dull the pilot's night vision for the nerve-wracking search ahead of him. All the dials gleam faintly with radium paint.

As soon as the chocks are taken away, you "go into your office," concentrate on the instruments. You don't even have a chance to lift your landing gear until you have about 3,000 feet under you—a second's distraction from intense concentration on the instruments might send you spinning into a dive that you would never come out of before your 3,000 feet were eaten up and you are splattered over the earth.

And up in the air, you patrol a plotted area, until you see the dark blob in moonlit skies that means a flight of Nazis is near, or until your "A1" operator picks up the scent and guides you to the quarry.

Then its "tallyho, there they go" and you begin to chase. You get on their tail first. Then you stalk them—their engines drown the roar of your own.

Closer and closer you creep up—because your Havoc is faster than the Jerries. Your fingers ache to press the teat, to let him have a burst at 300 yards, at 200 yards, but no, hold it, hold it, 100 yards now; still you must hold it; and now it's 50 and you press the teat and your guns blaze and the Jerry explodes in the night like a box of matches.

The Havocs are doing that job, the Yankee Havoc—even better than the Beau fighters the British built for the night hawking.

But we'll never be satisfied until the superiority of all the American aircraft that have gone "over there" to help beat Hitler is so

clearly established that the American boys in the Eagle squadron will unanimously demand, "Give us American planes."

Today, they fly Hurricanes.

The Farm Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

EDITORIAL BY TOM LINDER, GEORGIA STATE COMMISSIONER OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial written by Hon. Tom Linder, Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Georgia, entitled "The Farm Wages."

This article, in the face of all types of propaganda which is going out to the country through the press, telegrams, and letters from selfish groups and those who oppose farmers and wage earners, should be very convincing that something should be done to protect that great class of people whose responsibility it is to feed and clothe 130,000,000 Americans.

If the agricultural interests of this country, which represent 24 percent of the total population of the United States, had a fair price for which they produce, in line with the prices that they have to pay for that which they purchase, it would mean employment and millions and millions in purchasing power, of which this country is sadly in need at this time.

The Agricultural Committee, of which I am chairman, is now holding hearings on major farm bills. It is our purpose in the near future to report to the Congress a bill which will be fair to all other groups but, in the meantime, will absolutely give to farmers that which we have done for various other groups, actual parity for their products.

The editorial follows:

THE FARM WAGES

A lot is being said now about farm wages being so low and the fact that people are leaving the farms to work on public works.

A farm is like any other business: it must pay the wages that it can afford to pay.

The exodus of people from the farms is not confined to farm labor; it is equally applicable to people who own the land. This proves that the income of the farm operator is as low in proportion as the wages which he pays for help.

The Ellaville Sun, Ellaville, Ga., of February 14, 1941, carries a most illuminating article on this subject. It also shows that the exodus from the farms is nothing new; it has been going on for years. During the 10-year period of 1926 to 1935, out of 107 girls who graduated at the county-wide high school, only 12 remained on the farm; while out of 26 boys raised on the farm who graduated during those years, only 4 are still on the farm.

This condition will prevail so long as farmers are discriminated against by national laws. The real trouble with farming is the same as it was in the days of the old Farmers Alliance and Populist Party. That condition has never been remedied, but it has been made worse by each succeeding Federal administration. That condition is caused by undertaking to protect industry with tariff walls and shutting their eyes to the fact that this protection to industry was gained at the expense of agriculture. The farmer, being unorganized and unable to make his voice heard in Washington, is naturally made the goat in this scheme of economics.

A diversified and well-balanced farm operation is of prime necessity in Georgia. We are doing all that we can to encourage the growing of cattle, hogs, and other food crops to a sane extent and based on good business judgment.

It must be remembered, however, that merely changing the crop produced by the farmer will not remedy the fundamental trouble.

The farmer who raises cotton and sells it at less than the cost is bound to go broke, it's true. We should not forget, however, that the farmer who produces beef cattle, hogs, vegetables, or fruits, and then has to sell them at less than the cost of production is equally certain to go broke.

It is easy to say that the growing of beef cattle will bring the farmer back, or that the planting of fruit trees will bring the farmer back, or that the raising of poultry and the growing of vegetables will bring the farmer back.

The truth of the matter is that the only thing that will bring the farmer back is a profitable market for what he grows—whatever his crop may be. A profitable market means a market that brings the farmer a net profit above the cost of production. The first cost of production is the interest that he pays on his land. If the amount of Federal and bank mortgages was reduced and the interest rate was reduced, this would be a major factor in reducing the cost of all crops grown and bring a profitable market that much nearer to the farmer.

One thing is certain: Unless farming is made profitable for the farmer the time is not far distant when the question of food will bring an acute worry to the people of the great cities. The time is not far distant when the scarcity of farm labor will be of much greater concern to the people who live in metropolitan areas than it will be to the men who are trying to operate farms.

TOM LINDER,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

Aliens, Too, Must Choose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN JARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE FRANKLIN (PA.) NEWS-HERALD

Mr. JARRETT. Mr. Speaker, aliens within our country must now show where they stand. This is right and is covered in the following editorial from the Franklin (Pa.) News-Herald of April 23:

[From the Franklin (Pa.) News-Herald of April 23, 1941]

ALIENS, TOO, MUST CHOOSE

These are days when men must choose.

Days of drift and dream are over. Now, under a proposal by Secretary Hull to Congress, aliens too must choose.

Some have been drafted into the armed forces, probably without anybody's giving the matter much thought. Several foreign countries have objected, and properly so. We would certainly object if American citizens in Germany or Britain were drafted into those armies. It works both ways. So Secretary Hull is quite right in suggesting that Congress pass an amendment to the Selective Service Act, which would permit aliens thus called up after registration to be exempted at their request. It should be done, for it is no more than we would demand for our own nationals in other countries.

But the Secretary suggests this additional proviso: That such an alien, having asked and received exemption, should never thereafter be allowed to become a citizen of the United States.

So aliens, too, must choose, if they are called up in the draft. If they are merely temporary residents in the country on business, they will, of course, ask and receive exemption. Such people do not ordinarily expect to become citizens anyway, so no hardship will be worked.

But thousands of aliens are in a different case. They have come to the United States vaguely expecting at some time to become citizens and fully identify themselves with the national life. Such a man should no more be exempted than a citizen. He benefits daily from the security and conditions of the national life. He expects to benefit from them for an indefinite time in the future. He should bear his share in preserving them.

It would be unfair indeed for such a one to refuse armed service, to watch American citizens serve and perhaps die to preserve free conditions, and then, the emergency over, apply for and receive the benefits of citizenship.

To bar forever from citizenship a man who was unwilling at time of crisis to bear the burden that citizens bear is no injustice. It is elementary fairness that at times like this aliens, too, should be required to choose.

The time is coming for every man to do his part, no matter how small, in the cause of national defense. All these years we have taken the American way of life quite for granted, the day is soon coming when sacrifice in one way or another must be made.

Condition of Polish Citizens Deported to Siberia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD P. GALE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

LETTER FROM THE POLISH CENTRALE, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Polish Centrale of Minneapolis, signed by John S. Kowalik, president, and Bert B. Olesinski, secretary:

DEAR SIR: In behalf of the Polish Centrale of Minneapolis, who voices the sentiments of 15,000 Polish Americans and as racial members of a people who have suffered more horribly than any who have come under the domination of Hitler and Stalin, feel that this world cannot possibly continue to be half free and half slave.

During the winter of 1940–41 the Government of Soviet Russia deported to Siberia more than 700,000 women, children, and old men, who, fleeing the German invasion in September 1939, took refuge in the eastern provinces of Poland, now occupied by the Soviets.

Those unfortunate peoples live now in Siberia, suffering from hunger and cold. They are perishing by thousands, and hence appeal to all the nations of the world to save them.

We beg you, Honorable Congressman, to request the Department of State the sending, in accordance with the Soviet Government, of an official or private mission to the determined places, with the purpose of bringing aid to those most unfortunate victims of the war.

Very respectfully yours,

JOHN S. KOWALIK, *President.*
BERT OLESINSKI, *Secretary.*

Labor Situation in the Bridgeport Industrial Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LE ROY D. DOWNS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE BRIDGEPORT (CONN.) POST

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, under permission granted me, I would like to insert an article in the Appendix of the RECORD, taken from the Bridgeport Post of April 25, 1941, dealing with the labor situation in that area:

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post of April 25, 1941]

A GOOD RECORD

Congressman ROY DOWNS, of South Norwalk, took occasion, on the floor of the House last week, to praise the harmony which has thus far been displayed between employees and management in the Bridgeport industrial area.

Although Congressman DOWNS described this district as "a virtual arsenal of defense," he pointed out that we have not had a single serious defense strike.

Said Congressman DOWNS:

"This record is to the credit of labor. You cannot blame the rank and file of labor for these defense strikes. * * * Labor in New England does not invite people of un-American tendencies into their organizations. * * * The rank and file of labor is truly as American as the membership of this great body. They need the help of the Government in a definite and strong move to clean the Communists, Nazis, and others from their ranks."

These are true words, and we hope that the Bridgeport district may continue to enjoy industrial peace because of a spirit of cooperation between labor and management. It cannot be all one-sided. A lot of nonsense has been written about the radicalism of workers who are only trying to get better economic conditions for their own families. But a lot of nonsense has also been written about the greed of management which has been doing nothing more than to try to remain solvent, continue in business, and pay wages. There ought to be some way of getting together. This, of course, particularly applies to all contracts affecting defense. Neither labor or management should attempt to profit by the Nation's emergency, but each should strive to avoid slow-downs or tie-ups while ironing out any difficulties that may arise.

Bridgeport's good record is apparently the product of such cooperation.

St. Lawrence Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, which is now contemplated, is bringing a storm of protests from the people throughout our country. The very fact that such a contemplated program cannot be completed in less than 6 years, and that it will cost almost $1,000,000,000, is the strongest evidence available that such proposal cannot aid in our defense program, and the huge expenditure of money contemplated for this project will, without any doubt, be highly detrimental to our defense program.

The taxpayers of this country cannot shoulder the great burden of our defense program together with other nonessential projects such as the St. Lawrence seaway project. They have their limitations. Our Government certainly does not want to crush the people under a tax burden which they cannot bear.

Mr. Speaker, it will not be very long until our Government will be asking the people to buy bonds and Government securities, for the purpose of financing the defense program. A huge tax bill will soon be presented to the Congress, under which our people will be taxed to the very limit of their ability to pay. This tax bill, which is surely coming, will make the people realize that pay day finally comes, and that they are now meeting the obligation they owe, which has been very largely created by many such projects as the St. Lawrence seaway project.

In my own State of Indiana, the State chamber of commerce is violently opposed to this unnecessary project at this time; those businessmen recognize the very great danger in the expenditure of such a vast sum of money as this project would require at a time when the people are struggling to meet the cost of our defense program. Our people, regardless of party affiliation, are opposed to this unnecessary project. A very enlightening editorial appeared in the Indianapolis Star, of date April 24, 1941, which expresses the views of the people of Indiana on this highly important question, which editorial reads as follows:

INDIANA'S SEAWAY PROTEST

Representative Hoosier businessmen have increased the long national list of industrialists, farmers, and professional groups opposing the proposed $1,000,000,000 St. Lawrence seaway and power project. The board of directors of the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce, by unanimous vote, registered a protest against the needless and costly enterprise. A referendum of the chamber membership also was taken, disclosing that 91 percent objected to the scheme.

The Hoosier businessmen recognized that such huge expenditures at this time would interfere seriously with concentration of every effort toward national defense. They also knew that any attempt to label the waterway as a defense project would be deliberate misrepresentation. The water route from the Great Lakes to the sea could not be completed in time to expedite direct shipping. The power project will not contribute to national defense, since neither the United States nor Canada requires the electric current which will be generated.

The St. Lawrence waterway is one of the Presidential dreams; like the proposed Florida ship canal and the Passamaquoddy scheme. The original excuse of benefiting the midwestern farmer has been dropped. This huge burden imposed on the taxpayers would provide little more than another Federal power program to drive the private utilities out of business. Existing defense emergencies have been advanced as a smoke screen to disguise the fallacy of the seaway proposal.

The State chamber went on record in a resolution which pointed out that the waterway and power project would "prove a serious, if not fatal, obstacle in our present emergency of national-defense efforts by a futile diversion of manpower, material, and money." It is hoped that the Indiana delegation in Congress will not disregard this attitude of the State's business leaders.

Mr. Speaker, we have one challenge today, and that is to build and develop our national defense. We must be prepared to defend ourselves in case of an attack; we must protect our country, our people, and our institutions. If the administration now in power insists upon the promotion of useless and unnecessary projects, such as the St. Lawrence seaway project, in the face of the existing emergency, then we cannot properly develop our national defense, because our people cannot stand the double burden; their taxes, their purchase of bonds, their eternal struggle to live, will be greater than they can bear if luxuries such as the St. Lawrence seaway project is forced upon them.

Let us meet the challenge of the day, let us prepare for our defense. While we are engaged in that major problem let us put aside every unnecessary project which calls for the expenditure of the taxpayers' money. We need that money for defense.

Should Not America Make the Peace Move?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUDOLPH G. TENEROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

ARTICLE BY WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST

Mr. TENEROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, 1941, I introduced a resolution,

House Joint Resolution 131, for the purpose of creating a joint congressional peace commission. I requested the Congress to assume the initiative in setting up such a commission and suggested that we communicate with other nations not at war to carry on negotiations for a peace that will best serve humanity. Although the establishment of a joint congressional peace commission would constitute an unprecedented action on the part of Congress, it is my firm belief that world conditions today fully justify that action.

The cause of peace must necessarily be made the object of general consultation and built on a union of the nations and people of the world. In order to arrive at a workable solution, equitable to all, the rights and limitations of each and every people and nation must be clearly defined, the principles underlying the relations of governments toward one another definitely established, and all international obligations and agreements ascertained and determined.

When we attempt to comprehend the vast armament program which has been planned for us for the next few years and attempt to envision the attendant suffering, loss, and confusion which must inevitably follow in the wake of "total warfare," we are forced to the realization that we are condemned to pass through a crucible which bids fair to destroy the entire human race.

That all wars are futile to victor and vanquished alike is an established fact. At this point I would like permission to incorporate in my remarks the following timely article by William Randolph Hearst, which appeared in the Times-Herald on April 26, 1941:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of April 26, 1941]

Winston Churchill, Premier of England, has repeatedly declared that he will agree to no peace except a peace of victory.

What victory?

Whose victory?

If Mr. Churchill is contemplating an English victory, how long will we have to wait for it, and how is it to be achieved?

England was unable to achieve victory when it had Poland and Norway and Holland and Belgium and France on its side.

Is it going to be able to achieve Mr. Churchill's prescribed peace of victory without all or any of those five nations, and without Greece and Yugoslavia also?

England has been offered a peace which would respect and insure the integrity of the British Empire.

Would that not be the equivalent of a peace of victory?

What else does Mr. Churchill mean by a peace of victory?

What kind of a victory does Mr. Churchill demand?

Does he mean that there will be no peace until England has conquered the Continent of Europe and the Axis Powers have bent the knee and bowed the neck to another Versailles Treaty—to conclude one war and compel a dozen others?

Moreover, England never has conquered Europe—never in her whole history.

Russia and Germany and Austria and England together defeated the armies of Napoleon in 1815.

France and England and Italy and the United States together defeated the armies of Germany in 1918.

England cannot hope alone to conquer Europe and she is not doing it.

She is just now being expelled from her last position on European soil.

She is just now being deprived of her last European allies.

She has against her Italy, Austro-Germany, Japan, and Russia.

Make no mistake where Russia stands.

She is a silent partner to the Axis but a very eager and active one.

And Stalin hates England more than Hitler does.

Austro-Germany, Italy, Japan, and Russia have the greatest armies of all the nations of the world.

If Russia does not fight, she will nevertheless supply the materials for the Axis armies and the food for the Axis civilians.

So how is England going to overrun Europe or to starve Europe?

Where is she going to land her troops on European soil?

And why is she going to land them since she can't keep them there when they are landed?

Why not make a wise peace and end this war in which all the odds are against England?

There will be other wars—unhappily—and in the next war the odds may be on England's side as they were in the Napoleonic wars and in the World War.

Your columnist wants to see England win.

He wants to see the British Empire survive.

He wants to see better odds and better conditions for England when she fights her fight—and better leadership.

Churchill is a well-meaning, eloquent-speaking old gentleman; but he is no Pitt, no Disraeli and no Lloyd George.

He is, we greatly fear, neither a strategist nor a diplomat.

Mr. Churchill disparaged the Russian-Japanese pact and intimated that it was aimed against Germany.

But, according to the Associated Press, "the Soviet Union, through the newspaper Pravda, official mouthpiece of the Communist party," said it was not directed against Germany, and "bluntly described the new Soviet-Japanese pact as a bewildering blow at the plans of the United States and British interests."

"The attempt to belittle the importance of the Soviet-Japanese pact," continues the Communist organ, "suffers a fiasco. The nerves of certain Anglo-American commentators are giving way."

Thus in diplomacy Mr. Churchill has gained no brilliant success, while in strategy he continually repeats the disaster of his World War Gallipoli.

His defeats are accomplished in the same way and for the same reason.

"Too little and too late" has become a byword in describing his aid to his Allies.

Now there are no more Allies, unless the United States be one.

Are we going to entrust our fortunes to the director general of the Norway debacle, of the Belgium-French desertion, and now of the Greek-Yugoslav disaster?

The English people are not satisfied with their leadership.

The London Evening News, a very important paper, says of the situation in North Africa:

"This is no diversion. It is a well-prepared blow for a glittering prize—to overrun Egypt, stand astride Suez, and seize Alexandria, the key to all British power in the Mediterranean and the Balkans.

"Even while they were crouching to spring we were told how lost those poor inexperienced Germans from the north would be in the desert if ever they came there.

"It is time that some of these spreaders of fairy tales were given a long rest."

The Daily Herald, authoritative organ of the powerful English Labor Party, says:

"Our ostriches try to persuade themselves—and us—that every Allied triumph is a major coup and every enemy triumph a side show.

"Let us expel the childish notion—the imbecile notion—that the trend of war in the Balkans and Africa can have no weighty effect on the real war.

"Libya should make an end to all that nonsense that it could not happen here."

Neither is Australia satisfied with the war leadership.

The sacrifice of the Australian imperial force in Greece may lead to a political crisis.

Labor members of the House are reported to be eager to defeat the Menzies government because the war cabinet acted in secret and did not consult the advisory council.

In response, Prime Minister Menzies of Australia has called for the formation of a "truly national war administration."

Shall America plunge into this maelstrom of confusion and disaster and strive to bring about that vague illusive "peace of victory"?

Or shall we endeavor to promote a peace of equity and justice now and not wait for that distant day when a peace of victory—someone's victory—will be negotiated amid the ruins of the nations?

Friends, 7 months ago your columnist put forth his impotent effort for peace.

Lloyd George, the great English Prime Minister of the World War, had written an encouraging article on peace, and your columnist sent him the following cabled message:

WYNTON, MCCLOUD, CALIF.,
September 22, 1940.

DAVID LLOYD GEORGE,
London:

I read your article today with great interest and emotional admiration. I agree entirely with your views.

Would it be possible for you and my humble self to do something to bring this whole war to a just and reasonable cessation?

My chief interest is as an American, but I also have material and personal interests in England.

It would seem to me that if the war is pursued to a stalemate, not only will there be disastrous destruction, but the difficulties of making a proper and all-preserving peace will be increased rather than diminished.

Unless England should win an overwhelming victory, she might never make a better peace than now; and if she did not win an overwhelming victory, she might not make peace as protecting to all her imperial interests as she could today.

If the war continues, not only will destruction continue, but there is some possibility of America being drawn into the war on one side and Japan on the other side, which would widen the devastation without hastening a conclusion or compelling a decision.

I know you have a crystal-clear view of the situation and the highest position among the statesmen of the world and the prestige of great achievement to back you.

I have only my earnest interest and such appeal as I might be able to make to the American people.

Can anything be done, and can I be of any service?

WM. RANDOLPH HEARST.

CRICCIETHPO,
September 25, 1940.

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST,
Wyntoon, Calif.:

In complete sympathy with your desire that effort should be made to bring this horrible struggle to a peaceable conclusion, but I am strongly of opinion that this moment inopportune for appeal whilst grim battle now pending has not reached issue.

When German plan for invasion definitely checked and both sides faced with prospect of prolonged and exhausting war, then appeal for peace conference might succeed.

Premature intervention might prejudice chances.

Earnest personal greetings to you.

LLOYD GEORGE.

David Lloyd George is one of the greatest statesmen in the world, but is there a better chance of making a just peace today than there was a year ago, and will there be a better chance to make a just peace a year from now than there is today?

Should not we Americans make the move to save the world from the destruction of enduring war and to avert that destruction to ourselves?

The Vinson Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

MEMORANDUM BY RUSS NIXON, NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVE, LABOR'S NONPARTISAN LEAGUE

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum on communications between House Naval Affairs Committee and the C. I. O. re the Vinson bill:

A serious question has arisen concerning the adequacy of the opportunity given to labor and other interested parties to present testimony before the House Naval Affairs Committee on H. R. 4139, the so-called Vinson bill, providing for compulsory "cooling-off" period, freezing open-shop status quo, etc. The C. I. O. takes the position that no adequate opportunity or notice was given labor in regard to these hearings. They further are of the opinion that the record of the committee on this question demonstrates a deliberate plan to preclude full discussion of this all-important bill. Because debate has already ensued regarding the facts involved in the procedure of the committee, it seems wise to set forth in detail the exact circumstances.

The original Vinson bill, H. R. 2850, was introduced in the House of Representatives by Mr. VINSON of Georgia on January 29, 1941. A revision of this bill was introduced by Mr. VINSON on March 21, 1941, and numbered H. R. 4139. During this period and up until Monday morning, April 14, the offices of the legislative representative of the C. I. O. and Labor's Nonpartisan League kept in touch with the Naval Affairs Committee, being informed consistently that the date for the hearings had not been set.

The first official communications addressed (although indirectly) to the C. I. O. was a letter under date of March 22, 1941, which went to Mr. Philip Murray in his capacity as a member of the National Mediation Board. A copy of this letter is included. It is to be noted that this letter was sent to each member of the Mediation Board. It is to be further noted that no mention was made of hearings on the Vinson bill. The second paragraph of the letter seems most normally, as written, to be interpreted as requesting an answering letter rather than testimony before the committee. It was, in fact, so interpreted by every person who received this letter.

It is abundantly clear that no interpretation of this letter would justify the position that Mr. Murray had been advised of hearings on the Vinson bill and had been asked to testify.

In the period following the sending of this letter, no definite date was announced in the press or elsewhere, or in any other fashion, by the House Naval Affairs Committee as to the start of hearings. From April 3 to April 14 the House of Representatives was in recess. During this period, it was clear that no hearings were to be held by the Naval Affairs Committee.

On Monday morning, April 14, it was announced that hearings on H. R. 4139 were to begin the next morning at 10:30. A telegram, copy of which is included, was sent at 11 a. m. to Mr. Philip Murray, addressed to the Congress of Industrial Organizations in Washington, D. C. The Washington office of the C. I. O. was closed on Easter Monday, April 14. The telegram was received on Tuesday morning, April 15, and was delivered to Mr. Philip Murray in Pittsburgh, Pa., just before he entered important steel negotiations. It was necessary that some time be taken by the C. I. O. to make the arrangements necessary for appearance before the committee. It was expected that reasonable time to respond to the first notification of the opening of the hearing would be provided. Such proved not to be the case. Forty-nine hours after the telegram announcing the opening of the hearings was sent from the office of the committee, the hearings on the bill had been closed; and 78 hours after the telegram was sent, the bill was reported out of committee. In terms of effective receipt of the telegram by responsible C. I. O. officials, it was only 27 hours until the hearings were closed and 56 hours until the bill was reported out of the committee. That this was inadequate notice seems beyond all argument. It should be pointed out, moreover, that no indication of the abrupt closing of the hearing is contained in the telegram sent to Mr. Philip Murray. The C. I. O. had every reason, on the basis of precedent, to expect that with adequate hearings several days could elapse before it was necessary to inform the committee of the exact arrangements it had been able to make for appearing before the committee.

Comparable experience was had by Mr. John Green, president of the C. I. O. Marine Shipbuilding Workers of America. Reading in the papers that the bill had been introduced in the House, Mr. Green requested that he be allowed to be heard by the committee some 3 or 4 weeks ago. He received a letter in response from the committee telling him he would be given an opportunity to be heard. Nothing further was heard from the committee until Mr. Green received a telegram about noon on Tuesday, April 15. This telegram instructed him to appear before the committee at 10 o'clock the next morning to present his testimony. This notice of less than 22 hours was completely inadequate for Mr. Green. It compelled him to appear under great disadvantage and with considerable difficulty before the committee.

When it was announced that the committee hearings were closed on Wednesday noon, Mr. VINSON was called upon at once by the following representatives of the C. I. O.: Mr. C. D. Fowler, of the C. I. O. publicity department; Mr. John Green, president of the C. I. O. Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America; and Mr. Russ Nixon, national representative of Labor's Nonpartisan League; and representative of Mr. John T. Jones, legislative representative of the C. I. O. A protest was entered as to the proceedure followed by the committee which precluded adequate presentation of labor's position. These representatives were informed by Chairman VINSON that the hearings were closed.

Some differences of opinion appear to exist as to whether or not Chairman VINSON agreed to provide further opportunity for later appearance before the committee. The three representatives of the C. I. O. are in complete unanimous accord that such opportunity was not presented by Chairman VINSON. They further state that Chairman VINSON showed a callous disregard for labor's views and indicated strenuously that this bill was to be reported out of the committee (as it was) on the following day. That this was the position taken by the chairman is corroborated by the fact that the committee went ahead without any reservation on the basis that the hearings were closed. No announcement, private or public, was made to indicate in any way that the hearings were to be reopened.

The very next morning, Thursday, April 17, the committee went into a special session with the drafter of the bill, Mr. Morgan, of the Legislative Drafting Division of the House of Representatives, to complete through amendment and revision the provisions of the bill. As noted above, the bill was reported out of the committee in the afternoon of Thursday, April 17.

In view of the above facts, it is clear that no adequate opportunity was presented either for an adequate testimony on the part of labor or for adequate testimony on the part of other interested parties. The flagrant nature of this inadequacy is all the more apparent when it is realized that after the hearings were closed, through the simple device of substituting "national" for the word "naval" in the provisions of the bill limiting its jurisdiction to naval-defense contracts, the bill was extended to cover virtually all of American industry.

The letter and telegram follow:

MARCH 22, 1941.

Mr. PHILIP MURRAY,
President, Congress of Industrial Organizations,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MURRAY: I am enclosing herewith a copy of H. R. 4139, which I introduced on March 21. This is a revision of H. R. 2850, which I introduced on January 29, 1941.

The Committee on Naval Affairs, of which I am chairman, would appreciate any comments, suggestions, or criticisms which you would care to make with respect thereto.

It has been my purpose in the bill (1) to give statutory recognition to the National Defense Mediation Board which the President created by Executive order just the other day; (2) to give that Board, by statute, virtually the same powers and duties as were given to it by the President in the Executive order; (3) to impose, by statute, on employers and employees virtually the same obligations which were imposed on them by the President in the Executive order; (4) to treat by statute the troublesome question of the union shops in the same manner as such question was treated by proclamation of President Wilson in creating the National War Labor Board; and (5) to implement these powers, duties, and obligations and use treatment with adequate enforcement provisions.

The bill is drawn to relate solely to naval contractors, for the reason that jurisdiction of the Committee on Naval Affairs is limited to matters dealing with the Navy. Should the bill be reported to the House, however, it will be possible to extend its provisions to the whole national-defense program. Hence, in considering the bill it was considered to be in connection with the whole of that program and not merely in connection with that part of it relating solely to the Navy.

Thanking you for your kindness, I am,

Yours very truly,

CARL VINSON,
Chairman, House Naval Affairs Committee.

APRIL 14, 1941.

Mr. PHILIP MURRAY,
Congress of Industrial Organizations,
Washington, D. C.:

Hearings will commence tomorrow morning before the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives at 10:30 o'clock in room 313, old House Office Building, on H. R. 4139, to further expedite the national-defense program in respect of naval construction and procurement by providing for the investigation and mediation of labor disputes in connection therewith and for other purposes. The committee will be glad to have the views of your organization at the hearing.

CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Naval Affairs Committee.

Cardinal O'Connell Denounces Those Who Would "Sell Out Their Country" to Enter the European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE BOSTON POST

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Cardinal O'Connell, from the Boston Post of April 24, 1941:

[From the Boston Post of April 24, 1941]

DON'T JOIN WAR, SAYS CARDINAL—COUNTRY MUST LET NATIONS FINISH IT THAT STARTED IT, HE TELLS WOMEN'S CONGRESS

The United States must stay out of the war and let the nations which started the war finish it, William Cardinal O'Connell told the Congress of Catholic Women yesterday, pointedly adding that President Roosevelt's word that the United States shall keep out is promise enough for him and should be promise enough for everybody.

Making his annual address to the congress at St. Clement's Church, he denounced warmongers and propagandists and accused many of them of imposing on the widely acknowledged generosity of Americans, while others are attempting, he warned, "to sell out their own country."

Disputing the widespread propaganda, which, he said, paints the war as a brave war, he said that the skulking under the oceans, the blasting of ships, the bombing air raids, and the starvation of a lot of women and children is not bravery but absolute cowardice.

"You can't glorify that kind of war for me," he said, as he urged the congregation of women, which completely filled the church, not to be misled. Bravery, he said, undoubtedly there is, but most of what the propagandists have been picturing as bravery is cowardice.

The cardinal urged the women to pray steadfastly for peace, but, moreover, he added with stress, they must work to root out from society the modern tendencies toward godlessness which bring on world strife and civilization's ruin.

HITS AT RADIO PROGRAMS

War, although it was a chief topic of the cardinal's hour-long address, was but one of the many topics he discussed. He denounced the shallowness of radio programs, the evil influence of the movies, the ridiculousness of modern fashions, the worship of wealth, and the abuse of leisure.

War, nevertheless, was the topic for which he reserved his strongest and most impassioned words.

"Don't let anyone put it over on you that this is a courageous war; it's rot," he said.

"And they are trying to get us into this war," he added, pausing a moment before he vehemently cried, "Never!"

"We have the word of our President, and that ought to be enough for all of us. It is enough for me," he said.

He urged: "Let us all pray God that the officials of our Government will stand out strong and firm in their determination that this country will not be dragged into this war."

PLAYS PROPAGANDA

"And when one sees the various propaganda in the press, in letters, and in orations, one wonders if Americans really love their own country," he said. "We know that Americans are generous, but when it comes to selling out their own country—" here he paused.

"Let those who started the war finish it. It is not our affair," he warned, and then added: "We have seen too much in the past of the abuse of the kind-heartedness of Americans." At this point the cardinal declared that he spoke as an American and a lover of America.

"Defend ourselves—yes," he said.

REFERS TO MARSHFIELD FIRE

"We are all united on that. We want perfect security for the Nation. Let us pray Almighty God to bring peace to the world. That is the work of Christian women; that is the work for all of us. And when peace comes, then they will realize that much of the causes of all this trouble is infidelity to God. Man has not considered his purpose in life."

The cardinal used the incidents of the Marshfield fire to draw an analogy of how wars begin and how a tiny flame can bring great devastation. In Marshfield, he said, lands surrounding the town were dried up, and when a careless smoker dropped a match or a butt, a flame leaped up and proceeded to make wide devastation. When thousands of souls are dried up from godlessness, a similar conflagration can break out, he said.

"When you take away the thought of God and the thought of the duty toward God; when men and women just think of pleasure, getting money, and something else just as selfishly, then the ground dries up and the soul becomes desiccated. There's nothing in it. It is ready for the flames. And then someone tosses a cigarette on it, or a match. All Europe is like that.

"First of all," he began, " it is true that the world of the present time seems to be bereft of its senses. It seems to be ceasing to reason about things and to act through spite, or hatred, or some other motive that is not in the catalog of Christian virtues.

SEES PEOPLE'S DUTY

"And, of course, it is the duty of all Christians to do all in their power to bring back the people of the earth to the service of God. That is the reason of the creation of man; and without that—well, there is no reason for man's existence. God created us to know Him, to serve Him, and to love Him, and to do His will on this earth, and to glorify Him forever in all eternity.

"These principles are being lost sight of. For some time there has been a creeping paralysis over what was formerly the religious attitude of the people; a certain decadence of morals has crept in. It shows itself in a thousand disagreeable ways. First of all, the fundamental principles of Christianity have been protested and challenged in the lay schools and the universities, and the professors and those in charge seem to be acting as if determined they are going to put Christ out of the world," he said.

PRAISES SESSIONS

"Of course, when that happens," he continued, "then comes the ruin of civilization. You have had a wonderful congress in many ways. I am so delighted that so many have attended the congress and that the quality of the speeches was so wonderful."

Then the cardinal praised the address of Edward B. Hanify, who spoke Tuesday on Christian Citizenship. The cardinal called the address "a superb summing up of the case against infidelity and paganism. If you heard that alone, the congress would have been most worthwhile," he added.

He discussed decadence among womanhood. He said that there always have been women who have had no high ideals, but they were not so conspicuous as they are today.

"The idolatry of the stage stars and the movie actresses," he charged, has contributed false standards for many women. "I am not saying anything against them. I don't judge them, but they are not the models to which Christian women ought to look," he said.

Discussing fashions, the cardinal humorously said, "This idea of fashions is beyond us mere men," and, continuing, said, "but I tell you this quite on the sly, that I think all of us men feel rather sad when they see a woman trying to make herself look ridiculous."

The cardinal struck out against women who go to the communion rail with their fingernails, lips, and cheeks painted. "It is almost blasphemous," he said.

TOO MUCH PLEASURE

"In the world today," he went on, "there is too much pleasure, too much luxury, too much selfishness." He then pointed out as the examples for women to follow their mothers.

"When our mothers and fathers were struggling in this country, they weren't thinking of luxury and degeneracy or pleasure; they were doing their duty, and you know it," he said. "What are we doing, you, their daughters, and we, their sons?"

Turning again to the matter of women's dress, he added: "I don't mean that everyone should dress like a nun. I don't care what capital declares the fashion—Paris, London, New York, or Washington. Don't follow after these silly, foolish things that seem—I don't like to mention the word. There is a certain moderation, and Catholic women should give the example. You have your own ideals. You were well brought up. I am talking like a father to his family; I am using the intimacy of a father, which is the right of a father. If the Christian women don't set the example of a holy life, then who will?"

LITTLE MARTYR

The cardinal turned to a discussion of wealth, stating "the more limited, it seems, in their resources, the more wonderful men and women are." "Worship of wealth," he said, is "a part of the paganism of the day."

"The little girl who has to get up early in the morning and stand on her feet all day—she is a little martyr. We know them, and you know them," he said, "but the woman who has the leisure and the wealth, is doubly bound to give good example."

"I do glance now and then at the society columns—but God help us: It is wonderful, isn't it, for the world to know that someone was wearing an ermine wrap. How silly it all is. There is so much to do with life and time," he said, as he urged his hearers to do all in their power to "preserve the principles of Christian conduct."

Referring to present-day radio programs, the cardinal scored them as "simply barbarous."

"I love music," he said, "and find much relaxation in it. I am very fond of it, but this radio music is just the most rotten stuff that man can compose. Is that the sort of music that Americans like? It is really vulgar, low-down stuff—both the words and the music." "Radio plays are not any better," he said.

HITS AT MAGAZINES

He turned to the picture magazines, many of which, he said, started out well but turned into nothing but magazines pandering to sex. He no longer is able to look at them, he said, as he termed them "the products of filthy minds."

"Where does one find a decent picture book? Never before was there such rotten filthiness as there is today," he said.

Following the cardinal's address, solemn benediction was held by the Reverend Richard A. Rogers, administrator of St. Cecelia's parish, which includes St. Clement's Church. The closing hymn was of the cardinal's own composition, The Hymn to the Holy Name.

Following the service, the cardinal gave his blessing to the multitude and invited a group of the officers of the congress within the altar rail, where each kissed his ring. Previous to the service an organ recital was given by Irvin Brogan, a graduate of Boston College.

Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. JOHNSON

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS, OF ARKANSAS

Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ELLIS] before the Thomas Jefferson Club at Parkersburg, W. Va., on April 14, 1941:

Who was Thomas Jefferson, and what was his contribution that should command our attention at this hour?

Life to us is liberty. Of few men can it be said, "He stood at the gateway of life and opened wide its portals that the multitude might enter and enjoy more abundantly the riches of God's creation." Such a man was Jefferson.

A little while ago it was Lincoln who noted that, "Fourscore and ten years ago our fathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

We then were testing whether this Nation should live as one or two democracies. Today, fourscore years later, we are involved in an even greater, though less tangible, conflict, testing whether democracy itself shall live.

We are met here as Democrats, as members of the oldest political party in power in any major nation. As heirs to that illustrious party of the people, we are heirs also to an almost sacred philosophy of government. We are met in honor of him who visioned, enunciated, and executed that philosophy and gave it life as a governing force in the world.

Thomas Jefferson was born, lacking 2 years, two centuries ago yesterday, the son of undistinguished parents, the third child in a family of 10. From boyhood he was a student, and upon his entry into William and Mary College at 17 he was immediately accepted into the exclusive little fraternity of one of the professors, of a distinguished lawyer, George Wythe, and of the Governor of the Colony, Francis Fauquier. For 2 years these four intellectual giants dined together once a week and indulged in mutual exchange of the best thought of the day, though there is no evidence that they ever came to a common conclusion. This for Jefferson was the opportunity and the beginning.

After graduation he spent 5 years studying the law and acquiring the beginning of what was to be the best library of the land. Then he practiced law for 7 years, earning as high as $10,000 annually. Like Franklin, he was a genius at many arts. He studied the classics and the Bible religiously, and even did a New Testament translation of his own. He was an accomplished violinist, an artist, architect, gardener, farmer, hunter, botanist, horseman, essayist, inventor, manufacturer, politician, statesman, and diplomat. From early manhood he was a chronic and meticulous writer, but as a public speaker he was poor.

His own county of Albemarle elected him to the house of burgesses in 1769. He stood in the hallway at Williamsburg and heard Patrick Henry's famous resolution and there gained his inspiration for his bold and fearless career. He was ready for the battle, for even before this he had had engraved upon a seal for himself his motto, "Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God." He was on the Committee of Correspondence that stirred the Colonies to action. Thus he began a long career of 40 years of constant official service for his country.

He was elected a member of the Virginia Conventions, then of the Continental Congress, of the Virginia Legislature, Governor of Virginia, Member of Congress, Minister to France, Secretary of State, Vice President, and President of the United States.

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Jefferson's first great opportunity came at the age of 33, a year after his election to the Continental Congress. On June 11, 1776, he had been appointed along with Franklin and Adams and two others to draft a suitable Declaration of Independence. Franklin was the most important man in the Congress, but he had been sick with the gout. Adams had refused because, he said, he had become too "obnoxious" by his clamor for independence, so they wished the job off on the tall, silent, young, red-headed, grey-eyed lawyer from Virginia, about whom John Adams later said that he had not until that time heard him utter three consecutive sentences.

Jefferson set to work, and at last, with rare judgment and clever literary skill, he amalgamated the essence and some of the form of three already existing documents, one of which he had written himself, and polished them into one of the world's most famous pronouncements, proclaiming, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by the Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness."

After acceptance of the formal declaration, a new copy was made, the one now enshrined in the Library of Congress. The original Jefferson carried away to his home in Virginia, where it lay among his files untouched for 47 years "before the country suddenly awoke to the fact that the Declaration of Independence was an imperishable state paper." At long last and while he still lived Jefferson began to receive the acclaim justly due him.

Thus came the first of his great achievements, and in the document were both the objectives later embodied in the Constitution and the ideals which later inspired the Democratic Party.

The Declaration of Independence remains the most revolutionary of all documents.

Among the old letters of John Adams I find one which he wrote his wife on the evening following the first day's debate and the day after the passage of the Lee resolution calling for the declaration: "Yesterday the greatest question was decided whichever was debated in America, and a greater perhaps never was nor will be decided among men. A resolution was passed without one dissenting colony that these united colonies are, and of right out to be, free and independent states."

HIS WORK IN THE VIRGINIA LEGISLATURE

Jefferson retired from the Second Continental Congress in 1776, returned to his native State, and entered the legislature with the hope of revising and modifying Virginia's laws that they might more nearly conform to his philosophy of Republican government. He succeeded in breaking down the laws of primogeniture and entail, in practically disestablishing the English church and in enacting one of the best laws the world has even seen for public education, from the common schools to and including the University of Virginia.

Jefferson did not believe that the Church of England, operating virtually as a government and indeed sanctioned by the State, should force its monopoly so savagely upon the people. Though an ardent student of the Bible, his efforts brought down upon him the wrath not only of the church but of those "high-flyers" of colonial society, as he called them, who principally through their favors from the crown, dominated everything. Throughout his official life this monstrous opposition arose again and again to strike at him on every turn.

Even Alexander Hamilton, while they were both candidates for the Presidency, was a party to a movement within the church designed to eliminate Jefferson. Pamphlets were spread through the land referring to him as "a mean-spirited, low-lived fellow, the son of a half-breed Indian squaw sired by a Virginia mulatto father; raised wholly on hoecake made of coarse-ground southern corn. He would sell his country at the first offer made to him cash down, should he be elected to fill the Presidential chair." At the conclusion of a speech containing these statements, it was unanimously voted by the assembled freemen present "that in case any individual, or individuals, should dare to vote for that half Indian, half nigger, half Frenchman—Thomas Jefferson—he, or they, should be rode on a green, split chestnut rail, sharp side up." (Incidentally he was not only the foremost champion of free worship but also of the freeing of the slaves.)

In a sermon of the Fourth of July preceding the election, Dr. Timothy Dwight, president of Yale, prophesied faithfully the terrible consequences of permitting the ungodly Virginian and his desperadoes to seize the reigns of political power: "Is it that we may see the Bible cast into a bomb fire * * * is it that we may see our wives and daughters as victims of legal prostitution, soberly dishonored, speciously polluted, the outcasts of delicacy and virtue?" and on and on into what becomes too vulgar to repeat here

Upon Jefferson's election, certain pious women in New England buried their Bibles in their gardens, fearing confiscation.

If Jefferson had settled the many issues he raised as completely as he did this one, there would never have been any other party, for this one never raised its head again. But at what a price.

And yet there are those of us who flinch at the first sign of opposition.

Only Jefferson's ability and his personal popularity enabled him, always at least a decade ahead of most great men of his time,

to force his education system through the Virginia Legislature. It is not unimportant to note that at the same moment he was forcing the separation of his church and state he was installing public education as a function of the government and as the greatest weapon of a free people.

SERVICE IN FRANCE AND THE BILL OF RIGHTS

Although Jefferson was in France from 1784 until 1789, his was the greatest influence of any one man upon our Constitution including the Bill of Rights.

In checking through his old letters I find that 2 years before his departure for France he wrote, "I never saw a native American begging in the streets or highways." Then I find a letter which he wrote back to the States a year after his arrival in France: "Of 20,000,000 supposed to be free in France, I am of the opinion that there are 19,000,000 more wretched, more accursed in every circumstance of human existence than the most conspicuously wretched individual in the whole United States."

Even in 1814, after he had been President, he wrote of America, "We have no paupers."

While in France he kept up his constant stream of letters and he and his friends exacted unofficial promises of the Colonies that the Bill of Rights would be added before the Constitution ever was ratified.

In one of these letters he said—and note the resemblance to our own time: "I asked myself what could be the reason that so many should be permitted to beg who are willing to work in a country where there is a very considerable proportion of uncultivated lands"; and his conclusion was that "whenever there is in any country uncultivated lands and unemployed poor, it is clear that the laws of property have been so far extended as to violate natural rights. The earth is given as a common stock for man to labor and live on."

SECRETARY OF STATE

As the first Secretary of State, Thomas Jefferson's greatest achievement was in expounding what was later to become the Monroe Doctrine and in so eloquently enunciating his philosophy of government that when Washington sided with Hamilton, thereby virtually forcing Jefferson's resignation from the Cabinet, Jefferson took with him the sympathies of a majority of the people, and thus came into existence for the first time a party of the people as opposed to the Federalists or Tories or Tyrants—and there is a modern term for them.

AS PRESIDENT

As Vice President Jefferson had continued his fight for the rights of the common man and thus had secured his election in 1801 as President.

The first President to be inaugurated in Washington, D. C., he acted swiftly to build the United States into a place of security and respect among the nations of the earth. His annihiliation of the Pirates of Tripoli and his purchase of the Louisiana Territory were events that occur once in history. He feared that the United States could not endure as a democracy should the Empire of Napoleon surround us on the West. It is true that no provision existed in the Constitution for any such adventure but although Jefferson believed in strict interpretation of the Constitution—where human rights were endangered—he also believed that it should be a living thing.

At the end of 1 year even Hamilton congratulated him upon his administration.

Until his death in 1826, Jefferson remained one of the most powerful figures in the Nation's history. It was his letter to President Monroe in 1823 that encouraged and inspired Monroe to announce to the world what now is known as the Monroe Doctrine.

The occasion of Jefferson's death provided one of the strangest coincidences of all time. Of the 56 signers of the Declaration of Independence, only 2 of them—he and Adams—later became President—the one who wrote it and the other who steered it through the Congress—and both of these masters died at almost the same hour on the same day—July 4, 1826—the fiftieth anniversary of, as they styled it, "The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America."

Historians record at least 21 different achievements that would entitle the Sage of Monticello to a permanent place in history. And so it was with extreme modesty that he in preparing the inscription for his own tomb listed of his achievements only: "Author of the Declaration of Independence; of the Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom; and Father of the University of Virginia."

JACKSON, CLEVELAND, BRYAN, AND WILSON

Andrew Jackson, Grover Cleveland, William Jennings Bryan, and Woodrow Wilson were the big four who kept alive and contributed most to Jeffersonian democracy in that long expanse of years between Jefferson and our present leader.

THE G. O. P.

It is said that we still have in the United States another political party.

May I give you here a picture as suggested by the columnist Jay Franklin:

Once there were two hairy mammoths, with long, curved tusks, inquisitive noses, and gluttonous appetites.

One was cavorting around the Siberian tundras in the Pleistocene Era, stuffing his tummy with Alpine poppies and similar delicacies left behind the retreating glaciers. Lord of all he surveyed and concerned only with his own immediate contentment, he defied all danger signals. The glaciers had been retreating steadily for thousands of years, hadn't they? What cared he if the birds were flying south? Snug in his warm woolen coat he refused to believe the glaciers were on the move again.

Just the other day they dug him out of an iceberg, hair and all, frozen solid, taken by surprise in an unfair caprice of nature that apparently had no further use for giant mammoths and had decided that the Pleistocene age was over.

Then there was the other creature, the American tycoon (genus G. O. P.), who cavorted among the lush savannahs of laissez faire, stuffing his maw with rugged individualism, corporate mergers, special privilege, and other Wall Street delicacies left behind the retreating forces of mercantile philosophy. For generations the grass had grown greener, the pastures wider, and there seemed no reason to believe that eventually the entire world might not become this creature's playground. He merely smirked at the rising tide of unemployment; he laughed at Hitler and possible world revolution. These things would pass—they always had. He had enormous cash reserves, laws, and judges, and philosophies which provided him with a thick coat against the storm. He would not believe that the climate of public opinion had changed and that human nature had rung down the curtain on the age of rugged individualism and industrial laissez faire.

They'll dig him out some day from the cold iceberg of history and they'll marvel at how he was tolerated so long among the monopolies and want and inequalities of opportunity which he created.

We have seen the mammoth of this genus trample and exploit the masses since the War between the States. We have seen him sink the Nation's battleships after World War No. 1, rather than be taxed a little to sustain them. We have seen him permit millions to go unemployed and cold and hungry, and we have seen him keep hands off while we lost our homes. We can still hear him bellow forth, as the people slipped the iceberg down upon him in 1932, "* * * grass will grow in the streets of a hundred cities."

Eight years have passed and we have seen him struggle, through a policy of negation and obstruction, to make his boast come true. Last fall we heard again his trumpet, warning that if we did not resurrect him, "this way of life will pass." We have seen him oppose rearmament and give aid and comfort to the dictators.

But the people did not resurrect him, and the grass did not grow, and this way of life did not pass—and shall not pass—and we shall not comfort the dictators.

JEFFERSONIAN DEMOCRACY TODAY

Not since the day of Jefferson himself has Jeffersonian democracy bloomed forth so profusely as during the past 8 years. We forget so quickly.

In St. Paul, Minn., at a Jefferson Day dinner on April 18, 1932, several months before the election of that year, the then Governor of New York warned the Nation that "great fear has swept the Nation" and that we are "facing an emergency today more grave than that of the war." After reviewing the national crisis and pointing out that democracy also means equality of opportunity, the Governor observed that, "as the great Virginian sat at Monticello in the twilight of his life he saw the rise of manufacturing and the growth of the cities and he still held fast to the principles that a truly national economy is many-sided."

As is usually the case in our democracy, the greater the crisis the greater the leader, and so the people recognized in the Governor of New York another Jefferson standing at the gateway of life.

Stunned and staggering, the rich and the poor, the tyrants and the lowly—all fell begging at his knee; all were happy for the radiance of his hope.

Eight years have passed, and now in every town and every countryside stand enduring monuments to the democracy that our party and our leader put to work. Look at them. There is our bank-deposit insurance; there are our idle men employed; there are new roads and streets, Legion huts, community buildings, and schools; there are the N. Y. A., C. C. C., and new vocational training programs; there are Farm Credit, Farm Security, Soil Conservation, Reforestation, Surplus Commodity Marketing, and the A. A. A.; there are rural electrification, Federal and United States Housing, and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation; there is social security; there are new flood-control and rivers and harbors programs, T. V. A., Grand Coulee, and on and on—a new Army, a new Air Corps, and a new Navy.

All this under the administration of that gallant humanitarian and Jeffersonian Democrat, the recognized leader of peace and democracy in the world. Your leader and mine, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Had either Jefferson or Franklin Roosevelt lived in the day of the other he would have been the other's greatest ally.

We Democrats may make mistakes, but they won't dig us out of an iceberg.

WHAT OF TOMORROW?

All this is history. In the light of it what is there of hope and inspiration for us? To build now our defense against enemies and potential enemies from without the United States and to build now our defense against enemies and potential post-war enemies from within, whether they be individuals or conditions—that is the twofold task supreme in the mind of every true American.

Everything that Jefferson and the party of Jefferson have fought for for one and a half centuries, including the ideals and the governments of every country of the Western World, stand condemned and have been promised destruction by the new forces of tyranny that threaten to engulf the earth. It must be admitted that we know not at this moment how those forces shall be stopped but again the graveness of the hour has added to the stature of the man at the

helm and, war or no war—and God grant that it shall be with no war—I have every confidence that in the end justice will prevail, that the outlaw governments of Europe will be overthrown and that peace and democracy will again settle upon the earth in a fervor of sweetness not heretofore enjoyed.

OUR POST-WAR COURSE

But after the war, what then? Surely we shall not be a party directly or indirectly to winning the battles and yet lose the cause. With the victory that shall accompany peace will come also unemployment, a crippled economy, and fear and uncertainty. It well may be that the hours that shall follow the war will be darker than the hours of the war itself. We must, like Jefferson, forget individual selfishness. We must take the broader view and we must recognize, each of us, some responsibility for seeing to it that democracy is never finished, that it shall be a tool for opening new frontiers for providing equality of opportunity and for securing the rights of the individual—including the right to live and work. As yet, only one general proposal for tiding us over the inevitable post-war depression has made the headlines. It is that of the President to provide a reservoir of projects for our own internal development.

It has been my honor to introduce in this session of the Congress, with the approval of the administration, one of the largest of those projects, the proposed Arkansas Valley Authority—a project covering an area seven times the size of the T. V. A. and one-tenth of the United States; a project that will open new frontiers by securing our lowlands from $9,000,000 direct flood damage annually; by opening four great rivers to navigation; by irrigating new lands; by developing tremendous, cheap hydroelectric power; by using the vast stores of oil and gas and coal of the region to build peak hydro power into firm power, and by thus making possible an industrialization necessary for a well-rounded economy in a region rich in natural resources but poor in per capita income—a region that will help absorb the unemployed of the East and North, whereas that region is now contributing one-fourth of its sons and daughters annually to the North and East and West.

And this project, like many others, will pay for itself in direct benefits, not to mention the tremendous benefits of using the idle wealth of the Nation to develop the idle resources with the idle manpower. This vast undertaking, like T. V. A. and many others, will in the end cost the Nation nothing.

To borrow a phrase from Jefferson, "We hold the necessity of the enactment of these projects for the general welfare of the people and the preservation of our democracy to be self-evident."

Let us then determine, you and I, that as we face these perilous days ahead we shall keep ever in mind the example of Jefferson and the ideals of his sacred philosophy, all of which he borrowed from the Bible itself.

If we do that, God being with us, no sacrifice and no task shall be too difficult.

The Vinson Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

ARTICLE BY MARK THISTLETHWAITE

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Mark Thistlethwaite, Washington correspondent for the Indianapolis News, which appeared in that newspaper on April 23, 1941:

[From the Indianapolis News of April 23, 1941]

MOMENTS IN WASHINGTON

(By Mark Thistlethwaite)

WASHINGTON, April 23.—The principle of the Vinson bill to curb strikes in plants engaged in national-defense production is neither new nor untried. This principle of requiring observance of a "cooling off" period at the time of a threatened strike was crystallized into statutory law 15 years ago to apply to the railroads and their employees. Experience since then has justified completely what was proposed as an experiment. The rail carriers and the commercial air lines, which later were brought within the law's purview, have been free from strikes growing out of disputes between employees and managers.

The Vinson bill would establish in the national-defense production field the principle of conciliation, mediation, and arbitration that the Watson-Parker Act of 1926 established in the field of transportation. It would depend for success, as does the Railroad Anti-strike Act, on a "cooling off" period for a peaceful settlement of differences based on public opinion after the merits of a controversy have become known as a result of conferences and direct negotiations.

However, the situations of 1926 and 1941 are widely different, and thus the Vinson bill faces bitter opposition whereas the Watson-Parker Act was virtually unopposed. Organized labor, in the present emergency, is against antistrike legislation in whatever form proposed. Its leaders are demanding that the existing right of immediate strike not be infringed in any way. They are fighting the Vinson bill and lining up their friends in Congress against it. This means a hard battle in contrast to the rejoicing on both sides that marked enactment of the Watson-Parker law.

The term "cooling off" as applied to the Vinson bill, in all current discussions, is no newer than the principle of the proposed legislation. First use of this descriptive term was by James E. Watson, of Indiana, when the railroad peace bill of which he was a coauthor was up for approval. As chairman of the Senate's Interstate Commerce Committee, the Hoosier championed the legislation that had been worked out and agreed on by the carriers and the brotherhoods. "For 60 days the status quo shall be preserved; no strikes shall happen; no lockouts shall occur; no trains shall stop," Watson told the Senate. "This period of repose, this cooling-off time, will give the public full knowledge of the situation." This was on May 6, 1926.

Whether the Vinson bill, if enacted into law over the opposition of labor, would prove as beneficial as the Watson-Parker law is to be doubted. Successful administration of the Railroad Peace Act has been due to the loyal support of management and trainmen. Having sponsored the legislation, the carriers and their employees were under a moral responsibility to see that it worked. Their joint acceptance of this obligation continues to this day. To both belongs the credit for preservation of amicable relations and for an uninterrupted transportation service, and the good will of 1926, still existent, accounts for an efficient and reliable transportation system in the present emergency.

Calvin Coolidge, who as President signed the Watson-Parker bill and thereby made it a law, offered a word contribution which has reappeared in the discussion of the Vinson bill. Praising the carriers and their employees for the cooperative effort in the public welfare, Mr. Coolidge said that the solution ought to be an example to all other industries. "Those who ask the protection of civilization should be ready to use the methods of civilization," he added.

Coolidge's discussion included remarks which on repetition sound as timely as though uttered today instead of 15 years ago. "A strike in modern industry has many of the aspects of war in the modern world," he said. 'It injures labor and it injures capital. * * * It injures the economic welfare and general comfort of the whole people. * * * It tends to embitter and divide the community into warring classes and thus weakens the unity and power of our national life. * * * Labor can make no permanent gains at the cost of the general welfare."

It Can Be Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE LEAD (S. DAK.) DAILY CALL

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial from the Lead (S. Dak.) Daily Call on the record of fiscal achievement by States under Republican administration, including that of my own State of South Dakota. The editorial follows:

[From the Lead (S. Dak.) Daily Call of April 23, 1941]

REPUBLICANS CAN DO IT

In these days of billions for defense and billions more for the Roosevelt deficit, it is always refreshing to read of reduced budgets and taxes in Republican-administered States.

Under the leadership of Republican Governor James, Pennsylvania has reduced the 2-year budget for 1941–43 by 10 percent. The 1939–41 total was $607,000,000, while the new budget is $543,000,000.

The new Republican administration in Indiana has enacted into law virtually every pledge of the 1940 State Republican platform. In doing so a new record for economy has been made, and the State treasury will have a favorable balance of more than $10,000,000 by 1943, in spite of the dire prediction of Democrats that the program would result in a huge deficit and in spite of the 50-percent reduction in the gross income tax for retailers.

Republican South Dakota had a delightful problem on its hands this spring. Governor Bushfield's administration piled up a new surplus in 1940, and the question was what to do about it. It was generally agreed that taxes should be cut, but there were different opinions as to which taxes should be given the ax.

It was finally agreed to slash 1 cent from the sales tax, reduce the personal-income tax, and turn over the remainder of the saving to various school districts. The $4,150,000 saved last year brings the total for the Bushfield administration since 1939 to $7,650,000. The annual State expenditure is approximately $29,000,000.

Most significant is the fact that these savings were not effected by eliminating any of the State's essential services, but by a businesslike administration. Governor Bushfield

has maintained that government, like private business, should live within its income.

Washington papers please copy.

Conference of the Inter-American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

PROGRAM OF THE CONFERENCE, REPORT OF THE ORGANIZING COMMITTEE, AND THE DECLARATIONS, RESOLUTIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CONFERENCE

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of the House of Representatives to a very young organization that has come a long way, and can go a long way, in building up friendly relations between this country and our American neighbors. The organization to which I refer is the Inter-American Bar Association which was organized May 16, 1940. The constitution, bylaws, press releases, and address by William Cattron Rigby were inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD by Hon. Morris Sheppard, of Texas, at page 4520 of volume 86.

The president of the association, Dr. Manuel Fernandez Supervielle, made a very impressive speech at a dinner given in his honor at the Army and Navy Club Monday evening, October 28, 1940. This speech was placed in the Appendix of the RECORD by Hon. HATTON W. SUMNERS, of Texas, at page 6949 of volume 86. I am sure you will all be interested in rereading the foregoing extensions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The First Conference of the Inter-American Bar Association was held at Habana, March 24 to 28, 1941. The program of this meeting, the report of the organizing committee, and the declarations, resolutions, and recommendations adopted by the first conference are of particular interest, and I am including them herewith:

PROGRAM OF THE FIRST CONFERENCE OF THE INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, HABANA, MARCH 24–28, 1941

MONDAY MORNING, MARCH 24, CHAMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, NATIONAL CAPITOL

9:30: Opening of the conference by the Vice President of Cuba, the Honorable Dr. Gustavo Cuervo Rubio. Introduction of official personnel by William Cattron Rigby, chairman of organizing committee. Roll call by the secretary general.

Addresses of welcome

9:45: The mayor of Habana, the Honorable Raúl G. Menocal.

10: The Secretary of State of Cuba, the Honorable José Manuel Cortina, on behalf of the National Government.

10:30: Dr. Natalio Chediak, for the Colegio de Abogados de la Habana.

10:45: Response by Secretary-General William Roy Vallance.

11: Presidential address, Dr. Manuel Fernández Supervielle.

MONDAY AFTERNOON, MARCH 24, PLENARY SESSION, HOTEL NACIONAL, SALA VEDADO

3: Address by Dr. Enrique Gil, Federación Argentina de Colegios de Abogados.

3:30: Report of the organizing committee, William Cattron Rigby, chairman; and submission of bylaws. Submission of resolutions, of proposed amendments to the Constitution, and of rules of procedure. Adoption of bylaws and of rules of procedure for the conference. Appointment of resolutions committee and other committees.

4: Round tables:

I. Sala Vedado:

Comparative constitutional law: Chairman, Frederic R. Coudert. Address, Frederic R. Coudert, The Constitution of the United States in a Time of World Revolution.

Papers by—

Dr. Noel T. Dowling, to be read by Frederic R. Coudert.

Dr. Rafael Cuevas Zequeira, Puerto Rico, One Link of a Future System of Jurisprudence in the Western Hemisphere.

Wenceslao Troncoso, Similarities and Differences Between the Constitutions of the United States of America and the Dominican Republic.

Dr. Esteban A. Alfonso, On the Advisability of Limiting Constitutional Precepts in the Field of Procedure in the Penal Law.

Dr. Enrique Hernández Corujo, Advisability of Including in the Constitution Adequate Protection for Technical Officials of the Government.

II. Sala Taganana:

Administrative Law and Procedure: Chairman, Harry S. Knight. Paper by Judge Félix Pérez Porta, Administrative Law and Procedure.

III. Sala Santa Clara:

Immigration, Naturalization, and Nationality Laws: Chairman, Dr. Eduardo Salazar.

Papers by—

Dr. Albert E. Reitzel, Recent Developments Relating to the Admission, Residence, and Expulsion of Aliens and Change of Nationalities Under the Law of the United States of America.

Dr. Enrique Gay Galbó, Nationality and Citizenship.

Dr. David Whitmarsh, Immigration Legislation.

C. G. Pella, Draft of Reform of Legislation Which Regulates in America the Loss of Citizens as a Consequence of Military Service in a Foreign Country.

Henry F. Butler, discussion.

TUESDAY MORNING, MARCH 25, HOTEL NACIONAL, SALA VEDADO

9:30: Address by the Honorable Jacob M. Lashly, president of the American Bar Association.

10: IV. The Role of the Lawyer in the Defense of the Americas.

Addresses by—

Col. Edwin Ruffin Beckwith, The Role of the Lawyer in the Defense of the Americas.

James W. Ryan, Program for Western Hemisphere Cooperation and Defense.

Dr. Luis Anderson, The Role of the Lawyer in the Defense of the Americas.

Dr. Luis Anderson in the chair.

Hon. William S. Culbertson, The Reign of Law.

Dr. Dantés Bellegarde, The Role of the Lawyer in the Economic Defense.

Dr. Rigelio Pina, The Role of the Lawyer in National Defense.

Dr. Leonor Saavedra, The Responsibility of the Lawyer at This Historic Moment and in the Defense of the Americas.

Dr. Natalio Chediak, The Bar Associations in the Defense of the Americas.

Dr. José López G. de Villalta, The Role of the Lawyer in the Defense of the Americas.

Dr. Emilio del Real, The Role of the Lawyer in the Defense of the Americas.

Dr. Cosme de la Torriente, The Defense of Democracy.

Dr. Miguel Angel Campa, The Juridical Significance of the Declarations of Panama and Habana.

Dr. Enrique Guiral, Draft of a Declaration on the Reaffirmation of the Principles and Precepts of International Law.

Dr. Felix Chediak, Natural International Law and Legitimate (Just) War.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON, MARCH 25, HOTEL NACIONAL, SALA VEDADO

3: Address by Judge Herbert F. Goodrich, The American Law Institute.

3:20: Address by Dr. Antonio S. de Bustamante, member of the International Court of Justice.

3:40: Address by Dr. William Draper Lewis.

4: Round tables: Comparison of civil and commercial laws, including real-estate and mortgage laws; commercial arbitration; negotiable instruments; the law of trusts and trustees of Canada and the United States; Powers of Attorney. (In two parts.)

V. Session A, Sala Vedado. Chairman: Edmundo Miranda Jordao.

Papers by—

Hessel E. Yntema, Comparative Legal Research and Unification of Law.

Dr. José Béguez César, Property—Its Social Function.

Dr. Salvador Waldo de Castroverde, Would the Creation of a Uniform Mortgage System for the Countries of the Americas be Advisable?

Dr. Agustín Aguirro, Mortgages as Guaranties of Bearer Certificates Transmissible by Endorsement.

Dr. Isabel Siero Pérez, The Rights of Collateral Descendants in the Americas.

Dr. Manuel Dorta Duque, The Ownership of Real Estate—Stabilizing Influence in Inter-American Relations.

Dr. Virgilio Ortega, The Life Insurance Contract—Rights of the Insured and the Beneficiaries.

Dr. Alberto Blanco, On the Unification of Private Law in the Americas.

Dr. Francisco Javier Villaverde, The Future of Voluntary Mortgages.

Dr. E. Le Riverend, New Matrimonial Forms.

Dr. Oscar García Montes, Consideration of the New Trends in the Civil Law as a Necessary Antecedent to Possible Unification of Private Law.

VI. Session B, Sala Taganana, corridor A. (Adjourned to 10 o'clock Wednesday morning, March 26.) Chairman: Judge Otto Schoenrich.

Papers by—

Judge Otto Schoenrich, Comparative Law and Pan American Solidarity.

Dr. R. G. Patton, The Land Title Records of Canada and the United States.

Dr. Guillermo de Montagú, Negotiable Instruments.

Dr. Carlos A. Llanes, Toward Inter-American Legislative Unification.

Dr. Antonio Iglesias, Legislative Unification.

Dr. Raúl Seelig Ruibal, On the Legislative Unification of Trusts.

Dr. Gregorio del Real, Inter-American Unification of Commercial Legislation in Regard to Negotiable Instruments.

Dr. Mario Nin Abarca, The Rights of Minorities in Stock Companies.

Dr. J. E. Gorrin, The Trusts and Their Application in Cuba.

Dr. Fernando Colomar, Mortgagee and Trustee.

Dr. Luis de Solo, Powers of Attorney and Representation in the Courts.

VII. Sala Taganana: Customs Legislation and Commercial Agreements: Chairman, Dr. Dantés Bellegarde.

Papers by—William E. Masterson, Customs Restrictions in the Countries of the Western Hemisphere.

Dr. Lawrence D. Egbert, Latin American Commercial Treaties.

Charles E. Jackson, The Problem of Conserving Fishes that Migrate Across International and Interstate Borders.

Dr. Mercedes Gatell, Inter-American Commerce.

Dr. Roberto A. Netto, The Drawback.

VIII. Sala Santa Clara:

Communications: Including Air Law, Telecommunications, Maritime and Highway Transportation. Chairman: Dr. J. Blanco Ustariz. Address: Dr. J. Blanco Ustariz, Aerial Legislation.

Papers by—Dr. Antonio S. de Bustamente, The Constitution of International Committees on Aviation.

Howard S. LeRoy, Trends of International Aeronautical Law.

John A. Eubank, Some Aspects of Aeronautical Jurisprudence Related to Aerial Warfare.

David E. Grant, The Law Relating to Transportation by Air.

Dr. José Ramón Gutiérrez, Advisability of Creating an Inter-American Institute of Communications and Transportation.

Dr. Rogelio Sandrino, Sovereignty Over Air Spaces.

WEDNESDAY MORNING, MARCH 26, HOTEL NACIONAL, SALA VEDADO

9:30: Address by Dr. Alberto Cruchaga Ossa, Colegio de Abogados de Chile. The Lawyers Before International Tribunals.[1]

10: Address by Dr. Alberto Ulloa, Colegio de Abogados de Lima. Observations on the Present Status of Law.

10:30: Round tables:

IX. Sala Vedado:

Inter-American legal documentation: (a) Bibliography of American Legal Sources. (b) Establishment of an Official Bulletin or Organ of the Inter-American Bar Association. (c) Establishment of an Inter-American Journal of Comparative Law. (d) Inter-American Exchange of Legal Publications. Chairman: Dr. John T. Vance. Address: Dr. Vance, Inter-American Legal Documentation.

Papers by—

Dr. Félix Magloire, Inter-American Legal Documentation.

Harry C. Shriver, Current Session Laws and Statutes (to be read by Francis W. Hill, Jr.).

Dr. Bartholomew Landheer, Need for Inter-American Journal of Comparative Law (to be read by Miss Mary Agnes Brown).

Dr. Crawford W. Bishop, Current Codes of Latin America.

Francis X. Dwyer, Current Session Laws and Statutes of Canada (to be read by Miss Marguerite Rawalt).

Dr. Herminio Rodriguez Von Sobotker, Bibliography of American Legal Publications.

Dr. Lincoln S. Méndoz, Inter-American Exchange of Legal Publications.

Dr. Armando Mencia, Unification of Inter-American Legal Documentation.

Dr. William Sanders: Discussion.

X. Sala Taganana:

Tax problems, including taxation and regulation of public utilities, international double taxation, etc. Chairman: George Maurice Morris.

Papers by—

Edwin D. Ford, Recent Trends in Regulation of Public Utilities in Latin America and their Effect on the Aibility of Public Utility Companies to Meet Demands for Service.

Mitchell B. Carroll, Prevention of Double Taxation in the Americas Through the Development of International Law.

[1] Owing to illness, Dr. Cruchaga Ossa was not able to present his address in person.

XI. Sala Santa Clara:

Protection of intellectual and industrial property. Chairman: Dr. Camilo de Brigard Silva.

Papers by—

Dr. Stephan Ladas, Inter-American Copyright Protection in the Americas.

Dr. Ricardo Moré, Bases for Unification of Patent Legislation in the Countries of the Americas.

Dr. Carlos Gárate, Protection of Patents, Trade-Marks and Trade Names, and Industrial Property.

Dr. Natalio Chediak, The Precarious Situation of Copyrights in the Americas.

Dr. William Sanders, discussion.

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON, MARCH 26, HOTEL NACIONAL, SALA VEDADO

3: Address by the Honorable D. L. McCarthy, president of the Canadian Bar Association.

3:30: Round tables:

XII. Sala Vedado:

Legal education: (a) The importance of international and comparative law studies to inter-American cooperation. (b) Exchange of chairs and scholarships. (c) Practicability of an inter-American institute of comparative law and an academy of international and comparative law. (d) Contributions of private legal organizations to the work of unification and uniformity of law undertaken by official inter-American agencies. Chairman: James Oliver Murdock. Address: Mr. Murdock, The Challenge to Legal Education in the Americas.

Papers by—

Philip C. Jessup, The Importance of International and Comparative Law Studies to Inter-American Cooperation.

Dr. William Sanders, Unification, Uniformity, and Codification of Law in the Americas.

Dr. Germán Riesco, Means by Which to Advance the Prestige of the Legal Profession and To Promote Relations Between the Jurists of the Western Hemisphere.

Dr. Pedro G. Medina y Sobrado, Creation of an Inter-American Institute of Comparative Law.

Dr. Juan C. Zamora, Creation of an Inter-American Institute of Comparative Law.

George A. Finch, Materials for the Study of International Law.

Dr. Enrique Gil: Discussion.

XIII. Sala Taganana:

Judicial power and judicial administration, legal aid. Chairman: Judge Lawrence D. Hyde.

Papers by—

Charles E. Bradway, Legal Aid Work in the Americas. (To be read by Miss Beatrice Clephane.)

Dr. José Agustín Martínez, Uniformity in Regard to Extradition.

Dr. Gerardo Moré, On the Creation of a Tribunal or Superior Court Which Might be Called the Grand Jury of National Justice, and On the Advisability of Prohibiting Contract Clauses Waiving the Jurisdiction of a Given Court.

THURSDAY MORNING, MARCH 27, HOTEL NACIONAL, SALA VEDADO

9: Round tables:

XIV. Sala Vedado:

Industrial, economic, and social legislation. Chairman: Hon. William S. Culbertson.

Papers by—

William E. Reese, Comparison of National Wage and Hour Legislation Applicable to National Public Work.

Curtis Shears, Economic Cooperation.

Dr. Eduardo Salazar, Future Foreign Investors in their Relation to Present Legislation of the American Republics.

Dr. Virgilio Ortega, International Unfair Competition in the Field of Insurance. Measures for its Suppression.

Dr. Carlos Raggi, Unification of the Legislation of the Americas in Regard to Labor Jurisdictions.

Dr. Eduardo C. Lens, Procedural Trends in the Field of Labor Law.

Dr. José Garcia Pedrosa, Labor Jurisdiction and its Procedure: (a) Creation of labor courts in those American countries where they do not exist; (b) Procedural laws for the settlement of jurisdictional conflicts between courts in the field of labor.

Dr. Raúl de Cárdenas, Moratoria and International Credit.

XV. Sala Taganana:

Criminology; Penal law, procedure and administration: (a) Crime prevention: Medical, educational, juvenile court, and juvenile institution aspects. (b) Uniform and reciprocal laws: Extradition; defense; regulation of traffic and transportation. (c) Criminal procedure, pre-trial, trial, post-trial. (d) Penal treatment: Quarantine, classification based upon medical and other data, on conference and diagnosis; treatment process by experts, housing work, etc. (e) Administration, including personnel: Police investigation; judicial, prosecutory, probation, and parole, penal institutions.

Chairman: Dr. José Agustin Martínez.

Papers by—

Ledo. Héctor Beeche, Bases for the Unification of Penal Laws in the Americas. (Paper to be read by Dr. Martinez.)

Dr. José Agustín Martínez, Unification of Penal Legislation and Uniformity in Extradition Legislation.

Dr. José Agustín Martínez, Contribution of Internal Penal Legislation in the Protection of International Peace.

Dr. Manuel Oliva Rodriguez, On the Means of Extinction of Penal Action in Regard to the Foundation and the Object of the Penal Action.

Dr. Evelio Tabio y Castro Palimino, Mercy Killings Before the Law.

Dr. Manuel Pérez Picó, Inter-American Cooperation of Laboratories and Identification Departments.

Dr. Francisco Caronne: Criterion for the Unification of the Legal Definition of Political Crime in America.

Dr. José Miró Cardona, Judicial Intervention in the Execution of Sentences.

Dr. Armando Raggi, Contribution of International Conferences to the Progress of Penology.

Dr. Francisco Ponte Domínguez: Trends in the Parole System in Cuba.

11: Closing plenary session: Chamber of the House of Representatives, National Capitol. Address by the Honorable Edmundo Miranda Jordao, Instituto da Ordem dos Advogados, Brazil.

11:30: Address by the Honorable Robert H. Jackson, Attorney General of the United States.[2]

12. Address by the Honorable Victor Vega, the Minister of Justice, of Cuba.

12:30: Report of resolutions committee, and other committee reports. Adoption of amendments to the constitution, if any. Election of elective members of the Council. Election of vice presidents. Adjournment.

REPORT OF ORGANIZING COMMITTEE, FIRST CONFERENCE, INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

The Inter-American Bar Association was organized on May 16, 1940, by lawyers from different countries present at the Eighth American Scientific Congress. Its origin and general purposes are outlined in the printed circular in the Spanish language sent out by this committee February 1, 1941, carrying the preliminary program of the conference, as

[2] Address read by Ambassador Messersmith in Mr. Jackson's unavoidable absence.

well as in that of January 25, 1941, of the distinguished Committee on Cooperation with the Inter-American Bar Association, appointed by John T. Vance as chairman of the American Bar Association's section of international and comparative law, and headed by George Maurice Morris. Copies of both of those circulars are appended to this report.

There are present at this conference representatives of national associations of 16 countries, all the way from Canada in the north to Argentina and Chile in the south, as well as of 31 State, Provincial, city, and special law associations of different kinds, falling in the category of constituent geographical associations under our constitution. Definite ratification of provisional signatures to our constitution, or definite resolutions of adherence to this association, have now been received from the national associations of countries and from constituent geographical associations. A list is appended.

At the organizing meeting on May 16, 1940, Dr. Manuel Fernandez Supervielle, the president of the Bar Association of Habana, was unanimously elected as our provisional president; William Roy Vallance, secretary general; Curtis Shears, assistant to the secretary general, for the United States; and William Cattron Rigby, treasurer; and this organization committee was appointed. Dr. Raoul Herrera Arango, second secretary of the Cuban Embassy to the United States, was afterward requested by President Supervielle to act as his representative with the committee at Washington, as well as to be a member of the local committee of arrangements of the Habana Bar Association for the conference. Dr. Herrera has given us freely of his time and has been a great help. Our thanks are due to him as well as to his chiefs, the former and present Ambassadors from Cuba to the United States, Dr. Pedro Martinez Fraga and Dr. Aurelio F. Concheso, for their courtesy and good will in sparing him from other pressing duties to aid us.

In line with the precedent set by the Argentine Federation in its meetings with the associations of Brazil, Chile, and Peru, and in accordance with the recommendations of the American Bar Association's committee in 1934, our constitution creates a "delegated association" composed of representatives of its member associations, instead of having individual members. That committee said on this point in its 1934 report:

"By this means alone could the affiliation become truly comprehensive and typical of the respective bars. Experience in other professional fields makes this so plain that it needs no argument."

There is pending, however, a proposed amendment to the constitution offered by Mr. Phanor J. Eder, of New York, for action at this conference contemplating election of distinguished individuals as honorary members. Its adoption would not affect the essential character of this association as a delegated body.

The formal purposes of the association are stated in article I of its constitution. In addition an underlying purpose—perhaps, in those times of stress, its most important immediate purpose—is the cultivation of mutual acquaintance and of friendship among the lawyers of our different countries, and through them the advancement of the spirit of good neighborliness among the peoples of the Americas.

Appended are copies of reports of a number of bar association committees upon adherence to this association—those of the New York State Bar Association, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, the Philadelphia Bar Association, and the Law Association of the Province of Quebec—all indicating careful examination and a general appreciation of the purposes of this organization.

In accordance with the resolution appointing it, this committee has prepared and presents with this report the bylaws of this association, and recommends their approval. Rules of procedure for this conference, based upon original drafts by a committee headed by Mr. George Maurice Morris, of the United States, and by Dr. José Agustin Martínez, of Cuba, have been approved by this committee for presentation at this session.

In framing the agenda for this conference, the committee has kept several general purposes in mind. Representatives designated on behalf of national associations are addressing general sessions of the whole conference. Special subjects are considered at separate round tables, in papers and discussions by specialists in those subjects, or by lawyers especially interested in them. In the subjects for the round tables the committee has tried to choose such as may prove suitable for further study by permanent committees and sections of the association.

The officers of the association and the committee have had the benefit of the sympathy and cooperation of distinguished lawyers in the different countries of our continent as well as of the governmental authorities. Acknowledgment should especially be made of the cooperation of the Government of Cuba, particularly of the President, the Honorable Fulgencio Batista, and of the signal mark of his approval of the purposes of this organization evidenced by his intended presence and opening of this conference today. Active and most valuable assistance has been received also, among many others, from President Jacob M. Lashly of the American Bar Association, Dr. Leo S. Rowe, Director General of the Pan American Union and the members of his staff, and from the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, particularly its secretary, Mr. George Finch.

The Commission on Commercial and Cultural Relations between the American Republics—Nelson A. Rockefeller, coordinator—has made the association a substantial grant to assure it the means to defray the expenses of the conference. The great help given by that commission, as well as by other friends, is acknowledged.

It is recommended that greetings and felicitations from the conference be extended to Dr. Antonio S. de Bustamante, Dr. James Brown Scott, and Dean John H. Wigmore.

For the committee:

WILLIAM CATTRON RIGBY,
Chairman, United States.
EDMUNDO MIRANDA JORDAO,
Brazil.
LUIS ANDERSON,
Costa Rica.
DANTES BELLEGARDE,
Haiti.
CAMILO DE BRIGARD SILVA,
Colombia.
NATALIO CHEDIAK,
Cuba.
J. BLANCO USTARIZ,
Venezuela.

Appendixes not attached.

DECLARATIONS, RESOLUTIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED BY THE FIRST CONFERENCE OF THE INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

I. DECLARATION OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE PRINCIPLES OF DEMOCRACY, INTERNATIONAL LAW, AND CONTINENTAL SOLIDARITY

The first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association declares:

First. Its unreserved devotion to the democratic principles on which the American republics were founded.

Second. Its desire for the strengthening of the cordial relations existing among the countries of America.

Third. Its allegiance to the principles of international law and the precepts of international conduct set forth in the treaties and resolutions approved by the International Conference of the American States.

Fourth. Its determination to cooperate effectively in the defense of the foregoing principles and precepts.

II. RECOMMENDATION ON THE UNIFICATION OF LEGISLATION RELATIVE TO FOREIGN INVESTMENTS

For reasons arising out of the present international situation, among them being those set forth in the paper Future Foreign Investors and Their Relations to the Internal Legislation of Each Country, the First Conference of the Inter-American Bar Association resolves to recommend that the academies, institutes, or associations of lawyers, and particularly those which are members of the Inter-American Bar Association, exert influence in their respective countries in behalf of legislative uniformity in matters relative to foreign investments, endeavoring to have included in such legislation principles which, while assuring the integrity and economic and commercial progress of each country, shall afford the foreign investor sufficient protection to encourage such investments.

III. RESOLUTION ON INTER-AMERICAN CODIFICATION OF AIR LAW

The First Conference of the Inter-American Bar Association resolves—

First. That the president of this Conference officially request, in the name of the association, all the Governments of America to organize immediately the National Commissions of Aviation recommended by the First Inter-American Technical Aviation Conference at Lima in 1927.

Second. That the President also request the said governments to arrange to have their national commissions collaborate with the national societies known as Inter-American Aviation Squadrons.

Third. That he communicate this resolution to the Pan American Union with a request that it urge the national commissions to undertake the work assigned to them, and that the Permanent American Aeronautical Commission (C. A. P. A.) be organized as soon as possible.

Fourth. That he undertake all the measures of publicity that he may consider necessary and desirable for the achievement of the foregoing objective, and that he report on the result thereof to the second conference of the Inter-American Bar Association.

IV. RESOLUTION ON JUDICIAL ASSISTANCE

Whereas the present provisions made by the republics of the Americas for international judicial assistance, aspecially between the tribunals of the common law and those of the civil law system, are uncertain, inadequate, inefficient, and expensive of operation; and

Whereas a spirit of international legal solidarity exemplified by the Hague Convention on Civil Procedure of July 17, 1905, the Bustamante Code, annexed to the Habana Convention of February 20, 1928, the draft convention prepared by the League of Nations Committee of Experts for the Progressive Codification of International Law, and the more recent Draft Convention on Judicial Assistance prepared by the Research in International Law under the auspices of Harvard Law School, renders desirable the inclusion of all the republics of the Americas in a common system of judicial assistance.

The first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association resolves—

First. That this association favors the execution by all the states of the Americas of treaties or their adherence to a convention providing a simple, expeditious, effective, and inexpensive system whereby the tribunals of each country, by invoking the assistance of the tribunals of others, can procure the service of documents and obtain evidence within the territory of others, procure information upon the law of other states, and assure the

recognition and execution of their final judgments, according to the recognized principles of international law; and

Second. That the members of this association recommend to the proper authorities of their governments that appropriate steps be taken to effectuate the purposes of this resolution.

V. RESOLUTION ON THE ADOPTION OF ADVANCED STANDARDS OF LEGAL ETHICS

The first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association resolves—

First. To recommend to the member bar associations and, where no bar association exists, the judicial authorities of the respective country, to create law libraries for the use of those persons entrusted with the administration of justice and for the use of the legal profession.

Second. To encourage the establishment, within the law schools of each country, of courses on legal ethics.

Third. To express the hope that the law schools of the Americas shall prescribe, as a condition of entry and as a requisite for a law degree or of a doctorate in jurisprudence, the satisfaction of high moral standard.

Fourth. The executive committee shall encourage discussion among bar associations of America on the subject of the formulation of a code of professional ethics, the results of which shall be submitted to the association at the next conference.

VI. DECLARATION ON THE INCORPORATION INTO THE LEGISLATION OF THE COUNTRIES OF LATIN AMERICA OF THE ANGLO-AMERICAN INSTITUTION OF THE TRUST

The first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association declares that it recognizes the advisability and feasibility of incorporating in the civil law of the Latin-American countries the institution of the trust along the lines upon which it exists in Anglo-Saxon countries, and recommends the enactment of adequate laws so that in this important matter the two great legal systems in force in the American continent may be brought into harmony.

In voting affirmatively on this declaration, the Brazilian delegate formulates the reservation that he desires to undertake a study of the matter.

VII. RESOLUTION ON INTER-AMERICAN COPYRIGHT PROTECTION

Whereas it is essential from the viewpoint of the development of the cultural relations of the American republics and of the best interests of each one individually, that the legal associations and organizations which make up the association endeavor through all means at their disposal to improve inter-American copyright protection, the first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association resolves—

First. To recommend to the countries signatories of the convention on literary and artistic property, signed at Buenos Aires on August 10, 1910, which have not yet done so, to deposit their instruments of ratification as soon as possible.

Second. That it is desirable that the convention be amended in certain aspects in accordance with the suggestions made by the Eighth International Conference of American States.

Third. To request the associations and organizations which are members of the Inter-American Bar Association to work, with all the means at their disposal, for the achievement of the foregoing purposes.

VIII. RESOLUTION ON THE STUDY OF THE IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND NATIONALITY LAWS OF THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS

The first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association resolves to request the executive committee of the association to study the immigration, naturalization, and citizenship laws of the countries of the Western Hemisphere with a view to assembling and disseminating information pertaining thereto, and to make recommendations for resolving differences and harmonizing these laws, with necessary broadness and opportune flexibility, in order to achieve the greatest uniformity possible.

IX. RESOLUTION ON THE APPOINTMENT OF A COMMITTEE ON THE UNIFICATION OF LEGISLATION RELATIVE TO THE CIVIL STATUS OF PERSONS

The first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association resolves to entrust to a technical committee a general comparative study of legal documentation in the countries of America relative to the civil status of persons, and concerning other relevant questions, in order to obtain inter-American unification of legislation in this matter.

X. RESOLUTION ON DISCRIMINATORY, EXTRATERRITORIAL, AND DOUBLE TAXATION

Whereas taxes may unnecessarily obstruct inter-American trade if they do not conform to sound principles of jurisdiction, the first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association resolves that the members of the association recommend to their respective governments the conclusion of treaties to prevent discriminatory, extraterritorial, and double taxation.

XI. RESOLUTION ON THE EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION RELATIVE TO ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

The first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association resolves to establish a system of exchange of information on administrative procedures in the various countries of America.

XII. RESOLUTION ON THE CREATION OF NATIONAL CENTERS OF LEGAL DOCUMENTATION

The first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association recommends the establishment of national centers of legal documentation in the countries which have either present or future members of the association.

XIII. RESOLUTION ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A SECTION OF THE ASSOCIATION ON CUSTOMS LAWS AND COMMERCIAL TREATIES

The first conference on the Inter-American Bar Association resolves to request the executive committee to study the desirability of organizing a section of customs laws and commercial treaties of the association.

XIV. RESOLUTION ON THE PUBLICATION OF A JOURNAL OF THE ASSOCIATION

The first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association resolves to request the executive committee to study the feasibility and desirability of publishing a journal devoted to the activities of the association and to the publication of articles of interest to the legal profession.

XV. RESOLUTION ON THE CREATION OF NATIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHICAL INDEXES OF LAW MATERIALS

The first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association recommends—

First. That the bar associations of the Americas create and publish bibliographical legal indexes in their respective countries, so that such work may lay the foundations for the ultimate creation and publication of the American Bibliographical Index.

Second. That the bibliographical indexes shall be made in accordance with a uniform plan which the council of the association shall provide.

XVI. RESOLUTION ON THE APPOINTMENT OF A COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY

Whereas a paper has been presented to the conference entitled "Bases for the Unification of Legislation Relative to Industrial Property in the Countries of America," and also an excellent work entitled "Partial Unification of the Trade-Mark Laws of America," the first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association resolves to create a committee of the Inter-American Bar Association which shall report on the matters taken up in the two above-mentioned works at the earliest moment, and that the said committee shall be composed of one expert on industrial-property matters from each one of the American countries.

XVII. RESOLUTION ON THE TRANSLATION OF THE RESTATEMENT (OF THE AMERICAN LAW INSTITUTE) OF THE PRIVATE LAW OF THE UNITED STATES

The first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association resolves—

First. To endorse the resolution approved by the Eighth American Scientific Congress in May 1940 recommending the translation into the other languages of the American republics of the Restatement of the Private Law of the United States of America, formulated by the American Law Institute.

Second. To recommend that the translation contain, in addition to copious explanatory footnotes, brief historical and analytical introductions on the origin and nature of the corresponding Latin-American and Anglo-American legal concepts, principles, and institutions.

Third. To express the opinion that the result of this work should greatly advance and facilitate the successful completion of the important tasks relative to the unification of commercial and civil law and uniformity and unification of legislation entrusted to official agencies by the International Conference of American States.

Fourth. To recommend that once the volume relative to conflict of laws of the American Law Institute has been translated, official and private legal agencies and organizations cooperate in a detailed comparative study thereof with the Bustamente Code of Private International Law for the purpose of examining the extent to which the two systems may be reconciled.

XVIII. RECOMMENDATION ON THE RATIFICATION OF THE BUSTAMENTE CODE ON PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW

The first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association recommends that the signatory countries that have not ratified the Bustamente Code of Private International Law, signed in Habana in 1928, be urged to do so at the earliest possible moment, by the respective bar associations.

XIX. RECOMMENDATION ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF RELATIONS BETWEEN THE LAW STUDENTS OF THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS

The first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association resolves to recommend the development of correspondence and contacts between law students of the various universities of America as a means of advancing the study of legal science.

XX. RESOLUTION ON THE CREATION OF AN INTER-AMERICAN ACADEMY OF COMPARATIVE LAW AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

The first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association resolves—

First. To create in the city of Habana, Cuba, the Inter-American Academy of Comparative and International Law, the purpose of which shall be to promote and develop studies on those subjects, especially with reference to matters which affect and interest America, in order to encourage cooperation in legislative matters and to bring about mutual understanding.

Second. For the fulfillment of its purposes, the academy shall organize in Habana every year, if that is possible, special courses on matters of comparative law and international law, particularly for the students of America, by professors of the different American countries, thus contributing toward the development of the international spirit.

Third. As financial resources for carrying out its purposes, the academy will have, in addition to what it may collect from registration or matriculation fees, such donations

or contributions as may be made to it by the Governments of America and by private or official institutions that may have an interest in developing such studies.

Fourth. The academy shall be organized by a commission of seven members, appointed by the executive committee of the Inter-American Bar Association. The commission shall have full powers for drafting the statutes and regulations by which the academy is to be governed and to decide all matters in connection with its functioning, as well as to fill vacancies which may occur within the commission.

XXI. RECOMMENDATION ON THE APPOINTMENT OF A COMMITTEE TO STUDY VARIOUS PROJECTS

The first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association recommends—

First. That the executive committee study the proposals made to the conference relative to the creation of an American Institute of Comparative Constitutional Law, of a Pan-American Institute of Comparative Law, and of an Inter-American Office for the Unification of Penal Legislation.

Second. That the said committee present its recommendations thereon to the next conference of the association.

XXII. VOTE OF THANKS

The first conference of the Inter-American Bar Association, on terminating its deliberations, wishes to record its profound gratitude to the President of the Republic, to the high officials of the Government, to the Supreme Court, to the House of Representatives, to the mayor of Habana, to Dr. Manuel Fernández Supervielle, and to the Colegio de Abogados of Habana, for the many courtesies which they accorded the delegates attending the conference.

It likewise desires to express its appreciation for the efficient services by which Dr. Raoul Herrera Arango has contributed to the successful results of the conference.

Pius L. Schwert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION FOR HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION, AND RECREATION

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I consider it an honor to insert with my remarks the following resolution of the California Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, honoring our late colleague, PIUS L. SCHWERT:

Whereas Congressman PIUS L. SCHWERT, having worked untiringly and unceasingly in support of H. R. 1074, which bears his name; and

Whereas his unfortunate and untimely death on March 12, 1941, having deprived us of a stanch supporter and friend: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the California Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, meeting in session at Fresno, Calif., from April 3 to 6, 1941, at its eleventh annual conference, record deep appreciation for his services in behalf of health, physical education, and recreation, and convey to his family this expression of appreciation as well as sympathy in its hour of sorrow.

Against Defeatism—Is This the Gray Twilight of Democracy? We Believe Not

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE RAPID CITY (S. DAK.) DAILY JOURNAL

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I offer for the RECORD the following editorial from the Rapid City (S. Dak.) Daily Journal:

IS THIS THE GRAY TWILIGHT OF DEMOCRACY? WE BELIEVE NOT

Success of the German blitzkrieg in the Balkans and in Egypt has given rise to a new wave of defeatism in the United States. Over the coffee cups in downtown cafes, on street corners, and wherever men meet, we now hear many who freely predict that America cannot save Britain or democracy from defeat.

Defeatism is not a new phenomenon in the United States. Once before within the last dozen years it was the attitude of many. In 1932 and 1933, when the country hit the bottom of the depression, there were many ready to write democracy off the books, to cry quits, and let panic have its way with them.

We weathered the crisis and soon recovered from our gloomy mood. We started on the long, slow pull to recovery, took set-backs in stride, and faced the future with hope.

Now we have another task before us: preservation of the democratic way of life we hold dear. We have chosen to throw our weight into the scales against those nations which seek to destroy that way of life, not only within their own borders, but throughout the world.

The task calls for steadfast courage, for the pluck and determination which our forefathers demonstrated time and again in dealing with the problems they were called upon to face. Defeatism was not in their make-up. Had it been, we should never have gained our independence in 1776, the Union would have been torn asunder in 1860, Cuba would still be under the domination of Spain, the Kaiser would have triumphed in 1918.

Are we now going to give up without a struggle the heritage of freedom and liberty for which our forefathers fought, or are we going to preserve it for those who follow us? The latter course, with all that it may entail in the sacrifice of privileges—nay, even life itself—is the American answer.

Other Americans, in other days, left with us these stirring words:

"We are not weak if we make a proper use of those means which the God of Nature has placed in our power. * * * The battle, sir, is not to the strong alone; it is to the vigilant, the active, the brave."—Patrick Henry.

"The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots."—Thomas Jefferson.

"Damn the torpedoes! Go ahead!"—David Glasgow Farragut, at the Battle of Mobile Bay in 1864.

"With reasonable men, I will reason; with humane men, I will plead; but to tyrants I will give no quarter, nor waste arguments where they will certainly be lost."—William Lloyd Garrison, great leader of the fight against slavery.

"Let us have faith that right makes right; and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."—Lincoln.

"I propose to fight it out on this line if it takes all summer."—Grant.

"Far better it is to dare mighty things, to win glorious triumphs, even though checkered by failure, than to take rank with those poor spirits who neither enjoy much nor suffer much, because they live in the gray twilight that knows not victory nor defeat."—Theodore Roosevelt.

Is this the "gray twilight" of American democracy? We hope not, and we believe not.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

RESOLUTION BY THE WISCONSIN STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin:

Assembly Joint Resolution 13

Joint resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take the necessary steps for the procurement of a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway

Whereas the exigencies of war have created an entirely new atmosphere in which the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway project can be discussed by the United States and Canada; and

Whereas a special committee of high officials of both countries have under discussion the feasibility of such a project; and

Whereas, the placing of heavy war orders and the needs of future preparedness require new electric power; and

Whereas there would be certain conveniences and economy in having ocean-going vessels proceed directly into the Great Lakes rather than having a double handling of commodities; and

Whereas it is best that all factions of both countries forget their past differences for the common defense; and

Whereas President Roosevelt in a recent message to Congress said, "It is urgent that the project (Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway project) be undertaken at the present time not only from the point of view of our own defense but also in terms of those of our neighbor, Canada": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of Wisconsin memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to proceed at once to the end that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway be made a reality; be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to both Houses of Congress, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

Full Parity for Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

LETTER FROM C. W. CROES, SECRETARY-TREASURER, SOUTH DAKOTA STATE COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter, which I have received from Mr. C. W. Croes, secretary-treasurer of the South Dakota State Council of Agriculture, stressing the need for immediate congressional action looking to the establishment of parity prices for agriculture:

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE,
Brookings, S. Dak., April 25, 1941.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CASE: The defense program of the United States of America cannot be successful unless each of the three great economic sections of society—labor, industry, and agriculture—can carry its part of the load.

The South Dakota Council of Agriculture believes that agriculture is seriously handicapped in its share of defense work, and will remain so unless parity prices for agricultural commodities be established in fact.

In the agricultural adjustment acts of 1933 and 1938 and other acts related thereto it was declared to be the policy of Congress that agriculture was entitled to, and should be given, a parity price for basic farm commodities.

The present program for agriculture, though of great benefit, has not been wholly effective in raising farm prices to a just level with the prices of the things the farmer finds it necessary to buy, and adjustments should be made in the program to bring this about; but any adjustments made must not fail to recognize the parity principle adopted by Congress as a worthy and fair basis for American farm prices.

Unless definite action is taken now to assure farmers parity prices for their products, along with the guarantees already assured industry and labor, the consequences will surely be serious not only to our farmers but to all classes of our citizens if this war long continues.

The council insists that parity be the basis for Government support of farm price levels.

Recent changes in the farm program as announced by Secretary of Agriculture Claude Wickard, April 3, fail to recognize parity as a fair basis for Government price support; and substitutes, therefore, supports of a designated price on a few commodities, which price, by the time further production will be ready for market, may leave the farmer in just as bad, if not worse, position than he has been in during recent months and years, due to increased costs of commodities he uses in production and living.

We, therefore, urge the President of the United States and the Congress to the necessity of immediate action, looking to the establishment of parity price for agriculture.

The council further does not limit its support to any particular measure now offered, but desires to lend its support to any one of the measures before Congress that the Congress finds can be effective in delivering a full parity return to agriculture.

Very truly yours,
SOUTH DAKOTA STATE COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE,
C. W. CROES, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

P. S.—The secretary-treasurer of the council is directed to transmit the above to the persons addressed.

Los Angeles Health Defense Exposition of the Los Angeles County Medical Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

REPORT BY JACK O. T. CARTWRIGHT

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD in view of the recent statement to the press of Surgeon General Thomas Parran, of the United States Public Health Service, in which he termed "a national disgrace" the condition of 30 to 40 percent of our young men called for military service and called it "a public-health problem to challenge the maximum intelligence of American medicine and public health," I include the following report by Mr. Jack O. T. Cartwright, director of public relations of the Los Angeles Health Defense Exposition held in Los Angeles, Calif., February 2 to 9, inclusive, of this year:

LOS ANGELES HEALTH DEFENSE EXPOSITION, SPONSORED BY LOS ANGELES COUNTY MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, EDUCATES THOUSANDS OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIANS ON DEFINITE STEPS TO BETTER HEALTH AS A PART OF OUR IMPORTANT NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM

For the first time in the history of American medicine the ethical physicians and surgeons of one of the largest medical associations in the United States stepped out from behind their consultation desks, masks and gowns of the operating room, and test tubes of the laboratory to have real heart-to-heart talks with the public when the Los Angeles Health Defense Exposition was held in Los Angeles from February 2 to 9, 1941.

The Los Angeles Medical Association, headed by Thomas C. Myers, M. D., president; William M. Gibbs, M. D., vice president; and L. A. Alesen, M. D., secretary, has shown the way in which American medicine can aid in the national-defense program of the United States.

Among the leading doctors of medicine in Los Angeles County who also took part in sponsoring the program were Phillip Stephens, M. D.; E. Vincent Askey, M. D.; Harlan Shoemaker, M. D.; James DeWitt George, M. D.; John C. Ruddock, M. D.; William Paul Thompson, M. D.; John W. Crossan, M. D.; Edwin C. Nippert, M. D.; Donald A. Charnock, M. D.; and Arthur Smith, M. D.

Dr. Alesen, aided by Dr. Charnock, chairman of exhibits for the health-defense exposition, worked unceasingly for 10 weeks prior to the opening date of the exhibit with Guy L. Bowe, exposition director, and myself, as director of public relations, to arrange the first health-defense exposition ever staged by ethical medicine.

The primary object of the entire exposition was to educate the public on health and steps to be taken in health defense. To prevent or avert disease was the theme rather than cure of disease.

The Los Angeles County Medical Association was aided in its program by the Los Angeles County Dental Society, the Southern California Retail Druggists' Association, the California State Nurses' Association, and the Los Angeles Board of Education.

The specialist units of the medical association joined wholeheartedly in the program with special exhibits on the heart, lungs, eyes, throat, childbirth, and all the various phases of medical, surgical, dental, and nursing sciences.

Each exhibit had to pass a rigid board of censors headed by Dr. Charnock and its inclusion in the exposition depended upon whether it was scientifically sound and proven and would beneficially educate the public.

The exhibits occupied 100,000 square feet of floor space in the Los Angeles Shrine Auditorium and more than 150,000 persons jammed the exposition during its life of 8 days. Three times that many would have attended later exhibit dates, but the hall was not available for the medical men to continue their exposition.

The exhibits were not the type of silent, static booths, statistics, dummies, and models usually associated with explanations of medical and surgical science but colorful, moving, dynamic demonstrations.

Mr. Bowe and Mr. Cartwright, with approval of the ethical men of medicine in charge of the exposition, worked out demonstrations, programs, and unusual displays so dramatic that they not only attracted thousands of people intently interested in health, but so full of drama and general public interest that publicity efforts resulted in several thousand newspapers throughout the country using photographs, stories, and other descriptive material about the exposition. In this manner millions of readers were reached with this huge educational health program, as well as the thousands who attended the actual exposition.

People came to see and hear their own heartbeats, and in special events radio programs over three different stations broadcasts of the most interesting and helpful parts of the show were staged, reaching thousands of radio listeners throughout the Western States.

These health defense exposition pioneers broadcast the heartbeats of unborn twins, the heartbeats of beautiful girls, and other features, to attract attention of the public to the great need for health defense.

Lectures on health, colored motion pictures on health, and especially prepared articles on health and the various scientific tests necessary to determine good health or bad health resulted in hundreds of newspaper articles and pictures.

In this way the Los Angeles County Medical Association led the way in a definite step toward a possible national program of health defense which, if we urge the other communities of our several States to adopt, will do much toward solving the very health problem which our Surgeon General of the United States revealed to the press of this Nation at Boston, Mass., on April 2, 1941.

Good health is the greatest asset of individuals, communities, States, or a Nation, for as Rabelais wrote:

"Without health life is not life; it is only a state of languor and suffering—an image of death."

The results of this farsighted and timely movement toward more readily understood health education through the holding of such a health defense exposition as this one sponsored by the Los Angeles County Medical Association is apparent in the cooperation and

assistance which the newspapers and radio of America lent to the affair because of its great public interest.

Such public health defense expositions throughout the United States together with health education in our schools, among our industrial workers, among parents and our millions of adolescents just reaching manhood or womanhood should be of prime importance in alleviating the deplorable conditions which our Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service recently pointed out as damaging to our national welfare—our national defense.

JACK O. T. CARTWRIGHT,
Director of Public Relations,
Los Angeles Health Defense Exposition.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *April 10, 1941.*

The Colorado-Big Thompson Reclamation Project and the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE LEWIS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. LAWRENCE LEWIS, OF COLORADO

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the Colorado-Big Thompson project, now under construction in northern Colorado, is one of the outstanding works of the Bureau of Reclamation. No other project ever constructed or proposed will supply a more pressing need or will forestall the continuance of greater annual economic loss. This project is designed, not to develop a region now uninhabited but to supplement an existing but inadequate water supply for an area which has been settled for 60 to 70 years. During the past decade the inadequacy of this water supply has been accentuated by an unprecedented drouth. No other project has ever been more maturely considered or more carefully planned in engineering and in financing; none other gives to the United States greater assurance of ultimate prompt repayment of the cost in full.

For the information of those who may be interested but who are not now familiar with the details of this project, I submit the following detailed statement:

THE REGION TO BE BENEFITED BY THE COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON RECLAMATION PROJECT

The area forming the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District, which will be served by the Colorado-Big Thompson reclamation project, includes the valleys of the Poudre, Thompson, and St. Vrain Rivers and of Lower Boulder Creek, and the valley of the South Platte River from above Platteville to the Nebraska State line. It includes most of the irrigated sections of Boulder, Larimer, Weld, Morgan, Washington, Logan, and Sedgwick Counties, in northern Colorado, east of the main range of the Rocky Mountains which constitutes the Continental Divide.

In this territory, which has been settled for 60 to 70 years, are about 800,000 acres of irrigable land under ditch, of which about 615,000 acres are taxed as irrigated. This irrigated section is served by 120 ditch systems and 60 storage reservoirs and includes about 8,200 separate farms or tracts.

The total population of the district, according to the 1940 census, is about 137,000, of which about 66,000 is rural, and about 71,000 urban. It includes 29 cities and towns, large and small, namely: Fort Collins, Loveland, Longmont, Berthoud, Wellington, Johnstown, Windsor, Milliken, La Salle, Evans, Eaton, Ault, Pierce, Greeley, Masters, Weldona, Fort Morgan, Brush, Union, Merino, Atwood, Sterling, Iliff, Proctor, Crook, Red Lion, Sedgwick, Ovid, and Julesburg. Some of these have been settled since the 1870's.

The assessed valuation of all real and personal property in the district is about $130,000,000, of which approximately $40,000,000 represents the assessed value of the farms and their improvements and the remaining $90,000,000 the value of the town and city property and all business and industrial developments.

The original water supply for the district is from the mountain flow of streams, known as the Poudre, Thompson, and St. Vrain Rivers and Boulder Creek, plus the discharge of the South Platte River at Fort Lupton. The average annual original supply is about 850,000 acre-feet, or a little over 1 acre-foot per acre for the land in the district. However, this supply is supplemented by the return flows to the streams so that the average annual diversion for irrigation in the district for both direct and storage uses, is about 1,500,000 acre-feet. The annual original supply of water varies greatly from about 420,000 acre-feet in the shortest year of record to as much as 1,400,000 acre-feet. This original run-off in the past 10 years has averaged only 690,000 acre-feet.

Only about 10 percent of the irrigation systems have priorities which have furnished them a satisfactory supply during the past decade. The remaining 90 percent of the territory has suffered in a varying degree depending on the priorities, storage capacity, and geographical position on the stream.

According to estimates, worked out from United States crop reports and other official data, crop losses for the past 10 years have ranged from $3,000,000 in 1930, to $13,000,000 in 1934, and have averaged over $7,000,000 for the 10-year period.

The demand for electric energy in northern Colorado is increasing rapidly. To supply this increasing demand an additional 25,000 kilowatt steam unit is being installed by a private utility. It is anticipated that the normal rate of increase in demand will be such that additional capacity will be required by 1943. Defense industries will further increase this demand.

HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

The possibility of securing an additional supply of water for this part of northern Colorado on the eastern slope of the Continental Divide from the headwaters of the Colorado River on the western slope has been considered for over 50 years. The actual start of the present program was made in August 1933, over 7 years ago.

At that time the Weld County Commissioners and a group of Greeley men undertook the job of determining whether such a project was feasible. Funds were secured by donations from Weld and Larimer Counties and from chambers of commerce and others in the territory.

The services of R. J. Tipton, an eminent engineer of Denver, in cooperation with the State engineer's office and L. L. Stimson, of Greeley, were secured to do this work. Mr. Tipton made a careful study and analysis of the entire situation and, in December 1933, submitted his report. Due to limited funds available, no extensive field surveys were possible and the report was mostly based on existing records and other data.

Briefly, the report concluded that an average of at least 300,000 acre-feet of water could be secured from the headwaters of the Colorado River; that the estimated cost of the project was reasonable, and that the need for a supplemental supply in northern Colorado would fully justify the expense. The report outlined a tentative plan for a complete project, which included development of electric power.

In April 1934 a meeting of representatives of irrigation systems throughout the territory was held at Greeley and the Tipton report was presented and discussed. At this time, a temporary organization was formed and a committee of 11 were selected from various parts of the district. The committee was authorized to make every effort to carry the movement forward.

During the balance of the year 1934, with the Tipton report as a basis, the need for the project was explained to Washington agencies by citizens from the locality and by the Colorado delegation in the Congress. In January 1935 Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes made an allocation to the Bureau of Reclamation of $150,000, under provisions of the National Industrial Recovery Act, for the purpose of making a complete survey and report as to the feasibility of the project.

Early in 1934 it had developed that probably there might be considerable opposition to the project from the Western Slope. Water users in that part of the State west of the Continental Divide were apprehensive that the project might prove to be a definite threat to their water rights. Accordingly they organized a protective association. A large number of meetings were held during the years 1934, 1935, and 1936 for the purpose of attempting to harmonize the differences and arrive at a basis of understanding that would allow the project to go ahead and would also provide proper protection to water users on the Colorado River. Several conferences were held at Grand Junction and other Western Slope cities and towns. A basis of understanding was finally agreed upon, at a State-wide meeting held in Denver on June 13, 1935, by the adoption of the Delaney resolution to the effect that any diversion of water to the Eastern Slope should be based on careful surveys and provide adequate replacement for all water diverted from the Western Slope.

This fundamental theory was finally set out in the United States Senate Document No. 80 as of June 15, 1937, and was embodied in the enabling act of the Colorado General Assembly authorizing the organization of the district and in the repayment contract with the United States.

United States Senate Document No. 80, just mentioned, is a synopsis of the report of the Bureau of Reclamation on the Colorado-Big Thompson project and includes an outline of construction and operating conditions to which the project will be subject, covering in detail the agreement entered into between the Northern Colorado Water Users Association and the Western Colorado Protective Association.

In addition to the delays caused by discussing and satisfying objections from irrigation interests in western Colorado there was considerable opposition in the years 1934 to 1937 from those who were apprehensive lest the project would interfere with the Rocky Mountain National Park or would mar the scenic beauties or detract from recreational values of that mountain area. All of these objections were finally met and satisfied in one way or another.

In the fall of 1935 arrangements were made to secure an allotment for a W. P. A. project for the purpose of making an economic survey of the territory to be served by the project and to prepare the data that would be necessary to demonstrate the economic necessity for the construction of the project. This survey was

to be supplemental to the engineering study being made by the Bureau of Reclamation and was directed by L. L. Stimson under general supervision of the Bureau.

Up to January 1935 the work of organizing the movement had been handled by the committee appointed at the mass meeting held in April 1934.

THE NORTHERN COLORADO WATER USERS ASSOCIATION

In January 1935 the Northern Colorado Water Users Association was incorporated as a mutual stock company to carry on the program. The first meeting of the directors of the association was held in Greeley on February 9, 1935. The incorporators and first board of directors were Charles Hansen, W. E. Letford, T. M. Callahan, R. C. Benson, Moses E. Smith, J. M. Dille, Charles A. Lory, C. M. Rolfson, William A. Carlson, Burgis G. Coy, and Robert J. Wright.

The board adopted bylaws and provided for sale of stock to help defray expenses. During the life of the association $25,412.69 was received from sale of stock, from donations, and from a voluntary assessment of 1 cent per acre paid in by many of the irrigation organizations. Over 60 of such organizations took stock in the association.

At the first meeting the board adopted resolutions extending thanks to Secretary Harold L. Ickes and all others who had aided in securing the allocation of $150,000 for the survey of the project by the Bureau of Reclamation

Charles Hansen was elected president of the association. Later Thomas A. Nixon and William R. Kelly were retained as attorneys for the association and J. M. Dille was appointed secretary-manager.

The active life of the association continued until July 1938—a period of over 3 years—and during this time much of the preliminary work of organizing the project was accomplished. Three stockholders' meetings and over 40 meetings of the board of directors were held in this period.

Much work was required to meet the continuing opposition to the project from eastern people who were apprehensive that Rocky Mountain National Park would be impaired, to meet and satisfy the interests on the western slope and to secure the authorization and first appropriation for the project from the Congress.

It was also necessary to cooperate with officials of the Bureau of Reclamation, who were conducting the survey of the project, to carry on a campaign of education by meetings, news articles, and other means to inform the public of the plans that were developing and to gain popular approval and support.

Later on the association developed the plans for organization of a conservancy district, sponsored the legislation for the enactment by the Colorado General Assembly of the State enabling act, conducted the preliminary conferences leading to a repayment contract with the United States, and attended to many other necessary preliminary details.

THE PROJECT REPORT BY BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

In the fall of 1936, the full report of the Bureau of Reclamation, which had been under preparation by Mills E. Bunger, under the supervision of Porter J. Preston, was completed. This report was approved by John C. Page, Acting Commissioner of Reclamation, and by Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior. It outlined a combined irrigation and power project, described a feasible plan for diversion of 310,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado River and found that the revenue from the sale of water at a price of $2 per acre-foot over a period of 40 years, together with the income from the proposed power plants, constituted a feasible project under the reclamation law and recommended construction.

The report filled two large volumes under the following heads:

(1) The economic survey of northern Colorado, showing the losses prevailing and the justification for the project.

(2) A complete description and analysis of land and water supplies of the Colorado River Basin, proving the existence of a surplus supply that could be diverted from the western slope to the eastern slope, and indicating the measures necessary to protect fully all present and future needs in western Colorado.

(3) Description and detailed plans for over 30 of the principal features of the proposed irrigation and power project and the part each one would take in the completed project.

These features included Green Mountain Dam and power plant to be constructed on Blue River on the western slope, primarily for replacement purposes; Granby Reservoir and Shadow Mountain Lake for collection and diversion of the Colorado River water on the western slope; the Continental Divide tunnel; the conduits and power plants along the Thompson River and the reservoirs and canals for storage and distribution of the water on the eastern slope.

In this report the several units of the work were segregated as either irrigation or power features and a plan outlined whereby irrigation would pay for one group, estimated to cost $24,800,000, and power would pay for the remaining $19,000,000 of the total estimate of $43,800,000.

This report furnished a firm basis on which the future development of the program could rest.

ENGINEERING FEATURES OF THE PROJECT

The Colorado-Big Thompson project consists principally of the following features: (1) Continental Divide tunnel, about 13 miles in length; (2) Green Mountain Reservoir and power plant, on the western slope, for the purpose of providing replacement of water to the western slope and generating hydroelectric energy at power plant No. 5; (3) Granby Reservoir, on the western slope, which constitutes the main reservoir to regulate the water which is to be diverted from the western slope to the eastern slope; (4) Shadow Mountain Dam, on the western slope, which is a diversion structure to divert water from the North Fork of the Colorado River; (5) the Granby pumping plant and canal, on the western slope, which is for the purpose of pumping water from Granby Reservoir to the tunnel; (6) five power plants on the eastern slope; (7) three reservoirs on the eastern slope; and (8) three supply canals.

NORTHERN COLORADO WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT, ORGANIZED UNDER STATE LAWS OF COLORADO

In the fall of 1936, when it became apparent that the report of the Bureau of Reclamation on the feasibility of the project would be favorable, it was recognized that existing district organization laws of the State of Colorado were inadequate to meet the requirements for the operation of such a project. New legislation obviously was required to provide an organization to guarantee repayment of the construction cost to the United States and to provide for a more equitable assessment in accordance with the benefits.

It was realized that the need for additional water varied widely on different farms, and therefore that the plan for allotment of water should be flexible and on a voluntary basis so that each farm owner could secure just as much as he needed and no more. It was realized also that business and industry of the entire community, which depends on the basic income of the farms, would be greatly benefited by the increased and stabilized water supply, and therefore should in some way participate in the repayment in recognition of the indirect benefits to be received. These and many other considerations indicated that a form of conservancy district might be the best agency to obtain all the results and benefits that were possible.

After many months of effort by the attorneys and the directors, the ideas and plan were finally incorporated in the form of a bill for an enabling act to be introduced in the Colorado General Assembly providing for the organization of water-conservancy districts. Attorneys Thomas A. Nixon and William R. Kelly were counsel for the district. The bill was drafted in final form by Mr. Nixon.

This bill was passed without objection by the 1937 session of the General Assembly of Colorado and became law on signature of Gov. Teller Ammons on May 12, 1937. Later, quo warranto proceedings, to determine definitely the constitutionality of the act, were instituted in the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado. On May 2, 1938, the court rendered a unanimous opinion upholding the legislation.

While the act is lengthy, in brief it provides, as a public benefit, for organization of conservancy districts by any district court of Colorado upon petition of a required number of property owners. The board of 11 directors is appointed originally and as terms expire, by the district court. The board appoints officers, has power to acquire and hold property, appropriate and acquire water rights, enter into contracts, levy taxes and assessments, allot water, and, generally, to administer the business of the district.

As a reflection of the indirect benefits, the board may levy, on all real and personal property in the district, a tax of not to exceed one-half mill during construction of the project and of not over 1 mill thereafter. In case of default or deficiency, an additional levy of not more than one-half mill may be made.

The act further provides methods for allotting water to individuals, municipalities, and irrigation districts, and for collecting special taxes and assessments for such use of water. The board has the power to contract with the United States for construction of works, when authorized by an election on the proposed contract by the property owners of the district.

During the summer of 1937 the association officers decided upon the territory to be included in the proposed district and circulated petitions to the district court of Weld County for the formation of a district under this act. The district's boundary line follows the section lines including the irrigated area that will be served or benefited by the project. The district covers a total of 1,481,000 acres.

There were 1,607 signers of owners of irrigated lands and 1,388 signers of owners of other property. The petitions were filed in the district court of Weld County. No protesting petition was presented. On September 20, 1937, Judge C. C. Coffin held the hearing, heard testimony supporting the need for the district, and issued a decree establishing Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District.

On September 28 Judge Coffin named the following the first 11 directors of the district: Charles Hansen, W. E. Letford, Ray Lanyon, Robert C. Benson, Ed. F. Munroe, Ralph W. McMurry, Moses E. Smith, William A. Carlson, J. M. Dille, Robert J. Wright, and Charles M. Rolfson. The first meeting of the directors was held at the office of the district in Greeley on September 29, 1937, when Charles Hansen was elected president, other officers were appointed, and plans laid to push the progress of the project as rapidly as possible.

At this meeting a levy of three-tenths of 1 mill was made on all property in the district to defray necessary expenses.

THE CONTRACT WITH THE UNITED STATES

Previous to the organization of the district the association had discussed with officials of

the Bureau of Reclamation the terms of a repayment contract. After the conservancy district had finally been organized as the contracting agency, the same men as officials of the district were in a position to proceed to negotiate a contract that would be acceptable for submission to an election of property owners.

This project for supplying supplemental water to many various users in a well-developed irrigated territory and also for developing electric power was quite different from the usual reclamation project. The problems presented were complicated and novel.

Many conferences were held and many drafts of the proposed agreement written and later discarded as new ideas emerged from the discussions. The final draft was agreed upon in Washington with President Hansen, Attorney Nixon, and Directors Moses E. Smith and Ray Lanyon representing the district.

The contract describes the 33 features tentatively determined upon and designed to deliver an average of 310,000 acre-feet to eastern slope streams. It provides that the irrigation feature and the power feature (the power feature to be retained by the United States) shall share equally in the total cost of the project, estimated at $44,000,000. It provides further that the obligation of the district shall in no event exceed $25,000,000.

As to the power feature, the cost will be repaid to the United States from sale of power at wholesale to distributing agencies.

As to the irrigation feature, it is provided in article 6 that, beginning the next year after the project is completed and water is delivered, the district shall pay $450,000 per annum for 20 years, $500,000 per annum for the next 10 years, and in each of the last 10 of the 40 years one-tenth of the amount necessary to complete the total.

Under the Federal reclamation laws the total cost of the irrigation feature as determined by the Secretary of the Interior (but not to exceed $25,000,000 in this case) must be repaid, without interest, in 40 annual payments.

The contract, which filled over a page of newsprint, covers many obligations of each party thereto, including provisions for operation of the project, overhead expenses, rights-of-way, levies and assessments, status of project water, obligations to the western slope, and many other detailed provisions.

After many discussions of the contract with the attorneys, officers, and R. J. Tipton, consulting engineer, the directors approved it as to form on May 23, 1938, as being the best possible contract under which the project could be built and a repayment program set up that would meet all obligations promptly and would provide proper distribution according to benefits, in conformity with the general plan incorporated in the Colorado District Act. Pursuant to the provisions of this law, the directors adopted a resolution approving the contract and submitting the question of executing the contract to an election of property owners to be held on June 28, 1938.

For the purpose of this election, the district was divided into 24 voting districts by combining the voting districts as now set up in the various counties. The resolution was published in all daily papers. Other news and explanatory articles were circulated to acquaint the property owners with the question to be voted upon. At the election 7,508 votes were cast for the contract and 439 votes against it. On July 5, 1938, the board adopted a resolution authorizing the execution of the contract.

THE PLAN OF OPERATION OF THE PROJECT

As before stated, the project is expected to deliver an average of 310,000 acre-feet of water annually.

The water impounded in reservoirs on the western slope will flow through the tunnel under the Continental Divide and to the power plants on the Thompson River on the eastern slope at a fairly uniform rate the year round, and will be stored in Horsetooth, Arkins, and Carter Lake Reservoirs on the eastern slope, so that the full supply can be delivered on demand or within a period of 60 days to the Poudre, Thompson, and St. Vrain Rivers.

The fall on the eastern slope, to be utilized for power, is 2,974 feet (334 feet more than half a mile), developed in a distance of 22 miles. This fall will be utilized in a series of power plants on the eastern slope. I submit that very few other projects afford such a long fall within such a short distance or such an opportunity for development of electric power.

The three reservoirs on the eastern slope have a capacity of 256,000 acre-feet. Granby Reservoir, on the western slope, which stores the Colorado River water for regulation through the tunnel, has a capacity of 482,000 acre-feet, so that the total storage capacity of the project is 738,000 acre-feet. This provides carry-over capacity, so that in years of plentiful local supplies in the district a part of the year's available supply from the project can be carried over until the next year.

As mentioned above, the district must repay to the United States one-half of the cost of the project (but not to exceed $25,000,000) in 40 annual payments without interest, starting 1 year after water is delivered to the water users.

The conditions in this district (where present water supplies vary so widely under the different irrigation systems and often under the same system and where the need is solely for supplemental supplies) seemed to require that a plan be developed that would provide the utmost flexibility and allow each individual landowner to decide for himself whether he wanted any of the water and, if so, how much.

It was not thought desirable or even possible to attempt to put through any plan which would in any way exert any compulsion on anyone.

Under the act it is possible for a mutual stock company of water users to contract for an allotment of water for distribution to its stockholders, and probably two or three such companies will do so. Officers of the district believe, however, that they can produce the greatest benefits and more nearly assure prompt repayment of the cost of the project if the water is carefully allotted on a basis of petitions from individual landowners.

To be able to secure the proper distribution of the water on this basis, it was necessary that the cost and terms of payment be definitely fixed so that any and every landowner who needed water would feel safe in filing a petition. The directors therefore decided to distribute the 310,000 acre-feet of water at a fixed price of $1.50 per acre-foot per annum during the term of the repayment period and in accordance with the provisions of the district act enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado. The balance of the cost of the irrigation features of the project will be secured from the general tax on all property in the District.

The Colorado act provides three classes of petitions for allotment under which repayment by water users is secured from taxation.

Under class "B," the board may make allotments to petitioning municipalities which agree to secure annual payments by taxation of city property.

Under class "C," irrigation districts may secure an allotment of water and agree to levy the necessary taxes on their district lands to provide the payments.

Class "D" provides the authority and method by which individual landowners may petition for an allotment of water for certain tracts of land and agree that the annual charge of $1.50 per acre-foot shall be a tax lien on the described land. In other words, the payment is to be levied and collected as a part of the county taxes. This is the method by which most of the water will be allotted.

Under all three of the above classes, legal notices must be published, hearings held by the board of directors, and the order of the board adopted and recorded to consummate the allotment.

In addition to the above procedures, section 25 of the act provides that the board may sell or lease the use of water by contract.

METHOD OF WATER ALLOTMENT

Early in 1938, after the general plan had been completed and approved by the directors but before starting the campaign for allotment of water, the district collected and compiled a large amount of data concerning water supplies and uses in the district.

From various county records, the data was secured to set up a card file showing description, ownership, valuation, irrigated acreage, and other details concerning every farm in the district. From the State irrigation officials, all data available regarding water diversions and supplies of the various irrigation systems were compiled. From the irrigation companies, lists of stock ownership were secured. With all this information, the district was able to determine the approximate average annual water supply of each individual irrigated farm or tract to be used as a guide in determining the amount of water that could properly be allotted under the general policy of the board of directors.

This policy may be stated to be that only the amount of water from this project sufficient, in addition to present supplies, to furnish an adequate annual supply shall be allotted to each farm. This is to prevent speculation and to spread the benefits as widely as possible. The board favors the use of water as high up on the streams as possible because of the value of return flow for use lower down the streams. The board will not pass on petitions for allotments to lands now dry unless there should be a surplus after all needs for supplemental use have been met.

Preparation of the form of petition for the allotment of water to individual farms, class D, that would be generally acceptable and still fulfill the requirements, necessitated much time and study. The same provisions included in this form were, of course, incorporated in the petitions and orders for class B and class C allotments, and in contracts to be executed under authority of section 25 of the act.

During the summer and fall of 1938 the district mailed notices to landowners, published news articles explaining the opportunity, and set up additional agencies in towns other than that in which the main office is located for the purpose of securing the petitions of all who were interested.

At that time there were received 6 class B petitions (municipalities) for a total of 26,400 acre-feet, 1 class C (irrigation district) for 6,000 acre-feet, 1,934 class D for a total of 158,187 acre-feet, and 4 proposals for contracts under section 25 of the act for 41,180 acre-feet. The total of all petitions received at that time was 231,767 acre-feet.

In January 1939 the secretary published the legal notice of hearing on the class D petitions. On April 8 and August 5, 1939, the board adopted resolutions allotting a total of 133,146 acre-feet on 1,732 of the above class D petitions. The others were rejected or deferred for future consideration. Every class D petition on which water was allotted had been carefully checked for ownership, accuracy of description, and the land inspected in the field. Later in the year the board allotted water on six petitions for municipalities and for one irrigation district and executed three contracts under the authority of section 25.

At the present time a total of 166,226 acre-feet has been allotted and made of record and petitions for an additional 61,229 acre-feet are awaiting action by the board. The situation is considered satisfactory for the present and no attempt will be made to allot the balance of the water until the construction of the project is further along and more information is available regarding a number of problems that must be solved before the allotment is completed.

FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS

The first appropriation by Congress for construction of the project was made in July 1937. This was for $900,000 and was for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938.

The authorization of the project and this first appropriation were the consummation of over 4 years of persistent effort by the sponsors of the project led by President Hansen, of the Conservancy District, and by the united efforts of the entire Colorado delegation in the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, namely, Senators ALVA B. ADAMS and EDWIN C. JOHNSON and Representatives EDWARD T. TAYLOR, FRED CUMMINGS, JOHN A. MARTIN, and LAWRENCE LEWIS.

The total appropriations and allotments for the project to date are shown below:

N. I. R. A. allocation (investigation)	$150,000
Reclamation fund appropriation, 1938 fiscal year	900,000
Reclamation fund appropriation, 1939 fiscal year	1,250,000
Reclamation fund appropriation, 1940 fiscal year	1,500,000
Reclamation fund appropriation, 1940 (deficiency)	850,000
Reclamation fund appropriation, 1941 fiscal year	2,000,000
P. W. A. allocation (1938)	1,400,000
Total	8,050,000

Every appropriation secured has been the result of organized presentation of the merits of the project to congressional committees and various Federal agencies by the entire Colorado delegation in the Congress and by all State and local officials regardless of partisanship.

In the years that are past the problem was to get any appropriation at all to keep the work going. Now that the project is well under way the object is to secure larger sums so that the program can be expedited and the water and power made available as soon as possible.

An appropriation of $5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1942 would be required to enable the Bureau of Reclamation to continue work on Green Mountain Dam and Power Plant, to push the driving of the Continental Divide Tunnel, which is the bottleneck of the project, and to start construction of Granby Reservoir so that it will certainly be completed and filled with water when the tunnel is completed.

During the year last past, there has been an increasing interest by several Federal agencies in the power features of the project, particularly as to the amount of power to be made available, the cost and how soon it can be ready for use. Accordingly, arrangements were made by the district officials for preparation of a comprehensive special report on the power possibilities of the project to supplement a general report prepared in the fall of 1940. These reports outline a proposed construction schedule that will complete the project in 1945. These power studies have been completed by the Colorado Water Conservation Board under the supervision of R. J. Tipton. A number of copies have been placed in the hands of the appropriate Federal agencies.

It is hoped that these reports will serve to enlist the further interest and assistance of several Federal agencies in recommending larger appropriations in the future in order to secure the power at an early date for defense purposes.

All appropriations for the project to date have been from the reclamation revolving fund, a limited fund from which a number of projects are being financed. It is hoped that the 1942 and subsequent appropriations will be made from the General Treasury which is already financing several other larger reclamation projects such as Grand Coulee and Central Valley.

CONSTRUCTION PROGRESS

Actual construction on the project began in the fall of 1938 with erection of buildings, construction of roads, and other preliminary work.

GREEN MOUNTAIN DAM AND POWER PLANT

The first large contract let by the Bureau of Reclamation was for the construction of Green Mountain Dam and power plant on the western slope. This contract was let in November 1938, to the Warner Construction Co. of Chicago. The contractor began operations immediately and during the first year made good progress in excavating and lining the 20-foot diameter diversion tunnel and operating shafts at this dam, in starting the stripping of the foundations, and in performing other preliminary work.

In the second season (1940), the temporary cofferdam diverted the water of Blue River through the completed diversion tunnel, the stripping operations were completed, four cut-off walls were constructed, the powerhouse foundations and part of the spillway were completed and a start was made in building the dam itself.

All the remaining work on Green Mountain Dam and power plant has been carefully scheduled on a basis that will complete the job early in 1943 so that the river flow of that spring can be stored and power production started.

CONTINENTAL DIVIDE TUNNEL

The Continental Divide Tunnel is the key feature of the project and the one that will require the longest time to build. When completed, this tunnel will be 13.06 miles (68,980 feet) in length, with a diameter of 9 feet 9 inches inside the lining. It will have a water-carrying capacity of 550 second-feet. From the beginning, the district officials and the Bureau of Reclamation were anxious to get it started. After consideration of several methods of performing the work, including building the tunnel by force account, it was finally decided to call for bids on short sections of the tunnel.

EAST END OF TUNNEL

On April 8, 1940, bids were opened for excavation of 8,000 feet at the east end of the tunnel. The contract was awarded on April 25 to S. S. Magoffin Co., Inc., of Englewood, Colo., which submitted the lowest of 10 bids. Actual work started in early June of 1940. Labor and other difficulties caused some delays but this contract was completed in February 1941 nearly 6 months ahead of the time limit. This portion of the tunnel was driven at the rate of over 1,000 feet per month and indicates the progress that can be made with efficient management and good equipment.

As the result of opening bids on February 3, 1941, S. S. Magoffin Co., Inc., the lowest of three bidders, was awarded a contract for excavation of an additional 7,000 feet on the east end of the tunnel. This contract also includes construction of the concrete invert lining for this additional 7,000 feet and for the 8,000 feet already driven. The invert is the bottom one-third of the tunnel lining. Work is now well under way on this contract.

WEST END OF TUNNEL

On June 20, 1940, bids were opened for 6,600 feet of tunnel excavation at the west or Grand Lake end. There were five bidders on this schedule, with Platt-Rogers, Inc., of Pueblo, Colo., the lowest. Actual excavation on this contract started in September of 1940, and on April 15, 1941, the heading was in 4,600 feet from the west portal. At the present time the work is proceeding at the rate of 40 feet per day.

INCIDENTAL CONSTRUCTION WORK

In addition to the work on the two large features above mentioned, the Bureau of Reclamation has constructed numerous buildings, including offices, residences, dormitories, garages, warehouses, and similar structures, most of which are at the project headquarters near Estes Park village on the eastern slope. Some smaller groups are located on the western slope at Shadow Mountain Lake and at Green Mountain Dam to accommodate personnel of the Bureau during construction and during future operation in those areas. The Bureau has also constructed 176 miles of power transmission lines and 12 substations, partly for construction needs, but all of which will be a part of the completed power-distribution system.

The rate of progress made at the east portal of the tunnel to date proves that this controlling feature can be completed in 1945 if capable contractors are kept working. On this basis a construction schedule has been set up which will complete the essential features of the project by 1945. This schedule, with supporting reasons, was incorporated in a document prepared by the Colorado Water Conservation Board in November 1940. Copies of this report are available.

OUTSTANDING FEATURES OF THE PROJECT

Outstanding features of the Colorado-Big Thompson project are:

1. Assured repayment of the entire cost of construction under a conservancy district organization authorized by statutes of the State of Colorado, with power of general property taxation designed to obtain contribution from indirect beneficiaries, including towns, cities, and utilities. Costs of water to the farmers are well within their ability to pay.

2. Elimination of crop losses, which average $7,000,000 a year, by providing a necessary supplemental water supply for 615,000 acres of highly developed farm land in a district with a total assessed valuation of approximately $130,000,000.

3. As incidental to the use of water for irrigation purposes, generation of electrical energy in sufficient quantities to meet increasing demands within the area, including defense industries; the power feature carrying its full proportionate share of the construction cost.

Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE MESSENGER

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express sincere appreciation for the following short article, which appeared in the Messenger, organ of the Evangelical and Reformed Church.

[From the Messenger of February 20, 1941]

A HUMANE PROPOSAL

Pointing out that the voice of religion has been raised against unemployment, and that

representatives of all faiths have united in a demand that "action be taken to eliminate it as a social evil from our land," Congressman VOORHIS, of California, has introduced a bill in the House of Representatives urging the establishment of a commission to develop a program for the "permanent elimination of mass unemployment in the United States." Industry, labor, agriculture, as well as church organizations are to be represented in this commission which is directed to give especial attention to a study of post-war peacetime economy in order that the reduction of defense expenditures will not result in depression and severely aggravated unemployment. This is one of the problems to which the best brains and the most sympathetic hearts in America certainly should be devoted.

National Conference of Real Estate Taxpayers Urges Appointment of a National Commission to Study Federal, State, and Local Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

RESOLUTION BY THE CONFERENCE AND ADDRESSES BY HON. MYERS Y. COOPER, OF OHIO, MAJ. A. A. OLES, SEATTLE, WASH., AND DR W. H. HUSBAND

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on April 25 and 26 the National Conference of Real Estate Taxpayers held a meeting in the city of Washington and engaged in an examination and a study of the need of readjusting our entire national, State, and local tax structure. It will be conceded there is no subject of greater importance pending before the American people today than the question of taxation, not alone to finance our all-out preparedness program, but also to provide adequate revenues for national, State, and local government on a scientific basis, making an equitable distribution of taxes based on the ability to pay and relieving the inequitable burden now resting on real estate in many of our States and local communities.

This conference passed unanimously a resolution urging the creation of a commission on taxation to study the entire field of taxation in the United States. This subject is of such vital importance that I deem it fitting to include this resolution as a part of my remarks, together with the address of the Honorable Myers Y. Cooper, former Governor of Ohio, and president of the conference, which is a most thought-provoking and informative address on the whole subject of taxation.

I also include as a part of my remarks the addresses of Maj. A. A. Oles, of Seattle, Wash., and Dr. W. H. Husband, member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, delivered before the conference and dealing with this subject of taxation. The resolution and addresses are as follows:

THE COMMISSION ON TAXATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Whereas the National Conference of Real Estate Taxpayers urges the establishment of an agency to study the tax structure of our cities, States, and the Nation to the end that this structure may be better integrated, and made more stable and equitable; and

Whereas the conference believes that the agency most capable of doing this successfully would be one created by the Congress and representative of all levels of Government and of all taxpayers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is petitioned to create the commission on taxation in the United States, as described hereafter.

This commission is charged to compile and analyze the facts in relation to:

1. The effects of the present Federal, State, and local tax structure upon the various elements in the social and economic life of the Nation; upon the financial stability of the three levels of Government; and upon the general public welfare.

2. The pyramiding and overlapping of the intergovernmental tax structure among the three levels of Government and among the 175,000 minor tax-levying authorities.

3. The causes and effects of decentralization and blight in the residential and commercial areas of our cities, and the effect of these on the financial stability of our cities and States.

This commission is further charged to recommend a program for integrating and unifying the entire tax structure upon a pattern or policy of economic and social concepts consonant with the modern democratic principles of the Nation.

The personnel of the commission is to be representative of all interests. Included will be representatives of the Congress, of the Federal Treasury, and of other appropriate agencies and executive departments of the Federal Government; of the legislative and executive departments of State governments; of the legislative and executive departments of local governments; and of taxpayers, including representatives of urban and rural real-estate taxpayers.

To implement the commission, appropriation of not less than $500,000 annually is to be made by the Congress; authority is to be granted to utilize all pertinent records of the Federal Government; State and local governments are to be requested to grant similar cooperation; the right to hold hearings and to subpena witnesses is to be provided.

The commission is to be instructed to organize itself by election of a chairman and vice chairmen; it is to be empowered to employ an executive secretary and such clerical and research assistance as it deems necessary; it is to be empowered to retain the professional services of attorneys, research agencies, and economic advisers. Members of the commission will serve without compensation, but will be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and similar expenses when engaged in the work of the commission. The commission will pay its employees and fix their compensations.

The commission is to be instructed to make periodic progress reports to the public and to the Congress. It is to make its final report and recommendations not later than January 1, 1943. The final report and recommendations are to be made to the Congress and to each State and local legislative body and chief executive officer; further be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be published and delivered to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, to each Member of the Congress of the United States, to the council of State governments, the Conference of Mayors, the Legislators' Association, the constituents of the National Conference of Real Estate Taxpayers, and to the press and the press associations.

Done this 26th day of April 1941 in Washington, D. C., by the National Conference of Real Estate Taxpayers.

MYERS Y. COOPER, *President.*
JAMES MCD. SHEA,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.
LAWRENCE G. HOLMES,
Secretary.

ADDRESS OF MYERS Y. COOPER, FORMER GOVERNOR OF OHIO

Members of the National Conference of Real Estate Taxpayers, 1 year ago a momentous movement was launched in this city to reexamine the real-property-tax structure of the Nation and, if possible, to suggest a plan whereby some semblance of order and uniformity could be developed in substitution for the chaotic condition that has prevailed throughout the various taxing districts of the entire country.

At this conference there was banded together taxpayers in a movement of such general significance as to offer a new hope that confiscation of property through excessive taxation was soon to be a thing of the past. The widespread interest in the work of that conference was of such importance as to attract general attention, since it promised relief to real-property owners from the twin burdens of high valuation and high rates. The conference adopted plans that were sound and capable of fulfillment.

At last we had something to offer that gave greater assurance to the distressed property owners than mere resolutions of deploring and condemning without doing anything about the matter.

The rights of the property owners were clearly stated, and the disposition and ability to protect those rights through the adoption of a sensible, workable, and understandable plan were asserted with courage and conviction.

As this organization extends its influence in cooperation with its supporting groups, we shall hear less of the resounding thud of the sheriff's hammer on the auction block where exorbitant taxes have forced the sale of property. Serious losses have occurred in border-line cases where small relief from excessive taxation would have enabled hard-working people who want to hold onto their property to do so.

TAX CONFUSION ELIMINATED

We need to get taxation out of its present state of confusion, where all forms of wealth will share in the cost of government on a fair, just, and equitable basis—out where the man who pays the bill will know the sources of public income and how the money is to be spent.

In all too many instances the real-property taxpayer has been flailed out until about all there is left for him and his household is the chaff.

In protecting the rights of property owners against undue invasion of public-spending agencies, the responsible attitude is taken of making democracy work by preserving constitutional guaranties to which the citizen is entitled in the protection of property ownership. More we do not want; less we will not accept.

Any discussion of the tax question must necessarily take into consideration sound economy as a very first step, and by sound economy I mean efficient conduct of public affairs, eliminating waste and extravagance of every character.

We cannot accept the unsound fiscal theory so often advanced: "The more that is spent in public service the better it will be for the taxpayer who foots the bill."

Anyone familiar with the present tax structure as it applies to real estate must know that it is obsolete and archaic. It met the requirements of 100 years ago in a satisfactory manner, but it is no more qualified to meet present-day conditions than the ox cart

is qualified to meet present-day transportation requirements.

The remedy we seek is a modernization of the tax structure to prevent existing abuses by putting an end to haphazard methods such as prevail today. That is what the late Professor Seligman, of Columbia University, distinguished as a tax authority, was emphasizing when he called the property tax one of the worst taxes in the civilized world. "It is so inequitable," he said, "that its retention can be explained only through ignorance or inertia."

Let it be well understood that the National Conference of Real Estate Taxpayers is not seeking an escape for the property taxpayers of their rightful contribution to the support of government, but they do object to going beyond such responsibility.

We cannot take the position that the property tax is a bad tax for the reason that historically the facts are to the contrary.

We must, first of all, take an intelligent position on the rightful place of the property tax in the scheme of Government maintenance and put a stop to making a football of it.

We must not permit the interest in home ownership to diminish through default in making use of the remedies at hand to modernize the present property tax structure and to eliminate grave abuses contributing to discouragement in the ownership of homes and land.

In every community in the 175,000 taxing districts in this Nation there is dissatisfaction and unrest. The abuse has been so general, the excess burdens on small property owners have been so uniformly severe, that a remedy to relieve this intolerable situation would be equally applicable to every subdivision and every hamlet throughout the country.

We have had all too much political debt paying in the form of excessive and unnecessary public pay-roll expenditures by appointing and retaining political hangers-on who render no real service to the taxpayers.

Government is the one place where employment has shown a tremendous gain in peacetime, and the only place in recent years, or up to war preparedness, where there has been a gain in employment, for that matter.

There has been too much costly duplication of effort through the functions of overlapping bureaus. Increased personnel and duplications have loaded a charge on the Public Treasury of from 100 to 150 percent in many divisions during the past 10 years.

Thus it is not hard to visualize just why deficits pile up, extra bond issues are required, taxes increased, to meet governmental expenditures that far exceed the revenues.

I cited a moment ago that the inequities were great, and that an adjustment was due in virtually every tax district throughout the country. It is reported that a house which sold for $5,000 in Seattle, Wash., pays $1.50 per $100 in taxes, whereas a house which sold for $5,000 in Jersey City, N. J., is taxed at $7.50 per $100. The ownership of these properties receive from the municipalities exactly the same benefits in education, sanitation, hospitalization, police and fire protection, and such other customary services as a municipality affords.

We are dealing with hearthstone problems and their magnitude represents the summation of small abuses which collectively have reached huge proportions inflicting distress on countless numbers of people.

It is an American principle, vouchsafed to every man, that here in our democracy the right is inherent to own property and to be protected in that right. But what protection is there and what encouragement is there in ownership of property if there be an abridgment of that right when the property owner is saddled with a tax burden beyond his ability to pay?

It is an accepted fact that "the power to tax is the power to destroy," and let me say the abuse of that power has in it the authority to deny the necessities and comforts of life by infringing on family living conditions.

I am concerned about the fear which all too many people express of their Government. Better, far better, if we are to maintain a true democracy of a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," that those in authority feel a little less secure, that they have a little more concern as to the attitude of the people whom they serve, if we are to have effective public service with due regard for the interests of the taxpayers, who by the sweat of their brow foot the bill.

I sometimes think if a greater concern was exhibited as to how to reduce taxes than the concern as to the discovery of new methods for wringing additional taxes from those who pay the cost, the problem would be met and our democracy safeguarded.

Economy and efficient public service are not incompatible and the people's progress is measured by the extent of a harmonious cooperative relationship designed to produce effective public service.

Sight should not be lost of the fact that a prime objective of government is "to do for the people collectively the things they cannot do so well or do at all in their separate or individual capacities." Public officials should not forget that they are the custodians of delegated authority.

The science of government is becoming increasingly complex. The call is for men of capacity, experience, and integrity, to man the posts of responsibility in America's greatest business enterprise, if we are to expect the tax dollar to reflect the same degree of value in public service as it reflects in successful private enterprise.

Samuel Crowther in an admirable address on Fighting for a Great Tradition asserted that "Our Government was becoming a bewildering thing until we hardly know what it is all about." "Our income," said he, "and corporate taxes are frankly aimed at the redistribution of income and inheritance taxes are capital levies designed to break up fortunes, great or small, for the benefit of somebody or other, while our real-estate taxes although ostensibly based on a reasonable income from the realty, in many cases come very close to being capital levies." "The redistribution," said he, "to date has not, as far as I can discover, satisfied anyone other than those engaged in handling the redistribution."

I should like to add to this statement that we have innumerable cases in our cities where the taxes on real estate have become actual capital levies, and the challenge to the National Taxpayers' Conference is to lay the keel for a program to stop this sort of thing.

The sale of real estate in many cities is made on a basis of 50 percent of tax values.

In one eastern city with a million population the first 900 sales of real estate in 1940 were made on an average of 50 percent of the tax value of the property sold. One-half of the tax, you see, was collected on wind. Perhaps that's where the slogan originated, "It's an ill wind that blows nobody good."

The situation becomes the more involved because of the confusion on the part of public officeholders as to the full meaning and importance of public credit. Unable to live within the income, the disposition to achieve things more desired than necessary leads to a resort to excessive borrowings, which have got to be met by excessive taxes. Such procedure frightens capital, slows down enterprise, and turns wage earners into the street jobless, while the market for farm and factory is curtailed. And this is so even though huge expenditures for war purposes obscure these fundamental facts.

It is not contended that all bond issues should be opposed by real property owners, who, in the main, must pay the carrying charges and ultimately the debt, but in every such instance, the proponents of the debt creation should be compelled to prove their case, and when the public is satisfied with such proposal, the cause is usually a good one.

You can preach economy until you are blue in the face, but you won't get it if the public service is to be indoctrinated with the idea that we have got to go beyond the bounds of public requirments. Pressure groups have frequently forced extravagances on the public without due regard for the safety and security of American institutions.

There is beyond question too much elasticity, too much freedom in debt creation, and this has had to do with the excessive load which the taxpayers are compelled to carry in increased cost of government. As it has been put, "We, the people, have demanded too much of government."

Many responsible people who cry loudest for government economy insisting that high taxes are ruining their business and confiscating earnings are flagrantly guilty of running up the cost for their own pet schemes while the getting is good.

We are in a tremendous preparedness program which has already resulted in a huge national debt. That preparedness means that come what may, America will stand its ground and defend its rights against any force, however powerful. We have got to go through with that program regardless of the cost, and we should do it as good American citizens without political bias. Sooner or later this war is going to be over, and we want to continue to maintain the American way of living when that time comes.

While public attention today is focused on huge Federal spending, which is so big that nobody can comprehend its meaning, let us not forget that the home base must be kept sound. Here is the last-ditch defense which we dare not surrender. We must preach and practice economy in the conduct of local government as it has never been practiced before if we expect to come out of this conflict with heads up and with the opportunity preserved to start over again with an assured future.

The motivating influence back of the tax reform which we advocate primarily has to do with the protection and stimulation of ownership of property, of homes, farm, and real-estate investments.

Any movement that has for its purpose the increase in home ownership and to provide better living conditions for the people, stimulating thrift and personal incentive, should have the encouragement and the assistance of all who are sincerely interested in the welfare of their country.

It is an undeniable fact that home owning means a deepened interest in government and the maintaining of a higher standard of living.

The tremendous amount of money being expended on the defense program should have a favorable influence in the building and selling of homes. Home building should not be disturbed, since adequate housing requirements is in itself a strong arm of defense. There are a number of important influences that operate today against home building, home ownership, and real estate generally, which can be brought under a rational control, the advocacy of which is a prime responsibility of this organization. The disposition is to be helpful, although I sometimes think the merits of the suggestions have not been given due consideration.

STORY OF BEGGAR AND DIME

The F. H. A. has made it possible for countless numbers of people to literally start on a shoestring and eventually acquire a debt-free home. My own experience covering more than a third of a century in the sale of property on a plan of easy payments bears out the statement I now make that this legislation is prac-

ticable, the benefits great, losses negligible, and is of tremendous economic and social value.

On the other hand, there is serious invasion of the field of private enterprise through Government housing projects that are in direct competition with private ownership. In such instances it is a conflict of ideologies as between the theory of Government ownership as against stimulation of private ownership. The Government's well-intentioned solution of the housing question simply does not make sense when there is encouragement on the one hand to own property and highly competitive discouragement on the other hand. It reminds me of Aesop's Fable of the Dog and Hare.

In the chase after the hare, the dog, having made a good meal, was in no hurry to conclude the sport, and so he would lick the hare, and then nip him, until finally the hare, in great fright, cried out, "Who are you, friend or enemy? If a friend, why do you bite me so, and if an enemy, why caress me?" And this seems to be pretty much the situation in a program that offers the finest possible cooperation in the development of home ownership on the one hand, and then subjects private property to harassing competition in suburban areas, where virtually every tenant is capable of sharing the cost of government and does not need a subsidy.

If we must have Government housing, it certainly ought not to invade a field where private enterprise is capable and eager to serve, and where the attack is direct on home ownership, adding new burdens of taxation on those who are trying to hold on to their homes. Certainly there is not the slightest excuse for any Government housing project, other than in blighted areas, to ask for a subsidy. It should be a mandatory matter that the Government pay the same ratio of taxes on Government-owned income property just as private owners of property pay; otherwise an utter collapse of the property tax as a sustaining influence in municipal affairs will inevitably follow.

President Philip W. Kniskern, of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, clearly stated the position of property owners when he said that both for present and future economic health it is important that a minimum of needed housing be Government built and that a maximum be privately built, but he emphasized it is essential above all else that we have the housing we need, where and when we need it, giving the sound advice that "rambling complaints are no substitute for complete and accurate facts and action. * * * Unless we can provide sound and satisfactory housing for our defense workers our entire defense program will be impeded."

"In all our planning we must guard at all times against the creation of ghost towns, against the building of permanent housing beyond normal requirements, especially in our small cities and rural section. If we do not do so, we shall burden these communities with bankruptcy taxes for many years to come."

Let me say that actual defense housing is entirely outside our consideration of the general housing problem. That is beyond question a matter for Government responsibility and action.

It is unwise to adopt a permanent housing program that makes it more economical to live in subsidized public property than to own a home.

There should be a meeting of minds between the Government and private enterprise, including financial institutions, which will solve this problem on the basis of improving social conditions and strengthening the national economy with the least possible disturbance to the economic life of the Nation.

MUST HAVE DEPENDABLE INFORMATION

If we are going to reduce Government costs we must first of all discover extravagance, prevent leakage and waste, and abolish nonessentials in the public service. We should have, and that with the least possible delay, a more thoroughgoing integration of the tax structure of National, State, and local government, and it must be developed along comprehensive, well-coordinated lines. True, the National Government collects no property tax; however, the penetrations are such that the national taxing program extends through the whole tax structure.

It is highly desirable that a commission be created by the Congress, and at this session, setting up authority to go into the whole taxation matter in great detail. Such a commission, appointed as a scientific fact-finding agency and composed of men thoroughly competent to make an analysis of taxation problems, would, beyond question, develop material of vast importance to every taxing district in the country.

The question transcends partisanship and obviously must be kept out of the political zone in the studies and recommendations made.

A fact-finding research with Government authority back of it would, I am convinced, be hailed as a sound and sensible approach leading to a successful diagnosis of the situation resulting in great reduction in the cost of Federal, State, and local governments. It would remove the guesswork that permeates the whole taxing structure.

Paul G. Hoffman, distinguished businessman and student of public affairs, in discussing benefits arising from such a commission, had this to say:

"The possibilities of such a study are limitless. The report issuing from it might well be our magna carta of taxation for years to come. The commission might well prepare schedules of tax sources and rates to meet budgets of varying sizes. Such a report would make visual to all the people their tax burdens at various governmental cost levels."

Let me say this, that it is conceivable that such an analysis would develop the fact that we are spending a lot of money for worthless services which might well be eliminated and which are not worth the cost of maintenance.

President Roosevelt and Secretary Morgenthau have both expressed hearty approval of a national commission such as I have been discussing here.

I quote from the President's Budget message briefly on this point when he insisted that "no really satisfactory tax reform can be achieved without readjusting the Federal, State, and local fiscal relationships," and he urged a thorough investigation of the possibilities of a comprehensive tax reform."

It is a matter of great encouragement to know that the Federal Government recognizes the importance of such a study and the need for simplification of the problem of taxation. Mr. Morgenthau has reiterated the stand he has previously taken on this question, in which he stated:

"It is generally recognized that real estate taxation in most sections of the country is unduly high," and while this was not primarily a Federal Government matter, the report went on to say that "the development of plans which may have a tendency to lighten the burden is certainly to be encouraged," and gave assurance of cooperation in further development of this proposal.

Let us have a new Magna Carta of taxation to modernize the structure to the end that no man shall be called upon to go beyond his ability to pay in meeting the cost of government.

For the first time there is organized effort to cope with the tax question, with uniform authority and the right to speak for a vast number of taxpayers throughout this Nation.

There is mobilized back of the National Conference of Real Estate Taxpayers the solid support of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, with its 15,000 members, who need no call to the colors in supporting a movement that has for its purpose a more just and equitable tax system; the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, an organization that has loaned tremendous sums of money on real-estate developments of great economic value to the Nation; the National Grange, a great spokesman for the farming interests of the country, realizes that excessive taxation has lowered farm values; the National Association of Apartment Owners and the National Association of Building Owners and Managers, representing vast investments on the part of private enterprise in improved real estate and contributing a large share of earnings to public revenues, now insist that the very security of the investments which they represent is dependent upon a sound solution of this whole problem.

We are not wanting in leadership. A great volunteer army awaits the call to put into effect a sound tax program throughout the Nation that will stabilize values and income and offer the best possible security for the maintenance of government itself.

One year ago there was adopted at the initial meeting of the National Conference of Real Estate Taxpayers a set of principles which fairly comprehended the problem confronting the taxpayers of the country. The suggestions which I now make embody many of the principles then enunciated and which I am convinced if adopted would prove a veritable boon to the ownership of property. I offer these suggestions in the interest of greater economic stability, the improvement of the social order, stimulation of housing and building generally under the banner of private enterprise. They are:

(1) A national commission on taxation and land policies of the Nation to evolve a long-range tax policy for all governments.

(2) Consideration of the importance of taxing real estate on a basis of productivity.

(3) Reduce the cost of government by a prudent spending of public money in harmony with the public income.

(4) Make government income-producing property pay its share for local government on the same tax basis as privately owned property.

(5) Give greater consideration to the earning power of property in matters of tax assessments.

(6) Coordinate taxation to prevent overlapping and unwarranted confiscation of earnings and values.

(7) The adoption by taxing authorities of a more vigorous tax-collection policy to prevent defaults.

(8) Put a tax limitation ceiling on real estate for its protection and to limit unbridled public spending.

(9) Amend the Federal laws so as to permit not less than 10 years for liquidation of real estate to meet Federal inheritance taxes.

I have already discussed in some detail the importance of a national commission on taxation and land policies and I now desire to take up a few moments in the discussion of two or three other suggestions.

Tax limitation has been adopted by nine States in the Union and the results have been highly beneficial and satisfactory. Not a single State where tax limitation prevails would consider for a moment a return to the old methods and this is a complete answer to some statements which have come to my attention made by certain municipal organizations that limitation is a failure.

None of the dire things predicted as to what would happen to the various States and subdivisions should tax limitation be imposed has ever come to pass.

The facts are that limitation has encouraged new enterprises to come into States that have modernized their tax structure. The ownership of homes and farms has shown an upward trend, and by broadening the tax base

more dependable public revenues have been realized.

I have never known business to flee from reduced taxes, but we have seen many an industry pull up stakes and leave a State where the taxes were exorbitantly high.

The need today is to underwrite greater stability in the matter of public revenues, and since real estate has been carrying an average of 25 percent above its rightful share as compared with other forms of wealth it is not hard to see that to bring in all taxable values on a parity is in the interests of stability in tax revenues and prevention of confiscation of property.

EDUCATION

One of the main objections which has been leveled at tax limitation has had to do with education. In all of the studies that have been made as to the effect on the educational systems as a result of tax limitation, I can say to you it has been clearly proved that the educational system has been greatly strengthened.

In the nine States which have put a ceiling on their real-estate-tax rate—namely, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, West Virginia, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Nevada, Washington, and Rhode Island, the proportion of school revenues derived from the State has greatly increased. The average in 1930 in these States was 13.4 percent of school revenues supplied by the State, but these increased to 41.4 percent in 1940; in other words, the former narrow base resting entirely on real estate worked to the disadvantage of education, but after a limitation on real-estate taxes the base was immediately broadened until in these nine States it far exceeds the national average.

I come from Ohio and I should like to give you some very dependable figures which I have just received from the tax commissioner of our State. I asked the question as to the effect of limitation after 8 years' experience.

The revenues for school purposes in Ohio in 1940, according to the tax commissioner, totaled $134,000,000. Of this amount the State furnished from the general revenue fund $53,000,000 as against only $21,000,000 in 1934. Mr. Evatt, State tax commissioner, states:

"The revenue of the public schools in Ohio in 1934 from property taxes and State funds amounted to about $107,000,000. It has already been pointed out that these revenues amounted to about $134,000,000 in 1940. Thus it is obvious that the tax limitation has not prevented the public schools of Ohio from putting on an expanding program."

Thus the burden on real estate has been lessened by more than $30,000,000 for schools, since State funds are not realized from real-estate taxes, while on the other hand, practically the entire local tax is levied on property.

The total reduction in real-estate taxes in Ohio due to the constitutional tax rate limitation is in the neighborhood of $40,000,000 per year. There is no way of estimating what the additional tax load would have been with the introduction of old-age pensions, direct relief, and other new demands upon the State, if there had been no real estate tax limitation imposed in the year 1933. This limitation has on the other hand resulted in the creation of a school foundation program receiving its income from State tax sources which equalizes educational opportunities throughout the State, and in the opinion of the tax commissioner is one of the most complete educational programs in the Nation. Thus does Ohio's tax commissioner summarize the benefits of the constitutional tax rate limitation after 8 year of successful operation.

Ohio has pulled the key log of excessive taxation and the State is living within its income.

I suggest that you carry back with you the benefits to be derived from tax limitation and seek its introduction into your State tax system.

Taxing real estate on a basis of its earning power is constantly gaining support in this country. It appears the productivity of property has been given but little consideration in our present system of taxation. This change calls for extensive research and exploration and it should be a major objective of this tax conference.

Real-estate taxes do not concern simply the taxpayer only, but all citizens. It has to do with the progress of education and social necessities, of enterprise of every character, of government maintenance, and the general welfare of the people.

The fight we make is utterly unselfish. It is for every man's opportunity to ultimately acquire the American ideal of a self-owned home.

Today, as never before, we ought to thank God that we are American citizens, living in the most enlightened country on the face of the earth, great in her independence and the strength to meet foes without, and seditious conspiracies within; with courage and capacity to ride out any economic storm; to maintain a scale of wages and living unprecedented; a Nation so rich in natural resources that she can supply her every need and indefinitely, if need be, self-reliantly go forward while maintaining her national authority upon land and sea.

We are not going to carry the flag of our Nation at half-mast in any crisis; nor will be surrender to dismay or defeatism. We shall meet every test in a spirit worthy of the ideals, institutions, and ancestors of which we boast.

We may well stand solid in a time like the present, highly resolving in the spirit of Abraham Lincoln, who took up his pen and wrote his first message to Congress in 1861, offering great patriotic challenge:

"Having chosen our course, without guile, and with a pure purpose, let us renew our trust in God, and go forward without fear and with manly hearts."

In this spirit, let us go forward with renewed faith in our country, doing our part as free men determined to remain free. Forward with manly hearts.

OVER-ALL PROPERTY TAX LIMITATION

(Address of Maj. A. A. Oles, of Seattle, Wash.)

The taxation of property in the United States is not scientific; usually it is little more than a bad habit inaugurated for one type of development and carried on through 150 years of ever-changing industrial and social order. Property, as represented by homes, farms, and commercial-land investments, does not now represent the entire wealth of the country, it does not produce the entire income of the country, it does not indicate the complete ability of the people to pay taxes and property owners do not receive the entire benefits of government. We must admit, therefore, that the owners of wealth represented in land and building investments should not be called upon to bear the entire burden or an inequitable proportion of the cost of government. Admitting this, we must agree that taxes on property should be limited. The only question at issue, in my opinion, is the point at which the tax should be halted.

There are three schools of thought on this subject of tax limitation:

1. There are those who hold to the theory that taxes should be limited to the amount necessary to perform the primary functions of government—those things which can be better done by government than by individuals—and that all production in excess of that amount should be left in the hands of those who produce.

2. There is another group who believe that taxes should only cease at the point of diminishing returns; in other words, that government should collect up to a point which will continue our present profit system and use that money for inaugurating social reforms, caring for those unable to care for themselves and raising the standard of living of those unable to get along themselves under a competitive commercial economy.

3. Then there is a third class who believe that taxes should be used not only for the primary functions of government and social betterment, but that taxes should be increased to the point of confiscation of all property in land and that a new type of government and social order can be ushered once this is accomplished. In other words, there are those who seek the socialization of land through unpayable levies.

Only the third class believe in unlimited taxation of property.

This conference at its first meeting committed itself to the promotion of an over-all limitation of taxes on property. The people making up that conference believed in the right of private ownership of property; they were satisfied with our profit economy; they liked the American way of life; they sought to encourage people to own homes, to invest in farms and commercial property by an assurance that this could be done without fear of having their investments absorbed by overambitious governments. They believed in limiting the taxes which can be levied on real property. Their stand was based on a practical knowledge of the tax situation as it affects real property owners throughout the country. They knew that taxes had passed the point necessary to the proper care of the absolutely essential functions of government; they knew that in many cases they were beyond the point of diminishing returns and safe social changes and they hoped by definite limitation to prevent the complete socialization of land as advocated by the third class.

While most of us believe in limiting taxes in some manner, we have several theories as to how the limitation can be accomplished.

Unfortunately there is a vast difference between theory and practice. This is as true in the matter of tax control as it is in any other line. There are two ways to limit taxes: First, through election of representatives who will, under all conditions, hold taxes to a proper level, and second, by putting a ceiling on taxes by constitutional or statutory provision. One very large group of our people advocate the first method and think taxes can be controlled by the election of proper representatives, men who have a profound understanding of public finance and a long-range view of penalties which inevitably follow the violation of sound economic principles in the conduct of government. Practically we have not been able to control the expenditures of our Federal Government or expenditures in any of our 48 States—I might say any of our thousands of tax units—by the democratic process of electing these supermen to office. We, who represent property owners, have learned this in that realistic school of increasing government needs and diminishing long-range economic thought. Theory and practice have been in conflict and theory seems to have taken the count.

In the past 10 years governmental costs have jumped from 13 percent of our total national income to 30 percent, and our total public debt, Federal and local, from $30,000,000,000 to the present all-time high of more than $60,000,000,000. Control of expenditures and debts, where it has existed at all, has resulted from tax limits imposed by States.

Today we find ourselves in the position of having property-tax rates in most States so high that they bring the saturation point within a normal vision; so high that they compare either favorably or unfavorably with

a totalitarian state. We have in most taxing units expenditures at a point where no known system of taxation will produce the required money, and we finance government by deferred taxes and mounting government debt. In my opinion, and in the opinion of most of us, taxes must be controlled by the same power that levies taxes—by statutory law or constitutional prohibition.

Over-all tax limitation is one of the objectives of this organization. And let me interpolate here my personal opinion that tax limitation, which necessarily limits the power of government, is the greatest safeguard of a capitalistic system. I favor, as I believe you favor, our system of progress. War and political compromise may and perhaps will prolong our present economic life, but tax limitation—limiting all exactions of government to the growth of production—is the only system which will preserve democracy and our free institutions.

Everyone, except those who hope for eventual socialization, favors tax limitation. We must either believe in tax limitation or in unlimited taxes. Even those who believe and hope for the eventual triumph of the State over the people who make up the State have not opposed a limit on any tax except that on property. Gas taxes, income taxes, insurance taxes, sales taxes, and every other tax except property taxes are limited by the enactments which levied them. Property taxes are left open in most tax-levying units, to absorb excess appropriations and for the deficits of economically irresponsible governments. The only tax which is not limited over all and at least by statute is the tax on real and personal property.

Strangely enough, with most of our people convinced that property-tax limitation is desirable, they hesitate to suggest or promote over-all limitation. Limitation is not an innovation. Today 48 States in some manner limit the property taxes which can be levied by their municipal subdivisions. County taxes are likewise limited by statute or constitutionally in all of 48 States. Yet only 9 States have over-all limitation.

It seems to me that knowing these things as we do and having committed ourselves to the principle of over-all property-tax limitation, there remains for us the task of convincing the voting public of three things:

1. That over-all tax limitation is practical.
2. That it is fair and in the interest of the public.
3. That it can be accomplished.

As to its practicability, I bring you the experience of one State—Washington. I live in this State; I know its problems, and I have been closely associated during the past 20 years with real property. I knew in 1921, the first year that Laurence Booth and Jim Wheeler, pioneers in tax limitation, first suggested tax limitation, that limiting taxes was not in accord with the best theories on the subject of taxes; that it was frowned upon by most of the so-called tax authorities. What I did not know, and what a lot of other people did not know at that time, was that it was the only method by which mounting taxes could be controlled and the right of private property in land preserved in a country of constantly expanding government. Last fall we conducted the fifth successful campaign; one that gave us a 3-to-1 majority for tax limitation. After 10 years' experience 70 percent of our people favor tax limitation. In our State we had reached the point of diminishing returns and also the point of confiscation. Our delinquency in 1932 reached an average of 30 percent. Under a tax-limit law it was reduced to 10 percent in 1940. Our average delinquency in 1932 does not correctly picture our condition. Certain governmental bills—for example, bond interest and redemption—must be paid regardless of collection, and we found counties and other taxing districts trying to get on with as low as 25 percent of the amount estimated and levied. Mounting delinquencies and no funds for local governments meant not only the confiscation of private property but the eventual collapse of local governmental units. These conditions have been corrected by tax limitation, and the shift of property taxes to other sources of revenue is pictured for you in the chart prepared by our State tax commission. In 1931 we had a total governmental cost in our State of, roughly, $100,000,000. Real- and personal-property taxes accounted for 79.5 percent of the total expenditures. And 17.35 percent of the total was from gasoline and motor-vehicle taxes, which might also be termed personal-property exaction.

In other words, almost 97 percent of our taxes were paid by the people who owned tangible property, property that was in sight and could not escape the eye of the collector. Income, intangibles, and other wealth were free from Government exactions. Our shift to other sources was not accompanied by an increase in total governmental cost notwithstanding the fact that during the past 10 years we have had to try to properly feed and clothe that one-third of our population who vote so solidly and consistently for an increasing share of the things the producers produce. We have more relief, better educational facilities, and more roads than ever before in the history of our State, and we are still keeping our totals within the 1929 limits. In addition, we have reduced our county debt by 46 percent, our State debt by 25 percent, and our school debt by 34 percent.

And we believe we know the answer to this question: Does property-tax limitation make other taxes? In our State, the answer is definitely "no." We find that 27 States have retail sales taxes, while only 9 have any over-all property-tax limitation; and we find that 20 of these States without property limitation have, in addition to the retail-sales tax, an income tax and other sorts of taxes not in vogue in our State. Our other taxes would have come without property-tax limitation; they will stay should the property-tax limitation be removed. We believe, and our experience has proven, that definite tax limitation is both practical and desirable.

As to the second point, tax limitation is fair and in the interest of the public. By fair I mean it is on an equality with other forms of taxation. Did you ever make a comparison? Figured from a 2-percent tax on a home valued at $6,000, you would pay $120 per year in taxes. Such a home would have an annual rental value of about $720, and the owner would be paying a 16-percent tax on gross income value for doing what social workers tell us is preserving the American home and standard of living. If he were renting his property, his tax on net would approach 40 percent. No one ever heard of such a tax on sales, on insurance, on intangibles, or on income. If there is an element of unfairness, it certainly, at least in the case of the home, is on the levying of such a tax.

Now let's look at commercial property—and that's the kind of property with which I am especially familiar. Most commercial property pays from 15 to 25 percent of its gross income to government, and in practically every city in the United States Government is taking in taxes from commercial property owners more than is being taken by the owners for their investment and for their management.

Is tax limitation in the public interest? One may as well ask if democracy and the right of private property is in the interest of the public. We believe that it is and we know when we glance at the record of the past 10 years that unlimited taxes mean the confiscation of private property in land. And this is not a new thought. Books have been written and organizations have been formed in advocacy of the principle of absorbing private ownership of land by excessive taxation, and every year the advocates of this system have made small gains which must eventually spell success unless the people who believe in private ownership, in personal liberty and in democratic government awake to the menace of expanding government and excessive tax levies against real property. Tax limitation is fair and in the public interest. It can be accomplished. Nine States have enacted over-all limitation laws. In my State we have repeated the experiment every 2 years since 1932 and at the last election, a campaign which I had the pleasure of directing, we carried the State by a majority of three to one and we won in every precinct in the State. This after 10 years' experience with tax limitation. Today we have practically no opposition except from those who stick to theories in the face of our practical experience and from those who believe that government should be all powerful and that personal rights must be sacrificed to the aggrandizement of the State.

How can it be accomplished? I know of only one way and that is to get out, organize and do it. Persuade your legislators if possible—and it's not probable that you can—initiate if you can and most of the States can. But do it while you still have more home owners than you have public employees and social workers—for you must always remember that tax limitation restricts the rights of those who live by government.

Taxation and Security

(Address by Dr. W. H. Husband, member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board)

The decade of the thirties will long be remembered as a momentous turning point in the affairs of the Nation. Various opinions exist as to the final outcome of the changes which have taken place but such concepts of future prospects are at best tenuous, human forecasts. It is much more realistic to try to comprehend what has already taken place and to adopt a course of action which is related to the facts as we see them now. Of course, our own defense program and the war abroad take the spotlight and serve to divert attention from the problems of more normal living but, wherever possible, they should not be used as a cover for various maladjustments in our existing economy.

One of the most significant developments during recent years has been the quest for security. More than we realize, this search for certainty and freedom from risk has been in the minds of most people—rich and poor, the farmer and the city worker. It is for this reason that it would be a mistake to assume that the various reforms which have been set up to provide security affect only the well-advertised "lower third." Obviously, there is no such condition as perfect and ultimate security and we need only to look at the present hazards of war to recognize the stark reality of the many risks which will overhang our future lives. Nevertheless, in the interest of order and national progress, it is still important to do all we can to encourage the maximum security consistent with the American way of life.

Contrary to widespread and popular belief, the road to security is by no means an easy one. It is not paved by either good wishes or easy spending but instead is created only by sacrifice and thrift. Even those modern disciples who have advocated a campaign of more spending have simultaneously given support to various forms of savings. Representative of the latter are such well-known features as the present governmental insurance program for old age and retirement, and the insurance of deposits and savings accounts. Indeed, the very essence of security is an exchange of present use and enjoyment for later availability

and comfort. This principle applies equally to the programs of security provided directly under individual sponsorship as well as to those taking form under governmental auspices.

Some critics believe that undue emphasis is now being placed upon security and that more stress should be placed upon adventure and a willingness to assume greater risk. Undoubtedly there is much merit in this point of view, particularly when the search for security arises as a result of fear. However, when provision for security is positive instead of negative and is earned instead of bestowed, then it may well be one of the chief cornerstones of a strong nation. Unfortunately, too many people look to the Government to provide a security which in the last analysis can be obtained only through reasonable self-reliance. Not only are there great dangers to many of our familiar freedoms under a governmental setup which guarantees security for all, but its cost and administrative complexities stagger the imagination. It is in this sense that security means a cost or sacrifice of other values, and the primary question is by what means we wish to achieve it.

The most practical way, in my opinion, is to place the major responsibility upon the individual. At the same time, it should be expected that the Government would adopt policies and provide numerous facilities which could render material aid to the individual.

One of the chief means of obtaining individual security is found in home ownership. Imagine the impossible, if you will—a nation where everyone owned his own home, free of debt and without any taxes to pay. Could you ask more in the way of individual security or of national stability? The home and the nation would be so welded into a compact whole that no aggressor would dare attack it and, in addition, an important shock absorber would be provided against the stresses and strains of economic distress. This fiction of 100 percent home ownership is obviously impractical for many reasons and probably impossible of achievement in the world as we know it. Nonetheless, we can do much to lend every encouragement to those who do seek to provide this form of security and to avoid unnecessary burdens which penalize home ownership.

The Federal Government has already taken many steps to foster widespread ownership of homes. The Federal Home Loan Bank System and the Federal Housing Administration have been the means of providing both economy and convenience in the terms of financing. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation went even further and saved approximately 1,000,000 homes from foreclosure by directly advancing sufficient funds to refinance the outstanding indebtedness. However, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation is in reality more than a financial institution—it is a laboratory where the problems of individual home owners can be seen and analyzed in the light of actual experience.

True, it is a liquidating institution, but I have high hopes that through it many benefits will be passed along to individual home owners and to private lending institutions. Day in and day out, we are testing such familiar characteristics of home ownership as the terms of financing, the size of down payment, the scope and need for reconditioning, and of such indirect burdens as taxes and insurance. Besides, we have had all the familiar "aches and pains" arising from the management of individual properties.

To date, it has been my observation that one of the most serious deterrents to sound home ownership is that of an unfair tax burden. In the 8 years of operation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation the total tax disbursements now amount to approximately one-sixth of the total original loans. An analysis of our tax accounts shows the following distribution:

Taxes and assessments paid and included in original loans	$230,598,089
Tax advances to original borrowers and vendee accounts	145,687,871
Taxes on acquired properties	67,788,696
Total disbursements for taxes	444,074,656

In addition to these taxes paid by the Corporation, a much larger amount has been paid by the borrowers themselves. If this were added to our own payments, the total tax bill would probably amount to approximately one-half of the total original loans made about 8 years ago. At times, some observers have been perplexed by the anomalous picture of a Government official criticizing taxes because it seemed to be a case of "biting the hand that feeds you." I believe that these facts will make the reason clear: Like any home owner, we pay taxes and do not receive them.

I should like to point out, too, that I criticize unfair taxation on homes not only because they are a burden upon the home owner, but because I believe they are equally a threat to the stability of local government. The home owner feels the effects immediately, but the taxing authority will suffer in the end just as sure as the sun rises and sets. Eventually, declining home values, curtailment of new construction, increasing vacancies, and many other familiar signs of a decaying real-estate market will become a burden instead of a source of revenue to the city. And unless many cities adopt constructive, reasonable tax programs, their policy of oppression will lead to inevitable bankruptcy. This sort of talk is not popular with many tax officials, but it is said solely to be helpful and in the interest of local and national security.

All too often property taxation is a relic of an earlier day more than it is a calculated financial process which is designed through careful planning to achieve the maximum benefits. Also, the tax rate is determined more by the pressure of expediency than as a factor to build a sound foundation for future community growth. But to command respect and to be effective, government must do more than direct our life by rule and regulation; instead, it must apply to itself those reforms and changes which are necessary to keep abreast of changing times. Specifically, I may suggest modernization of tax programs along the following lines:

1. Establishment of a fair ratio between the tax burden and the income return.

2. Provision of reasonable tax-servicing facilities.

3. Reasonable exemption for low-cost homes.

One of the most pronounced developments in the field of housing during the past decade has been the sharpening of the objective. In the twenties, new construction was more or less aimless and homes were constructed mainly because they could be sold. For the most part, demand was molded to houses instead of producing housing types which were determined by careful market analysis. The results of this policy are apparent in almost every city today—excessive vacancy of unwanted types, and large, expensive homes which are a drug on the market. Out of this, fortunately, has come a more careful appraising of housing needs and we are now trying to produce what the mass of our people really want—low-cost homes.

Thus far the concept of low-cost housing has been limited to the initial outlays for construction. However, to be complete, low cost must also embrace the ensuing operating costs of ownership. Indeed it is much more important to determine that the $3,000 to $5,000 house can be paid for and maintained than whether or not it can be produced. Already, many improvements in financial arrangement have been effected which will materially aid the liquidation of debt. For the most part, fair and equitable rates of interest have been established and the monthly payment for financing has been made to conform with the borrower's income. Unfortunately, comparable progress has not been made in many legal arrangements which affect home ownership and financing. The title search pays tribute to legal tradition more than it serves as a facility of sale; foreclosure costs and delays are a source of risk to both borrower and lender; and the tax structure is geared more to meet the financial needs of the taxing authorities than it represents the capacity of home owners to pay.

I am not ready to declare finally that all homes below an established minimum cost should be totally tax exempt, but I do think that the question is deserving of our most serious thought. In many respects, the issue is comparable to the application of a sales tax on such recognized necessities as bread, milk, and butter. Likewise, minimum shelter accommodations is equally necessary and much can be said in favor of a public policy which would lend every possible encouragement to low-cost housing. On the other hand, there is real merit in the argument that limited and reasonable taxation on these homes might well serve as an incentive of interest in local government. Probably no flat generalization on this subject is warranted but one cannot escape the correlation between the results of H. O. L. C. operation and the tax burden.

Whether it be pur coincidence or a condition of fundamental causal relationship, it is a fact that we have had a smaller percentage of foreclosures in those areas where taxes were either exempted or established at more reasonable levels. For example, the foreclosures in Florida amount to approximately 9.3 percent of the original loans made in that State; in New Jersey, where prohibitive tax schedules are frequently found, the percentage is 35.3. Again, Georgia, which has partial tax exemption, has a percentage of 11.8, while a comparatively high-rate State like New York has 37.5 percent. I would be the first to recognize that many other factors, such as business conditions, population trends, costs of construction, etc., would undoubtedly have a direct bearing upon these results, but, at the same time, it is also possible that the tax rate may have exercised serious "termite" influence upon the self-same factors.

It is difficult to determine the ideal tax rate, but certainly it may be said that taxes should be scrutinized and studied just as much as the charge for interest. Indeed, it would appear that we have reached a point where further pruning of the interest rate may be detrimental to the best interests of home ownership. In many areas the cost of funds to the home owner has been cut in half but taxes seem to go merrily upward in a spiral irrespective of supporting values. In the Home Owners' Loan Corporation portfolio, there are many loans in some States where the monthly tax accrual exceeds the total installment for both interest and principal. Obviously, there is little incentive under these conditions to liquidate the financial indebtedness because the home owner will still be left with an intolerable burden.

For the country as a whole, annual taxes represent about 2.7 percent of the amount of original loans made. Keep in mind that these loans were made on a formula which permitted them to be equal to 80 percent of an average of current market, cost of repro-

duction less depreciation, and the capitalization of the average rentals for the preceding 10-year period. As a result, our original loans often exceeded market value and were generous, to say the least. To show the range of tax burden in relation to the amount of original loans, the following table is of interest:

Ratio average annual tax to average original loan

Percent:	Number of States
0 to 0.9	1
1 to 1.9	15
2 to 2.9	13
3 to 3.9	12
4 to 4.9	7
5 to 5.9	1
Total	49

Another way of measuring the tax burden upon home owners is to compare it with the interest charge—that is, the cost of capital. As you know, home-financing institutions are increasingly arranging for the monthly collection of taxes so as to avoid the hazards of a lump-sum annual payment. In the case of H. O. L. C. more than 390,000 accounts have been set up on this basis. An analysis of these accounts shows the following relationship between the monthly tax accrual and the monthly interest charge:

Ratio of tax and insurance monthly installment to interest installment

Percent:	Number of States
20 to 39	6
40 to 59	5
60 to 79	10
80 to 99	18
100 to 119	7
120 to 139	1
140 to 159	2
Total	49

Such statistics as the foregoing reflect clearly the significance of taxes as a cost of home ownership. However, in taking steps to secure better balance in the distribution of these costs, our opposition must be constructive and helpful. Cities are burdened with operating and financial costs which must be met and their dependence upon property taxation as a source of revenue is generally recognized. Therefore in suggesting revision of existing tax structures we must do so with full recognition of the rights and responsibilities of both sides. There must be careful marshaling of the pertinent facts and it must be recognized that the time interval required for adjustment may call for patience and understanding.

The second proposal has to do with the establishment of a fair ratio between the tax burden and the income return. One of the most widely accepted principles of taxation is the ability to pay—and certainly such ability is determined more by income than it is by the incidence of ownership. In earlier days there was often a measure of justification for a direct tax on the property because appreciation of values was normally anticipated and because at that time tangible property was a more reliable index of wealth. Today, however, there is less likelihood of any continued and major advance in property values, and especially in the case of homes. Moreover, such a basic item of necessity as a home should not be a trading medium for purposes of speculation, and, in the long run, it is not good business to sell homes on the basis of a possible increase in values. Frankly, we need to sell homes for what they are—long-time consumption goods which normally depreciate and must eventually be replaced.

It may be contended that the consonance between property values and the income return should cause little difference as to which base is used for purposes of taxation. Undoubtedly, there is much truth in this principle as it relates to market values, but, unfortunately, there has been a failure to adjust assessed values to reflect the pronouncements of the real-estate market. It is not easy to assemble mass statistics to measure the extent of the discrepancy, but I have seen innumerable cases where the assessed value exceeds many times the current appraisal of a property. One case comes to mind of a property which was appraised at approximately $5,700, but its tax value was $20,500. Upon application for relief the assessed value was generously dropped to $19,500, only to be restored to $20,500 the following year.

To give evidence on a wider scale, the following facts about the tax factor in the management of H. O. L. C. properties are offered:

State of New York: 145 single-family properties—taxes were equal to 33.1 percent of the gross rental; 224 multiple-family properties—taxes were equal to 23.5 percent of the gross rental.

State of New Jersey: 57 single-family properties—taxes were equal to 31.7 percent of the gross rental; 57 multiple-family properties—taxes were equal to 30 percent of the gross rental.

Such consolidation of results means that many properties had a tax ratio well in excess of the average, while others, of course, must have been less than the average. In the 2 States combined, 15 properties showed a ratio of taxes to gross rental in excess of 50 percent, and 40 properties ranged from 40 to 50 percent.

Turning briefly to other geographical areas where the H. O. L. C. had sufficient concentration of holdings to warrant reasonable general observation, the following data covering single- and multiple-family properties in Chicago and Kansas City are presented:

Chicago: An analysis of 76 properties shows the ratio of taxes to gross rental of 20.5 percent, ranging from 16.1 percent in the west zone to 25.5 percent in the north zone.

Kansas City, Mo.: An analysis of 54 properties shows that taxes were equal to 26.4 percent of the gross rental income.

In many fields of business enterprise it is frequently regarded as startling news when the taxes equal or exceed the return upon investment. In comparison, real estate is being crucified upon a cross of taxes. Fortunate indeed is the management which can show any return at all upon real estate, and especially if allowance is made for all overhead, including depreciation and the cost of capital. Under the circumstances it is little wonder that many financial institutions make it a policy to dispose of real-estate holdings as rapidly as possible. In turn, such rapid liquidation precipitates a depreciation of values which is more or less continuing in character until the liquidation program is completed. One of the weakest elements in the whole real-estate market today has been the inability to clean up the enormous real-estate overhang which has existed from the early thirties.

It is because of such conditions as the foregoing that I offer the second suggestion for tax reform, namely, that the tax rate should be established on the basis of income instead of being levied on the basis of an assessed value which is usually obsolete. In an earlier period little harm was done because it was common practice to establish a tax value which was usually less than the market value. Today the opposite relationship is not uncommon, and properties are being taxed with little regard for their current position.

Probably the chief cause of resistance against the use of income as a base for property taxation is the fact that in this country the valuation approach has been established by long tradition. However, such a reason represents an interesting bit of archeology, but it is sadly deficient as a premise of economic activity. In the latter, income is a primary determinant of success or failure, and this applies to the field of real estate as well as it does to manufacturing companies, public utilities, and the many other categories of business enterprise. In brief, the present system of property taxation too often fails to distinguish between the dead and the living.

Obsolescent properties are not given a reasonable chance of recovery because the prohibitive tax load acts as a taboo on needed reconditioning and seriously undermines any opportunity for a reasonable return upon investment.

Not only does the use of rental income as a basis for taxation make it possible to give a better deal to property owners but, in addition, it offers many advantages to taxing authorities. The appraisal of property is a costly operation and wide differences of opinion of valuation indicate the possible inequities under the present system of establishing a tax base. In contrast, the task of computing rental income is simple and there is surprising uniformity of results. Of course many city and State officials would say that the pressure of debt and the need for operating revenue would make it exceedingly hazardous to change the basis of property taxation at this time, but this response is not satisfying because it is neither constructive nor based upon the development of a sound future position.

Finally, to keep pace with these changing times, taxing authorities should consider carefully the need for adequate and well-organized servicing facilities. Foreclosure, once recognized as a positive remedy of tax and loan delinquency, is now being viewed in its true perspective—a tragic burden on the home owners and a form of pyrrhic rescue to cities and mortgagees. It is true that there will always be some need for this drastic remedy but we need to achieve a condition where it may be said that foreclosure was at least not the result of failure to service loans properly. Only by a comprehensive servicing arrangement can consideration be given to other alternatives of relief.

To bring the present tax picture into focus, it may be observed that all too often taxes are "received" more than they are "collected." Collection implies the exercise of due care and responsibility on the part of the taxing authority, while the act of receiving places the burden primarily upon the taxpayer, with the taxing authority playing a relatively passive role. What is needed is aggressive and organized servicing: Prompt and regular billing of taxes due; provision for installment payments where necessary; and studied revision of excessive penalties which discourage the regaining of a current status once the taxpayer is in arrears. All this costs money now, but it will save money in the end.

There can be little doubt that in the future the total tax burden will be greater than ever before in our history. The inevitable quality of this outlook means that little is to be gained by irrational complaint or giving vent to more popular "griping." However, the size of the tax load does make it imperative that it be distributed fairly and with due consciousness of the ultimate results. It is from this balanced point of view that I believe taxing authorities should lend a sympathetic ear to the cries of distress on account of property taxation. Large areas today are being blighted not simply because of deteriorating neighborhood encroachment but also because of the tax burden, which any sensible person will avoid whenever the opportunity presents itself. Also at stake is the security of individual families, cities, and our whole governmental structure. May heed be paid to the latent and existent dangers before it is too late.

H. R. 2794

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

STATEMENT AND REPORT ON BILL TO APPOINT SONS OF DECEASED VETERANS TO MILITARY AND NAVAL ACADEMIES

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am taking advantage of my unanimous consent to include in my extension of remarks an explanatory statement of H. R. 2794 and its companion bill in the Senate, S. 658.

I also include the report of the Senate bill which passed that body and is now over here for disposition.

The statement and report follow:

H. R. 2794—EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

[A bill authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy of sons of soldiers, sailors, and marines who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received or disease contracted in line of duty during the World War]

The act of June 8, 1926, which this bill amends, increased the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and number of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy by 40 at each institution and provided that appointments to fill the vacancies created by the act should be made by the President from among the sons of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines who were killed in action or died piror to July 2, 1921, of wounds or injuries received or disease contracted in line of duty during the World War.

The appointment under this act corresponds to those made by the President from among enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and National Guard. They in no way affect congressional appointments or those made upon recommendations of Senators and Representatives.

The youngest of the possible beneficiaries of the act of June 8, 1926, was born in December 1921 and has now passed his nineteenth birthday. After 1941 he will be too old to enter the Naval Academy, and after 1943 too old to enter the Military Academy. This act, unless amended, will thus expire by its own limitation in 1943.

The purpose of the act of June 8, 1926, was to provide educational and professional opportunities for a limited number of sons of those who sacrificed their lives for the country in the World War. The increase in the authorized number of cadets and midshipmen was incidental to this primary purpose.

The limiting date, July 2, 1921, specified in the act, is more or less arbitrary. The son of a veteran who has died since that date of a service-connected disability is just as much entitled to assistance as one of a veteran who died prior to that date and after his discharge from the military or naval service. This was realized at the time the act was passed, but it was felt that some limit should be placed upon the number made eligible for these comparatively few appointments. This was accomplished by confining the appointments to sons of those who were killed or died during the legal period of the World War.

The number of eligibles, originally more than 6,000, is now 594 for appointment to the Military Academy and 57 for appointment to the Naval Academy. Next year, all will be too old to enter the Naval Academy, while the number still eligible for the Military Academy will be only 201.

This bill (H. R. 2794) extends the provisions of the act of June 8, 1926, to include the sons of those who have died since July 2, 1921, or may hereafter die, of a World War service-connected disability, or, to use the language of the bill, "of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, or preexisting disease or injury aggravated, in line of duty during the World War."

The records of the Veterans' Administration show that there were on December 31, 1939, 19,639 sons of veterans who have died since the World War of service-connected disabilities. These boys range in age from infancy to 21. The number rendered eligible under this bill who will desire to take the examination, in any one year, for appointment at the Military and Naval Academy is, of course, problematic, but, judging from the experience with the examinations under the original act, it is believed that it will not be so great as to render the administration of the act impracticable or burdensome.

[Act of June 8, 1926 (44 Stat. 704; U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1091a and title 34, sec. 1036a)]

The number of cadets authorized by law prior to June 8, 1926, at the United States Military Academy, and the number of midshipmen authorized by law prior to June 8, 1926, at the United States Naval Academy, are each hereby increased by 40 from the United States at large, to be appointed by the President from among the sons of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States who were killed in action or died prior to July 2, 1921, of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted in line of duty during the World War: *Provided*, That one-half shall be appointed from among the sons of officers and one-half from among the sons of warrant officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

PROPOSED CHANGE

That the number of cadets now authorized by law at the United States Military Academy, and the number of midshipmen now authorized by law at the United States Naval Academy, are each hereby increased by 40 from the United States at large, to be appointed by the President from among the sons of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States, including members of the Army Nurse Corps (female) and Navy Nurse Corps (female) employed in the active service by the War Department or Navy Department, who were killed in action or have died, or may hereafter die, of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, or preexisting injury or disease aggravated, in line of duty during the World War: *Provided*, That the determination of the Veterans' Administration as to the cause of death shall be final and conclusive and shall be binding upon the Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy, respectively.

The act of 1926 authorized 40 additional cadetships for the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy to be appointed by the President from among the sons of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States who were killed in action or died prior to July 2, 1921, of wounds, or injuries received, or disease contracted in line of duty during the World War; 20 to be appointed from among the sons of officers and 20 from among the sons of warrant officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

The proposed changes in the act of June 8, 1926, remove the limiting date of July 2, 1921, when World War officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines shall have been killed in action or died of wounds, injuries, or disease, and make the law applicable to those who were killed in action or have died and may hereafter die. It also includes sons of members of the Army Nurse Corps (female), and Navy Nurse Corps (female) employed in the active service by the War Department or Navy Department. Further change is a provision that the determination of the Veterans' Administration as to the cause of death shall be final and conclusive and shall be binding upon the Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy.

The War Department estimates that the additional cost to the Government would be $25,290. This figure covers 24 cadets at $1,053.75. During the past 5 years an average of 16 cadets only were appointed under the act of June 8, 1926.

The Navy Department estimates that the additional cost to the Government would be (year 1942), 37 cadets, $65,305.

Heretofore both the War and Navy Departments have recommended against such legislation, principally due to the difficulties involved in determining eligibility of candidates for appointment under conditions imposed in the act of June 8, 1926, but since the Veterans' Administration must determine the cause of death, the Departments favor the enactment of this measure.

War Department report follows:

REPORT TO ACCOMPANY S. 658

The Senate Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 658) authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy of sons of soldiers, sailors, and marines who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received or disease contracted in line of duty during the World War, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with recommendation that it do pass.

This bill is designed to amend the second paragraph of the act of June 8, 1926. The language in the act and the proposed change are shown below:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 15, 1941.

Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SHEPPARD: The War Department favors the enactment of S. 658, a bill authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy of sons of soldiers, sailors, and marines who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received or disease contracted in line of duty during the World War.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to amend the act of June 8, 1926 (44 Stat. 704). Briefly stated, that act increased by 40 the authorized number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, and provided that such additional appointments be made from among the sons of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines, who were killed in action or died prior to July 2, 1921, of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted in line of duty during the World War. In view of the limiting date, July 2, 1921, prior to which the fathers of eligible candidates must have died, coupled with the statutory age of 22 years for admission to West Point, this source of appointment will lapse in 1943. The effect of S. 658, if enacted, would be to continue to provide vacancies

for eligible among the sons each year to fill the 40 cadetships provided by the act of June 8, 1926. Thus a source of appointment would remain open to these young men which otherwise would fall within the next 2 years.

The War Department has previously recommended against the enactment of several bills designed to continue these 40 vacancies beyond 1943 because of the administrative difficulties involved. Although certain provisions of S. 658 were embodied in varying degrees in previous bills, the present measure contains a proviso, which would remove much of the administrative difficulty heretofore stressed by the Department as an objectionable feature. This provision reads as follows:

"That the determination of the Veterans' Administration as to the cause of death shall be final and conclusive and shall be binding upon the Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy, respectively."

During the past 5 years there has been in attendance at the Military Academy an average of 16 cadets appointed under the act of June 8, 1926. In the event of the enactment of S. 658, it is believed that under its broad mandatory provisions all of the remaining 24 vacancies would be filled annually for a number of years by appointments from sons of deceased veterans and nurses. The estimated additional cost to the Government for these 24 cadets would be $25,290 per annum (24 times $1,053.75).

The War Department has always been in accord with the purpose of proposed legislation whereby the dependents of World War veterans might continue to share in the benefits provided by the original act. As S. 658 specifically provides that the determination of the Veterans' Administration as to the cause of death shall be final and conclusive, thereby greatly simplifying the War Department's administrative processes in considering the eligibility of candidates for these particular appointments, it is recommended that this bill receive favorable consideration.

The foregoing sets forth the views of the War Department only. The proposed legislation pertains also to the Navy Department.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

Navy Department report follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, March 19, 1941.

The CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE
ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Further reference is made to your letter of February 4, 1941, in which you request the views of the Navy Department in connection with the bill (S. 658) athorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy of sons of soldiers, sailors, and marines who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received or disease contracted in line of duty during the World War.

The general purpose of this bill is as stated in its title.

The act of June 8, 1926 (44 Stat. 704; U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1091a and title 34, sec. 1036a), increased by 40 the number of cadets and midshipmen authorized by law at the Military Academy and the Naval Academy, respectively, to be appointed from among the sons of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines who were killed in action or who died as a result of wounds or injuries received or disease contracted in line of duty prior to the official termination of the World War on July 2, 1921.

The bill S. 658 would, among other things, remove the prohibition against appointment of sons of veterans who died subsequent to July 2, 1921, extend the category of those whose sons are qualified for appointment under the act of June 8, 1926, to include members of the Army Nurse Corps and the Navy Nurse Corps, and provide that the determination by the Veterans' Administration as to cause of death shall be final and conclusive in determining eligibility of candidates for appointment.

The Navy Department has heretofore recommended against proposed legislation of this character due, principally, to the difficulties that would necessarily be involved in determining the eligibility of candidates for appointment under the conditions imposed by the legislation under consideration at the time. This ground for objection to legislation of this nature has been removed by the inclusion in the bill S. 658 of the provision with respect to the determination by the Veterans' Administration as to the cause of death.

In view of the above, the Navy Department interposes no objection to enactment of the proposed legislation.

The estimated additional cost to the Government for the ensuing 4 years which would result from the enactment of this bill is as follows:

Cost for 1942: 37 average number of additional midshipmen, $65,305.

Cost for 1943: 37 average number of additional midshipmen, $65,305.

Cost for 1944: 38 average number of additional midshipmen, $67,070.

Cost for 1945: 38 average number of additional midshipmen, $67,070.

This estimate is based upon the assumption that all 40 appointments will be filled during the calendar year 1941.

The Navy Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) JAMES FORRESTAL, *Acting.*

Embattled Farmers Fight for Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, while the battle for rural electrification goes on, the interference of the private power interests continues.

I should like to direct the attention of the Members to a situation within 40 miles of this Capitol, where a private utility is making a desperate effort to maintain an ancient monopoly to the detriment of the farmers of two counties.

More than 20 years ago, the Legislature of Maryland granted to the Potomac Edison Co., a subsidiary of the American Water Works Co., a franchise so broad in language as to embrace virtually the entire State. Since that time a public service commission has been created, and certain laws and regulations have been promulgated. Yet this company still insists on the principle that its monopoly still holds good, and that it has the exclusive right to determine whether the farmers in the northern part of Maryland shall or shall not receive electric service. Though this company has for years, and in spite of repeated requests, refused to grant service to thousands of farm homes except at exorbitant rates, it nevertheless contends in effect that no other company or agency has the right to serve within its area. That is a fair sample of the attitude of this ruthless power monopoly throughout the whole country.

The farmers of Frederick and Carroll Counties in the northern part of Maryland have made many efforts to get power. At a recent hearing before the Public Service Commission in Baltimore, they rose to their feet, one by one, and told of their efforts. They have petitioned individually and in groups, yet the power company was not interested. Farmers calling at the company's office were turned away with little or no information. Company representatives agreed to meet with groups of farmers, and then failed to show up. When compelled to quote rates, the company insisted that the farmers pay hundreds of dollars for construction of lines, which would belong to the company thereafter, and in addition agree to pay monthly minimum bills of $8 and $10.

As a result, even today, within 40 miles of our Nation's Capital, there are thousands of farm homes dependent upon kerosene lamps, hand-pumped water, and the farming methods of 50 or 75 years ago.

Last June these farmers at last found some hope of service. A cooperative association financed through the Rural Electrification Administration was organized in Adams County, Pa., just across the border. The farmers of Adams and several neighboring counties were going to have electricity at rates they could afford to pay. Immediately, the Frederick and Carroll County farmers asked the newly formed Adams Electric Cooperative to bring power to them across the State border into Maryland, and the Pennsylvania cooperative agreed.

Within a few weeks hundreds of Frederick and Carroll County farmers were signing applications for service. But suddenly the Potomac Edison Co., after 20 years of slumber, woke up.

No sooner had solicitors for the cooperative passed down a road than they were followed by power company employees. Within 24 hours the power company had 50 men in this area which it had neglected before. Within 48 hours carloads of poles and hardware were being dropped along the country roads.

Potomac Edison employees told newly signed members of the cooperative that they could never build their own lines. They told them that these cooperative lines would be weak and fall down in every storm. They told them that each consumer would be assessed heavily for any such damage. All of these things, of course, were completely false, the same old "fifth column" technique the Power

Trust has practiced to thwart rural electrification all over the country.

Their line-building crews came in and worked day and night. They built lines where they had few signed customers, or where they had no signed customers at all, and where there were not even any potential customers. These were spite lines intended solely to prevent the cooperative from constructing any lines of its own.

What happened to rates? Potomac Edison solicitors were apparently given full authority to set their own rates as they canvassed. Some farmers were offered minimums of $2.75; others as high as $6 and $7. The solicitors worked from early in the morning until midnight.

The farmers were not discouraged. They saw clearly that the actions of the company were unjust and probably illegal, and as free citizens of a free State they simply did not believe the company could get away with it. Harry Slattery, Administrator of R. E. A., reassured them by allotting $150,000 for construction of rural power lines in Frederick and Carroll Counties.

Through their attorney these farmers appealed to the Public Service Commission of Maryland to stop the Potomac Edison's construction of spite lines. Their appeal was well taken and well reasoned. As a cooperative they had no legal right to build any lines of their own until they had received authorization from the Public Service Commission. Yet the private utility company claimed the right to build wherever it chose, not to serve the public but to protect its monopoly.

For several hours the farmers presented detailed evidence. Yet at the end of the hearing the acting chairman of the commission stated simply that the commission's engineer had talked with representatives of the Potomac Edison and had reported that the company was complying with all rules and regulations. The acting chairman told the farmers that they had no rights, using those exact words. The commission then flatly refused to restrain the company in any way.

Working now against time, because new spite lines were going up every day, the farmers asked for permits from the roads boards of the two counties. Usually this is a mere technicality. The roads boards are charged solely with maintaining safety along the highways and with ascertaining that each new structure proposed constitutes no menace to safety. Such permits are granted to power companies and R. E. A. cooperatives quickly and as a matter of course.

But when the farmers went to the roads boards of Frederick and Carroll Counties in the free State of Maryland, there began one of the most astonishing performances by elected public officials that has ever come to my attention.

For weeks the roads boards did nothing at all; refused to take any action and refused to state any grounds for their delay, while the Potomac Edison Co. kept on building spite lines. The farmers replied by writing letters, attending meetings of the roads boards, and applying pressure in other ways. The attorney for the Carroll County Roads Board at last informed the cooperative attorney that the permit would be granted within a few days. Yet even this was only a way of gaining time for the power company. The permit never was granted. In Frederick County the attorney for that board explained the board's delay on nothing more complicated than his own absolute ignorance of the laws under which the board operated, and raised a number of legal questions so ridiculous that they would be laughed out of any court in the land.

Finally the Carroll County board wrote a letter to the cooperative. It stated that the board was going to give the power company 90 days in which to build all the lines it chose. At the end of that time the cooperative might possibly be granted a permit.

Thus for the past 3 months public officials of two counties have conspired with a private utility company to protect its monopoly. They have abdicated their duties to those who elected them.

The farmers, officials of the cooperative, and representatives of R. E. A. have stated repeatedly that their sole interest is in making sure that every farmer who wants service can get it. The R. E. A. has offered to withdraw from the area if the power company would only agree to serve every farmer that the cooperative would serve. But, with unusual frankness, officials of the power company have said that they are only interested in wrecking the cooperative and that they have no intention of serving every farmer in the two counties.

During the session of the Maryland Legislature a remedy was sought, a remedy too late to help the particular group in Frederick and Carroll Counties, but which would prevent similar situations in the future. Working with representatives of two existing Maryland cooperatives, 27 members of the house of delegates, including the speaker, introduced a version of the R. E. A. model act. This act includes what is known as a preemption clause. Under this clause a group of farmers, on signing up 50 percent or more of the unserved farmers in a given area and notifying the public service commission, are granted protection against any construction by private utilities in the area for 6 months and for an additional 12 months if the R. E. A. grants them a loan.

Then began a bitter fight to kill the bill without letting it come to a vote, for the demand of farmers in Maryland for power is such that few members of either house would dare to oppose such a measure publicly.

With the session nearing its close, the bill was delayed on the request of the utility lobby and hearings were postponed three times. Finally it came out of committee with a favorable report and passed its second reading. Late one night after the farmers and their representatives had gone home, Mr. John White, the floor leader, made a surprise motion to recommit the bill to committee. The farmers' friends went into action and administered to Mr. White what the Baltimore Sun called the worst defeat he has ever experienced. He withdrew his motion before it could come to a vote and the bill passed its third reading in the house. Between the house and the senate the bill was mysteriously lost and there was more delay until angry proponents of the measure compelled the opposition to find it. The senate committee delayed hearings and finally held one in the closing minutes of the session. Making a last-ditch stand, the opposition introduced 15 amendments to the bill which, if accepted, would have destroyed it. The senate committee accepted them, word for word.

With only 15 minutes remaining before the senate vote, the cooperatives' attorneys analyzed the amendments and found they could accept 12 of them safely. They prepared to fight on the other 3. After a bitter battle on the senate floor, the 3 destructive amendments were voted down and the measure passed the senate. So the bill is now awaiting the signature of the Governor and, though he has not signed it during the past 16 days, he has promised to do so.

But the farmers of Frederick and Carroll Counties who cannot be helped by this legislation because it comes too late, are making a last desperate stand to obtain electricity over their own lines. They are now pleading their case before the Public Service Commission in Baltimore, asking for a certificate of convenience and necessity which they must have in order to proceed.

The Potomac Edison has blanketed the entire area with lines. They have built more miles of line in the cooperative's territory in the last 5 months than they have built over their entire system in the last 5 years, but witness after witness has testified to the Public Service Commission that he signed with the cooperative first, and that even though the power company lines pass his very door, he has signed no contract with them and will sign none until the cooperative is actually dead. Witness after witness has testified that there are miles of power company line with no signed customers. Witness after witness has testified that the power company has not even asked for a service contract but merely for an easement enabling the power company to build the lines across his land.

The Public Service Commission of Maryland is known to be hostile. It has refused twice to assure the equality of the contesting parties by prohibiting further construction by Potomac Edison pending the outcome of the hearings, but the evidence is piling up. There could be little question as to the commission's action were it not for the fact that the power company lines have been built even though they are not serving the people the cooperative proposed to serve.

These two battles fought by the members of the Adams Electric Cooperative—one in Maryland and the other in Pennsylvania—are but illustrations of one startling truth: That a large number of private utilities have chosen this moment to renew their attacks on the R. E. A., that at this time when all good citizens are concerned primarily with matters of national defense, a large group of private utilities has resumed a campaign of de-

fense of their self-arrogated monopolies. They are once again raising the old battle cry, "we and we alone shall decide if farmers shall have electricity, and if we choose not to serve them, they shall not be served."

The people of Maryland and Pennsylvania ought to have the lowest electric rates in the world, and every farmer in those two States ought to enjoy the most abundant use of electric energy. Yet, last year, 1940, the people of Maryland were overcharged $14,747,000 for their electricity, and the people of Pennsylvania were overcharged $81,243,000, and the farmers in those States are having the battle of their lives to get any electricity at all.

The following article which appeared in Friday Magazine of April 25, 1941, is characteristic of the struggle the embattled farmers of America are now making, in order to secure electric service that has been so long denied them:

POWER COMPANIES HIDE THEIR LIGHT—FORGOTTEN FARMERS UPROOT TRANSMISSION LINES

Two-year-old Sonny Kann has never seen an electric light. When his mother, Mrs. Edwin Kann, of Shippensburg, Pa., makes his supper, she does it under the sputtering glow of an oil lamp. His dairy-farming father does chores by lantern, and if oil happens to run low they use candles. There is electric-line service only 500 yards away, but the Kanns would have to guarantee to pay $18 a month to get it. Private power trusts don't like to go even a few steps off the beaten track except for large fees. This situation led to the January 30 "post-hole battle," a farmer-utility fight that is still raging.

The Kanns are well-to-do, hard-working, native American stock, like their neighbors in rich, fertile Franklin and Cumberland Counties. The oil lamp is as much out of place in their modern home as horses would be pulling a 16-cylinder car. They have installed the latest type of plumbing, enjoy steam heat, and even have a telephone. But their radio is battery operated and a gasoline put-put motor drives their washing machine. This is because the Kanns, like 5,400,000 others, are skimmed milk to power trusts that want only cream.

Utility companies don't actually refuse service to the farmers. They simply make the cost prohibitive. They expect the farmers to pay all installation costs, furnish the poles and help set them, and then pay a hefty minimum every month. Farmers can hardly hope to clear much over their living expenses in an average year, and even with good crops they can expect to net no more than $500 for a year's work. So they can't afford the turn-on-the-switch luxury that is a commonplace in city homes. Some rig up their own little power plants, some plug along with the old oil and hope for a change.

Robust, red-cheeked Glen Mains, Jr., finished winter courses at Pennsylvania State College and set up dairy farming on his own. His biggest problem was lack of electricity. Pennsylvania Power & Light, utility serving his area, demanded a $12-a-month guarantee. Mains stayed on the candle circuit but began a check into Federal Rural Electrification Administration long-term loans to farm cooperatives. His check-up started a campaign that has already brought one hot farmer-utility clash in January and is now becoming a national issue.

Over in nearby Adams County, fruit growers were solving the electric-power problem. They formed the Adams Electricity Coop., Inc., borrowed $308,000 from the R. E. A., hired engineers and contractors, and prepared to serve themselves. They would own their own company; pay a $2.75 minimum a month. "That's what we need, too," said Mains.

Mains' neighbors agreed. Co-op fever spread like measles among local farmers, who realized more members meant lower rates. The Pennsylvania Power & Light got busy, too. Its agents visited farmers day and night, predicting the co-op would fold up. Minimum rates dropped like snowflakes. The power company bid for rights-of-way. Mrs. Fanny Horne sold hers. "They told me you had signed," Mrs. Horne explains to J. D. McCulloch, a farm neighbor. Deception had been used to get signatures, many charged. But McCulloch, son of Revolutionary stock, hadn't been fooled. He was one of two stubborn men, as they're now known throughout the countryside, who held out firmly. Their offer of a $50 bribe made him mad.

The other stubborn man was R. Boyd McCullough. Because these two refused rights-of-way, the P. P. & L. was forced to have bonds approved at county court before waiting crews could rush lines to areas mapped out for co-op planned service. During that delay the co-op filed a map with the public utility commission, preempting the territory where it had signed up a majority of potential consumers. Pennsylvania State law bans utilities from such construction, but P. P. & L. went right ahead.

As utility crews raced to put up poles in co-op territory, farmers took counsel with Attorney Daniel E. Teeter. "What'll we do if they put up poles in preempted territory?" they asked him. "The State law says that once the co-op has filed its map, the utility can't go in," Teeter told them. "If the crews start work, defend your property." The farmers hurried to the Big Spring area, a 4-mile stretch where activities centered, and got ready to block the lines that night.

Historic Big Spring mill was farmers' headquarters on January 30. "Don't let them dig a hole" was the watchword. But while landowners assembled with shovels, one gang of power company workers concentrated on the North Newton Township highway near J. D. McCulloch's property, and another worked near R. Boyd McCullough's land in West Pennsboro Township. Traffic, mostly utility cars, whizzed along usually deserted roads. Hundreds of utility men were at work. Farmers followed the company workers and shoveled dirt into holes as fast as they were dug. Sheriff Ira Dunlap came in to arrange a truce.

During the truce farmers warmed up inside the mill, talked about the co-op's rights and the utility's wrongs. "After refusing to serve us except at the highest rates, they're trying to put up spite lines, now that we're ready to serve ourselves," they said as they munched apples. They found out while talking that nearly all of them had just lately been offered a $2.75 minimum, same as the co-op's, now that the P. P. & L. saw that the farmers meant business. "But that's just a trick," they warned each other. "If we fall for that now and give up the co-op, the rates will go right up again. Anyway, we've the right to serve ourselves."

But the truce was one-sided. While farmers stayed inside the mill, the company had its crews continue to dig and set up poles. News came in that somewhere along the highway construction was still going on. Led by Glen Mains, Jr., the landowners poured out and prepared for action. "The Constitution gives us the right to defend our land and serve ourselves," they said. "No company is going to tell us we can't serve ourselves." While patrols set out to find where utilities might be working, the farmers burned up inside, built fires to warm up outside. There was tension in the air, and a spark could have set off a hot battle.

WHERE POWER COMPANY AND FARMERS MET

A few minutes later the co-op members found a crew setting a pole near the property of J. D. McCulloch. They got there too late to fill in the hole, so they did the next best thing. While some pushed utility workers to one side, others grabbed shovels and poured in dirt so loosely that the pole couldn't be planted firmly. P. P. & L. men took the fracas in good part; didn't lose their tempers. "This dirt is sure going to get worn out tonight getting shoveled back and forth," one of them said. The shovel fight lasted until 2 a. m.

That night persons unknown sawed down the pole that had been loosely set through farmers' intervention. D. A. Elias, P. P. & L. vice president, announced the company itself cut it down to avoid danger. Farmers just laugh when you mention it, because it's a serious thing to chop down utility property. But it stands near the 150-year-old farm of J. D. McCulloch, not far from historic Gettysburg, a reminder of the determination of the producers' co-op to fight this case out with the P. P. & L. even if it goes up to the United States Supreme Court. There is a good chance that the case will go that high. Since the January 30 "battle of the post holes," the P. P. & L. has stopped construction in territories preempted on the co-op map, but the struggle has been transferred to the State public utilities commission, where the Power Trust is challenging both Pennsylvania's law authorizing co-op preemption and the Federal law creating the R. E. A. All rural electrification is at stake.

Mrs. Guy Loy already has electricity in her farm home in Cumberland County. Her husband waited as long as he could, then reluctantly signed years ago with the P. P. & L. To get power he had to provide 27 poles, dig 32 holes, and help string the line himself. He figures installation cost him more than $300 and tells with some indignation how he had to struggle to pay the $16.80 which the company demanded for years as a monthly minimum. Recently it has dropped a little. Loy can never change over from the P. P. & L. to the Adams Co-op because the law setting up the R. E. A. forbids Co-ops' taking on private utilities' customers.

In spite of that, Loy is one of the strongest rooters the Co-op has, and he testified on its behalf before the Public Utilities Commission during hearings now pending. Practical farming can't be done successfully and profitably nowadays without power, says Loy, who has a reputation throughout the neighboring counties for knowing what he's talking about. Electric milkers, such as the one Loy's 9-year-old son uses here, mean fewer farm hands. Because the hen house is electrically lighted his hens lay more eggs in winter, when they bring the best price. "It means the difference between being in the black and going to the red," says Loy.

Cumberland's fight with the P. P. & L. is "the most important case ever to come before the Public Utility Commission," according to Commissioner Richard J. Beamish. If the company wins, he warns, every rural Co-op in Pennsylvania would be destroyed. Twelve such co-ops operate in the State now, serving 18,996 consumers. But interest extends beyond State borders. Maryland's Frederick and Carroll County farmers joined the Adams Co-op and are up to their necks in fights with Potomac Edison. Like all of rural America, they look for a co-op victory and a final decision defending producers' rights to use R. E. A. and give themselves electricity.

This battle must go on and will go on until every farm home in America is electrified at rates the farmers can afford to pay.

He that is not with us is against us, and I want to sound a warning now to every

Member of Congress, and to every elected official throughout the United States, that they are going to have to face this issue in the coming campaign.

I again call upon the Securities and Exchange Commission to enforce section 11 of the Holding Company Act, force these vast holding companies to release their grips on local utilities in order that the people's elected representatives may be enabled to see that the people are properly protected in their respective areas.

Let us put a stop to the racketeering of these ruthless utilities, develop the water power of the Nation, supply to the people of the country electricity at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution, and, as I said, electrify every farm home in America at rates people can afford to pay.

Food for Oppressed Peoples

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON, OF COLORADO

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address prepared by transcription to be delivered over a number of radio stations by the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Greetings, radio listeners. As you hear my voice, 37,000,000 innocent people are desperately hungry. As I speak, the women and children and the helpless aged dependents of patriots who a few weeks ago stood by Great Britain's side in a gallant fight for man's right to be free face the horrors of starvation and pestilence.

Trapped between the millstones of the British blockade and the German armies of occupation, the God-fearing people of Belgium, Norway, Holland, Poland, and Finland—the kinfolks of 15,000,000 American citizens—are existing, in this very hour, literally on hope. The hope they cling to so desperately is that the United States of America, the great humanitarian Nation of the world, will hear their plea for food and will prevail upon Britain and Germany to work out an agreement for their relief.

What are we going to do about it? This country has assumed the responsibility of becoming the arsenal of democracy. We are proud to be known as the defenders of democracy and Christian civilization. How can we aid democracy's cause, call ourselves a Christian people, and at the same time callously allow the conquered democratic peoples of continental Europe to starve, without a vigorous protest? How can Great Britain seriously believe that by starving her former friends, and our friends, that she is entitled to our help? The United States is trying to keep the flame of democracy burning in the British Isles and in continental Europe, but that flame must surely go out in the conquered nations if they can only secure food by adopting the Nazi way of life.

America is willing to make great sacrifices for Britain's security, but I do not believe that any of us want to buy Britain's security (if we could buy it that way) at the cost of famine and pestilence and death to millions of our lifelong European friends. Britain cannot be made secure by starving the conquered nations of Europe. In the long run it will mean insecurity for her. If Britain and the United States condemn the peoples of the small democracies to starvation, future generations will shudder to read the pages of that black history. Be not mistaken. Time would reveal not only the immorality and injustice of such inhumanity toward Britain's former helpless Allies who resisted the enemy as long as they were able to do so, but it would reveal also the stupidity of that inhumanity.

These friends of ours and of Great Britain are starving because of the rigors of a blockade aimed against Hitler. However, it is rather generally agreed by military experts that a food blockade is not going to starve out Germany this time. Long before this war began, self-sufficiency had been one of Hitler's military objectives. Self-sufficiency was one way in which he prepared for war. While the democracies were "coasting," the Germans were accumulating food and guns. Realizing they had been beaten down in the last war through the food blockade, they determined that there would be no vital food shortage this time. Many thousands of additional acres of German land were put under cultivation, and a new high level of food productiveness achieved. Enormous food reserves were stored up, and the German population adopted a scientifically planned rations system for conservation purposes. We may not like to think of this phase of the situation, but while continental Europe never has produced enough food to supply Norway, Belgium, Holland, and France, Germany has the food with which to feed her own armies and her own civil populations. Therefore, the blockade, admitted a potent weapon of the war 20 years ago, is not inflicting fatal injury on Germany. Her people are not going to starve. In this war, the sharp edge of the blockade falls upon the victims of aggression, not upon the aggressor. Great Britain's friends, not her enemies, are its victims.

It is obvious that Hitler will not feed conquered nations and let his own armies and his own people starve. That is not his ruthless method. Some contend that if the small nations are left to starve, they will revolt. That is wishful thinking. These people have been disarmed completely. They cannot overpower a machine gun with wooden clubs, nor bring a bomber down with rocks. Well-fed people in this country smugly say, "It is noble to starve for the sake of democracy," but one cannot help wondering how the person who is being starved feels about it when he knows that the democracies aided and abetted his starvation.

It is my opinion that Germany is basically responsible for the plight of the people in the small democracies. These people, however, are daily being told over the German-controlled radio that the blockade imposed by Great Britain, the friend for whom they fought and bled, is responsible for their present hunger. It is useless to argue ideologies with people who suffer famine. They are concerned with empty bellies, not finely spun theories of government. Hunger breeds irrational and savage hates.

When Great Britain achieves victory, as we all want her to, she will need friends in Europe. The rehabilitation of Europe will be made a thousand times more difficult if the small democracies hate her for their mass starvation, as they are certain to do, since they know that Great Britain will not permit food to come in from their colonies and their usual sources of supply. How much better for Great Britain if these friends were still her friends after the war! How much better for the cause for which she fights if her former comrades-at-arms had not been alienated from her.

These are the realities of the situation confronting both Great Britain and ourselves. She cannot avoid her grave responsibility where her helpless hungry former Allies are concerned. Nor can we, as democracy's arsenal—Great Britain's arsenal—avoid our grave responsibility. The products of our munition plants make the blockade effective, and the whole world knows it.

I do not believe any American listening to me wants the people of the small democracies to starve; neither do they want Britain to go down. If I did not believe with all my soul that Great Britain's friends can be fed without helping Hitler, I would not be here urging relief for them. In my opinion, it can be done without a single crumb getting to Hitler and the German people. A workable solution to this problem has been advocated by the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies, of which former President Herbert Hoover is honorary chairman.

This committee has not given up its fight to institute a relief program that will satisfy Great Britain. Millions of thoughtful, responsible Americans share its view that somehow, in some way the problem can, and must be met; and the sooner the better. Hunger cannot wait. The most recent proposal of the committee is that a trial feeding be made in Belgium where the situation is admittedly critical. There babies are dying from malnutrition, children are too weak to go to school, and the daily food ration of the population generally is less than one-third of the amount necessary to maintain physical health. Let a test be made in Belgium. Let us ascertain whether it is possible to feed the hungry without interfering with Great Britain's war effort, and without aiding Germany. Mr. Hoover states (and he is supported by the highest military authorities of the first World War, Gen. John J. Pershing, and Admiral William V. Pratt) that it can be done. Let's find out the truth, and stop these never-ending arguments.

The feeding test proposed for Belgium is that soup kitchens be established for 2,000,000 children and 1,000,000 destitute adults. The food would be eaten at the soup kitchens under the direct supervision of our own representatives. We would not only administer the relief, but we would guard and check imports and native stocks in such manner that no food could be diverted to the Germans; they having already agreed to cooperate in this test. Furthermore, they have agreed to cease taking food from Belgium, and to compensate her for that already pillaged. They have agreed to contribute 25,000 tons of bread grains a month to Belgium from their own stores, and not to bomb mercy food ships as they come through the blockade, one at a time. They have agreed that the whole feeding operation should be under neutral control.

So now, if Great Britain should also agree that the test be made, the hungry children of Belgium will be fed. And if the Belgian soup kitchen plan is successful, then a similar food-relief program can be safely extended to the other famine-stricken democracies, and 37,000,000 hungry people eventually saved from starvation.

If Great Britain were to sanction the Belgian experiment, and Germany were to break her word, as the enemies of the plan suggest, the program would cease instantly. The whole world, including the hungry, would know that full responsibility for their sad plight rested on Germany alone. The idealism of the British cause would be re-

fortified, and America's finest instinct as a humane people would have found expression.

We are told that it is our sacred duty to God and man to save democracy with our arms. I shall not argue that point, but if we must provide guns for democracy's fighting defenders, we should also provide food for democracy's vanquished former defenders. If one is to be done, both should be done; and both will be done, if Britain says the word. I believe Britain will say it. I believe that our great humanitarian President will exercise the unprecedented powers freely conferred upon him by the American people in this world crisis, and raise his voice in behalf of these helpless peoples. I believe that the way will be found whereby we can work hand in hand with our British neighbors to rescue their hungry friends.

America and Britain will then be entitled to pose as the champions of democracy and Christian civilization.

Our Western Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM C. BULLITT

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "Our Western Front," delivered by Hon. William C. Bullitt in behalf of United China relief. The address was delivered at Constitution Hall, Washington, D. C., on April 27, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To speak of the Chinese is to stand before 40 centuries of history facing a people whose civilization was great before Athens existed or Rome was founded: A people who today are as young in courage as they are old in wisdom.

All the bitter roads of battle and starvation that mankind is now traveling have been trod many times by the people of China. However tragic a street of sorrow—the Chinese have been down that street before. They have survived because in physical endurance and intellectual power they are unsurpassed by any people on earth. They have grown wise because long ago out of the sufferings of centuries, they learned to be true to themselves in the face of death, and adopted in their hearts as well as their minds the maxim: "Better a broken jade than a whole tile."

Our own relations with the Chinese have been exceptionally friendly since the day in 1783 when Robert Morris wrote to John Jay: "I am sending some ships to China, in order to encourage others in the adventurous pursuits of commerce." The commerce was profitable, and the adventurers returned with stores of tea, silks, shawls, wallpapers, paintings—and porcelain so exquisite that in our country porcelain became known simply by the name "China."

The Emperor of China of that day, examining certain mechanical inventions brought by traders to exchange for the products of his cultivated empire, commented in a manner that prefigured the destiny of his country until the present century. Through his officials, the Emperor superbly stated:

"Our empire produces all that we ourselves need. Your mechanical toys do not interest us in the least. But since our tea, rhubarb, and silk seem to be necessary to the very existence of the barbarous western peoples, we will, imitating the clemency of Heaven who tolerates all sorts of simpletons on this globe, condescend to allow a limited amount of trading through the port of Canton."

The emperors and the people of China continued to despise the mechanical inventions of the western world and to look down on soldiers. Since a considerable portion of the inventiveness of the western world was devoted to the development of instruments of war, China became less and less equipped to combat foreign aggressors.

It was not until the birth of the Chinese Republic that the Government of China fully faced the fact that China must adopt the techniques of the west or perish. And it was not until 1927 that Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek established the authority of the central government sufficiently firmly to begin large-scale modernization of China's way of life.

The 10 years that followed were years of enormous progress. Industries, railroads, paved roads, schools, colleges, laboratories, hospitals, were constructed with a speed that proved that the people of China had lost none of the qualities that had created their magnificent civilization.

The physical revival of China was accompanied by a moral and spiritual renaissance; a rebirth of patriotism and of the spirit of self-sacrifice, which finally found expression in the new-life movement under the leadership of Generalissimo and Madame Chiang Kai-shek.

China was well on the road to unity and strength—both moral and physical—when Japan struck. Indeed one of the chief reasons why Japan attacked China in 1937 was to stop the progress that China was making. The strength of China was growing so fast that the Japanese, who know that the Chinese are superior to them not only in numbers but also in endurance and intelligence, saw slipping away rapidly their chance to reduce China to the same condition of abject slavery that they had imposed on Korea.

There is an old and true French proverb which runs, "To govern is to foresee." Fortunately for the people of China, their Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek foresaw that the Japanese militarists would not permit him and his colleagues to carry out in peace their program and task of rebuilding China. In the autumn of 1934, when I talked with the generalissimo in Nanking, he predicted not only how Japan would attack and where Japan would attack but also when the Japanese attack would be made, and he explained to me his plan to meet the attack by giving space in order to buy time—a strategy familiar to Americans, since it was the strategy that George Washington employed during our War for Independence.

The generalissimo predicted that he would lose battles, but would win the war. He said that he would establish the capital of China at Chungking, in Szechwan, where he now stands, and that he would never surrender. Like Washington, he has proved himself to be not only a great general but also a great statesman. He has not surrendered. He will not surrender.

The Japanese Army which attacked China was fully equipped with all modern instruments of war—heavy artillery, tanks, and airplanes. The forces of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek had no heavy artillery, no tanks, and only a handful of airplanes. The Japanese were so confident that they would win a few easy victories and that Chinese resistance then would collapse that the Japanese Prime Minister, Prince Konoye, announced, "In 3 months China will be beaten to her knees." The Japanese won victories, but they did not win them easily, and Chinese resistance did not collapse, even though the Chinese had to meet the attacks of airplanes and tanks with nothing but rifles, hand grenades, and stubborn courage.

When the Japanese discovered that although they could win battles they could not end the war, they attempted to break the Chinese spirit of resistance by the infliction of unspeakable atrocities on the civilian population. Men and boys were lined up alive for bayonet practice by the Japanese soldiers. Whole towns and villages were burned and every woman in them raped. Chinese captives—civilians and soldiers alike—were soaked with gasoline and burned alive. Fifty million men, women, and children were driven from their homes. But the spirit of the Chinese remained unbroken.

After nearly 4 years of war that spirit is still unbroken. The Japanese Army has suffered a million casualties and today more than a million Japanese soldiers are bogged down in China, unable to advance to victory, unable to retreat without acknowledging defeat.

The eyes of Americans are turned toward Europe by events so tragic that we are apt to forget that for every man who has died resisting aggression in Europe, 10 have died in China; and that no men have ever risen to greater heights of epic courage than have the Chinese.

By the agreement that Japan signed in Berlin on September 27, 1940, with Germany and Italy, she leagued herself with the totalitarian dictators against us and all other nations that live in freedom. We have not yet been attacked by Germany, Italy, and Japan for one reason and one only—they have not been able to get at us. The British have held the forces of Germany and Italy on the other side of the Atlantic, and the Chinese have kept the Japanese so fully occupied that they have hesitated to add a sea war against the British or ourselves to their land war with China. By draining the energies of Japan, the Chinese have rendered and are rendering today a far greater service to the people of the United States—and of Great Britain—than any service that we have even rendered to them. The Chinese, no less than the British, are fighting battles which are the making of our security.

How long can the Chinese continue to fight our fight unless they receive more help from the United States than they are now receiving? Longer certainly than any other people could under the scourge and burden of like sufferings. But, just as the courage of the Greeks has not availed against the planes and tanks of the Nazis, so, unless greater material aid can be delivered to China, all the courage of the Chinese may not avail.

During the past few months the Japanese have occupied portions of French Indo-China, and have cut the railroad by which the Chinese received a large portion of the supplies they imported from overseas. The Burma Road, which has become the vital Chinese line of supply for instruments of war, can now be bombarded by Japanese aviators. If Japan should be able to occupy Burma, no military supplies from overseas could reach the Chinese armies. Only the long land route to the Soviet Union would remain open, and now the Soviet Union has signed an ominous agreement with Japan. This pact, in effect, gives Soviet assent to Japan's seizure of the Chinese Province of Manchuria, in return for Japan's assent to Soviet seizure of the Chinese Province of Outer Mongolia. No one is so naive as to believe that Japan and the Soviet Union have become friends. But by this agreement, these two countries have at least become brother bandits at the expense of China.

The Chinese believed that because they were fighting the Soviet Union's fight against Japan, they could count on the support of the Soviet Union to the bitter end. Now they have seen Stalin embracing Matsuoka on the platform of the railroad station in Moscow and breaking his promise to respect forever the sovereignty of China over all parts of China. They have seen the Soviet dictator promising Matsuoka that if Japan should become engaged in war—that is to say, in war with the British or ourselves—the Soviet Union would remain neutral. One hope of China has always been that in the end the Soviet Union would give China effective military support against Japan. The Chinese now see this hope in eclipse. Moreover, they are obliged to fear that even the trickle of supplies which now reaches them overland from the Soviet Union may be cut off—if Hitler so orders. For behind Stalin's agreement with Matsuoka lies Stalin's fear of Hitler.

The Soviet pact with Japan is Hitler's gift to the Japanese militarists. Now that Hitler's army and air force are on the Rumanian frontier of the Soviet Union, ready and able to cut Stalin off from the wheat of the Ukraine and the oil of the Caucasus, the Soviet dictator, cringing in his Kremlin, takes orders from the dictator in Berlin. And Hitler wants Japan to feel free from all danger of attack by the Soviet Union because he hopes that the Japanese militarists, feeling their flank protected, will, beguiled by his agents, dare at last to assault the British and Dutch possessions in the East and became involved in war with the British Empire and the United States.

Some Americans, with the same perverted view of human nature that made them consider Mussolini a great lover of peace and the hope of Europe, have recently been dreaming of Stalin as the great defender of the democracies against Japan and Germany, and have been trying to seduce him into an affectionate embrace. But Stalin has preferred to embrace Matsuoka. The Soviet pact with Japan will bring some gain if it makes all Americans realize that the Communist State is the enemy of all men who live in freedom, and that we as a nation can aid China in just one way—by helping her directly and doing it ourselves.

Our Government can help by financial aid and by the effective delivery to China of arms, munitions, and airplanes. We, as individuals, can help by giving all that we can give to the United China Relief.

Every dollar that is given to bind up the wounds of a Chinese soldier is a dollar given to aid a man who by fighting the fight of his own country has been contributing to the defense of all democracies. Every dollar that is given to help stamp out war epidemics of cholera, dysentery, typhus, and typhoid in China is a dollar given to strengthen the resistance of 400,000,000 people to an armed force that but for them might readily be turned against us. Every dollar that is given to build up the small cooperative industries which are being founded in Free China to increase production for the Chinese Government and the Chinese people pays for instruments to hold in check the men who have declared themselves our enemies. To help the Chinese is to help ourselves. They are fighting the battle of freedom and of free peoples, on what is literally—in a strategic sense—our western front.

All that we give to the United China Relief now will go to men, women, and children whose virtues have not changed since they were described twenty-two hundred years ago by the old Chinese poet Chu Yuan in these words:

"Though their limbs were torn, their hearts could not be repressed.
They were more than brave; they were inspired with the spirit of valor.
Steadfast to the end, they could not be daunted.
Their bodies were stricken, but their souls have taken immortality—
Captains among the ghosts, heroes among the dead."

We Americans, like all other peoples on this earth, face a tragic destiny. The dictators have abolished neutrality. To be neutral is to become their future victim. We cannot get off this planet; and Hitler, with Mussolini and Stalin in leash, and the Japanese militarists as gun bearers, is out to destroy us and all other peoples that live in freedom. He and his accomplices will not stop. They can only be stopped—stopped with shot and shell.

We have been hoping that the British and the Chinese, with material assistance from us, could stop the dictators without intervention of our armed forces; but we have not had the foresight or the will to produce a sufficient quantity of ships, airplanes, and other instruments of defense for the nations that, by defending themselves, are protecting us. For the past year we should have been producing as fast as if we were at war. We have done nothing of the sort. Even now we tolerate delays and continue to behave as if our motto were: "Too little and too late."

The British and the Chinese are hard pressed. For our own salvation we must turn all our strength into producing instruments of defense for them and for ourselves. We must not only produce but also deliver the goods. If we hesitate and vainly hope for temporary safety, then we shall surely perish. Do we look for peace with Hitler? He honors his peace agreements by attack in the night. Do we look for mercy? He shows his mercy with a bomb.

We have heard, to be sure, a knight of Hitler's Order of the German Eagle, telling us that we ought to stop helping the British and the Chinese and then everything would be all right. We should save our skins without having to fight. We should have peace.

What sort of peace?

We know that many states of South America are waiting only for the disappearance of the British Navy to turn totalitarian and invite the economic and military cooperation of the dictators. We know that if the British Navy should be eliminated we would soon see a totalitarian army and a totalitarian air force in South America, and that all Europe, all Asia, and Africa as well, would be organized against us. What peace could we have then? Democracies await incidents. Dictators make them.

Peace?

We could have peace at the price of submission to Hitler's will; at the price of accepting a puppet fuehrer in our country. We could have peace at the price of putting our churches under the heel of Hitler and our children into the hands of Goebbels for education in the creed of satan. We could have peace at the price of abolishing our press and our right to speak our minds. We could have peace at the price of tearing up our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution. We could have peace at the price of slavery.

I think that at that price we shall never have peace. I think that there is in America something which grew here, long before Hitler's Knight of the German Eagle was born—and that is liberty. I think that out of our soil and out of our sky there has grown a freedom which has opened the gates of hope not only to the people of this country but to the peoples of all the world. And I think that we are ready—as we have always been—to fight for that freedom.

We have no longer an easy choice between peace and war. We have a choice between keeping open the life lines to Great Britain and China and supporting those countries with all our strength, or fighting alone—and soon—in this hemisphere against the united forces of the dictators—with all of Europe, Asia, Africa, and the major portion of South America organized to supply their war machines. Choice? There is no choice. In self-defense, for our own preservation, whatever the consequences, we must back the British and the Chinese.

This is America, where men admit no master but God. This is the country where men and women faced a savage continent to keep faith with their Creator and themselves. This is the country of the men who held their guns at Valley Forge, when blood from their naked feet stained the snow. This is the country of Lincoln and Lee, of the men in blue and the men in gray. Has our marrow turned so soft that we do not dare to face the forces of incarnate evil? No.

It may be that in supporting with all our resources and all our strength the British and the Chinese, we shall have war. It may be that we shall not have war. But support them we will. And if the dictators wish to call that war, let them remember that this is one country that has never known defeat. Let them consider that against their conspiracy will stand a fellowship of peoples that hold freedom more dear than life. Let them recall that the bugles of man's unconquerable soul will never blow retreat. Let them remember that this is America.

Facts About Our Naval Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, almost daily we hear spokesmen of the administration defying the entire world with provocative statements and reminding Americans that this country has never been defeated in a war. Congress has appropriated huge sums for national defense and the development of a strong Army and Navy. However, the people are not aware of the fact that mere authorizations do not provide actual defense equipment, but that it is necessary to convert these funds into ships, planes, tanks, and other munitions.

It is shocking to read that while we are building a two-ocean navy there is little consolation in the fact that on April 1, 1941, our Navy actually had 329 vessels as compared with 359 on January 1, 1940, or a loss of 30 vessels. Likewise, it is disconcerting to learn that in the past 15 months the Navy has actually added only 9 vessels to shipways, and that of the 361 combat vessels reported under construction by Secretary Knox on April 1, 1941, only 63 were actually on shipways, the remainder being listed merely on paper as under contract.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald dealing with pertinent facts regarding the construction of our naval craft:

FACTS ABOUT OUR NAVAL BUILDING
(By Walter Trohan)

Only one out of every six Navy ships, listed as under construction in reports of the Navy Department, is actually on shipways, an official compilation of the naval-construction program revealed yesterday.

On April 16, Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox announced in a summary of the progress of naval construction that a tremendous increase had taken place in the number of ships under construction on April 1, 1941, as compared with January 1940.

He reported 361 combat vessels are under construction this month as compared with 61 on January 1, 1940. He also reported that 123 auxiliary vessels are under construction this month as compared with 16 on January 1, 1940.

The official naval records do not bear out the Secretary's claims. Most of the program which he boasted is on paper, according to the Navy's own compilation of the building program. The Secretary listed ships under contract as vessels under construction.

According to the compilation, only 63 of the 361 fighting ships, listed as under construction, are actually on shipways or being completed in shipyards after launching. On January 1, 1940, the Navy listed 61 fighting ships under construction, and 54 were actually on shipways. In the intervening 15 months the Navy has actually added only 9 vessels to shipways.

In the field of auxiliary craft only 13 of the 123 vessels listed by Knox as under construction are actually on shipways. On January 1, 1940, the Navy listed 16 auxiliary ships under construction, and 14 of these were actually on shipways. In the intervening 15 months 1 less auxiliary vessel is in construction.

On January 1, 1941, there were 74,385 persons employed on naval construction. At the beginning of this month, the number of shipyard employees had almost doubled, with 142,999 persons on the pay rolls of the eight Government yards and major private yards.

The current building program has taxed the facilities of American shipyards. The Government and private yards have accommodations for 63 fighting ships, the number the Navy is building.

The Navy has a program for increasing the Nation's shipbuilding facilities, but construction of new ways will take months, particularly since a drive is also under way for increased shipyards for the building of merchant vessels for Britain to replace those she is losing in the battle of the Atlantic.

The following table shows the number of vessels under construction and under contract for January 1, 1940, and April 1, 1941:

FIGHTING CRAFT

	Jan. 1, 1940		Apr. 1, 1941	
	Building	Contracted	Building	Contracted
Battleships	6	2	10	7
Aircraft carriers	2	----	1	11
Cruisers	----	4	9	45
Destroyers	32	----	26	174
Submarines	14	1	17	61
Total	54	7	63	298

AUXILIARY CRAFT

Destroyer tenders	2	----	----	3
Mine sweepers	2	----	----	60
Net layers	----	----	----	4
Gasoline tankers	----	----	----	5
Transports	----	----	----	2
Repair ships	1	----	1	3
Submarine tenders	1	----	2	5
Submarine rescue ships	----	----	----	5
Seaplane tenders	4	2	6	14
Mine layyers	1	----	1	2
Fleet tugs	3	----	3	7
Total auxiliaries	14	2	13	110

In the 15-month period the size of the Navy has been decreased by 30 vessels. A comparison of the Navy of Jan. 1, 1940, and the Navy of Apr. 1, 1941, is given in the following table:

	Jan. 1, 1940	Apr. 1, 1941
Battleships	15	15
Aircraft carriers	5	6
Cruisers	34	37
Destroyers	218	164
Submarines	87	107
Total	359	329

The Question of Convoys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

LETTER TO HON. SOL BLOOM, OF NEW YORK

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have today addressed to the Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Honorable SOL BLOOM, together with a copy of my earlier letter to him on the subject of convoys.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 29, 1941.

Hon. SOL BLOOM,
Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BLOOM: On April 14, I addressed a letter to you with regard to the convoy issue and certain statements which you had made in connection therewith.

Will you kindly advise me when a reply may be expected.

Very truly yours,

CHAS. W. TOBEY.

SENATOR TOBEY'S ANSWER TO REPRESENTATIVE SOL BLOOM'S CONVOY STATEMENT

APRIL 14, 1941.

The Honorable SOL BLOOM,
Chairman, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BLOOM: I was considerably surprised to read your statement against submission of the convoy question to the Congress, and your declaration that this question of convoys is strictly a matter for the President's determination.

In your statement you say, "Only the President can determine how and where convoys are needed, if they are needed. That isn't in our department * * *."

Isn't in our department? I recognize that the Congress, which is supposed to be a body representative of the people, has reduced itself to a sorrowful position by virtue of its "Yes-man" attitude, and I equally recognize that the Congress has turned over many of its powers to the President, but I cannot for a moment concede that we have reduced our status to that of a department, subservient to the whim and rule of the President. God forbid that the time will ever come when the people entirely lose the benefit of a Congress which has the determination in a crisis to exercise its constitutional prerogatives.

Your statement further says, with regard to convoys, "I couldn't imagine what such a resolution would say."

To relieve your imagination, I herewith enclose a copy of my anticonvoy resolution, which prohibits in the plainest of English language the use of the armed forces of the United States and American vessels and aircraft from transporting, delivering, or convoying articles or materials to belligerent countries.

Your statement further says, "We—the Congress—couldn't say we authorized convoys or we forbade them. The President has that power." In this position you are in disagreement with the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The argument is used that because the President, under the Constitution is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, it follows that he can send convoys of the United States Navy anywhere in the world that he chooses, regardless of any prohibition by the Congress.

This argument overlooks the fact that section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution gives to the Congress the power to make rules for the regulation of the land and naval forces. Therefore, while the Constitution makes the President the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, it further specifically provides that the Congress shall make rules to regulate the Army and Navy.

It seems clear from this that if the Congress makes a rule prohibiting the Navy from being used to convoy goods destined for belligerents, that this would be a rule within the meaning of the Constitution, and comes under the powers granted to the Congress by the Constitution.

Further, the same article and section of the Constitution provides that the Congress shall have the power to declare war.

The President himself has said that "Convoys mean shooting—and shooting means war." Can it logically be held, for example, that the President, because he is Commander in Chief of the Army, could send a large part of the Army over to German soil under orders to fight, without a declaration of war by the Congress? I have never heard that contended by even the most ardent interventionists.

It is equally true that the President cannot send United States warships to convoy goods for belligerent countries if the Congress by law specifically prohibits such action.

In conclusion, I raise this question: Is it fair and honest to the American people for us to allow action to be taken now which will immediately launch the millions of American citizens in a long struggle of active warfare, in the face of the fact that the President raised their hopes in his assurances to them over the radio, 2 days before he was reelected, that the first foreign policy of our Government would be to keep this country out of war; in the face of the fact that both the Republican and Democratic Party platforms gave the same assurances to the American people; and in the face of the fact that the Members of the House and Senate, only a few months ago, were elected to office on their solemn pledge that they would do all in their power to keep this country from being involved in the war?

This question I put to you in all earnestness and sincerity, and in view of your responsible position as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives I would appreciate from you a full answer.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. TOBEY.

A Plea for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

LETTER FROM REV. F. DORNBLASER

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the other day I received a most unusual letter from a most unusual person. In it Reverend Dornblaser, D. D., who is 100 years old and who served 4 years in the Civil War, makes an earnest plea for peace. This letter was written in long hand and one appreciates it more when he notes the trembling writing and the determination of the writer. Reverend Dornblaser's grandfather saw military service in the War of 1812. Two of his sons were in the Spanish-American War, their health was broken by their military service, and they are dead. His youngest, and as he says, his "only hope," was killed in the World War. He has paid in sweat, blood, and tears, and knows that Sherman was right. I ask unanimous consent to insert the Reverend Dornblaser's letter in the Appendix of the RECORD.

CHICAGO, *April 14, 1941.*

MY DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON AND ALL FRIENDS FOR PEACE: I am so glad that we have heroes in our country, and you will have a hard fight. Yes, feed the people with food, not with devil's food and war poison. "War is hell," said Sherman. I had enough war. My grandfather was a commander against the British in 1812. My two sons have been in the Spanish-American War; came home broken in health; all dead and gone. My youngest, my only hope, was killed in the World War. For what? I am 100 years old. Served 4 years in the Civil War. So, you see, I have enough. For 65 years I was a minister in the Lutheran Church. Save lives and save souls and God will bless you and our country.

Yours sincerely and respectfully,

F. DORNBLASER.

P. S.—Children and children's children will bless you in that holy war.

F. D.

Reed Report Drives Hard Toward Final Fusion of United States and British Civil Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

ARTICLE BY GEORGE D. RILEY

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by George D. Riley, in his column U. S. and Us, of April 27, 1941.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of April 27, 1941]

U. S. AND US

(By George D. Riley)

REED REPORT DRIVES HARD TOWARD FINAL FUSION OF UNITED STATES AND BRITISH CIVIL SERVICES—DREAM OF CECIL RHODES AND ANDREW CARNEGIE BEING REALIZED STEP BY STEP 40 YEARS LATER

RHODES, CARNEGIE, AND OXFORD

Cecil Rhodes, British Empire builder, dreamed of the day when there would be a confluence between the United States and Britain. He founded the Rhodes scholarships, approximately half of which are issued to the United States, more than to the entire Colonial Empire.

Andrew Carnegie, who died soon after Rhodes' death, was a devoted adherent of the Rhodes' policy of coupling the United States and Britain. He, too, left wealth to a foundation. Today, Clarence K. Streit, Rhodes scholar, is urging adoption of his Union Now movement which carried into great detail the aspirations of the youthful Rhodes. Streit, in his "Union Now with Britain," nominates President Roosevelt as prime minister of the western end of the union. Winston Churchill is his choice for prime minister, the eastern end.

—

Piece by piece, the United States Government's civil service is becoming the British civil service. This change is being accelerated. It started in the early 1930's and even before the report of the Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel.

One board after another has been appointed, always with the motto "improvement of the public service." And invariably we have found familiar faces on the different boards. True, one or two drop out in courtesy to their fellows whose names are imprinted on masterful reports which dispense with the public administration in learned terms. But these return at a later time and sit on future boards.

"Reorganization," "streamlining," "clearing houses." These have become commonplace terms not only in this country but in England. Hands across the seas have a common fellowship of anonymity. There is only one discordant note between the Brownlow reorganization committee's urge for "passion for anonymity" and the anonymity in the British ruling class civil service. Here are the words of Prof. Herman Miller Stout, University of North Carolina, speaking of "masters and servants" in the British civil service:

"With the increasing appreciation of the important role of the civil servants in the formation and execution of policy, there is some question of the desirability of continuing the virtually absolute anonymity of their (British administrative classes') opinions."

We find three of the same five members on the Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel reconvening only 2 years later, in 1937, as the President's Committee on Administrative Management, as follows: Louis Brownlow, Prof. Charles E. Merriam, and Prof. Luther Gulick.

"Freedom from patronage"

In 1935 these men found that "freedom from patronage permits concentration on positive service." In 1937 they wanted an "upward, downward, and outward" civil service. In 1940 legislation known as the Ramspeck Act joined the issue for the Brownlow committee and patronage, at least of the political variety, was ordered ended. Meanwhile the Reed committee made certain findings which closely knit in with the Brownlow committee's discoveries. The President followed through this week and adopted the Reed committee's recommendations, as well as Mr. RAMSPECK's thoughts on the subject.

However, Mr. RAMSPECK seems destined to become the forgotten man of his own act. The President strewed flowers in the direction of the Brownlow and Reed committees, but nary a posy or kind word for the author of the Ramspeck Act which entitled everyone to go about with broader smiles, justifying use of the Presidents phrase, "development of a broad system which will further encourage men and women of outstanding ability to enter the Government under conditions which will offer them fair and equal opportunities to build satisfactory careers."

Everything which happens today in the Federal executive civil service is designed directly to link inseparably and irrevocably the administrative government of the United States with that of Great Britain. This is brought about quickest and best by tying together the purposes and approaches of both Governments and by binding with an extreme closeness the personal practices in both countries. And if we have seemed to be slow in convoying munitions to Britain, that country has succeeded in convoying its civil-service system directly into Washington, laid down and delivered.

"Permanent official" is British title

"We recommend that each department and major independent establishment or agency give careful consideration to the advisability of creating the position of general manager, with an appropriate title," says the Reed committee. "Experience in all large-scale organizations, public or private, demonstrates the desirability of a single permanent official, not a policy-determining official, and his position should consequently be in the competitive classified service. He is directly and completely responsible to the political head of the organization—the secretary of the department, the commissioners, or the administrator."

The Reed committee, continuing with its adoption of the British system, says: "We recommend use of the so-called committee type of examination in selecting those who apply for higher positions in any of the professional fields. Briefly, as applied to the present problem, it would consist in the establishment of a special examining board for each examination. * * * The examining committee would make a careful analysis of records which have not been rejected and establish a small group of qualified candidates. There would follow an oral interview, in which the committee would act as the oral board. There would be no occasion to assign rankings to the limited number of names appearing on the final register."

This exactly is the British system for making selections for the administrative class, and which included the viva voce test. It further disrupts the competitive system and holds at bay the Civil Service Commission. By Executive order this plan was put into effect this week for attorneys.

The British civil-service selection of men to fill the good-pay jobs is made from a close, knotty group of schools. Oxford and Cambridge supply 76 percent of all the British Indian Service, the Home Service, and the Colonial Service. The British take their economists from the London School of Economics (the Columbia University—King's College) of England.

In the United States we pick our Foreign Service officers typically from Harvard with a scattering of what might appear to be courtesy geographical appointments to other schools. All of which suggests a quotation from the Reed committee for our own use:

"An active, positive program of recruitment, designed to attract to Government employment the top-ranking men in undergraduate and graduate courses in the natural sciences, be undertaken by the Civil Service Commission and by the appropriate departments and agencies."

This must mean that the civil-service machinery will be borrowed by agencies to narrow the field to the output of those schools which are deemed worthy of supplying quick brains, for we read further:

"Besides the effort being made to integrate recruitment for the civil service and the educational system, the type of examinations is important in attracting young university-trained people into the Government service. The administrative class examination is designed to test young men and women, not in the more or less practical work of a Government department, but rather in their mental ability."

The latter quotation, believe it or not, is not from the Reed report but from Professor Stout's Public Service in Great Britain, issued in 1938.

To this point it is apparent that the cost of higher education is beyond the reach of millions with meager means, thus constricting the field from which the better-pay Federal jobs can possibly be filled through the British civil service-Reed committee formulas. Even so, we find a plenitude of young men and women who have fine educations, but $1,620, and even $1,440, is the best they can earn with their studious preparation.

What, then, can be the goal of this close tie-up across the seas administratively? Demand for higher education for better-pay jobs also means higher education for low-paid jobs. The difference is that the former are filled from the alumni nucleuses of narrowed limits confined to a select few schools, while anyone may compete for the low jobs.

Viewed another way: A few schools supply candidates for higher administrative and professional jobs. Many schools supply the candidates for lower administrative jobs.

Collective Bargaining and Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

ARTICLE DISTRIBUTED BY THE WASHINGTON LEAGUE OF WOMEN SHOPPERS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Collective Bargaining and Defense," printed and distributed by the Washington League of Women Shoppers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND DEFENSE

WHAT IS COLLECTIVE BARGAINING?

Collective bargaining has been defined as "a mode of fixing the terms of employment by means of bargaining between an organized body of employees and an employer, or association of employers, usually acting through duly authorized agents. * * * It is a method of securing that equality which is presumed, under the free contract assumption of our law, to give to each party what he is entitled to and what is to the best interests of all." (Hoxey, Robert F., *Trade Unionism in the United States*, pp. 263–264.) The objective of collective bargaining is the formation of a written agreement which covers some or all of the following terms: "a minimum wage over as large an area of the industry as possible; the setting up of wage differentials upon the basis of seniority, experience, skill, or other scarcity factors; equal pay for equal work without regard to sex; overtime rates for overtime work; shorter hours and rest periods; restriction of output to preserve quality, spread the work, or prevent exploitation of the worker through excessive speed; and job control in hiring and firing, promotions, lay-offs, shop discipline, and the handling of grievances." (Brooks, Robert R. R., When Labor Organizes, p. 223.)

SUCCESS OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

At the outset of the defense emergency the principles of labor's right to organize and to bargain collectively, embodied in the National Labor Relations Act enacted in 1935, had the support of organized labor, and general acceptance among a majority of employers. After the validation of the act by the Supreme Court in 1937 there was clearly evidenced a trend toward greater industrial peace. The Fifth Annual Report of the National Labor Relations Board for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, states:

"The decline in strike activity is emphasized by a comparison of data for 1936–37 and 1939–40, periods of comparable business activity. The total number of strikes declined 49 percent between the two periods; the number of workers involved declined 63 percent, and man-days of idleness declined 66 percent. The number of strikes for recognition and against discrimination declined 62 percent."

Employment relationships in many of the mass production industries hitherto unorganized, including the largest steel companies and most of the great automobile manufacturers, had stabilized in collective agreements embodying the terms of employment, and, in many cases, machinery for the settlement of questions arising during the contract period.

EMPLOYER OPPOSITION

A few extremely powerful employers and employers' associations, among them dominating groups in the National Association of Manufacturers, however, continued to resist the Federal labor policy. Notable among these has been the group popularly known as "Little Steel." The Ford Co., acting alone, has remained adamant. Opposition to union organization expressed itself in repeated violations upon the part of this willful minority of the statutory injunction against "unfair labor practices," and in loud demand for the repeal of the act, or its emasculation by amendment. (Ed. note: The Ford Co. has been held guilty of such practices no less than seven times by the N. L. R. B.)

These employers, and many others, were dramatically exposed by the Senate Civil Liberties Committee's investigation begun in 1936 by Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE and by Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, of Utah. The hearings before this committee revealed the existence of antilabor activity in the form of industrial espionage, the importation of strike breakers from other communities, the use of industrial munitions against the workers and other forms of violence. Senator LA FOLLETTE, in the National Lawyers' Guild Quarterly, December 1937, said:

"The record of the Senate Civil Liberties Committee focuses attention sharply upon the need for responsible management. A Federal law guarantees to labor the right to organize freely and to bargain collectively. In the face of that law, employers have committed their labor policy to the tender care of Chowderhead Cohens, have spent thousands of dollars on gas and other thousands on union wrecking through espionage. And when called to account they have persistently concealed and evaded. Until management is prepared decently and straightforwardly to discharge its duties to its workers, its Government, and the public, it can ill afford to speak of the responsibility of labor."

The committee's record and reports reveal that the groups of employers sponsoring and using these practices waged a concerted campaign to nullify the N. L. R. A. and defeat its purposes, and that these groups are still in existence, many of them with their purposes and objectives unchanged.

NEW LABOR ORGANIZATION PROBLEMS

With the declaration of the national emergency, industrial production entered a period of great expansion. Speed in production became the outstanding demand. Millions of unemployed and many unorganized workers began to be absorbed into the industrial process. Workers migrated from their homes to towns where defense activity was suddenly expanding. Unions theretofore firmly entrenched or steadily progressing to a position of organizational maturity were faced with the realization that they must, in order to survive, bring organization to millions.

HOURS LENGTHENED

A survey made in December 1940 by the Bureau of Labor Statistics reveals that in 394 of the largest establishments in 11 key defense industries, where more than half of the estimated total number of workers in these 11 industries were employed, "almost one-half of the plants covered were operating at least 6 days per week. * * * Overtime was widespread throughout the industries surveyed * * * approximately 280,000 wage earners in the reporting establishments worked a total of more than two and one-half million hours of overtime during the midweek of December 1940." To the comment that this is fair enough since the workers received time and a half pay for overtime, one must point out that millions are still unemployed, that the efficiency of the worker is greatly reduced by continued overtime efforts, and that industrial accidents mount rapidly in number for overtaxed workers. As long ago as 1917 the Chief of Ordnance of the United States Army stated:

"In view of the urgent necessity for a prompt increase in the volume of production * * * vigilance is demanded of all those in any way associated with industry lest the safeguards with which the people of this country have sought to protect labor should be unwisely and unnecessarily broken down. It is a fair assumption that for the most part these safeguards are the mechanisms of efficiency. Industrial history proves that reasonable hours, fair working conditions, and a proper wage scale are essential to high production. * * * Every attempt should be made to conserve in every way possible all of our achievements in the way of social betterment. But the pressing argument for maintaining industrial safeguards in the present emergency is that they actually contribute to efficiency."

INDUSTRY PROFITS SOAR

Since the present emergency, profits in industry have soared. Philip Murray, C. I. O. president, speaking before the American Association of School Administrators on February 25, 1941, at Atlantic City, said:

"I have here a list of the earnings of six of America's outstanding corporations for the year 1940 * * * the total net profits of these six corporations for the year 1940 being $699,780,000 on 850,000 employees. * * * The General Motors Corporation, on each employee for the year 1940, had a net profit of $977 per employee. * * * The American Telegraph & Telephone Co. netted $528 per employee; the Standard of New Jersey netted $2,000 per employee; the United States Steel Corporation netted something approximating $420 per employee; the Du Pont Corporation netted $2,220 per employee, and the

General Electric Corporation had a net profit of $826 per employee."

LIVING COSTS SOAR, TOO

Today all indications point to a period of rising costs. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, between August 1939, the month before the outbreak of war in Europe, and March 1941 wholesale commodity prices rose nearly 10 percent; and, although costs at retail to moderate-income city families rose only a little more than 2 percent on the average over this same period, dislocation of production and of trade is almost certain to bring further price increases. Rental costs, according to reports of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, have already risen on one-third to one-half of the rented homes in many of the cities in which defense activities have been increasing.

WAGES LAG

It is frequently pointed out that wages also rise. But one must remember that while wages rise to some extent in some defense industries, the cost of living rises for all wage earners in all industries. Furthermore, World War experience proved that in a period of rapidly expanding industry, wage increases do not nearly keep pace with increases in living costs.

The American Federation of Labor's research and information service, basing its studies on data supplied by the National City Bank and the Labor Department, reports that net profits of 925 manufacturing companies increased an average of 26.9 percent in 1940 over 1939, after deduction of taxes, while average hourly wages in these companies increased an average of only 4.7 percent. Profits in these companies increased in 1940 over 1939 from 9.9 percent in the automobile industry to 190.7 percent in the aircraft industry. Yet the wages in the aircraft industry continue to lag behind those in the automobile industry. Figures released by the Bureau of Labor Statistics show that earnings in the aircraft industry in January 1941 averaged 77.6 cents an hour, as compared to 96.6 cents in the automobile industry. Labor feels that it is entitled to a share of the enhanced profits.

THESE FACTORS GIVE RISE TO STRIKES

In this changing situation lies the explanation for many recent strikes. Expanded production with greatly increased profits, longer hours and lagging wages, and the need to organize many workers newly drawn into industry are among the factors present which have always given rise to strikes. Bernard M. Baruch, Chairman of the World War Industries Board, was quoted in the Washington Star of March 11, 1941, as saying:

"Strikes are bound to occur, and justifiably, if any effort is made to take advantage of the situation to reverse labors hard-won advances.

"The wage earner cannot be blamed for demanding higher wages if he finds himself being squeezed by the rising costs of the necessities of life and at the same time sees industry receiving inflated profits, of which he does not feel he is getting a fair share."

NEVERTHELESS STRIKES HAVE DECREASED

Against the background that over the last 100 years of American history such periods as these have generally resulted in an increase in strikes, the Labor Division of the National Defense Advisory Commission reported as of March 1, 1941, a decline in the number and duration of strikes. (Labor Speeds Defense, Report of Progress, pp. 8, 9.) Some of its facts are as follows:

"Work stoppages due to strikes in American industry during the year 1940 accounted for an average loss of less than 2 hours per year per worker. * * *

"There has been a 47-percent decline in the number of man-days idle due to strikes during the first 6 months of the defense program over the corresponding period of 1939.

"The number of men involved in strikes was only about half as great during the first 6 months of the defense program as when the United States was actually at war 24 years ago. This is all the more significant when it is realized that total nonagricultural employment is 22 percent larger today."

LEGISLATIVE ATTACKS ON N. L. R. A.

In this session of Congress the same recalcitrant employer groups and short-sighted legislators continue to fight for the destruction of the N. L. R. A. In the official 1940 pamphlet, Policies Advocated by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, "outright repeal" of the act is advocated. Failing this desideratum, the Chamber urges the adoption of the Smith committee amendments. The National Association of Manufacturers in its annual report, December 1940, proposes the adoption of these amendments as "just a step in the right direction." It further suggests "that the status quo in bargaining relationships should be maintained so long as the preparedness program is a major national policy." In other words, further development of collective bargaining as an instrument of industrial peace is to be suspended although such peace is indispensable to the national defense. The Smith amendments which passed in the House last spring, but were not reported out of the Senate committee, have been reintroduced in the House by Representative SMITH and in the Senate by Senator HOLMAN. So crippling, so decimating to the powers of the act are these amendments that a minority report by two members of the original committee states that, if adopted in toto, the amendments would destroy the guaranties of employee freedom in self-organization and in collective bargaining.

Representative HOFFMAN in H. R. 1405 goes much further; he proposes repeal of the Wagner Labor Act and the substitution of an act which would make practically illegal ordinary organizing activities. Among the provisions of his bill is the deprivation of workers from benefits of the labor board he proposes to set up for having participated in illegal strikes, such as sit-down, general strikes, and strikes in violation of employment agreements.

ATTACKS ON STRONG UNION ORGANIZATION

Under the guise of measures to speed defense production or to prohibit sabotage, a swarm of bills have been introduced in the House of Representatives which violently attack the means by which organized labor protects its advances. The maximum achievement of a strong union is the establishment of a closed shop.

"A closed shop means that the employer agrees to employ only union members. Unions justify their demand for a closed shop on two grounds: (1) They allege that only workers who support the union financially and otherwise are entitled to the benefits which it secures. (2) They insist that if the shop remains open to nonunionists collective bargaining will be endangered. For the union will be seriously weakened, both because workers will not feel the need of retaining membership and perhaps more important because the employer will be able imperceptibly to discriminate in favor of nonunionists." (Commons and Andrews, Principles of Labor Legislation, p. 391.)

Representative HOFFMAN'S H. R. 1814 would outlaw the preferential and closed shop agreements in all establishments handling government orders. Representative SMITH'S H. R. 2695 has a provision which outlaws closed and preferential shops in defense work, not only for future contracts, but retroactively for past contracts. Representative Cox's H. R. 2694 seeks to enforce the open shop in any industry or establishment where there might be any order paid for directly or indirectly by the United States Government. Representative VINSON'S H. R. 2850 outlaws the closed shop on naval defense contracts. Notice that the provisions in these bills go even further than the N. A. M.'s suggestion that the status quo be maintained; i. e., freezing labor-management relations as they are now; these bills advocate complete retrogression.

Representative DIRKSEN'S H. R. 2662 would abolish union hiring halls in the maritime industry, requiring hiring through Government halls. This strikes directly at a gain won by the maritime workers after a difficult struggle, and could not but restore much of the past conflict and exploitation in this industry.

The check-off, a system by which the union dues and fees are collected by the employer, who deducts them from the pay envelopes, and which is embodied in a number of collective bargaining agreements is prohibited in another provision of Representative HOFFMAN'S H. R. 1405. Representative Cox's H. R. 2694 has a provision which would make it a crime for unions to solicit or receive dues, initiation fees, or union assessments from workers employed on Government contracts. Thus, it seeks to destroy union organization in defense industries.

Of course, many of these extreme measures may not receive serious consideration by the Congress. It is important to recognize, however, that they are an essential part of the antilabor campaign. They are not an attempt to correct such abuses as may exist in union practices, such as excessive fees and racketeering, but are a direct effort to obstruct the development of sound collective bargaining relationships.

ATTACK ON COLLECTIVE BARGAINING PRACTICES

With an aim to outlaw all strikes in defense industries, regardless of their cause and justification, three bills have been introduced in Congress which set up compulsory procedures for the handling of labor disputes: Senator BALL'S bill, S. 683, Representative SMITH'S bill, H. R. 2695, and Representative VINSON'S bill, H. R. 2850. With slight variations as to the procedures, the postponement periods, and the penalties, all three bills require labor and management, in the event of dispute, to give notice in writing to each other and to a Government mediation agency of intent to strike or lock-out and to submit the dispute to the investigation and recommendation of the agency. If the mediation is unsuccessful, report is made to the President for publication. This subjects the merits of the dispute to the pressure of public opinion. Until the expiration of the periods specified for the completion of this procedure any strike or lock-out is unlawful.

Legislation to compel the submission of a labor dispute to Government intervention without the consent of the parties concerned, even though only for investigation and recommendation, is a rare occurrence and contrary to the tradition of our Government, even in wartime. (Adjustment of Labor Disputes, Monthly Labor Review, November 1939, U. S. Department of Labor.) In disregard of this tradition these three bills are pressed and defended upon a false analogy. The public is asked to consider the success of the National Railway Labor Act of 1926, and the implication is obvious. If compulsory mediation has worked for years in one industry, why shouldn't it work in defense industries?

WHY THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT WORKED

The railroad industry, before the passage of this legislation, had long been strongly unionized, with the right of labor to bargain collectively well established throughout the industry. Unfair labor practices had been eliminated from the industry. Over a long period of years skilled negotiators had been developed and a mutual respect and will to agree had grown up on the part of management and labor. Collective bargaining agreements throughout the industry were in force long before the law was enacted.

Without such preconditions, compulsory mediation measures must work either against labor's efforts to establish its own bargaining power or be rendered ineffective by industrial disputes.

WHY RAILWAY ANALOGY DOES NOT APPLY TO THE DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Defense industries at present are not strongly organized. Philip Murray in a statement to the press estimated the organization in defense industries as from 20 percent to 40 percent. It is significant that for the most part strikes have been limited to those industries and establishments where union organization has been resisted by the employers and where collective bargaining procedures have not heretofore prevailed. As Ernest Lindley said in the Washington Post, March 21, 1941:

"If employers had not wasted so much energy fighting the National Labor Relations Act, nearly all industry by now probably would have been well past the stage of organizational strikes. These are the growing pains of collective bargaining. But until Bethlehem Steel, Ford, and other holdouts bargain collectively with bona fide labor unions, organizational strikes will remain a threat."

The dangerous outcome from such hostility to union organization was demonstrated in a report of the Senate Civil Liberties Committee, filed with the Senate March 31, 1941, which found that the Little Steel strikes of 1937 resulted from the refusal of the companies to accept the process of collective bargaining, and which warned that this same attitude on the part of such large producers as Bethlehem Steel and Republic Steel may today cause serious strikes, and should be recognized as a threat to national defense and a blow to national unity.

Unfair labor practices, labor espionage, lethal weapons and strikebreakers have been used in many of the establishments in possession of Government contracts. The signed collective-bargaining agreement, voluntarily arrived at, with its provisions for mediation and adjustments, is the exception, rather than the rule. In the absence of the signed agreement mutually achieved by the employer and the union representatives, the employer has always the right to deprive the worker of his job; the worker has as his means of achieving adequate and fair wages, reasonable hours, and decent working conditions only the right to strike, and the pursuit of a collective-bargaining agreement.

The Ball, Vinson, and Smith bills seem to be offered to the Congress in complete ignorance of these facts. When similar legislation was being considered in 1937-38 for the maritime industry, Secretary of Labor Perkins said: "A law that works because both management and men want it and are convinced of its usefulness is hardly likely to work when it is imposed on an industry against the will of either the employer or the employees."

HANDLING DISPUTES WITHOUT LEGISLATION

The foregoing legislation seeks to supply penalties for failure to postpone strikes or lock-outs. These penalties are loss of Labor Board rights, injunctions from a Federal court, fines, and imprisonment. The imposition of these penalties does not prevent strikes. Organized labor commonly strikes only as a last resort and has always sought instead to have industry establish and use the processes of collective bargaining. To penalize labor because the processes of collective bargaining are not established or accepted or functioning will only serve to alienate labor and intensify disputes when full cooperation is most vital.

Organized labor has cooperated willingly with the staff of the United States Conciliation Service and of the Labor Division of the N. D. A. C. in seeking to settle disputes by voluntary negotiation. This is apparent in the news reports of strike negotiations, but it is far more significantly proved in the reports of the Labor Division as to the settling of hundreds of disputes before they have reached the stage of strikes and headlines. (Labor Speeds Defense, page 8, incorporating testimony by Mr. Hillman before the House Judiciary Committee, February 20, 1941.)

In this framework of voluntary cooperation the National Defense Mediation Board was established by Executive order on March 19, 1941. The A. F. of L. recommended such a mediation board early in the emergency. The C. I. O., however, was opposed to its establishment for the reason that it might tend to freeze the status quo in bargaining relationships, as the War Labor Board tended to do in the World War. It was feared that even though existing collective-bargaining contracts might be protected and enforced crucial drives for organizing unorganized industries and for strengthening organization by gaining closed shop and check-off contracts might be frowned upon as disturbing factors.

There is, however, a distinction between labor organizing during the World War and now. Because of the N. L. R. A. organizing drives are now protected by law and union organization is recognized as filling a social need. The success of the National Defense Mediation Board in promoting industrial peace must, therefore, depend largely upon the extent to which it can bring about and insist upon compliance with Federal labor law.

USE OF THE GOVERNMENT'S DEFENSE PURCHASING POWER

One great safeguard of labor's rights lies in the Government's use of its defense purchasing power. The full use of this power would minimize the possibility of disturbances in labor relations in defense industries.

On September 1, 1940, the N. D. A. C. unanimously adopted the statement of labor policy submitted by Mr. Hillman as chairman of the labor policy advisory committee. This was that "all work carried on as part of the defense program should comply with Federal statutory provisions affecting labor wherever such provisions are applicable. This applies to the Walsh-Healey Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the National Labor Relations Act, etc."

The President endorsed this policy in a special message to the Congress on September 13, 1940, transmitting the declared policy of the N. D. A. C. Thereupon, the very Members of Congress who sponsor antilabor legislation organized an attack on this policy which was joined in by much of the press on the presumption that compliance with labor laws is necessarily an obstruction of the defense program. In response to this attack, congressional investigating committees were assured by the Defense Commissioner of Labor, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy that no defense contracts had been withheld or delayed because of charges of noncompliance with any of the labor laws on the part of any prospective contractor.

Today this declared labor policy finds expression in Procurement Circular No. 43, issued December 1940 by The Adjutant General's Office of the War Department, which provides that every invitation for competitive bids shall require a statement that the work will be carried on in compliance with the laws affecting labor. For failure to file this statement with his bid, Ford's bid was disqualified on an Army truck contract of $4,000,000, though it was the lowest bid received.

There is no similar administrative ruling governing negotiated contracts, which thus far have received the bulk of the money awarded. While, as a matter of practice, a provision requiring compliance with labor laws has been included in most negotiated contracts, it has been omitted to satisfy certain companies which did not wish to agree to it, notably Ford and Bethlehem. Ford holds several hundred million dollars of negotiated contracts and Bethlehem Steel more than a billion dollars, although both are notorious violators of the National Labor Relations Act.

LABOR'S PARTICIPATION

The President appointed Sidney Hillman, chief of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers' Union and a founder of the C. I. O., as the codirector of the Office of Production Management, after having first appointed him head of the Labor Division of the N. D. A. C. (now a part of the O. P. M.). Mr. Hillman has appointed labor leaders to serve as defense conciliators and as members of advisory committees on the activities of the Labor Division. Labor leaders, likewise, advise on the program to train workers in new skills and labor unions serve as agencies for locating skilled workers. The Labor Division has also organized the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee, composed of representatives of management, organized labor, and Government, which is the first defense effort at establishing labor standards acceptable on an industry-wide basis.

The executive council of the A. F. L. reported to the annual convention in November 1940 the policy that labor should have representation on all defense agencies dealing with matters affecting labor, specifying that representation be selected by the group concerned. At the annual convention of the C. I. O., held in November 1940, similar demands were made, and criticism was particularly directed against the fact that there was not only too little labor representation, but that there was no representation by labor's own nomination. The C. I. O. now advocates the specific plan of industry councils. This plan calls for a council established in each major defense industry composed of representatives of management and of organized labor, with a Government representative as chairman, to coordinate and direct production for defense and for consumer goods.

Organized labor thus uniformly demands representation of its own selection with appropriate authority for participation in determining the policies and practices of defense administration as it affects labor and production. With the growth of strong unions, safeguarded in the freedom to exercise their collective-bargaining rights, greater participation by labor in industrial policy and the administration of government may be expected.

CONCLUSIONS

"In this time of world crisis American labor is awake to the crucial need for a strong national-defense program. Labor recognizes fully that if the democratic way of life is to be preserved and enlarged our country must prepare itself for total defense—morally and materially." (Labor Advisory Committee of the N. D. A. C. New York Times, December 9, 1940.)

With this statement, the committee is in complete accord. We want the defense program to proceed with expedition and without obstruction from any source. Defense of our country and its democracy requires that the country be strong; this it can be only if it has a strong labor movement.

This report has sought to show, first, that labor's contribution to national defense depends on labor's unqualified right to organize into unions of its own choice, without interference, and to bargain collectively; and second, that the preservation and extension of these rights makes for industrial peace which is essential to the national defense. Only with freedom to exercise these rights can the worker gain or maintain that decent living which is the right of every American.

(Report approved by the executive board of the Washington League of Women Shoppers, April 2, 1941.)

American Women and Home Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY COL. CHARLES H. RUTHERFORD

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "American Women Can Help Home Defense," delivered by Col. Charles H. Rutherford, civilian aide to the Secretary of War, for Arizona, over station KTAR at Phoenix, on April 24, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience: I particularly desire to address this discussion on how American Women Can Help Home Defense, the women themselves, and particularly those who like Mrs. Nan Douglas, Mrs. Coit Hughes, and others, have shown great interest, or have training, or have natural aptitude for training, in the many lines of work that will be most useful in connection with both preparedness for defense in general, and in connection with home defense in particular.

The viewpoint of both men and women, as to the tasks that could be, and should be, undertaken by women, in connection with defense, preparations for defense, and even actual war, has changed very materially in the past years. Personally, I'm still pretty old-fashioned in some ways, and I should prefer not to see women trained for, and engaged in, any line of defensive or offensive service that would place them under fire. On the other hand I realize that, with the major battles apparently being fought by raining down fire and explosives on all alike, men, women, and children, that women must be and are as much exposed to the dangers of injury and death as the men are. That being the case it seems obvious that women can be of tremendous value in every phase of the work of taking measures for protection, and in every phase of the work that results from attack. But, of course, if women are to be useful in these various services they must be trained for them. Under war-emergency conditions an untrained woman would be just as much a liability and a nuisance as an untrained man—but no more.

There can be no question of the bravery or the patriotism of women. Women are just as determined to protect our way of life as men are; they are even more determined that their children, present or prospective, shall have the same equal opportunity, according to ability, that they have, and that their parents and grandparents had.

There can be no question either that various abilities and various adaptabilities are distributed among women in about the same proportion as among men. However, up to this time, under either normal conditions or under the present emergency conditions, facilities for developing and training useful natural abilities have not been as available to women as to men. Let us for a few minutes discuss the various phases of this problem, for the fable of feminine frailty has passed on. Native ability and clear thinking has made women as successful as men in the operation of their own businesses, and as helpers in the operation of every form of business and industry. True, the ability of women to contribute first-class service outside the home is in direct proportion to her responsibilities in that home, but there is no reason why every woman who desires to, and who has the ability to render service of value to the defense program, should not be encouraged to do, and should be trained at public expense for the work she is capable of doing.

Neither public sentiment as a whole, or sentiment among women themselves, has as yet crystallized into a definite plan for utilizing women to the best advantage on defense projects. But public opinion is very definitely trending in the direction of making the utmost practicable uses of women in the preparedness progra , and particularly in matters connected with home defense, where women can function efficiently and still be at home. Women themselves, if I am to judge from what many women have told me, and from the published expressions of many more, no longer desire that men alone should give their lives, or risk their lives, in order that they may continue to live and enjoy the privileges of democracy.

Women that have the natural ability—and there are many of them—when properly trained make excellent drivers and mechanics for trucks, ambulances, motorcycles, or motorboats. Their ability as nurses is well known. They can be trained as signalers, in decoding, radio, and wire transmission of messages. A few might even make the more glamorous and adventurous fields, like airplane piloting, though I doubt the advisability of trying to train women as combat flyers.

There can be no question, however, of the desirability of training women in practically every phase of home-defense work. Their services will be urgently needed if we ever are actually attacked by the modern methods as firemen as well as fire wardens; as operators of field kitchens to feed the homeless; as workers in bombproof shelters for the comfort, safety, care, and sanitation of those who seek shelter. In England the women are just as grimly and just as effectively doing their part in defense as the men; and we should, as a part of our own preparedness program, train our women as well as our men to be useful if war actually comes.

It seems to me, as it has seemed to many intelligent women who have given the matter careful consideration, that the training of women for war service is just as much a proper function of government as is the training of men. Just how this should be done, or where, or when, or under what conditions is yet to be decided.

But that is one of the blessings and privileges of the American way of life. We make our own decisions, as a people; we do not wake up some morning and find that someone has dictated what we are to do, and how. So, according to our regular method, we will proceed to discuss the matter, and eventually arrive at a definite plan, and then we will work the plan. To do this we will, of course, have all the ideas and opinions expressed that all kinds of people happen to possess. There are some women who want women trained just like men, for the Army, for tanks, planes, guns—the whole show. Then there are some who go to the other extreme and don't want women mixed up in this fighting business in any manner. Somewhere in between those extreme points of view we will work it out. Go ahead and think about the problem of what women can do for the defense of the Nation. Go ahead and talk about it, in your homes, in your clubs, over the back fence. Get up discussions about it. Write letters about it. Eventually—and it will not take long—there will be some definite, Government-sponsored program for training women to do their bit.

But in the meantime, a word of warning. Don't get all hopped up and start off after some quack idea; some organization that jumped out of the agile brain of some smart promoter who is interested in what he can make out of it—and what he can make out of gullible people whose very real and patriotic desire to be of service he can translate to his own advantage.

For instance, I'm told there are organizations being promoted—purely private organizations, with no Government sponsorship, no Government approval, no Government connections whatever—that are doing a wholesale business selling membership—and uniforms—to women.

Now, that would be funny, if it wasn't pathetic. So look out; don't get taken in.

Remember that the functions of women in the preparedness progam and the services women can render in home defense will be arrived at by the Government as a crystallizing of public opinion. When that has occurred definite plans will be formulated. These plans will be studied by our Representatives in Congress, and if necessary laws will be passed.

Depend upon it, when the Government—and that means the people of America—is ready to undertake the training of women for defense functions, you will find out about it, and you will have your chance for training in whatever field your native abilities lie. There is no need for you to waste your money buying uniforms and parading; if Uncle Sam decides he wants you in uniform, he'll furnish them.

So again, in conclusion, I say to the women who are interested—and you all are interested—think seriously, talk seriously, discuss carefully, the important problems of what women can best contribute to defense, and let your Representatives know what you think about it. That is the way we do things in America; and I thank Heaven that our women, as well as our men, are willing and eager to serve in any way to preserve our ways.

How To Defeat Hitler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

ARTICLE BY E. G. B. RILEY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "How To Defeat Hitler," written by Mr. E. G. B. Riley, of Laconia, N. H.

This article should prove of unusual interest because Mr. Riley is a well-known war analyst and radio commentator.

Previous articles and forecasts of Mr. Riley have been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and have attracted widespread attention.

In asking permission to have this article inserted in the RECORD, I do not necessarily concur with the views ex-

pressed in the article, but I do believe it to be of general interest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO DEFEAT HITLER

(By E. G. B. Riley)

Hitler can be defeated, but not by the methods now being used.

The course that Great Britain and the United States are now following will most certainly lead to the early defeat of Britain and bring down economic chaos and revolution in this country.

It is most necessary, in order to properly visualize the real hectic state of affairs, to realize that there are no war experts in existence today.

Where are Generalissimo Maurice Gamelin and the commanding general of the British forces in France of only a few months ago? What is the present status of General Wavell, last month's hero of Libya?

The heroes and war experts of yesterday become the military "goats" of today.

This evolution is the result of inexperience and failure to recognize the terrific battering power of coordinated mechanized air and land war machines.

These generals, competent to successfully command huge land forces when war was conducted on the same basis as 1915, planned their defensive and offensive campaigns along outmoded lines with the most disastrous results. Even General Wavell was unable to combat the offensive launched against his army after his successful occupation of the greater part of Libya because of a slight variation in the method of attack that had been previously utilized by the Italians in their first raid on British forces. General Wavell's decline in prestige may be partially blamed on the orders given to him by politicians who had sought to win diplomatic victories by promises of aid which could not be fulfilled.

No American, British, or French official observers were allotted to the German or Italian armies when they were engaged in fighting the Royalists in the Franco-Spanish War. In that war Hitler first utilized the mechanized ground units used in conjunction with airplanes, out of which evolved the present panzer-blitz system which has proved its worth.

There was not a single member of our Government capable of recognizing the terrible import to the United States of the new military methods that were being adopted because our Army observers were not given the opportunity to witness their efficiency in actual warfare.

This new system was first proven by the rapid rape of Poland, and then its military value was not given proper recognition because the so-called foreign war experts blamed the disaster on the weakness of the Polish Army.

The accomplishments of Hitler's mechanized units when directed against the Yugoslavians and the valiant Greeks, after the latter had wrecked the Italians, are even now considered astounding by our civilian war "experts." Our civilian experts, in the name of Uncle Sam, encouraged the Yugoslavs to offer armed resistance to Hitler because they knew nothing of the military power of his mechanized armies.

It cannot be denied that the United States and Great Britain are partially responsible for the futile loss of thousands of Greeks and Yugoslavians who would never have dared to combat while unprepared a tested, proven mechanized war machine, unless they believed that the United States and Great Britain would immediately give them both military support and badly needed munitions. Anyone familiar with the present state of our arsenal and the breakdown of our production lines must have had "his tongue in his cheek" when making such promises of aid.

Our high-ranking Army and Navy officers must now be given more opportunity to gain experience by personal observation of wartime panzer methods. No military observer, irrespective of rank, can qualify as being experienced in war tactics as practiced by the Germans without devoting months of study to the application of these methods in actual battlefield operations. No civilian or politician can bring back to this country a true picture of the actual military requirements of this Nation by spending a few hours or days conferring with foreign governmental and military heads.

It is long past the time when we should have replaced civilian "yes" men and women in the Government with the most progressive members of our Army and Navy.

Fighting or planning to fight a war along "horse and buggy" lines must be stopped here in America, and not in the future on foreign battlefields.

In view of actual developments covering the duration of this war, your analyst sees the necessity of a secretary of aviation in the Cabinet with equal rank with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy.

Would that these United States could recall to this world Gen. William Mitchell, the one man who foresaw the importance of wartime aviation units. I called attention a year ago to the necessity of concentrating on implements of war that would be available by January 1, 1941. That date has passed. We should certainly concentrate now on the construction of munitions of war that will be completed on or before January 1, 1942. Our major effort should be directed toward securing the equipment that can be completed in a minimum time for the proper arming of our Army and Navy.

When will our leaders learn that now we need vital war machines, planes, tanks, bombs, and guns? We need them here to equip our sons who are now in the Army and Navy. We will need them to defend the soil of North America.

Uncle Sam is following closely the pattern of France and Britain, which countries, when not at war and while inadequately prepared, uttered strong inciting and encouraging words which they were unable to sustain but which contributed to the devastation of Poland, Belgium, and many other small nations.

New weapons have been devised for use under all conditions. Hitler, recognizing that the Italians, with far superior equipment, could not hold their own with the Greeks, developed and improved mine-throwing tanks, so that they can blast away obstacles and negotiate many of the so-called impassable trails of the Transylvanian Alps, and armed asbestos-clad parachutists with flame-throwing machines for use behind the enemy lines.

Hitler, while improving his position in the Balkans, stalled until such new weapons were on hand and then—blitz.

Do you think it will be less than 2 years before the United States will have comparable tanks and equipment? If so, you are one of those wishful thinking optimistic individuals who are responsible for having Uncle Sam "lead with his chin."

Unfortunately for us a few impractical college professors, lawyers, and social workers have at times a dominant voice in our affairs and shape many of our governmental policies. These men, who in the past have shown that they cannot even solve our own domestic problems, are now rushing and pushing our sons on to foreign battlefields. It will be at least 1 year before our sons can be properly disciplined, trained, and equipped so that they will have an even chance battling with an experienced and tested enemy of equal numerical strength.

All aid short of war should be the policy adopted by the United States, but, first, all aid should be given to our sons who are now serving in the Army and Navy by providing them with the needed equipment which they now lack. Let us concentrate on properly uniforming, equipping, and training them.

In extending aid to other nations great care should be used not to bring about a repetition of the situation whereby planes, equipment, and munitions of war intended for certain nations eventually are received by the Nazis or some other hostile power.

Everyone, irrespective of age, should know that in the last World War the "Allies floated to victory on a sea of oil."

Everyone should know that Hitler cannot float to victory without a now more necessary "sea of oil."

Hitler is compelled by his new system of coordinated mechanized attack to use many times the quantity of oil used by the Kaiser in 1915.

The Germans with their usual thoroughness developed many sources of synthetic-oil products, and by capturing the Ploesti oil fields in Rumania they supplemented the approximated 1 year's supply which was stored in Germany in 1939.

In addition, the huge amount of oil and gasoline they secured by conquering Belgium, Holland, and France was of the greatest military value to them, but even though these supplies are augmented by limited shipments from Russia, the Germans are running short of both gasoline and oil.

This approaching shortage accounts for the intermittent periods of inactivity of the German Luftwaffe. The gasoline shortage explains why some of their troop-transport planes are powered with Diesel motors.

Hitler figured that this war would terminate in a speedy victory for Germany and Italy and that the duration of the war would be less than 1 year and, in no event, would it last longer than 18 months. He has been compelled to revise his estimate because of the gross failure of the Italians to hold up their end of the Axis war plans. To make matters worse, much of Mussolini's supply of oil—most of which had to be drawn from Germany—was captured in Africa.

Hitler witnessing the great destruction wrought by the valiant R. A. F. on his oil supply bases in France, Belgium, Holland, and Germany, not to mention that brought about by the bombing of his synthetic-oil plants deep in German territory, has had to revise his original plan of war. This plan was to have Italy capture Greece and then Yugoslavia, thus placing the Italians facing the Turkish boundary while the Italian fleet occupied the Aegean Sea.

Had Italy succeeded in carrying out such a plan, Hitler would have been free to follow out his original "anchor to windward" plan of "blitzing" Turkey in order to seize the oil fields of Iraq and Iran. In these two countries is located the only source of supply of oil that Hitler can reach without bringing Russia into the war as Britain's ally. Hitler is now headed for Iraq and Iran and the Grecian episode is only incidental to his plans.

Hitler has, within the past 2 weeks, through "fifth column" activities, brought about the overthrow of the pro-British Iraq Government, and his men now control the Iraq Government. He must be stopped from attaining this objective or he will dominate both Europe and Asia. In addition to gaining his most vital supply of oil, Hitler's conquest will shut off from the British this most accessible supply of oil, thereby placing a great additional strain on their tanker shipping problem.

With the same diabolical cleverness that he has displayed in his power diplomatic victories of the past year, Hitler is slowly but

surely swallowing the Russian bear. Stalin is now "on the spot" that Hitler has prepared for him and that spot is much too warm for Stalin's comfort. Stalin, by way of the Axis, is Hitler's ally, but Stalin is also Hitler's enemy because he is aware that Hitler is crucifying him.

When Russia was breaking her back on Finland's Mannerheim line, Stalin was forced, in order to maintain some small vestige of international prestige, to call on Hitler for aid. Hitler responded, but only after he forced Stalin to accept certain of his terms regarding Hitler's supervision of the Russian Baku oil fields and the delivery of oil to Germany.

Hitler's engineers and army officers were placed in strategic positions in Russia, but only after Stalin had purged every Russian officer who, up to that time, had any wartime military experience.

When Italy started to show signs of collapse Stalin thought that Hitler's dream of power was about to end and to hasten this end Stalin began to lessen his shipments of oil, nickel, and grain to Germany. This action forced Hitler to start his revised Balkan campaign. He placed a powerful German and Rumanian Army on the Pruth River, the Rumanian-Russian boundary extending north from the Black Sea, facing toward the Baku oil fields of Russia. Then Hitler evidently promised India to Russia if Stalin would guarantee that Turkey would permit German and Italian troops to pass through Turkey in order to reach Iraq and Iran, and turn over to Germany the control of the Dardanelles. Hitler has told Stalin that he is going to get oil from Iraq—or else. The "or else" means that if Germany has any trouble with Turkey or Russia, Hitler will take from Russia the Baku oil fields.

If the British will concentrate on protecting Iraq and Iran, Syria, Palestine, and the Suez Canal, and not attempt to protect all of their world empire, Hitler will be defeated and oil will have brought about his end.

Hitler, through a shortage of oil, will have had his mechanized army rendered impotent. Without his chief war weapon he cannot maintain control of the many countries he has conquered and which he is forced to occupy to maintain his supremacy. Armed resistance in these occupied countries will then result in revolution against German control and Hitler's power regime will collapse through internal discord and dissension.

Delays due to inability to secure oil for the operation of his mobile mechanized army will permit the United States to prepare for any eventuality and will permit the British to regain control of territory previously lost to Germany.

Russia, Finland, and other nations will turn on and rend apart that which is left of Hitler's "world empire."

The labor troubles, the strikes that are hamstringing our boys in the service, are more to be feared than Hitler, and are a thousand times more dangerous. The delay in production of one small, inexpensive part of machines or machinery may result in the loss of the deciding battle of the war.

We have a sure, immediate cure for these troubles, but we have not found the doctor with the courage to prescribe the remedy.

Ernest Bevin was England's doctor who knew the cure and did not hesitate to prescribe.

Would that we had such a leader to supplant some of the leaders we have in this country today—a man who would not countenance strikes in vital defense projects that are so necessary to our men in the Army and Navy. These strikes are encouraged by leaders who are sympathetic to the Communist, Nazi, and Fascist cause, or whose avariciousness makes them an easy prey to un-American influences and intrigue.

There are ways of dealing with such persons, and if labor itself does not act to correct this hampering situation, then Congress will be forced to act, and to act with a firm hand. This may take the form of restrictive strike legislation or eventually may go as far as reopening concentration camps in this country such as existed in the previous World War. Action must come, and come immediately. There can be no delay. Only by immediate action can we avoid following that path which Hitler has paved for us.

We cannot maintain a complete defense program under present conditions. Contrast what is happening in some places in this country today with the contribution that British labor is making under Bevin's leadership. British labor has accepted without complaint a 72-hour working week. Such hours were not established until the fall of France when Hitler was at the very gate of Britain.

Let us hope that we do not reach that point in America—but if the present sabotage of our defense efforts continues as a result of unwarranted strikes, we will have to take similar drastic measures. The American workingman is a real American patriot. He founded and built these United States; but, unfortunately, a small group of selfish, Communistic, pro-Nazi, pro-Fascist individuals have, without his authority, given forth utterances which falsely portray his position in this emergency.

Fellow Americans, remember that you constitute the Government of these United States, that those billions that are being hurled recklessly abroad are the billions that you will have to take out of your pockets or out of your future earnings. Bear in mind that Government has not one dollar of its own and that if any trace of democracy still exists you can stop this headlong plunge into economic chaos before it is too late.

Arm and equip our boys, prepare and defend our Nation and our adjoining neighbors, but do not endeavor to rule and dominate every foreign nation. Refrain from squandering your birthright in attempts to change human nature.

We cannot do the impossible.

Hitler has no doubt planned to take advantage of our most obvious proposed course of action. Hitler is aware that we are unprepared today and that we are straining our resources to send abroad planes, equipment, and munitions that we can ill afford to spare here.

From the activities of the present administration, it does not seem that the matter of convoying ships will ever be brought to the attention of Congress—and this prediction is made on the assumption that convoys will be used.

We have only a one-ocean navy, and it is physically impossible for us to have a two-ocean navy for a period of several years.

Hitler will undoubtedly take the steps necessary to bring about a war between the United States and Italy. When such a state of war exists, Japan, as per existing treaties, will be drawn into the conflict on the Axis side.

With our fleet spread in a necessarily thin line by reason of our taking over the military protection of the entire Western Hemisphere, which is apparently only the beginning of our voluntarily assumed obligations, we will be in the exact position that Hitler has anticipated and planned for us.

Then with our Navy convoying ships to so-called neutral Egypt, which may be captured by the Axis before our first delivery of arms can be made, Japan will make a feint toward French Indochina. With attention directed toward Singapore, the Japanese will capture the Netherland East Indies, thereby gaining the supply of gasoline and oil without which the Japanese cannot even continue their present war on China. Within 60 days of the day we start to convoy ships across the Atlantic, Japan will be actively in the war.

On July 1, 1940, via radio and press, your analyst announced the probable signing of the treaty of nonaggression between Russia and Japan, which is now being termed "startling and astounding."

Now it can be forecast that trouble in South America, in Argentine, Brazil, and Chile, fomented by Hitler, Mussolini, and Franco, will soon break out. Focus your attention on the Panama Canal and on our aviation factories.

Do not be "startled," or "astounded" in the very near future to hear of troop and aviation activities by combined Japanese and Russian forces within 300 miles of our Alaskan border.

This is all part of Hitler's plan for us and we are following it on schedule.

Remember, Americans, our larder is full but—our "Arsenal" is bare.

Mediation as Remedy for Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

ARTICLE BY JAY FRANKLIN

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able article by Jay Franklin, entitled "Mediation Is Best Remedy for Strikes."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE, THE PEOPLE—MEDIATION IS BEST REMEDY FOR STRIKES

(By Jay Franklin)

If Congressmen listen to the advice of ex-Gov. Clifford M. Townsend, of Indiana, now with the Office of Production Management and a member of the new O. P. M. plant-site committee, they will set aside their current proposals for compulsory antistrike legislation and rely on mediation to settle disputes in defense industries.

Compulsory arbitration has been tried in Canada, Australia, Kansas, and Colorado. The results have not been good. In fact, the results have been so bad that, where compulsion has been tried, it has been abandoned—except, of course, in the totalitarian countries to whose methods the democracies are opposed.

Governor Townsend believes that the most important thing in labor relations is mutual trust. This, of course, must be fostered and much past history must be lived down. Mediation is, according to his experience, the best course, for when legislation curtails the rights of labor all trust is ruined and the situation becomes dictatorship and the legislation destroys itself.

The former chief executive of Indiana claims to speak from experience and points to the Hoosier record under the mediation system which he set up. He is, therefore, very optimistic concerning national labor relations, although he admits that both sides are to blame—with some stubborn managers and antiquated owners, some radical or irresponsible labor leaders.

HOW IT WORKED

Governor Townsend established Indiana's mediation system in the wake of the 1937 wave of sit-down strikes. At one time he and C. I. O.'s Van Bittner lived in their clothes for 36 hours during the "little steel" strike.

Townsend then laid the groundwork for a truce with Inland Steel. During this period he demanded that John L. Lewis remove the C. I. O. regional director at Indianapolis because of Communist connections, and won his point from the grim leader of the sitdowns.

Then Townsend set up a one-man mediation board. For the director he picked a labor man who had been in prison 14 times for labor disturbances. The only weapon this Indiana State mediator possessed was the right to demand certain records when needed to settle a dispute. Since the establishment of this unique system, over 1,400 labor disputes have been settled inside 4 years in Indiana, no blood has been lost, and not a dollar's worth of property has been destroyed.

Since the establishment of this effective mediation system the State has witnessed a growth of half a billion dollars of corporate plant investment. Included are one large International Harvester plant and two General Electric plants. The corporations have told Townsend that one of the greatest inducements influencing their investments was the fact that labor relations were being handled intelligently and successfully in Indiana.

A FAIR TEST

Indiana is a good laboratory for testing mediation since the State is representative of labor and industry on the national scale. There are Gary and South Bend, and industrial enterprises include steel and rolling-mill products, automobiles, furniture, glass, soap, refrigerators, farm implements, pumps, and grain-mill products, in addition to coal, coke, petroleum, natural gas, limestone, gypsum, and pig iron.

Nearly every kind of labor organization is also represented in the State from the sailors on Lake Michigan to the United Mine Workers in the field, which used to contain John Lewis' central office for organizing coal.

Mediation produces better results than does compulsion, says Townsend, and results are what America needs to beat Hitler.

George A. Mathews

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned that the Honorable George A. Mathews, who was a Delegate from the Territory of Dakota at the time of the admission of the States of North Dakota and South Dakota into the Union, died in Los Angeles, Calif., April 19, 1941. He played an important part in the events leading up to the admission of these States into the Union.

Mr. Mathews was born in Potsdam, St. Lawrence County, N. Y., on June 4, 1852. He attended the common schools, Upper Iowa University, Fayette, Iowa, in 1874, and the law department of the University of Iowa, at Iowa City, in 1878. He was admitted to the bar in 1878 and commenced practice in Corning, Iowa, moved to Brookings, Brookings County, Dakota (now South Dakota), in 1879, and continued the practice of law. Mr. Mathews was prosecuting attorney of the fifth judicial circuit for the Territory of Dakota in 1884, a member of the Territorial council, and served as its president in 1887. As a Republican, he was elected a Delegate to the Fifty-first Congress and served from March 4, 1889, to November 2, 1889, when the Territory was admitted into the Union as the States of North Dakota and South Dakota. He was mayor of the city of Brookings, S. Dak., from 1897 to 1903, after which time he resumed the practice of law at Brookings, S. Dak. All those who were acquainted with him testify to the high character of his public service.

In connection with the service of Mr. Mathews as the last delegate from the Territory of Dakota, an interesting story is told. His term began March 4, 1889, the day that Benjamin Harrison, Republican, became President of the United States following the administration of Grover Cleveland, Democrat. In those days, that meant a great turnover of officeholders all along the line. And, Mr. Mathews, as the Republican from the Territory of Dakota had all of the patronage for the Territory of Dakota. Reports agree that he was besieged with persons seeking his endorsement for all the Federal positions in what soon was to comprise two States. On his endorsement hung appointments running from postmaster to United States marshal. Several land offices existed at that time, with several appointments in each.

It is to be remembered that in those days, Members and Delegates did not have a secretarial staff such as we have today. They were allowed only $5 a day for a session clerk, and the sessions did not begin with the Presidential inauguration. So, Mr. Mathews had to meet the extraordinary demands of patronage with his personal secretarial force in a day when the pay of a Delegate or Member was $5,000 per annum, and he served less than a year, as has been noted. It is not of record, however, that he complained on that score, and, as I have said, he retired to his home city of Brookings where he practiced law, served as mayor for several years, and finally retired to spend his last days in California, returning occasionally to visit friends in his home State of South Dakota.

The Great National Paradox—An Argument for the Referendum on Overseas Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1941

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I believe that all thinking persons must be deeply impressed by a very great paradox that exists in our national attitude toward the war that is raging overseas.

It is my considered opinion, based on wide contacts with national sentiment, that at least 98 percent of the people of America are firm and set in their determination that America shall keep out of these foreign conflicts and that only a meager 2 percent, or less, favor our participation.

The average American, representing, as I believe, at least 98 percent of his fellows, feels a sympathy for the British and would like to aid them, but not to the extent of endangering America. He thinks, as I do, that there is no need of our getting into the wars that are raging in Europe, Africa, and Asia, and that we would not if we would keep our heads, think of America first, and steer clear of foreign entanglements, as Washington and Jefferson advised us to do.

Yet with all of this vast body of public opinion insisting that we should build up our defenses at home and stay out of foreign wars which we had no part in starting, a large majority of our people are at this moment filled with fear that we will be dragged into war across the seas.

Those who believe in the infallibility of the Gallup poll will be interested to note that the Institute of Public Opinion has discovered the same identical paradoxical situation I have just outlined. According to the Gallup poll, 84 percent of the American people are against our participation in the war, but 82 percent—as of April 10–20—think we are going in.

All of which suggests that a review of the proposal for a referendum on foreign wars, which I first introduced in the Congress six and a half years ago, would be a contribution to sound thinking in these troubled times. Throughout the years I have steadfastly championed this proposal and I believe it is now more important than ever. We are in a momentous formative period in the crystallization of American policy and the fate not only of America but of the whole world, for weal or for woe, may depend largely on the outcome. Why should we not again take up for serious consideration the question as to whether the people should have a right to express themselves through a referendum on the greatest and most tragic question that can possibly affect them, their homes, and their loved ones? Under my resolution, a duplicate of which has been introduced in the Senate by Senator CAPPER, it is provided—

> Except in case of invasion by armed forces, actual or immediately threatened by an approaching military expedition, or attack upon the United States or its territorial possessions, or by any non-American nation against any country in the Western Hemisphere, the people shall have the sole power by a national referendum to declare war or to engage in warfare overseas. Congress, when it deems a national crisis to exist in conformance with this article, shall by concurrent resolution refer the question to the people.

It will be noted that under the resolution the referendum would apply only to proposals to send American boys into war overseas. If the United States or any other country in the Western Hemisphere is attacked or invaded there would be no referendum.

With all my heart I believe in democracy—the right of the people to rule—

and if this God-given right is vouchsafed to them, as I think it should be, it certainly should be theirs to decide the great and tragic question of reddening the soil of foreign countries with the blood of American boys, as well as the minor and inconsequential things of life. The citizen can now vote for constable, but he has no vote on war. How can I, a Member of Congress, say to my constituent, "You have sense enough and intelligence enough and information enough to vote for me for Congress, but you do not have sense enough and intelligence enough and information enough to vote on the question of sending your boy into the hell of a foreign war"?

I am not going to say that to any constituent of mine, because it would be a monstrous falsehood. Modern means of quick communication, the telegraph, the radio, the daily newspapers keep the people fully informed and they are amply competent to serve as a jury to decide whether our American soldiers shall be sent into foreign wars across the oceans.

I fervently hope that the time is not far distant when our statesmen in positions of power and responsibility will have a more kindly feeling for this great democratic principle of allowing the people who have to do the dying and the suffering and to bear the burdens and griefs of war, the right to decide whether our armed forces shall enter overseas conflicts. I firmly believe that if it had not been for the powerful pressure that beat down my resolution when it was before the House on January 10, 1938, it would now be a part of the Constitution, along with the Bill of Rights, and the great majority of the people whom the Gallup poll finds to be opposed to our participation in foreign wars would now have a chance to express themselves in a referendum which would be a binding decision.

At this time there is a sharp revival of interest in the referendum proposal and it is being debated in many circles and by many groups. It was the subject of discussion by the American Forum of the Air on April 6, when the merit of the proposal was presented by Representative WILLIAM B. BARRY, of New York, and Senator D. WORTH CLARK, of Idaho. By unanimous consent of the House I present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address delivered by our able colleague Mr. BARRY on that occasion, as follows:

In recent years Congress has been bombarded with public-opinion polls by administration spokesmen, newspapers, radio commentators, and others, as evidence of the people's support or opposition to important legislation. These, especially the Gallup poll, exert great influence on congressional decisions, and yet a number of them, including the once-famous Literary Digest poll, have been proven to be grossly inaccurate. Wouldn't it be a national tragedy if the Gallup poll erroneously found that a majority of Americans wanted war, and the President and Congress, misled on the views of the people, plunged us into war? That could happen.

Why not, then, have an official referendum of public opinion on sending our men to fight on other continents? There would then be no room for mistake or fraud—and such decision would be that of the people.

Another compelling reason for support of this resolution is that historians generally agree that of the four foreign wars declared by Congress during our history, two—the Mexican and Spanish Wars—were brought about by Executive pressure on Congress rather than by demand of the people. During the Mexican War Lincoln was a Congressman and Grant an Army lieutenant. They both subsequently condemned it as a wicked war, unconstitutionally begun by the President.

Before President McKinley sought and obtained a declaration of war from Congress against Spain, the Spaniards had already surrendered to every American demand. McKinley, however, kept their surrender message a secret and led this Nation into an unnecessary war.

Historians differ on American sentiment before the last war. However, we know that Wilson was reelected on his record of having kept us out of war—only to lead us in 5 months later. After 26 days of war, Congress was compelled to adopt conscription when only 48,000 men volunteered. This, I believe, was indicative of the real sentiment of the American people toward war at that time. In 1937 the Gallup poll found that 64 percent of Americans believed that our entry into that war was a mistake.

During my time in Congress I have witnessed Executive pressure change large blocks of congressional votes. Two outstanding examples were the Ludlow referendum and repeal of the arms embargo. It is my conviction that a referendum by the people would stiffen congressional resistance to Executive persuasion.

Today, in spite of the President's pledge not to intervene in foreign disputes and not to send our boys into foreign wars, we are already in the war with everything but men. The warmongers are now crying for American sailors to convoy and die. Is it unreasonable, is it asking too much, to give those who will do the fighting and dying an opportunity to let their President and Congressmen know how they feel about it?

St. Lawrence Seaway No Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS GLOBE-DEMOCRAT OF APRIL 6, 1941

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Sunday, April 6, 1941:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of April 6, 1941]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY NO DEFENSE

The administration's attempt to force congressional acceptance of an American-Canadian agreement on the St. Lawrence waterways project, is meeting with determined opposition which, we trust, will be sufficient to defeat it. It is virtually the same arrangement which was emphatically turned down by the Senate in 1934, and it has no more merit today than it did 7 years ago, despite its presentation by the President as vitally necessary to our national defense.

Much resentment is expressed in Congress and elsewhere because the President offers the measure as an agreement and not a treaty, although it is almost the identical document under consideration in 1934 as a treaty. However, a treaty requires a two-thirds vote of approval by the Senate; an agreement merely requires a majority vote of any quorum in both Houses of Congress. The latter, of course, is much easier to obtain.

The proposed treaty defines the "Great Lakes System" as comprising Lakes Superior, Michigan, Huron (including Georgian Bay), Erie, and Ontario, and the connecting waters, including Lake St. Clair. Residents of the Mississippi Valley, in particular, object to the inclusion of Lake Michigan. It is an all-American lake, no part of it lying in Canada. As long ago as 1812, under the Treaty of Ghent, complete American sovereignty over its waters was established and so remains today unless the present treaty (agreement) is ratified. Friendly as are our relations with Canada it is inconceivable that the Dominion Government should exercise authority in any degree over Lake Michigan, especially when its contemplated authority permits it to regulate water diversion for uses in this watershed. Nor is it understandable why such authority should be granted Canada when, under the treaty (agreement) the Dominion has the right to divert for its sole use all the water it needs for power or other uses through the Ottawa River, from Georgian Bay (Lake Huron) to Montreal. This is a diversion that could seriously affect the flow at Niagara Falls.

The weakest excuse is that that project should be pushed to completion now as a defense measure. Even the piecemeal dredging and installations at the International Rapids, suggested as the first work to be done, could not be completed within 3 years. The entire project, which comprehends a 27-foot channel from the eastern end of Lake Ontario to the Atlantic Ocean, could not be completed before 1947, possibly 1948. This may be long-range planning, but it has nothing to do with an immediate emergency which requires all the money and men and materials we can muster for more obvious necessities. It has been pointed out many times that the completed seaway could not be used by 95 percent of the passenger-cargo ships engaged in overseas trade, nor by 81 percent of the American cargo vessels or any of the tankers engaged in intercoastal trade. And it is well to remember that for 5 months out of every year the channel is frozen and all transportation is halted.

In its present form the treaty (agreement) is wholly unacceptable. It would saddle the entire country with a tremendous tax burden from which only a small area would receive any benefits at all. We do not need the seaway for power or defense or transportation. Congress will do well to disapprove now, just as it did in 1934.

Blitzing the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch

of Friday, April 25, 1941, entitled "Blitzing the People."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 25, 1941]

BLITZING THE PEOPLE

The blitz is on. We don't mean Hitler's blitzkrieg in Europe. We mean the Roosevelt administration's blitz in the United States to produce a war fever among the people.

Yesterday no less than three members of the Cabinet made speeches on the subject of the war. Secretary of Agriculture Wickard said it was high time the people "got excited" about the critical state of world affairs. As though the American people were so dumb that they do not realize what is happening in Europe! What does Mr. Wickard mean about getting excited? Does he mean that they should lose their heads and plunge into a war which, as dispatches from London indicate, may already be approaching its end?

Secretary Knox said yesterday that the United States cannot permit its goods to be sunk in the Atlantic, thereby making a plea for convoys. And a plea for convoys is a plea for war. Only a few weeks ago the President said:

"Obviously if one nation convoys ships, either under its own flag or that of another, through a hostile zone on the doctrine of chance, there is pretty sure to be some shooting, and that comes awfully close to war. That is the last thing wanted; we must not do anything to compel shooting."

Yesterday, also, Secretary of State Hull said ways must be found to insure that aid to Britain reaches its destination in the shortest of time and in maximum of quantity. While shunning such crude Wickardisms as "let's get excited," the Secretary said: "Events have shown beyond possible question that the safety of this hemisphere and of this country calls for resistance wherever resistance will be most effective."

A fourth member of the President's official family, Vice President Wallace, two weeks ago said, "The United States now has her second opportunity to make the world safe for democracy," meaning, of course, that we should repeat our history of 1917–18. Following Wallace's speech and preceding those of Wickard, Knox, and Hull, we had the testimony of Secretary Stimson that the United States Army must be prepared to fight anywhere in the world. Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones, a fifth member of the Cabinet, at the Associated Press convention, added his voice to the chorus. Secretary Ickes, a sixth member of the Cabinet, in a Chicago speech the other day, smeared citizens who are opposed to intervention. Sandwiched in these utterances were speeches of "Wild Bill" Donovan, who helped engineer the Yugoslav revolt; former Ambassador Bullitt, whose oratorical gifts have been drawn upon more than once to make belligerent speeches; and Paul McNutt, the Federal Security Administrator.

All this fits into a pattern. A rolling barrage of propaganda is being laid down to arouse the people out of what is called apathy, but which really is firm resistance to open participation in the war. The people, well-informed by press and radio, know what is going on in Europe. They are not poor, benighted heathens, but the most literate and intelligent population on earth. They know that Britain's downfall would be tragic, and would bring all sorts of desperate problems in its train. They want to help Britain in all possible ways—short of war.

The people also are for defense to the hilt. "Millions for defense," was the cry when our country was young. Today the cry is, "Billions for defense." The people are not asleep. They know the menace of Hitlerism just as the State Department does. The people of the United States will fight to the last man to save the soil of America. They have not been convinced that the way to do this is to enter the wars in Europe, in Africa, and in Asia.

While the Cabinet officials are trying to create a war spirit among the people, some of the columnists are pursuing a different line. They are urging the President to go farther and faster. Yesterday Dorothy Thompson said:

"Apparently, the President is waiting for 'public opinion' to indicate the line he should take. This kind of flirtation with the public can be fatal."

This is, indeed, impudent. Mr. Roosevelt is the most persuasive leader of public opinion this country has seen in generations, yet he must have people like the columnists to tell him how to do it. And one of the reasons the President is a persuasive leader is that he has a respect for public opinion. He knows it can be led just so far. He knows that this is still a democracy and that people cannot be seized by the nape of the neck and made to think what they do not want to think.

Yes; the barrage is on. It remains to be seen whether the people can be roused into war hysteria or whether, with all their sources of information about what is going on in this world, they will still permit the quiet voice of reason to counsel them. After all, it is they who will fight this war if it is to be fought; it is they who will pay for the war; it is their destiny that is at stake.

Whether or not we shall enter this war at the eleventh hour is the greatest decision the people have been called upon to make since the Civil War, not forgetting the first World War. We have confidence in their judgment, in that good old Yankee horse sense that has so often come to their rescue.

Our Infantry of the Air—The Civilian Air Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY COL. JOSEPH E. MYERS

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Col. Joseph E. Myers, president of the Aviation Defense Association, of Washington, D. C., over WSUN, St. Petersburg, Fla.:

Friends of Preparedness, I want to thank WSUN for this opportunity of addressing you today on the subject of Aviation, and especially so because of the convention of the Florida Junior Chamber of Commerce in St. Petersburg.

To St. Petersburg belongs the credit of being the cradle of National Aviation Day in America. It is therefore quite fitting to give full credit to the young men of the Jaycee Club of this city for sponsoring our resolution which resulted in the passage of Senator PEPPER'S resolution establishing the annual observance of National Aviation Day in honor of Dr. Orville Wright's birth date on August 19.

We are now preparing for the third annual celebration of August 19 in the city of Washington and we hope that the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the State of Florida and all other patriotic organizations will pass resolutions for the observance of this historical date as well as the observance of December 17, Pan-American Aviation Day, which we also sponsor.

Our main objective is to create a state of air-mindedness and air appreciation throughout the nations in the Western Hemisphere in order to effect a unified pan-American command. To this end, the Boy Scouts of America, the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, and others are cooperating with us in our campaign for safe air travel.

It is necessary to support this objective, if we are to preserve our liberty and freedom from Nazi domination and despotism. It is up to you and me to talk and think America first in the air and on the land and sea.

On every hand one hears the question, How do the Germans do it? The answer must be sustained air superiority combined with that tenseness of purpose amounting to almost superhuman ability.

Loss of air control immediately spells disaster. Only last night I heard a Greek radio observer state that the Nazi dive bombers blew up one tank after another with what seemed to me to be almost incredible accuracy. I will leave it to your imagination as to what may happen to ships of war proceeding without air convoy.

If lack of time to prepare in the air results in the invasion of England and the capture of the Suez Canal, then war will begin between Europe, Asia, and Africa against the Americans, because the people of America and Britain will never surrender.

Hence the necessity of establishing a strong coalition between the democracies, the building of great international superhighways connecting strategic points, and the construction of underground air bases throughout the Americas.

April events in the Balkans and the sinking of the Italian Fleet in the Mediterranean prove beyond doubt that superiority in the air means victory on land and sea. In fact the future of civilization and the continuance of our American way of life now hang in the balance.

The die is cast and we must bend all our effort to win the war. For this reason our air force must be so powerful that it can protect our Navy and shipping 1,000 miles from our shores, and a civilian air reserve must be established to repel any invasion by land. This will require the immediate construction of many underground air bases and auxiliary flying fields.

In the first World War, airplanes were the eyes of the armies and navies; since then, they have acquired radio ears and they have been so effectively armed with machine guns, bombs, and cannon that they may well be termed the artillery and infantry of the air. They constitute the most destructive implements of war ever known to man. In a war of nerves and machines requiring highly technical skill it will become necessary to use thousands of civilian aviators and mechanics of experience and worth, as well as to create a state of air-appreciation and air-mindedness throughout the nations, in the Western Hemisphere; to this latter end, we ask every patriotic man and woman, boy and girl in the Americas, to join the air reserve.

The shortage of experienced pilots and mechanics has occurred in Europe. The bottleneck is here now. This demands the use of all experienced flyers who are unable to pass the high requirements of our regular air service.

Col. Roscoe Turner, our aeronautical adviser, estimates that there are now available about 30,000 private pilots in the United States, and that some 200,000 light planes can be built in about 18 months' time. Colonel

Turner also contends that due to the tremendous speeds developed in our fighting planes, maneuvers are exceedingly dangerous, and that this great speed reduces their efficiency when near the ground.

Placed under a unified pan-American air command, such an army of four or five hundred thousand trained private flyers cement the ties of friendship and understanding between the nations in the Western Hemisphere and solves the question of any enemy attempt of invasion by land or sea.

A maximum of defense with a minimum of expenditure would obtain, were such planes equipped with light armor, machine guns, and bombing racks which would enable them to give a good account of themselves and to secure the release of many fighting air units for other work. Swarms of these light planes could defeat any invasion by land and, best of all, they can be launched from numerous small air fields and water basins which would be totally inadequate for our high-powered Army and Navy aircraft.

There are some persons who would ground all private flyers during the present emergency. Such a move would be no less than a calamity. It would reduce our air power by hundreds of thousands of capable flyers, and it is contrary to the pre-war preparations of the Germans which gave them their present air superiority. Furthermore, in the event of peace, it would wreck civilian flying.

Among the reasons advanced by those who would wreck our civilian transport system is that the use of private flyers might increase sabotage and allow infiltration of subversive persons. There is no more reason to believe that sabotage or subversive elements will obtain in a Government-controlled Civilian Air Reserve than in our regular air service.

We advocate immediate War and Navy Department control of all civilian flyers in cooperation with the Governors of States, and we urge all private flyers, mechanics, ground-crew members, and others to register in the Civilian Air Reserve of the Aviation Defense Association, with a view of lending their support to H. R. 4670, by Representative JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, to provide private planes with war equipment and to subsidize their operators, to effect a unified pan-American air command.

Make the Americas first in the air and on the land and sea and insure our liberty through sustained air superiority. Leaders are wanted for squadrons of men, women, boys, and girls and for thousands of observers, private flyers, mechanics, etc.

Procrastination never won a war—register now in the Civilian Air Reserve for the cause of civilization and the battle of freedom.

Colonel Lindbergh and Defeatism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

LETTER BY AMOS PINCHOT

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written to the President of the United States by Mr. Amos Pinchot:

NEW YORK, *April 29, 1941.*

The Honorable FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Because Col. Charles A. Lindbergh has made a frank, clear statement of what he believes to be Britain's chances in her war with Germany, you saw fit, at your press conference on Friday, April 25, to describe Colonel Lindbergh as a defeatist and a modern "Vallandigham." Vallandigham, as most people know, was a Representative from Ohio who was accused of treasonable utterances during the Civil War, convicted by a military court, and banished in 1863.

May I remind you, Mr. President, that some time ago you told your friend, Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY, of California, that Hitler's power was so great that, in all probability, Germany would win the war. On June 13, 1940, after expressing regret that your administration had not heeded Colonel Lindbergh's advice to build a great fleet of military airplanes, Mr. DOWNEY addressed the Senate, as follows:

"I might say that the President of the United States stated to me—and it is no violation of ethics when I say it, because he proclaimed it in the press—that the military power of Germany was so great that the overwhelming odds were in favor of Germany winning this war."

If making a low appraisal of Britain's chances of victory makes one a defeatist and a Vallandigham, who was the defeatist then, who the Vallandigham? May I also remind you that members of your Cabinet and other White House spokesmen have repeatedly stated that this country would go down to defeat and its people to slavery in a war with the Axis Powers unless we are protected by the British Navy. Certainly Colonel Lindbergh has never said anything like that. On the contrary, he has consistently held that, if we would prepare ourselves properly, it would be as impossible for Hitler to invade America as for America to invade Germany or the rest of the European continent.

Speaking of defeatism, on Thursday, April 24, at the Publishers' dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria, your Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Frank Knox, made a speech, a remarkable speech, which you endorsed next day. In that speech the Secretary said that, if we do not convoy war materials to England, so that the English may continue to protect us, the United States will assuredly be doomed. His exact words were as follows:

"We have declared that the aggressor nations must not be permitted to win. We have irrevocably committed ourselves to see that that is prevented. We have put all of our resources into the scales to bring defeat to those who would rule the world by force. We have acknowledged that our destiny, just as much as the destiny of the British Empire and the ultimate destiny of the conquered peoples of the Low Countries, of Scandinavia, of France, and of the Balkans, are at stake. Having gone thus far, we can only go on.

"Hitler cannot allow our war supplies and food to reach England—he will be defeated if they do. We cannot allow our goods to be sunk in the Atlantic—we shall be beaten if they do."

Did you ever hear Colonel LINDBERGH or Gen. Robert E. Wood, or any member of the America First Committee say anything as defeatist and old-womanish as that? Secretary Knox says we are sunk unless England holds our noses above water. That is a fine announcement for the head of the Navy to make to the world, and especially to the officers and enlisted men in the service. And it is a fine thing for the President of the United States, who is Commander in Chief of both the Army and the Navy, to endorse.

May I add that this dinner, at which the guest of honor, Secretary Knox, virtually declared war on one foreign nation, while he proclaimed our dependence on another, was also unusual in that it began by rising and singing—not the Star Spangled Banner, but God Save the King. And it may be said that your press conference next day was likewise unusual. For I believe it was the first time in American history that an American President has laid down the proposition that it is reprehensible, if not treasonable, for an American citizen to question another country's ability to defend itself, but praiseworthy to deny the ability of the United States.

Mr. President, at this juncture, when your administration is resorting to one device after another—patrols, convoying, and propagation of fear—to take this country into war—a war which you swore to avoid; a war which the people do not want and do not propose to have; a war for which our Military Establishment is sadly inadequate; a war from which the people of America can gain nothing but sorrow and disaster—it would seem that a little old-fashioned courage, common sense, and self-reliance might be in order.

Sincerely yours,

AMOS PINCHOT.

Corn and Wheat Quotas and Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, Joint Resolution No. 149, which is now under consideration, relates to marketing quotas of certain agricultural commodities. This bill calls for a 75-percent parity.

I am sure that all of the Members of the House know the general definition of parity. If you were to ask me to give a definition of parity as related to agriculture, I would state that parity is justice. Farmers will not get rich by securing full parity, but they will be enabled to secure a decent living. Seventy-five percent parity asked under this bill will not give justice. It is 75 percent justice; however, it will be a great help to the farmers of the Nation.

During the past few months we have heard it said by some, "Now is the time to get so and so." Those interested in agriculture do not take that attitude. This fight for parity is no new thing. It has been going on for years by the friends of agriculture.

As has been correctly stated by the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, chairman of the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations:

The appropriations to agriculture are not agricultural subsidies. They are consumption subsidies to prosperous industrialists who want cheap food in order to secure cheap labor for their factories and plants. It is those who are consuming food at less than the cost of production who are being subsidized rather than the farmer whose inadequate income is being scantily supplemented to barely keep his head above water while everybody else rides high.

Let us not continue to crucify agriculture upon the cross of false economy. You cannot have prosperity by one great element of our Nation and keep another under bondage. Give the farmer parity and it will be reflected in the pay rolls of industrial centers. The farmer desires a higher standard of living. Give him even a fair standard of living and he will spend all he makes for automobiles, trucks, tractors, radios, stoves, refrigerators, and hundreds of other manufactured articles. Today, in many places, farmers cannot buy even the necessities of life. He knows nothing of guaranteed wages and hours. His wages are small and his hours are long. Many have been forced to leave the farm because they could not eke out a living from the soil. Help us to prevent this.

I recall that during the last war there was a popular tune which ran something like this, How You Gonna Keep Them Down on the Farm After They've Seen Paree? They will not see Paris this time, but this problem of those leaving the farms is one which affects the industrial centers of this great Nation as much as it does the agricultural sections. After the present emergency many will be without jobs because there will necessarily have to be a reduction in the rate of production. What is going to become of these people? Many of them are today leaving the farm and their services are not required in the industrial centers. The passage of this bill will help to keep them on the farm. I want to see agriculture and labor join hands and march forward, yes, forward toward a great Nation. Let me appeal to you, my colleagues, not to forget the tiller of the soil and to give this bill your sympathetic consideration.

The Peace Within

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of Friday, April 25, 1941, entitled "The Peace Within," referring to the so-called Fight for Freedom Committee.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of April 25, 1941]

THE PEACE WITHIN

The manifesto of the new war group known as the Fight for Freedom Committee contains the following statement: "Once we accept the fact we are at war—even though it be undeclared—we shall at least find a peace within ourselves which can never come as long as we seek safety at the cost of others' sacrifice."

Bishop Henry W. Hobson, of Cincinnati, is chairman of the organization. Eighty-three year old CARTER GLASS, of Virginia, has accepted an honorary chairmanship. The membership list as published contains the names of clergymen and college deans and presidents, some of them identified as to age by the word "emeritus." Mr. Warburg's name appears, and a lady editor has signed up for the peace within for herself and the war without for the young men.

Many of the members doubtless can find no inner peace in war except vicariously. They will not seek release from inner turmoil by stopping a bullet or a bomb fragment, although even for the most infirm of them some service might be found in bombed areas in carrying consolation if not stretchers. Some there must be among the seekers of release who could make their quest where danger would be a bright spearhead pointed at them. They could join up where the fighting is and earn for themselves the inner peace they wish to receive from other persons.

Some of the searchers might be advised to devote themselves to self-restraint, contemplation, and communion with the equities of other people. If nothing but the sight of embarking divisions in which they have no sacrificial stake will bring them solace, their spiritual unrest is an expensive commodity for the people who must relieve them.

The old men seek vicarious adventure, vicarious courage, and vicarious sacrifice. They have joined up for the club-window front.

Political Outlook of American Negro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

ARTICLE BY OSCAR DEPRIEST

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix an article entitled "From a Republican Viewpoint," by Oscar DePriest, former Congressman for the First District in Chicago.

Mr. DePriest expresses the political outlook of the American Negro as published in the Brown American for April. Mr. DePriest is a leader in the political and industrial life of his community, who speaks and writes with authority gained through a lifetime of useful service in connection with city, county, and Federal Governments.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Brown American of April 1941]

FROM A REPUBLICAN VIEWPOINT

A discussion of the political outlook of the American Negro is extremely difficult at this time. Fast-moving events in this rapidly changing, warring world blur the picture. Warmongers in our own America add to the difficulty as they seek to draw us actively into the conflict.

Taking present world conditions into consideration, it seems to me that a quick glance at the national administration now in power should first be discussed.

A review of the entire history of the New Deal Roosevelt administration shows from beginning to end an avid desire of the President to thrive upon "emergencies" and to acquire increased powers by throwing a pall of fear over and weakening the courage of the American people. In one breath the "yes men" of the administration and the President himself tell us that we are dreadfully behind in our own war equipment, that our program of national defense is essential for our own salvation. With the next breath they tell us that our safety is dependent upon our ability to furnish Britain with all she needs to make victory for the British morally certain.

Just recently debates in Congress have brought out on cross-examination that the New Dealers would go so far as to send our ships as convoy and would lend our fleet to the English Government. Obviously, these would be acts of war and America would be drawn into a flaming world battle. Again we would be forced to send our boys to defend democracy on foreign battlefields while every day we see democracy slipping through our fingers and perishing here at home.

Here in America, although we may be unjustly separate as to race, we are nevertheless a definite part of the national life. We do have some privileges. We do have an opportunity to fight for our rights and to keep up that fight until it reaches the highest tribunal. With the exception of the diabolical practices carried on in the Southern States, we enjoy the right and privilege of a free ballot. And there is no legal reason why we should not enjoy equal rights with American citizens everywhere. It is up to us to keep these legal rights and to make active use of them.

Here in America we have made many outstanding contributions to the society in which we live. For many years after our race had become free, it was said of us that we could not take on the white man's way of doing things. But through the years we have met our false accusers in the court of public opinion and shattered this argument. Many times opponents to our progress have laid down certain conditions for us to perform; conditions precedent, we were told, to our fuller rights. Our own American Government has on occasion challenged us, and in every instance we have met that challenge with full stewardship and unimpeachable loyalty. This has been proved in every war from the Revolution down to present times. The Negro American has willingly laid down his life because he believed in the integrity of the men who were responsible for the management of our Government; because he believed, like other racial extractions in America, that his country would see him and his posterity adequately rewarded for shouldering arms to protect it against aggressor nations.

Because of the many hatreds which I have seen grow out of the last World War; because of the many injustices and indignities which I have seen my own racial group suffer, largely because the leaders of our Government were moral cowards and did not possess sufficient courage to take a stand for right, I have always thought that America should sum up the cost many times here and sustain democracy at home before plunging this Nation into another foreign war for democracy.

Politically, the Negro has just begun to scratch the surface. As a free race we have been contending for representation in the affairs of America for just 76 years. And we have accomplished much in this comparatively short time. But we must not be lulled to sleep by basking in the warmth of past

achievements. I cannot help but remind the Negro youth that the same forces which sought to keep their forbears in slavery are still at work. These forces have followed many of our parents from the South; from the South where the Democratic Party still controls; from the South where by various practices, intelligent, industrious, and well-to-do members of our race are denied the privilege of voting for Members to the United States Congress, denied the right even to make-like-Democrats and vote the Democratic ticket, denied the right to see democracy really function, denied the right to vote for the county sheriffs who collect their taxes and who are responsible for the protection of their lives and properties.

These and many others are the reasons why I have often asked, "Can a Negro under the present circumstances conscientiously be a Democrat?"

Often I have been met by the answer, "Of course, you know the Democrats of the North are different." But this is not true. The truth is that the Democratic Party of the North is controlled by southern Democrats; this is especially true in national affairs. Most of the important committees in both the upper and lower houses of Congress have as their chairmen Senators and Congressmen from the democratically controlled Southern States.

In several of the Southern States, the only qualification for voting in the primaries is a poll-tax receipt. In virtually all of the Southern States the democratic organizations claim that they are comparable to private lodges and that they are judges as to the qualification of their membership. The Democratic central State committees manage and control the primary campaigns; campaigns which practically determine the election of Members to the United States Congress. The expenses of these white-man's primaries are borne by all the taxpayers. The county clerks and constabulary forces guard the election returns and preserve the ballot boxes intact in the county buildings. These are public elections—but they exclude the Negro. I am hoping that the day is not far distant when these and other questions will be raised before our United States Supreme Court.

I have not yet been able to find any legislation protecting the interest of the American Negro on the Federal statutes or statutes of the respective States which was placed there by the Democratic Party. Those of our group who insist upon being Democrats will never be able to justify their position until they are able to drive bargains—bargains that will redound to the credit and benefit of our race. The Democrats must be informed that they cannot lull us to sleep by putting their arms around our necks in the North and a rope around our necks in the South.

If the Negro is to advance and be able to compete in the American way, he must do so by electing to office men who will neither be ashamed nor afraid to lead our fight for representation in all branches of our Government; men who will be willing and able to open new doors of opportunity whether in national defense or in everyday life.

Discrimination on State and Government-controlled jobs, denial of the right to earn an honest living where properly qualified, is now a challenge to every officeholder from the President on down. Putting thumbs down on these cheap and un-American practices would be the first step toward true national unity. If America wants a strong and impregnable Nation, the place to begin is in the hearts of its constituents. Until the Negroes select leaders who will not put their selfishness above the interest of the race, we cannot expect to get very far in the affairs of America.

This Nation has become great essentially because of our two-party system, a system that makes for democracy. But America cannot continue to boast of democracy as long as one of its parties persists in disfranchising more than 8,000,000 Negroes in the Southern States. The Negro must fight with courage and fortitude if he wishes to solve the many grave problems which face him today—if he wishes to take his real place in a real democracy.

District of Columbia Central Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

EDITORIALS FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR AND THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, three editorials regarding the proposed Central Library in the District of Columbia. Two of these editorials are from the Washington Evening Star, and one from the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 6, 1941]

CENTRAL LIBRARY THREATENED IN SEARCH FOR FUNDS

The rapid expansion of the Federal Government establishment, with its thousands of employees, has produced many acute problems which will require real money to meet, and the great difficulty is the finding of the money.

Federal workers have, in many instances, brought their families with them, and this has increased largely the burden of the public schools. New school buildings must be erected on sites yet to be purchased.

Large appropriations will be required, and even if the Overton formula is adopted and lived up to, more money must be found. The increase through the Overton plan would not produce enough to meet long-accumulated unmet needs, and Congress has so far found no solution to the local tax problem.

In their dilemma the District Commissioners have been looking for some place to tap for funds and have submitted four possibilities, as follows: (1) Passage of the Overton bill or some similar plan; (2) participation of the District in a Federal program for supplementing municipal facilities where defense efforts have overtaxed them; (3) postponement of repayment of P. W. A. and Capper-Cramton Act loans; (4) postponement of construction of the Central Library.

Pronounced opposition is shown in the press and in civic groups toward the fourth proposal of the Commissioners for the postponement of the erection of the Central Library. It is conceded that the need for additional school facilities is acute, but it must be remembered that the public-library system is an important part of the public-education system. The new Central Library is absolutely essential to the schools, even without this sudden required expansion, and its need will be greatly increased as proposed new schools are put in commission.

All of the neighborhoods, now without branch libraries, are waiting impatiently for the completion of the Central Library in order that an adequately equipped and staffed Central can service more branches. To delay construction of the Central building will delay the entire modest program of library extension.

Librarian Herbert is campaigning earnestly against any delay, and in this she is meeting a friendly attitude and promise of cooperation by the civic groups.

[From the Washington Post of March 31, 1941]

SCHOOLS AND LIBRARIES

When the District Commissioners listed postponement of the new central library as one way to get funds for direly needed school construction they caused some dismay among persons interested in the advancement of education. Such a transfer would be like taking off a sleeve to make a trouser leg. It should be said, however, that the Commissioners did not favor the step; they merely stated that the District had no suitable way to get funds.

As for the library, it is urgently needed, and has been for years. Dr. George F. Bowerman fought for it during the last 10 years he was librarian, and only this year his efforts were crowned with success through an item in the 1942 Budget. The site has been cleared and plans are well along, but the District now must hold up building until Congress assures an appropriation. In the meantime, the old library is so crowded that office personnel is housed in vestibules and on stairways.

There can be no doubt, however, that the added school funds are essential. The Commissioners lopped $5,000,000 from the school budget for 1942, but the tremendous influx of Government workers has forced them to ask $1,197,710 of it back. The money will have to come from somewhere, but not from the library fund. It is up to Congress to recognize its obligation and find the cash in some other way. When the House District Committee meets today to consider the Overton plan, which would bring the District an extra donation of over $3,000,000 on the theory that the Government should contribute in proportion to the land it takes up, the Members can at least make a fair beginning.

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 31, 1941]

THE LIBRARY NEED

When the District Commissioners, faced with the necessity of securing funds for an emergency school-building program, proposed as a fourth and last resort the deferment of construction work on the new public library, they pointed out that this procedure would have "the disadvantage of postponing an improvement already found necessary and appropriated for by Congress."

This is a conservative statement of the self-evident need for the new library facilities which have been authorized by Congress. While fully recognizing the necessity for providing new schools and new school equipment, the Board of Library Trustees, in expressing the "earnest hope" that these facilities could be had without postponing work on the new library, called attention at the same time to some of the more noteworthy shortcomings of the existing public-library facilities.

The present central library was built in 1902 to serve a population of less than 300,000, but today it is expected to meet the requirements of more than twice that many people. The book ordering, cataloging, and binding departments, for which new quarters had to be found 12 years ago, are now housed in two buildings, each more than a mile from the central library. This involves the annual transportation of many thou-

sands of books and considerable extra expense. The departments that remain in the old building, as pointed out by the board of trustees, are wholly inadequate to serve the more than 3,000 persons who use the halls and reading rooms daily. More than 120,000 circulating volumes are housed in stacks, which must be closed to the public and which are expensive to administer. Likewise, space for reading rooms, offices, and workrooms is either nonexistent or deplorably inadequate. The music division, for example, occupies a poorly lighted basement room, which was originally a public lavatory, and there are no reading rooms in numerous important fields.

These are but a few of the considerations which prompted Congress in 1938 to appropriate funds for the preparation of plans and specifications for the new building. The need which existed in 1938 is greater now, and it will be further increased if the necessary new schools for which the Commissioners seek funds should be built, since the schools make important demands on the facilities of the library.

My Answer to the United States Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

LETTER TO A. B. BARBER

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received from Mr. A. B. Barber, manager, transportation and communication department, Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, Washington, D. C., an invitation inviting me to attend a certain session of the annual convention of the United States Chamber of Commerce on the afternoon of April 30—to attend as an onlooker and not as a participant. It was very kind of the chamber to invite me down to hear a bill which I am sponsoring in the Congress condemned.

I quote here my letter of reply in full:

APRIL 28, 1941.

Mr. A. B. BARBER,
Manager, Transportation and Communication Department, Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BARBER: I appreciate your invitation to attend your conference meeting on transportation and defense to be held on April 30.

I note that in the printed program of the twenty-ninth annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States you list as your first speaker for the afternoon meeting of April 30, Hon. Ralph L. Carr, Governor of Colorado, on the subject, Federal Encroachment Through Regional Authorities.

I also recall that some months ago the United States Chamber of Commerce voiced its opposition to the proposed Arkansas Valley Authority and other proposals endorsed by the President of the United States for development during the inevitable post-war crisis.

I also recall that some weeks ago Governor Carr, of Colorado, close personal friend of the utility magnate, Wendell Willkie, called a meeting of the Governors of several Western States for the purpose of condemning projects designed to benefit all the people such as the proposed A. V. A.

It is evident that the interests of the American people and that the voice of the local chambers of commerce throughout the United States are never heard or considered by the United States Chamber of Commerce. Tactics such as these belong not to the American way of life but to Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini. The United States Chamber of Commerce is neither of the people, by the people, nor for the people, but it is for those ultraselfish and unscrupulously greedy interests of the American economic royalty.

The dictators of the totalitarian countries hold out hope to the youth of those nations for a better day if they win and succeed in driving democracy from the earth. What are we holding out in the way of hope for the youth in these United States? What will be the fate of the American youth if Hitler wins? And what will be the fate of the American youth if Britain wins? In either case the picture is dark.

It was a policy of destruction and negation very similar to that of the United States Chamber of Commerce that gave to the world such men as Hitler. It is your policy today that is destroying America.

I say to you that we have got to offer hope and inspiration to the youth of this land and we have got to make democracy work.

The proposed Arkansas Valley Authority which you have placed Governor Carr on the program to condemn is one of the greatest projects yet conceived by man and will do more to preserve the democracy, in my opinion, than the United States Chamber of Commerce can do to destroy it.

It is sad commentary but it is true that the best evidence I know that anything is right is for it to be first condemned by the United States Chamber of Commerce.

I am thankful unto God that in this free country I can decline your invitation to be present on April 30, and that I can advise you that, in my humble opinion, if you and others like you, who are likewise blind to any vision of the future, do not change your tactics the day will come, if you prevail, that even you will be sorry the United States Chamber of Commerce ever existed.

Yours sincerely,

CLYDE T. ELLIS.

P. S.—What the United States Chamber of Commerce needs is somebody big enough to change its diapers until it grows up and catches up with the times.

C. T. E.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

RESOLUTION OF INDIANA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a resolution adopted by the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce in opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project:

Whereas the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce, as an organization representing approximately 35,000 individual business interests in the State of Indiana, has a deep concern in the questions involved in the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project, and its probable effect upon the welfare of the State and Nation; and

Whereas the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce has just conducted a referendum among its membership and found the sentiment overwhelmingly opposed to the prosecution of this project (91 percent opposed and 9 percent favored it): Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors, for and on behalf of the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce, hereby expresses its disapproval of this proposal and most earnestly urges discontinuance of further consideration of its prosecution at this time for the following reasons, which represent some of the more potent arguments submitted by the membership, to wit:

1. Prosecution of the project at this time would prove a serious if not fatal obstacle in our present emergency of national-defense efforts by a futile diversion of essential manpower, material, and money—despite the claim of its proponents that it is necessary for that effort—in that:

(a) It would divert labor from direct defense and emergency-aid efforts, and there is now an alarming shortage of skilled labor.

(b) Technical and engineering skill is already at a premium and could not be diverted here except at the serious retarding of the armament-aid activities.

(c) All available materials are now desperately needed in defense-aid industries and any extra drain thereon, as required by this proposal, would be disastrous; and

(d) Another billion-dollar commitment, as would be necessary here, would divert much needed, and difficult to obtain, funds from the financing of the national-defense emergency—thus accentuating an extremely serious problem.

2. This diversion of the above essentials from our gigantic industrial and governmental efforts to meet the present emergency would be doubly serious since even its most optimistic proponents concede that it would require 5 years or more to produce even the first of the unproven benefits claimed.

3. From a long-range viewpoint the project also stands condemned in its inevitable placing of our national economy and standard of living in more direct and open competition with those of nations less favorably endowed. And there are no offsetting advantages from the standpoint of either exports or imports, because:

(a) Alleged more savings in transportation costs through the elimination of transshipment of exports would be an insignificant factor in enabling American products to compete with the low-cost foreign products in destitute Old World markets, which will be inevitable in the post-war period; and

(b) By thus opening the very interior of America to the importations from foreign countries, which due to war conditions are certain to be forced to produce goods at a starvation level, will prove disastrous to our price structures, depressing our standard of living, and threatening our national economy. This is obvious because most boats using this seaway to the extent it would be used would be tramp steamers which generally carry low-cost, destructively competitive products rather than the higher class importations ordinarily carried by the larger oceangoing ships; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this expression of view be appropriately conveyed to the President of the United States and to the Senators

and Representatives in Congress from the State of Indiana, and that the officers of the State chamber of commerce be authorized and directed to carry out this considered position by such other action and at such other times and places as may become appropriate.

Federal Reclamation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I desire at this time to call attention to the Members of the House that we might expect some time, we hope in the near future, that the war emergency will be over, and when that time comes there will be need for employment for those who will be released from their employment in the present defense projects. Therefore, following out the President's proposal that wherever possible worth-while and needed enterprises be studied and their feasibility and public need be determined, I feel that such projects could be immediately commenced, thereby absorbing much of labor that will be made available by the discontinuance of the defense emergency projects.

With this thought in mind, I think there is no other governmental agency that can do more toward this than the Bureau of Reclamation under the Department of the Interior. I call to your attention the fact that in the Interior Department appropriation bill that will soon be up for consideration there is carried an item of $500,000, allocated to the Reclamation Bureau for making general surveys and investigations. Limiting the Bureau of Reclamation to $500,000 a year for advancing its inventory of western water resources and preparing information for the Congress does not seem to be good business. At least a million dollars should be provided for this purpose in order to secure the means for cooperation with the State and Federal agencies.

I make this statement from the fact that some of the appropriations carried in this bill are vital to the people of the district which I have the honor to represent. The vast majority of the people in the First Congressional District live in small communities, communities wherein there have been established fine schools, church facilities, recreation centers, and other things that go to make up a community life. These communities were established almost a hundred years ago and established in this manner for a particular reason. First, and foremost, they were established where culinary and irrigation water were accessible; and, second, they were banded together as a means of their own defense and security.

Utah, as the pioneer irrigation State of the Union, is water conscious. Approximately 80 percent of its crops are harvested from irrigated land, and the economy of the State as a whole is built on conservation and utilization of the meager water supplies that are or can be made available.

The agricultural census just completed shows the cropped land in Utah in 1939 was nearly 200,000 acres less than in 1929. In 1934, a year of serious drought, there was an even greater decrease. While the plowable pasture acreage shows some increase, the fact remains that Utah is endeavoring to support a population of 548,000 persons with less than 967,000 acres of cropland harvested.

On the basis of national requirements as reported by the Bureau of the Census, Utah should have from one and one-half to two million acres of land in the production of crops.

These figures are cited for two reasons:

First. To show that expansion of the Federal reclamation program is necessary to feed the increasing population of the West and does not add to the burdensome surpluses that are plaguing agriculture where wheat, corn, and cotton are the major crops. It should be noted that Utah's great need now is for supplemental water supplies to rehabilitate and maintain established communities.

Second. These reports clearly indicate that Utah requires projects that will anchor its families in their present locations, provide additional agricultural production, and utilize labor that otherwise would be engaged in less permanent construction activities.

I believe the record will show that Utah has been a consistent supporter of the Federal reclamation program in every State in the West. It took an active part in advancing the Colorado River Co. for an equitable division of the waters of the Colorado River between the States of the upper and lower basin. The State agricultural college has pioneered in teaching the farmers the value of water, which is the lifeblood of the State.

With all this interest in water and irrigation, the State has asked but little of the Federal Government. The pioneers who braved the deserts and mountains in reaching the valleys of Utah nearly a century ago built a civilization on irrigation and the systems they installed in the main were adaquate until the pressure of population, coupled with droughts, presented needs that the State and its own people cannot meet. Bear in mind the population of the State has increased nearly 100 percent in 40 years.

I direct your attention to the water conservation and utilization program. To the minds of a great many western people, the development of small projects under this program for the rehabilitation of established agricultural areas is about the most important expansion of Federal reclamation since the law was enacted in 1902. While Utah has had only one small project authorized under this program—the Newton undertaking in Cache County—there are 15 or 20 others in the State that can qualify. Certainly, if best results are to be secured, the appropriation of $3,500,000 of reimbursable funds proposed in the bill is inadequate. The States in the Great Plains need these projects and there are many localities in the intermountain region where the program can be used to advantage for rehabilitation and in the employment of W. P. A. labor and C. C. C. camps. At least $1,500,000 should be added to this proposed appropriation. I say this for the reason that my district, as I have said before, has 15 or 20 other small reservoir projects that can qualify under the provisions of this program, and the estimated cost of these projects themselves would amount to nearly three and a half million dollars.

The American Dictator Has Decided on Entering the European and Asiatic Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of April 28, 1941:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of April 28, 1941]

THE PRESIDENT HAS DECIDED

AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON

(By Roscoe Drummond)

By every act, word, and gesture the United States Government disclosed during the past week that it has made up its mind concerning the war. No President and no Cabinet have been faced with a harder decision nor a more momentous one. But there is full evidence that the decision has been taken and that it embraces these considered intentions:

That American naval power will be used just as far as it is necessary to insure the safe and speedy arrival of war supplies to British shores.

That the Government will augment its support of Britain even if it means increasing the risk of war. Germany may start the fighting any time she chooses.

That the administration will take the initiative to bring the United States fully into the war before it will accept a Nazi victory and, prepared to appeal to the country and Congress, the President and the Cabinet will urge the Nation to act quickly and preventively rather than wait to face the Nazis entrenched on every front.

These decisions have not been formally announced. The President will choose his own occasion and his own way to make his position thus clear; but they are implicit in the events of the last 7 days. That these decisions have now been taken is the inescapable addition of these events.

On Wednesday President Roosevelt conferred with Mayor Fiorello H. LaGuardia at the White House and that night the Chairman of the Joint Canadian-American Defense Board revealed that America's neutrality patrol was even then reaching 1,000 miles out into the Atlantic.

On Thursday President Roosevelt met with his inner "war cabinet," attended, as it is, by the Secretaries of State, War, Navy, and the Treasury; by Harry L. Hopkins as coordinator of the lend-lease program; and occasionally by military and naval technicians.

That evening Secretary Frank Knox, speaking before the American Newspaper Publishers Association and addressing the Nation by radio, declared:

"Having gone thus far, we can only go on.

"Hitler cannot allow our war supplies and sunk in the Atlantic—we shall be beaten if they do. We cannot allow our goods to be sunk in the Atlantic—we shall be beaten if they do. * * * We must see the job through."

This is unqualified and official determination that the program of lend-lease aid to Britain is not going to stop at the factory door; that that aid is going to be delivered, safely and speedily, one way or another.

At another point in his speech Secretary Knox said significantly:

"All this [aid to Britain, produced and delivered] is needed for our own safety and future security. This is our fight. * * *

"We can no longer occupy the immoral and craven position of asking others to make all the sacrifice for this victory which we recognize as so essential to us. Our manhood and our self-respect demand that we shall assume our part of the burden."

This is an official and powerful appeal to the American people to support a government convinced that it must assume a larger "part of the burden," that security cannot be had by merely cheering for the British.

On the same evening, but timed for a half hour later, so that his speech would not overlap, Secretary Cordell Hull took to the air to ask whether the United States is going to oppose the march of Nazi world domination in cooperation with Britain or wait until Britain may be defeated and then face the Axis, with most of the world subjugated, by itself. Choosing his words carefully, Mr Hull said:

"Some among us, doubtless with the best of intentions, still contend that our country need not resist until armed forces of an invader shall have crossed the boundary line of this hemisphere, including the United States, until the invading countries had acquired complete control of the other four continents and of the high seas, and thus had obtained every possible strategic advantage. * * * This is an utterly short-sighted and extremely dangerous view."

This is unqualified and official disclosure that the Government believes the Nation must be ready to enter the war fully rather than tolerate a Nazi victory, and that it will be prepared to take that initiative in the face of any visible prospect that Hitler cannot be defeated otherwise.

Finally, at his press conference on Friday, President Roosevelt himself broke a rather long period of silence on war policy and embraced as expressing precisely his own views every word uttered by his top-ranking Cabinet officers. It could hardly be otherwise, but Mr. Roosevelt made it official.

At the same time as the President was accepting the basis of the third objective of policy, mentioned above—the objective of preferring to fight rather than accept a Nazi conquest of four continents, he revealed further steps implementing the first two.

He quietly and quizzically dropped into the laps of the correspondents the information that the Nazis may even now be occupying, in part, the island of Greenland, the Danish possession over which the United States has now accepted a protectorate and whose inviolability the United States guarantees under the Monroe Doctrine. He announced that measures were already being taken to counteract this reported occupation.

The President also announced an indefinite extension of the American neutrality patrol, declaring that it would reach to the seven seas, if necessary, to keep war from the Western Hemisphere.

Last week the President's words and the President's acts were those of a man who has made up his mind, who has reached a solemn and solid decision.

The President Is Responsible—He Hides Behind the Lady's Skirts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SOMERSET (PA.) DAILY AMERICAN

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's editorial from the Somerset Daily American, of Somerset, Pa., is so accurate a description of the President's adroitness in escaping responsibility that it should be placed in the RECORD. Here it is:

[From the Somerset (Pa.) Daily American of April 28, 1941]

PERKINS

It takes a great deal more courage to tell a lady that she fails to measure up to the requirements of a situation than it takes to tell a man. But man or woman, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, has all that it takes to handle that sort of a delicate situation.

Before the adoption of the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution one heard a good deal about "equal rights." It had an alluring sound.

"Equal rights" entail equal obligations. That's where woman suffrage has failed.

Too many of the "equal rights" advocates seek to escape from equal obligations by way of their skirts.

One does not have to charge the Secretary of Labor with seeking to escape her obligations by way of her skirts. She belongs to an outfit that has perpetually sought to escape its obligations. Indeed, the obligations to measure up to which Senator BYRD says she has failed were imposed upon her by a President who imposed them upon her with the obvious purpose of using her skirts to escape his obligations.

Senator BYRD sent Miss Perkins a telegram April 21, calling upon her to certify the coal strike to the United States Mediation Board, asking for an immediate reply. Miss Perkins certified the strike to the Mediation Board at midnight of April 23.

Addressing the Senate Friday, Senator BYRD said:

"Certainly the bungling and lack of courage on the part of Miss Perkins has greatly aggravated the situation, and her failure to act with promptness and firmness at the beginning of the strike, handicaps greatly the efforts of the mediation board at this late hour, when only a few days stand between practically a complete stoppage of all industrial life in America by the inability of obtain coal supplies.

"It is commonly reported and generally believed that the failure of Miss Perkins to certify sooner this strike was because she did not desire to offend John L. Lewis, who has declared publicly that he would not permit the coal strike to be mediated by the National Mediation Board.

"Is John L. Lewis bigger than the Secretary of Labor? He may be, but he is not bigger than the Government of the United States in this hour of national peril. Before this emergency is over I predict that the American people will not tolerate any man or group of men, whether it be a powerful labor leader or a powerful industrial magnate, to stand as an obstacle to the essential work of our national preparedness. Unless these obstacles to our preparedness program are removed by those in authority, in some way, some how, the American people will do what is imperative under our democratic form of government to clear the path for some quick and expeditious preparedness as will best protect our country in this hour of national peril.

"Madam Perkins today, as Secretary of Labor, the only person having authority to certify strikes for action by the Mediation Board, with her inefficiency and lack of decision and firmness in dealing with this responsibility, has made herself one of the most serious bottlenecks in our national preparedness efforts.

"Today nothing would do more to restore the confidence of the people of America in the determination of this Nation to go forward quickly and effectively in a national program of preparedness than to replace Madam Perkins as Secretary of Labor with a more competent successor. It is reported that the resignation of Madam Perkins as Secretary of Labor is on the President's desk. If so, he should accept it immediately."

Senator BYRD's conclusions have the approval of all his fellow citizens who place the general welfare above private greed.

Secretary Perkins ought to be relieved of further responsibilities in an office to which she should never have been appointed and in the administration of which she has reflected no credit upon the President, who named her a member of his Cabinet, nor upon herself.

Confederate Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

EDITORIALS FROM THE PENSACOLA JOURNAL AND THE TALLAHASSEE DEMOCRAT

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

[From the Pensacola (Fla.) Journal of April 26, 1941]

CONFEDERATE MEMORIAL DAY

Today is Confederate Memorial Day. In times gone by, the Ladies Confederate Memorial Association supervised appropriate ceremonies at the monument to Confederate heroes which stands in Lee Square.

Now, most of these noble women who kept alive the traditions and the valor of the leaders of the South are gone to their reward. It would be well for others, their sons and daughters and grandchildren, to carry on in their stead and place lovely flowers about the monument which stands for the

bravery and self-sacrifice that went into the lost cause.

This Memorial Day, however, should be a time for reflection. We should not only recall the noble deeds of 1861–65, but we should be thankful that the United States through the years has grown in unity and in strength and that today it stands in the world as one of the last safeguards for democracy, a barrier to dictatorship and aggression.

We should not allow disunity again to rear its head. Now as never before must these States remain united, not to the abolition of freedom of thought and expression, but for the purposes of keeping those rights and liberties for ourselves and for other peoples who are being trampled under booted foot and crushed by the motorized guns of the aggressor.

Not only must the United States act in unison, but all of the republics of the hemisphere must work together to keep subversive doctrines, foreign agents, and the attacker from these continents.

The War between the States is in the dead past. We may remember with pride the acts of its glorious leaders. But we never again wish to see such strife in this Nation, for if we do it will be the beginning of the end of freedom and democracy, of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, of the United States, and of the American way of life—of civilization itself.

[From the Tallahassee (Fla.) Democrat of April 25, 1941]

CONFEDERATE MEMORIAL DAY—ITS MEANING

Confederate Memorial Day will be observed tomorrow in response to custom and tradition.

This occasion is and has been one of great consequence in the South. Its meaning and importance are understood by all of southern blood, but are not easily explained. We do not so much deal with the Confederacy by intellectual as by emotional processes, and people of our section, voluble on many subjects, are not effectively articulate, as a rule, on this one matter.

But there is, nevertheless, a definite and precise meaning in the attitude of our people toward the Confederacy and the memorial day which helps to keep its memory fresh.

On Confederate Memorial Day we pay honor to the Confederate dead. In this all peoples everywhere may join. Without understanding of the objective for which they fought, without sympathy for the cause which was lost, anyone may respect the brave and the stalwart.

Courage and stamina are qualities which command respect everywhere. And the Confederate troops, outnumbered, poorly fed and clad, ill equipped with weapons and ammunition, held steadfast during many years of bitter hardship, to take their places beside the bravest of the immortal soldiers of history.

The little Confederate flags which tomorrow shall mark their graves are the badges of honor of brave men and true.

This is not all. To those who have grown up in the Confederate tradition, the day recalls an era, a way of life, and a philosophy which are no more but which shall never be forgotten.

The era was one in which the Southern States and southern statesmen were supreme in national counsels. Few, relatively, of southern families boasted mansions and households of hundreds of slaves, but all shared the prestige of the section which provided most of the early Presidents and a large number of the country's civilian and military leaders.

The way of life was that of free spirits. The great and the small were men to be reckoned with in those days, each an individualist, unregimented and unafraid, knowing such liberty as has not been enjoyed since in our land and as has not been known elsewhere in the period covered by written history.

The philosophy was that of Thomas Jefferson. Its cornerstone was the principle that that government is best which governs least.

The War between the States, we alone know, was the last stand of complete liberty for our people. It is a paradox that a people so free had not yet abolished slavery and an even more puzzling paradox that a war which, many came to believe in its later years, was being fought to set the slaves free, actually resulted in restricting the liberties of both white and black.

The quality which distinguishes the southerner is the desire to be let alone. Not all southerners possess this quality, and it is found elsewhere in this country and in others, but in the South it has been from the beginning the characteristic trait.

Our people fought to preserve the right to manage their own affairs, control their own destinies, hold governmental restraints and governmental paternalism to an absolute minimum. We know that was the lost cause, and it is because we know it that we experience that sadness on Confederate Memorial Day.

When the Stars and Bars are placed over the grave of a Confederate soldier we remember that under that sod is the body of a man in a gray uniform and beside him the cause for which he fought.

States Views to Madison County, Ind., Women's Republican Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. FOREST A. HARNESS, OF INDIANA

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following speech I made before the Madison County Women's Republican Club at Anderson, Ind., Monday, April 21:

I have been looking forward, since the recent reapportionment act made Madison County a part of the fifth district, to the opportunity which this meeting tonight affords me. First, as the Representative in Congress of the fifth district, I want to extend to you and to everyone in Madison County a sincere and cordial welcome into the family of counties which comprise what I very proudly assure you is one of the finest congressional districts in Indiana and in the entire United States.

Madison County folks will enjoy their membership in our district family, as I feel certain the people in the older parts of the district will enjoy having you with us. I know we are going to feel comfortable together right from the beginning because we start with so many important things in common. Madison is much the same sort of well-balanced county that is the average in the district. Your population is roughly half rural and small town, and half urban. In your economy industry and agriculture are in sound balance, and your industries are well diversified. The pattern is similar throughout the rest of the district.

As to the people, it seems enough to say that we are all Hoosiers in the fullest and best meaning of the term. We share hopes, aspirations, and viewpoints so nearly identical that I know you will move into the family circle without the slightest disturbance of routine.

I feel perfectly free, therefore, to urge you to make yourself at home and take a full share in the district councils and activities. Particularly do I want to invite you to call upon me and my office for any service or assistance I can render in Madison County. Don't feel that it is necessary to wait upon an official act or a formal date to call upon me in any matter in which I can be helpful.

Frankly, the offer to serve you is not entirely unselfish. I am anxious to meet and become acquainted with Madison County folks, and I know of no better way of accomplishing this than through the opportunities you may give me to serve you.

I expect to be a candidate for the office I now hold in the primaries and elections of 1942, and I think it is not too early to make that fact known generally among you. Because I expect to seek your support in the next election, I want you to know me and to understand my political philosophy just as early as possible. If you will indulge me for a few minutes, I would like to outline the creed on which I have twice been elected to this office, and by which I sincerely try to measure my service to the people of the Fifth District, and to the Nation.

I won't admit to classification by any of the common terms—"radical," "liberal," "conservative," or "reactionary." In the first place, I never have liked the idea of stamping individuals by these terms, because I never have found two persons whose definitions have been identical. And most particularly within the past 8 years have the terms become confused and misleading. I am a liberal, but in the original, and which I believe to be the true meaning of the term, rather than in the new application of the word as it has come to be used by the New Deal publicity writers. I am not the kind of liberal who believes in change for change's sake, or who makes a regular habit of shattering precedents without a thought to the consequences. I am the kind of liberal, rather, who instinctively fears the encroachment of government, and who wants so to curb it that it will always be the servant, rather than the master of the people.

At the same time there is much in my philosophy that is conservative, in the old and true meaning of that term. My conservatism springs from a deep respect and admiration for the Constitution, upon the framework of which the American Republic has been built. In my humble opinion, the American Constitution is literally a political and social miracle, unequalled anywhere in man's history. I am the kind of conservative who will fight, at all costs, to preserve this priceless heritage because I sincerely believe that within its form American progress, prosperity, and welfare are limited only by our own human limitations. I have no objection to a liberal interpretation of the provisions in the Constitution, for I believe that the founding fathers foresightedly planned to apply it broadly and flexibly enough to meet any conceivable condition. I do, however, protest with all my strength against any attempt to evade, to nullify, and to twist the spirit and provisions of the basic law because I believe that an effort to destroy the effectiveness of any part of it seriously threatens the entire foundation of our Government.

I am a rugged individualist in the sense that I believe in the dignity and the inviolable rights of the individual, including that supreme right or power of sovereignty. I believe that the State shall be the servant of the people, created by individuals voluntarily pooling just a little of their rights and privileges for the welfare of all. I believe this because government, no matter what the form, is sterile. It cannot produce or create

anything of itself. Government may be the means to organize, foster, and protect; or to coerce, confiscate, and destroy the creative capacity of a people. It may provide the wholesome atmosphere in which a people's creative energies are devoted to social, cultural, and material advancements; or it may be the instrument which strangles and enslaves these energies. But in no case and in no real sense is government of itself creative.

It naturally follows that I am vigorously opposed to much that has taken place in America in the past 8 years under the New Deal.

I am unalterably opposed to the disrespect and contempt for law, the courts, and the Constitution which have all too frequently cropped out in the administration's impatience when these bulwarks of the American way of life have stood in the way of dozens of untried success formulas and social prescriptions which the President became intrigued with from time to time.

I am definitely against the centralization of power and the growth of bureaucratic agencies by the score, which are definitely breaking down the doctrine of States' rights and steadily encroaching upon the sovereignty of the States and the individual.

I particularly object to the spreading philosophy that Santa Claus lives in Washington; that the virtues of thrift, energy, and self-reliance are old-fashioned and just a little bit indecent; and that the Federal Treasury somehow or other can make everybody comfortable, secure, and happy by magic. The illusion of security without effort or responsibility under a rich, wise, and generous Government is all the more dangerous because, for a time being at least, it can be made to seem plausible. I particularly deplore the specious arguments by which such large numbers of American people have been lulled into forgetting that this or any government can spend or give away nothing which it does not first collect in taxes, or for which it does not mortgage its people's future.

I have been completely in disagreement with the numerous major economic fallacies of this administration. To recall only a few of the most important, I have opposed all of these:

1. The amazing absurdity that millions of Americans were unemployed, ill-clothed, ill-fed, and ill-housed because America 10 years ago had reached full maturity, because it was becoming a static economy, and because we were cursed with a surplus of productive capacity, both in agriculture and industry. Also the equally absurd conclusion that the way to secure for our underprivileged one-third the "more abundant life" was to destroy our surpluses, along with a part of our national capacity to produce the abundance which marks the American standard of living.

2. The amazing fallacy that high prices make prosperity, which was largely responsible for the devaluation of our dollar and the sterilization of gold.

3. The deplorable mistreatment of American business, including restrictive and punitive taxation, destructive regulation, and direct Government competition, all accompanied by continuous prosecution and persecution in the courts of law and public opinion at the very time when widespread unemployment should have made it imperative that Government do everything reasonable to assist private enterprise to put men back to work.

4. The unfathomable inconsistency of working, on the one hand, to jack up all American wages and prices by every imaginable artificial means, but, at the same time, on the other hand, removing or reducing tariff barriers through a series of reciprocal trade treaties to allow factory products made at slave wages and agricultural commodities grown by peon labor to compete increasingly in American markets.

This is by no means a complete list of the points at which my own political creed is at variance with that of the administration. It is enough, however, to illustrate how completely I object to the trend of Government in recent years. There are, of course, accomplishments in the records of the past few years to which I can subscribe. Much of the social legislation has been desirable, if not absolutely necessary. In saying this, however, I ought to point out again that I am the kind of liberal who instinctively fears the encroachment of Government into any new field, and who regrets that our human imperfections made a large degree of regulation necessary in our increasingly complex civilization.

In this group of accomplishments are our efforts to legislate for the welfare of labor, our new means of regulating the investment and securities market, our acceptance of national responsibility for the relief of unfortunate citizens, our new machinery for extending credit to American home owners and farmers, etc.

None of these laws is so far adequate or satisfactory. In almost all of them the administration has been notoriously bad. In fact the President himself admitted this fact when he said at the close of the last campaign that he could have made a much stronger case against himself than had his opponents merely by attacking the administrative weaknesses of the New Deal. But incomplete as these laws are, and as deplorably as they have been administered, they are based upon principles which all reasonable persons accept as inevitable in our increasingly complex economy.

It may seem a waste of valuable time to review what, in light of present conditions, may seem to be past and temporarily unimportant history. I hope, however, that you don't feel that I am thinking and talking abstractions at a time when our own house is threatened by the fires which are destroying our neighbors. I hope you feel, as I do, that these are fundamental precepts to be cherished in every circumstance. To be honored the more faithfully, in fact, in times of adversity.

Transcending everything else in importance today, of course, is the grave international situation, our own hazardous relation to the wars now raging, and the status of our own war program.

Let me review my own position for you briefly as it relates to these grave questions. In the first place, I have vigorously and consistently opposed the steps by which the President has taken us this far into the war. I use the term "has taken," advisedly for, make no mistake about it—if there still is any doubt in your mind—we definitely and actively are participants. The famous phrase "steps short of war" no longer has validity or meaning. We can say now only "the steps short of actual hostilities," and hope, as we say it, that we may still avoid that final step.

I have, as I said, opposed the steps we have thus far taken, not because I am unsympathetic to the victims of aggression, or even because I am unwilling that we should offer every reasonable aid. I am even willing to agree with administration leaders and other proponents of all-out aid that the future of America will be much more difficult following total victory for Hitler than it will be if he and totalitarianism are destroyed.

To this end, I voted for the $7,000,000,000 appropriation by which we have implemented the Lend-Lease Act. I supported this appropriation not alone from sympathy for Britain, but for the better reasons that America has been committed to a definite new policy in its international relations. Wrong as I may think that policy to be, it was adopted by a large majority after extended discussion and debate which gave every viewpoint, and every interest was considered. Under those circumstances, I could not see how I could do less than support an adopted policy.

Furthermore, the President had pledged, as a condition of the new authority he sought, that this new policy would be used as a means to avoid war, rather than to enter it. Finally, I was guided by the fixed American habit of unity in our foreign relations. There can be no successful policy which will be respected by other nations unless there is solid support behind the President, who is our national agent in our relations with the rest of the world.

Nevertheless, I can't see any favorable conclusion of a policy that stops short of outright hostilities. There is increasing evidence that Britain, together with the feeble assistance she is able to recruit in Europe, will never be able to destroy the German war machine, even with the materials we can furnish when we are in full production. The question of getting those materials into hands that can use them effectively is right now critical, for Britain alone simply cannot prevent shipping losses which there is no hope of replacing. Because it is futile to invest our energies and resources in aid to Britain merely to offer them as a helpless sacrifice to the German submarine blockade of the Atlantic, we are simply going to be forced to the fateful decision of throwing our Navy into action, or of backing down on our proud pledge of total assistance to any country which can be induced to resist the Axis Powers. I repeat that that crisis is upon us right now, and we must face it—not 6 months or a year hence. Thus, even this soon after we declared ourselves actively for intervention and made our own President the Quartermaster General for all forces opposing the Axis Powers, we begin to face the terrible consequences.

It was for the reason that I foresaw that such crises would continually confront us that I opposed the passage of the lend-lease act. There is the further reason that I remembered Europe's history through the last 300 years and recalled that in that entire period there never has been a sound and lasting peace upon that continent. All of you are doubtless familiar with the general "balance-of-power" formula, by which intervals of peace have prevailed in Europe. This is simply the essence of power politics, in which one group of powers has been allied opposite another group of powers. When these main alliances have been reasonably in balance, and when each group has been deterred by fear of the consequences of attacking the other, there has been peace. When the balance has been destroyed for one reason or another, there has been war. And during all this period, Britain has masterfully maintained a position at the center of the teeter board, throwing its weight first one way and then the other, but always at a price, and to the ultimate advantage of the Empire.

This is not to criticize British diplomacy. It is merely to point out that this diplomacy is failing in this century to accomplish what it has always been able to do before, namely, maintain the European balance of power. British diplomacy, plus Allied arms, seemed at the point of defeat in the first World War when we interceded in what we mistakenly thought was a noble effort to save democracy and to end all wars; but what actually was nothing more than an act to restore Britain to her increasingly precarious position at the center of the teeter board. Now, just 20 years afterward, with all the disappointments and disillusionments of that first experience still fresh in our minds, we are again about to persuade ourselves that we should undertake another crusade—and for purposes just about as vague and idealistic. This time we shall undertake to establish the "four freedoms," deluding ourselves with the childish notion that any nation which allies itself with us is a democracy, or at least fighting for the democratic principles.

It may be to our advantage to enter the European wars again. It may be true that the tremendous advances in transportation and communication have dwarfed the world, or that our own rapid development as a nation has thrust us, regardless of our desire in the matter, into the position where we can no longer isolate ourselves from the world's troubles. I do not accept that proposition, but granting that it were so, I wish that we in America might grow up and get over the crusading spirit which makes us picture ourselves as the white plumed knight riding against the enemies of an innocent world.

If it is true that we must intercede in the troubles of the world, then it is high time that we drop our naive delusions and develop a tough, hard-boiled, realistic diplomacy that knows what it will mean to accept the responsibility for policing a troubled and recalcitrant world.

Our defense program is moving about as well as could be expected. There are heartbreaking delays and instances of confusion, indecision, and poor administration which are costing us terrifically in time and money. We can look back with regret that our armed forces have been so sadly neglected, especially within the past few years, during which the totalitarian menace was growing in such a manner that we could not possibly have missed its serious implications had we been willing to face it. We can regret the fact that the American industrial machine had gone through a protracted period of depression, attended by political and social reform which left it badly disorganized and unprepared for the tremendous demands which have suddenly been thrown upon it. It is too late for recriminations now, however, for all that is history and we are confronted with a tremendous job which must be done in record time.

It is a job which only the productive genius of the American industrial system could possibly accomplish, for we alone have what it takes to do it. We have the raw materials, the potential capacity, and the ability in proportions unimaginable anywhere else in the world. All that is lacking to date is the firm will and the unity of purpose that are the spark plugs of this American machine.

A last word about this firm will and unity of purpose. These last but most important requirements have not fully crystallized as yet, because the American mind is still confused. We want to aid Britain, but we are preponderantly against going to war to do it. We want to make our own defenses impregnable, but we have so fallen from our old national habits of thrift, energy, and initiative in recent years that our soft and flabby muscles groan at the sudden exertion we must undertake.

Because current labor troubles have held the spotlight and because labor generally has drawn severe criticism and is even threatened with drastic legislation, let me say just a word about that situation. There is nothing wrong in the rank and file of American labor. What is happening here is nothing but a symptom of the general condition of our national system. I don't condone jurisdictional strikes in defense industries or the grave mistakes that certain radical and selfish labor leadership has made. But I do insist that the real fault lies with the administration which has sadly misled labor, which has poorly administered labor laws, and which even now hesitates to demonstrate the firm leadership which will enable American labor to orient itself to the tremendous job it has to do. I insist that the average Indiana workman is just as patriotic and loyal and just as anxious to contribute his full share to this big job as any other citizen; and that he will contribute a full share to the job when he is given the leadership which will demand and inspire national unity.

The remaining job is to slough off our habits of softness and ease, to end our delusion of security through government, and to take up our belt, roll up our sleeves and go to work with less thought of profits, high wages, and easy working hours and more thought of national safety. When we do that, we again will show the world a miracle that could happen nowhere else in the world except in the American system of free enterprise, functioning in unison and harmony as only our own free people can function.

Irrigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD today, I include the following statement which I made on the question of irrigation before the Committee on Appropriations under date of April 17:

I am glad of this opportunity to appear before the Committee on Appropriations in the hearing for the Department of the Interior.

The phase of this appropriation in which I am particularly concerned is that relating to the Bureau of Reclamation. My State of North Dakota is a part of the Great Plains area, which has in recent years been beset with many difficulties. In the two decades preceding the one dating from 1930-40, my State enjoyed tremendous development both in population and in its productivity. So remarkable was it in the production of fine quality No. 1 Northern wheat, that it was frequently referred to as the "bread basket of the Nation."

Beginning about the year 1934, and almost continuously thereafter, especially the central and western section of the State has been the victim of most unfortunate circumstances in the way of drought.

I am sure this committee is familiar with the problems that have existed in many sections of the Great Plains area. The State of North Dakota has had its rightful share of these difficulties. From the years 1930-40 North Dakota has had a net loss in population of nearly 54,000 people in its 52 counties. Many of these people who are leaving the State are doing so at approximately middle age, and I need not remind you that this is a difficult period in life to find a new place to take up your abode. In many cases they have gone into Western States, where their problem has been very difficult due to the entirely different methods of agriculture that prevail there. It is by all means their choice, if possible, to remain in the country which has so long been their home. The Western States on the Pacific coast well know of the effect of the migrations from the Dakotas and other Great Plains States on their own economy.

The harvested acreage in North Dakota has decreased by millions of acres in the past 10 years, due largely to drought. The accumulated deficiency in moisture of more than 20 inches in this great area is an unsurmountable obstacle to a permanent recovery through natural means. Our only hope to restore our water levels and to compensate in some measure for this deficiency in rainfall is through the establishment of irrigation and reclamation projects. This can be done conveniently along the streams that cross the State, and particularly in the wide, fertile bottoms of the great Missouri River, which flows almost diagonally across the State. As the result of these various problems, drought, and so forth, normal farm operations have been impossible. While the rural population has been tremendously reduced, the cities and towns, generally speaking, have grown considerably. This is due to the fact that many of these farmers in distress, who did not leave the State, have moved into the cities and towns, and have gone on Federal relief, and by so doing have tremendously accelerated the problem of relief to the National Government.

It is my wish, in appearing before this committee, that I may induce the Government to review the situation in the Great Plains, and particularly in the State of North Dakota, and attempt to bring about some means of permanent recovery, rather than to continue on a perpetual relief basis.

From 1933 to 1940 the Federal Government, through the W. P. A. and its predecessor agency, spent more than $92,000,000 for relief, and this figure does not take into consideration the matching funds supplied by the State, county, and local governments, nor does it include F. S. A. or F. C. A. funds allocated to the State.

Our farmers, because of the drought and the subsequent shortage of feed, were compelled to liquidate their livestock holdings. This occurred particularly in the years of 1934-36, when the drought was very devastating and quite unparalleled in the history of the State.

Until such time as they were compelled to liquidate their herds, the State of North Dakota had never become a perpetual burden on the Federal Treasury. They are now at the mercy of a ruinous one-crop agriculture. In order to stabilize this agricultural industry in the great west area, and to provide as much protection as possible against recurring droughts, steps must be taken by the Federal Government to utilize the water we have in our streams, and which is now almost entirely wasted.

Resulting from these distressing experiences, the viewpoint of our people has undergone a great change during the past decade, and today they are viewing their land and water use problem in a much broader light than they did prior to 1934. Our State legislature is aware of the great need for establishing irrigation projects, and has already gone a great way in making surveys and conducting educational campaigns. Today our people in the dry-land areas of North Dakota realize completely that they can rebuild a stable agriculture, if only insured of feed crop, and this is obtainable by the use of surplus water.

We are anxious to be practical about this problem. We are anxious to gain all assistance possible from the Federal Government through the Bureau of Reclamation in establishing these smaller irrigation projects, and it is for that reason that I urge this committee to recommend that the appropriation for water conservation and utilization projects in the Great Plains be increased from $3,500,000,000 to at least $5,000,000,000.

The development of the technique provided for in the Case-Wheeler Act enables North Dakota and other Great Plains States to accomplish irrigation with a minimum cost per acre-foot of water. The Bureau has conducted numerous investigations in western North Dakota; many of the projects are along the Missouri River, where an adequate water supply is available.

We are hopeful that out of the investigations thus far completed or in progress a

number of them will be approved and thus become eligible for financing through the Case-Wheeler program.

Another feature which should be taken into consideration is that the original Case-Wheeler program, and the appropriation for it, was intended specifically for use in the Great Plains area.

I understand that last year a portion of these funds was allocated to States outside the Great Plains area, and this work necessitated spreading existing appropriations far more thinly than would otherwise have been required.

It is my honest belief that if at least six or eight blocks of 5,000 to 8,000 acres in western North Dakota could be placed under water through the operations of the Case-Wheeler program, those areas would be assured of an annual feed production which would not only rehabilitate the livestock industry, but create a more stable income in other branches of agriculture.

With irrigation, farmers on the uplands would never need to go more than 100 miles to get feed supplies, whereas during drought years in the past they have had to transport feed from 400 to 600 miles. Such a program was thoroughly uneconomical, and as I have already mentioned, great portions of the herds were moved out of the State, and today have not been replaced.

At the present time North Dakota has only one major irrigation development, being financed by Federal funds, and even that is a small project in comparison with some of those in other States. This project is known as the Buford-Trenton development. It will rehabilitate around 265 families, and will stabilize winter feed for livestock on 300,000 acres of range land.

We need more of this type of project in my State, and throughout the entire Great Plains area, and it is my belief that under the provisions of the Case-Wheeler Act great strides can be taken in establishing such projects.

Because of the crying need for the establishment of these projects, I believe that the estimate of $500,000 for investigations of water resources in 17 Western States is entirely inadequate. We could spend that much in North Dakota alone, without wasting a single dollar. I believe that the appropriations for this purpose should be substantially increased. I recognize that your committee is concerned with the problem of reducing appropriations rather than increasing them. I cannot fail to point out to you that the Government has seen fit for a considerable number of years to continue the Great Plains, and particularly North Dakota, on a relief basis, and I see no possible way by which this can be discontinued, unless we can discover a plan of permanent rehabilitation.

To my mind there is no better way to solve the problem which confronts the Great Plains States than through a practical and well-coordinated program of irrigation; a program which would enable farm families to reestablish themselves on a self-sustaining basis, and thus eliminate the necessity of subsidizing them through ever-mounting relief grants which do nothing to achieve a fundamental solution. In the long run there is no question but what a few million dollars spent for irrigation projects in western North Dakota will be far more economical than continuation of the present dole, which is maintaining many of these people on a bare subsistence level.

When you consider that over the past several years the Federal Treasury has been spending between five and six thousand dollars per family through Work Projects Administration and agencies which preceded it, the advantage in speeding up a program whereby these people can help themselves should be readily apparent.

The long years of drought we have had throughout the Great Plains States clearly demonstrates that agriculture in this area cannot be permanently sustained or placed upon a stable basis without water conservation and irrigation. Our only salvation is to supplement that deficiency in rainfall by developing the water resources of our streams and rivers, waters which are not now being utilized, waters which are being drained from these dry-land areas only to augment the flood problems in the States below us.

I should like to include here a statement made by Mr. E. A. Willson, executive director of the State public welfare board, pertaining to the cost of public-assistance payments for the month of February alone.

FEBRUARY PUBLIC-ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS TOTAL $1,476,990

Public-assistance payments for North Dakota during February totaled $1,476,990, compared with $1,586,668 in February 1940, E. A. Willson, executive director of the State public welfare board, reported Wednesday.

The payments include those from Federal, State, and county governments for public relief and earnings of persons employed under Federal work programs, but do not include costs of administering the programs or costs of materials, equipment, and supplies used on work projects.

Aided 103,752 persons

Willson said it was estimated that February payments benefited 29,706 households, which included 103,752 persons, or 16.2 percent of the total State population.

"The economic record for North Dakota in 1940 was one of exceptional improvement," Willson declared. "Agricultural income in 1940 was better than in any year since 1929. Total agricultural income, plus Federal benefit payments, amounted to $156,647,000, as compared with $140,000,000 in 1939 and $102,000,000 in 1938."

Payments in February for direct relief amounted to $645,138, including $152,623 for old-age assistance, $76,332 for aid to dependent children, $4,942 for aid to the blind, $119,215 for general public relief, $27,165 for F. S. A. subsistence payments, and $264,861 of surplus commodities.

N. Y. A. students earn $26,756

Earnings of persons employed under Federal work programs in February totaled $831,832, distributed as follows: C. C. C. enrollees $157,410, N. Y. A. student work program earnings $26,756, N. Y. A. out-of-school work program earnings $45,133, W. P. A. earnings $586,429, and earnings on other Federal work projects $16,124.

Public-assistance payments in 1940 totaled $15,345,601, compared with $18,429,297 in 1939 and $24,407,882 in 1938.

May I say, with all possible emphasis, that the people of central and western North Dakota would not want to be on a permanent relief basis. They would not want to come in a continuous procession to the Federal Treasury for hand-outs. This area can never be rehabilitated and made a sustaining part of our national economy on a relief basis. What is needed is irrigation. Irrigation along the streams that will supplement the uplands and will insure these farm families against crop failures of all crops and which, even in the worst years, will at least provide them with enough food for their household use and to maintain their livestock. The people of North Dakota are concerned to get themselves off the relief load to go back upon the land and not remain as residents of the towns and cities supported by the Federal Treasury.

I further suggest to this committee that you give due consideration in this increased appropriation for the work of the Bureau of Reclamation to the fact that this Great Plains area has in no way thus far participated in the multi-billion-dollar defense spending program. They have no big factories and no big industrial developments. They have to depend almost entirely upon the soil for their living. Not only that, but because this defense spending has not, and will not, generally speaking, fit into these areas, the problem of relief and unemployment still remains. It seems to me, therefore, that a program of expanding irrigation development at this time constitutes a double-barrel attack on the problem which confronts the Great Plains, while on the other hand making possible a more stable and sustaining agriculture and taking up the slack of unemployment by giving work to those on relief, on worth-while projects which are ultimately paying for themselves.

I urge, gentlemen, that you view in all seriousness the great question that confronts this part of our Nation. It can be solved, and its road is open for solution through the Case-Wheeler Act, and such a program is truly an investment in the future, and by so doing it will help to restore what was once, and will be again, a great land and truly always a great people.

Parity for Butterfat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

LETTER BY LOUIS J. HOUK

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture from Mr. Louis J. Houk, president of the Indiana Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, complaining against the price at which the butterfat market has been pegged.

The letter follows:

APRIL 24, 1941.

HON. CLAUDE WICKARD,
Secretary of Agriculture,
United States of America,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WICKARD: In our meeting of the Indiana Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, held at Purdue University, West La Fayette, Ind., Tuesday, April 22, 1941, there was much discussion on the relative value of butterfat when compared to the value placed on other commodities.

Butterfat has been pegged at 31 cents per pound. I note that the parity price of butterfat for the month of March was nearly 38 cents per pound. That means about a 7-cent difference. Farm labor is being depleted by the demands in other industries, and at the present time there is not sufficient qualified labor to take care of the needs on the farms. Labor for dairy farms is something that must be more than just ordinary labor. I would class it as technical labor. Not only is labor scarce but the prices are advancing to such an extent that, at the prices we receive for the dairy products, it is almost prohibitive at the present time.

Now, if all other commodities are going to be permitted to soar to higher planes, why should not dairy products be set on a higher basis. You are wanting to stimulate production in some of the commodities raised

on the farm and then at the same time hold the food values down to lower levels regardless of the prices we have to pay for the products we purchase. Now, all we are asking is a square deal. What we want is an agricultural dollar that is worth a hundred cents, in its relation to all other industry dollars.

Because of these facts and many others that might be mentioned, I feel that the price of 31 cents per pound on butterfat is too low, and that it cannot be justified; therefore, in the interests of good dairying, and to maintain a good supply of high quality milk, this price should be at least a price that would be parity as we look at it in the 1941 markets.

Hoping that you may give this matter some consideration, I beg to remain,

Yours respectfully,
LOUIS J. HOUK, *President*,
INDIANA COOPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS' FEDERATION,
Fort Wayne, Ind.

Convoys—The Last Straw

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, convoys mean shooting and shooting means war. We hear on every side that war is inevitable, even we are at war, and there is nothing we can do about it. Until we are engaged in military action we must continue to hope that we can avoid the ultimate catastrophe. We stand on the brink of war. The shooting has not begun. America is on the verge of throwing our treasure and our blood into the European struggle, with the consequences that no one can foretell. On the decisions made by our people and their leaders may depend our national welfare for years to come.

The country wants to defend itself, aid Britain, and stay out of war. During the hearings and the debate on the lease-lend bill we were told it was a peace measure, a bill to keep this country out of war. Both the proponents and opponents of the bill believe that incidents which would certainly involve us in war could not occur if American vessels were kept out of the danger zones. American warships and planes manned and piloted by American boys will be needed to make convoys effective. With our Navy and air force in the war, our Army will not be far behind.

Would you be willing to risk the lives of 6,000,000 American boys and at least $200,000,000,000 in a struggle across the sea? Do you believe it would be easy to transport and land millions of American boys on unfriendly soil? Are we to rush arms and the cream of the American Navy, marines, Army, and air force every time Britain is in danger? What could America write into a peace treaty which would preserve peace and promote justice in Europe? Would we now be willing to maintain standing armies abroad and battleships in foreign ports to enforce a peace? Would you be willing to neglect our own defense for a fighting chance on foreign soil? If we go to war, what are we going to war for?

These are serious practical questions which are ignored by many people, but which mean much to the American mothers whose sons would become the bloody pawns of battle.

War, in reality, is the destroyer of life and property. War means black-outs, shrieking shells, and speeding bombing planes across the sky. Most of us remember the horrors of the last war and its aftermath; the dead upon the battlefields; the bitter tears of womanhood; disease, hospitals where armless, legless, and blinded men await eternity. We also recall the terrible depression, the insufferable burdens of costs, and the dislocations of everything that makes for normal happiness.

In 1917 we entered the World War to save this country for democracy. The United States received nothing from this war but a several-billion-dollar war debt, thousands of disabed young men, and shiploads of flag-draped coffins. Surely it has not come to the point where America must raise a crop of boys every 20 years to be slaughtered in Europe. We do not want to create a new generation of Gold Star Mothers.

Many have said it is impossible for Hitler to invade England. If this is true, we know it would be impossible for him to invade America. I do not believe he would have one chance in a million, in making a successful invasion of the United States, if we have the proper defense.

By making democracy work at home, we can best give service to the world, by protecting what we have o the continent on which it functions, we can do by our example of success that which our armies could not permanently achieve. Right ideals can move eastward from this continent to Europe as readily as wrong ideals can move westward from Europe over here. Let us give devotion to our right ideals at home.

Our destiny is to make America the home of democracy. We must keep America out of Europe and Europe out of America.

British Plots To Destroy American Nationality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE LONDON TIMES

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the London Times of April 3, 1941:

[From the London Times of April 3, 1941]

ANGLO-AMERICAN RELATIONS—SUGGESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

Our parliamentary correspondent writes: "Mr. Craven-Ellis is to ask the Prime Minister in the House of Commons—

"Whether he wil' suggest to President Roosevelt that the United States of America and the British Commonwealth of Nations should jointly consider entering into a solemn act of union, which will provide for the United States of America and the British Commonwealth of Nations becoming one nation, with joint organs of foreign, financial, and economic policies, the citizens of the United States of America enjoying citizenship of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and every British subject enjoying citizenship of the United States of America; and providing further, for the admission into such union of other nations whose people are likewise desirous of strengthening the foundations of world society.'

"Mr. Mander has given notice to ask the Postmaster General:

" 'Whether he will consider the advisability of issuing an Anglo-American stamp, in association with the authorities of the United States of America, as a symbol of the unity of the two great Anglo-Saxon nations in the present struggle.' "

An American Peace Offensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. VORYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN M. VORYS, OF OHIO

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last Friday and Saturday I was privileged to be a member of the Round Table at the annual spring conference at Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., during which we discussed many phases of the central topic, "America in a World at War." On Saturday night I gave an address in which I proposed "An American Peace Offensive Now." I recognized there, as I do now, that there are many difficulties in such a course, many questions involved, and that I do not know all the answers. This whole subject is one which is difficult to mention now without being misunderstood. I feel strongly, nevertheless, that we have an opportunity for peace action now that may never arise again, and I therefore give you, under leave to extend my remarks, the proposal I made at that conference, not as a final solution of the problem, but with the hope of stimulating discussion:

Any American who mentions the despised word, peace, in the spring of 1941 is supposed to apologize. It seems to me there are four good reasons for discussing America's peace aims now.

WHY DISCUSS PEACE NOW?

First. Congress has turned over to the President the power and the appropriations to participate in the war, and this participation is being conducted without taking Congress or the public into the Executive confidence and without any apparent desire for public discussion as to this participation. Therefore, since Congress and the public have nothing to do with the war, they might well spend their time now in a discussion of the next peace, for between censorship and hysteria the time for public discussion may be limited.

Second. After all, the reason we are going to fight is to get peace. Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman, a most efficient soldier who was born in the same town I was, said: "War's legitimate object is more perfect peace."

Third. This is a good time for us to talk peace. Anatol Muhlstein, in the April number of New Europe, says: "In order to have a general conception of what a pacified Europe should be, it will not be sufficient to consult in a hurry, between two plenary sessions, some prominent experts, brought together on the eve of the peace congress. This is a long-range work, a work of thought and scientific research which independent minds must undertake without delay."

Fourth. This is a good time to propose peace in Europe; before we start to fight. I believe that an American peace offensive now could be our most effective aid to Britain.

A. If Britain is losing, and must sue for peace soon, we can open negotiations far better than she can.

B. If, as seems more likely, a stalemate lies ahead, the peace talk might as well be started now as later.

C. If Britain is winning, then for reasons which Mr. Clarence Streit has mentioned and in order to preserve what former Ambassador Bullitt calls our "moral authority," we had better obtain some commitments while we are needed by one side and feared by the other.

In any case, since peace is inevitable, why not try to have it now, before we have started fighting, before entering the endless series of reprisals that make up modern war, before we enter the military way of life—for $43,000,000,000 worth of defense articles means more than spending money, it means a new way of life.

A PEACE OFFENSIVE NOW

Is there a chance for an American "peace offensive" at this time? Both Lindbergh and Dorothy Thompson, from whom I copied the phrase, have said so. President Wilson conducted a successful peace offensive in the last war. The question is now being discussed in Britain. For instance, in the April memorandum of the Imperial Policy Group, it is said:

"The Nazi leaders are doing their utmost to persuade the people that this is a life-and-death struggle for Germany, and some of our propagandists are assisting them. * * *

"There are those who believe that to offer Germany a generous peace on the condition that she discards her present policies and leaders would be to make another way of escape for a race the record of which is deplorable. There are others who feel that the war can only be brought to a decision if and when a majority, or at least a very formidable minority, of the German people can be enlisted on our side as virtual allies in the struggle against nazi-ism. These two points of view are vigorously held by two schools of thought. Sooner or later we shall have to come to a decision as to which policy we intend to follow. Until we do our propaganda can scarcely be intelligent and will certainly prove indecisive. Our choice, when it is made, will bear an extremely important relation to military strategy.

"If we decide that to offer tempting peace to the German people in order to induce them to throw off their present policies is impracticable, then we must not reckon upon the occurrence of any internal break-down until as the result of air bombardment, economic blockade, and successful military action on land Germany and her forces are so utterly crippled that there is no physical alternative to surrender. If we decide upon the other policy as an inducement to the German masses to assist us in our task, then we should propagate it with the utmost vigor in order to gain the maximum advantage."

THE CHANCES FOR PEACE NOW

There are many who say that peace talk with Germany now is impossible. Joseph Choate, when asked whether he could play the violin, said: "I don't know, I never tried."

No one can say that real peace talk with Germany is impossible because it has not been tried since the war began. So far Hitler has had all the psychological advantages that go with peace proposals. From such information as we can obtain, however, there would seem to be a good chance for an American peace offensive which is worth trying. We learn through many leaks in the censorship that the German people want peace. Germany has had enough aerial bombing, has lost enough men, to bring the glories of war home to the people. Among the German people are many who fear the dynamism of Hitler, who fear that each Nazi victory merely sets the stage for further fighting, further suffering. The German soldiers in the occupied countries are becoming restless. We hear on good authority that the possible entry of America into the war brings up ominous memories in Germany. We can start peace proposals better now than after we are in.

DEMOCRACY'S PEACE AIMS

What are our peace aims? The two great spokesmen for our side, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, have been reticent and vague on this subject. President Roosevelt has promised everyone the four freedoms and self-determination. Mr. Churchill has said he favored a few "practical measures of reconstruction," but disliked all talk of a new order and wanted to preserve traditional England. Such a peace aim is unsatisfactory to Harold Laski, who says:

"No state in which there is mass unemployment, especially after an experience like war, can hope to remain a democracy. * * * What follows is the inescapable necessity for the State to control, in the name of the whole community, all those vested interests which * * * are indifferent either to the fact or the consequences of unemployment. * * * The movement of democratic forces now will not, as in the past, be prepared to halt at the frontiers of economic and social privilege."

The self-labeled 1941 Committee Commentary has suggested that Britain must "win the peace" as well as the war, and has suggested this program:

1. Organizing all opposition to the Nazis and Fascists.

2. Open declaration of Britain's war and peace aims.

3. Giving a concrete demonstration of what Britain is fighting for by starting to rebuild her social system at once.

Mr. J. B. Priestley has gotten into difficulties as a radio commentator because of his impatience to discuss peace aims.

The Malvern Conference of the Church of England stated a peace program which proposed "a cooperative commonwealth as a new order for Europe." In this country Mr. Willkie has spoken of preserving the American way, the British way, and the Chinese way. Senator WHEELER has made suggestions which have been "cussed" and discussed.

Vice President Wallace, making an unusual speech for a Vice President and doubtless with the approval of the administration has publicly suggested a Pax Democratica with a bill of rights and a bill of duties involving:

1. A crushing of Nazi ideology;

2. An international order sufficiently strong to prevent the rise of aggressor nations;

3. The defeated aggressor nations must have the opportunity to buy raw materials and sell manufactured goods without discrimination;

4. The peace must be such as to release private capital for the development of our hemisphere.

While statesmen and politicians are vague and brief as to peace, while editors and columnists who are so helpful in predigesting ideas for us are for the most part silent as to peace talk, the church people are talking peace. A number of conferences are being held to attempt to formulate into a workable program the Christian ideal of peace on earth among men of good will. Dr. E. Stanley Jones, a great Methodist missionary and world statesman in the realm of the spirit, has said that America's role in this crisis should not be that of intervention or arbitration, but of mediation, to produce a cooperative world centered around one idea—equality of opportunity. He suggests for discussion seven points:

1. We will undertake to give equality of opportunity to everyone within our own borders. Two classes are disinherited among us: those who haven't a white skin, and those who haven't wealth, inherited or acquired. We will wipe out those two disabilities by giving equal opportunity to all. Democracy means equality of opportunity—social and economic as well as political.

"2. We will undertake to give equality of opportunity to all who come to our shores. That would mean putting the Asiatic peoples on the same quota basis as the rest of the world, 2 percent of those in the 1890 census, which would mean only about 250 people from all Asia. This would take the sting out of our relationships with Japan.

"3. We will insist on the redistribution of the raw materials of the world to all on the basis of equality of opportunity.

"4. We will insist on the redistribution of the land opportunities of the world. Peace is precarious as long as 25 percent of the earth's surface is held by one nation, Great Britain. It would be a happier and more prosperous Britain if she would divide some of the land space of the world with the have-nots. To that many Britons themselves agree.

"5. We will insist that all subject nations or peoples be given a free, unhampered opportunity to choose their own destiny.

"6. We will agree to enter a Federal union, based on a limitation of national sovereignty, with all nations of good will, whatever their particular type of government.

"7. As evidence of our good faith we will cancel all debts owing to us. Further, we will place at the disposal of this Federal union the gold we have buried in our vaults, provided it is used for purposes of world reconstruction on the basis of need, apart from race or nationality."

THE WAR AND THE REVOLUTION

You have heard today a number of peace aims in addition to those I have just given you. They are all vague and various, as they must be on a vital question that has had so little attention. They have one thing in common—none of them describe a world, an America, such as we now know. They also reflect what every real student of this war knows—that a world revolution is going on as a part of, and cause of and result of this war. There is violent disagreement as to just what this revolution is. It is called a revolution against the west, against Roman law, Greek logic, Christian idealism, against democracy, against the "haves." Congressman JOHN RANKIN, a New Dealer who voted for the lend-lease bill, put it this way in the House debate: "There are at least two things in this

world that have come to an end—domination of the world by floating navies, domination of the financial world by the gold standard." A revolution against gold and naval power. James Brunham calls it the managerial revolution, a label approved by Stuart Chase, as something different from capitalism or socialism. I can think of no better quick description than this—a revolution against free capitalism. It is going on in every country, going on in the United States. We have seen evidence of it here in our meetings So far it is not our war but it's our revolution. If we could only understand it, and in some way think it out instead of fighting it out, as we did in the Protestant Revolution, the French Revolution, the industrial revolution we cculd make this a better country, a better world.

SUGGESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

I have some suggestions for peace aims for America. Like the others, they are vague—a basis for discussion rather than a final set of demands:

1. We will preserve this country as a Republic and work out the internal effects of this world-wide movement on our system by peaceful, intelligent evolution—not by violent, blind revolution.

2. We will preserve our hemisphere intact against the military or political aggression of the world.

3. We recognize the right of similar areas to preserve themselves intact against our military or political aggression.

4. We believe that neighboring states must learn to live together peacefully in union, as we have. We will not approve of the domination of one race, or one nation, or one man in such an area. We are opposed to unions or axes based solely on color, language, race, or ideologies. We want a regime in Europe that is not a balance-of-power mosaic. We believe people who live near each other must unite in peace.

5. We believe in equality of opportunity for all nations in markets, raw materials, acquiring land, and emigration to all undeveloped land.

6. We believe in reciprocity of opportunity as to markets, materials, land, and emigration as between developed lands.

7. We will refrain from interference in the affairs of nations which do not interfere with our affairs.

8. We will do our part in maintaining world peace, order, and justice based on these principles; we will not enter any arrangement that inevitably involves an immediate war or violation of our Constitution.

9. We will participate in progressive disarmament.

THE PEACE OFFENSIVE

We shou'd immediately formulate our peace aims. We should debate among ourselves in this country the definite proposals we shall make for peace, so that we will not be merely begging for a peace conference, but will be making a real "peace offensive." We are neither appeasers nor defeatists. We would at the same time make it clear that we were not attempting to dictate, but were offering the friendly services of mediation.

We would offer the promise of food, money, and material as an inducement to make peace and keep the peace. We would threaten the use of tariffs and embargoes against those who fail to keep the peace. Whether I approve of it or not, the threat of war would be involved in the refusal to consider our proposal under present circumstances.

We would not have to rely on Hitler's word for the keeping of such a peace. Terms could be arranged for impounding arms, by both sides, joint or international control of strategic positions, conditions applicable to both sides, and that would involve no loss or injury to any nation intending to keep the peace, so that peace would depend upon more than Hitler's promise. If all the other terms were satisfactory, if both sides were subject to the same requirements for guaranteeing the peace and if Hitler alone refused these guaranties and insisted upon continuing the war, we would have found a way to separate the German people from their leader. In order to make such a peace offensive effective, however, it must be made intelligently and in good faith. I don't know whether it would work. The time to try it, however, is before we go in. We will never have such a chance again.

But some will say—this would be only a truce. I don't think so, but always before we have thought each war was the last war, and at the end that we were entering perpetual peace. Perhaps it would be wise for us to know this time that war would come again unless we waged peace as bravely and wisely as we wage war. Are we in danger of defeat in peace? Can't we make our American system work better than any other? Have we no faith in persuasion versus propaganda, Yankee ingenuity versus slave labor, Republican government versus any other kind, Christian love versus pagan hatred?

My countrymen, America hasn't led the world in war. I feel certain we could, but before we risk everything in trying it, let's risk nothing by trying to lead the world in peace—something in which we know we can lead the whole world. Friends, we have our faults and our frailties, but after all, in cold blood, the Nazis aren't the greatest nation on earth, Britain isn't the greatest nation on earth, we are the greatest nation on earth. We owe it to thousands abroad who are otherwise sure to die this year to give them the chance to live, in peace, before we send our thousands to die with them.

These Things Are Ours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. MATTHEW F. McGUIRE, ASSISTANT TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, April 16, 1941, at Parker House, in Boston, Mass., the Honorable Matthew F. McGuire, Assistant to the Attorney General, delivered a most able and thoughtful address that has a lesson of great value in it to all of us who are so deeply concerned with the trying period in which we are living.

Mr. McGuire spoke at the annual banquet of the Boston University Law School Association, and in his characteristically able manner he concisely and clearly points out the imminent danger to our way of life resulting from the rapidly spreading Hitler philosophy in other parts of the world, and particularly in Europe.

I am glad to have the privilege of making this a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address follows:

There is a view in the city of Washington which to Americans should be one of the most inspiring in all the world. It runs, straight as the crow flies, for a distance of over 2 miles, beginning at the Capitol, down across a beautiful landscaped Mall, past the Washington Monument and the famous reflecting pool, to the Lincoln Memorial, thence across the Potomac to the storied heights of Arlington, with Lee's Mansion overlooking the river, to the rolling hills of Virginia beyond.

At the Capitol end, with the books of the law cradled in his arms and his juridical robes about him, stands Marshall, the soldier who fought with the men of Virginia in the great struggle that culminated in the achievement of our independence—Marshall, the jurist, who as a great Chief Justice welded the Colonies into the Federal Union.

At the other end, looking toward Marshall, sitting alone and in simple yet majestic state, is the solitary and melancholy figure of Lincoln, looking out not now upon the work of Marshall tumbled into ruin, or upon the smoke of battle rising out of the Shenandoah and over the hills of Arlington, nor upon States broken and dissevered about him, but upon a country united as never before, exceeding even his fondest dream, and risen to the heights of the heritage that is ours.

We as lawyers should be proud of that heritage, for while laymen contributed in an immeasurable degree to the achievement of our independence, it was lawyers who led the way, and the great names of the period read like a roster of the American bar.

Public life, then as now, seemed to be the lawyers' natural forum.

They took the democratic idea and convinced the American people of its inherent wisdom, translated it into objective reality, laying the foundation for the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States and of our American Commonwealth which was builded upon them.

They were the inheritors of those fundamental liberties which antedate the common law, which are written in the heart of every man by the Almighty Hand of the Great Law Giver.

They were the inheritors, too, of a common intellectual tradition and of a norm of private and public morality which despite the religious upheaval of the sixteenth century came down to them practically intact, so that when they said—as they did say—in our Declaration of Independence: "* * * All men are created free and equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights * * *," they gave practical and concrete evidence of their belief in the overlordship of God and the spiritual kinship of man.

There were very few debunkers in those days. Men still clung to the fundamentals and the eternal verities, and although we may smile at the manners and customs of the period, there was a substance to it and a fiber in it that somehow today we sadly lack.

Out of these fundamental concepts have sprung those things which are ours: Freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of conscience—the right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own heart—those fundamental freedoms which we take for granted.

If the democratic idea is to survive and the constitutional government in America which has been predicated upon it is to be maintained, then our devotion to it must be something more than mere lip service or casual allusion.

For despite anything that we may have done or failed to do, we find it threatened today by forces more sinister in their objective than any in human history since the day when Charles Martel overcame the hosts of Mohammed upon the field of Chalons.

A peaceful country, we suddenly find ourselves compelled to create a large standing army and to train it with all the ability and all the power we possess, to double and even triple the size of our fleet, to turn great num-

bers of our people to the production of instruments of violence because there are those who threaten not only our peace, but our very way of life, who openly proclaim there is no God but Caesar, that the altar of the omnipotent state is the only shrine, before which every head must bow and every knee must bend.

This philosophy of force is the new alpha and omega and must be the first and last concern of men who too long have labored under the delusion that human liberty and the God-given rights that spring from it is the foundation stone of civil society.

This conflict is not a mere struggle of armaments. It is not the revolution of a free people to determine a change in their government. It is the spawn of that atheistic culture and philosophy that stems from Nitzsche, Marx, and Engel, the matriarch of all those other "isms" that have sprung from generations of irreligion, the repudiation of fundamentals, false liberalism, and the pursuit of the cult of pleasure that reduce men to automata, that explains history by economics—and wages this war, not against armies only but against our very concept of society, against women and children, destroys homes, separates mothers from fathers and children from both, and holds over all the stark terror of the concentration camp and a slavery more terrifying than the Siberia of the czars and the galleys and the salt mines of ancient Rome. Such—this so-called total war.

How can we then be indifferent to this thing which is happening in Europe. It isn't a question of liking the British Empire, or disliking it. It is a question of meeting a menace that defies all pattern. It has leapt all barriers, and like a tidal wave sweeps all before it.

Not so many years ago Europe seemed so far away. Within our lifetime the genius of the human mind has brought to us the knowledge of events as quickly as they have occurred, making them as near as though they happened at the doors. Giant clippers leave New York and in a few hours bring their shining hulls down upon the bay at Lisbon—distance no longer lends enchantment.

We cannot be indifferent any more than the people of this city and this Commonwealth could be indifferent to what happened at Lexington and Bunker Hill, or any more than the people of this country could be indifferent to what happened at Waterloo, although the knowledge of the event was not brought home to them until long after it occurred.

This America of ours—under the providence of God, for it cannot be explained in any other way—has been designed to be the one shining oasis in a desert of darkness; it has been the haven of those pilgrims of human liberty who came here from many lands and in many Mayflowers to achieve it.

Go to the graves at Plymouth—see the terrible harvest of that first winter here in the Old Bay Colony and you will get a slight picture of what the achievement of liberty meant in America.

Go over to Charlestown and see the shaft that marks the battlefield of Bunker Hill, and you will get some small idea of what the achievement of that liberty was to mean in blood—that you and I might enjoy it.

Go to Gettysburg and see what sacrifices were demanded of the generation that preserved it, and look about you on every side of this great country of ours, at its marvelous cities, its peaceful towns and villages, its rolling hills and fertile valleys, vibrating with the pulse and stuff of life, and you can see that it was not only blood but sweat that made America.

Nor do I need to remind you, whether your forebears came here in the first *Mayflower* or in the thousands of other *Mayflowers* which followed it, in the creaking barks and clippers of the forties with their dark and reeking holds, or in the steerage of those ships of the latter era, of what we owe them for their contribution in sweat and tears to the wonder that is America. These things are ours. We have known their cost; so, we should be neither Jew nor gentile, Irish or English, French, German, or Italian, or any other composite or amalgam, but Americans, and resolve that the hates and prejudices of the older world cannot abide in the new under the bright light of a new day and the flaming splendor of a new sun. What we need to do is to never forget that fact.

You can depend upon it, to paraphrase the words of the great Edmund Burke, that the lovers of freedom will be free. Have no doubt about that.

What we need, however, is to recapture some of the idealism, some of the practicality, and some of the spirit and the devotion of the founding fathers. What we need is to purge out the old leaven and to reaffirm our belief in the Fatherhood of God and in the fact that men exist, not for their stomachs or their purses, nor as the pawns of others, but for a destiny that is eternal, and that governments exist not as the instrument for the privilege of the few but for the greatest good of the many.

"Sursum corda"—"lift up your hearts"—should be our battle cry, while presenting the phalanx of a united democracy against those who hate the name and would root out and erase, if possible, the very word from the hearts and minds of men.

It will mean sacrifices, sacrifices upon the part of labor and upon the part of capital, upon the part of those in high places and low; it will mean longer working hours and heavier taxes, all a small part which we are asked to pay to preserve the liberty that we now enjoy and the philosophy and the way of living it has engendered.

To us as lawyers it is the call to a high emprise. To us as Americans, the call to a new crusade.

It means that this liberty of ours shall not be enshrined, as has been said, like the Roman gods of old, in cold and impersonal marble in some lone temple on some lone hill, but a living, vital, vibrant thing, sprung from the hand of the Author of all Good, and enshrined forever in our hearts and those of our children.

Relief for Polish Citizens Destitute in Siberia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTON F. MACIEJEWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

Mr. MACIEJEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to take the opportunity to call the attention of the Members of the House to the deplorable plight of over one-half million Poles, many of them relatives of stanch American citizens, who, after the occupation of eastern Poland by the Soviet authorities, were deported to Siberia and practically exiled.

Like many other Members of the House, I have received numerous appeals suggesting that the Soviet authorities be requested to permit an official or private American mission to proceed to the Soviet Union to minister to the needs of these unfortunate peoples, who are suffering from lack of shelter, warm clothing, and food. In other words, unless immediate help is accorded them, they must die from exposure and starvation.

Knowing that the American democratic Government stands for humanity, I hope that prompt steps may be taken to effect a friendly arrangement with the Soviet authorities, as suggested, whereby relief from this country may be extended to those who are now destitute in the Soviet Union.

Henry Ford—By Labor Voted Labor's Friend—Those Who Would Destroy Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY GERALD L. K. SMITH

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following is an address delivered by Gerald L. K. Smith over station WJR, Detroit, a few days ago:

Recently a stranger, an agitator, spoke in a Detroit high school auditorium, and referred to Mr. Henry Ford as Public Enemy No. 1. Ten thousand imps of hell have been turned loose by the destructive forces of our Nation in an attempt to discredit the man who has done more for Detroit and American industry than any living American. I have watched the newspapers this week as entire pages have been devoted to pictures of men who are using the bureaucratic, dictatorial powers of a Fascist regime as instruments with which to conspire against the good name of this pioneer, this man of vision, this creator of ideas, this one whose farsightedness reached out a hundred years ahead of us all to create 5,000,000 jobs and to establish a precedent of high wages for industrial labor.

I have studied the countenances of these men whose pictures appeared in the paper, as with smirking grins upon their faces they lie in wait for this great man, in the hope that they may be able to spring at him like a dog from the bush, like a serpent from the weeds and sink their poison fangs into the life of a man whose value to America can never be truly estimated.

These who lie in wait, these vultures, these buzzards, make up a motley crew of men who live by their wits as a substitute for honest and creative toil. They are politicians, conspirators, Communists, racketeers, parasites. With few exceptions they represent no constructive element in our community or in our national life. They combine with several elements who hate Henry Ford, who hate him because he is against foreign war, who hate him because of his industrial genius, who hate him because of jealousy, who hate him because he has dared to fight for the preservation of the independent and competitive enterprise which has made America.

And behind this hate, and cooperating with this hate, is one of the most ruthless combinations of conspiracies ever to be leveled against the welfare of one American. Perhaps not since Abraham Lincoln has one man been so universally persecuted by the forces of destruction and evil as has this prophet of true Americanism, Mr. Henry Ford.

We see the conspiracy of persecution, the conspiracy of revenge, the conspiracy of confiscation. Then there is the conspiracy of competition. Strange as it may seem, gigantic enterprises, operating in the same field of endeavor, who have hated Henry Ford for five decades because of his ability to keep his institutions free from the choking hand of Wall Street and international finance—because of this ability on his part, these corporate interests have developed an unholy mania, a jealousy, a contempt, bent upon his complete destruction.

Those who own these gigantic enterprises in competition are not citizens of Detroit, neither do they accept the responsibility of local citizenship. They represent cold-blooded, absentee, corporate ownership answerable to the ruthless banking interests of New York City, which symbolize the forces that have been set in motion to get us involved in this foreign war.

Unbelievable as it may seem, there are more than a few visible evidences of the fact that these jealous corporate competitors have been willing at times to appropriate for their own purpose these plots that have been hatched by these evil forces against this mighty man and the tremendous and constructive institutions which he personifies.

Now these politicians, these "reds," these loafers, these walking delegates, join together to create synthetic committee hearings in an attempt to establish in the minds of the American people the idea that Henry Ford is a criminal, while these who would destroy America sit in the seats of honor in Washington, Lansing, and Detroit. Who are some of these self-righteous reformers who pose as the apostles of progress while they would discredit Henry Ford and his enterprises?

Maurice Sugar, attorney, friend, and pal of practically every Communist and revolutionary who ever came to the city of Detroit, unable even in a trial which he himself instituted to prove that he was not a Communist.

John Anderson, the Communist, who virtually sits on top of a great section of the automotive industry tonight. Has he been called into any committee? He joins the chorus of hate in this conspiracy to brand great Americans as criminals.

Wyndham Mortimer, Communist organizer of all workers in the airplane industry. A self-righteous bureaucracy which seems to take particular delight in the persecution of Henry Ford seems not a bit excited over the fact that a disciple of Joseph Stalin sits in command over the workers who are building our defense airplanes tonight.

Edwin S. Smith, appointed by the President to the National Labor Relations Board, is branded by the congressional committee as an affiliate and member of pro-Communist "front" organizations. He is elevated to a position of high authority over industry and labor; he is looked upon as a progressive reformer, while he joins with this gang to brand our first citizen as a criminal.

Felix Frankfurter, the ruling spirit of the high court, the chief adviser of the President, the one who was given credit for writing House Resolution 1776, the former friend and defender of the anarchists, Sacco and Vanzetti, sits in judgment over men like Mr. Ford. But we are asked to brand such men as Henry Ford, who helped build the real America, as a criminal. Oh God, save America from this treason.

Sidney Hillman, former intimate of Nicolai Lenin, boasts of what he proposes to do with Henry Ford. Speaking with such a foreign accent that he can scarcely be understood, with a background of communistic agitation, this former Russian-born revolutionist now is thrust upon the American people by this Washington bureaucracy and joins his voice with this chorus of conspirators to brand this great American as a criminal.

We read long articles of the greatness of William Knudsen, the Danish immigrant who now is grateful for the opportunity that America gave him. Where did Mr. Knudsen get his first opportunity? What institution and organization gave him the vision and the training and the background necessary to catapult him into his phenomenal position of leadership? That opportunity was given to him by Mr. Henry Ford.

I hear smirking remarks from business executives in Detroit and elsewhere who seem to take evil delight in observing the work of these arch conspirators as they plot against this great man. Shame on such men. In many instances they themselves were made by Henry Ford. The very opportunities which they enjoy were set in motion by Mr. Ford and his kind.

God pity America when the Sidney Hillmans come to power and the Henry Fords are branded as criminals. God pity America when the Walter Reuthers, who were trained in Moscow in the science of revolutionary activity, ride about in specially chartered American military airplanes and are introduced by kowtowing bureaucrats as men with great ideas.

Walter Reuther, the originator of the sit-down strike, the revolutionary arm of the Communist Party, honored by the President, glorified by men in high authority, an alumnus of Lenin University, in Moscow. God pity an America that honors such men and would brand Henry Ford as a criminal.

This controversy is not a labor controversy. He was the first to pay a living wage to the industrial workers, and he was hated as much for that as anything he ever did. The question does not involve a relationship between Mr. Ford and the United States Government.

If Mr. Ford should be questioned, if Mr. Ford is to have contact with his Government, let him be treated as an American, by real Americans, instead of manhandled by this motley gang of "reds" and racketeers and Communists and saboteurs—these destroyers of America, these disciples of Stalin, these children of the devil who are poisoning our schools, poisoning our churches.

Yes; they condemn Mr. Ford, but with the same eloquence they condemn the holy church. Yes; they curse Mr. Ford, but with the same profanity they curse the name of Christ. They cursed him when he whipped Wall Street; they cursed him when he fought for peace before the last World War; they cursed him when he changed from model T to model A, and from model A to V–8; they cursed him when he increased the wages of his workers; they cursed him because it is the nature of vermin, it is the nature of evil forces to destroy and hurt and condemn the good, the high, and the noble, the prophetic, the creative.

I speak these words tonight through no desire to patronize a great man. The voice you hear tonight is as independent as truth itself. I owe no debt to Henry Ford. I have no obligation to fulfill. These cantankerous, repulsive, un-American agitators, these Communists, these racketeers, these rats, these reds, who conspire against the spirit of America and the spirit of progress and the spirit of individual enterprise and the spirit of the Constitution, gore me to the soul.

My defense of this great American tonight, this creative and progressive pioneer, this man whose name, along with Edison and Lincoln, will be engraved upon the pages of American history—I defend Henry Ford tonight not because he needs defense, not because he needs anything that I possess, but because America needs Henry Ford and other Henry Fords.

There are boys tonight in America, selling newspapers, plowing in fields, sweeping floors, who need to be told that the America that made Henry Ford is still here, who need to be told that the spirit of America will not permit these agitators and racketeers, these disciples of Stalin, these Fascist-minded bureaucrats to destroy that abundant ozone of opportunity which American youth deserves.

I use the name of Henry Ford not as the name of a man, but as the symbol of the American opportunity that was and the American opportunity, pray God, that should be kept alive for the generations yet unborn.

Labor and the Ford Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUDOLPH G. TENEROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

Mr. TENEROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, recent strikes have been so magnified in the press, on the radio, and even in the Halls of Congress the impression has been conveyed that there exists a serious labor problem in this country. A biased and distorted picture has been presented in a manner obviously intended to prejudice the public. As a matter of fact, if existing laws pertaining to labor had been obeyed no strikes would have occurred.

Although hundreds of thousands of workers have been added to the pay rolls of industry due to the national-defense program, we have, actually fewer strikes. Man-days lost in 1940 were less than 25 percent of those lost in 1937 and approximately 33 percent of those lost in 1939. In this connection the United States Department of Labor issued the following statistics concerning strikes:

	Strikes
1937	4,740
1938	2,772
1939	2,613
1940	2,450

These authentic figures clearly indicate that the number of strikes is decreasing.

Recently Mr. Sidney Hillman, Associate Director General of the Office of Production Management, addressed the American Society of Newspaper Editors. I am taking the liberty of quoting some of the highlights of his address as follows:

I wonder how well known is the fact that most industrial disputes are settled without any stoppage. Every week hundreds of labor contracts expire and are renewed without evoking even a ripple.

In the strikes which have occurred, surely we have no right to place the blame upon labor without informing ourselves as to the underlying reasons. When large profits are reported in the press, labor justly feels it is entitled to some fair share of them. When labor is denied various rights guaranteed to it by law, labor cannot be expected to sit by without protest.

The great majority of American employers share with the great majority of American labor unions the credit for the unusually small number of strikes in the last year.

Even more important in this connection is the patriotism and vision of the leadership and the rank and file of organized labor. They have unstintingly given their support to the defense program.

In a thorough study of the country's strike situation the Twentieth Century Fund found the following reasons for our strikes: (1) Rise in the cost of living; (2) labor's desire to receive its just share in the face of industry's rising profits; (3) the contest between the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L., and (4) the production speed-up.

Now, a pertinent fact not generally known and a fact which the opponents of organized labor would have us remain unaware is that industry was on a veritable sit-down strike in 1940. Many large concerns refused to expand, sub-let contracts, and rejected, in many instances, Government contracts until the Government met their terms. They wanted no roof for their profits. This caused a delay of close to 9 months after which the Government finally capitulated. And yet some blame labor for retarding the defense program.

At this point I should like to quote Mr. Paul V. McNutt, Administrator of the Federal Security Agency. Recently he said that "A free labor movement protected by the law of the land would be more productive than slave labor." He further stated that 8,000,000 members of labor unions in the United States have about 15,000,000 dependents and they benefit some 40,000,000 other workers. This makes 63,000,000 (one-half of our total population) who would therefore be directly affected by the impact of any harsh law designed to deprive citizens of their natural rights or by the loss of any of the existing rights given to labor by law.

Congress has enacted three laws which are now in force and which are of vital importance not only to labor but also to industry. They are: (1) The National Labor Relations Act; (2) the Wages and Hours Act; and (3) the Walsh-Healey Act. Briefly, these laws specifically provide machinery for holding elections; restrain employers from adopting certain designated unfair labor practices which would interfere with the right of the workers to organize into unions of their own choice; permit collective bargaining; specify a minimum wage and time and one-half for overtime; and stipulate that on Government contracts in excess of $10,000 prevailing wages and time and one-half over 40 hours must be paid.

In this era of industrialization is it not better that labor and industry see eye to eye? There must be a correlation of operations between labor and industry if any degree of harmony and efficiency is to be achieved. Industry will be taxed, and so will the worker, in order to meet this gigantic defense program. There should be an equitable participation by labor in the profits of industry so that the laboring man can assume his share in the defense program and meet the rising cost of living. Too many of our industrial leaders seem to be motivated by a lust for efficiency and speed alone, oblivious to an appraisal of social factors. Domination of labor would appear to be the goal of many. I have reference here to those who have fought organized labor for years; concerns which have set up small empires in this social structure of ours. On the other hand, we have those who realize and appreciate the transition which is taking place in that structure. These latter concerns live up to the law, but their names do not appear in newspaper headlines. These concerns are beginning to show a deep and sincere understanding of the new relationship between labor and capital. Grievances, exactions, and adjustments are made so that ultimately mutual benefits to labor and industry alike will be realized.

Mr. Speaker, if the three laws to which I have referred were obeyed there would be no industrial strife. But when we have companies like the Bethlehem Corporation, the Allis-Chalmers Corporation, the Vultee Co. of California, the Harvester Co., and the Ford Motor Co. defying the law, discord and strained relations between industry and labor is inevitable. I mention these particularly because the newspapers have headlined the strikes in these companies for weeks.

Let us examine the record. Let us consider the profits of some of these corporations:

	Net profits
1. Bethlehem Steel Corporation	$50,000,000
2. Vultee Aircraft (opposed to an increase in wages above 50 cents an hour)	380,000
3. International Harvester	23,000,000
4. U. S. Shell Corporation	102,000,000
5. General Motors Corporation	195,000,000
6. General Electric	55,000,000
7. Du Pont Corporation	97,000,000

Figures show the net earnings of 175 concerns in the first quarter of 1941 up 16 percent. The following statistics show the earnings of certain groups compared as follows. (Associated Press compilation, April 26, 1941):

	1941	1940	Increase
			Percent
10 food	$16,295,000	$14,860,000	10
8 railroad	20,254,000	15,876,000	28
8 chemical	5,489,000	5,112,000	7
6 machinery	2,528,000	1,889,000	34
6 railway equipment	4,322,000	4,159,000	4
5 utility	10,401,000	9,685,000	7
79 miscellaneous	106,206,000	95,080,000	12

Note, if you will, the percentage of profit increase as far as food companies are concerned.

Notwithstanding these increases and existing laws protecting the rights of labor, we can attribute our recent strikes to a disregard of labor laws, together with industry's denial to labor of a just share of its rapidly increasing profits and the obvious rise in the cost of food as shown by the Associated Press compilation given above.

Labor has complied with all labor laws. In a recent letter received from Mr. R. J. Thomas, president of the United Automobile Workers of America, it was stated that their more than 700 collective-bargaining agreements invariably call for periods of notice and negotiation before strikes can be called. Labor has evidenced a sincere desire to cooperate, but have not some of the industrialists conveyed the impression that they are above the law? Some have refused to obey these acts, in some instances necessitating court action. The National Labor Relations Board has rendered decisions against many concerns, large and small, among them the Bethlehem Corporation and the Ford Motor Car Co.

In speaking of strikes, I would like to mention the recent one in the Ford Motor Car Co. at Dearborn, Mich. Thanks to the cool and level-headed leadership of the C. I. O., the State police, and the C. I. O. pickets at the gates, lives were saved and a race riot prevented. Much has been said in the press concerning this strike, but only one side of the story has been told. In order to have an unbiased picture of this dispute, allow me to present certain facts of which little or nothing has been said.

It has been said that the Ford Motor Car Co. fired eight union representatives. These key men in the collective bargaining apparatus set up by the United Auto Workers were dismissed April 1, 1941, because they had taken time from their jobs to present the grievances of fellow workers to management. Another reason given to some of the men was that the management did not recognize them as representatives of other workers. The press steel department represented by one of the discharged men stopped working because the men felt that collective bargaining was no longer possible with the discharge of their duly elected representative. I might add that for weeks previous to this date these men had been acting in their capacity as representatives of the workers. They had met consistently with management to discuss wages and working conditions in the shop and concessions were granted by both sides prior to the summary firing of these eight union representatives. These men were discharged without warning, because they were following a procedure which the company had tolerated or even encouraged on immediately preceding days.

On Tuesday evening, April 1, 1941, the union leadership contacted the Ford Motor Car Co., the sheriff of Wayne County, and Charles Dewey, Department of Labor Conciliator for the purpose of entering the plant to instruct the workers to continue working and to abandon stoppage of work. Their motive was to attempt to settle the controversy by peaceful negotiation, a clear indication that the union leaders did try to avert trouble. However, permission was refused union officials by representatives of the Ford Co. and their efforts failed through no fault of their own. Moreover, the union requested the company to continue the construction of the aircraft plant in the River Rouge properties during the subsequent strike. The union pledged that

the way was open at any time for a return to work of A. F. of L. building craftsmen who had been employed in that plant. This aircraft work was the only national-defense job of importance then carried on at River Rouge. The company refused to comply with the union's request and the work was therefore stopped at that plant for the duration of the strike.

Early Wednesday morning, April 2, a picket line was ordered at all Ford gates. The picket was comparatively peaceful considering the fact that approximately 85,000 men were striking. Some of the pickets were injured but this was due to conditions that were being fomented within the plant. Those inside were told that they would be molested upon leaving. Among these were some good and honest workers, but in the same group were some who were looking for trouble and creating it.

It has been stated that the damage done in the plant was in the tool and die department. This department worked through all of Tuesday and left the plant when official notice came to them of the strike. The men put their tools away, cleaned up the department, and walked out of the plant. At this point I would like to insert in the RECORD excerpts from two affidavits I have of men who worked in that department, showing that no damage was done to any machinery in their department when they left. I am withholding the names of these workers to avert possible reprisal:

From the time I started my shift to the completion of my shift I know that there was no damage done, and I was in a position to know whether or not there was any damage done to the machines in my department, which consists of the entire die room. In addition to this, my superintendent never complained of any damage right up to the time we left the building which was about 1 a. m. His jurisdiction extended over the entire building and it would seem reasonable that if the amount of damage claimed by the company actually existed, that as chairman of the building he would have taken it up with me.

I would also like to add that when I came back from union headquarters I had to walk through about half of the building. I can state definitely that if there was any damage done to any of the machines along the aisleway where I walked I would have noticed it immediately, because after being in the die work for so many years our eyes are trained to notice anything unusual, particularly about our own machines.

The foreman, Mr. Fuller, told us to go down and ring out our cards. On my way down I stopped at the heat-treat department and told the men the strike was officially on. They told me they couldn't leave the department since some of them would have to stay and take care of the ovens. We agreed to leave three or four men there, which we did.

All the way down to the time clock I saw very few men from other buildings in any part of the tool and die room, except in front of the superintendent's office. I didn't notice any damage to any of the machines, and I can state that I didn't see anybody going around trying to do any damage to any of the machines. When I reached the time clock it was out of order because it was an electric clock and there was no electric power.

I have another affidavit showing the use which was made of Army blitz-buggies by imported workers within the plant. These blitz-buggies, intended for the United States Army, were taken over by these people and driven recklessly throughout the grounds of the Ford Motor Co. Maintenance men who were sent into the plant at the suggestion of the union to keep up company equipment were attacked and many sent to the hospital.

It is miraculous that no lives were lost in this strike and in this connection I quote the following resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Dearborn, Mich.:

Whereas the city of Dearborn recently experienced a labor dispute and controversy resulting in a strike at the Ford Motor Co. in the course of which proponents of the various factions involved exhibited their sympathies by picketing and other public demonstrations, which, if uncontrolled, might easily have resulted in strife, bloodshed, and fundamental disturbance of the peace and good order of the citizens; and

Whereas all responsible representatives of the factions immediately concerned in said controversy were fully cognizant of the dangers inherent in the situation, wholeheartedly cooperated to restore peace and good order: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That Murray D. Van Wagoner, Governor of the State of Michigan, the Ford Motor Co., and the United Automobile Workers officials be and they are each respectfully lauded for their mutual cooperation and untiring efforts which resulted in prompt and speedy cessation of the dispute and controversy in an amiable manner to the ultimate benefit of the people of the city and the Nation at large.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion may I say that I have known thousands of Ford workers personally. They constitute a hard-working and patriotic group of our citizenry.

In all sincerity I feel I should know something of the problems of the American worker and the struggles of organized labor to obtain better working conditions in order to insure a stabilized future for his family and himself. The great industrial cities of Detroit and Hamtramck are both represented in the First Congressional District of Michigan. Encompassed in Michigan's First are some of the mightiest industrial units on the face of the earth. A partial list embraces Plymouth, Dodge, Chrysler, and Chevrolet.

It is my sincere hope that strife between labor and industry will be terminated altogether. Progress along this line is already under way. The past 2 weeks have made that apparent. The National Defense Mediation Board, consisting of 12 men, which was set up recently, has rendered yeomen service. Five of the most annoying labor disputes have been settled by this Board.

We are a united nation, but can only remain so provided industry recognizes its responsibilities to labor in the degree that labor has already recognized its responsibilities to its country.

Membership in Communist, Nazi, or Fascist Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LELAND M. FORD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

LETTERS BY HON. LELAND M. FORD, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters written by me to the Attorney General in connection with two bills I have introduced:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 28, 1941.
The Honorable ROBERT H. JACKSON,
Attorney General of the United States, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: This will acknowledge receipt of copy of your letter of April 14, original of which was addressed to Chairman HATTON W. SUMNERS, of the House Judiciary Committee, on the subject of my bill, H. R. 1841, to make it a deportable offense for an alien to associate with Communist, Nazi, or Fascist groups.

I note you say that the phraseology is indefinite. I further note, however, that you do not offer any phraseology which you consider definite. This bill was offered in order that your Department might have the means and the power to deport the type of citizen mentioned in the bill. Your Department does not take any action, does not obtain any results, and you fall back and give as your excuse that you have not the legislation to cover. Now I am offering you the opportunity to get such legislation and will ask that you change this bill so that it will accomplish the purpose.

As far as I am personally concerned, I do not see that this bill is so indefinite in its phraseology. As a matter of fact, I think it is rather specific. You will have to admit that it is not any more indefinite than the terms "accessory" or "accomplice," as used in bills defining murder in this country. You will also have to admit our courts, for the past 150 years, have been able to construe and determine what the words "accessory" and "accomplice" to murder were and are.

I think, if you are going to do your full duty and are sincere, you will either accept this bill or make suggestions that will accomplish what you think to be more specific or definite phraseology.

Sincerely yours,

LELAND M. FORD.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 28, 1941.
The Honorable ROBERT H. JACKSON,
Attorney General of the United States, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: This will refer to your letter of April 4, original of which was addressed to the Honorable HATTON W. SUMNERS, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and referred to my bill (H. R.

3455) to make membership in Communist, Nazi, and Fascist organizations unlawful.

I note, in the last paragraph of this letter, you say that this bill is a duplicate and therefore unnecessary. I cannot square this statement with the action of your Department, and that is, that you have consistently stated that you could not deport these people because, under the law, you had not the facilities. Now, when we furnish this bill to you, you say that it is unnecessary. It seems to me that you should either deport these people under the legislation we already have, or make suggestions as to what is actually needed so that you can deport these undesirable aliens.

Will you please give me a statement on the number of aliens you have deported for these reasons within the last year? I would also like to have a statement of the number of actions you have commenced against this type of person. An early reply will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

L. M. FORD.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ROCK COUNTY HERALD, LUVERNE, MINN.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. A. O. Moreaux, editor and publisher of the Rock County Herald, of Luverne, Minn., has for many years encouraged the development of waterways and has worked hard in the upbuilding of the great midwestern agricultural area.

"Mabe" Moreaux, in the following editorial, brings out the numerous advantages which would accrue to our Nation, both industry and the farmer, if the St. Lawrence seaway is developed. The Midwest was seriously damaged by the Panama Canal and, in Mr. Moreaux's opinion, the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway would offset this damage done to our section by the construction of the Canal.

As a student of this subject, Mr. Moreaux's opinion is well worth studying, and I hope that the Members of this House will take the necessary time to read the following editorial:

[From the Rock County Herald, Luverne, Minn.]

EARLY ACTION IMPERATIVE

President Roosevelt probably is well adviced concerning the delay in bringing the new St. Lawrence seaway agreement with Canada up for consideration by Congress, but in the absence of explanation this delay is disquieting to the millions of people in the Midwest who for so many years have been looking forward to consummation of this great project as a measure of relief from the transportation handicap under which the midcontinent has suffered since the opening of the Panama Canal. It is not Mr. Roosevelt's habit to permit proposals he submits to Congress to long lie dormant without pressing for action.

It is understandable that the President is sorely harassed by national and international problems incident to the European war, the increasing need of providing Great Britain with vastly more aid than has as yet been possible to give, and at the same time carry out the big armament and defense program so desperately needed in this country. But the St. Lawrence seaway and power projects are, as Mr. Roosevelt has so clearly stated, of great importance in our defense program, with time an important essence in their completion. Delay is therefore a cause of concern.

This concern, however, does not reflect any doubt of Mr. Roosevelt's sincerity in wishing to proceed with all possible speed in securing approval by Congress of the seaway agreement. But it does reflect a fear that he has found opposition to the agreement so strong in Congress that he considers it inadvisable to immediately press for action.

It is no secret that the opposition to the St. Lawrence project is better organized and more strongly entrenched than when the treaty was defeated in the Senate in 1934. The same selfish interests which opposed the treaty in 1934 are not only again active, but they have been active for over a year in perfecting organizations and amassing huge funds with which to fight the St. Lawrence development. In opposition to the navigation feature are all the shipping interests of the Atlantic seaboard, the Eastern railroads, the Mississippi Valley Association, the Great Lakes Carriers Association, and all other associations and organizations they have been able to influence to support them. Plus this is the opposition of the private electric utilities companies whose opposition is directed against the power development which is an important byproduct of the St. Lawrence development. Combined, these oppositions can wield a tremendous influence upon Congress, particularly in the House, by reason of the disproportionate representation held by the Eastern industrial States.

However, notwithstanding this most formidable array of opposition the case for the seaway is far from hopeless. The factual evidence of benefit to the midcontinent developed over the years by the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Association remains as irrefutable today as it was in 1934, when after prolonged hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee the committee by an overwhelming vote approved the treaty for ratification.

Today, these irrefuted facts not only remain but have been corroborated and expanded by more than a year and a half of restudy conducted by a special commission created by President Roosevelt under the Department of Commerce. Plus this, the President has thrown the full weight of his influence back of the project and will make a last-ditch fight to secure congressional approval of the new agreement he has negotiated with Canada.

In demanding the seaway the Midwest is asking only for justice in the transportation handicap placed upon it in the opening of the Panama Canal. What this handicap means can be partially illustrated by the fact that the opening of the seaway will reduce transportation rates on dairy products from Minnesota and other northwest States to New York from $6 to $7 per ton, merchandise rates 50 percent, and grain rates 25 percent. To further illustrate the existing handicap is the fact that it now costs as much to ship, for instance, a case of canned corn from Racine, Wis., to New York as it does to ship a like case by boat from San Francisco to New York by way of the Panama Canal.

While the Midwest is predominantly agricultural, and the farmers will derive the greatest benefits from the opening of the St. Lawrence to ocean boats, comparable benefits will be enjoyed by industry and all commerce, for comparative savings in transportation costs will be reflected wherever water transportation is feasible. The development of the St. Lawrence will virtually mean the bringing of the Atlantic into the heart of the continent, giving the interior benefits of a sea base for transportation rates comparable to that enjoyed by the country's seaboards.

While Secretary of Commerce, Herbert Hoover headed a commission appointed by President Coolidge in 1926 to make an exhaustive investigation of the economic factors in the proposed St. Lawrence seaway. Upon completing this work with the aid of an able corps of engineers, economists, and transportation experts, Mr. Hoover reported that "the benefits to agriculture alone would annually exceed the cost of the project," and that the "benefits to industry would exceed the benefits to agriculture."

The fundamental economic conditions of the country have not changed. Transportation rates have been increased instead of lowered. The distances from the interior to the seaboards remain the same. The Midwest still continues to suffer from the transportation inequalities imposed by the Panama Canal. The only remedy for these inequalities lies in the development of the St. Lawrence seaway, whereby the interior of the continent may have not only an outlet for water-borne traffic to the markets of the world, but a waterway to the coastal ports of our own country.

Is the St. Lawrence Seaway Necessary to National Defense?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY EASTERN REGIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY AND POWER PROJECT

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, despite undisputed evidence that the proposed St. Lawrence seaway is an economic monstrosity incapable of justification as a sound and practical project, the advocates of this so-called dream waterway continue to press their claims that it is a necessary adjunct to our national defense.

Every loyal American is eager to lend his undivided support to the program of national defense and is just as zealous in demanding that camouflaged projects be exposed in their true light as an effort to prey on the patriotic impulses of this great Nation.

The following resolution adopted at Philadelphia on April 15, 1941, by the Eastern Regional Conference of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway and Power Project, reveals many true facts that should be carefully reviewed when considering the practical value of

the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project.

The resolution referred to is as follows:

Whereas there is now before the Congress of the United States an agreement negotiated by the accredited representatives of the Governments of the United States and the Dominion of Canada; and

Whereas the President of the United States has expressed his intention to request affirmative legislative action thereon; and

Whereas representatives of labor, industrial, transportation, civic, and commercial organizations situated in the Middle Atlantic States have this day assembled in the city of Philadelphia as the Eastern Regional Conference on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway and Power Project to consider the various claims advanced in support of economic and defense advantages allegedly attainable by the proposed construction of hydro-power generating facilities in the International Rapids section, and a deep waterway to provide navigation channels with a least depth of 27 feet; and

Whereas we believe that this project, which has lacked economic justification through the years and is now urged as a defense measure, is contrary to the real and immediate needs of national defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, It is the sense of this conference that the Congress should withhold approval of any legislation designed to effectuate the aforesaid agreement, it being our conviction that the proposed project would be inimical to the best interests of the peoples of the United States and Canada in that it would—

1. Deprive the United States and Canada of much-needed labor, funds, and vital materials essential to immediate defense requirements;

2. Require 4 years or more to complete the first stage of development to provide a limited amount of power, and a much longer time to complete the navigation features of the project;

3. Not provide for the construction and use of shipbuilding facilities on the Great Lakes within the time required to meet emergency needs as now foreseen;

4. Involve expenditure of large sums of money far in excess of any properly measured economies;

5. Destroy and divert large consumer markets for fuel, with attendant loss of employment in production and transportation industries;

6. If the amount of traffic claimed by proponents be developed, cause a surplus of transportation facilities during the open season of navigation but demand that existing transportation facilities be maintained at a high standard of efficiency to meet requirements during the closed season of navigation;

7. Remove incentive for the expansion of taxable utility and transportation agencies in vital industrial regions;

8. Invoke the aid of Federal subsidy to produce benefits which are now more quickly and advantageously being supplied through private initiative;

9. Divert a substantial volume of commerce from coastal harbors, reduce employment, restrict industrial development, and penalize the initiative and the large capital investments which produced the port facilities now serving the vast interior section of the Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to Members of the Congress, with the confident hope that this subject will be dealt with in the customary legislative manner by affording an opportunity to all interests to be heard.

Convoys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEANNETTE RANKIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

PETITION OF CITIZENS OF MISSOULA, MONT.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition received by me recently, signed by 25 citizens of Missoula, Mont.:

MISSOULA, *April 15, 1941.*

Miss JEANNETTE RANKIN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MISS RANKIN: We, the citizens of Missoula, Mont., have the honor of writing you again—this time as we feel if we send out convoys with British supplies there will be danger of us getting into war.

And we are not in favor of our American boys going abroad and taking part in a foreign war.

Yours respectfully,

Mrs. Zay A. Morgan, 206 South Fifth Street E.; Dena Wing, 602 River Street; Mrs. L. D. Taylor, 614 Gerald Avenue; Mrs. Vinnie A. Burdick, 737 South Fifth Street W.; Mrs. Jennie Conwell, 745 South Fourth Street; W. F. Steinbach, 726 South Fourth W.; Mrs. A. E. Buker, 1424 Sherwood; Mrs. Tillie Minnerly, 442 Alder Street; Mrs. W. H. Beacone, 103 South Fifth E.; Mrs. C. M. Rasb, 212 West Spruce Street; Mrs. L. E. Nelson, 439 West Broadway; Ena Johnson, 1416 Cooper; Mrs. J. Jesmore, 339 North Avenue W.; Mrs. Mabel Zeh, 526 East Front; Lillian Rossbach, 1135 Cooper; Mrs. James A. Sage, 309 Pattee Street; Mrs. Margaret Burk, 528 East Front; Mrs. Olive Bomgardner, 311 North Pattee; Mrs. Cora M. Doll, 610 West Spruce Street; Mrs. T. C. Branson, 805 Rollins; Frank Gasperino, Rural Free Delivery No. 2; T. C. Branson, 805 Rollins, Missoula, Mont.; J. L. Condotta, St. Regis, Mont.; L. O. Amos, Northern Pacific Depot, Missoula, Mont.; Mrs. Sadie Moore, 827 South Fifth Street W.

It Is Later Than We Think

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, OF TEXAS, BEFORE A JOINT SESSION OF THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a speech recently made by our outstanding colleague, the constructive gentleman from Texas, Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. JOHNSON describes so graphically the challenge facing this country that I feel his speech should receive the attention of all thinking Americans:

Friends and fellow Texans, I am honored that you have given me the privilege of speaking to you. This capitol has been a part of my life. My father, Sam Johnson, served as a member of this legislature for many years, and my visits to the capitol during that time were the thrill of my boyhood days.

As a Texan, I am proud of the history of Texas. As an American, I am proud of the part Texas has played in the molding of the history of our great country.

This year, the celebration of San Jacinto Day has a special significance for it finds the world again in the midst of a struggle for independence. Democracy is undergoing its most bitter attack, and our own fate is undeniably a part of the fate of the world.

When one speaks today of the future of democracy, he must do so with thoughtful confidence. Americans have been taught by their fathers and their fathers' fathers to believe in democratic principles. So thoroughly have we learned this, it is impossible for most Americans to conceive of an America not free.

One cannot separate the thought of the future of democracy from the continuity of our own country as we know it. An American is not born of a certain blood or ancestry. Throughout the history of our country, there has predominated a common belief in the rights of man. A belief so strong it has welded together into one nation every nationality. This blending has not been a miracle. It is the inevitable result of men with common ideals finding a place where their ideals might have a chance to develop and to produce the Nation we all love.

WE MUST PULL TOGETHER

Our responsibility is for the future of democracy. Our ancestors have built a democratic country. We ourselves have proved it can work, and that it is the most logical and happy way of living. Has this been done in vain? Have we created a democracy to perish after so short a life? We hear from all sides that democracy is threatened. It is difficult not to believe this when all over the world men are killing men, destruction is on the march, and democracy has perished where once before it was growing and thriving.

I say we have not worked in vain; that democracy must not perish from the earth.

America has never before had such an opportunity to point to its own way of life as an example for the rest of the world. I believe the time is approaching for the birth of a democratic world—a world with common ideals—a world without barriers.

To achieve this there is work to be done. We will do it, for we are a nation of workers. There will be times when confusion between our different interests within our borders will seem insurmountable. We have so-called capital, we have labor, the farmer, the businessman—each with his problems. Each of us has his individual life he does not wish disturbed. All of these things are a part of a democratic government. All are minorities which go together to make a whole, and what the whole demands the parts must concede.

DEMOCRACY MUST ACT NOW

We are the children of a generation of men and women who worked, fought, and sacrificed for liberty, for freedom. We will do the same. We must work without consideration for individual gain at the moment, knowing, that as a reward for our labor, we and our children, and all of the people of the

world, will have a better life for centuries to come.

Nazi and Fascist principles have temporarily taken Europe and are spreading into the Balkans, Africa, Asia, and the Far East. Why? Because—and let's face facts—European democracy fell down on the job. Dictatorships are the consequence of the failure of democracy.

European democracies between 1930 and 1939 turned out some of the prettiest statements the world has ever heard. Free government became flowers and flapdoodle outside, but chaos within. With parties and cliques sacrificing national strength to gain minority advantage, governments were falling to pieces under their own noses, but the people didn't know it. France couldn't make up her mind. England clung to an outworn system. The little fellows watched the big fellows and followed suit to disaster upon disaster.

All the while crafty dictatorships were making plenty of hay, by unifying themselves from within. True, they accomplished unity with the sword, the torture chamber, and the concentration camp. But the point is they did it. Unemployment, economic and social bellyache kept European democracy in bed for years, an ice pack on its head and a roaring hang-over for company, but totalitarian states didn't go to bed. They weren't even sick. They confiscated all business, industry, and labor and with every last mother's son at work, they converted their resources, and everything else they could lay their hands on, into war machine. They permitted no unemployment. They tolerated no complaints from capital. They stifled any protests from labor. They made their farmers put up and shut up.

WE CAN MEET THE FASCIST CHALLENGE

We Americans don't like that sort of government. We wouldn't tolerate it. But that is the kind of government, that is the idea, the remaining democracies in the world must fight. If they refuse to fight that idea, and insist upon old-time remedies for new-time upheavals, the results may well be disastrous.

Certainly I am no defeatist. I just like to know the size of the fellow I have to whip, where he came from, what he thinks about, and how he slugs.

Well, what are we doing about it?

To begin with, 1,200,000 American boys are undergoing army training. By midsummer this number will be 1,500,000. On the sea and in the air, our naval forces number 230,000.

We must produce for them—rapidly and without delay—planes and tanks, battleships and bombers—better than any forces in the world possess. Not just as good, but much better.

Thousands of empty Texas acres are being used to train soldiers for our Army and pilots to control the air above us. Within the last year, in addition to our Army-consciousness, I have tried to make Texas Navy-conscious. On the Gulf coast millions are being spent for new shipyards. In Dallas a new Naval Reserve station is on the way. At Corpus Christi, the greatest naval flight-training base in America is today actually training pilots.

TEXAS YOUTH IS PREPARED

Here in our own University of Texas which we all love, instead of being a factory grinding out Communist comrades, we have a plant training 100 red-blooded Texas boys to command Navy ships on the water and in the air in our last stand for principles just as precious—just as dear as Houston and his 200 fought for at San Jacinto.

Over yonder this year, the Aggies of A. and M. are polishing 615 of the cream of our boyhood crop from every section of the State—from the plains to the Gulf they have come and under matchless leaders have prepared themselves as officers equipped to direct our armies in defending our soil. Our church schools, our teachers' colleges all are doing their part. To the chief executive and to you members of the house and senate who wisely have provided for this training program the Nation owes a debt.

We have all the resources, we have all the manpower, wealth, and education necessary to make our position impregnable if we forget personal gain and remember national safety.

The riflemen at San Jacinto didn't have much. They possessed scanty and inadequate supplies. They were few in numbers. They won because they used what they had of men and supplies a full thousand percent.

When we lose a minute, wrangling among ourselves, in disputes about who is going to do what, who is going to get what, we lose something all the gold at Fort Knox can't buy back. With every second wasted, we rush one step nearer the universal disaster.

If American democracy is to survive it can't do it on conversation. It can't survive on the glories of the past. No. If American democracy endures it will be because Americans want it to. Because they want it to so much they will offer their "blood and sweat and tears" to make it survive. Winston Churchill never spoke more magnificent words than these: "I bring you blood and sweat and tears."

At first the British Government did a lot of playing to the galleries, but when it went on a 24-hour schedule, applied its blood and sweat and tears, then it stemmed the tide a little. When democratic statesmen forgot what was best from their standpoint and considered what was best for democracy, men all over the world took hope. The boys at San Jacinto won in blood and sweat and tears. They talked and thought in rough, practical terms, not in gardenias. They wanted to survive, and so must we—to the point of personal sacrifice.

ALL GROUPS MUST SACRIFICE

I have been the friend of business and industry and a champion of our American system. But today we must say to American capital: "We know your prerogatives and have battled to protect them. Still there are privileges superior to yours and above those of any other minority in America. Your Government must call on you, and you must respond if you treasure your precious advantages."

I am a friend of the American laboring man, and in his behalf I have a written record. But to labor, organized or unorganized, I want to say this: We know your principles; we cherish and have fought for them. Still, there are interests superior to yours—those of your American Government. When you vote to strike you must think not only of your gain but of your duty to all of your fellow men. You must think of the threat your Government faces—what it needs in this hour is to have you and your precious privileges. If there be subversive influences anywhere around you, deal with them as all Texans deal with traitors.

AMERICA COMES FIRST

The security of the country is above that of any single group—labor, capital, the farmer, what have you? When, in the scramble to save yourselves individually all you minorities become willing to sacrifice the whole people for yourselves, you will jump through the trap of your own gallows.

We cannot be free men and at the same time disorganized, bull-headed, obstinate, selfish men.

Capital, labor, and the farmer must not make war among themselves. They must solve their differences with conferences, not tear gas and clubs. They tried fighting in France. Today France is in chains. They tried it in England. England has almost lost her life. They tried it in other democracies, and they are no longer on the map. Can we not profit by Europe's experiences?

Since we started spending billions of defense dollars, we have run into bottlenecks. A strike here has chopped a few days from plane production. A capitalist yonder struck on orders for British planes. The wrong on both sides has cost us more than we can afford.

The day any man, or any minority, poses as superior to America under the Constitution, that day the man or minority becomes your enemy and my enemy. The Constitution, which confers privileges, also imposes duties and obligations. Again, the units must rally to save the whole.

I regret I cannot tell you that we have done a perfect defense job. I cannot. We have been slow and have lost time. We have stopped to bicker among ourselves and to wrangle. We have thought too much of our own security and clique security when we ought to have been thinking of national security.

WE MUST PRODUCE MORE

Listen: From 1933 to 1939, Germany spent $90,000,000,000 getting ready for this war; America spent nine. In 1939 Germany invested another $36,000,000,000; America scraped up less than two billions. In 1940 and again in 1941 Germany invested another $60,000,000,000. In 1940 we set up $6,000,000,000 and only doubled it in 1941. The score: Germany, $230,000,000,000; America, $30,000,000,000. Germany's two hundred and thirty billions are in materials on the field. Some of America's paltry thirty billions is still on paper and on order.

Do you still think we have time to loaf, to argue, to waste time? No. It is later than we think.

For 8 years, under President Roosevelt, our Government, returning democracy to the people, has been building us from within. We have relieved the distress of our unemployed millions, sustained their health, morale, and skills. We have educated and trained our boys and girls through the N. Y. A. and the C. C. C. We have refinanced the debts on our homes and farms and brought interest rates down within the ability to pay. We have made real headway clearing our city and rural slums; we have made home ownership possible for the little fellow. We have conserved our natural resources, stopped the onrush of floods, and made waste waters generate electric power we need now for our farm homes and national defense. We have given our laborers jobs, supported business and industry in the construction of great public works. We have awakened to the farmers' many problems and made conscientious efforts to assist him back to a decent American living standard.

PUT EVERY MAN TO WORK

With such a foundation, we surely cannot be hopeless, even though we may find the road rough in spots.

Americans by voluntary methods can and will accomplish what the dictatorships have done with the lash.

Nothing so challenges the American spirit as tackling the biggest job on earth. That is what this is. Every American will become a statesman in such an emergency. He must avoid satisfaction with himself, for in satisfaction lies deterioration. Americans are stimulated by the big job—the Panama Canal. Boulder Dam, Grand Coulee, the lower Colorado River developments, the tallest building in the world, the mightiest battleship. So fortification of the greatest democracy makes all other projects seem trivial.

First, we must all get to work; second, we must all work longer and harder, no matter what our job may be. We must ferret out new ideas, create new processes, willingly drive last year's models—cheerfully tell manufacturers that American mothers want planes for their boys instead of pans for their kitchens.

We have the draft, which takes the cream of our crop for the Army and Navy. It puts these young men into uniform to defend us. We have laws permitting us to draft factories. Public opinion sets standards which capital, labor, and agriculture must meet, yet we are still plowing along under the one-horse, dollar-a-year-man system. Many of the men

in Washington now directing our defense are men who try to work for their companies 3 days a week and their Government the other 3.

Frequently they get their jobs mixed.

Why not immediately take a census of management in this country? The results will reveal where the executive brains and the executive leadership of America are located. With plenty of men already in the ranks of production and the materials for them to use, we find the Government short on big-management generals. We must have them, too, even if they must give up $50,000 a year for $5,000 a year salaries. Why not draft executive and management brains to prepare and produce the equipment the $21-a-month draftee must use and forget this dollar-a-year tommyrot? Would we send an army into the field under a dollar-a-year general who had to be home Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays? To ask that is to answer it.

ROOSEVELT IS A GREAT LEADER

America and the world are blessed today in that destiny has given us a great and mature man to lead us. President Roosevelt is a leader whose judgment has been found both wise and just. We can trust and follow him, for he embodies the spirit of love for fellow man in which democracy was born and with which it will carry forward to the future when peace comes after this trial is past. His is a difficult, a tremendous job. He does it with joy, in the knowledge that, working for the whole, the individual finds his own compensation.

I am proud that I enlisted in the cause and have worked with him since 1932. As a candidate for Congress there were no doubts about where I stood on the Roosevelt program. As a Member I have kept the faith, and as we approach the dark days ahead, I want my people to know I will devote to the future the same willingness to fight in the trenches as has characterized my actions in the past. I pledge you fear of political consequences will not silence me, and the lure of national spotlight will not entice me. In these critical hours Americans must support—not snipe at—the President.

I believe in America, in democracy, and in our Government from the President down to the lowliest servant of it. I believe in this Legislature and the Representatives of the State of Texas which our people have chosen to serve them. I believe also that in the soul of man lies the power to control the future, whether that soul be called in modern terms English, German, Italian, French, or Greek. I believe that all men in all places have a common idea which will rise when its bonds are stricken away. They all want to be free.

Even though there may be trying months to come, saddened perhaps by sorrow and sacrifice and tears, my hope and belief is that the same undying courage, the same love of freedom, the same unconquerable spirit which raised the flag of independence over Texas, one day will raise it over a democratic world.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED J. DOUGLAS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, on March 21, 1941, President Roosevelt announced to Congress that a new executive agreement had been negotiated with Canada for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. It should be borne in mind that this time an executive agreement was negotiated with Canada, and not a treaty. The reason for this is obvious. In 1934 the Senate of the United States refused to ratify a proposed treaty with Canada for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. This time our courageous President will take no chances on not being able to get a two-thirds majority in the Senate, as required by the Constitution. An executive agreement will do for his purposes. Thus he will have to get only a majority in both Houses of Congress to provide for the authorizations and appropriations to carry out the agreement. The difficulty of securing a two-thirds majority of the Senators to approve of the treaty is not a hazard that he dares to face.

Let us see what this project really amounts to. It would provide for construction of a 27-foot channel through the St. Lawrence River between Lake Ontario and Montreal. This would be effected through the construction of a dam that would raise the level of the water behind it approximately 80 feet, together with the necessary canals and locks around the several rapids in the river between the proposed dam and Montreal. In addition, the Welland Canal and the canal at Sault Ste. Marie would have to be deepened. The total direct costs of all of these works would be $405,137,000, of which the Canadian Government would pay $175,950,000 and the United States $229,183,000. Of the amount chargeable to the United States, $90,000,000 will be contributed by the New York State Power Authority.

But these figures do not in any way represent the total cost of the development. For at least 13 harbors on the United States side of the Great Lakes and 2 on the Canadian side would have to be deepened to allow 27-foot boats to enter. Interest on the investment during the period of construction at 3½ percent would have to be allowed. The figure of $405,137,000 does not include any allowance for contingent expenses. According to a thorough study prepared by the Niagara Frontier Planning Board—a public body authorized by the New York Legislature in 1925—the total direct cost of the project would be $655,000,000, of which $240,000,000 would be borne by Canada and $415,000,000 by the United States. Despite the fact that these are astronomical figures, this same impartial Government source asserts this is far from the whole picture. Supposedly the life of the project would be 50 years. Then interest would have to be paid on the bonds for that period and there would be the cost of operation and maintenance. When these items are taken into account the total cost of the project, including cost of construction, interest, and maintenance cost during its life, would be $1,220,000,000, of which $597,000,000 would be borne by Canada and $623,000,000 by the United States. To help indicate the tremendous cost of this project it should be remembered that the Panama Canal cost only $375,000,000.

Let us view the arguments for the construction of this project at the present time and analyze their validity. Although the project has been before the people of the United States in one form or another for more than 15 years, President Roosevelt now advances a new argument in favor of it. This argument is that the project is required for national defense. The primary reason why it is needed for national defense, it is alleged, is that we will require the electric power that will be generated for defense industries. But when does the agreement with Canada call for the completion of the power facilities? Why, the date is 1949, and, according to engineering estimates, the earliest date that it could reasonably be expected to be completed would be 1946 or 1947. Thus, on October 17, 1940, President Roosevelt said:

> The surveys of the Federal Power Commission and the National Power Policy Committee have convinced me that the development of the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River should be undertaken at the earliest possible date as a part of adequate provision to meet the continuing power requirements of the defense program in certain essential centers of war-material production in the Northeastern States.
>
> The potential power at this site is best adapted to meet the requirements of expansion in certain essential defense industries, including aluminum, magnesium, ferro-alloys, chemicals, etc. Actually, the Aluminum Co. of America has recently arranged for the import of 30,000 kilowatts of additional power from Canada to meet the pressing requirements of its existing plant located at the very site of the proposed St. Lawrence project and, I am reliably informed, is seeking additional supplies from across the border. Such imported supplies are, in effect, on an annual basis subject to being withdrawn if required by the Canadian power market.

Are we to conclude from this that the administration expects an unusually protracted war? Normally, it has been talking about a defense emergency lasting about 2 or 3 years at the most. But should we conclude now that it will last 8 years? On this basis either the defense argument is ill-founded or the administration has been grossly lacking in honesty in discussing the defense emergency with the American people.

An oft-repeated argument in favor of the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway is that it will result in tremendous savings of freight rates to the American people. Most of the estimates of savings resulting from reduced freight rates have been distinctly fallacious and misleading. One of the major reasons for this has been that they have not considered the effect upon the community as a whole of the construction of such an undertaking that would compete with all existing transportation facilities. They have not taken into account the cost to the public of each ton of freight transported through the seaway as a consequence of operating costs, interest, and amortization, nor have they included any allowance for the loss that would be suffered each year through the loss of freight on the part of railroads and other forms of inland transportation, including the New York State Barge Canal. When these are taken into consideration the alleged actual saving resulting from the construction of the seaway becomes in reality a loss to the national economy. The total savings in freight charges for

both exports and imports, according to the Niagara Frontier Planning Board, would be only $8,800,000. But in computing even this saving in reduced freight charges no account is taken of the cost to the public of the construction and maintenance of the seaway. But in addition to the alleged saving in freight charges there would be a number of very great additional costs to the community. We must take into account the loss of freight traffic on the American railroads, a loss of traffic on the New York State Barge Canal, and other inland waterways. The gross loss each year from this construction would be $51,000,000. When we deduct from this the $8,800,000 resulting from the decreased freight charges the net annual loss to the national economy, apart from the cost of operation and maintenance of the seaway, is $42,000,000.

To undertake a project that in the long run will cost well over $1,200,000,000 for the purpose of diverting the movement of freight from American railroads to foreign shipping seems most illogical. In the last 9 years vast sums of money have been loaned by the Federal Government to railroads in order to prevent them from going into bankruptcy, but at the same time the Federal Government would be jeopardizing the very security of these loans by constructing this project. The stockholders of the American railroads have in many instances received no dividends for years. This project would certainly insure that this course would be followed for years to come. It is generally believed by all competent students of transportation that what this country suffers from is not a dearth of transportation facilities on the eastern seaboard but rather from a great overdevelopment of such transportation facilities.

Supposedly the St. Lawrence seaway is to provide a 27-foot channel from the Great Lakes to the ocean. What ships will benefit from this? American ships with sufficiently small draft to ply the new canal constitute but 5 percent of the world's merchant shipping, whereas 30 percent of the total world's shipping is of shallow enough draft to use the waterway. Thus it would appear inevitable that most of the business of carrying goods to and from the lake ports would fall to foreign shipping, and American shipowners would receive practically no benefit from the projected undertaking. Thus, from the standpoint of transportation, there appear to be practically no arguments in favor of the seaway. In fact, all of the arguments that can be advanced are distinctly against it.

From the standpoint of the production of electric power, there is no more to be said for this project than there is on the transportation side. The total cost of the works chargeable for power production, or for power production and navigation jointly, is $269,000,000, of which the United States will bear $206,000,000 and Canada $63,000,000. It should be noted that the power produced at the project will be divided equally between the United States and Canada. The total amount of power produced on the project will be 1,642,000 kilowatts. Of this, the United States will get 821,000 kilowatts. Thus it would appear that since the Canadian cost of the power project will be $63,000,000 and the cost to the United States $206,000,000, the United States will be paying three times as much for each kilowatt of power produced as will Canada. The St. Lawrence Power Development Commission of the State of New York estimated that power facilities in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence could be developed at a total cost to Canada and New York State of $180,000,000, as against $269,000,000 chargeable to power under the proposed navigation and power development. The cost per kilowatt of installed generating capacity on the entire project would be $163. But since the United States is contributing a great deal more than Canada for its half of the total power produced, the cost per kilowatt of installed capacity on the 821,000 kilowatts the United States would receive would be over $250.

Let us see how this all compares with the cost of the steam generation of electric power. On July 9, 1940, the National Defense Advisory Commission testified before the deficiency committee of the House Appropriations Committee relative to the cost of construction of steam plants in the Tennessee Valley to supplement hydroelectric developments in that area. In the testimony of Mr. Dunn, consultant to the Defense Commission, it was stated that the cost per kilowatt of installed capacity of a modern steam plant is only $87.50, as compared with the figure above quoted of $163 per kilowatt of installed capacity on this entire project, or of $250 on the power to be received by the United States. Instead of a cost of $269,000,000 to build this project under the present plans, steam plants to produce an equivalent amount of power would cost but $143,675,000, or but 53.4 percent of the cost of this project chargeable to power. These figures, of course, are only the cost of installation of generating facilities. What would be the actual cost of such power wholesale in the areas of New York where it would likely be consumed? The cost of St. Lawrence power delivered wholesale in Buffalo would be 3.46 mills per kilowatt-hour, whereas the cost of producing power by steam generation at the same load factor in Buffalo is 3.4 mills. The cost of delivery of this power in New York City would be 4.91 mills, as against a cost of production in New York by steam plants of 4.5 mills. New York City, of course, would be the largest potential market for the consumption of this power, and the possibility of sending such power uninterruptedly to New York with present transmission equipment is exceedingly dubious. Consequently it appears that power produced by the generating stations to be located in the International Rapids section of the river could not be economically sold in the principal consuming markets in New York State. Thus it would appear that from the standpoint of power production the project cannot be justified.

From the review that has been presented it appears that this project cannot be justified on the ground that it is necessary for national defense, nor on the ground that it will produce great savings for transportation to the people of the United States, nor on the ground that it will produce electric power in an economical manner. Thus it must be concluded that there are no logical arguments that can be advanced to support this tremendous undertaking.

A Private's Letter

REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I received a very interesting letter, which I thought should be brought to the attention of the House. It is from a young neighbor and is addressed to my brother and to me. It is as follows:

APRIL 19, 1941.

DEAR GENE AND VINCENT: I thought that it was time that I should write to you and let you know how things are going in the training of our Army. This account is not by any means a professional one but merely a few things that I have observed. Firstly, the life isn't too bad at all. The housing conditions are as near perfect as anyone could expect, notwithstanding the fact that the barracks we are in were put up in record time. Every barracks has two floors, and each floor has about 30 men sleeping there. The cots issued are surprisingly comfortable, although there is no evidence of any Beautyrest mattresses. We have ample latrine facilities, with hot and cold showers. Everything about the barracks is kept neat and clean. Sanitary conditions are marvelous. The Government really outdid itself in the housing problem. I don't doubt that these barracks are of the type which will endure all the elements for quite a long time to come and will fulfill other purposes than mere dwellings for military men.

Next we have the food problem. I can honestly say again I was not only surprised but flabbergasted at the conditions. The food is good and simple; nothing extravagant but yet it is the type which is tasty and filling. It puts muscle where muscle should be and bone where bone should be. Potatoes are the cook's forte; beef stew his piece de resistance. We have plenty of solid bread, strong coffee, and peaches. There seems to me to be a very large waste, however. Each company has its own money with which to feed its men, and they use it up, come what may. If 2C pounds of potatoes, peas, turnips, etc., are not eaten, the uneaten portion is thrown away. Somehow I can't conciliate this with the need for new economy. Of course, this is a small item, but if every company in every regiment in every camp throughout the country follows the same procedure as we do, then there is a waste large enough to warrant a stoppage. As a final word on the food, I can say it is far more than in my most anxious, optimistic moments before I was inducted I ever hoped for. I am completely satisfied in an epicurian sort of a way.

I imagine what you would like to know more than anything else is the actual duty for military training itself. It is a distinct tribute to the Army officials when I say that their plans and schedules are held to strictly and are the type which gives a man unaccustomed to such work a good insight into what he might expect in time of war. You would

be astounded if you knew how close you can walk to a man in ambush without seeing him. An officer in the brushes not 20 yards from us. There were at least 30 men looking for him, taking one step at a time. I was about 2 yards from him before I spotted his pants legs. When we saw that demonstration every man started to get serious about the training. We are taught every trick of camouflage, ambush, and attack. When to show ourselves and how to show ourselves, how to shoot from behind trees, bushes, and from defiles and hills. The men realize that these instructions and advice are coming to us after a frightful tuition of human lives were lost and paid for to gain this knowledge. When we first arrive, if we were in actual combat, 100 men could have wiped out the 5,000 men just starting training. Today I doubt if an equal force could do the same damage. When our year's service is up every selective man leaving will, or should have, the necessary training to wage a successful warfare. The drilling of the men is monotonous and irritating, particularly under a hot sun, but yet somehow you don't mind when you realize you are a cog in a well-trained and well-drilled organization. I'd match my platoon with the plebe class at West Point, and there would not be much difference.

Gene and Vincent, I know this letter is not as personal as I would like it to be, but I thought a few words from one actually under the training for our defense would give you some insight into how things are going. I waited until last to register my complaint, which, although often joked about, is a genuine and universal one—the noncommissioned officers, corporals, etc.—bah! Nasty bunch if I ever met one, but yet they are the Army discipline. I heard about my brother Bill's good fortune and I want to add my appreciation to that I know my family feels. You know I am always at your service for anything I can do, which sometimes seems very insignificant to me.

Regards to your mother. Best of luck to you both.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Kamo—Supertransmission R. E. A. Cooperative for Kansas, Arkansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1941

EDITORIAL BY C. F. BYRNS, EDITOR OF THE SOUTHWEST AMERICAN

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, if we have the vision to make full use of the great resources at our command in these United States I think it may be truly said that the day of the pioneer has just begun.

Last week there was formed of 19 rural electrification cooperatives in the States of Kansas, Arkansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma—principally in the corners of those States that lie in the Grand River watershed—a huge supertransmission cooperative whose members will be the 19 co-ops and which will serve to bring to them the cheaper power being generated at the Grand River Dam.

This is a new step in the field of power in this age of electricity. It is a new step for the American people. It is a newly discovered means of delivering public power that is being produced in this country at a relatively low cost, to the people.

Herewith, I insert in full a most excellent editorial by Mr. C. F. Byrns, editor of the Southwest American, one of Arkansas' largest newspapers, which appeared last week:

[From the Southwest American]

Cheap power from Grand River Dam in northeast Oklahoma will be made available to 50,000 farmers in Arkansas, Oklahoma, Missouri, and Kansas if plans of Congressmen from the four States go well.

An immediate allotment of $50,000 from the Rural Electrification Administration and another $200,000 from defense funds will be sought immediately to finance initial construction of the heavy transmission lines from Grand River Dam to connect with 19 rural electric cooperatives in the four-State area.

A supercooperative known as Kamo was organized at a recent meeting in Vinita, Okla., attended by representatives of the Grand River Dam Authority and of local rural electric cooperatives.

Congressman CLYDE T. ELLIS, of Arkansas, and United States Senator JOSH LEE, of Oklahoma, are taking the lead in the plans.

A reduced wholesale rate for power purchased by the cooperatives is one objective of the plan. A gridwork of electric lines which will make Grand River power available to many more farmers in the four-State area is another. Eventually it is planned to tie in Grand River power with Norfolk Dam, on which construction recently started, in Baxter County, Ark.

The plan of Kamo calls for eventual construction of 800 miles of heavy transmission lines, costing about $2,000,000. An immediate allocation of $50,000 from the Rural Electrification Administration will practically exhaust that agency's funds for the present fiscal year. To push the project along, the Congressmen and Senators will ask the President to allocate $200,000 of defense funds to keep the work going until July 1, when R. E. A. will have additional money.

Congressman Ellis said in Washington the new supercooperative will buy power in large quantities from Grand River Dam authority for 4.5 mills a kilowatt, compared to the present average price of 12.5 mills a kilowatt. The saving to customers of the rural cooperatives he said will be half a cent a kilowatt.

This is a significant development, not alone for what it is in itself, but for what it indicates for the future. It is a logical step toward the final establishment of some such agency as is proposed in the Arkansas Valley Authority bill now pending in Congress—an agency created for the purpose of correlating all the power production, flood control, and navigation aids which are constructed, under construction and projected in the valleys of the Arkansas, the White, the Red, and the St. Francis Rivers.

Grand River Dam is on the most important tributary of the Arkansas in eastern Oklahoma. Norfolk Dam is on the White. Denison Dam, now under construction, is on the Red, on the southern border of Oklahoma. These three form a triangle which embraces much of eastern Oklahoma and northwest Arkansas.

Flood-control dams, some of them designed for eventual power production as well, are under construction at various points in the valleys of the four streams. Privately owned dams, usable in some degree for flood control, exist at various places. Altogether 37 flood-control works, many usable also as power producers, have been recommended by the United States engineers in the four river valleys.

The creation of a single authority with the power and the finance to construct what is needed and to operate all of them as parts of a whole is a logical and inevitable development.

St. Lawrence Seaway

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment for just a moment on the project that will be before the Congress very shortly known as the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep waterway project. I do not suppose there is a more meritorious measure, or a measure that will mean more to the American people, than this project. There has been no project, however, about which more misleading propaganda has been circulated in America than this particular project. The lobbies are active and have been active for months. An educational program is needed if this sort of misleading and untrue propaganda is to be avoided.

A colleague asked me 2 or 3 weeks ago, "Tell me something about this project. They tell me you cannot get any power up there because most of the year the St. Lawrence is frozen over and the ice prevents the development of power."

Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from the secretary of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario giving the facts on that situation. The letter reads as follows:

THE HYDRO-ELECTRIC POWER
COMMISSION OF ONTARIO,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Toronto, April 22, 1941.

Mr. W. A. PITTENGER,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.,
United States of America.

Re operation of power plants under winter conditions.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of April 10, inquiring as to the operation of our power plants under winter conditions, has been received. I note that statements have been made by those opposed to the St. Lawrence project that, on account of ice, power could not be generated on the St. Lawrence for several months during the year.

This Commission operates 44 hydroelectric plants varying in capacity from about 1,000 horsepower up to several hundred thousand horsepower, the total installed capacity of our plants being of the order of 1,800,000 horsepower. These are located all over Ontario and some are in the northern part of the Province, where low temperatures are experienced during protracted periods in each winter.

The records of the commission, extending now throughout a period of 30 years, show that, with one particular exception, none of the plants have been taken out of operation

on account of ice for any period exceeding more than a few hours, and these occurrences have been during the time when ice is first being formed in the rivers. The case mentioned had reference to one of the commission's plants in the Niagara River, and the shut-down was due to a heavy run of ice from Lake Erie which filled the gorge below the Falls where the plant is situated. The greater part of the generator room was filled with ice and the equipment was damaged; the necessary repairs required 2 or 3 months to complete. Had the plant been in any other situation—for example, above the Falls, as in the case of two other of the commission's plants, or farther downstream, as in the case of the largest plant operated by the commission—the only result would have been to reduce somewhat the output for a matter of a few days.

There are many hydroelectric plants operated throughout Canada at which low temperatures are encountered, and it is safe to say that it is very exceptional for any of them to be closed down on account of ice. Certainly, with the exception noted, no case is known where a plant has been closed down for a protracted period such as is mentioned in your letter.

I trust that this information will be of use to you.

Yours very truly,

OSBORNE MITCHELL,
Secretary.

The Colorado-Big Thompson Reclamation Project, When Completed, Will Stop Crop Losses Due to Water Shortages, Which Have Averaged Over $6,000,000 Annually for the Past 10 Years and Amounted to Over $12,000,000 for 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE LEWIS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

STATEMENT OF J. M. DILLE, SECRETARY-MANAGER OF NORTHERN COLORADO WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by J. M. Dille, secretary-manager of Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District, the repayment agency for the Colorado-Big Thompson reclamation project:

I am secretary-manager of the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District, the repayment agency of the Colorado-Big Thompson project. For 30 years I have owned and operated farms, and during that time served as manager of irrigation companies in this area.

I wish to speak on behalf of the 160,000 people in our district who are anxiously awaiting the completion of the project which was authorized for construction 4 years ago, and to urge that adequate funds be made available to complete the project as rapidly as possible. That district has an assessed valuation of $140,000,000, consists of 615,000 acres of irrigated land, and comprises one of the best developed agricultural areas in Colorado.

On previous occasions it has been shown that actual crop losses due to water shortages have averaged more than $6,000,000 annually for the past 10 years. Such losses for 1940 have been estimated at over $12,000,000, and the water prospects for 1941 indicate that another year of short crops is probable.

Water shortages are not uniform on the 8,000 farms in the district. While a few of these farms, comprising about 15 percent of the total, have water rights which are adequate even in short years, the major portion of the area bears the shortages in varying degrees, with the result that a large number of good farms have been abandoned, while the owners of many others are insolvent and in destitute circumstances but are trying to hold on until water from the project is made available.

While the population of our larger towns has increased somewhat in the past decade, the rural population has decreased on account of the large numbers who have been forced to give up on account of lack of water. I have personal contact with these conditions and know that the losses and distress are very real and very large. The Federal Government is affected by this situation. The Farm Security Administration reports that over 60 percent of the loans made by that agency last year were in default and that hundreds of farmers in the area are receiving subsistence grants. The Federal land bank, which has about $15,000,000 in farm loans in the district, has been forced to foreclose on many farms and is having difficulty with others. As an example of the situation, one irrigation system with which I am personally connected, had only 18 days' run of water last year. The 220 farmers under this ditch planted their crops, irrigated part of them once, and then had to watch them burn up and be left with little or no income for the season's work.

The losses which I have mentioned do not include those suffered by the business and industry in the district which is dependent upon the agriculture of the area. The latter probably exceed the losses in value of crops on the farm. These losses are reflected in an increasing degree in reduced buying power, delinquent tax collections, and in increased unemployment, relief loads, and assistance from Federal agencies. Actual sale value of all real property and particularly of farms has declined to an alarming degree in the past few years.

The additional 310,000 acre-feet of water, to be made available by the Colorado-Big Thompson project, will provide an adequate water supply and enable this territory to become prosperous and self-supporting.

The conservancy district which I represent, was organized in 1937 as the agency to contract with the United States for construction of the project, to secure repayment of the costs and to allot and distribute the water. A repayment contract with the Government was made in 1938. The entire cost of the project will be repaid by the water and power users. The district organized under a recent Colorado State law is unique in many respects. All real and personal property in the district is taxed to cover a part of the annual repayment charges to the Government. The balance of the cost, chargeable to irrigation, will be liquidated by water charges collected as taxes from municipalities and the individual farms to which water is allotted.

Since the cost of the water to the farmer is well within his ability to pay and with approximately $150,000 raised annually by the district through general taxation and with the power revenues which will be made available, this project is unquestionably sound and will repay every dollar advanced by the Government within the terms of the reclamation law.

Pensions and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. LARRABEE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

Mr. LARRABEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to set forth in detail, my proposal that we consider the question of the serious importance of social security, or, if you please, domestic security, as an important factor in national defense.

At this time, as war clouds gather, there is grave danger that some of our greatest domestic needs may be obscured by the paramount problem of defense. If this happens, a loss in national morale is likely to follow.

With this thought in mind, I have submitted a proposal to the Congress, through the Ways and Means Committee, which, if adopted, would tend to encourage our people to a greater zeal for the maintenance of the democracy which we seek to defend, in that defense would be coupled with the abiding knowledge of security from want as well as from fear.

I have proposed that the Federal Government levy a 5-percent gross-profit tax, in lieu of other proposed defense taxes, 65 percent of the revenue from which would go to national defense and the remainder to extend the coverage of the Social Security Act to all citizens and to place social security entirely on a pay-as-you-go basis.

This proposal is in line with both the needs of the Nation for increased revenue for defense from sources which will not tend to stifle production or to discourage private enterprise and for improvement of our existing social-security structure.

My proposal was made simultaneous letters sent to President Roosevelt, Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau, Chairman Robert L. Doughton of the Ways and Means Committee, and Congressman Jere Cooper, chairman of the Subcommittee on Taxation of the Ways and Means Committee. In my letter to Chairman DOUGHTON, I requested a hearing before the Ways and Means Committee on the proposal in conjunction with the tax hearings now being held by that committee.

In estimates submitted with the proposal I have figured the tax yield on the basis of a 5-percent gross-profit tax at $6,142,500,000 for defense and $3,247,500,000 for pensions. To arrive at the taxable gross profit I take the gross income of the Nation, estimated at $467,000,000,000, and subtract the cost of materials or property sold so as to reach a

"value added" basis of $247,000,000,000. From this I subtract $42,000,000,000 to cover a basic exemption of the first $80 per month—$960 per year—of gross income, leaving a taxable balance of $205,000,000,000, 5 percent of which would be $10,250,000,000. My plan would allow a further credit to employers and employees who now pay some form of Federal retirement taxes, amounting to $800,000,000. The estimated most of administration, including the collection of the tax and handling the entire general annuity system, is $60,000,000 per year, leaving a net tax yield of $9,490,000,000 according to best available figures.

These figures were compiled for me by Arthur L. Johnson, national executive and legislative secretary of the General Welfare Federation of America, who has spent the last 4 years in Washington on social-security and tax matters.

This tax base would be equitable, would not pyramid taxes, would never tax a loss, and would produce a stable revenue. At the hearings on social security held by the Ways and Means Committee 2 years ago the tax experts called by the committee recommended a similar tax base for general taxation purposes.

The cost of collecting the defense portion of the tax would be practicaliy nil if coupled with my proposal to amend the Social Security Act, so as to include all citizens within its terms, by means of a 2-percent annuity tax such as is proposed in my bill, H. R. 1410, known as the General Welfare Act or General Welfare Act amendments to the Social Security Act.

These proposals appear to meet the needs stressed in the President's message to the Congress on January 6, 1941, on the state of the Union, in which the President indicated quite plainly that extension of the Social Security Act coverage is an integral part of our national-defense program, and it appears this joint national defense-social security revenue program would eliminate necessity of overlapping of other taxes, the possible necessity for increases in and establishment of many so-called nuisance taxes, and simplify to a very large extent the problem of obtaining funds for defense with which the Congress is now wrestling, raising revenue for two major items of Federal expense "as painlessly as possible."

RELIEVES PROPERTY-TAX BURDENS

In addition to these advantages the enactment of this proposed program would also eliminate the necessity of heavy property taxes by local units of government and the States to finance their share of one-half the cost of the old-age pension benefits program, by establishing a reasonable direct Federal old-age pension system in lieu of the present Federal-State cooperative system, in which so many objectionable features, including heavy cost of administration, have been found.

I present herewith an estimate of the tax yield possible under such a program, which estimate was prepared for me after lengthy research by Mr. Johnson:

Estimate based on best available U. S. Government statistics for year 1939

Groups	Gross income	Cost of materials	Taxable balance
Manufacturing	$56,828,807,223	$32,118,242,488	$24,710,564,735
Retail sales	42,039,138,000	27,325,439,700	14,713,698,300
Wholesale sales	55,265,640,000	46,975,794,000	8,289,846,000
Real estate, including rentals	48,000,000,000	20,400,000,000	27,600,000,000
Construction	8,000,000,000	4,000,000,000	4,000,000,000
Service establishments	22,970,000,000	250,000,000	22,720,000,000
Agriculture	9,620,000,000	1,520,000,000	8,100,000,000
Forest products	100,000,000	65,000,000	35,000,000
Mining (except petroleum)	3,500,000,000	1,400,000,000	2,100,000,000
Petroleum	3,000,000,000	1,000,000,000	2,000,000,000
Fisheries	50,000,000	10,000,000	40,000,000
Electric light, power, and gas	3,000,000,000	400,000,000	2,600,000,000
Transportation	6,000,000,000		6,000,000,000
Communications	1,400,000,000		1,400,000,000
Finance	100,000,000,000	80,000,000,000	20,000,000,000
Wages and salaries	60,000,000,000		60,000,000,000
Interest and dividends	10,000,000,000		10,000,000,000
Inheritances	9,000,000,000		9,000,000,000
Miscellaneous	25,000,000,000	5,000,000,000	20,000,000,000
Tanneries	50,000,000	30,000,000	20,000,000
Gifts	4,000,000,000		4,000,000,000
Total	467,823,585,223	220,494,476,188	247,329,109,035

Exemption of first $80 per month ($960 per year) income	$42,329,109,035
Total taxable gross profit or "value added"	205,000,000,000
2 percent tax on this would bring in	4,100,000,000
Credit allowed employers and employees for Federal annuity taxes paid	800,000,000
Total tax yield	3,300,000,000
Estimated cost of administration (1⅔ percent, or $5,000,000 per month)	60,000,000
Net tax yield (per year)	3,240,000,000
Amount necessary to pay $30 per month to 9,000,000 annuitants (per year)	3,240,000,000
On national-defense basis	
An additional 3 percent tax on $205,000,000,000 would bring in	$6,150,000,000
65 percent of total 5 percent tax yield would bring for defense (per year)	6,142,500,000
Balance to go into General Annuity Reserve Fund to protect future payments	7,500,000

Mr. Speaker, in simple terms, my pension proposal consists of a blanketing in of all omitted groups and classes under title I of the Social Security Act for a flat $30 per month coverage, the groups now covered by title II of the act and by other forms of Federal annuities, such as civil-service and railroad annuities, being allowed to draw their annuities through the systems under which they paid and being given a credit, as against the general gross profit tax, for any retirement taxes paid.

MANY FAVOR PENSION PLAN

One hundred and forty Congressmen have signed a nonpartisan steering-committee resolution in support of the pension bill, H. R. 1410. Those Congressmen come from 36 States of the Union, 51 from the Central States, 36 from the Southern States, 29 from the Eastern States, and 24 from the Western States. There are 90 Democrats on the steering committee, 45 Republicans, 3 Progressives, 1 Farmer-Laborite, and 1 American Laborite. Nine solid State delegations have signed the resolution, 2 members of the Ways and Means Committee, 14 members of the Appropriation Committee, and 13 chairmen of the House committees.

This group is the largest ever gathered together on behalf of a general Federal pension, and their signing represents the greatest pension progress in the history of America. Those who have signed the resolution are:

Alabama: George M. Grant, Democrat, Second District; Luther Patrick, Democrat, Ninth District.

Arizona: John R. Murdock, Democrat, at large.

Arkansas: Clyde T. Ellis, Democrat, Third District; Fadjo Cravens, Democrat, Fourth District.

California: Harry R. Sheppard, Democrat, Nineteenth District; Charles Kramer, Democrat, Thirteenth District; Lee E. Geyer, Democrat, Seventeenth District; Jerry Voorhis, Democrat, Twelfth District; John H. Tolan, Democrat, Seventh District; Albert E. Carter, Republican, Sixth District; A. J. Elliott, Democrat, Tenth District; Ed. V. Izac, Democrat, Twentieth District; Carl Hinshaw, Republican, Eleventh District; Thomas F. Ford, Democrat, Fourteenth District; Harry L. Englebright, Republican, Second District.

Connecticut: William J. Fitzgerald, Democrat, Second District; James A. Shanley, Democrat, Third District; Le Roy D. Downs, Democrat, Fourth District; Lucien J. Maciora, Democrat, at large.

Delaware: Philip A. Traynor, Democrat, at large.

Florida: Joe Hendricks, Democrat, Fifth District; Lex Green, Democrat, Second District; Pat Cannon, Democrat, Third District.

Georgia: Albert Sidney Camp, Democrat, Fourth District; B. Frank Whelchel, Democrat, Ninth District.

Idaho: Compton I. White, Democrat, First District; Henry C. Dworshak, Republican, Second District.

Illinois: Anton J. Johnson, Republican, Fourteenth District; Robert B. Chip-

erfield, Republican, Fifteenth District; Noah M. Mason, Republican, Twelfth District; William G. Stratton, Republican, at large; J. V. Heidinger, Republican, Twenty-fourth District; Anton F. Maciejewski, Democrat, Sixth District.

Indiana: William H. Larrabee, Democrat, Eleventh District; Gerald W. Landis, Republican, Seventh District; Noble J. Johnson, Republican, Sixth District; Raymond S. Springer, Republican, Tenth District; George W. Gillie, Republican, Fourth District; Louis Ludlow, Democrat, Twelfth District; Earl Wilson, Republican, Ninth District; William T. Schulte, Democrat, First District.

Iowa: Ben F. Jensen, Republican, Sixth District; Vincent F. Harrington, Democrat, Ninth District.

Kansas: Thomas D. Winter, Republican, Third District; John M. Houston, Democrat, Fifth District; U. S. Guyer, Republican, Second District.

Louisiana: A. Leonard Allen, Democrat, Eighth District; Newt V. Mills, Democrat, Fifth District; James Domengeaux, Democrat, Third District; F. Edward Hébert, Democrat, First District; Vance Plauche, Democrat, Seventh District; Hale Boggs, Democrat, Second District; Jared Y. Sanders, Jr., Democrat, Sixth District; Overton Brooks, Democrat, Fourth District.

Massachusetts: Joseph E. Casey, Democrat, Third District; Thomas A. Flaherty, Democrat, Eleventh District; Pehr G. Holmes, Republican, Fourth District; Lawrence J. Connery, Democrat, Seventh District; Charles R. Clason, Republican, Second District.

Michigan: Rudolph G. Tenerowicz, Democrat, First District; Frank E. Hook, Democrat, Twelfth District; Paul W. Shafer, Republican, Third District; George D. O'Brien, Democrat, Thirteenth District; John Lesinski, Democrat, Sixteenth District.

Minnesota: H. Carl Andersen, Republican, Seventh District; Harold Knutson, Republican, Sixth District; Richard T. Buckler, Farmer-Labor, Ninth District; Melvin J. Maas, Republican, Fourth District; Richard P. Gale, Republican, Third District.

Mississippi: Ross A. Collins, Democrat, Fifth District.

Missouri: Dewey Short, Republican, Seventh District.

Montana: Jeannette Rankin, Republican, First District.

Nebraska: Carl T. Curtis, Republican, Fourth District; Karl Stefan, Republican, Third District.

Nevada: James G. Scrugham, Democrat, at large.

New Jersey: William H. Sutphin, Democrat, Third District; Elmer H. Wene, Democrat, Second District; Charles A. Wolverton, Republican, First District.

New York: Alfred F. Beiter, Democrat, Forty-first District; Vito Marcantonio, American Labor, Twentieth District; Edwin A. Hall, Republican, Thirty-fourth District.

Ohio: J. Harry McGregor, Republican, Seventeenth District; Harold K. Claypool, Democrat, Eleventh District; George H. Bender, Republican, at large; Clarence J. Brown, Republican, Seventh District; Michael J. Kirwan, Democrat, Nineteenth District; Dow W. Harter, Democrat, Fourteenth District; Stephen M. Young, Democrat, at large; A. D. Baumhart, Jr., Republican, Thirteenth District; Martin L. Sweeney, Democrat, Twentieth District.

Oklahoma: Wilburn Cartwright, Democrat, Third District; Jed Johnson, Democrat, Sixth District; Jack Nichols, Democrat, Second District; Will Rogers, Democrat, at large; Ross Rizley, Republican, Eighth District; Victor Wickersham, Democrat, Seventh District.

Oregon: Walter M. Pierce, Democrat, Seventh District; James W. Mott, Republican, First District; Homer D. Angell, Republican, Third District.

Pennsylvania: Ivor D. Fenton, Republican, Thirteenth District; Harry L. Haines, Democrat, Twenty-second District; Charles L. Gerlach, Republican, Ninth District; Samuel A. Weiss, Democrat, Thirty-first District; Charles I. Faddis, Democrat, Twenty-fifth District; Guy L. Moser, Democrat, Fourteenth District; Francis J. Myers, Democrat, Sixth District; James A. Wright Democrat, Thirty-fourth District; J. Buell Snyder, Democrat, Twenty-fourth District; Francis R. Smith, Democrat, Fifth District; Augustine B. Kelley, Democrat, Twenty-eighth District.

Rhode Island: John E. Fogarty, Democrat, Second District; Aime J. Forand, Democrat, First District.

South Carolina: Joseph R. Bryson, Democrat, Fourth District; John L. McMillan, Democrat, Sixth District; James P. Richards, Democrat, Fifth District; L. Mendel Rivers, Democrat, First District.

Tennessee: John Jennings, Jr., Republican, Second District; J. Percy Priest, Democrat, Fifth District; Clifford Davis, Democrat, Ninth District.

Texas: Nat Patton, Democrat, Seventh District.

Utah: J. W. Robinson, Democrat, Second District; Walter K. Granger, Democrat, First District;

Washington: Warren G. Magnuson, Democrat, First District; Charles H. Leavy, Democrat, Fifth District; Knute Hill, Democrat, Fourth District; John M. Coffee, Democrat, Sixth District; Martin F. Smith, Democrat, Third District, Henry M. Jackson, Democrat, Second District.

West Virginia: Robert L. Ramsay, Democrat, First District; John Kee, Democrat, Fifth District; Jennings Randolph, Democrat, Second District.

Wisconsin: Reid F. Murray, Republican, Seventh District; William H. Stevenson, Republican, Third District; Joshua L. Johns, Republican, Eighth District; Frank B. Keefe, Republican, Sixth District; B. J. Gehrmann, Progressive, Tenth District; Henry Sauthoff, Progressive, Second District; Merlin Hull, Progressive, Ninth District; Lewis D. Thill, Republican, Fifth District.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO AS AGAINST BORROWED PENSIONS

In order to show the inequalities which exist in our present pension system I am inserting here a chart of comparative benefits under the present law and as I propose to amend it. The Federal Government is now paying $20,000,000 per month to our needy aged as pensions to match State appropriations. The Federal portion is not financed in any way at all and the bill is all charged to posterity. In other words we are giving paupers' pensions to some grandparents of today but are asking their grandchildren to pay the bill plus interest on it until paid. This is not right, and I feel that we should place the whole system on a pay-as-you-go basis and grant an honorable, earned annuity to all over 60, for which all would pay during their producing years, either directly or indirectly, so as to provide, at the outset, the pensions set forth in the second portion of the following chart:

Chart of comparative benefits (Social Security Act—General Welfare Act)

Place	Now under Social Security Act [1]			Under General Welfare Act amendments		
Region and State	Number of recipients (over 65—now classed as paupers)	Monthly Federal payment (States add same amount)	Average Federal payment (States match this)	Estimated number of recipients (retired citizens over 60)	Estimated monthly payment from Federal Government at $30 to all	Estimated Federal-State total monthly payment to needy aged
Total (United States)	2,054,380	$20,686,092	$10.07	9,000,000	$270,000,000	$37
Region I:						
Connecticut	17,353	235,264	13.56	130,000	3,900,000	43
Maine	13,335	138,782	10.41	80,000	2,400,000	40
Massachusetts	86,743	1,250,559	14.42	370,000	11,100,000	45
New Hampshire	6,375	67,633	10.61	50,000	1,500,000	40
Rhode Island	6,968	69,288	9.95	55,000	1,650,000	40
Vermont	5,271	42,293	8.14	35,000	1,050,000	38
Region II: New York	120,231	1,485,086	12.35	920,000	27,600,000	42
Region III:						
Delaware	2,568	14,634	5.70	20,000	600,000	35
New Jersey	31,359	328,077	10.46	280,000	8,400,000	40
Pennsylvania	99,914	1,092,361	10.94	675,000	20,250,000	40
Region IV:						
District of Columbia	3,434	43,605	12.70	40,000	1,200,000	42
Maryland	18,330	162,568	8.87	125,000	3,750,000	38
North Carolina	36,847	186,127	5.05	160,000	4,800,000	35
Virginia	19,460	96,403	4.96	150,000	4,500,000	35
West Virginia	18,579	130,442	7.02	100,000	3,000,000	37
Region V:						
Kentucky	53,689	238,907	4.45	190,000	5,700,000	34
Michigan	77,005	643,299	8.36	330,000	9,900,000	38
Ohio	131,829	1,512,467	11.48	540,000	16,200,000	40

[1] These figures from Social Security Bulletin, January 1941, the latest available.

Chart of comparative benefits (Social Security Act—General Welfare Act)—Continued

Place	Now under Social Security Act			Under General Welfare Act amendments		
Region and State	Number of recipients (over 65—now classed as paupers)	Monthly Federal payment (States add same amount)	Average Federal payment (States match this)	Estimated number of recipients (retired citizens over 60)	Estimated monthly payment from Federal Government at $30 to all	Estimated Federal-State total monthly payment to needy aged
Region VI:						
Illinois	141,216	$1,546,204	$10.95	565,000	$16,950,000	$40
Indiana	67,148	606,895	9.04	285,000	8,550,000	40
Wisconsin	53,020	596,709	11.26	245,000	7,350,000	40
Region VII:						
Alabama	20,033	92,803	4.63	135,000	4,050,000	34
Florida	37,467	232,717	6.21	130,000	3,900,000	36
Georgia	37,556	153,171	4.08	160,000	4,800,000	34
Mississippi	24,491	104,910	4.29	115,000	3,450,000	34
South Carolina	17,593	69,709	3.96	80,000	2,400,000	34
Tennessee	40,283	203,394	5.05	175,000	5,250,000	35
Region VIII:						
Iowa	56,140	590,879	10.35	230,000	6,900,000	40
Minnesota	62,904	664,692	10.57	215,000	6,450,000	40
Nebraska	28,393	273,428	9.63	110,000	3,300,000	40
North Dakota	8,908	74,476	8.36	40,000	1,200,000	38
South Dakota	14,951	144,549	9.67	44,000	1,320,000	40
Region IX:						
Arkansas	24,433	96,962	3.97	105,000	3,150,000	34
Kansas	27,916	276,035	9.89	150,000	4,500,000	40
Missouri	106,746	798,668	7.48	325,000	9,750,000	37
Oklahoma	74,641	664,902	8.91	144,000	4,320,000	38
Region X:						
Louisiana	33,656	209,783	6.23	115,000	3,450,000	36
New Mexico	4,866	40,645	8.36	20,000	600,000	38
Texas	119,612	814,044	6.81	345,000	10,350,000	36
Region XI:						
Arizona	8,400	117,545	14.00	25,000	750,000	44
Colorado	41,679	618,475	14.84	85,000	2,550,000	45
Idaho	9,661	101,218	11.17	30,000	900,000	40
Montana	12,186	112,719	9.25	35,000	1,050,000	39
Utah	13,585	153,008	11.27	30,000	900,000	40
Wyoming	3,440	41,006	11.92	10,000	300,000	40
Region XII:						
California	149,789	2,836,295	18.94	350,000	10,500,000	50
Nevada	2,305	30,556	13.26	6,000	180,000	43
Oregon	19,404	207,664	10.70	90,000	2,700,000	40
Washington	39,977	450,541	11.27	145,000	4,350,000	40
Territories:						
Alaska	1,537	21,565	14.03	5,000	150,000	44
Hawaii	1,802	11,666	6.48	6,000	180,000	30

THUMBNAIL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE

Mr. Speaker, for a concise thumbnail analysis of my measure, H. R. 1410, I offer the following schedule showing the salient features of the measure and its complete integration into our present social-security and pension structure. Full credit is given to all employers and employees who now pay some form of Federal tax for annuity purposes. This eliminates the possibility of double taxation and permits the workers in question to draw their annuities under the systems to which they have been contributing.

The measure represents a complete and fully worked-out attempt to solve our pressing pension problems, and even the smallest details have been taken care of. Funeral benefits are even provided for annuitants, a sound tax base has been worked out, and a flat guaranty below which annuities may not fall is established so as to make this measure the very best there is in the pension field. The analysis of the measure follows:

How to synchronize general and special pensions (through the General Welfare Act)
(H. R. 1410)

Descriptive items	General pensions (under General Welfare Act amendments to title I, Social Security Act)	Differential gear (the secret of it all)	Special pensions (under General Welfare Act amendments to title II of Social Security Act and other Federal statutes)
Guaranteed pension	$30 per month to all over 60		$30 per month to all over 60.
Augmented	May earn $15 per month		May earn $15 per month.
Supplemented	By States on basis of need		By States on basis of need.
Supporting tax	2 percent gross profit tax	Credit, under general pension tax, to employers and employees for all Federal retirement taxes paid.	2 percent gross pay-roll tax.
Tax deductions	$80 per month or $960 per year		None.
Additional tax	None		1 to 1½ percent (railroad and civil service).
Future tax	do		½ percent in 1946; ½ percent in 1949 (Social Security Act).
Additional benefits	do		Up to $55; survivorship (Social Security Act).
Ultimate goal	$60 at 60		$85 at 60.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT POINTS OUT THE WAY

Mr. Speaker, interesting to many are the words of our United States Supreme Court on the question as to whether a Federal pension is desirable. The language follows:

Congress did not improvise a judgment when it found that the award of old-age benefits would be conducive to the general welfare. * * * The plight of men and women at so low an age as 40 is hard, almost hopeless, when they are driven to seek reemployment. * * * Approximately 3 out of 4 persons 65 or over were probably dependent wholly or partially on others for support. * * * The problem is plainly national in area and dimensions. Moreover, the laws of the several States cannot deal with it effectively. * * * State and local governments are often lacking in the resources that are necessary to finance an adequate program of security for the aged. * * * Apart from the failure of resources, State and local governments are at times reluctant to increase so heavily the burden of taxation to be borne by their residents for fear of placing themselves in a position of economic disadvantage as compared with neighbors or competitors. * * * A system of old-age pensions has special dangers of its own, if put in force in one State and rejected in another. The existence of such a system is a bait to the needy and dependent elsewhere—encouraging them to migrate and seek a haven of repose. Only a power that is national can serve the interests of all. (*Helvering* v. *Davis*, 301 U. S. 619, May 1937, upholding the constitutionality of the Social Security Act.)

PRESIDENT EXPRESSES SIMILAR VIEWS

The President, of course, irrevocably tied up national pensions with defense in his address to Congress on January 6, 1941, on the state of the Union, in which he said:

The need for the moment is that our actions and our policy should be devoted primarily—almost exclusively—to meeting this foreign peril. For all our domestic problems are now a part of the great emergency.

As men do not live by bread alone, they do not fight by armaments alone. Those who man our defenses and those behind them who build our defenses must have the stamina and courage which comes from an unshakeable belief in the manner of life which they are defending. The mighty action which we are calling for cannot be based on a disregard of all things worth fighting for.

The Nation takes great satisfaction and much strength from the things which have been done to make its people conscious of their individual stake in the preservation of democratic life in America. Those things have toughened the fiber of our people, have renewed their faith and strengthened their devotion to the institutions we make ready to protect.

Certainly this is no time to stop thinking about the social and economic problems which are the root cause of the social revolution which is today a supreme factor in the world.

There is nothing mysterious about the foundations of a healthy and strong democracy. The basic things expected by our people of their political and economic systems are simple.

They are:

Equality of opportunity for youth and for others.

Jobs for those who can work.

Security for those who need it.

The ending of special privilege for the few.

The preservation of civil liberties for all.

The enjoyment of the fruits of scientific progress in a wider and constantly rising standard of living.

These are the simple and basic things that must never be lost sight of in the turmoil and unbelievable complexity of our modern world. The inner and abiding strength of our economic and political systems is dependent upon the degree to which they fulfill these expectations.

Many subjects connected with our social economy call for immediate improvement.

As examples:

We should bring more citizens under the coverage of old-age pensions and unemployment insurance.

We should widen the opportunity for adequate medical care.

We should plan a better system by which persons deserving or needing gainful employment may obtain it.

I have called for personal sacrifice. I am assured of the willingness of almost all Americans to respond to that call.

A part of the sacrifice means the payment of more money in taxes. In my Budget message I recommended that a greater portion of this great defense program be paid for from taxation than we are paying today. No persons should try, or be allowed, to get rich out of this program; and the principles of tax payments in accordance with ability to pay should be constantly before our eyes to guide our legislation.

If the Congress maintains these principles, the voters, putting patriotism ahead of pocketbooks, will give you their applause.

In the future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms.

The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world.

The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world.

The third is freedom from want—which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings, which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world.

The fourth is freedom from fear—which, translated into world terms, means a worldwide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—anywhere in the world.

That is no vision of a distant millennium. It is definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our own time and generation. That kind of world is the very antithesis of the so-called new order of tyranny which the dictators seek to create with the crash of a bomb.

To that new order we oppose the greater conception—the moral order. A good society is able to face schemes of world domination and foreign revolutions alike without fear.

Since the beginning of our American history we have been engaged in change—in a perpetual peaceful revolution—a revolution which goes on steadily, quietly adjusting itself to changing conditions—without the concentration camp or the quicklime in the ditch. The world order which we seek is the cooperation of free countries, working together in a friendly, civilized society.

This Nation has placed its destiny in the hands and heads and hearts of its millions of free men and women; and its faith in freedom under the guidance of God. Freedom means the supremacy of human rights everywhere. Our support goes to those who struggled to gain those rights or keep them. Our strength is in our unity of purpose.

To that high concept there can be no end save victory.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH SHOULD ACT

Mr. Speaker, the executive and judicial branches of the Government having thus expressed their views, it remains for the legislative branch to act, as it alone can initiate the system necessary to give real economic security to all of our senior citizens in the sunset of life. I, therefore, beseech my colleagues to join the General Welfare Act steering committee and do their bit to help secure enactment of this soundly financed and reasonable old-age pension measure which is now pending before Congress. I commend it to you, my colleagues, for your very earnest consideration. Let us do something very definite toward enacting the measure at this session of Congress.

Our American Government—What Is It? How Does It Function?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is available through the folding room of the House of Representatives at this time 20 pamphlets on the subject, Our American Government—What is it? How does it function? This number of copies is only sufficient for a Member's own office use. The public will be permitted to purchase these documents through the Government Printing Office for 20 cents per copy postpaid.

It is House Document No. 152, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, and contains 252 questions and answers relative to our National Government. The foreword in this document is as follows:

FOREWORD

September 12, 1940, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 138 questions and answers on Our National Government—What Is It? How Does It Function? These questions and answers were reprinted in pamphlet form and have been widely distributed by Members of Congress and others. This pamphlet has proven to be so popular that many people, including Members of Congress, professors, and teachers, have insisted that it be made a public document, in order that it may receive greater distribution.

Accordingly, the pamphlet has been revised to include 252 questions and answers for the purpose of embracing thoughts and suggestions that have been submitted. As a public document it may be purchased through the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., and each Member of Congress will be allowed a small quantity for his own use.

I desire to express my appreciation to the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress for many helpful and valuable suggestions, which are contained in the revision, and for their work in editing and arranging the revised copy. The three charts, which are included, were prepared and furnished by the United States Information Service; other helpful service was given by this department in the revision.

WRIGHT PATMAN, M. C.

Mr. George W. Stimpson, former president of the National Press Club, Washington, D. C., a member of the Press Gallery in the House of Representatives, who is author of Popular Questions Answered, Nuggets of Knowledge, Things Worth Knowing, and Uncommon Knowledge, has been very helpful to me in this compilation.

The Director of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, Dr. Ernest S. Griffith, examined the text of this document before it was printed and sent me the following letter:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, April 17, 1941.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have just completed my reading of your admirable document on Our National Government. You have been able to include in it an amazing amount of detail, and at the same time have made it an interesting and accurate study.

I am delighted that the Legislative Reference Service was privileged to have a part in its preparation.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,
Director, Legislative Reference Service.

The document contains three charts, which graphically explain the Federal Government, the United States Senate, and the House of Representatives.

At the end of the document, there is a full and complete index.

The questions, which are answered, are as follows:

QUESTIONS

GENERAL

1. What is the difference between a pure or direct democracy, and a representative or indirect democracy?
2. What are the essentials of a republican form of government?
3. How does the National Government of the United States of America combine both democratic and republican principles of government?
4. What is the purpose of the National Government?
5. What is the meaning of "separation of powers"?
6. What is the "supreme law of the land"?
7. Was a new Constitution the expressed object of the Convention of 1787?
8. Where are the originals of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence?
9. How may the Constitution be amended?
10. What is the Bill of Rights?
11. What is the "lame duck" amendment?
12. Why was a constitutional amendment necessary to change the date of the beginning of the terms of President, Vice President, and Members of Congress?

ELECTIONS

13. Were political parties contemplated under the Constitution?
14. What incident led directly to the formation of political parties?

14a. What were the first two major political parties?

15. What was the first method of Presidential nomination?
16. When did the system of national nominating conventions become established?

17. Is the President actually elected on election day (Tuesday after first Monday in November)?
18. If a Presidential nominee dies before the date of election, how is a successor chosen in his stead?
19. How are Senators and Representatives elected?
20. Why are Congressmen elected in the State of Maine in September instead of November?
21. Have United States Senators always been elected by the people?
22. Does Congress determine the boundaries of congressional districts?
23. Do all congressional districts have approximately the same population?
24. What is the population of the average congressional district?

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH IN GENERAL

25. What is the Congress?
26. Why is the Senate referred to as the "upper House" and the House of Representatives as the "lower House," and is one House actually lower than the other?
27. How long have we had a Congress?
28. What is the term of a Congress?
29. What is a session of Congress?
30. Is there a fixed limit to the length of a session?
31. What is the longest session of Congress on record?
32. Under what circumstances may the President call a special session of Congress?
33. In what circumstances may the President adjourn Congress?
34. When Congress is in session, at what hour do the two Houses meet?
35. How can anyone, within the Capitol, determine whether or not either House or Senate is in session?
36. How may a person, outside the Capitol Building, determine whether or not either House is in session?
37. What is a Congressman?
38. What is a Delegate, and a Commissioner?
39. How many Members are there in each House?
40. Has the House of Representatives always been composed of 435 Members?
41. How many Members has each State in the House and Senate?
42. How will the 1940 census affect the representation from the several States?
43. What oath is taken by Members of Congress?
44. What is the practice as to administration of the oath, when a Member's right to a seat is challenged?
45. What is the length of the term of office of Senators and Representatives?
46. In the event of the death or resignation of a United States Senator, how is the unexpired term filled?
47. In the event of the death or resignation of a Representative, how is the vacancy filled?
48. What are the qualifications of a Member of the Senate?
49. What are the qualifications of a Representative in Congress?
50. What are the salaries of the Representatives and Senators in Congress?
51. What allowances do they have to assist them in serving their constituents?
52. Do Representatives use all their $200 for supplies and stationery?
53. Why is 20 cents a mile allowed to Members for travel allowance instead of the 3 cents or less per mile charged by the railroad companies?
54. Do Members of Congress become wealthy by reason of their service?
55. What are the duties expected of a Member of Congress?
56. Are widows of Congressmen who die while in office compensated by Congress?
57. Where do Members of Congress reside in Washington?
58. Can Members of Congress be impeached?
59. Are eating places provided in the Capitol for Members and their guests?
60. Is smoking permitted in Congress?
61. Is there a bar in the Capitol?
62. Are the Members provided with offices in which to conduct their business?
63. How should one address a Member of Congress if he desires to communicate with him?
64. Who was the first woman elected to Congress?
65. Who was the first woman to serve in the Senate?
66. How many women are Members of Congress at this time?
67. What is the congressional courtesy rule regarding correspondence between one Member and a constituent of another Member?
68. Should one communicating with a Members of Congress send postage for reply?
69. Are visitors and representatives of the press allowed to listen in on the proceedings of Congress?
70. What are the duties of a page in the Senate, and do they differ from the duties of House pages?
71. How are pages dressed?
72. Suppose a Member desires to summon a page, how does he make his wishes known?
73. Do Senators have individual seats?
74. Do the Members of the House have individual seats?
75. How can a Member be reached over the telephone when the House is in session?
76. What is the well of the House?
77. What is the mace, and what is its importance?

CONGRESS—ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURE

78. How are the activities of Congress controlled?
79. Who presides in the Senate?
80. Who presides in the House?
81. Who presides over the House when Congress first meets and before a Speaker is selected?
82. What are the duties of the Speaker of the House?
83. Who are the officers of the House?
84. What is a party leader?
85. Is the majority leader, in either branch of Congress, elected by the House or Senate?
86. What are the duties of the whips of the House?
87. What are the customary proceedings when the House meets?
88. How are the rules of procedure determined?
89. What is a "gentleman's agreement" in Congress?
90. What is the steering committee of the House of Representatives?
91. How can any citizen get his views considered by Congress?
92. What are the stages of a bill in the House?
93. How does a Senator introduce a bill?
94. How does a Member of the Senate obtain recognition from the President of the Senate, and how long may he speak?
95. How does a Member of the House of Representatives obtain recognition from the Speaker to address the House, and how long may be speak?
96. What is a quorum?
97. What is meant by senatorial courtesy?
98. Why are congressional standing committees necessary?
99. What are the names of the standing committees of the Senate?
100. What are the names of the standing committees of the House?
101. How are the members of the standing committees of the House selected?
102. What is meant by the "seniority rule"?
103. What arrangements are made for a meeting of a standing committee of the House?
104. Under what circumstances do House committees themselves originate bills?
105. Do the committees hold hearings on all bills referred to them?
106. Does the committee to which a bill is referred effectively control its disposition?
107. What is the first reading of a bill?
108. What is meant by the different calendars of the House?
109. What is the Committee of the Whole?
110. How are votes taken in the House?
111. How may a record vote be obtained in the House? In the Senate?
112. What is pairing?
113. What is the difference between a general pair and a live pair?
114. What is the previous question?
115. What are the functions of the House Rules Committee?
116. What business can be transacted by unanimous consent?
117. What is a filibuster?
118. What filibustering tactics are possible in the House?
119. What method does the Senate have for meeting a filibuster?
120. What is a conference committee?
121. What courses are open to the President when a bill is presented to him?
122. What is a veto?
123. What is a pocket veto?
124. Is there any restriction on what a President may veto? May he veto a declaration of war or a constitutional amendment?
125. Are many bills vetoed?
126. Are bills often passed over the President's veto?
127. Has President Roosevelt's veto been overridden in many instances?
128. What ceremony attends the signing of a bill by the President?
129. What becomes of the bill after it is signed?
130. When does a bill, introduced at the beginning of a Congress become dead and no longer open to consideration?
131. Why are most of the bills that become law in the name of a comparatively few Members of Congress?
132. Is legislation much influenced by oratory?
133. Are all of the laws of the United States published in one book? If so, how may it be obtained?
134. What is the difference between a bill and an act?
135. What is the difference between a resolution, a concurrent resolution, and a joint resolution?
136. What is the largest number of bills ever introduced in a single Congress?
137. How does the total of measures introduced in Congress compare with the number enacted?
138. Are all of the measures enacted by a Congress public laws?
139. What was the first act of Congress?
140. What was the first substantive act passed by Congress?
141. How many times has Congress declared war?
142. Why must tax bills originate in the House?
143. What are Executive orders?

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

144. What qualifications are prescribed for the President?
145. Is an Indian eligible to the Presidency?
146. What is the wording of the oath taken by the President?
147. How was the date determined for the beginning of the first President's term of office?
148. What is now the date for commencement of the President's term?
149. What President has served the shortest length of time?
150. When has the regular term of a President been less than 4 years?
151. How many Presidents have served two complete terms?

152. How many Presidents have died in office?
153. How many Presidents have been assassinated?
154. Has a President ever been impeached?
155. Has a President ever resigned from office?
156. Has any President been inaugurated more than twice?
157. What is the oldest Federal building in the Capital?
158. Have all of the Presidents and their families resided in the White House?
159. Has the White House ever been destroyed?
160. How many Presidents have died in the White House?
161. What provision is made in case of the death of a President in office, or his removal, resignation, or disability?
162. Why were the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor omitted from the succession?
163. Who becomes President if a President-elect dies or is disqualified before the date fixed for the beginning of his term?
164. What is the present salary of the President?
165. What allowances does a President receive?
166. What official privileges, if any, are extended to an ex-President?
167. Has an ex-President ever served in Congress?
168. What ex-Presidents have held Federal office (other than as Members of Congress) after their Presidency?
169. Is Abraham Lincoln the only President to have been born in a log cabin?
170. Which Presidents were bachelors when elected?
171. Has a President ever been married in the White House?
172. Which Presidents were related?
173. How many Presidents were slave owners?
174. Has there ever been a President from a State west of the Mississippi?
175. Which President was drafted for military service?
176. Why is the President's wife called the First Lady?
177. What privileges or allowances have been granted to widows of Presidents?
178. Does the President ever appear personally before Congress to deliver his message?
179. What State has supplied the most Presidents?
180. How have personal characteristics of the Presidents been reflected in nicknames?
181. Does the President ever wear a uniform?
182. What President first had an automobile?
183. Who administers the oath to the Vice President?
184. When was the Vice Presidential oath administered outside the territorial limits of the United States?
185. What other official title does the Vice President bear?
186. Does the United States furnish an official residence for the use of the Vice President?
187. What salary does the Vice President receive?
188. Who was the first Vice President to sit regularly with the Cabinet?
189. What Vice President refused to sit with the Cabinet?
190. How many Vice Presidents have filled out a President's term?
191. Has a Vice President ever resigned?
192. What is the Cabinet?
193. What was the so-called Brain Trust during President Franklin D. Roosevelt's first term?
194. Has a member of the President's Cabinet ever held at the same time another important appointive office?

JUDICIARY

195. Does the Supreme Court owe its existence to Congress?
196. Has the Supreme Court always consisted of nine Justices?
197. What form of oath is taken by a member of the Supreme Court?
198. What oath do members of the bar of the Supreme Court take?
199. What salary do Justices of the Supreme Court receive?
200. Has the Supreme Court always met in Washington?
201. How long has the Supreme Court had a building of its own?
202. What cases may be brought originally in the Supreme Court?

THE CAPITAL, CAPITOL, ETC.

203. What technically constitutes the Capital of the United States?
204. Why is the building in which Congress meets spelled "Capitol" while the Federal District is the "Capital"?
205. Was the Capitol Building designed and built as a unit in its present form?
206. What is the front of the Capitol?
207. What change in exterior construction of the Capitol has been seriously proposed in late years?
208. Why does the United States flag fly over the Capitol in Washington at night?
209. Why was the White House placed a mile and a half from the Capitol?
210. Has the mansion where the President lives, at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, an official designation? And when and why was it so named?
211. Who was the architect of the White House?
212. Does the White House conform to any special type of architecture?
213. What is the difference between the White House and the Executive Offices?
214. How can it be determined whether or not the President is at the White House?
215. Has the District of Columbia always been its present size, geographically?
216. Are the boundaries of the District definitely fixed at present?
217. Is the city of Washington synonymous or coextensive with the District of Columbia?
218. When did the United States Government move to the District of Columbia, and from where?
219. Have the residents of the District of Columbia ever had a vote and an elected government?
220. Who now legislates for the District of Columbia?
221. Why are there no tall buildings in Washington?
222. Is Inauguration Day a national holiday?

STATES

223. How can a new State be created?
224. What is an enabling act?
225. Would it be possible for Texas to be divided into five States without the consent of Congress?
226. What guaranty does the Constitution carry with respect to the form of State government?

PATRIOTIC SYMBOLS: MISCELLANEOUS

227. Who has custody and use of the seal of the United States?
228. What is the flag?
229. How is the number of stars in the flag determined?
230. What is the "pledge to the flag," and when did its use become general?
231. What is the approved ceremony for use in schools when pledging allegiance to the flag?
232. What are some of the improper uses of the flag?
233. Why are flags flown at half staff?
234. What was the original name of our national anthem? When did it become our national anthem?
235. What response is necessary when the national anthem is played, on the part of military personnel and civilians?
236. Does the Government do its own printing?
237. Are the proceedings in Congress published and preserved?
238. How does the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD differ from the ordinary newspaper or magazine?
239. How may the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be obtained?
240. How are Government documents available to the individual citizen?
241. What are some comprehensive and authoritative sources of information about the various governmental departments and agencies?
242. Does the Library of Congress contain a copy of every book printed in the United States?
243. To what extent does Congress foster and appropriate for education?
244. How many public employees are in the civil service in the several branches of the Government?
245. How many public employees in the several branches of the Government are not in the civil service?
246. Can a Member of Congress influence the rating and grades of applicants for civil-service positions?
247. When did the expression originate, that "To the victor belongs the spoils"?
248. How does the present immigration law restrict the formerly unlimited immigration?
249. Are persons of any particular race barred as such from acquiring United States citizenship?
250. What kind of an oath is an alien required to take before he becomes a naturalized citizen of the United States?
251. Is a soldier required to take an oath when he enlists in the Service?
252. What is the American's creed?

Oklahoma City Cooperates in Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the vote on the defense bond issue in Oklahoma City yesterday that passed by a ratio of 19 to 1.

In this way, Oklahoma City proves its gratitude for the location in the Middle West of two large defense projects, and will expend $982,000 of its own money to cooperate in this way.

The bond issue was occasioned through donation to the Federal Government of 960 acres of land for the new middle-western air depot at a cost of $255,000. In addition, a total of $527,000 was voted for a new municipal airport.

The new airport was required to handle commercial traffic because the existing municipal airport had been turned over to the Army as a military airport and used by a large bombardment squadron there. The old municipal airport represented an investment of city funds far in

excess of $1,500,000 and was leased without cost to the Federal Government for its use through this emergency.

In addition, the bonds voted provided for an extra $200,000 to make available when needed, additional land for the bombardment squadron located on the old airport. The money will be used to buy an additional 1,600 acres for expansion of these facilities.

I merely want to call the attention of the House to the fact that Oklahoma City and other cities of the Middle West are anxious and willing to do their part in assisting the defense program. They are willing to put up hard cash for land and other facilities needed by the Army.

We appreciate the fact that the city will benefit in many ways from these military expansions. We know that it is good business to spend some of our money to give land and cooperate with the Army in locations they place in our section.

But in this day, when so many communities are asking for vast Federal subsidies because defense plants or cantonments have been located in or near them, it should be a welcome relief to have the midwestern communities willing to carry a part of the load.

Because of this cooperation and this willingness to carry some of the defense burden, I sincerely hope that the Army officials and those in charge of our defense production will continue to decentralize as much as possible our defense plants. I hope they will locate more and more plants in the Middle West where they are not only safe from interruption by attack, but where the towns and cities are anxious to assume a part of the burden of the cost.

Regulation of Administrative Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

RESOLUTION BY THE KENTUCKY STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, having in mind the Logan-Walter bill, passed by Congress at the last session with a view to meeting the imperative demand for fair play by administrative agencies, and the veto of that measure by the President, I include, under leave to extend my remarks, the text of a resolution unanimously adopted by the Kentucky State Bar Association at its recent annual meeting, after adoption previously by the executive committee of the Louisville Bar Association.

The quotation under paragraph G is from Daniel Webster.

I am confident that the resolution reflects a very large preponderance of legal sentiment throughout the Nation.

The resolution follows:

Resolved by the executive committee of the Louisville Bar Association, That it approves in principle and recommends to the Congress and the Legislature of Kentucky the adoption of legislation designed to produce these results:

(a) As nearly as may be, to give notice to and permit participation by all interested parties in the making of administrative regulations governing the hearing and determination by administrative bodies of controversies;

(b) The segregation of investigating and prosecuting functions from judicial functions in administrative procedures;

(c) The independent selection of administrative hearing officers other than the heads of agencies, designed to secure their independence of judgment;

(d) The application by administrative agencies in hearings of the basic principles of evidence, and a recognition of the right of cross-examination in all such hearings;

(e) Adequate requirement of the making of findings of fact and conclusions of law and the statement of reasons for administrative decisions;

(f) Specific notice of hearings in all cases and an opportunity for the persons directly interested to be heard;

(g) In short, in administrative proceedings, a return to the fundamental conceptions of due process "which hears before it condemns, proceeds upon inquiry, and renders judgment only after trial"; and, finally,

(h) A definite broadening of the scope of judicial review of administrative decisions, to the end that the very foundations upon which our democratic structure has been erected may not be destroyed by the substitution of the rule of men for the rule of law. The performance of judicial functions and the holding of judicial office, in some way not to be defined, almost invariably produce an objective, dispassionate, impersonal approach, for which there is no substitute.

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be furnished to the commissioners of the Kentucky State Bar Association, to the Senators and Representatives from Kentucky, and to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee in the Senate and House of Representatives.

War for the United States Means Social Revolution, Economic Chaos, Dictatorship, and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times for April 27, 1941:

[From the New York Times of April 27, 1941]

FOSDICK WARNS UNITED STATES NOT TO ENTER WAR—SEES ONLY SOCIAL REVOLUTION, ECONOMIC CHAOS, DICTATORSHIP, AND COMMUNISM AS RESULT—SCORES DEMOCRACY PLEA—SAYS OF MAKING WORLD SAFE, "I CANNOT MAKE THAT DEVIL LOOK LIKE AN ANGEL"

The Reverend Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick endorsed yesterday the stand of "millions of plain Americans who still are saying, 'Stay out of belligerent participation in this war'." He declared in his morning sermon at Riverside Church, Riverside Drive and One Hundred and Twenty-second Street, that if the United States entered the war, he could see in the end only "social revolution, economic chaos, dictatorship, and communism." Dr. Fosdick had this to say:

"The choices we now must make in national policy are difficult and hazardous. No one of us wants to do wrong. All of us are tempted to mistake some devil of a policy for a saving angel. We must be tolerant of deep differences of judgment and must respect the consciences of those with whom we cannot agree.

"But for myself I am convinced that the millions of plain Americans who still are saying, 'Stay out of belligerent participation in this war,' are right. Whatever else may be uncertain, this seems to me clear, that for us to plunge as belligerents into this war now would do three things:

"First, greatly expand the area of the war; second, incalculably extend the duration of the war; third, vastly increase the economic and moral havoc of the war. And out of a war so expanded in area, extended in time, and accentuated in destruction, I can see no ultimate victor except social revolution, economic chaos, dictatorship, and communism.

"For myself, I cannot idealize another war as a means to make the world safe for democracy. I cannot make that devil look like an angel."

Gen. William E. Mitchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

LETTER FROM T. J. FARRELL, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from Mr. T. J. Farrell, of 70 Prospect Park West, Brooklyn, N. Y., relating to House Resolution No. 17, introduced by Representative MCCORMACK and covering the career of Gen. William E. Mitchell.

The Honorable JAMES J. HEFFERNAN,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I know that all air-minded Americans and veterans who served under him will deeply appreciate anything done to clear the record of Gen. William E. Mitchell.

Born in 1879, he attended Racine College and received his bachelor of arts degree from Columbia University. He later also graduated from the United States Army School of the Line and the Army Staff College.

He was the youngest officer of the United States Army to participate in the Spanish-American War and subsequently served during the Philippine Insurrection and the Mexican Punitive Expedition. From 1913 to 1916 he was a member of the Army General Staff and from March to September 1917 was aviation officer of the American Expeditionary Forces, being the first American officer under fire in the last World War. He

was the first flying officer of the United States Army to cross the lines (April 22, 1917).

He was Chief of the Air Service, Zone of Advance, until February 1918; of the First Army Corps to June 1918, and subsequently Commander of the Air Service of the A. E. F., participating in all the major operations and battles of our forces.

He returned to the United States in 1918 and served as director of military aeronautics and chief of training and operations until 1921, when he was appointed Assistant to the Chief of the United States Army Air Service, which post he held until his resignation from the service in 1926. He died in New York City, February 19, 1936.

General Mitchell was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross; the Distinguished Service Medal (United States); Commander of the Legion of Honor; Croix de Guerre with five palms (France); Commander of the Order of St. Mihiel and St. George (British); Commander of St. Maurice and St. Lazarus, Grand Officer of the Crown, Cross of Merit in War (Italy).

Lest we forget, it was General Mitchell who pioneered and advocated the tactical use of the airplane in warfare. The proof of his theories is the record of the tremendous power of the air force in the present war.

I wish to extend to you personally my own gratitude for your interest in House Resolution No. 17 as introduced by Representative McCORMACK, covering General Mitchell's record. I can also assure you that all World War aviators and Aviators' Post, No. 743, of the American Legion, as well as all Americans who love justice and fair play, join me in this wish.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS J. FARRELL,
Formerly Lieutenant Air Corps Reserve Military Aviator, United States Army.

President of United Office and Professional Workers of America Replies to Representative Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

LETTER AND TELEGRAM FROM LEWIS MERRILL, PRESIDENT OF THE ORGANIZATION

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and telegram:

UNITED OFFICE AND PROFESSIONAL WORKERS OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., April 4, 1941.

The Honorable VITO MARCANTONIO,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MARCANTONIO: I am enclosing a copy of a telegram I sent to Representative DIES last week. He has not inserted this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I wonder whether it is possible for you to have it inserted for me? I would like to have my denial appear there.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS MERRILL,
President.

COPY OF TELEGRAM SENT TO REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN DIES ON MARCH 28, 1941

According to reports contained in the Baltimore Sun of March 27, 1941, you have again, in the face of my consistent denials, listed me as a Communist. I am not now nor have I been a member of the Communist Party. I do not know what sort of evidence has been adduced before your committee, but I do know that I have had no opportunity to appear before your committee nor have I ever had an opportunity to subject evidence before your committee to a critical examination. My communications to you have uniformly been unanswered.

My organization and myself are much too busy overcoming employer resistance to collective bargaining to be concerned with these matters. Communism is no issue in our union, and we do not intend to permit its introduction by the Dies committee. Our union is opposed to control by any minority group. Any attempt at such control would be met with prompt exercise of union discipline. The United Office and Professional Workers of America provides adequate forums for debate on policy, regular elections, and conventions, supervision over the acts of all of its officers, national and local. We cannot but conclude, therefore, that you are not concerned with the truth of your allegations but seize upon the flimsiest excuses to attack us and through us the C. I. O. of which we are a part.

I think in all fairness that this communication should be placed by you in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

LEWIS MERRILL,
President, United Office and Professional Workers of America.

Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

LETTER FROM LEWIS ALAN BERNE, PRESIDENT OF FAECT

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

FEDERATION OF ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS, CHEMISTS, AND TECHNICIANS,
New York City, April 23, 1941.

Hon. VITO MARCANTONIO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I am impelled to communicate with you at this time because of the unfounded and unprincipled charges levelled against our international union by Congressman DIES in his speech before Congress recently. The statements and allegations made in that speech are so palpably unfounded and unsupported, that in all justice, the true facts should be known.

For several years now, Congressman DIES has periodically attacked our organization from the public platform, on the floor of Congress, and over radio networks, on the grounds that it was Communist dominated and controlled. During this period, I have repeatedly asked for the opportunity of appearing before the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities for the purpose of exposing the character of these attacks and the nature of the evidence upon which they are allegedly based. To date I have never received any acknowledgment of my requests, nor have I been accorded the opportunity of submitting a statement.

At the outset, may I state that the FAECT is a bona fide economic organization of technical employees affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations. Its program, policies, and objectives, are in accordance with the soundest principles of Americanism and democratic procedure. In the entire history of our union, not one single instance can be shown in which any of our activities and objectives were in opposition to the American form of government, subversive, or a danger to national defense.

On the contrary, our membership have for years given unselfishly of their time, energy, and genius to the advancement of our democracy, the improvement of professional ethics and standards. Those of our people employed in the Government service, have similarly a record of loyalty and unselfishness. Many of them have given up to 25 years of their lives to the Government service.

We have noted that whenever our organization was successfully conducting a campaign for improvements of the conditions of technicians, Congressman DIES never failed to come to the assistance of antilabor employers by releasing his unfounded charges. At present we are engaged in a strenuous campaign to oppose an attempt to freeze men to their jobs and their wages in the shipbuilding industry. We are also active in negotiating contracts in the aviation and automobile fields in New York, California, and Michigan. It is thus no coincidence that the attack comes at this time.

In his latest statement, Congressman DIES lists a series of names of persons allegedly officers and members of our union and allegedly either Communists or Communist-dominated. An indication of the reliability of his statements can be seen in the fact that 6 of the 18 mentioned have never been members of our organization. Several have been slandered for having contributed articles to Technical America, a monthly publication which we have not published for the past 2 years. These persons were never members of the FAECT. Mr. DIES has indicted our technical school, where we are teaching ship design and drafting courses in an effort to qualify men for this important industry. We undertook this only after the Navy Department itself refused our request to institute such courses in order to help improve the defenses of our Nation. He indicts one of our chapters for picketing a Federal agency in 1936. You, yourself, at that time, supported this struggle on the part of our chapter in Washington for the redress of grievances when no procedure was established at that time for such disputes. It is pertinent to state that we were victorious in that campaign, and many of our demands have now become common practice in the Government service.

Our program, history, and activities are a matter of public record. We can refer you to some of the country's outstanding technical publications, such as Engineer-News Record, Pencil Points, Architectural Record, Iron Age, Architectural Forum, and others, in which the work of our FAECT has been reported from time to time. Various municipal, State, and Federal agencies such as the President's Committee on Civil Service Improvement, Navy Department, United States Housing Authority, Civil Service Commission, New York City Board of Estimate, etc., have all been consistently informed about our activities and program. In several instances we have made acknowledged and outstanding contributions to the improvement of the work of these agencies.

Until May 1937 we were an unaffiliated national union, and upon that date were granted a charter as an international union by the

Congress of Industrial Organizations. We were formed in August 1933. The objects of the FAECT are clearly and unequivocally set forth in our constitution, and I quote a pertinent part therefrom:

"Article I, section 2.—Object: The object of the FAECT shall be to unite into one organization all employees doing work of a technical nature who are eligible for membership, in order—

(a) To maintain, protect, and advance the economic welfare of all technical employees.

(b) To extend the benefits of collective bargaining and to secure for technical employees means to establish peaceful relations with their employers.

(c) To maintain determined adherence to obligations and responsibilities under collective bargaining and wage agreements.

(d) To secure for members protection and full benefits of their patents and inventions.

(e) To secure legislation safeguarding the economic security and social welfare of the workers of America, to protect and extend democratic institutions and civil rights and liberties and thus to perpetuate the cherished traditions of this democracy.

(f) The FAECT in order to advance its legislative and economic activities, may cooperate with progressive groups in independent political action of labor.

Membership in the FAECT is open to all bona fide technical employees, and our constitution provides that "no person otherwise shall be barred from membership because of race, color, creed, nationality, sex, religious or political beliefs" (art. II, sec. 2). The union is a democratically administered organization in which all policy-making and administrative posts are filled through regular electoral process. The chapters are self-governing, locally administered bodies affiliated with the international union. National officers are elected at annual conventions. Delegates to annual conventions are elected by membership meetings of the individual chapters. Voting at national conventions is constitutionally restricted to regularly elected delegates. The convention elects a general executive board of 15 members, which is the highest body of the organization in the period between conventions. Thus you can see that our form of organization and activities are based upon the best traditions of American democracy.

May I submit that Congressman DIES has not only failed to introduce any bona fide supporting evidence to substantiate his charges against our organization, but has also never cited one case in which any activity or policy, or act, of our organization as a whole, can be honestly considered as subversive, un-American, and inimical to the principles laid down in the Constitution of the United States. In conclusion, may I say that the FAECT is an American organization dedicated to advancing and protecting our democratic institutions, to defending our Nation against attack from within and without, and to the creation of such conditions as will make it possible for us to continue our contributions to society and the people. We believe that our efforts to improve professional standards of technicians and our alliance with the labor movement, is our most effective contribution to this end.

The FAECT is opposed to, and will not sanction, control of our organization by any group of a political nature or otherwise, nor will we accept so-called domination by the Communist or any other party. At the same time we shall not be intimidated nor diverted from our noble purposes by unscrupulous attacks, demagogic statements, nor by so-called champions of Americanism, who, at the taxpayers' expense, commit those violations of Americanism which they were originally appointed to ferret out. I feel that this statement of facts should be known in all fairness to the patriotic and loyal group of men and women in our organization who have been so unjustly and maliciously slandered.

Respectfully yours,

LEWIS ALAN BERNE,
International President.

Harry J. Roy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, Harry J. Roy, son of Mr. and Mrs. Maurice Roy, of Mansura, Avoyelles Parish, La., lost his life in the crash of a torpedo bomber on Wednesday, April 16, 1941, at San Diego, Calif. This young man was 24 years of age. He enlisted in the Navy 3 years ago. At the time of his death he was attached to the aircraft carrier *Enterprise*. The parents of this young man are splendid citizens. His father is a hard-working farmer.

Harry J. Roy was well and favorably known in Avoyelles Parish and was a fine, upstanding, and loyal son. His high patriotism was evidenced by his service to his country in which he made the supreme sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, I extend to the father and mother and the two brothers and the sister of the deceased my sincere sympathy. While his family and friends will miss this fine son, they have the consolation that he gave his life in helping his Nation in this great emergency. He set an example of devotion to duty. Yes, we will miss his presence, but the heroism, loyalty, and devotion to duty which he exemplified will linger long in the minds of his family, friends, and all who knew him. All honor to his memory.

St. Lawrence Seaway, the Florida Ship Canal, and Certain Other Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM MIAMI (FLA.) HERALD

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point copy of an editorial from the Miami Herald of April 14, 1941, in reference to the St. Lawrence seaway, the Florida ship canal and certain other projects, entitled "Political Juggling."

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald of April 14, 1941]

POLITICAL JUGGLING

That Senatorial move to merge the St. Lawrence seaway with the Florida ship canal and certain western development projects in a $1,000,000,000 omnibus bill is an example of political juggling which should be emphatically condemned.

It is an admission by the proponents that some of the projects lack merit on their own account and could not be passed except as they are linked with others.

Each gigantic project of this type should be considered and acted upon separately. There can be no sound argument against that, and none would be presented. The suggestion must come from politicians who are sinking very low in their regard for public rights and the Treasury.

In view of the present emergency and huge debts, not a single measure should be passed unless it is absolutely essential. The Florida ship canal is a raid on the Treasury to benefit certain land owners in northern Florida. There is no other excuse or reason, and none with logic has been offered. It would threaten the welfare and production of southern Florida and it would serve no purpose. Yet, our Senators, supposed to represent the interests of the people, would dump this thing into the pot with other projects in the hope that the whole mess would be approved.

Democracy cannot be served nor can it survive if our Congressmen continue to operate on such a rotten basis.

Let Us Face the Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times for today:

[From the New York Times of April 30, 1941]

LET US FACE THE TRUTH

I

In New York Harbor, on an island close to the steamship lanes, stands the most famous statue in the world. It is not the most beautiful statue, but to many millions of passengers coming up the bay it has seemed to be. It stands for one of the dearest dreams in human history—liberty.

The millions who pursued that dream began to come before there was a statue to greet them. They came first when the shores were lined with solemn woods. They came in sailing ships when the voyage required 2 months or more. They came in crowded steamship steerage under hardships not much less. They came to Plymouth Rock and to Ellis Island.

They came for one reason, escape: escape from religious or political persecution, from caste systems, from overcrowding and from lack of opportunity. But the hope of leaving all of the Old World behind could not be realized. Their hearts and heads forbade it. Their roots in its culture ran too deep. And the sea itself grew ever narrower. Express

steamers began to cross it long ago in less than a week. Airplanes can span it now in less than a day. The wireless leaps it in less than a second. Emotion, ideas, even physical force can now move around the world more effectively than they could cross the tiniest country a century and a half ago.

There is no isolation. There are only lines of defense. Distance is vanishing. Strategy is everything. And strategy in this year of grace has become the art and science of survival; survival in the personal sense, survival of ideas, survival of culture and tradition, survival of a way of life.

II

Those who tell us now that the sea is still our certain bulwark, and that the tremendous forces sweeping the Old World threaten no danger to the New, give the lie to their own words in the precautions they would have us take.

To a man they favor an enormous strengthening of our defenses. Why? Against what danger would they have us arm if none exists? To what purpose would they have us spend these almost incredible billions upon billions for ships and planes, for tanks and guns, if there is no immediate threat to the security of the United States? Why are we training the youth of the country to bear arms? Under pressure of what fear are we racing against time to double and quadruple our industrial production?

No man in his senses will say that we are arming against Canada or our Latin-American neighbors to the south, against Britain or the captive states of Europe. We are arming solely for one reason. We are arming against Hitler's Germany—a great predatory power in alliance with Japan.

It has been said, times without number, that if Hitler cannot cross the English Channel he cannot cross 3,000 miles of sea. But there is only one reason why he has not crossed the English Channel. That is because 45,000,000 determined Britons in a heroic resistance have converted their island into an armed base from which proceeds a steady stream of sea and air power. As Secretary Hull has said, "It is not the water that bars the way. It is the resolute determination of British arms. Were the control of the seas by Britain lost, the Atlantic would no longer be an obstacle—rather, it would become a broad highway for a conqueror moving westward."

That conqueror does not need to attempt at once an invasion of continental United States in order to place this country in deadly danger. We shall be in deadly danger the moment British sea power fails; the moment the eastern gates of the Atlantic are open to the aggressor; the moment we are compelled to divide our one-ocean Navy between two oceans simultaneously.

The combined Axis fleets outmatch our own; they are superior in numbers to our fleet in every category of vessel, from warships and aircraft carriers to destroyers and submarines. The combined Axis air strength will be much greater than our own if Hitler strikes in time—and when has he failed to strike in time? The master of Europe will have at his command shipways that can outbuild us, the resources of 20 conquered nations to furnish his materials, the oil of the middle east to stoke his engines, the slave labor of a Continent—bound by no union rules, and not working on a 40-hour week—to turn out his production.

Grant Hitler the gigantic prestige of a victory over Britain, and who can doubt that the first result, on our side of the ocean, would be the prompt appearance of imitation Nazi regimes in a half dozen Latin-American nations, forced to be on the winning side, begging favors, clamoring for admission to the Axis? What shall we do then? Make war upon these neighbors; send armies to fight in the jungles of Central or South America; run the risk of outraging native sentiment and turning the whole continent against us? Or shall we sit tight while the area of Nazi influence draws ever closer to the Panama Canal and a spreading checkerboard of Nazi air fields provides ports of call for German planes that may choose to bomb our cities?

III

But even if Hitler gave us time, what kind of time would we have at our disposal?

There are moral and spiritual dangers for this country as well as physical dangers in a Hitler victory. There are dangers to the mind and heart as well as to the body and the land.

Victorious in Europe, dominating Africa and Asia through his Axis partners, Hitler could not afford to permit the United States to live an untroubled and successful life, even if he wished to. We are the arch enemy of all he stands for; the very citadel of that "plutodemocracy" which he hates and scorns. As long as liberty and freedom prevailed in the United States there would be a constant risk for Hitler that our ideas and our example might infect the conquered countries which he was bending to his will. In his own interest he would be forced to harry us at every turn.

Who can doubt that our lives would be poisoned every day by challenges and insults from Nazi politicians; that Nazi agents would stir up anti-American feeling in every country they controlled; that Nazi spies would overrun us here; that Hitler would produce a continual series of lightning diplomatic strokes—alliances and nonaggression pacts to break our will; in short, that a continuous war of nerves, if nothing worse, would be waged against us?

And who can doubt that, in response, we should have to turn our own nation into an armed camp, with all our traditional values of culture, education, social reform, democracy and liberty subordinated to the single, all-embracing aim of self-preservation? In this case we should indeed experience regimentation. Every item of foreign trade, every transaction in domestic commerce, every present prerogative of labor, every civil liberty we cherish, would necessarily be regulated in the interest of defense.

But the most tragic aspect of this attempt to survive, alone on our continent, is that it would amount at best merely to sustaining life in a charnelhouse. With Britain gone, with the bright lamp of English liberty extinguished, with all hope of resurrection denied to the little democracies that have contributed so generously to our civilization and our culture, with the hobnailed boots of an ignorant and obscene barbarism echoing in every capital from London to Athens, we should live in a new world, changed beyond all recognition.

In this downfall of democracy outside the United States there would come, for many of our own people, a loss of faith in our own democratic system. Our confidence would be undermined, our vision dimmed, our ranks divided. In a dark, uncertain world we should stand alone, deriving from no other country the sustaining strength of a common faith in our democratic institutions.

What would it profit us to achieve, at last, this perfect isolation?

IV

The Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor has looked down across the bay at many men who have crossed the ocean to find freedom. It stands now as a silent witness to the fact that we are already locked in mortal combat with the German system.

American courage and American idealism, together with the sound common sense of the American people, summon us to the defense both of our physical security and of those moral and spiritual values which alone make life worth living. This defense means many things. It means, in the first instance, a clear recognition that the most dangerous of all courses we could follow in this hour of decision is a policy of drift; of do-nothing while there is still time to act effectively; of letting hesitancy ripen into disagreement, and disagreement curdle into factions which will split the country.

It means strong leadership in Washington; a willingness to forego the methods of indirection and surprise and veiled hints and innuendo, and to state the plain facts of the situation boldly. It means leadership which is as generous as it is strong; leadership which is willing to forget old quarrels, ready to bring into positions of high power and into the innermost confidence of the Government the accredited spokesmen of the opposition party; leadership which is at last prepared to delegate all necessary authority to the engineers of American production.

It means a genuinely firm insistence that strikes or lockouts in defense industries will no longer be tolerated by public opinion. It means more immediate aid to the brave people who are now fighting in the front line of our defense. It means encouragement to American aviators who are ready to fly our own planes in the battle over Britain. It means a determination to see that our vital supplies reach England, under the protection of our own guns. Above all else, it means a decision to avoid the same mistake that the democracies have made over and over again—the mistake of too little and too late.

There is no escape in isolation. We have only two alternatives. We can surrender or we can do our part in holding the line. We can defend, with all the means in our power, the rights that are morally and legally ours. If we decide for the American tradition, for the preservation of all that we hold dear in the years that lie ahead, we shall take our place in the line and play our part in the defense of freedom.

Deportation of Harry Bridges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SANTA MONICA EVENING OUTLOOK

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Santa Monica Evening Outlook of April 4, 1941:

[From the Santa Monica Evening Outlook of April 4, 1941]

THE TRICKING OF DEAN LANDIS

The revelation by Director Hoover of the F. B. I. that the whole Landis hearing of the charges against Harry Bridges was farcical because Mr. Landis was not given the power to take testimony under oath casts the most serious reflection on Secretary of Labor Perkins and her management of the Labor Department.

It is not new to learn that Madam Perkins is biased and partial or incompetent in the administration of the laws, but it does come as a surprise that a man of the high standing of Dean Landis should have been used deliberately as a decoy to protect Mr. Bridges against prosecution and deportation.

The manner in which Mr. Landis and the public were tricked, according to Director Hoover, was that Landis was appointed as a contract labor examiner and not as an immigration inspector. In the Immigration Service inspectors have power to administer oaths and to compel witnesses to give testimony under oath. Contract labor examiners have no such power. Mr. Landis did not know that he had been tricked and oaths were administered in the hearings he held, but as he had not the necessary authority to administer oaths, they were invalid. Witnesses could testify falsely and not be guilty of perjury.

It is obvious that somebody in the Labor Department was interested in making the Landis proceeding a farce. If it was not Madam Perkins, it was subordinates she trusted. In either event, she was responsible for making Mr. Landis ridiculous, for a large useless outlay of public money, and for protecting Harry Bridges against deportation.

A more convincing demonstration of Madam Perkins' incompetency or duplicity could hardly be asked. Her sympathy for the Communists is no longer doubtful. If she is not a Communist herself, she has lieutenants who at least are "fellow travelers"; otherwise the trick played on Dean Landis and the public would not have been possible.

And President Roosevelt continues this woman in her place of high responsibility.

The Lend-Lease Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. KELLY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1941

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks regarding the passage of the lease-lend bill, being confined in the Naval Hospital during the discussion of this bill and receiving an abundance of mail for and against it, I deem it my duty to express my attitude in supporting my vote in its favor.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to quote an article that appeared in the Evening Star in Washington on January 20, 1941, by Joseph E. Davies, in which he said:

This year is probably one of the most fateful which our civilization has experienced. It is heartening, therefore, to find that in our country there is a national unity and singleness of purpose in which bespeaks the strength and morale power of our people and the vitality of America's love for freedom and liberty.

Despite the fact that the world is on fire, we have conducted and just finished a national election under the established and normal democratic processes of representative democracy. The culmination of this process is this inaugural, wherein a very great man is being inducted into office as President of our country.

That election was strongly, if not bitterly, contested. Yet upon one issue there was substantially no difference between the position of either candidates or the platforms of the two great political parties. Upon that issue, namely, the question of what constitutes the duty of America in this great war which is engulfing the world, there was practically intellectual unanimity and spiritual unity among the 130,000,000 of our citizens. It is deeply significant that this inauguration symbolizes that unity.

There can be no question but what the entire country is united on both the desirability and the necessity for complete national defense in a war-mad world. Moreover, there can be no doubt but what American men and women of all parties have been a unit in the feeling of a deep moral revulsion and horror against the wrong that has been done to the weak by the strong, as well as deep condemnation for the cruel injustice and tyranny which has been thrust upon weaker nations by aggressors who seek to impose their will upon the world.

In the great abundance of mail received in my office, by people sincere in their belief that the passage of H. R. 1776 would be a declaration of war, I do not question the sincerity of most of these people, but I do question their wisdom.

With the march of world events and with wars about us it has become more clear each day that this is the supreme and vital concern of our national life.

Today we have witnessed a vast campaign of misrepresentation of what this bill when passed by both bodies will do. Some maintain it will place us right into war. Some of this misrepresentation is based upon ignorance of not knowing the facts. Some is malicious and deliberate.

Many say that this will cloak the President with so much power that he practically will become a dictator. Some say it will deprive the Congress of its control over the public purse. That is not so.

The President as Commander in Chief of our armed forces has always had the power vested in him by the Constitution itself to preserve and defend the rights of its people, with Congress always maintaining the right to declare war.

It is charged by those who are vicious in their remarks, that the President will be a dictator and that Congress has completely abdicated its power and responsibility. That also is not true. On the contrary, Congress would be freely and intelligently manifesting its control over the purse.

Under the Constitution of the United States, only Congress can declare war. Neither this bill or any other bill can withdraw from Congress this sovereign power.

By direction of the Constitution of the United States the conduct of our foreign affairs is entrusted to the President, and we cannot deprive him of that responsibility.

What this bill actually does is imply a certain amount of confidence in the judgment and patriotism of the President, and at the recent election for this high office did not the people themselves declare that faith in the President?

Many people are naturally confused by statements they read, by radio addresses, and by agents of paid propagandists.

Back of the widespread American desire to help England today is a belief that such aid is more likely to keep war from the United States shores in the long run than it is to draw America in.

Probably the whole phenomenon of the American people's desire to help England win cannot be completely understood without taking this fact into consideration. Ever since the first shots were fired in Europe 19 months ago this question has underlain a great part of the debate in this country on lifting the arms embargo, exchanging destroyers for naval bases, and increasing the scale of United States help through the lend-lease plan.

In the survey of voters in all parts of the United States they were offered two opposite statements as to the probable results of American aid and were asked to choose between them. The statements were designed to reflect the arguments of the pro-aid and anti-aid groups, respectively.

Based upon the Gallup poll of February 2, 1941, 70 percent of those interviewed were of the opinion—

That sending war materials to England is helping to keep us out of war, stating in their belief that if Britain can keep Germany in check there is less chance that we will have to fight the Germans later on.

Twenty-three percent believed that sending war materials to England is bringing us closer to getting into war.

Seven percent were noncommittal. Upon the decision passed by Congress of this important question, only the future and constant changing of history can and will determine which course is the right one.

I know that the President is determined in keeping us out of war. I know that every Member of Congress is determined to keep us out of war.

I recall back in September of 1939, when Congress reconvened in a special session, to lift the arms embargo provision of the Neutrality Act, for the purpose of keeping us out of war. When in its regular session defeated this very purpose, by a group of men sincere in their belief that by not lifting the arms embargo it would keep us out of a war that was then imminent. But in the special session those who originally opposed this change, finally saw the light and changed their attitude and voted for the lifting of the arms embargo provision of the Neutrality Act. I recall very vividly the terrific confusion of the minds of people on that question—yes, the same isolationists spurred on by propaganda, many sincere and many influenced by agents of "fifth-columnist" activity, then expressed their opinions that to lift the arms embargo would be a step to war.

I remember very well a radio appeal to the mothers of America, by the Reverend Father Coughlin, demanding that they march on to the homes of their Representatives and demand that they and their families march with them in a peacetime demonstration in opposition to lifting the arms embargo, stating that by doing so would put us into the war all the way by Thursday next, which was the day Congress was to convene. He further stated that he, as a man of God, knew we were then three-quarters into the war, and that if the mothers of America did not take drastic action that we would be all the way into it by the end of the week; that was in the month of September 1939, and much to the false statement then of Father Coughlin, this

is 1941 and this Nation has managed to keep out of this terrible war, and with the help of God we will, unless of course we are attacked—then it is the duty of every American person to defend this Nation.

The Republican Party in many sections has practically excommunicated Wendell Willkie for the statements he has made, saying the President is right by asking the passage of the lend-lease bill. To my way of thinking Willkie has shown himself to the American people as a real American, placing the security of his country far ahead of political ambitions.

In these troublesome days it is not a question of politics—what one political party believes is the best course to follow. Only by unity of thought and action based upon the cooperation of all the people can America remain at peace.

Economy at the Expense of Agriculture

REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS RIZLEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure every Member of the House fully realizes the present plight of agriculture in this country and has, as he should have, at least a desire to alleviate the condition of the American farmer. Yet, while strikes continue to harass and threaten the entire defense program, and while we are guaranteeing cost-plus to labor and industry, I notice, from the press reports and otherwise, that Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau, in his endeavor to now start a much-belated program of economy, says that we must strike first at the American farmer, to make effective the so-called economy, by taking from him one-half of the billion dollars that he says must be taken from the Budget and to which he refers as nondefense items.

It is hardly conceivable to anyone who remembers anything about World War No. 1, that agriculture products should be classified by the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, as nondefense items. It will be recalled by all who had any part in agricultural affairs during the conflict of 1917 and 1918, that within a few days after President Wilson's memorable address and message to the Congress, and the resultant declaration of war, there came the slogan, "Food will win the war!"

This was heard everywhere, and the whole country was placarded with huge billboards and other means of advertisement, heralding to the world that food and fiber was our first line of defense; and it is interesting to remember that then—as well as now—the allies, business, labor, and the consumer, wanted a low price fixed for agricultural commodities.

Today, as then, business and labor want increased prices for their goods and services—witness the strikes for higher wages, and the fast-rising cost of the things which business and industry have to sell—and yet, the farmer who must pay these increased prices for what he buys, and for the labor that he must employ, is told that he must not ask for parity, or near-parity, and that that part of the Budget which affects him is nondefense.

I say, Mr. Speaker, it is unwarranted and unfair, particularly in view of the ridiculously low prices the farmer is receiving for his products, when compared with labor and industry.

Today neither the press, the public, or anyone else seems to be concerned about the farmer's place in the national-defense program. We are building battleships, tanks, airplanes, bombers, and all other instruments of modern warfare to the tune of billions. In fact, the Congress has already authorized and appropriated thirty-two billions plus—five billions more than it cost us to fight the last World War, so far as dollars are concerned—for our defense program. Yet, as I say, no one semes to be concerned about the place the farmer is to have in that program.

I am afraid it is due to the fact that because of the huge so-called surpluses of wheat, cotton, and other farm commodities, everyone thinks America has an abundance of foodstuffs to feed the world indefinitely. But we must not forget that starvation has always been considered the most effective weapon used in war; and right now, as has always been the case in every war in the past, it is again being used. Literally hundreds of millions of people are suffering gnawing pangs of hunger and want.

We must remember that the condition of the American farmer is much different now than it was in 1917 and 1918, and I am afraid too many of us do not realize just what may be ahead. Were it not for the blockade against farm products, the hungry and naked millions of Europe and Asia would soon use up every surplus pound of food and fiber in this country. The blockade may continue, millions may starve to death; but sooner or later the cry of humanity will break the military blockades and public opinion will not allow the conquered nations of Europe to starve.

Yes; we are hearing a great deal about munitions, battleships, and airplanes, and I yield to no one in an earnest desire for a two-ocean navy and for the strengthening of our defense program where no aggressor nation or group of aggressor nations will dare to attack us, and am in full sympathy and accord with a program that will make the defense of this country impregnable.

But, after all, there will be no mass production unless there is plenty to eat. An army always "marches on its stomach," and our soldiers are fed even though citizens are in want.

I predict that if agriculture is not reckoned with in this huge defense program, more quickly than many of us now realize there will be concern about the farm problem, and there will be a rude awakening for those who think agriculture is not important in this program.

While today we seemingly have an abundance, yet how quickly this condition may change. One bad crop could absorb all of our so-called surpluses.

The world will never forget how the American farmer came to its rescue during the closing years of the last World War. Food was the crying demand, and the farmer produced it. With less help and equipment, he increased his production and answered every call of a hungry world. He did not strike and refuse to plant or harvest. He did not hoard his products and say, you must pay me unreasonable prices or I refuse to sell. He answered the appeal of patriotism, and he will do so again; but he is entitled to fair treatment.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is an old but nevertheless true saying that agriculture is the basis of all wealth and prosperity; and the farmer, like the bread he produces, is the staff of our national life. The place of agriculture in the social, economic, and political structure is so fundamental that from a standpoint of self-interest alone every class of citizen in the Nation should lend its active cooperation in effecting the rehabilitation of the industry; for no nation can be economically safe when an industry of such influence as agriculture is in an unhealthy state.

I hope this Congress, in its desire to strike from the Budget items which are not strictly defense items—and, goodness knows, there are millions of dollars which rightfully come under this classification, that could and should be stricken—will have the stamina and courage to stand foursquare for the American farmer.

Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

EDITORIAL OF J. S. GRAY, EDITOR OF MONROE (MICH.) EVENING NEWS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the matter of convoying lend-lease-give material to the Allies is a live question with the American people today. Mr. J. S. Gray, editor of the Monroe (Mich.) Evening News, along with Walter Lippmann and Wendell Willkie, has been an ardent supporter of the President's foreign policy during the present conflict in Europe. Mr. Gray is one of the leading editorial writers in Michigan, and while I have not at all times agreed with his philosophy in connection with the present World War, his editorials are always well worth reading. Therefore, pursuant to the permission granted to me, I include his editorial of April 28, 1941, which is as follows:

[From the Monroe (Mich.) Evening News of April 28, 1941]

LEADERSHIP

It seems incredible as well as unfortunate that Americans should have to listen in to a

broadcast from London to come to a full understanding of the policy to which their President has committed them. Yet it is very doubtful if very many of the millions of Americans who heard Winston Churchill over the air Sunday had had any such conception of American naval policy as he enunciated as a result of reading President Roosevel's cryptic definition of patrols and convoys last week.

Mr. Churchill said plainly and fearlessly that the new move by the President of the United States would enable the British Fleet to concern itself with protection of the Atlantic lifeline only in the eastern half of the ocean.

Mr. Roosevelt used circumlocution and every other rhetorical device to avoid telling the people the plain truth about the use of patrols to protect British shipping half way across the Atlantic.

Obviously the White House, which just recently chided the country for not taking the crisis abroad seriously enough, is not being as frank and plain spoken with a people not at war as Downing street is with a people whose backs are to the wall.

Walter Lippmann and Wendell Willkie, men who have stood behind the President squarely on his foreign policy, have now become outspokenly critical of his failure to assume the responsibility of leadership and tell the people frankly and plainly what it is necessary to do in order to maintain that policy. Their words are freighted with significance.

In refreshing contrast, Mr. Churchill told the people of the British Empire Sunday exactly what dangers confronted them, and from what direction they came. He minced no words in admitting defeats, and ventured no optimism in predicting victories. Such leadership inspires a democratic people by its very frankness, and instills confidence by its very candor.

Rome and Berlin recognized the significance of the President's definition of convoys and patrols; Winston Churchill understood what he meant perfectly. The American people, however, were seduced into thinking that our newest venture on the high seas is only an extension of Coast Guard activity beyond our shores.

It is time that the White House assumed the leadership without which the Nation cannot fulfill the serious obligations to which it has willingly committed itself. It is time that the President spoke frankly. It is time to abandon play on words and subterfuge when a change in policy or an extension of aid to Britain is undertaken. The people are ready to follow whatever course the Nation's leaders believe must be taken to protect our interests and defend democracy. But they must know what that course is and be prepared step by step as it is plotted. This is no time for subterfuge.

It is with the method by which the President chooses to extend our foreign policy, rather than with the policy itself, that we disagree. From the very beginning of this war the Evening News has stated its belief that the United States should boldly adopt every measure necessary or desirable in connection with its own self-interest. We believe that the protection of our shipping to Great Britain has become essential to our policy, and perhaps should have been undertaken long since.

We do believe that every one of these measures ought to be taken with the full understanding of the people under the clear leadership of the President. Such forthrightness is mandatory if we are to be a fully united people, and necessary if we are to effectuate these policies without a gradual involvement in the war lacking the essential mental preparation.

Free Postage for Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BROOKLYN EAGLE

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle on April 28, 1941, dealing with free postage for soldiers, which I have previously advocated:

[From the Brooklyn Eagle of April 28, 1941]

FREE POSTAGE FOR SOLDIERS

The average man is no great shakes as a letter writer. Most parents can testify that absent sons don't write as often as they might and many a wife knows that she has to keep nagging at her husband to get him to write the letters he should.

Which is just another reason why the Government might well consider the proposal which Congressman JAMES J. HEFFERNAN, of Brooklyn, says he will press to provide men in the armed services with the franking privilege. On a pay of $21 a month, the matter of 3 cents postage for each letter becomes something to consider. A soldier or sailor who knows that he need only drop his envelope into the mail box is just that much more likely to write to the people at home. Anything the Government can do to encourage his writing letters is worth considering, if only for its effect on his morale and that of those he left behind.

Mayor Assails Grumbling in Defense Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTON F. MACIEJEWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

ARTICLE BY MAYOR EDWARD KELLY, OF CHICAGO

Mr. MACIEJEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mayor Edward Kelly, of Chicago, appearing in the Chicago Daily Times of Friday, April 25, 1941:

[From the Chicago Daily Times of April 25, 1941]

MAYOR ASSAILS GRUMBLING IN DEFENSE CRISIS

Mayor Edward J. Kelly, believing that the present crisis in Europe and its serious future consequences calls for a greater emphasis on the dangers that the American people face, today issued the following statement:

"A few days ago I discussed at length some of the problems of our national defense with a high-ranking British official who was a flying ace in the last war and is now actively engaged in purchasing equipment for England. He stated that he was in Paris 24 hours before it fell. The night clubs and amusement places were filled with hilarious crowds oblivious of the fate that awaited them. They had the Maginot-line complex that had lulled them into a false safety.

"Only after they were vanquished did they moan sadly: 'Why did they feed us such lies about our impregnable defense?'

"This same official also happened to be in Prague and Warsaw where the same conditions of gaiety and wishful thinking prevailed. He said that when Czechoslovakia and Poland fell so swiftly the people were liquidated into slavery and starvation overnight.

"'IT CAN'T HAPPEN HERE'

"There is an attitude among certain people in our Nation that the conflict in Europe is no concern of ours, and the only conclusion they draw from this holocaust of humanity abroad is that 'It can't happen here.' The bombings of European cities are far from us. We may not feel the impact directly of annihilation and destruction nor sense fully the tragedies that have been strewn in the wake of all this ruthless mechanized murder. But the fate of Europe can be the fate of America.

"If our Nation is forced to acquiesce in every economic policy that the dictators might see fit to impose on us once they control Europe and Asia, we will face an encirclement no different from other nations that went under. If we must match their slave labor with our skilled and higher-paid craftsmen, our markets and our standard of living will hit the toboggan.

"The alternatives to totalitarian tyranny are few: Resist or submit; defend what we have with all we have or starve with what they give when they want to give it.

"VICTIMS OF COMPLACENCY

"The propaganda of the peace lovers might desire to placate the dictators, but famine plays no favorites, and slavery has no royalty. The starving Frenchman today has no different destiny than the starving Pole. The poverty of one subdued nation is the same as any other.

"Peace-loving peoples may turn away from the storm clouds and try to keep facing the sun—but behind their backs with tanks and dive bombers is the onrush of forces that would crush everything we hold dear.

"Patriotism and prayers are not enough. Unless this country is strong enough in a military and economic way to stand its own ground and defy any power or combination of powers that despise our way of life, then we, too, can be the victims of complacency and delay that defeated other democracies.

"It is not hysteria to point out the dangers in front of us. It is not warmongering to plead for more unity and more action in developing our sinews of defense. The ranks of industry and labor must move shoulder to shoulder in this great defense effort. All our citizens must spend every waking hour in buttressing the national morale with something more than lip-service loyalty.

"STAKE IN DEMOCRACY

"Every citizen has a vital stake in this enterprise of safeguarding our democracy. Every American, regardless of class, creed, color, or party affiliations, should be a part of a solid unbroken line of support to the manufacturers of defense implements and supplies for England and the other democracies. Our Nation and our neighbors to the

north and south have no happy hide-out from the revolution that engulfs Europe and Asia and no permanent immunity from the economic muscle that spawns nothing but full concentration camps and empty churches and schools.

"If any Americans are worrying about the cost of safeguarding our democracy or the amount of profit to themselves, let them remember the wealthy and the royalty of other nations now enslaved. If they are thinking that the price of sustaining our way of life is pinching their pocketbooks, let them look into a future where markets are a myth and money is a memory from a past civilization.

"It's a question of confidence and courage the American way or starvation and moral degradation the totalitarian way.

"CHIDES 'GRUMBLING'

"Some of our people today are grumbling. Things are in 'tough shape'—but there will be a call for far greater sacrifices and far greater personal cooperation with our neighbors and with our Government if we would save for ourselves and for our children the liberty and equality and human justice that we value so much.

"A calm and unprejudiced comparison of our own conditions at their worst gives conclusive proof that we are far, far better off than is the richest man in Europe today. Looking into the gaunt and despairing faces we see pictured of the men, women, and children abroad—the homeless refugees denied their country and their God—should make us stop to realize how great are the blessings of this still thriving and still free democracy.

"The hand and heart of government here still thinks in terms of relieving unemployment—preventing starvation and disease, curing slum areas, creating better homes and better schools, advancing the spiritual as well as the economic opportunities of our people.

"Any sacrifice—any tax upon our pocketbooks, our patience, no matter how great it may seem to us now—is a cheap price to pay for the preservation of our system of government and our way of life."

We Are All Americans Together

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK NICHOLS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, our national-defense program, I believe, is getting along fairly well. I believe that our people are thoroughly aroused to the threat of danger to their liberty and are ready to do their part to so fortify our Nation that none will dare attack us.

In making these statements I discount the wild stories of carping critics and the apostles of despair. I believe we have a great leader in President Roosevelt. I believe we have great and capable men at the head of our Army and our Navy. I believe we have great designers and builders of airplanes, tanks, battleships, and all the other equipment needed in present-day warfare. And I believe we have a great people.

NOT TIME FOR WILD TALK

I do not think anybody is going to whip the good old United States of America. We are going to come out of this crisis all right. Of course, we may feel a little pain in the region of our pocketbook. And we may have to knock a few heads together to stop strikes and other such obstructions to the national will. But when the dust clears away I think that old Uncle Samuel will still be the toughest customer on the horizon.

I have not had much to say since we started our continuous session on national defense last year. You know I was a buck private in the World War and learned to do what I was told without doing very much talking. I do not think that this is the time for wild talk, and for one American to be challenging the patriotism of other Americans. I have tried to restrain some of my more impetuous colleagues—without much success, I must add.

I do not like to hear some of the speeches that are made on this floor. Some Members get up and attack unions, all unions, it seems to me, and fan the flames of trouble. Other Members get up and attack business management, and declare that the leaders of our industry and our geniuses of machinery are not doing their full duty. Some get up and declare the farmers are trying to profiteer on the rest of the people. Some say the President is sly and conniving and not to be trusted to carry out our foreign policy.

SELECTIVE SERVICE REVISION NEEDED

I have voted for most of the measures necessary for our defense program. I voted against loaning a half billion dollars to South American countries to further the good-neighbor policy since I do not think you can buy good will.

But I think that the time has come to plan a general revision of the heart of our defense program, the selective-service plan. I think that we ought to start changing this from an emergency program to a long-term program. We ought to plan on the induction of about a half-million youngsters into the Army each year for intensive training, and take these when they reach a certain age. I favor the age of 20 years to start their service. Then when they complete their year's service to the Army and the Nation they will arrive at the age to cast their first vote, and I am sure will be better citizens than they would be without this service.

But I believe now, as I believed when we had the Selective Service Act up for consideration last year, that the youngsters who are asked to give this year's service to the Nation are entitled to the aid and assistance of the Nation in building up their health. I think that the young man who is going into the Army at 20 should be first called out at 18 and given a thorough medical examination. If he needs dental treatment or minor operative care, this should be done at Government expense. It will help him both in civil life and in military life. He should again be called at 19 and examined and perhaps given additional medical treatment in order that he may be fit for service when he arrives at the age of 20.

In this manner the excessively high proportion of youngsters turned down as being unfit for duty will be drastically reduced. We will salvage at least half of them. And, given this expert treatment which will make them feel better every day of their lives, the young men will be grateful to their country and will be more ready to serve when called.

EVERYBODY HAS HIS PART

I favored a program of this kind when the Selective Service Act was brought up last year, but because of the urgency of the emergency I could see that it might be necessary to call out men up to the age of 35, temporarily. As soon as our Army leaders think we can, however, we should limit the selection of our youngsters in the manner I have outlined above, and also offer them this health program.

The American people are ready to pay taxes to support the defense program. The people, I believe, trust the leaders of our Nation to direct our efforts in the right channels. They know that we do not want to impose our wills upon any other people, but only to insure our own liberties and our right to work out our own destiny in our own way.

Congress is going to stay on the job until this crisis is over. Congress ought to stay on the job. My people back home don't expect to see me until the job is finished. I know that they are busy doing their jobs, too. I know that they are producing the things the Nation needs to the fullest of their ability. I know that those selected for service in the armed forces are going with good grace and with the blessing and support of the folks they leave behind them.

Let us, as good Americans, try and work out our differences without calling each other names. We are all in this thing together. Everybody cannot be the captain, but everyone should be expected to pull his weight.

Why Farmers Oppose Daylight Saving Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF FRED BRENCKMAN, WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Fred Brenckman, Washington representative, the National Grange, over stations of the National Broadcasting Co., on the Grange Hour, from Washington, D. C., April 19, 1941:

Two bills have recently been introduced in Congress for the purpose of establishing

so-called daylight-saving time on a Nation-wide scale for approximately half the year as a permanent arrangement. One of these bills, H. R. 3789, was introduced by Congressman DONALD H. MCLEAN, of Elizabeth, N. J. The McLean bill would extend the daylight-saving period from the last Sunday of March to the last Sunday of October, a period of 7 months. Under the terms of the other bill, H. R. 4206, introduced by Congressman EUGENE J. KEOGH, of Brooklyn, N. Y., daylight-saving time would be observed from the last Sunday of April until the last Sunday of October each year, a period of 6 months.

The closer we come to active participation in the war as a belligerent, and we are coming closer every day, the more likely it is that a drive will be made for the enactment of daylight-saving legislation.

UNPOPULAR DURING WORLD WAR

It will be recalled that under the terms of a statute approved by President Wilson during the World War, the United States observed daylight-saving time during 1918 and 1919. After 2 years of experience with this innovation, Congress was deluged with protests against the continuance of daylight-saving time and many bills were introduced to repeal it. One of these bills was passed and was vetoed by President Wilson. On August 20, 1919, the bill was passed over his veto. The vote in the House was 223 to 101, while in the Senate it was 57 to 19.

After this emphatic expression of disapproval, it was generally taken for granted that no further efforts would be made for the reestablishment of daylight-saving time. So far as the farmers of the country were concerned, they were glad that this nuisance had been disposed of.

However, various large cities of the eastern section of the country proceeded to observe daylight-saving time on a local scale. In numerous instances, this forced nearby cities and towns to adopt the same standard of time under penalty of suffering many inconveniences and hardships. In my home State of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia was the first to consider the advisability of enacting an ordinance for daylight-saving time, but the city solicitor advised the council that it had no legal authority to enact such an ordinance, referring to the fact that a State law dating back to 1887 prescribed that the legal time of Pennsylvania should be in accord with the time fixed by Congress.

In an effort to overcome the difficulty, a bill was introduced in the legislature at Harrisburg, providing for daylight saving time during the summer months. After hearings and full debate, this bill was defeated in the house by a vote of approximately 5 to 1, showing conclusively that the sentiment of the State was predominantly in favor of the observance of standard time.

But while the legislature was still in session, the City Council of Pittsburgh passed what it was pleased to term a "recommendatory ordinance," suggesting that the clocks be turned ahead an hour on a given day, with the understanding that "fast time" should be observed during the summer months. Since this arrangement was contrary to the wishes of many of the workingmen of Pittsburgh and their families, an application for an injunction was made to restrain the city council from putting "outlaw" time into effect within the limits of the municipality.

The judge before whom these proceedings were brought betrayed a partisan attitude. In substance he said, "There is only one kind of legal time in Pennsylvania, and that is standard time. But there is nothing mandatory about the resolution passed by the city council. It is simply recommendatory, and what are you going to do about it?"

The trouble with the Pennsylvania standard time law was that it contained no penalty for violations. Following the lead of Pittsburgh, Philadelphia passed a "recommendatory ordinance," providing for daylight saving, and most of the cities and towns tributary to Philadelphia were virtually compelled to follow suit. In considering the validity of such "recommendatory ordinances" one may well ask by what right a city council undertakes to recommend a course of action that is contrary to the law of the State, even if the law does not provide any penalty for violations.

Daylight saving time has been a very controversial issue throughout the northeastern section of the country for a score of years, and the question has not been settled to the satisfaction of a large proportion of the population in that territory.

CLAIMS OF ADVOCATES CONSIDERED

The proponents of daylight-saving time assert that it will save fuel in industry by reducing the amount of coal consumed in artificial lighting; that it will improve the health of the people by giving them an extra hour of sunlight; that the number of accidents decrease as people work under natural light instead of electric lights, and that it will make an extra hour available for outdoor sports and other activities.

With most industries operating on a basic week of 40 hours, there does not seem to be much substance to the argument about saving fuel.

So far as accidents are concerned, it is a fact that it is not as well known as it should be that there are more accidents in agriculture than in any other industry. Unless we are to proceed on the assumption that it does not matter if the farmer and the members of his family are crippled or killed while working under artificial light, before daybreak or after dusk, this argument falls flat.

Daylight-saving time is by no means such a great boon to city people as its advocates would have us believe. In most parts of the country, during June, July, and August, we frequently have exceptionally warm weather for weeks at a time, and it is impossible to get refreshing sleep in small city houses until after midnight. Turning the clock ahead an hour does not cool the atmosphere. The result is that city people do not and cannot rest until the air is cooled off, and being obliged to rise an hour earlier, they are deprived of just so much sleep each night at a time when sleep is most needed to renew their strength and safeguard their health.

I know that many housewives are opposed to daylight-saving time. The wives of workingmen must get up an hour earlier in the morning to get breakfast for their husbands and prepare their children for school. When evening comes, it is a difficult matter to persuade the children to go to bed and sleep while it is still daylight.

HOW IT AFFECTS THE FARMER

The reason why farmers object to daylight-saving time is that they must work in harmony with natural law or they work to no purpose at all. Farmers who are engaged in dairying must always rise at an early hour to get their milking done. The dairyman who gets out of bed at 4 o'clock to milk his cows in the morning under standard time must necessarily rise at 3 o'clock under daylight-saving time. As any reasonable person should be willing to agree, that is an unearthly hour to ask anyone to get up.

Before hay or grain can be stowed away in the mow it is necessary to wait until it has been dried by the sun. Most of the summer showers come in the afternoon and evening, frequently making it necessary to wait until the ground has been dried the next morning before doing any cultivating or harrowing.

Farmers who employ hired help encounter many difficulties under daylight-saving time. As I have indicated, during the early morning hours conditions are frequently such that it is impossible to work to any advantage in the fields, and if the hired help wants to quit when the factory whistle in some nearby town blows, say at 4 or 5 o'clock in the afternoon, the predicament in which the farmer is placed may easily be imagined.

Only a small proportion of the people of the United States now live under daylight-saving time. The vast majority of the people, including practically all the farmers, together with many industrial workers and their wives, have no use for it. Under the circumstances, any attempt that may be made in Congress to pass a daylight-saving law will be sure to meet with strong and determined opposition.

A Call for American Manpower to Enter the Bloody Holocaust of War for British Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK SUN

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Sun for April 26, 1941:

[From the New York Sun of April 26, 1941]

EXPECTS UNITED STATES IN WAR—SMUTS CALLS FULL AMERICAN AID NEEDED FOR VICTORY

CAPETOWN, April 26.—Prime Minister Smuts prophesied in a broadcast today that the United States would go all the way in war. He said that only through the United States full participation would a way to British victory be clear.

He said that he was looking forward to this development not only for the sake of victory, but also for peace that will follow. He added that he could not see a real peace without the United States participating.

WEST SOMERSET, ENGLAND, April 26.—Vernon Bartlett, a Member of Parliament, asserted today that he believed the United States would actually be fighting in the war very soon.

During the next few months, he said in a speech, Great Britain will have to do everything possible to avoid a knockout blow, "retreating from the enemy when necessary in order to keep him guessing until American support comes in an overwhelming flood."

War Propaganda and Charles A. Lindbergh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SPRINGFIELD (MASS.) FREE PRESS

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include an editorial from the Springfield Free Press of Massachusetts, under date of April 26, 1941, entitled "Just as Belloc Said."

The quotation from the great English writer, which makes reference to the visit of the British King and Queen to the United States, was an uncanny prophecy, because of the fact it was made as far back as June 10, 1937. In advance of the royal visit, the House will recall a similar statement made by me on May 4, 1939, when I said:

Were the King and Queen to come here with a substantial payment on the war debt there would be a decent purpose in their visit; but, no, they come here as advance agents for Britain's next war.

Hats off to the British money lords and politicians. What a magnificent job of propagandizing us into World War No. 2 they have done to us gullible Yankees. Let it be recalled that the Minister of British propaganda in the last World War, the late Lord Northcliffe, once said of the people of the United States:

They act alike; they dress alike; they think alike; they are like a lot of sheep, easily led.

In the light of present British propaganda, which has brought us to the brink of the European war, we may well appear before the bar of public opinion and plead guilty to Northcliffe's indictment. Who has not witnessed the boldness of British propaganda in this country since the visit of the King and Queen. The present war was scarcely started when every conceivable agency was employed to hasten our entry into the war on the side of Great Britain; the subsidized motion picture, screen, the radio, the newspapers, magazines, the pulpit, and the stage, all utilized daily to create a preposterous but strange philosophy that one has to be pro-British to be a good American. So successful has been this propaganda that we now have an American gestapo; fingerprinting, wire tapping, labor baiting, censorship of the press, and name calling are the latest contributions to our national unity.

BLACK-OUTS

When a great American like Charles A. Lindbergh is called a copperhead by the President of the United States because he dared to exercise his constitutional right of free speech, it would seem we have lost our sense of balance and respect. No one should question the right of the President of the United States or any other individual to express his opinion on the war or any other issue. If the day comes—which God forbid!—when free speech is banished and men's motives are assailed because of their respective views on important public questions, then the end of our democracy is at hand.

The President, like every other individual, is human and no doubt regrets his public reference to Charles A. Lindbergh. It would be a fine thing for the cause of national unity if the President would reinstate Charles A. Lindbergh as colonel in the United States Army Air Corps Reserve and tender to him a public apology.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Free Press of April 26, 1941]

JUST AS BELLOC SAID

Mr. Hilaire Belloc was well known 4 years ago for his American Letters, but he should be even better known on that score today. There is one letter in particular of which Americans now should take stock—the Last Letter from America, printed in G. K. Weekly of June 10, 1937. It is a letter of prophetic insight, a letter which was considered then an extreme of speculation but which now we can sadly recognize as all too true. Here is a part of it:

"It is probable, short of catastrophe, that there will be a State visit paid to the United States by some reigning monarch of England. He (or she) will make a triumphal tour, and the reliance we confidently place in America to come to our support against wicked men will be enormously increased. As it is, English propaganda already does almost what it likes with American opinion, and a royal progress of this kind would make our effect as permanent as such things ever are. * * * And if we have trouble with Ireland, the American press will denounce Ireland."

Both "he and she," the King and Queen of England, did come to the United States. Their tour was triumphal. America flocked to the sidewalks to see them go by. The press maintained a steady din of apotheosis, idolizing the King and Queen as though we were still their subjects and believed in their God-given right to rule.

We swallowed the royal visit for the bait it was intended, just as Belloc had predicted. Faced with the prospect of another major war with Germany, the English Government dispatched their King and Queen as ambassadors to enlist the sympathy of the American public and to create the illusion that we must continue to aid the "motherland" in whatever straits it might subsequently find itself.

The day is fast approaching on which the British expect their royal visit to be repaid in full. This country has already contributed its moral support and its full economic and industrial effort. But the British will not be satisfied with this. When the British take the offensive, if they ever round that corner, they will want our men. They will want the pilots we are now training, the tank operators, the gunners, etc. They will want our ships and the men who sail on them. They will ask America, through the proper American associates in Washington, to reciprocate the royal visit with a delegation of two or three million soldiers.

German propaganda is geared to a totalitarian reading and listening public. We in this country easily recognize the Goebbels' product and reject it as such. But the British are great propagandists also. In the years following the last war we learned of the subtle but effective British propaganda machine which had been instrumental in pulling us into that conflict. Now, during this war, we are again under the full force of the British method of propaganda. Our press is swallowing it and swelling it before unseeing eyes. It is a propaganda designed especially for us by people who understand our psychology all too well, and once again we are being taken by the hand and led toward the holocaust. Mr. Belloc understated the force of British propaganda. There is no "almost" about it; British propaganda does what it likes with American opinion.

The third prediction of Hilaire Belloc is also borne out. The British are having their troubles with Ireland. The Irish are refusing to sacrifice their resources, their men, and their cities for the sake of Britain. And we, as children following the British pied piper, are denouncing Ireland and the neutrality to which it is bravely clinging. We at the beginning of the war asserted in voice and in law our determination to remain neutral. We have given up our neutrality and are flaying Ireland for displaying the strength of purpose which we relinquished.

At the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE JACKSON (MICH.) CITIZEN PATRIOT

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission given to me, I include herein an editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot of April 27, 1941, which is as follows:

[From the Jackson (Mich.) Patriot Citizen of April 27, 1941]

AT THE CROSS ROADS

The United States definitely has reached the cross roads. Having gone all-out short of war on a program of aid to Britain, we discover that Hitler's submarine campaign is sinking our munitions and supplies before they reach England. That puts us on the spot. Mr. Roosevelt has assured the world that we are in this business "until victory." And it now looks very much as though victory cannot be sure without actual American participation in the war.

That is the meaning of the profound pronouncements Thursday night by Secretary of the Navy Knox and Secretary of State Hull. The country is being prepared for abandonment of the "short of war" business. We're going further along the road followed when the Neutrality Act was amended, when the 50 destroyers were traded to Britain and when the lease-lend bill was enacted.

And the challenging thing about the spectacle is that the American people obviously do not look upon this as our war and are not ready to take part. Every poll shows that fact. Our recent page 1 correspondence from Washington reported that 80 percent of the people are opposed to getting in the war. Members of Congress say that their mail is as high as 10-to-1 antiwar.

But, as Senator VANDENBERG said when the lease-lend bill was passed, "you can't go half way over Niagara Falls." We can't retrace our steps.

That the administration is aware of the public's opposition has been revealed many times recently. Mr. Hull said Thursday: "Too many people assume that the present struggle is merely an ordinary regional war."

Unquestionably the attitude of the public has slowed up the President. The public took him at his word when he said during the campaign and since that no Americans would be sent out of the Western Hemisphere to fight.

That the administration is preparing openly to give up that policy was indicated when Hull said: "Some among us, doubtless with the best of intentions, still contend that our country need not resist until armed forces of an invader shall have crossed the boundary line of this hemisphere. But this merely means that there would be no resistance by

the hemisphere, including the United States, until the invading countries had acquired complete control of the other four continents and of the high seas, and thus had obtained every possible strategic advantage, reducing us to the corresponding disadvantage of a severely handicapped defense. This is an utterly short-sighted and extremely dangerous view."

Mr. Hull is actually criticizing the view expressed by Mr. Roosevelt not many months ago. Speaking to the teamsters' union last September 11, he reiterated the statement from the Democratic platform and pledged himself to it. That statement was: "We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack."

Now Mr. Hull tells us that to refuse to fight outside of the Western Hemisphere is "utterly short-sighted and extremely dangerous."

Secretary Knox went even further Thursday night than did Mr. Hull. Said he, "Having gone thus far, we cannot back down. There is no retracing our steps. We have committed ourselves in this world struggle. If we should attempt to back down now, England would go down to catastrophic defeat, and we would face a world-wide victorious Germany and her allies whom we should have to fight alone."

This newspaper long ago said that, if this is our war, we should say so and should take up our swords on the side of Britain; and if it is not our war, we should keep our nose out of it. But the administration has persisted in a silly course of saying one thing and doing another. It has indicted Germany and supported Britain while at the same time declaring its purpose to remain at peace. That anomalous course was unsound from the first moment it was expounded.

The administration is now at a point where it can no longer "play horse" with the issue. It holds back because the country isn't ready for war. But the truth is that the country would be more nearly ready if the administration had been honest in stating its policies and had not talked peace while inviting war. The crisis which now confronts us was made in Washington.

Location of Proposed Veterans' Hospital in the Philadelphia Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

REMARKS MADE BY HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE FEDERAL BOARD OF HOSPITALIZATION, JANUARY 16, 1941

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted me, I am placing in the RECORD my statement and testimony before the Federal Hospitalization Board regarding the location of the proposed veterans' hospital for Pennsylvania, which I urged should be in the Philadelphia area:

Congressman BRADLEY. General, I would first like to ask, if I may, a question so that we probably will have a better understanding of the situation here this morning. Some of the communications which have been received by Members of Congress announcing this hearing date have stated that the purpose of the hearing was to determine a site in central Pennsylvania. Now, I would like to know, and my colleagues would like to know, right at the start, if the Board has already decided on a site in central Pennsylvania.

General HINES. I may say the Board has not decided on any site. The Board indicated sometime ago, with the information before them, that they thought this unit should be located in central Pennsylvania. Since that time, upon the request of many who have been interested in it, the Board has given the subcommittee power to hold an open hearing with regard to location.

Congressman BRADLEY. Then I take it for granted that that part of the communication is not the present situation.

General HINES. It is not binding upon this subcommittee to make a recommendation.

Congressman BRADLEY. In other words, the question is not settled as to location in eastern or central Pennsylvania?

General HINES. It is not.

Congressman BRADLEY. Thank you. I represent a district in Philadelphia. I want to say at the outset, I don't wish to take the position that the hospital should be located absolutely within the confines of Philadelphia; however, I do feel that the area now served by the naval hospital in Pennsylvania, in the area of Philadelphia, the eastern part of Pennsylvania, is where this new hospital should be located. As you well know, the Veterans' Administration is providing beds for about 500 to 600 patients in Philadelphia. With the present expansion, the building up of our Navy, etc., it is fair to assume that in the future the Navy is going to have greater need for the hospital in the city of Philadelphia and for that reason we have to provide adequate facilities for the veterans in the eastern part of the State of Pennsylvania. I don't think that in other parts of the State the needs at present are as great as in the eastern part of the State.

The official figures of the Veterans' Administration indicate that the center of population affected by the present congested hospital situation is in the metropolitan area of Philadelphia. In the fiscal year 1938 there were 4,585 patients received in the naval hospital in Philadelphia. Of that number 4,042 came from the Philadelphia area, indicating that there were only about 500 some odd cases from the Harrisburg or the Scranton territory. In the fiscal year 1939 there were 4,447 patients in the naval hospital in Philadelphia, of which 4,075 came from the Philadelphia area. So far for the fiscal year 1940, from July to December, there were 2,426 patients in the naval hospital, of which 2,054 came from the Philadelphia area.

In the eastern part of Pennsylvania there are 200,000 potential cases of veterans of which about 140,000 to 150,000 are located in the Philadelphia area. We have in Philadelphia perhaps the greatest medical center in the world. One of the chief causes of complaint at the present time is that the veterans are denied the services of the most eminent physicians and specialists in the United States. If the hospital is located too far from the metropolitan area of Philadelphia, we will continue to be without the services of these men who are willing to volunteer their services for $1 a year. To my way of thinking there would be no justification for locating this hospital anywhere except in eastern Pennsylvania and at a site that would be as near to the city of Philadelphia as would be possible and at the same time provide for certain environments which would be desirable.

I think that the Board should take into consideration the number of patients who have been given treatment during the past 3 or 4 years and where they are located, and the hospital should be in a place where it would be accessible to the largest number of men and where transportation facilities would be easily provided, not only for the purpose of taking the men to the hospital but also for visitors; and I say that if the hospital should be erected in central Pennsylvania, we in eastern Pennsylvania will be back to the Veterans' Administration next year for a facility in the eastern part of the State, which we are entitled to, because we cannot agree that there will be any justification, even for the purpose of a so-called soldiers' home, in locating this institution or this facility in any part of the State where it would not serve the area where the greatest number of veterans now are and for whom adequate hospital facilities have not been provided. I submit to the Board the figures, which are the official figures of the Veterans' Administration, showing the resident location of the men who have been receiving hospitalization for the last 3 years.

General HINES. We have that of record, unless you wish it to be put in the record again.

Congressman BRADLEY. I would like to put it in the record. I think other phases of the matter will be gone into by my colleagues.

General HINES. I would like to ask one question if you do not object. If you are assured that the naval hospital would still be available to the veterans in the vicinity of Philadelphia and that the increase in the Navy is not going to result in a reduction in the number of beds which are now given the veterans there, about 600, would you still feel that a new one would be necessary there?

Congressman BRADLEY. I am glad you asked that question.

General HINES. I think it is necessary because that assurance was given the Board at the time that they indicated in their judgment they liked the area of central Pennsylvania to be surveyed.

Congressman BRADLEY. May I ask who gave that assurance?

General HINES. Admiral McIntire, member of the Board, the Surgeon General of the Navy.

Congressman BRADLEY. I don't think it is possible for any man to visualize what the Navy needs will be in the next 10 years. We realize that the naval hospital is primarily a naval institution under the complete control of the Navy, so much so that outside physicians are not allowed there, to give the veterans the benefit of their knowledge, at the present time.

I am a member of the Naval Affairs Committee and I have intimate knowledge of the expansion, which is taking place in our Navy; for that reason I believe I am justified in saying, I don't think it is possible for Admiral McIntire or any member to predict what the needs of the Navy are going to be at that hospital for the next 10 years. With a big fleet in the Atlantic it can easily have need of all the facilities at the naval hospital in Philadelphia.

General HINES. There is one element I do not believe you are familiar with, Congressman. When it was originally designed it was designed to give us not less than 450 beds.

Congressman BRADLEY. That is right.

General HINES. I remember very well when the Congressman from that district found the funds were tied up following the Economy Act and asked that the Veterans' Administration assist in getting them released for that project because we were interested to that extent.

Congressman BRADLEY. There were also a million dollars of the funds of the enlisted men of the Navy used in the construction of that hospital. One million dollars were taken from the Navy enlisted men's medical fund, and that went into the construction expenditures. To all intents and purposes it is a naval hospital and always will be. They will have the first claim and the veterans may be allowed to use what may be left. I

agree with you it was probably through the influence of the Veterans' Administration that the decision was finally made to construct the hospital, but it nevertheless is, first of all, a Navy hospital.

General HINES. It was due to the need of the veterans.

Congressman BRADLEY. It is not adequate at the present time and we really feel that as the Navy is built up there is going to be less opportunity for the veterans to receive services there, and that the one place in Pennsylvania where a new institution should be is in the eastern part of the State, and when you consider the eastern part of the State you must consider the territory in or adjacent to Philadelphia to get the advantage which Philadelphia offers as a medical center, with the attendant services of many eminent specialists, and also at the same time thereby secure a location in the area where the overwhelming majority of veterans who will be hospitalized reside.

General HINES. I might also place in the record here the fact that at the time the Board indicated the feeling that the unit should be in the central part of the State of Pennsylvania we were not faced exactly with the emergency that has since developed.

Congressman BRADLEY. That is right, General. I am not interested in any particular site, no particular piece of land or location, except that the hospital should be in the part of the State where it will do the greatest good to the greatest number of veterans.

St. Patrick's Day and Tolerance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

ADDRESS BY RT. REV. MSGR. FULTON J. SHEEN

Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of the House an address given in New York City by the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, of the Catholic University of America, before the Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, on the occasion of their one hundred and fifty-seventh anniversary dinner, held March 17, 1941.

I know that those Members of the House and their constituents who derive great pleasure in listening to Msgr. Fulton Sheen's radio broadcast on Sunday evenings will read this address with great interest. His radio audience embraces millions of people of every race and creed—Catholics, Protestants, and Jews—to all of whom he appeals for tolerance. There is no room in this country of ours, this America, for anything but tolerance, and his mission will have been a noble effort if it succeeds in teaching all of us this simple lesson.

Msgr. Fulton Sheen is one of the most militant leaders of the Catholic Church and one of the most distinguished citizens of this country; a friend of outstanding statesmen and the lowliest and most humble citizens alike. He is a crusader and a scholar. The address which follows is of particular interest to those of us who claim Irish descent, recalling as it does many of the outstanding traits and characteristics which constitute the Irish heritage. It is a mixture of the wit and pathos which has characterized the true Irishman for centuries.

We recall, too, that the Ireland of today has been built upon blood and sweat and tears, but out of the agony of her history she has engraved three marks of character on her escutcheon which constitute her badge of honor—tolerance; a stout heart, and a sense of humor. She stands now on the threshold of another great crisis and the heart of every American beats with sympathy for the plight of that ever-brave little island.

We salute her while we pray:

I am becoming a kind of biennial disturber of peace, like the wife who inscribed on the husband's tombstone, "He rests in peace," but who, when the will was read leaving all to the first wife, added another line, "Until we meet again."

The last time I was here I spoke on Blarney and Boloney. Blarney is the varnished truth, boloney the unvarnished lie. Tonight I shall speak on the Rainbow of Irish Character.

There are more rainbows in Ireland than any other country in the world, for it never rains there but the sun shines, like a child that smiles through its tears and makes human rainbows. There is no climate in Ireland—only weather. One never knows whether it will rain or whether it won't. Now, the Irish character is like Irish weather—it has a rainbow in it; there is never a joy without a tinge of sorrow, and never a sorrow without a joy. Every Irishman is a beautiful mixture of joy and sorrow. As the skies above him alternate between sunshine and mist, so the heart within him alternates joy and sorrow, a smile and a tear. All his joy is seasoned with the myrrh of sorrow; and all his sorrow is lightened with the incense of gladness. This is a typical Christian phenomenon. The church, for example, in the midst of her two penitential seasons of Lent and Advent, introduces a Sunday of rejoicing called Laetare and Gaudere, to keep our faces from getting too long and to keep our eyes on the feast beyond Then, on the feast of Easter, the church enthrones on her altar the image of the Saviour hanging on a cross.

We find that mixture of joy and sorrow in the fact that St. Patrick's Day always falls in Lent, but we also find archbishops who say to us on March 17, "Forget it—rejoice and eat meat." We find it too in the life of our divine Lord, who never once spoke of His cross without referring to His resurrection, nor of His resurrection without reference to His cross. Thus are we reminded that no sorrow is irreparable or final on this earth, and that no joy is complete in this world but only in the glorious Easter of eternity.

Now for some samples of this rainbow quality of the Irish which are to be found in their music, in their folklore, in their humor, in their outlook on politics, and in their poetry.

In music the majors are used generally to denote gladness and minors to denote sadness. In Irish music there is a greater intermingling of majors and minors than in any folk songs in the world. Take, for example, the Minstrel Boy that starts with a major and then with the lines "Land of sing cried the warrior bard, Though all the world betray thee" breaks into a minor. Have you ever noticed in this connection that the Irish are either very good singers or else very bad singers? There are no "in betweeners." On one side of the road they sing like birds; on the other side of the road they croak like crows. And the two of them are as much a part of the Irish people as shillalah and county fairs.

On the one hand there are singers who bring joys like John McCormack or our own John Finnegan of blessed memory. I remember once asking John McCormack if his father could sing. The answer was no. Your mother? No. Your grandfather? No. Your grandmother? No. Where did you get your voice? In answer he blessed himself, "In the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."

On the other hand, there are the singers like the rain who bring sorrow. I am one of them. I sing all my songs in the skeleton key—it fits anything. There is always something missing when I sing—generally it is a tin cup. Several years ago I was invited to address the musicians of the United States at their annual convention at the Metropolitan Opera. I began by saying, "It is quite fitting that I, who could not carry a key on a ring, should be asked to address the musicians of the United States on April Fool's Day." I know one Irishman who is such a poor singer that when his wife told him to walk the floor with the baby the baby would pretend he was asleep.

Consider next the intermingling of sun and rain or joy and sorrow in Irish humor. It is part of the Irishman's nature; but you will never find that same strain naturally in other people. In Americans it is generally artificial; it comes out only in our stories about drunks. The Irishman has his rainbow when he is sober; the American only when he is in a state of amiable incandescence. Consider the Irish maid who fell downstairs and broke all the new dishes. As she picked herself up she said, "Well, thank God they weren't washed."

To find a similar mixture of humor in tragedy you have to get an American intoxicated; like the drunk who fell 36 stories down the elevator shaft at the Empire State Building and, as he stood on his feet, said, "I said, 'Up.'" Take the young Irish caddy I had one day in Dublin. Just ahead of me was an American who had two too many—not too many strokes, but too many cups. He was down so deep in the bunker of the fifteenth hole, I counted 16 echoes. When I got up to that bunker, my caddy found a pair of false teeth. I said, "Whose are they?" He said, "They must be the American's. They were still gnashing when I picked them up."

An Irishman can see the funny side of tragedy in public life—the colossal wastage of taxes to pay professors who would destroy America by teaching Russian bolshevism. It is not to the point to say, as some newspapers do, that only 3 percent of the professors and 20 percent of the students are disloyal to their country. Why is it you will not find a single Communist teaching in Manhattan College? Why none in Fordham? Why none in St. Patrick's Parochial School? Why none in Mount St. Vincent's? Why none in any single Catholic school, college, or university in the United States? Because having learned to serve their God, these schools have learned to serve their country.

But the Irishman, looking out on this sad condition of schools, sees a touch of humor in it. Take, for example, a college which we will call the "Little red schoolhouse." It has a lot of Trojan horses. The Irishman is interested in pedigrees and he is right in saying that those Trojan horses were sired by Joseph Stalin, damed by the taxpayers of New York—to say nothing of the Trojan mares. I heard that certain colleges and universities in New York City were not going to give out diplomas to the graduates this year; they were going to give the sheepskins to the taxpayers, because they were led like lambs to the slaughter. The professors in certain universities and colleges in New York City are the most learned professors in the world, because they are the "best red." One of these professors who had been teaching atheism died last week. An Irishman called to pay his respects, looked at the corpse attired in evening clothes, and said: "All dressed up and no place to go."

Every politician has three hats. One he wears on his head, one he throws into the ring, and one he talks through. Con McCool told me he knew a politician who supported so many "reds" for public office and education that he tried to become a porter so he could wear the red hat.

And now for the rainbow in Irish folklore. Again the intermingling of sunshine and rain. You know the leprechaun. It is the little shoemaker fairy, only about an inch high. The leprechaun always hides behind single bushes. That is why no Irishman would cut down a single bush in Ireland. And you will notice in Ireland how often an Irishman will tip his hat when he passes a certain tree or when he passes a certain rock, because tradition has it that that was where mass was read during the penal days.

One particular morning Bridget O'Toole was on her way to mass and she spied a leprechaun. Now, if you look at a leprechaun intently, you make the leprechaun a prisoner. He purchases his release by granting you three wishes. The Irish are great, you know, for three wishes. Not like the mind reader who went on the stage once in Sing Sing Prison and said to the prisoners: "Now think of a number" and they booed him off the stage.

An Irishman thinks only of one number—three. You may not tell anyone you have seen a leprechaun, otherwise you do not get your wishes. Well, Bridget O'Toole was elated that she had seen this leprechaun, and she wanted a little assistance, so she came home to Michael and said: "Michael, if you could have anything in all the world that you wanted, what would you like to have?" At that moment there was a man going by selling lanterns, and he said: "I want one of those lanterns." And just at that moment a beautiful lantern wafted across the room and suspended itself over the fireplace. Well, Bridget O'Toole was so mad, that of all the fine castles of the English lords in Ireland that he might have had, he should have chosen a silly, stupid lantern, she said: "Glory be to God, I wish it were hanging from the end of your nose." Whereupon the lantern began to hang from the end of Michael's nose, and she had to use her third wish to get it off and then she had none left.

One finds, too, the intermingling of joy and sorrow in Irish poetry. Take, for example, the poem about the Irish cop and the Irish maid:

"He said to me, 'Fair Maiden,
And what is it you do?'
I said, 'I'm a living-out girl
on Fifth Avenue.'

"He said, 'I've rarely seen a maid
With so much sweetness in her.'
I said, 'I'd like to cross the road
And hurry home for dinner.'

"He looked at me and raised his hand—
Ah Lord and who am I
That millionnaires in motorcars
Should stop to let me by?

"One gesture from his noble hand,
One swift look at the throng
And the roadway clears like magic
And the people move along.

"I dreamt of him, and in my dreams
He stood in worlds afar;
He kept the planets in their course
And star from striking star.

"And little hoped a timid maid
As plain as I to win him;
He's so beautiful and mighty—
There's some archangel in him.

"But one night when Fifth Avenue
And all its roar was still,
I heard his shiny whistle blow
Beneath my window sill.

"I ran from the lonely kitchen
And let the curtain drop—
And put my hand into the hand
That makes the whole world stop.

"A song of love he sang to me;
His words were sweet and low;
I did not dare resist the voice
That makes the whole world go.

"I ran away to be his bride,
My heart was all a-quiver—
Now I'm climbing seven flights of stairs
Beside the Harlem River.

"If you see a big policeman
You people passing by
With a wistful look upon him—
You will know the reason why.

"He is tired of the cross streets
And lonely in the noise;
And he's longing for the traffic
Of his little girls and boys."

And this little poem too, brings in the same rainbow quality. It was written by an Australian priest, Father John O'Brien. I will mention, merely for the sake of two or three in the radio audience who may not be familiar with one or two incidents in the poem, that the Irish wives always call the husband "himself." And so, when the daughter asks the mother for something, she never says "Ask your father"; she says: "Ask himself."

I hope there is no one here who is unfamiliar with the expression "The trimmin's on the rosary." I can remember the "trimmin's on the rosary" in my own family. "Trimmin's" are very common in Ireland. When the rosary is finished there are always some extra prayers that are added. For example, "Let us say five Our Fathers and five Hail Marys for Mrs. Murphy who is sick. Let us say three Our Fathers and three Hail Marys for Mr. O'Toole who lost his son. Let us say three Hail Marys and seven Our Fathers for Mrs. O'Brien that she may sell that piece of land." Those are the "trimmin's on the rosary." This poem brings out that rainbow quality:

Ah, the memories that find me now my hair is turning gray,
Drifting in like painted butterflies from paddocks far away:
Dripping dainty wings in fancy—and the pictures fading fast,
Stand again in rose and purple in the album of the past.
There's the old slab dwelling dreaming by the wistful, watchful trees,
Where the coolabahs are listening to the stories of the breeze;
There's a homely welcome beaming from its big, bright friendly eyes,
With the Sugarloaf behind it blackened in against the skies;
There's the same dear happy circle round the boree's cheery blaze
With a little Irish Mother telling tales of other days.
She had one sweet, holy custom which I never can forget,
And a gentle benediction crowns her memory for it yet;
I can see that little mother still and hear her as she pleads,
"Now it's getting on to bed-time; all you childer get your beads."
There were no steel-bound conventions in that old slab dwelling free;
Only this—each night she lined us up to say the Rosary;
E'en the stranger there, who stayed the night upon his journey, knew
He must join the little circle, ay, and take his decade too.
I believe she darkly plotted, when a sinner hove in sight
Who was known to say no prayer at all, to make him stay the night
Then we'd softly gather round her, and we'd speak in accents low
And pray like Sainted Dominic so many years ago;
And the little Irish mother's face was radiant for she knew
That "where two or three are gathered" He is gathered with them too.
O'er the paters and the aves how her reverent head would bend!
How she'd kiss the cross devoutly when she'd counted to the end!
And the visitor would rise at once, and brush his knees—and then
He'd look very, very foolish as he took the boards again.
She had other prayers to keep him. They were long, long prayers in truth;
And we used to call them "Trimmin's" in my disrespectful youth.
She would pray for kith and kin, and all the friends she'd ever known,
Yes, and everyone of us could boast a "trimmin'" all his own.
She would pray for all our little needs, and every shade of care
That might darken o'er The Sugarloaf, she'd meet it with a prayer.
She would pray for this one's "sore complaint" or that one's "hurted hand,"
Or that someone else might make a deal and get "that bit of land;"
Or that Dad might sell the cattle well, and season's good might rule,
So that little John, the weakly one, might go away to school.
There were trimmin's too, that came and went; but ne'er she closed without
Adding one for something special "none of you must speak about."
Gentle was that little mother, and her wit would sparkle free,
But she'd murder him who looked around while at the Rosary:
And if perchance you lost your beads, disaster waited you
For the only one she'd pardon was "himself"—because she knew
He was hopeless, and 'twas sinful what excuses he'd invent,
So she let him have his fingers, and he cracked them as he went,
And, bedad, he wasn't certain if he's counted five or ten,
Yet he'd face the crisis bravely, and would start around again;
But she tallied all the decades, and she'd block him on the spot,
With a "Glory, Daddah, Glory!" and he'd "Glory" like a shot.
She would portion out the decades to the company at large;
But when she reached the trimmin's she would put herself in charge;
And it oft was cause for wonder how she never once forgot,
But could keep them in their order till she went right through the lot.
For the little Irish mother's prayers embraced the country wide;
If a neighbor met with trouble, or was taken ill, or died,
We could count upon a trimmin'—till, in fact, it got that way
That the Rosary was but trimmin's to the trimmin's we would say.
Then "himself" would start a grumbling—for the public good we thought—
"Sure you'll have us here till mornin'. Yerra, cut them trimmin's short!"
But she'd take him very gently, till he softened by degrees—
"Well, then, let us get it over. Come now, all hands to their knees."
So the little Irish mother kept her trimmin's to the last.
Ever growing as the shadows o'er the old selection passed;
And she lit our drab existence with her simple faith and love.

And I know the angels lingered near to bear her prayers above,
For her children trod the path she trod, nor did they later spurn
To impress her wholesome maxims on their children in their turn.
Ay, and every "sore complaint" came right, and every "hurted hand"
And we made a deal from time to time, and got "that bit of land";
And Dad did sell the cattle well; and little John her pride.
Was he who said the Mass in black the morning that she died;
So her gentle spirit triumphed—for 'twas this, without a doubt,
Was the very special trimmin' that she kept so dark about.
But the years have crowded past us, and the fledglings all have flown,
And the nest beneath The Sugarloaf no longer is their own;
For a hand has written finis and the book is closed for good—
There's a stately red-tiled mansion where the old slab dwelling stood;
There the stranger has her "evenings" and the formal supper's spread
But I wonder has she "trimmin's" now, or is the Rosary said?
Ah, those little Irish mothers passing from us one by one!
Who will write the noble story of the good that they have done?
All their children may be scattered, and their fortunes windward hurled,
But the Trimmin's on the Rosary will bless them 'round the world.

Ireland looks out on the war and knows that barbarism is not final, because Good Friday was not final. She sees a rainbow in the sky of Europe and understands better than any people on earth, with the possible exception of Poland, the issue at stake. The battle in Europe is the microcosmic struggle that was once waged in microcosmic pattern in Ireland. England today is fighting to preserve the right to call her soul her own. In other words, England is fighting to preserve the very freedom she once tried to extinguish in Ireland. Those who denied food to the hungry often feel the pinch of hunger themselves, and those who tried to crush the soul must know how it feels to have it crushed. And in this struggle for freedom England could look nowhere better for inspiration, heroism, and faith than to Ireland. Ireland knows how to resist invasion; she resisted it not for 2 years but for 200. And perhaps England is looking there for her inspiration, for just a short time ago Prime Minister Churchill announced that he was awarding the highest decoration the Empire could bestow to nine men distinguished for bravery and sacrifice in resisting invasion—and seven of them were Irishmen.

Where shall we look for hope among the nations? What shall be the symbol of a regenerated world? Certainly not the swastika, the thing that started out to be a cross and then double-crossed itself and became a tortured cross or a swastika; certainly not in the hammer and sickle, the instruments of beating and cutting and destruction, the tools that keep a man's eyes fixed on the dust and metal, away from the stars and the heaven of his destiny.

There is one symbol left—the symbol of the Irish faith: the folded hands. They cannot strike, for they were not made for offense; they cannot protect, for they were not made for defense. They can only imprecate, only pray—a carnal decade; 10 Irish spires aspiring heavenward for the souls of men. And by and through those folded hands may the race of Cain be brought beneath a cross where there is a man enthroned upon it like a wounded eagle; and through those prayers may the clenched fists of the race of Cain be opened to release their hate. Then when hate has gone out of the world those hands that were nailed by hate will detach themselves and fold themselves together not in judgment but in embrace that all the world may know how sweet is Ireland that kept its faith in Christ.

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Deep Waterway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1941

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the completion of the proposed Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep-waterway project will benefit the people of the entire North American Continent. It will make possible trade and commerce now denied the people of the continent. It will be of lasting benefit and will mark one of those accomplishments that will promote the general welfare of all the people and will enlarge the opportunities for good of all who are engaged in the struggle for economic betterment.

CONGRESS WILL ACT ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION

I am not taking the time to trace the history of legislative efforts to have this project completed. However, it is interesting to note that on October 16, 1940, President Roosevelt, by Executive order, established the St. Lawrence Advisory Committee, and on October 17, 1940, transmitted a message to Congress, accompanied by his Executive order. Thereafter negotiations were carried on by the Government of the United States and the Canadian Government, and an agreement was reached by the two Governments for completion of this project. This agreement was transmitted to Congress by President Roosevelt on March 21, 1941, together with a message from the President, that he would submit concurrent legislation for action by Congress in order to make the agreement effective. The President's message is House Document No. 153. Legislative proposals will be before Congress in the near future.

GEOGRAPHICAL AREA INVOLVED

Those interested in the bare facts regarding the improvement will be interested in a document issued by N. R. Danielian, director of the St. Lawrence survey. This document has been prepared under the direction of the United States Department of Commerce. Part 2 of these series of reports deals with the navigational aspects of the proposed improvement, and also discusses engineering plans for deepening channels, building locks and dams, and so forth. Attached to this document is a map which gives most effectively a picture of the geography of the area and the proposed improvements. I shall refer to this map in my discussion here today. It points out Lake Superior and Lake Michigan, with their cities and ports. Then, to the east of these great bodies of water commerce continues on Lake Huron, and from Lake Huron moves into Lake Erie, thence into Lake Ontario, which connects with the St. Lawrence River, and then to the Atlantic Ocean. The proposed project would enable ocean vessels to travel from the eastern seaboard, enter the St. Lawrence River, and travel a distance of 2,687 miles to Duluth, Minn., the most western point on the Great Lakes.

CONSTRUCTION WORK REQUIRED

Referring again to the map, a most valuable exhibit, the actual construction work is pictured as follows:

First, one new lock will be required at Sault Ste. Marie, and dredging will be required in the St. Marys River at the eastern end of Lake Superior. The next engineering project, as shown on the map, is in the connecting channels between Lake Huron and Lake Erie. This involves the dredging of the St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair, and the Detroit River.

The third improvement noted on the map requires dredging in the Welland Canal. In the International Rapids, on the St. Lawrence River, the map indicates power development and the construction of locks. The Soulanges Canal will require two new locks, and the Lachine Canal will require a new canal and locks. The purpose of these improvements is to deepen those places in this great water highway which cannot be traveled by ocean boats to a depth of 27 feet. In some places the depth at the present time is only 14 feet.

The maker of this pictorial map states that it is designed to give the layman a bird's-eye view of the widely discussed Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project. He says that the seaway plan visualizes the creation of a great marine highway for commerce providing deep-draft navigation from the westernmost port on Lake Superior 2,687 miles to the Atlantic Ocean.

90.4 PERCENT OF SEAWAY ALREADY BUILT

Of the seaway's total length, 90.4 percent is complete, consisting of natural waterways of the Great Lakes, the St. Lawrence River, and a system of connecting rivers, canals, and locks, which have already been built in natural progression by Canada and the United States. The incomplete sections total 258 miles, and chiefly require dredging channels to a depth of 27 feet, permitting passage of ocean-going vessels. The economic importance of the areas tapped by the seaway is shown on the map by the dollar value of the principal products of States bordering the waters. The significance of the trade routes is revealed by the enormous annual cargo tonnages carried through the Great Lakes. These figures are from the last census of manufacturers taken in 1937. The power project, of primary concern to New York State, calls for harnessing the tremendous flow of the St. Lawrence River an average of 220,000 cubic feet of water each second. Proponents of the plan estimate the power available will produce

an average annual output of 5,700,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

The St. Lawrence project backers further point out that the market for such power within economical transportation distance—300 miles—covers most of the North Atlantic States and the heart of the Nation's industrial area. Total cost to the United States of the entire project is estimated at $273,000,000. Of this huge sum, $90,000,000 is to be assumed by New York State for the power project. Canada's share is set at $270,000,000, of which $130,000,000 is credited for work on the Welland Canal. This leaves $140,000,000 to be spent by the Dominion.

VAST COMMERCE ON GREAT LAKES NOW WILL BE INCREASED

We must not lose sight of the fact that already there is a vast commerce on the Great Lakes. In 1937 it was estimated that 87,633,699 tons of cargo was carried through the locks at Sault Ste. Marie, and 113,836,956 tons passed through the Detroit River. I quote from part 2 of the St. Lawrence Survey, on page 6:

Despite its limitation to a depth of 14 feet, the present St. Lawrence Canal system is one of the busiest waterways of the North American Continent. A large amount of commerce passes over the upper river between the Great Lakes and Montreal. The traffic has grown steadily from 2,000,000 tons in 1910 to more than 8,000,000 tons in 1938, and in late years local or way traffic has amounted to an additional 1,000,000 tons. Grain, petroleum products, pulp and pulpwood, coal, ore, and iron and steel products are the principal items of freight tonnage carried on the present canals. It is significant that included in this traffic is a sizeable transoceanic business. During the 3-year period, 1937 to 1939, for example, there moved directly between lake ports and European ports approximately 600,000 tons of freight, requiring over 400 trips by small oceangoing freighters. This direct service was provided by Norwegian and Dutch lines which had constructed specially designed ships for this purpose.

The above quotation answers a lot of fanciful arguments of the opponents of the seaway. One of their favorite claims is that there is no need for the improvement. The steady increase in traffic and the fact that the Dutch and Norwegians, under present difficulties, could find it advantageous to travel from Europe to faraway Lake Superior with their products is an answer to the oft-repeated suggestion that there is no need for deepening the St. Lawrence.

GREAT MIDWEST LANDLOCKED EMPIRE

The Midwest lies between the mountains on the eastern side of the United States and the Rocky Mountains. The Midwest has now become an industrial center, and I need only call to your attention the automobile industry, manufacture of tires, and so forth. It has been estimated that 40,000,000 people in the Midwest would be benefited by the deepening of the St. Lawrence and the building of the locks for ocean-going traffic. The products of the eastern cities could come at reduced costs to Great Lake ports, and the products of the Midwest region could be sent to the people of New England and the Atlantic seaboard. I do not here enumerate the vast possibilities for the economic betterment of our people which will come from this project. It is interesting to note that in 1929 Henry I. Harriman, president, Boston Chamber of Commerce, issued an exhaustive booklet showing that New England and the East would derive great benefits. He said that they would be able by reason of the cheap transportation afforded by the St. Lawrence seaway to ship the products of their factories to the Midwest, and in return would be able to bring from the Midwest its products greatly desired by New England and the Atlantic seaboard. I commend his report to every interested person. What he said then was true and equally applies at the present time. Further, the possibilities of cheap waterway transportation makes possible commercial intercourse not only with the Pacific ports of our country but with the rest of the world. At some other time I expect to go further into detail.

THE PANAMA CANAL AND ITS RELATIONSHIP

In this connection it is interesting to note that the Panama Canal commenced doing business in 1914. It was an important development, and no one today would advocate that it should be discontinued or abandoned. Its construction, however, makes all the more imperative the completion of the St. Lawrence waterway project. In part 1 of the St. Lawrence Survey, prepared by Mr. N. R. Danielian, director, in the United States Department of Commerce, we find the following discussion on page 4 of this document:

The Panama Canal was opened to commercial traffic on August 14, 1914. It seriously weakened the competitive position of the Middle West. Its effect was to bring closer, economically speaking, the Pacific and the Gulf and Atlantic seaboards, and to diminish the economic advantages, in terms of transportation costs, of the Middle West in relation to both seaboards.

By the end of the war, both ocean and rail freight rates had risen in the general inflationary movement of prices. After the conclusion of the armistice, there was a brief boom in shipping. But the release of ships that had been interned or incapacitated in the war, combined with the depression of 1920–21, created a surplus of shipping. Consequently, shipping rates collapsed and remained for some years under pre-war levels. Rail rates, however, did not recede in the same degree.

This development greatly exaggerated the normal differential between ocean and rail costs, with the result that, while the Atlantic and Pacific littorals were brought far closer together by the Panama Canal, the Middle Western States at the same time were farther removed, in terms of cost, from San Francisco and New York than in 1914. The result was the erection of an economic barrier around the midcontinental area which tended to impede commerce. Since the last World War the movement to construct the St. Lawrence waterway has been interpreted in part by many authorities as a move on the part of the interior to restore its economic parity with the Atlantic and Pacific littorals.

CONGESTION OF RAIL TRANSPORTATION

The difficulties in the interior as compared to the eastern and western littorals were increased in the post-war period by the partial break-down of the railways during the war. In this time the tremendous expansion of tonnage moved, together with the special problems created by the war, proved too great for the railways to handle with efficiency. Much of the testimony before the International Joint Commission during 1920 and 1921 indicated that the railway facilities at that time proved inadequate. Since a great part of the advantages of the mass-production methods developed in the middle western area depended upon cheap and efficient transportation, the need for an alternative method of transportation to relieve the congestion upon the railroads was doubly great.

Mr. Danielian gives you in brief language the powerful argument and he sets forth facts which in my opinion cannot be challenged. This document was issued by the Department of Commerce, an agency of our Government, uninfluenced by propaganda, and its conclusions are sound.

SECTIONALISM AND THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER DEVELOPMENT

The St. Lawrence seaway project which, of course, involves the Great Lakes on the American continent, should not be a sectional matter. What benefits one part of the country results directly or indirectly to the good of other parts of the country. We should have an American viewpoint, unless we wish to obstruct progress. The leading opponents in the House of Representatives recently to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project are my esteemed colleagues, the Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, and the Honorable HAMILTON FISH, of New York. We have no more able or patriotic men in the House of Representatives than these two distinguished and leading statesmen. I cannot agree with them, however, because I think both of them have sectional viewpoints. One of them thinks that the boundary lines of the United States are coextensive with the boundary lines of the State of Pennsylvania. The other believes that all of the United States is to be found within the confines of the great State of New York. Both have had a bad start in geography. They have recently been joined by my esteemed colleague, the able and energetic gentleman, Mr. PLOESER, who hails from St. Louis, Mo. In his speech on April 25, he said, and I quote:

Congress has expended hundreds of millions of dollars for the improvement of a great inland-waterway system in this country. This system comprises the Mississippi River from the Twin Cities to the Gulf, the Ohio River from Pittsburgh to the Mississippi, the Missouri River from Sioux City to the mouth, the intracoastal canal from Corpus Christi to a point connecting with the lower Mississippi River, and a great waterway from the Great Lakes system, down the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers to the Gulf and out to the sea.

I commend my colleague Mr. PLOESER for his candor and his frank admission that hundreds of millions of dollars has been expended for the improvement of our inland waterways. I vigorously disagree, however, with his conclusions, namely, that after the Mississippi Valley people get what they want, the people in the rest of the country are to be forgotten and left to travel to that undiscovered bourne from whence no traveller returns. It has been my privilege to vote for these appropriations, or at least part of them, which have been of lasting benefit to the good folks in the Mississippi Valley. I adopted a national viewpoint in so doing. I did the right thing. Just as a matter of fair play and justice to the people of the Middle West, we are entitled to consideration from the repre-

sentatives of the Mississippi Valley section.

RAILWAY EMPLOYEES BENEFITTED BY WATERWAY PROJECT

One source of opposition to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project comes from representatives of the railroad brotherhoods who have been led to believe that this project will cause unemployment among their ranks. I know full well the problems which have confronted them during past years. Passenger-bus lines and freight-truck lines have seriously handicapped the railroads. I want to say to the employees of railroads in the district I represent that the St. Lawrence project will lead to increased employment for railroad men. The increased freight tonnage which will come to Great Lakes ports will require increased activity on the part of the railroads in the Midwest. All of this tonnage, or a large portion thereof, will be transported inland to points with 16 or more Midwest States. This means that more freight trains will have to be operated and more railroad men put back to work. There is no escape from this conclusion. President Roosevelt, whose sympathy and constructive work for railroad employees needs no recital at this time, is asking for immediate action and favorable action on the St. Lawrence seaway project.

PROJECT ENDORSED BY WOODROW WILSON AND SUCCEEDING ADMINISTRATIONS

I want to conclude these remarks by quoting from the letter of transmittal of N. R. Danielian, director, St. Lawrence Survey, in which he advises the Secretary of Commerce under date of September 14, 1940, as follows—and I quote from page 5 of part I:

Every national administration since the time of President Woodrow Wilson has been in favor of proceeding as expeditiously as possible with plans to construct a seaway for oceangoing vessels from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic.

President Coolidge and President Hoover were particularly active in promoting the cause of a seaway. The Republican platform of 1932 contained the following resolution in support of the St. Lawrence seaway:

"The Republican Party stands committed to the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway. Under the direction of President Hoover, negotiations of a treaty with Canada for this development are now at a favorable point. Recognizing the inestimable benefits which will accrue to the Nation from placing the ports of the Great Lakes on an ocean base, the party reaffirms allegiance to this great project and pledges its best efforts to secure its early completion."

The new administration which took office in 1933 was equally desirous to see the seaway constructed. On July 9, 1932, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, then the nominee of the Democratic Party, telegraphed President Hoover his support of the latter's efforts in behalf of the project:

"I am deeply interested in the immediate construction of the deep waterway as well as the development of abundant and cheap power. * * * It has already been too long delayed."

Mr. Speaker, the above endorsements in no way limit or exhaust the long list of distinguished people and organizations which have from time to time taken favorable action on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project. The American people realize the lasting benefits which will come to them. We are spending billions of dollars on a national-defense program. It is no argument at all to say that while that is being done our domestic projects and programs should be cast in the background. The sound position to take is just the reverse. We should do everything to build for a greater and better America, and this attitude should be the basis for a national defense which will be permanent and at the same time benefit future generations.

Defense Savings Bonds and Stamps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

RADIO ADDRESSES BY THE PRESIDENT, THE POSTMASTER GENERAL, AND THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, last evening over the radio networks the President of the United States and the Postmaster General delivered addresses pertaining to the defense savings bonds and stamps which are to go on sale today. The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, introduced both speakers. I ask unanimous consent that the three addresses be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. HENRY MORGENTHAU, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 30, 1941

Tomorrow morning, the Government of the United States provides one answer to the question that patriotic Americans have been asking ever since the national-defense program was undertaken.

That question has been: "What can I do to help? As the defense savings bonds and stamps go on sale tomorrow in every State and county, city and town in America—it will be possible for everyone—literally everyone—to take part in the national-defense effort.

Defense savings bonds and stamps are not for the few; they are for the many. They are for the great mass of the people, for the laboring man, the skille mechanic, the office worker, the employer, the housewife, the retired businessman—even children can save their pennies to buy the stamps exchangeable for defense-savings bonds.

Let this be clear: Your Government is frankly seeking the current, regular savings o the people—all the people—men, women, and children. It is not asking you to buy one bond or one set of stamps and let it go at that; it is inviting you to save regularly and systematically by putting your money into the soundest investment on the face of the earth—the United States of America. Why does your Government want the savings of the people? Obviously there are faster and simpler ways for the Government to raise money. Why has the Treasury Department taken this more difficult course? Here are the reasons:

First, as I have said, your Government wants to give every one of you a chance to have a financial stake in American democracy, an opportunity to contribute toward the defense of that democracy, and the right to say to yourself, "I am doing something to help." Secondly, your Government wants to encourage the habit of thrift in all the people, to prevent a spending spree of the kind that accompanied the last war, to provide a check against high prices, to safeguard and stabilize the current American standard of living. Finally, your Government wants to provide each of you with a cushion against the post-war period, when, inevitably, adjustments of employment will have to be made. Your Government wants every American family to face this post-war adjustment period with savings protected and guaranteed by the full faith and credit of the United States of America.

We are now engaged in the greatest defense building program in the history of the world. Just as its results will be unprecedented, so will its cost.

But the billions that will be required to build all the planes and tanks and guns and battleships are not beyond our powers to supply. We can finance our defense, gigantic as it is, just as surely as our factories and men can turn out the weapons.

It is with full confidence in the willingness and eagerness of the American people to share the defense effort that this program of defense savings has been planned by the Treasury Department.

There is to be no "drive"; there are to be no quotas; there is to be no hysteria; there is to be no appeal to hate or fear. The defense savings bonds and stamps are presented as an opportunity—an opportunity for each citizen to buy a share in America.

Consequently the Treasury Department will not measure the success of the defense-savings program in terms of money alone; it will measure success in terms of people participating; in terms of the number of partners it wins among the men and women and children of the Nation.

And now it is my privilege to reserve the first defense-savings bond—not to be delivered, of course, until the opening of business in Washington tomorrow—in the name of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the President of the United States.

And it is my further pleasure to present to you now the Postmaster General of the United States, under whose direction the Post Office Department has done such a splendid job in making the United States savings bonds available in the past; my good friend, Postmaster General Frank C. Walker, who speaks to you now from Des Moines, Iowa.

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL FRANK C. WALKER

Thank you, Mr. Secretary. I am happy indeed to pledge to you and the people of America the complete cooperation and patriotic support of the Post Office Department and its thousands of employees from coast to coast in the defense-savings program. These employees—postmasters and clerks throughout the Nation—are well qualified for the all-important roles they will play in this great undertaking by the Government and its people.

These same postmasters and clerks have served the Treasury Department and the public with great distinction before. Through their hands have passed the billions of dollars worth of baby bonds and postal savings stamps already purchased by 2,000,000 Americans. The Post Office Department is very proud of that record, and it stands ready to render an even greater service in the cause of defense savings.

The new defense-savings bonds and stamps will be within easy reach of all

Americans, no matter where they live. They may be purchased in every first-, second-, and third-class post office in the country, and they also will be available at some 400 fourth-class offices, making a total of 16,000 points at which the stamps and bonds will be available.

At every one of these offices the public will find our employees extremely cooperative and eager to be of assistance in every way possible.

They have been given complete information about the bonds and stamps and they are prepared to answer all of your questions. All offices have been supplied with brochures containing all vital information about every type of bond and postal savings stamp—and I would suggest that those of you who are not prepared to make an actual purchase tomorrow morning drop in at your post office and get one of these brochures to study at your leisure. All post offices have also been supplied with attractive pocket albums for postal-savings stamps. These albums provide a quick and convenient way for everyone to exchange current savings for bonds.

And so, on behalf of all the employees of the Post Office Department, I want to say that we are ready and eager to serve you. Do not hesitate to call on us for information whenever you need it. And we all hope that each one of you will get the habit of going to your post office regularly to save with your Government for the preservation of everything for which the Government stands.

Secretary Morgenthau has reserved the first defense-savings bonds in the name of the President. It it now my pleasure to reserve—for delivery tomorrow morning—the first defense-savings stamp, also in the name of the President of the United States.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

Secretary Morgenthau, Postmaster General Walker, Americans everywhere, one thought is uppermost in my mind as I make grateful acknowledgment of this dual honor. It is that in reserving the first defense-savings bond and the first defense postal-savings stamps in the name of the President, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General have given emphasis to the national character of the defense savings campaign. This character of the campaign is national in the best sense of the word—for it is going to reach down, we hope, to the individual and the family in every community, and on every farm, in every State and every possession of the United States.

It is national and homey at the same time. For example, I am buying not 1 stamp but 20 stamps to go into little books for each of my 10 grandchildren. And the first defense-savings bond is being made out in the name of Mrs. Roosevelt as beneficiary.

It is fitting that the President in his purchases should be the symbol of the determination of all the people to save and sacrifice in defense of democracy.

In the larger sense, this first defense bond and these first defense stamps reserved to the President, constitute tangible evidence of partnership—a partnership between all of the people and their Government—entered into to safeguard and to perpetuate all those precious freedoms which government guarantees. In this time of national peril what we all must realize is that the United States Government is you and I and all the other families next door all the way across the country and back again. It is one great partnership.

This evening we are giving thought to the financial structure of our partnership. We are engaged in an all-out effort to perpetuate democracy in the New World by aiding embattled democracy in the Old World. From the Atlantic to the Pacific, America is in full beauty of glorious springtime. And we have eyes to see the beauty of our country this spring as we never saw it in any spring before.

For a great many people are appreciating our blessings the more when they realize what blessings so many other millions of people have lost this spring and last spring—so many millions of people who hoped and prayed and even assumed—taking it for granted that fate would let them live on as they had always lived.

In the few words which I am speaking to my fellow countrymen tonight, I desire above all else to emphasize the thought that in just such measure as we support our Government will it be strong, effective, and safe.

Defenses that were adequate 10 years ago are today a broken reed. New machines in the air, on the land, and on the sea have created a revolution in the conduct of offensive war and defensive war.

Nations and lands safe 10 years ago by virtue of the mere fact of distance away from possible aggression have today been overrun by mechanized conquerors. Distance is no longer a guaranty of safety.

Your Government, therefore, is arming; factories spring up; production multiplies—a country-wide unanimous effort of planning and of work.

At this time we add another call—a frank and clear appeal for financial support to pay for our arming and to pay for the American existence of later generations.

With jobs more plentiful and wages higher, slight sacrifice here, the omission of a few luxuries there, will swell the coffers of our Federal Treasury. The outward and visible tokens of partnership through sacrifice will be the possession of those defense bonds and defense savings stamps, which are, at the same time, a guaranty of our future security.

Your Government asks that you make this sacrifice. But is it a sacrifice? Is it a sacrifice for us to give dollars when more than a million of our finest young men have been withdrawn from civilian life to accept the discipline of military life in defense of our country? No; sacrifice is not the word. This defense savings program is, rather, a privilege and an opportunity—an opportunity to share in the defense of all the things we cherish against the threat that is made against them. We must fight this threat wherever it appears; and it can be found at the threshold of every home in America.

Fellow Americans, I ask you to demonstrate again your faith in America by joining me in investing in the new defense savings bonds and stamps.

Charles A. Lindbergh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. SMATHERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

LETTERS RELATING TO SPEECH-MAKING OF CHARLES A. LINDBERGH AND AN ARTICLE FROM THE AMERICAN MERCURY MAGAZINE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, during the course of the past month I have received thousands of letters from citizens of my State of New Jersey protesting against the speech-making activity of Mr. Lindbergh, who claims residence in New Jersey.

I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of one of these letters, together with copy of a letter directed by me to Mr. Lindbergh.

I also request to have published, in connection herewith, an article appearing in this month's Mercury magazine, on the subject of Why Lindbergh Is Wrong.

There being no objection, the letters and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 24, 1941.*

Hon. CHARLES A. LINDBERGH,
Englewood, N. J.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed you will find a copy of one of many letters reaching my office. This particular letter comes from a constituent of mine residing at Princeton, N. J., the subject matter of which interested me, and most certainly should interest you.

I concur with this gentleman, in that it is about time you stop making these speeches—made, apparently, in an endeavor to divide the people of this country, and to try to sell them on the false doctrine of German invincibility.

If you want to help this country, which, incidentally, made you what you are through its manifold gifts, you should offer your services and flying knowledge—a subject about which you undoubtedly know much—to the Government, and stop your speech-making endeavors, setting yourself up as an authority on matters international—a subject about which you apparently know nothing.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM H. SMATHERS,
United States Senator.

[Enclosure.]

KURKJIAN & CO., INC.,
Princeton, N. J., April 24, 1941.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SMATHERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We protest against the last speech of Charles A. Lindbergh. Such men were responsible for the fall of France and other countries. We believe in national policy of our President.

Please do everything you can to aid the President.

Very sincerely,

K. KURKJIAN,
President.

[From the American Mercury of May 1941]

WHY LINDBERGH IS WRONG

(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky)

Col. Charles A. Lindbergh has on repeated occasions in the past year offered his personal views on the war in Europe and on America's strategic position. Because of his deep hold on the emotions of Americans, those views have been received by a part of the public as somehow typical of the aviation fraternity as a whole. Nothing could be further from the facts. It was because of our natural reluctance to disturb a glowing symbol of American aviation achievement—the lovely legend of an aeronautical oracle in the popular imagination—that many of us remained silent, though we found ourselves in essential disagreement with him.

Indeed, we resented inwardly the manner in which that symbol was being dragged into the muddy market places of political argument. The writer for one has felt that the Colonel's prestige was being unfairly exploited by special pleaders—well-meaning

and otherwise—who played on the strings of his genuine patriotism. They inveigled him into fighting their battles by "expertizing" on international politics and economics, war strategy and air tactics, a hundred matters foreign to his flying experience.

All aviation people share, in some measure, the glory that is Colonel Lindbergh's. The laurels on his brow, we know, represent a tribute to all men and women who have given their years to the advancement of American aeronautics. And that is why we have been loath to argue with him as he continued to expound his opinions on the air, in the press, and at congressional hearings. This despite the embarrassing fact that his judgments were being erroneously attributed to all of us. But in his most recent pronouncement, A Letter to Americans, published in Collier's, Colonel Lindbergh issued a clear-cut challenge which aviators who disagree with him can no longer ignore. He called on readers to cut through the vague talk and demand from "experts" practical answers to practical questions of national defense.

In taking up the challenge, I must of necessity treat the colonel simply as a fellow aviator—human, fallible, and conditioned, like the rest of us, by limitations of knowledge and experience. Colonel Lindbergh would be the first to admit that by sitting for 33 hours in the cramped cockpit of a single-motored airplane, between New York and Paris, he did not miraculously acquire a superior grasp of all the complex principles of aeronautical science. He was not thereby automatically transformed into an authority on military tactics and strategy, the design and manufacture of airplanes, the organization of air power, or other matters which he has since then been maneuvered into discussing.

Colonel Lindbergh, whose intelligence and integrity are beyond question, would readily admit that he knew neither more nor less about such subjects at Le Bourget than he had known 33 hours earlier in Long Island. But having been catapulted into the ungrateful role of national hero, he was thereafter expected to speak the last word on everything remotely related to aviation, and on a lot of things wholly unrelated to it. The romantic exaggerations of a popular hero's qualities add up to a cross he must carry through life—and the colonel's exploitation in recent months by ax grinders has been a species of crucifixion.

As an American citizen deeply concerned for the security of our country and the preservation of its democratic way of life, I have opinions, of course, on the political aspects of the colonel's testimony and speeches. I feel, however, that neither his views nor mine, in that department, necessarily carry more weight than those of any other citizen. But when it comes to aviation, I consider myself not only justified in joining the discussion but in duty bound to speak candidly in line with my experience and convictions on the technical phases of the controversy.

I do so as one who has devoted his entire life to designing, manufacturing, and piloting airplanes, and to the extensive study of the potentialities and tactics of this new weapon. That study has been made against the background of a naval, military, and engineering education and 3 years of very active combat experience in the first World War. Like Colonel Lindbergh, I had the opportunity to make a close-up investigation of European air power just before the outbreak of the war, for 7 full months in 1939, when I observed Nazi planes in flight and in construction and, myself, flew British fighters and other European models.

Colonel Lindbergh's chief contentions, on the technical and strategic side of the discussion may fairly be summarized thus:

1. That Great Britain cannot win even with American assistance—or at least that its chances are so remote as to be negligible.

2. That by giving full productive aid to Britain we are "depleting" our own forces and weakening American security, even to the point of "danger of invasion."

3. That the United States, given proper defensive measures is absolutely safe in "any predictable future," because "we can build a military * * * position that is impregto attack." In short, he argues for old-fashioned "isolation" behind impregnable ramparts.

I am boiling down a great mass of his public expressions; yet these seem to me the major technical issues which he has raised. On all three I disagree with him fundamentally, and on all three for substantially the same underlying reasons. Colonel Lindbergh apparently bases his judgments on existing aeronautical equipment, and on an immediate strategic picture which may well prove to be ephemeral. To put the matter bluntly, I think that he has failed to grasp the full potentialities of air power; he has failed to understand the revolution in warfare that it is forcing relentlessly upon the world, the United States included. I am, indeed, amazed that anyone so close to aviation, even if he has not himself designed, built, or fought in warplanes, could remain so profoundly unaware of the swiftly expanding horizons of air power and their implications for American national security.

But let us tackle each of his main points separately.

II

All sentiment aside, there seems to me no valid excuse for a defeatist attitude in relation to Britain's prospects in the war. I am convinced not merely that it has a chance of winning, but that, given the full material backing of the United States, it has only a minor chance of not winning. In offering this broad summation I am speaking, of course, not only of England but of the British Empire.

I base my judgment first of all on the fact that this conflict is developing primarily into an air war, with victory ultimately on the side of the superior air power. The British Empire plus the United States add up to an aviation potential decisively outweighing Germany's, even with a conquered Europe in tow. "If England is able to hold out for several years," Colonel Lindbergh told a congressional committee, "and if we devote our maximum wartime effort to the production of aircraft, we can almost certainly equal or exceed the air strength of Germany." In this he was making the most conservative possible estimate of the balance of forces.

The war is shaking down to an epochal contest between two groups of producing nations. One of them, under Nazi control, will be more and more plagued by shortages of critical materials; it will be under continuous and growing attack by enemy aviation, operating with increasingly undernourished labor working in large part sullenly under coercion. The other, the Anglo-American bloc, its production centers widely scattered over the world, will have access to all materials; it will operate in many regions under relatively peaceful conditions, with labor that is voluntary and well fed. In that tug of war of production, equality in air power for the Anglo-American bloc is already within sight, and rapid establishment of supremacy seems in the cards.

In the study of European aviation on the threshold of the war to which I have alluded, it was obvious to me that German production facilities were the world's best. But it was no less obvious that the British planes were tactically superior. They had been conceived later than the equivalent Nazi types, since Hitler had "frozen" his models earlier for mass production. The German bombers were inferior to the British in defensive armament and bomb load; the British pursuits outperformed the Nazi pursuits.

I was convinced, therefore, that despite Hitler's great advantage in numbers he would have a hard time of it against England. As early as April 1940, before the test had been made, I put myself on record to that effect, and on June 1 I wrote that a German invasion of England was impossible under those conditions. Nothing has happened as yet to alter my opinion in that regard.

No doubt the world would have been better off today if Colonel Lindbergh's findings on air power in Europe in 1938 had been heeded. His warnings against the underestimation of Nazi Germany's air strength have been amply and tragically justified. Actually it took no special insight to discover German air superiority or the inadequacies of French and British aviation. It was all so glaringly evident that only the fatal faith in Maginot lines, traditional naval might and obsolete concepts of defense can explain French, British, and American complacency in the business.

On the other hand, Colonel Lindbergh failed to appreciate, or at least to note clearly in his public reports, the crucial qualitative advantage of the British over German planes. Having had no direct and intensive experience as a combat pilot, he was inclined, like laymen, to be rather dazzled by sheer numbers. Yet it is the British edge in quality which to date has denied control of the air over England to the enemy and thereby in effect saved the British Isles in the face of Hitler's numerical edge. As long as the R. A. F. retains its qualitative margin, Nazi invasion will remain an empty threat. Not until Hitler can bomb the islands in the daytime with relative impunity can they be conquered. He cannot do this unless he has more effective air equipment than any which he has thus far demonstrated.

Another item in what might be called Colonel Lindbergh's aviation "ideology"—one that helps explain his pessimism about Britain—deserves attention. He believes that Germany is, to use his own phrase, "a natural air power"; that we in America are a natural air power; but that other countries, and especially England, are not. The whole idea is fallacious. There have been natural seapower nations because some are surrounded by water and others are not. But all nations are surrounded by air. What gave Germany its lead was not some inherent air superiority but its revolutionary courage in cutting through outmoded strategic notions. Its advantage was psychological. By now Britain's fine performance and the amazing rise of its productive tempo despite a late start are no less impressive than Germany's initial lead.

Students of the science of warfare know that when comparatively equal foes are locked in combat the advantages shift from time to time. As in a wrestling match, now one has a seemingly decisive hold, now the other. For the observer the danger is that of mistaking temporary advantages for permanent ones. That is the mistake the colonel is making.

He was correct when he said that Germany now has a strategic advantage because its air bases surround the British Isles in a semicircle from Narvik to the Bay of Biscay. But he failed to note that this condition is by no means eternal. If Germany were simply fighting the British Isles, his conclusion might possibly hold. But Germany is fighting the British Empire and, in terms of production, also America. Churchill has stated that, if necessary, the struggle would be continued from the outposts of the Empire. In the same sense that Germany today surrounds England, the Empire and its allies surround Germany and the conquered area under its tutelage.

The range of striking air forces is being quickly enlarged, and with every increase the

strategic relation between Europe and Britain tends to be reversed. We come ever closer to the day when Germany, all of Europe, will be the center of a circle of hostile air power. Recent British entrenchment in North Africa, for example, foreshadows that encirclement. In the long run—and admittedly it may be a long and costly run—it will be easier for the British to obtain control of the air over Europe than for Europe to assume control of the skies above the British Empire. The direct attacks on Germany's vital centers will be undertaken from far-flung bases; not alone from Africa and perhaps the Near East but inevitably, in time, from Canada and even India. To cope with this Hitler would have to dominate the skies over virtually the entire globe.

Colonel Lindbergh has pictured England as a concentrated target, in the center of Germany's scattered bases. By his own logic, we must visualize Europe as comparatively a concentrated target surrounded by hostile air power operating from widely scattered encircling bases. Once we admit the possibility of superior Anglo-American air power, we must also admit the likelihood that the European target may be hammered into submission. The Colonel puts a lot of stress on the need for invasion—I shall deal with that concept later. But with air control firmly in British hands over any given area in Europe—Italy, southern France, any part of the Balkans—Germany could not prevent occupation of such area if it were deemed necessary. There is now general agreement on the principle that operation of ground forces is impossible if the skies overhead are held by the adversary.

Should the British Isles fall to Germany, the burden of the conflict would be transferred to the Empire and the struggle would then go on for years and years—while the kind of air power is constructed that is needed to reduce a Germanized Europe. If the Islands remain in British hands, the equalization of the two sides in the war will proceed rapidly. If Colonel Lindbergh's fondest hope, as he stresses, is to prevent prolongation of the war, denial of aid to Britain at this time is the worst possible method of achieving his purpose. In doing what it can to prevent the conquest of the British Isles, America decidedly is not prolonging the hostilities.

Nor should it be forgotten that while the contest is under way, the Nazi conquerors of Europe will have to police a hostile, if not actually subversive, Continent; will have to feed hundreds of millions under conditions of extreme shortage. They will hold a beleaguered and hard-pressed Continent, torn within itself, and pitted against a British-American group relatively unified and under far milder economic and political pressures. Already the human and material resources of the British Empire are beginning to affect the balance. Factories, and training grounds, and new bases are springing up throughout North America, in Australia and New Zealand, in Africa and the Middle East.

The pattern has not yet fully emerged, but it is a pattern in which Hitler's domain will be increasingly under siege by a constantly more powerful, determined foe whose strategic position must improve with time. The main force against the emergence of this pattern is the offensive against British commerce which, if successful, would break the strangle hold around Europe. But Germany is still far from success in that respect. The better employment of air forces will in time cancel out this Nazi advantage. Even now it is possible to establish lanes across the narrowest parts of the Atlantic protected by canopies of air power. The first line of defense against submarines is aviation; the only defense against air raiders on the high seas is aviation. And such aviation, we have reason to expect, will assume air control over the ocean lanes before the Nazi attack on shipping can prove decisive.

Thus, despite the immediate advantage for Germany, the rapid reversal of the balance is entirely possible. Only when some approach to equality is attained can there be any point in even talking about negotiated peace. Colonel Lindbergh showed his mettle when he stated, "I want to see neither side win. I would like to see a negotiated peace." He knew he was going against the popular tide of feeling, but he had the courage of his convictions. But if he genuinely desires neither side to win, should he not encourage immediate and extensive assistance to Britain? Since he believes that the victory of Germany is almost inevitable, should he not seek to level the scales a bit?

Indeed, all those who truly seek a durable negotiated peace can scarcely urge it seriously at this time, when Hitler holds most of the chips. Such negotiations would be a farce in the nature of the case. Regardless of how it might be camouflaged, a peace now would leave Germany in possession of a big stick and unhampered in making it even bigger. The whole undertaking could amount only to an armistice in the shadow of Nazi militarism, during which an armaments race would be unfolded, with the United States as the chief and most worried contender in the race.

Since negotiations can only take place as between approximate equals, it would seem Colonel Lindbergh's duty to help promote military equality. That can be achieved only in two ways. First, by curbing Germany—which we are doing through economic and other pressures. Second, by strengthening Britain, through providing it with the weapons of modern war. Under any other conditions a demand for a negotiated peace is tantamount to a demand for a German-dictated peace.

III

Now let us look at the second of Colonel Lindbergh's contentions. Can we prepare for our own defense if we "deplete" our forces and "strip" our aviation for Britain? My answer is that the very process of building for Britain—or, for that matter, for anyone else—serves to fortify our own strength.

I agree completely with Secretary of War Stimson's statement, in his letter to the Foreign Relations Committee, that it is not the number of planes on hand that counts in measuring national security—but the capacity for producing planes. Certainly we need an adequate number of all types of aircraft to keep our personnel in combat trim. Beyond that, our accretion of power must be judged by the expansion of our production facilities, the development of contingents of skilled labor in the defense industries, our intensive experience in building, handling, and maintaining large masses of airplanes.

These are things which we cannot ship to England or anywhere else. They stay with us as a permanent fortification of our country. They are the immediate dividends on the investment of effort and materials in provisioning Britain.

In his Collier's article and elsewhere Colonel Lindbergh has underlined the criminal failure of France and England to gear themselves for the realities of the danger that threatened them. Assume for a moment that those nations had been engaged for years in serving as arsenals for some other nation; for China, let us say. In pushing maximum production for China they would have been keyed up to a superb productive pitch—and would have been able to switch that production for themselves when the Nazi danger loomed. Even thus our all-out productive effort for Britain is forcing us in time of peace to key production, experience, discipline, and psychology to our own defense needs should the supreme challenge come.

To take advantage of the possibilities thus opened up, we must begin now to plan for the future. The new plants, for instance, must be constructed not simply for their present use but with a view to their subsequent use for vastly different and more imposing types. Without a clear prevision of the aviation that is coming we shall continue to trail Germany and England. We need to recognize that our air problems are different from theirs and plan logically to meet those specific problems. But—and that is where I join the issue again with the colonel—we can do so without interrupting a steady and ever larger flow of the present output. Our over-all task of preparing for the future air war is at this stage a matter of audacious designing, experimenting, planning. None of that, of course, is handicapped by the mass production for Britain; on the contrary, that production serves as a proving ground for creative aeronautical effort. In the act of equipping the British we shall be laying the foundation for our own air supremacy.

A significant contradiction can be traced through the arguments of those opposing aid to Britain. On the one hand, they show that American aviation now available or under construction is deplorably below standard, obsolete or quickly obsolescing. On the other hand, they insist that we must hold on to all that equipment to avoid depleting American defenses. There seems to me no warrant in common sense for conserving obsolescing arms. It is untrue that bad equipment is better than none. To the extent that they produce a false sense of safety they are worse than none. An inventory of outmoded aviation will only encourage a delusion of security; Italy, for example, has paid a high price for such a delusion.

Practically everything we now possess in the way of fighting aircraft, including models on the production line, would be useless in the kind of air war we may have to tackle. Pursuit planes seem the most natural for us to keep here. However, they are the types that become obsolescent most rapidly, as proven under actual combat in this war. Why hold on to them, since they would, so to speak, only die on our hands? The bombers we are producing are conspicuously unsuited for our own national needs. They are too short in range to use against any potential enemy. The whole theory of drawing our domestic and British production out of a single faucet, so to speak, is fallacious. Let us plan, design, develop the industrial foundation for the kind of air power essential to meet our eventual needs; meanwhile vast production facilities are being made ready for the purpose in manufacturing for British use.

Colonel Lindbergh has told, and told truly, how France and England could not break through their lethargy until war overtook them in earnest. We in America have been in the grip of the same sort of lethargy. In the great effort to aid Britain we are breaking through it. Our Government is fully justified in drawing the picture in dark colors. It recognizes the importance of arousing the American people to the real world of power politics and contending greeds in which we live. To accuse it of "hysteria" is especially short-sighted in the light of what wishful-thinking complacency did for France and other nations. Far from weakening us, the conversion of America into an arsenal for other nations is forcing the organization of a military industrial machine, strengthening the national muscles, making Americans conscious of their exposed position in a predatory world.

I submit, therefore, that the argument that we are undermining our own defenses in extending assistance to Britain—judged on purely technical grounds—does not stand up.

IV

I come finally to the crux of the dispute—the defensive position of the United States. Are we impregnable? Can we be made impregnable? Have we the right, under the new conditions created by air power, to divide our security into "offensive" and "defensive" elements?

Much of the confusion on these questions derives from a loose use of the word "inva-

sion" and the idea behind it. Invasion happens to be an obsolescent concept, and in the near future will be acnowledged, I am convinced, as a stone-age concept. To show that an enemy could not land armies and occupy a country mile by mile proves approximately nothing. The same enemy, if it succeeds in wresting control of the skies overhead, can pound the country into helpless wreckage without the need to occupy territory. Should it be argued that ultimate victory could not be obtained by that alone (though I believe it could), the fact still remains that it is a type of destructive fury to which no nation will wish to expose itself.

The basic procedure in modern warfare is no longer occupation. It is total destruction—and that is achieved from the air. One nation can now, with its aviation arm, strike at another as a totality, rather than inch by inch. That's the core of the "total war" idea, and that is the new threat, the air-age threat, against which we must be prepared. It is a threat in which oceans have already lost some of their protective valu> and are destined to become soon as illusory a defense as the Maginot Line proved.

The bombing of American objectives from across the ocean is already possible, as Colonel Lindbergh himself stated. With every year that possibility will be extended until, finally, the American continent will be as vulnerable to attack as the British Isles. The Atlantic will be no more protection than the English Channel; the only protection will be the size and the quality of our own air power.

While competent and realistic in dealing with existing types of aviation, Colonel Lindbergh is curiously timid in estimating the immediate future of air power. He fails to visualize the speed with which the "reach" and striking power of aviation are expanding. Already Nazi bombers are harassing British merchantmen in the last third of their journey across the Atlantic; soon enough it will be a half instead of a third. And the process will not stop until oceans are spanned with the utmost ease.

That 33-hour journey which made history and a national hero is perhaps too deeply imprinted on Colonel Lindberg's memory, making him unduly conscious of oceans as barriers. I venture to guess that he remembers too vividly the hazards and strains of the flight and his physical exhaustion at its finish, so that he retains an old-fashioned respect for oceans in some ways analogous to the fateful French respect for the Maginot fortifications.

To the practical men in the aviation industry, engaged in designing planes for planned tactical purposes, military aircraft with a range of 25,000 miles, equal to the circumference of the globe, seem wholly realistic in the predictable future—in 5 years at the outside. That will mean that no nation and no part of any nation will be immune from direct attack from any part of the world. And long before that, the Atlantic, then the Pacific, will fall under the domination of one air power or another, in total disregard of respective naval strengths. There will be no genuine defense against it except in the air. Oceans will be just so many Skagerraks.

I can understand how generals and admirals, nurtured on older strategic notions, close their minds against this picture of the emerging aviation of tomorrow. But I find it hard to understand why a man like Colonel Lindbergh should do so. I can only surmise that the colonel, having no military background and having come across the whole thing late in his career, remains impressed with the frozen tactical thinking of the past. It has for him the fascination of novelty. He has not caught up with the fact that the orthodox assumptions have been invalidated by air power and the lessons of this war.

Thus he takes the need for invasion and occupation and troop deployments for granted. Thus he still puts his faith in "defensive" armaments and techniques, as represented by wide oceans, powerful fleets, and defensive aircraft. He ignores the elementary military principle that the best defense is always a vigorous offense—a principle that applies a hundredfold more strongly in air power. To wait for enemy attacks and then to parry the blows is well-nigh suicidal. The one sane defense against air attacks is to annihilate their points of origin in the enemy country.

It will matter nothing that the armadas of bombers, thousands of them perhaps, will travel 10 hours or more before reaching American objectives. They will be crossing at substratospheric altitudes, perhaps with relief crews, under ideal conditions of comfort. On arrival at their destinations, the crews will be as fresh and rested as if they had stepped out of their own homes after breakfast. In modern planes, after all, what is the difference between flying for 3 hours to the interior of Germany or Italy and flying 10 hours across the ocean to the interior of the United States? Of all the elements involved in the undertaking, the period of approach is the least risky and the least exhausting. Once over enemy territory, whether the bomber is above the Ruhr or Pennsylvania, the Midlands or Chicago, London or New York, makes not the slightest difference technically. The procedure after arrival is identical—and the disastrous consequences of the visit are identical.

It is a curious truth, though not yet widely understood, that the more industrialized a country is, the more vulnerable it is to destruction from overhead. American industries, grouped in thick-sown concentrations dependent on centralized sources of power, make ideal targets for air attacks. The tremendous expanse of our country may give us a feeling of hugeness, but the vital centers are few and extremely exposed.

I contend that those who deny the practical possibility of an eventual air attack on America are lulling the American people into a false sense of safety as dangerous as the Maginot Line mentality that cost France its independence. Colonel Lindbergh, so well aware of what wishful thinking in such matters has done to European nations, should be the last one to join in the lullaby.

We had better discount our oceans and even our navies, while acknowledging their present importance, in considering the immediate future. The sooner we recognize that impregnability—the retirement ostrich-fashion behind ocean ramparts—is a thing of the past, the better. Such isolationism is ruled out physically by the advent of air power and the giant steps with which it is enlarging its range. Every new weapon has ended someone's isolation. The Indians were isolated in the Western Hemisphere until sailing ships and gunpowder overtook them. The last margins of oceanic isolation are crumbling, and no amount of rhetoric and patriotic invocations can alter the fact.

The Atlantic has already been narrowed to 8 hours or less. The future air traffic of the world will spin its web between continents with scarcely a second glance at oceans. It will crisscross over America as it speeds between points halfway round the world. Like some isolated prairie town suddenly yanked into the big, wide world by a new railroad junction, we shall find ourselves suddenly in the very midst of world air traffic, completely open for commerce or for destructive onslaught. It is well enough to preach a phantasmal ocean-guarded isolationalism to those who still live in the past. A new generation, alert to the changing realities of a new age, must and will reject it as a dangerous, ostrichlike evasion of reality.

It is unfortunate that Colonel Lindbergh has allowed himself to be used as spokesman for the soporific philosophy of make-believe isolationism, defensive armaments, and unrealistic withdrawal from a narrowed-down, highly integrated, modern world. But to doubt his profound loyalty to American ideals is the sheerest absurdity; and to blame him for his role is no less absurd. The Lindbergh of the popular imagination is a graven image, a sort of deity of aviation, which the American people have carved for themselves. We should not blame the real Lindbergh, therefore, if that diety does not, on demand, perform miracles of political, economic, and strategic insight.

The National Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me before the Appleton, Wis., Chamber of Commerce on April 24, 1941, on the subject The National Picture.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When Alex Benz spoke to me about your gracious invitation to be your speaker at this annual meeting, I was delighted to accept.

There are many reasons for accepting your kind invitation, but I suppose the primary reason is because I have so many old and valued friends in Appleton.

I am indeed gratified at having this opportunity to visit with old friends.

"Oh, how good it feels—the hand of an old friend!"

Browning says:

"Hand grasps at hand, eye lights eye, with good fellowship. And great hearts expand and grow one, in the sense of the world's life."

When we speak tonight about the national picture we naturally consider the material and social progress which we have made in the United States. And yet the fact that we have made headway in our material and social progress is due in a large degree to responsible groups of citizens like this one tonight who are devoting their time to real progress in business, in government—and what is even more important—in living.

On March 31, 1940, your group issued a report which stated that the year 1940 marked the completion of two decades of service for your organization to the community.

ALL GROUPS AFFECTED BY SAME ECONOMIC TIDE

I heartily endorse the statement in your annual report that your group "recognizes the truth that the interests of all are so interwoven and interdependent that all groups or classes are always equally affected by the same economic tide."

In this single statement your organization has recognized a great fundamental truth.

I believe that recognition of that truth throughout the land would be a decisive step in correcting some of our existing economic maladjustments, and I further believe that it would do a great deal to unify all of the people of the United States.

PHYSICAL ASPECTS OF NATIONAL PICTURE

The subject of our discussion this evening is the national picture. The first consideration in our national picture must be a brief consideration of the physical aspects of the national picture.

Our land occupies about 6 percent of the total area of the globe. We have about 7 percent of the world's population. But, as is well known, we have about 60 percent of the world's telephone and telegraph equipment.

We look out over 60 percent of the world's wheat and cotton, 70 percent of its oil supplies, 50 percent of its copper and pig iron.

We claim nearly 67 percent of the banking resources of the world. We own half of the world's supply of gold, and our purchasing power is greater than the purchasing power of 500,000,000 Europeans.

This is the land where 10,000,000 persons, with twenty to forty million dependents, are direct owners in the larger industries of the country.

At the present time we are mobilizing these resources in a tremendous defense program. There have been difficulties in this mobilization, but, nevertheless, it cannot be denied that we have made tremendous strides and that we have almost unparalleled natural resources and equipment to draw upon.

In other words, the national picture, as it is concerned with our physical equipment, is an encouraging picture and a picture which presents tremendous material advances for which we must be grateful.

Here we are the most powerful nation in the world, 131,000,000 souls, located geographically in the most favorable position from every viewpoint and relatively safe from attack because of the two oceans. With a little vision we can become practically self-sustaining.

From the standpoint of production, the standard of living, and from every other material advantage we are way ahead of any nation the world has ever known.

However, we are not free from problems. We have entered upon a great defense program which may become an offense program, and as a result we are spending our resources at a prodigal rate.

FARMERS NOT GETTING REASONABLE COMPENSATION

Our farmers, outside the favored few, approximately about 20 percent, have not been getting reasonable compensation for what they produce. Speaking in the Senate of the United States just a few days ago and using the most recent Federal statistics available—1939—I called attention to the Wisconsin dairy situation.

In that year we produced about 12,000,000,000 pounds of milk. If 20 percent of our farmers were within the favored milkshed areas, that left 80 percent who got less than 2 cents a quart for their milk. There are almost a million people in Wisconsin dependent upon farming. That would leave about 750,000 of that million who haven't gotten a fair break. Something will have to be done.

Another angle of our defense program is mirrored forth in the tremendous cost of that program. Recently I opposed the appropriation of $7,000,000,000 to finance H. R. 1776. I was one of nine in the Senate who voted against it, and my reasons as stated on the floor of the Senate were:

(1) The President's failure to inform the Congress as to what steps he is taking to secure collateral security for the property, credits, and so forth, to be loaned or sold to Britain.

(2) The fact that the appropriations were not backed up by a realistic tax program.

(3) The utter lack of any disposition on the part of the managers of government to cut down on nondefense items.

(4) The careless manner in which the people's money is being spent in this defense program.

(5) The power to appropriate has become synonymous with the "must" requests or dictates of the Chief Executive.

Any one of these objections would be a subject for a speech.

FACTORS MENACE MATERIAL ASSETS OF NATION

There are factors which menace our material picture today. In 1890 the average worker gave possibly 1 day's work out of every 14 to government. Most of us do not realize it, but recently, according to experts, before the current emergency, government was taking the economic output of 1 out of every 4 working days. Naturally, this has drained our economic bloodstream.

In the first 3 months of the present year Congress appropriated more than $16,000,000,000. The assessed valuation of the State of Wisconsin is a little over $4,000,000,000. In other words, in the past 3 months we have appropriated more than four Wisconsins.

SHOVELING BILLS MEANS MORE TAXATION

Now, that cannot go on forever. Spending in these pork-barrel figures means that we are in for a period of sacrifice. We are going to have staggering bills with higher and more painful taxation. We must be prepared to stand the gaff.

The banks are loaded with idle savings because of lack of investment channels.

These factors, too, are part of the economic and material portion of the national picture.

On the other hand, almost every business and financial long-term forecast today is based on the fact that the industrial expansion involved in our defense program has only begun.

I do not know how great it will become, but I do know that it will become even more extensive. I do not know what will happen to our national expenditures, but I think it is likely that they too will be progressively skyrocketed by this administration.

DIFFICULT TO PREDICT WHAT THE TREND WILL BE

It is difficult to predict just precisely what the trend will be, but it is reasonable to believe that unless that trend is materially altered by events abroad—by the possible involvement of the United States or by the collapse of the Axis or by the return of world peace—the trend will be for greater industrial expansion and greater governmental spending.

At the present time the banner headlines are devoted to labor troubles. These are serious troubles. I believe they will be overcome. I believe we cannot longer jeopardize our national security by continued labor difficulty. I believe that public opinion will eventually insist on a decisive labor policy for this administration.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION MUST BE UNINTERRUPTED

It will be difficult to eliminate industrial disputes until there is in the country an overwhelming unanimity of conviction not merely that strikes must stop but that the Nation must be defended.

Men in the same boat, if there is danger, will pull in unison. Apparently there is not that sense of danger among the conflicting parties in America today.

A recent Gallup poll indicates that a large percentage of the people are in favor of outlawing strikes during the period of the present emergency, but strikes persist. Yet we must realize that there are undoubtedly over a hundred men engaged in production where one man strikes.

LABOR SITUATION DEMANDS PERSPECTIVE

The situation calls for perspective and understanding and patience—patience with the problems of America, especially the labor problem. We must be careful in this situation to see that the pendulum does not swing away over to the other extreme, resulting in the destruction of legitimate rights and privileges. We must remember that sometimes right is on one side and sometimes on the other.

The President sold the country on the need for the lease-lend bill and on the appropriation of $7,000,000,000. This was done on the basis and in the belief that the country was in jeopardy; that we needed the bill and the money for defense; and, according to the polls, approximately 90 percent of the people of this country were in favor of aid to Britain. Yet a recent poll indicates that 87 percent are not in favor of war.

But now, in this strike situation, we have two explanations: First, that there may be some sabotage in our defense production. It will be remembered that Hitler said that America would destroy herself, referring to his ability to divide us into warring factions, as he did in other countries which he has weakened and then overrun. It will be remembered that a recent poll showed that 72 percent of the people were of the opinion that many labor-union leaders were racketeers, 14 percent disagreed, and 14 percent had no opinion.

Secondly, that both management—and this is the point I believe in—and labor, or one or the other, as the case may be, do not comprehend the full force of the emergency argument which put over these two measures.

These combatants still cling to their rights; they dwell on their grievances and hug their prejudices. They will behave as they are accustomed to behave in normal times. They will not rise above ordinary habits of ordinary times.

We have no assurance that America comprehends the tremendous and difficult problems up ahead which require unity and sacrifice.

What do we need? We simply need a realization, if it is a fact, that this country is in jeopardy. We need to be sold the proposition that we have to pull together for production; and we have to realize that production is the nub of the matter. When that point is reached, I am satisfied that both management and labor will cease contending, except in those instances where, as it has been suggested, there are "fifth columnists," or racketeers, or foreign influences at work.

Where that situation exists, it is the business of the Government to step in and see that such activities cease.

These strikes have not been all loss. There is coming to the fore in American consciousness the thought that the public has a big interest in the picture.

Heretofore only management and labor were consulted. They had the whole say. Now the public is becoming audible. This will mean legislation giving consideration to the rights of the public.

Every strike causes loss to the public.

This is no time to permit the pendulum to swing so that it will obliterate legitimate rights and privileges. The question is not one-sided. So long as man continues to be man, the battle for economic power will go on. We have known of instances where labor, generaled by racketeers, has overplayed its hand. We have seen instances where the employer, through stubbornness and lack of comprehension that he was living in a changing world, has missed the mark.

But, as indicated by the polls, this country of ours is in no frame of mind for a stoppage in its production. It is calling out to all Americans for sacrifices. It is asking citizens everywhere for sacrifices. It is time for labor unions, employers, youth in the Army, taxpayers—for all of us to realize that this is no period for "business as usual"; no time for labor or management to be swayed and governed by grievances and prejudices. When

the house is on fire, there is no time for the fire department to go on a vacation.

There is something here that dissolves all pettiness, all minor differences. There is something here that unifies, that makes for a spirit of national cooperation. That something is national safety—the safety of home and loved ones, the safety of democratic principles.

When I came back from Europe, realizing the world emergency situation, I said on the floor of the Senate: "If I were in the councils of labor and wanted to advance unionism and labor's rights, I would advise the leaders of labor to issue a pronouncement in substance stating that during the period of the emergency there will be no strikes."

I believe if that course had been followed, labor would have advanced itself. I do not want to see labor prejudice its legitimate gains. In this country it probably has a union membership of between 7,000,000 and 9,000,000. Both labor and management must recognize that there is a great responsibility owed by both to the rest of our citizenry. In this great Nation no individual or group lives unto itself alone. There are great obligations to be fulfilled by all.

If the recent polls are correct—and I have no reason to distrust them—there is a clear indication that the public does not approve of what has been done. I am not acquainted with the merits of any of the strike situations. I pass no judgment on the merits. I only know that if the international situation is as bad as we were told it was in the lend-lease debate—and we know that Britain needs all the aid in the shape of material that we can give her—then no one has the right to stop defense production, because defense production, then, is a national matter in which 131,000,000 people are involved—not merely labor and management.

Therefore it is not unreasonable, unpatriotic, or un-American for a government to say to management and labor, "Carry on; open up the factories; labor, go to work and allow negotiations to go on while production is going on." It is fair to both management and labor that government in each such case give assurance that the questions in issue will be settled quickly.

In the present situation the right of labor to enjoy the American standard of living at a fair wage or the right of capital to receive a reasonable return is not involved. There is involved the duty and obligation and right of Government to speak definitely and clearly on a vital subject that involves the security of the lives and property of 131,000,000 people.

FURTHER PREDICTIONS FOR BUSINESS

Because a decisive knock-down-and-drag-out victory in the present war is unlikely in the near future, it is my prediction that we will become involved to an increasingly greater degree.

I think that in the next 90 days we may see this administration whoop up a national psychology, keyed to terms of national emergency. There will be an increase, rather than a decrease, in the mobilization of industry.

Because of abnormal demands, this administration will probably take steps to scrap the supply-and-demand factor. Prices may be determined primarily by costs rather than supply and demand.

More price schedules are on the way. There will probably be inventory controls. There will be more rationing and allocation—tax rates will be higher than ever before—the normal surtax and excess-profits taxes will be boosted.

INFLATION CAN STILL BE AVOIDED

Inflation has been defined as a change in money which tends to reduce its purchasing power.

Inflation is not such a remote possibility. As a matter of fact, inflation in the United States is already an actuality, or, at least, we might say that inflation has already been injected into our credit and money system. I do not think we have fully felt its effects up to the present time.

I do think that our gold holdings, our excess reserves, our low money rates, and our Government spending all make for a perfect set-up for a run-away inflation, though, fortunately, there are a number of controls on that inflation.

I regret keenly that control of the use and allocation of capital funds has passed from private hands to Government hands during the past 8 years. The business of raising money for new capital investment has shifted to Washington—and I do not believe it belongs in Washington.

Government borrowing and spending have largely superseded similar investment of funds by private enterprise.

I submit that one of the basic questions which will confront American industry and American business, in the years up ahead, will be the choice between a blackjack collectivistic economy and a revitalized economy of free enterprise.

To such a question there can be only one answer. If we are opposed to totalitarian doctrines abroad, we cannot adopt them here, or we render our opposition pointless.

There are at least five obvious checks on inflation:

1. High tax rates.
2. A loss of export business, due to war conditions.
3. Our large surplus of raw material and labor.
4. Our free competitive market.
5. Sale of Government bonds to individuals and business concerns, with defense-financing bonds taken out of the banking system.

Of course, there are also a number of arbitrary controls which could be used:

1. The reserve requirements of banks can be stepped up to reduce the risks of credit inflation.
2. The rediscount rates can be increased to discourage excessive borrowing.
3. Government controls over the banking system and over prices can be increased.
4. Government could sell future bond issues to the general public instead of to the banks where they create fiat credit.
5. The Federal Budget on nondefense items can be brought into line.
6. Competitive bidding among themselves by Government defense agencies can be stopped.

The elimination of inflation during the period of defense armament would eliminate the psychological fear of deflation after the war.

INDUSTRY WILL HAVE TO MAKE ADJUSTMENTS

In other words, there are some possibilities in the national picture for a business boom, but there will also be a number of factors which will make it necessary for industry and business to roll up their sleeves for a great many adjustments.

Business will have to fit into the picture of an industrial mobilization of men, machinery, money, and materials. Business will be jockeyed into the place of a Reserve officer in the Quartermaster Corps in an age of mandatory and voluntary priorities.

There will be an increasing problem in operating in an atmosphere of growing labor shortage—increasing production requirements and increasing military manpower requirements.

America's business will continue. It will grow, but it won't be business as usual.

This is not an overly encouraging picture. I am deliberately attempting to present a realistic picture. I do not want to imply, however, that there is anything in the national picture which will make business and industry sing the dirge of defeatism.

"The great lesson of life is to believe in what the centuries say as against the hours."

I do not believe, even in an age of mobilization of business and industry, that we can afford to subscribe to any pessimistic defeatism. I refuse to believe that American initiative will ever become permanently collectivistic.

I do see a dwindling emphasis on individualism in business and industry, and to a large extent that is to be keenly regretted, but I feel that in its place there will emerge an increasing emphasis on cooperation.

I would like to emphasize, also, the fact that we cannot neglect the long-range viewpoint.

WE CANNOT ORGANIZE SOUND LONG-TIME ECONOMY ON COLLECTIVISTIC OR TOTALITARIAN BASIS

Our immediate concern is with production and defense, but we must not neglect the long-time viewpoint of a sound American economy.

I do not believe we can create such a sound economy for the readjustment period, which will follow Europe's war, if we adopt a collectivistic or totalitarian economy.

I want to look ahead now to the time when we will shift from a defense economy to a peacetime economy, and I want that shift to be made without any back-breaking period of readjustment.

I do not want to see a period of tremendous boomtime overexpansion. I do not want to see a staggering public debt and crushing taxation with rising unemployment.

These are problems which we must confront now.

I do not think Government can anticipate these problems of itself. Government and business and the American people working together can do the job.

NEW HORIZONS UP AHEAD

I believe there are new frontiers for American business. They will not be geographical frontiers. To a certain extent they will be mental horizons.

In order to reach them we have to get out of the doldrums of defeatism. Our American economy will not go to pot. To a certain extent these new horizons will be the horizons of research, visioned today in the laboratory.

I do not think these new horizons will be primarily the result of any formal scheme of redistribution, but will rather be the result of the creation of more values to be distributed.

We have made tremendous advances in science, and these tremendous advances themselves are a smashing answer to the indictment that America's system of free enterprise has stagnated.

We have the facilities. We have the resources. We have the money, and I know that we have the will to meet the economic challenges of the period which will follow a cessation of Europe's conflict.

I believe in the future of America, and I believe in research. I do not think government has done enough in the field of research, and I sincerely hope that government will do more research, both laboratory research and the kind of research which means long-range planning.

APPLETON PROVIDES AN EXCELLENT EXAMPLE OF RESEARCH ACTIVITY

I might add that when we speak of research, there is no finer place to discuss such a subject than the city of Appleton. Appleton is a splendid example of research. Here in this city you inaugurated a unique experiment in adult education in 1929 when you created the Institute of Paper Chemistry.

This institute, in a relatively unexplored field, devoted its energies to research for the pulp and paper industry, and other industries concerned in production of a related nature. Yours was the first institute of its kind in the entire United States, and you deserve great credit for the excellent job you have done.

FOREIGN POLICY PART OF NATIONAL PICTURE

Defense and our foreign policy are today a vital part of the national picture.

From the stage at Washington we see, as you people here do, a world at war with only the Americas, North and South, at peace.

Will we continue to remain at peace? all America asks.

Eighty-seven percent of the people, according to a recent poll, do not want our Nation to engage in war. Yet 90 percent of the people want all-out aid to Britain.

We are told that we can expect more and more action on the part of America in the future and this may bring us into the fray.

We are taking over bases in Greenland—Danish territory.

The administration will be sending our Navy flying boats out over the Atlantic scouting for German submarines and surface raiders.

More destroyers and ships will go to Britain.

The administration is taking over foreign-owned ships in our ports, sending material to Suez and to Greenland, and opening our ports for the repair of British men-of-war.

We are getting into stride in the production of ships and planes and war material.

Will we convoy? That question will be determined, I believe, by British needs, as the administration interprets them. We are risking war now. Today Britain's need is great. Her forces are spread out very thin on land and sea. She must beat the submarine and air raiders or lose. She needs supplies, ships, and planes.

I said Britain's need—to be determined by future events—will determine whether we shall convoy. If her need becomes more critical the administration may seek to direct a shift in public opinion so that America will respond. This conclusion, I base upon the observation of what is going on in America and our pace toward intervention especially over the last 18 months.

There is no question but that we will be called upon to make that decision unless there is a change in the fortunes of war. I might add that I anticipated this danger in the passage of the lend-lease bill (which I opposed) but the administration refused to admit the issue. Now they will have to face the issue—the issue they dodged then.

Observers in Washington feel war is approaching closer to our shores. But war is not inevitable.

America should realize the whole picture. In this last year we have gone a long way toward preparedness, but not far enough. Even now there is talk of keeping our boys in camp for a longer period, because they haven't had the equipment to train them. (Incidentally I made that prediction when the selective-service law was passed and I was ridiculed for it. Now it is coming true.) But the Army is rounding itself into shape and, except for the strike situation, American industry is getting in stride in war production.

This is no time for our emotions to direct us. We must calmly face the greatest crisis in our history. It is a great crisis, because three nations, Germany, Italy, and Japan, are challenging the world order of which we are a part. They not only want dominant positions in Europe and in Asia and Africa, but also in the Americas and in the South Pacific.

When Hitler struck a year ago, we were in a very precarious condition—almost defenseless. We had a Navy, but it was not balanced. It didn't have a coordinating air arm. We were practically without an Army, and America was defenseless from the standpoint of ability to produce armament.

Secretary Knox tells us that our Navy is now prepared—the best in the world, with 324 ships supported by 1,754 auxiliary craft. It also has, which I am glad to announce, a large and highly trained naval air arm consisting of 3,250 planes and 3,700 pilots.

Since Hitler struck, we have obtained sites for bases ranging from Greenland and Newfoundland to Bermuda and Trinidad. It is well for us to remember that every man in the Navy and the Marine Corps is a volunteer. As a member of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, I am glad to give you the assurance, which comes from the best source I can summon, that our first line of defense, the Navy, is prepared.

The Army is another story, but there has been a considerable improvement due to the fact that industry during the last 16 months, has been grinding out equipment. We are getting 6 light tanks a day now, and soon will be producing 15.

In medium tanks we are producing at the rate of five for each 8-hour shift. These tanks are supposed to be more powerful in fire power, in armor, and in speed than the tanks of any other nation.

The Garand rifle is being produced at the rate of 3,500 a week. We do not have an adequate number of machine guns and anti-aircraft guns. We are also deficient in our artillery. Britain's ability to withstand the onslaught has given us this breathing spell in our defense preparations. We should never again be blind to what is going on in the world.

We must realize that to get all the safety insurance that is necessary, we must be prepared to sacrifice and expend effort physically, financially, and spiritually.

This America belongs to all of us, but none of us had very much to do with making her what she is. Our fathers did that for us and handed down to us of this generation this America for us to maintain intact and hand down to future generations.

In the last decade America has grown soft in more ways than one. History will give Hitler the credit for having awakened us out of our dream of ease and plenty to a realization that values in life are lost unless they are guarded. To guard America we must be united.

On land and sea I have seen folks forget their petty differences when a great storm came up. Well, a great storm may strike this Nation. This is no time for us to think we can carry on as usual. It is time for all of us to submerge our petty differences, our petty quarrels, that result from a failure to forego some petty right. We are all of that breed we call American. We are custodians of great value. We must realize that.

If America would get her latent inventive genius into action and find the answer to the submarine and the bomber, we could keep out of the fray. This pressure for American intervention would disappear then. If the submarine could be stopped, if the bomber could be stopped, we would see a disintegration go on in the ranks of the Axis.

I said that America should realize the whole picture. Russia is an enigma. Japan is an open partner with Mussolini and Hitler. It is true the whole world has been awakened out of its lethargy by the blitzkrieg of Hitler. But Hitler's blitzkrieg consisting of mechanized tanks with coordinating Stukas, would not have accomplished what it has accomplished if it were not for the unity of Germany, in its economics, in its production. America doesn't need the ruthless control of labor and industry that Hitler has to accomplish the same result. But America must have unity. We may differ on nonessentials, but on this question of loyalty there must be no difference.

AMERICA ALSO HAS RESOURCES IN ITS NATIONAL CHARACTER—RESOURCES WHICH MUST BE REBUILT

Thus far our discussion has concerned itself largely with material values in the national picture. These material values are important, but there are other values which are even more important. They are values which involve American character—and they are spiritual values.

America has a magnificent heritage of things of the spirit. If the United States were destitute tomorrow of all of her material wealth she would be rich if she retained the American character. Nations may be looted of material possessions by brigands. It is more difficult to pillage a nation of its national character.

In this land we have a national character which embodies the concept of equality and the great freedoms which we regard as traditional. Along with these freedoms and along with our doctrine of equality, the American character has always been one embodying fair dealing, honesty, idealism, thrift, industry, faith.

I think that recent years have tended to partially sabotage American character. I think that recent years have partially undermined American morale. I think that recent years have tended to partially drain American virility.

The United States is fundamentally a land of independence, where government is dependent upon the people, rather than the people upon the government. That doctrine has been changed in recent years.

The United States is fundamentally a Nation of hard-working, thrifty people. In recent years there has been a gradual erosion of that doctrine. We have encouraged "leaners" on government, and we have replaced independence with dependence. The old ideas of thrift have almost been shell-shocked into oblivion. Today we live on the shabby doctrine of "spend to the limit," "borrow all you can," and "postpone paying the bills." We have blackjacked interest rates until there is little incentive for private investment, and we have pilloried the average businessman as an "economic royalist."

We have bartered convictions for bread. Relief has been administered as political pap.

We have subsidized one group after another into subservience to this administration, and that, by the way, is exactly what happened in totalitarian lands abroad.

This growing dependence on government, this scrapping of the doctrines of frugality and independence and paying as you go is nothing new. It has been the first step in the break-down of the moral fiber of every country which has gone totalitarian or which has fallen before the totalitarian onslaught.

I submit that it is absolutely vital that we do everything in our power to retain the American character in our people and the American character in our Government. And I believe America is waking up to that need.

We are essentially a nation of law. In other lands we have seen the break-down of legal morality, and today we confront a similar domestic problem. We are undergoing certain fundamental alterations in our basic concepts of law.

In other lands we have seen the doctrine that law results from force and that "might makes right" so that law is couched in terms of penalty rather than remedy—so that man's status is derived solely from the state.

In other lands an increasing emphasis on government—on the state—has resulted in dwindling rights for the individual so that finally all he retains are a few "privileges" which he enjoys at the sufferance of the state. This is directly contrary to our American concept of law and our way of life.

I believe in the importance of social groups when they are a means to the end of protecting individual rights, but not when they become an end in themselves. Government by pressure groups must cease. Today this administration rejects any type of appeasement in its foreign policy, but follows a weak-kneed policy of internal appeasement.

Another factor in altering our American character has been the growth of administrative bureaus, stealing the function

of the legislative branch. In recent years we have been confronted with the idea that American lawmakers, whether they be city councilmen or Senators of the United States, apparently are unable to write understandable English.

At any rate, it appears that every law which is written from city ordinances to acts of Congress have to be "interpreted." The interpreters are not elected officials. They are the heads of Government bureaus. They constitute an American army of illegitimate lawmakers, and they are largely responsible for the uncertainty of Government rulings affecting business.

We know there are too many laws, but by the same token there are far too many departmental rulings. You businessmen know what I mean when I speak of these administrative rulings. I think that in the field of public administration we need to return to fundamentals in American character.

In other words, not only labor and industry have to be united, but bureaucrats in Government have to be unseated from their high horses.

The S. E. C. must reexamine its policy and must cut through the unnecessary red tape regulations and restrictions. For the duration of the emergency the Trust Division of the Department of Justice should limit its interference with industries engaged in getting production in the defense program.

We are engaged in a major operation—seeking to make America safe and keep our freedom—and this is no time for the pseudo reformers to continue their so-called reform tactics. Neither is it a time for any Government board or commission—the National Labor Relations Board, the Federal Communications Commission, or the Treasury Department—to interject into the picture a course of conduct that will result in debilitating the morale of our people.

This is no time for pettifogging tactics or for throwing the monkey wrench farther into our economic system. It is a time to get rid of every saboteur (that includes the Government highjacker or bureaucrat) and for all Americans to unite on the forward march of America.

The United States, my faith tells me, will win the "battle of output in a machine-making war, and America will be strong in the defense of America."

I think we might well conclude with the encouraging words of Psalm 46: 1, 2: "God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore will not we fear, though the earth be removed and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea."

Daughters of American Revolution Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

ADDRESS BY H. R. BAUKHAGE

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. H. R. Baukhage, commentator of the National Broadcasting Co., before the Fiftieth Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in Constitution Hall, Washington, D. C., on April 19, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Madame President, delegates to the Fiftieth Continental Congress, National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, you are completing a successful congress. You are about to leave the Capital and return to your homes throughout the Nation.

You came here, not merely to conduct the business of your society, but, like two and one-half millions of other pilgrims who visit us each year, you came to pay your tribute at the shrine of your Nation here beside the Potomac.

I am wondering if you realize how your pilgrimage differs from theirs—how it should differ. They and you have looked upon the flowering beauty of this spot which the Father of our Country chose to be the Nation's Capital. They and you have looked upon the memorials of our country's great, in stone and marble; listened to the whisper of history in the immemorial elms on the White House lawn and along the storied avenues, where for more than a century and a half the American cavalcade has passed. These sights and these experiences you shared with our other visitors. But there is one thing that they did not share with you. You came not merely as the other pilgrims came, paying tribute at this shrine, but as representatives of an organization which is a living symbol of the very stuff of which the shrine is made.

You are here by one right, and one right alone.

It is a right conferred on you through the generations by a man who left his shop or his farmstead, his wealth or his poverty, his family and his community, because of an idea—a belief that his liberty and the happiness of those he left behind were as dear as life itself.

The establishment of our liberty was his obligation. His willingness to make whatever sacrifice was necessary ennobled him. You share his blood, and with the nobility of patriotism comes down to you the obligation to preserve the liberty which he established. That is noblesse oblige.

One hundred and sixty-six years ago today shots rang out over the quiet village green of Lexington. Men fell on both sides, martyrs to the cause in which they believed. Today we must not lose the true meaning of that conflict. We must remember that there echoes down from that historic day no harsh battle cry of soldiers hoarse with hatred and mad for plunder, but rather a cry of hope to all men who would be free, regardless of race, creed, or nationality. In that hour freedom was won. It became your noble heritage and mine.

I am one of those whose duty it is to record and report history in the making, but seldom we realize the significance of the things we record. Only the other day an experience I had when the war broke out came back to me vividly. I was suddenly back on one of the last trains to enter Berlin before the present war was declared. (I was on my way to make a series of broadcasts for the National Broadcasting Co.)

I was sitting with a good-looking passenger. We had been chatting on trivial things, when suddenly he rose, opened the door to the compartment, looked up and down the aisle, and returned to his seat.

Then in a voice with a haunting anguish in it I shall not forget, he said:

"I wish I might live in a free land again."

At first I was shocked at the frankness of such a remark in Gestapo-ridden Germany. But soon I learned that it was not so strange. This middle-aged German was voicing the suppressed yearning that has been within the human bosom since the first man turned his face upward from the clod. But only as I recalled it nearly 2 years later did I realize that incident's significance. That cry has become the symbol for the desire of a whole continent where the people of one country after another have seen the torch of freedom sputter and go out. I can now interpret the somber faces of the French soldiers I saw marching into the Maginot line, the bitterness of the weeping women when the trains pulled out. These were expressions of a people who had lost not only their freedom but their faith in free institutions.

I came face to face with the fact that if the forces moving in the world today continue, perhaps even free-born Americans may someday echo the universal cry of despair I heard as the storm broke over Europe: "I wish I might live in a free land again."

Do not think I am a defeatist of democracy. Democracy itself does not fail, anywhere on the earth. It is the people who fail democracy, well-meaning people like you and me here today. We fail democracy when we refuse to realize that we must make as great an effort to nurture the growing tree as our forefathers did when they broke the soil to plant it.

Can democracy be defended? I do not believe it is so much a question of can as of will.

Today totalitarianism has thrown down the gauntlet to democracy and threatens to drive it from the face of the earth. We do not fear the legions of the dictators. Already we are forging weapons of defense for the greatest arsenal of the world. Our most serious danger is not so much from invading armies. If the fate of our democracy rested solely on ships, guns, planes, tanks, and men, I do not believe we should be too much concerned over the Nation's future. This may be a boast but, as the President says, "not an idle boast."

But when I ask the question, Will we defend democracy? I am thinking of another host that threatens us, deadlier than the ones with guns, for like those for whom Jesus prayed, "they know not what they do."

I am thinking of those in America today who are failing democracy.

Can democracy be defended against such unwitting enemies? It cannot be done alone with graphs and charts and statistics—in committee sessions or by holding meetings and passing resolutions. It cannot be done by singing songs or repeating shibboleths. These things are empty symbols unless they represent a living force. Your meetings, your resolutions are no more than the vain repetitions of an esoteric cult unless they represent the faith of your fathers which you are translating into works.

Democracy cannot be defended unless it is renewed in the hearts and minds of each generation. Yours is the noble heritage—yours is the obligation to defend it.

What are your weapons? You have two.

First, the precept. Then the process.

The child must be taught what democracy is, must be shown how it works in the little group in which he moves. A very definite effort has been made in the last 5 years to implement the democratic way of life in and through our schools. You are familiar with this effort. Are you familiar with a study of the democratic spirit and educational practice, made in 90 American secondary schools by the Educational Policies Commission? Here are some of the things this survey tried to find out:

Does your school stress memorizing information about democracy as a substitute for democratic behavior? Is the course of study

in citizenship derived from civic problems which are faced by young people and adults today? Are social functions chiefly for the social elite of the school and the community?

Have you ever asked any of these questions about the schools in your community? If you have not, you do not know how well the foundations for the defense of democracy are being laid in your community.

Without the percepts, processes are meaningless. As we talk about processes it becomes clearer that democracy does not fail but that people fail democracy because democratic processes only stop when they run against the stone wall of self-interest of individuals and groups—a wall raised in the face of an indifferent majority.

For example, there is a man who represents a certain very large and very worthy organization in the National Capital which had already derived certain benefits from the Government. It was satisfied. The national organization was opposed to pressing for further legislation in its behalf. But its representative was worried about his job so he went out and addressed local units, whipped them up into a desire for additional benefits, obtained backing of individual groups, swept the national organization off its feet and staged a healthy raid on the Treasury.

If the people in those local communities had taken an interest in what was going on, had brought as much pressure to bear on their Congressmen as this minority did, that could not have happened.

This very thing is going on every day in a smaller or larger scale in every community. As a result, there exist as thriving but dishonored institutions the labor racketeer, the millionaire real-estate owner who makes slum clearance impossible, the city-hall gang, and all the other minorities who are destroying the processes of democracy. They are destroying the processes of democracy because of the indifference or the ineffectiveness of the majority which is unwilling or unable to unite for the common good. If you are one of such a majority you are doubly failing democracy, because you are not only denying its privileges to your community but you are standing by while your heritage is being squandered.

Without the process the precept is useless.

The school and the home may implant the principles of democracy in the minds of the youth. That teaching may be implemented by actual democratic experiences in the child's daily activities. But if he discovers that liberty and equality, freedom of thought and expression are not allowed to function in the larger world of political and social and economic life, he will be bitterly disillusioned. Then the sturdiest faith will waver. Disappointment and disillusionment are the twin conspirators that lure their victims into the clutches of every whispering ism offering a false panacea for ills.

The organization which has brought you here has done as much as any in the Nation to perpetuate the memories of the men and the events which have made this country what it is today—the last bulwark of democracy in a helpless world. But your task does not end there. You must preserve more than a memory of our glorious yesterdays. You must live the spirit of those memories today. You must build a fresh tomorrow.

There is a totalitarian counterrevolution in the world today. If its armies threaten our shores, we will rise to defend our homes as we always have. That may be tomorrow; or, if God is merciful, never. But the counterrevolution has its allies within our country today. I do not refer to "fifth columnists" or enemy agents. I refer to selfishness, greed, and easy living, indifference, disillusionment, and, as the President said day before yesterday, a complacence which is a luxury in these times that no loyal citizen can afford.

Daughters of the American Revolution, these are the enemies of the democracy which your forefathers fought. Yours is the nobility of that heritage. Yours is the obligation to see that it is preserved.

Noblesse oblige.

Let me tell you why I make this plea. It is because I have seen with my own eyes what happens when a people fail democracy.

We here in America are spending too much time fighting straw men. We think that if we can superciliously dust a few radicals off of our left coat sleeve, or push a few fat Fascists aside with our right elbow, then we can all relax, sing God Bless America (and us), and the country is saved.

So far neither of these parasites have had much to do with the curtailment of our liberties. We are still a fairly free people. It is true that some of us have to wait ignominiously on the curb in the face of an autocratic green light while the motorcade passes. It is true that some of us have to suffer silently amid the cushions of our limousines while an arrogant red signal holds us up. But on the whole we still have a good many privileges. Let me tell you about a people who have lost theirs.

Do you remember that in 1929 a great American historian wrote: "The constitution of the German Republic"—I am quoting—"is the very model of progressive democracy"? What happened to it? The German people failed democracy.

We all know that the Germans created a liberal republic on the ruins of the defeated Prussian autocracy at the end of the last war. It was handicapped at the start, it is true, by lack of encouragement from the other democratic nations, by the Communist and monarchistic groups who were not sympathetic with this idea, and by the lack of democratic experience of the German people. Also, the young republic suffered a cruel blow almost at birth from one of the worst periods of inflation in history—when it took a basketful of marks to buy a loaf of bread. Nevertheless, disintegration of the German democracy was due to weaknesses which may occur in any country.

The chief reason for the downfall of the German Republic was that the German people did not have a Benjamin Franklin to tell them that if they did not hang together they would hang separately. The various groups—the industrialists, the agriculturalists, and endless other interests—even though the majority of them believed in the republic, refused to work together. They strove, not for the general welfare, but for purely selfish, economic aims which would benefit their own class at the expense of the others. They could always unite to defeat the party in power, but they could not agree on any constructive measures. The parliament soon became a futile debating society.

When the Government and the people, sincerely trying to keep the Republic together, saw that parliament was hamstrung they began to increase the influence of the executive. The Weimar Constitution gave the Chief Executive special power in an emergency, but it never intended him to find an emergency in every pigeonhole. However, he did. And the courts, which are usually the least radical element in a modern democracy, supported the party in power. So did the civil service. Career men were appointed to Cabinet posts on the theory that they were nonpolitical. But they, too, fell in line with Government policies—devoting themselves chiefly to keeping their jobs. The unpropertied classes, supported to some extent by the extreme right, grew in power. Hardly disguising their purposes, they fought for their own betterment at the expense of the middle class. The middle class, you know, is the backbone of any democracy.

In Germany, the middle class—what was left of it—began to disintegrate because of pressure from above and below and because of growing fear and uncertainty—fear of bolshevism and uncertainty as to the effectiveness of their leaders. Meanwhile, the National Socialist Party, which had been the National Socialist Workers Party, began to thrive on hate, and feed on discontent. It appealed to the disillusioned democrats with its ballyhooed hatred of bolshevism. It appealed to the nationalists with a hatred of all other nations which had oppressed Germany. It appealed to the hatred of all the things which the Republic had tried to do and failed, as for instance, the attempt to obtain by negotiation modifications of the Versailles Treaty, and to improve economic conditions made worse by the 1930 depression.

And so, more and more of the disappointed, despairing, and disillusioned middle class, wracked with uncertainty forsook the democratic processes which they had never really given a chance to operate and enlisted with the brown shirts in their creed of force. Finally, the Government itself succumbed, personified by the then fast-failing Hindenburg. Hitler was made Chancelor.

The German people were willing to trade their tattered coat of liberty for what they believed was brown-shirted security. They deserted the spiritual concept of the rights of man for the harsh logic of the moment. They forgot the wisdom of their own great poet, Goethe, when he has Mephistopheles say in the prologue of Faust that man possesses what he calls reason—"thence his powers increase to be far beastlier than any beast's."

I saw the results at first hand of that bargain with the devil.

That is how one people failed democracy.

A people who, as Kipling wrote, "That puts her trust in reeking tube and iron shard, all valiant dust that builds on dust, and guarding, calls not thee to guard."

Now I do not say that the American Republic is built upon such shifting sands that the storms that blow about us wreck our solid foundations. But I do say that now, if ever in our history, our liberties need to be watched with the eternal vigilance that has always been their price. We must be as strong within as when the young Nation struggled into being bastioned only by its faith, the spirit that rose at Lexington and Concord, the spirit born in the solemn pact signed in the crowded cabin of the Mayflower. The spirit that was reborn in each new colony, the spirit that was written into the eternal parchment in Philadelphia, that lived in the stout hearts of the pioneers who led the wagon trains into the West, led onward by the star toward which throughout the ages wise men and foolish have moved—blindly, perhaps, and gropingly at times, but always in the hope that their children and their children's children would live in its light.

The trail the covered wagon left has gone. New pioneers went out on trails of steel to raise new towns—then came the easy life when we forgot the pioneer who tilled his field, his rifle by his side—that easy life is over. Once more the call of the minutemen has gone out. This time to wake the spirit that must guard our heritage lest it be squandered here, within our gates.

Can democracy be defended? I cannot answer that question. Nor can the President of the United States, nor all his generals and admirals—the answer rests in the hearts and hands of each of you.

Noblesse oblige.

Alleged Discriminations Against Colored People by Consolidated Aircraft Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

LETTERS FROM EDGAR N. GOTT AND WALTER WHITE AND AFFIDAVITS BY C. D. JOLLY AND T. R. DUNLAP

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, at my request there was printed in the Appendix of the RECORD on March 13, 1941, a statement by Mr. Walter White, secretary of the National Association for Advancement of Colored People, as recently published in the New York Post, alleging certain discriminations against Negroes applying for employment by the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation of San Diego, Calif.

I have received a letter from Edgar N. Gott, of the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation denying some of the statements made in this article. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Gott's letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I submitted Mr. Gott's letter to Mr. White, and in reply have received the following statement from him, accompanied by affidavits made by C. D. Jolly and T. R. Dunlap, of the industry and labor committee of the San Diego branch of the National Association for Advancement of Colored People. So that the public may have both sides of the controversy, I ask unanimous consent to have these two statements also printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSOLIDATED AIRCRAFT CORPORATION,
San Diego, Calif., April 4, 1941.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 13, 1941, includes extension of remarks made by you which the RECORD states were derived from an article written by Walter White, National Association for Advancement of Colored People, printed in the New York Post. I wish to call your attention to the following:

1. I am not the manager of Consolidated Aircraft Corporation.

2. I did not say white men won't work with Negroes.

3. Nor did I say that there are no trained Negroes.

4. I did not say that we would employ no Negroes.

5. I did not say the United States Government had no power to force me so to do.

For further bearing on the subject I am quoting from a letter written by me on March 6, 1941, to Assemblyman Paul A. Richie, of the California State Legislature:

"We extend the opportunity of employment to any American citizen regardless of race, creed, or color. True American citizenship, including loyalty to American institutions and absolute allegiance to the United States and the democratic principles for which they stand, is, of course, essential. We do, however, reserve the right, in extending opportunity for employment, to consider the qualifications of the candidate, his or her past experience and ability, with a view to determining whether or not he or she is capable of filling any position which may be available at the time.

"We have in the past employed Negroes in positions which they, as individuals, were capable of filling, and will continue so to do. In employing persons of this race you must, of course, realize that the attitude of their fellow workers placed in close contact with them must be given every consideration. We have at present over 16,000 men employed, and, although we request the information on our application blank as to whether the applicant is white or otherwise, once he is employed we keep no separate record of this. We are therefore unable to give you the number now in our employ. The question of placing Negroes in training schools is a matter over which we have no jurisdiction and one which should be of interest only to the applicant and to the school in which he desires to obtain his training."

It is to be regretted that the New York Post has made such manifestly erroneous and, above all, misleading statements—especially at a time when everyone is trying to put his shoulder to the wheel. It is requested that you give due cognizance to this letter and that you extend same in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Yours very truly,

EDGAR N. GOTT.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
New York, April 29, 1941.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: Absence from the city and delay in receiving certain information requested from San Diego relative to the attitude of the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation of San Diego toward the employment of Negroes have caused my delay in complying with your request for comment upon the letter of April 4, 1941, from Mr. Edgar N. Gott.

I enclose herewith copy of affidavit from Messrs. C. D. Jolly and T. R. Dunlap of San Diego, regarding the interview Messrs. Jolly and Dunlap had with Mr. Gott on November 13, 1940, at 1:30 p. m. You will note in this affidavit that Messrs. Jolly and Dunlap swear under oath that Mr. Gott did state that the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation "would not employ Negroes in the skilled or semiskilled class"; that the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation as a private corporation "hired whom they desired and that the United States Government could not make them do otherwise"; and that Mr. Gott did say that "he did not believe the skilled white employees would work together with skilled Negro employees."

This would seem to resolve itself into a question as to who is telling the truth.

In affirmation of the veracity of Messrs. Jolly and Dunlap is the experience of William A. Dickinson, Jr., of Bakersfield, Calif., with the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation of San Diego. Employment was offered by Consolidated to all graduates of the Bakersfield Junior College who had completed a course in aircraft metal. Mr. Dickinson, a Negro, completed the course with a straight B average. Six of his white fellow students were given employment by Consolidated. Dickinson was curtly informed by Consolidated that "No Negroes accepted."

Whatever Mr. Gott's personal or official position may be on the matter of employment of Negroes, the most complete answer may be found in the figures of the number of Negroes employed at a time when Consolidated is seeking trained workers. In response to a telegram I sent to San Diego, I am informed that out of 16,000 employees at Consolidated only 9 Negroes are employed, and these as lavatory janitors. This obtains despite the fact that Consolidated is being paid for the airplanes it produces by the United States Government, whose funds are obtained by taxation of Negro Americans as well as white ones.

The attitude of the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation gives additional evidence of the need of passage by the United States Senate without delay of Senate Resolution 75, which provides for a Senate investigation of the widespread discrimination against Negroes which the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, both in San Diego and elsewhere, as well as many other concerns to whom orders have been given for the national-defense program, are practicing.

Respectfully,

WALTER WHITE,
Secretary.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
County of San Diego,
City of San Diego, ss:

We, C. D. Jolly and T. R. Dunlap, being duly sworn, depose and say that on November 13, 1940, at 1:30 p. m., as members of the industry and labor committee of the San Diego branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, received the following statements or declarations made by Mr. Edgar N. Gott, public relations director and vice president of Consolidated Aircraft Corporation in the city of San Diego:

First. That he was at that time public relations director and vice president of Consolidated Aircraft Corporation.

Second. That he did not believe the skilled white employees of the above-mentioned corporation would work together with skilled Negro employees.

Third. That the above-mentioned corporation would not employ Negroes in the skilled or semiskilled class.

Fourth. That as a private corporation they hired whom they desired and that the United States Government could not make them do otherwise.

C. D. JOLLY.
T. R. DUNLAP.

On this 16th day of April 1941 personally appeared before me the above-named C. D. Jolly and T. R. Dunlap, to me known, and made oath that they personally signed the above instrument and that the information disclosed therein is true and full to the best of their knowledge and belief.

[SEAL] VIRGINIA BETH CLARK,
Notary Public in and for the County of San Diego, Calif.

My commission expires December 10, 1942.

British War Aims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Christian

Century of the issue of April 9, 1941, entitled "Lord Halifax Reveals British War Aims."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Century]

LORD HALIFAX REVEALS BRITISH WAR AIMS

After a press conference in New York, during which he told more about British war aims than any high official of that country has yet revealed, it is safe to say that Lord Halifax will henceforth be more carefully protected from the probing questions of members of the American fourth estate. In this hour-long session, which followed his careful and innocuous Pilgrim Society address, Lord Halifax began affably and ended with acerbity. The acerbity was due to his realization that in the conference he had made the following admissions: (1) That Britain will not lose the war even if American aid does not arrive speedily; (2) that the post-war settlement will not include economic arrangements into which Germany can enter; (3) that Britain does not intend to abandon her system of Empire preferential trade agreements with their emphasis on economic nationalism; (4) that "the nations of the British Commonwealth will be frightfully jealous of anything that weakens their unity" and therefore will not be likely to accept closer economic ties with other nations, including ourselves, (5) that President Wilson's 14 points would not now be acceptable as a basis for peace; (6) that "the idea that Great Britain is to go Communist or Socialist or totalitarian, or something of that kind is quite fantastic"; (7) that while India has been given a promise of dominion status if she will help in this war, to accede to Gandhi's request that a date be set when dominion status will be made effective "has not been possible and will never be possible." This was in answer to a reporter whose question was, "Lord Halifax, last night you affirmed the absolute value of the human soul. You spoke of equal political opportunity for all peoples. You said that Britain's chief aim was human freedom, and you pictured a community of nations in which no country would dominate its partners. Does this imply that Britain is willing to free India?" Boiled down, these admissions of the British Ambassador reveal that Britain is fighting to retain the status quo within Britain and within the Empire. For a detailed account of this extraordinary interview see the New York Times for March 27.

Steps Toward War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM ARGUS CHAMPION OF NEWPORT, N. H.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Argus Champion, of Newport, N. H., entitled "Let's Watch Our Step."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Argus Champion of Newport, N.H.]

LET'S WATCH OUR STEP

The flow of propaganda intended to lure the United States into the European conflict has reached such a stage that every American who loves his country should be on guard against the creation of a war sentiment.

The billions of money that our Congress has voted for national defense was for the purpose of keeping war away from our shores. It was gladly given with the understanding that its purpose was solely to insure peace in the Americas. Aid to Britain, short of war, was sanctioned, and still is sanctioned, in the belief that such aid was a measure of defense, against war, for this Nation. Yet, in spite of this overwhelming sentiment, we hear more and more talk by the warmongers among us about the likelihood of American intervention.

We are not going the limit of material aid to Britain for the purpose primarily of preserving the British Empire or wiping out Hitlerism in Europe. It is not America's mission to shape the policies or the destinies of Old World states that from ancient times have continually engaged in bloody conflicts. It is not our purpose to drift into foreign entanglements that can lead only to misery and ruin. The insurance of American defense and American peace is our one purpose.

We should frown upon every effort of the war propagandists to lead us, step by step, into a course that endangers our peace. We should seek to bolster by every possible means, the determination of the vast majority of our people to stay out of the war. We are going to the utmost limit of generosity and decency and prudence in extending all-out material aid to Britain in her emergency. We should be going to the limit of folly and recklessness in allowing ourselves to be dragged into the hell that exists in the Old World.

The War in Our Lap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The War in Our Lap" appearing in the Chicago Tribune of April 30, 1941.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune of April 30, 1941]

THE WAR IN OUR LAP

Sir Gerald Campbell, British minister under Lord Halifax in Washington, made an astonishing speech Monday night in Washington at the annual dinner of the United States Chamber of Commerce. He said that Colonel Lindbergh's statement that a negotiated peace would favor England conferred the right to make a protest and express an opinion.

Campbell said it was British business to decide whether they were to desert the victims of German aggression in Europe "whom we are pledged to free." He added that if they abandoned what is called the first line of defense, the members of the chamber of commerce might as well cancel the word international "and give up all idea of holding meetings abroad for many decades to come. You must also give up the idea of trusting us—your best customers."

In another part of the speech Campbell said: "We may be despicable, decadent specimens of white trash, but at least we are white and not yellow." It is likely the speaker thought that if Mr. Roosevelt could call Colonel Lindbergh a traitor a British minister in our national capital could infer that he was also a coward. Yellow was a word frequently used in Great Britain and France to describe American conduct prior to April 1917 in the other war.

There was an outburst of name calling following Mr. Wilson's "too proud to fight" speech. Colonel House in May 1916 noted that it was evident that unless the United States were willing to sacrifice hundreds of thousands of lives and billions of treasure, "we are not to be on good terms with the Allies."

Mr. Churchill may think that Campbell committed an indiscretion, but we doubt that either Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Hull will call the attention of the British diplomat's government to his conduct. Americans who do resent it may find additional reason for being disturbed when they learn first from London that Mr. Roosevelt within the next 2 weeks will make a speech which will virtually be a declaration of war on Germany and Italy. "It will, however, leave to Germany the onus of making the first warlike act against the United States."

When that announcement was called to the attention of the White House staff it was admitted that Mr. Roosevelt intended to make a very important speech about the middle of May and that it might be "something sensational."

The British at home complain that they are denied reliable and complete war news by their own Government. Americans are in somewhat worse plight. They gain knowledge of their Government's intention through leaks in London. Mr. Roosevelt may be about to put peace entirely out of reach by what he plans to say. He has about come to the point where Hitler will find no reason whatever for not declaring war. He may go to war without any more words about it. Mr. Knox, Secretary of the Navy, with the approval of Mr. Roosevelt, has said that Germany will be defeated if it does not stop the flow of American supplies to Britain and that America must see that it does not stop them.

On that statement of facts and intentions, regardless of what Mr. Roosevelt may say and do in a few weeks, Hitler may decide that the time has come when it is to his advantage to strike without warning at the first opportunity, and that may be precisely what Mr. Roosevelt wants him to do and is trying to force him to do.

The war then is in our lap.

Strategic Evacuation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CORNELL DAILY SUN

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

RECORD an editorial entitled "Strategic Evacuation," and a letter appearing in conjunction with the editorial, published in the Cornell Daily Sun of April 15, 1941.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cornell Daily Sun of April 15, 1941]

STRATEGIC EVACUATION

As Axis military and diplomatic blitzkriegs continue to modify the political face of Europe, Asia, and Africa, it grows increasingly important that the American people demand two things of their Nation's foreign policy: that it be judged by its effect on the security and prosperity of our Nation; that it be kept realistically abreast of a changing world and above domination by selfish interests.

Today it is important that we look at our foreign policy in this practical light. Our aims are neither the preservation of the British Empire nor the policing of the world. Our primary interest is in the security and prosperity of our Nation.

Considered from this point of view, it is vital that we withstand the efforts of vicious pressure groups which are operating within our Nation for the purpose of diverting our policy from these true American aims to a course more favorable to other interests. At this time it is obviously important to consider the British "fifth column" machine as foremost among those in operation, for its demonstrated effectiveness makes it a dangerous obstacle working to separate America's foreign policy from America's best interests.

In the past several years it has seemed wisest to give aid to anti-Axis forces in Europe as the best method of protecting the United States. This was, however, merely a means to an end. Since this means was first adopted the world situation has changed, and it becomes vital that we ask ourselves whether the original means is still the best possible for our end. This is a question of the greatest practical concern to the United States, and must be decided by practical, clear-thinking men.

In meeting this challenge we must remember that we are in a nation no longer emotionally stable. Our prejudices, biases, and emotions have been manipulated to a point making it difficult for us to clearly appraise the respective alternatives before us. Yet we must make the decision—our Nation's future rests on it. Moreover, we must stand ready to make such decisions for each new development in international affairs.

It is imperative that we ask ourselves at all times not "what is the best way of preserving democracy in Europe, of defeating the Axis, of saving Europe's down-trodden nations," but instead we must constantly make our policies measure up to the practical standard of "what is the best way of safeguarding the security and prosperity of our Nation." These other ideals may be worthy, admirable, backed up with historical and religious support, but above these stands the fact that today we must first secure our own future and then concern ourselves with the future of others.

We must stand honest to the reality that the Axis victories may make it strategically wise for us to withdraw from our present interventionist course to one of consolidating and improving our position in this hemisphere. We have learned much in recent years from the British about "strategic evacuation," and as American citizens interested primarily in America's future we must stand ready to perform such an evacuation from our present interventionist policy if Europe's events should make it necessary for our protection.

CORRESPONDENCE

TO THE EDITOR:

Since the passage of the lease-lend bill on March 25 the main emphasis of our foreign policy has been placed on unity of action through this established policy. Recently, however, other questions have arisen (especially the convoy) which are about to afford us another opportunity to define the foreign policy of our country. And it is important that we realize that such is still our privilege.

The strategy of the interventionists has been, briefly, to identify the interests of the United States more and more with those of the anti-Axis countries, particularly Great Britain, rather than with the best interests of the American people. First we were told that we must supply the Allies with all aid short of war; we were to give to others the implements with which to fight "our" war, remaining out of the conflict ourselves.

Then the interventionists gradually threw off their disguise and openly advocated "all-out aid" which, though it might lead to war, was necessary. By that time, the emphasis was placed not on the desirability or undesirability of America's entrance into the struggle, but rather upon the necessity of underwriting the victory of one of the contestants. Since that time, policies have been approved because they will benefit Britain, Greece, and Yugoslavia (with whom our interests are identified) or condemned because they are "just what Hitler wants." Thus, our decisions are now seemingly dependent upon the effect they will have upon the governments involved in this war and their acceptability to foreign statesmen. But what about their effect on America?

All of us know of the tremendous consequences of modern war. By armed intervention into World War II, the United States would: (1) incur war material costs far in excess of those of 1917; (2) incur the costs resultant from loss of normal production; (3) lose, in all probability, a terrific number of men; (4) and endanger the civil rights of its citizenry, and possibly even its form of government.

Therefore, every American must make one vital decision. Shall American foreign policy be governed according to its ability to protect democracy in America or according to its acceptability to a friendly foreign power? I feel that it is the duty of every citizen to ask himself how our present foreign policy will affect the democratic ideals and the security of the United States.

Signed,

AN AMERICAN.

The Triple-A Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

ARTICLES FROM THE ELGIN (NEBR.) REVIEW

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point some clippings taken by me from a small country weekly newspaper published by a friend at Elgin, Nebr., known as the Elgin Review. These clippings cover a friendly, but rather serious, debate between the editor and a neighboring farmer as regards their views on some phases of the triple-A program. It began with an editorial by the editor entitled "We Would Debate." I ask that the editorial be printed at this point, and that it be followed by the letter written by the neighboring farmer, and that in turn by the editor's reply.

I also ask to have included in the RECORD, following the matters above referred to, a quotation from a real farmer and real philosopher, Jim Squire. Jim Squire operates a small but homey farm in the sand hills of Nebraska. He writes a weekly column for this paper, headed As a Farmer Sees It, and he usually hits the nail on the head. I wish there were more like him.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Elgin (Nebr.) Review of March 20, 1941]

WE WOULD DEBATE

Refusing to lend stored corn to desperately needy Nebraska farmers, Secretary of Agriculture Claude Wickard gives as his reason for not doing so the excuse that to do so would "directly contravene the price-stabilizing objectives" of the farm program.

He makes no concrete explanation of how this would come about. As a matter of fact it is doubtful that the lending of corn to drought sufferers in the entire United States on a basis of need would have any particular effect on the market. The price of corn is definitely established by the Government's price-pegging activities.

The real threat to the administration's program is HENRY WALLACE'S hybrid corn, through which the Iowa and Illinois farmers grow greatly increased yields on smaller and smaller acreages. Another threat is the practice of permitting southern farmers to take acreage out of cotton and plant it in corn.

Despite a definite promise that the ever-normal granary would be used in just such cases of drought as have prevailed in our State for some years, the Department of Agriculture prefers to dispose of its unwieldy surpluses by sales of corn in 25,000,000 bushel lots to Great Britain at one-half the price needy Nebraskans would have to pay.

"Stabilizing objectives!" Piffle! Bible-reading Henry should complete the story of Joseph's administration in Egypt and then act with as much humanitarianism as did Joseph centuries ago.

Granting that there have been several good features in the farm program, it would be an enjoyable evening's fun to get Henry, Claude, or even Freddie Wallace, the very well paid State triple-A administrator on the lecture platform for a debate. Next best will be to direct a few questions toward them. Maybe next week would be a good time, and this column a good place.

[From the Elgin (Nebr.) Review of April 17, 1941]

TILDEN FARMER TAKES HIDE OFF REVIEW EDITOR

TILDEN, NEBR., *March 26, 1941.*

Mr. F. V. PETERSON,
Editor of Elgin Review and
Secretary to the Governor,
Lincoln, Nebr.

DEAR MR. PETERSON: I've just read your article entitled "We Would Debate" which was published in your last edition of the Elgin Review. I wish to state that I do not believe you would need go quite so far as Vice President Wallace, Secretary Wickard, or even Freddie Wallace to answer your proposed arguments. You could hardly expect men of their caliber to be too much concerned over the feelings of some small country-town newspaper editor who apparently has become "riled up" over the failure of the Department of Agriculture to recommend some plan which he has been supporting.

Under BUTLER'S plan, as I understand it, he proposes to lend corn to the needy Nebraska farmers and in turn they are to repay it in bushels in some future years when

they raise corn. In the first place, Mr. Peterson, we must remember that the great National A. A. A. program is definitely not a relief set-up and that the principal objective of the entire program is to stabilize we farmers' prices through acreage adjustment and through commodity loans which have so obviously bolstered our prices of both corn and wheat, and not to depress our markets by dumping or in reality giving away millions of bushels of corn to farmers who would otherwise be in the market for grain, and thereby causing direct competition to our markets. Is there any absolute guaranty that the corn which BUTLER proposes to loan to the needy farmers, will ever be repaid? What would become of the corn loaned to farmers who would the next year decide to quit farming or would be forced to quit farming because of the depressed prices received from what grain they did raise as a result of this unbusinesslike method of proposing to aid the drought-stricken farmers? Moreover, could such a program be limited to Nebraska or would we be forced to extend the program to all other drought-stricken areas of the United States and if we did, how many millions of bushels of corn do you suppose it would require to supply the needy farmers of Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, the Dakotas, Colorado, and any other drought-stricken area that there might be in the United States?

The great majority of those farmers to whom Mr. BUTLER proposes to lend corn have nothing to feed it to. We would merely be giving corn away which we had put under seal for the purpose of bolstering our prices to farmers, who in turn would put the corn on the market, the very thing which we have attempted to avoid, and thereby establish direct competition to our corn markets. I don't believe the farmers of the United States want to adopt such an "unbusinesslike method" of aiding our drought-stricken farmers.

I wonder if Mr. BUTLER ever attempted to run his business on such a basis. No doubt he had several reasons why he submitted his corn plan. One might have been to undermine the very foundation of the farm program, to which he is obviously not in sympathy, by releasing the very corn which we have sealed to keep off the market. Another might have been to put more corn into the regular channels of handling grain, thereby stimulating Mr. BUTLER'S own business. And another, last but not least, might have been to create more votes for Mr. Butler in the recent election by attempting to make farmers believe that he was in sincere sympathy with them and was trying to help them.

I fully realize, Mr. Peterson, that those farmers in the drought-stricken area are most unfortunate and that something must be done. I know this from my very own experience. However, I don't believe the logical answer is Butler's corn plan, but, on the contrary, it is crop insurance on corn. Even you must admit that the all-risk crop-insurance program on wheat has proved most successful and is most certainly a businesslike manner in which to solve our problem. We farmers really do, believe it or not, want to carry on our business in a businesslike manner, just as the grainmen and even the newspapermen of the country are doing.

In regard to HENRY WALLACE'S hybrid corn through which greatly increased yields are being produced on smaller acreages, I can only state that Mr. WALLACE or any other man who has aided in developing hybrid corn is to be highly complimented for their discovery in increasing corn yields. Planting hybrid corn and other means of increasing corn yields is the wise thing for farmers to do. It is simply the means by which farmers take advantage of more efficient methods to lower their per unit cost and increase their incomes. It is entirely reasonable for farmers to produce their corn as cheaply as possible. Higher yields is one way to lower per bushel costs. Likewise, being able to produce the same number of bushels on fewer acres makes it possible for the farmer to deplete less acres of land and to seed larger acreages of legumes on his farm, thereby increasing the value of his land. We must remember that we must leave the soil in a position to produce food for the people of our Nation for generations to come, and it is fully realized that the soil of our Nation has too rapidly been becoming depleted. If we raise more corn per acre, it simply means that we will need to raise less acres. Probably you shouldn't be too severely criticized for condemning our hybrid corn since you, not being a farmer, but having been a school teacher and a newspaperman, could hardly be expected to understand this situation.

Regarding the practice of permitting southern farmers to reduce their acreage of cotton and increase their acreage of corn, please let me point out a few facts in this connection. During the period from 1928 to 1932 inclusive, the period before we had a farm program, the 12 Southern States planted an average corn acreage per year of 28,920,000 acres while during the period from 1933 to 1938, the years of our A. A. A. program, they planted an average acreage per year of 30,926,000, an increase of but 2,006,000 acres. In 1939 they planted 30,888,000 acres. In the 1928 to 1932 period the 12 Southern States produced an average of 442,141,000 bushels per year while in the 1933 to 1938 period they produced an average of 445,316,000 bushels per year, an increase of only 3,175,000 bushels per year. In order to give you a clearer picture, Mr. Peterson, so that I can feel assured that you will understand it, let me give you this explanation. Antelope County, your home county, has been allotted 139,156 acres of corn for 1941, a figure which many critics of the A. A. A. program claim is a drastic cut, which when multiplied by a yield of 25 bushels per acre, which I'm sure you'll agree we could easily raise with ample rainfall, would result in a production of 3,478,900 bushels, a figure representing 303,900 bushels more corn than the 12 Southern States have increased their corn production during the program years. And Antelope County here in Nebraska, as you know, represents only one of the hundreds of counties in the Corn Belt and a low producing county, too, when compared with counties in the States of Iowa and Illinois.

Just how much have we farmers in the Corn Belt increased our acreage of cotton during the program years? Practically none, if any. And neither have the southern farmers increased their acreage of corn materially, Mr. Peterson, and they never will. We can't raise cotton profitably and they can't raise corn profitably. The average yield of corn in the 12 Southern States is 15.1 bushels as compared with an average yield in Iowa of 49.5 bushels, and an average yield of the entire United States of 27.9 bushels. These figures are authentic, Mr. Peterson, and I suggest that you study them.

Regarding your statement that the Department of Agriculture prefers to dispose of its unwieldy surpluses by sales of corn to Great Britain in 25,000,000-bushel lots at one-half the price needy Nebraskans would have to pay, I wish to state that that, too, is an untrue statement. The United States Government sold the corn you mentioned to Great Britain delivered f. o. b. Montreal, Canada, at 50 cents per bushel. Just a few days ago I talked with a trucker who was delivering corn from this area to the drought-stricken area of Nebraska at the price of 60 cents per bushel. I don't suppose a man of your ability could hardly understand how the sale of surplus corn from the United States to Great Britain could help the farmers of this country and how it might also help Great Britain in this time of great need, and in a time when the United States is doing everything possible to aid Great Britain in her fight of democracy versus dictatorship.

Let me also make a few remarks in connection with your statement as to "the very well paid Nebraska State A. A. A. Administrator, Freddie Wallace." I wonder how it happened that your salary as secretary to Governor Griswold was increased from $2,400 to $3,600 a year, a net increase of $1,200 over the salary paid to the secretary of former Governor Cochran. Perhaps it is because you're a better secretary than Governor Cochran was ever able to employ, or perhaps it is because you're a former school teacher and a newspaperman, or maybe it was for some other reason. I wonder what the "needy Nebraska drought-stricken farmers" would have to say about that if they knew it.

It's amazing how so many people who have never had any practical experience on a farm or who have possibly read something about the farm out of a book, can know or think they know so much more about the farmers' business than do the farmers themselves. I'm sure I know very little about your newspaper business and I frankly admit it. However, I do believe I have some knowledge of the agricultural situation, having been a farmer for the 67 years of my life in addition to having been awarded a first-class advanced certificate in scientific agriculture, and one of exactly the same rating in geology from a noted agricultural university in Wales before coming to this country.

If you are so very much interested in debating, may I suggest that you call at the office of Fred Wallace in Lincoln and I'm sure he'll be glad to answer a few of your questions. However I don't believe you have the courage to attempt to debate in person, but would rather publish your arguments in your little newspaper in order that you will not need to face an argument. If you intend to direct more arguments to Henry Claude, and Freddie, may I suggest that you select a topic on which you are a little better qualified to speak. Also, if you wish to carry on your debates in a manner which is fair to both sides you might print in your newspaper a part of this letter, at least the direct answers to your questions.

Before closing I wish to state that I believe if you will review the above statements in an unbiased state of mind that you must agree that your arguments have been answered quite conclusively.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS EVANS.

P. S.—If you fail to print the answers to your arguments in your paper, some of my neighboring farmers and myself shall be obliged to have the entire letter printed in some other newspaper of the county.

[From the Elgin (Nebr.) Review of April 3, 1941]

WE LOSE OUR HIDE

I'm not wise enough to be an owl. What's more, I've never seen a boiled owl, although I've heard and read about 'em. Anyway, if you want to know how we imagine owls are boiled, turn to next week's Review and read a letter which a reader over Tilden way has addressed to us.

Mr. Lewis Evans, objecting to some of our observations of the farm program, "takes the hide off" the editor as he tosses a torrent of slashing, tearing, battering, bruising words at us. All sizes and shapes of words are used. There are 10, 25, and even 50 centers brought into play as well as some that are tinted with the acid of sarcasm. It's a real Roman holiday, and the blood, our blood, runs right freely.

Mr. Evans does a good job, and we have written and thanked him for the letter which

we are pleased to have. We have told him that we are always glad to have communications from our readers, and that, space permitting, we will print as much as possible of them. Maybe when you read next week's offering you will be inspired to dip your pen in poison and "have to." If so, more power to you.

In our letter to Mr. Evans we said in part: "While I have never been actively engaged in farming, except for brief periods of work as a farm laborer, yet, being a native Nebraskan and having spent my entire lifetime in the State, I am fully conscious of the fact that the welfare of all of us is utterly dependent upon the success of those engaged in agriculture. I am interested, as I assume you are, in anything that will promote Nebraska agriculture. My interest transcends that of any partisan or organization tie." With that spirit in mind, I will try to find time to prepare some answers for Mr. Evans' rather lengthy discourse.

[From the Elgin (Nebr.) Review of April 24, 1941]

THE EDITOR REPLIES TO MR. EVANS—CONTINUES DISCUSSION OF THE FARM PROBLEM

APRIL 24, 1941.

Mr. LEWIS EVANS,
Tilden, Nebr.

DEAR MR. EVANS: As I stated in my letter of acknowledgment, it was mighty fine to hear from you and it has been a pleasure to print your letter in the Review. I hope that our readers found it interesting and that, should the occasion arise, we may have the privilege of further communications from you.

It seems unfortunate to me that in discussing the Butler corn-lending plan you did not limit your comments strictly to its merits but found it necessary to question Senator BUTLER'S integrity and sincerity. He is the owner and operator of two large farms in Furnas County, is a triple-A cooperator, doesn't have one penny in the grain business, and since entering the United States Senate has been making a valiant fight to get the corn-lending plan adopted and has on several occasions risen to the defense of the American farmer when administration forces have attempted to employ the American taxpayers' (farmers included) money to bring South American farm products into the United States in competition with the products of Nebraska producers. Should you be interested, I would refer you to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 7, 20, and 31. I am certain that Senator BUTLER would be pleased to correspond with you regarding any phases of the agricultural program and to send you copies of his speeches in behalf of the Nebraska farmer.

The Butler plan was a result of the 7 terrible years of drought and attendant human suffering that have prevailed over a large portion of our State. For several years my neighbors south of Elgin have seen fiery blasts destroy their vegetation, watched their cattle starve or be trucked away to the market at great loss, while their families have gone without adequate clothing, medical and dental services and, in some cases, without proper food. Last summer the area from Elgin to the Kansas line, from Saline County to Colorado, was again a picture of desolation, possibly the worst in several unspeakable bad years. Men were at their wit's end, many gave up farming in August, merchants despaired of the future, thousands of our fellow Nebraskans cried for help. Seeing this, viewing the plight of his farm neighbors and at the same time conscious of the vast mountains of corn held by the Government under its so-called ever normal granary program, HUGH BUTLER, to his eternal credit, suggested the lending of corn to his fellow citizens (our neighbors) in order that they might keep on the farm the milk cows, chickens, cattle, and hogs that would furnish them with food and some little cash income to tide them over the winter. Instantly thousands of Nebraska farmers, business and professional men wrote praising the plan and hailing it as a lifesaver.

The proposal was made in early August 1940, and had it been put into effect at once would have done untold good. Many farmers could have stayed on their farms, Nebraska cattle and hogs wouldn't have been further reduced to pitifully low levels and thousands of Nebraska farmers would have been in a position to benefit by the cattle prices that have prevailed and the new hog and poultry prices that the Government is establishing. Even put into effect now, the proposal would still have great value.

In November 1939 the North Central Division of the A. A. A., a division of the Department of Agriculture, put out a pamphlet, N. C. R. Leaflet 401, entitled "Here's Our Farm Program for 1940," in which it stated: "Farmers can look upon the record corn carry-over in 1939 as an accomplishment in building an ever-normal granary. If foreign demand requires larger supplies or if crop failure comes, the ever-normal granary will meet the situation well."

Having read this promise, knowing the great need that existed in the State, and viewing the numberless shiny tin cribs into which corn had been poured, it seemed unbelievable that our Government would permit people living within the very shadows of those cribs to be driven off their farms for the lack of corn, corn which Uncle Sam had in tremendous abundance.

You suggest that the adoption of the plan would "depress" the market and possibly "undermine" the farm program. I am unable to accept your reasoning and for your information quote here the opinion of a long-time dealer in grains, who states that it could have no such effect:

"I do not see any possible way in which this plan could be construed as bearish or depressing on the corn price. If it is any factor at all in establishing values, it would be on the 'up' side, as it is a means of providing corn to the farmer feeder who is unable to purchase corn under present conditions. Therefore it should increase the consumption of corn and not only create a better demand at this time but also enable the distressed farmer to hold on to his livestock until such time as he became a producer, and at that time he would be in a position to consume his products rather than to throw it on the market.

"Since the Butler plan is a loan plan and not a gift, it is my opinion that it would be of very little effect as a market factor and if any effects at all were visible it should be toward strengthening corn prices. I believe this would be the conclusion of any economist."

You also ask how much corn would be required to carry out the plan in Nebraska and if it is adopted here whether it should not be extended to other drought areas in the Nation. Again I have turned to experienced farmers and country elevator men and they estimate that 5,000,000 bushels would have been ample to care for the Nebraska requirements. In 1933, Antelope County produced more corn than they suggest was needed. The plan should have been extended to all parts of the country suffering drought. Good neighborliness at home might be shocking in some circles but still seems sound to me. Anxiety for our own unfortunate would seem as commendable as chasing to the ends of the earth to distribute American charity.

In a world in which poverty abounds, in an America in which Milo Perkins, Chief of the Surplus Marketing Administration, says that thousands of American boys are rejected for military service because their health has been undermined "living on an average of a nickel a meal at retail prices," in a world where needs are endless, in such a world it is impossible for me to understand the doctrine of scarcity production and I'm in agreement with you in applauding Henry Wallace's new role of expanding production through hybrid corn. Here's a wish for more power to him. May he produce for health, defense, prosperity, and cut out the nonsense of killing little pigs, plowing under the fruits of nature and, in general, trying to make us wealthier by making us poorer. The change is wonderful and I'm willing to accept it even if I can't understand a policy of paying people to take acres out of production while encouraging the use of hybrids that increase total production faster than acreage reductions decrease it.

An America back at work, an America in which all have a purchasing power great enough at least to have enough to eat would go a long way to solve many of the farmer's most perplexing problems. It seems regrettable that those in authority for the past several years haven't concentrated on this, the main problem, rather than looking for shortcuts.

Your statements with reference to the production of corn in 12 Southern States corresponds closely with those I have before me. Fourteen Southern States—Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and Arkansas—increased their corn acreage from 27.9 percent of the national acreage in the years 1924–33 to 32.9 percent of the national acreage in the period 1934–40. The increase in corn production in bushels in the same period was from 17.5 percent of the national total to 20.6 percent.

One observer suggests that the impact of the Southern States' increased acreage won't be felt until they go for hybrids. He feels that they will increase their production as they gain more experience with corn and also points out that there has been a slight increase in cattle and hog production in the South. I am not familiar with possibilities of the South in the corn, hog, and cattle field, but hesitate to look with approval on triple-A encouragement of these people to enter what we have been pleased to feel was our productive province. Things have been tough enough for us as it is. Also, here's another instance of paying one group to take acres out of production while permitting another group to enter the field.

You write that my statement that the Government sold 25,000,000 bushels of corn to Great Britain at a price about half of that our needy farmers would have had to pay is untrue and go on to say the corn was "delivered f. o. b. Montreal, Canada, at 50 cents per bushel." Now we are getting some place. We first learned of this transaction through a trade journal. Later mention was made in the daily press. To verify the press reports I wired several Washington sources only to learn that the Commodity Credit Corporation refused to make public the details of the sale. Now for the first time I get definite information as to the price and point of delivery. May I inquire as to your source of information? What department or person provided you with it, and under what date? I should like to hear from you immediately on this point. You state that the corn was delivered f. o. b. Montreal. That seems our Government paid the freight. The freight item is of great importance in this discussion. If the corn originated in Iowa, as is my impression, the freight charges by rail to Chicago and the water rates from there to Montreal could easily amount to enough to mean that the Government sold the corn for around 30 cents per bushel. If the corn went by rail all or more of the way than to Chicago, the charges would, of course, mount. The C. C. C. said last summer that it would not sell corn for less than the loan price of 61 cents plus a year's storage of 7 cents, plus, as I recall, certain interest charges, which means that their price to Nebraskans last summer, provided they would sell at all, was 68 cents per bushel

plus. Accordingly, if the Government paid the freight to Montreal, as you state, you will soon see that my one-half-price statement becomes correct.

But irrespective of all that, even at 50 cents, the corn was sold at less than Nebraskans could buy it. And I'll confess my inability to understand the motives that would prompt our Government to sell corn cheaper to Great Britain than it would to Nebraskans who needed it desperately to feed a few chickens, some pigs, and a couple of milk cows in order to get through the approaching winter. If that be treason I'm guilty and proud of it. Twenty-five million bushels, five times the corn needs to give relief in Nebraska, went to Great Britain at a premium.

By the way, Government agencies have been peddling free oranges, potatoes, grapefruit, and a lot of other commodities about the country and I assume properly so. Why not corn? Is there something peculiarly different about it or about the need of drouth-stricken farmers for it? If so, what? The Butler plan didn't contemplate that it be free but that corn be repaid in kind. Which also recalls your query as to whether the farmers would repay their loans. You wonder if there is any "absolute guarantee that the corn will ever be repaid"? I don't know of anything in this world that is absolute with the possible exceptions of taxes, death, and New Deal deficits but of this I am certain, Nebraska farmers are just as honest as they make them and there are statistics that can be offered in proof if you insist.

I think the farm program has many fine features. I feel that it has done much good for Nebraska. I want to see it continued and strengthened. I should like to see it and the National Government more genuinely interested in American agriculture and not so eager to sacrifice home interests to those abroad. I have hope that some progress is being made.

The triple-A set-up should be established upon a different basis in Nebraska and several of her neighboring States. Fact of the matter is that Nebraska, Kansas, and the two Dakotas are the only States in the Union that have practiced scarcity production. Nature forced it upon them and in a big way. Triple-A figures show that in Nebraska our farm cash income purchasing power dropped nearly one-half in 10 years—to 55 percent in 1938 and 65 percent in 1939. Ours was the greatest loss in the Nation. While that was the situation here, some States made gains as high as 32 percent. We contend that farm benefit payments should be increased in hard-hit areas like Nebraska and reduced in States up to or above normal in purchasing power of farm cash income.

Your statement that the farm set-up is definitely not a relief program might be abruptly challenged by certain heavy Federal taxpayers, were they to hear it. They would wonder just what term you would apply to it, inasmuch as in 1939 it withdrew about $1,000,000,000 from the Treasury. Certainly it is a process of taking from one part of our society and giving it to another. Personally, I am in favor of it, regardless. For 150 years we have subsidized American industry through a system of protective tariffs. The farmer has been paying tribute and would seem at this late date to be entitled to substantial consideration.

It brings no joy to me to note that after 8 years the present farm program has not been able to reduce production in the United States, raise prices, and thus achieve parity (this was its announced program for farm prosperity), and today the American farmer enjoys somewhere in the neighborhood of 80 percent of parity, which means that in this respect he is in no better position than he was back in 1930. Maybe this condition accounts for HENRY'S transfer to the South American scene.

I gain the impression from your letter that the farm program is not subject to criticism, particularly from one not a farmer. All of us in Nebraska are dependent upon the farm and interested in any movement to improve farming conditions. More than that, many of our farm problems are economic and political in nature, and as citizens and taxpayers we would all seem to have a legitimate stake in them and every reason to enter into full discussion.

That farmers are not unanimous concerning the present program seems apparent when one reads the comments of Edward A. O'Neal, southern president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, who, in a recent Des Moines, Iowa, speech, insisted that steps be taken at once to check a trend toward excessive bureaucracy in A. A. A. administration. He was quoted as being afraid that the program would become so costly to administer and would be so tangled in red tape that it would lose its present widespread support among the farmers. I also recall that last summer a Nebraska farm leader was quoted in the daily press as saying, "We have no quarrel with farmers who accept benefit payments. In many cases they have been lifesavers. But we should be working for a real cure that will make compensating hand-outs unnecessary." These statements are encouraging to me, because they indicate that our farm leaders are studying and searching for ways in which to improve our farm program rather than blindly accepting the status quo; maybe I should say HENRY quo.

Unquestionably the farm problem is a difficult one. Unemployment, changes in food demands, scientific advances in farming, the loss of foreign markets, dislocations resulting from the overexpansion during World War No. 1, disparity between the prices paid for goods bought and those sold by the farmer, drought, and many other factors have conspired against the farmer. Solution of our agricultural problems will require our best thought and friendly cooperation.

It has been suggested to me that either you or your son is or has been in the employ of the triple A. I wonder if such a close association might exercise some influence in your attitude toward the matters under discussion.

With reference to your invitation for me to meet and talk with Fred Wallace, may I suggest that I have heard from several sources that he is a splendid chap and that nothing would please me more than to meet and visit with him. As a matter of fact, I am certain that HENRY WALLACE is an A-1 fellow also. All of us have much in common. I rather suspect that our field of agreement would be some 90 to 95 percent with our area of disagreement accordingly rather limited.

And now, even though the subject has just been nicely opened, I must end this letter. In closing, may I say that I'd still enjoy that opportunity to debate.

With kindest regards,

Very sincerely yours,

VAL PETERSON,
Editor, Elgin Review.

[From the Elgin (Nebr.) Review of April 24, 1941]

AS A FARMER SEES IT

(By Jim Squire)

Wanted to do a bit of carpenter work and my saws being in typical farmer condition I decided they needed to visit Mr. Skinner. Took them to his shop and as he tuned them up I talked with him a bit. Sez he, "I enjoy your column in the paper, but I don't always agree with you."

Sez I, "It will be a terrible thing if the time ever comes when we all agree. Life will be pretty dumb and dead and progress will stop."

"Just the way I feel about it," said Mr. Skinner. "I can't learn anything from the man I agree with. The only place I can learn is from the man who knows something I don't or thinks differently than I do."

Which philosophy I should like to call to Mr. Evans' attention. He writes rather venomously in last week's Review concerning Val Peterson's criticism of the A. A. A.'s refusal to loan sealed corn to needy farmers. And judging by last fall's vote, it wasn't just "some small town country editor" who thought things weren't being handled right.

And apparently Peterson and Butler were ahead of Wallace and Wallace in their thinking, anyway. Received a letter yesterday from the A. A. A. Quoting parts of it, "Every farmer should understand that the new food plan and the resulting revisions in A. A. A. are for but one purpose—to convert corn into concentrated foods as fast as possible. One of the immediate ways we can do this is by feeding hogs to heavier weights, increasing dairy production by feeding more grain, and stepping up egg production and farm flocks as fast as possible. For the future we must increase the farrowing of hogs, enlarge our dairy herds, and continue to increase the size of poultry flocks.

"Now is the time to use part of the abundant supply of corn we have in the ever-normal granary."

As for Peterson's salary, you watch him awhile and you'll say he earns it.

Since it seems to be customary to give scholastic attainments, will say I am a graduate of Park Center High School, which has 10 grades.

Also, since when (in this country at least) has it become either necessary or advisable for editors to talk only about their own business? Do people want editorials about linotypes and unpaid subscriptions only? Cannot matters of public policy be discussed? Or is this Russia or Germany now? At least one national farm organization has insisted that the A. A. A. be taken clear out of politics and the administration has consistently refused to do this. Remember those "farm dinners" a year ago in March, with WALLACE and Roosevelt as the featured speakers? Now see who is Vice President.

This column cannot be accused of being anti-A. A. A., since it has received much favorable publicity herein, and I don't wish to see it killed off by unwise or inflexible management. Being above criticism or unable to make use of it is that sort of management. So I am glad to see the A. A. A. reverse itself on this sealed-corn business. True, it leaves Mr. Evans in a bad hole, but if he can take it like he can give it he'll be all right.

P. S. Dear Fred and Val: If I do not see this in your miserable small-town paper this week, I shall get me a rehabilitation loan and start a daily paper in Elgin, with a Sunday comic section containing forty-leven pages. So print it or else.

Hitler's Economic Blueprint of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

ARTICLE BY JOHN CUDAHY

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an article written by Mr. John Cudahy, American Minister to Ireland,

1937–38, and Ambassador to Belgium, 1939–40, on the subject of Hitler's Economic Blueprint of Europe.

This article by Mr. Cudahy seems to me to be rather impartial, and it goes into the economic and financial phases of European conditions.

The matter referred to follows:

BERLIN, April 26.—Before leaving home many people spoke to me about the consequences for business and trade in Europe if Germany dominated the Continent after the war.

No one seemed to have any definite ideas on the subject. Speculations varied from predictions of dire economic calamity, the overwhelming majority view, to the belief of a very few that German supremacy might possibly mean a long era of industrial expansion and prosperity, such as in the latter nineteenth century, after the Franco-Prussian War.

My editors asked me to investigate conditions first-hand, to consult with financial and business leaders in Germany, and to talk with officials who are directing the economic policy of the Third Reich and may be charged with the same responsibility if and when peace comes to Europe. I was commissioned, as an inquiring reporter, to get a German economic blueprint. This I have attempted.

I have interviewed businessmen, financiers, and the men who determine the fiscal and commercial policies of the German Government, and have tried to tell of these interviews just as faithfully and objectively as I could. As a reporter, I have no right to pass upon the doctrines enunciated by Nazi leaders, and I have made no attempt to do so.

NATION BANKRUPT IN 1933

Upon the inauguration of the National Socialist government in January 1933 the financial assets of the German Government consisted of $25,000,000 in gold and a meager supply of foreign exchange. Germany owed billions abroad. The truth was that Germany, with 7,000,000 idle, was bankrupt.

Dr. Hjalmar Horace Greeley Schacht rushed to the rescue by creating a system of pegged, fiat money. I remember my first meeting with the finance minister in 1933 and I blush to recall how, schooled in academic economic principles, I assured Dr. Schacht that any fiat currency was bound to germinate self-destruction. But the fiat money system worked in Germany regardless of what textbooks said.

At the outset, Dr. Schacht made a distinction between the internal function of this money and its use as foreign exchange. His controlled mark had no gold or silver to sustain it, but instead was based on production of German industry and agriculture.

Seven million unemployed were put to work in industry, on roads, and public works. A year later came the rearmament program which, according to Hitler's statement, represented an investment of over $22,000,000,000 at the outset of the war. The consequence of this great employment was an increase of national income from 46,500,000,000 reichsmarks in 1933 to 59,105,000,000 in 1939. Money ran from hand-to-hand with a velocity which made unnecessary added volume so that circulation of 5,722,000,000 reichsmarks in 1933 was augmented only to 7,774,000,000 reichsmarks in 1937. There is, however, a striking increase and an evidence of war inflation by December 31, 1939, in the circulation figures of 14,502,000,000.

CREDITS WERE FROZEN

Under the Schacht system, all went well enough as far as the internal aspect of the currency was concerned but, in foreign trade, restraints on purchasing power and prices meant nothing. Beyond the borders of Germany, the reichsmark had no purchasing power and very tenuous credit or exchange value.

Therefore, Swiss creditors decided to freeze a credit in the Central Bank at Zurich against German debtors. This was the origin of blocked credits, controlled currency, and foreign bilateral-barter-trade agreements. France, Great Britain, Belgium, Norway, and Sweden immediately followed the example of Switzerland, and foreign exchange dealing with Germany became a thing of the past. Denied any other means of payments in foreign trade, Germany was forced to balance exports against imports.

The Rumanian bilateral trading agreement, concluded in March 1939, and described by its author as the "economic clinic for a sick continent," is typical of Germany's balancing agreements to meet its deficiency in foreign exchange. This provides for an exchange of German manufactured goods for Rumanian raw materials, i. e., the same business arrangement which once made the Reich the greatest industrial nation of Europe.

Similar agreements have been made with Hungary and Bulgaria, which, according to German planners interviewed, assure Germany adequate food supplies for an indefinite time. The Danubian Valley is the granary of Europe, they say, and the natural complement of Germany's industrial economy.

REICH'S WIDE ORBIT

Bilateral trading agreements also have been negotiated and are in operation with Spain, Switzerland, Italy, and Russia. With Sweden under German control and with Norway, Belgium, industrial France, Denmark, Czechoslovakia, and Poland occupied by German military forces, the realities are that there is little space in Europe which is not within the gross raum, or economic orbit, of the Third Reich.

The author of the agreement with Russia gave me solemn assurance that deliveries of pig iron, wheat, phosphate, oil, and manganese had been entirely satisfactory and in accordance with the terms of the contract, despite difficulties in making transfers from Russian freight cars to Polish narrow gage tracks. I got a shock when I thought of our South and the 1,000,000 bales of cotton which, he assured me, had been brought during the last year from Russia to German textile mills.

Under the influence of these bilateral trading agreements, the foreign commerce of Germany in Europe has grown so fast that it is now equal in volume to what it was before this war, despite the complete loss of British, North American, and South American markets, I was told.

Beyond Europe, I was told by Reich experts, South America is another natural complement for the expansion of industrialized Germany in the field of foreign trade. Far more than Africa—for it will be many years before the primitive people of Africa can develop a demand for the output of German industry—South America has a growing need for the chemicals, electro-technical machinery, glass, porcelain, etc., which Germany can turn out so well.

As these demands of the South American continent expand under the influence of the modern economic era, German engineers with German equipment will dig tunnels, level hills and lay out roads and routes of transport, while German machinery will be installed in South America's growing industrial plant.

Does this mean expulsion of American trade in South America? The German experts I interviewed insisted that it did not. They said that American articles now sold in South American markets were the typical output of American mass production in which the United States has an unusual supremacy—passenger automobiles, trucks, electrical refrigerators, radios, and business machines. I was told the presence of these American products did not mean cutthroat competition with such imports as dyes, cutlery, textiles, etc., which are German specialties.

Statistics demonstrated that German exports in South America, while they have increased during latter years, were now only on the level reached by Germany prior to the Great War. Typical of German-American trade rivalry in South America, they said, was Brazil, where American goods were sold in greater volume than German, with the prospect that this ratio would continue indefinitely.

But the most persuasive argument offered for increased German participation in South American trade was the prospect of the same broad development of an expanding economy from increased purchasing power which was envisaged by the bilateral trading agreements in Europe. The sale of wool, cotton, meat, copper, hides, and other South American raw materials to Germany by using the proceeds of German imports will mean a South American balance with which to buy North American goods in greater volume, I was assured, and thus will all be benefited—Germany, South America, and the United States.

COOPERATION BASIS

The basis of future trade relationships between Germany and the United States must be founded on cooperation, I was told. The Germans were frank in their statements that they saw no relevance between trade and political philosophy. Business was business, based on reciprocal needs, and it was, from their viewpoint, no more logical for people of different political faiths to refuse to recognize each other commercially than for people of different religions to shun one another's society.

It is true, they admitted, that Germany has no gold to offer for its purchases from America, but gold has ceased to be essential. International trade, they insist, in the last analysis always has had its foundation in reciprocity, and the history of dealings between Germany and the United States is convincing proof that these two economies should supplement each other.

From 1890 until 1905 American markets took an enormous volume of German goods until this trade was abruptly curtailed by a prohibitive American tariff policy. But even after that there was considerable trade with a balance favorable to America. German capital invested abroad was in large measure placed at the disposal of American businessmen for development of American enterprise before the World War, they said, and Germany has great need for American agricultural produce such as cotton, lard, tobacco, vegetable oils, and commercial metals.

For these raw materials, exports of dyes, cutlery, electro-technical machinery, and other scientific equipment for which Germany, by long tradition, has acquired a special aptitude, would be the exchange.

WAGE SCALE DIFFERENCES

I confronted the Germans with the great spread between the living standard of the American workman and that prevailing in Germany and the difference in wage scales. In Germany, ordinary labor receives the equivalent of $10 a week and the most skilled craftsman gets only $25 weekly. They themselves stressed the conclusive significance of labor in industry; by their own figures, manufactured output was 91 percent labor and 9 percent raw materials. How then, I asked, could American manufacturers survive inundation of world markets by German industry?

The answer was that one should not judge by present condition, but should rather look to the normal times which prevailed before the World War.

At that time, they said, German wages were only 30 percent lower than those paid in the United States and, with deductions for German social services, there was very little difference between the rates of compensation for German and American labor. The present government in Germany has, as

its primary purpose, improving the lot of the common man, they said, and there was no question but that, after this war, the standard of living for labor would be greatly raised.

This was one of the chief concerns of government in peacetime, I was told by officials of the Ministry of Labor, and the standard of living for the man who worked with his hands in Germany in a better future would be greatly improved. Already measures were in progress to increase wages and these would continue to advance to higher and higher levels.

The economic blueprint spread out by the Germans for my inspection divides Europe into areas of industry and natural raw materials.

The Baltic States are grouped together, as are the Scandinavian countries. France—with two aspects, Mediterranean and Atlantic—is another unit. Spain, Yugoslavia and Italy, with the countries of southeastern Europe, are others.

The men with whom I conferred were economists, men of business and financiers, so no attempt was made to explore the political phase of the future Europe. Yet all of them expressed the conviction that the balance of power doctrine in Europe was inherently vicious and responsible for the recurrent wars which have afflicted the continent during the last 300 years.

Peace and stability, they assured me, could never be maintained by balancing nation against nation. The lesson of history was eloquent with that tragic truth. What was needed in Europe was a German policeman to assert authority and give direction to forces of permanent, tried, authentic strength. All consulted shied from the word hegemony, but they did believe that some constructive power of guidance and control was necessary and that such guidance and control was naturally German.

TRADE BARRIERS EXPUNGED

The picture they drew of the future was one in which suicidal arbitrary barriers to trade were expunged and prohibitive tariffs, quotas, trade controls, and monetary restrictions relegated to memory. On this economic map, the continent would be partitioned into spheres of raw materials and industry. Trade would be free, but not with the freedom of unbridled license. All would be planned and regulated by law, the law of supply and demand of production and consumption, like every well-ordered organization.

"It is all so easy," they insist. "All that is needed is intelligent supervision of distribution." The argument runs as follows: There is great plenty on this earth. Unlimited supplies of raw materials exist in some quarters and unsounded resources for creation of manufactured articles in others. The thing is to balance the two. Then you will have wealth and will raise the standard of all to levels compatible with the progress of civilization.

Modern economy, they declare, is one of expansion. Modern definition of economy is not to economize in the sense of saving, but to distribute purchasing power. According to this theory, every experience since the last war demonstrates that spending, not saving, is at present the source of prosperity. They come back time and again to the driving impulse of capitalizing demand and describe, with great detail, the full amplification of what they mean.

INTERNATIONAL DIVISION OF LABOR

When I raised the question of money, they disposed of that with a light gesture, pointing to the monetary triumph of Germany, where men were put to work and money was issued on the production of their anticipated effort. What Germany has done at home, they say, will be accomplished by German bilateral trade agreements throughout Europe and in this new economy there will be an international division of labor and economic grouping, each area producing in accordance with its capacity and all complementing each other with reciprocal trade relationships under the direction of Germany, with Berlin as the central clearing house.

They describe an economic world in four major blocks: Germany, the United States, British Empire, and bracketed together, Italy and Japan. They do not mention Russia and consider most of Asia, Africa, and South America as fields for development which will require great effort and large expenditure of capital before they can be considered part of the modern economic area. They recognize that within such grouping there exist sharp cleavages in government and political philosophy, but see no reason why this should be a hindrance to harmonious commercial relationship.

The complicated structure of modern economic organization has made each part of the world dependent upon the other for fulfillment, they assert. Europe can live without America, as America can live without Europe, but such mutual isolation will cause hardship to both continents and greater hardship in America with its great surplus of raw materials.

GREAT DOMESTIC PROGRAM

At the conclusion of this war Germany alone plans on spending more than $6,000,000,000 in a great domestic program for building workingmen's houses, reequipment of transportation systems, modernizing of rural villages and farm dwellings, and what Germany needs, the Nazis say, is an example of requirements for all Europe. Materials and labor necessary for reconstruction after this war are enormous, and this is where, they claim, the United States can play a heroic, constructive part for the rehabilitation of Europe and the world.

America is keeping 80 percent of the world's gold, and fabulous riches lie idle in America begging for employment. All this wealth, say the Nazi economists, can be used for the rehabilitation of Europe on the same sound terms with which the wealth of Europe created the wealth of America, not in ill-advised loans like those of the frenzied twenties, but in a spirit of sound business, as a capital investment. All this assumes that Germany will win, but all of the bankers, businessmen, and economic experts with whom I talked appeared to have no question that the dominant position of Germany on the Continent was unquestionable and would remain so.

When I asked what part gold would play in this post-war economy, I was answered by the question: How can Germany, with only $25,000,000 of yellow metal, enter the markets of the world on the gold standard? And before I could attempt an answer, I was asked further to define the present-day monetary function of gold. I explained, in my effort to find a responsive reply to this second query, that the experts of our Treasury Department have been grappling with the problem of our piling up surplus gold supplies for years, and if they have found a solution they have not yet announced it.

APPEALS TO HISTORICAL ARGUMENT

Somewhat defensively I appealed to the historical argument and described how, ever since ancient times in the Orient and among the Greeks, gold has served as the medium of exchange in commercial transactions and no adequate substitute has yet been found. As a measure of valuing possessions, gold has immutable, intrinsic value, is precious, limited in supply, and has always been the object of covetous imagination—qualities essential for a universal gage of wealth.

All this sounded pretty rhetorical when the head of the Belgian commission, passing through Berlin on its return to Brussels, told me how gold and American dollars had been spurned in Moscow. The commission went to Russia 2 months ago and ever since then has been engaged in discouraging negotiations concerning food supplies for famishing Belgium. Belgium has deposited in New York vaults more than $100,000,000 and yet, as this is written, Belgian children are fainting from hunger.

The Belgians went to Moscow confident that American gold was the most popular inanimate object in the world, and they had not the slightest doubt the Russians would avidly accept it for Ukrainian wheat. But they soon found out the Russians were not interested in gold under any circumstances. Completely jolted, they urged that in America gold was still considered of value and could buy things. The Soviets replied that they had gold enough of their own to use on Americans. They were producers of gold themselves, they said, and what they wanted from Belgium were things they did not produce at home, such as more useful metals, machines, cranes, and electrical equipment.

HAD TO GIVE ZINC

So matters stood paralyzed, with the Belgian people begging for bread and the money of the commission begging for them; but no gold argument or appeal could wangle a single grain of wheat from the hard-boiled Bolsheviks. In the end a saddened, disillusioned commission came away with only a promise of 15 days' wheat supplies for which they have given away all the available zinc to be found in Belgium.

It will be 3 weeks before these lean rations reach the empty Belgian mills, and nothing further will follow until the deliveries of machinery arrive in Russia. It takes 15 months to manufacture a crane according to Soviet specifications, and to finish the machines and electrical equipment demanded by this barter-bargain is likewise a long and complicated process. So the prospect for 8,000,000 hunger-languishing Belgians is not a happy one.

This spectacle of destitute Belgium and its bulging purse of gold is regarded by the Germans as a demonstration of the penury of standardized money. The professorial group in Government circles here claims that the test of any money is its buying capacity, and that, judged by this test, the days of gold are finished.

These economic evolutionists offer as an ideal monetary system the Schacht bilateral trading agreements to be expanded into a multilateral system, with the reichsmark as the common denominator of international currency. Berlin would be the financial capital of Europe and the clearinghouse for all international transaction, where debit or credit differences would be liquidated by the Reichsmark instead of gold, with Germany acting as controller.

Opposed to this theoretical view are the majority of conservative men in the National Socialist Party who have had practical business training and whose convictions have been welded in the forge of competitive experience. These men believe that gold is still important in international trade and can perform an important function, although they say it can never assume the controlling role it played before 1918. Its significance, they say, is as a stabilizer of currencies—the basis for settlement of debit and credit differences—but they do not believe that gold will ever again serve as the broad issue basis for currency.

In the same breath they are frank in saying they can think of no substitute for gold in international credit operations. The barter foundation of German bilateral trade agreements can have no capacity for expansion, they concede, but must be limited to specific transactions like the trade of German agricultural implements for the oil of Rumania. In such a deal there can be no purchase without an offsetting sale—an export counterbal-

ancing an import. Therefore, no element of the speculative future can be admitted—the transaction does not of its nature permit the doing of business except by matching goods.

This is a weakness and limitation of all barter arrangements which business-trained men in Germany frankly recognize. They agree that the foreign trade they have perfected is doing business without money and admit that without international money there exists no opportunity for insurance against foreign currency appreciation, such as the hedging operations of the gold standard days.

Then, on foreign exchange markets the value of the Reichsmark was every day registered in the currency of every other country and the German merchant could buy New York cotton 6 months ahead, protecting himself against the rise of American dollars in terms of German money before the delivery date, and likewise safeguarding against the decline of the Reichsmark compared with the dollar.

The United States, they point out, is now the holder of 80 percent of the world's supply, is still accumulating, and soon there will be little if any gold outside of the American Treasury vaults—a situation which proclaims its own futility. How, they demand, can any other country, even Britain, participate in world trade if gold is indispensable and we hold all the cards?

SEE TWO COURSES OPEN

There are, they say, only two logical courses to follow in order to liberate our imprisoned gold and make it circulate in the arteries of world commerce. One method is for us to import more goods than we send beyond our borders and pay for such essential imports in gold. For even the United States has not an economy of autarchy or a complete self-sufficiency and must shop abroad for such necessaries as tea, coffee, manganese, tin, and rubber.

Germany has trade relations with countries which ship these commodities to American markets, and the German suggestion is that the United States in such countries be substituted as a debtor to Germany. They say that in the East Indies the United States buys tin and rubber, and Germany sells machinery. An American importer of tin and rubber, instead of paying his vendor in the East Indies, would pay a German firm which has shipped machinery, and in execution of such triangular arrangements the East Indian dealer would get German machinery, the American would get tin and rubber, and the German would get the dollars which he could exchange for gold. By this means a large supply of our stagnant, useless metal would become useful, unshackled, and set free to work in the markets of the world, to expand trade and go forth on a mission of peace in dispensing prosperity and good will toward benefiting mankind.

Another proposal was that we take our perplexing treasure and put it to work in the reconstruction of war-wasted Europe, where the need will be vast not only for consumer goods but in rebuilding transportation, bridges, harbors, canals, demolished factories, dwellings, and what not. I was candid in saying that I thought this prospect would be met by unreceptive silence among my countrymen, who were warned rather than encouraged by their investment experience in Europe after the last war.

The reply to this was that no one was hitting at a financial saturnalia such as that which occurred in the half decade before 1930, when American bankers, seemingly oblivious of their own security and their debtor's capacity to repay, deluged Germany with their begging billions. What was suggested was a scheme of investment which could be scrutinized with the searchingness American insurance companies use on any commitment of funds for their policyholders.

After this war, which all in Government positions professed to believe would end in a few months, a balance sheet of Europe could, they were certain, stand up to critical inventory which would reveal potential possibilities for American capital with a prospect of profit even greater than that realized by European investors in the half century before the last war, when this continent was the creditor of the western world.

Construction Costs at Camp Edwards, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Camp Edwards is situated on Cape Cod a short distance from the city of Falmouth, Mass. This was a fixed-fee job. The original War Department estimate for Camp Edwards was $7,240,462. On December 31 the War Department estimated that it would cost $29,000,967. Estimates made by the contractor on March 14, 1941, state that the total cost for the work authorized to that date would be $28,560,967 and that the total cost will exceed $29,000,000. I spoke at length on this project before the House on January 16, 1941, in making a preliminary report. My remarks will be found on page 166 and succeeding pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date. The statements at that time were based upon the information furnished me by the contractor and by the War Department. Naturally, there would be some changes in those estimates and figures now that the job is practically completed. In order to make a complete report I will have to repeat some of the statements I made at that time giving the actual figures, whereas the figures submitted to me then were based on estimates.

LAND ACQUISITION

Camp Edwards was a National Guard camp and consists of approximately 19,200 acres of land, all of which was turned over to the Federal Government by the State of Massachusetts for a nominal consideration.

SITE

I visited this camp on March 15, 1941. The site is level and, in my judgment, a good site as far as location, soil conditions, drainage, and other elements are concerned which go to make up a good cantonment site. It was very muddy the day I was there and the men were drilling in mud. My first impression was that this was a faulty condition of the soil or drainage. A closer examination, however, revealed the fact that we had an unusual condition which one finds in that area and on that type of soil during a short period in the spring of the year. The ground had frozen to some depth. When the thaw came and the top portion of the soil thawed the water had no way of draining until all the soil had thawed. As soon as the frost was out of the ground the natural drainage through the sand soil eliminated the wet conditions. The camp is located in a rectangular form in such a way as to occupy the smallest space practicable, reducing the required length of utility lines.

CAMP CAPACITY

This camp originally provided for a total capacity of 26,762 officers and men. Subsequent construction has increased the size of the camp to a capacity of 33,660 officers and men, or an increase of approximately 6,000, or 22 percent. The total number of buildings erected is 1,385, including 471 63-man barracks and 169 170-man mess halls.

CONTRACTOR

The Walsh Construction Co., incorporated under the laws of the State of Iowa, was the contractor on this project. An examination of this contractor's qualifications shows that they have had 41 years of experience in construction work under practically the same management. Among the larger projects which they took part in was the construction of spillway tunnels at Fort Peck, Mont., the Grand Coulee Dam, and the New York City-Delaware Aqueduct. They gave me a list of their construction projects, including various public works for cities, States, and Federal Government aggregating a total of some $83,000,000. They also furnished me a list of railroad work of various types and items, including $103,000,000. If the itemized statement furnished me as to the work they have performed is correct, and I have no reason to doubt it, this construction company, through experience, was qualified to do almost any type of work.

CONTRACTOR'S OVERHEAD

The contractor's overhead costs are as follows:

Engineer and construction quartermaster expenses charged as contractor's overhead	$80,831.99
Fire and police departments	118,989.84
Sanitation and clean-up	60,411.45
General administration and office expense (includes administration, accounting, timekeeping, time checking, material checking, equipment rental checkers, and all general office expense)	756,186.93
Insurance, compensation, public liability, and property damage	321,000.00
Old-age and unemployment taxes	307,514.21
Total of above items	1,644,934.42

It was interesting to note that, in addition to the above taxes, the employees on this job paid out of wages received for unemployment and old-age taxes an additional $113,894. The contractor's overhead as above itemized, including taxes, insurance, and so forth, was 5.7 percent of the total cost of the project.

ARMY OVERHEAD

The Army adds 11 percent overhead to each fixed-fee job which is broken down as follows:

First. Four percent for engineering, including consulting-engineer work; this includes the contract-engineer's fixed fee and overhead which, on this project, was 1.503 percent of the cost of the job.

Second. Two percent for Army overhead; that is, for the Washington office.

Third. Five percent for the construction quartermaster's overhead and contingencies.

The construction quartermaster informed me that his total overhead was $150,000, or seven-tenths of 1 percent. The 11 percent actually charged up on this job for Army overhead, including contractor-engineer costs, amounted to $3,190,000.

ALLOCATION OF ARMY OVERHEAD

The Army overhead of 11 percent amounted to $3,190,000 and was allocated as follows:

I. Four percent to engineering, including the overhead of the camp construction quartermaster. The latter's overhead amounted to seven-tenths of 1 percent, or $150,000.

II. Five percent for construction quartermaster general, including the fixed fee and overhead of contract engineer. The latter in this project amounted to $387,339, or 1.503 percent and contingencies.

III. Two percent for general Army overhead. The field overhead of the Army, including items I and II, equaled $537,339, leaving $2,652,661, or 9.1 percent of total cost, for Washington office of Army for overhead and contingencies.

QUALIFICATIONS OF THE ARCHITECT-ENGINEER

The engineering work was done by Charles T. Main, Inc. Charles T. Main has been a consulting engineer for nearly 50 years as an individual or through partnership or corporation. He has been president of the American Society of Engineers and the American Institute of Consulting Engineers. The six associates who are directors have been with the concern for periods of time ranging from 17 to 35 years. This company has done engineering work on over $50,000,000 worth of contracts and has done consultation work on a great many additional projects, including work for the T. V. A. Mr. F. M. Gunby, one of the directors, who is in charge of Camp Edwards, did everything in his power to furnish me with all the information that I asked for. The architect-engineer's cost, including his fixed fee, inspection work, and all other costs up to March 7, 1941, was $387,339, or 1.503 percent of the construction cost.

CONSTRUCTION QUARTERMASTER QUALIFIED

Three construction quartermasters operated on this project: Maj. H. L. Alger was construction quartermaster up to November 15, 1940. Capt. Karl M. Pattee was in charge until January 30, 1941, and Capt. F. E. Robbins subsequent to that time. I have met Captain Robbins and Captain Pattee and both seemed to be conscientious and efficient officers. Captain Pattee is a qualified construction engineer and worked for approximately 7 years as construction and maintenance officer as well as in a supervisory capacity for the Civilian Conservation Corps. Captain Robbins has also had considerable experience of the same type. Mr. Frederick M. Kissenger, field auditor in the Construction Division, was very efficient, in fact is outstanding. He served 13 years as instructor of actuarial science, accounting, and economics at Temple University. He has been a certified public accountant since 1926.

EMPLOYMENT

The total employment of the contractor's force reached a peak during the week ending November 9, 1940. At that time the total number of employees was 18,343. Of that number 10,151 drew carpenter wages or were carpenter foremen and carpenter superintendents, 5,010 were laborers, laborer foremen, and labor superintendents. The balance on the pay roll were mechanics, clerks, timekeepers, plumbers, electricians, checkers, administrative force, and so forth. From 60 to 65 percent of the men drawing carpenter wages were not carpenters.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The job was commenced on September 16. On or about December 1 the entire crew was reorganized. There were 30 sectional superintendents under whom were various types of foremen who had crews under them. The original carpenter foremen had 20 men. This crew was reduced to 12 with a pusher at the head of each group of 12. While there is no doubt in my mind that there was rather a loose organization at the beginning, the contractor claims that when the job was reorganized the foreman of each crew was a carpenter or mechanic. I had many letters giving me information regarding the organization and the fact that those drawing carpenter wages were not carpenters. One carpenter wrote me that he had worked on 4 different carpenter crews. One of the foremen was an R. F. D. carrier, 1 was a day laborer who had worked on the job about 5 weeks, the third was a lobster fisherman and the fourth was actually a carpenter. The lobster fisherman foreman had a crew consisting of himself, a bond salesman, an insurance man, a meat cutter, a gas-station attendant., 3 laborers who were not carpenters, 1 good carpenter, and 1 rough carpenter. I believe, however, that at least a part of this condition was corrected when the crew was reorganized. The carpenter foremen and pushers were appointed by the section superintendent.

WAGE SCALE

The wage scale on this job was originally fixed by the Secretary of Labor under the terms of the Bacon-Davis Act. The original determination was made on August 27, 1940. I am informed by the contractor that the original wage scale was undoubtedly the wage scale of the various unions of the vicinity of New Bedford, Mass., the city nearest to the project. New Bedford is a city with approximately 100,000 population. I have a photostatic copy of the decision and wage scale as fixed and revised by the Secretary of Labor. I do not wish to place the entire scale in the RECORD but will take the crafts which did most of the work, giving the wage rate as fixed on August 27, and then the increase under the supplemental order of September 28. This is as follows:

	Per hour	Increased to—
Laborers, unskilled	$0.625	(1)
Painters	.90	(1)
Pipe layers	.65	(1)
Plumbers	1.00	(1)
Plumbers' helpers	.65	(1)
Roofers	1.10	(1)
Sheet-metal workers	1.50	(1)
Structural-iron workers	1.50	(1)
Truck drivers:		
1½ tons or less	.67	(1)
Over 1½ tons	.71	(1)
Bricklayers	1.25	[2] $1.50
Carpenters, journeyman	1.00	[2] 1.17½
Cement finishers	1.25	[2] 1.50
Electricians	1.00	[2] 1.50
Operators of power equipment, blade graders, 40 horsepower and over	1.00	[2] 1.15
Motor graders, 40 horsepower and over	1.00	[2] 1.15
Tractors, 40 horsepower and over	1.00	[2] 1.15
Plasterers	1.25	[2] 1.50
Plasterers' tenders	.80	[2] .90

[1] No change. [2] Per hour.

The increase made by the Secretary of Labor on September 28 was the equivalent of a 15-percent increase in the total labor cost.

In addition to the above increase made by the Secretary of Labor, the subcontractors increased the rate of pay of electricians, sheet-metal workers, and plumbers, as follows: The original pay for the electricians, fixed by the Secretary of Labor, for a 48-hour week with overtime in excess of 40 hours, would have been $52 per week. The subcontractors revised the schedule up to $84 a week, or 61.5 percent above the regular union scale at New Bedford. Sheet-metal workers would have received $78 a week for the 48-hour week. As revised by the subcontractors they received $90.80 a week, or an increase of 16.4 percent. Plumbers would have received $52 a week under the original scale fixed by the Secretary of Labor, which is a union scale; revised by the subcontractors to $90 per week, or an increase of 73 percent. The increased cost of the job by reason of the 15-percent increase in the original labor scale above referred to by the Secretary of Labor was approximately $1,800,000. The amount of this increase by the subcontractors in the wage scale equaled $200,000. While these were lump-sum contracts, they must have been fat contracts to enable the subcontractors to voluntarily add to the wage scale as fixed by the Secretary of Labor an increase that amounts to this sum. My contention is that this $200,000 represented only a part of the excess cost of these so-called lump-sum contracts. It will be recalled that these subcontracts were not advertised as stated in my speech of January 16, but the bidders were selected by the contractor himself.

The amount of premium paid for overtime was $1,000,000. Carpenters and laborers drew time and a half for overtime and Saturdays, and double time for Sundays. All other trades drew double time for all overtime. The entire crew worked on a 40-hour-week basis. The three items above referred to, that is, the increase in the labor rates by the Secretary of Labor, the subcontractors' increase in the wage scale and the overtime item amounted to $3,000,000, or 10 percent of the total cost of the project.

OVERHEAD, TAXES, INSURANCE, AND INCREASED LABOR COSTS

First. The contractor's overhead costs as itemized, less insurance and taxes, are $1,015,420;

Second. Insurance, old-age compensation, public liability and property damage; and unemployment taxes on the project aggregated $629,514;

Third. 11 percent Army overhead aggregated $3,190,000;

Fourth. Increased labor cost due to overtime and increase in the wage scale by the Secretary of Labor and by subcontractor amounted to $3,000,000. It is interesting to note that the items above specified, that is, increased wage scale, overtime, insurance and taxes, contractor's and Army overhead aggregate $7,834,943 or $594,000 more than the original Army estimate for the entire project.

LUMBER

Approximately 63,000,000 feet of lumber was used on this job. The first 34,056,500 feet were purchased by the procurement section of the construction quartermaster's division at a cost of $1,399,722 or at an average of $41.10 per thousand. The officials at the Washington office informed me that this was the price on the job at Camp Edwards. In addition to this 34,000,000 feet the contractors purchased the next 26,000,000 feet at a cost of $46 per thousand delivered on the job. The lumber was hauled by truck from the railroad siding to the camp, a distance of 11 miles. In January I called the contractor's attention to the fact that he had paid $4.90 more per thousand for the lumber than the Army had paid and that the Army officials in charge had informed me that the price had come down. The contractor contended that the War Department price was the price delivered at the siding and not at the camp and that the haulage was in addition to the $41.10 a thousand that the contractor charged up. I took this matter up again with the contractor's representative when I visited the camp in March. He informed me that the construction quartermaster had ordered him to make a detailed report of all lumber purchased and the cost and also a detailed report of the use of all lumber. He further informed me that he had made a complete report to the construction quartermaster and promised to send me a copy of this report. This he failed to do. The difference between the $41.10 per thousand paid by the Army and the $46 a thousand paid by the contractor is $4.90. The contractor's representative stated that they had a subcontract whereby the subcontractor hauled the lumber from the railhead to the job for $1.85 per thousand. This would leave $3 a thousand still unexplained. I had information that the contractor who had hauled the lumber dumped it on the ground. This was verified by the project manager of the contractor. When I called his attention to the damage that such lumber as siding, flooring, and so forth, would sustain if a truckload is dumped on the ground, he contended that there was very little damage to the lumber.

LUMBER DELIVERIES

Five hundred and forty-two cars of lumber or approximately 13,500,000 feet arrived on the job within 18 days after the date the contractor was ordered to proceed, with 248 more cars in transit at the end of the 18 days. The contractor received his orders to proceed on September 12. On September 16, 17 carloads of lumber arrived at the railhead This lumber continued to arrive daily, reaching as many as 71 cars per day on September 25 with an average of 39 cars per day from September 16 to September 30. During that 2-week period 542 cars of lumber were delivered at the station and, on September 30, 248 more cars were in transit. The record shows that the total gross pay roll for the week ending September 14 was $905; for the week ending September 21 it was $13,890; for the week ending September 28 it was $78,446. It can be seen that this first 13,000,000 feet of lumber arrived before the contractor had an opportunity of employing carpenters or help of any kind. Lumber continued to arrive at the same rate throughout the next 6 weeks. The contractor had lumber to the right of him, lumber to the left of him, lumber in front of him and lumber behind him. In fact, all one could see was millions of feet of lumber. The first bill of lading arrived on September 26 at which time they had already received over 500 cars of lumber. As late as October 14 the contractor was still requesting bills of lading for lumber he had received during the month of September. As a result of this lack of information it was impossible to check the lumber in and impossible to plan the proper distribution of the same which resulted in considerable cost in redistribution of the lumber as the work progressed. One can imagine what happens when one scatters nearly 800 carloads of lumber in less than 30 days over the building area. Lumber had to be moved before sewer lines and water lines could be constructed. It was impossible to proceed with sewer and water lines until after the buildings were more or less complete. It is difficult to realize the confusion that must have resulted from this sort of a policy. The contractor had no opportunity to organize or to prepare for the lumber. Time and help that he should have devoted for planning and building was taken up with moving and removing lumber. No one with any business sense in the construction of a job would permit anything of this kind to occur, and the responsibility must be placed squarely upon the Army officials and the construction quartermaster, and not upon the contractor. It was impossible even to begin to compute the extra cost of moving and removing this lumber, of the delay in putting in utilities, and of the handicap placed upon the contractor because of the method by which this lumber was rushed to the job.

INSPECTION

The quality of lumber was inspected by the Lumber Inspection Bureau, Inc., a Massachusetts corporation operating as a contractor without regard to invoice. For this inspection they received 50 cents per thousand feet. Subcontractors unloaded the lumber from the railroad cars and hauled it to stock piles or job. The truck hauling such lumber was checked by the contractor and construction quartermaster at the railroad when the truck left and later checked on the job, time being kept. The subcontractor was paid $1.85 per thousand feet for this service, which seemed to me to be very reasonable. The lumber was dumped on the job and stock piling was not included. The Government paid for the actual amount of lumber received as tallied without regard to invoice. Lumber inspectors inspected the lumber as to quality, grade, and moisture content. The Lumber Inspection Bureau reported that they had tallied up to February 5 a total of 57,330,920 feet. I quote the folowing from their letter:

> With the exception of two cars which we rejected we believe the lumber as a whole would average 40 to 50 percent above grade called for and not over 2 or 3 percent below grade.

RATIO OF LABOR AND MATERIAL, ETC.

The weekly report ending March 14, 1941, shows that the accumulated expenditures plus obligations on this project was $26,177,036. It further shows that the accumulated expenditures plus obligations for labor up to that date was $11,681,911. This shows a ratio of approximately 45 percent labor and 55 percent material, and other expenses.

UTILITIES

The original Army estimate of the cost of the utilities on this project was $540,000. The actual cost of the utilities now almost completed is $5,751,117, or more than 10 times the original estimated cost and an increase of over 900 percent. The amount of money spent for utilities equals 80 percent of the total cost of the job. One million three hundred and thirty-eight thousand and two hundred and eighty-three dollars of this is for grading and clearing roads and truck parks. Seven hundred and eight-three acres of scrub land was cleared, and to avoid danger of fire all brush and trees were hauled away rather than burned. The above amount also included the cost of the railroad hereinbefore referred to. The following gives an idea of the extent of the utilities constructed:

Water lines (feet)	212,990
Electric-service lines (feet)	1,123,750
Sewer lines (feet)	182,304
Disposal plant (gallons per day)	6,000,000
Pumping station (gallons per minute)	5,300
Water storage (gallons)	1,400,000
Gasoline storage (gallons)	356,000

RAILROADS

Ten miles of railroad was built at a cost of $662,000. One-hundred-pound relay rail being used. The railroad furnished all material under subcontract. The railroad was constructed by the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. on a subcontract basis and built on a subgrade provided for by the railroad company. The rails cost $28.75 per gross ton.

POWER SAWS

One hundred and thirty-two power saws of different types were used on the job, both in a central mill and at various sections of the job.

EQUIPMENT RENTAL

The total value of all the equipment on this project was $2,659,512. The total rental paid up to March 7, 1941, was $823,537.70 while the total valuation of the recaptured equipment was $53,394. Approximately 5 percent of the equipment rental was paid to the contractor. The remainder was paid to outside parties.

CONCLUSIONS

I. The original estimate of Camp Edwards was $7,240,462. The actual cost will be $29,000,967, or more than four times the original estimate. Taxes, insurance, contractors' and Army overhead, labor overtime, and wages aggregated $7,834,943 or $594,000 more than the original estimate of the cost of the entire project. This is itemized as follows:

First. The contractor's overhead costs, less insurance and taxes was $1,015,420.

Second. Insurance, old-age, and unemployment taxes on the project aggregated $629,514.

Third. Eleven percent Army overhead aggregated $3,190,000.

Fourth. Increased labor cost due to overtime and increase in the wage scale by the Secretary of Labor by the subcontractor amounted to $3,000,000.

II. Site: The site chosen for this camp is level, has good drainage and the buildings were located in a rectangular form which allows the greatest number of barracks within the smallest area, making it possible to reduce the cost of main sewer, electric, water, and telephone lines. The original estimate was supposed to provide for a total of 26,762 officers and men, the present camp provided for 33,660 officers and men or an increase of approximately 6,000 men. While the camp capacity was increased 22 percent, the cost was increased 300 percent.

III. Eighteen thousand three hundred and forty-three men were employed at the peak of the construction program, 10,151 of whom drew carpenter wages. Sixty to sixty-five percent of the men drawing carpenter wages were not carpenters.

IV. Eight hundred and twenty-three thousand five hundred and thirty-seven dollars was paid in rental for equipment which had an appraised value of $2,659,512. The rental paid equaled 31 percent of its appraised value.

V. Lumber: Sixty-three million feet of lumber was used on this project, 34,000,000 of which was purchased by the construction quartermaster's office at $41.10 per thousand, while the next 26,000,000 feet was purchased by the contractor at $46 a thousand. Both the contractor and the construction quartermaster contend their costs included delivery to the project. The construction quartermaster and the officer in the procurement section contended that lumber had come down in price between the dates that the construction quartermaster made his purchase and the contractor made his. The contractor contended that the Army price did not include delivery from the siding to the job, that it cost $1.85 per thousand to make such delivery. This differential of $4.90 per thousand remains unexplained, despite the promise of the contractor to furnish me with a detailed report.

VI. Lumber deliveries: Eight hundred cars of lumber were delivered to the contractor in less than 30 days, aggregating 13,500,000 feet between September 16 and September 30. The contractor received his order to proceed on September 12 and without giving him an opportunity to organize, lumber was delivered at the rate of 39 cars per day during the first 2 weeks succeeding September 16. On September 30, 542 cars had been delivered and 248 cars were in transit. The record shows that the total gross pay roll for the week ending Septmber 14 was $905; for the week ending September 21, it was $13,890; and for the week ending September 28, it was $78,446. It can be seen that this first 13,000,000 feet of lumber arrived before the contractor had an opportunity of employing carpenters or help of any kind. Deliveries were arriving at an average of 39 cars per day. The first bill of lading did not arrive until September 26, at which time they had already received over 500 cars of lumber. As late as October 14 the contractor had not yet received bills of lading for lumber delivered in September. Lumber was scattered all over the building area, dumped wherever possible to dump it and it had to be moved and removed before sewer and water lines could be constructed. In fact it was impossible to proceed with sewer and water lines until after the buildings were more or less complete. The cost to the taxpayers because of the confusion caused by this method of delivery is difficult to estimate, but was without a doubt, enormous. The responsibility for this must be placed squarely upon the Army officials and the construction quartermaster of the United States Army, and not upon the contractor.

VII. Inspection: The subcontractor who inspected the lumber reports that with the exception of two cars the lumber would average from 40 to 50 percent above grade.

VIII. Ratio of labor and material: The weekly report ending March 14 shows that the accumulated expenditures plus obligations was $26,177,000 and that the accumulated expenditures plus obligations for labor was $11,681,911. Based upon these figures, the ratio is approximately as follows: Labor 45 percent; material and other expenses 55 percent.

IX. Utilities: The original Army estimate for utilities was $540,000. The actual cost is $5,751,000 or more than 10 times the original estimate. This is an increase of over 900 percent over the original estimate. It is also interesting to note that the actual cost of the utilities equaled 80 percent of the original estimate of the cost of the entire project.

Protect Us From the Aggressor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, billions of dollars worth of treasure and, perhaps, before we are through, millions of lives will be expended in an effort to stop the aggressions of Hitler. His brutal murder of hundreds of thousands of peaceful people, his destruction of smaller countries, will forever remain a blot upon the history of the world.

With Hitler triumphant in Europe, here in America every citizen will be called upon to make some contribution, some sacrifice, to end his reign of terror; to free people who are slaves to his ambition.

Brutality, wherever found and by whomever exercised, should meet the condemnation and the opposition of everyone. Only a free, unoppressed, courageous people, fully prepared, can successfully meet this danger which threatens and would destroy us.

But brutal aggressors have no more justification here in America than has Hitler on the world stage. All the talk, the whole crusade, against Hitler and his brutality, his destruction of equality of opportunity, give out the hollow ring of hypocrisy, unless we here at home protect our people from the brutality of aggressors.

Recently, from a representative of a State-chartered labor union at Detroit came two communications, the substance of which I will shortly give you. These communications disclose that again in the city of Detroit, as so often before in that and other cities, men, masquerading behind the mask of a labor union, traitors to the cause of labor, are brutally and aggressively destroying equality of opportunity, attempting to enslave citizens of Detroit and, by the exercise of force, carry on their racketeering schemes.

Although I do not represent the Detroit districts, in fact, live on the opposite side of the State, the following letter came to me on April 7:

HONORABLE SIR: Here are a few facts I, the undersigned, am sending you, and which you as our Representative should know and give us your intelligent support.

I am one of 65 employees in an organization which has been in business in Detroit for 15 years, and have been such employee for the past 8 years.

We have our own employees' union with a charter from Lansing and are 100-percent satisfied.

We know:

1. That we are the highest paid, each in his or her own particular work, among corresponding types of employees in this or any other State.

2. That we work under the best working conditions.

3. That we receive vacations with pay.

4. That we receive bonuses at Christmas.

5. That since company started it has never had a moment's labor trouble of any kind.

6. That our employers are considerate, fair, and thoughtful.

Now men from the American Federation of Labor are trying to force all of us into their organization, and admitting the above facts frankly state they cannnot improve our working conditions nor our wages, that we must pay them $7 entrance charge and $2 monthly, which is their sole interest in the matter.

That if we refuse, they will picket the plant, our customers also, which would close the plant; necessary raw materials could not be delivered, so we would be thrown out of employment, and, furthermore, they even threatened bodily violence if we did refuse.

On behalf of myself and fellow workers, we ask you as our elected representative, if something cannot be done to stop American Federation of Labor's unreasonable, arbitrary, and unnecessary interference with this organization's employees.

Is it possible that we have no constitutional rights to protect us against such gross imposition, that we must submit to their threats, though we have not a single complaint and nothing to arbitrate.

Meanwhile, our employers and ourselves have lost time over visitations of these racketeers, two of whom, we understand, are under Federal indictment under the Sherman Act, and all of us are agitated and upset concerning the matter.

Respectfully yours,

ROYAL O. ROUSE.

445 Field Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

P. S.—A prompt reply will be deeply appreciated.

To that letter I replied in effect that, under the recent decision of the Supreme Court, there was no way by which the picketing of the plant could be prevented and that the Federal legislation which we needed to punish some of the reprehensible acts being carried on by criminals masquerading as labor leaders were amendments to the National Labor Relations Act, the Sherman Antitrust Act, the Clayton Act, and the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

In reply to that letter, came the following communication:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 21st in reply to mine of the 7th and for which I thank you sincerely.

Permit me to add to my previous statements for your information, and to further arouse your interest: I am president of the "New Era Employees' Benefit Association."

As such, I am 100 percent their spokesman, and on their behalf, my own, and as an American, with unquestioned rights under the Constitution of our country, I am heart and soul seeking to secure justice by my own efforts, and through the assistance of those upon whom we have a right to call, and, as I see it, such justice cannot be secured without promptly stopping the extortionate and uncalled-for demands of the racketeers in labor unions.

Our organization or union, with a legal State charter, is within the jurisdiction of the Wagner Act, is not company-controlled, but entirely in the hands of employees, and an election would demonstrate by acclamation that we would be our own bargaining agent if any bargaining was to be done.

There is no need for bargaining or for arbitration, no point being at issue, therefore, we are informed the N. L. R. B. can do nothing toward solution of threats hanging over us.

J. R. Steelman, Director of Conciliation, in Washington, D. C., to whom President Roosevelt turned over the facts I presented to him, referred me to Commissioner L. R. Rye of that Service at 225 Federal Building, Detroit, and he stated: "There is nothing our Department can do."

Thurman Arnold, Assistant Attorney General, to whom Senator PRENTISS M. BROWN presented the facts, also says in his answering letter:

"In view of the recent decision of the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *William L. Hutcheson, et al.*, the activities which are the subject of Mr. Rouse's complaint, cannot be reached by the antitrust laws. Furthermore, since there does not appear to be any present interference with interstate commerce, it would seem that there is no basis for action by the Federal Government under any statute. In my opinion Mr. Rouse's only recourse at this time is to the State authorities."

Our attorney concedes that as the laws and the courts now stand he is powerless to aid in curbing the evil and inexcusable situation.

To get a bird's-eye view of our case quickly, please glance at the attached summary of facts covering what we face.

Learning of a Cleveland situation somewhat similar to ours, though not quite as favorably situated as to employer and employee conditions and relations, I went there, and found as follows:

Under threats and fearsome of results, they knuckled down to A. F. L. racketeers and now their happy situation has been superseded by these conditions:

Employees met the money demands exacted, owners have practically nothing to say as to running their business, an A. F. L. steward is in control, their truck salesmen (who had a union of their own) worked on commissions on sales, and now their earnings are 50 percent less, because their hours of activity are reduced arbitrarily, net profits for company are reduced, and the spirit and enthusiasm previously existent have disappeared in the plant.

It seems to me, and it grows apace in the minds of increasing numbers of the sane-thinking American people that we are fast approaching a tidal wave of such calamitous and evil possibilities that are beyond estimating or picturing.

Every moment lost in taking steps to curb the increasing drift makes more certain a chaotic wallowing that will be beyond all control, and all will be helpless victims.

Sinister international influences are everlastingly at work for selfish, grasping, materialistic motives, caring not a jot for America, its Constitution, its institutions, its people, or its future state.

Blindly we fall into their schemes, while our own internal evils are left unchecked, and those fomenting and spreading them grow more bold in their marauding and heartlessness.

When they boast of their power, when they laugh and sneer at our laws, and speak of envisioning their enormous possibilities through organizing all the grocers, all those who supply them with food products and other household necessities, of being able to dictate to them, to canners, manufacturers and others, prices, employees' wages, hours, etc., it proves how secure they are growing to feel, and little effort is necessary to grasp how great this menace can become.

As an American, I give these thoughts expression, and if they aid, even in small degree to arouse you and others to prompt and practical action, no one will be happier than I.

As an employee acting for a small group of fellow employees, who are happy in their labors in the employment of two Christian, just and considerate men, and as a man—the father of a family, meeting all a citizen's obligations—I conclude this letter, without apologies for the time I have taken, because I believe you are glad as an American to get the common man's viewpoint.

Finally, I conclude with the expression of this hope, that if it is within the bounds of possibility that you, with the assistance of others, will evolve a way to stop these union organizers, so-called, from closing the plant of our employers, seriously injuring the business they have worked up during the last 15 years through hard, honest, ethical work, and from throwing all of us out of employment.

Their uncalled-for and valueless demands are shown on the attached Summary of Facts.

Thanking you, I am,

Respectfully yours,

ROYAL O. ROUSE.

445 Field Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

APRIL 29, 1941.

In the matter of New Era Employees Benefit Association, Royal O. Rouse, president, 445 Field Avenue, Detroit, Mich., and the American Federation of Labor organizers

SUMMARY OF FACTS

1. Employer: Nicolay-Dancey, Inc., 5801 Grandy Avenue, Detroit.

2. Business: Manufacturers of scientifically processed potatoes in chip and julienne form, packed in varied sizes, at varied prices.

3. Years operating: Continuously from 1926.

4. Any labor troubles: Never.

5. Factory: Thoroughly and modernly equipped.

6. Working conditions: Excellent.

7. Union employees' wages: Best in the industry.

8. Overtime: Allowed.

9. Vacation: Allowed salaried and other employees with pay.

10. Bonus: Paid at Christmastide.

11. Awards: On completion of 10 years service each employee is presented with a handsome inscribed present.

12. Picnics or banquets: Given from time to time.

13. Employers' attitude: Always just and considerate.

14. Employees: Formed their own independent local union, secured a State charter, and it is entirely in control of members.

American Federation of Labor organizers demand we must join their organization; that each employee must pay an entrance fee of $7 and $2 each month, while admitting they cannot improve our factory or labor, or wage conditions, and that if we do not, they'll picket the plant, prevent deliveries of raw materials, of products going out, and thus close it up.

To these were added greater threats.

Then, into my office on yesterday came Mr. Rouse and Mr. Crews, both representatives of the labor union. They told me—and, apparently, they are reliable men—that three so-called organizers of the American Federation of Labor informed them that, unless the employees whom they represented paid $7 each as a membership fee and thereafter $2 a month to the American Federation of Labor, the American Federation of Labor would put their employer out of business.

These labor organizers were told by Mr. Rouse that the employees would, if necessary, get the necessary trucking equipment to haul potatoes from the warehouse to the company's plant. This statement was met by the assertion that, if that was attempted, the union, equipped with Buick cars and with plenty of men at its command, would see that the trucks never reached their destination.

The attention of these men was also called to the strength of the union, to the fact that others who had attempted to oppose the union's will had been financially ruined and that some had been beaten.

In view of the recent bat murder in the cleaning industry in the city of Chicago; in view of what recently happened at the Detroit plant, where hundreds of thousands of dollars of machinery necessary for national defense was wilfully and maliciously destroyed—and by the way, such destruction is a felony in the State of Michigan—in view of the beating of many of the Ford workers at Dearborn and considering the fact that the C. I. O. at that time took possession of the public highways of the State of Michigan, these threats made by the A. F. of L. organizers were not idle talk and cannot be so considered.

If the Federal Government, as is apparently the case, will not give protection to American citizens, then I call upon the law-enforcing officers of the State of Michigan to give protection to the citizens of Detroit, who desire, by earning a livelihood for themselves and their families, to stay off of the relief rolls and save the State of Michigan the necessity of caring for them and those dependent upon them. I call upon the law-enforcing officials of the State to give to these citizens of Wayne, who have appealed to me, protection from the aggressors here at home.

I call upon the law-enforcing officials of the State to make investigation and to prosecute, under section 17 of Act No. 176 of the Public Acts of the State of Michigan for the year 1939, any and all men who may have violated the law by attempting to practice coercion against the employees of Nicolay-Dancey, Inc., and who are attempting to gain control of the food supply of Detroit.

Unless we can first put our own house in order; unless we can insure the citizens of Detroit, of Wayne County, of the State, and of the Nation that they shall have that equality of opportunity which the President said must prevail everywhere in the world, there is little use of our attempting to oppose the world aggressor, Hitler.

Against the monster who brings oppression, suffering, and death to the people of the Old World we shall have no adequate protection unless here at home we do away with the parasites, the hyenas, the oppressors, who will destroy the spirit, the courage of those who must bear the burdens of successful opposition to Hitler.

If the potatoes grown by the farmers of Michigan cannot be delivered to this factory, to be there made by these employees into potato chips, until some organization in Detroit has collected whatever dues and fees it may name from those employees who are engaged in changing the farmers' product into a more edible form, then, indeed, the beginning of the end may be seen.

In my own home county, a farmers' cooperative organization, the Hamilton Farm Bureau, has been forced to pay a membership fee of $50 per year and dues of $5 per month for the privilige of putting their own men on trucks to deliver their products into the city of Chicago.

With the Secretary of Agriculture pegging the price of farm products and organizations insisting that the butter, the milk, the eggs, the beef, and other farm products cannot be delivered to the hungry people of the cities, except as they are delivered through members of their organizations, until they have collected their toll, tell me what would happen if the farmers should organize and refuse to deliver, or permit delivery, of food to the cities until their price was paid.

Is it not about time that only those who contribute something of value be permitted to add to the cost of the things we use? Cannot the people of the cities, the people's chosen representatives, who make and enforce the laws, realize, understand, that the imposition of a fee or a charge upon the handling of the necessities of life, when no service is rendered, is just plain racketeering?

A Separate Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

STATEMENT BY COL. ROSCOE TURNER

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a statement by Col. Roscoe Turner, who is a constituent of mine, and who is regarded as one of the greatest aviators of all time.

Colonel Turner is an ardent advocate of a separate air force as one of the essentials of our national defense. I hope every Member will take the time to read his illuminating statement on the all-important subject of aviation.

The matter referred to follows:

MUNICIPAL AIRPORT,
Indianapolis, Ind., April 7, 1941.

The Honorable J. E. RANKIN,
Congressman from Mississippi,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RANKIN: I want you to know that I am very grateful to you for your kind letter of March 28 and all the nice things you have to say. I have been a little slow in answering, but I wanted to get some material together.

No. 1. Aviation personnel are all specialists, and they are all very highly trained in their particular profession—pilots, navigators, radio operators, meteorologists, etc. Therefore, control should be in the hands of similarly trained personnel, so that they understand the problems of the men aloft. For instance, weather forecasting has to be entirely different for aviation than it does for anything else, because of the rapidly changing conditions and the fact that the airplane covers so much territory in such a short time. Therefore, we have had to develop a very highly specialized way for forecasting the weather. Before a man can direct a pilot in the air on how to fly through bad weather and how to control his ship he has to know something of the conditions that a pilot is up against. You can also take the finest navigator in the world, who has been a seagoing man for years, and put him in an airplane, and he will have to rearrange all of his navigation because of the speed with which the airplane travels. Therefore, we have had to develop special navigation for aviation.

No. 2. At present our Air Corps is being coordinated to the ground and sea forces, whereas it should be the reverse. Our ground forces should be coordinated to the Air Corps. For instance, Germany took over Poland, Norway, Belgium, and France, and the Air Corps was the first line of defense. Then came the shock troop, next the tanks and mechanized cavalry, followed up by the infantry to do the mopping up. In the case of Norway, the Air Corps moved up first and the Navy followed. Therefore, it has been plainly demonstrated beyond any shadow of a doubt by the finest military air force in the world that aviation is going to rule the world, so why should we subordinate it because of a few high hats in Washington who have been trained along slower methods of doing things and stayed on the ground all their life, and just because of their greed for power, they are going to subordinate aviation. I assure you that it is because of just personal, selfish reasons that the Army and Navy wish to subordinate aviation. For instance, the Navy wants to hold it down because of the fact that they hate to relinquish any of their power and authority. It also might occur to you that there is a lot more money involved in building battleships than building airplanes, so there is something to think about there, because of the steel industry. The steel industry, as you know, conducts a very high-powered lobby in Washington all the time.

No. 3. Another very good illustration is, you will recall that Commander Rosendahl, who was trained in the lighter-than-air operation and then after his tour of duty, the Navy called him off of his work and put him back on the water as a seafaring man. Therefore, all of this expensive training is for naught, and there was no one else who was capable of taking his place. I can also tell you that if they had listened to him they might not have had so many disasters in the lighter-than-air in the Navy. Since the people of aviation have brought something new to the world in the way of transportation and also in the way of domination (I think I can use this word advisably because the airplane is going to dominate the world, both from a military as well as a commercial standpoint) since we are in this position, I think that the people in aviation certainly are capable of manufacturing and ruling their own destiny a little bit better than someone on the ground who knows nothing about it. The only way that aviation can come into its own and rule itself properly is through the efforts of Congress to separate and take it out from under these people in Washington where it is more or less a political set-up. In other words, the people in aviation are certainly not going to do anything that would hamper their own progress. Whereas the people in other walks of life, give aviation second place in their thoughts.

No. 4. I might tell you something else that will bring this further to a head. An investigation committee was out checking up on accidents and while they were doing this an airplane came in for a landing and one of the men, a high Government official, said that he didn't know that airplanes had lights. It seems to me that if he doesn't know any more about aviation than that, he certainly has no place on an investigating committee trying to find out what causes accidents.

These are the most important points that I have in mind right now, and if I can be of

any further assistance in helping to get us a separate air force, do not hesitate to call on me, and I will be glad to come to Washington any time.

I am certainly very grateful to you again for writing me such a nice letter and for anything that you can do for us in aviation.

Most cordially yours,

ROSCOE TURNER.

Promotion of Reserve Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT L. VREELAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, a year ago the Reserve officers of the State of New Jersey honored me by electing me as the president of the Department of New Jersey, Reserve Officers' Association. On May 17 of this year I will retire from that position at the State convention in the Essex House, Newark.

This has been a most eventful year for our country in its international relations and, because of this factor, one of the most eventful for the Reserve officer. The National Guard and Reserve officer bill of last year authorizing the induction of the National Guard and Reserve officers into the Federal service has taken from civilian life nearly all of the officers of the rank of captain and lower, greatly deleting the available active men of the organization, making it a most difficult task to carry on. Those remaining, as good soldiers they are, have valiantly shouldered the duties of the younger officer and the organization has continued.

A situation has developed in the service, which I believe is most unfair, but which I am assured will be rectified within a reasonable time, because I know the Army has realized the value of the Organized Reserves. We, as Reserve officers, have indicated our patriotism and desire to be of service to our country by the acceptance of our commissions in peacetime. For years, it has been required that we complete correspondence courses, attend troop schools, and spend 2 weeks at camp, when the appropriation would permit it. During the time of the pacifist tendencies of the people of the United States, in spite of the fact Mr. Hitler was arming Germany, those of the Reserve were not considered too highly in the eyes of the people and in many cases referred to in rather uncomplimentary terms. In spite of the criticism, we carried on and tried under adverse circumstances to prepare ourseives for any eventuality and in most cases at our own expense. We were glad to do it as a patriotic duty to our country and because we were far-sighted enough to realize that some day there might be hostilities.

The time has now arrived when the Reserve officer is being called upon to augment the officer personnel to carry out the program of the expansion of the military. In every case he has given up his civilian life, and in many cases a good job, willingly and without complaint. He is doing his duty and making good use of the training he has obtained in his spare time, greatly filling the urgent need of the Army. As General Marshall said in substance at the midwinter meeting and dinner of the association, the Reserve officer has proven invaluable to the expanded Army and justified the efforts of creating it. The Army has welcomed the Reserve officer and values his service, and I know the Army does not wish to be unfair.

There is, however, a condition existing that is most unfair. Under peacetime regulations a Reserve officer had to wait a given period according to his rank, finish his correspondence courses, and appear before a board before promotion. We see the Regular Army now promoting men regardless of time in grade. We see the National Guard rewarding its officers by promotion without the peacetime requirements, but the Reserve still remains as before. A Reserve officer on active duty does not have time to do his correspondence work; he is learning by doing. In many instances the Reserve officer is capable of doing the work of a higher rank. Why should his ability not be taken advantage of and why should he not be rewarded for achievement?

The National-Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a word in behalf of our national-defense program.

It certainly is disturbing to me, and to my constituents, to pick up a newspaper—for instance, the Washington Evening Star—and see four items on one page such as follows:

Board Confers With Three Groups on Coal Strike.

House Bill Would Widen President's Priority Power.

Byrd Demands Ouster of Madam Perkins for "Two-Fisted" Man. Charges Secretary Is Serious Bottleneck in Defense Program.

Cantonments Pass Estimates by $338,000,000.

Then I pick up another newspaper and find where 60 out of 61 General Motors C. I. O. unions are to strike. In other papers, I see where men have been killed. I pick up other papers and find pictures of the C. I. O. racketeers with baseball bats, clubs, stones, and so forth, in their hands, ready to shed the blood of those who are willing to work for the defense program of the United States. These are the same C. I. O. leaders that scream for their individual rights under the Constitution of the United States but deny those rights to everybody else. This is only a partial list of the crimes that the leaders of this C. I. O. group have committed. They have committed practically the same crimes and use the same tactics on the rank and file of their own membership by forcing them to join their unions against their will.

I now see by this morning's paper that this same C. I. O. union outfit is going to keep unemployed some 400,000 men who want to go back to work in the coal industry and defense. Any person with a grain of sense in his head knows that this strike in the coal industry is striking directly at the heart of our defense program. How long is it going to take those in charge, or those with authority, to understand that the C. I. O. leadership is not leadership with American ideals, with American understanding, nor is it inspired with the idea to help our defense program or to help labor. Do not those in authority understand, as some of us have been telling them for the last couple of years, that most of these C. I. O. leaders are Russian agents, as the record will disclose? That they are here for the purpose of sabotaging this program and destroying this American form of government, and are operating as a "fifth column" so that they may either destroy this form of government or deliver us to their European bosses, as has been done in other countries? Do we actually have to be destroyed and delivered because certain of our officials lack the intestinal fortitude to do their American duty in the American way?

How much further does this failure, Perkins, have to go to destroy this country? How much further does the Russian revolutionist Hillman have to go to prove to this administration that he is there to sabotage the program for the C. I. O. leaders? What further proof do we have to submit than has been submitted on the Russian-educated Reuther and many others of their leaders?

These Russianized, communized officials who have been welcomed into the heart of our Government, where they can best stick their dagger into the heart of our defense program, prate and prattle of how they have settled disputes. They have settled nothing. They have just used their positions to sell out the country, to agree to every demand that the C. I. O. racketeer leaders have made, and have officially made the "pay off," if I may use the terminology of the gangsters that these C. I. O. leaders well understand, because that is what they are. In every instance where the gangsters have demanded their pound of flesh in additional costs they have received it. Every condition they have demanded has been fulfilled. Any half-witted dumbbell could get into a position where he would say nothing but "yes." Has industry or the public who pays the bill ever had one decision? It has now come to a point where American industry has been delivered into the hands of these Communists. American industry has practically no voice in the management of its own affairs or in the matter of who may be employed or not be employed, no matter how dangerous they may be, and, no matter how much sabotage they may commit, the matter of discharge no longer remains in the hands of business.

Any thinking man is bound to tell you that this is a terrible condition if the facts are really known, and that it is bound to lead to one place only, and that is to delivery of this country into the hands of the Socialists and the Communists.

Now, our administration comes before us for three and one-half billions in additional taxes. Perhaps it is far easier to ask the taxpayer for money than it is to get down to real business and put this Government on a business basis. Perhaps it is far easier to ask the taxpayer for money than it is to stand up to the socialistic, communistic, racketeering C. I. O. leader and tell him that he cannot have absolute control of everything in this country and all the money in it. That would take what might be called American courage.

My people, and I think the people as a whole, are very sick of this whole procedure, and they are very much disappointed in the continued wastefulness of this administration. Thousands of my people have asked me why this administration cannot get real Americans to fill positions in the defense program; why this administration continues to be filled with all those who actually are Communists or fellow travelers, or who have been Communists or fellow travelers. They ask again, why, out of 130,000,000 people, cannot enough real honest-to-God, tried, true Americans be put into responsible positions without resort to Russian revolutionists, Russian Communists, Russian students, and agents of these foreign governments.

I have never had one single person express any confidence in Perkins or Hillman, but, on the other hand, every single individual, both Republican and Democrat, has expressed nothing but contempt. I believe this to be true throughout the great majority of congressional districts, and I think the time is coming when we must rise up and demand the resignation of the type of person such as Hillman, Perkins, and many others in our administration, and, in addition to this, ask imprisonment either in Federal prisons, or in internment camps, of those C. I. O. un-American labor leaders such as Reuther, and many others designated by the Dies committee who are not Americans at all and who are not working for the welfare of American labor.

It certainly is a tragedy in my mind, the way national defense is being carried on, and it is my opinion that if we are ever going to need national defense, as our administration has led us to believe we will, we will find ourselves in the same position as France found itself, the Greeks have just found themselves, and all others of the European nations which actually needed defense. This all has to do with the actual production.

There is another force that is bound to make itself felt. This is the dissatisfaction of the young man of this country who has been drafted and whose every movement is directed by the Government whether they like it or not. The Government tells him when to go to bed, when to get up, when to march, when to halt, what to eat, and what to wear. He knows no N. L. R. B.; he knows no Wages and Hours, and he draws for all this $21 a month. In some instances, he may have sacrificed his business, given up a fine position which paid him more than this, but he has patriotically acquiesced out of his consideration for his country and Americanism. Now we find these jackals, personified in the leadership of the C. I. O., who demand, in many instances, more than $21 per day. These same jackals refuse to work themselves or let any one else work, and refuse to supply the defense instruments and put them in the hands of the young manhood of the country, who are willing to lay down their lives for their country. Does this administration, or anyone with a grain of common sense, think that this young manhood likes this?

My personal thought is that this Communist-dominated leadership is working from many angles. One is to physically destroy or sabotage the defense program, the other is to physically destroy or sabotage the morale of our young manhood by causing them to be dissatisfied, and, in the long run, to create a revolution.

I think the answers to some of these questions are—and they should not be any longer delayed—the jailing or imprisonment of these C. I. O. traitors and saboteurs in high position in our Government, and the discharge of such as Hillman and Perkins.

Windsor Post Office Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert my address delivered at the dedication of the Windsor Post Office in Windsor, Conn., on Saturday, April 26, 1941, as follows:

Every man likes to feel that as he goes through life that here and there he builds a sort of monument whereby in the years to come some few people may remember him. Some men give vast sums of money for a school, an art gallery, or a church. Some men construct with their hands and minds priceless works or art and literature. Some men leave their mementos through important engineering works. I have no gifts which would enable me to leave such a trace of my having lived. Yet I do like to feel that here and there during my lifetime I have been instrumental in the accomplishment of a few worth-while things.

And so I try on occasion to build through politics the sort of memorial which will give me a measure of satisfaction and satisfaction and enjoyment to others.

This structure was the last post office I recommended.

I want to add in passing my appreciation to your leaders who cooperated with me in securing this building. I will not name them all, but I must mention Charlie Mahoney, your postmaster; Albert Lennox, your very fine American citizen; Daniel Howard, Carl Goslee, and John Conklin. Their devoted interest to Windsor is an inspiration to all of us.

It probably will be the last post office to be built in Hartford County for many years to come. All money now is being devoted to projects which will strengthen our national defense. Post offices are the gift of a Government at peace to its communities at peace.

Thank God we can dedicate a post office today. The dedication of a post office is a symbol of life as it should be lived in this century of civilized progress. All of us here today are comparing this event marking the development of the first settlement in Connecticut, or anyway, one of the first two settlements in Connecticut, with the events marking destruction of towns and cities centuries older than any in America. The contrast hits us personally when we stop to realize that practically all American citizens are descended from men and women who came to these shores from those same devastated areas in Europe.

What is happening over there is the thing that we never want to have happen here.

What is happening here today is what we want to see happening the world over. There will come a time when the war to preserve our way of civilization will have been won, and then we will start the tremendous task of reconstruction, and the restoration for all people, of the way of living that we have been taught to reverence in our great democracy.

All the towns and cities and villages in America started pretty much as Windsor did. A group of pioneers and their families built a few log cabins, a church, and meeting house. For one reason or another, our cities and villages, starting from scratch in this same way, grew in different directions. From them have grown the metropolises of the country, the mill centers, the cultural centers. There are no skyscrapers in Windsor—no smoke clouds the atmosphere as it rises from chimneys of factories and mills. There are neat streets with neat homes and an abundance of God's fresh air.

There are liberty-loving people who respect each other's rights, each other's way of living, and each other's religion. They combine in a community which symbolizes the permanence of America.

A post office is more than a convenience. It is the central nerve of the town's activities and of the Nation's activities too. For the mail reaches and connects every individual, every business establishment, and every home with every other. The post office is the center of the connecting link. When a town develops from a stamp window set-up in a home to a separate building, devoted solely to the post office's activities, then that town, although it may be far from being a metropolis, takes on the status and dignity of the largest city in the country.

It is on that score that I congratulate you. It is on that score that I share the honor and the felicitations, which today are being given to you.

Last Monday the war headlines shared prominence with the baseball season, which opened in Washington. I was talking to the President that noon. Suddenly he interrupted the conversation and turned to a pile of letters on his desk and said, "I must hurry and sign these, as I am going to the baseball game." I smiled with him and I thought how good it was to be an American when the President of the United States takes time from critical international affairs to throw the ball which opened the 1941 season.

Today our Nation for the first time in its history is training its young men in military camps during peacetime. All the resources of the country are being marshaled for national defense. Cities of ancient cultural

and historical significance in other parts of the world are being leveled to the ground Intrigue and sabotage are destroying friendships between nations and are forming strange alliances between rivals who formerly despised one another. Entire peoples are struggling for their very existence against tremendous odds. The world has capsized, yet here we are gathered together, as though none of these things were happening, to declare again our allegiance to America and to democracy as we dedicate a small but tremendously important post-office building. So long as citizens whose ancestors came from all other countries of the globe can gather together and with the common bond of American citizenship dedicate an American institution, we need have no fear about the permanence and growth of our democracy.

The even tenor of our normal living has not been noticeably disturbed. I wonder if that is the reason that we on the whole, are complacent about the danger that threatens our very existence as a free people.

The great revolutions which have turned the world over in other lands have not touched us. We seem unable to comprehend either their physical wreckage or their political and economic chaos. Sometimes it seems to me that the American people are treating this war as a Roman holiday. Too many people want to know what there is in it for them. A newspaperman recently returned from Europe after many years said to me only this week: "The American people don't seem to realize that the menace to this country is almost as great as it is to Great Britain."

The day may come when we too will have to choose between freedom and enslavement. Will we be physically and morally prepared to defend our freedom? We will if each and everyone of us gives full recognition to the real nature of this struggle which is going on in the world today, and evaluate it for what it is—not a struggle to preserve an empire or to build a new one—but a struggle to preserve our way of life.

Many years ago, before our Republic was founded, a great statesman called upon the Colonies to stand together for independence, and uttered these historical words, "United we stand, divided we fall." There was a time when if the free nations of the world had banded together, aggression would have been resisted. Instead they stood on the sidelines and watched one nation after another fall to the aggressor, wishfully thinking that their turn would not come, and if it did come, they could meet separately and alone. Turkey fears that she will be the next victim. Would Turkey be afraid if she had joined forces with Yugoslavia and Greece 3 weeks ago? Would Belgium, Norway, Denmark, and Holland be occupied countries had they joined forces with England and France before they were invaded?

Four and a half years ago in Chicago, our President called for a quarantine of the aggressors. Some of us thought he was an alarmist. Some called him a warmonger.

There are some innocent people who still believe that we can make peace with the aggressors—that we can adjust our ways to theirs. This innocence is based largely on ignorance, largely on the influence of individuals who would prefer the dictator's way. Some of these individuals represent forces which, from time immemorial, have opposed progress in the way of social and economic reform; reform which would raise the living standards of American citizens; reform which would give every man and woman, no matter how low his station in life, a little of the comfort and happiness which belongs to a freeman.

To a great extent, I have seen these forces at work in the opposition to the New Deal, but long before that I saw them at work in the opposition to reform proposals which, on a smaller scale, were attempted in the State of Connecticut, and in my own city of Hartford.

For example, small, so far as the national welfare on the whole is concerned, but important insofar as it would mark progress, is the Enfield power and navigation project, which is now under consideration by a committee of the Congress. The opposition advances arguments which, on the surface, appear sound and reasonable. But experts of the Government, engineers in the Army and in the Power Commission have thoroughly studied the doubts that they have raised. The question of flood control, for instance, has been thoroughly analyzed, and the Army and Power Commission's engineers have emphatically stated time and time again that construction of this power and navigation dam will in no way increase the flood hazard. Government engineers have been discussing features of the project constantly with the railroad engineers in an effort to work out a plan which will bring about benefits for the people of this region and at the same time win the approval of the railroad.

Every engineering device and experience is being exerted to develop the benefits of this project and at the same time cause no particle of injury to anyone. After all the Government engineers are your engineers, and yet the threat of flood hazard continues to be raised as a bogey to frighten the people against this project. The real crux of the opposition is that the project will develop electric power at cheaper rates, and will bring down the cost of electricity. But the opposition is silent on this aspect. Instead they try to belittle the project by claiming that not sufficient continuous power will be generated to warrant the cost. That argument has been used ever since the first public power project was proposed in America.

We have all seen the flaming advertisements for electric equipment. These advertisements fairly glow with the advantages this equipment will bring the housewife. I want to see the advertisers sell their electrical appliances. I want to see their widespread use in our homes. But I wonder how many homes in my district can afford to avail themselves of these appliances.

I well remember my visit to Switzerland less than two years ago when I found every home—and there are few wealthy people in that small country—fully equipped with electrical utensils and appliances of every description. Over there nature's gifts to the people are developed for the benefit of the people.

But all this struggle, no matter in what direction it tends, is part of humanity's struggle. It has always been this way, and probably always will be this way. And I would prefer that these struggles be resolved in the democratic way, rather than through harsh methods of dictatorship. I prefer that all questions of the day, whether they are small questions or big questions, be thoroughly aired in the public forums, in the grocery stores, and in the post offices.

This priceless gift of discussion and criticism and decision has been taken from most of the people of the world. This priceless gift we must preserve for America.

The first group of settlers in our State spent their first night right here in Windsor. Here they remained to live as free men. The public discussions in your meeting houses, the religious freedom exemplified in your first church, the law and order set up in this community by your first elders, have extended to every corner of the State and beyond. Here you have preserved the vital democratic forces which give strength to all the communities of our Nation—big or little it does not matter. All of them are symbolized by this post office building. With the help of God may it always be this way.

The University of San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE SAN FRANCISCO NEWS

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article about the University of San Francisco which appeared in the San Francisco News as of April 26, 1941:

[From the San Francisco News of April 26, 1941]

"They built it too far from town * * *"

That's what they said the warm October day of 1854 when one Father Nobili stood in the sun-drenched adobe doorway of the College of the Mission Dolores and watched the retreating forms of his only two paying students making their way across the sand dunes back to the tiny town of San Francisco.

After a scant two years in which debt had piled on debt and creditors obstinately pressed their claims, the little two-story college, flanked by a saloon on one side, and within hailing distance of Mission Dolores on the other, was closing its doors.

Failure though it was, the little college had planted the seed of an idea for the building of a Jesuit school in San Francisco. A year later, in early summer, with the energetic Father Anthony Maraschi, S. J., at its head, a new college, St. Ignatius, came into being.

It stood in the sand dunes on Market Street, between Fourth and Fifth, where the Emporium stands now—and even at that was outside the city limits. A rambling boardwalk wound through the dunes to its doors, and the clamor of the days of the Vigilantes was faint and far away, for those were the days before the city crawled westward.

The years rolled by. Attendance doubled, redoubled, then doubled again. In 1859 the State of California issued a charter to allow St. Ignatius to confer degrees; in 1860 the entire school turned out for "a most enjoyable afternoon" at its first football game.

By 1870 the school had been rebuilt to accommodate the scores of new students. Big news of those days was the gift to the school of a ton and a half bell, ordered but not paid for by the fire department, and the astounding feat of St. Ignatius' Father Neri in illuminating four blocks of Market Street with carbon arc lamps of his own invention—first in the world.

Big news a little later—in 1878—was the moving of St. Ignatius to a new site at Van Ness, Franklin, Hayes, and Grove Streets.

Swank was the word for this latest college plant, whose library was the best west of the Mississippi, and whose gymnasium sported a swimming pool, indoor track, reading rooms, and handball courts.

Workmen put the finishing touches on this last bit of the college in 1905. A year later, on the morning of April 18, 1906, San Francisco Peninsula moved suddenly, as the outflung arm of some sleeping giant might twitch restlessly. There was a thunderous roar and clatter, and then the gigantic whisper of flames destroying half a city, and with it St. Ignatius College.

Well, they couldn't kill San Francisco, and neither could they kill St. Ignatius. A ramshackle row of buildings known as "the shacks" went up at Hayes and Shrader Streets, while the Jesuit fathers planned a new and greater church and college to be built on the windy fog-swept hills on a tract bounded by what are now Golden Gate Avenue, Masonic, Fulton, and Parker Streets.

"You're building it too far from town," the doubters told them, but they built anyway. In 1912 the cornerstone of the new church was laid. In 1926 James Rolph broke ground for the college building. In 1931 St. Ignatius College became the University of San Francisco, though the high school adjoining the college retained the old name.

Second oldest university in the State, alma mater to a host of San Francisco's best "names," University of San Francisco lists some 1,200 students today in night classes and the arts, business, and law colleges.

Head of its faculty is middle-aged, energetic Father William J. Dunne, S. J., who still pitches ball for the faculty on Homecoming Day.

It was of him, and of those other Jesuit Fathers who "built too far out," that former Archbishop Edward J. Hanna wrote:

"They have builded well, and formed generations of enlightened, noble-minded Christian men. Their success in the past is but an assurance of still greater success to come."

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

RESOLUTION OF SERVICE CLUBS OF DETROIT AND VICINITY

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a resolution adopted by eight service clubs of Detroit and metropolitan area requesting the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation enabling the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project by removing the existing barriers.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas legislation is now pending before Congress of the United States which will enable the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and

Whereas the deepening of the St. Lawrence Channel as advocated by President Roosevelt will enable us to make our full contribution to the present needs of our Nation and to participate in the postwar program of world rehabilitation and stabilization; and

Whereas all economic and engineering surveys made by our Government have conclusively proven the feasibility of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project and forecast a benefit to the entire Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the following organizations: Exchange Club of Northville, Northville, Mich., Trenton Exchange Club, Trenton, Mich., North Detroit Exchange Club, Detroit, Mich., Optimist Club of Highland Park, Highland Park, Mich., North East Exchange Club, Detroit, Mich., Soroptimist Club of Detroit, Detroit, Mich., Kiwanis Club of Allen Park, Allen Park, Mich., Exchange Club of Eastern Detroit, Detroit, Mich., that we do formally and respectfully request the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation enabling completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project by removing the existing barriers; and be it further

Resolved, That a formally attested copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States of America and to the Senators and Representatives in our National Congress.

Respectfully submitted.

EXCHANGE CLUB OF NORTHVILLE.
TRENTON EXCHANGE CLUB.
NORTH DETROIT EXCHANGE CLUB.
OPTIMIST CLUB OF HIGHLAND PARK.
NORTH EAST EXCHANGE CLUB.
SOROPTIMIST CLUB OF DETROIT.
KIWANIS CLUB OF ALLEN PARK.
EXCHANGE CLUB OF EASTERN DETROIT.

DETROIT, MICH., *April 28, 1941.*

Observations of a Realtor-Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. LELAND M. FORD, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statements made by me to the California Real Estate Association at the request of this organization:

Naturally, one of the things that impresses a new Congressman, and should impress everyone, is the tremendous volume of money that is voted in the Budget.

The next impression one receives comes somewhat as a shock when he realizes that every dollar of this money will have to be paid from the only obtainable source of all governmental money, and that is, through taxation. One wonders how long our people can stand up under such excessive taxation. Pursuant to this line of thought, one is then led into wondering how much security there is left in this country. How secure can the property owner be under a government that owes such a vast amount as $45,000,000,000? Expressed in other words, it can be called forty-five thousand million dollars. How secure can any of us be under a bankrupt government?

We may also ask ourselves the question, in connection with national defense, how good is national defense in a country that owes $45,000,000,000? These things strike us very forcefully.

The next thing that impresses one forcefully is this tremendous amount of so-called "regulation of business." I think reasonable regulation of business is all right, but when regulation reaches the point where it begins to destroy business, I think that one may look therein and consider that this regulation, together with overtaxation, is at least one of the answers and the cause of much of our unemployment. Business certainly cannot pay taxes with the same money that it would use to furnish employment to the country.

If one is inclined to think at all, I think, also, they certainly must be impressed with this constant encroachment of Government ownership and control, which amounts to socialism, upon what we have formerly known as our American form of government.

Let us see if this is just merely a statement or whether it is true, and consider and balance the facts. The Federal Government certainly is in the power business; it certainly is in the banking business; it certainly is in the building business; it certainly is in the insurance business; and, all told, there are some 89 types of business that the Federal Government is engaged in. I don't care whether you are a Democrat or a Republican or what your political affiliation may be, I say to you that you have got to consider the Government entering into business and definitely answer correctly what it is. This, then, brings us to the question, Is this, or is it not, socialism, and if it is socialism, how far are we going to let it go? This certainly is the first step toward nazi-ism, fascism, or communism. As a matter of fact, nazi-ism was formerly known as national socialism. In following this thought it might be well to consider what are the effects of these types of government, which always end up in a purely dictatorial, despotic form upon all of its people. When I say all of its people, I mean all, and list a few. Business and industry on one side, employee and labor on the other. They are both lost. The same is true of the property owner; wealth is conscripted and property is confiscated. It might be well for us to consider seriously some of these things and ask ourselves the question, Where are we going, and where do we stop? Labor and business of all types might well ask themselves what its ultimate destination would be under a changed form of government here. At least one thing that we can see would be this: What effects this type of government in Europe has had on these very things, and we might find a solution by asking ourselves a question. Are there any labor unions in Italy, Germany, or Russia? What has happened to business in these respective countries? What has happened to the individual liberty of the people in these different countries? And what has happened to religion? With reference to religion, it, along with many of these other things, has first been restricted, then partly liquidated, and then wholly liquidated. I, as a newly elected Congressman, have been seriously impressed with the encroachment of this socialism upon what we have formerly known as our American form of government, and, unless it is checked, I am wondering what is going to happen to those things which we have heretofore known as freedom and individual liberty. I do not think it is too late to check this thing and stop it and return to our American form of government, and I think the way that it can be done will be by the uniting of the real Democrats and the real Republicans to fight it. I have always stated that the Democrats and Republicans can certainly meet on the common ground of the safety and welfare of their Nation, above all else.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there is much interest being manifested

in the country over the proposal to construct the St. Lawrence waterway project. There seems to be a tremendous lot of opposition to it.

I maintain that at this time this program is not necessary for national defense, and I further maintain that it would be unwise to incur this tremendous obligation when the people are being threatened with a tremendous increase in taxes.

I hold in my hand a petition signed by several hundred workingmen in my district, all of whom are opposed to the construction of this project. Most of these are railroad men. The miners and mine operators and the rivermen and businessmen generally are opposed to this project.

In my service as a Member of Congress I have always tried to do what is for the best interest of the people of my district and what is for the best interest of the country generally. Now is the time to economize in Government expenditure so that we may be in position to provide adequate defense to protect the Nation.

I expect to oppose the St. Lawrence waterway project not because it does not have any merit but because it has not sufficient merit and is not sufficiently needed to justify our spending many millions of dollars in these times when we need this money for other purposes.

Vast Majority of College and University Students Do Not Want War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

LETTERS FROM CARL SNAVELY AND EDITORIAL FROM THE CORNELL DAILY SUN

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters from Carl Snavely, the well-known football coach at Cornell, and an editorial from the Cornell Daily Sun. I commend the reading of these letters and the editorial, not only to all college students, but to men and women of all ages in America:

CORNELL UNIVERSITY,
Ithaca, N. Y., April 29, 1941.

Hon. HAMILTON FISH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FISH: The boys of the United States do not want war and do not feel that the United States has any reason or right to become involved in the European conflict. The enclosed editorial and letter to the editor, clipped from the Cornell Daily Sun, give expression to the views of the vast majority of college and university students, regardless of the organized efforts which here and there have secured expressions of contrary emotions.

Undoubtedly, the sentiment of the young men of the United States is overwhelmingly favorable to the Allies, but the desire to sacrifice themselves and everything that Americans hold dear in an insane effort to police, reform, and finance the entire world is almost totally lacking, and I do not believe that it ever will be possible to get their united support for such a program.

In closing, I want to express my personal approval and appreciation of your own efforts to steer America straight through this perilous crisis.

Very sincerely yours,

CARL SNAVELY,
Coach of Football.

APRIL 11, 1941.

President FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: For the first time in my life I am exercising the right of a citizen of the United States to express his views to the highest authority of his country. I do so with hesitancy, realizing that my influence is of infinitesimal importance, but feeling, nevertheless, that it is a part of my duty as a citizen to do what I can in presenting to our leader the feelings of a great mass of our citizens concerning one phase of the critical and perilous situation which our Government is now facing.

The sentiments and motives underlying your foreign policy are laudable in the eyes of practically every American; but, nevertheless, the overwhelming majority of us do not want war, and we are depending upon you and your leadership to keep us out of it, according to your promise. In my contacts with a considerable number of American youth, I find it to be strikingly obvious that, despite expressions of anti-Axis emotions, the young men of America are bitterly opposed to the idea of war. As American involvement becomes more imminent, they are becoming less and less impressed by the theory that this struggle is an inescapable conflict of ideologies, and they are less and less ambitious to become martyrs in a crusade for a vague, impersonal, and visionary cause.

We realize that the present situation may warrant a threatening attitude in our dealings with foreign diplomats and we are aware of certain gratifying developments which seem to have resulted recently from such an attitude on our part in the field of international relations. But, with respectful yet sincere frankness, many of us fear that the broad objectives outlined in your recent fireside chat, commendable though they undoubtedly are, are beyond the limits of practicability and even possibility until human nature has gone through many centuries of further evolution. Regardless of America's great resources, we shall be making a terrible mistake if we assume that it is possible for the United States to police, protect, capitalize, or reform the entire world. An attempt to do so will mean perpetual war and poverty and the loss of all the superior blessings and higher standards of living which now characterize the American way of life.

It is conceivable, although by no means certain, that we might defeat the Axis Powers in battle, but neither side would win in such a struggle. In all probability, and regardless of our wishful thinking to the contrary, such a war would last for years and, at best, its cost in terms of butchery, mutilation, death, destruction, horror, and universal impoverishment would be so great that all previous catastrophes of American history combined would be insignificant in comparison. No home or individual could escape the extremities of sorrow and sacrifice, and we should consider the fact that this sacrifice would be permanent as far as most Americans who are living today are concerned.

Few citizens have paused as yet to visualize the consequences of such an ordeal simply because they do not conceive of it as an actual probability. They may never awake to the danger until it is too late, but before they actively enter the struggle, if they do, I believe that they will rise en masse in bitter and passionate protest against it. It is doubtful that they can ever be thoroughly united in such an undertaking unless America is actually attacked.

Let us arm America to the teeth and defend it to the death. Let us help Great Britain as far as we can without endangering our own existence. But instead of dissipating all our resources in a gigantic gamble abroad, let us marshal our forces for the economic struggle that is to follow this war, no matter who wins. Instead of being seduced by a few visionary and impractical advisers who are clamoring for the supreme sacrifice, mostly on the part of other individuals, let us be guided by the lessons of history concerning wars and crusades and the tragic fate of nations which have overestimated their own powers or their obligations in the control of world affairs, and let us consider the interests of the vast but inarticulate majority of our own people.

Let us not be deluded by the fallacy that we can engage in this war to a limited extent, such as, for example, the convoying of shipping. Once we are caught in this cataclysm there can be no turning back, no halfway measures. We will be committed to a war to the death—a struggle of years and of near extermination for both sides. The American people can escape it. They do not want it. They will never approve it except in the actual defense of their own country and if our leaders venture too far, they should not expect to be excused or forgiven by the survivors of the ensuing ordeal or their children or their children's children or by the historians of the future.

Yours respectfully,

CARL G. SNAVELY,
Coach of Football.

[From the Cornell Daily Sun of April 15, 1941]

STRATEGIC EVACUATION

As Axis military and diplomatic blitzkriegs continue to modify the political face of Europe, Asia, and Africa it grows increasingly important that the American people demand two things of their Nation's foreign policy: That it be judged by its effect on the security and prosperity of our Nation; that it be kept realistically abreast of a changing world and above domination by selfish interests.

Today it is important that we look at our foreign policy in this practical light. Our aims are neither the preservation of the British Empire nor the policing of the world. Our primary interest is in the security and prosperity of our Nation.

Considered from this point of view, it is vital that we withstand the efforts of vicious pressure groups which are operating within our Nation for the purpose of diverting our policy from these true American aims to a course more favorable to other interests. At this time it is obviously important to consider the British "fifth-column" machine as foremost among those in operation, for its demonstrated effectiveness make it a dangerous obstacle working to separate America's foreign policy from America's best interests.

In the past several years it has seemed wisest to give aid to anti-Axis forces in Europe as the best method of protecting the United States. This was however, merely a means to an end. Since this means was first adopted, the world situation has changed, and it becomes vital that we ask ourselves whether the original means is still the best possible for our end. This is a question of the greatest practical concern to the United States and must be decided by practical, clear-thinking men.

In meeting this challenge we must remember that we are in a nation no longer emotionally stable. Our prejudices, biases, and

emotions have been manipulated to a point making it difficult for us to clearly appraise the respective alternatives before us. Yet we must make the decision—our Nation's future rests on it. Moreover we must stand ready to make such decisions for each new development in international affairs.

It is imperative that we ask ourselves at all times not "what is the best way of preserving democracy in Europe, of defeating the Axis, of saving Europe's downtrodden nations"; but instead we must constantly make our policies measure up to the practical standard of "what is the best way of safeguarding the security and prosperity of our Nation." These other ideals may be worthy, admirable, backed up with historical and religious support, but above these stands the fact that, today, we must first secure our own future, and then concern ourselves with the future of others.

We must stand honest to the reality that the Axis victories may make it strategically wise for us to withdraw from our present interventionist course to one of consolidating and improving our position in this hemisphere. We have learned much in recent years from the British about "strategic evacuation," and as American citizens interested primarily in America's future, we must stand ready to perform such an evacuation from our present interventionist policy if Europe's events should make it necessary for our protection.

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

ARTICLE BY RAYMOND J. KELLY

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Raymond J. Kelly, past national commander of the American Legion, urging the construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway as a twofold national bargain; defense against aggression and defense of our national economy in the competitive markets of the world after the war. The article follows:

Production for the defense of America might well utilize all the machinery of America's production facilities.

Yet a high percentage of those facilities, located in the favored and sheltered and easily protected interior of America, are unused. They are unused because the products of these interior facilities can't get through to the sea.

The production facilities I refer to are in the region of the Great Lakes. The reason the defense output of this region can't get through to the sea is a 48-mile stretch of the St. Lawrence River located in the International Rapids.

This stretch, now limited to vessels with a draft not beyond 11 feet, represents less than 3 percent of the Great Lakes-to-the-sea route and makes that route resemble a sack of meal with a string tied around the middle.

Remove the string and the Great Lakes plants could now be turning out a billion dollars' worth of materials for defense. The cost of removing the string would be approximately that of two battleships.

With the string removed the St. Lawrence route could carry everything but battleships and airplane carriers. As it is the Great Lakes shipyards must be content with small orders for small boats, while most of their productive capacity goes unused. One Wisconsin firm has a contract for submarines, but these must be cut in sections and reassembled on the Atlantic coast before they can take their places as watchdogs of the Nation.

Existing shipbuilding facilities on the coasts of America are already booked solid 2 years ahead. How soon they can hope to complete the requirements of a two-ocean Navy or meet the increasing demands of the United States Maritime Commission is a moot question. Certainly, the adequate defense of America requires that we get all the ships we can as fast as we can get them. And this implies utilizing every possible production facility in America.

It was this urgency which recently led President Roosevelt to say of the seaway: "It is now a vital necessity." The President added that "The United States needs the St. Lawrence seaway for defense. The United States needs this great landlocked sea as a secure haven in which it will always be able to build ships and more ships in order to protect our trade and our shores."

In this attitude the President's judgment coincides with that of every single one of his predecessors since 1911. Every President in the past 30 years has regarded the seaway as a patriotic measure in the national interest, above political and sectional prejudices. A plank in the Republican Presidential platform of 1932 endorsed it. Republicans and Democrats alike, who were motivated by national welfare, have given it their unqualified approval.

It is a defense measure now. But it was not a defense measure when endorsed by Herbert Hoover, Calvin Coolidge, Warren Harding, Woodrow Wilson, and President Taft. It stood, then, on the sole merit of aiding our national economy. Today it has the additional merit of aiding defense. Today it offers us a twofold national bargain: Defense against aggression and defense of our national economy in the competitive markets of the world after the war.

Keep American Boys Out of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

ARTICLE FROM RIVER FORESTER, RIVER FOREST, ILL.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following reprint of an article recently appearing in the River Forester, of River Forest, Ill.:

[From the River Forester, River Forest, Ill.]

KEEP OUR BOYS OUT OF FOREIGN WARS, PLEAD MOTHERS

A group of mothers in the River Forest Methodist Church are deeply concerned with this Nation's trend toward a foreign war. They do not believe that the United States of America should seek to police the world, but believe that we should build our own defenses against the political intrigues of Europe.

In addition to writing letters to Congressmen and the President, these women have conceived of a plan of advertising their convictions. In this paper will be found an advertisement containing the pictures of their sons when they were babies. The mothers tell us that they want their sons to build happy homes, develop wholesome communities, make their contribution to our social and industrial life and to worship the Infinite God unafraid.

Very significantly they remind the President of his pledge as late as October 30, 1940, when he said: "I have said this before, and I shall say it again and again: Our boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars." The women say: "Mr. President, we count on your integrity."

This group of Methodist women are hoping that other mothers in other churches will follow their example and help build a sentiment in this country that will keep us out of foreign wars. Each woman whose son's picture appears in the advertisement, will cut the picture and article from the paper and send it to the President. The women will also send copies of this article to their friends and urge them to take similar action.

NO "FLANDERS FIELD" FOR OUR BOYS

Where "poppies grow, beneath the crosses, row on row."

We bore our sons and reared them that they might breathe the air of freemen and live to build happy homes, develop wholesome communities, help promote a high type of education for all, make their contribution to our social and industrial life, worship the Infinite God unafraid.

If they live, we shall realize this American dream.

If they die, the dream becomes but a tragic memory.

Mr. President, we appreciate your pledge of October 30, 1940: "I have said this before, and I shall say it again and again: Our boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars."

Mr. President, we count on your integrity.

Respectfully,

Mrs. Richard W. Bock, Mrs. Lotus D. Brennen, Mrs. Owen Davies, Mrs. R. R. Grant, Mrs. Albert C. Hilker, Mrs. M. Homer, Mrs. George G. Jones, Mrs. Sebastian Kmiecik, Mrs. Stanley Kiemke, Mrs. John K. Lankford, Mrs. C. W. McIntire, Mrs. George Minion, Mrs. George A. Nichols, Mrs. Edw. L. O'Brien, Mrs. T. J. Peters, Mrs. Susan Porter, Mrs. Leonard G. Schneller, Mrs. Julius F. Tascher, Mrs. Eliza Taylor, Mrs. Maude E. Waite.

Legislating by Court Assailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Law-

rence, from the Washington Evening Star of April 30, 1941:

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 30, 1941]

LEGISLATING BY COURT ASSAILED—SUPREME TRIBUNAL SAID TO HAVE PUT MISSING WORDS IN LAW

(By David Lawrence)

Five Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States—all of them appointed by President Roosevelt—have united in a decision which may well revive the Nation-wide controversy over the Court which developed in 1937.

The charge then was that the old Court "legislated" and that it was, therefore, not liberal. Today the new Court, packed by the present administration, has undertaken more boldly than the old Court or any other Court in history to supply words and text to a statute which were never approved by Congress.

The effect of the decision may be epoch-making in American history. For five Justices—a majority of the Court—say, in effect, that an employer must hire anybody who claims he was discriminated against because of union affiliation when applying for a job. If the Labor Board rules that the employer refused to hire for one reason or another, it does not matter what the evidence really shows—the Labor Board's word is final. More than this, even though the Wagner law specifies what are or are not unfair labor practices and permits the Board to issue an order to cease and desist from such practices, the statute did not give the Board power to think up any kind of punishment it cared to apply.

But the Supreme Court now says a governmental board or commission—not merely the Labor Board but any governmental agency—can apply punishments of their own, irrespective of whether such punitive action is specified by Congress.

This form of administrative absolutism caused a revolt in the House of Representatives and the Senate in the last session when the Logan-Walter bill was passed by an overwhelming vote only to be vetoed by President Roosevelt. The usurpation of the lawmaking power by the highest court in the land comes at a time when the Nation is engaged in a debate on the importance of combating the Fascist system of government-imposed law without recourse to a national legislature.

STONE PRAISED FOR DISSENT

The latest instance, known as the Phelps-Dodge case, revolved around the refusal of the company to hire two men who had been union agitators. They were not employees of the company when applying for jobs and yet the Labor Board ordered the company to hire them and ordered also that back pay be awarded to these nonemployees from the date of their application to the time the Board ordered them taken on by the company.

Nothing in the Wagner law authorizes any such order by the Labor Board. The law speaks of reinstating employees who are discharged because of union activity or connections. But this covers an employee already at work. The Chairman of the Labor Board told a committee of Congress last year that he thought the Congress intended to make the law read "instate," as well as "reinstate," but just forgot.

It now develops that the five Justices of the Supreme Court appointed by President Roosevelt decided to supply the missing word, and it is a mark of credit to that great liberal, Harlan Fiske Stone, Associate Justice, that he did not concur in what the New Deal Justices endeavored to do. This is one of the rare occasions when Justice Stone has been found disagreeing with the New Dealers. In his dissenting opinion, which is also concurred in by Chief Justice Hughes, the following declaration is made by Justice Stone:

"We agree that the petitioner's refusal to hire two applicants for jobs because of their union membership was an unfair labor practice within the meaning of the act, even though they never had been employees of the petitioner [the company], and that under section 9c the Board was authorized to order petitioner to cease and desist from the practice and to take appropriate proceedings under section 10 to enforce its order. But it is quite another matter to say that Congress has also authorized the Board to order the employer to hire applicants for work who have never been in his employ and to compel him to give them back pay."

SUPPLYING MISSING WORDS

If the Supreme Court of the United States can supply missing words in Federal statutes, not merely by contortion of existing language, but actually supplementing the text itself, then the historic form of government which America has enjoyed for 150 years will have vanished.

The extreme of administrative autocracy and absolutism, however, has been reached in another case—doubtless soon to be upheld by the New Deal's Supreme Court—wherein the Labor Board ordered an employer to hire workers who had not even applied for a job or asked to be hired. The board supported its fantastic conclusion by the theory that the workers' failure to apply for a job was caused by a belief that even if they did apply they would probably be discriminated against. This is known as the *Nevada Consolidated Copper Corporation case*, decided on August 24, 1940. Here is a decision based on a conjecture. But what the Supreme Court has just done is to uphold the absolute powers of such governmental agencies. The Court now affirms the Fascist doctrine proclaimed not so long ago by Herr Hitler, namely, that judicial decisions should not be based on written constitutions or specific statutes, but on policy and "public sentiment. It is not what Congress said when it wrote the law but what Justice Frankfurter and his colleagues say Congress should have or might have said which is now the supreme law of the land. There doubtless will be a diminishing enthusiasm in America for a war to save this kind of democracy.

Flannery Longevity-Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to incorporate in the RECORD my statement made before the members of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee on Tuesday, April 22, 1941, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as a new Member of Congress, this is my first appearance before the Post Office and Post Roads Committee, and I am happy that my initial appearance is in favor of a very worthy measure, the Flannery longevity-pay bill, H. R. 1057. I heartily endorse this bill that provides a just reward for the postal employees of the United States Government.

I have always subscribed to civil-service laws, having introduced several such bills while I was a member of the Pennsylvania Legislature, and I heartily subscribe to the principles set forth in the Flannery longevity bill; in fact, I firmly believe the increments are insufficient, and I would not hesitate to vote for a larger pay increase for each 5-year period that a postal employee remained with the United States Government after his first 10 years' service. The pay increments as stated in this bill are so just and reasonable that the committee should promptly and favorably recommend the Flannery measure to the Rules Committee so that we Members of Congress may have the opportunity to vote for same, and promptly send it to the Senate.

Similar principles as H. R. 1057 are now on our statute books affecting the men in the Army and Navy service of the United States Government. Will anyone on this committee dispute the fact that the postal employees are just as vital a part of our National Government as the men in the Army and Navy? There is not a branch of our Government in which a greater trust is imposed on anyone than the postal employees; there is not a more loyal group in our entire Government than the postal employees, and there is not a more industrious group than the postal employees. In all kinds of weather and under adverse conditions, they faithfully perform the services for our great Government.

The Flannery longevity bill will promptly reward the postal employees for faithful and loyal service. It does not help any political appointee, but only rewards employees who have shown their fitness, and who have been in the employ of the Government for a period of 10 years or more. While we are spending billions of dollars to help England and billions of dollars for our own national defense, I do not believe we would be criticized by the taxpayers of America if we appropriated $30,000,000 to reward the postal employees of our Nation by passing the Flannery longevity pay bill. Certainly the postal employees will have to meet increased cost of food, clothing, etc., just like the men in private industry who have just received pay increases, even if only in private employment one day. The Flannery longevity bill grants this little increase to the postal employee to enable him to meet increased prices. I firmly believe that we Members of Congress can perform a worth-while service if we enact this measure into law, and I therefore urge you members of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee to report this bill out favorably and as expeditiously as possible to the Rules Committee. I feel certain that there will be very few of the 435 Congressmen of the United States who will dare oppose this measure to reward the faithful, loyal, and trustworthy postal employees of the United States Government.

The United States Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. ELIOT

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. JOSEPH E. CASEY,

of Massachusetts, before the New England Council at Washington, D. C., on April 30, 1941:

A year ago when you came to Washington, Congressman J. JOSEPH SMITH, of Connecticut, addressed you upon the state of the United States Army. At that time he made a masterful statement which must have impressed you. His conclusion was, and I quote, "At the present rate of progress we are still several years away from readiness to defend ourselves." Tonight I want to talk to you about the United States Navy. I select this subject because of the fact that you heard about the Army last year and if you learn as much about the Navy tonight as you did about the Army a year ago, you will have a pretty comprehensive picture of our defenses.

Since coming to Congress, I have served on the Naval Affairs Committee, and for the past 5 years I have been a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy. The uncertainty of political life is such that during that short period of time, I have become ranking member of this Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations.

The most important individual in the Navy is the President of the United States. In times of peace, we rarely think of him as Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy. Tonight we think of him thus because our country is in deadly peril and every good American holds himself ready for any call for his services which the Commander in Chief may make. It may call for minor sacrifice of income. It may mean longer hours of labor. For some it may mean the rupture of home ties by enlistment in the armed forces. These are part of the obligations of citizens in a free country when that country is in danger. The man who can summon us to fulfill these obligations is the President—every American's Commander in Chief. What sort of man the President is becomes of vast importance when national peril impends.

President Roosevelt is a sincere, earnest, and patriotic American who understands what Americanism is and is ready to make any sacrifice to preserve it. He has completely foresworn partisanship and is animated by as fine and high a purpose to serve his country in its hour of danger as any man who has ever filled the Presidential office and discharged the arduous duties of a Commander in Chief. He is devoted to the cause of the common man and can appraise the reactions of the average citizen under conditions of stress and strain better than any man of his generation.

Prior to becoming President, he served as Assistant Secretary of the Navy. He thoroughly understands the essentials of high strategy, and in the disposition and employment of naval and military power he is probably the equal if not the superior of any naval authority now living. He has shown that, throughout this present world crisis—the gravest in the world's history—he possesses one quality above all others, and that is the quality of courage. His ability and courage give us assurance that our free way of life will be preserved. The successive measures which he has taken has provided at least a reasonable hope that the march of totalitarianism can be halted.

In 1933 when he took office, he began a naval-building program, the units of which are operating, thank God, with our fleet today. In 1934 an allotment was made to the Navy of $238,000,000 out of N. R. A. funds for the construction of 32 vessels. In 1935 an additional $25,050,333 was made available for the construction of 20 additional vessels. From that time on, the tempo of construction was stepped up, so as to reach a treaty total of underage vessels by 1945.

Congress did not authorize the replacement of battleships, despite the request of the Administration, until the Navy Department, through the passage of the Naval Appropriations Act of 1937, when two were commenced. Two more were laid down in the Naval Appropriation bill of 1939. Two were laid down in the Second Deficiency Act of 1938, two in 1940, and two in the 1940 regular act. All were replacements, designed to keep up with foreign navies.

The present accelerated emergency program began in September 1939. On September 3 of that year Great Britain declared war on Germany. In September 1939 the Navy contracted for 76 vessels; in 1940 for 23; and in 1941 for 629. In September 1939 the number of shipbuilders who had Navy contracts was 6. In the current year, this number was increased to 38. Every ship that is under construction is ahead of schedule. Those that are being delivered are several months ahead of their contract.

All Navy work is being done on a 3-shift basis at the present time. Prior to the emergency, the entire shipbuilding industry was on a 5-day, 40-hour week. In regard to future difficulties, there are a number of materials which may cause a hold-up on production. They are: (1) structural steel; (2) aluminum; (3) probably the most important of all, steel forgings; (4) armored deliveries. We have undertaken the largest naval building program in history without knowing the date of our deadline. The deadline is always tomorrow and we must therefore do as much today as is humanly possible.

From a national-defense point of view, we must consider only on the basis of the worst that can happen to us from the wars raging all around us. The worst that can happen is a combined attack on the Western Hemisphere by all powerful conquering nations from across both our shores. Unless we are prepared for the worst, we cannot hope for the best. In a world dominated by force, America must be so equipped that no combination of powers will dare attack us. The battleship is still the backbone of our Navy, despite criticism which tends to minimize its value because of the increasing strength of aviation. The battleship still rules the seas and will continue to rule the seas for a long time. The striking power of the battleship is great and accurate, and any invasion of this hemisphere would end in failure so long as our battle line remained intact and could engage enemy fleets there. We now have 15 battleships. Up until the present program was put into operation, we had not laid down a single battleship since 1919. On April 9, 1941, there was commissioned the battleship *North Carolina*, the newest and most powerful battleship afloat and the first one commissioned since 1933. This gives our Navy 16 battleships. The naval-building program calls for the completion of 16 more, which will give us a total force of 32 battleships. All of these will not be completed until 1946. Another one, the *Washington*, being built at the Philadelphia Navy Yard, will be commissioned sometime this spring. Three more—the *South Dakota*, being built at the New York Shipbuilding Corporation; the *Indiana*, being built at Newport News; and the *Massachusetts*, being built at the Fore River Shipyard—will probably be finished in 1942. That year (1942) will find us with 20 battleships. Three more—the *Alabama*, being built at the New York Navy Yard; the *Iowa*, being built at the New York Navy Yard; and the *New Jersey*, at the Philadelphia Navy Yard—should be completed in 1943, so that year will find us with 23 battleships. Two more—the *Missouri*, being built at the New York Navy Yard, and the *Wisconsin*, at the Philadelphia Navy Yard—should be finished by 1944, and that year will find us with a total battleship strength of 25. The others ought to be finished by 1946, which will give us a total battleship force of 32, the backbone of a two-ocean navy.

Then there is the aircraft carrier, which operates with the fleet and serves as a protection to our battleships because of its ability to swiftly launch planes, to engage enemy planes and ships, and to scout and bomb long distances from the fleet itself. We now have 6 aircraft carriers. Twelve are under construction. The Bethlehem Steel Co. at Quincy, Mass., is building one, the *Cabot*. Upon their completion, we will have 18 aircraft carriers.

An efficient fleet must have a great number of light and heavy cruisers. With less armor and striking power than the battleship, but with the speed and guns to ward off fast vessels of the enemy (such as attacking destroyer squadrons), the cruiser's value is inestimable. We now have 37 of them. Upon completion of the program we shall have 91 light and heavy cruisers.

The destroyer is perhaps the most useful of all our smaller vessels. Possessed of high speed, maneuverability, and gun and torpedo power, it can rush in on an opposing fleet and break up its effectiveness of fire through well-directed torpedo attack. Its great work in escorting convoys during the World War is well known to most of us, when not one man was lost in transporting over 2,000,000 of our soldiers to France. With its depth charges, the destroyer can spell death to submerged submarines. We now have 159 destroyers. Upon completion of the program we will have 364.

Submarines can be employed both with the fleet or alone to harass the enemy battle line or attack enemy convoys by sneaking into their midst and letting go their deadly charges of torpedoes. We now have 105 submarines. Upon completion of the program we will have 185. All in all, this vast armada will consist of 690 competent vessels instead of the present 322.

The fleet air arm is most important to all present and future naval activity. Upon completion of the naval expansion program we will have 15,000 planes of all types—7 times its current number.

To man this future Navy and to fly these planes, we will need afloat and ashore a total of 33,500 officers and 461,000 enlisted men.

The efficiency and power of the Navy was greatly enhanced by the acquisition of the Atlantic bases. They give us an outer line of defense from Greenland to the Caribbean. These bases prevent the element of surprise being on the side of an attacking enemy. From them our scouting planes can cover the wide Atlantic and discern an approaching foe. From them our ships can more quickly engage an attacker far from the shores of the mainland.

And so the Navy's immediate task is to maintain the outer line of defense in order that you men of industry may continue to supply the democracies resisting aggression and to supply the United States of America, as speedily as possible, with all the equipment which will make it possible to attain a victory of civilization itself.

There you have it—the American Navy. It consists of ships, planes, men, and bases. What does it accomplish in a tangible way? The most important thing it accomplishes is that it will, during our lifetime, prevent this country from becoming a theater of war. It gives to our citizens a feeling of security and peace, born of the knowledge that the awful consequences of war will not be visited upon our civilians or their homes. I think this faith is well founded, because Hitler's terribly efficient machine army has yet to show that it can cross any considerable expanse of salt water.

The maintenance of this Navy will mean greater expenditures, greater efforts, and greater taxes.

This Navy, however, cannot, in the nature of things, be accomplished until 1946. Time, therefore, is our most valuable ally. Our immediate task is to supply the democracies now resisting aggression materials of war in order that they can continue to resist. If that resistance is not successful, I can see

nothing ahead but the maintenance of huge armaments with crushing taxes and the loss of our main surplus market—Europe. If, however, as we all hope and pray, that resistance is successful, then we can look forward to a lessening of the huge cost of armaments and to reverting to the ways of peacetime pursuits.

Let us see things clearly. We are not concerned with any country attaining a national victory or to perpetuate any country's empire. If that were our aim, we would be foolish meddlers. Everyone who sees clearly, knows that this is a war in which the forces of paganism are being impressed not only upon the German Nation but also upon the conquered countries of Europe. World domination is the ultimate goal. It means the death of western civilization. It means paganism supplanting the precepts of Catholicism, Protestantism, and Judaism. It means the end of democracy as we know it. It means, from a material standpoint, economic encirclement. We cannot and must not let this happen.

Let us, therefore, all unite in order that our combined efforts may contribute effectively to the making of a better, kindlier, more tolerant, and saner world.

Flood Control at East Hartford, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

ARTICLE BY BULKLEY GRIFFIN

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Bulkley Griffin pertaining to flood control at East Hartford, Conn., which appeared in the Hartford Times on Saturday, April 19, 1941:

[From the Hartford Times of April 19, 1941]

WASHINGTON

(By Bulkley Griffin)

The pen with which President Roosevelt signed the fifth supplemental defense appropriation bill is now in the possession of Congressman HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN, Democrat, of Hartford, a gift from the Chief Executive. This was the bill which carried the $1,640,000 for completion of the East Hartford dike project.

The office of the Hartford Congressman is a proper depository for the pen. The flood-control project is in his congressional district. Furthermore, there has been no Member of Congress more outspoken not only in behalf of Hartford flood control but also in behalf of the President's whole New England flood-control program. The President could always count on the support and vote of Mr. KOPPLEMANN.

Representative KOPPLEMANN'S interest in flood control for Hartford dates way back. When he lived on Front Street he had first-hand observation of the floodwaters backing up through the sewers and flooding cellars. One day a young boy, a friend of his, was drowned in one of these flooded cellars. When Mr. KOPPLEMANN came to the Hartford city council one of his first efforts was to secure construction of an intercepting sewer for the protection of Hartford's east side. He carried his project finally to triumph over the lethargy or opposition of some of the richer city fathers, who were not so aroused over the plight of the east side.

His interest in flood protection has continued. When he came to Congress he found it easy to support the New Deal's proposals along this line for New England. He was quick to detect what the administration called the joker in the proposed interstate flood-control compact, the grant to the States of control over any power developed by the proposed flood-control reservoirs. This clause meant, in effect, said KOPPLEMANN, that the private power companies would control the power, and that the consumers would not receive the lower rates that were possible.

The story of that New England flood-control battle is now history. President Roosevelt won victories in Congress and this year in the Supreme Court. The Federal Government does have control over the power, the Court has decreed. Of interest for the moment is the fact that during this long fight, while most New England Members of Congress either supported the interstate compact or were hesitant to take sides, and while former Governors Cross, of Connecticut, and Hurley, of Massachusetts, either denounced the Roosevelt program or sat on the fence, Congressman KOPPLEMANN was one of the very few who consistently spoke and worked for the New Deal's contentions and Federal authority over flood control and power.

Meantime he did not lose sight of Hartford's flood-protection problems. These continued immediate, while the comprehensive New England flood-control plan was bound to consume several years in the attainment. It was right after one of KOPPLEMANN'S talks with President Roosevelt late in 1937 that the latter suddenly made available Federal money for start of the present Hartford dikes program. This was at a time when his political enemies were saying that KOPPLEMANN'S opposition to the proposed interstate compact was depriving Hartford of flood protection. The action of the President answered that argument rather significantly. The Congressman has the pen with which the President a little later signed legislation appropriating funds for the Hartford work which he had begun with some W. P. A. money.

Now the Hartford chapter seems about to be closed. The pen that signed the fifth supplemental defense appropriation bill bears witness that the final money for completion of the East Hartford dikes has been voted. In the pending War Department civil functions appropriation bill that has already passed the House and is now before the Senate committee, with expectation of approval, is the $964,000 required to complete the Hartford dikes—the Park River conduit is the final item—which has been a $4,614,000 project.

The Arsenal of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

ORATION BY ALLEN PFORSICH

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD the original oration prepared by Allen Pforsich, a 16-year-old senior of Glassport High School, Glassport, Pa., who has been one of its outstanding orators. He recently won second place in an oration contest conducted by the public schools of Allegheny County. Mr. Pforsich's original oration is a masterpiece, and in said oration he carries out the sound reasoning and the principles set forth by the President in the lend-lease bill—that America become "the arsenal of democracy." With such American youth as Allen Pforsich Americans need not fear the future.

The oration follows:

THE ARSENAL OF DEMOCRACY

(Original oration by Allen Pforsich, Glassport High School, Glassport, Pa.)

Surging over the radio this evening came the startling and terrifying news—England has been defeated; her allies, Greece and Turkey, have been beaten to their knees; Gibraltar, Suez, the Dardanelles—the life line of a once-mighty empire—have fallen. In the Far East, Singapore, Australia, and French Indochina have surrendered to the greedy ambition of warlike Japan. Crafty Russia, seeing the handwriting on the wall, has joined the fellow dictator states in the mad scramble for the spoils of war. Even now hysterical men and women rush into the streets shouting, "The war is over." Yes; the war is over—but in its place chaos and havoc reign.

In Europe, Asia, Africa, over half a world, the people of conquered nations are homeless, starved, diseased, dying. Across the bleak horizon ride the four horsemen of the Apocalypse—War, Famine, Pestilence, and Death—spreading fear and terror in the hearts of men. Cities, mighty cities of mighty nations that towered majestically above a happy populace, have been leveled to the ground. Towns, hamlets, peaceful farms—all stand paralyzed in terrible desolation. Beneath the salty waves lie the ruins of great fleets. A once mighty but now dying empire at long last finds the sun setting on her broad domain; her subjects, mowed down by war's fearful armada, lie prostrate, discarded on life's final ash heap.

And out of the war's debris of war has arisen a sinister, godless horde of men who live by the wild man's creed, "Kill or be killed, crush or be crushed." These were once strong men, knowing no fears, men whose standards and ideals had reached amazing heights. Now they roam abroad in murderous packs like their barbaric ancestors, plundering, pillaging, burning. For powerful men told them lies, and they believed these lies; their leaders, blinded by visions of power and glory, said, "Follow us," and thoughtless men followed them in equal blindness. Men who knew not hatred killed because a few hating men told them to kill. The crimson sword of the dictator has silenced those who dared to understand, those who dared to foresee, those who dared to stand in the way. In man's darkest hour he could see no guiding light; there seemed no help for him who too often had turned in disdain from a helping hand.

But who has won and who has lost? Who can name the victor or the vanquished in this senseless orgy of destruction? We only know that democracy, art, science, culture, civilization itself have fallen, and in their places have appeared false gods and idols, symbols of greed and jealousy—cruel and savage conquerors who rule by fire and sword. Is this the end brave men throughout the ages have fought valiantly to achieve? Has nation risen against nation, and brother killed brother with the ultimate goal in their minds to destroy humanity? Did men of courage a quarter of a century ago die in vain in a war to end all wars? Yes; they died in vain because an inspired victory was followed by

an uninspired peace; they died in vain because their leaderr planned in vain; they died in vain because men of power, like Caesar, scorned the warning of the beggar in the market place.

Many of you, no doubt, are thinking—these things will never be; these are merely the frenzied fears of those whose too active imaginations have been kindled by an all-consuming flame of hysteria. But none of you can deny that the rape of Czechoslovakia and of Poland were no figments of the imagination; that Denmark prostrated herself at the feet of the conqueror, while firing hardly a shot in self-defense; that Norway was overrun from without and betrayed from within. None of you can deny that Holland and Belgium within a few days lay broken and bleeding under the merciless heel of Hitler's mechanized legions; that gay and confident France, secure behind her great Maginot line, defended by one of the finest armies in Europe, had hoisted the white flag of surrender to avoid complete annihilation. None of you can deny that, with a path through the Balkans now opened, the fate of plucky Greece and defiant Turkey may well be sealed. Nor can you deny that gallant Britain, proudest of nations, confident in her will to throw back the invaders, has at last raised her voice in urgent pleas for immediate aid, lest she too be swept aside by a madman's dream of world empire.

And who, indeed, can longer doubt that such a dream has taken shape. We see it unfolding in green-gray waves across the continent of Europe. We see its sinister shadow moving menacingly across miles of ocean to embrace our neighbors to the south of us. We see its symbol, the crooked cross, unfurled in defiance before our very eyes in a land that we like to call our own. Realizing our tragic inability to defend ourselves, we at last are taking steps to build a strong defense. Recognizing that if Britain falls we stand alone, the last bulwark of democracy and freedom in a hostile world. Recognizing this, we have pledged all we can spare that England may not fall.

A few weeks ago our President coined a phrase which well describes the part the United States must play in world affairs: "America must become the arsenal of democracy." Our people have accepted the challenge of their leader, and already the wheels of industry are turning in answer to that challenge. How strong our arsenal will become depends not on just a few of us but on all of us. The actions of Congress must not be delayed by petty bickering or political expediency. Private enterprise, fully awake to a solemn duty, must substitute patriotism for profits. Labor, sensing a chance to gain through the urgency of the Nation's program, must, nevertheless, resolutely turn its back upon that chance. Our arsenal of democracy must become a wholly integrated mechanism, each cog efficiently and effectively performing its separate function.

Friends, I plead not for an indolent, lethargic, self-satisfied America; but rather for an inspired America. We must prepare not only against an invasion of homes by force but against an invasion of minds by propaganda. Individually we may remain the same carefree people who want to continue to enjoy peace, liberty, and the right to happiness. Politically we must cease to be individuals, but become instead implements in the service of an ideal. Mortally we must become a well-organized military unit, quick in self-defense but slow to fight another's war. Let us not for one moment forget the lesson learned a quarter of a century ago when war in all its hellish fury was deglamorized by the slaughter of thousands of unprepared American youths. But we must stand solidly for liberty; we must hold aloft the guiding light toward universal freedom; and we must point the way, finally, to a just and lasting peace.

Then will the God-given concept that right makes might be restored to the peoples of the earth; then will Mars, merciless god of war, be supplanted by the God of peace, tolerance, and brotherhood; then will America, defender of right, friend of the oppressed, become, in truth, the arsenal of democracy.

Rockland Voluntary Aid Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

BYLAWS, LIST OF MEMBERS, AND GENERAL OUTLINE OF ORGANIZATION

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bylaws, list of members, and general outline of the Rockland Voluntary Aid Society, Inc.

I am very desirous that the Members of Congress and the citizens of our country examine this plan of giving aid and trust that many communities in the United States will find it advisable to adopt this very worthy and exceptional charitable plan.

The matter referred to follows:

REPORT ON ROCKLAND VOLUNTARY AID SOCIETY, INC., SUFFERN, N. Y.

In December 1940 the Rockland Voluntary Aid Society, Inc., was formed at Suffern, N. Y., primarily to help needy persons who were not qualified for public relief. The society confined its work to those in the immediate vicinity of the town of Ramapo. Due to the publicity the movement has had, especially from the New York City newspapers and national news agencies, the founder of the movement, Anthony A. Cucolo, of Suffern, has received hundreds of requests from individuals and organizations for information as to how such a movement might be started in other places.

Mr. Nidd, local relief head, qualifies all aid given by the society and after investigation either recommends or turns down the case. This system is evident in the attached reports by Mr. Nidd.

It is a remarkable thing that Mr. Nidd, who is in the best position to know, announces there is no known case of want in the town of Ramapo and "if there is it is only because the Rockland Voluntary Aid Society has not heard of the case."

Mr. Cucolo, who came to this country as an Italian immigrant and who worked up in the contracting business to a position of influence in his county, founded the idea. Mr. Cucolo in building the Storm King bypass, created a lasting monument, an achievement which the late Col. Frederick Stuart Greene, for years New York State superintendent of public works, said was the largest project ever attempted in the Hudson Valley.

It was not in recent years that Mr. Cucolo first thought of the idea but back in 1928, before the crash. He discovered that the feeling was growing rapidly that the poor think the rich do not give enough, and the rich think that they give too much. He observed, especially through his intimate contact with labor, that a good percentage of money donated to charity did not get to the needy. He met a philanthropist of national reputation, he discussed his idea with the philanthropist, who said: "It would be a great thing if such an idea could be carried out, but I doubt very much if it can."

The crash came. The general relief plan followed. As the years rolled by Mr. Cucolo realized the sufferings and hardships imposed on those who could not qualify for relief. He knew from school authorities that when the school doctor examined the children many parents were notified of physical defects in their children. Teeth, tonsils, wax in ears, eyesight—many things needed attention. What happened? Those on relief went to the relief head and received proper attention. Those who could afford it acted as promptly. But the good old middle-class family, who refused charity and simply could not afford it, let the matter drag until nothing was done and permanent injury in the child's physical well-being resulted.

Mr. Cucolo was certain that the doctors and nurses in any community would do this work for nothing if it was proved to them it was a real charity case. As one doctor put it, "Tony, the doctors today are doing more than half their work without getting paid. If any doctor knew the case was a truly worthy one he would not hesitate to donate his services."

The barber was consulted and he agreed he would not mind cutting hair for anyone in need if it could be done when business was dull. The shoemakers also agreed to mend shoes for persons who could not pay. Merchants responded with much enthusiasm. However, many of the more important residents doubted if the idea would work.

Under Mr. Cucolo's leadership several of the leading residents in Ramapo met and it was decided to give the plan a trial. The result has been that as residents saw the plan work out in their own neighborhoods they sent in contributions unsolicited and started in working actively for the society. The society has placed dozens of men in jobs.

There is not a doubter in the town of Ramapo today. The citizens feel the relief load of the future will be lighter because persons who were on the downgrade and might become eligible for relief would, with help from the society, never have to go on relief. The old spirit of "help your neighbor" is again in the air at Suffern and the vicinity. People are cheerier and there is a different feeling generally. Fred Nidd has on his books startling cases.

No one aided will ever be asked to repay the society. If a person regains his place in the scheme of things he may repay only by making a contribution to the society so that someone else might be aided.

The method of operation is clearly described in the attached bylaws.

BYLAWS

ARTICLE 1. NAME

The name of this corporation shall be Rockland Voluntary Aid Society.

ARTICLE 2. OBJECTS

Believing that charity is best expressed in action, whether by voluntary monetary contributions or by free services to mankind, a local voluntary organization for the community of Suffern, N. Y., should be formed; this thought has been duly expressed by Mr. Anthony Cucolo of Suffern who is the originator and founder of this movement and it is through his efforts that the Rockland Voluntary Aid Society has been organized.

The sole purpose of this organization is to give support to all those found to be in need, regardless of race, color, or creed. It is to be strictly a nonprofit organization and all funds will be directly applied to charitable purposes.

ARTICLE 3. MEMBERS

The members of this organization shall be as follows:

Any corporation, firm, partnership, association, or individual from 16 years of age and

up, shall be eligible to membership by a payment of 50 cents or more to this organization which shall entitle him or her to a 1-year membership unless sooner terminated as hereinafter provided, and shall entitle him or her to vote at any corporate meeting.

ARTICLE 4. OFFICERS

SECTION 1. The officers of the corporation shall be a president, vice president, secretary and treasurer. The office of secretary and treasurer may be combined as secretary-treasurer. The office of president and vice president shall be elected from the health and welfare committees. The officers shall be elected at the annual meeting of the association in January, and shall take office immediately after their election. The board of directors shall have the right to appoint more than one vice president, who shall ex-officio be a member of the board of directors.

The duties of the president shall be to serve as presiding officer at all meetings.

The duties of the vice president shall be to act as presiding officer in the absence of the president.

The secretary shall keep all records of meetings and attend to all correspondence.

The treasurer shall be custodian of all funds and shall keep a record of all money received and spent, and submit a quarterly report.

ARTICLE 5. BOARD OF DIRECTORS

There shall be a board of directors consisting of not less than 9 nor more than 100 who shall have the right to elect a chairman of their board. Members of the health and welfare committees, and those contributing $50 or more annually shall be eligible to be elected to the board of directors. The president, vice president, secretary, and treasurer shall be ex-officio members thereof. One-third of the board of directors shall constitute a quorum unless 20 or more directors are elected, in which event 9 shall constitute a quorum.

The board of directors shall manage the affairs of the association, subject to the provisions in these bylaws, and shall hold office for 1 year, or until their successors are elected.

ARTICLE 6. MEETINGS

SECTION 1. The annual meeting of the corporation shall be held on the second Monday of January each year.

SEC. 2. A quarterly meeting shall be held on the second Monday of April, July, and October each year.

SEC. 3. Special meetings may be called at any time by the board of directors or by the president and shall be called by the secretary upon the written request of five acting members stating the purpose of the meeting.

ARTICLE 7. ELECTIONS

All elections shall be by written ballot. The officers elected shall enter upon their duties immediately upon their election and shall hold office for 1 year or until their successors are elected or appointed. In case of a vacancy in any office or committee, it shall be filled by the board of directors until the next annual election excepting in the case of a vacancy existing in the office of president when the vice president shall act as president until a president shall be elected at the next annual meeting.

ARTICLE 8. SUSPENSIONS AND EXPULSIONS

Any member of the corporation may be suspended or expelled by the board of directors if, after investigation, the board finds that any member has deliberately and willfully made a profit in any transaction with the corporation.

ARTICLE 9. COMMITTEES

The officers shall appoint the following committees or any other committees to carry out the purpose of this corporation:

A. Health committee: This committee shall consist of doctors, dentists, and nurses.

B. Welfare committee: This committee shall consist of the local welfare officer, school nurses, and a representative of the county welfare office.

C. Sponsoring committee: This committee shall consist of the following members from local businesses and professions: Grocers, restaurant owners, drug-store owners, clothing-store owners, fuel and coal dealers, barbers, cobblers, printers, public utilities, undertakers, and attorneys or any other business or professional person who can be of help in carrying out the purposes of this corporation. The duties of the members of the sponsoring committee shall be as follows: Selling of merchandise or giving professional services to the organization on a strictly nonprofit basis and only when authorized by the health and welfare committee.

The members of any of the above-mentioned committees shall have the right to vote in any annual election.

ARTICLE 10. GENERAL SUPERVISING COMMITTEE

This committee shall be comprised of the president and treasurer. Their duties are to approve and disapprove the recommendations for aid requested by the health and welfare committees. They shall authorize the purchase of commodities or services and order the treasurer to reimburse fellow members of the sponsoring committee upon execution of said orders.

ARTICLE 11. REQUESTS FOR AID

Any member of the organization can refer for investigation to the Health and Welfare Committees any person or family who may be in distress. Any person or family may also directly apply for aid to any member of the organization. These requests for aid will be referred to the Health and Welfare Committees for investigation and promptly acted upon.

ARTICLE 12. REVENUE

There has been heretofore donated the sum of $2,000 which will be duly deposited in a local bank to be designated by the Board of Directors and to be used for the purposes herein mentioned. At no time can more than one-half of the cash balance on hand be spent in any one year, the said cash balance to be determined by the actual cash on deposit after the payment of all liabilities of said corporation as of the 31st day of December in each year.

Donations, no matter how small, will be accepted from the general public, but in no time shall any form of entertainment be allowed for the purpose of raising funds. The sole policy of this organization is to receive only voluntary donations.

ARTICLE 13. ADMINISTRATION

The treasurer shall deposit all money received in the designated bank.

All checks shall be signed by the president and by the secretary or treasurer.

All bills shall be paid within 10 days of the ensuing month; the president and secretary and treasurer shall audit all bills before payment.

The sponsoring committee shall present its bills together with the authorized order to the treasurer for payment.

ARTICLE 14. OTHER CHAPTERS

This society shall have the right to establish or grant permission for the establishment of new chapters in other communities that desire to pattern their organization after this society.

ARTICLE 15. AMENDMENTS

These bylaws can be amended at any regular or special meeting, but the proposal for such amendment shall be brought up by motion for consideration at any meeting; however, the vote on such amendment shall not be taken until the subsequent meeting. For amendments to be carried, it shall be necessary to have a two-thirds vote of members present.

The following is a list of officers and committees:

E. A. Scala, M. D., president; Fred B. Nidd, first vice president; Alonzo E. Williams, second vice president; Timothy G. Mullane, secretary; Louis J. Carissimi, treasurer.

Board of directors: Anthony Cucolo, chairman; Henry von L. Meyer, Sr.; Albert E. Arnove; Julius Boeschen; Ed. Botta; James Van W. Brown; Nicholas J. Carissimi; W. Van Alan Clark; James J. Fava; Louis Goldberg; David Greenstein; Samuel Greenstein; Herman F. Imwolde; Williard A. Lynch; Frank Maloy; Pincus Margulies; Henry von L. Meyer, Jr.; William E. Miele; William Mills III; James J. Brown; Perley Morse; Walter Naumann; Thomas F. O'Brien, Sr.; James J. Fava, Jr.; Anthony Cuculo, Jr.; Congressman Matthew J. Merritt; John C. Petrone, M. D.; Reuben G. Riggs; Ralph Rogo; Joseph Rosenfeld; Anthony Scarr; August H. Temple; Wilbur W. Ward; Ralph Saldutti; Stanley Baird; LeRoy Smith.

Sponsors: Helen Wanamaker; Joseph Vilord; W. Frank Markle; Dr. Royal F. Sengstacken; Dr. C. P. Hussey; Dr. A. J. Maged; Dr. Frank J. Errico; Dr. Howard F. Maged; Dr. J. G. Veith; Dr. Robert F. James; Helen Heffner; Mary McCarten; Martha Henry; J. K. Patterson; McPhillips Bros.; Whritner Lumber Co.; August Garifalos; Fred DeLibero; John Procaccio; the Mart Shop; Joe Levine; Rogers Drug Store; Paret & Lamouree; Tribune Press; Ramapo Valley Publishing Co.; Rockland Light & Power Co.; Rockland Gas Co.; Joseph Driscoll; Wanamaker & Carlough; Patsy Marinelli; Levine's Drug Store; Washington Market; Gattuso Bros.; the Globe Store; Jimmie's Diner; Eureka House; Anthony Fiorentino.

Food for the Hungry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

RESOLUTION OF ST. JOSEPH COUNCIL, NO. 2272, KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS, WEST POINT, NEBR.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, today I received from the officers and members of St. Joseph Council, No. 2272, Knights of Columbus, West Point, Nebr., resolutions indicating their hopes that some of our surplus food be distributed to the hungry and needy people in Europe. In order that all Members of Congress may have an opportunity to read these resolutions I include them herewith:

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS,
ST. JOSEPH COUNCIL, NO. 2272,
West Point, Nebr., April 25, 1941.

Hon. KARL STEFAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STEFAN: St. Joseph's Council, No. 2272, Knights of Columbus, at its last regular meeting, unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the European war has brought and will continue to bring increasingly great distress and suffering to the innocent peoples of Finland, Norway, Holland, Belgium, Poland, and other small nations of Europe and

normal food supplies have been curtailed, destroyed, or commandeered, and it is inevitable that unless additional food supplies are soon made available, millions of people in these countries will be brought face to face with famine and pestilence; and

"Whereas the members of this organization have thoroughly examined the proposals of the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies, under the direction of Herbert Hoover, and believe that they present a logical and safe plan to alleviate unparalleled distress, and believe further that it embodies the highest principles of Christianity and is most worthy of the support of the American people: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That this organization heartily endorses the plan; and

"Whereas the experience of the last war demonstrates that this plan can be put into effect without any military advantage to either side, and whereas, before further plans can be laid, the cooperation of the Government of Great Britain in permitting the vital food supplies for the stricken nations, to pass through its blockade must be secured: Therefore be it further

"Resolved, That we urge our Representatives in the Congress of the United States to use their utmost influence, both with the Congress, and with the President of the United States, toward securing the cooperation of the government of Great Britain, in furthering the proposals of the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies."

Sincerely yours,

ST. JOSEPH'S COUNCIL, No. 2272,
KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS,
JOSEPH BOSHECK,
Grand Knight.
LEO J. SCHMITT,
Recording Secretary.

Rockefeller's Anguish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, after great travail John D. Rockefeller has decided that we shall enter the war "to the limit and at any cost."

In his recent letter to Mr. Arthur Hays Schulzberger, publisher of the New York Times, Mr. Rockefeller says:

> It is my firm conviction, arrived at in anguish of spirit, that the people of the United States should see this conflict through; that we should stand behind the British Empire to the limit and at any cost.

I, too, want to aid the British Empire to the limit. That limit short of war, short of financial prostration, short of criminally depleting our own defenses to the extent that we cannot protect ourselves.

I want to aid Britain and the embattled democracies, but not at all costs to the Nation. I refuse to sacrifice 5,000,000 young Americans, to ruin our economy, to saddle generations of our offspring to oppressive debts. And to finally sacrifice the great system of government for what purpose? To back up Mr. Rockefeller's oil diplomacy? To leave the Nation in shambles in order that his oil empire may be preserved intact?

Fellow Americans, there are some burning questions to be answered in connection with Mr. Rockefeller's great anguish of spirit.

When has his corporation and their subsidiaries ceased supplying gasoline and crude oil to the Axis partners?

At any cost, Mr. Rockefeller? That implies a sacrifice of wordly goods in addition to our manhood. I suggest you take the initiative.

How about the sales of Standard Oil and Humble? How about the shipments to the Axis from Humble's Aruba? What has been the activities of Standard-Vacuum in the Orient in fueling the bombers of the Japanese aggressors so that they can murder thousands upon thousands of Chinese civilians in open cities?

Does Mr. Rockefeller disclaim all liability in connection with the operation of Standard Societa Italo-Americana Pel Petrolio?

We must concede that no profit is now being made by Mr. Rockefeller from Deutsch-Amerikanische Petroleum-Gesellschaft. But why? Because of unfavorable exchange rate and difficulty of communication. Has this corporation been written off Standard's books? No.

If we are to effectually help Britain and China and other countries—and God knows we all hate Hitler and want to stop him—then we must cease furnishing war supplies to the Axis—not only as a government but as businessmen—and this includes Standard Oil and subsidiaries. I suggest Mr. Rockefeller's anguish, which is now mental by his own admission, take more material form and that he and his organization cease helping the ruthless partners of the Axis.

In looking over the map of the empire of the Rockefeller clan, it is easy to see why he is ready to get in this war at all costs. Making allowances for his fine philanthropies, he must still bear the terrible indictment of the American people for urging us into a war for which we are unprepared and which we do not want.

It is propaganda such as this, which is given full throat by big business and designed by such men as Winthrop Aldrich, of the Chase National Bank, and brother-in-law of Rockefeller, that is attempting to lead us into chaos and dreadful disaster.

The last war made 16,000 millionaires. This coming war bids fair to do the same. What is going to be the reaction of the debt-ridden, dispossessed farmer, the tax-burdened worker, who has had to sacrifice every gain made after years of struggle, the ordinary citizen, who have given up their sons, sacrificed their American standard of living, and for what? So that big business and the huge cartels they operate can grow fabulously rich.

What about the millions of young men who will die on the coast of Portugal or at Dakar if we declare war?

When this reaction takes place in an awakened America I am eternally grateful that I shall not have to answer their grim charges.

Must They Starve?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

ADDRESS OF MSGR. ROBERT P. BARRY

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Msgr. Robert P. Barry, personal representative of his eminence, Cardinal O'Connell, over radio station WMEX, Boston, Mass., April 25:

On the occasion of his eighty-first birthday, his eminence, Cardinal O'Connell, voiced the sentiment of thousands of Americans when he said, "I cannot help feeling tremendous pity for the poor suffering people of Europe. It is heartbreaking to think of the millions who are now facing starvation. As a humble priest of God, a lover of the blessed charity of our Saviour, Jesus Christ, I cannot understand why the experiment may not at least be allowed to be made to help Mr. Hoover in his wonderful Christian noble plan of feeding the starving populations, to save the people of Europe."

Many of us, like Cardinal O'Connell, cannot understand why the experiment Mr. Hoover proposes should not at least be tried. For the stark fact is that 37,000,000 people—half of whom are children—in the small invaded democracies of Europe, face famine and pestilence and living death. These people are not enemies, but our friends, and Britain's friends. As Britain's allies, they have already experienced all the horror of modern warfare; they have been bombed from the sky, their homes have been destroyed, their cities and towns and villages wrecked and pillaged; and now they know the ignominy of subjection to armies of occupation; now they know war's most dreadful aftermath—hunger. Many of us, who are Britain's truest friends, are profoundly disturbed by the present policy she is pursuing with regard to these helpless people. We would be disloyal to her best interests and the realities of this crisis, if we did not utter solemn warning now.

America is Britain's partner in the present war. Our sympathy for Britain and our "all out" aid to Britain are based on the premise that Britain is the champion of Christian civilization, out to defeat the brute force of paganism, of which Hitler is the symbol. But Christianity cannot be championed by those who harden their hearts and steel themselves against the appeal of starving innocents. Such an attitude is contrary to our Master's will. It denies the basic principle of His teaching, which is compassion. It also challenges the idealism of the British cause.

Already it is being said here in America that to speak of saving Christian civilization, at the same time condemning the small democratic nations of Europe, who also have fought the brute force of paganism, to famine and decay and pestilence, is mockery. Already the great moral issue has been raised, and America, the great humanitarian nation of the world, and the only nation in the world that undertakes great humanitarian works, is loathe, indeed, to accept the principle that the starvation of her lifelong national friends—starvation of the blood kin of 15,000,000 American citizens—constitutes a le-

gitimate weapon of war. These things are being said by those of us who love Britain and believe in Britain. We see her producing a condition from which she and the cause of democracy will suffer for years to come.

Why is this so?

First, with food enough to sustain life, the small democracies of Europe will keep their faith; they will have the will to continue passive resistance so far as they can while in subjection, and to rise in revolt when the opportunity comes.

Starved, they cannot do so. Nowhere in the entire history of famine has revolt due to famine ever been recorded. Strength is needed for that. Where there is the horror of slow hunger it is only disease that runs riot. Disease and hate. Hunger breeds terrible hates.

With Germany continually dinning into their ears that their condition of starvation and disease is due to the British blockade, that such food as they obtain is given to them by Germany, the time will come when, instead of regard for Britain and America, there will be fierce hatred of Britain and America—the two great democratic nations—because not even an attempt was made to save them. We will be held everlastingly responsible for being indifferent to their pleas for life now. And Britain will be remembered as the nation determined to let her friendly neighbors starve on the mere suspicion that food might reach Germany.

The feeding experiment that Mr. Hoover proposes for Belgium is amply safeguarded against German benefit in any way whatsoever. It stipulates that the Germans must not only cease requisitioning native food but must give food to Belgium. Germany is required to agree that the neutral commission in charge of the feeding program has absolute control and direction of all Belgian food supplies, native as well as imported. Germany has agreed to these stipulations and has made her first contribution of 20,000 tons of grain and 20,000 tons of potatoes. If Britain agrees as well, the hungry children of Belgium can be fed. And if the experiment works in Belgium, then a similar food relief program will be launched in the other democracies—and 37,000,000 will be fed. If Britain were to allow the test to be made in Belgium, and Germany were to break her pledged word, the program would cease instantly. Then the world would know that full responsibility for the starvation of these people was Germany's alone. Britain would not be blamed, because she could not be blamed. Her sincerity could not be questioned, or shortsightedness of policy on another count.

Which brings me to the discussion of another reason for questioning the wisdom of this policy of Great Britain. It relates to the fact that by blockading food from her Allies, Britain is unwittingly forcing manpower into the service of Germany. This is especially true of Belgium.

During the last World War, when the Hoover commission was permitted to feed the Belgians, it is a matter of record that the Belgian men, set to forced labor in Germany, refused to perform their tasks because they knew their women and children and their aged dependents were being cared for at home. Brand Whitlock has recorded the story of their martyrdoms; of how thousands of them died rather than obey German orders; they could refuse to obey them then because no harm would come to their families; and they did refuse, as free men.

Not so today. If a Belgian laborer in Belgium or Germany performs the task set for him by the Germans, his family gets food. If he refuses, his refusal causes his family to starve. I wonder how many men—however brave and patriotic—could be brave and patriotic at the price of torture to their helpless and innocent loved ones? I thank God that I am not put to the test. And I cannot find it in my heart to condemn the Belgian father who works for Germany today in order that his wife and children may have bread.

Some will say that Germany is responsible for their plight and is therefore responsible for feeding them. This Germany has begun to do. She is already sending bread grains to Belgium, but there are other foods that Germany cannot provide because her own supply is insufficient—i. e., the so-called fats.

Others will say that Germany cannot be relied upon to keep any agreement. It is true that no regard for her word and no feeling of compassion can be expected to influence Germany to keep any agreement she may make. But there is evidence that Germany fears one thing—pestilence. She knows that typhus, virulent influenza, and other epidemics stem from areas of starvation and that they have no respect for nationalities or national boundaries. In the first World War Germany kept similar engagements. She is doing so now in respect to Poland. We believe that she will do so with respect to Belgium and the other occupied countries, if only because of her fear of the spread of disease.

A great body of opinion throughout the country believes that something should be done to enable the people in the occupied countries to obtain food in a way that will not be of military advantage to Germany.

Over 800 of the Nation's leading men and women have expressed approval of the program by becoming members of the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies; many of them are from Massachusetts. In more than 2,000 communities over the country, local committees are seeking to spread information regarding the situation in those countries and the program in their behalf. Over 3,000 public bodies by formal resolution, and hundreds of thousands of individuals by their signatures, have given their approval to this program.

I feel sure that many of you are wondering how you can aid in bringing it about so that the people in the small democracies of Europe can receive enough food to sustain life without contributing to the military advantage of Germany. There is a way in which you can help very materially. If you belong to an organizttion that has not yet formally approved the program in behalf of these people, you can aid by bringing it about so that it passes such a resolution, a copy of which should be sent to the Boston office of the Committee on Food for the Small Democracies, in room 549, Little Building, or to the national office at 420 Lexington Avenue, New York City.

Strikes in Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JARED Y. SANDERS, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

RESOLUTIONS BY LOUISIANA ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two resolutions, one adopted by the Baton Rouge Lodge, No. 490, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, and the other by the One hundred and thirty-ninth District Conference of Rotary International, relative to strikes in defense industries.

The resolutions in question are as follows:

Whereas it is apparent that a national emergency exists due to strikes in industrial plants vital to the national defense; and

Whereas President Roosevelt has proclaimed that this country has become the arsenal for all the democracies; and

Whereas contracts for national defense aggregate billions of dollars, and work thereon is being delayed because of strikes in industrial plants, causing a serious menace to our safety: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Baton Rouge, La., Lodge, No. 490 of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, That we condemn the delay in national defense caused by these shut-downs of industrial plants, with contracts for the Army, Navy, and Air, that we deplore the delay in carrying out these contracts, and demand that our National Government order these industrial plants to start work at once, and that it fix the responsibility for these strikes and shut-downs and deal severely with those responsible therefor; be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to President Roosevelt, our Senators and Congressmen, and the press.

I certify that the above resolution was adopted unanimously by Baton Rouge Lodge No. 490, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, at a regular session held April 16, 1941.

[SEAL] L. F. RUAUD, *Secretary.*

Whereas President Roosevelt has proclaimed that our country has become the arsenal for the democracies; and

Whereas contracts for national defense aggregate billions of dollars, and work thereon cannot be begun or speeded up because of strikes and the shutting down of plants, causing a serious menace to the safety of the democracies; and

Whereas, irrespective of the merits of the strikes, we declare that national safety demands that drastic steps be taken immediately by the Government to put an end to this dangerous and destructive condition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 45 Rotary Clubs of the One Hundred and Thirty-ninth District in conference assembled, That we condemn the delay in national defense caused by these strikes and shut-downs of plants with contracts for the air, Army, and Navy; that we deplore the delay in carrying out these contracts; and that we urge our National Government order these plants to start work at once upon these contracts; and that it fix the responsibility for these strikes and shut-downs and deal most severely with those responsible therefor; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President, Vice President, Speaker of the House, Senators and Congressmen from Louisiana, and the press.

CERTIFICATE

I, the duly elected and qualified secretary for the One Hundred and Thirty-ninth District Conference of Rotary International, said conference composed of delegates from 45 respective Rotary clubs situated in the communities located within said one hundred and thirty-ninth district, do certify that the above and foregoing resolution was unanimously adopted by said conference in convention assembled at Baton Rouge, La., on the 22d day of April 1941.

M. D. HENDERSON,
Secretary, One Hundred and Thirty-ninth District Conference, Rotary International.

Approved:

J. A. WELCH,
Chairman, One Hundred and Thirty-ninth District Conference, Rotary International.

The South's Challenge and the Nation's Challenge to You and Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS, OF ARKANSAS

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to consent granted, I include the following able address made by my colleague, Hon. CLYDE T. ELLIS, Representative from the State of Arkansas, at the State convention of the Young Democratic Clubs of Florida at St. Petersburg, Fla., in my district on March 28, 1941:

I am honored on this occasion and I am happy to be in your beautiful State—the State of HARDIN PETERSON, LEX GREEN, PAT CANNON, JOE HENDRICKS, and BOB SIKES, and of Senators ANDREWS and PEPPER, your able and effective delegation, your friends and mine, in Congress.

You and I are southerners—and we are also Americans. We are met here as the true sons and daughters of the new South.

Fourscore years ago we were involved in a great conflict testing whether this Nation should continue as one or two democracies. Today we are involved in an even greater, though less tangible, conflict testing whether democracy itself shall live.

The challenge of the Colonies in '76 and '89 was met—principally by the youth of those days—and conquered. Thirty-three of the 55 signers of the Constitution were under 45 years of age, 22 were under 40, and 4 were under 30. That challenge—whether the people are capable of governing—has recurred to us in all its fury. Youth is daring, and we, as the young men and women of this day, must dare to meet it. The people of Yugoslavia, led by its youth, have within the last few hours given to the world a dramatic and noble example.

We as Democrats, you and I, are heirs to the oldest and most illustrious political party in power in any nation; heirs to a sacred philosophy of government that will stand with Christianity, for its ideals are Christianity. As such beneficiaries we assume the responsibility of preserving, for the world if necessary, government founded on the brotherhood of man.

If we were Republicans our responsibilities would be none the lighter, except that they are not the party in power.

While it is true that the economy of Florida, like that of my district in the Arkansas Ozarks, is partially dependent upon northern tourist dollars, and while it is true that Florida has escaped many headaches common to the South, yet we are inextricably bound together in a mesh of southern traditions and economies and discriminations that make us one. Between the South and its proper development lie certain barriers common to all Southern States.

Our safest course is to acknowledge the truth—face the fact that the South is "the Nation's economic problem No. 1"—and as young, progressive Democrats dedicate our lives to the task of doing something about it. To do less is to be unworthy of our priceless liberties, wrought from tyranny in the blood of our forebears.

In our 13 Southern States live 37,013,087 people (1940); 97 percent native-born.

Our birth rate exceeds that of any other section, and we are the only States producing for the Nation substantially more than our death toll. We are the only bright spot in the picture of a nation growing old because of the rapid decrease of its birth rate and the constant increase in its life span. And yet we are not outgrowing the other sections. Too many of our young men and women, finding no room in our economy for themselves, migrate North and East and West. Thus one-fourth of our natural increase in sons and daughters—our most precious resource—is exported annually.

EDUCATION

There are 6 children to every 10 adults in the South, as compared with 4 children to every 10 adults outside the South. The South must educate one-third of the Nation's children with one-sixth of the Nation's school revenue. As evidence that we aren't able to do a creditable job of it, the latest figures show that only 16 percent of our school children are in high school, as compared to 24 percent in States outside the South.

THE SOUTHERN ECONOMY

Every section is primarily agricultural, industrial, or commercial. Neither alone, but a combination, provides the safest and most wholesome all-round economy.

Herein the South is deficient, for ours is an agricultural and raw-materials economy, exposed to the ravishings of exploitation.

In 1939 the Nation's per capita income was—and these are the latest figures—$536. The South's per capita income was $314. Florida's was $457. Yours was the highest of the Southern States, but deduct your $250,000,000 tourist income and yours would have been only $322, or barely above the average. The figure in my State of Arkansas was only $244. In the Nation only 20 percent of our people depend directly upon the soil for a living. In the South 42 percent depend directly upon the soil. In Florida the figure is 20 percent, the same as the Nation.

Commerce, capital, and industry have long been highly organized for their own welfare. They fix their own prices and control their own markets. You and I pay them annually unseen billions in the form of such intangible subsidies as the high protective tariffs and because of such barriers as those existing in the freight-rate structure. Even labor is so highly organized that it now sells its product, and rightly so, into a protected market. Agriculture alone of the "big five" still lies barren and unprotected.

AGRICULTURE

Agriculture in Florida and the South, like everywhere else in the world, is more than just an occupation. It is a way of life. Just now the picture confronting us has both a dark and a bright side The dark side is that agricultural commodity prices are still only 87 percent of parity. When a farmer sells a dollar's worth of his product—as compared with the prices of 1909 to 1914—he receives for it not a dollar but 87 cents. Not only in those five so-called basic commodities covered by the parity payments—cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, and rice—but in practically every other crop grown on American soil, we have a surplus. Furthermore, our farm exports, which had already dwindled down to below 10 percent of the total production, have been virtually destroyed by the war.

But the bright side is that we are standing at the dawn of a new day in agriculture, a day in which the lands of Florida and the South will play a new role. Two factors have made this possible.

First, we have passed from an age of scarcity to an age of plenty. For the first time in the history of the world man is able to produce—thanks to science—enough that everybody could enjoy a comfortable living. In ancient times those with plenty acquired it by, in some manner, taking away from those at the bottom.

Plans are under way to spread throughout the earth a new slogan something like this, "In the democracies no one shall go hungry." It will be a double-edged sword. It will contrast the conditions of democratic with totalitarian peoples, strengthen our morale, and inspire us to a new yearning for the better things of life. To the subjected peoples menaced by the pangs of hunger and want it will emphasize their inferior status and inspire them to a yearning for the same unfettered freedom. It is that yearning which constitutes the most effective weapon for the Serbs and Greeks and the lack of it which contributed most to the fall of France.

Secondly, we are in the process of bringing about a revolution in diet. Scientific studies in food reactions on even our mental aptitudes, our outlook upon life, and the mass psychology have been under way for years. We have now learned, as you know, that we have been destroying by the milling process the most valuable content of the natural grain of wheat. Within a few days new flours will appear on the market with the thiamin not only restored but with other vitamins added. Late discoveries in mental attitudes intensify our concern over our failure to consume sufficient fruits and green substances. British stores of fruits and fruit juices are very low. Eggs, dairy products, and meats are also vital and are likewise scarce in England. An effort will be made within the next few months to export to the Isles, and to some extent to the conquered countries, vast quantities of these essentials.

But no less interesting to us is the fact that there exists in our own diet, yes, yours and mine, a grave deficiency in these same foods, due not alone to low incomes but also to lack of education.

It is estimated that 50 percent of the American boys now being rejected in the draft have nothing wrong with them but the effects of poor diet. Great Britain has just completed a most interesting experiment. She took at random 1,000 rejected boys, placed them under proper diet for 60 days and sent them back for reexamination. Eighty-five percent passed.

In the United States today an Army meal costs 21 cents. The average American meal costs 10 cents. To bring the average American meal up to a minimum of the Army standard in fruits, eggs, dairy products, and meats would add a net $2,000,000,000 annually to our farm income. Add two billion to the farmers' total cash sales income of $8,354,000 for last year, for these particular commodities, and the South will show new life.

Herein lies hope if you and I are equal to the occasion.

Already cotton is no longer king. Last year income from livestock alone in the 10 Cotton States exceeded that from cotton. Our cotton exports will fall this year from 6,000,000 bales annually to approximately 1. Even though our own consumption is rapidly increasing and will likely reach a record in 1941 of 9,000,000 bales, the Surplus Commodities Corporation will have to purchase another half-million bales, and the A. A. A. program will have to pull the yield down to 11,500,000 bales—and still we will have left on our hands 1,000,000 bales to add to the present surplus.

Great Britain won't need any of our surplus wheat, except what Canada can supply, and will be able to take very little of our tobacco—unless, of course, we force some of these commodities upon her. We are confronted squarely with the problems, first of improving our diet by education and equalization of opportunity, and, secondly, of shifting our quantities of production from those crops which in the past have depended upon foreign trade to commodities essential to our menu.

Can we, you and I, meet this challenge?

INDUSTRY—BARRIERS

The greatest gap in the South's economy is the lack of its proper industrial development. It is evident from your Brookings Institution survey report of the Florida fiscal situation, released this month, that one of your greatest difficulties is the lack of proper industrialization—that is, the industrialization locally of at least those natural resources found within your borders as contrasted with their removal from the State at raw-material prices.

The per capita income of any State in this Union is almost the exact inverse ratio of the percentage of its population depending upon agriculture. No section exceeds the South in those minerals, fuels, and raw materials normally required for industrial development. In addition to practically every mineral, we have two-thirds of the Nation's oil and gas deposits and one-fifth of its soft coal.

There are two monstrous barriers to the South's normal industrialization, and even to her proper commercial and agricultural development: (1) high power rates, and (2) high, discriminatory freight rates.

HIGH POWER RATES

North of us and east of my State, the Tennessee Valley Authority seems to have provided the answer to the high power barrier. Using only the natural resource, the falling waters of the Tennessee that had been wasting themselves to the sea down through the ages, the Authority today is delivering to the people electricity at a rate they can afford. Their rates average barely half as high as mine in Arkansas and far less than half as high as yours in Florida. The private companies operating there are making more money than ever before. Industries, including defense industries, are moving into the T. V. A. faster than the T. V. A. can supply the power, and so there has come to that area a prosperity heretofore unknown.

It is estimated by the Federal Power Commission that in the South there are today over 3,000,000,000 kilowatts of undeveloped hydroelectric power.

Our rivers should be harnessed now. Thus would come cheap electricity to every community of the South.

The Federal Power Commission, as you know, is now publishing annually the typical electric bills of all cities in all States. I hold in my hand here the Commission's report on typical T. V. A. bills. If we turn to Tupelo, Miss., for instance, we will find that there 25 kilowatt-hours of residential service cost 75 cents, 100 hours cost $2.25, and 250 hours cost $4.25. By way of comparison, I quote you here the rates of one of your larger cities—and I have selected one from among those with the lowest rates in Florida. In that city 25 kilowatt-hours cost you $1.91, as compared with the 75 cents of Tupelo; 100 kilowatt-hours cost you $6.08, as compared with the $2.25 of Tupelo, and 250 kilowatt-hours costs you $10.08, as compared with the $4.25 of Tupelo. Your commercial and industrial rates are proportionately high by comparison. Although your rates are a little higher in Florida than elsewhere in the South, nevertheless, high rates prevail throughout the South, except in T. V. A. They prevail because of this process of exploitation by the absentee-owned, Wall-Street-controlled Power Trust monopoly. Last year the people of Florida used 1,017,436,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which you paid $31,344,182. Now, under the Tupelo, Miss., rates—the T. V. A. rates—you would have paid for that same current $13,597,189, and you would have saved $17,746,993. And, for the benefit of those who would charge that T. V. A. rates are unfair, may I point out that if you had paid the prices prevailing in Ontario, Canada, where they have an old, old hydro system, this same current would have cost you $11,932,640, and your savings would have been $19,411,542. Furthermore, the figures actually show that over in Tupelo and throughout the T. V. A. area, where the per capita income is much lower than yours, the people are using more than twice as much current as you are using—because the rates are low.

In the 13 Southern States last year as compared with T. V. A. rates we were exploited in overcharges a total of $156,465,243. This is our tribute to the power lords as their "indentured servants" down here in this economic dominion of the Northeast.

I say these things to you because we have got to do something about it, and because we will do something about it.

It is unfortunate that you of Florida have but very little potential hydro power, and that you have no deposits of coal, gas, or oil for power production, but it is fortunate that to the north of you, and within easy power range are billions of kilowatt-hours of potential hydro production and vast deposits of coal to supplement that in any amount.

Plans are now under way in the Congress to start some of these developments and to have others ready to go when the war is over; but there is tremendous opposition, and many of the companies that are bleeding the South by this process are using the very funds that they extract from us to fight the South in its effort to achieve this development.

The power situation in Florida affects that in my own State of Arkansas at this minute, in this way: When the Aluminum Co. of America stepped up its operation a few days ago at Alcoa to 24-hour production it required 150,000 additional kilowatts. T. V. A. could supply only 80,000. Seventy thousand had to be found somewhere else. T. V. A. turned to the companies operating in North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida. They could supply only 35,000 kilowatts. T. V. A. was under contract to supply the Arkansas Power & Light Co. 35,000 kilowatts on an exchange agreement, so in order to furnish the other 35,000, T. V. A. virtually cut Arkansas off.

It has been my honor to introduce in the Congress at this session an administration-sponsored measure known as the Arkansas Valley Authority bill to develop the Arkansas, the Red, the White, and the St. Francis River basins, covering approximately one-tenth of the United States, along the line of the T. V. A. It would cover part or all of every Southern State west of the Mississippi and would vitally improve conditions throughout the South.

You have here in Florida one of the world's richest phosphate deposits. Nothing is more essential to life nor to a prosperous agriculture than phosphate in the soil. The deposits are scarce in the world and our soils are rapidly becoming depleted. You have many phosphate companies operating here now but if you had the cheap electric power to break those phosphates down into the highly concentrated superphosphates lately developed in T. V. A., there would be huge additional profits for your State.

As we go along it well to remember two things that we are prone to forget: One, that a power system is essentially a monopoly granted and tolerated by the people in return for reasonable service—which in the future their failure to render shall be implied as a request for their passports—and two, that developments such as T. V. A. will in the end cost the Nation nothing.

DISCRIMINATORY FREIGHT RATES

The second of these barriers is high freight rates. The freight-rate structure built up by the railroads over the decades past to favor the industries of the North and East is an unscientific conglomeration of figures apparently made purposely unintelligent for public consumption. They have, for instance, different and dissimilar rates between each two points in the United States.

Your rates on industrial shipments originating in Florida are 40 percent higher than those on commodities originating north of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi. The rates on those originating in my State average 75 percent higher.

With apologies for so many figures, I give here a specific example. Suppose you ship from Atlanta to Chicago, a distance of 731 miles, 100 pounds of typical first-class freight. Your rate is $2.10. But suppose your competitor in New York City ships the 100 pounds to Chicago, 890 miles or 159 miles farther, his rate is $1.67 or $0.43 per hundred cheaper than yours.

Or suppose you ship the 100 pounds from Atlanta to Louisville, 449 miles. Your rate is $1.66. Suppose your competitor in New York City ships it. This distance is 852 miles—nearly twice as far—and his rate is $1.64, or 2 cents less than yours.

We have recently obtained slight reductions on some commodities, but we haven't scratched the surface yet. The Interstate Commerce Commission has the power through a crude process of law to order rate reductions, but those orders are few and far between.

These barriers—high power rates, high discriminatory freight rates, and others—are walls of servitude which cannot endure. If they persist, some young generation of intelligent and daring southerners will rise up and destroy them.

WE OPERATE BY POLITICAL PARTIES

We, of course, must operate through political parties. Thus are we most effective. Let us turn the spotlight of our two great parties on these problems, not historically but objectively. I give you, first, a picture as suggested by the columnist Jay Franklin:

Once there were two hairy mammoths, with long, curved tusks, inquisitive noses, and gluttonous appetites.

One was cavorting around the Siberian tundras in the Pleistocene era, stuffing his tummy with Alpine poppies and similar delicacies left by the retreating glaciers. Lord of all he surveyed and concerned only with his own immediate contentment, he defied all danger signals. The glaciers had been retreating steadily for thousands of years, hadn't they? What cared he if the birds were flying south? Snug in his warm woolen coat, he refused to believe the glaciers were on the move again.

Just the other day they dug him out of an iceberg, hair and all, frozen solid, taken by surprise in an unfair caprice of nature, which apparently had no further use for giant mammoths and had decided that the Pleistocene age was over.

Then there was the other creature, the American Tycoon (genus G. O. P.) who cavorted among the lush savannahs of laissez-faire, stuffing his maw with rugged individualism, corporate mergers, special privilege, and other Wall Street delicacies left behind the retreating forces of mercantile philosophy. For generations the grass had grown greener, the pastures wider, and there seemed no reason to believe that eventually the entire world might not become this creature's playground. He merely smirked at the rising tide of unemployment, he laughed at Hitler and possible world revolution. These things would pass—they always had. He had big cash reserves, laws and judges, and philosophies which provided him with a thick coat against the storm. He would not believe that the climate of public opinion had changed and that human nature had rung down the curtain on the age of rugged individualism and industrial laissez-faire.

They'll dig him out some day from the cold iceberg of history and they'll marvel at how he was tolerated so long among the monopolies and want and inequalities of opportunity which he created.

We have seen this creature trample and exploit the South since the War between the States. We have seen him sink the Nation's battleships after World War No. 1, rather

than be taxed a little to sustain them. We have seen him permit millions to go unemployed and cold and hungry and we have seen him keep hands off while we lost our homes. We can still hear him bellow forth, as the people slipped the iceberg down upon him in 1932, "grass will grow in the streets of hundreds of cities."

Eight years have passed and we have seen him struggle, through a policy of negation and obstruction, to make his boast come true. Last fall we heard again his trumpet warning that if we did not resurrect him, "this way of life will pass." We have seen him oppose rearmament and give aid and comfort to the dictators.

But the people did not resurrect him and the grass did not grow, and this way of life did not pass—and shall not pass—and we shall not comfort the dictators.

The Democratic Party is traditionally of the people and for the people. Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson settled that. The last few years have been no exception.

We took over in 1933 a stunned and desperate nation and we set about at once to rebuild and restabilize it from within. In every town and every country-side stand enduring monuments to the democracy we put to work. Look at them. There is our bank deposit insurance; there are our idle men employed; there are new roads and streets, legion huts, community buildings and schools; there are the N. Y. A., C. C. C., and new vocational training programs; there are farm credit, farm security, soil conservation, reforestation, surplus commodity marketing, and the A. A. A.; there are rural electrification, Federal and United States Housing, and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation; there is social security; there are new flood control and rivers and harbors programs, T. V. A., Grand Coulee, and on and on—a new Army, a new Air Corps, and a new Navy—all this under the administration of that gallant democrat, humanitarian, and friend of the South, your leader and mine, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

We may make mistakes but they won't dig us out of an iceberg.

CONCLUSION

Tonight, as government by the people faces its supreme test throughout the earth and as the freedom of all non-Axis nations faces peril, let us as Americans resolve to meet, at any cost, the challenge of defending our democracy and its ideals, and then, as internal discriminations and economic injustices threaten to enslave great sections of our country, let us as southerners resolve also to fight like Jackson at New Orleans to rid the South of all known barriers and to make democracy work.

Rhode Island Declaration of Independence

REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to invite the attention of the House to the importance attached by the people of Rhode Island to the date May 4. On Sunday, May 4, we of Rhode Island will celebrate the one hundred and sixty-fifth anniversary of our State's declaration of independence from the British Crown, and we extend to you, Mr. Speaker, and to every Member of the House, a very cordial invitation to join with us at exercises to be held in Statuary Hall, here in the Capitol, at 2:30 o'clock. These exercises will be held under the auspices of the Rhode Island Society of Washington, D. C.

The smallest of the American Colonies, Rhode Island, speaking through its general assembly, announced 2 months ahead of the other Colonies, through a solemn declaration of independence, that it could no longer tolerate the tyrannical abuses to which its people had been subjected by the government of George III, King of Great Britain.

The State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, which is the official name of the State, has an area of only 1,300 square miles—1,067 square miles is land and the rest water—has a coast line of 400 miles that is washed by tidewater. Yet it boasts of a population of 713,346 persons, as shown by the Sixteenth Decennial Census, taken April 1, 1940.

We of Little Rhody, as our State is popularly known, like to think of our State as the cradle of religious liberty in America, and we look with respect and admiration upon its founder, Roger Williams, for bringing that honor to us.

Banished from Massachusetts for his political and religious opinions, to escape deportation to England, Roger Williams fled, in the rigors of the New England winter season, to the shores of Narragansett Bay, and there he founded Providence, now the capital city of our State.

His soul's desire was to do the natives good. He was an idealist and a philanthropist. His most pronounced characteristic was his love for his fellowmen, whether English or Indian. He was a friendly man. He had faith in democratic government—the rule of the people. Throughout his life his appeal for the settlement of every dispute was to reason, not to force. The religious liberty or freedom of thought that he demanded for himself, he extended to all who sought refuge with him from the theological and political rigidity of the Puritan commonwealth.

Is it any wonder, therefore, that the inhabitants of the Colony of Rhode Island, believing in and practicing the principles of its founder, arose on May 4, 1776, and declared their independence from the tyrant rulers from overseas?

I include at this point in my remarks the full text of the Rhode Island declaration of independence, and I invite all of you to read it. I am sure that everyone who reads that historic document will draw from it much inspiration applicable to these trying days through which we are now passing.

AN ACT OF INDEPENDENCE BY THE COLONY OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS, PASSED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT THE OLD STATEHOUSE IN PROVIDENCE, MAY 4, 1776

An act repealing an act entitled "An act for the more effectually securing to His Majesty the allegiance of his subjects in this, his colony and dominion of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations." And altering the forms of commissions, of all writs, and processes in the courts, and of the oaths prescribed by law

Whereas in all States existing by compact, protection and allegiance are reciprocal, the latter being only due in consequence of the former; and

Whereas George III, King of Great Britain, forgetting his dignity, regardless of the compact most solemnly entered into, ratified, and confirmed to the inhabitants of the colony by his illustrious ancestors, and till of late, fully recognized by him, and entirely departing from the duties and character of a good king, instead of protecting, is endeavoring to destroy the good people of this colony, and of all the United Colonies, by sending fleets and armies to America to confiscate our property, and spread fire, sword, and desolation throughout our country, in order to compel us to submit to the most debasing and detestable tyranny, whereby we are obliged by necessity, and it becomes our highest duty, to use every means with which God and Nature have furnished us, in support of our inviolate rights and privileges, to oppose that power which is exerted only for our destruction.

Be it therefore enacted by this general assembly, and by the authority it is enacted, That an act, entitled "An act for the more effectually securing to His Majesty the allegiance of his subjects, in this his colony and dominion of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations," be, and the same is, hereby repealed.

And be it further enacted by this general assembly, and by the authority thereof, it is enacted, That in all commissions for offices, civil and military, and in all writs and processes in law, whether original, judicial, or executory, civil or criminal, whereon the name and authority of the said King is made use of, the same shall be omitted, and in the room thereof, the name and authority of the governor and company of this colony shall be substituted in the following words, to wit:

"THE GOVERNOR AND COMPANY OF THE ENGLISH COLONY OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS

"That all such commissions, writs, and processes shall be otherwise of the same form and terms as they heretofore were; that the courts of law be no longer entitled nor considered as the King's courts; and that no instrument in writing, of any nature or kind, whether public or private, shall, in the date thereof, mention the year of the said King's reign."

Provided, nevertheless, That nothing in this act contained shall render void or vitiate any commission, writ, process, or instrument heretofore made or executed, on account of the name and authority of the said King being therein inserted.

While celebrating this historic event, it is fitting that we should pause to pay a special tribute to the author of that great document, Jonathan Arnold.

Had he contributed nothing else to the life and history of the United States than his draft of the Rhode Island Declaration of Independence, his descendants would

be fully justified to proclaim him a great man.

But he did much more for his country. A cursory study of his life shows that he was a member of the General Assembly of the Colony of Rhode Island at the time he wrote the declaration of independence.

He was a physician. Possessed of great organizing ability, he was made Surgeon General in the United Colonies under George Washington.

He was a Member of the Continental Congress from 1782 to 1784, and his claim to fame in that connection was his declared policy of independence. When an attempt was made to impose secrecy on the Members as to what occurred, he declared he would not be bound—that he wanted the right to let his constituents know what was going on.

When he left Congress he became a lawyer and finally become chief justice of the Supreme Court of the State of Vermont.

We take pride on this occasion to pay tribute to the memory of this great man who so distinguished himself in the fields of medicine, public affairs, and law.

We pause furtner, Mr. Speaker, to pay our respects to a distinguished descendant of Jonathan Arnold—his great-great-grandson, the Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, now the junior Senator from Rhode Island. Like his illustrious ancestor, he is a native of our State, and we are all proud of the unselfish and outstanding service he has rendered and is now rendering to his State and country as a member of the Rhode Island General Assembly, as Governor of the State, and now as a United States Senator.

That the declaration of independence by the general assembly was not an idle gesture but the result of a well thought out and carefully determined plan of men who had been subjected to a long series of abuses and intolerable treatment is attested to by the constitution they drew up and which the people of the State adopted. I quote a few excerpts:

[Excerpts from the Constitution of Rhode Island]

We, the people of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, grateful to Almighty God for the civil and religious liberty which He hath so long permitted us to enjoy, and looking to Him for a blessing upon our endeavors to secure and to transmit the same unimpaired to succeeding generations, do ordain and establish this constitution of government.

All free governments are instituted for the protection, safety, and happiness of the people. All laws, therefore, should be made for the good of the whole; and the burdens of the State ought to be fairly distributed among its citizens.

Whereas Almighty God hath created the mind free; and whereas a principal object of our venerable ancestors, in their migration to this country and their settlement of this State, was, as they expressed it, to hold forth a lively experiment, that a most flourishing civil state may stand and best be maintained with full liberty in religious concernments.

We therefore declare that no man shall be restrained, molested, or burdened in his body or goods, nor diqualified from holding any office, nor otherwise suffer on account of his religious belief; and that every man shall be free to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience and to profess and by argument to maintain his opinion in matters of religion; and that the same shall in nowise diminish, enlarge, or affect his civil capacity.

Every person within this State ought to obtain right and justice freely and without purchase, completely and without denial, promptly and without delay.

In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury; to have the assistance of counsel in his defense, and shall be at liberty to speak for himself; nor shall he be deprived of life, liberty, or property unless by the judgment of his peers or the law of the land.

The citizens have a right in a peaceable manner to assemble for their common good and to apply to those invested with the powers of government for redress of grievances or for other purposes, by petition, address, or remonstrance.

The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

The New Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have studied the statement of Mr. John L. Sullivan, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and also the statement of Mr. Colin F. Stam, chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, over the week end so that I might get a clearer understanding of the suggestions offered for the new tax bill. I have several suggestions to make for the committee's consideration.

First. I feel that it is decidedly unfair to the taxpayer, particularly those who will find the new tax bill quite a heavy burden, to force them to give a substantial share of their earnings while wealthy newspaper corporations are being subsidized by the Government. I therefore feel that the second-class mail matter should be put on a paying basis. I appreciate that there are many small daily and weekly newspapers that cannot afford to make such a payment. I therefore suggest that daily and weekly newspapers having a circulation of not to exceed 7,500 or 10,000 should be exempted from this particular provision, but I do feel that it is an injustice and an inequality to tax the man who is struggling along on a modest income, trying to support a wife and a couple of children, trying to pay his insurance policies, and trying to buy a home, and use part of his money to grant a subsidy to the Chicago Tribune, the New York Daily News, the New York Times, the Washington Star, and many other prosperous newspaper corporations.

Second. I also feel that the taxes on radio broadcasting stations should be substantial. Such stations are virtually a monopoly which is granted by the Government and protected by the Government through its licensing features. Why should such a monopoly, granted and maintained by the Government, not contribute liberally to the Government's support? Personally, I would be very happy to give the Government half of my earnings if the Government would grant me a license for a broadcasting station.

Third. One more recommendation and I have finished. The taxpayer making a net income up to $4,000 or $5,000 a year, who has a wife and three or four children, usually obligates himself not only for life insurance but also for health and accident insurance, sometimes for the annuity type of insurance in addition to the foregoing, and also buys a home ranging in price anywhere from $5,000 to $10,000. All these obligations fix his income in certain channels for years to ccme, and if the Government places upon him a very substantial increase in his taxes he will have to drop some of the other things in order to meet his obligation to the Government. It would seem to me that we could raise a very appreciable amount with the newspaper and broadcasting-station tax which would help in relieving the lower-income producers of their additional burdens by a substantial amount.

METHOD OF PAYMENT

Obviously it would be to the interest of the Government to have a steady stream of revenue flowing in as a result of these tax measures. Usually payments are made on a yearly or quarterly basis. It would, no doubt, be a distinct advantage to the Government to have a monthly system of payment on income taxes, but in the ordinary course of events that would involve a huge amount of bookkeeping and mean considerable added expense. This we want to avoid.

For the taxpayer monthly payments would be a blessing, for the taxes which he has to pay to the local municipality, to his State, and to his Government fall too closely together. If the Federal payments could be spread out over a year, it would, no doubt, aid him in accumulating the money and meeting his obligation to the Government.

Our new tax bill will, no doubt, reach millions who have never yet paid a Federal income tax. Hundreds of thousands, if not several millions, of these taxpayers do not have checking accounts or bank accounts of any nature whatever. Furthermore, they do not have a savings account on which they can draw when their taxes are due. They are the smaller income groups that are paid weekly or monthly and usually have many places to pay their salaries when they receive them. Many of the taxpayers in these groups buy on the installment plan. Therefore, if we could devise some method by which they might pay a little out of their weekly or monthly salaries as

they earned them, they would not have much of a problem about their tax at the end of the year.

Therefore I make the suggestion to the committee for its careful consideration that revenue stamps be printed in the denominations of $1, $3, and $5 and be placed in the post offices throughout the United States so that the small taxpayer may be able, without any expense or difficulty, to go to his post office and purchase a $1, $3, or $5 stamp, as the case may be. He can put that stamp in a folder and in due season will have purchased sufficient stamps to pay his tax.

This is a benefit to the taxpayer because it does not burden him with a lump-sum payment on the 15th of March. It is also a benefit to him because he will save a little as he goes along.

To the Government it will be an advantage because there will be revenue flowing in steadily throughout the year, and also it will be an advantage because the tax will be collected, which in many cases otherwise will never be collected by the Government.

I trust that the committee will give this matter earnest and careful consideration, as I feel it is worthy of time and attention.

Men of Athens

REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, we are all well aware that Demosthenes, the great orator of ancient Greece, won his fame in his orations trying to arouse the Athenian people against Philip of Macedon. The history has been well told many times, but nowhere have I seen it as well told as recently in two editorials in the Oregonian, a newspaper of Portland, Oreg.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include these editorials.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The editorials referred to follow:

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of April 21, 1941]

THE GREEKS HAD A NAME FOR IT

Quite as the musical ear, in listening to the latest opera, isolates strains from earlier music; so the historical eye, in scanning the morning paper, detects in the contemporary scene much shameless imitation of things gone before.

Regard the news of the past week end. Herr Hitler, well along in his job of uniting Europe—a task which he claims to have had to undertake by force because the democracies had failed to accomplish it by peaceful means—has assertedly celebrated his birthday with his troops in the field. They batter their way down through the Hellenic peninsula. And meanwhile, here in the United States, Wendell Willkie and the Most Reverend Gerald Shaughnessy of Seattle, Catholic bishop, have been engaged in a cross-country argument over isolation and intervention. Personalities have obscured the issue, but that seems to be the story underneath. Should the United States consider what is happening in Europe and Asia as vital to itself, or should it keep more strictly to itself? Mr. Willkie and Bishop Shaughnessy are, in the last analysis, symbols of viewpoints.

Now, consider how familiar all these strains are to the historian. One such historian, Frederick H. Cramer, sat down recently and wrote his charges of plagiarism for the benefit of the magazine Foreign Affairs. The April issue carries the article under the title, "Demosthenes Redivivus."

Three and a half centuries before Christ the Greek peninsula and its hinterland were the modern world in miniature. The area, due to chopped-up topography, was divided into city states, some democracies, some military dictatorships. Athens, Sparta, and Thebes were traditionally of greater power than most of the others. Now a king of Macedon, to the north, named Philip, who had learned the secret of the phalanx during a stay in Thebes—exactly as Germany secured the tank from Britain in the World War—began a career of conquest. He had secretly perfected great numbers of troops in this latest military device. He was, however, a practical fellow. He softened his opponents by the "fifth column" method whenever and wherever possible. No war except as a last resort. And always he was careful to avoid battle on two fronts. Disunion of the enemy was his unceasing technique.

Philip's idea was to unite the Greek people whether or no, arguing that the democracies had failed.

Down in rich and comfortable Athens, as Philip progressed, the people and their leaders divided into isolationists and interventionists. Demosthenes became the spokesman for the latter—the Roosevelt-Willkie of his time. The three most famous orations ever delivered by man, the Philippics, were devoted to the attempt to stir democratic Athens to the positive action of going to war with Philip while there still were allies. On the other hand, there were those in Athens who cried that Demosthenes was a warmonger, who said that Philip only wanted living space, and that when he had achieved it Athens could do business with him. Don't be saying bad things about him, they counseled. They objected to war taxes, argued against military expenditures that threatened inflation, fought proposed conscription for the army and for labor. One Aeschines was an eloquent Senator Wheeler of his day. They appealed to all the instincts of evasion among the wealthy Athenians, and cried traitor at those who appealed for "union now" with Thebes. So Philip sardonically advanced, reducing the city states one by one because Athens could not bring itself to assume the leadership of a defense league. And in each place he set up a Quisling government, to the humiliation of decency and patriotism. Finally he overawed the Phocians, who guarded Thermopylae; and with that pass, close to the walls of Athens, in his hands, it was all up with Athens. Too late the people realized their comfort must be defended. They marched out at last, without allies, and were done to death at Chaeronea.

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of April 25, 1941]

"O MEN OF ATHENS!"

Permit us to pursue a little further the matter of what was said and done in ancient Athens when Philip of Macedon began his series of conquests, reducing the Greek city-states one by one, by a nice coordination of panzer phalanxes and "fifth columnists." It really is too utterly utter, if you know what we mean.

The Athenians, as we have pointed out, promptly divided into interventionists and isolationists (the latter including the appeasers). Demosthenes was the spokesman for the interventionists, and his friends supported the Committee to Defend Athens by Aiding the Olynthian Confederacy, while Phocian, and in time Aeschines, backed the No Foreign War and the Athens First organizations. And to begin with, Demosthenes had much the worst of it, because the initial conquests by Philip (of such places as Byzantium and Rhodes) seemed very far away, and the Athenians were fat and placid and did not want to be disturbed. They said Philip was only after living space and wanted to reunite the Macedonian people. Demosthenes replied that such was not the case. He declared that Philip was a man whose sole desire was glory, and that he would not be stopped in the pursuit of glory except by superior force. To which the interventionists snorted "phooey." They said Philip was the tool of his business interests, that this was just another imperialistic war, and that presently business could be done with him.

The Athenians did, however, agree to aid short of war for Olynthia (a city near the present Salonika), and at the very end they decided to convoy. But the convoy arrived just after the city had fallen. (Philip returned Olynthia, by the way, to pasturage.)

This turn of affairs, of course, brought Philip considerably nearer the gates, and the matter of "union now" with Thebes began to be debated in earnest. There is no record, as Frederick H. Cramer observes in his article on the subject in the current issue of Foreign Affairs, that the interventionists thought to demand that Thebes and Macedon state their war aims. (Folly, as he remarks, has made strides since those days.)

But the isolationists did arise in the forum and call attention to how many times Athens had warred with Thebes, even in the immediate past. They demanded to know why Thebes had never given dominion status to India. (Pardon us if we get a little tangled at times.) And hadn't Thebes sold the last League of Nations down the river? Indeed, they demanded sternly, what Athenian would be such a weakling—so unpatriotic—as to refer to Thebes as the first line of defense for Athens? Never! Athenians had fought Thebans at Concord and Saratoga, and knew them for black-hearted rascals with an objectionable accent. Besides, the Theban diplomats were career men with whom it was dangerous to sit down at a green table, because you always lost your pants. This, they repeated, was just another imperialist war, and the way to save democracy was to make democracy work at home. That is, whitewash more walls and build new waterworks. Presumably Philip would be so impressed that he would sheer away in humblest amazement. Defend the Attic Doctrine, O Men of Athens, and don't let the Theban propagandists slicker you.

Icarus, the young man who attempted a nonstop flight from Crete to Syracuse, had fallen into the sea and been lost this long while, but there were other forward and admired young men of Athens to argue that perhaps Philip represented the wave of the future. And plenty of people were willing to attend, because many of the wealthy feared the loss of their property more than the loss of Athens, while many of the rest were merely poor at mathematics, and could not weigh the difference between the gamble today, with allies, and the gamble tomorrow without them.

It is a sorry tale with an unhappy ending, in that Athens fell and never again attained greatness until the year 1941—and then a tragic greatness. But we recount it because we suspect that upon scrutiny it will turn out to bear certain lessons for the present. At least it would seem fair to conclude that whether or not Athens should have gone to war on behalf of Olynthia, or should later

have tried to form closer relationship with Thebes, at least it should have shifted its W. P. A. from whitewashing walls to defense work, and it should have cut down its automobile production more than 20 percent. It should have trained and built for the hour of crisis without reservation. It should have recognized Philip for what he was—destruction on the march. Athens was a fool, and so are we.

The Strike Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1941

LETTER FROM E. BLUMHAGEN, SPEAKER OF THE OKLAHOMA STATE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include herewith as part of my remarks a timely and thought-provoking letter I have received from my personal friend, Hon. E. Blumhagen, popular and brilliant young speaker of the House of Representatives of the eighteenth session of the Oklahoma Legislature.

The strike situation wherein hundreds of millions in defense contracts are involved, has reached a serious, if not an alarming, state. The public is demanding that the national-defense program must not be delayed, crippled, or slowed down on account of strikes and lock-outs or for any other reason or excuse. As one who has supported labor 100 percent on all occasions I feel that Speaker Blumhagen has expressed the opinion of the vast majority of the citizens of Oklahoma and the Nation with reference to this disturbing and perplexing problem.

The communication in question follows:

MARCH 13, 1941.

Hon. JED JOHNSON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I am writing to you as an average citizen of Blaine County, Okla., concerning a matter that, in my opinion, should receive the immediate and earnest consideration of the Congress of the United States. I had the good fortune to be present at a meeting the other night composed of a good number of outstanding citizens of Blaine County. At that meeting the question of what at this time constitutes the greatest peril to this country was discussed. Spontaneously and almost without exception, it was the opinion of those present that the attitude of organized labor toward the national-defense program greatly endangered our national unity and jeopardized seriously the entire defense program.

I am naturally sympathetic toward labor and toward the people who comprise that great group commonly referred to as the laboring class. I commend the present administration for its sympathetic attitude toward the problems of labor. I do not believe that labor has achieved anything to which it was not truly entitled. I believe I speak truthfully when I say that my record in the Legislature of Oklahoma has on the whole been favorable to labor. Yet I do not believe that labor is justified in its present attitude toward the national-defense program. Our Government has said to certain of its citizens that they must go into the Army for a year's training. It makes no difference what our business or profession may be, all of our citizens are gladly and willingly making the sacrifices necessary to train themselves so that they may be able to take an active part in the defense of our country. I myself am registered; and if and when in the opinion of my country my services are needed, they will gladly be made available. In view of all this, it is difficult to understand why our Government should tolerate this great series of strikes on defense projects by labor. Personally, I doubt that there has been any serious deliberate effort on the part of the employers engaged in defense production to deal unfairly with labor, but be that as it may. I have no brief for an employer who seeks to deal unfairly with labor, for I believe that he should be dealt with summarily, but not in a manner that a strike does.

I believe that the laboring class of people should welcome the opportunity to be a part of a great program of national defense to the end that we may preserve our American institutions and our American way of life. I believe that labor is probably not fully aware of the seriousness of the national emergency, for I can't believe that labor is any less patriotic than any other group, yet a continuation of the present attitude of organized labor can have but one effect, and that is to create the impression that it is not willing to subordinate its interests to those of the common good.

I know that it is said that we should not undo the social progress that has been made in the last 8 years. However, any action taken during a national emergency could not and would not be construed as a precedent in ordinary times. Just the same as my interests as an individual must and should be subordinated to the common good, the interests of labor should and must likewise be so subordinated. I urge you, therefore, as my Congressman, to take the position that strikes on national-defense projects will not be tolerated. I grant you that labor is entitled to the assurance that employers will not exploit them during this emergency, but surely proper relations can be maintained between employer and employee without cessation of production activities.

Respectfully yours,

E. BLUMHAGEN,
Speaker, Eighteenth Legislative Session.

At War's Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE COLUMBUS (OHIO) DISPATCH

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to refer you to an editorial which strikes the note of leadership which has been sadly lacking here in Washington—a keynote of courage combined with common sense—eyes on the stars but feet on the ground. I hope this American practical idealism will guide the President as we stand at war's crossroads.

The editorial follows:

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch of April 25, 1941]

AT WAR'S CROSSROADS—IS AMERICA FACING DANGER OF BEING MISLED?

Another debacle in the steady march from Narvik through Dunkirk to the Aegean Sea is clearing the last effective British fighting force from the continent of Europe save that sturdy handful holding the rock above Britain's lifeline at Gibraltar.

Adolf Hitler, hated by all free peoples, sits entrenched in the Berlin hub of the German wheel, its tire of steel encircling a subjugated domain such as Napoleon only dreamed of but never accomplished.

At this moment that domain is free to produce food and airplanes and tanks and guns—necessaries of life and munitions of war—without interference by strikes and indecisions, so long as he sees fit to keep his combat divisions in the field for conquest.

Neither futile wishful thinking nor sympathy for kindred peoples in dire distress, nor bombastic promises of aid by a friendly but confused administration in Washington, can becloud the fate of Czecho and Poland, Austria and Hungary, Denmark and Norway, Belgium and Holland, the mighty France, Bulgaria and Rumania, Yugoslavia, and Greece—Greece the bravest of the brave for centuries uncounted—all of which have fallen before the faultless preparation and mighty driving forces of the Nazi war plan and its mass machinery.

This is no time for recrimination against the new colossus of Europe.

This is no time for idle speculation over how far he plans to go.

Nor is this the time for elation and false hopes over casual allied successes which may have no bearing on the ultimate outcome of the titanic struggle.

This is no time for fear nor apathy nor indecision; certainly no time for recklessness and for confused national leadership whose motives and intent and purpose are hidden from the American people under a smoke screen of promises inconsistent with their capacity for fulfillment and doubtful as to the wisdom of their conception.

All of this does not mean that the British people are beaten; far from it.

It does not mean that the American people are afraid.

To the contrary, they are courageous, sympathetic, generous, purposeful, and powerful.

They are not pinching their pennies, either for aid to others or defense for themselves. They are willing to sacrifice, to pay until it hurts, and pay again and again and again.

They are not shrinking from any responsibilities, but they will demand, if not already aroused to it, a reasonable measure of effectiveness in their aid to others, and a full measure of defense for themselves.

President Roosevelt having taken everything pertaining to the war and defense into his own hands, had the world's greatest opportunity to exercise wise leadership.

The President and his close advisers, the minority saber-rattling element in the Army and Navy group in Washington, with all the bureaucrats and warmongering hangers-on, are under increasing scrutiny at the bar of public opinion.

Can they retain the confidence of the American people when airplanes are offered to England before our airplane factories are built; when naval vessels are actually given, and more promised, while our own Navy is crying for ships not yet laid down in incompleted yards; when tanks and guns are promised to belligerents while our own conscripted

army of boys has scarcely seen a tank or a modern field gun, a bomber plane, or a hand rifle?

Can they retain the confidence of the American people with a leadership which cabled King Peter a promise of aid 14,000 miles away with the panzer divisions quivering on his borders and his domain torn by internal strife; when, within a fortnight after that promise, King Peter is a fugitive on foreign soil and his country absorbed by the Axis?

Will that type of leadership make of America a laughing stock in Berlin and Moscow and Tokyo and Rome, where respect for American sanity and fear of a united American might should prevail?

Standing at the crossroads of the World War, the American people, unafraid and purposeful, will do well to get down on their knees—not to Berlin, not to London, not to Tokyo, and not to Washington—but to the Overruler of them all, praying that American leadership be guided back to clarity of vision, sound purpose, sane procedure, and an abiding faith in the principles which have made America strong and great.

Pennsylvania State Legislature Observes Americanization Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, May 1 was celebrated throughout Pennsylvania as Americanization Day, due to a resolution passed by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

As a prelude, on April 30, at noon, 1 hour was set aside by the house of representatives to formally observe the occasion. In the presence of the Governor and his cabinet and other State dignitaries I had the pleasure of sharing the speaking assignment for the program with my colleague, the Honorable FRANCIS J. MYERS, of Pennsylvania.

Under leave to extend my remarks therein, I include the following address delivered by me on the subject Americanism:

Mr. Speaker, members of the house of representatives, and fellow Americans, it was with a sense of deep gratitude that I accepted your kind invitation to address you on such a momentous and unique occasion. As a Member of the Congress of the United States you and I have much in common. We are charged with grave responsibilities in discharging our trust as legislators for a free people.

It is noteworthy that this body of duly elected representatives of the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania pause in their deliberations to give expression to the basic ideals on which this Nation was founded. Your action is comparable to that of Congress, when on the birthday of George Washington the National House of Representatives pays tribute to the Father of our Country by reading and meditating on our first President's Farewell Address.

Gentlemen, in my capacity as a Member of the Congress of the United States I congratulate you on your exemplification of true Americanism. By your example you have demonstrated that the zeal and patriotism of the early colonists who founded this great Commonwealth still burn brightly in the heart of every Pennsylvanian. It was on Pennsylvania soil that the breath of life was given to this great Nation. At Philadelphia were adopted the Articles of Confederation; there the Declaration of Independence was written and signed; there the treaty of peace that ended the Revolutionary War was ratified; and there also the Constitution of the United States was formulated. Today Independence Hall in Philadelphia stands as a mighty monument commemorating the birthplace of this Nation, and it truly depicts the Quaker City as the cradle of American liberty.

We as Pennsylvanians have a proud heritage in the patriotic fervor that permeated our forefathers. Their contribution to this great Republic is one of the brightest pages in the history of our great Nation. The courage and valor displayed at Valley Forge, Brandywine, and Fort Necessity spurred on the gallant stand that caused the Union forces to make Gettysburg the turning point in the Civil War and has since transformed its hallowed ground into a national shrine. The torch of freedom given to us at Gettysburg has been carried aloft by loyal Pennsylvanians through the Spanish-American and World Wars.

Today, as the war clouds gather over this last peaceful nation, Pennsylvanians, true to their traditions, are rallying to meet the challenge to the American way of life. The tramp of marching feet resounds in all of our 67 counties as Pennsylvania youth respond to the call of their country. Industries hum with activity as they strive to break all production records in their determined effort to supply the needs of an adequate national defense.

In short, Pennsylvania—the keystone in the original 13 States—is truly today the cornerstone of our national-defense efforts.

Here in Pennsylvania we have room for only one "ism"—true Americanism—an Americanism that keeps strict faith with every word in the Bill of Rights and in every line of the Constitution. We believe in the kind of Americanism that gives you and me the right to express our opinions, to approve or disapprove, to commend or criticize, as we see fit.

Our Americanism gives us a legal right to meet under the same roof as coworkers in the ranks of labor, as farmers in our local granges, as businessmen in our chambers of commerce, as fraternal brothers in the Masonic order, or the Knights of Columbus, Eagles, Elks, Odd Fellows, or Moose.

We recognize and cherish the spirit of Americanism which leaves our newspapers free to print anything that does not conflict with the laws of libel or decency. As business leaders, laborers, or farmers, we appreciate the right that is ours to publish our own periodicals without the heavy hand of a censor to tell us what we, the people, are allowed to read. We realize that a free press must be available to all, and that if we deny it to those with whom we disagree today, it may be likewise denied to us tomorrow.

As taxpayers and law-abiding citizens, the Americanism we advocate gives us the privilege of presenting our petitions to the highest court in the land if we feel we have been wronged. We insist as true Americans that nothing shall interfere with that right.

If our public servants, our duly elected representatives in our town councils, our county and State legislatures, or in the Congress of the United States enact laws contrary to our ideas we believe in the kind of Americanism that grants every citizen the opportunity to petition our lawmaking bodies for corrective legislation. We want that opportunity as individuals. We want it as farmers, laborers, lawyers, doctors, or bankers, if we feel our mutual welfare is being endangered.

In 1620 our Pilgrim Fathers migrated from England in search of individual liberty. One of their most important objectives was to establish homes in a new land where they could cling to the religious faith in which they believed. The Americanism we know teaches us that the blessing of religious freedom must be ours forever if America is destined to survive. There is no compromise with this fundamental truth. You and I would be repudiating Americanism if we should deny our neighbor the right to walk with his Lord and his God in his own way.

Tolerance for the rights and privileges of others is the essence of Americanism applied to religious freedom, free speech, free press, or other individual liberties. There must be freedom for all or freedom for none. Those who would have America half free and half slave are traitors to the spirit of Americanism.

Let us keep this fact uppermost in our mind at all times—Americanism is not something you can sell for a price nor is it something you can take off and put on when you own a certain kind of uniform. Americanism is a way of life—a way of living, and not something you acquire by paying membership dues in a secret society.

The real Americanism that we know, feel, and breathe in Pennsylvania is the Nation's gospel. Can any one of us look on the world today and fail to thank God for the blessings of our form of government? We are the most fortunate of nations. Nowhere else today is there a people so free to pursue life, liberty, and happiness. Yet this blessed privilege is abused by many so-called Americans and efforts made to destroy it in various ways.

Today Americanism is being challenged by enemies within and without. There are insidious forces at work within our own country who are seeking to undermine the basic ideals of the American form of Government. These political termites are tirelessly gnawing at the pillars of the Republic. They are encouraged by indifference on the part of many lukewarm Americans and by the active work of foreign governments.

Regardless of how false and dangerous are the political philosophies of the Communist, the Nazi, Fascist, or any other group, we must admit reluctantly that the advocates of these new-fangled political concepts are fired with a fanatical zeal and enthusiasm that staggers the imagination.

This nationalistic frame of mind has transformed into a mighty military machine a nation that in 1918 was conquered and subdued. For 7 years prior to the present war, you and I read in the newspapers or witnessed in the news reels the systematic effort employed to arouse the national consciousness of the second greatest industrial nation in the world—Nazi Germany.

We saw legions of German youth depicted in brown shirts and raising their hands in salute to an insignificant Austrian paperhanger, now held in abject contempt by the nations of the world as the "Beast of Berlin"—Adolf Hitler.

Today those same youths are the sparkplugs in the blitzkrieg that has reduced 14 countries in succession to a state of servitude.

Let us dwell for a moment on the activities of other nations since the year 1920. When we look back we now recall with vivid recollection that while Hitler pursued his program the remainder of the world was content to take everything for granted and be lulled into a false sense of security. When the rude awakening came, we found that not only other nations but even ourselves were unprepared for this new challenge to the peace and security of the civilized world.

Through the grace of God, we, as a nation, have been spared actual combat with the ruthless forces now overrunning the plains of Europe. Meanwhile, we are engaged in a feverish effort to build an adequate national defense at the earliest possible moment. Such a gigantic task provides a real testing ground and an opportunity to view the principles of true Americanism at work.

The need for a united nation devoid of any partisan motives was never more apparent as we shoulder the burden of providing an adequate national defense.

What we need is more enthusiasm and zeal for Americanism. If the dictator nations can muster loyalty and enthusiasm for their bloody and lustful regimes, what is there to prevent America from casting off her lukewarm attitude and experiencing a revitalization of American principles and ideals?

The crying need of the hour is for every American, regardless of creed, race, or social position, to be inspired by the courage and fortitude of those brave patriots to whom Valley Forge and Gettysburg proved the acid test of their patriotism and found them unafraid and glorious in their victories.

We fellow Americans may have honest differences of opinion in regard to many questions, but there can be no compromise on the fundamental principles of Americanism.

Our tolerance as a Nation, intended as a blessing, has been seized upon by subversive groups to promote their own gospels of hate and oppression. To those alien parasites let us in unmistakable terms serve notice that their presence here among a free people will not be countenanced. Let the Communist return to Russia and face the secret trial and consignment to an unmarked grave by the light of the moon. Let the Nazi, Fascist, and their kind return to the fatherland, where the principles of human liberty have been discarded and where no man dare call his soul his own.

There should be a mass movement on the part of every legislative body to provide the means of transportation to these base ingrates who, while enjoying the privileges and blessings of America, are in the same breath laboring incessantly to uproot and destroy every vestige of liberty and freedom. Let them demonstrate their sincerity for godless Russia and Nazi Germany by departing from our shores, and every loyal American will utter a prayer of thanksgiving.

In similar fashion, I hold no brief for the lukewarm American, but instead regard him with contempt. The day of reckoning has arrived, and he must remove his cloak and stand revealed in his true light as a pussyfooter and one who accepts the blessings of American citizenship with no thought of assuming its duties and obligations.

Today America is for Americans, and let such a slogan be on the lips of every school child, preached from the pulpits of the Nation, and inscribed on every heart.

In this critical period of world history let us evaluate the many blessings that are bestowed upon us by citizenship in this great Republic. Let us join with the distinguished minority clerk of the national House of Representatives, William Tyler Page, in subscribing wholeheartedly to the lofty sentiments contained in his famous composition entitled "The American's Creed":

"I believe in the United States of America, as a Government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a Republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

"I, therefore, believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies."

The Garand Rifle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

NEWSPAPER DISPATCH FROM FORT BENNING, GA.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have from time to time heard criticism of the Garand rifle and of its selection by the Army as the standard rifle for our troops. There recently appeared in the public press a very interesting news article. Under leave to extend my remarks I am including this article in the belief that it may be read with profit by us all. It is not only interesting, it is instructive:

FIRING GARAND RIFLE, ROOKIES SOON MARKSMEN—QUALIFY IN "UNDREAMED OF" NUMBERS; CONTROVERSIAL ARM IS SUPERIOR

FORT BENNING, GA., April 24.—A soldier's rifle is a personal and vital arm. Especially for a United States soldier, it is a symbol of his national heritage—of wars and wildernesses won. At least it should be. Military leaders know it would be a bad thing if men lacked pride and faith in their rifles, and there were some misgivings about replacing the simple and reliable Springfield (model 1903) with the more intricate and frankly less dependable Garand, a semiautomatic.

But nobody was quite prepared for the hullabaloo that arose about a year ago and which has been fanned again by publication of unfavorable excerpts from a report of competitive tests made by the Marine Corps.

Visiting camps in the south, this reporter heard selectees and National Guard men, who had not fired the Garand, wondering whether Washington bureaucracy was about to hand them an inferior weapon. They said they had seen no answers to criticisms they had read.

Here at Fort Benning, home of the infantry school for officers and of the policy-shaping infantry board, are all the answers about the new primary arm of our fighting forces. They're not exactly official but you could call them authoritative, because the officer I interviewed is Col. T. S. Wessles, rifle instructor at the infantry school, test officer during part of the Garand's 15-year development, and an exceptional marksman who several time has gone to the National Rifle Matches at Camp Perry, Ohio.

SHOOTS MORE EASILY THAN SPRINGFIELD

Sitting in his office, Colonel Wessles rapidly took apart a Garand (now known as the M1, meaning model 1) and explained how it works. This is the main idea: About 2 inches from the end of the barrel, and at a right angle to it, is a hole smaller than the lead in a pencil. Part of the expanding gas which is driving the bullet goes through this vent, whams into a tiny pistol, which in turn pushes back the breech mechanism, ejects the old shell, and puts in a new one as it closes. All quick like a mouse. The rifleman doesn't have to work a lever or bolt; he just aims and squeezes the trigger.

The reason the Army and Marine Corps adopted the M1 is that it can fire from two to three times as many aimed shots per minute as the Springfield. Every phase of modern warfare is a race for superior fire power, and no foreign nation has an infantry rifle that can throw anything like the amount of lead that the Garand does.

Down to the last screw and spring, the Garand has 71 parts, the Springfield 94. But Colonel Wessles said there are more important parts in the M1, and that it really is more complicated. Hence it is somewhat less reliable. "But you just can't get the same standard of absolute dependability in a semiautomatic that's possible in one you operate by hand," he added.

He probably was thinking of tests by the Marine Corps board in which guns were doused in gooey mud, dragged through sand, and sprayed with salt water. The Springfield still could be fired. The Garand, with more intricate parts and closer tolerance, often jammed. Regarding actual breakage of parts, though, the officer declared that ordnance mechanics on the range are no busier making repairs than they were when the famed Springfield was used.

The front end of the Garand recently has been altered slightly to avoid a wabbling flip that was given to the tails of bullets as they passed the gas vent. The M1 is about as accurate as the Springfield and was especially commended for accuracy by the sharpshooting marines. There is no trouble with fouling. Colonel Messles said that in a test of the new front end, a rifle was fired 5,000 times without cleaning.

Naturally, any fast-shooting hand weapon gets hot during sustained fire. The colonel said he has shot the Garand until the wood around the barrel burst into flames, but it kept on working all right.

THE GARAND'S ADVANTAGES

He named some specific advantages: 1. The M1 uses a clip of eight rounds instead of the Springfield's five. At the last shot, the clip is ejected with a resonant bong.

2. The M1 is easy to take apart and clean in the field.

3. The sights are in every way stronger and superior. Adjustment is closer and easier. Elevation and windage are changed by thumb screws that click, and each click represents 1 inch to each 100 yards of range.

4. The trigger stays in adjustment better than the Springfield's.

5. The shell ejector is sturdier, surer than the Springfield's.

6. A rifleman can conceal himself better with the Garand because he doesn't have to raise a hand above the level of the barrel to operate a bolt.

7. The Garand has about one-third less recoil.

Performance of the M1 in the hands of troops should settle the controversy about it, but the Army has no official statistics so far. At Fort Sam Houston, Tex., I was told that more than 90 percent of selectees and other recruits were qualifying as marksmen or better with the Garand. That is a proportion previously undreamed of.

Here at Fort Benning, the score is even higher among classes of officers—many of them reservists who haven't fired a rifle in years. Colonel Wessles said that of his last class of 185, who had scarcely any practice because of bad weather, 70 rated expert riflemen, 52 sharpshooters, 63 marksmen, and only 3 failed to qualify.

EASY TO HANDLE IN RAPID FIRE

When we went out on a range to shoot a Garand I soon learned its advantages in rapid fire, which is the part of the record course which used to ruin the scores of most novices who shot the Springfield.

With the old rifle you were supposed to shoot 10 times a minute at 200 yards. The new rule, for the Garand is 16 shots a minute. Colonel Wessles, though, began by loading and firing 4 clips of 32 shots in 60 seconds, and scored 154 of a possible 160. At any slower rate of fire he seemed never to miss. My best target was 15 bull's-eyes and 1 in the adjoining 4-ring—2 clips fired in 44 seconds. As one who used to like to shoot

the Springfield, I was especially impressed with the Garand's soft recoil and the way it kicks straight back, with very little wavering of the sights from the target.

Presently Lt. Col. G. A. Pollin and his son came by. George Pollin is a normal-sized 13-year-old who never had fired a .30-caliber rifle. He lay down and, with 1 clip at slow fire, plunked off 6 bull's-eyes and two 4's. Some other visitors were Lt. and Mrs. C. B. Wolfe. She wasn't dressed for the muddy firing line, but she stood up and blazed away with the 9-pound rifle and didn't mind the recoil.

Incidentally, having heard various Army men pronounce "Garand" in every possible way, I asked Colonel Wessles, who knows the inventor. Proper pronunciation is with a hard "G," as in the first syllable of "garage," and with the accent on the "and."

Two Warnings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, we are in a world crisis, which requires sane and deliberate thinking on the part of Americans. It is alarming to observe the forces of publicity which are being utilized in an effort to distort developments confronting our Nation today.

I have confidence in the ability of our people to act wisely in meeting this challenge, if they can resist the sinister influences of propaganda. In this connection, it is timely to recall the warnings of two outstanding Americans, whose advice is worthy of consideration now. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the following admonitions to our people.

Mark Twain said:

A few fair men on the other side will argue and reason against the war with speech and pen and at first will have a hearing and be applauded, but it will not last long; the others will outshout them. * * * Before long you will see this curious thing: The speakers stoned from the platform and free speech strangled by hordes of furious men who in their secret hearts are still at one with those stoned speakers but do not dare say so. And now the whole Nation, pulpit and all, will take up the war cry and shout itself hoarse and mob any man who ventures to open his mouth, and presently such mouths will cease to open.

George Washington said:

Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike of another causes those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

Mr. Speaker, no convoys, no war.

Objectives of the Regular Veterans Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

OUTLINE ADOPTED BY THE FOURTH NATIONAL CONVENTION

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I place in the RECORD the objectives of the Regular Veterans Association as adopted by its fourth national convention:

NATIONAL DEFENSE

A highly trained and well-equipped Army, capable of defending the entire Western Hemisphere.

A two-ocean Navy, capable of meeting and destroying any possible combination of enemy naval forces.

Repeal, modification, or amendment of all existing State laws that prevent citizens of such States who are serving in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard from voting.

R. V. A.'S EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM, 1941, AS ADOPTED BY THE FOURTH NATIONAL CONVENTION

1. Privileges of hospitalization of all United States veterans' facilities for former Regulars of the military and naval service. Amendment of public law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, so as to permit any person having an honorable discharge from any of the regular services to be eligible for admission to the various Veterans' Administration homes.

2. Increase in pensions to widows and dependents of deceased Regulars who have died of service-connected disabilities.

3. Elimination of regulations which prevent members of the United States Soldiers' Home and of the United States Naval Home from receiving their full pensions while residing in these homes.

4. Upward revision of the present pay scale throughout the Regular Establishments.

5. Increase in the quarters and rental allowances for all retired personnel to $30 per month.

6. Provisions for retirement privileges for enlisted personnel of the Regular Army after 25 years of service.

7. Opposition to any law that will permit States or local political subdivisions to apply sales taxes to sales made in post exchanges or similar stores on military and naval reservations, ships, or stations.

8. Retention of the reenlistment allowance until it can be replaced by satisfactory pay schedules.

9. Good-conduct medals for all honorably discharged Army enlisted men.

10. Continued preference to all honorably discharged veterans of the Regular Establishments under all rules and regulations promulgated by the United States Civil Service Commission, and a law that will require this Commission to publish all eligible lists and to make appointments from the list in order of merit, with no eligible passed over without legal and adequate reason therefor.

11. Preference to all honorably discharged regulars in admission to C. C. C. camps and on W. P. A. jobs.

12. Elimination of the so-called green ticket of the Coast Guard.

13. Adoption of a uniform salute to the flag for civilians and soldiers alike.

14. Equalization of charges to all veterans residing in United States Soldiers' Home and United States Naval Home.

15. A voice in the management of the Soldiers' Home for enlisted men of the Army, who own and support the home, and preference for employment at this home to veterans of the Regular Army.

16. Increase of $10 per month in amount now being paid hospitalized regulars.

17. Equalization of pay and allowances among the services.

18. First pay grade, pay and allowances, and rank for first sergeants of the Army and Marine Corps.

19. Brigadier general rank for our Army Chief of Chaplains.

20. Lieutenant general rank for the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

21. Removal of legislative restrictions on Army post exchanges.

22. Permanent noncommissioned officers' warrants for noncommissioned officers of the Army, with promotions based on merit as evidenced by tests, records, and examination.

23. Placing the fixing of Army noncommissioned officer strength in the hands of the Secretary of War.

24. Making the purchase of Government life insurance by military and naval officers and enlisted men possible at any time during active service instead of 120 days after acceptance of rank or enlistment.

25. Educational institutes for the Army and Navy whereby correspondence, educational, and vocational courses may be made available to personnel of the Army and Navy similar to personnel of the Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and United States Army Air Corps.

26. A law to extend the date of expiration of enlistment of personnel under treatment in hospitals.

27. Reduction in hospital rates for dependents of Coast Guard personnel from $3.75 per day to $1 per day.

28. Adequate pensions for dependents of deceased retired regular officers and enlisted men.

29. Pensions for service-disabled Regulars to equal that of wartime rates.

30. The same allowances for enlisted men of the first three grades throughout the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

31. The pay and allowances of their wartime rank upon retirement be given to warrant officers and enlisted men who served during the World War.

32. Retirement pay for ex-temportry commissioned World War officers of the Coast Guard and Navy be similar to that provided for the Army.

33. Legislation looking toward the increase of appropriation for land and sea border patrol.

34. Retired Army men to be entitled to hospitalization.

35. Cancelation of the existing list of eligibles for appointments to warrant officer in the Army be opposed.

36. The Navy and Coast Guard veterans who served abroad in time of war or during peacetime expeditions be entitled to campaign medals.

37. Credit for purposes of longevity pay for service in the National Guard, Regular Army Reserve, Navy Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and Coast Guard Reserve.

38. Three-quarters retirement pay with certain minimums for career enlisted men of the regular services.

39. Complete overhaul and modernization of the entire pay, pension, and retirement systems of the Regular services.

40. Chief warrant officer rank for the Army, with all enlisted men of the first three grades being given opportunity to qualify.

41. Authorization to transportation companies to reduce rail and bus fares to 1 cent per mile for all officers and enlisted men while on furlough or while traveling at their own expense.

42. A minimum monthly pension of $50 for all Regular veterans with arrested tuberculosis.

43. Full credit for all service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard for retirement and logevity purposes.

44. Uniform charges throughout the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard for the hospitalization of the dependents of all officers and enlisted men.

45. Pensions for dependents of deceased retired officers and enlisted men.

46. Denial of public office and voting privileges to all who advocate change or overthrow of our form of government by use of force or internal disturbance.

47. Immediate deportation of all aliens who by speech or act advocate or encourage anti-American doctrines, internal disturbance, or change in American laws or institutions or in any way attempt to meddle with American economic or political affairs.

Germans Sacrilegious—Why Not Stop German Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

EDITORIALS FROM THE CHATTANOOGA NEWS-FREE PRESS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two editorials that recently appeared in the Chattanooga News-Free Press entitled, "Why Not Stop German Bureau?" and "Germans Sacrilegious."

I am in full accord with the conclusions reached in these editorials. We cannot place the full strength of this Nation in a struggle against the enemy and at the same time permit distribution of the enemy's propaganda. I see no answer to the demand that the activities of the German Bureau be stopped.

The editorials follow:

[From the Chattanooga News-Free Press]

GERMANS SACRILEGIOUS

Blood-boiling is a dangerous business in warm weather, but this editor suffered an involuntary attack of the ailment yesterday when the periodical Facts in Review, from the German Information Bureau, of New York, came to the desk. The book is full of the customary insidious propaganda, notably with various pictures and articles to demonstrate that the Germans are feeding the peoples of the conquered nations and helping them with their agriculture.

Of course, everyone who keeps up with the times, knows that these peoples are not being fed by the Nazis but are making pitiful appeals to the United States to escape starvation. Furthermore, anyone who has studied the German psychology knows that if these peoples are being aided in making their crops, the Germans will eat the lion's share—or shall we say the swine's share—of the products.

What made the blood to boil, however, was a beautiful spring-flower picture on the inside cover, and opposite it an article headed "Easter in Germany"—with a lot of bunk about how all over Germany "Easter bells jubilate, singing of His glory."

The Hitler government has been trying to eliminate Easter and "His glory" for years, and it is disgusting sacrilege for a German propaganda sheet to try to include Easter and a stab at religion in its poison.

More and more we feel that Facts in Review, and all the score or so of publications given out by this bureau, should be suppressed.

[From the Chattanooga News-Free Press]

WHY NOT STOP GERMAN BUREAU?

We are always willing to listen to both sides of any controversy. We have studied the international situation in vain for any justification for Adolf Hitler's campaign to subjugate a continent, perhaps the world, in the name of the "superior race," the Teutons. We have tried to find any elements of human progress in Hitler's brutal Nietzsche philosophy and his contempt for Deity. It isn't there. Whatever historic and current-day basis for complaint there may be found against England and its allied countries—whether they are genuine democracies or not, or whether even our own country is a real democracy or not, the so-called democratic governments must have our support. These governments have a background of religion and human values. If they are imperfect now, they hold within them, by their very structure, the possibilities of improvement; but in nazi-ism is only slavery, giving all one's liberties for a crust of bread and a bit of cloth to wear.

Therefore, we feel the time has come for a definite, total break with nazi-ism, and under such a break the German information agency in New York, of whose propagandizing efforts a McCallie School official complained in the News-Free Press of Sunday, should be eliminated from the American picture. We trust that Representative ESTES KEFAUVER may be able to interest official Washington in eliminating this agency from the mails.

These propaganda sheets, often handsomely illustrated brochures, boosting nazi-ism and carefully glossing over its brutishness and defiance of God, are received often in this office. For us, they only serve as inflammatory material to make us more eager to witness the end of Hitlerism; but to less determined people who have not studied both the psychology, the aims, and the methods of the fiend of Berlin they might easily plant seeds of doubt as to the justice of America's position.

County Commissioners of Blair County, Pa., Endorse Townsend Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF BLAIR, COUNTY, PA.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include therein the following resolution adopted April 9, 1941, by the Board of County Commissioners of Blair County, Pa.:

We, the undersigned members of the board of county commissioners, county of Blair, State of Pennsylvania, believe something must be done to provide adequate pensions for our deserving senior citizens, and, at our regular meeting have adopted this resolution:

"Whereas the members here assembled believe that a national uniform system of old-age pensions should be adopted throughout the United States of America; and

"Whereas the propcsals embraced in the Townsend bill (H. R. 1036) will greatly relieve, if not entirely abolish, unemployment, and will provide to the people the American standard of living; and

"Whereas the various States of the Union are finding it difficult to raise a sufficient revenue to finance the payment of adequate pensions to the aged; and

"Whereas that a universal tax be levied and moneys so raised shall be divided pro rata and paid to all citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 60 years and over: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United S'ates of America to consider the basic principles of the Townsend bill (H. R. 1036) now in committee; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That one copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of the following: The honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee; the Honorable JAMES J. DAVIS, Senator; the Honorable JOSEPH P. GUFFEY, Senator; the Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Congressman."

CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
HERBERT S. BOLGER,
D. S. BRUMBAUGH,
Commissioners.

The American Sugar Market Should Be Saved for the American Sugar Producers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Members of this Congress to a Sugar Division Agricultural Adjustment Administration regulation regarding sugar quotas, which will be found in the Federal Register of Tuesday, April 15, 1941, page 1919. The table shows the additional prorations in terms of pounds, raw value of sugar, which is additional raw sugar to be imported because of the inability of the Philippines to supply their 1941 market quotas. This deficit of 146,464,000 pounds of sugar, raw value, was allotted to various countries throughout the world, and in so doing the Department of Agriculture deprived the American beet- and cane-sugar producers of an increased acreage which should have been given to them in 1941. When you consider that

the Department of Agriculture allotted only an acreage of 114,000 for 1941 to the State of Colorado, as compared to 142,000 acres for 1940 and a 10-year average for Colorado of 145,000 acres, you begin to realize what this Administration intends to do for our beet industry.

Taking one county in Colorado—my own county, Larimer—we find the reduction in acreage for 1941 is 35 percent below the 20-year average and 28 percent below the 10-year average. The entire county district was allotted only 11,805 acres for 1941, while the Fort Collins district alone for 10 years has averaged 12,290 acres. The two factory districts in Larimer County have each planted annually more acreage than is now allotted under the 1941 contract for both of them.

Sugar production is one crop which is not produced in surplus quantities, as the limit of our production has been about 26 percent to 28 percent of our annual consumption. Just why the beet and cane growers should be penalized to assist foreign countries is a question the Congress should have answered by both the Agriculture and State Departments.

In past wars and national crises the farmer always has stood in the front rank in the support of his Government, not only in the production of food but also in the sacrifice of his sons. Who is able to say, under the present world conditions, that the price of sugar might not increase to the heights it reached in the past war, which in some instances was 33 cents per pound? Should this condition arise the laboring man and the average American family would have to pay the penalty for the mistakes in the direction of our agricultural policy. What is the use of voting large sums of money for parity payments and at the same time pursuing a policy of prohibiting farmers from producing sufficient acreage of nonsurplus crops to meet the demands of our own American markets?

Little excuse can be offered by Members of the Congress for the situation now existing in the sugar-beet and cane industry. Early in the session the Congress had an opportunity to pass legislation that would have relieved this situation; but no action was taken simply because certain departmental heads, and I call to your attention that they are not the duly elected representatives of the people, offered stiff opposition to the reallocation of the sugar from the Philippines. The situation is critical and we should act without delay to change the Sugar Act to permit unlimited production of beet and cane sugar during this world crisis.

I attach the table as issued on April 15 by the Acting Secretary of Agriculture:

Additional prorations (in terms of pounds, raw value)

Country:	
Argentina	42,207
Australia	590
Belgium	852,170
Brazil	3,466
British Malaya	75
Canada	1,633,662
China and Hongkong	834,236
Colombia	774
Costa Rica	59,640
Czechoslovakia	762,393
Dominican Republic	19,308,640
Dutch East Indies	612,063
Dutch West Indies	19
France	507
Germany	339
Guatemala	969,710
Haiti, Republic of	2,668,541
Honduras	9,939,029
Italy	5,070
Japan	11,608
Mexico	17,465,350
Netherlands	630,830
Nicaragua	29,595,003
Peru	32,180,972
Salvador	23,767,903
United Kingdom	1,015,360
Venezuela	839,703
Subtotal	143,199,860
Unallotted reserve	3,264,140
Total	146,464,000

The St. Lawrence Waterway and the American Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I note that Secretary Morgenthau has recommended the discontinuance of the C. C. C., the N. Y. A., and various other departments that he calls "nonessential for defense" in order that the Budget might be reduced $1,000,000,000.

Some time ago the United States and Canada entered into an agreement known as the St. Lawrence waterway treaty. This waterway, to my mind, will cost the United States Government $1,000,000,000, and certainly by the furthest stretch of the imagination would not come under the category of a defense project. Not only this, the United States by this agreement abandons its ancient contention that Lake Michigan is an American lake. This body of water has become forever, through this new agreement, an international body of water, which belongs to the St. Lawrence watershed instead of to the Mississippi watershed.

The construction of this waterway would, in my opinion, cost the Canadian Treasury only about $38,000,000. Most of the construction work will be done in Canada, which means that Canadian engineers, Canadian labor, and Canadian materials will be used. I would respectfully call the attention of the Members of Congress who are interested in Canadian sovereignty to article 5 of the St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty. This article protects Canadian sovereignty over all structures lying on the Canadian side, even though these structures have been built with United States money.

I would also call the attention of the Members of Congress to one of the articles of the St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty which states that all British shipping in all parts of the Empire shall have the right to navigate in the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence waterway for all time. This means that all British ships, as well as all Canadian ships, shall have access through the deepened water channels to the head of Lake Superior. The Great Lakes become the Mediterranean Sea of North America. The waterway will thus provide a direct route for the shipment of grain, flour, coal, and other commodities between interior Canada and Great Britain. We thus will have Windsor, Hamilton, Toronto, Kingston, Montreal, and Quebec on an invaluable imperial trade artery connection with the mother country and in direct competition with the United States.

I respectfully call the attention of the Members of Congress who are real and true friends of the American farmer to these facts.

The Farm, America's First Line of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS, OF TENNESSEE

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein an address delivered by me over the network of the Mutual Broadcasting Co., May 1, 1941, at the National Farm Youth Foundation, Dearborn Inn, Dearborn, Mich. The foundation was honoring the first-place awardees of area competition at the end of the National Farm Youth Foundation's first year of free scholarship in farm management and engineering. Classes included 10,000 young men between the ages of 18 and 25 from throughout the United States, living or working on American farms.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, Governor Van Waggoner, ladies and gentlemen, Theodore Roosevelt once stated that "No nation has ever achieved permanent greatness unless this greatness was based on the well-being of the great farmer class, the men who live on the soil; for it is upon their welfare, material and moral, that the welfare of the rest of the nation ultimately rests."

We are certainly living in an unsettled and constantly changing world today—a world in which science and industry are making great strides, even as our social and economic structure undergoes vast changes.

Underlying all science and development, however, is one basic work which always must and will be done. We are speaking of farming, which is the world's oldest occupation but its newest science. Since this country has more than $63,000,000,000 invested in 7,000,000 farms which produce an annual average estimated market value of $10,000,000,000, it can readily be seen why farming is our greatest industry.

It is frequently asked "To what extent do metropolitan centers depend on agriculture?" Those in the cities often look upon rural communities largely as places from which they receive food and materials and to which they can sell goods manufactured in cities. This is true to a great extent, but the farm population does more than this. During the 10-year period between 1920 and 1930 the farmer sent several billion dollars to the cities. For example, to settle estates as the result of the death of parents, farm people paid their city relatives $4,000,000,000. Farmers paid city dwellers $8,000,000,000 in interest on loans. Farmers who rented land paid $10,000,000,000 to persons in cities who owned the land. In many other ways the farmer has helped in no small way in building up and sustaining the economic life of this great country.

Enough for the industry of farming. How does this gigantic resource back of American democracy form our great line of defense?

During the present feverish struggle for supremacy of a group of nations over the rest of the democratic world and its way of living armies are crushing everything before them; staff officers are poring over plans for attack or strategic retreat; armament plants go on 24-hour schedules; those articles which we have considered essential to the enjoyment of life are relegated to the background only to have their places taken on the great assembly lines of our manufacturing plants by tanks, planes, shells, and guns. These are all extremely essential in waging a modern war; yet, food, and food alone is the basis for any defense. Without it, planes, guns, high explosive shells, and other instruments of destruction are useless, and, since farms supply our food needs, plowshares, not bombs, will eventually decide the issues.

Lack of food is taking its toll in many European countries. Nazi Germany is gradually finding that no nation or nationality can be successfully ruled whose stomachs are empty. We are constantly receiving reports indicating an undercurrent of unrest among the conquered, spurred to almost rebellion due to hunger and starvation.

In conquered Europe food is no longer an economic end, but a political means to subjugate and even annihilate nations. After conquering a country Hitler demands that all German soldiers be fed by the country in which they are stationed. He then proceeds to divest that country of its remaining food supply. A million pigs and 200,000 cattle were taken from occupied France. As a result, this country is in drastic straits. The great population shift from occupied to unoccupied France has forced her to strike out for food regardless of the consequences to others. The Swiss paper Volksrecht stated that 800,000 tons of wheat were removed to Germany. Germany rules its conquered peoples mercilessly by rationing their food supplies according to th degree of complacency with which these peoples accept their new masters. In Poland, where Hitler seems determined to wipe out every vestige of the Poland that was, famine stalks on every hand.

Mussolini learned in Africa that food was necessary for his armies. He reviewed many well-fed soldiers in Rome and bragged about his army; but when he sent it to Africa, loaded down with guns and ammunition, he learned again the great lesson often repeated in history, "No army is greater than its food supply." Much of the failure of the Italian effort in Africa was due to poor and inadequate food.

The ability to keep Spain from joining the Axis Powers has been predicated largely on the fact that Spain is poor and needs food supplies greatly. The knowledge that food and financial aid can be best obtained from America has kept Spain neutral.

Even Britain is having her food difficulties. Approximately 200,000,000 bushels of wheat is needed. At the beginning of the war only 12,000,000 acres were under cultivation. About 5,000,000 more will be cultivated by 1942.

Just this year (February) it was announced that a German-Belgian commission had negotiated with Russia for food supplies for conquered Belgium. In February Russia tried to exchange a million tons of grain for Norwegian aluminum. Germany interfered with this because they are determined to regulate all food supply for Europe, since it is finally upon this supply they must depend to assist in holding all they have conquered. In other words, there is a direct relationship between the economic and political problems of the world which must be taken into account in this mad race for the supremacy of democracy versus totalitarianism.

A nation with food is still the most powerful factor in the present conflict. Despite the credit which will be given to arms and munitions, and as has been said these are important, very important, yet the trump card in the game of war will be the food resources of the United States, providing this country realizes this advantage and bends every effort to organize rural America to the task of feeding the world.

The more acute the food problem becomes in Europe, the greater becomes the strategical strength of the United States. The food power of our Nation will be a greater factor in the final outcome of this world conflict than land, sea, or air power. The ultimate strength of any nation is its ability to deal advantageously with the victors in any conflict. America's future as a world power lies not only with its basic wealth that finds its origin in the soil to finance the materials of warfare, but its future lies in its ability to open its stores of food and again become the Nation to which the world turns for subsistence.

Strictly military forces are not sufficient alone to whip the world, but an agricultural structure can be built sufficiently powerful to dominate the policies of the world. Once again the real power of a nation depends upon its food plus wealth created from the land. But food is the basic element in any economy.

During the last World War America started equipping the farms too late for effective work. This will be repeated if a constructive program is not devised to make possible the development of an American agriculture sufficient to not only meet the great adjustments necessary in taking care of home consumption on such a basis that every American will receive the type of food necessary to his well-being but will develop a domestic market sufficient to meet the great demand made upon it now and in the future by Britain and those democracies who are striving to maintain the great democratic line of defense. If Hitler should win this war, and we certainly do not expect him to, he would also need the food supply of the New World.

Great attention, public interest, and anxiety has been focused on those industries which are making implements of war. Every effort has been expended in a retooling program sufficient to place us in a position which is necessary to help the democracies win in this struggle. Yet few of us realize that if we are to supply the food necessary for the defense of our ideals we have a job of tooling up for agricultural defense. This is essential just as it is for our industries to enlist the cooperation of their tool rooms and supplies before they are in a position to swing into full production.

Since the foods we need are of a nature best produced on the so-called family farm, it naturally becomes important that tools adaptable to general farming be made available as quickly as possible and in the greatest possible quantities. This cannot be accomplished unless everyone is acutely aware of the fact that practical plans must be made for our agricultural defense effort, just as plans have been made for our industrial defense effort.

Few are conscious of the fact that the real scarcity of production tools and materials has not yet occurred. There are two good reasons for this. The first is that industry has been busy tooling up, with the result that the real demand for materials has not yet been felt. The second reason is the fact that management in general does not realize the difficult material conditions they are about to face. When this is realized there will be a mad scramble for material.

The steel market is now feeling the impact of British buying, which was delayed until after the passage of the lease-lend bill. The pressure on the market for raw materials will be increasingly great unless priorities are established to enable the manufacturers of farm equipment to secure adequate steel and other raw materials, as well as perishable machine tools required to fabricate the equipment so sorely needed. Such action is necessary if the American farmer is to be put in a position to do his part in national defense.

During its lifetime, America has derived a majority of its leadership from men and women whose background is that of small towns and farms. They learned of the true values of life from the land—on the land. American clear thinking, soundness of judgment, and resourcefulness have come largely from persons who have grown up with those essentials at the very seat of fundamentals which is in the rural communities of this Nation.

The one outstanding difference between America and other nations of the world is the individualism found in this democracy. Vitality and initiative have marked America's forward progress. Those characteristics have stemmed from the land; from the rugged independence that has flowed from a rural background, and from an educational system which has encouraged those worth-while things in democratic life.

If our way of living is as important and essential to us as we say it is then we must continue all effort to stop the migration from the farm of those to whom we look to carry on our American ideals—American farm youth.

There are four fundamental factors which will assist in accomplishing this:

First. To so cut the cost of farm products that farming can be made prosperous without increasing the cost to the consumer.

Second. To make farming attractive to youth and so largely stop the drift from the land.

Third. To assist all industries through a prosperous agriculture and to stimulate greater industrial use of farm products by cutting costs, thus increasing the total farm market.

Fourth. To lay the foundation for a greater national security.

Our national economy must be a flexible one. Such flexibility can be attained by blending industry, agriculture, and transportation into smaller and more flexible units. To carry this out successfully smaller cities, villages, and rural communities must of necessity become the hubs of our national economy.

You ask, "What part can youth, particularly farm youth play in this movement?" Farm youth in the past has supplied the life blood to the great cities. The job now is to place these young people and the value they represent on family farms; in commercial businesses necessary to rural communities, and in industry made available to them in the heart of agricultural areas.

If this is done, and it can be done, we can accomplish—

1. A flexible national economy which will insure greater security for all.

2. Young people from farms—some of America's finest stock—will be able through

greater opportunity for constant employment, to marry and become heads of families, thereby perpetuating rural families which are the backbone of this Nation.

3. Ownership of land can be returned to active farmers as a result of definite steps taken toward proper training of prospective farm owners and the rendering of financial assistance to youth.

4. Between 1920 and 1930, $30,000,000,000 in value and money—approximately one-third of the gross farm income—went off the farm as a result of migration to the cities and the loss of farm ownership. A flexible economy will retain this wealth in future years in rural communities. As a result, rural America will find most of its ills rapidly disappearing. To accomplish this however it is necessary that farm youth find opportunity close to home.

5. Such a national economy will result in the management of rural affairs returning to local communities where they are best understood.

This is a big job but let us repeat it can be accomplished if a prompt and right start is made by—

First. Educating and training farm youth so that they are prepared to make good in the occupations they choose.

Second. Finding adequate vocational opportunity for these young people.

Third. Making available financial assistance through normal channels to purchase farm land and small businesses in rural communities.

Fourth. Encouraging manufacturing establishments to decentralize into smaller communities. Many men who were formerly from rural communities and are now keymen in great manufacturing institutions can be induced to give valuable assistance to the communities of their youth.

Fifth. Having freedom of farm and business enterprise that will bring a proper financial return to good managers.

Sixth. Encouraging a greater percentage of our population to live off the fruits of their own enterprise, instead of depending upon the enterprise and industry of others.

In the development of a program such as this suggested we must depend upon men who understand our country as a whole, while at the same time are familiar with local farming, industrial, and commercial conditions as well.

Our young farm men can accomplish these aims if they have the support of those older and more experienced than they. May we quote Mr. (Henry) Ford in announcing the establishment of the National Farm Youth Foundation. He said, I believe in mixing the old and the young. The generations should mingle. When I was a young man all my friends were older men. They had everything to teach me. There is a way for older men to be of help to younger; and when this becomes widespread we will have found more than a few bright boys—we will have discovered a bright up-and-coming generation."

This National Farm Youth Foundation, of which you young men present and the thousands listening in (if broadcast) are members, is the outgrowth of this philosophy and the feeling that the young farm men of this country are interested in remaining on the farm and that they will make good if but given a chance.

Industry and agriculture have joined hands to broaden the opportunity for farm youth.

Your foundation, established a year ago by the Ferguson-Sherman Manufacturing Corporation, with the active cooperation of Mr. Henry Ford and Mr. Edsel Ford, had as its objectives:

1. To give young men who plan to stay on the farm knowledge and training in what to grow, how to grow it profitably, how to conserve the resources of the soil, how to manage labor and machines, how to market farm products, and how to finance the entire operation. Such education to prepare these young men to become better farmers, more successful landowners, and better citizens.

2. To train young men who prefer to enter business for better service to the agricultural community. To help them prepare to become the merchants, bankers, public officials, and leaders of rural communities.

The sponsors hoped and believed that the foundation would fill a real need among the young of the farms, many of whom have been able to see little ahead except manual labor; that by taking full advantage of the foundation membership these young men would gain a new picture of the science and business of farming—a new vision of the opportunities that exist on the land; that the education, training, and experience offered would give them better preparation for farm ownership and for agricultural leadership; that by this opportunity they would be better able to prevent a break in the family circle; that no longer would they feel the need to seek opportunity in crowded industrial centers; instead, that they would help make the farm a still better place to live, a more attractive place to raise a family, and a place of greater opportunity for the future.

Let's now look at the record. Although only in its first year, 10,000 young farm men between the ages of 18 and 25 are active members of the Foundation. Within the first 9 months about 5,500 of these had successfully completed their educational training—over 100,000 examination papers were successfully completed. This represented approximately 550,000 hours of study.

Hundreds of your members have traveled from 25 to 200 miles per week to attend their classes. What has been their reaction? Let us quote from just a few of the letters received:

John H. Timken: "I have learned a great deal at our Foundation meetings. The lessons received are worth the time spent and the 68-mile trip."

Don Harrington, New York: "Believe me when I tell you this is the biggest thrill of my life."

Clyde Linder, Colorado: "With every lesson I feel more and more secure in looking at this business of farming as my future."

Earl Bowser, Ohio: "This program will keep a lot of young men on the farm who would have otherwise gone to the city. It has given me a lot of encouragement in the way of staying on the farm."

Charles Carson, Jr., Michigan: "I wish you knew how much this course means to me. It's really made a wonderful difference in my work in managing my father's farm."

Lloyd A. Engstrom, Nebraska: "In the past few years the industry of farming had become a drudgery to me. Things had been going downhill rapidly. My hopes of attaining success in life had almost vanished. But the sun has risen once more. Things have become brighter and more clear to me. It has renewed my courage, my hopes, and my strength to go forth in life and help my fellow men to make America a better place to live in."

Frank Graves, South Dakota: "All of us in our class, I believe, have been shown that farming can be profitable. Some of us believed that farming was profitable, but we were somewhat like a ship without a rudder—shifting to the right and left of our course. But now, we of the first class are about to go to work with a determination to get things done."

J. F. Boyd, Jr., Mississippi: "Being a member of the Foundation has convinced me that I will be much better off by staying on the land than many boys who are going to the big city."

You young men present have carried out your past year's work so successfully that you are being honored today for that achievement and have been awarded position with your sponsors and after additional training will return to your own communities to better serve the American farmer. Hundreds of others will eventually be placed in positions of responsibility as a result of their activities in the foundation. The greater number will remain on the farm better able to make a definite contribution to the development of American agriculture.

The thousands of young men enrolled this past year, and the thousands to be enrolled this year, will some day be the heads of farm families and history clearly indicates that the strength of American agriculture has been in the family. American agriculture will develop new family circles, new land ownerships, and most important, the ability to successfully manage and engineer the farm operation. The accomplishment of this will bring about eventual prosperity and a greater appreciation of the advantages of rural life.

The high morale of our Nation springs from long generations of men and women who have consistently battled the viscissitudes of nature to create the wealth of this Nation and its food and our young people are the Nation's greatest wealth and our great line of defense in perpetuating our worthwhile democratic way of life.

The Young People of America Are Most Concerned in the Fight to Preserve the American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Republican leader of the House and chairman of the Republican National Committee, before the annual convention of Connecticut Young Republicans at Waterbury, Conn., and broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System on Saturday, April 26, 1941:

It is a real pleasure to come to Connecticut and join in this enthusiastic conclave of Young Republicans. No one knows better than I the tremendous power of action inherent in the ranks of the thousands of earnest, eager, patriotic young men and women who are enlisted under the Republican banner.

Because I do appreciate the part the Young Republicans had in our labors of last fall, and because I realize what they can do next year, I have named a special committee to further organize and develop the Young Republican movement. You of Connecticut may well be proud that one of your own members, Samuel F. Pryor, Jr., vice chairman of the Republican National Committee, has been selected to head this drive. Out of the efforts of this committee, I am sure, will come a real fighting organization of Young Republicans which will have a very

important part in the Republican victory which is coming in 1942.

I cannot let this occasion pass without paying a tribute to a distinguished member of our party; one who is impressing the Nation with his outstanding ability as a debater; a man of keen judgment, who will battle fearlessly for any cause he believes to be right. I refer, of course, to Senator JOHN DANAHER.

One of the tragedies of the last campaign was the defeat of your brilliant Governor, Raymond E. Baldwin. I am glad—but not surprised—to learn he is courageously continuing the battle. The careful reconsideration of the good people of Connecticut undoubtedly will rectify the mistake of 1940 and return him to the Governorship in 1942.

These are dark days in the world. Many nations seem to have gone into an utterly mad carnival of war and destruction. Fighting, or preparations for fighting, occupy the attention of all peoples, except, perhaps, some of the so-called uncivilized tribes of Africa and the South Seas.

Peace—a word which once blessed most of the world—can no longer be spoken with assurance anywhere on the globe, as men rush to battle to kill each other, as the so-called civilized countries spend huge sums for insane and ghastly mass murder and destruction.

Our Nation stands on the very verge of this war. This world madness will surely bring, regardless of the final military result, a terrible economic disaster. Unless there is a powerful, vigilant, and fearless minority constantly on guard in this country of ours, we may lose our personal and political liberties here at home. Unless we are alert, we may see the end of constitutional government. We must be vigilant if we would preserve the two-party system. We must carefully watch each step that is being taken, lest there come an end of that balanced Government which has given America more freedom, more happiness, and more prosperity than has ever been attained by any other people on the face of the earth.

Now, let us make the issues clear. I am not here making charges against any particular individual or party. We are trying to face realistically and with sound American common sense fundamental facts which cannot be brushed aside by a gesture or rendered less dangerous by our trying to close our eyes to their menacing potentialities. We are here today dealing with conditions, not theories. We are considering principles, not personalities. We are scanning the signs of the times and policies of government, not the likes or dislikes, the preferences, or the prejudices of persons, mistaken though they might be in their choice of methods by which to perpetuate democracy in the world or in America. A grave danger faces the people of this country. I believe I would be doing less than my duty if I did not raise my voice to warn against it.

This danger, rampant in the world, menaces us along with the rest of the free men and women of the human family. War is a deadly poison which spreads by contagion. Its deadly effects, so far as free governments are concerned, ramify and operate through economic channels as terribly as through gun barrels or by blasting bombs. The cannon and the bomb bring sudden death, but the economic and social diseases which follow in the train of war's madness are lingering maladies which torture men and peoples to a slow and horrible death, with awful suffering along the way.

We must at all costs, young Republicans, save our American way of life. Yours is the greater stake in that issue. It can be done. I am confident it will be done. The American people are becoming aroused. The people are long-suffering and slow to act, but when the American people make up their mind and reach a conclusion, when they determine upon a course of action, theirs is the voice of final resistless power and authority. They will do the job.

No single group in America has a deeper or more vital interest in the preservation of the American way of life than have the young people. No single group can do more for the preservation of the American way of life than the millions of young Americans who want—and are entitled to—a chance to be educated; to get positions in which there is an opportunity to advance; a chance not only to live but to be happy while living; to enjoy the advantages and comforts of life; to contribute their share toward making this a better land to live in.

The great Republican Party—and the Republican Party is a great party—wants, it is eager, to enlist your aid in the continuance of the tremendous battle we have been waging and which we shall continue to wage until success is achieved—the battle to preserve the American way of life.

Our American way of life is based upon the most profound concepts of the Infinite of which man is capable. Fundamental truth, as we understand the word, underlies every idea embraced in that way of life which we call the American way. Therefore, if we have the will and the courage to persevere in this great cause we are justified in believing God will bless our efforts.

We attain the American way of government—and therefore of life—by political devices. Proposal, disagreement, discussion, compromise—those are the factors of our way of government. Power shifts from one party to the other; men succeed other men to posts of responsibility in administration, but the principles of the American way are fixed; they are stable; they are unvarying; we propose, we disagree, we discuss, and we compromise—always recognizing the individual's inalienable rights; always according a full measure of respect and consideration to the views and the rights of the minorities. So, then, in considering the preservation of the American way we must of necessity consider the political measures by which the American way is effectuated.

We made excellent political progress last year under very difficult conditions. We have improved our position in numerous elections held since last November. Twenty Republican State governments; more than 1,100 Republican county governments, and a substantial minority in Congress give us a firm foundation upon which to build for further success in 1942 and a great victory in 1944.

We have been hearing much of late about national unity. The American people want national unity. We Republicans in Congress will, of course, cooperate fully in support of measures which we believe will build a strong national defense and strengthen the security of the American people.

Complete national unity comes only through honest cooperation and fair dealing. It cannot be complete if one great group in our country is denied a part in arriving at the decisions and is asked merely to ratify decisions reached by a selected few. Unity is not possible so long as the dominant party insists upon taking full advantage of the Nation's emergency to strengthen its grip on the controls. Unity cannot be complete when favoritism is shown in the awarding of contracts; in the spending of the people's money; in giving any one group in our country special consideration over any other group; in pursuing a partisan spirit in appointments.

I repeat, we must have national unity if we are to emerge safely from our grave situation. Every man, woman, and child in the Nation must make sacrifices to this unity. Yet, in all candor, unity—complete unity—depends upon one man—that man is the President of the United States. He must, through words and deeds, inspire the people with confidence. In this grave hour he must not be the leader of a party. He must be the leader of his country. He must name men and women to direct our national defense because of their experience, ability, and standing in the Nation; not because they are loyal friends for whom he has an affection; not because they are New Dealers; not because their appointment will be of party advantage. The men and women to direct our defense efforts must be selected solely because of their fitness to do the particular job for which they are chosen. Any other course is a blow against our national security, and will make vastly more difficult the attainment of national unity.

Now let us consider for a moment the recent appointment of Harry Hopkins to the post of supersupervisor of the greatest spending program of all time—aid to Britain and her allies. In all sincerity I ask, "Is he the best-fitted man for this great post?" The Boston Post, a great independent Democratic newspaper, says:

"He comes to this job with none of the training commonly required for even a far less important position.

"He will regulate vast buying of war materials, yet he has never been either a purchasing agent or a soldier. He will allocate contracts for some of the mightiest war machines ever conceived by man, and he probably has not the faintest idea of their construction, their functions, or their eventual employment."

Thus comments a Democratic newspaper which would like to support the administration.

And let me quote an article by Frank Kent in a great independent Democratic newspaper, the Baltimore Sun. Said Mr. Kent:

"If his (the President's) purpose is to make Mr. Hopkins the real boss, then the situation is indeed frightening. No unprejudiced person can look at Mr. Hopkins—this has nothing to do with his health—and believe he measures up to the job. No informed man can review his record, either before 1932 or since, and consider him equipped by training, experience, ability, or physique for so huge a responsibility. It is not surprising that there should be widespread perturbation over the President's act. Here is a job which clearly calls for a strong, competent, experienced man. He has selected a weak, inexperienced, notoriously incompetent man, whose chief claim to fame is that as W. P. A. Administrator he wasted more money than any other public official in history, and permitted an agency for the relief of human misery to become saturated with politics to the point of a national scandal. Mr. Roosevelt has said the first thing is to win this war, and the idea of the lease-lend bill was to do exactly that. It is not an unfair statement to say that it would occur to few besides the President that Mr. Hopkins is the kind of man with whom to win a war."

The other day a department official visited one of our Army camps. He went to suggest certain work to be done. An Army officer said he could name several persons competent to do the work. The official said this was not necessary; he put his hand in his pocket and brought out a list of persons whom he said must be hired. That is political job grabbing at its worst; it will be bitterly resented by the American people.

All groups are expected to pay the taxes for defense; all groups are required to send men into the draft; all groups are expected to fight and, if necessary, to die for the country. All groups should have an equal chance for work, and not have the selections made by one or two politicians, who will choose only their own personal friends or supporters.

This sort of incident is not helpful to creating the unity and morale we need. My object in pointing this out is for corrective

purposes. We must clear the national defense of the political job grabbers.

I know it may sound old-fashioned these days to talk about the need of efficiency and economy in government. But it won't be old-fashioned to mention those matters much longer. Necessity will force drastic economies in some of our peacetime activities. The defense efforts will require vast sums. The Nation will be hard pressed, beyond our present conceptions, to carry the burden. Heavy taxes will be imposed which will shock the people; and they will, after a while, insist upon rigid economy in both our peace- and wartime expenditures.

The administration has failed to give us any leadership in reducing the expenditures of the huge political bureaucracy in Washington and scattered over the whole United States. Only when the people who pay the bills insist that we must have real economy can we expect it from the present administration—if then. We have in the last 8 years lost sight of the value of money. We talk of billion-dollar expenditures as glibly as formerly we talked of thousands.

Have you ever stopped to think just how much money a billion dollars really is? No human can comprehend it! Here's an illustration:

If one of you young persons began to count dollar bills at the rate of 100 bills a minute, and kept at it 8 hours a day, 5 days a week, with no vacation and only 5 holidays, how long would it take you to count—simply to count—a billion dollars? It would take you more than 80 years, if you didn't lay off a day of sickness, took no vacations, and only five holidays a year—provided you lived that long.

When the appropriations and authorizations already granted Mr. Roosevelt to spend have been spent, the national debt will have been increased by more than $50,000,000,000 since he assumed the Presidency. At the rate I have just outlined, if a man had started counting dollar bills about the time the great pyramids of Egypt were being built and had counted until now, he would just be finishing up the counting of $50,000,000,000. But words become futile. We become dazed by the magnitude of these figures.

The time is not far off, my young friends, when this Nation will become much more conscious of the spending than it has been in the past. The next tax bill will attend to that. We must begin to think of how, where, and when we can save in peacetime spending if we are to complete our defense preparations and still avoid national bankruptcy, economic chaos, and the wreckage of our governmental, political, and social systems.

In addition to preparing for war, we must plan for the aftermath of the war, which may well be far more terrible than the war itself. The Republicans in Congress are preparing a program which we hope to present to cushion the shocks of the post-war period.

As we face these trying days, I do not despair. We know well the pitfalls and perils ahead. But we will win out. I have supreme faith in the hopes, the ambitions, the sound sense of the common people of America.

You can trust the people of America to do the right thing. They will not be deceived by "fifth columnists" or the propagandists of alien doctrines. They will rally to sound, sane government. We will survive and emerge a more robust and more powerful America.

In all this travail, America will find her soul. A new America will come forth; an America whose people will be stronger of character, more self-reliant, a people more eager to work and to build, a more courageous people who, like their forefathers, will overcome all obstacles and bring to pass finer and better conditions.

My young friends, out of these grim, dark days comes a real challenge to you whose ambitions and hopes lie before you. Rally under the flag of the party of Abraham Lincoln to meet the perils of this grave hour. Once before the Republican Party was given the task of preserving a united country. We will do the job again.

We will rescue America from its perils. We will save constitutional government. We will preserve private enterprise and opportunity for all. We will give every group of our people equal rights and equal justice.

We will bring America back to financial solvency and a new birth of political freedom. No party could be entrusted with a greater responsibility or be given a greater opportunity for service than will ours in the next few years.

America challenges us. Let us meet that challenge with courage and patriotism.

Aspects of the International Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

EXPRESSIONS FROM CITIZENS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON REGARDING ASPECTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

WHAT ARE WE FIGHTING FOR? WHY SHOULD WE ENGAGE IN ACTS OF WAR IF WE ARE FIGHTING FOR PEACE? IF OVER 80 PERCENT OF THE PEOPLE OF AMERICA OPPOSE GOING TO WAR, WHY DO DIPLOMATS AND INTERNATIONALISTS TRY TO PROVIDE PROVOCATION FOR WAR? LET US CURE OUR OWN ILLS BEFORE ATTEMPTING TO DIAGNOSE THE ILLS OF OTHERS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, my offices are in receipt of hundreds of provocative, intelligent, and scholarly letters from constituents within the State of Washington who expatiate their unalterable hatred of war in the strongest language and their indignation at the prospect of being involved.

These thoughtful folks set forth their views relative to the critical international situation and express their opinion as to the steps which they believe should be taken by their beloved country to keep out of war and to keep our ship of state on the level keel of the future. Overwhelming are the arguments against employment of the United States Navy as convoys. The plain citizens of the United States do not want to convoy because they fear it will furnish an excuse to warmongers and their camp followers to engage in wars in Europe and the Orient.

The letters speak for themselves.

ROOSEVELT HIGH SCHOOL,
Seattle, Wash., April 22, 1941.

Representative JOHN M. COFFEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE COFFEE: You have my every encouragement to vote against making America the arsenal or the larder of democracy. I believe that it should be our policy in national affairs to make America the home of democracy. That is America's destiny.

This is practically a quotation from Robert M. Hutchins' speech made over the Mutual Broadcasting System, March 30, 1941; however, it expresses my thoughts better than I can put them myself. Seldom do I write to my Representative, but I will write letters all year if I can prevent our trying to save the world for democracy again.

As Hutchins said, "What are we fighting for?" We certainly do not want to preserve the British Empire. They wouldn't even settle for air bases until we gave them 50 destroyers. Further, I don't believe we can push down the world's throat the four principles of freedom, which our President said we should give to the world. If we fight to give freedom of press, freedom from fear, freedom from want, freedom of worship to others, we become dictators by so doing.

If we had perfected our form of government to the point that we could show the people of the world what freedom really means, we wouldn't have had 12,000,000 unemployed during the depression. Neither would we be proud of the fact that 250,000 babies had been born last year without medical care. How about the sharecroppers in the South, and the poor, starved coal miners in Harlan County, Ky.? If our President really is a democrat, can't he and his advisers find some way to bring back prosperity besides priming the pump, or as he seems to be doing now, arming to the teeth?

If we are going to continue a democracy, it looks to me that we had better start now and make this the home of democracy.

My family have been here in this country since 1776. We fought the British then so that we might have these freedoms of which the President speaks. I still think we have a long way to go in bringing them into actual existence. God bless you, and give you the strength to keep your powder dry until you see the white of their eyes. Let's make it the home of democracy now. That is what I am teaching the kids here.

Very sincerely yours,

SAM N. GLASS.

MARITIME FEDERATION OF THE PACIFIC,
Seattle, Wash., April 15, 1941.

Congressman JOHN M. COFFEE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please be advised that Washington District Council No. 1 of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific, representing 15,000 members of maritime and fishing unions in the Pacific Northwest, is seriously concerned over the contemplated elimination of intercoastal shipping. We have been informed that one of the first steps to be taken in the aid-to-Britain program resulting from passage of H. R. 1776 is to be sale of all intercoastal ships to Britain and other belligerents.

There are some 113 ships regularly engaged in carrying freight between the east and west coasts of the United States; over 7,000,000 tons being transferred yearly by water carriers. Were this to be done, it would be disastrous to business and the general public welfare, particularly on the Pacific coast. It would mean a serious dislocation of commerce and business. Thousands of seamen would be thrown out of work. Earnings of thousands of longshoremen and other water-front workers would be drastically reduced.

In addition, it would mean a rise in prices of a good many commodities. At the present time, most bulk freight is carried by water between the two coasts; this includes practically all lumber and lumber products, grain, flour, steel products, etc. The railroads would be able to move this freight, but their rates would be considerably higher.

We cannot feel that this sacrifice, with the economic and commercial dislocation which would result therefrom, is worth while. We are dubious, first, that "all-out aid to Britain" would in any manner whatsoever aid democracy; and, second, that Great Britain needs these ships in order to carry out her war. Lloyds of London, a world authority on shipping, in their recent report stated that Great Britain at the beginning of the war owned and controlled 8,977 ships, with a tonnage of

21,001,925 tons. In addition, when Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and France were absorbed by the Axis, Great Britain secured from these countries additional tonnage amounting to 12,320,685 tons, which make a total of 33,320,000 tons. This does not include the millions of tons Great Britain herself has built since the war began, nor does it include the million tons she has received from the United States.

Further, we are fully aware that by no means all of this tonnage is being used to carry on the war. Much of it Britain is using for regular business and the carrying on of strictly commercial and money-making shipping; it is being used in direct competition with American shipowners and taking the jobs of American seamen.

Despite this President Roosevelt sought and received an appropriation of $7,000,000,000 for national defense, $629,000,000 of which is to be used for buying or building ships, vessels, boats, water craft, supplies, materials, spare parts, and accessories to Britain. In addition to this tremendous tax burden we now face the prospect of losing all our intercoastal ships, which would have the serious aforementioned results.

Under this program we are depleting our merchant fleet to such an extent that we cannot transport raw materials needed in our own commerce and national-defense program, while at the same time British shipowners and financial interests are extending their control over the world's trade routes. Such a program means the bread and butter of a good many thousand maritime workers.

In view of the recent activities of the Army and Navy Departments, we are also seriously disturbed over the obvious plans of the Army and Navy to transport enormous numbers of troops outside the United States. The Associated Press on March 11 reported that the Government is gathering "a vast transport fleet that in a national emergency could move more than 250,000 soldiers at one time to any point in the Western Hemisphere or beyond," and stated that the Government had at that date already acquired passenger ships totaling 270,000 tons with a capacity for 75,000 men.

In the light of these events, are we still to naively believe that the lend-lease bill is not a war measure, that American soldiers will not be sent outside of the United States to fight in a foreign war, and that American ships will not be used as convoys to deliver the huge ship and war orders to Britain?

We are told that we must give "all-out aid to Britain" for the cause of democracy. We see no semblance of democracy in Great Britain nor in the countries she controls, where hundreds of millions of inhabitants live in virtual servitude. Neither do we see any semblance of democracy in the moves which have been consummated by our own administration during the past few months. We find the pages of the daily press replete with threats by industrialists and high governmental spokesmen threatening to break strikes, force governmental mediation, emasculate our trade unions, destroy our civil rights.

We want to build and maintain our democracy, not become a pawn in the imperialist war of power politics of Europe.

Since the war emergency arose, labor and industry have been asked to sacrifice alike for the cause of national defense, and what do we find? Statistics show that profits of United States Steel leaped from a $7,000,000 deficit in 1938 to a $102,000,000 profit in 1940. General Motors jumped profits from $102,000,000 in 1938 to $195,000,000 in 1940. Profits of Bell Aircraft increased by 3,000 percent in 1940 over 1939. Bethlehem Steel increased 97 percent; Douglas Aircraft, 275 percent; General Cable, 235 percent; General Steel Casting, 19,560 percent; Vultee Aircraft, 1,370 percent, and so on down through practically every industry. Yet we are told, in the face of these figures, that there is to be no profiteering during this war.

We have not forgotten that in the last World War 17,000 brand new millionaires were created as a measure of their sacrifice, together with several billionaires.

We see Members of Congress repeatedly giving lip service to the needs of the American Merchant Marine as a means of securing higher profits for money-making shipbuilders and operators. As the shipbuilding industry reaches boom heights reminiscent of World War I, the American public is treated to the spectacle of congressional floor leaders pleading for still higher terms.

Are we to accept without question or protest these huge profits on the part of industry and the close collusion of the United States Maritime Commission with the shipping interests to promote higher profits as the measure of sacrifice on the part of industry?

It is ironical when compared to what is and will in the future be expected of labor in the way of "sacrifice." For the past few months labor has been continuously attacked and slandered, both in the legislative bodies in Washington and the several State legislatures. Labor has been requested to work longer hours; refrain from striking, regardless of what conditions prevail. The very fundamentals of organized labor have been attacked—the right to collective bargaining and the hiring hall. Various attempts have been made to place the men who sail our ships under the jurisdiction of shipping commissioners, which would destroy our organizations.

We see the Department of Justice attacking union leaders, as exemplified by the persecution of Harry Bridges. We find every militant action by organized labor in an attempt to protect the living standards of the workers branded and condemned as "sabotage." There is a revival of the time-worn criminal syndicalism laws, resurrected from the musty archives of various State legislatures. There is a Nation-wide persecution of all minority parties which are opposed to the administration program.

During the past years we have seen the same events which are now taking place here, as outlined above, happening in Germany and France. We witnessed labor's rights curtailed, dictator control established, opposition parties and movements destroyed, civil liberties abandoned, and the living standards of the people broken down by excessive taxation. Such is not democracy; it is the very foundation of fascism, and we are opposed to it.

When billions of dollars are appropriated, not as a gift to foreign nations but for the welfare of the American people, and when the efforts of the administration are directed toward bettering the living conditions and the future of the American people, then we shall have true democracy. We shall have and enjoy true democracy when the democratic rights of the people are upheld by our representatives in Congress. They include the right to strike, bargain collectively, hiring halls, the right to freedom of press and speech, and the protection of civil liberties. These are the rights guaranteed to the American people under the Bill of Rights; they are the essence of democracy, and we shall fight to preserve them.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH HARRIS, *President.*

TACOMA, WASH., *April 28, 1941.*

JOHN M. COFFEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COFFEE: I am now 20 years old, the same age at which my mother was hearing of a war in Europe and thinking of it as vague and far away; was seeing her childhood friends marching off to war, unable to believe that some of them would not return. Then came the time of waiting, reading, wondering.

Now here am I hearing of a war in Europe whose great disasters do not seem so vague. My friends are not marching off to war as yet, but they are looking forward with distaste to a year's training in the Army. However, most of them would not be fearing it so much if there were not the thought of war in the near offing.

I don't proclaim to know how to solve this problem, but I do know—and so do my many friends—that we don't want war.

I have just finished 2 years of college. I am now working on a small but progressive community paper. I have studied journalism and want a chance to go far in this field. I and my folks have made many dream plans for my future. Just now America has obtained a high standard of living which is within the reach of most of its citizens. In school I learned how to make a budget, how to buy a house on the F. H. A. plan, and to look forward to a happy life. I thought my only battle was going to be one of matching wits—not guns.

All of my friends and myself are puzzled—at a loss. We don't want war. Even if the Axis Powers win and change our economic system some, we girls don't want a period of waiting at home, wondering whether our boy friends, brothers, sweethearts, or husbands are going to come back to us.

The boys don't want to suffer through the miseries of another war, and then through the great depression that would probably follow.

Boys that are in college now have planned their courses to help them in following the career in which they are interested. Now they are afraid to plan.

We are hearing of what our President is doing. We object to our country's heads going ahead and involving us deeper and deeper into the war. So many things are being kept from us. It doesn't seem just to us that we should not be asked for our opinion, yet how can we give it?

Some have said, "Write to your Congressman," so I am writing to you. This is my plea to you, to Congress, to the President of the United States—remember our future, we who will fight and wait, remember that we don't want war.

Sincerely yours,

ROSALIE SIEGLER.

A Plea For Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith insert a statement as follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Last fall when you were campaigning for reelection you stated in Philadelphia on October 23, 1940:

"To every man, woman, and child in the Nation I say this—your President and your Secretary of State are following the road to peace. We are arming ourselves not for any foreign war. We are arming ourselves not for any purpose of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes. I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party: 'We will not participate in foreign wars and will not send our Army, Naval, or air forces to fight in

foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack'."

Mr. President, you are now sending our ships into the danger zone that you established under the Neutrality Act. Why do you do so? Germany said she would sink any vessels in the danger zone; and if she does and they are the United States vessels, you will claim we are attacked and then you will be responsible for us getting into war. Do not do it, Mr. President, for the sake of America and the American people. Mr. President, the American people want no European war We want peace. We sent the boys across the ocean once to make the world safe for democracy. What a miserable failure it has proven to be. "Do not do it again," is the plea of the great mass of American people. To get into a European or Asiatic war will not bring anything but misery and poverty. Use our good offices to settle the war by peaceful means; that is the only way for us to act, and we must do it now.

Peace by arbitration, peace by acting under the Golden Rule. Let us preserve our form of government and our freedom.

Resolution Opposing Involvement of the United States in Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OSCAR YOUNGDAHL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE MINNESOTA CONFERENCE OF THE AUGUSTANA SYNOD

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution by the Minnesota Conference of the Augustana Synod at its eighty-third annual convention held in Gloria Dei Church of St. Paul, Minn., consisting of Lutheran pastors and laymen, representing a constituency of approximately one hundred thousand members, as follows:

1. We, in these days of stress and strife, are more than ever thankful to God for America, its free institutions, its form of government, and the American way of life.

2. We endorse the remarks and observations of Dr. Emil Swenson, the president of the conference, as contained in his report, relating to the present international situation.

3. We pledge all of our energies, talents, and resources to the preservation and defense of our country and its democratic form of government.

4. We are opposed to the United States of America becoming involved as a belligerent in the wars of Europe.

5. We are opposed to this country sending its Navy, its Army, or any of its defense forces to foreign seas or shores to take part in the present war.

6. We call upon and expect our chosen leaders and representatives to keep their solemn pledges to not send our American boys to fight on foreign soil.

7. We commend those courageous men in Congress who have opposed the involvement of this country in foreign wars, and at the same time urge them to advocate and support all measures which will tend to conserve and husband our national resources for such use as may be necessary for the full, complete, and adequate defense of our country in case we are attacked.

8. That copies of this resolution be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Governor of the State of Minnesota, to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Minnesota, Wisconsin, North Dakota, and South Dakota, and to the press.

9. That we pray to God for peace.

Unwise Antifirearms Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

LETTER FROM THE NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from the National Rifle Association of America:

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., April 30, 1941.

The Honorable EDWIN A. HALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: One of your constituents, Mr. Lawrence Briggs, has forwarded us a copy of your Washington News letter dated March 31, and a copy of your radio speech of Tuesday, April 1, concerning unwise antifirearms legislation.

May I take this opportunity to express the appreciation of the quarter of a million organized rifle and pistol target shooters of the United States for your outspoken support of their viewpoint in this matter?

I believe you will be interested to know that we have received information from a reliable, conservative source close to one of the groups which has been agitating for registration of all firearms, to the effect that an attempt may be made to include such a registration provision as a rider on one of the urgent deficiency appropriation bills which Congress is passing without too minute examination of details in connection with the national-defense program. Because such an attempt at new legislation in connection with an appropriation bill could be thrown out on a point of order if caught by any Member of the House, the thought occurs to me that an attempt might be made to incorporate such Federal registration of firearms in the pending tax bill.

Fortunately, the House Ways and Means Committee has on several occasions in the past granted extensive hearings on such proposals and has rejected them. It is possible that Mr. DOUGHTON'S committee might for that reason refuse to consider a tax for the registration of firearms in connection with the new tax bill. However, in view of the source from which our information was obtained, we believe it is important to closely examine all new tax bills and appropriation bills which may come before the present session of the Congress. Consequently we are passing this information along to you for whatever it may be worth. Our previous experience with the proponents of this type of legislation has indicated clearly that they are not averse to stooping to sharp methods in an effort to put their ideas across.

Again thanking you for your active interest in this important matter, I am

Cordially,

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION,
C. B. LISTER, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

Certain Government Departments Should Be Removed From Overcrowded Washington to More Centrally Located Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY TIMES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under the permission obtained to extend my remarks, I insert a timely editorial appearing in the Chicago Daily Times of April 28, which relates to the subject matter of a short speech I made this afternoon on the unfortunate overcrowded condition of hotels, restaurants, and housing in Washington. The article more fully explains the need of relief to congested Washington by removal of certain departments of the Government to the more centrally located cities of the country, and sets forth the advantages that the city of Chicago offers in this connection to the Government and to the public.

No one can dispute that Chicago, being centrally located as it is, would be most economical for the departments, and a better place for Government employees to work and live in.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Times of April 28, 1941]

BACK TO THE FARMS

The imposing Department of Agriculture Building in Washington is one of the biggest office buildings in the world. Its many acres of floor space are divided into 4,500 office bays. And in spite of the size of its main building, the Department of Agriculture sprawls over 25 others in Washington.

When Washington was chosen as the Nation's Capital the United States was a thin line strung from Maine to Georgia along the Atlantic seaboard. Washington was ideally located, about midway between Portsmouth, N. H., and Savannah, Ga.

There is no purpose to be served in reviewing the way the Nation spread until the Capital finally came to be at one of the country's extremes rather than its center. Nor do we suggest that the Capital be removed to some interior point. Both tradition and investment firmly anchor the seat of government on the banks of the Potomac.

But Washington is terribly overcrowded. Plans are now being made to build five or six additional Government buildings. A chronic housing shortage plagues Government workers and others who live in the District of

Columbia. The city is sprawling into Virginia and Maryland. Rents are sky high and real-estate values towering dizzily.

There is no end in sight. The prospects of war, our actual involvement, if we do get in, and the post-war era of readjustment all will add to the complications of Government and to the size and number of Government agencies. And 10 years is the least time anyone could prophesy for this war-induced growth.

We don't see why it is necessary to concentrate all of the major functions of the Federal Government in one spot remote from a majority of the American people. We don't see why it isn't entirely feasible to distribute, far more widely than is now done, certain departments, bureaus, and agencies which could operate satisfactorily outside Washington.

For a starter we suggest that the Department of Agriculture, or at least a good part of it, ought to be located right here in Chicago. In fact, we've got a site for a Department of Agriculture building all picked out—just west of the post-office building on the new Congress Street superboulevard. We'd even like to have that only the start of a Government plaza extending west from the postoffice. There are other Federal agencies which could be located on Congress Street. And a new State office building could go up in the same row.

CHICAGO IS CENTER OF FARM LIFE

From the national standpoint, certainly the farmers of the whole country would be a lot closer to that department of government most affecting them if Agriculture were here rather than in Washington. Chicago is concededly the greatest farm market center in the world. Isn't it logical to have the Government agency dealing with farmers and farm products located here too?

This isn't the only department which might well be located here. Why not have the Department of the Interior somewhere in the interior of the Nation?

Then there are such agencies, just to name a few, as the Civil Aeronautics Authority, the Bituminous Coal Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Social Security Board (already half in Baltimore), the Bureau of Mines, the Inland Waterways Commission, Office of Indian Affairs, National Mediation Board—for railway labor problems—and the Veterans' Administration. There are a good many reasons why they might well be located in Chicago, near the Nation's center.

Of course, it probably would be necessary for the top policy-making executives to remain in Washington. But it would be simple for them to commute by plane or train between Washington and Chicago when necessary. And it would be cheaper to build Government buildings here and cheaper for Government employees to live here.

Jefferson's Ideals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OSCAR YOUNGDAHL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MINNEAPOLIS TIMES-TRIBUNE

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Times-Tribune of April 28, 1941:

[From the Minneapolis Times-Tribune of April 28, 1941]

JEFFERSON'S IDEALS

Congress paid appropriate attention to the birthday of Thomas Jefferson a few days ago. The House paused to hear Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi read the first Jefferson inaugural address, delivered in 1801. Jefferson, revered as the founder of the Democratic Party, was truly a great apostle of democracy with a small "d," and in this brief address he commended its principles to the people of the infant nation.

Jefferson did not call it democracy. He expounded "federal and republican principles," but he gave us on that far-off day one of the best expositions of democracy ever heard or read. Some honest men, he said, fear that a republican government cannot be strong. He challenged their fears.

"I believe this, on the contrary, the strongest Government on earth," said the third President on that March day 140 years ago. "I believe it is the only one where every man, at the call of the laws, would fly to the standard of the law, and would meet invasions of the public order as his own personal concern. Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the form of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question."

Jefferson set forth then his ideals of government, ideals still worth striving for if never perfectly attained. They corresponded in the main to the "freedoms" found in the Bill of Rights, and found their climax in these words: "A wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, which shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government, and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities."

The words of Jefferson were well worth the attention of Congress, far more profitable than nine-tenths of the current speeches dealing with the specific problems of today.

Plasterers' Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

LETTER FROM CONSTITUENT

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter sent me by a constituent with regard to wages paid plasterers:

APRIL 10, 1941.

Hon. LELAND M. FORD,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LEE: In my letter to you dated April 4 I stated that on defense subjects at San Diego, on Saturday time and a half was paid on time and a half. The contractor who gave me that information was in town this week and advises me that he is not paying time and a half on time and a half. He is paying on a 9-hour work day regular time for 6 hours and time and a half for the additional 3 hours, and on Saturday he is paying time and a half, as all Saturday time is rated overtime. The result is that for plasterers with a base rate of $1.50 an hour, 5 days a week, the daily wage is $15.75, and on Saturday it is $20.25.

Our soldiers in uniform are going to be indignant at the exempted boys receiving almost as much a day as the men in uniform receive a month. I hope that you and your associates will probe this situation fully.

Pope Pius XII Plea for Prayers for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUDOLPH G. TENEROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

Mr. TENEROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, on April 25 there appeared in the Washington Post an appeal by the Pope of Rome for prayers for peace. He has asked the world to set aside the month of May as a month dedicated to peace so that tranquility may soon be restored to a war-torn world. I would like to ask permission that his letter be embodied as part of my remarks:

VATICAN CITY, April 24.—While we are fully confident that the faithful and especially children under guidance of their parents, will be mindful of our invitation of last year and will gather before the altar of the Most Blessed Virgin, the Mother of God, during the coming month of May to invoke peace for anguished and afflicted humanity, we desire nevertheless through the medium of this letter addressed to all.

As the bitterness of war increasingly distresses and crushes the hearts of men, and as dangers of every sort, threatening so many nations become more appalling, we confidently express the wish that the faithful raise minds and hearts in prayer to heaven whence alone, in the midst of such profound mental perplexity and material disorder, can come hope of better days

If our prayers and aspirations have not as yet had the result which we ardently desired, our trust in God must not be lessened on this account, but we must all continue with constant and perservering devotion to be "patient in tribulation, instant in prayer" (Romans 12:12).

Expiation and charity—the signs of God are hidden from us but we are certain, although innumerable and grave offenses call down avenging justice of heaven, the Lord nevertheless is "father of mercies and God of all comfort" (II Corinthian 1 : 3), and we know His love and benevolence for us is boundless.

But there is still another motive for our trust and hope for we have at the throne of Almighty God the most amiable Mother of God and our mother who, through her all-powerful intercession, can certainly obtain for us all the favors she asks of Him.

Let us then place ourselves and our problems under her protection that she may make our prayers and aspirations her own and enhance the value of works of expiation and charity which we must offer in a generous nature to satisfy the Divine Majesty.

May she dry all our tears, strengthen us in all our sufferings, console us in all our sor-

rows and, in lightening these afflictions, enable us with hope of eternal reward to bear them more easily.

If in calling to mind our sinfulness, we feel ourselves unworthy of her maternal affection, let us lead our children in ever increasing numbers to her sacred shrine, especially during the month of May, that they may plead our cause—those little ones with innocent souls and lips unstained, who in their limpid eyes, seem to mirror and reflect something of the splendor of heaven.

United with us in prayer, let them petition that wherever covetous greed now holds sway, there the reign of love may soon prevail; that where now the spirit of reprisal persists, forgiveness may be exercised; that for discord among men there may be substituted loving harmony which reconciles and unites them; and, finally, that where now deep enmities are aroused, unhappily provoking widespread disorder, there may be effected new ties of friendship which will calm the hearts of men and bring to the universe tranquility of an order founded on justice.

Comfort for suffering—let these little ones implore of the most amiable Mother of God heavenly comforts for all those who are suffering and particularly for refugees, exiles, and prisoners, and for wounded in hospitals; let them ask of her perseveringly with their innocent voices that the duration of this awful misfortune be brief so that after having "rightfully suffered for our sins we may at least be relieved by comfort of divine grace"—Roman breviary for fourth Sunday in Lent—and that therefore there may soon return to earth resplendent rays of universal, substantial, and lasting peace which, in order to conform to the inviolate demands of justice and charity, will not conceal germs of discord and rancor, nor embody causes of future wars, but which, by effecting a fraternal, harmonious union of nations bound together in friendship and by helping all peoples to enjoy the fruits of their labor in tranquil freedom, will accompany and lead them with hope and confidence along the paths of their earthly pilgrimage toward the heavenly fatherland.

Meanwhile, we charge you, our beloved son, to make our wishes and exhortation known to all in the manner you deem most opportune, and first of all, to sacred pastors who will certainly wish to bring them to the attention of the flocks entrusted to their care.

In pledge of divine grace, and in testimony of our benevolence, we must cordially impart apostolic benediction to you, our beloved sons, and to all those, especially children who will receive this, our exhortation, with ready and spontaneous devotion.

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the National Catholic Welfare Conference issued the following statement following a series of meetings held here in Washington by their board, comprised of 10 archbishops and bishops of the Catholic Church:

The will of America today is set on peace, not war, as the aim of our defense program. The strongest defense weapon with which we can equip the American soldier is a clear vision of the kind of peace that constitutes our ideal. An august voice has sounded again and again in an America still at peace, as well as in a Europe already at war, applying to the conditions of our day the Gospel message of peace on earth to men of good will.

It is significant indeed that the authoritative spokesman for widely divergent Christian groups in a great nation now at war has publicly accepted these five points as basic principles for a just peace and commended them to the consideration of their government. (The five-point peace program as outlined by Pope Pius XII.) This action is an inspiration to all who have the cause of true Christian peace at heart. Those who so lightly dismiss high-minded statements of principle as hopelessly idealistic in what they would call a world of hard facts, can find no comfort in the pronouncements of the Pope. But those who long for a world in which men and nations can, if they will, open their hearts to Christian truth, and mold their lives on the Christian principle find heartening support in his brave words. That, he and his predecessors have repeatedly said, is a spiritual bulwark of national defense for every people that loves peace and true freedom.

No armament for national defense for peace can be strong which lacks the spiritual armory of prayer for peace. Even though the news of the day seems to offer little prospect of an early peace which will be just according to Christian or even humanitarian standards, we know that "the hand of the Lord is not shortened that it cannot save, neither is His ear heavy that it cannot hear" (Isaiah lix). In the spirit of Christian brotherhood, therefore, we shall pray, first of all, for the victims of cruel war in all lands. In the same spirit, too, we shall pray for an early peace; we shall pray for a world-wide peace; we shall pray for a peace not based on the oppression or the destruction of peoples but for a peace which will guarantee the rights and the honor of all nations and satisfy their vital needs. And in our prayers we shall not forget fervently to beg God to guide and strengthen our President, our Congress, and all our civil authorities in the overwhelming responsibilities of this tragic hour.

Mr. Speaker, the National Catholic Conference referred in their communication to the five-point peace program as given to the world by Pope Pius XII on Christmas 1939 and which has since been the topic of universal discussion. For this reason we believe it well to repeat the recommendations given in his message:

Amidst the strife and tumult of varied world happenings, imperturbability of spirit is that real joy which resides in the power to withstand the storm through trust in God. We unite with Christ, principle, and fount of every grief and joy.

Where others lose themselves, where the waters of affliction and desperation submerge souls in cruelty, those who trust in Christ can do everything and, in harmony with order and the justification and magnificence of God, rise above the disorders and storms of the world with equal courage and order.

The indescribable disaster of war, which Pope Pius XI, with profound and extreme regret, foresaw and with the indomitable energy of his noble and most high spirit wished by all means to avert, has broken out and is now a tragic reality.

Before this tremendous war, an immense bitterness overcame our souls, sad and troubled that this holy feast of Christmas, this feast of the Prince of Peace, must be celebrated to the funeral roar of cannon and under terror of flying war missiles, in the midst of menaces and dangers of armied navies.

It seems that the world has forgotten Christ's message of peace—the voice of reason. We of the Christian brotherhood have been obliged to see a series of irreconcilable acts, irreconcilable both in regard to international rights and to principles of national rights and to the most elemental sentiments of humanity, acts which show in what chaotic and vicious circles has the sense of justice been deviated from useful consideration.

In this category are premeditated aggressions against a small, laborious, and peaceful people on the pretext of a threat which neither exists, nor is desired, nor is possible.

Atrocities and illegal use of means of destruction even against noncombatants, refugees, old people, women and children, and disregard of human dignity, liberty and life are acts which cry for the vengeance of God, as does ever more extensive and methodical anti-Christian and even atheistic propaganda, mostly among young people.

To preserve the church and her mission among men from every contact with such anti-Christian spirit is our duty, and this is also our sacred and intimate wish as the father and teacher of the faith.

With anguished worry we are forced to contemplate the accumulating spiritual ruin before us—accumulating because of confusion of ideas which, more or less voluntarily, shades and distorts truth in the souls of many people, whether they be involved in war or not.

We therefore must regard with alarm the tremendous amount of work that will be necessary when a world tired of fighting wishes to restore peace—to break down the walls of aversion and hatred which have been built up in the heat of the strife.

Aware of the excesses to which that way of life leads, and of the political doctrines and acts which ignore the laws of God, when the disputes became critical we attempted, as you know, with every endeavor and to the last moment, to prevent the worst and to persuade men in which hands power lay and whose shoulders bore the grave responsibility, to abstain from armed conflict and so to save the world from incalculable disaster.

These efforts, and those coming from other influential and respected sources, failed to produce the hoped-for effect, chiefly because of deep and apparently irremovable distrust—distrust which had grown in recent years and which had raised insurmountable spiritual barriers.

The problems were not unsolvable, but this distrust, originating in a series of particular circumstances, stood in the way with almost irresistible force and to such an extent that there no longer was hope for promises made or for the maintenance of possible amicable conventions.

Finally every effort to promote a peaceful solution became hopeless. There was nothing left but to try to lighten the burdens of war, although the effort to bring Christian charity to regions where the most urgent need of it would be felt was obstructed by difficulties not yet overcome.

With indescribable anguish we watched this war initiated and proceeding in such unusual circumstances.

If up to now—excepting the bloodstained soil of Poland and Finland—the number of victims may be considered fewer than was feared, the total sorrows and sacrifices have reached such a point as to inspire great anxiety in those concerned with the future economic, social, and spiritual condition of Europe, and not of Europe alone.

The more the war monster strives for, swallows, and allots itself material means which are placed inexorably at the service of war needs—mounting from hour to hour—the more acute becomes the danger, for nations directly or indirectly struck by the conflict, of what we might call pernicious anemia, and they are faced with the pressing question, "How can exhausted or weakened economy, at the end of the war, find means for economic and social reconstruction among difficulties which will be enormously increased, and of which the forces and artifices of disorder, lying in wait, will seek to make use in the hope of giving the final blow to Christian Europe?"

Such consideration of the present and future must cause much concern to the leaders and sane members of every people, even in the fever of the war, and cause them to examine the effects of the aims and justifiable end of war.

We believe those who with watchful eyes consider these serious potentialities and the possibility of which an evolution of events will, notwithstanding war and its horrible accompaniments, hold themselves wholly pre-

pared to define clearly, so far as they themselves are concerned, the fundamental points of a just and honorable peace at the opportune moment; and that they would not flatly reject opportunity for negotiations, whenever the occasion presents itself, with the necessary guaranties and security.

First. A fundamental condition of a just and honorable peace is to assure the right of life and independence of all nations, large and small, strong and weak. One nation's will to live must never be tantamount to a death sentence for another. When this equality of rights has been destroyed, injured, or imperiled, the juridical order requires reparation whose measure and extent are not determined by the sword or selfish, arbitrary judgment, but by the standards of justice and reciprocal equity.

Second. That order, reestablished in such a manner, may be tranquil and durable—the cardinal principles of true peace. Nations must be liberated from the heavy slavery of the race for armaments and from the danger that material force, instead of serving to protect rights, become the tyrannical violator of them.

Conclusions of peace which failed to attribute fundamental importance to disarmament, mutually accepted, organic and progressive both in practice and spirit, and failed to carry out this disarmament loyally, would sooner or later reveal their inconsistency and lack of vitality.

Third. In any reordering of international community life it would conform to the rules of human wisdom for all parties concerned to examine the consequences of the gaps and deficiencies of the past; and in creating or reconstituting the international institutions, which have so lofty a mission, and at the same time one that is so difficult and full of the gravest responsibilities, they should keep present before them the experiences which poured from the inefficacy or defective operation of similar previous projects.

And, since it is so difficult—one would be tempted to say almost impossible—for human weakness to foresee everything and assure everything at the time of the drafting of treaties of peace—when it is difficult to be entirely free from passions and bitterness—the establishment of juridical institutions, which serve to guarantee the loyal and faithful fulfillment of terms, and, in case of recognized need, to revise and correct them, is of decisive importance for an honorable acceptance of a peace treaty and to avoid arbitrary and unilateral ruptures and interpretations of the terms of these treaties.

Fourth. A point which should draw particular attention if better ordering of Europe is sought concerns the real needs and just demands of nations and of peoples as well as of ethnical minorities; demands which, if not always sufficient to form a strict right when there are recognized or confirmed treaties or other juridical titles which oppose them, deserve at all events benevolent examination to meet them in a peaceful way and, where it appears necessary, by means of equitable, wise, and harmonious revision of treaties.

Once true equilibrium among nations is thus brought back and the basis of mutual trust is reestablished, many of the incentives to resort to violence would be removed.

Fifth. But even better and more complete settlements will be imperfect and condemned to ultimate failure if those who guide the destinies of peoples, and the peoples themselves, do not allow themselves to be penetrated always more and more by that spirit from which alone can arise life, authority, and obligation for the dead letter of articles in international agreements; by that spirit, namely, of intimate, acute responsibility that measures and weighs human statutes according to the holy, unshakable rules of divine law; by that hunger and thirst for justice which is proclaimed as a beatitude in the Sermon on the Mount, and which has, as a natural presupposition, moral justice; by that universal love which is the compendium of and most comprehensive term for the Christian ideal, and therefore throws across also a bridge to those who have not the benefit of participating in our own faith.

We do not fail to recognize the grave difficulties which interpose themselves against the accomplishment of the aims which we have traced in broad outlines in a desire to lay foundations for, to put into effect, and to preserve—a just international peace.

But if ever there were an aim worthy of the concourse of noble, generous spirits, if ever there arose a spiritual crusade which with new truth sounded the cry "God wills it," it is truly that high aim and this crusade—to lead peoples back from the muddy gulf of material and selfish interest to the living fountain of divine law, which alone is powerful and gives that morality, nobility, and stability of which a lack has been felt far too long and which is gravely needed to repair the damage done to most nations, to humanity, and to those ideals which are at the same time the real ends of peace based on justice and love.

We wait for and hope that all those who are united to us by the bond of faith, each at his post within the limits of his mission, will keep both mind and heart open, so that when the hurricane of war ceases and is dispersed there will rise up in every nation and among all peoples farsighted and pure spirits, animated by courage, who will know how and will be able to confront the dark instinct of vile vengeance with the severe and noble majesty of justice—the sister of love and companion of all true wisdom.

Mr. Speaker, the Catholic Church is asking that as a Nation we pray for peace. But this is not a Catholic problem, nor a Protestant problem, nor is it a Jewish problem — it is a universal problem. Agonized voices of men, women, and children throughout the world are looking to America for us to remain at peace. The President of the United States and the United States Congress are besieged with please that we remain out of the world conflict. The forces of destruction of the Old World eagerly seek to engage us in their age-old struggles for supremacy, and selfishly urge us to fight, in many instances brother pitted against brother.

The first encyclical of Pope Pius XII, presenting his views on the function of the state in the modern world, is a masterpiece, and I would like to quote here a few brief excerpts:

EXCESSIVE NATIONALISM

The first of these pernicious errors, widespread today, is the forgetfulness of that law of human solidarity and charity which is dictated and imposed by our common origin and by the equality of rational nature in all men, to whatever people they belong, and by the redeeming sacrifice offered by Jesus Christ on the altar of the cross to His Heavenly Father on behalf of sinful mankind.

NATIONS ENRICH UNITY

And the nations, despite a difference of development due to diverse conditions of life and of culture, are not destined to break the unity of the human race, but rather to enrich and embellish it by the sharing of their own peculiar gifts and by that reciprocal interchange of goods which can be possible and efficacious only when a mutual love and a lively sense of charity unite all the sons of the same Father and all those redeemed by the same divine blood.

ALL RACES EQUAL IN THE CHURCH

Those who enter the church, whatever be their origin or their speech, must know that they have equal rights as children in the house of the Lord, where the law of Christ and the peace of Christ prevail.

PATRIOTISM

Nor is there any fear lest the consciousness of universal brotherhood aroused by the teaching of Christianity, and the spirit which it inspires, be in contract with love of tradition or the glories of one's fatherland or impede the progress of prosperity or legitimate interests. For that same Christianity teaches that in the exercise of charity we must follow a God-given order, yielding the place of honor in our affections and good works to those who are bound to us by special ties.

TOTALITARIANISM

The idea which credits the state with unlimited authority is not simply an error harmful to the internal life of nations, to their prosperity, and to the larger and well-ordered increase in their well-being, but likewise it injures the relations between peoples, for it breaks the unity of supranational society, robs the law of nations of its foundation and vigor, leads to violation of others' rights, and impedes agreement and peaceful intercourse.

A GREAT COMMONWEALTH

A disposition, in fact, of the divinely sanctioned natural order divides the human race into social groups, nations, or states, which are mutually independent in organization and in the direction of their internal life. But for all that, the human race is bound together by reciprocal ties, moral and juridical, into a great commonwealth directed to the good of all nations and ruled by special laws which protect its unity and promote its prosperity.

RESPECT FOR RIGHTS—FIDELITY TO COMPACTS

Such principles demand respect for corresponding rights to independence, and to life and to the possibility of continuous development in the paths of civilization; they demand, further, fidelity to compacts agreed upon and sanctioned in conformity with the principles of the law of nations.

The indispensable presupposition, without doubt, of all peaceful intercourse between nations, and the very soul of the juridical relations in force among them, is mutual trust. The expectation and conviction that each party will respect its plighted word, and are ready to enter into discussion and to avoid recourse to force or to threats of force in case of delays, hindrances, changes, or disputes, because all these things can be the result not of bad will, but of changed circumstances and of genuine interests in conflict.

BASIS OF NEW ORDER

Once the bitterness and the cruel strifes of the present have ceased, the new order of the world of national and international life, must rest no longer on the quicksands of changeable and ephemeral standards that depend only on the selfish interests of groups and individuals. No, they must rest on the unshakable foundation, on the solid rock of natural law and of divine revelation. There the human legislator must attain to that balance, that keen sense of moral responsibility, without which it is easy to mistake the boundary between the legitimate use and the abuse of power. Thus only will his decisions have internal consistency, noble dignity, and religious sanction, and be immune from selfishness and passion.

EFFORTS TO PREVENT WAR

What has already happened and is still happening was presented, as it were, in a vision before our eyes when, while still some hope was left, we left nothing undone in

the form suggested to us by our apostolic office and by the means at our disposal, to prevent recourse to arms and to keep open the way to an understanding honorable to both parties. Convinced that the use of force on one side would be answered by recourse to arms on the other, we considered it a duty inseparable from our apostolic office and of Christian charity to try every means to spare mankind and Christianity the horrors of a world conflagration, even at the risk of having our intentions and our aims misunderstood. Our advice, if heard with respect, was not however followed.

WORLD RECONSTRUCTION

This she (the church) knows—that the truth which she preaches, the charity which she teaches and practices, will be the indispensable counselors and aids to men of good will in the reconstruction of a new world, based on justice and love, when mankind, weary from its course along the war of error, has tasted the bitter fruits of hate and violence.

CHARITY TO WAR VICTIMS

A vast field opens up for Christian charity in all its forms. We have full confidence that all our sons * * * will be mindful in imitation of the Divine Samaritan of all these who, as victims of the war, have a right to compassion and help.

THE HASTENING OF PEACE

Whatever we can do to hasten the day when the dove of peace may find on this earth, submerged in a deluge of discord, somewhere to alight, we shall continue to do, trusting in those statesmen who, before the outbreak of war, nobly toiled to avert such a scourge from the peoples; trusting in the millions of souls of all countries and of every sphere, who call not for justice alone but for love and mercy; above all, trusting in God Almighty.

PRAYER

Pray everyone; pray uninterruptedly: "Pray without ceasing." In this way you will put into practice the sublime precept of the Divine Master, the most sacred testament of His heart, "That they all may be one" (St. John); that all may live in that unity of faith and of love from which the world may know the power and efficacy of Christ's mission and of the work of His church.

Mr. Speaker, during this month of May, when we are asked to concentrate on a lasting peace, I believe we should begin our planning for a permanent organization bent on eventual peace negotiations. The time to negotiate for an enduring peace is now—not after our rich wealth and resources have been sunk in the seven seas or strewn to the four winds—and after the flower of our young manhood lie buried in many lands. We may differ as to which method we should employ in undertaking negotiations, but the nations across the oceans are looking to us to stop this wholesale destruction of human life and property, and they are praying that it may be soon.

Those who wish to embroil this Nation in the quarrels and hates of other nations become enraged with Americans who insist they do not wish to participate in the destruction of human beings or become victims of a war machine; but it seems to us that unless we stop now before millions of our young men have been sent overseas, we may find ourselves too late with our prayers and wishes, and instead of having as our country the richest on the face of the earth we will have the most impoverished and the most desolate.

Late Senator Morris Sheppard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. SOUTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. FRITZ G. LANHAM, OF TEXAS

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Speaker, a few evenings ago, in the presence of a large group of Texans assembled here in the city of Washington, my colleague, Hon. FRITZ G. LANHAM, delivered an exceptionally eloquent and impressive tribute to the late Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The address follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, meeting as we do as fellow Texans, proud of the history and traditions which in their worth and inspiration have afforded us an exceptional heritage, it seems fitting that for a few moments tonight we should pause in solemn contemplation to pay tribute to the memory of a late lamented and beloved friend whose illustrious career of service proved him true to that priceless heritage from the fathers. At such a time and with such a purpose, I feel impelled to adopt as my own the supplication of lines of a beautiful poem by Lord Tennyson:

"I would that my tongue could utter
The thoughts that arise in me."

Words have not been coined to speak the language of the heart. There is no vocabulary for love. It finds its manifestations in sentiments and emotions and in deeds which can but poorly betoken the impulses so deeply felt.

Our fellow Texan, MORRIS SHEPPARD, has departed to a better and a perfect sphere, but he lives and will continue to live in the hearts of his family, his friends, and his countrymen, who can never forget his distinguished service, but who will remember even more vividly his unfailing gentleness and kindliness.

In the State capitol at Austin there reposes appropriately a portrait of this celebrity of our Lone Star State, but his portrait which hangs on the walls of our hearts is one more fondly cherished, a likeness of his Christian spirit which so illumined his path that others, too, could see the way to the goal of beneficent accomplishment.

Though his record was one of conspicuous and laudable attainment, well known to all, and needless now to be recited, it is this temporary parting from the man, the friend, the loved one, even more than the cessation of his notable work among us, which impresses upon each of us a sense of irreparable loss. The artist in every worth-while endeavor is greater than the product of his brush.

What is the mission of man? We are taught in Holy Writ that he is made in the image of God. In the light of this revelation, one may best exemplify one's worth as a man by preserving in its glory that wonderful image. And how is this image manifested? Surely in a miniature presentation of those three outstanding attributes of Deity—power, knowledge, and vision.

True power is altruistic ambition at work, fulfilling a laudable task.

True knowledge is the reward of the assiduous searcher for truth, who finds in his zeal the golden treasury of its worth.

True vision is the guiding light of a useful life, leading to a happier humanity and a better and brighter world.

MORRIS SHEPPARD, by his industry and purpose, acquired and practiced that trinity of graces. They are the distinguishing traits and accomplishments which characterized the labors of the pioneers of our State and Nation. In appreciative appraisal of those pioneers, MORRIS SHEPPARD was not merely their ardent admirer but their faithful and worthy successor. He leavened his work with that other heavenly attribute of love, and love in full measure was the boon returned to him by a grateful people. "Out of the heart are the issues of life," and out of his heart came the friendly and helpful spirit that will remain with us all as a benediction. Tennyson was right when he said:

"Howe'er it be, it seems to me
'Tis only noble to be good;
Kind hearts are more than coronets
And simple faith than Norman blood."

To that "land that is fairer than day" MORRIS SHEPPARD has been called to his reward. And as we reflect upon the promised entrance to that world of glory, surely with reference to our beloved and lamented friend we may find an appropriate thought in the sentiment of the epitaph at the tomb of John Howard Payne:

"Sure when thy gentle spirit fled
To realms beyond the azure dome,
With outstretched arms God's angels said,
'Welcome to heaven's home, sweet home.'"

And may I be forgiven if I add in feeble lines of my own what I conceive to be the message of love and confident hope our hearts would utter in parting from a comrade so dear:

"Goodbye, good friend;
In God's good time,
In God's good clime
We'll meet again.

"And in that land
Where we shall know
No pain or woe
We'll understand."

The Contrast in Bridges' Trials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SANTA MONICA OUTLOOK

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Santa Monica Outlook of April 25, 1941:

[From the Santa Monica Outlook of April 25, 1941]

THE CONTRAST IN BRIDGES' TRIALS

It is a most remarkable reflection on Madam Perkins, of the Labor Department, and her

Dean Landis investigation of Harry Bridges, that it failed to bring to light the overwhelming evidence of Bridges' connection with the Communists which is available in the present trial.

The facts existed then as now, but no thorough effort was made to secure them. Not until the Justice Department turned loose the F. B. I. on the inquiry were they brought to public knowledge.

This plainly is proof either that Madam Perkins did not want to have Bridges convicted or that she was incompetent in not knowing how to proceed. Either one alternative or the other is true. In either case, the official indifference or incompetence, whichever it was, is indefensible and unpardonable.

The abundant evidence in the present Bridges trial leaves no doubt in the public mind of the close relation of Bridges with the under-cover campaign which the paid agents of Moscow have been conducting for years in America. Aside from Mr. Bridges' connection, it reveals a magnitude of communistic propaganda and organization which constitutes a very grave menace to America's future. The undermining of American ideals and institutions has been going on for years without a word of interference from the Government.

It is high time the people moved in this matter. Meanwhile, Madam Perkins, apparently by the grace of Mrs. Roosevelt, continues to be President Roosevelt's Secretary of Labor.

Patrolling Means Shooting War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1941

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt said not so long ago that "convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war."

Convoying—of the old kind—has been abandoned to a great extent. When supply ships or cargo ships traveled in convoys, they were more or less a collection or group of cargo ships with naval vessels operating to the rear of them, in front of them and on each side of them. In convoy formation these cargo ships could not zigzag in the darkness without running lights, without danger of collision.

Recent practice is to let the cargo ships zigzag their own way across the ocean, the advantage being that with the ships widely separated enough only one ship was a target, and that ship, zigzagging, was frequently moving off its course of the moment. Meantime, a patrol of war boats is ranging the waters. These patrol boats make it exceedingly dangerous for any submarine to put its periscope above the surface. Yet it is necessary periodically for submarines to come up and run on the surface in order to recharge their batteries for undersea work.

In the present war, no submarine commander will run the risk of coming to the surface to hail a ship to determine what flag it flies. The American destroyers, which the President traded to Britain, and the other American boats which have been transferred to the British flag and service are, of course, exactly like their American counterparts, both in appearance and in machinery operation and propeller sound. The result is that under the new order in which the American naval boats are patrolling as far as 2,000 miles out from our shores, they must necessarily operate in waters in which German submarines could expect to be found, and the result necessarily must be either that the German submarine commanders will have to refrain from firing on any boats whose propellers they might hear, or of making the mistake of hitting an American war boat. If the latter should be the case, the incident necessary to plunge this Nation into a shooting war will have occurred.

There can be no question, if we are to face this situation frankly, that the patrol operations of the Atlantic Fleet two or three thousand miles offshore necessarily involve increased hazards of some such "incident" as an American war boat being struck by a German submarine torpedo.

Mr. Roosevelt's order to the Atlantic Fleet is unquestionably designed to aid in the delivery of machines and munitions of war to Great Britain and her allies. The German Government may be expected, of course, to regard the operations of our Atlantic Fleet as hostile operations. Whether by design or mistake, one of our boats gets hit by a torpedo or an aerial bomb and is sunk, we will be in a shooting war the cost of which in blood and agony and money to the American people no man can foresee.

Regardless of how we view the situation, it would seem both common sense and essential that the American people know the implications and the potentialities of this new policy of sending our fleet two or three thousand miles offshore to operate. It undoubtedly means a shooting war in the near future.

Passamaquoddy, Florida, and the St. Lawrence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, a few years back Uncle Sam embarked upon one of the greatest engineering experiments in the history of mankind. It was a project truly worthy of Hollywood's choicest adjectives, "colossal," "terrific," "super-super." Up in Maine the folks were excited. Their Government down in Washington was going to harness the tides. The tides are still unharnessed, and Passamaquoddy is now only a memory. A few mere millions were sunk in the mud, but they were speedily forgotten as the Washington merry-go-round whipped furiously off to newer and still more intoxicating pleasures.

Some of us remember, too, the Florida ship-canal proposal. It was going to cut a channel across the northern end of Florida to encourage commerce and bring the more abundant life to thousands of men and women down South. That one got into the moving-picture news reels. We saw wonderful pictures of a huge dried-up ditch, with a good deal of rusty looking machinery along the sidelines. By the time it had disappeared from the picture it was not even regarded as a potential celery patch.

The St. Lawrence waterway proposal, whatever its merits may be, comes along as a fitting successor to the grandiose schemes concocted by the febrile imagination of the New Deal. Like both of the other projects, a feeble effort is being made to link its construction with a national-defense build-up. The utter puerility of this endeavor is apparent at the merest glance. Two other arguments have been invented to reinforce the recognized weakness of the defense position. Washington sources "close to the President" have urged the St. Lawrence waterway as a potential producer of hydroelectric power on a tremendous scale. Then, too, they argue that the St. Lawrence development would enable us to build shipyards on the Great Lakes beyond the reach of air raids.

An examination of each of these arguments is certainly in order before Congress votes the huge sums necessary for this project.

To consider the defense suggestion is to recognize its futility. By even the most optimistic estimate, the St. Lawrence job would take some 4 years for completion. If we are still in the defense "emergency" then, our entire economy will be far out of line. The St. Lawrence project will be only a minor matter in comparison with our entire defense machinery. Every defense "expert" believes that a 4-year period will take our efforts completely beyond the realm of practicability. We cannot work now on defense projects so far removed into the future.

As for the hydroelectric power position, it has been frequently pointed out that at Niagara Falls there stands an idle power plant capable of generating more electric current than anyone believes necessary for the Great Lakes area. What possible justification can there be for a new plant under such a state of affairs?

As for the third assertion with respect to the construction of oceangoing vessels out of the reach of bombing planes, the answers seem all too obvious. We know enough about the tremendous progress of aviation to realize that no man may set limits today upon the range of military planes tomorrow.

And this is where the debate stands for the present. We have a choice before us. Is it more useful to spend our funds for the construction of this waterway than to spend them for the construction of more planes, ships, tanks, and guns? Would Winston Churchill, answering this question for us, choose the St. Lawrence waterway or would he choose the weapons of war?

This is no time for another Passamaquoddy. It is a time when every dime spent should be expended for essential defense purposes. Let us not squander funds in time of danger which we have

husbanded carefully in time of peace. Let us not undertake a project in a day of emergency which we have refused time after time to undertake in days of calm and considered judgment.

Digest of International Law by Green H. Hackworth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

STATEMENT BY STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, for those who think that international law is dead the following abbreviated statement from the State Department on the forthcoming publication of Legal Adviser Hackworth's volume will be interesting.

It ought never to be forgotten that one of the most marked and historical cleavages we have in the realm of man's progress concerns the words of Grotius. Of him it was rightly said, "In gathering the materials of international law, he had to go beyond national treaties and denominational rests for a principle embracing all mankind." From his time it became possible to make politics "a matter of principle and of conscience so that men and nations differing in all other things could live in peace together, under the sanctions of a common law."

The statement follows:

DIGEST OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, BY GREEN H. HACKWORTH, LEGAL ADVISER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

There are being released on April 28 the first two volumes of the new Digest of International Law, by Green H. Hackworth, who has been the Department of State's legal adviser since 1925.

The last preceding Digest on International Law prepared in this country was that by John Bassett Moore, published by the Government in 1906. The new digest does not revise earlier digests or incorporate material published in them; instead it deals with material and events originating in the period subsequent to 1906 which have hitherto not been covered by a study of general scope. The work will be of immeasurable value to officials of the Government in providing precedents and background for the formulation of decisions on questions of law and policy currently arising, as well as to others who are interested in or who deal with matters pertaining to international law and related subjects. The material has been selected largely from the vast accumulation of diplomatic correspondence of the Department of State; statements by foreign offices and treatise writers; pronouncements by judicial and administrative tribunals, national and international; international agreements; legislative enactments, etc.

I

Volume I contains five chapters. Chapter I deals with the general nature of international law; its sanction, its source, its relationship to municipal law, its development, and efforts looking to its codification.

Chapter 2, relating to states and their governments, deals with the nature and classification of states, the rights and duties of states, and kinds of governments. It includes a section on mandates, a subject peculiar to the period in question.

Chapter 3 treats of the "recognition" of states, of governments, and of belligerency. It covers the methods, prerequisites, conditions, and effect of recognition, also the effect of nonrecognition.

Chapter 4, on territory and sovereignty of states, deals with methods of acquisition and loss of territory, effects of changes of sovereignty, and with certain changes in the Territorial possessions of the United States in the period covered, etc.

Chapter 5, on national jurisdiction and territorial limits, has to do particularly with boundaries, rivers, straits, bays, etc., and the marginal sea, including problems arising in connection therewith.

II

Volume 2 contains at the outset a chapter on national jurisdiction, covering such subjects as the supremacy of the territorial sovereign; authority over persons and property within the national domain; legal remedies; police and other regulations relating to such matters as freedom of speech and of the press, religious freedom, and the practice of professions; martial law (not to be confused with the law of war which is covered in a later volume); punishment for crimes committed outside the territorial jurisdiction; jurisdiction over foreign vessels in territorial waters; the inviolability of territory; and the duty of states to restrain injurious agencies.

Chapter 7 relates, on the other hand, to the exemptions from territorial jurisdiction of foreign states, their sovereigns, their military forces, vessels of war, other public vessels and property, and of state agencies or instrumentalities. It reviews the rights of the United States in extraterritorial countries, and explains their present status. Finally, the chapter deals with the subject of asylum as another type of exemption from territorial jurisdiction.

Chapter 8, the final chapter in the volume, is devoted to the subject of the high seas and connecting waterways. It discusses the important subjects of freedom of the seas, nationality of vessels, and interoceanic canals.

The manuscript for four additional volumes is practically completed. It is intended that there shall be, in all, seven volumes with an additional index volume. Since the basic expense of printing this work is borne by the Department of State, the Government Printing Office is able to offer the book to others at a nominal sum ($2 for vol. 1 and $1.75 for vol. 2) covering only the cost of running off additional volumes for sales purposes.

Political Refugees Coming to America From Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1941

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to quote nine paragraphs from a statement issued by the State Department, December 18, 1940; the statement pertains to political refugees seeking to come to America:

Persons coming for permanent residence must under this law secure immigrant visas; those coming for a temporary stay, visitors' visas; those who desire to pass through the country en route to another country, transit visas. The granting of visas is under the jurisdiction of the Department of State.

Persons arriving on visitors' visas are under the law permitted to remain a temporary period. Those arriving as transients are limited to 60 days. If the privilege is not extended the person is supposed to leave the United States or be deported. The extension of privilege and the steps looking to departure or deportation are under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice.

Obviously it was legally impossible to accept them all. The laws of this country prescribe the number of persons to be admitted as immigrants. Applications far in excess of the legal limit had already been made by other persons and from only a few countries of Europe were immigrant visas available. That, however, did not prevent the demand, but it did add to the congestion.

Spontaneously there developed in this country movements to save to the world the brains, the character, and the spirit which motivated these distraught persons and to facilitate their departure for this country. The names of some were well known to the American public because of their literary, musical, or artistic achievements, their political doctrines, their scientific contributions, or their capacity for organization—but there were many others whose names were not known who had been leaders of thought and directors of movements in entire accord with American social and political philosophies. The sentiment to save these persons from becoming derelicts or from death developed into committees organized by sympathetic and understanding Americans.

Visitors' visas are granted provided the person can return to the country of his origin or can leave for a third country; provided further that the person intends to do so—for otherwise he would be an immigrant intending to live here; and that he will not become a public charge while here.

Consequently, the committees requesting visas for certain persons were required to give assurances to the Department of State that they would make every effort to arrange for the departure of the person if admitted and that he would not become a public charge while here.

Transit visas are granted to permit a leisurely stay in the United States while traveling to or awaiting accommodations to travel to another country and with similar conditions.

Consequently, the committees asking visas of that character were requested to give those assurances before the visa could be issued.

Those assurances were satisfactorily given in each case, and the name and other essential data were telegraphed to the consuls abroad. The various committees recommended a total of about 2,000 names. Each name was checked against official Government information lists, and only about one dozen of those names were found to be of persons whose presence here would be prejudicial to the best interests of the United States. For the rest, visas were authorized. About 1,000 have actually been issued abroad. Of the balance, some have been only recently dispatched, some applicants are in hiding or under assumed names for their own protection, some are inaccessible to the consuls, and some have removed from the consular district to another district and are still being sought.

Since the statement of the State Department of December 18, 1940, indicated that the "names of some of the political

refugees were well known to the American public because of their literary, musical, or artistic achievements, their political doctrines, their scientific contributions, or their capacity for organization," I, on January 10, 1941, requested the State Department to prepare a list of the political refugees referred to in the Department's statement of December 18, 1940. Those on the list seeking admission to this country were sponsored by various organizations in the United States. I also requested the State Department to state to me the occupations of the political refugees approved for admission to this country by the President's Advisory Committee for Political Refugees, the date and kind of visa issued to each, and the Consular office involved. Incidentally, it should be borne in mind one coming here on a visitor's visa is expected to remain here for only a temporary period.

At no time in the history of our country has it been more important to the welfare of this Nation to be double sure that those who are permitted to enter this country are 100 percent true to our form of government. Lukewarm believers in democracy walking bowlegged with suggested changes, changes which find their inception in the mind of those who advocate a new order are not safe people to have in this country. Many of those who at heart believe in communism, nazi-ism, and fascism will reluctantly say they are opposed to our form of government, but they will enumerate countless changes which in their opinion should be made. Often it is found, when the proposed changes are examined and evaluated, that they are nothing less than disguised excerpts borrowed from authoritarian doctrines. How important it is to know not merely something but much about the background of any person who comes to this country from any of the countries whose people have accepted communism, nazi-ism, or fascism; in fact, we should know much about any person who is permitted to come to America now. No more Trojan horses are needed here. In this connection, the summary provided me by the State Department infers that no information is currently available concerning 40 of the first 1,000.

The authorities of the State Department have been kind enough to make a list—available now—of the first 1,000 cases recommended by the President's Advisory Committee for Political Refugees; they have also provided an interesting summary pertaining to the first 1,000 people. It is revealing to note what vocations have been followed by some of the people; one discerns, for example, only 3 of the first 1,000 people are farmers.

The summary mentioned follows:

The following is a summation of occupations of the first 1,000 refugees whose names were submitted by the President's Advisory Committee on Political Refugees. (The following was complied according to the latest information available.) Of this number, 697 have received visas.

Members of families (includes children, mothers, students, and widows)	472
Journalists, writers, and authors	90
Merchants, businessmen, traders, industrialists, manufacturers, and bankers	89
Jewish leaders and rabbis	72
Attorneys and lawyers	32
Editors and publishers	27
Professors and teachers	25
Artists, art dealers, and lecturers	17
Physicians and doctors	15
Government officials (includes judges, army officers, etc.)	15
Secretaries, stenographers, and clerks	14
Engineers, chemical and electrical	9
Social workers	8
Business managers	8
Labor leaders	7
Chemists	6
Musicians and composers of music	5
Photographers	4
Carpenters	4
Farmers	3
Film producers and writers	3
Dentists	3
Salesmen	2
Printers	2
Actors	2
Statisticians and research workers	2
Furriers	2
Fashion designers and dressmakers	2
Nurses	2
Locksmiths	2
Architects	2
Electricians	1
Radio broadcasters	1
Petroleum refinery employees	1
Concert singers	1
Soldiers	1
Plumbers	1
Real estate agents	1
Economists	1
Interpreters	1
Mathematicians	1
Librarians	1
Machine draftsmen	1
Metallurgist-accountants	1
Egyptologists	1
No information	40
Total	1,000

Processing Tax on Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

ADAMS, OREG., *March 28, 1941.*

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President, United States of America,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Having read an article in a recent magazine wherein it was stated that you and Secretary Morgenthau were opposed to anything in the nature of a processing tax on the farm crops which are covered by the present farm program, I feel that I should write and let you know how one farmer (and there are many more of the same mind) feels about the matter.

In the days of the Federal Farm Board, the chairman of that organization, Mr. Alexander Legge, spoke in this county and urged us wheat farmers to curtail our production. At that time we had no program to hold the farmers together and accomplish that end, and, of course, it was not done.

Under the present program, it could be done if we do not make the loans on the surplus crops too high. For the past 3 years the wheat loans have been a floor under our wheat price. They have enabled the farmer who was not complying with the program to plant his usual acreage to wheat and get along on about the same level as those who are planting under acreage allotments and receiving the parity and conservation payments.

We feel that the noncomplier is just riding on the coattails of those who do comply and would like to see the program changed enough to make it advantageous to be in compliance. This could be done by keeping the loans as low or lower than during recent years and passing a law, or amending the present law, to provide for a certificate plan to raise the funds for parity payments.

We realize that the only thing that has kept 50 percent of the farmers in this county from going broke is the fact that we had the wheat-allotment program of 1933–35 and the programs which have followed it, with approximately 97 percent of our wheat farmers complying with the present program.

We also know that the percentage of compliance is not so large in some counties, but if loans were lower and parity payments higher the fellows on the outside would probably come in.

We are unafraid of regimentation, but are afraid of conditions which may develop if our wheat is not kept under control.

We have State and Federal taxes on gasoline and no one is hurt. The funds are used to pay for roads, and the one who is on the road most of the time wears out the road and pays more tax than the one who stays home most of the time.

If under uncontrolled conditions the wheat grower cannot subsist, where is the wrong in placing a processing tax on wheat to assist the farmer who grows it?

A. R. COPPOCK.

An Unfortunate Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE OSHKOSH (WIS.) NORTHWESTERN

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oshkosh (Wis.) Northwestern:

[From the Oshkosh (Wis.) Northwestern]

AN UNFORTUNATE CONTROVERSY

It is to be regretted that President Roosevelt, nettled by Colonel Lindbergh's recent address, in which the famous flyer and aviaton expert said Great Britain could not win the war against the Axis totalitarian powers and that the United States cannot win the war for England, regardless of how much assistance we extend, should have departed from calm and temperate statements to accuse Lindbergh of being another Vallandigham. Indirectly, but unmistakably, the President

branded Colonel Lindbergh as a "copperhead," a term that intimates treasonable utterances.

History records that Vallandigham, an Ohio Congressman, made speeches during the progress of the Civil War that upheld the Confederate South. As a result of his speeches this traitor to the North was conducted over the lines to the Confederacy.

Because Colonel Lindbergh disagrees with the Roosevelt administration's foreign policy and the President's methods of helping Great Britain to win the European war was no excuse for smearing the noted aviator as a "copperhead." The application of the "Vallandigham" classification and approbrium was uncalled for and beneath the dignity of the office the President holds.

Since when has there been any restriction against free speech in a free and peaceful nation? And since when has it become treasonable utterance to discuss peace and express individual opinions on the conduct of our Government officials?

Colonel Lindbergh acted wisely and moderately, under the circumstances, in sending a letter Monday to President Roosevelt resigning his commission as a Reserve officer in the United States Army Air Corps. The President had implied that Lindbergh was useful no longer as a Reserve officer; had questioned his loyalty, character, and motives. Hence the colonel took the only action suitable—to withdraw into private life.

Thus services that might have been exceedingly helpful in the present national-defense program will be lost to the Nation, and a controversy has arisen that is likely to have exceedingly unpleasant repercussions and influences detrimental to national unity.

We believe the Chicago Tribune expresses the situation pertinently in this editorial view of the matter:

"Col. Charles A. Lindbergh has resigned as a colonel in the United States Army Air Corps Reserve. He sent his resignation to the Secretary of War and explained why he did so in a letter to Mr. Roosevelt. To Mr. Roosevelt, the colonel said he had hoped he might exercise his rights as an American citizen to place his viewpoint before the people of the country in time of peace without giving up the privilege of serving his country as an Air Corps officer in the event of war.

"Mr. Roosevelt told the reporters last week that Colonel Lindbergh had not been called for active service because the Army had no place for Vallandighams. Vallandigham was a northern traitor in the Civil War. Mr. Roosevelt's remarks in stigmatizing Colonel Lindbergh as a traitor to his country must have been resented by all fair-minded people and by everybody who was not unbalanced by passions.

"No man of honor could submit to such reflections upon his loyalty and upon his character and, as Colonel Lindbergh said, he had no alternative. He was forced to resign, and the Air Corps having refused to take advantage of the services of America's most intelligent and best-informed aviator now loses him, at least for the duration of this precarious peace. It may be that Mr. Roosevelt has made it impossible for Colonel Lindbergh to serve his country as he desired, even in time of war.

"These are costly consequences to flow from intemperate and unjust remarks. Mr. Roosevelt's habit is to question the character of any citizen, no matter how devoted, who opposes his foreign policy. He endeavors to close debate by calling the opposition silly, uninformed, dishonorable, and treasonable. The country is at peace in theory, if not in fact. The rules of conduct which apply in wartime are not imperative now. It is, rather, imperative that there should be full and free discussion of issues before decisions are made.

"Colonel Lindbergh has the Congressional Medal of Honor. That is another reply to Mr. Roosevelt."

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, it's Woodrow Wilson Roosevelt. Mark ye well, mark ye well!

The Chief told our Governor that convoys were as out of date as muskets.

GUFFEY, the bachelor, wants the convoys. Senator, tell it to Mother's Day.

Franklin complains because Lindy does not chirp about democracy. Think of it.

We would rather fly with the "Lone Eagle," with his wings clipped, than with Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky.

"The people are too damn dumb to understand."—Hopkins. So we will call them patrols and not convoys.

Travel in the United States has been greatly increased in the past 2 years—one good thing to come out of their war.

Can 81 percent, according to Gallup, resist the 19 percent and the British? No other question is important. Unfortunately, it has resolved into a one-man decision.

I am not in favor of dissipating our strength in the defense of nations abroad. If we get into this war, our democracy will be lost in its aftermath.—O. P. May.

London issues exclusive report that our President will go on the air with an important message about the middle of May. Ten Downing Street ahead of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

They have turned loose on the unsuspecting public a flood of warmongers who are endeavoring to whip up sentiment for joining the slaughter in Europe's eternal wars.

I am sorry Washington has felt so belligerent. We really never had reason for it and we now have no plan to enforce democracy. We are fast getting out on a limb.—George C. Adriance.

Rockefeller has come out for war. The Rothschilds have been for it from the beginning. The Du Ponts and all their in-laws are for it, too. Wars always make the rich richer and the poor deader.

Eire's Bases and Premier Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1941

STATEMENT BY WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, in all the discussion over the naval bases in Eire which are desired by the British Government there are some aspects of this matter which ought to be remembered in passing judgment.

The present most powerful of British personalities, Premier Winston Churchill, uttered thoughts on the whole subject in 1938, which are timely reminders of his foresight and his reasoning. At the time he was a member of Parliament and he spoke as such on May 5, 1938, when the Eire bill was up for disposition:

We are going away; we are giving up these ports, and giving to this other government the right as well as the power to forbid our reentry. You had the rights. You have ceded them. You hope in their place to have good will, strong enough to endure tribulation for your sake. Suppose you have it not. It will be no use saying, "Then we will retake the ports." You will have no right to do so. To violate Irish neutrality should it be decared at the moment of a great war may put you out of court in the opinion of the world and my vitiate the cause by which you may be involved in war. If ever we have to fight again we shall be fighting in the name of law, of respect for the rights of small countries—Belgium, for instance—and upon the basis and within the ambit of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

When we are proceeding, as we should be in such unhappy circumstances, upon the basis of law and equity, how could we justify ourselves if we began by violating the neutrality of what the world will regard, and what we are teaching the world to regard, as the independent Irish Republic? At the moment when the good will of the United States in matters of blockade and supply might be of the highest possible consequence, you might be forced to take violent action against all law and accepted usage, or alternatively you might be forced to sacrifice Ulster, or, in the third place, do without the use of these almost vitally important strategic ports. What is it all being done for? What are the new facts which have led to this sudden departure? To me, it is incomprehensible. To the world, to all the hungry aggressive nations, it will be taken as another sign that Britain has only to be pressed and worried long enough, and hard enough, for her to give way. If that is so, by that very fact you will bring the possibility of war nearer and you will lessen your resources for dealing with that danger. You are inviting demands from every quarter. You are casting away real and important means of security and survival for vain shadows and for ease.

Why the Overton Formula Should Be Adopted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. HUNTER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

OPINIONS OF PROF. AL PHILIP KANE OF THE GEORGETOWN LAW SCHOOL

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, whatever else might concern us if the matter of the fiscal relations between the Governments of the United States and the District of Columbia were less bound together, the

only question that merits our consideration at this time is whether the House of Representatives should now express its approval of the principle embodied in the so-called Overton fiscal formula.

I put this question to Prof. Al Philip Kane, of the Georgetown Law School. His answer is as follows:

Yes; and in order to determine what the House should do in this matter it is necessary to answer these questions:

1. Does the United States owe an obligation to defray any part of the expense of maintaining the District of Columbia?

2. If so, does the Overton formula provide a fair, equitable, and acceptable plan for the discharge of that obligation?

These questions will be answered in the order in which they were posed.

THE UNITED STATES DOES OWE AN OBLIGATION TO DEFRAY PART OF THE EXPENSES OF MAINTAINING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

True it is that if the city of Washington had been established on the banks of the Susquehanna, as many of the Members of the First Congress contended it should be, and not on the shores of the Potomac, as it actually was, the area now comprising the District of Columbia would probably still be a rural appendage of the Maryland town of Georgetown and a county neighbor of the Virginia city of Alexandria. Certain it is that the Congress of the United States would not be concerned with its local problems of administration and revenue.

We must start, then, with an admission that the city of Washington is what it is primarily, if not exclusively, because of the presence here of the Federal Government. In that Government the city found its genesis; from that Government it received its form and substance; by that Government its growth and development were directed; and upon that Government its very existence depends, for if the Government should suddenly decide to sacrifice its investments here and to move its headquarters to another location the city would quickly become a town of empty buildings and of hollow values.

At the same time, however, we must remember that the Federal Government could not have been and would not be what it is now had it not been for the sanctuary which the District of Columbia (be it Susquehanna or Potomac) provided for it. The constitutional provision for the establishment of a Federal district wherein Congress was to have exclusive legislative jurisdiction was not inserted in our supreme charter by accident or because of a special prescience on the part of the founding fathers. It was placed there for the very practical reason that local politics had egregiously interfered with the operation of the Continental Government and destroyed in large measure the effectiveness of the Articles of Confederation. The draftsmen of the Constitution had learned by a very enlightening experience that the central government had to be free of local prejudices and local politics.

The only hope of salvation for the developing nation appeared to be the establishment of its home in virgin territory where everything would be subject to its control and subordinate to its interests. This expedient was adopted. Fortunately, it worked well. Both city and Nation prospered; and today we have a beautiful and expansive municipality housing a tremendous governmental machine.

Consequently it is ridiculous to talk of determining the amount of the Federal Government's contribution to the expenses of the District of Columbia in terms of a comparison between assessed values of publicly as compared with privately owned real estate, because in the final analysis substantially all property values in the District are dependent upon the presence here of the Federal Government.

It is nevertheless true that the Federal Government and the District government are not two distinct entities but are mutually complementary organisms comprising one single body. One could not be what it is without the other. One gives of its substance to the other. Each is but a different phase of the other. When the Commissioners of the District of Columbia perform a governmental function they are acting not by virtue of any inherent powers of sovereignty, but merely as agents of the Federal Congress assisting the Congress in the discharge of the duty imposed upon Congress by the Constitution to furnish an adequate and satisfactory system of government for the District of Columbia.

At the risk of being charged with being guilty of oversimplification we may bluntly state the principles controlling the responsibility of the Federal Government in these few sentences:

1. The Federal Constitution confers upon Congress the exclusive right to legislate for the District of Columbia.

2. This has been interpreted as giving the Federal Government the right of complete governmental control over the District.

3. Where there is a right of government conferred, the law imposes a correlative duty.

4. This duty is an important one because the welfare, the independence, and the integrity of the National Government are dependent upon it to an extent not ordinarily realized by the citizens or comprehended by Congress.

5. The duty imposed on Congress in this instance (and one which it cannot conscientiously shirk) is the duty to provide for the District an adequate system of government which, if it is to have the slightest relationship to democratic forms, must be based upon principles which are fair and equitable to the Federal Government and the rest of the Nation, and fair also to the people who reside in the District.

6. This means that the Nation should not be gouged for the benefit of the District, and that the people of the District should not be expected to bear an unreasonable tax burden for the benefit of the rest of the Nation.

7. Evidence produced by various agents of Congress and of the Federal Government has been introduced before this and earlier Congresses showing that the people of the District of Columbia are now bearing a tax burden which is at least average for cities of comparable size. Accordingly, it may be said that they are bearing a fair and reasonable tax burden.

8. Evidence prepared by the Acting Auditor of the District has been introduced before subcommittees of the House and Senate within recent weeks which shows that even though this tax burden be borne (as it is, cheerfully) there still must be a deficit if the city is to be properly managed and improved considering its position as the Capital of the Nation and the model city of the world.

9. The minimum responsibility of the Federal Congress in the premises cannot be less than a duty to supply the difference between the reasonable cost of furnishing an adequate system of government for the District and the amount which will be yielded by the people of the District in the discharge of their reasonably adapted tax burden.

Some Members of Congress have expressed difficulty in understanding why the Federal Government should "contribute" to the expenses of the District of Columbia. The use of the word "contribute" is indicative of a failure to understand the relationships between the two governments as developed in the foregoing propositions. The District does not grovel or snivel, Lazarus like, at the Federal trough. It does not ask for a largess or a donation. It merely tells the Federal Congress that it is doing its part of the mutual job and reminds the Congress of its own obligation to do the rest.

It thus appears that the fiscal problem is not what the District wants Congress to do but what ought to be done by Congress if it is to discharge its constitutional obligation. The primary responsibility is not on the District but on Congress to furnish good government for the District. From this it should follow clearly and without doubt that the annual establishment of a lump-sum "contribution" having no relation to the practical necessities of the case and having no direct relation to the difference between the reasonable cost of government and the reasonable tax yield in the District does not amount to a proper discharge by Congress of what it should do under its constitutional grant of power and responsibility.

Elsewhere the particular inequities of the present system have been elaborated upon and developed. The validity of many of the criticisms of the present situation cannot be gainsaid. Washington does have to maintain a clearer city, with wider streets and better bridges. It does have to furnish fire and police protection for tremendous Federal investments. It is required to have a much more extensive system of parks than other cities of comparable size; and it is true that, while there was an increase of only 12 percent in the assessed value of all real estate located in the District during the period 1930–38, the value of tax-exempt property owned by the Federal Government increased 35 percent during the same period, thereby indicating that there is a constantly diminishing amount of taxable property which must bear the burden of the cost of government, which is constantly increasing, thereby increasing the tax burden of the individual property owner and particularly of that rare bird, the individual who has his domicile in the District of Columbia. It is true that the Federal Government buys park property (thereby taking it off the tax rolls), takes the title in its name, and requires the District to reimburse it for the purchase price. It is true that the District pays to maintain the Zoo and the National Park and Planning Commission and other purely national enterprises. The instances could be multiplied over and over again, but the multiplication of such arguments merely provokes controversy and renders impossible a dispassionate study of the situation.

The stark reality of the matter is simply that Congress has the upper hand and that, if it wishes to disregard what it ought to do in favor of what it is willing to do, the people of the District of Columbia are completely at its mercy. Congress has the power of a Hitler or a Stalin as far as District taxes or finances may be concerned. It can exempt from taxes whomever it pleases. It can make the taxes as high or as low as it pleases. It can raise the Budget or lower it and add new items, whether needed or not and whether desired by the District people or distasteful to them. The Congress can either discharge its duty or abdicate its responsibilities when it has a duty to act. It becomes in this case a tyrant because of its lethargy.

We therefore waste time when we select particular instances of inequity. Inequities must exist if the fiscal relationship is not sufficiently flexible to meet changing conditions, for the simple reason that the governmental necessities of the Federal and District Governments do not expand and contract on any fixed or direct ratio either absolutely or in relation to each other. Therefore it is only by introducing a principle which permits some flexibility that the inequities can be eliminated or even reduced.

The poignancy of our problem is brought out by a simple illustration. The current defense program involves an expansion of governmental activity. It requires a sudden growth of the District of Columbia. It necessitates the extension of water and sewer facilities into hitherto undeveloped portions of the District. It probably involves an expansion of the Surveyor's office, the Building

Inspector's office, and other branches of the District government. Finally, it demands an increase in school, recreational, and hospital facilities. Where is the District to obtain the funds to finance these improvements? The only possible sources are taxation and the Federal Government. Ultimately, the District may be better off, because the capital expenditures are made, but the immediate beneficiary of the expenditures is the Federal Government. The needs of the Federal Government have created the needs of the District. Today's needs of the District for schools, playgrounds, and hospitals are not those of an independent, self-sufficient community but of an important and necessary adjunct of the Federal Government.

The Federal Government should realize that the District is not a poor relation which must be accepted and condoned, but is its own good right arm. It is hampering its own activities when it fails to provide flexibility in the fiscal relationship between itself and the District.

In the light of the foregoing example, it is interesting to observe that the Acting Auditor of the District testified at a joint hearing of subcommittees of the House and Senate District Committees on March 6, 1941, to this effect:

"It is evident that the maintenance and operating cost of the District government is increasing at the rate of approximately $700,000 annually, and that the funds available for capital improvements are decreasing," and brought his testimony to a close with this language:

"The conclusion is that since it apparently is not possible to curtail the maintenance and operating cost of the District, capital improvements will decline unless additional revenue is produced or some formula adopted which would result in larger Federal payments toward the expenses of the District government."

DOES THE OVERTON FORMULA PRESENT A FAIR AND EQUITABLE PLAN FOR THE DISCHARGE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL DUTY?

I think that there has been no better statement of what the relationship should be between District and Federal Governments than that contained in the report of the joint congressional committee of 1915 (Senate Document No. 247, 64th Cong., 1st sess.), namely:

"Nothing is clearer to us than it never was the intent that this District should bear all the extraordinary burden of expense incident to its plan and occupancy as a national city. * * *

"Our unanimous conclusion is that the rate of taxation in the District should be fixed and certain; that the Congress should pursue a definite policy of regular and liberal appropriation, having in view not only the permanent moral and physical advantages of the city but also its preeminent beauty and grandeur as the municipal expression of the Nation's home and its people's pride."

I do not see how it is possible to set an accurate appraisal on the services which the District performs for the Federal Government or on those which the Federal Government performs for the District. It is physically impossible to appraise the value of the real estate occupied by the Federal Government for the simple reason that the property has no value to anyone else and no value at all (at least in the aggregate) unless the Government occupies it. You cannot set a value on a man's heart apart from the man, because he cannot function without it.

If this matter were purely academic, it could seriously be disputed whether it is within the realm of human capability to devise a formula for Federal participation which could be proven by mathematical calculations to be a fair and reasonable one. I should certainly be distrustful of a formula which claimed such virtues on the ground that it would be a moral impossibility to include mathematical rigidity and fairness and equity in the same general concept. At best, any formula must be merely a rough approximation.

The Overton formula places Federal participation in the annual expenses of the District on a percentage basis, the percentage to be used for a given year by taking the ratio that the land owned by the United States Government (less certain excluded types) bears to the total landed area in the District. For the current year, that would place Federal financial responsibility at 21 percent of total expense of maintaining the District government.

I must confess that at first this seemed to me to represent a rather niggardly participation, although it calls for an increase from the 13-percent participation provided by the present lump-sum appropriation. Accordingly, if I were disposed to oppose the formula, it would be on the ground that it did not make a sufficient provision. Having studied the District finances and having seen the Federal appropriation reduced first from 50 percent to 40 percent of the total and then reduced to the crumbs-from-the-table plan of lump-sum allotment, I was distinctly afraid that it was just a slight palliative for a slightly aroused congressional conscience. I must admit, however, that this feeling was based on intuition and sentiment rather than on any cold logic.

After giving the matter much thought, I believe that the Overton formula is at least worth testing in the crucible of experience. Neither government can afford to permit the disgraceful annual quibbling over the amount of the Federal participation to continue indefinitely. Neither government can afford to have a system so complicated established that it would bring all the horrors and headaches of *Smythe* v. *Ames* over into the field of government. Establishing a formula on the basis of real-estate values is impracticable. Increasing the tax burden is impracticable, especially in view of situation respecting domicile in the District. A fair distribution of personal-tax burdens in the District of Columbia is virtually impossible in the light of recent decisions of the United States Court of Appeals for the District, holding that a person who has lived in the District upward of 20 years continuously and who has no dwelling place elsewhere is nevertheless not domiciled in the District. The Overton formula has the virtues of simplicity and ease of application. It rests on a basis of reasonableness. It is apparently acceptable to the Commissioners of the District. It is superior to any other plan as yet proposed.

I believe that it should be adopted.

Pan American Studies—Gauld on Brazil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

ARTICLE BY CHARLES ANDERSON GAULD

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for the RECORD an article on Brazil by Charles Anderson Gauld, in the April 1941 issue of the Journal of Geography. Mr. Gauld is a specialist on Brazil and Spanish America at the Library of Congress. He joined the staff of our national library in 1938 after 7 years of study at the three leading universities of the Pacific coast, including the State University of Washington in Seattle. Mr. Gauld is a member of the Descendants of the American Revolution, a progressive group whose ideals differ as much from those of the conservative Daughters of the American Revolution as the aims of the tories did from those of the founding fathers.

Mr. Gauld's grandfather was the late Gen. T. M. Anderson, noted military figure in the State of Washington, for whom Mount Anderson in Olympic National Park was named. He is a kinsman of the Honorable R. C. Anderson, first American Minister to Colombia, who was named United States delegate to the first Pan American Conference, called by Simón Bolívar. Anderson's death in 1826 while en route to Panama prevented our being represented at that historic gathering, prophetic of the many inter-American conferences since, and of the efforts to attain hemisphere unity for democracy and defense against reactionary European imperialism.

Recently Mr. Gauld has written a number of articles on Latin America, emphasizing the significant cultural and economic contributions throughout this hemisphere of the Negro, and the strategic importance of the No. 2 nation of the Americas—Brazil. Both the Negro and Brazil have received too little consideration in the United States, even with the recent increase in interest in Hispanic American culture and solidarity for the development and defense of the New World. There is also a need to stress the importance of the participation of labor in pan Americanism to make it a democratic people's movement. If good-neighborism remains the property of officials and of big business, it will fail.

The article follows. It gives factual background data on much of the ground I covered in my two speeches on Brazil in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages A1171 and A1916.

[From the Journal of Geography for April 1941]

BRAZIL TAKES A CENSUS

(By Charles A. Gauld, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.)

Brazil took its fifth general census in the fall of 1940. Our greatest New World neighbor skipped the count scheduled for 1930, the year of the revolution in which Getulio Vargas and his cowboys from the southernmost state of Rio Grande do Sul swept into Rio and national power. The last census was in 1920, when Brazil had about 30,000,000 inhabitants.

Some 45,000 enumerators in Brazil's 3,300,000 square miles will count an amazingly diverse population of possibly 43,000,000 people. So isolated are some villages of the far interior grasslands and mountains and the Amazon jungle, that it will take weeks for the returns to reach Rio. Many Indian settlements on the smaller tributaries of the Amazon, over 2,000 miles from the Atlantic, can be reached only by launch and canoe. Some of the naked Indians of the innermost jungle, in the heart of the South American Continent, have scarcely seen a white man since the collapse of the wild rubber boom 25 years ago. Occasionally census enumerators may have run grave risk of fever, accident, and even harm by Indians who were victimized and enslaved by rubber seekers 30 years ago. As during many periods of United States history, the Indian found

only disease and death at the hands of the white man. Scattered through 2,000,000 square miles of hills, grasslands, and tropical rain forests, mostly along lonely rivers, are the remaining pure Indians of Brazil. They were not counted in the censuses of 1872, 1890, 1900, and 1920. No one knows how many there are, but they are usually estimated as well under a million. It remains to be seen how many will be counted in this census.

THE CENSUS TASK

For weeks the returns will pour into Rio de Janeiro from enumerators who have visited homes in all the different sections of Brazil. Earliest probably will be the returns of cosmopolitan Rio. Past censuses have all dealt more fully with Rio as the national showplace and capital, than with any other part of Brazil. Next may come the returns from the prosperous industrial and agricultural states nearest Rio in south Brazil. There are the States of Rio de Janeiro and Espirito Santo with their light industries and sugar and coffee plantations. Just inland from them is Minas Gerais, one of the world's great mining areas. The census will show Minas Gerais to resemble Texas and California in size and diversity. With doubtless over 7,400,000 inhabitants, it is Brazil's first state in population and its second in coffee, manufacturing, and nearly everything else.

In the far south are Paraná, Santa Catarina, and the gaucho State, Rio Grande do Sul. From this State of pampas and fine herds of cattle comes President Vargas, since 1930 the strong man of Brazil. Most impressive of all will be the statistics from the State and city of São Paulo, the heart of south Brazil and of the nation. São Paulo is the richest and most dynamic of Brazil's 20 states, producing a greater proportion of Federal Government revenue than any other half-dozen states. São Paulo city, the country's business capital, is often called "the Los Angeles of South America." These southern States are in the Temperate Zone with cattle, agriculture, and industrialization like parts of our South and Midwest. They alone are connected with Rio by both rail and steamship lines, federally owned.

NORTH BRAZIL

Slower to be enumerated may be the north and northeast of Brazil. The northeast has a densely populated coastal plain, for centuries characterized by big sugar and tobacco plantations, run by the labor of millions of Negroes. Its historic ports are noted for colonial churches and old buildings. Here the Dutch for a few decades seized and profitably ran an enormous sugar plantation colony until driven out in 1654. Nieuw Amsterdam was then but a village. From the bulge of Brazil that juts out toward Africa into the South Atlantic to the Amazon jungles are the part-Indian states of north Brazil. Their capitals are all seaports, several of which France tried to seize, along with the mouth of the Amazon, at the very time she was settling New Orleans. Needless to say, if either Holland or France had succeeded in holding tropical northern Brazil, the census would have a very different task.

The hilly interior is isolated and retarded, suffering in large areas from droughts and a lack of rail and motor roads. Its cattle, cotton, and tropical products give northern Brazil little wealth and commerce for the census to record. Industries and big cities are few in this least-favored region, over whose sun-baked towns fly the planes of the rival airways of Germany and the United States.

SOUTH BRAZIL DOMINANT

The census data will show indirectly that Rio, Porto Alegre, and São Paulo and the industrialized states of southern Brazil control the nation's economic life and destiny. In this region comparable to our Northeast, are most of the banks, cultural institutions, factories, and major cities. To them have migrated many Europeans and generations of young Brazilians in search of careers, just as young Americans seek opportunity in our National Capital and chief cities.

COMPARISON WITH UNITED STATES

The 45 questions asked of individuals and families resemble those in our census and will bring out certain interesting social and economic differences between the American and Brazilian peoples. When the returns of both censuses are analyzed, it will be clear that Brazil and the United States are several decades apart in economic development and the resulting social effects.

For example, Brazil has the population and level of industrialization of the United States 90 years ago. Most Brazilians live in rural communities, raise large families, and have poor transportation facilities except by water—just like North Americans in 1850. Brazil in 1940, however, has far fewer foreign-born than this country in 1850 or 1940, because Brazil received in the past century but 4,600,000 immigrants. This is only a small fraction of the immigration to the United States. As a result of war and starvation and chaos in Europe during the next decade, Brazil's 1950 census, if not interrupted by internal troubles of its own, may record the presence of a considerable number of new immigrants. People are badly needed to populate its largely empty interior and as additions to its small class of educated and skilled farmers and workers.

RACE MIXTURE

Brazil's census will differ from ours in one interesting respect, namely race. We are overly-precise in listing all non-Caucasions as such, even to the point of labeling as Indian or Negro those who are three-quarters white. Brazil lacks this Anglo-Saxon preoccupation with race, having inherited Portugal's tolerance in race relations. As a result of 4 centuries of mixture of Portuguese colonists with Indians, Negroes, and those of mixed blood, Brazil is the world's most unusual melting pot.

Brazil's census is not expected to show race mixture very clearly, any more than the previous ones. (Vera Kelsey's "Seven Keys to Brazil," 1940, which is excellent on race mixture, says that since the creation of the republic in 1889, mention of race has been avoided in Brazilian censuses largely in deference to the former slaves, the last of whom were freed without bloodshed or bitterness in 1888.) Several million of the estimated 43,000,000 Brazilians who are partly Indian or in part Negro may be listed as Caucasian.

Why not? In the first place, the officials would have too much difficulty specifying and determining complex combinations of Indian, Caucasian, and Negro blood. Furthermore, few educated Brazilians, knowing our prejudices, care to publicize details of large-scale miscegenation, about which they feel some embarrassment. They realize that their country may have only about 14,000,000 whites, or a third of the population. Most of the whites live in dominant South Brazil.

Contrastingly, there are possibly 16,000,000 Brazilians with a noticeable amount of Negro blood, amounting to, roughly, 40 percent of the nation. We have some 13,000,000 Negroes and mulattoes, who form only 10 percent of our 130,000,000. In Brazil the most numerous group is the mulattoes and persons of three-way mixture. There are many nearly pure Negroes in northeastern Brazil, which is the Black Belt. It is a great plantation area, racially and culturally comparable to our Black Belt of the deep South, but with fewer whites. Gilberto Freyre, the eminent authority on northeastern Brazil, feels there are practically no Negroes there without some admixture of Indian or white blood.

COMPARISONS WITH SPANISH AMERICA

In northern Brazil, between the bulge and the Amazon Valley, are most of the possibly 6,000,000 persons of mixed Indian and white descent. The few pure Indians are numerically unimportant. The Indian forms a far greater element in the total blood stream of Brazil than in North America, but a lesser amount than in most Spanish-American countries except Uruguay and Argentina.

Brazil, unlike Mexico, Central America, and the Andean nations, is definitely not an Indian-and-mestizo nation. Racially it more closely resembles the Caribbean Islands, where Negro blood has for centuries been prominent or predominant. In Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, and Puerto Rico there is almost no Indian blood, as the Indian died off before 1550 and the hardier Negro appeared as the plantation laborer. The 1940 census will not be very helpful in understanding Brazil's racial composition, but out of these diverse elements Brazil is fusing a new race under the tropical sun—tolerant, talented, and richly endowed with the things of the spirit.

WHITES IN BRAZIL

More accurate in the census will be the information obtained on the national origins of white Brazilians. Heads of families, their wives, and any living grandparents will be asked the country of origin of themselves and their parents. This may somewhat alter the writer's table of estimates based on five years of reading:

Portuguese descent	5,500,000
Italian or half Italian	3,800,000
German or half German	1,100,000
Spanish, Slavic, Syrian, etc	3,600,000
Estimated total	14,000,000

It will be noted that most white Brazilians are descendants of immigrants from fascistic countries. Many of these Brazilians have relatives living under totalitarianism. They form the dominant element in Brazil, whereas we in the United States like to think we are farther removed from European ties and influences.

An examination is now in order of the possibly 14,000,000 whites in Brazil whose national origins the census will disclose.

As Brazil's mother country, little Portugal has sent it the most settlers from Europe. Indeed, for years Portugal's chief export was peasants. Its kindly and pleasant people have gone to Brazil in a steady stream for four centuries. Most left Portugal pious and illiterate and with little or no capital to invest. Today they have no powerful fatherland behind them. Many in Brazil became rich, educated, and progressive. A great number have through hard work risen to the middle class. But others of Portugal's immigrants live in nearly the same poverty and ignorance and on the same bad diet of manioc meal, rice, and beans as the millions of Brazilian peasants and townspeople of mixed race. In general, the five or six million Brazilians of pure Portuguese ancestry have a love of culture, a zest for life, notable talents in music and literature, and exceptional freedom from race prejudice.

Since Brazil became independent of Portugal in 1822, however, Italy has contributed even more peasants to Brazil than has Portugal. In many years toward the end of last century, the number of Italians arriving in southern Brazil was several times as great as the total of all other colonists. Like the Portuguese, most of the Italians came poor and illiterate from a backward homeland. They have readily merged with the predominant population of Portuguese descent in south Brazil.

The German migration, chiefly via Hamburg, was small but steady. For a century Germans have been gradually expanding in numbers and influence in Brazil's important southern cities and agricultural zones. Many German-speaking Brazilians originated in Austria-Hungary and in eastern Europe's Lutheran colonies of Germans. Most have tended to retain their language and customs, and their farming and business ability. Some

non-German Brazilians have intermarried or sent their children to German schools, influential in a land of over 70 percent illiteracy. There may be somewhat over a million German-Brazilians, but there are nearly four times as many of Italian or part-Italian ancestry. Both groups have made significant contributions to Brazil's development. The German-Brazilians have been the more successful in diversified farming and trade, and because of their education and better health they are more prosperous than the masses of mixed blood in northern Brazil. (For the same reasons, German-Brazilians are important from a military viewpoint. Most Brazilians dread a Nazi victory.)

In recent decades several thousand Japanese have gone annually to Brazil. Like our capable Japanese-Americans in Hawaii and California, they are fine truck farmers and shopkeepers. Most live in rich São Paulo State. There are fewer than 270,000 in all Brazil. Interestingly, they are generally from Kyushu, the isle of Japan most visited by Portuguese merchants and missionaries in the sixteenth century, when Brazil was in its infancy as but one among Portugal's many colonies, for its brief empire was the first on which the sun never set.

Some Brazilians dislike their Japanese fellow citizens, despite the fact that thousands of them are good Brazilians, adopting the language, customs, and Christianity. In fact, most of Brazil's citizens of Slavic, Italian, Syrian, and Teutonic origin have similarly adopted Brazilian culture, adding distinctive qualities to the national life of Brazil in the same way that our later immigrants have become Americanized, enriching life in the United States.

The census will show the distribution and blending in Brazil of the descendants of the 4,600,000 European colonists since independence. About 80 percent have been Latins from lands now Fascist. Some 2,500,000 went to São Paulo state alone, as it has been rapidly expanding since 1890. Over a million Italians went to this state. The census may show that they and their children comprise over 2,000,000 of the state's 6,500,000. Some of them are rich. The tallest building in Brazil, towering over São Paulo's busy downtown triangle, bears the Italian name Martinelli. Brazil's chief chain of factories is Italian-owned.

We North Americans may well look forward to the publication of the fifth Brazilian census. With the decline of France and Italy in the coming post-war chaos, Brazil may supersede them as the greatest land of Latin culture.

(Americans reading the census figures will think that São Paulo and other Brazilian cities are larger than they really are. This is because Brazil customarily gives the population, not just of the city limits, but of the city, all its suburbs, and the surrounding area of the "municipio," equivalent to a county here. Not realizing this, United States writers will perhaps continue to make the error of not allowing for this or pointing it out.)

A Democracy of Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER T. BONE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5, 1941

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very interesting address delivered by Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE, Vice President of the United States, before the New York Young Democratic Club, Inc., at the Astor Hotel, New York City, on April 30, 1941, on the subject, A Democracy of Responsibility.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy to address the New York Young Democratic Club tonight. These are days when thoughts of country must come first. You will therefore pardon me, I hope, if the things I say are just as appropriate for all Americans as they are for young Democrats. It is wise for all of us in the United States to think about the ties which bind us closely together in one great Nation, regardless of creed, race, region, or political party. It is a bad time to think of the things which separate us.

Men and women under 40 years of age find themselves faced with unusually heavy trials and suffering. All the young people in the free democracies of the world are being tried as with fire to see if they are heroes or quitters; to see if they have the courage, the intelligence, and the vitality to maintain their freedom. Those of us who are over 40 years have the advantage of having been close enough to World War No. 1 to understand, as a result of our experience, the forces which are now moving to make the world such a hellish place. We know the forces which created nazi-ism. We are not surprised that the agents of Nazi Germany should take advantage of every opportunity to stir up conflict and confusion, so as to soften us in the United States for easy conquest, as they have softened and conquered other free nations.

Yes, it is difficult for those who are under 40 to realize the kind of world into which they have been born. They have suffered, because so many have been unable to find jobs. And in the case of those who found jobs there were many thousands who got wages so low that they thought they could not afford to get married.

Among those who had jobs at good salaries are many thousands in the military service today who were obliged to leave their homes to accept Army pay, which in many cases is only one-fifth or one-tenth that which they received in private life. It is easy for young folks to reach the conclusion that world events are discriminating against them.

Young people a generation ago approached World War No. 1 with an air of eagerness and excitement. War in those days still had wrapped around it much of the old-time atmosphere of romance and adventure. The young people today see things straighter. They know the present war, which only one nation wanted, and for which only one nation was prepared, and which only one nation really started, is a pure horror. It is like the nightmare of a deadly disease. It is horrible because it is an attack not only against the bodies of men but also against their minds. It is creeping across the world, moving in on one free nation after another, first by psychological poison, lies, corruption, and discord; then by the storm of fire and steel; and, finally, in the last stage, by the terror of slavery under the gestapo. The Nazis, by bluster and bluff, reinforced by hard work and enthusiasm, have spread their deadly power over most of Europe and Asia. Time is running short. Much as we hate the choice, the issue of slavery or war may be forced upon us as it has been forced on others.

As each one of us looks at the terror which is abroad in the world and sees the hurricane blowing our way, he asks, "What can I do to carry my share of the responsibility for the safety of our country?" For some the responsibility has been laid down by law. They are now in military training. They will defend the independence of the United States, if need be, on the field of battle. But the vast majority of the young people of this country will find their responsibility in other lines. Their job is to carry out their civilian duties, just like those of us who are older. If the civilians want to avoid either war or slavery, they must do one thing supremely well, and that is to produce to the limit, as quickly as possible, the guns, the planes, the ships, and all the other things that help produce planes, guns, and ships. Maximum production will strengthen those nations which are still fighting the Nazi horror overseas.

I am proud of the fact that in 1941 the United States will produce 22,000 defense planes, as compared with 4,500 in 1940—but this is not enough. I am proud that this year we are making a third more steel than last year—but this is not enough. Our growing production has put heart in all the free people of the world, and has brought hope to those who lie under the Nazi terror. But we have just begun to produce. We must put our backs into the job and make such a record as will convince the Nazi leaders that we mean real business and that we are not merely playing at production in a half-hearted sort of way. Young men, old men, managers, and workers—we are all in the same boat. Women have a very special part to play, because so much of the courage and endurance of the human race is theirs. They pushed us to victory in World War No. 1, and they can do it again.

The responsibility for work and still more work rests on every man and woman in defense industry. But work in itself is not all. On every citizen rests the responsibility for promoting the harmony, the unity of purpose, and the determination that will make for efficiency and success. Let me illustrate by speaking of the settlement of strikes.

You have heard of the delays that were caused by workers in the defense industries, and you have heard of the delays that were caused by corporations that dickered with the Government for weeks and months before they would sign a contract for defense production. You have heard demands that the Government crack down on labor and crack down on industry. But we in the United States believe that before we crack down on our fellow citizens we should have patience to listen to either workers or manufacturers who want to be heard. We have faith that the best efficiency in the long run comes from free and willing cooperation. But in time of great emergency like the present the people of the United States have the right to demand sincere and earnest effort from both labor and management to settle all differences among themselves or with the Government with promptness and good will. There is as great patriotism in working overtime to settle a defense contract or strike as in working overtime to rivet the wing of a fighting plane.

You can do a service to our country on the very front line of our defense by building good feeling, not only between management and labor, but also between Christian and Jew, between white and Negro, between Protestant and Catholic, and even between Democrats and Republicans.

The Nazis count more than anything else on getting us bogged down squabbling among ourselves. Your answer to the Nazi agents is to do your job in whatever position you may be. It is up to you to cement the brotherhood of freemen, that is the heart and soul of America. Whether you work through an organization or as an individual, it is your duty to work every day on this great job of strengthening our American brotherhood.

When I use the word "America," I am doing so in the big sense, the true sense, to indicate this whole hemisphere. Love of liberty and belief in the dignity of the human soul characterize the latin culture south of the Rio Grande just as truly as they do our own culture in the United States and Canada. The Latin Americans by nature hate the very

essence of nazi-ism, and they are eager to see us in the United States demonstrate in a truy big way our ability to produce enormously and speedily of those products which will insure peace or freedom to this hemisphere and the entire world. We cannot let our brothers to the south down.

We must develop with the greatest possible speed a democracy of responsibility capable of expressing itself in unprecedented production. If this does not come to pass, our political and economic democracy will go the way of last year's birds' nests.

And so I say to you: Keep yourself strong and healthy, both physically and mentally. It is going to be fashionable to be in good health. Get the necessary sleep, food, rest, and exercise so that you can work harder. If you read, listen to the radio, or go to the movies, do these things in such a way that you can work harder. Whether you are in the Army or in civilian defense, I want to say to you that the emergency is now sufficiently great so that your strength belongs to your country. If you use that strength to the utmost now to produce, you may be able to prevent either war or slavery from coming to this hemisphere.

When we win the war, as I am confident we can by producing to the limit, we shall be confronted with the problem of the peace. Twenty-five years ago we won the war and lost the peace, because we were not ready to do our part in fighting against human suffering and poverty. This time, as we take up the heavy burden of winning both the war and the peace, we must assume the responsibility of laying broad and deep the foundations of freedom, comradeship, good will, and mutual service, so that in the world to come there can be a permanent peace in which no nation can cause fear of aggression. Those who preach defeatism in this hour of world crisis are enemies of the human soul. Peace will come to the world, not as the result of bowing in slavery under the yoke of the Nazi terror, but as the result of freedom from nazi-ism and all it stands for. Long as it may take, we shall win our freedom from the threat of nazi-ism, and thereafter we shall build a peace that will endure.

Dedication of Woodrow Wilson Birthplace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5, 1941

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered yesterday by the President of the United States in dedicating the birthplace of Woodrow Wilson, at Staunton, Va.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are meeting here today to dedicate a new shrine of freedom. By this action we are bearing true witness to the faith that is in us—a simple faith in the freedom of democracy in the world.

It is the kind of faith for which we have fought before—for the existence of which we are ever ready to fight again.

I can think of no more fitting place in all the land for Americans to pledge anew their faith in the democratic way of life than at the birthplace of Woodrow Wilson. In this quiet Presbyterian manse first saw the light of day one whose whole active life was dedicated to the cause of freedom, to the conquest of fear and to the liberation of the eternal spirit of man from every thraldom imposed by force.

Woodrow Wilson was fortunate in his birthplace and favored in his parentage and environment. This was a home of plain living and high thinking and wherever the family moved in the migrations incident to the religious calling of the father they carried with them ideals which put faith in spiritual values above every material consideration.

In the tragic conflict which the world witnesses today and which threatens everything we have most loved as a free people, we see more clearly than ever before the unyielding strength of things of the spirit. All of recorded history bears witness that the human race has made true advancement only as it has appreciated spiritual values. Those unhappy peoples who have placed their sole reliance on the sword have inevitably perished by the sword in the end.

Physical strength can never permanently withstand the impact of spiritual force.

Woodrow Wilson's whole career was a triumph of the spiritual over the sordid forces of brute strength. Under his leadership this country made great spiritual progress.

Of Woodrow Wilson this can be said: That in a time when world councils were dominated by material considerations of greed and gain and revenge he beheld the vision splendid. That selfish men could not share his vision of a world emancipated from the shackles of force, and the arbitrament of the sword in nowise detracts from its splendor. Rather does the indifference of hostile contemporaries enhance the beauty of the vision which he saw and enlarge the glory of the world he sought to rebuild.

He will be held in everlasting remembrance as a statesman who, when other men sought revenge and material gain, strove to bring nearer the day which should see the emancipation of conscience from power and the substitution of freedom for force in the government of the world.

It is good for America that this house in which Woodrow Wilson was born will be preserved for us and for many future generations. In this valley of Virginia it will remind America that his ideals of freedom were wide enough to support democracy in all the world. He taught that democracy could not survive in isolation. We applaud his judgment and his faith.

War and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, OF MINNESOTA

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio speech made by me on the question of war and peace.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends, I am glad to have the opportunity to talk to you for a few minutes this evening on the question of war and peace.

Public officials in every country going to war say they go to war in the interest of peace. We have a terrific propaganda to get us to go into the World War which is now being fought. The program of getting us into the war has been carried on under a mask and slogan of keeping us out of war. That was the program before election, but since election you do not hear anything about "short of war."

Their propaganda for the lend-lease bill was based on the same claim. They said it was a bill to keep us out of war.

They have said they did not want convoys to convoy ships into the war zone, because that would mean war. Now they say they want convoys, even though it means war.

Now they are not talking about aid "short of war." Now they do not say that they are for peace. Now they do not say they are opposed to convoys. Now, when they have the legislation and the money, they are for war on the part of the United States, and now, over the radio and the news reels and in the newspapers, they complain that 85 percent of the American people do not understand them and do not agree with them about going to war.

They say they can't get this country into the war until the people understand and believe what they have been saying all the time. They say that the mind of the general public in the United States is so confused.

I ask you, can anyone wonder that the state of mind of the American people is in a state of confusion? Of course, the people's mind is confused because they believed these men were telling them the truth. The people made the mistake of believing what they were told both before election and after election. And these commentators and propagandists are disappointed because the people have intelligence enough to remember what they were told before election and what they were told after the election. But in view of what they are now told, they are beginning to suspect the honesty of these propagandists. Now they are beginning to understand they never intended to keep you people out of war.

First they succeeded in repealing the Neutrality Act. Then they kept the war issue out of the campaign by saying they would keep us out of war. Then they succeeded in passing the lend-lease bill.

Now, of course, they are more frank. They think the time now has come to shove you in.

It is not necessary for me to repeat the words they have said, because you all know they have said the things that I have intimated here, and far more. Some of the leaders now state openly to the public that they lied and that they had to lie in order to fool the people.

Mr. Herbert S. Agar, editor of the Courier-Journal, of Louisville, Ky., one of the most influential and persistent members and agents and lecturers of the committee called "All Aid to the Allies Short of War," spoke in Boston on March 13, on the occasion when an honorary degree was conferred upon him. What he said on that question is quoted, in part, in the New York Times of March 14; and I read from the quotation in that paper:

He said "that there had been too much lying by the supporters of the lend-lease bill in the United States Senate and in the press."

As one who had taken a leading part in supporting the bill, Mr. Agar said that he preferred Senator WHEELER's analysis of it.

He quoted Mr. Wheeler as denouncing the measure as "not a bill to keep America out of

war but a bill to enable the President to fight an undeclared war on Germany."

"That is precisely what it is," said Mr. Agar, "and if its defenders had defended it on those grounds, we would have won 2 weeks sooner.

"One side kept saying in the press and in the Senate that this lease-lend bill is a bill to keep America out of war. That's 'bunk.'"

And then he continues:

"And I think that failure to say except what a thing means is an illustration of why our democratic world is being threatened now."

Of course, democracy is breaking down when public officials and creators of public opinion lie to the people.

Mr. Agar is a very competent, well-known witness who has lectured not only in Minnesota but on many radio hook-ups and in many States for this committee organized to get us into the war under the published slogan "All aid short of war."

No one is in better position to know than Mr. Agar that his companions to get us into the war lied. He is too intelligent a man not to have known it all the time. Why didn't he state before election what he said on March 13? Why didn't he state it before the repeal of the Neutrality Act? Why didn't he state it before the passage of the lend-lease bill? Now he says that Senator WHEELER and other so-called isolationists' definition of the bill was right, when they said it was a "bill to get us into war."

Now, with all this background of prevarication, of bunkoing the people of America, they now complain that there is a lack of unity amongst the people for going to war. How can you expect unity of 130,000,000 people based on a foundation of deliberate deception—deception by organized minorities in control of avenues of information, like newspapers, radio, and the movies, and also deliberate deception by men in high public office who have sworn their loyalty to our Constitution and in so doing have taken an oath to confine their activities within the authority granted them in that supreme law of the land.

American unity and defense cannot be built on a foundation of broken promises undermining the faith of a great people.

Testimonial Dinner to Hon. Vincent Dailey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley at a testimonial dinner given to Vincent Dailey by the New York Young Democratic Club, Inc., at the Hotel Astor, New York City, on April 30, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. FARLEY. May I at the outset extend my congratulations and my hearty approval of the program of the New York Young Democratic Club in selecting each year a notable Democrat of the Empire State to pay tribute to him and his achievements at a State-wide testimonial dinner. I was privileged to be an honor guest on a similar occasion. Governor Lehman, Attorney General Jackson, and other eminent New Yorkers have been recognized in a like manner.

I am happy indeed that the members of the Young Democratic Club have chosen my good friend Vincent Dailey as their honor guest of this year, and in recognition of the distinguished service he has performed for the party have made him the beneficiary of this delightful occasion. No man in the State of New York has contributed more generously of his time and efforts to advance the Democratic cause, and no man in our State has attained a more enviable record of successful accomplishment.

During the last 10 or 15 years it has been my privilege to appear at many testimonial dinners here and throughout the country. I have enjoyed them all very, very much, because they were dinners given as a tribute for close personal friends of mine in various fields of endeavor, friends for whom I have a very high regard. But I know of no dinner of this character that I have ever attended that gave me the same degree of pleasure as does my presence at this gathering for Vincent Dailey this evening.

The attendance here of so many men and women in this crowded ballroom is evidence of the fact that there are thousands who feel as I do, and if this hall were twice as large it would not be possible to accommodate the host of friends of Vincent Dailey who want to pay him the tribute he is entitled to receive for his services to the Democratic Party in the last 10 or 12 years.

I had never met Vincent until 1930, and during the campaign that year for the reelection of Governor Roosevelt, he was of material assistance to me in traveling through the State, giving me reports and advice on the conditions as he saw them. As far as I know, he had no political experience up to that time. But his reports indicated that he was a keen observer and the information that he submitted satisfied me that he was the type of man I wanted to have associated with me in my efforts in behalf of the Democratic Party in the State of New York. He has remained with me and the State committee down through the years.

He was one of my most responsible and confidential advisers in the famous 1932 convention in Chicago, and during the campaign that followed, he acted for me, directing the work of the Democratic State Committee while I was serving as national chairman. In the New York campaign that year and in the national campaign of 1936, he gave the same unqualified support and direction. In the campaign of last November, the campaign of 1940, he directed the activities of the Democratic State Committee in a manner that won for him, I am sure, the respect and confidence of many who up to that time had failed to fully realize his true worth and service to the party.

Vincent Dailey has been my right arm down through these never-to-be-forgotten years. He has a spirit of loyalty that knows no bounds, a characteristic that is recognized by everyone who comes in contact with him. He is an extremely frank person, a realist who states the facts as they are. The one quality I like to see, and which I appreciate more than any other in public or private life, is the attribute of telling the truth. That is a thing I like about Vincent Dailey. He will always tell you the truth, let the chips fall where they may.

Somewhere I recently read a characterization that reminded me of Vincent—he is always busy, yet never hurried; always pleasant, yet never effusive; always reserved, yet never disdainful. In short, he is a splendid representative of the party organization.

These are momentous days in the history of this Nation. We are all concerned about our country and its future, concerned because of our love and affection for it. We are jealous of its progress in the past and, of course, jealous of its preservation as a nation. It is, therefore, essential that we work together as a unit. Regardless of what differences we have or may have had, regardless of anything that may have happened in the past, it is our imperative duty as American citizens to give to the President of the United States and those who surround him our wholehearted support and cooperation in their tremendous responsibility. It is our fervent hope that God will guide them in their efforts.

We have gathered here this evening to honor a splendid American. We are Democrats in a partisan sense, but we are also democrats in the broader implication of the word and adhere with unwavering loyalty to the ideals of our Republic. In the days that are to come, there will be serious responsibility placed upon our party leaders, and we are fortunate to have men like Vincent Dailey in positions of trust and confidence.

In honoring him, the Young Democratic Club of New York has added laurels to its distinction. Knowing Vincent as I do, for he is my personal friend as well as my political associate, I am sure that he is overwhelmed, and if he had his way about it he would prefer to be sitting here and taking part in this demonstration for someone other than himself. The party will never be able to repay him for his loyal devotion to its cause, but I am sure that he derives full and complete compensation in being permitted to serve the party of his fatih and adoption.

May I in closing extend my heartiest congratulations to you, Vincent, and at the same time express the hope and sincere wish that you will be spared for many, many years so that we may continue to work together in the future as we have in the past to advance the cause of the party we love so much.

Taxation and Nondefense Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD, OF VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on the Washington Evening Star Forum, Monday, April 28, on the subject of the new tax bill, the necessity for curtailing nondefense spending and the obstacles to our preparedness program.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In this hour of national peril, what is the supreme obligation of an American citizen to his country—to this country that has given to generations of Americans in the past and, I pray God, will give to all future generations, more peace, more happiness, more contentment than have ever before been enjoyed by the citizens of any great nation. Our supreme obligation today is to prepare this country to be so invincible and so strong as to overwhelm any attack that may be made upon it, and at the same time to continue to give aid in greater and greater amount to Great Britain.

This is the job we have set our hands to do. It is a colossal task. Before it is successfully

accomplished, it will require the united sacrifice of a united people. And upon our success or failure depends not only the future security of free and democratic people everywhere, but also the future preservation of organized government as we know it and desire it.

As our financial contribution to this emergency, we here in the United States are immediately faced with truly gigantic public expenditures. Already $40,000,000,000 has been appropriated by your Congress for our own defense and for aid to England, and we continue to appropriate more and more as time goes on. As we authorize military expenditures in such colossal amounts, your Federal Government continues nondefense spending on the same extravagant standard as has characterized the New Deal spending policy of the past 8 years.

There is now before the Congress of the United States a new tax bill, in which you and all citizens of America have a greater interest than in any previous tax legislation, as this provides for the imposition of new and additional taxes such as the American people have never before experienced. The United States Treasury has asked for tax legislation to provide three and one-half billions in new tax collections. This is to be added to the existing tax levies, which are at present yielding $9,000,000,000 making a total levy of twelve and one-half billions to be paid by the American taxpayers to the Federal Government alone in the coming year.

TAX LEVY NEARLY DOUBLED

The magnitude of this tax levy is emphasized when we recall that this is nearly twice as much as were the peak tax collections for the last World War, when six and one-half billions were collected in 1920. Except in 1920, and the present fiscal year, this tax levy will be more than twice as much as any levy in any other yearly period of our history. But this is not by any means all that the taxpayers must pay in the form of taxes in the coming year. To this twelve and one-half billions of Federal taxes must be added $4,000,000,000 of State taxes and another five and one-half billions of local taxes. So next year, we, the American taxpayers, must pay our proportionate shares of tax bills aggregating $22,000,000,000. This is one-fourth of all the wages, the earnings of corporations, the dividends, royalties, rents, interest, and individual gross incomes of all of our citizens—one-fourth of all the elements of national income.

This $22,000,000,000 over-all tax bill means an average collection of nearly $200 in the coming year from every man, woman, and child in America. At this rate, the average family of four must pay $800 in taxes, after paying their own living expenses and other obligations.

To state it another way, this $22,000,000,000 annual tax levy is more than twice the total yearly value of all the products of agriculture, including the products of the forests and the products of the mines. That is to say, it is more than twice the value of all the new wealth that comes each year from the soil, under the ground and from the forests. And even with this staggering burden of taxation, your Federal Government in the next year will be able to pay only one-half of its probable expenditures. That is, for every dollar collected in taxes another dollar will be added to the public debt.

We all recognize that taxes in the main must come from productive business. The Government may confiscate the property of the wealthy and deplete all reserves of wealth, but this will pay only a fractional part of our present expenditures. In the final analysis, taxes will be paid, as the President once expressed it "out of the sweat and toil of every man who labors." That is to say, taxes mainly must be paid out of business transactions and operations, placing a burden directly upon every one who buys and every one who sells, either by direct or hidden taxes.

PRAISES MORGENTHAU STAND

I congratulate and commend Secretary Morgenthau for advocating this increase in taxation. In the situation that confronts us, it is imperative to increase the Federal revenue as a check to the evils of uncontrolled inflation and to avoid the possibility of an insolvent Government, burdened by debt beyond the ability of the people to finance.

The new taxes will be a grievous burden to bear. The heavy hand of Uncle Sam will reach into every home, into every business, into the pockets of every American who buys or sells. It will add to the cost of every one's living, but it is a sacrifice that we must make. While spending great sums for national defense, when employment and profits are increasing, this is the time to collect the taxes to pay in part for these emergency expenditures. When the war ends, it is not likely we can continue to pay huge taxes. In the intensity and excitement of these stirring days, never let us forget that when the present war is over, when the vast expenditures for military and defense preparations cease, every sign points to a world depression such as has never before been known, and the implications and far-reaching consequences of which are terrifying to contemplate. After the war, those in foreign nations who have bought our goods will be unable to do so, because of their impoverishment, and here in this country we will face tremendous unemployment, with a public over-all debt which will certainly reach $100,000,000,000, and maybe more.

In the support of this tax bill, for the first time since the administration adopted the policy of deficit spending and pump priming to promote business recovery, your Government and the administration are taking a realistic view of our financial condition. It would have been much better, I think, if there had been greater taxation during these past years of deficit spending, or, better still, if the spending had not been so great.

Under our democratic system of government, the only effective resistance to public spending is the imposition of taxes. We have on one hand groups of citizens demanding public spending. These demands can be held in moderation only by the protests of the taxpayers who must pay the bill. This is the usual process of our democracy. It is the system the American people followed since the beginning of our Republic until 8 years ago when we adopted the fallacy of trying to purchase prosperity with borrowed money. Tax-conscious citizens, alert and vigilant to public extravagance, provide one of the most effective balances inherent in our constitutional democracy. Under New Deal spending for the past 8 years, this protection has been inoperative, as the Government, instead of exacting taxation for current disbursements, at least in major part, consistently spent during this long period $2 for every dollar received from taxation, and thus has accumulated a public debt of great proportions. The result is that the average person in America has not been made conscious of unprecedented expenditures, as one-half of the expenditures were financed by the issuance of Federal bonds, and not from taxation.

RESPONSIBILITY ON CONGRESS

I have always confidently believed that if taxes had been levied currently to cover the expenditures of the vast sums for the past 8 years the protests of the taxpayers would have been so vehement and politically effective as to have prevented much of the waste and extravagance that have occurred. It has truly been said that "the power to tax is the power to destroy," and a great responsibility now rests upon the Congress to distribute and equalize this terrific burden of taxation so that the least possible injustice, hardship, and interruption to business will result.

While the Treasury does not estimate it as high, I confidently predict that in the coming fiscal year the Federal Government will spend a total of $25,000,000,000. In fact, the authorizations and appropriations already made are nearly twice that amount. Productive capacity is the only restriction on even greater expenditures. That is to say, the capacity of our manufacturing plants to produce war materials of every character and description—ships, tanks, airplanes, guns, and other military supplies.

The ominous events in recent weeks in Europe, happening with lightning rapidity, are acting as a spur and incentive to more immediate and greater military expenditures for our own defense and aid to England.

Roughly speaking, this $25,000,000,000 of expenditures for the next fiscal year will be divided as follows: First, eight billions of appropriations for so-called peacetime or nondefense spending. Second, perhaps as much as five billions will be spent for aid to Great Britain. The remainder will be spent for our own defense and the operation of our military establishments.

When you and I, in our private affairs, face the need of an unexpected and unprecedented expenditure, which is of such a vital character that our failure to provide the funds endangers those things near and dear to us—perhaps the very existence of our loved ones—we look around and reduce as we can our spending for those things less essential—those things we can very well do without, until the emergency that faces us is over. Your Federal Government is faced with such emergency, but is not doing this very obviously wise thing.

Even though you have heard to the contrary, your Federal Government is not decreasing its nondefense spending but is continuing to spend in the same reckless and extravagant way that has placed upon you the huge public debt which now constitutes a first mortgage on the property of every citizen of our Republic.

NO ACTUAL REDUCTION

The Budget submitted by the President to the Congress in January embodied no actual reduction in nondefense spending, although by changing the totals in classifications the impression was conveyed that such a reduction had been made. For example, the new Budget eliminated from nondefense spending the entire and complete cost of the operation of the Army and Navy. We have always had an Army and a Navy, and we always will. If the normal cost of the Army and Navy is restored to the Budget classifications as submitted by the President, you will find in the Budget estimates a decrease of only $59,000,000 in nondefense spending, as compared to last year. And even this estimated reduction, inconsequential as it is, has since been wiped out by deficiency appropriations, so that unless strong leadership develops and an aroused public opinion demands it, acting upon the Budget as submitted by the President, there will be no reduction in nondefense spending for the coming year. If increases made to the farm appropriations by the Senate over and above Budget estimates are finally enacted, your Federal Government will spend more for strictly nondefense spending than in any peace year in our history, excepting in 1936, when the soldiers' bonus was paid.

Our nondefense spending can and should be reduced by $1,000,000,000. You, the taxpayers, who are now being asked to make the sacrifice at the call of patriotism by paying greatly increased taxes, should demand that every extravagance, every unnecessary nondefense expenditure be eliminated, and that the savings thus realized be given to national defense.

Under the President's Budget, for example, $1,478,000,000, will be spent for unemployment relief during the next year; spent during a period when reemployment will soon reach a goal, as predicted by Chairman Knudsen in his testimony the other day, where "there will be no unemployment in this country next fall." Yet the Budget rec-

ommends nearly $1,500,000,000 for unemployment relief, which is four times as much as was spent for relief in 1933, the low ebb of the depression.

A year ago I proposed in the Senate a reduction of 10 percent in nondefense spending, including the salaries of Senators and Congressmen. It was defeated by a majority of two. We, the American taxpayers, cannot go on a strike. Our Government can force us to pay taxes assessed against us, or take over all our property and all that we have. But under our democratic processes of government your voice can and will be heard in Washington, if you demand of your Representatives and of your President that there be a reduction in all expenditures of a nondefense character; a reduction of at least $1,000,000,000, which I assure you can be accomplished by efficiency, by the elimination of duplicated agencies of government, by a reduction in the top-heavy and constantly growing Government personnel, and by the elimination of luxuries in government, and by curtailing some activities that can be spared at this time, without doing injury to those essential services which a government should perform for its people. To me it is inexcusable that in the face of these tremendous necessary defense expenditures, at a time when the call is being made to the American people to sacrifice by paying such taxes as have never been known in our history, we should continue to spend at Washington as much or more for nondefense spending and continue our free, easy, reckless spending.

REDUCTION IN BUDGET ASKED

It is not enough for the Secretary of the Treasury to oppose appropriations above the Budget. This is commendable, and for this he should be congratulated, but the Budget itself should be reduced. As that Budget was submitted to the Congress by the President, the President can revise his estimates to accomplish a substantial reduction in this nondefense spending. The mechanics of appropriations by Congress are not generally understood by the public. The only composite and coordinated statement of Federal expenditures comes from the President in the submission of his Budget recommendations to the Congress. Appropriation bills then come before Congress singly, one for each of the departments. Only the appropriation for each department is considered at one time. Budget reductions can be recommended in the light of the whole and applied where they best could be absorbed.

Let me say before I conclude that our program of national defense is not progressing in a way essential to guarantee our security. The country would be surprised to know how few modern military planes, how few heavy tanks, how few ships, how few big guns America has produced since the European war began 20 months ago, and how meager is the production of essential war equipment scheduled for the months ahead.

We may pass a dozen lease-lend bills, but the huge task this country has set its hand to cannot be accomplished without total sacrifice on the part of all of our citizens.

Those who pay taxes must sacrifice by paying heavier and heavier taxes. Industry and businessmen must make their contribution by devoting their industrial output, when necessary, to essential war equipment at the expense of their normal business. Then, too, we must have no war profiteers in this emergency. Our boys must sacrifice by training for military service. Those who labor must sacrifice by working longer hours on defense projects and not interrupt those hours by unnecessary strikes. We can tolerate no bottlenecks in our program of total preparedness.

We must first recognize that no nation has ever successfully accomplished military preparedness by working 40 hours a week. We have before us the tragic fate of France. France worked 40 hours a week, and Germany worked under her totalitarian government as much as 80 hours a week. The result was that France was overwhelmed by the most stupendous military machine and military equipment the world has ever known. In the face of the fall of France 3 months later, we reduced our workweek to 40 hours. Our industry is geared in the main to a 40-hour week with, of course, some exceptions; but even this short workweek is being interrupted by continuing new strikes in vital industries.

Labor has its proper privileges. I want justice done to every laboring man, but interruptions of work caused by bickerings and jealousies among unions should not be tolerated at the expense of the security of our Republic.

I believe in the right of labor to collective bargaining. I know the vast majority of American workmen are patriots to the heart and do not countenance the willful acts of a small minority; but for the good of America and for the credit of labor, defense strikes must be stopped and stopped quickly.

The Mediation Board appointed by the President has no power to act. It has no power even to investigate strikes unless a certification is first made by the Secretary of Labor. It is impotent to deal with any situation, no matter how grave, unless first requested to do so by the Secretary of Labor.

Recalling that the Secretary of Labor never found cause to disapprove sit-down strikes, is it reasonable to wonder whether the Dykstra board ever will be allowed to proceed to its proper functions?

In the meantime there is a tragic loss of time in giving aid to Great Britain—aid which the country is demanding, aid which the Congress of the United States has directed should be given in unstinted measure.

What Congress should do and must do quickly is to vest the Mediation Board with full power to investigate the strike situation throughout the country, to endeavor to prevent strikes before they occur, and then to give the Board authority to enforce its own decisions. Until this is done, we have only the hope of an aroused public opinion to prevent the continued strikes in vital defense industries, but this public opinion, although now aroused throughout the length and breadth of America, has been impotent to force those who are responsible for the strikes to abandon their purpose and work for the common good of our Republic. And I say this with equal reference to industry and to labor, whichever may be responsible for this tragic delay in our preparedness program.

FORGETTING POLITICS URGED

It is a farce that in this time of national peril a board should be created without power even to investigate unless some other agency of the Government first allows it to do so, and then, even after such certification is made, the new Board has no power to enforce its own decisions except that of persuasion, which has already been tried and failed.

Political considerations should today be forgotten; all authorities should act with promptness and courage to meet this menace which has arisen to our security and welfare. This is no time to hide behind the cloak of a public act which the people of America are told is designed to accomplish a given purpose, and then refuse to give the agency created the power and authority to accomplish that purpose.

Tonight the Nation stands on the verge of a tie-up of all business, due to the bituminous-coal strike called by John L. Lewis. This strike has existed for 28 days, and during that 28 days coal production to the amount of nearly 50,000,000 tons has been lost. All coal reserves are nearly exhausted, and all industry faces a shut-down.

Madam Perkins, the Secretary of Labor, did not certify this strike to the Mediation Board until 23 days after the strike began, and during this period bitterness and disagreement rose which made the task of the Mediation Board doubly difficult so that no progress in settlement of the strike has been made.

Is John L. Lewis bigger than the Secretary of Labor? He may be, but he is not bigger than the Government of the United States in this hour of national peril. Before this emergency is over I predict that the American people will not tolerate any man or group of men, whether it be a powerful labor leader or a powerful industrial magnate, to stand as an obstacle to the essential work of our national preparedness. Unless these obstacles to our preparedness program are removed by those in authority, in some way, somehow, the American people will do what is imperative under our democratic form of government to clear the path for such quick and expeditious action as will best protect our country in this hour of national peril.

STRIKE COMPROMISES ASSAILED

For weeks and months our Government has compromised with the strike situation in defense industries, with the result that the menace to national security continues and grows. A National Mediation Board is appointed with no power to act or even to investigate until Miss Perkins gives permission, and then it has no power to enforce its own decisions. Madam Perkins, as Secretary of Labor, has shown such ineptness and inefficiency as to add greatly to the general confusion. It is time for stern and firm action, and for someone to speak in all the majesty of the Government of the United States of America in this hour of great national crisis. It is as futile as it is absurd to continue to talk about giving greater and quicker aid to Great Britain unless we are willing to do the things to produce quickly the military equipment Britain so urgently needs.

The one man who can speak for the American people is Franklin D. Roosevelt, our President. All he would have to say is that strikes in defense industries must stop at once; that we cannot longer tolerate any interruptions in our own defense and our aid to Great Britain either from capital or labor. Such an announcement would receive an overwhelming public acclaim. The President would unite America as we must be united if we are to do our part.

In millions of homes tonight in conquered democracies in foreign lands bitter regrets and self-recriminations fill the hearts of people who were once free and are now slaves because they did not recognize their dangers; because they were unwilling to change their accustomed mode of living; because they would not give up their luxuries; because they preferred the soft and easy life to that of sacrifice and self-control. Can we here in free America give tangible demonstration that a democracy can be efficient and effective; that a democracy can be strong and hard if need be; that a democracy can act firmly, wisely, and expeditiously? I pray God we can.

Credit Unions Aid National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON JAMES M. MEAD, OF NEW YORK

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

RECORD an address on the subject Credit Unions Aid National Defense, delivered by me over station WOL at Washington, D. C., on May 1, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Thirty-two years ago a new institution was born on American soil. It was a humble and experimental institution. It was intended to be operated by common working people for their own benefit, and its plan was simple. It was based on the idea that working people could do more for themselves by putting their spare earnings together than by using them separately. With everyone in a given group putting aside just a little from his weekly pay, a common fund would soon be built up from which anyone in the group could borrow when he needed money.

Thus the participants in the plan were stimulated to save more steadily, and, at the same time, they freed themselves from the usurer and the loan shark when they had to make a loan.

The new institution took the name "credit union." It received legal status through special State laws, first in Massachusetts and then some years later in my own State of New York and elsewhere. Eventually all but six States passed such laws. Seven years ago Congress provided for Federal chartering of credit unions and thus put the stamp of Federal approval on the plan.

For awhile after they were started back in 1909, credit unions spread slowly. Then it gradually dawned on the working people of America that this was just what they had been looking for. One section after another saw credit unions take root and flourish. Churches endorsed them and set up credit unions of their own. The Post Office Department formed 300 credit unions for its employees. Teachers found the plan an excellent device for financing themselves. Factory workers, railroad men, telephone operators, police and firemen, hotel employees, department store clerks, all increasingly came to set up and operate their own credit unions.

When the Federal Government took up the idea in 1934, the credit-union movement received the final stimulus to set it into high gear. Progress and expansion continue month by month and year by year. Fully 3,000,000 working men and women are now enrolled in credit unions Every working day sees 3 to 4 new credit unions started. Every week more than 10,000 new members join. Last year these humble pay-roll workers of America, through their credit unions, loaned each other $300,000,000, and not a penny was contributed by the Government or by an outside agency. Directly or indirectly, every cent came from the nickels, dimes, and dollars which these enterprising rank-and-file workers spared from their pay envelopes.

But my purpose tonight is not to tell in detail how the credit unions have grown into a national institution. Rather, I want first to extend a word of greeting from the Nation's Capital to all the millions of credit-union members and friends of the movement. And then I wish to answer briefly the question rising insistently in many minds. "How can our credit union help out in the national emergency?"

My answer is simple. But it really goes beyond the credit union itself and applies to the individual working man and woman, especially to the one who feels that his freedom, his aspirations, his standard of living are vitally involved in the world struggle of today and tomorrow.

When such a one asks, "What can I do in my little way to help the cause of national defense?" my answer is, "You may be called upon to do many things in the future. But one thing you can do here and now. You can make yourself ready for any such future service by getting your personal money affairs straightened out. Clear up your debts. And above all, start building for yourself a good reserve of savings."

"At first glance that may seem to be a curious way of rendering patriotic service. But let me remind you of two things: The first is, that in preparations for defense there is a money front for the Nation as well as a military front or a production front. We must draw on the savings of all our people for the billions necessary to protect ourselves and our liberties. You make yourself a soldier on this front when you pile up your savings.

"The second point is that the whole strength of a nation lies in the spirit and morale of its people. Many factors contribute to morale. But not the least of them is the ease of mind that comes to a man when he finds himself with a healthy and growing savings account, or other property, and when he can reflect that his family will not be left penniless if he should be taken away.

"He lives and works with more freedom and more initiative when he has such a safeguard. Multiply his state of mind by 130,000,000 and you can see how vastly more effective our whole national effort will be if our individual citizens see to it that their own money affairs are in good shape and they can give themselves fully to the task in hand.

"There is one further point that should be made that requires a long-range view. Wages and income now are on the upswing. But undoubtedly there will come a time of readjustment when defense expenditures taper off and we must work our way back to a normal, stabilized economy.

"Money saved now will be our cushion for the shocks of such a change, both personally and nationally. Every dollar you can save now is a patriotic dollar, adding to the safety of our country, and adding as well to your own comfort and well-being."

Such would be my counsel to the individual worker. And those considerations point the way to service for the credit union. In fact, they offer an exceptional and unique opportunity for social and patriotic service. Not an institution in the country is in a better position, perhaps none so good, to help and encourage popular saving for defense and peacetime purposes.

The credit union is made up entirely of working people, mostly of very moderate income. They feel that it belongs to them. It has no other purpose than to work for their benefit. It has its office among them, on the factory premises or otherwise conveniently close by. It operates at the very root of the national economy. How could there be a better agency, then, for maintaining the national morale at a high level through a universal encouragement of thrift and sound financial health?

This question is increasingly important: "What special steps can a credit union take to fulfill its responsibilities? At a time when the rest of the Nation is turning rapidly toward national effort, is it fitting that the credit union should satisfy itself with a mere business-as-usual routine?"

If I may assume, for a moment, that I am talking directly to the tens of thousands of officials of the credit unions of the United States, I, indeed, recommend strongly a vigorous program pointed toward aiding the national mobilization for defense.

There are many things to do. For Federal credit unions a special new avenue of usefulness has recently been opened. The Treasury Department has designated credit unions, operating under Federal charter, as issuing agents for the sale of defense-savings bonds. That means that Federal credit unions may keep a supply of these bonds on hand at all times and sell them to credit union members and to the general public.

This is a priceless opportunity for directly useful work. I would urge every Federal credit union not to lose a minute in getting under way. As President Roosevelt last night reminded us the sale of these bonds is to reach down to the individual and the family in every community, and the possession of a bond will be tangible evidence of the partnership between the Government and the people. Federal credit unions, in the plants where they operate, are the nearest of all agencies to the worker when he gets his pay. They should be the first to offer him the chance to make his partnership with the Government an active one.

A great many credit unions still cover only a fraction of their membership field. Is it not possible to improve this situation? The increased use of credit union facilities would open the door of thrift to tens of thousands of additional people. In every other way, I recommend that the credit union seek to realize the full possibilities in its own field. Its achievements are no longer to be measured merely in terms of benefits to individuals. They now add their little to the grand total of national strength, at a time when such strength is more vitally needed, perhaps, than ever before.

In themselves, credit unions are a shining example of the beneficence of democratic processes. They are one more of the proven experiments in better living which spring continually from our basic democracy. Under totalitarian conditions they would wither and die. They will not fail to join, with all other American institutions, in whatever heroic effort may be needed to preserve the great unselfish principles which made their existence possible.

All-Out Demand Requires All-Out Effort, Says Senator Mead in ORT Dinner Address

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES M. MEAD, OF NEW YORK

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at the ORT dinner held in the Astor Hotel, New York City, on April 27, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has made me happy to be able to accept the invitation to dine with you this evening because I have the highest regard for the accomplishments and objectives of the American ORT Federation.

I have attended numerous ORT functions in the past, and I have been impressed with the vocational and humanitarian activities continuously carried on by your Federation.

It is refreshing to be here in this genial atmosphere. Under such friendly, neighborly circumstances, I am reluctant to turn to any discussion of a serious nature. But no one can be in Washington without sensing the utter seriousness of current circumstances. It is difficult to find any substantial note of encouragement or optimism out of the news reported daily from the continent of Europe. To those who espouse the

cause of democracy and representative government the brutal realism of the fall of 15 nations under the ruthless heel of the dictatorships is a fact impossible to absorb without utmost anxiety.

We are gearing our Nation to the highest possible pitch of production in this gigantic defense effort. There can be no alternative. It is an all-out demand that requires an all-out effort. There can be no compromise with necessity and the defense program is the most vital necessity in our entire national history.

In this all-urgent drive for defense, the ORT plays its role. It also looks to the future when its long-range planning will prove invaluable to reconstruction programs that are bound to come. The thousands of men and women trained in the ORT trade and farm schools and industrial workshops will be equipped with skills that will be required to rebuild a devastated Old World.

You who are supporting ORT are doing your part in the essential task of preparing for what we all fervently pray will be a better day for all of the world.

Tonight I wish to leave with you a few thoughts about our responsibilities as good citizens and about the role of all of our patriotic people in this serious emergency.

True Americans, who subscribe to our most fundamental doctrine, namely, that all men are created equal with certain God-given rights (including life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness), are inherently opposed to class hatred, racial prejudice, and religious intolerance. The concepts of totalitarianism, which would classify one race as a superrace, are contrary and repugnant to our fundamental philosophy.

We are a nation of many races and many creeds, welded together by a common bond which is a mutual respect for human rights. We believe that one man is born no better than another and that no man can achieve happiness without individual freedom and the right to live an unmolested personal, political, and religious life.

We have seen the rise of despotism and the spread of intolerance becloud the governments of many lands. Today we observe the infection of intolerance contaminating a widening area across the seas. Even within our own shores we can find evidence of anti-minority agitation. We should initiate an all-out effort to stamp out these prejudices wherever we find them to exist. They breed and thrive in the distorted, abnormal, and anti-American minds of groups who constantly seek a toehold in this country and in other democracies in this hemisphere. We can abolish intolerance and bigotry and racial prejudice, which form the first line of offense against democratic institutions, by bringing their authors into the glare of public attention, and hence into universal disapproval.

We can get an example as praiseworthy and patriotic as did the Colonists of Washington's era by our devoted loyalty to the cause in which our Republic is so much concerned.

Democracy can repel with relative ease the direct attacks upon it, but it is the attack by indirection and subterfuge that catches us off guard. The hidden hand of the despot seeks in cunning and devious methods to accomplish its purpose of crippling democracy.

At this time I wish to make reference to one absurd allegation that is part and parcel of this insidious infection, bred and spread by anti-American influences. Recently we have been witnessing covert acts and charges that identify the anti-Semitic. Jews in Europe have for the past several years been suffering another sporadic wave of persecution. They have been driven from their homes, from their businesses, from their synagogues, and they have been stripped of their material possessions and of their human rights. They have been powerless to effectively resist because they are a relatively small minority.

It is most unfortunate that anti-Semitism finds any encouragement in America. Nevertheless, its manifestations crop up now and again in this defense crisis. Only recently Governor Lehman, of New York State, found it necessary to name a special committee to investigate discrimination against minority groups in employment on defense projects.

The possibility that skilled workmen may be denied an opportunity to serve their Nation in defense activity because they belong to any minority group or come from certain European ancestry may seem remote to you, but it is not entirely fiction.

The allegation to which I make particular reference is a popular charge, nurtured and cultivated in some instances by anti-Semitic groups. I think you may have heard in one way or another that the Jews in America have never taken a large part in the military defense of the Nation, and that they have been traditionally unwilling to engage in military service. The most cursory examination of American history will brand this charge as false.

It might be well for us to review some of the facts so that we will be able to stop this calumnious whispering campaign in its tracks. The first Jewish settlers that we know about landed on the shores of New Amsterdam only 34 years after the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock. This group sought refuge from persecution in Brazil. One year after this first group landed, Asser Levi, a member of this group, refused exemption from military duty and joined the militia, which served as the Army in that early period. From that time on—from 1689—we can credit the Jews in America with an unusually splendid record of military duty. They have participated in every war in which this Nation has been engaged, and they have done so to an extent far in excess of their ratio to the general population. Twenty-four Jewish officers served under General Washington. Among them were four lieutenant colonels, three majors, six captains. The names of Major Nones and Major Franks are credited with outstanding service during the War of the Revolution. Many other Jewish patriots aided in financing the cause of the Colonies. Perhaps the best known of these was Haym Solomon, who contributed a large share of his wealth toward the cause of independence. It is interesting to note that years later his son served as a captain in the War of 1812.

During the War of 1812, although the Jewish population in the United States was extremely small, we find that important military contributions were made by Jewish officers and soldiers in the Regular Army.

Many people do not realize that 10,000 Jewish soldiers fought in the Civil War. About 6,000 of this number defended the Union cause. It is important to remember that these 10,000 Jewish soldiers were drawn from a total population of about 150,000 in this country. That is an exceptionally large percentage, but it is typical of the record in all of America's military conflicts. Nine generals, 18 colonels, 40 majors, 200 captains were among the Jewish officers of the Civil War. In addition to the direct military service, A. G. Myers was Quartermaster General of the Confederacy. Judah P. Benjamin was, in turn, Attorney General, Secretary of War, and Secretary of State; David D. Leon was the first Surgeon General of the Confederacy.

It might be recalled that the first soldier to enlist in the Spanish-American War was a Jew by the name of Maurice Juster. This valiant soldier was the first man to fall in the Battle of Manila. Fifteen Jews went down with the *Maine* at Cuba, a large number of Jews served in the Navy during that war. Among them were at least 20 Jewish officers and Rear Admiral David Taufsig.

A quarter of a million Jews served the United States in the World War. This was nearly 5 percent of the total number of men under arms in the United States. When you hear the fallacious and absurd charge that Jews are not patriotic military participants, you might point out that, while they then constituted only 3 percent of the population of this country, they provided 5 percent of the total number of men under arms in the World War. It is interesting, too, to know that the relative proportion of Jews in the combatant branches of the armed forces was far greater than in the noncombatant branches. There were 7,929 commissioned Jewish officers, and of this number 32 were colonels, 39 lieutenant colonels, 340 majors, 1,201 captains, 4,802 lieutenants, and, of course, large numbers in lesser ranks. Three thousand five hundred Jewish soldiers lost their lives in the World War; 12,000 were wounded.

Today these same high percentages of Jews are in military training, and should the defense of this country require their active service they will prove patriotic and able soldiers.

It seems to me that it is the responsibility of each of us as American citizens to be quick to spike charges against the patriotism of any of our people when those charges are patently fraudulent. To reflect on the character of the race and religion of a group which has rendered such heroic service in the defense of the Nation is not only scandalous but dangerous. If we permit whispering campaigns of this character to endure, we will unconsciously contribute to the very end which the enemies of democracy hope to attain.

The very essence of this democracy is the protection which it affords to all people of all nationalities and religions to the right of uncurbed self-expression. When we encourage the break-down of those basic rights we strike at the very root of our favored system.

As one who is not of Jewish extraction I point with pride, as an American, to the military contributions which have been made by American Jews. You may boast of a most remarkable and effective record in the defense of this Nation. Let that fact be emblazoned on the record of the Nation.

Today the patriotic cooperation of the Jews of America in the defense of the Nation is in keeping with their historic role. We must never permit the advocates of anti-Semitism to hang their hats on the peg of criticism in that respect. Furthermore, we will prepare ourselves to refute any other unfounded, untrue, un-American implications which libelously defame the Jewish people or any other minority in this country. We hope that more and more Nations will emulate our example and that the curse of persecutions of innocent minorities will eventually be eliminated throughout the world.

Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. HAROLD H. BURTON, OF OHIO, TO OHIO FEDERATION OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me

for the Ohio Federation of Republican Women's Organizations on the subject Outline of a Sound Foreign Policy for the United States.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTLINE OF A SOUND FOREIGN POLICY FOR THE UNITED STATES

(Statement to the Ohio Federation of Republican Women's Organizations by Senator HAROLD H. BURTON, of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio, May 2, 1941)

In our foreign policy our great need is for orderly thinking, devotion to our Constitution, and faith in the American people.

We need leadership that will unite America in a policy that is unmistakably a policy for the defense of America, on whatever scale and whatever plan is demonstrated to be necessary to meet the needs of the day.

The outline of our foreign policy should include these basic propositions:

1. We must and we shall, at all costs, preserve America's freedom.

This calls for a program of defense invincible in modern warfare on land, on sea, and in the air. It must command the unquestionable respect of those who listen only to the strong. It should seek a strength so great that it will guarantee to ourselves and to the world either that we shall be let alone or that, if attacked ,we shall win. The Nation already supports and is committed to this policy. What we need for it, most of all, is time to make it effective.

2. In doing this, we must preserve America's own institutions and freedoms.

This means the wholehearted support and preservation of our constitutional structure and procedure, and of our Bill of Rights. It means full cooperation between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our Government. It means that if new governmental policies, such as the authorization of price fixing or the establishment of important executive branches of the Government, are to be adopted that this shall be done by law after consultation with the executive branch of the Government, and not by Executive order issued without consultation with the Congress. This means freedom of the press, of assembly, of worship, and, as far as possible, of individual opportunity. It means patient and cordial recognition of the right of freedom of speech by those loyally opposing as well as those loyally supporting the administration. It means freedom of speech for Gen. Hugh Johnson and Col. Charles Lindbergh as well as for Secretaries Knox, Stimson, and Ickes.

3. In doing this America must stay out of the war if and as long as this is possible consistently with the defense of America's freedom.

This means, just now, for example, no convoying by American naval vessels of war materials to belligerents. It does not mean any lack of diligence in policing or patrolling the high seas in the defense of American rights, people, and properties, including our insular possessions and the areas that come within our Monroe Doctrine and the Pan-American agreements that have grown from it. It means diligent defense but it does not mean aggression or incitement to aggression. It means limiting our aid to other nations to the lending or leasing of things, not of men. It means a bona fide and convincing recognition of the fact that the American people and the Congress, which is their constitutional representative on this issue, have not declared war, that they do not want to declare war, and that they do not want to enter upon an undeclared war. Our policy of national defense does not authorize war unless we are attacked or unmistakably threatened with attack. We are not now so threatened. Our national defense does not now authorize an attack by us on anyone. It does not authorize our provocation of attack upon us by anyone. It does not authorize our cargo carriers to enter combat areas. It does not authorize our naval vessels to convoy war materials to belligerent nations, although it does fully authorize the production and supplying of those materials as rapidly as possible and in as large and effective quantities as the President shall deem to be necessary for the defense of nations whose defense he now deems, under the law vesting him with that discretion, to be vital to the defense of America.

4. In doing this, America must be a united nation.

This means unity between the Government, the manufacturer, the farmer, the industrial worker, and the taxpayer. This means unity between capital and labor in the interest of uninterrupted production. It means a governmental guaranty of fairness and a governmental policy of firmness toward employer and worker alike. The employer and the industrial worker is at heart the same kind of a patriotic citizen out of uniform as is the general and the soldier in uniform. We all are in a common, essential patriotic service. Genuine, fair leadership can secure the same complete response to a call for patriotic service from men out of uniform as it can from those whom it places in uniform.

5. In doing this, all of us, officials and private citizens alike, must forget every personal, party, and other prejudice.

The President, in doing this should demonstrate a deep faith in the people and in their representatives. He should take the people and the Congress far into his confidence and in return he will receive their confidence. He should not attempt to force America further than he can carry a substantially united Nation with him. Divided, a free people is helpless. United, a free people is invincible. A free people will go to whatever limits are necessary to defend and preserve their freedom, but to have the dynamic strength inherent in freedom their action must be voluntary. It must be based upon deep conviction freely arrived at on the basis of facts clearly understood. America will follow a leader who points the way of truth but he must not hide or color the truth. He should lead in the exposition and analysis of the true facts and in the determination of policy based upon them. This calls for a knowledge of facts by the President and his staff and also for a frank sharing of those facts and his interpretation of their meaning with the Congress, the Governors, the mayors, the industrial, the agricultural, the labor, the civic, and the religious leaders of the Nation.

6. In doing this there must be on every hand deep faith in American principles and in the American people. There must also be an expression of that faith by the President and by the people.

There can be no doubt that with sound homes, teamwork in industry, and a united Nation that we can defend America. We must have faith in one another and faith in God. Courage is conviction translated into action. It is as great as the conviction is deep. We shall save America in proportion to our conviction of its soundness and our faith in it. The heart of our foreign policy, as well as of our domestic policy, must be our complete and immediate personal and official dedication of ourselves, our fortunes, and, if necessary, our lives to the service and defense of America.

National Defense Morale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5, 1941

ARTICLE BY HON. JAMES J. DAVIS, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article I prepared for the Trade Union News, Philadelphia, Pa., published May 2, 1941, entitled "National Defense Morale."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Trade Union News, Philadelphia, Pa., of May 2, 1941]

NATIONAL-DEFENSE MORALE

(By Senator JAMES J. DAVIS)

The men behind our machines in the workshops and factories of the Nation are the surest hope of our defense. Soldiers, sailors, marines we must have and increasingly we are calling them to the colors but without the efficient building of manpower in our factories the military functions of defense will fail.

In the factory where the machines of defense are being fashioned there is need for more inspiration and understanding. The cause for which all of our efforts are now directed must be presented in a convincing way that will commend itself to the conscience of every true American. The fundamental principles of representative government, freedom of speech, press, assembly, and worship must always be held before the minds of those who toil for the Nation's defense.

The worker wants to have a feeling of accomplishment in his task. Men do not work for bread alone; they work for the protection of their homes, the schooling of their children, and the maintenance of their liberties. This is very real to them and the threat of loss of these blessings carries a genuine desire among them to give their utmost for the preservation of the American way of life.

With the adoption of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution there was erected one of the milestones of American liberty. Many attempts have been made to violate the rights of free individuals. These attempts have been made by Congress, Presidents, courts, and States. Attempts have been made to penalize men for free speech, to place a censorship over the press, to authorize unlawful search and seizure of private papers, to place men twice in jeopardy for the same offense, to take private property without compensation, to subject men to imprisonment at hard labor without indictment, to deny to an accused man the right to confront his accusers, to compel a man to testify against himself, and many other willful efforts to enslave men. In all these cases the Constitution and the Bill of Rights were invoked to protect the individual.

During wartimes the people willingly impose restrictions upon themselves, and the

Government may impose restrictions under the Constitution. But even during war individual rights secured by the Bill of Rights cannot be violated. Neither Congress, nor the President, nor the courts can suspend the Bill of Rights on account of war. The right of life, liberty, and property must be kept secure in the United States.

America stands for the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights.

America is an ideal, a principle, a way of life in which there is equality of persons before the law.

America grants equal protection under the law to all religions, with favors to none. All men are here free to worship God or not to worship God, in harmony with the individual conscience. Here we have a total and complete separation of church and state.

America recognizes the individual rights of men to their own realm of faith and religion.

America stands for an equal opportunity for all to acquire property and to enjoy the fruits of one's labor and enterprise.

America maintains the right of citizens to criticize abuses in the government, to disagree with political policies, to differ in religious ideas and modes of worship, and to tolerate opposing opinions.

America stands for the right to work and the right of the worker to quit his work. Our high standards of living have come because we have been able to maintain our production. America grows strong as America keeps busy.

America stands against dictatorship and for our representative institutions of government.

American workmen believe in these principles. They should be held before their eyes in the factories and workshops of the Nation in their national defense days.

Involvement in Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5, 1941

STATEMENT OF HON. ALF M. LANDON

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a statement made at Kansas City last Friday night, May 2, by Alf M. Landon, of Kansas, dealing with the problem of foreign relations of the United States. Governor Landon made this statement in introducing Senator BENNETT CLARK, of Missouri, at a meeting sponsored by the America First Committee. I wish to state that I heartily approve the position taken by Senator CLARK and Governor Landon, both of whom are rendering a most valuable public service in the campaign they are making against the involvement of the United States in foreign wars.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The fight to save this great country from the lunacy of another world war is still being carried on. It is a fight that must go on. It is the fight to help the American people maintain the determination they have expressed repeatedly, to stay out of war.

Let's get the record straight. Long ago we made up our minds that this was not our war. Therefore, we are willing and anxious to help England with materials, but not men. Because of our determination not to send expeditionary forces we said, through the Congress, that England must come to American ports to get this material. The present national administration was reelected on a pledge to maintain that policy.

The American people have a distinct recollection of the many promises of the President to keep us at peace. They had the right to continue to feel safe and secure. But the people now are becoming distinctly disturbed by the administration's twilight steps to war. But they still accept the President's statements that what he is doing does not mean what it seems to mean.

As soon as the election was over the tune of some of the leaders on both sides changed. They became much more bellicose in their expressions and their policies. Almost, one would think that the administration had been elected on a war policy instead of a peace policy.

Campaign slogans were discarded, as easily as Hitler sloughs off his slogans. In every election there is a gross misuse of slogans. But that is something to be discouraged, not condoned. Certainly that is particularly true of life and death issues which our foreign policies involve in such times as these.

There is no new factor since the election except the Nazi temporary and pyrrhic success. All the factors affecting our decision have been fully and intelligently discussed for more than a year. All the possibilities of the present situations were canvassed long before they occurred.

If for any reason, new or old, the President desires to reverse this policy of peace, let him seek action by the Congress. Let the President make recommendations to the Congress—not at the last minute when there is nothing else for Congress to do but declare war. But let him, instead, seek immediately and forthwith, authority for the change from the policy the country decided on at the last election.

I warn my fellow Americans that after the war is over, if we become involved, any other course will precipitate a dangerous wave of pacifism and isolationism. A reaction greater than the reaction after 1918, when the American people thought they had been fooled and tricked by Woodrow Wilson's campaign slogan, "He kept us out of war."

In his last press conference the President is reported as laughing at the confusion of the correspondents, caused by his tangled statements.

He hasn't taken the people into his confidence enough for them to know why he is doing the things he apparently is planning without asking the Congress. Only by a candid presentation of the facts, and the free discussion of those facts, can he have the cheerful, wholehearted support of the people now. Of course, once war is declared we never have disunity. We close ranks behind our government.

In this deadly business we need a strong, active public opinion. That opinion can only be kept active by strong, candid statements and recommendations from the Chief Executive, and by free discussion.

There is now, and there always has been, a plain attempt by this administration to discourage discussion of its management of the country's affairs. Americans cannot even be as critical of British management as the British themselves, without being accused of being disloyal to our country. To accept that premise means that we are full allies of Great Britain now.

Only yesterday there was a wonderful exposition of what England is fighting for. The English people forced a Cabinet change. And what's more, they did it without an iota of accusation of disunity from the men in high places. Mistakes can only be corrected by an intelligent discussion of the facts.

For a year and a half the slogan has been drummed in our ears that to defend America we must defend England. If 150 years following our declaration of independence, we are still dependent on Great Britain for our survival, we are certainly in a bad way. What a comfort that slogan must be to the bloody, barbarian Nazis.

Such meetings as this afford the opportunity for enlightened discussion of these questions. The absolute necessity for such enlightening was never greater.

Let no one be deceived, either at home or abroad. Once the United States flag is deliberately fired on—whether it is by reason of patrols, or convoys, or any other reason—once the flag is fired on, our response becomes inevitable—war. Such a step means war to the finish, over the years. It means doughboys in new expeditionary forces. It means sending our men not only to Europe, as we did before, but to remote parts of the world. Wars are not won by half-way measures. Wars are not won by bluff. Wars are not won by clever moves by the heads of state. The greatest deception that has been practiced upon us is the implication that we can have war, and not suffer the consequences of war.

The American people do not do anything in a half-hearted way. Americans do not wage half-hearted wars. When the American Navy and Marines and air arms go in, the finest infantry in the world will be there too, because, war means doughboys.

This Republic can survive only if we preserve the freedom to carry on enlightened discussion of the administration's management of our affairs. In time of peace and in time of war, this freedom is a part of our elementary heritage. Those who exercise that freedom should not be subjected to smears and sneers, as they have been from this administration since its inception. Let no foreign dictator mistake free discussion for disunity in the United States, and let no one seek to destroy that free discussion at home.

I am happy to present a man who has fought on the field of battle and who has also fought on that equally heartbreaking field of free discussion in the face of bitter and unjust attack. I present one of the ablest and most courageous Members of the United States Senate, BENNETT CLARK, of Missouri.

Germany's Title to Possessions of Conquered Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5, 1941

LETTER FROM RALPH F. LOZIER, PUBLISHED IN THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a letter from Ralph F. Lozier of Washington, published in the Washington Post of April 16, 1941, deal-

ing with Germany's title to possessions of conquered nations.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of April 16, 1941]

CONCERNING GERMANY'S TITLE TO POSSESSIONS OF CONQUERED NATIONS

For many years I have read with interest and profit Mark Sullivan's comments on public affairs. But his article published in the Post of April 12 is shot through and through with error, unsound reasoning, and illogical conclusions. In discussing the title of Germany to unconquered possessions of conquered nations, he either asserts or leans to the conclusion that the title to these unconquered colonies would pass to the Nazis as the result of the conquest of the mother country. This is an unsound conclusion.

He says, "By conquest Germany got some kind of title to the American territories of those conquered nations." Title by conquest extends only to the territory actually conquered and seized by the triumphant nation, unless title to these unconquered possessions is subsequently acquired by treaty. A nation can be divested of its title to its territory only by cession or force. Where the divestiture is by treaty, the title passes without any immediate or outward change in the possession. But when one nation by force overruns and seizes the territory of another nation it acquires title only to the territory actually conquered and taken into its possession. Title by force or conquest applies only to seized territory.

Germany has conquered the Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark, and Norway, but has acquired no title to such possessions of these conquered nations as have not been actually seized or possessed by the Nazis. The situation is analogous to a bandit seizing and carrying away three-fourths of a citizen's property, which act would not divest such owner of the title to the remaining one-fourth not seized by the outlaw.

Mr. Sullivan says: "Germany has title, but does not have possession." I assert that Germany has absolutely no title to the territory of these defeated nations that has not been seized and held by Germany. Capturing a part of the navy of a conquered nation would not transfer the title of the uncaptured ships to the conqueror, and, by the same token, ruthlessly seizing a part of the territory of a nation does not divest the conquered nation of the remaining portion of her territory.

Mr. Sullivan further states: "Germany would by conquest of Britain get a conqueror's title to the British dependencies in the American hemisphere." Conquering Britain will not give Germany a "conqueror's title" or any other kind of title to the British dependencies in the American hemisphere, unless and until Germany seizes these colonial possessions or forces from England a cession of them. A "conqueror's title" rests solely on force, seizure, and ability to hold possession, and until that force is directly applied to these Western Hemisphere territories, and possession thereof taken, title to these dependencies remains in the mother countries until and unless renounced by treaty.

And, until Germany actually seizes and holds possession of these American hemisphere possessions, the United States or other nations may acquire title to such possessions either by treaty or conquest. In other words, these unconquered, unseized, and unceded possessions in the Western Hemisphere still belong to the mother countries and are still subject to either purchase or conquest by the United States or any other nation.

To illustrate: If Germany overruns and totally conquers Great Britain, while she would have a "conqueror's title" to the British Isles, she would, by virtue of such conquest, acquire no title whatsoever to Singapore, Gibraltar, and other British outposts, unless they were ceded by Britain, or unless Germany seized and held possession of them. And certainly, by conquering the British Isles, Germany by virtue of such conquest, would acquire no title to Canada, Australia, India, and other self-governing countries constituting the British Commonwealth of Nations.

RALPH F. LOZIER.

WASHINGTON, April 12.

When Peace Comes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5, 1941

ARTICLE BY HON. JAMES J. DAVIS, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "When Peace Comes," prepared by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] for the Moose magazine for May 1941.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Moose magazine of May 1941]

WHEN PEACE COMES

(By United States Senator JAMES J. DAVIS, director general and pilgrim governor)

A wartime boom holds within itself the seeds of its own collapse. The greater the boom the more certain will be the coming of a depression which will make the last one seem like a pigmy. Wars always lead to severe depressions. The great need of the present hour is sufficient national intelligence to provide for a gradual and an orderly recovery of the normal activities of peaceful pursuits after the peak of defense production shall have passed. because defense activities are temporary.

We were in the World War for only 20 months, but the shock of that event so thoroughly penetrated to the lives and fortunes of our people that many years were required before normal activities were restored, and even today the far-reaching consequences of that grim struggle are evident all around us. Ethelbert Stewart, eminent Commissioner of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor during the years I was Secretary, 1921–30, estimated that at the beginning of this period there were 5,700,000 off pay rolls and the unemployment then would match that of any time before or since if the same methods of tabulation were used in a uniform way. Strikes abounded in the key industries of the country in 1921–22, when more than a million men were out on strike at one time. These and kindred problems may once again confront us.

It is not too soon now to expect that various agencies of government and private institutions of study and research shall begin the task of finding ways of rounding out defense in terms of peacetime economic activities which shall be substantial enough to provide work for our entire population after we have met the military emergency which now confronts us. The National Resources Planning Board, the American Federation of Labor, the Social Science Research Council, the Brookings Institution, and other prominent organizations have already made a beginning in this field.

The great Gladstone once said: "The expenses of a war are the moral check which it has pleased the Almighty to impose upon the ambition and the lust of conquest that are inherent in so many nations. The necessity of meeting from year to year the expenditures which it entails is a salutary and wholesome check, making them feel what they are about and making them measure the cost of the benefit upon which they calculate." Today it seems that this check has operated tardily, for open warfare has been active in various parts of the world for the last 10 years. And daily the struggle increases.

There are three ways in which a government may finance a war or any other emergency—by taxes, by loans, or by the issue of paper money. It is now understood that the burden of war cannot be shifted to future generations by any means of financing. A national debt is estimated in terms of the necessity it imposes of paying interest. The principal of the debt may or may not be repaid at some future date; the interest must be paid. The necessity of levying taxes for interest payments may have an unfortunate effect on production by decreasing the volume of investment. Therefore it is now imperative that in time of war we shall steadfastly direct our thought to the time of peace.

We still suffer from the depression which came upon us in 1929. Large relief rolls continue throughout the land. Low interest rates show the volume of our idle capital. Low standards of living indicate the lack of adequate work for the unemployed. Too many dollars, too many machines, too many men are idle and apparently useless.

These problems have not been met in any fundamental way. Various experiments have been tried which promised quick and easy cures. The dollar was revalued; the made-work program was instituted; Government spending was increased, and numerous other ways have been sought to soften the blows of the depression. We know now that these attempts were only partially successful; they served to maintain the needy at a low level of existence but did not call into positive action the constructive forces of the Nation. Sound recovery methods have not been tried.

Another set of influences which bear heavily upon us comes out of the first World War. The fragments of world trade are in the utmost confusion. Europe is undergoing a revolution which must inevitably destroy established patterns of social and economic life, giving place to the development of new forms which are still little understood. Though it is not now possible to predict the final outcome of the war, it must be evident that the strength of the Axis Powers is a serious challenge to Britain. If Britain loses her trade position the struggle for pelf and power between competing totalitarian groups would doubtless prove a disturbing influence for many generations to come.

WEIGHTIER PROBLEMS

The coming of the second World War has released upon us even more serious problems. The course of the war to date has required us to launch an emergency defense program which is already straining the ordinary patterns of our economic life. Increasing concentration of our resources, men, money, and machines on production of the implements of war has provided work and at the same time diverted our production from the ordinary channels of civilian need. The more we devote our resources to military purposes, the greater will be the strain on our civil standards of living. When you have more guns you have less butter. This is true, whether applied to foreign countries or our

own. Let us be realistic enough to say that at the present time we face the needs of a military economy in the United States and Canada.

Particular danger lies in the fact that as men, money, and machines go back to work to forge the implements of war, with hunger goading on the urge to strife, our economy will take on the appearance of prosperity. It is the mirage which has a purple beauty even as it leads swiftly to the dark road of death. We shall be tempted to believe that at last we have overcome the paralyzing influences of the depression and finally caught up with the stream of progress. Armaments cannot be used to produce the goods or perform the services the people need. Armaments are a diversion of our resources from the instruments of production to the instruments of destruction. War piles up poverty and, although national defense is now imperative, we should realize what a severe strain it brings to the lives of our citizens.

FEWER UNEMPLOYED

It is anticipated that the national-defense program will have outstanding and comprehensive effects on the social-insurance programs under the Social Security Act, the Railroad Retirement Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. The combined effect of increased employment and higher wage rates will result in a rise in contributions paid under the various social-insurance programs. However, the shift from private to public employment under the defense program may handicap the insurance standing of those taking Federal jobs, for workers hired for the defense program will receive no protection under the civil-service retirement and disability programs. Defense activity is also expected to result in decreased benefit payments for unemployment insurance. Not only will there be fewer unemployed persons, but the duration of their unemployment is apt to be shorter. Moreover, men serving for a year under selective service will—unless action is taken to preserve their benefit rights—be ineligible for unemployment benefits during the interim between discharge from the Army and reemployment in private industry. The effect of defense measures on old-age and survivors' insurance benefits is less predictable. The demands for older, skilled workmen, combined with the inducement of increasing wage rates, may result in the continuous employment of persons after they reach age 65, and may also bring back into employment workers who had retired, but whose monthly benefits are less than they can earn in defense-stimulated employments. On the other hand, the general increase in national income, distributed in purchasing power to the families of the Nation, may enable elderly persons to retire who could not afford to do so under circumstances of low family incomes.

The problems of inflation may come upon us. While in Germany after the war, I witnessed the distressing conditions induced there by currency inflation. There is very little that a university or a hospital or an institution such as Mooseheart, which is endowed or dependent on the income of investments, can do to protect itself from the ravages of currency inflation and continue its present services. In Germany, after the inflation following the first World War, endowments were substantially reduced. In most cases there remained only the value of the physical property. The debts arising out of the national-defense program probably will add to the inflation forces we now have, depending on the methods used in financing. I understand proposals are now being made that $60,000,000,000 be spent by our Government in the next 3 years for defense purposes. The new debts will add new dangers.

The question often comes to me: Will it be safe to leave money in a bank during the coming years? The brief answer is, "Yes." The banks are, of course, safe—probably more liquid that ever before, and everyone should make every effort—sacrifice, if need be—to keep a margin of cash on deposit to care for the inevitable emergency. Considering the fact that accurate prediction of the future is impossible; that heavy taxes must be paid; and that incomes may be quickly and unexpectedly impaired, a bank balance—however modest—should be kept if at all possible. While this is always not practicable, still, when opportunity permits, it should be seized immediately.

IMPORTANCE OF HOUSING

As we look to the future, our attention is called to the economic outlook of the American people in terms of housing, for the stability of home life has always depended and will continue to depend on a house in which to dwell, where children may be born and life carried on in familiar and well-kept ways. No one knows what the economic situation will be after the war. We can, however, say this: Increasingly, if people have money, they will spend a liberal portion of it for new or improved houses. The interest of the Government in housing will continue so that buying a home on the monthly purchase plan will become as familiar as buying an automobile on the installment payment. It will be necessary for the Government to protect itself and the real-estate market so that Government-insured houses will not clog the ordinary economic channels in case of a prolonged depression. At the present time there is a tremendous shortage in low-priced houses, those which cost $4,000 or less and can be purchased by people who have incomes of $2,000 or less. Civic organizations and fraternal orders are carrying the message of this need. Sound city planning is now being adopted which will help to make this dream come true, where a hard-working man can have a house and home.

The President's Remarks Concerning Colonel Lindbergh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM ST. JOSEPH (MO.) NEWS-PRESS

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial with reference to the President's observations about Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, written by one of the most distinguished editors in Missouri, Arthur D. Burrowes, of the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press, and published in that newspaper on Tuesday, April 29, 1941.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press of April 29, 1941]

TIMELY OBSERVATIONS

Charles A. Lindbergh had a perfect right to say what he did last Wednesday night. His letter to the President yesterday was entirely within his rights. We are not at war. Even Presidents do not enhance their greatness by flippancy and facetiousness in press conferences. Some day somebody may gravely wrong the President by thinking he has delusions of grandeur. The President of the United States should never have called Colonel Lindberg a copperhead.

The President should read his history. But a man so busy he cannot distinguish that "Martin, Barton, and Fish" is not and never was alliteration, probably has not the time to mark out the fine distinction between Congressman Vallandigham, of Ohio, in the Civil War and Colonel Lindbergh today.

War had been declared when Vallandigham spoke his words denouncing the Civil War. We are not at war. And it was only last October the administration was saying we were not going to war. Remember? All aid, short of war. We can still hear the President's Harvardian pronunciation and accent. This attack on Lindbergh seems to us to be a violation of that spirit of fair play that says every American can speak his piece. Lindbergh has done just that. And that is all.

The trouble is we are in war hysteria. We saw that at that Lindbergh meeting in New York last week. There was more murder in the looks of both pro and antis on the street than, we bet, in the opposing armies of Europe. It might well have been another Paris Commune in the dying days of the Bourbon autocracy. We predicted this war hysteria and we all warned each other against it. Now we have reached the place where one of our charming pro-British friends out in the newsroom goes into mental and spiritual convulsions whenever the ticker ticks off a bad piece of news for the telegraph desk.

But to get back to Copperhead Vallandigham—and here is where Mr. Roosevelt should read history. For almost 3 months after the fall of Sumter, Lincoln did not dare call Congress into session. Why? He could not get a majority to back him. Even then for months it was debated whether the writ of habeas corpus could be suspended. That never was given congressional approval.

Now, remember, Vallandigham branded Lincoln a usurper. Vallandigham contended the South could never be conquered and that the war would bring political and economic ruin. Vallandigham was wrong. So is Lindbergh today. There is this difference. One man uttered treason in wartime. The other spoke his God-given right to warn and warn and warn until the very moment war actually is declared.

It might be well to follow the course of Mr. Vallandigham. He was beaten for reelection but only by skulduggery, a gerrymander to change his district for the purpose of beating him. He was arrested and sentenced by a military court for the duration of the war, but the popular resentment at the verdict was so great Lincoln banished him to behind Confederate lines. Later he went to Canada, where he did all he could to destroy the United States Government; yes, the Canada we now seek to aid. He was a candidate for Governor of Ohio during his period of banishment, and in 1864 returned unmolested to sit in the Democratic convention that nominated George McClellan to oppose Mr. Lincoln.

To compare the two men, Vallandigham and Lindbergh, was unworthy of a great President. It would be unworthy of a little President. Vallandigham encouraged desertions in wartime, tried to prevent raising of troops, and, in effect, did everything to cripple the power of the Government of the United States. Has Lindbergh done any of these things?

Let us repeat. We do not agree with Colonel Lindbergh at all. We think Hitler is a world menace. Lindbergh probably does not. We think, and so does much of Washington, that the future of this country is gravely imperiled unless Great Britain wins. Lindbergh does not think so. But neither does Herbert

Hoover. He was a great man once, that fellow Hoover. A lot of you high hats voted for him in 1928 because Al Smith had a whisky voice and went to the wrong church. Many others in high places agree with Lindbergh. Why castigate him?

We regret exceedingly his resignation from the Reserve force of the Army. Of course, he may have been forced out. But let the administration go slow. There was not the war fervor in Washington this month there was in April 1940. Does the President know that? Can the administration put us to war if we do not want to go to war? We wonder. To us out here in the Middle West it seems that Britain is making a grand fight, but there are still a few of us left who think that, so long as the administration insists we are not at war, it is the right of Charles Lindbergh or Hoover or William Castle or Senator Wheeler or Senator Clark or anybody else to try to urge us to stay out of war.

British Cities and Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5, 1941

ARTICLE FROM UNITED STATES MUNICIPAL NEWS

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "A Message From Britain on Cities and Civil Defense," published by the United States Conference of Mayors in the United States Municipal News of May 15, 1941.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the United States Municipal News of May 15, 1941]

A MESSAGE FROM BRITAIN ON CITIES AND CIVIL DEFENSE

It will be recalled that on January 31 last, the United States Conference of Mayors submitted a report to the President outlining the organization and activities of a civil defense program for the United States. There was little of an original character in the report. It was based largely on the bitter experience of English cities in meeting their new responsibilities—because it was believed that available actual experience instead of theory and old philosophies should determine, in large part, the program for our country.

It was stated that any effective organization must recognize the fact that bombs, gases, artillery shells and microbes simply fail to recognize State political boundaries. Hence, in the event of an emergency we must set up direct relationships between the cities and other local units with the suggested Federal civil defense organization which would operate through a number of Federal regional offices to be established for each of the existing Army corps areas. Further, complete responsibility should be placed on the shoulders of the cities within each region and the Federal regional offices must be completely coordinated with the military branches of the Government.

Unfortunately, as yet, we have made little progress even in the field of preliminary planning for civil defense along these lines. A few so-called State defense councils have been created, some of them political in nature, even though, as stated above, they would be useless agencies so far as civil defense in an emergency is concerned. We still have a surplus of Federal coordinators, offices, divisions, agencies, bureaus, departments, et cetera, here in Washington with little or no unity. About the only favorable sign is the fact that a number of cities such as New York have developed integrated plans for the protection of the civilian population.

The present condition cannot be permitted to continue, and we are hopeful that in the next few days a plan based on the realities of the situation will be placed in effect.

This whole problem is so important that there is reproduced in this issue of the United States Municipal News one of the most authoritative statements on this subject which your editor has been privileged to hear. It was delivered in Ottawa on April 22 by the Right Honorable Malcolm MacDonald, High Commissioner to Canada from the United Kingdom, before the annual conference of the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities. Mr. MacDonald's statement, which ought to be studied by every official in the United States, follows:

"THE ROLE OF BRITISH CITIES IN THE DEFENSE OF BRITAIN

"(By the Right Honorable Malcolm MacDonald, High Commissioner to Canada from the United Kingdom)

"I am proud to be your guest this evening. But I feel somewhat overawed by the company. I was myself once an humble member of a municipal council in Britain, but never rose to the giddy heights of being a mayor. It is an honor to be here on the occasion when the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities are entertaining so many of their colleagues from the United States.

"This is a gathering of civic heads, of the chief citizens of the chief cities and towns throughout Canada and in parts of our good neighbor, the United States. You have supreme responsibility in municipal administration. You are the prime ministers of local government. There are some people who, because it is called local government, think that it is something of comparatively small importance. They are wrong. The very opposite is the case. The units of local government are the cells which build up together a vital part of the democratic body politic. I shall not presume to speak of local government in Canada and the United States. I am not sufficiently acquainted with your procedures here to estimate its exact importance. But I can speak of the place of local government in Britain, and I have a suspicion that what I say about it there will not be wholly inapplicable to its position in this continent. In Britain we are fighting now to maintain our democractic liberties. We think that they are so essential to our material and spiritual well-being that there is no sacrifice we would not make in their defense. Well, at the very heart of our democratic system lies self-government in local affairs. Without a healthy system of local government democracy would not exist.

"It performs a number of indispensable functions. For instance, municipal and other local councils are often the colleges, so to speak, from which our national leaders graduate. Some of our most famous prime ministers have begun their political careers as local councillors or aldermen, and some of them even rose to be mayors; and they owed much of their success in statecraft to the lessons in the difficult art of government which they learned. I suppose this may be the largest gathering of future Prime Ministers of Canada and Presidents of the United States that I shall ever have the honor to meet.

"Again, local government is a wide net that draws in many fish. It attracts into its manifold activities, its electoral organizations, its committees, and its councils a countless host of citizens, all of whom thus get some practice in government. So government ceases to be a monopoly of the few—the rich or the privileged. Some capacity in government is widespread; a large proportion of the citizens in the State are also to a greater or lesser degree rulers. This is itself a sure safeguard against dictatorship. When so many have tasted the interest and enjoyment of power they will not lightly yield it up to a tyrant.

"But, above all, a sound development of local government prevents the system of parliamentary democracy itself from declining into another form of dictatorship. If too much power is concentrated in the central government, it tends to reproduce some of the bad qualities of a dictator. It is necessarily aloof; it is not in close touch with the everyday life of the people in their various localities, and cannot adapt itself to differing local conditions which require some elasticity in government; its administration is rigid and bureaucratic. But if large powers of administration are widely delegated over many local councils, who are in close association with conditions in their respective areas, administration can be tempered to varying circumstances, and then government becomes intimate and sympathetic with the people. That is the great, essential function of local government. It prevents democracy from becoming bureaucracy.

"But you have not come here to listen to me philosophizing. You are met to consider local government in relation to war. You are anxious to know what is the part played by the municipalities and how they have acquitted themselves in the crisis in Britain. I can tell you quite simply. Local government in Great Britain never had such a glorious vindication as during these last 9 months when the Nazis have descended upon the island in their most savage fury and attempted to lam the life out of it. It is as though a murderer strikes viciously—smash, smash, smash, at his victim, endeavoring to break his bones, to spill his life's blood, to knock the breath out of his body. But the victim won't oblige. His bones do nothing more than crack, his blood continues to circulate, and he goes on breathing. And instead of succumbing he gradually gathers his own strength and strikes back at his assailant, using his fists until in the end he has the murderer by the throat and at his mercy. That is going to be the end of the story of this fight between Britain and Germany.

"Well, we owe the survival of Britain during those fateful months in large measure to the municipal authorities. We owe it, too, to the new regional organizations which have been interposed as a link between the central government and the local authorities. That is a new piece of machinery in our system of government which was invented to serve a wartime purpose and which has proved so valuable that I believe it will live on into the days of peace. But much of the brunt of the resistance of the air raids has been borne by the municipal authorities themselves. If I may say so, I can tell this magnificent story with special knowledge, because the Minister of Health—which was the rather unhealthy post which I held until I departed for Canada—with the Minister of Home Security now as a close colleague is the minister of the central government most concerned with watching and supervising the work of the local authorities.

"Our organization of civil defense is based on those authorities. They are the units of action. The air-raid wardens, the rescue squads, the fire brigades, the first-aid teams, and all the various companies which form the great army fighting this civilians' defensive war are organized in units based on

municipal areas and in commands under the municipal authorities. I think it is scarcely appreciated by the public in Britain and beyond how remarkably efficient the work of the local authorities has been. I don't say that it has been by any means faultless. One or two local authorities have been failures; we have had to replace them. And all of them, no doubt, made mistakes. The British people have not suddenly become a heavenly host of angels, possessed of all the virtues. They are very human—human in their frailties as well as in their sudden manifestation of qualities that are sublime. Even the municipal authorities have made mistakes. Nevertheless, our debt to them is huge, and its full measure is not generally known. For we could not advertise it sufficiently. We could not turn the brilliant searchlight of publicity on much of the details of their work. Otherwise it would have led to information reaching the enemy which he greatly desired to have. We did not wish to inform him each morning after the raids of the night before of the amount of destruction that he had succeeded in doing or that he had failed to do in any particular case. Nor, when he had done much damage, did we wish to tell him how quickly that damage was repaired. It was far better that he should think that the hurt which he had done to a town was lasting, so that he assumed he could scratch it off his visiting list for a while and not return to it immediately to give it another dose of his savagery.

"Therefore the gigantic scale of much of the work of local authorities went unrecorded in the newspapers, unnoted by the public. For instance, if after a single night's raid a town discovered at dawn that four-fifths of its water supply was destroyed owing to broken mains, we didn't tell our public; we didn't tell the enemy. And when by Herculean efforts the water department of that municipality repaired the mains so swiftly that half the water supply was restored at the end of 48 hours, three-quarters of it by the end of the third day, and the whole of it by the fourth, we didn't tell that, either. Yet these miracles of repair and recovery were being performed all the time.

"Town after town received the honor of the attentions of the enemy. Each in turn had its night of vicious assault. Some of them received the attack on 2 or 3 nights in succession. London took its punishment every night for 2 whole months. Many of them received repeated return visits at intervals. All of them replied to barbarism with heroism.

"The list of stricken towns is now a long one: London, Glasgow, Cardiff, Coventry, Birmingham, Liverpool, Newcastle, Portsmouth, Bristol, and a great host of others. There is one remarkable thing about the roll of honor. Every name upon it is classified as wounded. None of them is killed. None of them has died of wounds. Not one of them has ever withdrawn for a moment from the active fighting line. They have scarcely even done what the gallant Sir Andrew Barton is reported to have done in the rollicking ballad which records his hectic naval action. Struck by a cannon ball, grievously wounded, missing a limb or two, he sat down upon the deck of his frigate and cried cheerily to the sailors:

> " 'Fight on my merry men all,
> I am hurt, but I am not slain,
> I'll lay me down and bleed awhile
> And then I'll rise and fight again.'

"The battered boroughs of old Britain have not lain down to bleed awhile. They have dressed their wounds whilst they stood and fought. There is no more glorious page in the proud history of municipal government.

"The multitude and variety of their actions during and immediately following the phase of battle are extraordinary. In many of them they get invaluable help from voluntary organizations, and especially that superb women's organization, Women's Voluntary Service. I can only select a representative example of their activities. The local authority supervises the police and air-raid wardens who keep watch and ward in the streets; and the fire brigades who extinguish the conflagrations, and the first-aid posts where the walking casualties are tended; and the ambulance and hospital services which care for the more seriously wounded, and the discovery, identification and burial of the dead. They regulate the evacuation of women and children where it is necessary to get them out of harm's way, and they provide food, clothes and shelter for families who are themselves unscathed but whose homes have been blown to kingdom come. Their expert departments handle the work of restoring the damaged water, gas and electric supplies; they are responsible, too, for organizing the swift and steady repairs to many scores of thousands of damaged houses so that their occupants can live in them again as soon as possible after the raids.

"That is just a selection out of the modern list of duties of municipal councils in Britain! It is a sample of what is coming to you if after the Battle of Britain there is a Battle of Canada or a Battle of the United States of America.

"Let me take you even closer to the scene. Let me show you a glimpse of the municipal authorities in the actual front line at the moment of action, as you might see them any evening in Britain. It is 9 o'clock in the evening in Ottawa now; it is 2 o'clock in the morning in that little island. This is the scene that, whilst we sit here, is being enacted in many places there. It is pitch black in the streets; there is a drone of airplanes overhead, punctuated by the whistle and crash of bombs and the angry retorts of the anti-aircraft guns. The nerve center of civil defense action in every borough is what is called the control room. This is a cluster of underground apartments beneath some convenient building—usually the town hall. There are gathered the local civilian chiefs; they are on duty all night; they rarely get home; they take it in turns to snatch some sleep on the camp beds in the control room dormitory. There is the town clerk who has, so to speak, discarded his wig for a tin helmet. There is His Worship the Mayor. It would be an abuse even of the poet's and orator's license to say that he has discarded his chain of office for a suit of chain armor. But that chief civic dignitary who before the war spent his evenings dozing through after-dinner speeches now spends his nights very much awake helping to direct semi-military operations. These and the other control officers are surrounded in those subterranean rooms by the heads of the several civil-defense services, as generals in the moment of battle are surrounded by their staffs. And in a room next door are the messenger boys, ready at any moment, if there is a break-down in communications, to issue into the street above, jump on their bicycles and ride through the bombardment to deliver information to some sector of the front. Some of those boys have met a hero's death on those journeys. And in another room are the telephone girls; for, as I say, these control rooms are the very nerve center of all the action in the borough. Into them is telephoned by the police and wardens in the streets above news of every incident as it occurs; a high explosive bomb in this road, a stick of incendiary bombs on that block of buildings, an unexploded bomb somewhere else, and so on. And immediately the chiefs of staff telephone out from the control room directions to the appropriate civil defense services strategically distributed at their stations over the whole area above. To the stretcher bearer and ambulance parties waiting for a summons to help the wounded, to the rescue squads who will tunnel through the ruined buildings to release the living, to the firemen always ready to engage the flames of this modern hell, and to the rest.

"It has been a lovely revelation, this swift, cool, efficient adaptation of a multitude of ordinary citizens to the task of fighting a war on their own doorsteps. Untrained to warfare, they have acquitted themselves under fire like crack troops. And among those to whom I used to take off my tin hat in most profound admiration were your fellow mayors. Night after night I have had the honor of being with them and their colleagues in their control rooms, and of stepping with them into the streets on tours of inspection of their various services. There is a long tradition in British history that the chosen heads of each municipality are the guardians of the civic freedom and rights of every one of their fellow burgesses. In some periods of stress and strife in our national story, mayors, aldermen, and town clerks have even died on the battlefield or the scaffold defending those sacred rights against some contemporary tyrant. But never was that high tradition of the mayor's office upheld more nobly than it is today, when the civic dignitaries of municipalities all over the Kingdom are cool leaders in the forefront of the firm—and it is going to be the victorious—resistance to Hitler's attack on the whole stock of our democratic liberties."

Thus, the message from the former Minister of Health of Great Britain who played a leading part in English civil defense. It has often been said that somehow or other England always "muddles through." At present it is clear that we are "muddling through" and, unless we can utilize the experience abroad, we shall have failed to build up a structure and program based on the realities of modern warfare—instead of a structure and program based upon archaic and obsolete political boundaries. Civil or passive defense in the United States must be organized along the same lines as active or military defense, namely, on a national foundation, if we are to be prepared for an emergency that all of us trust will never occur. As one municipal official recently stated:

"Our present organization for handling civil defense may satisfactorily meet the needs of community singing, folk dancing, and basket weaving but it is ill-suited to the job ahead of us."

Holy Name Society Breakfast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley at the annual communion and breakfast of the Holy Name Society of the New York Post Office, at the Hotel Astor, New York City, on April 27, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. FARLEY. It was with real pleasure that I received the invitation of the Holy Name Society of the New York Post Office to join in your annual communion and breakfast, even though I am no longer associated in an official capacity with the Department.

There is something fine and traditional about the Postal Service that gets into your blood. It starts from the time when you are sworn in and it stays with you to your dying day. That is the attitude of everyone who has ever been connected with the Service; and, like others who have retired from active duty, I shall always feel during my entire lifetime that I am part and parcel of this great organization.

You are to be heartily congratulated upon the great showing which you made at the altar rail in St. Patrick's Cathedral this morning, and the thousands who have assembled here to break bread together on this delightful occasion.

Your spiritual director, Father Kiernan, must be indeed a happy man today. The officers of your society may well be proud of this impressive demonstration. At a critical moment in the history of all civilization, at a time like this, when the assertion is made that religion has died out, that God has taken a holiday, it is gratifying, it is reassuring, to see this vast body of men openly pledge their unwavering loyalty and devotion to the faith of their fathers and the honor of their country.

As I have stated, I shall always be interested in the welfare of the Postal Service. I am delighted with the reports of progress and the continued success that is being made under the administration of our mutual friend, Frank Walker, the Postmaster General. We are fortunate that we have such a man in charge of this great department of the Government. He is a splendid Christian gentleman, an able executive, and a man whose whole heart is in his work. I am sure that he is delighted, as we all are, in the loyal and efficient support that is being given to him and his assitants in full measure by the postmasters and postal employees throughout the Nation.

I am glad to learn that postal receipts continue onward and upward. In establishing so many camps around the country, the Army has undoubtedly done its share to increase the business of the Post Office Department. The clerks and carriers have probably observed the increase in what might be termed personal correspondence. I am sure all the boys in the camps are writing to their sweethearts, and the sweethearts are writing to the boys. Of course, the postmasters, the clerks, and the carriers are not privileged to read any of the letters, but perhaps they may take an occasional look at a postal card.

One of the first impressions to be gathered here this morning is the unity of purpose that has brought us together. "United we stand, divided we fall" has a special significance to each American today. We have all seen the result of the military strategy to divide and then destroy. Let us not be deceived. We listen to the radio from early morning until midnight, and we realize that what is happening abroad is bound to have an effect upon our own country. We are all thankful for what we have here, and the thing for us to do is to work together as American citizens and to give our united support to the President and to the administration.

We should be so united in the defense of our democracy that you could go out on the street and ask the first man you meet how he stands on the question, multiply his answer by 132,000,000, and obtain the public opinion and the private sentiment of the American people.

There are those who find fault with our system of government. There will be faults in any system of government that is directed by human beings. But with all its faults, who is there that would care to exchange it for a system of government that dictates what you shall think, what you shall say, and how you shall live; a system of government that would deprive us of our freedom of worship, the freedom of the press, and the right of free speech.

A line of the inscription on the pedestal of the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor reads: "I lift my lamp beside the golden door." This country has always been and always will be the land of opportunity. We must not lose sight of the fact, however, that the brave men and women who came to settle on our shores in the early days for the most part sought the opportunity of religious freedom. We must keep that thought in mind, and it must be forever a part of the American heritage.

The characteristic of this Nation is essentially spiritual. The purchase of ammunition, tanks, airplanes, and the implements of war will be of no avail without the moral and spiritual support of the rank and file of our people. Let us stand together and let us face the world together as one solid, unified force for the maintenance of our American ideals and the preservation of our beloved country.

It has been a real pleasure to be with you this morning and to see each of you again. I hope to be invited to be with you in the future, and if I am, I assure you that the postman won't have to ring twice.

Auditor of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM PUERTO RICO WORLD JOURNAL AND STATEMENT BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the World Journal of Puerto Rico, which refers to a recent appointment to an office in Puerto Rico, and also a statement by the Attorney General of Puerto Rico regarding the same matter.

There being no objection, the editorial and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Puerto Rico World Journal of April 28, 1941]

A NEW AUDITOR

Occasionally we hear about a man who has worked faithfully for his employer in a position of responsibility for many years, only to be overlooked when the time comes to move some one to a higher and more lucrative position. In most instances the promoted man is able to hold the higher post through the efficient and experienced efforts of the frustrated veteran.

Such a man is José-G. López, acting auditor of Puerto Rico, whose failure to receive the appointment to the post of auditor has made a lot of people very unhappy on this island. Not only are they unhappy; they are confused. They have known Mr. López for many years. They have associated the efficient operation of the auditorship in Puerto Rico with a man who, for 2 months each year of the 9 years in which he has been assistant auditor, has taken the full responsibility of that important government office. There are many who recall that Mr. López started in the auditor's office 27 years ago and has worked continuously since then, establishing a record for honesty and ability that has been beyond reproach. Prior to becoming assistant auditor he served the people of Puerto Rico for 11 years as general examiner of accounts. If Mr. López were called upon to fill out an application for the post of auditor of Puerto Rico, no man could honestly deny him the appointment to the position that his background and record so clearly show him to be the best and proper choice for the job.

To add to the confusion, President Roosevelt has named Patrick Fitzsimmons, of Los Angeles, to the auditorship of Puerto Rico. Doubtless Mr. Fitzsimmons is a capable man and we would not presume to intimate that he will make a poor auditor. But, so far as Puerto Rico is concerned, all that is known about Mr. Fitzsimmons here is that he comes from Los Angeles, out in California, United States of America. What we do know, however, is that Mr. López, who comes from Puerto Rico, is more than capable of carrying on the work in which he has devoted 27 years of his life.

Evidence of Mr. López' ability to fill the position was most forcefully borne out through the recent acceptance by the legislature, and by Gov. Guy J. Swope, of the 1941–42 budget, prepared by Mr. López, and accepted without amendments * * * for the first time in the history of Puerto Rico. And more significant, perhaps, is the fact that this budget was prepared while Mr. López was acting auditor, and under a legislature controlled by a new party whose legislation was not only voluminous but of a nature that entailed the most exacting changes from previous budgets to provide for new revenues and new expenditures. Last year's budget, also prepared under the supervision of Mr. López, was so scientifically and efficiently compiled that it was closed at the end of the year with a surplus of $1,500,000.

In view of the development in Washington to a real inter-American consciousness that has as its keynote the cementing of good will between Spanish- and English-speaking peoples of this hemisphere, we feel that Washington missed the bus by a wide margin when it failed to give a Puerto Rican a position he deserved and one that he has proved himself capable of filling. Often repeated but seldom heeded, the Federal Government's treatment of the people of Puerto Rico is closely watched by the South American republics who see in Puerto Rico the proving ground of Uncle Sam's attitude toward a people with a similar language and much the same culture as their own.

With solidarity of paramount importance, the appointment of a Puerto Rican to the post of Auditor would have been a gesture of more significance and of greater value than the position in question would indicate. This administration should awaken to a new sense of responsibilities in dealing with Spanish-speaking peoples, whether they are citizens under the American flag or members of any one of the 21 republics.

The transformation from ill will to good will is not only highly desirable, it is necessary. A Puerto Rican has proved himself deserving of a position in the service of his own people. He has the endorsement of all political parties on the island. His record is excellent. Why was Mr. Fitzsimmons, of Los Angeles,

given the appointment of Auditor of Puerto Rico? Perhaps it isn't too late to give practical expression to the good-neighbor policy by naming José G. López to the post he deserves.

ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFERS REMEDY IN LÓPEZ CASE—SUGGESTS RESIDENCE OF APPOINTEES BE REQUIRED BY LAW

Suggesting what is believed to be the first solution to the Presidential appointment of relative strangers to governmental positions in Puerto Rico, Attorney General George A. Malcolm said yesterday that an amendment to the organic act could be passed making it obligatory for a candidate to be a resident of the island for 1, 2, or 3 years to be qualified for such an appointment. Citing the Territory of Hawaii as an example, the Attorney General said that their organic laws require that, among other qualifications, in any similar appointee.

The Attorney General's suggestion was proposed, he said, in the matter of acting Auditor José A. López who was regarded locally as the logical appointee to the post of auditor until it was disclosed a week ago yesterday that President Roosevelt had appointed Patrick Fitzsimmons of Los Angeles to the position.

Issuing a sharp warning that he did not wish to be misunderstood, or accused of interfering in a political matter out of his jurisdiction, Malcolm said, however, that, like others in Puerto Rico, "I have the highest respect for López' ability."

In clearly defining his stand on the matter, the attorney general asked, "Why can't the matter be treated in a nonpolitical, noncontroversial way by simply amending our organic act? I have the highest regard for López. I should have liked to have seen him appointed to the post. But going on from there, however, I am also acquainted with the new auditor (Fitzsimmons). I spent some time with him when he passed through here last year on his way from Santo Domingo to Alaska. I knew him in China and the Philippines. I know him also as a high-class man—a good fellow—but that is not the point. We have good men right here in Puerto Rico."

"The remedy," Malcolm added, "is not to deal in personalities. Why not in these cases pick the man best qualified, but preferably one who knows the island through having resided here. That could be done by such an amendment to the organic act."

Attorney General Malcolm suggested that it was not too late yet to secure such an amendment in time to reconsider López as auditor.

Central Valley Project of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 21, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST BY MAGNER WHITE

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, as one who has been active in the fight to secure congressional approval of California's Central Valley project ever since the coordination of the water resources within the interior basin of California was first suggested, I have found Mr. Magner White's article which recently appeared in the Saturday Evening Post under the caption of "We're moving the rain" of tremendous interest.

Because I believe that the facts and figures and descriptive matter which is contained in this tremendously able article will be helpful to my colleagues in the consideration of the Department of the Interior Appropriation Act, which now holds the attention of the Congress, I ask the unanimous consent of the membership that the article to which I have just referred be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection to the request of the gentleman from California, Magner White's article, We're Moving the Rain, follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of April 27, 1940]

WE'RE MOVING THE RAIN

(By Magner White)

You can ride through the Central Valley water-project area in California for 2 days without knowing you are in it, it is so big. You see only the 83 cities, towns, and hamlets; the rivers, the alpine mountains in the north, the dying orchards in the south, canals, barges, and power lines. It is more than 500 miles long. Virtually, the project tends to remake an area containing two-thirds of the agricultural lands of the State of California, that great mountain-hemmed basin which is the Central Valley; which, itself, is two valleys, the Sacramento in the north, the San Joaquin in the south.

There was never another project just like it. It doesn't add a single irrigated acre to the national total, yet, primarily, it is an irrigation project. Other projects have made desert and wastelands bicom; this one seeks to keep blooming about 2,000,000 acres of fabulously rich lands threatened with unique disasters. It extends from near the Tehachapi Divide, about 50 miles north of Los Angeles, almost to the Oregon State line. Two-thirds of agricultural California lies within its scope. Its mission, save for hydroelectric power, is not development, but rescue.

You ride in your car, travel afoot, float in river boats, glide in trains, and you see the symbolical elements of the economy it is designed to save. It is in shriveled asparagus plants, stunted by encroaching salt tidewaters on rich delta lands near San Francisco Bay, from which once came 99 percent of the Nation's canned asparagus, and where now $50,000,000 worth of factories, five municipalities, and 400,000 acres of land oftentimes gasp for fresh water. It is in the plight of a San Joaquin Valley farmer, trying vainly to get water from a well, now 250 feet deep and dry, which once—and that only 20 years ago— found "earth's sweet flowing breast" at from 10 to 20 feet. It is in that drought year of Indian legend when not a drop of water fell in all the great Central Valley. It is in the flood years—and you've read about those. What floods!

In 1862 boats rose up out of San Francisco Bay, proceeded up to Suisun Bay, then cut across country, over farmhouses and towns, 88 miles to Stockton, rescuing marooned citizens. That was the year newly inaugurated Gov. Leland Stanford led an inaugural reception party to the mansion at Sacramento and found the only way in was through a second-story window—by boat. In another flood several decades ago, steamboats went down to Tulare Lake, 200 miles inland, and were stranded. Yet drought strikes and river navigation is paralyzed. Need for the great new project is in all these extremes. It is in the 112.5 inches of rainfall recorded one year at Shasta Dam site and the less than 8 inches at Bakersfield at the other end of Central Valley the same year.

It is in the clamor of the people. Some saying, with Gov. Culbert L. Olson's New Deal administration, "Power! Power! Get ready for the Tennessee Valley Authority of the West and cheap, publicly owned power." Others in the San Joaquin Valley saying, "No; not power entirely. Give us water first, before our rich vineyards and orchards revert to desert—400,000 acres are threatened now." And still others, in the Sacramento Valley, saying, "Restore navigation on the Sacramento—boats and barges plying clear to Red Bluff, 200 miles inland; and give us flood control, for we are tired of being periodically washed away." And other groups, each with a separate prayer for deliverance.

The $170,000,000 Central Valley project seeks to answer all at once. Naturally, such a colossal order calls for a colossal project—and it is. "Its magnitude," says Walker R. Young, supervising engineer for the Bureau of Reclamation, in his office in Sacramento, "is astounding."

And that is astounding, for Mr. Young was the Government's construction engineer on the Colorado River's great Boulder Dam. Notwithstanding, "the Central Valley project is one of the most difficult and certainly one of the most important undertakings ever faced by the Bureau of Reclamation."

How big?

WHEN THE EARTH REBELLED

"From 1902 to 1937, the first 35 years of its existence, the Bureau completed reservoirs now irrigating 2,900,000 acres and sustaining a population of 860,000. This project alone will conserve water for 2,000,000 acres in a valley with more than 1,000,000 population—nearly 70 percent as much acreage as the Bureau reclaimed in 35 years, and more persons than live on all those other projects combined."

He said, "Astounding!"

For 90 years the project has been dawning. In that period it is estimated that about $3,000,000 has been spent by dozens of Federal, State, local, and private boards, commissions, committees, and agencies on studies, surveys, and investigations of the Central Valley and its meteorological, navigational, agricultural, and salinity-control problems. President Grant, who sent the Army's engineers to look into the situation, made a report to Congress on the valley's needs as early as 1873.

Civilized processes have finally forced action. The exploited earth has rebelled. Unprecedented floods come—a new one every few years. Fifteen feet recently was added to plans for the height of Friant Dam in the project because, after years of observation, a flood came along that justified changing the original design. The ocean creeps farther into the drained and clogged Sacramento River and into the heavily draughted San Joaquin, befouling wells, killing crops. San Joaquin Valley's water table falls and falls, and 40,000 acres are abandoned, and ten times that many are threatened. "By the normal processes of our farming, mining, and lumbering," said the National Resources Committee a few months ago, "we are creating a desert."

Here are the beginnings of one—in the second largest State in the Union. To the rescue. With two major dams, 350 miles of canals, scores of siphons, tunnels, bridges—27 in a 9-mile stretch of the Contra Costa Canal alone—and other auxiliary units. It is a national matter. It is a certainty that, sometime during the year, your table is enhanced with foodstuffs from Central Valley areas—grapes, raisins, figs, olives, walnuts, almonds, peaches, celery, spinach, asparagus, avocados, lemons, oranges, wines. Sixty percent of the 2,400,000 tons of grapes grown annually in this country comes from the San Joaquin Valley. Add vast cotton acreages and cattle ranches of the same area; fruit and nut groves and rice plantations of the Sacramento Valley, and you have a garden empire unexcelled in the world. But without controlled water, below par, or even

worthless. Desert. Silted and salted. Desiccated and drenched.

It is difficult to put into a nutshell sentence the project's fundamental engineering principle. The best description of it was by a Shasta Dam workman. Asked what all those men were doing there, digging and hauling, he looked up from his pneumatic drill and, with a dusty grin, said, "Mister, we're moving the rain."

And that's it. Central Valley's engineering problems all originate in misplaced rain. Too much in the wrong places or too little in the right places, and never in the right season. Two-thirds of the 37,400,000-acre basin's rainfall occurs in the upper, or Sacramento Valley, end. Only a third of the Central Valley's agricultural land is there. At the other end, in the San Joaquin Valley, the proportions are exactly reversed—two-thirds of the cropland, only a third of the water.

Therefore, move the rain.

And cure many other ills as you go along.

The Sacramento River flows southerly, the San Joaquin northerly. Rearrange some of that. Send the Sacramento farther south through a 100-mile canal called the San Joaquin pumping system, to relieve the San Joaquin. Because the San Joaquin's flow is going to be all but turned around on the map. The bulk of its waters, which normally flow north, are going to flow south through the 160-mile Friant-Kern Canal to those dying farms, vineyards, and orchards where the water table is dropping out from under the land. And, though far from its present northerly stream bed, it's also going to flow northerly through the 40-mile Madera Canal. After it's gone, send the Sacramento—at least some of its surplus waters, of which it often has plenty—to take over, and supply the 300,000 acres now drawing on the San Joaquin; the Sacramento to join the virtually departed San Joaquin's stream bed at Mendota through its 100-mile high-line canal. Switch the rivers around. Move the rain.

A STATE OF SUPERLATIVES

Each river will have its major dam. The Sacramento will have Shasta Dam, 12 miles north of Redding, named for the famous extinct volcano, Mount Shasta, which dominates that country. The San Joaquin will have Friant Dam, 20 miles north of Fresno, which will divert it into its two canals and send it, in new directions, on a new career.

One dam will be at the north end of the project, the other near the south end.

Together they are appropriately colossal, as befits their functions. There are already in California 618 dams with capacities aggregating 7,250,000 acre-feet. Shasta with 4,500,000 acre-feet and Friant with 520,000 will, together, store 70 percent as much water as all the other 618 combined. (Between us, a Californian gets a kick out of writing a story like this.) Everything about the project is super, like that. If the superlative is not attained directly in one way it is achieved obliquely in another.

But barge in anywhere along the 500 miles and you run into things that stand you still.

You go up around Redding, the Shasta Dam country. You hike through manzanita and chaparrel looking for game. Now and then you gaze on snow-peaked Mount Shasta, and you feel that exhilaration of the great, free, high spaces when suddenly: You hear, from somewhere down there in the bushes, a persistent, determined sound, like machinery. It can't be construction sounds from the dam—the dam is nearly 7 miles away. You mount a rise. You look down on—of all things—a winding, groaning device of the factory. A long, long belt conveyor out here in this wilderness.

It comes from nowhere, seems to be going nowhere; but wherever it is going, it seems to be going on forever, doggedly creeping on its rollers, up hill and down dale, through woods and across clearings; over a main State highway, twice across the Sacramento River, over four creeks—even over the Southern Pacific Railroad. Its wooden bents now 4 feet above the ground, now crossing highways and streams 90 feet up. Loaded with sand and gravel, what the engineers call "aggregate." Wait a minute—here comes a man. An inspector, apparently. It's good to meet someone way out here.

"Hey!" That stopped him. "What is this thing?"

He comes closer, puffing. "Well, sir," he says proudly, "this here is the longest belt-conveyor system in the world. That's some more of it over there on that hill, 2 miles away. She's 10½ miles long—'bout twice as long as any other'n ever built! She's takin' this stuff up to Shasta Dam. Ain't she a honey?"

She is. She starts near Redding, runs to Coram. She's lighted at nights with sodium-vapor lights, a spectacular sight for air travelers or others in the surrounding altitudes. She has 26 links, all interlocked, each motivated with a 200-horsepower motor, except for 4 down-grade units which generate power to help operate the other flights. Ten million tons of aggregate are going up to the dam on this system—enough to fill 200,000 gondola-type cars. Until Shasta Dam is completed, in 1944, this thing will never rest.

Shasta Dam is the key structure of the Central Valley Project. Grand Coulee Dam in Washington State, with a concrete mass of 11,250,000 cubic yards, is the largest thing ever made by man. Boulder Dam, 727 feet high, is the world's highest. But Shasta, with 6,000,000 cubic yards, will be bigger than Boulder, which masses only 4,360,000 cubic yards and, 560 feet high, will top Grand Coulee by 7 feet. This seems to put it in a class with the side-show midget advertised as "the smallest giant in the world"—but still, Shasta will be one of the greatest structures on this earth.

Notched into its 3,500-foot crest will be a 375-foot spillway. Some spillways are located at one side, or pass around the ends of a dam. This one goes over the top. Its waters will plunge 480 feet—nearly three times the drop of Niagara Falls—the world's greatest artificial waterfall. And Shasta, of course, will be "the highest overflow-type dam in the world." Done obliquely, and with a waterfall, but still—a superlative.

AN INDUSTRIAL MOBILIZATION

No one contracting firm in the United States would care to finance the cash-outlay requirements for the building of Shasta Dam. The bond requirements alone totaled $9,500,000—a bid-guaranty bond of $2,000,000, a performance bond of $5,000,000, and a labor-materials-payment bond of $2,500,000. So 12 nationally known contracting firms formed a special company, the Pacific Constructors, Inc. Some of the 12 were companies specially merged to join the big company. The combine won on a bid of $35,939,450.

In the company are: The Arundel Corporation, Baltimore; Foley Bros., Inc., New York; Hunkin-Conkey Co., Cleveland; A. Guthrie & Co., St. Paul; Gunther-Shirley Co. and W. E. Callahan Construction Co., Dallas; Shofner, Gordon & Hinman, Denver; Lawler & Maguire, Butte; and, all of Los Angeles, Griffith Co., Metropolitan Construction Co., American Concrete & Steel Pipe Co., D. W. Thurston Co., and L. E. Dixon Co.

Between Pacific Constructors, Inc., and the next bidder, the Shasta Construction Co.—also a combine, including members of the old Six Companies who built Boulder Dam—there was a difference in bid of only $262,907. Some of the difference seemed to lie in how to get the enormous quantities of aggregate and cement, and the resulting concrete, into the dam's structure. The Pacific Constructors, Inc.'s engineers solved the problem with an ingenious steel tower and cable system; a more common method is to use trestles and cars, at most supplemented with a cable or two. But this tower has seven cables—and that is unprecedented, so many tied to one tower; and it gave the company one of the most interesting problems ever developed in construction work, an unprecedented problem in harmonics.

The 4,000-ton steel tower in 460 feet high. Its four legs, spaced 184 feet apart, are set 100 feet into the ground. Operating machinery is located in three floors near the top. At the top, so far up against those vast backgrounds it looks like the traditional toothpick, is a 45-foot boom used in servicing the cable system. On the seven cableways—three of them more than a half mile long—glide carriages carrying concrete, up to 24 tons at a time. The problem was to keep the cables, all vibrating and singing back and forth to one another, from shaking the whole works to pieces. Supt. Frank T. Crowe, employed by the contractors, a veteran of Boulder Dam and other big jobs, was leery. No one knew what so many wild waves might do. If not properly set up, this "supermusical instrument" literally would "sing itself to death." Crowe called for advice, and the results showed his apprehensions were more than justified.

TUNING A TOWER

Adolph J. Ackerman, Pittsburgh engineer, was called in to contact harmonics experts of the Nation. He sat up nights; he traveled the continent; he consulted engineers of great electrical companies and physicists in colleges all over the country. The Bureau of Standards was called on to check formulas and theories. Consulting Engineer Henry D. Dewell, of San Francisco, also was put on the job. Conferences were held with Prof. Lydik S. Jacobsen, of Stanford University's vibration and earthquake testing laboratory.

Two cableways at Norris Dam, on T. V. A., had given a clue. An extensometer placed on these showed they were enduring stresses from 30 to 40 percent greater than conventional computations would indicate. Like bass strings on a great piano, with the loud pedal down, these cableways were generating sound waves, all below the human ear's range, and bouncing them back and forth, multiplying the effect each time until the total effect finally was like that of an impact of something weighing 75,000 pounds. This was with two cables. What about more?

It was determined that the cableways of more than 2,000 feet in length would emit waves which, though slow moving—only 500 to 600 feet per second—would be as irresistible as cannon balls. Not to mention a natural tension wave in each of the long swaying cables traveling 15,000 feet per second.

This was just the beginning.

"Considering five cableways," Ackerman reported, after a year's study and some differences of opinion, "with magnitudes of 30 to 40 tons per cableway"—bucket, load, carriage, and 3-inch cableway's weight included—"all transmitting into the headpiece of a central tower and into its supporting structure, we arrive at the enormous figure of 40,000,000 to 50,000,000 cycles!"

Obviously, none of the metals involved—I-bars, yokes, connecting pins; not even the 4,000 tons of steel in the tower—could have withstood any such vibrations. Imagine being hit forty to fifty million times by 30 to 40 tons. A proposed backstay arrangement on the tower was revised. Anchorage cables were placed where they would absorb, divert, or thwart the unwanted waves. Apparently these and other devices are placed at wild random; actually they are set with utmost scientific precision. Complicated.

"But," says Crowe, "she's hell for stout!"

When big dams go up, something—usually a town—is in the way and must be removed from the reservoir site. Here it's part of the

Southern Pacific's California-Oregon main line. It not only winds 37 miles through the site, it crosses the spot where the dam is being built. This complication is solved by an 1,820-foot tunnel under the west abutment. Trains temporarily rumble through and under, giving passengers a glimpse of the big machines mowing down hillsides, the hundreds of men removing brush for miles around, and the $4,500,000 plant the contractors had to put up before they ever poured a batch of concrete.

Later, when the trains move to a relocated line out of Redding, the bypass tunnel will be used to divert the river while the dam goes up higher. Then it will be plugged with a concrete plug 162 feet thick, and left to the ages—probably to puzzle future archeologists.

Relocation of the railroad is a $17,500,000 job. Thirty miles of new track and fifteen miles of highway are being built to take the railroad and a stretch of United States Highway 99 out of the reservoir area. Relocated railroad and highway come together 6 miles from the dam, after skirting a portion of the reservoir. This is the occasion for another big job to get them both across a tributary arm of the lake—the Pit River Bridge, which will be the highest double-decked and the highest railroad bridge in the world.

Highway traffic will travel four lanes on the upper deck, flanked by walkways; trains will travel below. The bridge will be 500 feet high, but, unfortunately, passengers will have no visual evidence of this, for, when the reservoir is full, the lower deck will be only 35 feet above the water. Paul Bunyan, the prodigious lumberjack of legend, might well have designed the concrete supporting piers. Visualize a No. 2 size Washington Monument, 95 by 90 feet at the base, 358 feet high—higher than the Tower of Babel. That's the largest pier. Two others are slightly smaller, seven others relatively insignificant, some only 100 feet tall.

CHANGING NATURE'S WAYS

But the three largest are so massive the bases must be cooled like a large dam, artificially, by circulation of river water through them in embedded metal tubes.

Shasta Reservoir from the air will look like a silver maple leaf set amid mountains. It will be a big leaf, for Shasta Dam will back the Sacramento and the tributary Pit and McCloud Rivers into their canyons 35 miles. The 29,500-acre lake will drain 6,665 square miles. The highest point in its watershed is Mount Shasta (elevation 14,161 feet). The 4,500,000 acre-feet of gross storage will be larger than the combined storages of the Tennessee Valley's Norris and Wilson Dams, but will be but a fraction of Boulder Dam's mighty 30,500,000 acre-feet.

However, again we come to one of those amazing Central Valley water project supers.

The Sacramento River is a mightier stream than the famed Colorado. The Colorado is 2,000 miles long. The Sacramento is only 400 miles long. But the Colorado's mean annual flow, averaged over 40 years by Engineer Young, who knows both streams intimately, is only 16,000,000 acre-feet as against the Sacramento's 21,000,000. At seasonal peaks this enormous volume tries to crowd into the Sacramento's limited stream bed, and this bunching of so much water in such a relatively small channel accounts for the Sacramento Valley's historic floods. Much of this water is on hand, contrarily, in the winter, when it isn't needed. In a period of 90 days enough water to float the United States Navy comes down and scoots into the ocean. A month later the river may have fallen so low boats have to be beached. Shasta Dam will change all this. Like Boulder Dam, Shasta Dam will harness a wild, overgrown winter and spring colt which, as yet, doesn't seem to know its own strength. In contrast, if you like, Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River will harness a lumbering elephant.

THE POWER QUESTION

Visitors to Shasta Dam, which is certain to become another prize western tourist attraction, will observe what seems to be a seven-story office building dwarfed in the perspectives at the base of the dam. This is the hydroelectric powerhouse. Here will be generated about 1,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power annually—and, before the power finally is distributed, possibly an equal number of political disputes and maneuvers.

This will add 20 to 25 percent to northern California's total power output. About 300,000,000 kilowatt-hours of this new power will be used to lift the Sacramento River's waters into the San Joaquin pumping system 200 miles down-State in the Delta. But subtracting this, enough will be left over to serve nearly 1,000,000 average five-room dwellings. Many farms will use the power for pumping. A portion will go for municipal and domestic uses. Naturally this power increase causes some concern to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., which distributes most of northern California's power. Governor Olson's administration is insistent that the power shall be sold to publicly owned power districts. The P. G. & E. has offered to buy the power and distribute it through its own lines.

Thus the municipal-ownership issue is an important political byproduct of the Central Valley water project. Governor Olson's administration emphasizes the power aspect of the project; so much so that many Californians have the impression that power is the prime purpose. Congress, however, considers the project primarily a navigation matter. It's an item in the Rivers and Harbors Act of August 26, 1937. Technically the Bureau of Reclamation considers it in the same light, but some authorities will tell you its most important feature is irrigation. So the project is all things to all men. Few projects have merged so many objectives.

Whooping up the power issue early this year, Governor Olson had important "assists" from Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes. Out of a clear sky, almost as if inspired, Secretary Ickes sent Governor Olson a letter while a power revenue-bond proposal was before the California Legislature. In this letter the Secretary announced California communities must "get ready" to receive Shasta Dam power by organizing power districts. Legislators were informed "the Federal Government wants us to prepare for publicly owned power"; but at this writing a proposal to "unfreeze" $50,000,000 of $170,000,000 originally voted for construction of the Central Valley project by the State itself seems doomed—it has been tabled in committee. The administration's plan was to divert this unused bond money to a State-owned power-distribution system and a supplemental stand-by steam plant.

The $170,000,000 was voted in 1933 by the legislature and upheld later on referendum. A proviso was that the amount of the bond issue was to be "reduced by such amounts as may be furnished by the Federal Government." This raised questions as to the bonds' legality when Congress authorized the project as a Federal reclamation undertaking in 1937. So California has on hand $170,000,000 of bonds—or authority to issue that amount. That is a lot of potential public money to be lying around unused. Public-ownership advocates, official and lay, have been busy trying to find some way to unfreeze at least some of the money for application to the vote-getting "cheap-public-power" movement. The California Water Project Authority, headed by Frank W. Clark, Olson's department of public works director, and an ardent municipal-ownership advocate, held hearings on the power question just before the legislature was convened in special session by Governor Olson. At these meetings, Clark reports in a letter, "the farmers turned out en masse from as far north as Shasta County to as far south as Kern County. For an entire day, speaker after speaker told the authority they wanted the power direct from the State." Nevertheless, two Republican members of the authority were unpersuaded; the authority split, 2 to 2, on recommending that Governor Olson put the $50,000,000 unfreezing up to the legislature. So Olson put it up anyway.

TURNING BACK THE TIDES

The P. G. & E. has not escaped the natural appellation in such a situation; Olsonites refer to it with affectionate sneers as the Power Trust. Some legislators were stubborn. They took the view that power was very much secondary to flood control and irrigation, and that, so long as Uncle Sam was building the project, why should the people of California put up millions for a power system? And there she lies—a sharp clash between public and private ownership. No matter who handles the power, it is expected, with irrigation revenues, to return to the Federal Government, in time, the entire cost of the Central Valley project.

Salinity control is another unique inner project in the Central Valley undertaking. At the common delta of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Rivers, waters of the Sacramento, controlled by Shasta Dam, will be used to "bump back" tidal waters coming up through San Francisco, San Pablo, and Suisun Bays. The salinity problem arises in almost the exact center of the Central Valley. Half a dozen municipalities, about 400,000 garden-truck acres, oil and sugar refineries, steel and paper mills, rubber and chemical plants, and usual mercantile and industrial establishments are affected.

A rich country, 20 miles wide by 50 long, is this delta country. It is called the Little Holland of California. In its 1,000 square miles are 550 miles of sloughs and channels. Much of it is at or below sea level. Its lands have been reclaimed and maintained at great expense by levees, drainage ditches, and pumping plants. To irrigate, the farmer simply taps one of the channels; he returns drainage water by pumping it up and over a levee. In some seasons of low river flow, such as the dry year of 1939, salt water from the bays invades the channels. As a result, some $30,000,000 annually in crops is threatened with the fate of Lot's wife.

This problem will be met with the Delta Cross Channel, 40 miles long, largely a widening of waterways between the Sacramento River at Hood and the San Joaquin at the southerly end of the delta. Through this channel, as well as by the Sacramento River itself, the delta channels will be flushed of salt water, and fresh water will be taken onto the dying lands.

PAYING FOR THE GOLD RUSH

More urban areas, including upland irrigated acres, will be served fresh Sacramento River water through the 46-mile Contra Costa Canal. Through concrete-lined banks this water will go to the industrial cities of Antioch, Concord, Martinez, Pittsburg, and Port Chicago—that gasoline-fumed, dark, busy area through which the traveler passes in entering San Francisco and Oakland from the east. This area has been desperate for fresh water. Water has been hauled in for filling automobile radiators. Bridge clubs have adjourned to Oakland so members might have fresh water for coffee. Manufacturing has waited on a water barge, overdue from a trip up the river to fresh-water areas. Pipe lines have been extended farther and farther inland after unbrackish water. Some communities have stored water from flood season to flood season, and run into precarious shortages before new floods brought new fresh waters. This accounts for the fact that since May 1936 the people have been organized into a canal-water district—waiting—and for the fact that the Contra Costa Canal, years before Shasta Dam's expected completion in 1944, is already half finished.

A controlled Sacramento River will end this salt menace.

The decreased river depths have been due not only to heavy irrigation draughts. Hydraulic mining, since the historic gold rush of '49 began in upper tributaries in 1856. This put debris and waste oil into the streams. Although unrestricted hydraulic mining was stopped by the courts in 1884, the debris has been coming down in diminishing quantities ever since. Agricultural California is still paying for the gold rush. In 64 years there have been 64 floods, and every one has moved its share of the earth farther downstream. Shoals have formed; channels are fouled; landings isolated by sand bars. Navigation, which started 100 years ago last August, and saw in 1 day in 1850, 24 vessels at the port of Marysville, has virtually halted at Sacramento, where once-busy boats now lie beached.

By stabilizing the flow the Central Valley project will rescue and revive the Sacramento's shipping. It needs rescuing. In 1926 river traffic was 1,222,993 tons of freight, of which 54,296 was fresh water in barges—the salinity problem was just beginning. A decade later, 1936, it was 770,127 tons, of which a fourth was fresh water. In the same period passenger traffic dropped from 76,288 to 32,323, and even that was high, due to short-haul trips, for in 1935 it had dropped to 17,145. The trend has continued downward, in contrast to the days when the Sacramento and Marysville water fronts were so clogged port officials had to tag vessels for overparking.

Navigation is a special concern of the United States Army Engineers. Under their direction the river channel probably will be improved between Sacramento and Red Bluff to supplement the stabilized flow under the project. Plans in preparation have not been made public. Boats on the rejuvenated river, coordinated with truck lines, will tap an enormous area—much of northern California; and livestock, fruit, and lumber-producing sections of southern Oregon and southwestern Idaho.

Hundreds of contracts are involved in the Central Valley project. None represents more diplomacy and cooperation than the agreement by which 2,314 water users in the northern San Joaquin Valley agree to take imported Sacramento River water in exchange for the San Joaquin water which will be diverted southerly and northerly, in a different area. This is in a territory where men have battled over water more than half a century, some dying with their boots on. The intensity of the scramble for water can hardly be overdramatized. The late Dr. Elwood Mead, Commissioner of Reclamation, once remarked: "Record books of every county in the State have been thrown open to entry of any sort of claim which need or greed might encourage. The aggregate of all water claims in California represents enough moisture to submerge the continent." The hottest spot in this scramble, in the past, has been right here where the San Joaquin flows, and where the Sacramento will flow and serve 300,000 acres when Mendota Canal is operating.

Peace, it's wonderful when 2,314 water users come to agreement in a deal so comprehensive. But they overlooked nothing. These northern San Joaquin irrigators want none of the fate that has befallen the be-salted delta. Even the quality of the water has been agreed upon, and the exact spot at which experts shall take the water regularly for study of its composition. Three eminent professors, studying the prospect, convinced the farmers that northern imported water would be all right.

So all is well—up to now—on the San Joaquin. But irrigators are wary of bicarbonates, sulfates, and chlorides in water. Let the cry, "The solids are comin" go out, and the resulting alarm would be like that preceding disaster. Without this diplomatic triumph, worked out by the Bureau of Reclamation and the 2,314 water users and approved by the State railroad commission, there could have been no Friant Dam to divert the San Joaquin and rescue the stricken south San Joaquin Valley.

Tragic evidence of the water problem down there is on every hand. Here's a peach orchard. Half of it is in bloom. Half of it is dead and shriveled. The well went dry. The grower, joining with a neighbor who still could get water, though only by pumping it from a depth of more than 100 feet, had to decide what trees he would allow to die. His decision is literally marked by the lines of life and death in the orchard. His neighbor's orchard is marked the same way. Common disaster has driven both to sacrifice so that each may have at least part of an orchard. Before the project is in full operation, more orchards and vineyards will die. But they can be revived; all they need is more water.

Meanwhile, the scramble for water is on. Big growers—Joe DiGiorgio, for instance, whose 11,000-acre vineyards are the world's greatest—share with smaller growers, and sometimes it's the other way around. Some of the larger operators have taken over neighboring acreages to work them, without profit, until the Friant-Kern Canal arrives. The owners couldn't meet the heavy pumping costs. The big growers are trying to hold the industry together; a dying orchard or vineyard next door might become a breeding ground for pests which would get out of hand and kill every vine and tree in the valley, big or little. Social and economic considerations seem to merge very aptly here.

The President's Water Flow Committee desribed the San Joaquin Valley water shortage as "the most acute found in any part of the United States." It is no wonder that when ground was broken for Friant Dam on November 5, 1939, 50,000 persons turned out to watch the ceremonial dynamite blast.

Friant will rate as the fourth largest dam of its type in the world. But few dams will be more important. It has the most dramatic rescue mission of any unit on the project. Without it, an agricultural empire would surely die in a few more years; a heavy blow would be dealt transcontinental railroads which haul these crops to you in 100-car fast trains; the Nation's tables would be impoverished, because these are mostly seasonal specialty crops which compete with no others in the United States—and, without Friant Dam, in a few more years you might be eating imported raisins and grapes.

Modernizing the Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

ADDRESS BY CAPT. EDWARD MACAULEY, UNITED STATES NAVY, RETIRED, A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege yesterday to present Capt. Edward Macauley, United States Navy, retired, a recently appointed member of the United States Maritime Commission, to the members of the California Society, to whom he thereupon delivered a most timely, instructive, and tremendously interesting address.

In the light of the importance of that which Captain Macauley had to say, his informative outline of the activities of the highly important governmental agency of which he is a member, it is to be regretted that he could not have been heard by more than the 250 people who were in attendance at the Washington Hotel meeting.

Because I feel that his speech merited a much wider audience, and in the hope that the substance of that which he then said may be given greater circulation, I ask the unanimous consent of the membership of this legislative body that that which Captain Macauley said yesterday be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection to the request of the gentleman from California, it was ordered that the address of Capt. Edward Macauley, of the United States Maritime Commission, be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The speech follows:

My fellow Californians, for many years we in the West have been trying to convert easterners to our more leisurely way of living. I think we were having some success. It was either our influence or the traffic lights which slowed down some of my New York friends from a gallop to a jog trot. I am afraid that we will have to suspend our campaign for the duration of this defense effort. We expatriates who are serving in Washington are close to the fast-whirling wheels of Government, and we can see the rapid tempo of political and economic developments. As a more recent arrival than most of you, I have been surprised at the speed with which our country is acting. The field of shipbuilding, with which I am most familiar, provides an excellent example. A year ago this Government was building merchant ships at the rate of 50 a year, according to a planned program of replacement for our aging cargo and cargo passenger vessels. In the last 4 months we have added 472 ships to that program, all to be built within 2 years, bringing the scope of our program from 50 ships a year to about 285 ships a year.

I shall not attempt to measure this increase in terms of dollars. With the billions which must be spent for the proper defense of this country and the support of British resistance, money figures are not as impressive as they used to be. Nor are money figures the important criterion that they used to be. As we all know, the primary object at the moment is defense and the cost of defense, whether we like it or not, must be a secondary consideration. There is another criterion of size, however, in the number of men needed for the building and operating of these ships. First, in the construction of these ships as well as the new naval vessels recently ordered, employment in the shipbuilding industry will more than double. Second, to operate these vessels we will need many thousands of officers and seamen. We believe that these 572 ships will require more than 20,000 seagoing personnel. Normally, our merchant marine employs about 55,000 on board deep-sea ships and this will be an expansion of more than a third. The new ships cannot be manned entirely by men with previous experience, because old ships which would normally be scrapped must be kept in commission during this emergency.

The Maritime Commission recently held a conference on the problem of the shortage

of maritime personnel. The precise steps to be taken are not yet determined but it is certain that some method will be found to man these ships with able, trained American seamen. The cooperation of the labor organizations of both unlicensed men and the licensed officers of all labor affiliations was offered the Commission in this conference, and their support in recruiting the additional seamen will be of tremendous help in solving the problem.

While this shortage of maritime personnel presents a great problem to the country, and while it is a regrettable development from the standpoint of putting an additional burden on the defense work of the maritime industry, it has a good side. It focuses attention on the tremendous importance of the men who go to sea. Too often do those of us not in the maritime industry think of ships as steel hulls, propelled automatically by machinery which never gets out of order and which automatically loads the cargo, warps the vessel out of the slip, navigates it across the ocean, makes a perfect landfall, and then automatically noses in to a slip in the foreign port before automatically discharging cargo. If the maritime industry could operate in this fashion it would be fine to concentrate all our thoughts on improvement of machinery and equipment. But it does not. Without proper and well-trained officers and men a ship is worse than useless. It is a danger to property and a hazard to navigation.

Great ships are not only huge machine shops, they are self-governing towns. The officers, engineers, and seamen of today must know what goes to make up the ship they are handling. The more the shoreside man, the man in the steamship offices, the operating man, is familiar with the problems of his brothers afloat, the better will both be able to pull together and bring success to themselves, their ships, and their companies.

In the old days, a good sea captain or officer needed a strong and far-reaching voice. Today a wave of the hand, the movement of a lever, or a quiet order serves the same purpose on board ship, and serves it better. A quiet ship is generally a well-disciplined ship.

Whether a ship is a smart ship or a slack one will be indicated by the conditions and performance of its brain and nerve centers, the bridge and the engine room and the officers who are in charge there. The organization and administration of a large vessel with a crew made up of many different elements and a large number of all kinds of passengers requires executive ability of the highest order and qualifications for leadership, firmness, tact, and consideration. Everything must be done for the health, comfort, and contentment of passengers and crew, and the vessel must be scrupulously clean and sanitary. Most passengers are landsmen, on an unfamiliar element and amid strange surroundings. They are deserving of sympathetic courtesy from the officers and men as representatives of the company which has received their passage money and is endeavoring to satisfy and please them. Formality and etiquette are very much in place on board ship, as they must be in any well-conducted organization, especially where authority and prompt and unquestioning obedience are of such importance. The dignity, self respect, and behavior of the officers will be reflected in the crew.

The Maritime Commission recognized this at an early stage and began a program for training able and skilled men to man its new and technologically superior ships. More than 12,000 men have already been reached by this training progam and as a result are doing their jobs better on the oceangoing vessels of this country.

The business leaders of the Pacific coast have in the past given considerable attention to the material side of the shipping industry. I am sure you were all pleased during the last 2 or 3 years to see new and efficient ships entering Pacific coast trade to carry your cargo and to bring in the imports which you need for your businesses. Being from the Pacific coast you appreciate possibly more than persons in any other part of the country the importance of shipping to a healthy business community. The attention which your businessmen have paid to the material side of shipping in supporting the establishment and operation of ship lines and in aiding in the establishment of new shipbuilding plants could well be supplemented by attention to the problem of getting and training good men to go to sea. This would not only be a service to the shipping industry but it would be a service to all business because it would be a protection to your property which travels over the water. This is not an academic suggestion on my part but a concrete one. They and you can encourage our young men to take up the sea as a calling. We may build ships—the best of ships—but we must have men—trained, experienced men—to run them.

All our attention should not be given to getting contracts to build ships and shipyards and steel plants. Some should be left for the problem of getting the best of our California and Pacific coast men to go to sea. In saying this I have a slight bit of regional pride. I think that the young men of the Pacific coast are unsurpassed for character and ability by the young men of any other part of the country. In 1919, while in command of an oceangoing vessel, the steamship *George Washington*, I had the honor of bringing to this country the Belgian King Albert and his Queen and the then crown prince, now the unhappy King Leopold, a virtual prisoner of the Nazis in his own country. King Albert told me then that he felt the typical American men were to be found in the far West—that there was the greatest development of the real American as distinguished from his European ancestral stock.

In urging men to go to sea and in facilitating their training for this service, you will not be asking them to undertake the privation and hardship they would have met 10 years ago. There was a time when living conditions on board ship were very nearly unbearable. Crowded, unclean forecastles, inadequate toilet and washing facilities, coupled with bad food, were frequently found on American ships. This has all changed, and for a very good reason. The efficiency of a ship and of her crew is enhanced by contentment with rooms and food. The new ships of the Maritime Commission program have clean, spacious quarters, adequate shower and toilet facilities, good ventilation and heating. In the crew's quarters the number of men per room is small, usually two, and there is a large locker for each. Hot and cold running water is installed in each room and over the basin is a shaving mirror with side lighting and with an outlet for an electric razor. The messroom is used as a recreation room between meals and has separate tables for four as well as long upholstered settees. A dresser, drinking fountain, and bookshelves are installed. A pantry serving both petty officers and crew is maintained for between-meal snacks. Officers' quarters have improved, too. The captain, chief engineer, and chief officer have individual rooms with individual toilet and shower. Officers' staterooms have settees, wardrobes, desks, drop-leaf tables, and medicine cabinets.

Nor has this program been restricted to the new ships. More than $1,500,000 has been spent in the past 3 years in improving crew's quarters, mess halls, and washrooms and in installing recreation rooms and new deck coverings on the older vessels of the merchant fleet. Expenditures per vessel have ranged from $15,000 on freighters to $100,000 on passenger liners. This is not to say there are no old ships with substandard crew's quarters, but they are rapidly being improved or replaced.

I have asked for your cooperation in getting men from the west coast to go to sea. I would like to show you how closely the west coast is tied to the development of the American merchant marine. Of the 764 merchant vessels building or under contract in the United States, 261 or about 35 percent are being built on the Pacific coast. This west-coast production will total 2,787,591 deadweight tons and will cost, according to contract provisions, approximately $540,000,000.

Of this Pacific coast program 177 ships are to be built in California yards—about 68 percent of the Pacific coast volume and a little more than 23 percent of the entire program for the Nation. Contracts amounting to nearly $355,000,000 have been awarded to California shipyards, representing about two-thirds of the total contracts placed on the west coast and nearly 25 percent of the total contract awards throughout the Nation.

What is undoubtedly of equal, if not greater, importance to Californians and the citizens of other Pacific Coast States is the activity by the Maritime Commission in building up, on a basis of permanent successful operation, the west coast shipping industry. Since the Maritime Commission came into being, it has been actively engaged in rehabilitating west coast shipping services to foreign countries. Several of these steamship lines have been reorganized with Maritime Commission cooperation. Notable among these are the American President Lines, formerly the Dollar Steamship Lines; the American Mail Line, and the Pacific Republics Line, which was formerly the Pacific Argentine Brazil Line. Allotments of new and fast ships from the Commission's construction program have been made to all of these lines and some of the vessels are already in service.

Under the present replacement plans the American President Lines will receive seven Commission-designed passenger-cargo vessels of 17,615 tons displacement and 18 to 19 knots speed, known as C–3's; four, the steamships *President Garfield, President Hayes, President Jackson,* and *President Monroe* already have been delivered and are in active service. The remaining three are expected to follow them within the next few months.

The American Mail Line has been allotted six C–2 cargo vessels of 13,893 tons displacement and 17 knots speed and 3 C–1 cargo vessels of 12,875 tons displacement and 15 knots speed, the first of which, the motorship *Cape Alava,* has been delivered and is now on its maiden voyage.

The Pacific Republics Line now has in active service two C–3 cargo ships, the steamship *Mormacsea* and the steamship *Mormacstar.* The third vessel of this type is scheduled for delivery to the Pacific Republics Line during the month of May.

While these plans, like all long-range peacetime programs, may have to be suspended and the ships assigned elsewhere during the emergency, you may be sure that with the dawn of the happy day when this crisis has been successfully weathered, they will once more be put into effect. Then again will sea-borne commerce resume its great historic function of spreading ever wider peaceful dealings between peoples, and with those dealings, as in the past, will come greater understanding and greater tolerance. In the world of the future it may be that the center of gravity will have shifted to the great Pacific area, bordered by so many races and colors and creeds, and then the groundwork that is being laid today will afford a firm foundation so that our Pacific coast may play its part in carrying on the constructive work of civilization.

Lakes-to-Gulf Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE HIGHWAY 45 ASSOCIATION

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, if we are to adequately prepare this country for national defense, it is going to be absolutely necessary for us to construct a first-class system of transcontinental highways, and especially north-and-south highways, or highways to serve those areas most vulnerable to attack.

As I have pointed out before time and again, our most vulnerable area, so far as threat of invasion is concerned, is the Gulf coast.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I am inserting a resolution of the Highway 45 Association, urging the construction of a four-lane highway to be known as the Lakes-to-Gulf Highway extending from Chicago, Ill., to Mobile, Ala.

We have just witnessed tragic examples of military disasters brought about largely by congested highways. We saw this happen in France, in Belgium, in Norway, in Holland, and more recently in Yugoslavia and in Greece.

Are we going to fail or refuse to take a lesson from those examples, and decline to prepare this Nation with adequate highway facilities?

By all means we should push the construction of these through thoroughfares and make them capable of carrying our military traffic in the event of an emergency.

And I submit that we could not find a better one to begin on than this Lakes-to-Gulf Highway providing us with a four-line highway along the shortest route from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico as set out in this resolution.

The matter referred to follows:

Resolution memorializing the committee appointed by President Roosevelt to plan the creation of a transcontinental highway system in the interest of national defense to include United States Highway No. 49, beginning at Chicago, Ill., thence to Kankakee, Ill., and thence down United States Highway No. 45 from Kankakee, Ill., to Mobile, Ala., known as the Lakes-to-the-Gulf Highway

Whereas the President of the United States has appointed the Honorable Thomas H. McDonald, Commissioner of Public Roads Administration, Washington, D. C., acting chairman; Hon. G. Donald Kennedy, Michigan highway commissioner, Lansing, Mich.; Hon. Bibb Graves, former Governor of Alabama, Montgomery, Ala.; Hon. C. H. Delano, Chairman, National Resources Board, Washington, D. C.; Hon. Harlan Barthelomew, city consulting engineer, St Louis, Mo.; Hon. Rex G. Tugwell, chairman, New York City Planning Commission, New York City, N. Y., as a committee to plan in detail the creation of a transcontinental highway system in the interest of national defense; and

Whereas United States Highway No. 49 from Chicago to Kankakee, Ill., and connecting with United States Highway No. 45 from Kankakee, Ill., to Mobile Ala., has been surveyed and proven to me the shortest possible route from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico; and

Whereas there is already a four-lane concrete highway from Chicago, Ill., to Kankakee, Ill., a distance of about 60 miles and a two-lane paved highway from Kankakee, Ill., directly south to Mobile, Ala.; and

Whereas it is not only the shortest route from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, but it is the most level route, unobstructed by mountainous or broken terrain, not one foot of the proposed highway would ever be subject to floods at any time; and

Whereas the proposed route of the continental highway would only cross one major river, namely the Ohio, which is already adequately bridged and thereby eliminating the expensive cost of the construction of large bridges, fills, etc., along the entire route, and

Whereas if war should come and this country should be threatened with invasion we would be handicapped with our inadequate north and south transportation facilities, and

Whereas this highway would be in close proximity to the steel and coal mines of the South and in close proximity to the island territories off of the great Gulf of Mexico which might be used by foreign countries as air bases, and

Whereas it is only 885 miles from Chicago, Ill., to Mobile, Ala., along this route and the said route is free of heavily populated cities, which in case of war, would slow up troop movements and movement of mechanized Army units: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association of U. S. Highway 45, immediately urge the committee appointed by the President to plan the construction of a continental highway system in the interest of national defense to include the route from Chicago, Ill., over highway 49 to Kankakee, Ill., thence over highway 45 to Mobile, Ala., which has been designated as the shortest possible route from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico and referred to as the Lakes-to-the-Gulf Highway; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished each individual member of the President's committee.

Aid for Great Britain

REMARKS

OF

HON. E. HAROLD CLUETT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

Mr. CLUETT. Mr. Speaker, the Nation in this dark hour is waiting for leadership. Shall the President, the heads of our Military and Naval Establishments, or overwhelming public opinion decide the momentous question now facing the American people? Great Britain is in a critical state, and only our help can save her from disaster. Shall we deliver the aid we have promised, or wait until it is too late?

While we argue, Hitler is overrunning the European Continent with the most powerful and cruel forces of war ever known. Only two nations can defeat him. We must act together, or the fate of each one of the conquered nations of Europe may be ours. Our action will affect the destiny of America for generations to come. Woodrow Wilson said: "We are participants whether we would or not in the life of the world. What affects mankind is inevitably our affair." Our pledge to Britain means convoys and the assistance of the American Fleet.

Mr. Speaker, the Sons of the Revolution in the State of New York have adopted the following resolution on this subject:

Whereas the preamble to the constitution of the Sons of the Revolution in the State of New York recites as one of the objects of the society "to inculcate in the community in general respect for the principles for which the patriots of the Revolution contended"; and

Whereas the Axis Powers are by their philosphy and actions endeavoring to destroy individual liberty which was one of the primary principles of the patriots; and

Whereas it is demonstrated that the sentiment of the people of this Nation is overwhelmingly in favor of defeat for the Axis Powers; and

Whereas this sentiment has recently been implemented by the passage by the Congress of the so-called lend-lease law; and

Whereas the effectuating of the above-named law depends on the labor of the people of this Nation, either direct or in taxes; and

Whereas the sentiment, implemented by law, effectuated by taxes and the sweat of American labor will be impossible of accomplishment unless the matériel manufactured here, in the "arsenal of democracy" reach those for whom they are the tools to finish the job: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of managers of the Sons of the Revolution of the State of New York, That the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States of America be empowered by the Congress to use any and every and the best means available, or to become available, to insure the prompt, continued, and uninterrupted delivery to the struggling peoples abroad of the matériel destined for them; and be it further

Resolved, That it is our considered judgment that, while this may not effectively keep America out of the war, it is the only method left by which the war may be kept out of America; and be it further

Resolved, That the widest possible publicity be given to this resolution; that copies be sent to the President of the United States, the Members of the Congress, the other State societies of the Sons of the Revolution, to representative patriotic societies in the city of New York, and to the membership of our own society.

The Democratic Party Understands "Appeasement"

REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we are not at war now. I do not

believe we are going to send any of our boys across the seas to fight in any European war, because, the President promised that to the American people before the election last October 30, in a speech at Boston, when speaking to the fathers and mothers of our country, when he said—

and I say it again, and again, and again, that I am not going to send our boys to engage in any European war.

Some good out-spoken Americans who not only want to make America strong in our defense but also want to stay out of the eternal European War must suffer name-calling abuses heaped upon them simply because they choose to be Americans and not hyphenated with any foreign power. Following is an interesting editorial from the Macomb Daily Journal of Macomb, Ill., under date of May 1, 1941, entitled "The Democratic Party Understands 'Appeasement'":

President Roosevelt is condemning people who urge that this nation stay out of a foreign war, calling them "appeasers" and "copperheads" and turning back to Civil War times to find such horrible examples as Vallandigham.

Now, the all-American appeasers of all times was Mr. Roosevelt's own Democratic Party. In August 1864, the darkest period of Rebellion days, Mr. Roosevelt's party met in Chicago in national convention, called the 4-year war a failure, and urged the immediate cessation of hostilities. On this platform the Democratic Party waged a national campaign in our Army's rear, while the southern forces, encouraged by this confession of defeat, strengthened their efforts to destroy the Union.

That there be no question of veracity the Journal publishes verbatim this peace plank of the Democratic "appeasement" platform of that most important campaign of 1864 won by Abraham Lincoln with a scant 5 percent majority of the popular vote.

The "appeasement" platform proclaimed:

"This convention does explicitly declare, as the sense of the American people, that after 4 years of failure to restore the Union by the experiment of war, during which, under the pretense of military necessity, or war power higher than the Constitution, the Constitution itself has been disregarded in every part, and public liberty and private right alike trodden down and the material prosperity of the country essentially impaired—justice, humanity, liberty, and the public welfare demand immediate efforts be made for a cessation of hostilities with a view to an ultimate convention of the States, or other peaceable means, to the end that at the earliest practicable moment peace may be restored on the basis of the Federal Union of the States."

W. P. A. in Connecticut

REMARKS

OF

HON. LE ROY D. DOWNS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker, on April 21, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], on the basis of a newspaper article, criticized the officials of the W. P. A. in Connecticut, and stated that they were endeavoring to prevent men on W. P. A. from accepting employment in private industry. In order that the record may be straight in this matter, I have secured from the W. P. A. authorities in Connecticut, a list of the questions asked by a reporter on the New Haven Register, and the answers given by the Connecticut W. P. A. office, and submit them herewith.

Records show that from September 1940, to April 1941, the W. P. A. rolls in Connecticut have decreased from 16,482 to 9,413, as follows:

September	16,482
October	15,752
November	14,947
December	14,040
January	13,444
February	12,143
March	10,924
April	9,413

In my opinion, the answers submitted by W. P. A. officials and the record of decreased W. P. A. enrollment shows that no effort is being made in Connecticut to retain men on the rolls when positions in private industry are available. I heartily agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] that men should be taken from W. P. A. rolls and placed in private industry as rapidly as possible, and my investigation reveals that this policy is being carried out in the State of Connecticut.

The list of questions referred to above is as follows:

The following is a list of questions submitted on April 16, 1941, by Harold A. Stagg, of the New Haven Register together with the answers as dictated and typed in this office and returned to Mr. Stagg on April 17:

1. Question. What is W. P. A.'s attitude in connection with placing its workers or key workers in private industry?

Answer. W. P. A.'s attitude is precisely this: It is, as it always has been, diligent in its efforts to place all workers, administrative, supervisory, and project, in private industry. Despite all claims to the contrary, workers in all these classifications have been leaving W. P. A. at a rapid rate over the past 6 or 8 months. We encourage them in it. We shall continue to encourage them.

As for key workers specifically, we have lost from the administrative staff alone during the past few months a number of persons whom we could and should logically consider as key personnel. They have been engineers, accountants, and other men and women in the professional field. Naturally, we feel their loss and losing them usually means doubling up the work now carried on by those who remain. We do not, of course, hold out any inducements whatsoever to anyone, no matter how important he may seem to be to the welfare of the W. P. A. program, to remain with W. P. A. when private opportunities present themselves.

2. Question. Is W. P. A. actively attempting to place its workers in private industry?

Answer. Emphatically, yes. It should be generally known that W. P. A., months ago, instituted a job-training program, in cooperation with the State board of education and the Connecticut State employment service, a program deliberately designed to place W. P. A. workers into private employment. Under this plan workers are trained under skilled instructors for jobs in factories, machine shops, etc., particularly where defense contracts are held. We pay these trainees their regular W. P. A. wages during their training courses, at the conclusion of which hundreds have already found private jobs. This is continuing on an ever-broadening basis.

3. Question. Does W. P. A. have any tie-up with the State employment service or any other employment agencies? That is, could requests for help be met and supplied?

Answer. Yes; W. P. A. has a definite tie-up with C. S. E. S. All project and nonrelief personnel must register with C. S. E. S. before they can be employed by W. P. A. It should be borne in mind that C. S. E. S. considers a person working on W. P. A. as unemployed—as far as their records are concerned. If we are to assume that you mean to ask whether or not W. P. A. would or could act as an employment agency, supply help to a given town, city, factory, contractor, or individual, the answer is no. However, when such opportunities arise and the worker may be assured of making as much as or more than his W. P. A. pay, he takes the job forthwith.

Another factor which ties W. P. A. in with C. S. E. S. is this: After the mandatory layoff for 18 months' continuous employment on W. P. A. projects, each person must reregister with C. S. E. S. And, of course, you should refer back to the previous question, which definitely ties us in with C. S. E. S.

4. Question. If an employer asked W. P. A. for a specific number of semiskilled or even skilled laborers, would it provide them by taking them off an active project? For example, a project as important as the Municipal Airport expansion program.

Answer. This is partially answered above. However, such potential employers shou'd first contact the C. S. E. S., where the names of all W. P. A. workers are on file, and, as stated above, are still considered unemployed. As for taking them off a certified national-defense project, while it has been done in the past, we prefer, of course, to have them taken first from what is known as the waiting assignment file. This file contains the names of persons who formerly worked on W. P. A. and who cannot find other employment, or names of new persons similarly situated. They are most in need. They have no jobs of any kind and if the persons required can be found in this file, it would, obviously be doing a favor to all concerned.

If the certified national defense projects are as important to national defense as apparently the War Department believes them to be, then it stands to reason that the crews working thereon should be permitted to see their work through to as swift completion as possible, despite the fact that they are working on W. P. A. projects. Very naturally, then, we had rather have workers taken from other projects—projects which could be held in abeyance—than to have them taken from anything so vital today as airport construction in key defense areas.

5. Question. In general, what, if anything, is W. P. A. doing to use its relief workers to fill the need in industry in Connecticut?

Answer. The answer to this, in the main, is found in the answer to the second question. It has been our experience, during the past 6 or 8 months in particular, to find it increasingly difficult to man certain projects because of a shortage of skilled, semiskilled, and plain labor. Workers have been leaving W. P. A. by the thousands for jobs in private industry—leaving of their own accord. The fact of the matter is that we are deliberately discouraging practically all types of projects calling for skilled help (in the construction line in particular) because of the shortage of qualified personnel. We had such people—thousands of them—at one time. They haven't left Connecticut. They have found jobs—private jobs.

You should know, too, that we do not allow W. P. A. workers to refuse jobs in private industry when they are offered and when the jobs pay as well as their W. P. A. employment and when the jobs are such as they are qualified to fill. Refusal to take such

private employment will lead to dismissal from W. P. A.

Here are some figures to bear out all that has gone before: In September of last year we had more than 16,000 employed on W. P. A. projects. Today we have slightly more than 10,000—and the rolls are still going down. They are now at the lowest ebb in the history of W. P. A., and the low mark is yet to be reached. Our previous low was in 1937, when we had some 13,000. Our high mark was late in 1938, when we had some 30,000. These figures should mean something. They should indicate that most of our W. P. A. workers—all of the remarks to the contrary notwithstanding—do not regard W. P. A. employment as a "career."

Defense Savings Bonds and Stamps

REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, throughout the country in every town and hamlet, in small and large post offices, defense savings stamps and bonds are being sold to help carry the financial load of our program.

It is surprising to find that on Capitol Hill, where we have three good-sized post offices under the shadow of the dome of the Capitol, you cannot buy a defense stamp or bond. The reason is that the sales are not permitted in contract offices.

All of the Members of Congress are anxious to help carry this financial load—all want to see this program go over. The employees and those who work in the Capitol, too, are anxious to cooperate. If made available, many will be sold here.

No other place in the Nation draws as many visitors as the Capitol itself. I believe it would be wise—I believe it would greatly boost the defense-bond sales if the Treasury would authorize the House and Senate Post Offices—or the sergeant-at-arms office in the Capitol to put these bonds and stamps on sale.

I believe further that the bonds could be boosted by sale to the public under the dome of the Capitol, which this money is to help protect. Thousands would buy if given the merchandising touch by the Treasury to "start your defense-bond savings under the dome of your Capitol."

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include a letter to this effect to Secretary Morgenthau of the Treasury Department:

MAY 5, 1941.

Hon. HENRY MORGENTHAU, Jr.,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: It has come to my attention in our campaign to sell defense savings bonds and stamps that under present regulations the three post offices at the National Capitol are not permitted to sell these defense stamps.

A check further revealed that nowhere on Capitol Hill are they available for the hundreds who work in the very shadow of the Capitol. Every Member of Congress and their employees are anxious to help carry a part of this financial load and to cooperate in the sale and purchase of these defense bonds.

It seems to me that the establishment of a place to sell these stamps and bonds at the Capitol would be good business, not only to make them available more readily to the Members of Congress but also to the thousands of visitors who come to the Capitol daily.

These visitors could be encouraged to start their purchases of these stamps and bonds under the very dome of the Capitol of their country, and I am sure that an outlet here would help greatly to stimulate such sales. More than 5,000 a day visit their Capitol, most of whom would be ready prospects for the purchase of the stamps and bonds.

I will appreciate your giving this your attention. With all good wishes, I beg to remain,

Very truly yours,

MIKE MONRONEY.

Political Aspects of the Cooperation Between Mexico and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

ADDRESS BY DR. ROBERTO CARDOVA, LEGAL COUNSELOR OF THE MEXICAN EMBASSY

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following thought-provoking address delivered today by Dr. Roberto Cordova, Legal Counselor of the Mexican Embassy, before the Section of International and Comparative Law:

Members of the American Bar Association: I am highly honored by the kind invitation which my dear friend Dr. Vance, the distinguished president of this bar, extended to me to come before this learned society to express my opinion with regard to the lawyer's role in hemispheric solidarity.

This broad subject cannot be covered in the small time I have at my disposal, and with the still smaller intellectual ability of which I can make use. Therefore I will content myself to present to you a few considerations on the political aspects of the cooperation between Mexico and the United States, which, lacking other possibilities, I will fill with the greatest sincerity.

I have had occasion to express—with pride and satisfaction—that in the field of inter-American cooperation, our two countries have achieved a great success. I reaffirm today this conviction, because I know that the bonds of friendship that now unite us, are here to stay, and will get closer and closer until the time when all of our natural difficulties will only be a matter of history. But there is of course, a long road ahead of us and the role of the lawyer in our two countries will be of paramount importance, to assure final and satisfactory results.

Of all professionals, the lawyer has been, in generations past, the one upon whom the task of framing the national policies has mainly fallen. To a great extent, the failure of cooperation or the success in the friendly unification of points of view and tendencies of governments are the responsibility of those charged in our countries with the legislative functions and the application of the principles of international law for the protection of public and private interests.

The respect for the courts and fair play which guide your daily routine work have crystallized in the national policies of the United States and have furnished a basic and reliable foundation for your actions in the field of international relations. The characteristic respect for judicial authority, for public welfare, before which the private interest must give way, has been transported and refined in the conviction that nations, as individuals, should abide by the provisions of the law and the dictates of the authority with jurisdiction to lay down the principles upon which the nations of the world must live in accordance with ethics and justice.

The United States, in recent times, has been a strong sponsor of the sanctity of these principles and of treaty obligations. For a good many years, your country has been insisting that nations, no matter how powerful or how weak, should all conform to the principles of equality before the law and the respect for the word pledged in an international contract. This attitude has won the respect, the admiration, and the friendship of all free and honorable nations, and I claim that the pride for all these, as of right, belongs to the lawyers and jurists of the United States.

We are living very critical moments. Unfortunately, history seems to repeat itself. The period which our forefathers traversed in the decade from 1820 to 1830 has come back to us with the same load of threats, of fear, and of hopes, which were the patrimony of our ancestors. In that decisive decade in the life of the Americas, we also find a strong combination of European countries which sought to conquer by force and without any regard for national feelings and institutions, the free and liberal countries of the Western Hemisphere. When, after the Congress of Vienna, the Holy Alliance was formed, it committed itself to regain the lost countries of America for the kingdom of Spain, thus crushing in its cradle the infant nations of the New World, which had just been born to the life of freedom, guided by your own Declaration of Independence and the French Declaration de Droit de l'Homme. We are today facing the same terrible danger. Powerful nations have erected themselves as the supreme judges of the destinies of mankind and its governments. As a hundred and twenty years ago, they also seek to force upon nations and individuals their own economic and political methods. For this purpose, they only advance one argument—sheer force; as a justification, they only offer a philosophical principle: "My right goes as far as my might." It is very comforting that now—as 120 years ago—this ruthless coalition against peace-loving nations once more finds America united in a single front against encroachments of lawless efforts to succeed in making force prevail against reason, against justice, and against law.

The Spanish-American nations of this hemisphere can never forget what we owe to the solidarity shown by the United States in 1823, when the generous and far-sighted Monroe Doctrine was framed. We fully realize what it meant for our independence, and are also grateful for the help which was extended at those trying moments in our history. Mexico, especially, has good reasons to be thankful for the generous attitude of your country, since in 1862 again we had occasion to prove the valuable friendship of the United States against European intervention in our territory. The great figures of Juarez and Lincoln will always live together in our memories, as they both lived together in the

fight against individual and national oppression. They both were lawyers, generous and strong; they both are the pride of our countries, who have them enshrined in the hearts of the people for whom they saved liberty and independence.

I should lack the sincerity I promised at the beginning if I did not point out to you here, as a friend to a friend, as a lawyer to a lawyer, some of the shortcomings that the cooperation between Latin America and the United States has had in the past.

Very soon after the Monroe Doctrine was proclaimed, your amazing economic growth, the realization of your own force, and the unfortunate exaltation of the feeling of self-sufficiency which swept this country, brought about the darkest moments in our common history: the well-known "manifest destiny" period provoked a complete misunderstanding of the real aims and generous spirit of President Monroe. Our countries at the turn of the nineteenth century, and for many long years, had good grounds to believe that the doctrine had as its basis only selfish motives of economic and territorial expansion. The European imperialism which we had successfully defeated together in 1824 again clouded the harmony of the Western Hemisphere.

The Spanish-American nations have never been willing to accept the aggressive and unilateral interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine; and they have fought persistently against its natural corollary, armed intervention. A strong movement of public opinion, as well as of political unrest, flooded the two American Continents from the Rio Grande to Patagonia, and Mexico was one of the leaders in the difficult fight against the distortion of the noble policy preconized by Monroe.

President Porfirio Diaz, well known for his friendship to the United States, in his message to the Mexican Congress of April 1, 1896, in order to avoid the evils of this misconstruction, suggested a new doctrine, which has come to be known as the collectivization of the Monroe Doctrine. His words are worthy of note. He said:

"The Government of Mexico shares the view of the doctrine which condemns as predatory any invasion directed by monarchical Europe against any of the American republics or against any of its free nations, all of which have today a popular form of government.

"Our history and the fight of our people to free themselves from an exotic empire, of European origin, form, and philosophy, and the bloodshed in that rude struggle, witness before the world our cult for independence and our hate for any kind of foreign intervention.

"We do not think that it will be sufficient, in order to achieve our aims, that the United States, in spite of its immense resources, should be entrusted with the task of defending alone the other republics of this hemisphere against the attacks of Europe, if they are still deemed possible; we believe that each one of them, by a declaration similar to that of President Monroe, should proclaim that any attack by any foreign power aimed against the territory, the independence, or the overthrow of the institutions of any American republic, would be considered, by the declarant nation, as an offense against herself, if the nation which would suffer the attack, or a threat of this kind, timely asks the help of the others.

"In this manner, the doctrine called today after Monroe, would become an American doctrine, in a broader sense, and although born in the United States, it will belong to the international law of all the American Continent."

This prophetic declaration has guided the government, as well as the statesmen and jurists of Mexico, ever since it was first formulated. In international conferences, taking every opportunity that we have had to express ourselves, consciously or unconsciously, we have worked toward the realization of this idea in America.

The struggle lasted for many years. I had the privilege of being present at the Sixth International Conference of American States, held at Habana in 1928, where the first open battle against armed intervention joined all Latin-American intellectual forces against the misinterpretation of the Monroe Doctrine and its disturbing effects. In the Seventh Inter-American Conference at Montevideo in December 1933 the enlightened administration that so ably still conducts today the destinies of your country, finally accepted the justice of our claims, and your distinguished Secretary of State Cordell Hull, in that momentous congress expressed the intelligent and generous understanding of the Government of the United States of the aims of all our peoples. He pledged the administration of President Roosevelt not to interfere in the affairs of any other country; he said that in view of the acceptance by his Government of the general principle of nonintervention, no government should fear any intervention from the United States under President Roosevelt's administration.

On December 28, 1933, President Roosevelt himself, speaking before the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, not only pledged his administration, as his Secretary of State had done a few days before, but, with a clear conception of the true significance of harmony in America and emulating President Monroe himself, introduced again in the cause of America all the spirit of your forefathers and of our ancestors. Very clearly he stated that not only his administration would be bound by the principle of nonintervention but that for the years to come the definite policy of the United States is contrary to armed intervention.

In December, 1936, during the Peace Conference, held at Buenos Aires, at the invitation of President Roosevelt, the able Mexican delegates, headed by our present Ambassador to the United States, Dr. Francisco Castillo Najera, introduced the already famous Additional Protocol of Nonintervention, which was signed and ratified by the 21 republics forming the Pan American Union. The signing of this treaty marks the turning point toward the paved road of true pan-Americanism and made it possible to sign, in 1938, at Lima, Peru, the Declaration of American Principles and the Declaration of the Principles of the Solidarity of America. The first one lays down the following points of international agreement:

"1. The intervention of any State in the internal or external affairs of another is inadmissible.

"3. The use of force as an instrument of national or international policy is proscribed.

"5. Respect for, and the faithful observance of, treaties constitute the indispensable rule for the development of peaceful relations between States."

The second, the so-called Lima Declaration, reads in part:

"That the peoples of America have achieved spiritual unity through the similarity of their Republican institutions and of the equal sovereignty of States.

"That on the basis of such principles and will, they seek and defend the peace of the continent and work together in the cause of universal concord. * * *

"That respect for the personality, sovereignty, and independence of each American State constitutes the essence of international order sustained by continental solidarity.

"That faithful to the above-mentioned principles and to their absolute sovereignty, they reaffirm their decision to maintain them and to defend them against all foreign intervention or activity that may threaten them.

"And that in case the peace, security, or territorial integrity of any American republic is thus threatened, by acts of any nature that may impair them, they proclaim their common concern and their determination to make effective their solidarity * * *."

All these instruments constitute the fulfillment of the most cherished aspirations of the Mexican nation since 1896, and, taken as a whole, they achieved the Americanization of the Monroe Doctrine.

In pursuance of its own policy, relying on the authority of two of the foremost statesmen you ever had, President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull, and in view of the faith of both countries pledged in these treaties, on April 1, 1941, Mexico signed with the United States an "Agreement for the reciprocal transit of military aircraft through the territories of both countries," without any restrictions as to the number of planes or flights. The agreement, nevertheless, provides that any country will be entitled to cancel the treaty at any time and the other country will have 24 hours within which the military planes of each country should leave the territory of the other.

This treaty would never have been possible without the international commitments to which I have referred, without the restitution to the Monroe Doctrine of its original meaning.

Real cooperation, reciprocal aid in all fields of human and governmental endeavors are now possible between our two nations. The community of economic, military, and political interests, is today a reality.

Very soon the United States will be the strongest military nation on earth Whatever the outcome of the European conflict might be, your country will emerge from the ordeal stronger than ever. May this strength be always used for the furtherance of peace and order—of justice in America and outside of America. I fear that the temptation to use this power for your own and particular interest will be very strong in certain sections of your public opinion and some of the agencies of your Government. I know the arguments that will be advanced by the imperialistic forces of the United States; they will only be a restatement of obsolete and worn-out allegations.

The example set forth in the present European conflict will not have a salutary effect upon the militaristic frame of mind in which this country might fall in the near future. In spite of these odds, Mexico is still confident that the enlightened opinion of the United States will sense the danger of indulging again in the use of force in America, which would certainly mean the destruction of the good will—of everything in pan-American relations which we have patiently built through all these years of common effort.

I hope that the Monroe Doctrine will always mean in the United States, and in America, collective security for all our countries—that it will always safeguard our independence against non-American states as well as against American states. With all my soul, I earnestly hope that the future generations of this hemisphere will never, never have to look back into history and reproach us, of the present generation, for having joined together as good neighbors—as brothers in a common cause—against European imperialism. The historic role of the American lawyer in hemispheric solidarity rests on the determination to fight any possibility of history repeating itself in America. Only in this way we will be able to maintain ourselves together and stand firmly on our ground in the forthcoming battle of the continents.

Advertising Is Essential to the Proper Growth of the Nation and Its People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

ADDRESS BY MR. RICHARD R. DEUPREE, PRESIDENT, PROCTER & GAMBLE CO.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, James S. Milloy, Washington newspaperman associated with Look magazine and the Cowles' newspapers in Des Moines and Minneapolis, has furnished me with a copy of an address delivered to the bureau of advertising section of the recent annual American Newspaper Publishers Association convention in New York by Mr. Richard R. Deupree, of Cincinnati, president of the Procter & Gamble Co., and holder of an important position in the raw-materials division of O. P. M.

Mr. Deupree spoke on Advertising Is Essential to the Proper Growth of the Nation and Its People. Because of the speaker's preeminence in the field of business and advertising and the contribution his address makes to a subject of such widespread interest throughout the country today, I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORRECTING MISAPPREHENSIONS

I have been wanting to talk on this subject for a long time, and I appreciate this opportunity. I so thoroughly believe that advertising is essential to the proper growth of the Nation and its people that I want to give you my reasons as clearly as possible. You can fuss at my viewpoint, find fault with it if you will, but if you accept it, then I think you have an obligation to build on this essential concept, to improve it, to make it articulate for the people at large in order to correct some misapprehensions in their minds about advertising and to make a strong story stronger. It will be good for the advertiser, it will be good for the publisher, and for the public. It seems to me that we the advertisers, you the publishers, and the advertising agencies have a real obligation to do this, to do it wholeheartedly, and to do it now, once we see the problem clearly.

Right from the start I want to define my terms and make this distinction.

TWO TYPES OF INDUSTRIES

There are two types of industries. One which lends itself readily to advertising. The other which does not. Now it may be a coincidence, but my observations show me that as a group the nonadvertisers have a sad record from the standpoint of research, development, profit, labor conditions, and labor troubles.

Now, on the other hand, if there is an industry which lends itself readily to advertising and yet does not advertise, I think that is a crime.

But perhaps a worse criminal, in my estimation, is the man who advertises his business badly, wastefully. I would like to hold him up to scorn, for he is an out-and-out waster. He is wasting his own or his shareholders' money. He does not fit into the modern economic order. He does himself no good and, what is worse, he is a blight on legitimate advertising. His sins as an unintelligent, unprofitable advertiser are visited on the successful advertisers, the men who deserve a place in the Hall of Fame for deeds well done and true contributions to society.

There has been a lot of talk that if we did not advertise a given product we could immediately reduce the price to the extent of the advertising cost; that advertising in general is uneconomic; that advertising should be limited; that it creates monopolies. You've heard it; everyone has heard it.

I am not going to attempt to answer these charges individually, for if I am right on the fundamental concept that advertising is essential to the proper growth of a nation and its people—and I think I am—then all of these objections are answered. At best they are academic and could be argued pro and con without ever being able to arrive at any definite conclusion satisfactory to both sides or to the majority of the people.

Naturally most of these attacks, these academic bickerings, are centered on successful advertising. Apparently if a man fails in his advertising, that is all right, but if he is successful, that is all wrong. His successful advertising is called expensive and uneconomic when actually just the reverse is true.

Almost 40 years ago I heard Dr. Conwell in his famous lecture Acres of Diamonds, use words to this effect: "Given normal health and normal mind, it is a crime to be poor. It is a crime to fail." I think that statement is right, and that is where I start with advertising.

AS OLD AS MAN

Advertising is as old as man. Man has always talked about his achievements, and always will. The more he talks the more he assumes an obligation to make good on his statements; the more he talks the more he stimulates himself to improve his record so that he can talk some more; the more he talks and the better things he does the more he stimulates others to equal or better him. So competition begins, and the pressure to do better himself is terrific, and all because he began to advertise his achievements. This is a crude illustration, as crude as the cavemen themselves, but in this way progress is started and maintained. Without that talk about his achievements, that advertising if you want to call it of his achievements, inventions like the wheel or sail, or thousands of others, might never have been made.

To put into concrete form what I am saying, I would like to talk about the soap business. I am more familiar with that than with any other, though I could also cite the shortening business, or others to make my point. In fact, I feel sure that most successful advertising follows this same pattern—differing in degrees, of course.

Now, in regard to the soap business: In 1880–90 the housewife paid 5 cents for Ivory soap. In 1941 a shopping housewife still can own her Ivory soap for 5 cents. Now let's make some comparisons. What about those 50 or 60 years?

Since 1880–90 the raw materials which go into soap making have about doubled in price. Wages that were 8 cents to 10 cents per hour then are now 80 cents to $1 per hour. In other words, they are about tenfold what they were. I doubt if such a thing as a Federal tax existed in those days.

Today, we pay Federal taxes equivalent to the amount of factory wages. Add the tax to the wages and we pay today twenty times the wage which existed in 1880–90.

RESULTS OF ADVERTISING

It does not seem possible that expenses such as I have mentioned to you could be absorbed if we had not advertised Ivory soap almost continuously since 1882. The pressure to make good on our advertised claims built up our rigid manufacturing standards, stimulated research and development all along the line, and Ivory set the pace for the entire soap industry. I feel that the development was made possible only because an advertised brand was leading the way and because there was a legitimate profit for achievement. These two facts acted as a continual spur. Just as fast as one improvement was made, the industry would be on your heels, then it was your turn and you had to keep ahead of the procession if you wanted to live with an advertised brand that was profitable.

Don't forget that approximately one-half of the soap produced in this country is still sold as a nonadvertised brand, in the strict meaning of the phrase, but the leaders have always been advertised. There is no doubt in my mind that without a pace setter like Ivory soap, neither the inclination nor the money would have been available for the development of the soap industry and, as I said before, I could cite you many other industries like ours.

I want to amplify this thought. Progress in the soap industry up to 1880 was almost nil because no fundamental changes had been made since soap was first discovered, so far as the soap maker was concerned. True, he had learned to recover glycerine and a Frenchman was responsible for an improved soda, but the product was still slabs of soap—unwrapped slabs of soap—cut into oblong bars or else just plain chunks.

The next 10 years, 1880–90, belong to Ivory; there was not a great deal of other development. And that brings us almost up to the turn of the century and from then on, there was a tremendous development in the art of soap-making, culminating in the peak period of changes and improvements since 1920. This simply is not the same business that it was even in the early 1900's.

PROFITS AND DEVELOPMENT

These great developments, that I have referred to as fundamental, did not come about overnight. Profits plowed back into the business had gradually sprouted a crop of developments and improvements. But please remember: Without the advertising that created broad consumption for the popular brands, there would have been no profits to plow back into the business. And with no profits, there would have been no crop of developments and improvements.

If you want to prove that statement, look at the other side of the picture. Go to the industries that for some reason or other are unable to make money and see how uniformly and discouragingly backward they are in developments and improvements. And remember this—I make the statement categorically—any industry that is backward in development is costly to the public at large.

I would like to say this to you in another way. In the 1880's when a man was making 8 cents to 10 cents an hour and the price of soap was just about what it is, or higher than it is today, the average family consumed about $8 worth per year. In those days it took the head of the family approximately 90 hours work to earn enough to pay his yearly soap bill. Today the family consumes about $10 worth of soap per year, but it only takes the workmen approximately 11 hours' work to pay his soap bill. That extra 79 hours of work can now be used for other necessities and some of the luxuries which modern workmen enjoy. If this isn't a contribution to society, then everything I have said here means nothing.

CITES FALSE THEORY

There has been a saying going around that if you build a better mouse trap, all the world will beat a path to your door. In the first place, I don't believe it. In the second place, I don't believe Emerson said it. I

think someone claims it was a creation of Elbert Hubbard. Anyway, I flatly say that it won't work; the man that built a good mouse trap had to talk about it to make it worth while—to make other people understand why it was good. If he hadn't talked about it, he would still be in the woods and nobody would have heard of either the inventor or his mouse trap.

I am not going to cover the whole gamut of reasons to substantiate the fact that advertising is essential to the proper growth of a nation and its people. I think I could talk for hours on the value of education through low-cost reading material, which, as you know, is more or less attributable to the fact that advertising carries such a large share of the cost of newspapers, periodicals, and radio. I won't speak of the rising standard of living due to the educational effect of good advertising; of the stimulus to invention and discovery in all sorts of industries through that educational effect. There are many other illustrations that could be offered and ways in which the subject could be presented, but I leave that to you.

I do want to leave this thought in your mind. If you agree with me that advertising is essential to the proper growth of the Nation and its people, then if through false reasoning or any other cause, worth while, honest advertising is crippled and hampered, it will be a sorry day for this country, not just for you and me, but for the people who today get better products and live better because of advertising. It would be the death blow to real industrial development, and you and we must see to it that this does not happen.

Answering Objections on the Overton Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. HUNTER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], offered some objections to H. R. 3490, which includes the Overton formula for determining the annual payment the Federal Government will make toward the expenses of the District of Columbia.

The gentleman's objections were based on what our investigations have shown to be an erroneous assumption; that residents of the District are not paying a fair and just proportion of taxes, as compared with the residents of comparable cities elsewhere in the United States.

To justify these statements he quoted real-estate tax rates in 22 cities. A few of these cities may rightfully have been called comparable cities, but it is difficult to picture Sioux City, Iowa; Phoenix, Ariz.; Cumberland, Md.; Topeka, Kans.; Fargo, N. D., and some of the other cities on that list as comparable cities.

The gentleman from Kansas also did not take into consideration a fact that is known to every real-estate operator in the country; namely, that a real-estate tax rate means very little unless methods of valuation are taken into consideration. In one area, real estate may be assessed for taxation purposes at 50 percent of actual selling price. In another, it may be assessed at 75 percent of market value. In the District, it happens to be assessed for taxation purposes at slightly more than 100 percent of actual sales or market value.

Your committee on the District of Columbia did not approve the Overton formula blindly. One of the steps was to secure a study of the tax situation by the Bureau of Census, which reported that residents of the city of Washington paid higher taxes than the average in the 10 cities nearest Washington's size in the United States.

I refer you to House Document 108, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, District of Columbia tax study report made to Congress pursuant to Act of May 16, 1938, and submitted January 16, 1939. The report was prepared by the special staff under the direction of Mr. Colin F. Stam, chief of staff, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and Chester B. Pond, director of the District of Columbia tax study, commonly referred to as the Pond Report.

This report shows that taxes on property represents 67.83 percent of the total taxes levied in the District of Columbia as compared with 61.76 percent of 12 selected States and 64.77 percent of the 48 States of the Union.

The joint committee above mentioned found that on investigation of 9,795 sales of real estate in the District of Columbia, covering the period 1930–36, the total sales price was $131,901,719 as against an assessed value of $136,715,690, or an average ratio of 104 percent assessed value to sales value.

The Pond report recommends that the maximum rate on real estate and tangible personal property should be $1.75 per $100 assessed valuation.

An examination of the 1942 District of Columbia budget shows an estimated total revenue from all sources of general fund taxation of $33,940,000 and a real-estate tax yield of $22,300,000. Therefore, the real estate pays approximately two-thirds of the total general revenue taxes of the District.

The District of Columbia budget also shows that the real estate contributes 60 percent of the total general revenue account.

Mr. Dent, assessor of the District of Columbia, recently examined the recorded sales of property in the business district of Washington, embraced in the area east of Rock Creek and south of Florida Avenue, for the period 1938 through 1940.

There were a total of 88 recorded sales, aggregating $12,652,336, conveying property of which the total assessed valuation was $13,289,310. The total assessed valuation was, therefore, 105 percent of the total sales value.

Furthermore, during the same period the assessor's office found that there were 68 sales of large apartment buildings in the District of Columbia, ranging in units from 13 to a maximum of 140 and in sales price from a minimum of $25,000 to a maximum of $560,000.

A comparison of the sales price of these apartments with the assessed valuation thereof shows a ratio of 106 percent of assessed valuation as against sales price. The total assessed valuation was $7,822,241, and sales price was $7,367,375.

The same investigation discloses that during the same period, 1938 through 1940, the sales of 60 large residences in the old city area represented a total sales price of $1,912,640, as against an assessed valuation of $2,974,717, or an assessed valuation of 35 percent in excess of sales value.

Also, a comparison of sales prices of six large office buildings in the downtown section with the assessed valuation shows a sales price of $1,272,000, as against an assessed valuation of $1,488,229, or an assessed value of 17 percent in excess of sales value.

Industrial Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. EATON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

VIEWS OF ALBERT W. HAWKES

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, at its annual convention held last week in this city, the United States Chamber of Commerce elected as its president for the ensuing term, Mr. Albert W. Hawkes, of New Jersey.

Mr. Hawkes has for many years been the active head of one of New Jersey's most important and successful industries. He is a man of vision, courage, and judgment, an honored and trusted leader among his own people. In both theory and practice he represents that important but seldom publicized segment of our national industrial life which solves its problems by the exercise of mutual understanding, good will, square dealing, and cooperation between employer and employee.

His views on industrial problems are set forth in a brief statement of policy which I insert at this point and which I recommend to the consideration of all who wish to see American industry rescued from the confusion and strife with which it is afflicted at the present time:

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 2, 1941]

HAWKES' LABOR-CAPITAL POLICY—NEW UNITED STATES CHAMBER PRESIDENT SUGGESTS SIX POINTS FOR EACH ECONOMIC UNIT

The new president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Albert W. Hawkes, of Kearny, N. J., is an exponent of the idea that in these days, understanding between capital and labor is of the utmost importance to pushing forward the national-defense program.

To implement his proposal he has laid down six-point policies, respectively, for labor and for capital.

To labor he says:

1. Labor should remember that labor is its own most important customer. Therefore, labor must serve labor fairly.

2. Labor's progress in improving its position must be at a rate not in excess of the ability of our system to adjust and absorb it.

3. Labor must remember there never has been and never will be a substitute for a full day's work, at fair pay, under good working conditions. We must all remember that to have, we must produce, and to produce, we must work.

4. Labor should not lose its advances by making unreasonable demands which will not be approved by the public.

5. Labor, in its own interest, should remember that the sins of a few capitalists were visited upon all capital, and public opinion—the "court of last resort"—can cause this to happen to labor. All of labor must watch to see that part of labor does not stultify it.

6. Labor, in its demands, should remember that under our system labor of today is often capital tomorrow. If our system of free enterprise survives, this is more likely to be true from now on than ever before. Therefore labor should never make demands upon capital which, when it becomes capital, it would resist if made by labor.

Mr. Hawkes cites six points of policy for capital to remember:

1. Capital should be willing to pay a fair price, in the form of sound adjustments in employee compensation and relationship, as insurance for capital's security and free use.

2. Capital must remember that voluntary cooperation leads to efficient production, and can result only from fair compensation under fair conditions.

3. Capital should remember that our extended machine-producing industry requires many buyers—and these result from the payment to many people of more than the minimum required for subsistence.

4. Capital must recognize that regardless of what others may do, it should make its full contribution to the solution of today's problems because, as freemen, it can act today, whereas the events in other great nations prove that the rights of free people have been curtailed or destroyed in their "tomorrow."

5. All capital and management should investigate and consider the wage-dividend plans of some of our great institutions.

6. Capital should remember that we are all human and if we have an interest in the profits of the business, then we support what benefits the business and oppose all things that injure it, not only in the plant but at the polls.

The Tax Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from one of my constituents:

STURGEON BAY, WIS., *April 29, 1941.*

DEAR MR. JOHNS: The papers are full of stories about lowering the income tax base and that may be all right for a great many people who are careless with money anyway, but I hope thought will be taken for the poor devil on a modest salary who is paying for a home. You know the chap I mean. He buys a second-hand car and drives it for 5 years. When sonny falls on the playground and breaks his arm the local taxpayers are not called upon to pay the doctor bill. No; dad wears his fraying suit another year and mother buys a new flower or clip for last year's hat and a new belt or collar for her 2-year-old dress. They try to keep the family's teeth in condition so their sons will not be found by the draft board to have a foul mouth condition.

When their hand-to-mouth neighbors get a bushel of apples from the relief depot they may have a treat once in a while of four-pounds-for-a-quarter apples. Mother gets a four-dollar permanent once a year and the girl next door who takes care of children rather often pays $8 for a permanent but her younger brother gets a fine, new wool mackinaw from the relief department while sonny gets a thinner one and wears a sweatshirt under it for extra warmth.

They say we are the salt of the earth, but a lot of us are getting tired of being used as the seasoning for the improvident.

If things get too tough you may be hearing from me again with the plea, "Please, Mr. Congressman, is there any way I can be squeezed onto Uncle Sam's pay roll?"

I am enclosing a clipping from last week's Advocate. I hope the discussions wax warm in New York. Maybe I'll learn new ways to lick this fresh depression that looms over the head of the modest-salaried man.

This sputtering is not directed at you, Mr. JOHNS. Heaven forbid. I worked hard for your reelection and am in agreement with you on most things but the war question, and that is understandable since I am the first generation in my family to be born under the Stars and Stripes and not the Union Jack. No; the whole purpose of this letter is to bring to your attention the plight of the chap who is being ground between the upper and nether millstones.

Sincerely yours,

GAY HARRIS.

A Square Deal for Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

LETTER FROM HON. V. A. BRADLEY, OF NASHVILLE, TENN.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from Hon. V. A. Bradley, of Nashville, Tenn.:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
STATE OF TENNESSEE,
Nashville, May 1, 1941.

Hon. ALBERT GORE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GORE: I am not at present one of your constituents, but expect to be beginning with your next term, hence this letter.

Farmers here are interested in the legislation pending in Congress designed to bring about parity exchange of agricultural with industrial products, and are closely watching its progress in that body.

With the billions being poured into industry and the Government letting contracts on a cost-plus basis, thus guaranteeing huge profits to industry, and with the wages and hours law and the Labor Relations Board to protect labor, giving it short hours and high wages, common justice demands that legislation giving those engaged in our basic industry, and contributing more to the prosperity of the entire Nation than any other single group, at least a guaranty for a fair profit on the products they grow and the long hours of labor they put in producing essentials for both peace and war.

Agriculture is not now, and has not been getting a square deal. It is in much worse condition than when I was a young man. I offer as proof of this assertion these two illustrations out of my own experience:

1. When a young man I bought a mowing machine for $35. Two years ago I bought one the same size, same cut, substantially the same construction for which I paid $95.

2. As a young man I purchased a wheat binder. Cost, $120. Paid for it with wheat at 90 cents per bushel. Had I purchased one last wheat harvest it would have taken more than 400 bushels to pay for it. And it costs me more to raise a bushel of wheat now than it did then.

Agriculture cannot survive under present conditions, except in the form of peasantry.

Give us your best. We need it. We deserve it. Justice demands that we have it.

Sincerely yours,

V. A. BRADLEY.

Distinction Between Western and Eastern Hemispheres

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address, which I delivered recently over the radio:

During my last broadcast, I talked a lot about the Western Hemisphere. Everyone else does, too, so much so, in fact, that there is a distinct tendency to forget that the distinction between the Western and Eastern Hemisphere is a purely artificial one.

The world is a unit—an indivisible whole. It is cut in two by no barriers of nature but only by an imaginary line drawn by man, so as to make it more easy to show on his maps and drawings. Our geographies may and can cut the world in half, but it never operates except as a unit. It's a good idea, every now and then, to look at one of those round globes which depict the earth's surface in full and which are available in many schools and libraries, just so as to remind ourselves that there really aren't two separate halves to the sphere we call the world. This will remind us of the vast distances between the continental United States and many sections of this Western Hemisphere in which it is

located. It will also call to mind that there are many places in the Eastern Hemisphere which are much closer and more accessible to the Continental United States than are many points in the Western Hemisphere. Gibraltar, for instance, is closer by sea to the entire South Atlantic Coast of South America than is the closest point in the United States (Miami). Dakar, Bathurst, and Freetown, on the coast of South Africa, are closer to South America than are our nearest bases in the Carribbean Sea. Attach a string to the globe representing the world at some point in the United States, say at Washington, and then swing the string around to various other points and notice the distances. Berlin you will find is closer to Washington than is either Buenos Aires or Rio de Janeiro.

LEND-LEASE BILL

The shifting fortunes of the present world struggle illustrate very vividly why some such measure as the lend-lease bill was necessary for the protection of this country. The turns of fate are so drastic and occur with such astounding rapidity, that it is impossible to foretell in advance where, if anywhere, the materials we are manufacturing for our defense can best be employed. Our continued control over these articles to the last possible minute is of the utmost advantage to us. The standardization of the British equipment with that of our own Nation which is being achieved under the Lend Lease Act, enables this great Nation of ours to use for its own particular purposes and needs those things which were originally earmarked for some other less fortunate nation. The Lend Lease Act has certainly not brought us any nearer to participation in the military and naval part of the war than we were before it was passed and put in operation. Claims that it was a war measure have not been justified. Certainly events have happened which have made the threat of war to us more imminent, but, in not a single case, has any one of these events been aided or abetted by the Lend Lease Act. As the theater of war operations grows and grows, the grim figure of war casts its shadow farther and farther. That is inevitable. The fact that this is so is the reason for that part of our defense program which is designed to limit the area of conflict and to keep it away from our own shores.

The furnishing of materials of war to Britain was started long before lend-lease was thought of. The opening of the Red Sea to American merchant shipping was by an executive proclamation by the President. The seizure of the German, Italian, and Danish ships was done under the provision of the act of 1917, which prohibits sabotage of vessels in our ports. The protectorate over Greenland, which in my judgment will be more likely to avoid war than to get us into it, was established by an agreement between the President and the Danish Minister.

The present discussion of convoys, as everyone knows, is not affected at all by the Lend-Lease Act. There are the major steps which have increased the present dangers which we have to face and consider. You may remember back in January, at the start of the present session, when the lend-lease bill was first up for discussion, that I called attention to the fact that those acts which would mean actual war could have been done long before, or could be done in the future without any legislation whatever; and I also pointed out that in all probability the question of our military and naval participation would hinge on the decision to be made on convoys, a question which at that time was well in the background and obscured by the intense public interest in the lend-lease debate. The more grim the storm clouds become, the more useful the act should be.

WORLD SITUATION TODAY IS VERY SERIOUS

The world situation today is very serious—so are our domestic affairs. We have made tremendous strides during the past year. Let us not overlook that. Whether what we have done to date has been enough we cannot say for sure. We cannot afford to assume that it has been. The time clock keeps running and the sand keeps trickling through the hourglass. The tasks which we must do loom larger and more imperative as the hours turn into days and the days into weeks. This should not be a cause for despondency or discouragement. Instead, this must be an incentive and an inspiration for greater effort on our part from now on. The most critical time for any nation is when it is halfway prepared. Aggressors see the sleeping giant slowly rousing. They fear his tremendous power when fully awake. They seek to strike before he is prepared to resist with his full capacities. So we must make haste. History down through the ages teaches us that national security must be attained in advance of the need for it. History today gives one example after another that more than ever before time is of the essence. Don't ever forget that the digestive processes are working on our side. Napoleon said, "All great empires die of indigestion." His empire, which at one time had almost the same boundaries as does Hitler's today, disintegrated from that cause. So did every other great empire of history. There is nothing to prove that imperial powers of digestion have improved at the same pace as have modern methods of mechanized warfare. Every success—past or future—places a further strain on the intestinal tract of the Nazi organism. Unfortunately, this process takes time and usually lots of it. The fact that it does means that a great many people in a great many places must have foresight, patience, and courage.

PUBLIC NOT GIVEN ALL THE FACTS

Not long ago I gave the President some very unstinted praise on the position he had taken with reference to the disclosure by the press of information about the transfer of certain air units in our armed forces to Alaska and the Far East. Military operations and movements require secrecy. In fact, I try to give the President support when possible and the benefit of the doubt when there is any real two-sided or three-sided question involved. My criticisms—as the present one—are for constructive purposes.

Recently a number of incidents have occurred which indicate clearly to me that the public is not being given all the material, nonmilitary, facts which the average citizen must have if he is to form an intelligent opinion on the issues he is called upon to decide.

The administration and the President are always calling on the Congress and the people to face facts. My contacts back home indicate that most people are ready to face facts as they are or as they may be, but they are having a lot of trouble finding out what the facts are. Too many of our leading spokesmen think that the way to win an argument is to call your opponent a warmonger, on the one hand, or an appeaser on the other. We are asked to accept glittering generalities on faith and not bother with the facts. Washington said, "In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion be enlightened." Governmental policy must receive united support if it is to be successful.

GREENLAND

At his press conference last Friday, the President said that Greenland already might be occupied in part by the Axis, but that he was not sure such was the case and that he could not say how the occupation was accomplished. I read this with amazement and consternation. Greenland is of immense importance strategically to the United States. The President has just concluded an agreement establishing a protectorate over it temporarily. That the President, who is also the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, should publicly state that he does not know whether or not Greenland was occupied right now by unfriendly powers seems incredible. If Mr. Roosevelt does not know what the situation in Greenland is, and he certainly should know, and there is no excuse for his not knowing it, then he had better make it his business to find out about it immediately, because there are very few citizens in this country who do not feel that this information is of immediate concern to us and who do not feel that who controls Greenland has a very decisive effect on our own safety and future well-being. Or is this a case where facts are not being given?

PUBLIC SHOULD KNOW FACTS

One question which is invariably asked me on my trips back home is how much of the American-produced goods which are being sent to England is being sunk. Another question invariably asked me is what is the actual rate of sinking of British vessels which are carrying goods across the seas to the British Isles. Various estimates on these questions appear in the different magazines and papers and they vary from time to time. Lately there have been rumors that the percentage was as high as 50 percent of the shipments of our goods. Some say not over 17,000 tons of British shipping per week is being sunk. I do not place any confidence in any of these statements; probably one of the guesses is true but there is no way to tell which one that may happen to be. It seems impossible for anyone to jar these facts from any department of Washington officialdom. Perhaps they do not know, but it seems incredible that they should not have at least reasonably accurate information. Secretary of the Navy Knox in a recent speech indicated he had detailed information on many of these subjects. In view of the decision which public opinion is asked to decide, whether in fact or at least theoretically being asked to decide, these figures certainly should be made known, if an enlightened public opinion is to be permitted and encouraged to make an intelligent decision, and if the growing demand for this information by our enlightened public opinion is to be satisfied. As accurate information as possible should be given at once.

Another evidence of this sort of thing was when the Secretary of the Treasury's recommendations for the new tax bill were sent to the House Ways and Means Committee, and that committee was then sworn to keep those proposals secret. If the amount of tax which people may be assessed is not a matter of interest and importance to everyone, then, of course, such secrecy would have no bad effect. But people are vitally interested in these proposals, even though those same people are ready to pay freely to provide the sinews of national defense. Certainly our domestic tax bill cannot be classed a military secret and certainly cannot be kept under cover for any considerable time. This latter fact makes the request for secrecy stupid and plain dumb, as well as dangerous and undemocratic. The recommendations were finally made public, but the idea of keeping such a matter of purely domestic public interest secret at all is rather alarming.

ETERNAL AND SPIRITUAL VALUES CONTINUE THROUGH ADVERSE TIMES

It has been very pleasant here at home this week end. There certainly isn't a more beautiful time of the year than early spring. Nor is there a more beautiful section of the world than this one right here in which we live. Watching the annual rebirth of Nature in all its glory and then contemplating the activities in which man is engaging through-

out most of the world today makes a strange and odd contrast. Dismal as the present circumstances are, God and Nature are again giving us a living proof that the eternal and spiritual values do continue through the most adverse times. Darker eras than the present one have been etched on the pages of history, yet, with all its recessions and backslidings, civilization has slowly struggled forward over the centuries. The structures that man is pulling down today in so many parts of the world with such vicious abandon are in themselves proof that man and his powers of destruction cannot utterly destroy any more than winter can permanently erase beauty and growth from the face of the earth.

Benefits of Defense Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS RIZLEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ENID (OKLA.) MORNING NEWS

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the huge amount being expended by war preparations, the fact still remains that while business and industry continue to take substantial profits from the defense-spending program, farm income is still below what it was in 1937. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in my remarks an editorial from the Enid Morning News, Thursday, May 1, entitled "Who Is Receiving the Benefits?" as follows:

[From the Enid (Okla.) Morning News of May 1, 1941.]

Time and again the administration has assured the people that there would be no profiteering out of our war preparations. Time and again the farmers have been assured that the benefits of defense expenditures (estimated to total 40 billion) would reach them in higher prices for their products.

We started our defense spending in 1939. The Department of Commerce report shows the net income of corporations increased from $1,230,000,000 in 1938 to $3,847,000,000 in 1939, and in 1940 their net income increased to five billions.

How about the dividends to stockholders in these corporations?

In 1937, the dividend distribution reached $4,124,000,000. And in 1940 the dividends reached the staggering total of $4,800,000,000. This was an increase in corporate net income, after the payments of taxes, of 25 percent. The Wall Street Journal states: "Corporate profits are still rising and will be much greater in 1941 than in 1940, in spite of increased taxes, higher labor costs and larger reserves to amortize plant expansion for defense."

What about the farm income? While the corporate net income has increased 25 percent, the farm income is still below what it was in 1937. According to figures from the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, the income of the 32,000,000 farmers in this country for 1939 the last year for which figures are available, was $5,635,000,000, or 8.1 percent of the total national income for that year. In other words, 25 percent of the population was receiving only about 8 percent of the national income. The same Government source reveals that national income in 1939 had recovered to 83.7 percent of the 1929 total. Farm income was only 77.6 percent of the 1929 total. This was in spite of the fact that in 1929 business and industry were in the midst of boom times, while the farmer, even then, was in a depression.

For the year 1939, the average per capita farm income for the entire United States was $266. For Oklahoma, it was $197, which is about the average for the cotton and wheat States. With cotton still at around 9 cents and wheat at 72–73 cents, the benefits of defense spending have not as yet materialized to the farmers of such States, and wheat and cotton, it must be conceded, are the two basic necessities in time of peace or war.

The farmers are not asking for inflated prices. They are demanding parity prices, that the purchasing power of farm products be equalized to the purchasing power of industrial products. Potatoes, for instance, on February 15, 1940, sold for 87 percent of parity. On February 15 of this year the price was only 62 percent of parity. The same is true of a great number of other farm-produced commodities. Eggs, on February 15, 1940, were selling at 112 percent of parity.

Last February 15 they brought only 68 percent of parity. Rye last year sold at 61 percent of parity. On February 15 of this year it sold at 45 percent of parity. The price of wheat on February 15, 1940, was 75 percent of parity. A year later it was 60 percent of parity. Similarly, the price of oats on February 15, 1940, was 74 percent of parity. By February 15, 1941, it had fallen to 64 percent of parity. The price of sugar beets in December 1939 was 70 percent of parity. In December 1940 this price was 67 percent of parity. The price of dry beans in December 1939 was 70 percent of parity. By December 1940 the price of dried beans was only 62 percent of parity.

The figures show that if the cost of food products has increased, the processors, not the farmers, have been getting the benefits.

At a time when corporate profits and industrial wages with administration approval are soaring high, should not the farmer be given at least the cost of production for his products? The green light from the President to his price fixer, Leon Henderson, would do the job and force a fair share of the benefits into the farm States where they belong.

Is Inflation Inevitable?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. RODGERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

ADDRESS BY DR. ALFRED P. HAAKE

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Dr. Alfred P. Haake, of Chicago, discussion leader on Wake Up America radio program and managing director, National Association of Furniture Manufacturers, before Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce dinner to Pennsylvania delegation of Congress and Senate, at Washington, D. C., April 30, 1941:

Inflation is not inevitable. It is the drifting refuge of those who lack foresight and courage and the will to prevent it. But, if you ask me, "Is inflation inevitable?" you must give me also the circumstances under which you ask the question. If you mean a continuing of the forces and policies now at work within the United States, the answer is "Yes; inflation is inevitable." In other words, inflation can largely be avoided or mitigated, if we will, but it appears doubtful that we shall.

Let's be sure we are thinking about the same thing when we talk about inflation. I do not mean a mere increase in the volume of medium of exchange, or money. There can be a very considerable expansion of credit and other money instruments without having inflation. And there can likewise be a contraction of the volume of money without having deflation. Inflation has to do with the relation of the quantity of money in use to the volume of business done. When the quantity of money and the volume of business rise and fall, but maintain the same general proportions to each other, we have neither inflation nor deflation; what we then have is elasticity, an essential characteristic of a satisfactory medium of exchange. It is when the quantity of money rises more rapidly than the volume of goods and services exchanged that we have inflation; when the quantity of money falls more rapidly than the volume of business done, or the volume of goods and services exchanged, we have deflation.

MOST DISASTROUS OF ECONOMIC DISEASES

Inflation is probably the most disastrous of economic diseases. It not only affects prices, wages, rents, profits, and interest, but worse, affects them unevenly, thereby bringing about a distortion in economic relationships without any concern for the just deserts of the various groups of people who are affected. It brings about arbitrary and harmful changes in distribution, giving unearned advantages to the debtor groups and penalizing undeserved and destructive disadvantages on the creditor groups, including millions of savings deposits and insurance policy holders. It brings about loss of efficiency in production and, even as it lowers the general standard of living it also increases the cost of war and the preparation for war. And then, just as inflation has punished the people on its way up, so deflation follows and makes even more horrible the punishment on the way down. It is bad.

Since inflation is a question of disproportionate relationship between the quantity of money and the volume of goods and services exchanged, or a rising price level, it is clear that the forces which bring it about must operate through one or other or both sides of the relationship. Some of these forces have been obscured in public thinking because so many of us have looked mainly or entirely at the issue of money as the cause of inflation, whereas the issue of money is only one of the causes and is itself the result of deeper causes.

CAUSES WHICH CAN BRING INFLATION

The forces now at work which can bring inflation are:

1. Competitive bidding by Government for defense materials and labor.
2. Speculative buying of commodities, in anticipation of price rises.
3. Increases in unit labor costs.
4. Governmental fiscal policies: (a) Financing defense program by borrowing instead of taxation; (b) monetary policies—gold dollar content, issue of fiduciary or fiat money; the gold prohibition law.
5. Too generous extension of bank credit (beyond the needs of production and distribution, leading to speculation and falsely high price levels).

REVIEW OF POSSIBLE CAUSES

As for the first, there is no real need for competitive bidding by the Government. It

was done in the previous war and contributed greatly to the inflationary period following. Rather than rely on competitive bidding, or the no less horrible plan of cost-plus, it would be wise to apply priorities. Fortunately, we have a generous supply of most raw materials needed and the capacity to produce huge additional quantities as they are needed, provided only we set up promptly necessary arrangements and tools. We do not need to have inflation from this source, and it begins to look as though we may avoid it here, provided particularly that the Government uses common sense in establishing wage rates on its projects. Parenthetically, it does not help the morale of our fighting forces to know that the boys back home are making plenty of "easy money," while those in the service train for $21 a month.

There has already been some speculative buying of commodities. Here, again, the existence of surpluses is helpful, for, in many cases, it really is not worth while to accumulate inventories until the surpluses melt and can no longer be replaced. Priorities also help here; and a campaign of education, including publicity activities can curb this danger almost to the vanishing point. So, while there undoubtedly will be some speculative buying, it does not constitute the danger it did 25 years ago. The thing to watch in order to prevent this danger is rising costs and diminishing productive efficiency.

Wage-rate increases constitute a real and vital danger. They were so during the last war and threaten to be more so this time. There is bound to be competition among employers for skilled labor and even unskilled labor. In addition, the unions are entrenched and enjoy official favor as never before. That throws a real responsibility on labor leaders, who are real powers in government now. Businessmen who might have protested vigorously 25 years ago now dare not stick out their necks, for fear of losing their heads.

The result is serious danger of harmfully high labor costs, rising prices, still higher costs and still higher prices—that vicious spiral of rising costs and prices that leads directly into inflation. I do not mean that anyone must be underpaid, or that earnings shall not increase. I do mean that any increased wage rates must be accompanied by increased efficiency, and that if efficiency remains the same higher earnings should result from more hours of work rather than higher wage rates. Unit costs must be held down and production vastly increased. Ironically enough, labor itself suffers from the lagging of wage increases behind price increases, and the further the process goes the more labor loses.

Governmental policy of financing the cost of defense and war by borrowing leads directly to inflation. If the Government discounts its notes at the Federal Reserve Bank, there is created immediately a vast addition to the quantity of money without corresponding increase in productive activity, and without setting in motion the commercial processes which would later withdraw the amount of money borrowed when, under ordinary commercial borrowing, the process which the discounted note had set in motion had been completed. Remember, please, that war activities destroy wealth, while commercial processes create wealth for human use.

Likewise, the selling of Government bonds, since most of these bonds must be bought with borrowed money, also leads no less surely to inflation, less directly, but no less surely.

SAVINGS MAY BE TEMPORARY BUFFER

There is a temporary buffer against this inflationary movement in the fact of existing accumulated savings in huge amount. To the extent to which these now idle funds and relatively idle funds can be drawn into Government bond investment, we can stall off inflation from this source, but at best it is only for a short time. And, to the extent that these funds are invested in Government bonds they are withheld from the more important job of financing production and distribution of goods commercially manufactured which, in turn, would provide the means of repaying the borrowed funds. The danger of inflation is very real and serious from this source.

Congress has already told us plainly that it intends to finance the defense and war program largely, if not entirely, by borrowing, in that the Federal debt limit has already been raised to $65,000,000,000, and is likely to be raised still higher. Government is notoriously fearful of taxing voters. There may be less hesitation in taxing a group with relatively few votes in order to win favor with a larger group having more votes, but that kind of taxation cannot pay the bill for national defense. It will be necessary to tax everybody, and I mean tax everybody.

There is tremendous danger of inflation in the existence and governmental possession of our huge gold supply, about 80 percent of all the monetary gold in the world. In 1933 the Government made a sleight-of-hand profit for itself by the simple expedient of pronouncing, by power given to the President, that the gold dollar should contain only 13.71 grains of gold instead of 23.22 grains. That automatically increased the amount of Federal reserve notes, and the gold certificates that could be issued against our Governmental gold hoard, by more than fifty percent, and we inflated to the extent of more than $2,000,000,000. At that time we had only about $4,000,000,000 worth of gold, but now we have more than $20,000,000,000 worth, at the new gold-dollar content level. By the simple expedient of further reducing the gold content of the dollar to one-fourth of what it now is, the Government could multiply the present gold certificate and Federal reserve note issue capacity, by its own act, by four times, simply creating out of hand that much more money.

In effect, this would be repudiation of three-fourths of the Government monetary obligations, or, if you prefer, it would be confiscation of three-fourths of such claims now held against the Government. Unfortunately, it would also affect the huge structure of private debt in the same way, even though the effect was not immediately discernible. The danger is made the more serious and likely in that we have on the books a law which prohibits the American citizen from owning and possessing any monetary gold. When that law was passed we had to turn in our gold and we would now be seriously punished if caught with any of it in our possession. That means that the Government can do about as it pleases in manipulating the gold dollar and its legal content, with enormous possibilities of impetuous and foolhardy action. The limit of possibility is entire repudiation of national debt and similar effect on private debts as well.

DANGER FROM EXTENSION OF BANK CREDIT

The fifth danger of inflation arises from extension of bank credit. On July 31, 1941, we had more than six billion and five hundred million dollars of excess reserves in our banks. The figure is higher now. That means that with the legally required percentages of reserves, we already had about $49,000,000,000 of deposits in our commercial banks and, on the basis of the excess reserves, we could add another $39,000,000,000, almost doubling the amount of bank deposit currency. That would be inflation indeed. Further devalue the dollar and each present dollar becomes a larger number of dollars and further multiplies the possible inflation. The picture is enough to frighten the very daylights out of the most optimistic banker.

Nor would it be enough to increase greatly the percentage of reserves required of the banks. The very existence of the huge gold hoard, held by the Government, is still the basic danger here. The present gold prohibition law has really accomplished nothing good and it does prevent the people of the United States from stopping any headlong, irresponsible and reckless program of finance for the Government; it helps prevent the realization that government, in any democracy, if democracy is to be preserved, must be no less reliable in debt payments than are private individuals. Democracy cannot live under insolvency.

THREE OUTSTANDING SOURCES OF DANGER

Evaluating the several sources of danger of inflation, I would name three as outstanding at this time:

1. High unit labor costs, or rising wage rates and overtime penalties without compensating increases in productive efficiency and output, and accompanied by consequent rising price levels.

2. Government borrowing to pay for defense and war.

3. Our huge gold hoard and the gold prohibition law.

Specifically how could we reduce the danger of inflation to prevent a recurrence of what happened after the last World War, culminating in the depression which began in 1929?

First, we should go to a 6-day week instead of a 5-day week, declaring a moratorium on overtime penalties for the duration of the war, thereby increasing earnings and production without increasing wage rates and unit costs. This is the first and indispensable step in preventing the vicious spiral of mounting prices and costs. Nor does it really penalize labor. For labor has far more to gain from helping maintain a reasonable stable-price structure and continued buying power after the war as well as during it, than labor has to gain from temporary sprees in buying, mounting costs of war, and suffering afterward with nothing preserved from the temporary spree of the inflationary period. In short, labor has far more to gain than to lose by holding prices down, and prices cannot be held down if wage rates go up and penalties are continued for overtime without compensation by corresponding increase in productive efficiency.

We must discourage speculative buying and hold prices down. Men should seek increased return through lowered net costs, through reduction of waste and better utilization of the means of production, but not at the expense of present wage rates.

PAY AS WE GO

Second: We must pay for defense and "pay as we go", using taxation instead of borrowing as our fiscal policy. I do not pretend that this can be inaugurated fully immediately, but we have the idle savings which can be used to absorb billions of Government bonds and give us a little time to get adjusted to and sold on the necessity of taxation. Instead of shocking the public with immediate full burden of taxation, we can ease that burden on ourselves as we take up the slack for the time being with Government bonds to absorb already accumulated savings.

In Canada they are already taking punishment like the men and women they are. They do not ask their government to delude them into thinking that their burden can really be cast on future generations and still keep Canada free. They are willing to meet financial cost even as they meet the real physical cost, which must be paid as they go in any case. Are we less manly than they? Are we utterly without courage to turn our politics into statesmanship? I refuse to believe it. I choose to believe that we can and even that we will.

REAL COST OF DEFENSE CONSISTS OF GOODS PRODUCED

It must not be forgotten for a moment that the real cost of defense consists of the goods which must be produced for that purpose. Appropriations of billions do not defend us any more than can pictures of airplanes and plans for tanks. We need airships that actually fly, cannon and guns that shoot, tanks that travel, and powder that actually propels projectiles. In short, we need goods, and the only way we can get them is to produce them. And the only way to produce them is to work.

It is encouraging to remind ourselves that our average annual income of $60,000,000,000 for the years 1933–37 was subjected to governmental taxes totaling about 22 percent. We paid thirteen billion and two hundred million for cost of government, and had left for maintaining our standard of living only forty-six billion and $800,000,000. Our income for 1941 will approximate eighty billion, and for the next 3 years can reasonably be expected to average all of $85,000,000,000 a year. Suppose we take 25 percent of that for government or about twenty-one billion and two hundred and twenty-five million dollars. We would still have an annual average of sixty-three billion and seven hundred million dollars for our standard of living, which is almost seventeen billion more than we enjoyed during the period of 1933–37.

With decrease in relief expenditures due to rapidly increasing employment, allowing an actual expenditure of seven billions for defense purposes, and approximately eight billions for State and local governments on top of the six billion which should then suffice Federal Government for other than defense purposes, and what we collect in the 25 percent of our national income will actually pay the bill as we go, and contribute mightily toward preventing inflation and subsequent depression. You may add to the costs of defense, or juggle the figures, but, with adjustments, it is still possible to pay as we go, or very nearly so.

Nor should this be a terrible hardship. They are doing it in Canada, and in England they are further increasing their tax burdens. The point is that both the Canadian and the Englishmen have come to prefer the taxing plan to kidding themselves with futile hopes that somebody else will pay for the war.

REPEAL GOLD PROHIBITION LAW

Third: The gold prohibition law should be repealed. In no other way can we be sure to avoid reckless tinkering with the gold dollar when the pressure grows too great for the courage of men who must make sound decisions. Nor will that be the danger sometimes depicted. During the height of our banking panic in 1933, only about 2 percent of our gold reserve was withdrawn by citizens of the United States and about another 8 percent by foreigners who can still withdraw.

WE DARE NOT BE COMPLACENT ABOUT INFLATION

Of one thing above all let me warn you. We cannot afford to be complacent about inflation any more than we can about strikes in defense production. Perhaps you can tell just where the danger line of inflation is and how we can go right up to it without danger of crossing. I frankly cannot and know of no one who can. The best illustration I know grows out of an experience I once had at Niagara Falls. The second time I was there I was able to study the scenery and the falls pretty thoroughly. I watched the enormous volume of water pouring over the falls, thousands upon thousands of tons of water going over, with no power on earth to hold them back once they came to the falls. And yet, I could look to my left, up the river, and see a point where a small rowboat might venture with some safety into the stream. I imagined a boat with some young folks entering the river up there. Knowing of the falls below, I would call to them, "Please, please go back to shore quickly. Somewhere in the river below you is a point beyond which you cannot go without going down to certain disaster and death. Pull for the shore while there still is time." And I imagined those young folks calling back to me, derisively, "Go to, you poor old mossback, you reactionary. If only you knew how pleasant and easy it is to go downstream, lots easier than pulling upstream, you would not give us such foolish advice." Well, I may be a mossback, I may even be a reactionary, but I am not interested in learning just how far we can go down the stream of inflation before we hit the falls. I am going to pull for shore just as quickly as the good Lord will let me get there.

America today is complacent. It is calling derisively to its would-be saviors, "You poor old mossbacks, why don't you try coasting along with inflation instead of breaking your back paying as you go." We have not yet awakened to the terrible seriousness of the task in hand. And I pray our merciful Father in Heaven that we may wake up before it is too late. France waited too long and was destroyed. England does not yet know whether or not she waited too long. We still have time. God grant we may use it effectively to produce goods, to pay the real price of sacrifice and work.

Dollar Devaluation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE INDIANAPOLIS STAR

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the President will urge that the authority be extended to him to further devalue the dollar for an additional period, and that the vast sum of $2,000,000,000, now in the hands of the Chief Executive, be continued and extended until June 30, 1943. The Federal Reserve bankers have urged that this power be not further extended to the President. A very enlightening editorial appeared in the Indianapolis Star, of Indianapolis, Ind., on this subject on the 1st day of May 1941, which I include in my remarks; I hope each Member will read this very brief editorial on this highly important subject.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein this very important editorial, appearing in the Indianapolis Star on the 1st day of May 1941, which editorial follows:

[From the Indianapolis Star of May 1, 1941]

LET DOLLAR DEVALUATION LAPSE

The President has asked that his authority further to devalue the dollar be extended until June 30, 1943. He also would have the $2,000,000,000 Stabilization Fund Act extended until June 30, 1943. Both powers expire at the end of next month, under the law as it now stands. The Federal Reserve bankers have urged that the President's right to cut the gold content in the dollar be not extended and, further, have urged that the authority he now has to issue $3,000,000,000 of printing-press money be rescinded.

The cancelation of the powers to devalue the dollar and to put out paper money was urged as one of the steps in a program to prevent inflation. The point was made that confidence in the stability of our dollar will be increased when the people know there is no likelihood of change in the gold content. The possibility of $3,000,000,000 of currency being added to the money in circulation is a disturbing factor, even if the money is not put into circulation.

The President is reported as preparing to take drastic steps to prevent inflation. Among the suggested measures is one to provide for price fixing. Along with the requests for more power, why not take the advice of the bankers and give up those that are charged with contribution to the chance of inflation? Congress will do well to take the advice of the financial experts and let the dollar-devaluation power of the President lapse, even though he is loath to let go of it as a bit of authority accumulated in dealing with the depression "emergency."

Strikes in National Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

LETTER FROM THE GROESBECK (TEX.) LIONS CLUB

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication from the Lions Club of Groesbeck, Tex., opposing strikes in national-defense industries. The letter is as follows:

GROESBECK, TEX., *April 23, 1941.*

We, the Groesbeck Lions Club believe the striking of any group of men employed in any industry engaged in the national-defense program is unjustifiable, a menace to national security, and disloyal, and we respectfully ask that necessary action to end all strikes in such industries be taken. We are mindful of the attitude of labor unions in France which hastened her doom.

Were our sons as they are called to the national defense to attempt to strike, we and the Nation would condemn such action as treason. Shall the men who produce the materials necessary to render effective the service of our young manhood by not only withholding their labor, though receiving many times the pay of our soldiers, but by preventing others from working who are willing and anxious to work? We say no, no, no.

We wholeheartedly endorse our national-defense program and of the same say in the words of the Declaration of Independence:

"And, for the support of this, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to our Government and to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

GROESBECK LIONS CLUB,
BUN A. CAYTON,
President.
H. FOUNTAIN KIRBY,
L. R. GEREN,
L. W. SHEPPERD,
Committee.

Farmers Should Be Provided With an Equal Opportunity Under the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

LETTER FROM G. H. GRIFFIN, OF WALHALLA, S. C.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a letter addressed to me on May 1, 1941, by Mr. G. H. Griffin, of Walhalla, S. C.

Mr. Griffin is an outstanding agriculturist, and I agree with him fully that the farmers of this country, who are responsible for feeding and clothing 130,000,000 Americans, are entitled to equal justice in line with that which Congress has given to many other groups, even by the passage of legislation for this purpose.

We hear much about the surplus of cotton and wheat. If the 30 percent of the people engaged in agriculture had an equal percentage of the national income of other groups, in other words, proper purchasing power, we would not have any surplus on hand at this time.

As previously stated, in that farmers are on a basis of about 65 to 75 percent of parity, it is very clear to me, and should be to all others who are concerned about the serious condition of agriculture, that it is impossible for a farmer to buy a dollar's worth of goods with 65 or 75 cents, and that is really the position of farmers today.

Farmers have been promised parity equality, and as chairman of the Agricultural Committee of the House, realizing my responsibility, and that of my committee, I want to state frankly that I will not be satisfied with any type of legislation which will not give to farmers that which they have been promised, and that to which they are clearly entitled—that is 100-percent parity.

The letter above referred to is as follows:

WALHALLA, S. C., *May 1, 1941.*

Hon. H. P. FULMER,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FULMER: This is to acknowledge receipt of a copy of the April 23 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which contains the speech which you made to the South Atlantic Cotton Association in Greenville on April 18, together with copies of letters written by you to Mr. Armand May, president, American Associated Companies, Atlanta, Ga., and Prof. Gurth Whipple, director, New York State College of Forestry, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.

I appreciate exceedingly your furnishing me with the copy of your speech and copies of these letters, and I have read all of them with a great deal of pleasure and interest, and particularly I admire the manner in which you have made reply to the two gentlemen above cited, copies of letters which you sent me.

After giving fairly careful thought and study to your speech made in Greenville to the South Atlantic Cotton Association, in which you outlined a remedy for the relief of agriculture, I thoroughly agree with your conception of the agricultural problem and your plan which will provide considerable relief and give to the producer a fairer share of the consumers' dollar.

I wish to take this means of congratulating you upon your most excellent knowledge of the agricultural problem as exists today and for the relief remedy which you have so amicably advanced in your speech commenting upon your bill now being considered by the Congress. My hope and prayer is that you will succeed in getting this pending legislation favorably acted upon by the Congress.

The one and only thing that farm people or agriculture needs or is entitled to is equal economic opportunity comparable to that now provided and enjoyed by other groups. Your proposal, I believe, comes nearer to providing this than any that has come to my attention, and I am in thorough accord with your plan, and fail to see why any group or interest could by the use of sound reason object. Not until agriculture rises from its prostrate position and assumes a horizontal or parallel position with that of other industries and groups will prosperity return to this country of ours.

I realize there is little that I can do to help you in this undertaking, but I wish to assure you that I shall do, and stand ready to do, whatever I can to assist you and those who agree with your efforts to bring about all agriculture wants, needs, and is asking for equal economic opportunity comparable to that of other groups. We want no advantages and expect none, but it is only fair that all Americans be provided with equal opportunity under the law.

With kind regards and best wishes, I am

Very truly yours,

G. H. GRIFFIN.

Convoys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from one of my constituents:

MEAGHER & MEAGHER,
Binghamton, N. Y., May 1, 1941.

Hon. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.

DEAR ED.: During the week of April 21 to April 25, the Binghamton Junior Chamber of Commerce straw-poll committee conducted a straw poll on the following question: Should the United States convoy goods to Britain? As chairman of that committee I am taking the liberty to forward the results to you, hoping that such results will be of assistance to you in reaching any decision upon the question of convoys when it arises in Congress.

This poll was conducted in the city of Binghamton by members of the junior chamber of commerce. One thousand one hundred and eighteen persons were questioned and results showed that 55 percent were against the use of convoys, 42 percent voted in favor of convoys, and 3 percent said they were doubtful about the use of convoys.

We hope to make this poll a regular service of the junior chamber of commerce. If there is any particular public question upon which you would like us to conduct a straw poll please let us know and we will give it serious consideration.

FREDERICK J. MEAGHER.

A Wisconsin "Red" Story—Best Joke of the Season

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

EDITORIALS FROM THE GREEN BAY PRESS GAZETTE

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

[From the Green Bay (Wis.) Press Gazette of April 30, 1941.]

A WISCONSIN "RED" STORY

Wisconsin has not lagged in "red" activities as much as some of its people may have thought.

There is Ann Christoffel, nee Ann Sabljak, alias Ann Stewart, wife of Harold Christoffel, president of the CIO Allis-Chalmers union.

The investigation concerning this lady has been sent to Washington upon the demand of a Member of Congress. It is typical of the routine directed by Moscow. The Wisconsin investigating committee says that it has proved beyond all doubt that the lady is a member of the Communist Party. And then it tells the story in detail.

First of all, quite naturally of course, she got on the Federal pay roll at $1,440 a year under her maiden name of Ann Sabljak. But the Wisconsin committee learned from a former "red" that in the party she was known as Ann Stewart and that she occupied an important position in the Young Communist League. The personnel director of the United States next appears in the evidence with his report that she denied she ever used the name of Ann Stewart. She admitted her marriage to Christoffel but vigorously denied her membership in the Communist Party. She concealed her marriage, she said, as a means of making more secure her job with the Government. But over and over she insisted she never had heard the name Ann Stewart. In fact, she was quite indignant about the charge of belonging to the "reds" or using a phoney name.

But investigators are persistent guys. They found that the lady had joined the First Methodist Church of Milwaukee under the alias of Ann Stewart. Then she admitted what she had so indignantly denied but a short time before, that she had not used the name of Ann Stewart.

Whether she joined the church at the time the manifesto went out from Moscow for all "reds" to "honey up" to all churches

with the expectation of choking them when a good chance appeared, we cannot say. But that this woman was an active, energetic party member worming her way around under false colors and false names the committee found supported by strong evidence.

Recently Harold Christoffel, the husband, denied he was a member of the "reds." Former members of the party, however, place him at its meetings leading the singing, particularly that great chant, Rise Ye Prisoners

But, according to rule No. 1 in the "red" catechism, it is a "red's" business to always deny that he is "red," it is his business to falsify in respect to everything where falsification may be advantageous.

It is noteworthy that these restless "reds" will at one and the same time bore into churches, into labor unions, and into Federal jobs, and expect to stay in all places by persisting in evasive conduct and answers.

[From the Green Bay (Wis.) Press Gazette of April 30, 1941]

BEST JOKE OF THE SEASON

Every time that Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau appears before a congressional committee with a new tax bill he takes out of a pigeon hole in his desk that same little statement urging Congress to economy and pointing to the piles of skeletons that mark the course in history of every spendthrift nation.

And, true to form, Mr. Morgenthau talked again recently about lopping off a lot of money from nondefense items in the Government's budget.

We would like to wager a good bottle of beer that if the press hadn't been present before the committee the members would have laughed until they cried, would have rolled around and slapped their knees in an uncontrollable fit of mirth at the very idea of expecting anything in the nature of economy from the present rulers of America.

When a college funny magazine can match the Secretary of the Treasury in gaiety and wit it will have arrived some place.

Tax Guidance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CROWTHER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the privilege of extending my remarks, I desire to present the following editorial published in the Washington Post of May 5, 1941.

The title "Tax Guidance," would be more expressive if it was followed by an interrogation point.

[From the Washington Post of May 5, 1941]

TAX GUIDANCE

The letter which President Roosevelt addressed to Chairman DOUGHTON, of the House Ways and Means Committee, in regard to tax legislation offers neither definite guidance nor moral support to legislators greatly in need of both. Although the President approves the Treasury's objective of raising $3,500,000,000 of new revenue, he does not urge adoption of its specific proposals to raise it. Indeed, there is a strong hint that he regards the Treasury's program as tentative. On the controversial issues of lowering income-tax exemptions and increasing excise taxes, Mr. Roosevelt is significantly silent. He takes refuge behind generalizations to the effect that every individual and every corporation should bear a fair share of the tax burden. He delivers familiar warnings against taxes that make the rich richer and the poor poorer. Since both rich and poor must be prepared to make heavy financial sacrifices for defense, this kind of appeal is singularly inopportune and unwarranted.

Incidentally, what does it mean in practical terms? It may indicate that the President is opposed to sales taxes or excise taxes on articles of mass consumption, as some commentators infer. However, that is pure assumption. And what is the President's purpose in decrying a tax basis so defined as "to exclude substantial and significant elements of income?" The incomes of the great majority of the American people are today (and would remain under the Treasury tax plan) exempt from income taxation. There is no hint that the President had these groups in mind when urging a broader tax basis. On the contrary, he was probably referring to the necessity of closing avenues of tax evasion in the corporate and upper individual income-tax brackets.

Nothing at all was said about the need for economy in nondefense outlays, although the President had a rare opportunity to back up Secretary Morgenthau's personal appeal for a billion-dollar cut in nondefense expenditures as a further means of reducing the 1942 Budget deficit. Furthermore, no reference was made to the importance of taxation as a means of curtailing civilian consumption and thus releasing labor and goods for defense use. In short, the letter to Mr. DOUGHTON is chiefly significant for its ambiguities and omissions rather than for its affirmations. It cannot fail to disappoint hopes that the President would offer all-out aid to those Members of Congress who are leading the fight for a comprehensive tax program and for substantial reductions in nondefense spending.

County Boards Should Be Appreciated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the county boards of our States have always appeared to me as the foundation of our Republic. Here is a group of men elected by people who know them personally, and the election and endorsement of one's neighbors is a true measure of appreciation.

These men work many hours without remuneration in carrying on the work of their office and receive but small pay when compared to the other public officers of the country.

This group of county board members are required to cooperate with the agencies promoted by the State and the Federal Governments. For the best interests of society as a whole, I am sure if more Federal and State control were delegated back to the county boards there would be—

First. A more economical and efficient administration of public funds.

Second. A fairer and more equitable distribution of public funds.

If the county boards could be called upon to make the proper use of W. P. A. funds for example, a great amount of overhead could be eliminated and this money would reach the pockets of needy in much larger proportions than it has in the past.

I am pleased to note that one of the leading papers in my district, the Shawano County Journal under date of May 1, 1941, in the following editorial most ably pays tribute to the county board of Shawano County, Wis.

[From the Shawano County (Wis.) Journal of May 1, 1941]

OUR COUNTY BOARD

A year of important decisions, careful planning and significant changes awaits the Shawano County board of supervisors, that important governing body of this county which meets next Tuesday to organize for a new year.

Most of the members have served over a long period of years, some have only a few years to their credit, while three members face a new path of service. Certainly we know each man, realizing the confidence and faith that have been placed in him by the people of his community, will come with a determination to give the very best kind of service he can command.

The people of Shawano County are fortunate to have as their representatives men who are entirely capable, men who think for themselves, whose decisions are the dictates of their own hearts. They come as servants of the people, each to act according to the best interests of the people, not only of the community they represent, but of the entire county as well.

The average citizen in many cases fails to recognize the tremendous responsibility that rests with each member of the county board.

Shawano County is fortunate to have a county board composed of members who represent business and professional life as well as agriculture. Many of them are farmers, some businessmen, two are attorneys, and others are prominent in the dairy field. The Shawano County board always has been a cooperative body and their accomplishments have been exceedingly commendable.

It is with confidence that the people of this county look to the new administration, knowing full well that each man will do his part to make this county exemplary among the 71 counties of this State.

For Peace in Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES MAGAZINE

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, we are all deeply concerned in securing the maximum production in our national-defense

program. We all realize that to accomplish this purpose there must be the minimum amount of disagreement between labor and capital.

There has been a great amount of misunderstanding concerning the work of the Department of Labor in connection with its accomplishments in adjusting the differences that have arisen between these two mighty forces in the field of production.

Since 1937 Dr. John R. Steelman has been Director of the United States Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor. An impartial examination of the record of accomplishments under his fair and impartial direction would convince any person of the great work that he has been and is now doing. He possesses a sense of fairness and impartiality rarely found in men directly concerned in this great struggle. He has inspired and won the confidence of both organized labor and the industrialist. It is this unusual trait in the man that has made it possible for him to accomplish what to many of us would seem to be the impossible and to bring these warring groups together at the conference table and adjust their many differences.

I am sure that when the Members of Congress and the American people have a better knowledge of the established facts in connection with the work of Dr. Steelman and his service there will be a substantial reduction in labor-capital conflicts and an even greater reliance placed upon conciliation as a means of adjusting such differences as do arise.

A short time ago there appeared in the New York Times magazine of March 30, 1941, a very able and informative article under the title "For Peace in Industry—A Conciliator's Creed," by Cabell Phillips, concerning Dr. John R. Steelman and the exceptionally effective and splendid work that the Conciliation Service is doing under his direction, and I am glad to make it a part of the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times magazine of March 30, 1941]

Industrial peace is domestic problem No. 1 in the United States today. News from the industrial battle fronts of America competes for front-page prominence with news from the military battle fronts overseas. Demands for antistrike and compulsory-labor laws are matched in volume and bitterness by demands for higher wages and crack-downs on uncooperative industrialists. The classic struggle between capital and labor is spilling over the rim of its academic confines.

Facing the challenge of this turmoil is the United States Conciliation Service. The one agency of the Government regularly empowered by law to participate in the settlement of labor disputes, it will have a growing role in the months to come. The recent Executive order creating the National Defense Mediation Board increases rather than diminishes this role. For the President's order takes cognizance of the Conciliation Service's record of achievement and the prestige and confidence which it has won from both management and labor. The new Board will function principally as a medium through which the most powerful pressure of public opinion will be exerted in disputes which the Conciliation Service finds itself unable to settle.

When you ask people in a position to know what they think of the Federal Conciliation Service there is almost unanimous agreement. They approve. "A fine job," "fair and impartial," "a splendid record of seeing objectively both sides of a dispute," they say. Within less than 60 days during the early winter the Service was endorsed, either by resolution or in public utterances of officials, by such diverse elements as the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Federation of Labor and the United States Chamber of Commerce. It is agreed that any bureau of the New Deal which attracts to itself praise from such mutually suspicious and antagonistic forces as these must possess a high potential of usefulness.

The Conciliation Service was set up in the Department of Labor in 1913. Its director since 1937 has been Dr. John R. Steelman, a genial 200-pound 6-footer with the guileless face of an Arkansas farm boy. Serving under him are 110 commissioners of conciliation distributed among the four administrative regions into which the country has been divided. The directors of these regions are in Washington. They are in daily consultation among themselves and with Dr. Steelman, and by telephone, telegraph, and mail with their representatives in the field. There is a constant stream of requests for their services.

A commissioner of conciliation is not an officer of the law. He has no authority or coercive powers. He cannot require that anything be done or not be done. He seldom enters a case until he has been asked. When he sits down to conference he can only reason, plead, and maybe bluff.

"The minute you make a cop of a conciliator you have destroyed his usefulness," Dr. Steelman says. "We do not want authority. We believe it to be the very antithesis of the spirit in which really effective conciliation is carried on."

A conciliator enters a controversy usually at the request of one or both of the contending parties: He hears both arguments, usually alone with the representatives first of one side and then of the other. He never takes sides and his first duty is to impress upon each his sincerity, his honesty, and his impartiality. They must recognize in him a friendly counselor whose point of view is not warped by the hatreds and prejudices which they themselves have acquired.

During the first conferences the conciliator is informed actually on only a few points upon which the controversy rests. From his own wide experience he can judge fairly accurately how just are the claims and charges involved. He is usually able to measure the relative components of reasonableness and stubbornness in charge and countercharge.

He maneuvers skillfully with first one side and then the other to find where compromises may be made. The union boss will admit over a friendly glass of beer that he could get his boys to accept a little less than the maximum wage increase they have asked if the management would play ball on vacations with pay. The president of the company will confide at luncheon that he might be persuaded to accept a preferential shop clause if it will not mean that he will have to fire his nonunion foundry crew.

Point by point common ground is arrived at. The factions have admitted to a trusted third party a willingness to make concessions which they would never have divulged to the opposition direct.

Thus armed the conciliator is ready at last to call the two sides together in conference. He knows the grounds upon which agreement can be reached. He knows that each side is eager for peace; as a skillful diplomat and psychologist he leads them to the objective they both seek. The action, then, is the result of mutual consent. Neither has lost anything. Neither has been made to do something it did not want. There is no aftermath of resentment to act as a fuze for a flare-up later on.

"Conciliation can be truly effective," Dr. Steelman believes, "only where the representative of the public commands the respect and confidence of both parties to the dispute. Respect and confidence can never be legislated. If I have a creed of labor relations, that is it."

John Roy Steelman gives therein a clue to his own success as a mediator. He is a husky, vigorous man in his early forties, with lively eyes and an enveloping warmth of personality. He is a Ph. D. and a former college professor. But you would be as likely to size him up as a dock hand who had hoisted himself up in the world by his bootstraps. His words tumble out with an almost juvenile eagerness when he talks, and his most academic discourses are punctuated by an effective choice of profanity which he never picked up in college.

He was born on a small farm in Arkansas in 1900. He finished high school in time to get into the Army for the last few months of the World War. By the time he was discharged he had made up his mind to get an education even if he had to fight another war in the process. Which, in a sense, he had to do. The family was poor, so he had to earn the cost of tuition himself. This he did by working in summers as a logger and sawmill hand in the cypress swamps of Arkansas. In time he had an A. B. degree from Henderson-Brown College.

But this was not enough. More summers in the logging camps; as a "blanket stiff" following the wheat harvests; peddling books and insurance. In winters he waited on table and corrected papers for professors at Peabody, Vanderbilt, Harvard, and North Carolina. By 1928 he had his full complement of degrees—five—and he settled down to a professorship in economics and sociology at Alabama College.

In 1934 Secretary Perkins made a speech there and met the young professor. Before the year was out she had pried him away from the cloisters and made him a commissioner of conciliation. Two years later, upon the death of Hugh L. Kerwin, who had held the post of Director of Conciliation since 1913, Dr. Steelman was named to succeed him.

The Director, like a good many of his associates, is frequently invited to outside jobs. Industrialists have offered him salaries tripling his present unspectacular earnings in the Government to take over their labor-relations departments. Powerful unions have tried to tempt him with high executive posts. He turns them all aside good-naturedly.

"Hell, this job is too much fun," he laughs.

One suspects there is also a strong sense of dedication in the make-up of this extroverted idealist. He spends from 10 to 15 hours a day in his office, and sees strings of callers late into Saturday afternoon and Sunday. His incredible energy and optimism are undoubtedly two of his principal assets as a mediator. He can usually "outsit" the other participants in a conference and hold them together in spite of weariness, frayed nerves, and seeming frustration. Early in March he kept a meeting going in his office between employers and employees for 29 consecutive hours. During the successful negotiations over a threatened strike at the Ryan Aeronautical Co. plant at San Diego last January, in which he participated by telephone from Washington, he did not leave his office for over 60 hours.

His office, incidentally, runs up one of the most staggering telephone bills in the Capital. It is not unusual for him to talk over long distance as many as a hundred times a day. Indeed, his penchant for the telephone has exacted the only physical penalty of his strenuous career. Constant use of the instrument is believed to have brought on the strange semiparalysis of the left wrist which

occurred several months ago. He has had to have a special device resembling a small radio installed on his desk into which he can speak and from which he can hear with no more exertion than the flipping of a switch.

Dr. Steelman adheres to no special technique in his approach to a conciliation problem. Beyond the routine of ascertaining the facts from both sides to the controversy and discovering the grounds upon which agreement can be reached, each situation has to be handled according to the peculiar exigencies involved.

In the Vultee Aircraft strike last fall he shuttled back and forth all night between the respective headquarters of the workers and the management with bait for small compromises. By noon the following day the cumulative total of those small compromises added up to the grand total of agreement, and the strike was settled forthwith.

Often he finds that moving the scene of negotiations away from the charged atmosphere of a struck plant to the relative calm of his office in Washington is effective. Not long ago one of his commissioners reported that he was unable to secure agreement between the workers and management of a small plant in New Jersey. Deliveries of certain defense materials were being held up. Steelman invited the negotiators to come to Washington. Feeling was so bitter that the union delegation refused to travel on the same train with the representatives of the operators. Once they were all in Washington around the conference table with Dr. Steelman and his staff, however, matters which weeks of negotiation back home had failed to settle were adjusted in the course of hours.

"You have done only a halfway job if in settling a dispute you have not made friends with both sides," Dr. Steelman tells his men.

In evidence of the fact that that warning has been heeded, he points to a bank of card index files in the office of his secretary. It contains the names and addresses of more than 15,000 people in every part of the country who are dependable friends of the Conciliation Service. Preachers, lawyers, union leaders, bankers, and ordinary workmen with influence among their fellows are included.

"Every one of them can be called on in a pinch," he boasts.

"For example, I got a telephone call one night as I was leaving the office a few months ago from the mayor of a small city in Oregon. He said that the restaurant and hotel workers' union there had voted to go out on strike at midnight. The whole town would be tied up, he said, and there probably would be an ugly public reaction.

"Well, I knew a little something about that situation. I knew the hotel and restaurant workers had something coming to them, but I also knew they didn't have a chance of winning their strike. It was a situation where a little heart-to-heart talking to was needed to adjust grievances on both sides.

"I didn't have one of my own men within 500 miles of that city, but in my file of 'unofficial conciliators' I found the name of a Catholic priest who had worked with us on another situation earlier. I telephoned.

"'Father,' I said, 'I've got a job outside your regular routine I want you to do for me. Get the union and hotel heads together and make them hold this situation up until I can get a man in there. Make the hotels and restaurants promise not to cut wages and the union promise not to strike for at least 2 days. I think we can settle this thing without anybody getting hurt.'

"He went right to work and got an agreement from both sides to observe the status quo. Two days later a conciliator got there and 2 days after that the controversy was settled. But if it hadn't been for that priest being on the spot when we needed him a really bad situation might easily have developed."

What happens when voluntary mediation fails? It doesn't fail often. In 1940 the Conciliation Service was called in on a total of 3,751 situations—strikes, threatened strikes, lockouts, controversies, arbitrations, consultations, etc.—of which more than 97 percent were successfully adjusted. In 746 of these situations strike votes had actually been taken. Seven hundred and nine were settled before the strikes began. Previous years have shown a similar record of achievement; in 1937, 95.9 percent of the situations were successfully adjusted; in 1938, 94.8 percent. The waste of millions of man-hours of wages and production was prevented.

When it becomes apparent that a voluntary agreement between the parties to a dispute cannot be obtained, the conciliator usually suggests arbitration with an agreement to both sides to abide by whatever final decision is reached. When the new Defense Mediation Board has begun to function, such difficult cases will be referred to it before arbitration is urged. For, regardless of how fair and impartial arbitrators may be, the service is convinced from its long experience that voluntary agreements arrived at by the disputants themselves are in almost every case preferable to decisions handed down by outsiders.

"I have seen at fairly close range, I think, as many strikes and lock-outs as any man in the United States," Dr. Steelman said in a recent address. "I have seen something, too, of what they cost labor, management, and the public. I have devoted a good part of my own working life to the task of fostering greater understanding between those who work and those who direct work in America's mills, factories, offices, and stores.

"I do not believe that such understanding—and the good will and efficiency which without it are well nigh impossible—can be furthered by compulsion. You cannot legislate peace. You cannot prescribe harmony. You cannot decree cooperation."

Strike-Bound Plants Show Huge Profits—Bad Labor Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the pen of A. I. Harris. Mr. Harris is a columnist whose articles, among other papers, appear in the Toledo Union Leader. While we are abusing labor we might pause for a moment to glance at the other side of the picture.

Instead of being so anxious to pass more legislation to cure the strike situation, it might be profitable to insist that even great industrial establishments obey the laws that are already on the books. Surely we are not ready to admit that these few notoriously law-violating firms are bigger than the Government itself. The article makes interesting reading:

[From the Toledo Union Leader]

STRIKE-BOUND PLANTS SHOW HUGE PROFITS—BAD LABOR POLICIES

On March 31 the Labor Division of O. P. M. compiled a list of all strikes that had occurred in so-called defense industries. The list was compiled at the request of Chairman VINSON of the House Naval Affairs Committee, who wanted it to bolster his plea for passage of restrictive labor legislation.

If Chairman VINSON is really interested in the causes of strikes, a study of this list of employers will afford him an excellent opportunity. He would find, almost without exception, that strikes have occurred in those industrial establishments that, while enjoying exorbitant profits as the result of the national emergency, maintain, nevertheless, labor policies among the most backward in the entire country. He would find here a group of employers who have been flaunting the National Labor Relations Act, who have repeatedly been cited before the N. L. R. B. for vicious labor practices, and who have been found guilty in decisions handed down by the Board.

Representative VINSON might do well to consult Moody's Industrials and Standard Statistics to find out whether these firms can afford to pay their workers decent wages. In that connection he would find that Bethlehem Steel increased its net profits from $24,638,384 in 1939 to $48,677,524 in 1940; International Harvester from $3,876,810 to $22,926,110; Curtiss-Wright from $5,218,258 to $15,746,874; Allis-Chalmers from $3,719,546 to $5,051,440; Babcock & Wilcox from $1,168,796 to $3,588,199; Aluminum Co. of America from $36,633,389 to $44,146,297; Crucible Steel from $2,803,596 to $6,230,180; Jones & Laughlin from $3,188,944 to $10,277,029; Youngstown Steel from $5,004,484 to $10,815,468; Todd Shipyards from $896,642 to $1,408,671; Harvill Diecasting Corporation from $51,470 to $96,312 for the first 9 months of 1940; Kellogg Switchboard from $16,623 to $52,820; Universal Cyclops from $864,219 to $1,088,885; Vultee Aircraft from a deficit of $779,129 to a net profit of $374,457, while Motor Wheel Corporation reported net profits of $1,849,239 in 1939 with net profits for the first 6 months of 1940 totaling $1,182,506. Henry Ford does not report the profits of his concern.

The above, it must be remembered, does not include the fat salaries that these "profit patriots" pay themselves; also, it must be remembered, defense profits are just beginning to roll in, and 1941 profits will make some of the above shrink into insignificance; and yet spokesmen of the National Association of Manufacturers are talking of the patriotic service and sacrifice for national defense of its members during the present emergency.

Chairman VINSON would render the country a real service by telling reactionary employers that the establishment of enlightened labor policies and payment of decent wages would solve the strike problem completely and aid in reaching a maximum defense effort.

We suggest that Chairman VINSON make a further study along the above line to the point of ascertaining to what extent the worker is sharing in the current prosperity. He can obtain some rather enlightening figures compiled by the Social Security Board and the Bureau of Labor Statistics. These figures will tell him the following facts:

The Du Pont Co., in 1940, made a net profit of more than $2,200 from each of its 45,000 employees, this profit, after deduction of all taxes, totaling more than $90,000,000. Standard Oil net profits for 1940 of more than $110,000,000 represents a profit of about $2,000 from each of its 55,000 workers. The six largest corporations listed—General Motors, American Telegraph & Telephone, Standard Oil, Du Pont, United States Steel, and General Electric—derived a net profit of

$797 from each of their 885,000 employees; and, whether you believe it or not—Ripley, attention—the income of these same workers for that year averaged less than half of $797.

The Social Security Board has prepared an average budget for a family of man, wife, and three children of $2,200 a year for decent living standard. This budget provides 11 cents a day for food per person; $5 a year for education per child; $1.50 per week for medical care; and $34 a month for rent—certainly most modest. And yet 29 percent of American workers earn less than $1,200; one-third earn less than $400; and only 8 percent as high as $2,200. It is difficult to see how the blessings of American industry are extended to the workers.

This country is now engaged in a very noble effort—the defeat of Adolf Hitler and all that Hitlerism implies. In the opinion of most intelligent people, the defeat of Hitler transcends everything else in importance. It would be impossible to calculate the blood and tears humanity will shed and the decades of darkness that will follow in the wake of a Nazi victory.

Labor baiters are retarding rather than aiding the national effort by their insistence of antilabor legislation. Nobody wants to see that effort succeed, wants to see labor strikes or anything else that will interfere with the production program. But democracy cannot put forth its best effort with industry waxing fat and the workers ground down in poverty. Industry can be put in its proper place if the Government wants to put it in its proper place—and its proper place is an obedience of labor laws as well as other laws, maintenance of labor policies that reflect the democratic standards of the day, and payments of wages that will assure an American standard of living.

That is the best, and only way of assuring that we will reach a productive effort to meet the needs of the day. There is no danger that industry will go on strike if the Government insists on the above program. The Government possesses a very compelling and convincing weapon if it means business.

TAKING OVER PLANTS

Some of the New Dealers close to the administration have been plugging hard to convince the President to take over one or two of the strike-bound plants to show industry and the country that Government can operate plants during a period of emergency more efficiently than can private management. There is little doubt that the President was ready to take vigorous steps in that direction in the Allis-Chalmers case when the aggravated strike in that plant was settled.

Government operation of a defense industry, it was insisted, would solve the problem of work stoppages, since Uncle Sam would hardly violate his own labor laws. Also, there is not a little convincing evidence that private enterprise, so-called, is largely responsible for the plight that the democracies find themselves in today.

Alonzo Dillard Folger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, recently while browsing through an old memorial address made by my father-in-law, the late Senator Guy D. Goff, I came across a stanza from a poem by an unknown author—

We know when moons shall wane,
When summer birds from far shall cross the sea,
When autumn's hue shall tinge the golden grain,
But who shall teach us when to look for thee,
O messenger of Death!

When the news reached me last Thursday that our beloved colleague ALONZO DILLARD FOLGER had lost his life from an automobile accident, that stanza leaped into my mind with potent force.

How well indeed we know when the seasons will change, the tides ebb or flow. How well indeed we know all about a thousand and one other things so mundane yet so important in our daily round of existence.

But, oh, how little we know about that moment that is coming to all of us when the messenger of death will tap on our shoulder and bid us follow him to his Master. Regardless of what we may be doing at the moment—regardless of what we think is its vast importance to us or to others, we will have no alternative but to obey that summons.

Out of a clear blue sky, busy at his duties, our late colleague had no opportunity to plead for a little more time. It didn't matter that he had a lot of important work to be done—that his country needed him—that we needed him here—that there were unanswered letters on his desk and loved ones anxious for him.

No, indeed, those things didn't matter. What did matter was that nothing mattered anymore. Out of all the excuses that mankind so aptly knows, there was none that would defer for a single second, that messenger of death whom so many of us unfortunately see fit to visualize as black-robed and cadaverous.

There is utterly nothing I can say here that will soften the shock of our colleague's death or compensate us for his loss in our councils. We are grieved and saddened and a bit bewildered. We do not like to think about it but we know it might be our turn next and for a little while we frantically contemplate how dreadfully unprepared we are in every way. There are so many things we still want to do—so many people we still must talk with—so many scenes we still wish to enjoy.

Well, time has given us the answer to that. We have lines to contemplate over, especially that one that commands us:

In the midst of life prepare for death.

Then, all too well we know the admonition on the sundial—

It is later than you think.

I do not think the messenger of death caught our colleague unprepared in the great things. In every way possible, he had always obeyed the principles upon which all honorable lives are founded. He was zealous, diligent, honorable. He made it a rule to give of his best so that he in turn would also be entitled to equal consideration.

As a successful attorney he played a worthy part in the litigations of men. As a judge he was merciful and considerate. In his position as trustee of the University of North Carolina, he did much to better the educational advantages of eager youth. His party in which he was serving as national committeeman from his State ever found him loyal and unselfish. Here in the House we found his counsels invaluable and timely to a Nation in the throes of great and shapeless things to come.

Yes; this was no unprepared colleague who has just left our ranks, never again to return. He lived every day in the fullest and best manner he could and so it did not especially matter to him that he might not have been able to realize the approach of death's messenger as he did the seasons. What did matter to him and what always mattered the most, was tackling the immediate problem at hand.

Now he is gone—"dead at the post of duty" as someone has eloquently put it. He is gone and we are left behind to remember an honorable, helpful, useful man with whom we were proud to associate and work.

To his family and to his friends and to his colleagues from the great State of North Carolina, I extend more than a little sympathy. We have mutually lost much, but by the same token, we have been enriched by contact with a character who was infinitely better than common clay.

Overwhelming Majority Against Convoying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

LETTERS FROM CONSTITUENTS

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, during the last 3 weeks I mailed out to the people in my district 45,000 letters, asking them for an expression on this all-important question of using our Navy and air fleet to convoy shipments to England and other democratic nations, as provided for in the Lease-Lend Act. I explained to them that I had voted against all the bills that might eventually involve us in another foreign war, but in spite of my opposition, these several bills became law, and therefore I am going along with them. Certain groups made it appear that since the lease-lend bill passed, the people had changed their attitude and were now willing to risk our becoming involved by seeing to it that these shipments reached England. That is why I mailed out these letters, asking my constituents to advise me of their stand. Up to now I have received nearly 4,000 an-

swers, and out of that total less than 125 are in favor of convoying.

I am including a letter from Reverend Korbitz, which shows the sentiment of his people. I also am including a few short letters picked at random. These thousands of letters are not inspired or sponsored by any group or organization; they are the honest expression of the people of my district, and embrace all nationalities. I invite anyone, Members or newspapermen, to inspect them, if they think that perhaps subversive groups had anything to do with them. I expect to get many more thousands during the next week or two, because my last letters have just about arrived there now. The letters follow:

ST. PAUL'S EVANGELICAL
LUTHERAN CHURCH,
Medford, Wis., April 30, 1941.

Hon. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE CONGRESSMAN: Though I have not become a registered voter of Wisconsin until recently and, for this reason, did not receive a letter request from you relative to your constituent's opinion of the question of convoying and active participation in Europe's war, yet a neighbor of mine and member of my congregation was kind enough to give me his letter to read, and so I am writing to you herewith and am also asking my members to write to you.

First of all, congratulations to you, Mr. GEHRMANN, for asking your constituents how they feel about the matter before you cast your vote in such an important matter as to give America's boys as cannon fodder. Would to God that the President would do the same. We have had enough of this "pulling the veil over the people's eyes" by saying we are not going to get into a foreign war. Roosevelt knows how the greatest majority of the American people feel about a foreign war—they are absolutely against involvement. He knows that and so do all the warmongers. So, instead of getting an actual vote on the matter, they are pushing us, inch by inch, and yard by yard, into this war. I was secretary of a pastors' convention committee that sent our pastors' disapproval to Congress in regard to lifting the embargo, stating our reasons for what would follow. We were promised not to fear. Then it was the lease-lend "strip tease" bill to denude the defense of America, and still we were promised not to fear a foreign war. Now the warmongers are crying, "What good will it do to have passed the lease-lend bill unless we get the goods to England?" Convoying or even policing the seven seas means war and nothing else.

Honorable Congressman, vote against convoying or even policing the seven seas. Vote against sending our fleet to Greenland or Iceland or the Red Sea. Vote especially against any and all attempts to propagate a "union now" with the British Empire. As Americans we want to retain our American form of government and our American ideals for which our forefathers bled and died.

Honorable Mr. GEHRMANN, vote for a good national defense of America first: Vote for thorough prosecution of all un-American isms in this country, including British Imperialism. We want nothing from Britain which many people of England are trying to cast aside. We do want to remain good Americans.

Mr. Conrad, editor of the Medford Star-News, is a good friend of mine. You may feel free to publish part of my reply in your letter to the papers. I know my entire congregation is against convoying or involvement in this war.

With kind greetings.

REV. F. W. KORBITZ.

SUPERIOR, WIS., *April 30, 1941.*

Hon. B. J. GEHRMANN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Have thought of writing you several times if only to encourage you to hold fast to the position you are taking in regard to our Navy being used to protect lend-lease shipments. As sure as this is done, I believe we are in the war without full preparation to meet exigent circumstances which are sure to follow. I know there are changes occurring in Congress rapidly these days, but I see no reason as yet, requiring to change your present position. There are three voters in my family that look upon your representation of our district most favorably, and others I have talked with.

No reply is necessary to this letter or expected.

Yours truly,

L. W. BEEBE, M. D.

ASHLAND, WIS., *April 28, 1941.*

DEAR MR. GEHRMANN: In answer to the inquiry, Shall our Navy be used to protect lend-lease shipments, our answer is emphatically, "No."

We appreciate your all-American attitude and hope we shall stay out of this war.

Mr. and Mrs. FRANK GRITTNER and family.

FREDERIC, WIS., *April 29, 1941.*

Hon. Mr. GEHRMANN.

DEAR SIR: Received the circular that you sent out from Washington. Thank you.

We are in accord with you, in that we do not want United States ships and men to convoy ships to England, or any step that will bring us into European war.

Mr. and Mrs. OSCAR HENDRICKS.

BALSAM LAKE, WIS., *April 28, 1941.*

The Honorable B. J. GEHRMANN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GEHRMANN: I wish to assure you that I am not in favor of our convoying ships to Great Britain, or of doing anything that may embroil us in this war.

The President favored the Neutrality Act, because it was designed to keep American vessels out of danger zones presumably, and how can he expect the confidence of any of the thinking element of this country while he shows himself willing to undercut his own avowed principles. Convoying, or patrolling (whatever that means) both seem to me contrary to the spirit and purpose of the Neutrality Act.

One is moved to wonder at times if Roosevelt or Churchill is the President of these United States.

Sincerely,

J. H. SPENCER.

SUPERIOR, WIS., *April 21, 1941.*

Hon. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN,
Wisconsin Representative.

DEAR SIR: I admire your stand against mixing this country into any European war. It is the worst thing that could happen to this country. I have overheard conversation between well-educated and well-posted men saying the same, and am sure there is at least 90 percent in this locality that is strictly against convoying ships to England, or any other rash act that may lead us into war.

Yours very truly,

G. K. MONSON.

MEDFORD, WIS., *April 28, 1941.*

Representative B. J. GEHRMANN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We are opposed to sending our ships to convoy materials to England. We believe that our equipment should be kept here to defend America.

During the campaign, President Roosevelt promised to keep this country out of war. We ask that you help him to keep his promise.

Respectfully,

GEORGE T. DUNKEL.

M. L. Benedum, Patriotic American, Speaks His Mind on Present-Day Problems

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

ARTICLE FROM PITTSBURGH (PA.) POST-GAZETTE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I include the following article from the Post-Gazette, of Pittsburgh. The interview is written by a well-known reporter, Ray Sprigle, and gives the fine patriotism and common-sense opinions of a great American, M. L. Benedum. In these trying days it is good to know the thoughts of this industrial leader:

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette of May 3, 1941]

BENEDUM "WILDCATS" AGAIN AT 72 FOR OIL TO EXPEDITE DEFENSE—"LET'S START DRILLING," HE TELLS "HIS BOYS" AFTER 4 MONTHS IN FLORIDA, AND BITS START BORING IN NINE STATES

(By Ray Sprigle, Post-Gazette Staff Writer)

His seventy-second birthday just around the corner, his social security pretty well taken care of by possession of one of the 12 largest fortunes in America, Mike Benedum, the world's No. 1 wildcatter, is on the prowl again.

He came back to Pittsburgh the other day after 4 months in Florida, and his "boys," the officers of the great corporations that make up the far-flung Benedum-Trees oil empire, met him at the station.

Mike, who almost could get past a recruiting officer despite his more than threescore years and ten provided he kept his hat on, listened smilingly to the comments on his coat of Florida tan. But not for long.

"Well, boys, what are we doing now?" he wanted to know. Because to Michael Late Benedum any conversation that doesn't have to do with oil is wasted talk.

"LET'S START DRILLING"

There wasn't a great deal to report. The "boys" hadn't bothered Mr. Benedum much while he was on vacation and development of new production which has been Mike Benedum's guiding light for half a century has been rather at a standstill through the winter.

But Mike had the answer.

"Boys," he suggested, and it was while they were still on the way from station to office, "let's start drilling. Let's iron out any difficulties after the bits are on the way down. But right now, let's drill."

That was 3 weeks ago. Today all the way from Pennsylvania to Texas, across nine States, the drills are on their way down.

Trucks are rumbling along Pennsylvania highways and across Texas plains, laden with casing and tools. Hard-bitten tool dressers

and derrick men are back on the job once more. Geologists and siesmograph crews are exploring new territory. Not only in Pennsylvania and Texas, but in West Virginia, Kentucky, Illinois, Ohio, Kansas, Arkansas, and Louisiana, Mike has No. 1 wells on their way down. And most of them are in wildcat territory.

SEES VAST DEFENSE NEED

The flowing gold that Michael Benedum has hunted and sweated for and frozen for, over three continents for half a century, once more is going into bonaza if he can read the signs right.

Wars are fought on oil these days. And defense and armament programs are built first on steel and then on oil. The way Benedum sees it, these thousands of tanks that are going to roll off the assembly lines soon, and the thousands of airplanes that already are taking to the air, are going to demand millions of gallons of fuel. Tens of thousands of trucks are rolling night and day where only thousands rolled before. More than that, America's millions, back on the job again, are going to burn up not only the road but tankful after tankful of gas.

And if the Nazis ever cut Britain's supply lines to the Mosul fields in Iraq, then America will become the Empire's major oil reservoir. Within a year, Benedum is convinced, the oil industry of the United States will have to go in for all-out production. The nightmare of proration and throttled production is going to become just a memory.

BOOM DAYS FOR OIL SEEN

Boom days for oil are almost here again.

So Mike Benedum is "wildcatting" again.

Not that he's under any illusions as to what's going to happen to his profits, if any. What with an ever-expanding defense program requiring ever-increasing billions of dollars and the likelihood that the United States soon will be at war, Benedum regards it as a certainty that industry can expect a practical moratorium on profits for the next few years at least. And he's perfectly willing to take it.

The American way of life has done pretty well by Michael Late Benedum in the past 50 years, as he's perfectly willing to admit. More than that, he's willing to pay a pretty steep price in order that that way of life may continue. The last war took his only son, Claude, who died in the Army in the "flu" epidemic. It's all right with him, he says, if this war, if it comes, only takes his money.

FREEDOM MOST IMPORTANT

"No man likes to give up the money which he has accumulated through 50 years of hard work and sacrifice," he'll tell you. "But this is a fight for liberty. The country is requiring its youth to give up personal ambition and opportunity. The time may come soon when many of them will be called upon to give their lives. If the rest of us should have to give up every dollar we possess, that's not too high a price to pay to remain free.

"If this country loses the freedom which has made it great, material wealth will be worthless."

That doesn't mean that the man who, on a salary of $75 per month scraped together "between $700 and $800" as he remembers, to start his first oil well and built it into one of the world's great fortunes, is worried about the future—either the country's or his own.

"Too many people are always looking for a chance to sit down and welcome disaster," he says.

"I read history; I've read history all my life. I like it, and I learn from it. In every one of these periods like the present, with the world or a nation uncertain and despairing, men of vision and industry and courage have begun the building of a new and better world, right while the old one is toppling about their ears.

SEES DOOM TO DICTATORS

"That's been especially true of America. And even the world outlook, dark as it is, isn't anything to despair about. Read your history. One would think, to listen to many of our 'best minds,' that totalitarianism is something new. It's as old as the world. Dictators don't last. Alexander, Caesar, Napoleon—all of them had their day. And then they passed. With them passed all that they stood for, and the world went on toward freedom. And the little man in Germany will pass too."

Don't try to talk to Mike Benedum about a changing world that confronts the youth of today. Right away he'll go historical on you.

"Changing world?" he says. "Of course it's a changing world. When hasn't it been a changing world? Who'd want to live in it if it wasn't? Do you think change and progress have stopped or evil will stop? The one thing that hasn't changed is the fact that energy and ambition still pay dividends. With them you can figure out just what you want to do, just where you want to go, and then go out and get what you want and go wherever you want."

OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL

"All this talk about opportunity having come to an end in America, that we have reached maturity, and now are just going to coast along is sheer nonsense. That's old man's talk," he tells his interviewer, or anybody else for that matter, because, after oil, that's Benedum's favorite subject—opportunity for youth.

"Sixty years ago as a lad down in West Virginia I heard solid men in the community lament that the country was coming to the end of its rope. They'd prove it to you. They'd point out that all of the tillable land was already taken up and that there just wasn't any place for a youngster to start.

"But there were other men, not only in West Virginia but all over the United States who didn't have time to worry about the passing of opportunity. They were too busy beginning the development of oil and steel and transportation, getting ready to make America over."

STILL IN MAKING

Well, Benedum ought to know what he's talking about, because in his own field, oil, he's one of the men of the passing generation who helped make this country over. And the point he continually makes is that the country is still in the making, that there are just as many frontiers as there ever was.

And don't try to argue with Mike Benedum that he couldn't do it again, starting today with $800 and, of course, youth. Almost daily he tells his "boys" as they gather for the noonday "family" luncheon at the Duquesne Club that has become a Benedum tradition:

"If only I was young again, with just a job, any kind of a job, and the opportunities I see all around, then I'd show you how to make a real fortune."

Columnists Are Trying To Force the President Into a War That 98 Percent of the People Do Not Want

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, Col. John Thomas Taylor, the legislative director of the American Legion, has been out in Indianapolis, and while there he made the following statement:

> The question of "all aid short of war" is forgotten. It is now a question of when we will get in. Some who should know believe it will be within 30 days. But I have not talked to anyone who believes it will be more than 60 days.

All of us on Capitol Hill know Colonel Taylor, and we esteem him for his fine patriotic motives and his likable qualities, while making some reservation for the fact that his prophecies sometimes fail to click.

If Colonel Taylor had asserted that there is a concerted effort among columnists, interventionists, warmongers, and all of the influences, varied and sundry, that want war, to stampede the President of the United States into getting this country into war within 60 days, or sooner, he would have been hitting right at the truth.

It is perfectly obvious that many columnists, writing for the interventionist press and representing and speaking for interests that for one reason or another want to plunge America into Europe's black and bloody chasm, have turned loose a barrage on the President to force him to get into the conflict. The way these interests have turned against our President, and are now trying to stampede him into taking the last fatal step into war is one of the major scandals of our time.

Knowing the President as I do, his strength of character, his sense of honor, and the value he places on a promise, I cannot believe that he is going to be bulldozed in this manner. I have unshakable faith in the many assurances he gave the people during the campaign pledging his word that American boys will not be sent into foreign wars, climaxed by the following categorical statement which he made at Boston on October 30, 1940:

> And while I am talking to you—fathers and mothers—I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again, and again; your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

And so, while I would agree with Colonel Taylor that there are jittery war bugs and special interests, particularly active along the eastern seaboard, that would like to get us into the war within 60 days, or tomorrow if possible, I would not agree with him that war is quite so close at hand. Despite all the gloomy portents I am placing my dependence on the President's frank and freely expressed promises to the American people.

I do not know to what extent Colonel Taylor mingled with the Indiana folks while he was out there, but if he had taken time to talk with Tom, Dick, and Harry and their fathers and mothers and wives, the people who have to bear the burdens and griefs of war, he may have a message to bring to the authorities at Washington. If he took time to obtain the consensus of public sentiment he undoubtedly learned that while Hoosiers are unanimous and united in favor of building up our national defense to the highest point of perfection, and will spare no expense or gruelling burden laid upon them

for that purpose, the vast majority, I should say 98 percent, or more, of the people of Indiana oppose sending our boys into the war that is raging in Europe, Africa, and Asia, and they believe that we would not do so if we would follow Washington's sound advice, keep our heads, think of America first, and steer clear of foreign entanglements.

Britain Must Not Stand Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I do not necessarily agree with the following editorial, which appeared in the Sun newspapers, of Baltimore, Md., on May 2, but because of the thought-provoking material, I include the comment herewith:

[From the Baltimore Sun of May 2, 1941]

BRITAIN MUST NOT STAND ALONE

The hour of decision is here.

It is plain that the British are being forced back into their island. On the Continent their Allies have fallen in rapid succession before the Nazi's mechanized armies. The remaining independent states—Turkey, Spain, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland—are subject to Nazi whim. In the Mediterranean Gibraltar on the west may be seized and Suez on the east. That sea may become a Nazi lake. Step by step the war machine moves in swift conquest wherever dry land provides a path for its soldiers, overwhelming in numbers, in modern equipment.

As the British are forced back into their island the Nazis intensify their assaults by air and sea. Their mechanized armies have been halted at the English Channel. But from the shoreline of the conquered Continent, their aerial armies seek to bomb into extinction the capacity and the will of the British to resist. They have made the vital port of Plymouth uninhabitable. At sea they unloose swarms of submarines and daily take devastating toll of the shipping upon which the beleaguered island depends for food and arms.

Britain stands alone, and Britain is being crushed and strangled.

This fact presents in ultimate form the question the people of the United States have been compelled to ask themselves again and again: How far shall we support the British people? Shall we go forward? Or shall we, at some stage, withdraw to our own shores and prepare to stand alone against the forces of conquest which are loose in the world?

The United States must answer this question in terms of its own preservation. Shall we more surely safeguard our territories and our institutions against future attack by aiding Britain in full proportion to her rising peril? Or shall we more surely safeguard ourselves by accepting her defeat as inevitable and concentrating our armaments for defense of our own shores? The question for us is not whether the British Empire, as such, shall be protected. That Empire has been, on the whole, an instrument of civilization. The world will be better if it shall endure. But when there has been failure of all measures proposed in calmer days for collective security, when international law is in ruins and anarchy rages, the first duty of this Nation is to guard its own household.

Properly, we believe, this rule has been kept in mind throughout the war. Knowing not only that the British Empire is an instrument of civilization, but also is a friendly nation, we amended our neutrality laws to permit her to purchase supplies in our markets. Yet we drew lines designed to keep war from our door. We sold her destroyers to be used in keeping open her sea lanes. Yet we demanded and received naval and aerial bases for the protection of our own shores. In time, as her resources became depleted, we enacted the lease-lend law to continue the flow of supplies. Yet we maintained lines drawn to guard us against war. These were not ignoble safeguards. It is not ignoble to guard the national household, by actions open and avowed, against the ravages of war.

But now the plight of Britain compels the United States to make final decision, under this very rule of self-preservation, whether we shall go further in aid of the nation who is our friend or whether we shall draw a final line. The time has come when candid men must realize that without greater aid actually delivered Britain will fall. This fact makes it imperative that the United States shall determine once and for all whether our own safety and security will be more surely preserved by protecting Britain or by standing alone on our own soil to face whatever issues the conquering totalitarians may present to us.

The Sunpapers, for their part, say to the administration and to the American people: Go forward in aid of Britain.

This means, in plain language, that we shall take whatever steps may be necessary to assure the delivery of our supplies to the British. Production in this country must be increased. It is not sufficient, despite roseate reports. Direction in Washington needs to be improved. An element of industry needs to be stirred. An element of labor needs to be sobered. But even the present laggard production for Britain will be largely wasted unless we take steps to make certain that our supplies of food and arms are delivered. The great but thinly spread-out British Navy is not adequate to assure delivery of our supplies. We must assume an increasing responsibility. That there are grave dangers in this policy no rational and honest man will deny. But this policy is the one alternative to the greater peril of faltering and standing alone.

It is not for the citizen to settle methods by which this country will assure the delivery of its supplies to Britain. The administration, advised by its diplomatic, military, and naval experts, must choose the methods by which we can most prudently and most effectually assure delivery. It must choose its methods with due regard to all factors in the Atlantic and in the Pacific. But whatever methods the administration shall find to be necessary—whether patrols or convoys or transfer of warships—the line of supplies to the British must be kept open and must be expanded, come what may. It is possible, by appropriate use of our resources, to put food into the stomachs of the British people, to put arms into their hands, to put new courage into their heroic hearts. It is possible to hold Hitler.

Those to whom the obvious dangers of this policy are gravely disturbing cannot shut their eyes to the peril for us in British defeat. They cannot shut their eyes to the political and diplomatic pressure to which the Axis would subject us in Europe, Africa, Asia, and gradually South America. Nor to the economic pressure. Nor, once the British Fleet is gone, to the military and naval pressure. They cannot shut their eyes to a fact which is quite simple and yet is so massive as to be almost inconceivable—the fact that our isolated security of many years is gone and that, if the British are defeated, this peace-loving Nation of 130,000,000 souls will be alone in a world where ruthless conquerors sit astride three continents and soon will be established in a fourth—South America.

There can be no joy in any course that is open to this Nation. Cut the tie with Britain and stand on our own soil or go further to rescue Britain—in either case toil and sweat will surely be our portion and truthful men will not disguise the danger of blood and tears. Behind us, perhaps for a very long time, are the days of aloof and comfortable debate on the good, the better, and the best in our domestic life. Fate looms before us in menace, whatever our course. But there is no escaping Fate by shrinking from it. Rather, it is for us to conduct ourselves in the manner of our fathers, who knew how to grapple with Fate, to master it, to bend it, to mold it in the strong hands of free men.

Britain must not stand alone.

The Middle-Age Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN J. MACIORA

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1941

Mr. MACIORA. Mr. Speaker, National Employment Week, May 4 to 10, will focus attention upon one of our gravest social and economic problems—that of barriers standing in the way of job opportunities for persons of middle age or older.

Federal Security Administrator Paul V. McNutt has analyzed the situation in a statement released May 3, which I commend to your attention. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am including the full text of the Federal Security Agency's announcement.

A great reservoir of skilled labor stands untapped when business and industry fail to take advantage of the experience and competence of workers 40 years of age and older. Administrator McNutt significantly reminds that the average age of World War veterans is 48—an age at which employment opportunity under present conditions is virtually nonexistent.

Because I am convinced there is no necessary relationship between efficiency and age in most occupations today, and because I apprehend that the problem will be greatly exaggerated when the defense program lessens its intensity, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 178, empowering the Secretary of Labor to investigate discriminations against labor on the basis of age, and related subjects.

Your interest in this movement, and your suggestions will help solve this continuing problem which must be solved

before any real advance can be made in the attack upon unemployment in the United States.

The announcement setting out Administrator McNutt's views and objectives follows:

Federal Security Administrator Paul V. McNutt today called upon the 4,500 full- and part-time State employment offices which are coordinated under the United States Employment Service to unite with local war veteran and other civic organizations in finding jobs for workers over 40 during National Employment Week, beginning tomorrow. By Presidential proclamation, signed April 3, the week of May 4 to 10, inclusive, has been designated as National Employment Week.

"In view of the greatly increased demand for workers with certain skills," stated Mr. McNutt, "employers needing help to fill defense contracts should reexamine the qualifications of these older men and women so that valuable workers will not be barred from employment."

"Among workers past 40," Mr. McNutt said, "are many World War veterans; men who now average 48 years of age. As the President has stated, these men have a special appeal to our national sense of responsibility, particularly during this time of national preparedness."

Mr. McNutt stated that men experienced in the field of airplane manufacturing, shipbuilding, and tool and die making are particularly needed at this time. He pointed out that very few young people have had time to acquire the skills necessary to hold down important jobs in these industries. On the other hand, he said, men and women in middle life possess abilities and skills which fit them for employment in many lines of work.

According to Mr. McNutt, it takes about 7 years for a man to become a first-class machinist. During the depression many skilled men working in the metal trades were dropped by employers who no longer had sufficient orders to keep a full staff on the pay roll. But now there is a crying need for just such workers, and it is becoming increasingly difficult to find men with skill and experience in metal trades for jobs in defense industries.

The President has asked all churches, civic organizations, chambers of commerce, boards of trade, veterans' organizations, industry, labor, and the press and radio to cooperate in promoting the employment of workers over 40. Toward this end, Mr. McNutt urged all such workers who are out of jobs to register at the nearest local office of their State employment service if they have not already done so. He particularly urged workers who have skills needed in defense jobs, but who are not using those skills in their present work, to list qualifications with the nearest office of their State employment service. "There must be many skilled workers," Mr. McNutt said, "in the over-40 group—men and women who are now available for jobs in defense industries or who could be made ready after a short period of training."

Workers who have had experience in these crafts but whose skills have become "rusty," can be referred by local State employment offices to "refresher" courses for brushing up on their skills. These same offices will then list them for job openings.

In the aircraft industry, according to Mr. McNutt, the greatest need at present is for sheet-metal workers, woodworkers, and inspectors. Shipbuilding concerns need ship carpenters, loftsmen, boatbuilders, ship fitters, caulkers, and marine machinists. The machinery-manufacturing shops have many openings for tool makers, lathe operators, and boring-mill operators, tool and die designers, and general machinists.

American Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1941

ADDRESS BY J. GORMLEY, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the important angles to the national-defense program is transportation, more particularly as it applies to the railroads. A short time ago Mr. M. J. Gormley, vice president of the Association of American Railroads, delivered an address on railway problems before the Second Annual Western Transportation Conference at the University of Southern California, March 13, 1941. Mr. Gormley's address contains some very interesting and timely factual matter that will be welcomed by the House membership, hence my request to have it incorporated into the RECORD. The address follows:

RAILROAD PROBLEMS OF 1941

I consider it a very great honor to be asked to address the second annual Western Transportation Conference of the College of Commerce and Business Administration of the University of Southern California.

We find that concern has grown up in some quarters as to the preparedness of the railroads to meet the transportation needs of national defense. This is my excuse for repeating so often what I have said on this subject since 1939. It has gotten to be an old story to me, but I am told it is new to many people.

TRANSPORTATION SITUATION IN 1918

In connection with the subject of the preparedness of the railroads to handle the defense traffic load, the question is often asked, How is it possible to avoid control of the railroads by the Government the same as was done in the first World War? What was the real basic cause for the railroads being taken over by the Government during that war and what has taken place since that time that makes it unnecessary for Government control during the present war? The causes leading to Federal control, I believe, were best enumerated by the late Honorable William G. McAdoo, Director General of Railroads, in his annual report for 1918:

"In order to understand the operating problems presenting themselves with the inauguration of Federal control, it will be necessary to recount some of the potent causes producing the serious conditions of congestion which resulted in the railroads being taken over by the Federal Government, and I will enumerate the steps which were taken to overcome them.

"Accumulation of export freight at North Atlantic terminals, which was reflecting itself immediately in an inability to successfully handle domestic freight. There was no coordination of rail and overseas transportation. The accumulation was chiefly disturbing because it was stationary, and frequently comprehended unloading on the ground, to be afterwards loaded upon cars and moved to piers. The lack of coordination between rail lines and the overseas carriers was overcome by the creation of the exports control committee referred to herein, and export freight was brought forward from the interior only when ocean shipping was available.

* * * * * *

"Heavy building operations by different branches of the Government, the contractors for which ordered materials forwarded far in advance of their ability to receive and unload. There was at one time over 5,000 carloads of piling alone for the Hog Island shipyard in excess of its ability to accept.

"On account of the feverish demand for materials of all kinds, manufacturers purchased raw materials from unusual markets in excessive quantities, with the frequent result that arrivals were badly bunched and unloading was slow and difficult. This was particularly true in the heavy manufacturing districts north of the Potomac and east of Pittsburgh.

"The necessity for giving priority to shipments of Government freight and the lack of a central control, even in a single department, to decide upon the degrees of importance in priority. This had resulted in many instances through the insistence of some energetic officer handling a single class of material in a preference movement being given to freight of minor relative importance."

A natural question arises at this point as to what are the changes in the railroad situation, including organization of the railroads, the Army and Navy and shippers generally that will obviate the difficulties that caused Federal control of railroads in the last war.

RAIL IMPROVEMENTS SINCE WORLD WAR

Nine billion five hundred million dollars spent since 1923 for improvements—divided 45 percent for equipment; 55 percent for other facilities of all kinds.

Result of expenditures: 1,146 cars and 17,000 locomotives installed new since 1923; 1,800,000 cars and 40,000 locomotives retired. Seventeen percent increase in capacity of cars; 36 percent increase in capacity of locomotives.

Efficiency in operation: 60 percent increase in train speed; 100 percent increase in tons per train hour; 62,000 cars per week can be loaded now for each 100,000 cars owned, compared with a loading of 42,000 cars per week for each 100,000 serviceable cars owned in 1918; 8,000,000 more carloads loaded in 1929 than in 1918, with a considerable decrease in the ownership of cars and locomotives; $30,000,000 less demurrage collected in 1939 than was collected in 1918, a decrease of 83 percent, with a decrease of only 30 percent in the number of loaded cars; a further indication of more prompt unloading by receivers.

RAILROAD ORGANIZATION EFFECTIVE

The railroads are now thoroughly organized through the Association of American Railroads, which is composed of all the essential trunk lines and a number of the essential short lines. Its headquarters are in Washington. The president of the association is assisted by an executive committee of six railroad chief executives selected from different parts of the country. The bylaws provide that when necessary this executive committee would be in continuous session. It is my belief that the association now has all of the required authority to meet any predictable situation.

The car service division of the association has 13 district organizations with district managers and 13 shippers advisory boards, one in each district. There has been recently added to the car service division a manager in charge of port traffic, with headquarters

in New York, with port transportation committees cooperating with him, and a manager of military transportation located in the office of the Quartermaster General at Washington, to cooperate with the War and Navy Departments and others in the interest of providing transportation and avoiding delays to equipment in the carrying out of the Government construction material movements. The manager of military transportation is also in general charge of troop movements, cooperating with the War and Navy Departments and with the territorial passenger associations of the railroads.

No such organization existed prior to the first World War.

GOVERNMENT REALIZES IMPORTANCE OF AVOIDING DELAYS TO EQUIPMENT

The Army and Navy Departments, through are Army and Navy Munitions Board, are now thoroughly organized and they have adopted a most important regulation which provides that in the shipment of materials for the Government, cars must not be loaded until it is known that they can be unloaded promptly at destination.

The reason we had 5,000 cars of piling under load, delayed waiting unloading during the last war for the construction of the Hog Island Shipyard before the plans had even been completed, was due to lack of proper organization and planning by the Government and the railroads. At one time during the last war the railroads had over 200,000 cars under load for the Government and receivers in general which could not be moved because of inability to unload. The enormity of this mistake can best be understood by stating that this tie-up of equipment eliminated practically 25 percent of the railroad capacity. These defects have been remedied and it is the determination of the Army and Navy and the railroads that they shall not happen again.

SHIPPERS' ADVISORY BOARDS

The 13 advisory boards of shippers have provided a means of cooperation that did not exist during the last war. Let me quote from the report of the car-service division of the Association of American Railroads, dated November 1940 as an example of how this cooperative effort works:

"The annual grain movement always presents the heaviest single boxcar distribution problem. This year unusual aspects of the winter wheat harvest caused unexpected complications. Not for more than a score of years has a crop gotten off to so discouraging a start, due to an extensive and lengthy drought in the Middle West in the fall of 1939. From the first Government report in April until July, the estimated crop jumped 30 percent, and in the area of principal production—Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Texas—production jumped 68 percent. More than half of this increase occurred after June 1. Late rains just before the harvest had a magical effect on production. New high records were established in the receipt of grain at terminal markets. At all terminal markets, through the cooperation of the grain trade, particularly the terminal grain committees sponsored by the shippers' advisory boards and the efficient work of the State grain inspection organizations, the crop was handled without difficulty."

This is another indication of the flexibility of the railroad machine and its ability to satisfactorily cope with emergencies.

PORT TRAFFIC CONTROL

It is well known that the congestion of traffic at the ports in advance of and during the last war was the start of the general congestion that occurred during that period. Having that in mind, it was determined in the fall of 1939 that an organization should be created to prevent such a congestion from recurring. To supervise this a joint committee was formed under the direction of the Maritime Association of New York, the Railroad General Managers' Association, the Association of American Railroads, the steamship operators, and others. The constantly increasing volume of traffic through the ports has been handled without any difficulty and without the necessity for issuance of an embargo to control the movement.

In this connection, let me call your attention to part of an article in the New York Times of March 2, 1941:

"WAR TRAFFIC FAILS TO CONGEST PORT—SURVEY SHOWS NO SUCH FREIGHT TIE-UPS AS OCCURRED IN LAST WORLD CONFLICT—COORDINATING UNITS BUSY—BRITISH SPOKESMAN DENIES THAT CARGOES ARE PILING UP HERE FOR LACK OF SHIPS

"Despite large-scale movements of war supplies to Britain and defense materials for United States military bases, freight traffic through the port of New York is being handled with virtually no congestion, a survey made here yesterday indicated.

"From representatives of the Association of American Railroads, the Port of New York Authority and shipping circles, it was learned that the obstructions that led to tie-ups along hundreds of miles of rail routes during the World War have not been in evidence at any time since the present conflict resulted in an expanded volume of trade here * * *."

TRANSPORTATION OF DEFENSE CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS

The manager of military transportation of the car-service division has been furnished with information as to all contracts made by the War and Navy Departments for construction projects. That information is relayed by him to the field forces of the car-service division. Through cooperation with contractors and others the principle of not loading cars until it is known that they can be unloaded promptly at destination is being carried out. Records show that with projects under way involving an estimated cost of over $1,000,000,000, cars arriving at points of construction have generally been unloaded on the average in less than the free time, or 48 hours.

ESTIMATED TRAFFIC, 1941–42

If there is to be a realistic approach to a problem, it first must be known what the problem really is. We know pretty accurately through the estimates made by the shippers' regional advisory boards what the traffic is expected to be 3 months in advance, but in an emergency of this kind it was thought desirable, if possible, to have a longer-range view of the traffic the railroads will be called upon to handle. Therefore, under the direction of Mr. Ralph Budd, transportation commissioner, the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense, the Bureau of Research and Statistics of the Advisory Defense Commission was asked to analyze the national-defense program and to make an estimate of the transportation requirements of the preparedness program and commercial traffic for the years 1941 and 1942. This estimate was made and was based in part on the estimated national income for those two years. These estimates of tonnage were then analyzed by the Bureau of Railway Economics of the Association of American Railroads and translated into carloads of revenue freight; this for the reason that carloading reports are the most current of railroad statistics and the best single measure for gaging equipment requirements.

FREIGHT-TRAFFIC INCREASE ESTIMATED

The production estimates by the Bureau of Research and Statistics of the Advisory Defense Commission, translated into carloadings by the Bureau of Railway Economics and supplemented by its own calculations for commodities not covered by those estimates, show the following results:

Total carloadings are estimated to be 39,780,237 cars for the year 1941, an increase over 1940 of 3,426,628 carloads, or 9.4 percent. Total carloadings in 1942 are estimated to be 42,493,982 cars, an increase of 2,713,745 cars over 1941, or 6.8 percent.

These estimated loadings mean that there will be about 76 percent as many carloads of freight handled in 1941 as were handled on the average for the years 1926 and 1929. The loading for 1942 is estimated at 81 percent of the loading in 1926 and 1929.

This is the first authoritative estimate coming from Government sources as to the traffic, both defense and commercial, to be expected for the years 1941 and 1942 and provides a reasonably accurate forecast of the future.

FREIGHT-CAR SUPPLY ADEQUATE

What is the car situation for dealing with this estimated transportation load for 1941 and 1942? In the first place, it should be remembered that the railroad plant is never used to its capacity. The nearest approach to capacity utilization occurs only in the peak months of September and October. The railroads, therefore, have no real problem in handling traffic until that season of the year.

It is estimated there will be in service September 1, 1941, not less than 167,000 cars that were not in service September 1, 1939, and of these, according to the figures of today, not less than 140,000 cars will be new since September 1, 1939. There was no difficulty in handling the traffic with a considerable number of surplus cars left over during the peak loading week in October 1939, when 856,000 cars were loaded. With the traffic load estimated by the Bureau of Research and Statistics of the Advisory Defense Commission, there will be a peak in October 1941 of approximately 870,000 cars and in 1942 of approximately 930,000 cars. This is based on the same seasonal fluctuations in the movement of defense materials as there is in the movement of ordinary commercial traffic, a situation which will probably not occur for the reason that defense materials will move without seasonal influence. The 167,000 cars that will be in service September 1, 1941, that were not in service September 1, 1939, will handle 104,398 carloads per week, or 5,428,696 carloads per year.

UNSERVICEABLE CARS LOWEST ON RECORD

We can disregard in these calculations the retirement of old equipment that will occur in the years 1941 and 1942. It is a well-known fact to railroad men that cars retired last year and to be retired in 1941 were of very little, if any, service in 1939 and, no doubt to a considerable extent, were in bad order at that time. We had on September 1, 1939, 224,603 cars in bad order, reduced to 107,182 cars at the present time, and now have the lowest number of bad-order cars on record.

Equipment is constantly wearing out, and new and better equipment is being purchased as the increase in traffic and net earnings justify. For example, 75,000 new cars were put in service in 1937 as a result of the increasing traffic of that year when there was no question of national-defense preparedness in prospect. Railroad plans do and must provide for handling all of the preparedness defense load, whether they get it or not. They do not ask to be relieved of anything by other means of transportation. In other words, they are the only indispensable means of land transportation at any time and under any and all circumstances.

RAILROAD FACILITIES UNLIMITED

I recommend today to writers, economists, and others that they consider transportation on the basis of existing conditions and facts instead of historical precedents. If they do so, they will find that in fact there is no limit to main line, yard, and terminal capacity. All that is required to increase the

capacity to any extent necessary is the addition of equipment and without the additions to other facilities. In other words, railroad capacity today is limited only by the ability of receivers promptly to unload cars and not use them for storage purposes.

The estimate of the Bureau of Research and Statistics of the Advisory Defense Commission, of the traffic load for the years 1941 and 1942 should eliminate the hysteria that is often in existence in times like this as to the traffic load to be moved.

SUBSTITUTION OF COMMON SENSE FOR HYSTERIA

It is extremely important that hysteria on the part of some people in connection with the demand that will be made on the transportation systems for defense preparedness and its possible effect on the movement of the commercial load should be dissipated. There is no real basis for concern as to the capacity of the railroads to handle without difficulty all the transportation created by the preparedness program and without any interference whatever with the movement of commercial traffic.

In this connection I will quote from an illuminating address made by Miss Harriet Elliott, Consumer Commissioner of the National Defense Advisory Commission, made at the National Farm Institute, Des Moines, Iowa, on February 21, 1941, reading as follows:

"Last December there were increases in the price of domestic fuel oil. Some merchants said that this was due to the defense program, others said that it was due to a shortage of tankers to transport the oil from the Gulf of Mexico to New England ports. Upon investigation we found that tanker and storage facilities were adequate to take care of existing demands and that operating costs had not risen. We made this information public and declared that there was no justification for an increase. Two weeks later the price of domestic fuel oil dropped.

"This brings me to another and extremely important phase of the work of the Consumer Division. That of combating misinformation, lack of facts and figures and what we call 'scare' advertising. Any emergency is likely to raise the public's blood pressure. A great many people do a great deal of talking and those who become hysterical get nowhere very fast."

Furthermore, in this same connection, I am quoting from the New York Times issue of March 1, 1941, under the heading "Steel capacity."

"The announcement yesterday by President Roosevelt that the steel-making capacity of the country has been surveyed and found ample to meet the requirements which will be made upon it is welcome news in more than one respect. It provides assurance that the program of national defense and of aid to Britain will not be hampered by deficiencies in this vital material, while at the same time all normal civilian demands can be met. In addition, the announcement should put an end to the demands which were being made by various economic planners for a large expansion of steel capacity."

I say the same thing for railroad capacity. There is on the railroads sufficient reserve capacity to meet expanding needs. They are the only industry in the country that is always in a state of preparedness.

Some concern has been expressed as to what would happen if the Government found it necessary to divert to other service all of the ships engaged in handling intercoastal traffic. We have figured this out and find that all the intercoastal traffic can be moved via the railroads in seven trains a day. In other words, one train per day for each of the railroads serving the Pacific coast eastbound. There would be a lesser number of trains west-bound but some empty cars would have to be moved west-bound by reason of the unbalanced traffic.

RESTRICTIONS ON TRAFFIC UNNECESSARY

As you all know, under the Railroad Administration during the last war, a great many arbitrary restrictions were made effective, such as increase in demurrage rates, arbitrary increase in carloading minimums, and various things of that kind, in the interest of adding to the car supply. We have said many times before, and now wish to reiterate that we believe, under present conditions and under any conditions we can possibly foresee, such restrictions or penalties are now totally unnecessary; and that, by proper cooperation and strict adherence to the principle of not loading cars until it is known that they can be unloaded promptly, there will be no necessity for such restrictions in the future.

I spoke of "proper cooperation." These are important words. As I understand it, cooperation rests upon a clear appreciation of the mutual responsibility of doing a job. Cooperation carries a distinct advantage to all parties. It is a democratic way of doing a job. In other words, it is a working together of human beings for a common end, and the ultimate capacity of human beings cannot be measured by statistics nor brought about by compulsion. Consequently, after many years of experience, it is my belief that embargoes to prevent congestion should be used only as a last resort, and only if and when cooperative control by shippers and receivers with the railroads and the Car Service Division of the Association of American Railroads has failed.

SHIPPERS' COOPERATION

As an example of cooperation by shippers I commend to you the following letter, dated February 28, 1941, from one of the largest shippers of food products in the country. By reason of the extreme modesty of the writer I refrain from disclosing his name or that of the corporation he represents:

"This company requires over 100,000 rail cars to handle its normal annual business.

"Our study indicated that much of our available sidetrack facilities were overburdened with cars carrying our inbound raw materials. This ofttimes delayed loading of our finished products, required by our customers. A detailed study of all inbound raw material cars at each plant indicated this disability could be halved by simply determining that the purchasing departments were following a time-worn custom of specifying, on our orders to suppliers, the phrase 'ship carload minimum weight.'

"We found that, actually, the purchasing departments in many cases had no actual knowledge of what the classification minimum weight was and, sometimes, cared less. When we asked them to change this clause to read 'ship maximum carload weight,' they immediately acquiesced.

"Under this plan we not only will require great many less cars for raw materials but we help ourselves substantially by gaining the added sidetrack facilities required for loading finished products.

"In one case, particularly, we actually had a requisition from one of our plant managers seeking permission to construct a second sidetrack. The above program made this entirely unnecessary.

"The point I want to emphasize here is that both our purchasing agents and plant managers immediately saw benefits to this company under this arrangement and undoubtedly others will find it equally beneficial if they proceed accordingly.

"The second part of our plan called for a review of classification minimums and average actual carloadings on our finished products.

"Here, again, we found many of our customers simply ordering a carload minimum, and the practice has been maintained over such a long period of years that our sales department could easily have taken the position that we just must not approach our customers to increase these requisitions; however, we found no hesitancy whatsoever in the sales department to start a vigorous campaign, through our entire sales organization, selling the idea to our customers that cars eventually would become scarcer, and the best way to insure an adequate supply of food products was to change from a minimum car to a capacity car. This undoubtedly will mean we will have fewer orders from these customers and less sales effort, and less detail for both customer and ourselves.

"The plan is being accepted in quite generous fashion. We have not made the capacity car mandatory as yet, but we have gained permission from the sales department to consolidate minimum cars into full cars and that will help considerably.

"I am glad indeed to assure you of our full cooperation to make this program as successful as possible and, thereby, help by helping ourselves."

Other shippers are doing the same thing but not having written me to that effect I am unable to give them credit as I have in this case. We commend the study of this statement by operating and purchasing officers of railroads.

ELIMINATION OF WASTE IN USE OF EQUIPMENT

In connection with efficient use of equipment, I quote from a recommendation to the railroads made by the vice president of our operations and maintenance department and approved by our board of directors:

"Pull empty cars from industrial sidings with same regularity as the loads are handled.

"Maintain checks on cars loaded with company material to see that they are loaded and unloaded promptly and that cars are loaded to maximum capacity where possible to do so.

"In purchasing standard material, such as spikes, ties, car decking, etc., buy in lots that will give maximum carload for each purchase instead of purchasing more often in units of 15 and 20 tons.

"I am quite sure that if these matters were handled uniformly by all railroads, it would have the effect of making available thousands of additional cars without any increase in cost, and that there would be substantial savings as a result of such action."

We ask shippers to remember that an increase in the lading of 1 ton per car, based on the 1940 traffic, is equivalent to adding 40,000 cars to the car supply. We ask the railroads to remember that a decrease in the turnaround time of cars of 1 day has the effect of adding 100,000 cars to the supply. In combination, therefore, an increase in 1 ton per car in the lading and a reduction of 1 day in the turn-around time is equivalent to adding 140,000 cars to the equipment supply. Certainly this is a challenge to all interested.

I close with the reminder again that there are no bottlenecks in transportation so far as railroads are concerned. They can only be created by a violation of the principle that cars must not be loaded beyond the ability of the receiver to unload promptly. The record up to date in this respect is entirely satisfactory.

Song for "I Am an American" Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. WORTH CLARK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5, 1941

SHOUT! WHEREVER YOU MAY BE, "I AM AN AMERICAN"

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the date of

May 18 has been set aside by President Roosevelt as I Am An American Day. For such an occasion it would appear entirely proper that a song—I may say a very good song—should be given recognition. Probably the Members of the Senate have heard and have sung during the past few months the song to which I refer, it is Shout! Wherever You May Be, "I Am an American." I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the words of this song.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOUT! WHEREVER YOU MAY BE "I AM AN AMERICAN"

On the street, in the home,
In a crowd, or alone,
Shout! Wherever you may be,
I am an American.
I am, from the heart of me.

Rich or poor, young and old,
Let this message be told,
Shout! Wherever you may be,
I am an American.
I'm proud of my liberty.

In the fact'ry, in the mill,
Thru each valley, from each hill,
Raise your voice and give America a thrill!
On the farms, in the schools,
Let's have one set of rules,
Shout! Wherever you may be,
I am an American.
I am, every part of me.

From Alaska's snowy peaks,
To the Southland's muddy creeks,
Listen in, because America now speaks!
On the farms, in the schools,
Let's have one set of rules,
Shout! Wherever you may be,
I am an American.
I am, ev'ry part of me.

Broadcasting Regulations of Federal Communications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 6 (legislative day of Monday, May 5), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON EVENING STAR AND AN ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in last night's Evening Star on the subject of regulating radio and also an article by David Lawrence, on the same subject, appearing in the same issue.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 5, 1941]

REGULATING RADIO

Serious legal issues, as well as questions affecting sound business practice, are raised by the new radio regulations which have been approved by the Federal Communications Commission.

In promulgating the new rules, five members of the Commission, with two dissenting, assert what is in effect an almost unlimited authority to regulate the radio industry. But the Federal Communications Act, from which the Commission derives its powers, contains no specific authority for doing any of the things which the Commission seeks to accomplish through the issuance of the regulations. Some color of justification may be found in the so-called public interest clause of the act, but if, under the vague authorization, the Commission, by bringing its licensing powers into play, can impose its will on the radio industry to the extent envisioned by the new rules, then it would seem that it is subject to no real restraint under the statute.

If the Commission, for example, can forbid the making of radio contracts for more than 1 year on the assumption that this is in the public interest, and can enforce this decree by refusing to issue licenses to noncomplying stations, where does its power end? Taking an extreme hypothetical situation for purposes of illustration, what is there to prevent a majority of the Commission from concluding that it is in the public interest to ban political speeches from the air and enforcing a regulation to that end by the threat to withhold licenses?

From the standpoint of sound business practice, the new rules also seem to be of dubious validity, although this is a matter concerning which hasty judgments are apt to be worthless. But, having due regard for this consideration, there seems to be no doubt that the Commission's action is designed to replace a system of national broadcasting which has given good service with a vaguely defined new set-up which may or may not prove more desirable. The Commission obviously is motivated by the belief that greater competition in the radio industry is to be desired, but it may be wondered whether it has given adequate consideration to the possibly destructive effects of the kind of competitive activities which would be fostered by the new regulations.

If the present system is broken down, what assurance is there that the good programs will not gravitate to the better stations to the obvious disadvantage of their smaller competitors? If a broadened field of competition is its objective, how does the Commission propose to insure that the less desirable stations, from an advertising standpoint, will get enough business to keep going? And, having the public interest in mind, what is to happen to the excellent sustaining programs which have been built up under the existing system?

These, with other questions raised by the new regulations, go to the very heart of the discussion which has revolved around the proper function of administrative agencies. Decisions of the present majority of the Supreme Court on the whole have tended to widen the field and broaden the powers of these agencies, and if it is shown that the resultant extension of their activities is more harmful than beneficial, it seems obvious that the remedy lies with the Congress, which created them.

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 5, 1941]

F. C. C. RULE HELD BLOW AT LIBERTY—BROADCAST ORDER SEEN PRELUDE TO UNITED STATES OWNERSHIP

(By David Lawrence)

One by one the precious liberties of the American people are being taken from them by a Fascist-minded bureaucracy in Washington. Last week the Supreme Court, ignoring the plain words of the law, took away from employers the right to hire whom they please. Now this week the Federal Communications Commission has issued an order which virtually destroys the freedom of radio.

The latest decree, which has no sanction in law and runs counter to the plain words of a decision of the Supreme Court, in effect, orders the destruction of the American system of broadcasting as the people of the United States have known it for the last 12 years.

Without public hearing the F. C. C. has given more than 400 broadcasting stations only 90 days completely to reconstruct their entire system of programs and business relationships to the national networks. Virtually all broadcasting stations, and particularly those which have licenses up for early renewal, now have a pistol at their foreheads—either they comply or their licenses will be revoked.

The decision, which was 5 to 2, reveals the minority as saying that the new decree will mean anarchy and chaos in the whole broadcasting business.

If there is constitutional authority for a governmental commission to destroy freedom of the air in broadcasting overnight, there will easily be found authority to destroy freedom of the press, too. Already the F. C. C. has arrogated to itself the right to say who shall run broadcasting stations, setting up a discrimination between citizens which has not the semblance of authority in either the law or the Constitution.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP SEEN

The ostensible object of the new decree is to get rid of alleged monopoly, but that is merely an excuse. The real purpose is to impoverish and demoralize the radio business so that the Government may take it over. Strong advocates of Government ownership constitute the Commission's majority personnel.

Congress alone can save the liberties of the people by prompt action. When the members of a Government agency become arbitrary and completely defy the courts and the law, Congress can, if it desires, pass a joint resolution staying the hand of the Commission at least until a thorough congressional investigation is made of the whole affair. Such a resolution, incidentally, could amend the radio law so as to require that members of the F. C. C. hereafter shall not hold office longer than 1 year. If, as the commission now orders, the relationships between stations and networks cannot be made for longer than a year, then the vast power over the broadcasting business which the F. C. C. usurps can best be controlled by the people in their own interest by making it necessary for all commissioners to come up for renomination and confirmation by the Senate once a year.

COURT'S RULING

The Supreme Court in very explicit language has said that the radio act does not give the Communications Commission power to regulate the business of broadcasting, but only to issue or revoke licenses and allocate wave lengths so as to avoid mechanical conflicts. If there is monopoly or unfair competition or unfair trade practices, the Congress has provided antitrust laws and has created the Federal Trade Commission with which to tackle such problems. Nothing in the statute gives the F. C. C. power to set itself up as a miniature Department of Justice or Federal Trade Commission. If this were so then any governmental agency could usurp such powers and carry on inquisitions and persecutions.

But the era of administrative absolution is here. While the American people have their eyes focused on the headlines of Europe, a game of sabotage is going on here which has even deceived the slumbering Members of Congress. The New Dealers, have from the first considered the State as the only instrument which can determine

what is good for the citizen. The theory of private initiative and free enterprise has been dealt blow after blow by bureaucrats who are almost as much sold on Government ownership and national socialism as if they lived in Berlin.

ENCROACHMENTS OF GOVERNMENT

The American people have enjoyed radio. Programs giving the finest opera music and the best plays together with educational and religious broadcasts have made American radio superior to anything else in the world. Now all this is to be stricken down because the system of revenues to pay the expenses of such entertainment is to be broken up by capricious-minded officialdom.

Both the National Broadcasting Co. and the Columbia Broadcasting System have made vigorous protest and doubtless the owners and managers of the hundreds of individual radio stations affected will make themselves heard, too, in opposition to the Commission's demoralizing order.

This destructive action, however, is just one of a series of steps by which governmental commissions are encroaching on the rights of the people, and not on just one business. It is one of the means whereby totalitarianism is imposed under the guise of law and regulatory order. Usurpation of power without check or hindrance leads to more and more abuse. With freedom of the radio gone, the next step will be limitations on freedom of the press and then freedom of speech. At a time when national unity is so important, it is incredible that the bureaucrats would be so bold, but with an acquiescent or indifferent Congress, the people can lose their liberties rapidly. It will be interesting to see whether Congress rises to the challenge laid at its doorstep by the five bureaucrats in the Federal Communications Commission.

Draft Incongruities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 6 (legislative day of Monday, May 5), 1941

ARTICLE BY JAY G. HAYDEN

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news article written by Mr. Jay G. Hayden, published in the Providence Journal of May 5, 1941.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence (R. I.) Journal of May 5, 1941]

DRAFT INCONGRUITIES GIVE FEDERAL OFFICIALS JITTERS—ADMINISTRATION SQUIRMS BUT IS IN TERROR OF INQUIRY SURE TO FOLLOW REQUEST FOR CHANCES; ARMY COMMAND WOULD DROP AGE LIMIT TO 18

(By Jay G. Hayden)

WASHINGTON, May 4.—Almost every day there is some new indication that the administration is squirming under the incongruities of its selective service army recruiting system, but that it is in mortal terror of the congressional investigation which a request for corrective legislation certainly would entail.

A little more than a month ago Brig. Gen. Louis B. Hershey, acting director of selective service, appeared before the Senate Military Committee to oppose a bill, offered by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, to exempt medical students from the draft until they have completed their college courses. Within the week General Hershey argued against blanket deferment of physicians and medical students on the ground that once the business of releasing army eligibles in groups was begun there would be no end to the business.

But on Saturday General Hershey issued an order instructing all local draft boards to grant deferment to practicing physicians and to medical students and interns "who give reasonable promise of becoming acceptable medical doctors."

MORE DRASTIC RULING EXPECTED

It is authoritatively reported that a far more drastic exemption is in the works—that General Hershey within a few days will tell the draft boards to take only unmarried men under 26 years old, thus deferring at one stroke the whole 26 to 36 age group.

What the Army high command would like to have done is to drop the age of compulsory trainees to 18 and release everybody over 23. Speaker SAM RAYBURN announced last week that the latter plan was under serious consideration and that it might include permission for each draftee to pick his own 12 months for Army training, any time within the 18 to 23 age span.

The difficulty is a change that would take in persons outside the present statutory 21 to 35 age limits would necessitate bearding the congressional terror. Hence, the search for some makeshift that can be done by Executive order. The fear is that if Congress once gets its hands on the situation it may upset the whole Selective Service apple cart.

The crux of the dilemma from which the administration is attempting to escape is that the draft law vastly overemphasized the need for a mass Army, and this at the expense of personnel requirements of the national-defense program, which now are looming as much more acute. Something like 10 times the money and organizational energy, for example, is being expended in the quest of an Army which can neither be equipped nor housed as things stand than is going into the recruiting and training of the much more vitally needed skilled workers for airplane plants and shipyards.

SIXTEEN MILLION ON ANXIOUS SEAT

Added to this is the circumstance that for something less than 250,000 men so far supplied to the Army by the conscription method, 16,000,000 eligibles have been placed on the anxious seat. It is impossible to measure the slump in productive efficiency draft worry has occasioned, but O. P. M. officials believe this is a considerable adverse factor.

The selective-service bureaucracy, including 6,200 local boards each with a complement of clerks, medical examiners, etc., is costing more than $20,000,000 a year to maintain. Assuming the maximum annual quota of 800,000, each of these boards would be called on for an average of less than three draftees a week; actually, the average per board so far has been nearer to one draftee a week. The reasons for this slack business, of course, are: First, the great number of voluntary enlistments and, second, the shortage of housing and equipment.

Certainly it is true that if the same great recruiting organization, devoted to providing an Army, had been set up at the same time last summer to recruit and train skilled airplane makers and shipbuilders, the crucial industrial preparedness program would be much further advanced than it is today.

THE YOUNGER, THE LESS WASTE

Col. Harry C. Kramer, executive officer of the World War draft and author of the present draft law, was the first to point out its unfitness for the purpose of creating an Army Reserve reservoir, for which it now is being used. Colonel Kramer's fundamental contention is that the older the trainees the more rapidly they evaporate because of marriage, physical deterioration, and other causes. Six percent of the men are married at 19, and less than 20 percent at 21, but 50 percent are married at 25 and 80 percent at 35.

Hence Kramer argues that the younger the men are trained the less waste. The present draft law, he says, would be ideal if the need was for a huge land army to man trenches as quickly as possible, but it is ridiculous from the standpoint of training men for use in a highly indefinite future.

The situation recalls a speech made by the late Senator Knute Nelson, of Minnesota, himself a Civil War veteran, at the time the World War draft law was under consideration. Arguing for 18 as the minimum age, Nelson declared that "over half of the Army we had during the Civil War consisted of boys of 18." Specifically, Nelson said, "There were 104,987 who were 15 years old; there were 231,051 who were 16 years old; there were 844,981 who were 17 years old; there were 1,158,438 who were 18 years old. Of those 22 years of age, there were only 618,555; aged 25, there were only 46,626; aged 44, there were only 16,071.

"The oldest man we had in the company in which I served was an Englishman who was 35 years old—only 35—and yet he was so much older than the rest of us that we called him Old Dad."

The Triumph of Mind Over Matter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 6 (legislative day of Monday, May 5), 1941

ARTICLE BY STUART CHASE

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Stuart Chase, appearing in the May 3 issue of The Progressive, entitled "The Triumph of Mind Over Matter."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Progressive of May 3, 1941]

THE TRIUMPH OF MIND OVER MATTER

(By Stuart Chase)

A recent letter to the New York Times carried this stirring sentiment: "The person who permits the thought, or voices the opinion, that we are too late, or that Britain will fall, is double a deserter in this battle for freedom."

As I write, the aid we dispatched to Yugoslavia is about 6 weeks too late, and Britian is falling out of Libya and Greece at an alarming rate. According to the Times' cor-

respondent this is error, to be driven from the mind, lest the thinker desert freedom. I am going to work on it, for I have a high regard for certain kinds of freedom, but I cannot guarantee success. Work as I may, I have a leaky mind into which facts occasionally penetrate. Then I have the devil's own time chasing them out again.

SOME FIRM CONVICTIONS

As a nation we certainly cannot be accused of not trying to become fact proof. Neither can many of our radio commentators and military experts. We have scored practically a 100 percent performance in holding the right thought right down the line since the war began. Most of us can point proudly to the following firm convictions:

That the Poles are hardy fighters. General Mud, furthermore, is coming to their aid. They may not have the equipment but they have the spirit, and it is the spirit which wins.

That the Germans missed the bus in their attempted invasion of Norway. Hitler has made a ghastly miscalculation. God help the Nazis as the British Fleet drives into the Skagerrak!

That the fortifications on the Belgian frontier are many times stronger than in 1914. No army can take them except at a prohibitive cost.

That the Dutch will open the dikes and drown the gray-green hordes.

That the Maginot line is impregnable.

That German soldiers have a slave psychology and cannot stand up against free men.

That Weygand is coming from Syria! He is flying over the front in Flanders! He sees the narrow corridor the panzer divisions have driven through to the Channel ports. He will attack and seal the corridor, and that will be the end of Hitler's rash adventure.

That the retreat from Dunkirk turned defeat into deathless victory.

That the French Army is the finest in the world.

That Allied money and resources will crush Germany. Her children will starve. Her people will revolt.

That Hitler did not invade Britain after the fall of France—and so another deathless victory.

That sea power will beat land power every time. Admiral Mahan said so in 1890. Walter Lippmann says so now, and it must be true.

That General Wavell has liquidated the Italians in Africa.

That the Greeks will drive the Italians into the Ionian Sea.

That Turkey will fight if Hitler invades Bulgaria. Ah, what hardy fighters those tough Turks are!

That Hitler has made a ghastly miscalculation in the Balkans. He must now fight a dreaded two-front war. A blitzkrieg is impossible in the mountains. Ah, what hardy fighters those Yugoslavs are!

That the British have new secret weapons; they have solved the problem of defense against night bombing.

That Russia will back up Turkey. Russia will back up Rumania. Russia will back up China. Russia will back up anybody.

That Japan is hopelessly bogged down in China. The guerrillas are making her task impossible. Japan grows weaker every day.

That $7,000,000,000 in paper money for loans and leases have Hitler stopped in his tracks.

That if Hitler cannot win this year, he can never win. He cannot win this year, so he can never win.

OUR GRIP IS STILL FIRM

These right thoughts we have conscientiously held, one after another, for almost 2 years, and on some of them we still have a good firm grip. The fact that most of them have turned out to be completely mistaken has not discouraged us in the least. Tomorrow, over the air, our favorite commentator will have a bright and lovely new thought for us to hold.

I, too, held thoughts like these, tenderly and against all evidence to the contrary, until France capitulated. That was a fact so gigantic that I could not gallop my mind around it. It plainly marked the end of the balance of power formula by which Britain had dominated Europe for 300 years.

Since then I have seen one earnest popular conviction after another blow up in our faces. I am beginning to wonder if these exercises in metaphysics are, after all, the best method for serving the cause of freedom.

MOONBEAM CHASING VERSUS BRUTE FACT

By the cause of freedom I mean the national interest of the United States. I realize that this is dangerously definite, but, after all, I really care about the United States, and I am not quite sure what freedom in general refers to.

Is the freedom of America to defend its territories and preserve its way of life really helped by devoutly believing things which are not so? How well can a nation of moonbeam chasers stand up against a combination of the most hard-boiled dealers in brute fact the world has ever seen?

I refer to the German and Japanese strategists. They win their victories by the most painstaking regard for military, political, and economic facts. When German diplomacy broke down in Yugoslavia the panzer divisions were right there to march into the breach. Panzer divisions are not invincible. They can be licked. But to lick them, is it not essential to face realities 24 hours a day, with no excursions into never-never land? Ask General Wavell.

A PLAN SHOULD BE READY

We want to see Hitler beaten so badly that almost any half-truth, any rumor, is mentally converted into full-fledged proof of his approaching downfall. Nothing could be more dangerous as a national policy. It is like going into the ring convinced that one can readily handle Joe Louis because he belongs to an "inferior" race. The next thing one knows the interne is shaking his thermometer in the ambulance.

It is said on all sides that sooner or later a show-down must come between the United States and the Axis. In one form or another, either military or economic, or both, I believe that statement to be true. The most probable real battleground will be South America. What kind of a battle shall we put up if we rely on right thoughts to direct our strategy?

If we refuse to believe that Britain can fall, and all our plans are geared to that end, will there be enough trees in the country up which we can climb if Britain does fall? Britain may hold out, and I hope she does, but I should like to have a plan ready in case the worst happens. A man, or a nation, is a fool not to prepare for the worst in the reeling world of 1941.

IF THIS BE TREASON

One of the right thoughts we have been told to hold is that Britain is our first line of defense. We are told little about our second and third lines. After Britain, the blue ocean—and then what? Citizens are entitled to know.

Suppose we send England not only aid—which she certainly rates—but the works? Suppose we give her the best of the Navy, the air force, all the antiaircraft guns in the place? We send them because we know in our secret hearts she cannot fail, so why not? Then something slips. Perhaps God nods. This gives the Axis a nice kitty with which to commence operations further to the west.

A dozen battleships, 200 destroyers, a thousand flying fortresses—a very nice kitty indeed. The Navy will not permit such a thing. Of course, no naval officer in his senses would dream of it. But this is exactly the kind of footless action which a policy of holding the right thought leads to.

I for one am getting pretty tired of banking all our spiritual capital in Europe, and permitting no thought that our treasure is anything but safe. One calm look at the military and economic situation makes it all too clear that it is not safe. It is in the most devastating danger. We need most of it right here in this hemisphere, ready for whatever storms may come.

If this be treason, make the most of it.

Resolution of Sons of the Revolution in the State of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1941

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas the preamble to the constitution of the Sons of the Revolution in the State of New York recites as one of the objects of the society "to inculcate in the community in general respect for the principles for which the patriots of the Revolution contended";

Whereas the Axis Powers are by their philosophy and actions endeavoring to destroy individual liberty which was one of the primary principles of the patriots;

Whereas it is demonstrated that the sentiment of the people of this Nation is overwhelmingly in favor of defeat for the Axis Powers;

Whereas this sentiment has recently been implemented by the passage by the Congress of the so-called lend-lease law;

Whereas the effectuating of the above-named law depends on the labor of the people of this Nation—either direct or in taxes; and

Whereas the sentiment, implemented by law, effectuated by taxes and the sweat of American labor will be impossible of accomplishment unless the matériel manufactured here, in the "Arsenal of Democracy" reach those for whom they are the tools to finish the job"; Be it

Resolved by the board of managers of the Sons of the Revolution in the State of New York, That the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States of America be empowered by the Congress to use any and every and the best means available, or to become available, to insure the prompt, continued, and uninterrupted delivery to the struggling people abroad of the matériel destined for them; and be it further

Resolved, That it is our considered judgment that while this may not effectively keep America out of the war, it is the only method left by which the war may be kept out of America; and be it further

Resolved, That the widest possible publicity be given to this resolution, that copies be sent to the President of the United States, the Members of the Congress, the other State Societies of the Sons of the Revolution, to representative patriotic societies in the city of New York, and to the membership of our own society.

Production and Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 6 (legislative day of Monday, May 5), 1941

ADDRESS BY WHEELER McMILLEN BEFORE SEVENTH ANNUAL CHEMURGIC CONFERENCE

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Wheeler McMillen, president of the National Farm Chemurgic Council and editor in chief of the Farm Journal and Farmer's Wife, before the Seventh Annual Chemurgic Conference at the Hotel Stevens, Chicago, Ill., March 26, 1941, and entitled "Production and Patriotism."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRODUCTION AND PATRIOTISM

WE WANT TO KEEP OUR AMERICA

(By Wheeler McMillen, president, National Farm Chemurgic Council, and editor in chief, Farm Journal and Farmer's Wife)

The United States—our Constitution, our riches of freedom, our wealth of natural and created resources, the farms and enterprises and institutions that flourish under our flag, the soil from which we have grown, and the ways of life that are ours—these we cherish. Today we affirm our patriotism with an understanding more clear-minded than ever before in our time.

We want to keep our America. Living and dynamic, it is still in process of creation. Not only do we want to keep it, but we want to keep on creating it.

We know the way. The way is to produce. Production built the Nation great, and only production can either preserve or advance our country.

At this present interval the task of defense demands vastly increased domestic production in order that every military and civilian need may be safely and continuously supplied.

Should the needless tragedy of war engulf our people, the ultimate effort in production will be desperately required throughout the conflict.

The after-era following defense or war, whatever the eventual shape of the world, will present conditions from which the only rescue will be production balanced to create jobs as well as goods.

Were there no need for defense, were there no impending catastrophe of war, the already monumental burden of national debt would admit but one possible solution, and that is the production of enough income to make its payment possible.

Leave out war, defense, debt, and future depression—even then the needs and desires of the economically less fortunate in our population would imperiously demand that there be more and more production. Their chance to earn comes only when production makes jobs for them.

Today we open the Seventh Annual Conference of Agriculture, Industry, and Science. The theme of our meeting is "Chemurgy in Defense—and Beyond."

Chemurgy is a doctrine of production. Chemurgy's philosophy seeks that every American may produce, earn, and consume more. The spiral of prosperity is production, jobs, earning power, consumption, more jobs, more earning, more buying. The spiral starts wherever new earning power can be initiated.

So the effort of our economy should be directed toward enabling our own people to earn more buying power. You can't import jobs.

Our 132,000,000 people can absorb fabulous quantities of goods. Few, indeed, are those who have reached the ceiling of consumption—who have bought everything they want.

Neither have Americans approached the ceiling of production. We may not even be in the basement.

A dramatic illustration of how science will expand America's power to produce can be taken from within the membership of this organization.

At the California Institute of Technology, a member of our board of governors, Dr. Robert A. Millikan, is installing a new 200-inch telescope. This instrument will penetrate space for a distance of 1,000,000,000 light-years—twice the present maximum. The scope of space which it will permit to be examined will be multiplied by eight; eight times as much of the universe will be seen as is now within the reach of human knowledge. So great will be the power of this instrument that if the Stevens Hotel were located on the moon instead of here on Michigan Avenue, it could still be seen.

On this program Friday morning, another member of our board of governors, Mr. Howard R. Huston, has promised to describe the first commercial electron microscope, now in use in the laboratories of his company. A mild glimpse toward the vast new universes of knowledge this instrument will open may be had by a comparison. The most powerful of present optical microscopes might enlarge the appearance of a human hair to the thickness of your wrist. The electron microscope would give it a diameter of 40 feet, or greater than the width of most city streets. The behavior of bacteria, the character of cellular and molecular structure, will become known far more intimately.

The historian who writes in 2041 may very likely put down that the great events of the 1940's were not international wars, but the first use of these two instruments for the multiplication of man's seeing power. From these new realms of knowledge will come wholly new forms of goods for human use. Lower cost methods and greater durability will permit more people to enjoy more things. Wastes from ignorance and disease will be lessened. Surely no one can doubt the power of the United States, if freedom of initiative is preserved, to continue its history of heightening human well-being.

The immediate prospect is darkened by the hideous shadow of war. Wars are made by politicians and plunderers. The fruits of war are misery and poverty and taxation, eaten in the bitter sauces of hatred and moral disintegration. The earth is growing poorer with each day of destruction. International thinkers and international politicians now want to intensify the destruction. They would force Americans to exchange what could well be our impregnable security for a share in the world's blood, hate, misery, and debt. They may succeed. Some of us are marking down their names, one by one, in our books of memory.

Wars may consume the accumulated tokens of wealth, they may destroy incredible tonnages of material, they may blow out the brains and shed the lifeblood of our ablest youth. We have to deplore the setbacks from war at a time when science and industry and agriculture have prepared new advances in well-being.

But after war comes reconstruction—building up after the destruction. Unless the savagery goes on endlessly, there will still be some soil. There will be sun and rain and atmosphere. We may hope to preserve the skills and sciences. With these and with earnest labor we can rebuild the American dream—provided only that politicians do not entangle us too deeply in the snarls of internationalism, and provided that the one galvanic generator of productivity remains—individual human freedom. Free Americans can outproduce totalitarian slaves.

A foremost danger is that internationalist thinking will tend to center attention on fifth-rate markets in other continents to the neglect of the world's one first-rate market here in North America.

The Government, industrialists, bankers, and traders have spent, lent, and given enormous sums to make sales in the Orient, the Antipodes, and in the faded markets of decadent Europe. Even while they are being tempted by the orchids of the Tropics, the home orchards are full of golden fruit. One American making $4 a day is a better and easier prospect than any 10 coolies or peons each earning 40 cents a day.

On the farms alone of the United States there awaits a hungry reservoir of needs. Once amply energized with buying power, the already voracious rural market will perform incredible feats of consumption.

The United States census counts more than 6,000,000 farms. Half of these earn nearly nine-tenths (89 percent) of the whole national farm income. These 3,000,000 produce by far the most, and therefore earn the most. Chemurgy's assignment is to enlarge the opportunity for all the 6,000,000 farms to produce profitably. The way to accomplish that is to enable farmers to produce every possible one of the agricultural items Americans consume, and beyond that to discover opportunities for farmers to produce new things, and further to find markets for the agricultural wastes.

Almost everyone agrees that $9,000,000,000 is not a fair income for agriculture. For years groups of farmers have been demanding that the Government guarantee parity. Parity, as defined, is a movable figure, a complex sort of mathematical will-o'-the-wisp, compounded on the relationship between what farmers bought and sold 30 years ago when it is assumed they got an even trade in the exchange of goods. If parity had been reached last year, the national farm income would have been around eleven and one-fourth billions.

The goal of parity is insufficient and inadequate. The services of farmers are certainly no less valuable and vital than a cross-section of other services.

The 1940 national income was $70,000,000,000. The 32,000,000 farmers were 25 percent of the people. A fair goal, it seems to me, would have been 25 percent of the national income, or seventeen and one-half billion dollars.

I might easily draw an enticing picture of the jobs that would make and of the flood of industrial goods that would move from factory to farm were the agricultural income raised by any substantial figure. More pertinent is how the income can be increased.

Most observers have long recognized the basic trouble in agriculture. Too much has to be sold in a buyer's rather than in a seller's market. Whenever supply and demand relations result in a seller's market the situation expresses itself in good farm prices.

Chemurgy's constant search is for new markets, new buyers. That's the urge in chemurgy. The percentage need not be large to swing a situation over to the seller's advantage. We have seen the expansion of soybean uses exert that effect. Several million acres grow soybeans which are in larger demand than the corn and oats that otherwise would have occupied the same acres. A lower-priced product is replaced with a higher-priced one. A domestic product moves into uses formerly filled by imported materials. More than 15 percent of the soybeans

are turned to nonfood uses, enough to help make the markets. The growers have more money than if the new crop had not appeared. That is chemurgy in action.

No crop situation is more difficult than that of cotton. No crop is so definitely faced with a buyer's market. Has chemurgy anything to contribute?

Ordinarily, some 12,000,000 bales are grown. From eight to ten million bales can be consumed domestically. The problem is either to find buyers for the 4,000,000 bales or to find something more profitable for the growers to raise. The export market is about gone; in the long run a blessing may be seen in the disappearance of a market that forever restricted the price to what a coolie in Peking or Penang could pay for his shirt. The process of finding new uses may add a little to the much-too-small dent it has so far made in cotton supplies.

But are southern farmers able to grow nothing else than cotton? If they grew all the vegetable oils now imported, a greater acreage would be required than is occupied by the excess portion of cotton. They cannot immediately grow all of the 2,000,000,000-pound oil imports, but we know they can grow some. For their cottonseed and peanut oils, chemistry finds added uses. They can grow castor beans for drying oils, and chemurgy hopes soon to see that crop on a sound domestic basis. We know that perilla grows wild in the South and therefore wonder why it can't be grown tame.

Sweetpotatoes grown there can be made into starch to replace the three to four hundred million pounds of imports. Woodpulp and paper manufactured there will add further opportunities. The utilization of southern wood products, as well as northern, is steadily opening into a variety of new markets. More sugar would immediately be grown, both in the South and in the beet areas, if restrictions against earning by farmers were removed. And on this program tomorrow we shall hear that cotton itself can be grown to industrial specifications so as to bring a premium in a seller's market instead of a loss in a buyer's market. Has chemurgy anything to offer toward the cotton problem? All it asks is a chance.

The export crops are the headaches of agriculture because they constantly struggle for outlets in buyer's markets. What then could be plainer common sense than to make the utmost effort to bring new crops to enough acreage that the competition will be among buyers for the product instead of among sellers for the market?

That is a basic part of chemurgy's program. New crops for existing or new markets, new uses and markets for the old crops, and profitable uses for those portions of production—stalks and straw, culls and byproducts—that now bring little or nothing.

Now, when defense is an uppermost thought, is a favorable time to push new crop research and trial. The national defense will be imperfect and incomplete until every single item of either military or civilian need can be produced at some price and in some place within our borders or very nearby. You can't defend the United States with imports.

This phase of defense is being neglected almost wholly by our Government. Already shortages in drying oils, in certain essential oils and herb products, are apparent. Your Council is doing all it can in these situations. One small result has been contracts between users and farmers for some hundreds of acres of formerly imported products. Industrial laboratories, working with the spirit of chemurgy, are heping to meet the drying-oil and other situations.

The great defense task of the years ahead is economic. Against the combined assaults of world-wide depression, poverty-stricken producers abroad, and tax collectors at home, we shall have to defend American jobs, American farmers, American business, and the American standard of living. The time to begin on that task is now. The one possible insurance against the foreseeable disasters of that era is to take every possible step toward increasing the profits of farmers. When the slump comes we dare not depend on foreign markets. There won't be any that are permanent.

Industry's one real hope then will be the American farm market. If the one-fourth of America that farms is then prosperous, the other one-fourth which depends directly on farm earnings will also be prosperous. Thus half of America will be in shape to consume the products and services that sustain the other half.

I see no other feasible insurance against the depression everyone anticipates. If anyone can offer something more practicable, he should be heard.

Only one school of thought objects to chemurgy's program. This is the school of internationalism. This badly educated school has never learned the fundamental principle that production has another function than the mere supply of goods. A highly necessary purpose of production is to supply consuming power to the producer.

The internationalists contend that goods should be imported from wherever they can be obtained most cheaply. They fail to take into account that buying power must be produced in the United States.

What would be the consequence if, when the wars are over and the munitions machines turn to other tasks, the United States were to follow that policy to its ultimate absurdity? Conceivably somewhere in Europe automobiles, plastics, and steel and farm implements may then be made more cheaply than here, so we buy them from Europe. Industrial Asia may be sending radios, ceramics, textiles, electrical items, and a multitude of products of the two-dime-a-day labor of the Orient. The whole earth will have bargains then to pour into America's market. Would not the logical result approach extinction of the purchasing power of our people?

If carried to the extreme such a policy would leave Americans unable to buy either from each other or from other countries. As long as we have unemployed acres and unemployed men, our policy should be to give our own people preference at every opportunity for production. The exporters, importers, shipping interests, and bankers would be wise indeed, if they would look at the records which show that the years when their business is most active are the years when domestic prosperity is highest. The internationalist trade doctrine of giving away American earning power is evil nonsense, of about the same compound as the curious internationalist political doctrine that foreign trade is an instrument for the promotion of peace. Full productivity and prosperity at home provide the soundest base for rational expansion of our trade with other nations.

Chemurgy is forthrightly nationalistic. Ideas, however, respect no international boundaries. Chemurgy is not only good for the United States, but it is good for any other nation which follows its philosophy of full development for all productive agricultural resources. On this occasion I would like particularly to extend a hand of fellowship to our friends the chemurgists of Canada, our best neighbors, who have organized their own council and to whom all our material is available. The literature of the Council goes to members in a dozen countries of the world.

The concepts of chemurgy are not political. They are economic and scientific. The National Farm Chemurgic Council is not political in its intent; never has been; and shall, I trust, never become so. I emphasize these facts, in order that what I wish to say next shall not be misunderstood.

The most fundamental division of opinion in the United States today is the cleavage between nationalism and internationalism. A large number of Americans believe firmly that the destiny of their country can best be achieved by undertaking to maintain freedom of speech and of worship, and freedom from fear and from hunger, within the borders of this Nation. They are nationalists.

They favor full development of the natural, human, and spiritual resources that are within the United States.

They definitely do not believe that the growth of the national economy has been completed. They are certain that wherever the energies and skills of Americans are not restrained the frontiers of production will be expanded.

Nationalists believe that the productive powers of the United States are such that, unaided and unentangled, every border and shore of our States can be defended against any possible combination of aggressors.

Nationalists hold deeply the conviction that the most precious rights of man can best be preserved, and that his highest economic and cultural destiny can most certainly be realized, by concentration toward building higher the great plateau of well-being upon which the United States now towers above a less fortunate world. Nationalists favor the peaceful cultivation of this plateau in preference to plunging down into the bloody swamp of international poverty.

The internationalists hold other views. Their doctrines of confusion and catastrophe are widely disseminated. Indeed, by determination of a majority of Congress and of the Executive, they are now national policy.

No matter how far we may disagree, in times of genuine crisis and emergency we all, as loyal Americans, subscribe to the sentiment of Stephen Decatur in support of our country.

There is no disloyalty, however, in pointing out that the great issue of internationalism versus nationalism has never been decided by the suffrage of the American people. The internationalists were successful at the 1940 conventions of both parties. The issue was not debated in last year's campaign.

No one of us these days can see far into the future. There is every indication that we shall see worse times before we shall see better. At some date the forces of destruction will have run their course. Then will come the task of paying for the damage, and of endeavoring to resume a forward course. Farseeing leadership will not await the bottom before beginning to chart the course upward. The policies of internationalism will then have to justify themselves in the light of events.

The thoughtful citizen of that time may reflect upon history. He may observe that during a century and a quarter of essentially nationalistic policy his country prospered and the well-being of its people steadily increased; and he may reflect that from the time his leaders turned to internationalism the advance of his country has been irregular and halting.

If this guess at the future is at all correct, the doctrine of nationalism will be thought about and discussed. Its values will emerge more clearly in the public mind. The issue is not yet closed. The post-defense and post-war procedures are still to be determined. It will not be surprising if major political parties will be forced to draw their lines on this division. One party may fly the banner of internationalism, and another the ensign of nationalism. A conservative prediction is that as destruction and annihilation proceed, the virtues of domestic production will become more clearly understood.

I have drawn this theme to your attention for a definite reason. It has seemed to be appropriate that the political connotations of these two forces be brought out into the

light. With the future implications in full view, perhaps we can see more clearly than otherwise that chemurgy, as a program of production, can and should proceed regardless of political events.

Internationalism for a time may set us back faster than we can go forward, but it cannot prevent us from facing to the front, making whatever countergains are possible.

In the final analysis, though we speak here of goods and things, these are not what really concern us. Our real concern is people—the human beings who find their lives most happily expressed in productive activity and their families best protected by the fruits of production. The great objectives of holding the economic machine in high gear are not mere goods nor mere dollars, the great consideration is that when the machine is not in high gear, the weakest, the least able are the first to be unemployed. If America can continue straight ahead to produce, there will be work and opportunity. With less than that industrial statesmanship cannot afford to be content.

Whatever the course of our country, now or later, there is patriotism in production. It is not isolationism that we preach, as may be said by those who use words in place of reason. If we are going to have effective defense against any imaginary or real aggression, self-sufficiency is plain common sense. When we can foresee the relentless approach of post-defense or post-war slump, it is plain common sense to prepare by starting to produce more earning power, and to earn more buying power, for those who will need it most.

I am one who firmly believes that we in the United States of America have an inspired mission on earth. Our farmers, working with our scientists and industrialists, have banished famine for the first time in human history. Our scientists and industrialists have dissolved distance, overcome gravity, conquered pestilence, and have made tremendous inroads on poverty. Ignorance is retreating. Humanity has been elevated to new heights in America, by Americans, here in our invigorating atmosphere of freedom, under representative government.

First among present obligations is to maintain liberty here—liberty for men to think, speak, worship and work. Under the blessing of liberty we can show all the world the supreme example of human well-being in a nation where freedom, production, and patriotism go hand in hand. We cannot hope to force our ways upon the peoples of the earth. But if we let the people of the earth see that we ourselves have devotedly adhered to freedom of speech and worship, that by our way of life freedom from fear and hunger can be enjoyed, we shall most effectively fulfill our inspired mission to aid humanity.

Larry Gilbert's Twenty-fifth Year in Baseball

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1941

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, more than a century ago the State of Tennessee sent one of its most gallant and valiant sons to the city of New Orleans to defend its gates against an invading army.

The name of Andrew Jackson will always be synonymous with the city of New Orleans because of that brave soldier's magnificent victory on the field of Chalmette. New Orleans will always owe a debt of gratitude to the State of Tennessee because of Andrew Jackson. He was a great American. He was a typical American. He was a forceful, fighting, two-fisted American. America today would be a better nation if we had more Americans like Andrew Jackson.

Today in the city of Nashville homage is being paid a New Orleanian, and I like to believe that this much-deserved honor and homage which is being paid this Louisianian is in part compensation for the debt of gratitude which New Orleans owes to Tennessee.

The Louisianian who today is being honored by Nashville, like the Tennessean who has long been honored by New Orleans, is a fighter, a man who has won his spurs not on the field of battle, like Andrew Jackson, but on the field of competitive sports. The man who is being honored today in Nashville, like Andrew Jackson, is a man who has never been known to turn his back on a friend or retreat from a foe. This man represents everything that is clean and honorable in the field of sports, and I want to say to the State of Tennessee that, as proud as Tennessee is of Andrew Jackson and as grateful as Louisiana is of the part which Andrew Jackson played in the Battle of New Orleans, we of Louisiana and of New Orleans are equally as proud of Larry Gilbert, who today is being honored in Nashville on the occasion of the beginning of his twenty-fifth consecutive year in the Southern League, as player and manager and developer of some of the brightest stars that have ever shown in the baseball firmament.

America today, Mr. Speaker, needs more men like Larry Gilbert.

America today, Mr. Speaker, would be a greater Nation if there were a greater number of men the type and caliber of Larry Gilbert.

In these days of peril and danger to our democratic way of thinking and living we need men who have known success in the American way; we need men who have lived by the American way; we need men who believe in the American way of doing things whether those men come from the athletic fields of competition, from the machines of industry, from the carpeted offices of big business, or from the plows of the farmers in the field. No matter from what walk of life these men come—they must all be fired with the knowledge and the thought that the American way is the right way of life. They must exemplify in their every action, their every word, and their every deed that they believe in the American way, that they live in the American way and are willing, yes, Mr. Speaker, to die if need be for the American way.

Larry Gilbert is one of those Americans.

In honoring Larry Gilbert today, Mr. Speaker, Nashville and the State of Tennessee pays homage not only to Larry Gilbert the man and the individual, but honor and homage to every man in baseball who, like Larry Gilbert, has brought honor and fame on himself by doing a good job.

It has been my privilege to have known Larry Gilbert during his entire baseball career.

It is my honor at this time to represent the congressional district in Louisiana in which Larry Gilbert makes his home.

As a small boy I watched the progress of Larry Gilbert in baseball. As a sports writer I came to know Larry Gilbert well, and I came to appreciate the full value of his friendship and his full value to the Nation as a teacher and developer of young men.

Larry Gilbert started like most American youngsters as a player on the sandlots of his native New Orleans. He was a left-handed pitcher. Because of his prowess at bat and his agility afield he soon became an outfielder, and in 1914 he was a member of now famous Boston Braves, "the miracle team" of the National League, which found itself in last place on July 4 and at the top of the National League in September with the championship bunting tacked to its mast.

It was this team which subsequently defeated Connie Mack's famous Philadelphia Athletics in four straight games, a feat not to be duplicated in a world's series contest until the invincible Yankees strolled onto the scene and into the baseball arena.

Because of a leg injury Larry Gilbert eventually was sent to the Kansas City Blues, from which club he was purchased by the late A. J. Heinemann, of New Orleans, for the sum of $3,000, which was raised by "Heinie" on his own personal insurance policy.

On the afternoon of May 6, 1917, Larry Gilbert walked on the field in the uniform of his native New Orleans. He was not to take off that uniform until he had brought much honor to it and to the city he represented.

In the baseball park where he had chased balls and acted as scoreboard keeper he was to find his greatest successes.

As a player he led his league at times in hitting and number of bases stolen. He was called "The Tris Speaker of the Minors." When his playing days were ended by a pitched ball he became the manager of the New Orleans team, succeeding the late Johnny Dobbs.

Winning pennants became monotonous to New Orleans under Larry Gilbert. A Gilbert piloted team never finished out of the first division.

Repeatedly offers came to him to manage major league baseball clubs, but Larry, devoted to his home city and attached to his life-long friend and benefactor, Heinemann, refused to leave New Orleans and passed up national fame and glory because of loyalty.

Heinemann died and Charlie Sommers, of Cleveland, succeeded as president of the New Orleans team. Sommers died and new people, a local syndicate, gained control of the baseball club, but still Larry Gilbert remained in his home-town uniform.

Came the day when the late Fay Murray, of Nashville, tired of seeing Nashville drawing up the rear guard in baseball, made Larry Gilbert a proposition which would give him half interest in the Nash-

ville club and complete charge of its operation.

It was such a tempting proposition that Larry Gilbert could not turn a deaf ear to it, but before accepting the offer he went to his New Orleans employees and asked them if they thought he would be disloyal. He was told that such loyalty as exhibited by him had seldom been found in any man and was advised to accept the proposition.

There was no laughing or rejoicing in New Orleans that day because Larry Gilbert had been lost to the people of New Orleans.

But there wasn't a man, woman, or child who had known Larry Gilbert who did not wish him success and godspeed in his new venture.

Mr. Speaker, I may have appeared rather expansive and somewhat superlative when I mentioned Andrew Jackson in connection with Larry Gilbert, but where in America today is the real baseball fan who does not think it is just as important for his team to win a baseball game as it is for an army to win a battle?

There is not a baseball fan in New Orleans who does not feel that Louisiana's debt to Tennessee has been repaid by Larry Gilbert. There is not a baseball fan in New Orleans who does not feel, in all sincerity, that as Andrew Jackson, the Tennessean, saved the city of New Orleans from a military blitzkrieg, Larry Gilbert, the Louisianian, saved Nashville from a baseball black-out.

When Larry Gilbert went to Nashville he took a team from the bottom of the ladder and placed it on the top rung. Today Nashville's baseball team carries the championship flag over its park because Larry Gilbert, alone, was able to plant it there.

Larry Gilbert is and has always been a credit to the game of baseball.

I always liked the thought that the battle of Waterloo was won on the fields of Eton and I have always liked to believe that the World War was won on the athletic fields of America.

There is something about American sports which breeds good citizenship, which develops character, which makes good Americans of those who participate. Larry Gilbert, during his 25 years in the Southern League, has helped develop young men who became famous on the baseball diamonds of America. He has developed character in men, young and old, whether they became baseball successes or not.

Right here in the city of Washington is a player who was sent here by Larry Gilbert and who has endeared himself to the baseball fans of Washington. Buddy Myer came to the Senators from the Pelicans after being grounded in the game of baseball by Larry Gilbert.

It was Larry Gilbert who first recognized the possibilities of Mel Ott, the "little giant" of the Giants and probably one of baseball's immortals of the future.

The roll call of those sent to the major leagues by Larry Gilbert is a long and an impressive one. It includes names perhaps forgotten by the modern baseball fan but recorded in baseball's history for all times. It includes such names as "Gink" Hendricks, the great Dazzy Vance, and "Hank" DeBerry of Brooklyn, Walter Barbare, Carl Lind, Eddie Morgan, Joe Sewell, Freddie Spurgeon, Odell "Bad News" Hale, Denny Galehouse, Johnny Humphries, and others of the Cleveland Indians; "Pinkey" Whitney, of the Phillies, and scores of others too numerous to mention at this time. A complete list of players sent to the major league by Larry Gilbert during his 25 years in the Southern League would be a roll call of the great and near greats of the American and National Leagues.

Last year the roster of the incredible Brooklyn Dodgers included the name of Charlie Gilbert, the second son of Larry Gilbert.

Larry Gilbert, Mr. Speaker, is a credit, not only to his profession but to any profession. Never once has the name of Larry Gilbert been linked with anything that was not honorable. Larry Gilbert has always been a gentleman, on and off the baseball field. Larry Gilbert is an institution in baseball, and Nashville does well today to honor him on the twenty-fifth anniversary of his debut in the Southern Association of Baseball Clubs.

Larry Gilbert is as popular in opposing cities as he is in New Orleans and Nashville. Greater tribute can be paid to no man in any field of endeavor.

Larry Gilbert is a typical American father. He has raised three splendid sons. His devoted wife is his constant companion off the baseball field and his most enthusiastic rooter from the grandstands.

New Orleans, Mr. Speaker, is proud of Larry Gilbert. Louisiana is proud of Larry Gilbert, and I have requested this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of the National Congress the observance of the launching of the 25 years of consecutive service of this splendid character in American life.

Mr. Speaker, baseball is a great game. The President of the United States annually honors the game of baseball with his presence at the opening game in Washington. Baseball is recognized as the national pastime. Baseball is as much a part of the American way as the democracy under which we live. When a man has served honorably and faithfully in the game of baseball he deserves full recognition.

There may have been greater managers than Larry Gilbert in baseball but certainly not in the minor leagues.

I unhesitatingly admit that there have been greater players than Larry Gilbert but, Mr. Speaker, nowhere in the American life has there been a more loyal and devoted character to his chosen profession than Larry Gilbert.

Give us more men of the sterling qualities of Larry Gilbert and we will have a stronger and better nation in which to live. Treachery, disloyalty, "fifth columns," and un-American "isms" would never creep into our daily lives if more men were sparked with the patriotism and loyalty of this man who has gone to the top of his profession in the American way—the only way we should know.

I join with the city of Nashville in today saluting Larry Gilbert, and I am proud of my years of personal friendship with him and the fact that I number him among my constituents in the district which I represent in this Congress from the State of Louisiana.

Larry Gilbert, I pay you the just tribute of your long and honorable career; may you live to observe your fiftieth anniversary in the game to which you have given the best there is in you.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks on this occasion, I desire to now insert in the RECORD a copy of an editorial which appears today in the Nashville Banner by Fred Russell, sports editor, also saluting Larry Gilbert on his twenty-fifth anniversary in the Southern League:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of May 6, 1941]

A graying gentleman with flashing brown eyes will walk into the Nashville ball park Tuesday night, May 6, 1941, swap his store clothes for a white, red-trimmed, knee-panted uniform and from the third-base coaching line manage a club through another game.

Just another game? No; it's the start of Larry Gilbert's twenty-fifth consecutive year in the Southern Association; the launching of the twenty-fifth year of one of the longest and most magnificent individual careers the game of baseball has known.

First as a player, then as a manager, a leader of men, Larry Gilbert has come to be known as Mr. Southern League, as one of the most thoroughly popular and most highly respected figures in any sport in the entire Nation.

Nashville is proud of Larry Gilbert. He is a baseball landmark, a credit to the game, a credit to athletics, a fine influence, an asset to this city. If we had the choice of the entire world, we still would take Larry Gilbert as Nashville's baseball representative.

Newspaper Publishers on National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1941

RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the 1941 convention of the American Newspaper Publishers Association:

Whereas the directors of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, having considered the greater opportunity for public service afforded to all American newspapers in this time of grave national emergency, and having recognized that other associations of newspapers and newspapermen in the United States were likewise aware of such opportunity, called a conference of the representatives of national and regional newspaper organizations; and

Whereas the accredited representatives of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the National Editorial Association, the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association,

the Inland Daily Press Association, the New England Daily Newspaper Association, the Pacific Northwest Newspaper Association, the New Jersey Press Association, the New York State Publishers Association, the Ohio Newspaper Association, and the Pennsylvania Newspaper Publishers Association, meeting in the city of New York, Tuesday, February 4, 1941, after full consideration authorized the issuance of the following statement of their unanimous purpose and intent:

1. That the newspapers recognize their primary obligation to further national defense in every possible manner.

2. That the newspapers also recognize their essential duty to furnish complete and accurate information compatible with military necessities.

3. That the newspapers in the performance of these obligations bespeak the cordial consideration and cooperation of Federal and State authorities concerned with national defense: Therefore be it

Resolved by the membership of the American Newspaper Publishers Association in annual meeting assembled, That this association hereby unreservedly ratifies and affirms the declaration of intent as approved in such conference, and declares its purpose to make such declaration fully effective through its officers, directors, and their committees for such purposes to be appointed.

Lincoln and the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1941

ESSAY BY LOUISE BRIGGS, OF MANSFIELD, OHIO

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I place in the RECORD an essay on Lincoln and the Constitution, by Louise Briggs, of Mansfield, Ohio, one of the winners of the essay contest sponsored by the American Legion of the State of Ohio. I am happy to say that the young lady lives in my congressional district.

The essay follows:

Abraham Lincoln was outstanding among those who made our Constitution the bulwark of American civilization. In those tumultuous times, when the chief topic of interest was that of slavery, Abraham Lincoln took over the reigns of our Government. Disagreeing factions were led to open violence because of the heated discussions of this topic. President Lincoln, the sturdy, humble champion of the underdog, could not stand idly by and see all of his ideals and convictions being trampled under the feet of tyrants. Such conditions could not be tolerated.

"All men are created free and equal"—on the foundation of this theory our Constitution and Government were built. Lincoln had no desire for personal wealth and popularity. His chief concern was for legislation that would benefit his friends, the common people.

There were strict constructionists who defied anything that was not specifically stated as being ethical by the Constitution. There was at that time nothing in the order of constitutional law favoring the Negro. Neither was there anything stating that he was not free and equal with a white person. Had he not been purchased by his masters? Was he not their property? Did not the Constitution say that the Union would protect a citizen's property? These were questions asked again and again. All this led to serious controversy and a threatened break between States.

The result, as we all know, was that South Carolina seceded from the Union. Six States within as many weeks followed her leadership. The act was termed unconstitutional by the northerners, while the southerners contended that it was their right and privilege. This brought to light the greatest defect of the Constitution, the inadequate definition of States' rights.

The great Civil War settled many questions; slavery was abolished; personal rights were defined; and the Federal Government was given precedence over State government, thus establishing governmental prestige between States and maintaining world prestige. The first steps to the realization of Abraham Lincoln's convictions had been attained.

But this was only the first step. He must yet do something to have these people made secure in their new-found freedom. In the face of a dissenting cabinet, he presented his proposed constitutional amendments to Congress. These were accepted and the former slaves were made lawful citizens with the right to vote. Had Mr. Lincoln's ideals been fully realized? We will never know, for he died shortly after from the wounds of an assassin's bullet.

A worthy man had been foresighted enough to see what would happen if immediate steps were not taken to knit the country more closely together. He set aside his own welfare and gave his life that we, the reapers of the fruits of the seed he sowed, might have something of which we could be duly proud; something that we could revere and hold sacred. He and the people who gave their lives gave us a heritage that has made ours the most beautiful and agreeable land in the entire world.

The Constitution for which Lincoln fought so desperately is now the stronghold of our Nation. Without it we could not stand in these dark, foreboding days of war, hatred, and destruction.

Truly we owe to our ancestors all the support that we can give to the protection of this document that was their ideal and guiding light in the establishment of a Nation unsurpassed in all the world in liberty, justice, and equality.

Keeping America Out of War

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, men are constantly rising on this floor and intimating that the President of the United States is trying to get us into war. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON] a moment ago read the President's statement wherein he said:

And I say it again, and again, and again, that I am not going to send our boys to engage in any European war.

The President has not violated that promise.

There are men on the outside, many of them violent political enemies of the President, who are doing everything they can to prod him into violating that promise and plunging this country into the European war.

They hate the President, they want to destroy him. They want to wipe out all the progress his administration has made. They think that if they can prod him into this fatal plunge it will cause him to go out of office discredited. That is exactly what they want. They want to choose his successor.

This is their old trick. This same element licked the boots of Woodrow Wilson, then turned and drove the dagger into his back, and then proceeded to destroy the reforms his administration had brought about.

They are becoming impatient, they seem to be afraid that President Roosevelt might make a movement for peace, bring this terrible war to a close, restore the peace of the world, and make himself the most popular leader on earth. That would spoil their plans.

They would not mind the return of peace to the world so much if they could first destroy Roosevelt, and at the same time get their pound of flesh. If they could accomplish his downfall, then they would probably demand peace and brand him as a warmonger. Then they think they could elect an administration that would do their bidding.

They are turning heaven and earth to get us to convoy vessels into the war zone, knowing that, as the President has been quoted as expressing it, "convoys mean shooting and shooting means war."

In my opinion such a movement would cripple instead of increase our aid to England. In the first place it is not necessary for us to convoy these vessels. It was understood when the lend-lease bill was passed that we were to lend or lease these vessels to Great Britain and that she would operate them under her own flag.

If necessary we could lend or lease vessels to Great Britain for convoy purposes. She has plenty of sailors, well trained to operate such convoys. Then if one of them were sunk it would not involve us in the war, since it would be under British registry and flying the British flag.

On the other hand, if we were to convoy these vessels under our own flag and one of them were attacked it would more than likely draw us into the war, paralyze our commerce throughout the world, probably bring Japan into the conflict, and impair our ability to furnish the supplies Great Britain so sorely needs.

Some men are clamoring for a declaration of war. But they seem to be in a hopeless minority just now. I wonder where they think we could land an army in Europe if we got into this war. But as I said, they seem to be in a hopeless minority, and their attempts to stampede the President and the Congress into war seem to be "backfiring" on them.

President Roosevelt is standing by his promise to the American people to keep this country out of war and not to send our boys to fight on foreign soil; and while Congress is rendering every possible aid to Great Britain short of war, I do not believe there are a dozen Members in this House who would vote to plunge this country into war today.

Protection of Shipments Under Lease Lend Act

REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER STEARNS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1941

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, reference was made on the floor of the House yesterday to a resolution recently adopted by the National Executive Committee of the American Legion, urging the protection of shipments under the Lease Lend Act. In order that the Members may have the exact text of this resolution before them, I take pleasure in placing it in the RECORD in full, under leave to extend my remarks, together with another resolution of the same committee, calling on the President to inform the country more fully as to the gravity of the situation that confronts us:

TWO RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, MAY 2, 1941

Whereas the American Legion in convention assembled at Boston, Mass., September 23–26, 1940, adopted a resolution whereby it urged the Government of the United States to exercise all lawful means to prevent the shipment of raw materials to aggressor nations and that it continue to extend to all peoples who are resisting aggression the fullest cooperation consistent with our obligations, our security, and our peace; and

Whereas thereafter the Congress of the United States, after full debate and proper deliberation, passed House bill 1776, known as the lend-lease bill, whereby the President of the United States is authorized to extend aid to Great Britain and her Allies in their efforts to preserve to the world the priceless right of freedom; and

Whereas we believe that practical and necessary aid to Great Britain and her Allies requires that war matériel, food, and medical supplies be delivered to them; and

Whereas there is grave danger that vessels carrying such matériel and supplies will be attacked by belligerent nations in violation of international law and in violation of compacts heretofore entered into by such belligerent nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the national executive committee of the American Legion, That we earnestly urge the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the Nation to employ such units of the United States Navy and auxiliary forces in such manner as in his judgment may be required to insure the safety of American vessels and their crews by guarding them against attack from any source; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States.

Whereas the President of the United States and the Secretaries of State, War, and Navy Departments have publicly stated that totalitarian aggression constitutes an immediate and grave threat to the safety of the United States; and

Whereas under such circumstances action by the people of the United States appropriate to the full extent of this emergency is vital; and

Whereas the people of the United States, not being fully informed of the true facts, do not understand nor appreciate the dangers of which the President and his officers speak, nor do they fully comprehend the full extent of this emergency which threatens the safety of the United States and its people and, therefore, have in consequence lapsed into a peacetime complacency: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Executive Committee of the American Legion that we urgently request the President and his officers to immediately make available to the Congress and to the people of this country a full and complete statement of the facts which constitute immediate danger to this Nation as they see it, in order that speedy and effective action may be taken for the complete protection of the country and to insure that singleness and unity of purpose among our people which is so necessary to national safety; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Legion pledge its utmost support to whatever plan of action shall be deemed by the President and the Congress to be necessary for the safety of this Nation.

Bryan County Patriotic Mass Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE DURANT (OKLA.) DAILY DEMOCRAT

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report published in the Durant Daily Democrat, in my congressional district, describing a patriotic meeting held in Durant, Okla., on April 23, 1941.

I hope that the Members of Congress and people throughout the Nation will read about these patriotic people whom I have the honor to represent in Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Durant (Okla.) Daily Democrat]

BRYAN COUNTY CALLS ON NATION TO DEVOTE ALL ITS ENERGIES TO DEFENSE

Warning that America, because of its own weakness, is in danger of being next on the program of aggressors' conquest, nearly 2,000 Bryan County citizens Wednesday night called upon President Roosevelt, the Congress, and the American people to subordinate all private industry to the program of national defense and protection of the American way of life.

Starting what they hope may be a national landslide of public sentiment against compromise with capital and labor in their disputes delaying defense production, the hundreds of Bryan County "grass roots" patriots stamped themselves as interventionists even to the point of feeding the beaten nations of Europe and Asia, then going to their defense with arms and ships.

The meeting unanimously adopted a resolution directed to the President, the Congress, and the American people demanding curtailment of all nonessential production to release labor, materials, and plant facilities for maximum speed in producing all adequate defense needs and calling upon capital and labor to immediately subordinate personal gain, "as a million draftees have done," to concentrate on every effort toward proper national defense.

Speakers warned of the critical situation facing America and its form of government and emphasized all American people must make sacrifices in money, time, and temporary loss even of their liberties to defend their way of life.

Businessmen, professional men, ministers, farmers, and laborers came from every nook and corner of Bryan County to pay their respects to dictators and other enemies of democracy, even to the naming of Charles A. Lindbergh, and offered their services to their Government in its time of danger and at another crisis in its history of battling aggression.

Visitors were here from many neighboring counties to see what it was all about and to carry home a resolve to organize their own counties along the same line.

John D. Steakley, Durant automobile dealer, declaring that automobile manufacture is in competition with the defense program, demanded a halt in the making of automobiles for private industry until the defense program is completed.

Mr. Steakley, one of the sponsors and chairman of the meeting, said America produced 4,000,000 automobiles last year, while building 1,500 airplanes for the United States and Great Britain.

Mr. Steakley revealed the idea for such a meeting as this was fostered by a group of Durant men 14 months ago. "Maybe it should have been held then," he said. "We hope it is not too late now. At least we can't delay any longer."

"France fell because it had lost its ideal," G. T. Stubbs, superintendent of the city schools, declared, "and our greatest danger is from within—within our own souls. If democracy will not work it is because we fail to make it work. If we fail it will be a defeatist attitude that makes us fail."

Mr. Stubbs, a World War veteran, also one of the sponsors of the meeting, declared that American stock living in 19 Southwestern States will win this battle of defense.

"We are the orbit around which unity of 130,000,000 American people can be attained."

"May we be spared the horrors of war, but as Christ died to make men holy, let us be willing to die to make men free," said W. E. Utterback, Spanish-American and World War veteran.

"Difficulties between labor and capital are the biggest problems we face in preparing to defend ourselves," he continued. "Yet America has never yet permitted anyone to hinder its progress in war or peace, and by its will of majority it again will surmount these difficulties."

"France fell spiritually before it fell militarily," C. C. Hatchett, Durant attorney said, warning Americans they must sacrifice their own pleasures, their own means and their own time and service to see that America does not fall.

"We must arouse ourselves from the nonessentials of life. It will take fortitude, and it will require the unity of every man and woman in America to overthrow the most brutal aggressors of all time. We must have spiritual guidance, and we must have a stiffening of our moral and spiritual life to accomplish the task before us."

County Judge Jake Loy, of Sherman, heading a delegation, including two newspapermen from Grayson County, Tex., lauded the spirit of Bryan County citizens for their action, saying, "I am going to ask Grayson County to do what you have done, and I commend this program to every county in every State in America."

"We're not prepared to defend ourselves, but if people of America act as you have acted, we will be prepared and very soon," he continued.

W. E. Schooler, publisher of the Hugo Daily News, said, "Can we do less than our boys have done who are in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps? We owe it to them as much as we owe it to those who have fought before and those who are coming after us to preserve this great land of ours."

A letter from Capt. Ralph Ownby, of Ninetieth Brigade headquarters company at Camp Barkeley, one of five Durant national guard companies in the national service, was read to the assemblage.

Captain Ownby said:

"All members of my unit, and I think that I express the attitude of members of the other units from Durant, were most pleased when we saw in the Durant Daily Democrat where everyone was being called to a patriotic mass meeting.

"We who are working day and night appreciate knowing that the folks back home are backing us up, and it gives us courage as we trudge along during the wee hours of the morning, moving from one battle formation to another, to think that those we respect and admire are joining hands with us in our efforts to carry out the plans which our Commander in Chief, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, has so carefully laid out for us.

"Express to each and every one of them, our joy in their participation in this great cause and assure them that we will give all that we have in the cause."

The event here attracted newspapermen from five outside cities, and other newspapers and all the press associations are carrying accounts of the meeting.

Outside newspapermen here to chronicle the first meeting of this character ever held, at least in the Southwest, were Edwin Hunter of the Daily Oklahoman and Times, Oklahoma City; C. L. Richhart, Fort Worth Star-Telegram; Newell Johnson, Sherman Democrat; Paul O. Tooley, Denison Herald; and W. E. Schooler, Hugo Daily News.

The resolution, adopted with a thunderous "aye" vote and signed by more than half those present, is:

"Be it known to all that we, the God-fearing, freedom-loving citizens of the United States of America living in Durant and Bryan County, Okla., do hereby assemble ourselves, by the grace of God and under the rights, privileges, and responsibilities guaranteed by our Constitution, for the purpose of considering the serious problems that affect and threaten the continuance of our democratic way of life and the perpetuity of our Nation.

"Because we love peace and want to share its blessings with all mankind, we declare the following principles and purposes, and recommend the same to our national leader, President Franklin D. Roosevelt; to our Congress; and to our fellow citizens throughout the Nation:

First. Curtail or eliminate nonessential production to release labor, materials, and plant facilities for maximum speed in producing all adequate defense needs; and

Second. That capital and labor immediately be forced to subordinate personal gains, as a million draftees have done, to concentrate on every effort toward proper national defense.

Third. That we and all other liberty-loving Americans be called upon to pledge sacrifices for defense and liberty.

Adopted on this the 23d day of April, 1941, at Durant, Okla.

The unusual and impressive ceremony was opened with advancing of the colors by Sons of the American Legion. The Durant High School band, directed by Theo Nix, entertained with a half dozen numbers or more while the crowd was gathering.

Rev. Cecil A. Denney, pastor of the First Christian Church, opened the service with invocation, and Rev. Fred Mesch, pastor of the First Methodist Church, gave the benediction.

DURANT, OKLA., *April 25, 1941.*

His Excellency, FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States of America,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We have the honor to transmit to you a message from the citizens of Durant and Bryan County, Okla., as expressed in an assembled mass meeting.

The citizens have felt for several months that they should assemble themselves and convey to you their convictions as affecting the national-defense program. Such a meeting was held Wednesday evening, April 23, with some eighteen hundred loyal citizens from all walks of life of this county present.

The conclusions of our citizens are frankly stated in the resolutions herewith attached that were unanimously adopted and signed. In the press of the crowd some names were not secured, but there were no objectors.

It is our hope that similar meetings may be held throughout the Nation in order to unify thinking and to strengthen our people to support our national program as you develop it. We stand ready and willing to be used in this program on your command.

Respectfully submitted.

J. D. STEAKLEY,
L. F. LEE,
M. W. FITZGERALD,
HOLLIS HAMPTON,
GLENN M. MCDONALD,
G. T. STUBBS,
Committee.

Be it known to all that the God-fearing, freedom-loving citizens of the United States of America, living in Durant, and Bryan County, Okla., do hereby assemble themselves, by the grace of God and under the rights, privileges, and responsibilities guaranteed by their Constitution, for the purpose of considering the serious problems that affect and threaten continuance of our democratic way of life and the perpetuity of our Nation.

Because we love peace and want to share its blessings with all mankind, we declare the following principles and purposes, and recommend the same to our national leader, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, to our Congress, and to our fellow citizens throughout the Nation:

Curtail or eliminate nonessential production to release labor, materials, and plant facilities for maximum speed in producing all adequate defense needs;

That capital and labor immediately be forced to subordinate personal gains, as a million draftees have done, to concentrate on every effort toward proper national defense; and

That we and all other liberty-loving Americans be called upon to pledge sacrifices for defense and liberty.

Four United States Objectives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SIOUX CITY (IOWA) TRIBUNE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sioux City (Iowa) Tribune of April 10, 1941:

[From the Sioux City (Iowa) Tribune of April 10, 1941]

FOUR UNITED STATES OBJECTIVES

Nowhere have we seen a better summing up of the American attitude toward the war than was made by Representative KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota during the course of a recent congressional debate. He reduced American objectives to four; and here they are:

1. That America stay out of the war.
2. That we extend all aid short of war to Britain and her associates.
3. That we build and protect our own Military Establishments so as to make this country impregnable.
4. That we preserve in this country our American system of representative government in which the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches share coordinate power.

Can you state the American viewpoint and purpose more succinctly than Mr. MUNDT has done?

No doubt our country seemed to wobble a bit and to squabble a lot in trying to adhere to such a four-point policy as the versatile South Dakotan has outlined, but on the whole it has, up to now, stuck fairly close to objectives.

We may have left an opening here and there through which some subversive doctrine might creep in, or which might be taken for authority for subversive action. Is so, the fault escaped detection in weeks of debate and a great many people have misjudged the purposes and principles of American officials.

Wake Up, Fiorello

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

It is getting to be a daily occurrence to find editorials in our leading newspapers similar to this one, complaining, on behalf of our citizens, against the inefficiency and neglect of the present administration of the city of New York, headed by Mayor LaGuardia. I regret that New York City has such an administration, but we must face the facts and admit that the people of New York are not getting the character of service which they deserve and for which they are paying exorbitant taxes.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 6, 1941]

The police apparently have solved, quickly and efficiently, the murder of Harry V. Maxwell, the advertising man who was shot and killed early Sunday while sitting in a parked automobile with a woman companion in East Eighty-first Street. This is good work and deserving of the gratitude of the community. And yet the situation disclosed by this tragic case is exceedingly serious. There have been many reports recently of thugs who made a systematic practice of robbing parked automobiles, and in some instances the occupants have been forcibly abducted and driven away. In one case reported to the police the robbers forced their way into an automobile which had only paused to wait for a traffic light to change. If the confession of the prisoner in the Maxwell killing is to be relied upon (and it sounds perfectly plausible), he and an accomplice had made a living by preying on persons sitting in parked automobiles, and it is probable that other combinations of crooks have been doing the same thing.

All this, notwithstanding the arrest in the Maxwell episode, reflects a condition in this city which is downright disgraceful. Robberies and beatings of persons in automobiles have been serious enough, deserving of grave concern, but it has taken a murder to focus public attention upon this menace to public safety—a menace which, admittedly, is not so easy to fight. Some drivers, often after having had a threatening experience or two, have made it a habit to lock all the doors of their automobiles from the inside, not only while parked but while driving about the city. This, no doubt, is a highly sensible precaution, and perhaps all drivers should be as careful, but at the same time the fact that such devices are necessary is by no means a pleasant thought. Surely there should be better protection. New York boasts of the ablest police force anywhere, and its detective arm regularly demonstrates its alertness and ingenuity in solving serious crimes. What we need now, clearly, is effective measures before, rather than after, the event. We decline to believe that it is necessary for motorists, no matter what the time of night, to be at the mercy of hoodlums and potential killers.

The St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN BOLLES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1941

LETTER FROM THE W. H. PUGH COAL CO., RACINE, WIS.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from the W. H. Pugh Coal Co., of Racine, Wis., a company which has been connected with Great Lakes transportation for nearly a century, on the St. Lawrence waterway, as follows:

W. H. PUGH COAL CO.,
Racine, Wis., April 23, 1941.

Congressman STEPHEN BOLLES,
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOLLES: The St. Lawrence waterway proposal is up for consideration, and we thought probably you would like to have our viewpoint on that question. Let me state that our company has been connected with Great Lakes transportation for nearly a century, and we can see no advantage to your district if this project is completed. As a matter of fact, the taxpayers will be carrying a terrific burden in the years to come because of this defense program, and anything nonessential should not be considered at this time.

The principal traffic on the Great Lakes is coal, grain, iron ore, and stone. These constitute well over 90 percent of the total tonnage and would not in any way be benefited by the proposed waterway. As a matter of fact, they would probably be harmed, as you would have foreign boats with cheap crews carrying merchandise which is now being carried by American ships paying a high wage scale.

During the past few years there has been some movement of wood pulp into northern Wisconsin from Sweden and Finland and a few cargoes of potter's clay for use at the Kohler plant at Sheboygan. However, the vessels carrying this material are of a size that the present waterway is suitable for their use, and there would be a very slight saving in having larger cargo ships in this trade.

Under normal conditions wheat can be carried from the head of the Lakes to England for about 10 cents a bushel on the combination rail-and-vessel rate. Of course, in times of war, the vessel rates are vastly increased, but any ships using the proposed waterway would, of course, be subject to a similar increase in wartimes. In this connection it might be well to note that United States is going to have a very difficult time exporting grain in the future, as this trade has been dwindling for many years, and when hostilities cease there is very little prospect for this country to export grain in competition with depreciated currencies and cheap labor in foreign grain-raising countries. Another thing to be considered is that, if through the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway, larger cargo boats could come direct to Lake Michigan ports, they would bring cheap foreign goods into this territory in somewhat larger volume than in the past and will be placing American industry and labor under competition with cheap products, which surely would not be to their advantage.

As a power project, the competition is entirely without merit, as the original cost is entirely too high. Even at the present time they are producing power cheaper in Wisconsin, with coal, than it is being produced at Niagara Falls with water power, and the Niagara Falls plant has an investment that would be only a fraction of the St. Lawrence project.

It is to be hoped that consideration be given to the fact that the lake cargo boats, as a rule, will not be adapted for ocean travel, as the construction is entirely different, and it would not be possible to interchange them successfully.

It seems that the above facts are sufficient reason for not considering the waterway project at all feasible, and it is our hope that you will use your best efforts against it.

Very truly yours,

W. H. PUGH COAL CO.,
W. H. PUGH, *President.*

Petition Against Involvement of United States in Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1941

PETITION OF ELECTIVE OFFICIALS OF ORANGE COUNTY, IND.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition signed by elective officials of Orange County, Ind.:

PAOLI, IND., *April 26, 1941.*

We, the undersigned, duly elected officials of Orange County, Ind., believing we represent the views of a large majority of the citizens of this county, realizing the impossibility of their each signing such petition, do, upon their behalf and in accordance with our own personal views, hereby petition you, the Honorable EARL WILSON, Congressman from the Ninth Congressional District of Indiana, requesting that you do all in your power, both by your vote and your most valuable influence, to defeat any measure which in your opinion may in any way have a tendency to involve this Nation in the European war, and that you wholeheartedly support all measures destined to prohibit such involvement.

A. R. Gassaway, auditor of Orange County, Ind.; W. O. Ritter, clerk of Orange Circuit Court, Ind. Bruce McFall, treasurer of Orange County, Ind.; Noble Ellis, sheriff of Orange County, Ind.; Garrett Ferguson, recorder of Orange County, Ind.; Ira Quakenbush, assessor of Orange County, Ind.; Charles R. McClain, surveyor of Orange County, Ind.; Orville E. Cornwell, superintendent of public schools of Orange County, Ind.

The Chivalry of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH A. GAVAGAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1941

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues of the House, I was thrilled yesterday learning that the government of Eire rushed aid and assistance to bombed and shattered Belfast, Ireland. Once again Irishmen extended the hand of brotherhood to stricken humanity. Once again southern Ireland exemplified to all the world her attributes of Christian chivalry and brotherly love. She has always done so in spite of what one may call the perversion of history. I have always believed that were I a teacher of history I would best serve by teaching the direct opposite to present understanding of certain events. One such

event would be the historical background of the artificial barrier known as North and South Ireland. Few really understand that this historical anachronism was conceived in the mind of Cromwell, described by the English historian, Clarendon:

A brave, bad man, with all the wickedness for which hell fire is prepared.

The common understanding of Ireland—even by some claiming intelligence—is a people and nation irrevocably divided by basic religious and racial barriers. This is the common belief even of so-called intellectuals who never "drank deep the cup." The historical truth, however, is that in all the tragic and heroic struggle for Irish liberty and human justice, the Protestant sons of Ireland gave their blood and lives in the sacred cause of Ireland's freedom. Need I recall the names of Wolff Tone, Robert Emmett, Charles S. Parnell, Sir Roger Casement, and a host of others, forming a galaxy of men whose minds, souls, and lives were consecrated and dedicated to the holy cause of Irish freedom.

Yea, I rejoice that Eire today has her Eamon de Valera who the love of humanity and justice prompted to rush to stricken Belfast the aid and assistance of the instrumentalities of the Government of Eire. The Prime Minister acted even in spite of a prior German warning of like destruction to Eire, in the event of aid and assistance to Northern Ireland. Real Irishmen heed not the braggart's boast and scorn his threats.

The New York Times of today contains an editorial that I believe timely and worthy of your thought and attention, and which I include in part in these remarks, as follows:

[From the New York Times]

BARRIERS BURNED AWAY

To save Belfast, capital of the black north, where so many bitter battles have been fought between Irishmen, southern Ireland rushed to her neighbor her own fire-fighting brigades and ambulance corps during Sunday night's terrific air raid. Eire forgot her neutrality in speeding instant aid to the victims of the Nazi holocaust, which did less damage to Britain's biggest shipyards than to office buildings, churches, and thousands of workers' homes. She defied the threat received after a previous raid, when German planes dropped warnings that Dublin might be given fires of her own to put out if she persisted in helping her northern neighbors. And Irishmen on both sides of the dividing line forgot their ancient feud as they worked together in the smoking ruins of an Irish city.

A mingled wave of sympathy and gratitude has drawn Belfast and Dublin closer than they have been in a generation. Against the forces of destruction battering down their common world, they have discovered that they are more united by the ties of humanity and civilization than they are divided by political antagonisms and religious differences. Chalk up this achievement to the credit of Mr. Hitler. He did not boast of it in his Reichstag speech, but here is something to high light the latest self-portrait of the frustrated peacemaker. His bombers have done more to burn away the barriers between the two Irelands than any Irish or English statesman has been able to do.

Civil Service Registers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1941

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill (H. R. 4639) which provides that the Civil Service Commission shall establish for persons between the ages of 40 and 55, separate registers for any position in the classified civil service for which such persons are otherwise eligible. No person not on such register shall be certified to any position in the classified civil service for which such a register is established until all persons on such register shall have been so certified.

My purpose in introducing this measure is simply that I would like to see middle-aged persons get a break; I would like to assure them their places in our vast scheme of living despite their ages, as long as they are still physically capable of performing their duties satisfactorily.

The letter which follows illustrates very well the problem facing middle-aged persons who must work for a living. It was written by a woman who knows from experience that some provision must be made for those whose age alone bars them from so many opportunities.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 18, 1941.*

Hon. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HEFFERNAN: Among your constituents in this district I know of five women—and there may be many more, no doubt—who are middle-aged, and unemployed for that reason and no other. The women I know are intelligent, capable office workers in good health. They have been bookkeepers, typists, stenographers, etc. Some lost a position because the boss retired and the younger man who succeeded him wanted younger help; some for other reasons. I lost my position because I worked for the Cunard White Star, Ltd., and when passenger service to Europe ceased because of the war there was no need to operate the baggage department. Although my immediate superiors tried to get me work with the British Ministry of Shipping, they were unsuccessful because I am of German descent. On that score I will say, I am American-born; my parents came to America when they were still rather young and they were married here.

My purpose in writing you is to ask: Cannot place be made somewhere under the Government defense program for the middle-aged persons who have done office work all their working lives, and who are unemployed, though still capable of working efficiently?

There seems to be organization everywhere but among the single, unemployed, middle-aged women.

In another generation such women lived out their lives in the home of a married brother or sister and were just "old-maid aunts" who faded out of the picture sooner or later.

Nowadays, however, since we have been independent and self-supporting so long, we don't like dependence nor the title of old-maid aunt.

Besides, most of the brothers and brothers-in-law earn almost too little for their own family needs without having to provide for a sister.

Science has done everything to make normal life longer for us; therefore, someone should be thinking up a way to make the mediocre women useful and self-supporting.

Somewhere in the program there must be something we can do. I, for instance, need to work for 16 years longer before the social-security benefits become payable.

The navy yard is nearby; perhaps we could be employed there. My shorthand speed is 95–100 words a minute, and my typing, 50 words a minute. I recently took a civil-service examination for stenographer, but, though I'm sure I passed the 120-word test in dictation and transcription, those papers were not marked because I did not pass the straight-copy test. That did not surprise me much, for somehow I could not do well to start with that day. I shall make application to take another examination, but the examination probably won't take place until next year or very late this year. In the meantime, I shall have to find some remunerative employment.

Congress is not idle, I know. But we seem to have been forgotten. Something should be done for us, or with us. We should count too. Has anyone given us a thought now that the country's resources are being assembled? Why are not our abilities resources too?

In answer to those who may say that during the long period of remunerative years we should have provided for the lean years, let me say that every girl who starts working as a stenographer cannot get to the top. There are those who start quite young, who draw the routine work, and who never marry, but stay on until they must make place for younger women. Saving is not always possible. In my own case I can show where I helped this and that one of my relatives until I had no savings left.

Can't you think of something we can do under the defense program or under any other Government project? I can gather together from this district a number of women between 40 and 55 years of age who are experienced in office routine, and who need remunerative work. The work need not be the office variety provided it does not require walking around or doing things older people can't do. Many of us can still keep records, compile statistics without being expert statisticians, take shorthand notes, and transcribe them. Also we could be correspondence supervisors or section heads.

The idea in writing to you is to remind you of the forgotten women, potential national human resources. Could not you (or Congress) find, immediately, work suitable for older women to do? They might qualify by examination or test, if necessary, but the young women should be excluded from the same tests. Please do not suggest that we take civil-service examinations and await our chance of being called unless the examinations are especially for persons between the ages of 40 and 55. Perhaps the work could be found first and the women fitted in later.

The situation for the middle-aged, single, unemployed woman is grave, I think. We pay taxes, and we vote. Won't you please try to unearth something for us to do?

Sincerely yours,

Miss A. S. P.

[H. R. 4639, 77th Cong., 1st sess.]

A bill granting civil-service preference to persons between the ages of 40 and 55, inclusive

Be it enacted, etc., That the Civil Service Commission shall establish for persons be-

tween the ages of 40 and 55, inclusive, separate registers for any position in the classified civil service for which such persons are otherwise eligible. No person not on such register shall be certified to any position in the classified civil service for which such a register is established until all persons on such register shall have been so certified.

Women's Club of Kremlin, Mont., Opposed to Involvement of America in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEANNETTE RANKIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1941

PETITION SIGNED BY CLUB MEMBERS

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition:

KREMLIN, MONT., *April 22, 1941.*
Congresswoman JEANNETTE RANKIN,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned members of the Kremlin Women's Club, do earnestly ask that you continue to make every possible effort to keep this country from becoming involved in any war.

We favor giving material aid to friendly countries who are fighting for their freedom, but are absolutely opposed to becoming so involved that it will be necessary for our men to fight in any foreign war.

Kremlin Women's Club, Kremlin, Mont.: Mrs. Isabelle Petrie, Mrs. Inez Koble, Mrs. Hazel Hansen, Mrs. Fred Swartout, Mrs. S. G. Vosen, Doris Pasma, Mrs. Jay Pasma, Mrs. Joe Hollenhorst, Mrs. John Donovere, Mrs. H. W. Cody, Mrs. Leonard Kenfield, Mrs. Wendell Winter, Mrs. Chris Vosen, Mrs. E. Purdy, Mrs. B. J. Robeck, Mrs. F. D. Duffy.

The Hard Way Is the Only Safe Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1941

THE HARD WAY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the hard way, in the long run, is the safe way. Saint Matthew was right when he wrote:

For wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: Because strait is the gate and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life.

The President spoke true when he said that taxes are paid in the sweat of the man who works; that the nation which continued to waste or to spend more than its income was as surely on the way to bankruptcy as the individual who followed a like course.

We have been wasting and spending. Now comes the day of reckoning, and, if we as a Nation are to continue to exist, the strait gate and narrow way is our only road to safety.

Democratic leaders in Congress have long realized this, and within the week have put on a drive to force the administration to cut down nondefense appropriations by at least a billion dollars. May success attend their effort.

For several years industrial workers in mass-production industries, or employed by large corporations (not clerks, teachers, professional men, farmers, or businessmen), have been receiving periodic increases in wages, shortened hours of employment. Those not so fortunate do not begrudge them these increases, with the shorter hours, but are beginning to wonder when they are to receive their increases. All would like to prosper together.

THE FIRST THING

Is preparation for defense. The O. P. M. has come to realize that a 30-hour week will not enable us to meet Hitler's 60-hour week. Hence, last week, the President, at its suggestion, called for a 24-hour, 7-day week—this to produce the munitions of war, the ships, to aid Great Britain.

It is time we quit riding the joy wagon and all begin to push it out of the deep mud, the sand, and up the hill. That is just what the farmer, the workingman, the clerk, and the professional man, the small businessman in the country have been doing the last 8 years—and, in addition—paying taxes on the cost of everyone's joy ride.

Now, says the President, we must all go to work—and really work. Well, many of us are used to it and we shall be glad to see the other fellow bending his back and taking on part of the load; and we only hope that the President does not mean that a favored few are to receive pay and a half and double pay for all the work they do to save themselves, as well as the Nation, after they have put in 30 hours a week. If he does, nothing will have been gained. As he said recently, let us all sacrifice. As I have written before, if this is our war, let us all take a piece of it—whether that piece be good or bad.

THE BURDEN

Of something more than three and one-half billion dollars is soon to be imposed upon your backs by way of additional taxes. If the danger is to our Republic and—from within or without—no doubt it is, we are all willing to sacrifice. But none wants anything wasted or foolishly given away. The bottom of the barrel is not so far away and for national defense we may possibly need not only all that is in it, but something besides. Let us see if we can get that something.

DOES THE PRESIDENT MEAN IT?

Too often the President gives lip service but does not follow through with action. So now again some are wondering whether he really means economy; honest, hard work; a businesslike administration; or whether he is "just foolin'."

A hint of the latter comes with his demand at this time for $20,000,000 to aid in building a highway from our Mexican border down through Mexico, Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Panama, to Panama City. The ultimate goal is a 12,000-mile highway from the United States to the Argentine.

Before we do that, and especially at this time, how about a few roads in your community? We would like to see the folks down in Argentina, but if we must build a highway to them, we may not have money enough to buy the gas to drive down.

The Rivers and Harbors Committee, at the suggestion of the administration, has renewed the drive for the Florida Canal. There are other schemes for spending money, including the one for $6,000,000,000 for public-works projects.

To top it off, an administration Interior Department appropriation bill contained a little item of $40,000 for a super-super-comfort station down on the banks of the Potomac, where they have the symphony concerts. That was a little too much for even this spending Congress. So out the item went.

CONCLUSION

Do the folks at home really want convoys, war, the sending of an expeditionary force, new and additional taxes, the giving of most of our defense materials to nations across the sea? I doubt it.

I think we rather follow the hard and narrow way, the way to self-discipline, the way of economy, even though it means temporarily more work and less of everything for us, but will give us the certainty of national existence and a better life for our children. Perhaps I am mistaken. Only time can tell.

California Tide and Submerged Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1941

RESOLUTION OF STATE LANDS COMMISSION OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas more than 90 years ago the State of California as one of the United States, by virtue of its sovereignty and the act of its admission to the Union, became the owner, in perpetual trust for its people, of all lands within its boundaries submerged by the waters along its shore, of all lands covered by the ebb and flow of its tides, and of all the lands beneath its navigable streams and lakes; and

Whereas, for over 90 years the sovereign State of California has maintained uninterrupted jurisdiction over said lands; and

during said years has expended vast sums of moneys of its citizens in building structures thereon, and in dredging and improving its ports and harbors, and in building bulkheads and breakwaters therein and thereon, and in doing all and every of the things that a free people find essential to be done to make its sovereign lands available for the beneficial uses of its citizens in commerce, education, and recreation; and in aid of the United States in the exercise of its functions in fishing and navigation, as specified in the Constitution; and

Whereas minerals have been found beneath certain of said lands, and the State of California, in the interest of conservation thereof and for the benefit of its people, has caused said minerals to be produced, thereby obtaining for the State and its people an income exceeding $900,000 per annum, thus lightening the enormous tax burden now resting upon the citizens of California; and

Whereas the title of the sovereign State of California to these lands and privileges over which it has for so long maintained unquestioned jurisdiction and expended so much of the treasure of its citizens, has been sustained by numerous decisions of the Supreme Court of the State of California and by the Supreme Court of the United States, in cases in which the principles involved were clearly at issue; and

Whereas certain officials of the Government of the United States, and also persons for personal gain, have for 2 years or more endeavored, and are now endeavoring to obtain the sanction of the President of the United States for the filing of court proceedings on behalf of the United States against the State of California and those holding under and subservient to the State of California, with the object of wresting from the State of California, and those holdings under said State, said sovereign rights so long maintained and exercised; and

Whereas the State lands commission, under the provisions of the act passed in 1938, is prohibited from issuing prospecting permits to prosect for oil and gas in tide and submerged lands, and is also prohibited from issuing leases or contracts for the extraction of oil and gas from tide and submerged lands unless such laids are subject to drainage by wells located or drilled on adjacent private lands, thereby conserving oil and other minerals which may be contained in such tide and submerged lands; and

Whereas the State lands commission, consisting of the director of finance, as chairman, the Lieutenant Governor of the State of California, and the State controller of the State of California, was established in 1938 and has jurisdiction over the State-owned tide and submerged lands; and

Whereas this commission is by statute vested with the power and authority to administer the lands owned by the State of California: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this commission protest the said proposal and any proposal to attack the title of the sovereign State of California in and to said lands, and asserts as the duly delegated body charged with the duty of administering said lands that it condemns said attempt and any attempt and will oppose the same by all lawful means; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this commission shall certify the passage of this resolution and shall forward a certified copy thereof to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Governor of the State of California, to the Attorney General of the United States, to the Solicitor General of the United States, and to each of the Members of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives representing the State of California, or any district thereof, in the Congress of the United States.

I, Webb Shadle, executive officer of the State Lands Commission of the State of California, do hereby certify the foregoing to be a full, true, and correct copy of a resolution of the said commission, duly adopted by a majority of the members of said commission, and entered upon the minutes of said commission at a meeting on March 13, 1941, at State capitol, Sacramento, regularly called, and at which a quorum was present; that I have compared the same with the original, and that it is a correct transcript therefrom and of the whole of the said resolution.

Witness my hand this 13th day of March 1941.

[SEAL] WEBB SHADLE.

Three Choices Seen for Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1941

LETTER IN THE NEW YORK TIMES ON MONDAY, MAY 5, 1941, FROM BROTHER BENIGNUS

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, as a student of public opinion, I have read many letters and articles appearing in the daily papers and magazines discussing the position of our Government in the present world crisis. Reading my congressional mail and talking to my constituents, I have discovered that even members of the same family are often in honest but violent disagreement as to the best course for us, here in the United States to pursue.

Among the confusing and contradictory views printed each day, it is refreshing to read the opinion of a fellow New Yorker, Brother Benignus, professor of philosophy, Manhattan College, published in the New York Times of Monday, May 5.

The arguments presented by Brother Benignus are logical, reasonable, and constructive. The professor's feet are right on the ground. This letter is like an oasis in a desert to the American reader who loves our great democracy.

Let us consider this consistent train of thought and profit by the philosophical presentation.

The letter follows:

[From the New York Times of May 5, 1941]

LETTERS TO THE TIMES—THREE CHOICES SEEN FOR US—WE MIGHT RISK ALL TO STOP HITLER, KEEP ALOOF, OR ARM TO BRING JUST PEACE

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Many of our statesment, private citizens, and journalists writing or speaking on America's position in regard to the war, present two alternatives: (1) Risking all to conquer Hitler now; (2) abandoning the world to Hitler. Uncritical acceptance of these alternatives is the basis of the pleas to assure delivery of our war goods to Britain, even if it means our physical involvement in the war.

Belief that these are our only alternatives following prior beliefs:

1. That a prepared and alert America can be successfully invaded.

2. That America cannot survive, remain herself, and follow her own way of life if nazi-ism rules Europe.

3. That it is useless and futile to seek any just negotiated peace now.

4. That there is nothing that America can do to save democracy and civilization except to throw herself into the task of defeating Hitler.

Military men do not admit the first of these propositions. Furthermore, the probability that Hitler will ever attempt to invade America is not lightly to be assumed.

CERTAINTY VERSUS PROBABILITY

As to the second proposition, certain clarifications are in order. Collapse of many private American interests that are tied in with the world market, and consequent hardship to many Americans, are fairly predictable outcomes of a Hitler victory. But economic strangulation and the end of our way of life are not. A more probable result would be a forced effort on America's part to bring herself to a degree of self-sufficiency somewhat approaching the degree possible for her. Further, why do we ignore the certain impoverishment that our war effort would cause, while worrying about the probable effect of a Hitler victory?

The third and fourth propositions embody the real defeatism abroad in our land today. Our power for peace and justice lies unused because we have given up hope and desire of using it. We prefer to prolong the war and to run the risk of getting into it ourselves, to end up, probably, lying exhausted alongside a prostrate Europe. If anyone says that a peace arrived at now would almost certainly be better than one arrived at after 4 or 5 more years of hate and killing and destruction, we call him an appeaser.

Our belief that America can do nothing for herself or for the world except to throw all her resources into the task of defeating Hitler is apparently leading us into a course of action which is not only nationally unwise but which will have, in all probability, the most dire consequences for the whole human race. It entails, actually, at this moment, the neglect of America's own defense. It entails a very real risk, and one which few of us seem to have seen in all its true horribleness. If the thought of Hitler's complete victory in Europe is enough to make us tremble, what about a Hitler victory in which America goes down with the rest? Then, indeed, all is lost, all hope is gone.

DOUBT OF EUROPE'S FUTURE

And suppose we beat Hitler, what then? Wars should be fought only for the peace that comes out of them. Most of us would concede that the awful sacrifice of American resources and lives that our fighting would entail would be repaid if its result were to be a just and orderly Europe in which a repetition of the present horror would be impossible; but who will say that the mere crushing of the present evil, nazi-ism, is a sufficient payment for our sacrifices, if Europe remains the same old place with the same old ferments, to simmer for another 20 years, and then boil up into a new "ism" when America's present crop of babies will have attained selective-service age?

America today has no peace aims worthy of the name. President Roosevelt's "four freedoms" constitute an admirable ideal, but neither the President nor anyone else has so much as hinted at a way to bring this ideal to actuality. The first necessary element in any post-war reconstruction is some power in the world that has not been involved in the destruction. The chances that America will be involved in the destruction if she enters the war are very high, regardless of whether final victory is hers or not. We had a year and a half of war the last time; does anyone think that it would be only a year and a half this time? And if America is physically and morally impoverished along with the other belligerents, there remains "red" Russia.

THREE CHOICES OPEN

If America becomes strong and remains true to herself, there is hope that she can

work out some effective machinery to adjudicate future international disputes peaceably. Of course, the facile answer to this is that it will be impossible to work out and operate any such thing if we have to deal with Hitler. But we do not know how long Hitler and Hitlerism can last, even assuming nazi-ism's complete victory in this war.

America's true alternatives are quite different from those usually put forward. America can make one of three choices: (1) She can risk all in an effort to stop Hitler now, (2) she can build up her own strength and keep aloof from Europe, (3) she can build up her own strength, physical and moral, to lead the world to a just international order.

The first of these choices means very probable disaster for America and for all the world. The fact that America is unprepared for war is a relevant fact, even if our statesmen and editorialists refuse to treat it as such. To take this course would be to gamble on national safety and to toss away our only chance of bringing any good out of present evils. America's brains, good will, and strength will be needed in the post-war world. To dissipate them in a war whose result cannot be foreseen would be an act of treachery to herself and to mankind.

The second choice would be both un-Christian and risky. Un-Christian, because it would amount to telling Europe to go ahead and destroy itself in its own favorite way. Risky, because it would offer to American politicians and editorialists the same recurring temptation to get into Europe's fights.

Only the third alternative makes American and Christian sense. America must stay clear of the European conflagration and build up her own physical and moral defenses, with the aim of doing what she can when she knows what she wants to do and when she is capable of doing something. She must reverse her misguided policy of being isolationist in peacetimes when she might accomplish some good, and interventionist in wartimes when she can only make "confusion worse confounded."

BROTHER BENIGNUS,
Professor of Philosophy, Manhattan College.
NEW YORK, *May 1, 1941.*

World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JARED Y. SANDERS, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1941

RESOLUTION OF KIWANIS CLUB OF BATON ROUGE, LA.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to put in the RECORD a resolution passed by the Kiwanis Club of Baton Rouge, La. This resolution was passed without a single dissenting vote, and I believe that it expresses very clearly just about how the people in my section feel about the present very dangerous world situation that confronts us.

From my own observation, I am convinced that the people themselves are ahead of the Congress in their appreciation of the danger and in their determination to take such positive steps as may be necessary to insure our national safety.

The resolution is as follows:

The Baton Rouge Kiwanis Club believes with deep conviction:

First. That the present European war was unprovoked by any acts or intent of the neighbor nations of the Axis Powers;

Second. That this war stands therefore before the world as a war of greed and aggression, pure and simple;

Third. That it is an unholy and unrighteous violation of unoffending peoples, revolting to every principle of humanity and the comity of nations;

Fourth. That it seems now clear that nothing less than world domination will satisfy the lust and greed for power of these violators of human rights: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Baton Rouge Kiwanis Club—

First. That we brand Germany, Japan, and Italy as outlaw nations who have breached the settled principles of international law so carefully built up around the council tables during the last several hundred years of western civilization;

Second. That it is our firm conviction that the acts and purposes of the Axis Powers are such that no nation or people anywhere on the globe can hope to remain neutral, except on terms and conditions specified by them and to end in becoming their tool and vassal;

Third. That the vital interests and perhaps the very continuance of our American democracy are at stake in this World War;

Fourth. That we deplore the blindness of any leaders in America who fail to see our peril and who hamper our will or hinder our effort to put America's manpower in readiness to protect our country and to do our share to preserve world order;

Fifth. That we call upon the Congress and all in authority to confect and to put into execution with energy and dispatch the measures and policies worthy of our great country in this solemn hour;

Sixth. That we favor a bold and realistic attitude in the face of the present dangers and suggest as an early measure that we make our Navy and shipping available to insure war material and supplies to the defenders of democracy;

Seventh. That a copy of these convictions and resolutions be sent to the Members of the Senate and House from Louisiana, to the Secretaries of State, War, and Navy, and to the President of the United States.

I hereby certify that the above resolution was adopted at a luncheon meeting of the Baton Rouge Kiwanis Club on Thursday, May 1, 1941.

RICHARD C. CADWALLADER,
Secretary.

Political Dishonesty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. FLAHERTY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON POST

Mr. FLAHERTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of May 6, 1941:

[From the Boston Post of May 6, 1941]

POLITICAL DISHONESTY

Congressman Casey, of Clinton, made a spirited and able attack upon the proposed redistricting moves in Massachusetts.

In the opinion of many of us he did not go far enough in his castigation of the motives of the bosses.

Politicians in either party have a queer code of honor in such matters.

They clamor for honesty and public service, yet they call such things as campaign contributions, appointment of inept officials and, finally, gerrymandering, honorable dealing.

They admit, as former Mayor Mansfield once said, that a man can be honest in some things yet politically dishonest all the days of his public life.

Maybe they can quiet their own scruples by such terms as "legitimate graft" (campaign funds), and "political dishonesty" (the gerrymander).

But the public makes no such fine distinction. From the earliest school days, our citizens are taught that this is a glorious land, filled with good works and democratic principles, and that we have the right to select our own public leaders.

Such pages in our history books are dismissed as so much hypocritical pap as soon as we are old enough to know our public men.

We discover that men with large fortunes at their command can spend as much in a single campaign as most of us can earn in a lifetime, despite the fact that the law declares, in effect, that this is illegal.

We find that they can batter and bribe themselves into public office. They can swamp strategic sections of their opponents' strongholds with fat wads of money. They may never take a dishonest dollar while in office, but the fact remains that they arrive there by dishonest means.

The gerrymander, the art of carving up a district to keep out political opponents, regardless of the proper representation of the people, is so dishonest that it is revolting, yet sanctimonious politicians agree that it is permissible, because they have gotten away with it for a long time.

In Massachusetts we have the same old story today. We have a maneuver afoot to gerrymander the Fifth and Eighth Districts so that Congressman ARTHUR D. HEALEY will be jolted out of office and the present senate president, Angier L. Goodwin, will slide in.

Thus the Republican machine will reward one of its faithful handy men and the district will get some exquisite misrepresentation.

As president of the senate, Mr. Goodwin can direct this strategy to take care of himself.

Labor Policies of Industries Participating in Defense Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEANNETTE RANKIN
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1941

RESOLUTIONS OF LOCAL UNION NO. 65, INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, AND OTHERS

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions:

BUTTE, MONT.

Whereas the most vicious propaganda campaign ever initiated is now being waged against the wage earner and organized labor; and

Whereas those responsible for this campaign fail to mention that the profits on the labor of each employee of the major corporations of the United States of America in 1940 was double the amount of wages paid; and

Whereas it is an insult to the intelligence and patriotism of the American worker to charge that their efforts to better their working conditions is an attempt to slow down defense production; and

Whereas press reports of strikes in defense industries fail to state that many of these workers receive as little as $12 a week, while many more receive less than $20 a week, and

Whereas industry made no attempt to get into production until they had compelled the Government to remove all profit restrictions, and give guaranties for amortization of plant expansion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That before the self-appointed saviors of our democratic institutions destroy the very things we are so proud to protect, by enacting legislation that would make slaves of free men and women, the United States Senate, the United States Department of Justice, and the United States Department of Labor, be, and they are hereby requested to make a complete investigation of the labor policies of the industries participating in defense contracts, with a view to protecting the wage earner's right to a just share of the profits made on these defense contracts, and be it further

Resolved, That these same Federal agencies make an investigation of the amount of money being spent by the National Association of Manufacturers on antilabor propaganda and their influence on the attitude of the newspapers of these United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the findings of these investigations be made public and furnished to all national and international unions.

Respectfully submitted.

LOCAL UNION NO. 65, INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS,
DAN SHEEHAN, *Secretary*.

Identical resolutions received from—

D. S. Lyons, secretary, United Association of Journeymen Plumbers, Gas and Steam Fitters, Local Union No. 673, Anaconda, Mont.

Dean Tardeville, secretary, International Association of Bridge, Structural, and Ornamental Iron Workers, Local Union No. 81, Anaconda, Mont.

Elmer Rude, secretary, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers, Local Union No. 666, Helena, Mont.

Perry S. Melton, secretary, Central Trades and Labor Council, Kalispell, Mont.

Tax Plan Would Halt Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1941

ARTICLE FROM PM

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I think it might be wise for the Members of the House of Representatives to weigh the matters hereinafter mentioned:

[From PM of May 2, 1941]

TAX PLAN WOULD HALT INFLATION

(By Nathan Robertson)

WASHINGTON, May 2.—The House Ways and Means Committee got a badly needed lesson in economics yesterday from two economists who know how to use the tax system to prevent inflation without placing the burden on the poor.

The economists were Dr. Albert G. Hart, Iowa State College professor, and S. E. Harris, Harvard University professor. Among all the witnesses the committee has heard on the new tax program they were unique for two reasons:

They were proposing a system that would hit themselves and others in the upper-income brackets harder than the Treasury plan, and would be easier on the poor.

They understood the effect of taxes on purchasing power and inflation.

SIMPLE TERMS

Dr. Harris explained the inflation problem to the committee in simple terms. He said that out of a $90,000,000,000 national income next year, $20,000,000,000 might go for national defense. That would leave $70,000,000,000 worth of things the people could buy. But with $90,000,000,000, to buy with, and only $70,000,000,000 worth of things to buy, prices would be bound to go up.

Dr. Hart presented a plan sponsored by 130 economists, including some of the Nation's best known, to meet this situation. It was to raise all the new revenue through income taxes and to provide for quick rate increases whenever the cost of living began to rise sharply, so as to absorb the excess purchasing power.

In order to work, Dr. Hart said, this system must not only be flexible but prompt. He said it would require an entirely new system because income taxes now are collected a year and 2 years after they are levied. The Treasury is just collecting now the taxes levied last year.

To get this promptness of action needed in draining off excess purchasing power, the economists proposed to collect income taxes at the source, just as social-security taxes are now collected. Employers would deduct from wages and dividends varying amounts depending upon whether the recipients were single, married without dependents, or married with dependents. Farmers and self-employed would continue to pay their income taxes annually as they do now, but would be encouraged by discounts to pay currently instead of the next year.

RELIANCE ON INCOME TAXES

An equally striking feature of the economists' plan was complete reliance on income taxes. To get away from the additional excise taxes proposed by the Treasury they would lower income-tax exemptions. They said only 18 percent of the national income is now reached by income taxes and recommended that it be extended to reach 50 percent. Then a half of 1 percent rise in the cost of living could be counteracted by an increase of 1 percent on the income tax.

Dr. Harris presented figures showing how the sales tax hits the poor man, the income tax the rich man. Here is how much people in various income brackets would pay under a sales tax, with food and housing exempt, and how much they would pay under the income tax the economists propose:

Income:	*Percent taken by sales tax*	*Percent by income tax*
Under $500	6.4	0
$3,000 to $5,000	5.1	5.8
$20,000 and up	2.7	9.2

American Trade Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1941

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a copy of a bill introduced by me on April 29, 1941, being H. R. 4575, as follows:

A bill to promote the economic welfare of the countries of North and South America

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of promoting the economic welfare of the countries of the North and South American Continents by removing the economic barriers of custom and tariff duties, and thereby permitting the free and unrestricted trade and intercourse between the people of these countries, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to initiate a customs union in the North and South American Continents within the confines of which there shall be free trade and articles of growth, produce, or manufacture, produced within these countries, shall be permitted to pass from all parts of this area free and unrestricted by customs and tariff duties. The provisions of this act shall extend to all countries in the North and South American Continents who shall remove all customs or tariff duties on goods imported from the United States. When such countries have certified to the President of the United States that imports from the United States are to be admitted duty free, all import duties and tariffs on goods from that country shall be automatically suspended: *Provided*, That the President may establish quotas of certain products to be imported when unrestricted importation would disrupt or nullify the domestic policies of the United States, such quotas to become operative unless Congress shall by concurrent resolution within 60 days set aside such quota.

The Gerrymander

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. FLAHERTY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH R. CASEY, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. FLAHERTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered over the radio last Saturday night by my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY]:

The title of my speech tonight is The Gerrymander. It is an abuse of power by a State legislature whereby the congressional

districts are so arranged as to throw into each district a majority of voters of the majority party, thus giving it practically all of the representatives from the State.

The word "gerrymander" goes back to the year 1812, when Elbridge Gerry was Governor of Massachusetts. At that time the Massachusetts Legislature contrived a redistricting scheme which gave one of the districts the shape of a lizard. Gilbert Stuart, the well-known artist, entering the room of an editor who had a map of the new district hanging on a wall over his desk observed, "Why, this district looks like a salamander." and put in e claws and eyes of the creature with his pencil. The editor replied, "Say, rather, a Gerrymander" and the name stuck.

This scheme was used most flagrantly in Missouri in order to deprive the Negroes of the right to vote. Some Republican leaders in Massachusetts now intend to revive it for the purpose of depriving the Democrats of Massachusetts of representation in national affairs The chairman of the committee empowered to report back to the legislature on redistricting is Angier Goodwin, president of the State senate. Under his direction, the Republican members of the committee have drawn up a plan which has for its main purpose the carving out of a congressional district that will insure Angier Goodwin a seat in Congress.

This pet district of Mr. Goodwin's would give him a district composed entirely of Republican towns and cities. He can't take any chances of having even one Democratic town in his district. On his merits, Senator Goodwin can't make the grade. He hopes to ride into Congress on the back of the gerrymander.

In order to carve out the district, Angier Goodwin and his cohorts felt that it was necessary to place three sitting, progressive Democratic Congressmen in one district—namely, HEALEY, FLAHERTY, and CONNERY. Congressman FLAHERTY's district is right in Boston and is overwhelmingly Democratic. So Mr. Goodwin and his handymen want to extend Congressman FLAHERTY's district so that it takes in that part of Somerville where Congressman HEALEY lives, and then goes out to Lynn and takes in that part of Lynn where Congressman CONNERY resides. Of course, only one of them could possibly win, and that would mean the elimination of the other two. Under this proposed scheme the great cities of Lynn, Lawrence, and Somerville are split and divided and thus robbed of their strength and unity. The combining of three Democratic Congressmen in one district is the most atrocious feature of the proposal. It deprives these Congressmen of the opportunity to fight for their seats in Congress.

In the case of my district, they propose to drop such Democratic strongholds as Southbridge, Dudley, Webster, Spencer, and Leicester, and to go all the way down toward Boston and add such Republican strongholds as Lincoln, Weston, Wellesley, Needham, and Dover, thereby insuring my defeat. But at least I can fight for my seat in Congress as I have fought for it on previous occasions. My district was originally a shoestring district as the result of a previous gerrymander. Nevertheless, I succeeded in carrying it each time I ran by increased majorities. The present gerrymander would give me tremendous obstacles to overcome, but that is nothing new in my political life—and I am not asking for any quarter for myself. I am speaking in behalf of those sitting Democratic Congressmen who have been deprived of even the opportunity to run for their seats by this dishonest, corrupt, and venal scheme to redistrict Massachusetts for the benefit of the president of the State senate, Angier Goodwin.

Mr. Goodwin undoubtedly thinks that placing three Democratic Congressmen in one district is a brilliant stroke of strategy. It is brilliant all right—so brilliant that it can be best described by a quotation from Congressman John Randolph, made in the House of Representatives on March 5, 1806, about something less reprehensible. He said, and I quote, "So brilliant, yet so corrupt, that, like a dead mackerel in the moonlight, it both shines and stinks."

All previous plans for gerrymandering pale into insignificance before this bold usurpation of the rights of the voters. The other plans were petty larcency. This one is grand larceny.

At the moment, the G. O. P. has the big majority of important jobs: Governor, majority of the legislature, and 9 out of the present 15 Congressmen. As a result of the last census, Massachusetts loses 1 Congressman. Republican bosses are not content with the majority of the big jobs. They want more. Therefore, Angier Goodwin and his handymen have designed a congressional redistricting bill which they think will give the Republicans 12 Members of the next national House of Representatives and the Democrats but 2. That is a ration of 6 to 1, and no man can claim that this represents the proportion of Republicans to Democrats in Massachusetts.

You all know that the Governor, in the last election, was elected by a very small majority. The fight was close, very close—so close that its outcome was in doubt for a long time and a recount made necessary. Indeed, in the past 16 years, the Democratic candidates for President have all carried Massachusetts.

Massachusetts is a democratic State. No man can honestly claim that it is any worse than 50–50. This plan makes it 84 to 16, which is utterly false and absurd.

If a Democratic Governor and a Democratic legislature ever proposed to put through a plan such as this, can you imagine the howl that would go up from the Republican press of this commonwealth. The Boston Herald did carry an editorial in which it mildly rejected the plan and stated that the redistricting, while a difficult job, ought to be done as fairly and equitably as possible. But I have yet to read where any other Republican paper in the State has condemned it. It comes with particularly bad grace at this time when the democratic form of government all over the world is threatened. It proves that Mr. Goodwin and his cohorts not only do not favor democratic representative government but are incapable of even understanding it. They are, in effect, attempting to gag the Democratic voters of Massachusetts from having a voice in national affairs. They have the power, they have the votes, but they haven't got the right. Decent Republicans throughout the State will combine with Democrats and independent voters in resenting it.

There may have been a time in the past when political trickery and political fakery were countenanced as being a necessary part of public life. That day has passed. Today more than ever, the voters of America demand that men in public life consider public office a public trust. The rights of the citizens must be respected.

In the face of the fact that during the past 16 years, each Democratic presidential candidate has carried Massachusetts by a decisive majority and during that same period, the people of Massachusetts have accorded majorities to the Democratic candidates for Governor at five State elections and to the Republican candidates at only two, this attempt to legislate out of existence the Democratic Congressmen of Massachusetts, violates all laws and rules of fair play, decency, and justice. Just as boldly and ruthlessly as any Hitler, they propose to ride roughshod over the principles of democratic government. If the plan succeeds, the Massachusetts delegation will be unrepresentative.

Let me make it clear that I do not charge the Republican State administration with responsibility for this proposal. All I know is that it was submitted by the Republican majority on the redistricting committee as a tentative plan. I am here tonight to unmask it in all its naked ugliness. I am here tonight to call it to the attention of the leaders of the Republican Party in Massachusetts. Now that it has been called to their attention, they cannot—and I believe will not—stand idly by and disclaim responsibility. If they do, I confidently predict that the voters will handle them without gloves in 1942.

During the last campaign I recall seeing the pictures of Governor Saltonstall and Lieutenant Governor Cahill on billboards throughout this Commonwealth, and underneath them the words, "They stand for honesty and integrity in government." Tonight I ask them to live up to that simple campaign promise. I warn them that as leaders of the Republican Party, if they remain silent, the voters will construe their silence as cooperation. I believe that they and decent Republicans everywhere will repudiate this nefarious enterprise that Angie Goodwin and his cohorts are now considering.

I understand that the Democratic members of this redistricting committee have a plan whereby the State of Massachusetts is divided into compact contiguous districts. This alternative plan does not split or divide a single city. Under this plan there would be established 8 Republican districts, 4 Democratic districts, and 2 doubtful districts. I do not approve of this plan. It is too much of a capitulation. I agree with the position taken by Labor's Nonpartisan League, which wrote to Governor Saltonstall under date of April 29, and stated, "Since the State of Massachusetts is about evenly divided between Democrats and Republican voters, any plan which would appreciably change the present representation in Congress would be manifestly unfair." Therefore we ought to have seven Democratic Districts and seven Republican districts. However, the Democratic minority on this committee state that they can't hope to get this—that the Republicans have the power and the votes and that they (the Democratic members) have submitted the alternative plan in order to salvage what they can. It will be very interesting to see whether the Republican leadership in Massachusetts will accept this alternative plan which gives the Republicans eight districts and the Democrats three in a State that is evenly divided. If they do, they can still save their faces, because, while the plan is one introduced by Democrats, nevertheless it was introduced because of the fear that the Republican proposal, which I have just discussed, would be forced upon them.

If the Republican leaders fail to accept this alternative plan they will stand convicted before the bar of public opinion as being b' :sed and sanctimonious frauds, interested in nothing except political power and pelf.

The choice is theirs. They cannot evade it. Either accept the alternative plan or commit political suicide in a most ignominious fashion in 1942.

Today, As Always, America Comes First With the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning, from the National Legislative

Committee of the American Legion, the following letter and two resolutions were received:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., May 5, 1941.

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOFFMAN: Enclosed please find two resolutions adopted by the national executive committee meeting of the American Legion on May 2, at Indianapolis, Ind.: One calling for the resignation of the Secretary of Labor, and the other forbidding strikes and lock-outs in industries.

I shall appreciate very much if you will have these two read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of the Members of Congress.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR,
Director, National Legislative Committee.

Resolution 43–B

Whereas it is essential at this time of grave emergency that there should be no lack of complete confidence in any officer of the Government if we are to attain full unity of purpose in this Nation; and

Whereas it is becoming increasingly obvious that there is a growing lack of confidence on the part of the American people in the abilities of the present Secretary of Labor to fully exercise the high responsibilities of that office; and

Whereas it appears that as long as the present Secretary of Labor is in office there will continue to be trouble in defense industries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Executive Committee of the American Legion, That it is the opinion of this organization that the cause of national unity in national defense will be best served by the tender and acceptance of the resignation of the present Secretary of Labor.

Resolution No. 43–C

Whereas for 19 years the American Legion, representative of the veterans of the war of 1917–18, have advocated universal service if war should ever again be our Nation's lot; and

Whereas if this Nation is to be spared and our way of life is to continue, our sacrifices must be universal. There are no private rights which transcend public safety. There are no material profits which cannot be recaptured and there is no wage situation incapable of adjustment after the work is done: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the national executive committee of the American Legion, That we demand of the national administration and the Congress legislation forbidding strikes and lock-outs in national-defense industry during the period of this national emergency.

Who Feeds the Fascist War Machine With American Oil, Munitions, and Dollars?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1941

EDITORIAL AND ARTICLES FROM PM

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I believe it will be worth while for each Member of the House to carefully weigh the matters hereinafter mentioned:

[From the New York PM of May 2, 1941]

WHO FEEDS THE FASCIST WAR MACHINE WITH AMERICAN OIL, MUNITIONS, AND DOLLARS?

Here—on the following pages—are the facts we've been able to find out. More important than the facts are the questions they raise—questions that only a congressional investigation can really answer.

Who's doing this to democracy's fight for life?

What are we going to do about it?

Meanwhile, George Reedy and Kenneth Crawford, in PM's Washington office, complain that we have undervalued their exposé of the part played by William R. Davis in selling oil to Germany. Here is their pertinent wire—and our reply:

FROM KENNETH CRAWFORD AND GEORGE REEDY TO THE EDITOR OF PM

What are you going to do about it?

After several months of investigation and several days of composition, we in the Washington office have prepared a series of articles on William Rhodes Davis, the big oil and peace man.

You have buried our reports on Mr. Davis in what would be the want ads if PM carried want ads. You haven't bothered to call attention to them on page 1.

We are concerned about such cavalier treatment of such important and significant news.

You seem to have been so preoccupied with the menace of distant Nazis that you can't see the menace of Nazi allies who are right under your noses. You have been fighting Nazis in Europe, in the north Atlantic, in Omaha, Nebr.—anywhere except in Manhattan. As distant fields look greener, so distant fights are more challenging.

It is simple enough to get worked up about fascism's unlovely works abroad. It is not so simple to get aroused and arouse others about the handsome Texan, the successful American businessman and adventurer, who looks out from the pages of PM (with monotonous regularity, if we may say so. Can't you find any other art in the morgue?). (For a full-page picture of Mr. Davis, see p. 21.)

Yet this engaging gentleman sold the Germans a good part of the oil reserves that drive the Luftwaffe bombers that kill our Allies in Great Britain night after night; the oil reserves that drove the tanks that mowed down our Allies in Greece; the oil reserves that soon will be driving machines against Gibraltar and Suez. Is it too much for your imagination to bridge the gap between fancy offices in Rockefeller Plaza and the rubble-strewn streets of London?

Mr. Davis built an oil refinery for the benefit of the Nazis—long before the war broke out, to be sure. He fed this refinery with crude oil from Mexico—up to and even after the Nazis were murdering Poles. He got access to the Mexican oil by worming himself into the confidence of labor leaders in Mexico and the United States of America. He tried to peddle a shabby peace plan to President Roosevelt after Poland had been conquered.

He has associated with and cooperated with agents sent to this country and Mexico by the Nazis to get war materials from us—war materials that one day will be used to kill American soldiers and sailors. He has contributed liberally to the organizations built up here to confuse us and make us easy prey for the Nazis.

We in the Washington office think William Rhodes Davis, his associates and the others like him ought to be investigated by a congressional committee with power of subpena. We haven't been able to find out all that should be known about him and them. We could only get what information people were willing to give us voluntarily.

We have raised some questions that should be answered. For example: Did General Goering seriously consider trying to overthrow Hitler after the conquest of Poland or were our officials told that to trick them into approval of the conquest? Was it just coincidence that John L. Lewis' anti-Roosevelt campaign broadcast cost just about what Mr. Davis contributed to various Republican organizations? How much military material have Mr. Davis and others shipped the Nazis by way of Japan and Russia? Who was the mysterious woman in the black veil who followed Joachim Hertslet, chief Nazi agent for the Western Hemisphere, around Washington the last time he was here with one of Mr. Davis' men?

We in the Washington office are going to keep on digging up facts about the William Rhodes Davises in the hope of persuading Congress that it should find out what they are up to and, if their activities are detrimental to the safety of the United States of America, as we believe they are, that these activities be stopped.

What are you up in the New York editorial rooms going to do about it?

GEORGE E. REEDY.
KENNETH G. CRAWFORD.

FROM THE EDITOR OF PM TO KENNETH CRAWFORD AND GEORGE REEDY

You are right—and you are wrong.

We know how you feel, having worked months on an important story only to find it missing from the front page. But you are wrong in concluding that this office is uninterested in exposing Fascist plotters at home. We think Fascist plotters at home are more important and more dangerous than Fascist plotters abroad. That is why we were so enthusiastic about your idea of tracking down William Rhodes Davis, when you first brought it up months ago.

But you are right that the fall of Greece, the President's new patrol policy, and the loss of the Mediterranean conspired to get our eye off the ball. We should have smashed your story harder, and you have our apologies. If the readers of PM had missed your story because it was printed on inside pages, they would get our apology, too. But we do not think they did miss it—one of the reasons we haven't got any ads in PM is just so we can never bury any story. We banged away with Davis as a daily must, even though in this news crisis we were dropping other series and features.

Why we agree that we should have played it on the front page is not that we do not think people read it. We know, from the mail and telephone calls, that they did. It should have been on the front page because the facts you have revealed deserve the most dramatic treatment we know how to give them.

There has been a lot of talk in the papers about Charles A. Lindbergh, spokesman for the "fifth column" in these United States. Personally—I do not know either, but on the record—I like Charles Augustus Lindbergh a lot better than William Rhodes Davis. As far as I know, all Charles A. Lindbergh has done about fascism is argue for a national policy favorable to it. All he has done is talk.

Aside from giving some stupid British statesmen misleading and inaccurate technical information about the competence of the Hurricane and the Spitfire to fight the Messerschmitt, he has never done anything but public-mouthpiece work for the Fascists. But your man, William Rhodes Davis, is something else again.

Your man William Rhodes Davis has made money out of this nasty business. Your man William Rhodes Davis has mixed innocent blood and guilty oil.

With you, I want to know a lot more about him. And others.

I want to know who was it in with him. I want to know who else has cashed in on selling the power to hoist the land mines over London, so they might be dropped on sleeping women and children. I also want to know who cashed in on driving shell splinters

of United States scrap iron into the bodies of Chinese peasants.

I want to shake these facts in the face of the American public and say, "Look at them. This is what fascism means. This is the fascism that is here already waiting for a Hitler victory, waiting for a chance to do to you what Hitler has done to the working people of Europe.

This is the Pandora's box that a Hitler victory over Great Britain would open here in our midst. Hitler has friends here whom he will want to reward in his victories, as he rewarded Quisling when he took Norway. Quisling is a comparatively nice fellow, stacked up alongside of Americans who sell munitions to the enemies of democracy.

Go to it. Keep telling us what you can find out, and we will keep hammering the question here: Who are these people, and what are we going to do about them?

R. I.

[From the New York PM of May 2, 1941]

W. R. DAVIS STARTED TO DELIVER MEXICO'S OIL TO NAZIS—THE BRITISH BLOCKADE STOPPED HIS TANKERS—BUT HE WAS STILL GETTING MONEY FROM THE NAZIS IN 1940—FOR WHAT?

(By George E. Reedy and Kenneth G. Crawford)

WASHINGTON, May 2.—William Rhodes Davis and his associates insist that they have done nothing to help the Nazis since the outbreak of war in the fall of 1939—that the more than $400,000 they collected from the Germans in 1940 was in payment for oil delivered before the invasion of Poland (September 1939) or immediately after.

The fact seems to be that the British blockade did stop the flow of oil from Mexico to Germany almost immediately. Mr. Davis lost two cargoes learning that the blockade was effective. He continued to ship to Italy, presumably for transshipment to Germany, until the British bottled up the Mediterranean, too. Discontinuation of the traffic was not a matter of choice; it was a matter of necessity.

But Mr. Davis, who says with Charles A. Lindbergh that he wants neither side to win the European war, has continued to collaborate with the Germans in other ways. He has peddled their goods in Mexico. He has sent agents into other country below the Rio Grande scouting for the strategic war materials the Axis powers need. He has brought German agents into the United States of America and Mexico to do Hitler's chores.

IT'S ALL LEGAL

He has continued to do these things as the Nazis have overrun Europe, and United States officials well know it. Up to now they could not or would not do anything about it. They probably could not because, as one of Mr. Davis' assistants pointed out to us, it still is not illegal for an American businessman to do business with the Germans. The United States of America is technically neutral and anyone is at liberty to sell Mexican oil or minerals to Germany if he can figure out a way of making delivery. This assistant did not admit anything. He merely stated a hypothetical case.

Mr. Davis went so far as to admit that he still, on occasion, exchanged messages with German authorities. But all his messages, he said, were open to inspection by United States authorities and none was in code. He added that he had always acquainted the State Department with the details of "every transaction I ever made."

This statement, we are in a position to say, is an exaggeration. Not all of the exchanges have been code free, although they might seem so to the casual reader.

BRINGS NAZIS TO MEXICO

Just before the German invasion of Poland, when Mr. Davis was doing a big business buying expropriated Mexican oil, shipping it to his Hamburg refinery, and paying for it part in cash and part in German barter goods, big bees were buzzing in his sombrero.

He proposed a plan which, in effect, would have made Germany the economic overlord of the United States of America's closest southern neighbor. His scheme involved construction of a railroad, a pipe line across Mexico from the Pacific to the Atlantic, purchase of ships for removal of guano from southern California and various other projects whose total cost would have run into tens of millions.

In August 1939 he brought to Mexico Joachim Hertslet, high official of the Nazi economic ministry and gauleiter of the Western Hemisphere, to look over the prospectus. With Herr Hertslet came Eugene Brieschke and another expert.

The idea was that Germany would extend credits for the development of Mexico's rich natural resources and pay itself back out of profits from the exploitation and barter. Mexico was to become Germany's Western Hemisphere trading post. Herr Hertslet, after conferring with Mexican officials in the presence of Mr. Davis, turned thumbs down.

FOOTHOLD IN MEXICO CITY

But Mr. Davis was not completely discouraged. After returning from Germany in October with his peace plan—a plan which would have made Washington the underwriter of a Polish Munich—Mr. Davis expressed confidence that the war would be of short duration and that his Mexican preserve would be waiting. Accordingly he kept open his Mexico City office, which, when we visited it last month, was doing business under the direction of E. S. Walnes. The name on the door was Damex Engineering Co. This firm is the successor of Davecome, the company that sold millions of dollars worth of oil to Germany in 1938 and 1939.

Asked about reports that Mr. Davis was buying up mercury and other strategic metals for shipment to Germany via Japan and Russia, Mr. Walnes said he had investigated the mercury market with the idea of keeping himself busy and making a little money for the firm. He said nothing came of it, though, because he discovered that the mercury market was so tricky he might lose more than he made. This seems strange because the Japanese bought tons of it last year and bid the price up to three times its 1938 level. Fulminate of mercury is used to make bomb detonators.

As late as last summer, after the war had been on for almost a year, Mr. Davis sent his associate, W. F. Flanley, to Brazil to investigate the possibility of trading oil for manganese ore, iron ore, and other essentials of war. Davis' agents had previously gone to Uruguay on a similar mission. Last fall Alberto Cuevas and Fredrico Franco Arch, who represented themselves as Davis' spokesmen, scouted Mexico for mica, sulfur, and mercury. They talked to Elmer R. Jones, of the Wells Fargo Co., about a plan for export of sulfur in quantity.

Last January Herr Hertslet, who had a Davis representative in tow when he visited Washington in the summer of 1940, was reliably reported back in Mexico helping a Japanese trade mission barter rayon at bargain prices for mica, tungsten, oil, mercury, and antimony. At one time in 1939 Japanese steamers were loading 8 to 10 cargoes of Davis oil every month.

AND OIL IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Davis once paid the expenses of H. H. Hagenmann, of the Junkers Co., for a trip to Mexico. And early last year he organized Avimex, apparently with the object of establishing himself or his German friends in the flying business.

While all this activity has been going on in Mexico, Mr. Davis also has been busy developing his Rincon oil field in Starr County, Tex., which is connected by pipe line with a tank field at Brownsville, the American port closest to Mexico. Officials of the Brownsville Chamber of Commerce told us last month about Mr. Davis' plan for building a $1,000,000 refinery in their town. He already owns a lion's share of the port facilities. Before we got there he had brought a party of bankers and other potential investors to the scene of the refinery project.

Just how valuable the Rincon pool is, how much oil is being shipped from it and where, is Mr. Davis' secret. We were told a lot of stories in Houston. Some competent oil men told us Rincon was a bonanza. A Mexican official, acquainted with oil in the Southwest, told us Mr. Davis was "getting some very nice kerosene out of it." Mr. Davis also has oil properties in Mexico but apparently is concentrating his attention on Rincon at the moment.

Mexican officials claim they are still selling some expropriated oil to the Continental Refining Co., which has a contract with Mr. Davis for exploitation of Rincon. Mexico's other customer now is the Eastern States Oil Co. of Galveston, which associates of Mr. Davis organized.

There is no doubt in the minds of informed American officials, whose names we are not at liberty to give, that Mr. Davis is, or has been until very recently, selling war materials to the Axis Powers and continuing to cooperate with Herr Hertslet. This traffic may now be stopped by Russia's refusal to permit transit of war materials over her territory as the British blockade stopped direct shipments to Germany. Even then, there will be the Japanese market.

[From the New York PM of May 2, 1941]

THE TIME HAS COME TO ANSWER: WHICH AMERICAN FIRMS ARE SENDING OIL TO JAPAN?—HERE'S A CHANCE TO SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT

In the belief that the American people are entitled to know which American companies are shipping oil to the Axis, PM sent the telegram on this page to the presidents of 16 of the leading oil companies in the United States of America.

Which companies are shipping oil has never been made public. We don't know. It's a "trade secret." A month ago we published a photograph of an export order of the Standard-Vacuum Oil Co. showing that as late as March 7, 1941, a shipment of 256,000 gallons of oil was made to Japan. This photograph is reproduced on the preceding page. That's one company, at least, that we know about. But what about others?

We will keep track of the answers we receive and pass on the information.

In addition to the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, here are the other companies to whom telegrams were sent:

Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., J. A. Brown, president; Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, E. G. Seubert, president; The Texas Corporation, W. S. S. Rodgers, president; Standard Oil Co. of California, W. H. Berg, president, Standard Oil Building; Gulf Oil Corporation, J. F. Drake, president; Shell Union Oil Corporation, R. F. A. van der Woude, president; Consolidated Oil Corporation, H. R. Gallagher, president; Phillips Petroleum Co., K. S. Adams, president; Tide Water Associated Oil Co., W. F. Humphrey, president; The Atlantic Refining Co., R. H. Colley, president; The Pure Oil Co., H. M. Dawes, president; Union Oil Co. of California, R. H. Taylor, president; Sun Oil Co., J. Howard Pew, president; The Ohio Oil Co., O. D. Donnell, president; Continental Oil Co., Dan Moran, president.

[Telegram]

MAY 1, 1941.

W. S. FARISH,
President, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York City:

An official British statement announced yesterday that up to the end of March nearly 29,000 innocent men, women, and children have been killed and 40,000 injured in Nazi air raids on Britain. Every American who can still be moved to indignation at these wanton

killings must ask himself: "How much American oil helped to refuel the bombers that brought this horror to the British people?"

PM is now printing a series of articles showing that William Rhodes Davis and his associates sold the Germans a good part of the oil reserves that fuel the Nazi luftwaffe. We know that oil is at this very time still going to Japan to help kill Chinese defending the independence of their country, and that some of this oil is available for Japan's Axis partner, Germany.

By every moral code it is revolting to the American spirit that Americans should take part in such a heinous business, particularly at this moment, when the American people have expressed their determination to beat fascism. Behind the cloak of "trade secrets" is hidden the identity of American companies who still participate in this traffic. We believe this is intolerable: that the American people have the right to know the names of those who are helping to arm our enemies against us.

We know that you are not doing this; but the only way for the public to know is to eliminate the innocent one by one. In line with this process, would you be good enough to let us know whether your company is shipping oil to the Axis Powers?

THE NEWSPAPER PM.

HERE'S THE FIRST ANSWER WE'VE RECEIVED

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
May 1, 1941.

NEWSPAPER PM,
Brooklyn:

Retel, May 1. Our company has consistently refused to fuel German or Italian vessels for some time as result of requests from the British Admiralty. We are selling some oil to Japan, securing a license from the United States Federal Government for each shipment and have not felt it to be in the best interests of all concerned for our company to attempt the determination of policies affecting foreign relations. Up to the present time the British Admiralty has made no suggestions to us with reference to sales of petroleum to Japan. May we suggest that you investigate oil sales by British and American controlled companies of oil from the Dutch East Indies, which are currently being made to Japan.

REESE H. TAYLOR,
President, Union Oil Co., of California.

The Pan-American Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 7 (legislative day of Monday, May 5), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at Cincinnati on Thursday night, April 3, 1941, entitled "The Pan-American Highway in Relation to Hemispheric Defense." This address was delivered under the auspices of the Cincinnati Automobile Club, which is one of the member clubs of the American Automobile Association, was broadcast over the Crosley Broadcasting Stations, and was rebroadcast over the shortwave station WLWO, of the Crosley Stations, in Spanish, to the Latin American countries of Central and South America, and in Portuguese to Brazil.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Henry, president of the American Automobile Association, Mr. Gardner, president of the Cincinnati Automobile Club, Mr. Switalski, general manager of the Cincinnati Automobile Club, members of the Cincinnati Automobile Club, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, initially I wish to assure the officers and trustees of the Cincinnati Automobile Club of my deep appreciation of their invitation to address you on this, your fortieth anniversary, and to congratulate you upon the acquisition of one of the finest automobile club buildings in all the world. It is certainly one of the most modern automobile club headquarters in the country, and it must be of pleasing satisfaction that you actually own it.

I am happy, indeed, to find myself with you in this palatial hall of mirrors of the Netherland Plaza Hotel in your thriving, teeming, prosperous city of Cincinnati, the gateway to the South; Cincinnati, with its welcoming arms outstretched to the north, east, south, and west, with its doors opened to the Atlantic, to the Pacific, to the Great Lakes, and to our sister republics of the south, welcoming at all times the 250,000,000 inhabitants of the Western Hemisphere. It is truly a city of hospitality.

Secondly, may I thank the Crosley Radio Corporation, through the medium of its two broadcasting stations, for the opportunity to reach at this time the ears of the more than 1,000,000 motorists throughout the length and breadth of this vast continent who are members of the American Automobile Association and the more than 275,000 boys constituting the membership roll of the school safety patrols in the more than 3,500 communities in the United States.

For more than 10 years I have had the honor of serving as one of the vice presidents of the American Automobile Association; and, having traveled extensively by automobile in virtually every country of the world where the modern arteries of civilization are to be found in the form of highways, I particularly can appreciate the tremendous aid and service which has been and is being provided by your organization to the motorists of the world, particularly in the United States and Europe.

It will doubtless be interesting to you to learn that the American Automobile Association was organized in 1902 when there were only 23,000 motor vehicles and less than 150 miles of improved highways in the whole of the United States. And I may say with just pride that its leadership in the field of motoring has unquestionably been a potent factor in the phenomenal growth of motorcar use, by Americans at least. Today passenger-car registrations alone total more than 30,000,000, and today there are more than 1,000,000 miles of improved highways, in comparison with 150 miles of improved highways only 39 years ago.

However, it will perhaps prove more interesting to some of you to learn that the Cincinnati Automobile Club is exactly 1 year older than the American Automobile Association itself. This club, one of the many A. A. A. clubs, was one of the pioneers in the development of the famous Dixie Highway, the Atlantic-Pacific Highway, the Appalachian Highway, and has been active in all good-roads work for exactly 40 years. This club alone now has more than 6,000 school-patrol members in its territory, which includes southern Ohio, northern Kentucky, and southeastern Indiana.

This club's most recent activity has been in the promotion of the Cincinnati-Charleston Highway, which has now been broadened to a military highway. On the Great Lakes to the north of us, and to the south, in the industrial district, and in the eastern seaboard at Charleston, S. C., it will be a supermilitary highway connecting industrial and defense cities with the seaboard; a military highway transporting raw materials to manufacturers, rather than having transportation depending entirely upon railroads, where one act of sabotage might destroy transportation for days or weeks. Such a project is truly an aid to our national-defense program, and I congratulate your club upon its activities in an endeavor to lay this ribbon of concrete which will lead from the southern seaboard at Charleston to Cincinnati and northward to the Great Lakes.

It is concerning national defense and hemispheric defense in connection with highways about which I shall address you tonight.

Several years ago I visited by automobile, boat, and plane the islands of the Pacific—from the Galapagos group off the coast of Ecuador—northward over the Pacific, through the Bering Sea and the Arctic Ocean to Point Barrow, the northernmost point in the Western Hemisphere; then across Canada to Labrador and Newfoundland and southward over the North Atlantic; then through the Caribbean to British Guiana, just north of Brazil. This trip I made with a view to making recommendations as to the welding of a band of steel which would provide us with a perfect defense by the establishment of outposts in the Pacific, the Arctic, the Atlantic, and along both coasts of the northernmost sections of South America. We have in mind the acquisition of islands off the coast of Ecuador. We have fortified our Pacific possessions. We are developing our defenses in Alaska, the Aleutian Islands group, and the Arctic. We have acquired rights to make establishment of bases—outposts—in Newfoundland, the Caribbean, and in British Guiana. We are fortifying against attack upon the Panama Canal from both its Pacific and Atlantic entrances. I am in high hope and believe that the band of steel which for many years I have favored soon will have been welded.

And now, in order to perfect to a large extent national and hemispheric defense, we are actually developing a combination military, commercial, and tourist highway which eventually will lead from Fairbanks in Alaska, where we have but recently established an Army air base, southward across the United States, Mexico, and Central America, traversing the Panama Canal Zone, with a terminus southward at Buenos Aires—the metropolis—and eventually northward to Rio—the most gorgeous city setting upon the earth.

Such a ribbon of concrete—such a course of modern arteries—will clasp the two continents of the Western Hemisphere, thus providing solidarity and hemispheric defense which we all seek during these perilous hours—hours filled with threats and fears of attack, penetration, and aggression.

It is a sad fact that throughout its history, the United States has felt itself infinitely more closely related to the culture, history, and commerce of various European nations than to the republics to the South. Unfortunately, the average North American child can reel off the date of the Norman conquest in England, the salient causes and effects of the French Revolution, but the average North American adult is strangely ignorant, for example, of the causes and effects of the Mexican Revolution, or of the great names of Bolivar, Sam Martin, Sucree, O'Higgins, and other heroes of Central and South America.

Likewise, the people of Latin America have never considered their destinies tied to the strange, rude people of the north, but rather to the decayed grandeur of an ancient em-

pire across the sea, to what the liberator Bolivar was pleased to call "The decadent philosophies" of the Old World.

Well do I remember with much appreciation my beloved but departed colleague, United States Senator Hamilton Lewis, who so ably represented his great Commonwealth of Illinois, and particularly well, when frequently he advised the people of our country to turn their eyes southward, southward where in the Latin American countries there reside a people in numbers approximating the population of the United States. Many times have I visited all the countries of Central and South America and on those many occasions have I observed the opportunities that await the industrialists, the businessmen and the youngsters of our Nation, all of whom may find enviable opportunities for employment, development, and trade in that section of the world.

If I were commissioned to issue a command to my countrymen in this critical hour of world history, it would be "eyes south." Too long now have we in the United States looked too exclusively to countries across the Atlantic. Likewise, if I might venture to issue a command to our sister republics south of the Rio Grande, I should say "Eyes north." Some of them, like our country, have looked too exclusively to European nations. The manifest destiny, welfare, protection, and safety of this hemisphere lies in friendly continental solidarity. The barrier of language, the lack of communication and transportation, have all militated against the understanding and cooperation essential to preserve and advance the political and economic independence of the pan-American nations.

Present disturbing world conditions demand the cementing of American strength to preserve American freedom. One of the most important developments of these conditions in this part of the world is the unanimous acceptance of all countries beyond the Western Hemisphere of the fact that an injury to one is the concern of all, and in speaking of these two continents of our section of the world, I recall to memory that Simon Bolivar, the liberator, was to South America what George Washington was to North America. Unfortunately, Washington is better known in Venezuela today than Bolivar is in the United States. Washington was resting in Mount Vernon before Bolivar's work was done, but the South American had been strengthened by the example of his North American comrade in devotion to independence.

In 1826, George Curtis, the adopted son of Washington, sent Bolivar a gold medallion containing a lock of Washington's hair and bearing a miniature portrait by Stuart. On it in Latin were engraved the words "This portrait of the author of liberty in North America was donated by his adopted son to him who achieved equal glory in South America." A letter from Lafayette accompanying the gift added: "Of all men living, and even of all men in history, Bolivar is the one to whom Washington would have preferred to send this present. What else can I say to the great citizen whom South America has honored with the title of liberator, a title which has been confirmed by two hemispheres, a man endowed with a prestige equal to his disinterest, who carries in his heart only the love of freedom and of the Republic?"

This was the man who blazed new trails 114 years ago, whose vision extended beyond the horizon of immediate independence for his native Venezuela, or even of independence for all Spanish Americans. In 1826 he summoned delegates to meet at Panama for the formation of a Congress made up of all the American Republics, the fulfillment of a glorious dream that had never grown dim through years of struggle and eventual victory. He believed that the future of this continent was wrapped up in the slogan which he proclaimed, "Unity, unity, unity."

Distance was greater in his day than in ours. There were lacking, even more markedly then than now, transportation and communications, and the unity and cooperation he sought to bring about failed of realization during his lifetime. However, transportation facilities by land and water have improved and those by air have been inaugurated, and we of all the Americas, both North and South, would do well to make utilization of Bolivar's slogan: "Unity, unity, unity."

The mutual interdependence of the American Republics and the logical continent-wide desire to establish a second type of union, understanding, and solidarity have been emphasized at pan-American conferences from the one called by Bolivar in 1826 up to that one recently held in Habana, Cuba, in July of 1940.

On April 2, 1889, there opened a conference called by the United States and attended by representatives of all the other American nations. Among the proposals of this congress was one authorizing the construction of a transcontinental railroad which would connect all the nations of the continent. However, the overwhelming development of automobile transportation and the perfecting of new methods of road construction soon made the building of a highway more feasible than a railway. As a result, the sentiments and mutual assurances conveyed in the various pacts and agreements between the American nations are now being practically applied to end the isolation which has made pan-Americanism a purely lyrical idea.

The pan-American highway, as originally planned, begins at Ottawa, in the Dominion of Canada, and finally ends in southern South America, and now the beginning of the latest pan-American highway idea will extend from Fairbanks, in Alaska, southward to Laredo, Tex., where the Ottawa branch will join.

The history of the pan-American highway is one of the engrossing chapters of hemispheric enterprise, and it might be said that after all these years this modern conception was the inspiration of a group of Latin American engineers which met in Washington, D. C., in 1924, and since then it has been the goal of two continents; however, the real history of the pan-American or all-American highway properly begins back in the sixteenth century. At that time all of what is now Central America was known as Guatemala, and the Spaniards, with their capital city in the northern part of the province, decided to construct a highway southward in order to cement their rule over their wild and inaccessible possessions, and with slave labor they built a massive bridge. Today this bridge is still standing and is in good condition. It actually will be traversed by the pan-American highway when it is completed, and cars bearing licenses from Iowa, North Carolina, Ohio, or Maine may shortly be utilizing this bridge built nearly 200 years ago.

Plans for hemispheric defense have given new impetus to this, one of the greatest road projects ever dreamed of by man, which would stretch from the snows of Alaska through the tropical swamps of Central America, over and along the Andes of South America, to the bustling, modern city of Buenos Aires in the Argentine. So with a world aflame, Uncle Sam, looking to his defenses, finds that two of his most valuable outposts—Alaska and the Panama Canal—are on the mainland, but today can be reached only by air or water. Railroading started in this country early in the nineteenth century, while automobiles began their great march toward popularity early in the twenties, but to date neither steel nor macadam reaches to these possessions. Although our own frontiers within the United States have seemed boundless, time and increased population are closing them to the American of pioneering instinct. Yet, to the northwest of us lies one of the most potentially rich, undeveloped territories in the Western Hemisphere—Alaska—still open to our people. Alaska alone covers 590,000 square miles, with all the variations of climate from that of the Temperate Zone to that of Arctic conditions. In many portions the climate equals that of the eastern seaboard of the United States, while, as a matter of fact, Juneau, the capital of Alaska, has milder winters than the Capital of our country, Washington, D. C. So vast is this expanse of Alaskan territory which we purchased for approximately $7,000,000 that it actually covers many more square miles than all of the States east of the Mississippi River. It is in Alaska that this pan-American highway will begin, and will run southward from Fairbanks across British Columbia, over the United States through Mexico, Guatemala, Salvador, Spanish Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama, the Canal Zone, Colombia, Ecuador, and at Vitor, Peru, where the road branches, one spur proceeding southward to Santiago, the capital of Chile, and across the towering Andes to Buenos Aires, the capital city and the metropolis of the Argentine. The other spur proceeds over the high level to La Paz, Bolivia, and from there to the Bolivian-Argentine border and through the Argentine pampas to Buenos Aires. From there a ferry connects with Montevideo, Uruguay. It is planned to extend the highway northward from Buenos Aires through Paraguay and perhaps in the immediate proximity of Iguassu Falls near the borders of Paraguay and Brazil, and then northeastward to Sao Paulo, the coffee center of the world, and terminating at the beautiful capital city of Rio de Janeiro, which nestles serenely beneath the towering peaks that overlook one of the most gorgeous bays in all the world.

A large portion of this vast stretch of cement, macadam, and sand-clay ways has been completed. There are stretches in Alaska, Mexico, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama, and Colombia which remain to be completed, but work today is going forward at an almost satisfactory rate upon most of these stretches with the aid of these respective governments in cooperation with the United States—and, I daresay that ere long one may in comfort by automobile make the trip from the near Arctic Zone across the three Americas to the very tip of the Argentine, and then northward to the road's proposed ultimate terminus at the capital of Brazil.

Last fall while in South America some of you will probably be surprised to learn that one of the longest automobile races ever to take place was run over a part of the Pan American Highway from Buenos Aires across the Andes to Lima, the capital of Peru, a distance of 3,000 miles and return to Buenos Aires, making a total of 6,000 miles. This race was participated in by more than 100 cars, all exclusively of stock type, and it was my privilege to have witnessed from the air a leg of this race when I was flying from La Paz to Salta in the Argentine en route southward.

I have driven over a goodly portion of the Pan American Highway and have flown over all of the rest of the highway. In talking last fall with people in all of the countries of Central and South America traversed by the Pan American Highway I was delighted to find them enthusiastic about its completion. They recognize that the completion of such a mammoth project will bring closer together the 259,000,000 of people of the Western Hemisphere; that it will be productive not only of a tremendous influx of tourists into our sister republic of Mexico, but southward over the lands once ruled by the Aztecs, the Mayans and the Incas. No more colorful country in all the world can be found than is to be seen along this route. No other section in the world possesses a history more interesting than the history of the western world. No other people upon the face of the

earth are more friendly, affable, congenial, than our brothers to the south, our neighbors of Latin America. Even today one may pilot one's car from Caracas, the capital of Venezuela, over a well-done highway to Bogota, the capital of Colombia, and southward to Santiago in Chile, or Buenos Aires in the Argentine, with the exception of a brief strip in Ecuador.

So, finally, soon we may go abroad without the use of a steamer. Soon we may motor to every republic of Central and South America and feast our eyes upon the towering pyramids, the tombs of the ancient Aztecs, the temples as spacious as those of India, the snow-capped peaks as towering as those of the Alps, and there and elsewhere the cathedrals as mammoth and as gorgeous as those of Europe. Then, southward, the towering peaks of the Andes; Lake Titicaca, 12,500 feet above sea level; the colorful Indians of all of these countries; the ancient ruins of western civilization, which some declare to be older than the civilizaion of Egypt; the palatial hotels and the mammoth public edifices of Buenos Aires, with its public underground garage accommodating 1,800 automobiles. And in tropical and mountainous Brazil, a country almost one-third larger than continental United States, where the Portuguese language is spoken by its 50,000,000 inhabitants, from where one may return by car to their respective homes in the United States or to our frontier in Alaska. If these 16,500 miles over which we have traveled almost from the North Pole to the South Pole have wearied us, then we may embark by palatial steamer from Rio with our car northward over the Atlantic through the Caribbean, touching perhaps British, Dutch, and French Guiana, within sight of Devils Island; and, homeward, perhaps for a day's docking at Trinidad, Martinique, the Barbados; and who knows but what we might find it possible to disembark at Santo Domingo and motor across that old Spanish dominion to lovely Haiti; then on the homeward stretch maybe we shall motor from Santiago, Cuba, across the island to Habana, where last year a very important meeting of the Pan American Conference was held; and then to our respective homes in the good old United States of America.

Longevity Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 7 (legislative day of Monday, May 5), 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES M. MEAD, OF NEW YORK

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the so-called longevity bill delivered by me in connection with the program of the United National Association of Post Office Clerks on Friday, May 2, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

First of all, I wish to pay my compliments to the United National Association of Post Office Clerks, under whose friendly auspices this program is conducted.

I join in this, their radio program, with great happiness and enthusiasm because it touches a subject in which I am deeply and genuinely interested.

To those of you who may be listening this evening and to postal employees wherever you are tonight, I wish to make this as simple and as clear and as unequivocally direct as I know how: I favor, first, last, and always the enactment by Congress of a longevity pay bill for postal employees.

I speak quickly and bluntly about this legislation because it is becoming a subject of increasing public interest. Occasionally, a well-meaning citizen questions rather critically my sponsorship of this legislation. He tells me that the postal clerk or carrier or other employee is in a favored status, both as to salary and security, and that a so-called bonus for him for long and faithful service cannot be justified under the economic conditions of today. Sometimes he may go even further and denounce the proposal as wholly and permanently without justification under any circumstances.

The history of this legislation makes it easy to believe that there are likewise Members of the House and Senate who would subscribe to this philosophy.

Therefore, I am unusually happy tonight to grasp this opportunity to make the case as I see it. It is a stand from which I have no intention of retreating. I believe in the justice of this measure, and I believe in it with all of the sincerity and earnestness of which I am capable.

We are now, I hope, approaching the successful conclusion of a long and often discouraging campaign. I first introduced a longevity pay bill in 1928. That was 13 long years ago. The fight still goes on.

Currently, hearings are being conducted by the House Post Office Committee on the legislation and, later on in this Congress, I intend to request hearings in the Senate. Each is a productive step toward the achievement of an honorable goal.

To get the record straight, the bill proposes that, after 10 years of service, all postal employees shall receive $100 per annum increase, and for every 5-year period thereafter, an additional $100 per annum until 30 years' continual service has been completed. At the present time, post-office clerks and carriers, for example, enter the service at $1,700 per annum and receive annual salary promotions of $100 until the maximum grade of $2,100 is reached. Once they have achieved the $2,100 per year grade, the prospect of further salary promotion is extremely limited

It boils down to the unpleasant truth that, in the vast majority of cases, the average postal employee is in a salary stalemate after he reaches the regular salary grade. Thus, an employee of this Government, in the Postal Service, may be no further advanced, so far as pay is concerned, at the conclusion of 30 years that he was at the conclusion of perhaps 5 or 10 years of service.

Should such a situation obtain, under force of law, in private enterprise, it would precipitate an issue that would rock the country. Of course, there is the very important element of job security involved, and rightly so. But even such security cannot compensate for a wage stagnation, under law, which affords virtually no hope of progress, nor allows any recognition of increased efficiency obtained from years of experience.

The longevity bill would provide a just reward for long, faithful, and efficient service with the Post Office Department. It would recognize that conscientious application to duty merits some material consideration. It would mark the man who has performed long and loyal service with a badge of tangible appreciation—an appreciation counted modestly yet effectively in dollars and cents. It would provide an immeasurable stimulus to morale within the Service. It would generate hope, inspire confidence, and promote good will throughout the ranks of the biggest business on earth. Furthermore, it would cite to other private and public enterprises the crystal-clear truth that the United States Government recognizes and rewards its faithful senior employees.

To be completely practical about the matter, a postal employee's competence increases commensurately with his years of service. It is equally true in almost any other trade or profession which you might name. But in the Postal Service, no matter how highly skilled an employee may become, his grade and his salary are stationary except in a few rare instances when he may, through unusual and fortuitous circumstances, fall heir to a higher assignment.

Supervisory and executive positions are relatively few and the prospects of the average village or city clerk or carrier or other employee to attain such posts are as relatively likely as that of the average employee in a plant becoming one day the president or executive head of the company for which he works. It does happen, of course, but the rank and file, including the highly competent and skilled, remain perforce in the grade which they attained a few short years after they entered the Service.

There has not been a general salary reclassification act since 1925. Sixteen years is a long, long time to wait for adjustments. Who can declare that the postal employees, by and large, have not been tolerant and patient? In my opinion, as a group, they have demonstrated a degree of restraint that has been both rare and commendable. The hour is soon to come, however, when they shall insist on the equity which they deserve.

The Post Office Department, in rendering its opinion on the legislation this month, stated that 147,153 employees would be affected, and pointed to the increased cost that would necessarily be involved.

I have discussed this subject with the Department officials in the past, both publicly and privately, on a friendly basis. I appreciate the anxiety of the Postmaster General, for whom I have the highest regard, to keep to a minimum the expenditures of his Department. In my judgment, it is the most efficiently and economically operated branch of the Federal Government, and I would do nothing to detract from or hamper that superlative record.

I am compelled to question, however, the value or extent of an economy which is effected by a tax on the morale and initiative of a large group of employees. I seriously question whether it actually is money in the pocket of the Department to regiment into a permanent salary rut the great bulk of its employees. A longevity pay act which would provide a modest reward for long and faithful service would, in my opinion, yield infinite dividends both to the personnel and to the Department. Perhaps you may think I deal in sentimentalities while the Department deals with realistic budgetary figures. It may be true to a certain extent, but my years of experience with legislative matters affecting postal employees convinces me that it is both blind and futile to eliminate the human equation in considering the justice and merit of personnel legislation.

Tonight I plead the cause of the longevity bill. My heart is in it. I know that where once the field of support for the measure was scattered and forlorn, today it is strong and united. With the strength that springs from accord and from the knowledge that the cause is sound, we will keep up the good fight.

Fiscal Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 7 (legislative day of Monday, May 5), 1941

ARTICLE BY FRANK R. KENT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine statement in the Baltimore Sun by Mr. Frank R. Kent on the subject of reducing nondefense spending and establishing a sound fiscal policy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun]

WASHINGTON, May 6.—When a member of the President's Cabinet or any other high Government official makes a public recommendation or proposes a basic change of policy, it is naturally regarded as news. The assumption is that he speaks for the administration. Particularly is this true when he happens to be recognized as on intimate terms with the President or when he speaks just after conferring with him.

Certainly it would seem that the newspapers are justified in construing—and the public in accepting—such statements as significant. But that is so distinctly not the case with Mr. Roosevelt and his administrative aides that the utterances of the latter, while they still make the headlines, are diminishing in importance among those whose job it is to observe and interpret national affairs.

The reason, of course, is that the President does not back them up, and any Government official's recommendation not backed up by the President just falls to the ground. He might better not have made it. Mr. Roosevelt not only does not back up such recommendations after seeming to approve, but on more than one occasion actually has gone in the other direction. This is a strange way to act, but that is how he has acted more than once, as men like Mr. John Hanes and Mr. Lewis Douglas can attest. A striking example has just been presented in the request, which the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reveals, Mr. Roosevelt has just made of Congress to extend for 2 years his power further to devalue the dollar and to operate a stabilization fund.

It may be recalled that some 5 months ago Mr. Marriner Eccles, head of the Federal Reserve Board, a strong New Dealer and warm friend of the President, publicly urged that these Presidential powers be ended, as a means of lessening the threat of inflation. Mr. Eccles' recommendation was made after he had talked both with the President and Mr. Morgenthau; and it was unanimously endorsed by all the other members of the Reserve Board, by the presidents of the 12 Federal Reserve banks, and all the Board's Advisory Council. Coupling the curtailment of power with insistence upon a reduction in normal governmental expenditures, these officials made an unprecedented request of Congress that seemed to have administration approval.

It was not for some weeks that any sign of disapproval was given, and then it seemed more a lack of enthusiasm than disapproval. Meanwhile, various administration spokesmen represented Mr. Roosevelt as glad to relinquish the power to devalue, and Mr. Eccles was highly praised for his sound suggestions. Now, most unostentatiously, Mr. Roosevelt throws the Federal Reserve Board advice "out the window" and asks Congress to extend his emergency powers over the currency until 1943, in face of the almost unanimous view of the Federal fiscal officials that to give them up would aid greatly the effort to avoid inflation.

No one offers much of an explanation of the President's action. Like many of his others, there is no adequate or easy explanation. In making his request Mr. Roosevelt does not meet the Federal Reserve Board's argument at all. He just ignores it. Such is his control of Congress that probably he will get what he asks, though there is certain to be some protest. That, however, is apt to be overshadowed by the tragic events of a great war, and thus, with slight public notice, the Government will refuse to take a step, urged by its own financial authorities, to guard against a great danger.

This by no means is an isolated instance of the President's refusal to back up his own trusted aides. A short time ago Mr. Morgenthau told the House committee that nearly a billion dollars might—and should—be saved by reducing normal expenses. This was in line with what the President himself had said in January. However, when he wrote his letter to Chairman DOUGHTON of the Ways and Means Committee, urging the new taxes, he neglected not only to back up Mr. Morgenthau but never mentioned the subject of retrenchment. A day or so later the committee indicated its desire for the Morgenthau economy, though the President had not referred to it.

It is a bad state of affairs. Here is the great Federal Reserve Board, appointed by the President, asking him to adopt one course and the President adopting exactly the reverse course. Here, too, are the Secretary of the Treasury and the Ways and Means Committee insisting upon a great cut in normal governmental expenditures, while the President fails to follow through and has, in fact, lent his influence to increasing at least one appropriation 100 percent. With such a complete lack of coordination and coherence, there is danger of the whole fiscal program drifting into chaos. It would be almost in the nature of a miracle if Congress, without Presidential leadership, should do the things essential to stability. But that seems the only hope.

Resolutions of Executive Committee of American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 7 (legislative day of Monday, May 5), 1941

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two resolutions adopted by the National Executive Committee of the American Legion on May 2 last.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the American Legion in convention assembled at Boston, Mass., September 23–26, 1940, adopted a resolution whereby it urged the Government of the United States to exercise all lawful means to prevent the shipment of raw materials to aggressor nations, and that it continue to extend to all peoples who are resisting aggression the fullest cooperation consistent with our obligations, our security, and our peace; and

Whereas thereafter the Congress of the United States, after full debate and proper deliberation, passed House bill 1776, known as the lend-lease bill, whereby the President of the United States is authorized to extend aid to Great Britain and her Allies in their efforts to preserve to the world the priceless right of freedom; and

Whereas we believe that practical and necessary aid to Great Britain and her Allies requires that war matériel, food, and medical supplies be delivered to them; and

Whereas there is grave danger that vessels carrying such matériel and supplies will be attacked by belligerent nations in violation of international law and in violation of compacts heretofore entered into by such belligerent nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Executive Committee of the American Legion, That we earnestly urge the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the Nation to employ such units of the United States Navy and auxiliary forces in such manner as in his judgment may be required to insure the safety of American vessels and their crews by guarding them against attack from any source; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States.

Whereas the President of the United States and the Secretaries of State, War, and Navy Departments have publicly stated that totalitarian aggression constitutes an immediate and grave threat to the safety of the United States; and

Whereas under such circumstances action by the people of the United States appropriate to the full extent of this emergency is vital; and

Whereas the people of the United States, not being fully informed of the true facts, do not understand or appreciate the dangers of which the President and his officers speak, nor do they fully comprehend the full extent of this emergency which threatens the safety of the United States and its people, and therefore have in consequence lapsed into a peacetime complacency: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Executive Committee of the American Legion, That we urgently request the President and his officers to immediately make available to the Congress and to the people of this country a full and complete statement of the facts which constitute immediate danger to this Nation, as they see it, in order that speedy and effective action may be taken for the complete protection of the country and to insure that singleness and unity of purpose among our people which is so necessary to national safety; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Legion pledge its utmost support to whatever plan of action shall be deemed by the President and the Congress to be necessary for the safety of this Nation.

The Place of Mediation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 7 (legislative day of Monday, May 5), 1941

ADDRESS BY DR. JOHN R. STEELMAN

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Dr. John R. Steelman, Director of Conciliation, United States Conciliation Service, Department of Labor, before the conference meeting on labor relations of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States on April 30, 1941. The subject of the address is, The Place of Mediation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The mind and heart of American business is advancing steadily toward the realization of progressive labor policies which make for peace in industry. Yankee ingenuity and that strong American characteristic of perseverance have been able to achieve in this country industrial and technological advances not to be found anywhere else in the world. The United States Chamber of Commerce is to be commended for the forward-looking business principles which it has accepted, and the increased steps which are taken day by day toward the realization of such ideals.

It is encouraging to see the leaders of American industry giving an ever larger place to the subject of healthy human relations in the conferences which they conduct and the meetings held under their auspices. It would make me happy to contribute even a little to your meeting on that broad subject today.

Mediation and conciliation are used interchangeably in our country. Some have sought to make definite distinctions between the two words. As far as I know, there is no basis of fact for such a distinction. Conciliation or mediation (whichever you prefer to use) is the process of bringing those who differ to the council table in a series of conferences, either separately or together, so that finally they may iron out their differences and agree to an accepted solution.

Conciliation is the age-long way of bringing harmony in the midst of conflict. It is the simple task of bringing those who differ around the council table. History is filled with the accomplishments of those who have followed this peaceful method of solving problems. Church councils have ironed out disputes in doctrine. King's councils have worked over the major problems of government. Trade associations and labor unions have met to agree among themselves upon those principles for which they are organized and those working procedures by which they carry on. Indeed, without consultation and common agreement there would be no government, no industrial organization, no labor unions, and no orderly way of life. Conciliation is just another word for organized peace.

A meeting of minds is a general basis of on-going civilization. It is necessary in international relationships as within the boundaries of our domestic difficulties. Diplomacy is a channel for the settlement of both international and national problems. In fact, there is no limitation whatsoever which may set on the good work of conciliation. Getting together is necessary in the home, the school, the church, the market place, the labor union, and the chamber of commerce. All of these have a common need—the bringing of people to the task of working and living together without resort to force or coercion.

The purpose of conciliation is to prevent unnecessary conflict and to bring understanding among those who differ. It is not always possible to get people to agree to harmonious action. Frequently it is necessary to urge people to give the time necessary to intelligent discussion of their differences. If more understanding can be established in this way, leading to greater productivity and assured good will, time spent in discussion is time well spent. But if there is no will to peace, no desire for open expression of opinion, and no genuine desire to improve working conditions and work efficiency, discussion in itself will not avail. Argument will never be a substitute for good will.

The arbitrary exercise of governmental power to enforce the transient desires of either labor or management can bring no permanent good. Legislation to outlaw strikes would be as fundamentally unsound as straight jacket legislation for the control of management. Unless the voluntary way of life which has brought such blessings to our country in the past can be continued, we shall have but little better to offer to the world than totalitarian bigotry. On our way to the maintenance of our American liberties we cannot afford to enthrone totalitarian concepts of government in our midst.

A recent article appearing in the Nation's Business carries this important statement:

"Despite the present need for speed, there are two good reasons for not rushing into a regimented economy: First, it is not the best way to win this struggle; compulsion is a weaker force than the enthusiastic efforts of a free people. Second, freedom too easily surrendered may be lost. The force we are combatting is totalitarianism; let us not surrender to it in advance."

Compulsory arbitration has been tried in various places, in foreign lands as well as in some of our own States. The Australian compulsory-arbitration law and the Kansas industrial-court law did not prevent strikes. A law to outlaw strikes can make them illegal; it cannot abolish them. The United States Chamber of Commerce has gone on record against the use of coercive measures for the settlement of strikes. Management and labor unite in favor of voluntary ways of solving these problems in our free land.

Practical necessities bring special problems in connection with mediation work. Every case is different. It is not possible to generalize about all of them or to present a formula which will meet all problems. The time, place, and individual circumstances of each trouble spot in the industrial fabric demands separate and personal consideration. Conciliators must go to their work with open minds. No prejudgment of a situation is possible. The need for care and adaptability is never more evident than in relation to industrial problems.

The conciliator must know human nature. He is called on to deal with it in the rough. A formal call upon the United States Conciliation Service for assistance does not always insure a warm welcome on the part of labor leaders or industrial managers when the conciliator arrives at the scene of the dispute. In only 2 or 3 instances, however, has the service of one of our commissioners been refused during the last 12,000 cases handled. It takes time to establish confidence with leaders on both sides. It requires more than an ordinary amount of tact and patience to bring them to understand the need for an honest facing of the facts relating to their differences. While technical equipment and economic data are necessary for the conciliator they will in no way compensate for practical common sense. The conciliator on the job has to be there with all the skill at his command or he should not be there at all.

The publicity attendant on strikes is always a problem in itself. When the conciliator comes to the seat of industrial trouble, he seeks to work quietly. The detailed work of conciliation which he accomplishes is seldom printed in the newspapers. For the conciliator is as much bound by professional ethics as a doctor, a lawyer, a clergyman, or any other public man could be. The newspapers may carry accounts of the visible manifestations of strikes and lock-outs. The inside story is usually known to a very few people.

Strikes are unusual trouble problems in industry. We have over 184,200 manufacturering establishments, each of which produces over $5,000 in goods each year. Last year less than 2 percent of these firms were involved in any form of work stoppages due to labor trouble. A work stoppage or a strike is news. Unfortunately we do not hear enough of our industries and business establishments which go on year after year with no strikes and no threatened strikes. The great majority of workers and business managers realize the importance of continued production, especially in these days of emergency need. A strike situation is not the ordinary course of business routine in the United States.

However, it will not do to minimize the seriousness of those stoppages which do occur. No one could be more aware than we of the Conciliation Service of the many problems arising from week to week. Not infrequently our work continues from 9 in the morning until almost dawn of the next day. During 1940, the Conciliation Service disposed of 4,665 situations involving over 1,700,000 workers.

In order most effectively to implement the work of the Conciliation Service, the National Defense Mediation Board was created by the Executive order of the President on March 19. This important body of distinguished leaders has at its command the combined conciliation sources of the Nation. It has proceeded to its work promptly and fearlessly and has well justified the faith which the President has placed in it. Emergency needs call for emergency aids and the National Defense Mediation Board is a substantial agency assembled for these emergency days.

The Conciliation Service has worked in close cooperation with the National Defense Mediation Board ever since the Board was created. This has been especially facilitated by the work of a liaison officer with the Board whose uninterrupted experience as a commissioner of conciliation goes back to before the World War. Another close link has come through the work of the conciliators on cases certified to the Board. As soon as the case is certified, the National Defense Mediation Board contacts the commissioner of conciliation on the scene asking him to continue to help the parties seek a settlement until the Board is ready to handle the case. A number of cases certified to the Board have been settled by the conciliator on the job before the National Defense Mediation Board called the company and union officials to meet together. When the case is taken to the Board, the conciliator usually comes to Washington to assist by sharing with the Board the information he has already obtained.

As for certification of cases to the Board, we have carefully instructed the entire staff of the Conciliation Service to give utmost attention to any potential Board case and to earmark, at the earliest possible moment, every situation which may at any time become deserving of such special treatment in the interests of the defense program. So far, 22 cases have been certified to the Board. Of this number, 12 have been settled. In 3 others, stoppages have been terminated and

further investigations are in progress. Six cases are pending.

The National Defense Mediation Board is authorized to seek adjustment and settlement by mediation and voluntary arbitration. The Board like the Conciliation Service has no power of enforcement. It is authorized to investigate issues, conduct hearings, take testimony, make findings of fact, and formulate recommendations for settlement. It can also make public such findings and recommendations whenever in the judgment of the Board the interests of industrial peace so require. The Board in no way implies any form of compulsory arbitration. The basic labor-relations policy of our Government is that agreement be freely arrived at by management and labor. We are still following the voluntary method long established for settling our disputes.

Conciliation and voluntary arbitration as methods used by the United States Conciliation Service go back to 1913 when the Service was established under the Department of Labor. Since that time the Service has been active in approximately 30,000 labor-management situations involving more than 23,000,000 persons.

When the National Defense Advisory Commission was established, the Secretary of Labor designated seven of our most experienced Commissioners of Conciliation to devote full time and energy to employer-employee relations in seven key industries: Steel, shipbuilding, oil, rubber, and chemicals, aviation manufacturing, machine tools, and building construction. Since then additional special commissioners have been designated for these and other vital industries. These men have brought peace to many situations by the wholehearted support of management and labor.

These industries are, of course, only a few of those upon which our defense program depends. All our 110 Commissioners have been instructed to give preference to all defense cases. We have a man on the case in a few hours and he keeps in daily contact with our Washington office. Full information, of course, is promptly relayed to all Government departments and agencies affected.

Throughout our work of the past few years we have observed a growing trend to the use of mediation in the early stages of management-labor differences. Naturally we have done our best to encourage this trend. During 1940, for example, out of more than 1,600 threatened strikes and controversies which were originally brought to our attention, over 90 percent were settled without stoppages of work.

More and more unions have adopted a policy of withholding strike action until the Conciliation Service has been notified of the difficulty and has had a chance to help work out a settlement satisfactory to all concerned. And more and more management representatives are calling on us in the earlier stages of any difficulties which are encountered.

As a further step in avoiding stoppages of operation, management, and labor in drawing up their agreements are increasingly providing that if they themselves are at any time unable to adjust a dispute over interpretation of any part of the contract, the matter shall be submitted to arbitration. As for the choice of an arbitrator, where no individual is specified, it is frequently provided that the Conciliation Service, upon request, shall designate some neutral person. A survey last year of over 1,200 agreements in our files disclosed that 62 percent contained provisions for arbitration.

So much for the inclusion in agreements of provisions for arbitration of any disputed interpretation or application of those agreements. There is another type of arbitration about which considerable misunderstanding exists. This is the arbitration not of the application or meaning of an existing agreement but of what some agreement, as yet unconcluded, shall be.

Mediation is not always effective. Sometimes all the efforts of the best conciliator fall short of developing a satisfactory solution of some aspects of a controversy. In these comparatively rare cases the conciliator will usually encourage the parties to submit to arbitration the point or points on which they cannot come to agreement. He encourages them, in short, to agree to arbitrate.

Arbitration of this type is often quite valuable and deserves the careful consideration of all parties whenever a dispute cannot be settled by other means. There are, however, limitations to its usefulness which cannot be ignored in our efforts for positive, constructive peace in the industrial field.

It has been my own experience and that of the Conciliation Service over many years that a solution reached by the parties themselves is to be preferred to any decision handed down by any outside party, no matter how well-informed and conscientious and impartial that outside party may be.

Many union leaders, without solicitation, have pledged their cooperation and are helping their members sensibly and patriotically to avail themselves of all the facilities of conciliation and arbitration. With this policy, I need hardly add, progressive American managements are cooperating most heartily. I commend to you at this time, that, in your own plants, mills, stores, and offices, you utilize all the facilities of conference and negotiation. In the event that a problem is not resolved by this procedure, we, of course, are at the service of your company and your employees. I suggest only that you call us in during the earlier stages so that, so far as in our power lies, we may help work out a voluntary solution before and not after a stoppage of operations.

Strikes and work stoppages are not alone responsible for delay in production. Defense activities have met with problems all along the line. Lags in production and bottlenecks of distribution have been found in many places. Common sense shows clearly that responsibility for these conditions cannot be measured in terms of any one factor. As we move forward in our national-defense program our achievement will be explained through the cooperation and efficiency of many men and institutions.

There is no end to the problems which we must solve and no way to fix responsibility for success or failure except as every citizen in the land shall accept his full responsibility. All of us should strive earnestly to promote peace in industry. We are challenged to accept the teachings of the world's greatest conciliator who, 2,000 years ago, in the Sermon on the Mount said, "Blessed are the peacemakers." The peacemakers are first of all the management leaders and labor representatives on the ground. Then come the interested citizens of the community and the mediators. It will take us all to do the job that lies ahead.

Defend Our Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1941

EDITORIAL BY T. R. CUTHBERT IN THE LABOR WORLD OF CHATTANOOGA, TENN.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Labor World of Chattanooga, Tenn., which was printed on May 2, 1941. The editorial was written by T. R. Cuthbert, editor of the Labor World, who states that it is the personal view of the editor and that the expressions contained in same may or may not coincide with labor officially, although he believes it does generally.

This editorial is worthy of the very serious consideration of labor and of those representatives who are especially interested in the advancement of the condition of the workingman. Mr. Cuthbert is a student of international affairs who is willing to face the situation bravely. His suggestions and conclusions contain much logic.

The editorial follows:

[From the Labor World, Chattanooga, Tenn.]

DEFEND OUR COUNTRY

(This editorial is the personal view of the editor, and the expressions herein may or may not concide with labor officially, although we believe that it does, generally.)

For weeks we have been squirming and fidgeting in our editorial chair, so to speak, and as war events are rapidly unfolding, more and more have we felt an "editorial" coming on.

Winston Churchill's speech Sunday finally set it off. His talk should do more than show the United States that England is doing her part to fight the world's battle for free government. It should bring clearer home to us here that we are yet asleep, that Hitler will surely win, despite England's bulldog traits, unless we wake up and get into the fight.

Four years ago we sincerely believed that we were prepared to refuse to go to war under any circumstances. That was before Hitler's amazing success in his vicious war aims, his threat toward all free countries, his overriding of the helpless democracies, and his terrible body blows to the greatest democracy of them all, outside of our Nation.

Today we say to labor and to the world that we must get into this war, regardless of cost or sacrifice. Let England take a licking, and as sure as tomorrow's sun, our time will come to face Hitler alone, in a world of defeated and helpless nations already under his heel. Hitler will not need to fight us militarily then—all he will need to do will be to draw economic strings tight around us—cheap wage Japanese labor, slave French and English, Belgian, Italian, and Scandinavian workers will be forced to produce the world's needs at prices that will close down our own factories, we will be strangled to such a point that we will be eager to die fighting rather than of slow starvation.

If we need to convoy ships right up the Thames River to London, let's do that. If Hitler does not like it, let our guns roar while we can shoot them.

If, possibly better, it takes an outright entrance into the war, let Congress tell Hitler, which includes Japan and Italy, that we are coming over to see them.

All this will cost plenty, the least of which will be increased taxes. Rather pay all our money in taxes, we say, for self-defense than pay half of our earnings to a ruthless dictator.

This is no time for mincing words.

We need airplanes, tanks, armaments, and ships. Many manufacturers are taking advantage of the needs of national defense to force their never-ending battle against organized labor. Labor will never give up its right to organize, and if necessary, strike in defense of the right of free trades-unions.

While we will bitterly oppose the attempts of these bosses to legislate our right to strike out of existence under guise of national need, we say to our people that ourselves, for the duration of the national need, will make every sacrifice to avoid all strikes that in any way touch defense industries.

Sometimes this might mean the temporary ruination of a labor union. It might temporarily allow such bosses the chance to achieve their aims. However, the day of reckoning will come when we have finally licked Hitler, and when we can once again turn our thoughts to our enemies within our home boundaries. We can settle all scores then.

Like it or not, costly as it may be, it will be labor that will lick Hitler. Divide our thoughts now between Hitler in Germany and the little Hitlers at home, and we shall surely see the day when Hitler himself will eliminate both labor and our little American Hitler imitators. He did it in Germany; he has done it everywhere his heel has trod.

Let the labor movement take the lead in practicing patriotism in the hope and confidence that capital and management will follow this lead for a united nation.

This is our spring edition. In springtime thoughts usually turn lightly to love. Today our thoughts turn heavily and grimly toward war in self-defense. Instead of sweetly chirping sprightly love notes, we feel the urge to shout:

"Wake up, America; get out those guns, tanks, planes, and ships. Steel yourselves to pay the price. Do it now or do it never."

Reapportionment in Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. COLE, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1941

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include two articles recently published in the Baltimore Sun, one by Gerald Griffin. I wish to comment briefly on the situation in Maryland, then insert the articles referred to.

My home State of Maryland, according to the 1940 census, has a total population of 1,821,244, an increase of 189,718 since 1930. The Second Congressional District of Maryland, which I have the honor to represents, accounts for 534,568 of this total, or more than 29 percent of the population of the State. At this time there are more than twice as many people in my district as there are in the First District of Maryland.

During the hearings held by the House Committee on the Census on March 5, 1940, I appeared before the committee and advocated the passage of legislation which would compel the States to meet such a problem as we have in Maryland—and which exists in other States also—properly and equitably, thus wiping out this inequality of population in districts, according to a constitutional procedure. I recognize, of course, the question involved as to the constitutional right of the Government to pass such legislation, but, after a careful study, I am convinced we do have the right in the exercise of our clear and exclusive power to decide who shall be seated as a Member of this House.

For the benefit of those interested possibly I should insert at this point a brief portion of a statement I made March 5, 1940, before the Committee on the Census of the House, which is found on page 73 of said hearings:

Mr. COLE. No; we do not have any Congressman at large from the State of Maryland. The situation, as in many other States, presents a problem in that the legislatures of the States are unwilling to tackle this problem for fear the new set-up will not be as agreeable to them as the one they have.

I represent three counties as well as about one-third of Baltimore City.

I am not advocating that any particular section be taken away from my district or anything be added to it. That is the job of the members of the Maryland Legislature in whom I have real confidence. I am satisfied with what I have or with whatever the legislature wants to do with my district; but I think the Congress should compel the States to meet a problem such as we have in Maryland and in other States properly and equitably, wiping out this inequality of population in districts according to a constitutional procedure.

As well as I know the personnel of this committee, which is composed of gentlemen of real ability, I am satisfied that you will be able to work out something remedial for existing conditions. The difficulty from a legal standpoint of writing into law a solution of the present difficulties, is recognized by all.

In the last Congress one of the bills introduced in connection with apportionment of Representatives in Congress provided that—

"If the population of the largest congressional district in any State entitled to more than one Representative shall be found, under the latest census returns, to exceed the population of the smallest district in the same State by more than 50 percent, then such districting shall be invalid and thereupon all Members of Congress in that State shall be elected at large until new districts conforming to the above requirement shall be established."

After studying the problem to some extent, and reading the law on it, but perhaps not so carefully as you gentlemen of the committee have, I believe the provision I have just read will find support in the courts. I may say in passing that I read considerable of the Madison debates in connection with this matter. I believe it is within the meaning of the Constitution, in connection with our rights in this matter, to provide something such as I have read; and I hope that such language or something similar to it will be incorporated in such measure as you gentlemen see fit to report.

Mr. GOSSETT. Would it be, in your opinion, constitutional for the Congress to mandatorily require of the States that they redistrict?

Mr. COLE. I think so; but we could not enforce it through court action. The House of Representatives, in the exercise of its clear and exclusive rights in deciding who shall be seated as a Member, could enforce such provisions. I believe that you could legally place such a provision in the law, that it would be constitutional, but, as I have said, I do not believe you could enforce it through judicial decree. I cannot think of any way by which you could compel the States to comply, other than to recognize that ultimately the House, and the House alone, would determine the right of one to a seat as a Member.

Mr. GOSSETT. Do you think it advisable for the Congress to attempt to lay down a formula for the States in the matter of redistricting?

Mr. COLE. Yes; in accordance with the suggestion I have made here.

While the question of the constitutionality of such a provision as I've quoted is not wholly free from doubt, I believe it would be warranted by the Constitution. The Constitution, in article I, section 4, provides:

"SEC. 4. The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators."

The Supreme Court, in *Smiley* v. *Holm* ((1932) 285 U. S. 355), discusses the breadth of the power given the States in this matter—"these words embrace authority to provide a complete code for congressional elections" (p. 366). The Court goes on to say:

"This view is confirmed by the second clause of article I, section 4, which provides that 'the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations,' with the single exception stated. The phrase 'such regulation' plainly refers to regulations of the same general character that the legislature of the State is authorized to prescribe with respect to congressional elections. In exercising this power, the Congress may supplement these State regulations or may substitute its own. It may impose additional penalties for the violation of the State laws or provide independent sanctions. It 'has a general supervisory power over the whole subject.' (*Ex parte Siebold*, 100 U. S. 371, 387; *Ex parte Yarbrough*, 110 U. S. 651, 661; *Ex parte Clarke*, 100 U. S. 399; *United States* v. *Mosley*, 238 U. S. 383, 386; *Newberry* v. *United States*, 256 U. S. 232, 255). But this broad authority is conferred by the constitutional provision now under consideration and is exercised by the Congress in making 'such regulations,' that is, regulations of the sort which, if there be no overruling action by the Congress, may be provided by the legislature of the State upon the same subject (pp. 366, 367)."

Certainly the statements quoted would seem to indicate that reasonable requirements imposed by Congress would be supported.

There are legislative precedents for reasonable regulations by Congress, which so far as I know have never been questioned. Thus in every reapportionment act since 1872, except the 1929 act, there have been one or more of the following requirements:

1. If the State failed to redistrict when there is a reduction in number, all Members shall be elected at large.

2. The districts shall be composed of contiguous and compact territory.

3. The districts shall contain "as nearly as practicable an euqal number of inhabitants."

The provision I advocate is no more than a specific statement of a rule similar to the general requirement of containing an equal number of inhabitants. Whether an excess of 50 percent is reasonable or not is a question of judgment. On that question I think everyone would agree that the figure is not unreasonable. Certainly any court will not lightly overturn Congress' judgment as to reasonableness.

Then there comes the question as to how such a statutory provision would be enforced. I don't think there is available any judicial machinery to enforce it. That is, no penal or civil sanction is imposed on the State if it violates. But I do think that the House of Representatives has the power to enforce the provision under the power granted it in article I, section 5, of the Constitution, which provides: "Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members." Such enforcement would then be by the refusal of the House to seat a Member or Members from the State violating the provision. That refusal, I do not believe, would be attacked in the courts, for the power of the House is, I believe, in this regard, absolute. The recent Child Labor Amendment case has indicated the refusal of the Supreme Court to decide so-called political questions and its willingness to decide that a question is a political one. It seems to me that the analogy is apt here, for

the election, returns, and qualifications of Members is a political question of the highest order.

Accordingly, I conclude that Congress has the power to provide this kind of reasonable regulation in connection with the election of Members of the House, and the method of enforcement available is one which is beyond judicial scrutiny.

The public ordinarily shows little concern over the reapportionment in our States and brings little influence to bear in advocating such legislation. Yet it is admittedly a process involving the very foundation of our form of government and is one to which not only Congress should give consideration at an early date but the legislatures of many States, certainly Maryland should do likewise.

I am glad the Baltimore Sun has renewed its interest in this subject. If the same interest is manifested while the legislature is in session and the people of the State are acquainted with the real situation, I am of the opinion that Members of our legislature would be willing to undertake a realinement of the districts of Maryland. For the purpose of preserving this interesting contribution to the subject and giving the Members of the House an opportunity to read them, I insert herewith the two articles of the Baltimore Sun to which I have referred:

[From the Baltimore Sun of March 30, 1941]

KEEPING CONGRESS SMALL DESPITE THE CONSTITUTION

(By Gerald Griffin)

The average Congressman's weakness for creating new Government jobs—and then tucking deserving constituents into them—is an axiom of Washington. Around the Capitol, for example, there are scores of patronage employees: Guards, doorkeepers, clerks, elevator operators, and the like. In the light of this frank interest in jobs, the occasional examples of congressional self-denial stand out like beacons.

One such example, curiously enough, involves the total number of Members of the House of Representatives. For if Congress took the Constitution at its word, it could provide a maximum of 1 Representative to every 30,000 of the Nation's population. On that basis there would be approximately 4,340 Representatives, with several thousand more clerks, doorkeepers, and guards. Instead, there are only 435 Members of the House. This total has been kept since the census of 1910, and has just been reaffirmed for another decade.

But despite this display of abnegation the legislators have had to wrestle with temptation when it has come to deciding how the 435 seats in the House shall be apportioned among the States. This year, moreover, temptation won out in the House, in a struggle between a Democratic seat from Arkansas and a probable Republican seat from Michigan. But it was balked in the Senate when the long debate on the lease-lend bill prevented an apportionment bill from reaching the Senate floor.

By reason of a law enacted in 1929, reapportionment of House seats among the States after a decennial census goes automatically into effect by a stipulated method, after a 60-day period, unless Congress passes a bill providing for some other method or for some new total. That period elapsed early in March, which meant that the so-called automatic reapportionment method will be followed.

The automatic method, however, merely determines how many Representatives shall go to each of the 48 States. It is up to each of the States to determine how its Representatives shall be allocated among the various counties. In States where the congressional representation is changed as a result of population shifts, this problem invariably brings out politics in full flower and provides new examples of ingenious gerrymandering.

Maryland's congressional districts show that problems of this nature can arise even when the number of districts does not change. Maryland has had six Representatives in the House since the apportionment after the 1870 census, its population growth having kept pace with that of the Nation. But its congressional districts have not been changed since 1902, when an equitable allocation was made, so that each Congressman represented almost the same number of constituents. Since then the Second District has grown tremendously, with the result that Representative WILLIAM P. COLE, Jr., now represents more than twice as many Marylanders as does, for example, Representative DAVID J. WARD, of the First (Eastern Shore) District.

ELECTIONS AT LARGE

States which have gained new House Members have sometimes had trouble in deciding how the new district should be laid out. If the State legislature can't make up its mind, for one reason or another, and fails to redistrict the State in such instances, the additional Representative may simply be elected at large. After the 1930 census, Connecticut, Florida, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Texas all gained Representatives and elected them at large in 1932.

Under the method of apportionment which has now become effective for the 1940 census figures, 10 seats in the House will be shifted in the 1942 elections. California gains 3 Members (because of its rapid population gain since 1930), and 1 each is gained by Arizona, Florida, Michigan, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, and Tennessee. These seats will be taken away from Arkansas, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Nebraska, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania, which will lose 1 each.

This computation is made by the major-fractions method, which was followed after the 1930 census. Another widely favored method of apportionment is called equal proportions.

It so happened that on the basis of the 1940 figures, use of either the major-fractions or equal-proportions method would have given the same results except for one House seat, affecting two States. Under the equal-proportions method, Arkansas would not have lost a seat, and Michigan would not have gained one.

Since Arkansas is safely Democratic, Michigan is inclined toward the Republican side, and the present majority in the House is Democratic, it was not strange that legislation was introduced providing for use of the equal-proportions method in apportioning House seats this year. And despite earnest arguments from the Republican ranks about the superiority of the major-fractions method (and taunts about changing the rules after the game had started), such legislation was passed by the House. It died in the Senate during the 3-week debate of the lease-lend bill.

It was largely because of this heroic struggle which apportionment induces among legislators that Congress passed the automatic apportionment law. In fact, so painful was the apportionment process after the 1920 census that Congress had simply ducked the issue.

In 1929, when providing for the 1930 census, Congress set up the automatic-apportionment plan. It provided that after the census had been completed the President should transmit to Congress a statement of the apportionment population of each State, together with an apportionment of Representatives to each State according to the existing total membership of the House. The apportionment was to be made according to each of three methods: (1) Method used in the last preceding apportionment; (2) major fractions; and (3) equal proportions. If within 3 months Congress took no action, apportionment became effective by the method used in the last preceding census (in this case, major fractions). The law was amended last year to allow for the change made in Congress' opening dates by the "lame duck" amendment, and the time allowed for congressional deliberation on the subject was reduced to 60 days.

Although the public ordinarily shows little concern over the apportionment battles which have raged in the National Congress and in State legislatures, actually it is a process involving the very foundations of our representative form of government.

[From the Baltimore Sun of April 13, 1941]

MARYLAND INEQUALITY INCREASING

Following a course not so much different from the familiar case of the man who keeps putting off a trip to the dentist, the State of Maryland has been putting off, from year to year, the rather troublesome task of bringing its congressional districts into line with population changes. It has been 41 years since the present districts were laid out, and Maryland is near the foot of the class, among the 48 States, in this respect.

New Hampshire has retained its present district lines for the longest time of all the States—since 1881. But New Hampshire has only two congressional districts, and their population growth has been so uniform that the 1881 apportionment is still fair. This is not the case with the three States which last changed the boundaries of their districts after the 1900 census. They are Arkansas, Illinois, and Maryland. Arkansas now must redistrict, because it is losing a Congressman, but Illinois needs only to drop one of its Representatives elected at large, and Maryland, which keeps its present total of six Congressmen, is under no compulsion to do anything at all about reapportionment.

MARYLAND OUT OF BALANCE

Many Marylanders are hopeful, however, that the State will do something about it; that the Governor and the general assembly will not keep putting the matter off indefinitely. For Maryland, unlike the fortunate New Hampshire, has not grown in such a way that the 1902 apportionment remains equitable. Actually, it is sadly out of line.

The 1940 census figures, giving the total population for each of the six Maryland districts, tell the story concisely. They show that the population difference among the districts, which was marked in 1930, has become even more pronounced:

	1940	1930
Total State population	1,821,244	1,631,526
First district	195,427	193,658
Second district	534,568	461,419
Third district	206,526	203,929
Fourth district	276,856	259,467
Fifth district	288,851	244,519
Sixth district	319,016	268,534

To take the most extreme instances, these figures mean that Congressman DAVID J. WARD, of the First District (the Eastern Shore), now represents 195,427 Marylanders in the House, while Congressman WILLIAM P. COLE, Jr., of the Second District, represents 534,568.

WHERE GAIN WAS GREATEST

More than 29 percent of the State's population thus is located in the Second District, which embraces Howard, Carroll, and Baltimore Counties and part of Baltimore City. During the decade from 1930 to 1940 the Second District accounted for 38 percent of the State's total population increase.

It probably is significant that the three districts showing the largest growth from

1930 to 1940 were all apparently affected by substantially the same influence, the population increases in areas adjacent to large cities. In the Second District it was probably the development of the suburban communities around Baltimore City which was largely responsible for its rapid gains; in the Fifth and Sixth Districts it was primarily the overflow of population from the District of Columbia which caused the sharp gains in Prince Georges and Montgomery Counties.

URBAN AREAS GROW

These figures indicate that the strictly rural sections of the State are becoming increasingly overshadowed, from the population viewpoint, by the urban and suburban areas. To translate these changes into new congressional districts in order to attain a fairly even division among the six Members of Congress, would call now for a reshuffling made to seem all the more drastic because of the 40 years of procrastination.

If the State's districts could be evenly realined, each would have a population of 303,540. Since the counties (including Cecil) now in the first, or Eastern Shore, district total only 195,427, this would mean that approximately 100,000 more people should be put into that district by including Harford and a part of Baltimore Counties.

Representative COLE's big second district would have to be trimmed down, and its present excess of 231,028 above the desired average would have to be apportioned among the others, particularly among the first and third districts. The fourth district, with 276,856, is not far below the projected State average per district. The fifth district is only 14,689 below the average, and the sixth district is 15,476 above it.

COLE ADVOCATES CHANGE

When the State legislature might tackle this job is a question which can be answered best by looking into the records of the various States and finding that few take any action unless impelled to by a change in the number of districts. Representative COLE, who has given a good deal of thought to the subject and who believes that Congress ought to take steps to induce action by the States, summed up the attitude of the State legislators during testimony last year before the House Committee on the Census, Mr. COLE said:

"The situation in Maryland, as in many other States, presents a problem in that the legislatures of the States are unwilling to tackle this problem for fear the new set-up will not be as agreeable to them as the one they now have."

WOULD FORCE ACTION

Mr. COLE endorsed a bill by which Congress would bring pressure to bear upon States which did not act of their own accord. Under such a bill, a district set-up would become invalid when the population of the largest district of the State was found, under the latest census returns, to exceed the population of the smallest district by more than 50 percent. If the districts in which such conditions prevailed were found invalid, then all Members of Congress from the State would be elected at large until new districts were established.

Mr. COLE said he thought such a law would be upheld by the Supreme Court as coming within Congress' powers to regulate the election of its Members. The House could enforce its action, he held, by denying seats to men elected in States which did not comply with the districting rule.

There is some difference of legal opinion, however, as to Congress' authority in this field, since some argue that it encroaches upon the States. It is a point which has been argued back and forth for generations, and no final determination is yet in sight.

St. Lawrence River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 7 (legislative day of Monday, May 5), 1941

ARTICLE BY C. G. FERRIS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I submit an article entitled "The Seaway Proposal and the Public Interest," and ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This article is by Mr. C. G. Ferris, executive vice president of the Illinois Chamber of Commerce, and appeared in its publication for May 1941. He has made a study of the subject and has been familiar with the various efforts that have been made to provide for the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SEAWAY PROPOSAL AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Further centralization of manufacturing industry in New York is one of the objectives of the power project in connection with the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway proposal, according to the third in a series of seven reports prepared by the St. Lawrence Survey of the United States Department of Commerce, at the request of the President. The report states that New York now shows only 11.6 percent of the total of the Nation's workers employed in manufacturing industry, while it showed 13.5 percent in 1937. The contemplated development, the report relates, "offers a new lease on life to New York State industry, a source of cheap electricity which should make possible the resumption of manufacturing growth."

Centralization of manufacturing industry in the East may be desirable, from a New York standpoint. In Illinois, and in most other States as well, however, decentralization of industry will be regarded as more advantageous. Certainly, there is no reason that should appeal to the great inland areas of the country why they should bear additional tax burdens to stimulate industrial growth in other sections as a product of public projects which discourage industrial growth closer to them. Yet that is precisely what the Department of Commerce report prophesies will result from the power development proposed, and that is exactly the reason it presents for support of the proposed agreement with Canada by New York interests. It is an equally good reason why representatives of Illinois and other States in the Mississippi Basin should oppose the agreement.

The Department of Commerce report says that a 25 percent or greater reduction in the rates charged industrial users for electric energy in New York should result from completion of the power project, thus reducing average rates below the average in adjoining States. It comments that it is clear "that New York State will suffer an increasing competitive disadvantage," unless cheaper hydroelectric power is developed, adding that "New York State, as a whole, has suffered a definite decline in manufacturing employment in the past 20 years." The St. Lawrence project, it is urged, would reverse that trend. The report, however, says nothing at all about the probable effects of such a development at the expense of the whole country, although the clear implication of its argument is that industrial growth in some of these other sections must have been greater relatively than in New York, during the past 20 years.

What reason is there why Illinois should support policies that have as their objective competitive advantage for New York in industrial competition with Illinois, and other States in the inland areas of the country, as ambitious to increase manufacturing employment locally as is New York, and as greatly entitled as New York to Federal preferment?

Representation that it is a national-defense project is by no means the only subterfuge involved in the proposal. The fact that the project could not, under any circumstances, be completed under 5 years, effectively lays the defense-advantage claims bare as pretense. But the agreement carries with it proposals for abandonment of United States sovereignty over Lake Michigan, without compliance with the clear intent of the Federal Constitution, which are at once more subtle and more sinister.

Presenting the proposal in resolution form now is plainly an attempt to evade the letter and intent of the Federal Constitution, which clothes the United States Senate with definite responsibilities in connection with all such agreements with foreign nations. It is likewise an effort to ignore, and make ineffective, a requirement of the Constitution; to extend executive power, and to contract the powers of the legislative branch of our Government. Approval of such a proposal by a majority of the Senate would constitute abandonment of responsibilities which the Senate has no lawful right to side-step.

C. G. FERRIS.

Involvement in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD P. NYE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 7 (legislative day of Monday, May 5), 1941

ADDRESS BY CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the address delivered by Col. Charles A. Lindbergh in New York on Thursday, April 24.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There are many viewpoints from which the issues of this war can be argued. Some are primarily idealistic. Some are primarily practical. One should, I believe, strive for a balance of both. But, since the subjects that can be covered in a single address are limited, tonight I shall discuss the war from a viewpoint which is primarily practical. It is not that I believe ideals are unimportant, even among the realities of war; but if a nation is to survive in a hostile world, its ideals must be backed by the hard logic of military practicability. If the outcome of war depended upon ideals alone, this would be a different world than it is today.

I know I will be severely criticized by the interventionists in America when I say we should not enter a war unless we have a reasonable chance of winning. That, they will claim, is far too materialistic a viewpoint. They will advance again the same arguments that were used to persuade France to declare war against Germany in 1939. But I do not believe that our American ideals, and our way of life, will gain through an unsuccessful war. And I know that the United States is not prepared to wage war in Europe successfully at this time. We are no better prepared today than France was when the interventionists in Europe persuaded her to attack the Siegfried line.

I have said before, and I will say again, that I believe it will be a tragedy to the entire world if the British Empire collapses. That is one of the main reasons why I opposed this war before it was declared and why I have constantly advocated a negotiated peace. I did not feel that England and France had a reasonable chance of winning. France has now been defeated; and, despite the propaganda and confusion of recent months, it is now obvious that England is losing the war. I believe this is realized even by the British Government. But they have one last desperate plan remaining. They hope that they may be able to persuade us to send another American Expeditionary Force to Europe, and to share with England militarily, as well as financially, the fiasco of this war.

SAYS ENGLAND MISINFORMS

I do not blame England for this hope, or for asking for our assistance. But we now know that she declared a war under circumstances which led to the defeat of every nation that sided with her from Poland to Greece. We know that in the desperation of war England promised to all those nations armed assistance that she could not send. We know that she misinformed them, as she has misinformed us, concerning her state of preparation, her military strength, and the progress of the war.

In time of war, truth is always replaced by propaganda. I do not believe we should be too quick to criticize the actions of a belligerent nation. There is always the question whether we, ourselves, would do better under similar circumstances. But we in this country have a right to think of the welfare of America first, just as the people in England thought first of their own country when they encouraged the smaller nations of Europe to fight against hopeless odds. When England asks us to enter this war, she is considering her own future and that of her Empire. In making our reply, I believe we should consider the future of the United States and that of the Western Hemisphere.

It is not only our right, but it is our obligation as American citizens, to look at this war objectively and to weigh our chances for success if we should enter it. I have attempted to do this, especially from the standpoint of aviation; and I have been forced to the conclusion that we cannot win this war for England, regardless of how much assistance we extend.

HOLDS WE ARE ILL EQUIPPED

I ask you to look at the map of Europe today and see if you can suggest any way in which we could win this war if we entered it. Suppose we had a large army in America, trained and equipped. Where would we send it to fight? The campaigns of the war show only too clearly how difficult it is to force a landing, or to maintain an army, on a hostile coast.

Suppose we took our Navy from the Pacific and used it to convoy British shipping. That would not win the war for England. It would, at best, permit her to exist under the constant bombing of the German air fleet. Suppose we had an air force that we could send to Europe. Where could it operate? Some of our squadrons might be based in the British Isles, but it is physically impossible to base enough aircraft in the British Isles alone to equal in strength the aircraft that can be based on the continent of Europe.

I have asked these questions on the supposition that we had in existence an Army and an air force large enough and well enough equipped to send to Europe; and that we would dare to remove our Navy from the Pacific. Even on this basis, I do not see how we could invade the continent of Europe successfully as long as all of that continent and most of Asia is under Axis domination. But the fact is that none of these suppositions are correct. We have only a one-ocean Navy. Our Army is still untrained and inadequately equipped for foreign war. Our air force is deplorably lacking in modern fighting planes.

When these facts are cited, the interventionists shout that we are defeatists, that we are undermining the principles of democracy, and that we are giving comfort to Germany by talking about our military weakness. But everything I mention here has been published in our newspapers and in the reports of congressional hearings in Washington. Our military position is well known to the governments of Europe and Asia. Why, then, should it not be brought to the attention of our own people?

SCORES INTERVENTIONISTS

I say it is the interventionists in America as it was in England and in France, who give comfort to the enemy. I say it is they who are undermining the principles of democracy when they demand that we take a course to which more than 80 percent of our citizens are opposed. I charge them with being the real defeatists, for their policy has led to the defeat of every country that followed their advice since this war began. There is no better way to give comfort to an enemy than to divide the people of a nation over the issue of foreign war. There is no shorter road to defeat than by entering a war with inadequate preparation. Every nation that has adopted the interventionist policy of depending on someone else for its own defense has met with nothing but defeat and failure.

When history is written, the responsibility for the downfall of the democracies of Europe will rest squarely upon the shoulders of the interventionists who led their nations into war uninformed and unprepared. With their shouts of defeatism, and their disdain of reality, they have already sent countless thousands of young men to death in Europe. From the campaign of Poland to that of Greece, their prophesies have been false and their policies have failed. Yet these are the people who are calling us defeatists in America today. And they have led this country, too, to the verge of war.

There are many such interventionists in America, but there are more people among us of a different type. That is why you and I are assembled here tonight. There is a policy open to this Nation that will lead to success—a policy that leaves us free to follow our own way of life and to develop our own civilization. It is not a new and untried idea. It was advocated by Washington. It was incorporated in the Monroe Doctrine. Under its guidance the United States became the greatest Nation in the world.

It is based upon the belief that the security of a nation lies in the strength and character of its own people. It recommends the maintenance of armed forces sufficient to defend this hemisphere from attack by any combination of foreign powers. It demands faith in an independent American destiny. This is the policy of the America First Committee today. It is a policy not of isolation, but of independence; not of defeat, but of courage. It is a policy that led this Nation to success during the most trying years of our history, and it is a policy that will lead us to success again.

We have weakened ourselves for many months, and, still worse, we have divided our own people by this dabbling in Europe's wars. While we should have been concentrating on American defense we have been forced to argue over foreign quarrels. We must turn our eyes and our faith back to our own country before it is too late. And when we do this a different vista opens before us. Practically every difficulty we would face in invading Europe becomes an asset to us in defending America. Our enemy, and not we, would then have the problem of transporting millions of troops across the ocean and landing them on a hostile shore. They, and not we, would have to furnish the convoys to transport guns and trucks and munitions and fuel across 3,000 miles of water. Our battleships and submarines would then be fighting close to their home bases. We would then do the bombing from the air and the torpedoing at sea. And if any part of an enemy convoy should ever pass our Navy and our air force, they would still be faced with the guns of our Coast Artillery and behind them the divisions of our Army.

DENIES UNITED STATES COULD BE INVADED

The United States is better situated from a military standpoint than any other nation in the world. Even in our present condition of unpreparedness no foreign power is in a position to invade us today. If we concentrate on our own defenses and build the strength that this Nation should maintain, no foreign army will ever attempt to land on American shores.

War is not inevitable for this country. Such a claim is defeatism in the true sense. No one can make us fight abroad unless we ourselves are willing to do so. No one will attempt to fight us here if we arm ourselves as a great nation should be armed. Over a hundred million people in this Nation are opposed to entering the war. If the principles of democracy mean anything at all, that is reason enough for us to stay out. If we are forced into a war against the wishes of an overwhelming majority of our people, we will have proved democracy such a failure at home that there will be little use fighting for it abroad.

The time has come when those of us who believe in an independent American destiny must band together and organize for strength. We have been led toward war by a minority of our people. This minority has power. It has influence. It has a loud voice. But it does not represent the American people. During the last several years I have traveled over this country from one end to the other. I have talked to many hundreds of men and women, and I have letters from tens of thousands more, who feel the same way as you and I.

SAYS MAJORITY LACKS POWER

Most of these people have no influence or power. Most of them have no means of expressing their convictions, except by their vote which has always been against this war. They are the citizens who have had to work too hard at their daily jobs to organize political meetings. Hitherto, they have relied upon their vote to express their feelings; but now they find that it is hardly remembered except in the oratory of a political campaign. These people, the majority of hard-working American citizens, are with us. They are the true strength of our country. And they are beginning to realize, as you and I, that there are times when we must sacrifice our normal interests in life in order to insure the safety and the welfare of our Nation.

Such a time has come. Such a crisis is here. That is why the America First Committee has been formed—to give voice to the people who have no newspaper, or newsreel, or radio station at their command; to the people who must do the paying, and the fighting, and the dying if this country enters the war.

Whether or not we do enter the war rests upon the shoulders of you in this audience; upon us here on this platform; upon meetings of this kind that are being held by

Americans in every section of the United States today. It depends upon the action we take and the courage we show at this time. If you believe in an independent destiny for America, if you believe that this country should not enter the war in Europe, we ask you to join the America First Committee in its stand. We ask you to share our faith in the ability of this Nation to defend itself, to develop its own civilization, and to contribute to the progress of mankind in a more constructive and intelligent way than has yet been found by the warring nations of Europe. We need your support, and we need it now. The time to act is here.

Convoys Mean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY, OF OHIO

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I made over the red network of the National Broadcasting Co., Tuesday night, May 6:

Ladies and gentlemen, the most important question before the people of the United States is whether or not we shall use patrols and convoys to insure delivery of war supplies to Great Britain, which were made available through the lend-lease-give-away bill recently passed by Congress.

The advocates of all aid to Britain short of war told us that the cash-and-carry amendment to our neutrality law, the peacetime conscription law, and the lend-lease-give-away law, together with the $7,000,000,000 implementing the same were all steps to guarantee peace by keeping America out of the war, and keeping war out of America. These same groups are now demanding convoys, and some are openly demanding war.

At a recent press conference, when questioned on the subject, President Roosevelt said, "Convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war."

If that statement reflects the state of mind of the President, and we keep in mind his pre-election promises that no American boys would fight on foreign battlefields, then the country has the right to breathe freely, confident the President will keep his sacred word; that he will not directly or indirectly advocate the use of convoys. He has the power to direct the use of convoys, but he has not the right to utilize convoys in war zones.

There are signs on the horizon indicating we are about to use convoys and patrols. Witness the refusal last week of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate even to consider debating the resolutions of Senators TOBEY and NYE prohibiting the use of convoys. By this action the people are denied through their Representatives the discussion of this important question. We recall the statements of Secretary Knox, Department of the Navy, and Secretary Hull, Department of State, on the use of convoys, and the statement of the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, who, only yesterday, came out unqualifiedly for the use of convoys.

This will give you an idea how close we are to war involvement. By every rule of international law the Axis Powers have the right, and they have so declared, to torpedo our ships if used as convoys. Should the U. S. S. *Alabama*, or the U. S. S. *Tennessee* be torpedoed and sunk while acting as convoys we would have another "remember the Maine" incident on our hands, and war would be inevitable.

Current newspaper advertisements by certain merchants in the United States and Canada now read: For sale, a comprehensive stock of British clothing and furnishings. They give thanks to the Royal Navy for insuring delivery of these goods to this continent, proving conclusively that Britain is now engaged in convoying her commerce to our shores. That being so, why does not Britain use her Royal Navy to convoy war supplies in the other direction instead of making demands for the use of our naval convoys, and the use of our ships to carry the supplies the taxpayers of America have so generously placed at her disposal.

Under date of April 4, 1941, in reply to an inquiry, I received a letter from Admiral E. S. Land, chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, informing that as of December 1, 1940, Great Britain had operating in the Pacific Ocean areas and in Central and South American waters 2,662 oceangoing steam and motor vessels of 2,000 gross tons and over with an aggregate gross tonnage of 16,828,009 gross tons. It is not reported that any of this tonnage has been sunk since that date. When it was suggested to the British marine minister that some of these ships be diverted to the Atlantic lanes he said, "It would not be done because Britain would not give up 1 inch of her trade, and that business would go on as usual."

In the light of these facts, don't you think the British have a colossal gall to appeal to us for ships when they have the greatest merchant marine in the world? Admiral Land and the members of his Commission are doing a fine job in building up our American merchant marine. The British should not be permitted to weaken their efforts.

Dr. Giselher Wirsing in his latest book, The 100 Families That Rule the Empire, discloses that this group who control the munitions industry, shipping, steel, and practically all of Britain's industrial wealth have control over 415 out of the 600 seats in the British Parliament, 181 members of the Parliament are managing directors or directors in 700 of the leading banks, industrial enterprises, shipping companies, and overseas trading concerns. Dr. Wirsing takes most of his data from the book England's Money Lords, written by an Englishman, Samuel Haxey.

Since the visit of the King and Queen to Washington in June 1939, every conceivable agency has been employed once more to command our blood and our treasure to save the Empire. The press, the motion-picture screen, the radio, stage, and the pulpit all compete in outdoing each other in placing the wreath of democracy on the imperialistic crown of the world's greatest Empire.

Ask the 400,000,000 people of India, the people of Ireland, the natives of South Africa, our friends in Trinidad, and the inhabitants of the vast territories and colonies held in subjection by the British Government about democracy. Ask the relatives and friends of the Jews who are periodically slaughtered by Arabs in Palestine what they think of the British justice and British democracy.

In a recent publication, Propaganda for War, by H. C. Peterson, the best factual book on propaganda in existence, you will find this important statement on page 4:

"The British campaign to induce the United States to come to their assistance affected every phase of American life. It was propaganda in its broadest meaning. News, money, and political pressure each played its part not only in London, New York, and Washington, but also in American classrooms, pulpits, and factories, purposely created so that it would not be impossible for this country to remain neutral."

When Lord Northcliffe visited this country he remarked of Americans: "They dress alike; they talk alike; they think alike—what sheep."

This was back in 1917. Can you not see the same uncanny parallel in propagandizing us into this World War. Then they called the Kaiser the "Beast of Berlin," and America was to be invaded by the terrible Huns. Now it is Hitler, and the invasion threat is once more with us. The Kaiser leads the "life of Riley" at his country estate in Holland. On occasions his blood relatives, the present King and Queen of England, together with the dukes and earls, all members of the Hohenzollern clan, send him greetings on his birthday; and British journalists who called him a beast 25 years ago continue to write and publish his memoirs. It is not beyond our imagination to ask our British cousins, What paperhanger are you grooming to fight 25 years from now in the third World War?

The international bankers created Hitler. If this is a war, as some of us believe it to be, for the control of world trade and the world's gold, we should insist they leave Uncle Sam out of it. Poor old Uncle Sam is "punch drunk" from the assaults of British propaganda administered to him. I predict should any attempt be made to send his sons into the battlefields of Europe, you will see a revitalized Uncle Sam on his feet fighting with determination that it will not happen.

No longer should we fall for the propaganda that because we speak a common language, Britain and the United States should form an alliance and invade together. Some of us recall, not so long ago, when we asked John Bull to make a payment on the war debt he shrugged his shoulders and with fine British cunning said, "Me no speak English."

Are we going to allow the British twice in a quarter of a century to draw us into the blood business of Europe? In an effort to protect their far-flung Empire are they going to be allowed to use the American-born sons of the Poles, the Greeks, the Hungarians, the Irish, the Germans, the Italians, the French, the Belgians, the Czechoslovakians, and the Yugoslavians, and other bloods, whose parents and grandparents emigrated from Europe and found asylum in this country in escaping the poverty and militarism of that war-torn continent?

Is it not evident of a totalitarian trend when we as a democracy engage in peacetime conscription, in censorship of press, fingerprinting, wire tapping, black-outs, labor baiting, and name calling—all in the interest of national unity? The creation of an American Gestapo forecloses our right to criticize the dictators of Europe who long ago threw into the discard the civil liberties of their people.

Our frontiers are not, as has been said, the chalk cliffs of Dover, or the Burma Road in China. Our frontiers are the "Tobacco Roads" of America; the roads of poverty, disease, and unemployment; the roads of slums, child labor, farm foreclosures, and illiteracy. Last Sunday's New York Times carried a story that out of 400,000 men who registered for peacetime conscription in the State of Georgia 45,000 could not write and had to sign their names with an X. These conditions along "Tobacco Road" are a greater threat to our democracy than the British-made dictators 3,000 miles away from our shores.

It is fashionable in many circles for some people to knit, sew, and furnish bundles for Britain. With few exceptions, I wonder how many of these society women ever wrapped a bundle of food and clothing, ever knit a sweater or stocking for the sharecroppers of America, or for the W. P. A. workers and their families, or for those who stood shivering in bread lines not so long ago in every city throughout this Nation? To essay the role of a Good Samaritan is one of the corporeal works of mercy. If food reaches hun-

gry stomachs and naked bodies are clothed anywhere in the world, we say "Amen." Yet there is another Christian doctrine that says charity begins at home. We still have one-third of our people ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed.

It is argued that since we have appropriated the $7,000,000,000 for war supplies for Great Britain we cannot permit these supplies to be sunk in the Atlantic Ocean. Our answer should be that of a colleague of mine in the House who responded to the same argument the other day by replying:

"I would rather see the entire $7,000,000,000 of war supplies sunk in the bottom of the Atlantic Ocean than to see even one of our fine American boys go down to watery graves."

Do any of you honestly feel that a country that believes in the divine right of kings can be a democracy? Don't you recall the words of Winston Churchill a few years ago when he said, "If I were an Italian, I would be a Fascist"? Don't you remember Churchill's broadcast to the Italian people a few months ago, when he told them to get rid of their leader, Mussolini, but never condemned the Fascist state? England, if the opportunity comes, will make a peace with the Axis Powers and leave the United States holding the bag. Yes, I predict England would even accept the Fascist state. Fascism tolerates the divine right of kings. Witness the preservation of the house of Savoy in Italy. The British love pageantry and royalty. Fascism would suit them admirably.

Those who will shed their blood and pay the cost of the war should be consulted before a decision is made. Our sympathies tonight are with the poor people of England and Germany and the other war-stricken countries of Europe and Asia. They did not start this war, and the poor people of the United States do not want war. They want no part of it. Threadneedle Street in London, with its 100 families that rule the Empire, and Wall Street of New York, with its economic royalists, want war, but Main Street, representative of the great majority of American people, do not want involvement in any foreign war.

It is my opinion that the time has arrived for all the churches who believe in the Prince of Peace, for all labor organizations, all farm organizations, the veterans of the first World War, and every American worthy of the name who thinks in terms of America first to express their disapproval of the final step toward war involvement.

Please write to the President of the United States—No convoys. Tell him that you remember the horror of the last World War and that you are determined there will be no new crop of Gold Star Mothers in America, and that one American unknown soldier is more than enough for this generation to mourn.

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1941

STATEMENT PREPARED BY HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN, OF WISCONSIN, IN COOPERATION WITH THE OFFICE OF A. A. BERLE, JR.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from St. Louis, in a statement before this body on April 25, intimated that the present proposed agreement between Canada and this country for construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway would mean the surrender of the sovereignty of Lake Michigan.

I conferred with Mr. A. A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, and through the cooperation of his office have prepared the following brief which entirely refutes the statement made by the gentleman from Missouri. My contentions are supported by the legal adviser of the Department and the Attorney General. Mr. Berle was one of three plenipotentiaries who signed the agreement on behalf of this Nation and his sources of information are unimpeachable.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT IN REPLY TO REPRESENTATIVE PLOESER'S REMARKS, APRIL 25, 1941

In his opening remarks the Representative from Missouri states that it will take so long to construct the project that the war will be over before it is completed. This argument was answered by the President when he said in his address to the Great Lakes Seaway and Power Conference at Detroit on December 5, 1940:

"Opponents of the project have pointed out that it takes 4 years to build this seaway. They know, but fail to mention, that it takes at least that long to build a battleship. They also know that this project will cost the United States less than three battleships, and that the power project will be entirely self-liquidating.

"* * * Only one who can say that we do not need the battleships that we are now building will dare to say that we do not need the essential Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway."

The argument that the United States surrendered sovereignty over Lake Michigan because of failure to include a special provision covering this matter in the agreement is clearly without merit. Canada has never questioned the sovereignty of this country over Lake Michigan, and there is no reason to believe that it intends to do so. To include a provision intended to prevent any claim to sovereignty on the part of Canada over Lake Michigan implies a fear on our part that such a contingency might arise, and fear generally implies a corresponding weakness. Such an attitude is tinged with childishness.

Furthermore he refers to the treaty of 1910, by which he presumably means the boundary-waters treaty which was signed January 11, 1909, and ratified by the President on April 1, 1910, and states that Elihu Root, at that time Secretary of State, "refused to have anything in the treaty about Lake Michigan. He said that he would not permit Lake Michigan to be mentioned in the treaty."

As a matter of fact, article I of this treaty provides:

"The high contracting parties agree that the navigation of all navigable boundary waters shall forever continue free and open for the purposes of commerce to the inhabitants and to the ships, vessels, and boats of both countries equally, subject, however, to any laws and regulations of either country within its own territory not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation and applying equally and without discrimination to the inhabitants, ships, vessels, and boats of both countries.

"It is further agreed that so long as this treaty shall remain in force this same right of navigation shall extend to the waters of Lake Michigan and to all canals connecting boundary waters."

If Canada should take a similar attitude regarding sovereignty over its territory, it might well include Georgian Bay, which lies wholly within Canadian territory and the Canadian section of the St. Lawrence River, both of which are mentioned in the agreement without any qualifications as to sovereignty.

To say that by including Lake Michigan as a part of the Great Lakes system "the right of this country to complete sovereignty" over the lake has been challenged is rather absurd, since Lake Michigan is a part of the Great Lakes system by act of God, and no act of any mundane authority can change that fact.

His statement that "it is extremely doubtful whether the Supreme Court could be induced to authorize a diversion of water from Lake Michigan in excess of the amount provided in the proposed treaty" is answered by the fact that the United States Supreme Court ordered a temporary increase in the diversion last December and that arguments were heard this week on the report of the master appointed to inquire into the application made by the State of Illinois for a permanent increase and the exceptions thereto by the interested States.

The statement that the agreement changes the terms and provisions of a number of treaties at present in effect is not entirely correct. The agreement specifically provides in article VII that certain rights of navigation accorded under the terms of existing treaties shall be maintained.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the question of the legal effect of providing for international cooperation in the development of the St. Lawrence project by means of an agreement instead of a treaty, I would like to quote from a memorandum prepared by the Legal Adviser of the State Department and a letter from the Attorney General of the United States on the subject.

FORMAL OPINIONS BY LEGAL AUTHORITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

(Memorandum by the Legal Adviser of the State Department, Washington, March 13, 1941)

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA FOR THE UTILIZATION OF THE WATERS OF THE GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE BASIN

For several years the United States and Canada have had under consideration the feasibility of a joint undertaking for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin so as to make these waters available to seagoing vessels, the development of hydroelectric power, etc. The Legal Adviser of the Department of State, in a memorandum dated February 10, 1939, expressed the opinion that an arrangement between the United States and Canada concerning the project could be effected by a simple agreement between the two countries and approval of the agreement by legislation in the United States and in Canada. The negotiations have progressed to the point where an agreement is about ready to be signed, but before proceeding to signature it is thought desirable to ascertain whether the Attorney General concurs in the view that the purposes may be accomplished in this fashion.

It is not necessary here to enter into a discussion of the treaty-making power or of the power of the President to enter into executive agreements with foreign countries. It is sufficient to say that a very large number of such agreements on various subjects have been entered into from time to time throughout the history of this country. Some of them have been specifically authorized by acts of Congress; others, though not specifically authorized, have been within the framework of acts of Congress; and still others have been concluded without enabling legislation on the subject.

Following the failure of the Senate to approve a treaty for the annexation of Texas, the annexation was accomplished by a joint resolution approved on March 1, 1845 (5 Stat. 797), after passage by a simple majority vote

of the two Houses of Congress. Likewise, in the case of Hawaii, a treaty of annexation had been signed on June 16, 1897, and approved by the Hawaiian Legislature but there was not sufficient support in the United States Senate to obtain approval by a two-thirds vote. Thereafter Congress passed a joint resolution to accomplish the same purpose which was approved July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750).

Of interest in this connection is action by Congress with respect to the construction of bridges across the international boundary—United States and Canada, subject to similar authorization by Canada. For example, Public Resolution No. 117, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, created the Niagara Falls Bridge Commission and authorized it to construct and operate bridges across the Niagara River, subject to "the approval of the proper authorities in the Dominion of Canada."

On November 11, 1927, President Coolidge issued a Presidential license to the Detroit-Ontario Subway, Inc., authorizing the company to construct, operate, and maintain a tunnel from a point in or near Brush or Randolph Street in the city of Detroit to a point on the international boundary line under the Detroit River. It is understood that corresponding authorization was given on the part of Canada by an order in council.

The improvement of the Great Lake-St. Lawrence Basin for navigation and other purposes would seem clearly to fall within the commerce clause of the Constitution, giving the Congress the authority to regulate interstate and foreign commerce. Where the undertaking with respect to interstate and foreign commerce involves boundary waters over which this country does not have exclusive jurisdiction, there would seem to be no reason why the Congress should not within its constitutional power enact legislation, contingent upon a like legislative enactment in the other country, signifying its approval of a joint undertaking signed by both Governments. The signing of an agreement by the two Governments would be but a convenient way of bringing about in advance of legislative enactments a joint understanding by the two Governments on a complicated question which could hardly be handled without such advance understanding. The agreement would contain provisions which might otherwise be incorporated in a treaty, but would not take the treaty form or follow the treaty process. It would not constitute a binding international agreement until Congress and the Canadian Parliament had indicated their approval.

LETTER FROM THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE UNITED STATES, MARCH 14, 1941

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1941.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have your letter of March 13 and concur in the conclusion reached by your legal adviser that it is legally unobjectionable, so far as this country is concerned, for the executives of the United States and Canada to enter into an agreement regarding the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep waterway project, conditioned for its effectiveness upon the subsequent enactment of necessary legislation by the Congress and by the Canadian Parliament.

If an agreement is executed and approved in this manner, its provisions would be binding upon the United States as respects Canada.

Respectfully,

ROBERT H. JACKSON,
Attorney General.

Another Appeaser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Chicago Tribune:

[From the Chicago Tribune]

ANOTHER APPEASER

The citizens who support the America First Committee have heard something of Vallandigham, the northern traitor in the Civil War.

The White House secretariat dug him up out of the copperhead history of the United States for Mr. Roosevelt's use in angry comment upon Colonel Lindbergh.

Mr. Roosevelt also spoke of appeasers who wanted Washington to quit in the War of Independence. His secretariat did not supply him with names. The America First Committee can give him one. It should go on the letterheads of the Union Now organization.

When Benedict Arnold conspired to surrender the defenses of his country to the British his self-justification was that it would be better for the countrymen to remain in colonial subjection to the British Crown and Parliament.

Defense Savings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. NELSON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1941

ADDRESS BY GALE F. JOHNSTON, FIELD DIRECTOR, DEFENSE SAVINGS STAFF, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address as delivered by Mr. Gale F. Johnston, Field Director, Defense Savings Staff, Treasury Department, before annual meeting of Missouri Chapter, National Chapter of Postmasters of the United States, on May 1, in Kansas City, Mo.:

Postmaster General Walker, President Nivert, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a privilege to be present at this important gathering and to hear the many fine messages of such a galaxy of distinguished Americans.

The privilege of appearing before you is doubly appreciated. The great program of the Treasury Department gives one that encouragement which is needed for real Americanism. In addition, it is a great privilege to be with this group which is representative of the finest ideals of American government.

The United States Postal Department commands the respect of the world, and particularly of every citizen of this country. The efficiency with which you operate, the great quality of your service to Americans, and the fine relationship that you have with individuals comprising the American public make the privilege a most important one.

As a further evidence of great devotion to this Nation's welfare, the Postal Department will now play the most important role in the national defense savings program. It is through your good offices that the American public will purchase securities. Through your personnel the American man and woman will find a liaison with the United States Treasury. It is difficult to conceive this program without the aid of the Postal Department.

An institution is but a reflection of an individual or a group of individuals. It may be said that a large measure of any success which the defense-savings program will enjoy must, of necessity, reflect the shadow of the many individuals comprising the Postal Department of this country.

The defense-savings-bond program is not a drive; it is an American crusade. It is an important part of a heroic battle for democracy and national safety.

Your Government must have vast sums of money. To meet the present cost of the defense program, the Congress has authorized the expenditure of nearly $40,000,000,000 over the next 3 or 4 years. Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau has suggested to the Congress that two-thirds of the total cost of defense may be raised by taxation and one-third by borrowing.

The United States Treasury has perfected what we believe to be a workable program of defense financing that gives every man, woman, and child in the Nation the opportunity of a partnership share in the destiny of his country.

During our last war we had Liberty and Victory bond drives. Quotas were set, time limits fixed, and high pressure was used to raise huge sums of money. Afterward there was a bad taste in the mouths of a great many people. This we want to avoid in this year of our Lord 1941.

The present financial program will, therefore, be different. We do not plan to have quotas or time limits. Instead, we are aiming to encourage long-range habits of thrift and saving among the rank and file of the American people. We hope and believe that vast sums of money, far in excess of previous records, will become available to the Government for its defense program, and we plan that the bulk of this money will not come from the resources of great financial institutions but from the savings of American citizens in every town and village of this great land of ours.

The national-defense program has brought to the American worker better employment and more money in his pay envelope. Since his cost of living has not increased in proportion, this means that he has a greater margin over and above his necessary expenses. What is he going to do with this excess? He will either spend as he earns or put something away for the rainy day. If he spends, this additional purchasing power at a time when the production of defense materials is cutting down the production of consumer goods will tend to produce a demand far in excess of the available supply of such goods, which, of course, is bound to increase the cost of living. This should be avoided if pos-

sible, or we may find ourselves in one of those upward spirals which are highly unpleasant at the time and which have a long drop and a painful impact at the end.

If the worker is encouraged to save a portion of his income, he is entitled to have his savings safeguarded, and that is exactly what the defense savings-bond program offers him.

This plan was not initiated as a mere dollar-raising scheme. The Secretary of the Treasury has other more convenient and less expensive methods of financing. But the defense of America depends not on money alone but rather on the morale of its people. Defense saving is a philosophy of thrift designed to encourage participation in governmental financing and make each bondholder an active partner in preserving our American way of life.

The savings-bond program is simple. Everyone can have a part—from boys and girls in school who have a few pennies to financiers with thousands of dollars to invest. There is room for every American in this all-out thrift movement.

That all may have a part in this program, the Secretary of the Treasury has authorized the sale of postal savings stamps in denominations ranging from 10 cents to $5. When stamps in the amount of $18.75 have been purchased they may be converted into a $25 savings bond.

Systematic saving will finance national defense and provide an income cushion for our citizens when economic readjustments are made after this emergency is met.

To familiarize our people with the plans and advantages of this defense program each State, county, city, and village will be organized to inform and encourage every citizen to serve his country by saving his money. The Treasury is not launching a sales campaign; neither will it permit coercion of any kind. The purchase of these securities will evidence the free will of a free people.

We face an emergency. It is not a State problem, it is not a regional question, and it is not a party polic . It is a national emergency, and every American is concerned.

Why Aid Saboteurs?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1941

ADDRESS BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excellent speech of the Attorney General of the United States, delivered before the American Judicature Society today, on the timely subject of "wire tapping," among other issues.

It raises the pertinent question: Why saboteurs and other public enemies should be protected from detection in their use of our communications systems?

The address follows:

Europe has resumed its ancient strife, and other peoples of the world are obliged to give considerations of defense and security first place in their thoughts. Our philosophy of government makes the law by which the physical forces of the Nation are controlled quite as definitely a part of our defense program as the mobilization of the force itself. We lawyers are again holding spring meetings under the auspices of our several legal societies to consider the state of our law. But we do not feel easy about it because we are finding it really difficult in the present condition of the world to give first consideration to our normal programs, to restatements of the law, to revisions of our court procedures, and to general advancement of the peacetime administration of justice. My association with your own and with related societies interested in the betterment of the administration of justice dates from long before I entered public office and makes the officeholder's customary profession of sympathy with your usual purposes superfluous. I can get right down to what is troubling me.

If we should put first things first, the legal profession would turn its highly competent and disinterested legal staffs to resolving the almost unbelievable conflicts, confusions, and obscurities in the mass of law that governs our defense activities. I do not suggest that the organized legal profession could or should project itself into the complex and controversial questions of policy that are inherent in many of the legal questions presented to us now. But, apart from any differences over policy, much of our statute law, supplemented by judicial construction in some instances, is technically deficient to meet present-day demands.

It is almost impossible for the legal staffs of the Government departments involved, pressed as they are by the routines of their work and immersed as they must be in daily perplexities, to give either the time or the detached thought necessary to the coordination and modernization of the many laws and interpretations of laws relating to defense activities.

There is some further disadvantage that attends our efforts in this direction due to the fact that we inevitably are regarded as proponents of a policy and advocates of an administration, but I venture to say that no more vital effort could be made than to name appropriate representatives of the legal profession and set them upon the task of considering what we may denominate broadly as defense law and its improvement.

Perhaps the greatest single difficulty arises from the changed custom of states as to the method of initiating a war. Our statutes for a century have been framed with the idea that war would begin with a gentlemanly and honorable declaration of war. That chivalrous practice has disappeared. Wars today are fought and won before they are declared. Any nation that in the presence of rising hostility and strain with another awaits a declaration of war to assert itself is as naive as a citizen who expects a burglar to make a formal call to announce his housebreaking intentions.

It is safe to say that under modern methods of warfare the most critical period for a nation under attack is the period preceding the actual employment of military force. It is then that forces are set in motion that will expedite or impede the military effort and which will either strengthen or rot out a nation's morale. In country after country, from Czechoslovakia to Greece, we have seen this pattern of a premilitary and nonmilitary invasion, an invasion of business, finance, labor unions, public opinion, and political organizations, all accomplished with the liberal use of expert personnel operating entirely under the protection of the laws of the land being invaded. The secret weapon of the Nazis has been the failure of nation after nation to recognize and deal with this nonmilitary invasion.

Our statute law has in many respects failed to take into account this nonmilitary period of attack. A good many of the Government's abilities to deal with its defense still await the existence of a formal state of war. For example, the nation's power to deal with certain disloyal aliens as "enemy aliens" has been considered to await some formal recognition of a state of actual belligerency. Yet we would be blind to the experience of a modern war if we did not recognize that actual activity by foreign agents who are realistically, if not legalistically, enemy aliens does not depend upon any declaration of war.

It may be said generally that most measures of internal defense can be successfully carried out only before the excitement and hysteria and bustle of necessary preparations strike a nation.

We are fully aware in the Department of Justice that we are under the duty to anticipate and prepare for the worst of eventualities, although we may hope and pray for deliverance from them. As the Department whose ties are so close to the legal profession that the functioning of our Department as a whole may be fairly said to depend in large measure upon the confidence and good will of the profession, it will be of advantage if I tell you frankly some of the things that are troubling us as to the measures that could be taken wisely to discharge this high responsibility. I recognize that the ultimate success of our work and judgment upon it will depend upon the good opinion of those who are more detached than we who are in the heat of the thing can possibly be. You will quickly and rightly condemn us for any neglect of the public interest. You will also quickly and rightly condemn us for any disregard of the rights of individuals to differ with the Government and to take measures which are considered to be within the range of their civil liberties, even though they result in some degree of nullification of the Government's efforts. In fact, our fate will probably be that a portion of public sentiment will do both.

It is no news to you that it is difficult to serve two masters. Yet the Department of Justice must labor under dual responsibilities. The public rightly expects its law officers to protect what the old indictment forms call "the peace and dignity" of the Commonwealth. On the other hand, the most unimpeachable authority commands us to protect and respect the rights of individuals to do many of the very things that may be steps in the process of undermining the stability of the Commonwealth.

It is inevitable that in the presence of threats to our national prestige and integrity our people will demand increased emphasis on the rights of the Commonwealth. These public pressures for priority to security of the State over the liberty of the individual arouse slumbering conflicts in which emotion, temperament, and experience often divide us more bitterly than the logic of either position would warrant. The task of keeping the confidence of public opinion which shapes today's events and at the same time of steering a course that will be approved by the sober second thought of the Nation is not easy.

It will help us to appraise these difficulties if we appreciate that our own principles and techniques for guarding our freedoms are by no means universally accepted among free peoples. In fact, our own system is the exception rather than the rule. The peculiar rigidity and uncompromising character of our American procedures is in sharp contrast with the procedures of Great Britain as they have been detailed for us by an eminent friend of civil liberty, Mr. Harold Laski.

The British solution of this dilemma between public safety and private liberty may be shortly stated as a combination of large official powers coupled with moderation in their exercise. The absence of a written Constitution leaves the Government as a whole in possession of all powers which any organized society may possess. Out of its ample power Parliament confers in times of emergency correspondingly broad powers upon England's executive officials. English civil liberties thus depend for their survival not upon legal

limitations so much as upon a high sense of responsibility, a temperament of moderation, and a tradition of nonpartisan and nonpolitical action on the part of legislators and executives, and by judges as well. Britain, to save liberty, relies on limitations bred into the blood and bone of Englishmen and fostered by their culture more than it relies on parchment freedoms.

A recent article by Harold Laski points out that "the Government has powers little short of absolute over the lives and property of its citizens" in Great Britain. For example, a regulation permits prosecution of persons charged with creating alarm and despondency. I think you will agree that a proposal to give any American prosecuting officer such a power would be met with screams of opposition. However, the British Government has apparently made moderate use of the power, prosecuting only about 105 cases. A dozen of them were dismissed. Of those convicted, only 20 were sentenced to imprisonment, varying from 1 day to 3 months, while the remainder were either bound over or fined.

Under a regulation granting power to suppress processions and public meetings, only three meetings have been prohibited in the whole country. The widest sort of criticism of the Government has been tolerated, even from Communists. Yet where national safety was endangered two Communist newspapers were suppressed, pursuant to a control of the press that would not be allowed in this country.

Perhaps the most drastic regulation is one which gives the Home Secretary the power to detain persons whose conduct and views make it seem likely that they may be guilty of action prejudicial to the safety of the realm. Under this power about 1,000 persons are detained. Some others have been arrested and later released. A power so unlimited and so vaguely defined, available against both citizen and alien, is unheard of in America.

Whatever the merits or defects of this British policy, the conferring of such broad powers upon a public official leaves little room for an alibi if he does not protect the safety of the state. On the other hand, the existence among his constituents of a vigorous and wholesome respect for civil liberties and for decent treatment of the individual leaves him under a sense of responsibility which goes a long way to prevent abuses of that power. While Mr. Laski does not acquit the police of instances of stupidity and harshness and while he admits that one of two magistrates in alarm and despondency cases have played the fool on the bench, he asserts that more than that the record does not permit anyone seriously to claim. Making allowance for the pressure which the imminence of invasion would seem bound to produce, we still must regard England as a citadel of civil liberty. And who will say that England is "soft"?

Broadly stated, our American method of protecting our liberties is the exact opposite of the British. By constitutional limitation we impose upon all government, including the Congress, the courts, and the Executive, numerous and inflexible limitations. Our Government does not have the full powers of most organized societies, partly because some such powers are reserved to the States, but also because many powers commonly exercised in Europe are withheld or forbidden entirely. Our devotion to the philosophy of limitation of power is so ingrained that the Congress and our legislatures adopt it as their policy and make very limited concessions of power to executive officers. The American assumption is that officers will abuse whatever powers they have. Too frequently the expectation is realized. Every period of our national history which has felt great stress and tension from abroad has left a trail in the administration of justice that we do not retrace with pride.

However, I want to put it to you squarely whether the excesses in the administration of justice and in investigative techniques which have prevailed during times of public excitement, and which our profession has rightly condemned as reprehensible, do not bear a distinct relationship to the very narrowness of the powers which are granted to our officials. I have found that the greatest pressures to overstep the bounds of lawful law enforcement arise in situations in which existing legal procedures permit no action at all looking toward the protection of society. Confession of inability to use the law for ends that are generally held desirable gives rise to a search for means outside the law or to a vigilante movement among the populace. It is certainly an open question whether a liberty to abuse liberty does not generate a danger to liberty itself. My confidence in the perpetuity of civil liberty in Great Britain is due in no small degree to the knowledge that the law officers will be able to prevent such abuses of those liberties as would give rise to their impairment.

On the other hand, the greatest danger that I can see to American civil liberties lies in the fact that they are so rigid. The English officials responsible, by prompt and moderate actions, tend both to satisfy the public that abuses will not be allowed to reach the magnitude of a public menace and also to exert a restraining hand on the abusers. In America up to the present moment we have found no technique by which the outright abuse of these privileges is preventable, even when abused in the interests of a foreign government.

To the future of the liberties we have known it is of utmost importance that our laws be made as effective as possible within constitutional and proper policy limitations. Lack of adaptability of antiquated statutes to present world conditions should be remedied. Deficiencies in the discretion to judges and to administrative officers should be remedied. Conflicts and confusion should be eliminated by restatement of our statutes. Let me suggest a few things that are happening that I think could be partially or fully remedied by adequate application of legal craftsmanship. The continued existence of these conditions is in my judgment as menacing to liberty as to safety.

We have over 6,000 deportable aliens, against whom proceedings have been completed and deportation orders are outstanding. But, because of transportation breakdown or because of refusal of their native countries to accept their return, they are still here. They are not only here, they are free. They include some bad criminals and a considerable number of Communists proven to have advocated overthrow of our Government by force and violence. But we can cite to the courts no statute to authorize us to do anything whatever with them when deportation fails. Hence, they are turned loose in habeas corpus proceedings and resume their evil ways in our society.

We have proposed remedial legislation. It is of great importance to the whole subject I am discussing. It needs the criticism where we are wrong and the help when we are right, of the organized lawyers.

Another example: We arrest foreign agents for doing acts detrimental to the country. The Constitution commands bail. A little bail is fixed, put up by the help of their Governments, and they walk out of the courtroom and return to their jobs of producing discord in America. We must find means to a more prompt and emphatic way of enforcing our own law. It is peculiarly a problem for lawyers.

We have today definite knowledge that the sabotage of ships in our ports was ordered by simultaneous telegrams sent to all ships' masters. They tell us that themselves. Yet the law officers of the United States cannot intercept those messages and use them as evidence in our courts. The wires of America today are a protected communication system for the enemies of America. Here, again, we have proposed legislation, carefully limited legislation, to give us an equal chance on the wires with saboteurs. Again I say—if we are wrong, we need your criticism; and if right, we need your help.

The whole field of combating alien-directed and financed propaganda against the policy of our Government is one of infinite legal difficulty, as you know. I do not think we are completely and constitutionally helpless, but we are sharply circumscribed. May we not compel propagandists to identify their stuff as we compel newspapers to disclose their ownership. Must we not only allow foreign attacks on our policy but also carry it for them in our mails? These are problems not easy of solution, they hit close to things fundamental in our life Their solution is no job for amateurs.

And let me say to you that the enemies of America are not idle. They show up at congressional hearings to oppose every move to strengthen our law enforcement; they show up in court astutely to raise every legal difficulty to prevent convictions and to obstruct obtaining evidence; they propagandize endlessly against investigative officials and agencies, against prosecution policies, against law enforcement itself. The force and prestige of the organized bar is needed to vindicate the competence of the law itself to deal with the burdens that the times put upon it.

I want to take this occasion to acknowledge free and generous cooperation from leading members of the bar whom without compensation, are assisting us in the discharge of duties—such, for example, as that of giving fair, impartial, and sympathetic hearings to conscientious objectors in the separate judicial districts of the Nation.

I frequently have offers of services from my public-spirited fellows of the bar who want to offer their services, and I know that in professional organizations there is no lack of public-spirited men who would be glad to give their service if they could be mobilized.

I venture to suggest that nothing could be more helpful today than the organization under the auspices of some of our legal societies of a high-minded and disinterested group to canvass and appraise suggestions for putting our legal defenses in order. I say to you in all frankness that Government lawyers are in a better position to tell you the problems than they are to work out the solutions. The pressure, the want of time, the burden of routine, and the commitment to departmental policy, prevent us from giving this sort of thing the quality of service it needs. You could bring to that task a quality of legal experience, of practical knowledge, and of public confidence in your disinterestedness which could be of inestimable benefit. I venture to suggest that the restatement and modernization of laws relating to defense in the light of modern emergency is as timely as any work in which the organized legal profession may engage.

If I could, in one sentence, state an appeal to my brethren at the bar, it would be this: "For the sake of your profession, your liberties, and your country, mobilize the great intellectual resources of your various societies in a master effort to put the law of national defense in order."

Foreign Policy—Three Schools of Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1941

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, neutrality and international law have been relegated to the limbo of forgotten doctrines in the past months. Seemingly the stage has been turned over to extremists in the persons of the so-called interventionists and the equally so-called isolationists. Apparently between the widening brackets which enclose these two schools of thought there is no other haven or sanctuary for the man who sincerely has followed the historic traditions and hopes of this Republic.

Such a forgotten group includes those who know from their study of the diplomacy of our Nation that real historic and classical neutrality has never gotten a fair chance in these United States in recent years. It virtually died still-born in the incipient days of the first World War and its entrance into our thoughts since September 4, 1939, has been as little noticed by the scholars of its history as it was in the first World War.

For the purposes of the record I am inserting a classification of the various schools of thought in neutrality, pseudo-neutrality, and the outright school of interventionists who believe that there is no place for neutrality in modern thought.

I have also added a few fundamental beliefs of international law as set out by Charles Franklin Phillips and J. V. Garland in their book, The American Neutrality Problem:

On the eve of the last World War, many rules for the conduct of international relations were regarded as well established and the United States operated on the theory that they would be obeyed by all belligerents.

Among those rules were the following principles, which have vital meaning today:

1. A belligerent may lawfully blockade the ports of an enemy and stop all ships bound to or from those ports. To be lawful a blockade had to be effective—that is, enforced by belligerent warships stationed near the ports of the enemy blockaded. The ships of neutrals that tried to run the blockade and were caught could be seized without violating any neutral rights.

2. Neutral ships carrying war goods (contraband) to any belligerent could be seized without violating any neutral rights.

3. Neutral merchant ships carrying only goods of peace (noncontraband) could be searched but they could not be seized, or attacked by any belligerent on the high seas unless they resisted.

4. No merchant ships of neutrals or belligerents could be sunk for any reason without warning and without providing for the safety of crews and passengers.

These were among the great rights which the Government of the United States had often asserted under international law. Most other governments had recognized them as binding. But after the last World War broke out, the warring powers on both sides violated most of these long-accepted rules of international law.

Owing to the submarine menance, Great Britain could not make her blockade of German ports effective by stationing warships in nearby waters. So Great Britain declared a paper blockade, planted mines in the waters near the German ports, and seized neutral ships bound to German ports.

On her part, Germany resorted to measures equally contrary to old rules of international law. German submarines sank the merchant ships of the enemy and of neutrals, without warning and without making any provisions for saving the lives of crews and passengers. Germany sent spies and wreckers into American factories to stir up trouble and destroy lives and property.

THREE SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT

During the past 6 years of the neutrality seesaw, three schools have fought to control United States peace policy: (1) The sanctionist school, led by former Secretary of State Stimson, aims to keep the United States out of war by penalizing aggressor nations which start wars, depriving them but not their victims of access to United States resources and credits; (2) the isolationist school, headed by some 40 Senators, argues that it is not the business of the United States to act as judge of international morals—let the United States keep out of war by having nothing to do with any nation that gets involved in war; (3) the school of the "historic neutrals" believes in standing pat on the pre-1914 international law which gives a neutral nation certain rights in the matter of trading with belligerents.

Sanctionists: All through the Italian-Ethiopian fight Colonel Stimson and his fellow sanctionists—among them President Nicholas Murray Butler, of Columbia University; Prof. James T. Shotwell, of the Carnegie Peace Foundation; Bishop William T. Manning—lived in hope that the League of Nations would invoke effective economic penalties against Italy. In November 1935 the League imposed sanctions (on arms, credit, raw materials) but omitted oil, asserting that no oil embargo would prove effective that did not include the United States. Any latent United States desire to do something drastic about joining in oil sanctions evaporated when Britain's Sir Samuel Hoare and France's Premier Laval made a tentative agreement in 1935 to let Mussolini get away with part of his Ethiopian swag. League sanctions did Italy no serious harm; were just strong enough to unite hitherto lukewarm Italians behind their dictator.

Isolationists: All the major neutrality-law battles since 1933 have been won by the isolationists.

Classicists: The school of classical neutrals has few famed adherents in Congress; but when the present neutrality bill was before the House 68 Representatives were in favor of outright repeal and a return to historical neutrality. Chief public advocate is the venerable John Bassett Moore, famed authority on international law. He is seconded by Prof. Edwin Borchard, of the Yale Law School, coauthor with William Lage of Neutrality for the United States.

The Moore-Borchard school does not believe in fighting other folks' wars and do not believe in trade embargoes. They point to Thomas Jefferson's Embargo Act of 1807, which drove the merchants and shipowners of New England to threaten secession.

National Defense and Negro Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. ELIOT

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1941

STATEMENT BY THE COMMITTEE ON NEGRO AMERICANS IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a very fine committee of outstanding citizens has come forward with a demand that in our defense program there shall be no discrimination against members of the colored race.

There has been experience in industry in the past and right now showing that colored men can do skilled jobs just as well as white men, but despite that fact, there are today many companies which refuse to hire Negro workers for skilled jobs.

There are millions of Negro Americans. They are good citizens. As a nation, we must see to it that they are not oppressed and suppressed. The country needs the work that they can do.

The statement of the Committee on Negro Americans in Defense Industries and the members of the committee are as follows:

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND NEGRO AMERICANS

(Statement of Committee on Negro Americans in Defense Industries)

Justice for Negro Americans in the program for national defense is a searching test of American democracy. Our concern for democracy in Europe or elsewhere lacks reality and sincerity if our plans and policies disregard the rights of minorities in our own country. The guaranty of such right is established by our historic national charters of freedom and constitutional government as applicable to all our people without regard to race, color, or creed.

It seems especially important to observe these in letter and spirit in our national industrial defense program in a year when we have voted with overwhelming public support to make our country a great arsenal for the democracies and when we celebrate the sesquicentennial of the ratification of the Bill of Rights. We can urge this with the more assurance because there are notable cases, both North and South, where Negro mechanics and artisans have been long employed in certain industries and projects with satisfaction to all concerned.

Negro Americans favor all suitable tests of fitness for any given job, but naturally and rightly oppose those based merely on race. Evidences are increasing of the exclusion of their skilled workers from certain defense industries and of the frequent refusal to admit qualified Negro students into training and apprenticeship programs. Among the many illustrations of such discrimination are the following:

That some corporations of national importance receiving large Government contracts have shown themselves unwilling to employ

skilled Negro workers or have taken on so few as scarcely to affect the general situation.

That in spite of a few creditable exceptions, companies manufacturing aircraft, automobiles, and gasoline motors are among those where such conditions prevail.

That, despite the excellent record of colored men in shipbuilding during the last World War and the encouraging experience in some navy yards and private shipbuilding plants today, there are companies with defense shipping contracts which either restrict Negro workers other than common laborers to semiskilled jobs or refuse their employment altogether.

That some of the leading industrial plants in different parts of the country do not approve the training of Negroes in defense classes even when these are financed by the Federal Government.

That there are cities in widely separated States where Negroes are scarcely receiving any opportunities to obtain the special training needed to supplement the existing group of skilled mechanics. The fact that they are not being employed in certain industries except as common laborers is used as a basis for restriction in training opportunities for them, while lack of such training will probably be used to justify failure to employ more Negroes.

No thinking person can fail to realize the loss to the cause of national defense through such conditions involving the Negro tenth of our population, and their harmful effect upon the character and attitudes of Negro Americans who are eager to give concrete expression to their patriotism. Frustration, destruction of morale, and the opening of the doors for subversive agitators opposed to the American way of life will be almost inevitable consequences.

The extent of these discriminations, their basic causes, the relative degree of responsibility for them of management, labor, and the public and the best way of meeting them deserve prompt, thorough, and impartial investigation.

Insofar as ignorance and race prejudice are responsible for determining our attitude toward any American citizen in the present emergency, to that degree do we uproot the moral bases of our American civilization and make way for the totalitarian scheme of life. Dictatorship aims to dominate the world by force, and to condemn certain racial groups permanently to subservient and inferior status. If we oppose Axis doctrines we must, to be consistent, oppose all race prejudice at home.

Nor is it a question of the injury to the Negro alone; it is also a question of the harm done to the Nation's unity and morale and its reputation abroad by an unjust attitude toward any group in our population. There has been some progress in recent years, but if race prejudice is given a new foothold under existing world conditions it is bound to spread and poison the entire body politic.

The country's immediate needs demand the cooperation of all willing, loyal, and competent workers. Similar cooperation will be needed in the work of reconstruction. Those, therefore, who raise unjust barriers at this critical period are responsible for obstructing the national defense and welfare.

This is no time for Americans to compromise with race prejudice and its attendant discriminations in industrial defense programs, whether public or private. It is destructive of those basic essentials of civilization—political, economic, cultural, educational, religious—which the ages have built upon the concept of the dignity and destiny of the human person. We maintain, therefore, that the time has come for the lasting repudiation of race prejudice as an influence in determining the policies of the Nation. The brotherhood of man—based on the fatherhood of God—is no mere adornment of a democratic society. It is accepted by religious and patriotic groups as fundamental. It should involve an impartial and inflexible justice practiced and experienced by all.

We commend this statement to the thoughtful consideration of the American people, and more particularly of leaders in government, industry, labor, and the organs of public opinion.

SIGNERS OF STATEMENT ON AMERICAN NEGRO IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Carl Ackerman, dean, School of Journalism, Columbia University, New York City.

Barry Bingham, proprietor, Louisville Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky.

Algernon Blair, contractor, Montgomery, Ala.

Rev. William Adams Brown, chairman, American Section, Universal Christian Council, New York City.

John Stewart Bryan, publisher, Richmond News-Leader, Richmond, Va.; president of William and Mary College.

James Byrne, New York City.

James B. Carey, secretary, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D. C.

Elmer A. Carter, member, Unemployment Insurance Appeal Board, Department of Labor, New York.

Harry Woodburn Chase, chancelor, New York University, New York City.

Rev. Henry Sloane Coffin, chairman, Interfaith Committee for Aid to the Democracies, and president, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

James McDonald Comer, president, Avondale Mills, Birmingham, Ala.

Howard Coonley, manufacturer, chairman of the Walworth Co., New York City.

Jackson Davis, president, New York State Colonization Society, New York City and Richmond, Va.

Stephen P. Duggan, director, Institute of International Education, New York City.

Edwin R. Embree, president, Rosenwald Foundation, Chicago, Ill.

Marshall Field, director, Marshall Field Co., chairman, United States Committee for the Care of European Children, New York City.

Lloyd K. Garrison, dean, law school, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.; former Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board.

Mrs. Charles W. Gilkey, former president, national convention, Y. W. C. A., Chicago.

John M. Glenn, ex-director, Russell Sage Foundation, New York City.

Bishop John A. Gregg, cochairman, department of race relations, Federal Council of Churches, Kansas City, Kans.

Frank P. Graham, president of University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.

N. Penrose Hallowell, chairman, board of directors, Lee Higginson Corporation, Boston.

James G. Hanes, chairman, Hanes Hosiery Mills Co., Winston-Salem, N. C.

Harold P. Herman, former chairman, Governor Lehman's committee on urban Negro, Valley Stream, Long Island, N. Y.

Robert L. Hoguet, president, Emigrant Industrial Savings Bank, New York City.

Edward L. Israel, chairman, Social Justice Commission of Central Conference of American Rabbis, Baltimore, Md.

Stephen S. Jackson, justice, domestic relations court, New York City.

Mordecai Johnson, president, Howard University, Washington, D. C.

M. Ashby Jones, honorary chairman, Interracial Commission, Atlanta, Ga.

Paul U. Kellogg, editor, the Survey Graphic, New York City.

Father John LaFarge, associate editor, America, New York City.

F. H. LaGuardia, mayor of New York City.

Morris Lazaron, rabbi of Baltimore Hebrew Congregation, Baltimore, Md.

Herbert H. Lehman, Governor of New York, Albany, N. Y.

Father Raymond McGowan, assistant director, social action development, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D. C.

Malcolm MacLean, president, Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va.

Spencer Miller, Jr., director, Workers' Education Bureau of America, New York City.

Newbold Morris, president, City Council, New York City.

Harold G. Moulton, president, Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C.

Howard W. Odum, director, Institute for Research in Social Science, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.

F. D. Patterson, president, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Ala.

Charles Poletti, Lieutenant Governor of New York State, Albany, N. Y.

Homer P. Rainey, president, University of Texas, and former director American Youth Commission, Austin, Tex.

A. Philip Randolph, international president, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, New York City.

Lessing Rosenwald, former chairman, Sears, Roebuck & Co., Jenkintown, Pa., and Chicago.

Msgr. John A. Ryan, director, social action department, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D. C.

Dean Sage, president, board of trustees, Atlanta University, Atlanta, Ga.; residence, New York City.

J. Henry Scattergood, Philadelphia, Pa., president, board of trustees, Hampton Institute.

William Jay Schieffelin, president, Citizens Union of New York City and trustees of Hampton Institute.

Charles Seymour, president, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Harper Sibley, former president, United States Chamber of Commerce, Rochester, N. Y., and Templeton, Calif.

C. C. Spaulding, president, North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Co., Durham, N. C.

Anson Phelps Stokes, president, Phelps-Stokes Fund, New York City.

Morton S. Webster, member of Stern, Lauer Co., brokers, New York City.

Luther Weigle, president, Federal Council of Churches of Christ and dean of Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.

William Allen White, editor, Emporia Gazette, Emporia, Kan.

Matthew Woll, New York City.

L. Hollingsworth Wood, chairman, executive board, National Urban League, New York City.

Mary E. Woolley, Westport, N. Y.; ex-president, Mount Holyoke College.

Arthur D. Wright, president, Southern Education Foundation, Washington, D. C.

Canada and the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1941

ARTICLE BY HON. C. H. CAHAN, K. C.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the first of a series of three articles by the Honorable C. H. Cahan, K. C., which have been published in the Montreal Gazette, and which concern the joint development of the St. Lawrence.

In recent press articles and literature distributed in this country by proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway, directly and by inference the American public is being told that the Canadian people favor the construction of this waterway. Fair-minded Americans who have studied both sides of the question realize that such is not at all the case.

The people of Canada are not unmindful of the real reason for the acceptance of this scheme by their governmental officials, who seem willing to go any lengths to secure the cooperation and support of this country in aid to Great Britain. Some Canadian leaders, however, have dared to warn against this unnecessary expenditure. Among them is the Honorable Charles H. Cahan, K. C., former Secretary of State of Canada. Mr. Cahan has served his Government since 1896. In 1930 in Berlin he represented the Canadian Government in effecting the settlement of accounts arising out of the first World War with the German Government. He was also a delegate at several conferences of the League of Nations in Geneva. In December 1932 he represented the Government of Canada at Paris and in January 1933, in negotiating a new trade agreement between Canada and France, and a convention concerning the rights of nations in commercial and shipping matters. It is quite evident that Mr. Cahan speaks with authority concerning the finances of his country.

Since 1938, when Canada's national direct and guaranteed debt was, in round figures, $8,000,000,000, her tax burden has been mounting. Canadian authorities estimate that the cost of the present war on the same basis as the former war will come to at least $1,700,000,000. Therefore these two figures alone, without taking into consideration any other contingencies, would increase their national debt to over $9,000,000,000, or an average debt of a little over $800 for every man, woman, and child. Yet proponents of this seaway proposal would force upon our friendly neighbors to the north this additional tremendous expense for the construction of a deep waterway in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River at this time when both countries should concentrate all of their men, materials, and money to speeding up their defense programs. Mr. Cahan's article which follows deals with the subject of treaties between the United States and Canada.

[From the Montreal (Canada) Gazette of March 20, 1941]

JOINT DEVELOPMENT OF ST. LAWRENCE

(By Hon. C. H. Cahan, K. C.)

The second article of the Constitution of the United States of America prescribes that the executive power shall be vested in the President, and that "he shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." In other words, the President may negotiate treaties with foreign countries, but no such treaty is valid and binding upon the United States unless it is ratified by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Senators present.

The St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty which was signed on July 18, 1932, and subsequently submitted by the President to the Senate of the United States, failed to secure the consent of that body on May 14, 1934. The vote was 46 in favor of the treaty and 42 against, instead of the two-thirds majority required by the Constitution.

It is now officially stated that negotiations are about concluded for a new St. Lawrence waterways treaty between the two countries, which will provide for only one dam across the river at Barnhart Island, instead of two dams, one at Crysler's Island and the other at Barnhart Island, as provided in the draft of the treaty of 1932, with some other changes which have not yet been made public. Until all the terms, which have been agreed upon, are officially made known, full discussion of the engineering problems involved in this latest scheme of development may not be definitely and satisfactorily discussed.

But the amazing press announcement is made from Washington that, as the President of the United States is not confident that the revised waterways scheme will obtain the consent of a two-thirds majority in the Senate of the United States, Canada will be invited to acquiesce in a method of ratification, by reciprocal or concurrent legislation by the Congress of the United States and by the Parliament of Canada, which will circumvent the express constitutional provision that a two-thirds majority in the Senate of the United States is required for the ratification of treaties with foreign countries.

It is therefore for Canada a vital consideration whether Canada's rights and interests in the proposed St. Lawrence waterways scheme will be fully and satisfactorily protected by any such method of reciprocal or current legislation as that which is now contemplated. It is obvious that if this new scheme of arrangement should be expressed in a treaty, in which the Senate of the United States shall have concurred by a two-thirds majority as required by the Constitution of that country, then such a treaty becomes the supreme law of the United States, and it may not thereafter be modified or annulled by unilateral action of the United States Congress. Moreover, it may not thereafter be revoked at will by the Executive Government of the United States, except provision for such revocation is contained in the terms of the treaty.

On the other hand, if the terms agreed upon are merely ratified by reciprocal or concurrent legislation, by the Congress of the United States or by the Parliament of Canada, the agreement will be merely temporary in its character. A statute enacted in ordinary course by Congress or by Parliament may be repealed by Congress or by Parliament, as the case may be, at any future time. Unless restrained by the terms of an existing treaty, a future Congress or a future Parliament is under no constitutional or legal obligation to maintain in force for the future any statute which has been enacted previously by the same or by a succeeding Congress or Parliament. Concurrent legislation by Congress and by Parliament does not afford that guaranty of permanence or stability which is the necessary foundation for such a vast and costly undertaking as that which is now proposed.

Since the treaty of peace which was signed at Paris in 1783 recognized the independence of the United States of America, a series of treaties have been negotiated between the United Kingdom and the United States that deal with the boundary between the United States and British North America, which now forms the Dominion of Canada, and that also deal with the respective rights of these two countries in and to their boundary waters.

There have been the Jay Treaty of 1794, the Treaty of Ghent of 1854, the Ashburton Treaty of 1842, the Treaty of Washington of 1871, and the Waterways Treaty of 1909. Each of these treaties was negotiated and signed on behalf of the British sovereign by one or more plenipotentiaries appointed by the Government at Westminster, and they are known as Empire treaties. By the terms of section 132 of the British North America Act the Parliament and Government of Canada have all powers necessary or proper for performing the obligations of Canada or of any Province of Canada arising under any or all of these treaties; but in the absence of a treaty, the Parliament of Canada is restricted to the legislative jurisdiction otherwise expressed in section 91 of that act.

By article 26 of the Treaty of Washington of 1871 the navigation of the River St. Lawrence in that section which flows from near Cornwall to the sea, through the Province of Quebec, is made free for purposes of commerce to the citizens of the United States. I quote:

"26. The navigation of the River St. Lawrence, ascending and descending from the forty-fifth parallel of north latitude, where it ceases to form the boundary between the two countries, from, to, and into the sea, shall forever remain free and open for the purposes of commerce to the citizens of the United States, subject to any laws and regulations of Great Britain or of the Dominion of Canada not consistent with such privilege of free navigation."

That treaty is not made subject to revocation by either country.

The St. Lawrence Waterways Treaty of 1909 further provides that "the navigation of all navigable boundary waters" (which include Lakes Ontario, Erie, Huron, and Superior) "shall forever continue free and open for the purpose of commerce to the inhabitants and to the ships, vessels, and boats of both countries equally." This description includes the entire waterway from the head of Lake Superior to the Quebec boundary at St. Regis, below Cornwall, where the forty-fifth parallel of latitude crosses the River St. Lawrence.

The present negotiations are chiefly concerned with navigation and with the development of hydroelectric power on the international section of the St. Lawrence River, which forms the boundary between the United States and Canada from Lake Ontario to the Quebec boundary at St. Regis. Within a distance of 10 miles above this point lie the islands of Long Sault and Barnhart. The boundary line in the river, as fixed by the Ashburton treaty of 1842, places both these islands in the territory of the United States; and nine-tenths of the total volume of water of the St. Lawrence River flows through the channel lying south of Barnhart Island and wholly in the territory of the United States.

Article 7 of the Ashburton treaty dealt with navigation of these southern channels through United States territory as follows:

"It is further agreed that the channels in the River St. Lawrence on both sides of the Long Sault and Barnhart Islands * * * shall be equally free and open to the ships, vessels, and boats of both parties."

In the negotiations preceding the signing of the Ashburton treaty, Lord Ashburton pointed out that the navigable channels south of the two said islands were on the United States side of the boundary, and he urged that an explicit declaration should be made in the treaty that these channels were open to navigation by the ships, vessels, and boats of both parties.

The development of hydroelectric power was not then thought of.

Democracy—A Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1941

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the United States is spending billions of dollars in the cause of democracy. We are building the world's greatest war machine to protect our democracy and to protect our country from aggression on the part of the totalitarian governments. We are financing a British-aid program on the theory that England is fighting the cause of democracy against dictatorship and, in so doing, is battling in our defense.

Yet, in a number of instances the leaders, and particularly the head, of our Government refuse to follow the principles of democracy. I have in mind the case of Col. Charles A. Lindbergh.

Colonel Lindbergh went before a congressional committee to oppose passage of the lend-lease bill, which authorizes the expenditure of billions of dollars to furnish the friends of our Nation with war supplies. Later in public addresses Colonel Lindbergh expressed the opinion that the British cannot gain victory over the Axis Powers, opposed American help to the British to the neglect of our own defenses, and suggested that a negotiated peace would be England's best method of dealing with Germany.

Now, we may not see eye to eye with Colonel Lindbergh on all of his suggestions, but I ask you Members of Congress—Are we not living in a democratic America where we have the right to say what we think, a right guaranteed to us by our Constitution?

A few days following the colonel's most recent speech on matters of foreign policy, President Roosevelt, during the course of an interview, condemned the famous flier's attitude and compared him with the appeasers of Revolutionary and Civil War times, and classed him with the notorious copperheads who opposed prosecution of the North's fight to save the Union in the great War between the States.

I respectfully call your attention to the fact that we are not at war. As long as we are at peace there should be no attempt to suppress the rights of the people, nor should those who insist on those rights be condemned for exercising the liberties which are so precious to us.

These liberties are the foundation of our democracy. If an attempt is made to suppress them, no matter what the means, then we are not adhering to democratic principles. And if we do not adhere to democratic principles, then we are no longer a democracy.

Democracy does not mean that the right of free speech should be restricted to those who agree with you in all things. It means that it should apply to all regardless of the nature of the expressed opinions.

If we are to spend billions in the cause of democracy, maybe go to war for it, let us practice it at home.

Concentrating on Essentials in Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1941

ADDRESS BY W. C. MULLENDORE

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by W. C. Mullendore, executive vice president of the Southern California Edison Co., Ltd., Los Angeles, Calif., before the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C., on April 30, 1941:

During the past decade the American people have undergone a revolution the meaning and consequences of which they do not yet know. Now, before we have either comprehended or recovered from that revolution, we have become involved in a great world war which will subject us to sacrifices, pains, and pressures far beyond anything which most of us now expect or imagine. Again, Uncle Sam is giving a benefit performance for the rescue of world democracy. His present position is comparable to that of the high-dive performer who has just started his dive. He is now in the grip of forces beyond his control, and if this world performance is to end in success rather than tragedy, it behooves all of us rapidly to prepare and firmly hold the safety net of national defense.

On the occasion of another great crisis in our history, Patrick Henry said: "This is no time for ceremony. The question before the house is one of awful moment to this country. * * * It is natural to man to indulge in the illusions of hope. * * * Are we disposed to be of the number of those who, having eyes, see not, and having ears, hear not, the things which so nearly concern their temporal salvation? For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to know the whole truth; to know the worst, and to provide for it." Although we do not desire at this time to recall too vividly the proposal which Patrick Henry was then discussing, we should know that the facts which now confront us are of even greater moment than those of which he spoke. It is quite as dangerous for us in 1941 to shroud reality with illusions of hope as it would have been for our forefathers, had they done so 165 years ago.

There may be times when a people can afford the comforts of ignorance, but this is not such a time. This annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States will have failed to justify its assembly if it does not contribute to the advancement of an understanding and appreciation of some of the harsh realities which must be faced by the American people in the grim days ahead. If we are successfully to cope with the gigantic tasks to the successful consummation of which we are committed, we must be prepared mentally as well as physically, and the first requirement of mental preparation is the clearest possible comprehension of the size and character of our undertaking.

At the outset, we are met with the question: Is any particular concentration upon the essentials for defense necessary? Or, may we safely proceed upon the assumption, which seems to prevail in the minds of some, that we have enough time and enough surplus productive capacity in men, materials, and equipment that we can step up our production sufficiently to meet the defense requirements without seriously interfering with our normal regime? To answer that question, let us take a look at our commitments.

THE GREATEST WAR EFFORT IN OUR HISTORY

First of all, is it true that we are committed to the greatest war effort in our history? Who can successfully challenge the truth of that assertion, startling though it seems? Except in general terms, no one has defined, and probably no one can define for us the size or limits of our undertaking. We have not declared war, but the President has clearly indicated that we are committed to seeing war through to a victory over the forces of aggression. How we would define victory, whether it means or will resuire invasion of Europe by armed force, whether we will pursue victory if England should fall, when we will be satisfied that we have established the "four freedoms" in the world, no one has undertaken to say. But it is incontrovertible that we have allied ourselves with the cause of the British Empire and that we have undertaken to do whatever may be found necessary to bring about the defeat of what is for the present the greatest aggregation of armed force, of military power, the world has ever seen. Whether we should have done so, whether our own vital interests demanded this commitment is still a subject of debate, but so far, at least, as it bears upon the extent of our present endeavor and program, we are officially committed to a "total effort."

The commitments now made, the already foreseeable size of the task, taken together with the inconceivably rapid expansion of those commitments, enable us to say unequivocally that our effort is to be limited only by our resources, our strength, and ability. The billions of man-hours of labor, the millions of tons of fabricated products of our mines, forests, and fields which we have already planned to dump into the bottomless pit of war, for exceed the amount which we ever before undertook to produce for the insatiable appetite of Mars. Starting with a $10,000,000,000 program some 11 months ago, we have already multiplied it fourfold, or to a point where, whether we measure it by man-hours of labor required or by dollars of present value, we are committed to an effort far exceeding the total of the last war.

ARE WE STRONGER THAN IN 1916–17?

Nevertheless, some people assert that even if that be true, we are stronger and comparatively better equipped to produce than when we made our greatest previous effort in expansion of production 24 years ago. But are we stronger? Let us see. In 1916 the Federal debt was less than one and a quarter billion dollars. Today it is fast approaching 50 times that amount. In 1916 our normal Federal expenditures were $734,000,000; now they are about $500,000,000; in 1916 Federal taxes were $726,000,000; by 1940 they had increased some 600 percent. In 1916 the attitude of Government toward business was friendly. Today there is far too much suspicion and jealousy, not to say hostility, in Government leadership toward business leadership, and their joint efforts are less cooperative and hence less effective. A similar growth of suspicion and hostile attitude characterizes the relationship between labor and management as compared with 1916. Not only are labor resources impaired by this increased antagonism between management and labor but the hours worked are shorter and the rate per hour is higher. During the past decade and prior to the war construction, the country's expenditure on plant and equipment has been insufficient by a wide

margin to maintain the capacity of the previous period or to keep pace with the growth of population. The average age of our durable goods, such as houses, railroads, and much of our manufacturing equipment was much greater in 1940 than in 1930. Also, a very large percentage of the consumption of the depression decade has been provided for not through the concurrent exchange of goods and services for goods and services, but through the acceptance of future promises to pay in exchange for the goods and services consumed, thus contributing to that unbalanced condition which today threatens the breakdown of our exchange system. Since 1916, our standard of living has greatly increased, at least in the sense that it takes more labor, materials, and services to meet the demands included within normal living requirements, and hence a greater proportion of total production is taken by normal consumption.

Partially offsetting these adverse factors as compared with 1916–17, are the facts that we started our present program with more unemployment and more idle capacity and much greater agricultural surpluses than in the former period. Also, we have made great improvements in technique of production and particularly have added greatly to production per man-hour by the addition of mechanical energy. After all our slowing down of the past decade, we still lead the world in both actual and potential producing power.

Summing up this portion of the picture and placing our net productive power against the demands to be made upon it, we can say this: We are a very strong nation. We can do much better than we are now doing. We are making progress and if and when we have hit our full stride, we will do the biggest job ever done; but, after all, there is a limit to our resources, our technical skill and total productive power, and there is no limit now foreseeable to the demands which will be made upon us. The inevitable conclusion is that at the best we can afford no waste and no lost effort; and that if we devote every possible cunce of strength to the task before us, it will be none too much.

Of course, we cannot at once, and without allowing some time for adjustment, reduce our standard of living by rigidly limiting the consumption of all nonessentials. Millions of our people are engaged in producing and distributing some goods and services which, strictly speaking, might be classed as nonessentials. To curtail, by any hasty or ill-considered action, their activities, by such extreme measures as rationing or other severe restrictions upon sale and consumption, would result in so much unemployment, loss of income, and other disruption of our economic life as to greatly weaken rather than strengthen our defense efforts.

Concentration upon essentials for defense, however, does mean immediate concentration upon the primary essential of increased production. It further means that when and insofar as a conflict between the production of essentials and nonessentials arises, priority must be given to the essentials.

THE MEANING OF "TOTAL EFFORT"

It is obvious that thus far we have partially failed to grasp the necessity of summoning to that increased production the full strength and power of the American people. Surely no one who is informed on current events, who has read recent polls reflecting current popular understanding, or who has been in contact with any considerable number of his fellow citizens in various sections of the United States can be under the delusion that even a majority have comprehended the meaning of "total effort" or the magnitude of the war effort to which we are committed. If proof of such assertion be demanded, we need only observe the apparent indifference or recklessness with which vital war production is interrupted, the insistence of governmental agents and agencies upon pursuing nonessential projects which absorb energy and wealth needed in war production, the determined official resistance to modification of laws which restrict production, and, finally, the lack of unity in definition or acceptance of war aims and purposes or the extent of our participation therein.

Yet if "total effort" means anything, if we are even to begin to measure up to the requirements of the greatest war effort in our history, we must concentrate upon production, not within the limits of our ease and comfort, nor within the limits of laws, rules, and regulations designed on the theory of abundance and overproduction and the obsoleteness of our economic and social order, but within the limits of our absolute capacity for that level of production which can be sustained over the probable period of the menace from the world condition into which we have thrust ourselves and into which we have been thrust by circumstances not of our choosing.

PRIORITIES REQUIRE SACRIFICE

It is not easy for any of us to accept the stamp of nonessential upon our activities. Quite naturally our reliance upon, as well as our belief in and devotion to, our particular task or undertaking leads us to resent any attempt to sidetrack it as being an unimportant contribution to national effort, and we are inclined to carry this attitude over into the vastly changed conditions of a war emergency. We are accustomed to having priority determined by demand and supply in a free market, and it is not easy to change to the system under which priority is fixed by orders from Washington.

There are obvious cases where priority clearly applies and concerning which there can be little effective argument. The use of a shipway and construction materials for the building of vessels of commerce or warships obviously has priority over the use of the same for building a private yacht for pleasure purposes. Limited stocks of metals, chemicals, or other materials required for defense must be devoted first to the highest necessity, namely, the production of needed war materials. Priority must be given in the employment of skilled labor required for vital aircraft production over toys or even over automobiles for pleasure purposes. Thus we might go on and cite innumerable other instances wherein the principle of priority applies so clearly that all reasonable people accept its validity.

Priorities require sacrifice. The necessity for subordination of the lesser need to the greater extends throughout our national life, and it applies to all our activities and needs in proportion to our abilities to bear sacrifice and the importance of our needs in relation to national strength. We do not want to lower our standard of living, but if that becomes necessary in order to divert labor and materials to the superior necessity of national defense, patriotism as well as common sense demands that we comply. In the last war we cheerfully and voluntarily gave up certain quantities of such foods as wheat, meat, and sugar in the interest of supply to our Allies and our own fighting forces. After all, we must measure any inconvenience or sacrifice asked of the civilian against the disruption of life's plans or even the possible loss of life itself, which is the sacrifice we require of those who actively serve in the armed forces.

All of this seems so obvious that it is a waste of time to labor the point. When the private citizen must give up his job and go into the Army, or may be required to close his factory for lack of materials, or to turn over to the tax collector earnings which he had hoped to use to satisfy his own needs—if these and a million other sacrifices must be made by the citizens who carry the burden—there should be no question that the agents and agencies of government should be likewise required to curtail the less essential of their activities and expenditures. Nevertheless, too many of the policies and practices of government have not yet been brought into line with this just and unifying principle of action.

CRITICAL IMPORTANCE OF NATIONAL SOLVENCY

That national defense depends upon national solvency is axiomatic. It has been repeatedly demonstrated that national insolvency, a break-down in credit, and serious depreciation of the medium of exchange leaves only one alternative, and that is the complete regimentation and tyranny of the totalitarian state. Yet the recklessness of expenditure, and the complacency about ever-increasing and accumulating deficits which prevailed in the years before the war, is now being continued and in some directions even intensified.

A false reliance is being placed upon swollen bank deposits and easy credit as evidence of an amplitude of capital and purchasing power for an all but unlimited program of expenditure. That these bank deposits and this easy credit are in large measure the result of wealth consumption instead of wealth creation, the result of debts and deficits rather than of savings and surplus accumulation, seems to be forgotten. Billions of dollars of the purchasing power represented by our existing bank deposits were spent not for productive wealth but for consumers' goods, which have been used up, and for nonproductive improvements, which are now expense accounts. We cannot fight a war or produce defense equipment with bank deposits alone, nor with congressional appropriations alone. But as this mass of bank deposits and these appropriations are thrown into the market for goods and services, they will create additional heavy demands, the impact of which cannot but reflect itself in shortages and increased prices. Such are the stern and inescapable economic facts and forces which must be taken into account in determining the advisability of the pursuance of such governmental activities and the promotion of such projects as not only do not contribute to but restrict and hamper productive efforts of the citizens of the United States.

In his message submitting the 1942 Budget, the President said in part:

"But little change can be made in the regular operating costs of government. As I indicated in my Budget message last year, the operating costs of the regular departments are already down to the bedrock of activities and functions ordered by the Congress. * * *

"It is our policy to retain the ideals and objectives of our social and economic programs in the face of war changes. * * *

"We should realize that even with a full functioning defense effort there will remain substantial areas of need and that social security, agricultural benefits, and work relief contribute to total defense in terms of the health and morale of our people."

These statements in the Budget message, taken together with the appropriations thus far sought and made, indicate that government is not applying the same yardstick of need to its own activities and expenditures that citizen taxpayers are required through taxation, regulation, and necessity to apply in their affairs in this difficult period. Aside from reductions in relief made possible through increased employment in defense production, there has been little or no cut in total normal expenditures by government, but, on the contrary, there have been some increases in activities and expenditures which not only do not contribute to but in some cases actually restrict necessary expansion in defense efforts.

For example, bureaus and agencies administering some of the newer regulatory and

reform legislation have intensified their restrictive rules and regulations despite the obvious fact that such intensified efforts tend to create further uncertainty and add to the fear and lack of confidence in markets and trade already resulting from the war. While it is urged on behalf of these intensified efforts at reform, that we desire "to retain the ideals and objectives of our social and economic programs," it does not follow that the failure to hotly pursue these reforms to their bitter end during this trying period will in any measure destroy their ideals and objectives.

It is pertinent at this point to recall the warning of the Reynaud-Daladier joint report on a somewhat similar problem in France during the period immediately preceding the war, when France was endeavoring to recover from the effects of too much reform and too little production. In part, this joint report said:

"Actually that part of the French population which creates wealth, which labors for the future, is continually diminishing, while that part which, directly or indirectly, lives on the state is constantly growing. * * * There is a steady fall in the number of Frenchmen who are ready to bear the risks of enterprise and creation. * * *

"That everyone should work more and that the state should spend less—for ourselves we see this as the only formula for salvation; it is elementary, but it is inescapable. * * *

"The problem is not to choose between preserving or repealing the recent social reforms, whose generous inspiration nobody disputes. The problem is to prevent them from dwindling to nothing, to prevent their benefits from evaporating in the high cost of living, to prevent employers and employed, in a country which is still poor, from having nothing to share but poverty."

Whether the urgency of attention to these sound principles is as great with us at this time as it was with France, we need not stop to argue, but at least in considering the expansion of our social-security laws to cover still more "areas of need" and in insisting upon the extension of the principle of other laws such as the Wages and Hours Act, we would do well to heed the tragic experience of France. We might also again recall the words of Marshal Petain, after the French defeat, when he said that:

"The spirit of pleasure has prevailed over the spirit of sacrifice. The people have demanded more than they have given. They wanted to spare themselves effort. Today, misfortune has come."

Our Government has a responsibility beyond that of merely refraining from unnecessary expenditure. Government must set the example in economy, and while asking sacrifices from those who pay, also require sacrifices from those who benefit from its appropriations. For example, it is difficult for the taxpayer to see the justification for doubling the expenditures of the Office of Government Reports, for expanding the activities of agencies dealing with improving land practices, or of immediately intensifying the program of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Nor are the proposals confined to the expansion of already existent activities which have no clear relation to immediate defense needs. Additional activities are urged—all in the name of national defense. Not content with the extensive regulations of the power, coal, and other industries, it is being urged also that the oil industry should be brought under similar governmental control. Further, a strenuous effort is being made to throw the cloak of national defense over the promotion of such projects as the St. Lawrence Waterway and other Authorities to be modeled after the T. V. A.

Many of these projects could not be justified under conditions of peace and prosperity. Now, when they could not possibly be completed in time to contribute to the really urgent defense needs, but when they would divert labor and materials which are badly needed in defense industries, to attempt to justify them by specious reasoning and juggled facts which connect them with defense, raises serious question as to whether there is adequate understanding of the seriousness of our crisis within those Government circles where we expect to find it first and above all.

There is a call for national unity, and no group in our country more ardently desires and thoroughly appreciates the necessity for such unity than those who are charged with the fundamental task of turning out the vital production. They understand, however, and they are asking their Government officials to understand, that the greatest menaces to unity are unjust discrimination and inconsistent policies. To ask citizens to sacrifice while permitting Government agents and agencies to spend unnecessarily is inconsistent. To offer no resistance to the extortion of higher wages through strikes and at the same time to tax away the earnings on capital, while decreeing that prices shall not be advanced, is likewise rank discrimination. Businessmen know the necessity for higher taxes, and they ask no extra profits from war emergency, but there is a minimum of earnings absolutely essential to business survival. In the making of sacrifices, those whose savings provide the capital cannot bear the whole burden. The goal of national unity and the concentration of effort upon national defense are not promoted by such unfairness and injustice.

No one has greater confidence in or greater desire for the effective realization of our national strength than the business leadership of the United States. The record of their efforts at cooperation, their prompt response to appeals for their assistance, bespeaks their realization that their lives and the future of the enterprises to which they have devoted their lives are endangered in this hour of common peril. They ask only that their suggestions, based on experience and governed by inescapable economic laws, should not be attributed only to selfishness and ignored.

IN SAVING OTHERS, LET US NOT DESTROY OURSELVES

Finally, we are concerned that in our concentration on defense and devotion to total effort we should not lose sight of the basic objective of all our effort. That objective is the protection and preservation of the freedom and the institutions of the present and future citizens of the United States of America. In our concern about policies and ideologies which threaten us from without we dare not ignore the ever-present danger of developing and nurturing these same policies and ideologies from within.

Our country consists not alone of square miles of land and precious natural resources, nor even of millions of human beings. Much more importantly, it consists of freedoms which make existence here distinctive and worth while. All forces which threaten those distinctive conditions and institutions which make possible the pursuit of happiness by individual free men and women threaten America. If in pursuing and combating these evil forces in foreign lands we should convert ourselves into a regimented people, should rivet upon ourselves the chains of tyranny, we would have lost for ourselves that which we now seek to gain for others. The essentials of defense, then, require, above all things else, that in attempting to save the world we do not destroy the essentials of American freedom.

One of our greatest perils in our present pursuit of missions abroad is that we shall undertake more than we can perform, and, in the exhaustion resulting from overtaxing our strength, fail both in our rescue mission and in the maintenance of our own Republic. A false and foolish pride which prevents men and nations from recognizing the limit of their power and resources has led to many tragedies. We are now making very broad and generous promises of aid and assistance throughout the world to an extent which is perilously near to being foolhardy. To lead other people to rely upon aid which we cannot furnish is no kindness to them nor credit to us. We are responsible if we mislead others to their injury, and we alone can appraise accurately our ability and determine what is within our power to undertake and adequately perform. The role of hero requires not only boldness and courage but judgment as well.

The demands upon us from those to whom we have promised assistance will be unlimited. They cannot and will not limit their demands to those which are within our ability to meet. They are properly first concerned with their own salvation, just as we must be. It is therefore up to us to determine what we are able to do, and if we do not limit ourselves to that which we can perform without incurring involvency or embracing the totalitarian state we will have failed.

The revolving wheel of destiny has brought us into the midst of one of the great crises of civilization. Whether mankind goes backward or forward for decades to come depends in large measure upon our courage and our wisdom in this testing period. We are called upon to face grim facts, to endure hardships and make sacrifices far beyond any for which our generation has yet shown either the strength or capacity. If we awaken in time, if God grants us the wisdom to choose and the will to follow the difficult road of mutual trust and mutual sacrifice, we will emerge from this darkness into a brighter day, in which we and our children can lead the world in the pursuit of a nobler and finer civilization. If we fail, another tragic ending will be written to another glorious chapter in humanity's upward striving. Let us believe and pray and strive to the end that all elements of our population, forsaking narrow selfishness, will have the vision to see and the strength to follow those converging paths which lead to the concentration of the full energy of a mighty nation of free people.

Attention of Secretary of War and Other Interventionists "Stumblebum Diplomacy"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1941

PRIZE WINNING EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK NEWS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the Pulitzer prize-winning editorial from the New York News entitled, "Stumblebum Diplomacy." I hope all Members of Congress will not only read it but digest it as well. The Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson's, war speech of yesterday conforms with the News editorial's definition of "stumblebum diplomacy."

[From the New York News]

STUMBLEBUM DIPLOMACY

The title of this editorial—"Stumblebum Diplomacy"—is meant to make some people mad in the hope that they may snap out of it. The word "stumblebum" derives, we be-

lieve, from the prize ring. A "stumblebum" is an ex-prize fighter who has suffered several knockouts, each of which was a minor brain concussion, and who now shuffles around on his heels without any clear idea of where he is going or what anything is all about.

We take up first the subject of British stumblebum diplomacy as related to the present war.

The Versailles Treaty in reality was the product of Marshal Ferdinand Focht (1851–1929) and Premier Georges Clemenceau (1841–1929) though Woodrow Wilson didn't know it.

Its object was to destroy Germany as a military and naval power forever, with its Navy given up to Great Britain, the Rhine demilitarized, and hostile airfields menacing it from Poland and Czechoslovakia. The treaty held for 20 years.

Meanwhile the Germans had made Hitler their leader, because Hitler was the German politician who most bitterly hated and most loudly voiced his hatred of the Versailles Treaty.

Hitler rearmed Germany, while British and French taxpayers refused to pay taxes to match Hitler's armaments. Finally, in 1938, Hitler said he had to have back the Sudetenland part of Czechoslovakia, with its big German minority; and there was where the Allied stumblebum diplomacy began to shine like a mackerel in the moonlight.

The British ruling class by that time partially saw Hitler's strength, but it loathed Russia. Accordingly, before and at the Munich conferences Russia was snubbed by the Allied diplomats. If they had been willing to forget Stalin's internal economy and be practical, they might have induced Russia to give a guaranty of Czechoslovak neutrality which would have meant something.

A week before the present war began the news of the Hitler-Stalin nonaggression treaty was published. This put the Allies on notice that Russia would be at least benevolently neutral toward Germany in the event of war. Yet the Allies encouraged Poland to fight for Danzig and the Corridor and followed it into the war just the same—the British diplomats eagerly, the French somewhat less so.

That war has now ruined France, at least temporarily, and gravely threatens the existence of the British Empire.

We now come to American stumblebum diplomacy.

This country now seems committed to the policy of underwriting every British war with European powers, whether Britain consults us about these wars beforehand or not.

That would be starry-eyed idealism at worst. The stumblebum phase of our diplomacy is now manifesting itself in the way we are treating Japan and Russia.

Britain has arranged for us to have Germany and Italy and maybe in due time France as enemies in Europe. But that isn't enough for our diplomats of the general cast of thought of Bill Bullitt. They must be forever snooting, snubbing, and insulting Japan and Russia into the bargain. We're embargoing shipments of more and more kinds of goods to Japan; we have now barred shipments to Russia of machinery or equipment usable for producing defense goods.

This is the same kind of stumblebum diplomacy as the British exhibited before this war. We have never seen it justified on any ground except that the United States disapproves of internal Russian and Japanese politics and economic arrangements. Our system is so much better, it is felt by our statesmen, that we can lick all these enemies at once because spiritual force is on our side.

Spiritual force is a very fine thing. But it hasn't yet shown its superiority as a winner of wars over the practice of taking on enemies one by one and defeating them with more, better, and bigger guns, planes, tanks, ships, and soldiers.

The Vinson Bill, H. R. 4139

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. LARRABEE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1941

Mr. LARRABEE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to give expression to my views concerning the bill, H. R. 4139, "A bill to further expedite the national-defense program in respect to naval construction and procurement by providing for investigation and mediation of labor disputes in connection therewith, and for other purposes."

In view of the several unfortunate delays that have recently resulted in the construction and production of materials, armaments, and ordnance for the defense of our Nation, it would appear from the reading of the above-quoted title of the bill in question that this bill might be the answer to the questions arising concerning this most serious problem.

However, a careful examination of the provisions of the bill, with especial attention to the possible construction that could be placed upon terms and provisions, either by administrative officials who might be selected to administer the act that would result, or by the courts, if called upon to determine a question at issue, brings forth some conclusions of vital interest.

The bill, I am sure, is designed and intended for the purpose of expediting national defense, but I have serious doubts concerning the result that we may anticipate in the event Congress enacts such a law.

I think it is most significant that both labor and employers—and when I refer to employers, I refer advisedly to seasoned, successful employers of large numbers of workingmen and women—have raised the question of grave doubt as to the wisdom of legislation of this type.

The major section of the bill proposes the establishment of compulsory mediation of all industrial disputes affecting the Navy defense production. It seeks to set up a new system of mediation, and couples this provision with an additional mandate making strikes illegal, a proposed new theory under national law, which might easily become most dangerous to the democratic form of government we seek to perpetuate through our whole defense program. Setting up criminal penalties, as this bill proposes, is a most radical departure from our whole theory of peaceful settlement of disagreements between employee and employer.

While the bill is, in a limited way, patterned after the very successful Railway Labor Act, it departs so far from the theory of that act in several particulars as to make the two impossible of comparison.

Each provides the so-called cooling-off period. Each prescribes steps that disputants should take before resorting to dismissals or changes in working conditions on the one hand or strikes on the other. However, the Railway Labor Act gains its strength and value from the pressure that may be brought to bear upon the disputing parties by the National Mediation Board and public opinion. Contrary to this accepted policy, the bill, H. R. 4139, proposes to resort to criminal penalties.

In the light of the major accomplishments under provisions of all other existing laws, it seems to me that this is a most dangerous defect in the pending bill. The fact that the illegal period (with reference to penalties for striking) would be limited in intent to from 25 to 30 days or longer in any one strike does not make it any the less dangerous to our accepted theory of peaceful settlement of disputes.

Labor has long considered that the right to strike—even when not used—is the only really effective bargaining instrument that workers have in dealing with certain types of employers. Many employers, it is sad to realize, would doubtless refuse to even begin negotiations with their employees as long as they had the support of the knowledge that the workers would have to remain at their jobs and could not strike without subjecting themselves to the danger of heavy crminal penalties.

Vice Chairman Davis, of the National Defense Mediation Board, rather clearly pictured the probable result when he said, in hearings on the question of compulsory antistrike legislation, before the House Military Affairs Committee:

> That to tell workers they have the right to bargain collectively, and at the same time take away from them the right to strike, is like tying a man's hands behind his back and telling him he has the right to fight.

The section of the bill establishing as a requirement of the law, a "cooling-off" period, as has been so aptly stated by someone, "might establish, instead, a 'heating-up' period." This section might very easily result in many frictions and irritations by placing workers in a position where they could take no effective action—no matter what the provocations might be—during the antistrike period. I doubt that any need for a compulsory "cooling-off" period exists. Nearly all union agreements, today, we are advised by reliable informants, provide voluntary so-called cooling-off periods of from 30 to 60 days during which negotiations are carried on in a peaceful manner by management and labor at the conciliation table. I am also informed that both the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. have voluntarily agreed to notify the United States Conciliation Service of every impending dispute and give that agency an opportunity to help adjust the differences. At the present time most of the disputes which the unions and the Conciliation Service cannot adjust peacefully are referred to mediation. Authentic figures show that this method of handling labor disputes has been successful in 90 percent of the cases in settling or averting strikes. These voluntary methods do not abridge the basic right of free labor and they do not make strikes a crime under Federal law. The

spirit of compromise cannot be encouraged by threat of fines and prison terms.

To say the least, this bill is in need of drastic revision, with a view of protecting democratic processes and personal liberties.

It has often been suggested, and I believe that there is merit in the suggestion, that industrial peace can best be achieved, not by compulsory anti-strike legislation, but by quick and effective enforcement of the existing National Labor Relations Act and the insistence that both sides in disputes abide by the intent, the spirit, and the provisions of this law, which has so often been upheld by the courts as a proper instrument in democratic processes. It is an established fact that wherever collective bargaining has been established and accepted by employers in good faith, strikes have been greatly reduced or completely abolished.

This bill also raises the question of the union closed-shop in industry, and sets forth a formula that would, it seems reasonable to assume, absolutely forbid new closed-shop contracts where such contracts are not in effect at the time the bill might be passed. It would freeze existing open-shop conditions by a provision to the effect that demands for closed-shop contracts cannot be considered a legitimate grievance under the law.

It is easy to see that this would immediately result in encouraging many employers to resist union-shop contracts and would give such employers as are opposed to unions legal support for anti-union open-shop activities. It would appear that this provision would increase, rather than retard or eliminate, industrial friction and industrial strife and would greatly weaken the entire structure of collective bargaining.

The so-called "Labor Act Amendment" provision of the bill forbids workers to "use coercive measures of any kind to induce a person to join their organization, or, to induce employers to bargain or deal therewith." This section may sound innocent enough on first reading, but it might nearly destroy the protection to organize which workers have under the National Labor Relations Act. It might be construed as rendering illegal any or practically all activities necessary for union organization and for securing collective-bargaining agreements.

Some judges have interpreted the most peaceful efforts of workers to induce others to join labor unions as coercion. The National Chamber of Commerce, in its Washington Review of April 14, 1940, describes even union requests for wage increases as coercion. In a published article it referred to such wage requests as attempts by labor organizations to coerce wage increases.

It would appear far better to leave the question of any illegal activities that overzealous, unscrupulous, or unethical persons who sometimes work their way into labor organizations, as they do into all other organizations, to such action as local authorities may deem advisable under provisions of existing State laws. Undue force, physical or otherwise, doubtless can be dealt with, if it were resorted to by labor, just as well under existing laws as it could be dealt with under a new law.

While it rides the wave of public indignation against subversive influences in our national life and the indignation against "fifth column" activity in the defense program, the so-called subversive provision of the pending bill is filled with dangerous portents.

Both labor and employer have spoken out against this section in no uncertain terms.

This section would deny to labor unions the communistic officers, and to persons with communistic views, tendencies, or persons who have at any time held membership in a communistic or other so-called subversive organization the right to benefits under provisions of the National Labor Relations Act.

Such a pronouncement would seem harmless enough, and probably appear to be beneficial in the light of needs for eradicating subversive influences from places where they might sabotage the defense-production program. However, it would permit employers to dismiss any worker if the employer "has reasonable cause to believe" that such worker holds subversive opinions or belongs or has belonged to a subversive organization. After dismissal workers would have 30 days to appeal the case to the Mediation Board. The burden of proof would be upon the worker, a reversal of our whole concept of democratic justice—"that the accused is innocent until proven guilty." Under this act the accused would be "legally" guilty until he could prove himself to be innocent. And how, I am moved to inquire, could anyone prove that he did not belong to the Communist Party, the German-American bund, the Nazi espionage service, or any other subversive organization that you can name? Where could an accused worker obtain evidence to prove he was not a member? Such organizations do not open up their membership lists to public inspection.

I would not say that an honest employer would resort to the use of such an instrument as this feature of the bill provides, but an unscrupulous employer would be delighted to have such a tool placed within his reach. With it he could accuse any employee of subversive tendencies or activity, dismiss him forthwith, and fear no danger from such action. It is likely that unscrupulous employers would immediately seize upon such an instrument of law for the purpose of dismissing, without danger to themselves, any person in their employ who had been active in unionism or union organization.

It would force the accused and dismissed employee to prove his innocence—a task that might easily be impossible if the unscrupulous employer were to trump up some framed evidence against the dismissed party.

And, even if the dismissed party found it possible to clear himself of the charges, the employer would face no penalty for having brought about the unfair action in contravention of the provisions of the existing National Labor Relations Act. The aggrieved employee could collect back pay, after a long tedious process, for the period he was out of work, but the Federal Government and not the employer would make the wage under provisions of this bill. Thus the taxpayers and not the guilty employer would pay for the employer's unfair discrimination in such a case.

Such a provision of law would establish another policy which I am sure we cannot afford, ever, to establish in this country.

The La Follette Senate Civil Liberties Committee has shown in reports from the investigations it has conducted, and hearings it has held, that there are many large employers in the Nation who scorn the National Labor Relations Act and refuse to recognize the accepted rights of labor.

The Government, and the public in general, have long accepted the theory that labor's basic rights must ever be protected. These rights are to organize into unions free from interference of employers, to bargain collectively with employers and to strike when these rights are violated or threatened.

I am convinced that the provisions of this bill might easily serve to destroy these rights. It would make it possible for anti-union employers to discharge union members without incurring any loss or penalty. It would permit employers in a period of rising living costs and increasing corporate profits to deny and ignore the demands of workers for higher wages and improved conditions, and to goad the employees into taking economic action which would subject them to criminal penalties.

Preservation of our democratic institutions and processes, protection of our rights to enjoy the freedom and privileges guaranteed by the Constitution, and the strengthening of the morale of the people, demand the defeat of this bill.

Why Not a Separate Air Force?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from a recent issue of the Washington Times-Herald:

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

WHY NOT A SEPARATE AIR FORCE?

Assuming for the purposes of this discussion that we really mean what we say about arming primarily for our own defense, what is likely to be the air arm's main job if we ever fight a defensive war?

We may be invaded from Canada or Mexico. If we should be threatened with such a land invasion, there would be a hurry-up call for the air arm to do what long-distance combating it could before the enemy reached the border.

In case of an attempted invasion from the Atlantic or the Pacific, the air arm's big job would be to send out long-range bombers from coastal air bases with orders to bomb the enemy as far at sea as they could and still get back to base. Fighter planes would escort them some distance out and meet them coming back, presumably. Given enough bombers, plus naval surface and submarine defenders closer in to the coast, plus an adequate Army, we should be able to keep the bulk of any would-be invading expedition from ever getting here.

DIFFERENT ELEMENTS

In either of these events, we can't see how it would profit us to have the air arm subject to orders from the naval arm, the land arm, or both. Cooperation among all three of these branches of service, certainly; but the air arm would be doing an essentially independent job.

Why not, then, a separate air command? Why the present jumble of Army Air Corps, naval aviation, marine aviation, Coast Guard aviation?

The three arms fight in three different elements. The Army fights on the land, the Navy on the water, the air force in the air. Each branch's technical problems are as different from the other's as the three elements in which they fight. To the layman, at least, it seems common sense that the air arm should be commanded by officers of equal rank with those commanding the Army and Navy, and should have an equal voice in the joint work of defending the country.

AIRPLANES ESSENTIAL

Not that we think the airplane has made the battleship obsolete, or made the infantry unnecessary in the winning of wars.

We can't see how Britain and the United States ever can beat Hitler without a gigantic land invasion of Europe by huge and powerfully armed expeditionary forces consisting mainly of infantry. Certainly the battleship has yet to be pounded into ancient history by the airplane, even in the comparatively narrow Mediterranean.

But the air arm has become tremendously important in war—far more so than it was in the last war. It, with the tanks, blasted the road for the infantry in the conquests of Poland, Norway, Holland, Belgium, France, Yugoslavia, Greece. We don't think it can win a war by itself; but it looks as if only a nation or alliance having decided air superiority can hope to win a war.

Why the reluctance, then, to give the air force equal standing with the Army and Navy? Why the weaseling compromise reported worked out in the War Department, whereby the air force will have "partial autonomy" within the Army, with a mere Assistant Secretary of War for air?

We think even a layman can dope out the right answer to that one, and that the answer is: Human nature. Most Army and Navy bigwigs humanly hate the idea of losing any thority. Naturally they can figure out endless explanations to show why the air force should be parked below the salt.

The fact remains, however, that Britain and Germany both operate on the separate air force principle, and that the R. A. F. and the Luftwaffe are today the two most powerful and efficient fighting air forces in the world. They cooperate 100 percent, by all reports, with the land and sea forces. France worked on the same principle before it was knocked out of the war, and the verdict on the French air force is that it was O. K. except for a little matter of the French politicans being too late with too little equipment.

Wouldn't it be wise for us to profit by this example set by the world's two most successful air forces, and look further into the advisability of setting up our own separate air command?

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1941

ADDRESSES BY HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN, OF NEW YORK

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speeches which I made recently on national defense:

SPEECH BY THE HONORABLE JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN, STATION WOL, MARCH 30, 1941, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The United States today is committed to a definite policy in national defense. The commitment was made last fall by popular vote in the national election. It was reaffirmed a few weeks ago in Congress by the passage of the so-called lend-lease bill. It was reaffirmed a few days ago, when Congress, by an overwhelming majority, voted $7,000,000,000 to implement the lend-lease bill.

That policy, briefly, is to provide certain democracies in Europe and the Far East with the ways and means, either to vanquish the declared enemies of the American way of life, or to keep them occupied until America itself is sufficiently prepared to stand off those enemies.

While I strongly and most earnestly endorse that policy, even if I didn't, the time for personal differences of opinion, and of individual judgment, has passed. Our country, as I say, is committed to that policy. And as good Americans, it behooves us to unite in insuring its success.

And let me say this: My endorsement of the lend-lease bill during my recent successful March special election campaign and my vote in Congress for the funds to make it effective, were based on a deep conviction that the only way to keep war away from this hemisphere, was to provide others with the means to handle the present declared enemies to our way of life.

Now I submit that lip-service to any policy, foreign or domestic, achieves no effective result. Moral support did not save Austria. Moral support did not save Czechoslovakia. Moral support did not save Poland. Nor did it save France. And because England's support to these nations, so important to her own national defense, came too late, or not at all, modern war in all its hideous devastation, came to the British Isles.

We must not repeat Great Britain's mistake. We must act, and act promptly. And this, I repeat, does not mean lip-service to the cause of American defense through aid to Great Britain, Greece, Yugoslavia, and China. It does not mean the loaning of money, which we know cannot be repaid, and which the last war proved would serve to absorb our own defense products, and place our own defense supplies under the control of foreign purchasing commissions.

What it means is bullets, and shells, and guns, and cannons, and tanks, and ships, and airplanes, and food. And it does not mean providing these things tomorrow, or next week, or next year. It means providing them today.

I admit, my friends, that this is a gigantic task. I admit there are risks involved. But I am convinced that the alternative is so awful—and I use this word literally and deliberately—that there must be no hesitation.

Well, we have taken the first steps. We have enacted the necessary legislation and provided by law the necessary funds.

The next steps, it seems to me, are obvious. First, we must produce the goods and then we must deliver them.

That we can produce the goods, both you and I know. The capital is there and the labor is there. That these two elements of our industrial set-up function and function promptly and efficiently, is primarily the business of the executive branch of our Government. That the Executive will have the cooperation of the Congress and of the people in this task I have no doubt. There must be no strikes and there must be no profiteering. There must be action. And we will stand behind the President in achieving it, for our way of life is at stake.

That we can deliver the goods presents a more difficult problem. For there are both physical obstacles and national risks involved. But again, it must be done, or the whole policy of national defense, to which we are committed fails—and fails hideously.

If we produce the goods, as I am sure we will, the docks of the eastern and western seaboards of our country will shortly be piled high with the material the present outposts of our democracy so sorely need. Today, the nations in question are themselves transporting this material to its ultimate destination. It is my fervent prayer that they will continue to do so. But should the day come when these goods, the use of which by these nations we have decided is vital to our own defense, remain on our docks undelivered, then I say we must deliver them whatever the risks.

I believe this can be done by meeting these nations half way, both literally and figuratively. I believe that acting under the existing neutrality laws, we can convoy this material at least half way across the ocean. This would speed up delivery, and increase the guaranty of delivery. Whether this is the solution or not, I am convinced of one thing, and that is that these goods must not lie idle on our docks, and must reach their ultimate defense destination. No war was ever won, no defense policy can ever succeed, with vital war materials lying unused on a dock.

ADDRESS BEFORE THE STUDENT SELF-GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION OF BROOKLYN COLLEGE, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 23, 1941

I think my acceptance of your invitation to appear here this morning was prompted as much as anything by the stated subject of your conference—A Democratic World at Peace. For I am convinced that the greatest contribution this Nation can make to present world conditions is to stand in its might for peace. I have said publicly before, and repeat here again with as much emphasis as I can, that we have stayed out of every peace and gotten into every war, and I want to reverse that picture.

But any such conviction implies the assumption by the United States of a powerful part in world peace. And because I believe that our Nation will never be able to play this role, so important to ourselves and to our neighbors, if she avoids her current responsibilities in the present war, I accepted your invitation to tell you what I think these responsibilities to be, both at home and abroad.

Peace does not just happen. Treaties, international laws, neutrality acts do not preserve a nation's peace, as many countries in Europe today have learned to their sorrow. No, my friends, modern peace must be aggressive. Peace-loving peoples must protect their peace by vigorous and affirmative action.

You, yourselves, must have had this in mind when you called this conference and provided in your program your "Triple A for Peace and Democracy."

I note that the first of these is: "All material aid to nations resisting aggression." And I am curious as to just what you really mean by that. Because if you really mean what you say, then you must be prepared to face certain risks involved.

My own approach to what amounts to the same conclusion is "All material aid to nations important for the defense of America." And in this cause I am prepared to face the risks involved.

Now, this may sound cold-blooded to you. It is cold-blooded. There is not an iota of sentiment in it. While I may, and do, admire the Greeks and the Chinese and the British in their present gallant fight against aggression, my concern is primarily the defense of our own country, so that she will be able to stand in her might for the establishment of a just and democratic peace.

To this end, we have a declared American foreign and defense policy, by act of Congress, representing all of you. That policy, briefly, is to provide our friends with ways and means either to vanquish our enemies or to hold them off until we ourselves are able to handle the situation. The avowed purpose of that policy is to keep this Nation at peace and to so firmly establish and maintain our own democracy that no nation will be able to block our progress. I firmly believe that this is a right policy and that it can be made effective. But, right or wrong, we are, as I have said, committed to it. And right or wrong, it can never be made effective in disunity or without prompt and vigorous action.

On various phases of that policy your Government has already acted. The Selective Service Act was part of it. The lend-lease bill was part of it. The extension of the Monroe Doctrine to Greenland was part of it. The seizure of the ships of the dictator nations which were within our ports was part of it. The creation of the various defense agencies, national and hemispheric, was part of it. The new tax bills are part of it. And I tell you that those irreconcilables who still seek to divide the Nation on effective pursuit of that declared policy will bear a heavy responsibility if the growing might of our Nation is undermined by the eventual failure of this policy to which we are committed. Even Gen. Hugh S. Johnson, a bitter opponent of the adoption of our present policy, said in his column in the New Work World-Telegram last Monday: "The time to debate that has passed."

For there is much more yet to be done. Under that policy, we have obligated ourselves to a production of material heretofore undreamed of. If we are to be successful, we must not only provide war material for Great Britain, Greece, and China in vast quantities but at record speed. We must also provide far vaster quantities for our own defenses here at home. And no labor disputes or profiteering or failure on the part of employer or employees to recognize that they are the defenders of democracy quite as much as any soldier or sailor in any camp or on any ship, must be allowed to wreck this program.

Finally, we must see to it that these war materials are delivered to their ultimate defense destinations. There are those who will tell you that American convoys for American goods, to be used for American defense purposes, will inevitably lead to war. They told you that passage of the lend-lease bill, with its provision for repairing belligerent ships in our neutral shipyards, contrary to the international law, would mean war. And it would have 25 years ago. They told you the seizure of the dictator ships in our ports would mean war. And it would have 25 years ago. They told you that mobilization of our manpower under the Selective Service Act would mean war. And it would have 25 years ago. Indeed, Germany still claims that the Russian mobilization was what started the last war.

But they don't point out to you that these so-called violations of international law have not led to war because the dictator nations, as a matter of record, no longer recognize international law, and that they declare war or engage in war when and where they want to, not because of the acts or policies of any other nation but in spite of them.

They don't remind you that Norway and Holland and Belgium and Denmark and Albania and Greece sought unsuccessfully to remain neutral and at peace. And that, if and when the dictator nations want to make war on the United States, no strict neutrality on our part is going to prevent them.

Nor do they remind you that you are being taxed $7,000,000,000 to implement the lease-lend bill and that if the goods considered necessary for our own defense, which are purchased with that money should be sunk en route, it is equivalent of dropping that money of yours and mine into the ocean.

I tell you, my friends, that the first step for "a democratic world at peace," so far as you and I are concerned, is vigorous and prompt action by a united people on our declared foreign defense policy.

The second point in the program of your conference is in fact two-fold. "Adequate national defense—military and social." I have already spoken of the military side. We have passed the Selective Service Act and I, of course, endorse it, although I hope to see the age brackets changed to 18 to 25, with the right to serve before or after completion of a man's education. We have appropriated billions for materials, guns, tanks, airplanes, shells, and ships. And I have pointed out the vital importance of speed and cooperation between capital and labor in their production.

As to "social" defense, I have always maintained that the creation of a contented community is essential to the preservation of any form of government and certainly the only excuse for a democracy is the establishment as fast and as successfully as possible of such a community.

Of course, first things should and must come first. In order to protect our democracy from its enemies abroad, we will all of us have to make some sacrifices. But this should not and must not mean sacrificing progress already made or side-stepping any of the principles of social reforms projected or established. Our democracy, for instance, would be in as much, if not more, danger from within as from without were we to pass it on to a future generation which had been deprived of the standards of education we have set ourselves.

I might say here that as a member of the State Constitution Convention of 1938, where I was chairman of the housing committee, I sponsored and spent weeks and months writing and debating the housing amendment to our State constitution, which the people adopted, and under which much of the low-cost housing in this city is now being built. I assure you I would resent most bitterly any interruption under the guise of an emergency of the program this amendment made possible.

About the last point in your program, "Academic Freedom, Civil Liberties, and Rights of Labor," I feel quite as strongly as you do. Too often in the past have we arrested progress with emergency legislation. There is now before the House, for instance, a so-called wire-tapping bill. I claim that it abridges one of the oldest of our civil liberties. We used to say that "a man's home is his castle." I fail to see why it is any better to violate the sanctity of the home via a telephone wire than via a front door. No doubt there will be many such measures, but I promise you I shall oppose them.

On the constructive side, I do think that labor might be protected from public misunderstandings and the abuse of its rights by unscrupulous labor leaders, politicians, or employers by sound legislation. The Mexican Government has recently enacted legislation for a "cooling off" period before strikes. And there is a bill which may come before the House next week, the Vinson bill, which approaches this problem much the same way, apparently, as the Mexican Government did. It is not in final form as yet, so I can't discuss its merits or demerits in detail, or say definitely how I shall vote on it. But the principle seems to be sound.

And then in protecting labor we must not forget that free enterprise is essential to any labor movement.

In conclusion, let me make this appeal to you on all these points in your program. Debate and discussion are essential to progress, but mere lip service to a cause never produced anything. Some youth organizations have specialized in what they can get out of democracy for youth. I appeal to you to make your slogan "What can we contribute to democracy?" If you who are young work at democracy, I ar confident that our democracy will remain successful, and that in the not too distant future we will have "a democratic world at peace." The surest guarantee that none of us will have to die for democracy tomorrow is that more of us will live for democracy today.

Regulation of Freight Forwarders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1941

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, at the request of one of my constituents, I am pleased to include with my remarks the following letter:

WHITTIER, CALIF., *April 16, 1941.*

Representative JERRY VOORHIS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you with reference to Senate bill No. 210, and House bill No. 3684, both for the regulation of freight forwarders. As a large shipper of merchandise in the furniture line from eastern markets, I believe that these bills in their entirety are detrimental to the best interests of the furniture merchants as well as to the ultimate consumer. Less-than-carload rates applied to pool-car shipments would increase the rate by 200 percent, which increase it would be necessary to pass on to the consumer.

I respectfully request that this communication be written into and made a part of the RECORD in opposition to the bills above mentioned. I would appreciate a personal acknowledgment of the receipt of this protest.

Yours truly,

H. J. PERRY.

A Bill To Encourage More Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE MOBILE PRESS REGISTER OF APRIL 27, 1941

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mobile Press Register of April 27, 1941:

[From the Mobile Press Register of April 27, 1941]

A BILL TO ENCOURAGE MORE SHIPS

Ships and more ships are the crying need of America and Britain today to successfully combat the Axis in the battle of the Atlantic. On the outcome of this naval warfare, which has gone on ceaselessly since the outbreak of hostilities, will depend, in all probability, the final outcome of the war.

The Nazi blockade unquestionably has made serious inroads on British shipping. Britain looks to America for replacements of ships. Some months ago the Maritime Commission declared flatly that America's merchant marine had no more ships which could be converted to the use of Great Britain. All available cargo vessels, the Maritime Authority set forth, were needed to convey raw materials to the United States.

Seriousness of the situation in regard to the shortage of ships is reflected by the Federal Government's frantic efforts to build cargo vessels in mass quantities and the administration's decision to requisition German, Italian, and Danish ships seized in American ports for our own or Britain's use.

It is national self-preservation for the United States to exhaust every means of terminating the shortage of ships. Such is the object of a bill by Representative FRANK BOYKIN now pending before the House Merchant Marine Committee. The measure would encourage private shipping interests to supplement the Government's efforts to build more ships by allowing unsubsidized lines to set up tax-free construction reserve funds for building new vessels. The Government-subsidized lines were favored in this manner last year and the Boykin bill would simply extend a similar privilege to shipping companies not receiving financial support from the Government. The Waterman Line and other unsubsidized companies thus would be encouraged to build new ships and additional obsolete tonnage could be turned over to Britain.

Even in ordinary times there would be sound arguments for the fairness of the measure introduced by Representative BOYKIN. In this time of grave national emergency there can be no logical contention advanced against the measure when the need of new tonnage is paramount. Congress should pass the Boykin bill without quibbling and without delay.

Steel Production

REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. SCHULTE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1941

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days we have heard a lot of criticism about the ability of the manufacturing plants in the United States to meet the demand made upon them in this defense program. I shall speak now about one of the industries located in my district, which is the largest manufacturing district in the world, and I read from a recent newspaper article:

UNITED STATES STEEL OUTPUT TOPS TOTAL GERMAN PRODUCTION—CHAIRMAN OLDS SHOWS STEREOPTICON SLIDES OF COMPANY'S DEFENSE WORK

HOBOKEN, N. J., May 5.—One American company, United States Steel Corporation, is turning out steel faster than all the mills in Germany, the company's board chairman, Irving S. Olds, disclosed to stockholders today.

This rate of steel making, he said, equaled the combined production of Great Britain, France, and Belgium in 1939.

In the first 3 months of this year, said Olds, rolled and finished steel products were turned out by United States Steel at 100.9 percent of the total capacity previously believed possible.

Olds showed the small group of assembled stockholders 62 stereopticon slides of the company's defense work in explanation, he told his audience:

"United States Steel corporation is building cruisers, destroyers, merchantmen, and tankers. It is producing armor and protective deck plate to meet the requirements of the military and naval expansion program; it is manufacturing shell forgings, unloaded shells and bombs of various sizes; it is sending large quantities of steel to Great Britain and Canada; it is supplying a steady flow of steel to manufacturers in different parts of the country who have taken contracts of the Army and Navy under the defense program; and its oceangoing steamers are bringing strategic materials from distant foreign parts to meet defense needs."

ORE REQUIREMENTS HEAVY

Concerning details of the corporation's national-defense work, Olds said:

"To meet heavy demands for national defense, it is estimated that 1941 ore requirements from the Lake Superior district will exceed 75,000,000 tons. The previous peak was in 1929 when 65,000,000 tons were shipped from the district. Equipment necessary to ore mining is being utilized to capacity.

"As a result of national-defense demands for electric furnace steel (high-grade alloy) we are speeding expansion of output by new installations having an annual capacity of 100,000 tons.

Olds told stockholders that United States Steel is ready to expand at any time the Government deems necessary.

Current production, if continued at the same rate, will surpass not only the production of German steel mills but equal the combined before-the-war production of Great Britain, France, and Belgium, Olds declared.

"Today the advancement of the national-defense program should rank foremost in the minds of everyone," he asserted. "The corporation has not deviated from its policy of cooperation to the fullest extent with the Federal Government and in making available to the Government its plants and resources for the early attainment of an adequate national preparedness.

"We do not know to what extent, if any, additional steel-making and finishing facilities may be found necessary to meet the steel requirements of future years, but when that need is established, the stockholders of the corporation may rest assured that the corporation will be ready to assume its proper share of the added task."

Noting that Leon Henderson, of the Office of Price Administration, had agreed that an increase in steel prices might be warranted, Olds asserted:

"It seems clear that a governmental price policy would not be in the best interests of the country if the consequence thereof should be to restrict production by such an essential industry as steel * * *.

"Furthermore, there can be no doubt about the propriety of the steel industry earning a fair return on its investment when operating at full capacity especially when consideration is given to the fluctuating character of the demand for steel and to the fact that over the last decade the return on the investment in the steel industry has been a most meager one."

Commends Work Projects Administration and National Youth Administration in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1941

LETTER FROM MAYOR ROGER L. PUTNAM, OF SPRINGFIELD, MASS., AND TWO RESOLUTIONS

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolutions:

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., *May 5, 1941.*

Hon. JOSEPH E. CASEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOE: Last Saturday afternoon the Western Massachusetts Association of Mayors, Selectmen, and County Commissioners, of which I am president, had the biggest meeting in its history. At that meeting they passed the two enclosed resolutions.

As a Representative of the State of Massachusetts in Washington, I know you will be interested in these resolutions, and so I am passing them on to you for your information.

Yours very truly,

ROGER, *Mayor.*

Resolved, That the Work Projects Administration be continued in its present form for the fiscal year of 1942 and that emphasis be placed in the elasticity of operations with particular reference to national-defense projects.

That it is the sense of this meeting that a vote of commendation be given to the present administrator, Denis W. Delaney, of the Work Projects Administration program in Massachusetts for its service to the individual counties, cities, and towns during the past year.

Resolved, That the conference of mayors, selectmen, and county commissioners in meeting at Westover Field, Chicopee Falls, Mass., commends the excellent work experience training program of the N. Y. A. in Massachusetts and its assistance to our cities and towns under the able and effective direction of State Administrator John L. Donovan, Jr.

We urge the Congress of the United States to expand further this worth-while program in Massachusetts in order that our youth may obtain needed work experience in the mechanical and other trades to prepare for the national-defense emergency.

Alabama-Coosa Rivers, Ga. and Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1941

STATEMENT OF HON. BIBB GRAVES, REPRESENTING THE CITY OF MONTGOMERY, ALA.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Hon. Bibb Graves, made at a hearing held on Monday, April 28, 1941, before the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, in connection with the proposed improvement of the Alabama-Coosa Rivers, Ga. and Ala.:

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the board, no man has greater respect, admiration for, and confidence in this elite corps of the American Army than I. I would believe that statement if I should go into a rehashing of the able, sound arguments here presented.

I shall try to direct your attention to one or two things suggested in this report that have not been enlarged upon.

I will read about three or four lines from the report. As to a rallying point, the district engineer finds that changes in economic conditions warrant a change in the recommendations and believes that the improvement of the Alabama-Coosa Basin for navigation, power, and flood control is now economically justified and he further recommends the ultimate plan of development, the principal features of which are—and I will not go into them because they are familiar to you.

The district engineer admits his partiality or, rather, his conservatism, by saying that the power development at selected sites can be sold at a somewhat lower rate without nullifying the economic justification of the ultimate plan.

The district engineer suggests that provision for changing freight rates should furnish a valuable assistance to the efforts to industrialize this section.

The people of Alabama and of Georgia are particularly gratified at the result of the fight they have made on freight rates. Since this report was filed in August of last year there have been more than 3,000 freight rates from the South to the North reduced. As a result of that, Birmingham coke is moving to Cleveland; Pittsburgh-plus has been abolished.

I call your attention to the things that are known to all men, especially to you; that the thing suggested brings about the result. In other words, if we get a freight-rate adjustment, there will be marked improvement of economic conditions. Witness what the freight-rate proposition was when this was first undertaken: The Birmingham district was operating at 17 percent of capacity, the lowest of any territory in America, but since the winning of the case in the Supreme Court of the United States, the Birmingham district, after the abolition of Pittsburgh-plus, never operated at less than the second highest. That is a conclusion reached from the suggestion that our district engineer makes that I would like to call to your attention.

Another thought that I would like you to dwell upon is this:

This is not a local or a sectional or a Georgia-Alabama proposition. It is a Nation-wide proposition, and if it were not a Nation-wide proposition, we would not have a right to ask the United States Government to do anything about it.

We have invested hundreds of millions of dollars in the inland waterways.

This is the greatest feeder of any undeveloped, possible feeding line today. The necessity of it I will show you here.

About 3 years ago, nearly, just about the last of my last term, the Public Service Commission of Alabama sent an expert to Chicago to investigate rates on food from Chicago to Gadsden, Ala., and Rome, Ga., and from Chicago to the leading ports of Europe.

Just as the Senator told you about wheat, one barge saved $1,500; that figure is before you. Of course, ocean rates now are all-out, but on peacetime figures it costs 53 percent more to ship a hundredweight of wheat from Chicago to Gadsden than it did to ship a hundredweight of wheat to Liverpool, Hamburg, or to Bremen.

We have, as they told you, a great cotton mill in Gadsden. How can it compete with Lancaster, England, in international business, when they are hitting us over the head with our own bread, when it is costing, as I say, 53 percent more to bring our wheat to us than it does to take it to Europe.

How can the great steel works compete with the Saar plants, or the Birmingham plants in England? They can't overcome what England overcame when she dug a ditch around Niagara Falls and got through water rates to European ports.

That concerns Gadsden and it concerns Rome.

I want to show you what the wheat farmers in Kansas, in peacetime, to get to the markets of the world had to sell on the basis of Liverpool wheat; they had to get it to water and send it to the other side of the world and compete with the labor of Russia and all the rest of the world, and it could not be done.

We have a market of our own right here.

This is a national proposition and the Senator from Kansas is as much interested in it as is the Senator from Alabama, and the wheat raiser is as much interested in it as the bread eater is.

We have put these hundreds of millions on the inland waterway. Let's finish the system.

I have practically no time in which to talk to you. I want to say a lot. What I want to say particularly is that we are to be constructive and not destructive. I have said that time and again and I have said, too, time and time again, that the conscience of America will never permit the using the taxes of the railroad companies to tear down the business of the railroad companies.

You gentlemen, representing this great arm of our Government, must recognize that the Congress of the United States has recently given to the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over water rates and you must assume that they are going to exercise that power; they are going to make transport not competitive but complementary. They have the power, now, and you must not assume that that arm of the Government, just invested with that power, would permit the use of a waterway to destroy something that is indispensable to America. It will be complementary, not competitive, and the Congress has done its duty and has given this power to this body to exercise and take care of that.

The same is true of the power companies. We must not destroy them.

I am glad to see that the report puts in the locks and all as transportation cost.

There is room for us all to live constructively, not to be destructive.

Now, one more thought, gentlemen:

The President of the United States has recently appointed an interregional highway committee. It is known to all that we are looking to the aftermath of this great emergency; that there must be something ready by which to absorb the millions of idle men and of idle manpower turned loose in the factories and from the Army, and whatnot, with nothing to do. There must be something to absorb the idle industrial power, and we are already looking to that, and I dare say—I happen to represent the South; there are five members on that committee—I dare say I will have much conference with you gentlemen concerning that before very long. I have your military roads, and so forth, already furnished, just as we supply that cushion to absorb the shock so we must see that this sort of thing will absorb some of that shock that we have heretofore experienced, and we are asking you not to stand in the way of Congress, not to say: No, you shall not consider this matter. We are asking you to put it on its way and when the time comes for Congress to take care of the shock, it will be ready, just as on the highway proposition; we will not have the debacle we had before.

This is a national proposition, a proposition to take care of what is to come.

I am sorry I have no more time.

Colonel BAIN. Thank you very much, Governor.

Lon Folger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1941

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay a simple tribute to my friend. I have known LON FOLGER from the year 1909, when he entered the University of North Carolina. He at once proved to be

a leader in his student days. His judgment and his counsel were always sought. He impressed all with his earnestness and sincerity, later taking his place along with leaders of our great State. LON FOLGER was faithful to the interests of his people to the smallest detail, but he placed the welfare of the Nation above all local or personal consideration. He has rendered the highest service to our State and Nation, and his name will forever be connected with those that have served our Nation in this critical hour. His friendship is a priceless memory. I will never forget his kindness to me. My regard for him was an affectionate one.

The following is an article and an editorial from the Greensboro (N. C.) Daily News:

[From the Greensboro (N. C.) Daily News of May 4, 1941]

LON FOLGER LEFT IMPRESSION ON THE HEARTS OF HIS PEOPLE

(By E. B. Jeffress)

Friday afternoon just as the sun was going behind the Blue Ridge Mountains in the little town of Dobson, loving friends in the presence of a large company of officials of State and Nation gently laid the remains of LON FOLGER to their last resting place. This was the community which had been the scene of his great activity.

LON FOLGER was an unusual man. He was a true friend. Although a politician, his advice could always be safely followed. He always had the interest of the common man at heart. He knew the people of his community and loved them. It will be hard to replace him in Congress, especially when men of sound judgment are so badly needed at Washington to deal with the problems that affect every human being in this country and the world.

LON FOLGER died a poor man but is rich in the love of his fellow human beings for him. He did not care to accumulate riches and did many an unknown act of kindness for his fellowmen which was a drain upon his private means. LON will long be remembered by the folks of his district and Surry County as a man with a great heart and an understanding mind. Had he lived it is safe to say that he could have continued in the service in Congress for many years. But his long service in behalf of his fellowman had drained his strength and it is a generally accepted theory that he suffered an attack which incapacitated him to handle his automobile which resulted in the accident.

At his funeral Friday there was abundance of evidence of the esteem in which he was held both at home and abroad. The floral display was one of the greatest in the State's history. While LON rests in the quiet village of Dobson the good work which he did for his people will long remain in their memory.

At the Jackson Day dinner in March when FOLGER and his coworkers fought to a satisfactory conclusion, the elimination of North Carolina's part of the national deficit may be considered the high point of his post as national committeeman. The dinner brought to the State men high in party affairs, including the national chairman, and a large number of folks from Washington.

FOLGER showed his ability when he got young Dick Reynolds to take the job of raising finances for the party, which proved a very fortunate selection. LON knew men and knew how to get them to work for what he thought was right. He was always close to the people and that, together with his organizing ability, accounted for his remarkable success. He was one politician that the average man could depend on. In my years' connection with the State highway work I knew LON well and I learned to know that he knew his county and he knew the men in it. He was a qualified political leader because he had that rare trait so lacking in many politicians. He was a warm-hearted man and close to the people. They may erect a great monument to LON, but no monument can surpass the real affection the people have for him.

[Letter from the Greensboro (N. C.) Daily News of May 3, 1941]

CONGRESSMAN FOLGER

That part of the once imperial Fifth North Carolina District that stayed put when the new Sixth was split off has lost one of the most effective politicians who ever represented it in the Congress of the United States.

ALONZO D. (LON) FOLGER would not have objected to being called a politican instead of a statesman. He knew his men and issues and worked at them in a painstakingly practical fashion.

Perhaps the most striking instance of Mr. FOLGER'S ability to take care of himself by thinking a step or so ahead of other practical partisans was his giving up an emergency judgeship rather than to turn over the Democratic national committeemanship. He wasn't doing badly as a judge, for he was a capable lawyer, but he knew where he wanted to go, and soon there he was.

A good many congressional careers are the result of accident. Not so that of the Honorable A. D. FOLGER. He wanted the post, went out and got it, and was maintaining his right to it when his car crashed with him on his way to a commencement speech.

The special election which is held to select his successor will have to be extra special if it fills the vacancy with a man who knows more about what representing a district in Congress is about.

The Selective Service

REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1941

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I received a very intelligent letter from the head of my home draft board having to do with the operation of the Selective Service and Training Act.

The questions and suggestions posed therein are, I know, of value to all who are interested in proper operation of this important service and I submitted them to General Hershey for his information and comment thereon. I submit herewith the letter mentioned, together with the reply of General Hershey:

BUFFALO, N. Y., *April 18, 1941.*

The Honorable WALTER G. ANDREWS,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a recent meeting of Local Draft Board No. 617, of which I am a member, my colleague, Mr. Roswell Park, stated that he had had a talk with you, followed by a note, asking that he advise you as to comments and suggestions he might have relative to the operation of the selective-service law. This served to remind me of our previous talk on this subject and of my promise to write you on the same subject.

I have been active in this work since the start and have given considerable time and thought to the problems constantly arising in the selection of registrants for Army service. The following comments are offered merely in an attempt to improve the process involved and are, in no sense, intended as nonconstructive criticism.

The major difficulties encountered by us in the front ranks, i. e., charged with the original problem of selection, are as follows:

1. The questionnaire itself needs revision and clarification, especially that portion dealing with dependents. The question with regard to the financial assistance afforded such dependents by the registrant, and the independent resources of the former, is confusing.

Many registrants think that the word "dependent" means only a wife or child. Strangely enough, others seem to think that the same word applies to more remote relatives and excludes a wife and child. A great many more have no understanding of the word.

My suggestion in this respect is that the questionnaire specifically ask whether the registrant has a wife, child, father, or mother, and what, if any, assistance is given them, together with the other resources of such person or persons. I would further suggest that, instead of referring to "other dependents," the questionnaire use the word "relatives" in asking whether any such persons are receiving help.

This may sound like a mere detail, but my experience has been that time and again the questions with regard to dependents have been left entirely blank when, in fact, the registrant had "dependents" who were receiving a substantial measure of their support from the registrant. We have made it a uniform rule not to classify any registrant until we have personally examined him under oath, just to make sure that the registrant was not entitled to deferment because of dependency of others, although the questionnaire was entirely blank as to the above. As I stated above, time after time men have been entitled to deferment but would have been inducted into the Army had the information not been forthcoming which was nowhere suggested on the questionnaire.

It also struck me that the requirement that the questionnaire be sworn to is perhaps unnecessary. A deliberate misstatement on the questionnaire could be made a penal offense, if it not already is, without the necessity of an oath. It is not always easy for a man to find a notary or a member or clerk of his draft board to take his oath. Many times men have called me on the phone, contacted me at home at night, and run around the last day of the questionnaire, seeking a notary and caused themselves unnecessary annoyance and, in many cases, loss of time over this requirement.

2. The regulations, in my opinion, should be more specific with regard to professions directly concerned with the armed effort.

For example, as I understand the law and regulations, the question as to whether a young doctor or dentist is to be deferred depends upon the local board. In most cases one cannot conscientiously conclude that, in a large city well supplied with men of these professions, the induction into the Army of a given physician or dentist would adversely affect the national health or well-being. On the other hand, it doesn't seem fair to induct these men into the Army without any assurance to them that, upon induction, their professional attainments will

be utilized in the proper branch of the service.

In practice there is considerable confusion and lack of uniformity in the action of the various local boards with regard to men in these professions and, in my opinion, some uniform, definite ruling should be made, either that young men in these professions, as well as pharmacists and perhaps mechanical and civil engineers, should either be deferred by the local boards in all cases or not be entitled to deferment; and, if the latter, some assurance should be given them that they will promptly be placed in the branch of the service for which they are fitted. Of course, this observation does not apply to men who are entitled to deferment on other grounds such as dependency, previous service, occupational connections, and so forth.

An especially difficult problem in this connection arises with young internes in hospitals. It is rather difficult to defer these men on the grounds that they are necessary to the maintenance of the hospital and, on the other hand, the hospitals are quite exercised when they lose men in this capacity. There has come under my personal observation the case of a given hospital having four young internes all similarly situated. One local draft board deferred two of these men; the neighboring board granted no deferments. This, of course, engendered bad feeling between those registrants not deferred and their board, and some friction between the boards involved.

My thought in this regard is that, in a profession such as I have referred to, as well as perhaps, teachers, who present similar problems, there should be definite regulations as to the proper classification of such men who are not entitled to deferment on other grounds.

3. Another difficulty arises with regard to "one-man businesses." Various registrants, especially in the older-age group, are sole proprietors of a specialized business which will have to be liquidated if the registrant is inducted into the service, resulting in throwing a number of men out of employment who, perhaps, are specialists in that business and not readily absorbed in industry.

Where the induction of such a man would result in the dismissal of a substantial number of employees, the board of which I am a member, has deferred the registrant on the grounds that the national welfare is served thereby. However, in many cases, such men employ only a relatively few individuals. It is difficult to persuade such a man that our action in inducting him is fair, when he can point to another man employing a few more men, who has been deferred.

I think that some definite ruling should be made to the effect, either that the sole proprietor of a business is not entitled to deferment in any event on such a basis, or, on the other hand, that he is, provided he employs more than a given number of employees.

4. Provision should be made, if possible, for a definite period to elapse between notice of classification in class 1-A and actual induction.

This may be impossible by reason of administrative difficulties, but some attempt, I believe, should be made to fix the time, and it should be considerable, between the time a man is advised he is subject to the call and the actual date of his induction. As the law is now administered and as the regulations provide, or perhaps I should say fail to provide, after an individual receives a class 1-A notice he has very little idea when he will be called. He doesn't know whether to quit his job promptly so that his employer may find a substitute or whether to take a new job if he is out of work, or if a new position is more attractive, but is left in a state of complete suspense after his classification. Many men have given up their jobs and then remained idle for several weeks or perhaps months, waiting to be inducted. Others have taken new jobs, only to be called suddenly, to the detriment of all concerned.

5. The class 2-A deferment on the general grounds that a man may be deferred if his occupation or calling is connected with the national health, well-being, and safety, etc., is such a vague generalization that in practice it means little, if anything.

Of course, at one end of the scale the problem is simple; that is, in cases where men are actually engaged in war industries. On the other hand, it is pretty difficult to find any productive calling that isn't either directly or indirectly connected with the national well-being. It would seem to me that it should be possible by this time so to catalog the major industries and callings as to give the local boards at least a concrete guide.

The results in the application of this broad classification have been, in many cases, fantastic, and the lack of uniformity in its interpretation by the local boards has created confusion, resentment, and is not conducive to public confidence in the administration of the selective-service law.

6. I believe that the physical standards required, in at least one respect, are susceptible to improvement.

It has been my experience that, due to the long succession of "depression" years, the registrant's teeth are, in many cases, badly neglected. Under the regulations, to place a man in class 1-A, he must have, I believe, in all, 18 opposing teeth. Time and again fine physical specimens have been rejected by the board because they could not meet these qualifications although efficient, artificial dentures were in use, or the registrant had less than the required number of natural teeth, or substantial portions thereof, supplemented by plates. I suppose that a man in actual combat service might be at a disadvantage if he lost or broke his plates, but for training it would seem to me that the regulation should be changed so that, if a man were able properly to masticate his food, he should be available for service even though all his teeth were artificial.

In this connection I should like to suggest that consideration be given to the compulsory rectification of trifling physical defects. It may well be that such requirement would not be good policy or that it might involve insuperable constitutional complications. However, men have come in, for example, with bad teeth which could be remedied, or requiring a slight surgical measure which would qualify them for service, but whose refusal voluntarily to take such measures prevents their induction.

7. The problem of resident aliens presents itself frequently, especially in a city like Buffalo, which is on the Canadian border.

The first question that comes to my mind in this connection is the provision in the regulations that a man who has filed his intention to become a citizen is subject to the selective-service law. It is my understanding that under the immigration law a man who marries a citizen need not take out such papers. In other words, that the marriage to a woman who is a citizen takes the place of filing his notice of intention to become a citizen. If it is the intention of the law that such a man is in the same category as a single man who has filed such notice of intention, the law and the regulations should both so state.

However, a much more important problem which again presents itself many times in a city on an international border, is that of single Canadian citizens who have lived here many, many years, who reside here, work in Buffalo, in industries drawing good wages, and yet who fail to file notice of intention to become citizens. It seems most unfair that these men can avoid the obligations of citizenship of this country, although they receive the same treatment in industry as citizens.

Of course, it may be that consideration of international law, treaties, or foreign policies prevent the induction of these men, but it seems not unreasonable to present this question to your attention.

8. Finally we come to the most difficult problem of all, that is, married men.

In my opinion, it is absolutely imperative that the regulations specifically prescribe the treatment to be afforded married men in each of the following categories.

a. Married men whose wives are working, under circumstances where, if the men were inducted into the service, the woman's earnings would suffice to maintain her in a comfortable, dignified, station in life, although perhaps on not quite the same scale as the two enjoyed prior to such assumed induction.

In this connection, time and again cases have come before the board where a man is earning from $20 to $40 or $50 a week and his wife, the same amount. In such cases, many times the wife has held her position for a good many years or perhaps has secured tenure in office as a school teacher or civil-service employee.

b. Cases such as "a" where there are one or more children who are either being cared for outside of the home or by paid attendants, where the wife's earnings alone are adequate to maintain the wife and children in a reasonably comfortable situation and on a scale not greatly inferior to that afforded by the joint earnings.

c. Cases where the wife has an independent, unearned income, adequate to maintain herself or the children, if any, on the scale mentioned in "a" and "b" above, without the husband's earnings.

d. Cases where the wife has an unearned income, adequate to maintain herself and the children, if any, on the scale enjoyed by the family before the assumed induction of the husband, but which, by reason of the husband's earnings, is not being used for family purposes, but is being accumulated.

e. Cases where the husband and wife are living on the husband's earnings but he has accumulated money or property adequate to maintain his wife or the wife and children's standard of living during the period of service, without substantial reduction of the family reserve.

f. Cases similar to the foregoing, but where the family consists of the registrant and his mother, father, or sister or other relatives, instead of the registrant's wife.

There has been the most hopeless confusion in the determinations of different local boards on one or more of the foregoing state of facts. Some boards uniformly grant deferment to married men, regardless of the accumulated means of the registrant, or the earnings or other income of the wife or other members of the family. Other boards classify in class 1-A, married men in one or more of these categories. A man in one district may hence be deferred, when another man in the adjoining district, having practically the same family situation, is inducted into the Army.

I believe that the failure to promulgate definite, concise rulings as to the treatment of married men and men with claimed other dependents, will seriously affect public confidence in the selective-service law and its administration.

Incidentally, another problem presents itself in surprisingly frequent instances and for which no proper provision is made in the regulations.

Very often men are living with women who, for some reason, they do not or cannot marry, but who maintain a common home.

In many instances these couples have children. Technically, under the regulations, the registrant cannot claim deferment by reason of the woman's dependency (since she is not a relative of the designated classes) unless she is under 18 or physically or mentally disabled. However, as a practical matter, to induct him under the circumstances may make this woman a public charge. Perhaps social or moral requirements necessitate failure to recognize such a status as affording deferment, but I present the question for such consideration as you may deem it worth.

This letter has been, perhaps too long, but I feel that there may be some benefit in a recital of the problems encountered by us engaged in the selection process.

Yours very truly,

ADRIAN BLOCK.

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., May 1, 1941.

Hon. WALTER G. ANDREWS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANDREWS: I received your letter of April 25, 1941, enclosing letter of April 18, 1941, to you from Mr. Adrian Block, and also letter of April 19, 1941, to Mr. DIRKSEN from Mr. Frank A. Stewart.

Mr. Block's letter indicates that he has a very complete and thorough understanding of the operations of selective service and of the problems with which we have been confronted. We, of course, recognize the existence of these problems, and have been attempting to work out satisfactory solutions. Thus far we believe that considerable progress has been made in this respect, and for your information I shall comment in detail on some of the points which are raised by Mr. Block.

The questionnaire, DSS Form 40, is at the present time being revised as it is recognized that it is deficient in some respects, and that there is room for considerable improvement. I have submitted Mr. Block's comments to the officers who are making the revision.

In connection with the deferment of men in professions and the deferment of students preparing therefor, we have been solving the problem administratively. For your information, we issued national headquarters memorandum of March 7, covering classification of registrants in training or preparation for activities necessary to the national health, safety, or interest, as an initial step. This was followed by subsequent national headquarters memorandum also dated March 7 which supplemented the first memorandum. A third memorandum has been distributed, based upon a report received from the Office of Production Management, which should clarify the situation and bring about much more uniformity. This memorandum sets forth that there is an over-all shortage of doctors in the United States, and that the known demands on the part of the armed forces and on the part of the civilian population will require a steady flow of medical-school graduates into the profession in order to maintain an adequate supply. The memorandum, of course, goes into considerable detail in order to be most helpful to the local boards. In addition to such administrative action on our part, the regulations now authorize the State director or the National Director to take an appeal from either a local board's determination or a decision of an appeal board. By use of this appeal procedure improper decisions that are called to our attention can be rectified.

In connection with internes, the above-mentioned memoranda also cover them; but an additional point should be brought to your attention, namely, that the War Department has informed us that internes who meet Army requirements may be commissioned in the Medical Reserve Corps and will not be called to active duty until they have completed at least 1 year's internship.

It is intended to cover the question of deferment of teachers in professional schools administratively in a manner similar to that with respect to doctors and medical students. We recognize, of course, that certain teachers are essential to train those who are needed to maintain the existing supplies of necessary men. Incidentally, many of such teachers are outside the age groups or are subject to deferment on other grounds.

The problem of the one-man business has thus far been left generally to the discretion of the local boards, and we have made no determination as to the number of employees that should be required in order that there be a deferment. We shall give further study to this problem and determine whether or not a definite yardstick can be established.

Mr. Block's suggestion that a registrant be informed of his induction date immediately upon being classified in class 1–A would be complied with if it were at all possible to do so. However, as more men will be classified from time to time into class 1–A than will be immediately needed to fill War Department requisitions, it is impossible to follow this suggestion. We have, however, advised our representatives to urge class 1–A registrants not to wind up their affairs until they have been definitely informed of their induction date. In addition to this, we have recently amended section 418b of the regulations to permit a local board to postpone a registrant's induction date for 60 days, subject to renewal for cause, where it determines that individual hardship would otherwise result to the registrant. This provision will permit local boards to give additional time to a registrant in order to complete a present activity, wind up his affairs, take an examination, complete a semester which he has already begun and to perform other such acts. We believe that we have this particular situation under control.

In connection with class 2–A occupational deferments, we have been maintaining close liaison with the office of the Under Secretary of War and the office of the Under Secretary of the Navy, and we have also been requesting and obtaining statistical information and reports from the Office of Production Management concerning supplies and existing and contemplated demands for various types of skilled men. As this information has become available to us, we have issued memoranda to State headquarters for dissemination to local boards.

It is our belief that handling the situation administratively in this manner is adequately solving various existing problems and will bring about a satisfactory solution.

In the States the various Government matériel-procurement agencies, businessmen, and union officials are in close contact with the occupational advisers attached to State headquarters, and we believe that in most instances men who should receive occupational deferments are receiving them. Whenever it is brought to our attention that such is not the case, we have an immediate investigation and determine whether or not an appeal should be taken. In some cases which have slipped through our hands because we were not informed about them prior to the man's being inducted, we have received perfect cooperation from the Army, and where justified, certain necessary men have been discharged. It is our opinion that in the future very few of these cases will proceed to the point of actual induction.

We have been giving careful consideration to the problems relating to physical condition of registrants and are very much aware of the great many remedial defects that could be removed by prehabilitation or rehabilitation. We have already issued releases on this subject, calling for the cooperation of the medical profession, colleges, and others to join in an effort in the interest of national health to combat these remedial defects. However, it is our opinion that we cannot legally compel a registrant to submit to treatment for the purpose of removing such defects, although we believe that our present plan will go a long way in remedying the situation.

Our legal department informs me that under the existing selective-service law an alien is not liable for training and service unless he has in fact made a declaration of intention to become a citizen. Therefore an alien who is proceeding to become a citizen without being required to make such a declaration is not liable under the law. As we are bound by the terms of the act, this is a matter in which we have no discretion.

As the Selective Service Act does not impose liability for training and service on nondeclarant aliens, we likewise have no jurisdiction over the point raised by Mr. Block concerning nondeclarant aliens who are Canadian citizens and who are residing and working in Buffalo. As nondeclarant aliens are not at present acceptable to the War Department for enlistment, it would appear that Mr. Block's suggestion could not be carried out without additional legislation requiring aliens to make declarations and become citizens.

In this latter connection we have had some inquiries as to why persons with bad criminal records and other undesirables are deferred. In answer to such inquiries, we have explained that the quality of the Army as a whole depends upon the quality of its personnel. The matter of morale must also be considered.

We certainly agree that the question of married men and the broader question of dependency have been an outstanding problem. We have been studying all aspects of this problem for a long while and have reached some definite conclusions upon which modified procedure will be based. It is expected that the existing regulations will be amended as soon as possible in order to carry out the new procedure and bring about uniformity.

While we were studying the question of married men and dependency, we attempted to secure more uniformity by way of administrative rulings and through appeals. This has been successful in numerous instances, but we recognize the problem will not be solved until the new procedure is put into effect.

In connection with a man who is living with a woman to whom he has not been formally married, such woman may qualify as a dependent in States where common-law marriages are recognized. Also, regardless of whether or not a registrant is in a State which recognizes common-law marriages, if he has any children by reason of such union, the children, although illegitimate, are eligible to qualify as dependents. We have not covered the situation beyond that point.

We are returning herewith the letters which you enclosed and are also enclosing copy of letter written to Representative DIRKSEN, which is self-explanatory. We are also enclosing a number of recent Selective Service releases directed to the solution of many of the problems raised by the letters of Mr. Block and Mr. Stewart.

I trust that the foregoing will satisfactorily serve your purposes, but we will be glad to explain in more detail any particular point

or points upon which you desire more information.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Deputy Director.

[Enclosures.]

Mr. Speaker, may I also state to the Members that at my suggestion Mr. Hershey will send to all members of the Military Affairs Committees of the House and Senate a copy of their regulations and releases to State directors. These are very clarifying throughout. If you will study them, you will find the answers to a great many of the inquiries which we are receiving daily, and I commend them to your attention.

Increase of Aluminum Production Facilitated by Columbia River Dams

REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1941

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, several times in the last 2 years I have called attention in this House to the fact that the power generated by the dams on the Columbia River would probably play an important part in the defense of this Nation. I also pointed out the probable shortage of aluminum and magnesium. This was brought home clearly today by press accounts of shortage and the fact that by midsummer 50 percent and more of the aluminum produced in the United States will be made on the Columbia River from the power generated at Bonneville and Grand Coulee. It takes 2 kilowatts running 365 days and nights to make 1 ton of this light metal so we can see the importance of these great dams.

There is an article in the Washington Post this morning calling attention to the fact that the President has asked for a large increase in the production of aluminum and magnesium. When we think of the fact that the German boys are riding light-metal airplanes to victory in continental Europe, we can see the importance of the improvements on the Columbia River and the necessity for authorization of the third Columbia River dam at Umatilla Rapids.

The Umatilla Rapids Dam has been included in the authorization bill of the Rivers and Harbors Committee. I have a bill pending providing for its construction. It is vitally important.

The following is the article in the Washington Post this morning to which I have referred, showing the increased demands for light metal:

[From the Washington Post of May 7, 1941]

METAL FOR DEFENSE—UNITED STATES STRIVING TO MULTIPLY ITS PRODUCTION OF ALUMINUM

Defense officials are embarking on a program to increase production of aluminum to between two and three times the present output and to raise magnesium production to from five to six times its present level, it was learned yesterday.

Although details of the gigantic expansion program are not crystallized, officials asserted that there was no alternative for the enormous increase and that it "has got to be put through," mainly because of the demands occasioned by the President's orders on Monday for a 200- or 300-percent enlargement of the heavy-bomber program.

The new schedule for both defense metals, whose strength and light weight make them indispensable for aircraft production, call for the objective being reached by 1943.

In aluminum, the current production of which is at the rate of about 600,000,000 pounds a year, present expansion plans already "in the works" will provide for an annual output of about 800,000,000 pounds by the end of the year. The new goal is said to be in the neighborhood of from 1,500,000,000 to 1,600,000,000 pounds annually.

POWER IS NEEDED

Magnesium production, which was only 14,000,000 pounds in 1940, is now flowing at the rate of about 25,000,000 pounds a year. The new objective is an annual rate of 150,000,000 pounds.

Major hurdle to be overcome in the new program is the availability of electric power, huge quantities of which are necessary to fabricate aluminum from bauxite and magnesium from brine.

As a result, great expansion of generating facilities at the T. V. A. and Columbia River dams will be necessary, it was learned. Some of the new plants made necessary by the program will obtain new power to be generated at Grand Coulee Dam, and others will draw on energy to be produced by enlarging T. V. A. capacity, it was said.

ALCOA TO HAVE MAJOR SHARE

Also undecided are the agencies which will undertake the program and the financing arrangements to be made. The Aluminum Co. of America, it was anticipated, would shoulder the major share of the work, although a relatively newcomer to the aluminum field, the Reynolds Metal Co., may also take part. The latter concern will be in production within a month in the Pacific Northwest, using Bonneville Dam power, and is said to have shown great success in its initial operations.

A possibility that the Government itself might undertake the production was also believed to be under consideration.

Although the program is still in a formative stage, it is reported to be developing very rapidly and may be definitely launched within 2 or 3 weeks.

Meantime, shortages of aluminum, particularly forgings, have already curtailed operations at some airplane factories.

Congressional Mandate Compels Unnecessary W. P. A. Reductions

REMARKS

OF

HON. M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1941

Mr. EDELSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have voted for every defense measure that came up in this House ever since I have been a Member of the House. At the time I voted for those measures I believed that we could not promote democracy for the people of the United States without preparing our defense against foreign aggression. In short, we are acting in the foreign sphere so that we may more fully protect our own people.

In my district I am advised this morning that the W. P. A. proposes to cut down considerably upon all white-collar jobs. In the light of such news I hope that the Members of this House will pause a few minutes to reflect on the significance of this news.

I wonder whether there is not stirring through this Chamber, despite the pleasant weather we are now enjoying, a dark shade of the past winter. How many of us recall that day last February when we blithely voted only $375,000,000 for W. P. A. until the end of June, even though we were warned that it meant that 650,000 people would be cut off the W. P. A. rolls, regardless of whether they could find any jobs in private industry.

At that time I urged a deficiency appropriation that would make unnecessary such discharges. The philosophy, or rather, the optimism which then prevailed was that as the defense program gained momentum and reached its height, it would rapidly reduce and then end unemployment. That optimism I could not share and still have not absorbed. England, with her back to the wall but her courage unabated, still has an army of 800,000 people registered on her unemployment rolls, people who, for one reason or another, cannot be used in defense production or any other employment. The same situation will be true here. We must continue to provide for people who will not fit into the defense program. It is said that Hitler, with characteristic Nazi ruthlessness, is killing off the aged, the old, and the infirm, who can contribute nothing to his military program and who are only a drain upon his resources. I do not think we will ever adopt Hitler's rule that those who cannot contribute to defense shall be exterminated. Yet are we any more humane because we will gradually starve to death Americans who, although they can find no place in our defense program, nevertheless have been summarily dismissed from W. P. A.

W. P. A. was created because the people of this country believed that it was better to provide work for those able and willing to work than to give them the soul-destroying dole of idleness. Where private industry could not provide jobs the unemployed were given jobs in work of public benefit until private industry was in a position to offer them jobs. That purpose is still valid. The deficiency appropriation of 3 months ago imposed a cut on W. P. A. in complete disregard of that purpose. Reductions are being made in our W. P. A. rolls not because there are less people in need of work relief but only because we have a defense program, even though it cannot absorb all those being separated from W. P. A.

I know that right now employment in industry is at an all-time high, production is even higher, and the shortage of

skilled labor is becoming more imminent, especially with increased shifts and the longer workweek. Despite all of these signs, the paradox remains that people on W. P. A. cannot find employment under our defense program. In the first place, defense contracts are not being given where unemployment is necessarily the greatest. According to Federal Security Administrator McNutt, 73 percent of primary defense contracts are in 20 centers, while only 19 percent of W. P. A. employment was in these areas. This shows that the defense program has a long way to go before it will end unemployment throughout the country. Certainly New York City has not benefited greatly from defense contracts and her W. P. A. needs are as great as ever.

In the second place, there are still about 1,000,000 more people qualified for W. P. A. for whom the defense program has no room because the trades, occupation, or art that they know bears no relation to defense, or because they are of an age or color which private industry will not hire. This is also true of many of those now on W. P. A. Age and color restrictions have not been eased by private industry under the defense program. Obviously, a man, no matter how skilled he is in his own field, is unskilled and unusable if it is not in a field relating to our armament program. A clerk, bookkeeper, tailor, cutter, or furrier cannot handle machine tools or work on an assembly line. No one can deny that when a retrenchment occurs in W. P. A. these unskilled are the first to go and in the greatest numbers.

Even if one out of every fifth defense job were filled by someone from W. P. A., as has been said, this would not justify retrenchment. To justify a dismissal of 650,000 W. P. A. workers there would have to be 3,250,000 new defense jobs created. Federal Security Administrator McNutt last month estimated defense employment to be approximately 5,000,000. I would herald an achievement which by June would even increase our defense employment to 7,000,000 and thus diminish our W. P. A. rolls to a mere vestage of their former strength. But neither one nor the other will happen.

W. P. A. for the month of May is putting through large employment cuts. In the recreation project in New York City the cut will be about 4 percent, and in the education project it will be over 12 percent. These cuts are in line with the total reduction in employment which will be effected in New York City and throughout the country. Nothing is said to show that the reduction in employment is the result of resignation rather than discharge. A cut averaging about 9 percent is rather staggering; and yet the bare fact is that this reduction is being made only because we mistakenly assumed 3 months ago that the defense program would make serious inroads on the W. P. A. rolls.

The cut in the education and recreation projects is ill-timed, ill-advised, and certainly bears no relation to the absorption of these people into defense production. The education program functions on the edge of the regular school program and supplies services which the city itself cannot furnish. It provides educational opportunities to the young and old, the sick, the mentally and physically abnormal, and the undernourished. It runs the nursery schools for preschool children whose mothers are working or ill. It serves milk and hot lunches to school children whose parents are on relief. It teaches sick and crippled children sc that they will not fall behind their classmates. It takes problem children and those who cannot cope with their lessons and by surveys and training in small groups, seeks to eliminate antisocial attitudes, and to bring them abreast of their classes. Further, it provides teachers who teach handicraft work and art as guides in taking underprivileged children to parks, playgrounds, museums, and other points of interest. This project also conducts classes in which deaf-and-dumb children are taught lip reading. Not the least of its tasks is to teach English and citizenship to thousands of adults, as well as to prepare reading matter for them. This is especially important, since New York City has over 1,000,000 aliens.

If the people employed on the education and recreation projects could easily find other employment, in or out of the defense program, there might be some justification for cutting down these two projects. If the work they were doing were finished or could be handled by the regular educational organization of New York City, the projects might be terminated if no other work could be found for the people now employed on it. Neither condition, however, has been shown to exist. Notwithstanding the absence of any such justification, cuts are being made. The only reason is because we have not provided enough funds and by our action in February deliberately ordered this reduction.

We have not as yet acted on the 1942 appropriation for W. P. A., which is still being considered by the Appropriations Committee. I think that the statements I have made here should be carefully considered by it. Whatever reductions have to be made in our civil expenditures should not be made at the expense of W. P. A., no matter how attractive and easy it may seem. I know that in many districts, just as in mine, there are still as many unemployed as before. I also know that defense contracts will have little effect on these unemployed, either because of their age, or their lack of skill in a defense industry. We must provide for them, we must give them work to do. We are already beginning to make plans for a public-works program to take up the slack of unemployment after the termination of our defense effort. That will aid those who have had defense employment. Shall we, in the meantime, let our almost perpetually unemployed starve? My answer is "no"! This year we gave for W. P. A., including a deficiency appropriation, $1,350,000,000. This necessitated a drastic cut in W. P. A. employment. Bearing that in mind, as well as the rises in the price of rent, food, and clothing, our W. P. A. appropriation for next year should not be less than $1,500,000,000, and if possible, $1,750,000,000.

The Upper Peninsula of Michigan and the National-Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1941

LETTER TO DIRECTOR OF INFORMATION, OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following extract from a letter I wrote to the Director of Information, Office for Emergency Management, Executive Office of the President of the United States:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 5, 1941.

Mr. ROBERT W. HORTON,
Director of Information, Office for Emergency Management,
Executive Office of the President,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I was just rereading your mimeographed copy of a release you sent me dated March 26, 1941, with regard to the National Defense Advisory Commission and was struck with the common-sense observations contained in that release. I am, however, completely and thoroughly disgusted with the fact that none of these suggestions seems to be carried out.

I believe I represent an area that is about as fine a glaring example of the area that was described in this release because I note that you state in it that the experience gained during the past 10 months would indicate that the immediate ends of national defense are largely consistent with the longer run objective of a better balanced industrial economy and to reach those objectives there were several suggestions made as to the principles that should be followed and should govern the location of new industrial facilities. For instance, (1) that sites be avoided in cities or regions where defense orders are absorbing or are likely to absorb the available labor supply, or to congest housing, transport, or other facilities; (2) that every possible preference be given to locations where large reserves of unemployed or poorly employed people are available and where industrialization during the defense period will contribute to a better long-run balance between industry and agriculture.

The Upper Peninsula of Michigan is a vast area that could be developed on a part-time industry, part-time agricultural basis. Some time ago the director of relief in the State of Michigan made the statement that 50,000 people would have to be moved out of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan or remain permanently on relief. I took issue with him at that time and claimed that with the natural resources of the Upper Peninsula being developed properly on a part-time agriculture, part-time industrial basis, we could not only take care of the people that were there but could take care of at least twice as many more but that we must have a basic data survey of the natural resources looking toward their development. This statement was made as early as 1935 and I made a speech that is contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on this subject. At one time the Upper Peninsula of Michigan had as high as 50 percent or better of its people on relief or W. P. A.

This area is strategically located at the head of the Great Lakes. In the Upper Peninsula in the western part along the Wisconsin border lies some of the largest iron mines in the world and in the Keweenaw and Houghton Counties peninsula we have the large deposits of copper. We have some of the largest copper mines in the world but they happen to be high-cost-production mines and with Leon Henderson's agency pegging copper at 12 cents per pound they have closed practically every one of those mines and the men there are on relief. We have at the eastern end of the peninsula the Saulte Ste. Marie locks through which twice as much tonnage passes each year than passes through the Panama Canal and Suez Canals combined. It is truly a strategic area, this Upper Peninsula of Michigan, where there should be large air bases, training fields, etc., to such an extent that there would be protection for this very strategic area. We have plenty of wide-open space that could be used for the erection of munition plants, ammunition dumps, and many other things in connection with the national defense. We have a vast virgin forest of hardwood which is the only remaining typical area of hardwood forest in the United States, and still the national-defense program does not seem to take this into consideration because the operators are going in there and slashing that national resource out to such an extent that within 8 years it will be nothing but a barren waste of slashings and stumps.

If the National Defense Advisory Commission is really interested in carrying out the program and the suggestions as set forth in the release of March 26, they would be interested in an investigation of this area.

I want to give you a further illustration of just what I mean. I have had people come down from my district, which is the Twelfth Congressional District of Michigan, and advise me that the W. P. A. officials have gone to the city officials and advised the city officials to pay the transportation of people to larger cities where there are factories and to pay their board in those cities until such time as those people obtain work.

You know and I know that the national-defense program is concentrated now in too few areas and should be spread out into the wide-open spaces. The Upper Peninsula is one of those spaces where there is a large reserve of unemployed and poorly employed people and where industrialization during the defense program could contribute to a better long-run balance between industry and agriculture.

I have heard so much about the national-defense program and the National Defense Advisory Commission and what they are going to do and what they have been doing, but I have not experienced in any instance where they have carried out any of these good suggestions.

Might I be so bold as to suggest that a study be made of the Twelfth Congressional District of Michigan toward the end of taking care of this very strategic spot in the national-defense program?

If our iron-ore mines are not important in the national-defense set-up, if our copper mines are not important, if our vast expanse of timber is not important, if our growing agricultural area is not important, if the transportation through the Soo locks is not important, then, of course, the program of completely forgetting the upper Peninsula of Michigan and treating it as though it was not a part of the United States is all right. But if these things are important, then it is all wrong.

This may be a very cynical letter, but the way things are going and the way this area has been ignored has certainly brought me to the point that I feel as though I am becoming a cynic.

Inasmuch as your office is the Office for Emergency Management, I would be very pleased to have some representative of your office call on me so that we might discuss this matter and probably interest the Office of Production Management and the National Defense Advisory Commission as to the strategic importance of this area known as the Twelfth District of Michigan.

I trust that this letter will not be merely passed on to some subordinate but will be given serious consideration.

Florida State Convention of the National Council of Catholic Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HENDRICKS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

ADDRESS OF BISHOP JOSEPH P. HURLEY

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Most Reverend Joseph P. Hurley, D. D., bishop of St. Augustine, Fla., at the Florida State Convention of the National Council of Catholic Women, Gainesville, Fla., April 30, 1941:

The Catholic women of this diocese are to be felicitated upon the ready generosity with which they have performed the tasks set them in the past, and upon the devoted spirit of self-sacrifice with which they have accepted, during this convention, the heavier and more demanding obligations of the future. To the country's imperative need of defense, you have responded with the pledge that you will dedicate yourselves to the work of maintaining and ennobling the spirit of the boys whom our Nation sends to us by surrounding them with the same healthy and virtuous atmosphere which they breathed at home. You have done it well. You will have your reward in the respect and affection of these boys, in the prayers of their mothers, in the gratitude of a nation, in the blessing of your church. Your influence here and throughout the country will go far toward equipping the American people with those solid resources of virtue, of piety, of religion, of conviction that their cause is just, of devotion come what may, without which no engines of defense can be effective. In the truest and most womanly sense, you are protecting your altars and your firesides.

Last night, from the lips of three of our priests now serving with the armed forces, you heard something of these boys whom you are to serve. They are clean American lads, generous, loyal, and radiant with those virtues which are traditionally American. I am glad to have such a text upon which to base my protest against those publicists of the written and the spoken word who on every possible occasion insist upon telling us all how bad we are, how decadent, how unregenerate, how pagan; who din into our ears that our homes and our schools are utterly evil, our Government corrupt, our public morals depraved. I, as the chaplains, do not believe that. We are not nearly as bad as some of these jaundiced fellows paint us. And I am beginning to suspect that some of these dyspeptic moralists are the dupes of a few men who have no interest whatever in morals, but who are seeking to discourage and divide us here in America. Evils there are in our land, and we should seek to remedy them. But let us not be unmindful of the warning of Shakespeare: "But 'tis strange: and oftentimes to win us to our harm, the instruments of darkness tell us truths; win us with honest trifles, to betray us in deepest consequence." No sin, I grant you, is a trifle, but our partial sins are scarcely to be compared with the totalitarian sin which has submerged Europe.

Paganism there is in America; too much of it, but it has not yet made the deep inroads into our fiber as it has in Nazi Germany. Over and above our suspicions as to the motivation of these men who stand behind the publicists, some of us are getting tired of the negative tirade in editorials, in public addresses, in radio broadcasts, condemning America and Americans as pagans when only the tenderest reference is made to that rampant paganism which has plunged a continent into tears and blood. I am sure that even if our case were much worse than in reality it is, this constant flow of invective against everything American is not the way to cure us. It is bad pedagogics; people, like children, are not corrected by perpetual scolding. One might well liken some of these commentators on the American scene to specialists who pass their time in pathological laboratories examining and reporting on diseased tissue. Let some of our critics take their eye from the microscope, and as the chaplains referred to above, look at the whole American man. It will give them back a sense of proportion. A healthy body may have a few diseased parts. And so it is with America. Our duty as moralists is first of all not to scare the patient by a head-shaking prognosis of death; we must then pull up the body's resistance by the nourishing food of positive doctrine and of positive virtue. And we must beware of pouring the searing acid of our invective into his wounds; those acids should be diluted and judiciously dosed lest we destroy the healthy with the diseased tissue. May I add, by way of candid criticism directed against a few of our national Catholic weeklies and reviews, that we Catholics will be unwise if we entrust any of our part in the work of national healing to practitioners whose only merit is their mastery of the acids of vituperation.

There is another group of men who, wittingly or unwittingly, are engaged in depressing our national spirit. They are those who day in and day out clamor that communism is America's enemy No. 1. I am convinced that until a few years ago, that was true, and that today, communism is still our enemy. But I am also convinced that, in point of urgency, if not in point of teaching, communism has now ceded its primacy to national socialism. It may well be that the menacing thing which now cowers in Kremlin may again advance to first place among those forces which wage warfare on God and man. But today the first enemy of our humanity—killer of our priests, the despoiler of our temples, the foe of all we love both as Americans and as Catholics—is the Nazi. Curiously enough, and let this be pondered, it has been through Communist complacency and help that nazi-ism has spread its devastation across the face of the west. Curiously enough, and let this be deeply meditated, these men who would have us spend all our energies combatting communism, are now in reality following the Moscow party line. That line, dictated from Berlin is this: "Confuse Americans; insert the widening wedge into every racial and religious cleavage; split America; sabotage American morale and we need

not worry about her powder factories and her assembly lines." I deeply regret to say that some good Americans, among them a few Catholic publicists, are now following this Berlin-Moscow party line. They will be chagrined and shamed when they wake to realization of the company they have been keeping. Dupes, incautious, indeed. In combatting one army, they have been caught broadside by another. Incident in Scyllam qui vult vitare Charybdim—these good but maladroit men, in seeking to avoid the whirlpool of communism, have steered their bark straight for the vortex of national socialism.

But the most serious and insidious attack upon our national spirit is being made by certain men who after a series of public defeats have now taken refuge in the sanctuary of peace, and from the loopholes they have drilled in that sacred edifice are now sniping at American morale. In the past they have opposed every step taken by the Government in legitimate national defense—the Neutrality Act, selective service, the lend-lease bill. Now, that in spite of their clamors we are well on the way to safety, these gentlemen continue to hold out against the Nation from the citadel of peace. The impression has been put artfully about by them that in some way, not specified, our Government, and more particularly our President, are intent upon leading us coldly, callously, and causelessly into war. The hope which is nourished by the men who have cunningly devised this new assault upon our national spirit (though not, I must say, by their dupes) is that this kind of peace propaganda will confuse and divide us and thus weaken our national effort.

All of us are for peace; no good man can look upon the prospect of war save with horror and loathing. Our Government wanted and wants peace. With the exception of the Holy Father, no living man has worked more intelligently, more perseveringly, more powerfully for peace than the President of the United States. During the years and months that preceded this titanic struggle he labored ceaselessly, tirelessly in the cause of peace. Long before most Americans were aware of danger he was throwing the whole weight of this country's influence into the balance on the side of peace. I recall a few years back that the President urged upon the dictators that they give guaranties not to commit acts of aggression against some 17 neighboring states; and I can never forget the snarling chorus of obloquy which arose from the belated champions of peace here even before Berlin's discourteous reply was uttered. Something of the foresight of our foreign policy may be seen from the fact that 14 of the states which the President sought to protect have now passed beneath the yoke of totalitarian tyranny.

God knows we do not want war. But neither did the sovereign peoples of Austria and Czechoslovakia, of Poland, of Denmark and of Sweden, of Holland, of Belgium and of Luxemburg, of France, of Yugoslavia, and of Greece, and the people of Britain. But they have had war with its havoc and its destruction and its death. They wanted peace, but the Nazi would not let them have it. Yes; we, too, want peace, but not the peace of abject surrender and degrading peonage; not the pitiful peace of Rumania and Bulgaria. We Catholics want peace, but the peace we want is the peace of Pope Pius, the peace of justice and of charity, of law and independence, of national life and not of national death; the peace of the four freedoms.

I question the credentials of some of these men who now plead for peace, just as I have questioned the kind of peace they would have us seek. I question their credentials, because some of them are the same men who but a few months back were inciting our people to the worst kind of war—civil war. I refer to the men who were responsible for that vulgar, hate-inspired campaign against our Jewish fellow citizens, which eventuated in attempts at racial discrimination and mob violence. It has been said that liberty is the last refuge of a scoundrel; peace, as I have described it, may well be the last refuge in this country of the Nazi propagandist.

Who has broken the peace? Who has outraged the nations of Europe? These men of the false peace have the wrong address; let them direct their chain letters and form telegrams, not to the White House at Washington but to the Reichskanzlerei in Berlin. Indeed, the men who are behind this profanation of the name of peace (though not, I again repeat, their foolish dupes) are not interested in peace except as a means of sabotaging our national morale and of destroying our defense efforts.

Who shall say that we have not here uncovered the secret weapon by which our enemies have sought to destroy us? That weapon was built in the propoganda studios of Berlin after detailed examination of models from Moscow. Some of the world's best technicians have designed it, and they have corrected its range and caliber through long trials under ideal experimental conditions on the pre-war battlefields of France, of Norway, and of all Europe. This weapon has already begun to fire, carefully and at calculated intervals, in America. The projectiles are apparently harmless in their candied coatings, but there is deadly poison within—the poison of racism, of religious prejudice, of Old World enmities, of the class struggle, of hatred, and of division. The target of the secret weapon is our national unity. The gunners are often some of our best people. In short, the plan for America—the inside job—is not murder but suicide. They would have us destroy ourselves. What a refinement of deviltry—to seek to encompass the ruin of our country through those same good and noble agencies which these enemies of the humankind have persecuted and destroyed wherever they have gone.

Of course, they will not succeed. Where the welfare of our country is in question, we Americans, with the exception of a negligible few who can be dealt with, are a solid unit. No need for me to tell you where the center of that national unity is. In Washington, at the White House and on Capitol Hill, are the men whom we have chosen to lead us through the dark valley of the world's travail. They are there in the seats of power because we wanted them there—because they have the confidence of our people; they are there through orderly process of law under our Constitution. In the conduct of the Nation's affairs they have the counsel of our Army and Navy. They are patriotic men. They are the embodiment of American unity. Them we will heed and them we will follow. By them our national course has been set; we accept that course as our own. I do not know, nor do I presume to prophesy, where that course will lead us—whether it will be possible in the long run to protect our national interests by measures short of war. All I know is that further decisions rest in safe hands.

Debate, of course, there will continue to be, not on our purposes but on the methods of achieving them, to the end that our Government may always be in touch with the thinking of our people. On the fundamentals of our national policy there is no further need to break up into panels of discussion; we cannot afford that luxury in a world of lightning aggression; on those fundamentals we must be united in a solid phalanx of action. The question is no longer academic; it is strategic. The wars of today start years before they break out, and are won or lost in the pre-war period. At their peril governments must take cognizance of this fact, even though public awareness and public opinion lag behind. Blitzkrieg can be won only by a blitzregierung.

Canada and the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

ARTICLE BY C. H. CAHAN, K. C., OF MONTREAL, CANADA

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following, which is the second article concerning the joint development of the St. Lawrence, by the Honorable C. H. Cahan, K. C., of Montreal, Quebec:

[From the Montreal (Canada) Gazette of March 21, 1941]

JOINT DEVELOPMENT OF ST. LAWRENCE

(By Hon. C. H. Cahan, K. C.)

II

The waterways treaty of 1909 defined "boundary waters" as "the waters from main shore to main shore * * * along which the international boundary between the United States and the Dominion of Canada passes," and then provided in the first article as follows:

"The high contracting parties agree that the navigation of all navigable boundary waters shall forever remain free and open for the purposes of commerce to the inhabitants and to the ships, vessels, and boats of both countries equally, subject, however, to any laws and regulations of either country, within its own territory, not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation, and applying equally and without discrimination to the inhabitants, ships, vessels, and boats of both countries."

Thus far the successive treaties have dealt with the navigation of all navigable boundary waters, but article 8 of the same waterways treaty also provides for the use of boundary waters for "power purposes" by declaring that the United States and Canada "shall have, each on its own side of the boundary, equal and similar rights in the use of the waters, constituting the boundary, for sanitary, navigation, and power purposes."

Along the first 67 miles of this international section, proceeding easterly, the St. Lawrence is a deep, slow-moving river, in which no water power can be developed. Then the river, proceeding easterly from Chimney Point, a distance of 48 miles, to the international boundary, at St. Regis, below Cornwall, embraces a series of rapids and swift-moving waters, which are now overcome for navigation purposes by the Galops, Rapide Plat, Farran's Point, and Cornwall Canals, all of which have been constructed and are now maintained by Canada at its sole expense. The increasing demand, chiefly in the United States, for hydroelectric power, has now introduced new factors into the

problem of providing deeper canals for the navigation of the St. Lawrence River.

It is now proposed to construct an enormous dam from main shore to main shore across the St. Lawrence River at Barnhart Island, which will utilize the total drop of 92 feet in the river from Chimney Point to Barnhart Island and produce 1,700,000 horsepower of primary continuous power, necessitating for its complete utilization an installed equipment of 2,200,000 horsepower, one-half of which may be used on the New York side and one-half on the Ontario side.

This proposed joint undertaking for the production of hydroelectric power was never contemplated by the framers of the existing treaties and never provided for by the terms of any of those treaties. In this proposed dam across the river, from main shore to main shore, at Barnhart Island, the necessary locks will be constructed for the ascent and descent of shipping in order to conserve the interests of navigation. Weirs and sluices also must be constructed in these dams, which will control the flow of water into Montreal Harbor; for upon the satisfactory control of the flow of water through these weirs the depth of water in Montreal Harbor will necessarily depend.

At present the Parliament of Canada has legislative jurisdiction over Canadian territory, and over the one-tenth of the volume of the river of St. Lawrence as it flows north of Barnhart Island, while the United States Congress has legislative jurisdiction over Barnhart Island and over nine-tenths of the volume of the river St. Lawrence which flows south of Barnhart Island. The problem is indeed a very complicated one, and though for about 20 years I have followed the discussions of this problem and have read every available public document, including, I think, every engineering report, dealing with the subject, I cannot at present conceive how any satisfactory solution can be found which is not expressed in an international treaty that is ratified by a two-thirds' vote of the Senate of the United States.

The Waterways Treaty of 1909 was primarily concerned with the navigation of boundary waters and with riparian rights to the use of such waters, the exercise of which on one side of the boundary might be productive of material injury to the navigation interests on the other side of the boundary.

The high contracting parties agreed in article 1 that "the navigation of all navigable boundary waters shall forever continue free to the ships, vessels, and boats of both countries equally."

Each of the high contracting parties reserved, in article 2, "exclusive jurisdiction and control over the use and diversion, whether temporary or permanent, of all waters on its own side of the line." Each maintained its right "to object to any interference with or diversions of water on the other side of the boundary the effect of which would be productive of material injury to navigation interests on its own side of the boundary."

Article 3 provided that except as "heretofore permitted or hereafter provided for by special agreements between the parties hereto, no further or other uses or obstructions or diversions, whether temporary or permanent, of boundary waters on either side of the line, affecting the natural level or flow of boundary waters on the other side of the line, shall be made except by authority of the United States or the Dominion of Canada, within their respective jurisdictions and with the approval" of the International Joint Commission. This approval is clearly confined to obstructions or diversions created by either party on its own side of the line.

Article 8 provided that "the high contracting parties shall have, each on its own side of the boundary, equal and similar rights to the use of * * * boundary waters" for domestic and sanitary purposes, navigation, for the service of canals for purposes of navigation, and for power purposes.

These provisions of the Waterways Treaty of 1909 clearly contemplated that each of the parties, on its own side of the boundary line, might continue, as theretofore, to construct canals for navigation purposes, and make diversions of water for domestic, sanitary, power and irrigation purposes, and the like, provided that in so doing the rights of the other party on the other side of the line were not materially injured.

But I respectfully submit that the proposed scheme of development at Barnhart Island, for both navigation and power purposes, does not fall within the scope of these provisions of the Waterways Treaty. The proposed scheme will involve far more than distinct and separate action, by either the Government of the United States or the Government of Canada, on its own side of the boundary. It proposes a joint undertaking of the two Governments on a vast scale. It proposes the joint control and management of this joint undertaking by the appointment of a new Joint International Commission.

This joint undertaking involves, for the first time in our history, the construction of an immense dam, from main shore to main shore of the St. Lawrence River, that will control the flow of the river from the side of this dam to the sea. It involves the maintenance of such a uniform flow of the river as will maintain and protect the navigation of the harbor of Montreal, and the flow of water, for navigation from Montreal to Quebec, in the channel which has been excavated by Canada at a cost of thirty to forty million dollars. It proposes that Canada shall, for all future time, own one-half the hydroelectric power produced by the construction of this dam at Barnhart Island, although nine-tenths of the natural flow of the river, which produces this hydroelectric power, is, at the site of the proposed dam, wholly within United States territory and under the legislative jurisdiction of the United States.

Such a vast scheme was certainly never contemplated by the provisions of the Waterways Treaty of 1909, which dealt with navigation of boundary waters and riparian uses of the flow of the stream; and, in my opinion, this joint undertaking can never be dealt with by concurrent or reciprocal legislation so as to maintain and protect for all time the vital interests of Canada in the navigation of the river and in one-half of the hydroelectric power that may be produced by the proposed constructions. Canadian interests can only be fully protected by a new treaty, and a new treaty will not be valid and binding upon the United States unless it is negotiated by the President of the United States with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, and ratified by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Senators present.

THE FRENCH PRESS

The waterways project

L'Action Catholique (Quebec): It is precisely because the waterways problem contains so many factors, ponderable and imponderable, that those who discuss it should obtain full information before crying either "treason" or "national salvation." We hope that at Ottawa and Quebec a loyal exposition of the question will be followed by a discussion not less loyal. The times are too grave for anybody to seek to make political capital over this issue. And the enterprise itself is too considerable in all its aspects and consequences for it to be decided in any "exaggeratedly simplified" manner.

H. R. 4466

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H. R. 4466, has been passed. It was passed without my vote because my vote is recorded against the passage of that bill. I was convinced, and I am still convinced, this is a war measure, is highly dangerous to the peace of our country, and if the provisions of this bill are exercised it will cause our involvement in this war. The people of our country do not want war. They want peace. They want to extend aid to Great Britain, short of war. But they do not want to send to foreign fields the sons of America to shed their blood in a war in which we had no part in its making. The people do not want any overt act committed which will lead us into this war.

It was disclosed during the general debate on this bill that there are now 26 Italian ships and 2 German ships in our ports, and, under the authority of the bill just passed, the President has the plenary authority to seize and take those ships. Those are the ships of belligerent nations. What will be done with those ships? What disposition will the President make of those ships, which belong to the Government or to individual citizens of Germany and Italy? During the progress of the bill an amendment was offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN] which would have prohibited the delivery of those ships which will be seized to Great Britain, or to any other belligerent nation, but the majority side of the House voted that amendment down by a vote of 220 to 160. The very serious threat involved in this bill is the extension of the authority to the President to seize and take the ships of foreign countries, both belligerent and nonbelligerent, which includes the ships of both Italy and Germany, and to do with those ships as he may desire, which includes the power to deliver them to any nation, either belligerent or nonbelligerent, including England or her allies. No one can tell what nation will be favored when the President makes distribution of the ships he may seize. However, the very fact that the amendment which was offered, which would have prohibited the delivery of those ships to England, was voted down by those who follow the dictates of the administration now in power is the strongest indication that these ships of Italy and Germany will be delivered to England—their enemy.

Mr. Speaker, if and when this is done, that will constitute an overt act of war, and every Member in this House is cognizant of that fact.

May I say that I have done everything within my power to keep our country out of this European war. I assured the good people of my congressional district that I was opposed to our entry into this war and that I would do everything humanly possible to keep our country out of it. My record stands untarnished. I have kept the faith. I have opposed every measure which has been proposed which was a war measure and which would, in my opinion, lead us into this European war. I was convinced this bill, H. R. 4466, was a war measure—one which will in the end lead us into this European war. Therefore I could not support that bill. I was thinking of some 30,000 of the fine boys who reside in my congressional district who would have to carry the guns and who would have to bare their breasts to enemy bullets in case of our involvement in this war. I was thinking of the boys who have now been ordered into the camps in our country, and who are training therein; those boys have the God-given right to know what is being done by those in positions of power in our country, which will probably send them forward to fight in another European war. This power to seize ships is vested in the President. If he exercises that power and sends the boys into another American expeditionary force to fight on foreign soil, the President will not only violate his positive promise made to the people of this Nation to secure his election as President for a third term but he will be guilty of the grossest fraud perpetrated upon his fellow man.

Our boys went to camp thinking that they were going for training; they were made to believe that the compulsory draft law was a peace measure—one which would keep us out of this European war. The lend-lease bill was also presented as a peace measure—one which would keep our country out of this European war. That was the statement of those who speak for the President; that was the plea for the passage of those bills. Yet, every one of those measures, including the repeal of the arms embargo, have been war measures. Each one of them has led us nearer to this war.

Mr. Speaker, we are yet at peace. When a nation is at peace and then enters upon the hazardous undertaking of seizing ships belonging to other nations, including nations who are engaged in war, such an engagement is highly dangerous. It is not alone the taking of the ships which involves us in danger, but for our Nation—now at peace—to make a delivery of those ships so taken to an antagonistic belligerent nation—that brings us wholly within the provisions of law that an act of war has been committed. When we go that far we have entered the conflict. We have given the weapon to the one to use against the other. We will have committed an overt act of war when we take that unhealthy position respecting the conflict.

We are yet at peace, but we will not long remain at peace if we continue to antagonize the belligerents in this European war. Every Member of the House realizes that we have been led down a succession of steps toward the battlefield, and we are now upon that field; we have not yet fired the first shot, and, thank God, no one has yet fired upon us. With legislation, such as H. R. 4466, being passed by the Congress, we will take another long step into this war, and, who knows, this may be the very step which will draw the fire from the enemy guns.

Mr. Speaker, we are unprepared for war. We have been preparing others for their war, it is true, but we have sadly neglected ourselves. I shudder when I think of the sorry plight in which we find ourselves. We have given both money and arms to other nations, and we have so little ourselves; yet, the Congress moves swiftly into a position which may bring war upon us quite soon—entirely forgetting our unprepared state. When the President wants more power, he asks the Congress for it; he has his great majority in both the House and Senate, and that majority gives the President just what he wants. We of the minority have fought the fight to keep our country out of this war. We are still fighting to save our boys, and our country.

These are very serious days. I was saddened when the majority voted to pass this bill. This is a war measure, and those who voted for H. R. 4466 know it is a war measure—one which is calculated to involve our country in this war. I hoped the majority would not plunge us into a position which may bring war before we are prepared to meet it. I did not think or believe the majority would vote to give the power to commit positive acts of war. If the President, and those who want to cause our country to become involved in this war, will take their positions in the front line, and fight—as the poor boys of our country will be forced to do in the event of war—then let them make this war. They have already made the war, I fear. They should not shun the element of danger. The boys have had no part in the making of this war; yet the President and his kind want them to fight it.

This bill merely gives the President the sole authority to commit another act of war. How far are we removed from active and actual participation in this war?

Some Facts About the Republican Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1941

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, my district in Nebraska has a formidable problem which Federal agencies will have to help us solve. The Republican River Valley, rising in Colorado and northwestern Kansas, and running through the southern portion of Nebraska, is subject to frequent and damaging floods. The year of 1940 witnessed as many as six distinct floods in several of the tributaries of this stream. And we are still vividly conscious of the grave disaster of 1935, when a total of 112 lives were lost, and damages—estimated by the War Department—took a toll of nearly $9,000,000.

Thirty days after these floods strike our crops frequently wither and die for want of adequate moisture, and this recent 9-year drought period, coupled with flood damages, has swept away so much of our topsoil that 10 percent of this entire watershed is already so seriously eroded that it will never again yield profitable crops.

Two years ago the unicameral Legislature of Nebraska passed a resolution memorializing Congress to recognize the Republican Valley as the State's No. 1 problem. The intervening years have seen continued floods and drought and progressive erosion damage, but not one move has yet been made by any Federal construction agency to bring us any relief.

The 1940 census reveals that a total of 65,000 persons have migrated from my State—one-half of the loss sustained was by my entire congressional district—an average of 13.2 percent per county—and this migration continues.

Our State legislature, taking cognizance once again of the seriousness of the situation in that section of the State, unanimously passed a resolution again calling the attention of Congress and Federal agencies to the extremely precarious conditions existing in the Republican Valley.

The resolution follows:

Legislative Resolution 21

Republican Valley flood control

Whereas the Congress of the United States, by the adoption of acts pertaining to flood control and reclamation, has recognized responsibility on the part of the Federal Government to control the destructive floodwaters of the basins of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, has declared this to be a national problem, and has heretofore authorized the expenditure of Federal funds in considerable amounts in the area for the improvement of conditions resulting from floods and droughts; and

Whereas the Republican River Valley drainage area in Nebraska, settled by people who are and have been making every effort to better their conditions in the face of adverse circumstances beyond their control, comprises many hundreds of thousands of acres of valuable land which has been greatly damaged by floods and droughts; and

Whereas the Republican Valley in Nebraska, a part of the great drainage area of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers, has thus far received but scant Federal recognition and reclamation; and

Whereas as a result of the 1935 and 1940 floods in that valley over 100 persons lost their lives, the property loss was tremendous, and much of the vital and valuable land in the valley has been imperiled and made subject to repeated damage from floodwaters, while, on the other hand, many thousands of acres in the area are in urgent need of the waste waters of the river for irrigation; the above conditions having combined to make agriculture unprofitable in the southwestern section of Nebraska caused relief loads which counties are unable to bear, causing population losses which mean reduced land values and tax yields; and

Whereas United States Army engineers have assured residents of the upper Republican River Valley that they could set up a

plan of flood control which would give protection to Kansas City and other points on the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers as well as farm and urban property in the upper valley, by means of the constructive and comprehensive Federal program for the protection of life and property from destructive floods and drought within the drainage area of the Republican River, including its tributaries, being admittedly a national problem, which said program is needed for the control, conservation, development, and beneficial use of the water and land resources of said area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska in fifty-fifth regular session assembled:

1. That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby requested and urged to cause to be made full, complete, and comprehensive survey and investigation into the claims of the residents of the Republican River Valley in Nebraska for flood control and reclamation therein, including the storing, preservation, and distribution of the waste and floodwater of said river and its tributaries for beneficial uses; and that the development of the irrigation program for the Republican River Valley be paralleled by flood control for said valley.

2. That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby urged to make early appropriation of said funds to insure the inauguration and continuation of internal improvement projects within said valley, and that the proper Federal agencies be empowered and directed to give early and careful consideration to the feasibility and advisability of constructing and maintaining dams in said area in Nebraska, including the various tributaries of the Republican River, for the said purpose of flood control, conservation, and other beneficial use of the water, including that of irrigation.

3. That a copy of this resolution be spread at large upon the journal of the legislature, and that the clerk of the legislature be directed forthwith to forward a copy of this resolution, properly authenticated and suitably engrossed, to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, to each Congressman and Senator from the State of Nebraska, to the Chief of the Army Engineers, Washington, D. C., to the Mississippi Valley Flood Association, to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and to the National Reclamation Association to the end that each of these Federal officials and agencies may know and recognize that the problem of the Republican Valley flood control is serious and that without flood control from which can flow irrigation and soil conservation, this area may become entirely destitute.

Introduced and adopted April 29, 1941.

Mr. Speaker, Maj. Miles Reber, in his testimony before the Flood Control Committee as a representative of the office of Chief of Army Engineers, said that the Republican Valley had a twofold problem. The first was the construction of the Harlan County Dam, at or near Republican City, Nebr., to control the floods below that point and for the benefit that would accrue to the Kansas City area. The second phase of the problem was the control of the floods west of the dam on the main stream of the river and the tributaries. In order to meet this twofold objective, I have introduced the bill H. R. 4383, which is in the usual form and seeks an increased authorization in the Missouri River Basin and contains the following language:

That this authorization shall include, in addition to the Harlan County Reservoir as set forth in House Document No. 842, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, such flood-control works on the Republican River in Nebraska as the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may find advisable.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the time is not far off when the entire problem of the Republican Valley can be undertaken. The so-called Harlan County Dam should be built. It will bring great protection to those people living on the river below the dam site and the industrial area at Kansas City. In my opinion, it is essential for national defense, because of the protection that it brings to Fort Riley and industrial Kansas City. The problem above the dam and in the tributaries is deserving of the best attention that the Federal Government can give to solve their flood problem which has cost so much in life and money in recent years.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to further extend my remarks by including certain material that has been submitted to me, including a newspaper report of the activities of the State planning board, a statement of Mr. M. O. Ryan, secretary of the Republican Valley Conservation Association, and a county commissioners' resolution:

STATE PLANNING BOARD MAKES ITS FINAL REPORT ON WATER RESOURCES AND PROPOSES SIX-POINT PROGRAM

LINCOLN, April 28, 1941.—Only basic readjustments in the use of land and water resources can rehabilitate and stabilize agriculture in Nebraska, the final report of the State planning board said today.

In a comprehensive 305-page water resources survey, the board recommended a six-point program to adjust problems which arise "principally from an undependable rainfall."

Nebraska is dependent upon soil and water resources, the report warned, and "culminative effects of the current devastating drought" now threaten the security of some areas.

The board recommended:

1. Conserve rainfall on individual farms by cropping practices. This would increase individual farm feed and forage supplies, improve livestock and domestic watering supplies, and make possible large gardens—enabling farm operators to cope with drought.

2. Develop extensively small water facilities by using small, single, or multiple field irrigation systems on minor drainages; develop flood irrigation on normally dry draws, and develop recharging of ground water supplies to make small pump irrigation developments possible.

3. Extend pump irrigation practices under "appropriate and timely legislation for regulation of ground water." The report said a vast field covering 100,000 acres existed for development of pump irrigation.

4. Construct large-scale irrigation projects where, "in consideration of all possible phases of development of water resources in a basin * * *," the land may be able to repay total costs.

5. Build flood-control dams as part of a basin-wide plan of development for all water uses.

6. Empower some State agency to take an active part in investigations and detailed planning for a comprehensive, coordinated plan for conservation of all available water. (This was purpose of recently defeated water conservation board bill in the legislature, asked by the Republican Valley Conservation Association.)

"The major possibilities for the further development of gravity irrigation are situated in the Republican Valley, the tributaries of the Loup and Platte," the survey reported.

The board blamed population decreases on the drought and warned that a more "established agriculture based on sound water conservation policies is absolutely essential to the maintenance of our present population."

The report on the three major rivers:

1. Platte: In general, water supply above Kearney is fully appropriated, even to a point where it has exceeded dependable supply. Additional developments below Kearney are questionable.

2. Loup: A channel storage reservoir above Columbus would stabilize flow of stream for benefit of Columbus power plant and would enable the lower Platte irrigation district to operate without a local storage reservoir.

3. Republican: "If all available water supply were conserved by means of storage facilities and released when needed for irrigation, the supply would greatly exceed the amount now needed for existing projects." An estimated 100,000 acres of land meets requirements for successful irrigation; suggested channel reservoir near Republican City in conjunction with "certain tributary reservoirs."

STATEMENT OF M. O. RYAN, M'COOK, NEBR., SECRETARY, REPUBLICAN VALLEY CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION, BEFORE FLOOD CONTROL COMMITTEE OF HOUSE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, on April 4, 1940, your committee, when questioning the United States Engineer Corps with reference to the flood-control problem in the Republican watershed, pointed out to the engineers that the single on-river dam at the Harlan County site would provide no flood protection to territory west of that site. It was west of that site that a damaging flood in 1935 took at least 112 lives, according to the Red Cross, and damaged farm lands to the extent of $8,832,000, according to the United States engineers.

Other damaging floods in the uppor Republican Valley are shown to have occurred in 1903, 1905, 1908, 1915, and 1923, and the year of 1940 again brought heavy damages. Whereas the Engineer Corps had attributed an annual average flood loss for the entire watershed above the Harlan County dam site, of only $500,000, an extended survey of just three out of a dozen tributaries of the Republican, conducted by the Nebraska State department of roads and irrigation following the floods of June and July 1940, totaled, as follows: Red Willow, $101,499.50; Frenchman, $355,395; and Medicine, $458,425, or a total of $915,319.50. There were other floods later in the season, also. Some of our tributaries last year reached flood stage as many as six times, and in many instances the damage surpassed that of 1935 in individual tributaries.

This flood menace contributed substantially to the human despair which resulted in heavy population losses between 1930 and 1940. The entire State of Nebraska lost 65,000 in population, but in our small congressional district, the great bulk of which lies within the Republican watershed, one-half of this entire loss was sustained.

To offset the precarious condition of agriculture and business generally in the watershed, the Federal Government poured millions in loans and grants into our territory until today it stands in advance of $3,000 for every farm we possess. But the emigration continues.

The upper valley, representing approximately 80 percent of the land area in the basin, last summer formed an organization of those cities and towns above the Harlan County site, in an attempt to help speed flood control and at the same time to attempt to utilize those flood waters for needed irrigation. It was felt that further expenditure of relief moneys, no matter whence their source, was not prudent, but that a rehabilitation program should be undertaken.

Commissioner John C. Page of the United States Reclamation Bureau has pointed out that 501 of the 650 counties in the Great Plains lost population, totaling 753,554 between 1930 and 1940, while 277 counties to the westward—where irrigation is quite general—had increased in population by 1,941,601. The Great Plains has suffered heavily during these recent drought years, and in the great majority of cases, an inadequate flow in the streams prevented any stabilizing effects from supplementary irrigation. The Republican watershed, with quite a stable flow, aside from flood peaks, offered unusual promise.

So, while the United States engineers—at the direction of your committee—were reviewing their former studies of the upper Republican Basin to ascertain whether there might be any means of bringing at least partial flood protection to that section, we found the United States Reclamation Bureau willing to undertake extensive investigations of feasible irrigation projects. We were advised on June 19, 1940, that the President had instructed the Engineer Corps to not initiate any flood-control projects "until the Reclamation Bureau's surveys had been received and reviewed." This gave us much hope, since it indicated that the War Department and the Bureau could coordinate their studies and bring forth a program which would provide both flood control and irrigation.

As early as October 17, 1940, the reviewing officer of the United States Engineers at Kansas City, told us they could construct an on-river dam at the Harlan County site, as well as a number of tributary dams, and have them come well within the 1-to-1 ratio of cost and benefits. They have subsequently reiterated this statement, as they proceeded with their review, which is expected to be completed and forwarded to the Chief of Staff July 1. They have also assured us that they could assign flood-control benefits to any Case-Wheeler project which would impound floodwater on the tributaries when approved by the Bureau of Reclamation. Half a dozen of these projects, storing water for irrigation, but with supplementary storage for floodwaters, linked with a major reservoir behind an on-river dam, could provide a flood-control program for the entire watershed which would cost the Army less than a single on-river dam and reservoir.

A tri-State compact, providing for the division of waters of the Republican River between Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska was negotiated this spring and is now before Congress for approval. It is based upon consumptive use of the waters. This, we maintain, is the most intelligent possible use of the soil and water resources of our territory.

For the foregoing reasons, we want again to appeal for the authorization of a comprehensive flood-control program for the valley as a whole, and that the Harlan County Dam not preclude assignment of flood-control benefits to such other upstream projects as the War Department may find feasible.

Whereas flood damages in recent years, coupled with drought and erosion, low farm prices, and other unfavorable factors, have combined to make agriculture unprofitable in this entire area, causing relief loads which counties are unable to bear, and causing population losses, which mean reduced land values and tax yields; and

Whereas we understand that the United States Engineers have assured the upper Republican River residents that they could set up a plan of flood control which would give protection to Kansas City, and to farm and urban property in the upper valley: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the southwestern district of the Nebraska County Commissioners' Association, embracing all of the Republican watershed, above Harlan County, does hereby petition Representative CARL T. CURTIS to provide for flood protection of our territory in his authorization bill now before the Congress, and that we petition the Flood Control Committee of the House, and the United States Engineers to realize that our problem is desperate, and that without flood control, from which can flow irrigation, soil conservation, etc., this area will quickly become entirely destitute.

Respectfully submitted.

MERLE ADAMS,
Arapahoe, Chairman.
L. E. MOORE,
Bartley, Secretary.

Tobacco Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVE E. SATTERFIELD, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, during the last two centuries the material wealth of this country has been vastly increased by the conquest and expansion of new frontiers. Today that is finished. The physical map is made. There are only two frontiers of wealth left to us, and they, of course, are subject to conquest by a free people, for these are science and invention. The basis of future taxes is restricted, and already the danger signals are flying in the face of a government trend induced by an unthinking citizenry to slowly but surely restrict free enterprise. The deliberations of the great Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives it would seem henceforward must be deeply concerned lest in its quest for revenue the one source which can produce it should be dried up.

I do not believe that the Congress has ever before in the history of this country been more nearly unanimously supported by Americans everywhere in its duty to impose taxes and to collect a revenue sufficient to meet the vast bill which the defense of our country entails. On the other hand, I am sure that "hidden taxes" are no longer hidden in any sense of that word. This form of taxation has been for many a year popular with those who momentarily were entrusted with the responsibilities and obligations of government. Popular with them for the reason that it always produced a substantial revenue with comparatively little opposition. Popular, too, with the users and the producers of the very commodities on which the tax was fastened, because they were either ill-informed or too credulous to understand that they, and not the corporations or individuals who turned the tax money over to the Government, are the ones who pay a substantial share of the bill. This state of affairs no longer exists. There are too many hustings, too many forums, too many sources of information constantly informing the average citizen of a lurking tax and its effect upon him.

In no instance can what I have just said be more true than in the case of the tobacco farmer. He has been the leading actor in a tragedy which has been playing to a full house since the turn of the century. In 1901 the tax on the finished products of his labor, cigarettes, was 54 cents per thousand wholesale.

In 1910 this was raised to $1.25 per thousand; in 1917, when this country then engaged in war was faced with the responsibility comparable to the task of today in fashioning our common defense, increased the tax on cigarettes per thousand to $1.65 in October of that year. Encouraged by the success of that venture, in 2 days less than a month the tax was again raised to $2.05 per thousand. Well do I remember that complaints from the South about these two tax raises were allayed with the understanding that this was a war tax and that when the war had come to an end these taxes would be repealed. What happened? Instead of repeal in February 1919 the Congress, faced with the loss of revenue due to the enactment of the prohibition law, once again turned to tobacco and raised the tax on a thousand cigarettes from $2.05 to $3. Those golden days which led us to the fateful months of 1929, accompanied by peace, did not, so far as I know, produce a lessening of the tax burden on this commodity. Instead, when more money was needed, the Congress added an additional tax of 25 cents, so that the tax is now $3.25 on every thousand cigarettes. Now that we are confronted with the possibility of war, it is proposed that we begin all over again to tax tobacco.

I do not believe there is in this country a group of people, beginning with the farmer in his fields and concluding with the manufacturer, who would more willingly endure uncomplainingly added burdens of taxation to pay for our common defense, if in his own heart he could be made to feel that he was beginning anywhere near scratch or on an even basis with the producers and manufacturers of other commodities upon whom the burden of taxation should fall evenly.

A great deal has been written about this Nation's tax system. Truth is we have no tax system in this country. We have instead many tax systems in the country. Today I am disturbed because I greatly fear that the Treasury Department in quest for moneys may be looking for the tax idealized by Turgot many years ago—the one which produces the most feathers from the goose with the least squawk.

In making an appeal against the imposition, certainly at this time, of further tobacco taxes it is not necessary to go into the question of the trend of centralization of tax collection, the multiplicity of taxes, the shifting of wealth and of population, the demands made by people upon their Government, or just where government is going, for above and beyond all of these things this fact must stand out, a fact that I dare say no member of this committee will deny, and that is that somewhere there must be a tax ceiling on tobacco. Apparently we have not realized this. When I think of the rapidity and the celerity with which taxes upon tobacco have been laid I am reminded of a quaint story which comes out of the tobacco country in my own

State. Within one of the tobacco-growing counties in Virginia where tobacco was raised by the Indians long before the coming of the white man there lived a man named Andy Clark, a lean, angular bachelor whose ability to kill a bull bat with a rifle on the wing had won the admiration and respect of all the youngsters in his immediate neighborhood. He was quite a philosopher. He used to sit atop an old-fashioned snake fence, and, whittling a stick, would say to his young and enthusiastic friends:

Boys, don't never start nothing, because sho' as you do the tendency is always more so.

In view of the continued increases in the tax upon tobacco, it would seem that the advice of this home-spun philosopher was sound.

The question of whether recommendations should be made for increased taxes on tobacco is no new question, nor does this issue project any new matter. It is the same old question.

In 1934 a subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee, headed by Fred M. Vinson, chairman, stated:

Your committee is of the opinion that the tobacco-tax burden is without reason and unconscionable. * * * The committee has reached the conclusion that there should be a real reduction of the taxes on all manufactured tobacco products. * * * Your committee does not feel that this 10-percent reduction for a particular manufactured product (10-cent cigarettes) is sufficient to meet the needs of the occasion. Such reduction would not permit of any substantial benefit to the tobacco grower. * * * It is the conclusion of your subcommittee that a reduction of 40 percent of all tobacco taxes should be made.

Mr. Speaker, these conclusions apply with greater force now than they did in 1934.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, who is the aggressor nation in Iraq?

We send dollars to China and gasoline to Japan.

It must be tantalizing to our warmongers that Germany commits no overt acts against us.

If the English Navy is our first line of defense, why does she need ours to do her chores?

Must we send a million men to Persia to defend democracy here at home? Let us have a Ludlow referendum on it.

The only way we can be defeated is to be denuded of our own defense by entering into wars of other nations.

The continued existence of America does not depend on the continued existence of any other nation. We stand on our own feet.

Why did not the President and Lord Halifax have their pictures taken together at Mount Vernon? It is closer than Staunton.

John Philip Sousa composed the march Hands Across the Sea. Who knows a good tune for They Picked Our Pockets, Too?

Some call it the Battle of the Atlantic. Others have another name for it. Whatever it is, it is not Lexington or Fort McHenry.

We are going to the Old World to start backfires. Once I lost my hat, then my shirt, and finally my pants, and also a haystack trying to control one I started.

"What king, going to make war against another king, sitteth not down first, and consulteth whether he is able with 10,000 to meet him that cometh against him with 20,000?"—Luke xiiii:31.

A Tax on Human Happiness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, probably no other commodity adds so much to the sum of human happiness as does gasoline.

It furnishes the power for trucks to bring the baby's milk from farm to doorstep. Our daily bread starts its journey on trucks from the wheat fields and is delivered fresh and zestful from the baker's oven by a gasoline-powered delivery truck. My lady's bonnet and habit journey over the highways as raw materials, rode by truck from factory to store, and, finally, carefully wrapped in tissue paper, were delivered by truck to the expectant lady awaiting their arrival at the threshold of her home.

Nearly 5,000,000 trucks are plying their way over the highways in the United States to meet the desires of the American people not only for necessities but also for the finer things that make modern living enjoyable.

Twenty-five million passenger cars are operating on the highways of this great Nation. Our families own more automobiles than all of the rest of the world combined. These cars are used to transport the family to church, the children to school, the mothers to market, and the fathers to work. They are an integral and a vital part of modern living. Curtail their use through excessive taxation and you sear the soul of better living. You compress the horizon of the American family. You restrict freedom of movement and opportunity of enjoyment. You lay a tax on human happiness to an extent probably greater than would be possible in any other way. Automobiles, owned by two out of every three families in the United States, and shared in by the other third of the families by means of buses with inexpensive fares, provide billions upon billions of hours of enjoyment to millions upon millions of families in the United States each year. Gasoline probably adds more to the sum of human happiness than any other single commodity in American life.

Despite the immense social and economic contributions of gasoline, there are some who look at it with a dyspeptic eye, and say: "The American people are too happy. Let us tax and tax and tax their motor fuel."

That trend of thought has been too common and has been pushed too far in legislative patterns of American life. Less than a quarter of a century ago there was no tax of any kind on motor fuel. Today, because it has proved such a boon to better living, it is subjected to heavy taxation. All the States impose heavy taxes on motor fuel. The Federal Government also imposes a "depression tax" and a "defense tax" on this magic substance that has lifted the American people far above the "horse-and buggy" standards of living. At the current rates motor fuel taxes are being collected at the staggering rate of one and one-quarter billion dollars a year. That amount is more than what all the people paid in all taxes to all taxing jurisdictions—Federal, State, and local—in the years before the advent of the horseless vehicle.

There are some phlegmatic individuals who confuse the happiness obtained from gasoline with the enjoyment derived from tobacco, liquor, and horse racing. They attempt to reason that the pleasure derived from motor fuel is of the same kind as that derived from tobacco or liquor. Upon that reasoning they conclude that heavy taxes on motor fuel are justified in the same manner as are high taxes on luxuries.

I believe that when a man takes his family out for an airing on Sunday afternoon in his second-hand jalopy the happiness that results from that outing is wholly different from the pleasure that would result if the father of the family, instead of spending his dollar for motor fuel, spent it for liquor on Saturday night. The laughter of the children in the back seat bears no comparison with the boisterous merriment in the back room.

As far as luxuries go, what is a luxury? Our forefathers toasted their toes before open fireplaces while their backs froze. They washed in the clothes tub. Furnaces and bathtubs were luxuries up until comparatively recent times. We could do without most of the refinements of modern living, but would we be happy? Should heavy taxes be placed upon washing machines, radios, telephones, automobiles, and motor fuel merely because we could get along without them by relapsing into the standards of living that prevailed a century ago?

And as far as gasoline goes, that is less a luxury item than appears on the surface. About 25 percent of the gasoline used in the United States is con-

sumed in trucks to provide economical transportation of commodities from producer to consumer. Of the motor fuel used in passenger cars, more than half is used in connection with business activities, according to the United States Public Roads Administration. Factory and other workers get to and from their jobs. Carpenters and other entrepreneurs use their cars in earning a livelihood. Yes; half of the motor fuel used in passenger cars has something to do with people earning a living. That gasoline, together with the gasoline used in trucks, accounts for two-thirds of the total gasoline consumed on the highways. That gasoline, by any stretch of the imagination, cannot be said to have been put to luxury uses—unless the desire of humanity for better jobs and better living is considered a luxury.

How can any rational men, in view of these facts, contend that heavy taxes should be piled upon gasoline by the State and Federal Governments. The present Federal taxes on gasoline amount to approximately 11 percent of the average retail price in the United States. If all retail sales were subjected to the same rate of taxation, a total of more than $4,000,000,000 in revenue would be produced—an amount exceeding that now being sought by Congress in new defense taxes. State motor-fuel taxes stand at an average of 31 percent of the retail price—or nearly three times the burden of the present Federal tax. Combined, these State and Federal levies on gasoline constitute the greatest tax on human happiness ever devised by the mind of man. The burden of that tax should not be increased.

In closing, let us glance briefly at the man in the front seat of the automobile. Studies by Government agencies reveal that three out of every five car-owning families have never purchased a new car. Thus, most of the automobile owners in this country are used-car motorists. They are not sitting in the lap of luxury. Other studies reveal that slightly more than half of the car-owning families in this country have incomes of less than $30 a week. Contrary to the thought of some, automobile owners as a class do not possess any extraordinary ability to pay taxes. As a matter of fact, the average $60 a year paid out to the Federal and State Governments in taxes on his car costs the typical motorist 2 weeks' wages each year.

Each half-cent tax on the gasoline tax takes 1 day's pay from millions of farmers, factory workers and others, who already are contributing 2 weeks' wages in taxes on their cars. Each half cent of the gasoline tax keeps millions of children out of the sunshine and fresh air. Each half cent of the gasoline tax, as Maurice Maeterlinck would say, hangs a leaden weight upon the bluebird of happiness of the American people—a bird already struggling under a terrific burden to rise and sing happily in the sunshine of opportunity, freedom, and democracy.

Let Congress not lay upon the bluebird the last and final tax weight that will break the bird's back, causing it to flutter, fall, and finally grovel in the mire of despair.

The Army Came to Monterey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

THE STORY OF FORT ORD CONSTRUCTION, BY NEAL L. McGINTY

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, in the April 23 and 24 issues of the Monterey (Calif.) Peninsula-Herald there appeared an article in which is told most interestingly the story of Fort Ord construction, an article in which is recounted a typical American effort, one which is being reenacted many places within the four corners of our country, to rearm our country and to render it invincible against attack by any nation or combination of nations on the face of the earth.

Because it comes to us from the capable pen of Camp Ord's superintending engineer of construction, Mr. Neal L. McGinty, of Monterey and Fresno, and constitutes an important contribution to the history of our country which is in the making, I am constrained to ask the unanimous consent of the Members of the House of Representatives that that which he has so entertainingly written be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection to the request of the gentleman from California, Mr. Neal L. McGinty's article, The Army Came to Monterey, follows:

[From the Monterey (Calif.) Peninsula-Herald]

THE ARMY COMES TO MONTEREY

(By Neal L. McGinty)

Since the faraway day in 1542 when Juan Rodriquez Cabrillo sailed his little ships, the *San Salvador* and *Victoria* over the dancing blue waters of this crescent bay this has been a port of ships and a place of guns, a land of the old conquistadors' dreams. They were certain that beyond these green pine-clad hills lay the seven fabled cities with their cathedral spires and buildings of pure gold.

Among the wanderers in the wake of Cabrillo came Sebastian Vizcaino and named this port Monterey, in honor of his friend Count de Monterey, Viceroy General of Mexico, but it was not until a century and a half later that Don Gaspar de Portola lost his way on the road to Monterey and found instead the Bay of St. Francis to the north. Portola, disappointed, returned to Mexico City and sought the help of a navigator. By water came Capt. Juan Perez, studying the log of Cabrillo, visiting each inlet and cove, found the lost port of ships, and unfurled the Spanish emblem over this land in the far-flung name of Spain.

EARLY ENGINEER

Overland and on foot came the gallant brown-robed Franciscan Padre Junipero Serra with Lt. Pedro Fages and 20 Spanish soldiers, among them Castanos, an engineer. Orders were, first, build the Royal Presidio de Monterey and next the Royal Chapel San Carlos. From Monterey in these glorious years that followed came everything concerning civil, military, and religious orders. In the years that followed Monterey was the traders' paradise, the haunt of the wandering sail; here were history's crowded pages written amid the wealth, the jewels, and silks of the East. Truly the old conquistadors' dreams were unfolding in all their splendor, but only to vanish when Marshall found a yellow flake of gold in the sands along the American River. Gold! Gold! And ships spread their white sails and rounded Point Pinos for the Harbor of St. Francis to the north, never to return. The days of her glory were at an end. The stirring days of which this is written are gone forever. There can be no such days again, and there is but faint hope that there will again be such men as Serra and his trusty Lieutenant Fages.

OLDEST POST

The Royal Chapel Don Carlos and the Presidio de Monterey still stand, the latter the oldest military post in all our land, and now a proud part of the new Fort Ord, the model link of the 240 new cantonments of our national-defense program, just 4 miles northeast of the city of Monterey and on the old Camino Real, now California's State Highway No. 1. Fort Ord, comprising some 21,000 acres, was so named in honor of Maj. Gen. Edward O. C. Ord, who, as a young officer, was stationed in the old Presidio from 1846 until 1849. General Ord graduated from West Point in 1839, later to become a distinguished commander in the Civil War, and died in 1883.

Less than 8 months ago this vast military reservation was just another pasture land near the sea, with its shifting sand dunes, scrubby oaks, withered grass, and here and there a crooked cypress. That was the landscape that met the eyes of Ford J. Twaits Construction Co. of Los Angeles and Morrison-Knudsen, Inc., general contractors of Boise, Idaho, when Lt. Col. Harold D. Stetson, constructing quartermaster (and, by the way, former resident of Fresno), handed them their drawings and blueprints and said, "Go ahead and build us a $16,000,000 home for Maj. Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell's Seventh Division."

FROM THE SOUTH

R. M. Conner, chief construction engineer of Los Angeles, with a long, successful record, was appointed project manager. Chief assistants to Conner included Paul B. Tichenor, general superintendent and W. W. Price, chief field engineer. Like the builders of old, all were from the southland.

Building statistics, we know, are at best uninteresting reading to the average person, but extremely interesting to architects; Fisher and McNulty's; and to engineering students of the high schools and colleges. But to tell the building of this project we must talk of the drone of mills, lumber, and of hammers and nails.

First came an administration office for the engineers, draftsmen, clerks, timekeepers, and the temperamental stenographer. Then came a tent city to accommodate 1,800 workmen, a bakery, kitchen, a dining room to seat 1,000 men at a meal, washrooms, bathrooms with their hot and cold showers, a field commissary where men could purchase anything from a safety razor blade to leather coats, and a first-aid station manned by a staff of registered nurses to care for unexpected injuries.

BIGGEST HOSPITAL

On came trainloads of equipment, caterpillars with their 30-cubic-yard carriers, bulldozers, locomotive cranes, trench diggers, a fleet of 50 trucks ranging from pick-up to heavy-duty units for hauling materials, and scores of electric-driven saws to shape 40,000,000 board feet of lumber, men to mold it into 1,428 one- and two-story buildings, barracks to accommodate 63 men each, warehouses, storerooms, post exchanges, mess halls, bakeries, offices, and every type of building necessary to a cantonment.

In addition there appeared 4 theaters, each with a seating capacity of 1,100. Here was built the second largest hospital on the Pacific coast comprising 104 separate units, 1,500 beds, 3 miles of canopied walls between its buildings with a separate 600-horsepower steam-power unit. This hospital is 1½ times the size of the Letterman General Hospital in San Francisco. There were also built 1,040 tent bottoms and frames built for the incoming National Guards of the Middle West and guard houses for "McGintys not so great," stables and barns for the 3,000 Field Artillery horses.

For "bundles for buddies" the world's largest steam laundry has been built with its 50,000 square feet of ground floor space that has taken 15 carloads of steam-laundry machinery to equip for 300 women operators. Three 150 steam boilers were installed to furnish steam and hot water.

And then there is the little Oregon pine-box coffin with a white cross above it with this simple inscription "Laddie," the beloved little dog that died of a broken heart.

LUMBER AND GLASS

The lumber alone at Fort Ord required a felling of a hillside of 100,000 Oregon pines, with a 24-inch base diameter and 60 feet high, that were born about 40 years ago. If this lumber was shaped to a boardwalk 1 inch thick and 12 inches wide, it would reach from San Francisco, Calif., across the continent and over the Atlantic to Berlin, Germany. Seven hundred and eighty thousand panes of glass were installed in the various buildings to let the sunlight in during the day. Two thousand five hundred miles of electric wiring were used to bring light at night.

The men of the Seventh must be the Army's champion gossipers for 700 telephone exchanges are plugging with their daily chatter. They eat at 5 miles of messroom tables on 10 miles of benches. Eleven thousand kegs of wire nails were driven, or approximately 107,000,000 individual nails that, if placed end to end, could begin at the Golden Gate, string along to New York City, then down the Atlantic coastline to a point far below Miami, Fla. Or if laid in a straight line, they would reach over the forty-second meridian in the Atlantic.

SOME NAILS

Over 424,000,000 hammer blows were struck by carpenters to drive this handful of nails home. The records of the first-aid station reveal that the carpenters missed the nail head 219 times, requiring medical attention to bruised fingers. A further check of this record indicates that 82 percent of the misslicks happened in the forenoon of the day following pay-day night. We are requesting the National Safety Council to check this as to the cause.

All the building roofs were covered with tar felt paper roofing and 4,000,000 square yards were required to do the job. Seventeen million roofing nails were used to fasten this paper to the roofs. Four million square yards of roofing paper are enough to cover 40 New York City blocks, or to cover 3,300 Fresno, Calif., dwellings and leave enough draping over the edges to work a fringe.

PAINT BY LAKEFUL

The exterior of the buildings was given 3 coats of cream-colored paint that alone consumed 50,000 gallons, and it was applied with brushes. An additional 10,000 gallons will be required for some interior work. Forty-two miles of gas mains, 42 miles of water mains, and 40 miles of sewer lines were placed in trenches from 2 to 5 feet of depth underground.

The caterpillar tractors and their 35-cubic-yard carriers moved 3,000,000 cubic yards of earth, hither and yon. From the 3,672 carloads of crushed rock received, a parking lot of 50 acres—the largest yet built—has been topped with a 7-inch stone facing, rolled as smooth as plate glass and as hard as native granite. Hard-rock facing was also rolled on 26.7 miles of paved roads and streets and on 18.5 miles of secondary roads.

LEAD THE WAY

The maximum number of builders on the contractors pay rolls at any one time was 2,300 men with a $80,000 weekly pay roll. In the 7 months from a pasture land to a city of 31,000 officers and men, with a $700,000 Army monthly pay roll, Fort Ord has become a reality. A mighty undertaking. Yes, but this among the first of the 240 cantonments being built or proposed on the schedule of our national defense program, completed and occupied on time, built without a fatal or serious accident happening to a man notwithstanding 1,150,000 man-hours of exposure. Again the California engineers lead the way. All of which prompted Maj. Gen. E. D. Peek, commanding general of the Ninth Corps Area, to issue the following statement: "A wonderful job has been done at Fort Ord by the contractors in their cooperation and speed in carrying out the $16,000,000 building project."

Monterey, the harbor that was, is again to be, as tens of thousands of young Americans roam through her streets and visit the old red-tiled buildings where history still clusters, where tender memories cling of Robert Louis Stevenson and the Sherman Rose. While within a short distance they may wander into the green vale where sleeps forever the brave Franciscan Padre that built Presidio de Monterey 170 years ago, and laid the foundation for Monterey's mighty Fort Ord.

Deportation of Certain Aliens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

AN OPEN LETTER SIGNED BY 53 PROMINENT AMERICANS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an open letter to the Congress of the United States of America signed by 53 prominent Americans.

AN OPEN LETTER

To the Congress of the United States of America, Washington, D. C.

We, the undersigned, join in urging upon the Congress of the United States of America that it defeat the legislative proposal to legalize "supervision and detention" of certain noncitizens ordered deported, but whose deportation, because of war conditions, cannot be effected through no fault of their own. This proposal has been embodied in two bills now pending before Congress, H. R. 3, introduced by Representative SAM HOBBS, of Alabama, and S. 1232, introduced by Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Jr., of Georgia.

We are convinced that these bills arise from a war excitement and are designed to further extend hysteria. They will serve to attach unjust and unwarranted suspicions and imputations to all Americans of foreign birth. They provide an instrument which may be used to inflame the public mind, to arouse hatreds which will destroy the democratic life of our country.

The provisions of the Hobbs-Russell bills are cause for the gravest concern. Subjecting certain noncitizens to "supervision," the bill requires that those so subjected must submit to medical examination, furnish information as to "circumstances, habits, associations, and activities," and must conform to "reasonable" written restrictions on conduct and activities. These provisions establish conditions amazingly similar to Fascist practices. They impose a regime of restriction and terror, whose only purpose can be to prevent the full exercise of democratic rights on the part of all of our people.

These bills, moreover, make possible detention without bail and imprisonment for long terms, some of which may amount to life, without jury trial. Thus there is incorporated the principles and procedures of the Fascist concentration camp as a part of the Government apparatus.

Furthermore, these bills seek to create a new class of deportable aliens by proscribing certain political, social, and economic opinions. This is a clear limitation of our democratic rights of free speech, press, and assembly. The effects of this provision will be to spread fear and to open the way for wholesale persecution, victimization, and discrimination of those whose views may differ from those of the advocates or administrators of the measure. Here, again, is a pattern of Fascist regimentation.

We are convinced that the Hobbs-Russell bills are actually a disguised attack on our American democracy, promoted and advocated under the pretext of national defense. They purport, of course, to deal only with certain deportable aliens; but, substituted for the tolerance and understanding with which the problems of the noncitizen should be considered, are the principles and procedures of fascism—supervision, the concentration camp, proscription of opinion.

These principles and procedures, once established for certain noncitizens, may readily be extended to our 14,000,000 naturalized citizens and to native-born citizens. To think that concentration camps will be confined to only one section of our people is to ignore the lessons and warnings of contemporary history, to be blind to the methods of Fascist encroachment on democratic rights.

For the reasons outlined, we believe that the Hobbs-Russell bills, or any similar legislative proposals, are undemocratic in intent and in inevitable effect. We, therefore, urge that the Congress of the United States of America defeat the Hobbs-Russell concentration-camp bills.

Signers of the open letter to the Congress of the United States of America urging the defeat of the Hobbs-Russell concentration camp bills:

Josephine Truslow Adams, Swathmore College, Pennsylvania; Rev. William C. Anderson, Bremen, Ind.; Emily Greene Balch, honorary international president, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Wellesley, Mass.; Herbert Benjamin, secretary, International Workers Order, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Viola Bernard, New York, N. Y.; Lewis Alan Berne, president, Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists and Technicians, New York, N. Y.; Alice Stone Blackwell, Boston, Mass.; Marc Blitzstein, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Ernst Boas, New York, N. Y.; F. J. Bogacius, president, Lithuanian Alliance of America, Boston, Mass.; Julius Boross, president, Steel Workers Organizing Committee, No. 1218, Pittsburgh, Pa.; James L. Brewer, Rochester, N. Y.; Joseph Cadden, secretary, American Youth Congress, Washington, D. C.; Dr. Abraham Cronbach, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio; Joseph Curran, vice president, Congress of Industrial Organizations, New York; Hugh De Lacy, chairman, American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born; Prof. Leslie C. Dunn, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Elmer O. Fehlhaber, vice president, Ohio C. I. O. Council,

Cleveland, Ohio; Prof. Ernst Feise, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.; Frederick V. Field, secretary, American Peace Mobilization, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Stephen Fritchman, chairman, Unitarian Youth Commission, Boston, Mass.; Pearl M. Hart, chairman, Women's League for Democratic Rights, Chicago, Ill.; Donald Henderson, president, United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers of America, Chicago, Ill.; Rockwell Kent, president, United American Artists, AuSable Forks, N. Y.; Rev. Owen A. Knox, chairman, National Federation for Constitutional Liberties; Leonard Lageman, secretary, Minnesota State Industrial Union Council; William Levner, president, W. P. A. Teachers Union, New York, N. Y.; Lucius N. Littauer, former Congressman, New York, N. Y.; Herman Long, chairman, Southern Negro Youth Congress, Birmingham, Ala.; Rosalie Manning, New York Conference on Inalienable Rights; M. T. Martentz, secretary, Armenian Progressive League of America, New York; Prof Kirtley F. Mather, president, Institute of Propaganda Analysis, Boston; Prof. F. O. Mathiessen, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Roy Mizara, president, Association of Lithuanian Workers, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Hon. Stanley Nowak, State senator, Michigan; Hon. Clifford T. McAvoy, deputy commissioner of welfare, New York City; Laurence E. Prendergast, secretary, New York City Teachers Union, Local 5; Patrick L. Quinlan, editor, The Gaelic American, New York, N. Y.; Wallingford Riegger, composer, New York, N. Y.; Mary W. Rittenhouse, Brooklyn (N. Y.) Bureau of Charities; Mr. and Mrs. Earl Robinson, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Prof. T. C. Schneirla, New York University, New York City; Jane Sherman, secretary, The Exiled Writers Committee, New York, N. Y.; Rev. William B. Spofford, editor, The Witness, New York, N. Y.; A. E. Stevenson, secretary, Cleveland (Ohio) Industrial Union Council; Calvin J. Sutherlin, organizer, Labor's Non-Partisan League of Connecticut; Dr. Harry F. Ward, Union Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y.; Theodore Ward, president, Negro Playwrights Co., New York, N. Y.; Max Weber, artists, Great Neck, L. I., N. Y.; Prof. Doxey A. Wilkerson, Howard University, Washington, D. C.; Dr. Mary E. Woolley, president emeritus, Mount Holyoke College; Dr. Max Yergan, president, National Negro Congress.

Will the People Keep Steadfast?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I believe in this government of the people, by the people, and for the people. I believe with all my heart in the workability and the greatness of a representative democracy. I concur in the statement made by Teddy Roosevelt:

> The majority of the plain people will, day in and day out, make fewer mistakes in governing themselves than any smaller class or body of men will make in trying to govern them.

Here in simple language is the finest statement of the principles of democracy it has ever been my privilege to hear.

All my life, circumstances have forced me to be a realist. I do not believe in the empty repetitions of creed without some attempt to be practical. I am the unbonded trustee of the welfare and future of 244,672 people who, year after year, have seen fit to place their confidence and trust in me by reelecting me to this high office. When a serious problem has presented itself I have asked the people to write to me expressing their views. Believing in the good judgment of the majority of the plain people, I have always accepted their counsel and cast my vote accordingly.

For the past two terms in this office I have faced the approaching specter of war. I have taken this grim issue back to the people from whom I derive my authority. Their answer was clarion clear and overwhelmingly decisive—no convoys; no overt acts which mean actual war. Over 97 percent of all the letters regarding the present international situation reaffirmed their faith and hope in an adequately prepared America, but reiterated with purposeful firmness that our leaders should not, in opposition to the majority will, take steps that would surely mean active warfare. All of these letters were written in response to my question, "Shall our Navy be used to convoy lease-lend shipments to Britain?"

Now that the people have chosen the path they wish to travel, and the course which I, as their Representative, am bound to pursue, I want them to resist with sound judgment and stability the insidious forces of the crafty power groups that are moving us to madness. In spite of the hysterical assaults on reason by seductive forces of propaganda, by the fomenters of mob psychology, and the appealers to prejudice and race hatred, I hope and pray that the people of my district will remain steadfast—steadfast in their determination to stay out of the recurring and bloody political and class struggles of Europe; steadfast in a wise course to build up and make this a well-armed and defended nation.

I came to this great land as an immigrant boy. I came here to escape Prussian intolerance and gain freedom. I wanted to live where men could create opportunities and build a living with standards of their own choosing. We, the adopted sons of America can count our blessings as they have been dramatized by comparison.

In all deference it may be said that perhaps our love of this land transcends that of her native sons.

After long years of service in our State legislature and here in the Nation's Capital, I have preserved the passionate belief and confidence in this system of government and its freedom that I had when I first started the long trip to these shores. I am not disposed to treat with levity or take for granted the opportunities we have for choosing our own manners of living and for selecting our government and directing its activities. I would be the last to affirm or vote for any measure which in my judgment would abridge some of our rights or be ultimately harmful to the people I represent. We should all be on zealous guard and particularly at times such as these, to keep this Nation from harm.

I want this Nation to prepare for defense on such scale that we shall be safe from attack and maintain our freedom. I insist that we shall solve the fiscal problems of our country and make workable our industrial democracy. Lastly, that we do not declare war on the specious excuse that it is to preserve democracy elsewhere only to lose it here at home. This last resolve has been strengthened by the flood of letters from home, all demanding and praying that we render all the help we can to Britain but avoid open hostilities. This will take sacrifice for our convictions and much strength.

We are still calm with a cautious watchfulness. What will be the reaction of the people if and when war comes? When hysterical mobs burn the figure of us who in this great Congress vote "no" on the war issues according to their expressed will. Will they show the same courage that we are called upon to give? Now, we are comparatively free to speak our minds. When and if we are gagged by a censored press and radio—will they insist on the right that we be heard in peaceful assembly? Will they allow us to respectfully and sincerely point out the path we want our beloved country to travel or will we be stoned from the platform as pro-Germans—as un-Americans—as traitors?

The people of Wisconsin have a shameful precedent before them that should bespeak caution to all of us. In the last war when our beloved Senator Robert M. La Follette, Sr., was courageous enough to vote against the war he was hanged in effigy. Since that time many members of the Wisconsin Legislature who served during that period have confessed with a self-admission of disgrace how they signed a petition to recall him from office. He was called a traitor and his family villified and abused. Later when sanity returned, he was sent back here with an overwhelming vote. Each year a pilgrimage of the grateful is made to his grave and here to his statute in the Capitol where they hold services in revered memory of this sublimely brave statesman, who, with unbending will and the courage of his convictions, withstood their wrath alone.

Think, America, think! All too soon this ugly picture may be a reality. If the time comes, and God forbid that it does, will they remember that they were once, in heart and mind, at one with us? We as believers in true democracy respected and reflected their will—we were honor bound to serve their dictates. Will the people meet with high moral courage the issue they produced, or will they join the howling mob of furious war-mad men?

If war comes and if we can reasonably expect the events of the last war to recur, and I think we can, will the communities in which we live turn hateful wrath and spite against our families and loyal friends? Or will our houses be painted yellow and our property destroyed? Or will they assume with dignity and purpose a place by our side?

Will those who are now commending our firmness and applauding us as right,

resolve that the issue is theirs and return the measure of loyalty that we have given, or will they turn us out from our present places and let passing time alone vindicate us?

These questions are not to be construed as a faltering or a change of heart as far as I am concerned. They are a serious reminder to the people that we are choosing a path not easy to travel. It is a road beset with peril and hidden pitfalls—but of your own choosing. When you point the way you must accept your share of the responsibility. I will not falter, no matter what may be the consequences.

Mark Twain in his monograph on war hysteria presents the problem with clear force and vividness:

WAR HYSTERIA

There has never been a just war or an honorable one. I can see a million years ahead and this rule will never change. The loud little handful will shout for war. The pulpit will object at first. The great, big, dull bulk of the nation will rub its sleepy eyes and try to make out why there should be a war, and will say, "It is unjust and dishonorable, and there is no necessity for it." Then the handful will shout louder. A few fair men on the other side will argue and reason against war and at first will have a hearing and will be applauded, but it will not last long; those others will outshout them and presently the antiwar audiences will thin out and lose popularity. Before long you will see this curious thing, the speakers stoned from the platform, and free speech strangled by hordes of furious men, who in their hearts are still at one with those stoned speakers, but do not dare say so. And now the whole nation, pulpit and all, will take up the war cry and mob any honest man who ventures to open his mouth, and presently such mouths will cease to open.

Mr. Speaker, I have chosen this time to make myself clear on the issues, because I can speak without coercion. Our statements now come with unquestioned acceptance because the "haters" have not yet branded us nor impugned our motives. You will still read these lines without emotion and compose your mind to the resolution that you will not be a participant to the barbarious and savage picture I have drawn. That is well, may you keep firm and remain steadfast.

The St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SHEBOYGAN (WIS.) PRESS

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press of May 3, 1941:

[From the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press of May 3, 1941]

LET CAT OUT OF THE BAG

According to an Associated Press dispatch the St. Lawrence waterway and power project is scheduled to be abandoned for this session of Congress.

Upon what authority the Associated Press gleaned this is not made clear, but whenever there is opposition to an undertaking like the St. Lawrence waterway in which the people are vitally interested congressional opponents of the measure usually circulate a grapevine statement of this character.

We do not question but what the Associated Press was informed in congressional quarters, because that is where opponents of a measure start their campaign publicity. To say that it started in congressional quarters doesn't mean that Congressmen originated the opposition. It comes from the representatives of big business, including the railroads. For years this Government has been keeping many of the railroads in business, and yet they are the first to voice their opposition along with the mine owners, chambers of commerce and the like from every section of the country where the St. Lawrence waterway might offer some competition. If the railroads and the mine owners were sincere they would look at this from a national viewpoint and likewise as a measure of benefit to the whole country.

When we were South we picked up a pamphlet issued by the National St. Lawrence project conference and bearing the names of some 40 corporations and associations that have just one viewpoint, to kill the St. Lawrence waterway.

The booklet is entitled "For National Defense?" and contains arguments that the St. Lawrence waterway could by no possible means be utilized at this time; that its completion would take until 1947, and that "long before that this war will be over one way or another." "Instead of helping national defense in the present crisis which is being fought out now in 1941 and not in 1947, the building of a St. Lawrence canal would be a positive hindrance. The United States is engaged in the tremendous task of rearming—now—for eventualities which, if they are ever to happen, will happen soon. That task is enough to absorb all the manpower, all the machines, all the materials, all the money which the United States can pour into it."

Then follows a long description of expenditures and a comparison of the costs of the Chicago Drainage Canal, the Suez Canal, Panama Canal, and the proposed St. Lawrence waterway, stating that its construction costs may reach $655,000,000. That is an absolute falsehood placed in this booklet to deceive the public. The building of the St. Lawrence waterway would cost less than the Panama Canal, and it would be of equal service. The arguments advanced against the St. Lawrence waterway and the objects and aims of those who are propounding the questions in the argument are best answered by a review of those associations that are against it.

The New Orleans Times-Picayune of some 2 weeks ago carried a lengthy editorial in opposition, contending that first consideration should be given to the Mississippi and other waterways in the South. You will note in the Associated Press dispatch yesterday that the Florida ship canal and other waterway projects costing a billion dollars would be urged by the South if the St. Lawrence were to go through. Well, suppose they were. If these projects have merit, they ought to be built, but for the Times-Picayune of New Orleans to combat the building of the St. Lawrence waterway shows the opposition that is developing in the South.

If we can't have the St. Lawrence waterway there will be no need for any other waterways in this country. For the information of our readers we submit the names of the individuals and the firms and associations which issued the booklet For National Defense? and in opposition to the St. Lawrence waterway. Look them over. Visualize the territory from which they come—largely from the East, South, and including the Association of American Railroads.

The Chicago Tribune, the railroad interests, the mining interests have all been opposed to the St. Lawrence waterway from its very inception. The fact that they are against the waterway should hasten action by the Congress of the United States and Canada. What would these great big associations that have signed their names to this booklet have in common with the people of Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and those States that are landlocked because of the absence of a waterway to the ocean. The list of signers follows:

Akron Chamber of Commerce, American Mining Congress, American National Livestock Association, American Short Line Railroad Association, Anthracite Institute; Association of American Railroads, Atlantic State Shippers Advisory Board, Boston Chamber of Commerce, Bronx Chamber of Commerce, Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, Hampton Roads Maritime Exchange, Inland Water Petroleum Carriers Association, Lake Carriers Association, Maritime Association of the Port of New York, Maritime Association of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, Merchants' Association of New York, Merchant Truckmen's Bureau of New York, Mississippi Valley Association, National Association of Shippers Advisory Boards, National Coal Association, National Conference of Investors, New Orleans Association of Commerce, New York Board of Trade, New York Produce Exchange, New York State Chamber of Commerce, Niagara Frontier Planning Board, Norfolk Port-traffic Commission, Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Ohio Coal Association, Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce, Philadelphia Bourse, Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, Southern States Industrial Council, State Port Authority of Virginia, Transportation Association of America, Warehousemen's Association of the Port of New York, and West Side Association of Commerce of New York.

National-Defense Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

ADDRESS BY MR. GEORGE H. CABANISS, JR., OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAR

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, because of the timely nature of this expression from one of California's leading lawyers, Mr. George H. Cabaniss, Jr., of San Francisco, I ask the unanimous consent of the membership of the House of Representatives to spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an address which he recently delivered before the Columbus Civic Club of San Francisco, an address in which the speaker outlines the consequence and explains the legal phases of our recently enacted national-defense legislation.

It might be well for me to point out at this point that Mr. Cabaniss is a veteran of World War I, a past commander of an American Legion post, the membership of which is composed of San Francisco lawyers of ability, who is again serving his country during these days of emergency as Government appeal agent, local board No. 84, under our Selective Service System. Because of his outstanding legal attainments and undoubted patriotic purposes, anything that he might have to say in respect to any public question is a valued contribution to the subject which might be under discussion.

There being no objection to the request of the gentleman from California, the address of George H. Cabaniss, Jr., of San Francisco, follows:

NATIONAL-DEFENSE LEGISLATION

(Address by Attorney George H. Cabaniss, Jr.)

Mr. Chairman, members of the Columbus Civic Club, your organization, one of the most representative in San Francisco, is to be commended for your patriotism and civic spirit. You have performed splendid work in Americanization and assisting persons of Italian birth in obtaining their citizenship papers, and are the articulate political organization of a representative group in the city and county of San Francisco.

The national-defense legislation of 1940 may be said to comprehend three distinct fields—manpower, industry, and finance. In other words, the Selective Service Act passed by Congress and approved by the President September 16, 1940, and the Soldiers and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, approved October 17, 1940, are concerned with the duty of the young men aged between 21 and 36, being registered, classified, selected, and inducted into the armed forces for the national defense of our country.

The latter act safeguards and protects certain rights of those who have been inducted into the armed forces.

The Selective Service Act is based upon the principle that every citizen owes the obligation of serving his country when needed. Approximately 16,000,000 have registered of whom no more than 900,000 may at any one time, under present conditions, be called to active service. In other words, approximately not more than 6 percent of the registrants will at any given time be in the Army of the United States.

The present act, in a sense, is based upon the 1917-18 act with a few exceptions which shall subsequently be noted.

During the period of the Civil War a draft act was passed. That act had certain weaknesses. Then a person could be exempted from military service by paying a substitute to take his place, or military service could be commuted by the payment of a fixed sum.

The 1917-18 act allowed exemptions of persons employed in certain occupations. One of the great weaknesses of that act was that a person employed, for example in a shipyard, was exempted, even though he might have been a window washer or a janitor and not a mechanic. Under the present act there are no exemptions granted. All male persons between the ages of 21 and 36, with the exception of persons joining the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps or the Reserves, or foreign diplomats, are obliged to register. Every alien, excepting diplomatic or consular attachés, is required to register.

The persons registering have been divided into four classes:

Class I. A. Persons immediately available for active duty.

B. Persons fit for limited military service.

C. Persons already members of the land or naval forces of the United States.

D. Students who will not be available prior to July 1, 1941.

E. Students available for limited service after July 1, 1941.

Class II. Persons deferred because of their occupation.

Class III. Persons deferred because they have dependents.

Class IV. A. Persons who have finished military service.

B. Public officials who, by law, are deferred.

C. Nondeclarant aliens.

D. Clergymen or divinity students.

E. Conscientious objectors.

F. Persons physically, mentally, or morally unfit. (Insane or criminal.)

For the administration of the Selective Service Act, draft boards, consisting of three members to serve approximately every 30,000 population, have been formed. It is the duty of each local board to register its registrants and to determine their classification. Attached to each local board is a Government appeal agent, an attorney. It is his duty to combine the functions of a prosecuting attorney and public defender. If any person who has been classified believes his classification unfair, he may take an appeal within 5 days of receiving written notice of his classification. If he demands that the appeal agent make the appeal for him, it will be the duty of the agent to do so, or the agent may, if he believes the board has wrongly classified any person, take an appeal either for the person so classified, or in behalf of the Governor.

In San Francisco there are 27 local draft boards. There are two appeal boards of 5 members each. Members of the appeal boards include representatives of business, labor, the medical and legal professions, and the general public.

I would advise any person who believes that he has been discriminated against to take an appeal immediately, for otherwise he will be deemed to have waived his rights.

During the World War period of 1917-18 certain aliens who had not declared their intention of becoming citizens, who did not understand the English language, and who did not waive their claims to exemption, were drafted and the courts held that there was nothing that could be done about the matter.

The selective service officials in administering the Selective Service Act are guided by the principles of justice. While each local board's determination is binding, each case is examined fairly and fully upon its own merits. There are no blanket classifications. In cases of dependencies the selective service officials have been urged to give the benefit of every doubt in favor of the registrant.

The Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act provides for a moratorium against certain civil actions against persons who have been inducted into the United States Army. While the Selective Service Act will end May 15, 1945, unless continued in further effect by Congress, the act states that no default judgment may be obtained in any court unless the plaintiff produces an affidavit that the person sued is not in the military service. If the person is in the military service the judge may require that a bond be posted to protect that person from any damages which may be caused by the judgment against him.

The families of persons in the military service, where the rental is less than $80 a month, cannot be evicted without court action, and the court may grant a 90-day stay of execution. In cases of purchases under conditional sales contracts, the party selling the article cannot recover possession without court action, and the judge may, as a condition of recovery of the article, make him return to the person in the military service the amount paid on the article. However, in the case of automobiles the court cannot grant a stay unless more than half of the purchase price was paid. A person in the military service is not required to pay his taxes and may have 6 months after the ending of his military service in which to pay the taxes. The interest upon the taxes cannot exceed 6 percent. Payment of income tax may be deferred until 6 months after the ending of the military service and no interest or penalty for nonpayment can accrue.

During 1917 the Espionage Act was passed, and only recently the United States Supreme Court affirmed the conviction in Los Angeles of two persons for violating that act. Both were sentenced to the payment of fines of $10,000 and one to 6 years' and the other to 3 years' imprisonment.

In that case a person named Salich, a naturalized Russian-born employee of the United States Government Naval Intelligence Department, for payment of $1,700, sold to Gorin, an agent of the Russian Soviet Government, confidential reports of the Naval Intelligence Unit in San Pedro, Calif., concerning the activities of certain Japanese who were suspected of espionage.

Under the Espionage Act in time of war the penalty may be death or not more than 30 years' imprisonment.

June 28, 1940, Congress passed an act known as the Federal Alien Registration Act, which provided that all aliens over 14 years old should register and be fingerprinted. Failure to register is a crime which may be punished by a $1,000 fine or 6 months' imprisonment, or both.

The State of Pennsylvania in 1939 had a State act providing that every alien should be obliged to pay a $1 annual registration fee and register and carry an identification card. The only aliens who were exempt from registering were aliens who had lived in the United States since December 31, 1908, and who had no criminal record, or aliens who had filed their first papers.

The act was held to be unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court, which held that the control of aliens is exclusively the duty of the United States Government, and that the States had no such control.

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL NO. 8 OF THE POLISH ROMAN CATHOLIC UNION OF AMERICA

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of Council No. 8 of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America:

Resolution of Council No. 8 of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, adopted at its regular meeting held on Sunday, March 30, 1941, held in the St. Hedwig's Parish Hall, Junction Avenue, in the city of Detroit, county of Wayne, State of Michigan)

Whereas the deepening of the St. Lawrence Channel as advocated by President Roosevelt will enable us to make our full contribution to the present needs of our Nation and to participate in the post-war program of world rehabilitation and stabilization; and

Whereas our national defense requires full utilization of the potentialities of our 21 active shipyards on the Great Lakes; and

Whereas engineering surveys made by our Government have approved the feasibility of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project and forecast a benefit to the entire Nation; and

Whereas the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River provide an unparalleled natural highway of over 2,350 miles from the heart of our Nation to the Atlantic Ocean; and

Whereas a deep waterway from our great inland industrial, mineral, and agricultural region is vital to our Nation and a bulwark of strength to our defense; and

Whereas, the people of Michigan and the States adjacent to the Great Lakes possess a natural right to transport their industrial products, agricultural and mining commodities to the markets of America and the world in the most economical manner; and

Whereas, the Detroit industrial area and the State of Michigan are a part of the great midwestern section of our country in which 40,000,000 people live; and

Whereas, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project is not only a defense measure but also a means of bringing a new era to the country's most important agricultural and industrial region: Therefore be it

Resolved by Council No. 8 of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, That we do formally and respectfully request the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation enabling the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project by removing existing barriers; be it further

Resolved, That a formally attested copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of State of the United States; to Michigan Senators and Representatives in our National Congress; and to the mayors of the cities of Detroit and Hamtramck, Mich.

Respectfully submitted.

COUNCIL No. 8 OF THE POLISH ROMAN CATHOLIC UNION OF AMERICA,
———— ————, *President.*
GENEVIEVE DUDEK, *Secretary.*

De Seversky Versus Lindbergh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE DALLAS MORNING NEWS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News of Friday, April 25, 1941:

[From the Dallas Morning News of April 25, 1941]

DE SEVERSKY VERSUS LINDBERGH

De Seversky's reply to the Lindbergh letter appeared in the current American Mercury almost simultaneously with the regrettably explosive scenes outside the meeting which the trans-Atlantic flier addressed in New York Wednesday. On the practical question of aid to Britain, the Lindbergh letter and the De Seversky article embody the essential differences between the America that thinks we can best defend ourselves by aiding Britain and that America that seems to think we are safe whatever happens.

So far as Britain is concerned, Lindbergh is frankly defeatist. He insists that the Britons are already beaten, this in spite of the fine defensive work of the R. A. F. and its ability to carry punishment to Germany in staving off a channel crossing. Because Britain is not self-sufficing, Britain is beaten unless supplies continue to come in steady and increasing amounts from this country. And whether Britain finally succumbs or not, our continued aid is self-insurance, because it gives us a longer breathing spell in which to correct our woeful state of unpreparedness for war.

The technical aspects of the air situation can be left to the two experts. De Seversky is certainly fully as well informed and more widely experienced than Colonel Lindbergh. You will pardon us then, Colonel, if we prefer his views to yours. And may we add that no contention you have made as to our effective defense in proud isolation has ever considered the economic side in which Hitler and his colleagues have steadily maintained that, if victorious in Europe, they can defeat us without firing a shot.

In one respect, Colonel Lindbergh erred grossly in his talk. He blames the fate of the overwhelmed nations on advice taken from us. What advice the luckless little countries took was not ours, but Hitler's. He advised and insisted that they maintain neutrality. And neutral they remained until with other barriers swept aside, Hitler in his own good time struck them down. What nation has fought Hitler because we so advised them? What nation outside of Britain and France has fought Hitler save in heroic effort to defend itself? Poland? Denmark? Norway? The Netherlands? Belgium? Yugoslavia? Greece? And what has it booted Rumania and Bulgaria and little Luxembourg that they agreed to the terms of the master liar of Berchtesgaden? Are we to understand then, Colonel, that on the precedent already set we are to make our peace with Hitler and expect to rest easy thereafter?

Secretary Stimson's Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD P. NYE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of this morning under the title "Our Secretary of War Outlines Our Naval Policy."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

OUR SECRETARY OF WAR OUTLINES OUR NAVAL POLICY

Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson Tuesday evening radioed a long speech in which he outlined what he thinks should be this country's naval policy regarding the European war. Mr. Stimson thinks we ought to use the Navy to make secure the seas for the delivery of our munitions to Great Britain.

Stephen T. Early, White House secretary, told reporters they could assume that Stimson had talked with the President before making the speech. Meaning it was an administration utterance. An advance copy of the entire speech was sent to the papers early Tuesday morning, to give them plenty of time to wind up and write editorials on it for Wednesday morning's editions.

We didn't wind up and shoot an editorial against the speech yesterday morning, because it didn't seem ethical, somehow, to do so. As Earle Combs, of the Yankees, once remarked, "'Tain't ethical to curve-ball a pitcher."

What we think about the Stimson speech is this: That we are headed for a shooting war, declared or undeclared, and that the administration is conditioning the public mind for such shooting war.

It does seem a bit strange, however, for our Secretary of War to be laying down the course for our Navy to follow. May we now expect to hear presently from Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox, laying down the course for our Army to follow?

What kind of war are we heading for? What will it be like? We have a notion it will include more and better shambles as a leading feature.

SHAMBLES IN TOKYO

We gather this notion from Tuesday's Senate speech by Senator CLAUDE PEPPER (Democrat, Florida), generally regarded as close to the White House horse's mouth. Senator PEPPER suggested changing our laws so as to give Generalissimo Chang Kai-shek, of China, "the advantage of some gallant American boys at the controls of some first-class American bombing planes. Fifty of them, in my opinion, can make a shambles out of Tokyo."

We wouldn't doubt that, Tokyo being made pretty much of wood and paper. But we thought the interventionists wanted first to make shambles out of Berlin and some key Italian city. Can it be that they expect to take on Germany, Italy, and Japan all at once, and perhaps even Russia?

The Japs no doubt could make a shambles of Manila; and, if they got even temporary control of the Pacific while our Navy was fighting the battle of the Atlantic for Britain, they could make a couple of shambles of San Francisco and Los Angeles. Indeed, it looks as if our chief foreign trade, both import and export, would be shambles.

That seems to be what we're driving toward. As we read these shambles advocates' reasoning, the ideal end to this war would be a condition of shambles all over the world, with the survivors living in caves of the kind pictured in H. G. Wells' The Shape of Things to Come.

WHAT TO NAME THIS BABY?

It looks as if most of us are going nuts with war fever and are headed inescapably for the holocaust. Senator GERALD P. NYE (Republican, North Dakota) suggests that this expected war will come to be known as the Roosevelt War. We dissent. We think "the Roosevelt Wars" would be a better name for it, because we think it promises to turn into a series of wars instead of just one chinchy little war.

"Wars" sounds much more impressive than "war." History has witnessed, for examples, the wars of Alexander the Great, the wars of Julius Caesar, the wars of Frederick the Great, the Napoleonic Wars. Up to now, the United States has had only individual wars—the Revolution, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, the World War.

To call this present war World War No. 2, or World War Jr., or by some such repetitious name, seems inapt and undramatic. The

Roosevelt Wars is a much more sonorous title and one which future historians should like.

We only hope that future historians will be able to record that the Roosevelt Wars were highly successful ones.

Oil for Our Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE LONG BEACH (CALIF.) INDEPENDENT

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Long Beach Independent of May 6, 1941:

[From the Long Beach (Calif.) Independent of May 6, 1941]

OIL FOR OUR ENEMIES

Day after day, week after week, millions of barrels of oil are being exported from our local harbor and are being transported to Japan. Japan is one of the signers of the tripartite alliance of the Axis Powers. Every American knows that these powers are openly and avowedly the enemies of the United States.

Somewhere, some place along the line are interests which are betraying the democratic interests of this Nation in a time of peril—and let's not mince words about that. All of the fine-spun diplomatic reasons are no excuse at all for placing into the hands of an enemy power the material most essential for the success of that power in operations against our security and vital interests.

This is an "all out" effort we are told. It is drummed into our minds and ears every day. Still we ship millions of barrels of oil to Japan. Is someone fooling us? Are we actually engaged in an effort to help the Axis defeat our friends and finally ourselves? Are we being betrayed in high places?

There are some interests who will exceedingly dislike what we say about shipments of oil to Japan. For their dislike we care not a fig. We do care about the United States and we do insist and demand that somebody explain this unwitting treason against our chances of ultimate victory over the forces of totalitarianism.

Every barrel of oil that goes to Japan becomes an Axis asset and a democratic liability. The wells which produce this oil are working for the Axis. The men who load it into tankers are working for Japan. The labor which runs the pumps is working for Japan. The Government could see to it these wells work only for democracy.

Japan is working for Adolf Hitler. The United States is against Adolf Hitler. In Axis eyes oil is more precious than diamonds, and here are we ladling it out with a prodigal dipper to arm our enemies. This fact has been made public time and time again, but we do nothing about it, and something must be done about it.

We know what the public's answer to the question of whether we should or should not ship oil to Japan would be. The answer would be an overwhelming "No." Everyone knows that, and yet the oil still flows across the Pacific into Japanese reservoirs, thence into Japanese war vessels, and thus powers the Axis drive to encircle the world of democracy.

Where are our leaders in this matter? We hear not a single voice raised against this suicidal continuation of business as usual—business for dollars—business against defense—business against democracy. The decision rests with the Government of the United States.

We stopped scrap-iron shipments, and we can stop oil shipments, but we don't. A few days ago the price of gasoline went up, and all of us pay for that increase although we have so much oil that wells are stopped down to only a fraction of their potential, and production is withheld from the domestic market but is sold openly and freely to our enemies.

These shipments are criminal, because they conspire to defeat democracy in a world at war. They are treasonable because they menace national security. Every American should see to it they are stopped and stopped now and that all goods of any kind being sent to any Axis country or Axis-dominated country be embargoed.

Are we going to repeat here the folly, the greedy connivance that ushered in the fall of France and every other nation now beneath the Axis heel? Have we our American De Wendels, trading materials of war to one another across the lines of our struggle? Are we going to let "business as usual" deliver us into slavery unspeakable or are we going to expose and tear away the shams that keep the great force of democracy from meeting and defeating Hitlerism within and without? Shall we fold our hands while our enemies are armed or will our Government act?

Once there was a Boston tea party. Unless something is done about oil for Japan, there will be a new kind of party based on the same flaming indignation that burst out of bounds in Boston when this Nation was young. Oil shipments to Japan must stop.

Convoys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. GERALD P. NYE, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an eloquent address delivered over the Mutual Broadcasting System last night by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] on the subject No Convoys; No War.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, the floodgates of war propaganda flung wide open these last few days, are subjecting the people of our country to a frantic verbal whipping.

America's interventionists are on the spot, driven frantic by discovery that the people could not be moved by pleas for any aid in Europe's war beyond that which could be given without dragging us into the war.

In this frantic hour the interventionists are putting the people of America on the spot. This week, or these next few days, are to determine whether or not America is going to be in Europe's war. And the people who determine that are going to be the fathers and the mothers, the sons and the daughters of America. Determination of this critical question rests now upon the question of whether the American people will make their wishes heard.

I cannot believe that there are people listening tonight who are not aware of the fact that members of the President's administration and spokesmen for the cause of intervention are "blitzkrieging" the American people into this war. All possible pressure, accompanied by deception, is being brought into play to cause that great majority of the people of our land opposed to going to war, to be fearful, and quiet, while the organized interventionist minority strives to give the President reason to believe that there is overwhelming public sentiment favorable to our getting into Europe's war, at least with our Navy, at once.

While the interventionists and the Cabinet members serve as shock troops, tossing their trial balloons, it is anticipated that the President will sit back and await tomorrow what is the public reaction to these proposals. If none but the organized interventionists pour their thought into the White House by letter and telegram now, the President may be given reason to say that he is forced to convoy by public sentiment. If, on the other hand, the American people will continue making their mind known, the result that accumulates in the White House can only be good.

This verbal blitzkrieg which has prevailed now for a few days, was precipitated by discovery that the people are unqualifiedly opposed to convoying. The President knew it because his mail and telegrams revealed it. Everyone knows it who has contact with the people of this country. The interventionists know it and they now find it their last chance to drive forcefully and quickly for action which cannot be revoked but which will lead America straight to war.

This verbal blitzkrieg by the interventionists has been cleverly organized. Survey it for just a moment.

Down the road to war we have been going with assurances by our leaders that ours were steps "short of war." Hesitatingly, the people have gone along, approving repeal of the arms embargo, the unlawful dispossession of 50 valuable destroyers, peacetime conscription. On down the road to war we have moved, adopting the lend-lease bill, abandoning the cash-and-carry feature of the neutrality law, appropriating, as a first installment on our leasing and lending and underwriting of a foreign war, $7,000,000,000. All the way have the people gone, but always with the positive assurance that those were steps to keep us out of war, steps "short of war."

It was fair to assume that ultimately the request would come to use our Navy to convoy production intended to aid Britain through the dangerous war zones. But when 2 weeks ago the stage was set for the push to convoying, the American people rose up in magnificent might, left no uncertainty in official Washington respecting their unqualified opposition to this further step, reminding the President that he had said some time back that "convoying means shooting, and shooting means war." The people at that stage cried out "Enough," and began demanding greater frankness on the part of American leadership.

The anger of those who were displeased by this showing of public determination found outlet through declarations by columnists that there was terrible and dangerous apathy over the country. This anger brought deception into largest play.

The Nation was told by the press one day that an administration Member of Congress had said that it was reliable that at least 40 percent of our aid was being destroyed before

it reached Great Britain. It followed that we must convoy this aid. "What is the sense of spending $7,000,000,000 to aid Britain when 40 percent of it does not get there?" we were asked. This was unadulterated deception, and when motion was made last Wednesday to get the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to invite the authorities who knew what the losses were to give the committee and the Congress the benefit of their information, the administration forces upon that committee denied the motion. There was determination that not even the Congress should be given access to truth in this hour when men were driving us to war.

But today truth has its hour. Admiral Land, of the Maritime Commission, has advised Congress that from December 31 to March 31, 205 vessels loaded with goods for Britain have cleared from United States ports for United Kingdom ports, that of these 205 vessels only 8 have been destroyed. A further disclosure is that in the months of March and April not one shipment of these goods from United States ports to British ports have been destroyed.

With that excuse for convoying smashed, what shall be stated by the interventionists as a sizable excuse for convoying now?

On the same day that this deception about losses was planted, the anger of that hour found the President declaring that there might be Nazis in Greenland. Knowing the circumstances that surrounded that declaration, the only conclusion to be drawn is that the apathy of the people had to be met by frightening them into doing the thing against which their sober judgment dictated.

That was but the beginning of this blitzkrieg to move America into this war. These last 3 days have brought into the drive deception, incitement to fear, demands for immediate action, and organization to roll onto the President's desk a mighty telegraphic response from people demanding convoying by our Navy.

Three days ago came the headlines announcing that 17 so-called experts were agreed that we could defeat Germany. On the same day came the word from one of these grasshopper statesmen who hops to England and hops back, President Conant, that it was time for America to throw her might into this war on just the naval side. And on that same day the President let the headlines say: "America is ready to fight for democracy again." Yesterday the blitz continued, with Senator PEPPER tossing up his trial balloon, proposing that we grab Dakar and the Azores, bomb Tokio, get tough.

Only last evening came Secretary Stimson with an unadulterated demand to use our Navy to deliver aid to Great Britain through the war zones, and declaring that Great Britain "has been accepted by us for a century," as having "accommodated our whole method of life" in America. No man knows better than Secretary Stimson the part that Britain played during this last century in striving to destroy our Union, and yet he would cause the people to adopt the theory that our very life depends upon Great Britain and her Navy.

Tonight the blitzkrieg continues, with Mr. Wendell Willkie's panzer division in a rally in New York, broadcasting a continuation of this spirit of hate and fear, and this demand for America to get into this convoying business without further delay.

Only when men lend their personalities to questionable programs are we entitled to deal with personalities. In this hour when personalities would drive America to war I am not going to hesitate to speak clearly with respect to some of these personalities. It is time now to speak and to act, tomorrow may be too late; to be as bold as are the interventionists. This is the time to be demanding that American leaders keep their promises—write an end to deception. This is time to be turning our backs upon those who have condemned themselves as insincere leaders.

Many of you heard Mr. Willkie tonight. His purpose in this hour is so diametrically opposed to the one he pledged last fall that I insist that his appeal now is subject to question. It was Wendell Willkie who, last November 4, said:

"Let us remember that dictatorship always begins by asking the people to give up some law or tradition for some special reason. The reason given may even seem logical. The motives behind it may be honorable and sincere. But if you give in to such reasons, little by little the structure of democracy is taken away from you without your realizing it."

This was the same Mr. Willkie who was prevailed on in February to do his hop to England and back, just in time to testify on the last day of the hearings on the lend-lease bill and appeal for this largest grant of power ever extended by a Congress to an Executive—the same Willkie.

During his testimony at that time, Mr. Willkie was reminded of his campaign assertain of October 30 when he said:

"On the basis of his (Roosevelt's) pas performance with pledges to the people, you may expect we will be at war by April 1941 if he is elected."

When asked whether or not he still agreed that might be the case, Mr. Willkie responded, "It was a bit of campaign oratory."

It was Willkie who, on November 12, with all call for campaign oratory gone, said:

"Mr. Roosevelt and I both promised the people in the course of the campaign that if we were elected we would keep this country out of war unless attacked. Mr. Roosevelt was elected, and this solemn pledge of his I know will be fulfilled, and I know the American people desire him to keep it sacred."

Could there be language more emphatic? Yet today we hear Mr. Willkie say things that have us wondering if he ever meant what he said when he expressed the desire to keep sacred promises that he and Roosevelt had made to keep out of war.

Let us be sure who leads these days and that sincerity governs.

America, don't you see what has been happening—what is being done now? Don't you realize that here is concerted effort to drive against the determined will of the American people—to take this Republic of ours into another futile European war that involves no issues new to those that were involved in the last war?

It is time for the people who have a heart for the future of America to emphatically make known to official Washington, from the President on down, that all of this blitzkrieg by the Winchells, the Thompsons, the Stimsons, the Peppers, and the Willkies is not a reflection of popular faith and popular belief. It is time to be demanding frankness, the abandonment of deception, to be reminding official Washington of the promises it has made as these so-called steps short of war have been taken. Among other things, the people should be reminding their President and their representatives of assurances that were given on September 21, 1939, when the President said:

"With the repeal of the embargo, this Government clearly and definitely will insist that American citizens and American ships keep away from the immediate perils of the actual zones of conflict."

Remind the President—and remind your Congress—that these words of 1939 were accepted as being a sincere assurance to the American people, and that May of 1941 finds the people demanding reassurance on this score of keeping out of the fields of war.

One does not associate with people in the East and West in this land of ours without knowing that there is an overwhelming demand that our country stay out of war. All the beautiful words in captivity are not going to alter that determination so long as the facts remain what they are today. Interventionists may go forth with their program of planting and fanning hate and fear, but so long as that part of our great people who constitute this overwhelming majority make it clear that they are for America first, the fanning and planting are to no avail.

To talk about carrying freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom from want, and freedom from fear to all the world, in our time and generation, does not mean much when all the people of America know that there is a considerable portion of these freedoms not yet available to all Americans. The cause that takes America into these foreign wars again has got to be a better cause than that.

I am not one of those who believes that the President of the United States has been without knowledge of the steps that have recently been taken by interventionists and members of his administration to make it seem that public opinion is driving him to convoying and to war. There will be those who will insist that the President has promised to keep us out of war, therefore he will not let these interventionists drag us in. But let me remind you that however much assurance may have been given to the people by the President, that Mrs. Roosevelt, so very recently, gave notice that the President had never given any such assurance or made any such promise.

Don't, I plead with you who hear me, don't let official Washington have any reason after this pending blitzkrieg is ended, to believe that the people are for the purposes which the blitzkreig has enunciated. Make yourselves heard, just as the interventionists are going to make themselves heard these next few hours, when with all the might of their organizations they will flood the President with telegrams and communications which would give the President chance to demonstrate that he was being pressured into convoying, that public demand insisted that convoying be undertaken. Americans, use the same machinery that your interventionist foes are using in this hour. It is the telling hour. It is the critical hour. It is the determining hour. Don't let the record of public expression that comes to rest in Washington these next few days be any excuse for a conclusion that the American people are for convoying, shooting, and going to war.

No Further Without War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. GERALD P. NYE, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by me last Saturday evening.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Time and again the President has given America assurance and promise that none of

our sons would be sent into war abroad. A few evenings ago at Los Angeles Mrs. Roosevelt, according to an Associated Press dispatch, said the President had made no promise to keep us out of war.

The President on January 6, 1941, proclaimed "freedom of speech, freedom from want, and freedom from fear, everywhere in the world, in our own time and generation," as the foundation to which our present policy of all-out aid (all out of the United States) was devoted. Yet in April his administration declared against such help as the Senate had written for larger parity payments to our distressed farmers. And in April the President labeled Lindbergh a copperhead for practicing freedom of speech in a plea to keep this country of ours out of war. And, again in April, the President contributed to the cause of "freedom from fear" the assertion that there might be Nazis in Greenland, and let pass without contradiction the probable plant that 40 percent of our lend-lease production was being sunk before it reached Britain, that therefore we ought to take the direct war step of convoying these goods.

Only 2 weeks ago administration leaders in Congress assured Congress that convoys were not being considered by the administration. Much was being said of the President's declaration that "convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war." Then in a few days came the bold announcements of how our armed forces were patrolling the sea lanes, and persistent is the effort, led by Cabinet members, to break down public opposition to the mad effort to get into the war over the convoy route.

In the Congress anticonvoy talks are met by silence, and when a proconvoy talk is made by an administration leader, that leader declines to debate the points of his arguments.

The administration would have the Congress and public believe there was no need to fear that convoys would be undertaken, but declines a chance for legislation forbidding convoys and closes the door against letting Congress have the information basic to intelligent action on the convoy issue. A Senate committee has this week refused to invite the testimony of those Government authorities who could reveal the true extent of losses of our shipments to England. Obviously they prefer to let the rumor stand that 40 percent of it is being lost. That order lets fear rather than knowledge prevail in shaping the public mind and making it ready to tolerate convoys.

This is no time for fear. If America is to be saved from the mess to be the lot of every civilization letting itself into this present war, America needs to adopt sanity and let truth have its rightful place in our thinking. We need to insist that deception cease being any part of our system of government or leadership in this hour.

Nor is this a time calling for explaining by those who would keep our country out of war. Those who would serve such a cause are not necessarily serving any but an American interest. To do something for America does not make the doer pro anything but American. This effort these days is no contest to determine who hates Hitler most or loves Britain best. It is alone effort to save America.

America wants no part in Europe's war, a war for the same identical causes that have held Europe its slave for centuries. We remember Jefferson's warning that—

"For us to attempt to reform all Europe and bring them back to principles of morality, and a respect for the equal rights of nations would show us to be only maniacs of another character."

And we are quite mindful that "if anyone believes the American people can go out and force other nations around to our way of thinking, he has a Hitler complex," as stated by Dr. Wilbur, of Stanford University. America remembers her failure of 25 years ago, when we were going to do so much for Europe and the world, only to find that we had only helped Europe to another early war.

America wants no part in Europe's war. However great may be our sympathies for the cause of Britain, they are not so great that the American people would go to war to save Britain in this war which Britain herself declared.

It is realization of this—that the people of this country count that we have gone as far as we can in aiding Britain; that we cannot resort to convoying; that we can go no further without resorting to part in the war—it is realization of this powerful sentiment that has so angered some administration leaders and all the interventionists these past 2 weeks. It has been an anger that seems to dictate both arrogance and boldness in leadership, as if these qualities might overcome the roll of popular sentiment against any further march to war.

However much he may strive to avoid responsibility for our entry in the war, however much he may seem now to choose to leave the decision on convoys to public sentiment and opinion, so long as he encourages and lets his own official family drive for convoying consent—if we get into this war over the convoy route, our war shall forever be known as President Roosevelt's war.

The people have followed his leadership so long as his lead was short of war. But the moment he began talking about "winning this war," and showed inclination to get into the convoying business, which he had previously said "meant war," the "blitz" of Presidential leadership was off, and the people made that clearly understood in their daily talk and their letters to the White House. The severity of this public voice was what caused the President to say that people did not understand the severity of the situation, which was followed by the "blitz" appearance of the President's Cabinet on the air to pave the way for continued following for the President in just one more little short step to war.

Let's make no mistake about it—this policy which has taken us so far toward part in this war was given by the President; he was never driven to it by the American people. The people may go along with him on patrolling and convoying, but only because he leads and gives them no alternative; never because they wanted patrolling and convoying. And if the people will continue their voicing of opposition, I doubt that the President will dare take the fatal step. Such a step calls for greatest unity, and it is clear that at this stage there can be no unity on going to war.

The President is not wanting to go down in history as the President who took the country to war after 8 years of protesting that his aim was peace. The White House strategy now appears to be for the President to let his official family take the lead in blitzing the people into a war mood. If they succeed, then he will appear to have been forced to act.

In the last few weeks the ventriloquist's voice has been frequently heard. Let's call the roll: On April 24 Secretary Wickard told the country: "I think it's time the farmers and the people of this country got excited about the world situation."

Secretary Knox on the same day declared: "We've committed ourselves. We cannot allow our goods to be sunk," which we can interpret only as a plea for convoys.

Secretary Hull also on April 24 said that "aid must reach its destination in the shortest of time in maximum quantity," and "ways must be found to do this." He, too, implied convoys when he said that our safety "calls for resistance wherever resistance will be most effective."

Vice President WALLACE has told us that "the United States now has her second opportunity to make the world safe for democracy."

Secretary Ickes, speaking in Chicago, smeared those who are opposed to intervention.

Former Ambassador Bullitt on April 27 scored us for not producing "as fast as if we were at war." He, too, implied convoys with his statement that we must "deliver the goods."

Secretary Stimson prepared us for what may follow with his testimony before a Senate committee: "Our forces must be prepared for the possibilities of war in many and varied terrains, it being quite uncertain in what part of North or South or Central America, or even possibly other regions, it ultimately may be necessary to use them in the defense of this country and its possessions."

Secretary Jones, Colonel Donovan, Administrator McNutt have all added their voices to swell the oral blitzkrieg, paving the way for convoys, which would mean war.

This administration blitzkrieg followed the appearance in several columns of statements deploring the people's "apathy." Since several columnists and writers used the same line at about the same time, I can only assume that they got it straight from the feed box, probably in the form of discreet hints dropped at the White House.

The administration knows that the people are not apathetic, that what is called apathy is plainly firm resistance to participation in war.

The President has always had a sense of history. He has always been conscious of the niche he was carving for himself in the halls of time. Of course, he will not want to be classed with that other President who took the country to war after his election on the slogan "He kept us out of war." If we are to have war, he would rather be driven to it, and he knows the people will not now support it.

Read the speeches of the President's spokesmen as this blitzkrieg continues. Listen to them over the radio. But, as you do, be aware that the speaker is a front for the man who calls the plays. I do not need to tell you that in these critical times public officials are not making speeches dealing with official foreign policy without advance approval. And as you listen to these speeches, picture the man who patiently waits for public opinion to catch up with him, public opinion that is whipped up by his panzer divisions of men who will take the rap for him after he has set the country on a road that leads straight to war.

Put it down as a fundamental truth: If we get into this war it will not be because the President tried to keep us out.

America wants to stay out of this war. Those who believe they can create the public opinion that will catch up with the President and the interventionists ought to be answered by the people acting as those who know that the way to catch up with the President is to overtake him, as you would a runaway horse, and stop him.

Let America really have freedom from fear. We are at peace still with the world. The only censorship we know is voluntary. Truth can still be entertained and opinion still has right of expression.

Let us be done with this fear that our dependence is upon the British Navy, the only Navy that has ever practiced aggression against this hemisphere.

Let us devote our preparation to our own defense and be done with this fear that aggression may be practiced against us. If it is aggressors we fear and would stop, let us not become again the partner of the land which for three centuries of military

aggression and conquest has builded the greatest empire of all time.

Let us, when we consider our world trade, in connection with the future, remember that on a normal basis it is only 4 percent or 5 percent of our economic dependence, and that our most severe competitor in this field is Great Britain.

Let us be doing more thinking of America and less of empires across the seas. If an empire dies, it will only mean that history is repeating itself, and that our forefathers successfully fought to free America from European empire builders.

And occasionally it would serve Americans well to remember that parts of the British Empire are doing far less by reason of the present war than we are doing—that we are doing more to save England than its possessions are doing to save England. All-out-aid for Britain on our part is silliness unless the British Dominions are themselves doing as much.

I do not criticize Britain for seeking our full aid. I do not criticize Canada because she has not yet done for Britain what we are doing. But it is truth that while we draft boys and can use them in Newfoundland and Greenland, Canada drafts only for a few months, not more than 4 months, of training, with no obligation for service out of Canada, even in Newfoundland. Canadian conscripts are paid $36 per month, while our draftees receive $21. We open our purse to the tune of $7,000,000,000 as a first installment, while Canada sells to England on a cash basis. Indeed, we are told by visitors that we are much more emotional about the war than the people of Great Britain themselves.

Let's be honest with ourselves. Britain and France made Hitler and then declared war against him. Having declared it, let them finish what they themselves started, if they can. If they can't then let them at least see what kind of a peace can be had and let us know what it is before they ask and receive our aid to the extent of participation in their war.

And one thing more, after all that has been reported about what Ambassador Bullitt may or may not have done to prod England and France to war, there comes now the unqualified declaration by Demaree Bess in the Saturday Evening Post that Colonel Donovan, Secretary Knox's "eyes" in Europe, told Bulgarian diplomats that "the United States was on the verge of entering the European war and would go on fighting Germany until Germany was defeated." If this sort of thing has been going on, then lets have it understood that these spokesmen were not speaking for the American people, that the American people were ready to help, but only by steps that would not involve us in the war.

It is not sport to be saying these things. But they must be said, and should be said, again and again. Had there been greater frankness on the part of American leadership while it was preaching peace, peace, peace for America, there would be no need now for such plain talk as is necessary to save peace for America while that same leadership talks about winning the war before we talk peace.

Watch the blitzkreig teams of Wickard, Wallace, and Knox; Stimson, Ickes, and Hull; Bullitt, Jones, and McNutt; Donovan, Winchell, and Thompson. Be ever mindful that in their approach these days they speak—the officials always—for the President. They may offer only trial balloons, but with Presidential consent. And let every trial balloon, when it invites the next step to war, be punctured by public protest straight to the White House, just as the people have directed it so well of late. Only in that manner can we hope to avoid partnership with Europe in a cause that has taken one after another of Britain's partners to national death and starvation.

Longevity Bill for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McCARRAN
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. PAT McCARRAN, OF NEVADA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by me on the program of the United National Association of Post Office Clerks on Friday, May 2, 1941. The subject of the address was the postal employees' longevity pay bill.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen who do me the honor of listening to me tonight. I want to express my appreciation for this opportunity to address you on the postal employees' longevity-pay bill, now pending before the Congress. This bill is not primarily a pay bill to increase salaries; neither is it a bill to provide compensation for many years of faithful experienced service; nor is its sole object to increase efficiency in the Postal Service. The postal longevity-pay bill is a combination of all these three factors—salary increase, for experienced service, in order to increase efficiency.

Briefly, the bill provides that postal employees who have rendered not less than 10 years of satisfactory service shall receive an automatic salary increase of $100, in addition to the annual salary, and $100 for each 5-year period of satisfactory service thereafter until the thirtieth year of employment; or, by putting the bill into operation, we see that after an employee has rendered 10 years of satisfactory service his salary automatically would be increased $100 annually, or approximately $8 per month. When he has completed 15 years of service he would receive another $100 increment, and so on for each 5-year period of service until he reaches the maximum of 30 years. After 30 years of faithful service he will have received a total maximum salary increase of $500 as recompense for the added experience and efficiency which he has brought to his job. That's the meaning of the word "longevity." Indeed, longevity, by any other name, can only mean "compensation for experienced service."

Under existing law, the average postal employee enters upon his duties with the knowledge that he may receive five promotions for efficiency, one each year. At the end of his fifth year he has nothing to look forward to by way of promotion or advancement. At that point he has reached the peak of advancement, except in a few circumstances, and this is true even though he remain with the Postal Service for the rest of his life. But as a matter of fact, 95 percent of those who enter the Postal Service in their youth do remain with it throughout their lives. All available records indicate that these employees have made, and will continue to make, a life career out of postal work. Postal work is a career job because its very nature requires special skills that can be gained only by experience. Moreover, postal work is accomplished mainly by manpower—that is, by individual efficiency. It could not be done otherwise. And so it is quite apparent that if we are to expect experienced postal employees to remain in their skilled capacities, we must look to their needs as reflected in the light of this passing era.

Advancement in the Postal Service is today regulated by a law enacted in 1925. That was 16 years ago. For 16 years these employees have had to content themselves with an antiquated wage scale, notwithstanding unthought of advancements in the American standard of living, which they are required to meet, and notwithstanding the fact that the Post Office Department last year achieved an unprecedented surplus of receipts over expenditures. In fact, during 7 out of the last 8 years the Postal Service has recorded remarkable surpluses of cash receipts over expenditures, and it is my belief that since the Post Office Department is essentially a service to the people, and was established for no other purpose, it should not be permitted to profit by that service at the expense of its employees.

The principle of longevity pay is neither novel nor is it untried. Longevity was recognized in the military branches of the Government as long ago as 1870, and it has constantly been extended. Today, those who make a career of their service with the armed forces may look to a longevity-pay increase of approximately 50 percent over the maximum service of 30 years. But longevity pay for postal employees, as embodied in pending legislation, can in nowise approximate that afforded to members of the armed forces. Although this is true, yet postal longevity will furnish a very desirable incentive to maintain postal efficiency at the highest possible peak, which, in turn, must result in a saving to all taxpayers.

The principle of longevity is sound. It has been proved by many years of testing, and I know of no more appropriate field for its application than the Postal Service. No one would presume that a salary law enacted 16 years ago, to meet living conditions 16 years ago, is or could be adequate to meet the high American standard of living of today. No one would presume that it is just and reasonable for the vast majority of postal employees in the lower brackets to be "frozen" in their particular skilled capacities after their first 5 years of service, without hope of promotion or advancement, and without regard to efficiency or ability. It is for these reasons that I am sponsoring postal employees' longevity-pay legislation, which I hope to see enacted into law by the present Congress.

The worker in any line of endeavor and especially in the service of the Government should not be permitted to get into the frame of mind that his worth has reached a limit, that his earning power can never be greater however much he may give of his devotion, thought, and energy. Let us give heart and hope to the postal employee as he gives his life to the great service that touches every hand and home of the Nation.

Participation of the United States in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. SMATHERS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

LETTER FROM KENNETH B. WALTON AND AN EDITORIAL FROM THE DARTMOUTH

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have pub-

lished in the Appendix of the RECORD a congratulatory letter written by a friend of mine in Atlantic City, N. J., Mr. Kenneth B. Walton, and addressed to the editor of The Dartmouth, Dartmouth College, N. H., and also an editorial written by the Dartmouth College newspaper, under the heading, We Have Waited Long Enough.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENTS RESTAURANT & BAKING CO.,
Atlantic City, N. J., May 6, 1941.

The EDITOR, THE DARTMOUTH,
Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.

DEAR SIR: Please allow me to congratulate you and your associates on the directorate of The Dartmouth on the splendid editorial you recently printed on your front page entitled "We Have Waited Long Enough." I have thought it so good that I have had copies made of it as per the enclosed for private distribution.

It is very encouraging to find that you undergraduates of Dartmouth understand so fully the grave necessities of this day and hour. You have set a notable example for all the colleges of America, and I have sent it to Haverford College, where I graduated, to ask them to print something as good (if they can).

To cry only that we want peace is so self-evident that it is silly. Everyone wants peace, of course. Unfortunately we have no such simple choice. There has rearisen the plundering force of German brutality and aggression in such a form that our only choice is as to when is best to fight to repel it, because the American people will never surrender what we have. When they see the problem clearly they will call for war as loudly as you do who understand beyond the headlines of today.

There are some who counsel that we should sit tight, arm ourselves to the teeth and do nothing to take part in the present frightful struggle abroad, except perhaps to give the British Empire munitions if they can take them away. Such a reckless policy can be embraced only by those who are mesmerized by wishful thinking or blind to anything beyond tomorrow.

They would have us let Germany, which has been building a war machine for 8 years, defeat England and have us turn our heads the other way. Thus with the peoples of the whole Continent of Europe, western Asia, and at least northern Africa at their mercy, the Germans would settle down to several years of building a huge navy and trans-Atlantic striking force. They would probably be able to outstrip our naval building with all of Europe's shipyards at their disposal and with millions of conquered people to work for them under bondage. And what a still more desperate struggle we should have to contemplate 5 years from now. The recklessness of isolationist nonsense which would submit us to such terrible struggle is beyond belief. We would not even be able to choose our time to strike before Hitler built too powerful armaments, without appearing in the eyes of the world as the aggressor nation which would break the then peace.

Between this prospect and action now, while we have a strong British Empire as allies, there can be no sound choice except yours. Now we can defeat this menace to our country with allies; with all the world behind us (except Japan, neutralized by our fleet). Now we can fight with every chance to attain victory and peace within a few years, with the aggressors confined to the Continent of Europe and already weakened by blockade and bombing. Now we can win this fight at infinitely less cost in blood, suffering, and treasure than there would be if we let these plunderers consolidate their gains and arm as naval powers.

Your course is the sound, wise, realistic, and conservative course. I hope that we may see evidence that most of the other colleges of America will shun the reckless, wishful thinking that we can buy an easier path with a few months of peace now. The time for half-way measures has passed; it is time to strike hard to defend all that is America.

Thanks again for your fine editorial. With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,
KENNETH B. WALTON, *President.*

WE HAVE WAITED LONG ENOUGH—DARTMOUTH COLLEGE NEWSPAPER ASKS PRESIDENT TO WAGE IMMEDIATE WAR

(The following letter, addressed to President Roosevelt, was written yesterday by a member of the 1941 directorate of The Dartmouth. The 1942 directorate feels it is the best current expression of The Dartmouth's editorial opinion, and feels it is of enough importance to put on this morning's front page.—Editor, The Dartmouth.)

SIR: Now we have waited long enough. We have seen the Greeks go down, and we have heard the words of a Greek: "On October 28 Roosevelt pledged America's complete aid to Greece, but not a single cartridge has yet arrived from the United States." Greece held on no longer. Like other modern small countries—even one or two modern big countries—Greece found that brave men cannot indefinitely fight airplanes with rifles.

Now we have waited long enough. We hear that Greece has fallen, and on the same radio broadcast we hear that the United States is sending Britain some ships—"small ships, 20 torpedo boats." It is travesty in the midst of tragedy. We cannot laugh, though; only shake our heads in dumb amazement.

All over the world men are waiting for you. In Greece, in Yugoslavia, in Norway, in France, in Belgium, in Holland, in Poland, you are the only hope of men who fought and lost. In England you are the only hope of men who are still fighting. It must be that in Germany itself there are men who think of you as the only hope.

In America we, too, hope. We know that your action is the only thing left that can change the course of the world. Because we know that, although the soldiers of the British Empire have fought longer and harder and better than any other soldiers, they cannot fight alone and poorly armed forever.

Now we have waited long enough. We have seen the United States slowly move toward war—through conscription, industrial defense mobilization, and the Lease-Lend Act; we have known that it moved too slowly.

We have not produced enough guns, tanks, airplanes, bombs.

We have not supplied the ships to carry what we have produced across the seas.

Now we ask you to order complete industrial mobilization of the country on wartime lines. We ask you to set in motion the executive and legislative machinery which will stop the farce of producing automobiles, washing machines, gaudy fashions, and aluminum salad bowls while the peaceful world which is enhanced by these products is being blasted to pieces.

Now we ask you to authorize the sending of supplies across the seas in American ships, convoyed by the American Navy.

Now we ask you to send American pilots, mechanics, sailors, and soldiers to fight wherever they are needed.

In the dark catalog of our public events no other answer can be given. The world we know is breaking up around us, and we try to maintain business as usual. We do not wish to die, so we seek reasons for avoiding war. Our logic compels us to the warlike answer, so we rat on our logic and turn off our conviction with the craven phrase, "all aid short of war." In a world given over to war and bound to be shaped and determined by war we strike for peace.

We are not our best selves when we do this. The loudest voices are those crying "peace, peace," when there is no peace. In the Congress are men who, through an honest hatred of war, blind themselves to the consequences of refusing to wage war when it becomes essential. Having waited long, sir, we now ask you to override these voices; make us our best selves by waging war.

We cannot win without fighting. The people will not make up their minds that this is war unless we fight it. We will never win so long as we continue to lead strictly private lives, so long as we go on getting 7-percent profits, so long as we refuse to give up an inch of ourselves to something bigger than ourselves.

We can lose without fighting. If England loses, we stand alone. Ridden with internal dissension, hanging each other for "fifth columnists," bearing the weight of a huge conscript Army and a wartime economy, we will see Germany rule the world; and we will, out of that mess, produce a native fascism and an American Hitler. We will lose the war without even fighting it; or, if we do fight—finally goaded to it and still strong enough to field a unified Army—we will fight alone, in two oceans at the same time, against an incomparably stronger and more concentrated foe.

We can win if we fight now. We can wake the sleepers in America. We can move the self-hypnotics from the destruction they seek before the wave of the future. We can stop "business as usual" and work longer and harder and for less money to produce the things we need. We can send ships to England and to the Mediterranean and to the East Indies. We can build a hemisphere strongly resistant. We can act now to save the last best hope on earth a nation ever had of staying free and bringing freedom.

Now, having waited long enough, we ask you to help us do this. We ask you to believe in us as much as we have believed in you. We ask you not to leave us stranded like the Greeks.

CHARLES G. BOLTE.

HANOVER, N. H., *April 23, 1941.*

Tribute to the Late Senator Sheppard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

EDITORIAL BY DR. CLINTON N. HOWARD

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able editorial written by Dr. Clinton N. Howard for the Progress, the official organ of the International Reform Federation, in which a fine tribute is paid to our beloved and distinguished colleague, the late Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR MORRIS SHEPPARD

"Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; but the spirit shall return to God who gave it" (Ecclesiastes, xii:7).

This issue of Progress would not be complete without an appreciation of Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD, father of the eighteenth amendment, which abolished the legalized liquor traffic in the United States, the greatest moral enactment since the Decalogue, and the dream of Abraham Lincoln, the father of the thirteenth amendment, that abolished slavery, of a land without a slave or a drunkard.

In his Washington birthday address, delivered at Springfield, Ill., on February 2, 1842 (at 33), as published in the Sangamon Journal, Abraham Lincoln said, "And when that victory shall be complete, when there shall be neither a slave nor a drunkard on the earth, now proud the title of that land which may truly claim to be the birthplace and cradle of both those revolutions, which shall have ended in that victory."

This also was the dream of Senator SHEPPARD from the day that he entered public life until the day of his death, which occurred on April 9, after only 3 days of serious illness. The announcement of his death at the comparative early age of 66, was a shock to the entire Nation, without respect to party, church, or personal habits, for Senator SHEPPARD was respected alike by all.

Ten years in the House of Representatives, and 29 years in the Senate, as one of his colleagues said at the memorial service held in the Senate Chamber today, April 25, "without a stain on his personal or political career."

The editor has just come from that Senate memorial service, and he can truthfully say that never was greater tribute paid to mortal man so soon after his passing as was paid to the life and character of Senator SHEPPARD. Said one of his eulogists, recognized as a liberal and wet Senator, "No matter whether one agreed with all that he stood for, one always felt that Senator Sheppard was right. He was one of the most sincere and gentle men I have ever known."

To tell the story of his life and his achievements would fill a volume. He was the Dean of Congress, having served longer than any other living member, and so great was the respect in which he was held by the people of Texas that in the same year that they repealed the prohibition law by popular vote, they returned MORRIS SHEPPARD, the father of the law they voted to repeal, to the Senate by the largest majority he or any other Texas statesman ever received. The editor campaigned in that election and found a fixed gulf between drys and wets, but both sides wearing SHEPPARD badges. His death is a loss to a great cause and to the Nation.

The President told it all when he said, "He has gone to his account with every obligation to duty fulfilled." There, in 12 words, is an appropriate inscription for his monument, which doubtless the State of Texas will erect to his memory.

* * * * *

It was with heavy heart that we looked into his silent face as his body lay in state in the Senate Chamber on the day it left Washington for interment at his Texas home at Texarkana, where 25,000 mourners waited the arrival of the funeral train, and followed his body to the cemetery.

Senator SHEPPARD is dead, and as one of the speakers in the Senate today said, "We shall never see his like in the Senate again."

"Know ye not that there is a prince and great man fallen this day in Israel." We extend our deepest sympathy to his family, and express the hope that his successor will be a statesman of like high ideals.

America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a speech which I delivered before the Chamber of Commerce of the United States at its twenty-ninth annual meeting, held in Washington, D. C., May 5, 1941, with the introductory remarks of James Kemper, president of the chamber of commerce.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President KEMPER. We of Illinois are proud, pardonably proud, of our junior United States Senator. Affectionately and appreciatively we call him "CURLY" BROOKS.

He was a student at the University of Illinois when the World War broke out. He immediately enlisted and with his father and two brothers went to France. There he fought in many important engagements. Their seriousness may be indicated by the fact that he was wounded seven times. His heroism on the field of battle was recognized by the United States by the award of the Distinguished Service Cross both of the Army and the Navy and by France with the Croix de Guerre.

Returning to Illinois after the war, he completed his education in college and then in the law at Northwestern University. As assistant State's attorney in Chicago he won universal commendation for his achievements in a war on organized crime.

In November of last year he was elected to the Senate of the United States. We know that he is a lawyer; he likes to think of himself as a farmer. I venture the prophecy that he will be better known as a statesman—the type of statesman, I might add, who puts love of this America of ours above every other consideration.

I have the honor of presenting to you the Honorable C. WAYLAND BROOKS, United States Senator from Illinois. [Applause.]

ADDRESS BY HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

President Kemper, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am tremendously honored tonight to have the privilege of closing this all-important conference of the leaders of American industry and business, meeting in this the last great free capital of the world without the fear of bombardment, and I want to express my gratitude not only to the president of this association and his officers, but to its members for the fact that they have gathered in this all-important hour to find out what is ahead for America and to lay their plans to continue to play that all-important part which they have played thus far in building the civilization that you and I enjoy.

Tonight I see in this audience a number of my seniors in the Senate, and I wish to pay my tribute to them for the part that they will play in the arduous task that is ahead, for surely America stands tonight in a forest of question marks, and upon what we do in the Congress, what the executive branch of our Government decides to do, and the part that the businessmen of America will take in support of that action will depend the future of the liberty-loving people of the world.

The subject that they gave me tonight is a subject of love; it is of America—America, the world's new life, with none of the dust of the ancient day, none of her crumbling shrines, none of the ancient art; a people capable of throwing off the outgrown and outworn; the new life of the world. Yet we stand, asking of each other, "What part shall we play?" as the Chamber of Commerce of America meets to ask the question of itself, "What lies ahead?"

The past, of course, is secure. Nothing that we can do can add to or detract from it except that we may take lessons from it, for America is the hope and the dream and the fulfillment of the prayers of countless centuries of courageous men and women who longed for the day when there might be a government where all men might play a part, where the individual might be supreme, where the worship of God might be unrestricted and the initiative of men might be the challenge of the day.

It started as a result of a revolution, a revolution to throw off chains, traditions, slavery, and bigotry; a revolution that started in many ways, for as we read of it we find that they were not certain what they were revolting against. Some of them said, "It is a religious war," but there were bigots among them for they burned the Pope in effigy in the squares of Connecticut and said it was a war against him; others said, "It is a religious war but not against the Pope, but against the Church of England," and they were equally sincere but equally vicious.

Adams and Hancock said it was a war for the freedom of trade, but they spoke of their trade. Franklin and his associates said, "It's not only for a religious freedom and a freedom of trade, but a complete freedom, a war for independence." Yet they were struggling on, 13 colonies, 13 armies, 13 flags. But finally they agreed to sign a Declaration of Independence. They signed their names and willed their future and their fortune and their lives; they chose a common commander, and America started her march of liberty. She moved on for 75 years. And to this cause came the strong of every creed and every color and every nationality of the world, in unseaworthy boats, longing and hoping for the opportunity to help forge and build a new civilization.

America moved to the West. Finally, Illinois became a State. Then she made her contribution. Tonight I had the privilege of sitting beside and between two of Illinois' distinguished citizens. You have heard the tribute paid them here—Silas Strawn, former president of the American Bar Association and of this chamber; and James Kemper, president of a great insurance organization and retiring tonight from his responsibility here as president. But that's not the great contribution Illinois made, for out of the woodland, from the humble folk, Illinois presented at the most trying hour in the march of liberty of this Nation—Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln came with the experience of the humble man, who knew all the hardships and all the heartaches. Time will not permit to trace his history, but this will suffice. We often hear, in this land of ours, in political campaigns, folks say that this man or that individual is not qualified for the office he seeks. Certainly that could have been said of Lincoln when he sought the Presidency of the United States of America. He had no experience as an executive, but he proved to be the best qualified man in the land for he had a love of liberty, he had a love of all else, a love to preserve the Union, the Union of States, a government of divided power, a government of distributed opportunity, a government of law and not men, a government that was merely started on its way to distribute the opportunities of life to all men and women of all creeds and colors.

It can be said of him that he was born as humble as the son of God, in a hovel; reared in poverty; living a life of struggle against adversity; finally elevated to supreme command of a nation. He preserved the Union; he preserved a government; he set more men free, and like the son of God was crucified for his service to humanity. But the Nation moved on.

In this country of ours, womanhood, motherhood, have been elevated to a finer and a higher plane of respect than anywhere in the world; and yet my pretty mother died before she was ever given the privilege to cast her vote; she never cast her vote to select a prosecutor or a judge or a man to make the law. But that finally came. By 1917, all men, all women, all creeds, all colors, every manner of humanity known to God was free and equal under the kind of government that was established here, marching on to, shall we say tonight, its destiny or to its fate.

And then for the first time, as the richest nation in the world, with the highest standard of living that ever had been accomplished in the universe, we moved back into the Old World. For the first time we turned our backs on our own march of liberty and moved back into the bitternesses of the century-old struggles of Europe. I realize that it was a challenge. They said it was a war to make the world safe for our kind of understanding; it was a war to end all war. That seemed worthy of America's contribution. America had always contributed before. Out of God's blessing bestowed on us we had reached back into the Old World in its every difficulty; whether it be flood or famine, earthquake or war, wherever distressed people sent up their cry to a God-fearing people for help, America had extended her hand. But now we were asked to extend more—our blood, our force, our prayers. And we did. And we turned to with everything we had, believing, as the chaplain told me as a common soldier, that God was on our side. The German soldier of that day had printed on his belt, "Gott mitt uns," and his chaplain told him the same thing. But he came from a different government; he came from a government of centralized power where an individual with lust for power and the arrogance that goes with power was in command—and arrogance always will go with power, whether it is centralized in Germany, Italy, France, or America. The lust for power causes men to die. We felt that we were wiping it out. And when the armistice was signed we were glad, for our President spoke that day and said, "All that America has fought for has been accomplished." And the bells rang, the whistles blew, and old men and little children rejoiced in the streets.

Then the aftermath set in, and then the great boom came, and then the depression; and then somebody had to be blamed, and business became the whipping boy of America.

Then came the charges, and they charged business of America with being the obstructionists, the economic royalists, the selfish few, the upper 10 percent, the well-entrenched minority, the earls of privilege, the barons of finance. And the tirade went on and on.

With new agencies of propaganda came the radio, that blankets the Nation as the rain. No longer on the public platform alone, but reaching into the automobile and the fast-moving train, into the farm, the barn, and the cottage on the hill and the little room in the tenement district came the official voice condemning business, until finally all America began to wonder: Was business the enemy of American society?

Some men held true to their dreams of what America meant. I was taught that private enterprise and the American form of government were the twin sons of Columbia; they were born of the same mother; they were weak in the beginning, but sustaining each other they both became great, and the American Government became the greatest Government of the world, and the American people, through private enterprise, became the most productive and the builders of the greatest standard of living, the greatest joy that had ever been known. When one of them dies they both will die, for America, if she reaches her destiny, will cling to two things. One is a division of power of the Government with its distributive opportunity of people to participate and the right and the dream and the hope of the humblest son some day to build a finer plane, a finer bridge, a finer tower, a finer automobile, and, if necessary, a finer gun, than ever has been established or developed in the history of the world.

America with her ideals has traveled far. I think it was Carl Schurz who said, one time, that ideals are like the stars; you can't reach up and touch them and fondle them and hold them; like a seafaring man on a desert of water, you search for them, and when you find them if you follow them you reach your destiny. And those are the things that to me are important tonight. Whether we reach our destiny as a great people. We have done great things. We are only 6 percent of the world's area; we are only 7 percent of the world's population; and yet we enjoy and use 60 percent of all the telephone and telegraph facilities of the world; we operate on this continent 80 percent of the motor cars of the world; we produce 70 percent of the world's production of oil; we produce on this continent 60 percent of the world's production of wheat and cotton. We are the world's new life. What shall we do with it now? Shall we distribute it across the face of the earth? Can we settle the differences of the centuries, the bitternesses that have been engendered in the hearts of sons since birth? Ever since I came back from the last war I have wondered what the mother of Germany or the mother of France or the mother of Belgium or the mother of England must have said to the son whose father was killed in the war. Every opportunity that they were denied must be explained because somebody less than 25 miles away caused that handicap, that bitterness, that hatred that has been poured into the sons of the Old World for centuries, while we here have learned to know that the German and the Jew, the British and the French, the Belgian and the Greek, the Italian and the Spaniard, and all the nations of the earth are equal under our law, that every nationality has a right with us to enjoy the fruits of his own labor, and every mother has the right to instill a dream in the heart of her son that some day he may ride down Pennsylvania Avenue and occupy the White House.

That is a different world, and that these things shall live we must make wise decisions now. I, for one, as my family proved in the last war, will be for my country no matter what decision she makes, but in the meantime my thought is that the blood of America belongs to America and to American defense, and that the Government of America must realize that the Government didn't manufacture nor invent the washing machine nor the telephone nor the telegraph nor the automobile; the Government, if you please, calls on industry today to build the tank and the gun and the plane. We can draft men, we can train them in squads right, we can tell them to stand at attention, but they can't alone defend themselves or us against the plane that dives like a meteor from the sky; they can't stop with their common hands a tank traveling 50 to 75 miles an hour. America calls tonight for industry to produce as she has never produced in her life. And if industry is to produce, industry must know that she is a part of America; that she will have the understanding and the appreciation of the Government and its heads; that it may say to industry, "We call upon you as we do upon the soldiers that we take from their homes and their occupations; without that skilled labor that we take from you, you must build again a new force, build that mechanized force that seems to challenge the world."

America! That is my subject. Valiant America! We salute you, glowingly as befits our youth, reverently as befits our devotion, and silently as we sacredly pledge to guard the heritage that was given to us. We will reach one of two things, our destiny or our fate, and it depends upon industry and the sons of America to move together.

As one who is honored to be in the service of the Government I say to the industrial leaders of America: What a challenge comes to you. You have never failed; you won't fail now. God bless you and God speed you as you meet the emergency of this hour, and may America know that business is equally as important as the Government, the twin sons of Columbia, marching on not to their fate but to their destiny.

Broadcasting Regulations of Federal Communications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. JAMES L. FLY

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, on the 6th day of May 1941 the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] asked unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star of May 5, and also an article by Mr. David Lawrence on the subject of the operations and action of the Federal Communications Commission. I have before me a statement by Mr. James L. Fly, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, in reply to the article and editorial printed in the RECORD, above referred to, and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Fly's reply be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My attention has been called to a column by Mr. David Lawrence, appearing in the Washington Evening Star on May 5, 1941, and in other newspapers all over the country, and introduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 6 by Senator GURNEY. Mr. Lawrence discussed the recent network regulations handed down by the Federal Communications Commission, and stated that these regulations were issued "without public hearing."

That, as anyone who has followed the subject must be aware, is a serious misstatement. Let me quote from the introduction to the Commission's report:

"Between November 14, 1938, and May 19, 1939, the committee held hearings pursuant to public notice that the Commission would hear any person or organization desiring to present evidence on the matters included for investigation in Commission Order No. 37. The committee requested the national networks, regional networks, station licensees, and transcription and recording companies to present evidence. It also requested information by questionnaire from licensees of stations and from holders of stock in licensee corporations. In addition, persons and organizations requesting an opportunity to

present evidence material to the investigation were given an opportunity to be heard. On June 12, 1940, the committee issued its report based upon the evidence adduced at the hearings and the official records of the Commission.

"In November 1940 briefs in this proceeding were filed on behalf of the national networks and other interested parties. On December 2 and 3, 1940, oral arguments before the full Commission were presented by the parties. These arguments were directed to the committee report and to certain draft regulations issued solely for the purpose of giving scope and direction to the oral arguments. On January 2, 1941, supplementary briefs were filed on behalf of the three national network organizations in which were discussed the jurisdiction of this Commission with respect to matters covered by the committee report and the draft regulations, and in which attention was given to the actual and feasible limits of competition in the broadcasting field, with particular reference to network broadcasting."

David Lawrence, like myself, is an ardent defender of freedom of the press. It does seem to me, however, that a man who holds himself out to be a responsible newspaper columnist, should at least read a report before devoting a column to attacking it. The words which I have quoted appear on pages 1 and 2 of the report. Throughout the report there are references to the hearings and to the testimony of network witnesses at those hearings. I think the attention of the Senate and of the country should be called to the fact Mr. Lawrence devoted his whole column to an attack upon a Government report which he either had not read or fatally misconstrued.

Perhaps it might be argued Mr. Lawrence did not have time between the release of the F. C. C. report last Saturday morning and the release of his column last Monday afternoon to digest the report's contents. But certainly he had time to digest them by Wednesday afternoon. Yet here is what he said in the Washington Evening Star on Wednesday:

"No hearing was even given interested parties before the order was promulgated."

Even if Mr. Lawrence could not find time to read the report which he attacked on Monday and Wednesday, he might at least have read the two-page order. Mr. Lawrence said that "no hearing was even given interested parties before the order was promulgated." Yet the order on its very face calls attention to the fact that "extensive hearings" were in fact held, and that thereafter briefs were filed, oral arguments were had, and draft regulations were discussed in those briefs and oral arguments. When Mr Lawrence stated on Wednesday that "no hearing was given," had he really read the two-page order he was attacking?

Mr. Lawrence also said that the regulations were adopted "suddenly out of a clear sky." I wonder whether Mr. Lawrence really means that 2½ years devoted to hearings, oral arguments, presentation of briefs, and consideration of the record justify his phrase "suddenly out of a clear sky."

I have not myself had an opportunity to study carefully the report and order. I hope that it accomplishes what it purports to accomplish; the decentralization of the vast power over the listening public now wielded by two or three New York corporations. In this connection, I wish to submit for the record an editorial published in the Washington Post on Thursday morning, May 8.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 8, 1941]

CHAIN BROADCASTING

It is not surprising that the antimonopoly order issued last Saturday by the Federal Communications Commission has brought forth numerous protests. That order will effect some far-reaching changes in the relations of radio stations to broadcasting networks. No business organization likes to see established practices banned, and that is particularly true when the required changes involve a sacrifice of privileges. But the real question at issue is not whether the large radio networks find the new order burdensome, but whether it will best serve the public interest.

The F. C. C.'s order is based on the generally acceptable assumption that the public interest in radio may be protected most effectively by active competition among broadcasters and network systems. It recognizes, however, that this competition will be limited in any event because only a relatively small number of radio stations may be operated successfully in any community. Still the Commission insists that no artificial restraints upon competition be added to those inherent in the nature of the radio spectrum. Accordingly, it has laid down a policy of forbidding licenses to stations that are bound by contract to broadcast the programs of only one network. Even nonexclusive affiliation contracts between stations and network systems will be limited to 1-year periods, and no network will be permitted to operate more than one standard broadcast station in the same area.

At present only three major networks are in operation, and this field is dominated by the National and Columbia Broadcasting Cos. The F. C. C. does not deny that they are rendering good service. Its concern is with the concentration in a few hands of great power over this vital means of communication. The evidence is plentiful of concentrated power. When existing networks forbid their affiliate stations to utilize national programs from any other source, they close the door of opportunity to new enterprise in this field. When they insist upon 5-year contracts for this purpose, they effectively bolt the same door, and any hope of creating new networks is virtually destroyed. Surely Congress never intended to grant such monopolistic privileges to three broadcasting chains.

Of course, the rules now adopted by the F. C. C. should have been put into effect before the present network systems came into being. Lack of foresight in the past, however, is no reason to perpetuate relations that encourage monopoly. Rules similar to those included in the present order have already been applied to television and frequency modulation. And their application to existing radio broadcasting systems cannot be postponed indefinitely because important readjustments will be required. All that can be reasonably asked is that the Commission afford ample time for effectuation of the changes. Competition is still the mainspring of our economic system, even though there is need to prevent competition from degenerating into mere chaos.

Aid to Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. H. SCHWARTZ

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. HENRY L. STIMSON

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered on May 6 over a Nationwide radio network by Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, on the subject of aid to Britain.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 7, 1941]

TEXT OF STIMSON ADDRESS—SECRETARY OF WAR SAYS LIFELINE TO BRITAIN MUST BE PROTECTED

(Following is the text of Secretary of War Stimson's radio address last night:)

You will excuse a word of preface as to the personal position from which I speak. Today I am being called a warmonger by some of those who oppose our present efforts at national defense. As a matter of fact, for many years after the Great War, both as a private citizen and as Secretary of State, I labored with my full strength for the establishment of a reign of law among the nations by which their controversies should be settled by judicial methods instead of force. There was a time when such a movement seemed full of hope. Today that time has passed—temporarily, we trust—and our hopes for peace have been dashed by international aggression. The world is facing so great a crisis that all our efforts must be turned toward the defense of our Nation's safety. For that reason tonight I am speaking of that crisis and of our defense in meeting it.

In 1933 a group of men under the leadership of Adolf Hitler obtained possession of the Government of Germany and overthrew the German Republic. Mr. Hull, our Secretary of State, has recently well described the methods of those men as the methods of barbarism. Both within and without Germany they have set back the clock of time more than five centuries. They have embarked on a scheme of conquest which is avowedly intended to be world wide. For that purpose they have built up in secret an immense military machine based on the forced labor of Germany. They have already attacked, conquered, and occupied Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, France, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia, and have reduced the people of those 13 countries to a condition of semislavery to the Nazi despotism. They have attached to their Axis as vassals 2 other nations dominated by the same purpose of military conquest—Italy, guilty of unprovoked attacks upon Ethiopia, Albania, and Greece; and Japan, guilty of a similar attack upon her neighbor, China.

NAZIS BATTER DOWN DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

By this conquest they have destroyed the western civilization, which had been slowly building up in Europe ever since the Dark Ages. We are so close to these happenings that we can hardly yet realize the havoc which has thus been wrought both within and without the national boundaries of that unhappy continent. For example, for many centuries humanity has slowly been building up the rule of individual freedom in all its various manifestations; freedom of the person, including the abolition of serfdom and chattel slavery; freedom of the mind, including the freedom to think and talk and to write with our fellows; freedom of enterprise in our business and commerce; freedom to travel about the world with ever-growing liberty; and, finally, the crowning freedom of all—political freedom in respect to the choice of our governments.

This growth in freedom had been so long and so steady that we had come to believe it was soon to be the recognized system of the whole world. All at once it has been dashed aside and trampled on by these Nazi rulers who are proposing to establish a world order in which they shall be the masters and the people of all other nations their slaves.

They have left no such thing as individual rights or liberty within their territory or international rights of independence without their territory. Both domestic and international law have gone down under their blows. For the rule of law they have substituted the rule of the gestapo, the secret police under whose malign terrorism no vestige of personal freedom is safe.

This is the so-called new order which we face today. It has openly announced its hostility to us and to our order. It has been steadily encircling our western world. Its advance agents are already busy among the republics to the south of us, building strategic air lines through vital portions of that continent and creeping up toward our Panama Canal. Its armed forces are threatening West Africa, looking toward a jumping off place within easy reach of the Brazilian coast. Its propagandists are already vigorously active in our own population.

PLASTIC MINDS OF YOUTH BENT TOWARD INTOLERANCE

Hitler and his military associates have seized their opportunities with uncommon skill. They have used their power to inculcate into the plastic minds of a generation of youth the abhorrent and reactionary doctrines of racial intolerance and hatred of other men. They have taken advantage of modern science to develop in secret, while other nations slept, a mechanized striking force of unprecedented power. They have used every method of duplicity and of propaganda to surprise their victim nations with sudden attack. They now arrogantly confront the world, including ourselves, with the alternative of abject surrender or uncompromising forceful resistance.

I cannot recall that the United States throughout its history—even when it was small and weak—has yielded to such demand. Let us see whether there is any need of changing our policy now. In the first place, this so-called new order of Hitler is not new; and it has not and never will create order in this world. Hitler's regime of brutal lawlessness is merely one of those temporary reactions, which have occurred at intervals during all of man's long history of progress upward.

Since his origin millions of years ago, ambitious men have many times attempted a world-wide conquest over the liberties of their fellow men. But they have never permanently succeeded, and they never will. Hitler has taken advantage of the discontent of a troubled post-war period to impose his rule upon a docile-minded nation which has more than once temporarily yielded its love of liberty to an efficient autocrat. His rise has been facilitated by many an accident which might easily have been prevented. Many an unwary sentinel of liberty has been caught napping at vital moments. But as has always happened before, the progress of man along the path toward freedom will be taken up again and carried forward with new spirit and with fresh knowledge acquired by the unhappy experiences of the past. To be frightened into belief that Hitler had created a new and permanent world order would be as naive as it would be cowardly.

In the next place, let us examine the strategic conditions which must govern our defense against an admittedly serious danger, albeit it is only temporary.

The people of the United States have been greatly blessed by the geographical conditions of their homeland. Two broad oceans lie to the east and west of us, while north and south of us are only friendly nations of whose intentions and power we have no fear. Thus, the instinct of our people in regard to their ocean defense is a sound instinct. There is great possibility of protection in the fact that we have the Atlantic Ocean between us and Europe and the Pacific Ocean between us and Asia. So long as those oceans are under our own or of friendly control, their broad waters constitute an insuperable barrier to any armies which may be built up by would-be aggressor governments. But that condition of friendly control is imperative. If it should be lost, the oceans overnight would become easy channels for the path of attack against us.

LANDING ON HEMISPHERE WOULD THREATEN UNITED STATES

The development of modern air power greatly intensifies this necessity of friendly control of the oceans. It now makes it necessary for us to command not only the reaches of ocean adjacent to our own shores but the entire reach of the oceans surrounding the western continent; for if hostile nations possessing powerful armies and air power can once make a landing on the shores of our weaker neighbor nations either north or south of us, our immunity is gone. It would then become a comparatively simple matter for them to establish air bases within striking distance of the great industrial cities which now fill our country. And the only way in which we could prevent this would be the intolerable method of ourselves maintaining armies large enough to command the areas of our continent for thousands of miles beyond our own borders. Such a condition would transform the good-neighbor relations which now prevail throughout the American republics into the same abhorrent system of forceful domination which we are seeking to keep out of the hemisphere. In short, to the nations of America friendly control of the surrounding oceans is a condition of the reign of freedom and mutual independence which now prevails in that continent.

For over 100 years the control of the Atlantic Ocean has been exercised by the British Fleet. By the Washington treaty of 1922 Great Britain voluntarily consented to parity between her fleet and ours, and thus admitted us to an equal share in that control. The significant feature to us of this century-old condition has been that a country speaking our language, possessing our traditions of individual and legal freedom, and inhabited by a population from which considerably more than 50 percent of our own population is descended, has been accepted by us as a dominant factor in the ocean defense upon which our safety and mode of life depend. During that century we have accommodated our whole method of life to that situation. We have maintained no large standing armies. We have built populous cities upon our seacoast which are easily vulnerable to attack from the Atlantic Ocean. We have, in short, adopted a mode of national life which is dependent upon the continuance of a sea power of which we ourselves feel in no apprehension.

Today that situation is gravely threatened. The British Isles, which have been a fortress against any despotic approach to our shores through the northern reaches of the Atlantic, are threatened both by attacks from the air and blockade from the sea. If their Government should fall either from starvation or from attack, the British Fleet, if it survived at all, would have no adequate base for its continued operations. If the British Isles should fall, all of the great shipyards of Britain would pass into the hands of the aggressor nations, and their maritime shipbuilding capacity, thus augmented, would becomes six or seven times as large as our own. Under such conditions our own fleet would be quite unable to protect the Western Hemisphere from the overwhelming sea power which would then confront it. Even today its tonnage is exceeded by the combined tonnage of the Axis Powers, and, with the enormous preponderance in building capacity which they would then have, command of the entire seas surrounding us would in time inevitably pass into their hands.

BRITAIN'S THINLY SPREAD FORCES GIVE AMERICA PRECIOUS TIME

Furthermore we have only just begun to build up our military and air defenses. At least a year will pass before we can have an army and an air force adequate to meet the air and ground forces which could be brought against us if the control of the seas passes into Axis hands. Ten months ago we began to build up those air and ground defenses and the progress which has thus far been made has been satisfactory and has surpassed our expectations. But the stubborn fact remains that an adequately constructed and trained air force and army in a country of this size cannot be created in less than a minimum of 2 years fit to meet the air forces and army which Germany has been spending 6 years in producing. Time is the essential factor and time cannot be had if sea power is lost. Today the wide-flung forces of the British Navy are threatened in the North Atlantic, the Mediterranean, and in Malaysia. Those thinly spread forces today alone are securing to us that precious time.

None of these facts are new. They have been unfolded before the eyes of us all, if we would take the trouble to read the lesson. They have been the motive of the policy and action of our Government thus far and our people understand them and have approved the course which the Government has so far followed. Not only have enormous appropriations been passed by the Congress for our own defense but a statute, the so-called Lease and Lend Act, has been passed expressly for the purpose of furnishing aid to Britain and those other beleaguered nations whose defense the Congress has deemed necessary to our own defense. Under that act seven billion more dollars have been appropriated to effectuate that assistance. All of these statutes have been passed by overwhelming majorities.

Now, it is becoming every day more clear that all this alone is not sufficient. The lifeline of Great Britain is threatened. The high-water mark of the Nazi effort is at hand in the shape of an attack on the shipping which furnishes Britain with the means and the nourishment to maintain her battle. Not only does the blockade imperil the delivery to Great Britain of the munitions which we are sending her, but the supplies of food necessary for her population are already becoming gradually impaired. What are we going to do about it?

CAN TURN DARKNESS TIDE BACK FROM OUR WORLD

By the grace of fortune this most dangerous threat on all the threatening horizon is an attack which, if we will, we can successfully meet. While we are struggling to build up an uncompleted Army and an uncompleted air force, we have at our hands a naval instrument prepared and ready for just such an emergency in our defense. Right now, at this crossroads of history, it is within our power, if we choose to use that instrument, to turn the tide of darkness back from the Atlantic world, and while it is thus held in check, to gain the means which will preclude it forever from attaining its full purpose. For many years we have been building and maintaining this Navy. We call it our first line of defense. It has been our pride. In it are serving in the cause of patriotism the flower of our young manhood. If today that Navy should make secure the seas for the delivery of our munitions to Great Britain, it will render as great a service to our own country and to the preservation of American freedom as it has ever rendered in all its glorious history. Supplementing the efforts of the British Navy, it can render secure all of the oceans, north and south, west and east, which surround our continent. In that way it can help to hold in check the onward rush of the tide of nazi-ism

until the other defense forces of all the democracies are completed. This would eventually and permanently confine the malign forces of despotism until the virus has run its course and the tide of freedom has begun to rise again.

On the other hand, if our Navy's assistance should be withheld until the power of the British Fleet and nation is broken, its own power of execution would at once shrink to but an impotent fraction of what it could do at the present moment. If we should allow the present strategic moment to pass until the power of the British Navy is gone, the power of our Navy would become merely a secondary power instead of the decisive and winning power in the world contest. Is it conceivable that the American people would allow this to happen? After the carefully determined course which we have pursued until this moment; after the clear statements and appeals which have been made by our President in respect to the danger which confronts us; after the overwhelming response to his appeals which has been made by the Congress; after we have taken our place definitely behind the warring democracies and against the aggressor nations in the defense of our freedom; after providing for billions worth of munitions to carry on that defense and while we hold in our hands the instrument ready and able to make all these steps effective, shall we now flinch and permit these munitions to be sunk in the Atlantic Ocean? Our entire history shows no precedent to make such a supposition credible. Neither the Government nor people of the United States have ever given occasion to make anyone believe that such an act of irresponsibility and indecision would be possible.

The unrestricted submarine warfare which Germany is carrying on in the North Atlantic, sinking ships without warning and without the possibility of saving the lives of their crews, is not a legal blockade under the rules of marine warfare. It has never been recognized as lawful by the United States. America's spokesmen at international conferences have again and again condemned it as a form of piracy. It was expressly the violation of law and humanity involved in unrestricted submarine warfare which in 1917 caused the President and Congress to take up arms in defense of the freedom of the seas. Today Germany by these same illegal means is not only seeking to frighten our commerce and our vessels from the Atlantic, she has extended even into the Western Hemisphere a zone into which she has forbidden us to enter. Hitler has not only torn up all the rules of international law, but he is expanding his lawless activities into our own hemisphere.

READINESS TO SACRIFICE NECESSARY TO SAVE FREEDOM

Our Government is acting with care and prudence. But our own self-defense requires that limits should be put to lawless aggression on the ocean. The President has said that we must not allow the steps which we have already taken to become ineffective.

I do not minimize the danger which confronts us. This is an occasion for grave seriousness, but not for gloom or despondency. I have studied the military potency of the Axis Powers and I do not underestimate the courage of their men in battle. But I also know well the initiative, the ready aptitude, and the courage of the men of this country. I have become familiar with the plans which are being made by our military and naval leaders for our defense. Provided that we all act with promptness and a united spirit, I have full faith in the outcome.

But I am not one of those who think that the priceless freedom of our country can be saved without sacrifice. It cannot. That has not been the way by which during millions of years humanity has slowly and painfully toiled upward toward a better and more humane civilization. The men who suffered at Valley Forge and won at Yorktown gave more than money to the cause of freedom.

Today a small group of evil leaders have taught the young men of Germany that the freedom of other men and nations must be destroyed. Today those young men are ready to die for that perverted conviction. Unless we on our side are ready to sacrifice and, if need be, die for the conviction that the freedom of America must be saved it will not be saved. Only by a readiness for the same sacrifice can that freedom be preserved.

Federal Communications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article in the Evening Star of yesterday regarding a recent ruling of the Federal Communications Commission.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 7, 1941]

CENSORSHIP PATH OPENED BY F. C. C.—USURPATION SEEN IN LATEST DECREE ON BROADCASTING

(By David Lawrence)

Hardly more than a year ago—on March 25, 1940—a unanimous opinion of the Supreme Court, written by Justice Roberts, explained the law of radio and ruled that the licensing power of the Federal Communications Commission was limited solely to the allocation of mechanical facilities.

This opinion becomes pertinent now because the Commission last Friday issued an order which will virtually demoralize if not destroy the business of network broadcasting and program distribution in America. The Commission was never given such authority in the law itself, and yet more than 400 radio stations today face a penalty—the loss of their licenses—if they do not comply with the Commission's order to break up their existing program service.

Here is what the Supreme Court said, in part:

"The Communications Act does not essay to regulate the business of the licensee. The Commission is given no supervisory control of the programs, of business management, or of policy. In short, the broadcasting field is open to anyone, provided there is an available frequency (wave length) over which he can broadcast without interference to others, if he shows his competency, the adequacy of his equipment, and financial ability to make good use of the assigned channel. * * *

"Plainly it is not the purpose of the act to protect a licensee against competition, but to protect the public. Congress intended to leave competition in the business of broadcasting where it found it, to permit a licensee who was not interfering electrically with other broadcasters to survive or succumb according to his ability to make his programs attractive to the public."

HALTS NATIONAL SERVICE

And yet five out of the seven members of the Commission in their latest decree tell the stations that they will lose their licenses unless they change their present relationships with the network companies. National service, as the public has enjoyed it, must now be superseded by a purely local hit-or-miss scheme and no network can make an arrangement to sell its time for specified hours to a group of stations, even though the local station wants to do it that way and the public wants that kind of service.

The Commission has repeatedly licensed radio stations under the present system and a network series of programs has been built up which renders the American people satisfactory service, but the Commission, suddenly out of a clear sky, upsets the whole arrangement of 12 years and threatens not to renew licenses unless its edict is complied with.

Entirely apart from such mischievous use of governmental power to break down the stability of a business operation by means of the licensing authority—arrogating to itself powers not granted or delegated by Congress—is the fact that the Commission really endeavors to say what should or should not be broadcast over the air. It even hints in its latest report that it will control the talent participating in the programs.

OPENS WAY TO CENSORSHIP

If the licensing privilege in government extends to any such abuse, then the Government may set up censorship any time, not merely of the radio but of the newspapers. The second-class mail privilege is a form of license. The courts have ruled that it must not be used to decide what shall be printed, but it will be easy, once the Communications Commission has established a precedent, for a Government department to say how the newspaper business shall be conducted. In fact, the first step has been taken already by the Federal Communications Commission in threatening to refuse to permit newspapers to own broadcasting stations. There is no authority in law which allows the F. C. C. to discriminate as between citizens or companies in the granting of licenses, but once usurpation goes unchecked, the liberties of the people are gradually whittled away in other directions, too.

These words of Commissioners Case and Craven, who voted against the latest decree, are a clear warning against the fascism that's in the making in Washington:

"On the whole, radio broadcasting has an excellent record of public service. * * * Radio is so constituted that it is sensitive to public criticism and responds promptly to changing public tastes. For this Commission, or any agency of government, to attempt to substitute its judgment for that of the public involves an arrogant presumption which should be avoided at all costs. * * *
* * *

"It can be argued with logic that invasion of this economic field by the licensing authority in the absence of clear legal mandate would constitute an inevitable prelude to the second step of assuming the role of arbiter of public tastes.

"Circumstances may require the Federal Government to exercise broad powers in many fields of our economic life, but it is imperative that broadcasting be maintained as a free American institution."

NO NEED OF THREAT

Not content with a formal threat to revoke licenses unless its orders are obeyed, the F. C. C. now has turned over its report to the Justice Department for study and presumably prosecution. This is where the whole matter should have gone in the first place. The Sherman anti-trust laws apply to everybody. There was no need to threaten

to revoke licenses. But this is the era of arbitrary and capricious bureaucracy which ignores the statutes of Congress and stipulates its own penalties irrespective of the fact that there are no words in the law granting such punitive powers. No hearing was even given interested parties before the order was promulgated.

Is this the kind of democracy the American people are asked to tax themselves for and perhaps give the lives of their sons? President Roosevelt appointed these commissioners and he has encouraged the punitive practices of governmental commissions by refusing to sign the Logan-Walter bill, passed last session by an overwhelming majority of both Houses of Congress—a measure designed to curb the usurpers of governmental power.

British and American Civil-Service Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

ARTICLE BY GEORGE D. RILEY

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "U. S. and Us," by George D. Riley, published in the Washington Times-Herald of May 4, 1941.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 4, 1941]

U. S. AND US

(By George D. Riley)

MANY PARALLELS CAN BE DRAWN IN COMPARING BRITISH AND AMERICAN CIVIL SERVICE PLANS—ENGLAND FORBIDS PUBLIC EMPLOYEES JOINING LABOR UNIONS AND SCHOLARS GET THE CALL FOR GOOD-PAY JOBS

Last Sunday U. S. and Us related the intense efforts being made to interlock the American and British civil-service methods and administrative procedures into one common pattern. It was pointed out that several foundations are at work to bring about a close coordination between the two nations.

It was recalled that Cecil Rhodes originated the foundation plan whereunder American scholars were to complete their studies at Oxford. It was Rhodes' purpose that such scholars were returned to this country to preach a close understanding between these countries and advancement of international cohesion.

In return today, the Rockefeller Foundation is bringing from England to these shores highly selected students at its expense, while Nelson Rockefeller is coordinator of cultural relations with the Latin-American republics.

It is appropriate at this juncture to draw the parallels between the public services in the United States Government and those in the British civil service, both as they presently exist and as they are about to exist. Here are the main features in rough outline:

1. In England it is extremely difficult for a man to enter the administrative class of government without these connections: Education from Oxford or Cambridge, family background, money. Experience is a handicap for entrance into this class service.

FAMILY BACKGROUND AND MONEY

In the United States, education at one, two, or three selected schools having apparent association or affinity with Oxford and Cambridge is highly to be desired in the Federal administrative service. Those with family background and sufficient finances go far toward acquiring the all-important educational background demanded for the British civil service of the administrative class.

The British Foreign Office employs the oral-examination method of finding the man for the job. So does our own State Department. In England it is maintained that examinations are open to all, in the democratic manner, yet the entrance examination always has been expressly designed to find the "fortunate few who can manage to get to Oxford or Cambridge." This is the statement of Prof. W. A. Robson, civil-service authority in London and author of four works on the subject.

In the United States experience increasingly is a handicap for one who would enter the public service except those in the crafts and trades. It has come to the point here where the Civil Service Commission on more than one occasion has proposed that a fee be charged all who would aspire to take examinations. In England there is a charge, a stiff fee, for taking examinations, so steep, in fact, that charge is so great at times that, to quote from the Minutes of Evidence of the Royal Commission on the Civil Service (1929–31), we read:

"In no way facetiously it may be said that expense probably deters many candidates from Scottish universities. Besides the £8 fee, for sitting from the examinations, there is the expense of renting 'dugs' in London, and with the large number of candidates for the places to be filled many young people from over the Tweed do not care to risk a trial."

2. The Reed committee recently called, by a 4 to 3 vote, for a board of attorney examiners who will instruct the Civil Service Commission what to do. This is known as plan A or the Frankfurter plan, which has just been endorsed and ordered by the President to become effective.

ATTORNEY BOARDS SIMILAR

In England the Civil Service Commission is an appendage dangling in air, with little more than a record-keeping prerogative. It, too, has its board of lawyers, and each agency has its establishments division, each subordinate to the Treasury. The Treasury Establishments Division controls all other such units in all other departments.

Even as Chairman Reed and his three committeemen demand for this Government, the British Civil Service Commission approves the findings of the board of lawyers as well as the decision of the departments. This is the same scheme we are about to launch in the Federal service.

3. The British bureaucracy devises its own legislative proposals to be submitted to Parliament, generally through their own ministers. In the United States legislation is credited with having been written in executive branches by the "brain trust," Ben Cohen, Tommy Corcoran, James Landis, all from Harvard, and by Rexford Tugwell, from Columbia.

"Students of British Government have frequently pointed out the enormous—to many of them alarming—degree to which Parliament has abdicated its legislative duty in favor of departmental regulation," says Hiram Miller Stout. "Writing of this 'wholesale transference of control from Parliament to the departments,' Professor Laski has said, 'legislation by reference and by delegation has taken the place of the older method which regulated with a jealous precision each item of official activity * * *'."

THE INTERN SYSTEM

4. England has its "assistant principals" system. In this country we refer to them as "interns." The latter are hand-selected through the Rockefeller Fund-financed National Institute of Public Affairs, which lays deep stress on Phi Beta Kappa background. Prof. F. M. Davenport, who by coincidence is director of all the organized personnel chiefs, also is director of this intern-picking potentially quasi public bureau.

The young bureaucrats selected by the N. I. P. A. are sent abroad into the various agencies of Government, payless on the part of the Government. Some of them stick. Others use these openings for stepping stones to business jobs. This hothouse arrangement for picking public servants has its roots, not in the United States but in Great Britain, for we read:

"Men and women so recruited (as assistant principals) should be regarded as a cadet corps from which selection should be made to higher administrative posts, and members of this corps should be treated, so far as practicable, as a body available for service in any department in which the administrative class is employed."

This excerpt is from the report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Civil Service in England, February 17, 1920. The Reed committee has endorsed this selfsame interne-principal-assistant operation. In the British Treasury the future main bureaucrats are trained upon transfer from other departments and personnel control. In our own Government the Budget Bureau has arrogated this task and has called in men from various agencies.

Establishment of the British Treasury is identical with our Budget Bureau. An example is the labor-displacing method of Budget Bureau which only recently installed a $12,000 machine to displace human hands. Budget Bureau does its best work, whether as an efficiency bureau or labor-saving device force in the atmosphere of anonymity, as prescribed by the Brownlow committee in 1937. This keep-your-heads-down basis has its counterpart in the British Treasury. Few today can name offhand the permanent secretary of the British Treasury, who also is head of the British Civil Service.

In the United States everything pertaining to personnel must bottleneck initially through Budget Bureau: Hours (staggered), salary formulas promotions.

An Appeal Addressed to the German People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

LETTER TO THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication, which was printed in the Christian Science Monitor of Tuesday, May 6, 1941:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of May 6, 1941]

AN APPEAL ADDRESSED TO THE GERMAN PEOPLE

To the Christian Science Monitor:

Your readers may be interested in an appeal to be addressed to the German people

that a group of Germans in the United States plan to broadcast as the first in a series of messages to Germany.

A translation of the appeal, in part, follows:

"In this earnest hour we speak to you, fellow countrymen in the homeland, and beseech you, for the sake of our beloved country, for the sake of Europe, and of all humanity, to heed our message. As free Germans, we speak to you because our conscience and our faith in a better Germany to come commands us to speak.

"Hitler tells you: Soon there will be peace, and you will be the masters of Europe. We tell you: As long as Hitler commands German destiny there will be no peace.

"Hitler tells you: There is no alternative left for Germany but victory under his banner or a crushing defeat that will destroy Germany as a proud and independent nation. We tell you: There are many men in America and Britain who recognize that grave mistakes have been made by their own Governments in the past. They know as well as we know that lasting peace cannot come to Europe without the voluntary and wholehearted cooperation of the Germany people.

"Hitler tells you that the National Socialist revolution is bound to win the fight against the dying forces of capitalism and democracy. We tell you: The pressing social tasks of our age can be achieved through other means than the Gestapo terror. Germany's position in the world will be established through finer means than the military conquest of weaker neighbors. We tell you: The respect for the dignity of man and man's love for decency will never die.

"Our message to you, German countrymen, is that there lies before us a great and unique opportunity to build a new Germany and a new Europe—a world free of social oppression and vindictive persecution. The Christian tradition of Germany, the wealth of her social experiences, the energy and industry of the German people oblige them to play a role of leadership on the European Continent, but leadership in peace, in justice, and in progress.

"Many of you have come to join Hitler's legions or to acquiesce in his regime from clean and irreproachable motives. In the bare and hopeless hours after the first World War many of us thought we saw a ray of hope in the promises of national revival and social justice of the National Socialists. Many of you, in the years after 1933, saw and felt at first only the good sides of the Nazi revolution, the abolition of unemployment, the advance towards national unity and the like. You did not want to see its dangers and evil sides. Yet—

"Each time during these last 8 years that I returned to that sacred place that is home I found fewer and fewer among you who still knew how to smile and to be happy, as you once were, in spite of many cares and hardships, in those difficult but much maligned 14 years of the Weimar Republic.

"I remember with what gloomy and awesome apprehension we listened to Hitler's voice when he gave the command to invade Poland. With the same bitter and sad earnestness as last spring, you now prepare for a great assault upon a people that you do not hate and that does not hate you.

"Countrymen, in this late and somber hour we ask you once more to pause and to consider well the course of action you will take. Before you lies a grave and fateful alternative—the choice perhaps between disaster and survival. You still have an opportunity to separate yourselves from the man who is driving you and all of Europe into darkness and despair."

HANS SCHMIDT.

CHICAGO.

Is America To Go to War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared on May 5, 1941, in the Chicago Daily Tribune, entitled "Is America To Go To War?" having particular reference to the censorship and the reign of terror being established in Miami, Fla.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of May 5, 1941]

IS AMERICA TO GO TO WAR?

CLAUDE PEPPER'S Florida seems to have beat the gun and gone to war on its own account. The city manager of Miami, L. L. Lee, refused to allow the America First Committee to hold a meeting in Bayfront Park, where recently the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies was given a permit and Douglas Fairbanks, Jr., spoke.

The members of the America First Committee then sought the use of the Dade County courthouse, where public meetings have been held. The county commissioners refused the request, and one of the commissioners, with the approval of the others, said that the America First Committee was a subversive organization. Another commissioner added that organizations fighting national policy should not be encouraged.

The Florida officials can say that they are only following the example of the White House in describing the opponents of American entry into the war as treasonable. The distinguished Americans who head the America First Committee, men of long patriotic service, have been referred to in official Washington circles in terms which would imply that they were seditiously interfering with their country's cause in time of war.

The advocates of immediate war have jumped to the assumption that the Nation is now in it and that consequently any disagreement with governmental policies is in effect traitorous. If the people generally could be brought to accept such a theory, the opprobrium attached to the opposition might act as a suppression of free speech in a time when freedom of opinion and expression is most needed.

There is an issue before the American people, and most of them recognize it as one of the most serious in their recent history. Mr. Roosevelt has some fixed policies, the objectives of which become clearer every day. For some of them he has the consent of Congres, for others he still lacks that. The questions are in debate in Congress and they are being discussed all over the country.

The opposition to Mr. Roosevelt's program of direct armed intervention in the war consists of many men and women distinguished in public and private life. Many of them have service records which cannot be equaled by the party supporting war. The division is not upon party lines, although a majority of the Republicans in Congress are opposed to the Roosevelt policy when it goes beyond the Western Hemisphere.

No one is opposed to the protective measures being taken for the defense of the United States. The only criticism is of the delays and the mistakes which have slowed down the preparations described as of such imperative emergency.

The question about which honest men can differ involves the use to be made of the national resources as they are assembled in the armed forces. Patriotic men and women believe that the future of the country is best protected by building up defense and staying out of the war for which the country is not prepared. There are other people who no doubt sincerely believe that this involves dangers which would be minimized by helping the British now to defeat Hitler's Nazi forces. If such people are sincere and thoughtful, they do not regard the man who sees the other side as a traitor. They must themselves at times have their doubts. We all lack an exact and error-proof vision of the future.

The primary requirement in the forming of opinion and the making of decisions is that the motive be wholly one devoted to the security and well-being of the American people, now and in the future. That is an obligation particularly imposed upon persons in authority. The right to debate this momentous question is one of the guaranteed rights of American citizenship and the attempt to deny it by intimidation and vilification is one highly charged with the sort of rule which has blighted so large a part of the world.

This country is not supporting the rights of freemen by trying to suppress them.

Roosevelt at Wilson's Birthplace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem written by Horace C. Carlisle, of Alabama:

ROOSEVELT AT WILSON'S BIRTHPLACE

We are meeting today to rededicate here
A unique shrine of freedom upon
This rare spot, to the hearts of Americans dear,
Where, aback in the days that are gone,
Woodrow Wilson was born into being on earth,
To transcend the surroundings of his humble birth,
And become a great leader, to history worth
More and more, as the ages move on.

To the faith that is in us are we, by this act,
Bearing witness that we, trusting still
In democracy's freedom, a recognized fact,
Will continue to fight for it till
All the covetous wars raging elsewhere shall cease,
And the pris'ners of war all are granted release,
And the nations of earth, that are praying for peace,
Learn to live in accord with God's will.
In the quiet of this Presbyterian manse

Woodrow Wilson's foundation was laid—
Here he learned how to master adverse circumstance,
On his knees, while his own father prayed
For the wisdom, past all understanding, that comes
From Him who pinned the stars in the highest of domes,
Yet supplies all the needs in the humblest of homes,
And keeps those dwelling there unafraid.

In the tragic conflict which we witness today,
Threat'ning everything that we most love,
More than ever, we ought, as a people, to pray
For the spirit that comes from above—
For the spiritual growth of the human race stands
As a gage for the hopes of its mind and its hands—
When it moves in accordance with God's just demands,
His "amen" justifies every move.

At a time when world councils were reeking with greed,
Woodrow Wilson had vision to see,
Through it all, God's sublime handiwork, and the need
For more faith in the God of the Free;
And—although selfish men neither would nor could share
In this vision of his, that all men everywhere
Not learn war any more—in the land, sea, or air,
He contended that war should not be.

Woodrow Wilson in lasting remembrance will we
Ever hold, after others who fought
For material gain or revenge cease to be—
Like the conquests that they vainly sought—
It is good for Americans that this manse where
Woodrow Wilson was born, as love's answer to prayer,
Will be kept as a shrine—in democracy's care—
In the land of the brave and the free.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Editorials on Current Events

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

EDITORIALS FROM MINNESOTA LABOR ADVOCATE, PORTLAND (OREG.) JOURNAL, AND SALEM (OREG.) CAPITAL PRESS

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three brief editorials, each on a subject very pertinent to current events.

The first is an editorial entitled "A Crazy Money System," from the Minnesota Labor Advocate.

The second is an editorial from the Portland (Oreg.) Journal, under the caption "Those who believe that nothing stops the mail are given something to think about in the Montgomery Ward case."

The third is an editorial by A. M. Church, editor of the Capital Press, of Salem, Oreg., under the caption "Who will light the torch?"

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minnesota Labor Advocate]

A CRAZY MONEY SYSTEM

The Federal Reserve Board urges the restriction of money and credit to prevent price inflation, and some bankers are echoing the same sentiments. The view is that millions of workers will be set to earning wages and receiving buying power which will stimulate a demand for commodities which will mean that prices of goods, wares, and merchandise will go up and the price of the dollar will go down and those whose wealth consists of legal-tender cash and money due would lose in the process, and they want to keep money scarce and dear.

Jesse Jones, of the R. F. C. and Secretary of Commerce, takes the opposite view, and said he would continue to lend money when the bankers refused to make loans, and that with the enormous increase of production and exchange there was need for a like increase in the medium of exchange.

Now, what kind of a financial system have we when eminent leaders like those mentioned differ on such a vital matter? Is it not evident that we should take out of private hands the issue and control of money and its representative, public credit, and place it in control of a public, impartial court with facilities to determine the amount of currency necessary to meet the needs of the Nation at different times so that we may have an adequate and stable currency to avoid the course of inflation and deflation?

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Journal]

THOSE WHO BELIEVE THAT NOTHING STOPS THE MAIL ARE GIVEN SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT IN THE MONTGOMERY WARD CASE

"Neither snow nor rain nor gloom of night stays these couriers from their appointed rounds."

The United States Post Office Department borrowed this tribute given 2,400 years ago to the messengers of the King of Persia. The line is proudly emblazoned across the front of the post office in Washington, D. C.

Every postal employee—railway mail clerk, rural delivery man, or city mail carrier—seeks to make the slogan effective, just as do the veteran troupers when they say, "The show must go on."

And most Americans, proud of their service, also believe "nothing stops the mail."

But in Portland it wasn't snowing on May day; it wasn't gloom, as days lengthen, that restricted parcel-mail delivery to the Montgomery Ward & Co. mail order and retail store, which restriction is assigned by the company as one of the reasons for closing the plant and the releasing of 1,375 employees.

On the surface, the cause was the accumulation of mail beyond the delivery facilities of the Portland post office. But there has been going on since December 7, 1940, a strike at the Montgomery Ward place of business (in which the Post Office Department maintains the Wardway postal substation). Truck lines, railway express, and the railroads suspended service in order not to cross picket lines.

The situation has a precedent, but scarcely a parallel. In June 1937, restrictions were placed upon delivery of packages of food to the Republic Steel Co. in Cleveland. Somewhat the same action was taken at the Chrysler plant in Detroit. At both places strikes were in progress. But in each of these cases a new and extraordinary parcel-post service was involved, one that, had it been given by postal authorities, could have borne a strike-breaking label.

The Post Office Department, by restricting delivery of mail to the Montgomery Ward plant to the normal amount, may avoid the charge that it recognizes a picket line and that it is lending its facilities to one party in a labor dispute.

Montgomery Ward, in its effort to carry on, may have increased the volume of incoming mail to abnormal proportions and yet offered for delivery only mailable material meeting the requirements of postage length, breadth, and weight.

If the order in the Montgomery Ward case is forwarded from the Post Office Department in Washington, D. C., solely because of accumulation of mail, the subject becomes interesting to all agencies concerned with getting and maintaining industry and employment. Emergency delivery facilities might be organized.

But if it was given for any other reason, the reminder is due that when Lincoln spoke of "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," he meant all the people.

[From the Salem (Oreg.) Capital Press]

WHO WILL LIGHT THE TORCH?

There is no question but that this war, and all other wars, are caused by greed—the profit motive. As long as uncontrolled greed exists we will have wars. Will we have to adopt government ownership of everything or establish some sort of a socialistic world in order to banish greed and thus secure peace? There must be, somehow, somewhere, a less drastic way to curb man's inhumanity to man. The fecund and generous earth offers easy and luxurious living to everybody, but men and governments greedily reach beyond their necessities and try to grab the substance of others. Could they be satisfied with comfort and happy living and banish cupidity, there would be no wars. But men are stubborn. It seems that it should be easy to induce them to revamp their mental attitudes and thus escape war and turmoil and live happily; but try it and you'll be surprised at their reactions. Most of them will not even understand what you are talking about, and those who do will brusquely brush it aside with the time-worn inanity: "You can't change human nature," which is utterly false, for human nature has been changing and improving, slowly but surely, ever since the world began.

Well, the people of the world have their choice. They can stop following the false gods of avarice and cupidity and live happily in peace, or they can continue to kill each other off and postpone the brotherhood of man. Eventually peace and common sense will win, but it may take a long time. Incidentally, peace will not be brought about without a great spiritual reawakening couched on the teachings of the Prince of Peace. Where is the great evangel who shall light the torch?

Steps Toward War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE GRAND RAPIDS (MICH.) PRESS

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Grand Rapids Press of May 5, 1941:

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press of May 5, 1941]

STEP BY STEP

The calendar of steps toward war taken by this country since the outbreak of hostilities in Europe on September 1, 1939, offers an interesting study. It reveals how one step leading to another may carry a nation to the very brink. Some of the major dates are as follows:

October 1939: Establishment of neutrality zone around the Americas—first conceived as a step to keep the war away from America but now used as a means of taking patrols to the very zones of war.

November 3, 1939: Repeal of the arms embargo of the Neutrality Act.

May 1940: Congressional authorization of transfer of 119 Government-owned ships to Britain.

June 6, 1940: Announcement of trade-in policy by which old stocks of munitions were turned in for delivery to Britain.

August 1940: Arrangements for joint defense with Canada.

September 3, 1940: Transfer of 50 overage destroyers to Britain in exchange for naval-base sites.

March 11, 1941: Lease Lend Act approved. A $7,000,000,000 appropriation was adopted soon after to meet the cost. This placed America in the war economically.

March 1941: German, Italian, and Danish ship seizures.

April 1940: Extra-legal acquisition of Greenland base accomplished.

In addition to these steps there have been frequent embargoes on goods which might be used by Axis Powers. Loans through the Export-Import Bank have been directed to antitotalitarian ends. Funds of nations conquered by Germany have been "frozen" so they could not be used by the Axis.

Now there are other steps in process. The patrol of waters has been extended thousands of miles at sea to warn of Axis raiders—a form of convoy in everything but name. It is even suggested that these patrols will be extended into the Far East.

Not all these steps have been belligerent. Some of them would have been dictated even if this country had followed a course of strict neutrality. But on the whole they represent a distinct drift, edging ever closer to the conflict. Just a little more and we will be in it in fact as we are now in everything but manpower.

Ironically these steps have been taken "to keep us out of war," yet every one has brought us closer. It is only now that this pretense is being dropped.

Daylight Saving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1941

SURVEY MADE BY MERCHANTS' ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following survey made by the Merchants' Association of New York with regard to daylight saving:

DAYLIGHT SAVING—COMMUNITIES WHICH ARE ON "SUMMER TIME" FOR THE SEASON OF 1941

The Merchants' Association of New York, which for years has been a leading advocate of daylight saving, receives many inquiries regarding observance of this beneficial measure in the State of New York, throughout the United States and Canada.

To answer such inquiries and for the information of its members, the association has sent out a questionnaire to municipal officials and commercial organizations, from the results of which the following information and listings have been compiled relative to the observance of daylight saving time in New York, other States, and Canada during the current year.

Information is also contained herein regarding practices relative to daylight saving in certain foreign countries.

The most general period of observance in the United States is from 2 a. m., April 27 (the last Sunday in April), until 2 a. m., September 28 (the last Sunday in September). Variations from these dates determinable up to the date of this issue are listed.

Space consideration has prevented the listing of many small communities. Often these take their time from the nearest large center.

NEW YORK CITY

Daylight saving is observed throughout Greater New York, and this practice influences a large area surrounding the city, including all of Long Island, all of Westchester County, the entire State of Connecticut, and the entire State of New Jersey.

NEW YORK STATE

During the last few years the observance of daylight-saving time in New York State has expanded to such a degree that it is now in effect (for the most part, during 5 months of the year) in all communities classified as cities in the State; in practically all communities near those cities and in all other sections of the State, excepting those in which agricultural pursuits are dominant.

The cities are:

Albany, Amsterdam, Auburn, Batavia, Beacon, Binghamton, Buffalo, Canandaigua, Cohoes, Corning, Cortland, Dunkirk, Elmira, Fulton, Geneva, Glen Cove, Glens Falls, Gloversville, Hornell, Hudson, Ithaca, Jamestown, Johnstown, Kingston, Lackawanna, Little Falls, Lockport, Long Beach, Mechanicville, Middletown, Mount Vernon, Newburgh, New Rochelle, New York, Niagara Falls, North Tonawanda, Norwich, Ogdensburg, Olean, Oneida, Oneonta, Oswego, Peekskill, Plattsburg, Port Jervis, Poughkeepsie, Rensselaer, Rochester, Rome, Salamanca, Saratoga Springs, Schenectady, Sherrill, Syracuse, Tonawanda, Troy, Utica, Watertown, Watervliet (April 27–September 7), White Plains, Yonkers.

It is impossible to list all of the communities in New York State that will observe daylight-saving time.

The following localities reported as observing daylight-saving time in response to the Merchants' Association's questionnaire, are listed for the guidance of those using the association's survey of New York State for reference purposes:

Afton (June-September),[1] Albion, Altamont, Arcade (Village), Attica, Bainbridge (June 20-September 1),[1] Baldwinsville, Ballston Spa, Barker, Bath, Belmont, Bergen, Bolivar, Briarcliff Manor, Brockport, Bronxville, Canajoharie, Canastota, Candor (May 4-September 28), Canisteo, Canton (May 31-August 30), Carthage, Catskill, Cedarhurst, Chatham, Cherry Creek, Clayton (June 22-August 31), Clermont (May 1-September 30), Clifton Springs, Clyde, Cobleskill, Cooperstown, Corfu (April 27-September 7), Dannemora, Delanson, Delevan, Delmar, Depew, Deposit (June 1-August 31), Dobbs Ferry, Dolgeville, Dundee, East Aurora, Ellenville, Elmsford, Fairport, Fonda, Fort Edward, Fort Plain, Frankfort, Franklinville, Friendship, (dates not decided), Gallatin, Geneseo, Ghent, Goshen, Gouverneur (May 5-September 11), Gowanda, Granville, Greene, Green Island, Greenport, Hamburg, Hamilton, Harmon, Harrison, Hartsdale, Hastings-on-Hudson, Haverstraw, Herkimer, Hillsdale, Hobart, Hoosick Falls, Howes Cave, Hudson Falls, Hyde Park, Ilion, Interlaken, Irondequoit (April 27-October 4), Irvington, Johnson City (May 4-September 28), Kenmore, Lake George, Lancaster, Larchmont, Lawrence, LeRoy, Liberty, Lindenhurst, Livingston, Livingston Manor, Lowville, Lyons, Malone, (June 15-September 7),[1] Mamaroneck, Massena, Mayville, Medina, Monticello, Mooers (May 1-September 1),[1] Mount Kisco, Newark, New York Mills, Norwood, Nyack, Oriskany, Ossining, Otego (May 18-September 7), Owego (May 4-September 28), Oxford, Painted Post, Palmyra (Village), Pelham, Pelham Manor, Penn Yan, Perry, Pleasantville, Port Chester, Potsdam, Red Hook, Ripley, Richburg, Roscoe, Rouses Point, Rushville, Rye, Saugerties, Scarsdale, Schenevus, Scio, Scotia, Seneca Falls, Sidney, Silver Creek, Silver Springs, South Dayton (April 28-September 2), Spring Valley, Springville, St. Johnsville, Stuyvesant, Suffern, Tarrytown, Ticonderoga, Trumansburg, Tuckahoe, Tupper Lake, Tuxedo, Unadilla, Voorheesville, Walden, Warsaw, Waterford, Waterloo, Wellsville, Westfield, West Lebanon, West Point, Whitesboro, Williamsville, Yorkville (Oneida County).

CONNECTICUT

Daylight saving generally observed throughout the State.

DELAWARE

Daylight saving observed in Wilmington and a number of nearby towns in the northern part of Delaware.

GEORGIA

Entire State of Georgia has been placed on Eastern Standard Time by action of the State legislature. This has the effect of giving daylight saving to a large part of the State which has not had it before.

IDAHO

Cities of Kellogg, Mullan, Wallace, and Burke observe daylight-saving time throughout the entire year by adhering to Mountain Time.

ILLINOIS

Daylight-saving time observed in the Chicago metropolitan area.

INDIANA

Daylight-saving time is observed in practically all of the extreme northern counties of Indiana.

Communities in Indiana reported as observing daylight-saving time include:

Angola, Auburn, Bremen, Crown Point, Culver, East Chicago, Elkhart, Fort Wayne, Garrett, Gary, Goshen, Hammond, Hobart, Kendallville, La Grange, La Porte, Michigan City, Mishawaka, Nappanee, Plymouth, Shipshewana, South Bend, Topeka (May 3-August 30), Valparaiso, Wakarusa, Waterloo, Westville, Whiting, Wolcottville.

At time of going to press, the city council of Indianapolis is considering daylight saving. If it is voted, it will affect surrounding communities.

MAINE

Daylight Saving Time is widely observed in Maine.

Among communities observing Daylight Saving Time as reported in response to the Merchants' Association's questionnaire are the following:

Auburn, Augusta, Bangor, Bar Harbor, Bath (April 20–September 28), Belfast,

[1] Approximate dates.

[1] Approximate dates.

Belgrade, Biddeford, Bingham, Boothbay Harbor, Bridgton, Brunswick, Bucksport, Camden, Cape Elizabeth, Cape Porpoise, Caribou, Damariscotta, Deering Junction, Dexter, Dixfield (May 31–October 15),[1] Dover-Foxcroft, Eastport, Ellsworth, Fairfield, Farmington, Fort Fairfield, Freeport, Gardiner, Goose Rocks Beach, Greenville (April 27–September 8), Guilford, Hallowell, Harrison, Kennebunkport, Lewiston, Lincoln, Madison, Manchester, Mechanic Falls, Milford, Milo, Monson, Mount Desert, Mount Vernon, Naples, Norridgewock, North Anson, North Berwick, North Jay, Norway, Oakland, Ogunquit, Old Orchard Beach, Old Town, Orono, Pittsfield, Poland, Portland, Rangeley (May 1–October 1), Readfield, Rockland, Rumford, Saco, Sanford, Sangerville, Sebec, Skowhegan, Solon (April 27–September 7), South Portland, Thomaston, Waldoboro, Waterford, Waterville, Westbrook, Winthrop, Wiscasset, Woolwich, Yarmouth, York Harbor.

MASSACHUSETTS

Observance required by State law.

MICHIGAN

Under the terms of the State law adopted April 23, 1931, eastern standard time is defined as legal time for the entire State of Michigan.

However, by order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, effective September 27, 1936, only the Lower Peninsula is included in the eastern standard time zone throughout the year.

In the Upper Peninsula, eastern standard time is followed throughout the year in the territories surrounding and east of the following cities and towns:

Calumet, Hancock, Houghton, Manistique, Newberry, St. Ignace, Sault Ste. Marie.

The remainder of the Upper Peninsula observes central standard time, with the exception that from the last Sunday in April to the last Sunday in September of each year eastern standard time (daylight-saving time in that area) is observed in the following communities:

Escanaba, Gladstone, Gwinn, Ishpeming, Marquette, Munising (May 4–September 28), Negaunee, Rapid River.

MINNESOTA

Unofficial observance of daylight-saving time in grain exchange, brokerage houses, and radio station of Minneapolis.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Observance required by State law.

NEW JERSEY

Every city, town, and village in the State observes daylight saving.

OHIO

Entire State in eastern standard time zone throughout the year by order of Interstate Commerce Commission, effective September 27, 1936.

PENNSYLVANIA

The majority of the communities listed below observe daylight-saving time for the period from April 27 to September 28. Variations from these dates were not in all cases determinable up to the date of publication. Daylight-saving time places reported from direct and indirect sources include:

Adamstown, Akron, Aliquippa, Allentown, Ambler, Ambridge, Analomink, Annville, Ardmore, Arnold, Atglen, Bangor, Beaver, Beaver Falls, Bethlehem, Bird-in-Hand, Birdsboro, Boothwyn, Boyertown, Brackenridge, Braddock, Bradford (April 27–September 1), Bristol, Bryn Mawr, Camp Hill, Carlisle, Carnegie, Catasauqua, Center Bridge, Chester, Clairton, Coatesville, Columbia, Conshohocken, Coraopolis, Corry, Cresco, Danielsville, Dauphin, Delaware Water Gap, Devault, Downington, Doylestown, Dravosburg, Duquesne, East Earl, East Liberty, Easton, East Pittsburgh, East Stroudsburg, Eddystone, Edgeworth, Elizabethtown, Emmaus, Enola, Ephrata, Erie, Evans City (May 1–October 1), Fleetwood, Ford City, Franklin, Freemansburg, Freeport, Glenloch, Hamburg, Harrisburg, Hatboro, Hatfield (April 26–September 9),[1] Haverford, Haysville, Henryville, Highspire, Homestead District, Honey Brook, Hummelstown, Jenkintown, Kennett Square, Kittanning, Kutztown, Lancaster, Landisville, Lansdale, Lansdowne, Lebanon, Lemoyne, Leola, Lititz, Manheim, Marcus Hook, Marietta, Mars, Martins Creek, Marysville, Matamoras, McKeesport, Mechanicsburg, Media, Merion (Lower), Middletown, Midland, Milford, Monaca, Morrisville, Mount Bethel, Mount Joy, Mount Pocono, Munhall, Myerstown, Nazareth, New Brighton, New Holland, New Hope, New Kensington, Newtown, Norristown, Northampton, North Wales, Oaks, Ogden, Oil City, Palmerton, Paoli, Paxtang, Pen Argyl, Penbrook, Pennsburg, Perkasie, Philadelphia, Phoenixville, Pitcairn, Pittsburgh, Plymouth Meeting, Pocono Manor, Port Allegany, Pottstown, Pottsville, Quarryville, Quakertown, Radnor, Reading, Rochester, Rohrerstown, Royesford, Schuylkill Haven, Schwenksville, Sellersville, Shiremanstown, Skytop, Souderton, South Heights, Spring City (May 1–October 1), Springdale, Steelton, Stockertown, Stroudsburg, Swarthmore, Swissvale, Tarentum, Telford, Temple, Thorndale, Tionesta, Topton, Trainer, Union City, Versailles, Warren, Wayne, West Chester, West Fairview, West Reading, West Willow, Whitford, Wilkinsburg, Willow Grove, Wilmerding, Wind Gap, Wormleysburg, York, Zelienople.

The Merchants' Association is indebted to the Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce for a considerable part of the above list.

RHODE ISLAND

Daylight saving time has been adopted by ordinance in all the cities and most of the towns of Rhode Island between 2 a. m. on the last Sunday in April and 2 a. m. on the last Sunday in September (April 27-September 28).

VERMONT

Large sections of the State of Vermont use daylight saving.

Places from which observance is reported include:

Albany, Andover, Arlington, Bakesfield, Barre, Barnet, Barton, Bartonsville, Bellows Falls, Bennington, Berlin, Bethel, Bloomfield, Braintree, Brandon, Brattleboro, Brighton, Brookfield, Brookline, Burke, Burlington City, Cabot (May 20-September 20), Cambridgeport Canaan, Castleton, Cavendish, Charlotte (May 1-October 1), Chelsea, Chester, Clarendon, Colchester, Concord, Craftsbury, Danby, Danville, Derby, Dorset (generally observed), Dover, Dummerston, Duxbury, Enosburg Falls (village), Fairfax, Fair Haven, Fairlee, Gassetts, Gilman, Grafton, Grand Isle, Granville, Greensboro, Groton, Guilford, Halifax, Hancock, Hardwicke, Hartford, Hartland, Hinesburg (starting April 20), Hyde Park, Irasburg, Jamaica, Jay, Kirby, Lake Bomoseen, Lincoln, Londonderry, Lowell, Ludlow, Lyndonville, Manchester, Marlboro, Middlebury (April 27-October 26), Middlesex, Middletown, Milton, Montgomery, Montpelier City, Moretown, Morgan, Newfane, New Haven, Newport, Northfield, North Hero, North Troy (May 1-October 1), Norwich, Orange, Orleans, Pawlet, Pittsfield, Pittsford, Plainfield, Plymouth, Pomfret, Poultney (May 1-October 1), Pownal, Proctor, Putney, Readsboro, Richford, Richmond (May-October), Rochester, Rockingham, Roxbury, Royalton, Rupert, Rutland, Ryegate, St. Albans City, St. Johnsbury, Saxton's River, Searsburg, Shaftsbury, Sheffield, Shelburne (May-October), Sheldon, South Burlington, South Hero, Springfield, Stamford, Stockbridge, Stowe, Strafford, Swanton, Topsham, Townshend, Tunbridge, Vergennes City, Vershire, Vernon, Waitsfield, Wallingford, Warren, Washington, Waterbury, Weathersfield, Wells, West Fairlee, West Hartford, Westminster, Weston, West Pawlet (generally observed), West Windsor, White River, Whittingham, Williamstown (April 30-October 31), Williston, Wilmington, Windham, Windsor, Winooski, Woodbury, Woodford, Woodstock, Worcester.

A substantial part of the above listing comes from The National Survey, Chester, Vt.

CANADA

In September 1940, just before daylight-saving time was to revert to standard time, the Federal Government, by Order-in-Council under the War Measures Act, ordered those municipalities in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec which had operated on daylight-saving time during the summer of 1940 to continue on fast time indefinitely.

Following are communities listed in last year's survey as observing daylight-saving time:

Province of Ontario

Acton, Arnprior, Aurora, Belleville, Bowmanville Brampton, Brockville, Burlington, Cheltenham, Cobourg, Cooksville, Cornwall, Dundas, Fergus Fort Erie, Fort William, Gananoque, Georgetown, Grimsby, Guelph, Hamilton, Hawkesbury, Islington, Kingston, Leaside, Merritton, Milton, Napanee, Newcastle, Newmarket, Niagara Falls, Oakville, Orillia, Oshawa, Ottawa, Perth, Peterborough, Pickering, Picton, Port Arthur, Port Colborne, Port Hope, Prescott, Richmond Hill, St. Catharines, Smiths Falls, Streetsville, Sudbury, Thorold, Toronto, Trenton, Welland, Weston, Whitby, Woodbridge.

Province of Quebec

Arvida, Aylmer, Beauharnois, Black Lake, Coaticook, Chicoutimi (city and county), Coleraine, Cowansville, Danville, Farnham, Granby, Grand Mere, Hull, Isle Maligne, Joliette, Jonquière, Kénogami, Lachute, La Tuque, Lennoxville, Lévis, Magog, Metis Beach, Mont-Joli, Montreal (metropolitan area), Outremont, Port-Alfred, Quebec City and surrounding district, Richmond, Rimouski, Riverbend, Rivière-du-Loup, St. Hyacinthe, St. Jerome, St. Johns, St. Lambert, St. Raymond, Shawinigan Falls, Sherbrooke, Sorel, Temiscaming, Thetford Mines, Three Rivers, Valleyfield, Verdun, Westmount.

Canadian observance elsewhere:

Province of New Brunswick

Moncton (May 4–September 27), St. John (May 4–September 27).

Province of Nova Scotia

Dartmouth (May 4–September 28), Halifax (May 4–September 28).

Province of Saskatchewan

Estevan (all year 'round), Regina (April 13–October 12), Saskatoon (April 27–October —), Weyburn (May 1–September 30), Yorkton (all year 'round).

Province of British Columbia

Townships from Creston to Crowsnest along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway use Mountain Time throughout the year, although the district is in the Pacific Time zone and, notwithstanding that the railway operates on Pacific Time. The intervening townships between these two termini are listed below alphabetically:

Aldridge, Caithness, Canyon, Colvalli, Cranbrook, Elko, Erickson, Fassiferne, Fernie, Galloway, Goatfell, Hosmer, Jaffray, Jerome, Lumberton, Mayook, McConnell, McGillivray, Michel, Morrissey, Moyie, Natal, Rampart, Ryan, Sparwood, Tochty, Wardner, Yahk.

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

One hour daylight saving provided by statute from May 11 to October 5. Probable advancement of another hour in June.

[1] Approximate dates.

[1] Approximate dates.

FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Cuba, clocks advanced 1 hour June 1 to September 7, 1941.

Egypt, clocks advanced 1 hour April 15 to September 5, 1941.

Estonia (same time as Moscow), clocks advanced indefinitely.

France[1] (unoccupied), clocks advanced 2 hours May 5, 1941.

Germany, clocks advanced 1 hour, indefinitely.

(Occupied France, Netherlands, Belgium, and Denmark are reported on same time as Germany.)

Great Britain,[1] clocks advanced 2 hours May 3 to August 9, 1941.

Greece, clocks advanced 1 hour April 7, 1941.

Hungary, clocks advanced 1 hour April 7, 1941.

Iceland, clocks advanced 1 hour March 1, 1941.

Italy and the Vatican, clocks advanced 1 hour indefinitely.

Latvia (same time as Moscow), clocks advanced indefinitely.

Lithuania (same time as Moscow), clocks advanced indefinitely.

Mexico, clocks advanced 1 hour indefinitely.

New Zealand, clocks advanced 30 minutes September 28, 1941, terminates April 26, 1942.

Norway, clocks advanced 1 hour indefinitely.

Portugal, clocks advanced 1 hour April 5, 1941, probably terminate November 1, 1941.

Shanghai, clocks advanced 1 hour March 16, 1941.

Slovakia, clocks advanced 1 hour April 8, 1941.

Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 9 (legislative day of Thursday, May 8), 1941

EDITORIALS FROM SCRANTON (PA.) TIMES

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several editorials published in the Scranton (Pa.) Times of May 2 and May 5, 1941.

There being no objection the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Times of May 2, 1941]

OUR COUNTRY

To what extent, for practical and effective purposes, can the Government of the United States fulfill its military, naval, and economic commitments on the basis of applying them anywhere and everywhere beyond our own country?

The question is not propounded captiously. It recognizes what is increasingly in the minds of the American people as they witness the experiences of Great Britain and new phases of American policy.

Great Britain's empire is spread all over the map. Of necessity her defensive efforts are spread out pretty thin. Because of her diversity of territorial and economic interests calling for first protection, Great Britain has not been able to help much those allied with her in resisting Axis aggression.

The military force that Great Britain was able to send to Greece was only 60,000. Compared with the threefold forces the Nazis had in the Balkan area, British help for Greece could not have resulted other than in the forced evacuation that attended the British effort, fine and heroic as it was.

Because the British Empire is scattered all over the earth, Great Britain, being undermanned by comparison with Germany, cannot concentrate great forces outside the British Isles themselves to minimize the risks to her own empire and the communications vital to keeping it well knitted. Britain simply cannot give any decisive assistance to what are loosely referred to, here and overseas, as "the democracies."

Glorious resistance and damage inflicted upon an enemy are all to the good, but defeats, if too often, and retreats too prolonged, add to the dynamic qualities of an enemy and do not win battles for those on the defensive regardless of any enforced necessity to remain on the defensive. We in this country must be realistic in thinking things out since we are, more or less, among the pipers and the payers.

We have, to aid Great Britain, diminished our naval forces by 50 torpedo boats, 20 mosquito torpedo boats and 10 fast revenue cutters. Soon 20 more fast armored ships of small tonnage will go over. Fifty tankers, for service to Great Britain, are being assembled today.

We are dispersing troops to Hawaii, Guam, the Philippines and other American possessions in the Pacific and to the new leased bases all the way from Newfoundland north and east of Canada to the semi-Tropics.

We have assumed responsibility for protecting Greenland, a Danish possession. Then, there is South America. The latter is, truly, in our hemisphere. We also have in effect a wide and ranging sea patrol, so that our naval and military forces, are like Great Britain's, becoming more scattered all the time.

Great Britain's greatest and most disturbing peril is not only a Nazi juggernaut. A grave danger of the British people is inherent in Great Britain's many tenuous and undependable political alliances and obligations, in her vast expanse of territory and in her great navy and armies of many races and colors being distributed all over the globe. In this thinment of Great Britain's dispersed power is the signal for the United States not to sprawl itself out too far or bite off more than it can chew. We must have the vision, and courage to think of our own country, too.

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Times of May 5, 1941]

THE REMARKS OF ADOLF HITLER

On this side of the water the people do not believe in any Hitler promises or good intentions, although they aren't scared of him in the slightest.

Because of their contempt for him, based upon his acts, the American people cannot feel the slightest sympathy in what he said in his speech yesterday.

What particularly interests the American people is his disclaimer of having aims and ambitions, or intentions of war, against us.

It is true Hitler has not egged the United States into the war, but he gives notice now that Germany is better than any imaginable coalition that can be brought against her.

What is meant by Hitler is that if this country insists on carrying a chip on its shoulder—which some mighty high Americans have been carrying—Hitler may fight us.

To dwell on what Hitler says today is to warm over yesterday's hash. What interests or should interest our Government and the people is not trying to save the world whether it wishes to be saved or not, but to make the United States Navy, the United States Army and the United States flying service top anything and everything Hitler's got.

The people of this country are chiefly interested in what their Government is doing about the national defense. They feel if that defense is all powerful the American people will be able to finish Mister Hitler if he gets fresh with them. The place to find out that this is the sentiment of the people is not in the war-excited National Capital but out in parts of the country away from Washington.

ONE FROM THE WAR BOOK FOR US

Probably before the day is out the world will witness, in faraway Ethiopia, an incident involving Haile Selassie that is small compared with the terrible events of human slaughter elsewhere, but significant for what it is as a reminder of what a rotten thing is international diplomacy and war.

Haile Selassie was the outstanding civilized blackamoor chief of a half-civilized people in Africa. He sat on the throne of Ethiopia. On the fictitious fraud of the need of more "living room' the Italian state under Benito Mussolini warred upon the barefoot and barely armed Ethiopians.

A perfunctory protest and half-hearted boycott was put on Italy by the League of Nations, but none of the nations in the League nor the United States now being told it should go to war to "save democracy" for the second time in 25 years, got worked up to the point of going to war to save the independent, sovereign, and unoffending black people of Abyssinia. It has never been denied that Laval, Premier of France, and Hoare, of England, gave Mussolini the go signal in Ethiopia.

When the lowly little black King appealed again to the league England told him it couldn't do any more in his behalf. England followed up and recognized Mussolini's crime, or if not a crime his conquest, in Ethiopia.

After a time England had to go to war against Mussolini and Hitler and it needed the black tribes of Selassie. She withdrew "recognition" of the Italian conquest. British troops in that part of Africa and Selassie's tribesmen have now driven the Italians out of most of Ethiopia, so the Lion of Judah reaches Addis Ababa, today it is expected, to sit himself upon his ancient throne.

The case of Ethiopia is one for the book. People in this country being slugged or persuaded, in 57 varieties of ways, to enter a European war, should be interested.

"EVER READY TO FIGHT"

Dedicating a shrine to the memory of Woodrow Wilson, a truly great American, at Staunton, Va., yesterday, President Roosevelt made an important speech, but what the President said about the personality and service of President Wilson will be remembered less than what he said in the following paragraphs:

"We are meeting here today to dedicate a new shrine of freedom. By this action we are bearing true witness to the faith that is in us—simple faith in the freedom of democracy in the world.

"It is the kind of faith for which we have fought before, for the existence of which we are ever ready to fight again."

It is unreservedly possible to agree with the President as to the willingness of the American people to be "ever ready" for preserving their freedom and democracy, if it is their freedom and democracy.

What the American people have a right to see, through the clouds gathering around them, is that the European war is not unlike other European wars. Up to now the war has been shot through with international aims and ambitions that have been characteristically European.

[1] Clocks have been advanced 1 hour since last fall.

Woodrow Wilson, the war President in 1914–18, had to fight tooth and claw with the statesmen of the victorious Allied Powers—although this country's forces brought about the decisive victory—to keep a treaty, since judged by Allied statesmen as well as the Germans as evil in its results, from being worse.

The people are with their President on the abstract proposition of defending democracy, if it is democracy; and with him on the specific proposition of defending American democracy; and with him in making the national defense as it concerns American people, American institutions, and American land, positively certain.

The people of the United States have obediently followed all the persuasions to help "the democracies" with "all-out" aid "short of war," but it is only frank and honest recognition of the truth to say they are not united on becoming a shooting belligerent in another war of and by Europe now and, as with other European wars, for Europe in the end.

What did we get out of the first time we went in to "save democracy"?

The Japanese-American Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 9 (legislative day of Thursday, May 8), 1941

ARTICLE BY MIKE M. MASAOKA, OF SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Japanese-American creed, which has come to be accepted as representing the true sentiments of American citizens of Japanese ancestry.

The author of this creed is a young friend and constituent of mine, Mike M. Masaoka, of Salt Lake City, Utah. Mr. Masaoka—or Mike, as he is known to me and his many other friends—was the recipient of the Yamagata award as the Nisei of the year 1940. This award is given to the young Japanese-American who during the year has done the most to reflect credit upon those of similar parentage. The award is given to the outstanding young Japanese-American in the entire country by a Chicago group of young people. Mr. Masaoka has made a very splendid record, having served in many community activities, such as the community chest, the Red Cross, and the infantile paralysis drive. He received the Salt Lake City Chamber of Commerce's citizen of the community award for outstanding citizenship qualities. He is now debate coach in one of the Salt Lake City high schools.

I am sure Senators will agree with me that the Japanese-American creed reflects the true American spirit and the American way.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAPANESE-AMERICAN CREED

I am proud that I am an American citizen of Japanese ancestry for my very background makes me appreciate more fully the wonderful advantages of this Nation.

I believe in her institutions, ideals, and traditions; I glory in her heritage; I boast of her history; I trust in her future. She has granted me liberties and opportunities such as no individual enjoys in this world today. She has given me an education befitting kings. She has entrusted me with the responsibilities of the franchise. She has permitted me to build a home, to earn a livelihood, to worship, think, speak, and act as I please—as a free man equal to every other man.

Although some individuals may discriminate against me, I shall never become bitter or lose faith for I know that such persons are not representative of the majority of the American people.

True, I shall do all in my power to discourage such practices, but I shall do it in the American way; aboveboard, in the open, through courts of law, by education, by proving myself to be worthy of equal treatment and consideration. I am firm in my belief that American sportsmanship and attitude of fair play will judge citizenship and patriotism on the basis of action and achievement, and not on the basis of physical characteristics.

Because I believe in America, and I trust she believes in me, and because I have received innumerable benefits from her, I pledge myself to do honor to her at all times and in all places; to support her constitution; to obey her laws; to respect her flag; to defend her against all her enemies, foreign and domestic; to actively assume my duties and obligations as a citizen, cheerfully and without any reservations whatsoever, in the hope that I may become a better American in a greater America.

Convoys

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF], I call attention to the fact that when the lease-lend bill was passed it was understood that the Government could transfer these boats to British registry, and that they might then be used under the British flag. That does not mean that it is necessary for us to convoy these boats under the American flag. If we did, and one of them were sunk, it would probably draw us into the war, and that would virtually paralyze what assistance we are now giving Great Britain, because it would subject our commerce to attack all over the world and probably draw Japan into the war against us. That would compel us to keep our Navy, or a large part of it, at least, in the Pacific Ocean.

Therefore we would be far less able to furnish supplies to Britain than if we merely transferred these vessels to the British registry and let them do the convoying under their own flag.

This may not suit those warmongers who are doing everything they can to get President Roosevelt to plunge this country into war; but it is in accord with the President's commitments and with the understanding of a majority of the Members of Congress who voted for the lend-lease bill.

It will get the supplies to England and at the same time keep our country out of war and our boys from being sent to fight on foreign soil.

In fact, there is no foreign soil to send them to now on which a landing could be made—even if we were to declare war.

Congress is not in favor of going into this war; the American people are not in favor of going to war; President Roosevelt has said repeatedly that he was not in favor of plunging this country into war.

By transferring these vessels to British registry, as we understood would be done when we passed the lend-lease bill, we can give Great Britain all the aid possible, short of war, as we promised we would, and at the same time keep our country out of the European conflict.

Expression of Views of Two Prominent Idaho Residents on the International Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1941

TWO LETTERS FROM IDAHO RESIDENTS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, many earnest and thoughtful citizens of this country, realizing the dangerous and serious consequences of the course being followed by our Government in dealing witn nations at war in Europe, are giving words of caution and advice to their chosen representatives and through them to Congress and the administration. There are presented herewith two letters from residents of the State of Idaho for your especial consideration:

PARMA, IDAHO, *April 28, 1941.*

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Representative from Idaho,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITE: Last year when I wrote to you about employment you sent such kind and prompt replies I am writing this time on another subject.

Before going further, I want to say we are pleased with you and proud of the stand you have taken against war. Often people feel Congress Members are tempted by big money interests and are entirely out of our control and have forgotten us soon after election day. "Wars make rich men richer and poor men poorer" is trite but still true. At this time war could benefit only our few financiers and manufacturers who make up only a tiny fraction of the American people. Let that fraction don the uniform, pick up the pack, shoulder the rifle once, just one day, and see how long war lasts. It's not they

who fight. It's we young fellows. Our only reward would be a bullet in the back.

Mr. WHITE, conscription is all right. Army training is beneficial in many ways. We need the Army, and we'll fight willingly to defend America here at home. I'd like to express the views of an average young Idahoan. I have attended Lewiston and Moscow, have traveled twice to the east coast, visited Congress last summer during conscription debate, and am teaching my third year of grade school in this same community. I am 24, single, and shall be inducted soon after the close of my school.

Few single fellows are left, as so many of our old schoolmates have gone off to National Guard or Army camp. This is done willingly, but it's the daily papers, radio, movies, and floods of propaganda that depress us and give us the jitters. Such movies as Comrade X, Night Train, Arise, My Love, and Four Sons disgust and insult our intelligence. Let's not be swept away or even swayed by such simple attempts and the same old slogans dressed up and streamlined. Many are assuming the attitude of living for today, because there'll be no tomorrow. Certainly if war comes, there'll be no future for us.

For months it seems as if many acts of Congress and our foreign policy have invited hatred and war from foreign countries. Of course, we're not pro-German but let's remember England's history. Has she always loved us, France, or any of the other countries she does this year? Today John Bull keeps quiet about the dark account of conquest which built the empire.

Democracy can still work. Let's slam on the brakes before things get a bit worse here. Please vote against all measures which will take us a step closer to the brink. Remember the only ones wanting war are the very few who'll become rich. The rest of us are dead against it. It's not too late yet to save us from disaster. Stand against the tide More power and greater success to you.

Hopefully,

DONALD B. POTTER.

GRIMES PASS, IDAHO, *April 29, 1941.*

To the Members of the now convened Congress of the United States:

GENTLEMEN: I think it about time that you quit your shillyshallying around about this war business. We, the people of the United States, were led into a European conflict 24 years ago this month. The great cry at that time was we were going to "save the world for democracy." If that's what we've had the last twenty-odd years, let's not get ourselves in any such mess again.

You gentlemen, with the President, ran for office last fall on the platform that you would do your utmost to keep the United States out of war. All right; you have passed the so-called lease-lend bill to help Britain. Well enough. Please let's manufacture what Britain needs and let her come and get it. Don't please sanction any laws that will jeopardize our right to life and liberty as we have known it.

Let us arm ourselves on land, sea, and in the air to such an extent that no European power or combination of powers would dare start an invasion. We can and will do that in a big way if we all pull together.

As to the convoying of supplies across the oceans, I see nothing but danger in that. The one tragedy that took us into the other war was the sinking of a huge passenger liner that had a cargo of munitions, as well as women and children.

There might not be women or children involved in a convoy tragedy, though there would be American boys that we could ill afford to lose. So don't let's have any of that kind of business.

Far better we make the supplies and give them away than to take a chance on losing one boy's life in transporting the goods to where it is needed.

Should the time arise that Britain couldn't transport the supplies, then we will warehouse them and use them over on this side if and when any of the European gangsters feel lucky enough to try to take our freedom away from us. We have always defended ourselves against aggressors, and I see no reason why we aren't more able now to do so than ever before.

During the other Great War the United States built up the greatest and most powerful war machine the world has ever known—all that in a short time. We have the same resources now, with more knowledge and manpower than ever before, so why should we fear any power on earth?

Please let us not be led astray by this terrible round of propaganda and war hysteria the radio and newspapers are serving up to us every minute.

I am a man in my early forties and I may never be called into training, though I wish to say right here and now that I am ready at any moment to fight for my country against an invasion, but I'll not consent to being sent to foreign lands to help save anyone else's country.

Remember, gentlemen, there may be another election a few years hence.

JOHN A. MYERS,
A citizen, a voter, and a layman.

Promise To Keep American Boys Out of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1941

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT FROM CHARLES F. AND RUTH E. MAPES, OF CENTERBURG, OHIO

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to the President by Charles F. and Ruth E. Mapes, of Centerburg, Ohio:

CENTERBURG, OHIO, *May 6, 1941.*

MR. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
Washington, D. C.:

As an American mother, I expect you to keep the solemn preelection promise which you made to us that you would not send our sons to fight in a foreign war unless attacked.

But before election you did not tell us that all provocations and invitations for such an attack, including convoying by our Navy, would be given.

Certainly, a true American, President of the greatest and grandest country on earth, would not repudiate his word to American mothers. On this May 11, 1941, the day designated as Mother's Day throughout our country, remember your promise to the American fathers and mothers and that your third term as President of the United States is due to a very great extent to this promise. We expect you to keep it, as God is your judge.

You talk about making every place in the world safe for democracy. You remember in the debate on the lease-lend bill that someone told Mr. Knox that was why the last World War was fought, and he said that was just a shibboleth. In 25 years from now, what will the old cry be—another shibboleth?

The failure of Mr. Wilson to force democracy upon any people against their wish, or inability to govern themselves, is the most potent example and argument why we should not allow ourselves to be dragged into a second experiment of this kind.

You knew when you promised all-out aid to Britain that there might be difficulty in getting it there. But you still promised no foreign fighting for our sons. Better the whole $7,000,000,000 at the bottom of the ocean than one transport of American sons.

And remember we the common people furnish most of the money and the sons. It doesn't all come from east of the Alleghenies. How many of the men who cry war will go? How many of them went in the last World War? How many of them have sons who will go? It is easy to advocate war if someone else fights it.

So Mother's Day, when you meet your mother, remember your promise to all American mothers.

CHARLES F. and RUTH E. MAPES.

"I Am an American"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. J. F. T. O'CONNOR

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. J. F. T. O'Connor, United States district judge, delivered before the Los Angeles Breakfast Club on May 7, 1941, upon the occasion of a meeting devoted to "I Am an American" Day:

I am an American. What does it mean? The Lost Colony; the memory of Virginia Dare, first white child of English parentage born in the New World 354 years ago, before the Carolinas were christened; the early settlement of Virginia and the romance of Capt. John Smith; the Pilgrim Fathers; savage Indians; blizzards, whispering death; saved from ocean peril but confronted with new dangers on land. It is all a glorious part of a new nation's birth. A century had passed since the stout heart of a sailor, with high determination and great faith, had plowed the unfurrowed waves and claimed for God and his country a new land.

The early settlers met unfriendly red men, and the very soil seemed reluctant to yield subsistence—each toll of the bell signaled the departure of another soul. Did some stand on the bleak shores of the rockbound coast and attempt to penetrate the blue haze of the ocean mists? Perhaps. Did the memories of relatives and friends moisten the eye? Perhaps. But here were compensations. In their darkest hour of pain and hunger they found joy in the realization that they were freemen, able to think and speak and act and worship God as their conscience dictated. There was purpose in it all beyond the petty understanding of men's minds; ages ago, even before Mesopotamia was ruled by Hammurabi, 2,000 years before the Christian era, Sargon, nearly 700 years earlier, ruled from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean. Peace and war, war and peace, as one civilization supplanted another, as one empire rose and fell and cities were builded and destroyed, and on and on the so-called story of civilized man was written in blood and tears, in triumph and defeat. The theater for all this was the Old World.

In the pathway of the setting sun, 3,000 miles away, was another world, with giant forests and mighty rivers, with endless plains richer than the Nile, and majestic mountains

crowned with snow. Bison and buffalo, fish and fowl, fruits and wild grain in abundance—a veritable paradise on earth. Tell me, sage, why was this new world hidden for so many centuries from man? My own feeble explanation can, perhaps, satisfy only myself: It was in the divine plan that man should first prove his worthiness to this inheritance—that the bloody battles of ambitious kings, where people were his pawns, should be fought in the Old World and not in the New, that the fallacy of the divine right of any kind to rule should find its urn in the palaces of a decadent civilization; that the poisoned weeds of intolerance and race hatred should never be transplanted to the virgin soil of the land beyond the sea! Here a new race was to arise—not with a single origin, but from the blended blood of the best people from every land under the sun. Men and women with a new destiny, bringing from their own lands only the finest fruits of their civilization, and leaving in the ashes of the fires that burned through the centuries the hatreds and the jealousies that divided a people and destroyed empires.

Our road toward the accomplishment of our dream and destiny has been strewn with thorns and roses—nothing great was ever achieved without sacrifice. The red-stained snows of Valley Forge, marked by the shoeless feet of Washington's army; the courage of Barry, father of the American Navy, and the valiant exploits of John Paul Jones gave the highest evidence that the new Nation would vindicate the hopes of its founders. When Cornwallis waved the white flag at Yorktown it signaled the defeat of the Imperial Army and the triumph of American independence. A people had won the right to live as a free nation.

With the costly victory won, the process of democracy commenced its test under a Constitution which carefully protected the people against the wrongs inflicted by rulers upon their subjects. The fundamental truth expressed in the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," was, 13 years after it was written, embodied in the Constitution of the United States. Under this Constitution we have grown into a mighty nation. From Thirteen Colonies we have expanded across a continent—our flag floats far in the frozen north and far to the west where the lazy tropical waters wash the shores of our island possessions.

One hundred and fifty-two years marks the span of our national life under the Federal Constitution. During that period nearly every nation in the world has changed its form of government. The absolutism which we believed had gone forever has again raised its ugly head, and men and women under its jurisdiction are denied the right to speak or to write, and the accident of birth marks men and women for official assassination. Into the peaceful neighborhood fields of other countries plunge their mechanized engines of death, while destruction rains from the heavens and from under the sea. Fear hovers over every home in Europe—any moment the snakelike hissing of a bomb may crash the roof—little children with terror in their hearts and tears in their eyes, huddled together in dark underground passages, are denied the right to normal lives. What kind of citizens will their fear-crazed minds make of them tomorrow?

Again the tragedy of the Old World—thank God not the New. It is no pleasant task to recreate these scenes of horror in your minds—yet no more realistic method presents itself to make clear the proud expression, "I am an American." We appreciate its significance more today than ever before. The President and the Congress have asked the Nation to dedicate May 18 to a fuller appreciation of the value of American citizenship. Here in sunny California originated the idea which has captivated the imagination of all true Americans. Again in our famed Hollywood Bowl, on Sunday, May 18, we shall witness one of the most impressive patriotic ceremonies ever held under southern skies. I acknowledge to the great number of men and women assembled here this morning and to those listening on the air, my deep appreciation to Edward Arnold, president of I Am an American, and to Benjamin E. Neal, its founder, who have launched this successful movement.

In my court I have watched the expressions on the faces of hundreds as they have taken the oath of allegiance to the United States—a tear streak down the faces of men who would be firm in the face of death—a prayer from the lips of women whose memories recall less fortunate relatives or friends. They have suffered—they know what it means to say, "I am an American."

As Americans we must acknowledge a duty which we owe to aliens who come to our shores looking forward to citizenship in this country. The I Am an American Foundation seeks to emphasize this duty and to assist these aliens on their way to citizenship. There are 4,677,839 registered aliens in the United States at the present time. The I Am an American seeks an equal number of volunteer good neighbors who will each take one of these foreign-born for guidance, discussing with him or her the advantages of our free democracy, teaching him the value of citizenship in the United States, instructing him in the history of our people.

It is also the object of the I Am An American Foundation to honor native-born citizens who have reached voting age and aliens who have received their final naturalization papers within the past year, impressing upon them the seriousness of their responsibility as full-fledged American citizens. The first sentence in article 14 of the Constitution of the United States, section 1, provides: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside."

This shrine of friendship is indeed a fitting place to speak upon such a subject. Here the stranger from every clime, in the many years since this organization was formed, has been made welcome. Here men and women strengthen the ties of friendship and, in many instances, recement the broken bonds. The contribution which you have made to a better understanding between all classes and races, places the city of Los Angeles deeply in your debt. High honors have come to many of your members. Many have served in high positions in the counsels of our Nation and State and city. Some have received high honors from our great universities and colleges, but there is no higher honor, and there is no greater, more justifiable boast than for a man or a woman to say, "I am an American."

Chain Broadcasting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSH LEE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Federal Communications Commission for its recent anti-monopoly order with respect to the broadcasting chains. I feel that this is definitely in the interest of free communications.

I ask leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial complimentary of that decision which appeared in the Washington Post today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See editorial printed on request of Senator NORRIS, p. A2195, Appendix of the RECORD.)

Missouri Postmasters' Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. NELSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM L. NELSON, OF MISSOURI

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I made on April 30, 1941, before the Missouri Chapter, National Postmasters' Association, in Kansas City, Mo.:

Chairman Nivert, Postmaster Graham, Mayor Gage, and members and guests of Missouri Chapter, National Postmasters' Association, permit me first to express my appreciation of courtesies, which are so characteristic of Kansas City. I can pay this thriving city, located midway between the population and geographic centers of the United States and in the very center of the agricultural universe, no greater compliment than to refer to it as a magnified and enlarged country town, where hospitality and friendliness prevail. I love the small town and the country, where life is real and where the dwellers are neighbors in the fullest sense of the word. It is in such environment that big men, big postmasters, like "Boss" Graham, for Kansas City, and Rufus Jackson, for St. Louis, are produced. Real would have been the calamity had all our smaller population centers grown into cities whose people are counted in millions.

Gathered here together, as we are this morning, in this magnificent building, in this beautiful municipal auditorium, we meet as friends and fellow workers—postmasters, Missourians, Americans.

I speak to you as Missouri postmasters. I would add that we are happy to have distinguished officials such as Mr. Jesse M. Donaldson, Deputy First Assistant Postmaster General, as well as visitors from Oklahoma, Kansas, and Nebraska. Of course, too, we look forward to the visit tomorrow of Postmaster General Frank C. Walker.

The Postal Service represents the mightiest implement of human democracy. As postmasters, you are direct representatives of Uncle Sam. In fact, you as postmaster in your village, town, or city may be practically the only Federal official with whom the people are personally acquainted. So it behooves you not only to give service but to give that service with a smile, to serve all, and to serve impartially.

Some 300 years ago the Postal Service was first established in the colonies. Two

hundred years ago Benjamin Franklin was appointed postmaster at Philadelphia at a salary of $3,000, one-half of this going to his associates. Franklin was temporarily fired, it being charged, not that he read post cards, but that he had read a number of private letters. He was later shown to be innocent. In 1775, when Franklin became Postmaster General, he altered his frank to read "B-Free-Franklin." How appropriate seems this today, when the heart desire of men and women everywhere is to be free.

Speaking of freedom, I wonder if we, in the busy lives that we lead, give sufficient thought to the freedom which we enjoy. Here we have freedom of worship, freedom of assembly, freedom to listen over radio, free speech, free elections. We are free to read, comment, and criticize. Always, though, and especially at a time like this, any criticism should be constructive. This is no hour to fan the fires of hate. Rather do we need to take off the blind bridles of creed, class, politics, and whatever else might divide us, and be Americans without prefix or hyphen.

But I have digressed. I was speaking directly to you as postmasters. You and I are Federal employees. Your place, measured by the area in which you serve, is as important as mine. You are representatives of the greatest and best Government in the world. You are givers of service—yes, and keepers of secrets If every postmaster, every city or rural carrier, were to tell all he knows, I am afraid that more "scraps" would be started than could ever be stopped and the road to Reno might be more crowded than now. You are salesmen, but you have been warned that no attempt to boost sales be made near the end of the year when just a small addition is needed to put you over the increased salary mark.

The biggest bargain counter in all our country is the stamp sale window in any post office. Our Postal Service is not only the most efficient, but it gives most for the money Not all post-office buildings are fireproof, but legislation has now made most postmasters "fired-proof."

Some cynic once said, "A successful Congressman is one who can cause a post-office building to rise where only a rural route existed before." This is not my thought, much as we appreciate proper Federal buildings. Success is measured by service. One of the most far-reaching services that I have been able to render to the almost 300,000 people in the Second Congressional District of Missouri, which I have the honor to represent, is in making possible the appointment of efficient, capable, courteous postmasters, who impartially serve all patrons.

Just here I want to express my appreciation of the many postmasters from our district and who are here today, not only to learn and to enjoy the program but to give to our own Postmaster Nivert, president of the State association, their wholehearted support. Surely I am proud of our postmasters. I like that word "proud" as I have heard it used in rural regions, where a visitor is greeted with the salutation, "I am proud to see you." It goes well with "I reckon" and "you all." We may be old fashioned, but we are not too finicky to be friendly.

Delighted as I am to see such a large representation of postmasters from our district, I am especially pleased that so many ladies are present. In this connection it might be said that the first woman postmaster in the United States was a Missourian, Mrs. Richard Gentry, of Columbia.

It is great to be a Missourian. Great is Missouri, far enough north for hustle, and far enough south for hospitality. Missouri, daughter of Virginia, Kentucky, and other States to the east, is the mother of most States to the west. For the hardy pioneer who more than a century ago journeyed west from the States lying along the Atlantic coast, Missouri was the stopping place; a little later, for the sons and grandsons of these same citizens who, moved by the spirit of adventure, pressed toward the setting sun, Missouri was the starting place. From our State, roads, here dim or there deep, stretched like the fingers of one's hands and completely covered all that vast trans-Mississippi country from Oregon to Mexico. Only a few miles from where we are now assembled once stood a post on which was a signboard reading, "Oregon—1,900 miles."

Over that far Northwest trail traveled caravans made up of as brave men and women as ever lived. To Santa Fe, 700 miles to the southwest, went other fearless men. That trail, often marked by shallow graves or bleached bones, told a story of daring and of death. It was from Missouri, too, that 81 years ago the Pony Express made its initial run from St. Joseph to Sacramento. From that experiment came the expression, "The mail must go through." It did; it ever will!

While history was much in the making all over Missouri, it seems to have centered in what is known as the Boone's Lick country, or, as some of us mention with pride, as Little Dixie. By this, please do not understand that I am making any reference to politics, a subject absolutely barred when postmasters get together. High officials, including inspectors present, will please note.

From Howard County, where Boone's Lick Road and the trail to the far Southwest met, went John Becknel, Kit Carson, the latter guide of Fremont, and others who helped blaze the trail westward. From Boone County went Colonel Gentry with a regiment to the Seminole War. From the western part of the State went General Doniphan, who, with his men, as they marched to Mexico, set an all-time long-distance travel mark.

Not only have Missourians been pioneers, but they have been as fearless soldiers as the world has even seen. Of 2,361 battles, engagements in which 10 or more men were killed during the Civil War, 244 were fought in Missouri, as was the Battle of Boonville, first land battle of the war between the States. In that frightful fraticidal conflict, the bitterness of which has long since been "cast into the all-forgetting river," Missouri gave to the Union Army 47 percent of her fighting men, and boys in their tender teens were then "fighting men." To the cause of the Confederacy, Missouri contributed 23 percent of her sons—70 percent of Missouri's young men going to war for the causes which they believed to be right. Twenty-odd years ago in the World War three illustrious Missourians, Pershing, Crowder, and Koontz, made records, needless now to review.

Advocates of peace, for which all Missourians now fervently pray, our people, when in defense of home and those things dearer than life itself, are not afraid to fight. They remember that even the word "pacifist" ends in f-i-s-t.

Yes; we are thankful as Missourians, but more, we are thankful as Americans. Personally, I am thankful that we have one Wendell Willkie, one Franklin D. Roosevelt, and only one Charles Lindbergh. Well do I recall the pride I once felt in the latter. It was not so many years ago when the *Spirit of St. Louis* was successfully piloted across the Atlantic by "The Lone Eagle." Men glory in the daring of a lone eagle, its solitary flight symbolizing strength, but the perch, peck, and peeve of a rail bird arouses no such sentiments.

A short time ago the press told of a young man who, on entering the military service of our country, was found to have his heart on the wrong side. A day or two ago another man whose heart, it seems, may be on the wrong side, ceased to be a part of our military service. Time marches on.

I digress to suggest that because of the many unfounded rumors coming out of the National Capital, not all should be believed. For instance, any report that Secretary of State Cordell Hull, native Tennesseean and, in my opinion, premier statesman of the world, is about to attempt a lone flight across the Atlantic may be branded as false.

I am glad that we have in this assembly hall today the most beautiful flag in all the world. It is fitting that such a flag of red, white, and blue should float over every Federal building in the Nation, over every schoolhouse in our State, and that the things for which it stands should be treasured in our hearts and builded strong in our homes—homes which, after all, represent the real strength of the Nation. There is one place, though, that I would not have our flag fly. Somehow, it does not seem appropriate that it should be displayed over a pacifist camp or where conscientious objectors find refuge.

We may honestly and sincerely differ as to methods, but for those of us who call ourselves Americans and who must choose between dictatorship and democracy, there should be no serious difference. We must be Americans in the real sense of the word, believing in our country above all others. I do not suspect that there is one postmaster in Missouri whose Americanism is to be questioned. However, should there be one lacking in loyalty, he should quit the service of Uncle Sam. This view holds true of every public official, whether constable or Congressman, justice of the peace or President.

I have spoken to you as postmasters, as Missourians, and as Americans. Perhaps, you wish to have me say something of what is going on in Washington, key city of the world. I might summarize by quoting Will Rogers. And how we need that philosopher now, need him to use his good natured ridicule, need him to poke fun, need him to philosophize and to tell the truth in fearless Western way. Will Rogers, you will remember, once remarked that all he knew was what he read in the newspapers. I feel that this might be my answer to your question, and possibly I should add a limitation to the effect that I do not know all that I read in the papers.

The Congress, regardless of party, is united as it has seldom been. Of course, decisions are difficult at a time "when old paths are lost and new roads perplex." As Abraham Lincoln once said, "If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it."

Most, it seems to me, that we can safely do is to hope for the best and prepare for the worst, prepare to meet whatever the war-mad dictators of the world may attempt to deal out to us.

These are dark days overseas, difficult days here. This is no time for doubt or discord. With nations, as with individuals, God in His goodness sometimes takes us down into the depths so that looking up through the shadows we may see the stars. In times of trouble we find our solace and our strength. Not only do we need military preparedness, but we need moral preparedness.

It is for our beloved country to prove that we are good as well as great. Important as is the part that we now play, more important will be our leadership when comes the day, as come it will, when world sanity has been restored and the dark clouds of war no longer darken the skies.

In conclusion, I would stress how vital it is that we as a people and a nation keep to the right course. To a naval observatory went a sea-bronzed man, carrying with him a small mahogany box bound about with silver. It was the ship's chronometer. The captain was taking it so that it might be tested. He realized how important it was that compass and chronometer be true. The slightest deficiency might send his ship from its course, send it to the bottom of the sea. He was thinking not of himself alone but of his passengers and of those who made up his crew. If so important were the instruments of guidance and safety to the old captain,

much more important is it that we, as individuals and as Americans, make certain that all that we depend upon for guidance in our course—a course which may determine not only the direction but the continuance of civilization—be true. We do well, then, to look for guidance to the Master who set the stars in the far firmament, to the Master whose measurements of time are not days and nights but endless ages.

Electric Power Features of Colorado-Big Thompson Reclamation Project in Northern Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE LEWIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

STATEMENT BY R. J. TIPTON, OF DENVER, COLO., CONSULTING ENGINEER, BEFORE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT SUBCOMMITTEE OF APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, the primary purpose of the Colorado-Big Thompson reclamation project is to bring each year 310,000 acre-feet of water from the western slope to supplement the present existing but inadequate water supply for a region on the eastern slope in northern Colorado, which has been settled for approximately 70 years. As incidental to this primary purpose there will be developed in hydroelectric plants a considerable amount of electric power by taking advantage of the fall of water from the places on the western slope of Colorado where the water is gathered to the places on the eastern slope, where it will be used for irrigation.

At the hearing on this project held on April 17, 1941, before the Interior Department subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, Mr. R. J. Tipton, of Denver, Colo., consulting engineer for Colorado Water Conservation Board and for Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District, was one of the witnesses. His statement, which was devoted largely to the electric power features of Colorado-Big Thompson reclamation project, was as follows:

Mr. TIPTON. Gentlemen, I will hit some of the high spots. In order to make my testimony clear to the committee I should like to refer to some exhibits. I will try to do so in such a manner that the record will be straight.

There are two additional items which I want to mention as necessitating the early completion of this project. One is the rapid increase in the installation of pumping plants in the area which will be benefited by the project.

Approximately 1,500 pumping plants have been installed in the northern Colorado conservancy district, representing an investment of over $2,000,000. Most of these plants have been installed during the last decade and additional plants are being placed in operation each year. These plants constitute a duplication of capital expenditures in that they are intended to provide relief that will be furnished by the Colorado-Big Thompson project. The relief furnished by them, however, will not be permanently effective, nor is such relief provided for the territory as a whole. The water supply for the lower South Platte area consists largely of return flow from higher lands irrigated on the river and its tributaries. The withdrawal of water by the pumps already is depleting the flow of the river by reducing the return flow, thereby depriving many canals of water which they have formerly diverted under their old decrees. This situation not only will cause large losses of money but may lead to lengthy and costly litigation. To prevent this situation from becoming more acute by the installation of additional pumping plants and by the continual withdrawal of ground water which will require years to replace, the completion of the Colorado-Big Thompson project should be accomplished as soon as possible.

The next major item is power.

This project will generate, as a byproduct, considerable power. The demand for power in the region which will be served by the project has been increasing at a rapid rate. I will illustrate by outlining the condition with respect to the largest utility system in the area, the central system of the Public Service Co. of Colorado.

The installed capacity of that system on January 1, 1942, will be 165,500 kilowatts. The capacity available for the continuous generation of power, after allowing for reserve, will be 136,500 kilowatts. The demand last year was about 105,000 kilowatts. Twelve thousand kilowatts will be added by the new small-arms munitions plant near Denver, bringing the demand to about 117,000 kilowatts. The demand is increasing normally at the rate of about 7,500 kilowatts a year. This does not include probable increases which may result from additional defense industries.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is justifying the increase other than the munitions plant that you have just referred to?

Mr. TIPTON. Just the natural increase in the load in the area, both in the domestic load and in the agricultural load.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has that been made possible or accentuated by new distribution lines?

Mr. TIPTON. Yes; to some extent. A large number of rural electrification projects also are being constructed in the area served by this system. The per capita use of energy in Colorado is lower than in other parts of the United States. In the intermountain region it is 1,153 kilowatt-hours per capita per year, and in Colorado it is 642 kilowatt-hours per capita per year, and the per capita consumption in the United States as a whole is 941 kilowatt-hours per year. It is reasonable to assume that the per capita use in Colorado will increase materially. The use of customers under the Rural Electrification Administration systems should be greater than that of urban users, due to the operation of pumps and various types of farm machinery.

Mr. LEAVY. There is no question in your mind that even if this project should be greatly accelerated, as has been here suggested, the region will absorb the power that will be generated there?

Mr. TIPTON. I will go further than that. The point I want to make is that if construction of the project is not accelerated additional steam capacity will have to be constructed in that area in addition to the capacity which is being constructed at the present time.

Mr. LEAVY. There is no contract in existence contracting this power away to private utilities operating in that region, and there is no plan on foot of that kind?

Mr. TIPTON. No, sir; not that I know of. There are no contracts and, so far as I know, no negotiations. I am quite sure that that is true.

Mr. LEAVY. In other words, this project is not in any way being constructed in order to increase the amount of electrical energy that the private utilities may need for distribution?

Mr. TIPTON. No, sir. The byproduct of the project will be considerable electrical energy, and there will be a need for that energy in the area, no matter how fast the construction of the project is accelerated. By the time the first plant goes into operation in 1943 there will be an immediate demand for the energy generated by it. As soon as the tunnel under the Continental Divide can be completed, assuming the most rapid rate, there will be need for the power generated by the first power plants on the eastern slope. There is no question about that.

Mr. LEAVY. And if the local people want that power as public power, there is nothing in the picture that would in any way interfere with that desire?

Mr. TIPTON. Nothing at this time.

Mr. CARTER. Are any private companies distributing within that area at this time?

Mr. TIPTON. Yes, sir. The Public Service Co. of Colorado has the largest system in the area. It is the system which I just described.

Mr. CARTER. Have they made application for any of this power; do you know?

Mr. TIPTON. I do not think so.

Mr. CARTER. They have plenty of power of their own?

Mr. TIPTON. They are installing a new unit of 25,000 kilowatts at the present time in order to take care of the increased load. They will be on the ragged edge again in 1943, when the first project plant, on the western slope, is scheduled to go into operation. By 1945 the power which will be generated by the first plant of this Colorado-Big Thompson reclamation project, which is on the western slope and does not depend upon the tunnel, will all be absorbed and additional power will be necessary.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Tipton, as an expert in your profession, what are the private utilities within the area to which you refer doing to step up their ability to produce and pick up the slack at this time, if you know?

Mr. TIPTON. As mentioned, the largest company in the area is constructing an additional unit of 25,000 kilowatts steam capacity.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, the competitive field is wide open for any investing capital which sees fit to go along and produce and take care of the requirements?

Mr. TIPTON. There are no restrictions at all.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you.

Mr. RICH. Do you think the Government at any time would have to construct any steam plants there to aid and assist in this project?

Mr. TIPTON. No, sir. Personally I sincerely hope that that never will be the case.

In order to make that clear, Congressman RICH, I want to refer to this particular graph [indicating], which shows the situation from 1902 to 1940. It shows the amount of power which this project would have generated within that period.

These years embrace the lowest period, 1934 to 1935, of water supply since at least 1850.

Taking the energy that can be generated during this period of lowest water supply as a measure, about 720,000,000 kilowatt-hours of firm power per annum can be generated by all project power plants. This is in addition to the energy required for pumping at Granby pumping plant.

Now, it might be argued by some that it would be desirable to put in a steam plant to firm all energy to that quantity which can be generated during periods of high run-off. I think, however, anyone can readily see from the graph it would be uneconomic to put a plant in that would be used for only such a short time during this long time period.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Again asking you in your restrictive position as a professional man, having a pretty complete understanding of electrical

unit production, if you found that the water resources in that area were not there in volume enough to justify a firm-load requirement, then as a technical man what would be recommended to pick up the slack necessary to produce the total required load?

Mr. TIPTON. I think this project can dovetail in with existing steam plants and make a very excellent set-up in the area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Naturally, as long as you have the water power that is the proper commodity to use.

Mr. TIPTON. The energy during the infrequent periods of exceptionally low water supply can be firmed to a considerable extent by the use of off-peak steam energy from existing plants which will be interconnected with the project.

Mr. RICH. As an electrical engineer you would not try to put the peak to the point that you would always have steam to make it a firm-power project, would you?

Mr. TIPTON. That is an economic problem on each individual project. I do not believe the construction of a steam stand-by plant would be economical for this project.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. You would only use that in the case of an emergency.

Mr. TIPTON. Yes. And there will be sufficient existing steam capacity interconnected with the project to serve that purpose.

Mr. LEAVY. How many months of the year would you be taking water for irrigation purposes?

Mr. TIPTON. Water for this purpose would be used about 3 months in the year.

Mr. LEAVY. And the other 9 months it would flow across the Continental Divide for power purposes?

Mr. TIPTON. It will be used for power purposes for the entire 12-month period and stored during the 9-month period to be released for irrigation purposes during the 3-month period.

Mr. LEAVY. Then actually that water would flow across the Divide for 12 months in the year.

Mr. TIPTON. Yes, sir.

This [indicating] chart shows the estimated flow through the tunnel by months from 1902 to date.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What would be the capacity of Grand Lake there, what amount?

Mr. TIPTON. It is estimated an average of 310,000 acre-feet of water per year will be diverted from the western to the eastern slope.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In the case of a dry season how long would that last?

Mr. TIPTON. In a very dry season there may be a remaining shortage up to 200,000 acre-feet for adequate irrigation of district lands.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Are you going over on the east side of the Rockies to store the water?

Mr. TIPTON. Yes, sir. As part of the $54,000,000 project there are proposed to be constructed three reservoirs on the east slope. In addition there are numerous reservoirs owned by private companies which will be beneficiaries of the project, in which reservoirs some of the water can be stored.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They are very small, I suppose?

Mr. TIPTON. They are small, but most of them have some reserve capacity. They are small as individuals, but taken in the aggregate they represent appreciable capacity.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. At the present time there is quite a scarcity of water.

Mr. TIPTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In those privately owned reservoirs?

Mr. TIPTON. Yes, sir; that is true.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, may we have the witness outline that map? I think he understands it thoroughly, and I wonder if the committee wants to listen to him explain it for a few minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. He can do it briefly. We do not want to waste any time.

Mr. TIPTON. I can do it very briefly.

I want to refresh the recollection of the members of the committee on some of the major features of the project.

The main feature of the project consists of the 13-mile tunnel, which will divert water from the western slope to the eastern slope.

The main storage unit is Granby Reservoir on the western slope, which will have a capacity of something over 400,000 acre-feet. It will regulate the entire run-off of the basin tributary to the reservoir.

The water will be pumped from that reservoir to another small reservoir situated at Shadow Mountain from which the water will flow directly to the tunnel. The average pump head will be about 130 feet. Granby Reservoir can regulate the water in such a way as to permit a uniform delivery through the tunnel. The water will be transported through the 13-mile tunnel and thence through five power plants down to the mouth of what is called Big Thompson Canyon.

After passing through the power plants the water will be stored in three reservoirs situated at the foot of the foothills. From these reservoirs the water will then be distributed to the lands which need the water for supplemental irrigation.

As an essential part of the project there is a 152,000 acre-foot reservoir on Blue River, a tributary of the Colorado River, which is used for replacement purposes and the generation of power. This reservoir will protect present and future uses on the western slope.

I should like to discuss now what we consider to be a logical construction schedule for the project in order to support our contention that there should be appropriated more than $3,000,000 a year for the project. The bottleneck, of course, is the 13-mile tunnel. The construction of that item can be completed by the middle of 1945. At the present rate of construction it could be completed sooner. The tunnel is being driven from both portals at a present rate of about 90 feet per day. It is estimated about 18,000 feet will have been driven by June 30, 1941. To complete the driving of the remaining 51,000 feet by January 1, 1945, would require a rate of only 40 feet per day or 20 feet at each heading. However, we have fixed as a logical completion date for the tunnel the middle of 1945. In order that the project can be used at the time the tunnel is completed, other units must be started at once. The most important of these is Granby Reservoir. This reservoir will be required to permit the diversion of the full amount of project water through the tunnel. Construction of this reservoir will require about 3 years. It should be completed in sufficient time to store 1 year's run-off prior to completion of the tunnel so that water will be available to divert through the tunnel immediately when it is completed.

Therefore, construction of this reservoir should start this year in order that this can be done, and that work can be prosecuted in such a manner that it shall be completed 1 year prior to the completion of the tunnel.

To accomplish this and also to carry on expeditiously the work at the tunnel and at Green Mountain Reservoir $5,000,000 should be appropriated for the fiscal year 1942.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Has the necessary land been secured over to the western side for Grand Lake?

Mr. TIPTON. Yes; many items of rights-of-way have been secured and additional items are being secured.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is no hold-up on that, is there?

Mr. TIPTON. No, sir; there is no hold-up on the rights-of-way.

The construction schedule for 1942 just described is the minimum desirable. This [indicating chart] indicates our opinion of a desirable construction schedule through the fiscal year 1945. It shows Granby Reservoir starting this year and being completed 1 year prior to the time the tunnel is to be completed. Many other units of the project could be started this year and it would be desirable to start them, but that would require considerable sums of money. In order to take care of the minimum desired schedule $5,000,000 will be required during the fiscal year 1942.

I think that is all, Mr. Chairman, unless there are any questions you wish to ask.

Mr. RICH. May I just ask you this one question: What do you figure the whole sum total cost of this project is going to be?

Mr. TIPTON. The cost is estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation to be $54,288,000.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. All of which is reimbursable to the Government.

Mr. TIPTON. Yes, sir. Every dollar of it is to be reimbursed through the sale of water to the irrigators and through the sale of electrical energy.

Mr. LEAVY. And that part charged to the generation of electrical energy would be repaid with interest, I understand.

Mr. TIPTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEAVY. That allocation has not yet been made.

Mr. TIPTON. Repayment of the cost allocated to power is assumed to be made in 40 years with 3-percent interest.

Mr. LEAVY. This committee has had submitted to it by the Bureau of Reclamation a program that is an impossible program when this money has to come out of the revolving fund.

Your appropriation calls for $4,428,000 for the fiscal year 1943, and $8,000,000 for the fiscal year 1944, $11,000,000 for the fiscal year 1945, and $10,000,000 for the fiscal year 1946.

Mr. TIPTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEAVY. So unless there is some legislation to take major projects like this out from under the reclamation revolving fund this project cannot be completed as outlined.

Mr. TIPTON. That is correct, sir

And to consummate the logical construction program which we think should be pursued, there will be required during the coming fiscal year 1942, $5,125,000; in 1943, $9,940,000; in 1944, $10,615,000; and in 1945, $9,718,000. Even these sums will not complete the project, but sufficient features will have been completed to permit diversion of water to the eastern slope and the generation of some power.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Unless that money is in the revolving fund at the present you would not get that amount?

Mr. TIPTON. No. And it would take years to complete the project, during which time the large crop losses would continue, and considerable additional steam capacity would be installed in the area to supply demands which otherwise could be taken care of by project power plants. The Government also would have large sums of money tied up for a considerable length of time before repayment could start.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understand you have been familiar with the electrical industry within the area which we have been discussing over a long period; is that correct?

Mr. TIPTON. To some extent. I am not so familiar with that as I am with water matters.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you know of your own knowledge as to how far behind the demand in that area the operating utilities are and how long they have been behind the demand?

Mr. TIPTON. I can show that graphically by this chart [consulting chart]. This starts in 1915. This shows the installed capacity [indicating].

Mr. SHEPPARD. For the purpose of the record would you kindly call out the installed capacity, because the ordinary indication does not reproduce in the record?

Mr. TIPTON. Yes; I understand that.

The following gives the installed capacity of, and demand on the central system of the

Public Service Co. of Colorado for each fifth year since 1915, as read from the graph.

Year	Installed capacity kilowatts	Demand kilowatts
1915	40,000	30,000
1920	60,000	40,000
1925	78,000	55,000
1930	96,000	70,000
1935	96,000	72,000
1940	130,000	104,000

I do not believe they have been behind the demand, but they have been on the ragged edge several times.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Would not there be a greater demand for power if it was cheaper?

Mr. TIPTON. I think that is true.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And you cut the rate?

Mr. TIPTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Do you suppose there will be a lower rate when this is finished?

Mr. TIPTON. That is conjectural. The cost of generation of project energy will be cheaper than the cost of steam energy.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is supposed to be cheaper power.

Mr. TIPTON. It will cost a little over 3 mills at the wholesale market.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What is the average you pay now per kilowatt?

Mr. TIPTON. It costs about 5 mills to generate it by steam.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Haven't you any idea in the region what it costs now?

Mr. TIPTON. The present residential rate in Denver, Colo., is as follows for the monthly use indicated:

Monthly use, kilowatt-hours, and rate in cents per kilowatt-hour

	Cents
25	5.00
100	3.80
250	2.72

Mr. RICH. As an engineer in figuring out the cost of power so far as the Government is concerned you advocate the whole sum total cost of all this engineering work to be set up as a principal sum and then figure the rest of the cost to the Government for the construction of this project?

Mr. TIPTON. Yes; plus interest.

Mr. RICH. Certainly; but all over it and all other charges of every kind.

Mr. TIPTON. Yes; all charges, including engineering and overhead and the Bureau of Reclamation charges, are carried in as a part of the cost of the project. The cost of generating and delivering the energy is made up of the sum of the following: First, annual repayment and interest at 3 percent on that portion of cost of the project allocated to power; second, one-half of the annual operation and maintenance of the joint features; third, the annual operation and maintenance expense of the power plants and power canals; and, fourth, the annual depreciation of the power features.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That has already been done in this proposal.

Mr. TIPTON. That is right.

Mr. RICH. The same as on a private proposal.

Mr. TIPTON. Yes, sir; with one exception. It is contemplated the entire cost of the project will be recovered in 40 years and the project will be in 100 percent condition at that time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The gentleman stated that that has been done in this proposal.

Mr. RICH. We are hoping they are going to continue it; that is the only thing. He, as an engineer, has suggested that they will do it, but will they do it?

Underwater Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT FROM SIMON LAKE

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, whenever Simon Lake says anything about underwater carriers and vessels he commands respect, for his name is indissolubly linked with subsurface construction and inventions. We, in Connecticut, are proud that he has a laboratory in our State and I take this chance to present his views on a subject that is certainly in the forefront today.

For those of us who have made the freedom of the seas one of the bridgeheads of our foreign policy there is in his suggestion a manifest evidence of the inventive progress of our people. While Nazi Germany has developed aircraft into its tremendous lethal power and England, the master of the surface waters for a longer time than any one other nation, has displayed her versatility in surface resilience, the versatility in the submarine has been blessed by American ingenuity.

Have we made the most of it or have we neglected our opportunity in the complacent attitude of those who have shackled our merchant marine and destroyed the historic developments of a century of progress? Whatever the answer is on these questions there can be no controversy about our duty to examine this famous man's proposal.

He is famous, as his sketch from the Who's Who of 1940 shows:

Lake, Simon, naval architect, mech. engr.; b. Pleasantville, N. J., Sept. 4, 1866; s. John Christopher and Miriam M. (Adams) L.; ed. Clinton Liberal Inst., Fort Plain, N. Y., and Franklin Inst., Phila.; m. Margaret Vogel, of Baltimore, June 9, 1890. Inventor of even-keel type of submarine torpedo boats; built first experimental boat 1894; built *Argonaut* 1897 (first submarine to operate successfully in the open sea); has designed and built many submarine torpedo boats for U. S. and foreign countries; spent several years in Russia, Germany, and England designing, building, and acting in an advisory capacity in construction of submarine torpedo boats. Also inventor submarine apparatus for locating and recovering sunken vessels and their cargoes, submarine apparatus for pearl and sponge fishing, heavy-oil internal-combustion engine for marine purposes, etc. Pres. the Lake Submarine Co., the Lake Engineering Co., Merchant Submarine Co., Lake Submarine Salvage Corporation, Industrial Submarine Corporation, Lake Torpedo Boat Co. (also consulting engineer). Member Society Naval Architects and Marine Engrs., Am. Soc. M. E., Am. Soc. Naval Engrs. Instn. of Naval Architects (London), Soc. Founders and Patriots of America, Soc. Colonial Wars, S. A. R. Mason. Clubs: Engineers (New York); Algonquin (Bridgeport, Conn.) Home: Milford, Conn.

MAY 5, 1941.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A great political controversy is now raging whether the United States should use its naval vessels to guard convoys of merchant craft carrying products to Great Britain. The final decision on this question may mean peace or war for the United States.

I have, on numerous occasions, recommended the use of submarine cargo-carrying vessels, by means of which products may be transported from this country to England, without danger from the German submarine blockade, and without committing any unneutral act under the established rules of international law. I am generally given credit for having contributed very largely to the development of the submarine and I have been engaged in the designing and construction of submarines for more than 50 years. I know that the building and operation of such vessels is practical and no one entitled to be called a submarine expert has ever contradicted this statement. That it is feasible is indicated by the following extract from a letter to me from the State Department under date of December 4, 1939, quoting the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission:

"I am also in receipt of a letter of November 24, 1939, from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, in which he suggests that you be informed that the 'merchant cargo-carrying submarine in question, while beyond doubt an engineering possibility, cannot be considered an efficient cargo-carrying vessel. This is because of the complicated machinery and pumping equipment; the special and unusually robust type of hull structure necessitated by her ability to submerge, and the very high resultant costs. A merchant vessel must pay for itself by the cargo it carries.

"The Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission adds that it is, however, conceivable that in the presence of a serious crisis such as is pictured by you, a vessel of this type might be of some value; and that while the use of government funds for purposes of development of construction may not be justifiable there appears to be no valid reason for refusing your request that you be allowed to design and build such a type of ship for private interests, all within the provisions of United States legislation."

I think such vessels can be built and operated more economically than surface vessels of the same cargo-carrying capacity. Even if they will cost more, however, as suggested by the Maritime Commission, is it not cheaper in the end to adopt a method of "delivering the goods" to England which we know can evade the German blockade and which can be carried out without committing belligerent acts which may involve us in war.

It will take time, of course, to produce these vessels. It will take just as much time, however, to produce the necessary surface vessels to carry out any other program and when they have been built there will be no assurance that they can successfully run the blockade, either singly or in convoys, with or without the protection of the United States Navy.

No one seems to have paid any attention to this suggestion. No one seems even interested. France fell because she failed to keep pace with scientific and engineering progress. Great Britain is tottering for the same reason. The United States should not make the same mistake. If we really wish to "deliver the goods" to England and keep out of the war at the same time this is the way and, in my opinion, the only way to do it. It is the only sure way of transporting goods to England through the German submarine

blockade whether we want to go to war or not, as the cargo-carrying submarine can make the shortest voyages from our American shores to England without being seen or attacked by other ships or by airplanes.

Very truly yours,

SIMON LAKE.

The People Must Be Told the Truth—A Free Press and Free Speech Necessary to Preserve Our Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. LANE POWERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1941

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith an address given by Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts, Republican leader of the House of Representatives and chairman of the Republican National Committee, at a luncheon honoring five Republican assemblywomen of the State of New Jersey, at Trenton, on April 29, 1941:

It is always a real pleasure to attend any gathering of loyal, enthusiastic Republicans. It is doubly a pleasure to be here today to join in paying tribute to these Republican members of the New Jersey Legislature who are of the gentler sex.

Women have demonstrated their intelligence, ability, and capacity to sit with the men in the legislative councils; to help govern, to help make the laws; to help work out the problems of state.

There is a general tendency, it seems, to regard as something unusual and surprising the success women have made of statecraft—and politics—as though it were an accomplishment not to have been expected. I feel a bit differently about it. I am, perhaps, less inclined to enthuse as much as some over the success women have made as legislators because I have always expected, given a fair chance, they would be successful.

I have suspected for some time women are getting bored; and a bit resentful of being complimented merely as women rather than being treated as the equals of men in intelligence, capacity, and ability in the world of politics and government. Therefore, today I shall not try to turn flattering phrases and complimentary sentences for you. Anyway there are others who have much more talent for that art than have I. What I want to do is not to try to tell you what special work women can do, but to tell you what work needs to be done—and the women can take their fair share of doing it alongside the men. I do not believe women want to be given the simple, easy tasks because they are women. They are ready to tackle the hardest tasks right along with the men, and they will do their share of the difficult work just as ably, just as efficiently, and just as quickly as will the men.

Let me say to you bluntly the bigegst job we have ahead of us today is to preserve Americanism. We must preserve and perpetuate the American way. We must preserve and perpetuate constitutional government. We must foil the very subtle and clever schemes of those who would change our form of government into some brand of centralized absolutism—whether it be communistic, nazi-istic, fascistic, socialistic, or some combination of them. Those schemes have been planned. Those plotters are at work in this country. Within their own private circles they now speak openly of the form of government they intend, if possible, to bring about in the economic chaos and social bewilderment they believe will follow the war. The form of government they desire is not our revered and priceless American form of constitutional, representative republic, by a long shot. We must foil these schemers and their schemes. That is not a job which calls for the predominance of men or women. It is a task calling for the best there is in all men and women who believe in the American way, who believe in the Constitution, who believe in the Bill of Rights, who believe in the traditional two-party system.

I believe American men and women everywhere in the Nation want to be told the facts. They want to be told what they can do, what function they can perform toward providing the Nation with an invincible national defense. They want to know how they can help to solve those domestic problems which have been obscured—but greatly aggravated—by the war.

Several things must be done—and they must be done as quickly as we can do them if they are to be effective.

Now what part can the women in the legislative bodies, and the women in the clubs, and societies, and associations—and the women in the millions of American homes—what part can they play? What can they do to help preserve liberty, the American way of life and of government, to assist in the building of an invincible national defense?

Here are some of the things we can all do—women as well and as effectively as men:

1. Insistently demand the truth about defense production. The country is not getting the facts now. The people are not being told the truth about it. Had I the time I could quote you figures upon figures, statement after statement to prove the real situation is being glossed over, concealed from the American people, whose vital business national defense is and must be since it is they who must pay for it, man it, die for it if need be. We must make sure this so-called voluntary censorship of the news is not misused. It will not conceal a single essential fact from our potential enemies. It might be a very clever and effective way of concealing the facts, however dangerous or ugly they may be, from the American people. It could be a smooth way of excusing such concealments on the ground that to tell the people the general facts about our national defense would be to reveal to the agents of our potential enemies information of value to them.

2. Demand the truth about the strikes in the defense industries. It serves no good purpose to argue about percentages. There is no use comparing the number of man-hours being lost now with those lost in the first World War. It is waste of time to argue about whether the fault is that of the employers or of the employees. The need for an invincible national defense is too great, too vital, too pressing for us to lose a single day in any strike. Let us demand the work be kept going and let the decisions, through mediation and compromise, be retroactive. But let nothing stop the work on the national defense.

3. Demand the truth about defense expenditures. We are not getting the facts from the administration now. Republican Members of the Congress have personally investigated these matters and have found waste, indications of corruption and graft, and incompetency. Congress is not being told the truth about the waste and inefficiency now going on. The people are not being given the facts. Let's have them. A new tax bill which will shock the Nation, when the people learn the rates, is already on the way to enactment. The waste, the graft, and the inefficiency must be paid for out of the family pocketbook the same as the money legitimately and efficiently spent. This waste and corruption and inefficiency must be paid for in terms of milk the baby can't have; of shoes the other children cannot have; of clothes father and mother must do without; of many family necessities which must be sacrificed. I say here and now it is damnable for any man or any group of men to be allowed for one hour to leech on the people through the national defense. Run down and expose to public scorn and indignation the last man of them!

4. Demand the maintenance of free speech and free press. There must be no intolerance and abuse of those who exercise their right of free speech. Free speech and fearless expression of thought offer our most certain method of perpetuating our way of life. Let us demand an end to un-American intolerance. And the same thing applies to the newspapers.

5. Demand the maintenance of free ballots. Demand an end to favoritism and discrimination in the awarding of defense contracts. Demand fairness, justice, and honesty in the administration of the W. P. A. and the other relief agencies, in the agricultural payments, and all the other nonmilitary functions of the Government. Unless we do this, we will lose our government of, for, and by the people, and we will have put upon us a government of, for, and by the dominant political party. We have already gone far along that road.

6. Demand the national defense be managed, controlled, and produced by the trained and experienced military and naval experts, with the help of honest and experienced managers of industry and leaders of labor. This is no time to turn over to New Deal theorists the management and production of our national defense. They totally lack the necessary training, temperament, and ability to do the job.

7. Demand the right of the Nation through the minority party to audit and police the political bureaucracy, both in Washington and throughout the United States, which has thrown away many millions of dollars, and which the people fear will waste many more millions and not do the defense job efficiently. We must not forget our military defense against dangers from without may be defeated and our liberties lost and our Nation wrecked by agencies and causes within. Economic chaos, national bankruptcy are just as dangerous enemies to freedom and democracy as any dictators who ever lived—and they are vastly more difficult to detect in time.

8. Stamp out revolutionary communism, fascism, every sort of absolutism at home. Oppose them in your own communities. Stand for Americanism—and stand aggressively, earnestly, actively for it against every seduction, against every argument, against every threat. Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty, and that means vigilance by the hour and by the day, not each 2 or 4 years when elections come around.

9. Oppose and discourage class and sectional divisions, prejudices, suspicions, hatreds, frictions. "United we stand, divided we fall."

10. Demand real national unity. Resist demands for blind submission. Unity is not submission. It is intelligent cooperation. Submission is blind yielding to dictation, whether bureaucratic, administrative, or social—when nobody dares to disagree. Unity is reached through proposal, disagreement, discussion, compromise—the American way. We are unified as to the need for an invincible national defense. We all want it. We are not all agreed as to the methods

which have thus far been employed to get it. We believe—a lot of us—that national defense can be achieved more economically, more efficiently, more quickly under practical military and naval officials, industrial managers, and honest labor leaders than under political and social theorists, whose chief concern is to perpetuate themselves in power at the expense of the taxpayers.

11. Demand frankness and candor on the part of the administration about these eventful and vital matters which involve the lives, the happiness, the security and the property of all of us in our generation, and of those generations which are to come after us. We have heard much, indeed, about candor. We have had all too little of it.

12. There has been built up by means of a clever and widespread propaganda the claim it is unpatriotic, un-American, treasonable, to dare question a single statement or act of the administration in regard to government; or the national defense; or in regard to its policies. That simply is the device of political bureaucrats who do not want the facts to be known to the people.

We must be ready and willing to face the bitter criticism of those who want to conceal their acts and their policies when we demand those acts and policies be made known to the people who have a right to know about them.

The administration must not be a political administration. It must be a national administration.

All the people must give their sons and brothers and fathers to the draft. All the people must be ready to work, and sacrifice and die, if need be, for the defense of our country. All of us must pay and pay and pay—down to a far generation of Americans yet to be born. We are all vitally involved. We are all entitled to know the facts. We are all entitled to do our part. We are all vitally interested in preserving and perpetuating the form of government, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the way of life which have brought to us, as a people, the richest blessings, the finest living conditions, the greatest spiritual, and cultural and material advancement ever achieved by any people on the face of the globe.

We are all vitally interested in preserving this rich heritage and in passing it on, unimpaired, untarnished, to those who are to come after us.

In the name of humanity, in the name of conscience, in the name of all that makes life worth living let us demand—and secure—what is honest and just and right and efficient. Let us preserve our beloved country. Let us keep our unsurpassed way of life and not change it in panic, in fright, in despair or in futility.

We can come through the American way. Let's do it.

Keep the United States Out of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 9 (legislative day of Thursday, May 8), 1941

STATEMENT BY WOMEN'S NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued yesterday by the Women's National Committee To Keep the United States Out of War.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NINETY-FOUR PERCENT OF WOMEN OPPOSE FOREIGN WAR INVOLVEMENT—NATION-WIDE POLL BY WOMEN'S NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO KEEP U. S. OUT OF WAR ALSO SHOWS SAME PERCENTAGE VOTED AGAINST COMMON CITIZENSHIP WITH GREAT BRITAIN—POLL ANALYSIS REVEALS 77 PERCENT OF PRO-WAR VOTE CAME FROM EASTERN SEABOARD, WITH 41 PERCENT COMING FROM NEW YORK CITY

WASHINGTON.—Ninety-four and nine-tenths percent of the women in this country are opposed to foreign war involvement and common citizenship with Great Britain, according to analysis of returns from a Nation-wide poll just completed by the Women's National Committee to Keep U. S. Out of War. Only 5.1 percent voted for war involvement and common British citizenship, and 77 percent of the pro-war vote came from eastern seaboard States, according to a statement issued today at the committee's Washington headquarters by Miss Cathrine Curtis, national chairman.

"We have been hearing more and more about certain polls showing an increasing war involvement sentiment in this country," Miss Curtis said. "Unable to find anyone who had been approached and questioned by any of these polls, we decided to conduct our own poll, contacting women in all parts of the country direct by mail. We sent a special polling blank to housewives, nurses, school teachers, members of college faculties, business and professional women, doctors, lawyers, and others in every State in the Union.

"The questions asked were:

"'Do you oppose our involvement in the present European war?

"'Would you oppose a common citizenship with England, such as proposed by the Union Now movement?'

"We did not ask those voting to sign their names to the polling blanks, but made provision for signature and address for those who wished to so identify themselves.

"It is interesting to note that while 88 percent of those voting against war involvement and common British citizenship not only signed their names, but also gave their address; only 45.6 percent of those voting for war involvement and common citizenship so identified themselves.

"We consider this poll—with its direct contact by mail—a definite demonstration of the true sentiment of a vast majority of the women on the war-involvement and common-citizenship issues. They are definitely opposed to both, particularly west of the Allegheny Mountains.

"Analysis of the returns reveals that 77 percent of the pro-war, pro-common-citizenship vote came from the eastern seaboard States, with 55 percent of that vote coming from the Northeastern States and 22 percent from the southeastern group. These returns also show that New York City furnished 41 percent of the pro-war vote in the northeastern section, while certain communities in New Hampshire having a number of Rhodes scholars—Oxford University graduates—either in local faculties or in the local business and professional fields, furnished 26 percent of that section's pro-war vote.

"We included the question relative to a possible reunion with Great Britain—a common citizenship—because we recognize that is one of the strong underlying motives in the campaign toward war here. We feel this is more than evidenced by the fact that everyone who voted for war involvement also voted for 'union now', or a return to the colonial status from which our forefathers freed us by the wars of the Revolution and of 1812.

"Unquestionably, acceptance of this so-called 'union now' proposal by our people will be sought under the guise of 'uniting the strength of the democracies' or some such fanciful phrase. But, no matter how it may be cloaked in confusing language, this poll shows our people are opposed to it because they realize it means not only the loss of our liberties and independence, but also a union of world debts to be saddled upon the backs of our taxpayers," Miss Curtis' statement said.

The returns received by mail at the committee's Washington headquarters, show the following results:

	Percent
Against war and common British citizenship	94.9
For war and common British citizenship	5.1

The Women's National Committee to Keep U. S. Out of War was organized in 1939 as successor to the Women's National Committee for Hands Off the Supreme Court which, under the leadership of Miss Curtis, successfully led the women's campaign against the Supreme Court packing plan in 1937. Since it was organized 2 years ago, the keep-out-of-war committee has served as an information center for anti-foreign-war women's groups throughout the country, and has represented them before various committees on Capitol Hill, expressing for them their opposition to foreign war involvement.

Miss Curtis is well known, both on Capitol Hill and throughout the country, as a lecturer, writer, and economist. She has appeared before a number of congressional committees on behalf of women and their investment in our form of government, and is recognized as an outstanding leader of women, and a champion of their great stake in the Republic. She has just returned from an extended speaking tour of the West coast, where she was unanimously elected national chairman of the Mothers' National Executive Committee, an emergency organization formed for the purpose of coordinating the activities of mothers and women's groups in this country opposed to foreign war involvement.

The American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1941

ORATION BY FRANK CHURCH, JR., OF BOISE, IDAHO

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an oration on "The American Way of Life" delivered by Frank Church, Jr., 16-year old Boise, Idaho, youth, who won the 1941 national high-school oratorial contest conducted by the American Legion on April 18, 1941, at Charleston, S. C.:

During the course of the past year the American people have witnessed with apprehension the destruction of democracy in all parts of the world. We have witnessed this conquest at the hands of a brutal alien philosophy of life, and we have determined, in unanimity, that the fate of France, the fate of Norway, of Belgium, and of Poland shall

not be the fate of America. To realize this objective we are engaged in an unprecedented program of defense.

Do you believe that this effort to prepare is merely for the defense of our independence? Do you believe that it is merely to protect our farms, our industries, and our property, or do you believe, with me, that it is primarily to defend democracy, to defend freedom, to defend the American way of life? Our ambition to succeed in this attempt is laudable, but we will not succeed, we cannot succeed, in defending the American way unless we thoroughly and completely understand it. What, then, is the American way? How can we understand it? How can we defend it?

Over 50 years ago the noted clergyman, Henry Ward Beecher, made this statement: "The real democratic American ideal is not that every man should be on the same level with every other but that everyone shall have liberty, without hindrance, to be what God made him." In other words, that everyone is to have the opportunity to develop according to his own wish and his own ability. This, friends, is the one way to find and enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Around this ideal we have molded our manner of living in America and have founded it upon three fundamental principles of freedom.

The first of these principles is the natural development of our history. It is that of a society, free, classless, and equal. A free and equal society was inevitable in America. Our ancestors fled from Europe to break away from a society of privilege. In the New World they established one of justice and equality. In Europe, command and guidance were the result of hereditary rank. In America, authority and leadership became the result of diligence, ability, and toil. In Europe, opportunity was dependent upon riches and prestige. In America, dependent upon nothing, but open to all. Our system of free schools and our public libraries manifest that equality of opportunity afforded to every American. And we must keep it that way. We must keep it free from all privilege in order that every citizen, unhampered by birth, or rank, or wealth, might continue to enjoy an equal chance to succeed. We must, because a free society is the first of the three principles upon which our system rests. A free society is a vital part of the American way.

The second principle in our manner of living is inseparable from the first. What value would a free society have for any one of you if you were the victims of a regimented economy? Social freedom is worthless in an economy where all industrial policy is decided and directed from above, and where every position, every advancement is dependent upon the whims of a political bureaucrat. Indeed, the inalienable truth that social freedom must always go hand in hand with economic freedom has ever been recognized in America. Because of this we have encouraged free enterprise and private initiative. We have respected the freedom of every citizen, first, to select his own occupation, and, secondly, if possible, to own his own business. The natural ambition to succeed, the natural desire for private gain, and the efficiency-making competition of free, rival enterprise have built our dynamic economy, and our free, dynamic economy has given us more luxuries, more comforts, and a higher standard of living than any other people have ever enjoyed in any other place or at any other time.

Even so, this system is not perfect. Its greatest weakness is monopoly, for monopoly alone can destroy all its advantages and inevitably results in shocking abuse of power. But our Federal Government has the authority to destroy monopoly. It must use this authority. It must wage a constant fight against abuse of power and favor justice for the common man. It must do so in a constructive defense of our free capital and our free economy; for, economic freedom, as social freedom, is a vital part of the American way.

Today all of us are confronted with a tremendous task—that of defending our manner of life. We shall willingly defend it from without, but we are baffled and confused when we ponder how to defend it from within. Even at this moment an insidiously inspired propaganda campaign is causing that confusion. This campaign is being waged, not against social freedom, not against economic freedom, but against the third principle of the American way—political freedom. If this principle fails, the others shall perish; if it endures, the others will endure. The incomparable privilege of political freedom is more than majority rule or representative government. It is protection for the minority. It is the freedom granted to every individual to speak, to read, and to think as he pleases. It is the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. It is his guaranty, in emergency, of a speedy, public trial by jury, and his protection against excessive fines or cruel and unusual punishment. It is his right to be secure against unreasonable search or seizure in his person, his property, and his home.

Friends, of all our obligations to the American way not one is more vital than a jealous defense of political freedom against any kind of limitation, for there has been no period in all the centuries of the history of man where political freedom has been limited and where democracy has survived. This does not mean that our Government should take no action against spies, saboteurs, or traitors. Such is the obligation of responsible government. But it does mean that we must respect the political freedom of every citizen and every sincere minority, for only in that manner can we protect democracy, and only in that way can a truly enlightened people discuss fairly and adequately solve their problems.

If, during the crisis that confronts us today and tomorrow, we defend social, economic, and political freedom, guided by the precepts of Christian faith, we shall have maintained the American way. Preserve, protect, and defend these three principles, and no matter how dark the future may be a united America will move forward with unshakable courage and irresistible power toward unlimited democracy and happier times.

The Doctrine of Good Neighbors and the Solidarity Pact of Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1941

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I propounded to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN] a question on the ship bill relating to the South American nations. He answered as I expected that there was not the slightest intention to include them in this bill.

That is perfectly right, as it seems to me the bill only deals with "idle ships." However, it is important that we obtain this statement of the exclusion of our neighbors in order that the fullest implications of the good-neighbor doctrine be preserved.

I noticed with pleasure that the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee recommendation to the governments of the American Republics advising a common policy toward foreign flagships tied up in their ports by the European war. To me the important thing is not so much what they agreed upon, but that they agreed. They have met a situation that is causing trouble in every port, and they met it as pan Americans—solidly and unanimously.

I congratulate Under Secretary Sumner Welles for this splendid demonstration of unanimity.

It was certainly reassuring and inspiring to see gathered around a conference table at the Pan American Union these representatives of the 21 American Republics recommending in unison that their respective nations take over more than 160 foreign vessels idle in their ports.

The chairman of the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee, Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles, sat with the following men:

Arturo Lares, Venezuelan Chargé d'Affaires; Jose Richling, Uruguayan Minister; Santiago Rivas Costa, Uruguayan representative on the Committee; Julio Vega Battle, Dominican Chargé d'Affaires; Juan Chavez, Peruvian Commercial Attaché; Juan J. Soler, Paraguayan Minister; Juan Ehrman, Panamanian First Secretary; Leon De Bayle, Nicaraguan Minister; Raimundo Cuervo, Mexican First Secretary; Conzalo Carias, Honduran consul general at New York; Jacques Carmeleau-Antoine, Haitian Chargé d'Affaires; Henry Lewis, committee secretary; Enrique Lopez-Herrarte, Guatemalan First Secretary; Hector David Castro, El Salvador Minister; Colon Eloy Alfaro, Ecuadoran Ambassador; Rodolfo Michels, Chilean Ambassador; Ramiro Guerra, Cuban representative on the Committee; Octavian Beeche, Costa Rican representative; Gabriel Turbay, Colombian Ambassador; Carlos Martins, Brazilian Ambassador; Luis F. Guachalla, Bolivian Minister; Carlos Pardo, Argentine representative on Committee; Felipe A. Espil, Argentine Ambassador.

It is a far cry from the dawn of the good-neighbor policy through the Buenos Aires Conference of 1936 and the Lima, Peru declaration of 1938 to this present development but under the implications of those assemblies we have today a perfect demonstration of spiritual unity achieved through the similarity of Republican institutions predicated on an unshakeable will for peace. We have a practical demonstration that the good-neighbor policy is reaping dividends in these consultations. Here is what the advisory committee recommended:

Whereas subparagraph (D) of article 2, resolution IV, on economic cooperation, of the meeting of foreign ministers of the American republics at Panama in 1939 charged the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee with studying and proposing to the governments the most effective measures for mutual cooperation to lessen or offset dislocations in the trade of the American republics resulting from the present war;

The commerce of the American republics has normally been carried on in large measure in merchant vessels of non-American powers, many of which are not available for

such trade because of the increasing rate of destruction of the means of maritime transportation by the belligerent nations, the consequent increased diversion of such vessels to other trades, and the prolonged stationing by their owners of a large number of such vessels in American ports interrupting their normal commercial activities; and

The resulting shipping shortage has prejudiced and is prejudicing the commerce of and among the American republics, creating a very grave problem for the fundamental right of the nations of the Americas to preserve the trade which is essential to their normal existence;

Some of the American republics have already been forced to take step: with a view to remedying this situation; and

Bearing in mind the recommendations of the Inter-American Neutrality Committee, which were adopted by resolution I of the second meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American republics at Habana in July 1940, the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee resolves to recommend to the governments of the American republics:

A. That they declare that the foreign-flag vessels in American ports, the normal commercial activities of which have been interrupted as a consequence of the war, may now be utilized by the American republics in accordance with the rules of international law and the provisions of their respective national legislations, in such a manner as to promote the defense of their economies as well as the peace and security of the continent.

The utilization of said vessels through agreements with the owners of the vessels or by virtue of the right of each of the American republics to assume complete jurisdiction and control over such vessels, and as they may deem it convenient to satisfy their own requirements.

B. That just and adequate compensation for the utilization of the said vessels be made in accordance with the commonly accepted rules of international law and the national legislations of each of the American republics. In the determination of this compensation, the damages which might have been caused and the other obligations resulting by the presence of these ships in the ports in which they may be, shall be taken into consideration.

C. That they reaffirm their full right to the free navigation of those vessels, both in their national and international trade, once they are under the flag of any one of the American republics, and that they agree upon measures tending to facilitate the effective exercise of said right.

Mr. Speaker, in setting up this machinery under the direction of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American republics we have an ever-open opportunity for any one of them at their own initiative to call for a meeting "in the event that the peace of any of the American republics is menaced."

We have had a joint declaration of the American republics protesting the violation of the neutrality of Belgium, Holland, and Luxemburg under the Solidarity Pact of Panama of 1939. We have had the famous protest of the 21 American republics to violation of the neutrality zone in connection with the encounter between the naval forces of the British and the German belligerents in December 1939. We have even had a specific protest to Great Britain protesting against the hostile act of the British along the Brazilian coast.

It also ought to be remembered that—

The act of Habana provides for an emergency committee composed of a representative of each of the American republics, and will be constituted as soon as two-thirds of the American republics shall have appointed their members. The committee shall assume the administration of any region in the Western Hemisphere now controlled by a European power whenever an attempt shall be made to transfer the sovereignty or control of such territory to another non-American nation.

We can truly salute the consultative pacts and the entire doctrine of the good-neighbor policy.

Canada and the St. Lawrence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED F. BEITER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1941

ARTICLE BY HON. C. H. CAHAN, K. C., OF MONTREAL, CANADA

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the third of a series of articles concerning the St. Lawrence situation which were prepared by the Honorable C. H. Cahan, K. C., and recently published in the Montreal Gazette. I believe that Mr. Cahan's remarks are of great interest to my colleagues, and take pleasure in submitting the following, which completes the series:

[From the Montreal (Canada) Gazette of March 27, 1941]

JOINT DEVELOPMENT OF ST. LAWRENCE

(By Hon. C. H. Cahan, K. C.)

III

In the two articles, which the Gazette published on March 20 and 21, I contended that an agreement to carry into effect the proposed scheme for the construction of a dam across the St. Lawrence River at Barnhart Island, and for the development of hydroelectric power in the international section of the river, was not authorized by the terms of the Waterways Treaty of 1909, and could not be made effective by concurrent legislation of the United States Congress and of the Parliament of Canada. The legal opinions of Mr. W. Stuart Edwards, Deputy Minister of Justice, and of J. E. Read, legal adviser of the Department of External Affairs, more recently published at Ottawa, both concur in this contention.

Mr. Edwards, in a letter dated March 11, declared that procedure by agreement in this matter would not be justified by the provisions of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909. Mr. Read, in a memorandum dated March 12, declared that "procedure by concurrent legislation or by agreement could not be supported by the authority of the provisions of the Boundary Waters Treaty." Mr. Edwards also adds that "Canada is entitled to have the contract ratified in a manner or by a method which the United States will regard as binding. It is generally understood that a treaty ratified in accordance with the United States Constitution is binding upon the United States," that is, a treaty consented to or ratified by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Senators present. Mr. Edwards also suggested that an opinion be secured from the law officers of the United States, if possible from the Attorney General, as to whether the proposed procedure would be binding on that country.

Mr. Green H. Hackworth, the Legal Adviser of the State Department, Washington, in a memorandum dated March 13, subsequently stated as follows:

"It is not necessary here to enter into a discusison of the treaty-making power or of the power of the President to enter into Executive agreements with foreign countries. It is sufficient to say that a very large number of agreements on various subjects have been entered into from time to time throughout the history of this country."

This is certainly a very indefinite basis on which to base an agreement which involves the vital interests of Canada and the illustrations cited by Mr. Hackworth are somewhat alarming. He says:

"Following the failure of the Senate to approve a treaty for the annexation of Texas, the annexation was accomplished by a joint resolution approved on March 1, 1845, after passage by a simple majority vote of the two Houses of Congress. Likewise, in the case of Hawaii, a treaty of annexation had been signed on June 16, 1897, and approved by the Hawaiian Legislature, but there was not sufficient support in the United States Senate to obtain approval by a two-thirds vote. Thereafter Congress passed a joint resolution to accomplish the same purpose, which was approved July 7, 1898."

Public opinion has already passed an adverse judgment upon each of these remarkable proceedings. Texas, which was a part of Mexico, was overrun by an influx of immigrants from the United States, that was planned and carried out under the leadership of Moses Austin, an American citizen. These immigrants incited a revolution and the secession of Texas from Mexico. They first declared the independence of Texas, and then conspired to procure the annexation of the new Republic of Texas to the United States. The history of this movement is available to every student of American history.

In 1893, a revolutionary party in Hawaii, instigated by United States Consul Stevens, dethroned Queen Liliuokalani, declared their independence and placed the islands under the protection of the United States. President Cleveland sent Blount, an American, as Commissioner to the islands, who induced the people of Hawaii to proclaim a republic under Sanford B. Dole, another American, as president. President Cleveland then sent a treaty of annexation to the Senate for ratification, which his successor, President Harrison, withdrew. Congress then passed a resolution annexing the islands, and thereupon they became a Territory of the United States.

The people of Canado may approve of an agreement or a treaty for such a joint undertaking in the international section of the St. Lawrence River as that now proposed; but the majority of Canadians are not disposed to ratify any such proceeding as a mere preliminary to the annexation of Canada by the United States.

Mr. J. E. Read of the Department of External Affairs, Ottawa, says that:

"The question as to whether an agreement based on the legislative authority of Congress would give rise to a valid obligation is one that would depend primarily upon the constitutional law of the United States. It is one upon which it is not possible for a Canadian lawyer to speak with confidence and it is necessary to rely upon the formal opinion submitted by the advisers of the United States Government in legal matters."

Mr. Read thereupon indulges in what he terms "theoretical speculations," and proceeds to deal rather cleverly with the political

probabilities of United States executive and congressional action, even though not subject to any valid legal obligations, to conserve Canada's interests in respect of navigation and power production in the international section of the St. Lawrence River. But he does not assert that mere agreements, entered into by the United States and confirmed by statutory enactments, are valid and enforceable, or that such agreements are not subject to the changing caprices of future congressional majorities.

A treaty is a contract made between nation and nation, which is binding upon the contracting nations notwithstanding changes of government or changes in the personnel of their respective legislatures. The authority, in whom the treaty-making power is vested, is prescribed by the fundamental or constitutional law of each sovereign state; and under the rules of international law it is essential for the validity of a treaty that it is made by the sovereign power of each of the contracting states. Throughout the British Commonwealth this power is vested in the Crown; in the United States it is vested in the President, subject to the concurrence of a two-thirds majority in the Senate, as provided in the second article of the Constitution of the United States.

The second clause of the sixth article of that Constitution provides that—

"All treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges of every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

The third clause of the same article provides that "the Senators and Representatives * * * shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution."

The President negotiates treaties through the Department of State regular Ministers abroad, or special envoys or plenipotentiaries appointed for the purpose. The President negotiates and the Senate ratifies, two-thirds of its Members present necessarily concurring. The participation of the House of Representatives is necessary only when appropriations of money or other legislation is required to carry the provisions of the treaty into effect.

In hundreds of cases these prescriptions of the Constitution of the United States are clearly enunciated. Why should the legal advisers of the Canadian Government shut their eyes to these facts, or refuse to consider them on the plea that they are merely Canadian lawyers? The provisions of the United States Constitution dealing with this matter are written in plain and unmistakable terms.

Any intelligent person who reads the draft agreement presented to the House of Commons on Friday, the 21st of March, must admit that in form and substance it is a treaty, and its validity, so far as the United States is concerned, depends upon its ratification by two-thirds majority of the United States Senate.

With these facts staring him in the face, Mr. Jackson, Attorney General of the United States, on March 14, gave his opinion that the agreement in its present form is "legally unobjectionable so far as this country is concerned," and "its provisions would be binding upon the United States so far as Canada is concerned." Morally binding it may be, but merely moral obligations are not enforceable in the courts of the United States or in Canada. Mr. Jackson carefully avoids the real issue and fails to assert that the Government of Canada or any Canadian, whose interests are prejudicially affected by a breach of this agreement, could enforce its terms in the courts of the United States, in case it is not ratified by the Senate of the United States as prescribed by its Constitution.

A treaty, which has been duly ratified in conformity with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, becomes "the supreme law of the land," and is enforceable in all its courts. So vast and complicated are the Canadian interests involved that Canada should insist upon a ratification of the proposed agreement in a mode that is undoubtedly valid. Mr. Jackson is only concerned with a valid ratification by Canada; but it is of the highest concern to Canada that the proposed treaty should be properly and effectively ratified by the Senate of the United States, and therefore, Canada should not complacently acquiesce in any doubtful procedure such as that now proposed.

Lewis and Clark, Trail Blazers Magnificent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1941

ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting and thrilling accounts of the Lewis and Clark expedition to the Pacific Northwest which I have ever read is contained in a recent article by Mr. Richard L. Neuberger, published in the American Legion magazine, March 1941.

The article reads as follows:

TRAIL BLAZERS MAGNIFICENT

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

From St. Louis, edge of American civilization, Sergt. John Ordway, of the United States Army, wrote to his father and mother in New Hampshire: "Honored parents: I am now on an expedition to the westward with Captain Lewis and Lieutenant Clark, who are appointed by President Jefferson to go through the interior of North America. We are to ascend the Missouri River and then go by land to the great western ocean."

A courier went through the camp collecting such messages from men who were not sure they would ever be heard from again. Then, late on the rainy afternoon of May 14, 1804, the 29 members of the party embarked in two long, trim rowboats and a 55-foot bargelike bateau. They were voyaging into the unknown.

At St. Louis geography ended and myth began. The Indians whispered of the Shining or Rocky Mountains that scraped the sky. Was this merely one of their legends? Jefferson, when Minister to France, had heard mariners who sailed with Captain Cook on his Pacific voyages describe evergreen forests as boundless as the oceans and peaks high as the Alps, to be seen on America's western shore. Were their tales true? Jefferson's lively imagination had been fired and thenceforward he dreamed of sending brave men to "explore the great wilderness beyond the Mississippi and form a line of communication from sea to sea."

As soon as his envoys had bought from Napoleon for $15,000,000 the million square miles of territory that France claimed on the sundown side of the Mississippi, Jefferson asked Congress for $2,500 to finance its exploration. "And let us search out even that which lies beyond," he urged.

To lead the expedition the President selected his private secretary, 29-year-old Meriwether Lewis, believing that this young Army captain had a determination that nothing could conquer. Such a man was needed; there might be more than dangers of the wilderness to face, and temptations to turn back might be many. A race for empire was in prospect, for the British were talking of sending men to hoist the Union Jack at the mouth of the Columbia.

Jefferson suggested that Lewis select an alternative commander, and Lewis named his best friend, William Clark, a 34-year-old Artillery lieutenant.

They were in strong contrast. Lewis' thin countenance, with defiant jaw and slate-gray eyes, had an eaglelike intensity. He was taciturn, almost gloomy. Clark, red-headed, red-faced, was never stern or silent. His cheerful chatter often had revived the spirits of troops weary on the march. He liked to dodge officers' mess to eat with the men; he hailed colonels and corporals alike by their first names. He got along with Indians better than anyone else in the Army, possibly because he treated them as equals.

Clark went from post to post on the frontier, asking picked men if they wanted to plant their country's flag on the western ocean. Lewis arranged for supplies, which included presents for the Indians—mirrors, red cloth, needles, beads, calico shirts.

Men picked for the journey were enlisted in the Army at $10 a month for privates, $15 for the three sergeants, $80 each for Lewis and Clark, and as a bonus they were promised parcels of land. Whether any of them would survive to enjoy these rewards was doubtful. Their eventual destination was so indefinite that Jefferson gave them papers bespeaking the good offices of "our consuls in Batavia, in Java, and at the Cape of Good Hope."

As they rowed up the sluggish Missouri, under the flag with 15 stars, the party was a cross section of the expanding Nation. Alongside Kentuckians chosen for their woodcraft were hunters from Virginia, farmers from Vermont, carpenters from Pennsylvania. There were Irishmen, Scots, Dutchmen, and Frenchmen. Near Lieutenant Clark in the first boat crouched his brawny Negro servant, York.

The explorers had not gone far before they realized that the map the President had supplied was useless; it did not even indicate the correct direction of the river. All they could do was to follow the Missouri to its source. From there dead reckoning might take them to the sea. For the first few months it was an idyllic journey—comfortable camps at night, days uneventful save for sightseeing. By firelight the two leaders worked painstakingly on their journals, for the President and Congress wanted complete reports on plants, trees, beasts, birds, and Indians. One evening Lewis wrote: "In addition to the common deer, which were in great abundance, we saw goats, elk, buffaloes, antelope, the black-tailed deer, and the large wolves." They counted 52 herds of bison in 1 day.

Three months out of St. Louis, the adventurers had voyaged 850 miles and were not far from what is now Sioux City in Iowa. The going got harder. The clumsy bateau repeatedly lurched aground on sandbars. One man collapsed from sunstroke. Sgt. Charles Floyd died of colic in the choking heat of an August afternoon. They buried him on a high bluff, the first American soldier to die west of the Mississippi. The boats went on, the men silent, Lewis wrapped in thought. A man dead, many sick, the real perils just begun.

That night, instead of appointing a new sergeant, Lewis told the men themselves to elect a successor to Floyd. Amid much oratory three soldiers were nominated. Grizzled Patrick Gass was chosen. Next morning the party took to the boats with renewed zeal; Lewis had turned the men's minds from brooding over the loss of their companion.

Misadventures multiplied. Nineteen-year-old George Shannon, on scout duty, got lost and almost starved. A riverbank crumbled and nearly destroyed the precious supplies. Lewis, habitually scouting ahead, had several narrow escapes from stampeding buffalo.

Most of the Indians they met were friendly, grunting with pleasure over trinkets and delighted with whisky dealt out in judicious doses. Whenever possible, chiefs of nearby tribes were summoned to powwows under a sailcloth canopy, the flag flying, and told about the Great White Father in Washington to whom they now owed loyalty. Council Bluffs takes its name from one of these powwows.

Gradually the huge pile of presents shrunk and word of the remarkable white men spread over the prairie. To one mighty chief the generous Clark gave his army uniform. Several times Sioux warriors threatened an attack in an effort to get all the wonderful gifts, but were backed down by a rattling of cutlasses and by a reminder that the mysterious Great White Father could exterminate them all.

A lazy half-breed, Toussaint Charbonneau, interpreted. The party had picked him up along the route. With him was his 19-year old Indian wife, Sacajawea, slender in figure, with long braids and dark eyes. Six years before, she had been stolen from the Shoshones by marauding braves, and Charbonneau had won her in a gambling bout? A woman on the expedition? Lewis and Clark had hesitated, but they desperately needed Charbonneau. Besides, Sacajawea's tribe was said to dwell beyond the high mountains. Maybe this Indian girl would know the way.

Meadows and prairies gave way to rolling hills, the hills stiffened into plateaus. But the horizons still were land. Where did it end? Where was the Western Ocean?

Every day the party found landmarks new to white men. Where a river or promontory had a definite Indian name, Lewis left it that way in his journal. Other places were called after members of the expedition irrespective of rank.

The first heavy snows fell in November, trapping the party near the site of Bismarck, N. Dak. In the half year they had made 1,600 miles, all up the Missouri. A few traders had been thus far but no white man had ever gone farther. They built a stockade, calling it Fort Mandan for the friendly Mandan Indians, and here during the long dreary winter a baby boy was born to Sacajawea.

April 7, 1805, the last ice having drifted down the river, Fort Mandan was left behind. So was the bateau, too big for the narrowing Missouri and no longer needed for the dwindling supplies. Six canoes made of buffalo hides and willow branches took its place.

The country grew wilder, the landscape less hospitable. Mosquitoes and gnats were a curse. Buffalo were scarce and, without buffalo hide for patching, clothes and moccasins began to shred.

But the ragged frontiersmen now were unlocking the secrets of the continent. They came upon huge, ferocious grizzly bears that it took half a dozen musket balls to kill. They spent weeks of back-breaking toil portaging goods and boats past thundering cataracts which they called the Great Falls of the Missouri. And on May 26, a Sunday, Lewis, who had been scouting ahead as usual, came back to camp excited. He had glimpsed majestic mountains.

Independence Day, 1805, was celebrated at the foot of the Rockies, 2,500 miles and 14 months from St. Louis. Wistfully they drank the last of their brandy. Other supplies, too, were running low. Lewis wrote in his journal: "We all believe that we are about to enter upon the most perilous part of our voyage."

Only the Indian girl, her baby strapped to her back, had the vaguest notion where they were. From out of the memories of her childhood Sacajawea recognized a creek at which her people had collected clay for painting their war parties. When the dwindling Missouri abruptly forked into three branches her memory again helped. She sent them up the swiftest fork, which they named Jefferson River.

The stream twisted through a labyrinth of volcanic walls at which it clawed with white-capped talons. Sometimes the boats upset and their loads were swept downstream. The men waded through the glacier-fed water, pulling their leaky craft on long ropes, for they could not walk on the steep banks. "The men by being constantly wet are becoming more feeble," the captain noted. Sharp stones cut to pieces what remained of their moccasins and drops of blood flecked the stream. They had journeyed as close to the crest of the continent as water would take them.

Wherever they looked the skyline was a jagged row of pinnacles—mountains piled on mountains—such peaks as Americans never had seen. Each ridge surmounted brought a glimpse of a ridge higher still. Eventually they reached the region where now Montana joins Idaho, where the Rockies and the Bitter Root Mountains run parallel in a vast maze. Lewis sent scouts scattering to find some way across. They came back baffled, four of them nursing injuries from falls.

By now, Lewis realized that he must find the Shoshones or give up the expedition. His fatigued men could not drag themselves over those summits, let alone carry burdens; they must have horses. Rations were low and they could not survive a Rocky Mountain winter. Soon the snows would start, and it would be too late even to go back. They had not seen an Indian for 4 months, though Sacajawea insisted that she twice had seen the smoke signals of her people.

Lewis chose three men and pushed on ahead. Every morning when they broke camp they left beads and mirrors as tokens of friendliness to any Indians who might stumble onto the dead fires. At last, ragged and exhausted, they crawled to the top of a high ridge and looked down the Pacific slope of the Rockies. Here, on the Continental Divide, they unfurled the flag. They had two pounds of flour left.

As Chief Cameahwait and 60 mounted Shoshone braves jogged over the crest of Lemhi Pass late in the afternoon of August 13, they saw tottering toward them a tall, ragged stranger with pale skin. In his right hand he carried a cloth of red, white, and blue. Half a hundred paces to the rear were three other strangers with long, black sticks.

"Taba bone (white man)," the hollowed-eyed stranger said.

"Ah hi e! (I am much pleased!)" the young chief replied gravely. There on the roof of the continent the feathered savage and the Virginia gentleman embraced and slapped each other on the back.

Game had been scarce that year and the Shoshones were hungry, yet they shared with the white men. The captain's pulse quickened when the chief offered him roast salmon. Salmon from the sea!

Lewis bartered ornaments, coats, blankets and knives for 38 horses, which were sent back to bring up the main party. A dramatic incident marked the reunion of the two parties. Sacajawea, meeting Cameahwait, greeted him with affectionate cries. They were brother and sister! Nevertheless, when the party went on, Sacajawea chose to stick with her husband rather than return to her people.

A withered old Shoshone, whom Clark christened Toby, volunteered to act as guide. He was not much help. They wandered in the Bitter Root range like men in a rock-bound fortress, while snow began to plug the passes. Provisions ran out. They had to kill some of the horses, which were starving too, with ground bare of fodder. One day there was only a brace of pheasants for 32 mouths to eat. They scraped the bed of Hungry Creek for crawfish; they grubbed for roots. One wretched night they ate a timber wolf Lewis shot. Bratton was in desperate plights, and Lewis gave him his mount and struggled ahead on foot. A horse loaded with winter coats slipped, screamed in terror, and vanished over a precipice.

Finally they reached open country. They looked like skeletons, and now even the inexorable driver, Lewis, collapsed. While he lay beside the Clearwater River, too weak even to sit up, the others trimmed pine logs and burned out the cores to shape rude canoes. The work was hard for exhausted men and it went slowly.

In the canoes they floated down the Clearwater and into the Snake, at the spot where Lewiston, Idaho, stands. They paddled down the Snake and about the middle of October came to a mighty river which surged out of the north and bent westward. This was the Columbia—the Great River Oregon—which for two generations adventurous souls had dreamed of exploring.

For 3 weeks more they stroked the bulky canoes between mountains and grassy meadows and fir forests. One quiet night a soldier heard a far-off roar. Soon long swells rolled up the river from downstream. Gulls flew overhead. The water was full of salmon. There was a tang of salt in the air.

Fog cloaked the Columbia on the morning of November 7, 1805, but around noon it cleared and in the distance a wide expanse of tossing breakers was visible. For a moment the men looked out to sea in silence. Then they cheered. In his queerly spelled diary Clark scrawled: "Ocian in view! Oh, the joy! We are in view of the ocian, that great ocian, which we have been so long anixous to see!"

For the first time Americans had spanned the continent they would one day inhabit from coast to coast. On that lonely shore, the flag flapping at his back, Captain Lewis thanked the soldiers in behalf of President Jefferson. They had reached their goal ahead of any nation with rival ambitions, covering 4,100 adventurous miles in a year and a half. Just 125 years later one could board a plane at St. Louis after daybreak and be in Portland before dark.

Near present-day Astoria the expedition built a stockade, Fort Clatsop, that sheltered them during the second winter, and in the bark of a tall pine that overlooked the sea Lieutenant Clark carved this record:

"Wm. Clark December 3d, 1805, by land from the U. States in 1804 & 5."

Hoping that, even if they were lost on the way home, their success would be known, Lewis prepared a statement they all signed attesting that the party had reached the Pacific overland from St. Louis. The document was posted at the fort and copies were sent to Indian villages along the shore. No sign or trace of white men was visible, but perhaps a landing party from some frigate anchoring off that coast would come across them.

Late in March of 1806 the expedition began the long trek homeward. It required only a third of the time consumed in traveling west for now they had landmarks. Again Sacajawea was invaluable, riding at the head of the column with Lewis, her thin arm unerringly pointing the way. "She has equal fortitude and resolution with any member of the party," Lewis wrote. They arrived in

St. Louis on September 23, 1806, 6 months to the day after abandoning Fort Clatsop.

The Nation had given them up for dead. They had been gone 2 years and 4 months. Cheering crowds escorted them through St. Louis. Jefferson wrote his congratulations and triumphantly informed Congress of the expedition's success. They had traveled 8,000 miles through wilderness, had reached their objective and returned, had lost only 1 man. People were amazed by the information brought back—fierce bears which weighed 1,000 pounds; mountain ranges 3 times as lofty as the Alleghanies; buffalo herds measured by horizons; wild sheep with horns shaped like cornucopias; goats that leaped from crag to crag. The New York Gazette predicted that the region would probably never be traveled again, but President Jefferson visioned "a great, free, and independent empire on the Columbia River."

Curiosity about the far West increased. Men and women started looking with pride and hope toward the vast area across the Mississippi. The bulky journals of Lewis and Clark, supplemented with notes kept by two of the sergeants, were read in hundreds of homes. For the first time people had an accurate idea of what lay beyond the western frontier of the Nation.

The Lewis and Clark expedition still stands as the most important ever undertaken by the United States, clinching our title not only to the vast Louisiana territory but later to the Oregon lands as well.

Lewis was appointed Governor of Louisiana and Clark was named Indian agent for the region and promoted to the rank of brigadier general. Lewis, always a lonely man, was unhappy in political office. In the autumn of 1809, on his way to Washington to answer criticism of his administrative methods, he stopped for a night at an inn near Nashville, Tenn. Shortly after midnight a pistol shot waked the household, and the tavern keeper found the 35-year-old explorer on the floor with a gaping wound in his side. He died at dawn. Jefferson, stunned with grief, always believed the captain had committed suicide. Tennessee folk maintained that he had been murdered. The mystery has never been satisfactorily solved.

Not far from where Lewis died, a granite shaft stands, graven with the words of the President who sent him westward:

"His courage was undaunted. His firmness and perseverance yielded to nothing but impossibility."

Trees overhang the grave, and on stormy nights the wind roars through them like breakers crashing on the Pacific's distant shore.

Political Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1941

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION FROM STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on May 2, 1941, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some information concerning the first 1,000 refugees whose names were submitted by the President's Advisory Committee on Political Refugees. I desire to include in the RECORD supplementary information which I received yesterday from the State Department. Incidentally, an article appeared in the Washington Times-Herald May 8, 1941—yesterday—having the following headline: "United States Presses Round Up of Suspect Aliens—Jackson Orders Check of All Visitors' Permits." Observing the contents of the headline, one should note in the supplementary information that 371 of the 699 people referred to in the new summary were issued visitors' visas—more than 50 percent. It might also be noted that the three consular officers admitting the largest numbers of refugees were Marseille, 427; Lisbon, 221; Moscow, 91.

The supplementary information follows:

The following is a summation of the consular offices involved and the number and kind of visas issued in the first 1,000 cases on the President's Advisory Committee list:

Name of office	Number of cases considered	Number and type of visas issued
Marseille	427	43 immigration, 186 visitor, 89 unspecified.
Lisbon	221	104 immigration, 46 visitor, 20 unspecified.
Moscow	91	27 visitor, 7 unspecified.
Oporto	81	16 immigration, 60 visitor, 3 unspecified.
Nice	60	3 immigration, 22 unspecified, 24 visitor.
Lyon	29	6 visitor.
Zurich	25	13 immigration, 2 visitor, 2 unspecified.
Casablanca	17	1 immigration, 13 visitor.
Geneva	11	1 immigration, 6 visitor, 2 unspecified.
Stockholm	7	3 visitor.
Berlin	4	
Ciudad Trujillo	4	
Lourenco Marques	4	
Madrid	4	
Budapest	3	
Algiers	3	
Yokohama	2	1 visitor, 1 unspecified.
Rio de Janeiro	2	
Tangier	2	1 visitor.
Tokyo	1	
Nogales	1	1 immigration.
Luxemburg	1	1 visitor.
Bilbao	1	Do.

Total immigration visas	182
Total visitor's visas	371
Total unspecified visas	146
	699

Aid for Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTON F. MACIEJEWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1941

RESOLUTION OF JOSEPH MORDECAI BRENNER RELIEF SOCIETY

Mr. MACIEJEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas Joseph Mordecai Brenner Relief Society, a strictly charitable, not-for-profit organization, with principal office at 910 South Independence Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., since the day it was organized (January 19, 1930) until June 15, 1940, has aided individuals, families, and organizations known to be in dire need to the extent of thousands of dollars, of which about 10 percent has gone to those in the United States of America and about 90 percent has gone to those in the Republic of Lithuania; and

Whereas on or about June 15, 1940, Russia took over the three Baltic Provinces of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, as a result of which funds of the society available for Lithuania since then have remained idle in the society's treasury because prudence dictated that the society should determine whether or not it be advisable to continue to send funds to Lithuania; and

Whereas within the last 2 months the society, through its secretary, conducted a most thorough investigation and desires that its findings be made known to similar organizations, inasmuch as the society's experiences have convinced it that at this late date much confusion exists among many similar organizations in Chicago as to whether or not it be advisable to continue to send funds to Lithuania and the society believes that such confusion exists elsewhere in the United States of America; and

Whereas all the local banks which the society has contacted "paint such a picture" as to convincingly leave the impression that it is quite satisfactory to send moneys to Lithuania, with which "picture" the society was not satisfied; and

Whereas the society, later on in its investigation, endeavored to determine how much of the necessities of life, such as food, clothing, etc., the American dollar could purchase, when converted into local Lithuanian currency, since June 15, 1940, as compared with prior to that time; and

Whereas the society has been in communication, for pertinent information, with sources whose integrity, honesty, reliability, and impartiality is beyond question—sources which have access to such information, sources which are interested solely in the protection of the American public, sources which would have no reason other than to state the facts and their honest opinions; and

Whereas one of these reliable sources has given the society this information: "It has been our experience that wherever the Russians take control ordinary commodities skyrocket in price. I believe it, therefore, safe to say that the American dollar will buy infinitely less today than it would a year ago. The conversion rate is something that is obviously so uncertain that I couldn't even guess. Like the German mark, the ruble is very rubbery"; and

Whereas another of these reliable sources has given the society the information that the Soviet Government has closed all operations of charitable organizations supported by foreign funds or supplies of foodstuffs and goods; that there is no method by which such supplies can be sent to Lithuania; and that the remittance of dollars, while possible through American banks, is accompanied by an 80 percent loss in purchasing power through Soviet exchange regulations; that while, therefore, it might be possible to send remittances via Moscow to Lithuania, where lits and rubles are both in circulation, there is no assurance that the institutions referred to are still in operation, or that the funds would reach them; that it is understood that the joint distribution committee, after attempting to operate in Lithuania, has ceased such attempts; that such reports as have been received indicate that Jewish schools in the Baltic provinces and former Poland have been taken into the general school system, and even new schools set up for Jewish children; that it is emphasized that these are Soviet schools and that probably the organization and curriculum have been modified accordingly; and

Whereas the latter source has expressed the belief that the society and similar societies in the United States of America should concentrate their efforts in areas more accessible and outside of the Soviet orbit: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That during the existence of conditions substantially the same as at the present time, the society confine its activities entirely to assist those in dire need in the United States of America, and that the contents of this resolution be made known to the general public through several newspapers in the city of Chicago and through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and that for the purpose of securing insertion in the last-named publication, this resolution be sent as soon as possible to the Honorable ANTON F. MACIEJEWSKI, representing the Sixth Illinois Congressional District in the House of Representatives, in which district are located the principal office of the society and a large part of its 200 members and their families.

CHARLES FRILLING,
President.

Attest:

ALBERT HIRSCH,
Secretary.

Dated May 5, 1941.

Wickersham's Defense-Strike Opposition Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE FREDERICK (OKLA.) LEADER

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial from the Frederick (Okla.) Leader, praising the sound and courageous stand of my friend and colleague, the Honorable VICTOR WICKERSHAM, Congressman from the Seventh District of Oklahoma. The editorial was written by Mr. J. L. Newland, editor and publisher of the Leader:

[From the Frederick (Okla.) Leader]

OPPOSED TO STRIKES

When he is quoted in the newspapers as opposing strikes because of the detrimental effect they have on our defense program, Congressman VICTOR WICKERSHAM is voicing the sentiments of the Seventh Congressional District.

Ours is largely a rural district. It is a district which keeps its Army quota so nearly filled with volunteers that the selective-draft boards find their duties comparatively light. It is a district in which the proportion of native citizens is unusually high, and where patriotism is general.

In the Seventh District the people are willing to go their full length for America, and they expect other American citizens, or those who enjoy the benefits of the United States Government, to do likewise.

When Congressman WICKERSHAM declares he is opposed to strikes at this critical period in our Nation's life, he is, therefore, speaking the language of the people he represents.

Unless Washington Hears From People of United States in No Uncertain Terms, Brutal War Is Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE KNOXVILLE (TENN.) JOURNAL

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal of May 9, 1941:

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal of May 8, 1941]

UNLESS WASHINGTON HEARS FROM PEOPLE OF UNITED STATES IN NO UNCERTAIN TERMS, BRUTAL WAR IS AHEAD

Certainly some of the readers of this page recall William Seabrook's description of voodoo rites of West Indian natives. They will remember reading how, on certain nights, a drum will sound somewhere off in the jungle. From a hill miles away there will be an answering drumbeat; then from somewhere else, another, and another, and another.

Gradually a rhythm will be established, with the beats increasing in tempo. Bodies begin to sway to the savage exaltation of the drums; feet begin to move as the pulse of repeated stabs of sound assaults the ears. At last comes a frenzy of emotion that leaves the mind in complete paralysis, and always the steady, unrelenting challenge of the drums. The savages lose all sense of time and place, returning to their senses only when they are emotionally and physically spent. That is voodoo in the West Indies.

Voodoo methods are not confined to the West Indies.

The Roosevelt administration, unless the individual citizens of the United States make their wishes known in no uncertain terms, has decided upon active entry into the European war.

Mr. Roosevelt has not said so, but the signs are unmistakable. First, there were the light drumbeats of the New Deal columnists, the professional internationalists, the Dorothy Thompsons, all the list of United States "prominent" citizens bent upon another crusade to convert the globe to democracy at the point of the sword.

These beat upon the little drums and they didn't have the desired effect. There remained a majority sentiment in the country for aid to Britain without involvement; a conviction that this Nation is unprepared for war; that our democracy, if there is ever to be a last-ditch fight to preserve it, will be saved in this hemisphere rather than on some foreign battlefield.

So now come the big drums to quicken the pulse of war fever; to play upon our emotions; to convert an antiwar sentiment into a war sentiment; to gain a majority to the Government's already-fixed determination.

First there were remarks by the President that the citizens of this country were not aware of the dangers that face them, this to constitute a general background. Then Secretary of State Cordell Hull was brought before the microphone with an important drum; day before yesterday Senator CLAUDE PEPPER of Florida, beat the drum in the Senate; Secretary of War Henry Stimson night before last; and last night Secretary of the Navy Knox added his voice to the exhortations to war that soon will echo from radio station to radio station. And not to overlook anybody, Prime Minister Winston Churchill sends across the Atlantic his own special admonition.

No; the arts of voodoo are not confined to the West Indies. Here at home, in what may result in the most fateful decision of all our history, the drums of the administration take up the tempo. The words each ritualist employs differ from those of his colleagues. The approach is not always the same. But the conclusion they all reach and recommend is identical—the United States of America must become an active participant in the European struggle.

There is a general and not unjustified suspicion abroad in the land that Senator PEPPER is a nitwit, but nonetheless any man with such a soundingboard as the United States Senate cannot be ignored, because, unless there were other citizens of his type of mind, he could not be in the Senate. Further, it may be safely assumed that he speaks with the approval of the administration.

And what does the Florida Senator advocate in his go-to-war speech? Not that we simply enter the war on Britain's side but that we undertake also to provide the Chinese Army with flyers who, quite inadvertently, would "make a shambles of Tokyo." In effect the Senator wants a war with the whole world, despite the fact that our experts assert we are not even prepared to defend our own shores, much less to undertake aggression in all parts of the world.

No matter if it doesn't make sense, here is a United States Senator, hand in glove with the administration, advocating war on both oceans without delay. PEPPER can't be dismissed as an imbecile because there is no mental test required for membership in the Senate, and as a Senator his influence might turn the tide for war.

Then again there is Henry Stimson, admitted by the President's secretary to be speaking with administration approval. What does he say? In a nutshell, here it is:

"After providing for billions' worth of munitions to carry on the defense of our freedom, and while we hold in our hands the instrument ready and able to make all these steps effective, shall we now flinch and permit these munitions to be sunk in the Atlantic Ocean?

"Our entire history shows no precedent to make such a supposition credible. Neither the Government nor the people of the United States have ever given occasion to make anyone believe that such an act of irresponsibility and indecision would be possible."

In effect, the fire-eating Stimson dares the President to make any decision other than that of war. Yet Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG made public yesterday a letter from Chairman Emory S. Land, of the Maritime Commission, disputing the administration's claim that 40 percent of the ships bearing war materials to Britain has been sunk. Only 8 ships of the 205 sailing from United States ports since December 30 have been sunk, asserts Mr. Land, who should know. Whose figures are right? Are we to be pushed into war on a false set of figures?

Before this has been published Secretary of the Navy Knox will have added his belligerent words to early drumbeats of PEPPER and Stimson. There will be a succession of others, all hammering out the same exhortation:

War! Convoys! And a little later, troops!

We are admittedly unprepared to defend ourselves here at home. We are, in accordance with our national commitments, shipping so much defense material to Britain

that we can't build our own defenses. Yet to war we are urged to go.

Talk about voodooism!

Lindbergh on National Defense and National Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1941

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, recently Colonel Lindbergh was in St. Louis, Mo., and spoke on the questions of national defense and national unity. One of the outstanding editors of my district was at that meeting. His impressions are so important to those of us in Congress, that I am taking the liberty to read them:

SERIOUS IN HIS TALK

We heard Colonel Lindbergh make a speech in St. Louis a few nights ago, had a seat close up in the front row, and got every word he spoke. He talked on whether or not this Nation was prepared for war in the air as compared with the equipment that Germany has. He thought that as pertains to competing successfully with Hitler's air forces that we were at present no match, and that if we should pool our interests with those of John Bull, it would require some time to catch up with the production of planes that the Hitler organization would be able to turn out.

The colonel was interested in facts and figures. He was quite serious and kept well to his point, spoke dignified, didn't lose his head and blow up in discussing facts which 3 years spent in Europe and England studying air warfare had taught him. Senator CLARK of Missouri had preceded him and did not get the best of attention of the 15,000 audience that listened to him. But when Lindbergh came on the audience listened with rapt attention and drank in every word that Colonel Lindbergh said.

Digressing from his recitation of facts as he knows them—and we believe that he knows the lay of the skies quite as well, if not better, than anyone else in America—he put this question, which seemed to strike deep in the minds of his vast audience:

"Have we not problems enough of our own without dividing our people over the issue of a foreign war?"

It set us to thinking, what's the use of it all any way? We are fully in sympathy with England, from which mother country we separated over a century and a half ago, and we have all but forgotten the war we again fought with her for freedom of the seas half a century ago, and we have almost ceased to remember the aid that England extended the Confederacy when the South of our own land attempted to overthrow the Union. We are favoring England in her cause today in every way. And we belong to that crowd that has many prominent leaders, both on this side and on the British Isles, that feel that we can be of greatest help in the present struggle in which the British Empire is engaged, by staying out of this old bloody European quarrel that has been going on for centuries. With Lindbergh, we hold in all seriousness that every true American is ready to fight to preserve our Nation, and to do that fighting right here at home.

I want to say to you Mr. Speaker, that the thoughts of this editor about work to be done at home, is certainly entitled to the most serious consideration by every Member of the House.

Economy in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LE ROY D. DOWNS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE BRIDGEPORT (CONN.) TELEGRAM

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker, acting under permission granted me, I wish to insert the following article in the Appendix of the RECORD, taken from the Bridgeport Telegram, Bridgeport, Conn., of May 7, 1941:

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Telegram of May 7, 1941]

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

Private citizens are warned that they will not be permitted to buy new cars as freely in the future as they have in the past—the manufacturers will not be permitted to make them—and that they must be prepared to do without many other luxury items and to pay higher taxes on some of the things commonly used.

In other words, the people must pull in their belts, make sacrifices, and prepare to take this war seriously.

But is the Government prepared to make sacrifices? It is not, and that's one reason why so many people are ready to say to the politicians from President Roosevelt down, "It's time you set the example and stopped lecturing others."

For the Government of the United States does not propose to curtail its own extravagance in any way, shape, or manner. In addition to all the extraordinary cost of national defense, we are carrying at the same time an extraordinary Budget in history for nondefense expenditures.

There is hardly a fiscal expert of any kind who thinks it will be possible to stagger along forever under that double burden. But Mr. Roosevelt and all his department heads set their jaws like grim death when it is suggested that they should curtail any of their pet expenditures.

On the basis of the President's Budget message we are spending this year 6.5 billions for national defense and 6.7 billions for nonmilitary purposes. Next year it is proposed we shall spend 7 billions for nonmilitary purposes instead of cutting down this wholly extraordinary, inflated, and unprecedented expenditure.

When the rest of the country is beginning to revise family budgets, to pay higher taxes, and to make other sacrifices for national defense it is just as well for the Government to be prepared for an all but unanimous demand for some comparable action on the part of the Government itself.

The public is growing distinctly tired of being lectured at by a Government which says, "Do as I say but not as I do."

Echoes From Roosevelt's Jackson Day Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1941

POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Mr. Horace C. Carlisle, of Alabama:

ECHOES FROM ROOSEVELT'S JACKSON DAY SPEECH

While Democrats were celebrating
Their Jackson day, throughout the States,
The President ceased meditating
Upon the cruelties and hates
With which, across the troubled waters,
The warring Old World has to cope,
To join the New World's sons and daughters
In thanks to God for faith and hope.

Where there's no vision people perish—
Tho we have felt His chast'ning rod,
We have a hope that our hearts cherish—
We have a vision still of God—
It matters little to us whether,
Or not, our ways are understood
By others, since all things together,
Here and hereafter, work for good.

Tho we, thank God, have no dictator,
We know, if we sit down and wait,
That we may be run over, later,
By Hitler, whose own heinous hate
For freedom, liberty, and honor,
Has transformed Germany, that stood
With heaven's smile once resting on her,
Into a land athirst for blood.

If our kind of civilization
Should get run over, and destroyed,
The peace we seek, with expectation,
Will never be by us enjoyed;
Hence, it's become more clear than ever
That these momentous times demand
More courage and more real endeavor
To safeguard our beloved land.

We count it as "a thing of beauty,"
That special honors we've conferred
On Andrew Jackson, who put duty,
Regardless of what it incurred,
Above his own desires and pleasures,
That he might execute his plan
To render, in the fullest measures,
Real service to his fellow man.

In Jackson's time, the threatened danger
Came to the Union from within,
In his own section, where no stranger
Would dare such danger threats begin.
Tho, in our day, the threat, disturbing
Us, comes from far beyond the foam,
We fear that we have failed in curbing
Its terrorizing spread at home.

Before the day of Jackson, surely,
Two parties in existence here
Kept Liberty enthroned securely,
Which we, unto this day, revere;
And tho these parties fight each other,
Soon as election day is o'er,
Their diff'rences they quickly smother,
And work together as before.

Dictatorships hold in derision
The party principle; for they
Know that if with them such division
Existed, they'd be swept away—
So, in the lands ruled by dictators,

The common people are controlled
By merciless intimidators,
Who make them do what they are told.

Lest any should become his foeman,
And stir the great dictator's wrath,
They see that every man and woman
Walks in the straight and narrow path
Prescribed by dictatorial bosses,
And all of them are forced to bear
Upon their shoulders cruel crosses
Until they perish in despair.

Last year we held here an election,
And afterward the candidates
For President, upon reflection,
Accepted willingly their fates—
United in the undertaking
Which all of us are praying for,
They dropped their differences, forsaking
Them until ends this awful war.

We're writing now on hist'ry's pages
That, as Americans, we will,
Year after year, down thru the ages,
Hold honest, free elections still—
For freedom, liberty, protection,
And justice, all, depend upon
The sanctity of free election,
Backed by the prayer, "Thy will be done."

In just elections there's no trifling—
To buy votes vilifies success—
There should be left no chance for stifling
The innate freedom of the press,
Of speech, and of the air, and surely,
As long as we traverse the sod,
We should dwell here, endowed securely
With freedom, yea, to worship God.

These principles are God's creations,
And all of them now, everywhere,
Are threatened by dictator nations.
Broadcasting death and dire despair,
Ours is the great task of defending
These principles of freedom, whose
Existence freedom's foes are ending
In such ways as dictators choose.

These living principles of merit,
Real safety-first guards of the home,
Our children's children should inherit,
And pass on, thru the years to come—
Oh! let us ask ourselves, sincerely,
How long could we the strain withstand
If freedom, which we prize so dearly,
Should vanish from our peaceful Land?

If such an evil time should ever
Befall us, we'd no longer hold
Delightful gath'rings—but never
Will we by Hitler be controlled—
Americans have weighed these questions—
Our spirits spurn what they imply—
Our courage rises when suggestions,
Like these, bedim our peaceful sky.

Now, since America has spoken,
Republicans and Democrats
Consider it to be a token,
To them, like skillful acrobats,
To end all petty party quarrels,
And stand, united in this cause,
That we may win earth's choicest laurels,
And heaven's heartiest applause.

Democracy's arch foes are trying,
By fair and foul means, to destroy
Our faith in God, but we're relying
On it to be our safe convoy—
Their weapon is false propaganda—
Our weapon is our faith to fall
In line behind our Lord, Commander
Of earth and sky, the Lord of all.

Tho Communists are with us, preaching
The gospel of unfounded fear,
The lives our people live are teaching
God's truth thruout this hemisphere—
Let Hitler spread his propaganda—
Tho his deceptions never cease,
He'll fall before our Great Commander,
On bended knee, and sue for peace.

Back in the dim receding distance
Of Nature's unreturning past,
No nation's maintained its existence,
With faith in God too weak to last;
And, in the long march of the ages,
No nation, dwelling on the sod,
However, great a war it wages,
Can last, devoid of faith in God.

Brave Lincoln answered war's grave questions,
As dauntless Jackson did, with deeds—
Both of them followed God's suggestions,
And freely He supplied their needs.
Why should Americans fear trouble?
If we have faith enough to pray,
Effectively, to God to double
Our strength, He'll double it each day.

Our well-considered, persevering
Attainment of enduring peace,
Which to our spirits was so cheering,
Passed like the light with day's decease;
But when this new World War is ended,
May every nation of the sod,
Whose stay on earth shall be extended,
Resolve to keep faith with its God.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Decentralizing Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTON F. MACIEJEWSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1941

Mr. MACIEJEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the idea of decentralizing Washington is spreading rapidly. I mention this for the reason that during the past several days editorials have appeared in the Chicago Daily News advocating the removal of the United States Department of Agriculture to the city of Chicago.

We all know that in recent months Washington has been transformed by the defense program into one of the country's congested cities. By moving out of the city into an area of the country where its principal business is transacted the Department of Agriculture, the Government could acquire immense office buildings and could, at the same time, partly offset the general overcrowded condition that prevails in the Capital City today.

Chicago, it is believed, is the natural location for such department for the reason that within 500 miles' radius of that city the fertile fields of America produce more foodstuffs than any similar area anywhere on earth. As a matter of fact, barring Russia, no nation in the world produces as much farm products as this area yields.

I cite these facts not to remind you of the blessings of nature, but as one of the factors bearing upon the contention that the United States Department of Agriculture belongs in Chicago.

Here are some further items in the case: In the entire United States there are 325,000,000 acres of farm land. In the 500-mile area about Chicago are more than 120,000,000 of those acres. That is nearly 40 percent of the total. Adding Nebraska, Kansas, the Dakotas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Texas—all important farm States nearer Chicago than Washington—and the total jumps to more than 60 percent. In farm income the area is equally important. The total farm cash income in the United States in 1939 was $8,200,000,000. Of that, farmers within 500 miles of Chicago collected just under $3,000,000,000.

In view of these facts, it would seem the movement to decentralize Washington should be furthered and the United States Department of Agriculture removed to Chicago.

Convoys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1941

RESOLUTION BY LA CROSSE (WIS.) COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following resolution passed by the County Board of Supervisors of La Crosse County, Wis., at their regular monthly meeting held on May 6, 1941:

This resolution is in opposition to convoying merchant vessels across the seas and in opposition to any and all acts by our Government involving our country in the European conflict.

The resolution also recommends that Congress fix the prices of commodities and articles of universal use and necessity in conformity with the ability of the consumer to pay; and that there shall be no profiteering at the expense of the consumer of such necessities of life.

The La Crosse County Board of Supervisors also expressed their opposition to the present low price ceiling placed on farm commodities as unfair to the producer; and further recommended to Congress that farm prices be so fixed as to insure parity and thus insure the welfare of all the people of our Nation.

I want to commend the action of the La Crosse County Board of Supervisors in adopting the following resolution and I recommend their action be followed by all county boards in the entire United States: The resolution of the La Crosse County Board of Supervisors follows:

Resolved by the County Board of Supervisors of the county of La Crosse, Wis., That we instruct and recommend to our Representative in the Congress of the United States that we are opposed to the proposed plan of convoying merchant vessels across the Atlantic Ocean as a part of the national participation in the present European war, and that we are opposed to any and all acts by our Government that may involve this country in the conflict.

That we request and recommend that during these times that the prices of commodities and articles of universal use and necessity be fixed by act of the Congress or administrative authority in conformity with the

ability to pay, and that there shall be no profiteering at the expense of the consumer or purchaser of all such necessary commodities and articles of use in our daily lives by the placing of a maximum selling price upon all such commodities and articles of necessity and use.

We also express our opposition to the present low ceiling placed upon all farm commodities, as unfair to the producer, and we recommend that the prices be so fixed as to insure parity with all other merchandise and articles upon the markets and which are necessities to the welfare of all the people of our Nation.

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
County of La Crosse, ss:

I, Esther M. Domke, county clerk of the county of La Crosse, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was duly adopted by the County Board of Supervisors of La Crosse County, at the regular monthly meeting, held May 6, 1941.

ESTHER M. DOMKE,
County Clerk, La Crosse County, Wis.

The Role of Motor Transportation in American Life and American Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D. WINTER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1941

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, the cost of the gasoline is the largest factor in the direct cost of operating a motor vehicle. It is significant, therefore, that the service-station price of motor fuel, excluding taxes, has been more than halved since 1920. The quality of the motor fuel, of course, has improved to such an extent since that time that there is no unit adequate to measure the full degree of improvement. The resulting extensive development of motor-vehicle ownership and use has been made possible by this constant reduction in the cost and the ever-improving quality of the fuel.

The reduction in the cost of motor fuel to the consumer, however, would have been even greater but for the fact that the States and the Federal Government have been imposing taxes on gasoline at ever-increasing rates. At the present time, the average tax rate on gasoline sold in 50 representative cities throughout the Nation represents a sales tax of nearly 50 percent.

Now it is proposed that the Federal Government increase the present Federal gasoline tax rate of 1½ cents a gallon to 2½ cents a gallon. This will serve further to increase the direct cost of operating motor vehicles. It is important in weighing the advisability of such an increase in rate to consider how important is the motor vehicle not only to the everyday life of the average American, but also to the national-defense program to which we now are devoting so much of our effort and attention.

Before the last war the automobile was termed a pleasure car in this country, and no one thought the term inappropriate. But great advances have been made in the American way of living since that time. The standard of living in this country not only has caught up with the automobile but also has passed it to the extent that the automobile no longer is a pleasure car—it is the American family's fundamental mode of transportation. The automobile today is used primarily for business and other necessity trips.

Of course workers for some time now have been dependent on private automobiles to get them back and forth to work. This has been true because large industrial plants oftentimes are situated outside city limits and beyond the routes of mass-transportation lines. Workers accordingly have ridden to work in their own private automobiles or in the automobiles of their neighbors.

With the initiation of the national-defense effort, the worker has become several times more greatly dependent on the passenger car to get back and forth to work because of new factors which have developed. Workers now have to contend not only with plants that naturally are situated on the outskirts of town but also with plants that purposely are situated at considerable distances from business and residential centers to spare these centers from bombing attacks aimed specifically at the plants. Furthermore, the scattering of plants making defense materials in diversified parts of the country, some which never before have experienced industrial activity, to avoid concentrations that might make easy bomb targets also has been a definite part of the defense program.

The effect of such plant locations is twofold. Those defense workers living in nearby residential areas now have farther to travel to get to their jobs and back. But even more important, those plants that for strategic reasons are situated in areas where previously there had been no industrial production must draw their workers from great distances because of the shortage of skilled workers in the immediate neighborhood. The resulting great influx of workers invariable results in housing shortages. Those workers that can obtain homes in the neighborhood are exceptionally fortunate. Others may be forced to seek homes in towns and residential areas at least 20 miles distant. To these workers the automobile is indispensable in getting to their job of rearming America.

There are many such instances which already have been studied and recorded. In Charleston, Ind., a town with a normal population of 936 inhabitants, a new smokeless gunpowder plant of 450 buildings, representing an investment of $92,000,000, is being established. Simply to construct these buildings about 23,000 workers, a number of people 25 times greater than the town's normal population, was required. Obviously there was not adequate housing for these workers. Fortunately, because of the automobile, many of these workers could be quartered in neighboring towns, some as far as 35 miles away. Each day some 3,000 cars brought these workers to their jobs. Once the plant is built and thousands of workers are engaged in the production of the gunpowder, the same story of dependence on the automobile will be repeated.

In Seattle, Wash., many thousands of workers are busily engaged in shipyards and airplane plants. Evidence of the housing shortage is the automobile-trailer city on the outskirts of the town. Surveys have shown that at one airplane plant 9,000 workers daily arrive at their jobs in 3,000 private automobiles, many of these coming from localities 40 miles away. That means they must travel 80 miles a day to earn a living and do their bit in the preparedness program.

This same story is told even in the larger cities. In Buffalo, N. Y., there are 2 aircraft factories that are served only to a limited extent by mass transportation lines. One $20,000,000 plant actually is situated far from any mass transport service. At Flint, Mich., a survey of workers in 5 automotive plants, which to a greater and greater degree are turning to defense production, disclosed that fully 50 percent of the employees drive their own cars to work and another 20 percent ride with them as passengers. Those riding in private cars average an 18-minute drive from their home to their job. At Saginaw, Mich., it was found that 71 percent of the city's industrial employees rode to work in private cars, with 1 in 10 driving at least 10 miles to work daily.

The tiny town of Kittery, Maine, could not accommodate the 2,000 additional civilian workers who have taken jobs in the navy yards during the past year. However, the automobile is bringing men in from a wide area. Boston, 57 miles away, is furnishing daily commuters to the navy bases.

Probably the most outstanding example of the dependence of workers on their automobiles is found at the new Diesel locomotive plant outside of La Grange, Ill. There every single employee comes to work in his own or his friend's automobile. Their living places are scattered widely. Many come from the suburbs of Chicago, 30 miles away. The nearest point of mass transportation is 2½ miles from the plant.

Though most family automobiles are used primarily for driving to work or on business rounds, they are also used on a multitude of other duties vital to the best welfare of family life. It may be said that to a large degree the average family's basic standard of living is dependent on its automobile.

Perhaps the best example of the degree to which the automobile has extended the horizon of the average family's everyday world is found in the dependence on the automobile for shopping for the necessities of life. Surveys of farm family shopping habits have found that one-third of those interviewed would not be able to get to their principal shopping points by any means other than the family automobile. Without their car, 43 percent of the families said they would abandon their secondary shopping centers.

Other surveys have reported their results somewhat differently. They have found, for example, that six out of every

seven family cars are needed for the family shopping; that virtually all of these six are so employed at least once a week, and two-thirds of them even more often. A very high percentage of shopping was found to be done at considerable distances from home—more than two-thirds being done more than a mile away. Among the car-owning farm families 71 percent must travel more than 3 miles to do their marketing.

These conditions exist, of course, because mass transportation to marketing centers not only is unavailable to get to industrial and marketing centers from outlying districts but also in many instances is unavailable within these centers. A survey of the intraurban transportation facilities in the various cities shows that there are now 2,100 cities in the United States that have no mass transportation system whatsoever, not even motor busses. These cities represent nearly two-thirds of all the cities in the Nation. The combined population of these 2,100 cities is nearly 12,000,000 people. The routine movements of this important segment of the national population in the cities are dependent on the motor car. It is probable that more than five times as many people residing in the rural sections are even more dependent on their motor cars for better than "horse and buggy" transportation.

But the motor vehicle is important to the defense effort not only in the transportation of people but also in the transportation of goods and materials by motor truck. Modern transportation by boat, rail, or air utilizes the motor vehicle at some point in practically every itinerary. Today 32,000,000 cars and trucks operate the year round on more than 3,000,000 miles of highways.

Today for every seven families in America there is a truck at work transporting food, clothing, and other commodities vital to their welfare. Increasingly these trucks are being utilized to speed up the national-defense effort and it invariably has been found that they can do exceptional service, once given the chance. Past experience already has shown that by affording speedy, flexible, and economical service, motor transport has changed the complexion of commerce, industry, and agriculture. The motor truck's adaptability, speed, and low cost likewise will enable thousands of industries engaged in the production of defense materials to gear it intimately into their operations and thereby enable them to do a better job faster.

The United States census has shown that there are more than 48,000 communities in this country which are not served by the railroads. The bulk of these communities are engaged in economic activity that is fundamental to our strength as a Nation. Their only connection with the other centers is by motor transportation and they depend almost entirely upon trucks for the transportation of their food and their other goods. But even the larger centers also are dependent to a great degree on the motortruck for their food. During 1939 motortrucks hauled 53 percent of the livestock, 40 percent of the fruit and vegetables, 65 percent of the poultry, 39 percent of the eggs, and 27 percent of the butter received in all the major markets throughout the country.

The advantages of motortruck transportation once it has attained even higher stages of development, for it is not yet full grown, readily may be visualized. Its full value to the national-defense program which must reach its objectives in the shortest possible time easily can be imagined.

It is believed that the further increases in the tax rates on the motor fuel consumed in the motor vehicles, which are so fundamental not only to normal livelihood but also to our national effort to prepare for an emergency, would not best serve our national welfare. It is believed that the increase in motor fuel tax rates unnecessarily would increase the cost of motor fuel, which is such an important factor in motor vehicle operating costs, and thereby discourage the fullest possible utilization of motor transportation. Yet the fullest utilization of motor transportation is most necessary if the job on hand is to be done and to be done in the shortest possible time.

An Honest Representative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of yesterday:

[From Washington Times-Herald of May 8, 1941]

AN HONEST REPRESENTATIVE

Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes is by all odds the most dignified member of the Supreme Court. A paragon of august reserve, he can sit for hours listening to arguments without once changing expression. It is the younger Justices, Hugo Black and William Douglas, who lead in the court's occasional smiles.

But the dignified Chief Justice broke down the other day and treated himself to a hearty belly laugh.

Representative JOHN TOLAN, of California, as a friend of the court, was arguing a case involving the constitutionality of a California statute forbidding transportation of a pauper across the State line. Just before TOLAN appeared, the Court had been listening to a series of weighty arguments on due process, interstate-commerce regulations, and other dry legalisms.

The genial, white-haired Californian, who heads a committee investigating migrant labor conditions, quickly cleared the musty atmosphere.

"Now, I do not intend to discuss the issue of constitutionality in this case," began TOLAN. "Fact is, I don't know anything about the Constitution." Then, looking straight at Hughes, he added with a grin, "I've been in Congress too long."

Such frankness was too much for Hughes. Leaning back in his chair, he laughed until he shook.

The Highroad to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1941

LETTER FROM AMOS R. E. PINCHOT

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following letter from Mr. Amos R. E. Pinchot to Secretary Stimson:

MAY 8, 1941.

The Honorable HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR HARRY: You and I have been friends for many years; and, though our ways have parted since the old days, I have always thought of you as an able, honorable, and patriotic man. Yet as I listened to the measured sentences of your broadcast Tuesday night, I confess that I was shocked and deeply distressed. And I will tell you some of the reasons why.

1. Your broadcast began with a complaint against those who say you are trying to get America into war, who say you are a warmonger. Then you proceeded to call for convoying, which the President says will necessarily mean war. And you ended up with an exhortation to the youth of America to be ready to die in a war with Germany, which you virtually declared to be an accomplished fact, though Congress has never declared war.

2. You did not hesitate to base your plea for convoying on the incorrect allegation that American supplies cannot be delivered in sufficient quantity to Britain on account of the German U-boat blockade. On Wednesday, the day after your broadcast, Admiral Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, reported that out of the hundreds of vessels that have cleared from American ports only 8 have been sunk since the beginning of the year. He also reported that only 158 vessels, clearing from all ports of the world, have been sunk in 1941.

Harry, was that information available to you before your broadcast? If it was, you owe an explanation and, I think, an apology to every citizen of this country.

Why didn't you ask for convoying and war last summer, when Britain, as now, was calling on us for more planes and munitions, and when, according to your testimony before the House Military Affairs Committee, she was in such a desperate condition that her collapse and the seizure of her Navy by Germany was possible at any moment?

On July 31 you appeared before that committee and, after stating that we could no longer rely on our Navy and the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans for defense, you said:

"You, gentlemen, are the trustees of the security of the United States."

* * * * *

"A prudent trustee must take into consideration the possibility that in another 30 days Great Britain herself may be conquered and her shipyards pass under German control."

A few days later Secretary of the Navy Knox made a similar statement before the same committee, though he extended the period of possible collapse from 30 to 60 days.

Nevertheless, in the entire period between these prognostications and November 5, when the people went to the polls and reelected Mr. Roosevelt on his clear, categorical, and unconditional pledges of peace, neither you, nor the President, nor any man in the administration said a mumbling word in favor of convoys or any act by our Government that might involve us in war. And invariably all proposals to help Britain were coupled with the promise that, whatever happened, you people in Washington would do nothing that might result in war.

On October 30, at Boston, President Roosevelt told 22,000 cheering men and women:

"And while I am talking to you fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again, and again. Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars."

On many platforms he pledged no "intervention in foreign disputes," no "army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside the Americas except in case of attack."

Now, since on Tuesday night, as Secretary of War, you said the things the President has not dared to say for himself, I ask you this question: What are the hidden forces, who are the people with a vested interest in war, what are the mysterious, unspoken considerations that, after the ballots were counted, so suddenly switched Mr. Roosevelt from the path of peace to the high-road of war?

Sincerely yours,

AMOS PINCHOT.

Film Rental Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1941

TELEGRAM FROM ALBERT J. FINKE, OF PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 8, 1941.*

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The proposed legislation now pending in Congress to provide additional revenue to finance national-defense program includes tax of 5 percent on film rentals paid by exhibitors to distributors. I realize and am in full accord with the national-defense program and expect theater industry to carry its share of expense. There has already been levied on theaters a 10-percent tax on practically all theater admissions. Theaters are now collecting this tax. New proposed 5-percent film-rental tax, if passed, will result in staggering blow to theater industry. Distributors will pass it on to exhibitors. The exhibitor has no way of passing it on to public with result that burden will be upon exhibitor, and will be, in fact, a discriminatory sales tax that will change many theaters into losing propositions and force some theaters to close. This tax will result in cost to Oregon exhibitors alone in excess of $125,000 a year, a burden which we exhibitors will not be able to carry. At a meeting of exhibitors' organization of our State it was unanimously passed that your assistance be enlisted to eliminate this 5-percent tax on film rentals. We will greatly appreciate your help.

ALBERT J. FINKE,
Hamrick Evergreen Theaters.

Sugar Beets and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1941

LETTER FROM PRESIDENT OF AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING FOUNDATION AND ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT OF UNION SUGAR CO.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as the representative of one of the most important sugar-beet-producing areas in the United States I am vitally interested in the future of this highly specialized industry. This subject is deserving of the utmost consideration from the Congress of the United States at this particular time due to the fact that unsettled conditions throughout the world are seriously threatening our off-shore sugar supply.

I have never subscribed to the present policy of permitting the American sugar industry to produce less than one-third of the sugar that is consumed in the United States. I cannot subscribe to the action taken by the Department of Agriculture in reducing sugar-beet acreage throughout the country by 170,000 acres this year. The American beet grower and processor will suffer as a result of this move, and the American public will pay the bill.

The following letter from the president of the Agricultural Engineering Foundation and the speech by the president of the Union Sugar Co. are timely and pertinent. I wish to submit them for the consideration of the Congress:

AGRICULTURAL-ENGINEERING FOUNDATION,
San Francisco, Calif., April 17, 1941.

Hon. JOHN Z. ANDERSON,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We fully agree with the Agricultural Study Committee that—

"It is imperative for Congress to work out an affirmative and constructive approach to the rescue of agriculture from the dangers which menace the farmers. It is one of our gravest problems, and upon our efforts in behalf of the farmers will depend in a large measure the future prosperity, if not the very safety and security, of the whole Nation, as well as our national-defense program."

In our opinion the greatest menace to the welfare and prosperity of the farmers—the safety and security of our Nation and the success of our national-defense program—is the quota that has been placed upon the production of beet sugar within the continental United States, therefore removal of the quota is imperative—

1. Because sugar is an indispensable part of the daily diet of every family and supplies more energy, at less cost, than any other food, there should be an abundant supply at the lowest cost—but according to Milo Perkins, president of the Federal Surplus Commodity Corporation, United States Department of Agriculture, in an address at Des Moines, Iowa, February 14, 1940, he in substance said: "The 65 percent of our families, approximately 80,000,000 consumers, living on an average of $69 a month, need twice that much income for a minimum standard of living. Remember that millions of youngsters we are pumping into our own society on 5 cents a meal—innocent victims of malnutrition—make mighty poor citizens."

It is obvious that we are not producing enough sugar within the continental United States to supply our own people with an adequate sugar diet, and should we get into war our sources of sugar from island possessions and Cuba could be destroyed by the enemy or in transit, and the result would be that our 80,000,000 consumers in the low-income brackets would be the first to suffer.

2. Because sugar is indispensable in the manufacture of many essential foods, drugs, and chemicals, that every consumer needs and must have, and the very things that the Federal Government now proclaims are of the most vital items for our national defense, an adequate supply of beet sugar at low cost is imperative.

3. Because the production of beet sugar, both in the field and factory, operates substantial markets for all lines of local industrial goods and services, thereby increasing the wealth and commerce of every district in which beets are grown.

4. Because soil exhaustion is the greatest and most serious menace to the welfare, safety, and independence of our Nation, and while our Army and Navy can defend our land from foreign invasion, it will require the combined support of every Member of Congress to defend our soils from exhaustion and our consumers from malnutrition, by the removal of the quota on the production of beet sugar.

There is no element of the soil in beet sugar as it is solar energy in its purest and most beneficent form. On the contrary with every bushel of grain or other crop taken off the farm at least 25 percent is soil fertility, a total loss. While by feeding the beet tops and pulp we can return to the soil all of the fertility that the beet has taken out, and thereby increase the quality and lower the cost of all crops in the interest of public health.

Therefore for the welfare of our farmers—for the safety and security of our Nation—and to maintain our national-defense program—will you use your best efforts to remove the quota on beet sugar and expand its production within the Continental United States, and thereby eliminate the menace of malnutrition, and soil exhaustion, and at the same time make the United States an exporter of sugar, which the world will need if this war continues.

Enclosed herewith copy of the speech of Mr. Roland Tognazzini, president of the Union Sugar Co., before the San Francisco Advertising Club, April 9, 1941, and which I am sure you will find very interesting and instructive.

Yours very truly,

AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING FOUNDATION,
By OSWALD WILSON, *President.*

CALIFORNIA BEET SUGAR INDUSTRY—ITS GROWTH, ITS EXPANSION—WHAT IT MEANS TO CALIFORNIA AND TO THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

(Speech by Roland Tognazzini, president of Union Sugar Co., before San Francisco Advertising Club, April 9, 1941)

HISTORY

The history of the beet-sugar industry can well be said to be cloaked in one word—blockade—a word only too well known in this present day of submarine, surface, and aerial blockade. Although it was a German chemist who proved in 1747 that the beet contained a sugar identical with sugar from cane, it was not until the time of Napoleon that the modern beet-sugar industry received its start. Napoleon became interested in beet sugar when the supplies of sugar which France normally received from her colonies in the West Indies were cut off by the English blockade. With a population clamoring for food, Napoleon determined to become independent of overseas shipments, and to achieve this independence he "resolved to transport the colonies to Europe" by developing in the temperate climate of France substitutes for those things which theretofore had been grown only in the Tropics. Convinced that the beet was an efficient producer of sugar, Napoleon in 1811 ordered thousands of acres planted to sugar beets as quickly as possible, and set up six experimental stations at which instructions in beet culture were given to farmers and landowners. With this stimulus the sugar beet and its culture has spread to every nation in the Temperate Zone.

Turning to the United States, it was not until 1870—in California—that the first successful beet-sugar factory was erected. Credit for this success belongs to E. H. Dyer, and the location of his success is just across San Francisco Bay—at Alvarado. So it can be said that California is responsible for the first successful beet-sugar factory. Of momentary interest is the fact that during this period of growth California even had a plant built to make sugar from watermelons. It was not until 1888, at Watsonville, that the second successfully operated beet-sugar factory was built by Claus Spreckels. You have already been introduced to my good friend and competitor, Carl Maroney, general manager of the present-day Spreckels Sugar Company, who is responsible for the operation of factories at Woodland, Manteca, and Spreckels. In 1870, the initial year of beet-sugar production in California, 5,870 one-hundred-pound units were produced. By 1900 this figure had been increased almost one hundred times, and by 1917 California production exceed 4,000,000 bags. Through the 1920's California beet-sugar production fluctuated little. It was not until 1930 that California began its gradual climb to the top in the beet-sugar industry. By 1939 California had a record-breaking production in excess of 9,000,000 bags, or roughly 27 percent of the total beet-sugar production in the United States. During this period, in addition to the factories already mentioned, we now find California beet-sugar factories located at Oxnard, Hamilton City, Dyer, Tracy, Clarksburg and, of course, Union Sugar Company's plant at Betteravia in Santa Barbara County. The combined daily capacity of these factories totals 22,100 tons, or a potential daily production of 70,000 bags of sugar.

AGRICULTURE

California has been the leading sugar-beet producer in the United States since it took the lead from Colorado in 1938. Of the total acreage planted to sugar beets in the United States in 1940—some 990,000 acres—California had a total of 182,000 acres. For a better understanding of what this means to California agriculture it is necessary to consider the sugar-beet cycle. Late in the fall or early in winter the farmer is arranging to sign a contract with one of the five California beet-sugar companies to sell the beets he will be harvesting anywhere from July through December of the following year. Thus it is apparent that the method by which beets are purchased is unique in agriculture, for a basis of cash payment is agreed upon before the seed has even been sown. Once the farmer has contracted with the sugar company, work really begins, for there are many operations involved in the growing of sugar beets. Prior to planting, it is necessary to prepare the land, which involves plowing, fertilizing, leveling, etc. Planting begins in late December and may continue into April of the following year. The seed is planted in solid rows, and after about a month it is necessary to begin the blocking and thinning of these rows, which finally results in the transformation from a solid row of seedlings to a row composed of individual beets. From this stage to the time the beets are harvested, it is necessary that they be hoed, weeded, cultivated, and irrigated. During the harvest those beets grown within a reasonable radius of the factory are hauled directly by truck and those from outlying districts by rail. After arrival in the factory yard, they are thoroughly washed and then sliced into small thin strips, resembling shoestring potatoes, from which the sugar is extracted. At this stage there are two products, one, the juices containing what ultimately results in refined sugar, and the other which is made up of the exhausted strips of beets, or beet pulp. Now that the sugar-beet cycle has been considered, we are in a better position to discuss the importance of the sugar beet to our California agriculture.

It has been said that the sugar beet makes better farms. You may, with justification, ask why? It is a common observation that yields of other crops improve where sugar beets are grown. The sugar beet demands and effects a progressive mode of diversified farming. How the sugar beet beneficially affects other crops involves an understanding of the general principle of crop rotation. This universal basis for successful agriculture consists of growing three classes of crops in sequence: (1) cultivated, or intertilled crops; (2) small grain crops; (3) grasses of leguminous crops. A cultivated crop usually means such crops as sugar beets, corn, potatoes, cotton, tobacco, and garden vegetables. A cultivated crop requires a loosening of the earth around the plant, which improves the soil condition, destroys weeds and prevents their reseeding and dispersion. The form and nature of the sugar beet, and the sugar cycle itself explain why general farm conditions improve where sugar beets are grown. The root system of the sugar beet penetrates the ground to a depth of 6 or 7 feet, a mechanical disturbance beneficial in itself. The greater part of the tap-root system must remain in the ground, and with decomposition it contributes to fertility. Once the sugar has been extracted, since it contains no vegetable matter, the entire remainder of the beet may be put to economic uses. This is accomplished by feeding the vegetable portion of the beet to cattle and lambs. These vegetable byproducts are converted into meat and milk, and what is not sold in these forms is returned to the soil as manure. It has been demonstrated that the byproducts alone of an average acre of sugar beets exceed in feeding value the entire product of an average acre of corn. These byproducts are beet tops, beet molasses, and beet pulp. Beet tops consist of the leaves and a part of the crown of the beet, containing useful salts. They are a protein, or growth-promoting feed, and are available immediately after the harvest. Beet pulp, either wet or dry, is a carbohydrate feed. It consists of the slices of the beet which remain after the sugar has been extracted. The molasses is often mixed with dried beet pulp. Through the use of these byproducts the farmer is enabled to conduct a better livestock operation, and in so doing maintains soil fertility. This is the part the sugar beet plays in California agriculture. But in addition to this we must consider the fact that the grower's 1939 returns for a ton of beets in California was approximately $7 per ton, or a return of over $100 per acre—assuming 15 tons to the acre to be an average yield. In other words, this meant a return to California beet growers of well over $17,000,000. In some years beet-sugar farmers in the United States have had a return of as high as $100,000,000.

ECONOMY

Much has been said in recent years about the proper use of land, the need for crop rotation, the integration of agriculture and industry into a common purpose. Those who know the beet-sugar business see in it that proper fusion and balance of agriculture and manufacture which achieves the perfect economy. From the planting of the seed to the final production of pure sugar, the beet cycle is continuous and complete. Each stage is dependent upon another. Each succeeding operation supplements the one before. During its 6 months in the ground the beet stores up energy taken from the sun, air, earth, and water. During its 24 hours in the factory, the beet is separated into its useful parts. Man gets sugar. Animals receive pulp and molasses. The land obtains fertility through the animal. Nowhere is there waste. The conditions of life in scores of communities in the United States are directly affected by the prosperity or lack of prosperity in the beet-sugar industry. Approximately 100,000 farmers grow beets each year on close to 1,000,000 acres of fertile lands, such as in our Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys, as well as the fertile coastal valleys of Salinas, Santa Maria, and Lompoc. Sugar beets provide more employment per acre than any other major farm commodity. Not only do we have around 100,000 farmers engaged in growing beets, but we must also consider the fact that the production of each crop requires the employment of some 150,000 field workers. Factories and offices account for tens of thousands of additional workers. We must not overlook the fact that beet sugar stimulates employment in dozens of related industries.

For every pound of sugar extracted from beets, 1 pound of coal must be mined, one-half pound of limerock must be quarried. That means the industry consumes each year approximately 1,500,000 tons of fuel and 750,000 tons of lime. Cotton planters grow thousands of acres of cotton to be woven into bags, bag liners, and filter cloth. It has been said by accountants that an average acre of sugar beets produces $35 of railroad revenue—or an annual freight bill of, roughly, $35,000,000. The $35 derived from an acre of sugar beets is several times the average amount which railroads receive from any acre growing any other major food commodity. Other millions of dollars are expended annually by the industry for such things as coke, farm and factory machinery, automobiles and motortrucks, fuel and lubricating oils, gas, chemicals, etc., all of which contribute directly to our economy. To be brief, sugar-beet fields and beet-sugar factories are economic units which extend their benefits far beyond their immediate area, benefits which increase with any growth of the industry. How greatly they might be enlarged is evidenced from the fact that the production of beet sugar in the United States could be increased fourfold without creating a supply exceeding the consumption requirements of the Nation.

The beet-sugar industry has demonstrated its worth under the most trying conditions, and it invites comparison, on a basis of efficiency, with other producers supplying sugar to the United States. In any comparison, the two most important points are the yield of sugar per unit of area, and the number of man-hours of labor required to produce the finished product. The United States Tariff Commission, in its last investigation of the sugar industry, established that an acre of beets in the West produces substantially as much sugar as an acre of cane in Cuba or the Philippine Islands, which are major sources of the American cane sugar supply. Moreover, the production of a ton of refined beet sugar requires no more man-hours of labor than a ton of refined cane sugar. Thus, if lower costs in these tropical areas are not the result of a measurably greater yield of sugar from the same unit of land, or of less labor required to produce the finished product, then the answer must lie beyond any reasonable definition of efficiency. A logical explanation arises out of the statistics of the Commission: Lower costs in the Tropics are definitely the result of differences in standards of living, and not the result of any fancied advantages in production or manufacture. Higher land values, higher farm costs, higher wage rates in field and factory, higher taxes paid by both farmer and processor, the blessings of schools and roads—these are the factors that account for higher production costs in the United States than in Cuba or the Philippines. Yet, who would change them? For they reflect the American standard of living and the American economy.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Today we are faced with the most gigantic job that has ever confronted this country. The job consists of building and producing to the point where we can support not only ourselves in our essential national defenses, but also other nations in need. This effort takes a tremendous amount of energy upon the part of everyone in this country. Shifts working 24 hours a day consume more energy than shifts working 8 hours a day. Four million men in our Army will expend much more energy than the same four million men would in ordinary walks of life. In order to have and utilize this energy, this country must have energy-producing food and the foremost energy-producing food is admittedly sugar. This being the fact, what is the outlook for this vital product? How do we stand regarding our reserve supply of this indispensable ammunition? At best, questionable. This essential product is fast becoming scarce in the United States, with already a rise in price. I predict that, within 12 months, there will be an actual shortage. But what has this to do with the defense program? It is past history that 25 years ago we were involved in war; and what happened then? There was a tremendous shortage of sugar. Why? Because of the great shortage of merchant-marine tonnage due to its destruction, and the removal of tillable beet-sugar acreage in Europe, amounting to some 5,000,000 acres, which, converted into bags of sugar, amounted to roughly 200,000,000 bags. Thanks to our domestic beet-sugar industry we were able during that period in this country to have a small amount of sugar which was rationed to us. The scarcity of sugar throughout the world brought the price to 26 cents per pound as compared to the present day 5 cents per pound. And the 26-cent level was reached, not during the war, but in the year 1920. The repercussions of war are not found during its progress but years afterward. Today we are faced with a similar dilemma, and what have we done to make ourselves self-sufficient? Very little. At the induction of this administration into office in 1933 the Triple-A program was adopted, the theory of which was to reduce surpluses by the destruction of economic wealth; in particular the destruction of pigs, wheat, corn, and so forth. Beet sugar, however, was not one of the surpluses. To the contrary—far from it. This New Deal economic theory has been referred to as "the economy of scarcity." Nature, in order to show the futility of man, thereafter visited the Midwest with the severest drought ever experienced, resulting in economic and human catastrophe.

In addition, the Supreme Court declared the triple A program unconstitutional. Undaunted by this experience, the present Sugar Act was adopted in 1937 and has as its basic theory the zoning of various cane- and beet-producing areas. The primary result of this is that continental beet production in the United States is given an allotment of 23.19 percent and the continental cane 6.29, for a total only of 29.5 percent of the yearly estimated sugar consumption in the United States. By comparison in this zoning theory, Cuba is allotted 28.6 percent and the Philippines 15.41 percent, and so on down the line. In the fall of 1940 the beet-sugar industry produced 35,351,000 bags. The mainland cane area produced less than 10,000,000 bags of sugar. In all, mainland sugar production was less than 45,000,000 bags. This is to be compared to an estimated consumption for 1941 of 130,000,000 bags. You therefore see before you a program that, far from making this country self-sufficient in its most basic and necessary foodstuff, has brought us face to face with a potential scarcity to the point where we could be made practically destitute of sugar in the event foreign sugars could no longer be transported into our country. In this connection I need hardly remind this audience that daily and in ever-increasing numbers, ships are being sent to the bottom of the ocean, to the extent where it is admitted that approximately 9,000,000 tons have already found a watery grave. What is the full import of these sinkings? Simply this, that shipbuilding authorities state that within the next 12 months less than 1,000,000 tons of bottoms will be constructed. These large sinkings have and will continue to produce shortage resulting in the skyrocketing of merchant marine rates. By way of illustration the rate to haul raw cane sugar from the Philippines a year ago was $10 per ton. Today it is $35; from Cuba it was $2.40, and today it is $11. This trebling and quadrupling of freight rates would not be so serious if we could be assured of ships in which to transport sugar, but because of actual shortage, what bottoms are available have been and will be commandeered for the transportation of priority materials. The policy of the administration has been to protect foreign cane sugar on the theory that it was cheaper to import cheap cane raws. That might have been the case, but it is not so today, because as a result of the increasing freight rates and lack of bottoms, these cheap cane raws have become expensive cane raws. Consequently the refined product has advanced in order to permit the refiner to operate at a profit. If the beet- and cane-sugar industry in the United States had been permitted to have a normal growth, we would find ourselves today with a modicum of self-sufficiency and would not be confronted with skyrocketing prices, as happened in the last war, nor would there be fear of an impending scarcity of sugar. What is the administration doing? It continues to sit supinely by, advising the public that there is no shortage of sugar and that the price advances are unjustified. However, these authorities are very careful to refrain from indicating where this available sugar is located. I agree that there is no scarcity of sugar in Cuba and the Philippines, but I do ask, What good will sugar stranded in Cuba and the Philippines be to the consuming public in the United States?

Another vital foodstuff which is also becoming scarce in the United States is meat. I need hardly comment that high prices prevail, but as with sugar, boats are not available to transport the meat from South America to this country. But there is one way of continuing and increasing the cattle in this country and that is by feeding to them the byproducts of beet sugar, beet tops, beet pulp, and molasses, which are considered the most valuable foodstuffs for cattle. Molasses, in particular, plays an important role at this time of scarcity of cattle, since it materially increases the fecundity in the animal, with a resulting higher calf crop. But as in the case of raw canes, with cattle, likewise will foreign cane molasses be unavailable to this country because of a lack of "bottoms."

FINAL

What integral part is this industry playing or will it play in the national-defense program? This question, ladies and gentlemen, lies with your Government. If this administration will free the shackles from the sugar-beet industry, it can make this country self-sustaining in regard to this most important product. If nothing is done, history will needlessly repeat itself. It is, however, up to the public to become aware of this alarming situation and demand that the same be corrected. We are not asking for a subsidy but merely for the right to vigorously engage in free enterprise in order that a vital industry may do its part for the defense and economic welfare of this country.

Headlines From Various Newspapers Featuring Need of W. P. A. Employment

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1941

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following headlines from various newspapers featuring the necessity of W. P. A.:

No further welfare drop seen for city at present.—New Bedford Mercury.

Aldermen vote to eliminate W. P. A. lay-off.—Malden News.

Fears W. P. A. lay-offs will reach here.—Berkshire Eagle, Pittsfield.

W. P. A. cut news is due Friday.—Springfield Union.

Camp workers seek W. P. A. jobs—men laid off face lack of employment.—Boston Post.

Training course for jobless is requested.—Haverhill Gazette.

Welfare costs rise.—Lynn Telegram-News.

W. P. A. and relief rolls grow despite "boom."—Boston Traveler.

Further slash in W. P. A. forces looms.—Lawrence Tribune.

Skilled labor scarce, yet million in Nation seek W. P. A. jobs.—Boston Globe (feature story).

Mysterious W. P. A. lay-off affects 210 here, many with families.—Brockton Union.

Employment of Older Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 12 (legislative day of Thursday, May 8), 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON JAMES M. MEAD OF NEW YORK

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by me on May 8, 1941, on the subject The Older Worker Must Have a Job.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I welcome this opportunity to discuss some of the urgent problems facing the middle-aged and older workers of our country. As many of you know, President Roosevelt has proclaimed this week as National Employment Week. In his proclamation the President appropriately declared, "Despite great expansions in employment resulting directly from our vast national-defense program, the State and Federal Governments continue to be concerned with the problems of the older workers, many of whom still lack a place in industry. In the interest of utilizing all possible skills in our defense program I urge that employers review carefully their standards of physical qualifications to assure that these valuable workers are not barred from employment."

In thus speaking, the President, in my judgment, struck straight and hard at the very root of one of the Nation's fundamental economic and social problems.

Recently I introduced a resolution to provide for an inquiry into policies and practices which are discriminatory to our senior employables.

I have devoted considerable time and effort in this regard because I have felt for some time that the older worker has been getting all of the bad breaks insofar as employment and reemployment are concerned.

The employment problem of the older worker cropped up naturally with the advent of the machine age, with its mass production and speed-up requirements. Younger workers became more and more in demand because they were quicker, because they were capable of greater productivity, and because they were often more abreast of modern changes and innovations. This was a natural tendency, and one which offers some justification.

But this tendency of replacing older workers with younger men and women had its inevitable economic and social effects. Private companies tended to constantly lower their age requirements until it became a genuine difficulty for the man over 40 to land a new job.

Federal and State Governments, in many instances, obeyed the trend of the times and we found civil-service age requirements being constantly lowered. The man and woman over 40 discovered that they could not meet the age qualifications necessary for public employment. The field of opportunity continually narrowed. Demands for social legislation grew. Social security, unemployment insurance, old age assistance, employment on public works programs, and other provisions to assist this great group of jobless employables in the upper age brackets came into existence. Thus far, they have served a worthy purpose and most of this legislation will provide increased assistance as the years go by.

The fundamental question of whether the middle-aged and older worker could get a job, however, went unanswered. The depression of the early thirties threw millions of Americans out of gainful occupations. A plump proportion of this number were middle-aged and older workers. When the fog of depression lifted, they sought reinstatement in their old jobs. Thousands upon thousands of them never got their jobs back again. They were displaced with younger men and women when the time came to fill those jobs. Furloughed and dismissed employees in the older age groups were stunned with the unexpected realization that industry and government had no place for them.

As a result, they went on the relief rolls or into any type of temporary menial job that they could land.

Today, with the vast defense production program in full swing, these skilled older workers should be more in demand. So should the semiskilled and even the unskilled. Of the 3,000,000 additional workers expected to be employed between now and next autumn, undoubtedly a large number will be drawn from these older age groups. But, will this solve the dilemma of the older worker?

It has seemed to me that we ought properly to seek out all of the information obtainable in regard to this question. Once we have gathered all available information, we will be in a more favorable position to consider permanently helpful measures to correct conditions of discrimination.

My resolution directs the Secretary of Labor to investigate and to report to Congress on the nature and extent of age requirements and of physical qualifications demanded in both the public service and in private enterprise. It asks that a survey be made of the reasons for any restrictive employment policies and the extent to which these policies may be justified by differences in productivity, accident experience, workmen's compensation cost, the possible influence of group life-insurance coverage and private pension systems, and any other pertinent phase of the entire problem.

I am firmly convinced that the adoption of this resolution would result in the accumulation of evidence which would be vastly helpful in determining the need for and the character of possible future legislation. It would provide data not now available from any department of the Government or from any private source.

I have assured myself of the need for this type of information. Since the first of this year, I have communicated with the Secretary of Labor, the Office of Production Management, the Bureau of the Census, the Social Security Board, the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Federal Security Administration, the Work Projects Administration, the commissioner of labor for New York State, over 50 of the Nation's leading private industries, and large numbers of private citizens conversant with this general subject. I am not going to attempt to report to you now the information I have received from these sources, but it is significant and I intend to present it to the Senate Committee on Education and Labor to which my resolution is referred. It bears out the contention that we are somewhat wandering in the dark on a problem of vast and widespread intensity.

Within recent months the country has become aware of a labor shortage that in many vital defense lines is becoming acute. The Employment Service has appealed to workers all over the country to register. Many firms, it is known, have relaxed hiring restrictions, including age limits, and where this has been done reports are coming in showing that the older skilled workers are again proving themselves productive, reliable, and regular in their attendance.

But in spite of the shortage and the appeals for skilled help, the flood of letters from older workers continues, complaining of the difficulties of securing employment even for skill that is in great demand. The United States Department of Labor has received a steady flow of such letters, and in recent months there has been an increase rather than a falling off—brought on seemingly by the fact that many who were encouraged by the appeals for workers have been disappointed at the factory gates. A large potential supply of workers possessing skills, capacities, and working habits that would render them valuable in an emergency like the present is still waiting to be tapped.

To relax age-hiring limits in favor of some other weeding-out process, such as medical examinations, is not a solution. Any general selective principle needs to be carefully applied in individual cases in order not to defeat the very purpose of selection.

In the race to put America to work for defense, apparently one group of people has been left behind—the older workers. Many of the men and women over 40 with a multitude of skills and a wealth of experience are still being turned down by industry because of age. While a large number of firms as well as Government arsenals and navy yards have relaxed age limitations in hiring policies, older workers in many cases are still turned away from the gates of industry.

The United States Department of Labor has urged these workers to register with the local Public Employment Service office. This Service is organized on a national scale to clear job information in all areas on defense work. The Employment Service can also refer people to short vocational-training courses, with special emphasis on defense industries, given today by the schools under the direction of the United States Office of Education, in cooperation with the United States Employment Service and the Work Projects Administration. Such courses offer an opportunity to the older worker to brush up on skills which may have become rusty. But when the Employment Service refers an applicant to an opening, it cannot prevent the personnel manager turning the applicant down because of age.

Discrimination against the older worker means a waste of skills. Such discrimination threatens morale when we need to prove that democracy works for everyone—old and young alike.

"A lot is being said these days," writes in one thoughtful citizen, "of the activity of 'fifth columnists' and subversive activities in these United States of ours, and perhaps these things exist and are growing more rapidly than we realize through the unwitting aid of thousands who are at heart loyal American citizens but who through adversity and want of work which they are able and willing to do are led astray by subversive propaganda." This man goes on to say, "I do not wish to pose as a crank or a calamity howler, but the fact exists that there are thousands of trained men, carpenters, electricians, engineers, and various other trades who cannot obtain work at the only thing they know how to do because of the fact that they are near the 50 mark and younger men flood in from other parts of the country, and the young men get the jobs. * * * I do not ask big wages or boom conditions—just a chance to work at my trade for a decent living for my family."

This letter speaks for many other letters—from the older workers who need jobs. And the country needs these older workers.

I recommend that every citizen lend his utmost cooperation to the efforts now

underway to break down prejudices against the older worker. The Nation needs his services during this defense emergency. He, in turn, wants a job and badly needs a job. The time has arrived when we can develop a happy and permanent solution to this vexing problem. With your sympathetic cooperation the older worker can look forward to the dignity, security, and contentment that comes with gainful employment.

The War Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 12 (legislative day of Thursday, May 8), 1941

ADDRESS BY FORMER PRESIDENT HOOVER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered over the radio last evening by Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The speech is a remarkable statement by a remarkable man, and every American should read it. Absolutely free of all personalities, it calls upon all Americans to do some logical and unbiased thinking.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FELLOW AMERICANS:

For the last 6 months I have remained aside from the controversy on whether we should join in this war. I have been waiting to see the progress of our preparedness. I have wanted to see the situation abroad develop more fully. I had believed that the President was earnestly endeavoring to keep his promise to the American people of October 23:

"We will not participate in foreign wars and will not send our Army, Navy, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack."

In the past 10 days we have had many speeches and much propaganda, the meaning of which is to drive the American people into this war. One who has been honored by his country as a member of America's War Council in the last World War and as its Commander in Chief in subsequent troubled years must learn something of the principles of national defense and our setting in the world.

It is, therefore, my duty to speak out of my experience. I hope that, by sober discussion of the facts, I may contribute something of thought in this most fateful decision. I am not speaking as the representative of any party, of any group and committee, or any association. And despite the depth of emotion that I feel, I hope I may speak without passion and with respect for the views of my many troubled fellow citizens.

I do not need to express again my abhorence of the whole totalitarian movement or its dangers to the world. That there be no misunderstanding, let me state at the outset that I support provision of the maximum tools of war to Britain; that I am convinced we can give this maximum during her next critical months only if we keep out of this war; that putting our Navy into action is joining this war; that the whole European war situation is in transformation; that America is as yet unprepared even for adequate defense; that our people are not united. To go in now is neither wise nor for the interest of either Britain or ourselves.

As I have listened to these recent speeches it has constantly recurred to my mind that the problem before Mr. Roosevelt is far more difficult and complex than many of these speakers imagined. In the anxiety and emotion of the moment many do not recognize the stern facts.

THE NEW PROPOSALS TO JOIN THE WAR

It is now proposed that we should put the American Navy into action. That is a straightforward, understandable proposal which boldly makes clear the meaning of words like convoys or patrols. That is joining in this war, once and for all. From here the steps would be automatic. Our Navy must attack German submarines, ships, and planes if it is to be of any use. To make it effective then we must expand naval and air bases abroad. We must equip these bases with expeditionary forces. And that is war for long years to come.

WE ARE NOT YET AT WAR

There are those who say we are already in this war. That is not true. We are in a position of risk. But war has not been declared between ourselves and the Axis. Diplomatic representatives are still maintained on both sides. Our treaties are still in force. There is no killing of men between us. If this war were ended tomorrow it would not be necessary for us to make a new peace with Germany.

I am not arguing the spirit of our relations with Germany. I am only discussing the situation which exists. But it is a certainty that we shall be at war the moment our Navy is put into action. We are in the war when we send our boys either by air or by sea or on expeditionary forces with an intent to shoot at the Germans. Let us not coddle ourselves by thinking otherwise.

It would be more consistent with American honesty and American courage for us to face the straight issue of a declaration of war by the Congress, as the Constitution provides, than to creep into an undeclared war. It is due our people that the Congress should vote on the real question which underlies all this, "Shall we declare war on Germany or Italy or Japan?" In a national debate on that issue the whole of the facts could be placed before the American people and the people could reflect their views to the Congress. That question once openly determined by the only open process democracy knows, then our people would accept that decision—whatever it might be. The full facts and the truth is the way to achieve national unity.

FACING THE FACTS

We must face some hard facts. And there is among them the transformation of the military and political situation abroad. There is our unpreparedness. There is the practical aid that Britain now requires and requires at once. There is the lack of unity of our people.

This is no time for wishful thinking. Upon our decision depends the fate of our Nation. It is the time, of all times, for a sober and frank appraisal of new facts and new situations.

THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE WAR

The first hard fact is the transformation of the character of this war. No one can deny the grim possibility that Hitler may take Suez, Iraq, North Africa, and the Mediterranean. This would not, however, cut the vital life line of Britain. It might even release the British Fleet to protect their Atlantic lanes. In any event, Hitler can occupy all of continental Europe.

And from all this area he will get ample food supplies and vital raw materials for the German people. True, he is blockaded by the British Fleet, but the blockade cannot starve the German people or cut off their vital raw material supplies. It is only the people in the occupied democracies who will starve. Having been disarmed to their very carving knives, they cannot revolt.

A second phase of this transformation is that substantial army fighting seems likely to go into the background for many years. The British Armies cannot invade Hitler's Europe. Nor do I believe with all the 6,000,000 men that Hitler commands and his superior air force that he can now cross the Channel to England. To invade Hitler's Europe would require us to prepare 5,000,000 men in addition to the British Army. This time to invade Germany we would need to land them quickly and that might take 40,000,000 tons of ships to carry our Army over the Atlantic. And they might not be able to land even then. It would take 10 years to build those ships. And Hitler could not start toward the United States without equal preparation.

Therefore, with this transformation it does not appear that this war can be brought to a conclusion by armies or navies for years and years to come.

The undetermined weapon against Hitler is air power. And the character of air war is also being transformed. It is rapidly emerging to be long-range bombing with fighter planes to defend against the bombers. Accurate action in destruction of industrial and military objectives by daylight is no longer possible because of the efficiency of fighter planes on both sides. Manufacture of more and more planes will thus continue on both sides. But so far there is no effective answer to night bombing. It serves mostly to destroy large objectives, the cities and harbors, reducing them to rubble and killing civilians. And in this destruction Hitler has to fly only one-third the distance that the British have to fly to reach his point of attack.

And there is a transformation in the German blockade of England. The long-range bomber is developing as a primary weapon in the attack upon harbors and upon ships. Submarines are today partly scouts, sending word to the air forces. Naval protection of Britain's sea lanes is now subsidiary to air protection.

This moving transformation of the relation of army power, sea power, and air power presents new situations which are not yet clear. They involve many new considerations. They plainly indicate that America would be joined in a long, long war without a clear method of conclusion. And they emphasize England's immediate need, which I will discuss later on.

THE SITUATION IN THE PACIFIC

The second hard fact we must frankly face is that in the last war Japan was our ally and we had no need to defend the Pacific. But Japan is now openly allied to the Axis. She only awaits a favorable moment to realize her ambitions in Asia. That opportunity comes to her if we go to war in the Atlantic. Even if she does not open war upon us, her action and attitudes will be so potentially dangerous to us that we must instantly divert our energies to strengthen our defenses in the Pacific.

OUR UNPREPAREDNESS

The third of these hard facts that we have to face is our unpreparedness. We have been slow to organize for defense, as is always the case in democracies.

We are not prepared to go to war. Our industry will not be tuned up for another 8 or 10 months to produce enough of the tools of

war to equip our own defense and at the same time supply the needs of Britain. We do not have 300,000 men who are sufficiently equipped with planes, tanks and guns to meet 300,000 Germans, to say nothing of victory over 5,000,000 of them. We will not even have 1,500,000 men so equipped for probably another 12 months. We have no substantial air force of the type now being used in this war. It is true we have a magnificent Navy, but even that is not yet big enough for the job which it may have to undertake if we join in this war.

And preparedness for war consists not alone of men and tools and munitions. It also embraces the spirit of a people. This war is a total war. That means every energy of a people must be mobilized. We must have a united people to make successful total war. We are united in resolution to defend the Western Hemisphere from military aggression. We are united in building whatever of a war machine is necessary for this purpose. We are united in our condemnation of aggressor nations. We are united in wanting to help England defend her independence.

But beyond this we are a divided people. Do I need to prove this disunity? There is an obvious large majority of people who oppose the sending to foreign wars of our boys either on our Navy or on convoys or airplanes or expeditionary forces where they may have to shoot or be shot at. These oppositions are strongest in our youth, and it is youth who must die. There is no unwillingness in them to die to defend our hemisphere.

And to have a united people the Government must be united with the will of the people. A divided people cannot act effectively in the supreme issue of total war. That failure in unity was part of the disaster of France. The first necessity is to follow an objective upon which our people will agree.

History will assess the condemnation or the praise for the policies and the methods which have brought us to these dangers. That is not the question now. The question is what to do from here on.

AIDS TO BRITAIN

Our every sympathy, our interest is to assist the heroic defense of England. We have pledged ourselves to give Britain the aid of our factories and our farms.

Her most critical period is right now. It is during the next few months. What is the urgent need of England as expressed by her leaders time and again? Plainly she needs bomber planes to guard her sea lanes. She needs bomber planes and fighter planes to offset the attacks upon her cities and her harbors. She needs tanks, munitions, and food. She needs merchant ships to replace her losses. She needs minor naval warships to guard her sea lanes.

We are today giving her only a part of the scant production of our industries and retaining the other part for our own preparedness.

If we join this war we must join in earnest. We shall lose it any other way. If we join we must at once increase our Army to 3,000,000 or 5,000,000 men. We would have to use a larger part of our immediate manufactures to supply our own Army. We would have to use a larger part of our air production to defend our own coast cities. We would have at once to increase our protections for the Pacific Coast and our island possessions. We have to use a larger part of our production of fighter and bomber planes for them. We would have to hold merchant ships in reserve to carry troops to protect them. We are not building enough merchant ships now to meet British needs. We would have to use our light naval craft to convoy and protect our own sea lanes, especially in the Pacific.

In net, if we join this war we must use a larger portion of our present scant production for our own equipment and defense. We would have to do this at once. And that means if we join in ths war we must give Britain less tools of war during her most critical period.

If we stay out of this war we can take more risks in parting with our tools of war.

The British have said time and time again that if we give them the tools, they have the manpower to repel invasion; they have the men to man the warships, the merchant ships, and the airplanes.

THE COURSE WE SHOULD PURSUE

Today we are confronted with not one problem but many. What is the constructive American course amid these problems? Is it not clear that we will give less tools to Britain if we join in the war? The solution is not for us to go to war, but to give her every tool that will really aid her, regardless of our own preparedness. There are risks in this course, but it is the least perilous road we can now take. This solution will not please extremists on either side. Common sense and stark truth rarely do But I am convinced that here lies the road to national unity that is so essential to America at this time.

SOME OTHER QUESTIONS

We must also think other things through. And there are some other very disagreeable questions that must be answered before we take the plunge to war. We cannot refuse to face the facts of the situation when the fate of the Nation is at stake.

We wish to aid Britain, but we must face the fact that if she cannot maintain the independence of the British Isles with the tools and policies I have mentioned, it cannot be maintained by our joining in the war. If we are in the war and should Britain fail, we would be left to carry the war alone. And that war against Nazi-controlled Europe will have to be fought at a distance of 3,000 miles and for years and years.

In that event are we going to blockade Europe? If so, are we going to starve the 40,000,000 people in Great Britain? And how will we bring such a war to a conclusion?

WE MUST NOT BE SWEPT OFF OUR FEET

What the course of the American people may be in this conflagration of the world cannot rightly be determined now. We cannot appraise all of the factors. At the present we cannot judge the effect of the transformation going on in this war. But there are some things we can state with assurance.

Right now we need calm thinking. We need reason. We need tolerance. We need to approach these problems with deliberation. Until this picture is more clear it is folly to gamble with the fate of a Nation. Strong men do not need to rush. We must not be swept off our feet by the profound depth of our emotions. By no hasty or emotional act must we jeopardize the aid to Britain and the future of America.

THE PRICE OF WAR

Finally we must not forget the price we shall have to pay if we join in this war.

It means the sacrifice of our most precious lives and the hopes of millions of mothers and wives. It means the sacrifice also of our own liberty to a dictatorship of our own, inevitable in total war.

If we go into war we must pass through post-war bankruptcy. The savings of the people will be lost. The endowments of our universities, colleges, hospitals will be destroyed. And when the day of transformation of war into peace comes the Government will not be able to support the unemployed and the farmers. In this gulf all major industry must be operated by the Government. When we go to the peace table hate will again, as before, sit at that table endeavoring to destroy the hope of any real peace among men. Liberty will not recover on this continent for a generation.

But if, despite all this price, we are compelled to act with our military power, let us be thoroughly prepared. Let us make our determination within the frame of our Constitution by the decision of Congress. And when that decision is made there will be no disunity in America.

The Germans know all about our slow preparedness. They need have no momentary satisfaction in our unpreparedness. That will be forthcoming. The potential might of this Nation is the strongest thing in this whole world. If necessary, we can raise and we can eventually equip an army of as many millions of men as we need. We can make more ingenious tools of war and we can operate them better than any nation in the world. That strength is always here in America. The defense of the United States is not dependent upon any other nation. America cannot be defeated.

What Next for America in Government?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 12 (legislative day of Thursday, May 8), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN, OF VERMONT, AT NATIONAL TOWN HALL CONFERENCE, NEW YORK CITY

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN, Senator from Vermont, before the National Town Hall Conference in New York City on the evening of May 9, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If I pretended to know for a certainty what is next for America in government, I could very properly be accused of being either very foolish or very conceited.

As a matter of fact, in referring to the future the two words "if" and "unless" must be resorted to very frequently. Americans, however, are noted for their love of taking chances, and so, I am going to take a chance in mentioning some things which I believe lie ahead of us in government.

I readily admit that any prophecies which I dare make are undoubtedly colored by my hopes and my fears. I am not going to talk to you about the war tonight as such, because the problems of America and the changes that are taking place in America are not predicated on war itself and do not depend upon America's entry into or staying out of war.

Our most acute problems have already existed for many years. Defense programs, foreign entanglements, even conflict itself can neither deny nor solve them. A great national emergency can obscure them for a time, can postpone the judgment day as regards them, but in so doing it also intensifies and magnifies them.

For example, scant consideration is being given today to the fact that this year the United States Government, in spite of the tremendous increase in revenue, will fall short of paying current expenses of government, exclusive of defense costs, by over $2,000,000,000. When we fail by this amount to meet the ordinary costs of government when national income is high, we must recognize that we have a problem of such major importance as to rank even with foreign involvement.

This is only one of the matters which lie ahead for the American Government to cope with. The old saying is that we can be sure of only death and taxes. Indications are that we may soon expect enormously increased amounts of both.

With the increased speed of travel, with easier methods of communication, with modern improvements in transportation facilities, we are called upon constantly to make readjustments in our economic life and our living habits.

States are as near together today as counties were a generation ago. Nations are as close to one another as States were at that time. This situation has necessitated constant changes in government as well as economic matters.

It has become more and more impracticable and impossible for States to regulate and control vital factors of our economic system. A general trend toward centralization of government has been the inevitable result.

Rivers do not recognize State lines. Most communication and transportation systems have become wholly national rather than matters of partial State concern. A great problem has arisen through failure or inability of the States themselves to control and regulate the practices of great corporations whose business extends into all the States of the Union as well as all over the world.

Consequently each year sees more and more of these things coming very properly and necessarily under Federal rather than State jurisdiction. Therein is raised the question as to how far we can go without effacing local self-government. How can we meet the needs of changing times and still preserve the feeling of authority and initiative which patriotic citizens should possess?

Can this modern tempo of business and government be controlled and well ordered by the practices which have served us well for over a century and a half? These questions present to America a constant challenge.

On the 8th of March, when the Congress of the United States passed the lend-lease bill granting to the President the right to make secret alliances with any nation on earth without informing the Congress, when it gave to him almost unlimited control over all the resources and to a large measure all human activity in our country, we took a long step away from our wanted government of law toward an unwanted government of men.

Many thought this was an unwise thing to do that in the long run would defeat the purpose for which such legislation was intended. I felt and I still feel that the effect of this so-called emergency legislation will be as far reaching on the domestic life of America as it will be upon the geography of the nations.

Under the guise of a national emergency and under the enormous power granted by the lend-lease bill we may expect the administration of the United States to complete phases of its program which never would be sanctioned by a complacent populace in a time of serenity.

We are not going to return to the old days and the old ways of private industry. Unfortunately we are going to have a new group of profiteers and war millionaires in spite of all efforts to control profiteering by taxation. But before this emergency is over, we will, through our Government, through our emergency dictatorship, if you please, take from the hands of the few the control of great natural resources which properly belong to all the people of the Nation.

If you wish me to talk still plainer, I will say that before Mr. Roosevelt is deprived of his national-emergency powers, the American Government will have become one of modified, how modified I cannot say, state socialism. It will, however, still be called Democracy. I don't know whether that is his intention or not because he does not confide in me. But, unless I am guessing wrong, the Federal Government will own or control far more closely than heretofore the electric power, the transportation systems and the financial institutions of America. Greater Federal control will be exercised over industry through Federal licensing or chartering of great corporations.

Greater Federal control will be exercised over our rivers and other waters and over the land of the Nation, the oil, the minerals, the coal, and the forests. If this program goes too far, it would not be modified State socialism, but Totalitarianism with a capital T.

As an example as to how the President will use the national-defense emergency to attain his purposes, I call your attention to the St. Lawrence waterway. Some 20 years ago utility interests proposed to spend $1,300,000,000 in the development of this waterway, giving all navigation facilities to the United States and Canada in return for the right to develop electric energy.

The offer of these interests was not accepted, and since that time utilities in general have conducted a systematic and effective sabotage campaign to prove that the St. Lawrence development is impracticable, although they would pay most any price to secure the right of private development for themselves. Every President since Woodrow Wilson has advocated this development and yet the utility interests have been powerful enough to prevent it.

Now, the picture is this. Competent lawyers believe that the President has authority to go ahead with this development under the lease-lend bill, though he may have to go to Congress for the money.

America has become involved in the affairs of all nations to an extent which may result in our needing every resource which we possess to be used in a national defense or war program that may last over many, many years.

It is pot safe to assume that this war will be over in 2 years' time. Therefore, we must plan for a long time struggle.

If you will look at a map showing the location of the great national-defense plants recently authorized, you will see that the Great Lakes Basin is thickly studded with them. There is barely enough electric power to supply those already in operation there. More will be needed. The St. Lawrence can furnish it. If you will assume—and it need not be a wide assumption—that the shipyards of the Great Lakes will be called upon to construct ships that cannot reach the sea unless the seaway is constructed, then you will realize that public opinion now in opposition will change to a demand that this St. Lawrence development be put through with all speed.

I give you this as an illustration. It is only one. In fact, the President has laid before Congress a 6-year plan for natural-resources developments. Other countries have had 5-year plans, 10-year plans. Ours, just to be different, is a 6-year plan.

The desire of the President for Federal ownership or control of all natural resources, which has been so apparent during his years of office, seems to be well on the way toward fulfillment as a result of the emergency powers granted him last March under the lend-lease bill.

He will retain these emergency powers so long as he remains in office, for by July 1, 1943, when his statutory authority expires, these emergency powers will have become so geared into our political machinery that to remove them might mean the wrecking of the machine.

What else may we next expect in government?

We are not making many real friends among the nations of the earth. We are making only lukewarm allies of some nations that might be our friends. The time is not far distant when we are going to need friends. We are attempting to secure the friendship of many nations by the liberal use of cash. Or we are doing our part to starve the small nations of Europe who have been accustomed to look upon America as their friend and benefactor. We will be fortunate if we emerge from this entanglement with a single do-or-die friend among the nations of the globe.

As a result of this unfortunate international situation, America will from necessity become a great military nation—perhaps the greatest the world has ever known.

We are not going to send our boys back home at the end of a year's training. We are not going to stop until we have created an army of several million men, which will never be demobilized while the present administration is in power.

Of course, we face danger. But, being a military nation, feared and hated by the rest of the world, is not an enviable position. It does not bode well for either international or internal welfare.

It carries with it a possibility of fascism. While I don't believe you or I will see America a Fascist nation, yet fascism is undoubtedly a greater menace to our Government than is communism or any other "ism."

Big business today has become a bedfellow of big government. Big business, big government, big armies, working together have made more than one European nation what it is today. But if big business has any idea that it is going to take over the controls of the present administration in America, it will be disillusioned.

I think that big business and the present administration are enjoying a truce and not a treaty.

Let us watch out that America does not become a military Nation in the sense that other countries have become military nations. Neither military nor political might must ever again be used to suppress the rights of those groups that have made our Nation great.

Labor in America is highly organized, and all efforts being made to deprive labor of this fundamental right must be defeated. Friendly relations between labor and employer cannot be enforced through legislation. Agriculture is less well organized but nevertheless is a powerful factor. Organization of groups does not fit in with totalitarian control of government, even during emergencies.

Agriculture has incurred the hostility of some of the highest officials of Government. An order has just been issued that no employee of the Department of Agriculture shall engage in any activity tending to recruit the membership of a farm organization or hold office in any farm organization unless that group is federally authorized. Even the Grange, which is largely a social farm order, comes under this ban.

Farm organizations must not be strong if Government is to control agriculture.

A well-organized program to restrict or destroy the benefits of labor organization seems to be well under way.

The innumerable injustices committed in the application of the wage-and-hour law and other legislation of recent years give enemies of labor a potent weapon with

which to work. Labor itself is not entirely blameless.

Is the picture I am painting too pessimistic? Am I drawing too close a parallel between what is happening in America and what has happened to other nations?

I don't want to leave you thinking that I believe America is on the road to total ruin. We face no danger that cannot be overcome. What those who believe in totalitarian government attempt and what they permanently accomplish are different matters.

We have dark days ahead. Some of the darkest pages of American history are being written today. But on the farms of America, in the homes of America, in the industries of America are over one hundred million people who love their country, who love liberty, who are retaining their reason during these hysterical times.

Two years from now these people will send their representatives to Congress. Four years from now they will be in control of their government. The New Deal, as now constituted, will have had its little day. It will have been the instrument for performing much good, which good will live on, properly applied, after its evils have been erased.

It's no time now to lose courage, to consider disaster as wholly inevitable. We will start in again on the long uphill task of building internal security for America. We will again concentrate on producing wealth—not destroying it. We will strive to establish national integrity in the world and make friends once more among the nations.

Involvement of United States in European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 12 (legislative day of Thursday, May 8), 1941

EDITORIAL BY JOHN C. VIVIAN

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on May 8 the Denver Post published an editorial on the question of going to war, with which I am in complete accord. This editorial was written by John C. Vivian, Lieutenant Governor of Colorado and a popular World War veteran, who was acting as guest editorial writer at the time. I want my colleagues and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to have the benefit of Mr. Vivian's timely observations, and therefore ask unanimous consent to have this powerful, straight-from-the-shoulder editorial printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Denver Post of May 8, 1941]

(By John C. Vivian, Lieutenant Governor of Colorado)

The United States has been slowly but surely drifting toward the war in Europe ever since the belligerent nations first began biting at each other's heels. Every move we have made has been nearer, not farther away, from the conflict. The passage of the lease-lend bill made our entry into the conflict certain.

The irony of it all is that in the last 8 years, during which time the Nazis have been in the ascendancy and Hitler has been carefully planning the fruits he is now reaping, we have sat idly by and done nothing about it. We have had ambassadors, ministers, personal representatives, diplomats plenipotentiary, and extraordinary messing around in European affairs persistently during all that time. Why, nobody seems to know. Either they brought us no news of Mr. Hitler's preparations or else the Government, knowing what he was doing all the while, has failed to pass the information along to the people. If they didn't know what Germany was doing, in perfecting the most efficient war machine the world has ever known, they should have. If they knew and failed to take the American people into their confidence, someone is criminally liable.

Nobody will disagree that we should have been preparing to defend our own borders and shores during all that time. The American Legion and other veteran organizations have consistently called the attention of the Government to the fact that we should have been at this defense thing long ago. And yet we complacently allowed Hitler to build his death machine before our own eyes while the wool was apparently completely pulled over our orbs.

All of the experts agree, it seems, that we are in no condition to go to war with anybody at the present time. They likewise are a unit, it is believed, in the theory that we cannot adequately defend ourselves if we are called upon to do so. The writer is one of that vast school of thought who does not believe there is a ghost of a show for Hitler or the combined Axis Powers ever to invade America or transport enough planes or ships or what not to cause even the slightest embarrassment. If Germany cannot negotiate the English Channel of 22 miles, how in the name of common sense can she bridge 3,000 miles of unconquered ocean? It just doesn't make sense.

In Washington everyone is busy preparing for our entry into a war which is not ours and which is not of our making. It isn't a question of whether we shall enter the European imbroglio but when we shall enter it. Every preparation is for active participation. We will be convoying the merchandise we are sending abroad just as soon as Congress can get around to authorizing it, if that needs be. Every ship on the east coast that can be commandeered will be brought into use, if the experts in that city are to be believed, and at the earliest possible moment.

The boys who were told they were being sent to training camps for a year and for the purpose of maintaining our own defense are likely to find they are in for a much longer period and that they are being trained for actual eventualities, not in America, but elsewhere. Nobody knows where. It is generally believed down east that these youths are on their way to active service.

It's lamentable that we haven't taken the advice of the men of the World War—who know what war is and who have tried to tell the Congress and the administration for 8 long years what we should have been doing and how we have muffed the ball until the eleventh hour. These boys have been painting an exact picture throughout the years since the World War. They have memorialized Congress annually regarding the state of the Nation and have called a spade a spade. Had their advice been heeded, we would not find ourselves in the woeful state of unpreparedness we now seem to be in.

The greatest danger to America today is the lethargy, indifference, and apathy of our people. Mr. John Q. Public is prone to sit around luncheon and dinner tables in conferences and committee rooms, discuss the ills of the Nation and then do nothing about it. Most of us seem to be willing to let George do it.

The time has come when each citizen must take upon himself some of the obligations of citizenship which he has long neglected. We must not allow ourselves to fall into the same situations in which France and England found themselves in the years prior to the present war. In these countries the people allowed their emotions to get the better of their judgment. They had the same unwillingness to face realities.

Minorities have long played too prominent a part in guiding the destinies of our country. The only way to prevent actual conflict on the part of America in the present European fiasco, is for the American people to rise in their might and tell the President and Congress that we must not enter the war. They must insist the administration keep its promises that we shall not enter the war. They must pledge themselves individually and collectively to assist the President in keeping the promises he has made in this regard over a period of months.

There must be a unity of opinion and action on the part of our citizens if we are to mind our own business and keep the freedom and liberty which we have long enjoyed but which we have too long taken for granted. There should be an uprising of the masses to the end that America shall stay American; that the Constitution shall be preserved, that the ideals of our forefathers shall be maintained and strengthened and that we shall have none of the policies which have brought all Europe to misery, penury, and suffering.

It will mean sacrifices, in fact, many of them. We had just as well make up our minds to that if we are to remain inviolate. We must give up some of our pleasures; we must take more time from our business in order that we may begin paying a little more attention to the biggest business in the country, namely, the Government of the United States of America, an obligation which we have far too long neglected. The time has come when the people—all of the people—must take over their Government and run it themselves. Unless we do this and unless we do it now, this country will fall into less capable hands. Failing to do this, we are likely to wake up and find the things we have always considered near, dear, and precious, have vanished whence we do not know.

The President is quoted as saying:

"Convoys mean shooting and shooting means war."

If we are at war, or on the brink of war, why not tell us so? Undeclared war is the advantage of the Hitler type. From a defense standpoint, undeclared war is a disadvantage, like inviting the Trojan horse within our peaceful boundaries.

God grant that the President may keep his promises to America and the parents of the boys now in training camps to stay out of the war. It is the duty and obligation of our people to assist him in keeping them. They are a most solemn pledge and must not be violated or allowed to become a scrap of paper.

In contrast to the President's various utterances is the news from the Secretary of War that his Department has ordered four and one-half million medical tags for identifying men killed and wounded in action and that the President has requested the American Red Cross to prepare 4,000,000 surgical dressings. These are scarcely necessary for maneuvers or training purposes.

When Secretary Stimson was asked by Senator HIRAM JOHNSON how many coffins have been ordered the Secretary did not answer.

One trouble with us is we have been talking peace and preparing for war.

It is of paramount importance, in view of Secretary Stimson's announcement that he favors convoys, that the American people be fully informed of the situation as official Washington sees it. Not a small fraction of our citizenry have any idea how close we are to war, the condition of our armaments, the strength of the Army, Navy, and Marine

Corps, the campaign planned by the administration, or the details as to what our entry into the war means and to what extent we are likely to be involved. They have insufficient facts to form an opinion as to our ability to conduct a war.

Too much information regarding the situation has been kept away from the public. The administration should lay its cards on the table and take the people into its confidence. If this is done, Congress will soon know how the people feel about convoys and war. And it will find 90 percent of our population is against our entry into the European conflagration. If we are blindly led into it, a minority will be responsible.

What should we do? We should cease talking about crises and emergencies and face the fact that we must devote our energies to production and building defense material so badly needed by ourselves.

We should help England if she helps herself and proves to us she is interested in our future, too, by turning over to us her islands and securities to hold until the end of the war, so that if she should fall we may then move in our own right, not as aggressors but as defenders of our own property and our own liberty.

We should stop creating hysteria; we should quit this talk of fear; we should stop enacting legislation to delegated officials, boards, bureaus, and commissions which harass our people by virtually making laws solely in the dominion of Congress. We should build America strong by the voluntary energies of freemen. We should tell the people the truth about the foreign situation. We should redeclare our faith in America, valiant America, standing unafraid. We should tell the world we constitute the liberty and freedom-loving people of the earth and that the blood of America consists of the blood of all the nations of the earth. Furthermore, the blood of America belongs to America and to her defense to the last drop, for the defense and safety of her people, the peace of her people, and for the ideals for which she stands.

What should we do? We should be for America first, always.

Testimonial Dinner to Charles A. Hamilton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 12 (legislative day of Thursday, May 8), 1941

ADDRESS BY HARRY N. PRICE

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Harry N. Price at a testimonial dinner given Charles A. Hamilton on the occasion of his 85th birthday, on March 13, 1941. For a number of years Mr. Hamilton was treasurer of the National Press Club and he is the dean of the Capitol Press Gallery.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I want to recite for just a moment a short story of the career of the young man who is honor guest tonight on the occasion of the anniversary of his eighty-fifth youthful birthday. Charles A. Hamilton was born in London, England, in 1856.

I wonder how many of you know about Charley's migration to America? Well, it so so happened that sometime prior to Charley's coming, his parents had sailed for this country and had taken up their residence in Buffalo, N. Y. Charley was left behind to finish his schooling. He stayed in London for some time, but he yearned to join his parents in America, and so in 1869 Charley, then a lad of 13, took passage on the good ship *Fortuna*, a German brig whose crew numbered 12. Charley was the only passenger, and it took 43 days to make the trip from London. The ship docked at Brooklyn, and as he climbed ashore the captain said, "Charley, me boy, you act like you are one of the crew."

A week after that Charley joined his parents in Buffalo. He didn't want to go to school any more, and so his dad got him a job as an office boy for a lawyer at the weekly wage of $2. He stayed 1 week.

Charley must have had a yen for the newspaper business, for his next job was selling newspapers on the streets of Buffalo. When he was 22, Charley had established himself as editor and publisher of a weekly newspaper in East Aurora, N. Y., and he made it pay. Time went on, and the publisher of the Buffalo Commercial suggested to Charley that he ought to go on to Washington and become a correspondent. The publisher offered to pay him space rates, and Charley accepted. Incidentally, that publisher refused to pay 39 cents collect toll on one of Charley's stories because the subject of the story was a Democrat.

Charley landed in Washington in 1882, and soon thereafter he had made connection with a number of out-of-town newspapers as their Washington correspondent. One of the first papers he represented was the Minneapolis Tribune. Finally he became the correspondent of the Buffalo Times, owned by Norman E. Mack, until his death an influential Democratic leader. He continued to represent the Buffalo Times in Washington up to the time Mr. Mack sold the paper, and many was the scoop he pulled for Norman Mack.

I do not need to tell you that Charley is the oldest living member of the Press Galleries in the Capitol. His original card of admission is dated January 1883, after he had been here since July 1882.

Now, I have just a few words more. Charley not only stands as a newspaperman who has had a notable career as a correspondent. I think, perhaps, Charley Hamilton has helped to make more good newspapermen than any school of journalism ever did. He smoothed over the hard places in many an aspiring young man's career in the newspaper business, and I think it safe to say that he did more voluntary substitute work for some lazy correspondents who inhabited newspaper row up until the time that famous rendezvous disappeared with the erection of this National Press Building than any correspondent in Washington.

One of the fondest memories Charley Hamilton has is that his son, Maj. George Hamilton, of the United States marines, was in command of the marine regiment that was engaged in the last battle of the World War on the day the armistice was signed.

Not long ago I asked Charley what he thought of the Presidents he has known—and he has known all of them since Chester A. Arthur. He told me that Arthur was the best dressed, the finest sport, and the most popular President in his time—that is, up until the present; and Charley declares now that, in his opinion, Mr. Roosevelt is the most popular President ever to occupy the White House—certainly the most popular with newspapermen.

Today we can look back with pride and gratification on the grand deeds he has done, and we can only bow in humble tribute.

Beryllium

REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in 1938, when the Temporary National Economic Committee was organized, Europe was at peace; yet war clouds were gathering and tension was increasing. Defiance was being hurled without restraint, and even we were joining in the melee in a manner which usually leads toward eventual conflict. Nations were inventorying their military strength, some with undue optimism, but most, like ourselves, were extremely sluggish when it came to intelligent military preparation, competent to cope with the new dangers lurking at every turn.

It was at that time I learned of a new development in metal, a development that was revolutionary in its nature and held forth promise of great military and economic possibilities. Already men of courage in this country had spent 10 years of time and millions in money to carry on the struggle to make this metal serve a useful purpose in industry—and they had reached that goal.

Germany had gone through a similar struggle with equally successful results. This appeared particularly interesting because we found a working agreement existed between the leading concerns in both countries. This working agreement included an exchange of patent rights, control of territory, and so forth, making it seem worth while to determine how our country fares under such arrangements and what steps might be advisable if corrective measures were found necessary.

Our committee desired to study the problems such a new development met, particularly in this country as compared with an identical one in Germany.

We desired to learn, if possible, why Germany was able to make such rapid progress in building up its industrial institutions, and this seemed to be a lead in that direction.

We desired to compare their respective facilities for securing adequate financial support.

We wanted to learn about the protection each received from normal competition.

In addition, we desired to compare the protection Germany gave new industries with the protection given in this country—that is, protection from the ruthless competition a revolutionary industry frequently meets from those who fear that new enterprises may harm the old ones previously established.

The difference in methods used by this country and Germany in encouraging the development of wartime materials also seemed important.

After the preliminary studies were made, we felt an examination of this particular metal—called beryllium—would afford the best opportunity for the important comparisons we wished to make. We, therefore, held such an investigation of the beryllium industry in the spring of 1939 and the first comprehensive Government record was established as a result of these proceedings.

Long before the hearing I had learned many facts regarding this rather remarkable metal, facts in addition to the century-old struggle to produce it at all in commercial quantities and the added difficulty and experimentation necessary to get useful results out of it.

I found in Germany that a $10,000,000 plant housed the beryllium industry. In America it was necessary to use rented buildings.

In Germany other kindred activities were carried on under the same roof, activities needed in the processing and refining of the metal for commercial uses. In America no such equipment existed, except small units imported from Germany, because it was apparently too new and revolutionary to be taken up in the United States, where conditions were subnormal and the opportunity to raise new capital was difficult.

I found the German company producing beryllium was not the main company but a subsidiary of another giant industry that outranked even our largest American concerns. In America no such parent support had been available.

In Germany I found loans from the Reich came quickly and abundantly, particularly if the plant expansion served military purposes. In America such funds were only obtainable with delay and difficulty, if at all.

In Germany I found that close cooperation existed between the military experts and the plant management. I found these military officials were not only interested in the production in the plants but also were very conspicuous in the designing rooms and research laboratories. These laboratories were built in Germany on a scale unknown in our country, a scale which would make our great Bureau of Standards look insignificant by comparison. In the United States military representatives had never seen a pound of this material made and had shown little or no interest in research connected with this subject.

Facts such as these impressed me to such a point that I took the matter up with important Army officials, thinking I might have gathered something which would be worthwhile to bring to their attention. My first surprise was to find that their information about the subject of beryllium barely exceeded one page of typewritten data; second, that great reliance and dependence was being placed on the French and British to supply this country with detailed data on German activities having any bearing on war preparations; and, third, that anything new, regardless of its military possibilities, was not of interest to the Army until it had developed in industrial or commercial channels to where it could be had in competition and in large quantities, and until its value had been thoroughly tested and approved.

It was evident that such a development would never be made by the military authorities; consequently, it could only come by the progressiveness of private industry. This may be a fault partly chargeable to members of Congress, because we have held the purse strings rather tightly when it came to appropriations for experimental purposes.

By the time representatives of the beryllium industry had been called in for the hearing I had learned enough so that I felt no surprise when I found three representatives of the Germany Embassy were present. On the other hand, I was a bit disappointed, but not at all surprised, when I failed to see a single representative of our Army or Navy in the committee room.

Part 5 of these hearings carries the beryllium testimony, and it has been in greater demand than any book reporting the hearings because some very interesting facts were disclosed—facts of deep significance, having to do with both the problems of business and of war.

I want to mention some of the high points brought out by the committee.

First. Germany was further advanced in the industry and was doing things on a bigger scale than America.

Second. Japan was actively in the market for beryllium-bearing ore and beryllium oxide—in quantities overshadowing American production.

Third. Italy was buying and storing large quantities of beryllium-producing ore.

Fourth. Germany had used a special beryllium alloy bushing—which had never failed—in quantities that indicated she had at that time at least 14,000 superairplanes, modern, and ready for actual combat.

Fifth. Germany was exporting beryllium-copper and beryllium-nickel products, in finished form and of superior quality, to foreign countries; while we were making no finished products of comparable nature for either domestic or foreign trade.

Sixth. South American countries, Russia, and numerous other sources were supplying beryl ore in commercial quantities—beryl is the ore from which beryllium is produced—and, while found in half the States of our Union, no dependable supplies were being secured from this country.

Seventh. It was shown that 2 percent of beryllium alloyed with 98 percent of copper produced a metal with a tensile strength of 185,000 pounds—against a strength of 33,000 pounds for copper alone. Two percent beryllium alloyed with 98 percent of nickel produced a tensile strength of 300,000 pounds—against 155,000 for nickel alone.

Eighth. Both beryllium-nickel and beryllium-copper were in demand because of their outstanding strength, because they are noncorrosive, and because of their phenomenal resistance when used in springs, and because of their great accuracy in operation.

Ninth. It showed that a spring of phosphor bronze had a fatigue life of 400,000 vibrations—the best steel, 3,000,000—whereas beryllium-copper and beryllium-nickel will go to several billion before breaking.

Tenth. It showed these springs were so sensitive that for delicate aircraft and other instruments they rendered service no other known metal would perform.

Those disclosures should have been a forewarning of the mechanical superiority which crushed France and most of the other European nations.

Another interesting fact brought out was the protection given in Germany to a new industry struggling to establish itself in the trade. Over there a patent when granted is complete protection—over here it is not much more than an invitation to litigation.

In Germany ruthless efforts, by those indirectly affected, to destroy a new industry were completely banned and, very probably, if such an industry had military significance, those guilty of such interference might have found themselves before a firing squad.

In the case of the United States, our committee disclosed that some of the copper interests were actively conniving to destroy the beryllium industry, regardless of its merit, and it appeared that they had a possible ally in a firm actually producing the metal—at least, this firm appeared to be not out of sympathy with such proceedings.

One might ask why a producer of copper would not welcome a new metal containing in its composition 98 percent of pure copper. The answer is very simple—because of the strength and other qualities of beryllium-copper a lesser quantity of the metal is needed, which would reduce the poundage to a point less than is at present consumed. Another more potent answer is the fact that a substantial percentage of all copper goes into the production of phosphor bronze and the testimony secured from the phosphor-bronze industry showed that beryllium-copper would take the place of phosphor bronze in many uses and, while it would not in their opinion entirely supplant phosphor bronze, the metal had many additional uses to which it could be put.

It was further shown that about 2 pounds of beryllium with 98 pounds of copper would produce a product better than phosphor bronze. Phosphor bronze of the same weight would contain about 10 pounds of tin; hence, there was no evidence that the tin industry was friendly to beryllium's rapid development.

While the present cost per pound of beryllium-copper as against phosphor bronze is a little over twice as much, the quantity used is less, and, taking the history of all metals and considering the somewhat primitive equipment found in this country, it was not hard to visualize the time when the beryllium alloy might be a price as well as a quality competitor of phosphor bronze.

In the case of beryllium-nickel—considering its tremendous tensile strength—it is not hard to see that similar services might easily be performed with a lesser

quantity of nickel—so that, even before our war problems became so imminent, economic reasons were indicating that a new revolutionary development of this kind should be hastened by Government aid, so that its benefits would more rapidly accrue to the Nation at large.

In Germany, great attention was given to the effect of beryllium in other metals, such as steel, and we found experimentation going on, with some encouraging features, which might mean that in time we would have better materials than aluminum for aircraft construction.

Another interesting fact was brought out in discussing the qualities of these alloys. They have low surface tension; hence they can be cast with great smoothness and accuracy—almost the accuracy of machine-tooled parts. This showed great possibilities theoretically. However, it was not shown—and probably not known—whether such processes were in use in German industry.

At about that time, however, the Army and Navy were informed—by one of the beryllium companies—in writing, that they were welcome to investigate every detail of the industry; that all facts and information gained to date would be disclosed to them; and that even limited experimental work should be done at the expense of the company, or the material would be supplied if the Government itself desired to carry out tests for military purposes. The Army was shown dozens of uses to which the metal could be put and by the use of which many mechanical devices would be improved, but, while the war clouds were getting blacker every day, no move or evidence of interest was shown by those military gentlemen whom we hold responsible for defending our democracy.

But let us turn for a moment from international problems—even from governmental problems—and review the beryllium industry and its record from the beginning of 1939 to date. For the sake of brevity, I will confine this review to the Beryllium Corporation and its president, Mr. Andrew Gahagan, because from that source our committee obtained its most valuable information, and his knowledge of the subject, as compared to the testimony of others we heard, seemed preeminent.

After being told that a high degree of commercial development was prerequisite to Government military interest, the Beryllium Corporation desisted in any attempt to further interest it in its product. Instead, it confined its activities to commercial applications of beryllium alloys.

As a result its business increased rapidly and is now tenfold greater than in the year 1938.

The demand is greater than present production.

Yet items of greater weight have not been solicited because of lack of facilities for producing same.

When improved types of aircraft required resistance greater than other metals would supply, beryllium was ready to meet the need.

When aviation instruments required greater accuracy in some of their parts, beryllium made this accuracy possible.

When dependability meant safety or security in mechanical equipment, beryllium was there to insure that result.

But hardly a thing that went on aroused a flicker of interest in the eyes of Washington.

Last fall, however, as our preparedness program began to reach its more intensive stage, something stirred the lethargy, just a little, to be sure, but someone learned that indifference and discouragement had not snuffed the light out of this industry, and, as a result the National Research Council was requested to get up a committee to study this metal and report about it to the high authorities in official Washington.

Last fall such a committee was named; last month the report was made available to Members of Congress. I note the report is dated March 17, but it was about the 1st of April before it was available to Members of Congress. I might add that such a date, April Fool's Day, was very appropriate for the arrival of this report.

When I glanced at the personnel of the committee, which is composed of seven members and the chairman, I felt that it was ably headed by Dr. C. W. Mathewson, professor of metallurgy at Yale. On the committee, however, I note four members who to my mind were in an awkward position in such a group. I am referring to those gentlemen connected with firms who might be affected by the nature of this report. I am particularly referring, however, to Mr. John R. Freeman, Jr., technical manager of American Brass Co., and to Dr. C. Baldwin Sawyer, president of Brush Laboratories. If these gentlemen did not possess a voting control of the committee they were at least a dominating factor, as they, more than others, had a knowledge of the business, however limited that knowledge might have been. In my opinion, if they were selected by someone uninformed about the situation, it would have been a gracious and proper act on their part had they declined to serve in such capacity.

Dr. Sawyer, of the Brush Laboratories, is also the president of the Brush Beryllium Co. Dr. Sawyer, as president of the latter company, was a witness before the Temporary National Economic Committee. At that hearing three witnesses connected with the American Brass Co. also appeared.

First, I will explain the background of their appearance:

It developed that the Beryllium Corporation, after learning that small quantities of beryllium—not over 2½ percent—added to copper produced an alloy of phenomenal strength and hardness, presented this information to the American Brass Co., who were astonished and highly pleased with the results the Beryllium Corporation had obtained. They became interested in the production of fabricated materials such as sheets, rods, wire, and tubing, and bought beryllium content ingots from the Beryllium Corporation to supply the requirements for their finished products.

The American Brass Co., so they say, became so keen about beryllium and its possibilities that they concluded they needed a second source of supply for the metal, and the Brush Beryllium Co. was either created for, or at least became, their principal source of supply.

As their knowledge increased they discovered that beryllium alloys could, and to a large extent would, supplant phosphor bronze, which is an important part of their business. There ensued on the part of the American Brass Co. and the Brush Beryllium Co. a series of price jerkings, and so forth, which indicated that somewhere in the group there was a strong inclination to kill the industry entirely or control it for their special benefit.

The fact that I have a keen recollection of this hearing explains my surprise when I read the personnel of the committee named to give this country, in its emergency, a broad, comprehensive, and intelligent report on the beryllium situation as of the present date.

Now, as a further background to the recent report I am discussing, I want to take you back to our hearing in 1939, where it was shown that the beryllium industry faced to barriers. Strange as it may seem, the American barrier became more serious than the German.

After Mr. Gahagen's company had pioneered this business and had invested large sums of money, he found that numerous American patents had been taken out by a German concern which were apparently registered to block development of the beryllium industry in this country. As you know, this is not the only instance of its kind. After going to Germany and working skillfully, a transfer of these patent rights was secured which thus effectively removed all foreign threats.

As just mentioned, the American barrier had to do with the maneuverings of the American Brass Co., who apparently set out to rule or ruin the industry. Without going into detail, I might say it only made the Beryllium Corporation a complete unit so that now it is the outstanding producer of the metal itself, as well as the alloys in finished form. Through the courage and ability of Andrew Gahagan this industry was again saved for the people of the United States.

I urge you, with these few words of warning, to read this report. It is headed "Report of the committee on beryllium of the National Research Council." I wish for a moment to address myself to its substance and I hope you will bear in mind what I have said about it, when you may have occasion to read it.

We are passing through strenuous days where time is short to do those things vital to our future existence. These are times when quick decisions are necessary and, above all, when right decisions are paramount. Andrew Gahagan, president of the Beryllium Corporation, testified before the Temporary National Economic Committee that, after spending tens of thousands of dollars unsuccessfully trying to make an alloy of high beryllium content with aluminum and other metals, he gave it up entirely, as far back as 1933. It was reported that the Aluminum Co. of America spent substantial sums and got no better results.

Now, manifestly, any committee organized at this late date in our war preparations must have been created to get the latest, up-to-the-minute reports on the subject in question. The Committee on Beryllium, in its report, devoted half the

words to the exhuming of that almost forgotten subject, a beryllium-aluminum alloy, and then to its careful reburial.

Whether or not these courageous people who have brought another element into successful use are ever able to make it alloy in any amounts with any light metal is still in the experimental stage.

When it came to the heavier beryllium alloys, that is, beryllium in alloy with copper, steel, or nickel—where the real uses are manifest, and where every month there is substantial consumption for war purposes—no such voluminous attention was given the subject.

It would have been refreshing had this report shown something about the present volume, how it is being used and, incidentally, why large quantities of it are bought each month. All of this, with many more details, could have been obtained in a matter of days instead of months by visiting the principal source of production in this country and by an examination of its orders and official records. As a matter of fact, while this committee was pondering, the backlog of orders for beryllium alloys increased more than 100 percent, a fact which I pass on to the committee.

The committee report accredits beryllium with some importance in the military and economic world, but the tenor of it would, certainly, chill the enthusiasm of anyone with a single dollar in the business and would tend to paralyze those who have invested a few millions. Fortunately, the latter have more reliable data from which they chart their course.

This report, however, does show, in a somewhat vague manner, the possibility that enough beryl ore might be obtained, if sought for aggressively in the world market, to produce over the next 12 months about $35,000,000 in value of serviceable beryllium alloys. It even admits that a little advance in ore prices might increase the world supply and suggests that, out of the 30 or more known substances with beryllium content, new methods of reduction might add to the supply, but in the main I gather this committee wants the Government to think the industry rather unimportant.

One striking point is brought out, indirectly, which refers to the almost negligible quantity of beryl ore produced in the United States. It is a well-known fact that this ore exists in about half the States of the Union—the committee admits its existence in several States—and it reports that substantial tonnage can be had from countries like the Argentine and Brazil, but that nothing has been done by individuals or government tending to create an interest in producing this ore in the United States.

It does not indicate, however, that such practical facts as the question of ore have been gone into with very great thoroughness, all of which convinces me more and more that the Congress should ascertain the facts and foster legislation which will coordinate and compel, if necessary, the rapid development of this industry. Such a procedure would clear up controversial points and insure that those who harness additional elements will not meet and have to overcome the discouragement, obstructions, and handicaps which have beset the beryllium industry.

I am convinced that, to protect ourselves against a shortage of tin, we should see that proper measures are taken to procure for this country the maximum quantity of beryl ore, thus encouraging a new American enterprise, and lessen to whatever degree is feasible the stock piles of tin ore which are being accumulated.

Before closing, I wish to pay a compliment to the President and to his loyal friend and intimate associate, Hon. Leon Henderson.

Mr. Henderson served as the secretary and later as a member of the Temporary National Economic Committee before he became a member of the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense. I became an admirer of Mr. Henderson because of the fair and able way in which he performed his duties and, particularly, because of the attention he gave to the subject of beryllium in unraveling both its patent and its practical problems. I am glad his interest has continued, and I infer he has acquainted Mr. Roosevelt with the subject as I learn that the President has recently issued an Executive order putting beryl ore on the strategic and critical list. This makes me feel more certain than ever that it is important in this emergency and I believe, when history is written, the President will review with pride the part he played in the development of the beryllium industry.

Methods of Payment for Lands of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 12 (legislative day of Thursday, May 8), 1941

MEMORANDUM FROM HON. GUY CORDON, ROSEBURG, OREG.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, on March 24, 1941, I introduced Senate bill 1201, to provide for a uniform method of payment to the several States on account of certain lands of the United States.

A day or so ago I received from Hon. Guy Cordon, of Roseburg, Oreg., a memorandum vividly explaining the worthy objectives of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Memorandum on S. 1201

The uneven distribution of federally owned, tax-exempt real estate, held for purposes other than purely governmental operations—more in the nature of private proprietorship or for national values rather than for strictly local benefit—has resulted in excessively high tax rates in the localities where such lands are situated; this fact is now generally recognized, both within and without the governmental structure.

Accelerated acquisition of additional acreage by the Federal Government, running into the millions of acres—an acceleration which will unquestionably increase rather than decrease—has brought the resulting tax problems to the attention of a constantly increasing number of citizen taxpayers throughout the Nation.

Congress has long recognized the justice of some sort of contribution in lieu of taxes to local government for these vast Federal holdings, and has provided contributions from time to time, ranging from a percentage of annual receipts, as with regard to national forests, to submission to local taxation, as is done with lands acquired by the Federal lending agencies. The percentage of receipts method of measuring the payments is inadequate and unsatisfactory, for three main reasons, namely: (1) the amount of receipts is wholly dependent upon the wisdom of the agency heads who administer the particular lands, and varies with the judgment of the individual, to a great degree; (2) the payments are restricted to use for specific purposes by the local governmental agencies, thus preventing a general application to level tax reduction; (3) the payments cannot be anticipated in either time or amount so as to be budgeted by local tax-levying bodies and be reflected in a commensurate tax reduction.

S. 1201 provides a uniform method of determining the amount of these Federal contributions, and extends the policy to include Indian reservations, which are not of great extent, nationally viewed, but which present a critical problem to local government where they are situated. The enactment of this bill will result in establishing a level and equal payment on account of these lands, wherever situated, will permit of local tax reduction, and place the counties which are now suffering from the narrow tax base caused by the exemption of these lands from taxation upon the same basis as those counties where all the lands are privately owned and taxable. This result is accomplished by eliminating all percentage of receipts payments and using instead as a basis of contribution a percentage of the fair value of the lands involved.

S. 1201 applies to the following classes of lands owned by the United States: (1) national forests; (2) wildlife refuges; (3) lands administered under the terms of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; (4) Indian reservations and trust lands; (5) Taylor Act grazing lands; (6) lands sold under contract with title reserved; and (7) lands leased for value.

Under present law, contributions are paid upon lands in classes 1, 2, 3, and 5, all upon the basis of receipts, but with varying rates of percentage. Indian reservations and trust lands pay nothing, except such as are within Taylor grazing districts. Lands within classes 6 and 7 are of small area; they are unquestionably included because they are of the type for which contributions should be made.

Section 1 of the bill provides for the annual payment to the several States of a sum equal to 2 percent of the fair value of the lands of the classes named within such State. This payment is uniform in amount in every State having Federal lands of the classes affected, varied only by the fluctuating values of the lands; this makes for equity as between the States and between the various classes of lands. Section 2 limits the amount of annual payments to any county, to be apportioned by the State, to 40 percent of

the total annual expenditures of such county, thus discouraging any tendency to extravagance. Any balance not apportioned by the State is available for general school purposes.

Section 3 provides for the fixing of values on the lands and for the payments to the several States, for apportionment to the counties.

Section 4 authorizes the several departmental heads having administrative jurisdiction of the lands to fix the fair value of such lands, thus leaving with the Government control of the basis of payment; it may be assumed that the values fixed will reflect the values used by the several counties for local tax purposes.

Section 5 excludes from the operation of the bill all lands which are now subject to local taxation, such as those acquired by Federal land banks, etc., all of which remain locally taxable.

Section 6 simply authorizes the appropriation of funds to carry out the purposes of the bill.

Section 7, as amended, repeals the several provisions of law under which the various kinds of contributions are authorized at this time, placing all the lands upon the new uniform basis created by this bill.

Approximately 365,000,000 acres of public lands are affected by this bill—a very small fraction of the area of the continental United States, and an even smaller fraction of the value of the real property of the Nation. Small though the acreage and its value be as compared to the Nation as a whole, it very frequently represents a large part of the acreage and a large part of the real-property value of the counties where it is located; in some sections, notably in the South and West, a preponderantly large percentage of some counties is so held. For instance, in Arizona over 95 percent of one county is Federally owned and of the classes enumerated. So, while of little importance when viewed nationally, the problem is one of real consequence to local government in the areas where the public lands are situated. And it will become of importance to other localities as the Federal acquisition program develops; over 335 counties are now affected by the acquisition of national-forest land alone, without mentioning the many more that have the problem of reserved forest lands. The number swells to huge proportions when we add the various wildlife refuges, the Taylor grazing lands, and the Indian lands.

The translation of this bill into law will, it is submitted, be an act of simple justice to these far-flung communities which have long fought to keep local government going on a fraction of the potential tax base; it will place them upon the same footing as those more fortunate counties which have enjoyed the whole of their tax resources, in private ownership, and which have prospered above their neighbors for that reason.

Dangerous Concentration of Wealth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a short statement from the Washington Evening Star of Thursday, May 8, 1941, showing the enormous salaries drawn by leaders in, or heads of, various monopolies.

You will note that one man, Louis B. Mayer, as manager and director of a motion-picture concern, drew a salary last year of $697,048—or more than nine times the salary of the President of the United States. Another one drew $478,144, another $456,415—more than six times President Roosevelt's salary.

This will come as a distinct shock to the American people at this time, when their boys are being drafted into the Army at $21 a month.

I am sorry this list does not show all the enormous salaries and emoluments drawn by the leaders in the vast utility holding companies with which the American people are now burdened.

Is this democracy? Is this government of, by, and for the people, when a few favored individuals rake down salaries that no human being on earth could legitimately earn?

While we are trying to save democracy, to save our republican form of government, to save our way of life, and preserve those institutions that have made our country great, we ought to begin here, by raising the income and inheritance taxes in the higher brackets, breaking up these vast fortunes as well as these abnormal incomes, and turning them back through the channels of our economic life.

Already less than 5 percent of our people own more than 90 percent of our wealth. At this rate they will soon own it all. That is what breeds communism.

The matter referred to follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 8, 1941]

MAYER KEEPS TOP RANKING WITH SALARY OF $697,048—GRACE IS SECOND WITH $478,144; G. W. HILL, THIRD, GETS $456,415

Louis B. Mayer kept top ranking as America's highest paid executive last year, receiving $697,048 as managing director of production for Loew's, Inc., motion-picture company.

This was brought out today in a study of dozens of annual reports filed by large corporations with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Mr. Mayer's remuneration from Loew's was $8,677 more than in the previous year. He had no close competition for first place. The second highest on the pay list was Eugene G. Grace, with $478,144 as president of Bethlehem Steel Corporation. George W. Hill received $456,415 as president of the American Tobacco Co., and appeared to be a safe third.

These figures do not represent America's largest incomes, however, since many persons who get only small salaries or no salaries at all have large incomes from investments. The Treasury reported recently that 41 persons paid taxes last year on 1939 incomes of $1,000,000 or more.

OTHER LOEW OFFICIALS INCLUDED

Behind the top three in salaries or other remuneration came Hunt Stromberg, who got $332,267 as supervisor of production for Loew's, and Nicholas M. Schenck, who was paid $318,881 as president.

The $200,000 bracket included:

W. C. Fields, $255,000, and Deanna (Edna Mae) Durbin, $209,833, both paid by Universal Pictures Co., Inc.; Paul M. Hahn and Vincent Riggio, $251,849 each, as vice presidents of American Tobacco Co.; Harry F. Sinclair, $200,930 as executive committee chairman of Consolidated Oil Corporation; Walter S. Gifford, $210,150 as president of American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Ernest T. Weir, $245,400 as chairman, and George R. Fink, $245,300 as president of National Steel Corporation; Robert C. Stanley, $215,350 as president of International Nickel Co. of Canada, Ltd.; Harry W. Bracy, $206,402 as a branch manager for Kroger Grocery & Baking Co.

BING CROSBY GETS $150,000

Bing Crosby was paid $150,000 by Universal Pictures.

G. W. Vaughan was paid $148,671 as president of Curtiss-Wright Corporation, and B. S. Wright got $72,573 as vice president. National Distillers Products Corporation paid $165,000 to Seton Porter as president and $98,014 to Charles L. Jones as executive vice president.

Walter P. Paepke got $190,243 as president of Container Corporation of America. Bethlehem Steel Corporation listed $179,443 paid both to Quincy Bent and Robert Mackall as directors, and $139,506 paid both to Robert E. McMath and Frederick A. Shick as vice president and controller, respectively.

Other large remunerations disclosed by corporations included:

The Sperry Corporation, New York, $147,243 to Thomas A. Morgan as president, and $155,908 to Harry F. Vickers as president of two subsidiaries; the National Acme Co., Cleveland, $80,000 to F. H. Chapin as president; International Paper Co., New York, $97,674 to R. J. Cullen as president.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-THREE THOUSAND DOLLARS FOR PATRICK HURLEY

The American Rolling Mill Co., Middletown, Ohio, $106,213 to Charles R. Hook as president; $78,076 to Calvin Verity as general manager, and $74,900 to George M. Verity as chairman; the United Gas Improvement Co., Philadelphia, $90,000 to John E. Zimmerman as president; Consolidated Oil Corporation, New York, $101,040 to E. W. Sinclair as executive vice president; $123,000 to Patrick J. Hurley, of Washington, for legal services.

Crown Cork & Seal Co., Inc., New York, $100,200 to Charles E. McManus as president; American Telephone & Telegraph Co., $101,799 to C. P. Cooper as vice president; Thompson Products Co., Cleveland, $91,254 to F. C. Crawford as president; Borg-Warner Corporation, Chicago, $90,050 to C. S. Davis as president; Jewel Tea Co., Barrington, Ill., $95,352 to M. H. Karker as president; Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., $100,000 to P. W. Litchfield as president; General Aniline & Film Corporation, New York, $90,550 to D. A. Schmitz as president.

EIGHTY THOUSAND DOLLARS FOR A. W. HAWKES

Cluett, Peabody & Co., Troy, N. Y., $95,000 to C. R. Palmer as president; Radio Corporation of America, $100,900 to David Sarnoff as president, and $60,940 to James G. Harbord as chairman; Congoleum-Nairn, Inc., Kearny, N. J., $80,000 to A. W. Hawkes as president. (Mr. Hawkes was elected president of the United States Chamber of Commerce last week.)

National Biscuit Co., $96,600 to R. E. Tomlinson as president; Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co., Toledo, $61,350 to John D. Biggers as president; Standard Oil Co. of Ohio, $90,000 to W. T. Holliday as president; Allied Chemical & Dye Corporation, $125,000 to H. F. Atherton as president; Checker Cab Manufacturing Co., Kalamazoo, Mich., $72,301 to Morris Markin as president.

National Dairy Products Corporation, New York, $150,540 to Thomas H. McInnerney as president; American Woolen Co., New York, $75,750 to Moses Pendleton as president; Tidewater Associated Oil Co., New York, $78,565 to William F. Humphrey as president; Lambert Co., New York, $80,000 to John L. Johnston as president; St. Joseph

Lead Co., New York, $74,000 to Clinton H. Crane as president.

Houdaille-Hershey Corporation, Detroit, $50,000 to Charles Getler, president; $43,666 to Don S. Devor, vice president; $43,216 to Ralph F. Peo, vice president; Air Reduction Co., New York, $112,520 to C. E. Adams as chairman; Burroughs Adding Machine Co., Detroit, $85,150 to both Standish Backus as president and A. J. Doughty as vice president; Cudahy Packing Co., Chicago, $51,022 to E. A. Cudahy, Jr., as president; Swift & Co., Chicago, $65,000 to John Holmes as president.

GENERAL MOTORS SALARIES

General Motors Corporation, $100,670 and 3,782 shares of common stock to Charles E. Wilson, acting president and executive vice president; $100,150 and 3,145 shares of stock to Charles F. Kettering as vice president; and $100,150 and 3,135 shares of stock to Donaldson Brown as vice president and vice chairman of the board.

Otis Elevator Co., New York, $83,803 to Jesse H. Van Alstyne as president; Cities Service Co., New York, $150,300 to W. Alton Jones as president; Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., $106,410 to F. L. Carlisle as chairman; Union Bag & Paper Corporation, New York, $86,829 to Alexander Calder as president; National Steel Corporation, Pittsburgh, $150,400 to Thomas E. Millsop as director.

Kennecott Copper Corporation, New York, $101,220 to E. T. Stannard as president and $101,530 to D. C. Jackling as director; Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co., $89,582 to J. W. Andrews as president and $79,582 each to Ben Carroll, W. D. Carmichael, B. F. Few, E. H. Thurston, and G. W. Whitaker, all vice presidents.

E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., $162,720 to W. S. Carpenter as president, $140,556 to A. B. Echols, as vice president, and $129,813 to J. W. McCoy, as vice president.

International Nickel Co. of Canada, Ltd., $105,300 to John F. Thompson as vice president; Curtis Publishing Co., Philadelphia, $71,036 to W. D. Fuller as president; Kroger Grocery & Baking Co., Cincinnati, $116,875 to Albert H. Morrill as president; Eagle-Picher Lead Co., Cincinnati, $74,000 to George W. Potter as vice president; Safeway Stores, Reno, Nev., $119,666 to L. A. Warren as president; International Harvester Co., $99,399 to Sydney G. McAllister as president; Armour & Co., Chicago, $74,377 to George A. Eastwood as president.

Laclede Steel Co., St. Louis, $35,550 to Thomas R. Akin as president and $24,000 to W. W. Scott, Jr., as vice president; Missouri Portland Cement Co., St. Louis, $23,625 to M. Moss Alexander as president and $14,175 each to C. S. McArdle and R. G. Uhlig as vice presidents; St. Louis Bank Building & Equipment Corporation, $16,080 to J. B. Gander as president; Key Co., East St. Louis, Ill., $15,300 to Robert L. Dutton as president, $15,070 to Elmer A. Key, a salesman, and $9,101 to John C. Wiley, a salesman.

Peonage in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

ARTICLE BY GEORGE MEANY

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Meany, which appears in the American Federationist for May 1941:

[From the American Federationist for May 1941]

PEONAGE IN CALIFORNIA

(By George Meany)

Years before the Civil War a talented woman named Harriet Beecher Stowe wrote a book called Uncle Tom's Cabin, which dramatized the evil institution of slavery and lodged a hatred of that inhuman system in the hearts of millions. Miss Stowe's book stirred the emotions of multitudes who had never read a political speech or heard a serious debate on any theme, and in the opinion of historians was one of the prime factors in bringing about the abolition in this country of the ownership of humans of black skin by other humans of white skin. But Harriet Beecher Stowe's novel was published in 1852, and it was not until 13 years later that the thirteenth amendment went into effect.

In our times things are supposed to move more rapidly, as, indeed, they frequently do. Yet in our times another moving book has been written, a great book in the same noble tradition as Uncle Tom's Cabin. This book, exposing a vicious condition which is merely a latter-day version of slavery, has been read by tens of thousands of persons, and its heartbreaking story is familiar to millions who saw it unreeled before them in motion-picture form. The work is The Grapes of Wrath, by John Steinbeck. When the book first came out, and later when the film was made, the Nation was shocked. There were those who could not believe that such appalling conditions could exist. But they did exist, as subsequent Government investigations attested.

But it is some time since The Grapes of Wrath first appeared, and because things are supposed to move with celerity nowadays, and because people are so prone to conclude that all that is necessary to make a national canker disappear is to play the hot light of publicity upon it for a day or a week or at most a month, most Americans believe the state of peonage among the impoverished workers in California's industrialized agriculture was largely eradicated a long time ago.

Most Americans think the feudal exploitations of wage earners on the lowest rung of the economic ladder—the whole shameful pattern of a few miserable pennies for backbreaking toil, of oppressive conditions of labor in the fields and groves, of adults and children huddled together in the most primitive of hovels, of the theft of the workers' earnings by compelling them to trade in unscrupulous company stores—cannot possibly still be operative.

After all, The Grapes of Wrath aroused indignation of mammoth proportions. After all, the President and the First Lady, Senators and Representatives, Governors and mayors, and hundreds of other outstanding personages denounced the conditions and called for their abolition. After all, the newspapers—not all of them, but hundreds nevertheless—and the magazines assailed the existence of peonage. Isn't public opinion a mighty force? Of course, it is. And public opinion was seemingly 99 percent against the misery imposed upon the thousands of agricultural workers employed by "farmers" owning thousands of acres of productive California soil.

All this being true, one can readily understand why millions of Americans are convinced that peonage in California is a thing of the past. Perhaps you, too, have come to the conclusion that the scenes in The Grapes of Wrath that pained your heart and moistened your eyes are no longer enacted in California. If so, don't you believe it. Don't you believe it for 1 minute. Because it just isn't so. It isn't so at all. The same oppression, the same abuses, the same harrowing conditions of work and life—they still exist. They exist—nay, they are rampant—in a part of sunny southern California officially designated as Ventura County.

Ventura County is a place where many millions of lemons are grown annually. Twenty-two thousand acres of Ventura County are devoted to the production of lemons. One family alone, that of a man named Charles Collins Teague, controls, through direct ownership and through holding companies, 3,500 lemon-growing acres. There are 500 little fellows in the county who also raise lemons, but these individual growers cut little ice.

The Teague family and a handful of other big growers, with 9,500 lemon-growing acres among them, hold the lemon industry of Ventura County in the hollows of their hands. It is they who decree that workers shall have $5.30 or $2.94 or even only a few coppers to show for 2 weeks' hard physical labor. And it is they who, with their banking connections and monopolistic growers' association agreements, force the small operator to stay in line.

The workers employed in the lemon industry of Ventura County are divided into two main classes—pickers and packers.

The pickers are the men and women, boys, and girls who toil from early morning at the task of removing the fruit from the trees. They are the workers who labor in the groves.

The packers, as the word indicates, are the workers who fill the boxes and crates with the fruit for shipment to market.

When the time comes for the picking of the lemons, it requires thousands of workers in Ventura County—which lies adjacent to and just northwest of sprawling and fabulous Los Angeles County—to do the huge job.

As already intimated, the conditions of these wage earners constitute a tale of unbelievable misery and exploitation. Now let us be specific. Now let us get away from the generalities of the indictment and down to the particulars.

The lemon pickers of Ventura County are theoretically paid 30 cents an hour—when they work. If a picker is called out on a job, he is likely to find that there is no work to be done that day. He wastes several hours and doesn't receive a dime. Or, even if he is luckier, he will often have to wait a goodly stretch of time before the dew evaporates. Until the dew disappears picking is forbidden, and sometimes the dew stays for a fairly lengthy period. While the picker is patiently waiting for the moment when the overseer will authorize him to start picking, no money is being chalked up to the picker's credit in the company's books.

In the antebellum South, there was slavery, and it was hateful. But the singing cotton pickers were not made up by imaginary novelists. The slaves' lot was not an enviable one, yet they seemed to be enjoying themselves—to some extent anyhow—as they sweated in the fields. The Ventura County lemon pickers, although their employers do not legally own their bodies, lead lives that have been likened to those under slavery. In at least one respect the slaves of the old South were better off.

The Ventura County lemon pickers do not sing as they work. In fact, they do not even speak to one another, except surreptitiously. Unlike the slaves, they do not especially feel like singing, because they don't see anything to sing about, and they couldn't sing if they wanted to, because the employers' rules are that workers must not utter a sound. Violation of the rules means instant dismissal.

With the beautiful sunshine of California warming them, with God's sweet air to breathe, why should these workers be so sad? The answer to that is quite simple.

In the first place, the workers' wages are so microscopic that, even if they received all

that they earned, they could hardly begin to maintain themselves and their families decently.

But, in addition to the meager pay, there are many reasons for the lemon pickers' discontent. They live with their families in tiny, squalid, primeval shacks which have no more conveniences, for the most part, than the log cabins of the pioneers and which are not half so solidly built as were those structures in the woods a century and more ago.

And these dilapidated shacks are company-owned. However, tumbledown and unhealthful and demoralizing these hovels may be, the companies insist upon their rent—and they collect it by deducting it from the worker's wages. In view of the nature of the housing provided, the rents are extortionate.

Another racket conducted by the lemon grove operators is the company store. By this time almost everyone understands how this pernicious system works. The worker is compelled to make his purchases in the company-owned store; that's a condition for retaining his job. The merchandise in the company store is shoddy and criminally overpriced. When a purchase is made the clerk enters a notation in his book. When pay day rolls around, the debts to the store are deducted.

After the rent and company store and other deductions are all made, it's a rare lemon picker who has more than a very few dollars to show for his work. There is the case of one man who was paid only 18 cents for 2 weeks' work. This lemon picker was employed by the benevolent Saticoy Lemon Association of Ventura County.

His earnings were $11.59, but after deductions he was left with only a dime, a nickel, and three pennies—fine pay indeed.

One day late in January some 1,500 of these twentieth century slaves decided to rebel, decided to try to get rid of their shackles, decided to attempt to improve their conditions. These fifteen-hundred-odd Ventura County lemon pickers went out on strike. It was a peaceful strike. No sit-down; no slow-down; no violence. The workers merely ceased picking lemons, donned picket signs, and commenced to parade, in orderly fashion, to advertise that a strike was in progress.

The strikers' ranks were swelled promptly; a week after the walk-out began the strikers numbered 4,500. February went by, March went by—and still the strike continued. April came and April went and now, today, in May, the pickets still march. Their ranks remain unbroken, their morale continues high.

How did the strike come about?

Sick of the oppressive and degrading conditions, the lemon pickers banded together, as other workers had done before. Then they called upon the American Federation of Labor to send someone into their pitiful world to help them.

The American Federation of Labor responded and soon the Agricultural and Citrus Workers' Union, Local 22342, was established. But the A. F. of L. organizers did not want a strike if it could possibly be avoided. They strove to carry out the Federation's policy of winning benefits for workers through peaceful negotiations, rather than through strike action. They had no desire to see thousands of impoverished workers on strike if there was any way of escaping it. But there was no way.

The lemon pickers wanted recognition of their union. They asked the right of collective bargaining. They sought a little better pay. That was all.

And the employers flatly refused even to discuss the situation with the workers' chosen representatives. The lemon magnates said that any of their workers who wanted to see them, as individuals, could do so—if they came in meekly, with their hats in their hands.

"But we won't talk to any unions," bellowed the tycoons. "We won't stand for any unions around here. Unionism in Ventura County is out."

Innumerable attempts were made by the union to find responsible parties to whom they could talk and with whom they could negotiate a settlement of the issues in dispute. But the growers were adamant in their refusal to meet with union spokesmen. The strike, rendered unavoidable by the growers' attitude, began.

The first persons speaking, or claiming to speak, for the growers were the president and secretary of the notorious antilabor California organization misleadingly named the Associated Farmers. These gentlemen quickly dropped out of the picture.

Then Charles Collins Teague, of the California Fruit Growers Exchange, called a meeting of the growers.

"We cannot and must not accede to the union's demands," said he. "It would be better for us to let the fruit now on the trees drop to the ground than to grant their demands."

So the strike went on and the lemons began to rot.

The employers tried to recruit strikebreakers. Obedient servants of the omnipotent operators, the authorities of Ventura Junior College sanctioned a call for students to work as scabs. But this contemptible act failed to accomplish what it was intended to accomplish.

Then E. T. FitzGerald and L. N. Sisley, conciliators of the United States Department of Labor, proposed arbitration of the dispute by a committee of three—one appointed by the Secretary of Labor, one by the Secretary of Agriculture and one by Governor Olson of California. The plan called for the strikers to return to their jobs while arbitration went on. The union accepted the plan, but the secretary of the growers' committee tartly informed the representatives of the Federal Government that there was nothing whatever to discuss, nothing whatever to arbitrate.

Although this seemed to make the attitude of the employers quite clear, the union soon afterward addressed a letter to the secretary of the growers' committee. In this letter the union pointed out that it had been designated by the pickers as their collective bargaining representative and expressed a willingness to call off the strike if only the employers would recognize the principle of collective bargaining. The union did not then ask—nor has it ever asked—for a closed shop. But it did courteously suggest that a committee could be established to consider the industry's ability to pay its workers better.

No reply to this letter was ever received. And the strike continued.

The growers brought in some starving Okies to act as strikebreakers. Lacking skill at the work, the Okies caused extensive damage. And soon even the Okies showed their strong dissatisfaction with the pitiful wages paid them.

Striving to break the strikers' spirit, the employers first had the lights and gas shut off in the workers' miserable little homes. This action was particularly callous because there were young children in almost every striker's family.

Next the labor-hating employers proceeded to have the striking workers evicted from their shacks. The hardships resulting from eviction were counted upon to break the strike at last. But again the employers were disappointed.

Now in its fourth month, the strike is going stronger than ever. The western headquarters of the American Federation of Labor and the American Labor Citizen, official A. F. of L. newspaper published in San Francisco, have done a magnificent job of mustering the support of California labor and the public at large for the strikers' cause. Organizer Meyer L. Lewis, in charge of the western headquarters, has seen to it that the help given the strikers was material as well as moral.

Because the employers' high-handed refusal to sit down around the table with the workers' chosen representatives mocks the sentiments of the American people and because their anachronistic policy has cost each of them a fortune, organized labor is confident that victory will soon be had by the striking lemon pickers—a victory well merited.

But even if they stood entirely alone—which happily they do not—these workers could not be defeated. That was the conclusion I reached after visiting Ventura County. I saw conditions that were barbarous and shocking. But what impressed me most was the indomitable courage of these workers in the face of extreme adversity, their grim determination to carry their strike to a successful termination despite all hardships.

Men and women like these spirited lemon workers deserve to win because they are so clearly in the right. And, in my opinion, win they will—and soon.

The outspoken support of Americans everywhere who believe in simple justice can do much to speed the lemon pickers' day of victory.

How the Timken Roller Bearing Co. Solved the Week-end Black-out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. THOM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE CANTON (OHIO) REPOSITORY

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following news item published in the Canton Repository, of Canton, Ohio, my home city, setting forth the accomplishment of the Timken Roller Bearing Co., the largest industry in the city, in setting up a 168-hour workweek, and thus keeping its equipment working on defense material every hour of the week.

Announcement from Washington that Sidney Hillman, associate director of the Office of Production Management, is perfecting a plan for a 4-shift, 160-hour production week for vital defense industries, focused attention today on a schedule that has been in operation since August 1939 at the plant of the Timken Roller Bearing Co.

Terming it the "week-end black-out schedule," officials of the Timken Co. 21 months ago inaugurated a system enabling the company to keep its equipment running not 160 but 168 hours (24 hours a day, 7 days a week).

The Timken schedule betters the one proposed by Mr. Hillman by 8 hours a week. This was accomplished by an ingenious scheduling arrangement of shifts and crews whereby each crew works 5 extra 8-hour shifts

over each period of 20 weeks for which overtime is paid. It is through these 5 extra shifts that the Timken schedule reaches the additional 8 hours each week.

The arrangement of shifts has been so carefully worked out that every man works 5 days in a row and then is off at least 48 hours, after which he changes shifts. Over each period of 20 weeks each man has 5 Sundays off. The shift schedule runs 20 weeks and then repeats without change.

The Hillman plan, announced from Washington by United Press, would leave machines in vital defense industries idle only 8 hours a week, from 7 a. m. to 3 p. m. Sundays. This time, Hillman said, could be utilized for repairs and other essential maintenance work.

In his efforts to get general approval of the plan, Mr. Hillman has asked the cooperation of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Msgr. John A. Ryan, a Great Man and a Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE TIDINGS BY REV. R. A. McGOWAN

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I consider it an honor to have printed with my remarks the following article by Father R. A. McGowan regarding one of the most truly important books of recent years, the Autobiography of Msgr. John A. Ryan:

THE YARDSTICK—MSGR. JOHN A. RYAN'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY CALLED SOCIAL DOCTRINE IN ACTION

(By Rev. R. A. McGowan)

Monsignor Ryan's autobiography, issued by Harper's under the title, "Social Doctrine in Action," is a book that demanded to be written and that demands being read. The title describes the book accurately. It is the story of a body of the church's doctrine, a body of social doctrine, a body of doctrine on the relations of people in their social and economic life. And it is the story of that doctrine in action—in the varied and powerful activities of the daring pioneer of Catholic social teaching in the United States living during a fateful generation.

Fortunately the book turns out to be still more than an account of an interesting life. It is a history of ideas, or something of their origins, and of the many applications of these ideas to current and shifting facts in a busy life. The book is well printed and there is an ample index to let you go back over it easily and pick out the many parts you want to read again and to consult as matters come up for your decision.

As you read, several impressions grow on you with mounting effect from chapter to chapter. Here is a first-class mind thoroughly at home in American life and having at instant command the eternal principles of human rights and human duties. Here is a warm-hearted man who hates injustices, both because it hurts people and because it offends the order of human relations which God decrees. And here is a humble, completely honest, and a tireless worker. The combination has turned out to be a providential blessing to Catholic life in the United States and to the United States as a whole. Students will be writing Ph. D. theses on this or that phase of his work, and scholars will continue to study him and quote him and annotate his works.

But you shouldn't read the book only to get acquainted with Dr. Ryan, if perhaps you are not yet numbered among his many friends. You should read it to learn how, or learn how better, to think and act in the tragic time in which we live, through knowing how he has thought and acted. The book is a short course in how Catholic social teaching can be your guide.

For example, 4 years ago last October Monsignor Ryan started the formal study which 35 years ago this month resulted in his epoch-making book advocating a living wage by law, and 3 years ago this year he wrote a Minnesota bill for a minimum wage for women. He has been pioneering all along and he is still pioneering. Many things which he has urged he has seen adopted. Many other things which he has wanted have not yet come true.

The story of the things accomplished, of the things to be improved upon and of the things yet to be achieved—for example, wide purchasing power to end unemployment, the democratic organization of the industries and professions to make economic life right, workers' management, profits and ownership sharing, and world organization for justice and peace—will help you think straight and act boldly now. It is really a great book.

The Power to Clip the Coin

REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to continuing the power of the administration to clip the coin.

Mr. Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, is asking that the political power to clip the coin and produce inflation be continued beyond the present expiration date in June. He wants to continue in operation this power to depreciate the value of our currency and Government bonds. This power now makes it possible to destroy the value of our currency and bonds in the amount of no less than eight or nine billion dollars.

It is remarkable that this request should be made at the present time, when the whole country is becoming apprehensive of the dangers of inflation, when the Federal Reserve authorities see these dangers and are asking for legislation to cope with them, and when the administration itself openly recognizes the dangers of inflation and is trying to head them off by instituting the most drastic and far-reaching measures ever adopted in this country, some of which are:

First. A tax bill to increase our annual taxes three and a half billion dollars, the largest increase in our history.

Second. A price control agency with totalitarian powers to be found only in dictator nations, and to avert inflation the administration has also inaugurated a program to raise a huge amount of money by selling bonds directly to the public.

At this very time, perhaps more than ever before, supreme confidence is needed in money and Government bonds. Yet here is the Secretary of the Treasury asking Congress to extend this most dangerous power to further clip the coin and destroy the future value of our currency and Government securities.

Mr. Morgenthau does not give one single valid reason why this power should be continued. He says it should be extended since it has not been used for 5 years, and since there is—

no present intent whatsoever to devalue the gold content of the dollar.

Certainly such arguments give no assurance whatever of the future value of Government securities, instead they cannot help but produce doubt as to the future intent to use this power.

This power to clip the coin has already been used and more than $600,000,000 of the clippings were used to pay off Government bonds.

The important question is not whether there is any "present intent," or for that matter any future intent to use it further. It is enough to ask, is there a future possibility that this power may be used, which, if it were, it would destroy the value of Government securities. Why do they want this power if they do not think they might possibly wish at some future time to use it?

In my opinion, not only is there a future possibility it might be used, but a strong likelihood it will be.

Consider the experience of some of the nations whose political authorities have had the power to clip their coin ("devaluation" is a term used to deceive the people and to hide from them what is really being done.

In Italy there is this power. At a single stroke, in one instance, her politicians clipped 3.5 billion off the lira (Italian money) and thereby destroyed that much value of currency and Government securities.

The Russian dictator has the power to clip the coin. In one instance he clipped more than $9,000,000,000 off the ruble (Russian money), and thereby destroyed that much value of the currency and Government securities.

The political authority of France had the power to clip the franc (French money). Three times it used this power. During the World War the franc was worth nearly 20 cents. By 1938 the French politicians had it clipped down to where it was worth less than 3 cents. That meant a bond which was worth about $20 during the World War was worth, in 1938, about $3. The peasants of France who had given freely of their savings for Government bonds lost by these clippings about $17 on every $20

worth of bonds they purchased. The United States Government authorities condoned and actually promoted the French clipping of the coin in 1938. See Washington Evening Star, May 5, 1938, and Washington Herald, May 5, 1938.

Is it right that the American middle and working classes should be subjected to even the possibility of such treatment?

It is noteworthy that Mr. Morgenthau in his request for the continuation of the power to clip the coin does not mention a single accomplishment that has been achieved by this power thus far. Of course not, because there has been none. It failed to achieve a single objective for which it was ostensibly created in the first place. Up to now it has had but one effect: it has operated powerfully to undermine and destroy confidence in the future value of the dollar. It is one of the main monetary debauchments that has destroyed long-term investments and the free-enterprise process. This power alone, to clip the coin, has been the cause of keeping millions unemployed. It is one of the main underlying causes that is speedily driving our Nation into totalitarianism.

There is not a single reason why this power should not be abolished. There are innumerable good reasons why it should be abolished.

It is most desirable and important that whatever amount of funds is to be raised by borrowing should be obtained by selling bonds directly to the public. The present scheme of the Treasury in raising funds by simply depositing Government securities in the banking system and then checking against its own paper to pay its bills is a vicious inflation-producing process.

It is the duty of Congress to protect the purchasers of these bonds by providing every possible safeguard against their future depreciation.

Taxes for Defense on Luxuries or Necessities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, what is a luxury? That is a question that must be answered by Congress in its search for things to tax for the $3,500,000,000 of new revenue annually needed for national defense.

Proceeding on the theory that wealth in the form of luxuries can be taxed with least injury to the public and with least damage to the Nation's economic balance, efforts are being made to weigh carefully the types of wealth that can be subjected to taxation with most facility.

There are three general types of basic wealth in the United States, namely, first, land and its improvements; second, productive wealth, as cattle, machinery, motor-trucks; and third, consumptive wealth, as metal stocks, food supplies, and personal effects.

Real-estate taxes, which are levies on land wealth, by tradition and custom belong chiefly to the local units of government. The Federal Government has never levied a tax on real estate despite the fact that it is one of the chief forms of wealth in the Nation. At one time the States derived their principal revenue by sharing in levies on real estate, but most of the States have relinquished their stake in such taxation, leaving real-estate levies to the local communities.

The luxury theory of taxation is not applied to real estate. A golf course, or an amusement park, is not taxed at a higher rate than are neighboring homes. Nor are luxury taxes ordinarily applied to productive wealth. A farmer with 1,000 head of cattle does not pay a higher rate than does a neighbor with only 50 head on the theory that a large wealth of cattle places the owner in the luxury class.

Luxury taxes are directed at the third type, consumptive wealth. For purposes of taxation, consumption goods generally are divided into two groups—First, necessities; and second luxuries. The staple articles of food, as bread, butter, and milk, are classified as necessities, and probably will not be taxed to any great extent by Congress. Some of the finer types of foods, however, were taxed as luxuries in the United States during the last war. Ordinarily, clothing is a necessity, but an expensive fur coat is regarded as a luxury. Some goods are considered as wholly luxuries, as perfumes, liquors, tobacco, and so forth.

Last year Congress increased the Federal tax on gasoline by 50 percent to provide funds for national defense. Despite the enormous increase, there are proposals for further increases in the rate. Such proposals are perhaps made because of lack of understanding of the true economic function of motor fuel.

Motor fuel definitely is not in the same category with tobacco, liquor, perfumes, expensive furs, and other luxuries. Approximately 25 percent of all gasoline consumed in the United States is used by trucks in transporting goods from producer to consumer. Of the motor fuel used in passenger cars, more than half is used in connection with earning a livelihood, according to the United States Public Roads Administration. Thus two-thirds of all the gasoline consumed in the United States is in connection with people earning a livelihood. The use of passenger cars in bringing men and jobs together has increased enormously by the national-defense program. Millions of persons engaged in national-defense work get to and from their jobs by motor vehicle.

Most of the gasoline consumed in the United States, therefore, cannot be considered even in the most remote sense as a product to be subject to luxury taxation. Motor fuel used in going to church, in transporting children to school, or giving the family a few hours' recreation, contributes much in elevating social values in the Nation. Inexpensive gasoline is the greatest leveler of class in all history. In the horse-and-buggy days only the well-to-do owned horses and buggies. Today, more than half of the car-owning families in the United States operate inexpensive used cars on incomes averaging less than $30 a week.

Clearly motor fuel is not a luxury in the United States. Only a relatively small part of the gasoline consumed in the United States is used for recreational purposes by families with incomes of more than $30 a week. If the wealth of such persons is to be taxed, such would be accomplished more effectively by other forms of taxation. Gasoline is not a suitable base for such taxation, for it definitely is not a luxury.

GASOLINE INDISPENSABLE TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

Finally any increase in the Federal gasoline tax would burden directly the workers who now are engaged actively in defense work. The workers employed in construction of Army barracks and other such facilities, for example, usually cannot live on the premises, so they must drive back and forth to their work. Then, too, because of the unusual volume of work involved, workers on such projects oftentimes have been attracted from other parts, and they depend upon their cars to go home for the week end to visit their wives and their families. Similar considerations apply to workers in munitions plants.

On such defense projects, it is shown in studies by the Automobile Manufacturers Association, between 70 percent and 80 percent of the workers depend upon their own automobiles or those of fellow workers in traveling to and from their work. The significance of the automobile as a means of transportation for such workers is emphasized even further when it is appreciated that two-thirds of all the communities in this country with a population of more than 2,500 possess no system of mass transportation whatever, that is, trolley or bus lines.

Gasoline consumed in motor trucking also is of vital importance to satisfactory completion of the defense program. This factor is especially significant in some States because more than 40 percent of the communities are not served by the railroads. Hence their residents must depend wholly upon truck transportation for their contact with the outside world. This point is most important in consideration of the possible effect of an increased Federal gasoline tax on the defense effort because of the desire to disperse plants engaged in defense contracts away from railroad terminals and other similar centers of communication for strategic military purposes.

We Should Take Heed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, WAUPACA COUNTY, WIS.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the Board of Supervisors of Waupaca County, Wis., have sent me their Resolution No. 8, in which they call attention to the fact that they, as a body, are opposed to measures leading this country into war and, furthermore, are opposed to excessive nondefense expenditures which are needlessly increasing our national debt.

If millions upon millions of dollars of the Federal funds appropriated annually were allocated back to the States and counties, they would be more efficiently administered and large sums of money could be saved by these county boards, which are the foundation of our Republic. If the will of the people is the law of the land, we should pay more attention to the voices of the people themselves.

The letter of transmittal and resolution is as follows:

WAUPACA COUNTY CLERK,
Waupaca, Wis., May 8, 1941.

Mr. REID F. MURRAY,
Room 423, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed you will find a copy of Resolution No. 8 which was passed by the Waupaca County board on May 7, 1941.

Very truly yours,
L. J. STEIGER, *County Clerk.*

Resolution No. 8

To the Honorable County Board of Supervisors:

GENTLEMEN: The board of supervisors of the County of Waupaca, State of Wisconsin, representing a population of over 34,000 persons, prides itself in conducting the affairs of Waupaca County with a balanced budget and holding expenditures under income, and seriously objecting to expenditures which would force Waupaca County into debt.

We likewise know that a tremendous large majority of the citizens of Waupaca County, all a pesce-loving people who abhor war but nevertheless are loyal patriotic citizens who would fight to their last drop of blood for the defense of our beloved country.

We believe in the United States of America, with life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and

Whereas our national administration apparently has little regard for excessive expenditures of increased national debts by spending billions upon billions of dollars, and by increasing the national debt of billions more, which, if continued, will surely mean disaster; and

Whereas acts now taking place at Washington, D. C., appear to be leading our country into a war which would take our young men to foreign lands to fight, bleed, and die: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of supervisors of the county of Waupaca, State of Wisconsin, representing a population of 34,576 persons, hereby protests against the tremendous expenditure and exorbitant debt increases by the national administration and also protests against involvement in any war which will take our young men to a foreign land to fight, bleed, and die; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Congressman Reid F. Murray, Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., Senator Alexander Wiley, and the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, so that our protests may be made known to them.

Dated at Waupaca, Wis., May 7, 1941.

Approved and passed at the regular session of the board on May 7, 1941.

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
County of Waupaca, ss:

I, L. J. Steiger, county clerk of Waupaca, certify that on the 7th day of May 1941, the above Resolution No. 8 was passed by the Waupaca County Board, and the above is a true and correct copy of the resolution.

L. J. STEIGER, *County Clerk.*

Strike—While the Iron Is Cold?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE ROXBURY (N. Y.) TIMES

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Roxbury (N. Y.) Times of May 10, 1941:

[From the Roxbury (N. Y.) Times, May 10, 1941]

STRIKE—WHILE THE IRON IS COLD?

We have had a lot of talk about whether or not strikes were causing much havoc in the defense program, but until recently we haven't had very much in the way of calm and authoritative figures. Now, the National Association of Manufacturers has issued some statistics on defense and other strikes that should sweep a number of unsupported declarations into the discard.

The N. A. M. study shows that total number of man-days lost from strikes in the first 3 months of this year were more that three times as great as for the same period in 1940. In all, 3,022,918 man-days were lost in January, February, and March of this year; and of this total, 1,578,000 man-days were directly in defense industries.

The time lost in those industries would have been enough to equip about 1,402,480 American soldiers with the latest Garand rifles, or to provide more than 5,000,000,000 rounds of ammunition for those rifles. Seen in those terms—or in any others—the harm done can hardly be minimized.

The great danger lies in the attitude of some who continue to claim, in the face of the evidence, that the number or result of strikes in defense is really not very important. The figures knock that complacency galley-west.

Defense is either vital or it isn't. The American people think that it is, and will be paying billions in taxes to support their belief. In the light of that stand, there is an all-important need to work out solutions for any problems that arise without recourse to strikes that cripple our all-out effort for national defense.

Strikes in Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LELAND M. FORD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise again to talk on what I think is the greatest danger to our defense program, that is, the number of strikes that are now in process, or contemplated, that affect this program.

Listed in yesterday's Washington Post, and this morning's Post, there are strikes in 11 shipyards working on $500,000,000 worth of Navy contracts. This is an outlawed strike; an $11,000,000 order in the bag-loading plant at Pulaski, Va., affecting the $44,000,000 Hercules powder plant near Radford, Va.; $30,000,000 of work at the Boston Navy Yard; $9,000,000 in New Mexico. These are the amounts given. In addition to this, 6,000 workers were to strike in the Chrysler Corporation in Detroit; a strike is threatened in the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, freight handlers, express and station employees, and four midwestern railroads; 160,000 workers in General Motors are contemplating striking; C. I. O. strike in the United Engineering & Foundry Co., at Vandergrift, Pa.; thousands of workers were ordered on strike in 60 California canneries. This is the peak of the season. A proposed strike at the Murphy Body Corporation.

There, no doubt, are many others that are not listed here, but when one stops to contemplate the ramifications of these strikes, he knows that at least $594,000,000 of our war orders will be affected, as outlined above, with a possibility of the strikes affecting some $5,000,000,000, when consideration is given to all of the ramifications affected.

These strikes, in nearly every instance, are carried on by destructive labor leaders, who have not the interest of the rank and file of their workers at heart, nor the interest of the country at heart, but who are motivated purely by hopes of selfish gain regardless of whether they destroy their country or not. In some instances these strikes are outlawed. This is indicated by the statements of William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, in speaking of the strike at the shipyards in San Francisco. In all fairness, I believe that Mr. Green should be commended for his attitude and his statement that there should be no strikes in his unions, and wherever they do occur in his union they are outlawed and beyond his control.

Contrast this constructive attitude with the destructive attitude of the C. I. O. The C. I. O. leader is highly trained by

Communists and subversive interests to hit the strategic places where they may do the most damage, and therefore make the greatest threat to our defense program. As proof of this, they pick the shipyards, the powder plants, and have even not overlooked going away out on the desert in California and Nevada and striking at the borax works, which certainly produces strategic products that affect many industries. These communistically trained traitors and expert saboteurs certainly know where to strike an industry so that many others will be either slowed down or shut down, while all of these boards, Cabinet officers, and organizations set up to care for these things appear to be spineless and lack the intestinal fortitude to really stand up and stand out and represent the real interests of the great United States of America.

It appears to me that every time a showdown has come these weak representatives of United States of America have retreated. I say this because I am counting the results, and it is a reflection on the weak-kneed, mealymouthed policy of the United States Government representatives who have not had the guts to do the things they ought to have done for our defense program. Where has strong leadership gone? Where has patriotism gone? Where have real honest-to-God men gone, that this country can not obtain men in key positions who will put the interest of this country above any other interest? Has it come to a point where a man, in order to qualify for any position in this country, must be Russian-trained; must be Russian-born; must be a Russian revolutionist? It certainly appears so because every key position we have is filled by one of these or by one who, it is necessary to explain, is "no longer a Communist," or "no longer a fellow traveler," or "no longer a subversive interest." It is admitted that these people have been these things, and now they are admitted into the very heart of our Government to carry on their propaganda if they so choose.

As further evidence of this, take our so-called Secretary of Labor. I say so-called, because Madam Perkins has been the greatest failure that the country has ever known, and if there ever was a time when our country needed leadership in its Labor Department it is now. Every person in the United States knows the Perkins communistic, socialistic attitude, with her leaning to the left, and I think her statement on strikes exemplifies what she is when she says, "The right of the C. I. O. to strike is paramount to the right of the United States to have a defense program."

If God were good to this country, the greatest thing He could do today would be to send us some strong leaders who had no fear of anybody when the interest of the United States Government and this whole country were at stake. He would take away some of these mealymouthed defenders who are always friends of the Communists and subversive interests in court.

Why will representatives of the United States of America stoop to even talk to the Russian-trained Walter P. Reuther, who the record of this Congress shows to have gone to Russia and come home to carry out the Communist idea of government, and here and now we find him not only dictating to hundreds of thousands of men as to what they should do, but we find weak-kneed, mealymouthed, hypocritical, socialistic excuses of men as Government representatives dealing with these Communists and dignifying them in labor.

There is the Russian-born, foreign, Russian revolutionist Hillman. There are many others who could be named.

This is a fair question. Out of the 130,000,000 people in the United States, are there not enough tried and proven American patriots, whose loyalty and devotion to their country is unquestioned, to be placed in these key positions and to get rid of every questionable character in government? I still think there are, and I further state that if this country is going to continue as an American Government, these subversive interests will have to be thrown out, and honest-to-God, proven and trusted Americans placed in charge of our program.

I think this whole plan of mediation on labor has been a tremendous failure. Let us look at it. Have they settled anything? I say they have not. Every time these bandits, jackals, highjackers, communistic, revolutionary labor leaders have made a demand, what has happened? The answer is that the mealymouthed, weak-kneed, unpatriotic, cowardly representation of the United States Government has given in to the traitorous leaders who cut the throat of this Government's defense program. They have been a bunch of "yes" men, and in every instance have given in to every demand. They then say, "Look what we have done." Thank God, a few of us can see what they have actually done. Their sentiment reminds me of a bandit meeting a man on the street and sticking a .45 revolver into his belt and saying, "Give me your money." The victim forks over his money. That is the kind of compromise that our weak-kneed, mealymouthed Government representatives have made in their defense program.

That is the kind of conduct that is going to destroy this Nation unless the representatives of this Government change their attitude and show some intelligent strength where strength ought to be shown, or not only this armament program is going down, but the Nation itself is going down with it. I think this matter has been muddled along with long enough, and with Cabinet officials and others, with the consent of the administration, shouting "War," I think the situation is extremely dangerous.

I think the first step would be to get Madam Perkins out of the Cabinet, and I expect to lay on the Speaker's desk a petition to the President asking for her retirement. I would appreciate every Member in this House signing this petition in order that the President may really know what the country in general thinks of this labor situation.

I think the patriotic young manhood who have acquiesced in their service to government and who are serving for $21 a month, should be protected, and that these officials should bear in mind that when they cave in on these unjust demands of labor racketeers they are not only paying them many, many times as much as our young men receive for being drafted, but they are adding an additional burden to those who may be survivors of this young manhood, in the taxes they will have to pay in the future. Our young manhood are not blind to this, and while they are serving in training camps they are relying upon their officials and Congress to protect them, and I hope that these officials and Congress will not violate what amounts to a trust and not give these young men the fullest protection by turning these jackals back. If these men can lay down their lives to fight, then the least that high Government officials can do is to do their duty along their respective lines.

This Government has drafted these men, who know no hours and practically no freedom of action, and I say to you, therefore, that if these men accept that in the American spirit in which they have, no individual racketeer, nor any group of racketeers, has any right to strike at any place, at any time, against the defense program of the United States.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, in the course of a visit last week end in the Forty-second New York District, which I have the honor to represent, I encountered an alarming and widely circulated rumor that advocates of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway are hatching an undercover plot to gain congressional approval of this economic monstrosity by trickery. It is reported that our visionary friends backing the seaway project are preparing to attempt to inveigle the Congress into perfunctory authorization of the seaway by slipping through a casual amendment to some vitally necessary defense measure. In view of the subterfuge already resorted to by the administration to evade constitutional provisions respecting ratification of treaties with foreign nations, I have no doubt that such a conspiracy is in the making. That seaway advocates will succeed in their strategy is inconceivable because of the economic havoc which the proposed St. Lawrence channel to the ocean would impose upon the United States. But it is none the less timely that those of us who are everlastingly opposed to perpetration of this national folly should take warning and be on guard against parliamentary sleight of hand.

Moreover, I want to incorporate in the record that the people of New York, where the seaway fallacy is well understood, are overwhelmingly opposed to this

development and deeply resent the effort of the administration to propagandize the St. Lawrence project as a defense measure, which it is not from whatever angle we approach it. If the proposition were submitted to vote of the people in New York State, which, by the way, is the only 1 of the 48 States bordering on the St. Lawrence River, it could be predicted with confidence that less than 10 percent of the electorate would favor the seaway. I am sure less than 10 percent of the New York Members of the Congress would dare to vote approval of the project.

Seven years ago the Senate refused to ratify a treaty with Canada authorizing the seaway. And that Senate roll call indicated plainly that such a treaty never would be ratified.

Now the administration stoops to evasion of the Constitution. It is proposed to "jimmy" the proposition through as an executive agreement, thus dodging the procedure for treaties defined by the Constitution. This smacks too much of the methods pursued by Hitler and Stalin. In effect, if the American Constitution raises obstacles to realization of executive dreams—detour the Constitution. Of course, the next step would be abrogation of the Constitution and full-fledged dictatorship. The American people want national unity, but not at the expense of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

The contention of the President and his close advisers that the seaway is essential to defense is a preposterous imposition on American common sense. To begin with, the seaway could not be completed before 1947 or thereafter. This fact alone would disqualify the seaway as a defense measure in the present emergency.

Diversion of manpower, material, and money to seaway construction at this critical stage of world-wide emergency would seriously—yes, probably criminally—obstruct and impair national preparedness. Defense industries and agriculture are now facing a shortage of personnel. The outlook will grow much worse before it is better. The American people are confronted with a heart-breaking tax burden. We cannot afford to waste manpower and money to chase an economic will-o'-the-wisp for gratification of an Executive whim.

Even if the seaway had merit otherwise, it would be ice-bound nearly half of each year.

A defense measure that only works in the summer months would not afford much security.

Spanning the international boundary—the Niagara River—at Buffalo is the Peace Bridge, so named as a symbol of a century of unarmed peace between the United States and Canada. The seaway would make it imperative for both the United States and Canada to maintain armed fleets on the Great Lakes and extensive fortifications from the mouth of the St. Lawrence River to Duluth on the upper Lakes. It is not contended that an unbroken line of forts halfway across the continent and armed fleets on the Great Lakes would lead to breach of peace between the United States and our friendly neighbor over the border, but the inspiring ideal of peace without armament would no longer enthuse the peoples of the two nations.

Seaway sponsors lately have tried to catch the gullible by urging the project so that the Great Lakes' shipbuilding facilities could be employed in building warships. Already smaller fighting ships are being built on the Lakes and will find their way to the ocean in due time through the existing channel. The Government has not yet scratched the surface of possibilities in construction of smaller types of war vessels at inland yards. But to imply that battleships and cruisers could ever be built along the Great Lakes is pure buncombe. The projected channel of the seaway would not accommodate big fighting ships, and even if the channel were to be much deeper it would not be practical to construct heavier fighting ships on the Lakes. The seaway would be wide open to sabotage. One well-directed bomb would close the seaway to traffic, and all shipping within the Great Lakes would become landlocked indefinitely. Thus, this latest propaganda bubble "We need the seaway for defense" bursts of its own flimsiness. The seaway would obstruct national defense through misdirection of national energies and resources. It would become a defense liability.

Unbiased surveys repeatedly have exposed the seaway as an economic fallacy. It was because the seaway would be wasteful, impractical, and an economic boomerang that the United States Senate rejected the treaty in 1934.

The seaway would not provide new transportation where none exists. At best it would only afford surplus transportation in competition with established facilities for about 6 months of each year. The dislocation of established industry and transportation would be disastrous. Staggering property loss and widespread unemployment would result. The seaway would place the prosperous Great Lakes region at the mercy of tramp steamers from all points of the compass. These tramp steamers would flood the Middle West with cheap products from Europe the Orient, and South America. Labor and agriculture of our country would be forced into ruinous competition with the peon and regimented populations abroad. Our wage scales would be broken down and American living standards would be undermined.

The main support of the seaway project since it first became a question of national debate some 30 years ago has come from the Middle West, which has been lured by the counterfeit picture that Chicago, Milwaukee, Duluth, and other inland ports would be transformed into centers of commercial shipping like New York, Boston, Liverpool, Seattle, San Francisco, and other ocean-fronting cities. It is proposed to bring about this transformation with a 2,300-mile channel drawing 27 feet. Well, these inland ports would become havens for tramp steamers, but the *Queen Mary* would never dock at Chicago. The long, narrow, winding channel would be too costly and too slow for substantial merchantmen. Operation would be too hazardous. It has been estimated that scarcely more than 5 percent of the shipping of American registry would use the seaway, while the route would be wide open for the tramps. Certainly there is no encouragement in this proposition for development of a profitable American merchant marine.

Our country and Canada are good neighbors. A brotherly feeling exists on both sides of the border. But is it wise to invest upward of a billion and a half American dollars in an international waterway which our country cannot control? For, after all, the first 1,000 miles of the proposed seaway up the St. Lawrence River would be entirely in Canada. Also the Welland Canal—key to passage into the Middle West—is owned and operated by Canada on Canadian soil. American shipping always would be subject to charges and regulation by Canada.

The welfare of American labor, industry, agriculture, and transportation demands that this crackpot project be shelved for all time. Its construction would imperil national defense, impose serious economic dislocation, and disrupt national unity.

Anniversary of the Labor Encyclicals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR D. HEALEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

RADIO ADDRESSES OF REV. JOHN A. RYAN, HON. JOSEPH P. O'MAHONEY, OF MONTANA, AND HON. ARTHUR D. HEALEY, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following addresses:

ADDRESS OF RT. REV. MSGR. JOHN A. RYAN, D. D., DIRECTOR, NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE

On May 15, 1891, Pope Leo XIII issued his famous encyclical letter On the Condition of Labor, the Latin title of which is Rerum Novarum. Exactly 40 years later Pope Pius XI issued his encyclical On Reconstruction the Social Order, the Latin title being Quadragesimo Anno. This brief broadcast by Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY, Representative ARTHUR HEALEY, and myself is intended to commemorate the fiftieth anniversay of the first, and the tenth anniversary of the second of these great Papal documents.

Concerning the bad distribution of wealth and income, Pope Pius XI says: "The immense number of propertyless wage earners on the one hand and the superabundant riches of the fortunate few on the other is an unanswerable argument that the earthly goods, so abundantly produced in this age of industrialism, are far from rightly distributed and equitably shared among the various classes of men. Every effort, therefore, must be made that, at least in future, a just share only of the fruits of production be permitted to accumulate in the hands of

the wealthy and that an ample sufficiency be supplied to the workingmen."

What is ample sufficiency? Pope Pius defines it in the following terms: "The laborer's wages must be sufficient for the support of himself and of his family; sufficient to meet adequately ordinary domestic needs; sufficient to enable him to bear the family burden with greater ease and security; sufficient to free him from hand-to-mouth uncertainty; sufficient to support life's changing fortunes; sufficient to make some little provision for those who remain after him; sufficient to acquire a certain moderate ownership."

These specifications show that Pope Pius demanded something more than a bare living wage, something more than the minimum means of day-to-day livelihood. At least one-third of American workers are still living below this Papal standard.

How should the product be divided between capital and labor? In the words of Pope Pius XI, "The distribution of created goods must be brought into conformity with the demands of the common good and social justice." This is the Pope's answer to the question "How much of the product should go to the capitalist?" Only as much as is required by the common good. Therefore, if an interest rate of 2 percent, or even 1 percent, will induce men to provide all the capital that the community needs, the capitalist has no right to claim more than 2 percent. Therefore the recent plea of the steel industry for a rise in the price of their product, which would enable them to get higher profits than their 2-percent average during the last 10 years, is lacking in persuasiveness.

Lower interest rates are likewise required in order to bring justice to the workers. Labor cannot obtain a larger share of the product unless capital receives a smaller share. The only way to reduce the share of capital is by reducing the rate of interest. A considerable reduction in the interest charges upon industry would make possible at least five beneficent changes in our economy: First, higher wages for labor; second, lower prices to consumers; third, increased demand for goods; fourth, a decreased capacity for oversaving and excessive investment by the well-to-do and the rich; and, fifth, a reduction in our intolerable burden of mortgages and all other kinds of debts. All these benefits and reforms are implicit in the Pope's principle that capital's share of the product must be brought into conformity with the demands of the common good and social justice.

Concerning labor unions, Pope Leo XIII declared, "speaking summarily we say lay it down as a general and perpetual law that workmen's associations should be so organized and governed as to furnish the best and most suitable means for attaining what is aimed at; that is to say, for helping each individual member to better his condition to the utmost, in body, mind, and property." This comprehensive principle implicitly condemns the company union, the nonunion shop, and all the other devious devices by which labor is deprived of the opportunity to organize effectively, and to bargain collectively; it implicitly approves the National Labor Relations Act. The first step toward industrial peace and industrial justice is adequate cooperation between capital and labor. Unless employees have their own independent unions they cannot cooperate intelligently or effectively with the representatives of the employers.

The last statement that I shall present deals specifically with this matter of employer and employee cooperation. When employers are really unable to pay decent wages they should, says Pius XI, in Quadragesimo Anno join forces with their employees "to overcome all difficulties and obstacles, and let them be aided in this wholesome endeavor by the wise measures of public authority."

The five statements that I have quoted from the encyclicals are at once a comprehensive description of our economic maladies, and an indication of the way to complete business recovery. We must have a better distribution of the product, ample living wages for all workers, a smaller return to capital, effective organization of labor, and adequate cooperation between business, labor, and the Government.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, OF WYOMING, TO THE CATHOLIC CONFERENCE ON INDUSTRIAL PROBLEMS ON MAY 10, 1941

May I first say that I recognize and appreciate the honor which has been extended to me today in being permitted to participate with Monsignor Ryan in this broadcast, commemorating the anniversary of the great labor encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII and Pope Pius XI. The great services for labor and the common man which Monsignor Ryan has performed during a long and fruitful life are well known to all students of our economic and industrial life. He has been a faithful spokesman of the principles of common justice laid down by two far-seeing pontiffs, and it is a real distinction to be permitted to share a broadcast with him.

If one wonders how it happens that a religious teacher in Rome 50 years ago called the attention of the whole world to the need of solving the labor problem, and how a successor 40 years later pointed an unerring finger to the need of a reconstructed social order, the explanation will, I think, be found in the fact that both of these great pontiffs based their teachings upon the principle of human freedom and the dignity of the individual. It was for the improvement of the condition of each individual "in body, mind, and property" that Pope Leo issued the encyclical of May 15, 1891, and it was to summon the world to a reconstructed social order based upon the right of property that Pius XI in 1931 made his plea to mankind.

It seems to me that the significance of this occasion would be wholly lost if we should fail to note the contrast between the ideals and principles enunciated by the popes and the doctrines which are today being enunciated by the leaders of the totalitarian world. The conflict which threatens to engulf all civilization is a conflict between two diametrically opposing philosophies, one of which, preached by the dictators of Germany, Italy, and Russia, completely denies the right of the individual to either political freedom or private property and makes him the serf of the State, while the other, cherished for centuries in the hearts of the people of this country and their progenitors, proclaims that the State and all other human organizations are created by men and must be controlled by men for the cultivation of their material and spiritual welfare.

The social justice which the popes preach, the social justice which is the ideal of American democracy, is that which is wrought by men working together in equality for the common good.

To me this seems to be a summons to perceive that men are, in fact, as the American Declaration of Independence has it, created equal and that equality of opportunity and of right, both economically and politically, must be maintained just as in the sight of Heaven all men are also equal.

The attainment of the goal of an improved status for labor and the establishment of social justice is not, I take it, to be effected by any development of what we call class consciousness, nor by the waging of a class war out of which either a proletarian or a Fascist dictatorship may emerge. The conflict between labor and capital is only a passing phase resulting from the fact that there has been an undue concentration of property in the hands of some. If labor has the right, as we must acknowledge, to possess the fruit of its toil, that is to say, to become endowed with property, then the worker has the right to become the capitalist. There is no real antagonism between the worker and the capitalist. A just social order will protect the rights of both and neither will find it necessary to prosper at the expense of the other.

To me it has always seemed an utterly mistaken belief that capital may prosper only by the exploitation of labor, or that labor may improve its status only by depriving capital of something that it properly enjoys. That is the tragic mistake which has been the cause of so many bitter and bloody wars. Providence has placed us in a world which produces more by far than the imagination of man has yet been able to learn how to use.

There is enough for all, and our problem is to learn how to distribute it among all by that cooperation of business, labor, and government of which Monsignor Ryan has spoken.

Man's progress in the arts and sciences has been marked by a steady increase in his capacity to produce. Instead, therefore, of attempting to reduce production and then quarreling with one another over the distribution of an artificial scarcity, our thoughts should be focused, as the popes have so wisely advised, upon a more equitable distribution of an ever-expanding abundance.

In commemorating today the memorable encyclicals of 1891 and 1931 which emphasize the right of the individual thus to share in the production of society, it is appropriate to take note of the fact that the present pontiff, reasserting the principle enunciated by his predecessor, has again in a memorable encyclical proclaimed the sovereignty of the individual. Pius XII, in his encyclical of 1929, quoted the declaration of Leo XIII that the state exists to govern the commonwealth according to immutable law which recognizes the spiritual dignity of the individual.

He declared that when the state does recognize that principle, as this Republic always has, "it will help the individual human being to achieve his own perfection in the present world in all that concerns his physical, mental, and moral well-being and so promote the attainment of his supernatural end." In this and numerous other eloquent pronouncements the popes have always emphasized a fundamental principle of Americanism that the individual is superior to all organizations which he creates for his material and political advancement.

STATEMENT OF HON. ARTHUR D. HEALEY, OF MASSACHUSETTS, SATURDAY, MAY 10, 1941

Briefly and with characteristic penetration, Monsignor Ryan has disclosed the great vision and revelation of the Encyclical, Rerum Novarum, of Pope Leo XIII and its clarification and amplification by the encyclical, Quadragesimo Anno, of Pope Pius XI.

Promulgated 50 years ago today, the encyclical of Pope Leo XIII conclusively repudiated the extreme and conflicting claims of socialism on the one hand and archconservatism on the other, enunciating the sound Christian and democratic doctrine that has served as a blueprint for the attainment of social progress and justice for half a century.

Had the minds and souls of men and nations been less dwarfed by self-seeking, there might have been built on these solid teachings of the holy fathers a world-wide social and economic order which could have averted the terrible disaster which threatens to destroy a large part of the civilized world.

As Monsignor Ryan has pointed out, these documents both diagnosed the ills and prescribed the remedies of our social system, not

in obscure and equivocal language, but in clear and unmistakable terms.

It is entirely fitting that in this Nation of freedom and democracy we should commemorate with reverence and gratitude the anniversaries of these two great papal encyclicals. Here in America we have made great social gains—gains which fit squarely into the pattern suggested by the holy fathers. The American way of life has been the principal beneficiary of the inspired Christian teachings of those documents.

The majesty and dignity of the individual is respected and protected as never before in history. While individuals in other lands have been regimented and reduced to the status of mere chattels of the state, Americans are assured of personal liberties unrivaled in any other nation or period of history.

We have passed through a decade of great stress and emergency. Yet we have emerged with our liberties augmented and enhanced. In more abundant measure than ever before, we enjoy freedom of speech, press, religion, assemblage, and the other great privileges that make up our precious heritage.

No autocratic hand has torn the child from the bosom of his family for indoctrination in false precepts; nor sought to stifle the minds and souls of our citizens. The individual is the custodian of his own soul and may fearlessly worship his God according to the dictates of his conscience.

The 50 years that have elapsed since Pope Leo XIII's great pronouncement have witnessed the accelerating growth of a new phase of democracy—industrial and economic democracy. The condition of the great masses of workers has been greatly improved and labor has risen to new dignity and responsibility. This growth has been achieved principally through the development of the organized labor movement and the instrument of collective bargaining. It has accorded squarely with the methods suggested in Rerum Novarum and confirmed in the Quadragesimo Anno.

Today, in the stress of national emergency, there are many who advocate abandonment of social gains and curtailment of labor's freely won rights. No persuasive case has been made out for the necessity of such a retreat from our social objectives, and in the absence of such a case, we cannot safely overlook the fact that the social gains we have achieved have become integral parts of the great American heritage and tradition which we are determined to defend. We cannot preserve that heritage if we despoil it of its substance.

The great masses of Americans who have benefited by these social advances are no less patriotic than other groups. They are willing to make any sacrifices that the national good may require but will resent compulsion. Democracy has flourished because it is founded on voluntary cooperation and inspires the individual to the highest efforts. The adoption of coercive legislation will impair the very mainsprings of democratic action and will serve neither the defense nor the cause of democracy.

The immediate need is national unity * * * in the factory, office, shop, and every other branch of our far-flung economy. We shall have that unity only so long as the great body of Americans have faith in our form of government and are inspired, not intimidated, to defend it. In the faith that our Government is dedicated to the promotion of the general welfare and the attainment of social justice lies the source of our national unity and the strength of America. We cannot afford to impair that faith for less than sound and compelling reasons.

Half a century of flux and change, punctuated by emergency and crisis, has demonstrated the solidity and truth of the teachings of these great encyclicals. In the troubled days that are ahead, they can serve as unshakable beacons to guide us safely to the attainment of an order based on Christian principles of social justice. In the words of Pope Pius XI:

"In order that what has been well begun may be rendered stable, that what has not yet been accomplished may now be achieved, and that still richer and brighter blessings may descend upon mankind, two things are particularly necessary: The reform of the social order and the correction of morals."

"Wings Over Jordan"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEANNETTE RANKIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I think the people of America will be interested in reading the beautiful tribute to motherhood which was delivered in Cleveland, Sunday, May 11, 1941, by the gentlewoman from the Twenty-second Ohio District, FRANCES P. BOLTON. Following some very beautiful spirituals sung by the Wings Over Jordan chorus under the direction of Mr. Worth Kramer, the Reverend Mr. Settle introduced Mrs. BOLTON, who delivered the following address, which was broadcast on a national radio hook-up:

Thank you, Reverend Settle, for your gracious introduction and for the privilege of being a part of your devotions on this particular Sunday.

Every Sunday you reach the hearts of many people. Every Sunday the beauty of your music, the sincerity of your ministry draws thousands upon thousands of us a little nearer together, and a little nearer to a consciousness of God's need of us and our ever increasingly deep need of Him.

And on this May Sunday this is especially true, for it is Mother's Day!

Mother's Day! A day on which everywhere in this great land of ours, mothers are especially remembered and honored, and all our people stop for a moment to do homage to those through whom they received the great gift of life.

Just for these few minutes let us draw close together. Let us quiet our hearts. Let us stop the mad whirling of our anxious minds. Let us take ourselves away from war, from hate, from misunderstanding. Let us be still, deep down within ourselves so that we may indeed hear the "Wings" that are, and have been, and always will be "Over Jordan." Let us be still and know that He is God.

Yes; this is the 11th of May, the day that has been set apart from other days so we may pause and honor motherhood.

Everywhere in these United States, today, as yesterday in Mexico, mothers are being especially remembered. Meetings are being held in their name and flowers and messages are being sent and received. Let us who are drawn together through this wonderful medium of radio pause and think about all mothers, for they are the reason for the day. And, as we pause, let us send out a message of love and understanding to the mothers who have no one remembering them, to the mothers whose hearts are filled with sadness, disappointment, regret, misunderstandings, loneliness, agony, and fear. Let us reach out to them.

And let us consider motherhood a moment. Did man have anything to do with making mothers? No; God did that, and He made them universal—an experience that every race shares with every other race. For everyone that ever lived on this earth had a mother, and everyone who ever will live on this earth will have a mother, and every girl and every women dreams sometime in her life of motherhood; just as every boy and man dreams of the mother who bore him and of the mother of his children. So we who reach out to each other on this Mother's Day, reach out and touch a deep universal experience that should bring us very close together, that for today at least should break down the walls of misunderstanding that have grown up through the centuries.

Does God say to one part of mankind you shall not have mothers? No—rather, He says: Remember that no soul can come to life on earth except a woman goes down to the depths, to the very gateway of death—alone—to open that gate so that life may flow through her, into another human being. Have you thought of that?

And have you ever thought how many women have known only fear and desolation in their motherhood, yes, since the very beginning of time? Can we not promise each other as we join together on this beautiful May morning, that we will find ways to change this in tomorrow's world?

Today when there is so much cruel destruction, so much ruthless waste of life, let us stop and remember the cost of giving life, the courage, the fear, the agony, and the glory of it all.

As a nation we are confused but if we remember these things we shall stand firm against the pressures hammering us on every side that try to force us to accept war as the only solution for the problems of today. If we remember, we shall insist that America be made strong and impregnable, that America preserve the freedom that still is hers, so that when the fury of this carnage dies the light of hope may be rekindled from her torch and a new world be born.

Mothers of this Republic, let us be true to one another, and to the mothers of tomorrow's world. God gave us the task of giving life not death.

Let us not fail Him.

Federal Reclamation Program Stabilizing Influence to All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY B. COFFEE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. HARRY B. COFFEE OF NEBRASKA

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I am inserting herewith my statement in support of the Federal reclamation program before the House subcommittee on the Department of the Interior appropriation bill. The statement follows:

Coming as I do from a district in Nebraska which contains the greater part of the North Platte Federal reclamation project, I can testify to the stabilizing influence of this

program on agriculture as well as on the cities, towns, and surrounding range land which that agriculture supports. Members of this committee may know the comparisons which have been made between Scotts Bluff County, dominated for more than 30 years by this Federal irrigation development, and other counties in the State, as well as other arid regions, which do not have the advantages of water conservation. I would like to summarize a few as material evidence in point:

In 1900, Scotts Bluff County had 2,552 inhabitants, and was almost wholly dependent upon dry farming and cattle raising. Construction of the North Platte project began in 1905, and by 1910 the population had increased to 8,355. By 1920, the number of inhabitants was 20,710 and by 1930, 28,644. From 1930 to 1940, this county again increased its population, reaching 33,875.

While the State of Nebraska as a whole lost population at the rate of 4.7 percent from 1930 to 1940, Scotts Bluff County's population increased 18.3 percent. The city of Scottsbluff, which has expanded as the county has become stabilized, showed a gain in population of 41.5 percent.

When you consider this remarkable increase, coupled with the fact that 77 of Nebraska's 93 counties showed a decrease in population from 1930 to 1940, you get the full significance of what a Federal reclamation development contributes to the stabilization of agriculture and cities and towns dependent on it.

There is another type of irrigation development in my district which I desire to call to your attention. The Mirage Flats project, authorized and being built under the water conservation and utilization program, will serve a double purpose. It will stabilize an area where there have been frequent crop failures due to drought, and it will enable this section to support a larger population, which otherwise would be dislodged and forced to join the trek of migrants westward or in some other direction.

The Mirage Flats project, which will irrigate 12,000 acres, according to Farm Security Administration estimates, will provide for the settlement of 150 families on farms where they will be self-sustaining. Through land-use readjustments in the area and the winter feed that will be provided for livestock, the project will directly benefit another 120 families.

Work which has just gotten under way will provide employment for 4 years for 200 W. P. A. employees and for 400 Civilian Conservation Corps enrollees, who otherwise might be engaged in less permanent construction activities.

The construction of the Mirage Flats project, which will cost in all $2,560,000, will require only $985,000 directly from the general Treasury and that will be reimbursed by water users. The remainder, represented by W. P. A. and C. C. C. labor, will be a contribution by the Federal Government to the stabilization of an area where relief expenditures have been unduly heavy due to circumstances beyond the control or remedy of the local citizens. I recommend the decided benefits to the National Government through putting W. P. A. and C. C. C. expenditures into this permanent conservation work.

These observations show the results that have already accrued from an established Federal reclamation project and what may be expected from continuance, and I trust expansion, of the water conservation and utilization program, especially in the Great Plains.

The appropriation proposed for the water conservation and utility projects of $3,500,000 is not enough to expedite construction of new undertakings of this type. It should be at least $5,000,000.

The Bureau of Reclamation should have adequate funds to carry on its investigations of the water supplies of the West. The $500,000 proposed in this bill should be increased. There are many proposed irrigation projects in western Nebraska as well as in the other Western States that merit investigation by the Bureau of Reclamation. Adequate funds for investigation would tend to bring about the development of the most worth-while projects.

20 Questions America Must Not Dodge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, in the past 2 years I have listened to many warmongers beating the tom-toms. My pledges in the past elections were not mere campaign oratory. I have made an honest effort to make all of them come true. My pledge to the people of my district was to keep our American boys out of foreign struggles unless we were attacked. I have voted against every step which I believe would lead to war. As a veteran of the first World War, I fervently believe that we should never again soak Europe's soil with American blood.

We are at the crossroads of America. On the decisions now made by our people and their leaders may depend our national welfare for years to come.

The minds of the American people are confused. The issues must be presented to the American people openly, honestly, and squarely. I respect the views of honest Americans no matter how opposed they may be to my own.

In order to avoid further confusion, the following questions should be given conscientious consideration and study:

1. Should candidates for high public offices keep their campaign pledges?
2. If we were actually in the war, do you believe we would send more airplanes and war materials to England than we are now sending?
3. Do you believe this is our war?
4. Do you believe we made a mistake in entering the first World War?
5. Do you believe we should sell oil to Japan?
6. Do you not believe that interventionists could aid England more if they spent more time in helping to increase production of airplanes and war materials?
7. Should we raise a crop of boys every 20 years to be slaughtered in Europe?
8. Do you believe convoying would lead us into actual war?
9. Would we be willing to maintain standing armies abroad and battleships in foreign ports to enforce peace after the war is over?
10. America eliminated the cash feature from the Neutrality Act. Must we eliminate the carry feature by using convoys?
11. What could America write into a peace treaty which would preserve peace and promote justice in Europe?
12. Do we want to create a new generation of Gold Star Mothers?
13. Would you be willing to risk the lives of at least 6,000,000 American boys and $200,000,000,000 in a struggle across the seas?
14. Do you believe it would be easy to transport and land millions of American boys on unfriendly soil?
15. Are we to rush arms and the cream of the American Navy, Army, Marines, and air force every time Europe is in trouble?
16. Would you be willing to neglect our own defense by sending most of our war equipment to foreign lands?
17. Do you believe Hitler could make a successful invasion of the United States if we have the proper defense?
18. Do you believe foreign trade will amount to much, after this war is over, unless we furnish the money to other countries to buy our goods?
19. Do you not believe that right ideals can move eastward from this continent to Europe as readily as wrong ideals can move westward from Europe over here?
20. Would we be willing to support the four freedoms everywhere, by sending American sons to rot and die on foreign fighting grounds, battling for a peace no man has yet been bold enough to define or wise enough to propound?

I challenge the proponents of war to answer these questions honestly and fairly.

We Must Face a Grim Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

ARTICLE BY ROBERT L. NORTON

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert L. Norton from the Boston Post of yesterday:

[From the Boston Sunday Post of May 11, 1941]

WE MUST FACE A GRIM FUTURE—STARTING WITH TERRIFIC DEBT, NATION SPEEDS INTO AN ORGY OF SPENDING WITH ECONOMIES IGNORED

(By Robert L. Norton)

In facing the grim realities of the future it is just as well to accommodate ourselves to the fact that instead of "guns and butter," the prospect is for guns and short rations.

As a nation and as individuals we are shortly to be called upon to pay the piper. The Federal deficits, totaling $45,000,000,000 since 1931, are hanging like a millstone around the necks of our people and, in addition, we are facing colossal defense expenditures and the possibility of a war effort which will employ our total resources.

On another like crisis in our history, Patrick Henry said: "This is no time for ceremony. The question before the House is one of awful moment to this country. It is natural to indulge in the illusions of hope. * * * Are we disposed to be of the number of those, who having eyes, see not, and having ears, hear not, the things which so nearly concern their temporal salvation?

"For my part, whatever the anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to know the whole truth—to know the worst and to provide for it."

MUST REALIZE TASK

It is quite as dangerous for us in 1941 to shroud reality with illusions of hope as it would have been for our forefathers, had they done so, 165 years ago.

It should be perfectly clear that if we are to cope with our present gigantic task and those which are in front of us there should be a comprehension of the size and character of our undertaking.

At the outset it should be obvious that we cannot step up our production with men and materials and meet the demands of the defense program and at the same time maintain our normal regime.

Except that we are committed to the greatest war effort in our history, the size and the limits of this effort are not yet apparent, although our present occupation is startling enough in its implications. We have not declared but our policy of aid to Britain as represented by an initial contribution of $8,000,000,000 is joined with the purpose of seeing the war through to the finish and until the Axis nations are defeated.

What this will mean in the finality surpasses any effort of the imagination and defies rational prognostication. We are quickly edging into total war through successive steps taken in Washington and against the unquestioned will of the majority of the people.

Mr. Roosevelt has failed to deal frankly with such questions as to whether or not his determination to achieve victory means an invasion of Europe by an armed force, the preservation of British autonomy in Asia by going to war with Japan, and whether we shall pursue the war to establish "four freedoms" in the world, in case England should fall.

All of these questions are of vital concern but in lieu of a definite statement of war aims we, too, are blundering through in the much vaunted English fashion and without giving the cold consideration to our own best interests which common sense should require. The plain fact is that we have undertaken to vanquish the greatest combination of military power and armed force that the world has ever seen.

SELLING WAR HERE

Demands from Great Britain will increase, and today, while still theoretically at peace, we are witnessing the unique spectacle of the British Ambassador, Lord Halifax, campaigning through our Middle West trying to arouse the war spirit in that section.

Britain is not to be blamed, since her own salvation is at stake. But in America we would seem to be giving minor consideration to the matter of how far we can go without destroying our own national solvency and winding up by adopting the same totalitarian methods which we profess to despise and which we are willing to risk everything to vanquish.

It is all well enough to call for voluntary sacrifice in this hour of national peril, but people generally do not relinquish their advantages except under the spur of stern necessity. Whether we like it or not these sacrifices will be enforced by reason of gigantic public expenditures and staggering taxes.

In his Budget message Mr. Roosevelt said: "We cannot yet conceive the complete measure of extraordinary taxes which are necessary to pay off the cost of emergency defense and to aid in avoiding inflationary price rises which may occur when full capacity is approached."

The size of this tax levy is emphasized when we recall that this is nearly twice as much as were the peak collections for the last World War, when $6,500,000,000 were collected in 1920. The Treasury has asked for tax legislation to provide $3,500,000,000 in new tax collections. This is to be added to the existing tax levies which are at present yielding $9,000,000,000, making a total levy of $12,500,000,000 to be paid by the American taxpayers to the Federal Government alone in the coming year.

TAXES TO TAX US

But this is not by any means all that the taxpayers must pay in the form of taxes in the coming year. To these billions must be added $4,000,000,000 of State taxes and another $5,500,000,000 of local taxes.

So next year we, the American taxpayers, must pay our proportionate share of tax bills aggregating $22,000,000,000. This is one-fourth of all the wages, the earnings of corporations, the dividends, royalties, rents, interest, and the individual gross incomes of all our citizens * * * one-fourth of all the elements of the national income.

In the face of these astounding figures and despite the President's promise to cut nondefense costs, the Federal Government is not decreasing its nondefense spending but is continuing to spend in the same reckless and extravagant way, which is responsible for our huge public debt and which now constitutes a first mortgage on every family in the land.

Every baby born in the United States begins life with a public-debt charge of $502 against his future earnings. Every couple that marries starts housekeeping with a public debt of $1,004, in addition to what they may owe on the furniture. Every family with three children is carrying the equivalent of a mortgage of $2,510, or enough to pay for a modest home.

When the citizen must give up his job and go into the Army, or may be required to close his factory for lack of materials, or to turn over to the tax collector earnings which he expected to apply to his needs, if these and numerous other sacrifices must be made by the citizens who carry the burden, there should be no question that the agents and agencies of government should be likewise required to curtail nonessential activities and expenditures.

STILL SPENDTHRIFT

There is the same complacency now with regard to ever-increasing and accumulating deficits as prevailed before the emergency. The administration has not even made a beginning at the reduction of these expenditures despite the talk of a cut of $1,000,000,000.

Under the President's Budget, for example, $1,478,000,000 will be spent for unemployment relief during the next year, spent during a year when reemployment will soon reach a goal, as predicted by Chairman Knudsen, where "there will be no unemployment in this country next fall." Yet the Budget recommends nearly $1,500,000,000 for unemployment relief, which is four times as much as was spent for relief in 1933, the low ebb of the depression.

Mr. Roosevelt has come forward with recommendations for the expenditure of many millions for such projects as the St. Lawrence seaway and a highway to the Panama Canal, while at the same time blasting Members of Congress and pressure groups who are seeking appropriations under the guise of national defense. Certainly for the time of the emergency we might do without any of these projects.

To ask citizens to sacrifice while permitting Government agents to spend unnecessarily is inconsistent. It also savors of discrimination to offer no resistance to strikes for higher wages while taxing away earnings on capital and decreeing that prices shall not be advanced.

It should be emphasized that no one group or the Nation as a whole should fail to grasp the fact that we cannot profit out of a world calamity. And neither can we use our entire industrial machine for making the things of war, rather than the things of peace, without making a sacrifice in our standard of living.

Much is heard of the dangers of inflation these days and the Government is taking steps through the imposition of heavy taxes and the sale of "baby bonds" to decrease the consumer purchasing power. This will be easy enough in the field of middle-class incomes which are to be most heavily taxed. Persons in this class will naturally economize, perforce of necessity. But the greater purchasing power is centered in the earners of small incomes and the check here is less certain.

MUST PRESERVE SELVES

With all of our present difficulties, thought must be given to what will come after the war. It is all well enough to talk about enforcing democracy upon the world but in doing this it should not be forgotten that the objective is the freedom and the institutions of the present and the future citizens of the United States. Democracy must be saved without destroying it in the process.

Care should be taken that in the role of missionary to the world for the establishment of the "four freedoms" that we do not fail to sustain the Republic at home. We may be making promises that we cannot fulfill and exhausting resources which will be sadly needed, when and if we are called upon to fight for our own lives.

And we might finally take warning from that part of the Reynaud-Daladier report when France was facing not dissimilar problems with those of our own Nation, immediately before the war. The report said:

"Actually that part of the French population which creates wealth, which labors for the future, is continually diminishing, while that part which, directly or indirectly, lives on the state is constantly growing. There is a steady fall in the number of Frenchmen who are ready to bear the risks of enterprise and creation."

Farm Homes for Tenant Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

RESOLUTION BY THE OKLAHOMA STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma:

House Resolution 51

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to enact appropriate legislation to increase the purchase of farm homes for tenant farmers in the State of Oklahoma by the Federal Farm Security Administration under the tenant-purchase program

Whereas the experience of the Federal Farm Security Administration in purchasing farms for tenant farmers in the State of Oklahoma under the tenant-purchase plan establishes that no loss would be sustained in purchasing

farms for the many worthy and industrious tenant farmers within the State of Oklahoma; and

Whereas the purchase of farms for tenant farmers under said plan has established that ownership of farms by actual farmers results in more careful tilling and conservation of the soil; and

Whereas the purchase of farms for tenant farmers in the State of Oklahoma by the Federal Security Administration has resulted in improving the social and economic welfare of the State and Nation; and

Whereas the future welfare of the State of Oklahoma and the United States of America is greatly dependent upon the conservation of the soil and the maintenance of thrifty and prosperous home-owning farmers; and

Whereas the purchase of farm homes for worthy and industrious tenant farmers will result in improving the social and economic welfare of the State and Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the eighteenth session of the Oklahoma Legislature:

SECTION 1. That it is the sense of the membership of the House of Representatives of the eighteenth session of the Oklahoma Legislature that the farm tenant-purchase program being carried on by the Federal Farm Security Administration should be expanded and the purchase of farm homes for tenant farmers in the State of Oklahoma should be increased and that the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby requested to enact appropriate legislation expanding the farm tenant-purchase program in the State of Oklahoma and increasing the number of farms purchased by the Farm Security Administration for worthy tenant farmers in this State.

SEC. 2. *Be it further resolved,* That copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed and authenticated, be transmitted to the members of the Oklahoma Delegation in the Congress of the United States, and that copies of this resolution be also transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Presiding Officer of the Senate of the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the House of Representatives the 6th day of May 1941.

E. BLUMENHAYEN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

A Capable and Sincere Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

ARTICLE BY HON. PHILIP A. BENNETT OF MISSOURI

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I extend in the RECORD, an article from the Republican magazine of April 1941, by my colleague from Missouri, Hon. PHILIP A. BENNETT.

It is to be hoped that every Member of the House will read the article in question because it is from the pen of one of the most capable and sincere Members of this body—a man who understands that while two strong political parties are necessary for preservation of the Republic, our loyalty must be first to our country and second to our party.

The article follows:

[From the Republican Magazine of April 1941]

KIND OF LEADERSHIP G. O. P. NEEDS

(By Hon. Phil A. Bennett)

First of all, the G. O. P. needs leadership that is true to American ideals as they were before they were tainted and weakened by New Deal propaganda.

Second, the G. O. P. needs leadership big enough to understand that the best way for leaders to serve the Republican Party is to serve the Nation.

Third, the G. O. P. needs leadership that is well-informed; that realizes it is useless to fight Hitlerism while encouraging the Communists and labor racketeers at home; that understands New Dealism must be relentlessly exposed as the enemy of the American way of life.

Fourth, the G. O. P. needs leadership that is capable of understanding that bankruptcy calls for receivership; that a national receiver is called a dictator; that the citadel of American liberty is being undermined by clever and carefully thought out plans and that the wreckers must be removed before repairs can begin.

Fifth, the G. O. P. needs leadership that has always been true to the party and that will take advantage of knowledge possessed by leaders in various lines of endeavor and by Republican Members of Congress whose whole attention is given to national affairs; who have watched the growth of the New Deal from its infancy and understand its clever methods of propaganda.

Sixth, the G. O. P. needs leadership that it not puffed up with its own importance; that is blind to factionalism; that is alert to danger; that realizes its first duty is to save liberty and second to win elections.

Seventh, lastly, the G. O. P. needs leadership with sufficient courage to back its convictions.

PHIL A. BENNETT,
United States House of Representatives,
Sixth District, Missouri.

This Is Not America's War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEANNETTE RANKIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

ADDRESS BY DR. CHARLES CLAYTON MORRISON

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address at America First rally, in the Arena, Chicago, April 27, 1941, by Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison, editor of the Christian Century:

Before discussing the issue that is before us, I wish on your behalf to pay a word of tribute to the gallant American whose message we are about to hear, Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, of Montana. With patriotic zeal he has thrown himself into this crusade to rescue our country from the catastrophe of a war which is not America's war. The odds against him and those of us who stand with him have been and are tremendous. The facilities of action and of propaganda, and the weight of official prestige are on the side of the President and the administration. Our leaders have pursued a policy of forcing the Nation inch by inch into war while assuring us that war was the farthest from their thoughts. But their true thoughts are no longer concealed. Senator WHEELER has gone across the country like a modern Paul Revere, wakening the people to their danger and giving them courage to resist those who are leading them into it. We welcome him today on the last leg of a patriotic tour which the future may record as a historic turning point in America's destiny.

You would, I am sure, wish me also to pay a tribute to the organization, America First, under whose auspices we have gathered and to the patriotic and far-visioned men and women who, months ago, took up what then looked like a forlorn cause. They believed in the capacity of the American people to see the tragic predicament into which their Government was leading them, and by their courage they have put courage in us all. We salute you, Mrs. Fairbank, and General Wood, and all your brave and distinguished colleagues, and we rejoice to be soldiers in your army of peace for America.

All my thoughts about America's relation to the present conflict begin with the unshaken conviction that this is not America's war. The burden of proof rests upon those who declare that it is America's war. So far this proof has not been forthcoming. Such proof as has been advanced is highly fantastic and speculative. The proponents of our participation in the war seem to me to know too much. They know so much that their knowledge excites my skepticism. Let us look at some of the things they claim to know. They claim to know that this country can be easily invaded. They claim to know that Hitler purposes to invade and conquer it. They claim to know that if we are attacked we cannot effectively defend ourselves. They claim to know that if we go into the war now we can crush Hitler and save Britain. They claim to know that if we save the British Empire and crush Hitler we shall be able to live with Britain happily forever after, politically and economically. They claim to know that Britain and America together can establish order in the continent of Europe, and they claim to know that America will be able and willing to send and keep large military forces in Europe and other lands to police the chaos which will surely follow the war.

I say the proponents of the doctrine that this is America's war know too much. I do not wish to say that some of the things they know may not be true. But their vast knowledge when analyzed and carefully examined is seen to be hardly more than a tissue of fantasy and speculation and hypotheses. This kind of knowledge is too flimsy to justify the thesis that this is America's war. I am unwilling to see this country plunged into a war whose justification can be stated only in terms of fantasy and speculation and a chain of hypothetical possibilities, even though we cherish deep sentiments of partisanship for the side which would draw us into it.

I do not think, however, that we should impatiently throw into the discard the superhuman knowledge which our interventionists claim to possess. There is a sufficient possibility of truth in it to call for action on our part. The question is, What kind of action does this speculative and hypothetical outlook upon the future call for? If it is not sufficient to make this America's war, it is sufficient, you and I will agree, to require that the United States make herself strong enough within her own boundaries to defend the treasures of her civilization against an incalculable future. We can agree that the future is incalculable. No man knows enough to envisage the shape of

things to come. It therefore behooves the United States to be ready with as strong a navy as we can build, as great an air force as we can develop and as competent an army as we need to defend the independence of this Nation should the hour come when we must do so.

In a word, we ought to be prepared for America's war when and if such a war is thrust upon us. Preparedness against an incalculable future is a reasonable policy, but the plunging of this Nation into a war which is not our war, when we are not able to calculate even the consequences of victory, to say nothing of the consequences of defeat, is an irrational if not a suicidal policy. I adopt as my own the slogan of the committee whose call has drawn us together today: Defend America first.

How has it come about that the idea got itself established in many American minds that this war is America's war, that it is our duty to defy a nation that has not defied us, that it is our duty to enter the second time into the bloody arena of Europe's ancient struggles for empire and save the British Empire from defeat? One might have supposed that our experience in the last war and the disillusionment which followed it had effectively cured us of the sentimentalism which actuated us then. Certainly we thought we were cured. "Never again!"—this for 20 years has been the hearty resolution on the lips of all our people, Legionnaires, civilians, and statesmen alike.

What, I now ask, has happened to break down this resolution in the minds of so many of our citizens? My answer must be very frank. My answer is that the President of the United States, through a long series of utterances, and a cumulative series of deeds, has put the Nation in a position where public opinion is no longer free to express its deepest conviction against participation in this war. The Nation has been committed, step by step, to a war policy, steadily and stealthily committed, through a period of 3 years of official propaganda and official action until now the desperate and climactic argument for war is that we have already gone too far in to back out. This was the argument which the Secretary of the Navy made last Thursday night.

Yet the American people do not believe that this is their war. The succession of polls of public opinion reveal a constant overwhelming majority against our participation. These polls also reveal the paradoxical state of the American mind. While they show a vast opposition to war, they have consistently disclosed roughly a 50–50 division on the specific actions taken or proposed by the administration—such as the revision of the neutrality law, the transfer of the 50 destroyers to Britain, the lend-lease bill, and now the convoying of ships to the war zone—each of which registers a distinct further step toward war. How shall we interpret a public opinion which says overwhelmingly that it is opposed to participation in the war and yet weakens to a relatively even division on specific measures which carry the Nation further and further to the verge of war?

I do not think the interpretation of this paradox is difficult. The paradox in the people's mind is the reflection of the paradox in their President's policy. The American people trust their President. This spirit of trust in our leaders is of the essence of our democracy. The people are against entering the war, and they trust the President's solemn pledge that he will not take the country into it. Yet a large section of public opinion has tolerated the successive steps toward war because each step has seemed logically inevitable after the steps previously taken.

No explanation of this paradox in public opinion is possible except that the administration and its interventionist committees and supporters have deliberately exploited the trustful spirit of the electorate to produce a situation which will overwhelm America's overwhelming opposition to war by making war at last seem inevitable. This policy has been as clear as day at every step we have taken since the neutrality law was amended. It is illustrated afresh in the present convoy issue. During the debate on the lend-lease bill Senator WHEELER and his opposition colleagues repeatedly warned Congress and the country that the enactment of that bill into law would call for the convoying of ships to Britain. This was denied by the most responsible Senators representing the administration. President Roosevelt himself denied it, saying that "convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war," the implication being that the President was opposed to any act that would spell war. Thus reassured, Congress passed the bill. But now the logic of leasing and lending appears in the demand of Secretaries Knox and Hull that the United States shall guarantee the delivery of the materials which we are making great efforts to manufacture. Said Secretary Knox: "We cannot allow our goods to be sunk in the Atlantic; we shall be beaten if we do." We must find a way, declared Secretary Hull, "by which such aid may find its destination in the shortest time and in maximum quantity."

I am discussing the question I raised a moment ago: How has it come about that the idea got itself established in a large body of our public opinion that this is America's war? I have indicated the basis on which this question is to be answered. The idea has been established in public opinion, and the administration leaders now make bold to avow it, because the President of the United States, under cover of reassuring words and solemn pledges, has followed a policy of action which has involved the United States so deeply in the conflict that it is now plausible to claim that this is America's war. These progressive and cumulative commitments are now appealed to as the logic of our next step, the convoying of war materials, at the risk—I might say the certain risk—of involving us in what the President last January called the "shooting war."

What is the relevant deduction which we are bound to make from this policy of forcing public opinion? The deduction seems to me inescapable: This is not America's war; it is the President's war. By this I do not, of course, mean the war that is now raging in Europe. I am not making the charge that that is the President's war, despite the fact that there is trustworthy evidence to prove that our ambassadors, whom the President calls "my ambassadors," did give some kind of assurance that America could be counted on for help. When I say this is the President's war I mean that aspect of the war in which the United States has become involved.

The President began to wage this war long ago, perhaps at the dedication of the Chicago bridge not many yards from the spot where we have gathered today. A step at a time he has advanced his war into the consciousness of the American people by committing them to one action after another whose cumulative implications spelled ultimate and unreserved involvement. Today the Nation is awakening to the fact that its freedom to decide on the merits of the issue has been vitally impaired. Lulled by the President's assurances and pledges, America now finds itself caught in an acute and tragic dilemma. Either we must go on in a course which involves the hazard of national suicide, or turn back with humiliation for the Nation and its President. If we turn back, we call down upon our heads the execration of the British people who accepted the commitments of the President and his ambassadors and plunged all Europe into war on the assurance that the logic of our commitments guaranteed that the United States would eventually join up as a belligerent.

I dare not trust myself to characterize the moral implications of the ambiguous course which the President has followed in forcing his war upon a people whose fundamental decision not to go again into a European war remains unchanged. Again and again the President has demonstrated that no law can bind him, that he can circumvent any law that stands in the way of his determination to put the Nation into war. One by one the restrictive laws which reflect the public will have been cunningly emasculated—the Neutrality Act, the Johnson Act, and the constitutional provision that only Congress can declare war.

The President himself has already in effect declared war. He has designated the enemy and he talks in terms of victory. He has tied Congress to his war chariot, so that Congress no longer represents the people but represents the President. It does his bidding with hardly less subservience than Hitler's reichstag, which meets when he calls it together to rubber stamp the dictator's decrees.

I said a moment ago that the Nation has been forced into a tragic dilemma between going full length into the war and backing out. Secretary Knox says we cannot back out. But I say that the dilemma does not require that we take either of these two horns. We need not go on, and we need not back out. A third course is possible. We can stop in our tracks. We have already gone as far as our commitments require, which is all aid to Great Britain short of war. We can continue to fulfill those commitments. But while the people still have the power to do so, they must tell the President that he cannot take them further on the road to war. We can tell him that if he makes further commitments he will have behind him a reluctant and perhaps divided, but certainly a resentful, people.

Not since President Polk launched the unpopular and unrighteous Mexican War has any President risked war with a divided nation behind him. Behind Lincoln stood a virtually united North. Behind McKinley stood a united nation which actually pushed him into the war with Spain. Behind Wilson stood a united people convinced—albeit too easily convinced—that America should go gallantly forth to save democracy. But the Nation in its heart is not behind the President in the present war. He has the power to force the issue; he can bring about a situation which will spell war, and he has the power to plunge the Nation into the conflict by intensifying the present dilemma to the point where patriotic resistance will be outlawed. But when the President does that, it will be a tragic day for our country.

The interventionists are demanding national unity. By this they mean the shelving of all personal convictions and the rallying of all citizens to the uncritical and unreserved support of whatever course the President proposes. They tell us that the time has come when our patriotism is to be measured and tested by our loyalty to the President. I, for one, am willing to accept that test. I, too, wish to support the President; and I am here today to support him. But I have to choose which President it is I intend to support.

We have two Presidents. One President is for war. The other President is against war. I choose to support the President who is against taking America into this war. I choose to support the President who showed as long ago as 1936 how a President could take the Nation into war even against the constitutional provision which invests in Congress alone the power to declare war. By his day-to-day decisions, this President then said, he

could bring about a situation which would necessitate war or which would obviate it. He then asked our votes because he hated war and presented himself to us as one who could be trusted to make the day-to-day decisions which would keep us out of war. This was in 1936, and for this, among other reasons, he won my vote for a second term in the Presidency.

This is the President I now choose to support. I choose to support the President who, after this war came upon Europe, distinctly limited the aid which he asked for Britain as aid "short of war." I choose to support the President who in the 1940 election campaign solemnly and repeatedly declared to the mothers of America that their sons would not be sent to fight in any foreign war. I want to support that President. In giving him my loyal support I am compelled to resist the other President who has forgotten the words "short of war" and whose course since the election leads irresistibly to the breaking of the repeated pledges given to the electorate in soliciting the unprecedented honor of a third term. Mr. Roosevelt could not have been elected had he even hinted at the possibility of a lend-lease bill or of guaranteeing the delivery to Britain of the materials we were manufacturing for her.

I want to support the President, and I intend to do so. But the President I intend to support is the President we elected last November. He is our true President. He commands our loyalty. In his name our patriotism resists the other President who has risen up to displace him. I am bound to resist the President who frivolously talked nearly a year ago about 50,000 airplanes a year as America's contribution. I resist the President who lightly promised Jugoslavia help which he knew could not be delivered and led her to a cruel slaughter like that to which a similar promise by Great Britain led Poland. I am bound, in supporting our true President, to resist the President who manipulates words with such cunning cleverness as to make a "patrol" mean something essentially different from a "convoy," denying this intention to do the one while announcing the fact that he is already doing the other. In support of our true President I am compelled to resist the other President whose Cabinet members are now talking with his approval about an army and navy prepared to fight not only in this hemisphere but "in other regions," anywhere in the world. And in supporting our true President I am bound to resist the other President who degrades his exalted office by stigmatizing the name of a patriotic American like Colonel Lindbergh with the odious epithet of "copperhead" because, forsooth, he insists with great courage and candor that the President keep his pledges to the American people.

You and I are Americans. We believe in America's independence. Some of us are isolationists. I am not an isolationist. I am a noninterventionist in this war. But we are agreed on this: We are all for defending America first. We concede to no group of fellow citizens a loyalty to our country or to our President more wholehearted than our own. But we cannot support our two Presidents any more than a man can ride two horses going in opposite directions. We must choose between them. For myself, I choose to support the President who gave his solemn pledge that he would keep the country out of this war. We shall not achieve unity for our Nation so long as dissension and contradiction obtain between the words and the deeds of the head of the Nation. The purpose of our meeting today, as I see it, is to support the true President of the United States, the President whom the people reelected to his high office last November. With loyal hearts we pray: God save the President! God bless America!

State Supervision and Control of Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am vitally interested in H. R. 4545, a bill introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], providing for the acquisition and equipment of public works made necessary by the defense program.

When this bill was first introduced, I was very skeptical as to its wisdom, particularly with reference to the sections of the bill dealing with education and with hospitals. As this bill was discussed in its early stages, there was clearly an intent that the Federal Government should have some supervisory control, at least, over the schools, but as the discussion of the bill continued, the wisdom and the good judgment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds clearly maintained the old historic standard of education in America, namely, that the States should have full and complete jurisdiction thereof.

The paragraph defining this is section 203 (b), which states:

(b) No department or agency of the United States shall exercise any supervision or control over any school with respect to which any funds have been or may be expended pursuant to this title, nor shall any term or condition of any agreement under this title relating to, or any lease, grant, loan, or contribution made under this title to or on behalf of, any such school, prescribe or affect its administration, personnel, curriculum, instruction, methods of instruction, or materials for instruction.

A similar restriction was placed against Federal supervision and control of hospitals benefited under this bill in section 203 (c) thereof.

I want to congratulate the chairman and the Committee of Public Buildings and Grounds for their definite stand on the principle enunciated above. During the last few years we have seen altogether too much interference by the National Government in the internal affairs of the States until today Federal bureaus and Federal bureaucrats have greatly encroached upon the rights of every State in the Union.

One principle, however, has remained fairly intact. That is the principle that the State should have the supervision and control over the educational system of the State and should not be subject to the dictation and whims of a Federal bureaucrat. From the inception of the American Government it became a settled rule that the States should control education. This principle has been followed for years, and has produced a fine system of education in these United States.

This American policy of not interfering in the State's control of education differed widely from the European system.

During the time that our Nation was forming, England still kept her universities and public schools far removed from the commonalty, as centers for gentlemen who either intended to manage paternal estates or enter the church, the Army, the Navy, or civil service, giving the poor almost nothing except bare rudiments, offered in sectarian charity schools grudgingly aided by government doles. France under Napoleon had subjected education to the domination of the Nation. Prussia had also established a program of class education controlled by the nation.

Our forefathers, during the early growth of our country, wisely said that the proper place for the operation and control of our educational system was in the State and not the Nation.

Take my own State of Michigan as an illustration, which has been one of the pioneering leaders of education throughout the United States.

In 1817 the Legislature of the Territory of Michigan sketched in detail on paper a full program of education from the primary schools to the universities.

In 1827 the Legislature of the Territory of Michigan actually laid the foundation for our common schools.

In 1837 our State legislature, after the admission of Michigan to the Union, created our great university with its then four departments—literature, science, and the arts, law, and medicine. This was pioneer work in many respects for all the world. Other States had established fragments of such a system, but none had constructed it on so profound a basis. Nothing remained for Michigan to do in education except to elaborate the details and enlarge the structure of our educational system.

Therefore, in 1848, the Legislature of the State of Michigan, realizing that handicapped children were not receiving proper education in our State, created an institution for the instruction of the deaf, dumb, and blind.

In 1855, the Legislature of the State of Michigan organized an agricultural and industrial college, one of the first pioneering agricultural colleges in the United States.

And then to cap the climax, in 1870, the Legislature of the State of Michigan opened the doors of our university to women, thereby completing the education system of Michigan and establishing the thorough democracy of the educational scheme.

I am particularly proud of the stand that Michigan has taken on education. Therefore, when H. R. 4545 came before the House, I was especially anxious that no supervision or control of our educational system should be assumed by the Federal Government. It is my considered judgment that each State knows its educational problems better than the National Government could possibly hope to know them.

In my own State, the superintendent of public instruction and the entire school personnel of the State, superin-

tendents, principals, and all grades of teachers have demonstrated their love and zeal and efficiency for our public-school system.

Therefore, under H. R. 4545 any appropriations that may be made for any schools in areas congested because of national defense, will be administered, supervised and controlled under State jurisdiction, free from Federal interference. This is a wise principle, and I congratulate the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds for maintaining the old historic right of the State to supervise and control its own educational system.

The Country Newspapers Are Being Imposed Upon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

AN OPEN LETTER FROM WILL M. MAUPIN, EDITOR OF THE CLAY COUNTY (NEBR.) SUN

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, there is no group in the United States with more patriotism and with a greater spirit of community helpfulness than the editors of our country newspapers. Yet I find that literally tons and tons of material are being sent to these editors from the city of Washington with an implied request that they publish it without charge.

An editor friend of mine kept track of all the publicity that came to him from Washington during the last week in March. This editor measured up this publicity and carefully figured the total composition. The publicity sent to him from Washington in one week, if set in 8-point type, would have required 31 pages of newspaper print to hold it.

This mean 31 pages of printing for which the editor furnishes the paper, the ink, the machinery, and pays for the highly skilled labor required in printing it. Is it right that we expect these country papers to build up a morale for the defense of this country, assist in the selling of defense bonds, and the countless other things that must be done, on any basis other than the basis upon which all other work is done in our defense program?

Mr. Speaker, I wish to further extend my remarks by including an open letter to me from Will M. Maupin, editor of the Clay County Sun, at Clay Center, Nebr. I have no quarrel with this editor. I agree with him. I do submit it to this House for such consideration as it merits and I hope that many of the publicity bureaus in Washington will take due notice of the same.

AN OPEN LETTER TO REPRESENTATIVE CARL CURTIS

Hon. CARL T. CURTIS, *Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR CARL: After a rather extensive investigation of a large number—a darned large number—of Government agencies, I have made the startling discovery that there is one essential industry that not only has not been receiving Government support but has been the target of a "helluva lot of moochers" already on either the Government pay roll or on some relief roll. We have the ever-normal granary, parity payment for agriculture, payment for crops not produced, old-age pensions, knuckling to strikers in war preparedness plants, huge salaries to propaganda writers in a thousand and one Government departments, emissaries of the food-stamp plan drawing good salaries, and so many others that it would fill the pages of the Clay County Sun to enumerate them all.

But, my dear CARL, nowhere can I find a blooming thing calculated to promote, by Federal aid or subsidy the country newspapers, of which the Clay County Sun is one. Oh, yes; the country newspaper is supposed to be aided by a so-called free-postage concession, but all the advantage it is to most of us we could put in an eye and never wink a wink.

Now, my dear Carl, I ask you and your official associates what the heck good it would do to have a small army of propaganda writers living in luxury in Washington, and at the expense of the taxpayers, if the country newspapers refused to print the stuff? How far would all this agricultural relief program get if the country newspapers refused to give the program and progress space in their columns? How far would Uncle Sam get in his efforts to promote the sale of thrift stamps and baby bonds for the financing of the preparedness program if the country newspapers closed their columns to that patriotic program? Yet, my dear Carl, everybody but the country publisher is paid, and he is expected, and usually does, to spend his money for composition, paper, ink, presswork, and postage to get the program across to the public. While doing this the country publisher is paying his share of the taxes and often more than his share in comparison with many others. Your Federal propaganda artist can have his stuff printed for nothing in the Government Printing Office and can mail it free under a frank. But we country publishers must pay for having the stuff set up in type and then pay postage on the newspaper in which it is printed. The propaganda writer gets his fat Government check every month, often twice a month, while the average country publisher just don't. He gets his if, as, and when he can.

Now we country publishers claim to be and are as patriotic as any man or woman on the pay roll as manager or employee of the many Federal spending agencies. But there is a financial limitation to the country publisher's ability to demonstrate his patriotism. Paper houses insist on being paid for their wares; printers must be paid on the dot. The presses stand idle when the pressman is unpaid. And, strange as it seems, the editor and publisher and their families must eat, and there is a law against appearing nude in public.

In view of all this, my dear Carl, don't you and your colleagues think it is about time to give some consideration to the country newspapers while all this Government promotion work is going on? We are not asking for relief, merely asking that we be given a break.

It might be possible to dispense with the services of about nine-tenths of the propaganda writers now on the Federal pay roll, thus saving their salaries and expense accounts, and the cost of getting their editorial sheets printed at the Government Printing Office, and spend the huge sum thus saved in paying the country publishers a little for the space they give to the promotion of the preparedness plan?

As for the Clay County Sun, one of the humble country newspapers of the Nation, it will gladly give up a major part of its columns to Federal promotion, free and without price, just as soon as the rest of them give their services to the Nation free and without price. Until then the editorial wastebasket yawns, and does not yawn in vain.

With highest personal regards and best wishes, my dear Carl, this country newspaper remains, as ever.

Yours sincerely,

THE CLAY COUNTY SUN,
Clay Center, Nebr.

A World Divided

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of today:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 12, 1941]

A WORLD DIVIDED

Sometimes we wonder whether Abraham Lincoln may not have done posterity a disservice when, in a speech delivered June 16, 1858, he said, "I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free." He made that remark as a capper to the Biblical saying: "If a house be divided against itself, that house cannot stand" (Mark 3: 25).

What worries us is that the idea is now being applied to the world situation. Practically all administration spokesmen, from the President down, are using it as an argument for more and more United States participation in Europe's newest war.

Wendell L. Willkie, for example, put it this way at the interventionist rally in New York City a few nights ago:

"There is no compromise—the world will be dominated by free men or it will be dominated by enslaved men. We cannot appease the forces of evil * * *. Totalitarianism is a ruthless philosophy which cannot survive in a world where freedom exists."

In fewer words, "The world cannot exist half slave and half free."

The fact is that the world always has existed as a house divided.

There have been eras when all nations were slave nations; others when some were slave nations and some comparatively free and democratic nations. The United States in its short history has managed to live along in the world with various sorts of government functioning elsewhere.

We lived along with Czarist Russia, a black tyranny, for generations. President Lincoln himself, though ardently desiring democracy in his own country, was not above accepting Russian help in the Civil War, when Britain and France were helping the Confederacy.

We existed normally all the time Abdul (the Damned) Hamid II (1842–1918) as Sultan of Turkey was oppressing, robbing, massacring and torturing assorted peoples, including some of his own people. Democratic Great Britain, incidentally, kept Abdul's toehold in Europe secure because Britain didn't want Russia to get the Dardanelles.

Yet we are told now that our death knell as a nation will sound if tyranny isn't wiped out of all the world. The President, in his first message to Congress after his third inauguration, said we could and should bring to the whole world in this generation the "four freedoms"—of thought and religion, from want and fear.

The only trouble with the argument that the world cannot exist half slave and half free is that it simply is not true. It is the exact opposite of the truth.

The President is an excellent phrasemaker. We quote again an excellent set of phrases which he put together at Boston last October 30:

"And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again, and again, your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars."

House of Representatives Is Opposed to Convoys—Some Solemn Thoughts at the Brink of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, we are at the brink of war. It is time for sober thinking and plain speaking. A powerful group headed by interventionists, war promoters and columnists is bringing terrific pressure to bear to get us into war through the convoy route. Congress is not reacting favorably to this pressure. I am informed that a poll has been taken of the House of Representatives which shows that if a resolution authorizing the use of convoys were voted on now it would be defeated by about 100 majority. It is on the White House that convoy pressure is beating most fiercely. The war promoters have a theory that Congress can safely be ignored and that the President can direct the use of convoys without regard to Congress. The way they are trying to force the President to take this last fatal step into war is one of the major scandals of our time. The effrontery of the pressure group stands out in bold relief when put side by side with the statement made by the President at Boston on October 30, 1940, just before the recent election. I quote from his statement made on that occasion:

> And while I am talking to you fathers and mothers I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again, and again, your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

The war promoters are trying to compel the President to repudiate his solemn promise, well knowing that his word is pledged not only in that speech but in many similar speeches last year, when he assured and reassured the American people that their sons will not be sent into foreign wars.

I am receiving a heavy mail on the convoy question, in which all shades of opinion are expressed. I know of no reason why there should be any doubt of my attitude.

I made a pledge before election. In display advertisements which I inserted in all of the Indianapolis newspapers I said that I would do everything I could to keep America out of war unless our country is attacked. To my mind that was a solemn covenant. I stand today on that pledge, and I shall continue to stand on it in the future, come what may.

The President is said to have made the statement that "convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war," and with that statement I agree absolutely. My pledge being to help to keep the country out of war I could not, of course, vote for convoys, which would plunge the country into war. The issue is clean cut and unmistakable and I shall keep my promise. When I voted against the lease-lend bill I visualized exactly the situation that has now arisen. It did not require any gift of vaticination to foresee that ultimately there would be a demand for convoys to see that the goods we manufacture get to the various parts of the world. Why manufacture those goods if they are to be sent to the bottom of the ocean? is the question now raised. My answer is that I would rather see the bottom of the ocean strewn with cannon than with the bodies of our precious American boys.

I AM AN AMERICAN

I am an American. My intention and purpose is to vote as an American on all of the great issues that are burgeoning forth so numerously and so rapidly in these tragic times. If we in Congress will keep in mind what is best for our own country, to protect the integrity and the perpetuity of its matchless Government and the maintenance of its high Christian ideals, we will be doing the very best we can for humanity, for our country, and our God.

Let me outline briefly some of the cardinal features of an American policy which I think should have the loyal support of every Member of Congress, as follows:

First. To vote for national defense is an American vote. We must build up our national defense to the highest point of perfection, so that no conscienceless dictator, obsessed by fanciful dreams of world dominion, would ever dare to attack us.

Second. To vote whatever aid to Britain and the other democracies that will not weaken our home defense or entangle us in foreign wars is an American vote.

Third. To vote against any proposal whatsoever to send our American boys overseas to die in the shambles of foreign wars unless America is attacked is an American vote. Our hospitals are already full of the wrecks of human lives from the last World War. We can best serve democracy by saving our fine young men for the protection of our own shores.

Fourth. A vote against any attempts to black out the rights of labor and industry and the civil liberties of individuals is an American vote. Under the pressure of war excitement I shall never vote totalitarian measures into the law of the land.

I sincerely hope that out of the psychosis of war through which the world is now passing all of the constitutional rights of our free people may emerge unimpaired.

NATIONAL CREDIT AS IMPORTANT AS BATTALIONS

Fifth. To vote for a drastic cut in nondefense expenditures is to vote American. We are right up against the time when this matter of Government extravagance must be given consideration in order to avoid a financial debacle and the evils of printing-press money. Secretary Morgenthau talks about saving a billion dollars on nondefense appropriations but the estimates that come to Congress from the Budget Bureau are constantly for more and more money, piling debt on top of debt. We now have in sight a debt of $90,000,000,000, equal to between one-fourth and one-third of the Nation's entire wealth. One cardinal fact which should never be overlooked is that national solvency is as important to national defense as battleships and battalions. We cannot win a war with a bankrupt Treasury. We had better forget such impossible spendthrift projects as the St. Lawrence seaway, the fantastic scheme to harness the tides, and the grandiose idea of bisecting the State of Florida with a ship canal, for such drains on our Treasury would sap and weaken our financial strength to a point where it would be incapable of standing the strain of war. I applaud Secretary Morgenthau for his suggestion of a billion-dollar cut in nondefense expenditures, but I think he was too conservative. In view of the extreme urgency of bolstering our financial position I would suggest a cut of a billion and a half or two billion dollars. That would be a severe cut, indeed, and it would break the hearts of the spenders, but in the face of the gravity of the existing situation, lip service for economy means nothing and something worth while must be done.

INDIANA'S SANITY IN THE MIDST OF HYSTERIA

In this solemn hour, when war fever along the seaboards is running high and many of our citizens in those sections are thinking and acting irrationally, it seems to me, from all I see and hear, that Indiana is about the sanest spot in the Nation. Our Indiana people despise Hitlerism and all the hateful reactionary policies it stands for, but they wonder what we would be getting into if we take over and try to fight a war against three, and possibly four, of the most highly mechanized military powers of the world—a war we did not start. If I can discern their thinking processes, they are thinking of America and all it means to them, the land of homes, of freedom of speech and worship, the land of opportunities where every boy and girl has a chance to grow and bloom, and they do not want this lovely picture spoiled by any foreign entanglements. They are thinking of America, the world's most outstanding Christian and good neighbor, and they are thinking of America first.

Taxation and Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN T. TREADWAY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

WEEKLY NEWS LETTER OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF INVESTORS, APRIL 26, 1941

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following discussion of the tax question as appearing in the Weekly News Letter of the American Federation of Investors:

LID BLOWN OFF THE TAX "JACK-IN-THE-BOX"

DEAR FELLOW INVESTORS: With open hearings begun this week before the House Ways and Means Committee, the worrying tax question exploded with reverberations throughout the Nation. Published reports of the effect of Treasury recommendations on the pocketbooks of wage earners and the devastating inroads on the salaries of the large group of business and professional men with incomes between $10,000 and $50,000 stirred millions of hitherto complacent citizens out of their comparative indifference, and brought home to them at last the inescapable truth that they will have to help pay now, in a period of national emergency, for the improvident and wasteful policies of the Federal administration during the past 8 years.

TAX EMERGENCY "NOW" DUE TO WASTEFUL SPENDING OF RECENT YEARS

The present need for imposing three and one-half billion dollars in taxes on top of an already crushing tax burden is not due primarily to our national-defense program and our vast expenditures for aid to Britain. It is due wholly to the visionary and extravagant policies of an administration bent on concentrating all political and economic power in a central bureaucracy, with the Chief Executive a virtual dictator. Under the guise of social reform, with subsidies and bribes to various groups of voting citizens, billions upon billions of dollars have been doled out in recent years, and only a fraction of these billions was raised in taxes. The balance—some twenty-five or thirty billion dollars—was borrowed.

PUBLIC MISLEAD BY FEDERAL SPENDERS

The Government's deliberate policy of deficit financing, naively referred to as "spending our way to prosperity," has resulted in a Federal debt of more than $47,000,000,000 (exclusive of about five billion additional Government-guaranteed obligations). Objectors to this ruinous program were branded by radical leaders in the administration as Tories and economic royalists, and the people were repeatedly assured that there was no danger to the United States Treasury's solvency, as we were merely "borrowing from ourselves." The people were further pacified with fairy tales about big business and rich men paying the bulk of the taxes. The abundant life was just around the corner. And so the spenders perpetuated themselves in office and in power. Now the day of reckoning is at hand.

PLACING THE BLAME WHERE IT BELONGS

Under the circumstances, the administration today occupies an unenviable position before the American people. It will not be easy to escape responsibility for having led the Nation into a financial crisis in the face of a rapidly developing foreign-relations crisis. For national defense all worth-while Americans will willingly make any sacrifices necessary, but when they review the record of this administration they cannot be fooled into believing that the financial sacrifices now demanded are due to the national-defense emergency. If our Federal financial policies had been sound these last few years and our Treasury unburdened by the heaviest debt in history, the billions now needed for defense preparedness and for aid to Britain would not have precipitated a financial crisis of such proportions as to threaten our standards of living and even our system of government.

PATRIOTIC COURAGE ESSENTIAL IN CONGRESS

But there is no denying that this Nation is in a financial mess, and that only by adopting the soundest fiscal policies can grave consequences be averted. The alternative to practically confiscatory taxes is eventual inflation that would wreck our national economy and destroy our system of free private enterprise and individual initiative. The Treasury's theory of spreading the tax burden, even until it brings the small wage earner into its scope, seems justified under the circumstances, although it is impossible at this time to pass judgment on its full program, as the details remain to be revealed It is doubtful, however, whether Congress will have the courage to spread the income tax to the extent recommended by the Treasury. Members of the House must go before the electorate every 2 years, and they just do not consider it good politics to enact legislation that takes tax dollars out of the pockets of the mass of their constituents. In this emergency, however, patriotic courage must prevail over any selfish interests.

UNNECESSARY NONDEFENSE EXPENDITURES MUST BE CUT OFF

Until Congress manifests an interest in cutting out unnecessary nondefense expenditures, it cannot face the taxpayers—and voters—with clean hands. Members who vote additional taxes, and at the same time condone the squandering of Federal funds on unessential projects or subsidies, deserve repudiation at the hands of their constituents. Secretary Morgenthau, appearing Thursday before the House Ways and Means Committee, suggested that at least $1,000,000,000 could be cut from nondefense expenditures. Everyone familiar with the fiscal affairs of the Government knows that Mr. Morgenthau's estimate of possible savings (without sacrificing the relief or old-age programs) is conservative. In fact, Congress could reduce ordinary expenditures by at least $2,000,000,000 a year, thus relieving the pressure on taxpayers and at the same time expediting the defense program.

Mrs. Roosevelt Mistaken

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE HOLLAND (MICH.) EVENING SENTINEL

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Holland (Mich.) Evening Sentinel of May 10, 1941:

[From the Holland (Mich.) Evening Sentinel of May 10, 1941]

MRS. ROOSEVELT MISTAKEN

In Los Angeles a member of Mrs. Roosevelt's audience asked the question: "Do you think the President will keep his promise and keep us out of war?" The First Lady's answer was: "He hasn't made any such promise."

Now, that is about the most remarkable remark that has been made in a whole year of remarkable remarks. Regardless of whether the United States should go to war or not, fact remains fact and a matter of record remains a matter of record. If Mrs. Roosevelt is correct in her remarkable statement, then millions of normal Americans are mistaken. For millions of Americans (among them probably many of those who read this editorial) are ready to swear that they heard the President promise just that, with their own ears. Are we then mistaken for believing the testimony of our ears as over against the casuistry of the President's wife?

In one of the last speeches of the campaign last November this is what President Roosevelt said—millions heard it over the radio, and some of them copied the words down on the spot because of an instinctive feeling that they might be repudiated or ignored after the election. Here are the words, a matter of record:

"Your President says this country is not going to war."

If a promise to keep the Nation out of war can be made more positively and unequivocally than that, how must it be worded? The issue at the moment is not whether going to war is the right policy or not, it is merely the issue of who is mistaken. Are the American people to lie down humbly and let themselves be stepped on? It is a question of who is right, and the humblest citizen has as much right to demand respect for the evidence of his own ears as has the most exalted lady in the land.

The First Lady says: "He hasn't made any such promise." Then what do the President's words, "Your President says this country is not going to war," mean? Or don't they mean anything? Or were they mere campaign fodder? Did the President suppose that they would be forgotten as soon as the election was in the bag?

Mother's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, OF INDIANA

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an address made by my colleague, Hon. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, of Indiana, in the Amphitheater, at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, at Arlington Cemetery, on Mother's Day, May 11, 1941. His address follows:

Madam National President of the American War Mothers, distinguished guests, it is

a happy privilege to address every war mother, and every mother, everywhere, in this hour of universal sacrifice in our Nation. This is a beautiful occasion. Communing with us are many mothers from many American republics in the Western Hemisphere. It is a most happy privilege to greet the mothers today. This is your day—Mothers' Day!

We meet within the shadow of this tomb, and the sacredness of this spot reflects the solace and the beauty of peace. We are sheltered by the dome of heaven, temporarily safe from the destructive forces from without. The last resting place of our unknown soldier—known but to God—marks the place of our communion. This unknown son, of an unknown mother, sleeps while the war-torn world shudders before the threat and the mental distress of another conflict. For him all wars have ended. He sleeps in yon sarcophagus where kings and queens, men and women—the common people of nations—do him honor. May he rest in peace!

In the spirit of Mothers' Day we reflect upon both the beauty and the pathos of that annual event in our national life. Many may express their joy and pride because their mother is still with them. She is the guiding star of the destiny of men. For many of us mother is a hallowed memory. Her hands touch us only in our dreams. Blessed are those that still have the benediction of the fading eyes and the caress of her trembling lips: For our mother's love is the nearest approach to divine love that God grants to men. In our fervent memory of her we witness the gathered tears—for mother.

The very name signifies all that is sacred, all that is loyal, all that is sincere, all that is honorable. Her universal kindness throughout the years causes us to kneel at the shrine of sacred memories, where we honor her—mother.

When we speak the name there is that something which is eternal and immortal, that which inspires. They have been the torch bearers, they have blazed the trail, and no race has risen above the exalted ideals of its mothers.

Today we pause and reflect, because we recognize that the finest sentiment in life is woven about the home. The keystone of the home is mother. It is my firm belief that of all the sentiments which cling to the end of life and touch with mellowness the memories of the early years as they recede, the finest is the one enshrining mother. To pay a tribute to them is but to recognize the most unselfish emotion to which the human soul is capable.

Her love is more than instinct. It continues as long as life endures. Her fervent love for her child is the greatest force in the world today, because it endures through time, it is stronger than disaster, deeper than eternity, and remains imperishable before the storms and vicissitudes of life.

Mother.

The very mention of her name promotes a stern realization that she is the foundation of civilization because she has inspired achievement and established goodness; she has enriched and ennobled the souls of men and nations. She is the one ideal that remains after every other has been banished by disillusionment. There is no force which can destroy that picture of her protection or the memory of her prayers.

We speak of her again:

Mother.

There can be no higher privilege today than to offer thanks to that Divinity who so planned the universe as to give mothers to men. This tribute is universal. This day is dedicated to motherhood. For a mother's love there is no substitute. This thought has been so beautifully expressed in these words of tribute: "If there be truth in religion, then this holy sentiment was planted in woman's heart by the hand of God. It has made life possible. It is in truth the very source of life itself. When all other passions are dead it survives. It will pass through the furnace of disgrace and yet live. It will endure the scorching breath of contumely with unwavering fidelity." The spirit of this day makes ours a nobler Nation. The songs and poems inspired by love we hear, the eloquent sermons delivered in eulogy of mother; the flowers we wear in honor of her, the planting of trees in her memory, the unfurling of our flags—all these are our tribute and the expression of our fervent thoughts as we honor and revere our mothers. These are the symbols of our love and devotion—our humble, yet solemn, rededication of our faith in mother.

These are ominous days in our country. The souls of men are sorely tried. While we meet in this atmosphere of calm and sober reflection we are conscious that we are yet spared from assaults coming from without. We can express our thanks unto God that the Western Hemisphere remains at peace. May it ever be so. We shudder as we know the Eastern Hemisphere is aflame with war; that death, destruction, and devastation may be found on every hand and where weeping mothers pray that this tragic war may soon be ended; yet the war lords continue to pursue their daily task of war and death. The curse of mastery, the unalterable desire of acquisition, and the unthinkable purpose of satisfying a selfish desire—all of these elements, spurred on by the lash of personal domination and individual dictation, cause this cruel war to continue.

As we witness these sad and very serious days we realize that nations have been invaded and that men have fallen. The destiny of those nations is yet unknown, and their future is dark. The demands upon those people is yet in secret contemplation. What tomorrow will bring to their untold suffering we do not know. The future is shrouded in mystery.

There are other people in Europe whose outstanding bravery stands as a shining example of their faith to all other nations. They are yet holding fast. Our prayers go forth unto God that they may be victorious. The nightly raids of bombing planes, which come with the certainty of the darkness, do not deter them in their defense. Fathers, mothers, and children, with a morale as firm as if made of bands of steel, face each rising sun with a prayer upon their lips that "the war will soon end and their country may be saved."

What a tragedy to behold. Their country—their native land—may be destroyed or taken. Their homes may be lost. Their lives are in the balance. They face the untold cruelty of war and the ravages of the dictator who seeks to dominate. The anguish of those mothers today certainly exceeds all human comprehension. I know their prayers are constant and fervent. They embrace the song and sentiment of life.

Thus we view the present. The mothers over there have met the crisis with an unfaltering trust and with an indomitable faith. They are steadfast in their belief that an all-wise God will direct the cause of right and victory.

The wisdom of the guiding hand of mother will lead aright the stalwart men of the Americas. Before us are the myriad thoughts of our mothers humbly beseeching the God of men to restore to the world a universal peace. They pray that the destructive forces of nations may be transformed into constructive forces for good. They would that the savagery of those who seek to conquer other nations, that a new philosophy of life may be designed throughout the world, may be quickly changed into the promotion of peace. The creed of our mothers, inspired by the goodness of their souls, now carved in matchless script upon that tablet which endures throughout the endless space of time, speaks to us: "Let us have peace."

They know the path which leads to war is a false path to liberty and freedom. Our mothers, with their enduring affection, revere our liberty and freedom. These they would perpetuate. In this presence of peace and in the exalted presence of our mothers, in the shadow of the tomb of him who gave his life that liberty and freedom may prevail in our country and that our American way of life may forever continue in paths of unmolested peace, may we offer our prayers, with the fervency of our mothers, that this war may soon end and that peace may prevail throughout the world.

Throughout the Western Hemisphere our mothers are united. Their fondest hopes, their exalted desires, and their earnest prayers are entirely kindred. They pray alone, yet their utterances express the same desire. They sing "God Bless America" with the same fervent wish and the same high hope. The mothers' love and the mothers' prayers claim the same exacting influence, because they hope for peace in the Western Hemisphere. Their boys, and our boys, face the same threat in a world which is shadowed by war. The loss of opportunity to children is identical, one with the other. The fate of the one is the common fate of all. Today, the mothers of the pan-American countries meet here—meet with our mothers—they meet with the common aspiration and purpose that a universal peace may forever reign throughout the Western Hemisphere. May this sacred bond of human friendship, which now exists among all mothers in the Americas, become more closely fixed and more completely consolidated as the years roll by. The threat of war brings us closer as a people. Adversity establishes a common level for all. The love of all mothers for those finer and better elements of life constitute a stabilizing influence for the common good.

We cannot pass this hour without reflection upon the valor and the fortitude of our war mothers. They have stood the test of human suffering, yet their faith has remained untarnished. When the lowering clouds of grim and determined war came—when their sons responded to their countries' call—they met the crisis with an undoubted response of unalterable faith in God. Yes, their tears were shed—they were shed when they were alone—alone with God! They have never doubted, even when the path was rugged, that the endless destruction of human life would not long continue. They witnessed the consummation of their unerring faith when the war was over. Our war mothers have ever been happy to live in the paths of peace; their mission throughout the years has been to establish a lasting peace—an enduring peace. Their exalted influence in the Americas has materially aided in the development of that sturdy patriotism which is undimmed by time. They have builded so well in our nations. We place at their feet that perpetual wreath of love and sweet memories.

As we contemplate the sacred influence of this day may I say that it is quite unusual that in all history no nation had united to honor its mothers until our own country held its first Nation-wide tribute to our mothers on May 10, 1925. In passing may I pay a tribute to the Honorable Frank E. Hering, of Indiana, teacher, orator, and humanitarian, who made the first plea for a Nation-wide observance of Mother's Day. To him our Nation owes a debt of gratitude.

Then comes the tomorrow. No one can contemplate what it will bring. We will meet it. We will never falter. The war mothers of our Nation, our mothers throughout this hemisphere, will continue their earthly work. Their voices will be heard and we will witness their smiles as their inspiring counsel comes to us. In these days of human trials, when strong men need earthly

and heavenly guidance, and when it seems that we falter when we face our task, the cheery word of inspiration from our mothers sends us forward, undaunted, to meet the future. Whatever it may be, we will face it with the victor's smile guided by that eternal light emanating from the golden voice of mother.

We are inspired by our mother's love, because it has produced, fondled, reared, inspired, and glorified all of the shadowy hosts who have passed across the "mark of time" since man first raised his eyes to heaven. The word "mother" is, indeed, that golden cord which binds the earth to God.

War mothers of our Nation, you have served so well. Your inspiration ever guides our steps aright. While we linger in your presence, as we solemnly meditate in the sacred memory of our mothers, both living and dead—yet, with uncovered heads we stand in the presence of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, which inspires our unalterable course: You speak—a grateful Nation listens.

We speak her name again, Mother!
And we know,
"Behind the dim unknown
Standeth God, within the shadow,
Keeping watch above His own!"

Livestock and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. NELSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

ADDRESS BY G. B. THORNE, OF WILSON & CO., CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by G. B. Thorne, of Wilson & Co., Chicago, at Livestock Feeders' Day, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., April 10, 1941:

The subject I have been asked to talk about today is, Livestock and National Defense. While I have considerable misgivings as to my ability to handle this subject, it is an appropriate one, for it would be difficult indeed to talk about the livestock business from the market standpoint at the present time without giving considerable attention to the effects of the war and the national-defense program.

The national program of preparedness and aid to Britain is affecting the economic life of the entire Nation. Even though our country is not at war, we are rapidly approaching a war economy. Each week our Government is taking additional steps in governing the production, marketing, and prices of commodities in order to remove bottlenecks and greatly step up production of war materials.

Whether you are concerned with the market for livestock or with the market for any other commodity, new factors must now be taken into account which until recently were of no importance or nonexistent. These developments are occurring so rapidly that it is difficult to keep abreast with what has happened, to say nothing of the extremely difficult task of trying to foresee what is ahead.

This great national effort is affecting the livestock and meat industry in many ways. However, I shall confine my discussion largely to three major influences.

First, and perhaps the most important, is the effect of the national-defense effort upon the domestic demand for meats. One of the basic economic principles in the livestock industry is that the demand for meat is governed by the ability of consumers to buy the product. Consumers normally spend around 5 percent of their income for the purchase of meats. This means that when industrial activity and employment increase there is a corresponding increase in the demand for meat. Industrial activity has increased sharply during the past year and especially in recent months. Production of industrial goods is now at the highest level on record. Industrial employment has increased by more than 2,000,000 persons in the last year, and this does not take into account the increase in the armed forces. This gain in employment is not surprising when we realize that there have been authorized or are pending, national-defense contracts amounting to $45,000,000,000. Only about one-eighth of this huge total has been completed.

We already have seen considerable improvement in the demand for meats as a result of increased employment. To illustrate, the price of beef steers at Chicago now averages about $2 higher than a year ago in the face of larger slaughter supplies. The explanation is greater consumer buying power as a result of increased employment.

As more people are put to work, a further increase in domestic demand for meats may be expected.

It looks now as though it will be increasingly difficult for consumers to obtain durable goods, such as automobiles, washing machines, refrigerators, and similar articles, because of a diversion of raw materials and plant facilities from the manufacturing of these products to the production of war equipment. Thus not only will people have more total money to spend but they also probably will be willing to spend a larger share of it for foods.

Another important factor is the increased demand for meat products for the armed forces. Prior to the present program of expansion, the United States Army included only 187,000 men. In contrast to this, the War Department expects to have about 1,400,000 men in Army camps by June 15. The Navy also is expanding, although not to the same extent.

For a long time the United States has had a reputation of having the best-fed army in the world. This, of course, calls for liberal rations of meat. The office of the Surgeon General of the Army announced recently that our soldiers eat meat at the rate of more than 300 pounds per man per year. This compares with the present civilian per capita consumption of about 141 pounds. These figures are not strictly comparable, however, since the average of 141 pounds per capita for the country as a whole is an average for all persons of all ages, including infants. Nevertheless, it is safe to say that the average soldier eats considerably more meat than he would eat in normal civilian life. As a general rule, the soldier gets meat at 17 of his 21 weekly meals and liberal portions are served. In planning the diet for soldiers meat is considered to be of prime importance not only because they like it and it sticks to the ribs, but because it contains so many essential elements for the well-balanced diet including proteins, vitamins, and minerals.

The Army is buying all classes of meat, beef, veal, pork, and lamb. In buying its meats from month to month the Army plans to give greatest emphasis in its buying to those meats which are in relatively greatest supply. In this way, Army purchases should serve as a stabilizing influence on livestock markets and also provide the Army with meats at the most reasonable cost.

Beef constitutes a large share of the Army meat ration. The bulk of the beef bought by the Army is from cattle that grade medium and low good, according to the United States Government grading standards. These are cattle that, as a rule, at this time of year would have a limited feeding of grain. During the summer and fall it would include some of the grass cattle. This beef is somewhat above the average quality of beef consumed in the United States. While the majority of the Army beef is bought in carcass form, some beef cuts are purchased, principally rounds and chucks. The minimum carcass weight is 450 pounds, which is equivalent to 800 to 850 pounds, live weight, but the Army's preference is for heavy carcasses. Purchases are confined to steer beef except when boneless frozen beef is bought, in which case heifer beef of proper quality also is acceptable. The Army expects to use large quantities of the boneless frozen beef in connection with their field maneuvers.

The bulk of the Army demand for pork products is for bacon, hams, and loins. Army officials have indicated that they intend to buy a considerable quantity of spiced pork, packed in cans. This product will keep indefinitely without refrigeration and is made mostly from pork-shoulder meat.

Upon investigation we found that vegetable shortening was being used almost entirely by the Army for frying and baking and practically no lard was being used. However, Army officials have indicated a willingness to use more lard in the future. The National Livestock and Meat Board in cooperation with the packers is making an intensive survey of the Army's shortening requirements, in order that specifications may be prepared that will assure the Army of getting the kind and quality of lard that will meet its needs. The meat board also will cooperate closely with the Army by furnishing the camps and the Army's bakers' and cooks' schools with educational material on the proper use of lard and its superior qualities as a shortening. Lt. Col. Paul Logan, in charge of subsistence of the Army, and his associates are giving the livestock and meat industry excellent cooperation in matters of this kind. In turn, Mr. Pollock of the National Livestock and Meat Board, is giving the full time of his entire merchandising staff to the job of helping the Army train its cooks and their personnel in the proper handling, cutting, and cooking of meats and approved methods of using lard.

Supplying meats to the Army on such an expanded scale is a vast undertaking. We feel that it is of great importance to the livestock industry that the job be done efficiently and with maximum satisfaction to the armed forces. The importance of this job is one of the reasons why the meat-packing industry ranks high among the essential industries in the defense program, and we are leaving no stones unturned to satisfy the Army's requirements for meats in every way.

The third important influence of the war and the national-defense program on the livestock industry is its effect on the export demand for meats. One of the first effects of the war was to further curtail the exports of meat products which already were at a low level. Great Britain established what practically amounted to an embargo on pork and lard from the United States in the early part of 1940. This was done primarily to conserve dollar exchange for the purchase of war munitions. Large quantities of beef were available in Argentina at low prices, and with the enforcement of a rigid rationing system it was the view of the British Government that adequate pork supplies could be obtained from Denmark, Canada, and from home production. The supply from Denmark, of course, was shut off when that country was taken over by Germany. This still did not prove too serious to Great Britain from the standpoint of pork, since hog supplies had been greatly increased in Canada, and

a program for further expansion of Canadian hog production was under way. However, in more recent months with British production decreasing because of the lack of feed, and with losses due to bombings and to the sinking of ships in transit, meat supplies in Great Britain apparently have been much smaller than desired and reserve stocks are low.

When it became evident that the lease-lend bill would be enacted into law, giving aid to Britain by supplying all types of essential materials, the British Government indicated to our Government that substantial quantities of food were greatly needed. Consequently, our Government is making plans to supply the British with large quantities of food products under the Lease-Lend Act, and a considerable share of the food to be furnished apparently will be pork and lard. The purchases are to be made by the United States Department of Agriculture. The Department already has purchased, since the middle of March, forty-six and one-half million pounds of lard and six and one-half million pounds of pork for this purpose. The British Government has indicated an interest in obtaining a liberal supply of sterile, nonperishable pork meat in cans. This apparently is needed to hold in reserve for emergencies, when because of bombings or sinking of ships, the regular flow of perishable meats is seriously disrupted.

It is apparent, therefore, that three major influences, namely, increased employment in this country, increased meat requirements for the Army, and larger quantities needed for shipping abroad all point to a further substantial improvement in the demand for meat products during the remainder of the year if the war continues. Furthermore, it is likely that these factors will cause the improved demand to be well maintained for the duration of the war and of our national-defense activity.

Now let us look at the supply side of the market. The cattle population of the United States has been increasing steadily since 1938. The greatest yearly increase was in 1940 when cattle numbers increased nearly 3,000,000 head, bringing the national total to 71,666,000 head.

Missouri has shared in this expansion in cattle production. Numbers on farms in Missouri the first of the year were the largest in 23 years. Present indications are that farmers are continuing to hold back breeding stock, and it is very likely that by the first of next year the cattle population of the United States will be at or near the highest level on record as established in 1934. This expansion, which got under way in 1938, is just now beginning to be reflected in market supplies. Inspected cattle slaughter so far this year has been running larger than a year earlier, and there are more cattle on feed than a year ago.

Sheep production in the United States has not changed greatly during the last 10 years although there has been a slight upward trend since 1935. The number of stock sheep and lambs on farms on January 1 was 2 percent larger than a year earlier, and market supplies of sheep and lambs in 1941 probably will be a little larger than in the previous year.

Hog slaughter last year reached normal levels for the first time since before the droughts, but due to an unfavorable hog-corn ratio the pig crop of 1940 was reduced. Indications are that the spring pig crop this year also will be somewhat under the spring crop of 1940. Hog slaughter during the remainder of the year, therefore, is expected to be somewhat under last year.

Since the first of the year, however, the hog-corn ratio has been favorable, which, no doubt, has caused producers to make plans for expanding their breeding operations. A further decided stimulus to expanded hog production occurred last week when the Secretary of Agriculture announced that the Government will make purchases of pork products in the open market to support a long-term price for hogs of $9 per hundredweight (Chicago basis). It was announced that in pursuing this policy seasonal price variations would be taken into account, and the prices would be subject to customary market differentials for market grades and qualities. The Secretary stated that the policy of supporting prices at levels remunerative to producers will be extended over the period to June 30, 1943. The apparent purpose of this Government action was to give producers sufficient price assurance to cause them to step up production promptly, and thereby more adequately provide for the rapidly growing demand at home and abroad. The Department of Agriculture also has indicated that the reserve supplies of pork products that they intend to buy and accumulate also may be used to prevent excessive speculative price increases by releasing supplies to the domestic trade if prices get to unwarranted levels. Thus it is the intention of the Government to use their pork- and lard-buying operations not only to support prices up to a certain level but also to give stability to the market.

It is certainly important to national defense and the program to aid Britain as well as to the livestock industry that prices be maintained at levels that will be remunerative to producers and will encourage production. But it is equally important that we avoid if possible the experiences of the last war when prices of livestock and other commodities skyrocketed to unreasonable levels. The announcement made by Secretary Wickard last week that purchases of meats and lard for Britain and other nations resisting aggression would be used, not only to support prices, but to help stabilize them, should go a long way toward bringing about the desired objective.

The large numbers of cattle and sheep on farms and ranches in the United States and the abundant supplies of feed that are on hand place the livestock industry in a good position to supply the increasing requirements for meat at home and abroad. Hog supplies can, and no doubt will, be expanded materially within a short time. The industry, therefore, is well prepared to do its share for national defense.

I am sure livestock producers also are doing a lot of serious thinking these days about the problems that may confront the industry after the war is ended. This no doubt is especially true of those who underwent the hardships following the last World War. Meeting present emergencies is the first order of business, but it is not too early to think about and plan for what may be ahead.

There is a distinct possibility that following the war, especially if Britain wins, large supplies of meat from the United States may be needed in Great Britain and in Europe until such time as the livestock industry in those countries can be rehabilitated. Nevertheless, based on our past experience, it would be most unwise for us to assume that the wartime demand for meat will continue indefinitely after the war is over. Some major adjustments are inevitable.

One of the best safeguards we can take against severe post-war adjustments is not to neglect our domestic market during the period of the emergency. During the last war very little attention was given to this problem, and we suffered the consequences during the post-war period. The promotion of meat substitutes and the inauguration of meatless days during that period developed consumer resistance against meat which, even to this day, probably has not been completely overcome. This time the industry is in a position to supply adequate meats for all requirements and such harsh measures should not be necessary. Instead we should continue to tell the American public the virtues of meat and its importance in a well-balanced diet.

There is an urgent need, both from the producers' and consumers' standpoint, for greater consumption of meat in the United States. It is needed from the producers' standpoint because of the increasing abundance of feed crops in all sections of the country, which can only be marketed through livestock. It is needed from the consumer standpoint in order to improve the health and vigor of our people. Scientific facts are now available which show that many of the human ailments are due to deficiencies in the diet, and meat is one of man's most valuable foods from the nutritional standpoint.

People eat meat because they like it and because it satisfies them, but they do not always attach the rightful importance to meat as an essential part of the diet. Meat does not rank as high as it should in the public mind as an important source of vitamins, and consumers consider its protein content as unimportant. There are still many people who think that meat is not good for them, that it is hard to digest, that it is fattening, and is the cause of many diseases.

In contrast to these consumer beliefs, there is scientific evidence to show that meat ranks high in vitamins, especially in the so-called B vitamins, which we hear so much about these days. We know that meat is not hard to digest, that it can be used either as a reducing or a gaining diet, and that it is unexcelled as a source of essential proteins.

We in the meat industry are convinced that the domestic market for meats can be greatly expanded through a continuous program of consumer education, such as the one under way. It fits in well with the present program of national defense, an important part of which is to improve the health and vigor of the American people.

A Mother's Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a letter which I have received this morning, and which I am pleased to entitle "A Mother's Appeal." I shall not elaborate on the text of the letter, except to observe that it is the heartfelt plea of an American mother whose sentiments are indicative of the feelings of countless millions of mothers in this great Nation of ours. I urge that each of my colleagues direct their attention to this message:

MAY 8, 1941.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is in regard to this country's entering the war.

My sentiment is this: If our Congressmen and Representatives give in to put this country into another war which is not our war, I think it is high time we have a different form of government.

I want to inform you of the feeling of the people in this neighborhood. Some

are talking of getting up petitions to impeach the President, and telling our boys to rebel and not be sent across the waters. So you see revolution could be started very easy if this country enters that war. It is nobody's fault but you fellows sitting down there in Washington, D. C., supposing to be representing the people.

It does seem that us mothers are not given much consideration only when you want our votes.

I have raised my son up to be a perfect picture of manhood and to be a law-abiding citizen. I have sat at his sick bed many, many nights and prayed to God that his life might be spared, and now you have him in Camp Claiborne, La., preparing to go out to war to be shot down like a rat or to shoot some other poor mother's son; someone that if we were to meet him on the street anytime but wartime would greet him with a smile.

I pray that all you white-collared fellows in Washington would pick up your Bibles and be more concerned in what it contains than being so concerned in another man's war. We are promised a hell of brimstone and fire in the hereafter for man's deceitfulness and unjustness.

Men do not know what us mothers do sacrifice to keep up the race. I hope, Mr. Jensen, you take no offense at this letter and that you will use all the prestige you have on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, in answer to this letter I sent this typical American mother the following poem, which I composed last week and which I read into the RECORD of May 6, the words of which express my innermost feelings:

RIGHT MAKES MIGHT

Give us men today, oh Saviour,
Men who dare to do the right.
In this world of war-torn nations,
Pity those who make man fight.

If there be such ones among us,
Give them courage to turn back,
While the heavenly gods yet bless them,
Holding off that shroud of black.

Let them not from others pattern.
God is good, He made the sea!
Then he blessed us with America,
Where he willed we should be free.

Dare you then to other peoples
Dictate what they all must be?
Cross that ocean? Slay your brethren?
Who have not been blessed like thee?

Nay! I hear my comrades calling,
Send them bread to stop that fight.
Trusting God to save the peoples,
Who would learn that right makes might.

—Ben Franklin Jensen.

A Scheme to Nationalize Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention of Members of the House to a plan now being pushed by a group here in Washington to nationalize agriculture. This group appears to be violating provisions of the Hatch Act in its determination to regiment the farmers of America.

In this connection I desire to quote a letter which I received recently from Mr. F. V. Heinkel, president of the Missouri Farmers' Association:

MISSOURI FARMERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
COLUMBIA, MO., *May 9, 1941.*

Hon. PHIL BENNETT,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BENNETT: In the belief that owing to the stress of the times in Washington you may not have had opportunity to acquaint yourself with the flagrant attempt of the Soil Conservation Service to foist upon an unwilling agriculture of Missouri the State soil conservation districts plan, I am taking the liberty to write you about it; also, in the name of the organized farmers of this State, as well as the thousands more who will have no opportunity to be heard on the subject, to register with you a vigorous protest.

You will doubtless recall that in 1936, at the behest of the Secretary of Agriculture, the standard State soil conservation districts law, identified at Jefferson City as S. B. 170, was defeated by the State legislature because of its obnoxious features and bald objectives, and this despite the fact that an attorney came out from Washington to put it over.

In 1938 it was introduced as H. B. 156, though in slightly modified form, and was again defeated. Not long ago it was introduced in this session of the State legislature as H. B. 289, and was killed in committee on the grounds that Missouri is already doing a better job of conserving the soil than any other State, and, therefore, such a law would be "superfluous and an added expense." A few days ago, in the same session of the legislature, "the cat came back" as H. B. 565—but this time employees of the Soil Conservation Service had gone about over the State and rounded up some 150 farmers in 25 counties to testify in favor of the bill before the House committee, and the bill was reported out.

We are prompted to inquire: Why this persistence? Does the Hatch Act apply to employees of the Soil Conservation Service, one of whom spent many days lobbying for the State soil-districts bill at Jefferson City? Since Missouri is already doing a better job of conserving the soil than any other State in the Union, with eight of its fifteen million crop acres planted to legumes, why center all of this fire on us here in Missouri?

Nowhere in the country do farmers more strongly believe in soil conservation than in Missouri, and certainly this is true of members of the Missouri Farmers' Association. We cite these figures as proof: In 1940 Missouri farmers used 87,000 tons of phosphate fertilizer, spread 1,381,774 tons of lime, used mechanical control measures on 450,000 acres of land, and, as mentioned, grew 8,000,000 acres of legumes! This fine record was accomplished through the cooperation of farmers, voluntarily, with the Extension Department and other governmental agencies. Moreover, according to the Soil Conservation Service, Missouri has built more reservoirs than any State west of Pennsylvania except California, where water is used for irrigation purposes. In addition, we are making rapid strides in wildlife conservation through our own State agency, of which we are very proud. No other State, we maintain, can boast of such a record.

We contend that 90 percent of Missouri farmers do not want the State soil-conservation districts law. Were this not true, would the State legislature have turned it down three times in succession? We charge that three interests want this law passed in Missouri. They are:

First and foremost, the hired technicians of the Soil Conservation Service. They want it in order to hold their jobs, and as a pressure group to demand more money from Congress so that the power of this new Federal Bureau, the Soil Conservation Service, can be enhanced. This Bureau has already pressured Congress into appropriating $5,000,000 more with which to hire more technicians for these districts, and this at a time when the war situation calls for billions more in taxes, and when agriculture is selling products at less than cost of production. These officials and employees of this Bureau are bending every effort to foist this act upon the people of this State, and this in the face of the Hatch Act.

Second, in support of this bill are various local chambers of commerce, such as the one at Bethany. They ostensibly expect to get the business of a new flock of Federal payroll riders.

The third group is constituted by a small number of farmers who have enjoyed the privilege of having their land terraced at public expense, of having brush cut and fences built by C. C. C. boys who are now needed for the Nation's defense. Some of these farmers and a few others who have witnessed such operations are inclined to seek further assistance along this line. However, the facts are they will not receive such assistance under the districts law as the Federal funds are intended for payment of salaries of technicians.

The real directing hand, of course, is located in Washington, D. C. Certain people there apparently intend to use this new vehicle as a means of nationalizing agriculture when the war ends. They propose to direct from Washington every move that farmers make when the A. A. A. and its dole are made impossible by our post-war-straitened circumstances, and with our colleges of agriculture relegated to pure research activities. These are the charges we make of this undemocratic proposal, and we hold that this must account for the persistence behind it, since it is a fact that Missouri already excels all other States in soil conservation.

As proof of our contention that this is a bold intent to nationalize agriculture, your attention is respectfully directed to a very recent publication relative to State legislation for better land use, which is a special report by an interbureau committee of the United States Department of Agriculture. Chapter 111, page 36, reads, in part: "Practically all land in particular watersheds must be brought under uniform control. Arbitrary boundary lines should be ignored and programs formulated over naturally bounded areas."

This means that eventually every farmer will have to comply with ordinances passed by soil districts committees whether he wants to or not, with all lines, such as county and boundary lines of the farm, superseded by new district lines. The same special report states, "Machinery should be provided whereby a majority of the farmers can * * * compel a minority to comply."

In other words, according to the statement of the Soil Conservation Service itself, this latest proposed law, like its three predecessors that were killed at Jefferson City, is simply to prepare a way for an amended law that will compel all farmers within a given district to handle their land the way they are told to do it from Washington, or to have the work done on their farm and charged against them and stand as a lien against their land with provisions to sell that farm if need be to meet the costs. These provisions were set forth in the original standard law which was proposed in 1936, and are still in the minds of the Soil Conservation Service officials at this time, as witness their report issued within the past 30 days.

We do not believe that, understanding the situation, you will approve of the undemocratic intent behind the State soil-conservation districts law; nor of the use of Soil Conservation Service officials and employees in

creating a demand for such a law in Missouri, where the pace in soil conservation has been set for all other States. We see in this program most sinister possibilities, and want you to know that we of the Missouri Farmers' Association most heartily disapprove of them.

Sincerely yours,

P. V. HEINKEL,
President, Missouri Farmers' Association.

Mr. Speaker, the Missouri Farmers' Association is one of the strongest, most helpful, and best managed farm organizations in the Nation. I hope that the House will pay some heed to the statements made by Mr. Heinkel and that the Justice Department will look into alleged violations of the Hatch Act.

Under pretense of helping the farmers, many foolish and expensive things are being done. Billions of dollars have been spent by the "hot-dog" boys, and in spite of this, the plight of our farmers is worse today than it was in that terrible year of 1932.

As an example of waste and mismanagement, I quote from an article by Pearson and Allen, in the Washington Times-Herald of April 20, 1941:

MARYLAND MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen)

SOIL "CONSERVATION"

If Federal investigators really go into the Soil Conservation Service in Washington County, they will find plenty of things to worry about. How some of the inefficiencies have escaped the attention of Washington thus far is hard to understand.

For instance, Ed Conklin, a farmer not far from Hagerstown, owns about 70 acres with a value of around $3,000. Ed signed up for the Government's conservation program on his farm, and before the Government finished, it had spent around $6,000 on Ed's $3,000 acreage.

The job of terracing Conklin's acres was supervised by C. A. Frye, who is now chief engineer of the northeastern region. All during the winters of 1935 and 1936, C. C. C. labor crews hauled dirt to patch up the terraces, but the terraces did not hold. Finally, the trouble was corrected by the efforts of two low-ranking technicians.

But, in the end, Ed Conklin decided that terracing his farm was not particularly good for conservation, and 3 years later the terraces were entirely plowed down and obliterated. It has been said that a doctor's mistakes are buried, but an engineer's mistakes become a monument to his ignorance. Fortunately for the Soil Conservation Service this particular monument has been destroyed by Ed Conklin's plow.

FARMING BY THEORY

Another Washington County farmer is Don Easterday, who had about 24 acres treated for soil erosion at a cost of about $2,700 to the Government and a cost of about $80 to him. Then there is also the case of Frank Mullendore who had 22 acres treated by the Government at a cost of $3,800 to the Government and about $60 to him.

Chief result of soil conservation tactics in this area has been a complete loss of public confidence. This is partly due to the rather high-handed tactics of various soil administration officials. Instead of attempting to apply methods which would fit the local picture, officials apparently tried to fit the local situation into their own preconceived ideas on theoretical farming. Sources of local information, such as the county agricultural agent and local farm organizations, were ignored.

When some of the officials from Washington were looking into the situation last winter they were astounded at the utter lack of supervision and inspection done by line officials. In other words, the men who met the public as representatives of the Soil Conservation Service had practically no guidance from superiors, and the superiors knew nothing of the progress or lack of it in the field.

Principal measurement of accomplishment was the number of agreements signed with farmers to carry on soil-conservation practices. Emphasis was on the large number of agreements signed, and there was little or no effort to learn what these documents involved. This looseness of supervision and inspection within the organization may explain why people voted "thumbs down" on some proposed soil-conservation districts in several neighboring States in the northeastern region, including Pennsylvania, headquarters of regional chief mogul, John P. Jones.

BUREAU ILL WILL

A few of the men in the ranks of the service are struggling to maintain good public relations and render public service, but they are finding the back drag of administrative inefficiency a serious handicap. Some of the field technicians welcome constructive suggestions from supervisors with a practical conception of farming, but they have little regard for the impractical puppets of the various Soil Conservation offices.

Another difficulty with the Service is jealousy against subordinate officials who make good. For instance, one of the employees of the Hagerstown Soil Conservation Service project, J. C. Tignor, was furloughed because he was given a low efficiency rating. This man's immediate superior, B. D. Gilbert, area conservationist, who made the rating, refused to discuss with Tignor the reasons for this low rating, and he was furloughed.

Tignor's associates claim that he had an excellent record and was one of the most capable men ever stationed at the Hagerstown office.

Mr. Speaker, if the administration will quit importing competitive farm products, reduce the interest rate on farm loans to 3½ percent, cease coddling those groups that add so much to the cost of everything the farmer buys, and then leave the farmer alone he will get out of the red much sooner than the New Deal does. One trouble is a major part of funds appropriated in the name of agriculture are paid out to a few big operators and corporations. Such payments might well be limited to $1,000 to any one individual, and restricted to those who make their living by cultivating the soil.

In Missouri we have been doing a fine job of soil conservation through our agricultural college and county agents. We do not want dictation from Washington. We are opposed to regimentation—we want to preserve freedom in America.

National Defense Instructors Association of Buffalo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

NATIONAL DEFENSE INSTRUCTORS ASSOCIATION OF BUFFALO.

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS.
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: On March 1, 1941, a copy of the bylaws and regulations of the National Defense Instructors Association of Buffalo was mailed to your office. Since that time much progress has been reported by the various committees and untold good has been accomplished. Men of importance in national-defense capacities have been interviewed and their opinions obtained and complied with. Key men of industry have been contacted with a view toward closer cooperation, and many excursions through their respective plants have been conducted.

County welfare and W. P. A. rolls have been reduced, and State employment service has been augmented by individual members, through their contacts and acquaintances throughout industrial plants and many placements have resulted. Trainees have been subjected to competition in these plants against nontrainees and have emphatically demonstrated the advantages and results of their schooling. Home study and attendance on their own time to teacher-training classes have fortified the members with additional directive and administrative abilities, thereby promoting a smooth, uninterrupted flow of graduates through the national-defense training classes.

To men of the caliber embodied in this association, this is nothing extraordinary. Each a craftsman in his own right by many years of study and service in industry, and in many cases through years of directive experience as foreman, shop superintendent, and master mechanic, it demanded only self-initiative to select the proper program and put it into operation. Men with less experience and ability might well have been confused if suddenly drawn from their daily routine and given a mass of bewildered, untrained, and unequipped manpower to whip into the semblance of mechanics in the short period of 10 weeks.

It is not the purpose of this association to exploit the abilities of its respective members. Each is master of his own destiny at this crucial time when industry throughout the Nation is pleading for skilled craftsmen. Each realizes his own potential ability and worth in a way best known to himself. In this land of freedom and liberty each has the prerogative of deciding how he may best serve his country in this hour of need, and just what sacrifices he cares to make and what reward he shall demand.

Because of these circumstances and the fact that certain conditions are changing rapidly, it is the consensus of opinion among members of this association that the following matters be brought to your attention. This association considers these matters worthy of careful consideration; when properly adjusted, they should enhance the position of the individual member to a plane consistent with his abilities, demanded efforts, and prestige.

For instance, permanence; throughout industry, men with seniority rights have been rapidly advancing to better positions and better pay with the assurance that as long as there is work to do their job is secure. Many national-defense instructors have left their positions and jeopardized their seniority rights to act as instructors but can get no assurance from any source as to the permanency of their positions or the opportunity to continue in this work for any definite period longer than 10 weeks.

Because they have no certificate to teach in public schools, national-defense instructors are informed that they can in no way enjoy the privileges or benefits of regular teachers. That they are not eligible for pension, for sick leaves, or vacations, or leaves of absence. National-defense instructors are humans, on a par at least with regular teachers. They are under longer, more intense mental strain

than most teachers. They work mostly all night, and since nighttime is the time for social affairs and family reunion, it becomes necessary for them to eliminate all such indulgences. No man will tolerate such a condition too long.

Existing laws and regulations place the national-defense instructors on the Federal pay roll, while they are obliged to seek guidance and redress from local authorities. Local authorities demand obeisance, but assume no responsibility for assurance or security, such as insurance, old-age pensions, or social security. This protection should be afforded national-defense instructors.

The rate of pay for Buffalo for national-defense instructors is $1.50 per hour for all night work. In many trades and vocations this is on par with regular day-rate schedules. Part-time instructors receive a higher rate for teaching afternoons, in addition to regular salaries which they enjoy. Comparable with industrial rates in industry, $1.50 per hour for all-night work is low. National-defense instructors receive no consideration for all-night work and have no opportunity to work overtime or to earn better wages.

In the copy of the by-laws which you receive, the purpose of this association is clearly defined. Members have both individually and collectively endeavored to carry out this purpose and that it has been achieved, is clearly shown on the records of industry. Because the members of this association intend to continue this policy and to improve on it wherever possible, it appears consistent with good policy that the above matter be given important consideration. It is clearly apparent that these matters were overlooked in the hurried set-up for national-defense instructors but it is earnestly desired that you will have the opportunity to reflect upon them and to exert your full influence in the effort to correct these improvident circumstances.

With cordial regards, I remain

Very truly yours,

PETER C. SUTTON,
Secretary.

All of Wall Street Is Not for War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I am printing in the RECORD herewith a challenging and a clear-cut editorial from the Wall Street Journal for April 21, 1941. It offers a compelling argument against the use of convoys and points out the constitutional barriers prohibiting the President from ordering the use of convoys without first securing the sanction of Congress. It effectively answers the pleas of those who urge the President to usurp a power which he does not have and to strip the last vestiges of self-government from this country by taking unto himself the war-making powers of a free republic.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to this editorial not only because of its thought-provoking qualities but because it offers encouraging evidence that the persistent clamor for war coming from Thomas Lamont, the House of Morgan, and a few other international banking houses on the Street is not the universal pattern of thinking on Wall Street. While it may be true, as so frequently charged, that most of the bankers and attorneys engaged in the great game of international finances and the plucking of big and easy profits from foreign trade are financing and promoting the war propaganda now sweeping America, it is stimulating to note that the Wall Street Journal retains its sense of balance, its primary loyalty to the United States, and its courage to oppose the international bankers by insisting that it is the duty and function of Congress to vote on the subject of convoys or any other step which will finally determine whether America goes to war or remains at peace.

The editorial follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of April 21, 1941]

NO SUBTERFUGE

One of the arguments for using American naval vessels as convoys is that the action is necessary to make the lease-lend law policy effective. It does not make sense, say sponsors of the plan, to allow material for Britain to pile up on docks or to be sunk by submarines after we have manufactured it. We should ship it in American vessels and convoy those vessels.

When the lease-lend bill was before Congress some of its opponents envisaged this situation. They predicted that the next step would be a demand for convoys. Most of the advocates of the measure denied that the question of convoys was implied in any of its provisions.

We are recalling that, not for the purpose of raking among the ashes of arguments about things settled, but the course of the past may very well indicate the future.

Suppose we can get the ships to haul material to Britain. Suppose we can safely convoy those ships. Then are we likely to hear something like this:

"Getting a lot of materials to the British is useless unless she has the men to make use of those materials. Planes need men to fly them; guns, men to fire them. So let's send troops."

We have heard that Britain does not need men. So far as defense of the British Isles is concerned, that is probably true. Current developments do not indicate that it is true in Africa or in the Balkans.

Long ago we insisted that this country cannot be half in and half out of a war. Either we are all the way in, or we are not in. Despite statements to the contrary, we are not now in. The sentiment of the majority is for not going in.

No one seriously denies that convoys will be the first actual war step. Once it is taken there is no drawing back. And once in the war there is no choice except to go in with all we have.

We have said and we intend to repeat:

"Only by constitutional methods—that is, by enactment of Congress—should this country initiate a state of war.

"It follows that only by act of Congress should this country take steps which will cause another nation to attack it and thus force war."

And any other course is the course of subterfuge.

Elmer Lewis

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, too often we take our other blessings as we do sunshine and rain, without thought or any expression of gratitude.

But we have here in the Capitol of this Nation and in the service of Congress, a man who is a blessing and as to whom many are the expressions of gratitude. He is the remembered man, not "the forgotten man." To him, our sitting encyclopedia, we go with our daily problems concerning legislation, past, present, or proposed. He knows the answers and gives them so quickly that he seems to have anticipated and briefed every question in advance of the asking.

I refer to the distinguished officer presiding over our Document Room, Hon. Elmer Lewis, whose indefatigable and highly efficient service we appreciate tremendously!

This official, who serves so cheerfully, so faithfully, and so efficiently, cannot be given the full meed of praise which he has earned, but I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article which appeared in yesterday's Star, by Will Kennedy, which pays a part of the interest on our mounting debt to him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The article follows:

CAPITAL SIDELIGHTS

(By Will P. Kennedy)

The absorbing interest of "Americans all" in national defense, tax and labor legislation is shown daily in a small office in the Capitol, just off Statuary Hall, tucked away behind a circular staircase. There sits Elmer Lewis, superintendent of the House document room, with a photostatic memory and a card-index mind, backed by 22 years of experience, consulted daily by Members of Congress, officials in all departments, bureaus and agencies of the Government, the legal profession, business executives and the general public of the entire Western Hemisphere.

Elmer keeps track of more than 22,000 bills per Congress, and those who have had experience with him consider it a bad wager to get against his knowledge of any measure presented to Congress. Upward of 1,000,000 bills have been filed under his supervision. He has such a remarkable memory that "he can give you more information about any measure than most anyone on Capitol Hill," as leaders frequently have remarked. Members of Congress take visitors from back home to meet Elmer as one of the institutions and challenge them to ask any question about legislation that he cannot answer promptly. He keeps a card index on all measures but merely for a permanent record and to confirm his memory. He has been called by one recent Speaker "the unofficial secretary on legislation."

It is not only his ability to help locate information wanted instantly and accurately

that has endeared Mr. Lewis to a wide governmental, legal, professional, and business constituency, but his zeal to be of service. To thousands who have not met him personally his pleasant telephone voice is familiar. Not only is he known as an "information authority" to those in the Capital City, but throughout the entire United States. He comes from Stoughton, Wis., and retains his official residence there. A student in the University of Wisconsin when the first World War started, he quit to join the Navy, was attached to the American mine fleet in the North Sea, and helped in the German blockade. In the document room he served his apprenticeship under the late Joel Grayson, whom both Speakers "Uncle Joe" Cannon and Champ Clark pointed out as a "walking encyclopedia." He was considered an "indispensable man," but he devoted several years to training Elmer "to do this job better than anyone else ever did."

The Responsibility of the Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 13 (legislative day of Thursday, May 8), 1941

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, at 2:30 o'clock this afternoon the Vice President of the United States delivered a very able address at the convention of the National Association of Broadcasters on the subject The Responsibility of the Radio. I ask unanimous consent that this informative address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In talking to the radio broadcasters, I wish first to express my high appreciation of all that you who work in radio have done. You have carried the love of good music to millions. To the lonely and sick you have brought messages of goodwill, and have made it possible for them to enjoy church services on Sunday. Today you are building goodwill in Latin America by means of a two-way radio bridge, carrying across the skyways programs which will better enable us to appreciate the culture and music of Latin America, while at the same time our good neighbors are learning through the radio to know us better. You are proving that the Latin culture of the South and the Anglo-Saxon culture of the North are fundamentally alike, because both are founded on belief in democracy and freedom. So many of the broadcasters have had an awareness of the public interest in many fields that it gives me an unusual pleasure to be here today to greet the National Association of Broadcasters.

The radio-listening audience demands of the broadcasters a great responsibility. They expect of you the wisdom, the decency, the goodwill, and the enterprise which are the heritage of America. They appreciate the way in which you have kept them up to the minute in world events. But now, in this most critical year of the world, we who use the airways find our work hard and dangerous as never before because there is an organized effort by the agents of the Nazi Government to confuse the minds of the American people and to promote ill-will and dissension among us. In spite of this evil interference continually distorting the news and spreading lies and confusion, we have to go on steadily with the democratic process of free discussion as best we can. We must defend the spirit of America in our own words and actions against the poisonous influences that are attacking us day by day. Radio has an especially deep interest in the freedom of discussion which permeates the very spirit of democracy.

When, in the year 1791, our ancestors adopted the Bill of Rights, political democracy as we understand it was a new thing in the world. The foundations of political liberty had to be laid down in freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of worship, and freedom of assembly. That foundation was well and truly laid. We have not yet achieved perfection in the building of our political democracy, but we have made progress, and we are determined to hold the gains we have made and not to slip back to the savage tyranny that the Nazis threaten to impose on all freemen.

But political democracy was not enough to maintain the liberty and decency that we Americans hold as our ideal for human life. We found we must also have economic democracy, and we began to establish in law and custom the rights of economic freedom. Especially since the first World War, in the feverish prosperity and the shattering depression that followed, the need of economic democracy became more and more clear. After 1929, as the unemployment deepened, men were saying in every town in America: "What good is the vote without a job?"

We had to establish the right of every man in good health to have a job at fair wages, and the right of those who were aged or sick to have help, the right of youth to a fair chance for education and opportunity, and the right of all the people to proper food and medical care. Here also we have not achieved perfection, but we have made encouraging progress. We are determined to go on and build an economic democracy that is fit for a free people, and not to let the Nazis solve all our problems for us by reducing us to slavery.

But while we were building a political and economic democracy to protect our rights, we found we must go further and build into our customs and laws, and above all into our personal lives, a democracy of responsibility for the general welfare. The threat of war brings powerfully to our attention that we have duties no less than rights. And when the danger of war is past, if we are to succeed this time in establishing a true peace at home and abroad, we shall establish that true peace only by carrying on the full duties that are the strength and support of democracy.

We know now that the failure of peace after the first World War was partly the result of our own mistakes. We did our duty in the war, and we won all that any war can give—the right to make the terms of the peace. But when we had won the right to make the peace we were tired of facing hard responsibilities; and peace is a hard responsibility, at home and abroad. So we quit. We decided to go in for isolation, to mind our own business and let the world go where it would. The world has gone there.

Now we have a second chance to take up the responsibilities of a great nation in a world that desperately needs our help. This time our responsibility is greater than it was 25 years ago. This war will decide whether the Nazi tyranny shall impose its new order on the world, or whether the free peoples have another chance. This time, when we are called upon to play our part with the other free nations, to build and, year after year, to maintain a fair and democratic peace, we dare not shirk our responsibility.

To us here, who are not workers in what is called defense industry, it is clear that the duties of citizens go far beyond military defense. Total defense has no front line and no rear—where is the front in England? Are the front-line defenders of England the sailors who man the merchant steamers in the battle of the Atlantic? Or the Australians fighting in the desert of Libya? Or the night flyers fighting 30,000 feet above the streets of London? Or are they the women who tend the wounded where the bombs are falling, or who sit through long hours listening to the short-wave broadcasts of the enemy to decode his strategy from the pattern of his lies?

In our own country, too, there are many different services for our defense, but all are important. Some of our young men must serve in the armed forces. Many more, young and older, must give their time to building planes and ships and all the equipment for a military force. But the vast majority of the people must serve on the home-defense front, and home defense goes far beyond the material job of supplying food and clothing and houses. The home front includes every kind of service, and high on the list is the service of entertainment, information, and inspiration that is provided by the radio.

I hope to see the radio more and more reflecting the unbeatable spirit which is America in such a way as to make us genuinely proud of our defense effort and eager to go ahead producing with every atom of our strength. Our new Army camps are 90 percent complete. The Army air fields, including the overseas bases, are fully half done. Many of our big defense projects are ahead of schedule. We have worked hard, we are working hard, but we still are not working hard enough. The speed of our production, the magnitude of our defense effort during the next 6 months may easily make the entire difference between peace and war for the United States. The women must not only work themselves but stand back of the men, whether they be in management, in labor, or in agriculture, so that all of us will put our heads, our hearts, and our hands to the task. The job which we do in the next 6 months, turning out war materials in ever-increasing quantities, may easily make the difference between freedom and slavery for our children's grandchildren. Never has a generation of people had thrust on it such a responsibility as that which is ours.

Whatever opinions we may hold as to the American policy in the war, we are all of one opinion as to the need of building up the strength of America at home. We can use our talents and opportunities to help the American people meet the demands of the day with courage and confidence. We can help the people to understand what is going on, and where their service is most needed, and how they can find the greatest satisfaction in the responsibilities of citizenship.

For instance, if you are operating a local station, you can play a great part in home defense by calling attention to all the constructive things that are done to improve your community. Your neighbors want to be useful. They want to belong to the community and the Nation. What can they do? We can't do all the planning and organizing in Washington, and we have no desire to centralize all the planning there. Most of the organization for strengthening the life of each community will be done by local people who are self-starters and who know what the community needs. The other people who are good workers but are not able to start the work need to be told what is going on. The

radio can help the people find their places by telling the facts about organizations that serve the public welfare, as well as by spreading the official information about defense jobs.

In addition, you can do a great service by spreading widely the news of any community activity that has been tried and found successful. There will be some among your hearers who will take up the idea and use it in their own towns. Let me give you an example.

In Ohio, several farmers and their wives were asked to invite a dozen neighbors to spend the evening first in a discussion of farm problems, and second in refreshments and sociability. These groups of neighbors began meeting once a month at different houses, and a remarkable thing happened. Almost everyone came and kept on coming to the meetings. The idea began to spread. Now I am told there are over 100 of these monthly meetings in Ohio, and the system is spreading to other States. It seems a simple thing, hardly worth telling about. But this simple story of neighborhood meetings is worth its share of time on a national hook-up here and now, because these meetings fill a real need. Too many Americans are lonesome because the old-fashioned neighborhood has disappeared and has left them not belonging to anything. People can enjoy the movies, but they can't belong to a movie. These farmers in Ohio have built themselves a neighborhood to belong to, and there is new life in them. This story is an illustration of what you can do to help people find out how to take hold in their own communities. And, of course, when you have told them what is being done, you will tell them where to get exact information. Exact information about farmers' neighborhood meetings in Ohio can be obtained by writing to the Farm Security Administration at Washington.

But I cannot tell you all the stories, nor work out all the methods that you know so much better than I. All I can do is to urge you to use your own imagination. The people are important, each one in his place, but sometimes they don't know how important they are, and so they are discouraged. Tell them, and let them know how to get the feeling of belonging to the team.

You know that a man working in a powder plant is not the only defense worker in his family. The woman who makes a home for him and who takes her share of the risk without losing her nerve is as important as the man who does the labor in the plant. You know that not only in England under fire, but in America under the strain of national danger, women are as important as men, but the work that women do is more often left without recognition or understanding. You, the radio men of America, have the techniques to bring recognition and encouragement, and the sense of belonging to their country, to women as well as men who are bravely carrying their share of the load. You have done much good work along this line; I am urging you to do still more of it. You yourselves, when you do this kind of a job, are members of the team.

There is a second line of service that I should like to mention briefly, though the idea is entirely familiar to you. Everyone knows that news from abroad is censored, so that even what is said by American reporters is cut down to a pattern that represents the plan of the censorship. I believe it is worth while to emphasize continually the purpose of the governments that have colored our news. The Nazi government is lying even when it lets an American reporter tell a fact that is a true fact, because its purpose is to make Americans believe that Germany has already won the war and that we may as well quit. The pattern of truth and lies that comes out of Germany adds up to a planned attack on our security. We all know that. I suggest that we keep always in mind that the people who listen to us may be deceived unless we are careful to point out the purpose that lies behind the news and how that purpose is related to our interests as Americans. It is truth in advertising, not deception, to put the skull and cross-bones label on poison bottles.

Finally, and most important to my mind, is the opportunity that is given to all those who use the radio to promote unity inside the United States and a reasonable attitude toward all the world. We are under constant attack by the Nazi propaganda that tries to create bad feeling among us and false ideas about other countries. One of the greatest contributions any one of us can make to our defense is to resist this propaganda of hate at every point.

We can help the defense of America by going out of our way to encourage the service of all those minorities in our country who are loyal to the democratic ideal and anxious to belong to our brotherhood. It is good to remember that the two chiefs of the defense program are both foreign born, both natives of conquered nations, and one a Jew. Let us make a special point of recognizing the full membership in America of Jews and Christians, of whites and Negroes, of the Germans who came here for freedom's sake, of Italians who have no desire for a Nazi victory that would enslave their friends in Italy. Let us take a special pleasure in reporting the athletes, the great musicians, the business leaders, the successful Americans in every line, whose unusual names proclaim that they or their ancestors came from nations that now lie under the Nazi terror. They are glad to be Americans, and we are proud to have them among us. It is worth our while to say we are proud of Knudsen and Hillman, Einstein and Kreisler, DiMaggio and LaGuardia, and thousands of others who have made notable contributions to our life.

We shall also do well to keep our minds clear about the German people here and in Germany. The German people are not the same as the Nazi gang that has seized control over Germany. Most Germans are not gangsters. In Germany, the majority of the people are caught in a trap. They do not dare resist the Nazis, and they are afraid if they quit the war they may be punished unmercifully for the Nazi crimes.

Let us do our part to show here in America that we can distinguish between the great majority of Germans, whom we know to be good citizens, and the few who belong to the Nazi gang. The time will soon come, I hope, when we can help to encourage the decent, civilized Germans who are still caught in Germany to release themselves from their Nazi masters. In all that we say over the radio, I believe, we shall do well to keep that object in mind, for the cure of Germany will be an essential part of a true peace.

These are the thoughts that I should like to leave in your minds. We who do the talking need to take pains to understand the democracy that we are defending. Democracy is to be understood only by getting down to cases, where people act on their own initiative to serve their country in the place where they are. Let us understand this democracy of service and responsibility and tell the people what they are doing so that they can draw inspiration from one another. Let us do our part also to build the confidence of the people in their own strength and in the comradeship of all the free citizens of our country of every race, color, and creed. By fortifying our own democratic spirit we shall help in protecting our country against the attacks that are made upon her. Beyond that, we shall help to carry the light of hope to the people of Europe who are waiting their chance to overthrow the conqueror and win back their freedom.

The Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 13 (legislative day of Thursday, May 8), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS OF UTAH

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely and able address on the subject Does the Selective Service Act Need Amendment? delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] over radio station WMAL on the night of May 12, 1941, on the National Radio Forum under the auspices of the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOES THE SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT NEED AMENDMENT?

Does the Selective Service Act need amendment? It is, of course, in its administration being modified from day to day. The act also has had one or two corrective amendments suggested. Does it need general amendment? I will answer that question by first stating the purpose of the act. The act came into existence at a time of great national pressure for military preparedness and national defense. The President of the United States had already suggested that our industries should be expanded to the place where they could produce 50,000 airplanes a year. The foreign nations at war were ordering our output. The Neutrality Act had been amended so that these nations could purchase military equipment. The fall of France brought consternation to our people. The responsibilities which rested upon our Government to maintain the law and the policy of the Government in regard to the protection of the American states and the expansion of the Monroe Doctrine all contributed to the desire for increasing our national defense. A bill was introduced which would have provided for almost complete compulsory training and the registration of all males in the United States between the ages of 18 and 65. A most drastic law from the standpoint of our military history. If we had planned gradually for the great emergency which seems to be facing us we, of course, would have started years ago with the building up of manpower for industry, for education, for military service, and for the intensified national activity in general.

The theory of the Selective Service Act is based upon the fundamental notion that persons should serve in those capacities of national emergency when the endeavor of all is being stressed for a single objective, that each person should serve in that capacity which he can serve the best, and the judgment as to where he can serve the best is to be decided in the light of circumstances and by local boards in local communities. The Selective Service Act which finally became law is basically an educational act. It deals

with the training of men. It does not provide for universal military training. It provides for the training of an extremely comparatively small select group, each person's selection having been determined on the basis of actual need. In working out what should be the policy of the Nation in regard to registration of names from which to make this selection a compromise was reached after days of debate and after disagreement between the two Houses of Congress, which compromise was decided primarily because it was in keeping with the habits of the Army in receiving enlisted men with just a slight modification. The Army will recruit persons between the ages of 18 and 35. Both Houses had already decided that persons under 21 should not be registered. The theory behind that decision was that a person should be free from a break in his schooling and that the Army took those who wished to enlist at 18 and that such organizations as the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration which are giving splendid training should not be interfered with. The compromise reached made it possible to register those persons between 21 and 35. This would give names covering a great variety of occupations, calling for a great variety of deferments and exemptions and would allow better administrative experimentation in the initiation of the act.

We were told that as a result of study of the best available information furnished by the War Department and our Census Bureau that male persons between the ages of 21 and 35 would supply 13,500,000 names. This would be over 14 or 15 times as many persons as would ever be called in a given year. As a result of the registration we discovered that instead of only 13½ million persons being registered nearly 17,000,000 were registered. This fact should make it possible for us to make 3 general deductions: First, we did not know exactly the number of names a given group of ages would supply. Second, we learned that there was no general desire on the part of the people of our country to resist registration, but that registration itself was extremely popular, and the response was very much greater than was anticipated. And, third, that selective service when men were called would honestly be selective service, and in no sense universal training, because in a given year but 1 name out of 17 or 18 would be called to train. Thus, we see that the act in itself, and the administration of the act, so far has shown us that we have not the definite information needed for a modification or amendment in a general way at this time.

Before leaving this phase of the question, let me contrast our experience in 1917 with the registration last fall. There are still 169,000 who did not register either in the first or the second registration days of the 1917 draft. The Selective Service Act should be considered basically as a peacetime act. I mean that literally. It is service for training. The voluntary service for enlistment in the Regular Army moves on. The 120,000 Reserve officers are being called outside the scope of the Selective Service Act. The law itself demands that persons shall not be called for this training until the Army is ready with clothing, with equipment, with properly trained officers to give the training, and every safeguard has been placed in the act to protect men from the hazards experienced in 1917.

The quota system for training was set up so that each State could take credit for the voluntary enlistments into the armed forces of the country. I repeat the Selective Service Act is primarily educational. From the 900,000 men selected for training each year will come the nucleus for the new commissioned officers and noncommissioned officers who may enlist for service in the Regular Army.

Now a word about the amendments which have been suggested. First, there is the amendment that the registration be changed to 18 to 25 years. A word for and against that amendment is in order. In the first place let us find out just what the present registration is accomplishing before we change it. It was anticipated in the beginning that the first years of this training would be more or less experimental; that it would be wrong to take from the life of our Nation a greater proportion than was necessary of any given age of young men. It was thought, too, that in the beginning of this great training maturity and past experience should also be brought into the training as well as the immaturity of the youth. As time goes on when the trainers, which means the officers, become more efficient and a great body of young, trained, noncommissioned officers have been selected, then the tendency will be to reduce the upper age limit year after year. This should wisely be done right now by the selective-service method. A man, for instance, who registered in his thirty-fifth year and is not subject to call until he is 36 should not be called under ordinary circumstances.

The person selected should be called in the spirit of improvement of that person. The local boards must be trained to understand this. If you have a prospective officer say in the Medical Corps—a boy in his junior or senior year in medical college, or in a hospital—he should be deferred because his services as a doctor are too valuable to be interfered with. Necessary men in industry, when their services are more essential in industry, should definitely be deferred. But at the same time the Selective Service Act lays down the principle that in a democracy all men are entitled to equal privileges, as well as equal responsibilities. These men should not be deprived of their year's service and training if they think it is to their advantage to get it. Thus the voluntary system must be stressed even in the spirit of a local board's passing upon the desirability of an individual's training.

The Selective Service Act is to continue for 5 years. My humble opinion of it is that it will become so popular that it will be one of our continuing institutions. I repeat, it is primarily educational in its nature. Only 1 out of 17 persons can serve. It is a privilege to be called to this training. So far we have had a civilian director of the Selective Service. In making my first speech in defense of the Selective Service Act, I pointed out that that position should always be in the hands of a civilian. It is primarily civilian training—that is, the fundamental thought for that year will lay down the principle of proper discipline as to health, eating habits, ordinary morals, personal hygiene, and learning the fundamentals basic in citizenship. Even in the deepest war most soldiers' time is spent in training and in the present war, which is so highly mechanized, neither the country, the Army, nor the fellow soldiers can dare trust their lives and the very expensive equipment in the hands of the inefficient. You must remember that when 8 men are used in one of our great bombing planes, 3 of these men generally are commissioned officers. None of them are ordinary privates. They are generally noncommissioned officers or first-class privates. That will be the case in the mechanized tank groups, chemical warfare groups, motorized groups on aviation work, and the jumpers, for example, in parachute groups.

The Selective Service Administration should quickly learn how to use the year's training for corrective physical shortcomings and corrective health. In the past wars our standards have been so high in the first draft that only the highest physically fit are taken. When manpower becomes wanted we reduce our standards. How much more sensible it would be to reduce standards of selection for this year's training and correct such things as flat feet, improper eyesight, poor hearing, and ordinary physical defects that have come from malnutrition. Dental defects are nearly all corrective. This corrective work should also be stressed.

Again let me point out that the Selective Service Act fundamentally means the building of citizenry for America. Again let me say it is educational in its needs and I again want to call your attention to the fact that 900,000 selected youths of our country called to serve over a period of 5 years gives us 4,500,000 young men to train. Would any educational administrator ever have a greater opportunity than that? All of the experience in regard to corrective health measures which our great universities have worked out for their students should be made available for these young men. That idea is one which must come by growth.

I think it would not be out of place for me to suggest here what I have said about the great meaning of the Civilian Conservation Corps. That organization gave to boys a chance for 6 months' socializing experience, life with other men, companionable work where they learned the fundamental rules of men's interdependence and community endeavor. These boys, deprived generally of high school and college, experienced the socialized companionships that our Army and Navy were giving, were provided with a chance to work with other men, to live with other men, to grow and to learn the fundamentals of social hygiene and citizenship.

Selective-service groups then must furnish future instructors for other boys as they come along. The golden opportunities which our country lost after having together nearly 4,000,000 men in the last war should not be lost again. We attempted by the activities of the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board to teach the Nation the lessons which the great concentrations of 1917 gave us in regard to venereal diseases, but the people did not like those lessons and they were stopped. We attempted to train the boys by setting up vocational opportunities in all of our schools. Many gained much and some little, but we find now that the general health of the average boy is not much improved on what it was in 1917. I believe that if we can continue this selective training over a period of a number of years that the Nation will derive benefits in regard to social hygiene, proper living standards, proper food, and social living which will count for quite as much as any other factor in our whole big American educational scheme.

The Army is now offered this challenge: Can you make of these 900,000 selectees the type of citizens America expects you to make? Your first task, of course, is to train them for war, but your outstanding task is to train them for citizenship. American democracy rests upon a trained citizenry and a trained citizen Army is now a possibility. Thus the whole standard of American life may be raised if the administrators of the Selective Service Act will live up to its potential possibilities. I, of course, have faith that they will.

Now, back to the original question: Does the Selective Service Act need amendment? Better not to amend excepting to correct a defect. Better to administer the law in such a way that we accomplish the general objectives of the bill. And may I here state that when the bill that became the Selective Service Act was introduced it contained flowery language about saving our Nation from the ills that seemed to threaten, but the Senate Military Affairs Committee decided upon simple positive statements because the training itself justified the law and therefore they made the purpose of the law, "To provide for the common defense by increasing the personnel of the armed forces and providing for its training." The spirit of the act is found in this very short declaration "that in a free society the obligations and privileges of military training and service should be shared

generally in accordance with a fair and just system of selective compulsory military training and service."

There is one phase of the operation of the Draft Act which needs remedy and should be remedied at once. The act very wisely sets up a definite line of jurisdiction between those persons who are civilians and those persons who are inducted into the Army. Two groups of officials preside over these jurisdictions and each draftee must be passed by these two groups of officers. In each case a medical examination is given, but sometimes the doctors do not agree, and in this disagreement between doctors grave injustice is done. We all remember in the World War how men tried to enlist, but were turned down because of some physical defect and then were drafted and found all right. This resulted in loss both to the Nation for several months of the services of an individual and a loss to the individual of a chance for advancement. There are cases where men have been called up. They have been given farewells, as it were, by their friends, they have resigned their positions, have been passed by the draft doctor, and, in some cases, they have even given away some of their civilian clothing. Then they were disqualified by the Army examining physician and subsequently returned to civilian life, with its obvious embarrassments and difficult readjustments. The problem, then, is bringing the two groups of doctors together, and the administration should see that this is done at once so that the embarrassments which have occurred will not be repeated. One reason for the Selective Service Act is to overcome these various injustices. They can be overcome by a simple decision to allow a rule of reason to control.

The Selective Service Act contains a section which I sponsored that the Federal Government first had to guarantee men who are called from their work their jobs when they come back. This to me is very important. Not only do I want the men's jobs guaranteed but the reason for the act was to put both the employer and employee in harmony with its spirit, both realizing the educational good that would come from the year's training and thus causing the employer to want his men to get this training and causing the employee to want the training knowing that his job for his future industrial welfare is not to be jeopardized.

The Selective Service Training Act has now been in operation approximately 8 months. During this period we have seen many thousands of young men inducted into the Army. These men have come from all walks of life, selected in a thoroughly democratic process. They are being trained in accordance with the theory as outlined in the basic program.

I warrant that if it were possible to interview each one of these trainees and ask him whether he thinks that he is being properly trained and is learning things which will be of great benefit to him in the future, an overwhelming majority of them would answer in the affirmative.

Now, I want to hasten to add, if this training is so beneficial, why deprive any person of it by discriminating one type of person against another, all other facts being equal? Some complain that many are being selected and inducted who should be deferred, for various reasons. I will confess that cases such as this have occurred. But these are few and far between. We have the same thing happen with every law, though. We have even had people sentenced to death and long imprisonment wrongly through a miscarriage of justice; but would you repeal or amend that law simply because of that? The problem, then, rests in the local administration of the law rather than in the changing of the law itself. The local board, if it performs its duties honestly and judiciously, will do credit both to itself and the community. The boards are composed of highly respected, honest, and intelligent private citizens, and they are worthy of every confidence.

Let us, then, give this law a fair opportunity to operate, so that we may have the benefit of an ample background of experience with which, if need should later arise, we can intelligently consider proposals for amending it.

Responsibilities and Opportunities of University Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 13 (legislative day of Thursday, May 8), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS, OF UTAH

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Responsibilities and Opportunities of University Extension," delivered on May 7, 1941, by the able and distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] at the twenty-sixth annual conference of the National University Extension Association in Oklahoma City, Okla.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Dr. Horsfall, ladies and gentlemen, Dr. Horsfall forgot to mention that he has never seen me read a speech in his life and ordinarily I do not do it because I ran away from school during the period in my elementary education when students learn how to read and I have never learned how to read. I thank Dr. Horsfall for his kind words. He is safe in saying anything he wants to about me out here but since we, as educators, ought to all hang together, I warn him he had better not go home and say anything good about me or he might lose his job.

I wrote this talk because I knew that something would happen like has happened here today, something to make my mind jump all over the globe and back again. The stimuli that come from meeting with people who have had like ideals and who have seen like deficiencies and who are therefore sad. All of those things would cause a man to let loose of himself and talk in such abundance that your program would be marred.

I agree with Dr. Kelly that all wisdom cannot be in Washington, especially when both Dr. Kelly and I are here. [Laughter.] In fact you will find, if you listen through this speech, that I am such a great believer in Jeffersonian fundamentals that I would never believe that all wisdom could be centered in any one place, or in any one person.

It is with genuine pleasure that I meet with you this morning. I have been, during the past week, conferring with educators from all parts of the country incident to a public hearing in Washington on legislation designed to meet our grave educational problems. I must confess that as a university teacher with 20 years' service stripes to my credit these consultations have afforded real enjoyment and have been inspirational to me and at the same time have reminded me of the warmth, sincerity, and intellectual stimulus to be gained in the atmosphere of university life. I, therefore, especially welcome this opportunity to participate with you in this most important university activity.

To the thoughtful person, events throughout the world have been a cause for much sorrow and grief. At the same time, however, they should awaken within our hearts a desire to put our own house in order, so that we may safeguard for ourselves and build for our fellow countrymen a civilization free from devastation and barbarism. We wish to live in peace with a complete enjoyment of the freedom guaranteed to us by our Bill of Rights. It is a compliment and testimonial to our form of government and to Democratic processes that we are able in times of emergency to take self-inventory, so to speak, and make the necessary adjustments to make ourselves more efficient to cope with impending challenges.

If we can turn back the pages of history for a few minutes and review our national record during previous periods of emergency and trial we shall see that democracy has risen to its full stature and met these challenges with courage and conviction. In such instances when apparently insurmountable forces were about ready to wipe out our national existence we have taken note of the scientific principle "that to every action there is an equal and opposite reaction," have marshaled our economic, social, and political forces, and met the challenge. History reveals that in such periods of emergency, during times of hardship, struggle, and stress we have made our greatest advancement. This is especially true in the field of education.

Our great Revolutionary War brought forth the ideas and theories which evolved into the public-education system of America. Two years before the surrender at Yorktown, which assured the establishment of our Nation, Jefferson, acting on his deep convictions, wrote a bill for the establishment of public education in the State of Virginia, and during his lifetime made such declarations and utterances in support of education in democracy that his viewpoint in this regard is unmistakable. Let me cite you an example—Jefferson said: "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was, and never will be." On another occasion he declared, "No nation is permitted to live in ignorance with impunity."

We are also well aware of Jefferson's wisdom and educational interest in the establishment of the University of Virginia, and he at that time was even so far ahead of his time in this regard that he set aside a tract of land to be used for experimental purposes—this perhaps, constituted our first university experimental station.

I personally feel that if for no other reason than for his contribution to education, it is fitting that we honor the memory of this philosopher of democracy with a great shrine in the Nation's Capital. As Vice Chairman of the National Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission, I share a far deeper feeling of joy than is possible for me here to express in the dedication of this shrine.

Washington and other founders of our Nation shared Jefferson's views on the importance of education. In the Ordinance of 1787 land grants for schools in the Northwest Territory of what is now Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and other Midwest States were voted. This decision came on the heels of the Revolutionary War. Actually this famous ordinance adopted for the Middle West some of Jefferson's ideas which were rejected in Virginia. The wise decision of the ordinance

laid the foundation for our public schools in the Middle West, and, by example, throughout the Nation.

Now turning to another period of trial in our National history—the era of our struggle caused by the Civil War, we note that Federal interest in vocational preparation first took specific form, and in the year 1862 the Morrill Act was passed which laid the foundation for our present system of land grant State universities and colleges of agricultural and mechanical arts—the college system in which more than one-fifth of all college students are now enrolled.

I cannot help but stop for just a half a moment and call your attention to the fact of our evolving and changing Constitution and how the men who were responsible for the setting up of our Constitution and for the saving of it were the men who understood it best. And how men who come along and become beneficiaries of that Constitution, but slight in their judgment and restricted in their abilities to understand its growth, become the victims of a legalistic approach to it and cannot understand it.

The Morrill Act was passed first in Buchanan's administration. It was vetoed by President Buchanan because he pointed out that in the Constitution there was no provision for the Federal Government assuming the responsibilities of education. But Abraham Lincoln later on discovered that in the Constitution there was no prohibition against the Federal Government assuming the responsibilities of education and passed the act.

Lincoln, like Marshall of old, realized that the Constitution was set up to endure through the ages and, like Marshall of old, he caused it to be expanded so that it could in very deed become the companion of the American people in working out their destiny in liberty and in advancing the welfare of men, women, and children who make up the American people.

Turning now to the period of the Great World War we note that the Smith-Hughes Act was a product of the year 1917. It was this legislation that afforded the great stimulus to vocational education. Of course, anyone who is at all familiar with the schools of the United States is aware of the great progress which has been made during the past 20 years in the general field of vocational education. Due to legislation passed during this World War period, leaders in education have come increasingly to recognize that education for vocational purposes is a legitimate and necessary part of the public-school program.

The next critical emergency to face us was of a different variety, but was, nonetheless, a direct threat to our social scheme. I refer to the depression period. This national shock awakened our interest and consciousness in the welfare of the underprivileged youth. Here, again, when once we had uprighted ourselves after the staggering blows had leveled us, we acted resolutely and with dispatch and launched the manhood-building C. C. C., the N. Y. A., and W. P. A. programs. Here our Government entered into a new form of employment—the development of the worker was considered and advanced just as much as the accomplishment of the mechanical project under consideration. What is more important than the human development envisioned in these programs? As far as the practical aspects of such planning are concerned, I venture to say that there is not a single county in any State in the entire United States that has not realize tangible improvements of large magnitude because of the efforts of these governmental agencies.

Also, it has given me a feeling of great satisfaction to see the C. C. C. officials in the past 3 or 4 years make use of a little section of their enabling act permitting them to issue certificates of ability for work well done and completed. Because of this practice even before the onrush of industrial activity caused by the defense program employers were looking over the C. C. C. rolls for worthy candidates when they had jobs available.

May I pause there a second to show how much you need the educator at the elbow of the Government administrator. Our little paragraph said that the director may issue certificates of proficiency. It was not read, it was not studied. Its possibilities were not appreciated by the directors for some 2 or 3 years before this little instrument of recognizing the worth of the human individual was brought into play. There is more than one way to make a man.

In 1938 while visiting a camp in the West I was conferred an honorary certificate of ability as a truck driver. I took this back to Washington with me, had it framed, and confess that I have displayed this more and discussed it at far greater length than I have concerned myself with other degrees that it has been my pleasure to receive. I promise, though, not to use this certificate in getting me a job.

These are not the type of degrees that hang on walls or rest in trunks to collect dust. These mean bread and butter jobs for their recipients. I am happy to note that this technique which inspired our little group when we drafted the present C. C. C. Act has been adopted in the setting up of recent defense vocational programs. It is indeed a step forward in our educational institutions.

We can, I suppose, also consider the successful passage of the George-Deen Act as a product of this depression period. Though this act was not passed until 1936, the ground work for its passage and the urge for its passage was prior to this date. This legislation supplemented earlier vocational education programs and permitted the recognition of the distributive occupations, and the public-service occupations in the scope of Federal aid.

I relate this historical data to you this morning to point out that it is not new for American education to be confronted with crushing challenges. What is important is that the American system has permitted a forthright and ingenious solution of the problems at hand. Every crisis for a free people presents a challenge to education. Whenever democracy meets such a challenge it arrives at its solution and offsets danger by thinking and working out the solution to the impending trouble. This process of thinking and working both require education if desirable results are to be achieved. In fact, the problems of this generation, in contrast to those of earlier days, are so complex and difficult that education alone is the preeminent factor to their solution. We know that today, for instance, with the continual hum of industrial activity and scientific revolution, that the field of education is the cornerstone upon which we must build and provides the path which we must follow if we are to arrive safely at our destination.

What then can we expect of education today? Due to the extreme gravity of our present national situation, I suppose that many would, by the token of our strides during previous periods of emergency, expect a veritable reformation or period of renaissance to take place. As a teacher, I can merely point out to you the record of our experience. How far shall we travel? Just as far as the ability of the University Extension Service can reach. If your mission is to carry the university directly to the people your responsibility is to meet every demand which the needs of your country shall make.

The Army and Navy's chief peacetime responsibility is to keep themselves so organized that almost overnight expansion for supreme effort is possible. Since training is essential to overcoming any emergency is it not the task of extension divisions to be the drafters of and the leaders in the university's extraordinary responsibility of furnishing the trained manpower for any demand the Nation may make? The country's most essential reserve is your responsibility. Will you carry on? I think you will. Have you the imagination to anticipate needs? I know you have; that you will serve, meet every demand, and seldom be thanked, is a foregone conclusion. If you expected reward you would not be in the extension service. [Laughter.]

You are to prepare others to receive rewards. The extension worker must do the impossible. Such factors as time, background, residence, social influences, preparation, educational sequences, campuses, equipment, are not for you. You must educate almost by fiat. The country orders, "Let there be 5,000 gas enginemen" and you go to work and there are 5,000 gas enginemen. It sounds like magic, but it is not. It is merely the most sensible system of practical education yet invented. The time, the place, and the circumstance form the stimuli. You merely feed your students to the utmost of their potential capacity. Individual training thus comes naturally and men grow as they can, not measured by semesters, credit hours, or graduation days, but by tests of proficiency. I am not criticizing standard educational habits and customs. I am not even comparing them. I am merely justifying what you must do and calling it good even when measured by educational terms.

No one can say how far we must go. We do know that in the months just ahead of us, freedom faces the greatest test confronting it since the days of Jefferson and Washington. Education, therefore, the guardian of freedom, faces its greatest challenge. We know that the previous gains that I have related to you have not been made by mere idleness. They are not just natural results which have developed as a byproduct, so to speak, from our having to face national issues. Instead, in most instances, they have played a large role in the solution of the problems themselves. Education must, therefore, raise its colors, and prepare to bravely face the problems ahead. If we are to succeed, we must have education on the march. Extension implies movement and action. Ordinarily persons go to college. Your duty is to take the college to persons. Your very mission is the Nation's greatest compliment to the country's very dependence upon education that I know of.

As I have indicated, I do not meet with you this morning to assume the role of an oracle. Instead, I come to you as one vitally interested in our plans for the future. It is through frank and open discussions that we are able to plan and formulate our major policies. I feel, therefore, when we have such meetings as this and exchange our views we have a healthy sign that we are taking hold of the situation before us. We have often heard that an ounce of experience is worth a pound of learning, or to put it another way, that experience is our best teacher, we should, therefore, as much as possible draw from our human experiences and act accordingly.

The existing emergency has been with us now for many months, and it now appears that it is getting worse before it is getting better. We have had during the past year an opportunity to get things started. Education leaders throughout the country have at various times asked themselves, "What can education do to help America in the crisis?"

More than 2 years ago preparations for an emergency had been made. An inventory of all the vocational schools and all the equipment for training to be found anywhere in the United States had been made. With the fall of France and the Lowlands there was an even greater awakening to the imminence of peril to our institutions, and on June 17,

1940, the day after France asked for an armistice, Congress had appropriated $15,000,000 to operate vocational schools throughout the summer. Four days after the signing of this bill by the President vocational schools throughout the country opened their doors for registration. By July 15, 2 weeks later, 30,000 citizens were enrolled and engaged in learning skills needed for defense industries. By August 15, 1 month later, enrollments totaled nearly 100,000 and placements in industry had already begun. This is a fact to be heeded for those who are inclined to say that democracy is slow. Here is an example of the swiftness with which democracy can meet a challenge.

As the crisis deepened, the need for more skilled workers became apparent and Congress again acted, adding $60,000,000 for a broadened program. Today, a little more than 10 months after the inception of this defense-training program, a great army of skilled workers has been graduated from our schools and colleges for the front line of democracy—the front line which today stands in the shops and factories of American industries.

You have all read and heard about the magnificent new army of soldiers which the United States has organized in record time. You have heard very little about this other army—this army of defense workers which has been trained in our schools. I wonder how many of you realize that more than a million citizens have been trained in the public schools for defense in 10 months, since July 1, 1940.

This army of men for defense industries is more than twice the size of the draft army at this time. By the end of June it will be nearly as large as the draft army, plus the National Guard, plus the Regular Army. In this industrial-defense army are men of all ages. Some women are entering the ranks. Many more will follow as the needs of industries grow. This army is education's answer to the call on America for trained workers to staff the arsenal of defense. In the battle for democracy, education can take pride for being early in the field. It is hoped that it can never be said in this crisis that American education arrived "too late with too little."

Let us contrast this situation with education's part in the last World War. I do not discount the part it played in 1917. To discount it would be to discount hours and hours and hours of my own efforts. But this contrast is made to show that all the gains we made in 1917 and 1919 have not been lost.

April 1917 found American education unprepared to meet the demands of the World War. The Smith-Hughes Act for vocational education had been passed only 2 months earlier. In the United States there were only a few good vocational schools established by certain cities and certain States. Therefore, training of workers had to go on within factories under conditions a good deal less than satisfactory. Perhaps that is one of the reasons that almost none of the tanks, almost none of our big guns or ships, and very few of our airplanes were completed in time for use in the last war.

After peace came, our cities and our States, with the aid of the Federal Government, began to build a real system of vocational education in the United States. They began to build large and well-equipped schools. They began to recruit and train capable teachers of vocational skills. They began to develop courses of study which would teach these complicated skills in the most expeditious and effective manner. They began to develop the administrative organization to operate a Nation-wide, but locally managed, system of vocational training. Thus, when the aggressor nations began to march in Europe, the United States found itself with vocational schools and equipment representing a total investment of $1,000,000,000. I outline this to you not to suggest that we are entirely prepared to handle the vocational problems presented by the present emergency but to show the tremendous gains that we have made since the last World War.

As far as the present situation is concerned, however I am afraid none of us realize the full scope of the responsibilities of our vocational educational program. If this war is to be fought not on the battle fronts but in the industrial plants of our Nation, then American industry is the first line of defense of democracy. The proper functioning of our industries depends on the skill and training of our industrial workers and managers. It is only through education that the skill and adequate training can be realized.

As I have said, education is, therefore, the cornerstone of our defense program. We cannot afford to have any educational bottlenecks. And we will not have as long as our Nation expands through and under the direction of our trained educators and educational directors.

In looking to the future, then, we see we have much to do. What are some of our other challenges? Let me suggest a few:

The first is education for health. I do not know whether you have been watching the draft-rejection figures, but I have. According to reports released by the United States Army, 40 percent of the young men called up for the draft are being rejected in preliminary and final physical examinations. This is two out of every five. It means that two out of every five men are not physically fit to defend their Nation.

Of course, these figures do not mean anything until you inquire into the nature of these physical defects. When you do you will find that dental defects rank very high as the major reason for preventing men serving their Nation. In fact, as we examine these figures it is clear that many of the physical disabilities might have been corrected by proper attention to health. This is in part the job of the schools. We cannot today correct the defects which prevent men serving their Nation, but we can begin now with a vigorous health education program which will make our present generation fit to meet the emergencies of the future. And, indeed, to serve efficiently in peace as well as in times of emergency.

In 1918 it became one of my tasks to help administer the interdepartmental social-hygiene work. The World War and the concentration of troops had taught us many sad things about our body politic and about the social life of our Nation. One of the saddest was the prevalence of venereal diseases. If you have ever tried to pioneer in the teaching of decent habits, something which people do not like to talk about, you will know the need of real educational training. Our papers would not print such words as "venereal." They would not talk about syphilis. Our churches would not let our doctors come into their localities. And so a great effort derived from a remarkable stimulus, backed by the vision of one of the greatest men who ever served as President of the United States—a man who understood the need of a trained citizenry—failed. We failed because the people, for some reason or other, refused to talk about those things they hated to have mentioned.

That is not the first time in the history of man that that has occurred. I trust, though, that it will be one of the last times, and the educators should see that it is the last time.

Jefferson said, "Let the truth be known," and he predicted that ultimately it would prevail if it were known.

There was an opportunity, there was a chance, and there was a failure. Are we going to have any more failures like the failure of the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board after the last war?

Reports which reach us from abroad pose another challenge to American education—a challenge related to health education. The aggressor nations have succeeded in a large part because their men are physically fit and they are physically fit because the nations have taken pains and have spent funds to make them physically fit from early youth.

And here we must compliment Germany, not only with a changed attitude toward education but also her bravery for teaching it. One of the greatest institutions in the world, a great museum in Dresden, for the teaching of the ills of social diseases and one of the most satisfying experiences that anyone could have who was at heart a real educator would be to go to this great institution and see boys and girls, not by the scores but by the hundreds, going together hand in hand learning about themselves and how to prevent getting terrible diseases.

Can American education develop a program to create physical fitness for all youth in the United States? Nutrition is another subject of national attention. Millions of Americans do not have the right kind of food or do not know how to select or prepare food satisfactorily. Here again is another challenge to education.

We have not considered the subject of home defense in the way the British have worked it out, for instance, but if we are to resort to such a defense program, it is clearly apparent that if communities are to be put in trim to handle such a program we need skilled workers and organizers—again we have education.

Lastly, I bring you a challenge that looks beyond the present emergency and yet perhaps the most important challenge of all to American education. It has been said of the first World War that "we won the war but lost the peace." We won the war because we knew how to bring together an army of men and machines to overcome an enemy. We lost the peace because we were not wise enough to create a system of cooperation among nations. We are paying now for our failures to be wise enough to win a peace. We have already appropriated $39,000,000,000 to remedy that error. We will appropriate many billions more. Every pocketbook will be affected by this failure of our people and the people of other nations to be intelligent and wise enough to work out a cooperative peace. Therefore, let us begin now to study the problems of postwar reconstruction. Democracy can and shall win this present contest with totalitarianism. Then will come the great problem of reconstructing the world. Wisdom of statesmen will not be enough to put the world together again on a sound basis. We know under our form of government that democracy can never be wiser than the people it serves.

It is the part of American education to help our citizens, young and old, explore the problems of peace in the modern world of power and swift communication. We have seen what the vocational schools are doing to train skilled hands. We have seen what the engineering universities and colleges have done to train technicians. If we are to move forward, we must meet our new problems with equal effectiveness.

With all of these challenges before us, and perhaps many more which time will not permit me to outline to you this morning, what are we as individuals going to do to meet them, and to combat these forces which threaten our way of life?

I have mentioned that we must be ingenious and ever alert to adapt ourselves to the ever-changing circumstances. That is important, because we know that whatever general formula we now attempt to prescribe it will perhaps not totally cover the problem of tomorrow.

But aside from our efforts as individuals, as individual school boards, and individual groups which comprise our great population, what concerted action can we take which will serve as an impetus to offset

these ills, and give us the machinery to adjust ourselves and tackle the job to be done?

I submit to you that the finest general program that can be launched to face this situation would be the passage of the new Federal aid to education bill which is now pending in the Senate of the United States.

This new bill is designed to abolish educational inequalities throughout our country. If we are to defend ourselves in this country we must do so unitedly. There is no place for favoritism at such a time as this in our national scheme. Think for a minute what a calamity it would be if draftees under our Selective Service Act should be paid $15 per month when recruited from one locality of our country, and say, $90 per month when coming from another. Of course, our national pride would not let us tolerate such a condition. Yes, in just another form those very conditions are being tolerated. It is our intent, therefore, through this legislation to build our educational foundations and to extend our educational base.

Recent decisions of the Supreme Court have so opened the way for this extension that we as educators will be derelict in our duties if we do not assume the new responsibilities presented to us by these decisions. The immediate problems of the dislocation of our school systems caused by the defense program and even earlier to some extent by the problem of our migratory workers is a real burden to our school systems in many areas. In some communities, for instance, the public school facilities are faced with taking care of three times as many children as they had before. As you can well appreciate, this presents an insurmountable problem unless an expansion of school facilities is undertaken.

As Governor McNutt, our Federal Security Administrator, stated: "We can defer building a road, a bridge, or a building, and catch up on its construction later. We cannot put educational opportunity for our children in cold storage for the duration of the war or even of a period of financial stress and restore it later to an unschooled generation grown old. These must go through life a lost generation poisoning the processes of popular thought, political action, economic prosperity, and the national defense with their ignorance, lack of skill, and undisciplined judgments."

As we love freedom, let us work to make freedom possible. We will keep our allegiance to democracy, that form of government suited to free men, only as long as it is efficient to the degree that we develop skill enough to make free men capable and able to run their society and run their own lives, and that ability depends in a large measure on the quality and spread of American education. By making education efficient, we can make democracy work.

America's Last Clear Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 13 (legislative day of Thursday, May 8), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. CLAUDE PEPPER, OF FLORIDA

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on February 20, 1941, on the subject America's Last Clear Chance.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow countrymen, there is in the law a famous doctrine called the last clear chance. This means that in certain cases the law fixes legal responsibility, say, for an automobile accident, upon the party who had the last clear chance to avoid the injury done and failed to do so. The lend-lease bill now pending before the Senate and nearing passage, happily, could well be described as America's last clear chance to keep war out of the Americas.

Secretary Stimson, in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in response to a question I asked as to whether this were not our alternative to having this war strike us, used the homely but expressive phrase, "It's the last call for lunch, it seems to me."

The American people do not have to be told any more about the kind of a war this is; about what the objectives of the dictators are; about whether we are menaced by their threats or in the line of their conquest. For the American people already know these things as clearly and have pondered them as deeply as I. The polls of American opinion, the evidences of sentiment which come to Washinton in all of the myriad modern ways, leave us no doubt in our mind as to what the decision of the American people is about this struggle and the degree to which we are affected by it.

With a patriotic singleness of purpose, our people have made up their minds that the heroic British nation and British Navy are the iron bars which alone keep the dictatorial beasts from leaping at us from the Continent of Europe, with the collusion and the collaboration of the lustful and lust-hungry Empire of the Rising Sun. We know that even now, this minute, the Axis Powers in Europe and Asia are set for the spring, their muscles tense, their green eyes intensely watching for the psychological moment to make a universal assault upon our world frontiers.

Imaginative writers, many times, have contemplated some ultimate day when the hundreds of millions of the yellow men would pour down upon the white. History records that dictators out of the east in days past, rode their ponies as far as central Europe, and that more than once the pagan has almost established his mastery over the western world. But this is the first time in history when the powerful nations of the non-English speaking world, Occident and Orient, have thrown their evil lot together to conquer the English-speaking people of the earth. Without quite being aware of it, I am afraid, the English-speaking world now stands with its back to the wall against a hostile non-English-speaking world.

We are no match in a land war for our enemies. The geographical distribution of the English-speaking peoples is such that the only way the enemy can reach us is by obtaining the mastery of the seas. Only, therefore, upon the maintenance of our supremacy on the oceans can we remain secure; can we be safe against their assault. Only by the maintenance of our supremacy upon the seas can we remain world powers, keeping open the sea lanes of world trade, and retaining our contact with one another.

Ours is strategically both a defensive and an offensive position. We want no world territory. We aim at the conquest of no other land or people. We do not want more ground than we have. We do not seek a single resource, however strategic or critical it may be, save in the ordinary and honorable commercial way. We would not if we could, therefore, attack any other country or join issue with any other land power for the mastery of their soil, but we do expect also to be let alone in our lands. We expect others to do unto us as they would have us do unto them. In a military sense, then, the world knows that our only purpose is to act defensively—to save ourselves from any enemy who would come to take our homes away from us.

But in a peaceful sense the logic of our position requires an affirmative strategy. The whole English-speaking world is supported upon the basis of a world-wide relationship. We trade with every country, and all trade with us. We draw our materials, strategic and critical, from the ends of the earth, and we open up our storehouses in fair exchange with the wide world.

In order to maintain this position, therefore, the English-speaking world must keep open the trade routes upon the seas. We must keep the highwayman and brigand from closing those highways or levying tribute upon the travelers, like the highwaymen or the pirates of the past. Moreover, the ports of the world and the markets of the world must not be closed to us. There must be a fair and free opportunity for men to do business with us and for us to do business with the world upon satisfactory terms. There must be, therefore, a medium in which our world business may be carried on and the kind of a world in which honest trade may live. This contemplates, of course, respect for obligation and the pledged word, and the game of business being carried on without either party packing a gun or having a stiletto in his sleeve.

Furthermore, our kind of a world of necessity contemplates for the whole race a free play of ideas, freedom of the mind, and an international science and culture so that each individual or nation shall have its part in moving forward the pegs of human progress

That kind of a world is to the English-speaking people the very oxygen of life. We cannot be what we are and live in a different world.

In a peculiar and a very real sense, therefore, the life of the English-speaking world trembles under the most severe assault in its whole history.

The lease-lend bill is but a part of our national defense. It contemplates the preservation of the most strategic frontiers of the English-speaking world by the maintenance of the British Nation and the British Navy. The integrity of both are imperatively essential to the continuity of the English-speaking world as we now know it. They are the very right arm of our way of life in the world. We cannot alone keep safe our frontiers, even our own, keep open the sea lanes of world trade, determine the character of world currency and commerce and the standards of world morality, assure any possibility of a world culture.

As a matter, therefore, of the strictest national security, upon the age-old principle of self-defense, we are resolved to put every possible weapon in the hands of our heroic brethren of the English-speaking world; to give them all possible moral support, to strengthen the sinews of their resistance in every way within the genius and enterprises of our own power. We have chosen this bill as the method by which that shall be accomplished.

The Congress lays down the policy and the President executes that policy. The details—the manner in which British purchases are coordinated with our own acquisitions; the circumstances under which our yards become places of repair for British ships; the instances which require the communication of secret information, which is a necessary part of certain weapons we may sell; the terms and the conditions upon which the British may buy and the character and quantity of the consideration to be paid by them, when conditions may require that we let them have some of our own accumulated materials. All these are of course put in the only hands

in which they could be handled—the hands of the President.

But the policy remains in the hands of the Congress where it should be. It is the Congress which confers the powers granted by the bill. It is the Congress which by the clear provisions of the bill may take them back by a simple majority vote at any time. It is the Congress which limits the quantity of materials on hand of which the President may dispose and appropriates every dollar that may make possible any new materials to be sold and every penny of any contract for materials into which the President may enter.

To appease the critics and the skeptical we have even expressly stated what everyone knew anyhow, that the bill conferred no new power upon the President to convoy our ships and gave no authority for American merchant vessels to enter zones of warfare. And as a further concession the bill expressly recites what everyone knows would have happened anyway, that before the President disposes of any materials we have on hand he must consult with the Chief of Staff of the Army or the Chief of Operations of the Navy, or both.

Where, then, is this dangerous weakening of our own defense that some feign to see? For every student of modern warfare knows that it is not what a nation has on hand that so much determines its strength in materials as what its industrial system is geared to produce. Long ago when we proposed to lift the arms embargo some said that that would weaken our own defense, but we know that factories established with Allied funds, the industries brought into high productive efficiency with Allied purchases have given us a flow of materials available at any time for our own use, partially or completely, which immeasurably magnifies our strength.

Of course, weapons are most needed at the front, which is under the most severe attack. So long as the heroic British air force and the British Navy live in their virile strength, Hitler is too much occupied in Europe to be able to do much about us. But let them fall or, what is possible in this queer world, let them be added to the strength against us, and all that we have let them have, all that we possess, and all that we could make would not begin to be enough.

Where is this fancied dictatorship, when the Congress holds the reins of the power it has conferred, while the President carries the load like a willing horse? What executive has ever achieved tyranny when the people's representatives held the purse strings for every dollar spent? Of course, there are some who think that if a free people become strong they have lost their freedom. I venture to say that, on the contrary, in this day only by becoming strong can a free people retain their freedom.

In the World War, in the Civil War, in every great emergency we have ever had, the Congress conferred upon the Executive the power necessary to meet the emergency; and when the emergency passed, the Congress and the people reclaimed the power without the loss of a single civil liberty.

It is a bad time for democracy to lose confidence in itself and to become suspicious of its own prerogatives. Never more than now did conditions demand that democracy clear its decks for action—bold, intelligent, effective action. The dictators have no division in their strength; no disunity in their attack. A free people must not be coerced into unity and dragged into compliance. They must come eagerly together in common council and in common concert, chart their course, charge their leaders, coordinate their efforts, and so build a single spirit of unity and resistance that e pluribus unum becomes a fact and not a slogan.

In a new spirit let us hasten on together like a well-disciplined athlete to our place in the hard-pressed ranks of freemen.

Against Involvement in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 13 (legislative day of Thursday, May 8), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at a mass meeting of the American Mothers of Massachusetts in Boston Commons on Sunday, May 11, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A century and a half ago our forefathers stood here in Massachusetts on Bunker Hill and successfully demonstrated their determination to defend our Nation against the aggression of a great European power. To the powers of Europe they said, "We of America are united in defense. We want no part of European imperialism and constant war making, and we tell you to stay on your own side of the Atlantic Ocean."

Today you are gathered here in Boston Common to demonstrate your determination that this Nation shall be united for defense against any European power that should be so foolhardy as to attempt to trespass on American soil, and to demonstrate your determination that we shall not lose our democracy on the home front by launching ourselves into the long-drawn-out, costly struggle now raging in Europe, Asia, and Africa.

There are those who say that this policy is a policy of appeasement. Our forefathers did not regard that policy as such. Our forefathers did not participate in wars all over the world at the request of the British Empire. They did not join the Spanish armada against Great Britain, or the British fleet against Spain, but, whenever either of those countries came to attack us, our forefathers successfully defended America against them. We can do it again and again and again if necessary. And that goes for Hitler.

In the few years before the European war broke out Great Britain contributed to the rearmament program of Hitler to the tune of $3,000,000,000, and at a time when she was repudiating her debt to America. Now she is spending her millions in this country in a gigantic propaganda effort to sell us on the proposition that we can benefit by going through the same steps that we did when we went into the last war.

There are those in this country who seek to intimidate the American people by saying that we cannot defend ourselves against Hitler if he ever is so rash as to attempt to cross not the English Channel, but the whole Atlantic Ocean in an endeavor to conquer us. With trembling voices they suggest that Hitler might be able to conquer America if he is successful in conquering Great Britain and, overcoming the obstacles of famine and disease and economic ruin which will inevitably follow in the path of the European war, overcome a tremendous "fifth column" against him in the conquered countries of Europe, be able to hold these people down and at the same time, leaving a suspicious Russia at his back door, start out on a costly venture to cross the ocean in a doubtful attempt to conquer a well-defended, well-equipped powerful Nation of 130,000,000 indomitable, red-blooded Americans.

To these defeatists I say that we of America are 130,000,000 strong with an indomitable will to defend the home front, with a productive capacity greater than that of all Europe combined. To these defeatists I say that we can and will build up our Army and Navy and productive capacity to such an extent that no nation or combination of nations will dare to set foot on the Western Hemisphere. To these defeatists I say that if that attempt is ever made, we of America will fight as a united people.

Since I introduced the resolution against convoys I have received more than 19,000 letters from all over the country. More than 95 percent of these people are unalterably opposed to any attempt by the President to break his pledge to the American people. These letters come from people in all walks of life. Most of them are the plain people of America. All of them express a unity for national defense.

One of these comes from one who has been working for years with the young people of the country, and I believe that he expresses their sentiments when he writes:

"DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Let me thank you personally for your commendable efforts to keep the United States out of further involvement in the European conflagration. Please carry on. Our people must see the light before it is too late. I wish I could aid and encourage you in this vital endeavor, but I am afraid that my powers in that respect are very limited.

"Without questioning the conscientiousness or patriotism of those who think otherwise, I am one of the millions of individuals who believe that it will be a deadly, tragic, foolhardy, impracticable, and possibly suicidal blunder if the United States becomes actively engaged in the European holocaust, even to the extent of convoying war materials. The theory that we can engage in this war to a limited extent is ridiculous and inconsistent with the lessons of history and the processes of human nature. An attempt to do so will promptly engulf us to the limits of manpower and material resources in a struggle which, in all probability, will last for years and lead to nothing but terror, butchery, impoverishment, and the near extermination of everyone concerned.

"Our leaders have no right to gamble further with the lifeblood and, indeed, the very existence of our Nation. Let us arm America to the teeth and defend our own hemisphere to the death, but, in order to do so, let us conserve our resources for these purposes instead of dissipating them all over the face of the globe in a mad and fantastic crusade to police and reform the world. The American people do not want to enter this war.

"Yours sincerely,

"CARL B. SNAVELY,

"Coach of Football, Cornell University."

He who has for years been building up the character of young American manhood knows their thoughts.

Another letter received only yesterday is from a young man serving in the United States Army, and reads as follows:

"I was conscripted on Thursday last and, temporarily assigned to Camp Upton. I have made it a point to converse with men who are fellow 'draftees.' I find they are all agreed on this one salient point. They realize it is their sacred duty to defend the United States, but they are emphatically opposed to being flung to the far corners of the earth to defend the British Empire and foist democracy on people who never had it and who never wanted it. The men whom I have talked to all feel thankful that we have leaders in the Congress who are taking an active part as advocators of no convoys and no

A. E. F. Please continue your fight for truth against the small minority that controls the powerful instruments of propaganda in this country. Please don't fail us. Don't let us boys down in this crucial moment.

"Sincerely yours,

"JAMES J. LEDWITH,
"Camp Upton, Long Island."

The final letter I read to you is from a World War veteran.

"DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: May the mighty God bless you men who are fighting to defend the people of the country against the warmongers who are pushing us into the carnage of hell now raging in Europe. I am one of the boys who fought for democracy in the freedom of small nations in the A. E. F., 1917–19. What a joke. I was wounded and in the dead pile for about 9 hours until I was able to drag myself along the ground back to a dressing station. All for democracy, of course. Isn't it too bad that the warmongers could not have a little real war experience in the front line after zero hour. I often wonder how men of your type feel about those supposed-to-be Americans who are always ready to put the welfare and prosperity of a foreign empire above our own beloved America.

"Yours sincerely,

"JOHN NEVILLE,
"The Bronx, New York."

Fellow Americans, there is abundant evidence that the people of America are overwhelmingly opposed to our being launched into the war. Today you have turned out in thousands to demonstrate this. This mass meeting, under the sponsorship of the American Mothers, is but one of similar Mother's Day meetings being held in the larger cities throughout the country. The Mothers of America are being organized for effective work to let the President and the Congress know in no uncertain terms that they intend to hold him to his oft-repeated pledges to keep the people of America out of the war.

I now raise a question which I know is on your hearts, and when I have stated the question let me hear your answer. The question is this, and I hope that the President is listening to this broadcast: Is it fair and honest to the people of America for the President to broadcast to the millions of citizens just before election, I quote, "I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again, and again, your boys are not going to be sent to any foreign war.", end of quotation. And then, after the people have acted upon his assurance and had their hopes built up, to plunge them into the war? I ask you that question. Give the President your answer.

I say that the American people are going to hold the President to his promises.

Only a few days ago an administration spokesman stood on his feet in the Congress and said that there is an overwhelming cry in the country for convoys, despite the statement of the President that convoys mean shooting and shooting means war. Where does this cry come from? Does it come from the farmers of the soil? Does it come from the workmen in the shops? Does it come from the homes of America? No; it does not. Rather it comes from the propaganda mills of the British Empire.

And speaking of convoying, the President's spokesmen in the House and Senate urged passage of the lend-lease bill on the grounds that it was the best means of keeping the United States out of the war. Since they have achieved their purpose in getting the bill passed, they have cried out that we must convoy in order to get our lend-lease goods to the shores of Britain, despite the statement of the President that convoys mean shooting and shooting means war for the American people. And in making this appeal they have said that 40 percent of the ships carrying our lend-lease goods are being sunk on the Atlantic Ocean.

This past Wednesday, Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an official letter which he had received from Admiral Land, Chief of the Maritime Commission, which advised that during January, February, and March of this year, 205 vessels cleared from the United States to Great Britain, and of this 205 only 8, or 4 percent, were sunk.

These official figures were available to the President and to his Cabinet members, and yet for the past several weeks they have concealed them from the people while their spokesmen have been urging convoys. Why has not the President been frank and honest with the people on this issue?

In September 1939, in a broadcast to the millions of Americans, the President said, "You are, I believe, the most enlightened and best-informed people in all the world at this moment. You are subjected to no censorship of news, and I want to add that your Government has no information that it has any thoughts of withholding from you."

Words, words, words, meaningless words, coming from the lips of the President of the United States. The American people are not children. They have been promised the truth. Why was it not given to them? This situation about the withholding of the true figures on ship sinkings reveals the means they have been using to steal the minds of the American people in this matter of war or peace.

First they said we should lend, lease, and give the goods to England. Now they say that it is useless to lend, lease, and give our vital war materials to England if they are to be sunk en route, and that we therefore must go a step further and convoy. If they get away with that, the next argument will be that it is no use getting the war materials to England if there are not sufficient men there to use them, and that therefore we must send our American boys to the British Isles to man the weapons.

In its fight to launch the American people into the war against their will the administration is adopting means which are breaking down democracy here in America—methods which are undermining the faith of the American people in their own government, methods which are denying to the American people one of the very freedoms that the President professes he will enforce everywhere in the world. I refer specifically to the freedom of speech. But what the President insists upon is a one-way freedom of speech. A one-way freedom of speech is not freedom, it is not American, it is not democratic. If the people of America must first find out what is in the mind of the President and then speak his mind and nothing else, what are we to claim as a distinction between our brand of dictatorship and that of Hitler?

Let the administration's spokesmen mislead the American people on the amount of ship losses and you have what the administration calls "freedom of speech"; but let Col. Charles A. Lindbergh speak his honest convictions and give the facts that he knows and you have what the President calls the remarks of a "Copperhead."

This past Friday, on the Senate floor, I made an address in which I referred to a report of April 29th by the United Press which quoted in part the remarks of Senator PEPPER, of Florida, when he made an address to a regional conference of southern Democratic women leaders. The following statement of Senator PEPPER was read on the floor of the Senate, I quote "The people of the country have kept the Congress from impeaching the President for what he has already done in connection with the European war." To my knowledge, this is the first time that an administration member of the United States Senate has publicly stated that the Congress has a desire to impeach the President for his activities in connection with the European war. What was on the mind of Senator PEPPER when he made that interesting observation? The United Press further quoted the Senator from Florida, as follows: I quote, "Congress is paralyzed. It doesn't know what to do. It is afraid of what it must do."

Fellow Americans, I am not as much of an expert as Senator PEPPER on the question of the attitude of Congress on the subject of impeachment of the President because of what he has done in connection with the European war, but I do know this: That the millions of plain American people, by their letters to the President and to the Congress, have been an effective check-rein on the administration which is bent on launching us into the war.

It is time for the leaders of this Nation to build up the Army and Navy for defense of this hemisphere. The warmongers say that the people of America are too weak to defend this hemisphere. I say that the American people can match Hitler plane for plane and ship for ship and that the American people can and will successfully defend this hemisphere if Hitler ever dares to attempt to set foot over here. That would call for sacrifice and hard work but our pioneers are proof that the American people, as a unit, can overcome any obstacle on the home front when there is a task to be performed.

A man who saw active naval service during the World War and who is still in the Navy recently wrote to me and said, I quote, "I am too much of an American ever to say as the warmongers do that the British Fleet has been protecting our shores for over 100 years. What an insult to us boys of the Navy. There is only one Navy that ever did or ever will protect our shores and that is the American Navy."

Fellow citizens, I deplore the defeatist attitude of the interventionists who say that America cannot defend this hemisphere.

It has come to be an aphorism that the only lesson we learn from experience is that we learn nothing from experience. Back in 1917 the propagandists sold us on the argument that, regardless of the cost in money and lakes of blood, that would be a war to end wars (which it was not), that by our participation we would make the world safe for democracy and that the European countries would be forever grateful to the people of the United States for our participation. We went the whole way—billions of dollars were spent and the American people were taxed to repay those billions. Thousands of casualties resulted and we brought upon ourselves a terrific depression which resulted in long relief lines and unemployment.

If the warmongers are successful we will enter into a long-drawn-out struggle. Great Britain has an army of approximately two and one-half million men. Germany alone has an army of six and one-half million men. The military experts are agreed that a physical invasion of Europe would have to be made to accomplish the defeat of Hitler. The extra men to support the British Army would have to come from the homes of America. It would require an expeditionary force many times greater than the one we sent to Europe in 1917 and under much greater hazards. The cost in bloodshed, money and privation, and years of struggle would be immeasurable. Let it be remembered that once we get into the war, we will have to fight to the very end. Let it be remembered that war cannot be repealed; that bankruptcy cannot be repealed and that the dead cannot return home.

After the war is over, whether we are victorious or unsuccessful in our venture, there will be nothing left but poverty and ruin,

famine and disease. Then there will be a movement in all of the ruined nations for an enforced program of sharing the poverty equally, some degenerated form of communism to be based on general ruin and general despair. The war-gutted nations will not be able to resist such a movement after having shot away their very substance.

I have been severely criticized by some for not throwing my influence behind the drive for intervention. In taking my stand against involvement I am acting in accordance with my honest convictions, and no man should be asked to do otherwise.

A short time ago I received a letter from a professor at Dartmouth College which said: "I am surprised that you do not follow such intellectual leaders as President Hopkins, of Dartmouth, and Conant, of Harvard." I replied as follows: "Why don't you follow the intellectual leadership of such men as President McCracken, of Vassar College, President Hutchins, of the University of Chicago, and such spiritual leadership as that of William Cardinal O'Connell and Harry Emerson Fosdick?"

Only a few months ago a thoughtful appeal was made by William Henry Chamberlin, correspondent in Europe and Asia for the Christian Science Monitor since 1922, who said: "Let America's destiny be to keep bright the flame of civilization which was lit in Europe and which is now apparently going out there. Let us keep clear of adventurous crusades, which, after wasting our lives and property, will inevitably end in futility and disillusionment. Let us be strong for the preservation of peace in our own hemisphere, in the regions where we can reasonably hope to make our military, naval, and economic strength decisive. Let us shut our ears to the barrage of conscious and unconscious propaganda that will play on us with increasing force as Europe's death gamble becomes more and more desperate. Let us remember that by every Christian, democratic standard every individual American life is sacred and precious, to be sacrificed only if our own security is threatened; not to be thrown away in the interest of foreign powers. And let us never forget that the surest road to fascism, to communism, to every form of the brutalitarian state is through war."

Fellow citizens, make no mistake about it, the interventionists from the President's Cabinet on down have picked out the foreign fields on which the young manhood of America will die. They will be sent to die in Europe, in Africa, in eastern and western Asia, in the extremities of the Pacific Ocean, in every part of the Atlantic Ocean, in the Mediterranean and Red Seas, in the Suez Canal, in the Adriatic and Caspian Seas, in the Dardanelles and Bosporus Straits, in the Strait of Gibraltar, in the English Channel, in the North Sea, the Baltic Sea, and in the Indian Ocean, far, far away from America. This, in the name of defense.

If you have any doubt of the President's designs listen to the words of William Cardinal O'Connell. I quote, "I hope that this country stays out of war. I know the people want to stay out but the Government seems to ignore their wishes while still talking of democracy. * * * The trust of the people in their Government is a dangerous thing to toy with. There is a distinct feeling that things are going on behind the scenes unknown to the people. This is a sort of distrust that brought about revolution in Europe, the distrust of the people in their governments."

Cardinal O'Connell's views were reechoed only a few days ago by Archbishop Michael J. Curley, of Baltimore and Washington, who said, "I predict that our economic structure will collapse and that inflation will come to this country just as surely as it came to Germany if we get into this war.

"War is not glorious. Wars are not fought by men in swivel chairs. It is the common people who are dying today, who are suffering, and being blown to bits. * * * A fearful pressure is being brought to bear upon our country to send our vessels to Europe. What I don't like to see coming is our boys manning ships to fight and go down to the bottom of the ocean. * * *

"We gained nothing in the last war. Nor did we make the world safe for democracy. We only helped lay the foundation for future wars."

On this day, which is being observed throughout the Nation, I appeal to you to join in the Nation-wide movement of the people of America in opposition to our entering the war. I know that everyone here joins with me in the prayer that our next Mother's Day will not be a day of heartache and sorrow. In joining with this movement against involvement in the war you are in the company of millions of your fellow Americans. Were it not for the letters you are writing every day to your Senators and Representatives in the Congress and to the President the youth of our country would already be on their way to the far seas and to the foreign soil of Asia, Africa, and Europe.

Next week, in the Senate, I shall introduce my anticonvoy resolution as an amendment to the ship-seizure bill and will demand a roll-call vote in order that the people of America will have an opportunity to know which of their Representatives in the Senate are willing to disregard the will of the people on an issue which is a matter of life or death to the American boys. I measure my words when I say that the vote on that anticonvoy amendment will be a war vote. It will be a vote to decide whether the United States shall enter the war or stay out.

Your Senator WALSH has a long and consistent record against involvement in the war. I am advised that your Senator LODGE has expressed himself as opposed to convoys. I know that you will not fail to express your appreciation to your Senators and will not fail to let your Congressmen know how you, the people, feel on this crucial issue.

Do you, the people, want war? Listen to the words of Senator D. WORTH CLARK who, in an historic address on the floor of the United States Senate, said, "People of America, all of you will love war at first, but when the heartless shells begin to scatter the bodies of your boys amidst the yellow mud of some European or Asiatic battlefield, you will not love it quite so much. When the long streams of coffins start to roll into your homes, if there is anything left to put in coffins, then you will know something about the love of war. When the crippled and the maimed and the insane begin once more to fill new and hungry hospitals, and you have to close your eyes rather than look upon the horror of the thing, then you will have some idea of war. And when for the next 100 years you and your children and your children's children begin to toil and sweat and grub to pay back the billions and billions which are being so carelessly tossed away to preserve the financial and the far-flung empires of the world, then you will not like war. When the democracy which you sought to save abroad has vanished at home, when the freedoms of today are but misty memories, when the Government has taken over the railroads, the radio, the utilities, the newspapers, and other forms of public expression; when labor is conscripted and the farmers regimented, then, people of America, you may, amidst your blood and your tears, have some faint glimpse of modern war. What a ghastly hangover it will be."

South Atlantic Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 13 (legislative day of Thursday, May 8), 1941

ARTICLE BY GEN. DAVID P. BARROWS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "South Atlantic Defense," written by former President David P. Barrows, of the University of California. Dr. Barrows is also major general of the Army of the United States, retired. He has been both my general and my university president. I am proud to be able to say that.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the California Monthly of May 1941]

SOUTH ATLANTIC DEFENSE

DR. DAVID P. BARROWS [1] EXPLAINS WHY DAKAR IS VITAL TO AMERICA

In their concern over the progress of the World War and of the future defense of this country, the American people are overlooking the importance of the South Atlantic Ocean. The points of present strain and danger are, first, the lines of communication across the North Atlantic, the lines on which American commerce has mainly rested, the lines which give us as a people the closest ties with nations of common heritage and common culture, the lines that are essential if Great Britain is to continue to be the main opponent of the Axis revolution; the second dangerous situation which absorbs anxious attention is the eastern Mediterranean; and the third is the South China Sea and Malaysia. While American interests and American safety depend upon British military success in all of these theaters of operation, there is another area vital to our policy if we are effectively to defend the southern continent of this hemisphere.

This hemispheric defense has now become a settled resolution, perhaps the most important and definite resolution, in the American mind. Its defense is not an easy problem, or at least will not be an easy problem if the Axis Powers consolidate their European victory. The great effort which the German armed forces, together with the Italian, are now making to destroy British resistance in the eastern Mediterranean necessarily suspends active operations at the other or western end of this great sea. But if Great Britain can be shattered in the

[1] The author, David Prescott Barrows, 1895, professor of political science and chairman of the department at Berkeley, needs no introduction to readers of California Monthly because for a number of years he conducted The World We Live In, a monthly department of comment on world affairs. Dr. Barrows is particularly well informed in matters military, for he is State commander and major general, retired, of the California National Guard.

Aegean and driven from Egypt, the next offensive blow may be at the other end of the Mediterranean directed against the Straits of Gibraltar, the seizure of the French protectorate over Morocco and the west coast of Africa. There is reason to believe, now, that the main and final blow against Great Britain by German force will not be undertaken until England is entirely cut off from her overseas allies and supplies. To do this, German might must not only effectually cripple the transport of the North Atlantic and extinguish all British movement through the Mediterranean and the Red Sea, but must also threaten, if not destroy, the sea transport around the Cape of Good Hope into the Indian Ocean and to Australasia. This would make effectual the complete blockade of Great Britain.

Under certain circumstances this action may become the easiest adventure upon which Hitler's strategy has yet ventured. The special circumstances which would make it easy are two. First, a collapse of the resistance of the government at Vichy to giving the Axis military assistance. We do not know how close this collapse may be. We are told that the policy in the minds of Admiral Darlan, of Pierre Laval, and of others who share their position, is one of full cooperation with Germany "short of war." They seem convinced of the inevitability of British defeat, German triumph, and a recovery of French nationality only through the benevolence of Hitler. Marshal Petain has stood out stoutly and gallantly for observance of the French-German armistice conditions, which delivered France from the humiliation of aiding in the warfare against her late ally, Great Britain, but Petain may be undermined and silenced. The attitude of General Weygand, who commands the French forces in Algeria and Morocco, is undisclosed, but it is pretty evident what Hitler is trying to secure from France, and if he can secure French North Africa and French West Africa, the consolidation of German power on the north and west coasts of this continent should be relatively easy, provided that, as a second circumstance, the American people were to remain indifferent to his undertaking.

The westernmost point of Africa is Cape Verde, discovered and named by the Portuguese long before the voyage of Columbus. Immediately under this cape lies the important town and harbor of Dakar. It is perhaps the best and most important commercial harbor on the west coast of Africa. It has great fueling facilities for the four steamship lanes that converge upon it from the British Channel, from the eastern coast of the United States, from the Rio La Plata and Rio de Janeiro, and from Cape Town.

Dakar has grown into a great port of export and of call. The French have added in recent years to its development as a harbor, but in addition to its commercial importance, Dakar has a strategic value of the greatest interest to the American people. It is the closest port or possible naval base and air base to the American Hemisphere. It is the starting point for all judicious air flights across the South Atlantic to South America. Dakar, and indeed the whole of the vast governor-generalcy of French West Africa, is in the hands of officials and forces subservient to the Government at Vichy. Some months ago British naval vessels attempted to land at Dakar a Free French force under General de Gaulle, who apparently had been deceived into the belief that he and his corps would receive there a friendly welcome. They were met by gunfire which damaged at least one British fighting ship and drove the convoy party away from their undertaking. This hostile and decisive fire seems to have been generally attributed to French war vessels in the harbor at Dakar, but I think there was another factor of importance in the British repulse—namely, the island of Goree.

The writer spent a week in Dakar years ago when entering Africa on a visit to Timbuctoo, and he visited this citadel. May I be permitted to quote from the account of that African trip, Berbers and Blacks:

"The famous island of Goree is only a thousand meters long. It is quite solidly built over by substantial houses with long galleries and arcades and by fortifications that date from the past centuries when Goree's importance was notable. Toward the sea the island rises in a bluff, with steep descending cliffs upon which the surf breaks endlessly. At this high end of the island is the famous fortress of St. Michel. It is a well-equipped coast defense, and is garrisoned by a small detachment of French artillerists. At the foot of the bluff, mingled with the rocks and seaweed, I counted no less than 14 ancient iron cannon, with their discarded gun carriages. They were really of great size and with calibers of perhaps 8 inches. They had been tumbled over the precipice to make place for modern armament in this fortress which had guarded the settlement for centuries."

It is to be presumed that it was heavy gunfire from this citadel of St. Michel that repelled the British ships and de Gaulle's expedition. If German engineers secure possession of this point they can mount defensive fortifications on Goree and on the contiguous mainland around Dakar that might well make this locality as impregnable as the island of Helgoland.

In the writer's own mind there is no doubt but that this is a part of the Axis plan of world domination, for here could be created an indestructible naval base, and behind this port is an unlimited area adapted to air bases. A map and a pair of calipers will demonstrate to anyone how such a sea and air base would dominate the great eastern projection of South America and the coast of Brazil, all of which are within the radius of effective action of not only a naval fleet but of present-day air bombers.

However, this is not quite all. Off this coast of Africa and still closer to South America is the Portuguese possession of the Cape Verde Islands. This wind-swept, rather desolate archipelago, inhabited largely by colored folk, contains, nevertheless, what I think neither the Canary Islands nor even the Azores possess—namely, deep harbors, capable of forming bases for battle fleets. The best of these harbors seems to be that of Sao Vicente. If this country intends to maintain the protection that it already has declared over South America, it must never allow Dakar or the Cape Verde Islands to come into the possession of a power that we fear.

The effective protection of the South Atlantic depends upon two things—both of them in American possession: First, a powerful naval and air base somewhere on the eastern projection of Brazil; and, second, bases, both at Dakar and the Cape Verde Islands, capable of resisting hostile attacks from an aggressive enemy.

This matter at any time may become an urgent one. If we act in time, the south Atlantic and the Southern Hemisphere will be secure. Our military need may not be a series of fortified bases all along the coasts of South America. This probably would be unnecessary, and it would certainly be impolitic. For even if the people of these South American countries should permit us to spend money for their defense, such fortifications in our hands eventually would be regarded as so many little Gibraltars. One single base on the east coast of Brazil would presumably secure the whole, if balanced by something comparable on the West Coast of Africa.

These two points from which action could be taken would threaten any hostile force moving into this part of the ocean. If, however, raiding vessels got through this powerful oceanic line of defense and a more southerly base of operations were required, this could doubtless be obtained from the British in the Falkland Islands. These latter islands lie off the coast of Argentina and were probably secured by the British something over a hundred years ago, because, equipped with sea power, they control the Cape Horn route and the Straits of Magellan. It will be recalled that here, in the opening months of the World War, the German fleet, under Admiral von Spee, having annihilated the British Pacific squadron off the coast of Chile, met the fleet that had been promptly dispatched from Great Britain to the Falklands, and which annihilated the fleet of von Spee.

These seem to the writer to be the essential elements in the defense of the South Atlantic and the protection of South America from Axis disintegration and conquest. With all the regard and affection that can be felt for these South American republics, they are, nevertheless, a set-up for the propaganda, the intrusion, and ultimate control of the Hitler movement. They can be secured, one by one, and, if undefended, will be, until the menace of German power overhangs the Caribbean.

The American people find themselves in a new situation, a situation in which are gone the old defense mechanisms which happily protected us for so long—the European balance of power and the predominance in the Atlantic of the fleet of a country that had ceased to compete with us for political influence in the New World, namely, Great Britain. As a people we have yet to learn to think straightforwardly about our situation and to develop the will to act quickly and decisively in the face of danger which already menaces us but can still be controlled.

The War Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 13 (legislative day of Thursday, May 8), 1941

CORRESPONDENCE WITH HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. Alfred E. Stearns, headmaster emeritus of Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass., and my reply thereto.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION COUNCIL, INC.,
New York City, May 2, 1941.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: As an old friend, and one who for many years has valued highly that friendship and who has always held you in the highest esteem, it hurts a bit to write you what I feel compelled to say at this critical time.

Your deep interest in youth and its problems early touched a responsive cord in my heart. The confidence you reposed in me when you were Governor of New Hampshire

is still a prized memory. You will forgive me, then, I am sure, and in view of the added fact that however strongly I must disagree with you at this time, I do not now question any more than I have done in the past your absolute sincerity.

To me, it is simply inconceivable that any thoughtful man can fail to realize that whether we desire it or not the present World War is our war as much as it is that of England and her few remaining Allies. My deep regret is that we did not long ago frankly admit this fact and take our stand openly where we properly belong. Such an act on our part would have meant infinitely more to a stricken world, and perhaps even more to our own country. And it would doubtless have saved, as well, untold human suffering and countless human lives. Hide our heads as we may, we cannot escape this hideous octopus which even now is extending its sticky tentacles to this hemisphere. To restrict in any way our aid to England at this critical moment, when that brave country faces exhaustion, and the result of its heroic sacrifices for us as well as for itself seems to me the extreme of blind folly and ignorance. The question of whether or not we send our boys outside of this country is wholly beside the point. The real question is whether or not we propose to take our proper part in this titanic struggle where the issues between right and wrong, truth and falsehood, decency and brutality, spiritual idealism and avowed godlessness are more clearly drawn than they have ever been before in the world's long history; where brute force deliberately undertakes to destroy all those spiritual values in life which we have come to place above everything else, and by which alone man is able to rise to those levels for which his Creator bids him strive. That question calls for but one answer. Further, whatever we do now can only mean the lessening of those sacrifices in both blood and treasure which sooner or later we must inevitably face. We gain nothing by delay—more likely, we shall lose all.

A loather of war and all it stands for myself, my keenest regret today is that age does not permit me to offer my services and my life, if necessary, to those who still retain spiritual vision and who realize that there are things in life far worse than death itself. That alone would satisfy my conscience—and I still accept my conscience as the voice of God. If this world is to become subject to the hideous and brutal standards which the present rulers of Germany announce frankly as their own, death would be a welcome alternative. And that those standards are bound to prevail unless we take our stand promptly and without reservation at the side of England in this critical moment there can be no shadow of doubt. In God's name, then, why this terrible delay?

If I seem to be speaking strongly, I can only say that my feelings are much stronger than anything I can put into words. At the moment, every word you utter in your responsible position is eagerly awaited and enthusiastically acclaimed by Hitler and his lust-maddened followers. For years you, as a high-minded and public-spirited citizen, and I, as a headmaster, strove to inculcate in youth those high standards of Christian morality and conduct, truth and honor, justice and tolerance, which we know to be the very basis of sound character and manhood. Today, you extend your aid and offer encouragement to those who openly repudiate these same standards and who have deliberately brought up a whole generation of fanatical German youth to believe that these are the clear evidences of weakness and incompetence. How possibly can all this be if the position you advocate is as sound and patriotic as you believe it to be?

To me, this just does not make sense. If a year hence or earlier perhaps, for events are moving swiftly, the situation indicates that my reasoning is wrong and yours is right, I shall gladly admit my error. Would to God I could force myself to believe that an opportunity to do this might ever be mine.

Yours very sincerely,

ALFRED E. STEARNS,
Headmaster Emeritus, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.

P. S.—By curious coincidence, and since I began this letter, tickets of admission have been handed me for a discussion in which you are to take part, scheduled for May 6, here in New York City. Frankly, since I am convinced that this matter long ago passed outside the realms of proper discussion, I shall not have the heart to attend.

A. E. S.

MAY 10, 1941.

ALFRED E. STEARNS, Esq.,
International Educational Council, Inc., New York City.

DEAR MR. STEARNS: On May 3 I received your letter of May 2, which I know expresses your sincere views.

On May 4 I read the newspaper reports of the press release which you made in connection with your letter to me, which advised that you, as an old friend of mine, had "rebuked the Senator for his opposition to American convoys."

It is a part of my job to take rebukes, and when such is occasioned by my stand on an issue which I believe in as sincerely as I do the antiwar issue, I welcome straight-from-the-shoulder open criticism, whether it is favorable or unfavorable. America was built up on the principle of free exchange of thought, and I am glad to make a frank and full reply to your letter.

You state that "the present war is our war." If I felt that it was, I would favor immediate participation. However, after long and conscientious study of the issues involved, I am strongly of the opinion that it is not our war, and that it would be an immeasurable calamity for us to follow the same steps that we did in 1917, succeeded by disillusionment and regret.

Very little has been mentioned in the press about the Duesseldorf conference, which immediately preceded the present war. While it was in progress the British papers had much to say about it. It was nothing less than a British-Nazi conspiracy to enter into a trade-pooling agreement for the purpose of fleecing us of our South American trade.

In the few years before the European war broke out Great Britain contributed to the rearmament program of Hitler to the tune of $3,000,000,000, and at a time when she was repudiating her debt to America. Now she is spending her millions in this country in a gigantic propaganda effort to sell us on the proposition that we can benefit by going through the same steps that we did when we went into the last war.

It is acknowledged that if we get into the war we will be financing Great Britain's as well as our own prosecution of the war. If it lasts 3 or 4 years, our national debt will have run beyond the two-hundred-billion mark. Inflation will have become inevitable.

Before the present war broke out Chief Justice Hughes advised that he had grave doubts that we could survive as a democracy if we entered the war.

I recognize that if Germany conquers England we in the United States would have to make great sacrifices to continue to build up our Army and naval forces for protection of our hemisphere. At the same time I feel that it can be done, and that the detriment to this country, as weighed against the detriment if we go into the war, will be far less. Hitlerism cannot remain a permanent thing. In time the people of Europe will come into their own again.

You say in your letter that the question of whether or not we send our boys outside of this country is wholly beside the point. On this I wholly disagree with you, and my reason for this involves a matter of common honesty with the American people.

I refer to the fact that when the conscription bill was passed last fall (and incidentally it had my favorable vote) it contained an assurance to the mothers and youth of the country that none of the conscriptees would be drafted for purposes of fighting on foreign soil.

Just before the election the President, in an appeal for support, broadcast to the millions of Americans the following solemn pledge: "I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again, and again, your boys are not going to be sent to any foreign war." How can it be suggested that it is wholly beside the point whether or not we send our boys outside of this country in the light of these assurances?

It must be recognized that a Member of the Congress, in voting on this issue, has to consider it not from how it will affect him but from how it will affect the great mass of the American people, in this particular case, how it will affect the millions of young American manhood who have received solemn promises from the Government.

Only 2 days ago I received a letter from a young man who is in the Army. I am compelled to consider his views and cannot for a moment, in good conscience, say that whether he and his comrades are sent outside the country is "wholly beside the point." He writes as follows:

"I was conscripted on Thursday last and temporarily assigned to Camp Upton. I have made it a point to converse with men who are fellow draftees. I find they are all agreed on this one salient point. They realize it is their sacred duty to defend the United States, but they are emphatically opposed to being flung to the far corners of the earth to defend the British Empire and foist democracy on people who never had it and who never wanted it. The men whom I have talked to all feel thankful that we have leaders in our Congress who are taking an active part as advocators of no convoys and no A. E. F. Please continue your fight for truth against the small minority that controls the powerful instruments of propaganda in this country. Please don't fail us. Don't let us boys down in this crucial moment."

You further state that my deep interest in youth and its problems early touched a responsive chord in your heart. I am determined that my interest in youth and its problems shall continue to be foremost in my heart, and in connection with this I commend to you the testimony of one who for years has been building up the character of young American manhood, and knows their thoughts. I refer to a letter which I received just the other day from Carl B. Snavely, coach of football of Cornell University.

He wrote as follows:

"DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Let me thank you personally for your commendable efforts to keep the United States out of further involvement in the European conflagration. Please carry on. Our people must see the light before it is too late. I wish I could aid and encourage you in this vital endeavor, but I am afraid that my powers in that respect are very limited.

"Without questioning the conscientiousness of patriotism of those who think otherwise, I am one of the millions of individuals who believe that it will be a deadly, tragic, foolhardy, impracticable, and possibly suicidal blunder if the United States becomes actively engaged in the European holocaust, even to the extent of convoying war materials. The theory that we can engage in this war to a limited extent is ridiculous and inconsistent with the lessons of history and the processes of human nature. An attempt to do so will promptly engulf us

to the limits of manpower and material resources in a struggle which, in all probability, will last for years and lead to nothing but terror, butchery, impoverishment, and the near extermination of everyone concerned.

"Our leaders have no right to gamble further with the lifeblood and, indeed, the very existence of our Nation. Let us arm America to the teeth and defend our own hemisphere to the death, but, in order to do so, let us conserve our resources for these purposes instead of dissipating them all over the face of the globe in a mad and fantastic crusade to police and reform the world.

"The American people do not want to enter this war."

There are those who say that this policy is a policy of appeasement. Our forefathers did not regard that policy as such. Our forefathers did not participate in wars all over the world at the request of the British Empire. They did not join the Spanish Armada against Great Britain or the British Fleet against Spain, but whenever either of those countries came to attack us our forefathers successfully defended America against them. We can do it again and again and again if necessary. And that goes for Hitler.

Sincerely yours.

CHARLES W. TOBEY.

North Carolina and Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 13 (legislative day of Thursday, May 8), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE STATE MAGAZINE

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the columns of the State Magazine, published at Raleigh, N. C., by Hon. Carl Goerch, entitled "North Carolina and Relief." In bringing this editorial to the attention of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I wish particularly that they note that the "per capita expenditures by the Federal Government for relief and relief work in North Carolina for the period from April 8, 1935, when funds became available under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, through 1940, were the lowest in the Nation."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the State Magazine, Raleigh, N. C.]

NORTH CAROLINA AND RELIEF

Per capita expenditures by the Federal Government for relief and relief work in North Carolina for the period from April 8, 1935, when funds became available under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, through 1940 were the lowest in the Nation.

We doubt that many of our readers knew this. So far as we ourselves are concerned, we were in complete ignorance of it.

But it's a fact, and here are the figures to prove it:

District of Columbia	$361.74
Montana	251.26
New Mexico	157.82
Washington	134.73
New York	116.91
Illinois	108.36
California	101.31
West Virginia	98.37
Florida	89.40
South Carolina	80.76
Tennessee	59.45
North Carolina	48.46

Those are just a few States, picked at random. The national average for relief expenditures per capita in the country is $102.26. You'll notice that the expenditure in North Carolina is less than half that amount.

Altogether there are 28 States which get more than twice as much as North Carolina does. There are 10 States that get more than three times as much.

When we say "relief expenditures," we include many agencies, among them being Work Projects Administration, Public Works Administration, Civilian Conservation Corps, National Youth Administration, Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration, and so on.

There are two conclusions to draw from those extremely interesting figures. One is that North Carolina is in better shape than any other State in the Union; the other is that North Carolina hasn't been receiving her rightful share of funds.

Frankly, we do not know which conclusion is correct, but regardless of that, it would appear that North Carolina is having to support its sister States to a greater extent than does any other State in the Union.

And the reason we're calling this to your attention is not in the way of complaint, but merely to let you know the position which North Carolina occupies in connection with the financial status of the Nation.

It's worth paying a little extra just for the privilege of living and doing business in North Carolina.

Have They All the Answers?

REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1941

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following article is taken from the Merry-Go-Round in the Washington Times-Herald of recent date:

PRICE REGULATORS

The old James G. Blaine mansion on Massachusetts Avenue has the first push-button elevator ever installed in this country. Today, almost every time that elevator goes up, prices go down.

The elevator operates between the office of John Hamm on the second floor and David Ginsburg on the third floor, and these two young men, whose combined age is only 61, are the ace lieutenants of Defense Price Regulator Leon Henderson in preventing inflation.

As Henderson's lieutenants they are Washington's newest and most effective pair of brain trusters. Henderson learns from trade sources that the price of steel scrap is going up, and he sticks his head through the door of Hamm's office and says: "John, get busy on that, will you?' The elevator goes up from Hamm's office to Ginsburg's, and presently the price of steel scrap gets a jolt.

By comparison with Ginsburg, Hamm is an old man, age 32. Ginsburg is 29. Hamm is a Princeton product, Ginsburg is one of the Frankfurter boys, who made good at the Harvard Law School in 1934.

Any businessman who might be alarmed about this new brain-trust team should take a look at the cartoon in Hamm's office. On the wall is a genuine Daumier, vintage 1870, which shows at least that they have a sense of humor.

It's a drawing of a big man struggling against the efforts of three little men who are clinging to his arms and legs. The big man is Business, and the three little men are the 1870 version of the New Deal. In French, the caption reads, "How can I walk when you hold me back all the time?"

One. This delegation of power by the present administration with doubtful legal authority, if continued, will cause Congress to degenerate into a public debating society.

Two. If this country is expected to follow democratic processes, the price-control problem should be met in an orderly manner by a body composed of representatives of producers, consumers, and distributors.

Three. Is it not depressing to think that a 29-year-old Harvard "brain truster" has so many answers with so little experience behind him?

Four. The price fixers pegged butter at 31 cents per pound when the market price was 33 cents per pound the day that this was done. The price fixers have assumed the power to give the labor of the farmers a 10-cent per hour or less schedule with this 31 cents per pound butter price peg.

Five. If these "brain trusters" themselves had to extract some of the 108,000,000,000 pounds of milk produced annually in the United States, they would find that something would be going up and down beside the Washington elevators.

Six. For the welfare of this country we need more and more men with common horse sense and fewer and fewer Frankfurter "hot dogs" from Harvard.

I Am An American Day

REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, May 18, has been set aside as I Am An American Day. It seems to me that the people who are trying through this effort to lay emphasis on the meaning of American citizenship are doing a very fine and constructive thing. One of the efforts they are making is to get people who are American citizens to guide and assist worth-while people who are in this country, but who

have not yet become citizens, so that they may understand the meaning of citizenship and be informed and instructed in the ways in which they can acquire citizenship.

I feel this is an undertaking that should have the support of every earnest American and I feel it is proper to draw this to the attention of the membership of the House at this time. It is my hope that all of us will do whatever we can to make I Am An American Day the success it deserves to be.

The Blitz Is On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1941

AN EDITORIAL BY SEYMOUR S. TIBBALS, OF THE FRANKLIN (OHIO) CHRONICLE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is in the rural communities and the small cities of America that the soundest thinking is being done today. Seymour S. Tibbals, editor emeritus of the Franklin Chronicle of Franklin, Ohio, has long been recognized as one of the most able small-city editors in the United States. Mr. Tibbals has lived nearly three-quarters of a century in Franklin. For more than 50 years he has been a newspaperman. No one knows the thoughts, the ideals, and aspirations of the typical American community, such as Franklin, better or is more able to express them in writing, than is Seymour S. Tibbals. Therefore, I believe it will be beneficial to the Congress, and to the country generally, to make a matter of record an editorial written by Mr. Tibbals and appearing in the Franklin Chronicle on Thursday, May 8:

[From the Franklin (Ohio) Chronicle of May 8, 1941]

The blitz is on. A rolling barrage of propaganda is being laid down to arouse the people out of what is called apathy, but which is really a firm resistance to open participation in the war. The American people, well-informed by press and radio, know what is going on in Europe. They are not poor, benighted heathens, but the most literate and intelligent population on earth. They know that Britain's downfall would be tragic, and would bring all sorts of desperate problems in its train. They want to help Britain in all possible ways—short of war. Our people also are for defense to the hilt. "Millions for defense," was the cry when our country was young. Today the cry is "Billions for defense." The people are not asleep. They know the menace of Hitlerism just as the State Department does. The people of the United States will fight to the last man to save the soil of America. They have not been convinced that the way to do this is to enter the wars in Europe, in Africa, and in Asia. Yes, the barrage is on. It remains to be seen whether the people can be roused into war hysteria or whether, with all their sources of information, about what is going on in this world, they will still permit the quiet voice of reason to counsel them. After all, it is they who will fight this war if it is to be fought; it is they who will pay for the war; it is their destiny that is at stake. Whether or not we shall enter this war at the eleventh hour is the greatest decision the people have been called upon to make since the Civil War, not forgetting the World War which we entered "to make the world safe for democracy." We have confidence in their judgment, in that good old Yankee horse sense that has so often come to their rescue.

Colorado Retailers Question the New Ruling by Wages and Hours Act Administrator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1941

LETTER FROM COLORADO RETAILERS, INC.

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I think the retail dealers of this country are entitled to know that an effort is being made to include all of them under the Wages and Hours Act. I insert in the RECORD a letter received from a prominent hardware and implement dealer of Colorado, who has had years of experience and knows whereof he speaks.

In this great crisis every branch of the industrial life of our country should be considered as an integral part of our defense program. The small retailer who serves his community to the best of his ability is a part, not only of his own business, but of every activity in the community. The voice of our friends pointing out the injustice of the rules and regulations proposed by boards, bureaus, and commissions established by the Congress should by all means receive careful consideration. This letter needs no explanation:

EL PASO COUNTY RETAILERS, INC.,
Colorado Springs, Colo., May 10, 1941.

Representative WILLIAM S. HILL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: The Mountain States Hardware and Implement Association and the Colorado Retailers Association, together with over 1,500 members, are strongly opposed to the changes now proposed by the Administrator of the Wages and Hours Act. The new Bulletin, No. 6, differs in three principal ways from the edition of December 1938:

First, it permits sales to be regarded as retail sales, provided they are made in customary quantities without special prices. Now, that is not fair. Every man that is in or ever was in business knows that there are times and conditions that exist that force him to adjust a price or sell at a slightly lower price in order to meet some competition somewhere, either from a jobber selling direct or from many other causes which arise in the course of a business week—catalog houses, chains, etc, for example, and, last but not least, cooperatives, the Government itself, and the store without eight employees, which doesn't come under the act.

Second, an establishment cannot qualify as a retail establishment for the exemption of section 13 (a) (2) if more than a substantial amount of its sales are nonretail. "Substantial" is interpreted as meaning somewhere between 10 and 30 percent. Now, that is very vague; it is not at all clear. We would like, once and for all, a clear-cut decision. We ask that it be 49 percent, which is less than half. We all want to keep as many on our pay rolls as possible, but as sure as the sun sets, this 10 to 30 percent will of necessity put many people out of work. There will be absolutely no incentive to build up or grow; we will all have to limit ourselves to one or two employees.

You know it is plenty hard right now to keep one step ahead of the sheriff; with all of the taxes and new proposed taxes, what is one to do?

Businessmen as a whole who have worked years to build a business large enough to support eight or more employees have found themselves just getting by, receiving no return on their investment, only receiving a limited salary. They cannot carry much more of a load. Maybe they should be forced to close their doors; who knows?

We would ask you, as our Representative, to take this matter up for us with General Fleming, as head of the Wage and Hour Division, place our cause with him, and urge reconsideration to at least 49 percent nonretail sales with no further strings.

With kind personal regards.

COLORADO RETAILERS, INC.,
J. R. LOWELL, *President.*

National-Defense Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS OF HAROLD N. GRAVES, ASSISTANT TO THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Harold N. Graves, Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, broadcast from Washington over the National Radio Forum, May 5, 1941:

Tonight I am going to talk about the future—not alone that part of it which we can only guess, but that part which we can see clearly and certainly. I am going to talk about the future as it touches your pocketbook, my pocketbook, and the Nation's pocketbook.

What we as individuals all hope to do tomorrow, next month, and in the next decade represents also the country's desires and aspirations. As individuals, we hope to own homes, we hope to have children who will carry forward our names and do them honor, we want to give our sons and daughters the fullest opportunities for education and development, and we want constantly to improve our own position in life.

Multiplied and magnified 130,000,000 times this is also our Nation's ambition. As a nation we want to have peaceful and mutually profitable relations with other nations, so that we may go on adding to our

vast wealth of roads and schools, improving the goods we make and the goods we consume, raising our standards of living and increasing the benefits enjoyed by all of us who live in this country.

This we are all resolved and determined to do.

Today we have rolled up our sleeves and gone to work to insure this future. Our factories are humming, making our Military Establishment strong, so that we may be impregnable against any attack by force. Scores of our cargo vessels are being gathered to form a bridge of ships whereby supplies will be carried to our friends—the enemies of force across the Atlantic. Our young men are in training camps, learning the discipline and techniques of the modern army.

We are keenly conscious now that in addition to our bountiful privileges, we have duties as well. For a long time the people have been insistent in their desire to shoulder responsibility by paying higher taxes for defense. Eighteen months ago the opinion polls showed that 6 out of every 10 of us wanted to shoulder this responsibility. A new, stiffer Revenue Act was passed, but still more of us than before wanted to put our dollars to work to expand our Army, Navy, and air forces. Our leaders in Washington are now discussing new tax schedules to meet this want.

Last week the Treasury Department placed defense-savings stamps and defense-savings bonds on sale in post offices and banks near you. You already have heard about the nature and purpose of these stamps and bonds. They offer every citizen an opportunity to lend his money voluntarily to the Government, for his own profit and to help achieve the objectives that he wants to see achieved.

Our desires for the future and our impulse to protect that future now did not originate with us. They are common to all men. Our dreams for security, equality, and the right to stand on our own feet were borne to this Nation on great streams of immigrant peoples. They brought these human yearnings from Sussex, and Clydeside, from the farms of France, from Saxony and Bavaria, from Sicily and Lombardy, from the green hills of Ireland, and from Galicia in Poland.

We are not a nation because we speak one language; we speak many tongues. We are not a nation because we worship in the same way; we belong to more than 200 religious denominations. We are a nation because we are men and women of one idea: The idea of the greatest freedom to each individual, so long as that freedom does not harm our society.

Refugees from totalitarian countries are amazed at what our equalitarian society has achieved. Some of them have spent hours just photographing the hundreds and hundreds of automobiles which stand at the curbs of every American city. To us, this is commonplace; to them, it is a miracle. They are amazed at our gigantic riches. They are amazed at our spirit of easy comradeship—between the diner at a restaurant and the waiter, between the taxi driver and his fare. All men have had the same dreams as these, but in our country they look more real, and we shall go on making them more and more true.

Around us today, the world is a strange and almost unrecognizable place. An invader is in uneasy possession of one-third of China—an area as big as our whole Nation east of the Mississippi. Another invader is astride almost the whole continent of Europe. A crooked cross, emblem of that invader, waves in Norway at the continent's northern tip, and in Greece, nearly 2,000 miles southward.

The war machine of this invader is being fueled by the enforced labor and the confiscated money and resources of Czechs, Poles, Dutchmen, Belgians, Frenchmen, and other subject peoples. After the war, the carriers of the crooked cross intend that their industrial machinery will be operated the same way. In their world of tomorrow, they intend to be a master race, controlling the life of whole continents. In their world of the future, they intend to control by force the biggest monopoly of labor, of business, and of ideas in history.

We can see now some of the fatal mistakes that were made in Europe. One by one the countries of Europe were divided, one from the other. Too late, and too few, they began to feel concern, one for the other. One by one they were swallowed.

As with countries, so it was with individuals. In France, there was thought for present costs rather than future gains. In the last year but one before the outbreak of war France, on the edge of Europe's cauldron, spent less for armaments than did the United States, 3,000 miles away. In the allied nations there were men who thought that this was just another war in which they could muddle through to victory. Today, Paris is in the hands of the enemy, and Britain's cities and villages have felt the hot blast of destructive bombs.

Sober and serious as they are, Americans cannot say that their defenses and their weapons of war are now what they want them to be.

We can say that we and our chosen leaders have not repeated and are not repeating the errors of the countries across the Atlantic. We are cleaving fast to our friends, and we will not be divided from them. We are committed to help Britain, not only because Britain stands for our way of life, but also because by so doing we can defend our own interests and give ourselves time to stock our own arsenal. We already have made up our minds to spend, and we are spending unstintingly for defense.

In the 9 months between the first of last July and the beginning of last April our Government spent $4,500,000,000 for defense. Under the Lease Lend Act and other authorizations of our Congress we have so far planned the outlay on future defenses of nearly 10 times that sum—$39,600,000,000.

Our construction of plants and factories is nearing the first stage of completion. But this is only low gear. We intend to move and are moving into second gear and toward high gear, putting these factories to work in the production of finished materials in ever-increasing quantities. Before the end of this year we will find our Government spending more for defense than for all other purposes combined.

At this point our future is clearly visible. As far as our pocketbooks are concerned, tomorrow is marching from the horizon quickly toward us. Part of those billions for defense—used mostly to buy American materials and to pay American labor—have begun to flow back into our pockets, in the form of increased wages, more overtime pay, and larger dividends on stocks.

America is feeling boomy. Wages have risen faster than the price of the things we spend our wages for; our income has risen faster than our outgo.

This was also true for a time during the last war, and a spending spree resulted. Perhaps some of you remember that it was not uncommon then to see day laborers working in silk shirts. Perhaps some of you remember, too, the economic dislocation which followed. As America moved rapidly into the production of war materials, the production of other things—clothes, furniture, and so on—dropped. Even for a time after the war many of the everyday things that we wanted to buy were scarce and high in cost; those of use who had spent on silk shirts had to pay dear for cotton shirts.

That is one thing we want to avoid now. We want to live soberly today so that we will not regret tomorrow.

On the one hand, our decision to build our defenses with all our might means inevitably that our production of everyday goods will decline. If John Smith and Martha Jones move from their present jobs into war industries, then their labor no longer can be used for the production of everyday goods. If aluminum is needed for planes, then its use for making pots and pans must be limited. In the absence of other factors, this transition would result in a blowing up of prices to far above normal proportions.

On the other hand, however, the people have voluntarily decided to put an increased portion of their income into national defense. We have chosen, as a Nation, to increase our purchases of war goods, and to limit the amount of our incomes which can be spent on other things. The number of potential buyers of goods will be limited along with the amount of goods themselves, and a balance will be maintained. This is the first, firm line of defense against inflation.

In this line of defense taxes are our Regular Army, and defense savings stamps and defense savings bonds are our volunteers. Through their Representatives in Congress, the people vote the taxes. As individual citizens, they will make up their minds to contribute still more to defense funds and to their own personal futures, too. For the savings bonds will pay for national defense today, and when their value, plus interest, is returned to you they will pay for those things that you want to do and we all want to do in our world of tomorrow.

Our pocketbooks are all sizes, and the defense bonds now being offered by the Treasury are all sizes, too. There are thousands among you listening tonight who have already bought your first defense savings bonds or your first defense saving stamps. Some of you know perhaps better than I can tell you what the securities are.

Our bonds are divided into three families: E, F, and G. The F and G series are meant primarily for persons and corporations who make a practice of investing their earnings. They carry interest of about 2½ percent. Although they may be redeemed beforehand, the date when they come due is 12 years from the time of purchase.

The E bond is for the individual with a moderate or small income who still wants to do his part as a volunteer. E bonds vary in size from one which can be bought for $18.75 to another priced at $750. They carry a higher interest rate than the F and G bonds—2.9 percent—and they come due 2 years earlier; that is, in 10 years from the time of purchase.

In 10 years the Treasury will buy these bonds back for a third more than you paid for them. The $18.75 bond will be worth $25 and the $750 bond will be worth a thousand dollars.

The F and G bonds are meant for habitual investors, the E bond is the people's bond. You may buy E bonds for yourself, if you are married, you may buy them in the name and on behalf of husband, or wife, or for both of you at once, you may buy for son or daughter. Right now, defense savings bonds will buy guns, planes, and tanks. Tomorrow, they may buy a new set of screens for the house, or a college education.

If you are among those who cannot afford to buy a savings bond out of a single pay check, then savings stamps are within your reach. These are sold in the same places as bonds—that is, in banks and at post offices—and they come in denominations of from 10 cents to $5. They do not earn interest, but each stamp buyer receives an album in which he can save his stamps, and when he has accumulated enough of them, he can exchange them for an interest-bearing bond.

During the past few days, some of you undoubtedly have bought Government bonds for the first time in your lives, others may be thinking that you never in your lives heard so much talk about them.

For this, there is an excellent reason. In the past, the Treasury has sold most of its bonds to banks and investors—and with lower offerings of interest than are made

available to you now. Such issues, of course, will be continued, but today the Treasury does not merely wish to raise money—which it could do readily enough through banks—but it wishes to let every American who is able and willing to do so, buy a share in his country and a stock in his own future. Thus, he becomes a partner in the Nation and shares in this country always have been and always will be the most rock-solid investment in the world.

The dollar value of defense savings bonds is as indestructible as the hardness of diamonds. Only the Government can sell them, and only the Government can buy them back. They cannot be traded in on the exchanges, and they cannot be swapped; they cannot be beaten down in value, nor pushed up in price except through the normal accumulation of interest.

Subject to the single restriction that you cannot return bonds sooner than 60 days after the first day of the month you bought them, the Treasury always will pay you at least what you paid for the bonds. And the longer you keep the bonds the more their value will rise.

The Treasury frankly wishes you to buy savings bonds, but neither it nor any other Government department is going to stage a campaign to make you do so. The bonds will not serve their purpose if you buy one bond or a dozen and then stop. They are put forward as a means for every citizen to carry out a consistent and continuous savings program, to be followed week by week or month by month.

That is why we are not making a campaign. We are hanging out our shingle, to let you know that we are in the business of selling bonds. We are doing business and will continue to do business at convenient places—at your bank, at your post office.

Up to now, I have talked mostly about how volunteer bonds and stamps will affect the country and its economy. Your decision about your own savings program naturally will depend on how the purchase of bonds and stamps will affect you.

Nobody in this country can tell you or is going to tell you that you must do this or that with your money. You earned it, and you have a perfect right to do with it what you please. Some of you, particularly, should not participate in the bond and stamp program for the time being, because of pressing, prior claims on your income.

Those of us who are employed now for the first time in a long time, those of us who are in a position for the first time to maintain an adequate standard of living, those of us who are assuming new family responsibilities—all of us who fall into these categories should first provide for our vital wants.

For the great bulk of us—perhaps 50,000,000 or more—who can immediately begin to invest in savings stamps and bonds, common sense should dictate what proportion of our income we will spend and what proportion we will set aside.

We should all remember the men who bought silk shirts in the last war, and then afterward had to scrimp to buy cotton ones. Among the definite things in the future which we must take for granted is a period of post-war readjustment—when John Smith and Martha Jones, perhaps after a time of looking for jobs, move back into normal employment from war industry, and when our aluminum goes back into pots and pans.

Then we will move most smoothly forward with what we hope to do and want to do tomorrow if we have reserves for this settling-down period. Reserves then will help us to carry ahead our normal lives—establishing our comfort and security and getting on with our future in a peacetime world.

But for the present our stamps and bonds must serve a wartime purpose. Americans, least of all peoples, need to be told that dollars are weapons. This was a rich continent when Columbus discovered it four and a half centuries ago. We have made it richer still. Our skill, hard work, and teamwork have mined riches out of the ground and grown them out of the earth.

Once earned, our dollars have fought the good fight against poverty, ignorance, and disease, and have conquered time and distance. Our wide country is close-knit, bound around by an endless network of roads and communications. Our life in this Nation of ours, enlivened by a thousand opportunities for pleasure and self-betterment, is incomparably richer and more varied than the life on any other continent or in any other country on the globe.

Our machine civilization leads all others; and to those who say that this has made us soft, I answer that as a matter of fact we have been getting tougher and tougher since the time of Capt. John Smith. From the Old World we have come together and prospered. We are stricken less by disease, we live longer, and we are taller, heavier, and stronger than any of the single races which made us.

You and I and our children are better educated than the large mass of our European contemporaries. We regard each other, person and person and group and group, with greater respect, for within our free institutions, a mountaineer may become a Cabinet member, and an immigrant boy a captain of industry.

These things we have earned, and these things we mean to keep.

In this resolve the people of the United States are beginning to mobilize their great wealth. Five years ago we were amazed when a certain totalitarian regime appropriated $4,000,000,000 for armaments—forgetting that a few months previously we in this country had spent that much on Christmas presents alone. Now our tremendous, careless, incalculable riches are being poured into a purposeful program of democracy's defense.

Your Government asks you to take your part in this program. Invest in a savings bond, and then another and another. By so doing you will help yourselves and you will help to defend your country.

Thank you kindly, and good night.

Abraham Lincoln, Carl Sandburg, and Richard Martin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the Washington Evening Star carried a page-1 story of real human interest. To me it has more than mere local appeal and I present it to the House:

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 10, 1941]

STORY OF A MAN IN THE RAIN AT THE LINCOLN MEMORIAL

Richard Martin was driving around the Lincoln Memorial the other night when it started to rain.

He saw a man, who looked elderly, running for shelter. From the man's appearance, he got the idea the man couldn't afford a taxicab, even if one had been handy.

Mr. Martin stopped his car and offered the man shelter from the rain and a ride into town. The stranger said he wanted to be dropped at a downtown hotel.

As he got out of the car, he asked Mr. Martin for his address. The driver told him he lived at 1230 New Hampshire Avenue NW.

Shaking hands, the stranger said:

"You are a practical Christian."

The stranger said today that he was going to send Mr. Martin a gift—an autographed copy of a book. And on the flyleaf, he will write a few words to "The man who saved me from a drenching."

The man Mr. Martin picked up at Lincoln's shrine was the poet-author of a monumental work on Lincoln—Carl Sandburg.

Cracker-Barrel Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE HUNTERDON COUNTY (N. J.) DEMOCRAT

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hunterdon County Democrat, of April 24, 1941:

[From the Hunterdon County Democrat of April 24, 1941]

"CRACKER BARREL" OPINION

President Roosevelt last Friday referred to the "cracker barrel" as an American institution and indicated that the Government is looking to it for orders.

The cracker barrel, as such, went out after cracker makers started using sealed boxes for their product, but the "cracker barrel" as an institution has by no means disappeared. Every country store has its debate club, and along with the country stores are service stations and other more modern institutions where men meet and discuss affairs of the day, just as they have done for generations.

If Mr. Roosevelt wants to know what the "cracker barrel" philosophers are thinking, we can tell him that most of them are concerned about the war, of course. They are skeptical as to whether we can keep out of it, and even more skeptical as to whether our people are being prepared and conditioned to stand up against the strain another war will impose.

The New Deal's whole objective has been to soften the people, to make them critical if they suffer any adversity, to make them crabbed if asked to make any sacrifice, to look to the Government for a way out of every predicament they find themselves in, and to depend upon self-appointed "class" leaders to get for them what they term their rights.

As the President said in this press interview, many of the people are not aware of the serious predicament they face. What those who think and know what war means have been waiting to hear is that they cannot have their cake and eat it too; they cannot have leaf-raking projects and an effective preparation for defense; they cannot have skyrocketing wages and not have higher

prices; they cannot have boom wages in industry and starvation income for those engaged in farming and they cannot have efficient defense production under direction of social reformers who know nothing about production or management.

These are some of the things the cracker-barrel groups are discussing and if the truth were known, the "cracker barrel" boys are far out ahead of the New Deal directorate in advocacy of a program that will save America in these critical times. Their answer is hard work, an end to professional breeders of class hatred in high places, elimination of waste and extravagant spending in every department of Government, and the substitution of plain speaking for slick political salesmanship.

The American people can sacrifice. They will sacrifice. All they are waiting for is the call to do so and for those in high places to set the example, in order that they may have confidence that success will be the reward for the supreme effort every man and woman may be called upon to make.

National Defense Threatened by Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1941

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply disturbed to read in the Monday morning papers that an official of the United Automobile Workers of the C. I. O., one Walter Reuther, has issued an edict to the American people—to the Nation—to the President of the United States—as well as to the officials of the General Motors Corporation, that he would give them until next Thursday morning at 7 o'clock to agree to the union demands or else a strike would be called in the 61 plants of General Motors where that union has bargaining rights. Important national defense work is involved in this threat.

The President has called for speed and more speed in the building of the Nation's defenses. We have been told not only by the President, but by many other speakers, in the last 2 or 3 weeks, that the situation is critical; that time is of the essence in the building of our national defense. In the face of this, and after a deadlock extending over 10 days, following 8 weeks of negotiations in Detroit the Nation is now threatened by a manifesto issued by a man whose record, as set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at least justifies the suspicion, if it does not clearly show, that he is a communistic labor agitator.

We find this man Reuther, as a union leader, issuing a manifesto that the work of national defense will be stopped unless their arbitrary demands are met. They are seizing this hour of the Nation's peril to make unreasonable demands. The fathers and mothers of boys being drafted and taken out of their homes, and away from their business and forced into the Army at $21 a month, have been deeply worried over strikes. Many of these are purely jurisdictional in nature, and have nothing whatsoever to do with wages, hours, or working conditions. Yet they just as effectively delay the building of our national defense as do the strikes for increased wages or closed shop.

I know something about these conditions. There are over 413,000 people in the Seventeenth Congressional District of Michigan, which I have the honor to represent. It is the largest district in the State. Located within the Seventeenth District are several General Motors plants. Located in the industrial centers adjacent to it, are other plants in which many thousands of my constituents work. A strike in General Motors not only means that work on vast defense contracts will stop, but also that thousands upon thousands of wage earners will have their wages stopped; they will face privation and suffering if this strike takes place.

Behind this whole situation lurks terrible danger, bearing a similarity to conditions in France that must frighten any fair-minded man who studies both situations. The President himself in his Jackson Day speech declared:

> We have seen how the workers of France were betrayed by their so-called champions, the Communists. For no matter what Communist lips have to say, their actions have proved that in their hearts they care nothing for the real rights of labor.

On April 3 I presented to this House the details of what actually happened in France. The world depression resulted in a swing to the left over there. Socialist Leon Blum became Prime Minister in 1936. The first move was political and the second move industrial. They worked these two together.

I shall not repeat the details of the betrayal of France by her labor leaders, by her governmental officials, and by some of her military officials as well. What I desire to emphasize today is that the workers, the wage earners, of France are enslaved at this hour, and they were betrayed into that slavery by their own communistic leaders.

My fears for our country, and the welfare of my own constituents are not lessened by the presence on the Mediation Board of John Brophy, who has been branded a Communist by no less an authority than John L. Lewis himself.

I stated on April 2, on this floor, that patriotism and loyalty to our country do not exist in the ranks of the Communists, the radicals, and the saboteurs. I said then, and I repeat it, honest American workers go without work, and their families are deprived of the necessities of life because the enemies of the United States, and of the American workingman, are having their way. The President and his administration, by appointing to key positions in this Government individuals of questionable records, have done more to bring about the conditions now existing in our Nation than any other power.

We are now reaping the bitter fruits of that policy in this edict, this manifesto, insolently and defiantly hurled at the American people that vital defense work will stop at 7 o'clock on next Thursday morning. That edict comes from a man who is branded by a committee of this House as a subversive Communist, whose history as such was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by one of the outstanding Democrats of this House, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Judge COX, on January 16, 1941.

It is of the greatest importance to this Nation for us to know what dreadful, if not vital, effects strikes may have upon our national-defense efforts. We must know whether these strikes arise from the legitimate desires of the workers, or whether they are inspired by those who want to overthrow our Government, and to enslave the workers along with the rest of the American people.

I shudder to learn that John Brophy was named by the President to the Mediation Board, now sitting to determine whether or not a great American industry engaged in defense work shall become silent; shall stop its wheels; shall cease work. This man Brophy may not mean much to you, my colleagues, until I recall to you that this is the same John Brophy whom John L. Lewis publicly branded, along with others, as—and I quote his language—

> Fakirs, repudiated leaders, traitors to the union, opportunists, and purveyors of every falsehood, slander, and deception.

Mr. Lewis further described Brophy, among others, as an agent of the Communists and intimated that some of them were paid direct from Moscow.

The United Mine Workers Journal on another occasion stated that the leadership of Brophy and others was—

> Doing its dirtiest to capture the United Mine Workers and to transform this splendid union into a Communist organization.

It is not enough, Mr. Speaker, to say that Mr. Brophy may have changed his mind, or that times have altered conditions. If among the more than 130,000,000 people of this country there cannot be found to sit on mediation boards men whose records are free of these taints, then, indeed, is America bankrupt of patriotic citizens.

An editorial in the Detroit Times of May 10 truthfully said that strikes in our defense production plants constituted the bottleneck out of which—

> we may try to pull our head when it is too late—as was the case in France, which lost her the war with Germany, mainly because she would not inaugurate compulsory arbitration in her defense industries.

That paragraph from that editorial ought to be pasted above the desk of every Member of Congress. It ought to be read every night in every home in this broad, free land of ours. There is no guaranty that it may not become a prophecy unless we face this problem honestly, frankly, courageously, and wisely.

This editorial says further:

> We either have not the power—or will not use the power—to order peace in our defense industries, to order compulsory arbitration of all differences by the employer and employee in those matters that aim straight at our vitals—strikes which are so evidently fomented by Communists.

We are actually now in the process of demanding from the youth of our land the supreme sacrifice, if necessary, yet we

continue to temporize with a situation which constitutes a greater danger to the defense and security of this Nation than if whole divisions of those brave young boys were stricken by plague and rendered helpless.

The American people must know, the American people do know, that industrial contribution is just as important, just as vital, if not more so, than the disposition and use of the armed troops themselves. We are temporizing with this situation in which we find men branded as Communists, as enemies of our form of government, as enemies of our American way of life, sitting on mediation boards. We find them on the other side, as union officials, issuing orders and manifestoes to the American people, setting deadlines on which defense work shall stop. We cannot tolerate this sort of thing. The American people will not tolerate it when they know the facts. They are looking to us of this Congress as their representatives through whom they can be articulate, to remedy this dangerous condition. We have waited too long. We have been too tolerant with this condition. We have been negligent in our tolerance of a danger that may well take us down the road to ruin and land us where weeping France is today.

What this Detroit Times editorial means, what we all mean when we speak of compulsory mediation or compulsory arbitration, is that the mediators or the arbitrators will in all cases be persons who have no personal interest in the decisions rendered by them. Let us hope that if after 7 o'clock next Thursday morning there is a strike called in the important automotive industry, and an arbitration board is set up, that the members chosen to serve on such a board will be persons of such manifest openness and fairness of mind as to place beyond any doubt their disinterest except in the welfare of the Nation and the justice of their decisions.

It is high time for it to be said that no single group of citizens in this Nation has any monopoly on patriotism or loyalty to this country. We know it to be true—that businessmen—owners and managers of industry—have obviously more at stake in the welfare and the security of this Nation than professional labor organizers and agitators. These businessmen would, from a sense of enlightened self-interest, to say nothing of their patriotism, seek to settle on the broadest possible terms any of these industrial disputes which, we all know, are so gravely interfering with our national-defense efforts.

I think it is high time that we cease to remain silent while professional agitators seek to impugn every motive and every action of respectable business men and women. We have had all too much of that sort of thing.

I do not hesitate to say I have every confidence in the patriotism and the ability, and in the motives and the intentions of the men who lead and direct our great industries to do a practical, efficient and patriotic job in building the national defense.

It is difficult to speak with moderation when we consider some of the demands being made by these labor agitators. Let us remember that the boys who are being taken from their homes, from their colleges, from their businesses, will receive less than $1 a day and food, clothes, and shelter. Workers in civil life, union workers, make 6, 8, and 10 times that wage.

I want to make it clear that I am not holding the rank and file of American laborers responsible for these agitators. I firmly believe it is as important for us to free the rank and file of the union membership from the domination of labor racketeers and agitators as it is to protect the national defense against them.

If the urgency is half what we are told that it is, we cannot afford to lose one single day of national-defense production. If these strikes continue, Congress will be compelled in defense of our institutions and the American way of life to consider and pass legislation compelling labor disputes and controversies in industry, and between labor unions themselves, to submit their disputes to arbitration.

The Naval Affairs Committee of this House has already become conscious of the necessity for such action, and have recorded their recommendations to this House in what is known as the Vinson bill.

We must decide, Mr. Speaker, whether the great mass of patriotic American citizens, including the workers, shall prevail in their desire to preserve, in a war-darkened world, liberty, freedom and security, or whether we shall permit the advocates of alien doctrines to destroy them.

If It Were Not for Me, the Treasures of the Earth Would Remain Securely Locked—Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1941

ADDRESS OF J. ROY JONES, SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSIONER OF AGRICULTURE, COMMERCE, AND INDUSTRY, AND PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COMMISSIONERS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the opening remarks of J. Roy Jones, Commissioner of Agriculture for South Carolina and president of the National Association of Commissioners, at a called meeting of the commissioners in Washington, D. C., May 5, 6, and 7, 1941.

Believing that the agricultural commissioners of the United States are deeply interested in, or should be deeply interested in, agriculture and the producers of farm products, I invited the commissioners to appear before the Agricultural Committee of the House during the general hearings on farm legislation, for the purpose of giving their views and suggestions.

I appreciate their coming before our committee, and I am sure that their views and suggestions will be helpful to the committee in working out a major farm bill.

The address follows:

Gentlemen of the association, this is the first opportunity which I have had to express to you my gratification for the signal honor which you have conferred on me by electing me your president—particularly during my absence.

I have been in public life for a long time, and I very unhesitantly say that this is the highest honor I have had conferred upon me.

Our organization represents that great unorganized segment of our population which feeds and clothes the Nation.

Our clientele, so to speak, is the source of all of our wealth and upon their well-being depends the prosperity of the balance of the Nation. When agriculture sinks to below cost of production, the general trend of the country follows; and this is always true, except in abnormal times like those in which we are now living, when artificial conditions exist—and I mean by this, when spending, the national income is diverted from the normal channels of trade into production for the manufacture of the unproductive, or rather destructive materials.

Therefore, it is a source of great pleasure to me to be at the head of an organization whose aims and aspirations are for the benefit of the Nation's farmers; a class of our population which has always been a stabilizing factor throughout our entire national life. To me this is quite simple, for no man can till the soil without having an eternal hope within his breast; and no man can live in God's out of doors and commune daily with nature without having noble thoughts; no man can plant seeds into the breast of Mother Earth without feeling something divine within him, and when you have these three principles all in the heart of one individual, you cannot wonder but that this man will have a mental equilibrium, different from those in the hustle and bustle of city life; and, as a friend of mine once said, "If any man can be called one of God's noblemen, it is the American farmer."

I received word from the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture that farm legislation, and particularly that legislation which affects the five basic agricultural commodities, was not making the progress which he felt that it should make.

Of the various measures introduced before the present Congress for the benefit of agriculture, all had met with strong, well-organized opposition; whereas the proponents of these measures were completely unorganized.

The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House also let it be known that he deemed it imperative that the farmers be represented in Washington at the earliest possible date so that these matters could be ably presented to the Congress. The chairman stated that, in his opinion, there was no group so well qualified to represent the great mass of unorganized farmers as the commissioners, directors, and secretaries of agriculture of the various States, duly elected therefrom.

Time was of the essence and the calling of the executive committee was impossible if we were to be able to comply with the request of the chairman of the Agriculture Committee of the House.

Therefore, I took it upon myself to call this meeting, feeling certain that you would agree with me that it is the duty of our organization to lend our every effort to promote any legislation which will mean for the betterment of the farmers of our Nation.

I distinctly want this organization to feel that there was nothing presumptive on my

part, but my action was taken wholly and solely with the view of aiding and assisting the farmers throughout our entire Nation; when our national problems are in such chaotic condition as we now find them.

I do not mean, in any sense, to unduly criticize the leaders of our national affairs in the great emergency which now exists. However, facts are facts, and we must face them as such. The tremendous strides which have been made by industry working at full capacity and by organized labor in increasing their income are not true as to agriculture. None of our basic commodities have followed this upward trend in our national prosperity and none have reached that goal of parity at which we are all aiming.

If this trend continues, agriculture is bound to suffer. If increased cost of manufactured articles continues—and it is as sure to do so as the day follows the night—there will be an increase of costs on the part of our farmers. Unless the income of our farmer is materially increased, his purchasing power is bound to drop.

This is true of all of our crops, and this condition is not limited to any one section of the country.

Frankly, I am glad that such is the case, because all of us realize that there can be no national prosperity in farming when one section of the country is prosperous and another is in distress; for only a balanced agriculture will bring a uniform prosperity.

That this fact is rapidly being realized is the most gratifying event which has come under my observation since I have been president of this organization.

Closer cooperation between different sections of the country; the help of the wheat farmer to the cotton farmer; the rice farmer to the tobacco farmer; the corn farmer to the livestock man; and so on—throughout our entire agricultural program—has already accomplished good results which are going to bear fruits as years go on.

It is going to be my purpose to lend every ounce of my energy to continue this national cooperation and, with your help, and I feel positive that it will be unstintedly given by each of you, we are going to make even greater strides in the future than have been made in the past, and frankly, gentlemen, it is high time that this is being done.

During the past few months we have seen what strong organizations can do. We have seen them even challenge the authority of the Federal Government. We have seen critical industries, producing much needed war materials for defense, almost paralyzed by strikes. It is not my purpose to weigh the merits of these controversies between capital and labor—and in this I am speaking my personal views, and not as the president of this organization—but I am frank to state that, in my opinion, there is a fly in the ointment somewhere in our national set-up.

Near Columbia, S. C., is Fort Jackson, with 40,000 soldiers.

I have seen farm boys by the thousands called by the Government, put into uniform and taken away from their vocations for a year at $21 per month. I have seen them drilling without guns, marching without proper equipment, and whole divisions only 40 percent fitted out for active combat duty, while those who are charged with providing these materials for these boys in uniform are getting wages as high as $8 per day and better, and then strike and tie up productive industry for increased wages. In my opinion, this is grossly unfair and I believe that this organization believes as I do: That some action should be taken on the part of our Government to stop, and stop at once, the tying-up of essential industries by strikes which could and should be settled without the closing of plants.

Our President has stated that the Nation does not begin to realize the seriousness of our defense problem and our all-out aid to England. I may not realize to the fullest extent our danger, but I have confidence in our national leaders and when they state that the situation confronting America today is the most critical in our national life, I think it high time that every American citizen submerge personal gains for the common good and that we place our country first and our grievances, if we have any, second. And when all is said and done, it is the farmers of this Nation who are going to feed and clothe the workers, the soldiers, and others whom we may be called upon to help.

Fortunately, we have had no labor troubles in my State. Labor and industry are working hand in glove in this critical hour and I have every reason to believe that this condition is going to continue but, unfortunately, this does not prevail throughout our entire Nation.

No man living has a greater desire to see our laboring population prosper than I. I look with pride upon the gains which labor has made. I am happy to see sweatshops only unpleasant memories. I am happy to see the workingman toil shorter hours and have more time to enjoy his family and general recreation. I enjoy seeing those who have reached a certain age retire to live in comfort in their declining years, and I rejoice in all strides which labor has made. But I do not feel that a portion of labor should jeopardize our American way of life for personal gains and, as before stated, I feel that it is the duty of our Government to see that this condition is stopped, and stopped at once. Then, too, it is very unfair to the majority of laboring people who are putting forth 100-percent effort for national defense to be smeared with the unpatriotic actions of a minority. This may sound like strong language but it comes from the heart, and I believe that I voice the sentiments of every upright patriot in saying what I have said.

I therefore feel, gentlemen, that our presence in Washington today has the possibility of being productive for great good.

Mark Twain said that "everybody talks about the weather but nobody does anything about it." Everyone in Congress talks about parity, but up to the present time very little has been done about it.

At the very beginning of the present administration, one of the plans of the Democratic platform was parity for agriculture. Yet we have had 9½ years of talk about this important subject and are far from parity today. We must all realize that we are the spokesmen for the farmer. He does not have in the Capital highly paid and well-organized individuals or groups to present his views. He has no means to collectively lay before the Congress his problems, and there is no body of men in the entire United States better prepared or more ably equipped to speak for the farmer than is our organization.

Parity price is our goal, and we must never be content until it is reached. By collectively presenting our problems to the Congress at this time, I believe that we can focus the attention of the various Representatives upon the tragic situation of agriculture today; and, gentlemen, the situation is going to grow progressively worse unless the purchasing power of the farmer is increased, for there can be no shadow of doubt but that the articles he is going to have to buy will be substantially higher in the future than they have been in the past.

There are many things which deserve our attention. For the most part, there should be a focusing of thought on farm legislation, with the hope that there may be a meeting of minds on the major issues involved. Special and emergency matters will be given timely consideration.

There has been much discussion and quite a lot of publicity given to the question of prices. We have an obligation in connection with our marketing and related responsibilities to keep both the producer and consumer informed at all times regarding prices. In fairness to those who produce our food and fiber crops, it must be said that the prices which farmers are getting for their products are not high. In fact, prices generally received by them are considerably below parity, and in many instances below the cost of production. Information as to prices and values should be generally made known to consumer groups everywhere, most of whom are now and have been receiving increased wages or salaries for their services and higher prices for the things which they produce.

Since most commissioners, secretaries, and directors of agriculture, in accordance with statutory regulations, are being called upon to perform additional or emergency services in connection with the marketing of certain farm products, we should give timely thought to the new demands made upon us for services connected in many instances with national-defense activities in the different States. These developments serve to remind us of the need for speedy enactment of marketing legislation which is pending before the Congress.

I am hopeful that we can put up a solid front for agriculture and that each of us will be willing to submerge our personal opinions for the betterment of the whole.

I recently saw in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement from a farmer of the Midwest. If we could get over to Congress the sentiment of this one man, I believe that Congress itself would be more than willing to go down the line for legislation which will mean for the betterment of our great farming class. This farmer from the Midwest said:

"I AM THE FARMER

"I am the provider for all mankind. Upon me every human being constantly depends. A world itself is built upon my toil, my products, my honesty.

"Because of my industry, America, my country, leads the world. Her prosperity is maintained by me, her great commerce is the work of my good hands, her balance of trade springs from furrows of my farm. My reaper brings food for today, my plows hold promise for tomorrow.

"In war I am absolute, in peace I am indispensable—my country's surest defense and constant reliance. I am the very soul of America, the hope of the race, the balance wheel of civilization. When I prosper, men are happy; when I fail, all the world suffers.

"I live with Nature, walk in green fields under the golden sunlight, out in the great alone, where brain and brawn and toil supply mankind's primary needs, and I try to do my humble part to carry out the great plan of God.

"Even the birds are my companions, they greet me with a symphony at the new day's dawn and chum with me until the evening prayer is said. If it were not for me, the treasuries of the earth would remain securely locked, the granaries would be useless frames, man himself would be doomed speedily to extinction or decay."

Again, gentlemen, let me express to you my appreciation upon being elected your president and again let me pledge to you my best possible service which is in my power to render, and with the hope and prayer that through our collective efforts we may bring about a better way of living for those whom we represent.

The Farm Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JARED Y. SANDERS, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1941

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, it seems that efforts are being made to cut farm appropriations again and I am sorry to note that some Members have singled out the cotton farmer for attack. These people seem impatient because the agricultural problem is a problem. They overlook the fact that, for 75 years or more, discriminatory freight and tariff rates, either enacted or permitted by Congress, very nearly bled agriculture white. There would be no agricultural problem and no necessity for legislating about it now had it not been for legislation in the other direction for nearly a century. Thus do our "sins return to plague us."

It is true that by means of legislative controls we are seeking by artificial means to increase the price the farmer is getting for his produce; but this would not be necessary except for the fact that the farmer is living in a world of artificial prices, made so by this Congress and preceeding Congresses. Congress has in years past raised the price of industrial goods by means of a tariff which was nothing more or less than a subsidy to the manufacturers. We have fixed the price of freight rates, which was nothing but a preferential subsidy in favor of certain sections to the detriment of others. By means of wage-and-hour acts and various other regulatory measures, fewer hours and fair treatment for labor have been effected. All of these things affect the price of the goods and services that the farmer must pay in order to exist in an artificial price world thus created.

The air is full of the poison gas of artificiality. Recognizing this fact, the Congress has fixed up gas masks for industry, labor, commerce, and for the farmer. But some seem to object to the farmer wearing a gas mask. In reply I would say that the American farmer, and the cotton farmer among them, as well as others, might get along without a gas mask just as well as could anyone else. But, in fairness to the farmer, these people must not insist upon the American farmer being deprived of his gas mask unless they are going to apply the same rule to all other groups—an unthinkable thing to do in this day and time. And certainly there is no reason why these people should single out the cotton farmer and try to tear his protection from him unless they are willing to apply the same rule to the farmers in their sections and to the industries in their sections as well.

I repeat that there would be no farm problem if the Federal Government had not created one by artificial price levels, fixed by means of tariffs, wage-and-hour acts, and other social legislation which has resulted in the farmer having to pay an artificially high price for everything he needs. I commend to those who are interested in this subject the very worthwhile tables contained in the statement by the distinguished and capable Member the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 14, 1941. I cite you one of these tables:

Prices of selected industrial commodities purchased by farmers if such prices had followed prices of selected agricultural commodities sold by farmers, Dec. 15, 1940

Commodity	Unit	Price Dec. 15, 1940	Price at farm ratio
Mower, 5-foot	Each	$97.14	$32.16
Binder, 7-foot	Each	259.00	92.66
Paint, ready-mixed	Gallon	2.85	1.30
Lumber, rough	M board ft.	46.20	16.80
Kitchen chairs	Each	1.56	.54
Horse blanket	Each	3.50	1.66
Men's work shoes	Pair	2.59	1.48
Barbed wire	80-rod spool	3.54	1.84

This comparison will give you some idea of why the farmer needs help. It is because you are giving help to all other groups of the country by means of artificial price stimulation. Remove the tariff wall and remove freight-rate discrimination and take away Federal control of wages for labor, and the 5-foot mower that the farmer buys for $97.14 could be bought for $32.16. I believe that the Congress has done the very best that it could do with a very complex and complicated problem, and I have voted for all of the humanitarian and social legislation that has come before this body since I have become a Member. But I certainly do not believe that there is any fairness in the proposition that we should apply artificial aid and subsidy and Federal assistance to the other groups of this country and that the farmer should be deprived of the assistance he needs.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is no time for Members to be suggesting decreased aid to agriculture. Already the signs are beginning to point to the fact that the American farmer is getting the little end of the stick, and in appraising the situation, please remember that when the farmer gets sick, it is industry that, in a large measure, foots the bill. If the farmer cannot buy, the chances are that industry will not sell very much. Because under present world conditions, where in the world are we going to find a market for the products of industry except in our own back yard, where the farmer, hard working and uncomplaining as always, is endeavoring steadfastly, patiently, and courageously to make the best of a very bad bargain and to get his chores done.

I wish to call your attention at this time to another table submitted by the distinguished Member from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] the other day, showing the national income from 1909 to 1941 and the farmers' percentage of this income:

National income, United States, 1909–41

Year	Total	Nonfarm	Farm	Farm as percentage of total
	Million dollars	*Million dollars*	*Million dollars*	*Percent*
1909	26,415	22,070	4,345	16.4
1910	28,114	23,474	4,640	16.5
1911	28,480	24,251	4,229	14.8
1912	30,394	25,798	4,596	15.1
1913	32,133	27,560	4,573	14.2
1914	31,919	27,367	4,552	14.3
1915	33,210	28,404	4,806	14.5
1916	39,036	33,198	5,838	15.0
1917	47,385	38,482	8,903	18.8
1918	55,357	44,856	10,501	19.0
1919	60,354	48,756	11,598	19.2
1920	64,552	56,478	8,074	12.5
1921	54,210	49,883	4,327	8.0
1922	57,546	52,109	5,437	9.4
1923	66,171	59,620	6,551	9.9
1924	68,824	61,898	6,926	10.1
1925	73,278	65,852	7,426	10.1
1926	75,564	68,695	6,869	9.1
1927	76,457	69,618	6,839	8.9
1928	78,117	71,209	6,908	8.8
1929	80,372	73,542	6,830	8.5
1930	73,571	68,456	5,115	7.0
1931	62,384	59,303	3,081	4.9
1932	48,355	46,551	1,804	3.7
1933	45,771	43,174	2,597	5.7
1934	52,540	49,164	3,376	6.4
1935	57,007	52,770	4,237	7.4
1936	66,722	61,599	5,123	7.7
1937	70,758	65,282	5,471	7.7
1938	64,687	60,236	4,451	6.9
1939 [1]	68,127	63,821	4,306	6.3
1940 [2]	71,829	67,611	4,218	5.9
1941 [3]	80,350	75,700	4,650	5.8
INCLUDING GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS				
1933	45,933	43,174	2,759	6.0
1934	53,096	49,164	3,932	7.4
1935	57,590	52,770	4,820	8.4
1936	67,009	61,599	5,410	8.1
1937	71,120	65,282	5,838	8.2
1938	65,169	60,236	4,933	7.6
1939 [1]	68,934	63,821	5,113	7.4
1940 [2]	72,595	67,611	4,984	6.9
1941 [3]	81,050	75,700	5,350	6.6

[1] Revision of preliminary estimate given in table on p. 650 of 1941 agricultural appropriation hearings.
[2] Preliminary.
[3] Forecast.
Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

From this table you will notice that, whereas in 1909 the farmers of this country got 16.4 percent of the total national income, by 1940 this had dropped to 5.9 percent, and the estimated figures indicate that the farmers' share of the national income for the year 1941 will be 5.8 percent. In other words, the farmers today are getting one-third of the proportion of the national income that they got in 1909, therefore the farmers of today, even with other figures estimated at parity, have just one-third of the purchasing power that they had in 1909. And another thing of great significance is this fact, that 6 percent of our national income is going to farmers who comprise 22.9 percent of our total population.

And from this table you will notice another significant thing. The lean years of the American farmer coincide to a large extent with the depression years for the United States as a whole. And during the years immediately preceding the crash of 1929, the danger signs were there to be seen by those who had the vision. There were many people in this country who pointed out in 1926–27 that the farmers were losing their purchasing power under the agricultural conditions prevailing then as now in this country. These prophets proclaimed the truth—that unless something was done to help

agriculture, industrial and economic disaster lay ahead. But their prophesying was in vain; their warnings fell on unheeding ears. And, Mr. Speaker, the signs of impending catastrophe, I greatly fear, can be seen upon the economic horizon of our times. According to this table, in this year of 1941 all of the farmers of America will get less than 6 percent of the total national income, and if you include Government payments, even with these figures added, the total farm income for this Nation is estimated to be only 6.6 percent of the whole. Nor is this all, for we must recognize the fact that, in addition to the artificial stimulation of other group incomes already referred to, we are now faced with the concentration of our national income in the industrial centers in connection with our national-defense program. The tremendous appropriations which this Congress is making for the national-defense program, practically all of which is being spent in the industrial centers, tends to complicate tremendously the already complicated farm problem. For instance, Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, states that—

> Contrary to the belief of many uninformed people, the war and the national-defense program will not ease, even temporarily, the farm problem. Today the index of farm prices is 104, but the index of prices paid by farmers is 123 and the index of labor's wages is 229.

I wish to say a few words about the South, since cotton has been particularly discussed. It is true that the economic structure of the South is built largely around cotton. I wish to quote from a report of the Department of Agriculture in its pamphlet, Cotton, Lands, People—page 2:

> The gross farm income per person for the 10 principal cotton States for 10 years 1924–35 averaged $184. For the first 5 years it averaged $238; and for the last 5 years, $127. The cash income is even more significant. For the first 5 years this cash farm income amounted to $190 per person and for the last 5 years it amounted to only $95. It is impossible to distribute such a small cash income so as to give an adequate purchasing power to the entire farm population. It is impossible to achieve or maintain even an un-American standard of living on an income that low.

Members of Congress, complaining about cotton legislation should consider that $95 a year is a mighty small cash income, and remember that every one of these people in this farming section of which I am speaking—the Southland—and I speak of that only because it was a discussion of cotton that provoked these remarks, every one of these people—every one of these farmers—pay their share of taxes; some more, some less, but out of that $95 a year cash income comes some of the taxes that go to make up our Government revenue which is financing the national-defense program, and which is being so heavily concentrated in the industrial centers.

In other words, what we are doing is taking, in the form of taxes, a part of the slender resources from these $95 a year farmers and sending it in the form of Government defense spending, into the industrial centers where there is already more money than they can use—where orders are piling up, and where there is actually a shortage of labor.

Expenditures for national defense, grouped geographically according to States, are as follows:

States of the Northeast	$7,368,449,597
States of the Northwest	2,057,082,933
States of the Southeast	1,875,926,560
States of the Southwest	899,100,077

The State of Louisiana is included in the States of the Southwest, which has received less than a billion in spending for defense.

Unless the Government and the Congress appreciates the significance of these figures and takes steps to correct them, there is bound to follow, in time, a heavy dislocation of our purchasing power, with a consequent additional strain upon our economic structure.

These figures mean something. I have put my own interpretation upon what they mean and I hope and believe that each Member of this body will do the same. To summarize: Including Government payments, the farmers of this country, comprising nearly one-third of our population, will get only 6.6 percent of the national income in 1941. And remember, according to the figures presented by Mr. O'Neal, the few dollars that the farmer gets as his share of the national income is indexed at 104, but the index of prices which must be paid by the farmer for anything he needs is 123. And the index of labor's wages is 229. Then add to this the other fact that the cash farm income for the 10 principal cotton States for the years 1931–35 averaged only $95 per person per year.

Mr. Speaker, $95 a year, out of which must be deducted whatever taxes are payable, leaves a mighty small purchasing power per person.

One of the most important problems we have facing us is how to keep the currents of trade flowing in this country. If all of the purchasing power of this country is concentrated in the industrial centers, there will come a time when industry can sell only to itself.

The largest market and the most desirable market in which American industry is offered today, without let or hindrance, is the American farm market. As the distinguished Member from Georgia [Mr. PACE] said the other day, "The greatest potential market for American goods are the farmers of America," and we must put purchasing power into the hands of the American farmer to offset the tremendous concentration of national income in the great industrial centers incidental to our national-defense program.

In the report of economic conditions of the South, prepared for the President by the National Emergency Council, issued under date of July 25, 1938, on page 61, it is stated:

> The South is the Nation's greatest untapped market and the market in which American business can expand most easily.

Our people want to buy American goods. Our section is already sold on the desirability of buying American. The only thing lacking is purchasing power, and this must be provided.

It must not be forgotten that it was a collapse on the home front that brought about the defeat of Germany in 1918. A collapse on the home front can be just as disastrous as would be a great military defeat.

Of course, we must maintain the slender Government assistance now being given to the cotton farmers, and in addition to that we should take steps to see that the national-defense program is decentralized. The President has declared that this is his policy and all agree that it should be done. We cannot expect the President to personally supervise every contract. With the tremendous burdens now confronting our President, he has a right to expect that when he announces a policy that those associated with him would carry that policy into execution. Everybody says, "Decentralize," but nobody is doing it. It is my personal opinion that the Members of Congress, cooperating with department heads who have already declared themselves in favor of decentralizing this program should see to it that this is done.

Down in my section we have a great deal of surplus farm labor. This is a cold and unimaginative phrase. It means that we have many people out of work who want to work, people who are hunting jobs.

We have had only one strike affecting any national-defense unit or program in the entire State of Louisiana, and that was settled in a few days. Some strikes that have been called in other sections of the country are, no doubt, due to alien influences. Alien influence in my section is very small. The surplus labor is there. The spirit of the people cannot be surpassed in any section anywhere. The decentralization of the defense program, too, will be a step in the decentralization of industry that our economists have long warned is an essential step in the solving of our farm problem. And then, finally, I do not believe that there is any possibility of this Nation arming itself properly and quickly through bottlenecks that have been caused by the tremendous concentration of orders with a few firms and contractors located in a few great industrial centers.

Mr. Chester C. Davis, member of the National Advisory Commission, in a speech in New Orleans, La., on March 15, last, made some very interesting observations. He said:

> I was somewhat shocked a few days ago to see a tabulation of the distribution of defense orders to date not as between areas but between industrial concerns. Included in the tabulation were eleven and one-half billions of prime contracts awarded between June 13 of last year and February 15 of this year. This tabulation includes all types of contracts. Of this vast total, between one-fifth and one-quarter had gone to 2 groups of companies of closely interconnected ownership. Between 40 and 45 percent had gone to 6 closely interconnected groups. And a total of 80 percent has gone to 62 companies or interrelated groups of companies. There is rich food for thought in these figures. I believe they are closely related to the mediocre success we have had in apportioning a part of this new defense industry to the States represented here today. Our defense contracts are being absorbed by

a small handful of concerns. The very smallness of the number threatens to be a serious bottleneck on the full use of our industrial and human resources. It is a bottleneck which must be broken.

Mr. Davis stated elsewhere, in the same speech, that:

Up to March 1, plans have been completed for the construction of some 302 new facilities for defense production. Of these, only 24, valued at $166,271,660 have been located in the 11 States (southern) I have just listed, as compared with 302 at a cost of $1,574,523,000, in the rest of the country.

Mr. Speaker, this defense program must be broken up and decentralized. Never can we obtain the speed and volume required by the fearful emergency now confronting this Nation if we fail to recognize the danger inherent in the centralized policy as pointed out by Mr. Davis.

Mr. Speaker, I have made these remarks only through a sense of justice and fair play to the American farmer. Every day the sowing, the plowing, and the reaping is done in season. The milk, the bread, the meat to feed, and the cotton and the wool to clothe the people is produced—in good weather or in bad; in hot sunshine or in icy rain, the work goes on that a people may be fed and clothed. In this basic industry alone, there never rises to plague the Government or the people, the spectre of strike or walk-out. Transportation may cease at someone's nod; industry's wheels may stop because of jurisdictional proceedure or quarrel; the earth may cease to give up her fuel because of some difference between operators and miners; the sound of the hammer and saw may die away at some barracks—a building to house our boys—because of economic friction. But nothing stops the farm or the farmer. In season and out; in summer's heat and winter's cold; come good years or bad, the farmer works at his allotted task, that a people may be clothed; that men, women, and children may eat.

If a profit comes from his labor, he furnishes industry with its best customer, and, if at the end of the year the farmer shows no gain, industry suffers. But with that enduring hope that has been his throughout the ages, he bends his unyielding back again to the unending task of making a living for his loved ones, and to clothe and feed the world. Begrudge him not the little that he gets from a Government that is so lavish in its gifts to others.

The Automobile's Contribution to the Tax Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1941

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, all of us feel the burden of taxation, but the largest contributor to the support of our Government is the automobile industry. This is the same source which has done more to raise the standard of living in this country than any other. A recent study has demonstrated the importance of the automobile in the national economy and national defense.

Both the Federal and State Governments share in the taxes paid by the automobile industry. The tax burden has increased every year, except in 1938, since it was first discovered as an excellent producer of revenue. It has increased 50 percent in the last 10 years.

Based on the increased activity of the automobile last year over 1939, when a new record was set, estimates of tax collections in 1940 are made as follows:

State gasoline tax	$865,000,000
State registration receipts	450,000,000
Federal gasoline taxes	248,000,000
Federal excise taxes	134,000,000
Personal property and tolls	56,000,000
Municipal and county taxes	16,000,000

These separate sources aggregate the record-making sum of $1,872,000,000 without including an estimated amount of $105,000,000 in general retail sales taxes in 25 States. When compared with the 1939 automobile tax bill of $1,636,549,000, the 1940 estimate appears to be surprisingly conservative.

Thirty-eight percent of all tax revenue of the 48 States is paid by motorcar operators, and gasoline taxes constitute the largest single item of revenue. Originally, the State gasoline tax was imposed to help bear the burden of building roads, but the huge amounts obtainable from this source supplied the first opportunity to use motorcar taxes for general purposes. Thus about 16 percent of these taxes are diverted by the States.

When the United States entered the first World War, Congress utilized the revenue-producing possibilities of the automobile by imposing an excise tax. This was discontinued in 1929, restored again as an emergency measure in 1932, and boosted for defense purposes in 1940.

Thus an emergency automobile tax remained as a permanent tax for 9 years, producing approximately $1,000,000,000. Proposals to increase it from 7 to 25 percent seek to continue it in effect as a source of revenue for defense expenditures.

What does taxation of automobile transportation mean to the motorist? It means that on a per-car basis, the average new-car purchaser has to pay $40 in taxes of various kinds before he is allowed to use his car on the highways.

Add to that, 32 cents of every dollar he spends for gasoline, together with taxes on any accessories he may install in his car, or parts replaced, and he may be near or well over the $55.83, which has been estimated as the average tax for the 31,800,000 cars in operation in 1940.

To the tax-producing value of the automobile industry should be included more than 40,000 automobile dealers, thousands of gasoline station and suppliers, all paying substantial sums from their business operations.

Certainly, in view of its importance in the American economy and the fact that automobiles are already contributing more than their just share of taxation, careful thought should be given to imposing additional taxes which might seriously disrupt so vital a cog in our economic machine.

By reducing the number of new automobiles which will be available for next year's market, the automobile industry has already made a substantial contribution to the defense effort. Without doubt, further curtailment will be readily forthcoming should the future conditions indicate the necessity of so doing.

Wisdom demands that punitive taxation be avoided.

Choctaw County Defense Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1941

LETTER TO PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT AND RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT CHOCTAW COUNTY (OKLA.) DEFENSE MEETING

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a letter to President Roosevelt from Harvey M. Black, chairman, and a copy of the resolutions adopted at the Choctaw County defense meeting held in Hugo, Okla., on May 4, 1941.

Many of our citizens are becoming alarmed by the delays which are blocking the progress of our national-defense program and "all-out aid to Britain," and I understand that similar meetings are being planned in other counties in my district calling on the President, the Congress, and the American people to subordinate all private industry and private interest to the defense program and make all sacrifices necessary to arm the Nation for its defense in this time of crisis.

The letter and resolution follow:

MAY 6, 1941.

President FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Approximately 1,500 citizens of Choctaw County attended a defense meeting held in Hugo at the Hugo stadium Sunday afternoon, May 4. Rain began to fall just before the program opened and it became necessary to move to a local church where about 1,200 persons were present.

The meeting was not sponsored by any organization or any political group. It was called by a group of citizens for the purpose of learning the sentiment of the people.

Following a discussion of the different phases of existing emergencies a resolutions committee was appointed and directed to preserve the sentiment of the group in written resolutions. The report of the resolutions committee was adopted unanimously, and, as chairman of the meeting, I was directed to send a copy of the resolutions to you, together with a list of those persons attending who registered, as an indication of the opinion of Choctaw County citizens with regard to matters of national defense.

The original registration is on file in the office of the secretary of the chamber of commerce in Hugo.

Sincerely yours,

HARVEY M. BLACK,
Chairman, the defense meeting.

Whereas we citizens of the United States and residing in Choctaw County, State of Oklahoma, having assembled in Hugo for the purpose of considering the problems that affect the future of our Nation and the forces at large in this world which do threaten our liberty, our democratic form of government and the security of our Nation; and

Whereas we are conscious of the blessings of liberty and of peace; and

Whereas in this time of world-wide emergency we deem certain principles and purposes to be of paramount importance; and

Whereas we consider it proper to communicate to the President and the Congress of these United States as well as to all citizens thereof, our concurrence in these principles: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the people of Choctaw County, State of Oklahoma, do call upon those in authority to immediately curtail or eliminate all production in fields which are not essential to national defense to the end that material, labor, and plant facilities may be released to the task of producing for national defense; be it further

Resolved, That both capital and labor be required to subordinate selfish or personal considerations to the immediate necessity of producing at the utmost speed those material things necessary for adequate national defense; be it further

Resolved, That those in authority be permitted to use every means at hand for the suppression of espionage and sabotage; be it further

Resolved, That we believe it necessary and proper that this country give all possible aid to all beleaguered democracies; and, further, that our Nation take such steps as may be necessary to insure the safe arrival of our material aid; be it further

Resolved, That we hereby notify those in authority that we as liberty-loving Americans are willing to make those sacrifices which may be necessary to defend our liberty and perpetuate institutions of democracy in this world.

The foregoing resolutions are presented by your resolutions committee on this the 4th day of May, 1941.

FORREST M. DIVINE, *Chairman.*

Members of Committee:

W. C. Henry, W. B. Harris, John A. Bryan, John W. Jones, W. Bayless Irby, J. M. May, R. W. Harkey, L. Roy Patterson, L. E. Ferguson, R. C. Newton, Jake B. Cobb, C. A. Kimmons, E. M. DeWeese.

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. WALTER C. PLOESER, OF MISSOURI

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday evening, May 5, 1941, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WALTER C. PLOESER] delivered a very interesting and able address on the proposed Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project. His exposition of this subject is so lucid and his arguments are so logical that any reasonable man should be convinced that it would be most inadvisable for this project to be constructed at this particular time. Under leave to extend my remarks I include the enlightening broadcast by Mr. PLOESER.

There is a proposal before the Congress of the United States which, if enacted into law, would surrender control over Lake Michigan to a foreign nation. While the foreign nation, Canada, is our friendly neighbor, this in itself constitutes no justification for yielding sovereignty over any part of the United States.

The proposal to which I refer is the billion-dollar Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway. This is a plan to open the Great Lakes to ocean traffic and international trade by building a 27-foot channel through the lakes and rivers from Lake Superior to the mouth of the St. Lawrence River in Canada.

This seaway, as projected, would be built jointly by the United States and Canada, with the bulk of the cost falling on the American taxpayers. Aside from the cost, this project, if constructed, would enable foreign nations, with their control of the world's shipping and their cheap labor, to invade our own great inland industrial and agricultural empire. It would likewise irreparably damage American labor, agriculture, rail transportation, motor transportation, and industry in general.

This project came before the United States Senate in 1933 as a treaty. It was rejected by the Senate in 1934. Now it is presented to the Congress as an agreement. It is really a treaty being presented under a false name. It takes only a simple majority vote of both Houses of Congress to pass a resolution approving an agreement, while the ratification of a treaty in the Senate requires a vote of two-thirds majority. We can all readily understand why it is now called an agreement.

This treaty involves our sovereignty over Lake Michigan and it is my purpose this evening, in my limited time, to discuss this particular phase of the subject.

The Treaty of Paris of 1783 ceded all the territory east of the Mississippi River to the complete sovereignty of the United States.

The Great Lakes, all save one, became the common boundary between a part of Great Britain's Colonial Empire, Canada in the north and the young American Nation in the South. This one lake was Lake Michigan. Michigan was wholly within and a part of what was then called the Northwest Territory.

In 1787, our Federal Government, before the adoption of the Constitution, moved to protect this territory. Congress sent troops to protect the frontiers and set up a system of government. The Ordinance of 1787, which provided for the Northwest territorial government, made complete American sovereignty over all this country. It then became an integral part of the States.

Lake Michigan then became an exclusively American lake under the full ownership and protection of the American flag.

The United States Constitution recognized the acts of the Confederate Congress as organic law of the land. By Confederate Congress, I refer to the Congress of the Confederation of States prior to the adoption of the Constitution.

The sovereignty of the lake has been continuous and unchallenged since 1787—more than 150 years. I emphasize this point because attempts have been made to divide sovereignty over Lake Michigan. In the peace treaty negotiations resulting from the War of 1812, the British again attempted to acquire the Great Lakes. It is reported in the British papers recording the negotiations by the British and American plenipotentiaries at Ghent, that Great Britain demanded the possession of the Lakes with an exclusive right of building forts and maintaining ships of war, and that the Americans be precluded from establishing the same either on the Lakes, or the rivers, flowing into them. All the Lakes were demanded, including Michigan. But the British vacated this position under the American threat of continuing the war. The British delegates were severely reprimanded at home for yielding this position. Negotiating this Treaty of Ghent, which the British protested, were such great Americans as John Quincy Adams and Henry Clay.

Again in 1909 Great Britain and Canada attempted to include in the treaty with the United States, which is now referred to as the treaty of 1910, a provision limiting diversion from Lake Michigan and to again name it as a part of the boundary waters. Elihu Root, then Secretary of State, refused to agree to this limitation. Secretary Root explained to the Senate that his reason for refusing to agree to this provision was that Lake Michigan was an all-American lake, entirely within our country. He refused to have anything in the treaty about Lake Michigan.

To those people who do not have a clear mind's-eye picture of Lake Michigan and its relative location, I suggest that at your leisure you consult a map. You will find that Lake Michigan and the entire Lake Michigan watershed are within the boundaries of the United States. It is truly all American. I remind you that it is your and my duty to keep it and all other parts of the United States all American.

Being unable to get the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway project ratified by the Senate in 1934, the President is now attempting a devious method. This method directly usurps the constitutional prerogatives and responsibilities of the United States Senate.

The present agreement, if ratified by Congress, will bring to a successful conclusion Canada's and Great Britain's hope to internationalize Lake Michigan. They will have achieved a notable diplomatic and territorial victory. They will have accomplished that which the Congress of the United States and the Senate have consistently refused to concede. It will be a surrender without recourse.

In my opinion, to consider this treaty as an agreement before Congress is not only a direct affront to the United States Senate but illegal and unconstitutional.

To me it is certainly undesirable for the United States to surrender this lake. I wonder what the people of the Pacific Northwest would say if the Congress yielded sovereignty over Puget Sound to Canada; I wonder what the people of the great State of New York would say if Congress yielded sovereignty over Lake Champlain, or more important the great Hudson River, to some foreign nation. I wonder what the people of the States on the Gulf of Mexico would say if Congress yielded joint control and sovereignty over their great Gulf ports to Mexico, or to some South American republic. I wonder what the people of the Southwest, and particularly the State of California, would say if the Congress yielded joint control over San Francisco Bay to Japan. Coming from Missouri, representing St. Louis County and a part of St. Louis City, both on the Mississippi, I think I know what the several great States of the Mississippi Valley would say if the Congress yielded joint control over the Mississippi River or the Missouri River or the Ohio River to any foreign nation. I can

foresee the wave of resentment that will sweep this Nation when the full implications of this project are understood.

Few people will be misled by the claims of the administration and the proponents of the seaway that it is a defense measure. Experts are generally agreed upon the fact that this project once undertaken will take a minimum of 8 years and probably more for its completion. But there is a new habit here in Washington of putting the defense label on almost every kind of money-spending and money-wasting scheme to help it through the Congress.

So the St. Lawrence seaway has been called a national-defense project. In the present emergency, it would seem that, at least for the time being, we should not be concerned about instruments for national defense which attainment would be from 8 to 10 years in the future. Our job today is to concentrate on our immediate national defense.

The taxpayers of this Nation, struggling under increasing burdens, should be given every opportunity to express themselves on this St. Lawrence seaway project before they are called upon to shoulder the additional burden it will impose upon them. No other course is fair to the taxpayers. No other course is honorable by the Congress.

In the past Lake Michigan has contributed immeasurably to the national defense. Her shipyards and docks have served as training grounds for men in the marine industry. Our own Great Lakes Naval Training Station consistently trains huge groups of young men for service in our Navy.

Lake Michigan was selected for the site of this naval training station because it is in the middle of the continent, surrounded completely by American soil, and without an inlet that would make its siege or destruction possible by an enemy fleet. Here in security every phase of naval warfare and navigation may be taught with economy and safety.

It is neither wise nor consistent with national defense to surrender or share the great natural advantage we have through the undisputed possession of Lake Michigan.

There is another reason why we should retain our undisputed control over Lake Michigan. The day may come when we will need her broad expanse of water for a protected inland naval aviation base. It should be clear to all my listeners that if this really were a defense measure the proponents would be trying to safeguard our interests in Lake Michigan instead of trying to give them away.

It is my intention to discuss publicly other tremendously important economic features of this project in the near future. How this project would be injurious to American labor, agriculture, commerce, and industry are questions which directly affect the lives of all Americans. The public is entitled to be fully informed.

Tonight I stress two main points: First, Lake Michigan is, and for more than 150 years have been, an all-American lake, a part of the United States of America. Second, that the present attempt is but a renewal of old attempts to obtain the surrender of our sovereignty over Lake Michigan.

I am sure the American people are unwilling to surrender sovereignty over Lake Michigan. I am equally confident they will not allow their Representatives in Congress to surrender sovereignty over any part of the United States—land or water.

Gerrymander

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON LAWRENCE J. CONNERY, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by my colleague from Massachusetts, Hon. LAWRENCE J. CONNERY:

Friends of the radio audience, I am pleased to be privileged to address you in the name of Massachusetts democracy. I speak to you not as a partisan nor one seeking any special privilege for the Democratic Party but as a citizen of Massachusetts demanding that the right of our people to be represented in the Congress of the United States by persons of their own choosing be protected and preserved. And I bespeak an opportunity for the people of Massachusetts to be represented in the Congress of the United States by those who represent the views and wishes of the majority of our people.

Because of the national census of 1940, Massachusetts suffers the loss of one Representative in Congress. Therefore, it becomes necessary to reapportion the State into 14 districts. This means that for the next 10 years, until the 1950 census is taken, Massachusetts will have 14 Representatives rather than 15 in the House of Representatives in Washington.

The law requires that the reapportionment shall be based upon an allotment of approximately 308,000 people to each district, and that each district shall be contiguous.

A legislative committee, composed of members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Massachusetts General Court, has been given the responsibility of this redistricting.

It is not my desire to question the sincerity of those who have been entrusted by the Legislature of Massachusetts with this arduous task. But it is my desire to call your attention to the efforts of a few who seek to influence the decisions of those who make up the redistricting committee, thereby attempting to deprive you and millions of others in Massachusetts of being represented in Washington by those you would choose to represent you.

Some 2 or 3 weeks ago a so-called plan for redistricting the State congressional districts was presented to the Democratic members of the redistricting committee. This plan, which I understand, for the moment at any rate, has been tossed into the background, seems to me is so vicious and its intent so plain that I doubt that it could be tolerated, let alone accepted, by anybody—Republican, Democrat, or Independent. Republican Members of Congress with whom I have talked have frowned upon the unfair proposition with distaste.

The plan contemplates the carving of Massachusetts in such a way as would make certain the election of 12 Republicans and only 2 Democrats, totally eliminating 4 of the 6 Democrats now Members of Congress; FLAHERTY, HEALEY, and CONNERY would be resident in the same district and thereby either be forced to contend against each other or resort to the graceful retirement of 2 of them in favor of the other. The remainder of their carved districts would be so overwhelmingly Republican in complexion that it would be virtually impossible for any Democrat to win. In addition to this, the present districts of Democratic Congressmen ELIOT and CASEY would be made solidly Republican in character. Altogether these maneuverings completely eliminate 4 Democratic Congressmen.

This plan is typical of what some representatives of vested interests, those who in one way or another are constantly endeavoring to demonstrate their influence on Beacon Hill, would like to impose on our people; their intent being to deprive the liberal-minded people of our State of the right to be represented in Congress by more than a bare minority.

It is said by some that Massachusetts is a Republican State. I think it better to say that Massachusetts in days gone by was a Republican State. During the past decade the people of Massachusetts have elected as their Governors for a period of 7 of the 10 years, representatives of the Democratic Party. Despite the gerrymandering that took place 10 years ago, 6 of your 15 Congressmen are now liberal Democrats. In other congressional districts a change of a few thousand votes would have sent a Democrat rather than somebody else to Congress. During all of this period, and for 10 years prior thereto, your senior United States Senator, DAVID I. WALSH, has been a representative of the Democratic Party. President Franklin D. Roosevelt has carried the State of Massachusetts in every election; in fact, the Democratic candidate for the Presidency has carried the State on every occasion during the past 16 years.

Massachusetts at its last election, in its contest for Governor, indicated the even political party division that exists in the State by electing as Governor a man who received only one-fifth of 1 percent more votes than his Democratic opponent. The contest was so close that a recount was necessary. A change of less than 3,000 votes would have installed the Democratic candidate as your Governor.

The people of our great State are keenly concerned with legislation enacted by the Congress. Representation by men of liberal thought and action is vital to the welfare of our people. The Nation is proud of the able and conscientious leadership of our courageous majority floor leader and our Massachusetts Democratic colleague, Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK; Congressman ARTHUR D. HEALEY is a member of the all-important Ways and Means Committee; Congressman JOSEPH E. CASEY serves on the equally important Appropriations Committee; Congressman THOMAS A. FLAHERTY plays an important part in the building of our great new Navy through his membership on the Naval Affairs Committee; Congressman THOMAS H. ELIOT holds enviable membership on the outstanding Judiciary Committee;

while I have the honor of being the only New England member, Republican or Democrat, on the Labor Committee.

This representation means something, in fact a very great deal, to all citizens of Massachusetts.

I make no plea for these Representatives as individuals, but I do demand that those they represent be not deprived of their right of free choice.

It is my hope, therefore, that you will make your voice and your opinion felt with the members of the redistricting committee from your locality, to the extent at least, that in redistricting the State there shall be no gerrymandering, no finding of a soft place for any outstanding representative of vested interests.

There is no good reason why countless of our citizens should be deprived of the privilege of being represented in Congress by those who represent their views, in order that some ambitious persons, temporarily holding high public office in the Legislature of Massachusetts, may benefit by having seats in Congress carved out for them.

Let us hope, too, that the redistricting committee will be able to withstand the pressure of these attempted influences and agree upon a redistricting bill that will give to you and yours the right which you, as free Americans, should retain as a priceless heritage—the right of free selection.

I have stated that I do not desire to address you in a partisan spirit. I am happy to say that for the most part in these days of dire emergency there is very little partisan spirit among our people. I trust that this spirit will continue. Men may and do differ in their political views. For America it is good that this is so. For such differences of opinions and views are the very lifeblood of the freedom of a democracy. And true representation gives voice to all views and opinions. If we are to continue to maintain a true Americanism in Massachusetts then we cannot tolerate the stifling of so many hundreds of thousands of Democratic voices by silencing their chosen representatives.

I speak for fair play—for proper division of our State into the necessary 14 districts. I protest and join with many thousands of Democrats, Republicans, and Independents alike who are voicing their disapproval of any tactics in redistricting which can only result in a proclamation to the other States of our Nation that, to her everlasting disgrace and discredit, the iniquitous so-called gerrymander has been permitted to again run rampant in Massachusetts.

A Plea for Spiritual Solidarity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1941

SERMON BY REV. JOHN J. REILLY

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, with pride, I place in the RECORD the sermon delivered on Sunday, May 11, 1941, by the Reverend John J. Reilly, director of the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception at Catholic University, Washington, D. C., on the occasion of the solemn pontifical mass for the visiting South American naval officers:

"Of them whom Thou hast given me, I have not lost one—I will give them life everlasting and they shall not perish forever, and no man shall pluck them out of my hand."

These words are the words of our blessed Lord, but how beautifully apt they are today, for today they are celebrating Mother's Day, and these words fit well on the lips of all real mothers. And how doubly fitting they are today as the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception acts as host to you distinguished representatives of our sister American republics. Most of us are conscious of the tributes we owe our natural mothers, and most are conscious, too, of the Mother, Christ bequeathed us as she stood at the cross' foot—in whose honor this shrine is being built, and most prefer to think in terms of America as our mother, and why not? She has shown us all the tenderness and care any mother could have shown. She has provided for us, too, as mothers do for children; she guards us; she protects us; she pours out her wealth, her riches, her everything that God has given her, without stint or calculation, and as any mother she will not hesitate to sacrifice herself on any altar her enemies may fashion or construct. America can hardly be considered in any other way but as a mother, a prolific mother, too, as God would want her to be with her many children north and south, symbolic, too, of her Son's cross, the Son whom you enthroned in Rio, for the arms of the cross of that same Son stretch to the north and to the south just as well as to the east and to the west. The arms of the cross were all embracing, and so, too, were His mother's arms and the words of Christ have never seemed so apropos as they do these days on the lips of our mother America. "Of them whom Thou hast given me I have not lost one, and I will give them life everlasting, and they shall not perish forever, and no man shall pluck them from my hand."

Any mother who claims this must be disturbed from time to time, and America is disturbed right now, for such a boast, "Of them whom Thou hast given me I have not lost one," holds true only insofar as solidarity exists among such a mother's children, and solidarity has never suffered the way it has of late. The only solidarity bearing up right now against destructive forces is the solidarity of a spiritual kind. The spirit alone in Europe remains as an unbroken thing, the material ties that bound the nations are scattered through the length and breadth of all that land. America has taught the nations many things, but nothing she has taught them will ever have the value of the lesson she can teach right now—two continents spiritually so close no man can pluck one from the hands of Christ of Rio and Mary of Washington.

In view, then, of the need of a spiritual tie that will bind the children of one Mother America, we bid you most welcome to this National Shrine of the Mother of God, for whether you have ever been aware of it or not, there is a vast portion of thinking North Americans who consider there is more real power for peace and happiness in America right here in Mary's shrine than down there in the War Department. In no part of the United States should you feel more at home. They will point out many things of interest in this grand land, but you could return without getting the true picture of the United States, your neighbor. We know you will be glad to hear that Christianity and the things that are dear to Christ are doing very well right here. We think not in terms of any new order, or not in any terms of an old order; we are thinking in terms more eternal than both; we are thinking in the reign of Christ, and in spite of what our movies may have made you think, and in spite of how our salesmen have impressed you, this which you behold today, a mass in Mary's shrine, on the grounds of the Catholic University, is more a part of the real United States. They will do some window dressing for you—all tours of the kind do that. This is part of the America you see every day. This will remind you of your homeland. This will tell you more than anything of the possibilities within the great big American heart, for friendship and for solidarity. We dream the same dreams; we think the same things; we pray the same prayers as you.

Can we touch you then when, we invite you to turn with us toward a common mother, a mother that stands at the foot of the cross from time to time, a mother to whom we flee in time of war, a mother to whom we turn in time of peace, a mother big enough to embrace us all, a mother who can truly say when she thinks of both of us, "Of them whom Thou hast given me, I have not lost one"?

We bid you welcome then to the sanctuary of the United States, the place where you see holy things, to the place from which is radiated spiritual energy, and here at Mary's Shrine today, our prayer is that the Americas' shall always be big, big of body and big of soul, and big of heart. Mindful of the pains and sacrifices, and triumphs of the past, and conscious of our blessings here and now the prayer of all Americans should be for all our blessings, for all our benefits, for all our crosses, and for all our happiness, thanks, O thanks be to God.

Christ of the Andes, Christ of Rio, Mary of Washington, preserve the Americas. Keep them close as children of one mother. They have done as much for you as all the world. They have crowned their highest mountains, they have made more beautiful their Capital City with memories of you. Keep them safe from the forces that tried to keep you apart. Keep them safe in the American way, for the American way, O Christ and Mary, we think is the nearest way to Your way. Ad majorem Dei Gloriam.

Igor I. Sikorsky and the Helicopter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Sunday New York Times on the remarkable feat of Igor I. Sikorsky brings national eminence to the romantic career of the man whose name is indissolubly linked with that of Stratford and Bridgeport, Conn. No one who has read the Story of the Winged S, his autobiography, will ever forget the unflinching devotion to an ideal that characterized the youngest son of a professor of psychology in St. Vladimir University at Kiev.

I am taking advantage of my unanimous consent to insert the editorial:

[From the New York Times of May 11, 1941]

HELICOPTERS

A new world's record for sustained flight in a helicopter has rewarded the persever-

ance of Igor I. Sikorsky, better known in the world of the air for his large-scale transocean flying boats. With the designer at the controls, a strange-looking aircraft, requiring only 90 horsepower, hovered one day last week over an area no larger than a tennis court for an hour and a half. More significant than the breaking of a record, however, was the demonstrated ability of the Sikorsky machine to make vertical ascents and descents, to fly backward and sideways as readily as forward, and to maintain position with no forward speed, at the will of the pilot.

These characteristics raise many implications of interest. The new machine is relatively inexpensive to build and lends itself readily to mass production. It could be manufactured without important interference with any other aspect of the military-aircraft program. This being the case, it would seem that an aircraft which can operate successfully from a platform 40 feet square, has forward speed in excess of 100 miles an hour, can hover at will for observation and furnish a still platform for the firing of aircraft cannon or the dropping of bombs is worth serious consideration as a weapons of protection for merchant ships against submarine attacks.

To fit such ships for the use of helicopters would require no slow or expensive structural reinforcement, while the utility of aircraft of this kind for submarine spotting and destruction might well be very great. One of the secrets of Axis military successes thus far has been the willingness of the German command to make use of new weapons and new methods. It certainly would be worth while to find out without delay whether, in the helicopter, we have not a weapon which could be of great value in the bitter battle of the Atlantic.

European Food Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 14 (legislative day of Thursday, May 8), 1941

ARTICLE BY DR. J. I. FALCONER, OF OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on the European food situation, by Dr. J. I. Falconer, of the department of rural economics of the State University of Ohio, as published in the Ohio Farmer of the issue of April 5, 1941.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Ohio Farmer of April 5, 1941]

THE EUROPEAN FOOD SITUATION—"OCCUPIED" COUNTRIES FACE STARVATION

(By J. I. Falconer, department of rural economics, Ohio State University)

One of the much-discussed subjects of today is whether we should ship food to relieve the hunger distress in the occupied countries of western Europe. Of the 37,000,000 people in Finland, Belgium, Holland, Norway, and central Poland, great numbers are reliably reported to be facing starvation and disease. The situation is already critical in Belgium. The situation among the 15,000,000 people in unoccupied France is much the same. Of this situation there is little doubt. The problem seems to be whether starvation among these people can be prevented without playing into the hand of Germany.

Even in normal times continental Europe is short of certain essential foods and feeds. During the 5 years preceding the outbreak of war, between 5 and 6 percent of the bread grains consumed were imported, as were 8 percent of the feed grains, 90 percent of the feed concentrates, 68 percent of the vegetable oils, and 40 percent of the total fats.

HARVESTS POOR LAST YEAR

These deficiencies have become greater as a result of poor harvests, and it is generally agreed that disorganization due to military activities and the blockade have contributed to the shortage. Fish and whale oil are in normal times an important source of food and fat for continental Europe. Since the beginning of the war scarcity of gasoline, with which to power the fishing boats, together with restrictions on the movements of fishermen have greatly reduced the supplies of sea foods. The acute shortage of feed grains and concentrates means rapid depletion in livestock numbers which in turn decreases at an accelerated rate the supplies of meats and animal fats for human consumption.

One of the elements in the present food situation in Europe is the unequal distribution of the food supplies. Europe lost a portion of her surplus food-producing regions when Russia took over the three Baltic states, the provinces of eastern Poland, Bessarabia, and northern Bukovina, as well as 10 percent of Finland's agricultural land, including some of her best. Even so, it is not likely that Russia will provide Europe with any considerable quantities of food. The standard of living in Russia is low. Large food exports would tend to lower her already low standard of consumption. Furthermore, it may not be possible for warring Europe to produce the necessary manufactured goods to exchange for Russian food.

CAN EXPECT NO FOOD FROM BALKANS

The Balkan countries are nominally a surplus-grain-producing region. But the 1940–41 harvest suffered from adverse weather conditions. Even with the return of normal yield, the surplus grain would fall far short of continental European requirements. Furthermore, it is certain that the distribution of any surplus will not be made on the basis of nutritional needs but will follow the dictates of political expediency. There is little likelihood that exports from this region can be markedly increased except at the sacrifice of supplies needed for domestic consumption.

The countries facing the greatest difficulties from the standpoint of food supplies are Belgium, Norway, central Poland, Spain, France, Holland, and Finland. In contrast with the situation in these countries, Germany presents a different picture.

Before the war broke out Germany boasted that she was 83 percent self-sufficient in the way of food supplies, a position much more favorable than in 1914. In bread grains, Germany had become self-sufficient at the beginning of the present war and in addition had accumulated substantial reserves. The wheat acreage at the beginning of this war was 40 percent larger than in 1909–13. The greatest shortage appears to be in meats and fats, but even here the direct fat ration is now about 10 ounces per capita per week, as compared with 4½ ounces in 1917. It would appear probable that with her imported labor supply Germany can maintain her present agricultural output and that she will draw upon the available supplies in Europe wherever she can obtain them.

BELGIUM IN WORST STRAITS

Among the occupied democracies on the Continent the situation at present appears to be the most critical in Belgium. This little Nation with a population of about 8,300,000 is the most densely populated nation in the world, with a population per square mile four times that of Ohio. Moreover, less than 20 percent of those gainfully employed are engaged in agriculture.

As a result of this large city population, Belgium normally imports from non-European sources one-half of her food requirements. Add to this the poor crops of 1940, the destruction by invasion, and the inability to import feed for livestock as well as food, and it is apparent that the 80 percent of the population which lives in cities is in a desperate situation. The Belgium ration is already reported to be down to 960 calories, or less than one-half that necessary to maintain health. The lack of fats and other essential elements in the diet is causing devastating malnutrition, especially among the children.

All the evidence indicates a serious food shortage in the occupied countries. Can plans be developed for supplying the needed foods without helping Germany? The Committee on Food for the Small Democracies under the leadership of Herbert Hoover believes that this can be done.

THE HOOVER PROPOSAL

Features of the Hoover proposal are: That an experimental trial be made with Belgium. That 1,000,000 destitute adults, mostly mothers, and 2,000,000 children be fed by soup kitchens. That Germany ship into Belgium the necessary bread grains. That England permit the necessary fats, soup materials, and special foods for children to be shipped in through the blockade. That the food be distributed by a neutral committee agreed to by both parties.

It is further proposed that the imported food would be paid for by the Belgian Government in London, and that it would be shipped in vessels not now available to the British. To meet the objection that the supplies shipped in might be seized by the Germans, it is proposed to maintain such limited stocks on hand that if they were seized it would only amount to about one-half day's food supply to Germany. The plan would not be put into effect unless an agreement could be reached whereby the native food supplies would be protected. The plan is based upon the fact that feeding would terminate if there are violations by the Germans. If the experiment were successful, then it could be extended to the other democracies.

Aside from the humanitarian standpoint, there are other reasons which could be advanced for making the attempt to ship food to these distressed people in the small democracies.

The blockade is one of the main arms of the allied program of war. It has of necessity contributed to the shortages of food in the occupied countries.

Feeding these democratic peoples should help to maintain their courage and rebuild their morale.

WOULD FIX RESPONSIBILITY

It would increase the prestige of the United States and England as humanitarian nations by placing the responsibility for any failure to carry out the plan upon Germany, who could no longer say that it was the blockade which was responsible for starving innocent people.

Europe has been the market to which the American farmer has long looked for a market for his surplus farm products. Many of our own agricultural ills have resulted from the loss of this export market. Whatever we can do to maintain the good will of these small countries may mean much to us in the way of future markets.

That help now would be greatly appreciated cannot be doubted. At least it would seem worthy to make the attempt to feed these distressed people without giving material aid to Germany.

P. E. O.—A Torchbearer to the Present

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 14 (legislative day of Thursday, May 8), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some remarks which I made at noon today before the P. E. O. convention held at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great pleasure and a privilege to speak to you today on the subject P. E. O.—A Torchbearer to the Present.

Recently I talked to a certain group of women on the subject of our national economy. I called attention to the fact that in less than 90 days after the first of this year, Congress had appropriated over $16,000,000,000. The women didn't blink an eye at that. The fact didn't seem to register, so I turned to the mayor of Philadelphia, who was present, and asked him what the assessed valuation of the real and personal property of Philadelphia was. He answered, "A little over $2,000,000,000."

I then said to the women—"Congress has appropriated over eight Philadelphias in the last 90 days, and there aren't eight Philadelphias in this country of ours."

Recently I spoke to another group of women. This time I spoke on a political subject. I related the incident told to me in London in August 1939 after Mrs. Wiley and I had visited with Lloyd George and Mr. Churchill. It was related by Mr. Rhys Davis, a member of Parliament from Manchester. He said, "I hope we in England will have another year in which to prepare. Britain has been asleep to what has been going on. Some of our leaders have known it, but the nation hasn't realized it. We were lulled into security by the great dreams of your Wilson and by the hope that the League of Nations would provide some kind of security. Had Hitler struck 2 years before he would have found the English people totally unaware of the change in conditions—a people who would not have believed that war would come again. But in these last 2 years, our people have awakened to the fact that war is coming, but we are not prepared. There are two men who are entitled to be credited for the awakening in Britain. They are Hitler and Chamberlain. Every breach by Hitler, every promise broken, every treaty arrangement canceled, every neutrality violated, has contributed toward this awakening. Chamberlain's appeasement policy, together with Hitler's breach of faith has given our people a chance to see what is going on."

Today I am not going to speak to you women of P. E. O. and you B. I. L.'s about politics or economics. In this troublesome period, this group of 70,000 P. E. O.'s stand out to me as an exceptional group—an exceptional group in a world of stress and crisis—and the world needs you.

Yes; it needs you—your leadership, your level-headedness, your teachings—to overcome intolerance, injustice, hatred, lack of faith.

Your great objectives—faith, love, purity, justice, truth, tolerance, and growth of mind and spirit—have taught you something about the symphony of life. Browning says, "Life has meaning, and to find its meaning is my meat and drink." To you has been revealed the joy of being charitable, kindly, and loving. You know the joy of playing life's game with fortitude and courage and faith. You have learned the wisdom and the joy of guarding your tongue, of not indulging in slander, loose talking, and loose living. You have realized that in a troubled world you must give due regard to the rights and obligations of others. You have learned that exaltation comes from extending the helping hand to those who need encouragement—not simply to P. E. O.'s or people who go to your church—but to your neighbor, your neighbor's child, your community, your State, your Nation.

You know the value of a smile, a cheerful, kindly word in place of sarcasm, bitterness, and criticism.

How little it costs to be sympathetic—understanding. Yet sympathy returns a thousandfold to the giver. True sympathy dissipates the martyr complex. It heals the wounded spirit. It creates hope and gives courage so the fallen will arise and go forth, renewed to meet the problems of life.

Out of the P. E. O. have come great loyal friendships. While I know nothing specific about your secret work, I know that it does have the effect of making one dissatisfied with self if one is not living up to her best. You are not guilty of arrested development. You know growth is the law of life.

> "Thank God, a man can grow—
> Yes; grow away from his mistakes,
> And fears and limitations,
> To a fuller, grander life."

Luther always, when possible, had a rosebud in a small vase placed before him in his study. It suggested unfoldment, growth, development, the expanding life. When Goethe, the great German philosopher, came to die his last words were, "More light." Those who stood by his bedside thought he meant more candlelight, but that wasn't the case. Goethe was one of those great souls of whom it is said that when such a soul passes through the vestibule between this and the next life it can look both ways. Goethe threw back to tired humanity its greatest need—"more light." He saw that humanity needed, above everything else, the perspective that would lead it out of its self-created woes and troubles and wars. The Great Teacher said to humanity, "I am the light of the world." Without light there is is no abundant life.

In this period those of us who live so close to this world conflict often forget that we are called to be torchbearers, and this brings me to the subject of my remarks to you today—P. E. O., a torchbearer to the present.

Henley, in his Invictus, has said:

> "Out of the night that covers me,
> Black as the pit from pole to pole,
> I thank whatever gods may be
> For my unconquerable soul.
>
> "It matters not how strait the gate,
> How charged with punishments the scroll,
> I am the master of my fate:
> I am the captain of my soul."

The greatest light bearer of the present is that person who rekindles in human beings the desire for the free, the beautiful, and the serviceable life. Exaltation, or a trip mountainward, comes to such a person with such a torch.

Paraphrasing Henley's Invictus, we can say:

> "It matters now what faith we share,
> What hope and light we bring to man,
> We are the sculptors of the state,
> We are the builders of its plan."
>
> —*A. W.*

We beings are a composite of stardust and clay, but we must never forget we have an unconquerable soul. He who shaped you, shaped you with a purpose, with a purpose noble—not ignoble; shaped you with that something in you which impels you forward to accomplish great and splendid things.

Right now with the lights one after another dying down in other lands—going out temporarily—we must not permit that experience over there to diminish our ardor for the preservation of the American way and the great freedoms of which we are trustees.

The greater the challenge—and it is a great one now to you and me—the greater the responsibility to be fit to meet it. In a real sense, we are living in a great period—a challenging hour.

Some cannot tell whether it is a sunset or a dawn. Yet my faith tells me that the dawn is up ahead.

You remember Lord Byron's Sonnet on Chillon. Let me read it to you:

> "Eternal spirit, of the chainless mind!
> Brightest in dungeons, liberty! thou art:
> For there thy habitation is the heart—
> The heart which love of thee alone can bind:
> And when thy sons to fetters are consigned—
> To fetters, and the damp vault's dayless gloom
> Their country conquers with their martyrdom,
> And freedom's fame finds wings on every wind.
> Chillon! thy prison is a holy place,
> And thy sad floor an altar—for 'twas trod,
> Until his very steps have left a trace
> Worn, as if thy cold pavement were a sod,
> By Bonnivard—May none those marks efface!
> For they appeal from tyranny to God."

Yes; after the crucifixion came Easter morn.

There comes to my mind an incident told me by Senator HIRAM JOHNSON which illustrates how the people of San Francisco awoke from the paralysis resulting from the earthquake in 1901 and rebuilt the city.

This incident illustrates where you leaders come in—and truly you are leaders—in home, business, lodges, every contact. How much the world needs real leaders now—the leadership that will give poise to unbalanced minds, that will shoot courage and fortitude into the weak; that will loosen the fetters of narrowness and bias—give man a grasp upon his real self. Paul, writing to Timothy, said "God hath not given us a spirit of fear but (a spirit) of power and love and sound mind."

Not one of us in this period when so many people need our assistance, not one of us can pass the buck and say, "Let George do it." Each of you, who have received so much, so much of good, so much of what the world needs, must now go out and share that good. Everywhere there are those who need the right kind of stimulation, who need to be brought back to their moorings. Everywhere there are those who are fearful, hysterical, doubtful of the ability of America to come through, to meet the challenge. Let the God of confidence speak through you and you will see the fetters fall

I remember once hearing a bishop of a church say to his clergy—it was back in the troublesome days when the financial fabric of this country was breaking—

"I want you men who are shepherds of the flock, to go out and prove that you know what that means—'to be a shepherd of a flock.' I want you to go out and instill into those, whom you shepherd, a sense of courage and fearlessness. Now is your opportunity to show what the Wayshower meant when He said, 'I have come that you

might have life and have it more abundantly.' What your flock needs now is spiritual food, and if you have glimpsed your job, then you will be the great provider as He was."

Easter has been gone a month now. Surely the teachings of Easter dissipate one of man's greatest fears—the fear of dissolution. Easter teaches the continuity of the spiritual life, and when that truth is grasped we know there is no death. Leadership today calls for waking the slumberer—he who is asleep in his bed of fear and defeatism, he who lives only in the world of the senses, he who has never learned the art of rejoicing and giving of self.

While in this period, many of the old landmarks are disappearing, those which have been proved reliable and worthy are still with us. As leaders you can guard their integrity. Let me mention some of them—the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights, and, in a spiritual sense, the Ten Commandments, the Sermon on the Mount, and the tried and proved principles reflected in your great objectives.

Amid the tumult and the stress of the present day, no organization has the right to exist unless it contributes constructively to the solution of our problems. One of the finest things that any individual can do for himself and for those he contacts is to develop a sense of poise and mental serenity. Many people just don't know how to do that. You do. You have found that in thinking great thoughts, in performing simple kindnesses, in glimpsing spiritual truths, in singing great songs and hymns, in developing a sense of humor, in getting rid of any arrogant egotism, in developing perspective, that the way opens up and you are building more stately mansions for your soul. In so doing, you are building yourself and the state strong and durable.

We have a job—we of this generation. And organizations like P. E. O., with its 70,000 members, have a bigger and more important part in the program of keeping America safe, building her strong, and preserving her values, than most people comprehend.

You and I are the beneficiaries of all the past; all the great saviors and prophets, inventors, explorers, statesmen, and builders, in all the generations that are gone, have builded for you and me. We are the heirs of all the past, and you and I are trustees of the finest product of all the efforts of all the past.

This beloved America! We had nothing to do with shaping her, but she is ours and some of us, and especially you women of P. E. O.—you leaders—have the job of making our people conscious of the great treasure they possess.

It has been said that the average student who is given the benefit of 16 years in the public schools and 4 years in schools of higher education does not appreciate that education because it is literally handed to him on a platter. Well, that is just what happened to each of us. We were born Americans, and because of that fact—all these great values which have costs thousands of lives, hundreds of years of human effort—all these values were given to us gratis.

What do I refer to? I mean the American way of life with its great freedoms of speech, of press, of worship, of trial by jury, the right of petition, the trial by one's peers, the right to sell one's own labor and collect one's own wages, and the right to own and sell property.

We know now, at least some of us do, that these rights will perish, as they have in other lands, unless we preserve them. We are awakening to the reality of the situation. We are conscious of a great world revolution which, if it should successfully strike our shores, would turn the hand of the clock back. In other lands, these great freedoms do not exist.

And what is worse, in many lands the common people are satisfied without them. Why are they satisfied? A great philosopher once said, "Give the people light and they will find the way." These people haven't the light we have. They see through a glass dimly, but they are groping for the light.

That is why, P. E. O.'s, you are torchbearers to the present. Your function is to bring a torch to the minds of America. Never permit them to get in a condition where they would be satisfied with turning the hands of the clock back. God meant that men should grow spiritward. From mortality to immortality defines the route.

There was once a great torchbearer who said, "I am the light of the world." What did He mean? His life and His deeds and His teachings showed what that light was. He taught men that they were not slaves—they were the sons of God. He taught them that riches consisted not in the abundance of things but in the possession of dynamic ideas of truth.

He shot them through with a conviction that they were not mud men—they were part of the eternal plan, things of the spirit.

He preached the idea that life had continuity, and on Easter morning He made good His preachment to a troubled world.

Human life is an enigma and yet the Great Teacher taught there was nothing enigmatic about the life of the spirit.

Our political system in this country is built upon the theory of checks and balances—a Government with legislative, judicial, and executive departments.

In these difficult times, people who devote a part of each day to a pursuit of the things of the spirit, form a tremendous check and balance against the onslaught of the things of force, intolerance, and violence. These people provide the check and the balance that will carry America through the storm.

Reason and common sense and faith—what a bulwark.

Let me illustrate how they work, using a practical illustration out of the present.

Everybody knows a great debate is going on in this country. It not only takes place in the Halls of Congress, but it absorbs more or less everybody's attention. I refer to the subject of convoys and intervention in the war in Europe.

Some politicians and some columnists (including the "fifth columnist") have befogged the issue. Bitterness and bias and prejudice interjected into the debate on both sides have done anything but clarify the issue. If you want to know how muddy the situation is, talk to almost anyone about it. The other day I had a rich experience. It was my privilege to visit with one who saw clearly through the mist of human irrationality involved in this debate. He said there were two questions involved in this debate, and that the people had a right to decide which course this Nation should follow.

First, should we convoy the ships of a combatant nation which undoubtedly will mean intervention in the world war? Or, second, should we not convoy such ships and still give all other aid possible?

There you have it. There is no need for name-calling or mud-slinging to decide which course to take. There are many legitimate arguments that can be advanced on both sides of this issue, but there are a great many more that run into the field of conjecture. They are the unknown factors of the future—the imponderables of the future. But certainly, to the thinking individual, there is no reason for anyone to become intolerant of the other man's viewpoint. Are we not all brethren dwelling in the same house—America? Are we not all of that great breed called American, even though we stem from different blood streams? Have we not all, the same vital interest in preserving our common heritage, our American way of life?

Like Nehemiah, each of us is called to rebuild the wall. What a thought, we are builders of a stronger, greater homeland.

A saying of St. Augustine comes to my mind: "Others wrangle, I wonder." Ah, this thinker, in the midst of confusion, saw the glory of life and God all around him.

Knute Rockne, the great football coach of Notre Dame, once said, "The idea is the thing." Yes; the straight thinker, unconfused and undefeated, is the great need of our times.

In this stressful hour, P. E. O., with its membership of 70,000 women, believing in, and practicing its great objectives, can help, through the lives of its members, to give inspiration—the Greeks called it the flame of the gods—and guidance to those who tend to be intolerant, hysterical, and unpoised. Thus you become your brother's keeper; thus you bring light where light is needed; thus to the troubled mind you bring balance and calm—the antidote to injustice, intolerance, and revolution—and thus you justify the subject of my remarks today, "P. E. O., a torchbearer to the present."

Years ago in a stressful period I phrased the antidote to confused thinking in this thought, with which I conclude:

"Today I am free—and why?
Because I laid away the shell of yesterday,
And with tomorrow's sunrise, I hope,
To lay away the shell I grow today.
New skylines burst upon my view—
I know it is the law of life to grow.

"So open wide, ye windows of my soul.
I fear no more—the quest is on,
A hunter for the spiritual goal,
The glory of a God-enraptured man.
Gone are the gods of yesterday—
Narrow creed, superstitution, hate, and woe!
Gone, with other dreams that limit me.
Today, today, I am free!"

—*A. W.*

The New Sugar Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN THOMAS

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 14 (legislative day of Thursday, May 8), 1941

ARTICLE BY E. W. RISING

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article of merit, appearing in the April issue of the Sugar Journal, by E. W. Rising, executive vice president of the Western Beet Growers' Association.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sugar Journal of April 1941]

THE NEW SUGAR ACT

(By E. W. Rising, executive vice president, Western Beet Growers Association)

Yes; the lend-lease bill is out of the way, Congress has had its little vacation, appropriation bills are moving through smoothly, and there are rumors that consideration will soon be given to such matters as a new Sugar Act. As a representative of beet growers I am pleased to have this opportunity of making a few remarks.

Individually, we who are interested in the domestic industry are in agreement as to fundamental principles (excepting perhaps

the refiners), so there should no real difficulty in working out a program for securing a sugar bill that will protect the growers of beets and cane, employ a greater number of people, and provide for the sale of sugar produced from continental-grown products.

Our opposition will, of course, present a flood of argument well calculated to stir up jealousy and strife between the growers in different areas and in trying to run one group down a dead-end street in working for higher prices and another group in some other direction. Of course, we want fair prices for sugar; so does the manufacturer of automobiles, farm machinery, sewing machines, clothing, and every article we use. The cane and beet growers, however, do not want or expect any different or larger measure of protection than is given the fellow that manufactures the things they must buy. Price is by no means the main issue, but it will be one of the things talked about, with the idea of convincing the consumer that he has a great interest in this matter and may starve if he is asked to pay as much as 50 cents per hundred increased retail price for sugar, meaning $1.50 to $2 per family per year.

To secure the legislation we need we must agree upon two things:

First. That continental growers are entitled to as much of the market as they can supply, and this without apology to or permission of anybody. Just good old American horse sense, to be applied for the benefit of the farmer, in equal measure as applied for the benefit of the manufacturer. We will not continue to hold the largest share of the American market for manufacturers of our automobiles, farm machinery, etc., without measures calculated to reduce imports from foreign countries. There is certainly no justice or sense in the contention that we should have one system of protection for one type of manufactured articles produced by American labor and another practice for beet and cane growers and farm labor. No; I do not object to the good-neighbor policy, but I do object to a policy of so-called reciprocal trade that is run for the benefit of the eastern manufacturer and with little consideration given to the needs of the farmer.

Perhaps it might be a good idea if the growers of the beet and cane sections and the people of the cities and towns in those areas were to organize and do a little fancy trading with the areas that are now enjoying heavy trade balances from the farm areas mentioned. Why not arrange a reciprocal-trade arrangement for exchanging our sugar and other farm products for electrical products, generators, motors, pumps, household appliances, farm machinery, etc., on a 50–50 basis. The industrial East does not seem to know that trade balances with the sugar-producing sections are running as high as 8 to 1 in its favor, while countries now taking eastern manufactured articles under the much-advertised trade agreements seldom go above the 1-to-1 basis.

Regardless of the fact that I believe we are entitled to as much of the continental sugar market as we can supply, I am willing to adopt the basis suggested by Senator ELLENDER in his remarks in the United States Senate on March 13, 1941, and from which I quote, as follows:

"I have advocated since 1937 that by all means our continental sugar producers should be permitted to produce at least 40 percent of our requirements."

While I accept that suggestion I cannot help but wonder how the manufacturers of automobiles, farm machinery, and a thousand other articles would feel about the allotment of 60 percent of the continental market to manufacturers located in Cuba, Hawaii, and the Philippines.

Second. The bringing together of those who have greatest interest in securing increased acreage for cane beets and using joint efforts to carry out a program. There are three groups that have a special interest at stake—first, the growers; second, labor; and, third, the processors. There are now 70,000 beet growers, 90,000 field workers, and over 10,000 processing-plant employees, while the cane industry consists of 17,000 farmers and 100,000 other employees. These groups would be increased 35 percent by the adoption of a program to give continental growers the right to supply 40 percent of the market. In addition to those directly employed, labor has other groups including railroad, truck, mine, and cotton labor that are beginning to show interest.

We will not expect to receive cooperation from the refiners' group, except those using continental-grown cane. We will meet this group across the table for a fair discussion and solution of the problems presented. Because we will have opposition is no reason why we should allow a policy to continue for the benefit of a few thousand well-paid workers, while several hundred thousand could be benefited by a change of policy.

Recently there have been many indications that labor is studying the sugar policy of the United States and that labor is interested in the benefits that would accrue to it by increasing the number of workers. The growers welcome this interest. We feel sure that labor will continue to study the sugar problem and take an active part in its solution. The opportunity is now presented to the processors and refiners of continental-grown beets and cane to join the other two groups, the growers and labor, which will mean the beginning of a movement that will secure the adoption of a new Sugar Act and provide the means for increasing acreage of cane and beets, an increase in labor employed, and a larger share of the continental market for the products of our growers and labor.

Cost of Construction of Army Cantonment at Fort Belvoir, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, this is the fifth report on the 13 army cantonments I visited as a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Fort Belvoir is an engineer training camp situated in the State of Virginia some 15 miles south of the city of Washington on the Richmond road. This was a fixed-fee job. The amount estimated for this project under the original appropriation bill was $5,906,878. The War Department weekly field report for March 15, 1941, estimated the total cost for work authorized to that date at $14,290,452. The project was 90 percent complete on March 5. Fort Belvoir was originally a World War camp and contemplated the housing of 20,000 World War troops, but the World War project was never completed.

SITE

The World War tract consisted of 6,800 acres still owned by the Government—1,950 additional acres are to be acquired. Of the 1,950 acres to be acquired, 62 acres will cost $700 an acre. The engineers inform me that this 62 acres is necessary because of its location on the water front and that it is intended to be used for the training of troops in pontoon work. Five hundred and ninety acres of the tract to be acquired will cost about $80 an acre. This part of the site is to be used for demolition purposes. I made some inquiry, and authoritative sources inform me that the value does not exceed $50 an acre. One thousand one hundred and sixty acres is to be used for training area and will cost around $300 per acre. There are approximately 50 or 60 houses on this tract. The land is being acquired through the Washington office of the Quartermaster General.

CAPACITY

Fort Belvoir has for some time been a Regular Army engineering camp. All available World War areas were used, some of the old sites being now occupied by permanent Regular Army buildings. The original plans for this camp called for 643 additional buildings to house 442 officers and 18,027 men. There was practically no increase in the number of troops to be housed or buildings to be erected.

QUALIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTOR

The contractors on this job were Charles H. Tompkins, of Washington, D. C., and Potts & Callahan Construction Co., of Baltimore. The original contract was for $5,906,878. The contract was dated October 14, 1940. The architect was the firm of Slaughter, Saville & Blackburn, of Richmond, Va. Their contract was dated October 10, 1940. The camp construction quartermaster was Lt. Col. C. E. Myers. From the chart furnished me, the camp construction quartermaster, the contractor, and the engineer all appeared to be eminently qualified and experienced to do this work.

LUMBER

Approximately 33,000,000 feet of lumber was used on this project. The contractor purchased 6,824,000 feet at a total cost of $269,418 or an average of $39.48 per thousand. The Washington office purchased 26,534,000 feet at a total cost of $1,048,522 or at an average of $39.52 per thousand. Ninety percent of the lumber was delivered free on board over Army tracks at the camp. No lumber was permitted to leave the reservation once delivered. The cost of hauling the lumber from the railroad to the job with rented trucks was $4.50 per thousand. In view of the short haul from the railhead on the reservation itself to the building location, this seemed to be excessive, despite the fact that the wage rate of common labor was 80 cents per hour. It will be recalled that at Camp Edwards the contractor hauled lumber from a railhead off the reservation to the reservation, a distance of 11 miles, for $1.85 per thousand on a subcontract. Camp Edwards was paying 62½ cents for unskilled labor. It seems to me that there is an excess cost here of at least $2 per thousand or approximately $66,000.

INSPECTION

The lumber was inspected by both the construction quartermaster and the con-

tract-engineer on board railroad cars or while being unloaded from trucks as to quantity. It was checked as to quality by the contract engineer and construction quartermaster before unloaded. Out of 1,380 cars delivered, over 100 were rejected. It was inspected as to moisture content in the same manner, but no electric machine was used for that purpose.

RAILROAD

Eighteen thousand feet of railroad was constructed at a cost of $10,315. The price paid for rails was $42.79 per ton; 90-pound relay rails were used.

EQUIPMENT

The value of the equipment used at the peak on this job was $850,000. The amount paid in rental up to the time the job was 90 percent complete was $204,000. There was a recapture clause in the contract. The rental paid, I was informed, was 35 percent below the Associated General Contractors' schedule.

EQUIPMENT CHECKING

First. Equipment was checked as to fitness before being inspected by both the contractor and the construction quartermaster through their inspectors.

Second. Equipment was checked as to time by the field auditor of the construction quartermaster's office, each piece of equipment being numbered. The contractor's timekeepers also checked the time of the operator. The equipment was not permitted to leave the job except when on duty and then it was checked on and off the reservation. It was also checked at the repair shop to make sure it was not on the rental roll while being repaired.

BUILDING PIERS

Stovepipe forms were used instead of lumber in the construction of piers upon which the buildings were built. It was claimed that this cost 16 cents per foot, whereas lumber would have cost $1 per foot in material and labor. The piers were from 2 to 16 feet, with an average of 6 feet.

LABOR—CLOSED SHOP

This was a closed shop and no one was employed without a permit being issued by the union, and all labor was furnished through the union. The maximum number of 12,600 men on the job was reached about February 20. Of these, approximately 3,800 were carpenters, 3,800 laborers, 400 plumbers, 350 electricians, and the remainder were miscellaneous workers. Of the 3,800 carpenters it was estimated that approximately 10 percent were finished carpenters, 30 percent rough carpenters, and 60 percent had no carpenter training whatever. The contractor states that he could discharge carpenters and laborers without interference from the union, but this did not apply to mechanical trades.

UNION INITIATION FEES

No one was allowed to work without a permit from the union. The following gives a schedule of initiation fees required to join the union as given me at the job:

Carpenters: $50 to join; $75 if card lapses; $100 if card lapses again; $25 down, $5 per week. Out-of-town carpenters belonging to another union, $2.10 a month.

Painters: $150 to join; $50 down, $5 per week.

Truck drivers: $50 to join.

Rodmen: $11.50 to join.

Laborers: $50 to join. They can pay this in small payments.

Electricians: Initiation fee, $300; down payment, $30; balance in 90 days.

Plumbers: Initiation fee, $100.

Steamfitters: Initiation fee, $100.

Sheetmetal workers: Initiation fee, $167.50; down payment, $25; balance, $10 per week.

The above rates were given to the contractor verbally by men on the job.

LABOR—ORGANIZATION OF WORKERS

There was 1 superintendent and 1 assistant superintendent or project manager in the main office. There was 1 outside, or field superintendent, in the field. Under him were 15 area superintendents, each of whom had from 200 to 800 men. Each area superintendent had under him from 5 to 15 carpenter pushers and approximately 10 labor pushers. These labor or carpenter pushers had under them from 20 to 25 men each. The carpenter pushers, it was stated, were actually good carpenters. It was further estimated that 40 percent of the foremen were good.

LABOR

On January 1, 1941, this project was approximately 30 percent complete, the amount paid out for labor to that date being approximately $2,000,000, according to the pay roll chart furnished me. It costs $53,000 in labor for each percent of progress made. On February 28 the project was approximately 90 percent complete. The total pay roll was $6,118,000, showing that it cost $68,000 in labor for every percent of completion. During the period between January 1 and February 28, 51 percent of progress was made at a cost of approximately $4,100,000. This 51 percent of this project cost $80,000 for each percent of progress, whereas on the first 30 percent it only cost $53,000 for each percent of progress. During the period prior to January 1, the highest pay roll reached was $380,000, whereas the highest weekly pay roll reached between the period of January 1 and February 28 was approximately $575,000 per week. During the period from January 15 to February 28, the weekly pay roll exceeded $400,000 per week. There is no way I can account for the difference in progress made during the second half of this project as compared to the first half. At practically every other project that I examined, the progress made on the second half of the job was much faster and for less money than that made on the first half of the job. The larger the pay roll, as a rule, the more it cost per percent of progress made.

WAGE SCALE

The following gives a comparison of the wage scale paid by the Fort Meade project, which lies 15 miles north of Washington, and Fort Belvoir, which lies 15 miles south of Washington:

	Fort Meade	Fort Belvoir
	Per hour	*Per hour*
Carpenters	$1.25	$1.62½
Common labor	.62½	.80
Bricklayers	1.50	1.75
Electricians	1.50	1.80
Painters	1.12½	1.57
Plasterers	1.50	2.00
Plumbers	1.37½	1.65
Roofers	1.25	1.45
Sheet-metal workers	1.37½	1.62½
Steam fitters	1.37½	1.75
Truck drivers	.60	(1)

[1] 50 cents to $1 per hour.

TRAVEL ALLOWANCE

Workers were also allowed 75 cents per day for travel expenses. They could arrive 15 minutes late in the morning and leave 15 minutes early without being subject to discipline or deductions from their pay. This was allowed regardless of where the worker lived.

OVERTIME

Fort Belvoir, Va., lies approximately 15 miles south of Washington, while Camp Meade, Md., lies 15 miles north of Washington. By far the larger portion of the money paid in wages was paid to carpenters and day laborers. The carpenter wage scale at Camp Meade was fixed at $1.25, and at Fort Belvoir at $1.62½ per hour. Common labor was fixed at Fort Belvoir at 80 cents an hour, while at Camp Meade it was 62½ cents an hour. The amount of overtime paid at Fort Belvoir was less than $200,000 on the whole project, while the amount of overtime paid at Camp Meade was $1,808,000. The construction authorities at Camp Meade contended that the reason why this tremendous amount of premium for overtime was paid at Camp Meade was because the only way they could hold their carpenters and laborers was to pay them in premium for overtime an amount equal to the amount of the differential in the wage scale between Camp Meade and Fort Belvoir. What I mean by "premium for overtime" is excess time allowed for which no services were rendered; for instance, if a carpenter worked 48 hours a week and was working on a 40-hour-a-week basis, he was paid for 52 hours' work under a time-and-a-half schedule. He was paid for the 48 hours he worked and 4 hours overtime for which he did not work—in other words, he received a premium for the overtime. That if the wage scale at Fort Belvoir had been the same as Camp Meade, there would have been no necessity of paying this tremendous amount of overtime. It must also be noted that Madam Perkins in fixing this wage scale at Fort Belvoir under the Bacon-Davis Act fixed the wage scale of common labor at 80 cents per hour, while she fixed the wage scale of drivers of trucks of 1½ tons or less at 50 cents an hour. It is a well-known fact that truck drivers always receive higher wages in a community than common labor does. How she can justify this under the Bacon-Davis Act, which provides that she must fix the wages prevailing in the community where the project is located as the wages to be paid on the job, is beyond me. It would be interesting to examine

the original testimony upon which she based the determination that the prevailing wage at Fort Belvoir for truck drivers is 50 cents per hour while that of common labor is 80 cents an hour.

POWER SAWS

Each area had a mill with two table saws where 2-inch material was sawed and fitted before being moved on to a job. One-inch material was cut on the job with power and hand saws.

RATIO OF LABOR TO MATERIAL

The weekly report for the week ending February 28, 1941, shows that up to that date the total accumulated expenditures, plus obligations, on this project were $11,148,446, of which $6,113,288 represented accumulated expenditures, plus obligations for labor. Of the remainder, $5,035,157 represented accumulated expenditures, plus obligations for other than labor. This also includes construction quartermaster's overhead. On this basis the ratio of labor to material and other expenses would be labor 55.8 percent and material 44.2 percent.

UTILITIES

The original Army estimate for utilities was $543,000. The actual cost, according to the contract engineer, will be $2,084,900, itemized as follows:

Grading	$217,000
Roads, graveled, including drainage	241,500
Warehouse roads	9,000
Bituminous roads (we received instructions not to treat any roads after this estimate was made)	136,000
Sewage system	502,500
Water system, including wells, reservoirs, addition to filter plant and water lines	592,500
Electrical system	178,400
Railroads, new and reconditioned	160,000
Coal-storage trestle	42,000
Total	2,084,900

SUMMARY

I. Cost

The original amount estimated for this project was $5,906,878. The actual cost will be $14,290,452, or more than twice the original.

II. Capacity

Despite the fact that this project cost almost twice the original amount allocated to the project, there was no material increase in the capacity of the camp as originally planned. Fort Belvoir is a Regular Army camp. The original plans called for 643 additional buildings to house 442 officers and 18,027 men.

III. Site

The site will consist of 8,750 acres; 6,800 acres was the old World War camp owned by the Government and 1,950 acres will be acquired at a cost ranging from $80 to $700 per acre.

IV. Lumber

Of the 33,000,000 feet of lumber used on this project, the contractor purchased 6,824,000 feet at an average cost of $39.48 per thousand and the Washington office of the Quartermaster General purchased 26,534,000 feet at a cost of $39.52 per thousand. The average cost according to the Quartermaster General for lumber purchased ranged from $31 to $41. It cost $4.50 a thousand to haul lumber from the stock pile to the project, a distance of not to exceed 2 miles. At Camp Edwards the contractor hauled lumber from the railhead, a distance of 11 miles, for $1.85 per thousand.

V. Equipment

The appraised value of the equipment was $850,000 and the amount of rental paid was $204,000. The rate of rent paid was 35 percent below the associated general contractor's schedule. At Camp Meade the Army paid $468,822 for equipment rental which in most instances was from 100 to 200 percent higher than the associated general contractor's schedule.

VI. Labor

(a) This was a closed shop, and permits were required of all workers.

(b) The wage scale was the highest of any encountered on my trip. Fort Belvoir lies 15 miles south of Washington; Camp Meade lies 15 miles north of Washington. Carpenters' wages were fixed by the Secretary of Labor under the Bacon-Davis Act at $1.25 per hour at Camp Meade and $1.62½ per hour at Fort Belvoir. Common labor was set at 62½ cents at Camp Meade and 80 cents per hour at Fort Belvoir. The wage scale of the building trades was set anywhere from 15 to 50 cents per hour higher at Fort Belvoir than at Camp Meade. It is interesting to note that while the Secretary of Labor fixed the lowest wage scale for common labor at Fort Belvoir at 80 cents per hour, she set the wages of a driver of a light truck at 50 cents an hour.

VII. Labor allowance

Workers were allowed 75 cents per day for traveling expenses. They could arrive 15 minutes late in the morning and leave 15 minutes early without being subject to discipline or deductions from their pay. This was allowed regardless of where the worker lived.

VIII. Overtime

Less than $200,000 was paid for premium at Fort Belvoir as against $1,808,000 paid at Fort Meade. Fort Meade contends that this tremendous amount of overtime was necessary to prevent workers from leaving Fort Meade to go to Fort Belvoir.

IX. Utilities

The original Army estimate for utilities was $543,000, the actual cost was $2,084,900, or nearly four times the original estimate.

X. Ratio of labor to material

The ratio of labor to material was—labor 55.8 percent, material 44.2 percent.

XI. Comparison between Fort Belvoir, Va., and Fort Meade, Md.

Fort Belvoir lies 15 miles south of Washington, and Fort Meade lies approximately 15 miles north of the city of Washington. The following comparison is interesting:

	Fort Belvoir, Va.	Fort Meade, Md.
Estimated cost	$5,906,878	$9,053,187.
Actual cost	$14,290,452	$23,117,000.
Cost of lumber per thousand feet.	$39.48 to $39.52	$38.29 to $41.50.
Equipment rental paid.	$204,000	$468,822.
Appraised value of equipment.	$850,000	$1,114,422.
Percentage rental paid above or below A. G. C. schedule.	35 percent below.	100 to 200 percent above.

	Fort Belvoir, Va.	Fort Meade, Md.
Wage scale fixed by Secretary of Labor:	*Per hour*	*Per hour*
Carpenters	$1.62½	$1.25
Common labor	.80	.62½
Truck drivers	(1)	.60
Electricians	1.80	1.50
Bricklayers	1.75	1.50
Painters	1.57	1.12½
Plasterers	2.00	1.50
Overtime	$200,000	$1,808,000
Utilities:		
Original estimate	$543,000	$766,264
Actual cost	$2,084,900	$2,690,550
Ratio of labor to material:		
Labor—percent	55.8	65.5
Material and other expenses—percent	44.2	34.5
Maximum number of men employed	$12,600	$19,900
Carpenters	$3,800	$8,113
Day laborers	$3,800	$8,595

[1] 50 cents to $1.

Bonneville Project: Its Value and Benefits to the People of Southwest Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

STATEMENT OF HON. MARTIN F. SMITH, OF WASHINGTON, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I take pride in the fact that our national administration has brought numerous benefits and blessings to the communities and people of my congressional district, and that I have been privileged to participate in their actual consummation. The outstanding Federal project in my district is, of course, the Bonneville project, which I originally sponsored and have actively promoted through the years. This already has brought and will continue to bring to the citizens of southwest Washington more benefits and advantages than any project or enterprise, public or private, in our entire history. It will serve coming generations as well.

There has already been expended in the nine counties of my district over $12,000,000, and the expenditure of the further sum of approximately $10,000,000 is being authorized. The creation of new industries and pay rolls, giving employment to thousands of citizens, the employment provided in the construction of the substations and transmission lines, the power furnished to our local utility and rural electrification projects, and the reduced consumer rates which have resulted in vast savings to our people are some of the benefits which have accrued to our citizens from the Bonneville project. These facts are most gratifying to me.

I insert the statement which I made before the Committee on Appropriations on April 17, 1941:

STATEMENT OF HON. MARTIN F. SMITH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. MARTIN F. SMITH, from Washington, was in here this morning, and we just did not get to him, so we will now hear him as the next in line.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I deeply appreciate the courtesy of the committee in granting me an opportunity to be heard again in support of the Bonneville Dam project in Washington and Oregon.

It appears that I represent what is probably the most public-power-minded district in either Washington or Oregon, as we have adopted in every one of the nine counties in my district P. U. D. projects, and we have five rural electrification projects in my district.

I feel that I would be remiss at this time if I did not extend to the committee, and particularly to those members of your committee who were conferees on the first deficiency appropriation bill, the deep appreciation of our people out there for the action that was taken in striking out from the first deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 3868) the restrictive language applying to the $1,000,000 originally making available $300,000 for surveys and $700,000 for construction tools, equipment, and stock inventories, and thereby rendering this entire sum of $1,000,000 available instead for construction of the new transmission lines for the new Reynolds Metals Co. plant at Longview, Wash., in my district, so essential to the production of aluminum for the manufacture of airplanes for our national-defense program.

It is expected that construction of this plant will be completed about July 15, powered by 60,000 kilowatts of Bonneville-Grand Coulee electric power, and employing at the beginning about 300 men. The plant is to have an initial capacity of 60,000,000 pounds of pig aluminum per year, which is an increase of the annual capacity of 40,000,000 pounds first planned and now expanded to meet the national-defense needs.

The plant at Longview will give the Reynolds plant an annual capacity of 100,000,000 pounds of aluminum per year, or a third of the entire Nation's 1939 production. In fact, the Longview plant and the Alcoa plant at Vancouver, Wash., also in my district, will result in the Washington Columbia River Basin region in my congressional district having an aluminum-production capacity of nearly 30 percent of America's entire 1941 output.

An average Army or Navy airplane requires 10,000 pounds of aluminum, so the increased expanded capacity of the Reynolds plant will produce sufficient aluminum for 6,000 planes annually—a very substantial and essential contribution to our national-defense program.

Construction also has started on the new plant of the General Chemical Co., at Vancouver, to manufacture in liquid form a sulfite of alumina which is also used in powder form by Pacific Northwest paper mills.

Having had a part in the Bonneville legislative program, I consider it pertinent to inventory the results to date of the Government's long-range Columbia River development program and to chart its effect on the regional growth of the Pacific Northwest.

The Bonneville project received its initial start by the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1925 (Public, 585, 68th Cong., approved March 3, 1925). This act directed the Secretary of War to undertake a preliminary survey and to submit to Congress an estimate of the cost of surveying all navigable streams where power developments appeared to be feasible. Such surveys were proposed to formulate general plans for the multiple-purpose improvement of our outstanding streams—for navigation, flood control, irrigation, and the economic development of power. Growing out of this authorization, the Secretary of War, on April 12, 1926, submitted his report, which was printed as House Document 308, first session, Sixty-ninth Congress. Among the streams covered in the report was the Columbia River and its principal tributaries.

The 1927 Rivers and Harbors Act directed the Secretary of War to make the surveys recommended in House Document 308.

As a result of this latter authorization for surveys, the Secretary of War, in March 1932, submitted a comprehensive report which was printed as House Document 103, Seventy-third Congress. This remarkable report demonstrated that the Columbia and its tributaries could be developed in the greatest system of low-cost hydroelectric power in the United States.

The construction of the first Federal dam on the Columbia River was initiated in accordance with the recommendations of House Document 103 as Public Works Project 28, North Bonneville, Wash., on September 30, 1933. The dam, locks, fishways, and power plant connected with this project were designed and constructed by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army. As a result of a Supreme Court decision, the Bonneville project was formally authorized by Congress in the River and Harbor Act of 1935, Public, 409, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 20, 1935.

It was my privilege to have a part in the first authorization and early in 1937 to introduce a bill for the completion of the Bonneville project and the authorization of a transmission and marketing agency. This bill was enacted into law as Public, 329, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved August 20, 1937.

INVENTORY OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The marketing policies included in the act of August 20, 1937, are now providing a base for a new and substantial economy for the Pacific Northwest.

The surplus power from Bonneville is now being marketed at the lowest wholesale rate in America—at $17.50 per kilowatt-year, delivered at any point within economic transmission distance of the generating plant.

This low wholesale rate has already caused a general lowering of resale consumer rates on systems using Columbia River power, and following the general increase in domestic and commercial consumption, widespread rate reductions in other systems have been induced.

Since the authorization of the river and harbor bill of 1935, the rate reductions by the private utilities in Washington and Oregon have totaled over $6,800,000 annually. It has been estimated, including all public and private power systems, that the Bonneville development has produced electric rate savings in the States of Washington and Oregon totaling more than $13,000,000 in the period from 1935 to 1940.

DEFENSE APPLICATION OF BONNEVILLE POWER

After the past fiscal year was completed it became apparent that the defense industries would look to Bonneville for electric capacity to meet the growing demands of the national-defense program.

To date five industrial contracts have been executed at Bonneville, totaling 166,500 kilowatts. The largest of these contracts are with the Aluminum Co. of America and the Reynolds Metals Co., which have established large new ingot-production plants at Vancouver and Longview to supply the airplane industry, as I have already stated.

In addition, the Pacific Carbon & Alloys Co. and the Pennsylvania Salt Co., both defense chemical-producing concerns, have executed contracts and have started plant construction.

POWER CONTRACTS

To date the Bonneville Power Administration has 32 executed contracts totaling 218,352 kilowatts, which represents about 47 percent of the ultimate dependable capacity of the Bonneville plant. Power sales contracts have been executed faster than installed plant capacity could be completed. These contracts include 9 executed with public districts totaling 12,152 kilowatts; 10 with municipalities, totaling 6,450 kilowatts; 5 with cooperatives, totaling 1,750 kilowatts; 3 with private utilities totaling 31,500 kilowatts; and 5 with industries, totaling 166,500 kilowatts.

To date the Bonneville Power Administrator has received over 152 power applications, representing an amount nearly double the ultimate capacity of the Bonneville installation. It has been estimated that 84 of these 152 applications will result in a probable demand equal to over 80 percent of the ultimate capacity of the project. It is thus evident that the success of the project from a market standpoint is assured.

The fiscal year 1941 will see a remarkable growth in kilowatt-hour sales and accruing revenues. For this fiscal year it is estimated that the monthly peak will exceed 118,000 kilowatts and the kilowatt-hour sales will approximate 809,000,000 kilowatt-hours, with a resulting revenue of about $1,900,000. From the load in sight it is apparent that the power revenue will increase with the installed plant capacity until it reaches a figure in excess of $8,000,000 annually. Such revenues will provide a full return to the Federal Treasury in a period much shorter than the estimated amortization period of 40 years.

SCHEDULE OF GENERATING CAPACITY

To meet this rapidly growing demand the last session of Congress provided appropriations to insure the completion of all of the generating units of the Bonneville Dam.

At the end of the past fiscal year the Corps of Engineers had installed and were operating the first two units of 43,200 kilowatts each, or a total of 86,400 kilowatts. Two units, 54,000 kilowatts each, were completed in January 1941, and are now ready for service. Two additional units of the same size are scheduled for service in January 1942, and the remaining four units will be ready for service in the period between July 1, 1943, and July 1, 1944.

APPROPRIATIONS AND ALLOTMENTS

The total appropriations and allotments for Bonneville through the Seventy-sixth Congress are as follows: (1) War Department dam, lock, and power plant, $70,368,876, and (2) Bonneville Power Administration for transmission lines and accessories, $37,100,000, making a total of $107,468,876. It has become necessary because of the rapidly expanding market for Columbia River power to carry out the mandates of the act of August 20, 1937, to rapidly advance the construction of the high-voltage grid system connecting Grand Coulee and Bonneville and to provide feeder lines to reach the actual and potential markets. The construction of these lines has been rapidly pushed in order to keep transmission construction abreast of sales.

To date, design work has been performed on 16 substations, of which 4 have been completed, and surveys have been completed for 32 transmission lines totaling 1,750 circuit miles. Seven steel tower lines, with working voltages up to 230,000 volts, were under construction during the fiscal year. At the close of that year 2 of these lines were completed, the third was about 99 percent completed, the fourth 93 percent completed, and 2 had reached the 66-percent stage. The Budget submitted by the President for the fiscal year 1942 included two Bonneville items. These are: (1) Power plant, $7,170,000, and (2) transmission facilities, $12,958,500. The first item will cover construction which will be divided between Oregon and the Third Washington District and cover a new transmission line between north Bonneville and Vancouver, Wash., the north Bonneville substation, the Vancouver substation, and feeder lines serving the new industries in and around Vancouver.

Approximately half of the $70,000,000 War Department appropriation has been or will be spent in providing facilities located within the third Washington district. Out of the $37,000,000 transmission appropriations, $13,245,670 has been or will be spent on facilities within the third district.

TRANSMISSION FACILITIES

The transmission facilities within the third district for which funds were provided up through the fiscal year 1941 are as follows: Bonneville-Vancouver 230-kilovolt transmission lines Nos. 1 and 2, North Bonneville substation, Bonneville-Coulee 230-kilovolt transmission line No. 1, Vancouver-Kelso 230 kilovolt transmission line, Chehalis substation, Vancouver substation, Chehalis-River Crossings, Kelso substation, Chehalis-Raymond transmission line, Raymond substation, Klickitat extension, Aluminum Co. substation, and service lines, the West Coast properties, Centralia equipment, Mossy Rock transmission line, Ilwaco substation, dispatching facilities, Vancouver, and warehouses and shops located at Vancouver.

NEW REGIONAL ECONOMY

There is no region in the United States today that possesses such a large dependable source of cheap electric power as the Columbia River Basin. Such power is becoming the backbone of modern industrial development. With the expansion of industries requiring substantial amounts of low-cost power, industrial and defense attention is now being turned to the Pacific Northwest.

In the past the economy of this region was based entirely upon a depletable lumber industry and upon agriculture. Such types are now being augmented with new electrochemical industries, resulting in the large emergency power demands. Such a demand is supplemental to and in addition to a normal growing market accelerated by the lowering of electric resale prices.

POSSIBLE NEW INDUSTRIES

When this country is facing rearmament, the establishment of new defense industries in virgin territory becomes important not only from the standpoint of defense. Such industries include those which will produce aluminum, magnesium, copper, lead, zinc, chlorates, hydrates, and high-grade alloy steels. Such products are now essential to the aircraft, munitions, ordnance, and shipbuilding defense activities. In the post-defense period they can supply ready western markets. Such industries will locate and expand in the Pacific Northwest because of the importance of cheap power and the availability of native metallurgical materials.

In this connection it is well to note the present location of our national-defense industries. Due to past historical developments, most of such industries are located in the Northeastern States and east of the Mississippi, which represents an area about 13 percent of the country's land area. Previously the 11 Western States, covering 40 percent of the Nation's land area, have not been equipped with industries to provide the defense materials needed by the Pacific coast and our Pacific outputs.

The union of cheap power with these natural metallurgical and chemical resources is bound to change the previous economy. Zinc, mercury, tungsten, molybdenum now move east 2,000 miles for processing and fabrication. A good part of this material processed for defense and commercial use has to be returned 6,000 miles to our defense outposts in Alaska and Hawaii. With cheap power, these cross movements can be eliminated and the metals I have named can be processed in close proximity of the raw-material sources. The pig aluminum now being manufactured in the new Vancouver plant of the Aluminum Co., and which will be manufactured in the new plant of the Reynolds Metals Co., can be rolled into sheets and shapes in western mills to supply the large aircraft plants now producing on the Pacific coast. The foresight of Congress in early providing these electrical facilities has become a lifesaver in the timely availability of large blocks of power for defense production. Aluminum is the basic essential of aircraft production, and the mass aluminum process is not possible without large amounts of low-cost hydro power. It was the lack of aluminum and other essential electrochemical metals which resulted in low French production of planes. Such a situation caused the downfall of France.

The Pacific Northwest is now a vital part of the defense program because of the availability of such a large reservoir of high-class power. Necessity has opened up the region's great resources. The utilization of the cheap, dependable power sources will encourage the establishment of further electrometallurgical and electrochemical industries. These, with large pay rolls, will in turn augment the production capacity of agriculture and existing manufacturing plants. The effects of such developments are already being felt in this great country. All signs point toward a new regional economic order which our people have sought for many years.

FISCAL DATA

I submit the following statements:

Bonneville power administration

SUPPLEMENTAL CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE

Item	Total	Third Washington district
Bonneville-Coulee line No. 2	$3,785,000	
Bonneville-Vancouver lines Nos. 5 and 6	1,615,000	$1,615,000
Feeder-line connections	4,000,000	2,761,000
Advanced surveys	300,000	150,000
Construction tools and inventories	700,000	350,000
Permanent buildings	250,000	250,000
Operation and maintenance	250,000	250,000
Total	10,900,000	5,376,000
Less, approved in deficiency bill, H. R. 3836	1,000,000	
Net amount before Interior appropriation committee	9,900,000	5,376,000

58⅓ percent of entire estimate will be spent in third Washington district (estimated).

REGULAR SUPPLY BILL

Item	Total	Third Washington district
Grand Coulee-Covington line	$1,730,000	
Bonneville-Vancouver line No. 3	1,219,000	$1,219,000
Substation addition, 230,000 volts	4,022,900	2,457,700
115,000-volt lines	253,000	
Substation additions, 115,000 volts	848,000	151,000
Feeder lines	1,500,000	1,500,000
Advanced surveys	200,000	100,000
Construction, tools, equipment	300,000	200,000
Operation, maintenance, and marketing	885,600	450,000
Coulee lines	2,000,000	
Total estimate	12,958,500	6,077,700

46⅝0 percent of entire estimate will be spent in third Washington district.

Public utilities districts, third Washington district

District	1940 population	Date election held	Assets	Kilowatt-hours generated and purchased
Mason No. 1	1,500	1934	$82,000	1,215,000
Mason No. 3	10,103	1934	141,189	389,200
Cowlitz No. 1	40,155	1936	6,787,408	92,681,083
Lewis No. 1	33,979	1936	375,765	510,648
Pacific No. 2	15,928	1936	771,653	6,500,.00
Wahkiakum No. 1	4,286	1936	176,534	2,240,000
Clark No. 1	49,852	1938	(1)	(1)
Grays Harbor No. 1	53,166	1938	3,534,000	43,121,161
Skamania No. 1	4,633	1938	97,283	927,060
Thurston	37,285	1938	(1)	(1)
Total	250,887	------	11,965,832	147,584,152

[1] In process of organization.

Rural Electrification Administration financed developments, third Washington district

Project designation	Date started	Miles of lines	Total loans	Power source status
Washington:				
23, Grays Harbor	May 1937	24	$79,000	(1)
25, Cowlitz	do	174	211,000	(2)
27, Lewis	Oct. 1937	255	416,500	(3)
29, Skamania	Feb. 1939	31	28,000	(3)
33, Mason	Mar. 1939	71	51,000	(1)
Total		555	785,500	

[1] Local.
[2] Plan on using Bonneville power on completion of Bonneville lines.
[3] Contract executed for Bonneville power.

Municipal electric system and districts purchasing from Tacoma public plant, third Washington district

Project	Type	Total assets	Energy generated and purchased
			Kilowatt hours
Centralia	Municipal	$1,745,226	11,196,500
Mason public utility district No. 1	District	(1)	1,004,480
Mason public utility district No. 3	do	(1)	89,500

[1] Purchasing from Tacoma public plant which has interchange contract with Bonneville. Asset data not available at time of compilation.

Estimated expenditures in 9 Washington counties to Dec. 31, 1941

County and description of facility	Estimated expenditures for the county to Dec. 31, 1940	Estimated Work Projects Administration expenditure for clearing in the county to Dec. 31, 1940
Clark:		
Vancouver substation	$3,039,000	
Bonneville-Vancouver 230-kilovolt lines Nos. 1 and 2	975,000	$220,000
Vancouver-Eugene 115-kilovolt line	43,000	2,000
Columbia River crossing	33,000	
Vancouver-Kelso 230-kilovolt line	524,000	233,000
Total	4,614,000	455,000
Cowlitz:		
Vancouver-Kelso 230-kilovolt line	505,000	222,000
Kelso-Chehalis 230-kilovolt line	270,000	174,000
Total	775,000	396,000
Grays Harbor: Raymond-Cosmopolis 22-kilovolt line	84,000	
Lewis:		
Kelso-Chehalis 230-kilovolt line	362,000	234,000
Chehalis-Covington 230-kilovolt line	265,000	24,000
Chehalis-Raymond 115-kilovolt line	206,000	105,000
Chehalis-Centralia 69-kilovolt line	40,000	
Chehalis-Mossy Rock 69-kilovolt line	15,000	
Chehalis substation	1,357,000	
Total	2,245,000	363,000
Mason: None		
Pacific:		
Chehalis-Raymond 115-kilovolt line	184,000	95,000
Raymond-Cosmopolis 22-kilovolt line	30,000	
Raymond-Tide Flats 22-kilovolt line	15,000	
Raymond-Naselle Junction 33-kilovolt line	113,000	
Naselle Junction-Ilwaco 33-kilovolt line	25,000	
Naselle Junction-Cathlamet-Puget Island line	24,000	
Raymond substation and additions	390,000	
Tide Flats substation	45,000	
Naselle Junction substation	8,000	
Ilwaco substation	4,000	
Total	838,000	95,000
Skamania:		
Bonneville-Vancouver 230 kilovolt lines Nos. 1 and 2	512,000	127,000
Bonneville-Coulee 230-kilovolt line	311,000	41,000
Bradford Island crossings Nos. 1, 2, and 3	108,000	
North Bonneville substation service to Skamania County public-utility district	594,000	
Total	1,525,000	168,000
Thurston: Chehalis-Covington 230-kilovolt line	346,000	31,600
Wahkiakum:		
Naselle Junction Cathlamet-Puget Island lines	77,000	
Cathlamet substation	24,000	
Svenson substation	5,000	
Total	106,000	
Grand total	10,533,000	1,503,600

I could go into a great many more details here, but you have already heard other witnesses on Bonneville, particularly Dr. Raver, Administrator of Bonneville, so I am not going to do that; and thank you for your patience in listening to this statement.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Smith, in addition to the regular Budget estimates made last fall of $12,000,000 for Bonneville, there has been a supplemental estimate of $10,900,000, a million of which was authorized by the deficiency committee, and $10,900,000 is now before this committee. Has that been made necessary largely by the national-defense program?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I would say, Judge LEAVY, that it has. It has been found necessary to increase the facilities to serve the Alcoa plant at Vancouver and, of course, the new transmission lines and substations for the plant of the Reynolds Co. at Longview, as well as the other new industrial plants in that area.

Mr. LEAVY. And in addition to the R. J. Reynolds new aluminum plant under construction at Longview, since last year, the Aluminum Corporation of America has built a large plant and has doubled or trebled its capacity?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. They are trebling their capacity originally contemplated, necessitated by the national-defense program.

Mr. LEAVY. And the receipts from power at Grand Coulee and Bonneville are estimated at $6,000,000 for the next fiscal year?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I so understand.

Mr. LEAVY. And without the construction of these lines and the hasty construction of them the production of these light metals will have to be curtailed and likewise the return on the investment will have to be postponed?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. That is very true, the speed-up of our national-defense production, especially of airplanes, is absolutely dependent thereon; also the amortization of the cost of the project. It is my understanding that the National Defense Council has indicated they would like to have this new Reynolds plant go into production by the 15th of July. And, of course, we will also have to provide the additional units to serve the expanded plant at Vancouver of the Aluminum Corporation of America.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has the Reynolds investment in buildings, and so forth, reached a state where they can go into business as of July 15?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. They are striving to do so, I will say to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the approximate condition now?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. They are now proceeding with the construction of the plant as rapidly as possible.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have you any labor trouble?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. No labor trouble whatever.

Mr. RICH. When do you expect to have that Bonneville project completed?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I think by December 1943 they will have all of the 10 units completed.

Mr. RICH. How much money is going to be needed besides what has already been appropriated? You can substitute that figure in the record if you wish.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I can furnish that, if you would like me to furnish it for the record.

The information referred to is as follows:

"In addition to the regular Budget estimate of $12,000,000 and the supplemental estimate of $10,900,000, totaling $22,900,000, in support of which I have testified, it is estimated that probably another $10,000,000 will be required to complete the Bonneville project. The exact amount will depend of course, upon the location of the new industries to be served, how close or how far away they are from the dam—the distance the power load has to be carried and transmitted. The figure of $10,000,000 is only a rough estimate and is subject to variation, according to the engineers, but that is as nearly as can be approximated at this time. However, in view of the fact that this is a self-liquidating project, whatever the amount which the Government is called upon to invest it will be returned to the Treasury."

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Smith, of course the committee knows my interest in these matters, but you are far more familiar with matters involving your own district and involving Bonneville, and I am sure we are all appreciative of the splendid statement you have made in support of these Budget estimates.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I thank my distinguished colleague from my own State, whose services have been so valuable on this committee and in other respects to the people of the entire State of Washington, including my own district. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, for your courtesy.

Transportation and Defense Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, the American today has four media from which to choose in pursuing his travels. The airplane, the train, the steamboat, and the automobile are available to convey him to any point that he may wish to reach within the Nation's confines. It is due in no small way to the wise policy of public development and encouragement that this great transportation system—the finest and most comprehensive in the world—is available for his use. For the American people long have expressed their interest in all four media and at various times have promoted the development of one or another. They appreciate the place of each in the Nation's economic order, the way that one form supplements another, and they realize, too, that absence or discouragement of any one, regardless of the possible adequacy of the other three, would result in a transportation system which would be quite incomplete.

It is for this reason that in considering an economic sanction upon one form, whether it be regulation, subsidy, or taxation, proper deliberation should be given to the dynamic equilibrium that prevails among the various components of the Nation's transport network. For to favor or penalize one media without regard for the others would not only be discriminatory but contrary to the public interest which has been manifested actively since the formation of the union. In matters of taxation, especially, it is imperative that proper consideration be given to the relationship of a levy on a single form of transportation to operating economy and to the effect upon the dynamics of transport.

TAXES ON HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION

Consider highway transportation, for illustration. It is beyond dispute that private and commercial motor vehicle owners now are paying far more than

their equitable share of the cost of highways in the form of State gasoline taxes, registration fees, and other special levies. In my own State of Maryland motorists pay annually over $18,000,000 in special motor vehicle levies. They also pay all the general taxes paid by other citizens for the upkeep of government—local, State, and Federal—through the normal channels of taxation, that is, assessments on property, income, business, various commodities and the like. And, in addition, each highway user today is paying an average of $15 annually toward the cost of national defense through the Federal tax of 1½ cents on gasoline and the various Federal levies on automotive equipment.

These payments, which are over and above the road use levies imposed by the States and the normal taxes for all branches of government, are now providing some $450,000,000 annually toward the development of adequate armed forces. Of the four existing media, highway transportation is the only form which has been called upon thus far to bear a particular portion of this defense-tax burden.

A brief analysis of the operating costs of motor vehicles illustrates the effect of these levies upon their operations. The "out of pocket" costs involved in operating a truck, which include driver's wages, gasoline, lubricating oil, tires, and repairs, average about 10 cents per mile. Approximately 15 percent of this is expended upon mileage taxes, that is, levies on gasoline, lube oil, and tires which vary directly with the number of miles operated. This does not include registration fees, special permit levies, nor other imposts which truck operators charge to fixed costs, along with garage, insurance, and so forth.

The existing defense taxes alone represent about 5 percent of these operating charges. Anyone familiar with the keenness of the competition which prevails among carriers today, will appreciate the material advantage which this margin affords to the competitors of highway transportation.

If all motor vehicles are considered, the effect of these levies becomes even more significant. The mileage costs of the composite motor vehicle averages around $150 per year, more than $40 of which goes for operating taxes. National-defense taxes, paid to the Federal Government, alone amount to about $15, or 10 percent of the total operating expenses. In order to effect equality of taxation throughout the entire transportation system, it would be necessary either to eliminate the existing defense levies or place corresponding taxes upon the operations of other transport media.

MOTOR-VEHICLE TAXES AND HIGHWAY COSTS

It is claimed sometimes that motor-vehicle taxes are offset by highway expenses incurred by various units of government, and that highway users are enjoying a public subsidy. As previously mentioned, the defense taxes under discussion herein are in addition to the special road levies which highway users contribute for the development of road facilities. Inasmuch as these taxes are for development of an adequate Army and Navy, any consideration of road costs and their relation to motor-vehicle taxes is extraneous. It is worthy of mention, however, in this connection that Chairman Joseph B. Eastman, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, in his comprehensive four-volume study of public aids to transportation, found that highway users pay more than their equitable share of costs, while rail, water, and air transport are enjoying sizable public subsidies. The scale of overpayment by various classes of highway users is shown in the accompanying table.

THE DECLARED POLICY OF THE CONGRESS

The welfare of the Nation's transportation system today depends upon equality of treatment toward all forms of transport and the maintenance of equal opportunity among them. A national policy embracing this attitude was declared by Congress only a year ago in the Transportation Act of 1940.

It is hereby declared to be the national transportation policy of the Congress to provide for fair and impartial regulation of all modes of transportation * * * so administered as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each; to promote safe, adequate, economical, and efficient service and foster sound economic conditions in transportation and among the several carriers; to encourage the establishment and maintenance of reasonable charges for transportation services, without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices.

Considering this policy, does it seem proper that highway transportation should pay, as it now is paying, a defense tax amounting to 10 percent of motor-vehicle running expenses, while other transport media go scot-free? Does it seem fair to impose an additional tax upon the only fuel they can use while the fuel used by competitive media escapes without special defense levies being imposed upon it?

HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION INDISPENSABLE TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

Approximately one-quarter of all the gasoline is consumed in motor trucking, which certainly is indispensable to the defense program. The superior economies of such transportation unquestionably are playing an ever more important role in the current defense effort, so that any increased tax upon the gasoline consumed for this purpose merely would increase the cost of transportation of materials essential to defense and hence seriously handicap such effort. Even in normal times, studies by the Federal Public Roads Administration indicate, approximately two-thirds of the operation of private automobiles owned by farmers is for business purposes. This group of the population incidentally accounts for approximately 30 percent of all the passenger cars. Obviously the farmer will play an indispensable role in the provision of adequate foodstuffs in any defense effort. But he would be penalized heavily through increased Federal taxation of the gasoline which he consumes.

Even in the case of residents of urban areas, these same studies show, in normal times slightly more than half of the operation of passenger cars represents business pursuits. There is compelling evidence, furthermore, that this percentage is increasing rapidly as a result of defense needs. One of the chief obstacles to satisfactory progress of the defense effort, it is known quite generally, has been the serious shortage of adequate housing facilities in the vicinity of industrial areas upon which there is the greatest dependence for fulfillment of the defense program. The fact is that the housing shortage for defense workers is so serious that the magazine Look devotes the major article in its current issue to this problem. The Federal Government recently purchased two Hudson River excursion boats and converted them into floating barracks for defense workers in the South. It also bought a large number of automobile trailers to accommodate workers on defense projects, the trailers to be moved from job to job as occasion demands. Defense workers obviously want to live as close to the job as possible. When they have to travel long distances to work a tax on their automobile use is equivalent to a tax upon their inability to secure housing within a reasonable distance from this work.

Many specific instances of this situation might be cited. In Baltimore City, for example, approximately 85 percent of the workers employed at Sparrows Point, a steel center, drive to work in their own cars or ride with fellow workers. Likewise, with the immense growth of the Glenn L. Martin aircraft center, it is estimated that over 80 percent of the workers must necessarily use motor vehicles. Upon investigation, I find that the same conditions prevail in Youngstown, Ohio, a steel center; Midland, Mich., a chemical center; and Glendale, Calif., an aircraft center.

Of the 3,442 municipalities in this country with a population in excess of 2,500, it has been found that 2,130, or approximately two-thirds of the total, possess no system of mass transportation whatever. Their residents are required, therefore, to rely for transportation solely upon their own private automobiles.

It seems quite clear that higher taxes upon the gasoline consumed in such traveling would cause a serious disruption in the existing transportation facilities upon which defense workers must depend in moving to and from their work. In fact, it is not too difficult to envisage how such added costs would contribute to the current requests for higher wages to offset the effect of the increased tax. Such taxation, therefore, probably would tend to nullify directly much of the effort which is being expended currently in attempting to stimulate progress of the defense program.

ADDITIONAL DEFENSE TAXES

The additional levy on gasoline now being considered by the Congress would widen the tax differential between highway and other transport agencies. Such a levy would have a most adverse effect upon highway transport, therefore, and only could be detrimental to the

welfare of the transportation system as a whole.

If equality of treatment is to be maintained, it would seem necessary to place similar levies on other transport so as to produce approximately equivalent revenue from those sources before any further increase in highway levies is considered.

Not only would this accomplish the desired aim of the Congress to produce a tax yield commensurate with the cost of national defense, but it would be in accordance with the declared congressional policy of fair and impartial treatment to all transport agencies.

Comparison of costs per vehicle, by vehicle groups, as finally derived with payments made, 1932

Class of motor vehicles and rate capacity	Cost per vehicle	Payments per vehicle	Payments minus assignable costs
Passenger cars	$26	$26	--------
Taxicabs and other for-hire cars	61	81	$20
School busses	82	77	−5
Contract busses (seats):			
7 and less	41	56	15
8 to 20	46	113	67
Over 20	59	178	110
Common carrier busses (seats):			
7 and less	126	143	17
8 to 20	142	290	148
Over 20	188	437	249
Trucks (capacities in tons):			
Private: Farm	20	25	5
Other private:			
1½ and less	53	48	−5
Over 1½ and less than 3, single	67	92	25
Over 1½ and less than 3, combination	104	133	29
3 and less than 5, single	151	185	34
5, single	287	256	−31
5, combination	311	277	−34
Over 5, single	316	358	42
Over 5, combination	372	457	85
For-hire:			
1½ tons and less	102	105	3
Over 1½ and less than 3, single	152	178	26
Over 1½ and less than 3, combination	157	226	69
3 and less than 5, single	251	282	31
3 and less than 5, combination	193	349	156
5, single	457	403	−54
5, combination	457	465	8
Over 5, single	499	594	95
Over 5, combination	546	832	287

Source: Public Aids to Transportation, vol. I, p. 30.

NOTE.—Similar figures for 1937 not available, for explanation see vol. IV, p. 167.

Federal Gasoline Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, the current proposal to increase the Federal tax on gasoline holds many potential dangers, the results of which should be examined carefully before additional burdens are placed upon a commodity already heavily exploited for revenue. The danger to States is unusually imminent. Arkansas, and many other States, have constructed a system of highways, the costs of which are to be paid from revenues derived from a gasoline tax. These States have heavily bonded themselves for highway construction and the revenue realized from gasoline tax levies have been pledged to pay the bonds so issued and the interest on the same. For example, the State of Arkansas recently refunded its highway debt in the sum of $136,000,000 and pledged the first $10,000,000 of its highway revenue annually to discharge the obligation. Consequently, if Arkansas is to maintain its highway system and to have funds for any new construction it must raise in excess of $10,000,000 annually. From a practical taxing standpoint, nearly all of the revenues must necessarily be obtained from a tax on gasoline. Consequently, Arkansas imposes upon its own citizens a tax of 6½ cents per gallon on motor fuel to which must be added the present Federal tax of 1½ cents, making a total of 8 cents that must be paid in taxes on each gallon of gasoline consumed or substantially a sum equal to 50 percent of the value of the gasoline itself.

The present proposal to add another 1-cent tax by the Federal Government, although small in itself, would, when added to the present burden, necessarily result in a substantially decreased use of gasoline with a consequent reduction in the amount of total revenue actually received. It is generally recognized that a tax increase beyond a certain point lessens rather than enlarges revenue, and it is that situation which will face Arkansas and other States similarly situated, if the present gasoline tax is further increased. Our present highway system cannot be maintained; no new construction can be undertaken, and our bonds may be forced into default, all because of an insistence that an already overtaxed commodity be further and unreasonably taxed.

The highways of Arkansas and the other States are a necessary and integral part of the groundwork of the national-defense system. Over these highways are transported not only soldiers and military supplies and equipment, but the vast mass of commodities and materials behind the national-defense program. Without such highways the national-defense effort would either bog down or be materially curtailed and delayed. It is, moreover, calculated that with the diversion of coastal, water-borne shipping facilities to transoceanic routes, the burden of land hauls by both railways and trucks will materially increase.

It is, therefore, to the best interests of the United States that the individual States be left in a position where they may maintain and improve their highways to carry the burden imposed upon them. This they certainly cannot do if the necessary revenues for that purpose are to be diminished by imposing confiscatory taxes upon the only commodity upon which the States must rely for funds to carry their share of the burdens.

It is a mistaken idea, advanced by some, that gasoline is a luxury and taxable as such. As a matter of fact, over two-thirds of the gasoline consumed in this country is used in vehicles operated in whole or in large part in the prosecution of essential business enterprises. Most of these businesses operate on a small margin of profit and must continue to do so if the effort to hold down commodity prices is to be successful. The latter objective must, however, necessarily fail if the very businesses who are asked to hold down costs have their basic operating expenses increased by further taxes upon that which they must use in order to carry on.

All realize the existing necessity of raising revenue to finance the defense of this country. Sacrifices must and will be made. It is felt, however, that there are many commodities, now practically immune from taxation, which could be taxed, rather than increase the rate on an essential article which is already bearing a disproportionately high share of the tax burden, especially where the increase of the latter has so many features of danger both to the country and the individual States, and might serve to defeat the very purpose sought to be gained.

Still Another New Deal Chicken Comes Home To Roost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following article in the May 11 Washington Sunday Star clearly indicates that huge Federal expenditures in the interests of cotton have not met the fantastic hopes of the New Deal:

[From the Washington Sunday Star of May 11, 1941]

CROP-CONTROL PLAN IS BLAMED FOR LOSS OF COTTON MARKETS—FRANK AGRICULTURE REPORT DECLARES PROGRAM HAS OPERATED TO DISADVANTAGE OF UNITED STATES GROWERS AND AIDED FOREIGN COMPETITORS

(By Ovid A. Martin, the Star's special news service)

A startlingly frank report issued by the Agriculture Department's Economics Bureau declares that Government crop-control programs have operated to the disadvantage of American growers and to the advantage of foreign growers of cotton in world markets.

The report is regarded with particular significance because it was made public at a time when exports of American cotton, which once proudly dominated the world fiber markets, have slumped to the lowest point since pre-Civil War days.

This loss of foreign sales was reflected, in turn, by the accumulation of huge stocks of unsold cotton in crowded southern warehouses.

Foreign-trade authorities expect no more than 1,000,000 bales of American cotton to move abroad this season. This volume compares with about 6,400,000 bales exported last season and a record of 10,900,000 bales in 1926.

The Economics Bureau report said the control programs operated by another Agricul-

ture Department agency—the Agricultural Adjustment Administration—had helped bring about a shift in consumption from American to foreign cotton by holding prices of the American product above its normal relationship with cotton produced in other countries.

MARKET OUTLETS REDUCED

"These developments (loss of American export markets and increased consumption of foreign cotton) emphasize the fact," says the report, "that, in the absence of monopoly control of the world supplies of cotton, restrictions on production in the United States and price maintenance for American cotton, without similar restrictions and controls for other cottons, tend to reduce the market outlets for American cotton at the expense of the American cotton industry and to the advantage of cotton producers in other countries and of producers of other fibers that compete with cotton."

The report added that the possibilities of expanding cotton production in other countries had perhaps been underestimated. It declared that developments had greatly weakened, if not destroyed, any basis for confidence that expansion of production outside the United States offered no serious threat to the American cotton industry.

"The importance of the availability of American cotton at competitive prices in maintaining foreign outlets for American cotton is emphasized by data on exports," the report said.

It declared that during the first 6 years of the A. A. A. crop-adjustment programs (1933–38), exports of American cotton averaged 30 percent less than for the 10 years of 1923–32, whereas, for the same period, exports of cotton of competitive countries increased 30 percent.

EXPORT SALES "UNPROFITABLE"

Always ready to defend their programs, A. A. A. officials take issue with what they describe as the implications of the economic report. They agree that perhaps the crop programs have impaired the competitive position of American cotton in foreign markets. But they contend prices prevailing in world markets during the last 10 years were "unprofitable."

"There is no point," one A. A. A. official declared, "in selling cotton, or any other product, at prices which would bankrupt the producer."

The A. A. A. goes on the theory that it is better for the cotton producer as well as for the country to sell a smaller amount of cotton at fair prices than to sell a large quantity at below-cost prices. The net return to the farmer under this theory, the agency holds, is larger because his production costs on the reduced volume are smaller.

The A. A. A. officials contend the economic report overlooked several important by-products of the cotton program. They claim the program, by requiring farmers to observe soil-conserving and soil-building practices, has added millions of dollars to the productive value of southern farms.

Officials also claim that the program has encouraged and helped cotton farmers, particularly those in low-income classes, to produce more food and feed crops for their own use. The A. A. A. program recognized, they say, that cotton farmers had for too long a time depended upon a single cash crop for an income for virtually all their needs, including food.

Apparently anticipating the A. A. A. argument about the "unprofitability" of supplying world markets at low prices, the economics report said the extent to which American producers could afford to expand production and sell at reduced prices in order to compete more effectively with foreign producers depended largely on the alternatives available to American cotton producers.

LITTLE OFFSETTING ADVANTAGES

The report said studies indicated that returns from cotton usually were substantially greater than from alternative crop-and-livestock enterprises in the Cotton Belt. It also said industry apparently was not able to absorb the unemployed in the South at a living wage. Consequently, it concluded, attractive alternatives to cotton production were very limited.

"Under such situation," the report asserted, "the maintenance of prices for American cotton above their normal relationships to those of other growths permits cotton producers in other countries to take over a large proportion of the foreign market for American cotton with relatively little offsetting advantages to American cotton producers in the form of substantial improvements in the general level of cotton prices."

The report conceded that the effects of lost foreign markets might be offset temporarily, in whole or in part, by Government benefit payments to producers cooperating with crop programs. It cautioned, however, that some consideration might well be given to the situation in the event Government payments were greatly reduced or discontinued.

There is only one bright spot for the cotton producer, and that is the domestic market. Under the stimulus of the defense program, domestic consumption is running far above any level of the past.

Also contributing to this high level of consumption have been the Agriculture Department's surplus disposal programs under which cotton has been distributed among needy families in the South for cotton mattresses.

SURPLUS REMAINS PROBLEM

However, the surplus of old-crop American cotton when the new crop starts moving to market this summer is expected to be near the record level of 14,000,000 bales. This would be more than enough to supply domestic and foreign needs for a year. About 11,000,000 bales of this surplus either belongs to the Government, as a consequence of its grower-loan operations, or is stored as collateral for outstanding loans.

Just what the Government will do with this surplus is a problem that apparently must await future developments. Indications are that the surplus will be even larger next year. Steps are being taken to increase grower-loan rates on cotton. Such action would increase the disparity between American and foreign cotton prices in world markets and could be expected to result in even smaller exports.

It is possible that the A. A. A. may ask growers to make further reductions in cotton production pending conclusion of the war.

Some farm officials believe that, should the democracies win, the United States would be in a position to bring about an international cotton agreement under which exporting nations would divide up the world market so as to assure each an "equitable" share at reasonable prices.

America's huge surplus, these officials say, would be an important weapon in behalf of such an agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I might add that over a billion dollars have been taken from the United States Treasury for this one crop, cotton, which crop does not represent one-tenth of the national farm income. There was nearly twice as much cotton exported in 1940 as there was in 1939, and more in 1940 than in 1937 and 1938. The New Deal cannot expect too much sympathy on the grounds that the plight of cotton was a result of the loss of cotton exports due to the war.

Here is a crop which in one year, 1940, has had a $125,000,000 soil subsidy, a $96,000,000 parity subsidy, a $12,000,000 storage subsidy, a $40,000,000 export bounty, and thousands of dollars for investigation of new uses of the crop, and, after all these subsidies, is now in a most embarrassing position. The annual subsidies amount to over one-half the value of the crop.

Add to this complex situation the new sums which are to be extracted from the Federal Treasury if present legislation is passed. The most important is the amendment to increase Federal loans on this crop, without any foreign protection. The South makes believe it is against tariffs. It may be—for the foreigner. The present legislation lifts the American price of cotton by its boot straps—from 9 to 14 cents per pound—and if the world price is 7 cents per pound, it will take at least a 50-percent tariff to protect the American cotton grower, or, as a matter of fact, the United States Treasury. This administration has already put a 3-cent-per-pound penalty, or domestic tariff, on the American producer. This would be a 33⅓-percent tariff on 9-cent-per-pound cotton. The foreign farmer is not even required to meet this tariff.

When the people realize that, according to the latest figures available, 42 percent of the farmers of this country received $60 or less per year in subsidies; 79 percent of them, or about 4 out of 5 farmers, received $100 or less; and 93 percent of the farmers received less than $200, they will demand a reconsideration of the cross-purpose schemes of the New Deal.

Why continue the $10,000 checks to big corporation farmers that cause the surpluses? With mounting taxes, the public will insist on more horse sense and fewer frankfurter hot dogs in mapping out a common-sense, fair, and just farm program.

The United States Treasury cannot be continually used as an artificial means of maintaining the landed aristocracy of the South.

Location of Proposed Veterans' Hospital in the Philadelphia Area

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE FEDERAL BOARD OF HOSPITALIZATION, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 16, 1941

Mr. MYERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent

granted me to extend my remarks, I am placing in the RECORD my statement and testimony before the Federal Hospitalization Board regarding the location of the proposed veterans' hospital for Pennsylvania, which I urged should be in the Philadelphia area.

Congressman MYERS. General Hines and members of this subcommittee, first let me say I was in the very beginning at quite a loss to understand just why this hospitalization board had determined upon central Pennsylvania, and I have not yet been able to secure any figures or information which would prove it was to the best interest of the veterans themselves that this hospital be located in central Pennsylvania, and, when I say to the best interest of the veterans, I mean to the great majority of veterans.

I understand the state department of the American Legion has on three occasions at State conventions passed resolutions setting forth it was their desire that this hospital be located in eastern Pennsylvania, accessible to northeastern Pennsylvania. I certainly think that the members of the American Legion of our State have no selfish interest as to where the hospital should be located. Their whole interest is based on where it will best serve the great majority of the veterans, and I certainly do think that serious and careful consideration should be given to the action which has been taken by the American Legion members in our State on three separate occasions.

I further believe that this board should be guided by one rule particularly, namely, density of veteran population, and I am sure that all figures and all data and all available information certainly have proven to the veterans of Pennsylvania, to the Veterans' Administration here in Washington, and to the hospitalization board that eastern Pennsylvania is where the veteran population is densest.

Let me say, therefore, that I think we Members of Congress are somewhat at a loss when we are not informed and do not know why central Pennsylvania was determined on by this board. I do know in letters from the Veterans' Administration it was said veterans could best be served by locating a hospital there. I have not been able to get any information that would show to me, or prove to me, that the veterans could best be served by going to central Pennsylvania.

I understand further that even the Harrisburg area, from Harrisburg east, is looked upon by the Veterans' Administration as eastern Pennsylvania. The American Legion and other organizations look upon eastern Pennsylvania as that section of the State located east of a line drawn through the State at a point not quite as far west as Lancaster. And when we say eastern Pennsylvania, we mean a location somewhere in the vicinity of Philadelphia, not in the city, but somewhere near which is fairly accessible to northeast Pennsylvania.

I understood you to say, General Hines, that the veterans in the eastern section of the State had been provided for by a naval hospital and that that was taken into consideration by this board in determining a location.

However, as you yourself have just said, that was before the emergency program, and we know this country is now committed to a two-ocean navy and the personnel of the Navy will be doubled. This policy is not merely for an emergency of today or tomorrow; this country is committed to a two-ocean navy from henceforth, and therefore unquestionably there is going to be a greater demand by the Navy Department for beds in the naval hospital in Philadelphia. Even today more Navy men are being served in that hospital than a year ago. We should give that consideration and realize, regardless of what anyone in the Navy Department may say, that with the facts as we see them and have them staring us in the face it is only natural that the Navy will use more and more beds in that hospital. And so I say to you, General, with that situation before us we can't assume it is possible for you to assure us that you will always have 450 or 500 beds down there.

If an epidemic should take place, or if there is another influenza outbreak in the State, the Navy Department will want that hospital for its own men, as they really should, for we know that the money which was contributed came from the pockets of the men, and nobody can assure us that we will continue to have that number of beds in the Philadelphia Naval Hospital.

I am not committed to Philadelphia or a site immediately adjacent to Philadelphia, but I am unalterably opposed to locating this facility in central Pennsylvania. I do not feel I need to submit figures. Some have been submitted, and I know some of the members of the American Legion who are present will submit to you hosts of figures to prove the point I am making. I reiterate that it is from the eastern section of the State and the northeastern section of the State where practically all or an overwhelming majority of the veterans will come. If we make them go to central Pennsylvania, where so few of the veterans live, to receive hospitalization, we are not doing the right thing for the veterans. I do not hesitate to say that I believe the location of this hospital out in the central part of the State might be looked on as a waste of public funds, and I do believe that this board should give consideration to this and consider the question de novo and disregard what action has been taken by the board originally and give further consideration to the national-defense program.

The other matters that have been mentioned, transportation and medical centers, I will not go into; but coming from Philadelphia and considering that 92,000 veterans, or one-fourth of the veterans that our State gave to the World War, came from my city, from the city alone, I feel that that locality is where this hospital should be located. Thank you.

* * * * *

General HINES. Would you mind telling the subcommittee, in your judgment, where is the line that separates central Pennsylvania from eastern Pennsylvania?

Congressman MYERS. Well, General, first, let me ask, Where is the line as considered by the Veterans' Administration?

General HINES. The Veterans' Administration has not drawn any line. We usually take a patient from one point and send him to the hospital the shortest distance from where he is. We have certain areas assigned to certain hospitals, and generally an area within 150 miles is considered a reasonable distance. But throughout this whole consideration I know the full Board, and there is no secrecy about it that the Board considered central Pennsylvania as the place for the facility, but what they had to consider is known as a domiciliary facility—a home with a large number of domiciliary beds and a hospital to handle those beds and to take care of excess cases immediately adjacent thereto. Then, too, they considered that the Veterans' Administration had a hospital at Pittsburgh, in the western section of the State, and that they had an inherent right in the naval hospital, and they were assured the beds there would be always available. Now, I know that when this subcommittee reports to the Board—and, as I have indicated, the Board did not tie their hands in any way; it told them to consider all elements of this problem and present their recommendations to the Board. The subcommittee has to reopen this entire matter and listen to any argument on any location. But I know when it comes before the full Board they are going to ask that very question because the term "eastern Pennsylvania" is being used, and the Board would like to know what the Members of Congress and the veterans consider the eastern section of the State.

Congressman MYERS. In my humble opinion, eastern Pennsylvania certainly should be considered as that section east of a line drawn through the State at a point not quite as far west as Lancaster. I do believe the hospital should be located closer to the metropolitan area, and because you are going to erect a domiciliary facility is no reason why it cannot be closer to the city. I do not believe we should go out in the country, 75 or 100 miles from the city, which appears to be your purpose, for I am confident we can certainly find sites somewhere in the eastern section of the State even for a domiciliary facility; and let me add—I understand this, General—in the city of Boston you have both a naval hospital and a veterans' facility.

General HINES. We use the naval hospital there, and the Board has under consideration now the location of a new general hospital in that area—in the vicinity of Boston. That has not been definitely determined because a subcommittee is working on that at this time. Thank you, Congressman MYERS.

Civilian Defense, Protective Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Office for Emergency Management, Executive Office of the President, has placed on my desk today a booklet entitled, "Civilian Defense, Protective Construction." I note that it has been prepared by the War Department "with the assistance and advice of other Federal agencies."

It may be no more than a coincidence that this booklet appears during the week within which the President was to have made his convoy speech. The timing is perhaps unfortunate and a little premature in view of the President's sudden decision to postpone the speech until May 27, presumably in order to "ready up" public opinion for the forthcoming surprises which, it is broadly hinted, the administration is preparing for us.

This engaging little 36-page booklet, complete with scary diagrams, offers to the public the very latest information regarding the construction of air-raid shelters, the type of demolition, gas, incendiary, and other bombs which we may expect to receive from aerial attack, the effects of these bombs and protective measures which should be adopted to minimize damage. For example, we learn that subways in the United States would probably not provide adequate protection. Our city dwellers will be glad to note, however:

It has been pointed out that steel or concrete framed buildings are relatively safe

from anything but a direct hit from a high-explosive bomb, and the convenience and relative economy of a shelter inside a building may be determining factors in selecting the location of a refuge. Shelters within buildings have the advantage that they are easily accessible to occupants of the building and can be kept warm and livable. With a few exceptions, modern office, factory, and apartment buildings of more than four stories are usually of reinforced concrete or steel frame construction and offer suitable and very accessible locations for shelters within the building.

Mr. Speaker, I do not mean to minimize the excellent work of the War Department in preparing, in all its dreadful detail, this valuable handbook. I am also fully aware that the introduction to the booklet advises us that its mere issuance does not require us to start work immediately on the protective structures described. Nevertheless, it would be interesting to know why this booklet appears at this particular time, why it is being given very wide circulation, and whether our Government is contemplating the taking of such further belligerent steps as to render this booklet indispensable in every American home and office within the near future. If it is not expected that the information will be useful, then the Office for Emergency Management may well concern itself with other duties. If it is expected that all of us should know exactly what to do when the bombs start falling, then we are entitled to a frank statement from our Government as to what has been done and is being done which makes the dissemination of this information of such immediate importance.

Ex-President Hoover's Speech Should Have Sobered Our Minds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald for today:

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

IN THE NEWS—EX-PRESIDENT HOOVER'S SPEECH SHOULD HAVE SOBERED OUR MINDS

Ex-President Hoover's speech was a fine American utterance and did much to restore his prestige and position as a leader of American opinion.

Let us hope that it also did much to bring sober and unprejudiced thought to the American people.

On American Week at any rate we ought to be able to bring careful consideration to the best interests of our own America, and decide calmly and dispassionately whether or not it is for the present or future advantage of this country to project our people into this foreign conflict.

Mr. Hoover, according to the dispatches, stated that although our relations with the Axis Powers are strained, we are still not in the war.

But, he declared, we would be in the war the moment our Navy goes into action.

"And," continued the ex-President, "it is now proposed that we should put the American Navy into action.

"That," said Mr. Hoover, "is a straightforward, understandable proposal, which boldly makes clear the meaning of words like convoys and patrols.

"That is joining in this war once and for all.

"From here the steps are automatic.

"Our Navy must attack German submarines, ships, and planes if it is to be of any use.

"To make it effective then, we must expand naval and air bases abroad.

"We must equip these bases with expeditionary forces.

"And that is war for long years to come."

That the war will be prolonged for "years to come" is evidenced not only by ex-President Hoover's temperate statement but by the inadvertent words regarding our war activities uttered by Winston Churchill and Lloyd George in the recent vote-of-confidence debate in the British House of Commons.

Said Mr. Churchill, the Prime Minister, in discussing England's war chances for 1941 and 1942 and 1943:

"It may be that 1943, if we have to endure it as a year of war, will present easier problems.

"The United States patrol announced by President Roosevelt [not merely proposed, mind you, but announced by President Roosevelt] and on which the American Navy and air force are already engaged, takes a considerable part of the Atlantic in a certain degree off our hands, but we need a good deal more help.

"I expect we shall get a good deal more help.

"In fact, it has been declared we are to have all help necessary."

So we see from Mr. Churchill's speech that the war we are entering into so heedlessly is expected to endure, as Mr. Hoover says, "for long years to come," in spite of our entry, and, indeed, because of our entry.

Without our encouragement to war and without the commitments of our President—secretly entered into and undisclosed to the American people—the war would be over now, would have been over long ago.

And England would have accepted the terms of the Axis, guaranteeing the integrity of the British Empire and merely demanding that England keep her intrusive fingers out of Europe; that England allow European nations to form their own treaties and unions; and that England do not set one European nation against another and destroy both in order to maintain her own hegemony on the Continent.

It is clear from Mr. Churchill's remarks not only that our country has been committed by our autocratic President to war and that the United States Navy and air force are "already engaged" in "the patrol announced by President Roosevelt" but also that the war, in spite of the contribution by the United States of "all help necessary," is expected to last for years.

How much longer the war will endure than 1943 we do not know, but how formidable it will be we do know if we will only take a calm and factual view of the situation.

It is perfectly clear that we will have opposed to us not only Italy and Germany and Japan but also Russia, and also Hungary and Rumania and Bulgaria, allies of Germany, and probably soon Turkey, now almost a dependency of Russia and Germany, and even possibly France.

Says Lloyd George in the Commons debate:

"Why should Foreign Secretary Eden withhold a fact that is perfectly well known, that Turkey allowed German ships to pass through the Bosporus into the Dardanelles to seize those islands?" (Samothrace and Lemnos).

"The most serious aspect of Eden's speech is that in moving a vote of confidence in the Government he withheld essential facts from us.

"A road which is founded on the quicksands of illusion never yet led to victory."

"In the last war," continues Lloyd George, "America put her fleet in the Atlantic—every boat—while Japan was guaranteeing the Pacific

"What is Japan guaranteeing now?

"She is guaranteeing that she will take advantage at the first opportunity to wrest dominancy of the Pacific from America."

Most surely so.

And what is Russia, who was on the side of America and the Allies in the last war, guaranteeing in this war?

Only the bitter hostility of a powerful people, backed by the largest army in the world.

And what is France, which was the leader of the Allies in the last war, guaranteeing to America and England in this war?

What might happen to us if we do not get into this war is purely hypothetical hooey.

But what we will encounter if we do get into it is plain to everyone who is willing to consider dispassionately the cold, hard, and self-evident facts.

We will have almost the whole of Europe and almost the whole of Asia to deal with.

And while they will never be able to conquer us, will we be able for long years to come to conquer them?

So the war will endure until the world is exhausted and civilization is all but destroyed.

In the course of such a devastating and long-lasting war, our own country will become militarized, democracy will necessarily be submerged, the most iron-bound autocracy will take its place, and we will emerge eventually from the conflict not only destitute of material benefits but devoid of our liberties.

Said Lloyd George further in the Commons debate:

"I have had experience with American war organization.

"It is full of disappointments. You must remember the United States has never had Europe's experience of preparing for war with millions.

"They have very efficient arsenals, but their mechanical triumphs have been triumphs of peace—inventing, improving, and multiplying the weapons of peace."

And does the United States want to abandon its "triumph of peace"?

Does it want to discontinue "inventing and improving and multiplying" the instruments of peace?

Does it want, like alien nations, to devote itself to multiplying and persistently employing implements of murder and destruction?

How will that benefit our people?

How will that please the good God who has showered unnumbered blessings upon us, probably because we are a Nation of peace and progress and liberty, and not a Nation of war and hate and tyranny?

Perhaps God loves us because we have beaten our swords into plowshares.

Shall we now, in the heat of hate and anger, beat them back into the bloody instruments of war?

Yes! If we shall be fighting in our own defense, or for some genuine high purpose; but shall we fight merely to determine which foreign national shall dominate the continent of Europe or the continent of Asia?

Should we not rather heed the plea of our former President for calm thinking, reason, and deliberation and his warning that the

country must not jeopardize aid to Britain and the future of America by unthinking emotional action?

The United States today is unprepared, said the ex-President, but "the potential might of this Nation is the strongest thing in the whole world."

Then should not that might and menace be employed to bring about not the disasters of a long and indeterminate war but rather the blessings of a just and enduring peace?

Is not that a nobler endeavor?

Let us, therefore, be insistent in this higher aim, "and let us not be weary in well doing."

"If," as the Pope reverently writes, "our prayers and aspirations have not as yet had the result which we ardently desired, our trust in God must not be lessened on this account, but we must all continue with constant and persevering devotion to be 'patient in tribulation, instant in prayer.'"

The Late Brig. Gen. William L. Mitchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

RESOLUTION BY THE ILLINOIS STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith House Joint Resolution No. 21, recently passed by the Illinois House of Representatives and concurred in by the State senate. It calls to the attention of the Congress the injustice and unfair treatment administered to the late Brig. Gen. William L. Mitchell. The name of General Mitchell should, without question, be cleared, and I am glad the Legislature of the State of Illinois has called this to the attention of the country.

House Joint Resolution 21

Whereas the late Brig. Gen. William L. Mitchell enlisted in 1898 at the outbreak of the Spanish-American War as a private in the First Wisconsin Infantry and saw active service in Cuba and the Philippine Islands; then served on the Mexican border in 1912; and was repeatedly decorated during the World War by Congress and by several of our Allies for repeated gallantry and giving exceptional example to his fellow soldiers; and

Whereas he rose from the ranks during 28 years of spectacular achievement, having been the first American officer to fly over the trenches during the World War, the first American to scout troop movements by plane, commanded the largest concentration of airplanes in the then history of aviation; and

Whereas he continued to pioneer aviation progress by proving the feasibility of transcontinental flight, as a result of which our air-mail system was instituted; and

Whereas from 1920–24 he served as assistant to the Chief of the Army Air Service, in charge of operations and technical development, in which position he contributed invaluably to the development of military and civil aeronautics; and

Whereas he strove to impress his superior officers with the shortcomings and deficiencies in the Army and Navy flying units only to be rebuffed and demoted; and thereafter the crash of the dirigible *Shenandoah* and failure of Navy's flight by plane to Hawaii prompted him to charge incompetency on the part of his superiors and criminal neglect of national defense; and

Whereas although a separate inquiry substantiated the truth of his accusations, he was tried by a court martial for violating the ninety-sixth article of war, found guilty of a breach of discipline and suspended from the service for 5 years without pay but still subject to call; and

Whereas the practical effect of this decision was that the pride and dignity of military officials must be protected at all costs even at the risk of jeopardizing the effectiveness of national defense; and

Whereas General Mitchell's fearless adherence to principle resulted in his sacrificing his personal ambitions in an effort to arouse the Nation to a knowledge of its military helplessness; and

Whereas developments arising from the present European conflict demonstrate incontrovertibly that General Mitchell was possessed of prescience which placed him many years ahead of his colleagues; and

Whereas the stigma upon his memory should be officially eradicated: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives of the sixty-second general assembly (the senate concurring herein), That we respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to take such official action as may be necessary to clear the name of this soldier and patriot to the end that he who stood his ground, though persecuted, may be completely and forever cleared, and that a copy of this preamble and resolution be delivered by the secretary of state to each Member in Congress from Illinois.

Adopted by the house March 26, 1941.

ELMER J. SCHNACKENBERG,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

R. R. RANDOLPH,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Concurred in by the senate April 30, 1941.

HUGH W. CROSS,
President of the Senate.

EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Dawes Endorses Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following short news clipping from the New York Herald Tribune:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 14, 1941]

DAWES ENDORSES HOOVER—SAYS ADVICE AGAINST CONVOYS AND WAR IS "VOICE OF REASON"

CHICAGO, May 13.—Charles G. Dawes, Vice President in the Coolidge administration, said today that "I strongly endorse" the advice of former President Herbert Hoover against using American warships as war convoys and against participating in the war in any manner.

General Dawes' statement was: "I strongly endorse the statement of Mr. Hoover. It is the voice of reason, of experience, of patriotism, and of statesmanship. It is also the voice of wisdom and will be a guide to his fellow countrymen."

Ships and More Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

LETTER FROM MR. PAUL N. CARTER, OF SIERRA MADRE, CALIF., AND AN EDITORIAL FROM THE LOS ANGELES COMMERCIAL NEWS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a constituent, Mr. Paul N. Carter, a keen student of our foreign relations and particularly those with Latin-American countries. The editorial referred to in his letter is also included:

SIERRA MADRE, CALIF., *May 12, 1941.*

Hon. CARL HINSHAW,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As one who still believes there is an honorable road to peace without sacrificing all this country holds dear, I am taking the liberty of enclosing the attached editorial taken from the Los Angeles Commercial News of May 9, 1941.

Clarence Martin, in his editorial, has pointed out clearly some of the economic phases of this conflict concerning which the general public hears little. If our own way of life is to continue after hostilities cease, and assuming that some way may yet be found to keep us from active belligerency, considerable more attention must be given to the preservation of our economic front through adequate shipping facilities.

As pointed out in the attached editorial, we are following a course which will seriously cripple our efforts to maintain essential trade contacts both now and after peace comes.

Administration spokesmen repeatedly stress the importance of creating hemispheric solidarity. In order to attain this result it is essential to establish military coordination; but I believe even more important to foster wherever possible, economic independence of Latin-American countries from Europe. To attain this result steps should be taken to develop those Central and South American natural resources which will complement and supplement our own. Much of the raw material we obtain from other parts of the world could be produced in Latin America. By long-range planning and capital investment, a tremendous two-way trade could be developed.

To this end it seems short-sighted not to use a major portion of our defense and lend-lease funds to create among our Latin-American neighbors an economic defense through which a satisfactory peace may be won. Overseas trade will be a major factor, and its protection can only be maintained through preservation and further development of our merchant marine.

Trusting you may be able to make use of the attached editorial, I am,

Sincerely yours,

PAUL N. CARTER.

[From the Los Angeles Commercial News of May 9, 1941]

There are a few facts of American attitude toward the European war which are so clear they cannot be questioned. First of these is that the United States desires a British victory and is willing to extend every resource to that end. This is not only the earnest wish of the Washington administration, but of the vast majority of the American people.

The second fact is that ships and particularly American ships will be the most important factor in the conduct of the European war, for without ships England must starve and surrender.

The cry of "Ships, and more ships for Britain" is ringing in the ears of every high Washington official. We hear of plans for taking 2,000,000 tons of American ships and turning them over to the British for war material transport. We hear of plans to take over the entire intercoastal fleet, most of the Great Lakes fleet, and if necessary to close the Panama Canal.

We think the time has come for plain talk and pointed questions.

The American merchant marine is asked to sacrifice established trade routes and turn over 2,000,000 tons in American ships—while Britain maintains an almost normal foreign commerce in routes not connected with the war effort. This nonwar commerce is carried on with a fleet approximating 2,000,000 tons.

High British officials have said that every available British ship is used in the Empire war effort. That statement is false.

On the Pacific coast appear many display advertisements offering de luxe summer cruises to Alaska in British ships; British vessels still ply the trans-Pacific routes in trades remote from any war effort; British affiliated ships maintain a regular schedule from the Pacific coast to South America in competition with American ships and American firms; much of the Central American fruit arrives in British affiliated bottoms in competition with American vessels; British merchant lines still run from the West Indies to the United States in competition with American ships. Beyond the Western Hemisphere there are similar examples of British trade routes maintained in spite of the war.. There is the British commercial trade to Africa, India, and the Orient.

Rumbles of protest of the dual British effort of war and trade were heard in Congress this week as Representative JOHN M. ROBSION, of Kentucky, charged that the British are now using an 8-to-1 tonnage superiority to compete with American shippers in Western Hemisphere commerce.

ROBSION quoted Lloyd's figures to show that Britain had 21,000,000 tons of merchant shipping at the start of the war and acquired 12,230,000 tons from Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France. The United States, he added, has already turned over 1,500,000 tons and is building an additional 3,000,000 tons.

It is true that if the British should withdraw vessels from nonwar routes that British foreign commerce would suffer—but supply of the British military forces would be more secure if the vessels were used for war transport.

If it is a question of whether the British should maintain normal overseas commerce at the expense of the scanty American merchant marine, we think there is only one answer, and that is the protection of our own.

The United States is already engaged in a vast shipbuilding program, most of which is intended to aid the British. More than generous aid is on the way to Britain and vastly more to go.

Any plan for the strangulation of American foreign commerce while Britain moves surplus ships in normal trade calls for the most vigorous protest from American shipping. American steamship men, usually with a weak voice in public affairs, for once should make themselves heard.

CLARENCE MARTIN,
Editor, Commercial News.

Is Hitler Financed By America's Defense Program?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

ARTICLE FROM CLICK MAGAZINE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand an article from the current issue of Click magazine which I think raises a problem we will sooner or later have to deal with under our national-defense program.

The article is entitled "Is Hitler Financed By America's Defense Program?" The question is then answered in the text and documentary evidence accompanying it. It is shown that the Nazis get a "kick-back" on almost every airplane we build for ourselves or for Britain through patent assignments and licensing arrangements.

The company concerned in this article is the Rohm & Haas Co. and its affiliates, of Philadelphia. This is a large plastics manufacturing concern with monopolies on several products vital to our national-defense program. Some are indispensable on airplanes; others are used in torpedo boats. One of the affiliates of this firm was organized with the assistance of a German corporation. This German corporation got 30 percent of the stock in return and has had at least one representative on the board of directors ever since.

As the magazine says:

Something must be done now about the American stream of contributions to Hitler's war machine. The Army and the manufacturers who supply it have no normal way of determining which of the companies that deal in military essentials share their defense profits with Hitler. Congress alone has the power to correct this dangerous situation.

In order that all my colleagues may read this article, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include the article therein.

The article follows:

[From Click of June 1941]

IS HITLER FINANCED BY AMERICA'S DEFENSE PROGRAM?—CLICK EXPOSES THE WAY UNITED STATES DOLLARS FLOW INTO THE NAZI WAR TREASURY

On almost every airplane, from the tiniest pursuit ship to the giant flying fortresses, on torpedo boats, even on the houses built for the men who forge America's arms, Hitler gets a kickback.

The Nazi bombs that pulverized Coventry and Birmingham, the German tanks that rolled into the Low Countries and France, might have well been labeled "Made in United States of America," because American dollars helped pay for them.

During the last World War thousands of Allied soldiers were mowed down by shells made in their homelands and sold to the Kaiser by unscrupulous munitions makers. But it wasn't until 1935 that the Nye munitions committee of the United States Senate exposed this. This time we are supplying Hitler with the one thing he needs more than munitions—American money.

The story of how Click discovered one of the big leaks in the dam this democracy is erecting against the Nazi tidal wave is as fantastic as any detective thriller ever written. On February 17, a Mr. John F. Bergin appeared at our Philadelphia offices. Nervously he handed us his card, on which appeared the name "Rohm & Haas Co."

"We understand you believe we have Nazi connections and are investigating us," he said. "We've even been investigated by the F. B. I. and given a clean bill of health."

The knowledge that the F. B. I. never releases such information led us into our own investigation.

We discovered that Rohm & Haas is a chemical firm, making several products important to warfare. Among these are leather tanning compounds, adhesives, and the Plexiglas that goes into the noses of our bombers. We discovered that Rohm & Haas, of Philadelphia, is related to Rohm & Haas, of Germany; that Rohm & Haas is linked with the infamous I. G. Farbenindustrie, of Germany, which as far back as 1934 was spending $25,000 a year for Nazi propaganda in America; that the mysterious Mr. Bergin has acted as attorney for both Rohm & Haas and I. G. Farben in at least one Hitler-approved patent deal; and that American dollars flow from Rohm & Haas, United States of America, to Rohm & Haas, Germany. But that's not all we discovered.

Pudgy-faced Walther Funk was Hitler's economic adviser long before he became Nazi Germany's Economic Minister. When, on October 28, 1939—a month after the war began—Funk declared that economics would play as great a role as Stukas in the conflict, the statesmen of the non-Nazi world sat up and took notice. To many of them it was their first hint that Germany was prepared to fight democracy on the economic front, too.

One of Germany's most potent weapons on this front are the royalties her huge trusts collect from all over the world.

The Rohm & Haas companies in America control over 400 patents, most of them German. About 90 percent of these German patents were assigned to Rohm & Haas Co. and its subsidiaries after Hitler took power. Six years ago Rohm & Haas Co. made a deal with Rohm & Haas A. G. to pool their patents. Company Officer S. C. Kelton admits the Hitler government approved this deal.

These patent assignments and licensing agreements divide world territory with the German corporations. They usually limit Rohm & Haas Co. to the United States. Whether or not these arrangements are violating the United States antitrust laws is something for the Department of Justice to decide. Through these secret licensing agreements more American money reaches the Nazis.

We tried very hard to see Otta Haas, head of Rohm & Haas in the United States. But Haas has always been a hard man to reach. Forty years ago, with the late Otto Rohm, Haas formed a chemical firm in Germany. They made tanning products. Soon Otto Haas arrived in Philadelphia to set up an American branch of the firm. Rohm remained in Germany.

Although Haas became an American citizen, the Government took over Rohm's half interest in the firm during the first World War and later sold it for $350,000. Within a few years Haas bought it back for $400,000.

Even before the Government stepped in during the World War, Rohm & Haas Co. was always a closed corporation. None of the standard industrial directories lists its officers. Otto Haas is mentioned in Chemical Who's Who, but a notation reads, "Could not be verified." A United States Government official says, "The company deserves a leather medal for secrecy."

German patents have been the backbone of their business from the earliest days of their activity. Within 5 years of the sale of Rohm's stock another corporation was established by Otto Haas—the Resinous Products & Chemical Co. Nazi enterprises own 30 percent of the stock of this Rohm & Haas affiliate, which pays royalties to Hitler corporations.

As we in America prepare our defense against Hitlerism we should bear in mind what Nazi Economics Minister Walther Funk wrote in October 1939: "Modern war is only partially won by weapons. Facing totalitarian attack, we have arranged totalitarian defense." Even if sent unwillingly, American dollars transmitted to Hitler are bulwarks of his totalitarian defense.

Click feels that something must be done now about the American stream of contributions to Hitler's war machine. The Army and the manufacturers who supply it have no normal way of determining which of the companies that deal in military essentials share their defense profits with Hitler. Congress alone has the power to correct this dangerous situation.

Incorporated in the article are numerous photographs. Many are documentary, and appear as exhibits. Others, which are not suitable for reproduction in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, are described or summarized.

Exhibit 1 is a photograph of an employee of Rohm & Haas working on a plexiglas nose for a bomber. The following explanation appears:

The Nazis cash in on every one of these plexiglas bomber noses made by Rohm & Haas Co. in its Bristol, Pa., plant. Profits on plexiglas sales account for a large part of the royalties Rohm & Haas send to Germany.

Exhibit 2 is a photograph of United States bombing planes, with plexiglas noses, in flight.

Exhibit 3 is a reproduction of a release of the Office of Government Reports, National Defense Series, No. 5, September 20, 1940, showing a contract granted by the Army Air Corps to Rohm & Haas Co. for "Transparent Plastic Sheets," in the amount of $138,267, the largest contract listed on the page, with the following caption:

Rohm & Haas sells vast amount of plexiglas directly to the Government, as these reports reveal. But these sales represent only a fraction of their defense orders. Most of the firm's orders are placed directly by private aircraft manufacturers. The size of military-plane orders is kept secret. But count the number of bomber noses and gun blisters Rohm & Haas sells, and you can almost deduce the number of additions to our Air Force.

Exhibit 4 is a photograph of the Digest of Assignments ledger of the United States Patent Office and a photograph of a letter to the Commissioner of Patents, Washington, D. C., from the Rohm & Haas Co., together with the caption:

The Nazi chemical empire's deals in the United States are revealed in the official patent assignment book in Washington. Note that J. F. Bergin appears as attorney for both I. G. Farben and Rohm & Haas, of Philadelphia. On the surface, there is no significance in the transfer of a leather tanning patent from one firm to another. It is only when you realize that I. G. Farben—a heavy supporter of Hitler even before 1933—controls 40 percent of Germany's vast chemical empire that the link strikes home. Of equal importance is the revelation that I. G. Farben evidenced such complete trust in the Rohm & Haas Co. attorney, J. F. Bergin, that they retained him to act as their American attorney in this deal. It happens that in I. G. Farben the Nazis find two of the vital elements of modern total warfare—chemicals and money. Deprive a modern army of its chemicals and its gold for just one day and you seal its doom. Deals like this one help I. G. Farben keep going, keep Hitler in the cash it takes to run a streamlined war, as well as the cash needed to spread Nazi propaganda in this country. In I. G. Farben, Hitler has one more bulwark to rely upon.

Exhibit 5 is an official Nazi propaganda photograph of a young lady wearing a Plexiglas bridal crown and a photograph of the reverse side of this picture showing its origin, and the caption:

NAZIS CONTROL PLEXIGLAS

To Click's investigator, a Rohm & Haas Co. official, S. C. Kelton, admitted that for every ounce of Plexiglas that goes into American military planes a royalty is paid to Rohm & Haas Aktiengesellschaft (or A.-G.), of Germany, the parent corporation of Rohm & Haas Co. and the originators of Plexiglas. Like all German corporations, Rohm & Haas A.-G. must be pro-Nazi if it is to remain in business. And this firm is very much in business—Nazi business. This photo of a Plexiglas bridal crown was proudly released by official Nazi war propaganda bureaus in June 1940 and then mailed to all of the leading papers in America.

Exhibit 6 is a photograph of an assignment of application for patent in which Inventor Walter Bauer assigned a basic plexiglas patent to Rohm & Haas Aktiengessellschaft for 10 marks; with caption:

The German origin of plexiglas is clearly evident in this official Government document. Assigned by the German inventor to Rohm & Haas A. G. for 10 marks in 1929, the patent was subsequently reassigned to Rohm & Haas Co., of Philadelphia. The inventor assigned only the United States rights to Rohm & Haas A. G. in this paper, still the United States Rohm & Haas Co. sells plexiglas to the entire Western Hemisphere. Investigators suspect that this may be the result of a secret licensing agreement.

Exhibit 7 is a photograph of an assignment of patents to Rohm & Haas Co. by Rohm & Haas A. G., including the two basic Plexiglas patents, with caption:

Protection for Nazi patents against seizures like those of World War I may be the aim of these assignments. On July 7, 1935, in Germany, Rohm & Haas A. G. made out this legal form assigning a whole slew of its most valuable chemical patents to Rohm & Haas of Philadelphia. The first two patents listed are the basic Plexiglas patents. Rohm & Haas Co. took its time about filing this form with the United States Patent Office. In fact, it took 5 years and 4 months before it registered this assignment. But after Roosevelt's reelection in November 1940 the war feeling against Hitler was rising here. As a German corporation, Rohm & Haas A. G. is more likely to have its patents seized in event of war than an American firm.

Exhibit 8 is a photograph of excerpts from a series of annual corporation reports by an affiliate of the Rohm & Haas Co.—Resinous Products & Chemical Co.—showing the continuing presence of Germans on its board of directors, with caption:

German directors always sat on the board of an interesting affiliate of Rohm & Haas Co., the Resinous Products & Chemical Co., a Delaware corporation. Originally some 30 percent of this firm's stock was owned by Chemische Fabriken Dr. Kurt Albert A. G. of Germany. In fact, Dr. August Amann served as a director of both Chemische Fabriken Albert and Resinous Products until 1938. In 1939 Amann and Hermann Glock, the two German directors of Resinous Products, were replaced by two other German citizens, R. Haller and H. Ackerman. Nearly a year before Hitler invaded Holland, Haller registered as a resident of Rotterdam. During the first World War German firms established Dutch offices to get around British and American restraints. Recently Chemische Fabriken Albert assigned its holding to Chemie Holding A. G., a Luxembourg corporation. Forming Luxembourg corporations is the current German verson of the Dutch legal-address dodge of 1914.

Exhibit 9 is a photograph of a United States trade-mark registration for Tego, a plywood bonding agent; photographs of the assignment of this trade-mark to the Resinous Products & Chemical Co. by Th. Goldschmidt A.-G.; and a photograph of a United States Navy airplane, made with Tego; with caption:

Hitler shares Tego profits, too. As the documents show, Resinous Products bought the American rights to Tego from Th. Goldschmidt A.-G. of Germany in 1934. Goldschmidt is one of the most important Nazi chemical corporations. The assignment was made through the American consulate at Cologne. A cementing film, which makes a tough, plywood bond, Tego is used to make plywood—like the plywood in the wings and the fuselage of Navy planes—stronger than steel of equal weight. This makes Tego valuable to the United States both in aviation and in the construction of homes for defense workers and military people. It also makes it a great source of revenue for the gold-hungry Nazis. The coming boom in mass-produced plastic planes may make Tego royalties the most important Nazi gold source in the United States.

Exhibit 10 consists of five photographs—one showing the Rohm & Haas plant at Bristol, Pa.; another showing the Resinous Products & Chemical Co. plant, adjoining the Frankford Arsenal, in Philadelphia, Pa.; a photograph of American bombers for Britain, with plexiglas used; a photograph of a plexiglas violin; a photograph of a plexiglas fish bowl shaped like a human body—with caption:

Whether in bombers or glass ladies, plexiglas is still one of the steadiest sources of revenue the Nazi war chest has in America. The American anxiousness to adopt any new commodity has opened many doors to this new transparent plastic. The thousands of World's Fair visitors who first became aware of plexiglas when they stumbled across the startling plexiglas lady, similar to the fish bowl will be even more surprised to realize how much plexiglas is already figuring in their daily lives. In one of a hundred different usages and forms, plexiglas has been with them for several years. It might be in the dial of their auto radios, the frames of their new hairbrushes, in their new

shatterproof eyeglasses, or in the unique new signs in their store windows. No matter where they see it, it is still piling up royalties for Nazi firms. Today the great bulk of plexiglas royalties comes from American defense orders.

Defense Jobs for Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. ELIOT

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WALTHAM (MASS.) NEWS-TRIBUNE

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last week I brought the attention of the House to the very fine statement by the Committee on Negro Americans in Defense Industries. Today, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent editorial on the same subject from the Waltham News-Tribune. This progressive daily points out that discrimination against Negroes is not only undemocratic but may prove of serious hindrance to the rapid progress of the defense program.

The editorial states, "Our Negroes are 100 percent Americans," and the editorial is 100 percent right.

The editorial is as follows:

[From the Waltham (Mass.) News-Tribune of May 9, 1941]

DEFENSE JOBS FOR NEGROES

Dr. Anson Phelps Stokes, president of the Phelps-Stokes Fund and chairman of the recently formed Committee on Negro Americans in Defense Industries, is everlastingly right when, urging increased employment of competent Negroes in defense industries, he said: "Justice for Negro Americans in the program for national defense is a searching test of American democracy. Our concern for democracy in Europe or elsewhere lacks reality and sincerity if our plans and policies disregard the rights of minorities in our own country."

It has been alleged—and probably with considerable truth—that some manufacturing concerns of national importance, engaged on national-defense contracts, have discriminated against Negroes, without regard for their ability or fitness to fill the jobs they seek. Such discrimination is not only undemocratic, but, in view of the reported dwindling surplus of skilled labor may prove a serious hindrance to rapid progress of the defense program.

Here is a great reservoir of labor whose loyalty cannot be questioned. Our Negroes are 100 percent Americans. And also their efficiency is probably high, if given an opportunity to develop it—an opportunity they assert has frequently been denied even when they seek admittance into training and apprenticeship programs financed by the Federal Government.

It is said that Negroes are often surprisingly capable of operating precision machinery because they have good muscle coordination and sense of rhythm.

The handicap of color, like the handicap of age, apparently has been overestimated. As these facts are accepted, there may be many more Negroes taken off the charity rolls and the W. P. A. and given useful jobs aiding both industry and their country.

Louisiana Under Governor Jones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today at precisely this hour the "Louisiana hayride" ended, but the memory lingers on.

One year ago today in Louisiana the fetters and chains which bound a once free people in the only totalitarian government ever set up on American soil within the boundaries of a sovereign State came to an end when Sam Houston Jones shook his wrists free of those manacles and lifted his right hand toward God and took the oath of office as the Governor of Louisiana.

Appropriately did Governor Jones remark on that occasion:

Louisiana has returned to the Union.

Mr. Speaker, in the last 13 years there has been written, in Louisiana, one of the most fantastic stories of political history of all time.

For 12 of those 13 years, from 1928 until 1940, there was conceived and developed a dictatorship which attempted to deny to the people of Louisiana the very rights and privileges guaranteed under the Constitution.

If that dictatorship ultimately did fall, it was because it had failed in one important essential—control of the press.

If the press of Louisiana had been successfully throttled and controlled, Mr. Speaker, Louisiana today would probably have still been under the influence of that sinister dictatorship. But the press of Louisiana was not to be controlled and because the press of Louisiana was not to be controlled I am able to stand here today on the occasion of the first anniversary of the fall of that dictatorship and pay tribute to Sam Jones and the administration which he has headed since May 14, 1940.

It is of interest, Mr. Speaker, that on the anniversary of the first year of this new administration in Louisiana there should appear on the bookstands of the Nation the printed history of what went before Sam Jones became the Governor of Louisiana, and drove the rascals out of office, put the crooks behind prison bars, and made Louisiana, once again, a decent place in which to live.

It is also proper and fitting, Mr. Speaker, that this printed history should come from the hand of a newspaperman, a newspaper reporter who arrived on the scene at the birth of the dictatorship and saw its rise to power and its fall into oblivion.

I am proud that a newspaperman has written such a story and has contributed a book which in the future will be found on the shelves next to other histories of trying and critical times in our Nation's history.

I am proud that a newspaperman has written such a book and even more proud that this newspaperman was a contemporary of mine when I, too, covered the political front of Louisiana as a reporter and later directed the reportorial attack against this vicious machine from the city editor's desk of the New Orleans States under the guiding influence of that grand, gallant, and valiant editor of the old school of journalism, James Evans Crown.

Harnett T. Kane of the staff of the New Orleans Item has written what he calls Louisiana Hayride—the American Rehearsal for Dictatorship.

Mr. Speaker, I direct your attention and the attention of my colleagues in the House to this splendid contribution to current literature. I urge you to read it, to study it, and to take a lesson from it.

Within the covers of Louisiana Hayride is presented the almost unbelievable and fantastic story of what can happen in any State in the United States, just as it happened in Louisiana, if we do not believe that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Harnett Kane has written a factual story of the rise and fall of the Louisiana dictatorship. He has painted a vivid picture, colored with tragic humor, which sounds a warning to the people of every sovereign State to beware lest they too fall under the heel of a local demagog. Oh, yes, my colleagues, it can happen in America, it can happen here, it did happen in Louisiana. Do not let it happen in your State.

On the first anniversary of the new order in Louisiana it would be well to recall what happened between 1928 and 1940, and I know of no better manner in which to bring those years to your attention and to submit to you for consideration the words of this able author of Louisiana Hayride.

Harnett Kane has called the preface of his book, The Morning After. Indeed, it was a morning after the night before—a black, hideous night which lasted for 12 years.

As an introduction to the review of the first year in office of Sam Jones, Governor of Louisiana, I include in the RECORD, with the unanimous consent of the House, these words from the pen of Harnett Kane in Louisiana Hayride:

THE MORNING AFTER

Louisiana has swept America's first dictatorship into history. Twelve years ago its people went on a spree—a Louisiana hayride for 2,000,000 men, women, and children. They jolted, they jerked, they rolled happily in the straw over a bumpy but exciting road. They paid their fare; they knew, most of them, what they were getting; they liked it while they were getting it. They had little to say about their destination, but they did not mind that much. They giggled, they gasped, they held their breaths, and the show went on around them, among them, for them.

And word spread that there was room aboard for others, and these came running. From other States, from other regions, this bayou folks' bacchanale drew new audiences,

new participants. There were those, in time, who saw it change its character; saw the hayride emerge as the vehicle of a national juggernaut, its potential victim America.

A gun spat, and the first driver toppled. But he had hitched his vehicle to a force that took it onward. The self-designated Kingfish, Huey P. Long, was dead. Long live the Kingfish. Other kingfishes grabbed the reins and held them for the years that followed. The pace slackened. The riders calmed a bit. But the wagon still rolled, and the drivers still collected their tariff at intervals. Then, in 1940, came wreckage.

Soberly the people of Louisiana are looking backward today, some of them convinced that they were passengers on a test trip, a political try-out in advance of others that might have brought a different manner of life and outlook for all of America. Over, at least for the time, is a thing that most Americans thought impossible; a systematic totalitarianism on North American soil, functioning under the Constitution, under the flag, to the tune of the Star-Spangled Banner—with some minor notes of Dixie.

The most complete despotism in the Nation's history used the institutions of democracy to crush democracy. Through bad years and good years, depression and prosperity, it met the test; it worked. Like most modern dictatorships, it began with revolution, a poor-white rebellion. It went on to shift that rebellion's course, to betray it in a series of deals and understandings with most of the groups it attacked, and in a saturnalia of corruption, from its start to its end.

This full-dress rehearsal of an American tyranny came not through surrender to a power from without, as some fear dictatorship may strike, nor through appeasement of a force that was feared. It was a conscious acceptance of a regime that applied, slowly at first, then with increasing boldness, the old prescription for power, with new touches; bread and circuses—dispensations from above, free food and vaudeville—in return for acquiescence.

Its master was the first American demagogue to become a national threat; the first to clutch and use with machine-gun ruthlessness the current tools of mass propaganda and the instruments of violence, including State and National militia. The men who followed him at the reins were simple mediocrities who had learned a lesson and learned it well enough to serve their purpose. The dictator went, but enough of the dictatorship remained to keep a State in bondage while a heritage was stolen from it.

Huey, the Kingfish, loved power too well. His successors loved money too well. Between them, they bribed a people. In Louisiana's shifting background, in the currents that swirl about the South as a whole, it was all too easy for either gold or favor to corrupt. These 12 years have given America a liberal education in the seducing of a populace.

In place of freedom or the approximation of it which Louisianians had enjoyed, the State took "benefits." For a measure of security it swapped the kind of constitutional protections it had known. It received magnificent roads, tall bridges; eventually it gave its Louisiana fuehrers a reichstag that might have pleased a Hitler in its deep-sweeping subservience. The State took free school books for its children, new hospitals, new buildings; and it said little or nothing while its judges were caged. It accepted jobs and retainer fees, while it lost the right to have its vote counted as cast.

Year by year the pattern developed more clearly; legislators bought, in the dictator's words, "like sacks of potatoes"; a kept judiciary, up to and including the highest court in the State; quick ruin for the enemy, smiling benevolence for the friend.

Some may look on the Louisiana adventure as an isolated phenomenon, a fluke. It was not that, but the outgrowth of a politico-socio-economic problem that cried for solution. Louisiana's dictatorship arose out of the abuses of democracy that preceded it. His enemies made him by their puerile tactics; so it has been said of Huey Long, as it was said of Hitler and his social democratic opponents. But Louisiana's regime of force, like Germany's, was born of influences that went back for generations, that grew out of a demonstrated condition of inequity. Like other modern dictatorships, it placed its finger on deep-seated wants and needs, and it promised to meet them. Its slogan was "Share the Wealth." Its crusading evangelical creed quoted the Bible and cried Old Testament wrath on a nation that had not heeded its version of the Book's meaning.

Its appeal was national as well as regional. At one point "Share the Wealth" crossed the Mississippi, moved into the industrial East, sent propaganda arms into the Middle West and far West. The movement claimed 6,000,000 to 7,000,000 members, so threatening the Democratic Party, and potentially the Republican as well, that the professional prognosticator Farley feared that it might bring his party to a crisis. Millions of Americans believed that under the banner "Every Man a King" they would receive a fixed income, land, a home, perhaps an electric refrigerator and other guaranties of security. These millions were ready to back their man to the limit in an effort to achieve these objectives.

The tale is a tall one, a saga of tall ones. Absolutism came to Louisiana with a grin on its lips, a jest on its tongue. The Long men meant business, yes, but they were also Louisianians; and life can be funny at the same time it is venal. A gallery of engaging rogues, of highly diverting rascals, is the result: Cajuns of a smiling amorality; Italians of underworld background that did not bar them from public honors; Jews who grew wealthier by the process of special favor that speaks all languages; plain Anglo-Saxon thieves, fat men who grew fatter, lean and hungry men as dangerous as they looked. They advanced from rank as barbers and hot-towel men to masters of great estates; from shoe clerks to connoisseurs of expansive living. They invested in gold toilet fixtures. They dug private lakes. They named airports after themselves, to commemorate such arrangements as 2-percent cuts on the materials used therein. They built steam-heated shower baths for their cattle and pigs, ordered air-conditioning units for their own bathrooms. "Share the Wealth" was a slogan they understood well. There was so much to share that they stuck together almost to the end, one for all, all for one thing. They knew exactly what they wanted—everything in sight.

In the process, they took roles in a melodrama as wild, as picturesque, as fantastic in its drolleries as any in modern American history; an era marked by civil insurrections, riotings, and beatings in the legislative halls, by burlesques, bullets, and whimsy, mixed in the grand manner. The first dictator was a lusty, gusty fellow. His post mortem apprentices, carrying on for the master, were a "codfish" aristocracy, of gargantuan taste and humors.

Less than a year before the crash, the Louisiana State machine was ticking along serenely. Opposition had been purchased or crushed, or lay supine in the shade. Over Louisiana shone the sun of a golden Federal favor, showering rays of largesse. Then came one of the most odorous of American State scandals, one of the broadest gaged Federal inquiries in the history of criminal procedure.

Convicted, or awaiting trial or sentence, are the once political great of Louisiana, the near great, and the little great. Two hundred and fifty indictments have broken about their heads, against the machine's governor; the president of one of the South's leading universities; legislative officials, mayors, heads of major departments, millionaire racing and gambling men, allies of eastern gangsters; the leading contractors, architects, and builders; the president of the State medical society, doctor-managers of institutions, tax experts, W. P. A. assistants. Not least, a lady notary described as the Madame Queen (no relation to the Kingfish) of an alleged racket to reduce the taxes of all who would kick back half to the officials and their assistants.

Going, too, perhaps, is a legend of latter-day American tradition, Huey the Martyr. His specter had stalked the South, waiting in the twilight of its swamps for a day in which it might rally the Nation to a newer totalitarianism. Now, Louisiana believes, the ghost may have been laid. For the trail of deep-rooted crookeries goes back to this dictator and his doings, and tends to dissipate the illusion of a great man whose only thought was for the economically bereft.

Louisiana knows that it paid a higher price than the "benefits" of the hayride were worth. For every dollar that it gave the dictatorship took another in the dark. For the security the regime may have offered it stole the basis of security in the future. Today can be told, and in detail for the first time, the inevitable accompaniments of an authoritarian government the happenings under the surface of a fully operating American dictatorship. It is an exposition of the meaning for a democratic nation of its loss of a system of checks, balances and public sunlight.

But, you may say, it couldn't happen anywhere but in Louisiana. It could happen in almost any American state. Louisiana was divided. So are many other States—rural against urban elements, sect against sect, south against north. Louisiana had, and has illiteracy, want, low health standards. So, too, have other States. The process that succeeded in Louisiana has been tested. As in ancient Rome, as in modern Germany, Italy, and Russia, the politicians, playing upon the ingrown prejudices, the deepest needs and aspirations of their people, promised everything, gained power—and then used that power to multiply taxes, to dig deep into public funds for their own uses, and meanwhile to give back just enough to keep themselves in power.

Louisiana lost much in those 12 years of serfdom. But the period had some partial compensations—the provision of newer public services, a smoothly functioning administrative system, modernization of facilities. The regime took much, but it also gave something. The democracy that preceded it took less. But it also gave less.

Why did the people of an American State, a member of the Union for a century and a quarter, submit to despotism? Some of the reasons were largely local. Others go deep into the State's past and into the regional past. But essentially democracy failed because Louisiana's men and women came to feel that it offered them less than the other form To too many of Louisiana's citizens the rights and guaranties of democracy appeared to be academic exercises.

Democracy may fail in America not because dictatorships' guns are stronger but because the way of dictatorship may seem to hold a promise of greater gifts at home.

At the end, Louisiana changed its mind. But this southern revolt of 1940 against the system that came with 1928 was one which almost failed. Odds were against its success. Held in the hands of a group that boasted, with show of reason, that its dynasty could not be overthrown, Louisianians made the hard choice, then fought to carry it through. From streamlined autocracy Louisiana turned to another testing of the democratic idea. The Louisiana flare-up is more than a nauseous exposé. It is the climax of a significant period in southern history. Will the new regime succeed? Can such a regime offer to a long-kept populace enough to satisfy it? Or will Louisiana turn again to the easier way?

The problem on which this threat to the Nation once arose is still there, still unsolved. Maldistribution of the country's income may be expected to outlast the present war and the defense boom. The fertile

ground of discontent is still thickly sown. The seed of poor-white resentment in the country areas, of have-not yearnings in the cities, lies in the topsoil, ready to sprout under the hot rays of demagogy.

The South, a Southerner may admit, is more fertile than some other sections for this crop. It is still predominantly rural, largely defeatist in its philosophy, a debtor territory, a region in which wrenching poverty is often too common to excite more than casual pity. Will another Kingfish leap across this State or another State, speed by sound truck from hill to hollow, roaring joyously to his spellbound listeners?

A superbly effective sample technique of homebred tyranny has been tested out. The resources of a twentieth-century mass-organized American civilization have been tried upon 2,000,000 political guinea pigs, with results satisfactory to the analysts. Available here, as a result of Louisiana's experience, is a blueprint of a broader American dictatorship that may yet come.

But "the morning after" is ended, Mr. Speaker, and, although there are still traces of the headache, Louisiana can look forward to a brighter day.

Sam Jones has been the most sincere and honest Governor of Louisiana in many years.

True, he has made mistakes since he took office, but, as he himself said last night in an address to the people of Louisiana:

A year ago I predicted I would make mistakes. My friends, I have made them—the kind I said I would make—of the head, not of the heart. We of this administration will make more such mistakes, being human; but we will try to keep the balance in favor of progress and success for Louisiana.

When Sam Jones made a promise during the campaign for Governor, he meant to keep the promise, if humanly possible and within his power. Last night he recited 17 campaign pledges which he had made and described "16 fulfilled to the hilt, and one being constantly promoted in a campaign to fulfill it to the hilt," too.

Could more be asked of any man?

In one year's time Sam Jones has—

Opened long-secret State records so that the taxpayer may know where his dollar is going and how it has been spent.

Pushed legislation to ban double dipping and deadheading, which were among the popular pastimes of the repudiated administration.

Adopted laws designed to reform State election procedure and return to the people the right to a fair and honest election and an expression by the ballot under the democratic way.

Carried through a law that makes voting machines compulsory in New Orleans, and optional in other sections of the State.

Eliminated the State-wide 1-percent sales tax.

Reduced drastically the costs of tax collections, and increased many tax yields through rigid enforcement.

Gave what others had promised, but did not give—a reorganization of the State government, reducing 176 conflicting, overlapping departments, boards, and commissions to 20 clearly defined and modernized departments.

Adopted the first nationally praised and recognized civil-service system in Louisiana's history.

Reduced the automobile license to $3.

Eliminated the prerequisite of a poll certificate to vote.

Put into effect a general reorganization of the State's muddled, sieve-like financial structure so that a saving from this source of more than $2,000,000 in less than 1 year, may be claimed by the Governor's financial directors.

Prohibited deductions from salaries of State employees to fill political hope chests.

Strict enforcement of the State's bitterly disputed oil and conservation laws.

In addition he has continued free school books, homestead exemptions, good-roads program, and all the other appeals of the Huey Long era.

Returned local self government to the parishes and municipalities.

Made it impossible to use the National Guard for political purposes.

Removed Louisiana State University from the politics which had dragged its honorable name into the muck and mire of national disgrace.

Has abolished favoritism in State contracts and thrown the field open to the lowest bidder.

Has obtained for the State of Louisiana more defense training facilities than any other State.

Added 7,000 beneficiaries and $1,000,000 in benefits to the Social Security System.

Removed the port of New Orleans from politics and reduced the pay roll by 2,000 persons.

Undertaking the broadest program of State-financed aid to farmers ever staged in Louisiana.

These are some of the benefits which Louisiana has profited, Mr. Speaker, in the last year in Louisiana, in the first year after "the Louisiana hay ride" ended. These promises kept are but an index to what good, clean government in Louisiana or in any other State can accomplish when honest officials are in charge.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that I rise today to draw a comparison of the 12-year political hay ride to the 1-year symphony of sound, honest, sincere government.

I hope no State ever suffers what Louisiana has suffered and from which illness it is now beginning to recover. I do not expect many of my colleagues to fully appreciate the situation, because only those of us who have lived in Louisiana can ever know the full meaning of a dictatorship.

I am proud today, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to Sam Jones and his administration for what has been accomplished in 1 year, but I cannot close without also paying tribute to those who stood behind Sam Jones when the going was the toughest and the outlook was not so bright.

To the men and women, particularly the women, of Louisiana, who braved the frigid cold of the winter months to carry into every home the doctrine of good government, I pay tribute. To those of my colleagues in this House who stood shoulder to shoulder with Sam Jones from the very beginning of his fight, I pay tribute.

To the daring and courageous newspapers and their editors and to the reporters who did the "leg work" and the photographers who took the pictures of damning evidence of graft and corruption, I pay tribute.

Above all, Mr. Speaker, I pause at this moment to pay tribute to another Louisianian, who staked his political and financial security in the cause of good government in Louisiana and without whose aid there would not be an administration in Louisiana today headed by Sam Jones.

For 4 years, Mr. Speaker, the voice of Jimmy Noe, former Governor of Louisiana, was the lone voice in the wilderness which cried aloud against existing conditions in Louisiana. It was Jimmy Noe who initiated the widespread investigations into graft and corruption in Louisiana, and who at his own personal expense, obtained damaging affidavits which resulted in turning the spotlight on the rascals.

It was Jimmy Noe, Mr. Speaker, who gave me the tip which resulted in the publishing of the now famous picture of a Louisiana State University truck hauling building materials to the home of a colonel on the staff of the Governor, and which picture and story sparked the Louisiana scandals on June 9, 1939.

It was Jimmie Noe, Mr. Speaker, who, eliminated in the first gubernatorial primary, proved his sincerity of purpose and his loyalty to the cause of good government which he espoused, by rejecting financial and political security to cast his lot with Sam Jones in the second primary.

To the further credit of Sam Jones, let it be recorded that from every public stump in the State of Louisiana he acknowledged the part which Jimmy Noe played in his election, and at a later date following his inauguration made the statement: "I'll forever be grateful to Jimmy Noe."

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the name of Jimmy Noe should today be linked with the accomplishments in Louisiana during the past year because I do not believe any sound, logical student of Louisiana politics will deny that without the active aid and support of Jimmy Noe the dictatorship would not have fallen in February 1940, and Sam Jones would not have been elected Governor of Louisiana.

The people of Louisiana owe an equal debt of gratitude on this anniversary to Sam Jones and to Jimmy Noe.

Jimmy Noe made it possible for Sam Jones to ascend to the position by which he has been able to accomplish so much for Louisiana. The accomplishments of Sam Jones have given to America a better Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that I am a native Louisianian. I am glad that I have been able to live in Louisiana all my life and have been able to play some small part in what has happened in Louisiana.

I am proud of the fact that the democratic way finally has emerged the victor in Louisiana and that by the ballot a dictatorship has been overthrown.

I am proud that I supported Jimmy Noe in the first primary and I am proud that I stood by his side and supported Sam Jones in the successful second primary which ended, I hope for all time,

totalitarian government in the State which I love so dearly.

I am proud to know that one year after the inauguration of Sam Jones I can still say I am proud of the part which I played in his election because Louisiana today is a better place in which to live than it was a year ago today.

Louisiana Under Governor Jones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE PLAUCHÉ

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

ADDRESS BY GOV. SAM H. JONES, OF LOUISIANA

Mr. PLAUCHÉ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Gov. Sam H. Jones, of Louisiana, on May 12, 1941:

Ladies and gentlemen, I welcome you to New Orleans and Louisiana. I hope you, as credit men, will find us good risks, so that you will return again next year and through the years to come.

Your visit coincides with the anniversary of a very great event here in Louisiana. Day after tomorrow, at high noon, marks the conclusion of this State's first year of democracy, after more than a decade of grotesque and unbelievable tyranny. One writer has called that period America's rehearsal for dictatorship.

By whatever name called we in Louisiana know that through a long, dark era we lost the fundamentals of freedom made possible for all America by the blood, sweat, tears, and toil of our forebears. In this land of liberty it seems strange to you, no doubt, that an American Governor should, very bluntly and plainly, say to you that his State has just completed its first year of democracy—after a period of despotic rule.

It sounds strange to you because you have never lived in the dark as we have.

You never lived under a law that denied freedom of the press, a law that had to be nullified by the United States Supreme Court.

You never had to live under a law that denied the right of free elections—a law which gave us the right to vote, but gave the leader of one political faction the absolute power to control the conduct of elections and the counting of the ballots—a law in short which did, in Louisiana, what Hitler's edicts do in Germany—but a law, thank God, which was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of this State.

You never had to live in a State where laws were passed which had never been read by the Legislature, the contents of which were known only to the "Fuehrer" many of which were actually written and revised after the "Reichstag" adjourned its 5-day sessions and went home.

You never had to live in a State where the separation of the legislative and executive branches was so completely disregarded that the Governor actually appointed members of the legislature.

And I'm sure you never lived under a system where every single local appointive officer, in every county, municipality, and district, had to be approved by the ruling powers in your State capitol. Well we did.

You cannot conceive of an American State with an American "gestapo" with power to, and which did, control and supersede every local peace officer in the Commonwealth. Nor can you visualize a law which permitted the constabulary to arrest a citizen on a political charge, transport him to a distant locality, lodge him in jail without the benefit of bail by a judge of any court, subject only to release by the "leader of the gestapo." We here in Louisiana can visualize that. We have lived through it. We have seen these things done by authority of laws placed on the statute books by a supposedly free people.

You have never experienced the tyranny, the fear, and the trembling that come to a people where the power of the military was used to subject them to the will of the tyrant. Your laws permit a Governor to call out the National Guard in times of disaster, riot, rebellion, and serious civil strife; our law permitted the guard to be used when "in the opinion of the Governor" it was necessary.

You never witnessed the shameful spectacle of martial law over your State capital city for a period of 6 months at a time. We saw this, day after day and week after week, when there was no disaster, riot, rebellion, and strife—merely political difference.

It is difficult for you to imagine a State whose public records were by law made secret records, whose public books were exempt from the prying eyes of the auditor, and whose citizens were denied by law the right to know what was going on in the several departments of the State Government. Thus it seems strange to you that suits should be brought and seriously contested by which citizens sought the right to look on the inside of public records.

And, I suppose, a government which had the power to, and which did, make and break banks and financial institutions; which, by spite and vengeance, drove industry out of the State or catapulated it to fabulous wealth as it chose; which, by whim or caprice, denied men and women the right to practice their professions and trades, or granted that right without regard to qualification; which held the destinies of private citizens in its hands, with no less power than that exerted by the despots of the totalitarian States—I suppose such a government in an American State seems to you a fiction and a nightmare of the brain.

It was not fiction, my friends; we saw it, lived through it, and, thank God, survived it. A nightmare it was, and one that we shall long remember.

To you, as credit men, it will seem unbelievable that a State with one of the lowest per capita debts should sink its people into the highest per capita debt in the Nation. It seems unbelievable that a State debt could be increased 1600 percent in a period of 12 years. But in spite of the protests of some that it couldn't, it did happen, here.

We saw the pace of industry slacken, factories close, businesses move away and abandon their Louisiana domiciles. We saw commerce driven away and the great Port of New Orleans sink from second to sixteenth place among American ports.

And then, a little over a year ago, we saw a people rebel. We saw the sons and daughters of liberty-loving Frenchmen and the Anglo-Saxon pioneers rise up, as the sons and daughters of freemen will ever do, and strike down the tinpot tyrants and the crackpot corruptionists. We saw a revolution fought on Louisiana's restless soil—a bloodless revolution, it is true; but a revolution just as true and genuine as that which rose against the tyrants of France, or that which was enacted by the barons on the plains of Runnymede, or that which was written in the snow by the blood of Washington's soldiers at Valley Forge.

Our campaign for freedom was fought in the winter, too—in that season when, oftentimes, the spiritual as well as the physical morale reaches its lowest ebb. Not so in the determined days of a winter ago.

A political campaign turned into a holy crusade for democracy. Slaves rose up and rebuked their masters. Men who had cringed before the lash of the dictator suddenly became bold. The spirit of the zealots and pioneers of old suddenly rose once again in their posterity. Religious fervor entered the lists. Women took up the torch. Protestants offered their prayers; Catholics made their novenas; Jews, fighting a familiar fight against tyranny, came to the front.

The inevitable happened. The shackles were broken. The will of free men and free women, as always, prevailed. There was a day of rejoicing. The slow processes of democracy began to work again. Today, after a year, we function as a democracy again.

The dictator laws are gone. There is freedom of press, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly once again.

There is democracy within the state and down to each locality and subdivision. No totalitarian ruler issues decrees to his subjects. No Gestapo throws fear into the hearts of free men. No military commander rules in the name of the Governor. Martial law no longer rules our capital city. And gone are the laws which made free men slaves.

The books of the state are open—opened to the hilt, and every single transaction, over the dark days, is being brought under the searchlight of merciless audits. Now any citizen may walk into any department and see for himself the workings of his government.

Banks are free. Industry is coming back, literally by the hundreds of millions. Employment is up 50 percent above the national average. More than a thousand workers per parish have gone back to gainful employment. Commerce is gaining, notwithstanding the perilous days for maritime traffic. Never has the picture been brighter.

We in Louisiana are proud of our year of democracy. It has been arduous, full of headaches, setbacks, and tangles, and misunderstandings, but it has been finally crowned, I believe, with a success which the people of the State as a whole do not yet fully realize.

And what will be of particular interest to you is that Louisiana has become a good risk, morally and financially, not only within, but without the State. A year ago Louisiana might have been compared with a family supporting a great many prodigal sons, a family which suddenly, one blue morning, decided that it was time to reform and tread the straight and narrow; a family which decided that it wanted, again, to become a good risk in the eyes of the Nation.

We adopted a fiscal code. We provided, for the first time, preauditing, budget control, and central purchasing. We are providing $10,000,000 of additional services on less money than was previously spent in a biennium. We went in with a looted treasury and with tremendous deficits. Notwithstanding this we have sold callable bonds for 2.5 percent interest as contrasted with a rate of 5 percent on noncallable bonds issued by the old regime.

All of which shows that democracy and honesty and business management yield dividends, financial as well as spiritual.

And what is the lesson in all this? The answer, it seems to me, is that, after all, democracy is the only, and inevitable, form of government for Americans—whether they be Nebraskans, or New Yorkers, or Louisianians. That, if business, as we know it, is to continue as a free enterprise, it can continue only under a democratic system of government and under democratic philosophy.

If, therefore, the moral virtues which ushered America into existence are to continue; and if free enterprise, in which you

are so vitally interested, is to remain then democracy must be preserved.

Personally, I think these virtues and rights are worth preserving. I think they are worth preserving even to the extent of fighting, and if need be, dying for them. If the example of Louisiana, dark and dire as it has been, has served to teach the people of America the dangers of dictatorship, then our sufferings and our fight will not have been in vain. And perhaps, out of the tyranny and saturnalia, the moral fiber of the Nation will have been strengthened. If so, Louisiana is proud of its contribution.

I welcome you to a State which has met and withstood many disasters, physical and governmental, but which, after each new experience, emerges a better and finer land, populated by a richer and nobler people, the quality of whose moral fiber can never be doubted.

Use of American Convoys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

LETTER FROM MR. AND MRS. B. W. ASHWORTH, OF LEWISTOWN, MONT.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

Congressman JAMES O'CONNOR,
Washington, D. C.:

Again we voice our protest against this country becoming involved in the European war, and against the use of American convoys.

We endorse the aid-to-Britain policy, but we must stay out of the war, but if we use American ships for convoy we will be in the war.

Britain has not paid her last war debt, and she will never pay this one, so why not give her the ships and call them a gift?

If Britain has not the ships to send for American supplies, the practical common sense of the American people will say that these goods should be transported in some way.

The most effective way to do this and minimize the risk, would be to transfer to British ownership, with congressional approval, all vessels which we will use in such convoys, and have them manned by British sailors.

We will probably lose some of the goods and munitions destined for England, and possibly a loss of some of the convoying ships.

If that loss is to be suffered in any event, the chances of our being drawn into the war would be much less if both cargo and the convoy ships were British in ownership, management, and personnel, and our loss in in actually parting with these ships would be nil in comparison with our ultimate gain in not having been drawn into actual war.

Once we put American warships into the business of Atlantic convoying, we take the risk of them not being usuable for our defense.

Yours for keeping out of war.

Respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs B. W. ASHWORTH.

LEWISTOWN, MONT.

Who Is an American?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1941

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has proclaimed next Sunday, May 18, 1941, as "I Am an American" Day. The very subject of this proclamation suggests the question: Who is an American?

An American is the man who works behind the lathe producing the articles of industry;

He is the man at the desk conducting the financial affairs of the Nation;

The mother in the home teaching her children to love God and country;

The farmer tilling the soil to raise foodstuffs to feed his fellowman;

The politician following the precepts of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln;

The doctor, the clergyman, the truck driver, the lawyer, the clerk, the teacher, the stenographer;

The boys and girls in school; the salesman and the carpenter.

These people make up America. They hear strange and conflicting statements over their radios; they read of horrible and heartbreaking incidents abroad; they are bewildered by man's inhumanity to man; and yet they have a feeling of security in this land so blessed by God that its fertile fields, its broad rivers, its great cities, its rolling prairies, its mountain chains, and its natural resources make it the potential haven of all people who love and cherish liberty.

Their joys and sorrows, their desires and apprehensions become the emotions of a free people. Sometimes they tremble at the thought of the great problems that confront them; but then, with courage, they strive the harder to build an ever better land for their posterity. There are exceptions, it is true. But they are so few that their voices of despair are lost in the great prayer that rises from the hearts of their fellow beings. Americans have pride in their past and hope for their future. They are the ones who love America, who support its Constitution, obey its laws, respect its flag, and defend it against all enemies.

They are Americans, and you are one of them. Yes; you who work in the shop or in the office, in the field or in the home, in camps or on the sea, you are one of those persons to whom the whole world looks with envy—for you are an American.

You believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, and for the people; founded by pioneers who sacrificed their lives and fortunes to found a democracy in a Republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable.

Little wonder, then, that I as your representative in your Government, should feel the responsibility of truly reflecting your views. Little wonder that your cares and worries are mine; that I should feel pride in our accomplishments, and concern for our future. Little wonder that I should ever strive to mold the laws of our land to perpetuate those principles of justice, humanity, equality, and freedom, which we love so dearly. This is my glorious right and my bounden duty.

Truly this is a noble mission—I represent you Americans!

Aid to the Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVAN HOWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

RESOLUTION BY THE ILLINOIS STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint resolution recently adopted by the Legislature of the State of Illinois:

House Joint Resolution 29

Whereas the Federal Social Security Board has construed section 1002 (a) and other sections of the Social Security Act as authorizing such Board to veto any State plan for aid to the blind which such Board regards as treating the blind too generously; and

Whereas such Board in construing such sections has insisted that the States do not retain the power under the Social Security Act to determine, by statutory standards, what blind persons are in need and shall be eligible for assistance under any State plan for aid to the blind; and

Whereas the Board has insisted that State plans be so administered that blind recipients will be constantly under the dictation and domination of social workers in the management of their conduct and funds; and

Whereas such Board has insisted that recipients of blind aid under a State plan be not allowed to earn any money in addition to the amount of such aid; and

Whereas all of such positions taken by the Social Security Board are in patent abrogation of the stated purpose of the Social Security Act, namely "to enable the States to make adequate provision" for their blind citizens; therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-second General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein), That the President and Congress of the United States be memorialized to amend the Social Security Act in such manner as to prohibit the Social Security Board from disapproving any State plan for aid to the blind on the ground that such plan permits and encourages the blind to contribute to their own support, by earnings and income in addition to the State grant, without suffering a corresponding reduction in the amount of the State grant, or on the ground that the property income or other requirements in the State plan are too liberal; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States and to all of the Members of Congress from the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the house, April 17, 1941.

ELMER J. SCHNACKENBERG,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
R. R. RANDOLPH,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Concurred in by the senate, April 30, 1941.

HUGH W. CROSS,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Anniversary of Rhode Island Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

ADDRESSES BY WILLIAM J. CRANE AND JAMES J. HINES

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, on May 4, last, members of the Rhode Island State Society of Washington and their friends assembled in Statuary Hall, here in the Capitol, to observe the one hundred and sixty-fifth anniversary of the Rhode Island Declaration of Independence.

Mr. William J. Crane, honorary president of the society, and Mr. James J. Hines, the society's historian, delivered impressive addresses and by permission of the House I include them in my remarks so that they may be available for all to read. They follow:

RHODE ISLANDERS ARE REALISTIC

(By William J. Crane, Esq.)

Here in the presence of Roger Williams, so to speak, and on this day we commemorate the historic work of those gallant Rhode Islanders of 165 years ago who in defense of their liberties threw off the shackles of an unwise parent who had forgotten that there were some things in this life more precious than life itself. England, today, in her dark hour understands and appreciates the point of view of those Rhode Islanders, and by her own brave repulse of one of the greatest enemies of democratic principles in the history of the world is in the forefront of the defense of those very principles which were at once the criterion and guide as well as motivating principles of these great Rhode Islanders.

What were the motivating principles of these men—and of their women who so solidly stood by and encouraged them? Simply and ultimately, the practice of the virtues of faith, hope, and charity.

Faith in Almighty God was evidenced not only by their noble appreciation of their need of divine help and guidance in their hour of great distress but in the very selection of their meeting place—the First Baptist Church in the city of Providence. Indeed, the very name of the city of Providence is the constant reminder of the faith of our Rhode Island forebears in Divine Providence. But there was faith in the human, too, faith in each other, a strong, manly, and healthy belief not only in their loyalty to each other but also in the power of their united strength. Above all, faith, undying faith, in the worth and value of their cause.

This in turn was followed by hope, and hope springs from faith. Since their faith was boundless, so, too, was their hope unwavering at all times. Fortitude is the child of hope, and so we may easily understand how and why they unflinchingly went through not only the events of that memorable day but also throughout the remaining and subsequent dark days to the dawn of peace in 1873.

Even all the faith and hope in God and man they possessed was not enough. There still remained charity—love; love of freedom—the God-given right to think, speak, and act in accordance with the true worth and dignity of human beings, an unconsuming love of freedom, with all its implications, so that they were made ready and willing to make any sacrifices necessary for the achievement of their hopes—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as God gave them to understand those terms.

The same evils they faced, we face today. Like them we, too, can overcome them as successfully if we recognize, as they did, the necessity, the absolute necessity, of the return to a proper understanding and appreciation of the fundamental issues involved. I submit that the fundamental issue involved today is whether or not we are to resist the attempted destruction of faith in God and in man. Whether we agree with this or that argument advanced relative to the present world situation today, it seems to me that thinking people all agree that the basic problem for us to solve is whether we believe, with those gallant men and women, that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are so precious that, if need be, we will gladly offer to lay down our lives for them as they did. Strange as it may sound to some ears, there is something worse than evil in the world, and that is to fail to recognize evil as evil and not do something about it.

I realize fully that some may object that I am too serious in discussing these matters, and in such fashion. My reply is that unless we face the present situation realistically and in its fundamentals "it may be later than we think in this country." God grant that our fears in that regard may be utterly groundless.

In no spirit of futility may any American, but especially any Rhode Islander, so conduct himself in these days as to regard the symbol of hope on our State flag as an empty or merely emotional expression of an attitude on the part of those whose memory we commemorate—and bless—today.

Every public official recognizes the inherent right of every American citizen to criticise all public officials in the discharge of their public duties. On the other hand, in justice to those officials and especially in these times, the exercise of that right should be always motivated by good faith. This is no time for petty faultfinding, nagging, or "causing friction just to see the sparks fly." Now, more than ever, it is desirable for all Americans to understand and act upon the realization of the vital distinction between liberty and license.

We must and shall go forward with renewed faith in our great President and Commander in Chief, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the Congress of the United States, our State governors and legislators—indeed, with perfect faith in and respect for all of our lawfully constituted authorities.

The knowledge that this is the attitude of our American people will enable them all to proceed with the discharge of their weighty duties and obligations in such a way as to prove that, with God's help, we of America are the exemplification and the realization of the hope of the world today.

RHODE ISLAND'S CONTRIBUTION TO AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

(By James J. Hines)

Amid a world of chaos and turmoil we commemorate today a glorious chapter in the history of Rhode Island. Several weeks ago when the gallant peoples of Yugoslavia served notice upon the world that they would not submissively yield to superior force, and in the face of overwhelming odds, dared to challenge the impending aggression of Nazi tyranny, all the world stood aghast. Prime Minister Churchill very eloquently paraphrased the situation as follows: "Yugoslavia has found its soul."

One hundred and sixty-five years ago today Rhode Island "found its soul." Tyranny and oppression were enthroned. The aspirations of a liberty-loving people encountered only the insidious scourge of despotism. The dreams and the sacrifice of the early pilgrims seemed all in vain. Out of the maze of confusion and unrest an all-important question emerged. Would the forward march of democracy be thwarted? Would the impulses of the human spirit be further frustrated?

You will recall that in the year 1636 Roger Williams with his sturdy band of followers abandoned Massachusetts in search of a wider and fuller freedom, a freedom of tolerance which would permit the unrestrained worship of God as conscience dictated. The Rhode Island colony planted the seed of religious liberty on this continent and gave birth to a truly significant principle which was eventually to become enshrined in our Constitution. At this moment there are powerful forces in the world which challenge and deny that fundamental principle. They would destroy it in order to give plausible excuse for their inhumanity, their injustice, and their immorality.

Out of the clash of ideologies which today is taxing the energies of peoples everywhere and sapping at the very foundation of democratic governments, this principle of religious freedom will emerge triumphant. We of Rhode Island will find comfort in the knowledge that our contribution to democracy will serve in these critical days to reinforce the resolution of America to withstand the challenge of the times.

But religious liberty was meaningless in the absence of civil liberty. It would avail us nothing to speak of worshiping God freely according to conscience, knowing that only by the grace of tyrants could this sacred right live and flourish. It remained for Rhode Island once again to accelerate the forward march of democracy by giving expression to another impulse of the human spirit—namely, political liberty. The impulse which motivated the Rhode Island colony on May 4, 1776, to declare its independence of the British Crown is not dead. Within the past month we have seen manifestations of that spirit in other parts of the world. We know that the men and women of Greece and Yugoslavia have given their lives because of it. It is that fact which assures the final triumph of free peoples.

Undoubtedly when the early Pilgrims commenced their perilous journey across the turbulent seas to stake their future in the then unknown America, they were largely actuated by dreams of a utopia wherein the greatest measure of freedom, consistent with the general welfare, would be accorded to all and respected by all. History has recorded that great difficulty was experienced in those early days because many of the new ideas entertained by the colonists were shocking and repulsive to their more conservative brethren. Naturally there were those who revolted at the thought of severing all ties with the motherland and, on the other hand, there were those who felt that here and now was the unique opportunity to lay a foundation for a totally different mode of life.

The clash of ideas on political issues was as intense as it is today on economic issues. Roger Williams was notorious for his radicalism according to the standards of the day. He persisted in advocating the complete separation of church and state until the authorities would tolerate him no longer and ordered his banishment. Thomas Hooker, founder of Connecticut, was likewise denounced as a radical, and he too was compelled to flee the Massachusetts colony. John Winthrop had no faith in democracy, he unceasingly attacked the suggestion as nonsensible and impractical. Not a few of the colonists were uncompromising in their demands that the recognized Church of England become the established church of America. In the southern colonies a landed aristocracy was gradually concentrating wealth in a few of the more privileged families. The backwoodsmen, comprising largely German and Irish populations, were denied equal representation in the so-called representative assemblies. America was seemingly at the crossroads and a vital decision had to be made. Was the feudalism and despotism of the Old World from which our forebears had sought shelter to be perpetuated and inculcated in America, or would untried and distrusted democracy find here in America the vitality and nourishment for life?

How fortunate America has been. Whenever in her dynamic and illustrious history a vital decision had to be made and she appeared to falter on the precipice of indecision, great men of vision and foresight, men who instinctively felt the common touch, sensing the true greatness and significance of America, have come forth to lead her. Roger Williams and Dr. John Clarke, of Rhode Island, were two such men.

It remained for Rhode Island, under the leadership of these stalwart champions, to manifest to the world a practical demonstration of true democracy.

The royal charter issued to the Rhode Island Colony in 1663 by King Charles II has been universally recognized as the most liberal public paper ever promulgated by the British Crown. The principles enunciated in that historic document were mainly the product of the unsparing efforts of Dr. John Clarke, who, after 12 years of failure and disappointment, finally prevailed upon Charles II to acquiesce in extending to Rhode Island this incredibly generous charter of government.

The principles of civil and religious liberty which are set forth in our Constitution had their inception in the Royal Charter of 1663. Of all the achievements of the distinguished Dr. Clarke the authorship and procurement of this historic document was the most significant. From this time forth the Rhode Island Government was imbued with all the powers and prerogatives of a free, democratic republic, and the colony itself became recognized as the freest Commonwealth in principle and practice on the face of the earth.

Bancroft, one of America's foremost historians, said of the Rhode Island Charter of 1663: "Rhode Island was fostered by Charles II with great liberality. This charter of government, establishing a political system which few besides Rhode Islanders themselves then believed to be possible, eventually became the oldest constitutional charter in existence. Nowhere in the world were life, liberty, and property more secure than in Rhode Island."

Thus in only 2 colonies, Rhode Island and Connecticut, do we find from the beginning a belief in the democratic process. But Rhode Island alone was unique in that she singularly exemplified a firm faith in the common man, a faith without which democracy is untenable in theory and imperfect in practice. Incidentally, both Rhode Island and Connecticut owe their foundation to religious bigotry and political despotism so prevalent in Massachusetts at the time.

Is it any wonder then that the colony, already rich in tradition, met the crisis of 1776 with steadfast courage and conviction. The audacity of the deed compels our admiration, for "Little Rhody" has been among the most conservative and most loyal of the colonies. Imagine if you will the momentous decision that was determined and the inevitable retaliation and consequences. But Rhode Island acted alone, for there was no assurance that the others would follow her example. Under the inspiring leadership of Jonathan Arnold, the Rhode Island Assembly gave notice to the world that democracy was not to be the failure its friends had feared, its enemies had hoped, and its prophets had predicted.

In the cause of freedom and independence the Rhode Island Colony invariably took the initiative. As early as 1732, in an official protest against the Sugar Act, she denied the right of Parliament to tax the colony, and was the first to formally proclaim the principle, "no taxation without representation." In the Stamp Act resolution she was the first and only colony to direct her officers to defy the power of Great Britain; first to challenge the royalty in arms by sinking the sloop *Liberty* in 1769 and by burning the schooner *Gaspee* in 1772. Rhode Island was the first colony to urge a congress of colonies and the establishment of a permanent union; first to build a navy of its own, and which, under the command of Commodore Whipple, fired the first cannon on the high seas in defense of American liberty; and first to recommend to Congress the establishment of a continental navy and gave it the first commander in chief, Esek Hopkins.

This, then, is the unique contribution of Rhode Island to the making of America. We have need today of men no less far-sighted than Roger Williams and no less tactful than John Clarke. Great achievements have not all passed into history. A still more glorious future summons to its tasks the finest talents in an effort to solve the problems of our day. Surely we recognized that many of our fellow citizens are at the moment deprived of economic liberty just as our forebears were denied civil and religious liberty many years ago. This fact admittedly presents the most baffling challenge of our generation. It will tax the patience and ingenuity of men and women for many days to come, but ultimately the shackles of economic bondage will be broken. That sprit of action which inspired the gallant Rhode Island Colony on May 4, 1776, still lives in the hearts of Americans. Its inspiration will fortify the less fortunate and enable them eventually to walk with dignity, endowed with the blessings of opportunity and security. And in this battle for economic justice, if I may venture an opinion, Rhode Island, true to her glorious past, will make her contribution and, if necessary, her sacrifice.

War or Peace—It Is Up to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the most important issue before the United States today is whether we go to war or remain at peace. You will note that I do not say this decision rests with the American people or the Congress, although the Constitution provides the Congress has the sole power to declare war. In my opinion it is the President of the United States who will determine this issue. Of course, there is nothing that would prevent Hitler from declaring war on us if he chose to do so.

How then did it happen that the President must make this decision rather than the Congress? It is not because the Constitution makes the President the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, as other Presidents have had this same power and have never led this country into war until the overwhelming majority of the people and the Congress willed it. I believe it is because the Congress by its own actions has placed this burden upon the President, but only after he and his administration demanded, in the face of most vigorous opposition, that such responsibility be placed in his hands.

Before the war Congress passed the Neutrality Act, which was designed to keep us out of war. As soon as war occurred, the vital parts of this act were repealed and we found ourselves leaving the role of neutrals and entering the role of nonbelligerents. From that day on the Congress has granted to the President war-making powers on numerous occasions, and for all practical purposes, abdicated its right to declare war by the passage of the lend-lease bill, and subsequently the $7,000,000,000 all-out aid to Britain.

While the Congress still retains the nominal power to declare war, yet by placing these vast war-making powers in the hands of the President, he alone can maneuver the armed forces of this country into such a position that war would be inevitable. For example, he could do this by ordering convoys of British shipping or permit our own vessels carrying contraband to enter the war zones.

During the campaign last year both Presidential candidates gave their solemn word that this country was not to be involved in war. Time after time President Roosevelt pledged the American people we should not participate in this world conflict. I quote passages from speeches made by him during the closing days of the 1940 Presidential campaign:

We are arming ourselves not for any purpose of conflict or intervention in foreign disputes. I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party: We will not participate in foreign wars and will not send our Army, naval or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack.

It is for peace that I have labored; and it is for peace that I shall labor all the days of my life.—Philadelphia, October 23, 1940.

In 1935, in the face of growing dangers throughout the world, your Government undertook to eliminate the hazards which in the past had led to war. We made it clear that ships flying the American flag could not carry munitions to a belligerent; and that they must stay out of war zones.—New York City, October 28, 1940.

And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again, and again, your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.—Boston, October 30, 1940.

I am fighting to keep this Nation prosperous and at peace. I am fighting to keep our people out of foreign wars, and to keep foreign conceptions of government out of our own United States.—Brooklyn, November 1, 1940.

The first purpose of our foreign policy is to keep our country out of war.—Cleveland, November 2, 1940.

Mrs. Roosevelt, speaking at a meeting at Los Angeles on April 29, 1941, was asked the following question:

Do you think the President will keep his promise and keep us out of war?

She replied:

He hasn't made any such promise.

If the press is correct in interpreting Mr. Roosevelt's press conference of May 13, she is now hedging on this question, stating that the President had always qualified his statements about keeping America out of war with the phrase "unless we are attacked." That raises the question whether we would be justified in going to war if we deliberately provoked an attack by sending our vessels into dangerous zones or convoy British merchantmen.

Only a few days ago we were told by Capt. James Roosevelt of the United States Marines that we are now in the war except for shooting.

It is indeed alarming when Secretary Knox and Secretary Stimson and former Senator Minton advocate the use of convoys in spite of the fact the President says convoys mean shooting and shooting means war. They advocate the active participation of our Navy in the present conflict apparently with the approval of the President.

All this leaves us in a very confused state of mind. Who is right, those who say we are now in the war or should go into the war immediately; or those who say the President did not promise to keep us out of war? Or can we rely on the solemn pledges of the President himself when he promised he would not take us into war?

I sincerely hope that the President is doing his best to keep us out of war; and I believe so far as this country is concerned it is his sole responsibility whether we go into war or remain at peace, and I sincerely hope he will resist the efforts of the war mongers to push us into war.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee I have consistently opposed all measures that I felt would lead us into war. I am against convoying British vessels by our Navy as I think this would be one of the surest ways to become involved. I shall continue my efforts to keep this country at peace with the whole world.

The confusion of the situation is very well expressed by a pertinent editorial appearing May 12, 1941, in the Quincy Herald Whig (Quincy, Ill.) which I quote:

ROOSEVELT AND HITLER

Whether there will be war or not depends on two men—Roosevelt and Hitler.

There are many conflicting views in Washington as to whither we are headed. Those who have followed Roosevelt's course, from the repeal of the arms embargo in the fall of 1939, through the election campaign, the lease-lend program to aid Britain, the extension of the Atlantic patrol, and other significant moves, have a pretty fair idea of what he is doing. But does the public generally realize it?

Japan, from the best Washington opinion, is not to be considered now. The Japanese do not mean to fight and have no intention of taking the initiative. They are waiting for Roosevelt to make the first move, but they may even then hesitate to carry out any Axis agreements.

The pattern of the last war cannot be followed in this one. Those who have read Walter Millis' book, Road to War, may recall that he stressed the fact in 1917 America followed its dollars invested in Europe, and its financial self-interest. The road today follows a much different course and is more obscured objectively. It is a blurred picture showing the people of this country dragged toward war one day and the next day assured there will be nothing that will take them into the conflict.

There has been a build-up for active naval participation. But President Roosevelt is too careful to let the impression get out that he deceived the people, at least before the public demands that he act. He will probably say "no" to the interventionists who are calling for Hitler's head in an effort to show the country he is a man of peace.

The Nonplaying Dodgers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I am taking the liberty of including the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of May 13, 1941. One really must know Brooklyn in order properly to appreciate the Brooklyn baseball fan and it is refreshing that in these days the ardor and loyalty of these fans continue. The editorial is as follows:

THE NONPLAYING DODGERS

Those who do not quite understand Dodger fans must now realize, if they read the exhaustive analysis of these strange folk in our Sunday magazine, that the subject is much more complex than they had supposed. It is plain that the follower of the Flatbush team is not like other men. He knows depths of despair not known to the more phlegmatic. His moods of exaltation are stratospheric. With him baseball is not mere food and drink. It is tobacco, it is love, it is the before and the hereafter; even, when the team is losing, hell.

Anita Brenner's fine and sensitive article on this difficult subject of Why Is a Dodger Fan? suggests some of the difficulties in the way of achieving, in this case, the same smooth and frictionless bonhomie that marks other human contacts. The whole manner of approach to a Dodger fan at, say, the dinner hour must be molded upon the outcome of the afternoon's game. If McPhail's boys have lost, it is wiser and more humane just to ignore a Dodger fan if you wish to remain on speaking terms. If they have won, you have a moral obligation to perform. You must bend outward the sympathetic ear, hear in some detail how it was done and nod understandingly, in wonder and admiration.

It is not quite accurate to say that Dodger fans are merely running the team. They are on the team. We have seen Dodger nonplayers who were still trembling with excitement and a trifle out of breath 2 hours after a hard-fought game at Ebbets Field. They are as short of control as a Dodger pitcher on a bad day on the hill. But they are citizens, taxpayers, subject to the draft. They are born, marry, have children, die, but never grow old—in short have many but not all of the qualities of other mankind. We must bear with them, try as the years roll on to induce them to take things a little easier.

Puerto Rico's Shipping and Sugar Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOLIVAR PAGÁN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

LETTER TO HON. JOHN THOMAS, OF IDAHO

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith copy of a letter sent by me to the Honorable JOHN THOMAS, United States Senator from Idaho:

MAY 13, 1941.

Hon. JOHN THOMAS,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: On the floor of the Senate on May 9 you stated that it was unwise for this country to rely on offshore deliveries of sugar. Inasmuch as your remark has been interpreted as applying to Puerto Rico, although that may not have been your intention, I should like to explain the situation with respect to the sugar supply from our Territory.

While it is possible that some areas supplying sugar to the domestic market may encounter difficulty in completing their deliveries, because of interruption to ocean transport, Puerto Rico faces no such handicap. During the World War, when the United States and its Territory Puerto Rico were active belligerents, the island was able to ship every available ton of sugar without difficulty. At that time, Puerto Rico was virtually defenseless.

During the present emergency, however, the island is being converted into the most heavily fortified defense post in this part of the world. Both the Army and the Navy will have strong forces available to repel any attackers. Indeed, Puerto Rico is being relied on to play a vital part, not only in the protection of the immediate Caribbean area, but of the Panama Canal and other distant points.

Thus, there seems little likelihood that shipping from Puerto Rico will be interrupted. Moreover, because of the extensive defense facilities and the large number of troops that would be maintained in Puerto Rico in case of actual warfare, the necessity of maintaining close communication and of transporting the vast amount of supplies needed for the defense forces is adequate assurance that

there will be enough shipping space available to transport sugar to the mainland.

In addition, because of the prominent part that Puerto Rico is destined to play in the defense of this hemisphere, I am sure you will agree that it is imperative to keep the island on an even economic keel. Puerto Rico is forced by natural circumstances to rely almost entirely on sugar for the support of its nearly 2,000,000 people. Any reduction in the amount of sugar produced means a great hardship to the entire Territory. Certainly, it would not be to the interests of the United States to deliberately cause suffering and dissatisfaction among the people of a vital defense area.

Puerto Rico is more than willing to do its part for the national defense and welfare. That is demonstrated by the fact that all but 68 of the 9,600 men needed to fill Puerto Rico's quota under the Selective Service Act had volunteered for active duty before being called for service under the draft. In return, it is only fair to expect that this great country will protect the economic interests of the island's people.

Under the quota system sugar production in Puerto Rico already has been restricted to a greater extent than in any other area supplying the domestic market. Further restrictions, in my opinion, would be unjustified from any viewpoint.

In view of these facts, the people of Puerto Rico ask, and will greatly appreciate, your able help in making sure that there will be no undue handicaps or restrictions placed upon sugar production in the Territory.

Sincerely yours,

BOLIVAR PAGÁN,
Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

Convoying and War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to the Congress of the United States by one of my constituents:

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 10, 1941.*
The UNITED STATES CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C.:

To this august body of American statesmen, I want to quote to you, during these dark days, the ringing, impressive words, of that great illumined soul and Yankee patriot, Thomas Jefferson:

"I am relying for defense on our own army and our own naval force to protect our coasts and harbors. I am for free commerce with all nations; political connections with none, and little or no diplomatic establishments. I am not for linking ourselves by new treaties with the quarrels of Europe; entering that field to preserve their balance. For us to attempt to reform all Europe and bring them back to principles of morality, and respect for the equal rights of nations, would show us to be only maniacs of another character. The first object of my heart is my own country."

If Thomas Jefferson saw that the first object of his heart was the welfare of his own country, I feel, it's still every American's duty to see that America is their first and last consideration; and that duty, plainfully stated is, that America stay out of another European war; for the place to save our democracy is not in Europe but here at home in America, and to that end I ask you, this august body of American statesmen, that you keep us out of convoying and war, and by so doing, those dynamic words of Thomas Jefferson, live and breathe again, in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Respectfully yours,

HORACE BUSHNELL POTTS.

Defeat Part-time Waterway Pact—The Kellogg-Briand Pact—Hull's Misconceptions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

EDITORIALS FROM THE GAELIC AMERICAN, NEW YORK CITY

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include three timely editorials from the Gaelic American, New York City, on current subjects:

[From the Gaelic American, New York, May 3, 1941]

DEFEAT PART-TIME WATERWAY PACT

Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, speaking in the Senate on March 19, called the St. Lawrence waterway agreement, if carried out, a "broad highway for the invasion of the United States."

One of the main objections to the St. Lawrence waterway is that it would internationalize the Great Lakes and that the big cities of the Middle West would be liable to bombardment by hostile cruisers in case of a war between England and America. Some of our internationalists may say that such a war is unthinkable. War is not unthinkable, and as long as human nature remains what it is, the allies of today may become the enemies of tomorrow.

England invaded America in the War of 1812, sacked Washington, and burned the National Capitol. Senator BRIDGES was right when he warned that the proposed waterway may turn out to be a broad highway for the invasion of the Lake cities.

The St. Lawrence agreement, which has been signed by the Washington and Montreal Governments, is now before Congress. President Roosevelt has made it an emergency measure for defense and expects its prompt passage by the House and Senate.

The proposed agreement follows on the lines of the St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty which was defeated by the United States Senate in 1934. The present agreement is not in the form of a treaty, and a bare majority in both Houses will be sufficient for its passage. A two-thirds vote in the Senate is as improbable now as in 1934, and this obstacle decided the President to depart from the constitutional course of submitting the waterway project in the form of a treaty.

The advocate and spokesman of the canal interests stated that the proposed project would greatly lower the cost of light and power to millions of consumers. Already there is going to waste in this State water power more than sufficient to supply New York and the Eastern States with cheap light and electric power. There is no reason why these facilities should not be availed of by the State. Why wait for the St. Lawrence development when there is so much water power available in New York State? It is extremely doubtful if electric light and power could be had as cheap as it can be produced within the borders of the State of New York. The plea that cheap power from the St. Lawrence waterway would build up many industries now languishing, is farfetched and illogical. There is no business or industry in the country that is handicapped by the high cost of electricity.

This is not the time to spend a fabulous amount of American money on a project that is controlled by a foreign nation. It is not yet proved that the connection of the Great Lakes with the ocean would result in any appreciable decrease in freight charges. Our railways and canals have already reduced their charges to a very reasonable figure, and it has yet to be demonstrated that the proposed canal would lower carrying charges. Undoubtedly the St. Lawrence route would demoralize many railway systems, and throw thousands of employees out of work. Those who have invested their savings in railroad bonds would be reduced to poverty, and this would include widows, orphans, homes, and many religious institutions.

The international canal would also take business away from all our Atlantic seaports. Thousands of men would lose their jobs and result in greatly increasing the total of the unemployed. New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and other cities would be hard hit, and Montreal would become the commercial capital of North America. Our eastern seaport cities would lose trade and population, and taxation, Federal and State, should not be employed to injure great American communities.

The St. Lawrence canal scheme is a hangover from the Hoover administration, which failed miserably in all its negotiations for settling the affairs of the world. It seems strange that President Roosevelt should cling onto policies that brought to their authors failure and ridicule.

It must not be ignored that the St. Lawrence River is frozen for more than 6 months of the year. The ice sets in early, and it is well into the summer before the river is fit for navigation. There is no good American reason for the digging of a part-time canal, and passage of the agreement, signed by the United States and Canadian Governments, should be defeated in both the House and Senate.

[From the Gaelic American, New York, May 3, 1941]

THE KELLOGG-BRIAND PACT

In the Annual Report of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact of 1928 is lauded as a great antidote to war. Instead of being an antidote to war the pact of Paris has never functioned. Though ratified by 60 nations, it was never regarded by the world powers as anything more than a well-meaning peace gesture. It did not bind any country and there were no obligations involved. The pact had no teeth and no international body was entrusted with authority to prevent war. Secretary Kellogg was a well-meaning man and his enthusiasm for the pact was wholehearted and sincere. So noncommittal was the panacea for peace that it met with no opposition in the United States Senate. As no obligation was involved, the other countries passed it as a compliment to the United States.

It is stated, however, that neither Kellogg nor Briand was the author of the pact that never functioned and perished at birth.

James Shotwell, of the Carnegie Foundation, was the father of the pact. He forwarded it to Briand, then French Minister of Foreign Affairs, who, in turn, forwarded the document to Secretary Kellogg, who took it up with great enthusiasm and succeeded in having it ratified by the United States Senate without division. It had an equally easy passage in the sixty-odd countries that ratified the pact which was hoped would outlaw war for all time. The best that can be said of it is that it neither promoted peace nor outlawed war.

William Jennings Bryan was also a great peace advocate. While Secretary of State he had peace treaties ratified by the Senate and they were also agreed to by about 60 nations. He was very pleased with his success as a peacemaker, but when the World War started the Bryan peace treaties were thrown on the scrap heap. Bryan's dream of world peace was rudely shattered and he lived to see his own country engaged in the World War.

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace has been in existence for two generations, yet it has not prevented war or promoted peace. It has branches in many countries, but beyond providing salaries for clerical staffs, it has not prevented wars, which are becoming more frequent and terrible.

What the Carnegie Endowment and other peace societies have overlooked is that world justice must precede world peace. Until the injustices which give rise to wars are removed there can be no peace. To begin with, the conquering nations must give back conquered territory to the rightful owners and they must be willing to confine themselves to the limits of their own respective countries. There is no record that the Carnegie Endowment ever asked the aggressor nations to give back the fruits of their conquests. The pacifists have been barking up the wrong tree.

[From the Gaelic American, New York, May 3, 1941]

HULL'S MISCONCEPTIONS

Secretary Hull's speech, on April 2s, before the American Society of International Law, Washington, is devoted largely to a laudation of England's magnanimity in protecting freedom in her own island home and safeguarding it in other lands, notably the United States. England's enemies, he argues, are aggressors and conquerors who have set out to own and dominate all the countries of the globe.

Has Secretary Hull paused to consider that England for centuries has been herself a ruthless conqueror? She has acquired one-fourth of the earth's land surface by force and fraud. Her bad example has been followed by other nations ambitious to play the imperialist role. In every continent and in every sea she has seized large territories to which she is constantly adding new areas. As a result of the World War she has annexed a million square miles of territory. Hitler will have a long road to travel before he can equal in the extent of his conquests those of the British Empire. Secretary Hull was not happy in his selection of England as a champion of world liberty.

Like all the Anglomaniacs, Secretary Hull has ignored entirely the American Navy, which is now the strongest and best equipped in the world. He certainly knows that no European combination possessing the remnants of the fleets of the present European belligerents could with any hope of success cross the Atlantic to invade the United States or any part of the Americas. He gave no details of a plan of invasion by which from three to four million men could be landed on the Western Hemisphere. All military experts are of the opinion that no such force could be transported across 3,000 miles of the Atlantic with American warships, airplanes, and submarines to bar their way. As a natural barrier the Atlantic Ocean remains a formidable obstacle in spite of all the new engines of warfare of which the airplane, the submarine, and the tank are American inventions.

What Secretary Hull and all the warmongers entirely ignore is that no foreign power or powers have made any attempt or move to interfere with any part of the Western Hemisphere. In spite of the abuse of the Axis nations by Secretary Hull and his colleagues the German and Italian press has pursued a very moderate course under much provocation. It is obvious that the Old World military nations will in the present and the future have their hands too full fighting their own quarrels to be in a position to offer any threat to the Americas. Ample preparation for any contingency is in order for the United States and no patriotic American will grudge the necessary expenditure. We have the men, the resources, and there is no reason why we should not maintain a navy, army, and air force sufficiently imposing to deter any world conqueror from coming to our shores. In 1837, when the population of the United States was only 17,500,000, Lincoln said that a world combination could not gain a foothold in America in a test of a thousand years. The spirit of Lincoln is sadly lacking today in high places.

Gibraltar is very much in the news at the present time. Its possession by England recalls that it was seized from Spain for the purpose of making the Mediterranean an English lake. In spite of her pretense for world peace, as long as she persists in holding Gibraltar and other large areas of the world there is no prospect of amity or justice between the conquerors and the conquered. America should attend to her own internal concerns and let the Old World imperialist powers settle their own differences and fight their own battles. Our experience in the World War was a lesson which should never be forgotten by Americans of this or future generations. The colonial mind is very much in evidence among our most prominent warmongers.

Expenditures for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JARED Y. SANDERS, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, the Members have asked me as to the States grouped together in the chart used by me in my address the other day on the necessity of decentralizing industry in connection with our national-defense program.

In order to give the information desired, under leave to extend my remarks, I am herewith submitting the grouping of States according to the chart used by me. The figures represent expenditures for national defense by States according to latest statistics available.

States of the Northeast	
Connecticut	$540,632,185
Delaware	26,244,540
Illinois	310,272,928
Indiana	426,244,469
Maine	185,155,355
Massachusetts	846,307,924
Michigan	727,499,932
New Hampshire	97,213,610
New Jersey	1,370,941,064
New York	1,347,344,919
Ohio	420,513,007
Pennsylvania	1,019,260,431
Rhode Island	48,244,301
Vermont	2,574,932
Total	7,368,449,597
States of the Northwest	
California	$1,291,160,061
Idaho	2,009,628
Iowa	57,403,963
Minnesota	19,026,548
Montana	1,489,003
Nebraska	20,966,489
North Dakota	694,708
Oregon	55,389,416
South Dakota	771,219
Washington	511,814,394
Wisconsin	93,638,562
Wyoming	2,718,942
Total	2,057,082,933
States of the Southeast	
Alabama	$174,701,772
Florida	68,536,809
Georgia	50,483,550
Kentucky	42,604,425
Maryland	325,477,982
Mississippi	19,514,512
North Carolina	55,284,957
South Carolina	147,594,776
Tennessee	57,125,686
Virginia	854,703,471
West Virginia	79,898,640
Total	1,875,926,560
States of the Southwest	
Arizona	$6,074,620
Arkansas	7,574,573
Colorado	130,440,511
Kansas	63,538,575
Louisiana	38,015,030
Missouri	342,551,408
New Mexico	11,778,913
Nevada	3,376,189
Oklahoma	23,413,823
Texas	263,205,209
Utah	9,131,226
Total	899,100,077

Federal Gasoline Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1941

STATEMENT BY THE ALABAMA HIGHWAY USERS CONFERENCE

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Alabama Highway Users Conference has recently issued a statement dealing with the question of another increase in the Federal gasoline tax rate. I believe that the membership will find this article of interest. I realize that ways and means must be found to provide the necessary money for our defense, and that the committee handling this important matter has a problem in attempting to work out an equitable tax bill. Gasoline is a necessity, and I feel

sure that the committee will give careful consideration to all other measures before placing an extra tax on the already overburdened gasoline user.

The statement follows:

WOULD ANOTHER INCREASE IN THE FEDERAL GASOLINE TAX RATE BE CONSISTENT WITH SOUND TAX POLICY?

Today the tax burden of the American people stands at a level never before approached in our history as a nation. It is becoming increasingly important, therefore, that our taxes be so imposed that all citizens will bear a fair share of the cost of government proportionate with their ability to pay. More simply, our tax system must be reasonable and equitable.

Yet because certain tax measures in the past have proved to be prolific producers of public revenue, there generally is considerable temptation when more public funds are needed to turn to these established revenue producers as a matter of expedience without much consideration of tax justice. The gasoline tax is such a measure. Public administrators repeatedly have tapped this tax source, generally in accord with accepted tax principles, but often simply to raise revenue without much attention to principles.

ORIGIN OF THE GASOLINE TAX, NOW MOST IMPORTANT STATE TAX

The origin of the gasoline tax may be traced to the development of the principle that the portion of road and street costs properly assignable to motor vehicles should be apportioned among individual motorists according to their relative use of these facilities. Since the consumption of gasoline provided an adequate and practicable measure of vehicular road use, a tax on a gallon of gasoline originally was intended to be, in effect, a toll charge for a road trip of approximately 15 miles for the average passenger car.

The first tax on gasoline was imposed by the State of Oregon in 1919. This original measure proved popular because the rate was low and it generally was accepted as an equitable method of raising revenue for the improvement of roads demanded by car owners. Within 10 years every State and the District of Columbia had adopted this tax. Never before has a tax been accepted so universally in so short a period. Now a State rate ranging from 2 to 7 cents per gallon is being collected from the motorists. In addition, the localities in several States levy their own gasoline taxes.

The gasoline tax is now an established factor in the tax systems of the States. In fact, in most States it constitutes the greatest single source of tax revenue. In 1939 State gasoline taxes yielded $816,000,000, a sum representing 26 percent of total State tax collections, exclusive of pay-roll social-security taxes. No other one tax produced a greater percentage. Two States—Nebraska and Georgia—derived at least 50 percent of their tax revenue from the tax on gasoline.

THE FIRST FEDERAL GASOLINE TAX

In 1932, when the States already had come to rely heavily on the gasoline tax as a source of revenue, the Federal Government also enacted a gasoline tax at a 1-cent per gallon rate. This tax, unlike the State gasoline taxes, which were designed as a special charge against the motorists for the use of the highways, was enacted as a general emergency measure temporarily to provide funds for the relief of our Nation's unemployed.

This first Federal levy on gasoline was scheduled to expire in 1933, for it has never been intended by Congress that this be a permanent tax, but because the emergency still prevailed the tax was extended to 1935. The tax was even collected at a higher rate during the latter half of 1933—1½ cents per gallon—but the rate reverted to 1 cent per gallon at the start of 1934, when other tax revenues were made available by the repeal of the eighteenth amendment. In all, the Federal gasoline tax has been scheduled to expire on four different dates, but each time it has been extended. Congressional leaders had hoped that the economic health of the Nation would be recovered by June 30, 1941, and had scheduled the final expiration of the tax on that date. Unfortunately, late in 1939 conditions overseas gave rise to a greater emergency, the need for national preparedness. It soon became apparent that the initiation of a program of rearmament to insure our national security was a vital necessity.

RATE INCREASED TO HELP FINANCE NATIONAL DEFENSE

Our resulting national-defense preparations have required the expenditure of billions of dollars, and our Federal Government judiciously determined to finance this program, as far as possible, on a pay-as-you-go basis. This decision, of course, has meant the imposition of new taxes and an increase in the rates of taxes already being collected. The Revenue Act of 1940 accordingly adjusted the Federal-tax system to yield approximately $1,000,000,000 annually for the next 5 years.

All prevailing manufacturers' excise taxes, including the tax on gasoline, which were scheduled to expire on June 30, 1941, were extended for another 5-year period until June 30, 1945, and the tax rates increased. The majority of the rate changes represented increases of about 10 percent, but the gasoline tax was increased from 1 cent to 1½ cents per gallon, an increase of 50 percent. This 50-percent increase was the most substantial of all the increases in commodity taxes.

CONSUMERS OF GASOLINE HAVE CONTRIBUTED SUBSTANTIALLY TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Up to the time of the increase in the Federal gasoline tax rate for defense purposes, the consumers of gasoline had paid into the Federal Treasury nearly $1,500,000,000 in taxes on that commodity to aid the Government in a period of distress. With the new one-half cent per gallon increase in rate, these consumers of gasoline have been asked to pay annually $112,000,000 in addition to $224,000,000 in general emergency taxes they had been paying.

That the Federal gasoline tax has been productive of revenue and that those who pay the tax have paid it good-naturedly without complaint no doubt will be remembered when additional Federal funds are needed for general governmental purposes. The temptation will be to use this hard-working horse to death by again increasing the tax on gasoline. But if proper consideration is given to basic facts and principles behind a Federal gasoline-tax increase, the desirability of sound tax policy and tax justice would overwhelm the temptation.

SHOULD THEY BE ASKED TO CONTRIBUTE MORE?

A tax on gasoline is a tax on the consumer of gasoline—whether it be called a manufacturers' excise tax or a retail sales tax, for the tax is included as a cost in the price the consumer must pay. Any proposal to increase the Federal gasoline tax therefore must be considered primarily in terms of the consumer from whose pocket the tax eventually is paid.

Certain questions should be asked about this consumer and true and accurate answers provided: Is he rich? Can he afford the tax? What is his present tax burden? Is the commodity on which he is to pay the tax a luxury he can do without, or a necessity vital to his welfare? Would the proposed tax force him to curtail the use of that commodity? Is the proposed tax a fair measure of responsibility for a share in the cost of government? Is the consumer of gasoline already contributing a fair share toward the cost of government?

MOTORISTS, PRINCIPAL GASOLINE CONSUMERS, NOT A WEALTHY GROUP

Most definitely the motorist of today, the principal consumer of gasoline, is not rich. The day is passed when automobile ownership could be looked upon as an indication of wealth. Since that time there has been a remarkable extension of automobile ownership downward among millions of families with modest or low incomes. This widespread ownership of automobiles in America by families, rich and poor alike, is one of the wonders of the world. Even members of the automobile and allied trades were astounded to learn from a recent official study by the United States Department of Commerce that most of the motorists in this country, more than half of them, have a weekly income of less than $30.

TAXES PAID ON AVERAGE VEHICLE TAKES SUBSTANTIAL PART OF MOTORIST'S INCOME

Official studies also have shown that 10 percent of the typical car-owning family's budget, about $150 per year, is spent for the operation of their automobile. Federal, State, and local special automotive taxes account for more than one-third of this expenditure, an amount equivalent to about two weeks of the family income. One-third of the cost of keeping the family car, therefore, represents tax payments.

During 1939 the special automotive tax burden, averaged per vehicle, was itemized as follows:

State gasoline tax	$26.84
State motor-vehicle fees	13.47
Federal gasoline tax	6.26
Other Federal automotive taxes	4.25
Local automotive taxes	2.85
Total	53.67

With the increase in the Federal automotive tax rates by the Revenue Act of 1940, however, this tax bill for subsequent years will be even greater. The Federal gasoline-tax payment will be increased by 50 percent, or $3.13, and the cost of other automotive taxes will be increased by about 15 percent, making a total increase in annual Federal automotive-tax payments of $3.80.

EXTRA CONTRIBUTIONS EXACTED FROM MOTORISTS BY STATES TO FINANCE GENERAL BUDGET

It is true that the bulk of the motorists' special automotive-tax bill, specifically the State taxes, represents a special charge by the State governments for special services provided for the motorists as a special group. These services, of course, consist of the construction and maintenance of adequate highways. In fact, as already has been indicated, these State taxes were devised for that expressed purpose. Unfortunately, however, the motorists' willingness to pay these special charges for highways has been abused, for some of the States have misused these special funds to finance general nonhighway functions of government which should have been financed through general taxation of all citizens.

In 1939, for example, the States withdrew from these highway funds $182,000,000 to use for general nonhighway purposes. One must remember that the motorist is an average citizen who owns an automobile. Consequently the motorist, as an average citizen, pays all the regular taxes—income taxes, property taxes, sales taxes, and others—for the support of general governmental functions paid by those citizens not owning cars. Actually, therefore, in 1939 the motorists were compelled to pay $182,000,000 more toward the cost of general government than those citizens not owning cars. The motorist, as a result, contributes far more than his fair share of the cost of State government.

FEDERAL AUTOMOTIVE TAXES ARE ALSO EXTRA CONTRIBUTIONS OF MOTORISTS

The Federal automotive taxes were not even intended as highway-user taxes but sim-

ply as general emergency measures. All the revenue from these taxes on automotive chassis, tires, tubes, accessories, lubricating oil, and gasoline always has been, and still is, used to defray general governmental costs. Therefore, these Federal automotive taxes, which at the new rates will yield about $450,000,000 annually, also represent extra contributions on the part of car owners to the Federal General Budget to help finance unemployment relief and national preparedness.

This automotive special tax burden and these extra contributions to the cost of government, it must be remembered, come from the pockets of families whose income in most cases is less than $30 per week. In view of that fact, it must be recognized that these individuals have no unusual ability to pay taxes and that their tax burden already is most substantial.

THESE EXTRA CONTRIBUTIONS NOT BASED ON USE OF A LUXURY

The suggestion might be made that car ownership is a luxury; that if these individuals find their taxes excessive they should dispose of their motor vehicles. Such a suggestion would overlook the fact that the family motorcar is woven closely into the everyday living habits of approximately 70 percent of American families.

In most households transportation by automobile occupies a place among the necessities of life, ranking close after food, clothing, and shelter. A recent study by two of the country's foremost observers of social trends shows automobile use is well-nigh indispensable to modern-day living.

It is true that 20 years ago the man of modest means could not afford to own and operate an automobile. The price of the car itself, its fuel, tires, accessories, and replacement parts was prohibitive. Today the workingman is able to own and operate an automobile; American ingenuity and enterprise have placed within his reach this modern facility for economical transportation.

MOST CARS ON HIGHWAYS ARE CHEAP, SECOND-HAND VEHICLES

Furthermore, the great majority of families possess used cars, for studies show that such cars account for two out of every three cars on the road. More than half of the motorists have never owned a new car, and during a 10-year period sales of used cars have outnumbered the sales of new cars two to one. It is primarily for this reason that the value of the average car in operation today approximates only $200, a value only four times greater than the annual automotive tax bill averaged per motor vehicle.

CARS USED MERELY FOR BUSINESS AND OTHER VITAL PURPOSES

Because families of modest means have been able rapidly to extend their use of the motorcar, greatly improved living conditions have resulted. In the "horse and buggy" days, the absence of adequate and economical transportation made it impossible for a workman to live outside the city or industrial center which was his source of livelihood. Through the use of the automobile, housing congestion has been relieved and living conditions materially improved by the resulting diffusion of population. Life has been made healthier, happier, and safer, even for the resident of industrial communities.

For hundreds of thousands of workingmen and their families, a low-priced, second-hand car is the sole means of recreation. Even with present reduced rates, railroad fares represent a burdensome expenditure for family groups. But the automobile is not primarily an instrument of recreation. According to the United States Public Roads Administration, approximately 62 percent of the passenger-car travel on the highways is strictly for business purposes, family and commercial. Merchants, farmers, and salesmen are but a few of the classes of motor-vehicle operators which depend almost entirely on their vehicles for a livelihood.

UNIVERSAL USE OF AUTOMOBILES, GIVING EMPLOYMENT TO MILLIONS, ITSELF EVIDENCE THAT MOTORCAR NO LONGER IS A LUXURY

The average person usually thinks that such things as electric lights, bathtubs, and telephones are owned much more widely than automobiles. Actually, however, the automobile is the most universal of modern necessities. Most city families enjoy the advantages of bathtubs, electricity, and telephones, but the farm families do not. Although running water and electricity may be luxuries to the farmer, the automobile is not. In fact, automobile ownership is distributed more evenly between the cities and farms than is home ownership, which usually is cited as one of the very foundations of American life.

But the automobile is not only a necessity because of its use. It has also become a necessity in our national economic welfare in that it directly provides a livelihood for some 6,000,000 workers and their families in the automobile and allied industries. It is generally conceded that the automobile industry led the country out of the depressions of 1922 and 1933, and industrialists and economists alike took to the automobile industry again to bring this country prosperous years.

EVIDENCE SHOWS TAXES AFFECT OWNERSHIP AND USE OF AUTOMOBILES

Certainly no suggestion should be made to curtail the use of automobiles. Automobile use should be encouraged instead. But already there is convincing evidence that a heavy automotive tax burden tends to discourage car ownership and operation. A study made in 1938 revealed that population per passenger car in the 12 States having the highest tax per vehicle (averaging $71.14) was 8.1 persons, whereas the population per passenger car in the 12 States with the lowest tax per vehicle (averaging $43.40) was 4.1 persons. In other words, the 12 States with the lowest tax per vehicle had virtually double the passenger-car density on a per capita basis than did the 12 States with the highest tax per vehicle.

An analysis of new-car registrations made 2 years ago revealed that considerably fewer new automobiles have been purchased in those States in which the State gasoline tax has been increased since 1932. In those States which increased their gasoline tax rate new-car registrations showed an average increase of 177 percent between 1932 and 1938, whereas new-car registrations in those States which did not increase their tax rate increased 241 percent. That study concluded that potential purchases of 1,062,817 new cars failed to be effected because of the tax-rate increases.

Still another study has compared gasoline consumption in the 22 States in which gasoline-tax rates were increased during the period 1930 through 1937 with gasoline consumption in the 26 States and the District of Columbia in which no tax increases were made. During that 7-year period, gasoline consumption was found to have increased 35 percent more in those States with no gasoline-tax increases.

STATES RECOGNIZE EFFECT OF TAXES ON AUTOMOBILE USE

Even the States themselves officially have recognized that automotive taxes do affect automobile use. In the last few years about 20 States have changed the motor-vehicle registration date from the end of the calendar year to some other date when the motorist is likely to have more financial leeway than around Christmas and the start of the new year. State officials have testified enthusiastically that the postponement of the registration date has inevitably been followed by a marked increase in the number of motor vehicles in operation during the early months of the year.

There is adequate evidence, therefore, to show that the continued piling of taxes on the operation of motor vehicles definitely tends to discourage automobile ownership and use. Certainly, to disregard this fact would be to deny our Nation the economic, social, and cultural benefits made possible by our extensive use of motor vehicles, and consequently to contradict the traditional American idea of progress.

GASOLINE TAXATION RECOGNIZED AS STATE TAX FIELD

The curtailment of automobile use would have a most unfortunate effect on the fiscal systems of our various States. The degree to which the States rely on the gasoline tax for their public revenues already has been indicated. Ever since the enactment of the first levy on gasoline by the State of Oregon, the gasoline tax has been recognized as a field of taxation rightfully belonging to the States. This principle is recognized and supported not only by students and authorities in the field of public finance, but also by congressional leaders, even those serving on the committees which first recommended the enactment of temporary Federal tax on gasoline. In 1933, the Senate Finance Committee reported to Congress its opinion that the gasoline tax should be reserved for the States.

DANGERS TO STATES OF FEDERAL INVASION OF GASOLINE TAX FIELD

In their reliance upon the gasoline tax as a stable source of revenue, many States have pledged future receipts from this tax for the payment of interest and principal on their outstanding obligations. For the past few years, for example, one State has spent about 60 percent of the total revenue from the gasoline tax to service State and county highway bonds.

The gasoline tax still remains the main source of revenue used by the States to raise revenue to finance the development of their road systems. Curtailment of State revenue from this source would jeopardize the proper maintenance of these road systems to such a degree that public investments in highways totaling billions of dollars would be undermined and threatened.

The dangers of the invasion of the State tax field by the Federal Government have been so apparent and real to the various States that when an increase in the Federal gasoline tax rate was considered in 1933, the legislatures of 6 States adopted memorials requesting Congress to refrain from entering this State tax field and personal protests were filed by the Governors of no less than 11 States. Again, when the reenactment of the Federal gasoline tax was being considered in 1935, similar legislative memorials were adopted by another group of 11 States. In 1936, such memorials were filed by 2 States, in 1937 by 4 States, in 1938 by 1 State, and in 1939 by 2 States. It generally is agreed that only the extreme emergency of national defense restrained the various States from again filing violent protests when the gasoline tax rate was increased to 1½ cents per gallon by the Revenue Act of 1940.

The fact must be remembered that gasoline-tax revenues originally were intended for highway-financing purposes and highways are primarily the responsibility of the States. To quote one authority, "this principle has become so firmly established that Federal or municipal taxation of gasoline definitely is viewed as an encroachment of the States' prerogatives."

CONCLUSION: CHOICE OF GASOLINE TAX AS SOURCE OF ADDITIONAL FEDERAL REVENUE WOULD BE UNFORTUNATE

The foregoing considerations are believed to be sound and important. If the Federal Government finds need for additional revenue for the financing of its general functions, the choice of the gasoline tax as a source of additional revenue would be an unhappy one if for no other reason than the fact that the distance a citizen must travel on the highways is a poor measure of his responsibility for an

additional share of the cost of government—particularly when he already is making extra contributions to the public budget. Certainly the gasoline tax does not weigh properly the relative ability to pay of the various citizens traveling on the highways, for there is little difference in the degree to which an automobile is used by the well-to-do citizen and the citizen not so well to do.

The Time Has Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 15 (legislative day of Thursday, May 8), 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE SHREVEPORT TIMES

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Shreveport (La.) Times of Sunday, May 11, 1941, entitled "The Time Has Come."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Shreveport (La.) Times of May 11, 1941]

THE TIME HAS COME

A fundamental belief, held by almost all Americans, is that there should be complete and impregnable defense of our form of government and our way of living, so that both can be passed on to future generations of Americans.

One so-called class or another may complain about the abuses of capital or labor, or about this or that unjust law, or the ultimate interpretation of laws in the courts. But everyone knows that such complaints do not touch democracy itself.

Freedom of religion, of education, of speech, and of the press—these are the rights which inspire devotion to our form of government and our way of life. These are the privileges for which early Americans shed blood in their Revolution.

Some of our present-day orators do not understand freedom. They call it the great American heritage, a priceless possession of the people. They warn the Nation to stand guard over it, keeping it safe in a world stalked by greedy dictators.

But freedom is not an inanimate thing, like the gold buried in the hills of Kentucky. Freedom is not a commodity, to be put in a treasure vault.

It is a giant force, capable of leading men and women to superhuman triumphs. Unleash its power and it will guard itself against any enemy.

Today, in the gathering storm of world conflict, the full power of freedom should be used, at home and in foreign affairs, to strengthen our Nation.

There should be a moratorium on the issuing of new orders and regulations which hamper rearmament and slow down production. Every American, no matter what his place may be in the country's economic army, should be encouraged to exercise his talents freely in the Nation's behalf.

Citizens busy with their tasks should be freed of the nonessential interferences which normal peacetime bureaucracy imposes. Expansion of reform measures should be stopped. Fetters should be loosened so that all Americans will drive ahead full steam in the good, old-fashioned American way to get the job of national rearmament done at top speed.

The immense power of freedom should be used to defend freedom. If it is not so used, this emergency may become far more grave than any of us now imagine.

Serious questions relating to foreign policy have been before Congress for months. In both the House and Senate the majority has upheld solicitously the rights of a minority opposing the administration's program of aid to Britain. These minority obstructionists, aided by a few prominent citizens possessing no special knowledge of international affairs, have now carried their opposition to the point where it is an aid to Hitler and his associates, the self-proclaimed foes of freedom.

We believe the time has come for the congressional majority to break these minority chains and perform its duty freely and courageously, in accordance with the traditional democratic principle of rule by majority.

The time has come, too, for stronger, sterner national leadership.

Throughout the crisis which began with the crushing of Poland our great President has endeavored to maintain national unity and chart his course according to enlightened public opinion. He now finds himself handicapped by the vociferous minority which is attacking his foreign policy. If he waits for full unity to be displayed, in and out of Congress, his policy will collapse in frustration.

The President, as the leader of a free people, should take decisions into his own hands, casting aside the fetters of minority opposition.

He should inform the dictators and the world that ships of the American Navy and merchant marine—any ships flying the Stars and Stripes—are going to roam the high seas wherever and whenever they please. He should serve notice that the symbol of this free Nation must be respected, and that anyone who does not respect it will encounter the armed might of our country.

Hitler and Mussolini do not own the oceans. American ships should not be kept on leash to soothe the tempers of Europe's madmen. If the Axis cares to challenge the right of the United States to take aid to besieged Britain, let the challenge come.

This would be speaking the language of free Americans as it has been spoken for many decades, not alone by the man on the street but by our Presidents in times of national danger.

Speak out and direct us, Mr. President. You will find that an overwhelming majority of the American people will rise to applaud your courage, happy over the end of uncertainty, and full of confidence in ultimate victory for freedom and democracy.

Hospitals and Their Place in Our Social Scheme

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 15 (legislative day of Thursday, May 8), 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY BROOKS L. VINCENT

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by Hon. Brooks L. Vincent on hospitals and their place in our social scheme.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

May 12 has been designated as National Hospital Day, to be observed throughout the United States—the selection of the date being with propriety chosen to fall on the anniversary of the birth of Florence Nightingale, whose contribution to the development of nursing, and improvements in hospital standards are widely recognized and honored.

As public relations director of the Mississippi State Hospital, I am indebted to WSLI and WJDX for the use of their radio-broadcasting facilities in sharing with like officials throughout America in the commemoration of this significant day.

We who labor in hospitals, whether they be of mental disease nature or of general nature, know eminently well the gigantic contribution that hospitals perform in the physical and mental welfare of free people.

It has been said "Nothing multiplies so much as kindness." Certainly, this seems true in the successful life of hospitals, where kindness must be the chief cornerstone of life's structure.

Hospitals in the United States today face the most serious crisis in their history. Intelligent use of public-relation programs from hospitals may spell the difference between continued growth and stagnation. We seek to promote health through the spreading of knowledge of health principles and of the hospital's role in the advance of medical science. We hospital people do not close our eyes to suffering anywhere—war or no war. Hospitals have been, are, and will be ready for any eventuality, and even should the direct involvement of our country be averted, we must do what we can to relieve misery abroad. Nowhere can the medical professions practice isolation when disaster such as war strikes the people of any land.

Hospitals play a major part in preserving for us our most precious heritage—life itself. Three hundred and sixty-five days in the year hospitals are open, ready to aid the sick in their struggles back to health, to ease the last days of the dying, and to help mothers give birth to their children. Therefore hospitals must fit into its own community the same as a perfectly cut piece in a jig-saw puzzle—a piece that belongs to that particular puzzle and would have to be altered to fit in any other.

Hospitals provide the equipment and skilled personnel which enable the physicians to serve their patients most effectively; they make possible research into the causes of disease and the means for its cure. In the hospitals, our future physicians and nurses are trained.

Hospitals provide humane and scientific treatment and care and the highest degree of individual development for the dependent wards of the State.

Hospitals provide for delinquents such wise conditions of modern education and training as will restore the largest possible portion of them to useful citizenship.

In the case of mental hospitals, it is their aim to promote the study of the cause of dependency and delinquency and mental and moral and physical defects with a view to cure and ultimate prevention.

It is not economy by any stretch of the imagination to keep hospital appropriations low, if in so doing patients cannot be given adequate care and supervision, and overcrowded conditions interfere with hospital care conducive to early cure and improvement with corresponding early release and less expense to the State. For instance, since mental patients cannot be sent to general hospitals, satisfactory provisions of medical and surgical facilities must be made at

the State hospital. The best hope of the Commonwealth for minimum cost in caring for the physically and mentally ill lies in providing adequate facilities that the greatest possible percentage of cures and improvements may result.

If appropriations are too low to permit this, any immediate reduction in expenses is offset many times by increased costs to the State during a following period of time.

The laymen who are called upon to find a hospital for relatives are "somewhat reluctant" in knowing what to look for. Therefore, hospitals must contain modern equipment, fireproof buildings, beautiful gardens, and comfortable surroundings. Personalities influence the patient's recovery.

It requires no demonstration to prove that hospital patients will do better, will be happier, more contented, and will be more likely to improve or possibly recover when they have ample room in which to move about, and may enjoy the benefits and liberties of outdoor life, supplemented with the advantages of good medical care and all the associated activities which are now indispensable in good hospital care.

An ideal institution not only accepts the findings of others but attempts to add to the knowledge which the world has already acquired.

Pray God that Mississippi shall ever continue her leadership in that respect.

Herbert Hoover on Aid to England

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the attempts of a small minority throughout the country to stampede President Roosevelt and his administration into convoying vessels into the war zone with our own Navy, under our own flag, the country is rapidly coming around to the viewpoint that these vessels should be transferred to British registry and that the convoying should be done under the British flag.

If the Wall Street element throughout the country is justified in extolling Wendell Willkie and praising that "barefooted boy of the House of Morgan," I trust you will forgive me if I pause to pay my brief tribute to America's No. 1 private citizen, Herbert Clark Hoover, former President of the United States.

I have never been a Hooverite or a Hoovercrat. Mr. Hoover and I have not agreed politically, but he is a great American whose patriotism is unquestioned. He is not a candidate for office and says he never expects to be again.

As I have said before, he is the most intense pro-English, or pro-British of any man who has been President of the United States probably in all the history of this country. He lived in England for many years. Therefore, no one can accuse him of being anti-British or pro-German. He is intensely American.

I hope every one of you will read the speech he made the other night, in which he points out the danger of our getting into this war, and discusses the way to assist Great Britain and at the same time keep out of the war zone and out of the European conflict.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks I am inserting excerpts from the speech delivered by Mr. Hoover in New York on May 12.

The matter referred to follows:

For the last 6 months I have remained aside from the controversy on whether we should join in this war. I have been waiting to see the progress of our preparedness. I have wanted to see the situation abroad develop more fully. I had believed that the President was earnestly endeavoring to keep his promise to the American people of October 23:

"We will not participate in foreign wars and will not send our Army, Navy, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack."

In the past 10 days we have had many speeches and much propaganda, the meaning of which is to drive the American people into this war. One who has been honored by his country as a member of America's war council in the last World War and as its Commander in Chief in subsequent troubled years must learn something of the principles of national defense and our setting in the world.

It is, therefore, my duty to speak out of my experience. I hope that by sober discussion of the facts I may contribute something of thought in this most fateful decision.

FAVOR PROVIDING MAXIMUM TOOLS FOR BRITAIN

I do not need to express again my abhorrence of the whole totalitarian movement or its dangers to the world. That there be no misunderstanding, let me state at the outset that I support provision of the maximum tools of war to Britain; that I am convinced we can give this maximum during her next critical months only if we keep out of this war; that putting our Navy into action is joining this war; that the whole European war situation is in transformation; that America is as yet unprepared even for adequate defense; that our people are not united. To go in now is neither wise nor for the interest of either Britain or ourselves. In the anxiety of the moment many do not recognize the facts.

It is now proposed that we should put the American Navy into action. That is a straightforward, understandable proposal which boldly makes clear the meaning of words like convoys or patrols. That is joining in this war, once and for all. From here the steps are automatic. Our Navy must attack German submarines, ships, and planes if it is to be of any use. To make it effective, then, we must expand naval and air bases abroad. We must equip these bases with expeditionary forces. And that is war for long years to come.

There are those who say we are already in this war. That is not true. We are in a position of risk. But war has not been declared between ourselves and the Axis. Diplomatic representatives are still maintained on both sides. Our treaties are still in force. There is no killing of men between us. If this war were ended tomorrow, it would not be necessary for us to make a new peace with Germany.

TIME FOR SOBER APPRAISAL OF FACTS

This is no time for wishful thinking. Upon our decision depends the fate of our Nation. It is the time of all times for a sober and frank appraisal of new facts and new situations.

The first hard fact is the transformation of the character of this war. No one can deny the grim possibility that Hitler may take Suez, Iraq, North Africa, and the Mediterranean. This would not, however, cut the vital lifeline of Britain. It might even release the British Fleet to protect their Atlantic lanes. In any event, Hitler can occupy all of continental Europe.

And from all this area he will get ample food supplies and raw materials for the German people. True, he is blockaded by the British Fleet, but the blockade cannot starve the German people or cut off their vital raw material supplies. It is only the people in the occupied democracies who will starve. Having been disarmed to their very carving knives, they cannot revolt.

A second phase of this transformation is that substantial army fighting seems likely to go into the background for many years. The British armies cannot invade Hitler's Europe. Nor do I believe with all the 6,000,000 men that Hitler commands and his superior air force that he can now cross the Channel to England. To invade Hitler's Europe would require us to prepare 5,000,000 men in addition to the British Army. This time to invade Germany we would need to land them quickly and that might take 40,000,000 tons of ships to carry our Army over the Atlantic. And they might not be able to land even then. It would take 10 years to build those ships. And Hitler could not start toward the United States without equal preparation.

UNDETERMINED WEAPON AGAINST HITLER IS AIR POWER

The undetermined weapon against Hitler is air power. And the character of air war is also being transformed. It is rapidly emerging to be long-range bombing with fighter planes to defend against the bombers. Accurate action in destruction of industrial and military objectives by daylight is no longer possible because of the efficiency of fighter planes on both sides. Manufacture of more and more planes will thus continue on both sides. But so far there is no effective answer to night bombing. It serves mostly to destroy large objectives, the cities and harbors, reducing them to rubble and killing civilians. And in this destruction Hitler has to fly only one-third the distance that the British have to fly to reach his point of attack.

And there is a transformation in the German blockade of England. The long-range bomber is developing as a primary weapon in the attack upon harbors and upon ships. Submarines are today partly scouts, sending word to the air forces. Naval protection of Britain's sea lanes is now subsidiary to air protection.

This moving transformation of the relation of army power, sea power, and air power presents new situations which are not yet clear. They involve many new considerations. They emphasize England's immediate need which I will discuss later on.

SECOND HARD FACT IS HOSTILITY OF JAPAN

The second hard fact we must frankly face is that in the last war Japan was our ally and we had no need to defend the Pacific. But Japan is now openly allied to the Axis. She only awaits a favorable moment to realize her ambitions in Asia. That opportunity comes to her if we go to war in the Atlantic. Even if she does not open war upon us, her action and attitudes will be so potentially dangerous to us that we must instantly strengthen our defenses in the Pacific.

The third of these hard facts that we have to face is our unpreparedness. We have been slow to organize for defense, as is always the case in democracies.

We are not prepared to go to war. Our industry will not be tuned up for another 8 or 10 months to produce enough of the tools of war to equip our own defense and at the same time supply the needs of Britain. We do not have 300,000 men who

are sufficiently equipped with planes, tanks, and guns to meet 300,000 Germans, to say nothing of victory over 5,000,000 of them. We will not even have 1,500,000 men so equipped for probably another 12 months. We have no substantial air force of the type now being used in this war. It is true we have a magnificent Navy, but even that is not yet big enough for the job which it may have to undertake if we join in this war.

WHAT TO DO FROM NOW ON IS QUESTION FOR PRESENT

Our every sympathy, our interest is to assist the heroic defense of England. We have pledged ourselves to give Britain the aid of our factories and our farms.

Her most critical period is right now. It is during the next months. What is the urgent need of England as expressed by her leaders time and again? Plainly she needs bomber planes to guard her sea lanes. She needs bomber planes and fighter planes to offset the attacks upon her cities and her harbors. She needs tanks, munitions, and food. She needs merchant ships to replace her losses. She needs minor naval warships to guard her sea lanes.

If we join this war we must join in earnest. We shall lose it any other way. If we join we must at once increase our Army to 2,000,000 or 5,000,000 men. We would have to use a larger part of our immediate manufactures to supply our own Army. We would have to use a larger part of our air production to defend our own coast cities. We would have at once to increase our protections for the Pacific coast and our island possessions. We would have to use a larger part of our production of fighter and bomber planes for them. We would have to hold merchant ships in reserve to carry troops to protect them. We are not building enough merchant ships now to meet British needs. We would have to use our light naval craft to convoy and protect our own sea lanes, especially in the Pacific.

In net, if we join this war we must use a larger portion of our present scant production for our own equipment and defense. We would have to do this at once. And that means if we join in this war we must give Britain less tools of war during her most critical period.

CAN TAKE MORE RISKS IN GIVING BRITISH AID

If we stay out of this war we can take more risks in parting with our tools of war.

The British have said time and time again, that if we give them the tools they have the manpower to repel invasion; they have the men to man the warships, the merchant ships, and the airplanes.

Today we are confronted with not one problem, but many. What is the constructive American course amid these problems? Is it not clear that we will give less tools to Britain if we join in the war? The solution is not for us to go to war, but to give her every tool that will really aid her, regardless of our own preparedness. There are risks in this course, but it is the least perilous road we can now take. This solution will not please extremists on either side. Common sense and stark truth rarely do, and I am convinced that here lies the road to national unity that is so essential to America at this time.

We must also think other things through. And there are some other very disagreeable questions that must be answered before we take the plunge to war. We cannot refuse to face the facts of the situation when the fate of the Nation is at stake.

We wish to aid Britain, but we must face the fact that if she cannot maintain the independence of the British Isles with the tools and policies I have mentioned, it cannot be maintained by our joining in the war. If we are in the war and should Britain fail, we would be left to carry the war alone. And that war against Nazi-controlled Europe will have to be fought at a distance of 3,000 miles and for year and years.

In that event are we going to blockade Europe? If so, are we going to starve the 40,000,000 people in Great Britain? And how will we bring such a war to a conclusion?

What the course of the American people may be in this conflagration of the world cannot rightly be determined now. We cannot appraise all of the factors. At the present we cannot judge the effect of the transformation going on in this war. But there are some things we can state with assurance.

The Germans need have no momentary satisfaction in our unpreparedness. That will be forthcoming. The potential might of this Nation is the strongest thing in this whole world. If necessary, we can raise and we can eventually equip an army of as many millions of men as we need. We can make more ingenious tools of war and we can operate them better than any nation in the world. That strength is always here in America. It cannot be defeated. I deny that the defense of the United States is dependent upon any other nation.

Right now we need calm thinking. We need reason. We need tolerance. We need to approach these problems with deliberation. Until this picture is more clear it is folly to gamble with the fate of a nation. Strong men do not need to rush. We must not be swept off our feet by the profound depth of our emotions. By no hasty or emotional act must we jeopardize the aid to Britain and the future of America.

MUST NOT FORGET PRICE WE WOULD PAY FOR WAR

Finally we must not forget the price we shall have to pay if we join in this war.

It means the sacrifice of our most precious lives and the hopes of millions of mothers and wives. It means the sacrifice also of our own liberty to a dictatorship of our own, inevitable in total war.

If we go into war, we must pass through post-war bankruptcy. The savings of the people will be lost. The endowments of our universities, colleges, hospitals will be destroyed. And when the day of transformation of war into peace comes the Government will not be able to support the unemployed and the farmers. In this gulf all major industry must be operated by the Government. When we go to the peace table hate will again, as before, sit at that table endeavoring to destroy the hope of any real peace among men. Liberty will not recover on this continent for a generation.

But, if despite all this price, we are compelled to act with our military power, let us be thoroughly prepared. Let us make our determination within the frame of our Constitution by the decision of Congress. And when that decision is made there will be no disunity in America.

The Postponed Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune:

THE POSTPONED SPEECH

Mr. Roosevelt has again changed his mind about his broadcast to the world. He will not speak at the Pan American Union. Recently, when he was to dedicate the birthplace of Woodrow Wilson, he asked for a radio hook-up. Then the request was withdrawn. All arrangements were made for the world-wide broadcast tonight, and again there was a cancelation.

Mr. Roosevelt evidently is in a quandary. The American people know what he has promised them. They do not know all he has promised the British Government. The people here first heard of his proposed sensational speech from London. There it was said that he would virtually declare a state of war existing but would allow the overt act to come from Germany.

The first confirmation of that report at the White House admitted that the speech might be very sensational. Now that it has not been delivered on two occasions for which preparations have been made, the White House secretariat says that there will be nothing exceptionally startling about it.

Mr. Roosevelt's uncertainties are encouraging to the Americans who think that it is the obligation of their Government to keep their country out of a war in which it would make sacrifices without perceivable consequences beneficial to it or to anyone else.

For a month Mr. Roosevelt has been putting out feelers. He had Mr. Hull, Mr. Knox, Mr. Wickard, and Mr. Stimson say for him what he has hesitated thus far to say for himself. He approved of their speeches but still refrained from making their statements unequivocally his own.

Mr. Hull and Mr. Knox and Mr. Stimson, and then Mr. Willkie, said that the supplies to Great Britain could not go to the bottom of the ocean if America was to be saved, and Mr. Stimson went all the way across the Atlantic by saying that the American Navy was ready for service and that the flower of young American young manhood on the ships was filled with the highest patriotic spirit.

Stimson, as Secretary of War, committed the administration in downright fashion to a naval war with Germany. His words could mean nothing less than that and it was apparent that Mr. Roosevelt had put him out in front to speak for the administration.

The British Government undoubtedly has been led to rely on full American participation. The personal representatives Mr. Roosevelt has sent abroad, including Mr. Hopkins and Mr. Willkie, and including Army and Navy men, have confided his intentions. The American people are compelled to suspect that these commitments have been without reservations and that they have led the British Government to believe that as soon as American opinion can be brought to accept the consequences the United States will enter the war.

Thus Mr. Roosevelt may be confronted with promises made abroad and promises made here, promises to a nation at war and promises to a nation not at war, which are contradictory and irreconcilable. He cannot keep the promise that "your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars" and send the "flower of young American manhood" to fight off German raiders. He cannot stick by his assertion that convoying means shooting and shooting means war and then send the ships on convoy duty and deny that he is going to war.

Mr. Roosevelt has not succeeded in bringing this Nation around to his way of thinking or his proposals for action.

His hesitation is a sign that he doesn't see his way clear to go to war.

Hoover's Hard Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BINGHAMTON (N. Y.) SUN

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Binghamton (N. Y.) Sun of May 13, 1941:

[From the Binghamton (N. Y.) Sun of May 13, 1941]

HOOVER'S "HARD FACTS"

Hitler may take Suez, Iraq, North Africa, and the Mediterranean, but he can't cross the English Channel.

That is the opinion of former President Herbert Hoover as broadcast to the Nation, and it is an opinion shared by many other well-informed Americans.

When Herbert Hoover speaks we at least have the assurance his words are well considered, thoughtful, and based on long study and close observation. He has this advantage of men like Lindbergh who, right or wrong, are saying the same things over and over again, making tours of the country, speaking whenever an audience can be gathered together to listen to them. Mr. Hoover broke a silence of 6 months on Sunday night. He presented some new arguments.

Presenting the probable loss to the British of Suez and a German sweep of the Mediterranean, including Gibraltar, as one of the "hard facts" this Nation must face, the former President subscribes—or succumbs, if you wish—not to a doctrine of appeasement but to one of caution. Lindbergh subscribes to both, and there is another marked difference. The former wants us to make our aid to Britain effective. The latter wants us to quit, devoting all of our productive energies to our own defense. One takes the position that Britain is doomed. The other points a way to victory.

They both agree, however, that this Nation is divided. And they are in accord in their statements that we are not yet ready for war and won't be for some time. And there is no doubt in the minds of Hoover, Lindbergh, or any other thoughtful man, that if the Washington administration follows its present trend and uses our warships to convoy British ships we will be in the war from the day the first convoy sails.

What if Britain loses her last strongholds in Europe and in North Africa? She will still be unbeaten if she retains the British Isles and she will still be mistress of the world's greatest empire. She would still be able to wage war indefinitely and may eventually recover everything she stands to lose, and more.

Britain could clean up her own backyard, keep Atlantic lanes open, and protect her islands if she concentrated on this task alone. Her Mediterranean fleet, added to her might in the Atlantic, would be more than enough to insure delivery of everything she needs, including munitions, oil, and food from this side and without any help from our warships. She would thus make doubly sure that no invasion attempt will ever be made. That is her own problem, her job, and we are doing her no favor in holding out hope of active participation if we don't intend to go through with it.

Our industry, Mr. Hoover said, will not be tuned up to produce tools to equip our own defense and supply at the same time the needs of Britain for another 8 or 10 months. We haven't today sufficient equipment to meet 300,000 Germans, let alone 5,000,000 of them. A full year will be needed before we have a million and a half men backed by tools of war comparable to any Nazi division. And it would take 10 years, Mr. Hoover adds, to prepare the armies, build the ships, and make other necessary preparations before we could hope to carry the war to Hitler.

Likewise, Hitler would need the same period of time, 10 years at least, to get ready to bring the war to America. In 10 years a lot of things can happen to Hitler, Stalin, Mussolini, and Matsuoka.

Regulations for Radio Broadcasting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1941

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

KENMORE, N. Y., *May 8, 1941.*
Hon. WALTER G. ANDREWS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Same as a good many other citizens, the writer of this letter is greatly disturbed over the action of the Federal Communications Commission as shown by the new regulations for radio broadcasting. These regulations appear destructive, rather than constructive, insofar as chopping up a good chain and substituting random links here and there does not improve a chain. And it does appear that we get in this case, as individuals, the most in service from an efficiently operated and coordinated chain system. I believe that, in general, we have no good cause for complaint against the present broadcasting set-up, and certainly no reason for dismembering it.

It does seem as though the F. C. C. has taken upon itself the right to do things contrary to the best interests of the country at large, and just when we should get started to concentrate on fighting an outside enemy they undertake the job of undermining our inner structure. This, therefore, is written in the hope that through the efforts of yourself and other legislators this trend can be stopped very quickly and definitely so that our defense effort will not be made ineffective by our having to glance back to see what some would-be little and big dictators are cooking up behind us.

Your active interest in this matter and appropriate action, I am sure, will be appreciated at home.

Cordially yours,

OSCAR I. STRUVE.

For the Distributor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OSCAR YOUNGDAHL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1941

ADDRESS BY F. PEAVEY HEFFELFINGER

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of F. Peavey Heffelfinger:

The chamber of commerce requested that I tell you here today some of the adjustment problems faced by a distributor. I shall confine myself to adjustment problems of the so-called grain trade wherein my experience lies.

The machinery for the distribution of grain between the producer and the consumer is frequently affected by national farm legislation. We in the grain trade become concerned with agricultural legislation when it touches upon the function of grain marketing. We strongly favor any sensible plan which offers to give the farmer economic equality; we strongly oppose legislative hocuspocus which promises only to confuse the farmer or increase his marketing costs.

In our trade there was neither official nor widespread personal opposition to the passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. Our trade is close to agriculture and for many years we have recognized the serious problems that farmers must face. We studied the proposed Agricultural Adjustment Act and found nothing in it which expressly authorized the crippling or destruction of the grain-trade machinery. We knew we would be forced to make adjustments under the loan program, but we expected that impartial administration would seek the greatest advantage to the farmer with the least harm to necessary marketing machinery. In brief, we felt that the Congress had written this act for agriculture, but not against business.

However, under the administration of this act, real distress has been brought to certain branches of the trade so that now, more than ever before, their problem of adjustment has become a problem of preventing wide-spread disruption. Not all, but some of these problems have come through arbitrary administrative policies and decisions, and not from express orders of the Congress. Even some legislators, talking with us in the field, have expressed amazement at the direction of some of these administrative policies.

Insofar as I am able, I want to cite some specific problems of adjustment in our trade, using for illustration these four divisions:

1. The futures markets.
2. Cash grain commission receivers.
3. Warehousemen.
4. Processors and merchandisers.

Let me begin with futures marketing. At about the time of the Civil War, the increasing distance from surplus grain producing areas to centers of population forced the creation of a future-delivery system which could give time-and-place value to grain. Futures trading made possible a system of hedging grain, whereby country elevators, terminal warehousemen, merchandisers, and processors could make forward commitments without excessive risk of price changes. By

reducing risk in this manner, hedging greatly lowered the cost of distributing grain, and has been of distinct benefit to both producer and consumer. The futures market reflects public opinion as to grain values, striking a balance between buyers and sellers. It merely registers the price levels of sales and purchases. Condemnation of futures marketing is like condemnation of a thermometer that registers temperature without itself being responsible for it.

Futures marketing has sometimes been investigated under the suspicion or charge that it affects the farmers' price unfavorably. Perhaps the most comprehensive investigation was the one made in Canada a few years ago by the Canadian Royal Commission, headed by the late Sir Josiah Stamp. The Canadian Privy Council, answering complaints from some western grain producers, ordered the commission to investigate as follows: "To inquire and report what effect, if any, the dealing in grain futures has upon the prices received by the producers." The commission made a long and careful study, hearing scores of witnesses. They made a long and detailed report, of which they gave out this summary: "In brief, our answer to the question submitted is that in addition to the benefits reflected to the producer in furnishing a system of insurance for the handling of his grains, and in providing an ever-ready and convenient means for marketing the same, futures trading, even with its disadvantages of numerous minor price fluctuations, is of distinct benefit to the producer in the price which he receives."

The United States has built up an efficient grain futures marketing system which gives exactly these same benefits to our producers. But recently, as our Government has increasingly taken over the functions of the speculator-investor in grain, our futures markets have seriously declined in volume. The Commodity Credit Corporation, by making loans at levels above market prices, has been forced to take possession of large supplies of grain in settlement of the loans, and large surpluses have piled up in the Ever-Normal Granary. Thus, the Government accepts responsibility for potential losses, and becomes the chief speculator in future values. Futures trading has rapidly diminished until in 1940 the volume of trading on the Chicago Board of Trade was less than half of the volume traded in 1937, the year before the act became effective. During the crop movement of 1939, at a period when the hedging volume normally would have increased to its peak, there was little change; grain that formerly had been hedged by dealers and processors was now going under the loan and not into trade channels.

The Government loan sets a minimum price or floor; willingness of the Government to sell at that price plus accrued charges sets a virtual ceiling, leaving a narrow range within which the farmers' market price is caged. As the loan level is raised, more grain tends to go under the loan and into Government hands, until the Government can control the volume and freeze the price. As a result, the interest of speculator-investors has diminished until our futures marketing system faces some critical problems of adjustment.

This brings forward the similar adjustment problems of the second division of our trade, the cash grain commission receivers. The Government agencies have announced that they will not use the services of these commission merchants in moving Government-owned corn from country points to terminal storage. Remember, I am not talking of farmer-owned corn, but of Government-owned corn. In practice they do not use the commission man on ordering wheat into store, either. Through petitions starting more than 1 year ago, and lately through formal hearings in Washington, D. C., the commission men advanced the reasons why they should be employed in the movement of this Government-owned grain and thus be permitted to survive through the emergency. In the report which declined use of commission men's services by the Government, the Government did not question nor dispute any of the reasons or claims advanced by the commission men. Rather, they declined to use the firms, both cooperative and private firms, solely on the basis of figures which indicated that they could handle this work through Government offices in the field at less than the reduced rate offered by commission men.

Here is a new and amazing policy adopted by an agency of our Government: That, without taxes, without wage-and-hour restrictions on employees, without the usual commercial costs and controls which business must bear, it proposes to take over the functions of an established business if it can show lower operating costs. The situation that the commission men face here is in contrast to the situation in neighboring Canada where their wheat board, a governmental body, uses the services of commission men just as it utilizes the services of its entire grain trade in its desire to prevent serious economic maladjustment.

In passing, I mention another set-back the commission men have received. The Wage and Hour Division excluded commission merchants from the seasonal exemptions allowed under the act to the industry engaged in storing grain. While men in the grain trade thoroughly understand the actual and important part taken by commission men in getting farmers' grain into storage position for a loan, the Government excluded them from the partial exemption upon a purely legalistic interpretation of the storage operation. So commission merchants see their volume diminishing as more grain moves through Government grain offices and at the same time must meet rapidly rising costs. Naturally, the number of commission firms is decreasing, and those that remain are working against unfair odds.

A third grain-trade group, the warehousemen, have a different kind of adjustment problems. Large surpluses piled up under the ever-normal granary have naturally demanded a large additional amount of storage space. In fact, large grain crops this year could tax the sufficiency of storage facilities, in spite of the fact that both cooperative and private facilities are being expanded to meet the Government's needs. So temporarily at least we have the prospect of full patronage.

The Government's surplus grain is stored and handled by our warehousemen under a uniform storage agreement, the terms of which were written by Government agencies after conferences with the cooperative and private warehouse trade. The rates are lower than commercial rates, and the contract terms do not recognize the warehouseman's need for a complete cut-off, or termination-of-storage date. With the risk of employing trade terms without defining them, let me briefly explain this important point. The Government pays storage charges for only 6 or 7 months each year, the remainder of the year being free time. If this period of free time coincides with the time of crop movement, and wheat left in the elevator is removed from storage after the annual grain crop is moved, the warehouseman could be left without access to a volume of storage for an entire year We consider it an unfair hazard to demand of the warehouseman, but as long as the Government agencies have control of so large a volume of grain they can virtually dictate contract terms.

I am going to mention steel bins here, but to mention steel bins is to touch a sore spot in the warehouse trade. I speak advisedly because, at a time when the Government was filling its steel bins with some 70,000,000 bushels of corn, I had 2 empty terminal warehouses boarded up in Minneapolis and no employees at work in them except watchmen. The Government's first policy was to use steel bins for corn where country-elevator space was not available, and now even the country elevator operators are beginning to wonder what may happen in some given year when the Government has only enough corn to fill either the country elevators or the steel bins, but not both. Will they use the steel bins before they use the space available in country cooperative and private elevators? Under any normal conditions there is ample storage space for grain in the United States, well over a billion bushels of space. Government steel bins have added about 125,000,000 bushels of additional space recently, and now cooperative and private warehousemen are expanding this space further to meet the storage needs of the Government and the producers. In a conference here in February warehousemen offered to do all in their ability to meet the storage requirements of the Government if the Government agencies, in turn, would make certain minimum commitments for the use of the space, and at rates at least not lower than those in the present Government's contract. The Government would not give the full and necessary assurances asked but evidenced a willingness to use commercial space where available and where needed by them at rates to be maintained at least 1 year.

In a few instances I have mentioned the manner in which cooperative and private grain groups have worked together on their common problems of adjustment under the present farm legislation. Throughout most areas, and in most of the functions of grain marketing, cooperative and private interest have been in harmony. But like most other trades, we have had points of difference. Private grain interests have objected when Government agencies gave excessive favors to the cooperatives, through volume of either storage or merchandising. We have objected also to schemes under which existing country-grain facilities have been duplicated or crowded out by cooperative groups entirely financed by loans from Farm Security Administration under the guise of rehabilitation. But I am willing to admit there that this is not the policy of all farm groups or of all cooperative groups; we concede that many farm leaders have opposed this unwise use of taxpayers' funds to force the growth of the cooperatives.

The adjustment problems of millers, flax crushers, malsters, and other processors and merchandisers can be mentioned only briefly here. But I do point out that these industries are vitally concerted, because they store grain, use the futures markets, and hold memberships upon our leading exchanges. They cut their risks by using the futures markets, and can make forward sales at narrow margins for that reason. They would have a most serious problem if the futures markets were forced to close. The loan program has made market differentials necessary, and whenever these arbitrary differentials have changed the competitive position of the processors in any area adjustment problems are forced upon them. The loan program has sometimes limited the amount of grain available for processing in some areas at levels competitive with other processors in other areas.

These, then, have been some of the adjustment problems in our trade in recent months. They are repeated here, not because we wished to make a catalog of our complaints, but because the chamber of commerce asked that they be outlined for you. They are the problems of a trade close to agriculture and keenly conscious of the

economic inequalities in agriculture. Of course, we endorse the principle of full economic equality for agriculture; to deny it would be to deny the essentials of democracy.

As Americans we would oppose measures aimed toward the harm or destruction of agriculture; at the same time we believe that most farmers oppose any scheme openly aimed toward the destruction of their essential grain-marketing machinery. Some legislators, while considering the farm problem, quickly realize how many are the farmers, and how few are the grain dealers. Clearly we are another minority, and minorities in these days seem to have lost some of the protections inherent in our early philosophy of democratic government.

Our trade will continue to make adjustments as best it can to meet the long-continued emergency. We must continue in our belief that honest competition in business is desirable, and that government monopoly is undesirable. We will hold our costs as low as we can, and as low as taxes during the defense emergency, and the increasing costs of that emergency will permit. We will work willingly and steadfastly with any farmers, or groups of farmers, as long as they do not seek the replacement of a proven and efficient grain-marketing machinery by something which experience has proven uneconomic.

Unhesitatingly, we say that we have the duty, as well as the right, to stand for and protect the simple principle that private business must exist if our chosen system of government is to exist. Unhesitatingly we accept the responsibility of efficient operation and fair business dealing. We want to build and maintain the kind of business which we can honestly recommend to our sons and grandsons as truly valuable to society, and as typically American.

Unnecessary, Unjustified, Un-American Strikes in Defense Industries Must Stop

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1941

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter which I have received and the reply I have made thereto.

The letter I have had from William D. Ross, president of the Barre branch, Granite Cutters International Association of America, reads as follows:

BARRE BRANCH, GRANITE CUTTERS' INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Barre, Vt., April 29, 1941.

Mr. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In a report released by you to the Associated Press on April 3, you were credited as stating that the Vermont Federation of Labor had notified you of its approval of your demand of immediate congressional action to curb defense strikes.

Carmi G. Comings, president of the State organization, notified you to this effect. The Barre Branch of the Granite Cutters' International Association want to point out for your information and for the information of the public that Mr. Comings has no authority to speak for the executive council of the Vermont Federation of Labor and on April 3 he spoke as an individual member of the council and not for the council.

Our organization is affiliated with the Vermont Federation of Labor. We are for democracy in the affairs of the State and Nation and also in our trade-union movement. We do not grant nor recognize the right of any one man to indirectly place our union on record on any question of importance. We reserve the right to decide our stand on the important issues of the day in our own meetings by and through the democratic processes of our union.

We do not subscribe to dictatorship in world affairs or in the affairs of our union.

We reject Mr. Comings' statement of April 3. The Barre branch of the Granite Cutters' International Association in its meeting on Saturday, April 26, was unanimous in its condemnation of the unauthorized action taken by Mr. Comings and equally unanimous in its opposition to any and all legislation which tends to curb the rights of labor to strike in defense or nondefense industries.

Very truly yours,

BARRE BRANCH, GRANITE CUTTERS' INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION,
By WILLIAM D. ROSS, *President.*
SIDNEY EDWARDS, *Secretary.*

My reply to Mr. Ross' letter is as follows:

MAY 13, 1941.

Mr. WILLIAM D. ROSS,
President, Barre Branch, Granite Cutters' International Association,
Barre, Vt.

DEAR PRESIDENT ROSS: I have your letter of April 29 with respect to the communication I received from Mr. Comings, of the Vermont Federation of Labor, in regard to my statement concerning the strikes in defense industries. I have nothing to retract.

I do not care to enter into any controversy with you concerning Mr. Comings' authority. He is perfectly competent to take care of himself. What is bothering me is who is going to take care of the American people if such strikes are permitted to continue.

However, I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to make my position perfectly clear, although in the minds of most people, as reflected and evidenced by correspondence and conferences, I think I have made it plain, and it is understood by those who have taken time to study the strike situation.

It is realized by most people that wages and working conditions are not the real issues involved in these strikes in defense industries. This fact has been evidenced too many times to permit denial or to require further proof. Those who do not know this to be true should be advised that real subversive, un-American motives underlie, and are behind these strikes in defense industries. What is more, these underlying motives and subversive interests threaten us continuously. They never sleep. They are even worse than the strikes; they delay and hamper, and in some cases destroy our efforts at national defense.

I suppose you know that the total number of man-days lost as a result of strikes in the first 3 months of this year were more than three times as great as for the same period of 1940. That is a startling figure, but authoritative figures which I have before me show that 3,022,918 man-days were lost in January, February, and March of this year. Of this total over a million and a half man-days—or, to be exact, 1,578,000 man-days—were lost in defense industries.

To get right down to brass tacks, deliberate crippling of defense action is close to treason, for it aids and comforts our enemies in time of war.

The story for the next 3 months will be worse if the proposed strikes in defense industries and the strikes now in operation continue and are effective.

In the Sunday newspapers there were listed strikes in 11 shipyards working on Navy contracts amounting to $500,000,000; a strike affecting an $11,000,000 order in the bag-loading plant at Pulaski, Va., which in turn affects the $44,000,000 Hercules powder plant near Radford, Va.; a strike at the Boston Navy Yard involving $30,000,000 worth of work; a strike in New Mexico involving $9,000,000. These are the amounts given.

In addition, 6,000 workers were to strike in the Chrysler Corporation in Detroit; a strike is threatened in the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, freight handlers, express and station employees, and 4 midwestern railroads; 160,000 General Motors workers are contemplating striking; the C. I. O. has called a strike in the United Engineering & Foundry Co. at Vandergrift, Pa. Thousands of workers were ordered on strike in 60 California canneries, and a strike is in the making at the Murphy Body Corporation.

No doubt there are many others that are not listed here, but when one stops to contemplate the ramifications of these strikes he knows that at least $594,000,000 of our war orders will be affected as outlined above, with the possibility of the strikes affecting some $5,000,000,000.

These strikes must stop.

With all the provisions that have been made for the avoidance of strikes and for the protection of those who claim to be aggrieved, there is no occasion for a strike. In my opinion, there is no half-way business about this situation. You are either for America or against it. To strike in a defense industry and thereby to interfere with the safety of the people and the national defense is un-American.

In nearly every instance those who have instituted or initiated these strikes do not have the interest of the employee at heart. They are motivated purely by hope of selfish gain. They are Communists and racketeers who proceed for pay and without regard to whether or not they destroy our country.

The strikes for the most part are called at strategic places, selected by foreign advisers, where the most damage can be done to us and where our defense program can be most seriously delayed or affected. The racketeers and traitors directed from abroad pick for their sabotage the shipyards, the power plants, coal mines, airplane factories, machine shops, and other vital industries.

These are the facts. They cannot be lightly laughed off, arrogantly denied, or disproved.

In my opinion, if this thing goes far enough—and it has gone far enough already, as I see it—the plants will be commandeered and operated under Government supervision. Labor will be regimented and industry mobilized. One does not have to be even smart to sense that this is the road down which we are traveling. One must be blind who cannot see it.

National defense and the public safety are involved in these strikes affecting defense industries. Make no mistake.

The right to strike is not the issue at all.

I reassert and reaffirm the Coolidge doctrine that "there is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, any time."

The national safety is paramount. The security of the country, the welfare of our people, the protection of our homes, the

preservation of opportunity for our children—in short, the national defense—transcends every interest and every privilege of industry and labor at this time. No arbitrary attitude of self-seeking or greed on the part of either employer or employee, or both, should be permitted or tolerated or allowed to block the attempts and the determination of the American people to defend themselves.

It is high time that the people should realize the facts. They must be aroused to the seriousness of the situation and the insidiousness of the danger which lurks in these strikes in defense industries, for they threaten our very existence as individuals and involve the life of the Nation.

Legal methods for arriving at a settlement of all differences and for the arbitrament of all controversies, affording ample and complete protection for all the rights of everybody, have been provided and are accessible during the present emergency.

Unnecessary, unjustified, un-American strikes in defense industries must stop.

Yours very truly,

CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, *M. C.*

Convoying by United States Naval Vessels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE SARSFIELD SOCIAL CLUB OF BUTTE, MONT., AND THE PHIL SHERIDAN CLUB OF ANACONDA, MONT.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

BUTTE, MONT., *May 5, 1941.*

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: At a joint meeting of the Sarsfield Social Club of Butte and the Phil Sheridan Club of Anaconda, held on April 26, 1941, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted.

"Whereas it has been intimated that the United States Fleet is to be used to convoy merchant ships carrying munitions of war to certain belligerent countries now at war in Europe and Africa; and

"Whereas such merchant ships with their convoys must necessarily travel in enemy waters, which are infested with submarines and sunken mines and thus exposes them to the danger of being destroyed, which will inevitably lead this country into the European war: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the officers and members of the Sarsfield Social Club of Butte and the Phil Sheridan Club of Anaconda, in joint meeting assembled, do hereby go on record as being unalterably opposed to the use of the United States Fleet as a convoy for any merchant ships engaged in carrying munitions of war to any European or African port; and be it

"*Resolved*, That we petition His Excellency, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, to be ever mindful of his promises to the electorate during the recent campaign for reelection that no American boy would ever be sent across the Atlantic to fight on foreign soil; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; a copy to Cordell Hull, Secretary of State; a copy to Senators B. K. Wheeler and James E. Murray; a copy to Congressman James F. O'Connor and to Congresswoman Jeannette Rankin; and a copy spread upon the minutes of this meeting."

Committee:

M. J. MULLANE,
M. J. HARTNETT,
PATRICK MCGIVERN,
Butte.
MICHAEL LACEY,
THOMAS ASTEL,
MICHAEL SHEARIN,
Anaconda.

Implementing the Philippine Export-Control Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1941

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in a few days the House will consider a measure, Senate Joint Resolution 76, unanimously approved by the Military Affairs Committee, making applicable the export-control law—section 6 of the act of Congress of July 2, 1940—to the Philippines and other possessions and Territories.

This is designed to stop the shipments of certain critical and essential materials which are moving from the Philippines to certain foreign countries, particularly Japan and Russia. Shipments to Russia, through the port of Vladivostok, on the Pacific less than 500 miles from Japan, may easily find their way to Central Europe by way of the Trans-Siberian Railway, which connects with Polish and German railroads.

I favor the resolution. I hope it will receive nonpartisan consideration. It will implement and strengthen our national-defense scheme.

On March 31 last—see page 2759 of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—and a few days before that I took the floor and discussed the importance of having an export-control law for the Philippines to plug the hole through which banned materials have been moving to certain foreign countries and also to prevent the Philippines from becoming a base for the reexportation of those materials. I supported my discussion with extensive quotations from memoranda prepared by Mr. Vicente Villamin, Filipino economist, covering the movements of goods between the Philippines, Japan, Russia, and the United States.

As a member of the House Committee on Insular Affairs, I am aware that our definite policy is to let the Filipinos have local autonomy and self-rule and to legislate for themselves. When a Philippine legislation has to do with foreign countries it will have to be approved by the President of the United States before going into effect. I had hoped that this process would be followed in the present case, but, with the acquiescence of the Philippine government, we have chosen to extend our law to the Philippines, and I shall go along with that method. I want to see an export-control law for the Philippines. That is the leading consideration.

Mr. Speaker, my sole interest now is to see to it that the law we shall make applicable to the Philippines will achieve its purpose and not become ineffective in view of certain peculiar situations that may obtain in that section of the world.

I am presenting now for the RECORD a terse memorandum by Mr. Villamin which contains facts and raises questions which I am sure should receive the attention for remedial action of Brig. Gen. Russell Maxwell, of the Export Control office, and Mr. Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, both of whom addressed the Committee on Military Affairs on Senate Joint Resolution 76. As I understand it, their statements did not cover the matters presented in the Villamin memorandum.

Yesterday I introduced in the RECORD the fine statement of Mr. ELIZALDE, the Philippine Resident Commissioner, to the Military Affairs Committee, in which he expressed the eagerness of the Philippine government to cooperate with our Government in this matter of export control, for which I wish again as a Member of Congress to register my appreciation. The Commissioner's statement does not, however, contain a detailed discussion of the intrinsic issues to which the export-control law may give rise.

Mr. Villamin poses the question that since shipments to Russia are not under ban under the policy of our Government by which the so-called "moral embargo" on that country has been lifted, shipments from the Philippines could be made to Vladivostok and from there redirected to Japan, a matter of a day's steamer sailing, thereby defeating the export control law. This especially refers to shipments of iron ore of which the Philippines exported to Japan 1,192,000 tons in 1940 in comparison with nothing in 1933 and only 283,000 tons in 1935.

Concerning copra, coconut oil, and other materials now being imported to Japan from the Philippines over and above Japan's normal requirements and which are probably reexported to Russia and from there to Germany, the shipments of these materials to Japan will stop under the export-control law, but such shipments could go on direct from the Philippines to Russia, and there again the export-control law would be defeated.

He also points to the fact that shipments from the Philippines could be made to ports in China, especially those under Japanese control, and from there transported by the Manchurian Railway to connect with the trans-Siberian railroad on the north. And for that matter, such shipments could be rerouted to Japan as in the case of Vladivostok with the possible difference that it would be

harder to discover the process in the latter case.

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no doubt that vital and pertinent questions have been raised in the memorandum, and I am afraid that if we do not meet them satisfactorily there will be but little use of having an export-control law for the Philippines.

As I want to see the resolution become a law with the greatest legislative speed, I plead that Government agencies concerned with this matter, particularly the Export Control office in the War Department under Brigadier General Maxwell and the State Department, whose activities are under Mr. Dean Acheson, should examine this additional matter and offer remedial suggestions.

It may be necessary for the Military Affairs Committee to meet again immediately to hear further statements. I have the word of Mr. Villamin, who has studied the question very fully, that he would be glad to give more explanatory and supplementary information and discussion if and when desired by the committee.

His memorandum, which follows, contains two possible suggestions to remedy the questions which he raised.

His first suggestion is to have shipments to China or Russia covered by affidavits by buyer possibly to be supported by cash guaranties that the goods are for local consumption in those countries. He does not believe this could be very effective, for it would be almost impossible to enforce it.

His second suggestion is to have either the American or the Philippine governments, or both, to take the goods refused shipment under the export-control law on just compensation to form reserves or stock piles. In the event the Philippine government is to make the stock piles, adequate financial assistance will have to be given that government.

Mr. Speaker, I wish again to express my pleasure that the Philippines is going to have an export-control law and to thank President Manuel L. Quezon for his splendid spirit of cooperation in this connection.

The memorandum by Mr. Villamin follows:

THE VILLAMIN MEMORANDUM

(May 15, 1941)

Let me say at once that I favor an export control law for the Philippines. I hope the pending joint resolution extending section 6 of the act of Congress of July 2, 1940, may be acted on with the greatest legislative speed.

The questions I am raising here are vital and pertinent. I am convinced that they deserve consideration by Congress and the administration. Having studied the question of export control, I am desirous of cooperating to the end.

Our concern now is how to prevent the law from becoming toothless by circumvention. The following précis of facts presents situations that obviously require remedial treatment either by legislation or by administrative action.

As the situations here presented revolve around the position of Russia, it is pertinent to set forth the background of America's policy toward that country in relation to the export-control law.

On December 2, 1939, President Roosevelt, announcing to the press what has since become known as the moral embargo, declared that he hoped that American manufacturers and exporters of airplanes and parts thereof would bear the fact in mind before selling to certain foreign countries that the policy of the American Government condemned the unprovoked bombing and machine-gunning of civilian populations from the air.

The State Department, in statements dated December 15 and 20, 1939, pursuant to the announcement of the President, above quoted, enumerated more materials under "moral embargo" and suggested that the national interest required that there should be no further delivery to certain countries of plans, plants, manufacturing rights, or technical information needed for the production of high-quality aviation gasoline.

On July 2, 1940, the export-control law was passed, being section 6 of the act of Congress of July 2, 1940, entitled "An act to expedite the strengthening of the national defense."

As administered in pursuance to national policy of retaining the friendship of Russia, this law does not affect shipments of American goods to that country. It is not inconsistent with this policy for the United States to refuse shipments to Russia when local needs and priorities so require.

According to the latest information, the Russo-American commercial relations—again in obedience to national policy—are to be expanded rather than contracted. This means that sales to Russia will be subjected to the minimum of restriction and interruption.

On January 21, 1941, Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles advised the Russian Ambassador at Washington, Mr. Constantine A. Oumansky, that "the Government of the United States of America has decided that the policies set forth in the statement issued to the press by the President on December 2, 1939 [mentioned above] and generally referred to as the 'moral embargo,' are no longer applicable to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics," adding that "this decision is being communicated to interested American manufacturers and exporters." In other words, shipments to Russia are not barred.

The foregoing statements show that Russia can buy goods from the United States, and if Russia can buy from the United States she can buy from the Philippines. Now let us see how this will work in the Philippines and consider if the export-control law will not be rendered without effect if something is not done about it.

As I have already stated, here in the United States Russian orders for American goods under ban are made dependent on priorities and local requirements. The orders, with regrets, are often not filled for that reason. The American Government has first call on the goods, and it purchases them either for immediate use or for its reserves.

On the contrary, the Philippine government is not in a position today to refuse the Russian purchaser of Philippine products for a similar reason. If it approves the sales to Russia merely for the sake of selling it, it would not be going along strictly with certain imaginable policies of the United States. And if it disapproves the sales for no reasons as justified as that given by the United States in a similar case, it would violate the American policy toward Russia. Thus the Philippine government would be impaled on the two horns of the dilemma.

If the American Government will have exclusive control of enforcing the export-control law in the Philippines, then the Philippine government would be relieved of much, if not all, of its conceivable problems in this connection. The American Government naturally will get the obligations resulting from its enforcement of the law. Thus, I believe, it would be proper for the American Government to purchase for immediate use or for the stock piles Philippine products refused sales to foreign countries, including Russia, for reasons of priorities or American requirements. To this end it may be necessary to relax the quantitative quotas on Philippine products as provided in the Tydings-McDuffie Act.

Consistent with the idea set forth in the foregoing paragraph is the thought that if the Philippine government is to be expected to purchase unfilled foreign orders, that government, it seems to me, is entitled to be placed in funds to do so. That government is eager to cooperate with the United States to its fullest ability, but its financial resources are limited. It is considering asking for a loan from the United States Government.

Now I shall set forth some patent instances which could render the export-control law ineffective and illusory.

First. Under the law, shipments of, say, iron ore to Japan from the Philippines will stop. But such shipments could be made to Vladivostok or some Chinese ports, especially those under Japanese control, and from there rerouted to Japan, a matter of 1 or 2 days steamer's sailing. A precedent in point is the discovery a few years ago of shipments of textiles from Japan to the Philippines via Hong Kong, defeating a Japanese-American executive agreement on maximum quotas. The quotas were exceeded through that circuitous triangular procedure.

Second. That part of the imports of Japan from the Philippines which is over and above her normal requirements and which conceivably are being reexported to Russia or China destined for Central Europe via the trans-Siberian, Polish, and German railroads need not be missed by Russia and China, because it could be shipped direct to them.

These two possible situations, if not solved, would make the export-control law almost a surplusage.

My first suggestion as a remedial measure is what I have already stated, namely, that the government take over the goods that are refused shipment from the Philippines to certain foreign countries.

A second possible remedy would be to require Russian and Chinese and other unbanned purchasers of Philippine goods to make an affidavit, supported by cash guaranties, that the goods purchased are for final consumption strictly within their territories. This remedy is not dependable and well-nigh impossible of enforcement.

The above memorandum has been prepared in a rather hurried way, but its author is ready to respond to any request for further information as he is desirous as a Filipino citizen to give his cordial cooperation and his best thoughts in the interest of national defense.

As in my previous memorandum on Philippine exports, I have not given the iron-ore shipments to Japan. I am giving them hereinbelow:

Exports of iron ore to Japan, being 100 percent of Philippine total exports

	Metric tons
1940	1,192,000
1939	1,155,000
1938	911,000
1937	599,700
1936	654,000
1935	283,000
1934	7,000
1933	Nil.

Mr. Speaker, thus far is the latest memorandum of Mr. Villamin. In order to present an integrated body of facts and statistics in connection with the Philippine export-control law, I wish to again refer to my speech in this House of March 31, which contains Mr. Villamin's memoranda on the movements of other Philippine products between the Philippines and Japan, Russia, and the United States. Those memoranda represent

extensive work of research and correlation, and for all of which Mr. Villamin is entitled to the grateful acknowledgment of our Government.

St. Lawrence Waterway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. GEORGE H. BENDER, OF OHIO

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered yesterday over the radio:

A few years back Uncle Sam embarked upon one of the greatest engineering experiments in the history of mankind. It was a project truly worthy of Hollywood's choicest adjectives, "colossal," "terrific," "super-super." Up in Maine the folks were excited. Their Government down in Washington was going to harness the tides. The tides are still unharnessed and Passamaquoddy is now only a memory. A few mere millions were sunk in the mud, but they were speedily forgotten as the Washington merry-go-round whipped furiously off to newer and still more intoxicating pleasures.

Some of us remember, too, the Florida ship canal proposal. It was going to cut a channel across the northern end of Florida to encourage commerce and bring the more abundant life to thousands of men and women down South. That one got into the moving-picture newsreels. We saw wonderful pictures of a huge dried-up ditch, with a good deal of rusty looking machinery along the sidelines. By the time it had disappeared from the picture it wasn't even regarded as a potential celery patch.

The St. Lawrence waterway proposal, whatever its merits may be, comes along as a fitting successor to the grandiose schemes concocted by the febrile imagination of the New Deal. Like both of the other projects, a feeble effort is being made to link its construction with a national-defense build-up. The utter puerility of this endeavor is apparent at the merest glance. Two other arguments have been invented to reinforce the recognized weakness of the defense position. Washington sources "close to the President" have urged the St. Lawrence waterway as a potential producer of hydroelectrical power on a tremendous scale. Then, too, they argue that the St. Lawrence development would enable us to build shipyards on the Great Lakes beyond the reach of air raids.

An examination of each of these arguments is certainly in order before Congress votes huge sums necessary for this project.

To consider the defense suggestion is to recognize its futility. Defense is an immediate problem requiring, as the administration repeatedly has pointed out, concentration of all our industrial and economic forces upon the production of ships, planes, tanks, and other munitions. By the most optimistic estimate the power project of the St. Lawrence proposal could not be completed before 1946. Insofar as use of the Lake ports is concerned for the construction of ships of war, the scheme is impracticable, since the seaway could not be in condition to float such vessels before 1948 or 1949. Meanwhile no provision whatever has been made for adequate harbors or docks at the Lake ports for the accommodation of ocean-going vessels or the construction of ships of war. Proponents who advance this latter suggestion are out of line with expert opinion that vital sections of the seaway and power works would be exceedingly vulnerable to aerial attack and sabotage. The dam in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence, which is only a little more than 200 miles from the seacoast, would be especially vulnerable and, if destroyed, would trap all naval and other craft being constructed within the Great Lakes.

Furthermore, instead of aiding the defense program, it is the opinion of competent authorities that it would retard it by withdrawing from immediately necessary projects labor and material in vast amount. The same thing applies to the tremendous sums of money that would be withdrawn from our defense effort to finance the seaway and power project. If we are still in the defense emergency, our entire economy will be far out of line in the years between 1946 and 1949. The St. Lawrence proposal will be only a minor matter in comparison with our entire defense machinery. Every defense expert believes that a 5-year period will take our efforts completely beyond the realm of practicability. We cannot work now on defense projects so far removed into the future.

Chief among these obstacles in the St. Lawrence proposal is the belief of many well-informed Americans that in the immediate world emergency the millions of dollars (possibly reaching a billion, in fact) could be better spent for more pressing needs.

From the standpoint of national defense we must consider no less than five difficulties:

(1) The most optimistic estimate places the completion date of this project at a time somewhere in 1946–49.

(2) For the amount of money necessary to build the waterway we could build more than one hundred destroyers, thirty 10,000-ton cruisers, or fourteen 35,000-ton battleships. Ask Winston Churchill which he would prefer—the St. Lawrence development or the battleships, and you have an irrefutable answer to the specious argument that this proposal is an element in national or international defense.

(3) We are engaged in building the greatest standing Army and developing the largest Navy our country has ever known. The funds necessary to complete the waterway amount to more than the normal peacetime appropriations for both our Navy and our Army. I believe that as a nondefense expenditure these funds should not be appropriated where there are urgent defense needs still to be met.

(4) The argument that the development of hydroelectric power made possible by the project could be used for defense purposes is meaningless in the light of the fact that this power would not be available for several years, and in the realization that there stands an idle power plant at Niagara Falls capable of generating vast amounts of electric current still seemingly unnecessary.

(5) Mr. Roosevelt has said in support of the project that it is necessary in order that we may produce electric power "necessary to national defense."

As I have said, the power part of the project could not become operative until 1946. Meanwhile, we have at hand virtually inexhaustible supplies of coal for the generation of steam power where such power is needed, in adequate amounts and at one-half the cost of hydroelectric power. And in this connection it is pertinent to point out that both the proposed seaway and the power-project menace the future prosperity of one of our leading industries—coal mining. Experts of that industry who have studied all the reports and engineering data on the St. Lawrence project assert that the hydroelectric plant in the St. Lawrence would be directly competitive with steam production of power and that if the suggested 1,100,000 horsepower (the American share of production) were achieved, the coal equivalent of such a block of power would be 5,139,000 tons annually.

We must bear in mind several other factors, too, in seeking to reach a fair and intelligent conclusion with respect to the St. Lawrence proposal. The St. Lawrence is navigable only from May to November of each year. Available statistics indicate that only 5 percent of the ships which might make use of the waterway are American owned. Literally hundreds of labor organizations have gone on record in opposition to the proposed development. Railroads, inland water carriers, ports along the Atlantic and the Mexican Gulf are equally opposed to the proposal.

As for the assertion with respect to the construction of oceangoing vessels out of the reach of bombing planes, the answers seem all too obvious. We know enough about the tremendous progress of aviation to realize that no man may set limits today upon the range of military planes tomorrow.

When we realize these many objections to the St. Lawrence, and when we recognize that American taxpayers are already being burdened with tremendous taxes, with more in store for next year, I believe that we must determine to postpone consideration of the St. Lawrence waterway until such time as we can discuss it objectively and until we can afford to construct it.

And this is where the debate stands for the present. We have a choice before us. Is it more useful to spend our funds for the construction of this waterway than to spend them for the construction of more planes, ships, tanks, and guns? Would Winston Churchill, answering this question for us, choose the St. Lawrence waterway or would he choose the weapons of war?

In analysis it appears clear that this project, the cost of which might approach a billion dollars, promises little benefit to the American farmer, threatens the continued prosperity of miners and railroad employees and industries unable to meet the competition of cheap foreign labor products of which can be transported by foreign vessels at low operating costs and distress ocean freight rates.

Such competition would strike seriously at the prosperity of industries which depend upon our great inland markets, would cut down employment in our industries, and reduce revenues to our railroads, inland water carriers, and port and terminal facilities.

We have no clear conception of the cost of the project. It is variously estimated, as I said, to range between $600,000,000 to $1,000,000,000. We have, however, the precedents of similar constructions to guide our opinions on this proposal. We know that costs in the construction of seaways and canals greatly exceeded early optimistic estimates.

We know also that estimates of Government expenditures invariably fall far short of expectations. We have one example of that in recent disclosures of the estimates and actual costs of Army cantonments.

In this time of vast expenditure on immediate necessities of the defense program, with the prospect of tax burdens exceeding all levies in our history we should exercise the greatest caution in undertaking commitments which are not vital to our immediate necessities.

In my judgment, this is no time for another Passamaquoddy. Let us not squander funds in time of danger which we have refused in times of peace.

Housing Facilities for Government Agencies and Employees

REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1941

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, last week I called to the attention of the House the overcrowded conditions existing in the city of Washington. Since that time I have heard from many Members asking that something be done to relieve it. I have therefore prepared a resolution which I am going to file requesting the President to make some arrangements whereby some of the bureaus and departments not connected with the defense program would be moved to other cities where there is plenty of space—where there is no overcrowding.

This will bring about greater economy and greater efficiency, and I would like especially to point out the fact that Chicago is the focal point at the very center of our country and most favorably located to agriculture and industry. It must also be recognized that it is the railroad center of America, and in that connection I feel that the Interstate Commerce Commission would find that it would function most efficiently from Chicago; also, there is no reason why the Social Security Board and most of the bureaus of the Departments of Agriculture and Interior cannot be transferred to advantage. The transfer of these bureaus and agencies alone would relieve to a great extent the overcrowded conditions in Washington and, I repeat, would result in greater efficiency and economy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to embody in my remarks the resolution I am now filing, and I hope it will have the support of the membership.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The resolution referred to follows:

Whereas, due to the national-defense program, new bureaus and agencies have been created requiring additional office and working facilities in the city of Washington; and

Whereas, due to the tremendous increase in the personnel of Government service which has resulted not only in an overcrowding and lack of office facilities but in a serious shortage in hotel accommodations, rooms, houses, and restaurant facilities; and

Whereas adequate building and housing facilities may be had without delay not only in the city of Chicago but also in other cities favorably located, where the cost of living is more reasonable than in the city of Washington; and

Whereas, due to its central location and accessibility, many Government agencies conduct hearings and carry on other activities in the city of Chicago; and

Whereas if such agencies are located in the city of Chicago the Government will save tremendous sums in rentals, traveling expenses, and the time of its officials, and the removal of such agencies to Chicago will afford Government employees lower costs in living, better working and housing facilities, and will tend for higher efficiency: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President is requested and authorized to direct the transfer from the District of Columbia to Chicago or elsewhere such departments, or bureaus thereof, and such independent agencies whose activities can be conducted at least as efficiently and economically in such locality designated by him.

Gasoline-Tax Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. LARRABEE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1941

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY CONFERENCE OF INDIANA HIGHWAY USERS

Mr. LARRABEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a statement prepared by the Indiana Highway Users Conference, at their meeting at Indianapolis, Ind., May 8, opposing the proposal to increase the Federal gasoline tax.

It is my belief that the statement conveys the sentiment of a very large portion of the taxpayers, and I feel that their views deserve our most careful consideration.

The statement follows:

To bear a fair share of the cost of general government is the responsibility of every citizen throughout the country, and Indiana citizens will not shirk that responsibility. This is particularly true of the cost of the national-defense program.

The Federal gasoline tax is an excise tax, and the revenue it yields now is being used to finance general governmental functions, including national defense. The annual payment made toward the cost of general government by an individual in the form of Federal gasoline taxes obviously is measured by the amount of gasoline he consumes. Some individuals consume more than others because they live farther from their place of employment or because as farmers or salesmen they must consume gasoline to make a living. Accordingly, their Federal gasoline tax payments for the support of general government are greater.

It is the opinion of the Indiana Highway Users Conference that dependence on the gasoline tax to raise revenue for general governmental purposes is unsound because the distance a citizen travels on the highways or the extent to which he uses his farm tractor is a very poor measure of his responsibility for the cost of government.

These considerations have become particularly significant with the initiation of the preparedness program by the Federal Government, evidences of which may be seen in all parts of Indiana. Shortage of housing and labor in centers working on defense projects is requiring the assembly of skilled industrial workers from wide areas throughout the State and even from neighboring States. The transportation of these workers to their jobs has been facilitated by the private automobile to a degree possible by no other means. Consequently, workers are known to be driving back and forth to work each day on a round trip taking 4 hours, not through preference but through necessity.

In Indiana, hundreds of thousands of such workers are engaged in such defense production. There are the airplane parts and munitions plants at Indianapolis, the munitions plant in Union Center, the airplane motor plant at South Bend, the steel plants at Gary and other points throughout the State, and the aircraft plants at Fort Wayne. Studies by the Automobile Manufacturers Association show that about 70 percent of these workers depend upon their own automobiles and those of fellow workers in traveling to and from their jobs.

It would be unjust to increase the gasoline tax and penalize those Indiana citizens who thus must sacrifice a substantial portion of their own time in getting back and forth to their defense work by automobile. In addition to making sacrifices in personal time through no choice of their own, they would be called upon to pay a greater share of the defense costs, simply because they had to travel farther to get to their jobs.

The significance of the automobile as a means of transportation for defense workers is emphasized even further when it is appreciated that two-thirds of all the communities in this country with a population of more than 2,500 possess no system of mass transportation whatever, i. e., trolley or bus lines.

Gasoline consumed in motortrucking also is of vital importance to satisfactory completion of the defense program. This factor is especially significant because 1,213 communities in Indiana are not served by the railroads. Hence, their residents must depend wholly upon motor transportation for their contact with the outside world. Moreover, it is a definite national objective to disperse plants engaged in defense contracts away from railroad terminals and other similar centers of communication for strategic military reasons. Such plants must be served by motor transportation to get employees, raw materials, and finished products to and from these isolated localities.

Because the Federal gasoline tax has proven itself a substantial producer of revenue, there is temptation to turn to this tax again as additional revenue is needed. There is a tendency to forget that the gasoline tax is essentially a State tax, that every State in the country taxes gasoline, some at rates as high as 7 cents a gallon. In several States, local governments also impose their own gasoline taxes. A Federal gasoline tax necessarily must be considered as an addition to these taxes in order to weigh properly its burden.

Indiana collected a State tax on gasoline long before the enactment of any Federal gasoline tax and currently taxes gasoline at the rate of 4 cents a gallon. Together with the current Federal tax of 1½ cents a gallon, the State gasoline levy represents a sales tax of 38 percent on the retail price of gasoline at the service station in South Bend. Yet a retail sales tax of 3 or 4 percent usually is considered unreasonably excessive.

The gasoline tax now is an established factor in the Indiana State tax system. In current years it has produced about 32 percent of the total tax revenue of the State. Except for pay-roll taxes for social security, no other single tax produced as much revenue for the State.

Using revenue from the State gasoline tax and other highway-user levies, income from bond issues, and funds provided by the Federal Government's program of highway aid, Indiana has invested hundreds of millions of dollars in an extensive State highway system. Moreover, the counties, towns, and cities throughout the State receive from the State highway fund considerably more than $10,000,000 each year to spend on local

roads and streets. This investment would be jeopardized if the income of the State highway department, which is so dependent on the yield from the State gasoline tax, should be undermined by excessive duplicating Federal gasoline taxes, because roads must be properly maintained or they deteriorate rapidly.

Without complaint, Indiana motor-vehicle operators have accepted an extra portion of the costs of national defense. During 1940 the increases enacted in the Federal gasoline and automotive excise taxes were considerably greater than those imposed upon any other taxpaying group.

As average citizens motorists pay all the general taxes levied by the Federal Government. In addition, as highway users, they alone pay the special automotive taxes. As a result, Indiana motorists now are contributing in excess of $13,500,000 more each year to the Federal Government than other citizens of Indiana who do not operate motor vehicles.

Reliable studies by Federal governmental agencies disclose that the average Indiana motorist earns between $20 and $30 weekly. In spite of his low income, the Indiana motorist now bears a disproportionate share of the State and Federal tax burden. Special State automotive taxes are now costing the average motorist in Indiana more than $38 annually. Federal automotive levies extract an additional $15 per year. Indiana motorists, therefore, spend about 2 weeks' wages just to meet their annual automotive tax bill. Of course, motor-vehicle operators pay all the general State taxes, too.

Gasoline often carelessly is classified with liquor, cosmetics, and other luxuries. Such a classification is both erroneous and misleading. In most Indiana car-owning families transportation by automobile ranks right along with food, shelter, and clothing as a necessity of life.

The majority of all passenger-car travel on the highways is strictly for business purposes, according to Government studies. Recent traffic surveys indicate that nearly two-thirds of all traffic in Indiana is business and commercial traffic. Trucks alone account for more than 25 percent of all gasoline consumption in the State. And yet, both the State and Federal Governments tax gasoline as if it actually were a luxury.

Increased gasoline taxes inevitably must result in increased costs of moving goods vital to national defense, for the motortruck is depended upon to correlate the productive efforts of the entire Nation. Production centers are vitally dependent upon rapid and efficient highway transportation, and thousands of industrial workers and miners must use the automobile for transportation to and from their job of rearming America.

Since complete freedom of the highways, obviously, is essential to the defense efforts and to the conduct of civilian life, it is, therefore, well to consider that a further tax burden upon highway users may act as a barrier to trade which seriously will impede the Nation's efforts rapidly to attain complete preparedness.

The Indiana Highway Users Conference embodies the following organizations: Hoosier Motor Club; Automobile Dealers' Association of Indianapolis; Indiana Motor Traffic Association; Indiana Bus Operators' Association; Indiana Independent Petroleum Association; Indiana Farm Bureau; Indiana Petroleum Industries Committee; Indiana Retail Hardware Association; Private Truck Owners of Indiana, Inc.; Indiana Lumber and Builders Supply Association; Manufacturers of Dairy Products; Indiana Bakers Association; Indiana School Bus Drivers' Association; Indianapolis Auto Trade Association; Indiana Rural Letter Carriers' Association.

In Memory of Andy Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1941

POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit for insertion a poem written by Horace C. Carlisle in memory of William Andrew Smith, long and affectionately known by everyone on Capitol Hill as Andy Smith:

Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints. Psalms 116: 15.

ANDY SMITH

William Andrew Smith is gone,
Loved by everyone who knew him.
Every year, as time moved on,
Drew his friends the closer to him.
When, at eighty-six, he died,
Heaven's guardians saw to it
That the gate was open wide
And he peacefully passed through it.

All the Capitol reveres—
Friends, acquaintances, and neighbors,
Him who, sixty-five long years,
Was untiring in his labors;
And, because he was so kind,
Gentle, courteous, and clever,
Andy Smith will live, enshrined
In our memories forever.

There, in Statuary Hall,
At his desk, no more we'll greet him—
Every morning when we call
For a RECORD we'll not meet him.
We who knew him lost a friend
Whose sweet memory we'll cherish,
Which can, till our lives all end,
Never, never, never perish.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Longevity Pay for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 16, 1941

ADDRESS BY JOHN J. BARRETT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered on May 2, 1941, by Mr. John J. Barrett, president of the United National Association of Post Office Clerks, on the subject of Longevity Pay for Postal Employees.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening radio audience. In the beginning I want to thank this station for giving me this opportunity to speak with you for a few minutes about the Postal employees. God has blessed our country in many ways and one of those blessings is the fact that its employees throughout the years have proven to the American people, and to the world at large, that they are faithful and loyal. They are efficient and strive to increase their efficiency. This must be said of the employees of the Postal Service. Twenty-four hours a day, around the clock every minute of the hour, you will find a post-office clerk on duty, hail, rain, or shine, he performs his appointed rounds. His services are not confined to postal duties alone as witnessed by the distribution of the veterans bonus, the registering of the unemployed, the registration of the workers of this Nation for social security, the gigantic task of registering the aliens residing in this country and now the sale of defense bonds, and many more jobs of great magnitude not within the scope of the Postal Service. All of these tasks were performed faithfully and well. Nothing is more valuable to an employer than honesty, faithfulness, loyalty, and devotion to duty; it can well be said that Postal Employees possess all of these fine qualities. They devote their life to their job, thereby causing the least possible turnover of labor in any Government department. We all know how costly changing of employees is to an employer.

Are they not entitled to a reward for their long years of meritorious service? I believe the American people will answer "yes" to this question.

At no time in the past or at present have the postal employees received compensation comparable to their real worth. We ask our postal employees to be good citizens, we demand that they be a credit to our Postal Service, to themselves, and their families. We expect them to live and to rear their families according to the American way of life. We expect them to educate their children, to fortify them with the necessities of this life, and when we do this, and most of us do, we find after our task has been completed, we have little to look forward to for ourselves. Up to now Uncle Sam has not appreciated these men of the Postal Service for the work they perform so faithfully and well.

In 1928 the first longevity bill was introduced in the Congress, and in each succeeding Congress similar bills have been introduced. However, no action was every taken on any of these bills. The opportunity for promotion in the Postal Service is very much limited. The record proves this to be so, therefore, we must create an incentive for those men of the Postal Service who have not been fortunate enough to secure promotion to continue their loyalty and devotion to duty.

I know of no better way to accomplish this than through the establishment of the principle of longevity. I do not believe it is asking too much of the American people to reward its employees, who have proven their real worth, with the sum of $100 after they have served 10 years and for each succeeding 5 years, until he has completed 30 years.

Private industry rewards its faithful employees, so do individuals, why not the great-

est Government on earth? May I ask you to write your United States Senator and your Congressman in our behalf?

I Am an American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1941

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it is good that President Roosevelt, in accordance with an act by Congress, has proclaimed Sunday, May 18, as I Am an American Day. It is being observed in recognition of our citizens who have attained their majority or who have been naturalized within the past year.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with this subject I desire to include at this point certain parts of a speech by Hon. W. E. Baker, Federal judge for the northern district of West Virginia. It was given when this jurist spoke to 52 new citizens recently in Wheeling. The Intelligencer tells the story in the following way:

Judge Baker opened his address by giving the new citizens a warm welcome.

"You should be happy, for there is no earthly possession of greater value than being a citizen of the United States of America." He then briefly outlined the spiritual, philosophical and legal principles underlying what we call America, and demonstrated how the laws and customs of the United States have ever basically followed the preamble of the Constitution, and particularly the first series of amendments known as the Bill of Rights. After reciting these fundamental and undeniable rights of every American citizen, whether native born or naturalized, Judge Baker interpreted the same in plain language which all could readily understand. All this means, he said, "that you can go to any church you please; that you can see, read, and hear anything you like; that you can express your opinion freely; that your mail will not be opened or your telephone tapped; that you may join any political party of your liking; that you can vote for what or whom you please; that you can ever demand and get a trial by jury of your fellow citizens, if accused; and that neither your life nor property may be forfeited nor even your home searched without due process of written law."

The Federal jurist then explained that it is not necessary to be a lawyer to comprehend the primary purpose of all sound American law—that the Golden Rule always has been the guiding principle: "The Golden Rule," he said, "with but slight variation of phraseology, is the basis of every great world religion—the Christian, the Buddhist, the Confucian, the Mohammedan, the Hebrew, and even the great mythologies of antiquity. It is a striking historical fact that so long as a people practiced this principle in their daily lives, they survived; and that when they ceased to make it their guiding and abiding principle in both their private and their public lives, they perished." He then sharply contrasted the rights, privileges and safeties guaranteed by American law with the harsh and sumptuary dictates of Nazi and Communist governments, in which the citizen is simply the hopeless slave of a party, which is the "state," pointing out how this affected every kind of human activity—the home and the church, industry and the arts, and every domestic or civil consideration.

REVERE THE LAW

This led to an eloquent plea for law-observance by all, inasmuch as the people alone have power to make, amend, or repeal the laws which govern them in this democracy as they see fit. He quoted from Lincoln: "Let reverence for the law be breathed by every American mother to her babe. Let it be taught in the schools and colleges. Let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in the legislative halls, and enforced in the courts of justice. In fine, let it become the political religion of this country."

Judge Baker's concluding words were: The American Republic must always be true to itself, ever ready to protect the rights of the humble, to redress every wrong, to avenge every crime, to vindicate the majesty of the law, and to preserve inviolate our sacred principles of free institutions against enemies from within and against the attacks of pernicious alien propaganda whether armed with gold or armed with steel.

"Rome endured as long as there were true Romans and our beloved country will endure as long as we remain true Americans in spirit, thought, and deed."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include also the following editorial from the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Sun-Telegraph:

I AM AN AMERICAN—A PRICELESS BOON

President Roosevelt has asked the American people to observe Sunday, May 18, as I Am an American Day for the following purpose:

"To impress upon all our citizens, those native born and naturalized, the special significance of citizenship in this Nation."

The President may be sure his urging will not be in vain.

His suggestion fits squarely with the new national practice of designating a special day, and in many cases an entire week, for emphasizing the duties and privileges of American citizenship—and, of course, it was meant to do so.

American Citizenship Week, in fact, will be so widely observed throughout the United States this year during the week of May 12 to 18 that it hardly seems possible the movement could have attained its present importance and scope in just 2 years.

But that is exactly what has happened.

Two years ago, the observance of citizenship day was a purely local event in the city of Manitowoc and the county of Manitowoc in the State of Wisconsin. The object of the observance was to assemble all of the young people of the community who had attained the age of 21 during the year at a public ceremony, welcoming them to the status of American citizenship.

On that particular occasion 2 years ago the Hearst newspapers noted that 350 young men and women of the Wisconsin community had been so honored. The scene was so inspiring, and the idea so meritorious, that these newspapers were prompted to suggest Nation-wide emulation.

The response was amazing. In a matter of weeks cities as far away from Wisconsin as San Francisco and Los Angeles had likewise honored their newest citizens. Pittsburgh joined the movement at an early date.

And a year later, with the support of the American Legion and the National Education Association, there were Citizenship Day observances in a majority of the States.

While the original purpose of honoring new citizens is more than ever characteristic of the special day or week devoted to emphasis on American citizenship, it was inevitable that infinitely broader purposes would be served.

The special significance of citizenship is, of course, not a matter that relates to special groups.

As the President says, it is a matter of significance to "all our citizens, both native-born and naturalized."

Thus the privilege of saying, "I am an American," extends to all who are worthy of it and accept its obligations and conduct themselves in accordance with the fundamental principles of this Nation.

The manner of observance of "I Am An American Day" and of American Citizenship Week will vary in the several States.

In many communities, such as in San Francisco, where Mayor Angelo Rossi has appointed a special committee of citizens for the purpose, separate days of the entire week will be designated for specific purposes.

The functions and duties of government will be discussed for the information and enlightenment of the people on one day.

Other days will be devoted to greater appreciation of our basic American liberties, the freedom of speech and assembly, the freedom of the press and of religion.

Still other days will stress the historic background and tremendous merit of free education.

And, of course, those who attained citizenship during the past year, either by naturalization or attainment of maturity, will be recognized and honored on their special day.

This is one of the most constructive and invigorating of all our public enterprises.

It attests the alert and earnest Americanism of the President that he lends the weight of his high office and the inspiration of his exceptional personality to such an enterprise.

Never at any time in our national history has there been greater need for appreciation of the significance of American citizenship.

It is the target of alien, radical, and skeptical and disloyal attack. But it is also the hope of the civilized world and the richest possession of every man and woman who can say in all pride and humbleness, in all gratitude and appreciation:

"I am an American."

The Imperative Necessity of Economy—How To Save $2,000,000,000 in Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN T. TREADWAY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1941

STATEMENT BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE BY DR. GEORGE S. BENSON, PRESIDENT OF HARDING COLLEGE, SEARCY, ARK.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is my desire at this time to call to the attention of the House a most remarkable statement made before the Ways and Means Committee yesterday in the course of the hearings on the proposed tax bill. The statement deals principally with the imperative necessity of economy in Government expenditures, and specific references are made therein as to how we can save $2,000,000,000. For the latter reason

alone it is worthy of most serious consideration.

I have been a member of the Ways and Means Committee for a good many years, and I can truthfully say that this statement is one of the best that has ever been presented to the committee, not only during the present hearings but in my entire service. It was made by the president of a small college in Searcy, Ark., Dr. George S. Benson. We are accustomed to thinking of professors as impractical men, but Dr. Benson, both as manager of a school in Canton, China, and as president of Harding College, has had a good deal of practical experience in economizing and in getting the most for the limited funds at his disposal. During his experience in China, he said, he had learned the value of a tenth of a cent. Harding College, he told the committee, has no endowment and no State assistance, yet one can send four boys through the school for what the Government spends on one C. C. C. boy, provided the student works about 1 hour a day. One of the members of the committee paid Dr. Benson the compliment of saying that if he had a boy of university age he would certainly send him to Harding College.

Dr. Benson told the committee that Harding College had doctors of philosophy on its faculty receiving only $1,200 per year, while the largest salary paid was $1,800. Yet the high character of the college is attested by the fact that its students have won the highest awards in the great majority of scholastic contests.

I mention these facts so that the Members of the House may see that Dr. Benson is eminently qualified to speak as an expert in economizing. In my opinion, his statement should be circulated all over the United States. Here is a gentleman who has come out of the West from a small and little-known college to show the Congress how it can save money—a lesson which it needs to learn badly.

Dr. Benson was complimented on his testimony by numerous members of the committee, and I made the statement that as soon as the House convened today I would seek to have his able and forceful remarks made a part of the RECORD, which permission I now request, Mr. Speaker.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF DR. GEORGE S. BENSON, PRESIDENT OF HARDING COLLEGE, SEARCY, ARK., BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, MAY 15, 1941

My name is George S. Benson. I am president of Harding College of Searcy, Ark. I represent a small college, located in a small town, in a small State, but I know of no bigger, nor more important idea than the one to which we wish to add our testimony. Gentlemen, the citizens of Arkansas are interested in economy—individual economy, and governmental economy. They are expert at paring expenses to the bone. They have to be.

The average per capita income for all Arkansas residents is only $255 a year. For a family it is $969. If our people were not expert in eliminating unnecessary expense they could not live.

During the past 4 years our college has carried on a program to which the instructors and professors of every college in Arkansas were invited, and to the meetings of which heads of departments from every senior college in the State came. In these meetings economists and financial men, including Dr. E. W. Kemmerer and others of national reputation spoke and led discussions.

As a result of this program I have become increasingly interested in our Nation's financial future.

I have read all I could of the testimony given at your hearings.

I have recently discussed the subject which I am to present with the leading people of my State, including the former Governor of Arkansas, the president of the Federal Reserve bank, and so forth. A great deal of material has been furnished me by them.

I believe that these ideas are approved by the great majority of the citizens of my State, and I know that their manner of living is entirely consistent with these ideas.

You have heard quite a few witnesses from Chicago, New York, and also from various States, but I believe I am the only one who has come from Arkansas, and I hope you can spare 15 or 20 minutes for our views.

I wish to discuss the importance of eliminating nonessential governmental expenses in connection with the raising of revenue through taxation. And I may say frankly that, with many of the people of Arkansas, I am alarmed about the future of our Government if we continue to increase and increase taxation. My fear, however, and the fears of those whom I represent is not the fear of the taxpayer because of high taxes alone but a genuine fear least our capitalistic form of government be destroyed—a form of government which has given the best living conditions any generation of mankind has ever enjoyed.

Gentlemen, the entire history of nations and especially the economic history of nations during the past 25 years, shows that we, the people of the United States, are headed directly toward three steps, which occur in the following order—inflation, socialism, and the worst type of dictatorship. Unless the proper initial steps are taken by your committee and the Finance Committee of the United States Senate and the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses, it is my sincere belief that the people of this country will witness these events.

First. All savings, all property which today has a dollar value, all life insurance and annuities, in fact, everything upon which we have depended to make us financially independent when we grow old, will either be wiped out completely or will be worth only a fraction of its present value. This happened in Germany, France, Italy, and Russia.

Second. Following this or coincident with it, we can expect a socialistic form of government. Individual initiative, private ownership, the stirring of ambition through financial incentive, all of these and many other of our cherished ideals will no longer exist. This happened in German, Italy, and Russia. Although France did not completely give up the capitalistic system, the extent to which socialists controlled the government was sufficient to prevent proper defense preparedness and in the opinion of many was largely responsible for losing the war. No secret is being made of the fact that the present Government in England is expected to be exchanged for socialism. According to press reports, it is considered today by English leaders as having fewer evils than the other after-the-war possibilities. While it is true that Great Britain's leaders are being forced to look upon future socialism with complacency—with the thought that no other desirable alternative exists for them—it does not follow that the United States must likewise accept this philosophy. Whether or not we are forced to later on depends upon the steps taken now (before the 1941 tax bill is completed) by your committee and the Senate Finance Committee.

Third. In Germany, Italy, Russia, other smaller countries, and now in France, the inflation which led to socialism then led to dictatorship. This statement is so self-evident that it needs no explanation.

I shall endeavor to explain first, why we are headed toward these three steps and then explain why I believe that its prevention depends upon what is done by your committee, the Finance Committee of the Senate, and the Appropriations Committees.

ARE WE HEADED TOWARD AN INFLATION CONFLAGRATION?

Mr. Leon Henderson told you that during and after the last World War we had a rising price and wage spiral because no attempt was made to control prices but that every effort would now be made to prevent this type of inflation. Such efforts are very important, and the administration should be commended for making the effort, but I cannot believe that the Government will be successful in preventing these price rises, while I see:

1. The continuous parade of strikes being settled by wage increases—your Mr. Robertson indicated[1] that no strike from January to March had been settled on any other basis than an increased wage.

2. Scarcity and increases in prices on some imported raw materials, such as rubber, tin, hides, wool, sugar, silk, vegetable oils, etc.

3. Corporations being forced to pay the penalty scale (time and a half, I believe) for more than 40 hours per week, when a 40-hour week, in defense industries, is suicidal.

4. The great probability of corporations following the example of luxury and waste which the Government itself sets before them, instead of paring all unnecessary expenses to the bone.

No, gentlemen; if these things are to continue (and I have seen no certainty of their discontinuance—have you?), prices will rise.

This price-rising type of inflation, however, is not the form of inflation which I fear most. The type which I dread to think of is that which completely wiped out German currency and eliminated four-fifths of the value of the franc. Dollar devaluation may be achieved by different methods in this country, but the results would be just as disastrous, and I believe that we are headed in that direction.

WHAT ARE THE INDICATIONS OF OUR APPROACHING THIS TYPE OF INFLATION?

Mr. Jesse Jones, I believe, anticipates a Federal debt of $90,000,000,000, but this is probably not the limit, as about every 6 months the published estimated needs of bombers, ships, tanks, men, and other war material are increased. If he estimates $90,000,000,000 today, the estimate next year will probably be much higher. We also already have other governmental debt (not Federal) of $20,000,000,000.

Now, honestly, gentlemen, how do you think that we are going to pay this $110,000,000,000 or more? What do you think will happen after the war ends? Well, there will be a drop in war production of at least $20,000,000,000 per year—Mr. Leon Henderson estimated in his written report to you that by May 1942 we will be spending at the rate of $24,000,000,000 per year on defense—also several million men will be laid off employment, and several million soldiers probably will then be mustered out with few jobs available. Is it then that we will begin to reduce the billion dollars per year that we are now spending on W. P. A.? No; I expect this appropriation to be greatly increased after the war. Will our tax receipts then exceed our desires to spend to such an extent that the surplus can be used to pay off our $110,000,000,000 indebtedness? Is it not likely that there will be a strong temptation to wipe the indebtedness out through devaluing the dollar? Will

[1] P. 22 of report No. 1 of these hearings.

not some leaders explain that by revaluing the dollar at 20 cents our $22,000,000,000 of gold will increase in value $88,000,000,000, and then recommend that this $88,000,000,000 be used to reduce the indebtedness? Do you realize, gentlemen, that the interest on a $100,000,000,000 debt 5 years from now will probably be $3,000,000,000 per year, and that during the 10 years ending in 1932 the total United States Government expenses averaged less than $4,000,000,000? No doubt great pressure will be applied to wipe out this $3,000,000,000 interest charge, and the indebtedness, through dollar devaluation.

If from now until the end of the war Congress and the administration have a spendthrift, wasteful psychology, I shall expect some such suggestion to be enacted; but if every unnecessary expense is eliminated, if Congress and the administration are just as much interested in eliminating waste as they are in raising revenue, this need not happen.

WHAT ARE THE FACTS AND WHERE ARE WE HEADING?

First. Government officials are reluctant to recommend or discuss specific reductions. When Mr. Eccles, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board, testified here last week, he was unusually well informed regarding various methods of raising money through taxation, but he seemed to be unable to furnish any information regarding the amount of unnecessary nondefense expenses existing or any methods of reducing them. For example, Mr. Eccles presented a complete schedule of individual income-tax rates, also detailed suggestions regarding estate tax, gift tax, excise tax, excess-profits tax, and methods of closing loopholes; but, although questioned repeatedly, he was not able to specify a single expense item that could properly be reduced. He must have studied the subject, because he had previously made some general recommendations regarding it at the United States Chamber of Commerce meeting.

I regret that the intelligence which so ably furnished information on the many methods of raising revenue was not able to present one specific recommendation for reducing unnecessary expenses, although Mr. Morgenthau, another official, had previously stated,[2] "If the matter were very carefully examined, we believe it is possible to reduce the total (nondefense expenditures) by $1,000,000,000."

Mr. Leon Henderson, whose ability I greatly admire, also was not very helpful in suggesting specific reductions, although he discussed many items not usually associated with his office, such as gift tax, estate tax, life-insurance exemptions, etc.

Second. Unnecessary and unjustifiable nondefense expenses are increasing. In December 1940 there were 285,731 young men in the C. C. C. A month later there were 298,159.[3] Think of it, gentlemen, while drafting men in the Army and seeking volunteers for the Navy, we are actually increasing the C. C. C. enrollment of men of draft age. (C. C. C. has been budgeted at $265,000,000 for 1942.) As each enrollee costs the Government about $1,000 per year, this would represent an increased cost of twelve and one-half million dollars per year for the 12,428 men enrolled in January over the total enrollment as of December 31. Why is it so difficult for our Government experts to recognize that this expense can, and should be, reduced?

Third. I have estimated that between one and two billion dollars of nondefense items can be eliminated from the Budget, details of which will be given later.

Gentlemen, I am not an economist, banker, mathematician, tax expert, nor student of the law, but I believe that common ordinary horse sense will enable anyone to see that you can't pay off $110,000,000,000 as long as these conditions continue, except, of course, through the dollar devaluation type of inflation which has been so disastrous to European countries during the past 20 years. If we are to avoid this catastrophe a different type of thinking must be developed among Government officials. They must be just as deeply interested in reducing expenses and in pruning waste as they are in raising increased revenue.

REDUCING EXPENSES

This is a subject with which I have had considerable experience. Although Harding College has no endowment, and no State financial assistance, you can send four boys through Harding College for what the Government spends on one C. C. C. boy, provided the student works about 1 hour per day. This comparison may not be absolutely fair, because of the $1,025 cost for each C. C. C. enrollee in the 1940 fiscal year, $360 was paid to him. The costs, other than the $30 per month paid to the enrollee, totaled $665. This is more than enough to send two boys through Harding College, provided they work an hour a day. Why are we able to do this? We have learned how to eliminate every unnecessary expense, and we are making real sacrifices to enable these 500 poor young people to secure educations. Gentlemen, I sometimes wonder what you think, when the representative of a multimillionaire or a luxurious corporation comes before you and asks for governmental economy? Don't you often think that they are inconsistent? That cannot be true with us, however. We have, and have had, Ph. D.'s on our faculty receiving only $1,200 per year, who turned down offers elsewhere of $4,000 and more. They make these sacrifices to enable our poor young people to secure an education. Our highest salary today is $1,800, and yet our students, in competition with students of other colleges, have won the highest awards in the great majority of the contests.

I managed a school in Canton, China, for several years, raised and expended all the income, and there I learned the value of a tenth of a cent. So, gentlemen, when I say that I have had considerable experience in pruning unnecessary expenses, please do not think that I am boasting or that I am a theorist. I have estimated that if our governmental departments make the same revenue sacrifices which are being asked of all taxpayers approximately $2,000,000,000 can be saved, as follows:

	Millions	*Millions*
Items that probably can be eliminated during the emergency:		
C. C. C.	$265	
N. Y. A.	99	
Soil conservation	500	
Federal aid to roads	180	
Total		$1,044
Items which can probably be cut in half during emergency:		
Rivers, harbors, and flood control[1]	$121	
National park improvements	10	
Agriculture, forests, and trails	10	
Rural rehabilitation	66	
Food stamp	100	
Export bounties	100	
Last year's appropriation for W. P. A. (Will not the $20,000,000,000 defense program cut unemployment at least in half?)	1,325	
Total	1,774	
One-half is		$887
Items the total of which can probably be reduced 25 percent:		
Agriculture departmental expense (in addition to agriculture aids)	$114	
Department of Commerce	31	
Department of the Interior	70	
Department of Justice	55	
War Department — nonmilitary activities	45	
Miscellaneous independent offices	66	
Refugee relief	18	
Total	[2] 399	
One-fourth is		100
Grand total		2,031

[1] For several generations it has been assumed that this item contains "political pork." I believe that it is possible to reduce it.

[2] Congress used for franking in 1928, $845,000; in 1940,: $737,000. Departments used for franking in 1928, $6,000,000; for publicity and franking in 1940, $39,000,000. I understand that professionals are employed to prepare radio scripts and movie films and that the most luxurious types of publicity are included.

[3] I do not know what cuts could be made in these items. Some may need to be increased. It would be strange if a close scrutiny did not result in finding $100,000,000 that can be suspended during the emergency.

May I repeat that if your committee does not take some such step as recommended by Congressman DISNEY,[4] page 13, report No. 1 of these hearings, or unless the same results are achieved by other methods, we are approaching catastrophic inflation.

SOCIALISM

When the value behind the capital owned by capitalists in Germany was wiped out, it was easy to take the next step which resulted in socialism. I shan't take time to discuss this subject but surely you have recognized a general feeling in the air that after 5 or 10 years of war there is likely to be some controlling form of socialism in England and in the United States. There is a drift in that direction. Just the other day a high Government official indicated in his testimony here that the estate tax should be used to prevent a man from passing property to his children. Socialism and communism teach that. They would like to see all inheritances prevented and they want the death tax rates used primarily to prevent your having the right to leave anything to your children. Capitalism would increase estate-tax rates because the Government needs the money, but when our Government refuses to admit that such family obligations exist after death and when it uses the tax primarily to prevent you from passing your property to your family, then instead of capitalism, we will be copying from communism and socialism, from that form of government which in Russia and in Germany teaches that the family unit and the family religion must be destroyed because it is the state's greatest enemy. Gentlemen,

[2] P. 13, Rept. No. 1 of your hearings.

[3] P. 7, Employment and pay rolls, January 1941.

[4] "There is nothing on earth to keep this committee from including in a tax bill a list of repeals of appropriations. We might have some trouble getting a rule on that, but it can be done if we want to do it."

if our dollar, like the French franc is devalued to one-fifth of its present value, the change from inflation to socialism will then be almost a certainty, and just as night follows day, dictatorship will be the third step but it is in your power to prevent even the first step.

CONCLUSION

I hope you will not think that any of my illustrations are extreme. To me, the questions involved are extremely serious and the danger very real. We can avoid inflation and the evils which follow it, provided the first steps are taken before the House passes the 1941 tax bill that you are planning to recommend. We are at the crossroads—where will we be 5 or 10 years from now? That depends upon whether we continue drifting toward the three disastrous steps I have pictured or whether we change our course. In all seriousness I say, "May God help you."

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1941

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the forgotten man is Joe Kennedy.

An extensive poll in Indiana shows 7 percent for convoys and 5 percent for war.

Send Hoover, the only living ex-President, to Berlin as a messenger for peace.

The thought that Germany might crumble from within furnishes a reason why we are not needed.

Even Grace Coolidge has been lifted from cloister to lead the Freedom to Fight Committee.

There should be an Executive order against fireworks on this Fourth of July out of sympathy to England.

If we are dragged into the war when over 90 percent of the people are opposed to it, then democracy has failed here.

If we had stayed neutral, we might now have been the instrument for peace. Peace now would be a blow to communism.

We have a tradition of voting $2,500 for painting the picture of every Speaker of the House, even while living.

The 46-year-old Hess, who flew the North Sea alone, then inverted his plane and parachuted out, has raised the stock of us old men.

Harry Hopkins, our No. 3 man, was flown over the Atlantic to the same island and has done a lot of other flying alone upside down.

Andy Smith, 86, worked on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 67 years without retirement or luxurious quarters. He recalled John J. Ingalls' coming to the Senate.

The president of a small college in Arkansas told the committee preparing the tax bill how to save $2,000,000,000 per year. He was called a remarkable witness.

The visit of Lord Halifax to Kansas City had for its main purpose getting our boys in the war over there, and yet apparently he had a lot of attention.

Aid for Great Britain and the Defense of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. GIBSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1941

RESOLUTION OF LEON MARTIN POST, NO. 25, AMERICAN LEGION, BARNESVILLE, GA.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Leon Martin Post, No. 25, of the American Legion, at Barnesville, Ga.:

Whereas our country is definitely committed against an Axis victory and in favor of a victory of Great Britain and her allies; and

Whereas should the Axis governments emerge victorious in the present war, they will hold us accountable for this policy and we would be faced with a military or economic war, which we would have to fight without benefit of allies or the British Navy; and

Whereas the British Empire is fighting for everything we hold dear in life, including the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and

Whereas Germany, on the other hand, is determined to force enslavement of mankind upon the whole world and to insure sufficient future Germans to rule as masters of mankind, Germany is now raising a nation of illegitimates; and

Whereas it is a foolish and most unwise policy to allow our armaments and supplies that are so badly needed by England as well as by ourselves to be sunk before reaching their destination; and

Whereas as ex-service men, many of whom fought overseas, we feel that the prevailing idea of refusing to do our duty because we do not want American boys to fight except at home is a snare and a trap, because American soldiers had rather fight on foreign soil than to have their native land destroyed by modern-day methods of warfare: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Leon Martin Post of the American Legion of Barnesville, Ga., as follows:

(1) That the policy of the national department of the American Legion advocating the use of whatever means needed to insure safe and immediate delivery to England of the armaments and supplies shipped her be, and the same is hereby, approved.

(2) That Congress be urged to cease needless debate and to act without delay on all important legislation since idle talk during this crisis will only hurt America and her people.

(3) That conflicts between labor and industries be decried and strikes be condemned and the Government be given the power to take over those industries that refuse to submit labor controversies to arbitration.

(4) That all unfriendly aliens in this country be interned to prevent them from engaging in subversive activities.

(5) That those of our citizens whether "fifth columnists," isolationists, or "copperheads" who are now, after America has decided her course, trying to deter us in our efforts and in that course by preaching a doctrine of defeatism which can only give comfort to the aggressor nations, our national enemies, be condemned in no uncertain terms.

(6) That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States, copies to Members of Congress from Georgia, a copy to the national headquarters of the American Legion, and a copy to the press.

Adopted by Leon Martin Post, No. 25, on May 8, 1941.

JOHN M. HOWARD,
Commander.

MARKEY B. SMITH,
Adjutant.

The Farm-Labor Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1941

RESOLUTION OF POPE COUNTY FARM BUREAU ASSOCIATION

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House the serious problem in the making as regards farm labor. The following resolution adopted by the Pope County Farm Bureau Association in my congressional district serves warning of what is to come in the near future:

Whereas agriculture is a basic industry essential to national defense and there is an urgent need for stimulation in the production of certain foods such as dairy products, eggs, poultry, and pork;

Whereas there is becoming a threatening shortage of competent farm laborers because of the Selective Service drafting young men for military training from the farms: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Pope County Farm Bureau Association, That this organization go on record favoring the deferment of men employed on farms or operating farms.

POPE COUNTY FARM BUREAU ASSOCIATION.
JOHN JACOBSON, *Secretary.*

Report on Fort Devens, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Fort Devens is situated near the town of Ayer, Mass. It was a World War training camp with a

World War capacity of 36,832 men who were cantoned in 1,334 buildings. The total area of the World War camp was 10,607 acres according to the War Department records. The present project provides for 1,031 buildings which will house 24,296 officers and men.

COST

The original cost of this project was estimated at $12,474,061. This was a fixed-fee job. The latest field estimates that I have give the final cost when complete at $25,188,943, leaving a deficit of $12,714,882.

SITE

While the total area of the World War camp was 10,607 acres, the amount of land acquired up to March 1, 1940, was 15,000 with a thousand more acres to be acquired. The site is fairly well located. Practically the entire World War building area was used for either the permanent or temporary post which is being erected. The site is medium hilly, but not so as to require excessive grading costs. I have a contour map which shows that the buildings are located on fairly level land. The engineer's report to me shows that 23 miles of road was constructed and that road grading involving the removal of approximately 500,000 cubic yards of dirt was necessary.

LUMBER

Up to March 12, 50,000,000 feet of lumber was purchased, 44,000,000 of which was purchased by the Army and 6,000,000 by the contractor. The average price paid for the first 32,000,000 feet was $40.79 per thousand. The average price paid for all lumber was $41.86 per thousand board feet.

INSPECTION OF LUMBER

All lumber and material was counted or tallied by the contractor and rechecked by the construction quartermaster as it was unloaded from the car. In case of difference it was rechecked. All lumber was inspected as to quality and moisture content by the contract engineer and construction quartermaster. No moisture testing machine was used except in cases of disagreement. The lumber was up to grade and in some instances above grade.

SALVAGE

All forms were moved from building to building or area to area until worn out. Surplus lumber and material was hauled from a completed building to the next building site and no lumber was hauled to the dump that could be used on a building. The dump or salvage pile was worked over once and lumber usable for benches, tables, and so forth was salvaged and turned over to the camp quartermaster.

EQUIPMENT

The total value of all equipment used on this job was $1,525,000 of which $475,000 worth was owned by the contractor and $1,050,000 worth was owned by a third party. The amount of rental paid to March 1 was $610,500 or approximately 41 percent of its value. The Associated General Contractors' rental scale was used for all except the 13 bulldozers which were rented for a time. The usual recapture clause permitting the Government to take over any equipment they desired, applying the amount of rental paid against its appraised value, was contained in the contract.

INSPECTION OF EQUIPMENT AS TO FITNESS

Equipment was inspected as to fitness for use before rented by the contractor's mechanic and rechecked by the construction quartermaster's mechanics.

INSPECTION AS TO USE

The time of the operator of the equipment was checked four times each day. Each piece of equipment was numbered and checked four times each day in the same manner that the men were checked. All equipment and trucks remained on the job and no equipment was permitted to be removed from the reservation except the trucks that were on duty outside the reservation. Broken-down equipment was immediately sent to the repair shop where a record was kept and the time was checked to make certain that no rental was paid on equipment while under repair.

LABOR

This project employed 15,225 men at its peak, of whom 4,002 were carpenters and 7,424 were laborers. The contractor states that approximately 95 percent of the men who were paid carpenter wages were actually carpenters. He further states that 1,500 of the carpenters employed had worked for him prior to this job. The wage scale of the skilled and unskilled labor which did the larger part of the work was as follows:

	Original wage scale per hour	Increase
Asbestos workers	$1.50	
Bricklayers	1.50	
Carpenters	1.12½	$1.25
Cement finishers	1.50	
Electricians	1.12½	1.50
Laborers, unskilled	.58	.65
Machinists	1.25	
Mason tenders	.85	
Painters	.80	
Pipers	.65	
Plasterers	1.50	
Plasterer tenders	.90	
Plumbers	1.20	1.50
Steamfitters	1.20	1.50
Truck drivers:		
½ ton or less	.65	.68
Over ½ ton	.70	.71

POWER SAWS

The contractor had a central mill where the frames were fabricated. Sixty men worked at this mill. They also had power hand saws and gasoline table saws on the job.

OVERTIME

The sum of $1,350,000 was paid as premium for overtime, representing 5.3 percent of the total cost of the job. By premium I mean money paid out for services which were not actually rendered. A man working 48 hours in any 1 week where the 40-hour week was established would draw 56 hours pay if double time were given for overtime while he actually rendered only 48 hours of service. What I mean by "premium" is the money paid for the time over and above the 48 hours straight time, or 8 hours for which he was paid and did not render any service.

OVERHEAD

First. Army: 11 percent of $25,188,943, or $2,770,783. This included: (a) Camp construction quartermaster cost, as follows:

1. Pay rolls	$141,375.13
2. Telephone	1,277.38
3. Supplies	13,894.01
4. Auto expense	5,776.05
5. Miscellaneous	85.00
Total	162,407.57

This equals sixty-four one-hundredths of 1 percent.

(b) The Army overhead of 11 percent also includes the fixed-fee and contract-engineer expenses up to March 1, which were as follows:

Pay roll and social security	$123,405.70
Telephone	172.75
Office supplies and field equipment	17,304.04
Auto expense and rental	2,288.16
Miscellaneous	1,736.92
Total	154,907.60
Fixed fee—paid	26,172.00
Total	181,079.60

Second. Contractor's overhead: The following is a statement of the contractor's overhead:

Administrative salaries	$923,166.13
Office expense	141,273.92
Auto expense	10,552.10
Telephone	16,049.52
Total	1,091,041.67

The engineering expenses charged against the Army overhead included social-security taxes, which strictly are not a part of overhead. I do not have the amount of social-security taxes charged against the engineering expenses, but in view of the fact that the contract engineer's pay-roll item including the tax was only $133,504, it could not have been very large. It will be noted that after deducting the camp construction quartermaster's overhead and the contract engineer's overhead—the two items aggregate $343,486—it left to the Army $2,427,297 to pay contingent expenses and overhead other than the overhead incurred in the field.

Third. Insurance and taxes: The contractor paid out the following amount for insurance and social-security taxes:

Insurance	$270,948.21
Social-security taxes	333,474.73
Total	604,422.94

OVERHEAD, INSURANCE, AND TAXES

Summarizing the overhead, taxes, and expenditures, we have the following:

Total Army overhead of 11 percent, including contract engineer's and construction quartermaster's overhead	$2,770,783
Contractor's overhead	1,091,041
Insurance	270,948
Social-security taxes	333,474
Total	4,466,246

When we add to this the sum of $1,350,000 paid out as premium for overtime we have to charge against this project a total sum for the above items of $5,816,246, which represents neither equipment, site, labor, nor material.

RAILROADS

Six thousand six hundred and eighty-two feet of railroad track was built, which is 95 percent complete. The cost to date has been as follows:

Labor	$23,567
Overhead	4,713
Material	12,371
Equipment	7,678
Total	48,329

Ninety-pound relay rail was used. The Boston & Maine Railroad Co. furnished the material and the contractor did the work.

UTILITIES

The original estimate of the cost of the utilities made in Washington on this project was $1,064,000. The estimated completed cost is $4,325,000. The above utilities included 24.6 miles of water piping, 18 miles of sewer lines in addition to 5.8 miles of existing sewer lines. The utilities also included 23.2 miles of electric distribution lines. Thus it will be seen that the actual cost of the utilities will be more than four times the original estimate.

QUALIFICATIONS OF ARCHITECT-ENGINEER

The architect-engineer was Frank A. Barbour, of Boston, Mass. Mr. Barbour is one of the outstanding engineers in the East, being past president of the American Water Works Association, the New England Water Works Association, and the Boston Society of Civil Engineers. He is also past director of the American Society of Civil Engineers and the American Society of Testing Materials. He has had 35 years of private practice, mainly municipal engineering. He was supervising engineer to the construction of the World War camp at Fort Devens in 1917.

QUALIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTOR

The contractors were Coleman Bros. Corporation and John Bowen Co. of Boston, Mass. Coleman Bros. have been in the construction business as a general contractor for some 45 years, while John Bowen Co. has been in existence both as a partnership and corporation for 25 years. The officers of both companies have been with them from 13 to 25 years.

PRINCIPAL FACTORS AFFECTING COST

The principal factors affecting the cost are as follows:

First. Overtime: Work began October 20, 1940. Predominating instructions were that a completion date of January 15, 1941, must be met. Facing New England winter conditions, the contractors' force worked three shifts, 7 days per week from the start up to February 3; two shifts, 7 days per week to February 17; two shifts, 7 days per week to February 22; and one shift 5 days per week from February 22 to date.

Wages:

	Hourly rate	Overtime ratio	
		Saturday	Sunday
Common labor	$0.65	1½	1½
Carpenters	1.25	1½	2
Equipment engineers	1.375	2	2
Equipment mechanics	1.625	2	2
Electricians	1.50	2	2
Plumbers	1.50	2	2

Floodlighting for night work has cost approximately $200,000.

Likewise subcontracts were let on the understanding that the subcontractors would work overtime, some subcontractors figuring as high as 35 percent additional labor cost for overtime.

Total cost to general contractors of overtime labor above the day hour rate approximates to date $1,350,000.

Second. Comparative inefficiency of rush work: Inevitable reduction of efficiency due to manning of work for progress necessary to complete at specified date.

Comparative inefficiency of night work: Substantial disorganization of carpenter crews due to failure in delivery of lumber ordered in Washington. For many weeks a shortage of 10,000,000 board feet existed.

Third. Broken topography of site: Large volume of earth necessary for acceptable placement of buildings—due to broken topography. Probably 400,000 cubic yards moved for such placement of buildings. No actual record. Excessive cost of such work due to freezing of soil to depths of 12 to 30 inches—starting about 1 month after beginning of work (October 20). From about November 20 onward temperatures have generally been below freezing with minimums in November of 9 degrees, December of 2 degrees, January, 0, and so forth.

Fourth. Effects of low temperature: Probably one-third of all earthwork handled has been frozen. Approximately 100,000 cubic yards of earth frozen in large masses have been deposited in spoil banks and new soil obtained from deep borrow pits for back filling.

In a large percentage of the buildings with concrete foundation walls and concrete floors, the interior earthwork froze before the concrete floor could be placed—requiring removal and back filling with earth from borrow pits.

The cost of concrete has been substantially increased by low-temperature conditions due to the necessity of covering and the use of salamanders.

High early cement, calcium chloride, and heated water have been used in practically all concrete work.

Fifth. Excess cost of lumber (average price $42 per 1,000 feet b. m.).

Sixth. Summary of major conditions affecting cost: The general contract was awarded October 14, 1940—the work started October 20—with a paramount requirement that the project be completed January 3 (later January 15, 1941).

Thus a normal two-season job was required to be done in 90 days—two-thirds of which period came within the low-temperature conditions of a New England December and January.

Such completion proved impossible, even with 24-hour operation, and the work has continued through the winter with all the cost-affecting factors of low temperature.

Aside from the effect of winter conditions, the broken topography and the length of water, sewer, electric lines, and roads resulting from the distant location of certain regiments and the hospitals made the original cost, as estimated in Washington, of small significance when applied to this camp site.

RATIO OF LABOR TO MATERIAL

The weekly report for Fort Devens dated March 8 shows the following:

Accumulated expenditures plus obligations for labor	$9,325,906
Accumulated expenditures plus obligations for other than labor, including construction quartermaster's overhead	8,848,084
Total accumulated expenditures of all kinds plus obligations to March 8	18,173,990

On this basis the ratio of labor to material and other expenses was: Labor, 51.3 percent; material and other expenses, 48.7 percent. The contract engineers seem to vary in their methods of computing the ratio of labor to material and other expenses. In this case the contractor estimated the ratio of labor to material: Labor, 68 percent; material and other expenses, 32 percent. However, I have adopted the above method and taken the figures from the weekly report in order to have a uniform method for the purpose of comparison.

CLOSED SHOP

This was a closed shop. I was informed that the carpenters' union charged initiation fee of $65; labor, $40; and so on down the line. The carpenters' union required the payment of $10 a week and common laborers' union $5 a week until the initiation fee was paid. The project manager representing the contractor informed me that no one was turned down, as far as he knew, for work because he did not have the amount of the fee. He stated they had no labor trouble of any kind.

SUMMARY

Site: Fort Devens was a World War training camp situated near the town of Ayer, Mass. The entire World War building area was utilized, together with the utilities that were usable.

Cost: This was a cost-plus-fixed-fee job. The original estimate was $12,474,061. The actual cost will be $25,188,943.

Capacity: During the World War 36,832 men were housed in 1,334 buildings. The present project will provide for 24,296 officers and men, who will be housed in 1,031 buildings.

Lumber: Fifty million feet of lumber was purchased. The average price paid for all lumber was $41.86 per thousand.

Equipment: $1,525,000 worth of equipment was rented; $475,000 of this equipment was owned by the contractor; $1,051,000 by a third party; $610,500, or approximately 41 percent of the value of the equipment, was paid in rental up to March 1.

Labor: Fifteen thousand two hundred and twenty-five men were employed at the peak, of whom 4,000 were carpenters and 7,424 were common laborers. According to the contractor, 95 percent of the men who were paid carpenters' wages were actually carpenters. The wage scale of the crafts that did the most work was as follows:

	Per hour
Carpenters	$1.25
Electricians	1.50
Unskilled labor	.65
Painters	.80
Plasterers	1.50
Plumbers	1.50

Overtime: $1,350,000 was paid as premium for overtime, representing 5.3 percent of the total cost of the job.

Overhead: The 11 percent Army overhead on this project amounted to $2,770,783 of which $162,407 was paid to maintain the camp construction quartermaster's office and $181,079 was paid as fixed fee and overhead cost of the contract-engineer in the field. This left approximately $2,427,300 for the Army overhead at Washington. The contractor's overhead including administrative salaries, office expense, and so forth, amounted to $1,091,041 while $604,422 was paid for insurance and taxes. Five million eight hundred and sixteen thousand two hundred and forty-six dollars, or nearly 47 percent of the original estimate of the cost of the job, was paid out for overhead, overtime, insurance, and taxes.

Utilities: The original estimated cost of the utilities on this project was $1,064,000. The actual cost will be $4,325,000, or four times the amount.

Lumber shortage: Failure of the Washington office to deliver lumber ordered disorganized carpenter crews and added to the cost of the project. For many weeks a shortage of 10,000,000 board feet existed.

Ratio of labor to material: The total accumulated expenditures plus obligations to March 8 was $18,173,990. Of this $9,325,906 was labor and $8,848,084 was expenditures and obligations for material and expenses other than labor. On this basis the ratio of labor to material was labor 51.3 percent, material and other expenses 48.7 percent.

I Have Faith in the Youth of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1941

LETTER FROM DR. LEROY T. LAASE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, there are five colleges in my district. Whenever the opportunity arises to visit the campuses of the colleges, I love to do so. It has been my observation that the young men and women in our colleges are thoughtful, sincere, intelligent, resourceful, and patriotic. I wish to further extend my remarks by including a letter from Dr. Leroy T. Laase, of the University of Nebraska, which bears out my contention:

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA,
Lincoln, May 2, 1941.

Congressman CARL T. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: Last evening I had the privilege of being one of the judges, along with Supreme Court Judge Bayard Paine and District Judge Harry Landis, of the oratorical contest on the Bill of Rights sponsored by you for students in the colleges of your congressional district. I cannot resist writing at once and telling you that I was well pleased with what I heard and saw in that contest.

You would have been thrilled, I am certain, by the work of these young people in the contest. Some had superior manuscripts and others were superior in delivery, but all were sincere and doing some very constructive thinking. As would be expected, there were divergent points of view.

One of the speeches which particularly appealed to me was the speech of a German-Jewish refugee which developed the theme that after you had lived in Germany you really can appreciate the privileges of the Bill of Rights. As would be expected, his delivery was rather inferior, but the speech had a tremendous appeal and came from the heart.

Another speech which particularly appealed to me was the speech of a young man defending the rights of a conscientious objector. It was a rather bold stand and he might have done a better job of tying up his case to specific clauses in the Bill of Rights, but he was a Quaker and spoke with a tremendous amount of sincerity. His style and composition was easily the best, in my opinion, and his delivery was superior.

Another student, a young lady, likewise chose a rather bold stand. She cited considerable evidence to show that in our wartime hysteria, freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom of assembly, and freedom of press were all being suppressed somewhat. Her manner of composition was unnecessarily antagonistic when she might have been more conciliatory and her manner of delivery was a bit too belligerent, but she spoke with great conviction, and one could tell that she had done considerable reading and studying.

Another young lady did a fine piece of work in taking somewhat the opposite point of view, namely, that it might be necessary for us to sacrifice certain of our individual liberties during the immediate national crisis in order to defend and maintain the ultimate privileges of the Bill of Rights. She had a very superior delivery.

The manuscripts of the other two students were more ordinary, as were their deliveries. In view of the divergent points of view and variations in delivery, it is not surprising that there was some difference of opinion among three of us judges as to which student had done the best work. On one thing we were all agreed, namely, that all six of the contestants were quite equal in ability and all did a creditable piece of work.

Whether or not one is inclined to disagree with the point of view expressed by some of the contestants is to me not important. To me the important thing was that these young people were standing on their own feet expressing ideas that were the results of their own thinking about principles in which each believed, and in so doing were exercising the right of free speech and the right of free assembly—two of the great privileges of the Bill of Rights—which would not have been possible for them in certain nations of the world at this time.

I think that it is fine of you to sponsor this event. I hope that you will see fit to continue it another year. I wish that other Congressmen might see fit to do the same for the young people in their congressional districts.

Very truly yours,
DR. LEROY T. LAASE,
Acting Chairman, Department of Speech and Dramatic Art, University of Nebraska.

Little Missouri River Dam, Reservoir, and Channel Improvement Project—Calion, Ark., Flood Control Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1941

STATEMENT BY HON. OREN HARRIS, OF ARKANSAS

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein statements I made before the Flood Control Committee of the House on Wednesday, May 14, 1941, in behalf of the Little Missouri River, Ark., flood-control project and the Calion, Ark., flood-control project:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the privilege of appearing before your Committee on Flood Control in the interest of the Little Missouri River Arkansas project, a project of special importance to the people in the Little Missouri River Basin, and one of tremendous importance in the development of that region, first, because of the enormous need and necessity for flood control on this river and its tributaries; second, because of the need of additional power that Narrows Dam would give to the development of the strategic minerals in that particular area, and also electric power for the people who have heretofore been denied the privilege and benefits.

I have made quite a study of the justification of this project, and also I have a personal knowledge and familiarity with the need of this program, because I was born and reared in Hempstead County, only a few miles from this river basin. The area affected contains more than 2,000 square miles and some 132,000 acres of the richest farming land in the Southwest. I have seen all this territory flooded year after year, destroying all the efforts and labors of the people who were attempting to farm the land and maintain their homes. It is a treachercus stream, with usually heavy rains in the spring that quickly flood the entire basin, devastating and destroying what otherwise would have been fruitful years of farm production. In passing, Mr. Chairman, may I state that this river is now flooding this entire area, making it almost impossible for that land to be utilized during this year. In my lifetime I have observed the increased need of the project, especially from a flood-control standpoint, and recently for power development. This is not a new idea, and the Federal Government has recognized the justification and consideration of this project from a flood-control standpoint since 1872, a short time after the Civil War. It was then that the Government spent some money for channel clearance to relieve the destructive floods, but since then the river bed and the main streams have gradually been filled and clogged to the extent that the water is not permitted to have average flow, and therefore the need for this development has increased in the past few years.

The people who live in the area have attempted to protect themselves and their property by constructing canals on Terre Noire Creek, one of its main tributaries.

Some years ago, they organized a drainage district and constructed hillside floodways on each side of the valley. This included a canal 16 miles long with a levee constructed to take a portion of the headwater flow, together with the inflow from the adjacent hills and return to the main stream below the protected area. On the other side on the Ozan Creek, canals were constructed on the south and middle forks and recently people attempted a pilot channel for a canal on the north fork through the assistance of Federal-relief funds. However, these improvements have proven inefficient and have worked to even greater detriment in that they were not in a position to complete a job that was started. They have done their best in trying to save this rich farm land, but have gone about as far as they can.

To give some idea about this river basin and its importance, I would like to briefly state that it has its source in Polk County in the extreme western part of the State and flows in a southeasterly direction for about 150 miles, where it runs into the Ouachita River. The upper basin is in the mountain with rugged plateau areas and the streams are deeply entrenched in extremely narrow crooked valleys. After leaving the plateau area, the river enters a coastal plain, with a flat valley some 5 miles in width.

The population affected is estimated at approximately 150,000. However, it is somewhat smaller now because of the increased floods preventing progress and development, affecting even the gently rolling uplands and along the valleys.

The agricultural activities consist of general farming and fruit culture in this area, and industrial activities include sawmills, cotton gins, preparation and processing of fruits, and mining.

Of the 96,400 acres along the main river subject to overflow, 37,700 acres are cleared. Of the 25,000 acres along Terre Noire Creek, a tributary on the north, 11,500 acres are cleared and the 10,600 acres along Ozan Creek, a tributary on the south 6,500 acres are cleared.

The flood losses consist of crop damage and loss due to delayed planting of crops. The losses from floods have an average annual damage estimated at $160,000. I want to emphasize the fact that what has been in the past and could be in the future with proper flood control, the most productive and finest agriculture lands in our entire Nation, are now of very little benefit to our people.

POWER BENEFITS

Before this committee in April 1940 the Honorable Leland Olds, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, testified to you in behalf of this project, as follows:

"I have referred to the proposed Narrows project on the Little Missouri River in Arkansas. This project has been recommended for construction by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors as a dual-purpose, flood-control, and power dam and reservoir. A need exists for flood control in the valley of this river. The district engineer, who made the study of this problem for the War Department, found that it would not be economically feasible to construct the Narrows Dam for flood control alone; that the annual charges would exceed the annual benefits by more than $20,000. Studies by the district engineer, by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and later by the staff of the Federal Power Commission show that if the Narrows Dam is constructed for both flood control and power the annual benefits would exceed the annual charges by a very substantial amount. Under this plan there would be no reduction in the provisions for flood control. As a matter of fact, at multiple-purpose projects the provisions for power storage may very well enhance the value of the project for flood control, as there is always the chance that the most severe flood will occur during the period in which the power storage has been depleted, with the result that even greater storage is available for flood control than in a project built for flood control only.

"Getting back to the Narrows project, this would be a case where the sufferers from floods would be denied relief unless power was made a part of the project."

The Narrows Dam would be a few miles above Murfreesboro, in Pike County, and would have a reservoir with a gross storage capacity of 410,000 acre-feet and with maximum power pool at elevation 547 feet. This would control the headwaters of this basin, and, with the channel clearing on the main river and the two tributaries below, would completely harness the Little Missouri River Basin. It would give an initial power installation of 15,000 kilowatts, with provisions for future installation of an additional unit of 15,000-kilowatt capacity. This would make available cheap power for the development of the recently discovered minerals, particularly the cinnabar mines, from which raw material is obtained in the production of mercury. As we know, mercury is a very important product of our national-defense program, being a vital metal for explosives. Cinnabar is also found in California, Arizona, and Nevada, but 40 percent of the mercury during the years of 1935 and 1939 came from Italy and Spain. Cinnabar is found in the vicinity of this proposed power dam in great quantities, and to properly obtain the benefits from these minerals it is necessary to have electric power available.

There is within the vicinity of this territory two Rural Electrification Association cooperatives. One has already established a power line, which is now under construction and leading into this valuable area. This is for the development of the cinnabar territory; and if cheap power was available, the people in this rural territory could have the benefit of electricity in their own homes that they are now being deprived of.

ECONOMIC JUSTIFICATION

Every Department charged with making a survey and report have recommended this project. The Chief of Engineers, through the Secretary of War, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and the Federal Power Commission have recommended that it is economically justifiable, that a dual purpose flood control and power project at the Narrows site is an important and desirable unit in a plan to develop comprehensively the water resources of that region, that the benefits derived would exceed the losses by several thousand dollars. They recommend the Narrows Dam and Reservoir for power facilities, the improvement of channels of the Little Missouri River, Terre Noire Creek, Ozan Creek, and repairing of levees, all at an estimated cost to the United States of $6,800,000.

The Government of the United States could certainly make a good investment of this project. The great Southwest with all of the natural resources, and with which we have been blessed, is pleading for its share and equal opportunities and the people in this territory have been patient, but yet they are yearning for the opportunity that this project would afford them. The citizens and all of the people are unanimous for the construction by the Government and the development of this project and are willing and ready to cooperate in every way possible for them to do so. Mr. Chairman, I urge your committee to favorably recommend that this project be authorized.

CALION, ARK., FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECT

Mr. Chairman, I briefly want to call to the attention of the committee the importance of the proposed flood-control project of Calion, in Union County, Ark., and urge your favorable consideration in again reporting this project to the House for favorable action and inclusion in the flood-control program. This project, Mr. Chairman, was approved by this committee in the 1940 bill, which bill was never taken up and considered by the House, because of the national-defense program. I understand it is the policy of the committee to include these same projects in this year's bill, providing the Army engineers report that nothing has occurred that should alter the committee's favorable action.

The Army engineers testified before your committee that the project held its same status, and $50,000 should be authorized for flood protection to the town of Calion.

Calion, Union County, Ark., a fine little town of about 1,000 people has extremely large floods frequently. It runs up into the town, and thus the health, lives, and the property of those people are in constant jeopardy. This is on the Ouachita River, and in the last few weeks there have been two floods on that river and these people threatened with great losses.

The Government has spent some $50,000 in making a large recreational lake for fishing and other recreational facilities and the people donated some 2,000 acres in cooperation with the Government toward the construction of this very fine lake. The Ouachita River is navigable along there and Calion has become a very important center as a port. It is being rapidly developed and there is extensive oil operation in that territory. Oil is piped from El Dorado, Ark., and loaded on tank barges at Calion. There are two saw mills, and one has been established there for many years, and would be protected by this flood-control project if constructed.

The War Department reported in House Document 427, first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, approving a plan for a levee that would circle Calion at a cost of $49,700. This is a very small sum, but it is just as important to those people as those projects which cost millions of dollars, and I understand, Mr. Chairman, that this will be the committee's recommendation to Congress and will be included in the bill.

However, I want to call your attention to the fact that the Army engineers proposed another plan, which would protect the town proper and the Lake Calion area as one unit with the means of a levee extending from the Ouachita River from the railroad embankment to high ground south of Mills Creek. They estimated this would cost $169,900. However, they say that protection for both the town and lake area at this cost is not economically justifiable at this time. I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, the very efficient and fine service the Army engineers are giving, and I realize that they base their recommendations on the ratio of annual benefits to costs. Since this report was made to Congress in July 1939 there has developed a condition with regard to the river and lake that is likely to prove most serious. There is erosion to the extent that the river is going to take in the lake, and not only will the efforts and money of the Government and the people be lost but the fine recreational facilities given to thousands of people throughout that area will be taken away from them. I believe, under the circumstances, it is worth your attention and investigation, and I should like very much to urge that this committee include in this Calion project plan No. 2 of the engineer's report that will give us that levee not only protecting the town but the beautiful lake as well.

Federal Tax on Gasoline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1941

STATEMENT SHOWING TAXES ON GASOLINE IN MICHIGAN

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I herewith insert a statement showing the amount of taxes now imposed upon gasoline in Michigan. This will apply in greater or less degree to every State in the Union. The percentage of tax on gasoline will be greater in those States having a State tax of 3 cents on a gallon and less in those States having a State tax of less than 3 cents a gallon.

Before we tax gasoline and oil any more, it would be well to consider other commodities that now bear a far less burden of taxation in proportion.

The statement follows:

MEMORANDUM RE STATE AND FEDERAL EXCISE AND SALES TAX LEVIES ON GASOLINE IN MICHIGAN

On May 1, 1941, the average retail price of gasoline in Pontiac and Royal Oak was 12.6 cents per gallon at the service station, exclusive of all taxes. On each gallon, the State collected a special gasoline tax of 3 cents, which was the equivalent of a sales tax of 23.8 percent. The present 1½-cent Federal gasoline levy added another 11.9 percent to the price, which with the 3 percent Michigan general sales tax which also applies to the product, adds up to a total special sales tax on gasoline of approximately 38.7 percent.

If the Federal tax on gasoline should be increased 1 cent per gallon, it would be equivalent to another 8-percent sales tax, which would mean that gasoline consumers would pay a total special sales tax of more than 46.7 percent. This tax rate is almost 4½ times as great as that which Michigan citizens would be required to pay on such luxuries as furs, photographic apparatus, or musical instruments, if the proposed 10-percent defense taxes on these objects are enacted. It is almost 9 times as great as the proposed tax rates on candy and chewing gum.

Already the motorists of Michigan have accepted an increase in the Federal gasoline tax which was considerably greater than that imposed upon other commodities. On July 1, 1940, when the tax was raised from 1 cent to 1½ cents, the increase amounted to 50 percent. The next highest increase was 33 percent on distilled spirits, toilet preparations, and cabaret admissions. All of these are luxuries and hence not to be classified with more indispensable commodities such as gasoline, or are commodities whose consumption traditionally has been controlled through taxation. Most other tax increases imposed at this time ranged from 10 percent to 16½ percent.

Now gasoline again is being singled out for the greatest proposed increase in tax rate. If the current proposal to increase the tax from 1½ cents to 2½ cents were enacted, it would result in an increase of 150 percent over the basic 1-cent rate of the Federal gasoline tax which was in effect prior to the first defense tax increases in 1940. Only the comparable defense tax increases proposed for automotive equipment, parts, and accessories, which also are special taxes paid only by motor-vehicle operators, approach the rate of increase proposed for gasoline.

In fairness to the Michigan motorist, therefore, these facts should be carefully considered. Motor-vehicle operators in this State are now paying a total special sales tax on gasoline of approximately 36.5 percent. Michigan's 3 percent general sales tax is considered a rather heavy levy. Yet the consumers of gasoline pay a special sales tax which is 12 times as great.

No Convoys—No War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMILTON FISH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HAMILTON FISH OF NEW YORK

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over the Columbia Broadcasting System last night, May 15, 1941:

I have said repeatedly in the House of Representatives and at public meetings that I did not believe President Roosevelt would repudiate his solemn promises to the American people to keep us out of war. I am unwilling to believe that he will take any overt action, such as ordering convoys, and put us into war against the will of between 80 and 90 percent of the American people. If he does, he will sacrifice his great popularity with the people by repudiating his sacred promises to them, and by betraying them into war. Overnight President Roosevelt would become the greatest repudiator of his word in American history, and would go down in history as the President that bankrupted, ruined, and destroyed the Republic, in a war of his own making—a Roosevelt war.

The interventionist columnists and insiders have been for weeks talking openly about the sensational, destiny-making speech that President Roosevelt was to have made last night, that would proclaim the fateful decision to use our Navy to convoy British ships and inevitably involve us in war. The war-making columnists gleefully stated in the press that rough drafts of this convoy-war speech had been written 10 days ago, and that we were as good as in the war.

What caused the President to cancel the scheduled radio speech and substitute a fireside chat for May 27? I am not in the confidence of the White House, but it takes no prophet or soothsayer to figure out the real reason—public sentiment, the force of public opinion, the determined opposition of over 80 percent of the American people to involvement in war in Europe and Asia.

In the name of reason and truth, how could President Roosevelt evade or ignore the double promise he gave the American public—that "we will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army and naval or air force to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack." What could be clearer or more specific? If the English language means anything, it meant precisely what President Roosevelt intended it to mean and what the American people understood him to say.

It was a definite promise not to go to war. There were no ifs and buts or reservations, except in case of attack. It ruled out convoys on two grounds—because, according to the President, convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war, and because convoys require the use of our naval and air forces in foreign lands.

President Roosevelt was elected on this pledge, and I refuse to believe he intends to violate it and betray millions of Americans who voted for him, unless by the practically unanimous approval of the American people. President Roosevelt is my President, along with that of 130,000,000 other Americans, and I prefer to give him the benefit of every doubt until by some word or deed he repudiates his definite promises and pledges to the American people.

In the 1916 campaign Woodrow Wilson never promised to keep us out of war. It was made by campaign orators, and by posters that he had kept us out of war. Moreover, he submitted the war issue to the Congress, which voted overwhelmingly for it. There were only 50 votes in the House and 6 in the Senate against the war resolution.

That is all that the American people and the noninterventionist Members of Congress are asking for today: that the President submit the convoy issue, which Secretary Knox and Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, both agree is an act of war, to the Congress for its decision.

I have no quarrel with any American for advocating convoys and war, but I have nothing but contempt for any Cabinet officer or any public official who has taken an oath to defend the Constitution and then seeks to put us into the blood baths of Europe and Asia through the use of convoys without submitting the issue to Congress and the elected representatives of the people in an orderly, constitutional manner, and in the American way.

There is not the slightest justification for any attempt by the President or members of his Cabinet to ignore or evade the right of Congress under the Constitution to declare war. One hundred million American citizens who are against our involvement in war have a right to be heard through their Representatives in Congress.

There can be no unity in any war if the American people are forced into it by subterfuge and deception without the constitutional approval of Congress.

If our free institutions and constitutional Government have to be scrapped to get us into war through the back door by arbitrary and un-American methods, then there can be no unity in fighting foreign dictatorships under the guise of democracy.

The issue of war or peace transcends all party lines, and is greater than either the Democratic or Republican Party, or both combined, as it affects the destiny and security of America and the safety of our people. It must be decided by the American people regardless of party considerations, on the basis of what is best for America.

I am opposed to war, as it means ruin, bankruptcy, the end of our liberties and free institutions, death and disability for millions of young Americans, blood and tears, and the advent of chaos and revolution at home and communism abroad. The day we enter the war we will have lost, although we may be victorious in 10 or 20 years, but the only real victors would be the Communists.

Capt. James Roosevelt, who is traveling around the world at the Government's expense, telling the Chinese to hold the lines until we send our armed forces to help them, and the same thing to the British in Basra and Cairo, has issued an announcement to the world that America is already in the war except for sending troops. This is a

very interesting statement to 130,000,000 Americans who have had nothing to say about it, and who were not aware that we were in the war until they read Captain Roosevelt's statement.

It has not been the custom in the Regular Army, Marine Corps, or the Navy for officers to make public statements that would jeopardize the peace of America. Any other officer in the Marine Corps or in our armed forces could have been reprimanded immediately or dismissed from the service for such an offense, particularly in the critical times in which we are living. The fact is that Captain Roosevelt has not the faintest conception of what war is, nor have his three brothers, all of whom—contrary to the democratic spirit of the conscription law—are commissioned officers, with practically no training, and assigned to the noncombatant supply service. Is this an example of the President's "four freedoms" in action?

The statement of Captain Roosevelt that we are in the war is untrue and part of the defeatist program to involve us in war by saying that we are already in it. As an officer in the A. E. F., I know that war means mud, blood, and death, and also that the last war was a picnic compared to this one. We are not in the war, and we are not going into this war unless attacked. No shots have been fired, no American blood has been spilled, and no American ships have been sunk. We do not claim to be neutral; we occupy a nonbelligerent status in favor of the British, but we are not at war, and will not be in war until shooting starts and Americans are killed. Under the Constitution, the Congress alone has the authority to declare war, and not Captain Roosevelt, or even the President of the United States or "Lady" Eleanor, without the consent of Congress.

I have often criticized President Roosevelt's foreign policies, because I believed that step by step they were leading us to the verge of war. I also believe that President Roosevelt is more responsible for the spread of war hysteria and war propaganda in America than anyone else. He has packed his Cabinet with the most outspoken interventionists, including three former Republicans, and has encouraged them to make sensational, hysterical, and war-provoking speeches to inflame the passions of the American people and incite them to war. He has never failed from his Chicago quarantine and police-the-world speech of October 1937 to the present day to hurl personal epithets and thunderbolts of wrath upon all Americans who disagreed with his foreign policies and wanted to keep America out of war.

I was one of the recipients of his Olympian darts under the slogan of "Martin, Barton, and Fish." Later Senator WHEELER was publicly castigated. His attack on Colonel Lindbergh as a copperhead was churlish and childish.

President Roosevelt committed a serious offense against his own code of free speech as enunciated under the four freedoms when he called Colonel Lindbergh a copperhead, which implies treasonable utterances, for urging that America keep out of war because it was not sufficiently prepared. Whether you agree with Colonel Lindbergh's statement or not, he had an absolute right in time of peace, as a free sovereign citizen, to express his views. No American should be called a copperhead simply because he places the American flag above that of any foreign nation and wants to save America first.

All that is necessary to make Colonel Lindbergh the national hero of the American people in 1941 is for foreign nations like Canada to make absurd attacks on him, and for such foreign communities as Guelph, Ontario, to destroy all books and articles by him in order "to protect the Canadian youth." The Canadians, as our close neighbors, should realize that we Americans believe in freedom of speech, of the press, and radio, and if we did not we might just as well join the Nazis instead of lease-lending $7,000,000,000 of war materials to the British to help defeat Hitler.

I hope that the American people will not be alarmed by the recent radio speech of the Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson, rightly called "Wrong Horse Harry." There is nothing new in that speech. That was not a convoy speech; it was a war speech. He knows perfectly well that convoys mean war. The trouble with Mr. Stimson is that he is not satisfied to only have a war with Germany; he wants to go to war with Japan, Italy, and Germany, all at the same time and probably, if he continues his stumble-bum diplomacy and interventionist course, he will also take on France and Soviet Russia.

What he will have to say about the Army will come later, when he will urge sending American boys to the shambles of China, India, Africa, and Europe. For the present he has taken it upon himself to put our Navy into the war and thereby get us in through the use of convoys, but he is not fooling the American people.

The advocates of war are trying to read language into the lend-lease bill that was never there, or the bill would not have passed. The bill specifically stated that nothing in it should be construed as authorizing convoys. In addition, the Clark amendment provided that title to the defense articles must be transferred on leaving our shores, which is virtually a mandate against convoys.

The responsibility for the protection of lend-lease matériels has been the duty of the British Navy from the beginning, and it has done a very good job of it. Only eight cargo ships leaving the United States for England were sunk the first three months of this year, less than 4 percent, instead of the 40 percent published by the war-making propagandists, and the sinkings in the North Atlantic during April were less than in any month for the past year.

The repeal of the arms embargo, conscription, and the lend-lease bill were all supported in Congress as peace measures, and as the best way to keep out of war. Today the issue is crystal clear—convoys and war, or no convoys and no war. There can be no more camouflage, deceit, deception, and hypocrisy in an effort to fool the American people.

I stand where I have stood for more than a year—for all possible aid to Great Britain short of war and consistent with our own national defense. The American people want England to win and will give her aid regardless of what the Axis thinks about it. I am in accord with the program laid down by Herbert Hoover, of making America invincible on land, sea, and air, of increased production, and more merchant ships for Great Britain, but that we are not prepared and must keep out of World War No. 2.

The issue is clear-cut: Peace or war. And it should be discussed and debated throughout the Nation. The American people must decide this greatest of all issues, involving our destiny and the very existence of the Nation—by one yardstick: What is best for America.

In the East and South there is an unfriendly press, and throughout the Nation war propagandists, interventionist newspaper columnists, and radio commentators dominate and distort the news. I appeal to all American citizens who want to stay out of war to make known their views by writing or wiring President Roosevelt and the Members of the House and Senate: No convoys! No war!

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1941

ARTICLE BY RAYMOND J. KELLY

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article giving facts on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway by Raymond J. Kelly, past national commander of the American Legion:

Production for the defense of America might well utilize all the machinery of America's production facilities.

Yet a high percentage of those facilities, located in the favored and sheltered and easily protected interior of America, are unused. They are unused because the products of these interior facilities can't get through to the sea.

The production facilities I refer to are in the region of the Great Lakes. The reason the defense output of this region can't get through to the sea is a 48-mile stretch of the St. Lawrence River located in the International Rapids.

This stretch, now limited to vessels with a draft not beyond 14 feet, represents less than 3 percent of the Great Lakes-to-the-sea route and makes that route resemble a sack of meal with a string tied around the middle.

Remove the string and the Great Lakes plants could now be turning out a billion dollars' worth of materials for defense. The cost of removing the string would be approximately that of two battleships.

With the string removed the St. Lawrence route could carry everything but battleships and airplane carriers. As it is, the Great Lakes shipyards must be content with small orders for small boats, while most of their productive capacity goes unused. One Wisconsin firm has a contract for submarines, but these must be cut in sections and reassembled on the Atlantic coast before they can take their places as watchdogs of the Nation.

Existing shipbuilding facilities on the coasts of America are already booked solid 2 years ahead. How soon they can hope to complete the requirements of a two-ocean Navy or meet the increasing demands of the United States Maritime Commission is a moot question. Certainly the adequate defense of America requires that we get all the ships we can as fast as we can get them. And this implies utilizing every possible production facility in America.

It was this urgency which recently led President Roosevelt to say of the seaway: "It is now a vital necessity." The President added that, "The United States needs the St. Lawrence Seaway for defense. The United States needs this great landlocked sea as a secure haven in which it will always be able to build ships and more ships in order to protect our trade and our shores."

In this attitude the President's judgment coincides with that of every single one of his predecessors since 1911. Every President in the past 30 years has regarded the seaway as a patriotic measure in the national in-

terest, above political and sectional prejudices. A plank in the Republican presidential platform of 1932 endorsed it. Republicans and Democrats alike, who were motivated by national welfare, have given it their unqualified approval.

It is a defense measure now. But it was not a defense measure when endorsed by Herbert Hoover, Calvin Coolidge, Warren Harding, Woodrow Wilson, and President Taft. It stood, then, on the sole merit of aiding our national economy. Today it has the additional merit of aiding defense. Today it offers us a two-fold national bargain: Defense against aggression and defense of our national economy in the competitive markets of the world after the war.

Oil Industry Prepared to Meet Demands of America's Preparedness Program

REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1941

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, no question has been raised in any quarter concerning the ability of the oil industry to supply, in any amount, and at a price near the lowest in all history, all the gasoline and other petroleum products that will be needed by the United States, during its vast preparedness program, or by other nations friendly to the United States.

And no such question will be raised. It cannot be raised for the reason that there would be no basis for it. Only two other great industries might be named, concerning which there is like certainty of a full supply for all needs—coal mining and agriculture.

But a distinction might be noted as between oil and these other two great and essential industries. Both these others have been put under Government control in order that they might be rescued from the anarchy caused by unrestricted overproduction.

The petroleum industry has for the most part policed itself. Most of the States now, due largely to efforts of the oil industry, have State conservation departments, which give assurance that any recalcitrant rebels in the industry cannot wreck it by overproduction. And there is the Federal Connally "hot oil" act, prohibiting shipment in interstate commerce of oil produced in violation of the rules of the various State commissions.

So the oil industry now, when the United States faces one of the most dangerous periods in its history, and is frantically strengthening itself to resist any aggression from abroad, finds reason for congratulating itself on the farsightedness of its leaders, and the wisdom of the rank and file of producers in upholding their hands.

In the last World War there was fear of a shortage of oil. Now, with production greater than ever in history, the petroleum industry has behind it the backlog of a 14.3-year underground reserve, as of 1939. The reserve in 1935 was 12.2 years.

In 1940 United States production reached an all-time high of 1,351,847,000 barrels. In 1920, at the close of the first war, production was 442,900,000.

America is still the producer of much more than half of all the oil produced in the world. In 1920 it produced 442,900,000 of the world total of 688,900,000 barrels; in 1940 it produced 1,351,847,000 of 2,076,800,000 barrels.

What this vast production means to the United States in preparedness is obvious when it is realized that not an airplane could fly, not a truck could move, without oil. In addition to its motive power, oil is an essential lubricant; it furnishes many of the components of high explosives; here in America it supplies fuel for all truck transportation, as well as for an increasing proportion of railway traffic. It permits workers in war industry, as well as the troops themselves, to move easily and quickly to and from the job.

It is, of course, true that Germany produces oil from coal. But that process takes four times the labor to make that it takes to raise American oil from the ground and refine it. And the coal gas is not as good as gas from petroleum. Germany cannot produce the 100-octane gas which America is now furnishing British planes, and which gives them 25 percent more speed and 25 percent higher ceiling than regular oil.

America's oil is being supplied much cheaper than during the last war. In 1920 the cost per gallon to the motorist was 29.83 cents, now it is 18.41 cents.

It is true the motorist pays more than 18.41 cents. But that is because cities, States, and the Federal Government have been adding to the cost of oil. In 1920 taxes on oil amounted only to 0.1 cent per gallon, in 1940 the tax has risen to 9.08 cents—or almost half the total cost paid by the consumer.

A few other figures show how vastly the oil business has increased since the last war: There are now 390,000 producing oil wells; in 1917, 197,000; now there are 557 refineries, then 240; now 18 gallons of gas are produced from a barrel of crude, then only 9; now stocks of gasoline are 3,500,000,000 gallons, then 412,000,000; now 126,000 miles of pipe lines, then 50,000 miles; now 467 tank ships, then 54.

Furthermore, the "kick" in each gallon of gasoline is much greater now than during the last war. Then 100-octane gas was unknown; now it is available to fly all American planes.

Without desiring in any sense to draw invidious comparisons, but merely to stress the farsighted wisdom of the oil operators, it is necessary to bring out a few facts.

America now desperately needs ships, if it is to supply Great Britain with the munitions now being constructed here. It is not because America has not fuel for the ships that there is danger these munitions may not get across; it is because, since the last war, the Nation has neglected its merchant marine. In 1920 it possessed 28,183 ships, of 16,324,024 tons; now its merchant marine is reduced to 27,212 ships, of 14,018,188 tons.

Since the last war railway mileage has shrunk from 252,845 miles to 235,064 miles in 1939. But, of course, this shrinkage in railway transport has been more than made up by hundreds of thousands of miles of paved highways and the millions of motor transports which use them.

Steel production in 1920 was 42,133,000 tons; in 1939 it was 52,799,000. A large part of this increase was caused by the great increase in the demand for motorcars. But it should be noted that the steel industry, even after Germany had overrun France, insisted that its American capacity was sufficient for all war needs. Now every mill is operating at full capacity, and yet the demand for steel cannot be met. Automobile construction will be cut at least 20 percent next year, perhaps as much as 40 percent, for lack of steel. America cannot meet all demands for steel until new mills are constructed. Though high-grade ore is plentiful, additional means of transport must be provided to bring it to the blast furnaces.

A metal absolutely essential for air war is aluminum. Here again such a shortage has developed that aluminum, until new plants can be built and put into operation, will have to be devoted entirely to war uses. Production rose from 138,042,000 pounds in 1920 to 286,882,000.

Electricity is another bottleneck. Total production increased from 43,334,282 kilowatt-hours in 1920 to 130,336,050 in 1939, and prices, as measured by 100 kilowatt-hours, fell from $6.18 in 1924 to $3.96 in 1939. But this is an electric as well as a motor age, and production did not keep pace with demand.

One reason for the shortage of aluminum is that its production from bauxite ore requires a vast amount of cheap electricity. When aluminum producers awoke to the need for increased production, they were faced with a shortage of such cheap electricity. This is now being filled by the enlargement of existing aluminum plants in the Tennessee Valley and the construction of new ones in the Pacific Northwest, where vast amounts of cheap power are being made available at Federal power plants.

In only one respect, it might be thought, have the oil people been neglectful in preparing for the future. The southeastern seaboard has been largely dependent upon tanker transportation of its oil from the Gulf coast.

Now tankers are being requisitioned by the United States Government for the carrying of much-needed oil to Great Britain. These tankers will no longer be able to offer full service to the southeastern coast. At the same time the demand for oil in this section has increased vastly, due to the location there of a number of the Government's great Army training camps.

But the oil industry's leaders foresaw just such a situation. Two years ago they planned a pipe line from Baton Rouge through this southeastern section. It was blocked by the refusal of

the railways in Georgia to grant rights-of-way, and by the refusal of the Georgia Legislature to enact remedial legislation.

The oil industry has asked that Congress pass an act making it possible for interstate carriers to secure rights-of-way, when the needs of the country demand. Latest war developments indicate that such an act will soon be passed. Surveys have been completed, material has been ordered. The pipe lines will be ready for business within a few months after Congress gives permission.

As yet the oil industry hasn't been caught napping; it is prepared to answer every demand in America's vast preparedness program.

Cantonment Construction Project at Fort Riley, Kans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1941

LETTER FROM LT. COL. JOE S. UNDERWOOD TO WILLIAM L. HUTCHESON

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this morning I received a communication addressed to me by William L. Hutcheson, general president of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, whose head office is in the city of Indianapolis, in my State. In his letter to me, Mr. Hutcheson refers to recent criticism of his organization and its members in connection with defense work. He enclosed with his communication a copy of a letter from Lt. Col. Joe S. Underwood, of the Quartermaster Corps, dealing with construction work at Fort Riley, Kans.

Mr. Hutcheson informs me that the letter from Colonel Underwood was unsolicited. He believes that the information contained in it should be made available to the Congress and the country. I am glad to follow his suggestion that the communication from Colonel Underwood be inserted in the RECORD. The communication is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CONSTRUCTING QUARTERMASTER,
Fort Riley, Kans., May 7, 1941.

Mr. WILLIAM L. HUTCHESON,
United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners,
Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR SIR: The cantonment construction project at Fort Riley, Kans., is nearing completion and it is believed proper that I should advise you at this time as to the services rendered on that job by your local unions and their representatives.

The jurisdiction for your organization was established jointly between the Carpenters' District Council of Kansas City, Mo., Local Union 1445, Topeka, Kans.; Local Union 918, Manhattan, Kans.; and Local Union 750, Junction City, Kans.; with a joint office at Ogden, Kans., which is located directly adjacent to the east side of the Fort Riley Military Reservation.

The tremendous expansion of carpenter labor requirements which developed on short notice as materials arrived created a big problem for the union offices to handle and there was considerable confusion in the early stages of that work. However, under the able guidance of Mr. John E. Pennell, carpenters' district council, Kansas City, Mo., the situation was soon well in hand. I do not believe any office could be established to handle this problem under the existing "hurry-up" conditions without some difficulties developing.

The writer personally negotiated all union contracts in effect on this project and found all the union representatives to be eager and willing to meet all situations and problems with one outstanding aim which was to secure a solution which would protect union labor in its established policies, and at the same time be fair to the employing agency. All our points of difference were adjusted on that basis and I believe we are all mutually satisfied.

Some publicity has developed at some projects regarding the use of untrained and unqualified men as carpenters. We did have some of this develop in December or January as we were reaching our peak load. However, the fault was partially ours, as we were pressing the union offices to furnish more men at a fast rate, and with little advance notice. This prevented the union officials from securing a full examination of each applicant as to his qualifications, and in some cases the individual was permitted to go to work subject to a later examination by the union and also to release by the contractors if the individual was found unqualified. By cooperation of all concerned, this situation was quickly remedied, and I believe that all unqualified men were released after a short trial. I personally visited the union offices, checked their examination procedure, and assured myself that the union officers were making every reasonable effort to secure qualified men for us. I think the results on the job are a definite indication of the large measure of success of their endeavor.

I have endeavored in this letter to be both frank and fair in my comments, and in that connection I wish to commend to you the work of Mr. John E. Pennell in his official capacity as special representative of the Carpenters District Council, Kansas City, Mo. His leadership was self-evident in all my contacts with the local group of United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. I hope for an opportunity to work with him again, although, under existing prescribed procedure, I will no longer take such an active part in labor matters as I did on this project.

Yours very truly,
JOE S. UNDERWOOD,
Lt. Col., Quartermaster Corps,
Constructing Quartermaster.

The Truth About the Secretary of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARY T. NORTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1941

ARTICLE FROM CHICAGO DAILY NEWS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article published in the Chicago Daily News:

[From the Chicago Daily News]

MADAM PERKINS LOOKS LIKE THIS TO OUR MR. LAHEY—HER SERENITY STRIKES ONE MOST; ABUSE FAILS TO IRK SECRETARY

(By Edwin A. Lahey)

WASHINGTON, May 2.—A look of worry is the common mark of the average Washington face.

That gent in the plug hat is worried about the state of the universe; this one wringing his hands worries about the future of the Nation; another about increasing his share of the world's goods without being unpatriotic; that one about preserving the seat of his pants. Whatever it is they worry about, the mark is indisputable.

To find serenity of expression, you go to the third floor of the Department of Labor at Fourteenth Street and Constitution Avenue, keep turning until you come to the Secretary's office, and ask for Frances Perkins.

Here, next to President Roosevelt, say her friends, is the most publicly abused person in Washington. A thousand businessmen at the Chamber of Commerce of the United States convention rose to their feet and cheered the other day when a Chicago tycoon, using the technique of a lawyer in the South State Street Court, roared from the depths of his sympathetic soul:

"How long will it be until public opinion will become so aroused that it will demand the resignation of the Secretary of Labor, who condones sit-down strikes, who has prevented the deportation of alien Harry Bridges, etc., etc.?"

COLUMNISTS' ATTACKS

In between unpolished attacks like this, cosmic columnists, who bloom in Washington like the wisteria, have, in a ponderous procession from untenable premises to unshakable conclusions, advanced their cogent reasons for the removal of Miss Perkins from the Cabinet. Others have revealed the "resignation" of Miss Perkins in one exclusive dispatch after another.

Senator BYRD, of Virginia, a big apple grower, added his bit on the Senate floor last week by declaring that what this country needed was a "two fisted" Secretary of Labor with "intestinal fortitude." This comes under the head of local humor, because if there's anything Miss Perkins has, it's intestinal fortitude

You would expect to find a lady thus abused in somewhat of a pout.

Instead, there is a pleasant shock in finding a warm, human, middle-aged woman, betraying traces of a sense of humor behind the precise diction of the educated New Englander. What strikes you most is her serenity, which is not to be confused with a lack of awareness It is that look so few people have, the look that comes only from what Thomas à Kempis described as "living interiorly."

SHE'S NOT RESENTFUL

She doesn't feel resentful about the attacks on her. Sometimes she feels surprised, sometimes she feels rather sadly that perhaps her critics are simplifying their own problems by taking it out on her. Her kindly faith in the world at large is so great that she did not know until recently that there existed any sex antagonism toward her.

She is such a completely unresentful and Christian woman that it becomes a little disconcerting to realize that she means it. If Alexander Hamilton were alive and in public life, he would be her most violent critic, for he never meant anything so much as when he said.

"One great error is that we suppose mankind more honest than they are."

But, as indicated before, Madam Perkins' tranquillity is not the result of not knowing the score. She knows that labor skates are human and have their percentages of phonies the same as any other segment of society.

EVALUATES LABOR LEADERS

She further knows that the big labor leaders sometimes have their own axes to grind and that they do not represent the whole of American labor, about four-fifths of which are still untouched by the labor unions.

Because she knows this, and a lot more, the internal storms and criticisms from organized labor itself do not touch her. She keeps on doing what her department was created for—"to foster and promote the welfare of the workers."

The evidence that she does this is abundant. Year after year, since she entered the Roosevelt Cabinet in 1933, the annual reports have come from the Government Printing Office, detailing the achievements of the Department of Labor. We are not going to be the first one to read these reports, since they don't belong in this portrait, but there are enough outstanding things in sight to give you an idea.

The Government employment agencies are an example. They are completely the child of Madam Perkins.

Unlike any other public official in this town, she doesn't seem to care if she does not get public acclaim for her contributions to the society in which she feels such confidence. Like Ol' Man River, she just keeps rolling along, with her eyes set on the statutory objective of her office: "To foster and promote the welfare of the workers."

As unfairly and libelously as she has been represented by dubious friends of labor, her attitude is available for all who will read or listen to her public utterances.

LABOR'S RESPONSIBILITY

That attitude is that labor carries with it responsibility not only to wage earners but to all the people of the United States, a responsibility for observing contracts, for thwarting dishonest and subversive influences in its ranks, for conscientious efforts to adjust differences within the labor movement itself, and for cooperation with employers to avoid delays and interruptions and to increase production and efficiency.

She is calmly confident of the inevitable and universal development of happier labor relations and likes to think of a midwestern employer as the pattern of future thinking by industrialists. This employer, she relates with relish, had the happy idea that his workers were as important as his customers. With this in mind, he paid the same courteous attention to their complaints as his clerks did to the customers and the result was continuous and honorable peace.

In summing up it might be well to quote a rough and tumble labor skate, who would resent it if one suggested that he was paraphrasing the Sermon on the Mount, "Blessed are the clean of heart, and so forth." He dismissed some critic of Madam Perkins recently by snorting:

"Fanny Perkins? You're right, I'm for her. Because of the people that's against her."

Bases in the Atlantic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON (MASS.) HERALD

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of yesterday:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald of May 15, 1941]

BASES IN THE ATLANTIC

However we may differ on our policy in regard to the war in Europe, we Americans are united in our determination, whatever the cost, to fight to defend the Western Hemisphere. In his provocative new book, United We Stand, Hanson W. Baldwin, the military critic of the New York Times, discusses at some length the bases which we need for the effective naval, military, or air protection of that vast area. Although you may not agree with his conclusions in other fields—he is, for example, firmly against our outright participation in the European struggle—his observations on our defensive requirements in the western Atlantic are not likely to be challenged.

In the north, Mr. Hanson asks bases at Cartright, Labrador, and Julianehaab, Greenland, in addition to that which we are already establishing in Newfoundland. He suggests that other bases in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are desirable, if they can be achieved with Canada's cooperation.

In the south, of course, we are already building a base at Bermuda. As for the more distant Azores, which belong to Portugal, he holds that they are "clearly beyond our normal strategic scope." Nevertheless, "because of their future importance as potential air bases, we must consider the utility of these islands carefully. * * * In the case of hostilities, they would be made to serve our purpose by the use of the fleet and its marine force to seize them immediately upon the outbreak of conflict and by their organization as an advanced base."

Proceeding further south into the Caribbean, we now have what he regards as an adequate screen for the vital Panama Canal in our established or prospective bases on the Bahamas, Cuba, Jamaica, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Antigua, Santa Lucia, Trinidad, and British Guiana. But, he maintains, perhaps looking toward a possible German occupation of French Africa, that we must have a formidable base on Brazil's shoulder, possibly at Natal or Pernambuco. If the Brazilians decline to grant permission on the score of common defense, it would be worth $100,000,000 to us, he declares, to buy the necessary territory outright. This line of bases would insure, at least so far as the Atlantic coast is concerned, that we should be able to "bomb potential enemies in Europe, without in turn exposing our own mainland to retaliatory bombing."

Losses of Utah Honey Producers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. ROBINSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1941

ARTICLE BY RAY McGUIRE AND THERON LIDDLE, OF SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to insert in the RECORD an article written by Ray McGuire and Theron Liddle, both of Salt Lake City, Utah, for publication in the American Bee Journal. This article was prompted by the severe losses sustained by Utah honey producers as a result of faulty distribution of grasshopper bait.

The article follows:

[From the American Bee Journal]

Utah bee owners who sustained heavy losses during the summer of 1939 through the deaths of millions of bees from unknown causes are convinced definitely after 2 years' study that the deaths were caused by poison grasshopper bait distributed to farmers by the Federal Government and spread on the fields by the farmers. As a result of the intensive survey, the bee owners have introduced into the United States House of Representatives 49 claims asking the Federal Government to reimburse them for their losses. The claims, ranging from $110 to $22,000, total approximately $100,000.

The scourge virtually bankrupted many Utah bee men, some of whom lost as high as 90 percent of their bees. In the spring of 1939, Utah had approximately 73,000 hives of bees. By the fall of that year the number of hives is believed to have dropped to 45,000, and now the State has only 51,000 hives in spite of heavy replacements.

The Utah bee owners face a hard fight in their effort to obtain reimbursement from the Federal Government, for the Department of Agriculture has reported officially that the grasshopper bait did not cause the bee deaths. However, the Utahans are convinced that the bait poison caused the bee losses, and, aided by J. Fleming Wakefield, State bee inspector, they are continuing to pile up evidence with which they hope to win approval of the claims introduced into the House of Representatives by Congressman J. W. ROBINSON, of Provo, Utah.

In its report the Department of Agriculture contends that careful studies have proved that bees will not touch the poison bait, even when sweetened to be made especially attractive to the bees. In a report by the Utah Agricultural Experiment Station in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture, it is stated that in the immediate vicinity of apiaries, 460 applications of bait were applied on spread cheesecloth or burlap, and at rates 10 to 15 times those normally used for grasshopper control. Frequent observations were made during all hours of the day, during good honey flows as well as during dearths when little nectar was available, and when baits would be attractive to the bees if there were any attraction at all. In all these tests only 39 bees were observed to visit the baits, and none stopped to feed, the report states.

The cooperating investigators from the Department and from the Utah experimental station concluded from their experiments that there was no evidence whatsoever that grasshopper bait was attractive to honey bees or that they would feed upon it under any conditions.

The Utahans answer this report by admitting that the bees do not feed directly upon the bait, but they contend that the arsenic from the bait poisons the water in ditches and pools from which the bees drink. They back up these statements with State and Federal chemists' analyses which show water samples from bee-drinking spots to be contaminated with arsenic to the same degree that arsenic is revealed in the bodies of the dead bees.

The bee owners point out that virtually all watering in Utah is by irrigation, and that this water, after coming in contact with the poison bait in the fields, runs into drain ditches or stands in pools from which the bees drink. The Department of Agriculture argues that no great bee losses were reported in other States in which the grasshopper bait was distributed. The Utahans answer by saying that the States cited by the Department are not heavy irrigation States, and that many of them depend on rainfall for crop watering, thereby eliminating the drainage conditions existing in Utah.

The beemen in their fight for reimbursement from the Federal Government will depend on stories such as the following statement by Louis Christensen, bee raiser of Lehi, Utah:

"On June 27, 1939, grasshopper bait was spread on farms in the Lehi area, and at the same time an irrigating turn was in progress in the vicinity of my hives. On June 29 my bees started dying, and by July 3—only 4 days later—I had lost 432 colonies of bees.

"These deaths occurred before there was any fruit spraying, so the deaths could not be attributed to poison spray. The queens and drones were not affected, so the deaths could not have been caused by an infectious disease."

Similar experiences throughout the State have convinced Mr. Wakefield that the claims against the Government are justified, and he now is preparing all available data to present to Congress in defense of the Utah bee owners' reimbursement measures.

The Department of Agriculture, in denying that the grasshopper bait caused the deaths, contends that the deaths must have been due to poor management, infectious diseases, starvation, weather, fruit spray, or poisonous weeds.

Mr. Wakefield answers those arguments one by one as follows:

Poor management: Bees have been raised in Utah for 97 years, and most of the owners who lost heavily were experienced beemen of many years' experience.

Infectious diseases: The queens and drones were not affected as would have been the case with an infectious disease, and chemical analyses have proved arsenic to be the cause of death.

Starvation: Ample food obviously was available near the hives of many of the bees which died. Also, analyses of bees which were known to have died of starvation showed only 0.05 milligram of arsenic in the bodies, while bees which died in Utah's "plague" analyzed from 0.45 to 0.76 milligram of arsenic.

Weather: There were no unusual weather conditions during the period of the deaths.

Fruit spray: Research by the Utahans proved that bees would not touch the fruit spray which has been used in the State for many years without harm to the bees. Fruit spray did not contaminate the water because little of it reaches the ground.

Poisonous weeds: There are no large amounts of poisonous weeds in Utah, and none which contains arsenic.

"Our studies have convinced us beyond doubt that our bees were killed by drinking water poisoned by the grasshopper bait," Mr. Wakefield says. "Our next job is to prove it to Congress so the Utah bee owners will be reimbursed, and to the Department of Agriculture so a method of grasshopper control can be worked out which will not be injurious to our bees."

The Americanism of Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1941

SPEECH DELIVERED BY DR. R. D. W. CONNOR, ARCHIVIST OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered on May 11, 1941, North Carolina Day, at Stratford Hall, Westmoreland County, by Dr. R. D. W. Connor, a son of North Carolina, on the subject The Americanism of Lee:

I hope it will not seem to you a violation of the proprieties of this occasion if I open my brief speech upon a personal note. Lee and Stratford—what memories those names, those associations, stir within me. They call to mind a North Carolina boy of 12 or 14 years, who spent many a summer's day and winter's evening pouring over the pages of John Esten Cooke's Surrey of Eagle's Nest and Mohun or thumbing the pages of Jones' Personal Reminiscences and Long's Memoirs of Robert E. Lee until he knew them almost by heart. Lee became his hero and Stratford the Valhalla of all southern heroes, a place like Olympus of which he dreamed but never hoped to see.

Stratford, where 137 years ago a child was born who was destined to add luster to the name of the most illustrious of Virginia families. From that family, says his biographer, Robert E. Lee inherited a name writ as large as any in the history of his country and transmitted to him with an honor which it was his constant care never to tarnish. The negative virtue of bearing such a name for three score years and more without tarnish would have been sufficient distinction for most men, but for Robert E. Lee, was reserved nothing less than the glory of lifting it by his own achievements from mere distinction to immortality.

Before Lee's own fame reached its apogee those who bore the name thought it fame enough to be known as the Lees of Virginia. His father, "Light Horse Harry" Lee, the companion at arms of Washington and Greene, spoke for the Lee clan when he said: "Virginia is my country, her only will I obey." Certainly no other family so adequately personified the qualities and characteristics of Virginians, and those qualities and characteristics were woven into the very warp and woof of the personality of Robert E. Lee.

With such an inheritance, it was inevitable that General Lee should think of himself as preeminently a Virginian. In the supreme crisis of his life, when compelled to choose between the certain fame to be won as the commanding general of the armies of the United States and what at the time he believed would be the equally certain obscurity of a regimental officer in the Army of Virginia, he chose the latter without hesitation. Informing his elder brother that he had resigned his commission in the United States Army, he added: "I am now a private citizen, and have no other ambition than to remain at home." What a fate for the greatest soldier of his time to contemplate.

Lee had acted as a Virginian, and for a full half century his own people accepted him as such. For himself he desired no greater distinction, but the world would not have it so. Washington, men began to say, was a great Virginian, but he was also a great American. So, too, were Jefferson, and Madison, and Monroe, and Marshall, and, in our own times, Woodrow Wilson. Thus it began to dawn upon us all that to be a great Virginian is to be a great American, for certainly from no other community have the American people drawn more of those characteristics, both physical and spiritual, that we love to think of as distinctively American than from Virginia.

Americans hold to a pragmatic philosophy of life; Robert E. Lee was a pragmatist in the best sense of the term. Theories and philosophical speculations were not for him. War was his profession: but if he had a theory of war, it must be discovered in his acts, not in his words. His test of any proposed act or course of action was simply, Is it right; and if right, will it work?

Democracy is also a characteristic of American life. Robert E. Lee was a Democrat by nature, believing in "the absolute equality of all men before the law and before God." Lee's democracy was the kind "that levels by exalting instead of lowering"; his way of life was guided by the principle that one's pleasures and privileges are increased by sharing them.

Americans love peace. Robert E. Lee was a man of peace, but he did not belong to that category of persons who regard peace as merely the absence of war. He would have rejected Benjamin Franklin's aphorism that there never was a good war or a bad peace. The kind of peace that Lee loved was the peace of justice, the peace of liberty, the peace of righteousness, and for this kind of peace he was ever ready and willing to wage war. War, he said, is justified when peace is its object.

Americans love a life of action; so did Lee. Ease and idleness made no appeal to him; no man was less fitted for the cloister or the hearth. Never was he so happy as when astride the prancing Traveler he rode along his battle lines; or when matching his engineering skill against the mighty floods of the Mississippi; or when Mexican musket balls and grape were whistling over his head in a perfect shower; or when from Marye's Heights he followed the ebb and flow of battle across the Rappahannock. "It is well that this is so terrible," he said to his companions, "or else we might grow fond of it."

Americans love fair play and despise the player who disputes the umpire's decision. So did Lee. He fought his fight, he lost, he accepted the result. For him, no sulking in his tent, no vain regrets, no harboring of ill feeling against his victorious foe. To the people of the South he proclaimed his conviction that it was "the duty of everyone to unite in the restoration of the country, and the reestablishment of peace and harmony," and they accepted his advice. If to Lincoln belongs the credit for restoring the physical union of our country, to Lee belongs the credit for its spiritual restoration. Such is the American way.

But why multiply examples of Lee's Americanism? The sum of the matter is that in Robert E. Lee flowered not merely the virtues of Virginia, but also the virtues of America.

Some 30 years ago a New England Yankee published a book to which he gave the title, "Lee, the American." It almost took our breath away. Lee, who had thrown up his commission in the United States Army rather than make war upon the South. Lee, who had declared that he would never again draw his sword save in defense of Virginia. Lee, who for 3 long years carried the fortunes of the southern Confederacy on the point of his sword. Lee, the American. How could this be? Northern prejudice was not yet prepared to admit Lee into the company of Washington and Lincoln as the third in the triad of American immortals. Southern partiality was inclined to resent the intrusion of the Yankee psychoanalyst into the innermost secrets of the mind and soul of Lee. But time is the great physician of the spirit as well as of the body, and time was on Bradford's side. Bradford, indeed, had worked a miracle; he had fitted the American eye with bifocal lenses, one-half of which corrected the hyperopia of the northern eye which had seen Lee only as a dim, vague figure too far removed to be clearly preceived and understood, while the other half corrected the myopia of the southern eye which had prevented the South from seeing the larger significance of his career. To both North and South, Bradford had revealed a new Lee, and this revelation, I think, we may record as one of the most significant facts of recent American history. The intangibles are often important factors in shaping the history of nations; the spirit of "Lee, the American" must assuredly be reckoned as one of the most important factors in the spiritual reunion of our country.

It took Bradford himself 25 years to realize the full significance of his achievement. In the preface of the first edition of

his book, published in 1912, he stated that his aim was simply "to give a clear, consistent, sympathetic portrait of a great soul." In the preface of the second edition, published after a lapse of 14 years, he noted with gratification that the interest of the public, both North and South, in the subject of his book "seems by no means to have diminished." How could this continuing interest be explained? Bradford had the answer. "The colossal struggle of the European war [1914–18]," he wrote, "with all the passions and sacrifices involved in it, has made the American Civil War in general seem not perhaps less important, but more remote. Yet the great figures of Lee and Lincoln stand out and become more impressive and more significant for American life and thought as the years pass on. In a sense their problems were not our problems, but assuredly there never was a time when our country and all countries needed more their tolerant, human spirit and their broad, constructive intelligence." And so with prophetic vision, Bradford dedicated his Lee the American to "the young men, both of the North and of the South, who can make or unmake the future of the America of Washington, of Lincoln, and of Lee."

Washington who founded the Union, Lincoln who saved it from physical disruption, Lee who restored its spiritual unity—what message would they have for their countrymen today if they could speak to us? I think I know the answer, because I know that the things they stood for and fought for in their own times were not the transitory things of life but the things that are fundamental, universal, and eternal. Justice. Liberty. Righteousness. These are the things that make a people great; and these are the things for which a people who wish to remain great must be willing to make sacrifices, not merely for themselves but for men of good will everywhere. "We had," wrote General Lee, "sacred principles to maintain and rights to defend, for which we were in duty bound to do our best * * *." And I do not doubt that Lee the American spoke the sentiments of his fellow Americans, Washington and Lincoln.

American People Have Right to Demand Truth Concerning War Aims of Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1941

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a recent War Department newspaper release tells how Army clothing and equipment will be tested under simulated field conditions in a laboratory at Harvard University. Thirty soldiers, according to the release, will be used in the experiment, which calls for them to march on a treadmill at a rate prescribed by an Infantry regulation, carrying regulation packs, with 10-minute rest periods at the end of each hour of marching.

The release further states that the room in which the test will be made is to be kept dry and the treadmill is to be heated to 160° F., to simulate the heating of the desert sand. The equipment of the laboratory—

will be altered to make possible this test of performance of men marching under various climatic conditions existing in the United States.

There is a serious implication in this news release, Mr. Speaker. That implication is that somebody, somewhere in high authority in the United States, is planning to send American soldiers into climates so hot and so moist that the Army does not even know whether the clothing and equipment now being furnished will stand up under the climatic conditions the men will face. That is what this test is designed to show. That is the secret so cleverly covered up by the statement that the men will march "under various conditions * * * approximate to those found during summer months in the western desert region of the United States."

I know of no Member of this House, Mr. Speaker, who possesses the remotest idea that any of Hitler's panzer divisions are to strike in the desert of Arizona or in the sand stretches of the Mojave. How long are the American people to be fed this sort of stuff without being told a little of the plain truth about where our boys are to be sent or where they are to fight? Only a few days ago we read in the morning newspapers that many of our soldiers might be sent to French Martinique. We have been hearing for weeks that they may go to distant Dakar, on the bulge of Africa. The facetious remark made by former Representative Bruce Barton that American boys "must die for dear old Dong Dang" may prove to have been prophetic if the American people, if the fathers and mothers of this country, do not awaken and become alert to what is being planned. We are told that officers and soldiers are being taught Spanish. This news came out many weeks ago, and at the same time Mrs. Roosevelt recommended that American girls study Spanish.

This whole proceeding, Mr. Speaker, smacks of a deception and of a covering up of a dissembling that is serious, that is dangerous, and that is dishonest and deceptive so far as the American people are concerned. Most Members of this Congress will agree that if anybody is entitled to be told something about what is being done about this Nation getting into war, it is the men who must do the fighting and the dying in a war, and their fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, wives, and children.

If there is anybody who has a right to know what master minds are sitting behind the bulwarks of a great political bureaucracy, planning to send American boys to die on the hot sands of some foreign country, it is the boys themselves and their loved ones. Conditions approximating the desert regions of the United States. What the War Department means is conditions approximating Martinique, Dakar, Dong-Dang, and Heaven alone knows where else.

Mr. Speaker, what has become of all the solemn pledges that were made by the President of the United States that our boys were not to be sent to fight anywhere except in case of attack? It is high time the American people were told more of the truth of what is going on, of what is being planned and where our American boys are to be sent to fight and die. The American people are entitled to this information. They ought to have it. This Congress ought to see that they get it. Fairness to everybody demands definiteness now.

Coal! Will There Be Enough for You?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE CINCINNATI ENQUIRER

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I speak today for a great basic national-defense industry, that of bituminous coal, and for the men who own and operate it, as well as their employees, who, with their families, must look to and depend upon it for life, health, and happiness. I call it not only basic but important, because it is the great motive power that rolls the wheels of our marvelous industrial system and maintains the efficiency and effectiveness of the greatest and best transportation facilities known to the whole world, our magnificent system of American railways. Without the complete coordination and cooperative effort of these two great industrial systems all our efforts and plans for the defense of the lives and liberties of the free people of an entire continent would be futile and a miserable and hopeless failure. I know of no instance where either of these great and powerful economic forces have not fully and wholeheartedly cooperated with and supported our Government in our rearmament effort, and still I have not yet mentioned the most vital and important element of our citizenry in this connection, those who work in these two great industrial systems. Unless the engineer remains at the throttle and the fireman in his place, the locomotive will cease to haul the products of our farms and factories, and want and misery will come to haunt the families and homes of all of us, including the wives and children of the engineer and the fireman. Unless the 450,000 brave and courageous men who load the coal in our mines and the millions that work in our factories and mills answer the call to work and remain at their post of duty to the end of their shift, all industry shall become completely paralyzed, economic chaos and famine will soon follow, and liberty in the last stronghold of freedom will perish from the earth. Let us hope and pray that leadership in both industry and labor may quickly sense their whole responsibility in this hour of our country's peril. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks at this point in the

RECORD by including an article under the heading "Coal. Will there be enough for you?" which I clipped from the Cincinnati Enquirer of May 14.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer of May 14, 1941]

COAL! WILL THERE BE ENOUGH FOR YOU?

The most important material in our national-defense program is coal.

To produce the planes, tanks, guns, and munitions needed for defense, a continuous supply of coal is absolutely necessary. Important in maintaining this continuous supply is the storing of an adequate coal reserve by all consumers—home and industrial alike!

Coal consumption from May 1 to October 1, even before the peak of cold weather and national-defense industry demands begin, will be 206,500,000 tons.

Under ordinary circumstances an adequate reserve would have been built up at the mines, at retail coal dealers, and at industrial plants. In fact, on April 1, 1941, these reserve stores totaled 50,650,000 tons.

But the recent strike reduced stocks by May 1, 1941, to 13,500,000 tons.

For safety, this storage in homes, at retail dealers and in industrial plants by October 1, 1941, should total at least 50,000,000 tons.

This means that by October 1, 1941, there must be added to present stocks 36,500,000 tons.

The problem, therefore, is to produce, transport and deliver by October 1, 1941, the coal necessary to build up present reserves to 50,000,000 tons, plus the 206,500,000 tons which will be consumed by October 1, a grand total of 243,000,000 tons.

This is an average of more than 11,500,000 tons of coal each week.

During the period from January 1 to April 1, 1941, the average weekly production totaled only 10,400,000 tons, about 1,100,000 tons per week less than is necessary to provide a minimum margin of safety for insuring the necessary coal reserve for industrial and home use.

Because of the general acceptance of our domestic coals for storing by retailers and householders, mines in our district must of necessity furnish a very high percentage of this type of coal.

The softer structure, higher sulfur coals are not generally acceptable for storing purposes. Therefore, mines producing such coals rarely operate at anything near capacity during the summer months.

From May to September 1940, inclusive, the country's entire coal production was only 8,300,000 tons per week.

This year, in order to provide enough coal for only reasonable storage and meet actual consumers' demands, the coal industry should ship—and consumers accept—3,200,000 tons more each week from May through September.

This is probably the limit of the capacity of the mines and the railroads.

There are other factors which will tend to delay the building up of adequate coal reserves for the coming fall and winter months when cold weather will add its burden of increased consumption of domestic coals. These factors are: the use of coal cars by other national-defense industries; the congestion of cars at the seaboard and lake ports; the loss of employees at the mines because of the draft and the increased need for skilled labor by other defense industries.

As defense production, now only 50 percent under way, reaches its peak, the supply of coal will not satisfy the demand and the situation will indeed be serious for those who have not anticipated their needs.

In your own interest, as well as in the interest of national defense, it is imperative that as much coal as possible be speedily placed in storage in homes and in industrial plants—while operating and transportation conditions are most favorable.

In plain words, if all who will need coal this winter begin to store theirs now, as quickly as it is mined and shipped, there will be coal for all. If everyone waits until September and October to order coal, there will be such a piling up of orders that shipments and deliveries cannot be made to all. This should not be allowed to happen. It will not happen if you get your coal now.

Appalachian Coals, Inc., Transportation Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.

To be sure you have enough coal, store yours at once.

No "Union Now" or Any Other Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM COLORADO SPRINGS GAZETTE

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have an invitation to attend a Union Now luncheon to be held in Washington Monday, May 19. I do not intend to accept the invitation because I do not want Union Now or any other time. I want the United States of America to remain the free and independent United States of America that we have known for the past 160 years.

I shall have more to say about this Union Now luncheon the first of next week. In the meantime I shall be content to extend my remarks to include an editorial recently published in the Colorado Springs Gazette. The editorial follows:

[From the Colorado Springs Gazette]

NO UNION NOW

Both in Britain and in the United States there is some discussion of Anglo-American union, modeled, perhaps, after the American federation. British proponents know what they want. It is, first of all, victory in war, and then speedy economic rehabilitation. Their American associates seem more dazzled than reasoning. It is a peculiarity of Americans that for all their boast of material achievement, they accept inferiority in international affairs.

The Englishman is the very personification of a proud empire, fairly exuding the glorious history of a brilliant nation. He is British, first, last, and always, and he is undeviating in his patriotism and his devotion to the British interest.

The American bows as if by instinct. Perhaps his uniformed lodges have not afforded adequate escape. Maybe his democracy has worked less well along social lines than political and economic. He too, has a background of history as glorious as any written. He is a citizen of a first nation, the world's most powerful nation, a nation which need fear no one nor is under any compulsion to curry favor. He has every cause to be proud, but usually he is apologetic.

So American proponents speak Anglo-American union in terms of American political idiom, but on the basis of need urged by their British "cousins." Incidentally, the relationship itself no longer holds. The American has slowly evolved as a distinct race, a composite of many races, but showing the predominant characteristics of none. The hyphen no longer can be employed. The stock is peculiarly American.

There is a sentimental attachment for Britain that is not held for others with perhaps stronger blood strains, because of ideals and interests held in common. The course of empire and republic in many respects runs parallel. There has been an undeclared working arrangement in the past and there will be need for some such arrangement in the future. What that arrangement is depends upon what future needs may be, and nobody can foresee them.

The very idea of union, then, is little more than daydreaming. The basis on which it is offered by its American protagonists is a nightmare.

The suggestion is that because Federal union has served America well it automatically becomes the basis for Anglo-American union. The British will not agree. For that matter, they know nothing of federalization. They have rejected it in favor of empire. Empire and republic cannot be joined. What becomes of India in such an arrangement? What is the place even of the dominions? The British Parliament is not of the Commonwealth but of the United Kingdom. And what is the United States but a junior partner in an English-speaking union?

It is all very pretty, but it has no more substantial starting point than that flight of British fiction which finds Mr. Roosevelt spending the end of his term in Buckingham Palace, George and Elizabeth at some convenient spot, and the union Parliament convening in Bermuda to order Anglo-American affairs.

Foreign Trade Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 19, 1941

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the President issued yesterday in connection with the celebration of Foreign Trade Week.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As we join in the observance of National Foreign Trade Week this year, we know that we are facing a world-wide crisis of truly desperate intensity. Totalitarian aggression is now reaching out into nearly every quarter of the globe. It has become clear that this aggression menaces not only our foreign trade and our national business prosperity, but also the very social and spiritual framework of our democratic way of life. Already, and to a very serious extent, military and economic aggression have circumscribed the area within which the principles upon which we base our international commercial relations can operate.

International commerce in a world dominated by totalitarianism would never be carried on for the mutual benefit of all. It would be rigorously controlled for the sole advantage of those nations and ruling groups

which already have declared their determination to conquer the world and to subordinate to their own profit the welfare of all other peoples.

That this is a fact is attested by official or inspired German announcements. Trade in such a world would be merely another weapon for further ruthless aggression and subjugation.

Therefore, it is idle for us to talk of future foreign trade unless we are ready, now, to defend the principles upon which it is and must be based. That defense calls most urgently on every American for his immediate and utmost effort. Otherwise there can be no foreign trade of the future on fair terms, under democratic principles.

During the past 7 years the United States has made real progress toward the rebuilding of world commerce on the principles of mutual benefit, fair dealing, and friendly cooperation among nations. Despite the economic and spiritual black-out of certain countries, we are continuing to make progress toward this objective in cooperation with our good neighbors to the south and elsewhere.

Both now and after the emergency shall have passed the United States must continue its leadership in the preservation and promotion of liberal economic policies. Only through that leadership can this country fulfill its responsibility in the rebuilding of a world economy from the chaos into which it has been plunged by destructive trade restrictions, born largely of greed and unreasoning fear, and by ruthless aggression.

Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. HUGHES

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 19, 1941

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address on the subject We Belong to America, delivered by the Vice President yesterday in Washington, under the auspices of the National Education Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE BELONG TO AMERICA

To be able to say, "I am an American" is a precious privilege. St. Paul 1,900 years ago claimed preferred treatment on the ground of his Roman citizenship. We in the United States today have in our citizenship something far more precious than that which Paul valued so highly. Men paid money to buy Roman citizenship. Every year in the United States we give citizenship free of charge to two and one-half million young men and women who have just reached the age of 21. I wish there might be a special ceremony or birthday celebration for each of these two and a half million, so that the solemnity of the first day of United States citizenship might be fittingly observed.

For my part, I remember when that day came to me 33 years ago. My grandfather wrote me a special letter on the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship. Today the responsibilities of United States citizenship are far greater than in 1909. The word "American" means more now than it did then. In 1909 most of us looked on an American as merely a citizen of the United States. Today the idea of Pan-Americanism has become so strong that we look on the word "American" as denoting citizenship not merely in a particular nation, but also citizenship in the entire hemisphere. Every nation in this hemisphere is bound together by treaties on behalf of New World democracy.

To an increasing extent, I hope the citizens of Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, and all of Latin America, as well as the United States, will look on themselves as having in addition to their national citizenship a supercitizenship in America, the hemisphere where nations earnestly try to settle their disputes peacefully without lying, treaty breaking, or aggression. As citizens of the United States and America, we must do everything possible to make the America of the future worthy of the dreams of the great liberators of the past century.

We must never permit in America the development of the idea that one brand of humanity is superior to the others. We have here in America a chosen land but not a chosen race. I remember a boyhood friend whose mother was a Swedish washerwoman who spoke very broken English. The boy did well at school, made a business success, and became mayor of his town.

There was a time when certain so-called Americans looked down on the Irish. Later on they look down on the Italians, the Greeks, and the Poles. But as time has gone on we have found that the children of the poverty-stricken immigrants have learned our language and our habits and have done well. Listen to the names of famous people in athletics, in the arts, in politics, and in science. Read the names of the Yankee baseball players, the Notre Dame or Minnesota football players. Germans, Italians, Poles, Jews, and Negroes all make their mark not only in football and boxing but in business and the arts. Knudsen, from Denmark, and Hillman, from Lithuania, are active in running our great defense effort.

The foreigners have made America, and America has made them. We ask just one thing of our naturalized foreigners, and that is that they believe wholeheartedly in the American democratic idea. When they take their examinations to determine their worthiness for naturalization, they are asked questions designed to show their knowledge of the processes of democracy. It is my observation that many naturalized immigrants and their children appreciate the blessings of democracy more completely than many whose ancestors have lived here for 200 years. Democracy is not mere talk with them. They know that America is the land of opportunity—that there never has been such a chosen land and that there never will be its like again.

They want to do everything possible to cherish such a land, so that it may serve as a veritable mountain of the Lord to which all races may flow to live together in peace, abundance, and security.

America is not a land of the whites alone, the Negroes alone, the Jews alone, the Catholics alone, or the Anglo-Saxons alone. We like the Germans in America, provided only that they accept the American ideal and do not directly or indirectly give comfort to the Hitler idea of racial superiority, which is so utterly opposed to what America stands for.

And so I hope that on this day our fine German citizens will join with our fine citizens from every other land in thanking God for America—for this hemisphere which we mean to keep free today and for the centuries to come.

Foreign Trade Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 19, 1941

ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered last evening by the Secretary of State in connection with the celebration of Foreign Trade Week, which was broadcast over a Nation-wide hook-up.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tonight we inaugurate another annual National Foreign Trade Week. Again, as a year ago, it comes in the midst of war. You know as well as I that now there is little use in our talking about and planning for foreign trade unless the outcome of the war is favorable to the free peoples of the world. For trade means free bargaining to mutual advantage. To us it does not mean exploitation by military cliques backed by cannon. And so, for the present, our foreign trade consists more and more, and will consist more and more, of making and placing in the hands of nations which are resisting unlawful attack the tools of self-defense. This trade, like all trade, is futile if the goods produced do not reach those for whom they are intended.

We are a practical people. When we set ourselves to a task we finish it. We have set ourselves to the task of arming and supplying those whose successful defense is vital to our security. I have said before, and I repeat: We will not permit this purpose to be frustrated. We will find a way to insure that the weapons pouring in ever greater volume from our factories will reach the hands which eagerly await them. Only as we stand strong and united in this purpose, can we look forward to a brighter day.

We have seen during the past year the continued spread of ruthless aggression by nations bent upon world domination. We have seen the enslavement of every nation which was so unfortunate as to stand in the way and was not strong enough to repel aggression. Nations which were unable to protect themselves have been crushed by military frightfulness that has known no bounds. In each territory taken over, organized brutality has been carried to the utmost lengths in order to coerce conquered peoples into unwilling support of new conquests and an ever-widening circle of enslavement.

The safety of our Nation, as of every free nation, is in mortal danger insofar as our people permit themselves to be lulled into a false sense of security by those who mistakenly assume that two oceans, plus a natural desire to be at peace with all the world, will protect us. The paramount purpose of the leaders of the movement of conquest is to secure control of the high seas, which control is essential to the execution of their program of world domination. Every consideration of our own defense and safety requires that we see to it that Great Britain receives adequate supplies for her successful resistance.

At this critical moment we must not be weakened by internal division; we must

devote our whole energy to essential tasks. The production and transfer of essential supplies to those countries which are actively resisting aggression demand sacrifice of time and substance, and making of maximum effort, on the part of each and every American citizen. Delays in meeting full schedules of production of essential military supplies, whether caused by business complacency or by strikes, can and should be avoided, for they gravely endanger the safety of the Nation. Our greatest possible national effort must be made, not for the sake of other countries but primarily for the sake of and to insure our own security. Either the spread of lawlessness in the world must be brought to a halt or we shall soon find ourselves surrounded by aggressors and compelled to fight, virtually alone and against great odds, for our own national existence.

These are obvious dangers that lie immediately ahead. But they are not the only dangers. To get a more complete picture of what they involve, it is necessary to envisage the kind of an economic world that would exist if the would-be conquerors were to win. Their current pronouncements and practices provide an ample warning on that score.

The key to their economic program is contained in one simple word—"conquest." Every territory that they conquer is reduced forthwith to an economic master-and-slave relationship. The economic structure of the enslaved country is forcibly reshaped and systematically subordinated to the economy of the ruling country. Within the entire tributary area autarchy or economic self-sufficiency is set up as the central feature of economic policy. At the center of this widely dispersed web of captive nations the master country wields its vastly enlarged powers in an unceasing effort to ensnare, overwhelm, and enslave every remaining free nation in the world.

The tragic experience of the conquered countries of Europe provides unassailable evidence of how this system is applied in the field of trade. Under it, trade is reduced essentially to enforced barter. The would-be conqueror forces delivery to him, at his own price, of the goods he wants, and enforces this arrangement by every device of discrimination and arbitrary control. There is not the slightest pretense of promoting mutually profitable trade with other countries upon the basis of equality and fair dealing. It is a system based upon the principle not of economic cooperation but of economic spoliation.

In the face of these facts, no one need be in doubt as to the situation that would confront this Nation in the realm of trade, as elsewhere, in the event of an Axis victory. For the past 7 years our Government has taken the leadership in an effort to reopen the channels of international trade and thus to assist in world economic restoration, with resulting political stability, from which all countries, great and small, would benefit. It has proceeded throughout upon broad principles of cooperation and fair dealing, and has recognized that only mutually profitable trade can be truly beneficial and enduring. These principles are broad enough to include every country willing to cooperate in a program of economic peace. By the same token they stand at the opposite pole from the predatory policies and methods of the totalitarians. Between the two systems there can be no workable adjustment.

After the first World War an attempt was made to reorganize the world on a sound basis. New institutions were created and new methods of cooperation were established. All peoples shared the hope that a new era in international relations had begun.

Unhappily, shortly after the close of the World War, power fell into the hands of groups which advocated political and economic nationalism in their most extreme forms. The inevitable effects, politically, economically, and socially during the years that followed were utterly disastrous. The outcome was division and weakening, and final break-down of the necessary international foundation on which peace is based.

Knowing these facts as we do, it is none too early to lay down at least some of the principles by which policies must be guided at the conclusion of the war, to press for a broad program of world economic reconstruction, and to consider tentative plans for the application of those policies.

The main principles, as proven by experience, are few and simple:

1. Extreme nationalism must not again be permitted to express itself in excessive trade restrictions.

2. Nondiscrimination in international commercial relations must be the rule, so that international trade may grow and prosper.

3. Raw material supplies must be available to all nations without discrimination.

4. International agreements regulating the supply of commodities must be so handled as to protect fully the interests of the consuming countries and their people.

5. The institutions and arrangements of international finance must be so set up that they lend aid to the essential enterprises and the continuous development of all countries, and permit the payment through processes of trade consonant with the welfare of all countries.

Measures taken to give effect to these principles must be freely open to every nation which desires a peaceful life in a world at peace and is willing to cooperate in maintaining that peace.

Such a program has strength and endurance. It will stand long after the war-built arrangements forced on disheartened or imprisoned peoples by military conquest have fallen to pieces and have vanished utterly.

There still are people who do not see that if, when the present conflict ends, we do not have a system of open trade, they will not be able either to buy or to sell except on terms really laid down by the military forces and political authorities of the countries with which they have to deal.

Unless a system of open trade becomes firmly established, there will be chronic political instability and recurrent economic collapse. There will never be peace in any real sense of the term.

In the final reckoning the problem becomes one of establishing the foundations of an international order in which independent nations cooperate freely with each other for their mutual gain—of a world order, not new but renewed, which liberates rather than enslaves.

We shall not be able to do this until we have a world free from imminent military danger and clear of malign political intrigue. At present the world is scourged by both. We can expect no healthy development until the menace of conquest has been brought to an end. Only then will the time have arrived when steel is valued not in terms of the bombs that can be made of it but in terms of the instruments of peaceful life into which it can be forged, and when foreign trade has reverted again from cargoes of weapons and explosives to commodities that nourish and heal and enrich their consumers.

This Nation is resolved to evade no issues and to face harsh facts. We believe that there can be created a safer and more prosperous world. We have the tools, the resources, the brains, the hands with which to help make it such. But first the tide of force must be turned back. Once that is done, we and other nations can reestablish an open, cooperative economic life in which trade may increase, economic welfare may grow, civilization may advance, and the peaceful and benevolent instincts of masses of now prostrate people may once more flourish in the really worthwhile ways of life.

Resolution To Create a Fact-Finding Committee To Visit Nations at War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1941

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, by request of Hon. Charles G. Binderup, an esteemed former Member of the House of Representatives from Nebraska, I have today introduced a joint resolution for the creation of a special committee to investigate economic, political, and social conditions of all European nations involved in the war. In order that the people throughout the Nation may have an opportunity to become acquainted with this proposal of our former colleague, I present the text thereof for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ECONOMIC, POLITICAL, AND SOCIAL CONDITIONS OF ALL EUROPEAN NATIONS INVOLVED IN WAR

Whereas it is not only important but absolutely necessary that the Government of the United States, in order to properly and justly formulate its program with reference thereto, have as complete and definite information and knowledge as to the economic, political, and social conditions existing in foreign nations with whom we have international relations; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has heretofore recently sent special representatives to England and the British Isles for the purpose of ascertaining the true conditions existing in the British Empire; and

Whereas these representatives, together with private citizens who have gone to England on volition, have made confidential reports to the executive department of our Government with reference to the economic, political, and social conditions in the British Isles; and

Whereas it is equally necessary that the Congress and executive department of our Government have similar information with regard to other European nations, including those recently subjugated by the Axis Powers: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That a special committee composed of six members of the majority party in the United States Senate, four members of the minority party of the United States Senate, six members of the majority party of the House of Representatives, four members of the minority party of the House of Representatives, be appointed by the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House, respectively, to represent the Congress, and of five persons appointed by the President of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That this special committee be instructed to make personal investigations of the economic, political, and social conditions of each of the nations of the European continent, including those nations recently subjugated by the Axis Powers; and be it further

Resolved, That, as soon as the committee shall have been appointed, the committee shall proceed to organize by electing one of its members as chairman and one member of the committee as secretary, and that thereupon the committee shall divide, the chair-

man designating certain members to visit designated nations of Europe, and the member so designated shall personally and fully investigate the economic, political, and social conditions of the nation assigned to him and shall make a full and complete report of his investigation to the full committee. When all members have made report concerning nations assigned to them, the chairman of the committee shall make a full and complete report to the President of the United States and also to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That there shall be appropriated out of money in the United States Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, an amount of money necessary to cover the expenses incurred by this special committee, not exceeding the sum of $———.

Shall the United States Enter the European War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 19, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT A. TAFT, OF OHIO

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] on Saturday evening, May 17, 1941, on the subject Shall the United States Enter the European War? It is an able address, which I hope will be widely read.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans of the radio audience, the question whether we shall aid Britain, by convoys or otherwise, is no longer the issue before the American people. We are aiding Britain today in every possible manner short of war. The real question is much more fundamental—shall our aid to Britain be short of war, or shall we declare war on Germany if that course will be of assistance to Great Britain? The arguments for war and convoys are carried on with furore and emotion, and bitter vituperation against those who disagree. I want to discuss the problem with you tonight calmly, as I see the logic of the situation and the true interest of the American people.

EMOTION DOES NOT JUSTIFY WAR

History has shown that war sentiment is usually animated, not by logic, but by an unreasoning emotion. Today there is an intense hatred and resentment of German outrage. I sympathize with that feeling. I detest every utterance of Hitler and every action of the German Government in the last 8 years. Our prejudices are surely justified but we should not be guided even by a justified prejudice. I would cheer on an individual who entered a fight because of such prejudices and emotions, and I would call it chivalry. But a nation is not an individual. It should not be moved by the same motives which properly inspire an individual. Your leaders must consider the interest of 130,000,000 other Americans. What may be brave and chivalrous for an individual to undertake may be completely selfish for a nation or a nation's leaders. It is not unselfish for you and me to send other people's sons, as well as our own, into the holocaust of modern war. It is not unselfish for college professors to send their students to war even in a holy cause. I am tired of those editors and statesmen who look on war as a game to be played with 130,000,000 pawns. We have the duty to consider the interest of all our lions of foreign people in other parts of the world. We must face the results of plunging into war. We must determine whether war is really in any way in the interest of the men and women and children in the great industrial cities, in the towns, and on the farms of the United States.

THE ADVOCATES OF CONVOYS ARE ADVOCATING WAR

The immediate interest of the country is in the question of convoys, but it is obvious that the use of this term only conceals the real issue, for President Roosevelt himself has said, "Convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war." Senator PEPPER, regarded as a mouthpiece of the administration, made a speech last week in Congress openly advocating our participation in the war, with convoys as the first step. The so-called Fight for Freedom Committee, which would be small indeed if we eliminate the editors and writers and college professors, is publishing full-page advertisements saying "We urge the use of our mighty naval force to hold the seas of the world against the enemies of the world. Let's wait no longer." For some reason, editors and columnists and professors, who have never run a government or even a business, seem to be more moved by war emotion than the plain, average citizen who will have to do the fighting. There are not many of these brain trusters, but they are the most vocal part of the population.

Secretary Stimson last week advocated the use of our Navy to make the seas secure for the delivery of munitions to Great Britain. Of course, that means the destruction of German submarines, airplanes, and raiders which may attack British ships over in European waters. That is frankly war. Of course it would also be directly in violation of the President's express promise made just before the election, when he said, "We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack." Secretary Stimson has always been for war. Even before he was appointed Secretary a year ago he made a speech advocating convoys and other war measures.

Secretary Knox is openly for war. His speech of April 25, in which he says that we have committed ourselves in this world struggle, and are occupying an immoral and craven position in asking others to make all the sacrifice for a victory essential to us, is a reaffirmation of the warlike position Secretary Knox has occupied ever since 1939.

Mr. Wendell Willkie, in his speech at Madison Square Garden, said, "We want those cargoes protected, and we want them protected at once and with less talk and more action." Action means war, and he is criticizing the President for a failure to direct warlike action. Many newspapers are openly for war, and so are many columnists and radio commentators. The people have come to realize that the issue, War or Peace? is here today for their decision.

IMPORTANCE OF CONVOYS IS GREATLY EXAGGERATED

At the present moment this issue is still slightly camouflaged behind a demand for convoys. It is said that there is no use in manufacturing munitions and giving them to England unless we are prepared to guarantee that they are safely delivered in England. I suspect that the real purpose of advocating convoys is to provide an effective means of getting us into the war, rather than any concern about the arrival of our munitions. For it has now been made clear that in the first 4 months of this year less than 4 per cent of the ships carrying munitions from this country to Great Britain were actually sunk. These are the figures of the United States Maritime Commission, confirmed by the experience of the American Red Cross. When we consider also that our most valuable aid to England today is the supplying of bombing planes, and that these planes are flown over under their own power, the actual percentage of destruction is even less than 4 per cent. Furthermore, there is no assurance that if we convoy we can prevent sinkings, although we may somewhat reduce them. Apparently a considerable percentage of our munitions is destroyed after their arrival in England by the bombing of ships, docks, and warehouses in the harbors. Our convoys cannot prevent that destruction.

If what the administration wants to do is to aid England, it can accomplish a great deal more by speeding up production and eliminating strikes and providing a sensible Government set-up in Washington to secure that result. The argument for convoys is not sound, anyway. There is no reason why, because we choose to aid the British by making available in this country, free of charge, unlimited quantities of munitions, we should also assume voluntarily the burden of delivering those munitions in England and thereby go to war in England's behalf. England has more than half the merchant shipping of the world, a larger navy than we have, and control of the seas as much as seas can be controlled under modern conditions of warfare.

Think what the argument for convoys really implies. If it is sound to say that there is no use supplying munitions without delivering them, then it is just as sound to say that there is no use delivering munitions if the British have not enough men to handle them. Once we have convoys, the argument follows inevitably that we must send our Army to handle the growing flood of American munitions. Nothing is said now by the British about any shortage of men, but after a year and a half of war they have only been able to get a mixed force of 500,000 men to Africa, where they certainly need a million men today. The cry for men will follow the cry for convoys.

According to Secretary Stimson and Secretary Knox, convoys are a necessary result of the policy established by Congress in the Lease-Lend Act. But when the act was before Congress its advocates promised that it implied no convoys and would in fact prevent a war, synonymous with convoys. The act expressly provides that it shall not be construed to authorize convoys. It expressly forbids the sending of American merchant vessels to carry lend-lease material through the war zones. Surely even our warlike Secretaries cannot claim that the President has any right to convoy the vessels of foreign nations through the war zone in such a way as to involve the United States in war. The argument for convoys is a mere smoke screen for war. Step by step the advocates of war have led the country closer and closer to the precipice, always maintaining that at heart they are really for peace. Now the mask is off.

REASONS FOR AND AGAINST WAR

While I resent the tactics which have been pursued by the war party, I do not lightly dismiss the arguments which they now make for our entrance into war. You who listen tonight must examine those arguments without prejudice, in the light of the ultimate true interest of the American people.

What would we gain by entering the war, and what dangers would we avoid? For

many years the leaders in this country, of every party, have asserted that America should never go to war unless an attack is made on this continent. Shall we now depart from that established policy by going to war with a country which has made no attack on us, and whose violent language only matches our own?

IT WOULD TAKE MANY YEARS TO CRUSH HITLER

It is said that Hitler must be crushed and fascism eliminated from the world. Can this be done? I am no defeatist. I feel confident that England can defend herself against German attack. I think she can build up an air force which will do to the German cities what the Germans have been doing to the English cities. When that occurs I believe that a more satisfactory peace can be made than could be made today. But that is very different from crushing Germany. How are we going to crush Germany even with air superiority, when we see how England is defending herself today against air superiority? How can we finally crush Germany except by landing an armed force on the Continent of Europe? That may be easy for columnists to do in the newspaper, but it would take many years to build up an army that could do the real job. It would take class after class of American boys now still in their teens. War is costing England $25,000,000,000 a year; it would cost this country $50,000,000,000 a year. After 5 years what would be left of our economy or our prosperity when we had spent ourselves into bankruptcy? And then we could not be sure that we would finally be able to crush Germany.

EVEN IF WE WERE SUCCESSFUL, IT WOULD MEAN A PERPETUAL POLICING OF THE WORLD

Suppose, however, that we were able to do it. What are we going to do about it after that? There are 80,000,000 German people. Our most vociferous warriors do not propose to wipe out that people. They will remain the strongest people on the continent, and the most numerous except the Russians. If we wish to protect the small democracies, we will have to maintain a police force perpetually in Germany and throughout Europe. Secretary Stimson, Dorothy Thompson, and Henry Luce seem to contemplate an Anglo-American alliance perpetually ruling the world. Frankly, the American people don't want to rule the world, and we are not equipped to do it. Such imperialism is wholly foreign to our ideals of democracy and freedom. It is not our manifest destiny or our natural destiny. We may think we are better than other peoples, more competent to rule, but will they think so? Will they welcome an Anglo-American benevolent despotism any more eagerly than a German despotism? The inevitable result of what the war party is urging on this country is an American Empire, doing what the British have done for the past 200 years. But our people don't want to be emperors even if they could be.

There have been wars in Europe for a thousand years. There will probably be wars for years to come. Europe, its varied peoples and its small democracies, must work out their own salvation. No outsider can permanently aid them. We may think we know what the European arrangement should be, but we cannot impose it on Europe if we would. The British Empire is the greatest and wealthiest people in the world, but if it could not stand today without our going to war to bolster it up, then I doubt if it could long stand even with our aid.

WAR IS NO AID TO DEMOCRACY

In short, those who talk about entering the war do not think their program through. War is vain. We may favor freedom and democracy in every country in the world, but no one has ever changed the philosophy of other peoples for the better by conquest. No one has been able to impose for long a form of government on any people which does not wish it or is not suited to it. Today we hear again the blaring trumpets which demand that we make the world safe for democracy. We tried that in 1917, and out of that war grew more "isms" and autocracies and violent dictators than we had seen for a hundred years.

Far from safeguarding democracy, war is likely to destroy democracy right here in the United States. Congress today is abandoning the constitutional safeguards. It is granting unlimited powers to the President and Jesse Jones, and the Executive departments. A great war debt imposed on our present huge debt would probably break down the whole free-enterprise system on which the American type of freedom has depended. Some of these powers will end at the end of the present emergency, but if the war lasts for 5 years I doubt whether we ever will return to our constitutional system. I believe that there is only one justification for war, and that is the defense of the Nation and its freedoms against foreign or domestic enemies.

HITLER CANNOT INVADE AMERICA

The strongest argument for war made today is the claim advanced by Secretary Stimson that if Britain should be defeated we would be helpless against an attack by Germany, Italy, and Japan. The President denounced Colonel Lindbergh as a defeatist because he said that England cannot defeat Germany. But the real defeatists in this country are Secretaries Stimson and Knox, who say that this country, with the greatest natural resources and the greatest productive capacity in the world, is unable to defend itself without the British Navy. They assert that for a hundred years we have been hiding behind the British Navy, and that our naval policy has been based on that Navy defending our Atlantic coast while we defend the Pacific coast. But this is a complete misrepresentation of the actual facts. The British Navy has not always been friendly during the past hundred years. Since 1900 we have assumed the British would not attack us, but we have built a fleet able to defend us against any other nation or combination of nations, and built the Panama Canal so that it can move from one ocean to the other on an interior line. Today that Navy is twice the size of those of Germany and Italy combined. We are this year adding at least two of the most modern battleships, while the German and Italian fleets are being steadily injured and depleted. Our Navy is larger and more effective than the Japanese Navy.

I shall read what seems to be the heart of Secretary Stimson's argument because it illustrates the unsoundness of his position. He says:

"So long as the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans are under our own or a friendly control, their broad waters constitute an insuperable barrier to any armies which may be built up by would-be aggressor governments. But that condition of friendly control is imperative. If it should be lost, the oceans overnight would become easy channels for the path of attack against us."

With due respect, this proposition seems nonsense to me. It entirely ignores the recognized fact that a navy, to attack across an ocean, must be twice as large as the defending force. It ignores the fact that a naval attack on our Atlantic coast, defended by our Navy, is dismissed as impractical by every naval expert. An ocean is the most effective barrier of defense that the world provides. It is not necessary for us to control the European side of the Atlantic in order that we may defend the American side of the Atlantic. We do not today control the waters of the western Pacific, and yet our Pacific coast is perfectly secure. Think what Secretary Stimson's statement would involve if it were sound. It means that we and our allies, or we ourselves, must forever control all the oceans of the world, and by force prevent any other nation from building a navy able to go to sea and challenge that control even off its own shores.

Our Navy today can prevent a German army coming to South America. We are building, and can continue to build, a navy sufficiently strong to defend the American Continent against military or naval attack. We are adding two of the most modern battleships this year, while the German and Italian Navies are being reduced. We have the coasts on which to build as many shipyards as we need, and more steel to build the ships than all of Europe combined. If we stand on the line of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, we can so certainly defend that line that no nation will even consider a military or naval attack upon us. That is the only way we can insure peace for future generations of Americans. But if we intend to rule all the oceans of the world, if we say that the English Channel is our boundary, then we are always vulnerable. Under modern conditions of air warfare, England will always present a temptation to the strongest continental power, and we will be engaged in perpetual warfare. England must always interfere on the Continent to protect itself, and we would be drawn into similar interference. From the standpoint of our defense, the British Isles are a vulnerable output. Let us by all means help them to defend themselves, but let us not make war in order to dominate all the seven seas and rule the world.

It is extremely unlikely, I believe, that Hitler would attack this country. The alarmists picture a unified Europe, cooperating with Germany against the United States. As a matter of fact, Hitler will be badly involved in trying to govern a dozen different races in Europe, none of them pleased with his rule. He has a tremendous area to police, and turbulent peoples, including his own allies, who hate the Germans. No man and no race has ever succeeded in ruling Europe for long. To set out for America with the flower of the German Army and leave a smoldering volcano behind him is not a thing that any reasonable man would do. Hitler may be mad, but there has been method in his madness. He has little to gain by such an expedition, and all to lose. Napoleon's expedition to Moscow was nothing to such an enterprise. But whether he wishes to undertake it or not, there is no basis for any fear that he can succeed.

A BRITISH DEFEAT WOULD HAVE NO SUBSTANTIAL EFFECT ON OUR FOREIGN TRADE

One other argument is made for our entering the war. That is the argument of Mr. Willkie which is printed in a recent Collier's. It is said that we are wholly dependent on our foreign trade, and that that trade will be destroyed in the event of British defeat, particularly the trade with South America. I assert as vehemently as possible that no American nation should go to war over a question of foreign trade. The tremendous destruction of war is far greater in 1 year than the benefits to be derived by us in 20 years of foreign trade. The whole idea of making war on a country that has not attacked us because some day that country may be a successful competitor for foreign trade is so far from the point of view of the American people that I hardly see how it can be seriously urged even by those searching for a cause of war.

From a trade standpoint, this country is almost self-sufficient. Its foreign exports in recent years have amounted to $3,000,000,000 annually, about 5 per cent of its total income. Of this foreign trade, only $300,000,000, about one-tenth—or one-half of 1 per cent—of our total income, is with South America. It is utterly untrue that a reduction of foreign trade was responsible for the depression or an excuse for the piling up of a huge Government debt. As a matter of fact, our foreign

trade has been substantial during recent years. Undoubtedly, there will be some reduction in that trade when this war comes to an end, but that will be true whether Germany is victorious or Britain is victorious. The impoverished peoples of Europe are going to have to work for starvation wages in any event for a long time, and in many places are going to be able to undersell us. But that is the result of war, not of German victory.

On the other hand, a considerable part of our foreign trade will continue, no matter who wins the war. Three times as much of that trade is with North American countries as with South American countries. Even in South America, our trade in coffee with Brazil, for instance, must continue, because there is no other market in the world which can absorb the Brazilian production of coffee. The same is true of rubber in the East Indies and silk in Japan.

Undoubtedly governments will have more to do with foreign trade in the event of German victory, but I am afraid this is true no matter who wins. Only recently Secretary Hull made a treaty putting the whole coffee trade of the world on a quota system, and incidentally raising the annual cost of coffee to the consumers of this country by $25,000,000. But I see no reason why Government control of foreign trade would result in any greater regimentation or control of free enterprise and free competition within the United States than we already have. Our domestic trade and our domestic markets are larger today than those of the entire world a hundred years ago. We are almost a self-contained unit, and competition is severe in many industries where foreign imports are not now a factor. We can keep a free enterprise system and competition if we wish to. Why not? The whole trade argument is a bogeyman, dangled before us as a cause for war, simply because the average man does not have the figures or the information to reply to it.

"WAR IS HELL"

There are some who say that we are already in the war, but we are not. They will be surprised at the difference if we ever are. We could not stop at naval warfare. We would face all the realities of modern war from which the glamour has gone, and most of the heroism. War today is murder by machine. It is more destructive than it has ever been. It kills women and children as well as men. Five hundred thousand casualties in the World War are nothing compared to what may occur if we once become involved in this war.

For many years we have been building up the standard of living of our people. We have been trying to provide happiness for more people in greater amount. Two years of war will wipe out all the progress we have made. War will wreck trade and finance. A short artificial boom is bound to be followed by depression and hardship and unemployment. The petty difficulties of foreign trade would be a drop in the bucket compared to the inevitable cost of 5 years of war.

A PEACEFUL AMERICA IS THE HOPE OF THE WORLD

And now, today, now we face the choice. Are we going to go beyond the tremendous assistance we can give Britain by a speedy and efficient and unlimited production of war materials, to plunge into the cauldron of European and Asiatic war? If we are involved in protecting Singapore and the Philippines, much less aid and many fewer airplanes are going to England. Are we going to assume the task of maintaining forever a balance of power in Europe? Are we going to join a partnership the avowed purpose of which is to rule the world? Are we going to allow emotion to involve us in a war of which no human being can see the end?

There is only one way in which we can advance the cause of democracy in the world. That is by demonstrating that that form of government is the kind of government which will bring the greatest peace and security and happiness to the people who adopt it; by proving that even in time of war and emergency and crisis the essential democratic processes can be retained.

We have the means of remaining at peace. Up to this time the President has resisted the appeals of those hotheads who would precipitate the Nation upon an uncharted course. If the people back home, you who are listening to me tonight, and millions who think as you do, after calm and reasonable consideration, decide that war is unwise, we have every reason to believe that the President will abide by your decision.

Hope of the World Lies in Youth of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 19, 1941

ADDRESS BY BISHOP BERNARD J. SHIEL

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on last Thursday evening in the city of Chicago a banquet was given in honor of Most Rev. Bernard J. Shiel, D. D., founder and national director of the Catholic Youth Organization. Many dignitaries attended the banquet, including the Governor of the State of Illinois, the mayor of the city of Chicago, former Senator Sherman Minton, and others. I take this occasion briefly to discuss the address because of the inspiration it gave me when I had occasion to read it.

The address delivered by Bishop Shiel is a challenge to the youth of the world. That is the most thought-provoking part of his entire speech, even though he deals with current world events.

Bishop Shiel, who has had perhaps as much experience with the youth of America as any other man in modern times, says that the hope of the world lies in the youth of the world. In that statement I heartily concur.

Mr. President, when the bishop made this marvelous address he must have had in mind what Disraeli, the great Prime Minister of England said many years ago. Disraeli said that almost everything that is great has been done by youth.

I trust that every Senator may find the time in these busy days to read this brief address by Bishop Shiel, and I hope that other Senators may receive the same inspiration from it that I received.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From these experiences have come certain definite conclusions that are now burning convictions, and the most important of these is the problem of education for right human life. Without right education no free people can long endure, and least of all a people committed to the democratic way of life.

Now, the only possible foundation for right human life is the moral law. If the moral law be neglected or ignored, there remains only force, and force can never be the basis of right. Here you have the stark alternatives which always and everywhere confront mankind. Men must be governed either by the law of right, which is the moral law, or they will be governed by the law of might, which is the law of guns and all the other instruments of coercion. But without God there is no support for the moral law, and therefore without God and the moral law there is and can be no foundation for right human life. These conclusions are illustrated and sustained by contemporary history.

Undoubtedly we are living in one of the darkest hours of human history. Never in all the storied ages of mankind was the whole world so convulsed with horrors and atrocities. Wherever we turn our eyes frightful anomalies and incomprehensible absurdities confront our startled vision.

Over part of the world statesmanship is wholly bankrupt. In these nations today the normal processes of civilized life are disrupted. Brute force is the consecrated deity at whose bloody altars these nations worship. The social, economic, and political life of these peoples is little more than a horrid nightmare which appalls and terrifies.

In Europe, Asia, Africa millions of men armed with incredible engines of destruction are marching with one dread thought in their minds, with one hate-inspired purpose in their hearts, with one grim determination inspiring their every deed—to fill the earth with death and destruction.

The smiling valleys and the fertile plains are furrowed, blackened, and poisoned by a rain of shot, bursting bombs, and shell. The highways, the byways, and the fields are choked with the mangled bodies of the finest young manhood of the world. Peaceful villages and majestic cities are reduced to heaps of smoldering debris, under which lie buried thousands of women and children.

This description which falls so short of the frightful reality sounds more like a tale of unbridled savagery or raving madness than the recital of atrocities perpetrated by civilized men. No human mind, however powerful and profound, can fully comprehend the crimson guilt of it. No human tongue, however eloquent, can adequately express the horror of it. No imagination, however fertile and creative, can fittingly depict the blackness, the despair, the measureless magnitude of the tragedy.

But there is little use in complaining about evils unless we seek to ascertain their cause. No evil ever was or can be cured unless we remove its cause. What then is the cause of these portentous evils which threaten the life of peoples and the continuance of civilization itself?

For those who have eyes to see and minds to understand the cause is not far to seek. It is idle to talk about the little puppets—Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin—who strut their brief day upon the stage of life.

They have their guilt. It is a fearful, diabolic guilt because they have loosed the forces of evil which trample under their brutal feet all the consecrated rights of humanity. What then is the cause? All these nations have banished God and the moral law from their councils and deliberations. For as St. Paul says in his own powerful and graphic language, "When they knew God, they have not worshiped Him as God, nor given thanks. But they were puffed up in their minds and their foolish hearts were darkened. For professing themselves to be wise, they became fools."

The reason is as simple as it is demonstrative. God is truth. He is the source and fountain of all truth. Without God there is

no truth. Consequently when God is banished, truth is banished. When truth is banished, there is nothing left except lying, deceit, and hypocrisy.

This is the precise and exact history of the political world during the past 25 years. All these nations have made solemn treaties with one another and they have violated every article of them before the ink on the paper was dry. They have expressed enduring love and high esteem for one another at the very moment they were preparing feverishly to murder one another. They swear before earth and heaven that never again will they have recourse to arms to settle international disputes and the first time a dispute arises, they wheel out the engines of war.

Can anyone wonder at the reeking brood of multiplied evils, which feed like vultures upon the dead hopes of enslaved peoples? There is only one remedy. Remove the cause. All else is a silly palliative. Restore God and the moral law to the councils and deliberations of nations. The imperative question with which every law, every national policy, every international relation must be confronted should be, Is this in accordance with the eternal immutable principles of truth, of right, of justice, of human well-being, and happiness? Is it in conformity with the divine will and purpose? Let no one cherish the illusion there is any other remedy for the blindness, the stupidity, the reckless malice of those in high places who have all but wrecked the modern world. But some may ask, What has all this to do with education for right human life? I answer—everything. There is only one secure foundation for right human relations and above all for a genuine democracy and that is the great ideas of the fatherhood of God and brotherhood of man. Most certainly if we are all equally the children of a common father without distinction of race, color, or nationality, of social position, economic status, or political organization, then we have the most powerful motives of abiding love, of profound sympathy, and generous good will. Without love of our fellow men, sympathy and good will, right human relations and genuine democracy are fantastic chimeras.

Let there be no mistake about it, the supreme battle of the modern world is the battle for God and the moral law. There are powerful, well-organized forces which are aggressively and violently anti-God. The vast resources of government are employed to uproot from the minds and hearts of peoples the beneficent, constructive ideas of God, religion, and morality.

Over against all that I set the youth of the world. I am profoundly persuaded that the one human hope of the modern world is youth. Eager, courageous, enlightened youth can and will scrap the deadly international policies of lying, deceit, and hypocrisy. By youth, if by anyone, the blatant, shallow, destructive Godlessness of the political world will be swept into the Gehenna of abhorrent things.

We need a generation of young men and women who have an abiding faith in God and in the dignity, the worth, and nobility of human beings. We need young men and women who are athrill with the vision of the greatness, the goodness, the beauty, and the majesty of God and of all the children whom He has created. We need young men and women who will make the moral law the light, the guide, the inspiration of the public conduct of nations.

If we are to stamp out the deadly maladies which threaten to destroy all the decencies, all the amenities, all the culture, all the sanctities which make human life worth living, we must enlist a vast army of young men and women who are ready to battle with every ounce of their strength and energy to establish the reign of truth, of right, of justice, and brotherly love. They must be young men and women who have the dauntless courage, the quenchless enthusiasm to make the powerful and beneficent doctrines of the Master Teacher of the ages prevail over the law of cunning, the studied deceit. They must be young men and women who have an abiding faith in the that falter not, with hearts that quail not, highest ideals. They must march with feet whatever foes may oppose, whatever dangers may threaten. They must pull down the barriers to right human life erected by passion and prejudice. They must storm the strongholds builded by ignorance and vice. They must speak words of cheer and comfort to the sorely tried and afflicted. They must sustain the drooping courage of the faint-hearted.

They must make men realize that no material comfort, not brilliant social position, vast economic powers, or political dynasties, but God and the human soul are supreme. Then will shine again in the darkened skies of human life those polar stars of light and guidance, God and the moral law. Then the downtrodden and enslaved people may look up and be glad for the redemption is at hand.

Louisiana Under Governor Jones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. SAM JONES, GOVERNOR OF LOUISIANA

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues of the House, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it is my privilege to submit for the attention of yourselves and the Nation the first anniversary address of Gov. Sam H. Jones, of Louisiana.

This fine address is important in that it recounts in part the amazing record of good and honest government given our people of Louisiana in 1 short year.

It was delivered by Governor Jones on the night of May 13, on the eve of his first anniversary as chief executive of the sovereign State of Louisiana. Following are the Governor's remarks:

My friends, tomorrow is the end of a year. It was an extraordinary year for me. It was an extraordinary year for the State of Louisiana. It was a turning point.

A year ago tomorrow, at high noon, an era came to an end in this State. It was a dark era. You know that as well as I know it. The court records testify to the blackness of the night we escaped from a year ago. Yes; and the mills of the courts have just begun to grind.

So now, a year older than when I became your Governor, I hope wiser, and I know sadder for the trials and tribulations of that year, I go on record as being proud of that year; proud of you; proud of the reforms and improvements which, by your mandate, we have been able to make come true.

But listen: Before I say anything else I want to say the most important thing of all. Before I tick off one by one the hard facts of things done against things promised, I want to say that one thing here looms larger than all others in the eyes of the Nation. That is honesty. We have honest government now. In your heart—no matter who you are, friend or political foe—you know that we have honest government now. And in your heart—whoever you are—I think you rejoice in that enormous fact, because you love Louisiana. After all, honesty was what we fought for. That was what turned an election into a crusade. That was what, above all else, we won.

But, as the old campaigner said, "Let's take a look at the record." The record is written in bold type. I don't believe there is need for any confusion or even for any dispute about it. With the candidates on my ticket, I pledged you 17 specific things. We didn't whisper them or hint at them; we wrote them down, printed them in black and white; and that original platform was distributed by the thousands all over the State. I have a copy of it in my hand.

In the brief minutes allotted to me tonight I am going to try to report to you on the far-reaching reforms and benefits which have come and will come to Louisiana by reason of the forces we have set in motion. I shall use my original platform as my text, as the framework of all I have to say. The story I tell you is incomplete; much must be left out. But if I can give you the feel of the program we have put into effect this year, if I can sketch for you a blue print of things to come for Louisiana in the next 3 years, I shall be content.

Well, what was the first thing we promised? The platform said, End dictatorship and return power to the people. Reestablish the right of local self-government by cities, towns, parishes, school boards, and police juries with no exception and with no State interference.

That was the promise. Has it been kept? Do you know of anyone who hesitates to speak his mind about the Sam Jones administration? Are people afraid to talk now? You know they are not. Do you remember the time when people were afraid to talk—when fear haunted the cracker barrels of our little stores and the rostrums of our meeting halls? You know that you do. You know that the fear and the dictatorship have alike departed. I think some people who really approve our kind of government, deep down, are fussing and criticizing now for the sheer glory of exercising new-found freedom; well, let them; I don't mind.

What about the self-government of cities, towns, parishes, police juries, school boards?

The dictator laws are repealed. The odious law allowing the National Guard to be pulled into politics is no more.

You know that this administration leans over backward to allow the full democratic freedom of these units of government. We have freed the sheriffs' offices from control by Baton Rouge. We shall, however, make one exception to the policy of local option and home rule. Near our university and our great Army camps, gambling and other conditions likely to contaminate the young must be rigorously exterminated. I hope they will be put down elsewhere, too, by the local authorities who have full power to act. And where they need help from the State police, they will get it promptly, as they have gotten it in many parishes. Does that sound like the past? I think you will agree that it does not.

Further, we were so anxious to restore the Government to the people that we saw to it that boards of independent, non-office-holding citizens were set up for each major department, not to boss the head of the department but to advise with him as direct agents of yours and to act as appeal bodies in case of dispute. And best of all, to bring the people into the heart and core of government.

Well, a second plank in my original platform read as follows: "Guarantee fair elections. Guarantee all candidates honest representation at the polls and an honest count of all ballots. Do away with 'dummy' can-

didates, 'dummy' ballots, and 'dummy' registrations, and keep the free poll tax."

Was that plank carried out? In Act 46 of the first session of the legislature, we rewrote the primary election laws to provide clean, fair elections, prevent "dummy" candidates, and otherwise tighten the law. In Act 76 we provided heavy penalties for those selling their votes. In Act 84 we ordered voting machines for the city of New Orleans and paved the way for them in all the parishes; over the next 3 years this administration will have as its aim the installation of voting machines wherever these will materially help—as they will help in New Orleans—an honest count. We abolished the noxious poll receipts and framed a simpler, more efficient registration law.

All right, a third plank read as follows: "Do away with 'ghost boards' and overlapping commissions, saving the people huge sums of money."

If you will read Act 47 of the first session after I was elected you can have no doubt of the businesslike thoroughness with which that pledge was carried out. We took 176 conflicting, overlapping, often very nearly mythical, boards and commissions and we reduced them to 20 clearly defined and modernized departments, plus 2 independent establishments. This will, indeed, save huge sums of money; better than that, it will give us order out of chaos.

A fourth plank was this, I quote: "A fair tax system that will be just to all people. Kill the sales tax that is now on the necessities of life and do away with the tax tokens. Wipe out or reduce nuisance taxes that now strangle small business. Reduce automobile taxes to $3. Have a real homestead exemption that politicians can't misuse."

Now, what about that one? I don't have to tell you that the sales tax is dead, the tokens sold as scrap. You have the $3 auto license we promised you. The small businessman pays one license now. We increased the severance tax, which is not a tax on the poor and which is a sensible way to increase revenue from our vast and growing natural resources. And if you can show me a case where homestead exemptions are now used for the purpose of political pressure, give me the facts and I promise that the pressure will ease—and ease in a hurry. We of this administration consider it a part of our mandate to examine our homestead exemptions carefully in the months to come and try to enlarge and improve them if we can.

The fifth plank read as follows: "Destroy the system of spies who pry into private, civic, and political affairs and threaten free speech."

Now, for you who have eyes to see, it is unnecessary to point out that the old spy system went out on the 14th of May 1940. If we have any spies amongst us, you can be sure they are in the pay of Mr. Hitler or Mr. Mussolini, not of the Sam Jones administration. We do employ a few sleuths—sleuths in the form of expert accountants who are trying to track down some of the missing money which so mysteriously flew away during the lost and repudiated years. I think you approve of that.

And the sixth plank read as follows: Renew the honor of our educational system and redeem L. S. U. by clean, capable management and by taking this honorable institution out of politics. Free school books and free school teachers."

Well, you know that by constitutional amendment we set up L. S. U. as a free and self-respecting university establishment, governed by a board of supervisors; we took L. S. U. out of politics in such manner that it will be very difficult to get this university back into politics over the years to come.

Moreover, there has been a profound reorganization of the department of education. This is now one of the 20 modernized departments. I want you to know that it is making important contribution to the national-defense program. Many trade schools have been added; more will be added to develop skills for defense work. The Federal Government has made more than $600,000 available to trade-school development in the immediate future throughout the State. Many thousands of our young people will be trained under this plan; any youth wishing to receive this training should inquire of the parish superintendent.

In September 1940 a State advisory committee was organized to improve and expand the hot-lunch program in the schools. Now 2,132 schools serve hot lunches—real hot lunches scientificially and nutritiously prepared, not political hot lunches—and 179,606 children get them every day.

The State equalization fund is now $600,000 greater than ever before; many thousands of additional children are receiving the benefits of this special aid. Act 215 of the legislature last session provides for 10 days of sick leave for teachers without loss of pay. Act No. 316 modifies the teacher-retirement law to permit teachers to retire after 35 years of service. New courses of study, new textbooks have been secured to meet the needs of today and tomorrow. Yes, my friends, we remembered the teachers and we have by no means concluded legislation in their behalf. Over the next 3 years we propose to draw other teachers' bills, and finally solve, in a State which lacks the funds of the rich Northern States, the problem of truly adequate teachers' pay.

And so we come to pledge No. 8. I repeat it to you: "Abolish favoritism in State contracts. Establish free bidding and a fair chance for all bidders with no graft for any public official on State work."

My friends, once again I beg leave to remind you that we produced. We did it. And in the doing of it we passed the fiscal code bill, that vital nerve center of the whole new guardianship we have set up over your funds. The department of finance is at once the stern watchdog ever ready to pounce upon fiscal hocus-pocus in any department, and the wheel upon which all the financial transactions of the State revolve.

Under the department of finance, bids are fair to all qualified persons seeking business with the State. That is new. That is what we promised. Prodigious labor, countless hours of toil by many trained people, made possible this tremendous change to the accounting methods of 1941. The best efforts of other States in reorganizing their financial structure were studied. This setup is no untried experiment—it is the result of trial and error in 28 States of this Union along the same line; it is the result of the best brains we could get, from in the State and outside the State.

It is as if we changed from a store in which the clerks made change out of their own pockets and never told one another how business was going, to a great modern department store serving the needs of several million people. Yes; the change, the improvement, was as phenomenal as that.

And still in the department of finance, let's mark "Fulfilled as promised" after pledge eight and take up pledge nine. This one read: "Do away with deadhead officeholders; cut the padded pay rolls, and allow no politician to draw the salary of more than one man."

My friends, we have not only eliminated deadheads but we have sought to prosecute them where possible and regain moneys wrongfully obtained without service. Our new deadhead law prohibits a State employee who makes under $200 from contributing to any political cause. The division of accounts and controls of the department of finance will serve as a bloodhound to ferret out padded pay rolls, deadheads, waste. Now all expenditures are preaudited. This means that no purchase of goods or services is made until this department has checked to see whether the money is available and a voucher giving all details of the transaction is submitted before the money is paid out.

My friends, a deadhead or a double dipper who managed to wangle himself onto the pay roll today would find himself in so much trouble that I think he would give up the effort and go find himself an honest job of work.

And so pledge 9 must be marked "fulfilled" like the others, and we move on to pledge 10; and I read: "Kill the deducts." You who work for the State or have relatives working for the State and hear my voice tonight—all of you know that the "ducts" have flown for the last time. No public employee has one penny deducted from his pay check since May 1940; none will ever have a deduction made. Therefore, pledge 10 must be marked "fulfilled."

Pledge 11 promised to kill the laws which prevent the auditing of public records and open the records of the State and all its departments to the public at any time. Similarly, the next plank, No. 12, asked for honest audits of all State departments, with full publication. Public records now are wide open—by law. You know the condition of your treasury now for the first time and you know from the figures published in every paper in the State that we took office confronting a deficit and that, while we thought this deficit in the general fund would run to four or five million dollars at the end of this fiscal year, we now have it cut to a likely two million while we continue to pare and cut waste while keeping the essential services and adding to them. And listen to this: We have saved something over $2,000,000, by scientific budget control, out of funds appropriated by the legislature. And the savings continue.

Now, as for auditing State departments—well, the supervisor of public funds has audited on a scale never before accomplished in such a short time in any other State. Streams of figures have come out of his office—muddy streams of past malfeasance in some cases, streams which will flow on into the courts. His reports are thorough and they name names and amounts. They are honest public reports. He has just moved his staff into New Orleans for an audit of the affairs of that city.

Promise No. 12—fulfilled. Promise 13 said: "Place the Conservation Department strictly under all provisions of the Constitution. Stop the waste of our natural resources by favorites of the State administration."

Act 195 of the legislature not only opened up the books and records of the Conservation Department but those of all other departments. The fur trappers, the shrimp fishermen, the oil drillers—all of them have found that they can do business now in this State without paying tribute to any politician. Prove it? Well, the value of the fur crop each year is estimated on the actual return to the trappers. The 1939–40 crop was valued at a little over $4,000,000, the 1940–41 crop was valued at a little over $6,000,000. In simple terms, the trappers paid no tribute.

Your conservation laws are being enforced, as can be demonstrated by a few simple figures. As of April 10, 1940, a total of 148 shrimp trawling licenses had been sold; on April 10 of this year, 1,073 such licenses had been sold—and that doesn't mean there were that many more shrimp trawlers. It means the law is being enforced and you know it well.

Yes, my friends, No. 13 has been more than fulfilled, like the rest of them. And over the next few years our Department of Conservation is working toward a model fish and game division, toward the restoration of wild life of all types now depleted; toward better fish hatcheries, the scientific study of methods to replenish our muskrats, our wild turkeys, our quail. In the division of minerals, of course, I have already in many places told you the story of how we have saved the oil

and gas industry a sum conservatively estimated at $15,000,000 by the recycling and spacing methods we have put into effect.

No. 14 says: "Build and keep up hospitals that won't sink, public buildings that won't be shifted about, and paved roads that cost half what they have cost in the past; and real instead of imaginary farm-to-market roads."

Now, obviously we did not build a lot of new buildings in the first 12 months of office, but the buildings that are constructed under this administration won't sink or travel about. And we have a Department of Highways now that will build its roads for what the roads cost, not for what some politician costs; a Department of Highways whose director is a man widely beloved and addicted to a policy of telling the people what is possible on the funds available and what is not. The Federal Government will build and improve vital military roads as it is now doing.

You should know these things—the highway department gets from all sources about $17,000,000 a year. Fully half of that amount goes for the servicing of inherited debts. Think of it! Half of the highway appropriation pays the toll on past extravagance, past waste. Meantime, while we are hoisting this department out of financial chaos, we must make what money we have go further per dollar than ever before. We are doing that. Listen carefully to this, my friends: The highway department is pledged to go into the forgotten rural areas and build cheap roads where roads have been neglected. We have allotted $10,000 per year to each parish for this purpose—in a new way. We are letting the police jury of each parish pick the routes—thus bolstering home rule again and squeezing Baton Rouge politics out of the picture.

And mark well that your department of highways has played a lively and constant part in securing for you the tremendous defense facilities, the great camps, and the maneuvers on the grand scale which will come to us this fall. The highway department, cramped for funds and knowing full well that the maneuvers would cause serious damage to many roads, nevertheless pitched in with the Army engineers and said: "Come on; we'll do our part. Better for your tanks to cut up some roads than for us to lose these things—and maybe lose democracy, too." We know how it hurts to lose democracy in this State.

And I want to emphasize again that Louisiana did not get more defense-training facilities than any other State through accident. As our President once said: "We planned it that way." We are now in the best position of any State in the South to get subcontracts for defense manufacturing; we planned it that way. The police jurors, the mayors, and other parish officials rallied to my side and we sent "Big Bill" Knudsen the most complete manufacturing census of any State in the Union. We were the first on the scene with the facts—and we will add to the $200,000,000 in capital outlay coming to us from Washington for defense, and we will add to 50,000 new jobs we have secured for the unemployed through this work.

No. 15 is the pledge to strengthen the social-security system. Did we do this? We have merely added 7,000 beneficiaries and $1,000,000 in benefits, while actually spending less money because of efficient budgetary control. From the day I was inaugurated I have worked closely with members of the Louisiana congressional delegation to urge passage of a bill, introduced by a Congressman who endorsed the policies of this administration, which will make $30 old-age pensions a reality instead of a political football. I believe those $30 pensions are nearer than ever before. In the decade before the Sam Jones administration came into office, all pension efforts failed. No State of the financial strength of Louisiana could pay all alone the $30 pension without ruinous taxation. Working with the Federal Government, sharing the cost in the manner that I urged all through my campaign, the pensions can be paid. I honestly and sincerely believe we are going to succeed in the efforts we are now making to bring these pensions. I shall frankly tell you always of the progress we are making in the campaign for the pensions.

The sixteenth plank was a labor plank, urging cooperation between capital and labor and all the traditional rights of organized labor. I believe the tranquil relations between these groups in Louisiana, contrasted with strife and turmoil in some other States, is proof that this promise too has been fulfilled. And finally there was a pledge to agriculture, to increase prices so far as possible and aid market facilities.

My friends, this administration is undertaking the broadest program of State-financed aid to farmers ever hatched in Louisiana. The Secretary of Agriculture is cooperating fully in the plans we have made together and besides working for a banking policy that will grant loans on more than one crop, we are seeking to provide the first uniform and common-sense plan for getting the farmers' crops to the market—particularly the Army camps—and getting them sold there.

The last pledge was to take the ports out of politics. We have a dock board now with a membership recommended by leading nonpolitical groups—and by the way, our deadhead law removed 2,000 of them from the dock board, to which they won't return, I promise you, just before an election.

Well, my friends, there are the 17 promises of Sam Jones and his ticket. And here is the score: Sixteen fulfilled to the hilt and one being constantly promoted in a campaign to fulfill it to the hilt, too. I have given you simple facts, simple proof; the record is plain for all to see. I wish I could dwell on the fine work of the Collector of Revenue, who has cut his collection costs nearly in half and is collecting taxes with twice the efficiency of his predecessors, as the records show. I wish I had time to describe the splendid drainage program of the department of public works, but the clock presses.

A year ago I predicted I would make mistakes. My friends, I have made them—the kind I said I would make, of the head, not of the heart. We of this administration will make more such mistakes, being human; but we will try to keep the balance in favor of progress and success for Louisiana.

Now we are involved in a great defense emergency. I urge you to forget political fireworks for a while and join with me in a common unity of purpose. We can be proud already of our part in defense. The great Selective Service System of the Nation was based on the Louisiana plan, and we have administered the system in this State with a method and morale unsurpassed in all the 48 States. Washington knows that, knows that Louisiana is the nerve center of troop training in this Nation straining to prepare.

This administration knows the grim test for all of us which lies ahead. Come and let us meet it together. We struggled to make Washington see the light and give us Claiborne, Polk, Livingston, and Beauregard; all the air bases, recreational centers, shipyards which are here and on the way. They are a great responsibility. I ask you, for the period of this emergency, to give me your hand in a common bond of determination and unity. Will you do that? I know you will. God bless you all.

A Basis for World Peace

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, let me say in reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] that the overwhelming majority of the American people want to stay out of war, an overwhelming majority of the Members of this Congress want to stay out of war.

The President of the United States has said again and again and again that he wants to stay out of war.

Last night Secretary of State Cordell Hull laid down the following five points as a basis for world peace:

1. Extreme nationalism must not again be permitted to express itself in excessive trade restrictions.
2. Nondiscrimination in international commercial relations must be the rule, so that international trade may grow and prosper.
3. Raw material supplies must be available to all nations without discrimination.
4. International agreements regulating the supply of commodities must be so handled as to protect fully the interests of the consuming countries and their people.
5. The institutions and arrangements of international finance must be so set up that they lend aid to the essential enterprises and the continuous development of all countries and permit the payment through processes of trade consonant with the welfare of all countries.

I cannot see why any country on earth cannot accept those terms. They all say that is what they are fighting for. Let us put them to the test.

This morning's papers carry the statement that the people of France, bleeding France, the best friend we ever had when we were in trouble and needed a friend, is appealing to us to take steps to bring about peace, and suggesting that President Roosevelt take the lead.

I believe if he would do that, he could bring this war to a close and in that way make himself the most popular leader in the world.

I fear it is the only way to save the British Empire. If we should get into the war, there is no place for us to land an army in Europe; and if we landed one and drove to Berlin, as we would have to do to crush Germany, it would exhaust the manhood and resources of this Nation and soak the soil of Europe with the blood of probably 5,000,000 of our best young men.

Even if we could get everything we are now producing over to England, she probably could not get onto the Continent. It would merely save her from collapse, if it did that. A peace based upon these five points of Cordell Hull's would save Great Britain now.

I call upon the Christian people of this country, the ministers, the mothers, the fathers, to get behind such a movement and let their voices be heard in support of Cordell Hull and President Roosevelt in this movement for world peace.

Labor's Rights Under the Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 19, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR., OF WISCONSIN

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on Friday night, May 9, 1941, a dinner was given in honor of Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., by the Workers' Defense League, a national nonpartisan defense organization devoted to the vigorous defense of labor's rights throughout the country. At this dinner, held at the Town Hall Club in New York City, which was attended by some 500 leaders of labor and liberal thought, and to which many distinguished men and women sent their greetings, a bronze plaque of honor was presented to Senator LA FOLLETTE for distinguished service in behalf of labor's rights. This tribute was accorded the Senator because of his chairmanship of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, known as the Civil Liberties Committee or the Senate Subcommittee on Violations of Free Speech and the Rights of Labor.

During the forum on Labor's Rights Under the Defense Program, which took place in the course of the dinner, Senator LA FOLLETTE addressed the audience and a larger audience over National Broadcasting Co.'s WABC. Since his remarks are of special moment in this period of national emergency, I deem this speech, as well as the tributes paid by speakers and others to the work of the Senator and of the Senate's Civil Liberties Committee, worthy of incorporation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent that Senator LA FOLLETTE'S speech, and the introductory speech of Mr. Clendenin in tribute to Senator LA FOLLETTE, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In presenting the plaque to Senator LA FOLLETTE, Mr. David L. Clendenin, national secretary-treasurer of the Workers' Defense League, spoke as follows:

"Among the many testimonials and greetings we have heard this evening, Benjamin Marsh recalled in passing, how the idea of a Senate investigation of violations of civil and labor's rights came about. I recall with pardonable pride that it was the same set of facts—the cruel flogging, resulting in the death, of Joseph Shoemaker in Tampa and the night riding and terrorism directed against the sharecroppers—which at about the same time gave rise to the formation of the Workers' Defense League as an organization dedicated to the courageous, nonpartisan and militant defense of labor's rights.

"With the appointment of the Senate Subcommittee on Violations of Free Speech and the Rights of Labor, under your chairmanship, those who had been trying to do their bit to preserve and extend our democratic rights knew that here was a great and powerful ally.

"Despite every discouragement, despite every obstruction placed in your way, your committee hewed to the line and performed its great task. When corporations and powerful employers' associations sought to interfere with your work, you courageously persevered and exposed the great evils implicit in their labor policies. You uncovered the facts about industrial espionage, you brought to light the criminal use of munitions in industrial disputes, you laid bare the vicious employment of professional detective agencies, of hired strikebreakers and mercenary and criminal strike guards.

"If this were all your committee had accomplished, labor and the friends of liberty would be eternally grateful. But in addition your committee was responsible for the introduction of national legislation to outlaw the brutal practices which your investigations had exposed.

"Such an investigation, the scope and thoroughness of its work, is a tribute to the perseverance and courage of the committee, and especially of its chairman. It is moreover a tribute to the honor and respect with which the American labor movement looks upon you.

"Valiant son of a valiant father, battler for labor's rights and the liberties of the whole American people.

"For this distinguished service in behalf of labor's rights the national executive board of the Workers' Defense League has voted unanimously to award you this bronze plaque of honor. It is with great pleasure and a feeling of personal privilege that in behalf of the Workers' Defense League, I present this plaque to you, ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr."

(Senator LA FOLLETTE'S speech follows:)

I accept with thanks this token of recognition from you who have yourselves dedicated so much time, energy, and courage to a cause for which we share a mutual regard—the defense of labor's civil liberties. Naturally, I deem this not a tribute to me, but rather to the work of the subcommittee to which many persons have contributed. Particularly I should like to pay tribute to the unselfish and zealous cooperation of the senior Senator from Utah, the Honorable ELBERT THOMAS, who has served with me for the duration of the entire 4 years of laborious investigation.

I shall speak personally tonight and not as a member of the Senate Civil Liberties Committee. Nor shall I relate its history and contribution. The public record of its investigation will speak for itself in the seventy-odd volumes of testimony and exhibits, the 12 volumes of reports to the Senate, and the additional reports on its last and concluding investigation on the west coast which will be shortly forthcoming.

An undeniable record of violations of labor's rights has been revealed. Corrective legislation in the form of the so-called "Oppressive Labor Practices Act" was submitted during the last session of Congress and acted upon favorably in the Senate, but did not get to the floor of the House. Recommendations for additional legislation will be submitted in the committee's final report. Your consideration of these measures is invited.

Today the Nation is preparing to defend our free institutions from a serious menace—political totalitarian dictatorship. It is fitting, therefore, that we consider the relationship of labor to democracy and national defense. In my opinion, trade-unions, democracy, and freedom from dictatorship are synonymous. A political totalitarian dictatorship cannot exist alongside of free trade-unions. The reverse is equally true. Let no American be deceived on this score.

The first step, the sure sign, the essential aggression of every dictatorship that seeks to destroy democratic institutions is to strike down free trade-unionism and with it the right of labor to speak their protests against economic underprivilege, to assemble together and organize for joint action, and to bargain collectively with the managers of industry, be they private or public.

The right to picket and the right to strike, which constitute the chief bargaining weapons labor possesses, are outlawed; the leaders of trade-unionism are marked for political persecution of a thousand varieties; and some fake form of controlled labor front which is a version of a company union controlled by the State, is substituted for the free trade-union. It is the pattern in Germany, Russia, and Italy today. Our first concern must be to prevent this pattern from being fastened on American labor in this critical hour of decision.

Hence, labor's rights and national defense are inseparably linked; they are mutually supporting, damage to either in a democracy may be fatal to both; the furtherance of each strengthens both. No informed American who can free himself from the prejudice of his personal economic status and think in terms of the national interest will deny the truth of this analysis.

In my considered judgment, the most dangerous menace to labor's civil rights and a continued all-out productive effort for national defense is the drive to weaken and destroy those rights by legislative enactment. Under the pretense of promoting national defense a group of persons are working to pass a death sentence on industrial democracy. The Nation at large is either asleep to this danger or numbed by the obvious propaganda that has reached a new high in promoting national disunity under the pious garb of patriotism.

We cannot save democracy by destroying it at home. It would be one of the tragic ironies of history if, in the process of preparing for the defense of our national democracy, we blindly sacrificed it in a legislative lynching bee. This would be the inevitable result of many of the labor bills being introduced under the color of defense in Congress and the various State legislatures. The record of their sponsors in the press and CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will indicate that they are antilabor in their origin. The passage of these bills would be the first token of appeasement to the dictators, at home and abroad.

The stupid folly of this proposed congressional hari-kari would indeed be a confession that democracy cannot survive in a crisis; that free men cannot outproduce slaves.

Let not the men and women of America who do not value these rights of labor delude themselves that their sacrifice would save democracy for the rest of us. Other rights, equally valued, would soon be sacrificed. Let the fair-minded employers, the fair-minded newspapers, and the average American who values his political, religious, and intellectual freedom, rise up and be counted in the ranks of those who hold a respect for labor's rights to be a part of national defense. Any program of national defense that does not give our great mass of citizens a faith and conviction for which they will give their all will prove a sham and a delusion. We have already heard the words of Ernest Bevin, speaking of the heroic workers of Britain who each day are giving

the lie to those who say that the liberties of labor must be sacrificed on the altar of national defense. Those words are:

"Let bitterness and discontent get into the hearts of my army and then, by God, we've lost the war."

There is a second phase of sound public policy which is derived from this relationship between labor's rights and the national defense. Those who sincerely wish to promote the national defense through a maximum industrial production free from work stoppages because of industrial disputes will further a quick and vigorous extension of collective bargaining to defense industries. The so-called defense industries are now only about 30 or 40 percent unionized, according to conservative estimates. Many of our vital plants are lacking in the employer-employee machinery conducive to an avoidance and settlement of disputes that may, regardless of any law, lead to work stoppage or inefficiency.

The voluntary collective agreement between employer and union containing provisions for voluntary mediation and arbitration before strikes or lockouts is now recognized as the best possible insurance against work stoppages. Every such collective agreement is a pillar in the arsenal of democracy.

The converse is true. Every absence of a collective-bargaining agreement, every refusal to bargain collectively constitutes a threat to production for national defense. In the defense industries the situation is particularly serious Powerful groups having dominant positions in the defense industries have for years devoted their time, their money, their energy, and their great influence to prevent the exercise of labor's rights, to avoid collective bargaining and to violate the law of the land which has been on the books since 1935 This is not a loose statement. The record of the Senate Civil Liberties Committee shows that a large percentage of the companies involved in strikes officially listed today as affecting national defense, have been guilty of violations of the civil rights of their employees and recalcitrant in their attitude toward our national-labor policy.

I am peculiarly aware of the dangerous consequences of the past conduct of these companies and their present attitude. In the course of the work of the Senate Civil Liberties Committee I have seen the hearing room grow tense with the recital of past wrongs. I have seen the deep bitterness which such policies of labor relations bring in their train. A refusal to bargain collectively in good faith is of itself an affront and insult to the dignity and self-respect of employees. It rankles, more than that, it never stands alone, because it must be implemented by devices of repression, espionage, company unions, discrimination, and ultimately the purchase and use of arms. Opposition to collective bargaining and the use of such repressive measures poison the employer-employee relationship for years to come. This poison-embittered atmosphere between employer and employee exists in large and important sectors of our national-defense production, and we cannot move too rapidly to correct it.

That is the second way to promote labor's rights and the national defense.

Finally, to protect labor's rights and the national defense, we must treat those serious obstructions to production that tie down our giant industrial power. The cruel fact has been driven home to a shocked world that a nation with a dynamic expanding economy, which uses its human and natural resources to the maximum, will smash physically and philosophically a nation in which human and natural resources, manpower, and capital are not at work producing those things necessary for the problem of the day, be it defense from aggression or the extension of the good life.

We must throw off the shackles of monopoly, business-as-usual methods, an economy of scarcity, an inequitable distribution of the profits of our economy, and the remaining vestiges of a system of employer-employee relationships grounded in an inequality that breeds bitterness and strife. That is the successful method for fighting communism and Nazi-ism at home and repelling any threat of foreign aggression from abroad. Remove these obstructions and there will be a mighty building of the tools of national defense—planes, ships, tanks, and guns—in such quantities and with such common purpose and cooperative efficiency that those over the oceans will take heed and confine their horizons of conquest away from these shores.

It is essential, even under those conditions, that the responsibility, the patience, tolerance, and ingenuity of labor and management must be used fully, heartily, and in good faith to avoid and settle labor disputes without serious work stoppages. Under those conditions, collective bargaining, conciliation, voluntary mediation or arbitration will thrive and succeed in maintaining maximum levels of production. There is no other alternative. Any other course, even though accompanied by the most stringent legislative restrictions of labor's rights, will result in failure in our national-defense effort.

A wise public policy to protect labor's rights and promote the national defense will include:

1. The defeat of all legislative proposals designed to destroy or weaken labor's civil rights.

2. A rapid extension of collective bargaining and agreement procedures throughout defense industry.

3. A removal of the shackles on an all-out production program; and

4. A greater participation on the part of labor and its leaders in the discharge of responsibilities for national-defense production.

First of all, the American people should know who is behind and who stands to profit from this vicious and unscrupulous attack being waged on the rights of labor under the cloak of national defense. The leading behind-the-scenes participants in this shallow scheme to save democracy by putting it on ice are certain organized employer groups who have made it a regular practice and business to conspire against the rights of labor in their trade or region. They include the violent antiunionists who politely call themselves "open shoppers," the promotional and community business groups who hope to attract industry by maintaining cheap and unorganized labor supplies, and just plain "rugged individualists" with antiquated concepts of industrial absolutism.

These organized conspiracies against labor's rights are not vague matters of conjecture. The subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor has devoted a part of its effort to studying these so-called belligerent employer associations, and the results of those studies, based on sworn testimony and documentary records, have been submitted to the Senate. These reports treat the background and activities of certain employer organizations, including the National Metal Trades Association, the Associated Industries of Cleveland, the so-called Little Steel group, and the National Association of Manufacturers. There is available the published record of similar groups uncovered in the California hearings, which will be the subject of a report soon to be submitted.

These matters of public record show that it is a habit, indeed a function, of certain types of employer groups to build the necessary fires by propaganda and other devices that will pave the way for legislation restrictive of labor's rights, while these associations carry on organized assaults on those rights through labor espionage, company unions, black lists, strike-breaking systems, and various forms of coercion. This is no new phenomenon. These organizations functioned before the World War and were the subject of extended comment in the report of the Industrial Relations Commission published in 1915. These belligerent employers' associations led the fight against labor's rights after the World War, culminating in the great open-shop drive which so weakened organized labor during the 1920's.

These organizations mobilized the opposition to and defied the policy of section 7 (a) of the Natural Industrial Recovery Act; they fought the National Labor Relations Act both before and after its passage in the Congress and the courts. Since that act was passed and upheld by the United States Supreme Court, they have dedicated a large part of their effort to circumvention and avoidance of the law of the land. There can be no doubt that efforts will be made to foster, develop, and divert hysteria in this period of emergency against trade-unions and collective bargaining. On the wave of that hysteria will come increased activity to secure legislation restricting labor's rights, while they continue their own consistent drive to obstruct and destroy effective trade unionism.

Let us not suppose that the triumvirate of antiunion employers, antiunion legislators, and antiunion organs of "public opinion" have exhausted their resources in the recent blitzkreig waged against labor's rights because of strikes in defense industries. The machinery is well oiled and will continue to function at every opportunity. Public officials, legislators, trade-union members, and private citizens who believe in industrial democracy must be vigilant and courageous. Pure courage is not enough, nor is it sufficient to carry on an adequate legal defense of laborers and trade-union officials whose rights are unjustly violated. The fact must be faced that a large percentage of the general public does not understand this problem of strikes in defense industries. In fact, far too many are wholly uninformed of the functions and traditions of trade unionism. The fight for labor's rights cannot be waged exclusively in courts, union halls, or along the picket line. The larger forum for their expression is at the bar of public opinion.

There are some obvious fallacies in the current public analysis that strikes in defense industries are perverse, unnecessary, and disloyal activities than can be simply eliminated by passing a law. These fallacies, too, must be exposed. The real causes of strikes, whatever they are, must be revealed so that they may be understood. The false notion that strikes, which mean untold risks to the striker and his family in the loss of income and the potential loss of his job, are an enjoyable exercise without much reason except to obstruct production, is so silly that it should evaporate automatically. But, for some reason, that conception still lingers in certain quarters. The mistaken appraisal of all strikes as jurisdictional in character, involving simply struggles between two groups of union leaders to obtain control, is another bit of folklore which too many people do not recognize.

On the other hand, the fact that the primary cause of many of our most serious strikes in defense industries is the refusal of recalcitrant employers to bargain collectively receives very little emphasis. Even more surprising is the failure to emphasize the fact that many of the leading companies in whose plants strikes have occurred are guilty of a persistent course of illegal conduct which merits nothing but condemnation and must be uprooted by law, economic pressure, and public opinion as soon and as quickly as we would wipe out any other regular course of criminal and illegal activity.

I want to dispel, once and for all, a popular misconception, under the guise of which the foes of labor are seeking to destroy the hard-won rights of labor. I refer to the common

notion that defense strikes are seriously impairing our defense efforts.

Obviously, any work stoppage, whether on a mass scale in a strike or lock-out or individually because of illness or mechanical break-down, will affect total production.

Strikes in 1940 caused the loss of about six and one-half million man-days of work, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. For 14 years the Bureau has kept comparable statistics, and in only 2 of these years has the time loss been less. Compared with the last World War period, less than one-half as many workers were involved in strikes in 1940 than in any of the years 1916, 1917, or 1918.

These figures give an over-all picture for all industries. To satisfy skeptics who may think that defense industries are not typical of industry in general, I cite the further fact that in none of 11 industries which are most closely related to national defense—aircraft, shipbuilding, steel works, foundries and machine shops, aluminum, explosives, sawmills, machine tools, automobiles, electrical machinery, and engine manufacturing—in none of these 11 industries did the time-loss because of strikes exceed seven-tenths of 1 percent of total time worked; and in 8 of the 11 industries the time-loss was less than three-tenths of 1 percent.

Strikes during the last half of 1940, when the defense program was expanding most rapidly, involved 40 percent less man-days of idleness than in the last half of 1939. This is a remarkably good record of industrial peace, for, as everyone knows, strike activity is closely related to business activity.

Those who have tried to make labor the scapegoat in this production crisis had best look elsewhere if they really are serious about discovering the human bottlenecks in defense production. Their attention should be called to the time lost through injury and illness of workers, much of which could be prevented. More than six times as much time was lost because of illness last year than was lost due to strikes. More than four times as much time was lost because of industrial accidents. A manpower loss equivalent to that lost by strikes during the entire year of 1939 was lost every 14 hours of that year because of unemployment and part-time employment.

Pointing, in summary, to the May 1 report of the Department of Labor, that strikes in the United States have now declined to a point where only one-tenth of 1 percent of workers are affected, I heartily concur in a recent statement by Mr. Hillman, in which he said: "At the present moment the industrial-relations picture is far more favorable than any other time of equal industrial activity."

Many of the bills that have been introduced to regulate labor disputes and problems in defense industries are largely restrictive of labor's rights to strike or act in an organized way to secure collective bargaining, to protect their rights, to obtain union security, to maintain or secure a fair share in the proceeds of industry, to adjust income levels to rising prices, and to settle various and sundry grievances. The public must come to realize that the enactment of such legislation would not promote defense but only open labor in defense industries to abuses and exploitation. To assume that a certain group of employers would not take advantage of the situation and thereby profit at the expense of labor's rights, their competitors, and the general public weal would be highly unrealistic.

Efforts of this sort, however, should not be wholly defensive. The situation demands that collective-bargaining procedures and the protection of labor's rights through law and administrative action be aggressively and affirmatively promoted in defense industries. The damage to public morale and national unity that flows from the use of oppressive labor practices that violate labor's rights and interfere with its efforts to bargain collectively cannot well be endured in normal times. They should not be tolerated in a period of national emergency.

The governmental policies and machinery for mediation and arbitration should not become instruments for weakening the position of labor. Cooling-off periods, voluntary or mandatory, must not become heating-up periods. For employers to be allowed to take advantage of waiting periods to hire strike-breakers, lay in munitions of war, and prosecute various unfair labor practices that are calculated to destroy either the morale of the union or weaken its position is to encourage, not "cooling off" but an outbreak of the very struggle that mediation and arbitration is designed to prevent. Indeed, no waiting period, voluntary or mandatory, should be given unless during that time there are actual bona fide negotiations conducted between management and labor. There should be frank recognition that too prolonged waiting periods, voluntary or mandatory, where collective-bargaining rights and union recognition are at stake may be fatal to the position of the labor group involved.

Any attempt by statute to freeze or prescribe rigid procedures may defeat the very purpose of mediation, since it is the resourcefulness and adaptability of the trained mediator, plus the good will and informal cooperation of both parties, that spells success for mediation and conciliation.

Mediation and conciliation require great flexibility and leave much to the judgment and ingenuity of the mediator. The formula that works in one situation will not work in another. Mediation by precedent may handicap the mediator. The application of rules of law and evidence and formal procedure destroy the friendly aspect of a round-table mediation and convert the process into something akin to a legal contest. All experienced mediators and conciliators are familiar with these facts. All legislators are not. Hence it is important to leave the mediators and conciliators alone, free from legislative interference and procedure and the restrictions of substantive law. These positions of policy must be constantly urged and impressed upon the public and the legislative mind if we are to settle this problem of strikes in defense industries in a democratic way that will not sacrifice the rights either of labor or management or damage the national-defense effort.

I have every confidence that an implementation of wise public policy along these lines will strengthen labor's rights and promote the national-defense productive effort upon which we depend, in part, to save and sustain our total democracy.

Federal Highway Aid and Federal Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1941

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, increased Federal taxation of gasoline cannot be justified on the basis of Federal highway aid appropriations. Actually, the Federal automotive excise taxes have contributed since they first were enacted more than the Federal Government has spent, not only on regular Federal highway aid, but also on emergency make-work projects since that time.

It should be remembered, however, that the Federal automotive taxes are not highway-user taxes but general emergency revenue measures designed to aid the Federal Government through a period of financial distress. Therefore there is no justification for the taxation of gasoline and other automotive products at disproportionate rates.

Even if no Federal automotive excise taxes were levied for the support of the Federal Government Congress would be obligated to continue Federal highway aid. The Federal Government is responsible for a proportional share of highway costs and it is in recognition of its duties in this respect that the appropriations for highways are made.

It likewise is the duty of the Federal Government to establish and maintain a highway system which is adequate for national defense. This responsibility was brought to the foreground only recently in the modifications which were made to the Federal Highway Act. But long before the present crisis the Army was in consultation with Federal highway officials to insure the development of the national road network to its present degree of adequacy. Defense highways are a responsibility of the citizenry in general and not of the automobile operators as a special group.

The Federal Government makes frequent and continued use of the highways in carrying the mails—a use which establishes its duty to pay toward the support of these facilities. In fact, the Constitution of the United States charges Congress with the responsibility for post roads.

In addition, it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to aid in the free flow of commerce between States, a function in which the development of highways is one of the important component activities. The Federal Government performs this duty in facilitating water transportation by charting rivers and coastal waters, by constructing breakwaters and lighthouses, by providing the Coast Guard for the protection of marine interests; yet no special tax is levied for the support of this activity. Similarly, in fostering air travel, the Federal Government has constructed beacons and landing fields without exacting from the beneficiaries a tax for these services.

It is in the discharge of this duty that Congress regularly appropriates funds for highways. In view of its program for the development of interstate commerce, it would not be in keeping with past performances for Congress to shift its responsibility for highway improvement to those who make direct use of these facilities.

The position of the Federal Government in regard to highway aid and automotive excise taxes ably has been summarized by Hon. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT, a leading authority on highway finance in Congress, chairman of the House Roads Committee, and the coauthor of the Federal Highway Act for the past several years. In an address before the 1940 convention of the American Road Builders Association, he declared that—

the participation of the Federal Government in the improvement of highways in cooperation with the States, using General Treasury

funds therefore, is amply justified on the grounds of general welfare, national defense, post roads, and interstate commerce. When the first Federal Aid Road Act was passed in 1916, neither the States nor the Federal Government had levied any special taxes, commonly known as road-user taxes, such as the taxes on gasoline, lubricating oils, and motor vehicles.

I think it is important that these broader reasons for justifying Federal participation in highway construction be not even tacitly abandoned by road advocates by putting too much emphasis on the relationship between road authorizations and road-user tax revenues. There might come a time in a few years when these taxes would not be levied, but that would not, in my opinion, remove the justification for further Federal participation in road improvements.

Automotive taxes originally were imposed by the States, and ever since that time this field of taxation has been recognized as rightfully belonging to the States. Many States have come to rely completely on these highway user tax revenues for the development of their road systems and the payment of interest and principal on their highway bonds. Excessive Federal taxation of these same subjects would impinge on this revenue source and thereby jeopardize the income expectancy and highway programs of the various State highway departments.

The dangers of the invasion of the State tax field by the Federal Government have been so apparent and real to the various States that when an increase in the Federal gasoline tax rate was considered in 1933 the legislature of six States adopted memorials requesting Congress to refrain from entering this State tax field, and personal protests were filed by the governors of no less than 11 States. Again, when the reenactment of the Federal gasoline tax was being considered in 1935, similar legislative memorials were adopted by another group of 11 States. In 1936 such memorials were filed by 2 States, in 1937 by 4 States, in 1938 by 1 State, and in 1939 by 2 States. It generally is agreed that only the extreme emergency of the national defense restrained the various States from filing violent protests against the Federal gasoline tax rate increase to 1½ cents a gallon enacted by the Revenue Act of 1940. During 1941, however, 1 State again memorialized Congress not to increase further the Federal gasoline tax and to discontinue the tax as soon as possible. It is believed that many other States which did not file formal protest feel today that excessive Federal taxation is as dangerous to their welfare as they believed it was before the present emergency.

The fact must be remembered that gasoline-tax revenues originally were intended for highway financing purposes, and highways are primarily the responsibility of the States. To quote one authority:

> This principle has become so firmly established that Federal or municipal taxation of gasoline definitely is viewed as an encroachment of the States' prerogatives.

It must not be forgotten that the gasoline tax has become the most important single tax in the tax systems of the States. No other tax provides as much revenue to the State treasuries.

Shall Strikes Continue To Prevent National Defense—Shall We Have a Cooling-off Period?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I insert herewith a 4-minute statement made by me on the American Forum of the Air program, over WOL, Washington, on May 11, 1941:

Shall we enact legislation compelling those who strike in defense industries to give notice of their intention and wait a specified period before striking?

This Nation needs every resource at its command. The maximum of production is essential to our national existence.

A strike means that certain employees cease work, either remain in the factory and prevent production, or accomplish the same purpose by the use of a massed or armed picket line.

The question tonight resolves itself into this: Shall the men who work in a given plant, which is engaged in the production of national-defense materials, be permitted to stop production without being required to wait a reasonable specified time?

As a nation we have taken the position that Congress has the power, and that it is necessary, to enact laws which take young men from their homes and their families, from their schools and their colleges, from their places of business to aid in national defense.

If young men can be drafted to train, fight, and work at whatever task may be assigned them, is there any reason why those who remain at home in comparative comfort should not be compelled to work for the defense of their country in industry or on the farm?

Is there any reason why those, who sometimes receive twice as much for 1 week's work as the conscripted man receives for a month's wages, should have the privilege, or claim the right, of refusing to serve their country by working in industry? Should they not at least be required to give notice of their intention to refuse to aid in national defense?

In this nation of ours, there is presumed to be equality of opportunity. There must be equality of service. There is neither logic nor justice in compelling the conscripted man to serve when and where and at whatever task his commanding officer may direct and, at the same time, permitting the man who has not been conscripted, who has not volunteered, to refuse to assist in providing the very things without which the task of the conscripted or enlisted man becomes impossible.

The soldier cannot fight without shoes, clothing, guns, ammunition, trucks, planes. To accept the proposition that the Nation has neither the power to, nor should, compel the man who remains at home to aid in furnishing those things to the soldier boy is not only the height of inconsistency, but of absurdity.

Why compel him to fight, unless we compel the man behind the lines to furnish the things which make it possible to fight successfully?

If once it be admitted that the unions, the Communists, industrialists, or any group of citizens, can stop defense production in even the slightest degree, then the Nation has surrendered its right of self-preservation.

Conceding the right to strike, is there any reason why the union man should be permitted to say to the nonunion man that he cannot take and hold a job?

How can the gentleman representing the A. F. of L. question the justice of saying to those men who would strike, who would prevent others from working, "Strike if you will, but at least let us have notice of your intention to strike, so that we may employ other men to make the engines for the airplanes, the guns for the boys, the trucks for the Army, the ships for the Navy, upon which your existence as freemen, our national existence, depends."

Why should we not say to men who would strike, "You are angry today. Let us have a cooling-off period."

That organized labor itself has already accepted this proposition is shown by the fact that in practically every collective-bargaining agreement there is an arbitration clause, which, in effect, means a cooling-off period.

William F. Green, president of the A. F. of L.; Mr. Meany, secretary-treasurer of that organization, have time and again sanctioned contracts which contained arbitration clauses, which, in principle, are no more, no less, than cooling-off periods.

The record, however, forces them to admit that strikes are called without resorting to arbitration and despite the protests of union officials and union contracts.

Is there any reason why a policy of which organized labor has approved, a policy conceded to be just and reasonable, should not be enacted into law? As well might we argue that, because 95 percent of our people are honest, there should be no law against stealing.

That which the A. F. of L. has practiced to a large extent, which you concede to be fair and just, we now ask be enacted into law, so that the impetuous, the hot-headed, the lawless, may be made to conform to a policy which is necessary for the ultimate good and safety of the Nation.

Ernest Lundeen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY MRS. ERNEST LUNDEEN

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to insert the address delivered by Mrs. Ernest Lundeen, widow of my good friend and former colleague, the late Senator Ernest Lundeen. Senator Lundeen was a veteran of the Spanish-American War. On April 6, 1917, he was one of a small band who voted against America's entrance into the World War. It is regrettable that his patriotism should be questioned and impugned after he had left this sphere of activity and could no longer defend himself. Mrs. Lundeen's lines are not in defense; indeed, Ernest Lundeen needs no defense. In her radio address of last

evening, Mrs. Lundeen makes the people of America acquainted with the man who was my friend and colleague. It is a dispassionate and authentic review of the life of a great American patriot.

The address follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, I come to you on a mission which is unprecedented in radio broadcasting.

I am the widow of Ernest Lundeen—United States Senator from Minnesota—who was killed in an airplane crash on August 31, 1940.

Walter Winchell, who broadcasts over this network, has cruelly slandered my husband—after his death—by repeatedly suggesting that Senator Lundeen was not a loyal American.

This statement is malicious and atrociously false.

That is why I am speaking to you—not to defend my husband's record. Ernest Lundeen's record needs no defense. His record stands in Congress—and it is an imperishable record of true Americanism. Our 19-year-old son and 17-year-old daughter and myself are proud of that record. I do want to tell the people of America of this infamous thing—the libeling of a gallant gentleman who would gladly have died to make America safe—and who, if he were alive, would reply to all base insinuations with a clarity and vigor I fear I cannot achieve.

Much as I loved my husband, I shall not attempt to exaggerate his virtues or to ignore his faults. He was a robust, hard-hitting American, intensely alive to everything that affected his country and its people.

Perhaps the truest picture of him that could be presented is contained in a pencilled memorandum which I found among his papers after he had passed away.

Seated alone in his office at midnight of the day he had taken his solemn oath as a Member of the United States Senate, this is what he wrote on a sheet of paper which I have before me. I quote: "Midnight, January 3, 1937. May I be a Senator after Washington, Jackson, and Lincoln, and under God, always for our America."

That was his creed in a sentence. It wasn't written for publication, but it reveals the soul of the man who placed his country second only to his God. I want to repeat that sentence: "May I be a Senator after Washington, Jackson, and Lincoln, and under God, always for our America."

This is the man who, after the grave had closed on him and he could no longer defend his good name, has been ruthlessly slandered. The dead cannot be hurt by vilification; it is those who loved the dead and who all the years of their lives will bear his name with pride, they are the ones who feel the force of the dagger driven into the back of the dead.

Ernest Lundeen was born in South Dakota, the son of Rev. Charles Henry Lundeen, a humble minister of the gospel. My husband worked his way through school and college, graduating from Carlton College and the University of Minnesota. My husband was not a pacifist. Even before he was old enough to vote he had volunteered and served in the Spanish-American War. For 10 years he was a member of the Minnesota National Guard. He was noted for his efficiency in military tactics, and he achieved distinction as one of the most accurate marksmen in our country.

Ernest Lundeen served in the Minnesota State Legislature and in 1916 was elected to the World War Congress. He firmly believed that we should not become involved in any European war. He had been elected upon a vigorously reiterated campaign pledge that he would never vote to put this country into a foreign war. He kept that sacred pledge. He was one of that little band of 57 Members of Congress, who on April 6, 1917, were far-seeing and fearless enough to vote against a declaration of war.

In a memorable speech 24 years ago he predicted that thousands of our boys would die on foreign battlefields in a war that would destroy democracy. He foresaw that our involvement in that war would bring suffering and want to the people of America. How tragically true was his vision.

For saying these things my husband was denounced as pro-German. Then, as now, there were those whose emotions blinded their judgment. But Ernest Lundeen did not falter; he voted against conscripting American youth for service on foreign battlefields.

He was confident time would vindicate his course, and vindication did come—complete and glorious vindication. One touching tribute to his patriotism deserves mention here. On Memorial Day 1919 he delivered the oration at the National Cemetery, Arlington, Va., upon the invitation of the National Grand Army of the Republic, the highest honor that any citizen can receive on that occasion.

In 1932 and 1934 my husband was again elected to Congress.

In 1936 he was further honored when he was elected to the United States Senate. Already there were dark rumblings of another war in Europe. My husband reiterated his life-long opposition against our involvement in European conflicts. His opponent attacked his stand. With that clear-cut issue before them—the people of Minnesota elected Ernest Lundeen with an overwhelming majority of 262,000 over a man who had been three times Governor of our State.

After election my husband did not treat his pledges as campaign oratory. He urged absolute neutrality in the affairs of Europe. He was the first man in public life to demand that the United States secure possession of the West Indies and Greenland as essential for our own national defense. As long ago as 1919 he advocated a unified air force under a Cabinet head. Do not today's headlines again prove that my husband had vision and foresight?

From his first World War speech April 6, 1917, to the last speech he delivered in the Senate four days before his death—a 3-hour extemporaneous talk against our involvement in foreign alliances—his stand had been unswerving and constant.

Vicious innuendoes have been made by Winchell. Slanderers of my husband's memory have suggested that others wrote his speeches. This is a deliberate falsehood, designed to mislead. No one wrote my husband's speeches. He was fully capable of writing his own—and he wrote his own.

Winchell has referred to an address my husband delivered in New York on March 20, 1940. Winchell said this affair was arranged in honor of "A visiting German agent." This gentleman was the Duke Saxe-Coburg-Gotha of Germany—a grandson of Queen Victoria, a cousin of the present King of England, and vice president of the International Red Cross. Norman Davis, the chief of the American Red Cross—entertained this German visitor in Washington and prominent public figures, including officials of the State Department, were guests. Of course, Winchell didn't mention these facts when he described the Duke as a "German agent." And, of course, Winchell didn't explain that President Roosevelt also entertained this "German agent."

Even then my husband would not have accepted the invitation to speak at this dinner in New York until he was given assurance that the Duke was not here to collect money for Germany—but here only to promote Red Cross work and increase international trade.

It is customary when distinguished officials of foreign nations are guests in our country that the flag of their country be placed subordinate to our flag. When the King and Queen of England were here, Washington was aflutter with British flags.

At this New York dinner our American flag was directly behind the speakers' table. To show you the misrepresentation resorted to by my husband's enemies, I point out that a number of photographs of my husband were taken while he was speaking. One of those photographs was taken at such an angle as to convey the impression that my husband was standing beneath the swastika. As a matter of fact, he was standing under the Stars and Stripes. I have beside me four photographs proving the truth of my statement. It has been said by a pair of Washington columnists that my husband received a handsome sum for the speech. That is another deliberate falsehood, and those who wrote it know it.

My husband never expressed support—publicly or privately—for any foreign government. The one thought that filled his mind was the safety and well-being of America. His was not a divided allegiance. He sympathized with other countries and with other peoples, but he kept a rein on his sympathies because of his firm conviction that Americans should think of America first.

Doesn't it seem strange to you that these men who toss falsehoods about so lightly now that my husband is dead—never dared to speak or write a word against him while he was alive?

This sudden bravado against which a widow and her children have no redress comes from the fact that the law holds that a dead man cannot be libeled. These villifiers of my husband's memory waited until his voice was silenced and only the bereaved members of his family were left to listen and languish in his sorrow.

It is not necessary for me to tell you of our suffering. Try to imagine our position. Only a few days after the husband and father we loved had been laid away—this storm of malice broke.

My husband's colleagues in Congress expressed their indignation. Pearson and Allen—a pair of columnists who cooperated with Winchell in spreading these libels—had written that two Department of Justice agents were on the plane with my husband when it crashed—that they had been assigned to "watch him." All accusations of this nature are emphatically denied in the letters of Attorney General Jackson and J. Edgar Hoover, whose letters are carried in full in the October 9 and 15, 1940, CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS. Please allow me to read a portion of the Attorney General's letter. I quote:

"I wish to deny emphatically recently published press reports to the effect that the late Senator Ernest Lundeen, of Minneapolis—at the time of his death in an airplane accident on August 31—was under investigation by the Department of Justice. No inquiry into the affairs of Senator Lundeen has ever been instituted or contemplated—either by the Federal Bureau of Investigation or by any other agency of the Department of Justice—and any statement or report to the contrary is untrue."

But these assurances by the Attorney General of the United States and the Chief of his Bureau of Investigation had no effect on those intent on smearing my husband's memory. They continued to spread the libels—safe in the knowledge that legal steps could not be taken against them.

I know this presentation has been inadequate. I have done my best in these few minutes to explain this vile slander on my husband's memory. Why has the good name and patriotism of my husband been so slandered? There is only one explanation. If my husband had joined forces with the international warmongers, he would now be permitted to rest in peace. This campaign of vilification against the dead is just a part of brutal attacks on distinguished patriots who are living—all to serve as an object lesson that no one must dare to stem the tide of bloody war. No court of law will punish them; but they cannot escape just retribution.

Through the generosity of the National Broadcasting Co. I have placed my words in honor of my dead husband's life and record into the hearts and minds of the just and fair people of America. His record needs no defense. He was a soldier in his country's cause. He knew but one patriotism, and that was for America. He knew but one love, and that was for his family, his children. I, the mother of those children, wife of Ernest Lundeen, have spoken so that vilification shall not reach into the innocent grave nor besmirch the innocent ones who lovingly bear the name of Ernest Lundeen.

We Burned Our Fingers Once—Will History Repeat?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we saved Britain before and were called Uncle Shylock. Every nation which has followed her into this war has gone down to defeat. Are we to sacrifice more than a million lives, untold treasure, just to be used as a cat's-paw?

During this new period of hysteria we Americans will do well to see ourselves as the wise men of Europe see us—after we succumb to their interventionist propaganda.

As the New York Enquirer reminds us:

It will be an empty recompense for those Americans who, should the Nation enter the war, are unfortunate enough to survive the collapse of the Republic, to be told from beyond the Atlantic that Uncle Sam was befooled into reaching for his gun, as he was away back in 1917. A famed British writer, Hilaire Belloc, with that honesty characteristic of his type of Briton, made this frank disclosure in 1925, as to how America was gulled in World War days:

"The most comic part of the affair was the attitude toward America. We dared not insult America, for we were naturally as keen on getting American help as is a drowning man on catching a deck chair. In their ignorance, many people came to believe that it was the duty of the Americans to come over and help, and what was more astonishing still, it was represented to them as a matter of life and death, not to us but to themselves. The Americans were told—heaven knows whether any of them believed it—that if the Germans, Austrians, Bulgarians, Turks, and others won in their push against the English, French, and Italians, that after the half-baked won against the baked, the next thing would be a sailing of the conquerors over the sea for the rude domination of Scranton, Pa. Fiddlesticks! But people would really talk like that. They shock their fingers at the United States and said, 'It will be your turn next.'"

The American people must decide—and there is not a moment to lose—whether the forces that are dragging us to war and perdition, as we were dragged 24 years ago, should consummate their crime against God and America, or whether our country shall remain at peace and attend strictly to its own affairs.

We are still paying the cost of fighting Britain's last war. Out of it we got nothing but suffering, economic loss and abuse from those we aided. For once in our history, let us think of America first.

Southern Baptist Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by me before the Southern Baptist Convention in Birmingham, Ala., on Saturday, May 17, 1941, as follows:

America today—more than any other nation, at any other time in the history of modern civilization—is the final and best hope for the preservation of Christianity and freedom.

Though the last to surrender was not least in valor, those once free and independent nations of Europe no longer exist as such. They have fallen one by one until at last Great Britain, alone, stands to resist the invader's march. And it was to England—that isle of our mother tongue—an American poet once wrote these lines:

* * * if your courage wane
Through force or fraud, look westward to your child.

Today, not only England but all the ravaged nations of Europe are looking westward. They are looking to America, perhaps, as the world's last best hope for the preservation of Christianity and freedom.

WE MUST NOT FAIL

Humanity is suffering. With calmness and resolution let us say to ourselves: "We cannot; we must not; we shall not fail." The sin of failing was cited by our great Secretary of State when he asserted: "Were we to fail in meeting our responsibility, we would fail ourselves; we would fail the generations that went before us; we would fail the generations that are to come after us; we would fail mankind; we would fail God."

America, therefore, must be strong for we must not fail. We must build a tower of strength and a force of military might. Our power to preserve Christian civilization and the democratic way of life must surpass the power of the enemy to destroy them. Thus, we are moving in the determination to make America, by all odds, the strongest and most powerful nation on the face of the earth.

If we need an all-out defense effort to make America strong, then we need all-out realism, all-out sincerity to make that effort 100 percent effective. All-out realism or sincerity is simple. It means this, and just this, to every American citizen: support to the utmost whatever serves to increase our national strength and unity; oppose to the utmost whatever serves to destroy our national strength and unity. My purpose in coming before you this morning is to oppose to the utmost the liquor traffic which serves to destroy national strength and unity.

STRENGTH AND SECURITY OF AMERICA

It is reassuring to observe that the Nation as a whole is already supporting to the utmost all efforts for the increased production of planes, tanks, ships, guns, and other needed weapons of defense, but what is most disturbing is the fact that as yet the Nation has voiced little opposition to the ever-expanding menace of the liquor traffic, which through the medium of alcohol is undermining the physical, moral, and spiritual foundations on which rest the final strength and security of America. This is a serious matter. We have carried forward our production of the weapons of defense at top speed, but all too long we have neglected the conservation and strengthening of our manpower that is to defend this Nation if needs be.

The time has come, and it is later than you think, for the American people to firmly assert their opposition to the liquor traffic. These truths are held to be self evident:

First. Alcohol wastes national wealth needed for national defense.

Second. Alcohol saps the strength of manpower essential to national defense.

Third. Alcohol undermines the spiritual and moral forces which must sustain the efforts of men and women when the hour of greatest national crisis comes.

Alcohol wastes national wealth. Since repeal in 1933 we have spent $20,000,000,000 in the United States for liquors, not including illicit liquor. Today we are spending more than three and one-half billions annually for liquor, and for many months following the outbreak of the European war our importation of Scotch whisky from England was so heavy that it enabled Great Britain to maintain a favorable balance of trade with the United States despite her enormous purchases of planes, tanks, and other war materials from American manufacturers.

ALCOHOL DESTROYS MANPOWER

The total amount of our national income which is absorbed by alcohol annually is not fully represented in these figures since they only account for the outright sale of alcoholic beverages. The indirect costs of the liquor business run into still more billions of American dollars, as witness the size of our crime bill, which has reached a high of fifteen billion a year. It is conservatively estimated that arrests for intoxication cost the country at least $6,000,000,000, while another fifteen billion goes for the treatment and care of persons in mental hospitals due to alcoholism. At a time when billions are needed for defense expenditures how can we afford to dissipate so sizable a portion of our national income on alcohol?

Alcohol not only wastes national wealth, needed for national defense, it saps the strength of our manpower essential to national defense. During the last World War it was our own Gen. John J. Pershing who described alcohol as America's deadly enemy when he declared: "Banish the entire liquor industry from the United States; close every saloon and brewery; suppress drinking by severe punishment to the drinker * * * and the Nation will suddenly find itself amazed at its efficiency and startled at the increase in its labor supply. I shall not go slow on prohibition, for I know what is the greatest foe to my men, greater even than the bullets of the enemy." British Prime Minister David Lloyd George likewise said:

"We are fighting Germany, Austria, and Drink, and so far as I can see the greatest of these deadly foes is Drink."

Modern warfare is mechanized warfare; modern defense is mechanized defense in which men with clear brains and steady hands must exercise split-second judgment for precision in the operation of planes, tanks, and other motorized units of a modern defense system. This thing which confronts us is

not a theory, it is a practical problem; we simply must preserve the physical, fighting strength of this Nation for common defense against any eventuality. "To put alcohol in the human system," said the great inventor, Thomas A. Edison, "is like putting sand in the bearing of an engine." The fact that alcohol destroys essential teamwork between head and hand is reflected in the ever-increasing number of automobile accidents since repeal. In 60 percent of the fatal motor accidents for the year 1939 investigation proved that drivers had been drinking within an hour preceding the accident.

ARMY CAMPS UNDER PRESSURE LIQUOR TRAFFIC

If there are those who are inclined to view this particular problem without any expression of concern, I ask them, Can comfort be found in the fact that approximately 50 percent of the young men examined for Regular Service in the United States Army are being rejected because of failure to meet minimum standards of physical well-being? This is indeed an alarming revelation; but still more alarming are current statements from War Department officials exposing the pressure of the liquor traffic on the young men now undergoing training in Army camps throughout the country. Army Chief of Staff Gen. George C. Marshall recently deplored the fact that "establishments for the purpose of selling liquor are becoming increasingly active in the communities adjacent to camps." Said General Marshall: "Here we have on the one side a sordid business for the accumulation of money, and on the other the interest of every parent in the United States who has a son in the Army."

Now awaiting the action of the Senate Military Affairs Committee of Congress is a legislative proposal described as "a bill to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments." The author of this measure was the late Senator Morris Sheppard of Texas, that great leader of men who stood in the vanguard of the temperance movement for a half century. Though death has stilled his voice the example set by Senator Sheppard will live on after him as a beacon of light and inspiration to guide and direct those who are joined in the great cause for which he labored so long and so well. I am actively supporting this and similar measures designed to bolster our defense effort against the menace of the liquor traffic, and it is my determination to work for their enactment at the present session of Congress.

At the outbreak of the war, France was believed to possess the best-trained army in all the world. Not so comforting, however, was the fact that her per capita consumption of alcoholic beverages during the 20 years between World War I and World War II exceeded that of every other European nation. Germany on the other hand established higher standards of sobriety and discipline than ever attempted by the French or any European nation for that matter. A number of factors may have accounted for the incredible fall of France last spring but the factor of alcohol appears to have weighed heavily. The part that alcohol played in the fall of France was stated in a news dispatch from Vichy on August 24 last, reading as follows: "A government spokesman said today that alcohol was one of the chief causes of the moral collapse of France under attack."

Yesterday France came to grips with a Germany so intent on success and victory that she established higher standards of sobriety and discipline than ever attempted by the French people. Today, Germany being more intent than ever on success and victory has pushed to even higher levels those standards of discipline and sobriety. The question is: Will tomorrow find America softened by alcohol for the same sort of moral collapse which spelled disaster for France or will we be found hardened for any possible test of strength?

ALCOHOL UNDERMINES SPIRITUAL AND MORAL FORCES

In our drive for increased national defense, we must not forget that alcohol undermines the spiritual and moral forces which strengthen individual character and national unity. On the occasion of his last inaugural address President Roosevelt pointed out that a nation, like a person, has a body, mind, and spirit and, like a person, to be strong must possess a full measure of physical, mental, and spiritual vitality.

President Grover Cleveland once said: "I am firm in my conviction that * * * there is no calamity which a great nation can invite which equals that which follows from supine submission to wrong." An outstanding newspaper editor recently stated: "There is only one certain way to avoid disaster and that is through a recovery of respect for and touch with matters spiritual."

No true, thoughtful American would scoff at those words of warning. The pity of it all, however, is that our national attitude toward alcohol and the liquor traffic has been conditioned to such a high degree of indifference that millions of Americans are no longer sensitive to the injurious qualities of alcoholic beverages, nor are they fully aware of the burden which it imposes on our national strength. We have too long been subjected to a hideous brand of propaganda which seeks to make what is a lie the truth, and what is the truth a lie. We find the climate of public thinking still beclouded by the misty arguments and flimsy pretenses of those alcoholic missionaries who were once bold to preach the gospel that to legalize the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages would be no mistake and could do no harm.

We observe that interests of the liquor traffic have spared no effort in their attempt to drape the white linen of virtue over the naked evil of drinking. For instance, the word "saloon," the American people made it too harsh for social respectability, so exponents of the liquor traffic now describe drinking places as cocktail lounges. But is there anything which makes a cocktail lounge essentially different from a saloon except for the absence of a brass rail and the presence of women? As a member of the clergy recently pointed out, "the saloon has returned. It is here in forms a thousandfold more vicious and debauching than anything ever known in the palmiest days of the preprohibition era. The beer garden, the cocktail lounge, the night club, the dance hall, and a host of other forms of bedevilment have been thrust upon us."

National advertising on an unparalleled scale has been employed to weaken all lines of resistance to alcohol. What do we see in our newspapers and magazines—attractive, carefully worded, skillfully designed advertisements which begin with the brazen assumption that drinking is no evil and end with deceptive claims as to the values of alcoholic beverages. Thousands of dollars are spent daily to perpetrate the lie that beer is real food while hardly a penny is given to publicize the truth that milk is nutritious. And what do we see in our movies—leading players as heaviest drinkers. This is not the sort of stuff of which a strong, healthy, and virile nation is to be made.

In a book entitled "You Can Defend America," I recently read this:

"The fight is on. The fight against our softness, graft, laziness, extravagance, buck-passing, materialism—allies of the 'fifth column.' The battle line runs through every home, every office, every factory, every farm.

"It is a daily battle. It takes courage. Imagination. You've got to be tough inside. You've got to think hard, and live clean."

CHURCH MUST GO FORWARD

Let us here and now declare that for us "the fight is on"; that the church will take the lead in that fight; that we will fight on until victory is complete. In a great democracy such as ours, it is the force of public opinion and not the edict or order of any one man which determines our course of action, national policy, will and purpose. If the full force of public opinion is to be marshaled against the evils of alcohol and the liquor traffic, the church must go forward with courage and determination.

If we be conscientious, it is for us to realize that the fate of a nation will ultimately depend upon the strength and health of her population. If we be sincere, it is for us to realize that a nation, like a person, may drift with the tides of indulgence that end in oblivion or sail on the winds of self-discipline which lead to greatness. If we be true to the traditions of our forefathers, we must, in this fateful year of 1941, set our sails to the purpose of gaining such increased strength as may be essential for the fulfillment of America's destiny among the nations of the world.

This is a high purpose, part of a noble plan in which our hearts, our minds, our spirits must join. So to close, I make this poetic prayer:

We know the paths wherein our feet should press,
Across our hearts are written Thy decrees,
Yet now, O Lord, be merciful to bless
With more than these.

Grant us the will to fashion as we feel,
Grant us the strength to labor as we know,
Grant us the purpose, ribbed and edged with steel,
To strike the blow.

Knowledge we ask not—knowledge Thou hast lent;
But Lord, the will—there lies our bitter need—
Give us to build above the deep intent
The deed, the deed.

Americanism Redefined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

ARTICLE BY MRS. WILL M. WHITTINGTON, PREPARED FOR THE WEDNESDAY, MAY 14, 1941, MEETING OF THE CHAKCHIUMA CHAPTER, GREENWOOD, MISS., DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted I extend my remarks by including the following article by Mrs. Whittington, who had been asked to speak on the subject Americanism Redefined at the meeting held on Wednesday, May 14, 1941, of the Chakchiuma Chapter, Greenwood, Miss., Daughters of the American Revolution, to wit:

Webster's New International Dictionary defines Americanism as: "attachment or loyalty to the United States, its traditions, interests, or ideals." It is significant, I think, that in this sense, the meaning is unique. There are no such words as Frenchism, or Germanism, or Britishism to convey an analogous idea with reference to those countries. In fact,

in the early writings of the founders of the Nation there occurs no such expression, for so revolutionary were the ideas and aims which inspired the founding fathers that a new word came into the language to express their devotion to country, love of personal liberty, insistence upon national independence, approval of our institutions, patriotism, and the duty of defense.

Now the very wording of my subject, Americanism Redefined, suggests that by perhaps imperceptible degrees we have been traveling away from the original implications of the term and that we have arrived at a point where a new definition is necessary. The almost unbelievable events of the past year and a half have jolted us out of our comfortable complacency. In this crisis, when many of the institutions we thought unshakable are tottering before our helpless gaze, it is indeed time to take stock, individually and as a Nation. What does Americanism mean today? Has all that it signified, all that it implied in the early days of the Republic changed?

If we agree that Americanism is essentially loyalty to the American ideal, a redefinition is necessary only if the ideal has changed or if our allegiance has wavered.

The heart of the American ideal is the recognition of the value of the individual and the development of that individual for his own and the common good through liberty and social justice. The fundamental principle of our Republic is the concept that man is capable of governing himself. Surely not one of us has lost his faith in these bedrock foundations of our civilization, yet these are the bulwarks that are being assailed by the enemy. Today the war that threatens to envelop us is not merely a war of material weapons—guns and tanks and ships and airplanes. These are only the outward manifestations of a fiercer battle, the war of conflicting ideologies. The fight is that of the individual versus the superman, liberty versus tyranny, democracy versus totalitarianism.

It is one of the paradoxes of democracy that its fundamental principles may offer a vulnerable spot in its armor. Our most cherished traditions, freedom of speech and of the press, the right of assembly, have been used by enemies of democracy for spreading the most insidious propaganda against our way of life. They tell us that democracy has failed, that in the new order there can be no personal liberty, that progress comes, not in differentiation, but in uniformity.

As American citizens, we must fight unceasingly and implacably, against such subversive propaganda. Listen to the words of Thomas Jefferson, which might have been written for us in 1941: "Every society has a right to fix the fundamental principles of its association, and to say to all individuals that if they contemplate pursuits beyond the limit of those principles and involving dangers which the society wishes to avoid, they must go somewhere else for their exercise; that we want no citizens, and still less ephemeral and pseudo-citizens on such terms. We may exclude them from our territory, as we do persons with disease." This is sound advice for dealing with those for whom the blitzkrieg has become the symbol of results to be accomplished by dictatorship methods, efficiency a fetish, and achievement a god. Let them go where they can live under such a regime. We must and shall preserve the democratic method which is willing to a certain extent to forego efficiency in order to acquire moral dignity.

The development of the individual implies the inherent right to enjoy the fruit of his labors. For this our forefathers labored. In other words they believed in work as a means to accomplish the desired end. Do we, as a Nation, now subscribe wholeheartedly to this tradition? Or is "something for nothing" the watchword, the most possible gain with the least possible effort? Apparently many would like to revise the time-honored words "the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" to "the right to a living, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

I have recently seen a new play, Hope for a Harvest, the lesson of which could well be taken to heart by the public at large. It preaches the old-fashioned doctrine of work, and that along with our rights, which have been overemphasized, there are duties and responsibilities which we owe to society and our Government. The development of the individual for his own good is only half the picture—it is also for the common good, even at the price of self-sacrifice.

That the citizens should feel a responsibility for their Government is one of the distinguishing characteristics of a democracy. Now, as never before, it behooves us as patriotic citizens to support and look to the welfare of our country; not only must we contribute of our means, but of our interest, our thoughts, and our prayers. We may have become lax during the years of security, taking for granted the blessings that have accrued to us because we live in a democracy, and heedless of the dangers that were encroaching upon us unawares, yet in our hearts we have not departed from the teachings and precepts of our fathers.

So, let us say, it is not a redefinition of Americanism that is needed, but a rededication of ourselves as American citizens, a reaffirmation of our belief in democracy as a way of life. Truth stands, and true Americanism is as real and as potent as in days gone by.

But passive adherence to the democratic principle as a political form of government is not enough. We must show our faith in the kind of world that democracy makes possible, a positive, militant faith that will fight for the preservation of our traditions and institutions. The spirit is our weapon in the war we are fighting. Physical might has never been able to overcome spiritual force. Democracy can be preserved if we have the will and the spirit to do it.

When our forefathers entered upon their noble experiment of founding a democratic Nation, the eyes of suffering humanity were upon them, and they did not fail them. Today, the oppressed of the world look to us for the preservation of the democratic ideal. They shall not look in vain.

T. V. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

NEWS RELEASE FOR MAY 18, 1941

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement relative to the T. V. A.:

The Tennessee Valley Authority observes its eighth anniversary today, May 18, in the midst of the largest and most urgent work program in its history.

In addition to its huge normal program of construction and operations, T. V. A. with its 20,000 employees is carrying out national-defense assignments to increase its power capacity, produce ammonium nitrate for use in munitions, speed up completion of the 9-foot navigation channel, enlarge capacity for production of concentrated phosphate fertilizer, and build houses for industrial defense workers.

At the direction of Congress, the Authority is adding 360,000 kilowatts to its installed power capacity, principally by the construction of Cherokee Dam and the Watts Bar Steam Plant, to supply energy needed to produce more aluminum for airplanes. On authorization by the United States War Department, the Authority is adding a new ammonia plant and reconstructing Nitrate Plant No. 2, at Muscle Shoals, Ala., to produce ammonium nitrate at the rate of 300 tons a day. As agent of the Federal Works Administrator, T. V. A. is building 250 dwellings in the Muscle Shoals area and 100 in the Humboldt-Milan area in Tennessee to house industrial workers engaged in national-defense production. At the same time the Authority is moving ahead with its normal program, including the construction of Kentucky, Watts Bar, and Fort Loudoun Dams.

Eight years ago, navigation on the Tennessee River was largely restricted to local hauls of a hundred miles or so during the autumn and winter when heavy rains filled the channel to navigable depths. Today, an all-time record freight traffic of 97,000,000 ton-miles (1940) has been reached and gasoline, grain, and automobiles are among the important new kinds of freight moving over the river from points of origin outside the Valley.

Eight years ago floods in the Tennessee River were virtually altogether uncontrolled. Today T. V. A.'s system of eight major dams is providing 4,000,000 acre-feet of controlled storage, and completion of the dams now under construction will increase controlled storage to 10,000,000 acre-feet.

Eight years ago the Federal Government was utilizing the vast water power of the Tennessee River for the production of electricity at only one dam—Wilson. Lacking transmission lines with which to carry its power to market the Government had only one customer, the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation, and was selling only 21 percent of the electric power Wilson Dam could produce.

Today the Government's Tennessee Valley power plants are producing more than five times the amount of power that could have been produced by Wilson Dam in 1933. The Tennessee Valley Authority, with 4,900 circuit miles of its own transmission lines, possesses a ready market for all the power it can sell. Seventy-five municipal systems and 38 cooperatives are buying T. V. A. power wholesale and distributing it to more than 430,000 customers, who are saving more than $9,000,000 a year in electric bills as a result of T. V. A.'s low rates.

Eight years ago the Government's nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals had been idle for years. Since T. V. A. began operation a portion of the plant has been converted to production of phosphates and more than 290,000 tons produced, much of which has gone into demonstrations of good-farming practices on more than 35,000 farms in 27 States.

In its 8 years T. V. A., in cooperation with State and local agencies, has also developed farm and industrial equipment to help raise agricultural income and widen the uses of electricity, helped communities to plan their orderly development, cooperated in the checking of erosion on thousands of acres of land. The Authority responded to requests from communities for technical assistance in planning for local flood-control works and river-freight and passenger terminals, cooperated in public-health work, carried on research to develop new uses and wider markets for mineral resources, conserved the recreational values of its lakes by building demonstration parks, and cooperating in the construction of parks by States counties, and municipalities.

Milestones in T. V. A.'s 8-year record have included—

1933: Construction of Wheeler Dam started. President orders construction of Norris Dam; construction started. Tupelo, Miss., first municipality to contract for T. V. A. power. T V. A. agricultural-industrial research program started. An organization of almost 10,000 men and women recruited in less than a year's time.

1934: T. V. A. buys blocks of transmission and distribution properties from Mississippi Power Co. for $850,000 and from Tennessee Electric Power Co. for $8,605. Newly formed Alcorn County (Miss.), Electric Power Association begins using T. V. A. power. Knoxville, Dayton, and Pulaski, Tenn.; Athens, Decatur, Florence, Russellville, Sheffield, and Tuscumbia, Ala.; Amory and New Albany, Miss., contract for T. V. A. power. First electric furnace put into phosphate production by T. V. A. at nitrate plant No. 2 at Muscle Shoals, Ala. Product is 45 percent concentrated phosphate fertilizer. Single electric furnace has capacity of 16,000 tons a year. Authority signs first of 23 contracts for administration of phosphate demonstration program by land-grant colleges. Electric Home and Farm Authority incorporated in Delaware as T. V. A. subsidiary, "with the purpose of making feasible the increase in the use of electricity in homes and on farms, by seeking to improve the quality, decrease the cost, and finance the consumer purchase of electrical appliances." Fourteen preferred-stock holders of the Alabama Power Co. file suit (the Ashwander case) in the Eighth Judicial Circuit of Alabama to enjoin the sale of certain transmission lines, substations, and auxiliary properties by the company to T. V. A.

1935: Congress amends Tennessee Valley Authority Act to clarify the principles of allocating costs and keeping accounts, and to enable the Authority, for a period of 5 years, to issue bonds and lend a maximum of $50,000,000 to local governments for use in buying, constructing, or operating power transmission and distribution lines. T. V. A. buys block of transmission lines and associated facilities from Tennessee Electric Power Co. for $15,753. Second electric furnace installed at Shoals phosphate plant, increasing installed capacity to 50,000 tons a year. Somerville, Bolivar, Dickson, Jackson, Memphis, Milan, and Volunteer Electric Power Association (Decatur) Tenn., Muscle Shoals City, Ala., and Holly Springs, Okolona, Monroe County Electric Power Association (Amory), Pontotoc Electric Power Association (Iuka), and Tombigbee Electric Power Association (Tupelo), Miss., contract for T. V. A. power. First test-demonstration farm selected for utilization of T. V. A. phosphate fertilizer in rounded farming program. Construction of Pickwick and Guntersville Dams started.

1936: United States Supreme Court decides for T. V. A. in Ashwander Case. Aluminum Co. of America contracts for T. V. A. power for its plant at Alcoa, Tenn. T. V A buys certain properties of Alabama Power Co. for $1,080,974. Cullman Electric Cooperative (Cullman), Ala.; North Georgia Electric Membership Corporation (Dalton), Ga.; and Duck River Electric Membership Corporation (Shelbyville), Gibson County Electric Membership Corporation (Trenton), Middle Tennessee Electric Membership Corporation (Murfreesboro), Pickwick Electric Membership Corporation (Selmer), and Southwest Tennessee Electric Membership Corporation (Brownsville), Tenn., contract for T. V. A. power. Number of test-demonstration farms reaches 10,000 in 10 States. Norris and Wheeler Dams completed. Construction of Chickamauga and Hiwassee Dams started.

1937: First substantial operation of the T. V. A. reservoir system for flood control. Crests at Chattanooga reduced by 3 to 5 feet on four occasions; savings estimated at $750,000. Ohio River crest at Cairo, Ill., reduced by nearly half a foot, preventing flood from overtopping levees. Electro-Metallurgical Co. contracts for T. V. A. power for a plant to be located near Sheffield, Ala. Victor Chemical Co. chooses site near Mt. Pleasant, Tenn., for plant to make phosphate with T. V. A. power. Number of test-demonstration farms reaches 20,000 in 15 States. Third electric furnace installed at Shoals phosphate plant, increasing installed capacity to 75,000 tons a year. Chattanooga, Lincoln County Electric Membership Corporation (Fayetteville), Paris and Trenton, Tenn.; Cherokee County Electric Membership Corporation (Centre), Joe Wheeler Electric Membership Corporation (Decatur) and Guntersville, Ala.; and Northeast Mississippi Electric Membership Corporation (Oxford) and Tippah Electric Power Association (Ripley), Miss., contract for T. V. A. power.

1938: Tennessee Supreme Court decision directly affecting Paris, Fayetteville, and Clarksville, Tenn., removes final barrier to use of Public Works Administration funds by Tennessee municipalities for construction of electric distribution systems. Congress orders investigation of T. V. A. T. V. A.'s Shoals phosphate plant begins manufacture of 62 percent concentrated phosphate, highest concentration in history. First long-haul shipment of gasoline on the improved Tennessee River. Eighteen privately owned electric utilities bring suit against T. V. A. in Federal Court. Case decided for T. V. A. by three-member Federal Court sitting at Chattanooga. T. V. A. buys transmission and distribution properties from Tennessee Public Service Co. (Knoxville) for $2,549,488, from Holston River Electric Co. for $87,500, from Kentucky-Tennessee Light & Power Co. for $125,000, and from Grainger County Electric Co. for $7,500. Aberdeen, 4-County Electric Power Association (Columbus), Tallahatchie Valley Electric Power Association (Batesville), Water Valley, Columbus and Starkville, Miss.; Bessemer, Albertville, Cortland, Fort Payne, Hartselle, Scottsboro, and Tarrant City, Ala.; Brownsville, Carroll County, Clarksville, Columbia, Etowah, Fayetteville, Humboldt, Lenoir City, Lewisburg, Newbern, Cumberland Electric Membership Corporation (Clarksville), Ripley, and Weakley County, Tenn.; and Blue Ridge Electric Association, Inc. (Young Harris), Ga., contract for T. V. A. power. First local-planning assistance program established by T. V. A., in cooperation with the Alabama State Planning Commission, at Guntersville, Ala. Pickwick Dam completed. Construction of Kentucky Dam started.

1939: Congressional investigating committee upholds T. V. A. United States Supreme Court decision for T. V. A. in 18-utilities suit ends long litigation by privately owned utilities and others seeking to stop the Authority's power program. Congress amends Tennessee Valley Authority Act to enable Authority to issue maximum of $61,500,000 in bonds, principally to finance its share in the purchase of all the electric properties of the Tennessee Electric Power Co. All electric properties of the Tennessee Electric Power Co. bought by T. V. A., 22 municipalities and 11 cooperatives; T. V. A.'s share $44,949,400. T. V. A. buys blocks of properties from Memphis Power & Light Co. for $2,110,000, from Mississippi Power Co. for $1,333,000, from West Tennessee Power & Light Co. for $250,000, and from Bells Light & Water Co. for $7,840. First long-haul shipment of grain on improved Tennessee River. T. V. A. power operations reach paying basis. Power revenues in fiscal year total $5,445,197. Fiscal year's net income from power program more than $1,478,000, enough to absorb net power expenses brought forward from all preceding years and leave net income of nearly $900,000. Tennessee River freight reaches all-time peak of 91,000,000 ton-miles. T. V. A. report on the effects of rail freight-rate structure on the Southeast and Southwest submitted to Congress and published as a congressional document. Fourth electric furnace installed at Shoals phosphate plant, increasing installed capacity to 100,000 tons a year. Alcorn County (Miss.) Electric Power Association first distributor of T. V. A. power to become entirely debt-free. Cost of system paid out of earnings in less than 5 years. Alcorn first T. V. A. distributor to reduce rates below T. V. A. basic standard. Electric Home and Farm Authority transferred from T. V. A. to Federal Loan Agency. Nashville, Cleveland, Athens, Upper Cumberland Electric Membership Corporation (Carthage), Plateau Electric Cooperative (Oneida), Sequachee Valley Electric Cooperative (South Pittsburg), Tri-County Electric Membership Corporation (Lafayette), Meriwether Lewis Electric Cooperative (Centerville), Clinton, Gallatin, Harriman, La Follette, Lawrenceburg, Lexington, Loudon, McMinnville, Maryville, Mount Pleasant, Murfreesboro, Newport, Rockwood, Sevierville, Sweetwater, and Winchester, Tenn.; Louisville, Central Electric Power Association (Carthage), East Mississippi Electric Power Association (Meridian), Natchez Trace Electric Power Association (Houston), Macon and Philadelphia, Miss.; Murphy, N. C.; and Hickman-Fulton Counties Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation (Hickman), Ky., contract for T. V. A. power. Guntersville Dam completed. Construction of Watts Bar Dam started.

1940: Congress orders construction of Cherokee Dam and Watts Bar steam plant and installation of additional generators in Wilson and Pickwick Dams to increase installed capacity of T. V. A.'s power system by 360,000 kilowatts and supply power needed to produce more aluminum for airplanes in national-defense program. Construction of Cherokee Dam started within 24 hours on fastest work schedule ever attempted in United States large-scale dam construction. Congress amends Tennessee Valley Authority Act to enable the Authority to make payments to States and counties in lieu of taxes. T. V. A. buys block of properties from Alabama Power Co. for $1,989,000. A T. V. A. engineer, John H. Walthall, discovers a process for making alumina, raw material of aluminum, from clays found in abundance in the valley. First shipment of automobiles on the Tennessee River. Reynolds Metals Co. contracts for T. V. A. power for new aluminum plant at Sheffield, Ala. Six years of collective-bargaining relationship with employees formalized by signing of a contract between T. V. A. and the Tennessee Valley Trades and Labor Council, representing 15 union-labor organizations affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. Tennessee River freight sets all-time peak for second year in succession with 97,000,000 ton-miles. Steamer *Golden Eagle* voyages to Chattanooga; first passenger boat on the improved Tennessee River upstream from Muscle Shoals and largest ever locked through the upper dams. Number of test-demonstration farms reaches 30,000 in 22 States. Contracts for T. V. A. power signed by Benton County, Jellico, Springfield, Tennessee Valley Electric Cooperative (Savannah), Appalachian Electric Power Association (Jefferson City), Fort Loudoun Electric Cooperative (Madisonville), and Holston Electric Cooperative (Rogersville), Tennessee, North Alabama Electric Cooperative (Stevenson), Sand Mountain Electric Cooperative (Fort Payne), and Huntsville, Ala., and West Point, Miss. Hiwassee and Chickamauga Dams completed. Construction of Fort Loudoun Dam started.

1941: Congress increases T. V. A. appropriation to speed up construction of Fort Loudoun Dam by a full year for national defense. At request of United States Army, T. V. A. starts reconstructing and enlarging Muscle Shoals plant to product ammonium nitrate for use in explosives; maximum capacity 300 tons a day. T. V. A. develops new type of demountable house, produced by factory mass-production methods. Federal Works Administrator designates T. V. A. his agent to construct 250 houses at Florence,

Sheffield, Tuscumbia, and Muscle Shoals City, Ala., and 100 houses at Humboldt and Milan, Tenn., to house industrial workers engaged in national-defense production. One hundred and fifty of the Alabama houses and all the Tennessee houses to be of T. V. A.'s new portable type, so defense housing can be moved swiftly to meet changing needs. Fifth electric furnace authorized for Shoals phosphate plant, to increase installed capacity to 150,000 tons a year. Move spurred by England's need for concentrated phosphate to strengthen its land for war effort. One hundred and twenty-five millionth tree seedling from T. V. A. nurseries planted on valley land to check soil erosion and build forest resources. T. V. A. phosphate used by thirty-five thousandth test demonstration farm. Demonstration program covers 27 States. T. V. A. phosphates being tested by State agricultural experiment stations in 47 States. Seven millionth visitor sees T. V. A. projects. Contract for T. V. A. power signed by Caney Fork Electric Cooperative (Smithville), Tenn. T. V. A. power-generating system passes million-kilowatt mark in installed capacity, becomes eighth largest in Western Hemisphere. Customers buying T. V. A. power at rate of 6,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year. Authority's power revenue coming in at rate of about $21,000,000 a year. Net income enough to defray all costs of operating the T. V. A. system for navigation and flood control as well as for power production and still leave a net balance.

A Perplexed President—A Dazed Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

A PERPLEXED PRESIDENT

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the administration is on its way, and there is no speed limit; but just where it is going, why it is going, and where the destination no one seems to know.

With all the uncertainty, two things seem clear. We are headed for trouble—plenty of it. But what it will cost us in taxes, lives, and loss of freedom no one seems to have considered. Each day sees some new move toward war or preparations for war; more spending without thought of the taxes to be levied to pay for it.

Recently, the President caused his spokesmen, including Stimson, Wickard, Warburg, Knox, and many others, to tell us in substance that war was inevitable and that the Axis Powers must be destroyed. Typical is the statement of Secretary Knox, who, on May 11, said that it is our duty "to oppose the aggressor with enough force either to scare him off or to defeat him."

The aggressor, of course, means Hitler. We know Hitler will not scare. So we must defeat Hitler by force. Might we inquire where we are to apply this force? Can we defeat Hitler without sending an army to Europe? Whatever our feelings, can we succeed in that undertaking?

If we continue our present course and sometime, somewhere, we get into war with the Germans, the Italians, the Japanese, the Bulgarians, Rumanians, Hungarians, Turks, and the French, how long will it take us to defeat them and what will it cost in taxes and lives?

The President is perplexed because he has promised unlimited aid to Britain, and because he has promised to keep us out of this war, not once, but many times. Which promise shall he violate? He knows we do not want war, so he is worried. Perhaps the clearest of those promises is the one when he said:

> And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again, and again—your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

But he has promised all needed aid to Britain.

A DAZED CONGRESS

Congressmen know—at least, most of them—that the American people do not want war. They know that the administration is driving toward war. Congressmen had an opportunity to duck this issue in 1936, when LOUIS LUDLOW, of Indiana, introduced a war-referendum resolution, which would have given the people a vote on the question of going to war. Again, in 1937, Senator CAPPER made a like move and, in January of 1939, Democratic Senator CLARK, of Missouri, introduced a bill for a constitutional amendment which would have required a national referendum before the country could become involved in war.

But, at the request of the administration, Congress blocked this legislation, denied the people the opportunity to decide whether they wished to take part in a war which they, the people—not Congress, the Cabinet, or the President—would fight. And so now, the issue is back on Congress' doorstep. Do they like it? Not at all. But it is there and many of them are in the same predicament as the President. They, too, promised the people before election they would not involve this country in war. And now they find administration pressure applied to compel them to acquiesce in steps which will bring war.

ANOTHER WORRY

Congressmen know, too, that we cannot prepare for war or even for national defense, if strikes continue and production is slowed down or stopped in our factories. They know that we cannot win through our present emergency if we subscribe to the doctrine that a man cannot work here in what was free America until he meets the demands of a labor organization which would compel him to join its ranks and pay whatever fees and dues its leaders may impose.

They know that America cannot be free under such a system. But they lack the inclination or the courage to meet the question. And, between the indignant, outraged expressions of opinion which they get from their constituents and their fear of so-called labor leaders, they are doing just nothing except sweating and worrying.

If we are to keep out of this war and prepare for national defense, center your mail on the President or those Senators and Congressmen who are war-minded and who are afraid of union politicians and racketeers.

Defense of the Western Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker and members of the House, the latest Nazi conquests in Europe have brought a total of over 662,500,000 people under Nazi, Communist, and Fascist regimentation. This means that about one-third of the world's population must follow the dictates of the Axis Powers. For the Americas the decisive phase of this war has begun with the announcement that France and its colonial empire are to be put, we might say, at the disposal of Hitler. The Vichy surrender is a blow to the United States from the point of view of all the American republics, it is by all odds the most serious development of the present war. It is, in fact, the most serious threat to the independence and security of the entire Western Hemisphere since the eventful invasion of Mexico by Napoleon III on the eve of the Civil War.

The boa constrictor is tightening his coils around us, it seems. If we do not establish ourselves in positions where it cannot crush us we will have a terrible fight later on. I am against war, and believe if we hold the outposts, they cannot get at us. If we have to take the outposts after they have them, then there might be much bloodshed. In order to avert this, I believe we should accept the French colonies at this time in payment of the French war debt. We should not wait, as some countries have, until it is too late.

The President has wisely stood by his commitment not to become a belligerent in a foreign war. But what confronts us now is not a foreign war, and not a British war, and not, we hope, any total war. What confronts us now is a threat which bears more directly upon our own vital interest than upon those of Britain, for the defense of the Western Hemisphere is first, last, and always an American problem. I believe our Congress and our President fully realize the great danger and grave peril, as well as the grave decisions upon which depends the future security of the liberty-loving citizens of this world.

There Must Be No Black-Out of the Bible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, two notices of unusual spiritual import have come to me and probably to every other Member of the Congress in the last few days. The first, from the American Bible Society of New York, carries within its folder a letter from the most beloved of Yale's professors, Prof. William Lyon Phelps. That letter is worthy of reprinting, and I am taking the liberty of inserting it here.

The time for letting other people guess where we stand in spiritual matters is past.

Possessing a message which can save floundering mankind, and a textbook which contains that message, Christian people have a clear duty to proclaim it in every possible way.

Believing as I do that the Bible does contain the positive answer to the world's despair, I am concerned that it shall everywhere have the widest possible circulation in these difficult days.

No other agency in this country, to my knowledge, is "holding forth the Word of Life" as is the American Bible Society, which was dedicated 125 years ago to perform that single task.

Through the society this positive answer can be given, but only if a greatly increased income is provided. For not only must its own carefully budgeted program be maintained, but there are now the added responsibilities and opportunities caused by the warfare which is sweeping the world.

In order that the necessary support may be secured, I heartily commend the society's current seal campaign to your generosity. Your gift will help to prevent a black-out of the Bible.

My own faith has just published The New Testament of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, translated from the Latin Vulgate, a revision of the Challoner-Rheims version edited by Catholic scholars under the patronage of the Episcopal Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, published by St. Anthony Guild Press, Paterson, N. J., 1941. It is with particular pride that I mention this because the entire distribution and sale of this splendid work come under a townsman of mine, the Very Reverend Harry C. Graham, O. P., national director of the Holy Name Society, who is the spearhead of our attempt to place a New Testament in the home of every Catholic.

This work has the highest endorsement of the president of the Pontifical Biblical Commission, Eugene Cardinal Tisserant, and His Excellency, Most. Rev. Edwin V. O'Hara, bishop of Kansas City, Mo., in which they praise the use of May 18 as Biblical Sunday in the United States and entrusting the task of distributing the New Testament to the national headquarters of the Holy Name Society.

It is the fullest fruition of the encyclical letter Spiritus Paraclitus of Pope Benedict XV on the Reading of Holy Scripture. That magnificent encyclical closes with this superb thought:

Our one desire for all the church's children is that, being saturated with the Bible, they may arrive at the all-surpassing knowledge of Jesus Christ.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate my belief that these two organizations representing the Protestant and Catholic faiths of this country are fulfilling a truly democratic mission when they seek to place in the homes of every one of their communicants the New Testament.

Tax Whom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

ARTICLE BY FRANK C. WALDROP

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the privilege given to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article appearing in the Washington Times-Herald, of Saturday, May 17, by Frank C. Waldrop.

Every Member of Congress is receiving letters protesting against proposals now before the Ways and Means Committee, providing additional taxes to finance the present spending program, and Mr. Waldrop's article is pertinent.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 17, 1941]

DOLEFUL NOTE

Here is a letter from a gentleman who has been studying the schedule of proposed taxes now being considered in Congress. It is a very enlightening letter, both for what it says and what it leaves unsaid:

The WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The proposal of the Treasury Department that a new tax bill include a luxury levy of 10 percent on musical instruments is unsound. Not only do I believe that it is unsound, but it is dangerous.

I believe that musical instruments are tools of education and of trade. I think I am expressing the opinion of the majority of music dealers as well as artists, manufacturers, and educators when I make the assertion that millions of boys and girls are studying music because it benefits as an educational medium.

In these troublesome times we should think of music as we did in the last war when it was thought necessary in stirring patriotism and stimulating morale in both the military service and at home. Friends of music all over the country are writing and wiring in opposition of this tax.

You are at liberty to quote my feelings in this connection if you wish.

Yours very truly,

HOMER L. KITT.

You can guess easily enough that Mr. Kitt has a special interest in musical instruments or he wouldn't have written that letter. You are right. He sells musical instruments. High taxes on musical instruments mean fewer sales.

Mr. Kitt is fighting for his economic life when he writes a letter like this, and that, regardless of how much he may say about the need of music for patriotic and educational purposes, is his main purpose in sending the Times-Herald this letter.

But just a minute. Don't condemn him. His economic life is just as precious to him as yours is to you. Mr. Kitt is no more selfish, nor any less, than the newspapers when they fight for their lives against high taxes, or the farmers when they fight for their lives against high taxes.

The value of musical instruments to the community is real, just as the value of newspapers is real—we hope, we hope—and the value of farmers is real.

What concerns Mr. Kitt is that the Treasury Department may convince Congress that the musical instrument trade is less valuable than some other, and thereby snuff out its life.

Well, we hope not, for the sake of Mr. Kitt and all the other people who make their livings out of music and have enjoyment from it.

But somebody's business is going to take a beating before long. If the tax does take effect and horns are quieted and pianos unmade, chalk up just one more casualty of the war.

The horns and pianos will have gone to join the aluminum pots and pans—remember how the Office of Production Management put 10,000 aluminum-utensil makers out of work recently by decreeing the end of aluminum kitchenware, and the 20 percent of normal automobile production to be sliced off, and the thousand and one other things common to our way of life. Now all are under the gun.

We are beginning to catch a glimmer of what General Goering meant when he said "guns instead of butter."

But only a glimmer. Do you have any idea what our military commitments sum up to at this point? Let's run over the list of most obvious ones. Mr. Roosevelt has implied we are going to establish "four freedoms" all over the earth which do not now exist really anywhere on the earth entirely.

We are also committed, under the lend-lease bill, to give any nation he designates, whatever actual, tangible military goods and equipment he designates. Specifically, we have promised help to England, Poland, France, Norway, Denmark, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Greece, Holland, Belgium, Finland, and China. Perhaps to others also, but all these are on the public record.

To some of these we have actually made deliveries of goods. We are delivering an increasing volume wherever we can.

We are also committed to prevent invasion of the Western Hemisphere, and this is generally assumed to mean any point from the North Pole to the South, lying between Hawaii and the mid-Atlantic.

To achieve this system of defense we are doubling our Navy, building an Army of millions, and are laying the basis of 50,000 airplanes a year, plus 500 heavy bombers a month extra.

All these are our commitments. And we are the kind of country that goes through, strangely enough, in such matters.

Merely to build our defense of the Western Hemisphere is going to cost a lot more than present suggestions on taxes would signify, and the investment will be well worth every penny.

To send arms to all those countries which we have promised to help will multiply the unknown.

To follow those arms with men and to establish the four freedoms—wow!

Mr. Kitt get out your fiddle and play while you can.

Let Us Keep the United States Out of Entangling Foreign Alliances and Europe's Wars by a Pro-American Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. PHILIP A. BENNETT, OF MISSOURI

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the following radio address given over KMOX, St. Louis, Mo., on Saturday, May 10, 1941, by our colleague, the Honorable PHILIP A. BENNETT, of Missouri.

This is a critical hour for the Nation. While we are at peace with all of the world, there are people in this country who labor unceasingly to drag us into Europe's wars.

From a movement almost imperceptible at first, the tempo of their efforts has increased so rapidly during the past few months that one hesitates to forecast what new demands will be made in behalf of Great Britain on the morrow. While I do not question the faith or honesty of those who would plunge this Nation into war, I do question the underlying objectives of the war and the wisdom of the course they are asking their nation to follow. We all realize that a major crisis is rapidly approaching. And that crisis I do not believe is one that originates with or springs from our own problems of national defense, but rather is a crisis which had its beginnings in the secret diplomacy of Europe and the financial intrigues of the world's international bankers. From my study of the causes leading up to the present world conflict, I am convinced that world trade and gold are far more important factors in this war than any idealistic factors like freedom and democracy. In fact, I find substantial grounds for my opinion in the statement of Wendell Berge, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, at DeLand, Fla., last Saturday night, when he said, "This is admittedly a contest of economic power." Incidentally, I believe it is also a contest to preserve the profit system in Europe. With all of Russia devoted to communism and the Axis Powers doing business according to the socialistic philosophies, Great Britain and the United States are the only remaining nations that might be classified as capitalistic. And I pause to observe that capitalism has in this country at least been one of the cornerstones of freedom.

I have referred to the secret diplomacy of Europe. We know very little about the diplomatic maneuvers preceding the present conflict. But Joseph Stalin has lifted the curtain on at least one of the happenings. Speaking before the supreme parliament of the Soviet Union, on August 31, 1939, on the British failure to conclude a pact between Poland, Germany, and Russia, he said:

"They (England) needed a pact to guarantee Poland, but they did not concern themselves with Poland herself, who rejected the idea of assistance from the Soviet Union.

"How, under such circumstances could the Soviet Union proffer aid? Britain and France guaranteed aid to the Soviet Union in case of aggression in return for corresponding assistance. But their offer was so hedged about with clauses and peradventures, as to suggest that in case of need, their aid would prove fictitious, leaving the Soviet Union without effective assistance."

So Russia did not sign up with Great Britain and France. She chose to wait and when Hitler moved into Poland, so did Mr. Stalin and he got a big slice of Polish territory almost without a struggle.

Incidentally, both Great Britain and France failed to send troops to Poland when she was invaded, which gives some substantiation to the misgivings of Stalin as to the sincerity of their promises.

The story of the war since September 1, 1939, is generally known. In the last 18 months we have been doing our best to build up our own national defenses. And in that objective, I am sure every American will concur. In the meantime we have done much for England and her allies. These, of course, are small sacrifices, by comparison with those we will undoubtedly be asked to make in the near future. They are the sacrifices that 83 percent of the American people wish to avoid. They want to keep America out of war. They want to keep our boys here at home ready to defend America against the whole world if necessary. They see nothing to be gained by sending your son and mine into the slaughter pens of Europe, Asia, or Africa, and they as American citizens are entitled to have their wishes, majority wishes if you please, respected by their Representatives in Congress.

Last year the Democratic and Republican Parties, assembled in convention, adopted platforms which pledged their candidates to keep America out of foreign wars. As one elected to Congress upon the Republican platform, I feel that it is my solemn duty to carry out my party's platform pledges to the people to the utmost of my ability. However, I am grievously concerned, and sorry to report to you, that in Washington there is a growing disregard, not only for the platform pronouncements, but for the overwhelming desires of a majority of the American people. And that disregard, in itself, is a sign of the decay of representative government.

We are, in fact, approaching a dangerous situation when the duly elected representatives of the people turn a deaf ear to the pleas of their constituents. In a recent press conference the President is reported to have remarked: "Convoys mean shooting and shooting means war." This statement, coming from the elected leader of the Nation, coupled with his promise of October 30 at Boston, and I quote:

"I have said before and I say it again, and again, and again. Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars," have me figuratively up a tree as to what his intentions really are. When one considers the fact that Secretary Knox and Secretary Stimson are both for manpower aid for Britain; when one considers the President's statement at Staunton, Va., last Sunday, that: "We are bearing true witness to the faith that is in us—a simple faith in the freedom of democracy in the world. It is the kind of faith for which we have fought before—for the existence of which we are ever ready to fight again," one cannot come to the conclusion the President is uninformed. Thus the announcements by his aides bear his official approval, even though they are in direct conflict with the pledges made by the Democratic Party to the people, and by the President as a candidate for reelection. Amidst the confusion of this trying hour. I ask you to be cautious in your appraisal of the present situation. Let us all stop, look, and listen before our country is plunged into war.

In a few short months the policy of this Government has changed from a cash-and-carry neutrality, to a lease-and-lend belligerency, and we are now being importuned by the British and their spokesmen in this country to deliver the goods to England. This, of course, means convoys—convoys mean shooting—shooting means war.

It is significant to observe at this point that among those who favor America's entry into the present conflict, are to be found many of the economy-minded gentlemen who only a few months ago were busily criticizing the present administration for trying to take care of the poor, the unfortunate, and the unemployed here at home. Thus does war make strange bedfellows.

In concluding, may I summarize the situation as I see it? With this Nation now struggling under the appalling burden of a $50,000,000,000 national debt, we are still able to give or withhold the aid to Great Britain which, over a long period of years, will spell the difference between victory and defeat. But we must be prepared to go down the long road—to make many sacrifices—to forego many pleasures.

In making those sacrifices, not essentially for ourselves, it is doubly essential that while doing so, we shall not forget to preserve the bulwarks of freedom, of opportunity, and of justice at home. To do this requires a tolerant respect for the opinion of one's neighbor. It requires a sympathetic understanding of any man's right to honestly disagree with his fellow man upon the ends that may be achieved either through war or by a negotiated peace.

It is this thought that impels me to counsel you to cling to the principles laid down by George Washington and all the great leaders who have followed him in the Presidency of the United States.

The destiny of America must not be tied to the destiny of the British Empire. The destiny of America rests in the hands of her own people. Will you listen to the voices of the warmongers or will you demand that party platform and campaign promises be kept. Now is the time for action. Speak while you have opportunity. Remember that under dictatorship the only voice of the people is the cry of woe.

Our First Defeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, in the current issue of the United States News of May 23, 1941:

[From the United States News of May 23, 1941]

OUR FIRST DEFEAT—ADMINISTRATION AND INDUSTRIAL MANAGEMENT SURRENDER AT POINT OF GUN AS LABOR GETS 100 PERCENT OF ITS WAGE DEMANDS, THUS INCREASING DEFENSE COSTS AND STARTING INFLATION

(By David Lawrence)

The biggest news for America last week was not the flight of Rudolf Hess.

Nor the decision of Marshal Petain to turn the African colonies of France over to Hitler. Nor the rise of Axis power in the Near East.

The biggest news happened here at home—in Washington, where President Roosevelt suffered the most ignominious defeat of his public career. Unable or unwilling to deal with the C. I. O. any other way, he permitted his own National Defense Mediation Board to grant 100 percent of the wage demands of the auto workers' union and thus set the pace for a Nation-wide set of wage increases even as the Government strove feebly in other quarters to argue against price rises and inflation.

It was not the management of General Motors which surrendered in the settlement recommended by a board of President Roosevelt's choosing. It was the Government of the United States which surrendered. At a time when the youth of the Nation is being compelled to serve at $21 a month, the auto workers had their pay boosted by $208 a year. With overtime it will mount still higher. Nearly 70 percent of the total number of employees already were earning $2,000 to $2,500 a year.

The new increase in wages, estimated to be about $50,000,000 a year, is equivalent to about a full year's pay for 200,000 draftees or the personnel of 17 modern army divisions.

ENTIRE COST OF LIVING AFFECTED BY WAGE BOOSTS

The General Motors Corporation can stand the increase but can the American people stand it? For the wage level set in one company affects all the others and likewise raises the wage scales in related industries. And the American people will have to pay the increased costs all along the line. Prices certainly cannot be held down if wage costs increase. The scales paid for nondefense work automatically become the prevailing wages paid for defense work. Many of the auto workers are about to be transferred to defense contracts as the Government compels a 40-percent reduction in automobile production. On most of the defense contracts the big manufacturers are making less profit by a good deal than on their normal operations. This is because many of the contracts are on what is known as a cost-plus-fee basis. The fees fixed are amazingly small in relation to operations on nondefense work and usually net the companies only about 1 percent of the gross amount of the contract. But the wage costs—well, these can skyrocket anywhere, for the companies do not pay them. The American people do. And the principal agent of the American people is the President of the United States, who is supposed to keep the costs of national defense down instead of letting them go up to any heights demanded by a minority group of citizens at the expense of the vast majority.

LABOR IS USING ECONOMIC POWER AS BLUDGEON

Why didn't the General Motors Corporation refuse to grant the wage increase, knowing that the effect on our economic system and on the cost of the defense program would be damaging?

The answer is that the General Motors Corporation had no alternative. It if refused the demand, it would have brought on a major strike involving some 250,000 employees. And in strikes nowadays there is no protection whatsoever for the men who want to work. There no longer is a democratic method of taking a strike vote. The laborers, moreover, who disagree find themselves coerced by pickets who use violence. The President of the United States and the Governor of the State of Michigan recently refused to enforce the laws with respect to mass picketing and violence at the Ford plants. What assurance would the General Motors officials have had that they could operate their plants if they refused the union demands? None whatever.

There was a time when the Nation was led to believe that the only thing wrong with the labor problem was the refusal of management to bargain collectively. This was supposed to be the difficulty in the Ford case. But here is an instance in which one of America's largest employers has bargained collectively, in fact has had a union contract ever since the sit-down strikes of 4 years ago. Now that labor has achieved the right of collective bargaining, what is labor doing with its economic power? Is it exercising self-restraint in a national crisis or is it out to get all it can, irrespective of the effect on the rest of the citizenry? Unhappily the answer must be given that labor's leaders are abusing their economic and political power. The record belies any other conclusion.

The definition of "collective bargaining" in this case can plainly be written today as collective bludgeoning—a complete surrender by management to whatever wage rates labor happens to demand. In this instance it is plain, too, that the full acquiescence of the Roosevelt administration was behind the surrender.

There was another demand—the closed shop—which would have meant a complete monopoly for the C. I. O. auto workers' union as against the A. F. of L. This was abandoned by the union for the present—it meant no financial sacrifice to give it up and was doubtless a trading point from the beginning. Anyway, the C. I. O. has the exclusive rights of representation for the majority, and, having secured a large wage increase, the closed-shop provision becomes less important to the union. The issue will be revived in due course—1 year hence. The unfortunate truth is that General Motors, compelled by circumstances over which it had no control, denied potential protection if it refused to accede, took the only course available—capitulation.

But the responsibility is on the Roosevelt administration, which not only encourages wage boosts but declines to tax these profiteering benefits.

INEQUITIES IN TAX LAWS WILL CAUSE INFLATION

What may not be generally realized, however, is that the workers are committing economic suicide by allowing their selfish leaders to insist on higher and higher wage scales. The vast amount of purchasing power created by the pay-roll increases must go somewhere. It will be found bidding soon for consumer goods. The Government will try to hold prices down. This is impossible unless wage costs are held stagnant. The Government will force a curtailment of production in certain nondefense articles because of scarcity of raw materials, but this will not affect a large number of articles which will go up in price because labor costs there, too, will rise, and an extraordinary demand usually boosts the price.

We are on the threshold, therefore, of an inflation cycle of incalculable proportions. The well to do will be taxed heavily—in fact, to the point of confiscation. About 700,000 persons with incomes of $5,000 a year or over will have to bear the principal burden—they will pay 75 percent of the increased taxes. They will economize and also their incentive will be repressed. Meanwhile, because of politics, about $12,000,000,000 of gross income earned by 80 percent of America's families in the lower brackets will escape income taxes and direct defense taxes.

Because of politics also, the administration is just now boosting farm prices by Government loans.

ADMINISTRATION DOMINATED BY POLITICAL FEAR

This combination of political chicanery doesn't make sense for anybody—not even for the supposed beneficiaries. Because when inflation starts it affects the lowest income groups first and especially the large number of persons like school teachers and employees of Federal, State, and city governments, whose salaries rarely are boosted. It is usually long after the hardships of an increased cost of living have begun before persons with more or less fixed wages or salary rates are given increases to offset rises in the cost of living.

Economic leadership in Washington plus a certain courage to fight against selfishness in whatever form it rears its head could have averted the defeat last week in Washington. But so long as political fear dominates the governing authorities, there can be no effective leadership in a war emergency.

It is precisely this sort of decay and disintegration from within democracy that gave Hitler his chance in the last 8 years. The French Republic collapsed because of this very internal poison.

America is supposed to be in grave danger. The President himself says it is the most critical era in the history of our Republic. Democracy is believed to be fighting for its life. But judging by what is happening in Washington, the disposition is not to save America but to save the New Deal—to conserve its political power and to curry favor with groups which can win another election.

The public has a right today to make such an inference and to call an administration incompetent and inconsistent which, on the one hand, cries out about keeping prices down, and, on the other hand, encourages a rise in labor costs and farm prices.

It was the farmer and labor alliance which gave the New Deal its third term. It is the fear of the farm and labor vote by a selfish group of politicians that may be giving America its last term of free government.

For the economic collapse that must some day follow such foolhardy policies as are being pursued today must inevitably produce a terrible reaction against democratic government and sow the seeds of fascism in America.

Excise Tax on Automobiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

STATEMENT BY L. C. CARGILE, PRESIDENT OF NATIONAL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a statement of Mr. L. C. Cargile, of Texarkana, Ark., president of the National Automobile Dealers Association, made before the Committee on Ways and Means on Thursday, May 15, 1941, as follows:

My name is L. C. Cargile, 308 Olive Street, Texarkana, Ark. I am appearing as president of the National Automobile Dealers Association. Our association has upward of 17,000 members, each of whom is enfranchised by a manufacturer of automobiles to sell new automobiles, or automobiles and trucks, replacement parts, and accessories. Our members sell about 85 percent of all new automobiles sold in the United States. Through the 17,000 dealers who are direct members, and by reason of the cooperation of local and State automobile dealer associations, this association speaks for all automobile dealers who are articulate through organization.

I wish to present some comments on the Treasury Department recommendation to increase the excise tax on new automobiles from 3½ to 7 percent, and upon the recommendations of previous witnesses to increase

that tax to 20 percent or more. I should also like to comment on their suggestion to extend the tax to used cars. I also wish to record that our association opposes the proposal to increase excise taxes on accessories, replacement parts, and tires, the proposal for an usage tax, and the proposed increase in the gasoline tax, as being discriminatory.

I desire to state emphatically that this organization and its members wish to pay their fair share of whatever the cost of the defense program may be. As citizens and as businessmen we wish to have inflation avoided and we are aware of the dangers of uncontrolled prices in a war economy, but we are concerned because of the threat to the existence of dealers and their employees.

The automobile industry consists of three component groups—manufacturers, labor, and dealers. Throughout the duration of this emergency there will be opportunity for the use of the production capacity of the automobile plants and for the management of the manufacturing concerns in the production of primary defense materials. The automobile factory workers will likewise have increasing opportunity during this program, but that group consisting of the dealers and their employees are not only faced with lack of opportunity, but indeed may be forced out of business and employment. The dealers are making and will continue to make their contribution to the national defense, in a less direct and in a less publicized way, but in the nevertheless essential capacity of maintaining the highway transportation system in working order. As shown by the 1939 business census, automobile dealers are employers of 316,702 employees, with a total pay roll of $420,588,000 a year. Automobile dealers are important members of the business life in every city and village, and their continuance in business depends directly on there being automobiles to sell and to service. We recognize that the necessity of the defense program may force groups of men out of business, but as one of those groups facing that possibility, we are properly anxious that this result follow only in the extremity that it be necessary in order that the country may survive.

Motortruck transportation and private passenger transportation by automobile are absolutely essential to the defense program and keeping those now on the highway in continued operation and replacing those that are continually wearing out is the job of automobile dealers in the defense program which must not be interfered with. The speedy and uninterrupted transportation by truck is essential in the movement of goods to and from defense plants, is essential to bring the farm products to market, and to transport workers to defense plants in addition to the heavy normal requirements of nondefense workers. The millions of unemployed men who are being taken in to work in new defense plants, who will have to rely upon private automobiles for transportation to and from work, particularly in many new plants which are being built in locations which can only be reached by private automobile, are causing an increasingly heavy burden on the cars now in operation. In the interest of national defense, the supply of automobiles must not be allowed to decrease either through lack of facilities to keep present cars running or the lack of new automobiles to replace those daily wearing out and going to the junk pile.

Previous witnesses before you have proposed several objectives to be achieved by increasing taxes, in addition to raising revenue for defense expenditures. It was suggested that a high excise tax on automobiles would tend to discourage purchasing new cars, thereby resulting in decreased production, freeing materials, labor, and management for defense industry. It was also suggested that such decreased production and consumption would be desirable in order to build up a backlog of demand which, when released after Government spending for defense had ceased, would tend to stabilize the economy. There was a suggestion that a curtailment by a high tax would divert consumer spending to goods not competing with defense, or divert money into savings.

I am not qualified to express any opinion on how much money should be raised for the defense program at this time, and it is not becoming that I should do so. We do wish to urge, however, that the tax matter under consideration be viewed solely as a revenue raising measure and that the other suggested objectives which may be a part of an emergency period be approached directly and not indirectly through the tax device. It is impossible to predict whether a tax with a double purpose will produce the revenue expected or accomplish the secondary objectives. The suggestion to tax new cars 20 percent in order to curtail production might or might not curtail production. If it did curtail production, it would fail to produce the stated revenue, and if it did not curtail production it would result in a grossly discriminatory tax greatly disproportionate to taxes on other articles.

The automobile industry has already expressed a willingness to reduce 1942 model production by 20 percent, and it has been indicated in the newspaper this week that a further cut may be forthcoming. There would seem to be no necessity for attempting to indirectly force restriction by taxation in the face of such voluntary action.

The members of this association at their annual convention in Pittsburgh in January of this year adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the fulfillment of the national-defense program may require curtailment in the normal manufacture of automobiles; and

"Whereas it is the firm desire of automobile dealers to do their part in the national emergency: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That if curtailment in the production of automobiles becomes necessary in order to better promote the national-defense program, automobile dealers, through the National Automobiles Dealers Association, pledge their efforts to support that measure and to render to the public the best service possible during the emergency."

In view of the expressed willingness of the manufacturers to agree to any necessary curtailment in the production of automobiles, and in view of the expressed willingness of dealers to accept such curtailment, and by reason of the fact that in O. P. M., under Mr. Knudsen, there is existing authority to regulate the production of automobiles during this emergency to make that production consistent with the requirements of the defense program, it seems unnecessary and unwise to approach this problem through taxation. Furthermore, many of the secondary objectives advanced as reasons for a high excise tax on automobiles, parts, and accessories will automatically be solved through the direct-curtailment method.

A tax provided in the revenue act would be less flexible than a direct-curtailment method, and if the secondary objectives of such a tax did not prove to be effected, it would be necessary to revise by legislation that revenue act. It would impose a terrific burden on this committee and on Congress to frequently revise revenue acts to meet changing conditions in production and consumer purchasing during such a fast-moving emergency. Furthermore, when the defense effort has been completed and it becomes desirable in the public interest to immediately recommence normal automobile production, it would be necessary to wait until Congress could repeal the high excise tax in order to make normal production possible.

A selective excise tax always tends to be discriminatory as between the taxed and untaxed goods. Furthermore, with a selective tax which does not cover a wide range of article competing for the customer's dollar discrimination is emphasized. This excise tax on automobiles as a luxury is unsound as the automobile is in no sense a luxury but is a vital form of transportation primarily used for business and commerce by the working man and the farmer. To put a very high tax on automobiles would greatly intensify the already existing discrimination and inequity of this tax, originating as an emergency tax and continuing year after year.

Furthermore, such a tax would be discriminatory within the automobile industry as it would operate more harshly against the manufacturers and dealers of all but the lowest-priced cars.

The place of the automobile in the American way of living is drastically different today from what it was during the first World War, when the first excise tax was placed on automobiles. At that time the few high-priced automobiles then used were of a luxury character. Their ownership was, for the most part, restricted to the wealthy and their use was primarily for pleasure. Today, however, the automobile has become a necessity as a means of private transportation, and the great majority of automobiles in use are owned by those in the lower income brackets. The automobiles has become widely accepted because of its constantly improved quality and serviceability and by reason of its lowered price. It is most unfair to penalize the efficiency that has brought about the widespread ownership of automobiles by imposing a high punitive tax merely because it may appear an easy way to raise revenue. Such expediency without thought of fairness may be expected in totalitarian states, but is wholly unworthy of our democratic tradition.

All of the objections to an excise tax upon new automobiles apply with even greater force to the proposals made by some witnesses to this committee that an excise tax be imposed on used cars. The Treasury Department recommendations did not include any tax on used cars, and such a tax could not be looked to to raise revenue as it would be impossible to administer. Furthermore, such a tax would lead used-car owners into all sorts of devices to escape the tax and it would have the tendency to disrupt the normal trading and sale of used cars. None of the other suggested objectives could be applied to used cars as they do not in any sense compete with any defense industry, no backlog of purchasing power could be built up as these are deteriorating and continually diminishing articles, and as the use of automobiles is essential, as has been pointed out, no impediment should be placed on their acquisition and continued use.

In conclusion, may I state that we recognize that money must be raised for the defense program; that we are opposed to any excise tax on automobiles, automobile parts and accessories, tires, tubes, batteries, and gasoline, as all of these are essential to a vital form of transportation; that in this emergency period excise taxes on these articles may be necessary for the additional revenue needed, but the rate of tax which should be imposed on these articles should bear a fair relation to other manufactured goods; and that the automobile industry should not be selected to bear a grossly disproportionate share of the additional cost in this emergency.

Commemoration of One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of Adoption of Third of May Constitution of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. FLAHERTY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

RESOLUTION BY THE UNITED POLISH ORGANIZATIONS OF SALEM, MASS.

Mr. FLAHERTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication addressed to the majority leader, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, by the United Polish Organizations of Salem, Mass.:

UNITED POLISH ORGANIZATIONS,
Salem, Mass.

The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We, Americans of Polish descent, assembled in Salem, Essex County, State of Massachusetts, on this 11th day of May 1941, under the auspices of the United Polish Organizations of Salem, Mass., in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the 3d of May Constitution of Poland, unanimously adopt the following resolution:

"Whereas we, Americans of Polish descent, recognize that the democratic Poland, the land of our forefathers, has been brutally invaded, without declaration of war, and divided by Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia;

"Whereas the most inhuman army of dictators in its march over hereditary Polish territory having destroyed and murdered thousands of helpless civilians, and having bombed defenseless hospitals, schools, and churches, wantonly and deliberately machine-gunned escaping refugees;

"Whereas the Nazi and Soviet Governments, having unjustly and unmercifully murdered thousands of priests, nuns, professors, and national leaders, and having sent other tens of thousands into concentration camps without just cause, and having deported large numbers of men, women, and children to Siberia to die of starvation or disease, substantiating our belief that the ultimate goal of the barbaric invaders is the destruction of the Polish Nation: Therefore

"We appeal to the President of the United States, the Senate, and the House of Representatives, as men of good will and understanding, to stop the attempted extermination of innocent people, and pray that a commission be allowed to distribute aid and relief to these stricken people; be it also

"*Resolved,* That we express our deepest gratitude to the Government of the United States of America, and especially to an ardent champion of our cause, Majority House Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, for recognition of the present Polish Government in England, thus proving to the world that it does not approve of the partition of Poland by the invading powers; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That we all present here swear and affirm our wholehearted loyalty and allegiance to the United States of America, and as loyal citizens we stand always ready to make the supreme sacrifice, should it ever be necessary."

ZYGMUNT WYSOCKI, *President.*

Which Way, America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

SPEECH OF PROF. FRANK PRESCOTT, OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHATTANOOGA

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a speech entitled "Which Way, America?" delivered to the Young Democratic Club of Chattanooga on May 13, 1941, by Frank W. Prescott, head of Adolph S. Ochs department of government, University of Chattanooga.

This is a thoughtful and well-reasoned statement. With its general theme I agree. I recommend it for the consideration of readers of the RECORD.

The speech is as follows:

Just 3 short years ago Dr. William E. Dodd, American Ambassador to Germany, spoke to a packed chapel convocation on the university campus. This eminent historian unfolded the story of his colorful career in Berlin and disclosed that Hitler was engaged in a plan of world revolution and barbaric aggression. He spoke with a rich background of intimate knowledge not only of the older German culture, in which he had attained his doctorate at Leipzig, but also from the 6 crowded years of events in which Hitler had consolidated his regime. He declared that Hitler was bent upon conquest of Europe, upon reviving the old pan-German scheme of conquest in which he intended to enslave 450,000,000 people, and thence to secure Nazi hegemony of the world.

Dr. Dodd has passed on. But a world in which every humanistic value we attach to life is vanishing with lightning-like rapidity is confronted with a fateful decision. What we do in the next few weeks may change the course of history. For tonight the chickens of world disorder which Senators Lodge, Borah, Knox, McCormick, Hiram Johnson, Jim Reed, and others helped hatch have come home to roost. And, true to form, the heirs of these men are stumping the country from coast to coast, echoing the ventriloquisms of the politicians of 1920. These orators say now, as they said then: "Stay home; lock yourselves behind Chinese walls; attend to your own business. If Europe means to destroy herself, nothing can be done about it." These men regard themselves as realistic, practical men. But they would commit this Nation to a last-ditch defensive fight, with our back to the wall, standing alone in a world of eager gangster nations, without reliable and powerful allies. One of these experts, a certain ex-colonel in the Air Corps Reserve, offers us the same advice he reportedly gave the British in 1938.

So far as one can learn from a careful analysis of all his speeches and acts, no word or deed has come from him that would infer that the Nazi system of mass terror, exploitation, and total war is not the "wave of the future."

Both Hitler and Lindbergh agree that no merger of industrial resources is big enough to thwart the Nazi march of conquest and there is nothing America can do to prevent them from taking over Europe and Africa. But on the same day that their statements were issued, 17 American specialists who have made a comprehensive study of the war united in a joint pronouncement that "factors of fundamental importance still operate in favor of Britain and her allies and there is no warrant for presupposing a German victory." Four of the seventeen are admirals in the United States Navy who have made a lifetime study of strategy. The important point, it appears, is that the Germans must beat Britain down this summer and we have the power to prevent this if we shake off our creeping paralysis and make an all-out effort. The moral factors—or the imponderables that Bismarck used to weigh and consider—are against the Nazis. Finally, even if it be true that Britain is to lose, it is imperative that any German victory be delayed as long and made as difficult as possible.

The logic of this last point seems impregnable. And we have the word of four Cabinet members, who of all the people in America should have more cold facts at their disposal than laymen or even some of the experts. In their recent speeches all agree that we are being encircled; that one cannot appease a rattlesnake—either you fight him or let him have his way. Those who accept the Lindbergh thesis believe that if we let the gangsters have the Old World we can retain the New, with our institutions remaining unimpaired.

If history teaches anything since Hitler annexed the Saar Basin in 1935, it is that he has fooled some of the statesmen and people by saying, "This is my last territorial demand," followed by the proffer of the bloody hand of friendship in some meaningless 25-year peace pact. Today we know that any land with rich natural resources lying around loose will be taken by the Axis if they get the chance. The trump card of the Nazis is that the democracies are doomed because no one of them will ever be able to pull together with others like a team until it is too late. A well-financed propaganda campaign in America exhibits all the devices of "softening up" the victim by paralyzing the nerve centers of resistance, playing upon every American prejudice—partisan, class, race, nationality, and creed. Their appeasements give aid and comfort to the thousands of Nazi termites who bore their way into the vital tissues of national defense.

The assertion that it takes two to make a fight is made nonsense by Hitler in the long list of conquered nations. And if the future seems darkened by the shadow of militarism and perpetual wars, yet a far worse future may easily befall us. "Appeasement and wishful thinking" are the words written on the doors of 15 nations who resisted with inadequate force or gave up without a struggle, with the resultant slavery, dismemberment, and expropriation.

We, like the British, can rise above our appeasers and native Fascists. Keeping the sea lanes open will go a long way. But, as I see it, this is not far enough really to finish the job. So let us be done with weasel words about our neutrality and aid short of war, and quit thinking that total victory can be won by caroling God Bless America.

In a grim hour on the eve of our Revolution Patrick Henry said: "They tells us, sir, that we are weak. * * * We are not weak if we make a proper use of those means which the God of Nature has placed in our power. * * * The battle is to the vigilant, the active, and the brave. * * * Gentlemen may cry 'Peace, peace,' but there is no peace. Our brethren are already in the field. Why stand we here idle?"

I say, America must fight.

What Is England Fighting For and Why Are We Aiding Great Britain?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

LETTER BY HON. RAYMOND S. McKEOUGH, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein a letter written by my colleague the gentleman from Illinois, Representative RAYMOND S. MCKEOUGH, in response to an inquiry from one of his constituents who inquired "What is England fighting for and why are we aiding Great Britain?"

I consider his answer to his constituent one of the most intelligent—which, coming from him, naturally would be—and as most candid and enlightening.

I strongly recommend and urge every Member to read it.

The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1941.

DEAR MADAM: Replying to your letter of April 23, it is my conviction that England, in its resistance to Hitler, is fighting not only for her very life but is making a heroic contribution to the preservation of human liberty and the God-given rights that spring from it.

Our Government has solemnly declared, after full exercise of democratic processes by the action of the Congress, that it not only sympathizes with England's purpose, but has dedicated its vast power and influence to aid England to protect Christian civilization in resisting the atheistic culture and philosophy that stems from the ideologies of nazi-ism, fascism, and communism. This policy of our Government, obviously, imposes grave responsibilities. It is my earnest prayer, as I am sure it must be yours, that the President of the United States, who, under the Constitution, is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and all others in responsible positions in the Federal Government will, by the grace of God, with wisdom and courage, justly and duly discharge their heavy responsibilities, and thus protect all that we cherish as most sacred in life.

I, of course, am not unmindful that such conduct will impose great sacrifices on the part of our people, but every national emergency has called for such sacrifices. The present emergency is, without doubt, the most grave in our history, and may require larger sacrifices than were contributed by the generations who lived through former emergencies. It is my considered judgment that, no matter what sacrifice may be required to defeat the present threat to our security, and no matter how great, it will be insignificant to those that we will be compelled to make in the event the dictators of Europe and Asia are ultimately successful.

I have made reply to your communication because of my appreciation of your great concern. I should like to make individual reply to many other inquiries of similar nature which reach my office from residents of the district which it is my privilege, and accompanying responsibility, to represent in these serious times. That I am unable to do because of a lack of sufficient help. I trust you will make known my position to those to whom you refer in the last paragraph of your letter as being anxious to hear from me.

Yours very truly,

RAYMOND S. MCKEOUGH.

Gutzon Borglum's Last Writing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

AN ARTICLE ON MOUNT RUSHMORE—SHRINE OF DEMOCRACY, WRITTEN FOR THE STATE TEACHERS' MAGAZINES

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article on Mount Rushmore which was prepared especially for the use of the State Teachers magazines by the late Gutzon Borglum shortly before his death on March 6. This article has appeared in the South Dakota Education Association Journal and the Virginia Journal of Education and other State education journals. It is probably the last article the famous sculpter wrote.

The article follows:

MOUNT RUSHMORE—SHRINE OF DEMOCRACY

(By Gutzon Borglum)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This article was prepared especially for the use of the State teachers' magazines shortly before the death of the famous sculptor on March 6.)

In the Harney Range of South Dakota, an eastern outcropping of the Rocky Mountains, the Shrine of Democracy nears completion on Mount Rushmore as the manifestation of a group of ideas, not merely as the result of a flash or momentary impulse to carve a few colossal statues upon the face of a cliff.

The inspiration that developed into the creation of this gigantic work first came to the mind of Doane Robinson, the historian, of this great, picturesque, and turbulent West, whose life now spans close to a century. Robinson, pricked with a desire to immortalize the spirit that made America what it is, longed for the conversion of some of the Black Hills' great granite pinnacles into symbols and statues commemorating our greatness. In 1924, while taking part in the dedication of a memorial in one other Western State, he gave expression to an idea that finally, in its development, has grown to what we call the Shrine of American Democracy.

Any shrine of this sort must naturally contain the figures of Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, which is so fundamentally right that it has become the declaration of independence for all mankind and in its form has become the letter and the cornerstone of our freedom and that of more than 50 other nations; and Washington, the Father of his Country, who with his associates freed our forefathers and framed the Constitution—the ways and means by which the freedom declared by Jefferson could be lived and maintained.

In my desire to make the memorial and the history of this political record complete, and to include our day and life, I developed the drama and added to its design two other men: Abraham Lincoln, who played such a vital part in saving our great Republic; and Theodore Roosevelt, because of his making possible the completion of the Panama Canal. The Canal answered the longing of all Europe and the great interests in the eastern part of our country to find a short sea route to India. Also, as Mr. Coolidge said of Theodore Roosevelt, he was the only President who had the courage to tell growing big business: "Thus far you can go and no further for the safety of our Government."

Mount Rushmore is 500 feet above a natural parking place, 1,500 feet to the south, toward which the group faces. The stone, for all practical purposes we shall call it granite, is in excellent condition with very few interfering cracks. After removing about 20 feet of the surface all over the work, and, in seeking high relief at some points, cutting into the mountain to a depth of 90 feet, we found ourselves working in the very heart of granite untouched and unspoiled by 40,000,000 years of exposure.

The group faces south so directly that the sunrise touches the left of Washington's face. Both sides of the face are lighted some time during the day as the sun passes south and west over the head; and at the end of day it catches the last lingering light of the setting sun. The entire group is fortunately and splendidly lighted.

Jefferson recedes into the mountain a distance of about 40 feet and is just to the left and back of Washington. This forms a recess in the group across which Abraham Lincoln faces directly the two colonial Presidents. Between Lincoln and Jefferson you see the face of Theodore Roosevelt. I have arranged it so that he is turned slightly and is looking directly at Lincoln, whom he admired very much. The hand of Lincoln is shown drawing his coat about himself; and the hand of Jefferson, his left hand, is thrust forward as if he were about to call Washington's attention to something—possibly the present threat by the Old World against all democracy.

My own thought about the group, as I mentioned in my short speech to President Coolidge at the dedication in 1927, is that we are carving a memorial that will outlive our Government, although I clarified my statement by saying: "Not democracy, because the desire to be free and independent, and to be happy is older than democracy; it is born and is present in the consciousness of every living thing, and it will continue as long as life continues, as it will thrive and resist all interference with its happy existence."

Immediately back of the great group I am carving a hall, into which will be placed the records of our political, civic, and cultural growth—the development of electricity and steam, transportation, the telephone, the airplane, the radio, and the cinema. This great hall will be a hundred feet square and is located about two-thirds of the way up the mountain. The entrance to it is in a small gorge, cut by the ice aeons ago. A great wide granite stairway will lead to the hall, into the walls of which recesses in bronze and glass will be built to hold the records. There will also be found here statues in bronze of Benjamin Franklin, Patrick Henry, Thomas Paine, Andrew Jackson, and the great inventors, scholars, and other personages prominent in the service of American democracy and necessary to complete the record of the building of our great civilization.

The figures, that is the sculptural part of the memorial plan, are nearing completion and will be entirely finished during this year. They cost less than $700,000, and the tourist traffic they brought into South Dakota last

year exceeded in value 38 millions, according to various estimates, 80 percent of which is credited to Mount Rushmore.

The Black Hills are readily accessible by automobile, bus, and three railroads. The shrine itself is reached by two fine auto roads. One carries the great southeast traffic from Hot Springs and Custer over the beautiful, inimitable Iron Mountain road; the other, a wide and splendidly constructed road built by the State under Governor BULOW, comes from Rapid City.

There is no fee of any kind charged those visiting this memorial. I asked that of the Congress that created it; and it is the hope that when completed it will be protected as a shrine, as Franklin Roosevelt so dedicated it, somewhat religious in character and not cheapened by concessions or other commercial agencies that abuse and destroy the sanctity and beauty of nearly all our places of interest.

Tax on Carbonated Beverages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE JOHNSON CITY (TENN.) PRESS

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short editorial recently appearing in the Johnson City Press of Johnson City, Tenn., entitled "Tax on Carbonated Beverages Would Work Hardship." I feel that the Ways and Means Committee in working out the tax bill will give every consideration to the reasons set forth in this editorial as to why it would be unwise to place a 20-percent tax on soft drinks.

[From the Johnson City (Tenn.) Press]

TAX ON CARBONATED BEVERAGES WOULD WORK HARDSHIP

The United States' gigantic national-defense program obviously is going to cost a lot of money, and the billions of dollars it will require will come out of the pockets of citizens of all ages and social status. If the money is spent wisely and attains the desired results, not many men and women are likely to begrudge the expenditure.

Nevertheless, there are right and wrong ways of going about everything, and some of the Treasury Department's proposals for raising $3,600,000,000 for defense use seem injudicious.

Take, as a good example, the proposal that a levy of "1 cent per bottle and equivalents" be placed on all soft drinks. The Treasury estimates that this levy, which in effect would be a 20-percent tax on the soft-drink industry, would produce $132,500,000.

We shall not dispute a Treasury estimate, although the experts who make them have been known to fall woefully wide of the mark at times, but we do believe there is a strong likelihood that this total arrived at by the Government mathematicians is considerably too large. If the general public should be asked to pay 6 cents instead of 5 cents for a soft drink, the volume of sales would be reduced. The experience of such States as South Carolina and Kentucky with State taxes on such items has proved that.

This is particularly true because an increasingly large percentage of drinks are sold through automatic vending machines, which are standardized to operate after a 5-cent piece has been inserted. Addition of another cent to the price would make it impossible to continue sales by vendors, unless a new coin were devised that would work in the machines. This, of course, would make it necessary to spend a huge sum of money to adapt machines now in use to the new coin.

Another important consideration is the fact that if such a tax is instituted, 80 percent of the amount obtained will be paid by children, the working class and soldiers in camp. Carbonated beverages have become a necessity to millions of working people and children, who depend on them for a part of their daily nourishment. The drinks contain large percentages of sugar and other body-building materials, and have food value just as has candy—upon which, apparently, the Treasury does not mean to impose a tax.

It certainly appears only fair that if "soft drinks" are to stand a 20-percent tax, candy and many other articles which are no more necessities than carbonated beverages should also be taxed. No one doubts that the average soft drink maker and seller is willing to pay his part of the national-defense program, but there is reasonable objection on his part to segregating his own particular food product for taxation purposes.

Remember, only a fraction of a cent profit is made per bottle by the manufacturer of the average soft drink. Absorption of the 1-cent tax would mean a loss to the maker. Perforce he will pass the increase along to those millions of workers, children, and soldiers.

The truth is, the makers of carbonated beverages appear to be confronted by a difficult future. A proposed 1-cent increase in the tax on sugar will cost the industry several million dollars annually, and other proposed taxes will add to the cost of gasoline, fuel oil, automotive equipment, checks, tires and tubes, telephone, telegraph, transportation, refrigerators, insurance, light bulbs, coin-operated devices, and capital stock, all of which add to the overhead of beverage manufacture and distribution.

Obviously, the Treasury Department would do well to think the matter over carefully before it imposes a tax that will work a hardship on so many millions of people who never have too much money to spend.

Our American Citizenship and Governmental Faults

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE WORCESTER (MASS.) TELEGRAM-EVENING GAZETTE

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram-Evening Gazette of May 18, 1941:

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram-Evening Gazette of May 18, 1941]

OUR AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP AND GOVERNMENTAL FAULTS

In his proclamation designating this Sunday as I Am An American Day, President Roosevelt called upon "all Federal, State, and local officials, and all patriotic, civil, and educational organizations to join in exercises calculated to impress upon all our citizens, both native-born and naturalized, the special significance of citizenship in this Nation."

Perhaps at no time since the birth of our Republic has there ever been a greater need of a better understanding of the "special signifinance of citizenship in this Nation." That means that we require not only a fuller appreciation of the advantages in American citizenship and a firmer loyalty to the American form of government but also a readier willingness to confess faults in American institutions and a more persistent determination to end those faults.

We cannot, of course, expect perfection. Since government must be human, we cannot hope that government will be superhuman; that government will ever be above human frailties; that government will ever be able to advance further and higher than human nature will permit. We can, however, hope that government more and more will represent, reflect, and utilize the best in human nature. That is the goal of good citizenship.

The framers of our National Constitution understood human nature. They realized man's conflicting desires and man's tendency to hold his own purposes and his own ideas in high esteem. So they created a government of checks and balances, in which the power of one branch would act as a check and a balance against the power of another branch; in which any excessive ambition in one official or in one group of officials would be curbed by another official or by another group of officials. In addition, article X of the Bill of Rights, adopted soon after the Constitution itself had been ratified, declares that the "powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." That meant that the Federal Government as a whole would face checks and balances in the power of the separate States and of the people of all the States.

It is customary to express admiration whenever the balance between the Federal Government, on the one hand, and the State governments, on the other hand, is discussed. Yet in some respects this balance has created difficulties. In some respects it has made the task of government harder. The same can be said about the self-government of cities and towns within the States. In the relationship between the Government at Washington and the governments in the capitals of the 48 States of the Union, and in the relationship between the State governments and many cities and towns, there are the seeds of perennial controversy.

We need a strong Central Government; we need free State governments; and we need home rule for cities and towns. Those are not necessarily conflicting needs. But those needs do involve conflicting purposes and conflicting desires on many occasions, and those needs cannot be met without a far more intensive study of them and a far more intensive effort to meet them than we have yet seen.

The struggle for power and advantage between the different units of Government produces confusion and waste, and imposes needless burdens upon the individual citizens. Taxation in many forms, in which Federal and State and local governments compete, is only one example. And the loss of time and of energy and of national efficiency resulting from the endless quarrels regarding the rights

and duties and proper functions of our various units of Government cannot be calculated. But inevitably it is tremendous. For in addition to the task of making adequate laws, we Americans are engaged in a constant conflict as to where and by whom the laws ought to be made.

To cite that fact is not necessarily to suggest that any units of government should be abolished. It is, however, to suggest that unless we confess the folly of perpetual debate over the Federal-State-municipal interrelationship, unless we fully recognize the confusion and make a genuine effort to diminish it, then our American citizenship may be in danger of losing some of its special significance.

Disputes regarding the relationship between our units of government are mainly nonpartisan, so far as the long view is concerned. That is, neither the Democratic Party nor the Republican Party has an unbroken record of wholehearted support of any particular principle or system or purpose. Party government, moreover, despite its many advantages and its many achievements, has not succeeded in eliminating many needless complications in the general governmental task.

That may indicate that party government itself, as well as the framework of government, may be in need of radical changes. Our system of electing officials, our political campaigns, might need some revision. Walter Bagehot, famous English economist, essayist, and journalist, who lived from 1826 to 1877, said: "One of the greatest pains to human nature is the pain of a new idea."

It might be added that the pain is particularly acute when the new idea arrives soon after a previous new idea. A pioneer or an inventor in any field—mechanical or commercial or political—usually likes to see his own new idea remain new as the years pass.

Americans have always thought of their form of government as new because it departed from the past in many ways. Yet in these fast-moving days, is it not possible that some new things may be needed in our government, in various units of government—Federal, State, and local? Can we be sure that our governmental machinery is really adequate? Can we not make improvements without desertion of fundamentals, without disregard of sound and time-tried principles and methods? Good citizenship requires a thorough consideration of those and other questions. I Am An American Day should call attention to the shortcomings of our democracy as well as to its virtues.

The Hoover Food Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE F. ARNOLD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE BALTIMORE EVENING SUN

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Evening Sun of Baltimore of May 17, 1941:

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun of May 17, 1941]

POLL OF REPUBLICANS HITS HOOVER FOOD PLAN—SLIGHT MAJORITY AGAINST A. E. F. TO ENGLAND. QUESTIONS ON FOREIGN POLICY SENT TO RANK AND FILE THROUGHOUT NATION

Sentiment among Republicans in all sections of the Nation is opposed to former President Herbert Hoover on his proposal to send food to countries occupied by German armies, according to a poll being conducted by the Young Republican National Federation, the State branch of the organization was informed today.

The notification was included in results reported from a poll of "rank and file" Republicans on questions dealing with United States foreign policy. The poll is being conducted from the national headquarters in Chicago and the findings distributed to the State organizations.

NINE THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND FIVE QUESTIONNAIRES

Questionnaires have gone out to 9,205 Republicans making up a cross section of the party throughout the Nation, it was announced. These were divided among older party members, youthful Republicans, and women voters.

Findings on returns to date were announced as:

1. Most Republicans believe Britain will eventually win the war (71 percent Britain; 4 percent Germany; 25 percent stalemate).

A. E. F. OPPOSED

2. By a slight majority, weighed by Midwest isolationist sentiment, Republicans are opposed to sending Army, Navy, or air force to help England, even if it becomes apparent that Great Britain will be defeated without such help (52 percent opposed, 48 percent for).

3. A majority believes the United States would inevitably be involved in war with the totalitarian powers if Germany invaded and defeated England (54 percent yes, 46 percent no).

"STEPS TOWARD WAR" OPPOSED

4. The rank and file believes Republican leaders should oppose "steps toward war" (60 percent to oppose, 40 percent to follow administration in all matters of foreign policy).

5. All sections—East, South, Midwest, and West—oppose the Hoover plan for supplying food to occupied countries despite the British blockade (56 percent oppose, 44 percent favor).

6. All sections believe the United States should take part in peace conferences upon the conclusion of the war (65 percent yes, 35 percent no).

AGAINST "UNION NOW"

7. A similar majority now oppose "union now" or "federal union" among the United States, England, Ireland, Canada, Australia, etc. (69 percent no, 31 percent yes).

Although other polls of the Nation have indicated that the South is most strongly in favor of immediate and maximum aid to Britain, among Republicans this sentiment was found heaviest in the East—probably because of the negligible number of Republicans in the Southern States.

In the belief that Britain will be the eventual victor, for instance, the eastern Republicans voted 77 percent, the West 72 percent, the South 71 percent, and the Midwest 68 percent.

MIDWEST DISSENTS FURTHER

In favor of sending armed forces abroad, the eastern G. O. P. registered 55 percent, the West 52 percent, and the South 54 percent. The Midwest opposed by a majority of 61 percent.

The Midwest dissented again from the other sections on the query whether the United States would be involved in war following an Axis victory, for while 60 percent of the Republicans in other sections believed that to be the case, only 46 percent in the Middle West expressed that view.

Pegler in the Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE RHODE ISLAND FREE PRESS

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Rhode Island Free Press of May 16, 1941:

[From the Rhode Island Free Press]

PEGLER IN THE TIMES

Westbrook Pegler, using the Pawtucket Times as his journalistic mouthpiece in Rhode Island, has penned a column deciding that the time has come to vomit his spleen against Senators GEORGE W. NORRIS, of Nebraska, ROBERT F. WAGNER, of New York, and ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin.

The day after Pegler was awarded recognition for exposing the criminal record of a labor leader—which sent him off on the tangent of condemning the entire labor law—F. P. A., veteran New York columnist, very cunningly introduced in his column the observation that Pegler would now seek to win the Pulitzer Prize in 1942 by leading a crusade against the Wagner Act. It seems F. P. A. has been uncanny.

Senators NORRIS, WAGNER, and LA FOLLETTE led the fight for the Wagner Act. All three are great liberals, in their own right, without benefit of a controlled press—of benefit to them. Pegler is now in a definite scheme to smear these three Senators. He dismisses Senator NORRIS without recognizing that the Nebraska liberal vaulted over the political machines of both parties, in his own State, to be elected by the rank and file of the independent voters. And Senator LA FOLLETTE has done the same thing.

Pegler develops the point that Senator NORRIS must be for crooked elections because he attended the unveiling of the statue of Huey Pierce Long in the Hall of Statues at the Capitol. Pegler ought to read about the crooked elections financed and underwritten by the power trust in Nebraska in trying to defeat Senator NORRIS. But if we follow Pegler's argument—that NORRIS must be for crooked elections because he watched Huey Long's statue being unveiled—then we suppose by the same logic that Pegler is in favor of continuing the 10 percent pay cut on unorganized employees of the Pawtucket Times, since he writes for that paper and allows his column to appear therein every day. And the 10 percent pay cut was made late in the depression, and was not restored when the price of the paper was boosted 50 percent. Of course, the organized employees do not have to suffer such arbitrary handling—and Pegler is against the influence which comes from unionization.

Since Pegler and the press which sponsored him have had their advantage in spreading propaganda against labor by seeking to pin the blame on the workers for strikes in defense industries, the Rhode Island Free Press, obtaining figures from official Government sources, not only exposes this press-columnist conspiracy, but offers the facts:

From the start of the defense program through April 30—the period for which the latest compilation was made—75 percent of all time lost due to strikes was caused by the resistance to unionism of five big corporations—Ford, Allis-Chalmers, International Harvester, Bethlehem Steel, and Youngstown Sheet & Tube.

In that entire time, man-days lost due to disputes in defense industries numbered 2,322,901. Strikes at the five named companies accounted for 1,725,000 of the man-day losses.

These giant corporations have been fighting unions throughout their history. Had they obeyed the laws of the land and entered into collective-bargaining agreements with the unions representing their workers, three-fourths of the defense strikes would not have occurred. That's what the Government data shows, in black and white.

Clearly, then, if labor's calumniators had been really interested in averting strikes, they could have done so by cracking down on the five corporations and compelling them to obey the Nation's labor laws.

The Government figures, tabulated by defense officials, are also very illuminating on many other points. They disclose, for example, that only 2 percent of the strikes arose out of demands for the closed shop.

And yet many of the bourbons in Congress have tried to create the impression that the closed-shop issue has been the cause of most strikes; and Congressman CARL VINSON, of Georgia, has fathered a bill to prohibit new closed-shop contracts, all in the guise of preventing labor disputes.

Jurisdictional disputes, about which the same Tories have raised so terrific a hullabaloo, also accounted for a mere 2 percent of the time lost in walk-outs, and at this writing not a single jurisdictional controversy is holding up defense work anywhere.

Strikes to bring up low-wage scales caused only 4 percent of the idleness; 8 percent was due to demands for collective-bargaining agreements from antiunion firms, other than the five mentioned above, and the remaining 9 percent to a variety of reasons.

These figures can easily be obtained by Pegler and the Pawtucket Times, if they desire them, from the agencies that are collecting strike data.

They prove, once and for all time, that the fundamental cause of the overwhelming majority of strikes is the refusal of America's titans of industry to sit down at the same table with representatives of labor and negotiate with them in good faith.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT G. RUTHERFORD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA DISPATCH

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, the great majority of the people of Pennsylvania are opposed to the building of the St. Lawrence seaway as advocated by the President. Why the President should be so set upon this proposition at this time is hard to understand. An editorial in the Philadelphia Dispatch of May 18, 1941, says that it is an economic monstrosity. It is that, and more. The editorial is as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Dispatch]

ECONOMIC MONSTROSITY

Construction of the St. Lawrence seaway would dislocate and disorganize American business on a wide front. That is the gist of an important statement recently issued by the West Virginia Chamber of Commerce.

From the earliest days of this country's industrial development, the chamber explains, the ever-increasing flow of traffic from the Great Lakes region to the Atlantic seaboard has followed the pattern fixed in the most economic development of the most populous and industrially important section of the United States. It then says: "The Great Lakes-Atlantic coast railroad system * * * is the lifeline of a closely related and far-flung economy. This important system is magnificently adequate, and it is not an unimportant factor that central Canada's immense shipments of grain and other products which now help support it would be irrevocably lost if the St. Lawrence waterway should be constructed." The essence of the proposal, it adds, is that "we shall now provide a tax-subsidized substitute for this great network of railroads and highways, thereby dealing a mortal blow not only to the transportation system but to the economy which has grown up around it."

There is no lack of adequate and cheap transport in the St. Lawrence region—even as there is no lack of electric power. In essence, the St. Lawrence proposal amounts to spending hundreds of millions of the taxpayers' money to create tax-free, tax-subsidized transport and power services which are already provided by privately financed, heavily taxed, publicly regulated private industry. At this time, when the full effort of private enterprise in all its branches is needed to complete the defense program, and when every dollar of Government money must be applied to necessary purposes, the St. Lawrence plan is best described as an economic monstrosity.

Value of Farms in New York State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, including permission to include an article published in the New York Herald Tribune dated May 18, 1941, I wish to make the observation that the New Deal policies have diminished the farms, reduced the value of farm machinery and farm buildings, cut the production of some farm products by approximately 50 percent in the State of New York. The figures indicate that the New Deal blitzkrieg has had a devastating effect on the farmers of the Empire State.

The article follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

VALUE OF FARMS IN STATE CUT BY $368,830,000—CENSUS SHOWS DECLINE OVER 10 YEARS HAS REDUCED THEIR NUMBER BY 6,568

WASHINGTON, May 17.—The value of all farms in New York State, including buildings, declined more than $368,830,000 in the 1930 to 1940 period, according to the decennial census of the Department of Commerce. Between 1935 and 1940 the drop in values totaled in excess of $98,000,000.

In a review of agriculture for the State the Department discloses that farm lands and buildings were valued at $947,073,893 in 1940, compared with $1,045,391,981 5 years earlier and $1,315,904,741 at the end of 1930.

The decennial census places the value of farm implements and machinery at $138,341,935 at the end of 1940, against $173,606,369 in 1930, a drop of more than $35,250,000. No statistics are given for 1935.

SIXTY-TWO THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-NINE FEWER FARMS

There were 153,238 farms in operation in the State in 1940, against 177,025 in 1935; 159,806 in 1930; 188,754 in 1925; 193,195 in 1920, and 215,597 in 1910. Between 1910 and 1940 the number declined 62,359.

There were 2,390,508 persons tenanting and operating farms in the State in 1940. In 1935 the farm population was 2,895,685; in 1930, 2,781,077; in 1925, 3,314,544; and in 1910 there were 5,467,051.

Thus between 1910 and 1940 the farm population declined more than half. The shift to industrial centers, however, has not been so large as that experienced by other States with a predominantly agricultural economy. The census does not show where this population migrated.

The average size of farms in the State has not changed materially in the last 30 years. The average was 112.1 acres in 1940, against 102.2 in 1910. The peak average was in 1930, at 112.6 acres. A break-down by size of farms in operation shows that those of 100 to 174 acres predominated with 42,567. Next in importance were farms of 50 to 99 acres—36,874.

There were only 11 farms of 5,000 to 9,999 acres and only one of 10,000 acres and over at the end of 1940 and 1935. No statistics are shown for the other comparative census periods.

LARGE FARM PRODUCTION

New York, known largely as an industrial State, is also a large producer of milk, butter, potatoes, and other farm commodities. The following table, for the period 1909 to 1939, will give an idea of the output of important commodities:

	1939 [1]	1909 [1]
Milk.....gallons..	838,415,000	783,479,000
Butter.....pounds..	4,205,000	12,630,000
Wool.....do....	1,183,000	4,235,000
Honey.....do....	3,193,000	3,191,000
Wheat.....bushels..	6,458,000	6,613,000
Oats.....do....	19,490,000	34,795,000
Potatoes.....do....	24,924,000	48,597,000
Tobacco.....pounds..	1,398,000	5,345,000

[1] All statistics are for commodities produced except those for butter, which represent the number of pounds sold.

New York farmers reported to census officials that production of eggs in 1939 aggregated 97,212,000 dozen—a slight increase over 1935. In 1909, 71,191,000 dozen were produced.

In 1939 there were 1,927,000 cattle on New York farms, of which 1,361,000 were cows and heifers kept for milk production, and on 106,000 farms there were 1,190,000 chickens, compared with 136,000 farms reporting a total of 12,648,000 chickens in 1934.

World Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

STATEMENT BY GEORGE N. PEEK

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George N. Peek was special adviser to the President on foreign trade and president of the Export-Import Bank through 1934 and 1935. He was the first Administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Act in 1933. He resigned from the Administration at the end of 1935 because of irreconcilable differences in point of view on the farm and foreign trade policies of the administration.

For the past 20 years he has given a large part of his time to a study of farm and foreign trade matters. Prior to that time he was in charge of trade—foreign and domestic—for one of our largest corporations.

He was a member of the War Industries Board in 1918.

Recently, Mr. Peek, at the request of the America First Committee, prepared an answer to the claims of the war interventionists that we cannot live in the same world economically with Hitler in the event of an Axis victory. He sent his answer to the committee on May 14, 1941.

In the light of the President's speech opening National Foreign Trade Week and particularly in view of the speech of Secretary of State Hull last evening, the printing of Mr. Peek's remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time is especially timely. It is generally agreed that Mr. Peek is one of America's outstanding authorities on foreign and domestic commerce, particularly in reference to the exchange of agricultural products.

I am today in receipt of the following telegram from Mr. Peek:

If the President's statement on the 17th and Mr. Hull's five points yesterday mean anything at all they mean world free trade with the United States acting as underwriter and director general. Such fanaticism must not be permitted to drag us into war without an expression from the people, even if this means delay or "frustration" of the "aid Britain policy."

The answer prepared by Mr. Peek follows:

Opening. Can Hitler impoverish America? Can Hitler cause an economic collapse in this country by stifling our foreign trade, cutting off our markets, and denying us access to the vital materials we need? Can his slave labor, his barter system, his goldless economy invade us where his panzer divisions cannot? Assertions of this kind are made by the war interventionists, including a recent statement by Mr. Willkie.

Answer. No. Hitler cannot impoverish America by stifling our foreign trade, by cutting off either our markets or our sources of supply of vital materials. To assume that he can is a counsel of unreasoning defeatism. But America can impoverish herself by spending her substance on foreign wars.

One of the presumably convincing arguments put forth by many well-meaning people, as well as by the interventionists, is that although a victorious Germany might find it impossible to invade this country, she could destroy our world trade and force us to trade according to her wishes and on her own terms.

Now comes Mr. Willkie citing this argument as part of the interventionist campaign to take this country into war. He does not advance a single reason why his views should be taken seriously on account of any special knowledge or experience in the field of trade—foreign or domestic. He advances no new points. Rather, he seems to appear as just another advocate, this time on economic grounds, of the interventionists' campaign—a campaign to involve our country in a foreign war. In this campaign, too, his assertions may be regarded as "campaign oratory."

The arguments of one, however, are the arguments of all. They stem from the self-interests of a few. They are built on a false theory of trade. Therefore their case will not stand up before a jury of American informed opinion.

Question 1. Your statement may be perfectly true, but I think it must be substantiated. You say that the arguments of the war interventionists are based on a false theory of trade. Now, if Hitler were to control a large part of the rest of the world, would he not be in a position to dictate terms to us? Why is that a false theory of trade?

Answer. My reply to their argument has been that we hold the answer largely in our own hands. The same argument could be advanced with respect to Great Britain or other nations. My reply would be the same. Competition is the life of trade and is always a threat in private business, no matter from whom it comes. So it is with nations.

Political control is one thing—economic necessity quite another. Now, let us get this straight. There is no difference in principle between foreign and domestic trade, except as restrictions have been imposed upon the entry of goods and the transfer of funds between countries. The war interventionists' theory is that one party to a transaction could dictate all the terms and conditions of the trade between two or more parties. How false Every man, woman, and child knows better if he will think but for a moment. It takes two parties to complete a trade. The necessities and the desires of each are basic. To assume that one may dictate all the terms and conditions is assuming something which is not so. Therefore their case rests on a false premise and should be dismissed. As to Hitler's ability to dictate terms of trade to us in the event of a victory—no; that is where economic necessity comes into play. For example:

In 1933 and 1934 we demonstrated that we could trade with other nations to our mutual advantage. Indeed, we made some desirable deals—mutually agreeable ones with France, Spain, and Italy—but the administration refused to continue to trade. The reason given was that to do so would interfere with our trade-agreement policy, which was one of international altruism toward every country in the world save one. The real reason, however, was more obscure. In the case of Germany, notwithstanding that her two great necessities were understood to be easier access to raw materials and larger markets for her manufactured products, we denied her both, beginning as far back as 1934. The reasons were social and political. Vice President Wallace now says (address, Foreign Policy Association, April 8, 1941), "the next peace must give the * * * aggressor nations the opportunity to buy raw materials and sell manufactured goods without discrimination." If the President, Mr. Hull, Mr. Wallace, and the other New Dealers had recognized Germany's legitimate necessities in 1934 and since, instead of declining to trade with her, they might have made a real contribution toward world peace and might have checked the rapid rise of Nazi-ism and thus avoided the danger of American participation in this war.

Desirable opportunities to trade were rejected, also, for one reason or another, with England, Japan, Italy, and other nations. In 1939 we revised this position somewhat when we made an agreement with England to exchange cotton for rubber. No change in basic policy, however, is indicated by this isolated incident, as the President made clear in his message to Congress last January.

Question 2. Accepting your statement that it takes two parties to make a trade, what advantages would we have to use against Germany's increased bargaining power? You have shown that grave errors were made and it would have been possible to make desirable trades. But under German control of Europe and other areas won't the conditions be so different that former rules will not apply?

Answer. First and foremost in importance is our great market. We have the greatest consuming power in the world. Our purchases from foreign countries support a large part of the economy of many of them. For example:

Latin America produces 90 percent of all the coffee—we consume half of it. Europe, too, depends upon Latin America for her supply—about the same quantity as ours—although she has four times our population.

The Malay States, the Dutch East Indies, and small neighboring countries produce nearly 95 percent of the rubber and, including China, 60 percent of the tin. We use half of the rubber and 40 percent of the world's production of tin.

Japan produces nearly 90 percent of the silk; we buy 90 percent of her exports.

These are examples of the dependency of foreign nations upon our market. Others may be cited—that is, jute from India, diamonds and gold from South Africa, tea from southeastern Asia, etc.

The economy of such nations does not shift with the flag of the overlord. It relies upon our markets. It does not change with superpolitical control.

A careful canvass of the world's mineral production discloses that the non-American nations of the world are more dependent upon the Western Hemisphere than it is dependent upon them.

As an example of the dependency of other countries upon our markets, let us consider a few items:

In the case of rubber, in 1929 we imported 528,602 tons at an average price of 20.5 cents per pound; we paid foreign countries for it $247,420,000. By 1932 our imports had dropped to 393,731 tons and the price to 3.4 cents; we paid $34,273,000. By 1937 we had increased our imports to 592,528 tons, and the price had risen to 19.4 cents—a total of $252,859,000. The last 2 years show a greatly increased tonnage on account of our policy of storing up rubber.

In the case of tin the story is similar. In 1929 we imported 195,165,000 pounds at 45.19 cents, or $91,839,000. In 1932 we imported 77,995,000 pounds at 22.01 cents, or $16,474,000. In 1937 our imports amounted to 197,377,000 pounds at 54.24 cents, or $104,285,000.

This merely shows the necessity and desirability of an active American market for the products of foreign lands.

Then comes the question of technological development and the use of substitutes. Great progress has been made in this field in recent years.

The development of synthetic rubber has progressed to a point where we may say that, if necessary, we are no longer dependent upon the Eastern Hemisphere. Within a very few years we could produce our own rubber, as Germany has done. A number of our most important concerns are active in this field.

The same thing may be said of silk. Witness the great development of rayon and now nylon.

We are now preparing to smelt a considerable portion of our tin requirements in the United States from ore coming from Latin America. In addition, important substitutes have been developed from plastics and other materials, replacing tin.

This hemisphere can supply our manganese and potash—the former through the development of machinery and processes of refining low-grade ores here and in Cuba, and the latter through the development of our own mines.

These are examples only. There is great progress in other fields.

Trade is a fleeting thing. Conditions and methods change, demand and sources of supply with them. For example, we have seen England abandon the practice of a century as the leading advocate of free trade and the gold standard, and for a decade follow a new policy of tariffs, trade agreements between nations, and managed currency. I do not say that this is or is not the best way to conduct trade between nations, but the point is that that is the way world trade has been trending for more than a decade. We are the only important nation attempting to ignore this fact.

My view is that we must recognize the fact that we cannot prescribe the rules and regulations for all the world. Rather, if we are going to engage in trade with other nations, we should use our strategic advantages to negotiate country by country in our own interest.

We should, of course, keep ourselves in a position to join with other nations in improving methods of trading if and when the times comes that the rest of the world is ready to consider a change. But, in the meantime, we should refrain from playing Santa Claus and from opening our markets recklessly to nearly all the world and so exposing our national economy to influences from abroad over which we have no control. Our need is for more defense of our national economy—not less.

Question 3. If Germany, producing with slave labor, can offer better prices to Latin America, how can we compete?

Answer. That is a trick question. The term "Latin America" covers many countries and a wide diversity of economic interests. It must be remembered that Germany, and England, too, had substantial trade with South America before World War No. 1. There is nothing new about competition with them, except in degree. There are many considerations involved in trade besides price. Design and adaptability of products to do the work desired; terms, delivery dates; personal equation between buyer and seller; and numerous other things. Frequently we hear the phrase, "Quality is remembered long after price is forgotten." If price were the sole measuring stick, the manufacturer with the lowest price would be selling all the goods, be they automobiles or what. Competition would die. Monopoly would succeed it, and higher prices might then result.

The answer lies in mutuality of interest between nations and regional economic areas, all things considered. Under these circumstances there is only one intelligent procedure for us to follow, and that is to recognize the conditions under which trade is now conducted between nations, and then, so long as governments control the foreign trade of their nationals, negotiate country by country for the terms and conditions under which goods may be exchanged satisfactorily. Each country must recognize frankly the needs of the other.

Other things being equal, free labor can out-produce slave labor. We made our greatest progress after we abolished slavery—slave labor produces little buying power. American wage levels support our higher American standards of living. They protect the American workers on our farms and in our factories against the lower standards not only of the forced labor of the Axis Powers and Russia but of the low-paid labor of the Argentine and China and the cheaper labor everywhere outside the United States of America. Our wage levels must be insulated against the competition of a world turned upside down. We must stop letting foreign prices determine our domestic prices.

Question 4. What do you mean by foreign prices determining domestic prices?

Answer. World price very largely determines the domestic price of every crop of which we export a surplus. This price applies to the whole of the crop, whether consumed at home or exported, however much this burden is lessened by Government handouts. Industrial tariffs can and do protect prices of articles for which crop is exchanged. The fair exchange value of the crop is thus reduced in proportion to the protection afforded industry. Therefore the protective principle usually operates for the benefit of industry and to the detriment of agriculture.

This problem is as old as our history. Alexander Hamilton recognized it, and in his famous Report on Manufactures, written in 1790, after urging a policy of tariff protection for industry, observed that the day might come when it would be necessary to give agriculture an equivalent. He proposed at some future time to offset, by subsidy or otherwise, the farmer's disadvantage of having to buy in a protected market while having to sell in an unprotected world market at world prices.

Notwithstanding the millions and billions that have been appropriated for agriculture in the last few years, the basic fault remains—while we pay our farmers not to produce, we encourage foreign farmers to produce, not only for foreign markets, which we formerly supplied, but for our markets, by making it easier to import. Such a policy cannot be permanent. Its duration will be immeasurably shortened by the vast expenditures we must make for our national-defense program.

Question 5. Suppose we choose to follow a policy of complete isolation?

Answer: I have never heard anyone seriously urge such a course. However, we are in a better position to do so than any other nation. We are more nearly self-contained. More than 95 percent of our trade is domestic and less than 5-percent foreign. An increase of 5 percent in our domestic trade amounts to more dollars than an increase of 100 percent in our foreign trade. A few hardships might be imposed by trying to make ourselves entirely self-sufficient, but they would be nothing compared to the hardships which we would have to endure through participation in a foreign war. If regimentation is to result, as the war interventionists say it will, my answer is that I would prefer to regiment the 5 percent of our economy which is represented by our foreign trade than the 95 percent which is devoted to our domestic needs.

Question 6: In the early part of this interview you referred to the arguments of the war interventionists on the subject of foreign trade as stemming from the self-interests of a few. To whom did you refer?

Answer: Generally, I referred to the 18 percent shown by the Gallup Poll of the people constituting the interventionists. More specifically, I referred to those who profit most from international trade—the international bankers, ocean transportation companies, marine insurance companies, exporters and importers, etc.—as distinguished from the business concerns who do some foreign business incidental to their domestic business but whose business is primarily domestic. All of the latter group, if compelled to choose between a prosperous American market and one periodically shot to pieces by foreign events, in times of peace and war alike, as ours has been, would choose the American market.

As to individuals, I do not desire to deal with personalities, but one case stands out. Many Americans will recall that an international banker of New York wrote two books in 1936 opposing President Roosevelt's reelection. He supported Governor Landon, but after the Governor made his St. Paul speech, in which he took a stand for protection of the American market and for real Yankee trading, this banker wrote a letter to Secretary Hull saying that in view of Governor Landon's position, he would have to support the Democratic ticket. He is now one of our leading interventionists.

Question 7. Can you sum up in a few words what you think our policy should be and what the question boils down to?

Answer. I think that all of our foreign policies—political and economic—should be related definitely to our American needs and ideals, with the objective of protecting and perpetuating the form of government and the economic policies which have made our country great. Our aim should be to make possible to all Americans the fullest benefits of our form of government as granted by our Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The first requisite to this aim is knowledge based on reliable and comprehensive information, so that we may know what the problems are and consider them fairly. The second is a realization of the principle that foreign policies, whether political or economic, must not be permitted to destroy or impair either our form of government or our standards of living.

The question boils down to this, Shall we take advantage of our position of geographic and economic security and contribute to world peace and prosperity by developing our own country and by attending to our own affairs, or shall we toss our Nation into a common pool in the management of which ours will be only one voice and that not the controlling one? Shall we dilute our Nation's strength with the world's weakness?

Income Certificate Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting herewith a short address delivered by me over the Columbia Broadcasting System Saturday, May 17, 1941, in reference to various bills pending before the Agricultural committee, including my income-certificate proposal:

I deeply appreciate the fact that at this moment the great thought in the minds of the President, the Members of Congress, and the American people concerns the ruthless and destructive war that is now raging in Europe, and the building of our national-defense program as speedily and efficiently as possible.

However, I want to call to the attention of the administration, the Congress, and the American people that we cannot have a well-balanced and successful national-defense

program unless we have a well-balanced and prosperous agriculture. In other words, a successful agriculture is a major part of any successful national-defense program.

We passed a Senate bill this week, after substituting the provisions contained in House Joint Resolution 149 providing loans on cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, and rice equal to 75 percent of parity. This bill was sent to conference and the conferees agreed upon a loan amounting to 85 percent of parity. These loans will peg the price of cotton at 13½ cents per pound, and wheat at 96 cents per bushel. Farmers will also receive, in addition to these prices or loan values, their cash parity and soil-conservation payments.

This bill was passed to take care of this year's crop pending the passage of a real major farm bill that will definitely give to farmers a 100-percent parity price.

During the past 3 weeks, the Agriculture Committee of the House, of which I am chairman, has been holding general hearings on various bills, including my bill known as the income-certificate bill, proposing to put farmers on a parity with other groups without having to "tap" the Treasury of the United States every year for the purpose of paying a subsidy to the farmer. These bills include actual price-fixing, cost-of-production, and high-loan bills.

When the Farm Board was created and the high-loan program placed in operation under the Hoover administration, I stated on the floor of the House that it would be just like putting that much money in a rat hole unless we were able to absolutely control production in line with domestic consumption, and for export. You remember what happened when this high loan, or price pegging, came to an end.

The bills that provide for high loans even up to 100 percent parity usually provide for a further restriction in production. These proposals would cut wheat to 50,000,000 acres and cotton to 9 or 10 million bales.

If we do this, naturally the farmers of the South will be driven into dairying, growing of wheat, raising cattle, hogs, and growing all of these crops in competition with every other agricultural section of the United States, which would tend to bring disaster to all agricultural sections, including the South.

In the second place, the thing that has been destroying our cotton markets in the United States and in Europe has been the tremendous increase in the production and consumption of rayon and all types of synthetic fibers, including jute and many types of paper products.

These high-loan bills referred to would leave our market wide open for a tremendous increase in the consumption of these highly competitive products, in that these bills do not provide a compensatory duty on these products.

In the third place, under a high loan it would take a tremendous amount of money out of the Treasury of the United States to subsidize any amount of cotton that we might be able to export so as to place the price of our cotton on a competitive basis with foreign prices. For instance, a loan price at 16 cents on cotton would call for a cash subsidy of from $40 to $50 per bale.

Then, there is the price-fixing bill.

Congress has passed legislation in the interest of other groups, actually giving them the right to fix prices; for instance, the Fair Trade Practices Act, the Bituminous Coal Price Fixing Act, a tariff policy for industry, and a freight rate-making commission known as the Interstate Commerce Commission for Railroads.

There is the Wages and Hours Act placing a bottom under wages and hours, and I could mention many other pieces of legislation passed by the Congress in the interest of various other groups.

I do not believe, however, that we could work successfully the actual price fixing of farm products unless we could change our marketing and distributing system. There are just too many people handling farm products, all of which would make it impossible to keep a check on price fixing.

We hear much these days from these selfish, price-fixing groups about how the farm prices are destroying consumers. It is not the price that farmers actually receive for their products that tends to destroy consumers. It is the fixed price that consumers have to pay after these products have passed through numerous middlemen. For instance, the cotton manufacturers and the bakers of bread have been and are now kicking about any efforts that we may put forth in the way of giving to farmers a fair price unless we take money out of the Treasury of the United States. In the meantime, cotton goods today are selling at a price to consumers that would warrant the paying of 18 to 20 cents per pound for cotton; however, they have been buying the cotton for 10 to 11 cents. I am told that bakers produce and sell 60 loaves of bread out of a bushel of wheat. At 9 cents per loaf, this would mean $5.40 to the consumer for a bushel of wheat for which the farmer receives the pitiful sum of 60 cents.

The purpose of my bill is to place farmers on a parity with other groups as to prices for their products in line with the prices they have to pay for that which they purchase.

In addition to the income-certificate provision, my bill has four other definite and specific proposals:

First. The Secretary of Agriculture is to ascertain parity prices on cotton, wheat, rice, and tobacco, and at the proper time he is to announce these prices.

Second. A loan program will automatically become effective. The loans will be based on two-thirds of the parity price.

Third. A compensatory duty will be placed on rayon, other synthetic fibers, and jute comparable to the amount of the income certificate placed on cotton to avoid giving these competitive fibers an economic advantage.

Fourth. The difference between the loan price and parity will be paid to the farmer from the cash secured from the sale of the income certificates to the manufacturers or processors. No money will be placed in the Treasury or taken out of the Treasury to make these payments.

Suppose the Secretary determines that the parity price on cotton is 16 cents per pound. This would automatically mean that a loan of 10⅔ cents per pound basis on seven-eighth-inch middling cotton would be made available to the grower of cotton.

Suppose the parity price on wheat was $1.25. The loan in that case would be 83⅓ cents, and the amount that would have to be paid to the farmer between the loan and the parity price would be 41⅔ cents.

This would definitely accomplish two things: First, it would put a bottom under the price of cotton and wheat, thereby weeding out speculation; and second, we would definitely know the amount that would have to be raised under the certificate plan to pay the difference between the loan or the price that the farmer received for his cotton and parity.

The bill also provides that the income certificates will be based on a graduated scale in being applied to the different types of cotton goods, so that it would not work a hardship on consumers who buy heavy, coarse cotton goods like overalls, work shirts, etc. Cotton bagging and cotton sacks would be exempt.

Suppose a cotton or wheat farmer because of some hazard should make a short crop or no crop at all under the high loan, you would not have any cotton or wheat to sell or put in under the high loan, but under the income-certificate plan, if you had a total crop failure you would still get your full and complete income-certificate payment.

I haven't any patience with any man who at this time would further reduce the production of cotton and wheat because we have a surplus, with thousands of hungry people and ill-clad people in the United States today. The need for clothing and food in Europe is increasing daily. What are you going to do about feeding and clothing the millions in the United States who will be unemployed after the war? We should thank God that we are in this blessed position.

In closing, let me state that the procedure on the part of the Congress in giving price-fixing privileges to industry, the railroads, labor, and other groups, while feeding agriculture promises—thereby forcing agriculture into economic slavery—will go down in history as the greatest economic blunder that was ever foisted on a free, patriotic, and liberty-loving minority.

As a Farm State, Wisconsin Suffers Unfairly From Federal Taxation of Gasoline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

STATEMENT BY THE WISCONSIN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the Wisconsin Petroleum Institute Committee on the effect on the farm industry of Wisconsin of raising the gasoline tax:

AS A FARM STATE, WISCONSIN SUFFERS UNFAIRLY FROM FEDERAL TAXATION OF GASOLINE

Wisconsin is essentially an agricultural State. Throughout the State we produce in varying quantities practically every grain, vegetable, and fruit grown anywhere in the North Temperate Zone. We grow corn, wheat, barley, hay, flaxseed, potatoes, sugar beets, tobacco, and a multitude of other farm crops. We put up more peas in cans than any other State. Our production of hemp is the greatest in the country. We also rank high in the production of cranberries, apples, cherries, and plums. In the number of dairy cows, in the production of cheese, butter, condensed milk products and casein, we are one of the Nation's leaders.

Our manufactures include the cutting of lumber in the Great Lakes region, beet-sugar refining, woodworking, and the building of farm implements. We are also important manufacturers of motor-vehicle parts and bodies. We mine substantial amounts of zinc, pig iron, and other iron ore, particularly hematite. A good portion of our population is engaged in the operation of the fisheries on the Great Lakes.

Each and every one of these activities is important not only to the citizens of Wisconsin but also to the citizens of the whole Nation. And in the production of each and every one of these products gasoline is used. It is for this reason that the people of Wisconsin view with alarm the current proposal before the United States Congress which would increase the Federal tax on gasoline from 1½ cents to 2½ cents a gallon. Such

a tax is tantamount to putting a tax on the tools with which we in Wisconsin work to feed ourselves and to feed our Nation.

There are no exemptions and refunds in the Federal gasoline tax law for gasoline consumed for nonhighway purposes, as there is in the tax laws of several of the farm States. There is no escape from the Federal tax on gasoline, because everyone who consumes gasoline must pay it. The small farmer who uses gasoline to operate his broken old tractor must pay it, just as must the wealthy owner of a palatial yacht. Therein lies the injustice of the tax. The consumption of gasoline is neither a true measure of tax responsibility nor is it an indication of ability to pay taxes.

To the citizens of a State like Wisconsin the excessive taxation of gasoline by the Federal Government would be particularly unfair because most Wisconsin citizens are farmers and must use gasoline to earn a living. In an attempt to improve their chances of earning a decent living, most farmers today have mechanized their farms. New equipment and new methods have transformed agriculture from a primitive to a highly complex business.

The Wisconsin dairy farmer, for example, is greatly dependent on his farm tractor and his farm truck. He may even be dependent on a stationary gasoline engine. His farm tractor he uses to till the soil, plant, cultivate, and harvest the grains needed to feed his livestock. He must use his farm truck to haul his hay and other feed to the barn from the fields. The milk, of course, must also be hauled to the market or to the creamery. There too the farm truck must be used. The stationary gasoline engine may be used to generate electrical power. Certainly it is indispensable as a power unit to drive feed grinders and other basic farm implements. The tractor, the farm truck, and the stationary engine, in turn, all are powered by gasoline.

A similar example could be made of many other Wisconsin citizens who are dependent on the consumption of gasoline to help them earn a living. The fisherman uses gasoline in his boat. The lumberman uses gasoline in his sawmill. The fruit grower uses gasoline in the tractor which hauls his insect sprayer. The wheat grower uses gasoline in his mobile thresher. And so on down the list. We can also mention the traveling salesman and his dependence on gasoline to earn his livelihood.

It is interesting to analyze the effect an additional 1-cent-a-gallon increase in the Federal gasoline tax rate would have on these Wisconsin citizens. Take the Wisconsin dairy farmer for an example again. The dairyman with the old farm tractor that just eats up gasoline because he cannot afford a new one would be forced to contribute more to the support of the Federal Government and to the national-defense program than his neighbor who can afford a new tractor that is easy on gasoline.

The dairy farmer who lives farther from the market or the creamery than his competitor also would be asked to contribute more to the cost of the Federal Government and the national-defense program because he would need to consume more gasoline than his competitor. If one dairy farmer should be unfortunate enough to live where there is no electrical power line, he may use a stationary gasoline engine to generate his own—only to find that in addition to suffering that misfortune he must also pay more taxes because he consumes more gasoline than the more fortunate farmer near a power line.

And so it goes with the fisherman, the traveling salesman, the fruit grower, and the lumberman. In each case the Federal gasoline tax appears to be a tax on misfortune. The fruit grower who is unusually beset with insects and pests and therefore must spray his trees more than his neighbor must consume more gasoline. He thereby acquires the additional misfortune of being asked to pay more taxes. The fisherman who must travel farther to get to the best fishing grounds is also unfortunate enough to have to pay more gasoline taxes to get there than does his more fortunate competitor.

Such is the fallacy of using gasoline consumption as a measure of responsibility for the costs of general government. When the gasoline tax is used as a road toll, as it is by the States, it is a sound tax. Then the more a person uses gasoline to drive his car or truck over the roads, the more he contributes toward the cost of constructing and maintaining the roads from which he so benefits. But the Federal gasoline tax is not a road tax. Purely and simply it is a general tax to provide revenue to finance the general cost of government, the same as the income tax.

The annual payment made toward the cost of general government by an individual in the form of Federal gasoline taxes obviously is measured by the amount of gasoline he consumes. Some individuals consume more than others because they live farther from their place of employment or because as farmers or salesmen they must consume gasoline to make a living. Accordingly, their Federal gasoline-tax payments for the support of general government are greater. It is the opinion of Wisconsin citizens that dependence on the gasoline tax to raise revenue for general governmental purposes is unsound because the distance a citizen travels on the highways or the extent to which he uses his farm tractor is a very poor measure of his responsibility for the cost of government.

Because Wisconsin is an agricultural State and its residents are primarily farmers, the use of gasoline-tax consumption as a measure of tax responsibility in our State is particularly inequitable and unjust. Too many of us are dependent on the consumption of gasoline to earn our daily bread.

Mighty River Goes to Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, the Grand Coulee Dam and the Bonneville Dam on the Columbia River are constantly attracting increasing attention, and the American people are beginning to come to a better appreciation of what unexcelled possibilities for immediate and future growth are found in the development of the marvelous, beautiful, and mighty Columbia River.

Richard L. Neuberger, a special writer on the Portland Oregonian, has again written another exceptionally fine factual article concerning these two great dams and the river upon which they are located. The article appears in the Oregonian of May 11, and is characterized by the unusually rare descriptive ability that Mr. Neuberger displays in his articles concerning the great Northwest region.

Were it not for the exceptional foresightedness of President Roosevelt in directing the construction of these two giant projects back in 1933, we would find ourselves today so crippled by a shortage of electrical energy that our present airplane construction program would be impossible.

It was the dream of a few hardy and farsighted pioneers like Billy Clapp and Jim O'Sullivan, of Ephrata, Wash., and Rufus Woods, of Wenatchee, that kept the great Grand Coulee project alive. Through the efforts of former Senator C. C. Dill and others a sufficient interest was aroused in President Roosevelt to direct the beginning of these great projects 8 years ago.

Mr. Neuberger's article presents a fascinating and yet conservative statement of what has been done, of what is being done, and of what the future holds in connection with the mighty Columbia River. The article follows:

[From the Portland Oregonian]

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

Development of the Columbia River has been a dream of Americans ever since Thomas Jefferson's time. Today an ambitious program of development is far along. Millions of dollars from the United States Treasury have been spent to generate hydroelectricity, improve navigation, and reclaim and irrigate arid land.

With staccato rapidity new phases of that program are taking place. Scarcely a week passes by unmarked by some event of significance. A short time ago Grand Coulee Dam, mightiest structure ever reared by man on earth, began producing power. From Bonneville Dam transmission lines fan out like the rays of the sun. Factories break ground for new plants. Huge lift rocks at Bonneville and Celilo operate overtime hoisting boats into the upper river.

Happenings far across the seas have given added importance to the Federal Governments opening up of the Columbia. The British Empire is locked in a desperate struggle with the forces of fascism. America has promised to supply England with the sinews of war. Airplanes are needed, and ships and tanks and artillery. These things are produced with metal. Strategic metals, particularly aluminum, key to the airplane industry, are produced with huge quantities of electricity.

This was what President Roosevelt meant when he said that Grand Coulee had been "called to the colors." Vast amounts of power are required to rearm America and to bolster the war effort of Britain. New generators are being installed at Bonneville with all the speed which human ingenuity can muster. Work at Grand Coulee is many months ahead of schedule. The President and Congress have announced that the immense resources of the Columbia River are to be put to use in the conflict between the democratic nations and the Axis.

STATUS SURVEYED AFTER 7 YEARS

Today, 7 years after the development program on the great waterway was started, what is its status? How much money has been spent? How much power has been contracted for? Where have the big projects lived up to advance expectations? Where have they failed? What construction remains to be done? Are there any immediate prospects for change in the method of administering dams? In a word, how do Bonneville and Grand Coulee stand now? What is likely to be their dominant role in the future?

Bonneville Dam was completed in August of 1938, at which time two generators of 43,200 kilowatts each were switched on. In December of 1940 a new generator with a

capacity of 54,000 kilowatts went into operation. A similar generator was added in January of this year. This makes four generating machines installed at the present time. The total output of these machines is 194,400 kilowatts.

In January of 1942 two additional generators will be ready. These generators are now being installed and the size of the powerhouse is being increased. Dr. Paul J. Raver, Bonneville administrator, has recommended that the remaining four units be built as soon as possible. His recommendation has been accepted and Congress has appropriated funds for constructing the foundation for these generators.

POWER AT GRAND COULEE STILL PITTANCE

By next year Bonneville Dam will have an output of 302,400 kilowatts. The ultimate capacity of the project, when the other four generators are installed, will be 518,400 kilowatts. This would not be enough to satisfy demands, according to Bonneville officials. For that reason they say work has been rushed at Grand Coulee, where the eventual power capacity will be almost unlimited. "A good job well done," telegraphed President Roosevelt when Coulee poured a tiny fraction of its total output onto the Bonneville lines a short time ago.

The power produced at Grand Coulee is a mere pittance, a slight token of the vast torrent of kilowatts soon to flow from there. Two stand-by units of 10,000 kilowatts each are now in operation. On July 1 the first major unit will go into action. This will be the biggest piece of electrical machinery ever manufactured—a generator so vast that it required a train of 70 freight cars to haul it across the continent disassembled. The generator will produce exactly twice as much power as each generator at Bonneville—108,000 kilowatts.

In October of this year a second huge generator, the exact duplicate of the first, will be installed at Coulee. Generator No. 3 at Grand Coulee is billed for January of 1942. No schedule for the colossal plant follows after that. The final capacity there will be 18 units of 108,000 kilowatts apiece.

This will give a total output of 1,944,000 kilowatts, or nearly five times the capacity at Bonneville. Grand Coulee will dwarf into insignificance any other power plant in the world and will give the Pacific Northwest a huge reservoir of hydroelectricity far into the distant future.

How much power has been sold to date by the Bonneville power administration, which wholesales all the Federal energy generated on the Columbia River? Contracts have been executed for the sale of 278,830 kilowatts of energy. These contracts fall into five general classifications—public-utility districts, municipalities, cooperatives, private power companies, and industries. Here are the total Bonneville contracts by these groupings:

	Kilowatts
Public-utility districts:	
Skamania County [1]	280
Pacific County [1]	1,500
Wahkiakum County [1]	400
Klickitat County [1]	1,500
Tillamook County [2]	2,000
Kittitas County [1]	100
Lewis County [1]	400
Northern Wasco County [2]	4,000
Grays Harbor County [1]	2,000
Total	12,180
Municipalities:	
Cascade Locks [2]	200
Forest Grove [2]	750
Canby [2]	300
Monmouth [2]	400
McMinnville [2]	1,000
Centralia [1]	300
Ellensburg [1]	2,000
Eugene [2]	1,500
Drain [2]	250
Total	6,700
Cooperatives:	
Lincoln County [2]	300
Columbia County [1]	300
Wasco County [2]	200
Spokane [1]	800
Clatsop County [2]	150
Nespelem agency [1]	100
Salem [2]	100
Total	1,950
Private power companies:	
Portland General Electric [2]	30,000
Pac. P. & L. (Astoria) [2]	1,500
Total	31,500
Industries:	
Aluminum Co. of America [1]	162,500
Pac. Carbide & Alloys [2]	2,000
Pennsylvania Salt Co. [2]	2,000
Reynolds Metals Co. [1]	60,000
Total	226,500
Summary:	
Public utility districts	12,180
Municipalities	6,700
Cooperatives	1,950
Private power companies	31,500
Industries	226,500
Complete total	278,830

[1] State of Washington.
[2] State of Oregon.

From these figures it may readily be seen that sales of power to new industrial plants occupy 81 percent of the contract forms to date. Without the purchase by factories and industries of the bulk of the energy, only a thin trickle of juice now would be flowing through the power spigots.

PEOPLE IN REGION HELD SATISFIED WITH SET-UP

Officials of the private utility corporations maintain that the people in the region are satisfied with present power rates. They charge that Bonneville has been used politically in an effort to drive the private utilities out of the Northwest, but that the voters are not in sympathy with these tactics. The situation to date, according to power company spokesmen, confirms the claim that Federal development of the Columbia River must always be considered primarily as an encouragement to new industries and manufacturing plants.

New dealers take an opposite attitude. Congressman CHARLES H. LEAVY, of Spokane, says that public-utility districts have not had greater success in the Pacific Northwest because the power companies have spent more than $1,000,000 to hinder their program. Congressman LEAVY also points out that the very existence of Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams has compelled private utilities to institute sweeping rate reductions. The recent annual report of the Bonneville administration emphasized the rate cuts which have occurred in this area.

When all 10 generators are installed at Bonneville, the total cost of the dam itself will be $75,000,000. Added to this is the appropriation for the far-flung transmission system. Across the mountains and plateaus of the Northwest steel-latticed towers extend like a many-legged centipede. The poles and wires to date have cost $38,415,000. This sum will carry the transmission-line construction until June of the present year.

FOUR PLANTS CONNECTED IN POWER NETWORK

Nearly 500 miles of high-tension 230,000-volt line have been strung. This network is in the form of a triangle and will be the base of the Pacific Northwest grid system. A line extends from Vancouver northeastward through the Inland Empire to Grand Coulee. Another line, this one also a double circuit, stretches north from Vancouver to Covington, which is in the Puget Sound area. At present men are building a line running east and west between Covington and Grand Coulee.

This gridwork will throw back and forth energy from four vast public power plants. In order of size these plants are (1) Grand Coulee, (2) Bonneville, (3) Seattle's city light system on the Skagit River, and (4) the Tacoma municipal plant at Lake Cushman. Last year the Bonneville Administration arranged an interchange arrangement with the cities of Seattle and Tacoma whereby power from those plants can be switched onto the Bonneville-Grand Coulee circuit. A similar tie-up exists with the Northwestern Electric Co.

Feeder lines include 120 miles between Vancouver and Eugene, 35 miles between Bonneville and The Dalles and 100 miles between Portland and Astoria. Work on the last two routes is still under way. Around the rugged face of Shell Rock Mountain, high above the Columbia River, electricians cling like alpinists as they anchor the towers to the basalt and string the wires to the towers. Because of blizzards and ice the steel poles must be rooted in concrete.

The Bonneville appropriation would fill a sultan's coffers, but the Grand Coulee cost dwindles it by comparison. Already the stupendous barrier on the upper river has cost $135,805,000. By September of this year Grand Coulee will be entirely completed. All that remains now is the finishing of the parapet and the superstructure. The immense bulk of the huge dam itself is virtually done. Into it has gone enough concrete to build a superhighway across America from New York to Seattle and back by way of Los Angeles.

Only about 10 percent of the total power output at Grand Coulee will be necessary for pumping the water which will irrigate 1,200,000 acres of land in the Columbia Basin. In spite of this fact, the pumping plant at Coulee will be large enough to supply New York City with water for a century. A large amount of secondary power can be used for pumping, because the high-water period on the Columbia River coincides with the irrigation season. This means that a lot of surplus power will be available when the irrigation canals must be full.

ELECTRICITY LOSES EFFECTIVENESS IN LONG TRANSMISSION

After electricity has been transmitted about 250 miles it starts to lose its effectiveness extremely rapidly. Will power on the Grand Coulee-Bonneville grid system be wasted because of the length of the transmission lines? Will countless kilowatts be lost pushing the juice through valleys, over mountains, and down dales?

Engineers think not. At strategic points on the system the plants throw power back and forth. Each long stretch of line is dotted with a generating plant somewhere. There are numerous substations at key points—at Yakima, for example, nearly midway between Coulee and Bonneville. A year ago Fortune magazine pointed out that if technicians could ever solve the riddle of transmitting electricity vast distances, then the Columbia River could virtually supply power for the entire United States.

One other phase of the development program on the Columbia River has been a huge increase in navigation. The locks at Bonne-

ville operate day and night hoisting oil boats into the upper reaches of the river. Before the dam was finished the maximum year for tonnage going past Bonneville had been 105,000 tons. In 1940 through the Bonneville locks went 707,444 tons of cargo. This has affected shipping on the Columbia all the way to the mouth of the Snake River, far in the core of the Inland Empire.

Prior to the completion of Bonneville the locks and canal at Celilo, above The Dalles, were stranded like a boat thrown up on shore. Few vessels could get as far as Celilo because of the rapids in the Bonneville region. Now the 51-mile lake behind the dam has buried these rapids beneath layers of slack water. Last year 325,900 tons of shipping passed through the rock-ribbed Celilo Canal. Prior to Bonneville dam the biggest year had been a puny 23,448 tons. So far as navigation is concerned, the Columbia River is undergoing a rebirth.

There are many imponderables attaching to the Federal development program on the Columbia and no one can foresee what the future holds. Had it not been for a fearful holocaust in Europe, the present industrial activity might not be taking place. All along the river—at the aluminum plants, at the shipyards near the mouth of the Willamette—the sinews of war are being forged for the stern grapple with the Nazi armies.

Political obscurity also surrounds the future administration of the projects. The present Bonneville power administration, which markets power from the big dams, is a provisional agency. The permanent bureau has not yet been established. At the present time two bills are before Congress which vitally concern the Bonneville administration.

The Bone-Leavy bill would give the Bonneville administrator authority to buy out private power companies as a whole. No longer would public utility districts have to negotiate for small parcels of huge private systems. The Bonneville adminstrator then could sell, at long terms, the private distribution facilities essential to a particular public agency. For this purpose the Bone-Leavy bill would provde a fund of $200,000,000 with which to finance the purchases. According to sponsors of the bill, the fund ultimately would be amortized.

MEASURE WOULD SET UP BASIN AUTHORITY

The second bill touching the Columbia River program is the Rankin bill, introduced in the House of Representatives by JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi. This bill would set up a regional authority in the Columbia Basin similar to the T. V A. in the South. The measure has the support of Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS, "father of the T. V. A.," who on a trip to the Northwest last autumn said he did not see the wisdom of having three separate bureaus—the Army engineers, the Bonneville Administration, and the United States Bureau of Reclamation—dealing with problems on one river.

In a recent conference at the White House the President told Pacific Northwest Senators that he wants some Columbia River legislation enacted during the present session of Congress. Which bill it will be is still a moot question.

There is a distinct possibility that a third dam may soon be started on the surging waterway. The House Rivers and Harbors Committee recently approved the Umatilla project, which is sponsored by Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY and Representative WALTER M. PIERCE. This $23,700,000 dam would send boats and barges far up the Columbia and all the way up the Snake River to Johnson's Bar, at the lower end of Hell's Canyon. Last year the Umatilla project, which also would have powerhouse foundations, failed in the Senate by only 3 votes after an eloquent plea in its behalf by Senator MCNARY.

Constitutionality of Geyer-Pepper Anti-Poll-Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

MEMORANDUM BY MARTIN POPPER

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have received so many requests for a statement on the constitutionality of the Geyer-Pepper anti-poll-tax bill that I am today inserting in the RECORD a memorandum on the subject. The memorandum was prepared by Mr. Martin Popper, a prominent attorney of New York and Washington, who presented his views before the subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee last spring. Since the subcommittee did not see fit to print the hearings, I am taking leave to insert the memorandum in the RECORD.

Mr. Popper has shown in his memorandum that—

First. The right to vote for Federal officials is a Federal right derived from the United States Constitution.

Second. The poll tax is not a qualification for voting and therefore does not fall within the rights granted to the States under section 2 of article I of the Constitution.

Third. Congress has the right to pass legislation to protect a constitutional right and to prevent corrupt practices in the use of a Federal franchise.

The memorandum follows:

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF THE GEYER-PEPPER ANTI-POLL-TAX BILL

The sole issue is whether the proposed legislation is constitutional. The legality or illegality of existing poll-tax laws is not material. The courts might conceivably find such laws constitutional without in the least limiting the right of Congress to legislate on the subject. Therefore the decision in the case of *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U. S. 277), which held constitutional a Georgia poll-tax statute, does not affect the constitutionality of the Geyer bill. As a matter of fact, I shall show later that even the Breedlove case is authority for the constitutionality of the anti-poll-tax bill. (It should be added that the Breedlove case is not even judicially decisive on the question of the constitutionality of the poll-tax statutes in a Federal election because no distinction was made in that case between a State and a Federal election; i. e., between an election for State offices and an election for President, Vice President, and Members of Congress.)

The right to vote in Presidential and congressional elections is a Federal right arising from and based upon the Constitution.

Article I, section 2, of the Constitution states:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

The fact that the right to vote in elections for President and Members of Congress is a Federal right arising from the Constitution has been upheld by a long line of cases, including the following: *Ex parte Yarbrough* (110 U. S. 651, 652); *In re Quarles* v. *Butler* (158 U. S. 532); *Wiley* v. *Sinkler* (179 U. S. 58, 62); *Stafford* v. *Templeton* (185 U. S. 487); *Pope* v. *Williams* (193 U. S. 621); *Twining* v. *New Jersey* (211 U. S. 78).

In Ex parte Yarbrough the Court says:

"This proposition answers also another objection to the constitutionality of the laws under consideration; namely, that the right to vote for a Member of Congress is not dependent upon the Constitution or laws of the United States, but is governed by the law of each State respectively.

"If this were conceded, the importance to the general government of having the actual election—the voting for those Members—free from force and fraud is not diminished by the circumstance that the qualifications of the voter is determined by the law of the State where he votes. It equally affects the Government, it is as indispensable to the proper discharge of the great function of legislating for that Government, that those who are to control this legislation shall not owe their election to bribery or violence, whether the class of persons who shall vote is determined by the law of the State, or by the law of the United States, or by their united result.

"But it is not correct to say that the right to vote for a Member of Congress does not depend on the Constitution of the United States.

"The office, if it be properly called an office, is created by that Constitution and by that alone. It also declares how it shall be filled; namely, by election.

"Its language is: 'The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.' Article I, section 2.

"The States in prescribing the qualifications of voters for the most numerous branch of their own legislatures, do not do this with reference to the election for Members of Congress. Nor can they prescribe the qualifications for voters for those so nomine. They define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State. It adopts the qualification thus furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress.

"It is not true, therefore, that electors for Members of Congress owe their right to vote to the State law in any sense which makes the right to depend exclusively on the law of the State.

"Counsel for petitioners, seizing upon the expression found in the opinion of the court in the case of *Minor* v. *Happersett* (21 Wall. 162), that the 'Constitution of the United States does not confer the right of suffrage upon any one,' without reference to the connection in which it is used, insists that the voters in this case do not owe their right to vote in any sense to that instrument.

"But the court was combating the argument that this right was conferred on all citizens, and therefore upon women as well as men.

"In opposition to that idea, it was said the Constitution adopts as the qualification for voters of Members of Congress that which prevails in the State where the voting is to be done; therefore, said the opinion, the right is not definitely conferred on any person or class of persons by the Constitution alone, because you have to look to the law of the State for the description of the class. But the court did not intend to say that when the class or the person is thus ascertained,

his right to vote for a Member of Congress was not fundamentally based upon the Constitution, which created the office of Member of Congress, and declared it should be elective, and pointed to the means of ascertaining who should be electors.

"The fifteenth amendment of the Constitution, by its limitation on the power of the States in the exercise of their right to prescribe the qualifications of voters in their own elections, and by its limitation of the power of the United States over that subject, clearly shows that the right of suffrage was considered to be of supreme importance to the National Government, and was not intended to be left within the exclusive control of the States."

In the case of *Quarles* v. *Butler* (158 U. S. 532, at 535), Mr. Justice Gray says:

"Among the rights and privileges, which have been recognized by this court to be secured to citizens of the United States by the Constitution, are the right to petition Congress for a redress of grievances; *United States* v. *Cruikshank* (92 U. S. 542, 555); and the right to vote for Presidential electors or Members of Congress; *Ex parte Yarbrough* (110 U. S. 631."

In this case of *Wiley* v. *Sinkler* (179 U. S. 58, at 62), we find the same learned Justice using this language:

"The right to vote for Members of the Congress of the United States is not derived merely from the constitution and laws of the State in which they are chosen, but has its foundation in the Constitution of the United States."

Mr. Justice Peckham in the case of *Pope* v. *Williams* (193 U. S. 621, at 633), adds these words of caution:

"Although it may be observed that the right to vote for a Member of Congress is not derived exclusively from the State law. See Federal Constitution, article I, section 2; *Wiley* v. *Sinkler* (179 U. S. 58)."

And in *Twining* v. *State of New Jersey* (211 U. S. 78), Mr. Justice Moody says:

"Thus among the rights and privileges of national citizenship recognized by this country are the right to pass freely from State to State, *Crandall* v. *Nevada* (6 Wall. 35); the right to petition Congress for a redress of grievances, *United States* v. *Cruikshank*, supra; the right to vote for national officers, *Ex parte Yarbrough* (110 U. S. 651); *Wiley* v. *Sinkler* (179 U. S. 58)."

To further sustain this point, during my presentation before the committee, I quoted from a minority opinion in *Newberry* v. *U. S.* (236 U. S. 232), as follows. Justice White said:

"The provisions of sections 2 and 3 of article I of the Constitution, fixing the composition of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, and providing for the elections of Representatives by vote of the people of the several States, and of Senators by the State legislatures, were undoubtedly reservoirs of vital Federal power, constituting the generative sources of the provisions of section 4, clause 1, of the same article, creating the means for vivifying the bodies previously ordained (Senate and House); that is providing 'The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.'

"As without this grant no State power on the subject was possessed, it follows that the State power to create primaries as to United States Senators depended upon the grant for its existence. It also follows that, as the conferring of the power on the States and the reservation of the authority in Congress to regulate being absolutely coterminous, except as to the place of choosing Senators, which is not here relevant, it results that nothing is possible of being done under the former which is not subjected to the limitations imposed by the latter. And this is illustrated by the legislation of Congress and the decisions of this Court, upholding the same. See Act to Regulate the Times and Manner of Holding Elections for Senators in Congress, approved July 25, 1866 (14 Stat. at L. 243, ch. 245; act of May 31, 1870, 16 Stat. at L. 144, ch. 114; act of July 14, 1938, 16 Stat. at L. 254, ch. 254, Comp. Stat., sec. 10, 248; act of June 10, 1872, 17 Stat. at L. 347, ch. 415; *Ex parte Siebold*, 100 U. S. 371, 25 L. ed. 717; *Ex parte Clarke*, 100 U. S. 399, 25 L. ed. 715; *Ex parte Yarbrough*, 110 U. S. 651, 28 L. ed. 274, 4 Sup. Ct. Rept. 152; *United States* v. *Mosley*, 238 U. S. 383, 39 L. ed. 1335, 35 Sup. Ct. Rept. 904)."

I want to reemphasize that the minority opinion is controlling on this point. As a matter of fact, there are four separate opinions in the Newberry case. There was no disagreement in any of the opinions—majority or minority—on the questions with which we are now concerned. The majority decision turned on another question entirely, namely, the right of Congress to legislate regarding primary elections in the State. Therefore on the question before us the above quotation is not really a minority opinion, but a controlling opinion. At any rate, the principle that the right to vote in Presidential or congressional elections is a Federal right arising from the Constitution is amply covered by the other cases cited above. The Newberry quotation is merely added because of its clarity.

Article I, section 4, of the Constitution is further proof that the right to vote for Federal officers arises from the Constitution and is a "Federal function" in the words of Mr. Justice Pitney, who wrote on behalf of himself and Justices Brandeis and Clarke in the Newberry case. That quotation reads as follows:

"It is said that section 4 of article I does not confer a general power to regulate elections, but only to regulate 'the manner of holding' them. But this can mean nothing less than the entire mode of procedure—the essence, not merely the form of conducting the elections. The only specific grant of power over the subject contained in the Constitution is contained in that section: 'And the power is conferred primarily upon the legislatures of the several States, but subject to revision and modification by Congress.'"

The original intention of the framers of the Constitution—that the National Government was to have paramount authority in Federal elections—was made clear by Mr. James Madison, one of the authors, in the debates in the Virginia Convention called to ratify the Constitution. I quote from Elliot's Debates on the Federal Constitution, Virginia, pages 366 and 367:

"With regard to the other point, it was thought that the regulation of time, place, and manner of electing the Representatives should be uniform throughout the continent. Home States might regulate the elections on the principles of equality and others might regulate them otherwise. This diversity would be obviously unfair—should the people of any State by any means be deprived of the right of suffrage, it was judged proper it should be limited by the general Government. It was found impossible to fix the time, place, and manner of the election of Representatives in the Constitution. It was found necessary to leave the registration of these, in the first place, to the State Governments, as being best acquainted with the situation of the people, subject to the control of the general Government, in order to enable it to produce uniformity and prevent its own dissolution."

Another indication that section 4, article 1, places rather broad power in the hands of Congress is that the word "manner" used in that section has been held to at least include protection against corruption in elections (*U. S.* v. *Brandwell*, 243 U. S. 476; *Newberry* v. *U. S.*, 256 U. S. 232; *Burroughs* v. *U. S.*, 290 U. S. 543).

The question has been raised that the portion of section 2 of article I of the Constitution which reads: "The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature" might be construed as prohibiting Congress from enacting legislation outlawing the poll tax in Federal elections. The conclusive answer to this erroneous contention is that the poll tax is not a "qualification." It is a tax, used in such a manner that it denies the exercise of the franchise to millions of people. A qualification "is a constructive attribute which is related to the fitness or capacity of a person to vote." A State may determine that certain minimum requirements are necessary before a person is capable of casting his vote in a responsible manner consistent with the interests and dignity of the democratic process. Thus a qualification that a person must reach a certain age before he may vote is related to mature judgment. Educational qualifications are related to an understanding of issues and the intelligent choice of candidates. Residence qualifications are related to familiarity to the community, its residents are its problems. But the payment or nonpayment of a poll tax bears no such relation to a man's capacity to exercise the franchise or any other function of government. It is not even a property qualification in the sense that we understand the meaning of that term. The poll-tax statutes do not say that a person must own a certain amount of property before he may vote. They say merely that a tax must be paid as a prerequisite to the right of franchise. Therefore, it is not even related to the outworn idea that a property holder is better qualified to vote because he has a greater interest in government. Therefore, the poll tax is neither an attribute of fitness or in any way indicative of a person's status. One person may pay another's tax and, in fact, often does. A political machine may, and in fact often does, pay many persons' poll taxes. It cannot be said that one person's graciousness, opportunism, or criminal intent in the payment of another's poll tax can in any way establish that other person's fitness, capacity, or qualification to cast a ballot. It is clear, therefore, that the poll tax is not a "qualification."

The Breedlove case itself, above cited, is authority for the contention that the poll tax is not a "qualification," but a tax. In that case, Mr. Justice Butler said:

"Payment as a prerequisite is not required for the purpose of denying or abridging the privilege of voting. It does not limit the tax to electors; aliens are not there permitted to vote, but the tax is laid upon them if within the defined class. It is not laid upon persons 60 or more years old, whether electors or not. Exaction of payment before registration undoubtedly serves to aid collection, from electors desiring to vote, but that use of the status powers is not prevented by the Federal Constitution" (*Breedlove* v. *Suttles*, 302 U. S. 272)."

But a "qualification" is enacted by the State for the purpose of "denying or abridging the privilege of voting." Such an abridgment is enacted by the State under the authority delegated by section 2 of article 1 of the Federal Constitution which is the only provision in the Constitution under which the States derive such authority. Since in Justice Butler's own words in the Breedlove case the poll tax "is not required for the purpose of denying or abridging the privilege of voting" but "a familiar form of taxation," and since the right to vote in Federal elections is a "Federal function," arising from the Constitution, it is clear that Congress may legislate to protect a constitutional right and to outlaw a corrupt practice in the use of the Federal franchise. It must be remem-

bered that the Constitution gives Congress the express power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof."

Another reference to the above quotation from Justice Butler's opinion in the Breedlove case confirms the view that the Court understood the poll tax to be a tax and not a qualification The Justice says:

"Exaction of payment before registration undoubtedly serves to aid collection from electors desiring to vote."

This can mean only that citizens are first defined as electors by satisfying all the "qualifications" determined by the State and then are subject to the payment of a tax before they are permitted to vote.

During the hearings, questions were raised with regard to the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments. Congressman MURDOCK inquired whether the fact that Congress felt it necessary to amend the Constitution in order to destroy the effect of State laws which denied Negroes and women the right to vote did not indicate that the States "have the ultimate say-so as to what the abridgment shall be."

The answer is clear. The States "have the say as to what the abridgment shall be" if "abridgment" means "qualifications" under section 2 of article I of the Constitution. At the time the fifteenth amendment was passed and for hundreds of years before as a result of slavery, etc., a substantial section of the population believed that only white persons had the ability and intelligence necessary to participate in the function of government. In other words, the State laws at that time made it a qualification that one had to be a white person to be an elector. The original Constitution impliedly took this fact for granted by the manner in which it allowed the States representation in Congress on the basis of "free" population. So that the enfranchisement of the Negro people was accomplished by amendment to the Constitution in order to dispel once and for all the idea that race was a qualification for being an elector.

The same kind of historical factor determined that woman suffrage should be enacted by amendment to the Constitution. For centuries it had been the universal belief that only men had the ability to govern. It is clear, then, that the State laws made the male sex a qualification for being an elector. The nineteenth amendment was, therefore, a great democratic advance which was meant to demonstrate that sex was no longer considered a qualification for the right to vote. It is significant in this connection that the stanchest proponents of woman suffrage correctly took the position that only to change a qualification would the Constitution have to be amended. They maintained that sex was not a qualification and that, therefore, woman suffrage could be enacted by congressional legislation.

The point is that Negro suffrage and woman suffrage were achieved through the process of constitutional amendment in order to fundamentally change what had been recognized in law as a qualification. As has been pointed out in this memorandum, the poll tax is in no sense a qualification and, therefore, does not come within the kind of abridgment referred to by Congressman MURDOCK.

SUMMARY

1. The right to vote for Federal officers is a Federal right derived from the Constitution, specifically sections 2 and 4 of article I thereof.

2. The poll tax is not a qualification for voting and therefore does not fall within the rights granted to the States under section 2 of article I of the Constitution.

3. Congress has the right to pass legislation to protect a constitutional right and to prevent corrupt practices in the use of the Federal franchise.

The purpose of this memorandum has been to prove the constitutionality of the anti-poll tax bill (H. R. 1024), but another interesting question presents itself, namely: How far should Congress or a congressional committee go in refusing to pass proposed legislation solely on the ground of constitutionality.

It is clear, of course, that Congress should not pass a bill which on its face is patently unconstitutional. But when the constitutional questions involved are complex or novel, or when they are subject to various interpretations, then Congress ought to legislate on the basis of social necessity, leaving to the courts the question of constitutionality. Especially is this true when the proposed legislation seeks to remedy an urgent situation affecting a substantial section of our population.

This is not a novel theory It was succinctly stated by the President in a letter dated July 5, 1935, addressed to Congressman Samuel B. Hill, chairman of a subcommittee considering the Guffey bituminous-coal bill. Writing in favor of the proposed legislation, the President said:

"Admitting that mining coal, considered separately and apart from its distribution in the flow of interstate commerce, is an interstate transaction, the constitutionality of the provisions based on the commerce clause of the Constitution depends upon the final conclusion as to whether production conditions directly effect, promote, or obstruct interstate commerce in the commodity. Manifestly, no one is in a position to give assurance that the proposed act will withstand constitutional tests, for the simple fact that you can get not 10 but 1,000 different legal opinions on the subject. But the situation is so urgent and the benefits of the legislation so evident that all doubts should be resolved in favor of the bill, leaving to the courts, in an orderly fashion, the ultimate questions of constitutionality. A decision by the Supreme Court relative to this measure would be helpful as indicating with increasing clarity the constitutional limits within which this Government must operate—I hope your committee will not permit doubts as to constitutionality, however reasonable, to block the suggested legislation."

These principles expressed by the President are merely applicable to the anti-poll-tax bill (H. R. 1024). The majority of the subcommittee has indicated its belief that the poll tax is being used as an undemocratic method of disfranchising millions of our citizens. The passage of the anti-poll-tax bill (H. R. 1024) would greatly strengthen the democratic process and restore faith in democratic institutions to the millions of Americans for whom this has never yet been "a government of the people." No legal niceties should stand in the way of this historically necessary task.

Feasibility of Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

RESOLUTION OF THE PORT OF DETROIT COMMISSION

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I am taking the liberty of inserting a resolution adopted by the Port of Detroit Commission, at its regular meeting on Monday, May 12, 1941, urging the enactment of legislation enabling the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project:

Whereas the industrial area within the port of Detroit district is a large and important producer of export merchandise and products vital to the defense of our Nation; and

Whereas this district is a part of the Great Lakes region, which produces more agricultural commodities and has a greater industrial production than any other section of the country; and

Whereas this section of the country is now deprived of economical water transportation to the Atlantic coast by insufficient depth of water and rapids in the St. Lawrence River; and

Whereas the development of a waterway in the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River capable of passing the preponderance of ocean-going vessels would tend to stimulate and expand industrial activity in the Great Lakes region near the source of many of the bulky raw materials necessary to those industries; and

Whereas new industries vital to the defense of our Nation, notably naval shipbuilding, could be developed at points less accessible to an enmy (being more than 1,500 miles inland from our coast) if such an outlet were provided; and

Whereas engineering and economic surveys conducted by the Federal Government have approved the feasibility of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and

Whereas not only the Great Lakes region but the entire United States would be benefited by the project: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Port of Detroit Commission, That it does formally and respectfully request the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation enabling the completing of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and be it further

Resolved, That a formally attested copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Senators and Congressmen who represent the State of Michigan in our national Congress.

I Am An American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 20 (legislative day of Monday, May 19), 1941

ADDRESS BY HON. DAVID I. WALSH, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I delivered to recently naturalized citizens at Boston and Brockton, Mass., on Sunday, May 18, 1941. The subject of the speech was I Am An American Day.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Democracy is a very much misused word. A democracy is one of the forms of government under which people live. The best

definition that can be given of the democracy that we live under here in America is "a government of the people, for the people, and by the people." Another definition: Democracy is that form of government where the people, through the exercise of the voting franchise, govern themselves and determine for themselves their own way of life. Our form of democracy is one of our priceless heritages. However, there is something more important than the machinery or form of government. The political principles and ideals, the rights and liberties enjoyed by the citizens of a State, is the supreme test of the beneficent character of a government. Political ideals and principles vary widely. In some so-called democracies there is often only a shadow of the rights we enjoy in our American democracy. Indeed, there is very little, if any, difference between some democracies and the so-called totalitarian states. Dictatorships have and can exist under the name of democracy.

What we prize and boast of most in these United States is what we call Americanism—the American way of life. Americanism embraces the principles—civil, religious, and political—under which we live. To appreciate why we are proud to call ourselves American citizens we should understand what we mean by the term "Americanism."

It is not our material welfare that makes us proud of being Americans. The lofty principles underlying the American way of living were known, understood, and developed long before we achieved our present progress and our rivaled leadership in material greatness. Americanism represents much more than material achievement. Willingly throughout the years men and women have suffered and died, have endured the unspeakable hardships and sacrifices of war, not merely in defense of our material progress, but, above everything else, to preserve the political principles which to them represent the liberality and security of the fundamental institutions which the founders of the Republic established. Definitely and inspiringly did the founders express their noble purpose in the Declaration of Independence and again in the Constitution's preamble. I quote, "In order to form a more perfect union, establish justice * * * and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

"Establish justice." This, with the recognition of the inalienable rights with which God endowed man, is the beginning and end of Americanism. Equalities of rights and opportunities, unmolested pursuit of happiness, free speech, free assembly, freedom of worshiping God according to the dictates of conscience, security of property, and human rights are the basic foundations upon which our social and political institutions have been built, and now you new citizens have been given the precious right by your vote to participate in the affairs of our Government and help shape its destiny by preserving this heritage. It is the spiritual forces that inspired these principles and the application of them to our everyday life that makes us proud of being an American.

It is these exalted principles—justice, equality, and individual freedom—that alone can solve our future civic, social, and economic problems. In a word, these principles and these ideals constitute the soul and spirit of America, and they must be preserved if America is to survive. If we lose the spirit of the founders, we lose all, both material greatness and that which makes it worth having, and our priceless heritage will be gone.

It is the absence of these American political principles that explains the discontent of the masses in every part of the world in their natural aspiration to have a reasonable chance in life.

In desperation and perplexity the average man has been swept into the adoption of one or another of the dangerous isms of the day. We are not actually free from these movements. We have avoided up to this time the turmoil and catastrophes, poverty, and misery, of the present inferno in Europe and solved our complex economic and social problems by remaining aloof from the political systems of Europe and by the application of the principles of the founders to "establish justice" and to preserve the God-given inalienable rights that distinguish free men from slaves.

You new Americans now belong to the soul of America. You have within you the basis of great service to our beloved country. The history of the past shows that your predecessors have been loyal and have never failed in any crisis to serve and to sacrifice even life for the preservation of our traditions, our self-government, and our freedom.

Merely because some of you recently naturalized citizens were born in foreign lands where you and your children ate the bread of poverty and toiled for masters whose faces you never saw, and who robbed you of your just recompense for your toil; because you lived under an industrial or political system that treated you as mere tools, sapping your lifeblood, strength, and vitality for the enrichment of your masters; because some of you were illiterate, due to no fault of your own but to a system of government which suppressed education, realizing that knowledge would expose the unjust system and lead to a demand from the enlightened for a fair share of the resources of the world; because you lived under the flags of governments that were in reality, for you and your children, the black flags of materialism and tyranny, America does not deny you all the privileges and opportunities of the same citizenship that other Americans enjoy who, forsooth, happened to be born in America one or more days after their immigrant mothers arrived here.

Bear in mind, however, that naturalization certificates on reaching the age of 21 do not make you Americans. The test of American citizenship is not how quickly an alien can get into the courts to be naturalized or become of legal age but whether he possesses the American spirit. You are not a full-fledged American unless you have learned American ideals; unless there is instilled in your breast a hatred of tyranny and oppression and a love of freedom; unless you are willing to suffer, sacrifice, and die, if necessary, for the preservation of our free institutions which, with God's help, will continue to give to you and your children the largest and widest opportunities that any political institution in the world has ever secured for mankind.

You are not a real American if you entertain any prejudice against any other American, if you think of your fellow Americans in terms of race, creed, or conditions of servitude, and let me say to the so-called American natives that they are unworthy of their heritage as Americans if they think of Americans who were once aliens in terms of caste or class rather than as human beings with hearts and souls created by the same God that created them. When an unholy and inhuman prejudice, racial, religious, or social can prevail in a democracy, it possesses the sting of death.

What are the complaints some Americans make against the American citizen who a few years ago was an immigrant to these shores? Is it because he has not been industrious? No; no group knows the reality of the biblical injunction, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread" better than they. Is it because he has not been law-abiding? No; statistics overwhelmingly show how rash, unkind, and unjust it is to indict a group of people by statistics that may tend to sow more crime in one group than another. As a matter of fact, statistics show a few years ago that cities and States where the good old Anglo-Saxon American stock is at its purest have a worse record for the crime of murder than our large cities teeming with large populations of immigrants.

Is it because he is a slacker? In the World War the percentage of aliens exempted or deferred of the total number registered was 33. The percentage of Americans exempted or deferred of the number registered was 64.

Has he been lacking in thrift? The answer is found in the huge accounts in American banks recording the savings of the immigrants and the millions of acres of soil tilled by his strength and the homes of happiness and sanctity he has established.

But some complain that the immigrants have not always been sympathetic; that they have not learned our language; that they have not improved their social condition—but is this the immigrant's fault? Who are responsible, they or we? Has not the immigrant been obliged to go where we put him or rather where the captains of industry have put him? Have they not been obliged to cluster largely around a limited number of industries in industrial centers, forming themselves into colonies not easily penetrated by American influence, often being without funds to travel any great distance, they were obliged to enter the mines and mills nearest the place of their arrival. We have made many of their women, as well as their men, slaves of our industrial system, our greed. We have sent them and their children into the factories, sweatshops, down into the mines, into the depths of the earth, and on the docks and our wharves—wherever there has been lowly and fatiguing work.

To the immigrant we always gave the lowest place, socially and industrially. Why condemn him for remaining where we put him or envy him because he and his children have risen to higher circumstances in life. Has it not been toil, hard, steady, and constant toil rather than American ideals that we have offered the immigrant above anything else, and is not his industrial master often his only teacher of Americanism?

We have much with which to blame ourselves for our failure to make the immigrant understand and appreciate the term Americanism. Well we know we have done this, and we have done it regardless of the immigrant's social condition; regardless of Americanism; regardless of their souls; regardless of their spiritual welfare.

My elder fellow Americans, let us not forget that the races which have come to America have brought with them rich values, keen sense of good workmanship, tireless industry, a sane and intelligent outlook upon life, family solidarity, simplicity of living, and in general, a depth of spirituality. Let us think of this fine contribution and think less of his poverty, his lack of culture, his aloofness from social and political customs, his strange language. Look into the immigrant's heart and we will find therein the qualities and the inspiration that will make him an American—none more appreciative or more willing to sacrifice for their adopted land.

Of course, there are exceptions. There are undesirable men and women, worthless representatives of every race who have found their way here, but justice demands we should not indict all our immigrants because of the poor specimens and unworthy groups that have from time to time come to the centers of American life. Here, too, we have been neglectful in our failure to eradicate them and send them back to the tyrannical governments from which they fled.

In conclusion, let me say that Americanism constitutes, in my opinion, neither the language a person speaks, nor the clothes that he wears, nor the wealth that he possesses, nor the education he acquires. Americanism is of the soul in which exalted political ideals and truths should abide, all embraced in three words—equality, justice, and freedom. A soul, whether American born or alien, incapable of absorbing and living the political

precepts decreed at the birth of this Nation can never be an American.

You citizens who came to America as immigrants have it within your power to bring to America a new life, clean and cheerful and sweet, that will help to check the decay of ease and wealth; you can bring a realization to all of us of the horrors of war and poverty and servitude, the value of peace and justice, and a new value of the liberties and economic opportunities so long denied you in foreign lands. You may help to diminish the evils attendant upon material greatness and prosperity by making us stop permitting the ease and luxury of the day to develop into a spirit of complacency and snobbism. You may help to make us have a better appreciation of our free institutions when we think of the courage you had to fly from your oppressors in other lands and make stupendous sacrifices to escape the intolerable servitude that opened before you and your children in the land of your birth.

You may even make us comprehend the uselessness of trying to dictate to other peoples and other governments how they shall govern themselves and what shall be their moral standards; the folly of America trying to settle their century-old rivalries, jealousies, and wars; the devastating results that may come to us if we attempt to settle the balance-of-power ambitions of foreign countries, all of which led to the denial to you and your children of the blessings of freedom and committed through the years your kin to poverty and destitution.

You may even make us understand the dangers to America from the abandonment of the religious spirit of the founders and the drift toward irreligion in America.

Citizens, be loyal to America. Accept your responsibilities as an American citizen cheerfully. Combat unceasingly those unfriendly influences in our midst which seek the ruin of our institutions. Beware of foreign intrigue, even when it emanates from the land of your birth. Let not unpatriotic teaching in academic places, nor intellectual anarchists deceive you. Do not lose faith in the bravery and the spirit of sacrifice of Americans to protect our institutions, without dependency on any other nation for our safety and security. Above all, eliminate from your lives those dangerous agitators whose treasonable propaganda would crucify our free institutions. Let your love for America be constant, strong, and true. Teach your children to love America.

Finally, let us ask God to bless America and keep it true to the lofty ideals of its founders. Without the guidance and support of the God of Nations all the vast edifice of might, power, and prosperity of which we boast would crumble to naught. May your efforts and mine under His guidance make secure the enduring principles of Americanism.

St. Lawrence Waterway Project

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the 1-minute speech of the distinguished and able gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. I counted at least 12 errors in the remarks he made in that brief period of time. If he had had more time he would have put all the errors, all the fallacies, and all the propaganda that is being carried on against the St. Lawrence seaway into his speech in the Well of the House.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. One of which was that since the T. V. A. project was started, the consumption of coal in that area is about three or four times what it was before.

Mr. PITTENGER. Yes. He is wrong about coal, and he is wrong about everything else.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. No. I want to tell the gentleman something first.

Mr. RICH. I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. PITTENGER. All right.

Mr. RICH. When this administration puts the Government into all kinds of business and we become communistic like Russia, is that the kind of a country the gentleman wants this country to be? I do not want that.

Mr. PITTENGER. No. The St. Lawrence seaway project has no more to do with that proposition than the North Pole has to do with being located in the vicinity of the South Pole.

Mr. Speaker, suggestions that we are building a seaway for Canada are frequently made by people not familiar with the project. They like to drag this red herring across the trail in order to confuse the issues. The Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River have already been improved, partly by the Canadian authorities and partly by the United States, so that we now have already a 14-foot seaway. The new proposed project simply plans to deepen some channels and build some locks, so that when it is completed there will be a 27-foot seaway. This will make it possible for ocean-going boats to travel the St. Lawrence River and enter Lake Ontario, Lake Erie, Lake Huron, Lake Michigan, and Lake Superior. All of these lakes border on New York State, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. It is fallacious to argue that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project is a Canadian proposition. A look at the map proves the point.

Propaganda is now being spread to the effect that the coal miners in various sections of the country will be adversely affected by the new 27-foot channel. As a matter of fact, there is more and more demand for coal as time goes by. The demand is limited only by the high cost of transportation, which at the present time, and even with the St. Lawrence seaway project completed, makes it impossible for some localities to use coal as a fuel, or for the purpose of generating electric power. The completion of the St. Lawrence seaway will in no way change the situation. Figures are available which will show that the St. Lawrence seaway project will increase coal consumption and actually be for the benefit of the coal miners.

Those who are interested in facts in connection with this controversy should read a series of reports issued by the United States Department of Commerce. These reports, entitled "The St. Lawrence Survey," are prepared under the direction of Mr. N. R. Danielian, the director, in charge of this work. I commended to the attention of every Member of Congress these valuable documents, which will show what great economic benefits may be expected from a 27-foot channel instead of the 14-foot channel which now exists.

These documents will answer many objections which the opponents of the seaway are advancing at this time.

As I indicated some time ago on the floor of the House, a story has been circulated to the effect that the St. Lawrence River is frozen over most of the year, and that it would be impossible to generate electric power under the proposed project. One of my colleagues was greatly disturbed. He asked me about this propaganda. I wrote to the authorities in Canada and found out that the rumor was absolutely false. At some other time I shall discuss the power aspects of this project. Those interested in the report of the Canadian authorities will find the letter reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A1996. It is a most informative letter in connection with the study of the power angle of this proposition.

Porcupine Mountain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN BOLLES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

RADIO ADDRESS BY MRS. EDWARD LA BUDDE, OF MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, having unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I submit herein an address by Mrs. Edward La Budde, of Milwaukee, Wis., concerning Porcupine Mountain and the preservation of that remarkable area as proposed in H. R. 3793 and S. 1131. Mrs. La Budde in a radio address this month said, in part:

Unless the American people gird themselves for action, a great tragedy will overtake the last remaining virgin hardwood hemlock forests in the United States. They are situated mainly in the western part of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan and along the northern boundary of Wisconsin. The most beautiful and inaccessible area of greatest interest to nature lovers lies on the south shore of Lake Superior, within the confines of the Ottawa National Forest, and is

known as the Porcupine Mountains, so named by the Indians because of its resemblance to a crouching porcupine. This region is beautiful beyond description. Mr. Ben East, in the January issue of the American Forests magazine, has this to say: "The Porcupine country today is as it was in the beginning—an untouched roadless wilderness. And it has more than trees. It has beauty to take your breath away. Lonely lakes lie hidden in the deep-walled valleys, lakes that do not know the dip of a paddle blade from one year's end to another. Brawling mountain rivers, wild, dark, and rock-shattered, go roaring down to Lake Superior through steep-walled gorges, rocking over ledges in countless mist-hung waterfalls."

The Chippewa Indians inhabited this region for hundreds of years, and the first French explorers arrived at St. Marys River 2 years before the Pilgrims landed. Champlain and his associates were the first white men who saw the Chippewas, and they took back to Quebec the first account of Lake Superior. From then on we see an endless procession of famous explorers and missionaries, including Father Marquette. La Pointe on Madeline Island just across the big arm of Lake Superior, was the seat of the French Government in the West during these early days. In 1763 Great Britain took over this territory, and during this period the Hudson Bay Co. established a trading post on the island at the mouth of the Presque Isle River, which is one of the most beautiful scenic spots in the Porcupines. The water foams and swirls over tables, shelves, and steps of red sandstone. As one makes his way along the edge of the present outlet, the lovely hillsides disclose themselves wooded with virgin forests. Just above the point where the old and the new mouth of the river join, the larger and more beautiful falls can be seen, roaring and awe-inspiring, dashing over cascades of sandstone. The main falls are on the right, but more picturesque are the tiny falls on the left. For 3 miles up the river there is nothing to be seen but one continuous rapid cascade of falls; the beautiful forests march down to the water's edge, and no matter how hot the day may be, the canyon always contains a cool rush of air, filled with the delightful fragrance of pine.

This region is full of legends about copper and there are many old and famous mines in the Porcupine Mountains, whose history is lost in antiquity.

Adjacent to the Porcupine Mountain section on the east lies the broad flat valley of the Ontonagon River. Before the coming of the white man this valley was covered with the most beautiful and majestic white-pine forests in the world. This country had been ceded to the white man by various treaties with the Chippewa Indians and was carried as part of the public domain until 1778. About that year most of this section was given by the Government in the form of land grants, to canal and railroad companies as a means of encouraging transportation facilities. In 1880 the harvesting of the big trees began. Only the soundest cleanest pines were taken out of the woods; the smaller trees were left to burn up in the forest fires which were an annual affair. Some times thousands of acres burned at one time, and so in 10 or 15 years the entire area of beautiful forests was obliterated.

Turning back from these denuded plains we come again to the slopes and foothills of the Porcupine Mountains. The beauty of the sugar-maple groves, crowning the tops and slopes of the mountains, can hardly be visualized by anyone who has never visited this section of Michigan. One needs no greater lesson in conservation than to go from the denuded plains of the Ontonagon up to the fresh open park-like forests of the Porcupines with their beautiful lakes and streams, still covered with virgin growth. The ground is smooth underfoot and free from underbrush, while a great variety of flowers spring up where you tread, filling the air with perfume. It is unthinkable that these beautiful forests should be slaughtered and go the way of the pines. City people longing for fresh open spaces, tired of hard pavements, rushing traffic, and smoke-filled skies, can here fill their lungs with the clear cold air of Lake Superior, and find rest and peace beneath the tall pines, lofty maples, and oaks, in dimmed forest aisles. "To those who have eyes to see and ears to hear, it is a universe in which is being enacted the sublime drama of creation, a realm of ever-changing beauty, a stimulus to creative thought and effort." From the top of these mountains one can look forth upon the broad expanse of beautiful Lake Superior and if one is a poet at heart one can again see the Indians in their birchbark canoes, hear the voyagers sing their songs of the long ago as they paddled along these rocky shores, or one can walk along the mossy banks of the Big Carp River and see the wily trout attempting to leap the waterfalls to go ever higher to spawn—flashing their rainbow colors in the sunlight. But alas, all this exquisite beauty may be but a beautiful memory in a few years. Lumbering operations around the edges are gnawing deeper and deeper into the Porcupines. Unless the forests can be purchased from private owners very soon, it will be but a matter of a few years before this earthly paradise will be just another cut-over area.

The sad story of the white pine in the same State, "which were to last the world forever," is but a shameful record now of the white man's wasteful logging methods in his greed for money. Perhaps we will do better by the Porcupine Mountains—we can, if enough people become interested and are willing to do something about it. There are two bills now in Congress, H. R. 3793 and S. 1131, which, if enacted into law, will put the 165,000-acre Porcupine area and 200,000-acre virgin hardwoods, in northern Wisconsin, under State and Federal control. This means that good selective logging management will be practiced. It will not only protect the economic security of many thousands of people dependent upon the forests for a living but local governments as well. At the the same time 25,000 acres of the most beautiful and inaccessible area will be set aside as a wilderness sanctuary. America needs such sanctuaries for relaxation f. r study and for the pioneering type of recreation. The United States Forest Service, as well as the various States, have provided lavishly for the ordinary types of recreation which appeal to the vast majority of our people—picnicking, motoring, camping, and similar activities—but the primeval beauty of the Porcupines, which has by a miracle escaped the march of civilization, should be guarded jealously and left undisturbed for all time to come. Future generations will bless us for saving something of the forest primeval which will give our descendants a glimpse of what America looked like before the coming of the white man. Someone has said that "the measure of the citizen of today is his interest in the citizens of tomorrow." Conservationists, lovers of the out of doors, and clubwomen, the north woods are calling to you to save them. Unless the two bills, H. R. 3793 and S. 1131, will be enacted into law, these last remaining forest tracts will be gone in less than 5 years, due to the armament program now in progress and the heavy demands on the Nation's timber. Are you willing to make an effort and help save the Porcupines and the last hardwood stands in Wisconsin? Then organize for action.

Union Now—The Latest Subversive Activity in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we find in the United States today a surprisingly large number of Americans who are sounding cymbals, ringing bells, and tooting horns in a movement called Union Now, meaning a union of the United States with Great Britain.

This is a strange sort of development, this Union Now business. It has only been a little over 160 years since our forefathers—and the forefathers of some of these people who are lending their names to this movement—were spilling their blood at Concord and Bunker Hill and were suffering hunger and privation and cold at Valley Forge in order to bust up a union with the very Empire that these people now want us to reassociate ourselves with.

The incident which has aroused my desire to discuss this question was occasioned when there came to my desk last week an invitation to attend a luncheon in Washington for the purpose of promoting this Union Now movement. This luncheon was held Monday at the Willard Hotel, the day after the Nation had celebrated I Am An American Day.

A circular accompanying my invitation to attend this luncheon described Union Now as "a nonprofit membership association for Union Now of the United States of America and the six British democracies as a nucleus of a world government—of, by, and for the people." The circular further contained many questions and answers relative to the movement, some of which I shall discuss a little later on.

The information accompanying the invitation listed perhaps 25 names prominent in the Social Register of Washington as the luncheon committee. Mr. Clarence Streit, chairman and promoter of the Union Now movement, which also uses the name "Federal Union," was the main speaker of the occasion. The pamphlet further stated that a chapter of Federal Union—and I think it ought to be called Federal Union Now—has been organized in Washington under the name of Washington Association for Union Now, with headquarters located at 726 Jackson Place NW.

It is a curious fact, Mr. Speaker, that in looking over the list of names of individuals who have permitted their names to be used in connection with this promotion for the subjugation of the United States of America by Great Britain I find several who have been rather vociferous and emphatic, not to say bitter, in their denunciation of another or-

ganization called America First Committee. I am sure all Members of Congress know the aims and purposes of the America First Committee. It is, I think, about the kind of a committee that men like George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln would join if they were on earth today. Nevertheless, among some of the sponsors and patrons of this Union Now movement there are several who have taken it upon themselves to carry on a very active campaign of hostility against the America First movement.

Now, as I have said before on the floor of this House, I am one Member of Congress who, along with millions of other Americans, does not want union now with Great Britain or any other foreign country. I do not want it now. I do not want it at any other time. I am definitely and emphatically opposed to any Anglo-American alliance. I do not hesitate to say that I believe this movement for union now is, in effect, as subversive to our form of government and to the continued independence of the United States of America—and when I say independence I mean political and economic both—as is communism, fascism, or any other "fifth column" or Trojan horse activity. Mark you now, I have all the respect in the world for the Dominion of Canada. I do not harbor a single thought of enmity for any dominion or any colony of the British Empire. I simply do not believe the United States of America ought to be inveigled into any union now with any foreign country. Strictly speaking, when I say foreign country, I mean any country outside of the Western Hemisphere, but if somebody wants to create a lot of trouble for the United States, let them start proposing in some of the countries to the south of us just such a Union Now movement between those countries and the United States as is proposed between the British Empire and the United States and see what happens. Within 24 hours the whole southern section of the Western Hemisphere would be ringing with warnings that Uncle Sam had suddenly gone imperialistic.

I do not know—and it may not be of great moment here—how many of these socialites who are permitting their names to be used in connection with this promotion may feel that they could in this way repay obligations for having been lavishly entertained at the British Embassy. I did not check up to see how many of them or their offspring were permitted to curtsy to King George and Queen Elizabeth when those very likeable monarchs visited our National Capital. I am certain, however, that we all ought to regard these people in exactly the same category as we do those who are engaged in the promotion of communism, fascism, and of Communist and Fascist front organizations which have been publicly condemned by committees investigating un-American activities.

Clarence Streit, who, I assume, has found himself a well-paying position in this movement, should be regarded in exactly the same light as any other subversive gentleman who wants to destroy the independence of the United States of America. Now, it may be that Mr. Streit will be surprised or angry, or even hurt, that I should say this, but I cannot find any difference in principle and in objective between those who want to hook up this Nation in a union with Stalin's communistic Russia and those who would hook up and shackle it with the burdens of fighting and paying for all these European wars henceforth through Union Now with the British Empire. I cannot help but think that a man as smart as Clarence Streit might have found himself a vastly better, and certainly a vastly more American, activity by which to make a living.

It is not clear from the arguments made by these misguided Americans as to whether we are to be graciously given dominion status or whether England will merely grant us colonial status in the British Empire. But there are a good many millions of red-blooded Americans who believe that we do not need to throw overboard the advice of George Washington, and Thomas Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln, and most of the Presidents in between and entangle ourselves in foreign alliances, thereby letting ourselves in to fight and pay for all the wars of Europe henceforth. These several millions of Americans—by far the overwhelming majority of them—do not want any colonial status in the British Empire for their country; they do not want any dominion status in the British Empire for the United States of America; they do not want any political, commercial, or industrial union with Britain or any other foreign country, except the countries of the Western Hemisphere; they do not even want Britain to become a satellite of the United States of America.

Under this Union Now with Great Britain, I understand we will let down all of our tariff walls and institute a policy of free trade between the United States of America and the dominions and colonies of the British Empire. What will the American farmer say to that? What will the American manufacturer have to say about that? What will the American wage earners, whose wages are three, four, and five times the wages paid in the British dominions and colonies, have to say to such a proposal? All of these grave and, in my opinion, insurmountable economic obstacles to such a Union Now have been glossed over by spokesmen of the movement, who naturally desire that no one scrutinize too closely the economic impediments in the way of their cherished dream again to subjugate the United States of America to the rule of Great Britain.

Mr. Speaker, does anybody on this floor doubt for a moment that if we enter into a Union Now arrangement with Great Britain that we will have to submit to her dictation and domination? Anyone who believes that just does not know Englishmen.

Let me make my position clear. My sympathies are with those free governments in the world whose people are reaching ever outward and upward for the form of government, and the kind of life, that we call the American Government and the American way of life. I shall not undertake to explain, because even the most ardent of the proponents of Union Now and the most vociferous of the jingoes who want to go into this war right now, do not attempt to explain how we can carry the four freedoms into Cuba, into India, into the interior of China, into old Persia, into Russia, and into a lot of countries to the south of us within the limits of the Western Hemisphere. It is just futile and grotesque to talk, as these people do, of a plan to unite all democracies in a federal union. That is their purpose.

I pause here to ask Mr. Clarence Streit and his fellow associates in this Union Now movement, if India is included in the six British democracies? The first definition in Mr. Streit's very cleverly written circular says:

> What is meant by "Federal Union"? A union of democracies on the same general plan as the union of the 48 States.

In the second definition, this circular says:

> What is meant by a democracy? A government or state in which the authority to govern is derived from the consent of those governed and in which the rights of men, as defined in our Bill of Rights, are guaranteed and protected by the government.

Now, I am moved in a spirit of helpfulness to the Union Now movement to insert at this point just two paragraphs, I and IV, from the Bill of Rights as it appears in the Constitution of the United States:

Amendment I reads:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Amendment IV reads:

> The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons and things to be seized.

We find, Mr. Speaker, that free speech is one of the first tenets of the Bill of Rights. Do these folks intend to take free speech to the people of India? If they do, I fear we will have to fight England ourselves. The next thing in the Bill of Rights is freedom of the press. Do they intend to take freedom of the press to India? And so on, down the line. Now, I ask, what single provision in the Bill of Rights exists in India or in any other colony under British rule? What single tenet of the Bill of Rights exists in the dictatorship in Cuba? In the dictatorships in the countries to the south of us? Free speech? Free press? Some of the Indians, or some of the Cubans, or some of those poor folks in some of the so-called democracies to the south of us should try free speech and free press for just about a week and see what happens. Those great democracies would forthwith adopt Mr. Stalin's method of democracy in which free speechers

and free pressers are promptly liquidated.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken occasion to look up the promoter of Union Now, Mr. Streit. He has had a colorful, and in some spots a significant, career. Who's Who had him born in California, while the Washington Merry-Go-Round, in an article published May 17, had him born in Missouri. He is listed in Who's Who as a newspaperman and author. He holds degrees from the Montana State University—and this is one of the significant points in his career, I think—was a Rhodes scholar at Oxford University in Britain in 1920 and 1921. He married a French girl and is the father of four children. He has been foreign correspondent for the Philadelphia Public Ledger and New York Times, and was a League of Nations correspondent from 1929 to 1939. In that year he was with the Washington Bureau of the League of Nations. This, too, is a significant point in this gentleman's career. It is evident that his sympathies have been pro-British, to the exclusion, I fear, of that deep-seated devotion to the objects and purposes of the founding fathers which we expect most of our young men to have. Mr. Streit served in the Engineering Corps of the A. E. F. in 1917, and he was in the Intelligence Service in 1918. He was attached to the American peace delegation in 1918 and 1919. He is a member of the Academy of Political Science and the author of four books.

I do not take this occasion to excoriate or even castigate Clarence Streit. He is merely an incident—and I strongly suspect merely a tool—in a vast propaganda that is operating in this country, which I believe had its inception and is directed from across the seas. I have not the faintest doubt that if Great Britain can get Union Now with us, and can persuade us to help fight and pay for all her wars, and to pay the cost of her post-war rehabilitation, that Great Britain would welcome this Union Now arrangement.

It seems to me that these people who are promoting this Union Now movement ought to give a little thought to the men and women and children in the United States of America. It is, of course, perfectly absurd to take seriously the statement made by the President that he wants to carry the "four freedoms" to everybody "everywhere in the world." We have not achieved those four freedoms in the United States as yet. It seems to me that if we are going to be the Sir Galahad of the world, we ought to begin in our own bailiwick. How can we expect all the other peoples everywhere in the world to have much faith in our ability to provide them with the "four freedoms" if we cannot provide ourselves with them?

We have facing this Nation at this hour economic problems growing out of the first World War which were not settled when we were led into this hysterical plunge into this second war. Those problems are being aggravated day by day. The national debt is going beyond all human comprehension. We are racing down the road to national bankruptcy and inflation and economic chaos just as fast as we can go. Every member of this body who will give sincere and serious thought to the subject knows that those problems are going to loom up and menace the welfare, and even the very liberty and security of this Nation, more than any shadowy armies of any overseas dictators.

I am going now to ask Mr. Streit and his sponsors how we can solve the American farm problems by Union Now with the British Empire. Just how can we hope to continue to raise our living levels in this Nation by Union Now with the British Empire? There is a former British monarch now living in official obscurity in Nassau who is there largely because he wanted Union Now with an American woman and because he dared to speak out his horror over the dreadful condition of the laboring people in Britain. Is that the kind of Union Now we want for the American workingman?

I would like to ask Mr. Streit and his associates how we can hope to reduce our national debt by Union Now with Britain and by undertaking to assume a partnership in the problems which face the British Empire.

I should like to ask Mr. Streit and his associates if their Union Now proposal means that we are to identify ourselves with that nation under a labor socialism which Mr. Ernest Bevin, the British labor economist, and others, say will be the kind of a government Britain will have after this war is over.

I should like to ask Mr. Streit if the people of Great Britain will join the people of the United States in the celebration of the Fourth of July, which has been our custom for the past 150 years, or whether they will expect us to forego this celebration.

Yes; there are a multitude of questions that must be asked and answered about this thing. There are a multitude of questions that Mr. Streit and his fellow Anglophiles must answer for the American people. There are a multitude of questions which the members of this Congress, as the representatives of the people, through whom the American people articulate, and only through whom the American people can be articulate, ought to ask about this movement.

I, as one Member of Congress, should very much like to know who is financing Union Now. We are bundling for Britain. We are leasing, lending, and giving away; and I am convinced, and I believe my colleagues are convinced, that lease and lend have really become synonymous with give under the $7,000,000,000 aid-to-Britain bill. Yes; we are doing all of those things. Could it be that part of our own money is being used to propagandize this Nation into subjugation to the British Empire? Could it be that while we bundle for Britain, and our workers toil to make munitions and supplies for Britain, and while all of our people sweat and work to pay the taxes which must be levied against them to partially meet the cost of those supplies, that British money is being used to finance this propaganda for Union Now?

If this discussion were not running so long, I should like to quote a few of the warnings from Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln because, as usual, I find that these Union Now folks, like all propagandists, take a couple of lines from Lincoln quotations, carefully leaving out all of his emphatic warnings against just the sort of thing Mr. Streit and his cohorts are proposing.

I note in this Union Now circular that under question and answer No. 29, they say:

> Who is financing this and other propaganda for Federal Union?
>
> Thousands of American citizens whose names are on record at the State Department. No contributions have been accepted from non-Americans. We do not know nor care what the racial, religious, or partisan background of any contributor may be; the movement is neither Protestant nor Catholic, Christian nor Jewish. No international banker has a finger in it. It is a movement by, of, and for the common people.

"No international banker has a finger in it," the circular states. That is curious. I notice among the advisers, in fact, one of the members of the national committee is the wife of Thomas W. Lamont. "No international banker has a finger in it." No, that must not be the Thomas W. Lamont I am thinking of. It must be the wife of some other Thomas W. Lamont. The Thomas W. Lamont I am thinking of is a partner in the House of Morgan. I had understood at divers times that the House of Morgan was classed among the international bankers. Perhaps when an international banker joins Union Now he is no longer an international banker, he is just a Union Now banker.

If I had time, I should very much like to take the complete list of committee members, advisers, sponsors, and check up their interlocking relationships. It may not be known to the more guileless of American citizens, and even to guileless Members of this Congress, if there be such, that international banking connections are not worn on the sleeve like chevrons. They are carefully tied into interlocking directorates which resemble a very indirect spider web. If Mr. Streit seriously expects the American people to believe that no international banker has contributed in any way, form, or fashion to this propaganda for Union Now he ought to delete from question and answer No. 29 the statement that—

> We do not know or care what the racial, religious, or partisan background of any contributor may be.

Are we to assume that Mr. Streit merely looks them up from the standpoint of whether or not they are American citizens? Are we further to understand that everybody who contributes is thus investigated? I am moved to remark, "Bosh."

Now, before I close, there is one other statement in this questionnaire, question and answer No. 29, that I want to direct to the attention of the American people—the common people of America. The statement reads:

> It [Federal Union Now] is a movement of, by, and for the common people.

That, I fairly assume, means the poor folks—the farmers out in Iowa; the folks who live down below the railroad tracks; the people who earn their bread by the sweat of their brow. These would include that now famous "one-third ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed." Now,

in this movement we find, as members of the national committee, members of the council and advisers, and sponsors, besides Mrs. Thomas W. Lamont, the names of Mrs. Robert S. Brookings; Henry I. Harriman; Mrs. Ira Nelson Morris, of the famous packing clan; Admiral W. H. Stanley; Maj. G. V. Strong; Mrs. Frank A. Vanderlip; Rear Admiral H. E. Yarnell; Stringfellow Barr, president of St. Johns College; P. F. French, partner of the wealthy Price, Waterhouse Co.; George V. Cutten, president of Colgate University; and many others.

Now, Mr. Speaker, understand I have not a thing in the world against millionaires or bankers or college presidents or inheritors of great wealth or the associates of the Blue Book families; I am just trying to keep the record straight. I fail to find here in this list of committeemen and advisers and sponsors and contributors any of those from the ranks of the ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed, or those who earn their bread by manual labor.

This may be a movement of, by, and for the common people I, for one, hesitate to say that the people who seem to be moving it are at all common, and I am moved at this moment to exclaim, "O Abraham Lincoln, what strange movements use thy slogan, 'Of, for, and by the people.'"

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be understood as challenging the integrity or the earnestness or the sincerity of any of these people who are engaged in this Union Now movement. However, I certainly question their good judgment. I certainly doubt their Americanism. I certainly believe that, mistakenly or otherwise, innocently or by design—and I suspect there is a great mixture of both—these people are engaged in trying to enmesh the free United States of America in the troubles and the wars of Europe and the Orient. I want to raise my voice in this warning to the American people. Whenever we begin to take on the troubles of Europe and the Orient, we are taking on a cargo of troubles which will make any problems we now have seem like a game of checkers.

I want to warn the American people that if we go into any such alliance as this with "all the democracies of the world," including India, we will get to do the fighting and we will have to do the paying. If this Union Now crowd, or any other crowd like it, are successful in inveigling Uncle Sam in getting into the European war or the far-eastern mess with his men and his money, Uncle Sam will some time, sadder and wiser, come back home across the sea with nothing but his chin whiskers and a barrel.

For Heaven's sake, let us stay at home and solve our own problems. We hear all this talk about democracy. I should like to see it tried in the United States of America a little while just to see if it will work. We hear about carrying the "four freedoms" to people "everywhere in the world." I should like to see those "four freedoms" realized in the United States of America.

Let us face this situation realistically. Let us be on our guard against this sort of propaganda which inevitably springs up in a time such as we are now living in. Without any disrespect for these people at all who are engaged in this Union Now movement, let me warn the people, Mr. Speaker, we had better beware of the Union Now-ers and begin to devote the most serious attention and the most capable statesmanship which we can develop to solving those problems which stare us in the face here at home. If we do not do so, and do so soon, economic chaos will reduce this Nation to a state where neither Britain nor any other country will want union with us now or any other time.

Against Convoys, 92 Percent; Against Sending Our Troops Abroad, 95 Percent—A Revealing Poll of Public Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1941

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the Indianapolis News is one of the great newspapers of the United States. In respect to the international situation this journal has been eminently fair and has given equal space in its columns to the interventionists and noninterventionists to present their arguments. The News has a very large circulation not only in the city of Indianapolis but throughout the State of Indiana and the Midwest.

Recently the News decided to conduct a little enterprise of its own to ascertain the real state of the public mind in regard to convoys and our entering the war and sending our troops to fight overseas.

On its first page the News printed a ballot submitting to the people the following questions:

1. Do you favor convoying by the United States of ships carrying war supplies to Great Britain?
2. Do you favor the United States entering the war and sending of our troops abroad?

After each question a space was provided for the answer.

The replies came in by the thousands, and in this way there was obtained a true poll of public sentiment, as distinguished from some other polls, and one much-publicized national poll in particular, which is obviously geared to the interventionist program.

The tabulation of the replies showed 92 percent of those who responded were against convoys and 95 percent were against the United States entering the war and sending our troops abroad.

In announcing the result of the poll, the News said:

Readers of The News who expressed their views on two questions pertaining to the war situation through a straw ballot printed in Saturday's editions of this newspaper showed a preponderance of opposition to convoys and to the United States entering the war.

The results of the balloting, compiled today, showed that of the thousands who participated, 92 percent were against the convoying of ships carrying war supplies to Great Britain, while 8 percent were in favor of convoying.

In answering the second question in the ballot, "Do you favor the United States entering the war and the sending of our troops abroad?" 95 percent of those participating voted in the negative and 5 percent voted in the affirmative.

The replies came from a cross-section of central Indiana, including Indianapolis and surrounding cities, towns, and suburban areas.

The ballot was carried by The News at the suggestion of readers who had been interested in a discussion that had been carried on in parallel columns of The News by the Indiana Committee for National Defense and the America First Committee. Neither of the committees had anything to do with the printing of the ballot.

This sampling of public opinion in a typical American city and a typical American State may be regarded, I think, as indicative of a vast majority sentiment throughout the country against the use of convoys and against another American expeditionary force. This poll, according to my way of thinking, is an event of the deepest significance. War-promoting Government officials and other headstrong interventionists should ponder its meaning a long time before they commit America to a policy which from 92 to 95 percent of the people disapprove.

I only regret that the News did not include in its referendum one more question, namely, "Do you favor adequate national defense?"

I am sure the combined answer to this question would have been 100 percent in the affirmative. Our Indiana people, if I judge them right, are in favor of building up our national defense to the highest perfection, so that no aggressor nation or combination of aggressor nations would ever dare to attack us, but they are firm and unalterable in their conviction that we should keep our American boys out of Europe's bloody wars and steer clear of foreign entanglements. They believe that if America enters the war as just one more belligerent, it not only will place our democracy in jeopardy but it will forfeit its opportunity to be of service to humanity in the reconstruction of the world that will come out of the ashes of the present conflict.

Borglum's Works in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1941

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by

the House, I place in the RECORD a very interesting review of Gutzon Borglum's works in Washington written by Louis Varnum Woulfe. It appeared in his column The Post Impressionist, in the Washington Post this morning, May 19, 1941:

[From the Washington Post of May 19, 1941]

THE POST IMPRESSIONIST—GUTZON BORGLUM

Gutzon Borglum, better known for his sculpturing on Stone Mountain, Ga., and Mount Rushmore, S. Dak., has vanished from the life scene. Yet in different places works of his genius live—in bronze and marble. Despite his nomadic nature, he managed to pause in one locality or another long enough to leave the imprint of his artistic genius—somewhat like the gypsies of song, who scatter flowers wherever their caravans have rested. No matter what the inheritance of other localities may be, the Nation's Capital possesses eight of his creations.

Suppose we also become nomadic and, in this area, become acquainted with Borglum in bronze and marble. Let's make it a foot-trip, at least part of the way, for in Washington's fine spring weather there is both an invitation and an urge to get out in the open for a stroll. Since the course of empire wends its westward way, let's make a western goal stop No. 1.

Walking, we find ourselves initially at Twenty-third Street and Massachusetts Avenue, Sheridan Circle, now fenced in temporarily. Borglum fused into this equestrian statue a symbolism of the great cavalry leader during his famous ride down the Shenandoah Valley on October 19, 1864. When meeting his retiring forces, he exclaimed, "Turn, boys, turn; we're going back." Perhaps we brought with us an American history and have time to refresh our memories about this inspiring, courageous episode in national progress.

If, however, we are to take in all the scheduled points before day's end, we must hasten to Potomac Parkway, at the foot of Twenty-sixth Street.

Somewhat back from the highway, in keeping with his personal wishes for retreat from society, is a bronze figure of a man who, in life, made name and fame as a stump and platform speaker. Sated with this personal trait is the statue the sculptor brought into being, William Jennings Bryan, orator. While Bryan is mute today, these granite-inscribed words are graphic in reiteration: "You shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns; you shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold."

Advancing to the Pan American Building, Seventeenth Street and Constitution Avenue, "North America," emblazoned in gold, fascinates the eye in contrast with the white marble surroundings. A figure of a woman is above the legend, bearing a torch representative of enlightenment and a higher social order, while in her arms she protectively holds a child. This is a Borglum creation in marble.

FOUR PIECES IN THE CAPITOL

Time has crept apace and unwillingly steps are sacrificed. We'll now board the magic carpet for a flight to the Capitol. Here we find on view four of Borglum's works of art—two in bronze and two in marble. In Statuary Hall we catch sight of a seated figure in marble of Alexander H. Stephens, lawyer, Vice President of the Confederacy, Governor of Georgia, statesman, author, patriot. If in a philosophic mood, you will want to absorb these lines: "I am afraid of nothing on the earth, above the earth, beneath the earth, except to do wrong."

Beside it, as if the designer thought to let all beholders choose between two types of reproductions, is a standing bronze figure of Zebulon B. Vance, lawyer, legislator, colonel in the Confederate Army, Member of Congress, United States Senator, and Governor of North Carolina. Of this work, it is said, Borglum felt it was a piece of art that he considered his best characterization.

Forward of these two figures is that of Gen. John C. Greenway, in bronze, a noted mining engineer and distinguished soldier in the War with Spain and the World War. In the rotunda of the Capitol our inquisitive eyes observe a gigantic head of Lincoln—also a work of Borglum's, and a gift to Congress from a New York connoisseur of art.

BORGLUM'S OWN CHOICE

Once again we board the magic carpet and, zooming through the air, arrive at Rock Creek Cemetery, the silent city in the Nation's Capital. We pause to gaze at the memorial to Charles Mather Pfoulke, a one-time collector of and authority on tapestries. It is situated in a semicircular enclosure built of rough-hewn granite, with a bronze tablet on its outer side. Within is a draped figure of bronze standing beside an open tomb, inscribed, "Rabboni," meaning "Master."

In a lecture given a few years ago Gorglum acknowledged that he felt this beautiful piece of sculpture was his masterpiece. This life-size reproduction symbolizes Mary Magdalene as she greeted the Great Galilean. The sculptor has accurately preserved in the womanish face what might have been the delight and exaltation of that supreme moment in her life.

Now the stern, patriotic command of General Sheridan to his panic-stricken soldiers is an inspiring recollection; the stirring words of the Commoner are nearly lost in the echo; the appealing face of Mary Magdalene lingers as a sermon in forgiveness. The shades of evening fade out the charms of daylight. Sights once visible are lost by the shift. In such a serene atmosphere one pauses to meditate that a sculptor, by his interpretive art, bequeaths in passing from the mortal scene an enduring heritage to posterity.

LOUIS VARNUM WOULFE.

Lindbergh Charges People Were Misled on War Issue in 1940 Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 20 (legislative day of Monday, May 19), 1941

ADDRESS BY CHARLES A. LINDBERGH AT MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Charles A. Lindbergh in Minneapolis on Sunday, May 11, at 10:30 p. m.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One generation ago my father was speaking on platforms in Minnesota against American intervention in a European war. He believed that this country had a destiny of its own—a destiny that should be kept independent of foreign intrigue and free from foreign wars. He believed that the future of America lay more in the farms of the Mississippi Valley than on battlefields across the sea; more in the welfare of our factory workmen than in the balance of power in Europe.

RECALLS HYSTERIA

But the propaganda of war had spread through our country. Speakers from England addressed our meetings. Idealists called on us to fight. Hysteria, hatred, and intolerance arose. Even college presidents and their faculties joined in the cry.

When my father charged political and financial interests with leading us to war, his meetings were broken up, his patriotism was questioned, and the plates of his book were destroyed by Government agents.

The story from here on is well known. We entered a war that was going to make the world safe for democracy and end all need for war in the future. We sent 2,000,000 troops overseas, turned the tide of battle, and helped the Allies to victory. After that, we left the future of the world in the hands of our college presidents and our idealists.

TELLS OF CONSEQUENCES

You know as well as I how they proceeded to outlaw war and make the world safe for democracy. The greatest wars and the bloodiest revolutions of all history have taken place under their guidance.

From the Russian revolution to the Spanish; from the first World War to the second; from the Fourteen Points of Wilson to the four freedoms of Roosevelt the idealists have held sway. We formed the League of Nations; we demobilized our armies; we sank our battleships; we made practice of nonaggression. But the kind of democracy we fought for in the last war doesn't exist today, even in our own country.

Except for England, we have incurred the antagonism of every major military power in both Europe and Asia. And all this has been done in the name of democracy, peace, and civilization. As a matter of fact, the idealists themselves seem to be about all we fought for in the last war that remain intact.

WANT WAR AGAIN

Now they want us to go to war again, to save the world by means of some new idea. Speakers from England are touring our country today, as they did a generation ago. Our college presidents are shouting for war just as they did before. If only we send our armies abroad once more, they tell us, if only enough people in Europe can be starved and killed, we will be able to spread peace and democracy and our way of life over the entire earth.

People who have been pacifists all their lives are now saying that peace must be brought by war. Ministers are preaching that Christianity must be spread by famine. Our Government asks us to preserve democracy abroad by creating a dictatorship in our own country. And all this in the name of idealism.

But there are many people in the Nation who have ideals of another kind. There are many of us who believe that the place to save democracy is right here in America. We do not accept the claim that Christianity will thrive on famine, or that our way of life can be spread around the world by force. We believe that it is possible for a man or nation to be self-reliant, to be practical, to be successful, even to be tolerant, and still have ideals of the highest type.

ATTACKS PROPAGANDA

We in America have learned something since the last war. We know more about propaganda. We have heard of the secret treaties of Europe. We have watched Eng-

land and France wrangle through an entire generation until a new war came tumbling down upon their shoulders.

The question is whether we have learned enough to withstand the barrage of propaganda to which we have been subjected ever since this war began; and whether, if we can withstand that barrage, we will be able to impose our will upon the Government in Washington.

There was once a time in America when we could impose our will by vote. Candidates brought political issues before us and stated clearly their stand. After an election was over responsibility to the voters remained. That was what we once called a principle of democracy. Many of us thought we were still operating under that principle at the elections last November.

MISLED IN ELECTION

Both political parties had adopted platforms against intervention in this war. Both political candidates spoke constantly of peace. Many a sincere Democrat and Republican voted with full confidence that his man, if elected, would keep our country out of war. But it now seems doubtful that we even had two parties last November, at least as far as the Presidential candidates were concerned.

The people of this Nation were not given the chance to vote on the greatest issue of our generation—the issue of foreign war. And yet we are now told that we must go to Europe to fight for the very principles of democracy that were denied to us in our own Nation last November.

We have been asked to fight abroad for the "four freedoms." But there are other freedoms that our President did not mention. One is the freedom to vote on vital issues. Another is freedom of information—the right of a free people to know where they are being led by their Government.

MISLED ON DEVELOPMENTS

I doubt that any country in Europe has been less informed about the intentions of its government than we have been here in America. I doubt that any country there has been more misled about the actual developments of the war. For years the true facts about Europe have been hidden from us. Any attempt to tell them met with the utmost criticism and opposition.

When I stated in 1938, after a careful study, that the German air force was stronger than any combination that could be brought against it, I was charged with being both wrong and pro-Nazi. When I said in 1939 that this war could not be won simply by sending a few thousand airplanes and cannon to Europe, I was accused of being misguided and un-American.

When I told you in 1940 that the phrase "steps short of war" was nothing but a mask of war itself, I was called a "fifth columnist" and a Hitler agent. When I tell you today that we are not in a position to win this war for England, I am charged with being disloyal by the same politicians and idealists who denied all the other statements when I made them. But they cannot point to a single one that has not turned out to be true.

DENIES FAVORING REICH

The charges undoubtedly will continue in the future, and I do not know how much longer free speech will be allowed in this country. But as long as our laws permit it, I intend to continue telling you what I believe.

I have never wanted Germany to win this war. But I know that England is not in a position to win it, even with our help. That is why I have constantly advocated a negotiated peace. The idea that the entire continent of Europe can be blockaded into submission is ridiculous.

Short of an internal collapse, of which there is no sign today, the only way Germany could be defeated is by an invasion. Even if an invasion were possible, which I do not believe, the resulting devastation would be so great that Europe could not recover for generations, if it could recover at all.

TELLS INVASION DIFFICULTIES

The developments of this war have shown clearly how difficult it is to force a landing or to supply an expeditionary force on a hostile coast. If we intend to invade Europe against the opposition of the same army and air force that broke the Maginot Line and routed the British forces in Norway, Flanders, and Greece, then the United States must become a regimented and military Nation that surpasses Germany herself in totalitarian efficiency.

In that case we might as well realize that our way of life is a thing of the past, and that our children will be fortunate if they live long enough to see it again.

The conditions which exist in Germany today will seem moderate in comparison to those which will result from a prolongation of this war.

REPEATS FATHER'S WORDS

Men and women of Minnesota, I say to you today what my father said a quarter century ago. The future of democracy depends on our ability to govern our own country. It rests in the character of our own people, in the welfare of our farmers, and our workmen. What happens in Europe and Asia is of secondary importance to what is happening to us here in our own land.

It is far more essential for this country to have farms without mortgages, workmen with their own homes, and young people who can afford families than it is for us to crusade abroad for freedoms that are tottering in our own country.

In the stand he took a generation ago, my father was thinking of more than war alone. He was opposing a great change in our national policy, the same change Washington opposed in his Farewell Address—the merging of our destiny with that of Europe.

WAR IS NO SOLUTION

My father knew that one war would lead to another, and that a second would lead to a third. He knew that by entering war we would not solve the problems that were arising, either in our own country or abroad. In this, history has proven that he was right.

Now, you and I, in a new generation, are faced with this choice again. We have seen the result of one European war in which our country took part. Are we to enter a second at this time? Is the destiny of America to be forever merged with that of Europe? Are we to take the policing of the entire world upon our shoulders? Must our children fight again when the next European war takes place?

The answer to these questions depends upon the action that you and I, and millions like us, are ready to take. In every section of the United States men and women are assembling, as we have assembled tonight.

If we have the stamina and the courage to speak forth, if we are willing to organize and work, if we have enough character and faith to justify an independent existence for this Nation, American soldiers will not be sent to fight again in these intra-European wars.

APPEALS TO AUDIENCE

The America First Committee has been formed to give voice to the people in this country who are opposed to intervention. It is a nonpolitical organization open to any patriotic citizen of the United States.

Our principles are open and clear. We believe that the security of this country depends upon our own character and strength. We believe that the best way to defend our Nation is to keep our armies on our own soil. We stand for an independent American destiny.

If you stand with us, we ask you to join this committee. We ask you to help us by organizing meetings, by talking to your friends, and by writing to your Representatives in Washington. The crisis is here. We need your assistance now. The entire future of America depends on the action we take at this time.

A Disgraceful Blitz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1941

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, while "blitzkrieg" is an alien word, it seems to represent a form of rush tactics that is not unknown in America.

Now and for weeks past a heavy "blitz" has been going on in this country with the White House as the object of attack.

Because the President, as befits one in his position of grave responsibility, is soberly and seriously considering what is best for the country, and because he does not get us into war immediately the columnists, who have taken upon themselves the direction of the affairs of the Nation and the world, have lost patience with him. They are "blitzing" him in an effort to force him to lead America into the war by the convoy route.

The chorus of attacks on the President by the columnists, and the war promoters who speak through the columnists, is a major disgrace that would not be tolerated in any other country in the world. The fact that we have free speech in America does not change the despicable nature of these performances. As an old newspaperman who has some regard, I hope, for the proprieties, I am made sick at the stomach when I read the daily outgivings of the columnists and note their very obvious efforts to blitz the President. Knowing him as I do I do not think he is going to be bossed or bulldozed by anybody.

I think it is proper to remind these offensive columnists and their inciters of the promises made by Mr. Roosevelt during the campaign last year, his final word being delivered at Boston on October 30 when he said:

> And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again, and again, your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

Speaking in New York, on October 26, 1939, President Roosevelt said:

> In and out of Congress we have heard orators and commentators and others beating their breasts and proclaiming against sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That, I do not hesitate to label as one of the worst fakes in current history. It is a deliberate setting up of an imaginary bogeyman. The simple truth is that no person in any responsible place in the national administration in Washington, or in any State government, or in any city government, or in any county government, has ever suggested in any shape, manner, or form the remotest possibility of

sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That is why I label that argument a shameless and dishonest fake.

President Roosevelt, addressing the teamsters' union on September 11, 1940, said:

I hate war now more than ever. I have one supreme determination—to do all that I can to keep war away from these shores for all time. I stand, with my party, and outside of my party as President of all the people, on the platform, the wording that was adopted in Chicago less than 2 months ago. It said: "We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack."

Speaking at Philadelphia, October 23, 1940, Mr. Roosevelt said:

We are arming ourselves not for any purposes of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes. I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party: "We will not participate in foreign wars and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack."

Speaking at Boston Garden on October 30, 1940, Mr. Roosevelt said:

Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars. They are going into training to form a force so strong that, by its very existence, it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores. The purpose of our defense is defense.

In a fireside chat on December 29, 1940, President Roosevelt said:

There is no demand for sending an American expeditionary force outside our own borders. There is no intention by any member of our Government to send such a force. You can, therefore, nail any talk about sending armies to Europe as deliberate untruth.

A recent poll of Indiana sentiment taken by the Indianapolis News shows that 92 percent of the people are opposed to the convoys, which they believe would be certain to drag us into the war immediately. Our people prefer the wise assurances expressed by the President in his campaign speeches to the war madness of the columnists.